

Sukač, Roman

**Peculiarities of the national fishing: Slovak Rhythmic Law and related species**

*Linguistica Brunensia*. 2021, vol. 69, iss. 1, pp. 59-80

ISSN 1803-7410 (print); ISSN 2336-4440 (online)

Stable URL (DOI): <https://doi.org/10.5817/LB2021-1-3>

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/144163>

License: [CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

Access Date: 10. 12. 2023

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

Šmilauerová, Tereza

**Peculiarities of the national fishing: Slovak Rhythmic Law and related species**

*Linguistica Brunensia*. 2021, vol. 69, iss. 1, pp. 59-80

ISSN 1803-7410 (print); ISSN 2336-4440 (online)

Stable URL (DOI): <https://doi.org/10.5817/LB2021-1-3>

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/144163>

License: [CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

Access Date: 10. 12. 2023

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

Roman Sukač

# PECULIARITIES OF THE NATIONAL FISHING: SLOVAK RHYTHMIC LAW AND RELATED SPECIES<sup>1</sup>

## ABSTRACT

*The author discusses the conception of Rhythmic Law in Slovak as a national, linguistic phenomenon and presents his view that Rhythmic law is a (too) narrow term of rhythmicity as a general West Slavic phenomenon. Rhythmic Law is a natural process that generally occurs if a language has fixed stress and a distinctive length. The obsessive preoccupation of the exclusivity of Slovak language as an only West Slavic language with the Rhythmic Law prevents scholars from seeing that the same or very similar phenomena also exist in the Czech language, although they are restricted to only some paradigmatic forms and specific derivative categories, these phenomena are examined and compared with those of Slovak.*

## KEYWORDS

*Rhythmic Law; Slavic accentology; Slovak; Czech; dialects; quantity; phonology*

## 1 Introduction ...negatívne pôsobí dlhý pobyt rybárov v blízkosti hniezdnej nory rybárikov...<sup>2</sup>

Slovak historical linguistics grew up from the solid background of the linguistic pillars like Stanislav, Krajčovič and Pauliny. However, outside Slovakia, the essential works of Slovak linguistics have not been very well known. Most linguists abroad,

---

<sup>1</sup> Editor's note: the original paper was anonymized before the review, the author changed the style back to the more personal style after the reviewing process, the feature we preserve since according to style of the paper.

<sup>2</sup> The whole article, as well as the illustrative sentence, is a reminiscence of my paper *Fish and its Fisherman* (SUKAČ 2013b) where I first tried to describe the Czech length with three keywords in the background: *ryba, rybář, rybářík*.

especially modern phonologists, has not used any standard native compendium on Slovak, but the *Lexical phonology of Slovak* written by Jerzy Rubach (1993). His book often became the only source of Slovak data among foreign scholars, together with other papers on Slovak by Rubach and Kenstowicz, whose authority has put weight on the validity of their description of Slovak language. Since the beginning of the new millennium, the situation has changed a bit, thanks to the almost unlimited access to scientific papers and works via internet databases and various storages. Moreover, the new generation of Slovak scholars started to rediscover the importance of Slovak historical linguistics in the context of Slavic and Indo-European linguistics, but also to actively contribute to the recent linguistics discussion outside Slovakia.

One of the typical features of the Slovak language is **Rhythmic Law** (RL) which prohibits the existence of two adjacent long syllables. Rhythmic Law, originally a typical feature of the Central Slovak dialects, has been the element of the Slovak language planning for many decades. Since the Štúr codified the Cultivated Central Slovak, the RL has been incorporated into the Standard Slovak. The codification of standard form meant that many exceptions to the RL faced the tendency to be corrected. Codified data were incorporated into standard handbooks (*Pravidlá slovenského pravopisu*; *Slovník slovenského jazyka*) and then, curiously, discussed as the source of data for further research. Since 1993, the period of independent Slovakia and the new identification of the Slovak nation with the mother tongue promoted many changes for language planning.<sup>3</sup> In 1995 the *State Language Act* was adopted, and new codification handbooks and reference books were created, e.g. *Krátky slovník slovenského jazyka*.<sup>4</sup> As for RL, it meant that many exceptions or irregularities were challenged, and RL has been consistently applied. Moreover, Slovak linguists have followed the tradition of the exclusivity of the RL in Slovak among Slavic languages. Only Slovak has to have the RL. If something similar can be found elsewhere, e.g. Czech, such phenomenon must be called differently, e.g. **derivative shortening**. Such an approach also led to the almost total neglect of the results in Slavic accentology, Slavic comparative and historical linguistics or various streams of modern phonology. Only recently, some Slovak linguists rediscovered the modern Slavic accentology and tried to apply the results on the RL (PUKANEC 2016a, 2016b; HABIJANEC 2016, 2018).<sup>5</sup>

The purpose of my paper is to present the problem of RL from the position of an accentologist and show that the RL is just a variant of the characteristic feature, which we can also find in Czech and generally in West Slavic.

