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Let no one be surprised if, in speaking of entirely new principalities as I shall do, I adduce the highest examples both of prince and of state; because men, walking almost always in paths beaten by others, and following by imitation their deeds, are yet unable to keep entirely to the ways of others or attain to the power of those they imitate. A wise man ought always to follow the paths beaten by great men, and to imitate those who have been supreme, so that if his ability does not equal theirs, at least it will savour of it. Let him act like the clever archers who, designing to hit the mark which yet appears too far distant, and knowing the limits to which the strength of their bow attains, take aim much higher than the mark, not to reach by their strength or arrow to so great a height, but to be able with the aid of so high an aim to hit the mark they wish to reach.

— Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*
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### LIST OF SYMBOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.p. (a)</td>
<td>Proto-Slavic Accentual paradigm with fixed stress on final syllable of the stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.p. (b)</td>
<td>Proto-Slavic Accentual paradigm with fixed stress on the first syllable of the desinence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.p. (c)</td>
<td>Proto-Slavic Accentual paradigm with mobile stress pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>//</td>
<td>phonemic transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>phonetic transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{}</td>
<td>morphophonemic transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>consonant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>morpheme boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~</td>
<td>1.) alternates with, 2.) above vowel = neo-acute intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>reconstructed or non-attested form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>1.) fleeting vowel, 2.) end of phonological word or morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ь</td>
<td>back jer [u]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ъ</td>
<td>front jer [i]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>becomes historically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>comes from historically</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ABBREVIATIONS**

*Languages & Dialects*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Language/Dialect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Belarussian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Balto-Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChSl.</td>
<td>Church Slav(on)ic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Croatian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Common Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Contemporary Standard Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>Czech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC</td>
<td>Contemporary Literary Czech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čak.</td>
<td>Čakavian Serbo/Croatian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSL</td>
<td>Early Proto-Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>East Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMC</td>
<td>Germanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaj.</td>
<td>Kajkavian Serbo/Croatian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAT</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Literary Czech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG</td>
<td>Low German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPS</td>
<td>Late Proto-Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSo</td>
<td>Lower Sorbian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Macedonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCZ</td>
<td>Modern Czech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHG</td>
<td>Middle High German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>Old Church Slav(on)ic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCZ</td>
<td>Old Czech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHG</td>
<td>Old High German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Old Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSC</td>
<td>Old Serbo/Croatian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCZ</td>
<td>Proto-Czech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIE</td>
<td>Proto-Indoeuropean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plb.</td>
<td>Polabian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSL</td>
<td>Proto-Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RChSl</td>
<td>Russian Church Slav(on)ic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Serbian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/C</td>
<td>Serbo/Croatian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Slovak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLN</td>
<td>Slovenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slv.</td>
<td>Slovincian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Štok.</td>
<td>Štokavian Serbo/Croatian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukr.</td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USo</td>
<td>Upper Sorbian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Grammatical

| 1. | 1<sup>st</sup> person |
| 2. | 2<sup>nd</sup> person |
| 3. | 3<sup>rd</sup> person |
| adj. | adjective, adjectival |
| aor. | aorist |
| a.p. | accentological paradigm |
| AP | accusative plural |
| arch. | archaic |
| AS | accusative singular |
| cf. | compare |
| DP | dative plural |
| DS | dative singular |
| fem. | feminine |
| GP | genitive plural |
| GS | genitive singular |
| imp. | imperfect |
| imper. | imperative |
| infin. | infinitive |
| IP | instrumental plural |
| ipf. | imperfective |
| IS | instrumental singular |
| LP | locative plural |
| LS | locative singular |
| masc. | masculine |
| neut. | neuter |
| NP | nominative plural |
| NS | nominative singular |
| p.a.p. | past active participle |
| pf. | perfective |
| pl. | plural |
| p.p.p. | past passive participle |
| pres. | present tense |
| p.t. | past tense |
| sg. | singular |
| sup. | supine |
| voc. | vocative case |
## Major Reference Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ČJA I</td>
<td>Český jazykový atlas, vol. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ČJA II</td>
<td>Český jazykový atlas, vol. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ČJA III</td>
<td>Český jazykový atlas, vol. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSL</td>
<td>Etimologičeskij slovar’ slavjanskix jazykov.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gebauer</td>
<td>Historická mluvnice jazyka českého.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>Listy filologické.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machek</td>
<td>Etymologický slovník jazyka českého. Praha: Academia, 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSSČ</td>
<td>Příruční slovník spisovné češtiny, 1937-1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Niederle, L. Slovanské starožitnosti. (referencing the following):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oddíl I. Oddíl kulturní.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Díl I. Život starých slovanů.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Díl II. Život starých slovanů.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Díl III. Život starých slovanů.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oddíl II. Oddíl historický.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Díl I. Původ a počátky slovanského národa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Díl II. Původ a počátky slovanů jižních.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Díl III. Původ a počátky slovanů západních.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Díl IV. Původ a počátky slovanů východních.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSČ</td>
<td>Slovník spisovné češtiny, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StČS</td>
<td>Staročeský slovník. 1967-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vas.</td>
<td>Etimologičeskij slovar’ russkogo jazyka, t. 1-4 (Vasmer)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Old Czech Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AlbRáj</td>
<td>Ráj duše, a collection of Old Czech treatises attributed to Albert the Great. 2nd half of the 14th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch Č 6</td>
<td>(ed. F. Palacký, Prague 1872) Selected historical papers from 1401 to 1420.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch Č 18</td>
<td>(ed. J. Kalousek, Prague 1900) Selected historical papers from 1498 to 1502.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budyš</td>
<td>Budyšinský manuscript, containing Husite prose and verse. 1420.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChelČPost</td>
<td>Postila of Peter Chečický, Prague 1522, 282 fol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EvZimm</td>
<td>Winter readings (čtení zimnieho času), evangelical readings from the 2nd half of the 14th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HustPostH</td>
<td>Postila or Vyloženie svatých čtení nedělních. Prague Muz IV C. 18, fol. 1a-1961.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kruml</td>
<td>Krumlovský rukopis from the 1st quarter of the 15th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LegDuchM</td>
<td>Fragments of legends in verse, circa 1300. Muz 1 Ac 50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LegJidD</td>
<td>Fragments of legends in verse, circa 1300.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LegJidM</td>
<td>Fragments of legends in verse about Judas from sometime around 1306.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LegPil</td>
<td>Fragment of a legend in verse about Pilate from the beginning of the 14th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otc</td>
<td>Životy sv. Otcův, 15th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pror</td>
<td>Translation of the prophet Izaiah, Jeremiáše a Daniela from the end of the 14th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RokPostB</td>
<td>Postila, Brno, SA G 10, č. 115, fol.1a-324a, circa 1503.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SlovKlem</td>
<td>Latin-Czech dictionary, slovník Klementinský from 1455.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŠtíTvÁtA</td>
<td>Sunday and saint day sermons. Praha, UK XVIIC15, 254 fol; beginning of the 15th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TovHád</td>
<td>Ctibor Tovačovský z Cimburka (†1494), Hádání Pravdy a Lží o kněžské zboží a panování jich; 1467.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VýklKruml</td>
<td>Krumlovský výklad, latin-Czech biblical dictionary from the 1st half of the 15th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VýklŠal</td>
<td>Výklad Piesniček Šalomunových (Canticum Canticorum), 1st half of the 15th century.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abbreviations are taken from the StČS. This list includes only the most often quoted Old Czech sources. The abbreviations are identical to those used in the Staročeský slovník, úvodní statí, soupis pramenů a zkratek, Praha Academia, 1968. For more detailed descriptions of the works quoted, see Gebauer (1906, etc.).
Because of the many orthographic systems in use in the Slavic world, it is necessary to use several systems of transcription in this paper in order to accurately represent sounds and letters. When transliterating Cyrillic the following system has been used, reproduced from the *Slavic and East European Journal* with some minor changes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>В</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Г</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>(U, BR) g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ё</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>(U, BR) h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>І</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>(M) й</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Д</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Е</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Є</td>
<td>ë</td>
<td>ë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Є</td>
<td>ё</td>
<td>ё</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>І</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>І</td>
<td>ї</td>
<td>(U) ї</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Й</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>j</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>К</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>К</td>
<td>к</td>
<td>к</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Л</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ј</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>(SC, M) lj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>М</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Н</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Њ</td>
<td>ъ</td>
<td>(SC, M) nj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>О</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>П</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>С</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Т</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ђ</td>
<td>ѡ</td>
<td>(SC) ѡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>У</td>
<td>у</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>(CS) u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΟΥ</td>
<td>ou</td>
<td>(CS) u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ý</td>
<td>ý</td>
<td>(BR) w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ф</td>
<td>ф</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Х</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ц</td>
<td>ц</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ч</th>
<th>ђ</th>
<th>ё</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ь</td>
<td>Ь</td>
<td>Ь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ъ</td>
<td>ѣ</td>
<td>ѣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>П</td>
<td>п</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>У</td>
<td>ъ</td>
<td>ъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Є</td>
<td>ë</td>
<td>ë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ý</td>
<td>ý</td>
<td>ý</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ì</td>
<td>í</td>
<td>í</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Є</td>
<td>í</td>
<td>í</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ì</td>
<td>í</td>
<td>í</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Є</td>
<td>í</td>
<td>í</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Є</td>
<td>í</td>
<td>í</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>І</th>
<th>І</th>
<th>І</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>І</td>
<td>І</td>
<td>І</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Long vowels in Czech and Proto-Czech dialects will be marked by the acute accent in accordance with Czech orthography. A distinction between ů from lengthened
/*ú/ and Š\(^1\) from lengthened /*ó/, will be made throughout. Italicized forms represent spelling. When phonetic detail is called for, the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) is used between brackets denoting phonetic transcription: e.g. [bædʒ.ə] ‘badger.’ Old Czech manuscripts written before the adoption of a standard orthographic tradition present special problems of transcription that are discussed in detail in Chapter 3.

\(^1\) The circle or kroužek over the Š was intended by Jan Hus, the inventor of Czech orthography, to indicate the etymological source of long Š from /ó/ as opposed to long Š from /ú/. In general, long Š from /ó/ is preserved in word initial position. Elsewhere, long /ú/ > /uo/ > /ou/ (e.g. CLC ˈiːstɑ “mouth” vs. CLC ˈsoʊstɔ “morsel”).
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this doctoral thesis is to analyze vowel quantity in Czech synchronically and to trace its development from a comparative historical and dialectal perspective. By vowel quantity what is meant is the phonemic distinction in Czech of long versus short vowels. Vowel quantity is one of the characteristics of the Czech sound system that distinguishes it from other Slavic languages. A phonemic quantitative difference between long vowels and short vowels in Czech plays an active and important role in distinguishing between meanings of words. For example, the words {dal-Ø#} ‘he gave,’ and {dál#} ‘further,’ with a markedly long vowel, differ only with respect to the length of the vowel /a:á/, yet these two words are semantically and etymologically unrelated. Similar examples illustrate the same relationship for the other Czech vowel pairs: e.g. /e:é/ {lek-Ø#} ‘fear’: {lék-Ø#} ‘medicine’; /i:i/ {bit-Ø#} ‘apartment’: {bít-Ø#} ‘to be’; /u:ú/ {ú-tlum-Ø#} ‘drowsiness’ : {u-tlum-Ø#} imper. 2. sg. of infin. {u-tlum-it#} ‘to muffle’; /o:ó/ {bor-Ø#} ‘pine forest’ : {bór-Ø#} ‘borium.’

1 Throughout this paper the word Czech unless otherwise noted refers to the dialects spoken roughly within the boundaries of the Czech Republic and the people who speak these dialects. For a more detailed description of these dialects, see Bělíč, 1971. The Czech dialects spoken abroad (e.g. Vojvodina, Serbia; Texas, U.S.A.; Volyn, Ukraine) although interesting in their own right have not been included in this thesis because of a general lack of data for the core words and word forms under investigation.

2 In the dialects of Silesia (slezská/lašská nářečí) as well as the Czech dialects transitional with Polish (nářečí polsko-českého míšeného pruhu) the opposition between long and short vowels has been lost, although evidence of prehistoric length shows up as /u/ for /ó/ and /i/ for /ē/.

3 In Standard Czech (i.e. the literary language based on a 16th century central Bohemian dialect) /ó/ is somewhat marginal as a phoneme since it occurs only in borrowed words. In several Moravian dialects, however, as well as at an earlier stage in the dialect upon which the literary language is based, the opposition /o:/ /ó/ is phonemic.
Comparative historical refers to two distinct yet complementary methodologies: internal reconstruction and the comparative method. Internal reconstruction sensu stricto strives to understand the history of a language from data contained within the language itself, whereas the comparative method compares two or more languages that share a common ancestor. Both methods are employed here in analyzing data from the history of Czech and other Slavic languages to support hypotheses about the development of vowel quantity in Czech and the relationship of vowel quantity in Czech to the Proto-Slavic accentological system.

Comparative dialectal refers specifically to the dialect geography of the Czech Republic and what can be gleaned from the Czech dialects about the development of quantity in Czech in light of some newly available dialectal material in addition to several reliable studies compiled on individual dialects. Making use of what is known from these existing studies, together with supporting evidence from selected manuscripts dating from the 13th century, and further aided by the advances that modern historical linguistic methods have achieved in the reconstruction of Proto-Slavic, the present work will analyze the development of quantitative vocalic relationships in the Czech dialects, including the dialect upon which the literary language is based, beginning with the period just before the differentiation of Czech from Proto-Slavic and leading up to the present day. A major goal of this work is to make Czech data about quantity useful to other linguists working on Proto-Slavic accentology. For this reason, this thesis will concentrate on selected lexical items that have good Proto-Slavic pedigrees and that are

---

4 Czech manuscripts from the 9th and 10th centuries, or at least those which are copied from manuscripts this old, are not typically considered to be, in the strictest sense of the word, Czech, but rather Common Slavic (Old Church Slavonic) of a Bohemian rescension. From the 10th to the early 13th century, most of the documents that originated in the Czech lands were written in Latin. Therefore, the documents most pertinent to this study originate from the 13th century.
relevant for answering the questions posed by Slavic linguists. Topics investigated include the distribution of neo-acute, acute, and circumflex reflexes in the Czech dialects, morphological and phonological leveling of ancient accentological paradigms. The idea has been to pay particularly close attention to lexical items that are very old, that is, that are reconstructable as Common Slavic words\(^5\) used by the group of people that spoke Proto-Slavic, collect data about the form which these lexical items occur in throughout the Czech dialect region and in the oldest Czech manuscripts, and analyze the data from a historical, dialectal, and theoretical perspective.

Impetus for this thesis can be traced directly to my dissertation advisor, Prof. Bill Darden, who in reply to the question, “What should I write a dissertation about?” answered, “Czech quantity.” Without Prof. Darden’s unflagging support and advice, not to mention the countless hours he spent teaching me about the intricacies of Slavic accentology, this work would not have been possible. At the University of Chicago, I benefited from meetings with many individuals who helped in one way or another with this project. I am grateful to Prof. Howard Aronson for his encouragement and suggestions on how to make this thesis a better work, Prof. Victor Friedman whose advice regarding the presentation of dialectal material has been invaluable, Jim McCawley (†) just for being Jim and lending me his brilliant mind on a subject that does not even represent a major interest, Tony Buccini for teaching me what historical dialectologists do, Prof. František Svejkovský who is an inspiration to nearly everyone he meets and who guided me through Czech Literature, old and not so old. At the Dialectological Division of the Institute of the Czech Language, Academy of Sciences of

\(^5\) Of particular help in selecting words with Common Slavic pedigrees was a work by Kopečný, F. 1981, Základní všeslovanská slovní zásoba. Praha. [Basic Common Slavic vocabulary list].
the Czech Republic, many scholars provided me with access to information and were never too busy to answer questions I might have about quantity in Czech. Igor Němec, PhDr., Milada Nedvědová, PhDr. Stanislava Kloferová, PhDr. Karel Fic, PhDr. Jarmila Bachmannová, Prof. Pavel Jančák, PhDr. Jiří Kouba (†), Prof. Jan Havránek, the Fulbright Commission, Prof. Jiří Kraus. Further impetus came from Edward Stankiewicz (1993), Chr. Stang (1965), G. Shevelov (1965), Alan Timberlake (1983a, 1983b) and other scholars who have made reference in their work to the lack of descriptions of Slavic dialects that treat accentual features in a systematic, exhaustive, and unified way. The absence of such analyses has led to as many theories about Proto-Slavic intonation and accent as there are people working on the problem, as well as a tendency to beg for postponement of final judgment until the dialects can be reckoned with and included in the analysis. And quite rightly so. Most dictionaries and reference sources for Czech, for example, adhere strictly to the literary language (CLC), which is based on the Central Bohemian dialect. But this dialect is radically different in some respects from other Czech dialects and cannot by itself be expected to provide a complete and accurate description of the development of quantity in Czech any more than e.g. the dialect spoken in Belgrade can by itself be expected to provide a complete and accurate description of the development of accentual features in Serbo-Croatian.

*The Accentual Patterns of the Slavic Languages* (Stankiewicz 1993) brings us a steady leap forward in providing a systematic, exhaustive, and unified analyses of the accentual patterns of Slovene, Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian, Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian, and Slovincian. Now, with the completion of the first three (of five) volumes of the Český jazykový atlas (ČJA) and the availability to scholars of the data that have been collected over the past 50 or so years in order to produce the ČJA, the dialect geography of the Czech speaking community is sufficiently documented to allow a
systematic, exhaustive, and unified comparative historical and dialectal analysis of the
development and status of the feature the Czech language that plays a role in Proto-Slavic
accentual patterns – namely vowel quantity.

Notes on Major Sources

_Dialectological material from the Czech Academy of Sciences._

The Dialectical Division of the Institute of the Czech Language, Czech Academy
of Sciences (Dialektologické oddělení, Ústav pro jazyk český, ČSAV) provided
unrestricted access to the material that they have been gathering beginning in 1947 for the
Český jazykový atlas. This material, which has so far culminated in the publication of the
first three volumes of the ČJA (two more are to follow), is located in the archives of the
Dialektologické oddělení, Ústav pro jazyk český, ČSAV in Brno and contains all the
completed questionnaires from the project. The questionnaires,⁶ which were designed
and created with a view towards the historical development of the Czech dialects, were
filled out in duplicate by trained dialectologists who spent years in the field collecting
data from informants who were carefully selected to best represent the most archaic stage
of the dialect being recorded. These informants were often the oldest people in the
community who had lived in the very same communities for most if not their entire lives.
The data have been valuable enough to be designated a national monument (národní
památník) and are kept in metal drawers organized by the numbers which correspond to
the cities, towns, and villages that were selected to be part of the survey (ČJA I 1992:39-

---

⁶ The questionnaires went through several different phases over the years and there were also
questionnaires that were sent out early in the study that were specific to certain regions. For this
study, the questionnaire that was exclusively consulted was the final version of the one that was
used for the entire project, the Dotazník pro výzkum českých nářečí (Český jazykový atlas) 1964.
The duplicates are then arranged by the entry number from the questionnaires, which correspond to specific lexical items, or grammatical forms that were researched for the study. For each word or word form relevant for the present thesis, the number of the location and the form the word was attested in at that location was copied down, noting any local or idiosyncratic variation. This information has been used to map the words under investigation. Appendix A lists the locations of the towns and villages where the dialectal survey was conducted. The geographical placement of these Académie Véd (AV) survey locales is evident from each of the maps attached in Appendix B.
Dialect Regions

Throughout this study reference will be made to the dialect regions of the Czech speaking lands. The following map shows the major divisions of the Czech dialects. The divisions are somewhat arbitrary, based on a major isogloss or a bundle of isoglosses and morphoglosses that separate one dialect region from another. The Northeastern Bohemian and the Silesian dialects include several villages in Poland (118 Slané, 119 Jakubovice, 801 Bránice, 818 Velké Petrovice, 819 Křenovice).

Major Czech Dialectal Divisions

Key
A. Northeastern Bohemian dialects (severovýchodoceská nářečí)
B. Central Bohemian dialects (středoceská nářečí)
C. & D. Southwestern Bohemian dialects (jihozápadoceská nářečí)
   C. Dialects of Chodsko (chodsky úsek)
   D. Dialects of Doudlebsko (doudlebsky úsek)
E. Czech-Moravian dialects (českomoravská nářečí)
F. Central Moravian dialects (středomoravská nářečí)
G. Eastern Moravian dialects (východomoravská nářečí)
H. Silesian dialects (slezská nářečí)
Dialects of Chodsko (chodský úsek)

We will also frequently refer to the dialects of the Chod region. The map below shows details of this region. Of particular interest are the Chod towns that figured prominently in the Czech dialectological atlas project: 301 Postřekov, 302 Chodov, 303 Draženov, 304 Mrákov, 305 Zahořany, 306 Sulislav, 307 Všekary, 308 Lštění, 309 Černíkov, 310 Chodská Lhota, 311 Újezd.
Archive material for the Staročeský Slovník

The Archive material from the Czech Academy of Sciences for the Staročeský slovník provides details about the development of quantity in Czech over approximately a 200 year period, from the earliest preserved manuscript fragments of the oldest Czech legends in verse (dating from very soon after 1300 AD.), to the oldest printed texts of the early part of the 16th century (in some cases later if the edition is a reprint from an earlier copy). This material, therefore, is concentrated on the period of arguably the most intense historical development of Czech. The information comes in the form of 4” x 6” cards arranged in an enormous card catalogue alphabetically by word. Each section in the card catalog represents all the collated material about that word and is used to create entries for the Staročeský slovník (StČS).

The work to compile entries for the StČS was begun by Jan Gebauer in the 1880’s and began being published in fascicles in 1901 (see Syllaba, 1983, p.66-74 for further details regarding the publication of both of Gebauer’s great works, Historická mluvnice and StČS). Gebauer saw the publication of only the fascicles from the letter A up to the letter J before his death in 1907, although he had collected citations for words beginning with all Old Czech letters of the alphabet. The project was not renewed until 1966 by the Ústav pro jazyk český, oddělení pro dějiny českého jazyka, Československá Akademie Věd with B. Havránek as the chief editor. Although they are similar in intent, the StČS of 1903-07 and the StČS of 1966-99 are quite different in design, scope and approach. The new StČS has benefited from 40 more years of additional compiling of relevant citations by specialists in the field. A much larger staff, improvements in printing technology, and the type of conceptual organization that vigorous modern lexicological methodology provides (largely thanks to Igor Němec) has also contributed to making the
new StČS a most reliable source. However, the new StČS team, after reprinting the original two volumes of Gebauer’s StČS in 1977, has only just realized the publication of fascicle No. 21 *povolání – pravý* (1996). Because the *Staročeský slovník* is still not complete and probably will not be for another decade, and because there is much more information for the entries from A to J than is available in the published StČS of 1903-1907 and the reprint, it was necessary to cull information from the card catalog of citations at the Ústav pro jazyk český in Prague for this study on the development of quantity in Czech. In addition to the above, an unpublished, internal document written for the Academy of Sciences by Dr. M. Nedvědová on quantity in Czech as attested in the oldest manuscripts proved to be an invaluable guide to interpreting indications of quantity in Old Czech manuscripts and printed texts.
Chapter 1

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

This chapter is intended to provide a brief historical context for the settlement of the Czech lands by the Proto-Czechs and the formation of the Czech literary language or Contemporary Literary Czech (CLC). Although our knowledge of the Slavs’ early history is incomplete and sketchy in some areas, a great deal of attention has been given to the subject and a lively debate continues to this day. The discussion presented below synthesizes a fraction of the material relevant for establishing the Proto-Czechs in the Czech Republic with possible dialectal divisions suggested by early historical data. The next section outlines the formation of the Czech literary language. This discussion is important for the present work in establishing two basic facts: 1) the Czech literary language is based on the Central Bohemian dialects of the 13th through 16th centuries and should not be used exclusively for generalizations about the development of linguistic features throughout the entire Czech speaking territory and; 2) historical documents that reliably mark length are available several hundred years after the appearance of the Czechs in the Czech Republic, therefore any application of data to earlier periods concerning Czech quantity – be they synchronic, diachronic, or dialectal – involves careful extrapolation based on disparate and often controversial facts.

Beginnings

While the Slavs still lived together as a homogenous group of people, although pre-divisional regional dialectal features in all likelihood already existed, the language that they spoke was also more or less homogenous. The language of these early Slavs,
Proto-Slavic, has been largely reconstructed with precision and sophistication by Slavic linguists in an effort to trace the development of the various Slavic peoples and languages back to their collective roots. The investigation has taught us much about many aspects of their lives: where they lived, the tools they used, the plants they cultivated, their political struggles, cultural activities, religious beliefs, economy, legal system, and movements. Of particular interest to scholars has been the question of the Slavs’ original homeland and their early migrations. According to one commonly held and well supported theory, based, among other things, on the high concentration and etymologies of archaic Slavic toponyms in the region, the ethnicons mentioned in historical Greek sources (see Golab 1991:236-309 for an excellent analysis of the problem), and the study of trees for which the Slavs have common non-borrowed words (Rostafiński 1908, Moszyński 1957), the early homeland of the Slavs (6th century B.C. to the 1st century a.d.) was located north of the Carpathian Mountains in the marshy region of the upper Dniepr River known as the Pripet’ Basin (Polesie or Volyně) in present-day Byelorussia and Ukraine.¹

As the Slavs prospered and increased in number, they outgrew their homeland. Groups of Slavs – including those who later crossed the Elbe and Odra rivers and settled in Moravia, the Czech lands and Slovakia – began to migrate in search of more arable soil to support their brand of agriculture, avoiding heavily forested and mountainous regions that were not as fertile. In this connection we would like to quote Golab (1991:300):

¹ Dvorník (1956:3-13) argues for a broader region that extends West into Poland across the Odra River and covers the territory of the so-called Lusatian culture which archeological evidence shows was destroyed around 500 B.C.
So, the main thrust of the prehistorical Slavic expansion seems to have been west across the Bug River into the Vistula basin. Here I would like to emphasize the following points: many Slavic hydronyms in the Vistula basin have been transferred there from the Dniepr basin (*Visla*, etc., *Bugъ*, *Dunajъ*, etc.); and the dendric boundaries of typical western trees with etymologically non-Slavic names, which on our map are represented by the eastern boundary of the beech tree [Sl. *bukъ*, borrowed from GMC] indicate clearly that the Central Vistula basin, with the inclusion of the Central *Warta* basin (which already belongs to the Odra system), must have been a relatively old zone of prehistorical Slavic colonization, which at the beginning avoided sub-Carpathian forested areas (rich in beech woods) and sub-Baltic areas (also with beech trees).

These territories north of the Carpathians in all probability served as the launching pad for the migration of the Czechs and Slovaks in the 5th and 6th centuries, perhaps as early as the 3rd century (see below). The paths that the proto-Czecho-Slovaks followed over the Carpathian Mts. probably led through the Dukla Pass in the Eastern Beskyd Mts. between Poland and Slovakia, and the Jabluňkov Pass in Silesia between the Jeseník Mts. and Moravian-Silesian Beskysd. Some scholars believe that Avar attacks in 562 and 566 chased the West Slavs over the Odra and the Elbe rivers (Schenker 1995:21) and that the settling of Moravia and Bohemia thus took place after the Avar attacks. Niederle cites several German historians who expand on this theory and presuppose a chasing from the southern reaches of the Danube (SS II.3:182), but dismisses it on the grounds that the Avars did not arrive in Pannonia until the 560’s, whereas the West Slavs had certainly migrated beyond the Vistula to the Elbe River prior to this. He also argues that the civilization of the Western Slavs by the Avars could not have taken place on such a large scale. Gimbutas (1971:116) offers archeological findings, which, if accurate, would indicate that the Czecho-Slovaks began migrating through the Dukla Pass as early as the 3rd century. The area referred to, east of Košice at Prešov, where “cultural elements of
the ‘Przeworsk type’ … from the third to fifth centuries AD, which possibly represent the earliest Slavic occupation in this area,” is directly south of the Dukla Pass.

There is some evidence for a separate surge into Southern Bohemia based on archeological and cultural differences between the north and south Bohemians during pagan times. Shevelov (1964:373) also seems to think that at least one Slavic tribe, the Dúdlebi (SLN Dudlebi), migrated with the Avars to southwest Bohemia and northeast Slovenia in the mid 6th century from Volyně. The tribal name is preserved to this day in the designation for the region of Bohemia called Doudlebsko, but this migration did not necessarily have to be accompanied by the Avars. Nor did the Dúdlebi necessarily migrate independently of the other Czecho-Slovaks. The tribal name might well have been preserved amidst a larger group of migrating Western Slavs, most of whom also kept their tribal designation. Whatever the truth may be, historical sources are mute on the question of when and how the Czechs settled Bohemia, Moravia, and Lower Silesia.² It is evident that other Proto-Slavic tribes migrated at about the same time as the Proto-Czechs and Slovaks (some perhaps in unison) and were either assimilated when early tribal unions were strengthened or later tribal unions were formed. Some groups moved on further south (Croats),³ southwest (Slovenians), west (Sorbians), north

² The place name Bohemia is from the Germanic name Bai(a)-haimon (in Tacitus Bohemum) meaning the home of the Boi – the Celtic tribe that inhabited the Czech lands before the Czechs occupied their present territory (Trávníček 1935:3). The name Moravia is from the river Morava that flows south from the Jesenik Mts. through Eastern Moravia to the Danube River. And the name Silesia is in all probability derived from the Vandalian tribe name Sillingi, who inhabited Silesia before the Slavs arrived and who must have been later absorbed by the Slavs (Golab 1992:303-305).

³ According to Dvorník (1956:63, fnt.) “It seems that the Croats who migrated to the south on the invitation of Heraclius were the tribes which were settled in western Galicia, round Cracow and the upper Vistula, although some Slavs, still bearing their name, may have stayed in their old home and seem to be mentioned in the foundation charter of the bishopric of Prague in the tenth century.” This is not to say that the tribal name referred to an already Southern Slavic branch of the early Slavs, but rather that outshoots of a larger Proto-Slavic tribe settled in
(Pomeranians, Slovincians, Polabians) or expanded their territory in all directions (Poles).

We can also surmise that the formation of larger unions or alliances that allowed its members to make use of fortresses or who traded among one another characterized this early period. Niederle (SS, Oddíl II, díl III:183) sums the situation up succinctly:

Zbývá tedy jenom filologie, ale ta ovšem mluví ve prospěch vlasti a cesty severní, nebot’ nám ukazuje řetěz slovanských řečí tak navzájem úzce a starobylé spojený, že se tentýž řetěz, totéž territoriální spojení předpokládati musí i pro poměry prvotních dialektických středisk ve slovanské pravlasti, která byla na severu Karpat. Už v ní centrum pračeské bylo vedle srbského, polského a slovenského umístěno tak asi, jako dnes a Čechové se nemohli do nynější své vlasti dostati jiným způsobem než tím, že se posunuli ku předu v stálém dotyku na jedné straně s lužickými Šrby a na druhé se Slovincí. Přišli tudíž ze severovýchodu, čímž ovšem nevylučuji, že část, dostihnuvší přes Moravu Dunaje, mohla se do jižních Čech dostati odtud, od Dunaje, o čemž se dále ještě zmíním.

[All we have then is philology, which certainly attests to a northern enclave and a path of migration from the north, because it shows us a chain of Slavic dialects so interrelated, tight, and anciently connected, that this same chain must also entail a territorial connection for the conditions of the first dialectal centers of the Slavic homeland, which was in the northern Carpathians. The Proto-Czech center was already defined along with the Serb, Polish, and Slovene centers positioned the same way as today, and the Czechs could not have reached their present lands in any other way than by moving forward in constant contact on one side with the Lusatian Serbs and on the other side with the Slovenes. They came, therefore, from the northeast, by which I do not exclude the possibility that a part of them, extending across Moravia to the Danube, came from the Danube region to Southern Bohemia, which I will make reference to again].

territories west of their original homeland before the migrations of the South Slavs to their present locations.
Unfortunately, there are no direct historical sources about the life of neither these early Czechs nor the paths they took to reach Bohemia. The best evidence we have for the early dialectal divisions come from the present dialectal geography of the region. The extent to which dialectal features, particularly as regards vowel quantity, can be claimed to represent early dialectal divisions is difficult to establish. Some dialectal isoglosses seem to be very ancient indeed, and others are obviously of later provenance. Historical evidence for these tribal divisions begins in the 11th century. The most important sources are the founding charter of the Prague bishopric from 1086 (which exists in a copy from the 12th century), and Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Bohemorum, which confirms the old privileges from the year 973. In the charter of the Prague bishopric the borders of its territory are defined in terms of the tribes that lived there:

Termini autem eius occidentem versus hii sunt. **Tugust**, quae tendit ad medium fluminis Chub, Zedlza et Lusane et Dazana, Liotomerici, Lemuzi usque ad mediam silvam, qua Boemia limitatur. Deinde ad aquilonem hi sunt termini: Psovane, Chrouati et altera Chrowati, Zlasane, Trebovane, Pobarane, Dedosize usque ad mediam silvam, qua Milicianorum occurunt termini. Inde ad orientem fluvios habet terminos: Bug scilicet et Ztir cum Gracouua civitate provinciisque cui Uuag nomen est cum omnibus regionibus ad praedictam urbem pertinentibus, quae Gracouua est. Inde Ungrorum limitibus additis usque ad montes quibus nomen est Triti dilatata procedit. Deinde in ea parte, que meridiem respicit, addita regione Morovia usque ad fluvium cui nomen est Wag et ad mediam silvam cui nomen est More et eiusdem montis, eadem parochia tendit, qua Bauuaria limitatur.

[The boundaries (of Bohemia) to the west are the following. The **Tugust** stretches to the middle of the river **Chub (Kamb)**, the **Sedličané, Lučané** and **Děčané**, the **Litoměřici** and **Lemuzi** without interruption stretch to the forest that bounds Bohemia. Then to the north the following boundaries obtain: the **Pšované, Chorvati**, and other **Croats, Zlasane, Trebovane, Pobarane, Dedosize**,]
continue to the middle of the forest where the Milčane meet them. From there to the east the rivers form the boundaries: the river Bug it is certain and the Stir, where Kracov is, are civilized as is the province named Vag with the entire region already mentioned stretching out to Kracow. From the Hungarian boundary, their territory extends to the mountains named the Tatras. Moravia occupies this region east to the river Vag and to the mid Morava, which flows to the mountains, that bound Bavaria.

The names mentioned above in part refer to large tribes and in part to smaller groups or fortresses. The Tugust settlement occupied the territory from Domažlice south through the Bohemian Forest to the Cham in Bavaria and may be the ancestral territory of the Chods of Southern Bohemian.⁴ The Sedličané (Zedlza) are named after the settlement Sedlec located near Karlovy Vary (Carlesbad) in Northern Bohemia. Due to the gradual encroachment upon this territory by Germanic speaking peoples throughout history, the later resettlement of the same territory by the Czechs, and the intermingling of the two peoples, the dialects attested in and around Karlovy Vary are considered impure from a historical linguistic standpoint and tell us little if anything about the pre-historic dialect of the region.

The Litoměřici (< *Liutoměřici/Lutoměřici) were situated at the mouth of the Ohře where Litoměřice is located today. Along the Elbe further north near Děčín, the

---

⁴ Mauer (1984:7-10) summarizes the historiographic references to the Chods and their towns and villages. There is not, however, any clear evidence for determining from whence they arrived nor when they settled in Chodsko. Speculation ranges from Poland, to the lower Danube, to Southern Russia and even Switzerland, and various authors date their arrival from the Bronze age to the 11th century. The first mention of the town, Chodov, is in 1195, but Mauer (Ibid.:10, fn.) points out that this toponym is attested around Prague in 1185 and therefore offers little evidence for establishing the Chods as an ethno-linguistic group in place or time. Lutterer et al. (1988:123) gives further details regarding a third Chodov near Karlovy Vary and presents the etymology most often associated with the Chods – those that walked (chodili) along the border and guarded the territory against intruders.
Děčané settled and apparently also the Lemuzi. The Lusatian Serbs were separated from the Czechs by the forest north of the Krušné Mountains and by a line east of the Elbe that extended from Česká Kamenice through Česká Lípa to the peak Ještěd southwest of Liberec. South of this line past Bezděz to Mělník the Pšované lived. The Lučané, one of the largest tribes mentioned, occupied a wide expanse along the Ohře River from Žatec to Karlovy Vary and eventually extended their territory to the Mže River in the south.

The mention of the Chorvati and other Croats in the Prague founding charter has been the topic of considerable debate for decades. Most scholars agree that the ablative altera means here ‘the other side of some boundary,’ but the question is the other side of what? Their territory in Bohemia was probably bounded in the north by the Krkonoše Mountains and in the south by the Elbe River and in the west by the Jizera where the Pšované met them, but in Silesia the Croats are also known to have occupied the upper Vistula and Upper Nisa basins so the eastern boundary is difficult to determine. At any rate, in all probability, these groups represent outshoots of a larger tribe mentioned in the Nestor Chronicles as occupying the Upper Vistula basin, which completely lost their original dialectal roots and were absorbed by the local Czech dialects over a period of 1000-1500 years.

The Czechs are first mentioned as the Cichu-Windones in a manuscript from southern France, the Moissac Chronical, in connection with a Frankish expedition to the Czech lands in 805. From Kosmas’ manuscript we know that the tribe with the name Čechové occupied a territory which stretched to the south and west to the forest by Křivoklát past Libušín, along the Žuřín River by Mt. Osek and to the north along the lower Ohře to the Elbe. To the east, they reached to Kouřim beyond which the Zličané settled. Even though this tribe did not occupy the largest territory of the early Czechs, their rulers succeeded in unifying kindred tribes in Bohemia, Moravia and Slovakia.
whose administrative center was in Prague (Praha). These rulers gave the ethnonym Čechové to the unified entity whose power and prestige grew with the significance of Prague as its center. The name Praha first appears in historical documents in the 10th century most often in the High German. An interesting description of the city was given by Ibrahim ibn Jakub here quoted after Niederle (SS, Oddíl II, díl III:198, fint).

The city Frága is constructed of stone and limestone and is one of the richest trade cities. Russians and Slavs arrive from Krakow, and the Turkish Muslims, Jews as well as Turks arrive with goods and byzantine objects and trade them for flour, zinc, and various furs. Their land is the best of the northern territories and they have the richest means of existence: they sell for one “knšár” enough wheat to last for a month, and one “knšár” will buy enough barley to last a horse 40 days or will buy 10 chickens. In the city, one can also obtain saddles, bits, and shields that are made use of in this land.

It is therefore evident and understandable that the literary activity of the Czechs began and developed primarily around the culturally and economically most significant center in Bohemia with Prague as the only major contender. The dialects that were spoken by e.g. the Lučané, the Litoměřici, and the other tribes distinct from the Čechové most certainly continued to develop separately from the Central Bohemian dialect that was elevated to the status of the Czech national literary language. On the other hand, many dialectal features were without a doubt erased throughout history having normalized to the pattern of the literary language. To what extent quantitative features are preserved in the dialects or erased altogether is one of the subjects of this study and will be addressed in a later chapter.
This section is a brief introduction to the history of the contemporary Czech literary language (CLC), otherwise known as spisovná čeština, in very broad terms and is limited in scope to matters relevant for the philological study at hand. Our intention is to establish basic facts concerning the development of the literary language and Czech orthography in order to assess the reliability and relevance of Old Czech (OCZ) manuscripts and printed sources for determining the phonological history of the Czech language, particularly with respect to vowel quantity. It would be simple to determine the quantitative vocalic relations in pre-divisional Czech dialectal forms of Late Proto-Slavic if 6th to the 10th century Proto-Czech texts existed with markings for vowel quantity and ictus, but fate did not provide philology with such straightforward evidence. In fact, up until the 9th century there is scant written documentation of any Slavic language that was later connected with Czech, and there is a gap of about 500 years between pre-divisional Late Proto-Slavic dialectal Czech (Proto-Czech) and a firm Czech literary tradition with documents reliably marked for vowel quantity.

From the very beginning of a literary tradition in the Czech lands, OCS competed with Latin as the language used in all aspects of religious and literary life. The glagolitic OCS tradition that had been established in Moravia by the mission of St. Cyril (†869) and his brother Methodius (†885) in 862/863 was no doubt based on their own Makedonian speech. This OCS tradition was more dear to the Slavic inhabitants of the Great Moravian Empire than the Latin tradition and for a short while dominated the fray, but the use of OCS in church services met with immediate disapproval from Rome, which was under political and economic pressure from the Bavarian bishops already established in Central Europe to use exclusively Latin for religious activities. The original mission lasted only two decades, but it was nevertheless crucial in establishing OCS as the
liturgical language in the Great Moravian Empire at the end of Ró?astislav’s reign and enabled its resurgence in Bohemia in the 10th century under Prince Václav who had been schooled in both liturgy written in Latin and OCS. The predecessors of the original mission were chased out of Moravia to Bulgaria in 885 following Methodius’ death and the persecution, imprisonment, and the torture of Methodius’ disciples. Although three disciples, Clement, Naum, and Angelarius, escaped on a raft they built which floated them down the Danube to Belgrade, there does not seem to be any evidence that direct disciples of Cyril and Methodius fled to Bohemia. In 1027, nevertheless, with the prince’s support, Prokop, the monk, founded the Benedictine Sázavský Klašter (in Sázava, southeast of Prague) which became the progenitor of the glagolitic OCS tradition in the Czech lands for the better part of the 11th century. Among the manuscripts attributed to the Sázavský monks are the Legend of St. Václav, Besědy sv. Řehoře Velikého, and the Lives of St. Ludmila, St. Prokop, and St. Vít.

