

## CHAPTER 2

### SLOVENE *konj*

#### 2.1 INTRODUCTION

In the paradigm of the Slovenian word *konj* there is a most interesting alternation between different *o*-sounds. The stem-vowel is short in the nom.sg. *kònj* and long in all other cases. We find one of the two closed *o*-sounds which go back to early Slovenian long vowels in the loc.sg. *kônju* and the other in the gen.pl. *kónj*, in the inst.pl. *kónji* (*kônji*), and in the loc.pl. *kónjih* (*kônjih*). All other cases (except the nom.sg.) show an open *ó*, which goes back to the late retraction of the ictus from a following short vowel. The pitch is falling in the loc.sg. and optionally in the inst.pl. and loc.pl., while other long vowels are rising. Since there was only a single *o* in Slavic at the time when the new timbre distinctions had just arisen, the whole complicated pattern of alternations must be relatively recent. In this chapter I shall discuss how it came about.

#### 2.2 ICTUS

Since the open stem-vowel which we find in most case forms is due to the recent retraction of the stress from a short vowel, we must assume that these forms were end-stressed in early Slovene, whereas the closed vowel in the loc.sg., gen.pl., inst.pl. and loc.pl. was stressed. This situation is confirmed by the Čakavian dialect of Omišalj (Krk), where we find nom.sg. *stô*, gen.sg. *stolà*, dat.sg. *stolù*, nom.pl. *stoli*, gen.pl. *stòli*, dat.pl. *stolòm*, inst.pl. *stòli*, loc.pl. *stòlih* (Milčetić 1895:16). The final stress in the gen.sg. and dat.sg. cannot go back to the Balto-Slavic period because it would have been retracted in accordance with Ebeling's law. Thus, it must have arisen as a result of Dybo's law.

I assume that in Slavic, in contradistinction to Baltic, the rise of distinctive pitch is independent of the loss of the IE laryngeals. Somewhere between Meillet's law and the rise of the new timbre distinctions the stressed vowels in barytone forms of mobile paradigms

received a falling intonation and thereby became different from all other stressed vowels, e.g. \**vòdā*, \**nā vodā*, \**ròNkā*, \**lòmjā*, cf. Ebeling 1967:585f. I assume that the other stressed vowels became rising, e.g. \**žēnā*, \**trávā*, \**nòsjā*, \**xvájjā*, \**nesēno*, \**lomīšì*, Ru. *ženú*, *travú*, *nošú*, *xvaljú*, *nesenó*, SCr. *lòmīš*. In a later period, after the rise of the new timbre distinctions, rising vowels lost the ictus, if possible, to the following syllable, e.g. \**ženò*, \**nošò*, \**nosīšb*, \**nesenò*, cf. Ebeling 1967:590. This is Dybo's law. Thus, the final stress in Čak. (Omišalj) *stolà*, *stolù* points to an earlier \**stòla*, \**stòlu*, with fixed stress on the stem. The same accentuation must be assumed for Slovene *konj*.

After Dybo's law, the ictus was retracted from a long circumflexed vowel in a final syllable, cf. Ru. *nósiš'*, SCr. *nòsiš*. This is Stang's law. I do not assume that final jers had already been lost in this period, but they must have been very weak and did not count as syllables any longer, cf. the status of French word-final *a* during the past centuries. In the paradigm under discussion the stress was regularly retracted in the inst.pl. and the loc.pl.: Čak. (Omišalj) *stòli*, *stòlih* goes back to \**stolŷ*, \**stolĕxǝ*, which is the reflex of Balto-Slavic \**stólōiS*, \**stóloiSu*. The same must be assumed for the loc.sg.: Slovene *kònju* < \**koŋū* < \**kònjū*.

### 2.3 QUANTITY

The most complicated characteristic of the paradigm is the quantitative difference between the nom.sg. *kònj* and the gen.pl. *kònj*. If the length is due to the retraction of the ictus from the final jer, it remains unclear why the vowel has been shortened in the nom.sg. Indeed, if the nom.sg. and the gen.pl. were homonymous at the time when Dybo's law operated, it is hard to see how the difference developed unless we assume that one of the two forms borrowed its quantity from another type. This cannot have been the nom.sg. because there was no model, cf. Slovene *bòg*, SCr. *bòg*, with a long vowel in the nom.sg. of mobile paradigms.

