

Miriam-Maria SHRAGER

Indiana University

ACCENTUATION OF MASCULINE MONOSYLLABIC NOUNS OF SUSAK SPEAKERS IN NEW JERSEY*

Abstract. In the field of Slavic accentology, the theory of AP-D for Common Slavic (CSl) has been controversial for several reasons, primarily insufficient recordings of data from various dialects where it is supposed to exist. The present paper addresses this problem based on a recording of the Susak dialect, for which AP-D was known to exist (Hamm et al. 1956) but recordings were not available. The recordings for this study were taken in New Jersey, since Susak Island was deserted by most of its inhabitants to immigrate to the USA, where they live in a closed enclave in New Jersey.

1. Introduction

Comparative historical study of Slavic accentuation has resulted in a generally-accepted reconstruction of the accentual system of Slavic nouns and verbs (Stang 1957; Illič-Svityč 1963; Dybo 1963; Garde 1976; Kiparsky, Halle 1977; Dybo 1981). Stang (1957) was the first to reconstruct three nominal accentual paradigms for Proto-Slavic underived nouns, the accentual paradigms (AP) A, B, and C (Table 1). AP-A had consistent barytonic (root stress) stems; AP-B had consistent oxytonic (post-stem stress) accentuation; and AP-C had a mobile pattern in which the stress alternated between the first syllable and the ending. Proto-Slavic pitch intonations are reconstructed based on South Slavic intonations, East Slavic ictus position, and West Slavic quantities. AP-A was characterized by a root accent with an old acute intonation (´). The mobile paradigm, AP-C, was reconstructed with circumflex root intonation (˘) in Common Slavic, which was so realized when the root was accented. As for the intonation pattern of AP-B nouns, some forms have neo-acute intonation on the stem

* The fieldwork for this study was supported by the Mellon Research Grants from the Russian and East European Institute (REEI) of Indiana University at Bloomington. None of these organizations is responsible for the views expressed.

in contemporary Serbo-Croatian (SC) dialects. In Čakavian, for example, this neo-acute appears as a rising intonation, *dvǎ̌r*¹ ‘courtyard’. Following Ivšič 1915, Stang hypothesized that these neo-acute forms are the result of stress retraction from *jers* and certain other endings. Table 1 illustrates Stang’s reconstruction of the three nominal accentual paradigms.

Table 1. The Three Basic Reconstructed Accentual Nominal Paradigms in Proto-Slavic

	AP- A	AP- B	AP- C
masc.	*gǫdǫb̌	*bobǫb̌	*sǎdǫb̌ - *sadyǫ (instr. pl.)
fem.	*bǎba	*bědǎ	*vodǎ - *vǒdǫ (acc. sg.)
neut.	*ǫtro	*vinǫ	*něbo - *nebesǎ (nom.-acc. pl.)

Stang believed that the oxytone accentuation of AP-B was inherited directly from Indo-European, as opposed to Lithuanian, in which the oxytone forms resulted from Saussure’s Law (SL). However, Illič-Svityč (1963, 98–114, 144–145) compared the Slavic material with other IE languages and demonstrated that both Slavic paradigms, AP-A (barytone) and AP-B (oxytone), reflect IE nouns with barytonic accent; Slavic AP-A corresponded to IE roots with long syllables and AP-B to stems with short syllables, similar to the Lithuanian distribution of roots in AP-1 and AP-2. IE nouns with mobile-oxytonic accentuation are reflected in the Slavic mobile paradigm, AP-C.

Based on this, Illič-Svityč and Dybo concluded that Slavic AP-A and AP-B were in complementary distribution, originating from the dominant IE barytonic paradigm with a split conditioned by the length of the vowel of the root. Thus, while in Baltic the oxytonic forms of AP-2 were the result of SL, in Slavic the oxytonic paradigm, AP-B, resulted from Dybo’s Law (DL), and the distribution of IE barytonic nouns in Slavic and Baltic is fundamentally similar: Lithuanian AP-1 and Slavic AP-A nouns reflect IE long roots, Lithuanian AP-2 and Slavic AP-B nouns IE short roots, and all of them correlate to IE barytonic nouns, which contained inherently

¹ Ivšič (1915) designated the Čakavian neo-acute with the same symbol as the Lithuanian circumflex, due to their phonetic similarity (they are both rising).

accented (dominant) roots. On the other hand, AP-C consisted of inherently unaccented (recessive) roots. Table 2 presents the Balto-Slavic (BSI) accentual nominal system, following Dybo et al. 1993 and Dybo 2000; it combines the intonations (acute and circumflex) with the dominant / recessive roots.

Table 2. **Balto-Slavic Accentual Paradigms** (Dybo et al. 1993; Dybo 2000, 47)

IE	Barytone		Mobile-Oxytone	
	Long	Short	Long / Short	
BSI	1 (dominant) Acute / Circumflex		2 (recessive) Acute / Circumflex	
Lith	1 Acute	2 Circumflex Mobile < SL	3 Acute Mobile	4 Circumflex Mobile + SL
Slav	A Acute, Barytone	B Oxytone < DL / SL, Neo-acute < BSI Circumflex ²	C Enclinomena Slavic Circumflex ³	

It is notable that masculine *o*-stem nouns do not conform to this pattern; that is to say, Slavic masculine nouns of the mobile paradigm (AP-C) correlate to IE masculine nouns with two types of accentuation, barytonic and the mobile-oxytonic (Illič-Svityč 1963, 110–119). Additionally, Slavic masculine AP-B nouns correlate to IE neuter nouns. Thus, masculine *o*-stem short nouns of both IE accentual paradigms coincided in the Slavic mobile paradigm, AP-C, while the Slavic masculine AP-B paradigm was filled by IE neuter nouns. However, apparently not all the IE barytonic short stem nouns coincided in the mobile paradigm in Slavic. In Croatian Čakavian dialects, traces were found of the original differentiation of nouns with the original mobile accentuation and nouns with originally oxytonic accentuation (< IE barytone). In these dialects, nouns demonstrate a mixed type of accentuation. In the nominative they have characteristics of AP-C,

² The neo-acute, which has a rising intonation in SC, is sometimes a reflex of the BSI circumflex intonation, which coincided with the default rising intonation that resulted from SC retractions.

