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Abstract

This paper argues that the unexpected accentuation of the Slavic definite adjectives inflecting according to accent paradigms $b$ and $c$ can be convincingly explained by considering the relative chronology of the rise of the definite adjective and certain changes in the prosody of Slavic. It is supposed that the construction eventually becoming the definite adjective arose at a time when paradigmatic mobility had not yet developed in oxytone $o$- and $ā$-stem adjectives and when word-final vowels had not yet been shortened. Endings which were internalized due to the attachment of the enclitic definiteness marker, therefore, preserved their original prosodic features. Later accent retractions such as Dybo's law and Ivšić's law as well as paradigmatic leveling then resulted in the attested accentuation. As an exemplary case, the Slavic definite adjective accentuation is interesting for studying the prosodic development of word forms resulting from univerbation of two originally independent elements.
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1 Introduction

In Slavic, the nominal or short form of the adjective with regard to its accentuation behaves like any thematic noun. By contrast, the definite or long form, which arose from a merger of the short form with a definiteness marker of pronominal origin, displays a different pattern. Long-form adjectives belonging to short-form adjectives inflecting according to accent paradigm (AP) b show columnar accentuation on the root vowel, while long-form adjectives belonging to short-form adjectives inflecting according to AP c display either columnar accentuation on the root vowel or on the ending. In this paper, I show that this unexpected accentual behavior can be explained plausibly by taking into account the relative chronology of the rise of the definite adjective and certain prosodic changes. In short, I argue that the definiteness marker attached to the short form at a time prior to the shortening of word-final long vowels. Long-vowel nominal endings, which became non-final due to the attachment, therefore escaped shortening. In adjectives belonging to AP b (both short and long forms), these nominal endings bore the accent as a result of an advancement from the root syllable (Dybo’s Law, see 3.2). However, when later on the accent was retracted by one syllable to the left from long vowels sharing certain prosodic features (i.e., non-acuteness), only the long-form adjective provided an input for this change since in the short form the long vowel in the ending had already been shortened, cf. short form GEN.SG.M/N *bě̄́lā > *bě̄lā > *bě̄lā vs. long form GEN.SG.M/N *bě̄̃lājego > *bě̄lājego > *bě̄lājego (cf. Section 2 on the notation of Slavic preforms). The difference in the place of accentuation thus naturally follows from the relative chronology of generally assumed changes in the prosody of Slavic and the rise of the definite adjective.

Words inflecting according to AP c were originally accented on the ending. Following ideas put forward by Andersen (2009) and Olander (2009), I assume that paradigmatic mobility, which is the distinguishing feature of words belonging to AP c (see Section 3.1), did not arise when an end-stressed word was followed by an enclitic, i.e., when the accented syllable did not occupy the final position in the accentual unit. In this case, the accent simply remained in its original position. This was the situation in the definite adjective which, as mentioned above, arose from the attachment of an enclitic definiteness marker. Therefore, I assume that the rise of accentual mobility was blocked in definite adjectives belonging to AP c. Instead, the accent remained on the ending and was then, depending on its prosodic features, subject to the same accent shifts which occurred in definite adjectives belonging to AP b, the
only difference being the original place of the accent. Subsequent leveling then resulted in the attested columnar root- or end-stress in the definite adjectives inflecting according to AP c.

One advantage of this approach consists in the fact that it accounts for the accentuation of definite adjectives belonging to AP b in East Slavic without the assumption of contractions. Another advantage concerns the curious distribution of definite adjectives inflecting according to AP c in Čakavian dialects of Croatian. Here, we find columnar accentuation on roots containing a long vowel while definite adjectives with a short root vowel bear the accent on the ending. The parallel distribution in verbs of the aje-type suggests a common origin by regular sound change. Unlike earlier accounts, the proposed scenario allows for such an explanation (see Section 7.2).

As may have become clear from this short outline, some knowledge of Slavic historical accentology is required to follow the proposed scenario. To be precise, it is the characteristics and prehistory of paradigmatic accentuation in Common Slavic that will be relevant for the topic of the present paper. Following a brief note on notation in Section 2, these matters will be dealt with in Section 3. Furthermore, the origin of the definite adjective needs to be discussed since it occupies a crucial place in the proposed scenario. Section 4 is dedicated to this matter. The problem of the accentuation of the definite adjective inflection is then introduced in detail in Section 5. Section 6 discusses earlier approaches to this problem, and Section 7 sets out a novel explanation. The paper’s conclusions are presented in Section 8.

2 A note on notation

The prosodic changes relevant for the problem discussed in the present paper occurred within a period spanning from pre-Proto-Slavic times up to Common Slavic times. Unsurprisingly, apart from these prosodic changes, this period comprised numerous phonological changes. Including these changes in the discussion below would complicate the matter significantly without providing additional information pertinent to the proposed scenario. Therefore, throughout this paper, Slavic preforms will be written in a notation corresponding to the phonology pertaining to a late Common Slavic stage. This will allow the reader to concentrate on the relevant changes only.

The notational system adopted here is close to the traditional system used for Proto-Slavic (cf., for example, Derksen 2008). This makes it easier to com-

2 For an up-to-date reconstruction of Proto-Slavic phonology see Holzer (2003 & 2007).
pare the proposed scenario with earlier accounts (see Section 6), which will be given in their original notation. Moreover, whenever vowel length is relevant for the discussion, it is marked by a macron above the vowel sign: \( \ddot{V} \). Other prosodic features are indicated as follows. The accent inherited by Slavic from Proto-Indo-European is marked with an acute: \( \acute{V} \). A syllable having the innovated feature of acuteness will be indicated by gravis and a superscript dot following the syllable: \( \acute{\acute{V}} \). The reason for doing so will be clarified in Section 3.2. Circumflex syllables will be indicated by the reverse breve sign: \( \breve{V} \). A superscript tilde indicates a neo-acute tone: \( \tilde{V} \). A falling tone resulting from the advancement by Dybo’s Law (see Section 3.2) will likewise be indicated by gravis. Other accent signs used by individual authors to mark Common Slavic accentual properties will be explained in the text.

As regards contemporary Slavic, the traditional diacritics for marking prosodic features will be used. In Russian the acute indicates stress (not tone), and in Czech and Slovak it indicates vowel length. The different pitch accents in B/C/S are marked as follows: \( \acute{V} \) = long rising, \( \grave{V} \) = short rising, \( \breve{V} \) = long falling, \( \grave{\grave{V}} \) = short falling. In Čakavian data, the long rising reflex of the Common Slavic neo-acute tone is indicated by a superscript tilde: \( \tilde{V} \).

3 Paradigmatic accentuation in Common Slavic

In this Section, I will discuss the characteristics (Section 3.1) and the prehistory (Section 3.2) of paradigmatic accentuation in Common Slavic. In doing so, I will mostly adduce examples from the Čakavian dialects of Croatian and from Russian. These idioms are commonly believed to preserve the original place of accentuation best, and Čakavian, moreover, provides information about the original tonal features of the accented syllable.

3.1 Characteristics

At a pre-stage of Slavic any inflected word could be assigned to one of three distinct accent paradigms (henceforth AP) \( a \), \( b \), and \( c \) (cf. Stang 1957). Words inflecting according to AP \( a \) show columnar accentuation on the root, which
is accompanied by a specific tonal feature, the so-called acute tone (continued by Ź in Čakavian) (see Table 1). In AP b the accent alternates between the root syllable and the syllable immediately following the root (see Table 2). Accen-
tuation of the root is, however, secondary in AP b. It resulted from a retraction of the ictus from a jer (*ě, or *ě) in so-called weak position⁵ or from a non-
acute long vowel (see below). Thus, the masculine nominative singular forms Ru bób ‘bean’, Čak bȍb go back to a Common Slavic form *bobъ̀ and the mas-
culine locative plural Čak brẽstī̆h ‘elm’ goes back to CSl *brě̄stě̄̀xъ). Long vowels which received the accent as a result of these retractions show a specific tonal
contour in some dialects of B/C/S, the so-called neo-acute (marked as Ṽ, cf. Čak brẽstī̆h ‘elm’ above). The accent retraction from non-acute long vowels seems
to have been first recognized by Ivšić (1911: 169–177), which is why in the fol-
lowing this sound law will be referred to as “Ivšić’s Law” (cf. Kapović 2005: 84
fn. 36, Holzer 2007: 72).⁶ It should, however, be noted that a retraction had
been proposed already by Diels (1910) under slightly different conditions.⁷ In

---

5 A jer was in weak position word-finally and in a syllable that was followed by a syllable con-
taining a vowel other than a jer, or by an uneven number of syllables containing jers. Jers in
weak position were lost in the individual languages.

6 Until recently, retraction from non-acute long vowels has been referred to as “Stang’s Law”

7 Despite the claim of Kapović (2005: 82 fn. 30; thus also Holzer 2007: 73), the retraction from
a weak jer cannot, however, be attributed to Ivšić. It is implicit in Leskien (1899: 324), cf. "gen.
junáka = *junākə, vratára = *vratārə, nom. júnàk = uspr. junākъ, vratàřъ," and is mentioned
by Kul’bakin (1906: 288; cf. also Pedersen 1905: 299).
any case, by reversing the two rejections we arrive at a paradigm with columnar accentuation on the syllable following the root in AP $b$.

In contrast to the two other accent paradigms, AP $c$ shows mobile accentuation. It is either the root or the ending that bears the accent. Root accentuation is characterized by a specific tonal contour known as “Slavic circumflex”. Moreover, forms with root accentuation display curious accent shifts when accompanied by clitics. In case they are preceded by one or more proclitics, the accent falls onto the leftmost syllable within the accentual unit, cf. Ru ACC.SG.F gólouv ‘head’ (< *gȍlvǫ) but ná gólovu ‘entirely (adv.)’ (< *na’ón + ACC.SG.F gȍlvǫ ‘head’); in case they are followed by an enclitic, the accent advances forward onto the enclitic regardless of the presence of proclitics, e.g., ORu ACC.SG.F zémlju ‘earth/land’ (< *zȅmljǫ) but zemlju tù ‘this earth/land’ (< ACC.SG.F *zȅmljǫ ‘earth’ + ACC.SG.F tò ‘this’). These shifts are usually referred to as “Šaxmatov’s Law” and “Vasil’ev-Dolobko’s Law”, respectively (see Collinge 1985: 153–154 & 29–39). As synchronic rules, they render the place of accent of the corresponding forms predictable from the syntactic environment. Therefore, Jakobson (1963) analyzed these forms as phonologically unaccented and referred to them as “enclinomena”, a term that has persisted in Slavic historical accentology.

---

8 As mentioned above, changes in the place of accentuation in AP $b$ are secondary.
9 Old Russian examples are quoted from Dybo (1981: 49) in a simplified orthography.
10 For their diachronic interpretation, see below in this section.
11 For a criticism of the notion of “phonological unaccentedness,” see Rinkevičius (2021: 277–278).
### Table 3
Singular paradigm continuing Common Slavic AP c in Russian and Čakavian

(Ru zúb ‘tooth’, póle ‘field’, gorá ‘mountain’; Čak stóg ‘haystack’, pölje ‘field’, goră ‘mountain’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Čakavian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.SG</td>
<td>zúb</td>
<td>póle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.SG</td>
<td>zúba</td>
<td>póljia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT.SG</td>
<td>zúbu</td>
<td>pólju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC.SG</td>
<td>zúb</td>
<td>póle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS.SG</td>
<td>zúbom</td>
<td>póljem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC.SG</td>
<td>zůbe</td>
<td>póle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a In East Slavic, the masculine and neuter forms given in Table 3 do not differ in accentuation from those in AP a due to the loss of tonal features and analogical leveling. Differences in the place of accentuation are, however, preserved in the plural, e.g., gen.pl.m rákov ‘crayfish’ (AP a) : Zubóv ‘tooth’ (AP c), dat.pl.m rákam : Zubám, ins.pl.m rákami : Zubámi, loc.pl.m rákax : Zubáx.