3 See Sloboda et al. (2018) for the informative description of the national language planning in Slovakia.

4 Par. 2.3. of the Act: “Any interference with the codified form of the state language that is contrary to its regularities shall be inadmissible” (SLOBODA et al. 2018, 273).

5 For the current state of Balto-Slavic and Slavic accentology, see Sukač 2013a.



## 2 A brief history of the RL research till 1989<sup>6</sup>

As we can find the history or RL almost in every Slovak-written paper dealing with RL, it might be useful to deal only briefly with some (not all) theories and discussions on RL. Only general ideas will be presented.

Rhythmic Law was first defined by Ludovít Štúr in the 1846 book *Nauka reči slovenskej*. Štúr saw RL as a phenomenon without exceptions because he codified standard language based on the Central Slovak dialects. Other authors observed that various exceptions break the regularity of RL. Samo Czambel, in his *Rukoväť spisovnej reči slovenskej*, which was published in 1902 and became a standard description of Slovak based on Central Slovak dialects, stated that RL is valid only for Central Slovak and does not operate in West Slovak dialects. When Standard Slovak was codified in *Pravidlá slovenského pravopisu 1931*<sup>7</sup>, the *Pravidlá* text contained many exceptions to RL. But it never explained why those exceptions occur.

Since the 1940s Slovak scholars have tried to explain not only the origin of RL but also the process of codification of that phenomenon. The prominent Slovak linguist Štefan Peciar in 1946 criticized *Pravidlá* for not reflecting the language of real people and the exceptions from RL caused by infusing material from the non-Central Slovak territory. Peciar thought that RL appeared in Central Slovak after Late Common Slavic contraction and before Central Slovak diphthongisations. According to Peciar, the syllabic system of Slovak was transformed into the mora system with maximally three mora limitations in successive syllables. The system [- syllable] with more intensity and [+ syllable] with average intensity was transformed into the mora system. And this is RL. However, the system reverted to syllable-intensity interpretation, and that is why the RL is not regular now. Peciar also argues that the codification in *Pravidlá 1931* is wrong because the codification goes against the actual usage. This can be seen in -ár derivatives. For example, the codified form was *bájkár*, but actual usage is *bajkár/bájkar*, so the RL is regular there. In -ár derivatives, the suffix is long. Therefore the preceding syllable must shorten: *drôt-drotár*, *stól-stolár* but *krúžok-krúžkar*, *párky-párkar*, *lúka-lúkar*. As for the form *mliekár* and *sviečkár* where RL is apparently broken, Peciar argues here the diphthongs are unmarked in the system.

Here we can see the beginning of the **thin red line, which meanders through the further decades of RL research** – first, data are codified, then, these codified data are used as source material for research and discussions. Second, Slovak is considered an exceptional Slavic language due to the existence of RL.

<sup>6</sup> The following paragraphs are a thoroughly reworked version of Sukač 2017 so that it would reflect the more recent discussions of the RL.

<sup>7</sup> As I deal with the opinions of the authors and I do not discuss *Pravidlá*, I do not use it as a source of information for myself and do not put it into the list of references. The same applies to the other editions *Pravidlá* which I mention in the text.

Another Slovak big-name Ladislav Dvonč was intensively dealing with the RL from the 1950s till late 1990s, especially in his monograph from 1955. Dvonč observes that examples like *bieda-bedár*, *hviezda-hvezdár* support the fact that diphthongs are long. However, Dvonč sees RL only in successions of a long syllable-short syllable (*lúka-lúkar*) where the suffix is shortened after a long root. Forms like *bieda-bedár* are not examples of RL, but according to Dvonč, these are quantitative changes connected with derivation. But this explanation does not solve the problem of RL, especially when Dvonč agrees that RL is a three-moraic constraint in two neighbouring syllables. It seems to me entirely irrelevant whether this constraint is fulfilled in *lúkar* or *bedár*. In both examples, the total syllable weight in two syllables does not exceed three moras.

