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LIST OF SYMBOLS

Throughout this dissertation, examples from Slavic languages will be cited in two ways. For those languages employing Cyrillic alphabets, the standard AATSEEL transliteration system will be used, and this for the reader's convenience is given on page vi. It will be noted that there is one minor change; the raised comma ' not the apostrophe transliterates the so-called soft sign. For those languages employing Latin alphabets, the examples will be cited in the standard orthography of that language.

In the case of both Slovene and Serbo-Croatian, this dissertation will also observe the standard practice in scholarly works of adding stress, length and intonation diacritics. These are also well known and established by tradition but again the sake of convenience are given below.

For Serbo-Croatian these are the following:
- short falling intonation
- long falling intonation
- short rising intonation
- long rising intonation, reflex of neo-acute in Štokavian
- reflex of neo-acute in other dialects
- nonstressed length

For Slovene there are the following:
- long falling intonation
- long rising intonation
- short falling intonation
ø narrow e as opposed to the open e without a diacritic
ø narrow o as opposed to the open o without a diacritic

In addition to these traditional conventions, the following symbols will also be used.

^ old falling or circumflex intonation of Proto-Slavic
" old rising or acute intonation of Proto-Slavic
' new rising or neo-acute intonation of late Proto-Slavic
' position of stress without reference to intonation in both reconstructed and attested forms
\ palatalized segment
ð reflex of neo-acute in Russian dialects having various phonetic realization and any raised o in reconstructions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cyrillic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ааа</td>
<td>Ййй й</td>
<td>Ххх х</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ббб</td>
<td>Јјј Ј</td>
<td>Ццс с</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ввв</td>
<td>Ккк К</td>
<td>Ччч ч</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ггг (U, BR)</td>
<td>Кк'к'</td>
<td>Цц дц (SC, M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ггг, ггг (U, BR)</td>
<td>Ллл l</td>
<td>Щщ щ ŠŠ š (B, OCS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ггг, ггг (U)</td>
<td>Ллл л (SC, M)</td>
<td>Щщ щ ŠŠ š (B, OCS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ддд</td>
<td>Ммм m</td>
<td>Ёё &quot;', е (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ёёд (SC)</td>
<td>Ннн n</td>
<td>Ыы у</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Еее</td>
<td>Ннъ нъ нъ (SC, M)</td>
<td>Ёё Ё</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Еёё</td>
<td>Ооо o</td>
<td>Её Её</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ее (U)</td>
<td>Ппр р</td>
<td>Э э э э</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ее (SC)</td>
<td>Прр r</td>
<td>Ю ю ju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Жж</td>
<td>Ссс s</td>
<td>Я я ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Зз</td>
<td>Ттт t</td>
<td>А а q (OCS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Сс</td>
<td>Ддз (M, CS)</td>
<td>Є Є Є (SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Іиі, і, й (U)</td>
<td>Уу у</td>
<td>Є є Є (OCS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ііі</td>
<td>Уу в (BR)</td>
<td>Є є Є (OCS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Іїйй (U)</td>
<td>Фф f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B - Bulgarian
BR - Belorussian
SC - Serbo-Croatian
OCS - Old Church Slavonic
M - Macedonian
R - Russian
U - Ukrainian
INTRODUCTION

Anyone who during his academic career has taken even an introductory course in Slavic linguistics has encountered the phenomenon of ikavism. This term as traditionally applied in Ukrainian covers two distinct historical processes: ė > ũ and o, e > ũ in a syllable newly closed by the loss of a weak jer. The first of these (that is, the development of ė) is an unconditioned change operating without exception; it is noncontroversial and will, therefore, concern us only incidentally in this dissertation. The other facet of Ukrainian ikavism, is generally presented as a manifestation of compensatory lengthening. The loss of the jer caused the vowel of the preceding to lengthen, and this lengthened o or e after passing through several intermediate (diphthongs) stages finally resulted in ũ. If the instructor and/or textbook is somewhat more thorough than the average, mention will also be made of the fact that the new o, e resulting from strong jers are not subject to this form of ikavism nor are the anaptyctic vowels in the pleophonic reflexes of the tort-formula in East Slavic. The matter is then dropped leaving the impression that there is nothing more to be said about such a straightforward phonetic process, and that the problem is completely solved.

When presented in this manner, there is no reason why one should be dissatisfied with this explanation. Compensatory lengthening is a well known phenomenon in historical linguistics. It is no stranger to Slavic, and it seems to explain the data. Besides, the theory seems to
be universally accepted. None of the standard handbooks published in the Soviet Ukraine raise any doubts, nor do they offer any alternative explanations, and outside of the Soviet Ukraine very few Slavicists take much interest in Ukrainian historical phonology. Therefore, the problem never receives a proper airing, and it thus escapes the attention of those competent to tackle it. If a similarly fascinating problem existed in Russian, it would attract the attention of the great and small alike, and many new suggestions, insights, theories, etc., would come to light. It is only from such a pooling of resources that progress toward a solution can be made, but this type of scholarly discussion on the problem of Ukrainian ikavism has never evolved.

My own acquaintance with this phenomenon began almost twenty years ago when as a rural school teacher in largely Ukrainian speaking areas of Western Canada I began studying Ukrainian as a foreign language. The \( o, e > i \) alternation proved to be a constant source of frustration because none of the textbooks could present an adequate set of rules explaining precisely where the process operated and where it did not. Moreover, all attempts on my part to formulate some sort of rules produced results no more satisfactory than those encountered in the textbooks.

Later when I became more proficient in the language, I began teaching it to others both within the provincial school system and as a graduate teaching assistant at the university level. Here again the same problem arose, for my students although of Ukrainian extraction no longer controlled the language as their mother tongue but had to approach it as a foreign one. They too had difficulty with the \( o, e > i \) alternation especially its application or the lack thereof in the
genitive plural of feminine and neuter nouns. However, by this time I had acquire enough experience with the language to convince myself that simply a closed syllable was not sufficient to trigger this alternation. It required, in addition, an accent shift onto the vowel undergoing alternation.

By this time I had also made my acquaintance with historical Slavic grammar and with the usual compensatory lengthening explanation for ikavism. However, this standard textbook explanation and related attempts to explain away the exceptions simply did not correspond with practical classroom experience. There remained the sneaking suspicion that something was missing or that some vital part of the story had been overlooked. On the other hand, there was nothing in my early experience with comparative Slavic linguistics that allowed me to make any connection between stress shifts and change in vowel quality and/or quantity. This, of course, is because accentology is one of the most neglected phases of Slavic studies and also one of the most difficult for a beginner to pursue on his own. The student, however earnest and eager he may be, will search the libraries in vain for Slavic Accentology Made Easy or some such similar title, for no such handbook as yet exists. In fact, it might be argued that no such textbook could exist. This is not to say that accentology is so fantastically complicated that only a select few can ever possibly comprehend its mysteries. It may be nearer to the truth to say that one requires more time and stamina than intellect to become acquainted with the broad range of data necessary for perceiving accentological relationships.

Whatever the relative merits of stamina versus intellect, certain
facts remain. Our universities give the student little or no preparation in handling the complexities of this field should he wish to pursue it on his own. To make matters worse, accentology is so neglected in the programs of most Slavic Departments and also in the standard handbooks that the student is barely aware of the existence of such a field. Therefore, problems in historical and comparative Slavic linguistics requiring accentological solutions will inevitably be undertaken by unqualified people, that is to say, by people unaware that the answer to their particular problem may well lie in this area.

So it was with me. The standard compensatory lengthening explanation failed to satisfy, but there was nothing to put in its place. My own attempts at a more precise definition in phonetic or phonological terms also failed to satisfy. It was only later after acquiring some experience in comparative Slavic linguistics and after a completely separate interest had led me to study historical accentology did I become convinced that the $o, e > i$ shift in Ukrainian is in large part if not in toto an accentological problem. Nevertheless, because of the factors just described, this was a conclusion reached only after many false starts or, as it were, after years of wandering in the linguistic wilderness. I intend, therefore, to present in this dissertation the data and interpretation thereof on which I based this conclusion in the hope that others will be not only convinced but also stimulated to make use of these findings for continued research into this most fascinating topic.

The first step in this investigation will, of necessity, be a critical examination of the two theories thus far proposed which attempts
to explain ikavism on a purely phonological basis. This includes, of course, the oft referred to and generally accepted compensatory lengthening theory which will be discussed first and in considerable detail. After this, the less known and neglected anticipatory assimilation theory of O. Kurylo will be investigated. Throughout these discussions, reference will often be made to neo-acute and other accentological phenomena in order to demonstrate how this approach explains the data where the theories under discussion cannot. These points will then be summarized and expanded upon in chapter three, and this will be followed by an investigation of those areas where an accentological solution seems weak or unacceptable. Finally the entire argumentation will be restated in outline form in "Summary and Conclusions."
CHAPTER I

THE COMPENSATORY LENGTHENING THEORY

As any elementary handbook of comparative Slavic linguistics will inform us, Ukrainian is characterized by the feature of compensatory lengthening whereby $e, o > i$ in syllables newly closed by the loss of a weak jeř. This explanation, which has become traditional in all historical grammars of Ukrainian, is always put forward in the following stages:

1) The loss of a weak jeř is compensated by the lengthening of etymological $e, o$ in the preceding syllable: $e, o > ě, ő \rightarrow ĺ, ź$.

2) The lengthened vowel then diphthongizes: ě, ź $> ĵe, źo$.

3) These diphthongs are retained under stress in all northern Ukrainian dialects but revert to $e, o$ in unstressed position. These diphthongs monophthongize in the southern dialects regardless of stress: $ie, uo > i$.

4) Although $i$ is the most commonly encountered result of this so-called compensatory lengthening, others are attested: $ie, uo > ě, ź, u, y$.

In spite of the general acceptance of this explanation there exist several insurmountable difficulties which make the theory, at least, very doubtful if not untenable. Each of these difficulties will be discussed below.

1. The Problem of Chronology
The major difficulty here centres around the fact the new e, o originating from strong jers do not participate in the process of ikavism but only the etymological of late Proto-Slavic. In order to explain this we are forced to assume that the processes involved took place in the following chronological order:

1) the loss of weak jers: stol₃ > stol, st₁₃ > st₁;
2) lengthening of e, o: stol > stól, st₁ > st₁₁;
3) vocalization of strong jers: stól, st₁₁ > son.

It is obvious that there cannot be any great time lag between stages one and two. They are merely two facets of the same process since the loss of the final vowel is compensated by the lengthening of the vowel in the preceding syllable. The only alternative explanation is that all original e, o were lengthening (or diphthongized) in closed syllables independent of any compensatory mechanism. However, if we assume this, we are by definition abandoning the compensatory lengthening theory, and we are automatically also separating stages one from two by some considerable time and thus bringing it closer in time to stage three. And here the vicious circle closes, for stages two and three must have been separated by some considerable time lag because examples of the new e, o < ž, ž being engulfed by the ikavism process are few and insignificant. Here are included such forms as br'ivka, diminutives of brov'a < *brov₃ 'eye brow'; beskr'ivja, nedokr'ivja 'lack of blood, anemia' containing the root *kr₃ 'blood'. The latter two also occur with the expected o < ž, that is, beskr'ovja, nedokr'ovja and the adjective beskr'ovnyj is attested exclusively with o. Mention should also be made of instances like z'ibješ < *zvješ, pid'ijdješ <
\[*\text{pod\textbar}j\textbar\text{de}\textbar*c\] or \text{nadi\textbar}br\textbar'aty} < \text{*nadi\textbar}br\textbar\text{wati}. However, the paragogic \text{i} in these and all other prefixed verbs of a similar structure is a morphophonemic development (Andersen, 1969) not a phonetic one.

No matter how we juggle stage two in its chronological relationships to either stage one or three, we are in any event forced to assume some considerable time lag between stages one and three, and for this there is no documentary evidence. In fact, the documents indicate rather that the loss of weak jers and the vocalization of strong jers are more or less simultaneous processes. Yet the inescapable fact remains that original \text{e}, \text{o} in a closed syllable were already somehow altered before the new \text{e}, \text{o} also in a closed syllable came into existence. Otherwise we cannot explain the fact that the new \text{e}, \text{o} do not share the same fate as original \text{e}, \text{o}.

This chronological difficulty is recognized by Filin (1972:221-222) and before him by Trubetzkoy (1925:299) both of whom opt for the only possible way out of the impasse—by assuming the lengthening of original \text{e}, \text{o} before the fall of the jers. On Filin (1972:351) offers the following explanation:

There remains the supposition that before the fall of the reduced vowels in weak position, they were shortened (but not to zero) in various dialects but not in any identical or uniform way. In the south this shortening appeared to be more sharply felt so that it created conditions for some degree of lengthening of \text{o} and \text{e} before the weak \text{b} and \text{b}.

It is interesting that Filin has actually described a phenomenon more commonly known as the rise of the neo-acute. It is generally recognized that one of the earliest manifestations leading to the loss of the jers was the loss by these vowels of the ability to bear stress (G. Shevelov, 1965:443-44). This corresponds precisely to Filin's
initial shortening, and the lengthening of e, o before the weakened ě, ě is much more easily explained in terms of a stress shift; and, thus, by definition we are dealing with neo-acute, a well established phenomenon in historical Slavic linguistics.

2. The Problem of the Missing Diphthongs

Although not essential to the compensatory lengthening theory itself, the supporters of this theory have always considered the stressed diphthongs present in northern Ukrainian to be an archaic phase of the ikavism process present in the southern dialects. That is, the new į of these dialects originated from diphthongs as did the unstress e, o in closed syllables in the northern dialects (stages 3 and 4 of the traditional explanation).

To be completely convincing the supporters of this point of view would have to find some evidence proving the existence of diphthongs in the south. This, however, has never been done. No investigator, no dialectologist has ever discovered any trace of any sort of diphthong resulting from Proto-Slavic e, o in any of the southern dialects of Ukrainian. This is indeed strange where one considers that the dialects characterized by ikavism cover an area stretching from the foothills of the Carpathians almost over to the Caucasus. It is hard to believe that no village, no remote settlement, no isolated valley would preserve at least some traces of diphthongs in isolated lexical items. The same situation applies regarding the documentary evidence from this region. Nowhere do we find a spelling indicating the presence of diphthongs in those dialects. The northern dialects cover a much smaller area, but again we encounter a similar puzzle. Nowhere do we find evidence that
diphthongs ever existed in unstressed syllable. No such segments were discovered by such knowledgeable investigators as M. Lekomceva, and S. Tolstaja (1968) or T. Nazarova (1968) in their research on the vocalic systems of these dialects.

Given these data, it is certainly just as logical to conclude that ikavism of the south and the diphthongs of the north are not phases of one historical phonological process but are two independent phenomena. This possibility is entirely ignored by most contemporary historical grammarians both Russian and Ukrainian. In fact, even such outstanding scholars as V.V. Ivanov (1964:180-81) do not even seem to recognize the difficulties involved in connecting these two features. It is an indication of Filin's independent approach that he at least attempts to rescue the old theory by bringing in some fresh evidence. He claims to have found this evidence in the form of diphthongs in the southern dialects (1972:175,223) and unstressed diphthongs in the northern dialects (p. 227). For the first set of data he cites two articles by P. Prystupa (1961, 1962) and for the second an article by A. Svašenko (1965), but a careful reading of these articles leaves one unconvinced.

In the first place Prystupa undertook to investigate the reflexes of stressed ŋ (1961) and stressed o in newly closed syllables (1962) not only in southern dialects but in all western dialects—both south and north (that is, west of approximately the 28° of longitude). Regarding the reflexes of ŋ, diphthongs (eight variants) are indeed attested but in the northeast corner of the investigated region—precisely where they are expected. Prystupa himself recognizes none of the other reflexes as diphthongs, for all of these occur with a jot on-glide only after labials. These are best explained, as does Prystupa
himself (1961:146-48) by the general Ukrainian tendency to dispalatalize labials, thus *pêt' > *p'ät' > pyat'. Again in Prystupa's second article (1962:139) we read, "On the investigated territory diphthongs are attested north of a line Rovno-Novohrad-Volyn's'kyj." And this is well within the boundaries of the northern dialects.

Regarding Svašenko's article, several points must be stressed. First of all, the author investigated the phonetic peculiarities of the municipal records of Krolevec' from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. However, the city of Krolevec' even at the present time is just barely within the northern dialectal region, being almost on the very dividing line between the northern and southern dialects. Furthermore, it is situated in an area subject to large scale population shifts since ca. the sixteenth century, Krolevec' itself having originated only in the seventeenth century. It is, therefore, impossible to consider documents originating from this region as representative of either dialectal area, and the data therefrom are not reliable for reaching any conclusions regarding the dialectal history of either northern or southern Ukrainian. Even if one were to disregard all these reservations, the material presented by Svašenko would in no way justify Filin's statement (1972:226-27) to the effect that the Krolevec' municipal records indicate the existence of diphthongs in unstressed closed syllables. Svašenko himself (p. 171) states,

In unstressed position in the document e, o in a closed syllable are retained throughout . . . . The prefix and preposition pôd¹ constitute the only exception which in unstressed position has the monophthong u.

¹That is, for the standard Ukrainian pid < *pôdê (Zylko, 1966: 241).
The fact, therefore, still remains that to date no one has succeeded in discovering any diphthongs or even remnants thereof in the southern dialects in either stressed or unstressed position nor has anyone succeeded in finding any diphthongs or remnants thereof in unstressed position in the northern dialects. This constitutes fairly strong proof that ikavism and diphthongization of ė, ơ in newly closed syllables are independent processes and the latter is not an archaic stage of the former.

Supporters of the traditional explanation would answer that there is ample evidence for their point of view in the fact that we are at present witnessing the loss of diphthongs in favor of ikavism (T. Nazarova, 1972:22), but this phenomenon is attested only on the southern and western fringes of the northern dialects, that is, where the northern dialects are subject to southern influence. The spread of ikavism then proves nothing more than that a southern feature is moving gradually northward and not that the entire south was once characterized by diphthongal reflexes for ė and ē, ơ in newly closed syllables.

3. The Problem of the Transitional Stage

If one is to compare a Proto-Slavic form like *neslъ with the modern Ukrainian nіs, the mechanics of the change seem rather straightforward. The loss of Ь produces a lengthening of the preceding vowel, and this lengthened (and possibly tenser) ē raises to ĩ. All of these steps are perfectly logical and consistent with well attested phonetic facts, but the documentary evidence makes a shambles of this very plausible scheme. Throughout the medieval period we encounter the spellings nіось or nіосль (Medvedjev, 1962:173). The only conclusion is
that such spellings must have represented a high front rounded vowel of the ü-type which is still preserved in various Transcarpathian dialects (Pan'kevyč, 1938:51,96), for we have no evidence of this vowel (from e in a newly closed syllable) merging with Proto-Slavic C'u.

A similar problem exists with the development of *konъ > kin’ for which we find the spelling кунь. Yet this vowel must have been phonetically different from the Proto-Slavic ŋ, ŋ for which the same grapheme was used, for there are only two clear examples of this latter ŋ being caught up in the o > i process. These are *doprava > dubrava and dibrava and *kamę́хъ > kamę́x and kamę́x. Obviously the vowel in such forms as кунь represented not ŋ but an ü-type vowel. We are thus faced with the fact the o in a newly closed syllable underwent raising and fronting, and e in newly closed syllables underwent raising and rounding, but in the latter instance this rounding takes place only if b is the lost vowel. If b is the lost vowel we have no evidence of rounding, thus, for *kamenъ > kamin’ we find the newly lengthened e written with jat’—called in historical Ukrainian phonology the new jat’.

Even if we accept compensatory lengthening as one of the factors in the e, o > i change, we are also forced to seek some other conditioning factor(s) to explain the rounding of e and the fronting of o. It is not enough to say that in forms of the type *konъ, o is fronted due to the influence of the following palatalized consonant. It is phonetically quite true that all palatalized or palatal segments will produce some sort of fronting coloration in a preceding vowel, but only in the case of o in newly closed syllables do we get an actual front vowel. In words like okun’ or xrun’ we get [oku̯n’] and [xru̯n’] not
i or ü. On the other hand, what explains the development of *stɔlβ, *kotβ > stil, kit where we have no palatalized consonant to produce the fronting?

In a similar vein, what mechanism explains the rounding of e in forms of the type *nesli? It cannot be solely attributed to the following nonpalatalized consonant on the grounds that all such segments in Proto-Slavic were strongly velarized (Zuravlev, 1961). If this velarization were truly that pronounced we would expect to see its effect in the rounding of other front vowels in Proto-Ukrainian, and for this there is no evidence at all.

If the fronting of o and rounding of e cannot be explained in terms of the nature of the following consonant, then there is no other alternative but to explain these processes in terms of the following vowel. That is, in syllables of the type oC the fronting of o cannot be explained as due to the palatalized nature of the following consonant. The only way out of this impasse is to assume that the lost β, a high front vowel, somehow caused the fronting of o. Similarly in syllables of the type eC, since the consonant itself cannot be the conditioning factor, the only possible alternative is to assume that the lost β, a high back rounded vowel, is the factor causing the rounding of e. If this is true, the β, Ϝ could only have exerted this influence before they were lost. This, in turn, means that the e, o > i process began before the loss of the jers, and by definition is no longer a compensatory lengthening phenomenon.

Obviously the explanation presented above does not fully explain the rounding and fronting of e, o respectively. It does not, for example, explain the fronting of o in syllables of the type oCβ (*stɔlβ >
still) which obviously could not be caused by ɐ, nor does it throw any light on such problems as the absence of any change in forms like *nametъ > namet. Obviously other factors (to be discussed below) are involved, but the fact remains that the phonetic nature of ɐ, ɐ did play some role in the ɐ, ɐ > ɨ change and this pushes the initial stages of the whole process back in time to a point before the loss of the jers.

Before leaving this discussion, let us take a look at the situation in the northern dialects. Here syllables of the type ɨCbane oCbane result in diphthongs both with and without traces of fronting: *kotъ > kɨot, kɨet, kɨit or *kɔnъ > kɨon’, kɨen’, kɨin’ (T. Nazarova, 1968:96; F. Zylko, 1966:141,151,167-68). In the Volhynian area (western fringe) of the northern dialects we find also the monophthong ɨu: konъ > kɨn’, stolъ > stɨl (F. Zylko, 1966:167). From syllables of the type eCbane, ëCbane, ěCbane we find diphthongs of the ie-type without any trace of rounding, but from eCbane result diphthongs at least one element of which will be rounded: *neselъ > nɬ’iis’, nɬ’iiəs’, nɬ’iiəs, nɬ’iys (F. Zylko, 1966:151). The rounding of the front vowel here is again explainable only in terms of some labializing influence of ɐ, and this indicates that there must be some historic connection between the monophthongs of the south and the diphthong of the north. However, it does not prove that all the south at one time had diphthongs. It does rather seem to indicate that at some point in the history of late Proto-Slavic before the loss of jers in the southern regions of East Slavic, e in syllables of the type eCbane underwent some degree of rounding and developed to ɨ > ɨ in the south but diphthongized in the north.

Notice that the diphthongs resulting from eCbane are different from those resulting from either oCbane or oCbane. In the latter two instances
all the attested reflexes begin with a labial on-glide and this is what one would expect from a rounded vowel. The nonrounded element of these diphthongs can be best explained by a process of dissimilation. In the case of eCь, the presence of the rounded on-glide is definitely unexpected and not explainable as a dissimilatory process, for the diphthongs resulting from eCь, əCь, ɔCь show no such tendency. In fact, the tendency is in the opposite direction. In the Kozelec' region of Northern Ukrainian we find n'ies < *neslь in the younger generation but n'ь̆osь in the older generation (Nazarova, 1972:20).

4. The Palatalizing New ĭ

The difficulty here centres around the fact that the new ĭ < e palatalize a preceding consonant in all dialects of Ukrainian but not new ĭ < o, thus *neslь > n'is but *noeь > nis. F. Žylko states (1966: 180, 208, 244) that the nonpalatalizing new ĭ < o is characteristic for the entire southwest with the exception of the Bojko dialect but in the southeastern dialects ĭ < o for the most part palatalizes a preceding consonant.

The practice of distinguishing the two types of new ĭ, the non-palatalizing ĭ < o and the palatalizing ĭ < e, ĭ was the orthographic norm for Western Ukrainian (Galician) since it was first introduced by E. Železivs'kyj and S. Nedil's'kyj, Malorosko-nimečkyj slovar, L'viv, 1886 and continued in use until the late twenties of this century when it was abandoned only as a concession for the sake of uniformity with the Eastern Ukrainian practice. Nevertheless, the nonpalatalizing

---

1That is, the double dotted ĭ < ĭ and eCь, ə, but ĭ < o.
pronunciation of \( i < o \) was and is still wide spread in the southeastern dialects. In A. Kryms'kyj's grammar of Ukrainian of 1907, one of the first such published by a native speaker of the eastern dialects after the lifting of the prohibition against Ukrainian books in the Russian Empire, the author asserts (pp. 30-31) that "consonants followed by \( i \) are pronounced as soft Russian \( i' \)" but then he cites certain exceptions, all of which are with new \( i < o \). However, Kryms'kyj was opposed to marking this orthographically on the grounds that it creates certain difficulties (M. Nakonečnyj, 1962:153). One can only conclude that the nonpalatalized pronunciation of consonants before \( i < o \) was not universally observed by Eastern Ukrainian speakers in the early years of this century. The latest academic grammar (I. Bilodid, 1969:379-380, 395) still permits both the palatalized and nonpalatalized pronunciation as an orthoepic norm for standard literary Ukrainian.

There is, however, no such vacillation regarding the new \( i < e \), for in all dialects only a palatalizing \( i \) is attested. This is indeed strange, for in all other instances Proto-Slavic \( e \) is nonpalatalizing in Ukrainian. One usual explanation for this anomaly is that the so-called new jat' in forms like \( kamēn' < *kamēn' \) or \( pēδ < *pēδ\) shared the same fate as original jat' because both of them were presumably diphthongs (Bezpalko et al, 1962:152-53). Thus, the new jat' (like the original jat') gained the power to palatalize a preceding consonant.

The difficulty here lies in two unfounded assumptions: Firstly, we do not know the precise phonetic nature of Proto-Slavic \( ζ \) in the southern regions of East Slavic at approximately the same time as the loss of the jers, nor do we have any way of demonstrating the \( ζ \) was even realized as a diphthong. Secondly, it has already been demonstrated
above that we have no concrete reasons for believing that \( e \) in newly closed syllables ever passed through a diphthongal stage.

All we know for certain about \( \ddot{e} \) in the above mentioned regions is that it must have been a high front palatalizing vowel, for in all the southern Ukrainian dialects it develops into a palatalizing \( \dddot{i} \). Therefore, the assumption that \( \ddot{e} \) was realized as \( \dddot{i}e \) is fairly logical, but here again we run into another difficulty. As is well known, Proto-Slavic /i/ lost (or never fully developed) its power to palatalize a preceding consonant in all southern Ukrainian dialects. Given this fact, how do we then explain that a diphthong, the initial element of which is \( \dddot{i} \) still continues to palatalize? Nevertheless, if we are to explain the palatalizing nature of new \( i < e \) by its merger with \( \ddot{e} \), we are still engaged in a circular argument by maintaining that \( e \) in newly closed syllables was somehow phonetically altered causing it to merge with \( \ddot{e} \) and then along with the latter gained the power to palatalize. It is just as logical to argue that one of the phonetic similarities causing the merger of old and new jat’ is that both of them already had the power to palatalize.

Still we have come to grips with only half of the problem. How does one explain the palatalizing \( i < e \) in syllables of the type \( eC\ddot{e} \) where we do not get an immediate merger with original jat’? As indicated above, \( e \) in this environment undergoes rounding, but the preceding consonant is still invariably palatalized. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the long term process \( e > \dddot{i} \) began at a time when Proto-Slavic \( e \) still palatalized all preceding consonants in those dialects of East Slavic later to become Ukrainian. This brings then us face to face with the most interesting and, at the same time, vexing problem in
Ukrainian historical phonology—the loss by Proto-Slavic i, e of the power to palatalize a preceding consonant. This, in turn, is closely connected with the chronology of two other important features of Ukrainian historical phonology: (1) the _OVERFLOW_ and (2) the merger of i and y.

A full discussion of these problems would fill several volumes, but here we are interested only in discovering some solid grounds for placing the 'i > i, 'e > e either before or after the loss of the jers. If before, then it will be different to maintain that e > 'i is by its origin a compensatory lengthening process since the new palatalizing i can only be explained by assuming that it originated from a palatalizing e.

One argument for the antiquity of 'i, 'e > i, e are forms like ꢕt'ë < ꢕit'ëje in the western dialects of Ukrainian. It is argued that 'e > e must have preceded the loss of the weak jers; for if this rule had come into being after this, we would find the form *k'ëte, which is nowhere attested. The counter argument to this is that at the time of 'e > e, the above cited form would have been ꢕit'ëje not ꢕit'ë. Therefore, the sequence C'e was preserved. This is quite possible but not demonstrable. Furthermore, it assumes that at the time of 'e > e there existed in the language two grades of "softness" t'e < *te and t'je < *t'ëje. The phonetic distinction between t'e and t'je would be minimal at best, and it is difficult to imagine that if both types of syllables were in existence at the same time as the rule 'e > e was in operation that we would not in at least some few instances find examples of confusion whereby t'je would be caught up by the general rule applying to t'e.
Another counter argument in that the \( t' \) in the nominative singular was reintroduced from the other case forms such as the genitive (*žita) or dative (*žitju) singular where we have no grounds to expect dispalatalization. This is again possible but not very probable. The \( 'e > e \) process also dispalatalized the final consonant in the nominative singular of all soft declension neuters (former \( j^{b} \)-stems), thus, *šświadc \( e > ser(d)e \), *pol \( e > pole \), and there has been no reintroduction of palatalization in the nominative singular of this declension. Therefore, the argument just stated regarding the possible confusion of \( t' e \) and \( t'je \) is strengthened. It is all the more difficult to imagine that no forms ending in \( t'je \) would be caught up in a process which was dispalatalizing the final stem consonant of all soft declension neuter. These deverbal nouns in Western Ukrainian (all ending in \( -t'e, n'e \)) unfortunately do not constitute conclusive proof that the rule \( 'e > e \) preceded the loss of the jers, but they do point in that direction and will always constitute a very serious stumbling block for those arguing that dispalatalization is later development.