#### 3.2 Prehistory

As regards the prehistory of the three Slavic accent paradigms, it has been shown that AP a and b can be traced back to a proto-paradigm with columnar accentuation on the root. They find themselves in complementary distribution depending on prosodic properties of the root syllable (see Dybo 1962). Words inflecting according to AP a have an acute root syllable, while this prosodic feature is absent in roots of words belonging to AP b. With regard to nouns, an identical distribution can be found between Lithuanian APs 1 and 2, which are historically related to the Slavic APs a and b (cf. Illič-Svityč 1963, and see Senn 1966: 106–142 for the Lithuanian APs). AP 2 arose from a paradigm with columnar non-acute root accentuation by an advancement of the ictus onto an immediately following acute syllable (“Saussure's Law”; cf. de Saussure 1896; Collinge 1985: 149–152). Similarly, AP b in Slavic resulted from a paradigm with columnar non-acute accentuation on the root due to a rightward shift of the accent (hence the accentuation on the ending in the paradigms in Table 2). However, differently from Lithuanian, in Slavic the advancement did

---

12 This monograph has been translated into English as Illič-Svityč (1979).
13 Note that in Lithuanian the different accent paradigms are usually referred to as “accent types” (cf. Senn 1966). For the sake of convenience, however, I shall use the term “accent paradigm” also for this language.
not depend on prosodic properties inherent to the syllable following the root. Therefore, Dybo’s Law, as this prosodic change is usually called,\(^{14}\) shifted the accent by one syllable to the right regardless of the prosodic features of the following syllable.\(^{15}\)

The original root accentuation of AP \(b\) in Slavic and AP \(2\) in Lithuanian is confirmed by etymology. As has been demonstrated by Illič-Svityč (1963), a majority of words inflecting according to these paradigms have cognate forms with columnar accentuation on the root in Old Indic, Greek and/or Germanic.\(^{16}\)

Words inflecting according to AP \(c\), on the other hand, correspond to AP’s \(3\) and \(4\) in Lithuanian (cf. Illič-Svityč 1963). Like AP’s \(1\) and \(2\), the latter two types find themselves in complementary distribution with regard to the distribution of accented and unaccented syllables across the inflectional forms. AP \(4\) arose from an original paradigm with an accent curve as in AP \(3\) due to the operation of Saussure’s Law (see above). The differences in the place of accent can therefore again be traced back to a difference in the tonal features of the root syllable: acute (AP \(3\)) vs. non-acute (AP \(4\)). In Slavic, the difference between acute and non-acute root syllables has been neutralized, which is why we find only a single mobile paradigm, i.e., AP \(c\) (cf. Meillet 1902).\(^{17}\)

As concerns the affiliation of the mobile type in Slavic (AP \(c\)) and Baltic (AP’s \(3\) and \(4\)) to accentual patterns in other IE languages, it has been shown that mobile thematic stems and ā-stems predominantly have cognates with a columnar accentuation on the ending in Old Indic, Greek, and/or Germanic (cf. Illič-Svityč 1963). Considering the archaic character of Old Indic accentuation, most scholars assume that accentual mobility in Slavic and Baltic presents an innovation (cf. Sedláček 1914; van Wijk 1923; Hirt 1929; Pedersen 1933: 21–44; Kuryłowicz 1952; Kortlandt 1975;\(^{18}\) Rasmussen 1992; Olander 2009; Babik 2012; Jasanoff 2017).\(^{19}\) This is the view that will be adopted also in this paper.\(^{20}\)

\(^{14}\) This change is sometimes referred to as “Illič-Svityč’s Law” (cf. Garde 1976: 208–213).

\(^{15}\) Note that Holzer (1998: 41) considers the idea that Saussure’s Law presents a degeneralization of Dybo’s Law or Dybo’s Law presents a generalization of Saussure’s Law.

\(^{16}\) Note, however, the criticism in Kim (2002: 130–138) and Babik (2012).

\(^{17}\) This neutralization is usually referred to as “Meillet’s Law.” Opinions on the nature of this change differ widely. For example, Stang (1957: 9–10), Illič-Svityč (1963: 156–157), and Kortlandt (1975: 10–12) explain the neutralization in AP \(c\) as resulting from an analogical change, while Dybo (1971: 83–84), Garde (1976: 198–207), Holzer (2007: 56), Andersen (2009: 15), and Olander (2009: 130–131) operate with a sound change.

\(^{18}\) Note that in later publications Kortlandt assumes that ā-stems were mobile already in Proto-Indo-European (cf. Kortlandt 2006).

\(^{19}\) Further arguments for rejecting the reconstructio difficilior can be found in Olander (2009: 47–48).

\(^{20}\) For a different view, see Stang (1957), Dybo (2000), and Kapović (2015).
The rise of Slavic enclinomena and the rise of root-accented forms in Lithuanian APs 3 and 4 can be related to certain prosodic features of word-final syllables. As has been proposed by Olander (2009), it occurs when the originally accented final syllable of a phonological word was either short or contained a rising tone. Because Old Indic evidence points to a rising or high tone on accented short syllables in Proto-Indo-European, Olander formulates his accent law in terms of moras: a high tone in a word-final mora becomes low: ŭ > [-high] /_C0# (see Olander 2009: 155–159). This resulted in the word form not having any high tone, which is why it was interpreted as unaccented. An unaccented word form then received an automatic stress on the initial syllable. In Slavic, this stress is continued with a specific tonal contour: the circumflex. For example, the Slavic reflex of PIE NOM.SG.M *longós ‘open place’ is *lǫ̑gъ ‘id.’ (> B/C/S lȗg ‘grove’) and the Slavic reflex of PIE ACC.SG.F *gʰolh₂u̯áh₂m ‘head’ is *gȏlvǫ ‘id.’ (> B/C/S glȃvu ‘id.’) (see Olander 2009: 166–167 & 168–169).

From the perspective of Proto-Indo-European, the Mobility Law affected word-final short vowels and word-final sequences of two syllabic segments separated by a laryngeal. The latter sequences, according to Olander (2009: 156), received a rising tone when they were contracted in the prehistory of Slavic and Baltic. Endings which in Slavic and Baltic received an acute tone, on the other hand, were not affected by the Mobility Law, which suggests that this prosodic feature contained a non-high or non-rising contour. Moreover, it is now generally accepted that the Slavic and Baltic acute tone arose from a specific type of phonation which can be referred to as “acuteness” (cf. Jasanoff 2004 & 2017, and Holzer’s 2009 “Akutiertheit”). Certain phenomena suggest that this phonation was still present in Proto-Slavic independent of accentuation. Following Holzer (2005; 2007; 2009), I will therefore mark the feature of “acuteness” by writing a superscript dot after the syllable nucleus: V̄. Considering that the exact nature of this feature is unknown, I believe that it is more accurate to mark it with an unspecific diacritic than to use a superscript glottal stop sign as is done by Olander (2009). In case a syllable carrying the feature of acuteness is accented, this will be indicated by gravis: V̀ (see also Section 2).

---

21 A special type of phonation for syllables with an acute tone in Slavic and Baltic had already been proposed by Vaillant (1936: 114–115) and Stang (1966: 137). However, it is the merit of Kortlandt to have popularized this view in numerous publications (e.g., Kortlandt 1988).

22 In Kortlandt (1975) the superscript glottal stop sign represents a glottal stop. Olander (2015) interprets the feature of acuteness as glottalization and marks it with a subscript tilde. Jasanoff (2017) indicates the feature of “acuteness” by underlining.
A remarkable parallel to Olander’s Mobility Law has been brought forth by Andersen (2009: 11–14). In the Podravina dialects of Croatian, the accent is retracted from word-final syllables with a short high tone or a long rising tone onto the initial syllable of an accentual unit, e.g., general Slavonian NOM/ACC.SG.N ministranstvo ‘ministry’ > Podravina minnistarstvo, u ministranstvo ‘into the ministry’ > Podravina ū ministarstvo (see Klaić 1936 and Ivić 1958: 286–287 for a brief description of the prosodic system of this variety). Especially interesting are cases such as monosyllabic krȃlj ‘king’, which show that the domain of the retraction was the mora. The high tone was shifted from the last to the first mora of the long rising tone. This resulted in a change from a long rising to a long falling tonal contour, cf. general Slavonian krãlj (μ̈μ̈ = V̆́) > Podravina krȃlj (μ̈μ = V̆̀).

A parallel from a language with stress accent can be found in the Zaonež’e dialects of Russian. Here too, we encounter retraction of the accent from word-final syllables onto the initial syllable of a word, e.g., standard Ru NOM.SG.F sestrá ‘sister’ > Zaonež’e dialect s’ɔ́ʌstra, bez mužyka ‘without a peasant/fellow’ > b’ǽz mužyka. The newly arisen forms are even termed “novye enklinomeny” (“new enclinomena”) by Ter-Avanesova (1989).

What these two dialects have in common, moreover, is that the retraction does not occur when a word form is followed by an enclitic, e.g., Podravina rūkȁ me boli ‘my hand hurts’ (not †rȗka me boli) (see Klaić 1936: 182). Apparently, the retraction took place only when the high tone or stress, respectively, was located on the final entity of the accentual unit, i.e., the mora in the Podravina dialects and the syllable in the Zaonež’e dialects. Andersen (2009) proposes the same interpretation for Olander’s Mobility Law. When an oxytone word form was followed by an enclitic, the Mobility Law was blocked because the accent did not occupy the final position in the accentual unit. As this syllable was non-acute, later on it was a target of Dybo’s Law, which shifted the accent onto an immediately following syllable, i.e., the first syllable of the enclitic. In this way, Andersen manages to elegantly account for the accent shift traditionally referred to as Vasil’ev-Dolobko’s Law.

Table 4 presents Andersen’s scenario with the example of the adverb Štk zĩmũs ‘this winter’, which resulted from a merger of ACC.SG.F *zĩmǭ ‘winter’

---

23 Another example of accent shift onto an enclitic in Slavic besides those adduced in Section 3 is found in Russian masculine l-participles of reflexive verbs of the type rodilsjá ‘be born’ (PTCP rodit + REFL sjá). Pedersen (1935: 371–372) explains this accentuation as the result of a rightward shift of the accent by de Saussure’s Law. If we replace de Saussure’s Law, which is usually not assumed for Slavic in modern accentology, by Dybo’s Law, we arrive at an explanation identical to that of Andersen.
The root accentuation in this form resulted from a more recent accent retraction, the so-called neo-Štokavian accent shift. The original place of the accent is preserved in Ru dial. *zimús*, Bulgarian zimós (see Dolobko 1927: 678–679; Filin et al. 1976: 281–282; Georgiev et al. 1971: 640–641).

As can be seen, the presence of the enclitic demonstrative inhibited the accent shift by Olander’s Mobility Law, which affected only the final syllable of an accentual unit (cf. the development of ACC.SG.F. *zimǭ́ ‘winter’). Therefore, the accent remained on the original accusative singular ending. Later on, it was then affected by Dybo’s Law which shifted the accent onto the enclitic demonstrative.

