

SONDERDRUCK/OFFPRINT

vácāṃsi miśrā kṛṇavāmahai

Studien
zur historisch-vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft

Herausgegeben von
Harald Bichlmeier und Velizar Sadovski

Band 17

vácāṃsi miśrā kṛṇavāmahai

Proceedings of the international conference
of the Society for Indo-European Studies and IWoBA XII,
Ljubljana 4–7 June 2019,
celebrating one hundred years of Indo-European
comparative linguistics at the University of Ljubljana

Akten der Arbeitstagung
der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft und des IWoBA XII
vom 4. bis 7. Juni 2019 in Ljubljana
aus Anlass der Hundertjahrfeier der dortigen Indogermanistik

edited by
Luka Repanšek, Harald Bichlmeier & Velizar Sadovski

baar
Hamburg 2020

Baar-Verlag

Hamburg

URL: <http://baar-verlag.com>

E-Mail: info@baar-verlag.com

Bibliographische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliographie; detaillierte bibliographische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

© The authors, the editors and Baar-Verlag 2020

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Druck und Verarbeitung: SOWA, Piaseczno.

Umschlaggestaltung: Linda Sophie Gableske (5°sued), Dresden.

All rights reserved. This publication may not be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Printed and bound in Poland.

ISBN 978-3-935536-26-4

ISSN 2192-0133

Contents

LUKA REPANŠEK – HARALD BICHLMEIER – VELIZAR SADOVSKI	
Vorwort der Herausgeber	9
VELIZAR SADOVSKI	
Opening address delivered at the plenary session of the <i>Ljubljana</i> conference	11
LUKA REPANŠEK	
Zur Geschichte des Lehrstuhls für vergleichende indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft an der Universität Ljubljana	15
I. Proceedings of the International conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies	23
ROBERTO BATISTI	
Some putative Greco-Armenian sound laws and the role of the accent	25
ANNA BAUER	
All, many, some and more: Non-Numerical quantification in Anatolian	49
HARALD BICHLMEIER	
Das Ghostword aksl. <i>seštъ/seštъ</i> ‘klug, weise’ – oder: der lange Schatten des Franz Xaver (Ritter von) Miklosich (Miklošič)	67
VÁCLAV BLAŽEK	
Latin <i>aqua</i> and its relatives	83
FILIP DE DECKER	
An overall analysis of the augment in epic Greek and applied to some longer passages	103
MICHAEL FROTSCHER / CORINNA SCHEUNGRABER	
From ditropic clitics to prefixation. On the historical development of Germanic preverbs * <i>ga-</i> , * <i>bi-</i> , Goth. <i>dis-</i> , OHG <i>zar-</i> and Goth. <i>du-</i> , OHG <i>za-</i>	127

METKA FURLAN

- The origin of the Anatolian alternation *keššar* : *kiššeran*
and the Balto-Slavic alternations of the type *akmuō/kamy* : *ākmenī/
kamenb* revisited 143

JOSÉ LUIS GARCÍA RAMÓN

- Anatolian and Greek infinitives: Continuity of Indo-European
morphosyntax vs. areal development 163

RICCARDO GINEVRA

- Gods who shine through the millennia: Old Norse *Baldr*,
Celtic *Belinos*, Old Irish *Balar*, and PIE **b^helH-* ‘be white, shine’ 189

FEDERICO GIUSFREDI / VALERIO PISANIELLO

- Grammatical categories in contact: Gender assignment criteria
in Hittite borrowings from the neighbouring languages 209

BJARNE SIMMELKJÆR SANDGAARD HANSEN

- Minimum standards for acceptable sound laws.
Some alleged root nouns in Proto-Norse 235

EUGEN HILL / SIMON FRIES

- On personal endings of thematic verbs in Proto-Indo-European 255

STEFAN HÖFLER

- Vedic *mahá-* ‘large’ and Lithuanian *māžas* ‘small’.
The emphatic reading of possessive derivatives 285

SAMPsa HOLOPAINEN

- Criticism of some Indo-Uralic sound-correspondences 293

MATE KAPOVIĆ

- The genitive plural ending in Proto-Indo-European and Slavic 321

NIKOLAI N. KAZANSKY

- Conglutinate suffixes in Indo-European languages
and PIE reconstruction problems 347

GÖTZ KEYDANA

- Accentual mobility in Vedic 355

WERNER KNOBL

- Minimal change: New comments (2) and (3) on RV 10.129 367

PETR KOCHAROV

- The etymology of Arm. *amp* ‘cloud’ 385

DANIEL KÖLLIGAN	
Seething anger: Latin <i>furor</i>	399
KONSTANTIN G. KRASUKHIN	
Accent-ablaut paradigms vs. the ablaut-accent paradigm	415
ROSEMARIE LÜHR	
Raumkognition auf dem ehemaligen Gebiet der „Alteuropäischen Hydronymie“	433
MAREK MAJER	
The Indo-European prehistory of the Albanian word for ‘sister’	455
LAURA MASSETTI	
‘The light of truth, the wage of rightness, the remedy of excellence.’ On three inherited collocations of Greek ἀρετή, Vedic <i>ṛtá-</i> , Avestan <i>aša-</i>	467
WOLFGANG MEID	
How not to interpret Old Irish texts. <i>Táin Bó Cúailnge</i> . The final verbal exchange between Medb and Fergus	481
STELLA MERLIN	
“Pre-Greek” between theories and linguistic data. Examples from the Anatolian area	487
ALJOŠA MILENKOVIĆ	
Between semantics and phonological theories. The origin of PSl. <i>*jǫstb</i> ‘that, the same’	507
BIRGIT ANETTE OLSEN	
Insiders and outsiders. The etymology of Slavic <i>*vъnukъ</i> ‘grandson’	527
GEORGES-JEAN PINAULT	
Going home in Proto-Indo-European	539
VELIZAR SADOVSKI	
Indo-Iranian <i>*HamHa-</i> and the fighter’s ‘ <i>Sturm und Drang</i> ’, in compound epithets, personal names, and poetical phraseology from the Veda, Avesta and Ancient Persia (Ritual Formulae and Ritual Pragmatics in the Veda and Avesta, IV)	557
ANDREA SANTAMARIA	
The Greek evidence for an alleged PIE <i>*√sekh₂-</i>	581

ANDREY SHATSKOV	
Mixture of <i>hi-</i> and <i>mi-</i> conjugation forms in Hittite	599
ZSOLT SIMON	
Die luwischen Wörter für ‚Dolmetscher‘. Stammbildung und Etymologie	607
MARKO SNOJ	
<i>Morem, moram, maram</i> – A flash of insight into the Slovenian national character	617
TOBIAS MOSBÆK SØBORG	
Sieving the sources of <i>s</i> -extended verbs in Hittite	621
MIGUEL VILLANUEVA SVENSSON	
Osthoff’s Law in Balto-Slavic	645
II. Proceedings of the International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology (IWoba) XII	663
JANOŠ JEŽOVNIK	
A further look at the progressive acute-accent shift in the <i>Tersko</i> dialect of Slovene	665
MATE KAPOVIĆ	
Accentual paradigm D on Susak: New data	679
VYTAUTAS RINKEVIČIUS	
Prosodic marks in the Old Prussian <i>Enchiridion</i> revisited	707
Contributor contact information	725

ACCENTUAL PARADIGM D ON SUSAK: NEW DATA

Mate Kapović, Zagreb

1 Introduction¹

The Čakavian dialect of Susak has first been described by Hamm/Hraste/Guberina 1956 (henceforth referred to as HHG). The dialect has been propelled to international fame, at least in the circles of experts in Balto-Slavic historical linguistics, by Illič-Svityč (1963: 119, 1979: 103f.), because it was supposed to preserve the old accentual paradigm *d*² in monosyllabic *o*-stem (and old *u*-stem) nouns like **gordъ* ‘town’. Illič-Svityč was the first to successfully compare the accentual paradigms of Baltic and Slavic and juxtapose the Balto-Slavic paradigmatic accentual behaviour to the one observable in Vedic, Ancient Greek and Germanic. What he found, disregarding details and numerous additional complexities, was that the barytona of Vedic, Greek and Germanic correspond to an immobile accentual paradigm in Balto-Slavic (Lithuanian a. p. 2, Slavic a. p. *b*), while the oxytona in these three language groups correspond to a mobile (barytonic-oxytonic)³ accentual paradigm in Balto-Slavic (Lithuanian a. p. 3/4, Slavic a. p. *c*). This is indeed true of most nominal types such as the *ā*-stems, cf. Greek *ψύλλα* ~ Susak (my data) *balxǎ* – acc^{sg} *balxǔ* (a. p. B) ‘flea’, but does not hold in the case of *o*- and *u*-stems. There, instead of the expected immobile paradigm (found in Lithuanian), Slavic has an unexpected mobile paradigm: consider the case of Greek *γόμφος* ‘bolt’ vs. Čakavian (most dialects) *zûb* – gen^{sg} *zûba* (a. p. C) ‘tooth’. Illič-Svityč conjectured that some kind of secondary shift must have

¹ I would like to thank Willem Vermeer for his comments on the first draft of this paper.

² I will write the symbols that refer to the reconstructed/original (Proto-/Common) Slavic accentual paradigms in lower-case italics (*a*, *b*, *c*, *d*) and the symbols that mark synchronic accentual paradigms as they occur in later individual Slavic dialects/languages (here, mostly in the case of the Susak dialect) in upper case (A, B, C, D). Other important abbreviations used throughout the article are AB – Andrijana Busanić (informant); a. p. – accentual paradigm; DM – Dina Mačić (informant); EB – Elena Busanić (informant); LSCS = lengthening in (non-final) stressed closed syllables; LSS = lengthening in (non-final) stressed syllables; pauc. – paucal; stand. – standard; Štok. – (Standard Neo-) Štokavian.

³ The ictus could actually also fall on the medial syllable (which is to say on the first syllable of an ending).

occurred in Slavic. The intermediate phase of such a shift was then named a. p. *d*, which was supposed to represent a transition from the expected immobile stress to the usually attested mobile stress, thus a. p. *b* → a. p. *d* → a. p. *c*. Accentual paradigm *b* originally had immobile accent on the stem (with a later shift to the next syllable), while a. p. *c* had mobile stress (with initial or final accent, depending on the form and the initial accent shift to a proclitic); the presumed a. p. *d*, however, is supposed to be a combination of a. p. *b* and *c*, having mobile stress in the nom/acc^{sg} (which were the same in Slavic) and immobile stress elsewhere:

	a. p. <i>b</i>	a. p. <i>d</i>	a. p. <i>c</i>
nom ^{sg}	* <i>kljũčb</i> (* <i>nākljũčb</i>) 'key'	* <i>gōrdb</i> (* <i>nāgōrdb</i>) 'town'	* <i>svěrb</i> (* <i>nāsvěrb</i>) 'world'
gen ^{sg}	* <i>kljũča</i> > * <i>ključa</i>	* <i>gōrda</i> > * <i>gordā</i>	* <i>světa</i>
dat ^{pl}	* <i>kljũčemb</i> > * <i>ključemb</i>	* <i>gōrdomb</i> > * <i>gordomb</i>	* <i>světomb</i>

The alleged a. p. *d* would then be a transitional form of the expected a. p. *b* on its way to the usually attested a. p. *c* in *o*-/*u*-stems (with nom/acc^{sg} **gōrdb* as in a. p. *c* and gen^{sg} **gōrda* > **gordā* as in a. p. *b*). The origin and nature of this putative shift is not clear.⁴ Now, Illič-Svityč thought to have found the remains of the old immobile stress in *o*-stems (and original *u*-stems) in the then newly described Čakavian dialect of Susak. For instance, compared to the already mentioned Greek γόμφος, most Slavic accentual data points to **zǫpb* (a. p. *c*). However, Susak, according to HHG 106, provides *zûp* – gen^{sg} *zûbā* here (the same in my data from 2018), i.e., with the supposedly preserved end stress in the oblique cases (= a. p. *D*).

However, the HHG description of the Susak dialect was heavily criticized. We shall limit ourselves here to the critical review of the data relevant to the a. p. *D* and the critique of the accentual system.⁵ The latter is important because the lack of distinctive pitch could have made a possible later (thus not yet Proto-Slavic in origin) confusion of a. p. *B* and a. p. *C* much easier.⁶ Ivić (1959: 177), Stein-

⁴ One possibility is that the initial trigger was some kind of metatony that occurred due to the loss of final *-s in the nom^{sg} (cf. Nikolaev 2012: 86). One could compare this to the secondary recessive/initial accent in Slavic *u*- and *i*-stem a. p. *c* nom^{sg}, cf. Slav **sŭnъ* 'son' and **zvěrb* 'beast' with Lith *sūnūs* and *žvėris* (cf. Kapović 2015: 171⁶⁰⁶). Interestingly enough, the original end-stress of Slav **dbkti* 'daughter' (where there was no *-s, cf. Proto-Indo-European **dʰugh₂tēr*) may have well been variantly preserved, cf. Štok/Čak dialectal (*k*)*čī* (Kapović 2015: 541). However, there was no change, e.g., in the *o*-stem dat^{pl} **bogomb* < *-*mos* 'to the gods'.

⁵ In HHG 52 it is claimed that Susak has a "[u] osnovi [...] troakcenatski sistem", meaning that it has a pitch distinction. However, this supposed distinction is contradicted by many examples in their generally confusing study, cf. *m'ěso* 'meat' (53).