³ BSI circumflex is a rising intonation and should be differentiated from the Slavic circumflex, which is a falling intonation.

but in the genitive and in the nominative-accusative plural they have characteristics of AP-B (Hamm et al. 1956, 106). Consider the following examples (Illič-Svityč 1963, 119).

a. “Mixed” paradigm

Susak: *γrât*, gen. *γrâdâ*; *zûp*, *zûbâ*; *ryôγ*, *royă*

Istra: *grâd*, gen. *grâdâ*; *lûk*, *lûkâ*; *snég*, *snégâ*; *cêp*, nom-acc. pl. *cêpî*; *vlâs*, nom.-acc. pl. *vlâsî*

b. “Regular” mobile paradigm

Susak: *γlâs*, gen. *γlâsa*; *mîx*, *mîxa*; *xuôt*, *xòda*

Istra: *glâs*, gen. *glâsa*; *mêh*, *mêha*; *hòd*, *hòda*; *plên*, *plêna*

Additional traces of the original distinction were found in the East Slavic zone, e.g., in the west Ukrainian dialects and in the Kriviči dialects, which include northwest Russian and northeast Byelorussian dialects (Nikolaev 1988; 1989; 1991). These findings led to the formulation of another accentual paradigm, AP-D (Bulatova et al. 1988; Dybo et al. 1990; 1993), which is argued to constitute an archaic remnant of the original IE masculine orthotonic nouns (i.e., dominant stressed roots) with BSI circumflex intonation. In Slavic these nouns should have yielded an exclusively oxytonic accentuation similar to AP-B, but for reasons that remain unclear the intonation of the nom.-acc. forms of these nouns became recessive, with the oblique cases retaining the accentuation of the original dominant roots. This metatony of the nom.-acc. created a “mixed” paradigm characterized by enclitomena forms in the direct cases and oxytone forms in the oblique cases.⁴ The mixed paradigm was probably the reason that the whole paradigm became mobile in most of the Slavic dialects, as paradigmatic alternations were marked for the originally mobile paradigm with recessive roots, the AP-C.

Some linguists (Langston 2006, 260; Vermeer 1984, 359) believe that some of the evidence for AP-D, for example in Čakavian, should be dismissed because the material was not recorded properly or is ambiguous.

⁴ A phonetic explanation of tone change from dominant (high) to recessive (low) in nom.-acc. sg. is of a typological character. Dybo and Nikolaev (1993) assume that the disappearance of final *-*s* in these forms created metatony, similar to processes of tonogenesis reconstructed for the development of Old Chinese.

Regarding the Susak dialect, which provided some of the first evidence for the AP-D accentual paradigm, this argument may have some validity. The description of Hamm et al. (1956) has no recordings that would serve to back up their findings. Also, there are only 13 forms with “additional” oxytone accents in their description, and some of these forms are mentioned later in their description as having the regular barytonic accent in oblique forms. In addition, as was mentioned above, in the 1950s there was a massive exodus from Susak Island, which is now largely inhabited by newcomers. Thus, the peculiar accentual features of the Susak dialect were hard to verify.

2. The Current Study

A couple of years ago, we discovered a community of the original Susak speakers in New York and New Jersey and recorded material during two fieldtrips. The details of our fieldwork methodology follow, then we present our recorded materials. In this article we discuss only the data relevant to the issue of AP-D. The nouns are presented according to the CSI accentual paradigms and their reflexes in the Susak dialect.

2.1. Methods

The recordings were made during two fieldtrips to New Jersey and New York. The first trip was in December 2007; recordings were made by Martina Martinovič and Miriam Shrager in a church in Manhattan and in a private house. The second field trip was taken in March 2010; the recordings were made by Elena Boudovskaja and Miriam Shrager in two Susak clubs in New Jersey. The data were collected through recording direct and contextual elicitations onto audio tapes and digitally onto a laptop computer. The recordings contain narrative texts and specifically elicited words. The list of words for the interviews was based on a questionnaire elaborated by Vladimir A. Dybo, Sergej L. Nikolaev, and other scholars working within the basic theoretical framework of the Proto-Slavic accentual reconstruction established by Stang (1957). This questionnaire is designed to elicit the maximum amount of information on the accentual behavior of the inherited Proto-Slavic lexicon in all morphological categories. Thus, for example, for masculine nouns we primarily tried to elicit the forms of the sg. nom., gen., and instr., and the pl. nom., which are relevant to AP-D reflexes. Of course, other forms were produced by the speakers and recorded as well.

The main informants for this study were two women (J., M.) and three men (B., K., N.), all aged 60–75 years, whose recordings contain narrative texts and elicited noun forms. Recordings of other speakers, men and women ages 60–85, consist primarily of texts.

Listening interpretation and analysis of the recording was done by Miriam Shrager and Zorana Kristić, a visiting Croatian lecturer from Split, Croatia. Zorana is a speaker of a variety of Neo-Štokavian that has been significantly influenced by Čakavian. Some additional listening analysis was done by Mate Kapović, a linguist and a speaker of Neo-Štokavian.

2.1.1. Symbols:

In this paper the following symbols are used to designate accents:

˜ – long rising	˘ – short rising	˙ – stress (short)
ˆ – long falling	˝ – short falling	“ – old acute

3. Findings

3.1. Phonological Features

The Susak dialect shares several phonological features with other Čakavian dialects and with northwest Čakavian (NWČ), as well as possessing some unique features. Below is a brief overview.⁵

- Standard Croatian (StCr)⁶ *a* is reflected in Susak as open *o* [ɔ], and StCr *o* as closed *o* [o, uo].
- CSI *ě > Susak *i* (*did*, *cip*).
- In Susak there is fricativization of *g*, but in some words we distinctively heard a stop *g*, e.g. *grô̂t*. Possibly this is because in Susak *miesto* is used more often than *grad*.
- There is consonant devoicing in word-final position (*grò̂p*, *buô̂x*).
- Susak, as other Čakavian dialects, is generally characterized by the lack of Neo-Štokavian retractions (thus, the oxytone stress in AP-B is retained); however, some variation was found in this regard, as discussed below.