More difficult for the supporters of the antiquity of Ukrainian dispalatalization is the fact that weak front jer before its loss was definitely a palatalizing vowel but the new \( e < b \) is not. This, therefore, indicates the following line of development: *d\( \bar{b}n \) > *d\( p\bar{b}n \) > *d\( 'bn \) > *d\( 'en \) > *den'. Given forms like *mid > *měd, it is indeed difficult to argue that the \( d \) in *d\( \bar{b}n \) was never palatalized. Why then did it dispalatalized after \( b > e \)? One very plausible answer is simply that at the time of \( b > e \), a soft consonant plus \( e \) was already an unknown (or intolerable) sequence. That is to say, we have no concrete evidence that the \( d \) of *desjat > *desqat was ever pronounced palatalized.
whereas forms like *den' vs. *mëd' make it obvious that the d of *den' must have been. Why would it lose its palatalization if *d'e were a perfectly normal sequence in the language? In this correction two other points must be stressed. Firstly, the developments P.I.E. *i > e > e are merely stages in the lowering of a vowel from a highly palatalizing position to a less palatalizing one. Secondly, the earliest documents from the East Slavic regions indicate that the e > o shift was already in operation, that is, at least by the eleventh century (Filin, 1972:202) or somewhat earlier (Shevelov, 1965:427). This is approximately a century before the loss and/or vocalization of jers. Yet when the new e < e entered the system, it was subject to the same rule as applied to original e, thus, *brmältb > *brëmyj > *brëmyj proving that, at least, in this instance the new e < e underwent the same process as applied to the etymological e a century earlier. Could not the same be said of forms like *den' whereby the new e merely conformed to an existing pattern?

Reference to the e > o shift opens up a whole series of problems, the basic dilemma of which can best be illustrated by the form Žestro. Here we are forced to assume the palatalizing influence of the second e to explain why we get Žestro not Žostero, and then we must assume the nonpalatalizing nature of this same e to explain why we get Žestro not Žest'oro. Since this is then a problem fraught with many pitfalls, let us proceed from the known to the unknown.

It is now a well established principle in Slavic historical linguistics that until approximately the middle of the ninth century A.D. (Shevelov, 1965:385-86,422) Proto-Slavic possessed no mid-vowels— at least on the phonemic level and very possibly also on the phonetic level.
This vowel system was the one carried with them by those Slavic speakers who migrated northward toward the Gulf of Finland and Lake Ladoga (V. Kiparsky, 1963:75-84). Since the processes \( \tilde{a} > a \), \( \tilde{o} \) and \( \tilde{e} > \tilde{a} \), \( e \) that is, the shift from quantity to quality affected all of Slavic, it must have preceded \( e > o \) which affected under varying conditions only the northeastern corner of the Slavic world. It is also logical to assume that the latter process followed shortly after the former since it represents in a sense the adjustment of the vocalic system to new members. This places \( e > o \), at least, in its initial stages in approximately the tenth century, and this is born out by the earliest documentary evidence from the eleventh century. Furthermore, it took place at a time when the East Slavs were scattered over an area from Lake Ladoga to the Black Sea. One would expect, therefore, considerable dialectal variation, and this is precisely what we find (Filin, 1972:201-202).

Shevelov (1965:425-27) is quite likely correct in his reconstruction of various stages of \( e > o \) in East Slavic whereby the earliest (mid-ninth to mid-tenth century) independent of stress is \( e > o \) / \( \tilde{a} \), \( \tilde{o} \), \( \tilde{e} \), \( j \) — \( \tilde{a} \), all other manifestations of this process being younger. This, \( o \) of \( \ddot{u}l\ddot{u}d \) < \( \ddot{s}\ddot{e}\ddot{e} \) is older than \( o \) in \( n'os \) < \( \ddot{ne}s\ddot{e}d \), and obviously the youngest of all is encountered in forms like \( d'\ddot{o}\ddot{e}\ddot{e}v \) < \( 'de\ddot{e}\ddot{e}v \). Thus, however, is not really relevant for the history of Ukrainian. Whether the \( o < e \) of \( \ddot{u}l\ddot{u}d \) and \( n'os \) arose simultaneously in northern East Slavic or whether the latter is a century (or a century and a half) younger is not really important for Ukrainian. The important thing is that Ukrainian has \( \ddot{u}l\ddot{u}d \) but not \( n'os \), nor has it \( o < \tilde{e} < b \). Why should this be so? Surely there is no other answer possible than the one
suggested by R. Jakobson (1929:66), and this is simply that at the time of \( e > o \), the only palatalized (or palatal) segments in those dialects later to become Ukrainian were \( ȳ, ɨ, ɨ, ɨ, j \). As a matter of fact, Jakobson saw the \( e > o \) and \( 'e > e \) as simultaneous but competing processes in which the latter usually but not always won the day thus providing an explanation for those few exceptions in existence. Nevertheless, the fact remains that in Ukrainian \( e > o \) is operative only after \( ź, ɨ, ɨ, ɨ, j \), and this is explainable only by assuming that at that time \( e \) either did not fully palatalize or did not palatalize at all any other consonants in the system. This applies equally to whether we consider \( *\acute{z}elqdb > \acute{z}olud' \) and \( *nslb > n'os \) as simultaneous processes or as separated by a century. In the first instance it would mean that \( n \) was not palatalized at the time of \( e > o \). In the second it means that \( n \) failed to develop into a palatalized segment thus depriving the \( e > o \) rule of any further ground for expansion. Again if the two types of \( e > o \) just referred to are indeed separated by some considerable time span, and this is the majority opinion among Slavicists, it makes the Ukrainian developments less strange or perplexing for it would prove that in the mid-ninth and tenth centuries no region of East Slavic had fully palatalized consonants before Proto-Slavic \( e \). However, as regards the Ukrainian regions, Jakobson's suggestion is still the only one feasible, but Filin (1972: 200) dismisses this solution as "highly improbable . . . for the pronunciation \( p\acute{e}nycja, \acute{e}nytysja \), etc., shows that the change \( e > o \) after hushing consonants took place before the hardening of consonants before \( e \) and \( i \)."

Thus, once again we are in the familiar vicious circle. The
difficulty here lies in the fact that similar processes have been lumped together under one heading, and in this way develops the impression that they are historically simultaneous. Thus, it is true that Ukrainian is characterized by a feature whereby Proto-Slavic ʼi, ʼe no longer palatalize a preceding consonant, and this is obviously part of one and the same structural tendency in the development of the language, but this does not mean that ʼi > i and ʼe > e took place simultaneously. In fact, from the point of view of articulatory phonetics, it is much more logical to assume that any tendency to curtail palatalization in a language would begin with ʼe, the lower vowel and then proceed to ʼi. This seems to have been the situation in Proto-Ukrainian. How then does this answer the objections raised by Filin? The fact is that we do not need to assume a palatalizing ʼe to explain the nonoperation of the ʼe > o change. There are no unambiguous examples of this; the few examples that do exist can all be explained in other ways. This is not true of ʼi where the examples are a bit too numerous to be explained by analogy, etc., and here we have the additional consideration of forms like mid’ < *měďь where ь was obviously a palatalizing vowel and this lower (and probably less tense) vowel than ʼi.

Regarding ambiguous examples with ʼe, let us examine a few concrete instances. This discussion was initiated by citing the dilemma of the form běstero, but here we are dealing with two competing forms of the collective numeral morpheme {or} and {er}. Old Church Slavic shows the former, thus, bětorь, setorь, desetorь, whereas Serbo-Croatian has both bětoro, pětoro, šestoro, or bětvero, pěteoro, šestero as opposed to bětorь, pětorь, šestorь of Slovene where only {er} is used. In the North we have Czech patero as opposed to pātoro of Slovak. In modern
Polish the form is osworo < *sątvrno as opposed to the medieval catwór < *sątverb. Thus, is the ą of piąciorno due to the sound laws of Polish (*pętero > pięcioro) or is it due to the ą in the root (pętę > pięć) to which is suffixed {or}? Similarly in Upper Lusatian, the ą < t' of pięćory indicates that we are dealing with an original {er} but the non-palatalized m of sedmory indicates an original {or}. Thus, the Ukrainian șestero is an unreliable example not only for these reasons but also because for large areas of the Ukraine, ą never appears in any form of the root for the numeral six even where it would be expected according to the sound laws of Ukrainian. The standard literary ș'ostyj < *șestwij is limited to the eastern dialects.

Ukrainian has also many tort-formula forms such as ș'erevo, șered'a, or șeresl'o in which the e (instead of ą) of the first syllable seems to prove the palatalizing nature of the ą in the second. In the first place, not enough is known about the nature of the anaptyctic vowels in the pleophonic groups (Shevelov, 1965:410-12) to base any conclusions upon. In the second place, Filin (1972:315-18) has shown that r' < nj in southern East Slavic was losing or has lost its palatalization as early as the eleventh century. Therefore, whatever the phonetic nature of the anaptyctic vowel in, say, șeresl'o it would not have palatalized the preceding r. But if this is so, why do we not find a form *șoreslo attested at least in some document or dialect? This question in turn brings us face to face with the central fact of the e > ą change in Ukrainian, and that is its sporadic nature (V. Kiparsky, 1963:109). The number of so-called exceptions¹ is too large to be

¹ Included here are such examples as ș'epurno, șes'aty, șek'aty, şep'taty, șemp'aty, ș'erstvo, ș'ebraty, ș'erđka, etc.
explained away in any other way than by assuming that the $e > o$ process was cut short before it had time to envelop the entire lexicon (Filin, 1972:199-200), and this curtailment is understandable only by assuming that $'e > e$ took place prior to or simultaneously with $e > o$.

The $e > o$ change is least consistent in the extreme western fringe of Ukrainian ethnic territory where we still find such forms as věra, žena, šelo, šěka (Pan'kevyč, 1938:105; 1958:71). Not all of these are necessarily Slovakisms since, for example, there is no corresponding Slovak form for šěka from which a model could have been taken. In the southeastern dialects we find such forms as l'on < *l'ěn, s'o'myj < *se(d)měj, s'loa' < *slěza, l'odu < *ledu, kl'on < *klěn all of which are also attested in the western dialects as len, semyj, slyza, ledu and klen. Shevelov (1956) considers most of these forms to be importations from the North—either northern Ukrainian or Belorussian. This is very likely so given the mixed nature of these dialects which are the result of migrations largely in the sixteenth century. If not from the north, they could have only come from some area on the eastern fringe of the western dialects for none of the o-forms are attested in the heartland of these dialects. Whatever the explanation, this merely emphasizes once again the sporadic and nonuniform nature of the $e > o$ change in early Ukrainian.

There is one other bit of evidence tending to indicate that $'e > e$ preceded the loss of jers. There is considerable evidence that the higher vowel $i$ no longer palatalized preceding consonants by as early as the eleventh and twelfth centuries. This supposition is based on documentary evidence that scribes in the southern regions of East Slavic had difficulty in using correctly $i$ and $y$ (Filin, 1972:180-81, 350).
What linguistic facts lie behind this inability to distinguish ĭ and y? Sobolevskij (1907:135) and more recently Bulaxovs'kyj (1956:48-49) have argued that this is merely due to the influence of Bulgarian manuscripts of the tenth century and later, the writers of which were already having trouble in distinguishing ĭ from y. Such a possibility cannot be ruled out, but Filin’s point (1972:181) is well taken when he argues,

... it is, nevertheless, incomprehensible why this influence operated in such a selective manner; it appears in southern East Slavic documents of the tenth and eleventh centuries but in absent in Novgorod and generally in all northern writing of that time.

The confusion of ĭ and y by southern scribes must then reflect some specific feature in the speech of those writers. Filin believes this to be the merger of ĭ and y not only phonemically but also phonetically. He also believes that this merger preceded ĭ > ĭ and was if not its immediate cause then at least a contributing factor.

This may be true if we look at the problem in the following way. As is well known, in Proto-Slavic IE ĭ loses its rounding and becomes either a high central vowel (as in Russian and certain Ukrainian Carpathian dialects) or shifts still further forward to become a high front vowel (as in South Slavic). It is quite possible to imagine that in Proto-Slovene, for example, the presence of both palatalized and nonpalatalized consonants before ĭ (that is, t'î < tî vs. ti < ty) may have given rise to confusion and eventually to a generalization in favour of the form t'î > ti.¹ However, until this last step in taken there is no basis for the orthographic confusion in the use of the

¹This seems to be Filin's (1972:181) argument.
grapheme of ы and у, as evidenced in the documents. Even to the present day no Russian schoolboy has any great difficulty in the use of ы and у, nor for that matter does a Czech schoolboy have any trouble with the correct use of ĭ or y so long as these follow d, t, n. It is when it comes to writing words like липа, syn or пísek that little Janek must rack his young brains. It is only after ĭ no longer palatalizes a preceding consonant that ĭ and y can be confused orthographically. If these processes occur in the reverse order, how are we to explain those Ukrainian dialects (Lemko, and certain Transcarpathian) where ĭ and y have not merged, and ĭ remains a high front but nonpalatalizing vowel.¹

In connection with the same two features Filin mentions (1972: 308–309) that the Lemko dialects still preserve palatalized consonants before Proto-Slavic ĭ. Unfortunately he cites no reference more recent than Saxmatov. It is true that examples of this are indeed attested, but it is by no means clear whether we are dealing with an archaism or with sporadic innovations imported from the surrounding Polish and Slovak.

From Stieber's dialectal atlas of the Lemko regions, I had access to twenty-one maps² dealing with the reflexes of Proto-Slavic ĭ following a dental. Thirteen of these indicate no palatalization of the consonant. One map (Vol. I, map 35) records a s' in the lexeme

---

¹In this regard, see Z. Stieber (1956–64, 1960); I. Pan'kevyč (1938), p. 374. These dialects also possess a palatalizing ĭ < ě.

²Vol. VI was unavailable to me, but the index lists only one map (252) that would be instructive in this problem. The maps consulted were: 23, 35, 52, 53, 54, 103, 108, 109, 110, 176, 180, 186, 197, 198, 200, 203, 205, 220, 230, 314, 370.
kos'isko 'scythe handle'; for the same concept all other points recorded various forms of kis'ca, which is the more commonly encountered form in Ukrainian, whereas kos'isko is the usual Polish form. The other seven maps indicate scattered instances of palatalized n before Proto-Slavic i. In three such instances this palatalization was recorded only in one village (not the same village for the three lexemes). One of the three lexemes (Vol. II, map 52) Stieber records as praln'ik < *pral'nik in one village. Yet in the same village Stieber also records dinik < *dojn'ik without apparent trace of palatalized n. In four neighboring settlements Stieber noted a palatalized n in the latter lexeme but in free variation with a nonpalatalized n. On the other hand, three of these same settlements indicate only a nonpalatalized n for the former lexeme; the fourth settlement is unfortunately not recorded as regards this lexeme. For the Proto-Slavic *kolnica Stieber records (map 23) a palatalized n in five villages, but in all of these the form is klan'ici or klani'ci where we see clearly the Slovak reflex of tol't not the Ukrainian. But if Slovak and/or Polish influence is the explanation for n', how are we to explain c'? How are we to explain the presence of klani'ci in seventeen locations in the north central Lemko region?

The other two lexemes containing n' are *brnica and *branica--the former in four villages; the latter in five. These are both from the same area as is klani(c')i, that is, immediately west of the river Medzilaborce. Aside from this general area, these three lexemes all turn

1 Similarly there are fourteen locations mainly in the northwest where the form klanic'i is attested.
up with \( n' \) in various scattered locations at the extreme western edge of Lemko territory—in villages immediately contiguous to Polish or Slovak.

This is certainly not the type of data enabling one to speak of any preservation of the archaic palatalizing \( i \) in Lemkovan. On the other hand, certain very important facts about the Lemko dialects are made abundantly clear from Stieber's atlas. These are (1) Proto-Slavic \( y \) remains as a high central vowel. (2) There is no merger of \( y \) and \( i \) as in the vast majority of Ukrainian dialects. (3) Proto-Slavic \( i \) occurs in two main variants: either as a high front vowel or as a somewhat lowered and/or backed front vowel as in standard Ukrainian (for which we shall use the symbol \( \hat{i} \)). The former is more common in the west; the latter is more common toward the east of the region. (4) With the exception of these few instances discussed above, the reflexes of \( i \) are a nonpalatalizing vowel. (5) The reflex of \( \hat{y} \) is a palatalizing vowel—in the vast majority of cases 'i. Thus, out of all 21 maps consulted, I was able to glean only 22 examples of Proto-Slavic \( i \) palatalizing a preceding consonant. All but one concerned \( n' \), and even here \( å \) were in free variation with a nonpalatalized variant, and 15 examples occur in the commonly encountered -mica of feminine nouns. On the other hand, the same maps provided 240 examples of a nonpalatalizing high front vowel from Proto-Slavic \( i \). This feature cannot possibly have its origin in one of the surrounding Slavic dialects. It is obviously an archaisms and one of considerable significance in helping us to reconstruct the following relative chronology of \( i, y, \hat{i} \):

1) 'i > i. Proto Slavic i loses (or never fully develops) its power to palatalize a preceding consonant.

2) This, in turn, means that a nonpalatalizing high front vowel
will of necessity be articulated somewhat lower and/or backed than 'i--that is, moving in the direction of ě. The degree of this lowering differs markedly from region to region. Again the evidence of the Lemko dialects is very interesting, for here we find numerous instances where i and ě are in free variation (for example, Vol, VII, map 314).

3) At this point in time ě, whatever its pronunciation, was the highest palatalizing front vowel, therefore, ě > 'i.

4) i, y > ě, that is, a merger of the two high nonback non-palatalizing vowels.

The Lemko dialects as well as many other Transcarpathian dialects experienced only the first three of these processes.

Thus, the confusion of i and y in tenth and eleventh century documents is actually stage two of this process which had to be preceded by stage one. It is difficult to conceive that the dispalatalization processes of Ukrainian began with 'i > i if at the same time the lower vowel e still palatalized, and there is considerable evidence to indicate that both of these processes were at least well under way if not completed before the loss and/or vocalization of jers.

Finally after many necessary deviations we return to the question posed at the beginning of this section. Why is new i < e inevitably a palatalizing vowel? As shown, the argument that after lengthening, e was raised (and possibly tensed), and merged with ě to share its further development as a palatalizing vowel is a feasible explanation but circular (pp. 17-18). Even if true, it would explain only the eCb type of syllable but not eCb where we get no new jat’ but rounding of the e. At least, therefore, for these latter cases, we are forced to assume that
the process $e > 'i$ must have began at a time when $e$ still palatalized a preceding consonant, and this was apparently before the loss of the jers. How then can we use compensatory lengthening to explain the $e > 'i$ process if it began before the syllable was closed and there was as yet no loss of jer to compensate for?

In another place it was argued that the rounding of $e$ in $eC\beta$ is explainable only in terms of some sort of labializing influence of $\beta$ before its loss. However, one other explanation is possible. It is interesting to speculate that at some time when $e$ no longer palatalized, an $e$ followed in the next syllable by a weak jer was for some reason altered and eventually raised—possibly by a stress shift. This raised $e$ thus became a palatalizing vowel and was, therefore, subject to '$e > o$ rule. This would be very difficult to prove, but it offers the only alternative explanation to the rounding of $e$ in $eC\beta$ syllables. But here again we are dealing with a process which predates the loss of jers, and thus ruling out compensatory lengthening as a viable explanation.

5. The Nature and Number of the Exceptions

One of the most serious difficulties faced by the supporters of the compensatory lengthening theory is the vast number of exceptions that must be somehow explained away. This becomes very apparent if we examine a few statistics regarding the occurrence or absence of the $o$, $e > i$ change in these four morphological categories in which it is most frequently encountered. These are (1) the nominative singular of masculine nouns, (2) the nominative singular of feminine nouns ending in a consonant, (3) the genitive plural of feminine and neuter nouns, and (4) the masculine singular past tense of verbs.
All the examples were selected from V. Nin'ovs'kyj, *Ukrainian Reverse Dictionary*, 1969, and were restricted to the following: (1) roots containing either Proto-Slavic ē or ā and whose Slavic pedigree are well established. This excludes all words of foreign origin except for some borrowings from Germanic or Greek into Common Slavic; (2) to avoid problems of derivational morphological and needless repetition, prefixed forms are excluded, thus, only *xid < *xod* but not *yxid, xid, perexid*, etc.; (3) an exception to the above is made for those instances when a root does not occur in an unprefixed form. Then one prefixed form is selected thus, *donos* represents {nos} 'carry'. This, at least, allows for a very representative if not exhaustive sampling to work with.

For the first two categories 410 examples were selected, out of which 229 or 56% exhibited the ē, ā > ĭ alternation. This means that nearly half or 44% are presumably "exceptions to the rule." For the genitive plural 183 feminine and 29 neuter nouns were assembled. Out of this 212 total, only 51 or 24% exhibited the ē, ā > ĭ alternation. The so-called exceptions to the rule outnumber the examples by a majority of approximately three to one, and none of these can be explained if we adhere solely to the compensatory lengthening theory. The picture is no clearer when we examine the final category, namely, the masculine singular past tense of verbs with either ē or ā in the root or as stem formant suffix. There are only thirteen verbs of the type *nest'y* or *plest'y* containing ē, and all of them exhibit the ē > ĭ alternation. There are ten verbs containing ā--five of the type *rost'y, moht'y* and five of the type *bor'oty, pol'oty*. All these of the first group take the ā > ĭ change, but none of the second group do. Obviously, if the loss of weak jers ever did produce compensatory lengthening in Ukrainian,
it was a process greatly restricted in its operation and restricted by
factors which remains completely undefined.

It has long been known that one such restricted area for the
operation of e, o > i is with e and o resulting from the pleophony of
the tort-formula words. That is, the second e or o in b'ereh, 3'erep,
x'olod or s'orom are not subject to the same process as are Proto-Slavic
e or o. Thus, if we exclude all these forms from the list of examples,
for, say, the nominative singular of masculine and feminine nouns ending
in a consonant, we may cut 57 examples from the original list of 410.
This means that out of a new total of 353, we still have only 229 forms
exhibiting the e, o > i alternation. That is to say, the rule applies
in approximately two thirds of all instances, and this still leaves an
exception rate much too high to make the compensatory theory much more
credible than it was before. However, exclusion of the tort-formula
forms contributes nothing to our understanding of ikavism in Ukrainian;
it merely compounds the mystery. Why should these forms be exempt?

There are basically only two ways out of this dilemma
(Bulaxovs'kyj, 1956:56-58), and these are (1) at the time of the loss of
weak jers the second vowel in the pleophonic forms was somehow different
from original Proto-Slavic e or o and, therefore, did not undergo the
same processes as these latter, (2) the initial stages of the e, o > i
change had already taken place before the appearance of any anaptyptic
vowel in the pleophonic forms.

The first solution is offered by those who believe that ikavism
in Ukrainian is basically a compensatory lengthening phenomenon and can
have its origins no earlier than the fall of the jers. Therefore, it is
necessary for those scholars to explain why we have in modern Ukrainian
*vās < *vozi but *mor'os < *moroz. Their answer is that the second o in *moroz was not like the o of *vozi but was somehow phonetically or to use Bulakovsky's term "physiologically" different. We have already discussed above and at some length all the difficulties which militate against accepting the fall of the jers as the sole origin of ikavism, and these considerations alone make the above offered solution highly unlikely. However, the real difficulty here lies in defining the nature of this second vowel which was so different as to be exempted from the process affecting an original e or o. What could this mysterious vowel have been? Shevelov (1965:408-12) is very likely correct in assuming first of all the insertion of a schwa-type anaptyptic vowel between the final consonants of tort and then the assimilation of this vowel to the vowel of the first syllable as another manifestation toward vowel harmony within a word (Shevelov, 1965:360-62), thus, *tort, *tert > *torot, *teret > torot, teret. ¹ Presumably then the tort-formula words were in the second stage of development when the weak jers were lost, and thus the second vowel was not affected as were etymological e or o. If, however, these anaptyptic vowels were so different as not to be affected by processes affecting original e and o, why did East Slavic scribes consistently write moroz, soroz, perek, etc., and this even a century before the loss of the jers? Whenever they did depart from the norms of Old Church Slavic, they used only the graphemes o or e in the pleophonic forms and no other vowel. Surely, if the vowel had been so different, we would expect to

¹In the same place Shevelov also cites some evidence that this anaptyptic vowel was occasionally identified with y but this occurs only in North Russian and Belorussian and, therefore, not applicable to Ukrainian.
find numerous examples of variant spellings such as *morəbь, *morəsь, *moruəbь, *moruəsь or *berəbь, *beriəbь, etc. But this is not the case; it is not attested in the documents nor is there any evidence for such confusion in the contemporary dialects. On the contrary, the orthographic evidence from the earliest documents indicates clearly that the development of the tort-formula had already reached the third and final stage by the middle of the eleventh century. However, these spellings may well conceal phonetic or phonological facts which the Cyrillic script could not reflect. The explanation may be that the new vowels in the pleophonic forms were allophones of e and o, hence, the consistent spellings with e and o but reflexes differing phonetically from those for Proto-Slavic e and o. Then the question arises how are the phonetic environments for these allophones to be defined. There could hardly be any rule other than the following: [o] → [o^s] / e [l] — C. But surely we had identical environments in such forms as boroda < *borda and poroda < *poroda; morəbь < *morəbь and poroštь < *poroštь; polozь < *položь and položiti < *položiti, or polova < *pełva and polovymа < *polovyna. If it be argued that the rule may not have operated across morpheme boundaries because such phenomena are well known in linguistics, it is easily demonstrated that the tort-formula itself operated across morpheme boundary, for example, *mel + *ti > moloty. The theory of allophonic differences, therefore, falls away unless perhaps the second pleophonic vowels are an allophone not of e, o but of some other phonemes phonetically close enough to the former to explain the spellings torot, teret, tolot. The only segments fitting this description are /b/ and /β/. Therefore, we can postulate the following rules: /b/ → [b^s] / e [l] — C; b → [b] / e [l] — C. But again examples like vivtorok <
*ṽtoruk < morok vs. mat'irmij < materenj vs. deren <
dern prove that such proposed segments are not in complementary dis-
tribution and can, therefore, not be considered allophones of either
e, o or ṽ, ṽ. Thus, to explain the different reflexes of *moltə >
molotb > molot as against *kotb > kit, it is necessary to accept one
of three possibilities as follows:

1. (a) *kotb > *kōtb. o is altered for reasons not as yet
defined
(b) *moltb > *molotb. new o results from pleophony
(c) *kōtb > *kōt. loss of weak jers
   *molotb > molot.
(d) *kōt > kit.

2. (a) *moltb > *molətəb. a new phoneme develops from pleophony
(b) *kotb > *kōt. o lengthens as a result of loss of ṽ
   *molətəb > *molət. o̞ is not affected by loss of ṽ
(c) *molət > molot. o̞ and o merge
(d) *kōt > kit.

3. (a) *moltb > *m'olotb. pleophony provides a new source of o
   *storn' (gen. plur.) > *storon'b
(b) *kotb > *kōtb > *kōt. stress shifts alter the preceding
   vowel
   *storon'b > storónb > storōn
   *m'olotb > *m'olotb. no change in stress
(c) loss of jers
(d) final development of ə, ə > i

One thing, at least, is certain, and this is firmly established
by the documents; the development of tort preceded the loss of jers.
There is no way that this order could be reversed. Therefore, if we
accept either No. 1 or 3, we must accept the proposition that the e,
o > i alternation began before the loss of jers and is, therefore, not a
compensatory lengthening phenomenon, and all the argumentation presented
in the preceding sections has also tended to prove precisely that. If we accept solution No. 2, we must accept the existence of two hither to unknown phonemes for which there is not a scrap of documentary evidence. These phonemes would presumably have come into existence in approximately the eighth to mid-ninth centuries (Filin, 1962:247,252) and remained in existence until some time after the loss of the jers when they merged with e or o. This means that for the southern dialects of East Slavic we have approximately a century and a half (mid-eleventh to the end of the twelfth) of documentation, and nowhere did the scribes ever attempt to indicate these phonemes. It is difficult to reach any other conclusion than that the consistent spellings torot, teret, tolot, represented both the phonetic and phonological facts of the language. Solution No. 2 also forces us to accept the loss of jers as the major if not the sole factor triggering the e, o > i process, and this as shown in previous sections is a very difficult position to maintain.

However, No. 1 also has its drawbacks. The main weakness is the lack of motivation for phase (a). One would have to presume the operation of the following rule: o, e > o, e / — C [b], but there is really no phonetic justification for such a rule. One would also like to know why it did not operate in the tort-formula forms. That is, why do we not get tortь > törtь? If we make the further stipulation that the rule operated only across one consonant, this merely compounds the unnaturalness of the process. Nevertheless, "unnatural" rules are not an unknown quantity in linguistics, and the possibility of such a rule cannot be excluded. However, if such a rule did ever exist, it had to operate before phase (b), the pleophony or metathesis of the tort-formula; this means at some time before the ninth century when each new
linguistic process in Slavic still operated over wide areas. The tort-formula itself has only three reflexes; one would expect an earlier process to be in evidence over an area much more extensive than those few dialects later to become Western Ukrainian. Solution No. 3 avoids this difficulty by explaining the early beginnings of ikavism in terms of a process well known and attested in late Common Slavic, namely, neo-acute whereby stress shifts from a reduced vowel onto a preceding vowel which is subsequently lengthened. The existence of neo-acute phenomena in East Slavic is well documented and acknowledged by all scholars working in the field of accentology and/or East Slavic. Its presence in Ukrainian was argued by Bulaxovs'kyj as long ago as 1936. He was attempting to explain the so-called exceptions to the same phenomenon that interests us right now regarding the second vowel of pleophonic forms. Therefore, before proceeding with our discussion of solution No. 3, we must briefly examine these exceptions.