There is a good deal of speculation as to the origin and age of several Old Church Slavonic glagolitic manuscripts with language of the 9th and 10th centuries that have been shown to contain certain phonological and morphological features that are West Slavic in reflex – notably the Kiev Missal and the Prague Fragments. According to Vajs

---

5 There is somewhat of a polemic concerning Ró?astislav’s linguistic identity that involves the spelling of his name as either Rastislav which would indicate affinity with a Central Slovak dialect or Rostislav which would indicate Moravian or Bohemian affinity. Palacký (1936, vol. I.:80-81) refers to the prince using both spellings, but by implication acknowledges that the historically more correct form is Rastislav. He also mentions that the Great Moravian Empire (830-906 a.d.) extended far into Slovakia and Pannonia, and we know that the Slovak town, Nitra, played a very important role in the formation and expansion of the Great Moravian Empire.

several leading scholars differ as to their conclusions regarding the origin of these documents. Sreznevskij (1871:490-3) believes that the Kiev Missal is Moravian or Czechoslovakian. Geitler (Die slav. u. albanes. Schriften 153) thought it arose on Makedonian soil. Jagić (1890) who agreed with Sreznevskij, and Vondrák (O původu Kijevských listů a Pražských zlomků v Praze, 1904:4-5) believes that it is to be attributed to Pannonian Slovenian because Methodius’ disciples are believed to have continued their work in Sirmium on Lake Balaton after fleeing Moravia. Durnovo (Slavia I, 1922:219-227) admits that the author might have been a Czech whose language preserved nasal vowels in place of denasalized full vowels.

There is similar speculation regarding the origin of the Prague fragments and at least one reputable scholar, Jagić (Entstehungsgeschichte 106), attributes them to the Sázavský Klašter. The dates of these documents are also widely disputed. What is not disputed is the fact that no markings for quantity are present in these works (Havránek 1936:5) and that the above-mentioned manuscripts already testify to OCS’s loss in prestige by the many mistakes they contain. The OCS tradition in the Czech lands came to an abrupt end in 1097 when the monks at the Sázavský Klašter were chased out and the Prague monks from Břevnov burned down the monastery. To this day, no one knows what happened to the Sázava monks.

Bohemianisms are linguistic tidbits, isolated words or phrases, in a foreign context, in monuments written in German or primarily Latin. These are, for the most part, proper personal and place names, sometimes also common words that the scribe or author did not know how or did not want to translate; often they have a latinized form or they are transcribed incompetently. We find them from the turn of the 10th century in the Latin legends about Saint Ludmila (for example Slavibor), Saint Václav, Saint Vojtěch, and also in various papers printed in the following collections: Regesta Bohemiae et Moraviae, Codex diplomaticus et epistolovis regni Bohemiae et epistolovis regni Moraviae. Codex diplomaticus et epistolovis regni Bohemiae et epistolovis regni Moraviae.
From the end of the 11th century, the literary tradition began to shy away from Slavic/Czech in favor of Latin in both the religious and secular spheres of life. Apart from a handful of Latin/Czech glossaries and manuscripts with Czech marginalia (GlosBrit, GlosJag, GlosJer, GlosMV, GlosOl, GlosOpat, etc.) there is virtually no written record of the Czech language of this period. The Roman Catholic Church, whose influence had considerably been strengthened in Bohemia, did not tolerate Slavic/Czech. Even the first secular historical treatise of Bohemia and the Přemyslid dynasty, Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Bohemorum, written in the 2nd half of the 12th century by Kosmas (1045-1125), a deacon of the Prague Church, is in Latin with only a few words and proper names in Czech. This work, nevertheless, marked a broadening of literary interest, which supported the budding transition from Latin to Czech that was not to culminate in the establishment of Czech as the literary language until after the Hussite wars in the mid 15th century.

When in the later 12th and early 13th centuries the theatre arose as a new venue for literary activity, a growing and more diverse population (i.e. not only the clergy and monks) became involved in a new verbal art, which must have strengthened the status of the vernacular. Even though we have no direct records of it, we have to assume that a secular theatre, with magical scenes, criticisms of the church, paganism and diabolic references existed because the clergy specifically prohibited these practices. Since these subjects have no contact with ancient tradition, we can assume that the Czech literary tradition continued to develop despite its restricted use.
The Czech literary language in a restricted sense can be dated to sometime before the year 1300 with the beginning of a continuous body of Czech vernacular literature, concerned with life in the city centered on the activities of the inhabitants of the castle – especially the prince or king and his court as described in the series of court documents known under the collective title Klaret. Since the city of greatest cultural importance and activity at the time was Prague, it is natural that the Czech literary language from the beginning was based on the Central Bohemian Dialect spoken in Prague and its environs. During the reign of Charles I, King of Bohemia (Charles the IVth, Holy Roman Emperor) the Czech literary language expanded considerably to include prose texts used for scholarly and entertainment purposes. In addition, Charles the IVth, partly because of his Czech ethnicity (his mother was Czech), moved the capital of the empire from Aachen to Prague. Thriving from its new status as capital of a vast empire, international influences began to enter the country, leaving ample evidence on the language, a subject of considerable interest but with arguably little impact on the phonology or morphology of Old Czech. It was not until Jan Hus devised a method of rendering Czech sounds with a combination of Latin letters and diacritics in De orthographia bohemia in the early part of the 15th century that quantity began to be marked. Yet, even after Hus introduced his orthography, it took another two centuries before his ideas became a standard that was adhered to by the literate few.

We have tried to show the difficulty of the task of tracing the development of quantity in Czech by the use of early documents. The reader might rightly ask at this

---

7 Prof. František Svejkovský (personal communication, 2002) points out that the true literary language must actually seek its source in the sermons, prayers, and songs that were used in church services well before the end of the 13th century.

8 For a recent discussion concerning the authorship of De orthographia bohemia, see Vidmanová (1982:75-89).
point questions such as: Is there any way to deduce the historical developments of Czech quantity during the 500 years of Proto-Czech for which no historical documentation exists? To what extent can the present dialect geography of the Czech language be relied upon to tell us of the distant past? These are questions, which we hope to answer in the following chapters of this study.
SYNCHRONIC QUANTITY

The purpose of this section is to describe the current state of Czech quantity in the literary language and summarize briefly the results of inquiries into the phonetics, phonology, and morphology of quantitative phenomena in Czech.

*Phonetics*

The first significant attempt to measure Czech quantity in a laboratory occurred in 1893 by Jos. Král and Fr. Mareš. The goal of the study was to ascertain whether Czech metric verse depended on an accurate alternation of long and short syllables. Král, a classical philologist, recognized that the problem could not be solved with the naked ear, so he turned to Mareš, a physiologist, for help. Mareš constructed a special instrument, which was essentially a kymograph that consisted of a freshly prepared frog muscle tied to a telephone mouthpiece. The membrane of the mouthpiece reacted to speech by vibrating, sending a signal along the frog muscle which was attached at the other end by means of a lever to a pen that then etched the analog signal onto blackened paper wrapped around a turning cylinder. Although the measurements were not particularly


2 *ky.mo.graph* n [Gk *kyma* wave + *graph*] (1872): a device which graphically records motion or pressure (as of blood) -- *ky.mo.graph.ic* adj -- *ky.mog.ra.phy* n (*Webster’s Dictionary*).
exact (the frog muscle reacted too slowly to the impulse), the authors concluded that the relationship of Czech long versus short vowels was not 2:1 (as had previously been stated by Hattala 1854), but rather that long vowels were merely somewhat longer than short vowels. Later phonetic studies confirmed their results.

In 1900 a short article by two French linguists working in Le Laboratoire de phonétique expérimentale du College de France was published\(^3\) which tried to measure the effect of ictus (always on the initial syllable of the phonological word in the Czech literary language) on the intensity of the following syllable. The study showed that under certain circumstances, the ictus transfers some of its energy to the second syllable. The authors only tested 8 types of utterances and the results cannot be considered to be conclusive, but if correct, then a carry over of intensity from the first syllable to the second syllable occurs in the word types in Table 1 but not in the word types represented by the Table 2.

**Table 1 – Transference of ictus to 2\(^{nd}\) syllable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllable 1</th>
<th>Syllable 2</th>
<th>Syllable 3</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>short</td>
<td>short</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bude, ona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short</td>
<td>long</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>milá, kabát</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short</td>
<td>short</td>
<td>long</td>
<td>zeleným</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short</td>
<td>heavy</td>
<td>short</td>
<td>hubička</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2 – Non-transference of ictus to 2\(^{nd}\) syllable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllable 1</th>
<th>Syllable 2</th>
<th>Syllable 3</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td>long</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bliži</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td>short</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>vrána</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short</td>
<td>long</td>
<td>short</td>
<td>zavítal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short</td>
<td>short</td>
<td>short</td>
<td>žaludy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) Gauthiot and Vendrys. “Note sur l'accentuation du tchèque,” *MSL*, XI (1900).
In other words, they found that in disyllabic and trisyllabic words, an initial short vowel was the key for the intensity of the ictus carrying over to the next syllable. In trisyllabic words, the weight of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} syllable also played a role. It was only in trisyllabic words with a 2\textsuperscript{nd} heavy syllable that the ictus transferred some of its energy to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} syllable. What this suggests is that an initial long syllable would not contribute to the preservation of length in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} syllable of a phonological word, yet an initial short syllable followed by a long syllable in a disyllabic word would. In word final position, the authors note that quantity is unstable and this has been historically true as well. All word final lengths in Czech that are not the result of later contractions of VjV syllables have become short syllables.

Because Král and Fr. Mareš examined the lengths of words and syllables rather than individual segments with an instrument decidedly inadequate, Chlumský made an early analysis based on work in Rousselot’s Paris laboratory published in French,\textsuperscript{4} and translated into Czech in 1911,\textsuperscript{5} which followed the Scriptur method (Chlumský 1911:1). This method involved a gramophone hooked up to a needle that magnified the recorded sounds by scratching lines onto a piece of carbon paper. The title of the second published report itself, \textit{Pokus o měření českých zvuků a slabik v řeči souvislé}, belies the experimental nature of the study and Chlumský admits that at the time the experiment was conducted, he was just getting used to the methodology. He spends more effort on

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{4} Chlumský, J. “L'analyse du courant d'air phonateur tchèque.” \textit{La Parole}, 1902.
\item \textsuperscript{5} Chlumský, J. \textit{Pokus o měření českých zvuků a slabik v řeči souvislé}. [An attempt to measure Czech sounds and syllables in connected speech]; Praha, 1911.
\end{itemize}
the consonantal system than on the vocalic system, but he discovered, in general, that short vowels often are pronounced longer at the end of the phonological word—sometimes even equaling the duration of the pronunciation of long vowels. He also refers to the effect of ictus emphasis on the duration of all vowels, but with little detail.

The most comprehensive phonetic study of Czech quantity, which surpasses all previous studies, was conducted by Chlumský in 1925 and 1926 and published in 1928.6 This study is devoted to measuring vowel quantity in more detail than Chlumský’s previous studies and has to be called the definitive work on the subject for literary Czech (spisovná čeština). The informants that he used were all from Prague, nevertheless the results give empirical evidence for several phonetic tendencies generally noted in the dialects.

Když shrneme, co bylo řečeno, tedy u všech tří osob vidíme, I. že krajní samohlásky i, ú, (i, u) jsou zpravidla kratší než samohlásky ostatní, jmenovitě než á (nebo a) . . . Toto zjištění je důležité, neboť vysvětluje, proč tak snadno se krátí samohlásky i, ú daleko snadněji než á, zvláště když jsou v slabikách nebo slovech méně závažných. A v tomto krácení je zase pramen známých potíží pravopisných ve škole i mimo školu. (Chlumský, 1928:21)

[When we summarize what has been said about all three subjects we see that 1.) the vowels i, ú, (i, u) are as a rule shorter than the other vowels in the system, and markedly shorter than á (or a) … This discovery is important, because it explains why the vowels i and ú are much more likely to shorten than á, especially when they are in syllables or words that carry less emphasis. And this

tendency to shorten is also the source of the well known difficulties encountered in grammar school and elsewhere.]

**Morphology**

Morphological processes in CLC that involve vowel quantity are not too numerous to mention, but vary with respect to the historical layer the alternation reveals. Strictly speaking, to qualify as a synchronic phonological vowel lengthening we should only allow a/á, e/é, i/i, y/ý, u/ú, o/ó. Yet the system is complicated by the historical development of the vocalic system, and is further distorted by the present orthography which still uses the é although this vowel is normally pronounced [í] in obecná čeština.

For example, some masculine diminutives derived by the suffix {–ek#} are accompanied by lengthening of the root vowel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocalic Alternation</th>
<th>Masc. Substantive</th>
<th>Diminutive</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a/á</td>
<td>hlas</td>
<td>hlásek</td>
<td>‘voice’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e/é</td>
<td>oheň</td>
<td>ohének</td>
<td>‘fire’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e (&lt; ě)/í</td>
<td>řez</td>
<td>řízek</td>
<td>‘cut, cutlet’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i/í</td>
<td>list</td>
<td>listek</td>
<td>‘leaf’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y/ý</td>
<td>jazyk</td>
<td>jazýček</td>
<td>‘language’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u/ou</td>
<td>zub</td>
<td>zoubek</td>
<td>‘tooth’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o/ú</td>
<td>boh</td>
<td>bůček</td>
<td>‘god, idol’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u/ú</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o/ó</td>
<td>atom</td>
<td>atomek</td>
<td>‘atom’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telefon</td>
<td>telefónek</td>
<td>‘telephone’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 This rule is far from regular, however, in CLC, and there are yet other masculine substantives whose diminutives derived with {–ek#} exhibit shortening of the root vowel – stül → stolek ‘table,’ dům → domek ‘house.’
The productivity of this derivational pattern is illustrated by the examples *atom* → *atómek*, *telefon* → *telefónek*, but the alternation between /o/ and /ó/ is limited to certain environments – /o/ does not lengthen to /ó/ when the base word is monosyllabic or ends in a consonant other than /l, m, n, r/ (cf. *koh-i-nórek*), and even this rule is not steadfast (*zlom* → *zlomek*). The productivity of the lengthening in this class of words is compromised by the lack of examples where /u/ lengthens to /ú/. Historically, /ú/ diphthongized to /ou/ beginning in the 13th century. The alternation of /u/ and /ou/ is well preserved in masc. diminutives (*zub:zoubek* ‘tooth,’ *puk:pouček/puček* ‘seam’) as is the alternation between /o/ and /ů/ (*roh:růžek* ‘horn,’ *boh:bůžek* ‘god, idol’). Other derivational processes include the shortening of the root vowel as in *žába:žabka* ‘frog.’

There is also a tendency to lengthen /o/ in fem. ā-stems of foreign origin. This lengthening is a morphological process that is current in the modern language. An interesting example is the sign at the Prague metro station (recorded in 1996) on the B line named *Flora*. At one of the exits, some evil graffitist has scratched a čárka into the plastic above the /o/ in *Flora* to reflect the common pronunciation of this word as [flóra]. No doubt [flora] has become [flóra] because /ó/ is the mark of a foreign word as is /ũ/ and in this case an original /o/ has lengthened to mark the foreignness of the word.
Chapter 3

QUANTITY IN OLD CZECH

Detecting quantity in Old Czech documents

This section devoted to vowel quantity in Old Czech originates from linguistic material which captures the development of quantity in Czech over roughly a 200 year period as attested in the oldest manuscripts of legends in verse which appeared shortly after the beginning of the 14th century and continues with old printed works from the period around 1500 (in some cases from the 16th century when the work is from an older period). The data is therefore concentrated primarily in the period of the historical development of Czech that is used for the Old Czech dictionary project that Gebauer used in large measure for his dictionary. The documentation for this data makes use of material Gebauer collected (found both in his dictionary as well as in sheets of paper from his archives, left to the Ústav pro český jazyk and made use of for the new dictionary project which is publishing fascicles of the dictionary from the letters N to Z), as well as specially excerpted material collected from old Czech manuscripts, in some cases from old printed works, in which vowel quantity to various degrees of specificity were marked (see the attached list of relevant Old Czech documents).

The various degrees of detection of marked quantity and the different functions of diacritic marks especially over /i/ (as well as /ie/) and sometimes over /u/ is something which is important to take into consideration in some of the manuscripts. The vowel /i/ (short) is written either with a /y/ or with a /i/ but which as a rule are marked with a thin diacritic line (in addition to the common occurrence without the dot) in manuscripts
which do not mark quantity at all. In these cases the čárka has only the function of the
dot over the /i/ in contemporary Czech -- that is, to visually emphasize the letter. The use
of this mark (thin čárka) in manuscripts that which do mark quantity regularly therefore
makes it difficult to clearly identify /í/ (long) as well as differentiate between the two.

Unlike other well attested phonological changes whose various stages of
development are reliably documented by old Czech manuscripts and texts (for example
the change of /ie/ > /í/, /ò/ > /uo/ > /û/, /šč/ > /št'/ etc.), vowel quantity is problematic to
trace. From the viewpoint of old Czech scribes who were bound by the tradition of Latin
texts where the length of vowels was not graphically marked, vowel quantity was a
phenomenon that was of less importance than other phonological characteristics. The
functional load of vowel quantity in differentiating words was light. The failure to mark
the quantity of a vowel rarely interfered with the interpretation of the text being
transcribed. Just as in the orthographic systems of a number of contemporary literary
languages that do not mark quantity (Slavic and non-Slavic), differences in quantity arose
within the context of the words and forms used.

As far as the actual notation used to mark quantity in old Czech manuscripts and
printed documents is concerned, according to the orthographic system known in Czech as
“sprežkový” (e.g. combinatory), quantity in Czech was marked with double letters. For
example: negmaam (nejmám) EvZimn 14a, naa§§ (náš) t. 18a, modlaam (modláš) Pror
8a, waazzyy (váží) t. 24a, štaal ŠtítsvátA 63a, (stál) naarod (národ) t. 10a; šweey (svéj)
EvZimn 23a, lidee (lidé) t. 1b, obylee (obilé) Pror 57a, k kraloweey (k kralovéj) t. 16a,
podlee (podlé) ŠtítsvátA 91a, naleezaa (náležá) t. 98b; ziezlyw (žiezliv) EvZimn 9a,
hnutye (hnutie) t. 10a, napowijedaa (napoviedá) ŠtítsvátA 76a, wijera (viera) t. 176a;
od lidij (od lidí) EvZimn 11a, nuzij (nuzí) t. 6a, na vdolyy (na údolí) Pror 12b, vuodczyy
(vuodcí) t. 78a, wygiijty (vyjíti) ŠtítsvátA 37a, pijšmo (pismo) t. 40a, Kyy (ký) t. 56b; z
oonu (z ónů, ex illis) EvZimn 12a, nooh (nóh) Pror 26a; nešuu (nesů) EvZimn 7a, v mvu
uššij (u mú uši) t. 2b, šuvšyedee (súsědě) Pror 24a, rzkuvce (řkúce) t. 5a, mohvv (mohů)
ŠtíťSvátA 11b, popuudcze (popůdce) t. 125b, šuvzen (sůzen) t. 207a.

In documents where the diacritic markings devised by Hus have been more
systematically put to use, vowel quantity is indicated in a similar fashion to
Contemporary Czech—that is with a line or “čárka” above the vowel. For example: pán
HustPostH 76b, k žádoští (k žádosti) t. 81a, bázní (bázní) Budyš 77a, blátem t. 50a,
hledašě BiblNymb 56b, ptáka t. 63a; hodně HustPostH 82a, švatého (svatého) t., chléb
Budyš 81b, mordéré (mordérě) t. 5a, gméno (jméno) BiblNymb 2b, zlaté t. 11b; viéry
(viéry) HustPostH 77b, biédíč (biédě) Budyš 85b, miěšto (miesto) t. 45a; nepr.íšlušie
(nepríslušie) HustPostH 77b, šviedc.îme (svědcíme) t. 106a, chvíle … pile Budyš 27a,
lúpez.níky t. 15b, wína (vína 2.sg.) BiblNymb 103b, odyîmage (odji’maje) t. 76b,
pașty.r.i HustPostH 81a, býwá Budyš 7a, blýšká še (blýská se) BiblNymb 51b, šwîm
(svîm) t. 74b; bôh HustPostH 3a, vóli t. 82a, móg (mój) Budyš 22b, dolów (dolóv adv.) t.
2b, wókol (vókol adv.) BiblNymb 51b, wódcé t. 75b; o šmlûwu HustPostH 81a, neštût.
112b, bezûmý Budyš 35am bû.ë t. 41b, lúpe.ë BiblNymb 82a, wštûpiti šte (vstûpili ste)
t. 93a. As a distinguishing feature for vowel quantity a dot above the letter is also often
encountered. A period or dot over consonant letters was used to differentiate palatal
phonemes. The orthographic systems of the cited documents however are not complete
and simple remnants of the so-called combinatoric orthography. Diacritical orthography
was not, as shown by B. Havránek and others, reliably put into use in any of the
preserved old Czech documents.

In addition to the above-described systems, in old Czech manuscripts we also
meet with occurrences where quantity is indicated in a different manner. In this case,
the markings are different from the markings for consonantal markings. These are for the
most part found in the orthographic systems of the oldest legends in verse. Quantity of vowels is marked in them as a double letter with the second element written or transcribed as a superscript letter, for example: le’pe (le’pe) LegJidD 1a 15, liube¢ (l’ubé) t. 1b 6, Wššie¢ (všie) t. 1a 23, k o’ku (k óku) LegJidM 113. In some cases an arc over the vowel letter marks quantity, e.g. tbaa LegJidM 119, raad LegDuch 72, o gineem LegPil 2b 13, keezh, zdrawiee, wzdyychanyee, w buducziich, ziimu, rsiekuu, nemaluu, nuumiely. An arc above /y/ however without a doubt does not have the same meaning, as J.Cejnar showed in the introduction to his edition of the oldest legends in verse. From a complete analysis of the marked quantity in the oldest Legends, we can also conclude that the frequency of occurrences of marked quantity (by one means or another) is not the same for all vowels.

Another difficulty arises with manuscripts that mark quantity sporadically such as the Bible Olomoucká, rukopis Rokycanova Výkladu na evangelium sv. Jana (from 1492). In the latter, for instance, length is mark with a čárka (e.g. práwie) 74b, od mudrák. For this study, no OCZ texts have been cited that are known to not mark quantity. In instances where there is a question as to whether certain marks in the manuscript represent length or not, the practice has been rather to err on the conservative side and not assume quantity when there is doubt. Consequently, the number of OCZ manuscripts dating up to the middle of the 13th century that are reliable with respect to quantity is quite limited.
The Need for a General Theory of Slavic Accentology

Tracing the origin and describing the development of phonemic length, intonationally based paradigms, ictus patterns, and vowel changes in Proto-Slavic and Czech is a complex and incomplete field of inquiry. The objectivization of linguistic data is perhaps only possible in phonetic analysis with the increasing precision of digital recording technology and computer hardware and software that quantify these data and allow for their quantifiable manipulation and study. Dialectologists, in particular William Labov (1994), have been harnessing this technology for the synchronic identification of linguistic change in process. For this study, however, we must rely on somewhat less precise data recorded by trained Czech dialectologists (typically natives from the dialect region under investigation) who wrote down, and to a lesser extent recorded on magnetic media, the word forms they heard in the field with as much phonetic precision as their ears, tape recorders, and the notation system could distinguish. We must therefore lean on another scientific principle, relativization, to bolster arguments for the historical development of Proto-Slavic and Czech based on imperfect synchronic dialectal data.

The notion that humans are capable of discovering facts that they cannot directly observe has proven to be possible many times over in the sciences and the social
sciences. The study of Slavic accentology forces the historical Slavic linguist to believe in the same principle in order to support hypotheses that cannot be directly observed. Not only is it impossible to hear or read the Proto-Slavic language, but the scholar is equally as hampered – and at the same time challenged and lured – by the incredible complexity of the problems in reconstructing Proto-Slavic accentology. Because of a natural instability of prosodic features (Shevelov 1965:40), the reflexes of Proto-Slavic intonation have been subject to many levelings and adjustments in the individual Slavic languages, including literary Czech, which further obstructs the problem and makes it devilishly difficult to discover with any certainty how the true accentological system of Proto-Slavic was actually structured and what path of development the accentological system followed to reach the stages and systems represented by each of the Slavic languages and dialects alive today.

Since our task is to discover what, if anything, Czech in its entire dialectal geographical expanse can tell us about Slavic accentology, we will address accentological issues that Czech can truly illuminate. Rather than attempt to refute or support the much debated phonological laws and morphological processes that remain at the center of studies on Slavic accentology, intonation, and prosody at this stage of the study, we will instead work within an acceptable framework of the phonological laws and

---

1 Following Birnbaum 1963, Proto-Slavic (PSL) refers to the reconstructed language that emerged out of the Balto-Slavic unity and lasted up until the earliest Old Church Slavonic manuscripts. When specification that is more precise is called for, reference will be made to the three stages of Proto-Slavic (PSL I, PSL II, PSL III) as defined by Golęb, 1994. The term, Common Slavic, will be used to refer to the language of the Slavs during the period when Old Church Slavonic was used chiefly as the literary language shared by all Slavs – roughly from the mid 9th century through the 12th century.
morphological processes attributed to Proto-Slavic, with the intention of sorting out the
contribution that the Czech dialects can offer, where appropriate, to the arguments in
favor of or against the operation of these laws and their corollaries. We will begin quite
abruptly with several conventional tenets that affect the relationship Czech quantity has
to Proto-Slavic prosody and accentology.

*Proto-Slavic Length*

The origin of length in Czech can be traced circuitously by commodius vicus back
to Proto-Indo-European, which is not to say that the phonemic opposition of length in
Czech is directly descended from Proto-Indo-European (PIE). Classic examples that
show PIE length oppositions and their Slavic reflexes are for example: PIE /āː:/ Slavic
*māti* lat. *māter* ‘mother’ vs. Slavic *nosъ* lat. *nares* ‘nose,’ for PIE /ōːo/ Slavic *darъ*
lat. *dōnum* ‘gift’ vs. Slavic *oko* lat. *oculus* ‘eye.’ These words are typically cited to show that
Early Proto-Slavic (EPSL) merged the PIE long back vowels /ā/ and /ō/ as Slavic /ā/ and
the PIE short back vowels /a/ and /o/ as Slavic /o/. PIE oppositions in length are evident
in all Slavic languages in the distribution of what are today morphophonemically
conditioned ablaut alternations which in pre-dialectal Proto-Slavic include the
alternations /o/ ~ /a/, /e/ ~ /ě/, /#/ ~ /i/, /#/ ~ /y/.

---

2 The question about whether an opposition in intonation (rising pitch:falling pitch) was
inherited from Indo-European is beyond the scope of this study and irrelevant to the development
of prosodic patterns in Proto-Slavic and Czech. Whether accent was fixed on the penultimate (or
some other) syllable at the dissolution of Indo-European and the later development of free ictus
occurred when the rise of phonemic intonation caused a redistribution of accent patterns in Balto-
Slavic (or again only in Slavic) paradigms is admirably treated in Shevelov (1965).

3 With the exception of Balto-Slavic vowels lengthened before voiced consonants according
to Winter’s law (See Collinge 1985:225-227).
The point of departure for quantity in Czech is the earliest stage of (post Balto-Slavic) Proto-Slavic which we take to have inherited an opposition in length from Proto-Indo-European (PIE). The development of phonemic length in Czech must seek its source and explanation in the Proto-Slavic period when through a complex relationship of ictus, tone, morphology, morphophonemics, and vowel quantity – phonemic length emerged once again in Late Proto-Slavic (LPSL) only to be reshuffled in certain Proto-Slavic dialects, fortified in others, and obliterated in still others. Most prominent among the changes involve two general tendencies. The first was the redistribution of the PIE vowel system from one based on quantitative oppositions to a system based on qualitative distinctions. The second was the tendency towards open syllables, which, among other things, contributed to the elimination of nasal and oral diphthongs.

The inherited PIE quantitative oppositions in Early Proto-Slavic (EPSL) developed into qualitative distinctions, which allowed quantity in EPSL to become non-distinctive (redundant) until new quantitative oppositions evolved in LPSL through the interplay of ictus shifts, the shortening of long vowels and diphthongs under certain conditions (phonological as well as morphological), as well as the lengthening of previously short vowels and short diphthongs under certain conditions (phonological as well as morphological). Nevertheless, vowel quantity seems still to have been a characteristic of the qualitatively differentiated Proto-Slavic vowel system that persisted into LPSL. Without going through all the details, which are well documented (Shevelov 1965, Horálek 1963, etc.), we should say that by LPSL (Golab’s PSL III), the vowel system had radically changed. PIE */ē/ changed qualitatively by EPSL to */ē/ and
continued as /ă/ [ā] in LPSL. PIE */e/ became */æ/ in EPSL and raised to /e/ in LPSL which is the end result. PIE */ū/ by LPSL > /ý/ (either by push or pull chain in connection with the change of PIE */au, *ou > LPSL /ū/) and PIE */u/ lowered and became lax to /ъ/ by LPSL. PIE */i/ lowered and became lax to /ь/ in LPSL, and PIE */ī/ remained in LPSL as /ī/ but the length became redundant phonemically when PSL */i/ lowered and became lax to /ъ/. LPSL /ū2/ developed from PIE and PSL */au, *ou/ diphthongs, and /ěî2/ (phonetically identical to /ěî/) developed from PIE */oi/ diphthongs, except in certain morphological categories (e.g. o-stem masc. anim. NP desinence {-oi#}) where */oi/ > /ī2/. The PIE */ei/ diphthong by LPSL had become /ī2/ as well. Nasal diphthongs */en, *em, *in, *im, *em, *om, *an, *am/ were simplified in PSL in tautosyllabic positions to /e, o/, the timbre of the new nasal vowel reflecting the timbre of the initial segment of the nasal diphthong (i.e. original rounded nasal diphthongs > /o/ [ɔ], original non-rounded nasal diphthongs > /ɛ/). By the LPSL vocalic system, /e, ɪ, o, ь/ are considered short vowels, and /ă, ē, ě2, e, ɔ, ɪ, ɪ2, y, ŭ2 (< *ou, *au)/ are considered long vowels. The liquid diphthongs (or, er, ol, el) are also considered long at this stage. Liquid vowels /l, ɾ/, originally long in EPSL, developed in post-dialectal LPSL with long and short variants. This distinction is preserved somewhat in dialects of Czech and under certain conditions following palatal consonants and dentals in CLC.

Prosodic features that characterized the LPSL phonological system included: 1) intonation (+high tone:±tone), 2) quantity (+long:±long), and 3) force (+ictus:±ictus).
Length could occur on any syllable of the word, thus, there were words with one, more than one, or zero long syllables. Ictus, on the other hand, could fall on only one syllable, and was automatically assigned to the first syllable (counting from the left) with acute (high) tone. If there were no syllables in a word with acute intonation, circumflex intonation (stressed) developed on the first syllable of the word. Tone in Proto-Slavic, therefore, only contrasted on the initial syllable.

New quantitative oppositions were formed in LPSL because of phonetic shortenings under the following conditions:

- Word final long vowels in disyllabic and polysyllabic word forms, but not in monosyllabic word forms (see page 47);
- In unstressed syllables that were not followed by a short stressed syllable⁴;
- Stressed long syllables that were at least two syllables from the word final syllable, which often means stressed initial long syllables in polysyllabic words; e.g. CZ ulice, lahoda, lastovice, jahoda, palice, měsic.
- Under stress in word internal syllables (however inconsistently); e.g. motyka, lopata, rodina, kopyto, kobyła, poleno, hromada, otava, beseda, rokyta, kolenko, koryto, hovado.
- Post-tonic syllables under certain conditions (see Shevelov 1965:518-520).

The new shortenings once again created phonemic oppositions based on length, but dialectal features no doubt existed even during the earliest period of a more compact Slavic unity, and further dialectal distinctions seem to have understandably accelerated

---

⁴ In pretonic position before a short or long PSL vowel, length seems to have been retained; e.g. útroba, útěxa, koupel, koukol, stoupati, tráviti, kouřiti, žádati, vrátiti.
tangentially with the migration of the Slavs. The phonological systems of the individual Proto-Slavic dialects slowly began to emerge along the dialectal geopolitical plane. The development or abolishment of LPSL phonemic quantity, together with the development of paradigmatic patterns based on the LPSL intonational system with distinctions between acute, circumflex, and neo-acute intonation, and the consolidation or abolishment of free ictus in each of the Proto-Slavic dialects must have been interconnected. One might argue that such a cumbersome vocalic system was hardly sustainable, and in fact there are no contemporary Slavic languages that preserve as robust a system of quantitative and qualitative oppositions as in the period of Slavic dialectal dissolution. The East Slavic languages of Russian, Byelorussian, and Ukrainian show no residue of this original opposition. New lengthened short vowels in Russian and Byelorussian may provide evidence for the persistence of pitch or intonation distinctions on short vowels in East Slavic, but are of little comparative interest for Czech. The West Slavic languages, Czech, Slovak, and to some extent Upper Sorbian, have richly developed phonological and morphological systems which make use of oppositions in vowel quantity, whereas in Polish phonemic length survived until the fifteenth century and in Kashubian survived until the nineteenth century. Polish and Slovak are of limited help because the reflex of vowel length is detectable in few environments; in Slovak only in neo-acute syllables (Horálek, 1962:122, fn1) not in acute syllables, and pretonically (SK trūba ‘pipe’). Reflexes of pretonic length in Literary Polish show up only in nasal vowels and /o/ in certain phonological environments, e.g. P trąba ‘pipe,’ król ‘king.’ Certain Polish dialects show reflexes of long /œ/ and long /ä/. Upper and Lower Sorbian
are cited occasionally for their reflexes of the *TorT and *TelT groups, and Slovincian has gathered new significance in the equation since Stankiewicz’s analysis of 1993. In South Slavic, length is preserved under certain conditions in Serbo-Croatian and Slovene, in Bulgarian and Macedonian it is not. Serbo-Croatian and Slovene data will be cited often to support the classification of Proto-Slavic words into the Proto-Slavic accentual paradigms to which they belong.

The Role of the Dialects

Precisely when in history it is possible to speak about Czech as an independent language as opposed to a dialect of Proto-Slavic depends on one’s interpretation of what a dialect is versus what a language is. Some scholars argue that because the loss of the weak jers took place in all the Slavic languages at roughly the same time and ended the tendency towards syllable structures with increasing sonority, it is not possible to talk about individual Slavic languages until after the loss of weak jers (Birnbaum, 1963:2). Others argue that the difference between a dialect and a language is a political determination dependent upon national boundaries with certain other requirements such as a codified grammar based on a common body of literature, mutual intelligibility of all dialects of the language, a sense of ethno-linguistic identity, and the weight and number of isoglosses separating the dialect in question from its neighboring dialect(s). There does not seem to be a universal solution to the problem short of declaring a moratorium on the term language and referring only to dialects. Yet inevitably we would have to confront the question “dialect of what?” and we are back to talking about languages and dialects.
Most Slavic accentological studies (with some notable exceptions)\(^5\) focus on the literary languages for accentological arguments, for, as Stankiewicz (1993:2) explains “the selection of the contemporary literary languages as the primary object of study is motivated by the fact that most descriptions of these languages (in both grammars and dictionaries) provide exhaustive material for a structural and functional analysis of their accentual patterns, whereas no such materials are available for the accentual study of the dialects and the older stages of their development.” The implication here is not that one should depend exclusively on the literary language, but that often the most complete descriptions of relevant phenomena are available about the literary language and not about most other dialects. The same is true of Czech. Despite the excellent dialectological work being continually published by Czech dialectologists in the form of the Český jazykový atlas, complete structural analyses of the Czech dialects are still lacking.\(^6\) The methodological faults and fissures that arise from using data from one narrow dialect (be it the literary language, a composite of dialects, or a remote dialect) are many in number. In the context of the present study, one of the obstacles Slavic accentologists run into who rely on the Czech literary language alone to draw conclusions about the entire Czech speaking territory or to generalize about Proto-Slavic accentuation, is that the source of CLC is anything but a unified homogeneous (either


\(^6\) That is not to say that structural analyses of the Czech dialects do not exist. Bělič (1972), although modestly titled as Nástin české dialektologie [A sketch of Czech dialectology] is in reality extremely detailed and reasonably thorough. In addition, a number of excellent and adequately complete dialectal studies – Voráč (1955), Bělič (1953), Vydra (1923), to name but a few, have been published which add measurably to the accuracy of historical studies.
historically speaking or synchronically speaking) entity. The literary language is an artificial construct and is in fact an amalgam of various dialects, the most dominant of which are the Central Bohemian Dialects. The end result of relying solely on CLC for historical studies is that the view of the developments becomes blurred by the narrowness of the data set. To be sure, quoting one form from CLC as the normalized form of a word makes the task of representing the form for accentological comparisons less onerous, but by analyzing the development of quantity in the dialects (including the literary language), we are able to make more precise use of Czech data to help answer the various questions that remain puzzles for historical Slavic linguists and philologists. For example: Did the so-called neo-circumflex exist as a distinct Proto-Slavic intonation, Proto-Czech/Slovene intonation, or neither? What are the likely territorial origins of compensatory lengthening and the neo-acute intonation and how does Czech quantity help support or refute a center-periphery theory as shown by Timberlake (1983a, 1983b)? What relationship is there, if any, between the fixing of ictus on the initial syllable of the phonological word in Czech and the rise of the neo-acute? Was the shortening of vowels under the original acute intonation a Proto-Slavic phenomenon or was it already dialectal?

**Slavic Accentual Paradigms (a.p. = accentual paradigm)**

The consensus view of Slavic accentology (Stang 1965, Shevelov 1965, Bulaxovskij 1983, Dybo 1990) posits four accentual patterns or paradigms (a.p.) for Proto-Slavic. These four accentual paradigms are referred to variously, but the

---

7 Dybo et al. (1993) believe they have identified a fifth type (d), a variation of the oxytonic a.p. with accent on the NAS root rather than on the desinence.
important characteristics can be summed up by the reconstructed paradigmatic accent alternations of the Proto-Slavic system. There were two columnar fixed accent patterns – one on the root [a.p. (a)] and one on the first syllable of the desinence [a.p. b)]. There was one mobile pattern [a.p. (c)]. In the (j)ā-stems there is a fourth type – one with fixed accent and neo-acute intonation on the stem. The neo-acute intonation is undoubtedly a later development that is characterized by the retraction of accent one syllable to the left. In Czech, as evidence from dialectal data suggests, there seems to be a correlation between lengthening of vowels and the neo-acute intonation. The identification and classification of words within these accentological paradigms is based on somewhat regular correspondences in the Slavic languages. In combination with place of ictus in Russian, pitch and length in Serbo-Croatian and Slovene, and to some extent place of ictus in Bulgarian, Czech length or the absence of it is often cited as evidence of the belonging of a lexeme to one or another of the four accentual paradigms.

In a.p. (a) with a fixed stem stress pattern, acute intonation was correlated with fixed stress on the stem of non-derived disyllabic words (in contrast to derived words, e.g. R. got' ov, with a morphologically derived fixed stress and not a fixed stress as a reflection of the correlation between fixed stress and acute intonation). The a.p. (b), according to Illič-Svityč and Dybo, is the result of a Balto-Slavic shift from a fixed short or circumflex intonation on the stem to the initial syllable of the desinence. From the point of view of Slavic, however, a.p. (b) can be considered a morphological class. In a.p. (b) with a fixed columnar desinential stress pattern, acute intonation was also correlated with fixed stress on the initial long syllable of the desinence. In the mobile
a.p. (c) pattern, circumflex intonation is found on the word initial syllable (including proclitics) when the stress falls on that syllable and the syllable is long. If the stress falls on the initial syllable and this syllable is short (о, е, ъ, ь), a non pitch accent is posited. Stang (1965:42-45) claims that there were some cases of non-initially accented circumflexes, but all are in suspiciously morphological environments and the clear cases are instances of oxytonic accent on an internal syllable. These vowels lost their ictus through retraction with the resulting neo-acute intonation. Among the jā-stems (e.g. CZ vůle) there is another type of stem with neo-acute intonation characterized by retracted stress. The neo-acute introduced a new rising intonation which probably encouraged the loss of intonation on the old acute. Except for the Czech (and perhaps Upper Sorbian) periphery, all Slavic languages neutralize the old acute by shortening the long vowel. Correspondences in the contemporary Slavic languages provide details by which these four accentual types are identified for Proto-Slavic words.

**Czech Quantity and Proto-Slavic Accent**

With respect to these accentual types in Modern Czech, Gebauer was first to treat the historical development of Czech quantity as a reflex of Proto-Slavic accentuation (Gebauer 1894:586-613). He based his assumptions on the accepted theory still valid today (Miklosich, *Über die langen Vocale in den Slavischen Sprachen*, 1879:312) that Proto-Slavic syllables with front and back jers, /ъ/, /ь/, and the vowels /е/, and /о/, were short and syllables with /и/, /ы/, /э/, /а/, /у/, front and back nasal vowels, /е/ and /о/, and the liquid diphthongs /ер, ер, ол, ъг, ьг, ьл, ьл/ were all originally long. Citing examples such as *млкǝ ‘flour’ (CZ mouka) vs. *мка ‘torture’ (CZ muka), *нєсú indic. 3. pl.
(CZ nesou) vs. *nesq indic. 1. sg. (CZ nesu), Gebauer concludes that Proto-Slavic quantity was in flux but he does not attempt an in depth analysis of the relationship between Late Proto-Slavic intonation and Czech quantity beyond recognizing that there is some identification between the two. It is interesting to note, however, that Gebauer leans towards a view of Czech quantity that places the burden for Czech length more on the historical development of Czech than on the reflexes of Proto-Slavic prosodic features. He interprets, for example, length in derived imperfectives such as vidati (cf. viděti ‘to see’), slýchati (cf. slyšeti ‘to hear’), and nakládati ‘to load’ (cf. first singular kladu ‘I put’), not as the preservation of Proto-Slavic length, but as secondary Czech lengthenings. He also states quite clearly that contemporary Czech quantity is for the most part the same as Old Czech quantity as represented in the Old Czech manuscripts which mostly originate from the Central Bohemian dialects.