⁶ If a dialect distinguishes between *krāl* (B) 'king' and *glās* (C) 'voice', the genitive forms *krālā* (B) and *glāsa* (C) can hardly be confused. However, if the original pitch difference is neutralized (either completely or just in final syllables) and *krāl* (B) = *glās* (C), then the original *krālā* (B) and

hauer (1975: 24)⁷ and Vermeer (1979/2016: 3f., 1984a: 359) all rightly pointed out that there is no distinctive pitch in the dialect of Susak. Vermeer (1984a: 360) even goes a significant step further and says “that Susak material which is only attested in Hraste’s morphology without being supported by forms in Hamm’s part of the description cannot be used for accentological purposes. This includes the forms on which Illič-Svityč bases the assumption that the dialect escaped his law.” Though Vermeer seems to be right in some of his views on the matter (1984a: 359), especially as concerns Hraste’s work on the Susak dialect (partially on gen^{sg} -ě and -iě⁸ and perhaps in the case of pres. 3^{sg} -iě⁹), his caution concerning the a. p. D itself, though methodologically correct, turned out to be unwarranted. A. p. D forms do indeed exist in the Susak dialect and in that regard Hraste, perhaps surprisingly,¹⁰ seems to actually be a much more reliable source than Hamm.¹¹ Vermeer’s claim (*ibid.*) that Susak a. p. D “forms like *zūbǎ* are at best optional” is probably not correct either.¹² However, concerning Susak a. p. D, Vermeer (1984a: 360²¹) is careful to note that while he has “not yet come across (b)-stressed forms like *zūbǎ*”, his “material is still too limited to justify the conclusion that such forms do not in fact exist.”¹³ Cf. also his warning about criticism of the Susak a. p. D material from HHG: “we are not yet in a position to

glāsa (C) could potentially get confused due to the nominative forms being identical – either *krāl* can theoretically get a secondary gen^{sg} *krāla* (by analogy to *glās* – *glāsa*) or *glās* can get a secondary gen^{sg} *glāsā* (by analogy to *krāl* – *krālā*). Of course, the pitch neutralization itself will not automatically yield such innovative forms, as clearly seen by, e.g., Neo-Štokavian, where the *krāla* and *glāsa* type of genitives are well preserved and distinct, although *krāl* has been identical with *glās* for centuries.

⁷ Steinhauer (*ibid.*) also mentions that one of the authors of HHG, Petar Guberina, agreed in personal communication that Susak had no distinctive pitch opposition.

⁸ This problem is dealt with (on the basis of new dialectal material collected during field work) separately in Kapović 2021.

⁹ Vermeer (1979/2016: 2f.) found only /-iě/ in 3^{sg} of the present tense on Susak (HHG 119 have -ě in *krādě* as a variant as well), which agrees with my data (the form *restě* – HHG 162 – quoted by Steinhauer 1975: 32¹² is suspicious). It could be that -ě does not exist in the dialect (but it is not completely impossible that it was actually a fluke archaism attested in HHG).

¹⁰ It is indeed somewhat strange that a. p. D forms appear only in HHG 106 while there are no traces of them before that (cf. HHG 70, 83, 90 for gen^{sg} *zūba*).

¹¹ In any case, however shoddy Hraste’s work may have been, it is highly improbable that he would mishear the placement of the accent (rather than the pitch) and that, in doing so, he would somehow make up such aberrant forms as *zūbǎ*, differing from “normal” Čakavian, his own native Brač dialect, and standard Štokavian.

¹² In my own collection of data, many words are end-stressed only (e.g. gen^{sg} *xlōdǎ*, *ylōsǎ*, *tieyǎ*, *vrōtǎ*, etc.). Of course, this might be purely accidental and due simply to a failure to record the barytone variants. It is premature, however, to claim that all D-forms should necessarily be understood as variants.

¹³ On the other hand, Vermeer (1984a: 361²²) does quote an a. p. D form from his own Susak fieldwork data: *pʰōt* – nom^{pl} *plōt* ‘fence’. This kind of synchronic short-vowel a. p. D type seems to be widespread in Central Čakavian (Willem Vermeer, personal communication; cf. also Vermeer 2001: 143–146).

reject Illič-Svityč's idea altogether" (Vermeer 1984a: 358). Furthermore, Vermeer (2001: 142) points out that "the island of Susak [...] happens to be the only place where a. p. (d) appears actually to be attested". Following Ivić (1959: 172, 175, cf. also 182), he also proposes "that the Susak dialect, despite its peripheral location, is not marginal in a dialectological sense" (Vermeer 2001: 138), which is true. However, since possible traces of a. p. D were later reported from all across Slavia,¹⁴ Susak's possible (non-)peripherality is not really that important anymore. In any case, some indications of a. p. D forms seem to be present in the neighbouring dialects on the island of Lošinj as well.¹⁵ That is hardly surprising due to numerous other similarities between the two. Stankiewicz (1993: 34) and, more carefully, Langston (2007: 132) believe that Susak oxytone forms are (possibly) the result of a confusion between the original B- and C-types. Langston (*ibid.*) adds that more research is needed in order "to confirm the accentuation of these forms [...] before they can confidently be used as evidence for the reconstruction of a. p. (d)."

Thus, as we have seen, it was not only Illič-Svityč's reconstruction that was in some doubt but the very data (the synchronic a. p. D on Susak), upon which his theory was based, as well. That at least a synchronic a. p. D exists in the dialect of Susak was subsequently proven by Shrager 2011,¹⁶ who did fieldwork with Susak emigrants in New Jersey (US). She was able to find forms like *gen^{sg} nosă* 'nose' (the same in my data), which after more than half a century proved that a. p. D forms from HHG were real.

The aim of this paper is to bring forth new and conclusive data on the synchronic a. p. D in the dialect of Susak, which most certainly exists. The data was obtained by the author through fieldwork on the island in 2018.¹⁷ Additionally, the

¹⁴ Cf. e.g. the usual Neo-Štokavian adverbs *năzād* 'backwards' – *odozáda* 'from the back' and *năprijēd* 'forward' – *sprijēda* 'out front' with anomalous accentuation (a combination of a. p. C and a. p. B), Kapović 2015: 172 fn. 607.

¹⁵ Cf. in the now extinct dialect of Mali Lošinj (Zubčić 2017: 740, 748–749) *Muôst* – *gen^{sg} Mostă* – *instr^{sg} Mostiēn*, *Buôk* – *instr^{sg} Bokuôn*. However, in Čunski on Lošinj (Houtzagers 2003: 36f.) one finds the usual *gen^{sg} žida*, *vroâta* (unlike *žida/židă* and *vřôtă* on Susak in my data). Susak was and is economically tied to Lošinj (cf. HHG 14f.).

¹⁶ Cf. also Kapović 2015: 172 fn. 611, who was able to validate her data by listening to a small sample of Shrager's field recordings at a conference in Vilnius in 2010.

¹⁷ I visited Susak on November 9–11, 2018. I would like to thank my informants Elena Busanić, Andrijana Busanić and Dina Mačić, to Marta Fazlić from Mali Lošinj for her enormous and kind efforts to organize my stay on Susak and find informants, to Nadia Malović from Susak for her help in locating the informants, and to my colleagues Ivana Kurtović Budja and Nikola Vuletić for their initial help with finding potential informants on Susak. Additionally, I have listened to the dialectal radio show *Frižimenula* on Radio Mali Lošinj–Radio Jadranka with some speakers from Susak, kindly provided by the aforementioned Marta Fazlić. Not all my findings from Susak are presented in this paper – some information on the phonetics, phonology and prosody of the dialect is published in Ka-

question of the (lack of) pitch opposition in the dialect will be addressed (the dialect indeed has no distinctive pitch). After the presentation of the newly gathered material, the data will be compared to the Susak a. p. D material from HHG and Shrager 2011 and carefully analyzed. In the concluding sections of the paper, we will compare the synchronic a. p. D material from Susak with the data from Baltic and other Indo-European languages in order to see whether the a. p. D in monosyllabic *o*-stems (and original *u*-stems) on Susak is an archaism or not.¹⁸

2 A note on the informants

My informants on Susak were Elena Busanić (born 1939), from whom I gathered the bulk of my data,¹⁹ Andrijana Busanić (born 1939) and her daughter Dina Mačić (born 1977).²⁰ Henceforth, I mark the data with EB, AB and DM to indicate from which informant a particular form was elicited. Their dialect was not completely uniform. EB is originally from the upper part of Susak on the hill (*Gornje Selo*), which is “more Tsakavian” according to HHG (78),²¹ and this is clearly seen in her idiolect (e.g. *čě* but also *cě* for ‘what’). She lived in the upper part of Susak up until she was 17 or 18 years old and later in the lower part of Susak, which is “more Čakavian” according to HHG (*ibid.*).²² AB and DM (living in the same household) are from the lower part of Susak. AB had just a few marginal Tsakavian forms and DM none at all (her /č/ is always [ʧ]). There were some other differences between the informants, for instance only EB exhibited allophonic centralization of the stressed phoneme /ǃ/. However, all three informants had a synchronic a. p. D. More details are given in Kapović 2020.

pović 2020 (to be considered complementary to the present paper). An in-depth discussion of the accentuation of *ā*-stems and the problem of the gen^{sg} -*ě* and -*iě* will be published in Kapović 2021.

¹⁸ Of course, Susak Čakavian is hardly the only system with an a. p. D or indications of it, whether those be archaic or innovative – cf. the overview in Kapović 2015: 171–175. Some of the reported cases of a. p. D are definitely innovative, while some are implausible or mistaken – for instance, Rožić’s ‘*ǃ*’ in Prigorje Kajkavian, is not a special retractional toneme but probably a mark for the allotonic “*tromi naglasak*” (Kapović 2015: 60 fn. 126), which means that forms bearing ‘*ǃ*’ cannot be a reflex of a. p. *d* (cf. also Vermeer 2001: 146f.). However, this does not mean that there are no real traces of the supposed old a. p. *d*.

¹⁹ I additionally obtained a small amount of data during a later check-up telephone call with this informant.

²⁰ The two oldest informants were, thus, 15 years old when Hamm, Hraste and Guberina visited the island in 1954. In HHG 144f., the authors adduce texts by Jorjo, who was 32 years old at the time, thus only 17 years older than my two informants.

²¹ Though they do not note any special differences between the two parts of Susak elsewhere in the study (Steinhauer 1975: 17f.).

²² The two parts of Susak are part of the same town and, though very close to each other, are indeed (still) spatially separated.

3 Prosody and vocalism of the Susak dialect

Here, I shall provide a basic overview of the Susak prosodic system and some phonological features on the basis of my data.²³ The Susak dialect has unpredictable stress, which can fall on any syllable in a word: *'vidila* 'saw [fem^{sg}] – *ne'dila* 'Sunday' – *zove'mo* 'we call'. It also has distinctive quantity in stressed syllables (nom^{pl} *mo'ji* 'my [masc]' – *bo'li*: 'it hurts') and in first pretonic syllables before a short stressed syllable (*do'bra* 'good [indef. fem^{sg}] – *jo:'ka* 'strong [indef. fem^{sg}]'). In EB's idiolect, pretonic length is almost perfectly preserved (with only occasional shortening), while in AB/DM's idiolect it is preserved/realized somewhat haphazardly. High vowels (/i/ and /u/) can be both short and long in all stressed and pretonic syllables. Vowels /a/ and /e/ can be considered phonologically short in all positions (with some marginal exceptions), but they are usually phonetically long in non-final syllables (gen^{sg} /to'vara/ [to'va:ra] 'donkey', /'rekal/ ['re:kal] 'said [masc^{sg}]') and always short in final/only syllables (gen^{sg} *lemu'na* 'lemon', *smi:'ješ* 'you laugh [sg]'), except when [e] is an allophone of the diphthong /je/ after /j/ as in gen^{sg} *mo'je*:. The vowel /o/ can exhibit quantitative opposition in final/only syllable (*reče'mo* 'we say' – *čaku'lo*: '(s)he babbles'). In non-final syllables with *o*, the old (phonological) quantitative opposition is rarely expressed through length (because non-final phonologically short stressed /ǝ/ is often phonetically long, just like other non-high vowels), as in *'doma* 'at home' as opposed to *'do:la* 'she gave', and more often (but only in EB's idiolect) through very frequent centralization of the short stressed /ǝ/, as in /'molin/ ['mø:lin] 'I pray', as opposed to /'xro:nimo se/ ['xro:nimo se] 'we feed ourselves / eat' (centralization is an additional feature distinguishing /i/, which is phonetically [i̯] after dentals/alveolars, and /i:/). The diphthongs /je/ and /uo/ (e.g. *'rje:kla* 'she said', *'smuo:kva* 'fig') appear in the same positions as long high vowels (in stressed syllables and first pretonic syllables before a short stressed syllable) and are phonologically always long (though not always phonetically realized as such). From a diachronic perspective, we can say that there were no phonetic retractions of stress and that the frequent Čakavian pitch opposition of the "circumflex" and the "(neo-)acute" is not preserved, cf. Susak *'pje:t* 'five' = *pede'sje:t* 'fifty' (*pêt* but *pedesêt* in many Čakavian dialects with preserved old pitch distinction). Posttonic length was shortened without trace (e.g., *'mīsec* 'month') prior to diphthongization (thus, not **'misjec*) and **a:* > *o:*, while the old pretonic length is preserved in the first syllable before a short stress²⁴ (e.g. gen^{sg} *netjo:'ka*

²³ All the forms in this section are by EB.

²⁴ This is the only position where the preservation of the old length is expected phonetically (cf. Kapović 2015: 416–501).

‘nephew’). Old long **a:* yielded /o/ (IPA [ɔ])²⁵ (usually long, sometimes phonetically facultatively shortened in pretonic position) under and directly before stress, cf. *mlo:¹da* ‘young [indef. fem^{sg}]’ (in more archaic Čakavian varieties: *mlāddā*), *u¹zo:xomo* ‘we used to [impf]’,²⁶ *u¹zo:xu* ‘they used to [impf]’ (< **uzāxomo*, **uzāxu*). Old long **e:* diphthongized to /je/ (allophonically/phonetically realized in a number of ways) and old long **o:* diphthongized to /uo/ under and directly before stress (thus, the old opposition of **a:* and **o:* is preserved as the modern /o:/ and /uo/). Susak exhibits both of the usual later Čakavian lengthenings,²⁷ namely the lengthening of all non-final stressed vowels in closed syllables (before all types of consonant clusters), e.g. *‘ji:yla* ‘needle’²⁸ (henceforth LSCS = lengthening in stressed closed syllables), as well as the younger process of lengthening of all non-final stressed non-high vowels (/a/, /e/, /o/), e.g. nom^{pl} *bo¹ya:ti* ‘rich [masc]’ (*bogāti* in more archaic Čakavian), nom^{sg} *ve:li* ‘big [def. masc]’ (*vēli* in more archaic Čakavian), loc^{sg} *‘nə:vɔj* ‘new [fem]’ (*nōvōj* in more archaic Čakavian) (henceforth LSS = lengthening in stressed syllables). LSCS is older and predates diphthongization and **a:* > /o:/, cf. the already mentioned *‘rje:kla* (*rēkla* in more archaic Čakavian), *‘smuo:kva* (*smōkva* in more archaic Čakavian) and *‘klo:st* ‘to put (say)’ (*klāsti* in more archaic Čakavian²⁹). LSS is younger (and yields [a:], [e:], [o:]) without any change in vowel color or diphthongization. It is not completely consistent (just like LSCS) and some /a/, /e/, /o/ remain short (though rarely).