⁵ A thorough phonological description exceeds the scope of this paper, and is the subject of a future project.

⁶ In this paper we use “standard Croatian” for Neo-Štokavian.

- Stressed vowels often lengthen in closed syllables. When they lengthen before sonorants they can be rising, as happens in other northern Čakavian dialects (Langston 2006, 12).
- There is vowel lengthening in non-final open syllables; in AP-A nouns it seems to be conditioned by the stem vowel (see AP-A word list below).
- In Susak, unlike some other Čakavian dialects, we did not find many instances of the neo-acute (long rising) accent in AP-B words in the nominative singular. It seems to be conditioned by the syllabic structure and not by the accentual paradigms. Thus, the long rising accent can occur either in open syllables or in syllables closed by a sonorant (e.g., nasal in the instrumental case) in all accentual paradigms. The neo-acute occurred in AP-B words twice in the nominative when the target word was followed by a copula *je* (see AP-B word list below).
- In certain grammatical endings $m > n$, as in other Čakavian dialects. In this paper it is seen in the instrumental ending.

In addition, there are morphological features specific to Susak, such as the Susak nominative plural ending *-i*, as opposed to standard Croatian *-ovi*.

When Susak speakers spoke with our Croatian speaker, they often first produced the standard form and needed to be reminded to specifically produce the Susak form, which they were usually able to do fairly easily. For example, speaker J. constantly produced the standard Croatian form *sinovi* (nom pl.), and would give the Susak *-i* forms (*sini*) only after being reminded. Similarly for the lexicon: When a standard Croatian word was used in elicitation, Susak speakers sometimes would first use the standard form and only after a while would tell us that they use a different word in their dialect. For example, at first informants B. and N. used only Cr *kiša* and the word *dažd* only as a verb *dažži*; only when asked which form was older did they mention that in Susak they say *dažd*. Other times, however, they immediately pointed out that they use a word different from the standard form. There are many Italian loanwords in Susak, but it appears that Susak speakers are aware of their origin. The lexicon that is regularly used in religious contexts usually contains standard Croatian forms.

Variation between Susak and standard forms is also found in phonology and accentuation. On occasion, speakers would produce a mixture of

standard Croatian and Susak forms while declining a noun. At other times our informants themselves would point out the differences between standard and Susak accentuations, especially for AP-D nouns, where they would comment, “in Croatian it is *nòsa*, but in Susak we say *nosä*.”

Finally, it must be added that in our study it seemed that our male consultants better preserved the Susak forms than the female, and also produced them more readily. We speculate that there are sociolinguistic reasons for this. The women who participated in our study were long-standing, regularly attending members of the Croatian church who therefore interacted more frequently with other Croatian speakers, and thus were more exposed to standard Croatian. The men, however, were members of the Susak Club, where they regularly interacted with other Susak speakers on a daily basis.

3.2. The reflexes of CSI accentual paradigms in Susak

The accentuation of masculine nouns differs in many aspects from standard Croatian. Most important for our study was the treatment of the mixed paradigm, the AP-D nouns. However, not only do AP-D nouns differ from standard Croatian, but AP-B and AP-A nouns do so as well. AP-C nouns were the only ones with reflexes similar to the standard. We list the words of AP-D according to their CSI root types, and words of other APs are listed according to their CSI roots alphabetically; AP-D is such a subtle archaic feature that it requires categorization of this type. On the lists below the CSI nouns are followed on the same line by the nominative and genitive forms of the standard Croatian (Cr), taken either from Croatian dictionary (Anić 1998), Serbo-Croatian dictionary (Tolstoj 1970), or from ASSJa (see references). The Susak forms appear on the next line. The speakers J. and M. were women, recorded in the church, and the speakers B., K., N. were men, recorded in the Susak Club.

3.2.1. AP-D

The typical reflexes of AP-D, the “mixed paradigm,” have a root circumflex in the nominative and oxytone stress in the oblique cases. Some words have generalized the AP-B accentuation, i.e., a short falling accent on the root in the nominative and oxytone stress in the oblique cases. However, we found many instances of oscillation between barytone and oxytone forms in the oblique cases. There are three types of variations found: 1) between different cases within the paradigms, e.g., gen. *vrâga*, instr. *vrayôn*,

2) accentual doublets of the same grammatical case, e.g., gen. *grǝ̀da*, *grǝ̀dä* (more so in the genitive than the instrumental), and 3) accentual variation across speakers of a given word, e.g., J. gen. *prǝ̀xa*, M. *prǝ̀xä*. We address this issue in the Discussion and Conclusions section below.

We found that words with religious connotations are tending to replace originally Susak forms. It is interesting to note that sometimes when both variants were elicited, the phonological form correlated with the accentual variant, either of the standard or of the Susak (e.g., *vrâgon*, but *vrayôn*).

Below we list the nouns, classified according to CSI root type, in which typical AP-D reflexes were recorded. We omitted the AP-D nouns whose reflexes match those of AP-C, except when the two groups of speakers, men and women, are compared.