"Je tedy kvantita česká původu většinou podružného. Ale tím není řečeno, že by to byl původ pozdní a nedávný. Naopak, jednak změny hláskoslovné, které jsou účinkem délky (úžení a rozšířování), a jednak stará forma psaná dosvědčují bezpečně, že kvantita novočeská je celkem t.j. valnou většinou táž, jako v historické době staročeské" (Gebauer 1894: 338).

[Quantity in Czech is therefore from various sources. But this does not mean that the origin is a later, more recent development. On the contrary, in part phonological changes, and in part the old written forms clearly show, that new Czech Quantity is for the most part, that is, in most cases, the same as in the Old Czech historical period.]

This seemingly mundane observation by arguably the greatest authority on Old Czech ever to walk the planet turns out to be very significant. If Gebauer is right, it
means that the development of Czech quantity from Proto-Slavic accent was primarily prehistoric. Although our view of the development of prehistoric Czech is compressed by centuries of invisible development, the comparative method and internal (dialectal) reconstruction hints at a variety of demonstrable changes that occurred in the centuries between the dialectal dispersion of the Slavs and the first Czech manuscripts.

Concerning changes in Czech quantity, Gebauer distinguishes between old and new differences in quantity. The older distinctions, he points out, show up qualitatively, which presupposes the shifting of the Early Proto-Slavic vowel system from one based on quantity to the Late Proto-Slavic vowel system based on qualitative distinctions. The development of the second stage of the Late Proto-Slavic vowel system however, has been the subject of conjecture and debate. The argument for the Late Proto-Slavic development of a new opposition in length stems from the belief that “all long final vowels in di- and polysyllabic words, whether stressed or unstressed, were shortened” and that “no Slavic language now reveals any original length in this position” (Shevelov 1966:508). For Czech and Slovak, however, this statement may not be true as shown by Old Czech and attested forms in Southwestern Bohemian dialects. Leaving aside for the moment lengthening in auslaut position from contractions (e.g. /oje > é/ etc.), which are for the most part later lengthenings, Old Czech indicates that word final long vowels did

---

8 Dybo (2000:37-43) states that only unstressed word final long vowels were shortened in Proto-Slavic and identifies ten (10) environments in a.p. (b) and a.p. (c) with stressed acute endings. He presents arguments that reflexes in various Slavic dialects, mostly in S/C and SLN, either directly in the form of long vowels or indirectly by triggering the neo-circumflex provide evidence that the shortening of word final long vowels was phonological in unstressed desinences only.
in fact remain long in some cases, e.g. dial. obá, dvá, nikdý Háj herb 69b, někdý t. 191b, níhdá Btch. 446, sotvá Bart D. 8, OCZ nom. třie, ctyřie, adv. silnějšie (Gebauer 1894:339). Strong aorist forms in the 3rd person pl. for several verbal paradigms also preserve length (e.g. vedú, bolú, jídú, nesú, etc.). Trávníček (1935:249) argues that the length in the 3rd pl. aorist forms is by analogy to the present 3rd person pl. of the same paradigms where length was presumably preserved before a final soft /-t/ that was later lost. We find this hypothesis difficult to accept. Syncretism destroyed the tense opposition in prehistoric Czech between the 3rd person pl. aorist and the 3rd person pl. indicative forms, but it is unlikely that the aorist form would have tended towards the indicative form and adopted by analogy the long desinence because by doing so the tense distinction would have been neutralized. We find it more plausible to believe that the length in the aorist form is preserved (stressed) length and that the 3rd person pl. aorist and the 3rd person pl. indicative forms coalesced when the soft /-t/ was lost. In other words, the syncretism of the 3rd person pl. aor. and the 3rd person pl. indicative forms was caused by the loss of final /-t/ in the 3rd person pl. indicative and not by analogical extension of length from the indicative to the aorist. Moreover, in Slovak dialects we find length in the o- and u-stem masc. IP forms such as chlapý, vratý and even ā-stem IP forms such as cestami. Trávníček attributes these lengths either to some local innovation or to the local spread of neo-acute intonation, which determines the Slovak preservation of length. Central Slovak dialects also show length in neuter o-stem

9 Instrumental plural in {–ý} (long) is widespread and according to Stang (1965:31) occurs in Čakavian with the neo-acute accentuation.
nominative/accusative forms such as slová, mestá, okná, poliá. The origin of length in these forms is questionable. One explanation is the possible transfer of neo-acute length to this class of substantives only in the Central Slovak dialects that the Slovak literary language is based on. Slovene, however, also shows the reflex of neo-acute (rising intonation in the final syllable) on several cognate endings. So, perhaps the length in these forms is truly a preservation of Proto-Slavic neo-acute length that spread in endings before the loss of acute length and was shortened in other Slavic dialects including the dialects that literary Czech is based on. Nevertheless, one detail that is worth noting in this connection is the fact that only original long vowels in either Slovak or Czech may be dialectally long in word final position. We know of no instances where original short vowels in word final position show up as long, which may provide additional evidence that the lengths in question are preserved Proto-Slavic lengths.

**Dynamic Ictus and Fixed Ictus**

In Proto-Czech, as in LPSL, ictus was still dynamic and could fall on any syllable of the Proto-Czech word. Hujer (1936:9) notes that there probably were not many words in Proto-Czech that had the ictus fixed on the same syllable throughout the paradigm. He does not explain why he believed this, but subsequent scholarship has adequately demonstrated that the fixed ictus types [a.p. (a), a.p. (b), neo-acute] are very common. It is impossible to determine how long dynamic ictus lasted in Proto-Czech since ictus is not marked in any Old Czech texts as far as we can tell. We have some historical evidence that in the late 8th and the early 9th centuries OCZ still had dynamic ictus. The Slavs by way of Western Slavic dialects borrowed their word for king from the Franks as
an end-stressed substantive *karlь (from Karl Grosse) which later developed under the neo-acute intonation with retracted ictus in the nominative case. We also know from Old Czech words borrowed into Germanic at the time that in the 13th century, Old Czech had already fixed the ictus on the first syllable of the word. In Contemporary Czech dialects we find quite a few exceptions to fixed ictus on the first syllable of the word. In the Silesian,10 Oravian, and Eastern Slovak dialects the ictus is on the penultimate syllable as it is in Polish. It would logically follow, therefore, that Polish has influenced these dialects, but there are other dialect regions in the Czech lands and Moravia that are not contiguous with Polish dialects where the ictus is also on the penultimate syllable (hránické nářečí, starojické, na Karlovsku a Rožnovsku, na Zlínsku, u Holešova, Kroměříže, Přerova). The same process which fixed the ictus in Polish on the penultimate syllable most likely acted independently in the Czech dialects mentioned above, but we will probably never be able to determine whether or not this is true. At any rate, there can be little doubt that the loss of dynamic ictus in prehistoric Czech and the fixing of ictus on the initial syllable of the phonological word influenced the interplay of intonation and quantity. We surmise that since in many word forms the ictus would have been retracted in order to fall ultimately on the initial syllable, that this retraction would have tended to have, if anything, a lengthening effect on the syllable onto which the ictus was being retracted.

10 In other texts (e.g. Hujer, 1936), these dialects are sometimes referred to as the lašská nářečí from the word lach of uncertain origin (but used in the Primary Chronicles). Bělič (19671:12, fn.) notes that the term has a negative connotation in CZ (ničema ‘good-for-nothing,’ darebák ‘fool’) and therefore prefers the term slezká nářečí for the Silesian dialects.
Acute a.p. (a)

Literary Czech is often generally described as preserving acute intonation as length on the first syllable of original disyllabic forms of the fixed accent class a.p. (a). That is not to say that there are not other sources of length in Czech (e.g. the coalescence of –VjV– clusters pás < *pojasь ‘belt;’ neo-acute length kůň < *konь ‘horse,’ compensatory lengthening dial. plouh < *plugь ‘plow’: morphological lengthening děle/dýl, comparative of dlouhý ‘long;’ derivational lengthening Dáša dim. of Dašenka), or that the preservation of acute length is regular in any grammatical sense of the word regular. In fact, the most that can be said of original acute intonation is that a number of PSL words of the fixed stem-ictus a.p. (a) have long vowels in Literary Czech. According to this traditional view, if we examine, for example, a lexical item such as Czech sláma (< PSL *solma) ‘straw,’ the length of the vowel /á/ in the Czech word agrees with other evidence that the Proto-Slavic word contained a root vowel or diphthong whose intonation was acute, (sometimes referred to as high-pitch or rising). In Serbo-Croatian (and South Slavic in general), however, Proto-Slavic acute intonation shows up as brevity. S/C slăma with a short falling accent shows the expected reflex of Proto-Slavic acute intonation in S/C. In Russian, which does not distinguish between long and short vowels, a remnant of the Proto-Slavic acute intonation can be seen in the paradigmatic ictus patterns of the words with polnoglosie. Russian sol'oma with columnar ictus on the second syllable of a polnoglosie word supports the notion that the place of ictus was on the initial syllable and in this particular instance the intonation was acute. Slovene slâma with long-rising intonation is further evidence that the Late Proto-
Slavic term for ‘straw’ contained a diphthong /ol/ with acute intonation later identified with fixed place of ictus in Russian. Similarly in CZ rádlo ‘plow,’ which occurs in a representative selection of contemporary Slavic languages in different forms, the length of the vowel /á/ in the Czech word provides evidence that the Proto-Slavic word contained a root vowel or a diphthong that was high in pitch (acute) and that had the ictus fixed on that syllable throughout the paradigm.¹¹ Serbo-Croatian (S/C) rašlo tells us that the vowel in LPS fell under the acute intonation since /a/ was a long vowel and there is no rule to shorten a long vowel in PS except under the original acute intonation. The vowel could have been long or short as far as the S/C reflex is concerned. The short falling intonation, however, is the expected reflex of Proto-Slavic¹² (stressed) acute intonation. Russian 'ralo indicates that the place of ictus was on the first syllable and since the ictus is fixed on the first syllable throughout the paradigm, we have additional support for the claim that the word was accompanied by acute intonation in Proto-Slavic. Slovenian (SLN) rálo with long-rising intonation is further evidence that the LPSL term for ‘plow’ contained a long low vowel with acute (rising) intonation, which was identified with fixed place of ictus.

¹¹ The actual quality of the intonation, whether it was rising and then falling, steadily rising, or falling then rising is irrelevant and probably impossible to determine.

¹² The importance of distinguishing between the periods of Common Slavic with respect to the length of vowels is discussed in Birnbaum (1963) and Golab (1994) etc. In this thesis, we agree that length became phonemic in LPSL after the shortening of long vowels in various positions.
**Oxytonic a.p. (b)**

Czech also presumably preserves pretonic length in disyllabic words, which means that this class is impossible to distinguish from a.p. (a) by simply looking at the Czech form. A good example of an oxytonic ā-stem in Slavic that shows the preservation of pretonic length in Czech is *tromba* ‘pipe,’ CZ *trouba* (GP *trub*), SK *trúba*, S/C *trúba*, R. *trub̞’a* (AS *trub̞’a*), SLN *tróba*, P. *trába*. A good example of an o-stem oxytonic word with preserved pretonic length in Czech (and Slovak) is *bykъ* ‘bull, ox,’ CZ *býk*, SK *býk*, R. *byk* (AS *byk*’ a), S/C *bîk* (GS *bík*’ a), SLN *bîk*, AS *bîka*.

**Mobile a.p. (c)**

The Czech word *hrad* ‘castle,’ R. *gorod*, S/C *grâd*, SLN *grâd* ‘city,’ with a short /a/ in Czech, ictus on the first syllable of a R *polnoglosie* word in the NS, and falling intonation in S/C and SLN indicates that the Proto-Slavic word *gorðb* contained a diphthong /or/ that did not fix the accent on that syllable, but rather adhered to a mobile-type accentual pattern. More simply put, acute intonation in LPSL shows up in CLC often as length in disyllabic forms of the paradigm, circumflex intonation in LPSL shows up in CLC as brevity throughout the paradigm. This statement, however, as we shall see turns out to be far from formulaic for CLC and there is a great deal of divergence in the dialects. Nevertheless, the dialectal geography and distribution of length vs. brevity in

---

13 The actual circumflex (long falling) intonation occurred in this mobile type of word only when the ictus fell on the first syllable.
the fixed stress stems seems to indicate some patterns that provide a clue to the
countrum of the relationship between PSL accent and Czech quantity.

To take another example, the Proto-Slavic word *golva ‘head,’ Czech hlava, 
Russian golov’а, accusative *golovъ, Serbo-Croatian gláva, Slovene gláva; with the
pattern short /a/ in Czech, mobile ictus in the Russian polnoglosie paradigm, and long
rising intonation in Serbo-Croatian indicates that the word contained a diphthong /ol/ that
that did not fix the accent on that syllable, but rather adhered to a mobile-type accentual
pattern and therefore had circumflex intonation when the ictus fell on the word initial
syllable in Proto-Slavic. The circumflex intonation is defined as the intonation on the
initial syllable of a mobile class stem when that syllable is under stress. There is a sort of
puzzle to be worked out between Czech and the other Slavic languages that preserve a
distinction between long and short vowels in that circumflex length is preserved in S/C
and Slovene whereas in Czech the reflex of circumflex length is brevity.
Expected reflexes of root vowels in the Slavic Languages

Quantitative patterns in the (j)ā-stem feminine substantival paradigms in the Czech dialects reveal some striking facts about the development of quantity in Czech. Table 3, adapted for use from Dybo (1990:13) with several amendments, illustrates the expected reflexes of Proto-Slavic intonations in the most useful Slavic languages for accentological studies that preserve a distinction either in intonation, quantity, or in both. These are the patterns that we have good evidence for believing represent the various Proto-Slavic accentual types. For Czech, the table implies that in monosyllabic and disyllabic forms, length is possible in all stems except on circumflex (mobile) stems. For trisyllabic forms, length is possible in pretonic originally long initial syllables and neo-acute pretonic originally long syllables (initial and internal). Length under the neo-acute intonation in trisyllabic forms developed in Czech after the ictus was retracted (Stang’s law), but under the acute or circumflex intonation, length was lost. We believe that the neo-acute intonation that arose from the retraction of accent one syllable to the left in Proto-Slavic conditioned lengthening of the short vowels in Proto-Czech dialects in certain classes of substantives and morphological desinences that spread to the roots of other substantives with short vowels of the oxytonic class.
## Table 3 – Expected correspondences of Proto-Slavic intonational patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>No. of Syllables</th>
<th>Acute</th>
<th>Neo-acute on long syllable</th>
<th>Neo-acute on short syllable</th>
<th>Circumflex on long syllable</th>
<th>Circumflex on short syllable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/C</td>
<td>1 syllable</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 syllable</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 syllable</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/C Čak.</td>
<td>1 syllable</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 syllable</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 syllable</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/C Old Croatian</td>
<td>1 syllable</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 syllable</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 syllable</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/C Kajkavian</td>
<td>1 syllable</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 syllable</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 syllable</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovene</td>
<td>1 syllable</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 syllable</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 syllable</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>1 syllable</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 syllable</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 syllable</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>1 syllable</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 syllable</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 syllable</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S/C, S/C Čak, Old

Croatian, S/C Kajkavian

Slovene

Czech and Slovak

| | = short falling
| | = long falling
| | = long rising
| | = short rising
| | = short vowel without distinctive intonation
| | = long vowel
| | = short vowel
| | = unspecified for length – could be either a long or a short vowel.
One of the peculiar differences between Czech and the other Slavic languages with oppositions in quantity is that Czech seems not to show length where the others do, and does show length where the others do not, except in positions where the ictus was retracted. When the ictus was retracted as in the oxytonic stems of a.p. (b) and the neo-acute originally long jā-stems, Czech (with Slovak) seems to have preserved length rather more consistently than the other Slavic languages, and in the neo-acute originally short jā-stems, Czech consistently lengthens the short vowel. Deriving the CLC quantity patterns for (j)ā-stem paradigms from the PSL accentual paradigms is instructive in understanding the Czech developments.

If we look at the four LPSL accentual paradigms: acute [fixed root stress = a.p. (a)], oxytonic [fixed stress on first syllable of the desinence = a.p. (b)], circumflex [(mobile = a.p.(c)], and neo-acute (retracted stress), we can initially derive the following paradigms for the feminine (j)ā-stem disyllabic substantives according to the historically determined rules for the development of length in Czech:

Table 4 – Acute disyllabic feminine (j)ā-stems in CLC with original long root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case / Number</th>
<th>Proto-Slavic Form according to Stang (1965:56)</th>
<th>Rule for Preservation or Loss of Length in original Long Root Vowel</th>
<th>Expected CLC Form</th>
<th>Old Czech Form</th>
<th>Literary Czech Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>*körv a</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>KRÁVA</td>
<td>kráva</td>
<td>kráva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>*körv y</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>KRÁVY</td>
<td>krávy</td>
<td>krávy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>*körv ě</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>KRÁVÉ</td>
<td>krávě</td>
<td>krávě</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>*körv q</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>KRÁVU</td>
<td>krávu</td>
<td>krávu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>*körv ojo</td>
<td>Acute length lost in word greater than two syllables</td>
<td>KRAVOU</td>
<td>kravú</td>
<td>kravou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>*körv ě</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>KRÁVÉ</td>
<td>krávě</td>
<td>krávě</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table: Proto-Slavic Forms and Preservation/Loss of Length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case / Number</th>
<th>Proto-Slavic Form according to Stang (1965:56)</th>
<th>Rule for Preservation or Loss of Length in original Long Root Vowel</th>
<th>Expected CLC Form</th>
<th>Old Czech Form</th>
<th>Literary Czech Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>*kórvь ā</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>KRÁVY</td>
<td>krávy</td>
<td>krávy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>*kórvь́ь</td>
<td>1). Acute length preserved, 2). Morpho-phonemic loss of length in GP</td>
<td>KRAV</td>
<td>krav / kráv</td>
<td>krav</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>*kórv am ь</td>
<td>Acute length lost in word greater than two syllables long</td>
<td>*KRAVAM</td>
<td>kravám</td>
<td>kravám</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>*kórv ь</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>KRÁVY</td>
<td>krávy</td>
<td>krávy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>*kórv am i</td>
<td>Acute length lost in word greater than two syllables long</td>
<td>KRAVAMI</td>
<td>kravami</td>
<td>kravami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>*kórv ь</td>
<td>Acute length lost in word greater than two syllables long</td>
<td>*KRAVACH</td>
<td>kraváč</td>
<td>kraváč</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We should note here that there are no paradigms in CLC that match the expected result of the PSL acute (j)ā-stem paradigm for every grammatical case, although the CLC F Type paradigm with shortened root vowel in the IS, GP, DP, IP, and LP comes very close. The only deviation from the expected results in Type F is in the DP and LP desinences. Although phonologically we would expect length on the root in the GP (attested in many examples from OCZ), a morphophonemic rule operated for a time across the (j)ā-stem paradigms that shortened the root vowel in the GP. Wherever there is an alternation of length in a CLC (j)ā-stem paradigm with a long root vowel (Types D, E, and F above), the GP participates in the alternation and the root vowel is short.

Gebauer (III.I.:179) lists GP strák, múk, rýb, attested in OCZ from the acute a.p. (a), which means that either there was some residue of phonologically retained length in the

---

1 Stang (1957:96 & 168) reconstructs {*-ōm/ā} despite Meillet (MSL 22, p. 258) maintaining that the Slavic ending {*-ν} must be from {*-om/ā}. 
GP, or length from other forms of the paradigm spread to the GP. However, when one considers that even in the OCZ literary language (of Central Bohemian origin) NS *straka*, *muka*, and NS *ryba* had short root vocalism throughout the paradigm, it becomes obvious that the exceptional length in the GP attested in OCZ for these words is from a different source. The behavior of length in the GP has been attributed to two major factors, either: 1) the neo-circumflex shortening of original acute length, or 2) the generalization of an alternation in quantity between the GP and the rest of the paradigm in order to differentiate the GP. For the OCZ attested length in the GP of originally acute *(j)ā*-stems (OCZ GP *strák*, *můk*, *rýb*) that lost length in the rest of the paradigm, the best guess is that the length, even though it may have originated from a phonological retention of acute length in the GP of the fixed stem stress a.p. (a) class, by the time we have historical documents must be attributed to the generalization of an alternation in quantity between the GP and the rest of the paradigm in order to differentiate the GP.

It is important to notice additionally for ā-stem paradigms in CZ, that the DP desinence {-ám} and the LP desinence {-áč} were generalized very early in OCZ to most ā-stems.2 The source of the length in these desinences is uncertain, but the length is

---

2 Gebauer (III.I.:181) observed that LP {-áč} in OCZ sometimes is shortened, especially in the Chod dialects and that the DP {-om} from the o-stems is also attested in the Chod dialects Chod DP *kravom*. It is possible that the brevity in these desinences represents a residue of the expected CZ phonological reflexes and are not shortenings at all.

Jančák (1970:129) makes the following observations;“O stáří těchto krátkých západočeských koncovek –om, –ach nelze říci nic určitého. Jejich zeměpisné rozložení shodující se s typem –om však ukazuje, že impuls k těmto nářečním novotvarům mohl vyjit právě od krátkých tvarů na –om, zvlášt’ u analogických podob, např. v žen. *voda*, nastala totiž kolize mezi krátkým typem ‘kravom’ a původním typem ‘ženáющую. ‘ Její vyrovnání si pak ovšem vynutilo obdobnou změnu; u korespondujících tvarů, a to jak v témže paradigmatu, tak v tvaroch analogických u jiných vzorů
restricted to Czech, Slovak, and Polish dialects and might very well be connected to the
loss and vocalization of jers or to a spread of the neo-acute intonation in these desinences.
Length in Czech that is not PSL acute length or neo-acute length is often called
compensatory lengthening. In the u-stem LP where the desinence was {*-ь/-хь} (e.g.
*dom-ь/-хь), the vocalized jer does not become a long vowel (cf. CZ domech). Original
short /o/, however, in the o-stem DP {*-о-м-ь} does become long (e.g. chlapomь >
chlapом > chlapuom > chlapъm) as does the original o-stem GP {*-о-в-ь > -о-в > -уо-в
> ŭ-в > ŭ} that has been generalized to nearly all masculine paradigms in CLC. We
conclude from these observations that the lengthening of the stem vowel in the
substantival paradigms coincided with the loss of the weak jers but in all probability
began operating before the vocalization of the strong jers. Yet there is still the possibility
that it was the neo-acute intonation from the neo-acute class that spread to these
desinences and that the length developed here as a continuation of the neo-acute
intonation.

této oblasti zcela ve shodě s krátkými koncovkami –um a –im v 3. p. u ostatních typů skloňování
(pánum, mužum, městum; nášim, kost’um).” [Regarding the age of these short endings, –am, –
ach, in the Western Bohemian dialects, nothing certain can be said. But their geographical
distribution agrees with the distribution of the –om endings [DP], which shows that the impetus
towards these dialectal innovations could stem precisely from forms with –om, especially when
compared to a similar situation such as with the paradigm of voda. A collision between the short
type, kravom, and the original type ženám took place. This levelling then caused the same
analogical change in corresponding forms in the same paradigm but also in analogical forms of
other paradigms e.g. (pánom – kravom – ženam – ženach – klubach – klukam). Therefore the
forms with short -am in these dialects are agree with the short desinences –um and –im in the DP
of the other declensions (pánum, mužum, městum; nášim, kost ’um)].
Table 5 – Oxytonic disyllabic feminine (j)ā-stems in CLC with original long root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case / Number</th>
<th>Proto-Slavic form adapted from Stang (1965:60)</th>
<th>Rule for Preservation or Loss of Length in original Long Root Vowel</th>
<th>Expected CLC Form</th>
<th>Old Czech Form</th>
<th>Literary Czech Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>*trob à</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>TROUBA</td>
<td>trúba</td>
<td>trouba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>*trob ý</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>TROUBY</td>
<td>truby</td>
<td>trouby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>*trob ê</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>TROUBÉ</td>
<td>trubè</td>
<td>troubè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>*trob ō</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>TROUBU</td>
<td>trubù</td>
<td>troubu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>*trob ō̆</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>TROUBOU</td>
<td>trubou</td>
<td>troubo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>*trob ê</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>TROUBÉ</td>
<td>trubè</td>
<td>troubè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>*trob ý</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>TROUBY</td>
<td>truby</td>
<td>trouby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>*trob ţ</td>
<td>1). Length preserved pretonically, 2). Neo-acute retraction, 3). Morpho-phonemic loss of length in GP</td>
<td>TRUB</td>
<td>trub</td>
<td>trub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>*trob ō̆</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>*TROUBAM</td>
<td>trúbám</td>
<td>troubám</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>*trob ý</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>TROUBY</td>
<td>truby</td>
<td>trouby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>*trob ō̆</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>TROUBAMI</td>
<td>trúbami</td>
<td>troubami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>*trob ō̆</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>*TROUBACH</td>
<td>trúbách</td>
<td>troubách</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CZ reflexes of the PSL oxytonic (j)ā-stem paradigm exhibit the expected phonological reflexes throughout the paradigm except for in the GP and the desinences of the DP & LP. Gebauer (III.I.:179) lists GP pát, kóp, attested in OCZ from the oxytonic a.p. (b). These forms may represent a remnant of the reflex of the neo-acute intonation in OCZ, but in the GP, any phonological process that may have once operated has been nearly obliterated by the generalization of brevity in the GP, particularly in the oxytonic
class. In OCZ there is a paucity of original oxytonic forms that alternate in the grammatical cases that we find the acute substantives alternating in. There are very few examples in OCZ of shortenings of original oxytonic root vowels in the IS, DP, LP, IP. The natural conclusion to reach is that words of the oxytonic class were not subject to the loss of pretonic length in three syllable forms of the paradigm (in other words, pretonic length was not treated the same way as acute length) and that the spread of brevity in the GP was a later morphological development that affected nearly all long (j)ā-stem lexemes. Spurious OCZ shortenings in the IS, DP, LP, and IP for this class of words must be attributed to sporadic mirroring of the acute a.p. (a) pattern which was quite well preserved in OCZ.

Table 6 – Circumflex disyllabic feminine (j)ā-stems in CLC with original long root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case / Number</th>
<th>Proto-Slavic form according to Stang (1965:62)</th>
<th>Rule for Preservation or Loss of Length in original Long Root Vowel</th>
<th>Expected CLC Form</th>
<th>Old Czech Form</th>
<th>Literary Czech Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>*golv á</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>*HLÁVA</td>
<td>hlava</td>
<td>hlava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>*golv ý</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>*HLÁVY</td>
<td>hlavy</td>
<td>hlavy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>*golv ě</td>
<td>Circumflex length lost</td>
<td>HLAVĚ</td>
<td>hlavě</td>
<td>hlavě</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>*golv ő</td>
<td>Circumflex length lost</td>
<td>HLAVU</td>
<td>hlavu</td>
<td>hlavu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>*golv ojo</td>
<td>Length lost in word greater than two syllables long</td>
<td>HLAVOU</td>
<td>hlavou</td>
<td>hlavou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>*golv ře</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>*HLAVĚ</td>
<td>hlavě</td>
<td>hlavě</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>*golv y</td>
<td>Circumflex length lost</td>
<td>HLAVY</td>
<td>hlavy</td>
<td>hlavy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>*golv ř</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>HLÁV</td>
<td>hlav / hláv</td>
<td>hlav</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>*golv řm ř</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>*HLÁVAM</td>
<td>hlavám</td>
<td>hlavám</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>*golv ř</td>
<td>Circumflex length lost</td>
<td>HLAVY</td>
<td>hlavy</td>
<td>hlavy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>*golv řm i</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>*HLÁVAMI</td>
<td>hlavami</td>
<td>hlavami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>*golv řx ř</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>*HLÁVACH</td>
<td>hlavách</td>
<td>hlavách</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CLC is quite consistent in generalizing brevity in this class of substantives. Nearly all (j)ā-stems that we have classified as a.p. (c) (see Table 15 thru Table 18) are short throughout the paradigm and there are few dialectal exceptions. Map 13, however, which shows the dialectal distribution of length in CZ zíma ‘cold, winter’ illustrates the fact that attested dialectal length in the NS from an original a.p. (c) root is dramatically different (heavily concentrated in the Northeastern Bohemian dialects) from dialectal length in the NS of ā-stems that belonged to other accentual paradigms [e.g. CLC duha / CZ dial. NS douha from a.p. (b) shown in Map 11, CLC NS bříza / CZ dial. březa from a.p. (a) shown in Map 5]. If it weren’t for the many attestations of zíma in OCZ (e.g. SlovKlem 34a Bruma zíma, SlovKlem 48a Frigus zíma which shows that the word had two meanings – and in some dialects these two meanings are distinguished by an opposition in length 680 [v zimňe] ‘in the cold,’ [v žémje] ‘in the winter’), one might be inclined to explain this form as a local CZ dialectal innovation. It is possible that the dialectal forms with length are actually preserved pretonic length in the NS, or alternatively, that PSL *zíma showed early variation of its accentual paradigm.

If the stress was on the stem vowel /-a-/ in the DP, IP, and LP of the mobile paradigm, we would expect to see some residue of this length preserved in OCZ and the dialects, but there does not seem to be any. From the Czech data at least, it appears that the ictus in the DP, IP, and LP would have been on the final vowel of the desinence and not the stem vowel. We would also expect there to be some residue in OCZ and the dialects of the preservation of length in the NS, GS, and LS in the circumflex (j)ā-stems, but there are not many examples in the data we have looked at. The only other
alternative is to imagine that circumflex length in Proto-Czech was lost early enough for
the brevity to spread throughout the paradigm creating a class without length
considerably before the appearance of manuscripts and texts with markings for length.

In the GP, Gebauer (III.1:179) lists strán, hláv, nóh, vód, hór, růk, dúš with length
from the mobile paradigms. Map 14 shows the dialectal distribution of lengthened /ó/ in
the GP of */noha/, a.p. (c) ‘leg.’ The map shows that only a small area in the
northwestern Czech territory preserves the length. Length in the GP of (j)ä-stems is not a
morphological generalization in these dialects, and if it weren’t for the fact that there are
attested forms in OCZ with length in the GP of originally mobile stems, and that the
phonologically correct form is one that we expect to have length, it would be difficult to
rest a case on these examples as preserving old length in the GP. Nevertheless, we must
regard them as old. Whether the explanation for this length is phonological (e.g.
preserved pretonic length) or morphological (e.g. archaic tendency to generalize length in
the GP when the rest of the paradigm is short in order to differentiate the GP from the rest
of the paradigm) is not possible to determine from our data.

Table 7 – Neo-acute disyllabic feminine jā-stems in CLC with original long root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case / Number</th>
<th>Proto-Slavic form</th>
<th>Rule for Preservation or Loss of Length in original Long Root Vowel</th>
<th>Expected CLC Form</th>
<th>Old Czech Form</th>
<th>Literary Czech Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>*görđj 'a</td>
<td>1). Pretonic length preserved, 2). Neo-acute retraction of ictus, Desinence 3). Přehláska /a &gt; ě &gt; ĕ/</td>
<td>Hráze</td>
<td>hráze</td>
<td>hráze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>*görđj 'æ</td>
<td>1). Pretonic length preserved, 2). Neo-acute retraction of ictus, Desinence 3). Přehláska /a &gt; ě &gt; ĕ/</td>
<td>Hráze</td>
<td>hráze</td>
<td>hráze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case / Number</td>
<td>Proto-Slavic form</td>
<td>Rule for Preservation or Loss of Length in original Long Root Vowel</td>
<td>Expected CLC Form</td>
<td>Old Czech Form</td>
<td>Literary Czech Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>*gorđj 'i</td>
<td>1. Pretonic length preserved, 2. Neo-acute retraction of ictus</td>
<td>HRÁZI</td>
<td>hrázi</td>
<td>hrázi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>*gorđj 'q</td>
<td>1. Pretonic length preserved, 2. Neo-acute retraction of ictus, Desinence 3. Přehláška /u &gt; ŭ &gt; i/</td>
<td>HRÁZI</td>
<td>hrázi</td>
<td>hrázi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>*gorđj 'i</td>
<td>1. Pretonic length preserved, 2. Neo-acute retraction of ictus</td>
<td>HRÁZI</td>
<td>hrázi</td>
<td>hrázi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>*gorđj 'æ</td>
<td>1. Pretonic length preserved, 2. Neo-acute retraction of ictus, Desinence 3. Přehláška /a &gt; ě &gt; e/</td>
<td>HRÁZE</td>
<td>hráze</td>
<td>hráze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>*gorđj 'b</td>
<td>1. Pretonic length preserved, 2. Neo-acute retraction of ictus</td>
<td>*HRÁZ</td>
<td>hrází</td>
<td>hrází</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>*gorđj 'am ṛ</td>
<td>1. Pretonic length preserved, 2. Neo-acute retraction of ictus, Desinence 3. Přehláška /a &gt; ě &gt; e/</td>
<td>*HRÁZEM</td>
<td>hrázím</td>
<td>hrázím</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>*gorđj 'æ</td>
<td>1. Pretonic length preserved, 2. Neo-acute retraction of ictus, Desinence 3. Přehláška /a &gt; ě &gt; e/</td>
<td>HRÁZE</td>
<td>hráze</td>
<td>hráze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>*gorđj 'am i</td>
<td>1. Pretonic length preserved, 2. Neo-acute retraction of ictus, Desinence 3. Přehláška /a &gt; ě &gt; e/</td>
<td>HRÁZEMI</td>
<td>hrázemi</td>
<td>hrázemi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>*gorđj 'ax ṛ</td>
<td>1. Pretonic length preserved, 2. Neo-acute retraction of ictus, Desinence 3. Přehláška /a &gt; ě &gt; e/</td>
<td>*HRÁZECH</td>
<td>hrázích</td>
<td>hrázích</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The neo-acute on an original long vowel nearly always shows up in Czech and Slovak as length. Neo-acute on an original long vowel in the masculine stems also
preserves length throughout the paradigm (e.g. král, krále, královi, krále, královi, králem, králové, králů, králům, krále, králi, králich). The neo-acute on an original short vowel, however, has a different effect on the feminine stems than in the masculine stems. In the feminine jā-stems with neo-acute (see Table 8) the root vowel has length throughout the paradigm, but in the masculine oxytonic (j)o-stems with lengthened /o/ in the NAS (see Table 29), the length does not appear in any other case forms.

Table 8 – Neo-acute disyllabic feminine jā-stems in CLC with original short root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case / Number</th>
<th>Proto-Slavic form</th>
<th>Rule for Preservation or Loss of Length in original Long Root Vowel</th>
<th>Expected CLC Form</th>
<th>Old Czech Form</th>
<th>Literary Czech Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>*vōlj ʰa</td>
<td>1). Neo-acute retraction, 2). Lengthening of /o/ under neo-acute, Desinence 3). Přehláska /a &gt; ě &gt; e/</td>
<td>VŮLE vůle vůle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>*vōlj ʰe</td>
<td>1). Neo-acute retraction, 2). Lengthening of /o/ under neo-acute, Desinence 3). Přehláska /a &gt; ě &gt; e/</td>
<td>VŮLE vůle vůle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>*vōlj ʰi</td>
<td>1). Neo-acute retraction, 2). Lengthening of /o/ under neo-acute</td>
<td>VŮLI vůli vůli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>*vōlj ʰi</td>
<td>1). Neo-acute retraction, 2). Lengthening of /o/ under neo-acute</td>
<td>VŮLI vůli vůli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case / Number</td>
<td>Proto-Slavic form</td>
<td>Rule for Preservation or Loss of Length in original Long Root Vowel</td>
<td>Expected CLC Form</td>
<td>Old Czech Form</td>
<td>Literary Czech Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| NP           | *volj í f | 1). Neo-acute retraction,  
2). Lengthening of /o/ under neo-acute,  
Desinence  
3). Přehláška /a > ā > e/ | VŮLE | vůle | vůle |
| GP           | *volj í ř | 1). Neo-acute retraction,  
2). Lengthening of /o/ under neo-acute  
Desinence  
3). Přehláška /a > ā > e/ | *VŮL | vól | vůlí |
| DP           | *volj í am ř | 1). Neo-acute retraction,  
2). Lengthening of /o/ under neo-acute,  
Desinence  
3). Přehláška /a > ā > e/ | *VŮLEM | vólim | vůlim |
| AP           | *volj í f | 1). Neo-acute retraction,  
2). Lengthening of /o/ under neo-acute,  
Desinence  
3). Přehláška /a > ā > e/ | VŮLE | vůle | vůle |
| IP           | *volj í am i | 1). Neo-acute retraction,  
2). Lengthening of /o/ under neo-acute,  
Desinence  
3). Přehláška /a > ā > e/ | VŮLEMI | vůlemi | vůlemi |
| LP           | *volj í ax ř | 1). Neo-acute retraction,  
2). Lengthening of /o/ under neo-acute,  
Desinence  
3). Přehláška /a > ā > e/ | *VŮLECH | vůlích | vůlích |

The few examples of shortening in the IS in jā-stems, e.g. volí, koží, s-těží, Gebauer (1960, III.I:215-126) seem to come from the neo-acutes (not from the acute or oxytonic jā-stem paradigms) and indicate that there was some spread of brevity in the IS from original acutes into the neo-acute paradigms. There are, however, attested OCZ shortenings in the plural as well for several original neo-acute lexemes. All in all, there is not sufficient data at this time to suggest that a separate paradigm with shortened vowel only in the IS and not in the plural forms ever existed.
Feminine Disyllabic j(ā)-stem paradigms in Contemporary Literary Czech

Following Verweij (1993:494), it is useful to classify paradigms in the Czech substantival system according to patterns in vowel quantity alternations in the root vowels of originally disyllabic words. We see no need to improve dramatically on the system developed by Verweij and therefore reproduce this classification for convenience in reference. The only addition we have made is to offer a table for each gender rather than combining genders in the same table as Verweij has done. It should be noted that these paradigmatic classifications apply to Contemporary Literary Czech (CLC). Czech dialects may or may not exhibit the same patterns as the literary language.

A. Short root vowel in all forms;
B. Long root vowel in all case forms;
C. A long root vowel in the NAS, short root vowel in the remaining case forms;
D. Short root vowel in the GP, long root vowel in the remaining case forms;
E. Short root vowel in the GP, DP, IP, LP, long root vowel in the remaining case forms;
F. Short root vowel in the IS, GP, DP, IP, LP, long root vowel in the remaining case forms.
G. Slovak pattern with length in the GP;
X. Pattern ambiguous.

Dialectal material (in the form of maps attached in the appendices, attested forms from a variety of published dialectal studies, dictionaries, and forms collected from the card catalogue at the Institute for the Czech Language, Czech Academia of Sciences) whose data differ considerably from the facts found in CLC will be introduced in the
following discussions to support the membership of words in the accentological classes recognized for PSL.

Table 9 – Feminine disyllabic (jä)-stem paradigms in CLC³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case / Number</th>
<th>A (all short)</th>
<th>B (all long)</th>
<th>C (long NAS, else short)</th>
<th>D (short GP, else long)</th>
<th>E (short GP, DP, IP, LP, else long)</th>
<th>F (short IS, GP, DP, IP, LP, else long)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>muka</td>
<td>bříza</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>chvála</td>
<td>kráva</td>
<td>rána</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>muky</td>
<td>břízy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>chvály</td>
<td>krávy</td>
<td>ránų</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>muce</td>
<td>bříze</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>chvále</td>
<td>krávě</td>
<td>ráně</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>muku</td>
<td>břízu</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>chválu</td>
<td>krávu</td>
<td>ránů</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>mukou</td>
<td>břízou</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>chváloù</td>
<td>krávou</td>
<td>ranou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>muce</td>
<td>bříze</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>chvále</td>
<td>krávě</td>
<td>ráně</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>muky</td>
<td>břízy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>chvály</td>
<td>krávy</td>
<td>ránų</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>muk</td>
<td>bříz</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>chval</td>
<td>krav</td>
<td>ran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>mukám</td>
<td>břízám</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>chválám</td>
<td>kravám</td>
<td>ranám</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>muky</td>
<td>břízy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>chvály</td>
<td>krávy</td>
<td>ránų</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>mukami</td>
<td>břízami</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>chváli</td>
<td>kravami</td>
<td>ranami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>mukách</td>
<td>břízách</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>chválach</td>
<td>kravách</td>
<td>ranách</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Italicized forms in Table 9 show vowel quantity alternations within a given paradigm. As a shorthand way of indicating the forms of all the cases for a particular CLC word, the scheme shown above will be referred to by noting the letter of the declension type for the Czech words in the column labeled ‘Czech’ in the tables that follow (see Table 10 thru Table 19) which list the substantives according to Proto-Slavic accentual class. These classification tables represent Proto-Slavic (jä)-stem substantives, compiled from the works of various authors (Bulaxovskij, Dybo, Gebauer, Hujer, Kopečný, Shevelov, Vasmer, Trávníček, and others), that exhibit the patterns of

³ Although the jä-stem (soft paradigm = měkký vzor) desinences in CLC have been dramatically altered by the so-called Czech uumlaut (přehláška), the alternations of quantity in the root vowel of disyllabic words occurs in the same grammatical cases, so that the classification scheme may still be applied.
correspondences in the contemporary Slavic languages that are generally associated with acute, oxytonic, circumflex and neo-acute accentual paradigms.