It must be emphasized that some tort-formula forms do indeed exhibit the \( e, o > i \) change. Out of 61 examples of tort-formula nouns in the nominative singular of both the masculine and feminine consonantal declension, there are three examples of this change: \(*bereg\) > ber'ih, \(*smorod\) > sm'or'id, and \(*porog\) > por'ih. Of these, only the last two are accepted in the standard language. For the first example, the more commonly known b'ereh is the literary norm. Interesting here is the stress in this form. Speakers who use bereh stress the first syllable, and this is what one would expect since comparative evidence (e.g., Scr. brēg and Cz. břeh with a short vowel) indicate that we are dealing here with an original circumflex intonation. However, speakers who use berih inevitably stress the second syllable. A similar situation
exists with *smordid; the normative reference all indicate the stress as being on the first syllable, and again this coincides with comparative evidence (Scr. *smrod; Cz. smrad), but for many speakers especially of western Ukrainian dialects the stress is either on the *i in the nominative singular or *smorid as against *smorodu in the genitive singular. This is simply another small indication that the *e, *o > *i change is more closely connected with stress than it is with loss of the jers. Nevertheless, this form is often explained as being due to Polish influence. As we have seen, the *o > *i was not instantaneous but throughout the medieval period the documents consistently spells this sound with the grapheme u. It, therefore, in all likelihood represented a sound very similar acoustically to the Polish long o. Thus, Polish *smrod influenced the Ukrainian *smorod. But why should the influence be restricted to this word? Why did Polish chtod, gtod, or wróg not influence xołod, hołod and voroh? If there is an explanation at all, it is surely to be found in the propensity of people to quickly and eagerly adapt words of a profane, vulgar or even midly naughty nature from foreign languages. ¹ Therefore, Polish influence on *smorid cannot be ruled out altogether especially since smrid is also attested dialectally. The form por’ih "threshold, doorstep", is usually explained as due to the influence of riḥ < *rog since this latter has in Ukrainian the additional meaning of "corner, intersection, something with angular edges". This is then a feasible explanation; at present, it is also the only one.

From the assembled material there are 35 tort-formula feminine

¹Compare the use of osort in Polish instead of the indigenous czart, and every Ukrainian speaker knows psia krew whether he speaks Polish or not.
and neuter nouns which take the zero ending in the genitive plural. Out of these, 11 exhibit the e, o > i alternation; the rest do not. How then are genitive plural forms like vor'ona > vor'on vs. storon'a > stor'ın to be explained? It was precisely to this problem that Bulaxovs'kyj addressed himself in his 1936 article, and he is to be commended for his insight and ability to demonstrate that the o > i alternation here is a neo-acute phenomenon. He extended this to include the masculine singular, past tense of such verbs as stereht'y > ster'ih vs. mol'oty > mol'ov where the same relationship is observed. But why should this neo-acute in Ukrainian be limited to tort-formula forms? Would not any jer with final stress transfer this stress to the preceding vowel? This would effect equally all the former oxytones like *kot'b > *kót'b in the nominative and accusative singular as well as the former marginally mobile stressed nouns like *storon'b > *storón'b in the genitive plural. The relationship between the genitive plural of storon'a > stor'ın vs. vor'ona > vor'on is the same as between borod'a > bor'id vs. pryh'oda > pryh'od. Vor'ona and pryh'oda both have fixed stress on the second syllable and never did have a stressed jer in the genitive plural. Similarly, forms like m'olot show no o > i alternation not because they are a tort-formula word but because it never experienced a stress shift from the final jer. This same absence of stress shift would apply to all masculine nouns of the circumflex type as *mōlt'b > *m'olot'b, *gōleb > g'olos'b > h'olos, etc., as well as to the acute type of all genders, e.g., *mor'az'b > mor'oz'b, *vōma > vor'on'a, *bol'ito > bol'oto. The only instances where any stress shift could occur would have been in the genitive plural of those nouns belonging to the marginally mobile stress pattern, and this is precisely where we do find e, o > i in tort-formula forms, the
only exceptions being the three masculines (ber'ih, sm'or'id, por'ih) discussed above. Presumably the neo-acute should have existed in the genitive plural of any marginally mobile stressed noun regardless of gender so long as the case ending was a stressed ę or ę. In masculine nouns, of course, this has been erased because of the extension of {ovь} from the ũ-stems. However, the Russian v'olos (nom. sing.), v'olosy (nom. plur.), vol'os (gen. plur.), volos'am, etc., is obviously a remnant of this type of stress pattern. Thus, at a very early date in Proto-Ukrainian a pattern was established whereby in the vast majority of instances tort-formula forms did not participate in any alternation of the second e or o not because those latter were in some way or other distinct from any other e or o in the system but because they were not affected by fairly well known stress shifts in late Common Slavic.

Now we must return to our discussion of the three solutions proposed above. Regarding No. 1, may it not now be argued that the process in phase (a) is itself neo-acute and not some unknown, unmotivated and geographically very restricted process as stated above? This will not work, however, and precisely because of genitive plural forms like stor'in, bor'id, etc. If the stress shifts giving rise to neo-acute occurred before pleophony, than we would have to assume the following: *storn'ב > *stornь, from which we would expect *stóron or *storón. The actual form can be derived by from *storon'ь > *stornь > stor'in. Solution No. 3, therefore, not only explains why tort-formula forms seem to be exceptions but also explains those instances where ikavism does in fact appear in these forms and this all in terms of neo-acute processes which coincide chronologically with all the previously presented argumentation to the effect that ikavism had its beginnings
before the loss of the jers.

In addition to the tort-formula forms, there is another group of forms which supposedly constitute a general exception to the process of ikavism. These are all syllables of the structure $eC\bar{b}$; that is, there is no $e > i$ if the vowel in the next syllable was $b$, for example, *perpelb > p'erepel, *klenb > klen, *nametb > nam'et, *medb > med and mid (dial.), *popelb > p'opel (dial.) and p'opil, etc. It is strange that ikavism would not operate here if it were really the result of compensatory lengthening, but the supporters of this theory are then forced to postulate a series of exceptions to this general exception. These are (1) the masculine singular past tense of verbs of the type *neslб > nis (2) diminutives of the type *tetuka > titka and (3) genitive plurals *selb > sil. Bulaxovs'kyj (1956:52-55) suggests that the first set of exceptions may be a "specific phenomenon brought about by the dropping of the final sonorant l"; for No. 2 he suggests "neo-acute intonation" and for No. 3 "accentual peculiarities of the genitive plural". Before commenting on these problems, let us look at a few statistics.

As mentioned elsewhere, for purposes of this section a certain number of examples were chosen to obtain a representative sampling of forms. The largest group of examples were those having the zero-ending in the nominative singular (masculine and feminine consonantal declension). There were 410 examples in this set, and one is immediately struck by the relatively small number of instances where we find $e$ in the final syllable—only 142 examples or 35% of the total. In the feminine nouns the percentage is even lower—43 out of a total 183 or 24%. Why this should be so is difficult to say; it may be mere coincidence, but it could be connected with the inherited Indo-European
feature of ablaut whereby the o-grade is more commonly encountered in
the nominal forms of the root. In any event, it means that there is a
smaller field for $e > i$ to operate in and, therefore, fewer possibilities
for establishing definite patterns or models for discovering the truth
of the matter. Thus, out of the 142 examples, there are only 11 formally
of the structure $eC\bar{v}$ which take the $e > i$ alternation as against 45
which do not. What's more, among these 45 there are only three which do
not have fixed stress and three more which can occur with either fixed
or mobile stress. Here, for example, are forms like $^*nam\bar{t}b > nam'et$
in which the stress was apparently always on the $e$, and there never was
any stress retraction $\bar{v}$.

When, however, we turn to the remaining examples, that is, to
those forms originating from $eC\bar{b}$, the picture is not quite so clear.
Here there are 85 examples; 46 take the $e > i$ alternation; 40 do not.
In the latter instance, it is doubtful whether these 40 have any real
value or evidence, for 30 of them contain the deverbal suffix {tel'}
with is usual explained away as being of Old Church Slavic origin in
Ukrainian. This is almost certainly the case with such examples as
spasytel', xrestytel' or xranytel', but the same suffix is attested
elsewhere in northern Slavic as in Polish wierzyiciel, przyjaciiel,
nauczyciel, etc., or in Slovak kazatel', učitel', vychovatel'. Whatever
their origin, all such words in Ukrainian have either fixed stress
as in ljub'ytel' or a mobile type whereby $e$ is never stressed as in
uč'ytel' (nom. sing.), uč'ytel'ja (gen. sing.), etc., but učytel'i (nom.
plur.), učytel'iv (gen. plur.). The remaining ten members of this
group also have fixed stress.

Now let us look at the other set of 46 examples in which $e > i$
does occur. Of these only 16 have a stress pattern allowing one to
postulate a stress retraction from a weak jer, thus, dźemil', dźemelj'a <
dźemel'b, *dźemel'’a. This leaves 30 forms which exhibit e > i but show
no trace of mobile stress in the contemporary language. Twenty of these
contain the formant -enь from the accusative singular of the former
n-stems such as *korenь > *k'orin’, *kamenь > k’amin’ with stress fixed
either on the first or second syllable as in jaśm’in’, jaśm'enu. In
the examples kamin’ and jaśmin’ we recognize immediately two well
attested Proto-Slavic accentual patterns. In k’amin’ we are dealing
with fixed root stress on a former long acute vowel (e.g., Cz. kámen;
S.Cr. kámen); jaśm’in’ apparently belongs to the same stress pattern as
*čtrobа, *k太平ь, *k太平ь, *gotovьs whereby stress is fixed to a short
vowel in the second syllable. But a stress pattern as in kórin’ is
obviously secondary, for we have no evidence that Proto-Slavic ever
possessed forms with stress fixed on an initial short vowel of the root.
It would seem that originally k'orin’ belonged either to the marginally
mobile or the oxytonic stress type and as such there would be occasions
for neo-acute to arise. A similar state of affairs would have existed
with hr’ebin’, r’emin’, kr’eemin’, pr’omin’, etc., where the fixed initial
stress must be secondary, but it was from such forms as these that the
-in’ formant spread to take in all the former n-stems. V.V. Kolesov in
his recent work (1972:167-170) has shown that initial stress is modern
East Slavic languages words of the structure CVCVC (e.g., veńerь, govorь,
sokolь) is in all instances secondary. This line of argument will be
expanded elsewhere.

Before closing this section let us look at another group of so-
called exceptions in the feminine genitive plural of nouns containing
e in the penultimate syllable. There are 43 words in this set of examples—23 which historically had ə in the genitive plural and 20 which had ə. According to the standard explanations we would expect to find e > i in all the first group of 23 since this is lautgesetzlich where ə is the lost vowel. Instead of this we find only one instance of e > i. In the second group we supposedly have two conflicting features in operation. It is again supposedly lautgesetzlich not to have e > i where ə is the lost vowel but the genitive plural is an exception to this rule. Why all these exceptions should be necessary if ikavism is the result of compensatory lengthening is really quite incomprehensible. Nevertheless, in this latter group we find only three examples of e > i. These are ḍerəd'a > ḍer'ıd, serəd'a > ser'ıd (dial., Bulaxovs'kyj, 1936:66) and s'ered (stand.) and ber'esa > ber'ıza (stand.) and ber'ęs (dial., Bulaxovs'kyj, 1936). When, however, we once again apply the criterion of fixed or mobile stress, the picture becomes much clearer. Out of the entire 43, only four have mobile stress: two (ḡered'a, sered'a) take e > i; two (met'a, peлен'a) do not. All the rest have fixed stress of the type kud'el'ja; only one (šm'enja)¹ of these takes e > i. Now at least the exceptions are reduced to tolerable proportions. These would include šm'enja > šmin' and ber'esa > ber'ıza where we have no grounds to postulate a neo-acute, but with the latter the expected reflex ber'ęs is attested. The other exceptions are met'a and peлен'a where final stress should have given rise to neo-acute. It may be simply that since e > i in the genitive plural of feminine nouns

¹This form may well be hors de combat for purposes of our discussion since its etymology is not clear. That is, šm'enja < *šmenъ or *šmenъ (Vasmer, 1950-58).
is a statistical rarity, it has been eliminated in these two forms thus bring them into conformity with the majority. However, another interesting fact emerges; both nouns belonged to the columnal final stress type (Skljarenko, 1969:29; Kolesov, 1972:27), and this may prove relevant in explaining other facts.
CHAPTER II

THE ASSIMILATION THEORY

1. The Origin of the Theory

The only attempts to present this theory to the scholarly world were Olena Kurylo's 1927 article in Ukrainian and a later reworking published in French in Revue des Études Slaves, 1932, where it is said to have attracted the favorable attention of such eminent scholars as Meillet, Mazon and Martel (Serex, 1954:62,76). In spite of this, at present the theory is supported by no Slavist of note except C. Shevelov. It is not that it is rejected, it is not even discussed, mentioned or refuted. This is most unfortunate, for even if it is not accepted in full, it has many interesting facets.

The theory arose as a result of Kurylo's dialectological studies and research into the articulatory peculiarities of each of the two main dialectal regions of Ukrainian, that is, the northern dialects as opposed to the southwestern dialects. Thus, her suggestions or conclusions about ikavism came about almost as a side issue, and this may be another reason why her explanation of this phenomenon attracted so little attention. Much of her work concerned itself with matters far beyond the scope of this work such as the acoustic characteristics of the northern Ukrainian diphthongs,¹ the different nature of dynamic

¹Many of her observations have later proved correct. See V.M. Braxnov (1963).
stress in the northern and southern dialects, and intersyllabic phonetics of the southern dialects. In regard to this latter, she drew attention to the fact that prestressed e and o assimilate to a higher vowel in the stressed syllable. That is, in stoj'aty we have no appreciable qualitative change in the prestressed vowel as opposed to stoj'u + stu\j'u or stoj'it' \rightarrow stu\j'it'. A similar phenomenon exists with e which undergoes raising when followed in the next syllable by i, u or y. These were the facts which led Kurylo to suggest that the same feature may reach back to that period before the loss of the jers. The jers, being vowels higher than e or o, would have exerted the same raising influence on these latter as do i or u in the modern language. Thus, the first steps toward ikavism in *sto\l'b, *kon\b or *nes\l'b would have been a raising of e and o in the direction of i and u respectively but obviously not to the extent that they merged with these latter, for they share different fates. It is, however, immediately evident that we have here a ready explanation for the medieval spellings stu\l'b or kun\b, but Kurylo offered no such supporting arguments for her theory, nor did she ever have the time to do so or to develop the theory further. The early thirties brought Stalin to power in the Soviet Union, and Kurylo fell victim to the subsequent purges.

The precise nature of the charges against her are not known, but her work fell victim of an unfortunate tradition in Slavic linguistics. Since comparative Slavic linguistics arose during the period of romanticism, there was from the very beginning a fascination with antiquities of which the Hanka's forgeries are the most infamous example. In Ukrainian historical linguistics this desire to establish an ancient lineage for one's native language has been translated into a desire to
establish the antiquity of certain specific Ukrainian features, that is, to establish the existence of Ukrainian as a separate linguistic entity of ancient standing in order to buttress claims for political separateness. Whether or not Kurylo ever intended to use her research for such purposes is not known. Nevertheless, her work on both ikavism and the dialectal divisions of Ukrainian fell into an area where one could very easily be accused of bourgeois nationalism. This explains the reluctance to pursue any of her ideas\(^1\) even those much better researched and documented than her explanation of ikavism. Let us then discuss the pro's and con's of this theory.

2. The Weaknesses of the Theory

The major weakness of Kurylo's theory is that we have no proof nor for that matter any way of proving that the anticipatory assimilation phenomena of southwestern dialects are in any way prehistoric in their origin, or that they predate the loss of weak jers. Bezpal’ko (1962:162) cites two examples from the eleventh century of unstressed \(e\) being written as \(i\); all other examples are from the fourteenth century or later—well after the loss of jers. Regarding the writing of unstressed \(o\) as \(u\), Bezpal’ko (1962:164) cites no examples earlier than the fourteenth century. Kuraszkiewicz (1934:77–78) in his investigation of western Ukrainian documents from the fourteenth and fifteenth

\(^1\)Chief among these are her conclusions that the northern and southern dialectal division of Ukrainian is of great antiquity going back to late Common Slavic. Kurylo's contemporary, V. Hancov, also well documented the same view, but these ideas are not discussed apparently because Hancov was tried for his membership in Sojuz Vyzwoleńca Ukrainy. It was only in 1964 in a short article that Zylko took up the same theme without any reference to either Kurylo or Hancov. This is indeed a pity, for no progress can be made in Ukrainian historical dialectology until this problem is fully investigated.
centuries found some examples of this phenomenon, but their relative
rareness led him to believe that the process had not reached its full
development. The process, however, is undeniably old and definitely
attested by the fourteenth century. The two examples from the eleventh
century may, therefore, be significant straws in wind, but they hardly
constitute proof. This particular feature must be proved to have
operated before the loss of weak jers for the assimilatory theory to be
fully convincing. Baring this, we would be forced to contend that these
anticipatory processes were triggered only by ð, ð and not by any of the
other high vowels.

Let it be emphasized that even now the rule raising e and o
operates on the allophonic level, a low level phonetic rule so to speak,
which is not even obligatory in slow speech. If the rule came into
existence before the loss of jers, it operated in a language whose
structure was vastly different from that of the present day. The
syllabic structure has been radically altered; the palatalized non-
palatalized feature in the consonantal system has come into existence;
the stress system has been completely rebuilt due to the loss of
stressibility by the reduced vowels. An intonational system instead of
the present dynamic stress may still have been in operation. The
historically long vowels may still have been phonetically if not phono-
logically long. It is difficult to believe that such a low level
phonetic rule would have survived in tact through so many basic struc-
tural changes. In order to demonstrate that this did actually happen,
one would need to produce fairly substantial documentary evidence, and
this is lacking.
On the other hand, it can be argued that it is precisely this type of low level rule which is reflected most poorly in written form. Besides, the Russian feature of labialization of consonants before back vowels is similarly just such a low level phonetic rule which may very well be Proto-Slavic in origin. Some type of intersyllabic assimilation or harmony is more likely to have arisen in a language with the CVCV type of syllabic structure. When this structure was destroyed by the loss of jers, the rule ceased to be obligatory. What we see now in western Ukrainian may, therefore, be only a remnant of a much more extensive process.

If, however, we do admit the possibility that such a rule did indeed exist prior to the loss of jers, we are still faced with even more difficult problems. Let us take the two examples *snopʰʲ and *koʊ̯ʷaxʰ. We are now asked to assume that the two high back vowels ǔ, u exerted an assimilatory influence on the preceding o causing it to be raised. Why then in the modern language do we get *snopʰʲ > snip but *koʊ̯ʷaxʰ > koʊ̯ʷax? True, the latter form may be phonetically either koʊ̯ʷax or kuʊ̯ʷax depending on the tempo of speech, but the former is always snip. Why should the lower and shorter ǔ have exerted a greater influence than the higher and longer u? A similar relationship exists between *noʊ̯ʰʲ and *voz’itɪ or *nesl’ʲ and *nesl’i. Why would ǔ and ǔ cause an obligatory assimilation or raising but i only an optional one? It makes no sense to argue that the closing of the syllable in snip, nis or nis is the conditioning factor, for any assimilations had to take place before the syllable was closed by the loss of that very vowel which presumably caused the assimilation in the first place. One can
only conclude that whatever differences there may have between the o in *šonop' and that of *kož'uvn must have come into existence before the b was lost. Again we return to the same questions. Why should the shorter reduced vowel have greater assimilatory power than the longer (and presumably tenser) vowel? Why should b and y have greater power to raise a preceding e or o than do the higher i and u? If we are to defend the theory at all, it is necessary to conclude that b and y somehow or other exerted if not a stronger than, at least, a markedly different assimilatory influence than did the other high vowels. But accepting this, amounts to admitting that b and y acted independently. This is, of course, always quite possible, but it means that we are dividing the action of b and y and that of the other high vowels into two separate and distinct processes. This again is possible, but it deprives the theory of its basis in the articulatory facts of the contemporary western Ukrainian dialects, and these facts were the sole justification for Kurylo's advancing the theory in the first place.

Nevertheless, there are no theoretic reasons why b and y could not have exerted some sort of raising or narrowing assimilatory influence on a preceding e or o. The question now arises at what time would this have taken place. Shevelov, who supports Kurylo's theory, suggests (1965:447) that "it was a change whose inception antedated not only the reduction of jers but probably even their rise." One can hardly disagree with the initial phase of this statement. It is indeed difficult to imagine that the jers could exert any assimilatory influence after they had been reduced, that is, lost their power to form a syllabic nucleus. However, the latter part of the statement is far from obvious and for reasons already suggested. Since Proto-Slavic b and y arise from Indo-
European į and ū respectively, it is very questionable whether short į and ū would have caused assimilations which the corresponding long ǘ and ū did not. If then the jers are responsible for any assimilations, the process must have taken place sometimes after the rise of these vowels (ca. the late eighth and early ninth centuries) but before their reduction and subsequent loss (ca. the mid-twelfth century) in the southern regions of East Slavic. This places the supposed processes approximately in the period between the ninth and eleventh centuries.

The preceding considerations now brings us back to exactly the situation described above (pp. 37-39) under the heading of Solution No. 1, and much the same reservations apply. Briefly stated again these are as follows: (1) There is little or no phonetic motivations for this rule. Why are only e and o affected and why only by ƀ of ƀ? (2) These assimilation apparently did not operate with tort-formula form. If the rule was in existence before pleophony, we would except it to have effected the original root vowel, thus, *tortƀ > *tōrtƀ giving some reflex quite different from the one we have. If it operated after pleophony, we would expect it to effect the new e or o, thus, *morzƀ > *morozƀ > *moriz. Nor does the assimilation theory explain why do we actually get o, e > į in certain genitive plurals. (3) If such a rule ever did operate, it had to be in operation at a time before Slavic was deeply divided dialectically. One would, therefore, expect some traces of it in contiguous dialects. It is unusual for that period of Slavic linguistic history to have isoglosses of such a limited range. The reflexes of the tort-formulae were developing at approximately the same time, and these produced only three isoglosses. The only thing reminiscent of the process that we are looking for is a certain weak
tendency toward intersyllabic vowel harmony in Common Slavic (Shevelov, 1965:360-62) manifest in such examples as OCS *dreb* from Latin *discrepit*; OCS *vřed* where other Indo-European cognates indicate ĵ in the first syllable; OCS *dvěri* where cognates indicate and original ū in the first syllable. Within Slavic itself there are examples like Ukrainian, Russian, or Polish *baran* vs. the older Czech *beran*; Russian, Polish, Czech *klopot* vs. Serbo-Croatian *klēpēt*; OCS *t̩a̯n̩k̩j̩b* vs. Russian *tonkij* but Polish *cienki*.

Finally we must return to the so-called exceptions, for which some statistical data have already been given. The assimilation theory is as helpless here as the compensatory lengthening theory. Both of these theories by their very nature teach that every e or o followed in the next syllable by ļ or ļ should undergo phonetic changes leading finally to ĵ. This is simply not the case; neither theory explains why. Both theories are identical in their absoluteness; they differ only as regards the initial cause of ikavism and as regards the time of this initial cause.

We have already discussed the attempts of those supporting the compensatory lengthening theory to explain away the so-called exceptions. There is no such body of data regarding the assimilation theory because, as already explained, it has never been adequately discussed in the literature. Only Kurylo herself (1932:87) mentions that her theory apparently does not operate in the tort-formula forms. She explains this by taking refuse in the now familiar theory that the e and o of pleophononic origin were somehow phonetically different from the e or o of Proto-Slavic origin, and, therefore, not subject to the same rules as the latter. This explanation has also been discussed elsewhere.
3. The Strengths of the Theory

One great advantage of this theory is that it separates the ikavism of the southwestern dialects from the diphthongs of the northern dialects. It is still quite possible that the two phenomena are indeed connected, but the argumentation already presented makes it fairly certain that they are not different stages in the development of compensatory lengthening. Until such time as the northern dialects are more carefully investigated and documented, it is surely more profitable to work toward a theory which explains the data of the much better known southern dialects. Kurylo's theory is, at least, a step in the right direction.

In our discussion of the compensatory lengthening theory, we have constantly run into chronological difficulties. These difficulties in turn have all tended to prove that ikavism had its origin in processes having taken place before the loss of the jers, thus, proving that the loss of jers (i.e., compensatory lengthening) was not the cause of ikavism. There were two main chronological difficulties here, for the theory has no explanation as to (1) why do new e, o < ɛ, ɐ not participate in the ikavism process; (2) why does new i < e always palatalize a preceding consonant whereas Proto-Slavic e never does. The assimilation theory, on the other hand, by setting the origins of ikavism several centuries back avoids all these difficulties.

One of the most intriguing facets of Kurylo's theory is that it offers a possible explanation for the perplexing facts attested in the documents. As explained elsewhere, the scribes used the grapheme ɐ to indicate o in a newly closed syllable, Ĳu to indicate e in a syllable
closed by the loss of ə but ɛ for e in a syllable closed by the loss of ə. Thus, for spellings like kumə, njusə or njusə, we know that u and jə represented sounds which later developed to i but which the scribes chose to write with the same graphemes with which they wrote u and 'u presumably because of phonetic similarity with these latter. There is no other conclusion than that u and jə represented sounds of the type ɨ and ɨ respectively.¹ From this stems another conclusion; the fronting and raising of o in *konə > kûnə is best explain as an assimilatory process by which o is assimilated to the high front ə. Similarly with *nesə > *n'ûsə, e is backed (rounded) and raised by the high back rounded ə. In syllables of the type eCə, there would be no grounds for rounding or backing only for raising, and it is here that we find the spelling əCə. All of this is neatly explainable in terms of the assimilation theory whereas the other theory offers not a word of explanation.

However, the assimilation theory does not explain the developments in syllables of the type oCə. Here we have no way of explaining the fronting of the o, only its raising. Yet in forms of this type we invariably get i as the reflex, thus, *kotə > *kût > kit. This is not necessarily an insurmountable difficulty. Let us assume that initially ə merely raises or narrows the preceding o, for example, *kotə > *kôte > *kôt. Thus, after the loss of the jers, arose two types of vocalic alternation: (1) ə in a closed syllables alternated with o in open syllables in words of the type *kôt vs. kota; (2) ɨ alternated with o in words of the type kûnə vs. konə. Under the influence of this second group, the alternation of the first group was changed from ə vs. o to

¹This is no purely theoretical reconstruction but is actually attested dialectally. See below.
ü vs. o. This shift may have been aided by the fact that ü occurred more frequently than ơ, the latter having only one origin (oCь), the former having two (oCь, eCь). Thus, by allowing for the origins of ikavism at a time before the loss of the jers, the assimilation theory is able to account chronologically and phonetically for both the documentary evidence and the contemporary facts. This applies not only to the majority of southern dialects (including the standard language) where complete ikavism is in evidence but also to various peripheral and, for the most part, archaic dialects of the Western Ukraine where e or o in newly closed syllables of the type eCь, oCь, ь often give reflexes other than i. For example, in the Borżavs'ki dialects of Transcarpathia we find the archaic ü: *sokь > sük, *tetьka > t’üťka; the Maramoros'ki dialects of the same region as well as some Lemko dialects have a reflex which merges with etymological u: *tokь > tuk, *tetьka > t’utka. Note that in these latter, there is no trace of fronting, and this provides some proof for the suggestion offered above regarding two type of vocalic alternation in early Ukrainian, that is, *kőt vs. kota and *kün' vs. kon’a. It would seem that is these dialects the alternation was also simplified but in favour of ơ which later merges with u. These data are well documented by Nazarova (1971, 1972).

4. Final Comments

The considerations presented in the preceding two paragraphs make it very evident that the jers before their disappearance did indeed exert an assimilatory influence on a preceding e and o. There is simply no other means of accounting for the data, but does this prove Kurylo's theory in general? This can hardly be the case, for we still have far
too many exceptions. As mentioned, this includes all the tort-formula forms and masculine nominative singulars of the type *nametъ > nam’et, *zakonъ > zak’on (43% of all the collected examples), and feminine and neuter genitive plurals of the type *ved’er’a > *ved’erъ > ved’er, *požėa > *požėb > pož’ež (76% of all examples). How may one reconcile this high percentage of so-called exceptions with the undeniable truth that the jers did play an assimilatory role? There must be an addition factor involved, and the only one feasible is that of stress.

It is well established in Slavic historical linguistics that prior to their disappearance, weak jers lost their power to form a syllabic nucleus and, therewith, the power to bear stress. The shifts resulting from this fact completely reshaped the stress and intonational system of late Common Slavic. These shifts are particularly noticeable in those instance where the stressed jer was in final position, and we may safely postulate final stress in such forms as *něšlъ, in nominative singular forms like *konъ, *kotъ and genitive plurals like *zorъ (from *zor’), *storonъ (from *storon’a < *storn’a). As these final jers weakened, the stress shifted one syllable back. But it is difficult if not foolish to imagine that these shifts all took place, so to speak, over night. Our knowledge of modern Slavic languages with free and mobile stress demonstrates clearly that even in the normalized standard speech (not to mention the dialects) much vacillation in stress is permitted. Therefore, we may safely assume that for a certain period of time forms like *konъ admitted two possible stresses: (1) the older with stress on the final syllable, or (2) the newer with stress and neo-acute length (and/or intonation) on the ŏ. It is during this period when both stress
forms were in free variation that the jers is most likely to have exerted an influence on the preceding vowel and for anticipatory assimilation to have taken place. Such a solution accounts for the data in a plausible way.
CHAPTER III

THE NEO-ACUTE THEORY

1. The Overall Value of the Theory

In the two preceding chapters discussion of both the compensatory lengthening and the assimilation explanations for the origin of ikavism has often lead us to consider neo-acute phenomena as a reasonable third alternative in explaining the source of ikavism in Ukrainian. Now we must examine this alternative in detail to discover whether it explains more of the data in a more convincing way than do the other two competing theories. Previously all references to the neo-acute have tended to be very positive. That is, they presented only the strengths of the theory not the weaknesses. Therefore, this chapter will deal more specifically with the latter, but before we discuss any weaknesses both real and apparent, let us review briefly all the strengths.

By accepting ikavism in Ukrainian as a reflex of neo-acute, we automatically set the origins of this process back several centuries before the loss and vocalization of the jers. Thereby, we avoid the necessity of explaining why new $\varepsilon$, $\partial < \tilde{\varepsilon}$, $\tilde{\partial}$ are exempt from the workings of ikavism. We also have a plausible explanation for the fact that etymological $\varepsilon$ in Ukrainian does not cause a preceding consonant to be palatalized whereas the new $\tilde{i} < \varepsilon$ is always a palatalizing vowel. As was argued elsewhere, we have considerable grounds for believing that both etymological $\tilde{i}$, $\varepsilon$ lost their palatalizing power prior to the fall
of jers, but the operative word here is "considerable grounds" not "proof". Unfortunately, we may never obtain absolute proof for dating this process in Proto-Ukrainian, but the fact remains that it is preferable to set the beginning of ikavism back in time as fas as is reasonably consistent with our knowledge of the prehistory of Slavic. Neo-acute is consistent with this knowledge, and it allows us to avoid those chronological problems involved in explaining why new ĭ < e is always a palatalizing vowel and why new e, o < u, ù are exempt from ikavism.