Dvonč claims that it is important to know if the *-ár* substantive is deverbative or denominative. Would it explain the original shortening of the root syllable – *blud* > *bludár* or *blúdit* > *bludár*? Dvonč's interpretation of RL is a bit problematic. First, he claims that if the root syllable shortens in *-ár* derivatives, other derivatives follow the RL. So *víno-vínár*, *múr-murár* does not seem to show RL for Dvonč because the root syllable shortens. According to Dvonč, this would be the quantitative change accompanying the derivation. Should it be RL, we would have obtained *\*\*vínár*. However, the derivate *vinárník* perfectly obeys RL because the *-ník* suffix shortens after a long *-ár-*. The second problem is that Dvonč explains data according to the formulation of RL in *Pravidlá 1953*. The definition of RL in *Pravidlá* is taken as a fact for Dvonč's interpretation.

Having analysed printed documents in the 19th century, Dvonč observed that RL was active in this period but also started to be violated. But this analysis is done with the background of the *Pravidlá* formulation, and Dvonč does not try to explain either the origin or the violation of the RL. For example, his only explanation is that the root syllable does not shorten in productive forms like *béčko-béčkár* (but Cz *béčkař*), *fréza-frézár* (but Cz *frézař*). Dvonč rightly notes that *Pravidlá* codified *-ár* as a standard even if that codification is violated – *frézar*, *hláskar*, *výškar*, *hríbar*. Alas, he does not notice the obvious RL mechanism in examples like *ryba-rybár-rybársky* or *rybník-rybnikár* etc.

To sum up Dvonč's analysis of RL, we can say that according to him, the shortening of the root vowel before *-ár* is unproductive; RL is regular predominantly in the old layer of vocabulary. On the other hand, Dvonč sees the productivity of shortening in *-ík* derivatives: *perník-perníkár*. Dvonč also tried to find the distribution of *-ár/-iar* at deverbatives – when a 3pl verbal form ends in *-ia*, then deverbative ends in *-iar*, so *voziar*, *farbiar*. Deverbatives from verbs ending in 3pl in *-ú* have *-ár* suffix – *pisár*, *tesár*, even if *-iar* does not obey RL (*múciar*, *vtáčiar*, *sietiar*).

The 1960s made the explanation of RL more puzzling. Peciar (1968) observed similar tendencies to Dvonč that RL used to be regular before *-ár*, but Contemporary Slovak breaks the regularity and follows the tendency not to change the root quantity in the

process of derivation. Peciar divided derivatives with shortened root syllable before *-ár*. First, there are forms belonging to the older vocabulary layer: *bedár, hvezdár, le-kár*. Second, the root syllable is shortened in forms with morphological alternation of quantity in paradigms – *kôň-koniar, nôž-nožiar*. Third – there are deverbatives from short-root-syllable verbs – *pekár*. The suffix *-ík* also shortens before *-ár* – *cukrikár, gombikár, košíkár, medovníkár, perníkár, pilníkár*. According to Peciar, what we observe here is a derivative model *-ikár*, which obeys RL and is analogically extended as a model of derivation. Even if Peciar's model could function, it does not explain that we observe RL in other forms, e.g. in adjectives ending in *-sky*, e.g. *rybníkársky*.

Sabol (1977) considered RL as a result of the neutralisation of quantity. An “older” syllable “časovo staršia dlhá slabikotvorná hláska” influences the following syllable, which is shortened. Although Sabol takes the phenomenon of RL as systemic, it is not quite clear what the real motivation of the law is. His puzzling observation is that in the inflective-derivative border (which Sabol invents), the RL is not regular. Sabol cannot explain why the “neutralisation of quantity” is regular in the formation of diminutives *hlas-hlások*. He also mixes the quantitative alternation in derivatives with paradigmatic forms like Nsg-Gpl of a-stem feminines *hlava-hláv*. Sabol's fuzzy explanation that “standard Slovak possesses harmony to change quantity as a signal of morphological or derivational processes” did not contribute anything new to the knowledge of the principles of Rhythmic Law.