From Table 9, Type A with short vowel throughout the paradigm applies to original long vowel stems as well as to original short vowel stems. Many of the PSL mobile type (j)ā-stems of a.p. (c) in CLC have a short vowel throughout the paradigm. As far as the acute PSL (j)ā-stems of a.p. (a) and oxytonic PSL (j)ā-stems of a.p. (b) are concerned, a number of them in CLC also belong to this paradigm even though we have reason to expect acute long vowels and pretonic length to be preserved in CLC.

Ā-stems with original PSL long vowels that belong to the A type paradigm in CLC with shortened long vowel include e.g.: baba, brada, cena, cesta, chmura, děva, duha, duma, hlava, hnida, hřada, huba, hvězda, jíkra, jískra, jízva, klika, kuna, kupa, lava, lichva, měna, mluva, muka, něha, níva, pata, pěna, piha, pila, plena, pleva, ruda, ruka, ryba, řada, řasa, řeka, slína, sluha, sluka, snaha, stěna, straka, strana, středa, střecha, střela, štika, uzda, věda, vina, vydra, zima, žluna, žluva.

Ā-stems that belong to the A type paradigm with brevity throughout the declension in CLC with original PSL short vowels include e.g.: deska (< PSL *dъska), hora, jehla (< PSL *jъgъla), kopa, kosa, koza, mora, noha, nora, roba, rosa, rota, sestra, socha, sosna, stopa, voda, vosa, žena.

---

4 But see Map 10 for the dialectal distribution of lengthened /ó/ in this word.
Jā-stems in CLC with originally long PSL vowels that belong to this type with brevity throughout the declension include e.g.: duše, kaše, kleště, paže, seza, sukně, věž, višňě, zmije.

Jā-stems in CLC with originally short PSL vowels that belong to this type include e.g.: mez (< OCZ mezě), nozdra, rez (< PSL *rъzjā), země, zora (< PSL *zorjā).

Type B with long vowel throughout the paradigm applies to original long vowel stems as well as original short vowel stems. Ā-stems that belong to the B type paradigm with long vowels throughout the declension in CLC with original long vowel stems include e.g.: bříza, hlína, hlíva, hlíza, hříva, jícha, jíva, kláda, kýla, kýta, láaska, liska, máma, máta, prouha, roura, routa, síra, skýva, sláva, stoupa, sváda, škvára, šťáva, vláha, brázda, cěva, dýka, hlišta, jícha, jízda, krása, křída, licha, liska, míza, mouka, pýcha, slouha (m.), střída, třída, tříska, vláda, žláza.

Jā-stems in CLC that belong to this type include e.g.: báň(e), boule, bouře, čišě, diž(e), dýně, hloub(-i), houně, houšt’, hráz(e), chůze, chýše, káně, kdoule (< kǒduňa), koupě, louč, mříž(e), nouze, nůšě, pice, poušt’, příze, skráň, skřín, souše, stáj, stráň, stráž, šíje, šiř(e), tíž(e), tůň/tůně, vůle, vůně, výše, zár(e). Once again, however, the fact that these words have a long vowel throughout the paradigm in CLC is not sufficient to prove that they were acute stems in Proto-Slavic. A number of the jā-stems with long root vowel are in fact neo-acute stems (see Table 19).

Type C with long vowel throughout the paradigm except the NAS does not occur with (j)ā-stems. This pattern is reflected by the (j)o-stems of the type NS dům, GS domu, DS domu, AS dům, VS dome!, IS domem, LS domě.
Type D with long vowel throughout the paradigm except in the GP characterize bába, bída, bouda, hrouba, jáma, moucha, sláma, víra, skála, vrána, žába, díra, chvála, kroupa, touha, trouba, louka, strouha, misa, slíva, tráva, brány. Čá-stems in CLC that belong to this type include: hrábě, chvile, svíce.

Type E with long vowel throughout the paradigm except in the GP, DP, IP, and LP include several ā-stems: e.g. kráva, skála, vrána, and zero čá-stems. All of these words are original acute stems (see Table 10). We regard this pattern as the second most archaic pattern for original acute substantives.

Type F with long vowel throughout the paradigm except in the IS, GP, DP, IP, and LP is the most archaic. All of these words are original acute stems (see Table 10). The difference between the two paradigms, E and F, is reflected in the preservation of the reflex of the morphophonemic rule that shortened the root vowel in the trisyllabic IS form. Substantives of Type E have leveled out by analogy the alternation between the IS and the rest of the forms of the singular paradigm. There are several (j)čá-stems that preserve the alternation in the IS in CLC rána, síla, and several words that allow for type F as an option either in CLC or OCZ hrouda, kráva, OCZ dráha, lípa, míra, sláma, strouha, žíla, bríza, brána ‘gate,’ blána.

Acute Feminine (jčá-stems)

It should be mentioned outright that the lists of words in the tables are not intended to be exhaustive, though effort has been made to include as many relevant lexemes as possible. The idea throughout this project has been to focus on words with solid PSL pedigrees, although we have included words borrowed into PSL as well if they
appear to illuminate our knowledge of the PSL accentological system. Lexemes that were originally trisyllabic (e.g. CZ *jehla < *ji-gʲa) have been generally excluded from the scope of this analysis. Slovak forms are quoted as a point of reference for the Czech data and indicate where the length in the Czech form is innovative or preserved in contrast to the Slovak, and where Czech and Slovak share the length or lack of length. Because Slovak consistently preserves pretonic and neo-acute length, it is nearly diagnostic for these PSL accentual paradigms. Slovak also exhibits a great deal of regularity in the shortening of acute length in the (j)ā-stems as well as in other classes of stems. Although Slovene is not particularly useful in helping to establish the PSL intonational paradigm for the feminine (j)ā-stems because of the fact that SLN lengthened all stressed vowels, some clues are provided by the quality of originally short /e/ and /o/ type vowels. The closed variants [/o, ô, ě, ě/ (in the orthography used by Pleteršnik, 1894)], whether from an originally long vowel, diphthong, or short vowel in SLN indicate that the ictus was originally on that vowel, whereas SLN long open /ô, ě/ indicate that the ictus was retracted onto that syllable and later lengthened when all stressed vowels in SLN were lengthened. For place of stress, Russian proves to be most reliable, although for the identification of the oxytonic class versus the mobile class, we have discovered that what Stang alluded to (Stang, 1965:67) regarding a different type of mobile paradigm without retracted stress in the AS but with retracted stress in the NP (e.g. R slobod′a, slobod′u, ′slobody) may indeed be supported by the Czech data.

\footnote{For trisyllabic words that have lengthened short vowels to the right of weak jers that were lost, however, such as CZ lhůta/lhota < PSL *lʊgota see footnote 37.}
Table 10 – Acute disyllabic feminine ā-stems (all with original long root vocalism)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*rana</td>
<td>‘wound’</td>
<td>rána</td>
<td>rána</td>
<td>rána F</td>
<td>rana</td>
<td>‘rana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sila</td>
<td>‘power’</td>
<td>šila</td>
<td>síla</td>
<td>síla F</td>
<td>síla</td>
<td>‘sila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bolna</td>
<td>‘membrane’</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>blána</td>
<td>blána D/F</td>
<td>blana</td>
<td>bolon ‘a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*grôda/ *gruda</td>
<td>‘hunk’</td>
<td>grúda</td>
<td>grúda</td>
<td>hrouda, GP hrud D/F</td>
<td>hruda</td>
<td>‘gruda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*krava</td>
<td>‘cow’</td>
<td>kráva</td>
<td>kráva</td>
<td>kráva E/F</td>
<td>krava</td>
<td>kor’ova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*dorga</td>
<td>‘road’</td>
<td>drága</td>
<td>drága</td>
<td>draha OCZ dráha D/F</td>
<td>draha</td>
<td>dor’oga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lipa</td>
<td>‘linden’</td>
<td>lípa</td>
<td>lípa</td>
<td>lípa D/F</td>
<td>lípa</td>
<td>‘lipa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mêra</td>
<td>‘measure’</td>
<td>mjêra</td>
<td>mêra</td>
<td>mera, D / OCZ F</td>
<td>mera</td>
<td>‘m’era</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Although not attested in S/C and despite the fact that Russian is indeterminate, we believe *bolna is a clear example of an a.p. (a) ā-stem based on the CZ, SLK evidence. R bolon ‘a ‘tree epiphyte’ is probably the secondary form derived from a posited earlier Proto-Russian *bol’ ona a.p. (a) ‘tree membrane’ by way of an opposition in accentual paradigms. Vas. (1986, I:189) states that the R stress in bolon ‘a is different from the Lith. bâlnas ‘white,’ which indicates original acute (ā-stem).
8 In OCZ in several texts from the 15th century where vowel quantity is marked there is evidence that other cases in the paradigm had the shortened root form: “By kto tobo zlatû hruđu (IS) dal u bok” Kruml. 244⁶ “hruđu ohennû ignitam strumam” Otc. 35². Also in the PSSČ the word is given as alternatively F with /u/ in the IS, GP, DP, LP, and IP.
10 (Gebauer, III. I.:182).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*solma</td>
<td>‘straw’</td>
<td>sláma</td>
<td>sláma</td>
<td>sláma D/F</td>
<td>slama</td>
<td>sol’’oma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*struga</td>
<td>‘ditch, canal’</td>
<td>strúga</td>
<td>strúga</td>
<td>strouha D / OCZ F(^{11})</td>
<td>struha</td>
<td>dial. ’struga dial. strug’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*žila(^{12})</td>
<td>‘vein’</td>
<td>žila</td>
<td>žila</td>
<td>žila D/F</td>
<td>žila</td>
<td>’žila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*skala</td>
<td>‘cliff’</td>
<td>skála</td>
<td>skála</td>
<td>skála D/E</td>
<td>skala</td>
<td>skal’’a(^{13})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*vorna(^{14})</td>
<td>‘crow’</td>
<td>vrána</td>
<td>vrána</td>
<td>vrána D/E</td>
<td>vrana</td>
<td>vor’’ona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*baba(^{15})</td>
<td>‘old lady’</td>
<td>bába</td>
<td>bába</td>
<td>bába D</td>
<td>baba</td>
<td>’baba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*jama</td>
<td>‘ditch’</td>
<td>jáma</td>
<td>jáma</td>
<td>jáma D</td>
<td>jama</td>
<td>’jama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mucha</td>
<td>‘fly’</td>
<td>múha</td>
<td>múha</td>
<td>moucha, GP much D(^{16})</td>
<td>mucha</td>
<td>’muxa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*berza</td>
<td>‘birch tree, betula’</td>
<td>bréza</td>
<td>bréza</td>
<td>bříza B/F</td>
<td>breza</td>
<td>ber’’oza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*glina</td>
<td>‘clay’</td>
<td>glina</td>
<td>glina</td>
<td>hlina B</td>
<td>hlina</td>
<td>’gl’ina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*griva</td>
<td>‘mane’</td>
<td>gríva</td>
<td>gríva</td>
<td>hríva B</td>
<td>hriva</td>
<td>’gr’iva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*iva</td>
<td>‘yew, salix caprea’</td>
<td>‘iva</td>
<td>íva</td>
<td>jíva B</td>
<td>íva</td>
<td>’iva</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{11}\) (Ibid.:182). Gebauer also comments on the coexistence in CLC of a new formation with a stem *struh-* formed from the GP, that is short throughout the paradigm.


\(^{13}\) The R form indicates end stress. OR plural forms also indicate end stress (ESRJ:IV, 201), however a fairly old loan word exists in Russian ‘skala ‘musical scale’ with fixed root stress that could have very easily influenced skal’a ‘cliff’ to adopt an end-stress paradigm.


\(^{15}\) Ibid.

\(^{16}\) In OCZ in at least one text from the 15th century where vowel quantity is marked there is evidence that other cases in the paradigm had the shortened root form: “Belzebub se vykládá jako buoh much neb nad muchamy” [Beelzebub is described as the lord of the flies or over the flies] RokycPostBrň. 182 (StČS I.: 416).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*kolda</td>
<td>‘log’</td>
<td>klâda</td>
<td>klâda</td>
<td>klâda B</td>
<td>klada</td>
<td>kol’oda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kyla</td>
<td>‘hernia’</td>
<td>kîla</td>
<td>kîla</td>
<td>kîla B</td>
<td>kyla</td>
<td>kil’ a&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt; NP ‘kîly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*laska</td>
<td>‘tenderness’</td>
<td>lâska</td>
<td>lâska</td>
<td>lâska B</td>
<td>láska</td>
<td>laska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*slava</td>
<td>‘glory’</td>
<td>slâva</td>
<td>sláva</td>
<td>sláva B</td>
<td>sláva</td>
<td>slava &lt;&lt; CZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sliva</td>
<td>‘plum’</td>
<td>slîva</td>
<td>slíva</td>
<td>slíva B/D</td>
<td>slíva</td>
<td>‘sl’íva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*dêva</td>
<td>‘girl’</td>
<td>djêva</td>
<td>dêva</td>
<td>dêva A</td>
<td>deva</td>
<td>‘d’eva AS ‘d’evu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gnida</td>
<td>‘nit’</td>
<td>gnîída</td>
<td>gnîda</td>
<td>hnîda A</td>
<td>hnida</td>
<td>‘gn’îda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*jîskra</td>
<td>‘spark’</td>
<td>‘îskra</td>
<td>‘îskra</td>
<td>jîskra A</td>
<td>iskra</td>
<td>‘îskra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*êzva</td>
<td>‘sore, cut’</td>
<td>jàzva</td>
<td>jâzva Vas.</td>
<td>jîzva A&lt;sup&gt;20&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>jazva</td>
<td>‘jazva dial. jazv’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*klika</td>
<td>‘latch’</td>
<td>kljûka</td>
<td>kljûka</td>
<td>klika A</td>
<td>klika</td>
<td>kl’uk’a AS kl’uk’ u Ukr. kl’ uka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kupa</td>
<td>‘60, mound’</td>
<td>kûpa</td>
<td>kûp</td>
<td>kupa A</td>
<td>kupa</td>
<td>‘kupa AS ‘kupu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lava&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>‘bench’</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>láva</td>
<td>lava A</td>
<td>lava (ESSL)</td>
<td>‘lava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mêna</td>
<td>‘change’</td>
<td>mijéna</td>
<td>mέna</td>
<td>ména A</td>
<td>mena</td>
<td>‘m’ena AS ‘m’enu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*môka</td>
<td>‘torture’</td>
<td>mûka</td>
<td>mûka</td>
<td>muka A</td>
<td>muka</td>
<td>‘muka AS ‘muku</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<sup>18</sup> Ukr ‘kîla. Also the Dict. of 1704 has ‘kîla throughout according to the 17-volume Akedemačeskij slovar’ russkogo jazyka.


<sup>20</sup> OCZ jiezva indicates length, and jizva itself indicates original PSL length ě > iě > i > i.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*nëga</td>
<td>‘tenderness’</td>
<td>njëga</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>nëha A</td>
<td>neha</td>
<td>‘n’ega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS njëgu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS ‘n’egu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*niva</td>
<td>‘field’</td>
<td>njëva</td>
<td>njiva</td>
<td>niva A</td>
<td>niva</td>
<td>‘n’iva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS njivu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vas. niva</td>
<td></td>
<td>AS ‘nivu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pëna</td>
<td>‘foam’</td>
<td>pjëna</td>
<td>pëna</td>
<td>pëna A</td>
<td>pena</td>
<td>’p’ena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pëga</td>
<td>‘freckle’</td>
<td>pjëga</td>
<td>pëga</td>
<td>piha A</td>
<td>peha</td>
<td>’p’egij</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS pjëgu</td>
<td></td>
<td>OCZ piëha</td>
<td>Vas. piha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pleva</td>
<td>‘chaff’</td>
<td>pljëva</td>
<td>plëva</td>
<td>pleva A</td>
<td>pleva</td>
<td>pol ‘ova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS pljëvu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vas. pleva</td>
<td>Chod. pliva</td>
<td>AS ‘ovu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*rëpa</td>
<td>‘beet’</td>
<td>rëpa</td>
<td>répa</td>
<td>répa A</td>
<td>repa</td>
<td>’r’epa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ryba</td>
<td>‘fish’</td>
<td>riiba</td>
<td>riba</td>
<td>ryba A</td>
<td>ryba</td>
<td>’ryba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sorka</td>
<td>‘magpie’</td>
<td>svräka</td>
<td>sräka</td>
<td>straka A</td>
<td>straka</td>
<td>so ’roka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/svorka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tlapa</td>
<td>‘paw’</td>
<td>dial. lâpa</td>
<td>lâpa</td>
<td>tlapa A</td>
<td>tlapa</td>
<td>’lapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*vydra</td>
<td>‘otter’</td>
<td>vidra</td>
<td>vidra</td>
<td>vydra A</td>
<td>vydra</td>
<td>’vydra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*vâlna</td>
<td>‘wool’</td>
<td>vûna</td>
<td>vólna</td>
<td>vlna G</td>
<td>vlna</td>
<td>’volna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 OCZ *pieha* indicates length, and *piha* itself indicates original PSL length ź > ié > í > i.

23 Ibid. (op. cit.)

24 Ibid. (op. cit.)

25 Preservation of /tl/ cluster in word initial position for CZ & SK is a rarity.

Table 11 – Acute disyllabic feminine jā-stems (all with original long root vocalism)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*banja</td>
<td>‘spa’&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>bánja</td>
<td>bánja</td>
<td>bán(e) B</td>
<td>bán, baňa</td>
<td>'banja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kēsja</td>
<td>‘goblet’</td>
<td>čaša</td>
<td>čaša</td>
<td>čiše B</td>
<td>čaša</td>
<td>'čaša</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*dynja</td>
<td>‘cucumis melo, pumpkin’</td>
<td>dinja</td>
<td>dinja</td>
<td>dýně B</td>
<td>dyňa</td>
<td>'dynja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gunja</td>
<td>‘gown’</td>
<td>gůnja</td>
<td>OSLN gůn</td>
<td>houně B</td>
<td>huňa</td>
<td>dial. 'gunja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kapja</td>
<td>‘drop’</td>
<td>kâpl’a</td>
<td>kâplja</td>
<td>kâpě B</td>
<td>kaplina</td>
<td>'kaplja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mergja</td>
<td>‘fishing net’</td>
<td>mrěža</td>
<td>mrěža</td>
<td>mříže B</td>
<td>mreža</td>
<td>mer’eža</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pitja</td>
<td>‘food’</td>
<td>piňa Vas. pěča Rejzek</td>
<td>piča</td>
<td>pice B</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>'pišča</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*xyja/ *xyzja</td>
<td>‘shack’</td>
<td>hiša/ OSC liža</td>
<td>hiša</td>
<td>chýše/chyše chýže B/A</td>
<td>SK dial. chyža&lt;sup&gt;28&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>RChSl xyža dial. 'xyža</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kasja</td>
<td>‘porridge’</td>
<td>kâša</td>
<td>kâša</td>
<td>kaše A</td>
<td>kaša</td>
<td>'kaša</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sadja</td>
<td>‘soot’</td>
<td>dial. šâda</td>
<td>súja&lt;sup&gt;29&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>saze A</td>
<td>saža</td>
<td>'saža</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*vēgja</td>
<td>‘tower’</td>
<td>věža dial.</td>
<td>věža&lt;sup&gt;30&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>věž(e) A</td>
<td>veža</td>
<td>Vas.OR 'věža</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*višnja</td>
<td>‘cherry (tree)’</td>
<td>višnja</td>
<td>višnja</td>
<td>višně A</td>
<td>višňa</td>
<td>'višňa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proto-Slavic acute intonation is traditionally associated with length in Czech on initial syllables in disyllabic words, which includes many forms of the feminine (j)ā-stems of the a.p. (a) class. If we accept the Proto-Slavic paradigm for (j)ā-stem acute...

<sup>27</sup> For an etymological explanation of West Slavic meaning ‘cupola’ see Rejzek (2001:69).
<sup>28</sup> ESSJ, v. 8, p. 165-166.
<sup>29</sup> Lith. sídžiai indicates acute intonation. Map 24 shows the dialectal distribution of length versus brevity in this word.
<sup>30</sup> South Slavic points to oxytonic, SLK, R point to acute.
<sup>31</sup> The IS, DP, IP, LP are originally trisyllabic forms.
words as proposed by Stang (1965:56) and as illustrated in Table 4 with acute intonation on the root vowel of all forms in the paradigm except the GP,\textsuperscript{32} we expect the Proto-Czech retention of length on the root vowel as well until the phonological rule that shortened (stressed) acute length in forms greater than two syllables long began to operate. The observation that CLC on a semi-regular basis shows length on the vowel of the acute stem has led linguists to think of this length as preserved Proto-Slavic length despite the fact that Czech is the only Slavic language to presumably preserve acute length.\textsuperscript{33} In Serbo-Croatian and Slovene, stressed acute length was lost.\textsuperscript{34} In Slovak as well, stressed acute length was lost. Yet in more than half of the CZ (j)ā-stems identified as acute, the reflex of the vowel in the CLC stem is short throughout the paradigm (marked with A in Table 10 and Table 11). The source of this brevity could be due to the relatively high number of forms in the acute disyllabic (j)ā-stem paradigms that are three syllables long where brevity in the root is to be expected phonologically since there is other internal evidence that (stressed) acute length in trisyllabic forms was shortened in Czech (in addition to all other Slavic languages with the long:short opposition except

\textsuperscript{32} In Čakavian we find evidence of the neo-circumflex in the GP. The Slovenian pl. forms show neo-circumflex in the root vowel before a long vowel in the final syllable. The endings with long vowels were GP {*-ōvь}, NP {*-tı̆}, LP {*-tкь}.

\textsuperscript{33} Although hesitant to declare that acute length is preserved in USo, Schaarschmidt (1997:49) does give evidence in USo for the preservation of acute and neo-acute length in addition to evidence for the lengthening of PSL short vowels /e, o, i/ under the neo-acute. For RP (Rising Pitch = acute) USo brēza ‘birch’ indicates the preservation of length, as do USo drōha ‘road,’ CZ draha/dráhy, USo blōta, CZ bláto ‘swamp.’ For NRP (New Rising Pitch = neo-acute) he lists USo jēža ‘hedgehog,’ USo GS hrēcha ‘sin,’ CZ hřich, USo dial. strōža, CZ stráž(e) ‘guard.’

\textsuperscript{34} Length was later restored in Slovene, however, on all non-final stressed vowels.
 Examples cited by Shevelov (1965:512-517) include: 1) initial stress: S/C ūlica, CZ ulice, SK ulica, R 'ul'ica 'street;' S/C lāgoda, CZ lahoda, SK lahoda, U 'lahoda 'delicacy;' CZ jahoda 'strawberry,' R 'jagoda 'berry,' etc., 2) internal stress: CZ malina, R mal' 'ina 'raspberry;' CZ beseda, R b'es' 'eda 'conversation;' CZ lopata, SK lopata, S/C lòpata, R lop' ata 'spade,' etc. Pretonic length, on the other hand, in initial syllables (CZ útroba 'womb,' R utr' oba 'maw') and internal syllables (CZ kolbása, R kolbas 'a 'sausage') in trisyllabic words is generally preserved in Czech.

With these conditions in mind, we can then say that the paradigm in CLC closest to what we expect for feminine acute (j)ā-stems is represented by Verweij’s F-type words (e.g. rāna) – the class with shortened length in the trisyllabic forms (IS, DP, IP, LP).35 There are, however, only two ā-stem a.p. (a) roots that exhibit exclusively this pattern in CLC – rāna, and sīla. There are no (j)ā-stem roots that exhibit this pattern in CLC. The fact that in OCZ a number of CLC D-type a.p. (a) ā-stems belonged to the F-type paradigm (drāha, hrouda, krāva, míra, strohá) indicates that the phonologically expected a.p. (a) paradigm was more widespread than it is today. Of special interest are the acute ā-stems with root diphthong /-ou- < ú/, hrouda, strohá, moucha. These words show that the shortening of the vowel /ú/, which would have been phonological in the IS, GP, DP, LP, and IP is relatively unstable. All of these words in OCZ indicate the pattern of shortening in the cases we would expect from a.p. (a) stems, and all of them have

35 The shortening of acute length in the GP is be discussed separately (see p. 92).
retained the /ou ~ u/ alternation in CLC only in the GP. Other words show variation in CLC and the dialects (lípa, sláma, žíla, skála, vrána, bříza, jiskra, etc.) and they help to explain the development of the alternations in the (j)ă-stem paradigms.

The Source and Distribution of Czech Shortened Acute Intonation

In accordance with well established principles of historical linguistic change, we expect the NS to be the form most likely to serve as the source of analogical leveling in Slavic and Czech. By looking at original a.p. (a) (j)ă-stems that belong to Type A in CLC (brevity throughout the paradigm) and Type B (length throughout the paradigm) Type D (brevity in the GP only), Type E (brevity in the GP, DP, LP, and IP) it appears that the pressures of analogical change have acted on the CLC paradigms in favor of generalized length or brevity. It is also clear that the general tendency throughout the historical period has increased the number of shortened roots. The question is whether the length in these paradigms represent preserved Proto-Slavic length, or whether length was reintroduced by some other phonological or morphological process. First we will present the Czech dialectal data, next we will present the explanation offered by the Dutch linguists Kortlandt (1978) and Verweij (1993), then we will present our own interpretation of the data.

Czech Dialectal Data

There is no distinguishable relationship between the phonological or phonotactic structure of the root and the generalization of either length or brevity in Czech. The fact that many of the CLC disyllabic feminine a.p. (a) (j)ă-stems have a short vowel throughout the paradigm in CLC does not necessarily mean that they were not a.p. (a)
stems in Proto-Slavic. For example, NS jiskra ‘spark’ (< *jьskra) is an original a.p. (a) stem (S/C iska, SLN ḕskra, SK iskra, R šiska). Verweij (1991:503) correctly identifies the word as a.p. (a) and the comparative evidence also points to a.p. (a). Map 1 shows the dialects with attested length in the NS of /*jьskra/. NS jiskra is concentrated along the periphery of the Czech lands – namely, in the Chod dialects (AV Survey locales 301-311) the Southwestern Bohemian dialects in general, as well as the Northeastern Bohemian dialects (101-161) with some attestations in other Southern Bohemian dialects.

PSL /*griva/ CLC hříva also undoubtedly belonged to a.p. (a). Map 4 shows that brevity in the NS of /*griva/ is restricted primarily to the Czech-Moravian, Central Moravian, Eastern Moravian, and Silesian dialects. In the Silesian dialects, there is no opposition of short and long vowels. The brevity in the Moravsko-Slovensko dialects (near the Czech-Slovak border in southeastern Moravia) and in the north central Moravian dialects illustrates the diffusion of the PSL shortening of original acute length that we will present a full argument for below. In CLC hříva was not one of the lexemes affected by the diffusion of shortened acute lengths, but other lexemes were.

Map 5 shows the dialectal distribution for brevity in the root vowel of CLC NS bříza ‘birch.’ The distribution of CZ dialectal brevity (most often as březa) is nearly identical to the CZ dialectal pattern of brevity in hříva. We can safely say that the

---

36 Bělíč (1971:84) identifies the shortness of originally long /i/ (together with the shortness of originally long /u/) in the southwest and northern parts of the Central Moravian dialects as a relatively recent phenomenon which he attributes in part to the short phonetic duration of these vowels and the fact that the long and short variants are closer together in duration than the long and short variants of other long:short vocalic pairs. But the brevity attested for this word in other dialects is not a result of this tendency.
process responsible for the short variants in the dialects for these two words must come from the same source. Map 7 shows the dialectal distribution for length (řípa) in the root vowel of CLC řepa ‘birch.’ Here we see pretty much the same pattern emerging, but in this example CLC has been affected and the root vowel was shortened.

CLC jáma (ČJA II.414-415) with brevity throughout Moravia, and Silesia (length however in the larger towns such as Brno 63, Moravský Krúmov 62, Prostějov 66, Boskovice 64, Nové město na Moravě 53 no doubt influenced by the literary language) shows the same pattern, as does CLC draha pl. tant. ‘fallow field’ / dráhy ‘ruts, railroad tracks’ (ČJA II.322, map on 325). This word, however, has been influenced by a separate tendency to differentiate lexemes that can be construed as collective substantives or pluralia tantum. The neuter NP desinence {–a} accompanied by short root vowel is most likely responsible for the form pl. tant. draha. The original fem. pl. dráhy is common in the Southwestern Bohemian dialects with length.

Bulaxovskij (1983:161) mentions other examples of original acute (j)ă-stems where brevity in Moravia, Silesia, and Slovakia is the rule: klada, skala, rana, vrana, žila, lipa, hlina, sila, hruda, mřeža, etc. We therefore believe that the Southern Bohemian Dialects and particularly the Chod dialects preserve a more archaic form of the acute (j)ă-stems with length in the root vowel and that the shortening of the root vowel in acute (j)ă-stems in the Central Bohemian dialects is an innovation – but not one that spread by the power of the literary language.
The Czech Lengthening?

Kortlandt (1978) and Verweij (1991) have come up with an alternative solution to lengthened vowels in CZ that involves the lengthening of vowels that were originally rising (e.g. originally acute or with fixed internal stress on short vowels). The rule is formulated in the following terms: “A short rising vowel in an open first syllable of disyllabic words is lengthened unless the second syllable contains a long vowel” (Verweij, 1990:505). This rule is formulated to explain the quantity alternations in the CLC paradigm marked as Type F (e.g. rána, síla) and other lengths in CLC that are difficult to explain (e.g. lhůta < lhɔtɔ ‘deadline, term < freedom from obligation’),37 and to argue for a Proto-Slavic shortening of acute length that left a rising tone on the acute

37 Part of the merit of Kortlandt and Verweij\textquotesingle s analysis rests on its ability to explain the anomalous length in this type of CZ word with the structure Cъ\textsubscript{ъ}/C\textsubscript{ъ}Co/еТ, itself a rarity in Czech. CZ vzhůru < vzhør, shůry < shhör will serve as two other examples. In order to make their rule of Czech lengthening work with all its conditions, it is necessary to assume fixed accent on the /ơ/ in these words including lhɔtɔ/lhůta. Despite the fact that almost every example of {-ota} in CSR used as a deadjectival suffix is end-stressed, Dybo (1981:124) argues fairly convincingly for the derivational suffix {-ʼota} having fixed accent in precisely the OR word lgota (derived from an end-stressed adjective), an argument he bases on OR manuscripts and South Slavic manuscripts from two areas far removed from each other. We believe, however, that there is another more likely explanation for the length in CZ lhůta. First of all it is necessary to mention the fact that in CZ place names, one finds almost exclusively lhota (Sedláček 1908), which designates an ancient feudal parcel that became free of obligations to the lord. OCZ then made use of the variation in quantity to lexically distinguish lhůta ‘deadline, term.’ It is far from certain, however, that the length in lhůta is attributable to a stressed PSL /o/ in {-ʼota}.

Trávníček (1928:178) lists a number of forms which also had stressed internal /o/ but which show no lengthening, dialectal or otherwise: CZ kolo, oko, moře, boha, boje, boku, boru. In addition, EESL lists the OCS form of the word as sъlogota, which suggests that the /l/ was a long syllabic /ł/. The word may have had stress on the /o/ in the OR word lgota, but it is likely that the PSL stress was on the syllabic /ł/. The transference of length from long syllabic /ł/ is not difficult to accept if one considers that Czech does indeed preserve a distinction in long syllabic /ł/ vs. short syllabic /l/ when preceded by consonants. OCZ dlḥy > dlouhý, but OCZ dlḥs > dluh. The length in vzhůru and shůry can also be explained in various ways (Trávníček, 1928:177-179). In short, there are simply too many uncertainties to form a theory to explain several rare forms when a much more logical and verifiable scenario can be presented.
stems in CZ that was later lengthened by their rule except when followed by a long vowel as in IS ranou, DP ranám, LP ranách, or in trisyllabic and monosyllabic forms such as IP ranami, GP ran. An additional condition for this sound law is that the vowel that was lengthened had to have been originally stressed. This condition is added in order to explain the failure of their sound law to affect the oxytonic class in the same way. In the oxytonic class, the root vowel is long throughout the paradigm except in the GP. The so-called Czech Lengthening therefore presupposes that the preservation of pretonic length and the lengthening of old acute vowels is unrelated, and that all of the acute lengthenings occurred after the loss of the weak jers. Aside from the fact that the logic is circular and largely unverifiable, we believe there is a more tenable explanation for the alternations in the (j)ā-stem paradigms, to which the dialectal and historical data lend greater credence.

Interpretation of the Data

One point that is clear from OCZ regarding original long roots is that there have been quite a few analogical levelings in the (j)ā-stems throughout the history of Czech. Since we believe that the so-called Czech Lengthening is untenable and that the evidence supports the hypothesis that CLC a.p. (a) (j)ā-stems with original long root vocalism retained original acute length, our task is to try and explain the many cases in CLC where these roots have lost their length.

One possible interpretation is to attribute the loss of length in acute (j)ā-stems to some local Central Bohemian variation spreading from Prague as the center of the literary language. In several Southern Bohemian dialects (particularly those of Chodsko and
Doudlebsko), a number of these acute (j)ā-stems – as well as end-stressed ā-stems (albeit inconclusive for end-stressed jā-stems) and the neo-acute jā-stems – have a long vowel in the root (Voráč, 1955:28-29, cites pīna, plīva, slīna, hnlida, jiskra, sāze, kāše, rejba, houba, strāna, vīna, douha), whereas in the literary language these forms have a short root vowel. The persistence of long vowels in these (j)ā-stems in the Southern Bohemian dialects has suggested to some scholars that length in the roots of (j)ā-stems in general spread as a morphological marker in these dialects (as opposed to representing the preservation of acute length). But we do not believe this is the case. All of the words noted by Voráč were either original acute or oxytonic words except for strāna which was mobile.38 In truth, a long root vowel in (j)ā-stems in the Southern Bohemian dialects is not very regular at all. Circumflex (j)ā-stems with lengthened root vowels in the Southern Bohemian dialects are a rarity (strāna is the only example we have seen). Circumflex (j)ā-stems, put another way, preserve the same pattern found in CLC (Chod Postřekov jehla, koza, husa, kosa, kopa ‘kupa sena,’ země, mez, zīma, ruka, řeka, noha, struna), so if there had been a selective morphological extension of the lengthened vowel to (j)ā-stems in the Chod dialects, it is impossible to discover the morphophonemic environment to which the extension of the lengthened vowel was made without reference to the accentual paradigms. Moreover, the expected alternations in the IS or original a.p. (a) roots in these dialects is well preserved (cf. Map 2 & 8). The GP plural of many acute

38 The attested length in strāna in several Southwestern Bohemian dialects (Voráč, 1955 Map Va (e.g. 5a) indicates two locations – one near Domažlice, and one near Sušice) might very well be the only example of retained length in the Czech dialects in the NS, (GS, LS) of a mobile lexeme that has provided the source of the analogical leveling throughout the paradigm. One is indeed surprised not to find other circumflex words with residual long vowels in the NS (GS, LS).
lexemes in the Chod dialects exhibit shortening of the root vowel (e.g. Chod Postřekov NS kniha, GP knih; NS mísa, GP mis).

The question, then, is when and how did there come to be so many original a.p. (a) roots in CLC with a shortened original long vowel? The center-periphery pattern of shortenings shown by the maps cited above suggests that the forms with length are older and that the Central Bohemian dialects (including the Prague dialect) show a newer pattern with respect to the brevity in these lexemes. The dialectal patterns for the NS of jiskra/jiskra, dráhy/drahy, jáma/jama, řípa/řepa, hříva/hřiva, bříza/březa, kláda/klada, skála/skala, rána/rana, vrána/vrana, žila/žila, lípa/lipa, hlína/hlina, síla/sila, hrouda/hruda, mříže/mřeža are indicative of what we believe to be a specific phenomenon characteristic of the development of a.p. (a) feminine (j)á-stems and a.p. (b) feminine (j)á-stems in Czech (and other acute and oxytonic stem classes). All of Moravian and Silesian (and Slovak too) exhibit a short vowel in these lexemes. We believe that the actual innovation was not the lengthening of original acute (residually rising) vowels in Czech (as Verweij and Kortlandt propose), nor shortenings in Moravian dialects that spread from Prague as the center of the literary language, but rather shortenings of acute vowels that spread from the East through lexical diffusion perhaps during the 9th and early 10th centuries when the Great Moravian Empire was at its zenith of power and prestige. Luckily, there is comparative Slavic evidence to support this view too.

The fact that the Czechs and the Upper Sorbians were at the periphery of the Slavic expansion and theirs are the only Slavic languages to retain acute length suggests
that the Slavs had spread out too far for the phonological change \ [+acute +length > +acute ±length\] to be extended to the periphery of the Slavic territory. Upper Sorbian does indeed provide evidence of retained length precisely in original acute ā-stems, although the reflex of length appears to be restricted to *polnoglasie* words: USo *wróna, króva, brěza* (vs. *plesa*), *klóda* (but *slama*). The Proto-Slavic shortening of acute long vowels represents a dialectal sound change that was simply not carried out to the periphery of the Proto-Slavic dialects, and CLC (Pragocentric) and Upper Sorbian occupy the periphery.

**Instrumental Singular**

Analogical levelling of length in the instrumental singular of original a.p. (a) (j)ā-stems is prominent. Dialectal evidence for the preservation of an alternation in the IS is abundant, but it is obvious that there is no simple formula or dialectal-geographic pattern that can identify a preserved short vowel. The alternation is nearly exclusively restricted to original a.p. (a) roots. Gebauer (III. 1.:183) points out that in OCZ not all fem. ā-stems with a long vowel in the NS shorten the vowel in the IS. The examples that he gives are all with root vowel /á/: CZ *kára, krása, láška, páska, válka*. These words are all either loan words borrowed into CZ, or internal CZ derivations (with the exception of CZ *krása*, R *kras' a* – end-stress which we would not expect to shorten the long vowel in the IS).

OCZ *kára* < OHG *karre* ‘cart’ < Lat. *carrus* was probably borrowed with length. None of them show any tendency to join the OCZ paradigm with brevity in the IS. We note that other (j)ā-stems with a long vowel that are loan words from GMC do not typically indicate that the shortening in the IS, (or the GP, DP, LP, and IP). CZ *roura* ‘pipe’ <
MHG röre ‘reed, pipe’; routa OCZ rúta ‘Ruta graveolens’ < MHG rūte < LAT rūta;

stoupa ‘thrashing machine’ < Proto-GMC *stamp-; pīka ‘ancient stabbing weapon with a
long handle’ < Germ. Pike; pīpa ‘tap, pipette’ < LG Pipe; OCZ skýva ‘slice of bread’ <
OHG scība ‘slice, round’ – are attested only with shortening in the GP. These facts lead
us to believe that the F type paradigm was not productive even at the earliest stages of
borrowing from Germanic and further supports the hypothesis that this paradigm
represents the most archaic (and historically phonologically derivable) of all the ā-stem
paradigms.

Map 2 and 3 together show the distribution of long and short /a/ in the IS of kráva
(kravou/krávou ‘with cow’). CLC does not allow the shortened form. Map 6 shows the
locations of the Czech dialectal survey that have attested /i/ in the IS of bříza
(břízou/břizou). By a comparison of these three maps, what becomes clear is that the
cases where /i/ is long in IS břízou cannot be related to the same phenomenon as the
locations of the Czech dialectal survey that have attested length in krávou. The IS form
břízou is a secondary shortening from original /ě > ie > i > i/. Only the IS forms březou
can be attributed to shortening under the acute in trisyllabic words. IS březou is attested
in AV survey locales in the Northern Bohemian dialects (118, 119, 130) in the Southern
Bohemian dialects (307, 320, 424, 448, 457, 460, 462, 463, 464) and in the majority of
the Central and Eastern Moravian.

Map 3 also shows that there are in fact three phenomena associated with length in
IS krávou. One is the innovation of the analogical levelling of long /á/ in IS krávou in the
Central Bohemian and Southwestern Bohemian dialects, the second is what appears to be
a separate innovation of the analogical levelling of long /á/ in the IS krávou in the Central Moravian and Eastern Moravian dialects, and finally we see here illustrated the lack of opposition in quantity in the Silesian dialects.

**Genitive Plural**

It is noteworthy that where there is any alternation exhibited between brevity and length (CLC types D, E, F) within a given paradigm, the GP is the form most likely to exhibit an alternation. As mentioned above (Table 5), the generalization of brevity in the GP is also quite common in the a.p. (b) class of ā-stems (NS bída, bouda, dira, chvála, kroupa, touha, trouba, louka, tráva, brána, čára, váha, kůra: GP běd, bud, děr, chval, krup, tuh, trub, luk, trav, bran, čar, vah, kor). But there are no a.p. (c) words in CLC that have adopted an alternation between length and brevity in the GP. The shortened vowel in the GP has been attributed to the so-called neo-circumflex, whose environment is still not precisely defined. In the class of a.p. (a) (j)ā-stems, there is no phonological reason to posit the shortening of long vowels to the left of a weakened or lost jer. In the a.p. (b) oxytone ā-stems, the GP is an environment where the neo-acute operated and we would expect preserved length in this environment. It has been suggested, however, that the spread of brevity in the GP is a morphophonemic change that is motivated by a principle whereby the GP is differentiated from the rest of the forms by the generalization of brevity when the direct forms are long, and the generalization of length when the direct forms are short. There does not, however, seem to be much generalization of length in the GP except marginally at a very early stage of OCZ. In Slovak, length in the GP is consistent for all (j)ā-stem paradigms. It is logical therefore to imagine that most of the
OCZ GP forms with length are long as a result of Slovak influence, particularly in light of the effect Slovak appears to have had on a.p. (a) paradigms in Czech.