As regards the origin of the above-discussed accent shifts in the Podravina and Zaoneže dialects, it has been argued that they were contact-induced. In the case of the former, the neighboring Hungarian language, which has an initial accent, can be identified as the source of the accent shift (Ivić 1958: 287). The Zaoneže dialects, on the other hand, most probably adapted to the neighboring Finnic idioms (Andersen 2009: 12).

Considering the remarkable parallelism between the Mobility Law and the accent shifts in the Podravina and Zaoneže dialects, it seems justified to reckon with a contact-induced accent shift also in the case of the Mobility Law, even though we cannot identify the language which induced this shift due to a lack of records from the relevant period. This also makes it possible to explain the rise of enclinomena without positing an additional accent placement rule as required by Andersen’s (2009) and Olander’s (2009) accounts. As noted above,

---

24 See Dolobko (1927) for more formations of this type from different Slavic languages.
25 A parallel to the Mobility Law from the Žemaitian dialects of Lithuanian has recently been discussed by Rinkevičius (2021); cf. also Oslon 2010: 143 fn. 2 and Olander 2019: 171–172 with reference to a talk given by Rinkevičius in 2013. According to Rinkevičius (2021: 282), it can be attributed to language contact with the extinct Curonian language. A general discussion of the role of language contact in prosodic change in Baltic and Slavic can be found in Pronk (2018).
these scholars assume that phonological words which do not contain a high tone were automatically assigned an accent on the first syllable. Such an assignment rule cannot however be traced back to Proto-Indo-European and must therefore be interpreted as a Baltic-Slavic (or Balto-Slavic) innovation. Consequently, we must add an additional sound law to the history of these languages. If, on the other hand, we assume that the accentual pattern of enclinomena arose from a contact-induced retraction, the synchronic accentuation rule of these forms derives directly from this retraction: no ad hoc assumption of an additional rule is required to account for the accentuation of enclinomenon forms.

Because of its simplicity as well as the striking typological parallels from later Slavic (and Baltic, see fn. 27), I find Olander’s (2009) account together with Andersen’s (2009) amendment the most convincing among the available accounts, even though I interpret the Mobility Law as a contact-induced retraction and not as an accent loss (cf. also the interpretation of Rinkevičius 2021). The main objection that is raised against Olander’s explanation concerns the accentuation of the verb. In the present tense of thematic verbs, we find enclitomena as reflexes of forms with a full-grade root vowel which should have borne the accent on the root syllable and not on the ending. Olander (2009) deals with this issue by assuming that these verbs adopted their accentuation on the ending analogically to verbs with a zero-grade in the root (the so-called tudati-type). This has been criticized as implausible because in Proto-Indo-European, thematic verbs containing a zero-grade root presented a much smaller class than thematic verbs with a full grade in the root (see Kim 2010; Jasanoff 2017: 116 fn. 27). However, since we are dealing with a phenomenon in Slavic and Baltic, it is data from these branches that are most important for the reconstruction. More precisely, it is data from Slavic that take the most important place in the argument, since the verbal system in this branch has undergone less morphological restructuring as well as analogical leveling of the accentuation than Baltic.

If we take a look at those thematic verbs which, according to Stang (1942: 30–35), can be reconstructed for Proto-Slavic, we find that the ratio of verbs with a full grade in the root to those with a zero grade in the root is hardly of a kind that would make analogical extensions of a pattern from the latter to the former unlikely. Of the 82 verbs listed by the author, 14 are inconclusive because they contain a nasal vowel, which could go back to either a zero grade */ŋ/*ŋ or a tautosyllabic sequence */en/*on or */em/*om, or a long vowel */i, which may reflect either a diphthong */ei (full grade) or short */i (zero grade) in the context of Winter’s Law. Of the remaining 68 verbs, 38 have a full grade or a lengthened grade in the root and 30 have a zero grade in the root. Thus, about 44% of the
thematic verbs reconstructed by Stang (1942) had a zero-grade root. Whether all of these forms were thematic in Proto-Indo-European is less important for the question since the Mobility Law is a Slavic and Baltic sound law and not an Indo-European one. Against the background of analogical changes such as the spread of the athematic ending of the first person singular -m from only five verbs to all other verbal classes in B/C/S (cf. Janda 1996: 9–81), analogical adjustment of verbs with full grade in the root to verbs with zero grade in the root can thus hardly be considered implausible.

4 The origin of the Slavic definite adjective

In early Slavic, definiteness of a noun phrase could be overtly marked by a specific set of adjective endings. These endings arose when the inflected definiteness marker *j- of pronominal origin attached to the right edge of the adjective, turning into an affix (see already Leskien 1876: 131). Ultimately, the definiteness marker merged with the ending of the adjective, thereby forming a new set of adjective endings (cf. Vondrák 1908: 113–129; Tolkačëv 1959; Kuznecov et al. 2006: 70–74; Sommer 2019; Wandl 2022). The original state of affairs is still transparent in certain endings in Old Church Slavonic, e.g., GEN.SG.M/N *nova ‘new’ + *jego > OCS novajego, NOM.SG.F *nova + *ja > OCS novaja (cf. Section 7 for the entire paradigm). In other endings, the original situation has been obscured by haplology in the definiteness marker, e.g., GEN.SG.F *novy + *jejé > OCS novyje, or generalization of the vowel ţ at the cost of the original nominal endings, e.g., DAT.PL.M/N *novomę + jitus > OCS novyimę, LOC.PL.M/N *novéxę + jixę > OCS novyixę. The origin of this vowel can be found in the masculine/neuter nominal ending of the instrumental plural -y.

Slavic shares this way of definiteness marking with Baltic, which is why the definite adjective is usually referred to as a Balto-Slavic or Baltic-Slavic innovation (cf. Petit 2009). It follows that the origin of the definite adjective can be

26 Moreover, Stang (1942: 33) observes that in the controllable cases, PIE aorist roots are continued in zero-grade formations in Slavic, while present roots have a full grade in Slavic. Since there is a priori no reason to believe that the number of aorist roots was significantly smaller than that of present roots, a ratio which does not favor full-grade formations to an extent that would make analogical changes on the example of zero-grade roots unlikely can be posited even if Stang’s analysis of the attested forms is not correct in all details.

27 Note that “transparent” here refers to the etymology. Certain morphological innovations suggest that at this stage speakers already perceived the corresponding endings as single entities and not as two morphemes attached to each other in a concatenative manner (Wandl 2022).
dated to the pre-Proto-Slavic period. However, it should be noted that the rise of the definite adjective was not a single-step process. Univerbation reached its final stages separately in the two branches. For Slavic, the final merger of the adjective and the definiteness marker could thus have taken place in a post-Proto-Slavic period. For the scenarios proposed in Section 7, however, it is not immediately relevant whether the merger had already occurred prior to the proposed changes. What is important is that the coalescence of the adjective and the definiteness marker had proceeded to a stage that allowed these changes to occur. So as not to complicate the matter, hypothetical stages in the univerbation process are thus not marked in the notation adopted here.

It is common practice to distinguish between the two adjectival forms by referring to them as the nominal, short, indefinite, or indetermined form and the pronominal, long, definite, determined, or compound form of the adjective. Throughout this article I shall use only the terms short/long adjective and indefinite/definite adjective, since they seem to be the most common in the literature.

The original situation whereby definiteness of a noun phrase could be overtly marked by a specific inflectional pattern on attributive adjectives has been lost in most Slavic languages. Apart from B/C/S and Slovene, where the original situation is preserved in some case endings, the long-form adjective has ousted the short-form adjective in attributive function (cf. Hansen 2004 for an overview of the development in Slavic). In the East and West Slavic languages apart from Sorbian, the nominative singular and plural of the short-form adjective are, however, preserved in predicative position. As will be shown below, differences in the accentuation of the three gender forms of the (former) nominative singular are sufficient to reconstruct the original accent paradigm of adjectives.

---

28 Hill (2014), Mendoza (2015), and recently also Andersen (2021) entertain the idea that the definite adjective was borrowed from one of the two branches into the other.

29 According to Stolz (2010: 231) and Sommer (2018), the definiteness marker still displayed properties usually associated with clitics in Old Lithuanian.

30 This means that when speaking of the rise of the definite adjective below, it does not necessarily include the full merger of the two elements.

31 Note that it is often difficult to determine the status of a morpheme in the clitic-affix continuum even in contemporary languages (see Haspelmath 2011) and that it is impossible to do so for reconstructed pre-stages.

32 Note that in Slovene, apart from a handful of derived adjectives, the opposition definite/indefinite can regularly be distinguished only in the masculine nominative singular and with inanimate nouns in the homonymous accusative singular (cf. Lenček 1982: 213; Toporišič 2000: 320–321; Greenberg 2006: 42). For some remnants of the difference between indefinite and definite adjectives in Macedonian, see Mladenov (1929: 244–245).
Table 5  AP a nouns and adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Čakavian</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Adj ‘clean’</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Adj ‘clean’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>čȃs ‘moment’</td>
<td>čȉst</td>
<td>čás ‘moment’</td>
<td>čȉst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>sȉto ‘sieve’</td>
<td>čȉsto</td>
<td>sȉto ‘sieve’</td>
<td>čȉsto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>krȁva ‘cow’</td>
<td>čȉsta</td>
<td>koróva ‘cow’</td>
<td>čȉsta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5  The problem

As thematic and ā-stem nominals, short-form adjectives in Slavic originally inflected according to one of the three accent paradigms introduced in Section 3.1 (cf. Stang 1957: 100; Garde 1976: 33; Skljarenko 1998: 136–143; Kapović 2011: 349). In the contemporary languages this is still obvious from differences in the place of accentuation in the three gender forms of the nominative singular of the short-form adjectives. Adjectives originally inflecting according to AP a bear the accent on the root syllable in the masculine, feminine, and neuter forms. As can be seen in Table 5, this accentuation conforms to the accentuation of nouns belonging to this accent class. In AP b, on the other hand, we find root accentuation in the masculine singular, which in Čakavian is accompanied by a neo-acute tone in case of a long root vowel, and accentuation on the syllable following the root in the neuter and feminine forms (see Table 6). Again, this accentuation corresponds to the accentuation of AP b nouns. Adjectives inflecting according to AP c are accented on the root in the masculine and neuter forms and on the ending in the feminine form as is typical for nouns belonging to this accentual type (see Table 7). Therefore, even in a language such as Russian in which short-form adjectives have lost their inflection for case, the original accent paradigm can be determined from differences in the accentuation of the three gender forms. However, the original state can be obscured by analogical leveling (cf. Ru bèlo in Table 2). Hence, only a comparison with cognate forms in other Slavic languages and dialects or with data from earlier stages allows for a reliable reconstruction of the original accent paradigm.

Remnants of the original paradigmatic accentuation of the short-form adjective can be found in dialectal B/C/S (cf. Leskien 1914: 382–384). Moreover, retraction from enclitomemic adjective forms is attested in the Posavina dialects of Croatian, e.g., nȃ bosu nȍgu ‘on a bare foot’ (ACC.SG.F bòsu), ìz tȗda
TABLE 6  AP b nouns and adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Čakavian</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AP b</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Noun</td>
<td>Adj ‘white’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brĕst ‘elm’</td>
<td>bêl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krilȍ ‘wing’</td>
<td>belȍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ženȁ ‘woman’</td>
<td>belȁ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Čakavian</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AP c</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Noun</td>
<td>Adj ‘barefoot’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stȏg ‘haystack’</td>
<td>bös</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pȍlje ‘field’</td>
<td>bȍso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gorȁ ‘mountain’</td>
<td>bosȁ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) The vowel y is secondary in this word (see Vasmer 1953: 672–673).
(b) See Zaliznjak (1985: 136).