### 3 The 1990s discussions

The broader discussion about the problematics of RL in standard Slovak appeared in the 1990s when RL started to be considered a typical feature of Slovak in connection with the splitting of Czechoslovakia and strong identifying of the Slovak language with the separate nation. The new *Pravidlá* was published in 1991 and immediately provoked reactions from Slovak linguists. Alas – all those discussions were aimed at the problem of codification of RL, not at the explanation of it.<sup>8</sup>

Slovak linguists have not bothered about the origin and mechanism of Rhythmic Law.<sup>9</sup> Again and again, the RL is not being explained from its natural base but from

8 See the discussion in *Jazykovedný časopis* and *Slovenská reč*.

9 An anonymous, Slovak speaking reviewer of the preliminary version of my paper raised a question: why am I so surprised that the Slovak linguists should deal with the origin and mechanism of the RL when they have discussed it as a synchronic phenomenon in the Standard Slovak? Of course that they do not need to do it. Others elsewhere in the world can delve into the Slovak linguistic stratigraphy. But to understand the synchronic operation of a language phenomenon often requires the diachronic explanation (Slavic accentology). Otherwise, you only describe what you observe and discuss exceptions without even knowing why they exist. Concerning Slavic accentology and its rapid progress during the last 20 years, it was only Pukanec (2016a) who introduced the Proto-Slavic accentual paradigms to the Slovak linguistic circle (!) It was almost 60 years after Stang described the phenomena in his *Slavonic*

the forms which are codified in *Pravidlá*. The 1<sup>st</sup> edition of *Pravidlá* 1991 codified RL (to support using it). As for *-ar/-ár* derivatives, *Pravidlá* stated that those derivatives also undergo RL and so long *-ár* shortens after the preceding long syllable (*bábkar*, *dráhar*). In 1997, *Krátky slovník slovenského jazyka* (KSSJ) appeared with the subsequent editions, which also codified the new Standard Slovak.

Dvonč (1997) discussed the new codification system of *Pravidlá* 1991 and KSSJ, which both codified the rhythmicity of *-ár* suffixes after a long syllable: *bábkar*, *frézar*, *sánkar* but in KSSJ also *mlekár* instead of *mliekar*. The general tendency of *Pravidlá*, and especially of KSSJ, seems to firm and codify RL, even after diphthongs: *mliekar*, *sviečkar*, *dial'kar*, *škôlkar*, *cievkar* etc. with the claim that the genuine pronunciation is unstable (POVAŽAJ 1997, 233–234).<sup>10</sup>

The second edition of *Pravidlá* (1997) codified RL also for *-ar/ár* derivatives with the a diphthong in the preceding syllable: *mlieko-mliekar*. So when one wants to obtain Slovak lexical data, he is puzzled about the relevancy, because the old *Slovník slovenského jazyka* from the 1960s adduces *bábkar*, *bájkár*, *bárkar*, *mliekar* but KSSJ only *bábkar*, *bájkár*, *mliekar*.

The discussion about RL in the late 1990s was damaged by Ladislav Dvonč-Ján Kačala embarrassing polemics. They did not bring anything new to the explanation of how and why RL operates but turned into personal attacks and disparagement of each other's scientific competency. The main point of polemics was the clash about the codification of RL in KSSJ contra *Pravidlá* 1991, but soon the whole discussion turned into a ridiculous quarrel. Kačala's antagonising approach to other linguists resulted in cessation of the "scientific discussion" by the editors of *Slovenská reč*, where the polemics appeared. However, Kačala's articles on RL, which are useless to comment from our point of view, continued to be published regardless of the negative reviews due to Kačala's aureole as a prominent linguist (KAČALA 2008).<sup>11</sup>

The 2000s have not brought anything new to the explanation of the genesis or RL. Ďurovič (2006) devoted much time only to codification problems and attacking Kačala, which only provoked his fierce counterreaction (see above). The authors never discussed RL in the context of Slavic prosody or even accentology. The majority of works quoted are only Slovak ones.

---

*accentuation*. On the other hand, the synchronic explanation requires methodology, and this is where Slovak home linguistics also remained behind the development of modern phonological theories.

10 I do not want to devote any more space to further discussions about Dvonč's opinions which can be found elsewhere, e.g. in Kralčák (2007). Such theories have nothing to contribute to the origin of the RL in the context of Slavic accentology or Slavic linguistics general.