**Oxytonic Feminine (j)ā-stems**

The fixed end-stress a.p. (b) (j)ā-stem substantives in Czech also reveal some interesting patterns when compared to the acute a.p. (a) and mobile a.p. (c) (j)ā-stem patterns. Table 12 through Table 14 represent Proto-Slavic words that Dybo (1993:13), Trávníček (1932:150) or others, identify as columnar end-stressed (j)ā-stem substantives in Proto-Slavic, as well as words that we are endeavoring to classify here for this study as oxytonic. For the long vowel (j)ā-stems, the identification of oxytonic words is complicated by the fact that in the mobile a.p. (c), the NS form had end stress (therefore we would expect retained length) which makes it the logical source of analogical leveling in the direction of the end-stressed paradigm. We would also expect neo-acute jā-stems to have the lengthened grade in the root in the NS (and throughout the paradigm) making the detection of neo-acute vs. oxytonic jā-stems in Czech nearly impossible. Length alone in the NS of any (j)ā-stem substantive in CLC tells us very little about the PSL accentual class the word belonged to. Words that belonged originally to the mobile a.p. (c), however, show remarkable consistency in their failure to preserve length in any grammatical case forms, and show remarkable regularity of generalized brevity throughout the paradigm.
Table 12 – Oxytonic disyllabic feminine ā-stems with original long root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*běda</td>
<td>‘poverty’</td>
<td>bijěda</td>
<td>běda</td>
<td>bida,39 GP běd</td>
<td>bieda</td>
<td>b’ed’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS bijědu</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>AS b’ed’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP ’b’edy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*borna</td>
<td>‘harrow’</td>
<td>brána</td>
<td>brána</td>
<td>OCZ brána D</td>
<td>CLC NP brány40</td>
<td>brána</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS bránu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS boronu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP ’borony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*buda</td>
<td>‘booth’</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>bouda, GP bud41</td>
<td>búda</td>
<td>Vas. OR ‘buda42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*děra</td>
<td>‘hole’</td>
<td>déra</td>
<td>děra</td>
<td>dira, GP děr</td>
<td>diera</td>
<td>d’ir’a, dyr’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS děru</td>
<td></td>
<td>dial. d’oura</td>
<td></td>
<td>NP ’dryy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vas. dira</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gôba</td>
<td>‘mushroom’</td>
<td>gùba</td>
<td>gôba</td>
<td>houba, GP hub D</td>
<td>huba</td>
<td>Vas. OR ‘gub’a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

39 CZ běda arch. ‘bad luck, woe’ is used adverbially e.g. “Běda jim, běda těm cizincům z daleké země.” [Woe to them, woe to those foreigners from a far away land] (Vančura, 1939:68).

40 CLC brána ‘gate’ a.p. (a) and NS brána / NP brány ‘harrow’ a.p. (b) seem to be etymologically unrelated. Brána ‘gate’ shows variation between the D and the F paradigms in CLC characteristic of a.p. (a) roots, and brány ‘harrow’ has a short vowel in the GP, LP, DP, and IP which is peculiar for an original a.p. (b) root but is probably due to confusion with brána ‘gate.’ The conclusion to be reached is that there are two independent lexical items that are not etymologically related but which have nonetheless been differentiated grammatically to avoid lexical collision. Mach. (1971:64) indicates that brána ‘gate’ is based on a derivative *borni from *bort- ‘to fight, struggle.’ The switch of this word to the ā-stem paradigm might be related to vrata ‘gate,’ even though vrata is neuter pl. The fact that in OCZ brána ‘gate’ is most often short in the IS, GP, LP, DP and IP, (Gebauer III. I:182) and in CLC the root vowel is optionally long or short in these forms indicates that the word joined the a.p. (a) paradigm in Proto-Czech. The word brána meaning ‘gate’ only occurs in CZ, SLK, and dial. SLN. We propose that the word was derived from *borniti ‘to protect’ in dialectal Proto-Slavic at a time when there was a certain degree of unity between CZ, SLK, & SLN.

41 See Map 16 for the dialectal distribution of length in the GP.

42 Vas. I: 230 says R buda is borrowed from P buda < OHG buode ‘tent’ rendering the place of ictus in R meaningless.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *kropa | ‘grain of barley’ | krupa, AS krúpu | krupa | kroupa D | krupa | krup’ a  
|      |                 |     |         |       |        | AS krup’ u  
|      |                 |     |         |       |        | NP ’ krupy |
| *lúka | ‘meadow’ | lúka AS lúku | lúka | louka / luka | lúka | luk’a  
|      |                 |     |         | GP luk A/D |       | AS luk’ u  
|      |                 |     |         |       |        | NP ’ luki |
| *môka | ‘flour’ | múka AS múku | móka | mouka, GP muk D | múka | muk’a  
|      |                 |     |         |       |        | AS muk’ u  
|      |                 |     |         |       |        | NP ’ muki |
| *trava | ‘grass’ | tráva AS trávu | tráva | tráva, GP trav D | tráva | trav’a  
|      |                 |     |         |       |        | AS trav’ u  
|      |                 |     |         |       |        | NP ’ travy |
| *trôba | ‘trumpet’ | trôba AS trôbu | trôba | trouba, GP trub D | trôba | trub’a  
|      |                 |     |         |       |        | AS trub’ u  
|      |                 |     |         |       |        | NP ’ truby |
| *tuha | ‘desire’ | túga AS túgu | túga | touha, GP tuh D | túha | tuga’ Vas.  
|      |                 |     |         |       |        | adj. ’ tug,  
|      |                 |     |         |       |        | tug’a, ’ tugo |
| *xvala | ‘praise’ | hvála AS hválu | hvála | chvála, GP chval D | chvála | xval’a  
|      |                 |     |         |       |        | AS xval’ u  
|      |                 |     |         |       |        | NP ’ xval’y |
| *borzda | ‘furrow’ | brázda AS brázdu | brázda | brázda B OCZ na brazdách | brázda | borozd’a  
|      |                 |     |         |       |        | AS ’ borozdu  
|      |                 |     |         |       |        | and arch.  
|      |                 |     |         |       |        | AS borozd’ u  
|      |                 |     |         |       |        | NP ’ borozdy |
| *jucha | ‘fish soup’ | júha AS júhu | júha | jicha B | jucha | ux’a  
|      |                 |     |         |       |        | AS ux’ u  
|      |                 |     |         |       |        | NP ’ uxi |

43 The shortened form luka is the result of a morphological process whereby the –a adopted as the NP desinence from the o-stem neut. plural paradigms and shortened long vowel becoming the marker of collective nouns Geb. (III. I.:178). Other examples include mouka NP mouky but also muky,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*glista</td>
<td>‘worm’</td>
<td>glista</td>
<td>glista</td>
<td>hlist, hlista</td>
<td>hlista</td>
<td>glist’a, glist’y, glist’, glist’a m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*črêda</td>
<td>‘group’</td>
<td>čréda</td>
<td>čréda</td>
<td>třída B</td>
<td>trieda</td>
<td>čered’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*duha</td>
<td>‘rainbow’</td>
<td>dúga</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>duha A</td>
<td>Chod dúha</td>
<td>dúha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*hóba</td>
<td>‘mouth’</td>
<td>gúbica</td>
<td>góbec</td>
<td>huba A</td>
<td>OCZ húba</td>
<td>huba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kuna</td>
<td>‘weasel’</td>
<td>kúna</td>
<td>kúna</td>
<td>kuna A</td>
<td>kuna</td>
<td>Ukr. kun’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pelna</td>
<td>*pelena</td>
<td>peléna</td>
<td>pelenica</td>
<td>plena A</td>
<td>Vas. pléna</td>
<td>plena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pila</td>
<td>‘saw’</td>
<td>Čak. píľa</td>
<td>pilá</td>
<td>pila A</td>
<td>pila</td>
<td>pil’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*rêdsə</td>
<td>‘eyelash’</td>
<td>résa</td>
<td>résa</td>
<td>řasa A</td>
<td>OCZ řása</td>
<td>riasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ruda</td>
<td>‘ore’</td>
<td>Čak. růďa</td>
<td>rúda</td>
<td>ruda A</td>
<td>OCZ rúda</td>
<td>ruda / rúda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sluga</td>
<td>‘servant’</td>
<td>slúga</td>
<td>slúga</td>
<td>sluha, A</td>
<td>dial. slouha</td>
<td>sluha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

44 Cf. P ržęsa with reflex of length (pretonic).
The development of the doublet běda / bída with lexical (and grammatical) differentiation formed off the same PSL word was made possible after the phonemicization of length in CZ. The root form běd- in the paradigm of OCZ bieda would have been morphonological only in the GP. It is appears, however, that the adverbialized form is built on the NS, which would have retained the long vowel pretonically. The R paradigm may give us a clue to a possible source for the stem běd-.

45 Bulaxovskij (1983:158) believes that the shortening in hvězda is by analogy to the GP. But if retraction of stress to the first syllable in the NP in Russian identifies a mobile type without retraction of stress to the first syllable in the AS, hvězda ‘star’ might be an example of a paradigm that was leveled analogically to the NP. Without the influence of Hollywood on Proto-Slavic, it is natural to imagine NP *hvězdy being used more often than the NAS. This same argument might be used for řasa, střela, střecha, sluha, but does not work for vina, short also in SLK.
Stang (1965:67) noticed that there seem to be other types of mobile words in the separate
Slavic languages with stress on the first syllable only on the NAP but not in the AS. In
Russian NS b′ed′a, NA b′ed′u, NAP b′edy follows this pattern. If Stang is correct in
believing that this type in Russian (and Serbo-Croatian) is a [prehistoric] simplification of
the mobile class with stress on the first syllable in the AS, and we assume that the word
had circumflex intonation in the NAP, this would be the likely source for the shortened
form of the root in Czech.

\[ \text{CZ } houba < *gọba 'mushroom' (R dial. gub′a) and CZ huba < *gọba 'mouth'} \]
(R gub′a) were probably both oxytonic and may be semantically related to one another
because of the connection between the sponginess of the mouth and of mushrooms in
general (Vas.). In several OCZ documents we find the etymological form with length
(preserved pretonically) for CZ huba < *gọba ‘tlama, mouth’; GS húby Budyš 58b, NP
húby HrubLobk 67b. CZ lexically differentiated the two homonyms by utilizing a
distinction in the length of the root vowel (hub- arising as a stem alternate from the GP)
that other Slavic languages were not able to utilize. The only grammatical case in which
the two lexemes are indistinguishable in CLC is in the GP where the root vowel shortens
in houba GP hub and remains short in huba GP hub. The collision here in the GP,
however is not likely to have ever caused any difficulty in understanding, and with the
subsequent diphthongization of /ú/ /uo/ > /ou/ in OCZ further distinguishing the two
words, the two lexemes continued to co-exist side by side, whereas even if such a lexical
differentiation was initially present in other Slavic languages, the two lexemes as
homonyms might have not been able to persist because the collision of the two words in languages where a distinction in vowel quantity was not preserved, or where the distinction between /u/ and /ù/ was not transformed into a qualitative distinction, would not have supported the survival of one or the other lexemes. Slovene seems only to have preserved a word for ‘sponge’ gôba although the root meaning ‘mouth’ is also evident in gôbec ‘mug, snout.’ S/C added a suffix gu'b-ica ‘mouth’ retaining gu'ba as ‘leprosy, shelf-fungus.’ Russian has preserved the two lexemes but has differentiated them by preserving gu'b 'a ‘mouth’ primarily used only in the plural gu'b 'y ‘lips’ and gu'b 'a with a very specific meaning ‘vid griba iz semejstva trutovikov, rastuščego na stvolax drevjev i vyzvajuščego gnienie drevesiny’ (Ušakov, I.:635).

Map 15 shows the dialectal distribution of length (primarily /ù > ou/ except in the Central Moravian dialects with a raised closed /ô/ for etymological /ú/) for the GP of CZ louka < lúka ‘meadow.’ The concentration of lengthened forms appears to indicate a local phenomenon that is not necessarily related to the generalization of length in the GP from Slovak, however Map 16 showing the reflex of length in the GP of bouda shows a much wider distribution, very concentrated along the Czech-Slovak border, with many more attested forms with length in the Southern Bohemian and Northern Bohemian dialects. It is hard to say whether the spread of length in the GP boud should be attributed to an ancient period of close political and social ties with Slovakia, to the generalization of length from the rest of the paradigm, or to some other factor without further evidence, but the maps suggest that the GP with length in these two forms took
separate paths. What is most notable about the development of oxytonic stems with original long vowels in Czech is the correlation between the Type D pattern with shortened vowel in the GP (a morphological change) and the lack of attested short vowels (OCZ and CLC) in the IS, DP, LP, and IP.

Table 13 – Oxytonic / Mobile feminine disyllabic jā-stems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*děžja</td>
<td>‘wooden bowl for mixing dough’</td>
<td>děžva</td>
<td>děža</td>
<td>diža</td>
<td>OCZ dieže</td>
<td>B deža</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*nudža</td>
<td>‘need’</td>
<td>nuha Vas. nůžd’a</td>
<td>nůja, nőja</td>
<td>nouze B</td>
<td>nůzda</td>
<td>nužd’a / ’nuža</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*medža</td>
<td>‘boundary’</td>
<td>měda</td>
<td>méja</td>
<td>mez(č) A</td>
<td>medza</td>
<td>mež’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GS mědi / mědi</td>
<td>AS mědu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS mež’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP mež’i / ’meži</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The paucity of words that belong to this class make any generalizations about the development of quantity in Czech difficult, as do the difficulties in assigning these words to any particular accentual paradigm. CZ nouže could be either acute, oxytonic, or neo-acute, SK nůzda could be oxytonic or neo-acute, but S/C nůžd’a indicates acute because of the short falling intonation, and Russian also indicates either acute, oxytonic, neo-

---

46 Stang (1965:59) suggests that words with the suffix {-va} might also have been associated with neo-acute intonation, although he points out that only *kletva had a PSL stem in {-va} while others are due to later transformations. At any rate, without a S/C word that is identical to the other Slavic words, there is no evidence for neo-acute.
acute. The word *medja originally had a short vowel and there do not appear to be any examples in the Czech dialects of a lengthened form. S/C AS medu, CZ & SK without length argue for the mobile paradigm. The R NP alternate meži might also indicate mobility. The word *zmija / *zmeja is also unclear with respect to the accentual paradigm it belonged to. Vasmer (II:100) suggests that it may be an old ju-stem and if etymologically related to *{zem-} might be reconstructed as a PSL trisyllabic word *zm(i/u)j(a/u). In OCZ (Gebauer III.I:154) there are forms attested that show the reflex of the Czech contraction, zmi, but this is hardly surprising and is inconclusive with respect to quantity of the root in this word.

Table 14 – Oxytonic disyllabic feminine ā-stems with original short root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*groza</td>
<td>‘threat’</td>
<td>gróza AS grózu also gróza dial. gróza (ESSL)</td>
<td>gróza</td>
<td>hrůza, GP hrůz47 B</td>
<td>hrůza</td>
<td>groz’a AS groz’u NP ’grozy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kora</td>
<td>‘bark’</td>
<td>kóra dial. kóra</td>
<td>kóra</td>
<td>kůra, GP kůr B OCZ also kora</td>
<td>kóra</td>
<td>kor’a AS kor’u NP ’kory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kopa</td>
<td>‘sheaf’</td>
<td>kúpa / kůpa (SČS)</td>
<td>kópa</td>
<td>kopa / kúpa A/B</td>
<td>kopa</td>
<td>kop’a AS kop’u NP ’kopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kosa</td>
<td>‘scythe’</td>
<td>kósa AS kósu</td>
<td>kósa</td>
<td>kosa / kůsa A/B</td>
<td>kosa</td>
<td>kos’a AS ’kosu / kos’u NP ’kosy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47 According to Bulaxovskij (1983:280) the length in the CZ form is a result of the expressive nature of the word which means ‘horror, terrible.’ This explanation would perhaps be acceptable, if not for the fact that the simpler and more likely explanation of a phonetic lengthening due to retraction off the original end stressed syllable makes more sense in this case.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*mora</td>
<td>‘nightmare’</td>
<td>mòra</td>
<td>mòra</td>
<td>můra, GP můr</td>
<td>mora/mura</td>
<td>———</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*smola</td>
<td>‘tar’</td>
<td>smóla</td>
<td>smóla</td>
<td>smola / smůla</td>
<td>smola</td>
<td>smol’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sova</td>
<td>‘owl’</td>
<td>sůva</td>
<td>sůva</td>
<td>sova / sůva</td>
<td>sova</td>
<td>sov’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*stopa</td>
<td>‘step’</td>
<td>stòpa</td>
<td>stòpa</td>
<td>stopa</td>
<td>stopa</td>
<td>stop’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*žena</td>
<td>‘woman’</td>
<td>žèna</td>
<td>žèna</td>
<td>žena</td>
<td>žena</td>
<td>žen’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*osa</td>
<td>‘wasp’</td>
<td>ósa</td>
<td>ósa</td>
<td>vosa A Chod vůsa</td>
<td>osa</td>
<td>os’a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CZ kopa/kúpa ‘60 pieces of something, pile of hay’ is problematic for a number of reasons. The S/C form does not support oxytonism in this case, and there is no doubt lexical confusion as well with *kupa ‘pile of hay.’ The word *kůra ‘bark’ in OCZ is attested with the shortened form korou in the IS, presumably indicating shortening of the root vowel and not the absence of length throughout the paradigm (Gebauer I: 600), although other OCZ texts (Prešp, Rozk, BohFl.) show that there was variation very late and that at least some dialects either by analogy adopted NS kora or never adopted NS kůra.

What is interesting to note is that not only do pretonic long vowels remain long in the oxytonic class of Czech stems, but also pretonic short /o/ lengthens in many roots as if mimicking the lengthening effect of the neo-acute on short vowels. This fact gives us a

48 Stankiewicz (1986).
potential way of identifying pretonic (j)ā-stems as opposed to mobile (j)ā-stems in Proto-
Slavic and perhaps even of identifying neo-acute from original oxytonic stems. Slovak
does not lengthen pretonic /o/ in this class as consistently as CZ, but does lengthen /o/, as
well as /e/ and front and back jers, under the neo-acute. The behavior of the a.p. (b) (j)ā-
stem substantives in Czech is parallel to the lengthening of short /o/ in various other word
classes in Czech. Neo-acute classes that exhibit the lengthening of /o/ in Czech include
the class of jā-stem substantives represented by words like vůle ‘will,’ růže ‘rose,’ stůně
‘moan;’49 o-stem substantives with Proto-Slavic ictus retracted from a jer, such as vůl
‘ox,’ důl ‘mine.’ The details surrounding lengthened /o/ in these classes point to several
peculiarities that are worthy of note because they prove that the lengthened vowel has
been transferred to roots that are members of the same morphological class but not
necessarily related in the way that analogical changes are typically transferred – e.g.
phonologically or phonotactically.

Further factors influencing the retention of Proto-Slavic length in Czech (j)ā-stem
substantives relate to the fact that in non-initial position there could be no opposition
between circumflex and acute intonation. Since circumflex intonation occurs only on the
initial syllable of the mobile paradigm, acute intonation and circumflex intonation were
distinctive in word initial position only. This fact might have influenced Czech insofar as
it made length in PSL in the initial syllable of the word redundant because the opposition
between acute and circumflex intonation in the initial syllable carried the phonemic

49 CZ dial. vůlše ‘Alder orchard’ (< *jel’ix/a / *olšxa), SLK jelša, S/C joxa, SLN jelša SLN dial. olša, R
although not a jā-stem neo-acute, shows olša ‘a R dial. völša, also shows Czech lengthening of neo-
acute retraction onto a short vowel.
distinction. The fact that Czech provides three distinct paradigms in answer to the three
PSL paradigms, fixed root stress, mobile, and neo-acute, means that at the time (e.g.
before the development of phonemic length in Proto-Czech) there were three distinct
intonations: acute, circumflex, and neo-acute. Phonemic redundancy begets variation,
and variation encourages innovation. With intonation being contrastive in this
environment, the phonemic load for the distinction between long and short vowels to
carry would have been reduced and therefore not as critical for lexical or grammatical
distinctions as quantity might have been were it to have been the only distinctive feature
in this environment. But the variation in vowel length independent of intonation would
have strengthened the opposition of phonemic quantity in Proto-Czech, and with the loss
of a phonemic distinction in intonation (triggered by the rise of the neo-acute), the role of
quantity as a distinctive feature gained in importance. The implication here is that during
the early Proto-Czech period when intonation still played the primary role in
distinguishing like roots from one another (e.g. mouka:muka), quantitative distinctions
might have been less stable and more likely to vary dialectally or from one speaker to the
next. This might partially explain the tremendous variance in the Czech dialect
geography with respect to quantity. Despite this variance, however, what is remarkable is
the fact that patterns associated with original Proto-Slavic intonation and the
phonological reflexes of these intonational patterns persisted into the Proto-Czech period.
**Mobile Feminine (j)á-stems**

Table 15 – Mobile disyllabic feminine ā-stems with original long root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*borda</td>
<td>‘beard’</td>
<td>bráda</td>
<td>bráda</td>
<td>brada A</td>
<td>brada</td>
<td>borod’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*cêna</td>
<td>‘price’</td>
<td>cêna, cijêna</td>
<td>cena A</td>
<td>cena</td>
<td>cena</td>
<td>cen’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Čak. cênâ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS cen’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*cêsta</td>
<td>‘trip’</td>
<td>cêsta</td>
<td>cêsta</td>
<td>cesta A</td>
<td>cesta</td>
<td>cêsta Srez.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*golva</td>
<td>‘head’</td>
<td>gláva</td>
<td>gláva</td>
<td>hlava A</td>
<td>hlava</td>
<td>golov’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*grêda</td>
<td>‘perch’</td>
<td>grêda</td>
<td>grêda</td>
<td>hřada A</td>
<td>hrada</td>
<td>gr’ad’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pêta</td>
<td>‘heel’</td>
<td>pêta</td>
<td>pêta</td>
<td>pata A</td>
<td>pâta</td>
<td>p’at’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*rêka</td>
<td>‘river’</td>
<td>rêka</td>
<td>rêka</td>
<td>řeka A</td>
<td>rieka</td>
<td>r’ek’ a AS r’ek’ u / r’eku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*slina</td>
<td>‘saliva’</td>
<td>slina</td>
<td>slina</td>
<td>slina A</td>
<td>Chod slina</td>
<td>slina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*stêna</td>
<td>‘wall’</td>
<td>stijêna</td>
<td>stêna</td>
<td>stêna A</td>
<td>stena</td>
<td>st’en’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*storna</td>
<td>‘side’</td>
<td>strána</td>
<td>strána</td>
<td>strana A</td>
<td>Chod strána</td>
<td>strana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*zima</td>
<td>‘winter’</td>
<td>zima, AS zimu</td>
<td>zima</td>
<td>zima A</td>
<td>zima</td>
<td>z’im’a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50 CZ cena (along with zima and žena) are identified as oxytonic by Trávníček (1932a:150). Bulaxovskij (1954:153, 161) believes that the end-stressed Russian AS forms attested in the 1st half of the 19th century are secondary, however the comparative evidence suggests cena was oxytonic. Illič-Svityč includes this word (1963:26) among his list of Indo-European roots with mobile-oxytonic accent because of the fact that kainà belongs dialectally to class 4 in Lithuanian and because the Greek cognate is end-stressed. Literary Lithuanian, however, treats káina as a class 1 substantive. For Illič-Svityč (1963:100), the word was mobile in Slavic. Since there does not seem to be any evidence in the Czech dialects or in OCZ for length, even though S/C indicates a.p. (b), we believe it was mobile, a.p. (c).

51 See Trávníček (1935:258) for a possible explanation of length in OCZ ciesta.
Table 16 – Mobile disyllabic feminine á-stems with original short root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*doba</td>
<td>'period'</td>
<td>dōba neut. indecl.</td>
<td>dōba</td>
<td>doba A</td>
<td>doba</td>
<td>'doba AS 'dobu ukr. dob’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gora</td>
<td>'mountain'</td>
<td>góra AS görú</td>
<td>góra</td>
<td>hora A</td>
<td>hora</td>
<td>gor’ a AS 'goru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*koza</td>
<td>'goat'</td>
<td>kóza AS kózu</td>
<td>kóza</td>
<td>koza A</td>
<td>koza</td>
<td>koz’ a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*loza</td>
<td>'rod'</td>
<td>lóza AS lózu</td>
<td>lóza</td>
<td>loza (OCZ) A</td>
<td>loza</td>
<td>loz’a (Ukr.) AS 'lozu (Ukr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*noga</td>
<td>'leg'</td>
<td>nóga AS nógu</td>
<td>nóga</td>
<td>noha A</td>
<td>noha</td>
<td>nog’ a AS 'nogu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*osa</td>
<td>'dew'</td>
<td>rósa AS rósu</td>
<td>rósa</td>
<td>rosa A</td>
<td>rosa</td>
<td>ros’ a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*soxa</td>
<td>'dry twig'</td>
<td>sóha AS sóhu</td>
<td>sóha</td>
<td>socha A</td>
<td>socha</td>
<td>sox’ a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*voda</td>
<td>'water'</td>
<td>vôda AS vôdu</td>
<td>vôda</td>
<td>voda A</td>
<td>voda</td>
<td>vod’a AS 'vodu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identification of this class rests heavily on the alternation in the AS of the R paradigms. As noted by Comrie (1978:58-59) however, CSR cannot be relied on as the

---

52 Vas. (1986, I.:518) indicates that this word was originally neut. plural, which would explain the stress pattern in R and S/C. Nevertheless the CZ and SLN words behave as mobile stems.


54 R NP kózi DP koz ‘am is a partial argument as well for mobility.

55 Bulaxovskij (1954:160). Further evidence that rosa belongs to a.p. (c) is the fact that there is only one CZ dialect with *rusa/rūsa attested.
only source for the original ictus pattern in R, for “In the nineteenth century, there were rather more words in this [mobile] class, including v’esn’ a, zol’ a, izb’ a, nor’ a, ovts’ a, ros’ a, sox’ a.” One cannot help but notice that most of these words are of the short root vowel variety. The mobile feminine (j)ā-stems are generally characterized by brevity in the root vowel in Czech. Roots with short vowels, by virtue of the fact that short vowels could not carry acute intonation in Proto-Slavic unless the accent was fixed by a morphological process, exhibit the pattern expected for the mobile paradigms. Examples of lengthening of original short vowels for this class of circumflex stems is extremely rare. CZ zima is noteworthy since the lengthened root vowel can be found in a number of dialects in the North and Central Bohemian dialect regions and several Central Moravian dialects (see Map 13). The dialectal distribution of length in this word together with the fact that the Southern Bohemian dialects do not indicate any preservation of length suggest two things: first of all, it shows that lengthening in general in the (j)ā-stems in the Chod dialects and Southern Bohemian dialects is not a generalization made for all (j)ā-stems regardless of PSL class, and secondly, it indicates that there were some roots whose PSL intonation was in variation. A.p. (b/c) řeka is probably another example of a PSL word with intonational variation in the PSL dialects. We regard Trávníček’s (1932a:150) classification of zima as oxytonic to be puzzling unless he considered the word to show intonational variation in PSL. Since the distribution of lengthened circumflex in zima is much different from the preservation of length in pretonic a.p. (b) words and the preservation of acute and neo-acute length, there must have been a difference in intonation.
Relative Chronology

The fact that there is not more residual length in the end-stressed forms of original mobile words might suggest that the shortening of circumflex length is an older, albeit dialectal, phenomenon in Proto-Czecho-Slovak than the shortening of acute length is in dialectal Proto-Slavic. Most of the irregularities that the strictly phonological shortening of circumflex intonation would have created in the paradigm left no trace on the language by the historical period, whereas the irregularities created by the shortening of acute length in trisyllabic forms are preserved precisely in the ā-stem paradigm of CLC Type F. If it is true that the Proto-Czecho-Slovak shortening of circumflex length predated the shortening of acute length in PSL, since S/C and SLN retain circumflex length, we are faced with a situation whereby an opposition between acute length and circumflex length became an opposition between length and brevity in dialectal PSL Czecho-Slovak. Then when the shortening of PSL acute length began to operate (brought on by the rise of the neo-acute), circumflex and acute intonations essentially merged in Slovak, Moravian, and South Slavic. We imagine then two waves of sound change: the first wave that shortened circumflex length in Proto-Czecho-Slovak but which did not extend to South Slavic, and a second wave that shortened original acute length that extended to South Slavic but excluded Western Proto-Czech (and Upper Sorbian). The later operation of the shortening of acute length coincided with the greater expansion of the West Slavs to the West. The historical data corroborates the linguistic evidence in this case.
There are not enough examples of these paradigms to make any real generalizations about the development of quantity in the Czech dialects. We can only observe that circumflex length has been lost in the one example we researched and that is attested in enough Slavic languages to be considered Common Slavic. There may be other mobile feminine disyllabic jā-stems with original short root vocalism that can be considered Common Slavic.

**Neo-Acute Feminine jā-stems**

Table 19 – Neo-acute disyllabic feminine jā-stems with original long root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*gostja</td>
<td>‘thick liquid’</td>
<td>gušta, Vas. ‘čašča’</td>
<td>gоšča</td>
<td>houšť/houšť OCZ húšč/húščě</td>
<td>húšť</td>
<td>'gušča'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gordja</td>
<td>‘barrier’</td>
<td>grâda</td>
<td>grája</td>
<td>hráz(e)</td>
<td>hrádza</td>
<td>go 'roža</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kupja</td>
<td>‘buy’</td>
<td>kúpl’a</td>
<td>kúpnja</td>
<td>koupě</td>
<td>kúpa</td>
<td>'kupl’a Ukr. kupl’’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*suchja</td>
<td>‘drought’</td>
<td>súša</td>
<td>súša</td>
<td>souš (OCZ sůše)</td>
<td>sůš</td>
<td>'suša</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*storgja</td>
<td>‘guard’</td>
<td>stráža</td>
<td>stráža</td>
<td>stráž(e)</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>sto ‘roža</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tęgja</td>
<td>‘weight’</td>
<td>têža/têža</td>
<td>têža</td>
<td>tîž(e)</td>
<td>tiaž</td>
<td>‘ť’až</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*žęd’a</td>
<td>‘thirst’</td>
<td>žêda</td>
<td>žéja</td>
<td>OCZ žiezě</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘žažda’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20 – Neo-acute disyllabic feminine jā-stems with original short root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*xodja</td>
<td>‘gait, walk’</td>
<td>xōda</td>
<td>hōja</td>
<td>chūze</td>
<td>OSK</td>
<td>xožij</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*xvoja</td>
<td>‘evergreen’</td>
<td>xvója/xvōja</td>
<td>hvōja</td>
<td>chvojē/chvūjē56</td>
<td>chvoja</td>
<td>xvoja dia. xvoj’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kozja</td>
<td>‘skin, leather’</td>
<td>kōza</td>
<td>kōža</td>
<td>kūže</td>
<td>koža</td>
<td>kōža</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*nosja</td>
<td>‘rucksack’</td>
<td>nōšnja</td>
<td>nōša</td>
<td>nūše</td>
<td>nōša</td>
<td>noša dia. noša</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*volja</td>
<td>‘will’</td>
<td>vōlja</td>
<td>vōlja</td>
<td>vůle</td>
<td>vol’a</td>
<td>vol’a dia. vol’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*von’a</td>
<td>‘smell’</td>
<td>vōnj, vōnja</td>
<td>vónja</td>
<td>vůně</td>
<td>vǒňa</td>
<td>von’ dia. von’a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neo-acute intonation, strictly a Slavic development, arose from the retraction of ictus onto the preceding syllable. In Czech, the neo-acute intonation often shows up as length, which is most visible in its effect on originally short vowels when they show lengthening. The most prominent and widely accepted environment for this retracted ictus intonation is in words that ended in a stressed jer (e.g. *korl’ь > kor’ôl’). Yet it is difficult to make a case for the rise of the neo-acute intonation as a phonetic development. The neo-acute, on the other hand, can be identified in a number of specific morphophonemic environments with evidence for the neo-acute intonation in Czech. Here we are most concerned with the class of jā-stems that can be identified as neo-acute, either from comparative evidence, or from the lengthened /o/ that is preserved in CLC

56 CZ chvoj, chvoje, chvūj, chvūje together with the S/C and R forms indicates that there was variation in PSL with regards to the intonation. It seems that there might have even been variation with respect to the place of accent.
and the dialects. And in fact, the neo-acute forms a class of stems in the substantival system only for the jā-stems. A special group/class of constant root stressed feminine jā-stem substantives was identified by Stang (1965:57) as neo-acute. In Czech these roots almost always contain a long vowel or lengthened short vowel throughout the paradigm.

Verweij and Kortlandt believe that pre-tonic length is preserved length in CZ and that acute length is relengthened. If this is right, we would expect length to be retained in all cases of neo-acute stems such as *volja including the IS. If there is a difference in the dialectal distribution of *volí / vůl̄í vs. břízou / břízou, then there is a difference in intonation. And in fact there is a difference, we have not uncovered any dialects with the IS volí, although this form is attested in OCZ.

Stang posits for the neo-acute a retraction off circumflex endings such as the NS in certain end-stressed jā-stems such as *volj-a. Stang (1965:13) also believes that the neo-acute resulted from the retraction from a stressed internal circumflex syllable to the preceding syllable – even off of forms he identifies as neo-circumflex: e.g. god ̣in > ̣godin. Dybo (1993:15) rejects this theory based in large part on what he calls the law of Dybo and Illič-Svityč, which posits a Common Slavic shift of accent to the right off of short-circumflex syllables in Balto-Slavic ortho-tonic forms. Phonologically under the neo-acute retracted ictus from a word final jer, short /o/, short /e/ and even jers show up as long in Czech and Slovak (e.g. CZ kůň ‘horse,’ děšt´ ‘rain,’ SK jéž ‘hedgehog’). In the GP, the Czech literary language has leveled out most lengthenings of short /o/, /e/ and jers, but the dialects sporadically indicate that there was lengthening under the neo-acute in the GP (for example dial. nuh ‘legs,’ okén dial. ‘windows’). Some classes of words
that Stang (*Slavonic Accentuation*, 1965) says are neo-acute on short vowels with retracted ictus never show length in any language. PSL fixed theme vowel stressed verbal stems in Czech show the preservation of the long vowel under the neo-acute, for example *vrátiti* ‘to return’ is long and follows the PSL pattern of fixed theme vowel stressed conjugation (cf. *ztratiti* ‘to lose’ which is short and mobile), but reportedly short vowel neo-acute verbs such as the i-stems *voditi, nositi, choditi* which have retracted ictus in the 2nd and 3rd persons (cf. Russian *нou, носишь*) exhibit no trace of lengthening neither in Old Czech nor in the Czech dialects57. This means that there was no general lengthening of short /o/ under the neo-acute retracted stress. Stang also argued that the motivation for neo-acute retraction in the jā-stems such as *vůle* was the presence of circumflex long vowels in word final position. He cited evidence from Polish dialects that retained length on the word final /a/ in this class. Some scholars believe that there is no basis for Stang’s belief that the cited Polish dialects indicate circumflex intonation on the desinential /a/. If this is true, it leaves no motivation for a phonologically based neo-acute in this class of words. A possible explanation is that this particular neo-acute development is a later, different development of the neo-acute and that the lengthening of the /o/ in Czech reflects a morphological development that is specific to Czech and Slovak. Czech lengthening of /o/ in the pretonic B-type ā-stems

57 In Czech there is some residue of e-stem neo-acute lengthening (e.g. *mohu, můžeš, beru, béřeš*, etc.), which might indicate that the lengthening of /o/ under the neo-acute in the verbal e-stem class was phonological but not in the verbal i-stem class. Another explanation put forward originally by Vondrák (Gebauer III, 1894:33-34) is that the lengthening in these e-stems is somehow related to the old optative. At any rate, it is clear that the putative neo-acute intonation in the i-stem verbs is not related to whatever is going on in the e-stem verbs.
(see Table 14) is probably an extension of a class marker which is length, phonologically based only in the lengthening of short /o/ off the neo-acute in masculine substantives such as kůň. It is interesting that it is precisely the pretonic short /o/ of a.p. (b) fixed end stress ā-stems to which this class marker is extended. Phonologically lengthened short /e/ from the neo-acute retraction does not become a morphological marker extended to the a.p. (b) ā-stems as shown by the lack of length in Czech žena ‘wife.’ The extension of this lengthened /o/ class marker in Czech then serves to distinguish between a.p. (b) pretonic jā-stems and a.p. (c) mobile (j)ā-stems, a distinction that would have been seriously blurred if not obliterated by the fixing of ictus on the initial syllable of the phonological word in Czech.

The solution of this problem also has bearing on a more general question of Slavic accentology, namely, the question as to whether Proto-Slavic acute length was shortened everywhere including Czech and length was then reintroduced secondarily in Czech, or whether acute length in Czech is preserved Proto-Slavic length.

As noted above, the argument for the shortening of acute length in Czech is bolstered by the shortening of acute length in all other Slavic languages with phonemic quantity including Slovak. The problems in formulating a comprehensive theory for the existence of sound laws that operated to restore length in Czech and in defining the conditions and factors responsible for a reintroduction of length (Verweij, 1994:505) have proven formidable. This theory of Czech Lengthening, repeated here for convenience, is based on speculation that the original rising intonation persisted on long and short vowels: “A short rising vowel in an open first syllable of disyllabic words is
lengthened unless the second syllable contains a long vowel.” This theory was originally expounded in Kortlandt (1975:19) with the only difference in his formulation the stipulation that the law was operative in early Czech. Verweij additionally notes that Stang (1965:35) first speculated about the existence of some such sound law when he wrote: “As we have seen, in Czecho-Slovak, in the first syllable of an old disyllabic word, acute appears as long and circumflex as short. But it is possible that this may be due to a secondary lengthening of a rising vowel.” Stang (1965:36), however, states that he finds no convincing argument that acute was shortened in Proto-Slavic, and supports this idea by referring to the Latvian prosodic system with a three way opposition in tone (rising = Dehnton, falling = Fallton, broken = Stosston). The Czech Lengthening presumably operated in Czech after the loss of weak jers which can be discerned from the examples given by Kortlandt (kráva NS, but krav). Although there is some merit to the Czech Lengthening, for the masculine monosyllabic stems with a lengthened short vowel, the theory seems to fall apart. Verweij (1994, p. 526) is forced to admit that the paradigm to be expected where the Czech Lengthening is to have operated (lengthened vowel in the GS, DS, IS, LS, NP, AP, and IP) is nowhere attested in Czech. In fact quite the contrary, instead of lengthening of short rising (in their view) vowels in the GS, DS, IS, LS, NP, AP the only case forms with lengthened vowels are the NS and the AS. In other words closed syllables in predominately fixed end-stress paradigms. Verweij has no way of explaining the failure of the old acute to lengthen in the NAS either.
Monosyllabic feminine i-stems follow the same patterns as the masc.