TABLE 7  AP c nouns and adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Čakavian</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AP c</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Noun</td>
<td>Adj ‘barefoot’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stȏg ‘haystack’</td>
<td>bös</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pȍlje ‘field’</td>
<td>bȍso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gorȁ ‘mountain’</td>
<td>bosȁ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(sèla) ‘from a foreign (village)’ (GEN.SG.N tûđa ‘foreign’), ā tûdu sèlu ‘in a foreign village’ (LOC.SG.N tûđu ‘foreign’), nà lipu mjèstu ‘in a beautiful place’ (LOC.SG.N lipu), ā sûvu zèmlju ‘in dry soil’ (ACC.SG.F sûvu) (see Ivšić 1913: 42–44; Kapović 2011: 355). However, in most dialects and in the standard language, the picture has been obscured due to analogical changes. Since these developments belong to later periods, they are not discussed in this paper.

The above-described parallels to the substantive inflection are generally considered sufficient for establishing the presence of the three accent paradigms a, b, and c in short-form adjectives (see Stang 1957: 100–105; Kapović 2011). Moreover, older texts give testimony of the paradigmatic accentuation of short-form adjectives. For instance, in the Middle Bulgarian Evangelie n39 from the 14th century, we find the masculine genitive singular form dobrá ‘good’ with the accent on the ending as expected in a noun inflecting according to AP b (cf. GEN.SG.M Ru bobá ‘bean’, Čak bobà ‘id.’; cf. Hock 1992: 108). The same accentuation is indirectly attested in the Old Russian Merilo pravednoe (14th century). This manuscript reflects a Russian dialect in which CSI *a (< PSL *a)
was raised to a close o-vowel (most probably [ο] in IPA script) in accented non-circumflex syllables. In the script this vowel is rendered by omega, which allows inferences about the place of the accent. Spellings such as NOM.SG.M dobře ‘good’, NOM.SG.N dobřo, NOM.SG.F, GEN.SG.M/N, NOM.PL.N dobra, DAT.SG.M/N, ACC.SG.F dobra etc. reveal an accentuation according to AP b (see Zaliznjak 1990: 105 and cf. the accent curve of AP b in Table 2). Root accentuation in adjectives belonging to AP c in Middle Bulgarian is attested, for example, in the following instances taken from Evangelie 1139: GEN.SG.M glúxa ‘deaf’, DAT.SG.M slépu ‘blind’, DAT.SG.M xrómu ‘lame’, ACC.SG.F žívо ‘alive’ (next to NOM.SG.F žívá; see Hock 1992: 108 and cf. the accent curve of AP c in Table 3). Moreover, retraction of the accent onto a preposition from enclinomen forms attests inflection according to AP c in adjectives as well, e.g., ná desęto ‘on the tenth’ (na ‘on’ + ACC.SG.N desęto), kí drugu ‘to the other’ (kí ‘to’ + DAT.SG.M/N drugu ‘other’), both from Evangelie 1139 (see Hock 1992: 108). Parallel cases can be found in Middle Russian, cf. drúgъ ná druga ‘each other’ where the accent is retracted from the GEN.SG.M druga onto the preposition na ‘on’ (Tolkovanie Feofilakta bolgarskogo na evangelija ot Matfeja i ot Marka, 1499–1500; see Zaliznjak 2011: 820).33

If we now compare the accentuation of the long-form adjectives with that of the corresponding short-form adjectives, we first of all find that there is no difference in AP a (see Table 8).34 Both short and long forms have columnar accentuation on the root as expected considering that syllables bearing the acute tone are not targeted by any accent retraction in Common Slavic. However, in APs b and c the matter is different. As can be seen in Table 9, long-form adjectives inflecting according to AP b, unlike their short-form counterparts, have columnar accentuation on the root which, in case of a long root syllable, in Čakavian bears the neo-acute tone (Table 9). In AP c, where the short form has mobile accentuation, the long form in Russian generally has constant accentuation on the ending (Table 10; see Stang 1957: 102). Deviations from this pattern can be explained analogically. In Čakavian, on the other hand, long-form adjectives belonging to AP c are accented either on the root or on the

33 Cf. also drúgъ kó drugu, drúgъ zá druga (Apostol, 1564), drúgъ pri drugé, drúgъ péred drugom, drúgъ iz-za druga (Učenie i xitrosti ratnago stroenija pěxotnyx ljudej, 1647; see Zaliznjak 2011: 820).

34 However, note that in some Western South Slavic dialects, among them Čakavian dialects, we find neocircumflex instead of the original acute tone in definite adjectives belonging to AP a, i.e. Čak (Grobnik) NOM.SG.M/INDEF díg ‘long’ (AP a) : NOM.SG.M/DEF díg‘ (instead of *díg‘; see Langston 2007: 84). The rise of the neocircumflex in these cases clearly presents a recent phenomenon, typical for a limited area. Therefore, it will not be discussed in this paper.
### Table 8  AP a long- and short-form adjectives in Russian and Čakavian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP a</th>
<th>Ru</th>
<th>Čak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.SG.M</td>
<td>čístyj</td>
<td>číst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.SG.N</td>
<td>čístaja</td>
<td>čísta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.SG.F</td>
<td>čistoe</td>
<td>čísto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.PL.F</td>
<td>čístye</td>
<td>čísty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9  AP b long- and short-form adjectives in Russian and Čakavian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP b</th>
<th>Ru</th>
<th>Čak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.SG.M</td>
<td>bělyj</td>
<td>bél</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.SG.N</td>
<td>bělaja</td>
<td>belá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.SG.F</td>
<td>běloe</td>
<td>beló</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.PL.F</td>
<td>bělye</td>
<td>belý</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10  AP c long- and short-form adjectives in Russian and Čakavian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP c</th>
<th>Ru</th>
<th>Čak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.SG.M</td>
<td>borzój</td>
<td>bórz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.SG.N</td>
<td>borzája</td>
<td>borzá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.SG.F</td>
<td>borzóe</td>
<td>bórzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.PL.F</td>
<td>borzýe</td>
<td>bórzy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ending depending on the quantity of the root vowel. Adjectives with long root vowels show neo-acute accentuation on the root, while adjectives with short root vowels are accented on the ending (see Stang 1957: 102, Langston 2006: 269). As in Russian, deviations from these patterns in Čakavian can be explained as secondary (see especially Langston 2006: 269–274).

In Štokavian, we also find two types of accentuation, whereby no clear distribution can be determined (see Stang 1957: 102). As a matter of fact, Leskien (1914: 385–388) reckoned with an accentuation on long root vowels also in Štokavian. Since he still operated in a pre-accentual-paradigm framework, he does not, however, distinguish between adjectives of AP s b and c. Thus, bĳelī ‘white’, dȍbrī ‘good’ (both AP b) and lȉjepī ‘beautiful’, bȍsī ‘barefoot’ (both AP c) are treated as belonging to the same accentual class. The exceptions given in Table 12 demonstrate that in Štokavian adjectives belonging to AP c often have accentual variants. This clearly shows that some kind of analogical process was at work here, whereby it remains to be determined whether the original state of affairs resembled that in Russian or in Čakavian.

Stang (1957: 102) also finds two accentual types in Czech adjectives belonging to AP c. In this language, the accent has been confined to the initial syllable of the word. Nevertheless, differences in the length of the root vowel indicate whether an adjective originally had neo-acute root accentuation or final accentuation. Long vowels and diphthongs point to neo-acute root accentuation,

35 Note that according to Kapović (2011: 361–362), in the modern Croatian standard language with the exception of tūdī ‘foreign’ only the oxytone type is present in definite adjectives with long root vowels.

36 Note that especially in dialects we also find variants in definite forms of adjectives belonging to AP s a and b. Cf. the survey in Kapović (2011: 112–115, 341 & 361–362) and the literature cited therein.
while short vowels indicate final accen-
tuation. However, of the four exam-
pl es given by Stang (1957: 102) which ought to re fle ct former root accen-
tuation, namely Cz hloupý ‘foolish’, moudrý ‘wise’, přímý ‘straight’, skoupý ‘sparse’, only přímý inflected according to AP c. The other three belonged to AP b, where neo-
acute root accen-
tuation is the expected reflex (see above). This rather suggests a secondary origin and indeed, when comparing end-stressed adjectives in Rus-
sian with their Czech cognates, we find that the latter almost exclusively have a short root vowel which points to an accen-
tuation on the ending also in this language, cf., for example, Ru gluxój ‘deaf’, molodój ‘young’, suxój ‘dry’ with Cz hluchý ‘deaf’, mladý ‘dry’, suchý ‘dry’. The same seems to be true for Slovincian, where the only example with root accen-
tuation given by Stang is büesi ‘bare-
foot’, while the bulk of the examples have final accen-
tuation, e.g., gläxí ‘deaf’, mlædî ‘young’, sæxí ‘dry’. Therefore, evidence from West Slavic points to an origi-
nal accen-
tuation on the ending in long-form adjectives inflecting according to AP c.

To sum up, while short-form adjectives inflecting according to AP b bear their accent on the syllable following the root, long-form adjectives show columnar accen-
tuation on the root, which in the case of Čakavian comprises a neo-acute tone on long syllables. Short-form adjectives belonging to AP c, on the other hand, have mobile accen-
tuation, while the corresponding long-form adjectives show columnar accen-
tuation on the ending in Russian and most probably in West Slavic, and columnar accen-
tuation on the root or the end-
ing depending on the properties of the root syllable in Čakavian. The origin of these differences in accen-
tuation, which have not yet been explained satis-

---

**Table 12** Accentual variants of definite adjectives inflecting according to AP c in Štokavian (cf. Leskien 1914: 386–387)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>barytone</th>
<th>oxytone</th>
<th>translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>čěstī</td>
<td>čěstī</td>
<td>‘frequent’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glūhī</td>
<td>glūhī</td>
<td>‘deaf’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gnjīlī</td>
<td>gnjīlī</td>
<td>‘rotten’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ġūstī</td>
<td>ġūstī</td>
<td>‘dense’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slānī</td>
<td>slānī</td>
<td>‘salty’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sūxī</td>
<td>sūxī</td>
<td>‘dry’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tūdī</td>
<td>tūdī</td>
<td>‘foreign’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tvrđī</td>
<td>tvrđī</td>
<td>‘hard’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
factorily, will be discussed in the remainder of this paper. Section 6 provides a critical overview of earlier accounts of the problem. A new approach will then be presented in Section 7.

6 Earlier accounts of the accentuation of the definite adjective

Considering the influence Stang's (1957) work had on later research on historical Slavic accentology (e.g., Kortlandt 1975; Garde 1976; Dybo 1981 & 2001; Dybo et al. 1993; Olander 2009; Jasanoff 2017), I believe that it is fair to say that, as regards Slavic, the modern study of historical accentology begins with this scholar. Therefore, I will also begin my critique of previous approaches to the definite adjective accentuation with Stang's account, which for practical reasons is discussed together with the accounts by Dybo (1981) and Fecht (2010). This is not to say that the problem had not been recognized as such in earlier research. Explanations were, however, much less systematic in these studies because the nature of the accentual patterns was not yet understood.