TORT

- 1) *brěgъ – Cr. *brijêg*, *brijêga* ‘hill’
 Sus. J. *brǝ̀x*, gen. *briyǎ*, loc. *na briyü*, instr. *brǝ̀yon*, N., B. *brǝ̀x*, gen. *od briyǎ*, loc. *na briyü*
- 2) *gordъ – Cr. *grâd*, *grâda* ‘town’
 Sus. B., K., N. *grǝ̀t*, gen. *grǝ̀da*, *grǝ̀dä*, instr. *grǝ̀don*, pl. *grǝ̀di*, J. *grǝ̀t*, gen. *grǝ̀da*, instr. *grǝ̀don*, pl. *grǝ̀dy*, *yrǝ̀dov*
- 3) *moltъ – Cr. *mlât*, *mlâta* ‘flail; big (wooden) hammer’
 Sus. B., K., N. *mlǝ̀t*, gen. *mlǝ̀ta*, instr. *mlǝ̀tön*, pl. *mlǝ̀ti*
- 1) *porъxъ – Cr. *prâh*, **prâha* ‘powder, dust’
 Sus. J. *prǝ̀x*, gen. *prǝ̀xa*, M. *prǝ̀xä*, instr. s *prǝ̀xon*, K. *prǝ̀x*, gen. *prǝ̀xa*, instr. *sa prǝ̀xon*
- 4) *xoldъ – Cr. *hlâd*, *hlâda* ‘shade’
 Sus. J. *xlǝ̀t*, gen. *xlǝ̀dä*, instr. *pod xlǝ̀dön*, B., N. *xlǝ̀t*, gen. *xlǝ̀dä*, dat. *po xlǝ̀dü*, instr. *xlǝ̀dön*
- 5) *vorgъ – Cr. *vrâg*, *vrâga* ‘devil’
 Sus. B., N. *vrâx*, *vrǝ̀x*, gen. N. *vrǝ̀ya*, B. *vrâga*, instr. *vrǝ̀yon*, *vrâgon*, *vrayôn*, *vrayün*, pl. *vrâzi*; J., M. *vrâx*, gen. *vrâya*, instr. z *vrǝ̀yon*, pl. *vrâzi*, *vrǝ̀govi*
- 6) *vortъ – Cr. *vrât*, *vrâta* ‘neck’
 Sus. J. *vrǝ̀t*, gen. *vrǝ̀tä*, instr. z *vrǝ̀tön*, (z *vrǝ̀ton*), pl. *vrǝ̀ti*, B., N. *vrǝ̀t* ‘neck’, gen. *vrǝ̀tä*, instr. *sa vrǝ̀tön*, pl. *vrǝ̀ti*; gen. sg. *vrǝ̀ta* (?) pl. nom. *vrǝ̀ta* ‘doors’

ТЪ/ЪRT

- 7) *čьгвѣ – Cr. *cřv*, *cřva* ‘worm’
 Sus. B., K., N. *čārṽ*, gen. *čarvǎ*, instr. *čarvõn*, *čarvõn*, pl. *čārvi*, J. *čārṽ*, *čārva*, *čārṽon*, pl. *čārvi*, gen. *čārṽov*
- 8) *вьгхъ – Cr. *vřh*, *vřha* ‘up’ (-ǔ-stem)
 Sus. B., N. *vārṽ*, gen. *varxǎ*, instr. *varxõn*, loc. *na varxǔ* ‘peak; top of the mountain’, J., M. *vārṽ*, gen. M. *vrǎ*, J. *vřxa*, instr. *vārṽon*, pl. *vārxi*

Ŭ-stems

While the forms of nouns of the *TORT* and *Тъ/ЪRT* group seemed to be better preserved by the male speakers, there were almost no AP-D reflexes for *ŭ*-stem nouns among male speakers; female speakers, on the other hand, show some reflexes of this class. The list of *ŭ*-stems below is based on the lists of Stang (1957, 79), Illič-Svityč (1963, 143), Dybo et al. (1990, 1993), Zaliznjak (1995, 95), and Eckert (1963, 85).

- 9) *bokъ – Cr. *bõk*, *bõka* ‘hip’
 Sus. J. *buõk*, gen. *bokǎ*, instr. *bõkon*, pl. *bõki*, *bokǐ*, B., K., N. *bõk*, gen. *bokǎ*
- 10) *listъ – Cr. *lĭst*, *lĭsta* ‘leaf; sheet of paper’
 Sus. J. *lĭst*, gen. *lĭsta*, instr. *lĭstõn*, pl. *lĭsti*; *lĭš’č’e* ‘letters’, K. *lĭst*, ‘letter’: gen. *lĭsta*, instr. *lĭston*, pl. *lĭsti*; ‘leaves’: *lĭšt*, pl. *lĭš’č’e*
- 11) *nosъ – Cr. *nõs*, *nõsa* ‘nose’
 Sus. J. *nuõs*, gen. *nosǎ*, instr. *z nõson*, pl. *nõsi*, *nõsi*, *nõsovi*, B., K., N. *nuõs*, gen. *nosǎ*, instr. *z nosõn* pl. *nõsi*
- 12) *plodъ – Cr. *plõd*, *plõda* ‘fruit or any product’
 Sus. J. *plõt*, gen. *plõda*, *plodǎ*, instr. *plõdon*, pl. *plõdi*, *plõdovi*, B., K., N. *plõt*, gen. *plodǎ*, instr. *plõdon*, pl. *plõdi*, *plõdovi*
- 13) *rędъ – Cr. *rĕd*, *rĕda* ‘line, row; order’
 Sus. J. *riĕt*, loc. *na redǔ*, B., K., N. *riĕt*, gen. *riĕda*, instr. *riĕdon*, pl. *riĕdi*

O-stems

Some of the words in the list below have typical AP-D reflexes, while others have in Susak reflexes of AP-B (e.g., *krõf*, gen. *krovǎ*, *strõp*, gen. *stropǎ*).

