

## CHAPTER 4

# THE ADJECTIVE

### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

In the simple adjective we find the same accentuation types as in the substantive, e.g. \**ràdb*, \**stàrb*, \**čìstb*, \**sýt* with a laryngealized root vowel, \**běl*, \**gòl*, \**òstr*, \**nòv* with later oxytonesis according to Dybo's law, and \**bòsb*, \**sûxb*, \**jûnb*, \**mòldb* with old mobility, cf. Čak. (Novi) *stàra*, *čista*, *bělò*, *golò*, Slovene *junô*, *mladô*. The same types occur in suffixed forms, e.g. \**glàdbkb*, \**kýselb*, \**težžkb*, \**debèlb*, \**mêkòkb*, \**vèselb*, where the retraction of the ictus is due to Hirt's law in the first and to Pedersen's law in the last examples, cf. Slovene *glátko*, *teškò*, *mehkô*. The problem is that the distribution of the patterns has been obscured by the transition of many adjectives into other classes. Thus, the mobility in Čak. *novà*, *novo* is definitely secondary in view of the short vowel in *nòv*, which points to an old rising accent. As a result of the numerous transitions, it is hard to find exact correspondences between different languages. Now the question must be posed how this situation came about.

### 4.2 DOLOBKO'S LAW

The compound adjective results from the composition of two elements which gradually merged to form a unity. The composition goes probably back to the Balto-Slavic period in view of the close correspondence between Baltic and Slavic in this respect. The unity can hardly be so old, however. The Lithuanian forms *gėras*, *geràsis* point to the fact that the pronominal element in the compound adjective was still an enclitic particle at the time when stressed *e, a* were lengthened, i.e. shortly after the dissolution of the Letto-Lithuanian linguistic unity, but that it had developed into a regular suffix in the period when Nieminen's law operated (cf. Kortlandt 1974). In Slavic the clitic had become a suffix before the earliest loss of intervocalic \**j*, which took place before Dybo's law.

In words with mobile stress the ictus moved from the initial syllable

to the end of the word when an enclitic was added, e.g. SCr. *nòčas*, *jesènas*, *zimūs*, but *ljètōs*, *jütrōs*. This is Dolobko's law, which must be dated somewhere between the end of the Balto-Slavic linguistic unity and the loss of intervocalic \*j. Like Dybo (1962:26f.), I do not agree with Stang (1957:103) and Ebeling (1967:587) that the ictus advanced to the syllable preceding the enclitic. The above cases, like Ru. *rodiljsjá*, *rodilis'*, are inconclusive in this respect because of the lost jer. However, ORu. *postyžusjá* shows that the stress shifted to the enclitic itself, or rather to the last syllable of the compound, cf. Slovene *lahkegà*, *lahkemù*. The latter accentuation is also found in some Serbo-Croatian dialects. For the Old Russian and Middle Bulgarian evidence see Dybo 1971. Thus, the shift strengthened rather than attenuated the lateral mobility in Slavic noun inflection. This is another indication that Dolobko's law must be dated in approximately the same period as Pedersen's law. The similar accent shift in Bulgarian occurred much later and operated differently (Bulaxovskij 1921:286).

The timbre of the vowel in Ru.dial. *gôlyj*, Slovene *gôli* shows that the retraction of the stress is a result of Stang's law. Consequently, the paradigm must have had a number of long endings, which can only have arisen by contraction after the loss of intervocalic \*j. I assume that Slavic contractions go back to two different periods. Before the operation of Dybo's law, vowels in posttonic syllables were contracted after the loss of intervocalic \*j, e.g. Čak. (Novi) *pítā*, Bulg. *píta*, Polish *pyta* < \**pytâtъ* < \**pýtaetъ*. Later contractions did not affect the whole Slavic territory, e.g. Čak. *kopā*, Bulg. *kopáe*, Old Polish *kopaje* < \**kopā(j)etъ*. It is unclear to what extent the first type of contraction affected the East Slavic dialects. Adjectival forms like Ru.Ukr. *dóbrym* and the neuter nom.sg. Ukr. *dóbre* seem to indicate that the older contractions did reach East Slavic. Here Ru. *pytáet*, Ukr. *pytáje* may or may not be back-formations after Ru. *kopáet*, Ukr. *kopáje*, or the timbre of the vowels may have prevented contraction.

As a result of Dolobko's law and the early contractions, approximately the following paradigms existed in the Common Slavic period between Dybo's law and the loss of the laryngeal feature.

* <i>novŷ</i>	* <i>bosŷjb</i>	* <i>novâgo</i>	* <i>bosaegò</i>
* <i>novâ</i>	* <i>bosàja</i>	* <i>novûmu</i>	* <i>bosuemu</i>
* <i>novê</i>	* <i>bosojè</i>	* <i>novŷmъ</i>	* <i>bosŷimъ</i>

*novî	*bosli	*novŷxǫ	*bosŷixǫ
*novê	*bosyjê	*novŷmǫ	*bosŷimǫ
*novâ	*bosâja	*novŷmi	*bosŷimi

The loss of the laryngeal feature and the later contractions gave rise to an extensive interchange between these two paradigms. According to Stang's law, the ictus was retracted in the majority of forms belonging to the first paradigm, cf. Ru. *nóvyj, bosój*.

#### 4.3 THE COMPARATIVE

The stem vowel is rising in the comparative before the suffix *\*-je*, e.g. Ru. *molóže, doróže*. The long stem vowel in Old Czech *hůře, méně*, Ru.dial. *bôle* points unambiguously to a neo-acute. The most plausible explanation is that originally the comparative had fixed stress on the root so that the stem vowel received rising pitch, and that the word-final vowel was lengthened as a result of Van Wijk's law. Thus, the development of *\*gôre < \*gôrje* is wholly analogous to the development of *\*vôla < \*vôljaH*.

Stang assumes (1957:104f.) that the comparative shows proto-Slavic metatony and that the neo-acute in the words mentioned above is due to analogy. However, I fail to see the motivation for the analogy. After the loss of the laryngeal feature, the old acute vowels fell together with the short rising vowels, so that one would expect *\*ò* instead of *\*ô* if the origin of the intonation were analogical. The only argument against an original neo-acute is the short vowel in Čak. (Novi) *više, dráže, suše*. But here the short vowel can easily have been introduced after the long forms of the comparative, e.g. *mlâji*, cf. Štok. *mlâđi, mlâđost*. There is no reason to assume any real metatony at any stage in the development of Slavic.

Indeed, the possibility of *métatonie rude* is hard to accept if one agrees that the final loss of the laryngeal feature occurred as late as I have suggested. The difference between Ru. *zóloto, górod* and *pozólóta, ogoród* goes back to an original distinction between mobile stress in the simple noun and fixed stress on the prefix in the compound, with later shift in accordance with Dybo's law. In Slavic, in contradistinction to Baltic, there never was any metatony because there was no model for it.