6.1 Stang (1957), Dybo (1981), and Fecht (2010)

With regard to Stang’s (1957: 101–102) account, it is important to note that it stems from a time when Dybo’s Law had not yet been discovered. In his framework, words inflecting according to AP $b$ were originally accented on the syllable immediately following the root/stem. This was true not only for simple adjectives but also for definite adjectives. In the individual Slavic languages, contractions affecting the accented nominal ending and the first syllable of the former definiteness marker then resulted in a long vowel with a falling tone, cf. -žjV̍ > -ž- in Stang’s notation. The long falling tone was then affected by a retraction which shifted the accent by one syllable to the left, whereby the newly accented syllable acquired neo-acute tone (cf. Čakavian in Table 13).

In the singular, dual, and plural nominative and accusative forms, where we do not find contraction in Russian, the retraction may, according to Stang (1957: 101–102), be “due to the oblique cases.” However, for the masculine nominative singular Stang also reckons with a retraction from the originally accented jer, cf. *bělъjъ. This retraction, according to him, must be very old—Proto-Slavic, in his terms—since it did not affect weak jers which received the accent as a result of the advancement proposed by him for long-form adjectives inflec-

---

37 One of the few scholars who have not adopted Stang’s findings into their research is Stankiewicz (1993).
38 Thus also Skljarenko (1998: 300–301), Fecht (2010: 95–97) and others.
Rise of the accentuation of definite adjectives belonging to AP b according to Stang (1957: 101–102) as presented in Fecht (2010: 96–97)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>post-PSL</th>
<th>Čak</th>
<th>Ru</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG NOM/ACC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>*běľ-ъ-jъ</td>
<td>*běly</td>
<td>&gt;  běli</td>
<td>bélyj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>*běló-je</td>
<td>*běló</td>
<td>&gt;  bělo</td>
<td>béloe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>*bělă-ja</td>
<td>*bělă</td>
<td>&gt;  běla</td>
<td>bélaja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>M/N</td>
<td>*bělă-je</td>
<td>*bělăgo</td>
<td>→ běloga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>M/N</td>
<td>*bělu̍-jemu</td>
<td>*bělȗmu</td>
<td>→ bělomu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL GEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To account for the accentuation of the definite adjectives inflecting according to AP c, Stang (1957: 102–104) proposes a shift of the accent onto the syllable immediately preceding the definiteness marker in those forms which in the simplex bore the circumflex accent on the initial syllable (i.e., the enclitomena). He compares this transfer to the advancement of the accent onto the reflexive pronoun in the masculine form of the so-called l-participle in Russian, cf. rodíl ‘give birth to’, but rodiljsjá ‘be born’, and in adverbs of the type dial. Ru nočés ‘this night’, zimús ‘this winter’, osenés ‘this autumn’, B/C/S nóčas ‘this night’, jèsenas ‘this autumn’, zımūs ‘this winter’. These adverbs ultimately go back to combinations of a noun in the accusative and the demonstrative *sъ ‘this’. As the examples given above show, the adverbs bear the accent on

39 In this regard, Stang (1957: 102) refers the reader to the root accentuation in definite forms of nouns originally inflecting according to AP b in modern Bulgarian, e.g., SG.M.DEF králj- at ‘the king’ (as SG.M kral ‘king’) but PL.M kralé. Since the rise of the new definiteness marker in Bulgarian is, however, clearly younger than the accent retraction, the attested accentuation is not surprising.
the final syllable when the noun involved was an enclinomen (cf. Ru ACC.SG.F nòč', ACC.SG.F ősen' ‘autumn', ACC.SG.F zímu 'winter', B/C/S ACC.SG.F nòć ‘night', ACC.SG.F jësen 'autumn', ACC.SG.F zìmu), while the place of the accent does not change when the noun belongs to AP a (cf. dial. Ru léto ‘summer' : létos’ ‘this summer', útro ‘morning' : útros ‘this morning', B/C/S ljȅto ‘summer' : ljȅtos’ ‘this summer', útro ‘morning' : útros ‘this morning'). Stang, although reluctant to formulate any rules for advancement of the accent in these cases, nevertheless proposes the development presented in Table 14.

As can be seen, as for the adjectives inflecting according to AP b, Stang proposes contraction and subsequent accent retraction in some case forms to account for the accentuation of definite adjectives inflecting according to AP c (similarly Skljarenko 1998: 301–302). This resulted in a paradigm with mobile accent. Generalization of either the accentuation on the root/stem or on the ending then produced the attested paradigms with columnar accentuation on the root or ending (see Stang 1957: 104).

There are several problems with Stang's account. First of all, it depends on the assumption of contractions, which are however a relatively late phenomenon that is usually not assumed for East Slavic, cf. Cz NOM.SG.F -á, B/C/S -á but Ru -aja (see Kapović 2011: 126–127). To be sure, in the definite

---

Note: The table is not transcribed in the natural text representation.
adjective we do find truncated forms in Old East Slavic, cf. OESI gen.sg.m/n -ago (< *-ajego), dat.sg.m/n -umu (< *-ujemu), ins.sg.m/n -umь (< *-yjимь), loc.sg.m/n -ёмь (< *-ejемь), ins.loc.du -ъма (< *-yjима), gen/loc.pl -ъмъ (< *-yjixъ), dat.pl -ъмь (< *-yjимь), ins.pl -ъми (< *-yjимь; cf. Kuznecov 2002). However, these forms could also have arisen as a result of syncope or by adjustment to the feminine or the pronominal endings, which were disyllabic; cf. the feminine endings in Tables 18 and 20 and the pronominal endings OESI gen.sg.m/n -ого, dat.sg.m/n -ому, ins.sg.m/n -емь, loc.sg.m/n -омь, gen.pl -о, dat.pl -ёмъ, ins.pl -ёми, loc.pl -ёмъ (cf. Kuznecov et al. 2006: 74–76).41 The lack of contracted forms in East Slavic is especially problematic for explaining the accentuation of the feminine singular paradigm. All feminine singular forms had disyllabic endings (cf. OESI nom.sg.f -aja, gen.sg.f -yjé, dat.sg.f -ёji, acc.sg.f -ёjo, ins.sg.f -ёjo, loc.sg.f -ёji), yet still they show retracted accent in AP b, e.g., Ru acc.sg.f белу ‘white’. These and other forms with comparable structure can only be accounted for analogically in Stang’s model.

Another problem in Stang’s account concerns his explanation of the retraction in the masculine nominative singular (see above). As pointed out by Fecht (2010: 99–100), it seems contradictory to assume that a jer first behaved as “weak” and thus lost its accent to a preceding syllable, cf. *бёлъ-ь > *бё́лъ-ь, but later on developed further as a “strong” jer, i.e., developed into a different vowel instead of being lost (cf. fn. 5).

Finally, as again noticed by Fecht (2010: 100), Stang’s explanation of the accentuation of the definite adjectives in AP c starts from a misinterpretation of the advancement of the accent in enclinomenic forms, e.g., *suxъ > *suxёъ (see Table 14). Based on evidence from Old Russian manuscripts, Dybo (1971, 1975) has demonstrated that the accent advanced onto the clitic and not onto the final syllable of the enclitomen (Dolobko’s Law, see Section 3.1). Thus, in the definite adjective, the accent was shifted onto the definiteness marker and not onto the syllable following the root as assumed by Stang. The reason why we find the accent on the original masculine nominative singular ending is the accent retraction from “weak” jers. Therefore, Dybo (1981: 129) reconstructs the accentuation of the nominative singular forms of all three genders as in Table 15.

As mentioned above, the masculine form in the second column from the right resulted from regular retraction of the accent from a weak jer, cf. *suxёъ.

41 Later in East Slavic, the original endings were partly replaced by the pronominal endings in the definite adjective, e.g., OESI gen.sg.m/n -ago : MoRu -ogo.
Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEF</th>
<th>DEF&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG NOM.M</td>
<td>*sȗxъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.F</td>
<td>*sȗxъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.N</td>
<td>*sȗxъ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Stang (1957: 103) marks the place of the accent in this column by using a non-italic letter.

> *sȗxъjъ. The neuter form in the rightmost column, according to Dybo, is the product of leveling. Dybo does not give other paradigmatic forms.<sup>42</sup>

Dybo’s account is criticized by Fecht (2010: 104), who notes that it contradicts the general rules for accent placement in Balto-Slavic detected by Dybo. According to Dybo (1981, 2001), each morpheme in Balto-Slavic was characterized by a specific prosodic “valency”, either “dominant” (“high”, “+”) or “recessive” (“low”, “–”). The accent was then assigned to a given word form according to two simple rules: (1) If a word form contained one or more dominant morphemes, the accent fell on the first dominant morpheme; (2) if a word form contained only recessive morphemes, the accent fell on the first syllable of the accentual unit, including proclitics, or, if present, on an enclitic.<sup>44</sup>

The latter forms are the so-called enclinomena of AP<sub>c</sub>, and the synchronic rules governing the placement of the accent on clitics have been introduced as “Sachmatov’s” and “Vasil’ev-Dolobko’s” laws above (Section 3.1). Now since the pronoun underlying the definiteness marker in the masculine/neuter nominative singular has enclinomemic forms consisting of recessive morphemes, Fecht (2010: 104) assumes that the resulting definite adjective forms should receive an automatic accent on the root. To account for the final accentuation of NOM.SG.M *sȗxъjъ (not †sȗxъjъ), NOM.SG.N *sȗxojъ (not †sȗxojə), Dybo therefore has to posit an ad hoc rule (see Fecht 2010: 104).

---

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Skljarenko (1998: 299) and Kapović (2011: 349), who work in the same framework as Dybo, for a reconstruction of the entire paradigm.

<sup>43</sup> See Garde (1976) for a similar model.

<sup>44</sup> Note that according to Dybo (1990: 107–108) these valencies are not only a means of describing accent patterns in Slavic (and also Baltic) but reflect some prosodic realia, which in the Balto-Slavic period were still phonetically realized.
However, Fecht (2010: 104–106) believes that it is possible to salvage Dybo's account. To do so, he suggests not only considering the prosodic features of the adjective, but also those of the definiteness marker. The scenario Fecht proposes is presented in Table 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a.</th>
<th>b.</th>
<th>c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SG</strong></td>
<td><strong>NOM/ACC</strong></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>*súxь *jь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>*súxo *jь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEN</strong></td>
<td>M/N</td>
<td>*súxa *jego</td>
<td>*suxa-jego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAT</strong></td>
<td>M/N</td>
<td>*súxu *jemу</td>
<td>*suxu-jemу</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INS</strong></td>
<td>M/N</td>
<td>*súxy *jimь</td>
<td>*suxy-jimь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOC</strong></td>
<td>M/N</td>
<td>*súxę *jemь</td>
<td>*suxę-jemь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PL</strong></td>
<td><strong>NOM</strong></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>*súxi *ji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEN</strong></td>
<td>*súxy *jixь</td>
<td>*suxy-jixь</td>
<td>*suxýxь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAT</strong></td>
<td>*súxy *jimь</td>
<td>*suxy-jimь</td>
<td>*suxýmь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACC</strong></td>
<td>*súxy *jь</td>
<td>*suxy-jь</td>
<td>*suxyjь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INS</strong></td>
<td>*suxý *jimi</td>
<td>*suxý-jimi</td>
<td>*suxýmь (&gt; *súxymi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOC</strong></td>
<td>*súxy *jixь</td>
<td>*suxy-jixь</td>
<td>*suxýxь</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zaliznjak (1985: 121), partly based on the same evidence put forward by Garde (1976: 11–12), assumes that in regular or fast speech, sequences of orthotonic and enclitic forms as well as sequences of two enclitic word forms as well as sequences of two enclitic word forms
forms could form an accessional unit in Old East Slavic (Zaliznjak’s Early Old Russian, lasting until the loss of weak jers in the 12th/13th century) if they were closely associated semantically. The exact rules governing this accentuation cannot, however, be determined. According to Zaliznjak, it may have been facultative.