By accepting neo-acute as the sole (or major) factor giving rise to ikavism, we remove ikavism from a purely phonetic process and place it in the realm of suprasegmentals. Both of the other two explanations are in essence sound laws, and as such they should not be subject to such a high proportion of exceptions for which the theory provides no logical explanations. For example, the second palatalization of velars in Slavic is attested in all those grammatical categories for which comparative Indo-European evidence allows us to reconstruct the diphthongs oi, ai > ę2 and i2. These are (1) the nominative plural of ō-stem nouns and adjectives, (2) the dative singular of ā-stems, (3) the locative singular of both ō- and ā-stem nouns, (4) the locative plural of ō-stems, (5) the imperative mood. No matter what theory we use to explain ikavism in Ukrainian, all of the proposed explanations postdate the second palatalization. Yet the documents from the southern regions of East Slavic clearly show the second palatalization in all the categories listed above with a regularity that can hardly be attributed solely to scrupulous maintenance of the Old Church Slavic norms whereas any indications of ikavism are unfortunately rare.
Modern Standard Ukrainian (and most of the dialects) retains the second palatalization only in categories (2) and (3), but its disappearance in the other categories can be traced in the documents, and this is usually explainable in terms of some other morphological or phonological process. Thus, for example, in Ukrainian there developed a tendency to replace the nominative plural with the accusative. In this way the second palatalization was eliminated from category (1) not only in medieval Ukrainian but also in all other East Slavic dialects and to a lesser extent in the neighboring West Slavic languages where the same tendency is clearly in evidence. Similarly with category (4), the tendency to eliminate is seen in all of East Slavic, Polish and Slovak. Thus, not only do we possess a ready explanation for those instance where the second palatalization has ceased to operate in Ukrainian, we also possess evidence proving that it once did operate precisely in those environments where the sound laws and comparative historical linguistics would indicate. Even in those instances where the second palatalization has various reflexes as with x, kv, gw, sk + ĺ2, ć2, there is a certain geographic regularity. This is, we know what reflexes to expect in any given region.

Such regularities are strangely absent when we deal with ikavism. This becomes evident if we take a look at a few concrete examples. Such an example is provided by the development of the former n-stems in Ukrainian. Stang (1957:91-93) has shown that this declensional type also occurred with the usual three accentual patterns, as follows: ṭramę is an example of constant root stress (type a), ṭlemę of fixed stem stress (type b) and ṭjweę of mobile stress (type c). Therefore, in the genitive plural we may reconstruct respectively the following forms:
If we accept either the assimilation or the compensatory lengthening theory, we would then expect to find the new i in the final syllable if not in the literary language than at least in some dialects. But this is not what happens: in neuters of the former n-stem we never find i in the genitive plural but only e, thus, ran'en, plem'en, im'en. There is no light shed on the problem by claiming as the supporters of the compensatory lengthening do that syllables of the type eC' are exempt from the process. To admit such a limitation automatically means that we are not dealing with a pure compensatory lengthening process. The same would apply to the supporters of the assimilation theory. There is no logical reason why syllables of this type should not be subject to the general rule. Even if we accept this illogical restriction as some sort of linguistic oddity within the framework of either one of the two above mentioned theories, we must then turn around and explain why in fact the new i < e is found in forms like *nesi' > nis, *tet'ka > t'itka, *le'd > lid. How does either theory handle such contradictory reflexes as the genitive plural of *stremen, that is, *stremen' > strem'en as opposed to that of *re'eto, *re'set' > re's'it or the diminutives of these two *stremen'oe > strem'ioe and *re'set'oe > re's'ite' as opposed to *denn'oe > derevo'e? The traditional view maintains that e > i automatically takes place in syllables of the type eC'. How could one possibly explain such apparent anomalies in terms of a theory which teaches that every etymological e, o is lengthened (or raised) if followed in the next syllable by a weak jēr?

Now let us see if a neo-acute explanation handles the data any more convincingly than the other theories already investigated. If we
take a look at the original three genitive plural examples *r'amenь, *p'lem'enь, *j'nenь we see that neo-acute could arise only in the third form where we have good grounds for assuming a stressed jer with, of course, a later shift of stress onto the preceding vowel. The two remaining forms and all others belonging to these stress patterns will experience no such stress shift. Thus, within one declensional type a conflict arises; one set of nouns has no lengthening of e before the genitive plural ending ь; another set has lengthening. However, even in this latter group for some fairly long period of time the lengthened e will be in free variation with stressed ь. Therefore, the rise of the neo-acute is not a phonetically conditioned process in the same sense as is the reduction of jers in certain well defined environments. This latter is a typical sound law operating throughout with very few exceptions whereas the neo-acute is something entirely different. It represents an adjustment in the prosodic system arising only in those instances where a stressed jer was no longer able to fulfil its former role in the accentual system.

As long, therefore, as scholars attempt to define neo-acute, that is to say, ikavism in Ukrainian in terms of a conventional sound law, they are destined to come up with the same inadequate and inconsistent theories as described above. It is only by studying the Ukrainian development of Proto-Slavic prosodics, in particular the stress patterns, and the interplay between these patterns that some clarity is brought into problem. Thus, in explaining the three genitive plural examples cited above, we have three possible solutions. These are:
1) $e, o > ë, ë / ___ C \wedge_k, \wedge_k$. Such a rule allows for no exceptions in spite of their large number. Besides, in our examples it would automatically mean that every genitive plural had at one time a lengthened final vowel. How then could we possibly explain the reapparance of the nonlengthened $e, o$ in this case form? There would presumably have been no analogical model on which to base such a restructuring.

2) $o > ë / ___ C \wedge_k, \wedge_k$ but $e > ë > / ___ C \wedge_k$. This is the traditional statement, the ground rules, so to speak, for ikavism in Ukrainian. However, we have seen that this is phonetically unmotivated and illogical, but most damaging of all, it is also untrue.

3) $e, o > ë, ë / ___ C 'k, 'k$. This puts ikavism into the realm of prosodic features and, thus, gives it what appears superficially to be a maddeningly capricious nature. In the specific example *
\textit{jiměn}"b, there would be initially a period in which the two forms *
\textit{jiměn}"b and the newer *
\textit{jiměn}b existed side by side. Since, however, they were in free variation, the latter form being in no way obligatory, the fact of the lengthening (and/or change of intonation) is not reflected orthographically. Even after b was reduced to the point that it could no longer be a syllabic nucleus and was finally lost, the neo-acute e was still a rather minor prosodic feature. Its only function was to mark *iměn in the genitive plural as belonging to a specific accentual type, but such a marking was redundant insofar as forms like

---

1 It is immaterial here whether we accept assimilation or compensatory lengthening as the cause of change. The rule simply indicates a phonetic change of $e, o$ when followed by a weak jer.
'imene or 'imeni (gen. sing.) vs. imen'a (nom. plur.) and imen'y (old inst. plur.) clearly marked the accentual type in any event. Under such circumstances, the redundant feature can be easily dropped on the model of the other nouns in the same declensional type which had never possessed the feature in the first place.

A similar state of affairs is seen to exist when we examine more carefully the apparently contradictory diminutives rek'itce, streml'ince vs. derevo'e already mentioned above. In his study of accentuation and word formation in Proto-Slavic, V.A. Dybo (1968a:177-181) has shown that neuter nouns with fixed stem stress (Stang's type b) receive fixed stress and neo-acute intonation and length on the final vowel of the root when the diminutive suffix -e is added. That is, *rek'eto gives *rek'ítce < *rek'étce; and in Ukrainian we have the expected new i < e. On the other hand, neuter nouns of the mobile stress pattern (Stang's type c) receive final stem stress when expanded by the same diminutive suffix. Thus, *derevo gives *dereve'e with no stress shift from a weak jer and no new i in Ukrainian.

Objections may now be raised that even though the third solution handles the data better than the other two possibilities, it is still unacceptable simply because an accentological solution gives one a target so broad that it is impossible to miss. It is true that the prosodics of a language are a much less stable element than the phonology with an almost kaleidoscopic propensity to shift patterns, but all those who have striven for a phonological solution have also felt wide of the mark precisely because the problem is too broad and complicated to be defined by a neat phonological rule.
The next objection is that not all phonological rules are neat and all-encompassing. Is it not possible that ikavism in Ukrainian is something like the so-called third palatalization whose hit-and-miss nature has bedeviled Slavists ever since Baudouin de Courtenay first drew our attention to the phenomenon in 1894? However, as both Shevelov (1965:345) and Ježowa (1968) have demonstrated the third palatalization has its geographic home in the southwest corner of South Slavic where it operates with a very high degree of regularity. Transferred to the Ukrainian context, it means that we would have to find a dialectal region presumably somewhere in the western part of the Ukraine in which ikavism is attested with few or no exceptions. But no such dialect has ever been found.

Again in references to the third palatalization, the specific set of conditions giving rise to it are still debated, and this is not the place to enter into this discussion. If, however, we take one commonly accepted formulation that the third palatalization arises only if velars are in the following environment: ς, q + k, g, x + V (except b, y), we see that the conditioning factors are so specific that they cannot arise often. Because of this, the process cannot gather any great momentum and is also subject to the erosion of analogical levelings. For example, in the root *dvig, we would expect to find the third palatalization in the infinite formed with -ati but not with -nəti. It would not be expected in the first person singular of the root aorist (*dvig + b); it could presumably occur in the second person singular, dual and plural, and the third person singular and dual of the same tense (*dvig + e, etc, eta), but here, of course, the first palatalization takes precedence. This leaves only the first person dual and plural
( anál + omß, ovr) in the simple aorist where the conditions for the third palatalization are satisfied, but it is nowhere attested. This is relatively easy to understand if one considers that the third palatalization is lautgesetzlich in only two personal forms but only in verbs where either ë or õ precedes the velars. This automatically confined the third palatalization to such a narrow field of operations not only in this tense but in all other paradigms that it was doomed to considerable analogical attrition.

In principle there is no reason why ikavism could not be a similarly restricted phonological process; but if this is so, how would one define the environments? It is established beyond all doubt that ikavism is connected or triggered by a weak jer but obviously not by every weak jer otherwise the so-called exceptions would not be so surprisingly numerous. This was one of the major considerations forcing us to reject both compensatory lengthening and assimilation as viable theories. There must have been an additional factor or factors which restricted ikavism to a narrower field of operation. To return to the analogy of the third palatalization, it would mean that either the consonant following or the consonant preceding the e and o was in some way or other a conditioning factor. There is even the remote possibility that the combined effect of the consonants flanking the e and o may be the unknown factor. All of these possibilities were pursued in my investigation of this problem but always with a spectacular lack of success. There is some slight indication that the presence of a voiced consonant may have tipped the balance in favour of lengthening in some instances, but the evidence is not entirely conclusive and will be
discussed elsewhere (p. 110). Therefore, the additional factor limiting the operation of ikavism must be connected with the weak jers themselves and not with the consonants flanking the e, o. The only possible factor left is the loss of stressibility by the weak jers, and this in turn means that we are dealing with an accentological problem. It is the only logical alternative.

It should be emphasized again that a neo-acute solution for ikavism also explains the difficulties associated with tort-formula forms (pp. 34-42). Again by adapting some of Kurylo assimilation theory (pp. 56-58), the neo-acute solution allows us to explain the obvious immediate stage of ikavism when e, o in newly closed syllables were (and dialectally still are) pronounced as a ū-type of vowel.

2. Problems Connected with Neo-Acute Theory

Before accepting any theory, it is necessary to investigate all sides of the question and answer those points which seem to contradict the proposed solution. As regards to neo-acute, there are several such problems bound to raise doubts in the mind of any honest investigator. These are as follows:

1) If ikavism is really the result of neo-acute processes, why are only etymological e and o affected and not any other vowels?

2) Neo-acute as we know it from other Slavic languages is not restricted to closed syllables but can occur in open ones as well. Why then do we see the effects of these processes only in closed syllables?

3) How many apparent exceptions to the rule are created by accepting this theory and is there any reasonable explanation for those exceptions that do exist?
Before proceeding to an examination of each of these problems, it should be born in mind that No. 3 is by far the most vital consideration. The other two are interesting, but they fell into that category of questions which ask why something did not happen. In historical linguistics our present state of knowledge does not permit us to answer such "why" questions even when phrased in the affirmative. For example, we know that in relationship to Proto-Indo-European Germanic underwent a series of sound shifts in the consonantal system. Internal reconstruction and comparative evidence indicate that there were three shifts. Deductive reasoning and logical even allow us to arrange these shifts in their correct relative chronology. Borrowings from Latin or other neighboring languages help us to date one or all of the shifts. Assuming the correctness of our reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European, we may even describe the phonetic mechanics of the Germanic sound shifts. We may then compare and contrast these shifts with those of Armenian and if the similarities are too great to be coincidental, we may safely conclude that the speakers of Proto-Germanic and Proto-Armenian were at one time neighbors. However, when we start asking why did Proto-Germanic experience these shifts, we enter the realm of speculation. How much more speculative is it then to ask why only Germanic underwent these changes or why did none of the neighboring languages experience similar processes?

As regards our problem, it is sufficient to demonstrate that ikavism in Ukrainian parallels neo-acute processes in other Slavic languages and that all of these phenomena were triggered by one and the same course, namely, a stress shift from the weak jers. This is readily evident in such former oxytones as *noh'ë > nîh or *nesl'ë > nîs. It is,
therefore, natural to look for something similar in other oxytonic nouns $ji\bar{z}'ak$, $past'\bar{u}x$, etc., and to compare the $a$ and $u$ here with those of $rak$ and $ko\bar{o}'\bar{u}x$ which always had fixed stress and never experienced any stress shift from a final stressed jek. When absolutely no difference is discernible, it is natural to want to know why. It is to be hoped that at some time in the future the discipline will develop to a point where it can answer such questions, but at present all such questions can result in nothing more than speculation.

It is quite true that if the $a$ and $u$ of $ji\bar{z}'ak$ and $past'\bar{u}x$ were somehow quantitatively or qualitatively different from those of $rak$ and $ko\bar{o}'\bar{u}x$, it would add considerable weight to the proposition that neo-acute once existed in Proto-Ukrainian. On the other hand, the absence of any such differences does not prove that neo-acute never existed in these dialects nor does it prove that $*no\bar{e}'\bar{b} > ni\bar{e}$, etc., is not a neo-acute phenomenon. Nevertheless, even though any and all attempts to answer question 1) and 2) will fall into the realm of speculation, they are legitimate concerns and represent obstacles to the general acceptance of a neo-acute solution for ikavism. Therefore, some attempt must be made to unravel these puzzles.

3. Why Only $e$, $o$ Are Affected by Neo-Acute

Slavists are so accustomed to looking for neo-acute phenomena in West and South Slavic that we often tend to forget that its presence in East Slavic is also undeniable. I am, of course, referring here to the so-called Leka-type Russian dialects which are characterized by the presence of two $o$'s. These are the low back round $o$ of standard literary Russian and a higher back round vowel usually denoted either
with θ or with the Greek omega. This latter so closely parallels the occurrence of neo-acute vowels in other Slavic languages that there can be no doubt whatsoever that it arose as a result of the same processes. What's more, all of these dialects are far to the north and east of any Ukrainian ethnic territory. This proves that neo-acute length or intonation at one time extended to the very northern and eastern extremes of Slavic settlement. It would, therefore, be no surprise to find evidence of it having existed in Ukrainian.

This brings us face to face with the problem under discussion in this section. The existence of neo-acute in the Leka-type dialects of Russian is undeniable, but only insofar as it affected etymological o. Similarly in Ukrainian neo-acute is in evidence only with etymological e and o. This is very curious since the evidence from languages like Czech, Slovak, Slovene and Serbo-Croatian clearly demonstrate that neo-acute affected all vowels. There is, nevertheless, a certain regularity in the geographic distribution of these facts which can be summed up in the generalization that curtailment in vowel quantity increases as one moves in northeasterly direction. Polish at present gives evidence for neo-acute only with etymological o and the nasals.¹ Slovak is characterized by the rhythmic law, but it give evidence of neo-acute lengthening with all vowels. Therefore, the fate of neo-acute vowels in East Slavic may not be so strange after all when put into a general area context.

These considerations, however, do not explain why in Ukrainian

---

¹Dialectally there is also evidence for neo-acute with e, a, but only Kaszubian gives any indication whatsoever that ɨ, ɨ, u once differed quantitatively.
no other vowels but e and o give any indication of neo-acute length. As regards any other vowels, there are only two possibilities.

1) The stress shifts giving rise to neo-acute length affected only e and o, and the East Slavic dialects later to become Ukrainian never did have quantitative contrasts in any other vowels.

2) Neo-acute processes affected all vowels in Proto-Ukrainian just as they in all other parts of the Slavic world, but these distinctions were later lost in all vowels except e and o.

In the first instance, we are asked to believe that stress retraction in *kon'b or *nesl'b produced a change (length and/or rising intonation) in o and e, but in forms like *ruđnik'b (Czech, ručník) or *běgun'b (Czech, běhoun) the i and u remained entirely unaltered. This is highly improbable, but is the second alternative any more believable?

In the absence of any documentary evidence to support either alternative, we can only turn to other Slavic languages to look for analogous developments. Such a situation is presented by Upper Lusatian in the vowels ě and ę. V.A. Dybo (1963, 1968b) in his study of Proto-Slavic accentual, intonational and quantitative relationships as reflected in Upper Lusatian has established (1968b:68) beyond any doubt that these two vowels are the direct reflexes of processes inherited from Proto-Slavic and not the result of later indigenous Upper Lusatian developments. Thus, in brěza and wrôna we see the reflexes of Proto-Slavic acute (Czech, brůza, vrôna; Serbo-Croatian, brěza, vrôna), but this is now evident only with these two vowels. This being the case, it is indeed difficult to believe that none of the other etymologically acute vowels ever had acute length and intonation in Proto-Upper Lusatian.
That is to say, in forms like accusative singular vrónu vs. stronu (Czech, vrónu vs. stronu; Serbo-Croatian, vranku vs. strânu). There has always been a contrast either in intonation, length or vowel quality, but other formerly acute vowels as in rana, syka or lipa (Czech, râna, stíla, lipa; Serbo-Croatian, râna, stîla, lîpa) have never differed in any way from their historically circumflex counterparts. Such an assumption is hardly logical given the geographic proximaty to both Czech where vowel quantity is well preserved and to Polish where it was retained well into historic times. The logical conclusion is that the Upper Lusatian areas, as did the rest of Slavic, also knew distinctive pitch and vowel quantity, and later shifted this system into one which utilized only distinctive quantity as happened in the immediately neighboring areas. At a still later date, as in Polish, distinctive quantity is also lost. However, before this happened long and short ɛ, ɔ had ceased to contrast with one another quantitatively but already differed qualitatively. Therefore, the processes which eliminated distinctive length left ė (< ę) and ę (< ę) untouched. Could not the same developments have taken place in Ukrainian?

Objections may be raised to the use of Upper Lusatian as an analogy since we possess so little actual data about the development of vowel quantity in that language. This is perfectly true however logical may be the assumption of distinctive quantity in Upper Lusatian. In view of this fact, let us take another example where there are, at least, solid documentary data.

As is well known until approximately the end of the fifteenth century and beginning of the sixteenth century, Polish still possessed
distinctive vowel quantity. At that time the long vowels began to
differ quantitatively from their short counterparts giving rise to the
so-called pochylone vowels. In phonetic terms, it meant that all the
formerly long vowels were raised; in the traditional notation this is
indicated as follows: \( \ddot{a} > \dot{a}, \ddot{e} > \dot{e}, \ddot{o} > \dot{o}, \ddot{ą} > \dot{ą} \). Strangely absent
are all the high vowels. What happened to the formerly long \( \ddot{e}, \ddot{y} \) and
\( \ddot{u} \)? Did such vowels ever exist in Polish? We would have no evidence
that these high vowels ever differed quantitatively anywhere in Lechitic
if it were not for the testimony of the Kaszubian dialects and the now
extinct Slovincian. In both of these regions \( \ddot{e}, \ddot{y}, \ddot{u} \) give different
reflexes on the basis of former quantitative distinctions but the
differences now are strictly qualitative. For example, in Kaszubian
the short \( \ddot{e}, \ddot{y}, \) and \( \ddot{u} \) merge into a schwa\(^1\) (traditionally noted \( \ddot{e} \))
whereas the formerly long give \( \dot{i} (< \ddot{e}, \ddot{y}) \) and \( \dot{u} (< \ddot{u}) \).

A similar problem faces the investigator when dealing with the
standard literary dialect of Polish, for here the \( \dot{a} \) and \( \dot{e} \) have
disappeared. The reasons for their elimination from the system are
still the object of much debate among Polish scholars, but this does
not interest us here. For our purposes, the salient fact is that if it
were not for those dialects where \( \dot{a} \) and \( \dot{e} \) (or some further developments
thereof) are preserved, we would have no evidence whatsoever that \( a \) and
\( e \) in Polish ever possessed quantitative differences. How different then
is the situation with the \( \dot{e} \) pochylone! Even though this vowel has now
merged with etymological \( u \) in the standard language, this presents no

\(^1\)This is not an entirely unconditioned change. \( \ddot{e} \) remains after
palatalized consonants and \( \ddot{u} \) after velars and labials (Z. Stieber, 1966: 84).
great problem. A little internal reconstruction is usually sufficient to distinguish \( u \) of one source from the other. If this proves difficult or fails, there is always the external evidence of other Slavic languages or, for that matter, of those Polish dialects which preserve \( \delta \) as a separate entity (S. Urbańczyk, 1962:24-25). One could also draw a similar parallel from Eastern Slovak where distinctive vowel quantity has been lost, but before this took place many of the vowels had already begun to differ not in quantity but in quality (E. Pauliny, 1963:261-68). Now, it is only these qualitative differences which prove that Eastern Slovak once possessed basically the same quantitative relationships in the vocalic system as do the other dialects of Slovak.

In summation, therefore, we have seen that if a particular Slavic dialect once had distinctive vowel quantity and if this is later lost, then the fact that it once existed can be demonstrated basically in two ways. Either we must have solid documentary evidence or the former quantitative distinctions must be reflected in qualitative differences. The Leka-type Russian dialects prove the existence of neo-acute in East Slavic, but this is now evident only insofar as etymological \( o \) was affected. However, all the evidence available indicates that no vowels (except the jers themselves) were exempt from neo-acute lengthening (G. Shevelov, 1965:533-34). How could any vowels be exempt considering that the origin of neo-acute depended on the nature of the vowel (usually a jer) from which the stress was retracted not the nature of the vowel to which the stress was shifted? It is, therefore, perfectly in keeping with developments elsewhere in Slavic to conclude that in Proto-Ukrainian all vowels underwent neo-acute lengthening. This lengthening was later lost
without trace except in the case of ņ vs. ō or į vs. ħ. Because for these segments the distinction in quantity had shifted to a distinction in quality before distinctive vowel quantity was eliminated in East Slavic.

It is also interesting to note that in Slavic as a whole there is a strong tendency to do precisely what we have concluded for Ukrainian. Only Serbo-Croatian retains a phonologically quantitative difference between long and short ę, ő. All the others have either partially or entirely shifted the formerly long ę and ő to a higher vowel or diphthong, and this applies even to those languages which still retain distinctive vowel quantity. The mid vowels tend to shift to a qualitative difference whereas the high and low vowels tend to retain their quantitative differences. Thus, in the Leka-type Russian dialects ņ is a higher vowel than ő; the pochylone łę, łę of Polish give reflexes higher than the unlengthened ę or ő, and ş, ş of Upper Lusatian are higher vowels than ę, ő. Similarly in Czech long ę is either retained or gives ě and long ő gives û; in Slovak the long mid vowels develop into diphthongs the initial element of which is a high vowel (ę > ie, ņ > uo - orthographically ņ). In Slovene the reflexes of the neo-acute long ę and ő are the narrow ě and ď in contrast to the unlengthened open Ė and ŕ. Thus, in languages like Slovene or Slovak if the high and low vowels were suddenly to lose all their distinctive contrasts in quantity, it would be difficult to reconstruct this state of affair on internal evidence alone whereas the mid vowels would show this clearly on the basis of their qualitative difference. It is also interesting to note that in all the languages just mentioned the reflexes of the newly lengthened ę
tend to merge with the reflexes of ę exactly as happened in Ukrainian.

4. Why Neo-Acute Is Seen Only in Closed Syllables

In the preceding section some attempt was made to explain why only etymological e and o show traces of neo-acute lengthening in Ukrainian. Now we must attempt to explain why this evidence of lengthening is attested only in closed syllables. This is perhaps not so mysterious if we simply consider the origin of neo-acute. In the vast majority of cases neo-acute can arise only if we have a stress retraction from a weak jer. This, in turn, means that neo-acute length and intonation are automatically going to be found more often in closed syllables once the weak jer is lost. However, there are instances where neo-acute arises as the result of stress retraction from a strong jer or from vowels other than a weak jer. This occurs mainly in two morphological categories. These are neo-acute of the final root vowel of (1) the present tense of verbs belonging to the so-called recessive stress pattern (type b according to Stang, 1957:114-118) and (2) the pronominal (long or definite) form of adjectives which in the nominal form belong to the fixed stem stress pattern. To this group also belong certain adjectives which in their nominal form belong to the marginally mobile stress pattern (Stang, 1957:100-104). Examples of category No. 1 are Russian mog'un, m'ńēšź; Leka dialect mog'un, mőńēź; Czech mohu, můřēź; Slovak mőřem, 1 mőřēź; Slovene mőrem, 1 mőrēź; Russian nőš'u, n'osćĭź; Leka dialect nőš'ú, nősĭź; Slovene nőšim, 1 nőšĭź. Examples of category

1. These forms are obviously of analogous origin based on the presence of neo-acute in all persons except the first singular.
No. 2 are provided by the adjectival root *bělъ whose so-called short forms in Russian bel, bel'ō, bel'a, bel'y indicate that we are dealing with a former oxytone. The modern languages give clear testimony as to the existence of neo-acute, thus, Czech bělý, Slovak biele, Polish (dialect.) běły, Slovene běli, Serbo-Croatian bijeli.

Verbs with fixed final stress like the modern Ukrainian nes'yu, nes'є; leč'u, let'yę; horj'u, hor'y't' presumably never had neo-acute length on the root vowel, for here no stress shift onto that vowel ever took place not only in Ukrainian but in Slavic as a whole. Thus, from this point (i.e., the rise of neo-acute) onward in Ukrainian, we have two competing accentual paradigms in verbs containing etymological e and o in the root, that is, *gor'ы, *gorіtъ, *gorіtъ with no neo-acute on the root vowel vs. *nes'yę, *nósіtъ, *nósіtъ with neo-acute on the root vowel in all persons except in the first singular. This discrepancy may have been one of the factors leading to the elimination of neo-acute length in verbs of this type. However, there is a more substantial factor involved here, and that is that neo-acute in verbs of this type was perfectly predictable and therefore redundant. Let us examine the facts.

As is well known, in addition to the two accentual paradigms just referred to (Stang's type e and b respectively), there is of course, another type (Stang's type a) with fixed stress on the root vowel as in such verbs as *b'aviti, *l'ěsti, *č'ištiti. This stress pattern will occur only when the root vowel was originally long with acute intonation. These conditions automatically exclude any verb with an etymological short vowel as the initial vowel of the root. Thus, let us take for example three verbs all with the same vowel in the initial syllable in,
say, the third person singular *čístitb, *pišetb, *križitb < *križitb. The first two contrasted with each other, that is, the distinction between the two stress patterns in maintained by virtue of the contrast of acute vs. neo-acute; and we see this reflected in the modern languages: Czech čístí vs. piší, Serbo-Croatian čísti vs. piše, Slovene čistī vs. piše. The third example is distinguished by having either no intonation on the initial vowel (for those who believe that unstressed vowels were without intonation) or circumflex (for those who believe that all vowels had intonation). Whatever the precise distinction may have been, we again see the difference maintained in Serbo-Croatian križi and Slovene križi, but later developments in Czech now obscure the former differences between čístí (type a) and križí (type o). However, in Proto-Czech, as elsewhere in Slavic, there must have existed both a quantitative difference in the desinence: *čístiš, *čístit, *pišet, etc., vs. *križiš, križite, križite, etc. and, naturally enough, a difference in the position of the stress itself. It is, of course, this latter factor which is now the only contrast in East Slavic (Ukrainian, č'ystjat' vs. kryš'at').

In verbs whose initial root vowel were etymologically short the situation was much simpler. If stress ever occurs on this vowel, then it would automatically have neo-acute length as, for example, in the Leka-type Russian dialects: nösiä, xödiä, prösiä, lőviä, mölässä, etc. (Saxmatov, 1964b:113-114). The only other alternative is that if the root vowel were not stressed then the desinental vowel would be, and this latter would occur with neo-acute length. That is, the choice was either *ženíš or *nesěš < *neseš'. As long, therefore, as East Slavic retained distinctive free and mobile stress, neo-acute in verbs
of these types was quite predictable and, by definition, redundant.