As concerns the phonetic realization of the stress, short stress (traditionally marked as <˘>) is usually “canonical”,³⁰ meaning that it is nearly always very short, falling, abrupt and “sharp”. The “tromi naglasak” (traditionally marked as <˘˘>) (a longer, phonetically slightly rising realization), while usual in some dialects, is very rare (and probably non-existent on high vowels). The phonetic realization of stressed long syllables is very interesting. Usually, a long stressed syllable in non-tonemic dialects is pronounced as phonetically falling (akin to the long falling toneme, traditionally marked as <˘˘˘>, in dialects with pitch distinction),

²⁵ Susak /o/ is a mid-vowel ([ɔ] in very precise IPA symbols), just like /o/ in standard Croatian (likewise, Susak /e/ is IPA [ɛ]). HHG 64–66 write this vowel as <â>, but this seems to actually be [ɔ] (cf. the details in Kapović 2020: 526, fn. 143). Shrager (2011: 212) marks this vowel as an open <ɔ> [ɔ] in her paper.

²⁶ Cf. *užāxomo* in HHG 66. EB’s form is Tsakavian (z instead of ž).

²⁷ Cf. Kapović 2015: 594–619 for a comprehensive overview of these lengthenings in Čakavian as a whole.

²⁸ Cf. in Čunski (Houtzagers 2003: 48) on the nearby island of Lošinj acc^{sg} *jīglu* with no lengthening (also Štok. acc^{sg} *īglu*).

²⁹ Final -i was presumably dropped after lengthening.

³⁰ Cf. Kapović 2015: 47.

given that this is the unmarked pronunciation (the falling tone is less marked than a level/rising one). However, in Susak Čakavian the most frequent pronunciation of long stressed vowels is the one identical with the “(neo-)acute” in tonemic Čakavian dialects. While definitely not entailing any pitch distinction, Susak Čakavian clearly exhibits both the “circumflex” (falling tone) and the “acute” (usually level, sometimes rising and sometimes very slightly falling tone) variant – identical in pronunciation to the separate tonemes in Čakavian dialects with distinctive pitch. This is probably part of the reason that caused the confusion with the description of prosody in HHG. Thus, while *jô* ‘I’ and *dôn* ‘day’ can be pronounced exactly the same way as *jô* and *dôn* (or older *jā* and *dān*) in tonemic dialects (like Brač Čakavian), these are just non-distinctive different realizations in the Susak dialect; they cannot be used to distinguish words/meanings and are basically interchangeable (thus, *jô* and *dôn* can be heard as well³¹). The “circumflex” (falling) usually occurs on the final syllable of polysyllabic words, while the “acute” (mostly level) usually occurs on all non-final syllables and monosyllables (exceptions exist – perhaps slightly more so in the idiolect of EB). Cf. here the phonetic realization of long stress in the previously mentioned forms: end stress in polysyllables *bolī*, *mojê*, *ćakulô* but non-final stress in *dôla*, *mêlin*, *xrônimo_se*, *rjêkla*, *smuôkva*, *uzôxomo*, *uzôxu*, *jỹla* and monosyllabic *pîêt* (also *pîê*), *klôst* (also *klôst*). Long vowels originating in LSS almost always have the “acute” realization (with very rare exceptions), e.g. *tovāra*, *rêkal*, *boỹāti*, *vêli*, *nêvoj*. Since there is dialectological and descriptive value in recording non-trivial allophonic and allotonic variation (which is easily converted to phonological forms, while the opposite is not always true), the accent in the following Susak material will be marked with traditional (and in the case of Susak, allotonic) diacritics. The diphthong /je/ is also marked allophonically with its various realizations ([je(:)], [je(:)], disyllabic [i.e]). The centralization of /i/ (allophonic/predictable but reinforcing the quantitative opposition of /i/ and /i:/) and /ø/ (allophonic but with an additional distinction between /ø/ and /ø:/) is also always marked. A much more detailed discussion of Susak prosody, phonology and phonetics, including the consonants, is given in Kapović 2020.

4 Material

The material is organized into the synchronic accentual paradigms (short and long roots), where:

- a. p. A = short root-stress (disregarding LSS)
- a. p. B = end-stress (at least in the singular)
- a. p. C = mobile stress with the accent shifting to prepositions
- a. p. D = end-stress with the accent shifting to prepositions (a combination of B & C)³²

³¹ All four variants are attested in the data-set stemming from EB.

In a. p. B and D we distinguish B₁/D₁ with oxytonesis in the plural and B₂/D₂ with barytonesis in the plural. What follows is the table of synchronic paradigms (some features, like preresonant lengthening, are disregarded; note also that not all the relevant forms were recorded in each case and that in a. p. D different words had to be combined to illustrate the point in some cases):

		nom ^{sg}	gen ^{sg}		nom ^{pl}	accent shift
a. p. A	short	<i>rāk</i>	<i>rāka</i>		<i>rāci</i>	–
	long ³³	<i>yrīx</i>	<i>yrīxa</i>		<i>yrīsi</i>	–
a. p. B	short	<i>pōp</i>	<i>popā</i>	B ₁	<i>pop̃</i>	–
		<i>dvōr</i>	<i>dvorā</i>	B ₂	<i>dvōri</i>	–
	long	<i>djēl</i>	<i>dielā</i>	B ₁	<i>dielī</i>	–
		<i>klūč</i>	<i>klūčā</i>	B ₂	<i>klūči</i>	–
a. p. C	short	<i>būōx</i>	<i>bōya</i>			
	long	<i>pīr</i>	<i>pīra</i>		<i>pīri</i>	<i>nā pər</i>
a. p. D	short	<i>būōk</i>	<i>bokā</i>	D ₁	<i>boci</i>	
		<i>nūōs</i>	<i>nosā</i>	D ₂	<i>nōsi</i>	
	long	<i>prōs</i>	<i>prōzā</i>	D ₁	<i>prōzī</i>	<i>nā tex</i>
		<i>zūp</i>	<i>zūbā</i>	D ₂	<i>zūbi</i>	<i>nā brix</i>

The individual accentual paradigms are attributed with some amount of historical consideration. For instance, original a. p. D: nouns, potentially identical to a. p. B: if no accent shift to the preposition (“preskakanje”) has been recorded, are nonetheless put under a. p. D (these are marked as a. p. ^xD, see below).

The comprehensive description of the Susak synchronic accentual paradigms will be given in the next section. Lemmas are headed (alphabetized) by Štokavian equivalents (when they exist).³⁴ If the relevant form is attested more than once (per informant), the exact number of attestations will be indicated as 2x, 5x, 7x, etc.³⁵ The meaning is always given, but it should be understood to be rather provisional, given that the establishing of the exact meaning of the individual items was not the object of this research. Prepositions that occur with some of the forms are *na* ‘on, onto’, *o(d)* ‘of, from’, *po* ‘(up)on’, *prez/s* ‘with-out’, *s/z* ‘with’, *v/f(va)* ‘in, into’, *za* ‘for’.

³² Short stem a. p. C and D (unlike short stem a. p. A and B) are additionally characterized by morphological lengthening of the short /e/ and /ō/ to /je/ and /uo/ in the nom^{sg} (as well as in the acc^{sg} of inanimates), e.g. /būoy/ but gen^{sg} /boya/ [‘bo:ya] (cf. Štok. *bōg* – gen^{sg} *bōga*). For the historical account of this phenomenon see Kapović 2015: 231–233 and Kapović 2019: 100–108.

³³ Historically always an innovation.

³⁴ For illustration, usually without variants and with indications of the historical development only in case of innovative accentuation (but not for the supposed a. p. d).

³⁵ If sentences were pronounced more than once, this is also indicated, but forms from sentences written in brackets are actually already counted in the number of occurrences of the individual form themselves.

Symbols used for synchronic accentual paradigms as follows:

Short a. p.: A, B, C, D; long a. p.: A:, B:, C:, D:³⁶ (diphthongs included, vowels with LSS not counted as long); 1 – oxytone plural in a. p. B and D; 2 – barytone plural in a. p. B and D³⁷; half-long a. p.: B(:) (length only in some forms³⁸); mixed a. p.: B-C, C-D, etc. (some forms according to one a. p., other according to another a. p.³⁹); variant a. p.: C/D, etc. (variant forms according to two a. p.)^{40, x} – when there is a lack of data to support the final attribution of an a. p. (e.g., a. p. ^xD)⁴¹

a. p. A

Štok. *brāt* – *brāta*

EB *brāt* (3x) ‘brother’ – gen^{sg} *brāta* (3x) – acc^{sg} *brāta* (3x) – nom^{pl} *brāti* – pauc. *za dvô brāta* (3x) ‘for two brothers’; DM *brāt* – gen^{sg} *brāta* – instr^{sg} *brāton* – nom^{pl} *brāti* [a. p. A]

Štok. *đim* – gen^{sg} *đima*

EB *đim* (4x) ‘smoke’ – gen^{sg} *đīma* (2x) (cf. 3^{sg} pres. *se* [...] *đīmi* (2x) ‘it smokes’) [a. p. A]

Štok. *djēd* – gen^{sg} *djēda*

EB *đt* (6x) ‘grandfather’ (*neyōf otāc je menī đt* ‘his father is my father-in-law’) – acc^{sg} *đāda* (3x) (*vđila sen bābu i đāda* (3x) ‘I saw grandmother and grandfather’); DM *đd* – gen^{sg} *đāda* – instr^{sg} *đdon* [a. p. A]

Štok. *grijēh* – gen^{sg} *grijēha*

EB *yrīx* (3x) – gen^{id} *yrīxa* – instr^{sg} *yrīxon* (2x) – nom^{pl} *yrīsi* (cf. 3^{sg} pres. *yrīši* ‘(s)he sins’) [a. p. (“church”)]⁴² A: < *B;⁴³

Štok. –

EB *jāc* (4x) ‘ice’ – gen^{sg} *jāca* (< Venetian *giazo*), DM *jāc* [a. p. A]

Štok. *krāl* – gen^{sg} *krāla*

EB *krōl* (5x) ‘king’ – gen^{sg} *krāla* (should be **krōlā*);⁴⁴ AB *krōl*; DM *krōl* (3x) – nom^{pl} *krōli* [a. p. A/A: (obviously secondary)]

³⁶ Original a. p. *c* nouns can sometimes synchronically be identical (or appear to be identical) to a synchronic a. p. A: (if no accent shifts to proclitics and endings occur or this is not attested in the data). In such cases, we provisionally mark the noun as a. p. ^xC: nonetheless on historical grounds.

³⁷ Marked (B₁ or B₂, D₁ or D₂) when plural forms are attested, unmarked (B, D) when they are not. If both barytone and oxytone forms are attested, these are marked as B₁₋₂ and D₁₋₂.

³⁸ Not counting the preresonant lengthening and the morphonological lengthening in the nom(/acc)^{sg} of a. p. C and D.

³⁹ I.e. when there are no variants (of course, this can be or perhaps always is a mirage due to variant forms simply being accidentally unattested).

⁴⁰ As already mentioned, mixed and variant accentual paradigms are sometimes difficult to distinguish unquestionably due to some forms probably not being attested by chance. If a word is both C and D (thus C/D or C-D), we usually file it under a. p. D (except when D-forms look obviously secondary – for instance, the youngest informant, DM, sometimes has an odd instr^{sg} D-form in an otherwise C-paradigm).

⁴¹ When there is no mobility (such as the mobile stress in gen^{sg} *svīta* – loc^{sg} *svītū*) or accent shift to prepositions/conjunctions (like gen^{sg} *āstraxa*) in a. p. C: and when there is no accent shift to prepositions/conjunctions (like acc^{sg} *nātex*) in a. p. D: A. p. C: without (attested) mobility and accent shifts effectively looks like an (immobile) a. p. A: and a. p. D: without accent shift looks like a. p. B:.

⁴² Words prominently figuring in religious contexts sometimes tend to have a “standardized” root-stress in the Susak dialect (cf. similar observations in Shrager 2011: 213, 215).

⁴³ The expected and original a. p. B: is variantly attested in Shrager 2011: 220.

⁴⁴ Cf. the expected form in HHG 106.