It is doubtful, however, whether the examples adduced by Garde and Zaliznjak can indeed prove the proposed accessional behavior. The accentuation of the syntagmata cited from Russian epic poetry may also have been governed by metrical factors. They often occur verse-finally, where we also find syntagmata such as *vo čistó pole* ‘into the open field’ or *čistým polem* ‘through the open field’, in which the first component *čístyj* ‘clean; free’ inflects according to AP a and should thus bear the accent on the root syllable, or *na dobróm koní* ‘on a good horse’, in which both components are orthotonic word forms (both *dóbrýj* ‘good’ and *kon’* ‘horse’ originally inflected according to AP b). Most of the other examples adduced by Garde and Zaliznjak involve cases where two or more elements merged as a result of univerbation, cf., for example, *Ru segódnja* and the numerals cited above. Loss of one of the two accents in these cases is thus not surprising. Moreover, the neuter nominative plural in *trísta* ‘300’ was not an enclinomen (see Olander 2009: 181–182). However, it cannot be excluded that Zaliznjak’s (1985: 121) observation about the accentuation of subsequent enclinomena in Early Old Russian also holds true for earlier stages. Taking into account that the adjective and the definiteness marker were certainly closely associated in the construction which was to become the definite adjective, Fecht’s basic assumption could then be considered a feasible starting point.

In the paradigm resulting from Fecht’s scenario (cf. Table 16b), enclinomenic forms occur beside forms which are accented on medial and final syllables. According to Fecht (2010: 107–108), this distribution of accents across the paradigm was unusual for Slavic, which is why it was affected by analogical leveling. In Russian, either the barytone or the oxytone accentuation was gener-

---

45 Cf. further Nikolaev (2018: 372) on the specifics of accentuation in Russian epic poetry.

46 What is interesting, though, is that loss of the accent always affected the enclinomen that was not accompanied by clitics. Thus, in *Ru pjetátdcat’* ‘15’ (*< *pět’ na desęte* where both NOM.SG.F *pět’* ‘five’ and LOC.SG.F desęte ‘ten’ are enclinomena), the accent of the proclitic preposition *na* is generalized in the course of the univerbation. In *Ru odinátdcat’* ‘11’ (*< *edin na desęte*), on the other hand, the accent of the orthotonic numeral prevailed. However, this may also have been related to the prosodic features of the word forms involved. In any case, the place of the accent in *Ru pjetátdcat’* seems to contradict the assumption that the accent in a sequence of two accessional units with only recessive morphemes automatically fell on the first syllable.
alized starting from the paradigm in column b of Table 16. In B/C/S, on the other hand, contractions in some endings gave rise to long vowels with a falling tone, which were subsequently affected by Ivšić’s Law (see Section 3.1). As a result, forms with a neo-acute root accentuation were introduced into the paradigm. According to Fecht, this accentuation was most significant in the feminine paradigm, e.g., NOM.SG.F *gluxája > *gluxȃ > Čak glũhā ‘deaf’. Therefore, he assumes that Čakavian generalized the neo-acute root accentuation in adjectives with long root vowels from the feminine paradigm. Adjectives with short root vowels, on the other hand, generalized the final accentuation of the masculine and neuter paradigms and the plural.

I believe that Fecht’s account is unattractive for a number of reasons. First of all, it forces us to operate with enclitomonic word forms in the definite adjective, e.g., NOM/ACC.SG.M *sũxy-je and NOM/ACC.SG.N *suño-je, which did not leave any trace in Slavic. Moreover, the number of forms which would have regularly required neo-acute root accentuation in Čakavian does not seem to be very significant. This is especially true for the singular paradigm, where a retraction would have taken place only in three feminine forms. The proposed generalization of neo-acute root accentuation is, therefore, hardly self-evident. Considering that the short circumflex merged with the short neo-acute in later Slavic, cf. the short falling tone in both Čak NOM.SG.M bȍb ‘bean’ (AP b) and ACC.SG.F gȍru ‘mountain’ (AP c), we would also rather expect generalization of root accentuation in adjectives with a short root vowel in Čakavian. After all, forms such as NOM.SG.M *bȕsy (< *bȕsoj) ‘barefoot’ and NOM.SG.F *bȕsa (< *bosája) would not have differed with regard to their accentuation after the merger, cf. *bȕsy and *bȕsa, while the same would not have been true for adjectives with long root vowels, cf. NOM.SG.M *sũxy and NOM.SG.F *sũxa. In fact, neither Fecht nor Stang provides a good explanation for the distribution of paradigms with root and final accentuation in Čakavian. In the pre-B/C/S paradigm resulting from their scenarios, the distribution of forms with root accentuation and forms with accentuation on the ending is independent of the quantity of the root vowel.

6.2 Other accounts
Further accounts of the accentuation of the definite adjective are less elaborated. Kortlandt (1975: 39) believes that Slavic was affected by two chronologically different contractions. The first contraction occurred in the entire Slavic speech area. It operated prior to Dybo’s Law and affected only posttonic syllables. The second contraction, on the other hand, occurred only in a part of the Slavic speech area. Since we do not find any trace of contractions in East Slavic, Kortlandt is forced to posit a number of back-formations for this...
branch. With regard to the definite adjective, this concerns (originally) disyllabic endings such as Ru NOM.SG.M -yj, F -aja, N -aje etc. of APs a and b. They have to be explained analogically to words inflecting according to AP c, since only in this paradigm would these endings not have been in posttonic position. The assumption of such analogical reversals makes Kortlandt's explanation unattractive.

Untenable is Garde's (1976: 313–316) proposal of a retraction of the accent from vowels preceded by a glide *j. It is contradicted by Russian verbs in -aje- and -eje-, e.g., PRS.3SG pytájet ‘ask’ (INF pytát’), PRS.3SG kopájet ‘dig’ (INF kopát’), PRS.3SG celéjet ‘heal’ (INF celét’) (see Fecht 2010: 101).

Kapović (2005: 85) assumes that the neo-acute on the root syllable in definite adjectives of AP b arose analogically to the masculine nominative singular when AP c generalized stress on the first syllable of the ending to preserve the difference between the two accent paradigms. However, as the author himself showed in his detailed study on the development of adjective accentuation in Štokavian, Čakavian, and Kajkavian varieties of Croatian (Kapović 2011), at a later stage numerous mergers of different accent paradigms occurred. There is thus no reason to believe that this would have presented a problem for speakers in an earlier period.

To sum up, there are a number of different accounts of the accentuation of definite adjectives belonging to APs b and c which are all, however, problematic. The two main reasons are that they do not convincingly account, first, for the retracted accent in East Slavic, where we do not find contractions; and, second, for the distribution of adjectives with accentuation on the root and on the ending in definite adjectives belonging to AP c. In the next section (Section 7), I will propose a scenario that plausibly accounts for both of these facts.

7 Towards a new explanation

In this section, I give my own account of the accentuation of the definite adjectives belonging to APs b and c. Crucial for my explanation are (1) the relative chronology of the shortening of word-final vowels and the rise of the definite adjective, and (2) the relative chronology of the rise of enclinomena in AP c and the rise of the definite adjective. The first point is relevant for AP b, while the second point concerns AP c. Since I will be dealing with the two accent paradigms individually in Sections 7.1 and 7.2 below, I will also discuss these issues in relative chronology at the beginning of the corresponding sections.
7.1 **Definite adjectives of AP b**

In my opinion, the key to understanding the neo-acute root accentuation of the definite adjectives belonging to AP b lies in the relative chronology of the rise of the definite adjective (see Section 4) and the shortening of word-final long vowels. At a time prior to Ivšić’s Law, word-final long vowels were shortened in Slavic (see Vaillant 1950: 277–279; Garde 1976: 207–208; Kapović 2005: 76 on the shortening and Holzer 2005: 50 & 52–53 on its relative chronology). The domain of this shortening was the accentual unit. While the long nasal vowel in the ACC.SG.F *
žimǭ* was shortened in Common Slavic, cf. the short final vowels in B/C/S *
žimu* ‘winter’, Cz *
žimu* ‘id.’, it remained long when followed by an enclitic, cf. *
žimǭ sь* > B/C/S *
žimūs* ‘this winter’ (cf. Holzer 2005: 50; Kapović 2005: 76; Wandl 2022). Considering that the definiteness marker was an enclitic and that at least the origin of the construction underlying the definite adjective preceded the Common Slavic period, we may, therefore, assume that long-vowel nominal endings were still long at the time when the adjective and the definiteness marker merged (see Wandl 2022). Hence, the original vowel length was preserved (see Table 17, where prosodic features apart from vowel length have been omitted for the sake of convenience).

If we now consider that the rise of the definite adjective predates Dybo’s Law—the former is a pre-Proto-Slavic innovation (see Section 4), while the latter occurred in post-Proto-Slavic times (cf. Matasović 2000: 134–135; Holzer

---

In this regard, it is interesting to note that Lithuanian acute long vowels, which are shortened in word-final position due to Leskien’s Law (Leskien 1881; Collinge 1985: 115–116; Stang 1966: 115–119), have preserved their length in syllables that became internal within the definite adjective, cf. NOM.SG.F.INDEF gerà ‘good’ with shortened word-final acute vowel vs. NOM.SG.F.DEF gerōji ‘id.’ (*-ā + *jū) with preserved length.

---

TABLE 17 Shortening of word-final long vowels (examples: *
žima* ‘winter’, *
добр* ‘good’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>pre-shortening</th>
<th>post-shortening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ACC.SG.F | *
žimǭ*         | > *
žimǭ*         |
| ACC.SG.F + DEM | *
žimǭ sь*   | = *
žimǭ sь*   |
| GEN.SG.M/N.INDEF | *
добрā*       | > *
добрā*       |
| GEN.SG.M/N.DEF | *
добрā-jego*  | = *
добрājego*  |
| DAT.SG.M/N.INDEF | *
добрū*       | > *
добрū*       |
| DAT.SG.M/N.DEF | *
добрū-jemu*  | = *
добрūjemu*  |
we must begin our account of the definite adjectives belonging to AP b at a stage where the accent still rested on the root syllable. Dybo’s Law then shifted the accent by one syllable to the right onto the internalized nominal ending, which could contain a jer,\(^{48}\) a short vowel, a long acute vowel, or a long non-acute vowel. If the accent fell on an acute vowel or a short vowel other than a weak jer, it was not affected by any further retractions in Common Slavic. If the accent fell on a jer, the further development depended on the position of this vowel. If it was in strong position, i.e., followed by a syllable containing a jer, the accent was likewise not affected by any further replacements in Common Slavic, cf. NOM/ACC.SG.M *
\[\text{bě̄l-}j\] if the jer was in weak position, the accent was later retracted onto the root syllable (see Section 3.1). Such a case could have been the genitive plural, cf. the nominal ending GEN.PL *-\(\acute{\iota}\). However, this is one of the endings in which the original nominal ending has been replaced by *-\(\acute{\iota}\)- (see Section 4) from the instrumental plural, cf. OCS INS.PL.M \text{grady} ‘fortress; town’ (see Wandl 2022). Since the nominal ending of the instrumental plural seems to have been acute, cf. the final accentuation in ORu INS.PL.M \text{zubý} ‘tooth’ (AP c), \text{rodý} ‘birth’ (AP c) from the Čudovskij Nový Zavet (14th century) (see Stang 1957: 73; Zaliznjak 1985: 266, and cf. also Dybo 1981: 27),\(^{49}\) we would, therefore, expect the extended vowel to have the same prosodic feature. It follows that if the replacement of *-\(\acute{\iota}\)- by *-\(\acute{\iota}\)- in the genitive plural had taken place before retraction from a weak jer or even before Dybo’s Law, the retraction would have been inhibited. Unfortunately, we do not know when exactly *-\(\acute{\iota}\)- was generalized from the instrumental plural. Therefore, I will base my account on the reconstruction that is closer to the attested state of affairs, i.e., after *-\(\acute{\iota}\)- had already been generalized.\(^{50}\)