We have suggested some of the possible reasons why neo-acute length of the initial root vowel in verbs disappeared without trace in Ukrainian. It is, of course, impossible to know to what extent these suggestions are valid. One thing, however, is certain; the same tendency to eliminate long ę and ę was shared by all the western neighbors of Ukrainian. Modern Czech and Slovak show traces of the former state of affairs in only one verb: Czech mohu, můžeš; Slovak môžem, môžes. The reflexes of lengthened ę here correspond perfectly with the stress of Russian mog'u, m'ósčeš (dialectal mog'u, môžeš), but all other verbs of the same stress pattern such as nošt'u, n'cseiš; xošt'u, x'odiš; tešt'u, t'esiš, etc., show no lengthening at all in modern in Czech or Slovak. Yet both of these languages provide ample evidence that the same stress pattern produced neo-acute length with the etymologically long vowels. Thus, corresponding to the Russian kúplj'u, k'úpiš'; palj'u, p'ališ', we have Czech koupím, koupíš; pálím, pálíš and Slovak kúpim, kúpiš; pálím, pálíš, etc. The same languages also provide ample evidence for the existence of neo-acute on e and ę in other categories, for example, Czech vůle, vůně, chůze, jezírko, pěše; Slovak vól'a, vôňa, chôdza, pierko. Stang (1957:117) quoting Gebauer cites from Old Czech such forms as běřeš, děřeš, žěřeš, pěřeš, zůveš, nasůveš, with lengthened root vowel; but there are two difficulties here. Firstly, comparison of these verbs with their Russian or Ukrainian counterparts indicates that all of the cited verbs would have had fixed final stress in Proto-Slavic. Therefore, one would expect here lengthening of the theme vowel not of the root vowel. These forms are, perhaps, of analogical origin, but in analogy to what? Are they in analogy to koupíš, pálíš
where the root vowel is originally long or in analogy to a no longer attested *ěněi̯ or *nòsi̯a? Secondly, Czech has a tendency to lengthen vowels before sonants, e.g., smůla, sůva, lůno, pěro, etc.

The situation is no clearer in Polish. The standard language gives no evidence of lengthening in the one verb still showing it in Czech and Slovak, that is, mogę, možeš, etc., but Slovincian has here the reflexes for a long o in all persons except the first singular and third plural (Stang, 1957:114), which is a direct parallel to the state of affairs in Czech. This indicates that the pattern at one time did exist in Lechitic. However, as in Czech and Slovak, in the vast majority of examples, Polish provides no evidence for lengthening of a short root vowel in forms like chodzę, chodzisz; noszę, nosisz; proszę, prosisz. On the other hand, again as in Czech and Slovak, Polish provides ample evidence for the neo-acute lengthening of an etymologically long root vowel, e.g., wiązę, wiążesz (Russian, vjaž’u, vjaž’ěš’); sążę, sążesz (Russian, suž’u, suž’ěš’); stądzę, stądzisz (Russian, stupl’u, stupl’ěš’); błądu, błędsisz (Russian, bluž’u, bluž’ěš’), etc.

As will be noticed, the neo-acute length of the other persons has been extended by analogy into the first person singular as happened in Czech (váži, soudám, stoupám, bloudám). In both languages this length is usually extended into the infinitive form also although in Polish as late as the sixteenth century wiązać, sądzić, stępować, błądzić1 were still in use (Z. Topolińska, 1964:85).

There are, however, in Polish some few examples where we see the reflex of a lengthened o in the verbal root. Let us examine them briefly.

---

1Compare the modern standard wiązać, sądzić, stępować, błądzić.
Involved here are such verbs as wrócić, ktościć, młócic, włóczyć, pruć, and kłuc (the latter two, formerly spelled próć, ktoś). Even a not very experienced eye will immediately recognize that we are dealing here with tort-formula forms, and a comparison with either Russian or Ukrainian will show that we are dealing with verbs of the mobile stress pattern, e.g., Russian vorot’it’, voroś’u, vor’otīš’; kolotit’, kolos’u, kol’otīš’; molot’it, molos’u, mol’otīš’; por’ot’, porj’u, p’oreš’; kol’ot’, kolj’u, k’oleś’. As regards stress, the Ukrainian data are identical; these, therefore, are verbs of a stress pattern where neo-acute length is often attested. But why should neo-acute length be attested only in these tort-formula forms and not in any other verbs formerly of the same stress pattern having a short root vowel? Let us briefly examine the facts.

In modern Polish the conjugation of pruć and kłuc has been totally restructured so that we now have pruże, prużesz, pruje, etc., kłuje, kłujesz, kłuje, etc., in place of the older porze, porzesa, porze and kłę, kolesz, kłe without any trace of lengthening of the root vowel (Z. Klemensiewicz et al., 1955:364-65). It is obvious, therefore, the introduction of ő (now written u) into the personal forms is due to the influence of the infinitive not vice versa. This lengthening of the root vowel in disyllabic infinitives (i.e., disyllabic in the Proto-Polish sense before the infinitive marker ti > ő) is a well attested phenomenon in Polish (Z. Topolińska, 1964:67-68) and need not detain us longer here, for it has no bearing on our problem.

The difficulties, however, associated with verbs of the type ktościć, młócic, wrócic are much more complicated. Since length is
present in both infinitive and personal forms, it is impossible to
determined what the point of departure is. If we attempt an explanation
on the basis of the personal forms, we must explain why lengthening
occurs only in tort-formula forms. That is, why is there lengthening in
\( *v\acute{r}\acute{\text{o}}t\acute{i}\breve{s}\acute{\text{v}} \triangleleft *v\acute{r}\acute{\text{o}}t'\breve{i}\breve{s}\breve{\text{v}} \) but not in \( *n'o\acute{\text{s}}i\breve{s}\acute{\text{v}} \triangleleft *n'o\acute{\text{s}}'i\breve{s}\breve{\text{v}} \)? The only way out
of this dilemma is to assume that the stress shifts giving rise to neo-
acute took place before metathesis\(^1\)(e.g., \( *v\acute{v}\acute{r}\acute{\v}i\breve{s}\acute{\v} \triangleleft *v\acute{v}\acute{r}t'\breve{i}\breve{s}\breve{\v} \)), that is,
at a time when \( \text{o} \) or was still a diphthong and phonologically treated as a
long vowel. If, on the other hand, this lengthening originated in the
infinitive forms, we must look to forms of the structure \( \text{CV}C'\text{VCV} \)(i.e.,
\( v\acute{v}\acute{r}\acute{v}t\acute{\v}t\acute{\v} \)) in which there is a marked tendency to preserve the length of
the pretonic vowel. If this second solution is the origin of the long
vowel in \( v\acute{v}\acute{r}\acute{\v}oci\acute{\v} \) etc., then it is not part of the problem under dis-
cussion. If, however, the first solution is the answer, then it only
strengthens the oft repeated observation that neo-acute in verbs of this
stress pattern occurs most readily when the stress was retracted to a
phonologically long segment—either a long vowel or diphthong.

Summarizing then we may state the following:

1) All the languages capable of showing it indicate the existence
of neo-acute on an originally long vowel in verbs of the mobile stress
pattern (Russian, \( v\acute{j}a\acute{e}\acute{\v}u, v\acute{j}'a\acute{e}\acute{\v}e\acute{\v}, v\acute{j}'a\acute{e}t, \) etc.).

2) Slovene shows neo-acute on etymological \( e \) and \( o \) as well.

3) Russian Leka-type dialects show neo-acute on \( o \).

4) Czech, Slovak and Slovincian (Lechitic) have one remnant of

---

\(^1\)This is theoretically quite possible if we accept Shevelov's
dating for the rise of neo-acute (eighth mid-ninth century) and meta-
thesis (early ninth century).
neo-acute on short vowels in the verbal root *mog.

5) This neo-acute length is found in no other verb of the same stress pattern (Russian, noš'’u, n'osīš’, n'osīt, etc.).

6) In spite of statement No. 5, Czech, Slovak, Polish (including Kaszubian and Slovincian) all give ample evidence for the existence of etymological e and o with neo-acute length in other categories.

In view of the above, it seems relatively clear that Czech, Slovak and Polish (at least, the southern dialects thereof) at one time all had neo-acute length on short root vowels of verbs, but this feature was later eliminated—possibly for those reasons already suggested above (pp. 80-82). Therefore, the complete lack of evidence for neo-acute in Ukrainian verbs of the type n'osyš, n'osyt' or ź'enyśsja, ź'enyśt'sja is exactly in keeping with the developments of that entire linguistic region. The absence of neo-acute in verbs of the type just cited no more disproves the presence of neo-acute in Ukrainian than it does in Czech, Slovak or Polish.

Before leaving our discussion of verbs, it is interesting to note that the history of the desinential e is also very instructive in weighing the relative merits of an accentological solution as opposed to a phonological one. It is generally acknowledged that *nesēšъ, *nesētъ < *nesēš’, *nesetъ are the starting point for the long (now diphthongized) desinential vowels of Slovak nesieš, nesie. From verbs like these of the old type e, this ending has been extended to other like lexieš < *lešēšъ, lexie < *lešetъ which had fixed root stress and never experienced a stress retraction onto the theme vowel. The lengthening of this theme vowels here and of *kričīšъ < *kričīs’, *kričītъ < *kričītъ plus the South and West Slavic lengthenings by contraction in such forms as *zněš(ъ) <
*smaješt, sma(τυ) < *smajet  led to the complete triumph of long vowels in all the personal endings in Serbo-Croatian and very likely also in Slovene at an earlier stage. On the other hand, Czech generalized long ž and ţ in all personal endings but eliminated all traces of long č. Restructings of this type in the suprasegmental features of a language are by no means unusual.

Now if the accentological explanation as suggested above is applied to the Ukrainian situation, it is much easier to understand why there is no trace whatsoever of ikavism in verbal forms like neseř < *nesěš, nese < *nesět. If, on the other hand, we consider that the loss of a weak jer was the only cause of ikavism, then every -eřb and -etb should undergo lengthening regardless of the stress type of the verb. If this had ever happened, there could be no possible model for the reintroduction of e in the second and third persons singular. It is true that at a very early date (possibly before the eleventh century) the Proto-Ukrainian dialects began to lose or had lost the final t' in the third person singular (Filin, 1972:438-56). However, final t' is retained if followed by the enclitic form of reflexive pronoun. Thus, one would expect at least some trace in some dialect of ikavism in forms like smi'et'sja < *smi'jet sę, but such a thing is attested nowhere. This is even all the more mysterious as regards the second person singular which was after the loss of the weak jer always a closed syllable, but here too there is no trace of ikavism anywhere. This can hardly be explained if we maintain a purely phonetic origin for the phenomenon.

As mentioned previously, there is one other major category where neo-acute could arise as the result of stress retraction from a vowel
other than a weak jer and, therefore, occur later in an open syllable. This is, of course, in the so-called long (definite) form adjectives. The phenomenon is most regularly attested in those adjectives which belonged to the fixed final stress pattern in their nominal form. Examples of such adjectives are *dobr'ь, *gol'ь, *mokr'ь, and *ostr'ь (Kolesov, 1972:209), and these are attested in the Leka dialects dёbraj, gёlaj, mёkraj, vёstraļ. With adjectives having the marginally mobile stress pattern in their nominal (or the definite form) may occur with either fixed root stress and neo-acute on that vowel or with stress fixed on the nominal desinenence. The choice of one stress type over the other seems to be completely capricious; thus, *m'ëdärь, *m'ëdär'a, *m'ëdär'o gives in Russian m'udrijь, Czech moudrý, Slovak mūdri, Polish mądry, Serbo-Croatian mудри. All the evidence, therefore indicates that this adjective in the definite form had neo-acute on the root vowel; on the other hand, *sk'opь, *skop'a, *sk'opo gives in Russian skup'oļь, Ukrainián skup'ylь and Slovene sköpi all of which indicate fixed desinential stress, but Czech skoupý, Slovak skúpy, Polish skąpy, and Serbo-Croatian skúpi indicate root stress and neo-acute. The root *n'ovь, *n'ов’a, *n'ovo gives n'ovyjь in Russian and nòvajь in the Leka dialects but nov'yjь in Ukrainian; *c'ëlь, *cël'a, *c'ëlo gives both cìlyjь and c'ëlyjь in Ukrainian. The short root vowel in Czech and Slovak cely agrees with the final stress of Ukrainian, but the Serbo-Croatian cijelь agrees with the root stress of Russian c'elyjь.

As was the case with the verbs, neo-acute length is clearly reflected on etymologically long vowels but not so clearly on the short ones. Thus, from the examples already cited we see neo-acute length in
the Leka-type dialects in ððbraj, mèkraj, gòlaj, nèvaj, etc., but in
the corresponding forms in Czech, Slovak, and Polish there is no trace
of length. This could mean one of two things: either neo-acute length
of e and o in adjectives was eliminated as apparently it was in verb
forms or the majority of adjectives of this structure opted for the
fixed desinential stress pattern. Given the capriciousness in choice of
stress type for these adjectives, it is theoretically quite possible
that all such adjectives had fixed desinential and, therefore, never
experienced neo-acute lengthening of the root vowel. The later stabi-
lization of stress in West Slavic would, of course, obliterate any
evidence of this.

The comparison of this problem with that presented by the verbs
is valid in yet another respect. As with the verbs, neo-acute on a
short root vowel was perfectly predictable or redundant and as such was
expendable. If the root vowel was stressed, it had neo-acute; if the
root vowel were not stressed, then the adjective had fixed desinential
stress. On the other hand, an adjective with a long root vowel could
have (1) fixed stress on the root vowel with acute, e.g., *mílabb
(Serbo-Croatian mílì, Czech and Slovak míly, Ukrainian m'ýlyj), (2)
fixed stress on the root vowel with neo-acute, e.g., *glùpabb (Serbo-
Croatian glùpì, Czech hlùpy, Slovak hlùpy, Russian gl'ùpyj), (3)
fixed stress on the nominal desinence with no intonation (or perhaps
circumflex) on the unstressed root vowel, e.g., *krìv'abb (Czech kërivì,
Slovak krivì, Russian krив'oj'). The circumflex will definitely appear
in many forms of the nominal declension where its contrasts with the
acute of type 1) adjectives, that is, *mìla vs. *krìvì, mìla vs. *krív*a
(or *krīv’a?), *mīlo vs. *krīvo.\(^1\) These, in turn, contrast with the final stress (later neo-acute) of type 2) adjectives, e.g., *mīl♭, *krīv♭, *glūp♭ < *glup’♭. These intonational distinctions (later restructured to quantitative distinctions in all of North Slavic) were vital in maintaining the distinctiveness of each stress type. These relationships did not obtain if the adjectives had an etymological short root vowel; there would be either *bos’♭♭ (from *b’os♭, *bos’a, *b’oso – Stang’s type c) or *gōl♭♭ (from *gol’♭♭, *gol’a, *gol’o – Stang’s type c). The neo-acute in the latter example is merely a concomitant of stress. It is only in the nominal form that the neo-acute could have served to distinguish stress type b from c, that is, *gōl♭ < *gol’♭ vs. *b’os♭ < b’os♭. But this, unfortunately, cannot be verified in Ukrainian, for the short form adjectives as a category have disappeared.\(^2\)

There are, nevertheless, a few staws in the wind indicating that West Slavic (or parts thereof) may have known neo-acute on short root vowels. One such bit of evidence is provided by the Polish szósty, siódmym, ósmy and Slovak šiesty, siedmy, ôsmy. This is further supported by the data from South Slavic where Slovene and Serbo-Croatian (both the standard language and these dialects with a distinct intonational reflex for neo-acute) all have neo-acute length and/or intonation in these

---

\(^{1}\)The Serbo-Croatian krīv♭ indicates a change of stress pattern to one with neo-acute on the root vowel.

\(^{2}\)It would be interesting to investigate whether these two stress type have retained their separate identity in the Leka-type dialects (by virtue of neo-acute) more accurately than they have in standard Russian.
ordinals. The root stress of Ukrainian š'estyj (western dial. š'estyj), š'omyj (western dial. š'emyj), v'os'myj also lead one to the same conclusion, but this is contradicted by the final stress of Russian šest'oj, sed'm'o'j, vos'm'o'j and the short vowels of Czech šesty, sedmý, osmý. Other possible examples are Polish śusty, Czech dlouhý, Slovak dierný for which the root stress in Russian and Ukrainian (š'ovtyj, d'ovhyj, š'ormy) indicates the familiar pattern producing neo-acute. However, all of these are tört-formula forms, and the stress retractions may have taken place at a time when bř or cř was still phonologically a diphthong and, as a consequence, treated like a long vocalic segment. if this is the case, then we are dealing with nothing unusual.

By way of summary, let us restate the problem. We have attempted in this section to answer the following question. If ikavism in Ukrainian is in fact a reflex of neo-acute, why is it attested only in closed syllables. The explanation lies partially in the fact that neo-acute in the vast majority of instances originated because of a stress retraction from a weak jer. This automatically means that the reflexes of neo-acute will be attested most frequently in a closed syllable after the loss of the weak jer. There exists in Slavic only two major morphological categories where neo-acute is attested as the result of a stress shift form a vowel other than a weak jer. These again are neo-acute on the root vowel of (1) verbs belonging to the recessive stress type in the present tense, and (2) long form adjectives which in their short (or nominal) belong to the oxymone or, in some instances, the marginally mobile stress type. In both of these categories, the evidence is unequivocal as long as we are dealing with etymologically
long vowels, but there are only meagre traces of neo-acute lengthening of Proto-Slavic e and o in the same two categories. Nevertheless, these remnants do seem to indicate that neo-acute was known here also but was later eliminated possibly for reasons (redundancy?) already suggested. Therefore, the absence of neo-acute reflexes in these two (open syllable) categories in Ukrainian in no way argues for the total absence of that phenomenon in the language. Exactly the same situation obtains in all the neighboring languages where the former existence of neo-acute is undeniable. In this respect, Ukrainian merely fits into the general developments of the area as a whole. In view of the above considerations, we may, reasonably assume that neo-acute in Proto-Ukrainian developed in the following chronological stages:

1) Neo-acute came into existence for the same phonological reasons and in the same morphological categories as elsewhere in late Proto-Slavic.

2) This neo-acute was eliminated (or failed to develop completely) in categories where it was redundant. This occurred mainly (for reasons described above) with etymological e and o where stress was retracted from a vowel other than a weak jer.

3) The situation described above led to the elimination of neo-acute length (and/or intonation) of e and o except when these vowels were followed by a weak jer, that is, in a situation later to be a closed syllable. The same process apparently also took place in Polish, Czech and Slovak.

4) The distinction in quantity between long and short e and o shifted to one of quality in that the formerly long vowels were raised.
5) Distinctive vowel quantity is lost as elsewhere in East Slavic.

6) The raised e (< ě) and o (< ē) are not affected by the loss of distinctive quantity and later give the so-called new ī.

5. The Extension of the Neo-Acute

As is well known, every theory must, in the final analysis, be accepted or rejected on the basis of its ability to explain the data. We have seen that in this respect a neo-acute explanation for ikavism is better able to handle certain chronological and phonetic difficulties than is the compensatory lengthening theory. The hit-and-miss nature of ikavism suggest that we are dealing not with the reflexes of a traditionally understood sound law but with the operations of suprasegmental phenomena. Nevertheless, the neo-acute theory itself, like any other theory, is not without apparent exceptions. As regards this particular theory, an exception can be said to exist whenever ikavism occurs without any apparent stress shift onto the e and o concerned, or conversely whenever ikavism fails to take place in spite of an obvious stress shift. However, if ikavism is indeed an accentological problem, it is no longer necessary to demonstrate a stress shift for each and every instance of e, o > ī. It is necessary merely to prove the existence of a productive pattern, that is, a stress type, in which neo-acute is historically justified and after which other forms could be modeled.

One very serious group of exceptions consists of those nouns (of the former ũ-, ķ-, jô-, and ĩ-stems) which belonged historically to the marginally mobile stress pattern (Stang's type o). Comparative evidence indicates very strongly that these nouns had root stress in the
nominative and accusative singular and, therefore, did not experience stress retraction from the final weak jer. Modern standard Ukrainian and the dialects now make no distinction in these case forms between the former oxytones and the mobile stress paradigm. That is, we have *niž*, *nož'a* (gen. sing.) vs. *viz*, *v'osa* or *kín*, *konj'a* vs. *nis*, *n'osa*; there is no way of distinguishing one accentual type from the other on the basis of the nominative (and/or accusative) singular alone. On the other hand, the distinction is usually maintained by those Slavic languages or dialects capable of showing neo-acute. For example, the Leka-type dialects still distinguish between *kôn', nôž* vs. *nos*, *vos*, etc., as does Serbo-Croatian *könj*, *könja* (gen. sing.) vs. *nôš*, *nôsa* or *snôp*, *snôpa* (compare Ukrainian *snîp*, *snôp'a*) vs. *vôz*, *vôza*, etc., Slovene makes similar distinctions between *kônj*, *könja*; *nôž*, *nôža*; *kôź*, *kôža*, etc., on the one hand as opposed to *nôš*, *nosâ*; *vôž*, *vôza*; *mêd*, *medâ* (compare Ukrainian *mid*,¹ *m'edu*) on the other. Even in these dialects of Slovenian where intonations are lost, the distinction between stress type is still maintained by virtue of the qualitative and quantitative differences of the root vowel in the nominative singular.

In Ukrainian nouns like *nis*, *n'osa*; *viz*, *v'osa*; *mid*, *m'edu*, etc., we obviously have clear instance of ikavism, but it is difficult to escape the conclusion that new *i* in nouns of this stress type is of a different origin than in *nis*, *nož'a*; *kín*, *konj'a*; *pip*, *pop'a*, etc. It is precisely this former group of nouns which provides the strongest

¹Eastern dialects and the standard language have *med*, *m'edu*. 
arguments for those who see ikavism as a manifestation of compensatory lengthening. Under such circumstances one is very tempted to admit the possibility of some type of compensatory lengthening even if it is used to explain all instances of ikavism. It is tempting to speculate that ikavism may very well have two sources; that is, early neo-acute lengthening is later augmented by compensatory lengthening. However, once we admit this possibility, we must then answer all the objections to the compensatory lengthening theory which have already been discussed in some detail in the previous chapters. It was shown that the difficulties involved with this theory are by in large unsurmountable, and this applies equally whether we try to make compensatory lengthening the complete answer or whether we make it only a partial answer. All the considerations already discussed have shown this theory to be unworkable. Therefore, for nouns of the former mobile stress paradigm we must investigate the possibility that these nouns also experienced neo-acute lengthening in some way or that the presence of the new $i$ here is of some other origin—possibly an analogical extension.

With nouns formerly belonging to oxytone stress group, the matter is relatively simple. There are three case forms in which these nouns experienced neo-acute; these are the nominative and accusative singular and the genitive plural. With nouns of the mobile stress pattern, neo-acute can be expected only in the genitive plural, and this, of course, has been erased by the extension of $iv < ovinb$ to virtually all masculine nouns, thus, creating an open syllable in the root syllable.\footnote{A remnant of the former state of affairs is $\delta'obit$ (nom. sing.) vs. $\deltaobit$ (gen. plur.) as opposed to the colloquial $\delta'obotiv$.}
It is, therefore, possible that because of the relatively high number of instances in which genitive plural occurs (after all quantitative adverbs, numbers over 'five', direct object of negative verbs, prepositions governing the genitive) the neo-acute of this case form was transferred to the nominative and accusative singular where the syllabic structure was similar. That is, the neo-acute genitive plural *nôsô < *nos'ô influenced the other two case forms *n'ôsô because these also had a stressed o followed by a weak jer.

The only other instances for which we could postulate neo-acute lengthening in nouns of the mobile stress pattern is where stress would be advanced from a weak jer of a preposition (i.e., shifted forward) onto the root vowel of the governed noun, thus, *v'ô nosô > vô nôsô (Shevelov, 1965:51-55,445). The number of instances where this type of stress shift occurred would be so minimal that it would hardly warrant mention if it were not for another interesting fact of Ukrainian accentuation. This is the fact that prepositional enclisis is almost unknown\(^1\) in the modern standard language as well as in the dialects.

There are, unfortunately, no data allowing us to date the origin of this phenomenon in Ukrainian. A logical assumption is that the general loss of enclisis in prepositions regardless of the vowel involved would begin at the same time as the loss of enclisis in prepositions containing a weak jer. That is, on the model *v'ô nosô > *vô nôsô, *s'ô nosamô, *sô nosamô, *q'ô nosa > *qô nôsa, *k'ô nosu > *kô nôsu where the shift

---

\(^1\)Instances of this phenomenon exist now only in a few set expressions such as n'a nîsî, n'ad vešir, d'ô ána, n'a smîx, svît z'a ožî, etc.
is phonetically justified, we begin to get *n'a nōvę > *na nōvę, *z'a nōvę > *na nōvę, *p'od' nōvęm > *pod' nōvęm.¹ If this is indeed the case, then we have a ready explanation for the introduction of neo-
acute into nouns of this stress type.

Although the above theory is both possible and quite plausible, it is unfortunately impossible to prove with any form of documentary evidence. As is well known, the oldest fully accented text from East Slavic territory is the so-called Čudov New Testament of 1355, but none of the specifically Ukrainian texts reach back any farther than the second half of the sixteenth century.² Nevertheless, on the basis of material from this period, Ilarion (1952:230) states that prepositional enclisis was "already in a state of decay, possibly an archaic feature." Z. Veselovs'ka's (1970:153-159) not very exhaustive comparative study of Russian, Ukrainian and Belorussian accentuation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries provides only indirect evidence for the problem under discussion here. This occurs in her description of the stress of adverbs formed with a preposition + noun (e.g., naz'ad), short-form adjective (e.g., napr'avo) or collective numeral (e.g., nadv'oje). The predominant pattern in the Ukrainian data is that the stress does not shift on to preposition, whereas the Russian data show precisely the opposite trend.

¹It must be born in mind that nouns with fixed root stress (Stang's type a) would also serve as a ready model in that they were never subject to any prepositional enclisis.

²V. H. Skljarenko in his detailed historical study of the accentuation of the former z-stems in Ukrainian cites no source (from Ukrainian ethnic territory) earlier than 1581. Ilarion's oldest cited text dates from 1569.
Another difficulty arises when dealing with accentual units like *
ν'νος and *ν'ιωδή, and this is whether a forward stress shift from
a weak jer would give rise to neo-acute in the same way as does a shift
in the opposite direction. Since the term neo-acute implies both
intonation and lengthening and since intonation does not concern us in
Ukrainian, it may be better to state the problem somewhat differently.
That is to say, even if a forward stress shift should give rise to an
intonation quite distinct from neo-acute, can we at least expect
lengthening in these instances? Although this problem is very poorly
investigated, there is some evidence to indicate that lengthening did
indeed take place in such cases. Saumov (1964b:112-13) in his
investigation of the Leka-type dialects of Russian cites sədə, sədəy,
sən, sbəd and l'gəta < *s'ιωδή, *s'οδυ, *s'ογονь, *s'ιβροδή, *l'ιβοτα.
The latter example finds a perfect parallel in Czech lɪ́cta. Lengthening
caused by a forward stress shift is the most obvious explanation for
these data.

There is also some additional evidence from Slovene (Svane,
1958:39) where we find the following stress pattern with some prefixed
nouns: və́đ, və́đa (gen. sing.) < *v'ιωδή, *v'ιωδα. The nominative
və́đ corresponds precisely with the stress type kə́nə or nə́ə where we
see the expected shortening of neo-acute o in a final closed syllable.¹
In the oblique cases, however, we find the long open vowel kə́nja, nə́sa
and so on. Again, this is precisely what we would expect in Slovene
with former oxytones (Jaksche, 1965:65-66). Therefore, the long narrow

¹The exception to this rule is the zero-ending of the genitive
plural, that is, gə́n < *gon'Ь; və́d < və́d'Ь.
rising vowel in forms like \textit{vhd\'a} cannot have arisen as a result of a backward shift from the following vowel since this gives a long open rising vowel, nor is it the result of analogy with the nominative since, as we saw, this is a short falling vowel. The data from Slovene and the Leka-type dialects Russian coincide perfectly in that we have the normal reflex of a neo-acute but one which could not have originated from a stress shift backwards. There is no better way to explain these facts than to posit the following: \textit{\textasciitilde s\'wod\'a}, \textit{\textasciitilde s\'woda} > \textit{\textasciitilde s\'wod\'a}, \textit{\textasciitilde s\'woda} > Slovene \textit{shod`, shoda}, and Russian \textit{sz\'at}, \textit{sz\'oda}. No other assumption can explain the origin of a stress pattern like \textit{vhd\'o}, \textit{vhd\'a} in Slovene. On the other hand, Czech forms like \textit{vhd\'a} < \textit{\textasciitilde l\'egota} but \textit{\textasciitilde v\'od\'a} < \textit{\textasciitilde v\'ewod\'a} \textsuperscript{1} indicate that neo-acute length resulting from a forward stress shift is by no means as common as the lengthening that results from the weak jer shifting its stress leftward, for the latter is so well attested that no investigator can doubt it. The Slovene data, however, are particularly interesting in that regardless of the direction of the shift, the affected vowels are identical in quantity, quality and intonation.

Slovene also provides us with another interesting but less direct bit of evidence regarding the lengthening of vowels subject to a stress shifts from a preceding vowel. As is well known, approximately in the tenth century (Ramo\v{s}, 1961:144) in Slovene all stressed vowels both short and long with original falling (circumflex) intonation shifted their stress one syllable to the right, that is, \textit{\textasciitilde zl\'ato} > \textit{zlat\'o},

\textsuperscript{1} The Polish \textit{woh\'o}, \textit{woh\'odu} is not pertinent since Polish as a general rule has compensatory lengthening before voiced segments.
*sľov ≥ sľov, pō vodq > po vōdo. As indicated the vowel receiving the stress is lengthened, narrowed and with falling intonation. However, in those Slovene dialects (the standard language included) which no longer have distinctive intonations, these vowels differ neither qualitatively nor quantitatively from those which were lengthened and narrowed as a result of neo-acute. That is, once the distinction in rising and falling intonation is eliminated, there is no difference between the stressed vowels of po vōdo and vōd (gen. plur.) or between sľov and vōlja, nōsim. As similar process may well have occurred in Proto-Ukrainian dialects.

Thus, the data regarding neo-acute (or other lengthenings) resulting from a forward stress shift fall into three degrees of probability. The evidence for such a lengthening is most convincing when dealing with forms of the type *v'v%xod̄b, that is, in derivations containing a prefix with a stressed weak jer. In such instances it would appear that not only was the vowel lengthened but also received neo-acute intonation in exactly the same way as when the stress shift is in the opposite direction.

In second place as regards probability of lengthening are instances of the type *v'v%xod̄b, that is, a noun preceded by a preposition containing a weak jer but which because of enclisis formed an accentual unit. It is perfectly logical to assume that if *v'v%xod̄b gives *v%xod̄b, then there is no phonetic reason why *v'v%xod̄b should not give *v%xod̄b. This is very likely what happened since in the modern language it is only the context (or the orthography) which distinguish v%id 'entrance' from v%id 'in motion'. However, there are
several imponderables here, chief among which would be the working of whatever juncture phenomena may have been extant at that time. Again it may be quite wrong to assume that two morphological categories (that is, a preposition and a prefix) would behave identically simply because they are identical phonetically.