- Štok. *krùh* – gen^{sg} *krùha*
EB instr^{sg} *krùxon* ‘bread’; DM *krùx* – gen^{sg} *krùxa* – instr^{sg} *krùxon* [a. p. A]
- Štok. *kùk* – *kùka* (← **kùka*)
EB *kùk* (7x) ‘hip’ – gen^{sg} *kùka* (2x) – nom^{pl} *kùki* (3x) [a. p. A]
- Štok. *lùk* – gen^{sg} *lùk*
EB *lùk* (6x) ‘garlic’ – gen^{sg} *lùka* (3x); DM *lùk* – gen^{sg} *lùka* – instr^{sg} *lùkon* [a. p. A]
- Štok. *mš* – gen^{sg} *mša*
EB *mš* (3x) ‘mouse’ – gen^{sg} *mša* (2x) – acc^{pl} *mši* (6x) (*mōška lōvi mši* ‘cat catches mice’); DM *mš* – gen^{sg} *mša* – instr^{sg} *mšen* – nom^{pl} *mši* [a. p. A]
- Štok. *mrāz* – gen^{sg} *mrāza*
DM *mrāz* ‘frost’ – gen^{sg} *mrāza* [A. p. A]
- Štok. *prāg* – gen^{sg} *prāga*
AB *prāx* ‘doorstep’; DM *prāx* – gen^{sg} *prāya* – instr^{sg} *prāyon* [A. p. A]
- Štok. *přst* – gen^{sg} *přsta*
EB pauc. *dvō pāřsta* ‘two fingers’; DM *pāřst* – gen^{sg} *pāřsta* – instr^{sg} *pāřston* – nom^{pl} *pāřsti* [a. p. A]
- Štok. *pūt* – gen^{sg} *pūta*
EB *pūt* (4x) ‘travel, way’ – gen^{sg} *s.pūta*⁴⁵ – instr^{sg} *pūton*; DM *pūt* – gen^{sg} *pūta* – instr^{sg} *pūton* [a. p. A:⁴⁶ < *B:]
- Štok. *rāj* – gen^{sg} *rāja* (*ū rāj*)
EB gen^{sg} *od rāja* ‘from heaven’ – acc^{sg} *v. rōj* (2x) (*kļse būde moļi cē puoj v. rōj* ‘one who prays will go to heaven’) – loc^{sg} *v. rāju* [a. p. A]
- Štok. *rāk* – gen^{sg} *rāka*
EB *rāk* (2x) ‘crab’ – gen^{sg} *od rāka* – nom^{pl} *rāci* (4x); DM *rāk* – gen^{sg} *rāka* [a. p. A]

a. p. B

- Štok. *bōb* – gen^{sg} *bōba*
EB *bōp* (12x) ‘bean’ – gen^{sg} *bobā* (3x) [a. p. B]
- Štok. *dāžd* – gen^{sg} *dāžda* (ARj)
EB *dāš* (2x) ‘rain’ – gen^{sg} *dažjā* (2x) (cf. 3^{sg} pres. *dažjī* (5x) ‘it rains’) [A. p. B]
- Štok. *dīo* – gen^{sg} *dijēla*
EB *dijēl* (6x) ‘part’ – gen^{sg} *dielā* (2x) – instr^{sg} *dielūōn* – nom^{pl} *dielī* (2x) – gen^{pl} *trī dīli* ‘three parts’⁴⁷ [a. p. B₁₋₂]
- Štok. *dvōr* – gen^{sg} *dvóra*
EB *dvōr* (12x) ‘courtyard’ – gen^{sg} *dvorā* (2x) – nom^{pl} *dvōri* (4x) [a. p. B₂]
- Štok. *grōb* – gen^{sg} *grōba*
EB *grōp* (5x) ‘grave’ – gen^{sg} *grōbā*; AB *grōp* (2x); DM *grōp* – gen^{sg} *grōbā* – loc^{sg} *grōbū* – instr^{sg} *grōbūōn* – nom^{pl} *grōbi* [a. p. B₂]
- Štok. *grōzd* – gen^{sg} *grōzda* (*grōzd* – gen^{sg} *grōzda*/*grōzda*)
DM *grūōz* ‘bunch of grapes’ – gen^{sg} *grōzdā* – instr^{sg} *grōzdūōn* (cf. EB *grūōžje* ‘grapes’) [a. p. B(:) or D⁴⁸]

⁴⁵ Cf. the same *pūta* but also the original *pūtā* in HHG 106, 118.

⁴⁶ The same in Shrager 2011: 220.

⁴⁷ Vermeer (1979/2016: 2) says that Hraste is wrong about the *o*-stem gen^{pl} ending when he gives both *-of* and *-i*. Vermeer says that “*-i* is rare, and probably restricted to only a few nouns (e.g. *mis-iēci*), in the usual way” – however, in my data (which may be innovative in this regard, of course, when compared to the older stages of the dialect as fixed in HHG and Vermeer’s data) the ending *-i* is attested almost universally (with rare usual exceptions such as gen^{pl} *dōn* ‘days’).

Štok. *kľuč* – gen^{sg} *kľuča*

EB *kľuč* (4x) ‘key’, *kľuč* (2x) – gen^{sg} *kľučă* (4x) – instr^{sg} *s.kľučjên* (2x) – nom^{pl} *kľüči* (2x), *kľüči*; AB *kľuč*; DM *kľuč* – gen^{sg} *kľučă* – instr^{sg} *kľučjôn* – nom^{pl} *kľüči* [a. p. B₂]

Štok. *kôn* – gen^{sg} *kôna*

EB *kûôn* (2x) ‘horse’ – gen^{sg} *s.konă* (2x) – loc^{sg} *konû* (3x); DM *kûôn* – gen^{sg} *konă* – loc^{sg} *na.konû* – instr^{sg} *konjôn* [a. p. B⁴⁹]

Štok. *krîž* – gen^{sg} *krîža*

EB *krîš* (10x) ‘cross’, *krîž* (2x) – gen^{sg} *od.krîžă*, *krîža* (2x), *od.krîža* (2x) – loc^{sg} *na.krîžû* (3x) (*bjôx.je na.krîžû* (2x) ‘god is on the cross’), *na.krîžu* (4x) [a. p. B: (& “church” a. p. A:)]

Štok. *krôv* – gen^{sg} *krôva*

EB *krôf* (9x) ‘roof’ – gen^{sg} *krovă* – instr^{sg} *krovjôn*, *krovjôn* – nom^{pl} *krôvi*; AB *krôf*; DM *krôv* – gen^{sg} *krovă* – instr^{sg} *krovjôn* – nom^{pl} *krôvi* [A. p. B₂]

Štok. *lûg* – gen^{sg} *lûga*

EB *lûx* (3x)⁵⁰ ‘ash’ – gen^{sg} *lûjă* [a. p. B:]

Štok. *môst* – gen^{sg} *môsta*

EB *môst* (6x) ‘bridge’ – gen^{sg} *priko.mostă* (2x), *môsta* (3x)⁵¹ [A. p. B/A]

Štok. *nôž* – gen^{sg} *nóža*

EB *nyôš* (3x) ‘knife’, *nyôž* (2x) – gen^{sg} *nožă* – instr^{sg} *z.nožjên* (3x) – nom^{pl} *nôži* – acc^{pl} *nôži* (2x) [A. p. B₂]⁵²

Štok. *păs* – gen^{sg} *psă*

EB *păs* (17x) ‘dog’ – gen^{sg} *fcă* (2x) – acc^{sg} *fcă* (4x) – nom^{pl} *fcî* – gen^{pl} *fcî* (2x) – acc^{pl} *fcî* [a. p. B]

Štok. *pôd* – gen^{sg} *pôda*

EB *pôt* (4x) ‘floor’ – gen^{sg} *podă*; DM *pôt* – gen^{sg} *podă* – loc^{sg} *podû* – instr^{sg} *podjôn* – nom^{pl} *pôdi* (?) [a. p. B₂]

Štok. *pôp* – gen^{sg} *pôpa*

EB *pôp* (3x) ‘priest’ – gen^{sg} *popă* (4x) – instr^{sg} *s.popjôn* (2x) – nom^{pl} *popă* (3x) [a. p. B₁]

Štok. *rêp* – gen^{sg} *rêpa* (dial. also *répa*)

EB *riêp* (4x) ‘tail’, *riêp* – gen^{sg} *riepă*, *riepă*... – instr^{sg} *z.repjôn* (4x); DM *riêp* – gen^{sg} *rjepă* – instr^{sg} *rjepjôn* – nom^{pl} *riêpi* [a. p. B₂]⁵³

⁴⁸ Synchronically, this is a. p. D, but this is probably an innovation – cf. a. p. B (→ C) in Shrager 2011: 220.

⁴⁹ Strictly synchronically speaking, the only thing distinguishing a. p. B with preresonant lengthening in the nom^{sg} (cf. also *stjôl*, *vjôl*) from a short a. p. D is the C-type accent jump in a. p. D (which probably does not occur in all a. p. D nouns and is not always attested). Since it is historically clear that this is a. p. B and since a. p. D may display accent shift to the preposition, I list *kûôn*, *stjôl*, *vjôl* under a. p. B here.

⁵⁰ The accent *lûx* (HHG 166) must be a mistake.

⁵¹ This is possibly an (accentual) loanword from the standard (there are no bridges on Susak).

⁵² Synchronically, *nyôš* looks like *kûôn*, *stjôl*, *vjôl* (which have preresonant lengthening), but unlike preresonant lengthening, which can be described as a synchronic and thus automatic alternation (if not completely regular – cf., e.g., *dvôr* without that phenomenon), the lengthening before *-ž* is not regular synchronically and has a different historic origin (cf. Kapović 2015: 400, 403f.). Because its length in the nom^{sg} cannot be explained synchronically by a particular rule, it is best to classify *nyôš* as a. p. B(), with length in some cases (nom/acc^{sg}) and brevity in others.

⁵³ Historically, it is clear that this is not old a. p. *d* (cf. *rêp* in some Čakavian dialects).

Štok. *stól* – gen^{sg} *stòla*

EB *stȳōl* ‘table’ – gen^{sg} *od_stolā* – loc^{sg} *na_stolū* (2x) – nom^{pl} *stōli* [a. p. B₂]

Štok. *stūp* – gen^{sg} *stúpa*

EB *stūp* (3x) ‘tree’ – gen^{sg} *stūpā*⁵⁴ – nom^{pl} *stūpi* (3x); DM *stūp* – gen^{sg} *stūpā* – instr^{sg} *stupyōn* [a. p. B₂:]

Štok. *sūd* – gen^{sg} *súda*

EB gen^{sg} *sūdā* (2x) ‘court of law’ – dat^{sg} *sūdū* (2x) – acc^{sg} *na_sūt* (4x); DM *sūd* – gen^{sg} *sūdā* – instr^{sg} *sudyōn* [a. p. B:]

Štok. *štāp* – gen^{sg} *štāpa*

EB *ščōp* (4x) ‘cain’ – gen^{sg} *ščōpā* [a. p. B:]

Štok. *vōl* – gen^{sg} *vōla*

EB *vȳōl* (6x) ‘ox’ – gen^{sg} *volā* – nom^{pl} *vēli* [a. p. B₂]

Štok. *vřh* – gen^{sg} *vřha* (Vuk) (originally *u*-stem)

EB *vārx* (10x) ‘top’ (and ‘pile of grapes’?) – gen^{sg} *z_varxā* (2x) – loc^{sg} *na_varxū* (6x) (*bīla_sen na_varxū i_přisla_sen dōma* ‘I was at the top and then I came home’); DM *vārx* – gen^{sg} *varxā* – instr^{sg} *varxūon* – nom^{pl} *vārsi* [a. p. B₂]

a. p. C

Štok. *bōg* – gen^{sg} *bōga*

EB *būōx* (7x) ‘god’, *būōx* (4x), *būōx* – gen^{sg} *bēya* – dat^{sg} *fala_bēyu* ‘thank god’, *hvala_bēyu* – acc^{sg} *v_bēya* (*jō v_bēya vērujen* ‘I believe in god’) – voc^{sg} *bōže!*, *bōze!* (4x) – instr^{sg} *bēyon*; AB *būōx*; DM gen^{sg} *bōya* – instr^{sg} *bōyon* [a. p. C]

Štok. *brōj* – gen^{sg} *brōja*

DM *brȳōj* ‘number’ – gen^{sg} *brōja* – instr^{sg} *brōjen* [a. p. ^xC]

Štok. *brūs* – gen^{sg} *brúsa*

EB *brūs* (10x) ‘whetstone’, *brūs* (2x) – gen^{sg} *brūsa* – acc^{sg} *na_brūs* (10x) – instr^{sg} *brūson* (cf. 2^{sg} pres. *brūsis* ‘you whet’); AB nom^{sg} *brūs* (3x) (cf. 3^{sg} pres. *brūsi* ‘whets’); DM *brūsa* (2x) – nom^{pl} *brūsi* [a. p. C:]

Štok. *cřv* – gen^{sg} *cřva* (originally *i*-stem)

EB *čārf* ‘worm’ – nom^{pl} *čārvi* (3x) – gen^{pl} *čārvi*; AB *čārf* – nom^{pl} *čārvi*; DM gen^{sg} *čārva* (2x) – instr^{sg} *čārvon* (2x) – nom^{pl} *čārvi* [a. p. ^xC:]

Štok. –

DM *čȳōk* ‘blackbird’⁵⁵ – gen^{sg} *čȳōka* – instr^{sg} *čȳōkon* [a. p. C:]

Štok. *dān* – gen^{sg} *dāna* (originally *n*-stem)

EB *dōn* ‘day’, *parvī_dōn* (5x)⁵⁶ ‘Monday’ – gen^{sg} *dnēva* (2x) – acc^{sg} *dōn* – nom^{pl} *dnēvi* – gen^{pl} *mšec_dōn* (2x) ‘a month [literally: of days]’; DM *dōn* – gen^{sg} *dōna*, *dnēva* [a. p. C]

Štok. *dōl* – gen^{sg} *dōla*

DM *dyōl* ‘dale’ – gen^{sg} *dyōla* (?) – instr^{sg} *dyōlon* (?) [a. p. ^xC: (?)]

Štok. *dūh* – gen^{sg} *dūha* (ARj)

EB *dūx* (2x) ‘ghost’ – gen^{sg} *dūxa* – instr^{sg} *dūxon*;⁵⁷ DM *dūx* – gen^{sg} *dūxa* [a. p. ^xC:]

⁵⁴ Cf. the same in HHG 75.

⁵⁵ Probably onomatopoeic (cf. Skok and perhaps Italian *chioccolare* ‘to warble’) and usual in Central and Northern Čakavian.

⁵⁶ Cf. HHG 171.

⁵⁷ The gen^{sg} and the instr^{sg} were elicited in a religious context, thus it is not impossible that these forms have “church”-influenced accentuation.