- 14) *broďbъ – Cr. *brôd*, *brôda* ‘ship’
 Sus. B., N. *broût*, gen. *broďa*, loc. *na broďù*; J. loc. *na broďù*
- 15) *cěpъ – Cr. *cijêp*, *cijêpa* ‘flail’
 Sus. J., M. *cîp*, gen. *cipă*, instr. *s cipôn*, pl. *cîpi*; B. *ciêp*
- 16) *cvěťbъ – Cr. *cvijêť*, *cvjêta* ‘flower’
 Sus. B, K., N. *cviêt*, on grapes: gen. *cvietă*, *cvîta*, pl. *cviêti* ; of fig tree, gen. *cviêta*, pl. *cviêti*; J. *cviêt*, *cvît* (of fig tree), gen. *cviêta* / *cvêta*, *cvîta*, instr. *cvîton*, *cvîti*
- 17) *grobъ – Cr. *grôb*, *grôba* ‘grave’ (AP-B/D)
 Sus. J. *γròp*, gen. *γrôba*, *γrobă*, instr. *γrôbon*, *γrobôn*, pl. *γrôbi*, *γrobítiny*, *γrôbovi*, B., K., N. *γròp*, gen. *γrobă*, instr. *γrobôn*, loc. *na γrabù*, pl. *γrôbi*, *γrôbovi*
- 18) *kljunъ – Cr. *kljûn*, *kljûna* ‘beak’
 Sus. B., N. *kljân*, gen. *kljună*, instr. *kljunôn*
- 19) *krojъ – Cr. *krôj*, *krôja* ‘pattern’
 Sus. B., K., N. *kròj*, gen. B. *krojă*; N. *krôja*, *krôja*, instr. *kròjen*, pl. *kròji*, J. *krôj*
- 20) *krovъ – Cr. *krôv*, *krôva* ‘roof’
 Sus. J. *kròf*, gen. *krovă*, instr. *krovôn*, pl. *kròvi*, B., K., N. *kròf*, gen. *krovă*, instr. *krovôn*, loc. *na krovù*, pl. *kròvi*
- 21) *měxъ – Cr. *mijêh*, *mijêxa* ‘bag made of animal skin’
 Sus. J. *mîx*, gen. *mixă*, instr. *mîxon*, pl. *mîsi*, B., K., N. *mîx*, gen. *mîxa*, instr. *mixôn*, loc. *v mixù*, pl. *mîsi*
- 22) *plotъ – Cr. *plôt*, *plôta* ‘fence’
 Sus. J. *pluôt*, gen. *plôta*, *plotă*, instr. *plôton*, pl. *plôti*, B., N. *pluôt*, gen. *plôta*, instr. *plôton*, pl. *plôti*
- 23) *podъ – Cr. *pôd*, *pôda* ‘floor’
 Sus. B., K., N. *pôt*, gen. *podă*, instr. *s pôdon*, pl. *podî*
- 24) *prqъbъ – Cr. *prût*, *prûta* ‘whip’
 Sus. J. *prût*, gen. *prută*, *prûta*, instr. *sa prûton*, pl. *prûti*, B., K., N. *prût*, gen. *prûta*, *prûta*, instr. *sa prûton*, pl. *prûti*
- 25) *rěpъ – Cr. *rêp*, *rêpa* ‘tail’
 Sus. J. *riêp*, gen. *riêpa*, *bez riepă*, instr. *s riepôn*, pl. *riêpi*, B., K., N. *riêp*, gen. *repă*, instr. *repôn*, *repôn*, pl. *riêpi*

- 26) *rogъ – Cr. *rôg*, *rôga* ‘horn’
 Sus. J. *ruôx*, gen. *rôga*, *roĝä*, instr. *s royôn*, pl. *rôzi*, *rôgovy*, B., N. *rôx*, gen. *roĝä*, instr. *royôn*, pl. *rôzi*
- 27) *stropъ – Cr. *strôp*, *strôpa*, pl. *strôpovi* ‘ceiling’
 Sus. B., N. *strôp*, gen. *stropä*, instr. *stropôn*, pl. *strôpi*
- 28) *zidъ – Cr. *zîd*, *zîda* ‘wall’
 Sus. J. *zît*, gen. *zîda*, *zidä*, *prez zidä*, instr. *zidon*, pl. *zîdi*, B., N. *zît*, gen. B. *bez zîda*, instr. *zidôn*, pl. *zîdi*, gen. *zîdi*
- 29) *znakъ – Cr. *znâk* ‘sign’
 Sus. B., N. *znôk*, gen. *znôka*, dat. *po znôkù*, *po... znôku*, instr. *sa znôkon* (?)
- 30) *zqbъ – Cr. *zûb* ‘tooth’
 Sus. B., N. *zûp*, gen. *zubä*, instr. *zubôn*, pl. *zûbi*, J. *zûp*, gen. *zûba*, instr. *zûbon*, pl. *zûbi* (*zûbi*?)

3.2.2. AP-A

AP-A is characterized by two patterns of accents on monosyllabic nouns. The first pattern is characterized in the nominative singular by short or long falling, but in the oblique cases with an open non-final syllable we find lengthening and often neo-acute intonation, sometimes a circumflex; this is seen in stems with *-a-* and *-i-* (< **i*). This phenomenon exists in other Čakavian dialects to various degrees (Langston 2006, 124). The second pattern has the usual Croatian reflexes of the old acute, which is a short falling accent throughout the paradigm. This is seen in stems with *-i-* (< **ě*, **y*) and *-u-*.

- 1) *bratъ – Cr. *brât*, *brâta* ‘brother’
 Sus. J. *brât*, gen. *brâta*, instr. *z brâton*, pl. *brâti*, B., N. *brât*, gen. *brâta*, *z brâton*, *brâti*
- 2) *dědъ – Cr. *djêd*, *djêda* ‘grandfather’
 Sus. J., B., N. *dît*, gen. *dîda*, instr. *dîdon*, pl. *dîdovi*
- 3) *dymъ – Cr. *dîm*, *dîma* ‘smoke’
 Sus. J. *dîm*, M. *dîm*, gen. *od dîma*; B., K., N., *dîm*, *dîm*, *dîma*
- 4) *jugъ – Cr. *jûg* ‘south’
 Sus. J., B., N. *jûγ*, instr. *z jûgon* ‘south’
- 5) *kraĵъ – Cr. *krâj*, *krâja* (reflex of AP-C) ‘edge, region’
 Sus. J., M. *krôj*, gen. *krôja*, M. *krâja*, instr. *s krâjen*, loc. *na krâju*, pl. *krâjevi*, B., N. *krôj*, gen. *krâja*, instr. *s krâjen*, loc. *na krâju*, pl. *krâjevi*