In final place as regards probability are again prepositional phrases forming one accentual unit but in which the stressed preposition contains a full vowel, for example, *n'atnos. In spite of the possible obstacles mentioned in the previous situation, it is difficult to assume any great difference between the shift of *v'kodob > *v'kodb as against *v'k+koob > v+kob since the major factor here was the loss by a weak jers of the ability to bear stress. This was, after all, a process operating without exception. However, in order to posit neo-acute arising from *n'atnos > *n+tos, it is necessary to assume that *v'k+kodob > *v+kob acted as the model for the loss of enclisis in Ukrainian and that forms like *n+tos received their neo-acute by analogy to those instances where neo-acute had arisen phonetically. This, in essence, almost forces us to assume that the stress shifts from the two different types of prepositions took place almost simultaneously. This is quite possible but not provable since all we know for certain about the elimination of enclisis with prepositions in Ukrainian is that the earliest accentuated texts from the mid sixteenth century reveal virtually the same state of affairs as in the modern language. The situation was, therefore, stabilized sometime previously—but when did this process of stabilization begin? This we cannot answer; thus, the possibility that it began simultaneously with the shift of stress from prepositions containing weak jers must remain nothing more than a very
plausible suggestion. Thus, we have examined three additional routes by which neo-acute could have entered the mobile stress pattern. The evidence for some of these is moderately strong, and they would constitute, at least, contributing factors helping to tip the scales if other factors were already tending in the same direction.

One such factor is the large scale restructuring of the stress types which has occurred in Ukrainian. In his recent study of nominal stress patterns in East Slavic of the earliest period, V. V. Kolesov (1972:111-128) assembled 90 monosyllabic roots of the former ə-, jə-stems which can be fairly safely assigned to the oxytone group on the basis of both documentary and comparative evidence. Of these 90 roots, 60 still have, so to speak, living descendants in modern Ukrainian; but of these, only 26 still belong exclusively to the oxytone stress type. Eight of the remaining 34 now have fixed root stress, all the rest have a new type of mobile stress.¹ This new mobile stress as applied to Ukrainian means that the noun has fixed root stress in the singular but fixed desinential stress in the plural. For monosyllabic nouns if all the necessary conditions are present, the locative singular will be {u}, not {i}. When this occurs, the {u} is always stressed. Other forms of mobile stress are known, but none of them is productive although often quite instructive from an historical point of view. The major impetus for loss of final stress in the singular of these masculine nouns would seem to be the redistribution of the former ə-stem {a} and ū-stem {u} in the genitive. This process took place largely if not entirely on the

¹Six of these still permit either final or mobile stress.
basis of semantic factors so that in the modern language {u} occurs in
nouns specifying the following: (1) abstract concepts, e.g., strax,
str'axu; żal', žalju; smix, sm'ixu; 'uspix, 'uspixu; (2) intangible
items, e.g., v'iter, v'itru; voh'on', vohnj'u; h'olos, h'olosu; mor'os,
mor'ozu; (3) groups, collectivities or mass nouns, e.g., polk, p'olku;
sah'al, sah'alu; mak, m'aku; hrad, hr'adu; (4) items of great size or
indefinite shape, e.g., svit, sv'itu, lis, l'isu; step, st'epu;
bud'ynok, bud'ynku; (5) foreign borrowings and placenames. The matter
is, by no means, as simply defined as the above five categories would
indicate, and the problem could easily constitute an entire monograph
all by itself. Our purpose, however, is to demonstrate the connection
between the u-genitive and stress. This is best exemplified by those
nouns which still permit two genitive endings without any apparent
semantic distinction between being them. ¹ When this occurs, the a-
genitive will have final stress; the u-genitive, root stress, e.g.,
mist, most'a or m'ostu; dvir, dvor'a, or dv'oru; styd, styd'a or st'ydu;
rij, rocj'a or r'ocju. This does not mean that the u-genitive is never
stressed; occasionally it is. In the control group of former ɣ-stem
oxytones already referred to, we have seen that only 26 out of 60
remained their original final stress. Out of these, all but two still
have the a-genitive. But in general the development is clear; the new
u-genitive is accompanied by a shift to root stress.

There are also examples of the same process working in the

¹When there is a semantic difference, the stress does not usually
change, e.g., dub, d'uba 'of one oak tree' but d'ubu 'of oak' (as a
material, substance).
opposite direction. This occurs with nouns historically belonging to
the mobile stress pattern for which is reconstructed, with a very high
degree of certainty, root stress in the genitive singular of ṯ-, ḫ-
stem nouns. Some of these nouns—but only when they retain the a-
genitive, now have fixed desinential stress. Some examples of this are
*m'ěkъ, *m'ěxa; *m'ostъ, *m'osta and *s'ũlъ, *s'ũna (Kolesov, 1972:
135-38). These nouns designating definite, concrete and tangible items
were not subject to receiving the u-genitive. The original genitive
singular was thus retained but the noun was shifted into another stress
pattern so that we now have *mīxъ, *mīx'a; mīst, most'a; *ș'ouv'en, *ș'unn'a.
A twofold development has already been seen with *m'ostъ, *m'osta; the
modern Ukrainian most'a continues the original ending but with a new
stress; m'ostu continued the original stress with a new ending. Other
examples cited by Kolesov (1972:139) are perhaps the dialectal forms
hmiv'a, luh'a, roh'a, snih'a.1 The number of instances where a noun of
the mobile stress pattern is shifted to fixed desinential stress are
much rarer that examples of shifts in the opposite direction. However,
even these few examples serve to prove that at one time in Ukrainian
(perhaps in Proto-Ukrainian) the two nonfixed stress types (Stang's b
and ṯ) underwent considerable confusion and mutual influence.

The exact details involved in these restructurings are very
difficult to investigate not only because of the lack of accented texts
from the earliest period but also because comparative and historical
Slavic linguistics has as yet not been able to provide us with a fully

1These examples are cited by Kolesov simply as 'Ukrainian', but
the standard language and most dialects know only hm'īnu, l'ūhu, r'ōha,
sn'īnu.
reliable reconstruction of the mobile stress paradigm. Kolesov (1972: 129) cites four such attempted reconstructions; these are (1) Sedláček (1910:224), (2) Kuryłowicz (1938:20), (3) Stang (1957:74), (4) Hamm (1958:69).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>bog'ę</td>
<td>bog'ę</td>
<td>b'ogę</td>
<td>bog'ę</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>bog'a</td>
<td>bog'a</td>
<td>b'oga</td>
<td>bog'a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>bògu</td>
<td>bog'u</td>
<td>b'ogu</td>
<td>bog'u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>bògę</td>
<td>bògę</td>
<td>b'ogę</td>
<td>bògę</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>bogom'ę</td>
<td>b'ogomę</td>
<td>bog'omę</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>boz'ę</td>
<td>boz'ę</td>
<td>b'czę</td>
<td>boz'ę</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>b'ozi</td>
<td>b'ozi</td>
<td>b'ozi</td>
<td>b'ozi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>bog'ę</td>
<td>bog'ę</td>
<td>bògę</td>
<td>bògę</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>bogom'ę</td>
<td>b'ogomę</td>
<td>bog'omę</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>b'ogy</td>
<td>b'ogy</td>
<td>b'ogy</td>
<td>bog'y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>bog'y</td>
<td>bog'y</td>
<td>bog'y</td>
<td>bògy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>bozëx'ę</td>
<td>bozëxę</td>
<td>bozëxę</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dual</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>b'oga</td>
<td>b'oga</td>
<td>bog'a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.L.</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>bog'u</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>bog'u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.I.</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>bogom'a</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>bogom'a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In view of the great diversity in these reconstructions, Kolesov attempts to arrive at some sort of conclusion regarding their respective accuracy on the basis of East Slavic material. But after a careful presentation of all available data, he is forced (p. 141) to conclude that, "the facts of Old East Slavic are quite inconclusive as regards the proposed reconstructions of original paradigms. Based on these facts, it is possible to justify all four schemes by finding proof in favor of
any one of them."

On the same page in a subsequent paragraph, Kolesov qualifies this in the following way:

In the final analysis one could reconstruct two types of mobile stress paradigm for ř-stem nouns. Only when this has been done, will it be possible definitely and finally to speak about the accuracy of this or that reconstruction of a Proto-Slavic mobile stress paradigm. Obviously one may speak here about the gradual merger of two originally autonomous mobile stress types (approximately Kuryłowicz's reconstruction for original oxytones and Stang's reconstruction for original barytones). On the basis of Old East Slavic material, it is impossible to represent the stages in the merger of these two type of mobility. Illič-Svityč (1963:119) by comparing Lithuanian and Slavic material has shown that "the fusion of two accentual paradigms of the ř-stems into a mobile type is not Balto-Slavic, as Kuryłowicz considered, but a purely Slavic process."

Open checking Kolesov's reference, we discover that Illič-Svityč is referring to the merger of an original barytone paradigm with short (or long circumflex) root vowel with an original mobile or oxytone stress type. Illič-Svityč then cites certain data from Serbo-Croatian dialects indicating that the reassignment of a given noun to a given stress type is not uniform throughout Slavic and, therefore, was a process existing into later Proto-Slavic. Kolesov's argument seems to be that this reassignment and shiftings from one stress type to another is still in evidence in the earliest accented texts from East Slavic. This may be partially true especially in the sense that this type of reassignment is always taking place in any language which has free and mobile stress. Nevertheless, comparative evidence definitely indicates that Proto-Slavic had two types of stress other than the fixed root type with acute intonation, and this is clearly acknowledged by Illič-Svityč himself (1963:109-110) who also accepts Stang's reconstruction for the mobile
paradigm. By Kolesov's own admission, the data assembled by him are quite unreliable in reconstructing Proto-Slavic paradigms, but they are valuable and unequivocal in demonstrating the relative instability in the stress not only of the former mobile type but also of the former fixed final stress pattern and the mutual influence of these two types.

In view of the above, we shall attempt to reconstruct the stages in the accentological developments in Ukrainian whereby neo-acute was introduced into nouns where it is not phonetically justified.

1) The neo-acute comes into existence in oxytones in the nominative and accusative singular and in the genitive plural of all nouns belonging to the ĺ-, ĺ- and ĺ- stems. Nouns belonging to the same declensional types and of mobile stress will have neo-acute only in the genitive plural.

2) Redistribution of the genitive singular endings {a} and {u} in masculine nouns on a semantic grounds brings with it the accompanying changes in the stress patterns described above, e.g., bob'ě, bob'a > bōb(ѣ), b'obu vs. m'ostѣ, m'osta > m'ost(ѣ), most'a and m'ostu.

3) The extension of the ĺ-stem locative {u} creates a new type of mobile stress in the singular whereby all forms of the singular are root stressed except the new locative {u} which is itself stressed, e.g., boj'ě, vʲ boj'i > bōj(ѣ), vʲ boj'ũ vs. b'okѣ, na b'osĩ > b'ok(ѣ), na bok'ũ.

4) The original function of the neo-acute as a suprasegmental feature has now been lost. It originally marked that a preceding syllable had been stressed and that the stress was to be shifted forward again whenever the occurrence of a full vowel permitted this. This
rather straightforward system no longer applied, for now there are the following types:

(a) original oxytones with neo-acute in the nominative in which final stress is remained, e.g., kot'Ь, kot'a; noз'Ь, noз'a' > kot(Ь), kot'a; noз(Ь), noз'a;

(b) original oxytones with neo-acute in the nominative but with root stress, e.g., bob'Ь, bob'a; vosk'Ь, vosk'a; post'Ь, post'a > bоб(Ь), b'обу; vоск(Ь), v'оску; пост(Ь), p'осту;

(c) original mobile stress noun without neo-acute in the nominative but now with fixed final stress, e.g., m'ostЬ, m'остa; pl'одЬ, pl'оду1 > m'ост(Ь), мост'a; pl'од(Ь), plod'a (and pl'оду);

(d) original mobile stress nouns without neo-acute in the nominative which retain root stress in the oblique cases, e.g., p'отЬ, p'ота > пот(Ь), p'оту or v'осЬ, v'оса > v'ос(Ь), v'оса (with retention of the original genitive singular);

(e) root stress (of either origin: b or d) throughout the singular except for the locative where the {у} is usually stressed, e.g., vь p'отЬ; vь grob'Ь > v пот'у; v hroб'у.

5) After the various restructurings described above, neo-acute now may occur in the nominative (and accusative) singular in two different types of nonfixed stress. These are the one defined above under 4(a) and (b). Both of these stress types had in common the following: (1) they often shared the development described in 4(e); (2) the vocative (even of the former oxytones) was root stressed; (3)

1 This was original an ь-stem noun.
all the oblique case of the plural had desinential stress.\(^1\) Thus, neo-acute became associated with, that is, the mark in the nominative singular of any type of nonfixed stress. The corollary also applied: no lengthening indicates that the stress is fixed to that vowel.

6) In this way neo-acute lengthening spread to the nominative singular of those nouns defined under 4(c) and (d), that is, on the model kot'\(\dot{a}\) : most'\(\acute{a}\) < *m'osta we get *m\(\ddot{o}\)t(\(\ddot{u}\)) because of *k\(\ddot{o}\)t(\(\ddot{u}\)) < *kot'\(\ddot{u}\); on the model b'o'bu < *bob'a : p'o'tu < *p\(\ddot{o}\)ta we get *p\(\ddot{o}\)t(\(\ddot{u}\)) because of *b\(\ddot{o}\)b(\(\ddot{u}\)) < *bob'\(\ddot{u}\).

The introduction of neo-acute into the nominative and accusative singular of the former mobile type was possibly facilitated by another factor: a very commonly observed phonetic phenomenon whereby a vowel tends to lengthen whenever it is followed by a voiced segment. Therefore, once the redistribution of the \{a\} and \{u\} genitive had destroyed the function of the neo-acute as marking an oxymonic, and once the weak jer could no longer bear stress even optionally, then neo-acute length in the nominative singular became a common feature in many nouns regardless of the stress pattern they now followed. This confusion must have been aided by the natural phonetic lengthening of a vowel before a voiced consonant. For example, the presence of lengthening in brod(\(\ddot{u}\)), br'o'\(\ddot{u}\) < *br'o\(\ddot{a}\), *br'o\(\ddot{a}\) is due not only to analogy with nouns of the same stress type b\(\ddot{o}\)b(\(\ddot{u}\)), b'o'bu with neo-acute length but must also be

\(^1\)This means that n'osi (nom. plur.), n'osy (acc. plur.) of the mobile stress still differed from the same cases kot'i, kot'y of the oxymonic group. The former type of plural stress is all but unknown in modern Ukrainian; n'uby, nub'iv, nub'\(\ddot{a}\)m, etc., is the only example of a masculine noun of this type.
partially due to the presence of \( d \). This, in turn, would mean that a lengthened vowel was becoming all the more common is the nominative singular as a mark of that case form thus helping this feature to spread.

Now let us examine some practical applications of the six stages outlined above. Among the former oxytones of East Slavic assembled by Kolesov are the nouns *\( \text{l'ov} \) 'catch, take of a hunt' and *\( \text{skot} \) 'cattle, wealth in livestock'. Both of these now appear in modern Ukrainian without any trace of lengthening, that is, \( \text{l'ov} \), \( \text{skot} \) without ikavism. Why should that be so? In the first place, both of them are collectives and subject to receiving the \( u \)-genitive, e.g., *\( \text{l'ov} \) > \( \text{l'ovu} \) and *\( \text{skot} \) > \( \text{sk'otu} \). Secondly, by their very meaning, they are unlikely to occur in the plural; in fact, they never do. This means that the root vowel of both nouns is always stressed since the expected desinential stress of any plural forms are nonexistent nor is the stressed \( [u] \) of the locative singular attested for these two nouns. All of these circumstances have made \( \text{l'ov} \) and \( \text{skot} \) nouns with fixed root stress and as such give no indication of ikavism. They are treated in the same way as other fixed stress nouns like \( \text{sabob'on} \), \( \text{zak'on} \), \( \text{nam'et} \) or \( \text{osn'ov} \) (gen. plur.) < \( \text{osn'ova} \).

A similar situation exists with *\( \text{med} \) 'honey' which gives both \( \text{med} \) (standard form) and \( \text{mid} \) in Ukrainian. This noun belonged originally to the mobile stress type of the \( u \)-stems, and because of its meaning it experienced no changes in the original genitive singular ending nor

\( ^1 \)There is not general agreement in assigning this noun to the oxytones, but this is not important in the argumentation to follow.
in the root stress. In any event, it should have joined the stress pattern of *bob(்), bo'bu as did bro'd(்), br'odu, etc., but there is a major difference here. Because of its meaning *med will hardly ever, if at all, occur in the plural. ¹ If, in addition to this, the stressed {u} of the locative is eliminated in favour of {i} < ē of the ē-stems, then *med becomes for all practical purposes a noun of the fixed stress group. This is obviously what happened here; v *med'u still exists, but v m'edi is more common. This explains the parallel forms with and without ikavism in the nominative singular; *med is the natural development for those speakers who felt this to be a noun of fixed stress and *mid for those who perceived it as having mobile stress.

A somewhat similar history is shared by *sokᵊ 'sap', but here the end result is different. It was originally an ē-stem of the mobile stress type, and because of it meaning it will receive {u} in the genitive singular and will seldom occur in the plural. It should, therefore, development like skot without ikavism or at least like *med with parallel forms. This, however, is not the case, for *sik is the only attested nominative form. The difference here lies is the locative singular; the spread of {u} was conditioned by both semantic and phonetic factors. One such factor in the latter category is that the u-locative is very often used to avoid the occurrence of the second palatalization. Thus, v sok'u is the only form used, and because of this fact its status as a mobile stress noun is clearly maintained.

Lest anyone should think that an accentological solution explains

¹Both Holoskevych and Pohribnyj cite plural forms med'y, med'iv, but these are great rarities in common speech.
all, let us examine a potentially more difficult problem. In several instances cited above, *br'od> brid has been mentioned as an original ř-stem noun with mobile stress but which received lengthening of the root vowel for various reasons already described, the major one being that this lengthening marked the noun as belonging to a nonfixed stress type. However, if we turn to Pohribnyj (1964), the most authoritative Ukrainian reference work on stress, we find that brid, br'odu now belongs to the fixed stress paradigm. The structure of the word itself, that is, an etymologically short vowel in the initial syllable indicates that it did not belong to this stress type in Proto-Slavic, and the Serbo-Croatian brţd, brţda, and Slovene brţd, broda fully support such an assumption. Obviously then brid was shifted from its original type to the fixed stress paradigm as were lov, skot or med. Why then does brid not show the loss of ikaivism as do the other examples? Even within the framework of an accentological solution, it is not difficult to suggest an answer. The first set of example most likely represent very early stress shifts before the lengthened root vowel had changed qualitatively whereas brid represents a younger stress shift later than the change from quantity to quality in the root vowel. Very logical, but where is the proof? In this particular instance, however, we are in luck, for as recently as 1929 Holoskevyč (1955) still considered brid a mobile stress noun. Unfortunately, this example is cited merely because it is so atypical. In the vast major of cases there is no such ready answer, for Ukrainian has no standard reference work on historical accentology.

1This is listed in the bibliography as Holoskevyč (1955), but is the eighth reprinting of the original Kiev edition of 1929.
as Russian has in Kiparsky (1962). With the exception of a few articles, cursory sketches and historical comments in studies of the contemporary state of affairs, the historical evolution of stress in Ukrainian is an untouched field of research. When a problem like the one cited above arises, we have to rely solely on our reconstructions of late Proto-Slavic stress patterns and the facts of modern Ukrainian; the intervening centuries are, for the most part, silent.

Another potential weakness lies in stage two of the scheme proposed above. The difficulty here does not lie in the facts themselves; the modern language fully confirms both the expansion of the $\nu$-genitive and the usual shift of the affected nouns from the oxytone group into a mobile type. The problem lies rather in demonstrating the proximity in time between this process and the one mentioned in stage one. The closer they are in time, the greater is the likelihood of the various resulting restructurings described in stages five and six. Naturally, it is understood that such a major morphological rebuilding in the genitive of masculines would not be accomplished in short order. The number of parallel forms existing even now in the standard language proves this. However, for the suggested extension of a lengthened root vowel as a mark of nonfixed stress, it is necessary that the spread of the $\nu$-genitive began to take place shortly after or perhaps simultaneously with the rise of neo-acute. This would be at a time when there was great vacillation in the choice of genitive endings and before further developments more and more lexicalized stress.

The phenomenon of neo-acute is, as stated so often, of late Proto-Slavic origin and assigned by Shevelov to the eighth and mid ninth
centuries. In its initial stages neo-acute was merely a reaction to the weakening of jers and would not become obligatory at once. That is, to say, former oxytones would for a long time permit two forms (in free variation) in the nominative singular, e.g., *kot’b > *kôt-b or *kot’b.

As the jer continues to weaken, kôt-b will become increasingly more common, but the other form will still be possible until the weak jer loses completely its ability to bear stress. This latter phase cannot have preceded the final loss of weak jers by any great period of time, and this final phase for the southern regions of East Slavic began to take place in the early twelfth century. The initial and major impetus, therefore, in the expansion of the u-genitive and the resulting loss of oxytonic stress by the affected nouns must have taken place in the early part of a period extending from immediately after the rise of neo-acute until after the fall of the jers—but how long after is very difficult to say. One reasonable suggestion is that the cut-off point would occur only when the lengthened e and o ceased to be phonetically distinct.

Let us then outline in brief the steps in this process.

As we have seen, the road to ikavism proceeded along two different routes: eCb > *ÊC > iC and eCb > *ÆC > 'iC, oCb, b > *üC > iC. The so-called new jat’ of the first group merged with the etymological jat’, and by the thirteenth century the documents show unambiguously¹ that the typically Ukrainian development of ě > i (Filin, 1972:175) was already taking place. Because both new and etymological jat’ give in the final analysis the same reflex, we have no way of knowing whether

¹There are examples, albeit uncertain, of ě > i from as early as the tenth and eleventh centuries.
both of them merged at some intermediate stage and then developed to \( \hat{i} \) or whether each one developed to \( \hat{i} \) separately. All we know for certain is that the scribes used the grapheme \( jat' \) for both entities, but this proves phonetic similarity only, not complete merger. To my knowledge no one has undertaken any research to determine whether the scribes confused etymological \( \tilde{e} \) and \( \hat{i} \) more readily than new \( \tilde{e} \) and \( \hat{i} \) or vice versa or whether in equal measure. Nevertheless, we do have clear evidence of new \( \tilde{e} > \hat{i} \) from the fourteenth century whereas the earliest evidence of \( \hat{\acute{u}} (< \text{oC}_b, \text{eC}_b) > \hat{i} \) stems from the mid-sixteenth century (Bezpalko, 1962:154) although the older spellings with the graphemes \( u \) and \( \acute{u} \) are still abundantly attested well past the mid-seventeenth century. This means that by merging with \( \hat{i} \) the reflex of lengthened \( e < \text{eC}_b \) lost its ability to mark nonfixed stress at least a full century (possibly two centuries) before the same fate overtook the reflex of lengthened \( o \) and \( e < \text{eC}_b \). It is very probable that the splitting of the lengthened \( e \) into two distinct reflexes and the early removal by merger of one of these from its role of marking nonfixed stress explain in large measure why \( e > \hat{i} \) is much more poorly represented than \( o > \hat{i} \). Because of the special development with \( e \), fewer patterns would come into existence; therefore, there would be less chance for analogical extensions, but a greater chance that existing patterns may be erased because of their relative rarity in the language.

If, then, we regard neo-acute lengthening, and analogical extension thereof as a means of indicating nonfixed stress, then it could have fulfilled this role from the time of its first coming into existence until such time as the reflexes of this lengthening \( o \) merged
with another segment, thus, losing its distinctiveness and its ability to perform its previous function. Does this period of time correspond with what we know about the expansion of the u-genitive? If one takes into consideration the extensive and similar expansion of this ending in Polish, Czech, Slovak and Belorussian, it is most likely that we are dealing with a feature of Proto-Slavic origin. We would, therefore, hope to find evidence for this feature in the earliest secular documents from Ukrainian territory. Although there is no substantial body of such documents earlier than the fourteenth century, in these we find basically what was expected: the u-genitive is used far beyond its historical frontiers, but there is still considerable vacillation in the choice of an α- or u-genitive (Kuraszkiewicz, 1934:107; Bevzenko, 1960:34-36). An analogous situation also exists in the earliest Czech (Sirokova, 1961:112) and Polish (Kobylińska, 1968:114) documents, that is, in the fourteenth century. This proves that the phenomenon is of fairly ancient origin and, therefore, corresponds chronologically with that period of time when neo-acute marked nonfixed stress. In addition, the almost complete parallelism is the use of the masculine singular genitive ending would greatly facilitate the type of analogical restructurings suggested above in phases 5) and 6).

An interesting bit of supporting evidence is provided by two borrowings from Polish. The first of these is drit, dr'otu, drot'y (nom. plur.) 'wire'; as is obvious, it exhibits the o ~ i alternation and belongs to the new mobile stress type of Ukrainian. As Sławski (1952) points out the word in Polish is itself a borrowing from German of ca. the sixteenth or seventeenth century when it entered Polish in
the form \textit{drót}, that is, with the so-called \textit{o pochylone} which at that
time had not yet merged with \textit{u}. The question now arises: why should
this borrowing in Ukrainian have mobile stress? Neither of the source
languages could possibly have served as a model. The answer is-apparently in the nature of the root vowel. There is ample evidence
in the form of mutual borrowings to show that Ukrainian speakers
identified the Polish \textit{o pochylone} with their own lengthened \textit{o} and vice
versa. When, therefore, the word entered the language with this vowel,
it was automatically assigned the mobile stress paradigm. This is all
the more evident when we contrast this with another Polish borrowing,
\textit{krok, kr'oku, kr'oky} 'step' which in Polish has (and had at the time of
the borrowing) the \textit{o jasne}, that is, not \textit{pochylone}. This \textit{o} was identi-
fied by Ukrainian speakers with their own unlengthened \textit{o} and because
the noun contained this type of root vowel, it was assigned to the fixed
stress paradigm.

Up until now we have dealt only with monosyllabic roots of the
\textit{č-, jč-} and \textit{ǔ-} stems, but Ukrainian also exhibits ikavism in nouns of
the former \textit{č-} stem declension. We must, therefore, now investigate those
accentological factors which gave rise to this situation among these
nouns. As with other declensional types (except the \textit{ǔ-} stems for which
no fixed root stress is evident in Slavic) we find here the familiar
three types of stress paradigms (Stang, 1957:85-90; Illič-Svityč, 1963:
146-47). The fixed root type of stress, of course, does not concern us
since none of these contain the vowels \textit{e} or \textit{o}. The problems arise with
the other two types and for the following reasons: (1) it is difficult
to determine which noun originally belonged to which stress type; (2)
the contour of mobility for the mobile stress type has not been fully established.

Some of the complexities involved will be more clearly seen if they are demonstrated with examples. Let us contrast then an oxytonic noun with one of the mobile paradigm for which we will use Stang's reconstruction. For this latter will be used *kostъ; for the former, *peьъ which is considered an oxytone by Kolesov (1972:95) although this would not be accepted by all. Nevertheless, they may serve as examples. The forms with question marks are indicated thus by Stang himself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Dual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. peьъ</td>
<td>k'ostъ</td>
<td>peь'и k'osti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. peь'и</td>
<td>kost'и (?)</td>
<td>peь'ъъъ kostъъъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. peь'и</td>
<td>k'osti</td>
<td>peь'ъъъ kostъъъ(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. peьъ</td>
<td>k'ostъ</td>
<td>peь'и k'osti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. peьъъъъъ kostъъъъъ (?)</td>
<td>peь'ъъъъ kostъъъъи</td>
<td>peь'ъъъъ kostъъъъа</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. peь'и</td>
<td>kost'и</td>
<td>peь'ъъъ kostъъъъ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we assume a similar development in this declensional type as in the *a-stems (Stang, 1957:62), then we would expect a generalization of one of the two stresses in the instrumental singular. In East Slavic that would result in -ъъъъъъ being used in both paradigms. At a later date when weak jers lose their stressability, the paradigms will draw even closer together. In the singular only the dative would differ in stress and this case is seldom used with inanimate nouns. In the plural only the nominative, accusative and instrumental would differ. As a result of these stress shifts, neo-acute would come into existence in the oxytone type in the nominative, accusative and the instrumental singular and plural; in the mobile type this would occur in the instrumental singular only. Thus, a new type of mobile stress was gradually coming
into being at the same time as neo-acute length was becoming the mark of any nonfixed stress pattern. In this way, neo-acute spread from the former oxytone to all other nouns belonging to the same declensional type exhibiting a nonfixed stress which was also becoming more and more unified.

In the modern language the former ֵ-stems show ikavism in the nominative, accusative and instrumental singular and in the instrumental plural in those few instances where the original ֵ-stem ending has not been replaced by amī from the ā-stem, e.g., pič, p'eči (gen. sing.), pičču (inst. sing.); kist', k'osti, kistju, kist'm'y (also kostj'amī); hist', hosti, h'ist'm'y (also h'ostj'amī). In the nominative and accusative plural desinential stress has been replaced by root stress; a contributing factor here could have been that this solution was in conformity with all other ֵ-stems of the fixed stress paradigm. The suggested desinential stress of the genitive singular, although definitely attested in the Čudov New Testament (Stang, 1957:87), in modern Ukrainian occurs only in the declension of numerals, e.g., pjat', pjat'y; d'evjat', devjat'y.

The explanation proposed above, although very plausible, contains one disquieting flaw. It rests on the supposition that the ֵ-stem declension at one time possessed a considerable number of oxytones in order for this type to have introduced neo-acute into the new stress

---

1 kost'm'y is also attested in Ševčenko.