Monosyllabic stems for the most part, although the number of feminine monosyllabic stems in Czech is far fewer than for the masculine stems. The originally long vowel stems that remain long in CLC louč ‘kindling,’ pout ‘trip’ (masc. > fem.), ciev ‘kindling,’ pied ‘kindling,’ tvář ‘cheek,’ dášn ‘gum tissue,’ písň ‘song,’ tísň ‘kindling’ lén, čést, kád, mlád, pied, sín, síť, básň, bázň, plisň, přízň, vášň, žízň. Original long vowel stems that are short in CLC include běl, (s)běr, bran, hrud, hus, chut’, lat, lut, mast, směs, mysl, myš, nat, nit, past, pěst, řeč řit, san, sěč, strast, trest, věc, vlast. Short vowel stems for the most part remain short in CLC and include kost ‘bone,’ moc ‘power,’ moč (m./f.), noc ‘night,’ zlost ‘night,’ čest ‘night,’ lest ‘night,’ lež ‘lie,’ pec ‘night,’ plet ‘night,’ rež ‘night,’ ves ‘night,’ zed ‘night,’ žen ‘night.’ At least two feminine i-stems with original short vowels have lengthened the root vowel – hůl, sůl. There are isolated examples from OCZ manuscripts of other long vowels in forms that occur primarily with short vowels;
*krev/krév, lež/léž, ves/vés, rez/réz*, but not attested in more than one manuscript or consistently enough to deserve mention.
Chapter 6

MASCULINE MONOSYLLABIC STEMS

Expected reflexes of root vowels

Table 22 – Monosyllabic masculine paradigms in CLC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case / Number</th>
<th>A (all short)</th>
<th>B (all long)</th>
<th>C (long NAS, else short)</th>
<th>D (short GP, else long)</th>
<th>E (short GP, DP, IP, LP, else long)</th>
<th>F (short IS, GP, DP, IP, LP, else long)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>dub</td>
<td>žák</td>
<td>dům</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>dubu</td>
<td>žáka</td>
<td>domu</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>dubu</td>
<td>žákovi</td>
<td>domu</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>dub</td>
<td>žáka</td>
<td>dům</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>dubem</td>
<td>žákem</td>
<td>domem</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>dubu</td>
<td>žákovi</td>
<td>domě</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>duby</td>
<td>žáci</td>
<td>domy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>dubů</td>
<td>žáků</td>
<td>domů</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>dubům</td>
<td>žákům</td>
<td>domům</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>duby</td>
<td>žáky</td>
<td>domy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>duby</td>
<td>žáky</td>
<td>domy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>dubech</td>
<td>žácich</td>
<td>domech</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are fewer possible patterns of long versus short vowel alternations in the roots of masculine monosyllabic (originally disyllabic) substantives than there are for the feminine (j)ă-stems. Even the historically trisyllabic forms (IS, DP, LP) show less dialectal variation in the masculine substantival sub-system than the trisyllabic forms in the (j)ă-stem substantival sub-system. The masculine monosyllabic substantives are original o-, jo-, u- and i-stems, originally disyllabic (i.e. in the NS before the loss of weak jers), with weak /–ь/ and /–ь/ in word-final position in the NAS (if animate NS only) and GP cases. Among them we find both words very basic in nature and of very old deverbal derivation together with several loan words. The following categorization is
organized by PIE stem class and the Proto-Slavic accentological type to which the words
belonged. The accentological type has been determined by comparing relevant forms in
the modern Slavic languages. As noted above, R has been used to determine the place of
ictus,\textsuperscript{1} and the combination of S/C, SLN, CZ and SLK has been used to determine the
accentual paradigm: fixed root [a.p. (a) = acute intonation] fixed end-stress [a.p. (b) =
oxytonic] mobile stress [a.p. (c) = circumflex intonation]. Some reference is made to
Dybo’s d-type accentual paradigm [a.p. (d)] (Dybo, 1993:28) that is essentially a
variation on the oxytonic a.p. (b) – the chief difference being in the NAS where instead of
fixed end stress, the forms are believed to have had an intonation that Dybo calls
enklìnömennaja nisxodjashchaja. Since the acute fixed stem stress paradigm a.p. (a)
represents forms with stressed intonation that could occur only on long vowels (in
monosyllabic stems), as we would expect, no words with original short vowels can be
reliably assigned to this paradigm.

Serbo-Croatian forms and Slovene forms quoted are from the literary language
except as noted otherwise. As far as the classification of stems into the accentual
paradigms a.p. (a), a.p. (b), and a.p. (c) is concerned, we have leaned heavily on Dybo
(1993), Illič-Svityč (1963), and Stang (1965). Since the arguments made in this study
rely to some degree on the accent class to which the lexical items belonged, caution is
used to classify each word as accurately as possible. Since, however, there is
considerable disagreement about the membership of words to Proto-Slavic accentual

\textsuperscript{1} In some known cases, CSR does not preserve the original place of ictus and will be noted.
paradigms, when a word is not clear about its membership to a specific accentual paradigm, we have tended towards the view that best represents the data from the entire analysis of the masculine monosyllabics and the classification that allows for the most comprehensive view of the languages and dialects involved. Where there is conflicting data from other Slavic languages or dialects, or disagreement among Slavic accentologists regarding the classifications below, we have tried to indicate the divergence.

If we look at the three LPSL accentual paradigms: acute [fixed root stress=a.p. (a)], oxytonic [fixed stress on first syllable of the desinence=a.p. (b)], circumflex [(mobile=a.p.(c)], we can initially derive the following paradigms for the masculine (j)o-stem disyllabic substantives according to the historically determined rules for the development of length in Czech.²

² Tables 24 thru 27 apply to the u-stems as well for the most part. By early Czecho-Slovak, the o-stem and u-stem paradigms were virtually indistinguishable.
Table 23 – Acute monosyllabic masculine (j)o-stems in CLC with original long root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case / Number</th>
<th>Proto-Slavic Form according to Stang Reconstruction (1965:68-69)</th>
<th>Rule for Preservation or Loss of Length in original Long Root Vowel</th>
<th>Expected CLC Form</th>
<th>Old Czech Form</th>
<th>Literary Czech Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>*dýmъ</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>DÝM</td>
<td>dým</td>
<td>dým</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>*dým a</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>DÝMA</td>
<td>dýma/u</td>
<td>dýmu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>*dým ě</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>DÝMĚ</td>
<td>dýmu</td>
<td>dýmu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>*dýmъ</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>DÝM</td>
<td>dým</td>
<td>dým</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>*dýmъ йъ</td>
<td>Acute length lost in word greater than two syllables</td>
<td>DÝMEM</td>
<td>dýmem</td>
<td>dýmem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>*dým ě</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>DÝMĚ</td>
<td>dýmě</td>
<td>dýmě</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>*dým i</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>DÝMI</td>
<td>dýmy</td>
<td>dýmy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP⁴</td>
<td>*dýmъ</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>DÝM</td>
<td>dýmов</td>
<td>dýmu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>*dýmъ otъ</td>
<td>Acute length lost in word greater than two syllables</td>
<td>DÝMOM</td>
<td>dýmóm</td>
<td>dýmům</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>*dýmъ</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>DÝMY</td>
<td>dýmy</td>
<td>dýmy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>*dýmъ</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>DÝMY</td>
<td>dýmy</td>
<td>dýmy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>*dýmъ ехъ</td>
<td>Acute length lost in word greater than two syllables</td>
<td>DÝMECH</td>
<td>dýmech</td>
<td>dýmech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ Although the older o-stem IS desinence is undoubtedly {-омъ}, West Slavic generalized {-ьмъ} quite early, and the oldest West Slavic manuscripts already illustrate this fact. The origin of {-ьмъ} is almost certainly the u-stem declension.

⁴ For the history of this case form, see Gebauer (III:54-58).

⁵ There are several dialects that we know of that have the expected reflex in the DP desinence of acute stems. Dušek (1894-1908, III:24) names Kouto, Kolínek, Chrást, Bušovice, Měčín as villages in Southern Bohemia with either {-omъ} or {-umъ} as the regular DP o-stem desinence. The dialectal {-umъ} desinence is undoubtedly a much later shortening {-um < -ům < -uom < -óm}, which must have taken place after the diphthongization of /ó/ that operated from the end of the 14th to the beginning of the 16th centuries, but it is possible that the dialectal desinence {-omъ} represents an archaicism of the original phonologically correct o-stem form. Gebauer (III:58-59) assumes that {-omъ} attested in the Chod dialects (Domažlice) and in Doudlebsko represents shortening of the original {-omъ}, but we do not see any compelling reason that the shortened form may not represent the original desinence and that the lengthened form (with Czech neo-acute or compensatory lengthening) was later generalized. The phonological source of the lengthening in this desinence is problematic.
There are no paradigms in CLC that match the expected result of the PSL acute (j)o-stem and u-stem paradigm for every grammatical case. Leaving aside the analogical irregularities of the grammatical case morphemes, the expected shortening of acute length in the root of the trisyllabic forms (IS, DP, LP) does not survive as a declensional pattern. There are a handful of original disyllabic a.p. (a) o-stems with long vowel in the NAS and shortening throughout the rest of the paradigm in CLC (chléb, mráz, hrách, práh, vítr) and OCZ (Ján, mák,⁶ pán, pás < *pojasъ), but there is doubt as to whether this pattern reflects an archaic a.p. (a) paradigm. This same alternation pattern is common for original a.p. (b) roots with a short vowel that was lengthened in the NAS such as dům. Unfortunately, attestations of shortenings in only the IS, DP, and LP (the expected paradigm) for a particular acute lexeme in OCZ or even in a particular OCZ text are nowhere to be found in the literature or in OCZ manuscripts that we know of. Perhaps closer examination of OCZ manuscripts with an orthographic distinction of long and short vowels would provide documentation of the expected paradigm. The alternation in NAS pás G pasu gives us a clue about the diachronic behavior of this alternation. In the NAS as well as in the other grammatical cases we expect the phonological result of the contraction to be a long vowel (e.g. pásъ, < *pojasъ, pásu < *pojasu). The word pás, pasu must have adopted the alternation subsequent to the completion of contraction in the Czech lands, which means sometime after the beginning of the 12th century (Marvan, 2000). Furthermore, since we imagine that the most likely source for this alternation is in

⁶ CLC mák no longer preserves the pattern with short vowel in the indirect cases.
the words of the type NAS *dům*, GS *domu*, etc. where the length developed after the loss and vocalization of the jers, the alternation must be a development in *pás* that occurred independent of PSL intonation. Naturally, it is impossible to prove that the alternation in *pás* has the same source as in *mráz* and *hrách* or vice versa, but the possibility remains.

In the GP, Gebauer (III.1:55) lists OCZ *čás*, *hód*, *bóh*, *lék*, *hřiech*, *pár*, *plát*, *ráz* with the old o-stem zero ending and length in the root. He notes that these forms (GP in {-Ø} with or without length) are much more common in the oldest texts and are nearly non-existent in CLC (except in the occasional place name, e.g. *Hradčan*), but there is no correlation between length in the root in the GP and the original PSL accentual paradigms. Lengthening or preserved length in masculine disyllabic roots in the GP with {-Ø} would have been phonological in stems of a.p. (a), a.p. (b), and in a.p. (c) where the stress was on the jer. The tendency to generalize length or brevity in the root in the GP to distinguish this from from the NS does not seem to have been characteristic of the masculine substantives as it was with the (j)ā-stems, nor does SK preserve the original (j)o-stem GP {-Ø < -ъ/ь} desinence. Both Czech and Slovak generalized the u-stem {-овъ} in the GP. Lengthening in Czech (but not Slovak!) and an anomalous loss of the final /v/ gives us the CLC desinence {-овъ > -óv > -uov > -ův > -ů} with no alternation in the root. Yet the OCZ forms cited by Gebauer above are likely to have their source in early Czecho-Slovak where neo-acute lengthening or the preservation of original length in the GP of a.p. (b) and a.p. (c) (j)o-stems would have occurred. In a.p. (a) the length should have been preserved in the GP.
It is important to notice additionally for o-stem paradigms in CZ, that the CLC LP desinence {-ech} was generalized very early in OCZ to most o-stems and u-stems, however, the forms that end in a velar consonant show the reflex of the original long desinence as in {*-ēch > -ich} (e.g. LP jazycich). The source of the length in these desinences is uncertain, but it is found in Czech, Slovak, Polish dialects, Čakavian S/C, Slovene and might very well be connected to the loss and vocalization of jers or to a spread of the neo-acute intonation. Length in Czech that is not PSL acute length or neo-acute length is often called compensatory lengthening. In the u-stem CLC LP where the desinence was {*-ъ-xъ} (e.g. *dom-ъ-xъ), the vocalized jer does not become a long vowel (cf. CZ domech). Original short /o/, however, in the o-stem DP {*-o-mъ} does become long (e.g. chlapomъ > chlapóm > chlapuom > chlapům) as does the o-stem GP {*-o-v-ъ > -ô-v > -uo-v > ū-v > ū} that has been generalized to nearly all masculine paradigms in CLC. We conclude from these observations that the lengthening of the stem vowel in the substantival paradigms coincided with the loss of the weak jers but in all probability began operating before the vocalization of the strong jers. Yet there is still the possibility that it was the neo-acute intonation that spread to these desinences and that the length developed here as a continuation of the neo-acute intonation. We note, however, that if the neo-acute intonation spread to the LP desinence as well, it failed to lengthen the jer in the morpheme {*-ъ-xъ}.

---

7 Gebauer (III.1.:181) observed that LP {-ách} in OCZ sometimes is shortened, especially in the Chod dialects and that the DP {-om} from the o-stems is also attested in the Chod dialects Chod DP kravom. It is possible that the brevity in these desinences represent a residue of the expected CZ phonological reflexes and are not shortenings at all.
Table 24 – Oxytonic monosyllabic masculine (j)o-stems in CLC with original long root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case / Number</th>
<th>Proto-Slavic Form according to Stang Reconstruction (1965:68-69)</th>
<th>Rule for Preservation or Loss of Length in original Long Root Vowel</th>
<th>Expected CLC Form</th>
<th>Old Czech Form</th>
<th>Literary Czech Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>*sød ě</td>
<td>1). Length preserved pretonically,</td>
<td>SOUD</td>
<td>soud</td>
<td>soud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2). Neo-acute retraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>*sød à</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>SOUDA</td>
<td>souda/u</td>
<td>soudú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>*sød ū</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>SOUDU</td>
<td>soudu</td>
<td>soudú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>*sød ě</td>
<td>1). Length preserved pretonically,</td>
<td>SOUD</td>
<td>soud</td>
<td>soud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2). Neo-acute retraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>*sød ľě</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>SOUDEM</td>
<td>soudem</td>
<td>soudem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>*sød ě</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>SOUĐE</td>
<td>soudě/ů</td>
<td>soudů</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>*sød ě</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>SOUDI</td>
<td>soudy</td>
<td>soudy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>*sød ě</td>
<td>1). Length preserved pretonically,</td>
<td>SOUD</td>
<td>soudův</td>
<td>soudů</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2). Neo-acute retraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>*sød ỏmь</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>SOUDOM</td>
<td>soudőm</td>
<td>soudům</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>*sød ǚ</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>SOUDY</td>
<td>soudy</td>
<td>soudy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>*sød ǚ</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>SOUDY</td>
<td>soudy</td>
<td>soudy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>*sød ěхь</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>SOUDECH</td>
<td>soudech</td>
<td>soudech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CZ reflexes of the PSL oxytonic (j)o-stem paradigm exhibit the expected phonological reflexes throughout the paradigm. We were unable to find any examples in OCZ of shortenings of original oxytonic root vowels in the trisyllabic forms IS, DP, LP,

8 Although the older o-stem IS desinence is undoubtedly {-omь}, West Slavic generalized {-ьмь} quite early, and the oldest West Slavic manuscripts already illustrate this fact. The origin of {-ьмь} is almost certainly the u-stem declension.
IP. The natural conclusion to reach is that words of the oxytonic class were not subject to the loss of pretonic length in three syllable forms of the paradigm.

Table 25 – Circumflex monosyllabic masculine (j)o-stems in CLC with original long root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case / Number</th>
<th>Proto-Slavic form according to Stang Reconstruction (1965:72-77)</th>
<th>Rule for Preservation or Loss of Length in original Long Root Vowel</th>
<th>Expected CLC Form</th>
<th>Old Czech Form</th>
<th>Literary Czech Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>*bêrg ъ (?)</td>
<td>Circumflex length lost</td>
<td>BŘEH</td>
<td>břeh</td>
<td>břeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>*bêrg a</td>
<td>Circumflex length lost</td>
<td>BŘEHA</td>
<td>břeha/ǔ</td>
<td>břehu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>*bêrg u</td>
<td>Circumflex length lost</td>
<td>BŘEHU</td>
<td>břehu</td>
<td>břehu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>*bêrg ъ</td>
<td>Circumflex length lost</td>
<td>BŘEH</td>
<td>břeh</td>
<td>břeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>*bêrg ъм ъ (?)</td>
<td>Circumflex length lost</td>
<td>BŘEHÉM</td>
<td>břehem</td>
<td>břehem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>*bêrg ѡ (?)</td>
<td>Circumflex length lost</td>
<td>BŘEZÉ</td>
<td>břehu</td>
<td>břehu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>*berg i (?)</td>
<td>Circumflex length lost</td>
<td>BŘEZI</td>
<td>břehy</td>
<td>břehy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>*bêrg ĭ</td>
<td>1). Length preserved pretonically, 2). Neo-acute retraction</td>
<td>BŘÍH</td>
<td>břehov</td>
<td>břehů</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>*berg źom ъ</td>
<td>Desinence 1). Neo-acute retraction, 2). Lengthening of /o/ under neo-acute, 3). /o &gt; uo &gt; ť/</td>
<td>BŘEHŮM</td>
<td>břehóm</td>
<td>břehům</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>*bêrg y</td>
<td>Circumflex length lost</td>
<td>BŘEHY</td>
<td>břehy</td>
<td>břehy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>*bêrg y (?)</td>
<td>Circumflex length lost</td>
<td>BŘEHY</td>
<td>břehy</td>
<td>břehy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>*berg ěх ъ</td>
<td>Desinence Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>BŘEZÍCH</td>
<td>březích</td>
<td>březích</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLC is quite consistent in generalizing brevity in this class of substantives. If Stang (1965:72-77) is correct and the jers were stressed in the DP⁹ and LP of the mobile paradigm, we have found a possible historical phonological source for the lengthened vowels in the CLC masculine DP desinence {-ům} of hard and soft stems alike, and the

⁹ Stang is ultimately unsure about whether the stress was on the desinence in the DP, but offers evidence in support of this view.
LP desinence {-ich} of soft stem and velar stem masculines. As far as the roots are concerned, nearly all (j)o-stems that we have classified as a.p. (c) are short throughout the paradigm and there are few dialectal exceptions. The few examples of lengthened vowel in the old GP with zero ending of original mobile words (e.g. hód, bōh) must be explained as lengthening of /o/ under the neo-acute in Czech. But the GP in zero is very rare even in Old Czech – the u-stem desinence {-ovъ} dominated the fray very early.

Table 26 – Oxytonic monosyllabic masculine (j)o-stems in CLC with original short root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case / Number</th>
<th>Proto-Slavic Form</th>
<th>Explanation for Reflex of Original Short Root Vowel</th>
<th>Expected CLC Form</th>
<th>Old Czech Form</th>
<th>Literary Czech Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>*kônj ь</td>
<td>1). Neo-acute retraction, 2). Lengthening of /o/ under the neo-acute</td>
<td>KŮŇ</td>
<td>kůň</td>
<td>kůň</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>*konj æ</td>
<td>Non-lengthening environment without retraction</td>
<td>KONĚ</td>
<td>koně</td>
<td>koně</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>*konj ŭ</td>
<td>Non-lengthening environment without retraction</td>
<td>KONI</td>
<td>koni</td>
<td>koni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>*konj æ</td>
<td>Non-lengthening environment without retraction</td>
<td>KONĚ</td>
<td>koně</td>
<td>koně</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>*konj òm ų</td>
<td>Non-lengthening environment without retraction</td>
<td>KONĚM</td>
<td>koněm</td>
<td>koněm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>*konj Ŷ</td>
<td>Non-lengthening environment without retraction</td>
<td>KONI</td>
<td>koni</td>
<td>koni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>*konj Ŷ</td>
<td>Non-lengthening environment without retraction</td>
<td>KONI</td>
<td>koně</td>
<td>koně</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>*konj ų</td>
<td>1). Neo-acute retraction, 2). Lengthening of /o/ under neo-acute</td>
<td>KŮŇ</td>
<td>koní</td>
<td>koní</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>*konj òm ų</td>
<td>Non-lengthening environment without retraction</td>
<td>KONIM</td>
<td>koním</td>
<td>koním</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>*konj æ</td>
<td>Non-lengthening environment without retraction</td>
<td>KONĚ</td>
<td>koně</td>
<td>koně</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>*konj òm i</td>
<td>Non-lengthening environment without retraction</td>
<td>KONĚMI</td>
<td>koněmi</td>
<td>koněmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>*konj æx ų</td>
<td>Non-lengthening environment without retraction</td>
<td>KONÍCH</td>
<td>konich</td>
<td>konich</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analogical adoption of the i-stem desinence in the GP of this paradigm has obliterated any trace of the expected lengthening in this form. The expected lengthening in the NS (and AS of inanimate substantives) is not preserved in all lexemes. Various attempts have been made to phonologically explain CLC forms such as *dům, půst, růst, etc. We will examine this question below. Another major observation to be made about this paradigm is the striking fact that in contrast to the feminine end-stress paradigm with original short root vowel that was lengthened in all of the grammatical case forms in certain dialects (e.g. *kůlna, kůpa, vůsa, kůra), the length in the masculine substantives shows up only in the N(A)S.

**Acute monosyllabic masculine (j)o-stems**

Table 27 – Acute monosyllabic masculine (j)o-stems with original long root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*xлēбъ</td>
<td>‘bread’</td>
<td>hljěb, hljěba</td>
<td>hlěb, hlěba hlěb, hlěba ?</td>
<td>chléb, chleba C</td>
<td>chlieb, chleba</td>
<td>’xл’ěb, ’xл’ěba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*сěръ</td>
<td>‘tip, point’</td>
<td>cîp, cîpa</td>
<td>cîp, cîpa</td>
<td>cîp &lt;n&gt;, cîpu B</td>
<td>cep, cepa</td>
<td>’cep, ’cep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*дымъ</td>
<td>‘smoke’</td>
<td>dîm, dîma</td>
<td>dim, dima</td>
<td>dým, dýmu B</td>
<td>dym, dymu</td>
<td>’dym, ’dyma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*горъ</td>
<td>‘peas’</td>
<td>grâx, grâxa</td>
<td>grâh, grâha</td>
<td>hrách, hrachu C OCZ GS hráců Chod. GS hráchu</td>
<td>hrach, hrachu</td>
<td>gor ’ox, gor ’oxa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*клинъ</td>
<td>‘lap’</td>
<td>kîn, kîna</td>
<td>klin, klima</td>
<td>klin, klinu B</td>
<td>klin, klina</td>
<td>’kл’in, ’kлина</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*макъ</td>
<td>‘poppy’</td>
<td>màk, màka</td>
<td>màk, màka</td>
<td>màk, màku B OCZ GS maku</td>
<td>maku, maku</td>
<td>’mak, ’maka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSL</td>
<td>GLOSS</td>
<td>S/C</td>
<td>SLOVENE</td>
<td>CZECH</td>
<td>SLOVAK</td>
<td>RUSSIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*moržь</td>
<td>‘frost’</td>
<td>mràz, mràza</td>
<td>mràz, mràza</td>
<td>mràz, mrazu</td>
<td>C Chod GS</td>
<td>mràz, mrazu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*plaktь</td>
<td>‘crying’</td>
<td>plàč, plàča</td>
<td>plàč, plàča</td>
<td>plàč, plàče</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>plač, plaču</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*поргь</td>
<td>‘hearth’</td>
<td>prâg, prâga</td>
<td>prâg, prága</td>
<td>prâh, prahu</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>prach, prachu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ра́й/ро́йь</td>
<td>‘paradise’</td>
<td>ráj, rája</td>
<td>ráj, rája</td>
<td>also ráj, rája</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*skігь</td>
<td>‘scorpion’</td>
<td>štîr, štîra</td>
<td>štîr, štîra</td>
<td>štûr, štûra</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>ščur, ščura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*сyrь</td>
<td>‘cheese’</td>
<td>šir, šira</td>
<td>sir, síra</td>
<td>sýr, sýra</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>syr, syra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*тынь</td>
<td>‘fence’</td>
<td>tìn, tína</td>
<td>tìn, tîna</td>
<td>týn, týnu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>týn, ’tyna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*љеть</td>
<td>‘wind’</td>
<td>vjetar, vjetra</td>
<td>vjetar, vjetra</td>
<td>vít, vétro</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>vietor, vetra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bíчь</td>
<td>‘whip’</td>
<td>bič, biča</td>
<td>bič, biča</td>
<td>bič, biča</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>bič, biča</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*брат(г)ь</td>
<td>‘brother’</td>
<td>bràt, bráta</td>
<td>bràt, bráta</td>
<td>bratr, bratra</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>brat, brata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*чась</td>
<td>‘time’</td>
<td>čas, časa</td>
<td>čas, časa</td>
<td>čas, času</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>čas, času</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*долнь</td>
<td>‘palm’</td>
<td>dlàn, dlâna</td>
<td>dlàn, dlâni</td>
<td>dlâň, dlâne</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Chod (301-305) dlán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*гадь</td>
<td>‘snake’</td>
<td>gàd, gàda</td>
<td>gàd, gáda</td>
<td>had, hada</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>had, hada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*гнёвь</td>
<td>‘anger’</td>
<td>gnëv, gnëva</td>
<td>gnëv, gnëva</td>
<td>hnëv</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>OCZ hnev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*jugь</td>
<td>‘south’</td>
<td>jùg, jùga</td>
<td>jùg, júga</td>
<td>jih, jihu</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>juh, juhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*кра́йь</td>
<td>‘edge’</td>
<td>krâj, krâja</td>
<td>krâj, krája</td>
<td>kraj, kraje</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Chod (301-305) kráj, u kraje, na kráji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*plugь</td>
<td>‘plow’</td>
<td>plùg, plùga</td>
<td>plùg, plùga</td>
<td>pluh, pluhu</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>pluh, pluha/u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preserved length in Czech is often the mantra of Slavic accentologists for evidence of PSL acute intonation. Although it is true that preserved length in Czech shows up more often in original acute stems than mobile stems, more than half of the original acute masculine monosyllabic (j)o-stems listed in Table 27 do not retain the expected length in the roots. Variation is characteristic of every language. S/C číp, čípa, indicates mobility, and other peculiarities such as S/C máč, máka; prág, prága; bíč, biča require language specific internal/dialectal clarification. SLN svát, sváta; hláp, hlápa; větře, větra; štůr, štůra throw a little doubt on whether these words were original acutes or not, and SK chlieb, mráz, štúr, týň, vietor, with length transgress the SK rule shortening of acute length. But no Slavic language used for accentological arguments is as unreliable as Czech is. Explaining the numerous shortened acute forms in Czech has been taken up by other scholars. Bulaxovskij (1983:164-165) offers *ad hoc* explanations for the shortness in bratr (‘fonetičeskij fakt’) děd (from dědik) svat (parallel to starosvat)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>räkъ</em></td>
<td>‘crayfish’</td>
<td>rák, ráka</td>
<td>rák, ráka</td>
<td>rak, raka A</td>
<td>rak, raka</td>
<td>'rak, 'raka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>zęťь</em></td>
<td>‘daughter’s husband’</td>
<td>zęt, zęta</td>
<td>zęt, zęta</td>
<td>zet’, zet’a A</td>
<td>zat’, zat’a</td>
<td>'z’at’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>děďъ</em></td>
<td>‘grandfather’</td>
<td>děd, děda</td>
<td>tudi děd</td>
<td>děd, děda A</td>
<td>ded</td>
<td>'d’ed, 'd’eda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>svatъ</em></td>
<td>‘son in law’s father’</td>
<td>svät, sváta</td>
<td>svät, sváta</td>
<td>svat, svata A</td>
<td>svat</td>
<td>'svat, 'svata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>volхъ</em></td>
<td>‘Romanian’</td>
<td>vläh, vláxa</td>
<td>vláh, vláha Vas. láh</td>
<td>vlach A</td>
<td>vlach</td>
<td>vol’ox, vol’oxa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>холъь</em></td>
<td>‘boy’</td>
<td>xlâp, GS xlâpa (Vas. also GS xlâp)</td>
<td>hlâp, hlâpa</td>
<td>chlap A</td>
<td>chlap</td>
<td>xol’op, GS xol’opa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
vlach (shortness in the plural forms) pan (allegro speech) jih (from na jihu) hněv (deverbal from hněvati). Trávníček (1935:259) attributes shortness in the acute stems to metatony in certain morphological environments: “Tak v gen. pl. vznikla metatonii intonace novocirkumflexová, která se projevila v pěsl. krátkostí, čas atd. Metatonie vznikla bez pochyby také v nom. ak. čas, děd ... atpod. Většinou vznikla při tomto vyrovnávání buď veskrze krátkost nebo veskrze délka.” [So in the GP through metatony the neo-circumflex intonation arose, which shows up in Proto-Czech as brevity, e.g. čas etc. Metatony without a doubt also arose in the NAS čas, děd ... etc. In general, leveling then took place either by the generalization of brevity throughout the paradigm or the generalization of length]. This explanation is unsatisfactory. We have already indicated that we believe the shortening in the GP of (j)ã-stems is better explained as the tendency to differentiate the GP from the rest of the paradigm than as a separate hypothetical metatonic intonation called the neo-circumflex. Furthermore, there is no reason to believe that there was a change of intonation in the NAS of any stems. Finally, the shortening in the root of the GP of (j)o-stems in {-Ø < -ъ/ў} is nowhere a regular feature as far as we can tell from the scant evidence, dialectal or otherwise, and in fact we expect neo-acute (=preservation of length) phonologically in the oxytonic and mobile paradigms for the original GP.
In the Chod dialects particularly in this group we find deviations, especially *chleb*, *chleba; hrách, hráchu* (301-311, 313-337)\(^{10}\) s mákem (301-321); GS *práhu*. In Old Czech, we find little variation. Even *vítr* in OCZ always shows up with length.

**Oxytomic monosyllabic masculine (j)o-stems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*dělъ</td>
<td>‘part, share’</td>
<td>dįjel, GS dįjela</td>
<td>Vas. děl</td>
<td>dįl, GS dľu B</td>
<td>diel</td>
<td>d’el, d’ela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*grěxъ</td>
<td>‘sin’</td>
<td>grįjex, GS grijěxa</td>
<td>grèx</td>
<td>hřich, GS hříchu B</td>
<td>hriech</td>
<td>‘gr’ex, GS gr’ex’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*xlěvъ</td>
<td>‘stable’</td>
<td>hlěv, LS hlěvu</td>
<td>hlěv, GS hléva</td>
<td>chlév, GS chléva B</td>
<td>chliev</td>
<td>‘xlev, GS xleva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*hrustъ</td>
<td>‘brown beetle that eats vegetation’</td>
<td>hrůš, GS hrůšta</td>
<td>chroust(^{11}) B</td>
<td>chrůst</td>
<td>‘xrust, GS xrusta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*klŏvъ</td>
<td>‘joint’</td>
<td>Vas. klupko</td>
<td>klôb ? Vas. klôbko</td>
<td>kloub, GS kloubu B</td>
<td>klôb</td>
<td>‘klub, GS kluba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ključъ</td>
<td>‘key’</td>
<td>kljúč, kljúča</td>
<td>kljúč</td>
<td>klîč B</td>
<td>kl’úč</td>
<td>‘kl’uč, kl’uč’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kôťъ</td>
<td>‘corner’</td>
<td>kût, GS kûta</td>
<td>kôt, -a</td>
<td>kout, GS koutu B</td>
<td>kút</td>
<td>‘kut, GS kut’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*križъ</td>
<td>‘cross’</td>
<td>križ, križa</td>
<td>križ</td>
<td>kříž B</td>
<td>kříž</td>
<td>‘kr’iž, kr’iž’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pěstъ</td>
<td>‘fist’</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>pěsta</td>
<td>pěst, -i (f.) B</td>
<td>piest (m.) B</td>
<td>piest (f.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{10}\) Refer to Map 21 for the dialectal distribution of length in the GS hrachu/hráchu.

\(^{11}\) OP chrąst.
The Czech reflex on a long vowel in the oxytonic paradigm is extremely consistent. All of the oxytonic stems that we have examined have generalized the long vowel throughout the paradigm. Even oxytonic words, such as *hřich*, that are inconsistent in its reflex pan-slavonically are at least consistent in CLC (and Slovak for the most part). The situation is somewhat different, however, for the oxytonic roots with original short vowel. In a number of the words in Table 29, there is a good deal of

---

12 Polish *wąs* indicates end stress.
evidence for lengthening of the original short vowel in CLC. There is often further
dialectal evidence for lengthening of original short vowels in oxytonic stems.

Table 29 – Oxytonic monosyllabic masculine (j)o-stems with original short root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*дъждъ</td>
<td>‘rain’</td>
<td>дъжд, дъжда</td>
<td>дёж, деžjá</td>
<td>deš’t/deš’t’, dešte</td>
<td>дъжд, дъжда</td>
<td>‘дожд’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*дворъ</td>
<td>‘yard’</td>
<td>двор, двора</td>
<td>двор, двора</td>
<td>дvûr, dvoru</td>
<td>дvor, dvor</td>
<td>‘dvor, dvor’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*кољ</td>
<td>‘stake’</td>
<td>Kaj. kôl, kôla</td>
<td>kôl, kóla</td>
<td>kûl, kolu / kûlu</td>
<td>kôl, kola</td>
<td>‘kol, kol’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*конъ</td>
<td>‘horse’</td>
<td>kônj, kônja</td>
<td>kônj, kônja</td>
<td>kûn, koně</td>
<td>kôn, koña</td>
<td>‘kon’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*но̀ж</td>
<td>‘knife’</td>
<td>nôž, nóža</td>
<td>nôž, noža</td>
<td>nûž, nože</td>
<td>nôž, noža</td>
<td>‘nož, nož’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*постъ B (/D)</td>
<td>‘fast’</td>
<td>póst, pôsta</td>
<td>pûst, postu</td>
<td>pôst, postu</td>
<td>‘post, post’</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*столъ B</td>
<td>‘table’</td>
<td>stô, stôla</td>
<td>stôl, stôlo</td>
<td>stôl, stolu</td>
<td>‘stol, stol’</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*во̀лъ B</td>
<td>‘ox’</td>
<td>vô, vôla</td>
<td>vûl, vôle</td>
<td>vûl, vole</td>
<td>‘vol, vol’</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*бобръ u B</td>
<td>‘beaver’</td>
<td>dâbar, dâbra</td>
<td>Plet. bôber, bôbra</td>
<td>bobr, bobra</td>
<td>‘bobr, bobra’</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*бобъ B (/D)</td>
<td>‘bean’</td>
<td>bôb, bôba</td>
<td>bôb, bóba</td>
<td>bob, bobu</td>
<td>‘bob, bobu’</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*боръ u B/D</td>
<td>‘pine tree’</td>
<td>bôr, bôra</td>
<td>bór, bóra</td>
<td>bor, borus</td>
<td>‘bor, bora’</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*гвоздъ B</td>
<td>‘forest, nail’</td>
<td>гвозд, гвозда</td>
<td>gözd, gözda</td>
<td>hvozd, hvozdu</td>
<td>‘gvozd’, гвозд’</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 Original u-stems are included here marked with a superscript /u/.
14 See Map 17 for Czech dialectal distribution of lengthened /e/ (< *ъ).
15 Gebauer (I.III:609).
16 Gebauer (I.III:609).
17 Cf. Slvn. гвозд, гвозда ‘nail, wedge.’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*kosь</td>
<td>‘Turds merula’</td>
<td>kōs, pl. kōsovi</td>
<td>kōs, kōsa</td>
<td>kos, kosa</td>
<td>dial. kūs, kosa&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*koшь</td>
<td>‘horse’</td>
<td>kōš, kōša</td>
<td>kōš, kōša</td>
<td>koš/kūš, košê&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>kōš, koša</td>
<td>'koš, koš’ a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*roйь</td>
<td>‘swarm’</td>
<td>rōj, rōja</td>
<td>rōj, rōja</td>
<td>roj, roje dial. rūj</td>
<td>roj, roja dial. rōj</td>
<td>'roj, 'roja dial. 'rōj, roj' a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*skоть</td>
<td>‘cattle’</td>
<td>skōt, ?</td>
<td>skōt, skōta</td>
<td>skot, skota</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>'skot, skot’ a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sloйь</td>
<td>'layer'</td>
<td>slōj, slōja</td>
<td>slōj, slōja</td>
<td>sloj, sloje</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>OCZ sloj, sloja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*slonь B/D</td>
<td>'elephant'</td>
<td>slōn, slōna</td>
<td>slōn, slōna</td>
<td>slon, slona</td>
<td>slon, slona</td>
<td>'slon, slon' a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*stогь D</td>
<td>'haystack'</td>
<td>stōg, stōga</td>
<td>stōg, stōga</td>
<td>stoh, stohu&lt;sup&gt;23&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>OCZ stōh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*stroйь B/D</td>
<td>'ceiling'</td>
<td>strōp, strōpa</td>
<td>strōp, strōpa</td>
<td>strop, stropu</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>strōp, stropa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>18</sup> See Map 19 for Czech dialectal distribution of lengthened /o/.

<sup>19</sup> See Map 22 for Czech dialectal distribution of lengthened /o/ in this word.

<sup>20</sup> Illič-Svityč (p. 134) attributes the S/C reflex and transference to the mobile class as secondary and a result of lengthening of /o/ before /j/. In Czech, Gebauer believed that all /o/’s before /j/ were lengthened (Gebauer, 592-593). He quotes OCz forms from BiblA. Ex 14, 13 imper. bój sě, nč. dial. bůj sa, OCz boju sě (ty) sě nebuoy Levšt. 150b, bůj se Suš. 89, matcy se nic nebůj. To avoid lexical collision or by analogy to the forms in the paradigm that did not end in ř, the phonologically correct *bój (m.) was levelled to the forms of the oblique cases where there would have been no lengthening. In addition, there are many attestations of roj with length (Map 18). In the Silesian dialects the reflex of lengthened /o/, namely /u/ in roj is widely attested. Sporadic relics of length in roj are also attested in several Central Moravian dialects and Southern Bohemian dialects. The word voj ‘army,’ (cf. vojsko, vojín, etc.) is not attested with length. This fact however is due to it’s infrequent usage outside of compounds and by no means nullifies what was obviously a general Czech development which lengthened /o/ before /j/ at the end of the phonological word.

<sup>21</sup> Machek (1971:555) “Sem náleží i č. sluj < *slůj původně téhož významu jako sloj, ale v bratrské bibli s významem dutina, dira v zemi, jeskyně, jenž vešel i do spisovného jazyka.”

<sup>22</sup> This word was probably originally a mobile stem with variation to the oxytonic paradigm.

<sup>23</sup> See Map 20 for Czech dialectal distribution of lengthened /o/ in this word.
The Czech reflexes of the oxytonic paradigm a.p. (b) with original short root vocalism are discussed together with the mobile paradigm below as the two are interrelated.