Štok. *glād* – gen^{sg} *glāda*

EB *ylōt* (3x) ‘hunger’ – gen^{sg} *ōdylada* (3x); DM *ylōt* – gen^{sg} *ylōda* – instr^{sg} *ylodyōn* [a. p. C:-D:]

Štok. *gnōj* – gen^{sg} *gnōja*

AB *ynūōj* (2x) ‘manure’; DM *ynūōj* – gen^{sg} *ynōja* – instr^{sg} *ynōjen* [a. p. C]

Štok. *krāj* – gen^{sg} *krāja* (*nā krāj*)

EB *krōj* (6x) ‘end’ (also *krāj* (3x) (?), standard-influenced form) – gen^{sg} *do krāja* (2x) – acc^{sg} *nā krāj* ‘onto the coast’; DM *krōj* – gen^{sg} *krāja* – instr^{sg} *krājen* [a. p. C: < *A]

Štok. *līst* – gen^{sg} *līsta*

AB *līst* – gen^{sg} *līsta* (2x); DM instr^{sg} *listyōn*⁵⁸ [a. p. C:-D:]

Štok. *lōj* – gen^{sg} *lōja*

DM *lūōj* ‘tallow’ – gen^{sg} *lōja* – instr^{sg} *lōjen* [a. p. C]

Štok. *lūk* – gen^{sg} *lūka*

EB *božji lūk* (8x)⁵⁹ ‘rainbow’ (literally: ‘god’s bow’), *božji lūk*, *božji luġ* (6x), *božji lūx*⁶⁰ – gen^{sg} *božjeyā lūka* (3x) – instr^{sg} *božjin lūkon* (2x); AB *božji lūk*; DM *božji lūk* – gen^{sg} [...] *lūka* [a. p. °C:]

Štok. *mēd* – gen^{sg} *mēda* (originally *u*-stem)

EB *miēt* ‘honey’ (5x) – gen^{sg} *mēda* (2x) (*jīmaš mēda čō?* ‘do you have some honey?’) – instr^{sg} *mēdon* (5x); DM *mjēd* – gen^{sg} *mjēda* – instr^{sg} *mjēdon*, *mēdon* [A. p. C]

Štok. *mīr* – gen^{sg} *mīra*

EB *mīr* (4x) ‘peace’ – loc^{sg} *na mīrū* (3x); DM *mīr* – gen^{sg} *mīra* – loc^{sg} *na mīrū* – instr^{sg} *s mīron* (2x) (should be **z mīron*) [a. p. C:]

Štok. *mūž* – gen^{sg} *mūža*

EB *mūš* (5x) ‘husband’, *mūž* – gen^{sg} *mūža* (5x), *od mūža* (3x) – dat^{sg} *mūžu* – acc^{sg} *mūža* (2x) – loc^{sg} *po mūžu* (2x) – instr^{sg} *mūžen* (5x) – instr^{pl} *z mūži*; AB gen^{sg} *mūža*; DM *mūš* – instr^{sg} *mūžen* (2x) – nom^{pl} *mūži* [a. p. A: < *C:]

Štok. *pīr* – gen^{sg} *pīra* (*nā pīr*)

EB *pīr* (6x) ‘wedding’ – gen^{sg} *pīra* (3x) – acc^{sg} *nā pār* (7x)⁶¹, *za nā pār* – loc^{sg} *na pīrū* – nom^{pl} *pīri*; DM *pīr* (2x) – gen^{sg} *pīra* (2x) – loc^{sg} *pīru* – instr^{sg} *pīron* – nom^{pl} *pīri* [a. p. C: → A:]

Štok. *pūž* – gen^{sg} *pūža*

EB *pālš* ‘snail’ – gen^{sg} *pālža* (2x)⁶² ‘snail’ – nom^{pl} *pālži* (10x) [a. p. °C: (?)]

Štok. *rōd* – gen^{sg} *rōda*

EB *ryōt* (2x) ‘kin’ – gen^{sg} *rōda*, *rōda* – instr^{sg} *rōdon*; DM *ryōd* (2x) – gen^{sg} *rōda* (2x) – instr^{sg} *rōdon* [a. p. C]

Štok. *sīn* – gen^{sg} *sīna* (originally *u*-stem)

EB *sīn* (4x) ‘son’, *sīn* (2x) – gen^{sg} *od sīna* (2x) – instr^{sg} *sīnon* (3x); DM *sīn* – gen^{sg} *sīna* – dat^{sg} *sīnu* – acc^{sg} *sīna* – loc^{sg} *sīnu* – instr^{sg} *sīnon* – nom^{pl} *sīni* – gen^{pl} *sīni* – loc^{pl} *sīnami* [A. p. °C:]

Štok. *smrād* – gen^{sg} *smrāda*

EB (?) *smrāt* (2x) ‘stink’ – gen^{sg} *smrāta* (3x) (should be **smrāda* ← **smrōda*), *smrāda*⁶³ (cf. *smardī/smardī* ‘it stinks’) [a. p. °C:]

⁵⁸ EB only provided the collective form *līstie* ‘leaves’ (cf. HHG 166) and metaphorical *perō* ‘leaf’ (cf. HHG 171).

⁵⁹ Cf. HHG 153.

⁶⁰ There seems to be some confusion with the final consonant.

⁶¹ Cf. the same in HHG 69.

⁶² Same in HHG 75, 104. The accent might have shifted because the expected **pālžā* should have had a long pretonic *ā*, which was marginal in the system (cf. Kapović 2020: 520f.).

Štok. *srām* – gen^{sg} *srāma*

EB *srōn* (3x) ‘shame’, *srōn* (2x) – gen^{sg} *ne mēren ē_srama* (3x) ‘I can’t... out of shame’; AB *srōm*;

DM *srōm* – gen^{sg} *srōma* [a. p. C:]

Štok. *strāh* – gen^{sg} *strāha*

EB *strōx* ‘fear’ – gen^{sg} *strōxa* (2x), *ē_straxa ne_mēre* (3x) ‘he can’t out of fear...’; AB *strōx*; DM *strōx* – gen^{sg} *strōxa* – loc^{sg} *strōxu* – instr^{sg} *straxyōn* [a. p. C:(-D:)]

Štok. *svijēt* – gen^{sg} *svijēta*

EB gen^{sg} *svīta* (3x) ‘world’, *o(d)_svīta* (3x) (*krōj o_svīta*, *krōj od_svīta* ‘end of the world’) – loc^{sg} *svītū* (3x) – instr^{sg} *svīton* ‘people’; DM *svīt* – gen^{sg} *svīta* – instr^{sg} *svitūōn* [a. p. C:(D:)]

Štok. *vrāg* – gen^{sg} *vrāga*

EB *vrāx* (4x) ‘devil’ – gen^{sg} *vrāya* – instr^{sg} *vrāyon*;⁶⁴ AB *vrāx* – nom^{pl} *vrāzi*; DM gen^{sg} *vrāya* – instr^{sg} *vrayūōn* – nom^{pl} *vrāzi* (2x) [a. ^xC:/D₂:]

Štok. *vūk* – gen^{sg} *vūka*

EB *vūk* (4x) ‘wolf’ – gen^{sg} *vūka* (2x) – acc^{sg} *vūka*⁶⁵ [a. p. ^xC:]

a. p. D

Štok. *bōk* – gen^{sg} *bōka* and *bōk* – gen^{sg} *bōka*

EB *būōk* (10x) ‘hip’, *Būōk* (3x) ‘name of a beach just outside of the town of Susak’ – gen^{sg} *bokā* (2x), gen^{sg} *z_Bokā* (4x) (*prīšlā_sen z_Bokā* (2x) ‘I came from Buok’) – acc^{sg} *v_Būōk* (2x) – loc^{sg} *Bokū* (5x) (*kadī_si plāval?* *v_Bokū* (2x) ‘Where did you swim? On Buok’); AB *būōk* – gen^{sg} *do_bōka* (2x)⁶⁶ – loc^{sg} *bokū* – nom^{pl} *bocī* (2x) [a. p. D₁]

Štok. *brijēg* – gen^{sg} *brijēga*

EB *brīx* (7x) ‘hill’ (used also for the upper part of Susak) – gen^{sg} *brīyā* (5x) (*na_varxū od_brīyā* ‘on the top of the hill’), *brīya* (2x) – acc^{sg} *nā_brix* (10x) – loc^{sg} *na_brīyū* (2x); AB *brīx* (2x) – gen^{pl} *piēt brīzi* ‘five hills’; DM *brīx* (3x) – gen^{sg} *brīyā* – instr^{sg} *briyūōn* – nom^{pl} *brīzi* (2x) – gen^{pl} *piēt brīzi* [a. p. C:/D₂:]

Štok. *brōd* – gen^{sg} *brōda*

EB *brūōd* (2x) ‘ship’; DM *brūōd* (2x) – gen^{sg} *brodā* – acc^{sg} *na_brūōd* – loc^{sg} *brodū* – instr^{sg} *brodjēn* – nom/loc^{pl} *brōdi* [a. p. ^xD₂]

Štok. *cijēp* – gen^{sg} *cijēpa*

EB *cīp* (4x) ‘flail’ – gen^{sg} *cīpa* (4x) – acc^{sg} *cīp* (*a_ki_līpi cīp ovāj* [stand.] *jīma za_bōp mlōūt* ‘what a nice flail he has to thresh the beans with’) – instr^{sg} *cīpon* (4x) (*jō mlōtin z_otin cīpon* ‘I thresh with this flail’), *cīpūōn* (3x) (*cīpūōn_se mlōti bōp ili_bīzi* ‘beans or peas are threshed with a flail’) – nom^{pl} *cīpi* (2x) [a. p. ^xC:/^xD₂:]

⁶³ Attested as *smrāt* – gen^{sg} *smrāda* in HHG 104, which would be **smrōt* – **smrōda* in the idiolect of my informant, but I was able to elicit with great difficulty only *smrāt* – *smrāda* (and *smrāta*!) with standard vocalism (similar to *vrāx*). Thus, the attestation is not completely reliable. However, cf. the verb *smrādīt* with *-a-* in a. p. A and a strange pretonic *-ā-* in *smrādīyt* (HHG 177).

⁶⁴ Cf. Houtzagers 2003: 357 for the aberrant (“church”-influenced?) vocalism (cf. also Kapović 2020: 521f.).

⁶⁵ There are no wolves on Susak so this word was not easy to elicit (the informant kept insisting that on Susak they say *pās* and that there are no wolves). As for the reflex *u* < **l* instead of *al*, it occurs in other Susak words as well (cf. HHG 75 and from my data *sūnce* (3x) ‘sun’, *pūn* ‘full’ and *stūp* ‘tree’), cf. Vermeer 1975: 156f. The form *vūk* with an unexpected *-u-* (instead of the expected **vēk* with *-e-*), in what is likely a loanword (which may be the case with the Susak dialect as well), is also attested in Omišalj on the island of Krk (Vermeer 1984b: 285).

⁶⁶ Cf. gen^{sg} *bōka* (HHG 159).

Štok. *dôm* – gen^{sg} *dôma* (Vuk) & *dôm* – gen^{sg} *dôma*

EB *duôm* (4x) ‘home’ – gen^{sg} *domă* (2x) – loc^{sg} *domû* (2x) (cf. the adverb *dôma* (9x) ‘at home’);

AB gen^{sg} *dôma* (?); DM *duôm* – gen^{sg} *dôma* [a. p. C/D]

Štok. *glâs* – gen^{sg} *glâsa*

EB *ylôs* (4x) ‘voice’ – gen^{sg} *ylôsă*; DM *ylôs* – gen^{sg} *ylôsă* – instr^{sg} *ylôsyôn* [A. p. ³D:]

Štok. *grâd* – gen^{sg} *grâda*

EB *yrôt* (11x) ‘city’, *yrôd*, *yrôt* (3x) – gen^{sg} *yrôdă* (2x) – loc^{sg} *yrôdû*, v. *yrôdû* (2x) – instr^{sg} *yrôdyôn* – nom^{pl} *yrôdi*; AB gen^{sg} *yrôda*, *yrôdă* – loc^{sg} *yrôdû* – instr^{sg} *yrôdjên*; DM *yrôd* (2x), *grôd* – gen^{sg} *yrôdă* (2x) – loc^{sg} *yrôdû* – instr^{sg} *grôdjên* – nom^{pl} *yrôdi* (2x) [A. p. C:/³D₂:]

Štok. *hlâd* – gen^{sg} *hlâda*

EB *xlôt* (5x) ‘shade’, *xlôd* – gen^{sg} *xlôdă* (2x) – acc^{sg} *fxlôt* (2x), *fxlôd* – loc^{sg} *fxlôdû* (3x), *va₁xlôdû*; AB *xlôt* – acc^{sg} *na₁xlôt*; DM *xlôd* – gen^{sg} *xlôdă* – instr^{sg} *xlôdyôn* [A. p. ³D₂:]

Štok. *kļûn* – gen^{sg} *kļûna*

EB *kļûn* (7x) ‘beak’ – gen^{sg} *kļûnă*⁶⁷ [A. p. ³D:]

Štok. *mijêh* – gen^{sg} *mijêha*

EB *mîx* (11x) ‘wineskin’ – gen^{sg} *mîxa* (2x), *mîxă* – instr^{sg} *mîxyôn* – acc^{pl} *mîsi*; AB *mîx*; DM gen^{sg} *mîxă* – instr^{sg} *mîxyôn* – nom^{pl} *mîsi* [A. p. C:/³D₂:]

Štok. *nôs* – gen^{sg} *nôsa*

EB *nyôs* (4x) ‘nose’, *nyôs* (2x) – gen^{sg} *nosă*⁶⁸ – loc^{sg} *po₁nosû* (3x) – instr^{sg} *nosjên* – nom^{pl} *něsi*; AB *nyôs* (2x) gen^{sg} *od₁nôsa* (?) (standard-influenced?); DM gen^{sg} *nôsa* (2x), *nosă* – instr^{sg} *nosyôn* [a. p. (C)/D₂]

Štok. *plôt* – gen^{sg} *plôta*

AB *plyôt* (2x) ‘fence’ – *plotă* (2x), *plôtă* – gen^{pl} *plôti* [a. p. D₂]

Štok. *pôt* – gen^{sg} *pôta* (ARj)

DM *puôt* ‘sweat’ – gen^{sg} *potă* – instr^{sg} *potyôn* (cf. AB *spotîn₁se* (2x), *se₁spotîn* ‘I get sweaty’) [A. p. D]

Štok. *prâh* – gen^{sg} *prâha*

EB *prôx* (9x) ‘dust’, *prôx* (2x) – *prôxa* (2x); DM *prôx* 2x – gen^{sg} *prôxă* – instr^{sg} *proxyôn* [a. p. ³C:/D]

Štok. *prâz* – gen^{sg} *prâza* (ARj)⁶⁹

EB *prôs* (12x)⁷⁰ ‘billy goat’, *prôz* – acc^{sg} *prôză* (2x) – nom^{pl} *prôzi* [a. p. ³D₁:]

Štok. *rêd* – gen^{sg} *rêda*

EB *rjê*, *rjêt* ‘row’ – gen^{sg} *rjêda* – loc^{sg} *po₁rjêdu* (2x); DM *rjêt* – gen^{sg} *rjedă* – loc^{sg} *rjedû* – instr^{sg} *rjedyôn* [a. p. ³C:/D:]

Štok. *rôg* – gen^{sg} *rôga*

EB *ryôx* (5x) ‘horn’ – gen^{sg} *rôya* (4x) – acc^{sg} *ryôx* – instr^{sg} *royyôn* (2x) – nom^{pl} *rôzi* (2x) – acc^{pl} *rôzi* (7x) (*prôs kî rôzi jîma* ‘billy goat which has horns’), *rozi* (2x) – instr^{pl} *rôzimi*; AB nom^{pl} *rôzi* (3x) – gen^{pl} *rôzi*, *pjê rôzi* ‘five horns’ – acc^{pl} *rôzi*; DM *ryôx* (2x) – nom^{pl} *rôzi* – gen^{pl} *pjêt rôzi* [a. p. C-D (sg), C/D₁₋₂ (pl)]

Štok. *snijêg* – gen^{sg} *snijêga*

EB *snîx* (6x) ‘snow’ – gen^{sg} *snîyă* (3x), *snîya* (?) (could be a standard-like form) – loc^{sg} *snîyû*, *po₁snîyû* (2x) (cf. 3^{sg} pres. *snîžî* (3x)/*snîžî* ‘it snows’); DM *snîx* – gen^{sg} *snîyă*, *snîya* (?) – instr^{sg} *snîyûôn* – nom^{pl} *snîzi* [a. p. ³D₂:(C:)]

⁶⁷ With a standard / instead of the dialectal *l*.