2 This ending serves also for the dative and locative; the original instrumental is not attested being replaced by pjat'm'a, devjat'm'a, etc.
paradigm, but the evidence to support such a supposition is not very substantial. Stang (1957:85) is able to muster only one definite example thereof. However, it is extremely difficult to believe that a stress type like the oxytones so commonly attested in other stems would be represented by only one or two nouns in the ĺ-stems. The available data seem to indicate that the contour of mobility in the ĺ-stems differed from that of the ř- and řď-stems. This fact, coupled with the rarity of oxytones among the ĺ-stem, indicates very strongly that the merger of the oxytones and the original mobile type into a new mobile type is a phenomenon of Proto-Slavic origin. That is to say, some sort of merger like the one described above must have occurred, but as applied to ikavism the question of time is of the essence. If the merger took place (or was, at least, well under way) before the rise of neo-acute, then we have no explanation for the introduction of neo-acute length into this declension. On the other hand, the parallelism of the data from Russian, Slovene and Serbo-Croatian (Stang, 1957:86) argues very strongly for the Proto-Slavic origin of this paradigm. If this explanation is not accepted, then we are forced to assume that the end results are almost identical simply because the initial set of stimuli were identical. If, in turn, this last suggestion is correct, we would expect to find some traces of the former oxytonic forms scattered here and there either in the dialects or the accented texts. Kolesov (1972: 73-94,176-178) claims to have discovered precisely that by applying, among others, the following criteria: (1) the presence of desinential stress in the dative singular and nominative-accusative plural, (2) the presence of root stress in the instrumental plural, e.g., *p'ědmi <
*peč'ěmi* vs. *kostč'ěi*, (3) the tendency of the same nouns to show root stress also in the dative and locative plural (apparently by analogy to the development mentioned in the previous point) whereas the original mobile stress noun show desinential stress in the same cases, (4) the tendency of the former oxytones to resist prepositional enclisis especially evident in the earliest tests and especially with those oxytones the root vowel of which was etymologically long, (5) the presence of corresponding traces of oxytonic stress in South Slavic. When applied jointly as Kolesov himself states, these features provide fairly strong evidence not only for the existence of an oxytonic type of stress for the *ě*-stems in Proto-Slavic but also that the merger and mutual influence of two originally separate stress types were still taking place after the disintegration of Proto-Slavic although the first step in this merger very likely took place long before that.

In spite of the evidence presented above, certain nagging doubts still remain. If we interpret the data as Kolesov does, we are still at a loss to explain why the end results in Slovene, Serbo-Croatian and Russian are so strikingly similar to or why the Leka-type dialects show no trace of neo-acute lengthening in the nominative singular\(^1\) in the list of oxytones as reconstructed by Kolesov. His criterion No. 1 could mean nothing more than that the language at that time possessed desinential stress in other declension types\(^2\) and these influenced certain

---

\(^1\)This obviously, may be due entirely to our imperfect knowledge of these dialects. At least, I can find no evidence thereof in the material available to me.

\(^2\)This, of course, is an undisputed fact.
of ṭ-stems. Criterion No. 2 could be understood in an entirely different way. If we assume a development similar to that proposed by Stang (1957: 63) for the ā-, jā-stems whereby the instrumental plural stress of *sen'ami (type b) was generalized for *golv'amī < *golvam'ī. For the ṭ-stems this would give us ṭpeš'ami, ṭkost'ami, ṭžuš'ami, ṭdvar'ami; when weak jers lose their stressability, stress would shift backward in the first two examples but forward in the last two (Shevelov, 1965:445) thus giving us a model for the two stresses attested in the documents.

Criterion No. 3 is not essential in establishing oxytonism and can easily be attributed to influence of root stressed forms, already, a well established model at that time. The argument contained in No. 4 is somewhat more cogent but here again objections may be raised. Prepositional enclisis depended on the length and/or intonation of the initial stressed vowel of a root. Once both distinctive length and intonation are lost as in East Slavic, all the former barriers are down, and all manner of analogical restructurings and generalizations are bound to occur obscuring the original situation to the point where it is unrecoverable. The last point may prove nothing more than that any dialect which still permits final stress may also experience the extension of this stress type to forms where it did not originally exist. These considerations do not necessarily invalidate Kolesov's interpretation of his data; they cannot be simply dismissed out of hand.

In any event, they do not provide truly unambiguous proof for the existence of any large group of oxytones in the ṭ-stem.

For the sake of argument, however, let us assume that the loss of oxytones in the ṭ-stems is a process completed before the rise of
neo-acute. Does this then mean that we have no means of explaining ikavism in the descendants of these nouns in modern Ukrainian? No, this is hardly the case. It would seem that by the time Proto-Slavic dis-integrated there was one predominant type of nonfixed stress in the ĭ-stems, and this would be something very close to that type of mobility reconstructed by Stang. This means that we can safely postulate the rise of neo-acute in the instrumental singular, e.g., *kóst'þjǫ < *kost'þjǫ and very probably in the instrumental plural as well, e.g., *nó̂s'ómí < *nô̂s'ómí. This means that by a well established sound law, neo-acute has been introduced into a mobile stress paradigm precisely at that period in the history of Proto-Ukrainian when neo-acute length was becoming the distinctive mark of any nonfixed stress pattern.

There is also some evidence indicating that neo-acute came into existence in the locative plural as well. Stang (1957:89) cites such forms as kôståxь, nô̂s'òxь, that is, from manuscripts representing a Leka-type dialects. It is difficult to explain these neo-acute on any phonetic basis; the jer in the locative plural, i.e., *kost'áxь, *nô̂s'òxь is in strong position and, therefore, not subject to loss of stressability. It seems possibly that this is an analogical phenomenon brought about by the shift of stress from the weak jer in the instrumental plural. Since these shifts would have occurred at approximately the same time, they produced the same result. Whether or not this is the correct explanation is not all that vital to our problem; the documentary evidence indicates that we had neo-acute lengthening in one other case form of this paradigm.

Two other details of Stang's reconstruction are fairly firmly
established; these are desinential stress in both genitive and locative singular. Under these circumstances, it would be very easy for analogical generalizations to occur. There already existed in the language a pattern whereby nouns belonging to a nonfixed stress paradigm had neo-acute length before a weak Jer, and this, as we have seen, already existed in kóst’ji. Therefore, there would be a direct parallel between *kónb < *kon‘b, *kon‘/a (gen. sing.), *na kon‘/i and *k’ostb, *kost‘i, *na kost‘i. Under these conditions, neo-acute length could easily be extended to the root vowel of the nominative singular of *kostb since it too was followed by a weak Jer and belonged to a nonfixed stress type. The analogy is even clearer if we consider the former i-stem *gvozdб (Stang, 1957:90) which because of its gender was switched to the masculine jö-stem declension at a fairly early date, thus, on the model *kon‘/a, *na kon‘i and gvozd‘/a < *gvozd‘i, *na gvozd‘i we get *gvozdб because of *konb. There is also the possibility that *gvozdб was originally an oxytone, but the evidence here is ambiguous (Kiparsky, 1962:82).

Another type of apparent exceptions is created by those roots containing more than one syllable. This includes words of the type v’ëhir, v’ëhora (gen. sing.), veçor‘y (nom. plur.) in which we have a noun with mobile stress (Ukrainian type) and with ikavism, but the vowel so affected never receives the stress. It is, therefore, an entirely different situation than with nouns like kit, kot‘a for which we have concrete evidence to believe that the ơ participated directly in a

---

1This noun is no longer in use in the standard language having been replaced by cvàw. It still exists in the western dialects in the form hvîsd‘, hv’oṣdja‘.
shift of stress or like *nis, *n'osa for which we have an analogical model as described above. For *vy'zîr one is tempted to suggest that *ikavism took place here also for analogical reasons in that lengthening of the final root vowel in the nominative-accusative singular having become the mark of mobile stress was automatically extended to nouns of this type regardless of whether this vowel participated in the stress shift. This would be quite acceptable if it were not for the numerous tort-formula nouns with the very same stress pattern but without any trace of *ikavism, e.g., *h'olos, *h'olosu (gen. sing.), h'olos'y (nom. plur.). This is the basic problem with *ikavism in non-mono-syllabic roots in Ukrainian.

Before attempting some explanation to this problem, let us look at some of the other difficulties involved with roots of this type.

First of all, their relatively rarity hampers any exhaustive investigation or firm conclusions. Practically all of Stang's reconstructions of Proto-Slavic stress are based on data provided by monosyllabic roots. Nevertheless, there are sufficient data to permit us with a high degree of certainty to postulate for multisyllabic roots the same three stress types as evidenced with monosyllabics. As with the latter, the former oxytones present no difficulties in explaining the origin of *ikavism, e.g., *top'ir, *topor'a obviously from *topor'b, *topor'a. To this group also belong the following: *tyv'it, *tyvot'a; pyr'ih, pyroh'a; mor'ih, moroh'a; barl'ih, barloh'a; bat'ih, batch'a, and s'okil, s'okola, sokol'y (nom. plur.).

The last example cited leads us into the second difficulty, for here we have a noun which is no longer an oxytone but was clearly documented as such in the seventeenth century (Veselovs'ka, 1970:18) and
still is dialectically. One then wonders how widespread this phenomenon is. Is it merely an isolated case? Has there been a general trend to shift oxytones into some other stress types? But how does one establish the existence of any linguistic trend without a substantial number of examples? And so the vicious circle closed due to lack of examples.

However, the root *sokoľ is interesting for yet another reason: it demonstrates the contradictory nature of the evidence. As mentioned, it is documented as an oxytone in seventeenth century Ukrainian, and this is supported by standard Serbo-Croatian sokoľ, sokola but contradicted by Čakavian sokol, sokola. This latter is in harmony with Russian s'okol, s'okola, s'okoly and indicates, at least, a mobile stress paradigm or perhaps even fixed initial stress. On the other hand, Avanesov cites instances of desinential stress in this word in certain fossilized expressions. Yet again the Slovene sokol, sokola indicate an oxytone, but the Bulgarian sokol indicates that we are dealing with fixed stress on the final root syllable. Thus, for a trisyllabic form like sokoľ we have evidence for all three vowels having originally born the stress. The example of sokoľ is unfortunately not unique. Consider the case of *večer. Here certainly is a root well attested in every corner of the Slavic world; certainly there should be sufficient data for establishing a generally acceptable reconstruction. Yet on the basis of the same evidence competent and serious scholars arrive at very different conclusions. Illič-Svityč believes the noun originally belonged to a mobile stress paradigm (Stang's type e); both Kuryłowicz and Sadnik consider it an oxytone; van Wijk and Vondrák opt for fixed stress on the final root vowel, and Dolobko (Kolesov, 1972: 167) proposed two competing declensional types with differing stress:
*v'ezenь for an ь-stem masculine and věč'erь for an ь-stem feminine.

At least one point of unanimity seems to emerge from all the above. None of the investigators already mentioned nor any others consulted admit the possibility of fixed stress on the initial root vowel if that vowel was etymologically short. That is to say, a form like *jasenь could theoretically be stressed on any one of its three syllables. The modern Ukrainian form j'asenь (and j'asen) with fixed initial stress and no ikavism indicates very strongly that this word was always stressed on that syllable. ¹ There was, therefore, no stress retraction from the final weak jer and no concomitant lengthening of the e. On the other hand, a form like *lososь could have fixed stress only on the final root syllable or on the desinence, i.e., *los'osь or *lososь > *lososь. If the initial syllable were in any instance stressed, it could only be as a part of a mobile stress pattern. The modern Ukrainian los'osь, los'osja, los'osi indicates that we are dealing with the first alternative whereby no stress retraction ever occurred from the final weak jer. The same explanation also seems to apply to 'olenь which now has fixed initial stress (and without ikavism), and this, as we have just seen, could not have been the original situation. However, the Russian ol'enь, ol'enja; Serbo-Croatian jělenь, jělena; Slovene jélenь, jelénaь, and Bulgarian elën permit us with a very high degree of probability to reconstruct the Proto-Slavic form as *jel'enь.

Let us then apply these principles to the problem under discussion to see if there is some logical way of explaining ikavism in

¹Pohribnyj (1964) list j'asenь, j'asenaь, jasen'y. This is the first and only reference work to assign this noun to the mobile stress paradigm.
these multisyllabic forms for which any stress shift on to final is not readily apparent. The largest such group are words of the type r'ehit, r'ehotu 'guffaw, cackling laughter'; l'oskit, l'oskotu 'sudden jab in ribs, tickle'; h'urkit, h'urkotu 'rattle, rumble of wheels'. Nin'ovs'kyj lists twenty-four such nouns, but there are many more. All of them signify either some sort of noise or (a small group) a quick, sudden action. It can, therefore, be argued that since they are all onomatopoeic or interjectional in origin, they have no value in historical linguistics. This may be true to a certain extent, but it would apply more accurately to the initial imitative syllable than to the commonly attested formants ot, kot.

The main difficulty here, as with other multisyllable forms, is to establish the original stress type, but with these nouns there is an additional difficulty. They are rarely if ever used in the plural; native speakers, when consulted, supplied plural forms only with great hesitation and uncertainty trying various stresses usually with equal dissatisfaction. When pressed, they would, for example, settle for either h'urkotami (inst. plur.) or hurkot'ami but not hurk'otami. The stress of the plural as a clue to the past is, therefore, lost to us. However, when we look at forms like r'ehit or c'okit 'tinkling, tapping noise', we know that the fixed initial stress on a short vowel is not structural possible in Proto-Slavic. It is, of course, theoretically possible on the long vowel of h'urkit or lj'askit 'crackling, snapping sound of a whip or flag, etc. This may have been true at one stage; but, if so, it was quickly lost being replaced by the stress pattern in existence for those nouns with a short root vowel. This is proved by
the stress of the verb forms derived from these nouns. For example, from *hurkit we have *hurkot'aty > hurkoč'ŭ, hurk'očč and *hurkot'ity > hurkoč'ŭ, hurkot'yă in exactly the same way as with *rehit from which we have *rehot'aty and *rehot'ity. There are no instances where the stress is retained on a formerly long vowel, that is, always *hurkot'ity, *ljaškot'ity never *h'urkot'ity or *l'jaškot'ity.

The above considerations fairly effectively rule out the possibility of fixed initial stress even for those forms containing an etymologically long vowel. What then of the second syllable? Could the stress not have been fixed to this vowel? This possibility must also be rejected and again because of the stress of the verbs derived therefrom. Roots with stress fixed on this syllable will usually retain it on the same syllable in any derived verb. For example, from *got'ovă, *mɪn'ogă we get in Ukrainian hot'ovyty and mn'ošty, but with verbs of the type under discussion we have no instances in which the o in stressed; that is, *hurk'otaty or *reh'otaty are never encountered. This means that if fixed stress on the final root syllable ever did at one time exist, it was eliminated in favour of another stress pattern. But what could that stress pattern have been? Since we have eliminated the possibility of the stress being fixed on either of the two root syllables, we have no choice but to posit an oxytonic stress type. This alternative explains both the lengthened final root vowel and the stress of the verb forms. In support of these theoretical considerations, there is one concrete example—unfortunately, only one but very instructive. This is the noun vork'it, vorkot'a 'person or animal who makes a vor-type of sound'; it is used, for example, in reference to a cat that purrs
loudly or a person that mutters and grumbles to himself. Note that all other nouns of this type refer not to some animate being making the noise described but to the noise itself, that is, to an abstract concept. This, as we have seen, in precisely the semantic type of noun to receive the u-genitive and with it the loss of final stress. This, of course, would not apply to vorkit which refers to a concrete animate being. Thus, one may safely reconstruct for Proto-Ukrainian *warkotъ, *warkotъ > *warkotъ, warkotъ; *regotъ, regotъ > *regotъ, regotъ and later *r'egotъ or r'ehotъ.

One may be puzzled as to the final stress shift itself. Here the loss of oxytonic stress is not itself in question. There are numerous examples with monosyllabic roots to prove that the u-genitive tends not to be stressed. But why should the change in stress be *regotъ > *r'egotъ and not *regotъ > *reg'otъ? Here it is well to remember that marginal stress, that is, a shift between first and last syllables was not a unknown type in Proto-Slavic. This was also in conformity with an existing pattern whereby a root may have initial stress in some forms but stress on the stem of a verb formed from that same root, e.g., Russian veselъ, veselъ'a but vesel'itъ; Serbo-Croatian veselo but veseliti. In addition, a shift of one syllable back would have brought such forms into variance with forms like *los'oeъ or ol'enъ which had fixed stress on the second root vowel but no neo-acute lengthening in the nominative-accusative singular. A solution like *regotъ, *reg'otъ, *regotъ'ti would also be at variance with forms like got'ovъ, got'oviti1 in which the stress does not shift

1It is interesting to note that this adjective is one of the very few which still exist in Ukrainian in the so-called short form and this is hot'ov with no trace of ikavism.
to the verbal stem. The only other solution would have been for nouns like *regót⁵ to have abandoned neo-acute in the nominative singular and adapted the verbal stress exemplified by *got'ovití, etc. This, obviously, was not the path chosen.

Does this now mean that all such forms as v'ečir, hov'ir, k'uzil', etc., may safely be considered former oxytones? This would hardly be prudent, for although we may now have difficulty in separating the former oxytones from the former mobile type, we have no reason whatsoever for doubting the existence of the latter type among multisyllabics. One of these would seem to be the Proto-Slavic root *govor₃ as evidenced by Russian g'ovor, g'ovora; Serbo-Croatian gòvır, gòvora; Bulgarian gòvor. How then is one to explain the present Ukrainian hov'ir, hov'oru? What brought about the stress shift to the final root syllable and what was the cause of ikavism in nouns like these? The stress of this noun is extremely interesting because it exemplified a hitherto uninvestigated phenomenon in Ukrainian historical accentology. The stress of this noun as shown above is a fairly recent attempt at standardization on the part of Pohribnyj (1964). Holoskevyč in 1929 still cited this entry as having fixed initial stress, i.e., h'ovir, h'ovoru. Even this listing was not completely accurate; for vast numbers of speakers the actual stress was h'ovir, hov'oru, that is, with stress on the initial syllable in the nominative-accusative singular and only in that case but on the second root syllable in all other cases. This rather peculiar type of mobile stress is commonly encountered in nouns of the following type: prefix + monosyllabic root containing e or o, e.g., p'oklin, pokl'oru; d'oxid, dox'odu; r'ozvid, rozv'odu; r'onzij,
rosv'oju; n'apij, nxp'oju; n'astrij, nastr'oju. One is immediately tempted to see here some sort of Polish influence; this may very well be true to some small extent, but it cannot be the whole story, for the same tendency is very largely absent if the root contains an etymological long vowel, e.g., n'akas, n'akasu; p'opyt, p'opytu; p'idklad, p'idkladu; d'otyk, d'otyku; 'obmin, 'obminu. Besides, borrowings from Polish or through the intermediacy of Polish follow a different stress pattern, namely, fixed initial stress in all the singular forms but fixed stress on the second syllable throughout the plural. For example, from Polish żołnierz 'soldier, yeoman', we have in Ukrainian ż'ovnir, ż'ovnira, ż'ovnirovi, etc., but in the plural żovn'iry; profesor, profesora and in the plural profes'ory. This type of stress pattern is used very sparingly, if at all, by the modern standard language but is still very common in the speech of Western Ukrainian even among the intelligentsia. The origin, therefore, of Ukrainian p'oklin, pokl'omu must have other roots.

It is possible that this phenomenon goes back to Proto-Slavic and has its origin in that intricate accentual interaction between prefix or preposition and root as described and summarized by Shevelov (1965:51-55). It is his conclusion here that in Ukrainian the prefix stressed type is by far the predominant type in masculine nouns. This

---

1 Not all of these examples are accepted as 'standard' but are easily elicited from native speakers. See Ilarion (1952:107-114) for a fuller discussion.

2 Pohribnyj (1964) gives żovn'ir, żovn'ira, żovn'iry and profesor, profesor'y.
is also Ilarion's (Ohijenko) conclusion (1952:107-114) regarding the same feature. It seems, therefore, that the original state of affairs in Proto-Ukrainian would be one in which the vast majority of masculine nouns formed by means of a prefix plus root would be stressed on that prefix. This would apply particularly to these roots containing a non-acute vowel since, as Shevelov has shown, this was the basic tendency in all of Slavic. The chronology in the stress development of, say, modern Ukrainian pokl'în, pokl'onu (Pohribnyj, 1964) would, therefore, be as follows:

1) fixed stress on the prefix throughout the paradigm;
2) stress shifts from the prefix onto the root;
3) after a period of considerable free variation, a system evolves with prefix stress in the nominative-accusative singular but root stress elsewhere;
4) the prefix stress is eliminated in favour of fixed root stress.

Among the many questions left unanswered by this scheme, the only vital one for our discussion concerns the origin of stage No. 2. What could have caused such a stress shift? There are two possibilities. The first of these could have been the accentual unusualness of, say, such formations as *d'oborae,¹ for here, according to the data, we had fixed stress on an initial short vowel. An attempt to rectify this anomaly may have given rise to some sort of adjustment in the stress. However, this cannot be the whole story, for we see no such adjustment

¹The modern Ukrainian is either d'obîr or dob'îr, the latter being preferred.
in the case of, say, *d’okazь where the vowel of the root syllable is long.

The other alternative has to do with the fall of jers, for among the commonly used prefixes there are vь-, sь-, and vьсь- in which the jer would be in weak position when affixed to any root containing a full vowel. Therefore, contrasting the development of two forms *d’oborь, *s’boraь may throw some light on the problem. In the latter when the jer loses its stressability, the stress will shift to the following syllable (Shevelov, 1965:445) giving rise to neo-acute, i.e., *s’boraь > *s’bóraь.3 This, of course, will occur with every derived form, the root of which contains е or о and is prefixed by a syllable containing a weak jer but not under any other conditions. Thus, two competing formations come into existence: *s’bóraь vs. *d’oborь, and in this way neo-acute can easily be extended to forms where it is not phonetically justified. Similarly in Slovene, we saw that the stress type vhòd, vhòda can be considered perfectly regular in terms of Slovene stress and intonational developments. However, now the same stress type turns up in forms like poklòn, poklòna; nasílòn, nasílònà, etc. (Svane, 1958:39) where it can only be explained in term of an analogical extension of an existing pattern.

---

1 At present this form still has fixed initial stress in all cases.

2 One may possibly add jьь- which is attested as a preposition but not as a verbal prefix in northern Slavic. It may have been used in nominal formation but this is impossible to prove since sь and jьь merge in Ukrainian.

3 The data for positing neo-acute lengthening resulting from a forward shift of this type have already been given on pages 98-102.
The same thing must also have taken place with prefixed forms, the root of which contained a long vowel. That is, if we postulate *š'uborъ > *šubórbъ, then logic dictates the existence of *š'ukasъ > *šukásъ. Root stress would also have existed with those roots containing an original acute (Shevelov, 1965:54), e.g., *sa + *rēzъ > sar'iz; *per + *lāzъ > perel'az. In spite of these two sources of root stress, prefix stress obviously remained the predominant model, for it still is to this day. Such is not the case with those roots containing e, o; vacillation in stress and the use of parallel forms continue right up to the present time. It is very likely that the reason for this, that is, for the differing development in these two types of prefixed roots is to be found in the early loss of distinctive vowel quantity in Proto-Ukrainian. For example, the rise of neo-acute length in *š'ukasъ > *šukásъ may have given rise to an analogical development in *d'okasъ > *d'okásъ and/or *dokásъ, all three possibilities existing in free variation. The presence of neo-acute length would attract the stress, but when this was eliminated from the language, the factor motivating root stress disappeared allowing prefix stress to triumph. This, as we have seen, would not apply to the roots contrasting long and short e, o which already differed qualitatively before distinctive quantity was eliminated. Because of this, the forms *šuborъ and *d'oborъ were at variance and in competition with each other. In the first is neo-acute lengthening (or its reflex) but not in the second, and each has a different stress pattern; yet in both forms the same root with the same meaning is involved. Under these conditions analogical levelings are bound to take place, and in this instance almost all the conceivable possibilities are realized. In the majority of case neo-acute length is
generalized in a given root regardless of the prefix with which it occurs, e.g., *s'brb > *zbr; *dbr > dobir; *nabor > nabir. Less commonly, the nonlengthened form in generalized, e.g., s'brb > *zbr; *brb > brb or the model of *nabor > nanos (nanis is also attested), or there may be a mixing of both forms of the root, e.g., *s'brb > *brb > brb and on this model *prb > pryrist but *prb > parost. This latter has fixed prefix stress without vacillation; it apparently never experienced any stress shift and was always declined after the model of jasen' without neo-acute in the final syllable.

From the contrasting stress types, e.g., *v'brb > *vbrb > wib vs. *p'br > p'br, we get the compromise type: p'br, pe'br. It is, indeed, unfortunate that we possess no documents indicating the possible intermediate stages in the evolution of this stress type. All we know for certain is that the earliest stressed texts (sixteenth and seventeenth centuries) show that words of this type\(^1\) belong to nonfixed and unstable stress patterns (Veselov's'ka, 1970:59-60). This in turn means that the root of all such nouns could very easily acquire the mark of nonfixed stress, the neo-acute or its reflex, and especially in those roots which at any time had been prefixed by \(v\), \(s\), \(v\).

The competing stress types are instructive as regards this last point. For example, in the modern language all forms containing the root -bor are considered as having fixed root stress\(^2\) and with ikavism, i.e., dob'ir, ub'ir, nab'ir, etc. This, however, is a relatively recent

---

\(^1\)Words of the type with long root vowel also show vacillation but with prefix stress predominating. However, this is not part of our problem.

\(^2\)The only exception is \(v'ybr\), \(v'ybr\) and this applies to all other roots; \(v\) inevitably retains the stress.
development, prefix stress being well attested colloquially. On the other hand, nar'od, nar'odu also has fixed root yet without ikavism, but root stress here (nar'odъ) is attested as early as the sixteenth century (Ilarion, 1952:111) although n'arid, n'ar'odu also exists to this day. The scanty but interesting historical data presented by Ilarion (pp. 111-114) seem to indicate that the earlier a noun shifts into the fixed root stress pattern the more likely it is to eliminate (or fail to develop) the lengthened vowel. That is, it begins to be stress according to the model of los'osъ which has fixed stress on the second syllable and is without any reflex of neo-acute lengthening, that vowel never having experienced a stress shift. Other examples conforming to this model are pot'op, sak'on.

This whole discussion was prompted in the first place by an attempt to explain the ə > i change in the root *g'ovorъ > hov'ir (h'ovir, dial.). Now it is clear that this root has passed through the same stages as *d'coborъ > dob'ir (d'obir, doš'oru, dial.). This is not an isolated instance; there are several other examples where nonprefixed nouns of the structure CVCVCь,ь (i.e., long or short vowels from the Proto-Slavic standpoint) have been affected or influenced by the same acccentological processes as seen in prefixed forms with the same syllabic structure. This includes such nouns as k'uš'il', 'bath'; k'ură'il' 'distaff'; k'uk'il' 'type of weed'. The cognates in other Slavic languages indicate that all of these were originally stressed on the second syllable, that is, fixed on the predesinential syllable. This is evidenced by the preservation of length in the formerly prestressed (i.e., initial) syllable, e.g., Czech koupel, koudel, koukol; Slovak
kupel', kudel', kukoł; Polish kąpiel, kądziel, kąkol; Serbo-Croatian kúpelj, kúkolj.

K'up'il' and k'uk'il' are in fact rather poor examples, for the first is generally reconstructed as *kpl and the second cannot be satisfactorily reconstructed at all (see Vasmer); therefore, we do not know what precisely we are dealing with. If both contained the commonly attested formant suffix -el, then the problem of the original stress is of no matter, for the reflex of e is unconditionally i in Ukrainian, and the present i > e alternation k'up'il', k'up'elju; k'uk'il', kuč'elj, k'uk'elja are secondary. Other examples of this type of confusion are *medveđe > medv'id', medv'edja (gen. sing.) are *rıć > rıč, r'či (gen. sing.) and also r'či. All that is proved by these examples is that some nonprefixed form also experienced the same type of confusion vacillating between stressing the first or second syllable. How widespread this phenomenon was is impossible to say until more research is done on these accented texts still preserved. One chance example does turn up in Veselovs’ka (op. cit.) where we seen from the seventeenth century 'ostrovъ, ostr'ony (nom. plur.), ostr'ově as opposed to the modern 'ostrov, 'ostrova (gen. sing.), ostrovy where the vowel exhibiting the reflex of neo-acute no longer participates in any stress shift.

The most interesting fact about this type of stress is that it is never encountered in tort-formula forms. This applies even to those forms whose syllabic structure is remarkably similar to a prefixed derivation, for example, p'oloz (< *plož), p'olosa, poloz'y as opposed to p'ozir (< *po + xor), poz'omu, poz'ory. Why this should be so is
difficult to say. It could mean that the stress patterns of prefixed
derivation is older than the pleophony of the tort-formula. It could,
on the other hand, more likely be connected with that oft mentioned
but little understood native instinct which can distinguish roots from
prefixes. In any event, it is one more fact helping to explain how and
why the tort-formula forms resisted ikavism.

4. The Neo-Acute in Positions of Fixed Stress

Until this point we have discussed neo-acute as a suprasegmental
feature marking any type of nonfixed stress provided that the vowel so
marked participated in the process by receiving the mobile stress in at
least some forms. We must now, at least briefly, examine some of these
instances where neo-acute arose for different reasons. All of these take
us into the area of derivational morphology, more specifically,
suffixation, a complicated field about which several volumes could be
written.

One place where this occurs is in the formation of diminu-
tives from feminine and neuter nouns. For example, the former oxytones
and mobile stress will merge into a fixed stress pattern upon receiving
the diminutive suffixes ьк, ьк, e.g., *Зенъка > Зенъка > Зикка;,*
*горъка > горъка > гирка. 1 The difficulty of identifying the former
oxytones among the ь-stem declension has already been mentioned, but
this seems of no relevance in the diminutives, e.g., *ноёъка > *ноёъка >
*ниокка; *костъка > *костъка; *редъка > *редъка > *риока. It is very
likely that ikavism in the nominative nonsuffixed form is as often

1In the modern standard Зикка has mobile stress and гирка also
does colloquially, but this is a more recent development (Ilarion, 1952:
144).
influenced by the diminutive regardless of the original stress type. Examples for neuter nouns are cited above (pp. 64, 67).