**Mobile Monosyllabic Masc. (j)o-stems**

Table 30 – Mobile monosyllabic masculine (j)o-stems with original long root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*хвость B</td>
<td>'tail'</td>
<td>хвост, хвостa</td>
<td>chvost, chvostu</td>
<td>chvost, chvosta</td>
<td>'xвост, xвост a'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*пръсть</td>
<td>'finger'</td>
<td>пръст, пръста</td>
<td>prst, prstu</td>
<td>prst, prsta</td>
<td>'p’erст, p’ерст a'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*бегъ</td>
<td>'run'</td>
<td>бег, бега, Vas. биеж</td>
<td>бег</td>
<td>бег A</td>
<td>beh</td>
<td>'б’ег,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*блескъ</td>
<td>'lightening'</td>
<td>блес ’ак, блеска</td>
<td>блеск</td>
<td>blesk A</td>
<td>blesk</td>
<td>'bl’esk (3a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*боръ</td>
<td>'small cattle, castrated pig'</td>
<td>брв, брва</td>
<td>брв</td>
<td>brav A</td>
<td>brav</td>
<td>'боров, ’борова</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*бергъ</td>
<td>'shore'</td>
<td>бреж, брежа</td>
<td>бреж, прега</td>
<td>břeh A</td>
<td>breh</td>
<td>'б’ер’ег, 'б’ер’егу</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*брусъ</td>
<td>'blade'</td>
<td>брус, бруса</td>
<td>брус</td>
<td>brus A</td>
<td>brus</td>
<td>'brus (1a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*кургъ</td>
<td>'circle'</td>
<td>круг, круга</td>
<td>круг</td>
<td>kruh A</td>
<td>kruh</td>
<td>'круг, ’круга</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*кветъ</td>
<td>'blossom'</td>
<td>cvет, cvêta, Vas. cvijet</td>
<td>cvет</td>
<td>kvet A</td>
<td>kvet</td>
<td>'cv’ет, ’cv’ета</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*даръ</td>
<td>'gift'</td>
<td>дар, дара</td>
<td>дар</td>
<td>OCZ dar A</td>
<td>dar</td>
<td>'дар, ’дар</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*дълъ</td>
<td>'debt'</td>
<td>дуг, дуга</td>
<td>дług</td>
<td>dluh A</td>
<td>dlh</td>
<td>'dolg, 'dolga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*духъ</td>
<td>'spirit'</td>
<td>душ, душа</td>
<td>душ</td>
<td>duch A</td>
<td>duch</td>
<td>'dux, 'dux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*гольъ</td>
<td>'hunger'</td>
<td>глд, глда</td>
<td>глд, глда</td>
<td>hlad A</td>
<td>hlad</td>
<td>'golod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*голосъ</td>
<td>'voice'</td>
<td>глс, глса</td>
<td>глс</td>
<td>hlas A</td>
<td>hlas</td>
<td>'gолос (1c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSL</td>
<td>GLOSS</td>
<td>S/C</td>
<td>SLOVENE</td>
<td>CZECH</td>
<td>SLOVAK</td>
<td>RUSSIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gordъ</td>
<td>‘town’</td>
<td>grâd, grâda</td>
<td>grâd</td>
<td>hrad A</td>
<td>hrad</td>
<td>'gorod (1c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ȅзъ</td>
<td>‘weir’</td>
<td>jâz, jâza</td>
<td>jêz</td>
<td>jez A</td>
<td>jaz / jez</td>
<td>'jaz, 'jaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*listъ</td>
<td>‘leaf’</td>
<td>list, lista</td>
<td>list</td>
<td>list A</td>
<td>list</td>
<td>'l’ist, 'l’ist’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*měхъ</td>
<td>‘goatskin thermos’</td>
<td>mêh, mêha</td>
<td>mêh, mêha</td>
<td>mêch A</td>
<td>mech</td>
<td>'m’ex, 'm’exa NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*коіръ</td>
<td>‘thrasher’</td>
<td>cêp, cêpa</td>
<td>c’êp</td>
<td>cep A</td>
<td>cep</td>
<td>'c’er, 'c’era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*volsъ</td>
<td>‘hair’</td>
<td>vlâs, lâs</td>
<td>vlas A</td>
<td>vlas</td>
<td></td>
<td>'volos (1c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*vorgъ</td>
<td>‘murderer’</td>
<td>vrâg</td>
<td>vrâg</td>
<td>vrah A</td>
<td>vrah</td>
<td>'voroh (UK)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As expected, in CLC and dialectally, all the original mobile paradigms that we examined with original long root vocalism have shortened vowel throughout the paradigm. Original mobile words with short root vocalism, however, are subject to lengthened vowel in the NAS. Since the ictus in the NAS for the mobile paradigm was undoubtedly on the root, the environment cannot have been identical to the oxytonic paradigm. The lengthening in the NAS only occurs on /o/, which is rather suspicious. Original long vowels do not re-lengthen, so lengthened /o/’s must be the result of either compensatory lengthening in front of a lost jer, or by analogy to the oxytonic paradigm.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*bogъ C</td>
<td>‘God’</td>
<td>bóg, bôga</td>
<td>bóg</td>
<td>bûh, boha C</td>
<td>boh, boha</td>
<td>‘bog, ‘boga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*dolъ D</td>
<td>‘ditch’</td>
<td>dô, dôla</td>
<td>dôl, dôla</td>
<td>dûl, dolu C</td>
<td>dol, dolu</td>
<td>‘dol, ‘dola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*domъ C</td>
<td>‘house’</td>
<td>dôm, dôma</td>
<td>dôm, dôma</td>
<td>dûm, domu C</td>
<td>dom, domu</td>
<td>‘dom, ‘doma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gnojъ</td>
<td>‘manure’</td>
<td>gnôj, gnôja</td>
<td>gnôj, gnôja</td>
<td>hûj, hnoje C</td>
<td>hnoj, hnoja</td>
<td>‘gnoj, ‘gnoja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lojъ</td>
<td>‘lard’</td>
<td>lôj, lôja</td>
<td>lôj, lôja</td>
<td>lûj, loje C</td>
<td>loj, loja</td>
<td>‘loj, ‘loja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*orstъ</td>
<td>‘growth’</td>
<td>râst, râsta</td>
<td>râst</td>
<td>rûst, rostu C</td>
<td>vzrast, vzrasta</td>
<td>‘rost, ‘rosta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*vozъ C/D</td>
<td>‘wagon’</td>
<td>vôz, vôza</td>
<td>vûz, vozâ</td>
<td></td>
<td>voz, voza</td>
<td>‘voz, ‘voza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bodъ D</td>
<td>‘point’</td>
<td>bôd, bôda</td>
<td>bôd, bodu A</td>
<td>bod, bodu Ø</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bokъ D</td>
<td>‘side’</td>
<td>bôk, bôka</td>
<td>bôk, bôka</td>
<td>bok,boku A</td>
<td>bok, boku</td>
<td>‘bok, ‘boka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*brodъ D/C</td>
<td>‘boat, ford, ferry’</td>
<td>brôd, brôda</td>
<td>brôd, brôda</td>
<td>brod, brodu A</td>
<td>brod, brodu</td>
<td>‘brod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gonъ B/D</td>
<td>‘hunt’</td>
<td>gôn</td>
<td>gôn, gôna</td>
<td>hon, honu A</td>
<td>hon, honu</td>
<td>‘gon, ‘gona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*grobъ B/D</td>
<td>‘grave’</td>
<td>grôb, grôba</td>
<td>grôb, grôba</td>
<td>hrob, hrobu A</td>
<td>hrob, hrobu</td>
<td>‘grob, ‘groba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gromъ D/C</td>
<td>‘thunder’</td>
<td>grôm, grôma</td>
<td>grôm, grôma</td>
<td>hrom, hromu A</td>
<td>hrom, hromu</td>
<td>‘grom, ‘groma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*krovъ B/D</td>
<td>‘roof’</td>
<td>krôv, krôva</td>
<td>krôv, krôva</td>
<td>krov, krovu A</td>
<td>krov, krova</td>
<td>‘krov, ‘krova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ledъ C</td>
<td>‘ice’</td>
<td>lêd, lêda</td>
<td>lêd, lêda</td>
<td>led, ledu A</td>
<td>l’ad, l’adu</td>
<td>‘lêd, ‘l’da</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

24 Original u-stems are included here marked with a superscript /u/.  
26 See Dybo (1991:195) for explanation of ictus pattern B/D.
In Literary Czech there are a number of monosyllabic substantives which are characterized by an alternation between [long] /ů/ in the NAS and [short] /o/ in the other case forms. In rare cases, long /e:/ alternates with short /e/ in the same morphological categories. This alternation is a result of the phonological lengthening of an original short vowel (о, е, ё, ъ) of the root in the NAS forms. These substantives are typically masc. o-stems (kůl, stůl, půsta, bůh), jo-stems (kůň, děšt’, nůž, hnůj, lůj), or u-stems (důl, vůl), however several feminine i-stems may be cited as exhibiting a similar lengthening pattern (sůl, hůl). Attempts to explain this length as either compensatory lengthening as the result of the loss of a following weak jer, lengthening as the result of ictus retraction and the rise of the neo-acute (Stang’s law), phonologically or phonetically conditioned lengthening, morphophonemic lengthening, or a combination of some or all of the above
have been generally incomplete because of the complexity of the problem and the use of incomplete dialectal data or the unsystematic use of data from Old Czech. We will try to sort out the facts for Czech to determine if possible which factors and conditions contribute to the lengthening of the original short vowels, which attestations of the lengthened short vowels can be considered phonological, which attestations of the lengthened short vowels should be thought of as morphological extensions, and the reasons for such conclusions. Czech data both from the literary language as well as the Czech dialects will be utilized in an effort to bring as much relevant information as possible to bear on this complicated problem. Slovak, and other Slavic languages will be cited to support the theory that what on the surface may seem to be a single phenomenon is in fact several quite distinct but interrelated phenomena.

The Czech forms which regularly exhibit lengthening in the NAS are: oxytonic a.p. (b): dvůr, kůl, půst, stůl, děšt’, kůň, nůž, vůl; mobile c-type: bůh, růst, vůz, lůj, hůj, důl, dům. We also include sůl and hůl in this discussion since the alternation between /o/ and /ů/ (NAS sůl, hůl oblique sol-, hol-) in these words is almost certainly related. The somewhat regular lengthenings found in the Czech dialects for stoh ‘haystack’ (Map 20) kos ‘Turdus Merula=blackbird’ (Map 19) koš (Map 22) ‘basket’ illustrate what are very good examples of length that has not been preserved in the Czech literary language but whose dialectal distribution forces us to attribute the length to something more than idiosyncratic variation. It is important to mention that whereas mobile substantives with original short /o/ do exhibit lengthening, mobile substantives with original long vowel do not exhibit preservation of length. The pattern of dialectal retention of lengthened /o/
shows clearly that the loss of length in these forms of the original oxytonic paradigm was innovative in the Central Bohemian dialects upon which the literary language is based.

It is natural to find wide dialectal variation of a feature that alternates within a paradigm. Historically speaking, since the only forms in the oxytonic paradigm for masculine monosyllabic inanimate stems (o-stems, jo-stems, and u-stems) that would have been affected by the retraction of ictus from a jer that lost the ability to carry ictus were the NAS (and the GP for o-, jo- stems), the paradigmatic pressure for analogical leveling in favor of the original short vowel would have been considerable. One would indeed be very surprised that the alternation had been preserved at all if it weren’t for the fact that the source of the lengthened grade is precisely the NAS, in other words, the morphological categories that most often serve as the source for other targets of the analogical leveling processes. For animate o-stem and jo-stem substantives (such as *kos, *skot, *slon, *konj) the only form susceptible to a phonological compensatory lengthening of /o/ would have been the NAS and perhaps the GP if the GP {–ъ} was still extant at the time that the pattern was established and if the (j)o-stems adopted the u-stem GP after the phonemicization of length in Czech. For the u-stems (e.g. důl, vůl, bobr) only the N(A)S would have provided the correct phonological environment for compensatory lengthening in Czech and Slovak. It’s no wonder then, that if the compensatory lengthening of /o/ in animate *kosъ ‘Turdus merula,’ and *slonъ ‘elephant’ took place, that the lengthened vowel was leveled out by analogy to the rest of the paradigm without compensatory lengthening or neo-acute lengthening and ictus retraction. Map 19 shows that the dialectal distribution of neo-acute length for *kosъ is
restricted to what many consider to be the most archaic dialects of the Chod region in the
territory of the Southwestern Bohemian dialects. The word *skotъ is attested with length
in OCZ, but we were unable to collect dialectal data for *skotъ from the survey done by
the Czech Academy of Sciences. The word *bobrъ probably does not even belong here
because /t/ was no doubt syllabic and carried the ictus which would have blocked the
effects of compensatory lengthening. The word *slonъ, then, is the only end-stressed
animate form that shows no residue of the lengthened /o/ under neo-acute lengthening
conditions in this class of words. Perhaps this word along with *hvozdъ and *chvostъ
were not end-stressed in dialectal Proto-Slavic in the Czech and Slovak territories and
were therefore not subject to neo-acute lengthening.

The dialectal distribution of length in déšt’ (Map 17) illustrates by the
concentration in the Central Moravian dialects and the lack of attestations in the more
archaic Chod dialects that the lengthening in this case is a separate phenomenon from the
lengthenings represented by stoh and koš. The remaining examples concern only
lengthened /o/. Other sporadic attestations of lengthened /o/’s in Czech include: Výklad
kruml 132b (sir 38, 29) vapor znuoiıyor horkoft, from the first half of the 15th century; CLC
trôn27 ‘throne’ SK trôn < Lat. thronus < Gr. θρόνος.

27 The word tron was no doubt borrowed without length from Latin but acquired length to
mark it in Old Czech as a foreign word, much in the same way that words in contemporary
standard Czech are often marked by long /ó/ to distinguish them from native words as loan words
or words of foreign origin that have not yet been assimilated into the literary language, cf. móda,
dóm, flóra, bonbón, neón, vagón, stadión, milióň, balkón, medailón, pavilón, Bablón, Arón, tón,
Platón, maratón, zón.
One difficulty with interpreting the operation of compensatory lengthening and neo-acute lengthening has been the interest in equating the phonological environment with the morphological environment. The fact that Slovak shows a regular reflex of length in the GP (even showing the expected lengthening in liquid vowels!) has led to the belief that in Slovak, lengthening under the neo-acute in general is absolutely regular. A more likely explanation, however, is that lengthened vowels in the Slovak GP has become a morphological marker with generalization of lengthening to many paradigms where the lengthening effect would not have arisen phonologically. The source of this length may very well have been retraction off a stressed jer in the oxytonic accentual paradigm a.p. (b) and the GP of u-stems and ā-stems of a.p. (c) proceeded by a neo-acute lengthening in Czecho-Slovak, but that is not to say that GP length in Slovak is equivalent to neo-acute length since the effects have spread morphologically so extensively.

But why are some /o/’s lengthened under the retraction from a stressed jer but not others? As far as the words under investigation in this study are concerned, Slovak agrees with Czech for oxytonic a.p. (b) kôl, pôst, stôl, kôn, nôž, vôl. There is also a strong possibility that Czech dial. kūš/kuš, Slovak kôš reflect the same lengthening which must be considered neo-acute lengthening. In the Chod dialects we find further evidence (Hruška, 1907:47 “kūš, ale ost. pády pravidelně: koše, atd.”) that this word retained the short vowel in the other grammatical forms as expected for words that had neo-acute lengthened short vowel in the NS. But Slovak has no length for the words where /o/ was lengthened in the NAS for Czech of the mobile class. In fact, Slovak shows no
lengthening of any short vowel in words of the mobile accentual pattern. Two additional oxytonic Slovak substantives, bôb, strôp, show neo-acute lengthening. Czech bôb with long /o/ must be considered archaic. As far as the CZ dialects are concerned, we were unable to find data to confirm whether bôb shows up with length anywhere today. For the masculine monosyllabic stems, however, the Czech data indicate that whereas Slovak may have been the center of a center/periphery phonological phenomenon, Czech has extended the effects of neo-acute lengthening beyond it’s phonological source which is almost certainly the lengthening of /o/ in Late West Slavic or Czecho-Slovak in a special morphophonemic environment: /o/ > /ó/ /__C# when the ictus was retracted off of a jer as a result of the advent of the neo-acute intonation on the syllable one place to the left. It may appear that there is a phonotactic constraint on the lengthening of /o/ under the neo-acute in Czech as espoused by Černý, Vondrák, Trávníček et al. since oxytonic forms such as hvozd, slon, strop, chvost in CLC lack the short /o/ long /o/ alternation. It is possible, however, that the original neo-acute lengthening occurred everywhere in Czech but was phonetically influenced by the intervening consonant before length became phonemic and therefore the alternation of long /o/ and short /o/ was only preserved in paradigms ending in consonants where the phonetic lengthening was reinforced. The environment before sonorants is particularly supportive of the lengthening of /o/ under the neo-acute, especially before /l/.

There cannot be a general lengthening of /o/ under the neo-acute or by compensatory lengthening unless one assumes a kind of lexical selectiveness in the neo-acute retraction, but whenever there was a morphological based accent on an /o/, it tended
to lengthen it. If there were two separate retractions from auslaut they could have retracted at different times—one retraction associated with the neo-acute as in the jā-stems with lengthened /o/ such as vůle, důše, růže, etc. and the other retraction off of stressed jers which also no doubt caused phonetic lengthening of /o/ in CZ as in důl. It seems that indeed most /o’s were lengthened when the conditions were met for compensatory lengthening and in the grammatical categories that the neo-acute obviously became morphologized in such as the GP in Slovak.

The spread of the alternation created by compensatory lengthening to a.p. (c) mobile monosyllabic substantives in Czech (e.g. dům, bůh, sůl) was subject to the same phonotactic conditions as the preservation of the original alternation. The alternation tended to spread to lexemes whose stems ended in a sonorant or voiced fricative bůh, vůz, důl, dům, sůl. That the lengthening is not phonological in the mobile class is proven by the lexemes that end in the requisite consonant, /l/ for instance, that show no hint of length dialectal or historical such as mol ‘moth,’ bol ‘pain.’ The word růst ‘growth’ is the only example of the alternation where the environment is not before a sonorant or voiced fricative, but could be explained as an analogical change based on půst or is perhaps better explained by the fact that it is a deverbal derivation of růsti which has the same lengthening as něsti under the neo-acute intonation.

The extension of the alternation of long /o/ and short /o/ to the environment /__j/, (e.g. hnůj, lůj, dial. růj) however, appears to be a separate phenomenon whose source we find in the pronominal paradigm (můj, moje). We see from the dialectal distribution
of lengthened /o/ in /roj/ (Map 18) that the lengthened vowel is not phonological
everywhere before /j/ in the mobile class, but a morpho-phonemic analogical change.

We have tried to show that what may appear to be explainable by a single
phonological rule is in fact three separate linguistic phenomena. The first and most
regular is the lengthening of short vowels – primarily short /o/ – in Czecho-Slovak under
the retraction of ictus off a weakened jer and the rise of the neo-acute intonation. In the
case of masculine monosyllabic substantives, this lengthening is sometimes referred to as
compensatory lengthening, but this term is something of a misnomer that implies a
phonological lengthening of a short vowel in the syllable in front of a weak jer when in
fact the lengthening is attributable not so much to the loss of the weak jer as to the neo-
acute intonation that developed in the NAS in specific cases of certain PSL paradigms
(b), & a.p. (c) monosyllabic masc. (j)o-stems, etc.]. The second phenomenon is the
reinforcement of the phonetic alternation based on paradigmatic influences and
phonotactic constraints leading to the possible retention of the alternation within a given
paradigm. Finally, there is the analogical spread of the resulting morpho-phonemic
alternation to the mobile class substantives that end in consonants which reinforced both
phonetically and morphologically the lengthening of /o/.
NEUTER DISYLLABIC SUBSTANTIVES

Expected reflexes of root vowels

If we look at the three LPSL accentual paradigms: acute [fixed root stress=a.p. (a)], oxytonic [fixed stress on first syllable of the desinence=a.p. (b)], circumflex [(mobile=a.p.(c)], as we have done for the feminine ā-stem paradigms in Chapter 5 and the masculine (j)o-stem paradigms in Chapter 6, we can derive the expected paradigms for the neuter (j)o-stem disyllabic substantives in Czech in a similar fashion to assess whether or not there appears to be a correlation between the actual CLC paradigms and the reflexes that we would expect when taking into consideration the phonologically and morphologically conditioned rules for the preservation of length, the shortening of original length, or the lengthening of original short vowels in Czech.

Table 32 – Acute disyllabic neuter (j)o-stems in CLC with original long root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case / Number</th>
<th>Proto-Slavic Form according to Stang (1965:82)</th>
<th>Rule for Preservation or Loss of Length in original Long Root Vowel</th>
<th>Expected CLC Form</th>
<th>Old Czech Form</th>
<th>Literary Czech Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>*lět o</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>LÉTO</td>
<td>léto</td>
<td>léto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>*lět a</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>LÉTA</td>
<td>léta</td>
<td>léta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>*lět u</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>LÉTU</td>
<td>létu</td>
<td>létu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>*lět ř</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>LÉTO</td>
<td>léto</td>
<td>léto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>*lět řemě</td>
<td>Acute length lost in word greater than two syllables long</td>
<td>LETEM</td>
<td>lětem</td>
<td>lětem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>*lět ě</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>LÉTĚ</td>
<td>lětě</td>
<td>lětě</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1See Chapter 6, fnt. 8 above for an interpretation of the source and history of this desinence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case / Number</th>
<th>Proto-Slavic Form according to Stang (1965:82)</th>
<th>Rule for Preservation or Loss of Length in original Long Root Vowel</th>
<th>Expected CLC Form</th>
<th>Old Czech Form</th>
<th>Literary Czech Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>*lět a</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>LÉTA</td>
<td>léta</td>
<td>léta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP²</td>
<td>*lět ъ</td>
<td>1). Acute length preserved, 2). Morpho-phonemic loss of length in GP</td>
<td>LET</td>
<td>let</td>
<td>let</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>*lět опъ</td>
<td>Acute length lost in word greater than two syllables long</td>
<td>LETOM</td>
<td>létom /</td>
<td>létům /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>letóm</td>
<td>letům</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>*lět a</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>LÉTA</td>
<td>léta</td>
<td>léta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>*lět у</td>
<td>Acute length preserved</td>
<td>LÉTY</td>
<td>lety</td>
<td>lety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>*lět ěхъ</td>
<td>Acute length lost in word greater than two syllables long</td>
<td>LETECH</td>
<td>létech /</td>
<td>létech /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>letech</td>
<td>letech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just as we discovered with the masculine acute paradigm and its reflexes in CLC, there are no neuter paradigms in CLC that match the expected result of the PSL acute (j)o-stem paradigm for every grammatical case. We do, however, find evidence for an older pattern that reflects the phonological and morphophonemic reflexes that we would expect from the original acute paradigm. The word that is closest to what we would expect is precisely one of the words most likely to preserve an older pattern, *léto* ‘year, summer’ because of the frequency of its usage and core vocabulary nature of the meaning. Although the paradigm in CLC for this word is entirely unique, we have cited it here in order to illustrate what we believe must be thought of as the historical regularity of the prosodic sound changes that acted upon the Proto-Czech substantival system.

---

2 For the history of this case form, see Gebauer (III.I:54-58).
Table 33 – Oxytonic disyllabic neuter (j)o-stems in CLC with original long root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case / Number</th>
<th>Proto-Slavic Form according to Stang (1965:83)</th>
<th>Rule for Preservation or Loss of Length in Original Long Root Vowel</th>
<th>Expected CLC Form</th>
<th>Old Czech Form</th>
<th>Literary Czech Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>*vin 佗</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>VİNO</td>
<td>vīno</td>
<td>vīno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>*vin à</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>VİNA</td>
<td>vīna</td>
<td>vīna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>*vin ù</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>VİNU</td>
<td>vīnu</td>
<td>vīnu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>*vin 佗</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>VİNO</td>
<td>vīno</td>
<td>vīno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>*vin ㎞</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>VİNEM</td>
<td>vinem</td>
<td>vinem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>*vin 佗</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>VİNE</td>
<td>vinيمة</td>
<td>vinيمة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>*vin à</td>
<td>1). Length preserved pretonically, 2). Analogical generalization of neo-acute (from LP), 3). Neo-acute retraction</td>
<td>VİNA</td>
<td>vīna</td>
<td>vīna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>*vin 佗</td>
<td>1). Length preserved pretonically, 2). Neo-acute intonation &amp; preservation of length, 3). Morpho-phonemic loss of length in GP</td>
<td>VİN</td>
<td>vin/vin</td>
<td>vin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>*vin 佗</td>
<td>1). Length preserved pretonically, 2). Analogical generalization of neo-acute (from LP), 3). Neo-acute retraction</td>
<td>VİNOM</td>
<td>vinومة</td>
<td>vinومة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>*vin à</td>
<td>1). Length preserved pretonically, 2). Analogical generalization of neo-acute (from LP), 3). Neo-acute retraction</td>
<td>VİNA</td>
<td>vīna</td>
<td>vīna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>*vin 佗</td>
<td>1). Length preserved pretonically, 2). Analogical generalization of neo-acute (from LP), 3). Neo-acute retraction</td>
<td>VİNY</td>
<td>vīny</td>
<td>vīny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>*vin 佗</td>
<td>1). Length preserved pretonically, 2). Neo-acute retraction</td>
<td>VİNECH</td>
<td>vinech</td>
<td>vinech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stang (1965:82) believes that the stress in the LP was retracted producing [sic] the neo-acute intonation on the preceding syllable and that the generalization of this accentuation to the other grammatical forms of the plural was a development that was made possible in an effort to differentiate the oxytonic paradigm from the mobile paradigm that had the opposite pattern – that is, root stress in the singular and end stress in the plural. Even though OCZ must be considered mute on the question pertaining to the origin of initial stress in the plural grammatical cases of the oxytonic paradigm, the CZ reflexes of the PSL oxytonic neuter (j)o-stem paradigm exhibit the expected phonological reflexes throughout the paradigm under either scenario. The neo-acute intonation would have resulted in preserved length on the root vowel in the plural, and pretonic length would also have been preserved as length, but we have shown in Chapters 5 and 6 that short root vowels (particularly /o/) under the neo-acute intonation become long vowels as a rule. We would expect, therefore, more evidence for lengthened /o/’s in words from this paradigm if the neo-acute truly spread throughout the plural as Stang suggests.

Table 34 – Circumflex monosyllabic neuter (j)o-stems in CLC with original long root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case / Number</th>
<th>Proto-Slavic form according to Stang (1965:84)</th>
<th>Rule for Preservation or Loss of Length in original Long Root Vowel</th>
<th>Expected CLC Form</th>
<th>Old Czech Form</th>
<th>Literary Czech Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>*zòlto</td>
<td>Circumflex length lost</td>
<td>ZLATO</td>
<td>zlato</td>
<td>zlato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>*zòlta</td>
<td>Circumflex length lost</td>
<td>ZLATA</td>
<td>zlata</td>
<td>zlata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>*zòltu</td>
<td>Circumflex length lost</td>
<td>ZLATU</td>
<td>zlatu</td>
<td>zlatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>*zòlto</td>
<td>Circumflex length lost</td>
<td>ZLATO</td>
<td>zlato</td>
<td>zlato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>*zòltýmь</td>
<td>Circumflex length lost</td>
<td>ZLATEM</td>
<td>zlatem</td>
<td>zlatem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>*zòlté</td>
<td>Circumflex length lost</td>
<td>ZLATÉ</td>
<td>zlaté</td>
<td>zlaté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case / Number</td>
<td>Proto-Slavic form according to Stang (1965:84)</td>
<td>Rule for Preservation or Loss of Length in original Long Root Vowel</td>
<td>Expected CLC Form</td>
<td>Old Czech Form</td>
<td>Literary Czech Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>*zoltà</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>ZLÁTA</td>
<td>zlata</td>
<td>zlata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>*zoltì</td>
<td>1). Length preserved pretonically, 2). Neo-acute retraction</td>
<td>ZLATÍ</td>
<td>zlatí</td>
<td>zlatí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>*zoltomì</td>
<td>Root 1). Expect shortening Desinence 1). Neo-acute retraction, 2). Lengthening of /o/ under neo-acute, 3). /ó &gt; uo &gt; ū/</td>
<td>ZLATŮM</td>
<td>zlatům</td>
<td>zlatům</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>*zoltà</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>ZLÁTA</td>
<td>zlata</td>
<td>zlata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>*zolty</td>
<td>Length preserved pretonically</td>
<td>ZLATÝ</td>
<td>zlatý</td>
<td>zlatý</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>*zoltěchì</td>
<td>Root 1). Expect shortening Desinence 1). Length preserved</td>
<td>ZLATÍCH</td>
<td>zlatěch</td>
<td>zlatěch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the disyllabic neuter paradigm with mobile stress pattern was characterized by a stress shift to the final syllable of the desinence in the plural as Stang (1965:84) implies, and there was ever preservation of pretonic length in Czech, the effects have been all but completely lost. Nedvědová (unpublished ms., page 64) cites several OCZ examples of ancient mobile stems with length throughout the paradigm as doublets that she attributes to analogical leveling “břicho, tieto, máso, etc.” It is difficult to know whether these spurious examples represent a pattern based on phonological reflexes of the NAP forms with analogical leveling to the singular or are just random dialectal forms because the sources are not indicated. Gebauer does not mention them at all, to our knowledge, nor
are there entries in the OCZ dictionary project card catalogue or the published fascicles of the StČS that indicate any pattern of length in these words.

*Neuter Disyllabic j(o)-stem paradigms in Contemporary Literary Czech*

The disyllabic neuter (j)o-stem paradigms in CLC exhibit a mix of analogical and phonological levelings, dialectal influences, and morphological readjustment just as the masculine and feminine substantival subsystems that we examined earlier do. Many of the same general historical tendencies are supported by the synchronic and diachronic data for this class of word:

- the shortening of circumflex length in Czech and Slovak;
- the preservation of pretonic, acute, and neo-acute length;
- the generalization throughout the paradigms of either brevity or length;
- evidence for the morphophonemic substitution of the contrastive quantity in the root vowel of the GP to differentiate the GP from the other forms of the paradigm;
- widespread lexical shortening of original acute length that is preserved as length along the periphery of the Czech dialectal landscape – particularly in the Chod villages of the Southwestern Bohemian dialect region and the northern dialects of the Northeastern Bohemian dialect region (see Map 28).
Table 35 – Neuter disyllabic (j)o-stem Paradigms in CLC³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>břicho</td>
<td>bláto</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>dílo</td>
<td>léto</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>břicha</td>
<td>bláta</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>dila</td>
<td>léta</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>břichu</td>
<td>blátu</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>dílu</td>
<td>lětu</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>břicho</td>
<td>bláto</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>dílo</td>
<td>léto</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>břichem</td>
<td>blátem</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>dilem</td>
<td>létem</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>bříše</td>
<td>bláte</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>dilě</td>
<td>lěté</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>břicha</td>
<td>bláta</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>dila</td>
<td>léta</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>břich</td>
<td>blát</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>děl</td>
<td>let</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>břichům</td>
<td>blátům</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>dilům</td>
<td>letům</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>břicha</td>
<td>bláta</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>dila</td>
<td>léta</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>břichy</td>
<td>bláty</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>dily</td>
<td>lety</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>bříšich</td>
<td>blátech</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>dilech</td>
<td>letech</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost all neuter (j)o-stems have generalized a short vowel (Type A above) or a long vowel (Type B above) throughout the paradigm. Several minor groups of words deviate from the normalized patterns: Type D as in dílo ‘piece of work’ with GP děl along with several other words is a somewhat expected reflex pattern of original acute stems (although there is not a strong correlation between the two). Additionally, although we will not endeavor to reconstruct the accentual paradigms for consonantal neuter stems, original n-stem jméno ‘name’ has GP with shortened vowel jmen. Type E as in léto ‘summer’ with GP let and an optionally short vowel in the rest of the oblique plural cases: LP letech ~ lètech, DP letům ~ lètům, lety ~ lèty, is represented by only one word, but we believe there is evidence for this paradigm as a pattern (phonologically and morphophonemically close to what is expected from original acute stems) at an earlier

³ The letter G represents the Slovak paradigm with lengthening of the root vowel in the GP. The letter X represents a CLC paradigm with syllabic /r/ or /l/ in the root vowel.
stage of the language. There is also dialectal and historical evidence for further variation which we will discuss in the appropriate sub-sections below.

**Acute Disyllabic Neuter (j)o-stems**

Table 36 – Acute disyllabic neuter (j)o-stems, all with original long root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *lěto | ‘summer’ | ljěto | lětό | léto D/E | leto G | ‘l’eto
| | | ljěta | | | | ‘l’eta |
| *bolto | ‘marsh, swamp’ | bláto | bláto | bláto B | blato GP | bol’oto
| | | blátá | | | | bol’ota |
| *dělo | ‘action, piece of work’ | djělo | dělо | dilo D | dielo | ‘d’elo
| | | djěla | | | | ‘d’ela |
| *jětro (PSL pluralia tantum) | ‘liver’ | jětra | jětra | játra (pl. tant.) D | jatrá (pl. tant.) | ‘jatra (pl. tant.) |
| | | | | | | |
| *lyko | ‘phloem, cellulose layer under tree bark’ | lýko | líkọ | lýko B | lyko G | ‘lyko
| | | | | | | ‘lyka
| | | | | | | NP ’lyki |
| *maztlo | ‘butter’ | māslo | māšlo | māslo B | maslo | ‘maslo
| | | | | | | ‘masla
| | | | | | | NP masl’ a |
| *město | ‘place’ | mjěsto | město | místo B | miesto | ‘m’esto
| | | | | | | ‘m’esta
| | | | | | | NP m’est’a |
| *mydlo | ‘soap’ | mūlo | milо | mýdlo B | mydlo | ‘mylo,
| | | | | | | ‘myla
| | | | | | | NP myl’ a |

---

4 Hruška (1923) cites Chodov (AV locale 302) dialect with IS blatem “Děti, vy děláte s tím medem jako s blatem!” [You kids are making mud out of that honey.]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *pasmo | ‘band, belt’ | pásma | pásma | pásma | pásma | ‘pasmo  
|        |        |       |        | B     |        | ‘paasma  |
| *poto | ‘bond’ | púto | pótô Vas. | pouto | puto G | ‘puto  
|        |        |       |        | B     |        | ‘puta  
|         |        |       |        |       |        | NP ‘puta |
| *puzdro | ‘pouch, paunch’ | púzdro | Ø    | pouzdro | puzdro | ‘puzdro /  
puzd r’ o Vas. |
| *pravo | ‘right, law’ | právo | právo | právo | právo | ‘pravo  
|         |        |       |        | B     |        | ‘prava  |
|         |        |       |        |       |        | NP ‘prav’ a |
| *ordlo | ‘plow’ | râlo | râlo Vas. | rádlo | radlo | ‘ralo  
|         |        |       |        | B     |        | ‘rala  
|         |        |       |        |       |        | NP ‘rala |
| *rano | ‘morning’ | râno | rân m. Vas. | ráno | râno, raný | ‘rano adv.  
|         |        |       | râna GS Plet. | B     |        | |
| *ruxo | ‘robe, clothing, stolen from the enemy (Vas.)’ | rúxo | rúho | roucho | rúcho | ‘ruxo  
|         |        |       |        | B     |        | ‘ruxa Vas. |
| *sadlo | ‘lard’ | sâlo | sâlo Vas. | sâdlo | sadlo | ‘salo  
|         |        |       |        | B      |        | ‘sala  
|         |        |       |        |       |        | NP ‘sala |
| *sito | ‘sieve’ | sítot | sito | sito | sito G | ‘sito  
|         |        |       |        | B      |        | ‘sita  
|         |        |       |        |       |        | NP ‘sita |

5 In OCZ the IS is attested without length in ChelPost 156a, “když jeho lénem pohnú a břichem posrostlým sadlem.”

6 Several OCZ sources indicate shortening in the IS: VýklŠal 59b4, “mají váženy a šetřeny býti a jako sytem velikú pilností prosievány.” HusSlovník “sieto, sito: mají jako sytem veliku pilností (býti) proseyeweny.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*stado</td>
<td>‘herd’</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
<td>stádo B</td>
<td>stádo</td>
<td>' stado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>' stada NP stad' a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*věko</td>
<td>‘eyelid’</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>véko Vas.</td>
<td>viko B</td>
<td>veko G</td>
<td>' věko NP v'ek' i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>' v'eka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*brjuxo</td>
<td>‘belly’</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>br’icho A</td>
<td>brucho G</td>
<td>' br’uxo NP 'br’uxa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dial. br’icho B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*dělo</td>
<td>‘cannon’</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>dělo A</td>
<td>delo OR</td>
<td>' d’elo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d’elo</td>
<td>' d’ela’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*jutro</td>
<td>‘morning’</td>
<td>jútro</td>
<td>jútro</td>
<td>jитro A</td>
<td>jutro</td>
<td>' jutro / utra /s utr’ a NP 'utra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dial. jитro B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kreslo</td>
<td>‘arm chair’</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>křeslo A</td>
<td>křeslo Vas.</td>
<td>' křeslo NP 'křesla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSL only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>křeslo Ver.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*město</td>
<td>‘city’</td>
<td>mjêsto</td>
<td>město</td>
<td>město A</td>
<td>mesto G</td>
<td>' město NP m’est’ a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSL only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*nědro</td>
<td>‘breast’</td>
<td>njêdro</td>
<td>jádro</td>
<td>ňadra NP A</td>
<td>ňadrá NP</td>
<td>OR ' n’edro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSL only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>plur. tant.</td>
<td>plur. tant.</td>
<td>' n’edra CSR plur. tant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7 OCZ GP dil (Gebauer III, I:139).

8 Vasmer (I:497) believes the R is borrowed from P dzialo ‘cannon’ and that the Czech is too, but we believe the rise of quantitative oppositions in PCZ allowed for lexical differentiation from diló ‘piece of work’.

This same process differentiated město ‘city’ from místo ‘place’ as well as a number of other

Stang (1965:82) points out that Russian is not very reliable for identifying original
neuter acutes because many of them have merged with the mobile paradigm with stress
on the desinence throughout the plural. Be that as it may, most of the examples above
can be clearly identified as original acutes based on the S/C, SLN, and Czech/Slovak

10 See Map 28 for the dialectal distribution of length in this word. CJA III (2000:154, with
accompanying map) gives a full lexical treatment of this word. In Western Moravia, although
another lexeme raž has taken over for žito in meaning, wherever the earlier lexeme is attested, the
root vowel is short. This is the identical pattern we noted for original acute disyllabic masculine
and feminine roots that are short in CLC.

the effect of the acute should be on an original jer in Czech if the intonation was truly acute in
PSL.

12 Zaliznjak (1980:516) indicates that formation of the plural for this word is difficult to
fathom.
correspondences. Slovak appears to be less consistent in shortening original acute intonation in the neuter paradigms than in the feminine and masculine paradigms. The length that we find in SK pásčo, právo, ráno, rúcho, stádo, is the result of factors we cannot quite identify. We will point out, however, that /a/ is by far the most frequent vowel to be long in these original acute stems.13

Map 25 [Long /y:/ in the NS of /*lyko/ (a.p. a) ‘phloem’] shows a pattern that we have identified earlier as the spread of the shortening of acute length from the East to the West. Compared with Map 27 [Reflex of length in the Nom. Sing. of /*bolto/ (a.p. a) ‘mud, marsh’] and finally Map 28 [Long /i:/ in the Nom. Sing. of /*žito/ (a.p. a) ‘rye’] we can see that this spread has been carried out to a greater extent with bláto/blato and nearly entirely with žíto/žito.

In OCZ and CLC acute pl. tant. játra ‘liver’ shortens the root vowel in the GP jater. Oxytonic jádro ‘core, nucleus’ also shortens the root vowel in the GP jader. The shortening in these two words is more likely a relict of the morphological shortening in the GP within a paradigm that has a long root vowel in the other grammatical cases than the reflection of any phonological rule. However, we cannot completely rule out the possibility that the short root vowels in GP jader, jater, indicate that after the loss of weak jers and the vocalization of strong jers, the rule that shortened acute length in trisyllabic forms still operated at some level, phonological, paradigmatic, or perhaps even phonotactic or had spread to other paradigms after the loss of distinctive intonation took

13 Utěšený (1960:61) comments quite appropriately that the shortened original neuter acutes in the Moravian dialects he studied behave differently from the feminine acutes with shortened long vowels.
away the original conditions under which the trisyllabic shortening rule has been shown to have operated.

Table 37 – Oxytonic disyllabic neuter (j)o-stems with original long root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*čitlo</td>
<td>‘number’</td>
<td>číslo</td>
<td>číslo B</td>
<td>číslo</td>
<td>čisl’o, čisl’a</td>
<td>NP čisla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*dolto</td>
<td>‘wood-pecker’</td>
<td>dlijeto</td>
<td>dléto B</td>
<td>dláto</td>
<td>dolot’o, dolot’a</td>
<td>NP ’dolota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gnězdo</td>
<td>‘nest’</td>
<td>gnijëzdo</td>
<td>gnézdo</td>
<td>hnizdo B</td>
<td>hniezdo</td>
<td>gn’ezd’o, gn’ezd’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*jedro</td>
<td>‘core’</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>jádro D</td>
<td>GP jader</td>
<td>jadro</td>
<td>jadr’o, jadr’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kuzlo</td>
<td>‘smithwork’</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>kouzlo B</td>
<td>kúzlo</td>
<td>OR kuzl’o (Vasmer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kridlo</td>
<td>‘wing’</td>
<td>krilo</td>
<td>krilo</td>
<td>křidlo B (^15)</td>
<td>křidlo</td>
<td>kryl’o, kryl’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*liko</td>
<td>‘face’</td>
<td>lice</td>
<td>lice</td>
<td>lice B</td>
<td>lice</td>
<td>l’ic’o, l’ic’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*melko</td>
<td>‘milk’</td>
<td>mlíjeko</td>
<td>mléko B</td>
<td>mlieko</td>
<td>molok’o, molok’a</td>
<td>NP ’moloka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*myto (^16)</td>
<td>‘toll’</td>
<td>mito</td>
<td>mýto B</td>
<td>mýto</td>
<td>‘myto, myta</td>
<td>NP ’myta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{14}\) OCZ GP kuzl (Gebauer III, I:139).
\(^{15}\) OCZ GP kriel (Gebauer III, I:139).
From the Russian data and the S/C data it is evident that in the (j)o-stem neuter disyllabic oxytonic paradigm, the stress was on the initial syllable in the NP. Czech paradigms of Type B with length throughout the paradigm represent the expected reflex. In OCZ we do not find original oxytonic roots whose vowel quantity alternates in the

---

16 According to Vasmer (III:26), this word was borrowed from OHG mûta. R stress might indicate borrowing into R at later date from West Slavic.