⁶⁸ Cf. the note in Shrager 2011: 214.

⁶⁹ Cf. Slovene (Pleteršnik) *prâz* ‘ram’.

⁷⁰ Cf. HHG 173.

Štok. *tég* – gen^{sg} *téga*⁷¹ (ARj)

EB *těx* ‘vineyard’ – gen^{sg} *těyã* (2x) – acc^{sg} *nã,tex* (3x) – loc^{sg} *na,tieyĩ* (2x)⁷² [a. p. D:]

Štok. *vrât* – gen^{sg} *vrâta*

EB *vrôt* (5x) ‘neck’ – gen^{sg} *vrôtã* (2x) – loc^{sg} *vrôtũ* (3x), *pa,vrôtũ* – acc^{pl} *vrôti* (2x); AB *vrôt* (6x) – gen^{sg} *vrôtã*; DM gen^{sg} *vrôtã* – nom^{pl} *vrôti* [a. p. ^xD₂:]

Štok. *zîd* – gen^{sg} *zîda*

EB *zît*, *zîđ* ‘wall’ – gen^{sg} *od,zîdã* (3x) (*leruôj,mi pôl od,zîdã* ‘clock fell from the wall’), *od,zîda* – nom^{pl} *zîdi* – gen^{pl} *četîri zîdi* ‘four walls’; AB *zît* (3x); DM gen^{sg} *zîdã*, *zîda* – loc^{sg} *zîdũ* – nom^{pl} *zîdi* [a. p. ^xC:/^xD₂:]

Štok. *zûb* – gen^{sg} *zûba*

EB *zûp* (2x) ‘tooth’, *zûp* (4x), *zûh* – gen^{sg} *zûbã* – instr^{sg} *zubyôn* (4x) – nom^{pl} *zûbi* (6x), *zûbi* – gen^{pl} *zûbi* – acc^{pl} *zûbi* (2x) – instr^{pl} *zûbãmi* (4x); AB gen^{sg} *zûbã* – instr^{sg} *zubyôn* (2x) – nom^{pl} *zûbi*; DM gen^{sg} *zûba* – instr^{sg} *zubyôn* (2x), *zûbon* [a. p. C:/D₂:]

Štok. *ždrijêb* – gen^{sg} *ždrijêba* ‘lot’

EB *ždrîp* (2x) ‘cork’, *zdrîp* (3x), *ždrîb* (6x) – gen^{sg} *ždrîbã* – nom^{pl} *ždrîbi* – gen^{pl} *piê(t) ždrîbi* (2x) ‘five corks’; AB *ždrîp* (3x), *zdrîp* (5x) – gen^{sg} *zdrîba* (2x), *zdrîbã*, *zdrîbã* (2x), *od,zdrîbã* – loc^{sg} *ždrîbu* – instr^{sg} *zdrîbyôn* – nom^{pl} *ždrîbi*; DM instr^{sg} *ždribyôn* – nom^{pl} *ždrîbi* [a. p. C:/D₂:]

5 The Susak accentual paradigms⁷³

A. p. A in monosyllabic *o*-stem nouns is quite usual – it shows a stable short stress (no data on the gen^{pl} is available but since it usually has an innovative *-i*, the original neo-circumflex lengthening is probably gone) throughout the paradigm, with the usual phonological alternations, preresonant lengthening in the nom/(acc)^{sg} (e.g. *‘dim*) and LSS in polysyllabic forms of non-high vowels (gen^{sg} */brata/* > *[‘bra:ta]*). Some old a. p. B (*‘pu:t* – gen^{sg} *‘pu:ta*)⁷⁴ and a. p. C nouns (*‘mu:ž*) effectively switched to the synchronic a. p. A: by generalizing initial accent (if the accent shift to prepositions is eliminated in old C-forms) and *kraj* shifted to a. p. C by developing a secondary accent shift (*‘na kraj*).

The accentual paradigm B has the usual end-stress in the singular (gen^{sg} *po‘pa* – instr^{sg} *po‘pyon*) and the nom/(acc)^{sg} form of short stems is short (*‘pop*) unlike a. p. C and D short stems. In the plural, the minority of stems (B₁) are end-stressed

⁷¹ Cf. in Štokavian in Prapatnice (Vrgorska krajina, my data) *tég* ‘cultivated, flat field’.

⁷² Cf. HHG 59, 74, 78, 91, 96, 100f., 118, 127, 139, 142, 156, 163, 184. Hraste (HHG 96, cf. also 74, 78, 100f.) adduces the sentence *Bila sen na t’eyĩ* ‘I was in the vineyard’ as something female speakers would typically say (while men say *t’eyũ* (loc^{sg}) according to him). I have the same exact sentence attested (completely accidentally and not elicited) twice in my data (and from a female speaker, EB): *bîla,sen na,tieyĩ* (2x) (I write ⟨ie⟩ where Hraste writes ⟨e⟩). Vermeer (1979/2016: 2) notes that the *o*-stem loc^{sg} ending “*-i* is restricted to toponyms”.

⁷³ In the phonologically written forms in this section final devoicing, some sandhi phenomena (*od > o*) and lengthening of non-final short non-high vowels are disregarded. The diphthongs (which are phonologically always long) are not marked as long. The length resulting from preresonant lengthening is marked as phonological because it is not synchronically automatic (cf. *‘kyon* but *‘dvor*).

⁷⁴ Cf. e.g. Vrgada (Jurišić 1973) *pût* – gen^{sg} *pûta*.

(nom^{pl} *po'pi*), while most of them (B₂) receive stress on the stem (nom^{pl} *'voli*).⁷⁵ This duality of plural forms is the same as in a. p. D. Historically, these can be attributed to either the influence of a. p. D or the old loc^{pl} (**vòlixo*) and instr^{pl} (**vòly*) a. p. *b* forms, or both.

A. p. C behaves as one would expect. The result of morphonological lengthening in the nom/(acc)^{sg} is clear in all short stems (*'buoy* – *'boya*), accentual mobility is evident in most loc^{sg} forms of inanimate nouns (gen^{sg} *'mi:ra* – loc^{sg} *na.mi:'ru*) but not in plural forms.⁷⁶ The prepositional accent shift is well-attested (*'od.srama*). The a. p. C is considered to be securely attested only in those paradigms where at least one of the three adduced characteristics is present – otherwise all words without such alternations are provisionally marked as a. p. ^xC: (which in some cases may be identical to a. p. A:). This is usual in long stems (where there can be no morphonological length in the nom/[acc]^{sg}) and animates (where there is, as usual, no end-stress in the loc^{sg}).

A. p. D is a combination of a. p. B and a. p. C. Like a. p. B, it has end-stress in the singular (gen^{sg} *no'sa*, instr^{sg} *no'sjen*) and more rarely in the plural (nom^{pl} *pro:'zi*). Like a. p. C, it has morphonological lengthening in the nom/(acc)^{sg} (*'nyos*) and features the prepositional accent shift (*'na.tey*). In one case, mobility in the plural of an a. p. C noun seems to be attested, viz. nom^{pl} *'zu:bi* – instr^{pl} *zu'bami*, although this may actually be a D-form (instr^{pl} *zu'bami*, just like gen^{sg} *zu:'ba*). Most a. p. D words show variant C- and D-forms in the singular (gen^{sg} *'zi:da* and *zi:'da*)⁷⁷ and some in the plural as well (acc^{pl} *'rozi* and *ro'zi*).⁷⁸ However, as already mentioned, in some words (like gen^{sg} *vro:'ta*) only singular end-stress forms are attested, though one cannot be sure if variant forms perhaps exist but remain unattested by chance. Like a. p. B, a. p. D has two types in the plural – the rarer D₁-type with end-stress (nom^{pl} *bo'ci*) and the frequent D₂-type with initial stress (nom^{pl} *'nosi*). Plural variants are very rare (cf. the already mentioned *'rozi/ro'zi*). A long stem a. p. D: that has no nom/(acc)^{sg} lengthening and where prepositional accent shift (“preskakanje”) is not attested is synchronically indistinguishable from a. p. B:, except by the variant C- and D-forms, which often exist. As already noted, the youngest informant (DM, 1977) produced end-stress forms in the instr^{sg} (*ylo'dyون*, *li'styون*,⁷⁹ *stra'xyون*, *svi'tyون*, *vra'xyون*⁸⁰ –

⁷⁵ In HHG 106, only B₂ type seems to be adduced for short stems (*pôpi*) and only B₁ type for long stems (*klūčī*).

⁷⁶ Cf. also HHG 101 (only **gordb* has end-stressed plural forms, and these may actually be D- rather than C-forms), 104.

⁷⁷ It is not impossible that some initial stress forms in singular are perhaps due to the influence of the standard in codeswitching.

⁷⁸ The “mixed” a. p. C/D paradigm with C- and D-variants is also typical for Carpatho-Ukrainian and Pskov-Polotsk East Slavic dialects, e.g. gen^{sg} *róya/royá*, instr^{sg} *róyom/royóm* (Nikolaev 2012: 92).

⁷⁹ This form may not be an innovation since it is attested also in Shrager 2011: 216.

but EB *'svi:ton*, *'vra:gon*) of some words where otherwise only C-forms are attested in my data (gen^{sg} *'ylo:da*, *'li:sta*, *'stro:xa*, *'svi:ta*, *'vra:ga*).⁸¹ Thus, the variant a. p. D in these forms is in fact not so reliable, although such D-forms do agree in some cases with other Susak data – in the tables that follow below, I will list such words according to their agreement with the other attestations from Susak (though the attribution may be rather provisional in some cases).

6 Comparison with other data from Susak

In this section, the a. p. C and a. p. D data in original *o*- and *u*-stems⁸² collected by the author of this paper will be compared with other data from the Susak dialect (from HHG⁸³ 70, 83, 85, 90, especially 104⁸⁴ and 106,⁸⁵ 130, 139, 147, 159 and Shrager 2011: 215–218, 221f.) in order to see how well they match. For reasons of space, the full/actual data from other sources will not be adduced but analyzed synchronically in the same manner as the data in this paper. As a rule, in both lists we include only words that are otherwise reliably attested as a. p. C in most modern Slavic languages/dialects.⁸⁶ We also do not mark D₁ and D₂ separately, ^x in ^xC and ^xD and : for long stems, nor do we distinguish C-D and C/D (such instances are all marked as C/D) because that is not historically relevant. Some words have been excluded from the discussion on various grounds.⁸⁷

⁸⁰ This form is perhaps not an innovation since it is attested also in Shrager 2011: 215.

⁸¹ However, there are some words, like *cîp*, in which D-forms appear only variantly in the instr^{sg} (and not just by the youngest informant), where this seems to be an archaism.

⁸² We exclude original *i*-stems because of the prevalence of mobile stress there (cf. Kapović 2009). Other original stems (like *n*-stem **dъnъ* ‘day’) are marginal and thus also excluded.

⁸³ We reference here only those pages where singular oblique forms are attested (outside of sole loc^{sg}, where there is no distinction between a. p. C and a. p. D). The lengthened nom/(acc)^{sg} of a. p. C/D forms in short stems (HHG 53, 60, 62, 69) is also ignored here because it also does not distinguish between a. p. C and a. p. D (the same goes for the long stem nom/(acc)^{sg}, where a. p. C: = D: = B:).

⁸⁴ Here, only a. p. C is attested – a few of these forms have D-dublets in HHG 106.

⁸⁵ This is the only page in HHG where a. p. D forms are actually attested.

⁸⁶ In **pъlъbъ*, **rъpъbъ*, **smъxъbъ* and **stъbъlpъbъ*, the a. p. B is well-attested in modern Slavic and thus we do not include it into the Susak lists here. The same holds for **vъrxъbъ*, which is well-attested as a. p. B in Čakavian/Štokavian and shows secondary shortening of the original long stem. South Slavic **pъrstъbъ* also has aberrant (a. p. a) accentuation from a historical perspective. However, we do include here those words (like **bъokъbъ* and **domъbъ*) for which other dialects show a B/C vacillation if there is a possibility that this vacillation may be due to an original a. p. d.