- 6) *kruhъ – Cr. *krùx*, *krùxa* ‘bread’
Sus. J., M., *krùx*, gen. *krùxa*, instr. *krùxon*
- 7) *lukъ – Cr. *lùk*, *lùka* ‘onion’
Sus. J., M., B., N. *lùk*, gen. *lùka*, instr. *z lùkon*
- 8) *makъ – Cr. *màk*, *màka* ‘poppy’
Sus. J. *mâk*, M. *màk*, J. gen. *smâka*, *smâka* (?), instr. *z mākon*, B., N. *môk*, *mòk*, gen. *môka*, instr. *z mākon*
- 9) *morzъ – Cr. *mràz*, *mràza* ‘frost’
Sus. J., B., N. *mrôz*, gen. *mrāza*, instr. *z mrāzon*
- 10) *myšъ – Cr. *mìš*, *mìša* ‘mouse’
Sus. J., M., B., N. *mìš*, gen. *od mīša*, instr. *sa mīšon*, *s mīšon* pl. *mīši*
- 11) *ogljъ – Cr. *ùgalj*, *ùglja* ‘coal’
Sus. J., M., B., N. (*ugalj*), gen. *ùgla*, pl. *ùgli*, *ùgli*
- 12) *plačъ – Cr. *plàč*, *plàča* ‘crying’
Sus. J., M., B., N. *plàč*, gen. *plāča*, instr. *sa plāčon*

3.2.3. AP-B

The typical reflexes of AP-B in Susak have oxytone forms in oblique cases, with a variant specific to these dialects of long rising on the instrumental ending. Sometimes there is lengthening of originally short stem nouns, e.g., *dvôr*, *nuôž*, *pôst*. Among the list of AP-B words there are only a few with accentual doublets or variations. Among the long stems we found only in words denoting religious terminology (gen. *yrīxa*, *yrixà*, gen. *krīža*, *križà*, instr. *krīžon*, *križôn*), indicating interference from standard Croatian. Among the short stems, variations were found only in two words (*dvor* and *grozđ*), the latter most likely an AP-D word.

I) Long Stems

Unlike other Čakavian dialects, in Susak we did not find the neo-acute in the nominative on the long stems (except *pūt*), but instead we have long falling, the circumflex, which is probably an innovation. However, in two instances below, in (3) and (7), the neo-acute appeared in fast speech in a sentence in which the target noun was followed by the copula *je*. It is possible that neo-acute is being replaced by the standard Croatian circumflex, especially in closed syllables, but it can occur in open syllables (*dvôra*, *pôsta*, *pôston*) and in combination with other words in a sentence

(*dvôr*, but *dvôr je...*). Among long stem nouns, there are some that have reflexes of AP-C, either as the only form or as a variant, e.g., *prîšt*, *prîšta*; *γrîx*, *γrîxa* / *γrixä*.

- 1) *grěxъ – Cr. *grijêh*, *grijéha* ‘sin’
Sus. B., N. *γrîx* ‘sin’, gen. *γrîxa*, *γrixä*, instr. *γrîxon*, pl. *γrîsi*
- 2) *ključъ – Cr. *kljûč*, *kljûča* ‘key’
Sus. B., N. *kljûč*, gen. *kljûča*, instr. *kljûčen*, *ključëm*, pl. *kljûči*
- 3) *korljъ – Cr. *krâlj*, *krâlja* ‘king’
Sus. B., N. *krôl* (but: *krôlj je*), gen. *krôlä*, pl. *krôli*
- 4) *križъ – Cr. *krîž*, *krîža* ‘cross’
Sus. B., N. *krîž*, gen. *krîža*, *križä*, instr. *krîžon*, *križôn*, loc. *na kržü*
D/B
- 5) *pоtъ – Cr. *pût*, *pûta* ‘road, way’
Sus. B., N. *pût*, gen. *pûta*, instr. *pûton*, pl. *pûti*
- 6) *pryščъ – Cr. *prîšt*, *prîšta* ‘furuncle, boil’
Sus. B., N. *prîšt*, gen. *prîšta*, pl. *prîšti*

II) Short Stems

The stems with a short accent usually have the typical AP-B pattern, i.e., short falling accent on the endings. There are two examples with barytone throughout the paradigm in (10) and (15) below (gen. *jěža*, *pôsta*). The latter, however, has the neo-acute accent and a variant with a circumflex in the nominative, which makes it look more like an AP-D word.

- 7) *dvoгъ – Cr. *dvôr*, *dvóra* ‘palace, court’
Sus. B., N. *dvôr*, (but *dvôr je...*), gen. *dvôra*, *dvorà*, *sprid dvorä*, loc. *na dvorü*, instr. *sa dvorôn*, *dvorôn*, pl. nom. *dvorï*, *dvôri*, *dvôri*; J. gen. *dvôra* ‘back/front yard’
- 8) *dъždjъ – Cr. *kiša*, (*dăžd*, *dăžda*) ‘rain’
Sus. B., N. *dăš* ‘rain’, gen. *daž’ä*, instr. *z dažôn*, *dažôn*
- 9) *grozdъ – Cr. *grôzd*, *gròzda*/*gròzda* ‘cluster, bunch’
Sus. B., N. *γròst*, gen. *od γrozdä*, *γròzda*, pl. *γròzdi*; J. gen. *γròzda*
B/D
- 10) *ježъ – Cr. *jêž*, instr. *jêžom* ‘hedgehog’
Sus. B., N. *jěž*, gen. *jěža*, instr. *jěžen*, pl. *jěži*, gen. *jěžov*
- 11) *konjъ – Cr. *kônj*, *kônja* ‘horse’
Sus. B., N. *kônj*, gen. *konjä*, instr. *konjôn*, pl. *kôni*, 2, 3 *konï*