17 The OCZ dictionary project has not reached the letter R yet, but from the card catalogue at the Academy of Sciences we found quite a few attestations of NS runo as well as GP run: e.g. Albrj 67a „takéž modlitba bez náboženstvie jako runo volové;“ RokJan 171b, 2, „owce ma dwie sukni, gednu wzdy lidem dáwá a druhú zachovává, to gest runo, ktere dáwá;“ VýklKruml 41b2, „vellus lane runo volnij (rolnij?)“, VýklKruml „De vellibus z run.“

18 Bulaxovskij (1983:169) points out that not only is the shortening in CZ puzzling, but the SLN variant vědro / védro is also odd given the evidence for oxytonic from R and S/C.
grammatical cases that we find the acute substantives alternating in, although there was some tendency to shorten long root vowels in the GP and sporadically in originally trisyllabic forms (e.g. Tkač 44 “já jsem jemu ... vin nechtěl naložiti” Tkač 38 “měl se mnú spolky a viních kupectvi”). The shortenings in the GP we interpret as further evidence that the morphophonemic rule that changed a long vowel to a short vowel in the GP of an otherwise long root vowel paradigm and changed a short vowel to a long vowel in the GP of an otherwise short root vowel paradigm operated at some period in the history of Czech. The shortenings in trisyllabic forms of the oxytonic paradigm, however, are hardly numerous enough to deduce a pattern from or base a theory upon. We have from the feminine neo-acute paradigm several examples of shortened /o/ in the IS in OCZ (volí, koží) and other trisyllabic forms. It is possible that there was some mirroring of the acute paradigm with shortened long vowels in the trisyllabic forms or that there was an overlapping in time of the shortening of length in trisyllabic forms independent of intonation, but we may never know for sure how the intonation affected this rule or its possible spread to other environments.
Table 38 – Oxytonic disyllabic neuter (j)o-stems with original short root vocalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*pero</td>
<td>‘feather’</td>
<td>pero</td>
<td>pèro</td>
<td>péro B</td>
<td>pero</td>
<td>G p’er’o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pèra</td>
<td></td>
<td>pero A</td>
<td></td>
<td>p’er’ a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP pèra /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP ‘p’er-ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sedlo /</td>
<td>‘seat,</td>
<td>sèlo</td>
<td>sídlo B</td>
<td>sídlo</td>
<td>sedlo G</td>
<td>s’el’o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selo</td>
<td>settlement’</td>
<td>NP sèla</td>
<td>sedlo A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s’el’ a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*stèblo</td>
<td>‘stalk’</td>
<td>stáblo</td>
<td>stèblo</td>
<td>stèblo B</td>
<td>steblo / stèblo</td>
<td>st’ebl’ o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>st’ebl’ a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP ‘st’èbla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bedro</td>
<td>‘small of</td>
<td>bèdro</td>
<td>bédro</td>
<td>bedra pl. tant. A</td>
<td>bedro</td>
<td>b’edr’ o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back’</td>
<td></td>
<td>NP bèdra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b’edr’ a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP ‘bédra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*čelo</td>
<td>‘forehead’</td>
<td>čèlo</td>
<td>čélo</td>
<td>čelo A</td>
<td>čelo</td>
<td>čel’ o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP čèla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>čel’ a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP ‘čèla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pèklo</td>
<td>‘hell’</td>
<td>pàkao</td>
<td>pèklo</td>
<td>peklo A</td>
<td>peklo</td>
<td>‘p’eklo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GS pàkla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘p’ekla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP ‘p’ekla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*stegno</td>
<td>‘thigh’</td>
<td>stègno</td>
<td>stégno</td>
<td>stehno A</td>
<td>stehno G</td>
<td>st’egn’ o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP stègna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>st’egn’ a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP ‘st’ègna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*vez-tlo</td>
<td>‘oar’</td>
<td>vèsla</td>
<td>véslo</td>
<td>veso A</td>
<td>veso</td>
<td>v’esl’ o,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP vèsla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v’esl’ a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP ‘v’ësla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One tendency that was noted for the feminine stems with neo-acute intonation and masculine monosyllabics grammatical cases with neo-acute intonation (for feminine stems the pattern was noted as well in a number of originally oxytonic words), seems to be less

19 OCZ GP per (Gebauer III, I:146).
pronounced but present, nevertheless, in the neuter paradigms – we have found several attested lengthenings of original short vowels. As far as we can tell, the neuter words with attested lengthened short vowel in the Czech dialects are the following: CLC lůno ‘lap’ (indeterminate a.p.); CLC kůze (a t-stem, in variance with kozle) ‘goatling, kid’; CZ dial. kůtě (CLC kotě ) ‘kitten’ (a t-stem); in most CZ dialects including CLC stěblo (< stěblo) ‘grain stubble, chaff’ [a.p. (b)]; péřo ‘feather’ [a.p. (b)]; sídlo ‘settlement’ [a.p. (b)]; CZ dial. vůje (CLC oje pl. tant.) ‘wooden rod that connects the horse harness to the wagon’; and CLC pole ‘field’, which is attested in only four of the towns used in the Czech dialectal atlas project. All of these towns (103, 105, 106, 108)²⁰ are located in the Northern Bohemian dialect region. These examples do not lend themselves to the same interpretation. They did not all belong to the same paradigm and are difficult to make any generalizations about. We note, however, that stěblo, péřo, sídlo were end-stressed and it is possible that despite the fact there are a number of oxytonic neuter (j)o-stems with short vowel that remained short in CLC and the dialects (bedra, čelo, peklo, stehno, veslo), there may have been a tendency to lengthen short vowels of original oxytonic words when the ictus was retracted as there was under the neo-acute retraction of ictus.

²⁰ ČJA III (p. 100, map on p. 101) shows other concentrated dialect groups with půle that must be later lengthenings that are phonologically unrelated to půle even though the dialects are in the same general region, but not contiguous.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*bolgo</td>
<td>‘goodness’</td>
<td>blâgo</td>
<td>blagô</td>
<td>blaho</td>
<td>blaho</td>
<td>OR (ESSJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bologo dial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘bologo’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*dervo s-stem</td>
<td>‘tree, wood’</td>
<td>dîvo</td>
<td>drêvô</td>
<td>drevo</td>
<td>drevo</td>
<td>‘d’er’evô,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP dîva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘d’er’eva NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d’er’ evja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mâso</td>
<td>‘meat’</td>
<td>mêso</td>
<td>mesô</td>
<td>maso</td>
<td>maso</td>
<td>‘m’âso,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘m’âsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pivo</td>
<td>‘beer’</td>
<td>pîvo</td>
<td>pivo</td>
<td>pivo</td>
<td>pivo</td>
<td>‘p’îvo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘p’îva NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘p’îva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*proso</td>
<td>‘millet’</td>
<td>pròso</td>
<td>prosô</td>
<td>proso</td>
<td>proso</td>
<td>‘proso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘prosa NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘prosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*seno</td>
<td>‘hay’</td>
<td>sîjeno</td>
<td>senô</td>
<td>seno</td>
<td>seno</td>
<td>‘s’ëno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘s’ëna NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘s’ëna’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*slnce</td>
<td>‘sun’</td>
<td>sûnce</td>
<td>sôlnce</td>
<td>slunce</td>
<td>slunce</td>
<td>‘solnce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pod sûncem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘solnce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘solnce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*têlo s-stem</td>
<td>‘body’</td>
<td>ţîjelo,</td>
<td>têlô</td>
<td>têlo</td>
<td>têlo</td>
<td>‘t’êlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP ţîjela</td>
<td></td>
<td>OCZ GP tîl</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘t’êla NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘t’êla’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*têsto</td>
<td>‘dough’</td>
<td>ţîjesto</td>
<td>têstå</td>
<td>têsto</td>
<td>cesto</td>
<td>‘t’êsto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘t’êsta NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘t’êsta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*vêno</td>
<td>‘trousseau’</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>vêno</td>
<td>veno</td>
<td>‘v’êno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘v’êna NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘v’êna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*zolto</td>
<td>‘gold’</td>
<td>zlåto</td>
<td>zlatô</td>
<td>zlato</td>
<td>zlato</td>
<td>‘zoloto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘zolota NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘zolota’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*krosno</td>
<td>‘rucksack’</td>
<td>krôsna pl. tant.</td>
<td>krôsna pl. tant.</td>
<td>krosno</td>
<td>krosnà</td>
<td>‘krosno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘krosna NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘krosna’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39 – Mobile disyllabic neuter (j)o-stems
From the reflexes of original circumflex [a.p. (e)] (j)o-stem neuters with original long root vocalism and original short root vocalism in CLC and the Czech dialects, it is clear that the predictions made by the traditional rule that posits shortening of circumflex length is exactly what we see as the result. In general, the phonological shortening of original circumflex length and the generalization of the paradigm pattern with brevity throughout is one of the most consistent historical accentual principles that we find in CLC and the dialects. This principle applies to masculine, feminine, and neuter disyllabic substantives regardless of stem theme vowel and there appears to be very little evidence for dialectal variation. The one example of an original circumflex root with dialectal long vowel in the NAS is pívo ‘beer’ which is attested in a small region of Moravia as described by Utěšený (1960:67, Map II.D), and appears to be isolated and localized.21

Table 40 – Indeterminate neuter (j)o-stems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>SLOVENE</th>
<th>CZECH</th>
<th>SLOVAK</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*dno</td>
<td>‘bottom’</td>
<td>dňô</td>
<td>dňô</td>
<td>dno X</td>
<td>dno</td>
<td>dn ‘o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dn ‘a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP ‘donja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*stéklo</td>
<td>‘glass’</td>
<td>sklo</td>
<td>steklô</td>
<td>sklo X</td>
<td>sklo</td>
<td>st’ekl ‘o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>st’ekl ‘a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP ‘st’êkla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lono</td>
<td>‘lap’</td>
<td>lôno ESSJ</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>lûno B</td>
<td>lono G</td>
<td>‘lono,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘lona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP ‘lona</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A few neuter (j)o-stems are indeterminate with respect to Proto-Slavic accentual paradigm, but illustrate reflexes of other root shapes that might be relevant for other

21 The colloquial Prague pronunciation [pívo] is most likely expressive and unrelated to the dialectal form.
studies. PSL *dno was monosyllabic and shows no phonological divergence in Czech across the dialects. PSL *stšklo looks like an original oxytone but the Czech & Slovak reflex might be expected with vocalization of the jer (as in stěblo). Theoretically, the lengthening in PSL *lono CZ lůno might be attributable to the neo-acute intonation if it could be proven that the word was originally oxytonic. The entry in the StČS attests to the fact that the length is quite old – Gebauer cites two manuscripts from the early 15th century, with luono, lónu.
Chapter 8

CONCLUSIONS

By examining the geographical distribution of a single phonological binary feature, vowel quantity with the opposition [+long:±long], as a synchronic cross-section in selected ancient lexical items across the contemporary dialectal Czech landscape, and analyzing the variance of this feature against the diachronic phonological, morphophonemic, and morphological paradigmatic progression of its development, we have made use of a method that has provided evidence for sound changes, analogical morphological and morphophonemic developments that correlate to ancient intonational patterns which were characteristic of the Proto-Slavic common ancestral language. The summary enumerated below of the chief conclusions reached by this study is intended to show the importance of including dialectal data in future inquiries whose aim is to detect the traces of the Proto-Slavic language on the development of the individual Slavic languages.

1. Arguments in favor of the so-called Czech lengthening, whereby “a short rising vowel in an open first syllable of disyllabic words is lengthened unless the second syllable contains a long vowel” (Verweij, 1990:505) are circular and cannot be satisfactorily supported. The short rising intonation is supposed to have applied to both original acute vowels that were shortened prehistorically (while keeping their rising intonation), as well as
to internally stressed original short vowels. An argument for the shortening of acute length in Czech is seen as desirable in order to force Czech to agree with the other Slavic languages where acute length was lost, but we have tried to show that it is at least as plausible that the shortening of acute length was simply not entirely carried out on the Czech and Upper Sorbian periphery of the Proto-Slavic territory.

Additionally, the *Czech Lengthening* rule is supposed to have operated on /e, o, y, š/ as well, for which there is little evidence outside the oxytonic and neo-acute paradigms which are not supposed to have been covered by the rule – a clear contradiction to the proposal. The condition that the vowel lengthened only if it was originally stressed is designed to explain the fact that pretonic vowels in general retained their length in Czech, but in no way offers an explanation for original unstressed short vowels that lengthened either in CLC or dialectally such as *kůpa, sůva, růsa, vůje, lúno, děšť, hrůza, kůra, můra, vůsa*, etc. The restraint on the *Czech Lengthening* to environments not followed by a long vowel is required to explain IS *ranou*, DP *ranám*, LP *ranách*, a pattern that is only characteristic of a few words in CLC. According to the rule, GP *ran* does not lengthen because the originally acute /a/ was in a closed syllable, but the comparative evidence for a later morphophonemic rule in the GP offers a much clearer explanation of the interplay of length and brevity across the substantival system. In terms of Contemporary Czech, in
paradigms that have an alternation between a long and a short vowel, the alternation is always described as a shortening of the long vowel and not vice versa which is the exact opposite of what we would expect if the putative Czech lengthening were to have left its mark on the Czech paradigmatic system.

2. The traditional views of the retention or loss of length in Czech based on the original PSL intonations and their reflexes offer the greatest explanatory power. Acute length in literary Czech is preserved PSL length. The copious examples of original acute stems with shortened long vowel in CLC are to be attributed to influence from Moravian and Slovak dialects during the geo-political prominence of the Great Moravian Empire. These shortenings progressed by lexical diffusion and affected the Central Bohemian dialects, but the sound change was not carried out completely on the periphery. Southwestern dialects, and particularly the Chod dialects which formed a small but politically and socially cohesive group, were the most resistant to the shortenings of original acutes. The shortenings did not affect original neo-acute length, so there must have still been a distinction between neo-acute and acute intonation when the acute lengths were shortened. Evidence is abundant for feminine, masculine, and neuter acute paradigms. We have created the following Maps for this study that illustrate these principles: Map 1 – Lengthened /i/ in the Nom. Sing. */j̬skra/ (a.p. a) ‘spark’; Map 4 – Reflex of Short
Vowel in the Nom. Sing. /*griva/ (a.p. a) ‘mane’; Map 5 – Reflex of
Shortened /e/ in the Nom. Sing. /*berza/ (a.p. a) ‘birch’; Map 7 – Reflex of
Retained Long Vowel in the Nom. Sing. /*repa/ (a.p. a) ‘with beet’; Map 8
Map 11 – Long /ú/ in the Nom. Sing. of /*duha/ (a.p. a) ‘arc, rainbow’;
Lengthened /u/ in the Nom. Sing. of /*hus(a)/ (a.p. a) ‘goose’; Map 24 –
Lengthened /á/ in the Nom. Sing. of /*sazje/ (a.p. a) ‘soot’; Map 25 –
Long /y:/ in the Nom. Sing. of /*lyko/ (a.p. a) ‘phloem, cellulose layer of a
tree’; Map 27 – Reflex of length in the Nom. Sing. of /*bolto/ (a.p. a)
This hypothesis is further supported by data from Upper Sorbian. A
synthesis of the original disyllabic acute substantives and the Czech
dialectal shortening of the long vowels in the lexical items examined can
be found in Map 29 – Shortening of Acute Long Vowels in Prehistoric
Czech.

3. Traces of ancient accentological features can be detected in Czech, the
dialects, and Old Czech. A correlation between the CLC ā-stem paradigm
Types E/F and the Proto-Slavic acute accentual paradigm (a.p. a),
characterized by shortening of the original acute long vowel in the
trisyllabic forms IS, DP, LP. There is also a correlation between the CLC
ā-stem paradigms Types B/D and the Proto-Slavic oxytonic accentual
paradigm (a.p. b). A majority of the original oxytonic ā-stems have retained length throughout the paradigm. The CLC ā-stem paradigm Type A and the Proto-Slavic mobile accentual paradigm (a.p. c) coincide with one another rather neatly. Nearly all original circumflex words have generalized brevity throughout the paradigm. This correlation applies to masculine and neuter circumflex paradigms as well.

4. Proto-Slavic identification with a single accentual paradigm was not an absolute regularity: PSL words could vary dialectally / intonationally resulting in mixed reflexes among the Slavic languages -- sometimes even dialectally within a given individual Slavic language. A good example is represented by zima ‘cold, winter’ (see Map 13) with a distribution of length and brevity in the Czech dialects unlike any other word.

5. The best evidence in Czech of the Proto-Slavic neo-acute intonation is the effect the neo-acute had of lengthening short /o/ in CLC and the dialects. Numerous examples include chůže, chvojě/chvůjě, kůže, nůše, vůle, vůně, chřě, which form a morphological class in Proto-Slavic. The manner in which Czech has extended the effects of the neo-acute to other paradigms is discussed in Chapter 6 and 7 and is described as a morphological extension, most prominent in original oxytonic ā-stems.

6. Loss of circumflex length in Czecho-Slovak preceded loss of PSL acute length. The regularity that Czech and Slovak show in the shortening of circumflex length and the generalization of brevity in the words of a.p. (c)
provides clear evidence that this sound change was carried out in its entirety, and when compared and contrasted with the behavior of original acute paradigms with much greater dialectal variation, and neo-acute paradigms with separate but predictable reflexes, support for a distinction between circumflex intonation, acute intonation, and neo-acute intonation in Proto-Czecho-Slovak is provided.

7. There is excellent evidence in support of the morphophonemic rule changing a long vowel to a short vowel in the GP of an otherwise long root vowel paradigm and changing a short vowel to a long vowel in the GP of an otherwise short root vowel paradigm. The effects of this change, however, have largely given way in the Czech lands to the analogical process generalizing length or brevity throughout a substantival paradigm. All that remains of this rule is a morphological tendency to shorten the root vowel in the GP. Whenever there is an alternation between a long vowel and a short vowel in a CLC paradigm, the GP takes place in the alternation and is short. If we were to wager a guess and could see into the future, we would either predict that the generalization of brevity in the GP will continue to spread to other words, or will be analogically leveled to the rest of the paradigm for the lexical items that keep the alternation.

8. In contrast to the feminine oxytonic ā-stem paradigms with original short root vocalism that exhibit the reflex of lengthened /o > ř > uo > řu/ throughout the paradigm as the result of a morphophonemic spread of the
effect of the phonological neo-acute lengthening of /o/ in the soft-stem paradigms such as vůle, růže, etc. (e.g. Chod vůsa ‘wasp’), there is no similar pattern for the oxytonic neuter substantives with original short root vocalism, although there are several oxytonic words that appear to have lengthened original short vowel (stěblo, péro, sídlo).

9. Relative chronology

- Loss of circumflex length in Czecho-Slovak (and Upper Sorbian)
- Neo-acute retraction that feeds
  - Czech (Slovak) lengthening of /o/ under the neo-acute
- Shortening of acute length in trisyllabic words (may operate on neo-acute lengths as well: cf. OCZ voli < *volhjo but does not operate on contracted VjV sequences)
- Phonemicization of quantity in Czech and Slovak
- Onset of contraction
- Loss of weak jers
- Vocalization of strong jers
- Morphological generalization of short vowel / long vowel in GP in order to differentiate the GP from other forms of the paradigm
Bibliography

Major Reference works employed – Czech


Bartoš, František.
1906 Dialektický slovník moravský. v Praze.

Berštejn, S.B. et al.

Bibliografický katalog ČSFR.


Československé disertace 1900-1978. [Praha]: Statní knihovna ČSFR.

ČSAV. Ústav pro jazyk český.
1995 Český jazykový atlas. 1. díl. Praha:
1997 Český jazykový atlas. 2. díl. Praha:
1998 Český jazykový atlas. 3. díl. Praha:


Machek, Václav.
Rejzek, Jiří.

Sedláček, A.
1908 Místopisný slovník historický království českého.
Praha.

**Major Reference works employed – Other Slavic Languages**

1894-1895 Slovensko-nemski slovar / uredil Maks PletersnikV Ljubljani.

Snoj, Marko.
1997 Slovenski etimološki slova. Ljubljana.

Sreznevskij, I.I.

Vasmer, Max.

**Monographs and articles cited**

Bartek, H.

Bělič, J. – V. Křístek.
1964 Moravskoslovenská nářečí. Olomouc.

Bělič, J.
Blahoslav, J. Gramatice česká

Brněnský dialektologický kolektiv (J. Chloupek, et al.)

Bulaxovskij, L. A.
1954 Russkij literaturnyj jazyk pervoj poloviny XIX veka; fonetika, morfologija, udarenie, sintaksis. Moskva.

Collinge, N.E.

Comrie, B. & G. Stone.

Cuřín, Fr.
1967 Studie z historické dialektologie a toponomastiky Čech. Praha. mapa IV, a výklad spolu s doklady na s. 68n. Praha

Chlumský, Josef.
1911 Pokus o měření českých zvuků a slabik v řeči souvislé. Praha.
1928 Česká kvantita, melodie a přízvuk. Praha.

Černý, Fr.

Dialektologická komise. Dialektologická komise české akademie věd a umění.
1951 Pravidla pro vědecký přepis dialektických zápisů českých a slovenských. Praha.
1943 Pravidla pro vědecký přepis dialektických zápisů Věstník české akademie věd a umění, 52. Praha.

Dušek, V.J.
1984 Hláskosloví nářečí jihočeských I. Praha
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td><em>Hláskoslovi nářečí jihočeských II.</em> Praha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td><em>Hláskoslovi nářečí jihočeských III.</em> Praha.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td><em>Osnovy slavjanskoj aktsentologii.</em> Moskva.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td><em>Osnovy slavjanskoj aktsentologii: slovar’.</em> Moskva.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dybo, V.A. et al.
1990   *Osnovy slavjanskoj aktsentologii.* Moskva.
1993   *Osnovy slavjanskoj aktsentologii: slovar’.* Moskva.

Dzendzelivskij, J.O.
1958   *Linhvistyčnyj atlas ukrajinských narodnych hovoriv zakarpatskoji oblasti URSR I.* Užhorod.
1960   *Linhvistyčnyj atlas ukrajinských narodnych hovoriv zakarpatskoji oblasti URSR II.* Užhorod.

Česká dialektologická komisa. Ústav pro jazyk český, ČSAV. Praha.
1964   *Dotazník pro výzkum českých nářečí (Český jazykový atlas).* [Internal Questionnaire].

Flajšhans, V.
1903   *Nejstarší památky jazyka i písemnictví českého. Díl I. Prolegomena a texty.* Praha.
1957   *Klaret a jeho družina. – Sv. 1 Slovníky veršované, Praha, 1926. – Sv. 2. Texty glosované, Praha 1928.*
       – viz. též výbor z čes. lit. (akad.) I, Praha 1957, 772.
       Includes summaries and descriptions of works attributed to Klaret Sv. I. Vokabulár grammatický Sv. II. bohemář III. Klaret Glossář.

Folprecht, J.
1905   *Příspěvky k mluvě lidu slováckého na moravském Podluží.* Výr. zpráva reálky v Plzni. s. 15n.

Friedrich, Paul.

Gauthiot and Vendrys.

Gebauer, Jan.
1894   *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého.* Praha.
1906-1912 *Slovník staročeský.* Praha.
Gimbutas, Marija.  

Goląb, Zbigniew.  
Columbus, Ohio.

Hála, Bohuslav.  

Hattala, Martin.  
1854  Zvukosloví jazyka staro- i novo-českého a slovenského. Praha.

Havránek, Bohuslav.  
1936  Československá vlastivěda. Řada II. Spisovný jazyk český a slovenský. Praha.

Horálek, Karel.  

Hujer, Oldřich.  

Hruška, J.F.  
1907  Dialektický slovník chodský. Praha.

Illič-Svityč, V.M.  
1963  Imennaja aktsentuatsija v Baltijskom i slavjanskom. Moskva.

Jagić, Vatroslav.  

Jakobson, Roman.  
Jančák, Pavel.  

Kašík, A.  
1908  Popis a rozbor nářečí středoběčevského. Praha.

Kopečný, František.  

Král, J. and Fr. Mareš.  
1911  “Trvání hlásek a slabik dle objektivní míry.” Listy Filologické XX. Praha.

Kortlandt, F.H.H.  

Kučera, Henry.  
1961  The Phonology of Czech. ‘S-Gravenhage.

Kul’bakin, S.M.  
1903  “K istorii i dialektologii pol’skogo jazyka.” SORJAS LXX. Petrohrad.

Labov, William.  
1994  Principles of linguistic change: internal factors. Cambridge, USA.

Lutterer, Ivan; Milan Majtán; Rudolf Šrámek.  

Marvan, Jiří.  

Mauer, Eduard.  

Moszyński, K.  
1957  Pierwotny zasiąg języka prasłowiańskiego. Wrocław.

Palacký, František.  
1936  Dějiny národu českého: v čechách a v moravě. V Praze.
Přemysl, Janota, and Pavel Jančák. 1972  

Rostafiński, J. 1908 
*O pierwotnych siedzibach i gospodarstwie Slowian w przedhistorycznych czasach.* Cracow.

Schaarschmidt, Gunter. 1997 
*The Historical phonology of the Upper and Lower Sorbian Languages.* Heidelberg.

Schenker, Alexander M. 1995 
*The Dawn of Slavic.* New Haven.

Sedláček, A. 1920  
“Sheška starých jmen, jak se nazývaly v Čechách řeky, potoky, hory a lesy.” *Rozpravy ČA,* tř.I, č.60. Praha.

Shevelov, George Y. 1965 
*A Prehistory of Slavic; the historical phonology of Common Slavic.* New York.

Sköld, H. 1923  
„Sledy praslavijanskogo udarenija v češskom jazyke.” *Slovanský sborník F. Pastrnkovi.* Praha.

Slovenska Akademija Znanosti in Umetnosti. 1950 
*Slovenski pravopis.* Ljubljana.

Stang, Christian. 1957  
*Slavonic accentuation.* Oslo.

Stankiewicz, Edward and Dean S. Worth. 1966  
*A Selected bibliography of Slavic linguistics.* The Hague.

Stankiewicz, Edward. 1968  
*Declension and gradation of Russian substantives.* The Hague.

1986  

1993  
*The Accentual patterns of the Slavic languages.* Stanford, California.

Syllaba, Theodor. 1983  
*Jan Gebauer na Pražské univerzitě.* Praha.
Tichá, Zdeňka.

Timberlake, Alan.
1983a “Compensatory lengthening in Slavic: 1: conditions and dialect geography.” In: From Los Angeles to Kiev [V. Markov and D.S. Worth, eds.]. Columbus, Ohio.

Trávníček, František.
1908 “K voprosu o češkom količestve glasnyx” izd. Otd. russk. jazyka i slovesnosti, AN, 1918 XXIII, 2 izd. 1921:16-17. Moscow.
1932a “O kvantitě dvouslabičných ā- a já- kmenů s původním přízvukem na koncovce a s praslovanskými dlouhými vokály.” Časopis pro moderní filologii a literatury, 7. 1921, p. 150-152.
1932b Úvod do české fonetiky. Prague.

Ústav pro jazyk český, ČSAV
1945 Slovníkový dotazník pro nářečí českého jazyka I. Praha.
1948 Slovníkový dotazník pro nářečí českého jazyka II. Praha.

Utěšený, Slavomír.

Vaillant, A.
1958  
**Grammaire comparee des langues Slaves, t. II: Morphologie.** Paris.

Vajs, Josef. 
1932  
*Rukovět’ hlaholské paleografie: uvedení do knižního písma hlaholského.* v Praze.

Vančura, Vladislav. 
1959  
*Obrázky z dějin národa českého.* Praha.

Verweij, Arno. 
1982  

Vidmanová, Anežka. 
1994  

Vondrák, V. 
1904  
*O původu kijevských listů u Pražských zlomků.* v Praze.

1906  

1924  

Voráč, J. 
1955  

1962  

1976  
APPENDIX A – AV DIALECT SURVEY LOCALES
<p>| 1  | Cheb     | 73 | Kyjov     | 131 | Trnov  |
| 2  | Tachov   | 74 | Uherský Brod | 132 | Libel  |
| 3  | Karlovy Vary | 75 | Břeclav   | 133 | Liberk |
| 4  | Kadaň    | 79 | Mikulov   | 134 | Žampach|
| 5  | Most     | 81 | Opava     | 135 | Klášterec nad Orlicí|
| 6  | Ústí nad Labem | 82 | Ostrava  | 136 | Mistrovice |
| 7  | Česká Lípa | 83 | Příbor    | 137 | Horní Heřmanice |
| 8  | Rumburk  | 84 | Český Těšín | 138 | Obruby |
| 9  | Frýdlant | 91 | Šumperk   | 139 | Údnice |
| 10 | Trutnov  | 92 | Bruntál   | 140 | Myštěves |
| 11 | Nová Paka | 93 | Moravský Beroun | 141 | Neděliště |
| 12 | Hradec Královice | 94 | Jeseník | 142 | Sedlice |
| 13 | Vysoké Mýto | 95 | Osoblaha  | 143 | Bělečko |
| 14 | Mladá Boleslav | 101 | Držkov | 144 | Lány u Dašic |
| 21 | Roudnice nad Labem | 102 | Paseky nad Jizerou | 145 | Jenišovice |
| 22 | Praha    | 103 | Poníklá   | 146 | Skořenice |
| 23 | Kolín    | 104 | Horní Dušnice | 147 | Řetůvka |
| 24 | Rakovník | 105 | Mrklov    | 148 | Kozlov  |
| 25 | Příbram  | 106 | Hoření Paseky | 149 | Březinka |
| 26 | Benešov  | 107 | Všelibice | 150 | Úherce |
| 27 | Ledeč nad Sázavou | 108 | Frydštejn | 151 | Nouzov |
| 30 | Železná Ruda | 109 | Lestkov | 152 | Lužec nad Cidlinou |
| 31 | Plzeň    | 110 | Loukov    | 153 | Vlčí Habřina |
| 32 | Klatovy  | 111 | Nová Ves nad Popelkou | 154 | Lipoltice |
| 40 | Vyšší Brod | 112 | Horní Kalná | 155 | Jezbořice |
| 41 | Strakonice | 113 | Rtně v Podkrkonoši | 156 | Lukavice |
| 42 | Tábor    | 114 | Slatina nad Úpou | 157 | Horní Bradlo |
| 43 | Jindřichův Hradec | 115 | Horní Rybníky | 158 | Studnice |
| 44 | Prachatice | 116 | Hlavňov | 159 | Otradov |
| 45 | České Budějovice | 117 | Machov | 160 | Morašice |
| 49 | Slavonice | 118 | Slané   | 161 | Poříčí u Litomyšle |
| 51 | Jihlava  | 119 | Jakubovice | 162 | Trstěnice |
| 52 | Třebíč   | 120 | Mukařov  | 201 | Raná    |
| 53 | Nové Město na Moravě | 121 | Všeň    | 202 | Chrásťany |
| 59 | Svitavy  | 122 | Střeleč   | 203 | Sířejovice |
| 61 | Znojmo   | 123 | Úlibice   | 204 | Libotenice |
| 62 | Moravský Krumlov | 124 | Pecka    | 205 | Pnětluky |
| 63 | Brno     | 124(a) | Šárkovcova Lhota | 206 | Jilmín |
| 64 | Boskovice | 125 | Bílá Třemešná | 207 | Hřiškov |
| 65 | Litovel  | 126 | Vilantice | 208 | Orasice |
| 66 | Prostějov | 127 | Dolany   | 209 | Brníkov |
| 67 | Kroměříž | 128 | Slavětín nad Metují | 210 | Bechlín |
| 71 | Lipník nad Bečvou | 129 | Česká Čermná | 211 | Stražnice |
| 72 | Vsetín   | 130 | Kounov    | 212 | Sedlec  |
| 213 | Krpy               | 257 | Šimanov          | 407 | Božejovice       |
| 214 | Všejany           | 301 | Postřekov        | 408 | Sedlečko u Chotovin |
| 215 | Semice            | 302 | Chodov           | 409 | Prasetín         |
| 216 | Chleby            | 303 | Draženov         | 410 | Myslotín         |
| 217 | Vrbová Lhota     | 304 | Mrákov           | 411 | Rohozná          |
| 218 | Ohaře             | 305 | Zahořany         | 412 | Věšín            |
| 219 | Mikuláš           | 306 | Sulislav         | 413 | Drahenice        |
| 220 | Přibyslavice      | 307 | Všekary          | 414 | Čerhonice        |
| 221 | Běstvina          | 308 | Lštění           | 415 | Oslov            |
| 222 | Strížov           | 309 | Černíkov         | 416 | Borovany         |
| 223 | Mšecké Žehrovice  | 310 | Chodská Lhota   | 417 | Lom              |
| 224 | Dobrovíz          | 311 | Újezd            | 418 | Těmice           |
| 225 | Dolín             | 312 | Potvorov         | 419 | Polesí           |
| 226 | Budíhostice       | 313 | Hvzd             | 420 | Chanovice        |
| 227 | Kly               | 314 | Žebnice          | 421 | Čekanice         |
| 228 | Baště             | 315 | Nekmíř           | 422 | Stará Dobev      |
| 229 | Zápy              | 316 | Hromnice         | 423 | Albrechtice nad Vltavou |
| 230 | Královice         | 317 | Vochov           | 424 | Březi            |
| 231 | Tismice           | 318 | Čižice           | 425 | Březnice         |
| 232 | Krymlov           | 319 | Zemětice         | 426 | Borkovice        |
| 233 | Losiny            | 320 | Vlčí             | 427 | Tučapy           |
| 234 | Chlístovice       | 321 | Ježovy           | 428 | Pluhův Žďár      |
| 235 | Kozlov            | 322 | Habartice        | 429 | Kamenný Malíkov  |
| 236 | Tis               | 323 | Rovná            | 430 | Mosty            |
| 237 | Lašovice          | 324 | Nemilkov         | 431 | Nezamyslice      |
| 238 | Chyňava           | 325 | Přílepy          | 432 | Kraselov         |
| 239 | Korno             | 326 | Šípy             | 433 | Čepřovice        |
| 240 | Kosoř             | 327 | Kozojedy         | 434 | Křtětice         |
| 241 | Těptín            | 328 | Vejvanov         | 435 | Podeřiště        |
| 242 | Ostředek          | 329 | Volduchy         | 436 | Zahájí           |
| 243 | Popovice          | 330 | Lhúta            | 437 | Drahotešice      |
| 244 | Strojetice        | 331 | Chocenice        | 438 | Ponědraž         |
| 245 | Rejčkov           | 332 | Kramolin         | 439 | Mláka            |
| 246 | Dobrohostov       | 333 | Velenovy         | 440 | Lásenice         |
| 247 | Broumy            | 334 | Drozdov          | 441 | Jiřičná          |
| 248 | Radouš            | 335 | Těně             | 442 | Nezdice          |
| 249 | Velká Lečice      | 336 | Čičov            | 443 | Stachy           |
| 250 | Drevníky          | 337 | Číkov            | 444 | Onšovice         |
| 251 | Svatý Jan         | 401 | Drahlin          | 445 | Lažiště          |
| 252 | Křečovice         | 402 | Vysoká u Přibramě | 446 | Hracholusky     |
| 253 | Smilkov           | 403 | Horní Hbity      | 447 | Jáma             |
| 254 | Šebířov           | 404 | Zalužany         | 448 | Rojšín           |
| 255 | Bratrice          | 405 | Kovářov          | 449 | Čakov            |
| 256 | Velký Rybnik      | 406 | Ředice           | 450 | Vrábče           |
| 451 | Hůrky       | 610 | Slatina     | 654 | Biskupice   |
| 452 | Kojákovice  | 611 | Ctdružice   | 655 | Knínice u Boskovic |
| 453 | Staňkov     | 612 | Olbramkostel| 656 | Hrochov     |
| 454 | Přísečná    | 613 | Masovice    | 657 | Suchý       |
| 455 | Doudleby    | 614 | Plaveč      | 658 | Otinoves    |
| 456 | Ločenice    | 615 | Morašice    | 659 | Ruprechtov  |
| 457 | Soběnov     | 616 | Tasovice    | 660 | Radslavíčky|
| 458 | Slavče      | 617 | Věžná       | 661 | Otaslavice  |
| 459 | Třeběč      | 618 | Lomnice     | 662 | Ohrožim     |
| 460 | Buková      | 619 | Heřmanov    | 663 | Třebčín     |
| 461 | Rapšach     | 620 | Holubí Zhoř | 664 | Pěnčín      |
| 462 | Hodice      | 621 | Zbraslav    | 665 | Hvozd       |
| 463 | Světlá      | 622 | Chudědice    | 666 | Příkazy     |
| 464 | Volířov     | 623 | Žebětín     | 667 | Hnojice     |
| 465 | Dyjice      | 624 | Čučice      | 668 | Dolany      |
| 501 | Pustá Rybná | 625 | Hlina       | 669 | Velký Týnec |
| 502 | Rohozná     | 626 | Jezeřany    | 670 | Charváty    |
| 503 | Hrbov       | 627 | Syrovice    | 671 | Hrubčice    |
| 504 | Velké Losenice | 628 | Nosislav   | 672 | Tvorovice   |
| 505 | Světnov     | 629 | Ivaň        | 673 | Tištín       |
| 506 | Kadov       | 630 | Horní Poříčí| 674 | Morkovice   |
| 507 | Ubušín      | 631 | Zboněk      | 675 | Staré Hvezdlice |
| 508 | Věstín      | 632 | Bořitov     | 676 | Velký Újezd  |
| 509 | Vojtěchov   | 633 | Šošůvka    | 677 | Vinary       |
| 510 | Jámy        | 634 | Lažany      | 678 | Záříčí      |
| 511 | Bobrůvka    | 635 | Deblín      | 679 | Zdounky      |
| 512 | Krásněves   | 636 | Ořešín     | 680 | Radotín     |
| 513 | Bohdalov    | 637 | Habrůvka    | 681 | Nahošovice  |
| 514 | Řehořov     | 638 | Habrovany   | 682 | Loukov      |
| 515 | Velký Beranov | 639 | Telnice    | 683 | Hlinsko pod Hostýnem |
| 516 | Příseka     | 640 | Hodějice    | 684 | Němčice     |
| 517 | Hladov      | 641 | Bošovice    | 685 | Mysločovice |
| 518 | Červený Hrádek | 642 | Žarošice   | 701 | Spálov      |
| 519 | Báňovice    | 643 | Boleradice  | 702 | Ošovec      |
| 520 | Mladoňovice | 644 | Písařov    | 703 | Milotice nad Bečvou |
| 601 | Heraltice   | 645 | Jedlí       | 704 | Lhota u Kelče |
| 602 | Cidlina     | 646 | Chromeč     | 705 | Hoštálková  |
| 603 | Nové Syrovice | 647 | Dlouhomyšl | 706 | Rusava      |
| 604 | Oslavice    | 648 | Lepšín     | 707 | Fryšták     |
| 605 | Pavlínov    | 649 | Bohuslavice | 708 | Lhota       |
| 606 | Hodov       | 650 | Šumvald    | 709 | Kvasice     |
| 607 | Sedlec      | 651 | Palonín    | 710 | Huštěnovice |
| 608 | Příložany   | 652 | Bohdalov   | 711 | Cetechovice |
| 609 | Rešice      | 653 | Roubanina  | 712 | Buchlovice  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Město</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>713</td>
<td>Polešovice</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714</td>
<td>Vřesovice</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715</td>
<td>Jestřabice</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716</td>
<td>Vlkos</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717</td>
<td>Strážovice</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718</td>
<td>Kobylí</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719</td>
<td>Velké Bílovice</td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720</td>
<td>Šakvice</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721</td>
<td>Bernartice nad Odrou</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722</td>
<td>Petřkovice</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723</td>
<td>Juřínka</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724</td>
<td>Velká Lhota</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725</td>
<td>Trnava</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726</td>
<td>Klečůvka</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727</td>
<td>Částkov</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>728</td>
<td>Halenkovic</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729</td>
<td>Popovice</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>Ostrožská Lhota</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731</td>
<td>Vnorovy</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732</td>
<td>Radějov</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733</td>
<td>Rohatec</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>734</td>
<td>Mutěnica</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>735</td>
<td>Mikulčice</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736</td>
<td>Lanzhot</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>737</td>
<td>Hlohovec</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>738</td>
<td>Hodslavice</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739</td>
<td>Zubří</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td>Valašská Bystřice</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>741</td>
<td>Ubló</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742</td>
<td>Újezd</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743</td>
<td>Pozlovice</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744</td>
<td>Přečkovice</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>745</td>
<td>Nezdenice</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>746</td>
<td>Boršice u Blatnice</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747</td>
<td>Věrovice</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>748</td>
<td>Prostrední Bečva</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>749</td>
<td>Velké Karlovice</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>Halenkovo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751</td>
<td>Lužná</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>752</td>
<td>Študlov</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>753</td>
<td>Návojní</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>754</td>
<td>Bohuslavice nad Vláří</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755</td>
<td>Žitková</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>756</td>
<td>Strání</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B – DIALECT MAPS
Map 2: Short /a/ in the instr. sing. of */kora/ (A.P. a) 'cow'

For the names of AV dialect survey locales, refer to Appendix A.
MAP 6: Long /ɪ/ in the instr. sing. of /ˈberza/ (A.P. A) 'birch'

For the names of AV dialect survey locales, refer to Appendix A.
Map 5: Shortened /e/ in the nom. sing. of /"berza/ (A.P. A) 'BIRCH'
MAP 4: REFLEX OF SHORT VOWEL IN THE NOM. SING. 
/*griva*/ (A.P. A) 'MANE'

Legend:
- Shortened acute /i/ in /*griva*/
- AV dialect survey locales
- Major dialect boundaries

For the names of AV dialect survey locales, refer to Appendix A.
MAP 13: LENGTHENED /i/ IN THE NOM. SING. */ZIMA/ (A.P. C) 'WINTER'

Legend:
- **Lengthened /i/ in the NS of */ZIMA/**
- AV dialect survey locales
- Major Dialect Boundaries
- Rivers
- Roads

For names of AV dialect survey locales, refer to Appendix A.
MAP 17: LENGTHENED /E:/ IN THE NOM. SING. OF */DEST*/ (A.P. B) 'RAIN'

Legend:
- Lengthened /E/ in NS */DEST*/
- AV dialect survey locales
- Major Dialect Boundaries
- Rivers

For the names of AV dialect survey locales, refer to Appendix A.
Map 18: Reflex of Lengthened /o/ in the Nom. Sing. */roj/ (A.P. C) 'swarm'

Legend:
- Lenthened /o/ in the NAS of */roj/ (A.P. C)
- AV dialect survey locales
- Major dialect boundaries
- Rivers

For the names of AV dialect survey locales, refer to Appendix A.
MAP 19: LENGTHENED /o/ IN THE NS
OF */kos*/ (A.P. B) 'TURDUS MERULUS'

LEGEND

For the names of AV dialect survey locales, refer to Appendix A.
**Map 21: Long /a:/ in the gen. sing. of /"gorx"/ (A.P. A) 'pea's**

For the names of AV dialect survey localities, refer to Appendix A.
Map 23: Lengthened /u/ in the nom. sing. of */hus(a)/ (a.p. a) 'goose'

Legend:

For the names of AV dialect survey locales, refer to Appendix A.
Map 24: Lengthened /a:/ in the nom. sing. of */sazja/ (A.P. A) 'soot'
Map 25: LONG /y:/ in the nom. sing. of /"lyko/ (A.P. A) 'phloem'
Map 26: Reflex of length in the nom. sing. of */mɛlko/ (a.p. b) 'milk'
Map 27: Reflex of length in the nom. sing. of */bölto/ (A.P. A) 'Mud, marsh'

For the names of AV dialect survey locales, refer to Appendix A.
Map 28: Reflex of length in the nom. sing. of */zito/ (a.p. a) 'rye'

Legend:
- *Long /l/ in the NG of */zito/ (a.p. a 'rye'*
- *AV dialect survey locales
- Major dialect boundaries
- Rivers
- Roads
- Coastal Borders

For the names of AV dialect survey locales, refer to Appendix A.
MAP 29: Shortening of acute long vowels in prehistoric Czech