However, it is questionable whether the endings of the nom.sg. and the gen.pl. were in fact homonymous. Some scholars (e.g., Van Wijk, Pedersen) maintain that the long vowel in the gen.pl. is due to the reduction of the IE ending \**-ōm* to \**-ǝ*. I would rather agree with Meillet that the ending must be derived from IE \**-om*. First of all there is a chronological difficulty. If there has ever been an

ending *\*-ōm* on Slavic territory, it must have been shortened in the Balto-Slavic period, whereas the lengthening in the gen.pl. can hardly have been prior to the rise of the new timbre distinctions in Slavic. But there is no evidence for *\*-ōm* in Baltic either, since this ending would regularly have developed into *\*-ō*, cf. Lith. *akmuō*, Gr. *ákmōn*. Thus, I assume that both Lith. *-u* and OChSl. *-ъ* regularly continue IE *\*-om* and that Slavic length is secondary.

Ebeling assumes (1967:588) that stressed *\*-ъ* in the gen.pl. was lengthened after the rise of the new timbre distinctions and that the new length was subsequently extended to barytone gen.pl. forms. I fail to see the motivation for this change. Moreover, I find it hard to accept that lengthened *-ъ* was lost in the same way as short *-ъ*. The modern SCr. ending *-ā* cannot go back to a long *-ъ* which dates from this period because of the rising accent in *kosácā*, *ovácā*, where Stang's law would have caused retraction of the ictus. The SCr. ending *-ā* must have arisen shortly after Stang's law, cf. *sestārā*.

I conclude that there is no reason to assume a difference between the endings of the nom.sg. and the gen.pl. in the original form *\*kōnjъ* and that, consequently, the length in Slovene *kōnj* was introduced analogically after the originally mobile paradigm, cf. Slovene *gór* < *\*gorъ*. It should be noted that length cannot have been analogical in the latter paradigm because there was no model. The retraction of the ictus from a final jer must have preceded Dybo's law because otherwise we would expect a long vowel in the nom.sg. *kōnj*, SCr. *kōnj*. Thus, I assume that final jers lost their stressability in a period between the rise of the new timbre distinctions and Dybo's law, and that the ictus was retracted to the preceding stressable vowel, which became long and rising, e.g. gen.pl. Ru. *golóv*, *volós*, Čak. (Novi) *brád*, *nebés*, Slovene *mōž*, dial. *dán*, Posavian *dān* (Ivšić 1913:214) < *\*dōnъ*, loc.pl. Czech *mužích*, Slovene *možéh*, dat.pl. Czech *mužům*, cf. also Čak. *dá*, *želi*, *želé*, *sú*. Apparently, the ictus could not be retracted to a preceding jer in non-initial syllable, so that we have Ru. *détjam*, *détjax*, *ljúdjam*, *ljúdjax* < *\*dětъmъ* etc. This accentuation must be old because it is also found in Slovincian and Ukrainian. Moreover, old *i*-stems often show barytone dat.pl. and loc.pl. forms in Old Russian, e.g. *góstem*, *góstex*, cf. Stang 1957:89. These forms probably received falling pitch after the other barytone forms of the paradigm, cf. Slovene *kostēm*, which points to an earlier *\*kōstъmъ*. Indeed, I think that the source of the accentuation in Slovene *možēm* must be sought in the *u*-stems, cf. *gorām*, where there was no such

influence. The rising pitch in *možéh*, *kostéh* pertained originally to the *o*-stems, as did the ending itself. I suppose that in the period of the retraction pretonic jers were weak in non-initial syllables. Stressed jers in medial syllables can only have lost their stressability after Dybo's law, e.g. Ru. *golóvka*, *rúčka*, Czech *hlávka*, *roučka*, Polish *glówka*, *raczka* < \**rǫčьka* < \**rǫčьka*. Besides, pretonic jers in medial syllables did not lose their stressability before \**i*, where the oppositions /*ь* ~ *i*/, /*ь* ~ *y*/ were neutralized, e.g. Ru. *detěj* < \**dętĭjь*.