⁸⁷ Susak *'dru:γ* ‘partisan, comrade’ (Shrager 2011: 220) must be a standard loanword as clear from its meaning and this is probably true of **plodъbъ* ‘fruit’ as well, which Shrager (2011: 216) records but my informants (AB & DM) reject as dialectal. The form **krojъbъ* (Shrager 2011: 217) is also probably a standard loanword (rejected by EB). The form **stropъbъ* (Shrager 2011: 218) is definitely a standard loanword and so is **znakъbъ* (*ibid.*), rejected by AB & DM. I excluded Shrager’s (2011: 217) a. p. B/D for **grobъbъ* because there is no a. p. C/D lengthening in the nom/acc^{sg}, which points to an original a. p. b. Shrager (2011: 217) wrongly lists *'krovъbъ* as a. p. D because of the B₂-plural in

As a rule of thumb, the a. p. C list features those words which only have C-forms or mostly have C-forms beside some D-forms, which, however, could easily be secondary (e.g. attested in my data by the youngest informant, in most cases only in the instr^{sg}). Words are listed under a. p. D when D-forms are well-attested or when at least one source (of two) has a clear and a well-attested a. p. (C/D). However, the lists are still somewhat provisional in certain regards – when the individual sources differ (as in the case of **golsъ* and **potъ*, for instance), one could also propose an alternative attribution.

a. p. C

Proto-Slavic	HHG 1956	Shrager 2011	Kapović 2018
<i>*bogъ</i>	C	C	C
<i>*borъ</i>	C ⁸⁸		
<i>*brojъ</i>			C
<i>*dolъ</i>			C (?)
<i>*duxъ</i>		C	C
<i>*ědъ</i>	C ⁸⁹	C	
<i>*gnojъ</i>	C	C	C
<i>*goldъ</i>	C	C	C/(D)
<i>*kumъ</i>	C		
<i>*lojъ</i>	C	C	C
<i>*lŕkъ</i>			C
<i>*medъ</i>	C	C	C
<i>*mirъ</i>		C	C
<i>*mŕžъ</i>	C		C
<i>*pirъ</i>	C	C	C
<i>*rědъ</i>		C ⁹⁰	C/D (?) ⁹¹
<i>*rodъ</i>	C		C
<i>*smordъ</i>	C		C (?)
<i>*sormъ</i>	C		C
<i>*straxъ</i>	C		C/(D)
<i>*světъ</i>	C		C/(D)
<i>*synъ</i>	C		C
<i>*vblkъ (?)</i> ⁹²			C (?)
<i>*zvонъ</i>	C		

the paradigm. Shrager's (2011: 216) instr^{sg} *podon* must be secondary (oddly enough, she lists the Standard Croatian form as C instead of the usual B as well).

⁸⁸ HHG 130.

⁸⁹ HHG 139.

⁹⁰ Shrager (2011: 216) wrongly lists this as D instead of C (the end-stress in the loc^{sg} only is a characteristic trait of a. p. C).

⁹¹ A. p. D is attested only with the youngest informant.

⁹² Could easily be a loanword from the standard.

a. p. D

Proto-Slavic	HHG 1956	Shrager 2011	Kapović 2018
* <i>bergъ</i>	C	C/D	C/D
* <i>bokъ</i>	C/D	C/D	C/D
* <i>brodъ</i>	C	D	D
* <i>brușъ</i>	D		C ⁹³
* <i>cěpъ</i>	⁹⁴	D	C/D
* <i>domъ</i>			C/D
* <i>golsъ</i>	C		D
* <i>gordъ</i>	C/D	C/D	C/D
* <i>xoldъ</i>	D	D	D
* <i>kljunъ</i>		D	D
* <i>kvěťъ</i>		C/D	⁹⁵
* <i>listъ</i>	C/D	C/D	C(/D)
* <i>měxъ</i>	C	C/D	C/D
* <i>molъ</i>		C/D	
* <i>nosъ</i>	⁹⁶	C/D	(C/)D
* <i>plotъ</i>	D ⁹⁷	C/D	D
* <i>porxъ</i>	C	C/D	C/D (?) ⁹⁸
* <i>porzъ</i>			D
* <i>potъ</i>	C		D
* <i>prqъ</i>	⁹⁹	C/D	¹⁰⁰
* <i>rogъ</i>	C/D	C/D	C/D
* <i>sadъ</i>	D		¹⁰¹
* <i>sněgъ</i>	C		(C/)D
* <i>tęgъ</i>	¹⁰²		D
* <i>vorgъ</i>	C	C/D ¹⁰³	C(/D)
* <i>vortъ</i>	D	C/D	D
* <i>zidъ</i>	D	C/D	C/D
* <i>zobъ</i>	C/D	C/D	(C/)D ¹⁰⁴
* <i>žerbъ</i>	C/D		C/D

⁹³ Very well-attested as a. p. C.⁹⁴ Cf. HHG 74 (no oblique cases attested).⁹⁵ All my informants rejected **cvěťъ* and instead offered only the loanword *yarōful* ‘flower’.⁹⁶ The form *nā nos* (HHG 175) can be either a. p. C or a. p. (C)/D.⁹⁷ A. p. D recorded also by Vermeer 1984a: 361²².⁹⁸ A. p. D is attested only with the youngest informant.⁹⁹ No oblique forms attested.¹⁰⁰ I was not able to attest this word.¹⁰¹ AB & DM rejected this word.¹⁰² Well-attested (HHG 96, 100–101), but only in forms where a. p. C and a. p. D are not distinguishable.¹⁰³ D-forms only variantly in the instr^{sg}.¹⁰⁴ C-forms only in the idiolect of the youngest informant.

Although Shrager's analysis is sometimes faulty and certain details of her data as well as the transcription itself are not always perfectly reliable (not the placement of the stress, however),¹⁰⁵ it can be generally established that as far as a. p. C and a. p. (C/D) material in her and my dataset is concerned the match is almost perfect. The agreement of both Shrager's and my own material with a. p. C data in HHG is also high, no significant discrepancies being detectable. Almost all a. p. (C/D) nouns attested in HHG are attested as such in Shrager's and my material, the only difference being that in some cases HHG only records a. p. C whereas Shrager's and my data point to a. p. (C/D) (for **brusъ* HHG has D and my data shows a. p. C, which is the only such mismatch). This is probably due to HHG accidentally attesting only one of the variants, though post-HHG innovations on Susak cannot be ruled out. Generally speaking, it is safe to say that the corpus comprising the main representatives of a. p. C and a. p. D (i.e. C/D) nouns in the Susak dialect is now rather clear and that the synchronic opposition of the two paradigms (in addition to a. p. A and B) is fairly robust.

7 The historical origin of the Susak a. p. D

In accordance with what was discussed in the preceding section, we shall list here (in their Common Slavic form) those *o*- and *u*-stem words that can be adduced as the reflexes of the Proto-Slavic accentual paradigms *c* and *d*. The Susak synchronic a. p. C is taken to be the regular reflex of the old a. p. *c*, while the Susak synchronic a. p. C/D and D are taken to be the possible regular reflexes of the supposed old a. p. *d*. Words for which all three Susak sources (or two whenever there is no attestation in the case of the third one) agree on the accentual paradigm¹⁰⁶ are underlined.

a. p. C: **bogъ*, **borъ*, **brojъ*, **dolъ* (?), **duxъ*, **ědъ*, **gnojъ*, **goldъ*, **kumъ*, **lojъ*, **lōkъ*, **medъ*, **mirъ*, **mōžъ*, **pirъ*, **rēdъ* (?), **rodъ*, **smordъ*, **sormъ*, **straxъ*, **světъ*, **synъ*, **volkъ*, **zvōnъ*

a. p. D: **bergъ*, **bokъ*, **brodъ*, **brusъ* (?), **cěpъ*, **domъ*, **golsъ* (?), **gordъ*, **xoldъ*, **kljunъ*, **květъ* (?), **listъ*, **měxъ* (?), **molъ*, **nosъ*, **plotъ*, **porxъ*, **porzъ*, **potъ* (?), **prōtъ*, **rogъ*, **sadъ*, **sněgъ*, **tęgъ*, **vorgъ* (?), **vortъ*, **zidъ*, **zōbъ*, **žerbъ*

¹⁰⁵ Shrager 2011 generally lists a number of standard-like forms such as the nom^{pl} in *-ovi* (e.g. *plōdovi*, *rōgovy*: 216, 218), which are completely absent from my data (though see her comment on p. 213, where she explicitly acknowledges the fact). She notes a diphthong *yo* in nom^{sg} forms like *buōk* but not in instr^{sg} like *listōn* (216, cf. her comment on p. 212 though, where she mentions a "closed *o*"), where she also records *-ōn* (as in *xlōdōn*) and *-ūn* (as in *vrayūn*, both 215). Both are rather suspicious. She also lists a few forms that are definitely standard and not dialectal, cf. in this respect *vrxa* and *līs'č'e* (a Russian notation of what should be *līšće*) (216). These are all very minor points, however, and of no significance whatsoever for the question of the synchronic existence of a. p. D forms.

¹⁰⁶ We take a. p. D in one and a. p. C/D in another source as agreement, because a. p. D very often has variant C-forms. However, a. p. C in one and a. p. C/D in another source will not be considered an agreement because C-forms can be part of both a. p. C and a. p. C/D.

Of these, Nikolaev (2012: 171–173) in his recent reconstruction of Proto-Slavic a. p. *c* and a. p. *d* nouns,¹⁰⁷ adduces the following (those that match with the Susak data are underlined):¹⁰⁸

- a. p. *c*:** **domъ*, **duxъ*, **goldъ*, **golsъ*, **kumъ*, **medъ*, **mirъ*, **možъ*, **rodъ*, **sadъ*, **smordъ*, **sormъ*, **světъ*, **synъ*, **vblkъ*
- a. p. *d*:** **bergъ*, **bokъ*, **borъ*, **brodъ*, **brusъ*, **cépъ*, **gordъ*, **xoldъ*, **květъ*, **lókъ*, **měxъ* (also *c*), **moltъ*, **nosъ*, **plotъ*, **porxъ*, **potъ*, **rědъ*, **rogъ*, **sněgъ*, **vorgъ*, **zobъ*¹⁰⁹

Though the match is not perfect, our Susak attestations seem to be in general agreement with Nikolaev's Proto-Slavic reconstructions.¹¹⁰ In the case of the few problematic and questionable reconstructions (**rědъ*, **brusъ*, **golsъ*, **potъ*, **vorgъ*), the data from Susak is simply not clear and there is not much to discuss (our listing was provisional in the first place and either development, i.e., *C* → *D* or *D* → *C*, can be easily envisaged). A certain amount of secondary transfers is to be expected, as in the case of **sadъ* (**C* → *D*) or **borъ*, **lókъ* (**D* → *C*). Finally, let us try to compare the Susak data with Baltic and other Indo-European languages to check whether the updated dataset confirms Illič-Svityč's hypothesis (1963: 119, 1979: 103f.), according to which one should find a) Susak a. p. *D* (or *C/D*) corresponding to Lithuanian a. p. 2 and Vedic, Greek and Germanic barytona, and b) Susak a. p. *C* corresponding to Lithuanian a. p. 3/4 (Latvian *ˆ*) and Vedic, Greek and Germanic oxytona (or mobile stems). This is, obviously, not ideal since one should first try to reconstruct the Proto-Slavic state of affairs (cf. the just discussed attempts to do just that in Nikolaev 2012), but the reconstruction of Slavic a. p. *d* from various possible attestations in different dialects is outside of the scope of this paper. Let us then list all Susak *o*- and *u*-stems that have secure cognates in either Baltic or Indo-European in general (most of the Susak words do not):¹¹¹

a. p. *C*

	Susak	Baltic ¹¹²	Indo-European
expected	<i>C</i>	Lith. a. p. 3/4, Latv. <i>ˆ</i>	oxytona/mobile
<i>*duxъ</i>	<i>C</i>	Lith. pl. <i>daūsos</i> (4) ¹¹³	Gmc <i>*deuzá</i> . ¹¹⁴
<i>*medъ</i>	<i>C</i>	Lith. <i>medūs</i> (4) ¹¹⁵	Ved. <i>mádhu</i> , Gr. <i>μέθυ</i> ¹¹⁶

¹⁰⁷ In the “classical” accentological model, those who do not operate with an a. p. *d* would reconstruct an a. p. *c* for the entirety of these words.

¹⁰⁸ Those words that were considered to have a questionable attribution (marked with a question mark in the lists above) are not underlined.

¹⁰⁹ Nikolaev does not provide Proto-Slavic reconstructions for the following items: **bogъ*, **brojъ*, **dolъ*, **ědъ*, **gnojъ*, **lojъ*, **pirъ*, **straxъ*, **zvонъ* (a. p. *C* on Susak), and **kljunъ*, **listъ*, **porzъ*, **prqtъ*, **tegъ*, **vortъ*, **zidъ*, **žerbъ* (a. p. *D* on Susak).

¹¹⁰ He makes use of the Susak data from Shrager 2011 in his reconstruction attempts.

¹¹¹ Some imperfect comparisons, such as **listъ* (Susak *C/D* → *C(D)*) ~ Lith. *laiškas* (3/4) ‘letter’ (LKŽ) and **rědъ* (Susak *C* → *D*) ~ Lith. *rindà* (2, 4) ‘line, row’ (LKŽ), Latv. *riņda* ‘line, row’, are left out of consideration.

	Susak	Baltic	Indo-European
expected	C	Lith. a. p. 3/4, Latv. ^	oxytona/mobile
* <i>mīr̥b</i>	C	Latv. <i>miērs</i>	
* <i>smord̥b</i>	C ¹¹⁷	Latv. <i>smārd̥s</i>	
* <i>svēt̥b</i>	C → C(D) ¹¹⁸		Ved. <i>śvetā-</i> ¹¹⁹
* <i>syn̥b</i>	C	Lith. <i>sūnūs</i> (3)	Ved. <i>sūnū-</i> ¹²⁰
* <i>v̥lk̥b</i>	(?) C	Lith. <i>vil̥kas</i> (4)	[Ved. <i>vṛ̥ka-</i> , Gr. <i>λύκος</i>] ¹²¹

inconclusive:

* <i>gols̥b</i>	C & D ¹²²	Lith. <i>gãr̥sas</i> (4, 2) ¹²³	Gmc * <i>kalzā-</i> ¹²⁴
* <i>mēx̥b</i>	C & C/D ¹²⁵	Lith. <i>maĩšas</i> (4) ¹²⁶	Ved. <i>mešā-</i> ¹²⁷

counterexamples:

* <i>bog̥b</i>	C		Ved. <i>bhāga-</i> ¹²⁸
----------------	---	--	-----------------------------------

a. p. D

	Susak	Baltic	Indo-European
expected	(C/D)	Lith. a. p. 2	barytona
* <i>cēp̥b</i>	(C/D)		Gr. <i>σκοῖπος</i> ¹²⁹
* <i>dom̥b</i>	C/D ¹³⁰	<i>nāmas</i> (2 → 4) ¹³¹	Gr. <i>δόμος</i> ¹³² , Ved. <i>dāma-</i> ¹³³
* <i>gord̥b</i>	C/D	<i>gãrdas</i> (2 → 4) ¹³⁴	¹³⁵

¹¹² The meaning of the Baltic words is given whenever it differs from what is attested for Slavic.

¹¹³ ‘air, heaven’ (LKŽ).