In all these cases, then, the accent remains on the original nominal ending. However, when the accent was shifted onto a non-acute long vowel by Dybo’s

\[^{48}\text{Note that at the time when Dybo’s Law operated the Common Slavic jers may not yet have developed from PSl *u and *i. For the proposed account this is, however, irrelevant.}\]

\[^{49}\text{Forms with root accentuation can be explained analogically (see Stang 1957: 73; Zaliznjak 1985: 268).}\]

\[^{50}\text{Note that if we start from a stage prior to the generalization of *-\(\acute{\iota}\)-, we would also have to reckon with the preservation of the original nominal endings in the masculine/neuter instrumental singular as well as in the dative and locative plural. Apart from the genitive plural, we would then also find a regular retraction in the masculine/neuter locative plural, cf. GEN.PL *bě̄l-\(x\)> *bě̄l-\(x\)> *bě̄l-\(x\)> *bě̄l-\(x\) and LOC.PL.M/N *bě̄lě\(x\)> *bě̄lě\(x\)> *bě̄lě\(x\)> *bě̄lě\(x\). If one wants to assume non-acuteness of the generalized vowel *-\(\acute{\iota}\), one could think about positing influence of *-\(\acute{\iota}\)- from the feminine nominative plural and the masculine/feminine accusative plural.}\]

Law, the newly accented syllable fulfilled the conditions for Ivšić’s Law. Therefore, later in Common Slavic the accent was retracted onto the root syllable, which acquired a neo-acute tone. The development up to the stage after Ivšić’s Law is presented in Table 18. The step from column a to column b covers the operation of Dybo’s Law, while the step from column b to column c represents the operation of Ivšić’s Law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. PSI</th>
<th>b. post-Dybo</th>
<th>c. post-CSl-retractions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM.SG.M</td>
<td>*bě̆l-ja</td>
<td>*bě̆l-ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM/ACC.SG.N</td>
<td>*bě̆lo-je</td>
<td>*bě̆lo-je</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.SG.F</td>
<td>*bě̆la-ja</td>
<td>*bě̆la-ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.SG.M/N</td>
<td>*bě̆la-jecho</td>
<td>*bě̆la-jecho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.SG.F</td>
<td>*bě̆ly-je</td>
<td>*bě̆ly-je</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT.SG.M/N</td>
<td>*bě̆lu-jemů</td>
<td>*bě̆lu-jemů</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT.SG.F</td>
<td>*bě̆le-ji</td>
<td>*bě̆le-ji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC.SG.M</td>
<td>*bě̆l-jo</td>
<td>*bě̆l-jo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC.SG.F</td>
<td>*bě̆lo-jo</td>
<td>*bě̆lo-jo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSS.G.M/N</td>
<td>*bě̆ly-ji</td>
<td>*bě̆ly-ji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSS.G.F</td>
<td>*bě̆lo-jo/*bě̆lo-jo</td>
<td>*bě̆lo-jo/*bě̆lo-jo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC.SG.M/N</td>
<td>*bě̆le-jemi</td>
<td>*bě̆le-jemi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC.SG.F</td>
<td>*bě̆le-ji</td>
<td>*bě̆le-ji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM/ACC.DU.M</td>
<td>*bě̆la-ja</td>
<td>*bě̆la-ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM/ACC.DU.N</td>
<td>*bě̆le-ji</td>
<td>*bě̆le-ji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM/ACC.DU.F</td>
<td>*bě̆le-ji</td>
<td>*bě̆le-ji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT/INS.DU</td>
<td>*bě̆ly-jimã</td>
<td>*bě̆ly-jimã</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN/LOC.DU</td>
<td>*bě̆lu-ju</td>
<td>*bě̆lu-ju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.PL.M</td>
<td>*bě̆li-ji</td>
<td>*bě̆li-ji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM/ACC.PL.N</td>
<td>*bě̆la-ja</td>
<td>*bě̆la-ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.PL.F</td>
<td>*bě̆ly-je</td>
<td>*bě̆ly-je</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.PL</td>
<td>*bě̆ly-jixь</td>
<td>*bě̆ly-jixь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT.PL</td>
<td>*bě̆ly-jimu</td>
<td>*bě̆ly-jimu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC.PL.M</td>
<td>*bě̆ly-je</td>
<td>*bě̆ly-je</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC.PL.F</td>
<td>*bě̆ly-je</td>
<td>*bě̆ly-je</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS.PL</td>
<td>*bě̆ly-jimi</td>
<td>*bě̆ly-jimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC.PL</td>
<td>*bě̆ly-jixь</td>
<td>*bě̆ly-jixь</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With regard to the reconstruction of the prosodic features of the endings, I follow Olander (2009 & 2015). In the case of the feminine instrumental singular, the evidence is inconclusive, however. In attested Slavic, the original ending */-ǫ/* has been replaced by the pronominal ending */-ojǫ/ outside the definite adjective (see Olander 2009: 175–176 & 2015: 163–166), so that we find no evidence for the original accentuation in this branch. The comparative data from Baltic are ambiguous. The operation of the Mobility Law in Lithuanian AP 3 nouns (cf. Li ins.sg.f gá́lva ‘head’) points to a non-acute ending, while the definite adjective (cf. Li ins.sg.f mažá́-ja ‘small’) and operation of Saussure’s Law in AP 2 nouns (cf. Li ins.sg.f viétà ‘place’) speak for the reconstruction of an acute ending (see Olander 2009: 175–176). Therefore, in the reconstruction given here I consider both possibilities (see Table 18 and 19).

As can be seen, the proposed scenario accounts for the retracted accent in almost half of the paradigmatic forms (marked as bold in Table 18). The attested columnar accentuation on the root (see Section 5) can then easily be explained as a result of paradigmatic leveling. Compared to earlier accounts, this approach is clearly advantageous because it does not depend on the assumption of contraction, which is problematic from the perspective of East Slavic (see Section 6.1).

7.2 Definite adjectives of AP c

To account for the accentuation of definite adjectives belonging to AP c, one has to go back further in time. As we have seen above, most explanations dealing with the accentuation of this type operate with the assumption of Vasil’ev-Dolobko’s Law: a synchronic rule which shifted the accent from the initial syllable of an accentual unit onto an enclitic is posited (see Section 6.1). The origin of this law is not considered in these accounts. I believe that the key to understanding the accentuation of the definite adjectives belonging to AP c can be found in the diachrony of this rule.

---

51 Note that in Tables 18 and 19 certain forms of the paradigm are grouped together as is traditionally done in Slavic linguistics. And indeed, it makes sense to count homophonous forms such as the neuter nominative and accusative singular or plural only once when it comes to analogical leveling. However, in other cases, this may not be so clear. For example, should the feminine accusative plural be grouped together with the nominative plural of the same gender or with the masculine accusative plural, or should all these forms be treated separately? For the purposes of the present paper, however, this is of minor importance. Even if certain forms are separated or interpreted differently with regard to their accentual properties, the proposed scenario regularly accounts for the neo-acute root accentuation in enough case forms to reasonably explain the columnar root accentuation of the definite adjectives belonging to AP b.
As has been discussed above, Andersen (2009) argues that the domain of Olander’s (2009) Mobility Law is the accentual unit. The accent retraction onto the initial syllable takes place only if the accented final syllable is not followed by enclitics. When enclitics are present, the accent remains in its original position. If the accent which in this way escaped the accent retraction by the Mobility Law was non-acute, it was later affected by Dybo’s Law, which shifted the accent by one syllable to the right, hence onto the enclitic. The entire development is shown in Table 19 (repeated from Table 4 for the sake of convenience).

As we have already seen in the beginning of Section 7, the definite adjective coincides in structure with adverbs of the type B/C/S zìmūs. Therefore, I believe that their accentuation can be accounted for in the same way. Chronology does not pose any problem here. The fact that we find a parallel construction for definiteness marking in Baltic speaks for the age of this construction. Therefore, we may assume that the definite adjective—or rather the construction which was to become the definite adjective—arose at a time prior to the operation of the Mobility Law. Hence, it arose at a time when the original final accentuation was still preserved in AP c. When the enclitic definiteness marker attached to the adjective, the operation of the Mobility Law was inhibited, and the accent remained on the original ending. At a later stage, the accent was shifted from non-acute endings onto the definiteness marker by Dybo’s Law, just as it was shifted onto the enclitic demonstrative *sþ in the case of B/C/S zìmūs (see Table 19). If the newly accented syllable contained a weak jer, which was the case only in the masculine nominative/accusative singular, the accent was then again retracted onto the original nominal ending. The development up to this stage is presented in Table 20.

Note that Anderson (2009) does not interpret the Mobility Law as an accent retraction but as accent loss (cf. also Olander 2009).
### Table 20

Development of the accentuation of the definite adjectives belonging to AP c

|-----------|--------------|----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|----------|------------|---------|--------|--------|---------|---------|--------|---------|

The paradigm arising from this scenario contains forms which are accented on the original nominal ending and forms which are accented on the first or only syllable of the definiteness marker (cf. Table 20c). From this paradigm we can easily explain the final accentuation in Russian, B/C/S, Slovincian, and in Čakavian adjectives with a short root vowel. We simply have to assume a gen-
Western South Slavic accent retraction in present stem formation in -\textit{aje}\

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Štokavian</th>
<th>Čakavian</th>
<th>Slovene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INF *pětə́t̠ɪ</td>
<td>pytát̠′</td>
<td>pítati</td>
<td>pítati</td>
<td>pítati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS.2G *pětə́ješ̠i</td>
<td>pytáješ̠′</td>
<td>píτ̠aš̠</td>
<td>píτ̠aš̠</td>
<td>píτ̠aš̠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF *kopə́t̠ɪ</td>
<td>kopát̠′</td>
<td>kòpati</td>
<td>kopáti</td>
<td>kopáti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS.2G *kopə́ješ̠i</td>
<td>kopáješ̠′</td>
<td>kòpáš</td>
<td>kopáš</td>
<td>kopáš</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{a} The form with accentuation on the suffix stems from Karadžić’s (1898) dictionary.

Besides the Common Slavic accent retraction from non-acute long vowels (Ivšić’s Law) and weak jers, in Western South Slavic (B/C/S, Slovene) we find a further retraction which affects secondary long vowels with a falling tone. These long vowels arose from contraction of *-VjV-sequences that were accentuated on the first of the two vowel segments: *-V̄jV- > -V̄-, e.g., Ru pójas ‘belt’ but Štk, Čak, Sln pȃs ‘id.’. Differently from the Common Slavic retraction by Ivšić’s Law, the later retraction shifted the accent only onto preceding long vowels (cf. Langston 2006: 250–251). Table 21 presents the retraction on the example of present stem formations in \textit{aje}-. As can be seen, in Russian, where contraction does not occur, the accent remains on its original place in both the infinitive and the present tense. In Čakavian, Štokavian and Slovene, on the other hand, we do find contraction of -\textit{aje}- to -\textit{ā}- and hence a shift of the accent onto a preceding long vowel in the present tense, cf. Čak píτ̠aš̠, Sln pítaš̠, but not onto a preceding short vowel, cf. Čak kopáš, Sln kopáš.