- 12) *ножь – Cr. *nôž, nóža* ‘knife’
Sus. B., N. *nuôž*, gen. *nožã*, instr. *s nožèn*, pl. *nožì*
- 13) *поръ – Cr. *pòp, pòpa* ‘priest’
Sus. B., N. *pòp*, gen. *popã*, instr. *popòn*, pl. *popì*
- 14) *postъ – Cr. *pòst, pòsta, pòsta* ‘fast’ (AP-B/D)
Sus. J., M. *pòst*, gen. *pòsta*, instr. *pòston*, B., N. *pòp*, gen. *popã*,
instr. *popòn*, pl. *popì*
- 15) *ръсь – Cr. *pàs, psà* ‘dog’
Sus. B., N. *pàs, fcìna* (f), gen. *fcà*, pl. *fcì*

3.2.4. AP-C

AP-C is characterized by a long circumflex on the stem in the nominative and in the oblique cases by either short or long, usually falling, but sometimes we find the neo-acute, mostly in the instrumental, and almost none in the genitive. In several instances the accent retracts to the preposition, e.g., *òd jida*. It is evident that in the list of AP-C nouns there are almost no accentual variations within the paradigms and across speakers.

- 1) *bogъ – Cr. *bòg, bòga* ‘god’
Sus. J., M., B., N. *bòx / buòx*, gen. *bòga*, instr. *bògon*, pl. *bògovi*,
bògi
- 2) *drugъ – Cr. *drûg, drûga* ‘friend’
Sus. J., M., B. *drûx* ‘partizan, comrade’, gen. *drûya*, instr. *drûyon*,
voc. *drûže moj*, pl. *drûgovi, drûzi*
- 3) *duxъ – Cr. *dûx, dûxa* ‘ghost’
Sus. J., M. *dûx*, gen. *dûxa, dùxa*, instr. *dûxon*, pl. *dûxovi*, B., N. *dûx*,
gen. *dûxa*, instr. *dûxon*, pl. *dûxovi*
- 4) *dънь – Cr. *dân, dâna* ‘day’
Sus. J., M., B., N. *dôn*, gen. *dôna* pl. *dâni, dnèvi*
- 5) *gnojъ – Cr. *gnòj, gnòja* ‘pus’
Sus. J., B., N. *gnòj*, gen. *gnòja*, instr. *z gnòjen*
- 6) *goldъ – Cr. *glâd, glâda* ‘hunger’
Sus. J., B., N. *glôd*, gen. *òd glôda*, instr. *glôdon*
- 7) *jědъ – Cr. *jéd, jěda, *jéda* ‘bitterness’
Sus. J., B., N. *jît*, gen. *od jîda, òd jida*, instr. *z jîdon*
- 8) *lojъ – Cr. *lôj, lòja* ‘animal fat’
Sus. J., B., N. *lôj*, gen. *lòja*, instr. *z lòjon*

- 9) *medъ – Cr. *mêd*, *mêda* ‘honey’
 Sus. J. *miêd*, M. *miêt*, gen. *od mēda*, *od mēda?*, instr. *z mēdon*, B.,
 N. *miêd*, *mêda*, instr. *mēdon*
- 10) *mirъ – Cr. *mîr*, *mîra* ‘peace’
 Sus. J., M., B., N. *mîr*, gen. *mîra*, instr. *sa mîron*
- 11) *pirъ – Cr. *pîr*, *pîra* ‘wedding; anniversary; big feast’
 Sus. J. *pîr*, gen. *pîra*, instr. *pîron*

4. Discussion and Conclusion

In this paper we described the accentuation patterns of masculine monosyllabic nouns in the Susak dialect spoken in New Jersey. It is apparent that the New Jersey Susak speakers preserve the archaic accentual pattern known as the AP-D. At the same time, we see that AP-D nouns and other nouns are subject to generalization and analogy due to the influence of other Croatian dialects, especially the standard. In the main our description coincides with that of Hamm et al. (1956), but there are some differences. There are additional oxytone reflexes in AP-D words in our description, e.g., Hamm et al. (1956) list *brîx*, *brîya*, but we have *od briyâ* and others. In our description it seems that in monosyllabic words the neo-acute accent was replaced with the circumflex. Thus, long stem AP-B words are not distinguished from long AP-D words: both have barytone forms with a circumflex accent in the nominative and oxytone forms in the oblique cases. For example,

AP-D: *brîx*, gen. *od briyâ*; *xlôt*, gen. *xlodâ*

AP-B: *yrîx*, gen. *yrîxa*, *yrîxâ*; *krôl*, (but: *krôlj je*), gen. *krôlà*

As mentioned above, the neo-acute reappears in AP-B words in certain positions in the nominative, which is a topic for future study. However, it is evident that AP-D and AP-B are distinguished for many of the short stem nouns, as AP-D has lengthening and circumflex in the nominative, but AP-B words have short accent. For example,

AP-D: *buôk*, gen. *bokâ*; *broût*, gen. *brodâ*

AP-B: *yröst*, gen. *od yrozdâ*; *könj*, gen. *konjâ*

Regarding the problem of accentual variations of AP-D words in Hamm et al. 1956 and in our work, it has been mentioned (Langston 2007) that

these variations constitute inconclusive evidence of the existence of AP-D. However, looking at the three types of variations mentioned in this work (p. 214), it is evident that they mostly occur in AP-D nouns, and there are almost no such variations in other paradigms. There are two possible explanations for this variation being almost exclusive to the AP-D class: It is possible that the speakers themselves are confused due to the mixed type of the AP-D, and it might be due to interference from standard Croatian (we did not find evidence of dialectal variation among Susak speakers of New Jersey). It must be mentioned that other Slavic dialects with the AP-D paradigm, e.g. Kriviči dialects, also show accentual variations in AP-D nouns (Shrager 2007, 89). Thus, these variations might reflect archaic alternations native to the Susak dialect (and perhaps other Slavic dialects). Further comparative work will be needed to address this issue.