The length in the gen.pl. of mobile paradigms was analogically extended to the paradigms to which Dybo's law applied, e.g. Slovene gen.pl. *kónj*, *pás* (Posavian *pās*, cf. Ivšič 1913:213) versus nom.sg. *kònj*, *pàs*. This generalization of quantity must have taken place partly before and partly after the operation of Stang's law. Thus, we find Čak. (Novi) *svétāc*, *kòsāc*, *òtāc*, with retraction from a long vowel in accordance with Stang's law, next to *kosāc*, *otāc*, *ovāc*, where the vowel was lengthened later. The Slovenian gen.pl. *òvāc*, *lònāc* must be due to analogy after the inst.pl. *lònci* and the loc.pl. *lòncih*. The SCr. gen.pl. *lòpātā*, *kòljēnā* from *lòpata*, *kòljeno* present a problem. These words belong either with *pròzor*, gen.pl. *pròzōrā* to the type where Dybo's law applied, or with *jèzik*, gen.pl. *jèzikā* to the type with an original stressed medial syllable. The latter word can hardly have had initial stress before Dybo's law in view of the short vowel in Polish *język*, Czech *jazyk*. I assume that when the loss of the laryngeal feature yielded \**jezÿkь* < \**jezÿkь*, the paradigm conformed to \**prozòrь*, \**prozòrь*, which had arisen from \**pròzorь*, \**pròzòrь* in accordance with Dybo's law. Shortly after Stang's law the gen.pl. ending *-ь* was dialectally lengthened in mobile paradigms when it received the stress analogically after the other plural cases, e.g. Štokavian *žénā*, *póljā*, *gradóvā*, Slovene *gorā* next to *gór*, cf. Čak. *žén*, etc. This analogical development preceded the loss of word-final jers and the neo-Štokavian retraction of the ictus.

Before Dybo's law there existed a pitch opposition on short and long vowels in stressed initial syllables, apart from the laryngealized vowels, which were neutral with respect to quantity and intonation. The shift of the ictus from rising vowels to the following syllable caused the pitch opposition on short vowels to disappear in polysyllabic words. It is only natural that the pitch opposition was subsequently eliminated in monosyllables as well. It is recalled that word-final jers did not count as syllables any longer at this stage. As far as we can see, short falling vowels in monosyllabic words were lengthened

and merged with long falling vowels, e.g. SCr. *bôg*, *kôst*, *dân*, Slovene *bôg*, *kôst*, *dân*. This lengthening was probably Common Slavic in view of Ru.dial. *bog*, as opposed to *kôn*'. The distinction between these two *o*-sounds continues the old pitch opposition, not the original quantitative differences, as Vaillant suggests (1950:276). The pitch opposition on short vowels in polysyllabic words was later restored by the loss of the laryngeal feature, e.g. gen.sg. \**râka*, \**bôga*, SCr. *râka*, *bôga*, Slovene *râka*, *bogâ*.

#### 2.4 TIMBRE

As we have seen above, there is an alternation between three different long *o*-sounds in the paradigm of the word *konj*. The open *ó* goes back to the late retraction of the ictus from a short vowel, which is not carried through in all dialects. The difference between the two closed vowels is reflected in a part of the dialects only. I assume that they originated in different periods.

The timbre of the stem-vowel in the loc.sg. *kônju* is the regular reflex of the retraction according to Stang's law, cf. *môreš*, *nôsiš*, *vôlja*, *kôža* < \**možêšb*, \**nosîšb*, \**voľâ*, \**kožâ* < \**môžešb*, \**nôsîšb*, \**vôlja*, \**kôzja*. There are two remarkable things about this vowel. Firstly, it is reflected as a diphthong [uo] in Ru.dial. *môžeš'*, *nôsiš'*, *vôlja*, *kôža*, Czech *můžeš*, *vůle*, *kůže*, Slovak *môžeš*, *vôl'a*, and in the Slovenian dialects which show distinct reflexes of the two closed vowels. Secondly, it is reflected as a short vowel in SCr. *môžêš*, *nôsîš*, *vôlja*, *kôža*, Czech *nosîš*, Slovak *nosîš*, *koža*, Polish *możesz*, *nosisz*, *wola* (but *stróza* for Ru. *storóža*, Čak. *stráža*). On the basis of this comparison I assume that Stang's law yielded a Common Slavic quantitatively neutral rising diphthong \**uò* and write \**môžešb*, \**nôsîšb*, \**vôlja*, \**kôža* for the last prehistoric stage of Slavic. The diphthong was regularly shortened by the loss of its first element in Serbo-Croat and partly in Czecho-Slovak. On the other hand, the prothetic element developed into a labial fricative in Ru. *vósem'*, *vóstryj*, dial. *vôkna*. I do not think that the quantitative differences were dialectally conditioned because not only Czech and Slovak, but also Polish, Slovincian, and Kajkavian show both long and short reflexes of \**ò*.