The situation with masculine nouns is, unfortunately, not so clear cut. Here again we see a merger of the former oxytones and mobile stress nouns into the same stress pattern, that is, from the oxytone *kit, kot'a we get *kit'ok, kitk'a and from the mobile stress *vis, *v'ona we also have *vis'ok, visk'a. This fact even without any further comment helps to explain the extension of ikavism into the former mobile paradigm, but an attempt to discover the origin of this merger may prove even more illuminating. The difficulty here arises when we try to reconstruct the stress of the original forms. If we stress the first jerk, we get the correct stress for the nominative singular, e.g., *kot'ъkъ > *kit'ok, voz'ъкъ > *vis'ok, but how are we to explain the o > i if no stress shift took place? The oblique cases represent even more problem. If we posit *kot'ъkъ, *vоz'ъkъ for the nominative, then we must posit kot'ъk'a, voz'ъk'a for the genitive singular. In such an environment, we would expect the weak jerk to lose its stress by shifting it to the preceding syllable. This would explain the lengthening of the root vowel but not the final stress which is, of course, the actual situation. In order to arrive at the final stress of the oblique case, we must posit kotъk'b, kotъk'a, etc., but again there are two difficulties here. Firstly, this will not explain the lengthening of the o.

Secondly, suffixed forms derived from oxytones do not exhibit that type of stress. Dybo (1968a) has shown that the oxytones are quite consistent in taking the stress on the first syllable of a suffix just as they do the case endings. This would permit us to reconstruct for *kot'ъ the diminutive *kot'ъкъ, *кот'ъка > *котъкъ, *котъка. On the other hand,
for *votl* the original stress would be *votl*k', *votl*k'a > *vot'l*kb, *votl*k'a. Dybo (1968a:174-177) has presented some concrete evidence for precisely this postulated dichotomy in Bulgarian where the former oxytones and mobile paradigm are kept clearly distinct in their diminutives, e.g., stol'ec < *stol'eb* vs. kes'ec < *kés'eb*. Here we have a suffix -eb of the very same structure as -ekb; what applies to one should apply to the other. This is definitely true of Ukrainian, for the reflex of both of these diminutive suffixes show the identical stress pattern in the modern language, e.g., dvir'ok, dvirk'a; dvir'ec', dviraj'a (< *dvor'v*) and zub'ok, zubk'a; zub'ec', zuba'aj'a (< *z'qeb*).

What has obviously happened in Ukrainian is that masculine nouns to form diminutives generalized the stress pattern characteristic of mobile stress nouns and the lengthened root vowel characteristic of the oxytones. It is, therefore, not strange for us to find ikavism in diminutive forms where it is not fully justified historically since neo-acute had become a common feature in the final root vowel of all diminutives formed with -e, -ek.

Another morphological category in which we can expect to find neo-acute lengthening is in denominational adjectives derived by means of the suffix -en. As with the other suffixes just described, neo-acute is most consistently found in the former oxytones (Dybo, 1968a:153-155), e.g., *kon'en* > *kón'en*.-e. These forms also retain their final root stress in the so-called long form, thus, in modern Ukrainian k'innj, the short being nowhere attested. It is interesting that all the adjectives derived from the former en-stems all show precisely this type of stress, that is, kam'innyj, rem'innyj, krem'innyj, kor'innyj, jaš'innyj, hreb'innyj as if at one time they had all been oxytones. If
this is indeed the case, it is strange because all but one of these nouns now have fixed stress on the initial syllable, that is, \(k'\text{amin}'\), \(k'\text{orin}'\), \(hr'\text{ebin}'\) but \(ja\text{m}in'\). Our knowledge of Proto-Slavic stress tells us that fixed initial stress would not have been possible if the vowel of this syllable were etymological short. Aside from this, we know virtually nothing about the original stress pattern of these nouns. It is logical to assume the usual three types of stress, but this is not documented. All we know for certain is that all the derivations from these nouns show the stress patterns characteristic of oxytones. Here are included the following: collectives \(\text{kam}'\text{innja} < \text{*kamen}'\text{ije}\), \(\text{kor}'\text{innja} < \text{*koren}'\text{ije}\); diminutives \(hr\text{eb}'\text{in}\text{yk} < \text{*greben}'\text{e}\text{ïk}'\); other derivatives \(hr\text{eb}'\text{inka} < \text{*greben}'\text{e}ka\) (Dybo, 1968a:181-187,196). Whether or not this reflects the original situation or whether it is secondary is not really all that relevant. In its derivational morphology this entire declensional class was treated as oxytones; it is, therefore, little wonder that the nominative singular of these nouns also exhibits ikavism.

All of the above mentioned derivations produced forms with fixed stress. One other example is the suffix \(-v\text{etvo}\) which also produces neo-acute when affixed to an oxytone, e.g., \(\text{*v\text{edov}'\text{eto} > v\text{edov}e\text{eto}}\) > \(vd'\text{ivsto}\). When affixed to a fixed stress noun, that is, one containing a long acute, we also receive a root stressed noun but without neo-acute, e.g., \(\text{*bratv\text{estvo} > br'atv\text{estvo}}\). This means that stress on the final syllable of the suffix will occur only when attached to a root of the

\[1\text{It almost definitely is in the case of } \text{kam}'\text{innja} \text{ as the Čudov New Testament has } \text{kâmen}e, \text{ but then Serbo-Croatian } \text{kâmen}je \text{ contradicts this.}\]
mobile paradigm, e.g., *boštuv'o. This in turn will mean that this
latter type of stress is of necessity going to be in the minority and,
therefore, subject to erosion, to analogical levelings in favour of the
majority situation. This is born out by Min'ovskij who lists 580 nouns
with this suffix -stvo, only seven of which have final stress.

The significance of the above observations is simply that it
proves the existence of neo-acute lengthening in Proto-Ukrainian in
several very productive derivational categories and these are in no way
connected with mobile stress. When these are added to the great body of
other non-derived forms where neo-acute serves precisely to mark stress,
it is easy to understand that confusion could very easily arise. That
is to say, after the general rise of neo-acute, there came into existence
a great many syllables of the type \( \breve{VC}V, \breve{VC}'V, \breve{VC}_2, \)
that is, lengthened vowel produced by a stress shift followed in the next syllable by a weak
jer. Under these circumstances, it is very reasonable to assume that an
originally stressed vowel in the same environment may undergo analogical
lengthening even though there is no historical justification for positing
a stress shift onto it.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In order to demonstrate the value of an accentological solution to the problem of ikavism, it was necessary to subject the existing phonologically conditioned solutions to a very critical examination. There are only two such theories advanced to date, and since one of them, the compensatory lengthening theory, has by far the greatest currency, it was examined first.

It was shown that the standard compensatory lengthening explanation is quite inadequate to handle the following difficulties:

1) New e, o < ð, ð are never affected by that process which affected etymological e, o.

2) New ’i < e is in Ukrainian always a palatalizing vowel whereas etymological e never is.

3) e in syllables of the type eð underwent a process of labialization (as well as raising) before the final reflex i is obtained.

4) There exists an alarmingly large number of exceptions.

5) There is no convincing proof to connect Southwestern ikavism with the diphthongs of Northern Ukrainian. Supporters of compensatory lengthening have always linked these two phenomena together as two stages of the same process. However, this position could be discarded without any basic harm done to the theory in general, but the remaining four points present unsurmountable obstacles in accepting compensatory
lengthening as a reasonable explanation for ikavism.

The second alternative examined was that of anticipatory assimilation whereby the weak jers before their loss are said to have exerted an influence on the mid vowels of a preceding syllable. This produced raising and labialization in the case of eCë or fronting in the case of oCë. This theory sets the origin of the ikavism much farther back in the past than compensatory lengthening and, therefore, allows us to handle difficulties Nos. 1 and 2 mentioned above. It, of course, also explains difficulty No. 3 but is no more able to handle No. 4 than was the other theory. It remains as great an obstacle as ever. In addition to this, the assimilation theory contains a built-in contradiction. It ascribes to the short ë, ë assimilating powers not possessed by their long counterparts, ë and ë. Yet the optional and partial assimilating qualities of ë and u in contemporary Western Ukrainian dialects are cited as proof that anciently ë and ë exerted an even greater influence.

The discussion and criticism of the existing theories have shown that a satisfactory explanation for the origin of ikavism must meet the following chronological and historical requirements:

1) It began before 'i > e; otherwise we cannot explain why new 'i < e is always a palatalizing vowel.

2) It began before the loss of jers; otherwise we cannot explain the labialization of e in syllables of the type eCë.

3) It began later than (or approximately simultaneous with) the pleophony of tort-formula forms; otherwise we cannot explain ikavism in forms like stor'in < 'storon'ë (gen. plur.).

4) It cannot be a phonologically conditioned process. If it
were, it would be impossible to explain the large proportion of apparent exceptions. The assembled data indicate very strongly that ikavism is closely connected with shifts in stress.

We are, therefore, looking for an accentological process which is also capable of altering vowel quality and/or quantity and which took place in approximately the eighth to tenth centuries A.D. The neo-acute phenomenon is the most obvious if not the only possible process of Late Common Slavic which meets all these requirements. Neo-acute is most easily demonstrated in those instances where historical and comparative evidence enables us to posit a stress shift from a weak jer onto a preceding e or o. Here are included the following major categories:

1) the nominative and accusative singular of ジャー, ジャー, ジャー and ジャー-stem nouns belonging to the oxytonic stress type: *столъ, *нозъ > *столъ, *нозъ.

2) the genitive plural of all nouns belonging to either the oxytonic or marginally mobile stress type where the genitive plural ending was either ь or -овь:

*конъ > *конъ (ジャー-stem oxytone)
*котъ > *котъ (ジャー-stem oxytones)
*носъ > *носъ (ジャー-stem marginally mobile)
*сенъ > *сенъ (ジャー-stem oxytone)
*горъ > *горъ (ジャー-stem marginally mobile)
*синовъ > *синовъ (ジャー-stem marginally mobile)

3) the instrumental singular of feminine ジャー-stem nouns of both the oxytone and mobile stress types: *костъю, *песъю > *костъю, *песъю.

---

1Oxytones are rather sparesely represented (if at all) among the latter two declensional types.
4) the instrumental plural of *-stem of oxytones and these influenced by this stress class: *gost'čmi > *h'ostčmi.¹

5) nouns formed with a prefix containing a stressed weak jer: s'čborč, v'čchodč > s'čborč, včchodč.

6) prepositional phrases where the preposition contains a stressed weak jer: *v'č nosč, *v'č nočč > *vč nosč, *vč nočč. This source of neo-acute very likely increased as Ukrainian lost prepositional enclisis, that is, *n'a vōzč > *na vāzč because of *vč vōzč.

7) any form containing a suffix with stressed weak jer, of which only a sampling of examples can be mentioned here.

(a) the diminutives of all genders:

*ženččka > *žénččka (ä-stem oxytone)
*gorččka > *hórččka (ä-stem marginally mobile)
*rešččoe > *rešččoe (č-stem oxytone)
*kotččkč > *kótččkč (č-stem oxytone, p. 140)
*dvorčččč > *dvrčččč (č-stem oxytone, pp. 140-41)

(b) the adjectival suffix *čnč:

*konččmb > *kónččmb. These adjectives formed from an oxytone remain root stress and neo-acute in the so-called long form, thus, *kónččmb > k'ínmj.

but *n'očnčmb, nónčn'ma, n'očnčno and *r'odčmb, *rođčn'ma, *r'odčnčno. Adjectives formed from mobile-stress nouns (nog'ma, r'odč) in their long form may receive either desinential stress or root stress with neo-acute, thus, *nónčn'mč > nóččm'y and

¹The standard language still permits both h'ist'm'y and hist'm'y < *gostmm'i of the former mobile type.
*rodmyj > r'idnyj.

(c) the nominal suffix *etvo:

*vedov'estvo > *vedov'estvo (feminine oxtone)

8) the masculine singular of l-participles of oxytonic verbs:

*nels' > nels'.

On the other hand, a neo-acute solution is not fully acceptable until the following questions are answered.

1) Why are etymological e and o the only vowel affected by this neo-acute lengthening? An explanation is offered on pages 72-79. It was argued that there is really nothing strange or unusual in this situation. Barring clear documentary evidence, if a language loses distinctive vowel quantity, there is no way to recover this fact unless only quantitatively but also qualitatively. This is precisely the situation in Upper Lusatian. Here, although we have every reason to posit the existence of distinctive vowel quantity in prehistoric times, only the former long mid vowels betray any hint of this due to their present differences in quantity from their short counterparts. Similarly in Polish, if we had only the modern standard language dialect from which to draw data, we could establish the former quantitative only for the vowels ɛ vs. ɛ̃ and ɔ vs. ɔ̃ because these now differ in quality. But there is no evidence that the vowel ɪ, y, u, e, or a ever knew quantitative contrasts. We can only recover this from those dialects where quantitative differences had surplanted qualitative ones. This is obvious what happened in Ukrainian. When these dialects lost distinctive quantity, only e and o had undergone any change in quality.

2) Why do we see the affects of neo-acute lengthening only in closed syllables? This is explained on pages 79-93. Again this is not
really so surprising when we consider that in the vast majority of cases neo-acute can arise only as a result of a stress shift from a weak jer. This weak jer will, of course, at a later period be lost. Therefore, neo-acute will by its very origin occur almost exclusively in a closed syllable.

Neo-acute with an origin other than that just described can arise in only two instances. These are (1) neo-acute on the stressed root vowel of verbs of the recessive stress pattern in the present tense (examples on pp. 79-82); and (2) neo-acute on the stressed root vowel of the pronominal form of those adjectives which in their nominal form belong to the oxytone stress or occasionally to the mobile stress pattern (examples on p. 88). It was argued that neo-acute on short vowels in these two categories was redundant and, therefore, eliminated. Even if this explanation is not correct, it is undeniable that Ukrainian behaves typologically exactly like all its neighbors, that is, Polish, Czech and Slovak where neo-acute in these categories has also been eliminated except for a few odd remnants.

3) How can ikavism be explained in those forms for which there is little or no historical or comparative evidence justifying the assumption of a stress shift? In the main, this problem arises in the nominative singular of masculine nouns of any stem class and the former i-stem feminine nouns belonging to the marginally mobile stress paradigm (Stang's type c). Considerable attention (pp. 93-138) had to be devoted to this problem, for it seems to be a glaring contradiction—the reflex of a neo-acute without a demonstrable stress shift. Unless this difficulty can be satisfactorily explained, it will constitute a very grave
obstacle preventing general acceptance of neo-acute as a reasonable solution for the origin of ikavism.

In explaining this problem, the first step is clearly to bear in mind that neo-acute could and did arise in a great number of situations other than the nominative (and accusative) singular of oxytones. These have been listed on pages 146-48, and there is no need to repeat them.

In all the categories cited, there is one uniting factor; neo-acute may arise in any syllable followed by a weak jer provided that the root of the given form belonged to a nonfixed stress pattern.\(^1\)

In some instances the resulting form will have fixed stress but not the root from which it is derived. That is, \(^hōm\,ka < ^gōm\,ka\) has fixed stress but not \(^gor'a\), and so does \(^nōd\,m\,w\) but not \(^n'od\). Thus, neo-acute lengthening became the mark of any and all types of nonfixed stress. This fact alone may be sufficient to explain its spread to the nominative and accusative singular of nonoxytones like \(n'os\,̩\,v'os\,̩\,\), \(n'o\,̩\), etc., but other factors also played a very significant role in the extension of neo-acute.

Chief among these factors is the massive shift of the former oxytones (approximately 57%; pp. 103-104) into a new mobile stress paradigm whereby they eventually merged with the original mobile type. The motivation for this restructuring of stress patterns was the introduction (on a semantic basis) of the nonstressed \(u\)-genitive in place of the former stressed \(a\)-genitive. Thus, for example, the former oxytone

\(^1\)This, of course, will also apply to the former oxytones which because of the loss of stressability of jer have been formed into a new type of limited mobility.
*bob'v, *bob'a > *bóvb, *bob'a gave way to bóvb, b'obu and, thus, became indistinguishable in stress type from the former mobile r'odv, r'oda which also gave way to r'odv, r'odu. In this way neo-acute lengthening as a mark of nonfixed stress was transferred to the nominative and accusative singular of the former mobile stress nouns. A more concise summary is given on pages 108-10 and more details on pages 127-31.

It is also entirely likely and probable that a similar merger of oxytones with a mobile stress paradigm took place with nouns belonging to the i-stem declension. Here, however, the data indicate that this merger may well predate the rise of neo-acute, and there were possibly no i-stem oxytones left when the jers lost the ability to bear stress. Nevertheless, even if this possibility is admitted, restructuring in stress patterns and analogy can explain ikavism in the nominative-accusative of forms like nič < *noč'v or *n'ocv? See pages for further details.

Another factor in the spread of neo-acute is the influence of derivational morphology on the roots subject to these derivational rules. As already shown, two stress types of the former ā-stem merged into the same type when given the diminutive suffix, that is, žén'ka and gón'ka. The same applies to the other genders; with masculine nouns, two conflicting diminutive stress types merged into one. Thus, in modern Ukrainian viz, v'iza and kit, kot'a both have the same pattern when diminutivized, that is, viz'ok, visk'a and kit'ok, kitk'a. Both now exhibit the stress pattern originally associated only with nouns of the mobile paradigm but, on the other hand, both now exhibit ikavism which originally was associated only with the oxytones. A similar tendency,
although less pronounced, is observed with neuter nouns. Here, regardless of the original stress type of the noun, diminutives are commonly stressed on the final syllable, that is, on the e of *bce. This stress originally was characteristic only of diminutives derived from mobile stress nouns. On the other hand, ikavism of the root vowel has also spread, and this was originally characteristic only of oxytones. For example, from *rešet'oe1 we have *rešet'boce > *rešetbce > *rešitce (standard) and rešito'e (colloquial).

A similar if not greater influence could also be exerted by the adjectival forms. It has already been suggested above how by analogy with *bôbə, *b'obu, etc., neo-acute could have been extended to *rođə. This is, indeed, the case, but this extension was doubtlessly also influenced by the neo-acute lengthening which already existed in the adjective, *rođanbə. Similarly *večer'bnəbə > *večernəbə > *več'irmi[j must have helped to establish ikavism in the nominative singular of the root, that is, *več'ir, *več'ora. This in turn could also have been influenced by another derivative več'irka 'evening party' < *večerska < *večer'gka.

The foregoing discussion of ikavism as a reflex of neo-acute has demonstrated the advantage of positing an accentological solution for this feature of Ukrainian. These advantages can be summarized as follows:

1) The rise of neo-acute coincides exactly with that point in time to which all the other clues have led.

---

1 Final stress still exists dialectically whereas the standard form is r'ešeto.
2) Neo-acute is a well known and demonstrable process of Late Common Slavic which has left its traces elsewhere in East Slavic, that is to say, in the so-called Leka-type dialect of Russian.

3) In other Slavic regions where neo-acute is attested, the newly lengthened e or o have by in large also been raised just as in Ukrainian.

4) Ikavism in Ukrainian behaves exactly like the reflexes of neo-acute in the other Slavic languages, that is, strongly represented in certain morphological categories (both inflectional and derivational) but absent in others where identical phonetic conditions prevailed. This, of course, is precisely what one expects of a suprasegmental feature but not of a phonological rule.

5) An accentological solution allows us to explain those very numerous instances which remain inexplicable exceptions if we attempt a solution in terms of a conventional sound law. In short, it explains more of the data, and this fact alone makes it preferable to any other theory proposed so far.

Elsewhere it was suggested why an accentological solution for ikavism has not been proposed previously or, if proposed, not pursued. Thus far only three basic reasons have been put forward; these are the following:

1) Accentology, especially on the diachronic level, is a neglected branch of comparative Slavic studies.

2) Historical phonology of Ukrainian except within the Soviet Ukraine itself is also a neglected field of study and investigation.

3) Within the Soviet Ukraine, the political atmosphere is such
that a researcher must be careful with investigations tending to demonstrate the antiquity of any specifically Ukrainian feature for fear of the charge of "bourgeois nationalism".

The researching and writing of this dissertation has indicated yet a fourth factor more formidable than any of those thus far suggested. And this is the complicated interrelatedness of ikavism with several other major processes in the historical phonology of Ukrainian. Whatever explanation may be proposed for ikavism, it is clear that this explanation, to be convincing, must fit the facts regarding these other processes especially their relative chronology. An investigation of ikavism, therefore, has had this very beneficial by-product; it has forced some much needed precision into our thinking about the entire phonological development of Ukrainian and especially of the vocalic system. As is known, certain features in this development had their origin in late Common Slavic; therefore, taking the late Common Slavic vowel shift as a convenient starting point, the results of our considerations regarding the milestones in the history of Ukrainian may be outlined as follows:

1) The beginning of the late Common Slavic vowel shift from a system of quantitative contrasts to one of qualitative contrasts. The first stage of this is ѱ, Ѫ > ѳ, Ѵ and later ѳ > ѫ, Ѭ.

2) The pleophony of the tort-formula forms.

3) The final phase of number one: ѡ > Ѣ, Ѥ.

4) The shortening of the phonetically long vowels.

5) The shift of ѐ > Ѱ after the Proto-Slavic palatals before a hard consonant.
6) The rise of neo-acute and development of new phonetically long vowels.

7) Newly lengthened e, o change also in quality--by raising, rounding of e, fronting of o.

8) The loss (or failure to develop fully) by e of its power to palatalize a preceding consonant.

9) Simultaneously with number seven or shortly thereafter the same process takes place with i.

10) As a result of number eight, the e > o shift is curtailed.

11) As a result of number nine, two other processes can begin. These are (a) the merge of i and y, and (b) the raising of ë > ’i.

12) Withdrawal of neo-acute lengthening on e, o in the root syllable of verbs and adjectives if these vowels are followed by a vowel other than a weak jër.

13) East Slavic fails to develop distinctive vowel quality and the neo-acute lengths (except where quantitative changes have occurred) are eliminated.

14) The loss of and/or vocalization of jërs.

15) The new e < ë is subject to the patterns already established for etymological e (processes five and eight).

16) The continuation and completion of the ë > ’i in all regions of Southwestern Ukrainian.

17) The continued merger of i and y which is not completed everywhere.

18) The final development of lengthened and raised e, o for the most part to ĭ but also to u or ü.
APPENDIX A

DIALECTAL MAP OF THE UKRAINE

I. The Southwestern Dialects
   1. Lemkovian
   2. Transcarpathian
   3. Bojkovian
   4. Huculian
   5. Bukovynian
   6. San River
   7. Dniester River
   8. South Volhynian
   9. Podolian

II. The Northern (Polisian) Dialect
   1. North Volhynian
   2. Rightbank
   3. Leftbank

III. The Southeastern Dialects
   1. Steppe
   2. Central Dnipro
   3. Poltavan
   4. Slobožan
APPENDIX B

A GLOSSARY OF UKRAINIAN WORDS USED IN THE TEXT

bar'än  ram
barl'ih  lair, den
b'reeh  bank, shore
ber'esa  birch tree
bezkr’ivja  anaemia
bezkr'ovnyj  bloodless
bij  battle, fight
bik  side, edge
boh  God, lord
borod’a  beard, chin
bor’oty  to struggle, fight
br’atstvo  brotherhood, society
brid  ford, crossing (of a river)
bud’ynok  building, structure
ček’aty  to wait
č’elo  Transcarpathian
form of ĺol’o
čepurn’yj  dapper, elegant (adj.)
čered’a  herd, flock
čeresl’o  plowshare
č’erep  skull
č’erevo  stomach, belly
čerp’aty  to scoop, dig out, ladle
čerstv’yj  stale, hardened, robust
čes’aty  to comb, to card (wool)
c’il’yj  whole, entire, all
č’obit  boot
čol’o  forehead
č’ornyj  black (adj.)
čort  devil, demon
č’ystyty  to clear
den’  daylight
d’eren  turf, peat
d’erevo  tree, wood
d’esjat’  ten (numeral)
d’svjat’  nine (numeral)
dibr’ova  grove
dob’ir  selection, choice
d'okaz  proof, evidence

d'omos  denunciation, charge

d'otyk  sense of touch, feeling

d'ovhyd  long (adj.)

d'ox'id  income

d'rit  wire, cable

dub  oak tree or wood

dvir  yard, court

dvir'eos  diminutive of dvir

dvir'ok  as above

dsmil  drone

hist  guest

h'irka  diminutive of hor'a

hriv  anger, rage

h'oiros  voice

hor'a  hill, mountain

hor'ity  to be on fire, burn

hor'ovyty  to prepare

four'ir  dialect

hrad  hail

hr'ebin  comb

hreb'ingyk  diminutive of hreb'in

hreb'inka  hemp-comb

hreb'innij  pertaining to a comb (adj.)

hrub  grave, tomb

h'urkit  rumble (of wheels, etc.)

hurkot'aty  to rumble (of wheels)

hurkot'ity  same as above

hvisd  nail (archaic)

imj'a  name, Christian (first) name

jaom'in  barley, sty (on the eye)

jaom'innij  of or pertaining to barley (adj.)

j'asen'n  ash tree

již'ak  hedgehog

k'anim  stone, rock

kam'innja  rock, bolder (as a collective)

kam'innij  of stone, stony (adj.)

kin  horse

k'imnyj  equestrian, of a horse (adj.)

kiš  basket, container

k'issj'a  handle of a scythe

kist  bone

k'istka  diminutive of kist
kit  cat (male)
kit’ok  diminutive of kit
klen  maple
kl’opit  trouble, worry
k’orin’  root, sprout
kor’imija  roots (as a collective)
kor’innyj  of or pertaining to roots, basic (adj.)
koț’ux  sheepskin coat
kr’emin’  flint
krok  step, footprint
kryș’atyt  to shout, yell
kud’elja  distaff
k’uk’ili’  tare, furrow-weed
k’upil’  bath
k’uç’ili’  distaff, another form of kudelja

let’ity  to fly
lid  ice
lis  forest, woods
lj’askit  cracking sound (of a whip)
ljaskot’ity  to snap, crack
ljub’ytel’  lover (of art, music, etc.)
l’on  flax, field of flax
ıp’ux  broad-leaved burdock

l’oskit  jab (in the ribs), tickle
los’os’  salmon
lov  catch, take (of hunt)
luh  meadow

mak  poppy (flower or seed), poppy field
mat’imij  maternal, motherly, native (adj.)
med  honey
medv’id’  bear
met’a  purpose, goal
mid’  copper
mist  bridge, platform
mix  sack, bag, bellows
mn’ożyty  to multiply, increase
moht’y  to be able, can
m’olot  hammer
mol’oty  to grind, mill
mor’ih  turf, plot of grass
m’orok  darkness, obscurity
mor’oz  frost
m’udryj  wise, clever
m’ylyj  nice, loveable, pleasant

nab’ir  accumulation
nadibr'aty to take in access
nadv'ojе in two, in half (adv.)
n'akas order, directive
nам'еt tent
nan'os silt, jetsam
nap'ij drink, beverage
nar'od nation, people
n'astrij disposition, frame of mind
redokrivja anaemia
nest'y to carry, bear
nį̄ night
n'iška diminutive of nį̄
nis nose
nį̄̄ knife
nс'yt front, before (prep.)
perel'as style, passage in a hedge
p'erepel quail
per'ex'id transition, passage
pič oven, stove
pid under (prep.)
p'idklad padding, lining
pip priest (especially Orthodox)
pist lent, time of fasting
pit sweat
pjat' five (numeral)
plemj'a tribe, clan
plest'y to twist, knit, braid
plid produce, fruit
p'okl'in bow, homage
p'ole field
polk regiment
pol'oty to weed
pol'ova chaff
polou'yna half
p'olos runner of a sleigh
polez'yt front, before, before (prep.)
poloz'yt to put, place, lay down
p'opil ash
p'opyt demand, need
por'ih  threshold, doorstep, rapid (of a river)
p'orist  aftergrowth
por'oda  birth, stock, descent
pot'op  flood
p'ox'id  military campaign, expedition
pož'eža  fire, conflagration
p'oz'ir  appearance, pretext
pr'al'nyk  beater (stick) for laundering
prof'esor  professor, teacher
pr'omir'  beam, ray (of light)
pryh'oda  adventure
pšen'ycja  wheat
pyr'ih  type of dumpling

rij  swarm
rost'y  to grow
r'osv'id  separation, divorce
r'osv'i'j  development, unfolding

šč'eka  Transcarpathian form of ščok'a
ščok'a  jaw, lower cheek
sik  juice, sap
sel'o  village, settlement
šept'aty  to whisper
šerce  heart
sered'a  Wednesday
š'estero  six (collective numeral)
š'estyj  West. Ukr. form of šoustyj
skot  cattle, livestock
skup'yj  stingy, tight-fisted
sl'oz'a  tear
smix  laughter, merriment
sm'orid  stink, stench, filth
snih  snow
snip  sheaf
soj'uz  union, league
s'okil  falcon
s'omyj  seventh (adj.)
s'orom  shame, disgrace
š'ostjy  sixth (adj.)
spas'ytel'  savior
step  steppe, prairie
stereht'yi  to guard, protect
stil  table
stoj'aty  to stand
storor'a  side, direction
strax  terror, fright
strem'en'o  stirrup
styd  shame, scandal
svit  world
sxid  east

wik  trashing floor
t'itka  aunt
tonk'yj  narrow, precise
top'ir  axe

ub'ir  attire, clothes
uš'ytel'  teacher
'uspix  success

věš'erja  supper, evening meal
v'ečir  evening
v'ira  faith, belief, trust
vivt'orok  Tuesday
v'iter  wind
viz  wagon
viz'ok  diminutive of viz
voh'ora  fire
vork'it  loudly purring cat, cooing pigeon
vor'ona  crow
v'os'myj  eighth (adj.)
voz'yty  to haul, freight
všid  entrance
v'yšid  exit
vyzv'olennja  liberation

x'olod  cold
xran'ytel'  protector, guardian angel
xrest'ytel'  baptist
xrun'  traitor, quisling

zaboš'on  superstition
zah'al  totality, mass, public
žal'  sorrow, grief
zak'on  law, regulation
z'amīž only in the expression
v'yjtj z'amīž, to get married
(referring to a woman)

zbir collection

ž'ebraty to beg (money)

ž'ena Transcarpathian form of
žon'a

žen'ytysja to get married, to
take a wife

ž'erđka slender pole

ž'ibješ second person singular
of sbyty to strike loose

ž'inka woman, wife

žen'enga handful

ž'olud' acorn

žon'a wife, woman (archaic)

zorj'a star

ž'own'ir yeoman, soldier
(archaic)

zub tooth

zub'ec' diminutive of zub

zub'ok as above

ž'ovtyj yellow (adj.)

žyttj'a life

žyv'it stomach, abdomen, life
(archaic)
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