¹¹⁴ ‘wild animal’ < ‘breathing creature’, Illič-Svityč 1979: 97, Orel 2003: 71. Cf. German *Tier* ‘animal’.

¹¹⁵ Illič-Svityč 1979: 48, 128.

¹¹⁶ Vedic ‘honey, mead’ (RV) and Greek ‘wine’ are obviously not oxytona but neuter *u*-stems in Vedic and Greek can only be barytona (there are no examples with **-ū*). Nikolaev (2012: 49) considers this reflex in Vedic/Greek as regular in a recessive (– –) word (the neuter has no ending anyway and suffixal **-u-* is recessive, while Balto-Slavic **-u-s* has a dominant **-s*, which attracts the stress).

¹¹⁷ Attested only by HHG.

¹¹⁸ A single D-form appears here and only in the instr^{sg} (stemming from the youngest informant), so that it can safely be disregarded as innovatory.

¹¹⁹ ‘white’ (RV).

¹²⁰ ‘son’ (RV).

¹²¹ The word for ‘wolf’ is a known case of the discrepancy between the Balto-Slavic data and the rest of Indo-European (cf. Illič-Svityč 1963: 40f., Illič-Svityč 1979: 33).

¹²² If HHG has the older form here and the data from my informants is innovative, then this is another case of the expected Susak a. p. C.

¹²³ ‘sound’, LKŽ.

¹²⁴ ‘call’, Illič-Svityč 1979: 96, Orel: 209.

¹²⁵ HHG perhaps attests the most archaic accentuation if from Proto-Slavic original a. p. c. In that case, Shrager’s and my data possibly reflect an innovation. But cf. Nikolaev (2012: 80, 106–108), who reconstructs both Proto-Slavic a. p. c and d for this noun.

¹²⁶ ‘bag, sack’, Illič-Svityč 1979: 30, 96.

¹²⁷ ‘ram’ (RV).

¹²⁸ ‘good fortune’ (RV), cf. Illič-Svityč 1979: 101.

	Susak	Baltic	Indo-European
expected	(C/)D	Lith. a. p. 2	barytona
* <i>nosъ</i>	C/D		Gmc * <i>nās</i> - ¹³⁶
* <i>rogъ</i>	C/D	Lith. <i>rāgas</i> (2 → 4) ¹³⁷	
* <i>zobъ</i>	C/D	Lith. <i>žambas</i> (2 → 4) ¹³⁸	Ved. <i>jāmbha</i> - ¹³⁹ , Gr. γόμφος ¹⁴⁰

inconclusive cases:

* <i>brodъ</i>	C & D ¹⁴¹	Lith. dial. <i>brādas</i> (2 → 4) ¹⁴²	
* <i>sněgъ</i>	C & (C/)D ¹⁴³	Lith. <i>sniēgas</i> (2 → 4) ¹⁴⁴	
* <i>vorgъ</i>	C & C/D ¹⁴⁵	Lith. <i>vařgas</i> (2 → 4) ¹⁴⁶	

counterexamples:

* <i>lqъ</i>	C	Lith. <i>lañkas</i> (2 → 4) ¹⁴⁷	Gmc * <i>lānxa</i> - ¹⁴⁸
* <i>tegъ</i> ¹⁴⁹	D	Lith. <i>tingùs</i> (3/4) ¹⁵⁰	

To summarize, we have seven old a. p. C stems in the Susak dataset (**duxъ*, **medъ*, **mirъ*, **smordъ*, **světъ*, **synъ*, and perhaps **vlkъ*), which correspond to an old mobile stress in their cognates in Baltic and Indo-European. There are

¹²⁹ ‘wall-plate of a building’ (Hesychius), cf. Illič-Svityč 1979: 101

¹³⁰ Nikolaev (2012: 93f.), however, reconstructs a. p. *c* for Slavic. The Susak C-form which he cites (74) is not recorded by HHG nor does it appear in Shrager 2011.

¹³¹ Illič-Svityč 1979: 41f. (he proposes a different PIE etymology, however).

¹³² ‘house’.

¹³³ ‘house’ (RV).

¹³⁴ ‘pen (for animals)’, Illič-Svityč 1979: 102.

¹³⁵ Ved. *grhá-* ‘house’ (RV) is not barytone but also has a different ablaut (and is thus irrelevant for a direct comparison).

¹³⁶ Orel 2003: 281.

¹³⁷ Illič-Svityč 1979: 102.

¹³⁸ ‘edge, border’, Illič-Svityč 1979: 25, 99.

¹³⁹ ‘tooth’ (RV).

¹⁴⁰ ‘bolt’.

¹⁴¹ If HHG accidentally attested only a C-form from a potential Susak a. p. C/D pattern of this word, this would not contradict the a. p. D pattern recorded in both Shrager’s and my own data.

¹⁴² ‘dirt, large net, fishermen’s association’, Illič-Svityč 1979: 123.

¹⁴³ HHG perhaps accidentally adduces just C-variants.

¹⁴⁴ Illič-Svityč 1979: 102.

¹⁴⁵ HHG, perhaps accidentally, adduces C-variants only, though note that D-forms are not numerous in other two sources (they appear in instr^{sg} only).

¹⁴⁶ ‘hard life, poverty’ (LKŽ).

¹⁴⁷ Illič-Svityč 1979: 100.

¹⁴⁸ ‘strap’ (cf. Old English *lōh*), Illič-Svityč 1979: 100, Orel: 236.

¹⁴⁹ Dybo (1981: 25) reconstructs the adjective **tegъ* ‘heavy’ as originally belonging to the a. p. *c*. The meaning of **tegъ* developed from ‘hard work’ via ‘hard work in the field’ to ‘field’ etc.

¹⁵⁰ ‘lazy’, Дыбо 1981: 25.

two inconclusive items (**golsъ*, **měxъ*) for which HHG agrees with the cognates but the data from the other two sources do not. If HHG indeed records the archaic accentuation in these two instances, they may be counted with the first seven. There is one important exception to the rule, though – **bogъ* is clearly a. p. C in the Susak dialect, which does not correspond to the Vedic barytone. This can be explained in a number of ways: for example, Slavic **bogъ* could be influenced by Iranian (if it is not in fact a loanword from that branch altogether), as has sometimes been claimed, or, alternatively, attests to a later, secondary shift from a. p. *D to a. p. C (depending on the data elsewhere in Slavic¹⁵¹). In any case, one does expect some exceptions.

When it comes to Susak a. p. (C/D), we find 6 direct correspondences (**čepъ*, **domъ*, **gordъ*, **nosъ*, **rogъ*, **zqbъ*) to Baltic and other Indo-European languages. However, there are an additional 3 items (**brodъ*, **sněgъ*, **vorgъ*) for which Shrager's and my data point to a. p. (C/D) but HHG attests a. p. C only. In such cases, it is highly probable, as already intimated, that HHG accidentally attests C-forms only of what was actually an a. p. C/D pattern. Additionally there are two counterexamples – Susak **lqkъ* is a. p. C, not a. p. D (as would be expected), and Susak **tęgъ* is a. p. D, not a. p. C (as would be expected). These two words, however, are not in fact clear-cut counterexamples given that **lqkъ* is attested on Susak only in the collocation *božji lūk* 'rainbow' and that **tęgъ* as a noun ('field, arable land' etc.) is a secondary Slavic derivative and does not directly correspond to the Lithuanian mobile *u*-adjective.

In any case, though adequate examples are few (which is hardly unexpected), cumulatively it would seem that Illič-Svityč's claim that Susak preserves the old accentual immobile/mobile opposition in *o*- and *u*-stems, otherwise lost in most other Slavic systems, seems to be correct. Thus, it seems that the modern Susak opposition of a. p. C and a. p. D (C/D) in *o*-stems is of Proto-Slavic, Proto-Balto-Slavic and Proto-Indo-European origin and not a later innovation.

8 Conclusion

The main conclusions of this paper are:

- a) the Susak dialect does not have a tone distinction;
- b) the Susak dialect has a robust synchronic accentual paradigm D (C/D), as opposed to synchronic a. p. C, a. p. B (with which it shares some characteristics) and a. p. A;

¹⁵¹ In the Čakavian dialect of Sali on Dugi otok (in the data recorded by Elena Budovskaya and verified by the native speaker and dialectologist Božidar Finka – kindly provided by Sergei L. Nikolaev), which also has a synchronic a. p. D, the word in question is also a. p. C (*bōg* – gen^{sg} *bōga*).

- c) the opposition between a. p. C and a. p. (C/)D in old *o*- and *u*- monosyllabic stems in the Susak dialect seems to be of Proto-Balto-Slavic and Proto-Indo-European origin rather than an innovation.

REFERENCES

- ARj = *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, sv. 1–97 [dijelovi I–XXIII]. Zagreb 1881–1976.
- Dybo, Vladimir A. 1981: *Slavjanskaja akcentologija. Opyt rekonstrukcii sistemy akcentnykh paradigm v praslavjanskom*. (Studia philologica). Moskva.
- HHG = Hamm, Josip / Hraste, Mate / Guberina, Petar. 1956: Govor otoka Suska. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 1: 5–213.
- Houtzagers, H. Peter. 2003: On the phonology of the Čakavian dialect of Ćunski on the island of Lošinj. *Filologija* 41: 33–50.
- Illič-Svityč, Vladislav M. 1963: *Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom. Sud'ba akcentuacionnykh paradigm*. Moskva. [Illič-Svitych, Vladislav M. 1979: *Nominal Accentuation in Baltic and Slavic*. Translated by Richard L. Leed and Ronald F. Feldstein. Cambridge, Mass. – London].
- Ivić, Pavle. 1959: Mate Hraste, Josip Hamm i Petar Guberina: o govoru otoka Suska. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* I (1956) 5–213. *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 2: 171–183.
- Jurišić, Blaž. 1973: *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade, uspoređen s nekim čakavskim i zapadnoštokavskim govorima*. II dio: *Rječnik*. (Biblioteka hrvatskog dijalektološkog zbornika). Zagreb.
- Kapović, Mate. 2009: Rising mobility in Slavic *i*-stems. In: Lühr, Rosemarie / Ziegler, Sabine (eds.): *Protolanguage and Prehistory. Akten der XII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, vom 11. bis 15. Oktober 2004 in Krakau*. Wiesbaden: 236–243.
- Kapović, Mate. 2015: *Povijest hrvatske akcentuacije. Fonetika*. (Matica hrvatska. Biblioteka THEORIA / ΘΕΩΡΙΑ. Novi niz). Zagreb.
- Kapović, Mate. 2019: Shortening, lengthening, and reconstruction: notes on historical Slavic accentology. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 45(1): 75–133.
- Kapović, Mate. 2020: Notes on the Phonetics, Phonology and Prosody of the Čakavian Dialect of Susak. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 65(4): 498–534.
- Kapović, Mate. 2021: On the Accentuation of Genitive Singular of *ā*-stems in the Čakavian Dialect of Susak. *Zbornik u čast Mate Križmana*. Zagreb.
- Langston, Keith. 2007: Common Slavic Accentual Paradigm (d): A Reevaluation of Evidence from Čakavian. In: Kapović, Mate / Matasović, Ranko (eds.): *Tones and Theories: Proceedings of the International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology*. (Biblioteka Posebna izdanja / Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje). Zagreb: 121–150.
- LKŽ = *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* [http://www.lkz.lt/]
- Nikolaev, Sergej L. 2012: Vostočnoslavjanskije refleksy a. p. *d* i indoevropejskie sootvetstvija slavjanskim akcentnym tipam suščestvitel'nykh m. r. s *o*- i *u*-osnovami. In: Plotnikova, Anna A. – Klepnikova, Galina P.: *Karpato-balkanskij dialektnyj landšaft. Jazyk i kul'tura* 2: 2009–2011. Moskva: 32–189.
- OSA = Dybo, Vladimir A. / Zamjatina, Galina I. / Nikolaev, Sergej L. 1990: *Osnovy slavjanskoj akcentologii*. Moskva.
- Orel, Vladimir. 2003: *A Handbook of Germanic Etymology*. Leiden – Boston.
- Pleteršnik, Maks. 1894: *Slovensko-nemški slovar* I–II. (Zbirka Slovarji). Ljubljana.
- Shrager, Miriam-Maria. 2011: Accentuation of masculine monosyllabic nouns of Susak speakers in New Jersey. In: Rinkevičius, Vytautas (ed.): *Proceedings of the 6th International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology / Akten der 6. Internationalen Arbeitstagung zur Balto-Slavischen Akzentologie / Doklady VI Meždunarodnogo seminaru po balto-slavjanskoj akcentologii = VI tarp-tautinio baltų ir slavų kalbų akcentologijos seminaro straipsnių rinkinys*. (Baltistica – Priedas 7): 207–225.

- Skok = Skok, Petar. 1971–74: *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. I–IV. Zagreb.
- Steinhauer, Hein. 1975: The phonemic system of the Susak dialect. *Linguistics* 162: 17–39.
- Vermeer, Willem. 1975: Problems in the synchronic and diachronic phonology of Susak Čakavian. *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 18(2): 139–159.
- Vermeer, Willem. 1979/2016: *Brief report on the Susak dialect*. August 1979. [unpubl. manuscript]
- Vermeer, Willem. 1984a: On clarifying some points of Slavonic accentology: the quantity of the thematic vowel in the present tense and relate issues. *Folia Linguistica Historica* V(2): 331–395.
- Vermeer, Willem. 1984b: Opozicija tipa 'živo/neživo' u množini u jednom čakavskom govoru (Omišalj). *Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane: referati i saopštenja* 13(1): 275–288.
- Vermeer, Willem. 2001: Appendix: Critical observations on the *modus operandi* of the Moscow Accentological School. In: Lehfeldt, Werner (ed.): *Einführung in die morphologische Konzeption der slavischen Akzentologie*. 2. verbesserte und ergänzte Aufl. (Vorträge und Abhandlungen zur Slavistik 42). München: 131–161.
- Vuk = Karadić, Vuk Stefanović. ⁴1935: *Srpski rječnik istumačen njemačkim i latinskijem riječima*. Beograd.
- Zubčić, Sanja. 2017: O nekadašnjem čakavskom govoru Maloga Lošinja. In: Genis, René / de Haard, Eric / Lučić, Radovan (eds.): *Definitely Perfect. Festschrift for Janneke Kalsbeek*. (Pegasus Oost-Europese studies 29). Amsterdam: 735–755.