The long vowel in Slovene *kônj*, *gôr* must go back to an earlier period because it is characteristic of the gen.pl., where the ictus was retracted in mobile paradigms before Dybo's law, cf. above.

The timbre of the stem-vowel in the inst.pl. *kònji* and the loc.pl. *kònjih* must have been borrowed from the gen.pl. because the retraction of the ictus in these cases is due to Stang's law. Indeed, we find the expected \**ô* in dial. (Borovnica) *kuôjînaš*, i.e. *kônjih* (Ramovš 1921:229). Thus, we have an alternation between \**ò* in *kònj*, which goes back to the rise of distinctive pitch, \**ó* in *kònj*, which was lengthened analogically after the retraction of the stress from a final jer in *gòr*, \**ô* in *kônju*, which arose as a result of Stang's law, and open *ó* in the cases where the ictus has recently been retracted. The early Slovenian lengthening of stressed vowels in non-final syllables yielded the same *o* as the reflex of \**ô*, e.g. *gotôviti*, *osnôva*.

## 2.5 INTONATION

As will be clear from the preceding sections, we should expect a rising stem-vowel in all case forms of Slovene *konj*. Yet we find falling pitch in the loc.sg., and optionally in the inst.pl. and the loc.pl. Phonetically, a Slovenian circumflex in polysyllabic words can only have arisen as a result of either the progressive accent shift from an initial falling vowel, which must have occurred shortly after Stang's law, or compensatory lengthening, as I intend to show in detail on another occasion. In the loc.sg. *kônju* we have to assume that the falling pitch is due to shortening of the word-final vowel.

However, it is not obvious that the final vowel should be long. The form *nôsiš* < \**nôsišb* < \**nosišb* indicates that a long circumflexed vowel was shortened when it lost the ictus in accordance with Stang's law. The final length in \**kôñū* must have been restored on the analogy of paradigms where Stang's law did not apply, e.g. (o) *brātu*, (u) *grādu* (Valjavec 1897:158) < \**brātū*, \**gradū*. Length was introduced even in the dat.sg. after a preposition, e.g. *k brātu*, *h kônju*. A similar restoration of length must have occurred optionally (or dialectally) in the inst.pl. and loc.pl. This analogical development must have preceded the shortening of posttonic vowels, which caused the lengthening of the stem-vowel in these words. The latter development preceded the general lengthening of stressed vowels in non-final syllables, which did not reach the dialects of Prekmurje and Prlekija, e.g. (Prekmurje) *dělo*, *dějla* (Ramovš 1935:184), i.e. *dělo*, *děla* < \**dělo*, \**dělā*.

The solution proposed here may also explain the twofold reflex of \**ô* in Czech and Slovak. I assume that the laryngealized vowels

had fallen together with the short rising vowels shortly before Stang's law, so that we have *\*kráva*, *\*rĕzati* in the last Common Slavic period. A short rising vowel in an open first syllable of disyllabic words was lengthened in early Czech unless the following syllable contained a long vowel, e.g. *kráva*, but gen.pl. *krav*, and *řezati*, *řeži*. Similarly, we can assume that *\*ô* fell together with *\*ó* in *můžeš* < *\*môžešb*, but with *\*ò* in *nosíš* < *\*nôsišb* after the restoration of long *i* in the second syllable, cf. *bavíš*, *budíš* < *\*bàvišb*, *\*budíšb*. This restoration could take place more easily in *i*-verbs, where all the verbs to which Stang's law did not apply had long *i*, than in *e*-verbs, where both long *e* and short *e* were found, cf. Slovak *môžeš* versus *nesieš* < *\*neséšb*. In Serbo-Croat there was no lengthening of short rising vowels, and length was restored in all unstressed short vowels that alternated with long vowels, so that we would expect what we find.