If we now apply contraction and the second retraction to the forms in column c of Table 20, we arrive at the scenario in Table 22. Column 22a repeats the Common Slavic stage following Dybo’s Law and the accent retraction from weak jers. Contraction of *-VjV- sequences then led to the situation in column 22b. Where Dybo’s Law had shifted the accent onto the definiteness marker, contraction resulted in a neo-acute tone, cf. NOM/ACC.SG.N *-oje > *-o as in *bojə́ti se ‘fear’ > Čak (Novi) bät̠i se ‘id.’. Where, however, the accent on the internalized nominal ending was retained because it was acute, contraction
resulted in a long vowel with a falling tone, cf. nom.sg.f *-ːja > *-ː. Once these contractions had taken place, we arrive at a paradigm with either a long falling or a long rising tone on the first or only vowel of the ending (see Table 22b). When the root vowel was long, the accent was then affected by the second retraction. This led to a paradigm with neo-acute root accentuation in a majority of cases (see Table 22c). The columnar root accentuation in these adjectives (e.g., nom.sg.m Čak gusti, f gusta, n gustō ‘thick’) can, therefore, be explained easily as a result of paradigmatic leveling. Adjectives with a short root vowel, on the other hand, while also undergoing contraction, were not affected by the accent shift. They preserved the accentuation on the ending (e.g., nom.sg.m bosǐ, f bosȃ, n bosȏ ‘barefoot’), merely undergoing leveling of the tonal accent. In Štokavian, depending on the dialect, we find generalization of long falling tone on the ending or an interchange of neo-acute and falling tone. In Čakavian, accented endings always seem to be falling.

One possible disadvantage of my approach as compared to those of Fecht (2010) or Kapović (2011) (both working within Dybo’s framework) is that the final accent in Russian surnames such as Suxovó, Durnovó, Blagovó, Xitrovó cannot be explained regularly as an archaism (thus Fecht 2010: 106 fn. 237; somewhat less confidently Kapović 2011: 367 fn. 178, and others). These forms continue genitives in -ogo whose spelling has been adapted to the pronunciation (see Sobolevskij 1907: 276; Unbegaun 1995: 18 & 138–139). Since Fecht and Kapović assume that forms such as the masculine/neuter genitive and dative were originally accented on the final syllable of the definiteness marker, in their scenarios the accentuation of the above-mentioned surnames could be interpreted as an archaism. However, Kapović (2011: 374–375) from his analysis of Croatian data concludes that in Croatian dialects only forms such as Posavina gen.sg.m/n -ôg, Ozrinić (Montenegro) gen.sg.m/n -ôga, dat.sg.m/n -ôme, Turopolje gen.sg.m/n -ôga, dat.sg.m/n -ômu could continue gen.sg.m/n *-a-jegó and dat.sg.m/n *-u-jemú, respectively, while forms such as Rijeka and Grobnik gen.sg.m/n -o/egȁ, dat.sg.m/n -o/emȕ result from analogy with pronouns. The reason is that these endings occur in indefinite adjectives and, moreover, have a short initial vowel instead of the expected long vowel from

53 For details about the different accentuation of final vowels in Štokavian, Čakavian, and Kajkavian definite adjectives belonging to AP c, I refer the reader to Kapović’s (2011: 357–375) in-depth study as well as the literature cited therein.

54 Note that Russian g is pronounced as [v] in the masculine/neuter genitive singular ending of pronouns. Unlike in adjectives or pronouns, this pronunciation is indicated in the spelling of the cited surnames, probably due to the fact that the semantic link between them and the genitive has been lost.
**TABLE 22** Rise of root-accented forms in Čakavian definite adjectives of AP ć

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>post-CSl-retractions</th>
<th>post-SSL-contraction</th>
<th>post-WSSL-retraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM.SG.M</td>
<td>*sǔxȳ ̃-j̄b</td>
<td>*sǔxȳ ̃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM/ACC.SG.N</td>
<td>*sǔxo-j̄e</td>
<td>*sǔxo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.SG.F</td>
<td>*sǔxā⁻-ja</td>
<td>*sǔxā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.SG.M/N</td>
<td>*sǔxā⁻-j̄go</td>
<td>*sǔxāgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.SG.F</td>
<td>*sǔx̄ ̃-j̄e</td>
<td>*sǔx̄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT.SG.M/N</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i⁻-j̄mu</td>
<td>*sǔx̄imu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT.SG.F</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i⁻-ji</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC.SG.M</td>
<td>*sǔx̄ ̃-ji</td>
<td>*sǔx̄y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC.SG.F</td>
<td>*sǔx̄ ̃-j ̄q</td>
<td>*sǔx̄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS.SG.M/N</td>
<td>*sǔx̄ ̃-j̄mi</td>
<td>*sǔx̄ymi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS.SG.F</td>
<td>*sǔx̄ ̃-j̄q</td>
<td>*sǔx̄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC.SG.M/N</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i⁻-j̄m</td>
<td>*sǔx̄emi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC.SG.F</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i⁻-ji</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM/ACC.DU.M</td>
<td>*sǔxā⁻-ja</td>
<td>*sǔxā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM/ACC.DU.N</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i⁻-ji</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM/ACC.DU.F</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i⁻-ji</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN/LOC.DU</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i⁻-j̄u</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN/LOC.DU</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i⁻-j̄u</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT/INS.DU</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i⁻-j̄ma</td>
<td>*sǔx̄ima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.PLL.M</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i⁻-ji</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM/ACC.PLL.N</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i⁻-ja</td>
<td>*sǔx̄a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.PLL.F</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i⁻-j̄p</td>
<td>*sǔx̄a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.PLL</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i⁻-j̄p</td>
<td>*sǔx̄a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT.PLL</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i⁻-j̄m</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC.PLL.M</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i⁻-j̄m</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC.PLL.F</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i⁻-j̄m</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS.PLL</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i⁻-j̄mi</td>
<td>*sǔx̄imi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC.PLL</td>
<td>*sǔx̄i⁻-j̄m</td>
<td>*sǔx̄ymi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

contraction. A parallel analogy could thus also be posited to account for the final accentuation of the East Slavic surnames. As regards the above-cited endings from Posavina, Ozrinići, and Turopolje, they can be derived directly from GEN.SG.M/N *-ā-jego > *-ā-jego > *-ā-go, DAT.SG.M/N *-ū-jemu > *-u-jemu > *-ūmu as they emerge from the proposed scenario (cf. Table 22b).
Deviations from the original patterns of accenting definite adjectives belonging to AP c on the ending or, in the case of Western South Slavic, on the ending or the root depending on the accentual properties of the root vowel, may be explained analogically. The processes involved are often complex and require study of the history of individual adjectives. A discussion is, therefore, beyond the scope of the present paper. With regard to Russian, the reader is referred to Zaliznjak (1985: 310–316); Štokavian, Čakavian, and Kajkavian as well as some Slovene data are discussed by Kapović (2011). I am unaware of an in-depth study of the prosodic development of the definite adjective in West Slavic.

8 Summary and conclusion

In this paper I have shown that the unexpected accentuation of the Slavic definite adjectives belonging to APs b and c can be plausibly explained by considering the relative chronology of the rise of the definite adjective and certain prosodic changes. The syntactic construction that eventually developed into the definite adjective in Slavic and Baltic arose at a time when mobile accentuation had not yet emerged in o- and ā-stem nouns (including adjectives). Attachment of the enclitic definiteness marker inhibited the rise of accentual mobility in the definite adjective. As a result, the accent remained on the original nominal ending. Common Slavic accent shifts (Dybo’s Law, retraction from weak jers) led to an interchange of forms bearing the accent on the original nominal ending and forms bearing the accent on the first syllable of the definiteness marker. Analogical leveling then resulted in the final accentuation attested in East Slavic and Slovincian and is most probably reflected in the short root vowel of definite adjectives belonging to AP c in Czech and Slovak. In Western South Slavic, a further retraction shifted the accent from long vowels with falling tone resulting from contraction onto a preceding long vowel, which acquired neo-acute tone. Analogical leveling then led to a paradigm with columnar accentuation on the root in definite adjectives with a long root vowel. The distribution of columnar accentuation on the root or the ending depending on the length of the root vowel is preserved in Čakavian dialects of Croatian, but has been obscured by analogical processes elsewhere in Western South Slavic.

As regards the definite adjectives belonging to AP b, the crucial point concerns the relative chronology of the rise of the definite adjective and the shortening of word-final long vowels. When the definite adjective arose, word-final vowels had not yet been shortened. Length was, therefore, preserved when
these vowels came to stand in internal position due to the attachment of the definiteness marker. In AP $b$, such internalized nominal endings in Common Slavic received the accent as a result of Dybo’s Law. Endings which contained a non-acute long vowel were then affected by Ivšić’s Law, whereby the accent shifted onto the root syllable, which acquired neo-acute tone. As a result, a paradigm emerged with some forms accented on the root and others accented on the syllable following the root. Analogical leveling in favor of the former accentuation then led to the columnar neo-acute accentuation on the root typical for definite adjectives belonging to AP $b$.

The main advantage of the proposed scenario is that the accentuation of definite adjectives belonging to APs $b$ and $c$ can be explained solely by assuming accent laws which have been established based on data other than the definite adjective. No additional rules or concepts such as Vasil’ev-Dolobko’s Law or accentual valencies are needed. Moreover, in its explanation of the accentuation of the definite adjectives belonging to AP $b$, it does not depend on the assumption of contraction, which is problematic from the perspective of East Slavic. Finally, the above proposal allows for a straightforward explanation of the distribution of definite adjectives with columnar accentuation on the root and those with columnar accentuation of the ending in Čakavian largely by regular sound change. The analogical processes required are all typical cases of paradigmatic leveling.

From a broader perspective, the proposed scenario may lend further credibility to the assumption that Slavic and Baltic $o$- and $ā$-stems inflecting according to AP $c$ continue Proto-Indo-European paradigms with columnar accentuation on the ending. Starting from such a reconstruction allows us to derive the accentuation of definite adjectives belonging to AP $c$ by means of generally accepted accentual laws followed by trivial paradigmatic leveling. To account for the difference in the accentuation of short- and long-form adjectives in AP $c$, I have adopted ideas of Olander and Andersen. However, it should be noted that the hypothesis that the definite adjective, or rather the construction ultimately developing into the definite adjective, arose at a time when $o$- and $ā$-stem nouns of AP $c$ were still oxytone, could in principle be integrated into other explanatory models as well. As a case study, the present proposal illustrates the importance of considering prosodic domains when examining the accentuation of word forms resulting from univerbation processes. To account for complex phonological patterns, it is sometimes necessary to consider not only the relative chronology of individual phonological changes, but also the relative chronology of changes in morphology and syntax.
Abbreviations

Languages:
B/C/S  Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian
CSl  Common Slavic
Cz  Czech
Čak  Čakavian
MoRu  Modern Russian
OCS  Old Church Slavonic
OESl  Old East Slavic
ORu  Old Russian
PIE  Proto-Indo-European
Ru  Russian
Sln  Slovene
Štk  Štokavian

Grammar:
ACC  accusative
Adj  adjective
AP  accent paradigm
DAT  dative
DEF  definite
DU  dual
F  feminine
GEN  genitive
INDEF  indefinite
INF  infinitive
INS  instrumental
LF  long form
LOC  locative
M  masculine
N  neuter
NOM  nominative
PL  plural
PRS  present
SG  singular
SF  short form
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