SUSAKO ŠNEKTOS, VARTOJAMOS NIU DŽERSYJE, VYRIŠKOSIOS GIMINĖS VIENSKIEMENIŲ DAIKTAVARDŽIŲ KIRČIAVIMAS

Santrauka

Slavų akcentologijoje akcentinės paradigmos *d* teorija yra kontraversiška dėl keleto priežasčių, visų pirma dėl garso įrašų iš tarmių, kuriose manoma, kad ji turėtų egzistuoti, trūkumo. Straipsnyje problema nagrinėjama remiantis kroatų kalbos čakavų tarmės Susako šnektos, kurioje, kaip žinoma, akcentinė paradigma *d* egzistuoja (plg. Ham m et al. 1956), įrašais, atliktais Niu Džersyje, kur uždaroje bendruomenėje gyvena emigravusi į JAV dauguma Susako salos gyventojų. Tyrimas parodė, kad Susako tarmės vartotojai Niu Džersyje yra išlaikę a.p. *d* kirčiavimo modelį, tačiau tiek šiai paradigmai priklausa, tiek ir kiti daiktavardžiai paklūsta apibendrinimo bei analogijos reiškiniams dėl kitų kroatų kalbos tarmių, o ypač dėl bendrinės kalbos įtakos. Straipsnyje pateikiamas aprašas iš esmės sutampa su duodamu veikale Ham m et al. 1956, tačiau yra ir skirtumų: nurodoma daugiau oksitoninių a.p. *d* žodžių refleksų; teigiama, kad vienskiemeniuose žodžiuose neoakūtą pakeitęs cirkumfleksas, taigi ilgjojo kamieno a.p. *b* žodžiai neskiriami nuo atitinkamų a.p. *d* žodžių: ir vieniems, ir kitiems būdingos baritoninės cirkumfleksinės vardininko ir oksitoninės netiesioginių linksnių formos; tuo tarpu daugumoje trumpojo kamieno žodžių a.p. *d* ir a.p. *b* skiriamos: a.p. *d* būdingas šaknies balsio pailgėjimas ir cirkumfleksas vardininko formoje, o a.p. *b* – trumpas kirčiuotas balsis šaknyje.

REFERENCES

- Anić, Vladimir 1998, *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*, 3rd ed., Zagreb: Novi Liber.
- ASSJa – *Akcentologički slovar' slavjanskih jazykov* (Unpublished materials for the Accentological Dictionary of Slavic Languages by S.L. Nikolaev and G.I. Zamjatina).
- Bulatova, Rimma Vladimirovna, Vladimir Antonovič Dybo, Sergej L'vovič Nikolaev 1988, Problemy akcentologičeskikh dialektizmov v praslavjanskom, in Nikita Il'ič Tolstoj (ed.) *Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie (X međunarodnyj s'ezd slavistov, Sofija, sentjabr' 1988). Doklady sovetskoj delegacii*, Moskva: Nauka, 31–66.
- Dybo, Vladimir Antonovič 1963, O rekonstrukcii udarenija v praslavjanskom glagole, *Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija* 6, 3–26.
- Dybo, Vladimir Antonovič 1981, *Slavjanskaja akcentologija. Opyt rekonstrukcii sistemy akcentnyh paradigm*, Moskva: Nauka.
- Dybo, Vladimir Antonovič 2000, *Morfonologizovannye paradigmatičeskie akcentnye sistemy. Tipologija i genesis* 1, Moskva: Studia philologica.
- Dybo, Vladimir Antonovič, Galina Igorevna Zamjatina, Sergej L'vovič Nikolaev 1990, *Osnovy slavjanskoj akcentologii*, Moskva: Nauka.
- Dybo, Vladimir Antonovič, Galina Igorevna Zamjatina, Sergej L'vovič Nikolaev 1993, *Osnovy slavjanskoj akcentologii. Slovar'*, Moskva: Nauka.
- Eckert [Ėkkert], Reiner 1963, Osnovy na -ŭ- v praslavjanskom jazyke, *Učenyje zapiski Instituta slavjanovedenija* 27, 3–133.
- Garde, Paul 1976, *Histoire de l'accentuation slave*, Paris: Institut d'études slaves.
- Hamm, Josip, Mate Hraste, Petar Guberina 1956, Govor otoka Suska, *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 1, Zagreb, 7–213.
- Illič-Svityč, Vladislav Markovič 1963, *Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom. Sud'ba akcentuacionnyh paradigm*, Moskva: Izdatel'stvo akademii nauk SSSR (= *Nominal Accentuation in Baltic and Slavic*. Translated by Richard Leed and Ronald Feldstein, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1979).
- Ivšić, Stjepan 1915, Prilog za slavenski akcenat, *Rad Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 187, 133–207 (= Idem, *Izabrana djela iz slavenske akcentuacije*, München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1971, 83–159).
- Kiparsky, Paul, Morris Halle 1977, Towards a reconstruction of the Indo-European accent, in Larry M. Hyman (ed.), *Studies in stress and accent* (= *Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 4), Los Angeles, 209–238.
- Langston, Keith 2006, *Čakavian prosody. The accentual patterns of the Čakavian dialects of Croatia*, Bloomington: Slavica.
- Langston, Keith 2007, Common Slavic accentual paradigm (d): A reevaluation of evidence from Čakavian, in Mate Kapović, Ranko Matasović (eds.), *Tones and*

theories. Proceedings of the International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology, Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, 121–150.

Stang, Christian S. 1957, *Slavonic accentuation*, Oslo: I kommisjon hos H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard).

Shrager, Miriam 2007, *The accentual system of masculine nouns in “Kriviči” dialects*, PhD Dissertation, Indiana University at Bloomington.

Tolstoj, Il’ja Il’ič 1970, *Serbskohorvatsko-russkij slovar’*, Moskva: Sovetskaja ènciklopedija.

Vermeer, Willem 1984, On clarifying some points of Slavonic accentology: The quantity of the thematic vowel in the present tense and related issues, *Folia linguistica historica* 5, 331–395.

Zaliznjak, Andrej Anatol’ evič 1995, *Drevnenovgorodskij dialekt*, Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kul’tury.

Miriam-Maria SHRAGER
Department of Slavic Languages & Literatures
Indiana University
Ballantine Hall 510
Bloomington, IN, 47408
USA
[mshrage@indiana.edu]