11 Although this Kačala's article was declined for publishing by the reviewer because of the abusive language and mocking the opponent, the chief editor (S. Ondrejovič) decided to publish it. Kačala's paper is an excellent example of irrational hatred accompanied by monstrous self-concern. Why such behaviour could have been tolerated in the official journal of the *Ludovít Štúr Institute of Linguistics of the Slovak Academy of Sciences* remains a mystery.



Kralčák (2007) seemed to bring fresh air to the problem. However, he devotes a large part of his paper to the useless and dull discussion with various theories of Dvonč having the indispensable codification in the background. Kralčák wants to explain the origin of RL, but he still believes in Proto-Slavic metatonies (various changes of Proto-Slavic intonations in Slavic languages so that they could give observable quantitative patterns) which were refuted by Stang (1957/1965<sup>2</sup>). Kralčák (2007, 362) considers all cases of Slovak length come from the former neoacute.

Kralčák's central question "has the suffix *-ár* some specific feature which prevents it from the operation of RL?" (2007, 361) is transformed into the problem of the existence of the original neoacute in the preceding syllable. According to Kralčák, the original neoacute syllables in the derivatives *-ka*, *-ok* do not shorten and together with long suffix *-ár* (also long due to the "neoacute inheritance") break the RL rule: *bájka-bájkár*, *párok-párkár* etc. Kralčák's obviously thinks that the RL in cases of *-ár* derivatives operated due to the avoidance of "two dominant originally neoacute lengths". Only at the late 19th century the rising productivity of *-ár* suffixes violated the RL in new forms. This obscure theory leads to the silent prerequisite, that there are two types of lengths in Slovak. One came from the original neoacute and was resistant to shortening (*-ár*). Another one, of the unknown origin, was not resistant to shortening, e.g. *ryba > rybár > rybárik* (with obvious RL) and *ryba-rybník-rybníkár* with something like "derivation shortening" (?)

Kralčák's (2007, 369) explanation of the quantitative stability of *-ár* suffix leads to the semantic fuzziness: "jej kvantita plní sémanticko-pragmatickú funkciu: pôsobí ako nevyhnutný jednoznačný indikátor slovotvorného významu a potenciálne aj širšieho súboru derivačno-gramatických významov". Kralčák apparently thinks that the short suffix *-ar* would obscure the meaning of the derived word. But why such problem does not exist in Czech where the *-ař/-ář* or *-ač/-áč* are allomorphs without any difference of meaning? Kralčák gropes in the dark not only in Slavic accentology, but also in the grammatical processes in general.

## 4 Historical explanations of RL

While most of the Slovak authors have dealt with RL from synchronic and codification points of view, not many of them tried to explain it historically. One of the authors who tried to explain the origin of RL was Eugen Pauliny. As we now have a thorough analysis of Pauliny's theories by Habijanec (2008)<sup>12</sup>, I add only brief notes. Pauliny thought that RL originated after the loss of yers and due to specific Central Slovak conditions (PAULINY 1957, 1963). Pauliny thinks that pretonic lengths

<sup>12</sup> Although Habijanec criticised Pauliny in 2008, 2012 and 2018 as an example of *circulus vitiosus* in diachronic linguistics, he has not presented any reasonable alternative to the question on the origin of the RL.

were preserved, circumflex length was shortened both in Czech and in Slovak. Stress was fixed on the first syllable and the first syllables were long if they were formerly pretonic. It was thought that after a long syllable, a short syllable must follow (because of the structure – former pretonic length + stressed short syllable). According to Pauliny, that model of shortening was operating in the dialects where the yers were lost before the stress fixation and the process of contraction. Loss of yers causes the stress fixation, as Pauliny thinks. So after shortening of all lengths, there were only pretonic lengths left. After pretonic lengths, only short syllables could follow. New contraction lengths were shortened due to that model, e.g. \**mǫdrъjъ* > \**mǫdrŷ* > \**mǫdry* > *múdry*, but \**pekъnъjъ* > \**pekъnŷ* > *peknŷ*. Should contraction operate before stress fixation and loss of yers, the result would be a scheme where long syllables need not be in only formerly pretonic but also posttonic position. No Rhythmic Law should be observed, as it is in West Slovak dialects and the Czech language.

The development of prosodic patterns in Slovak was also briefly mentioned (alas) by Ján Stanislav in his monumental work on the history of the Slovak language. Stanislav (1967, 697–699) remains in the conception of the classical pre-Stang accentology using De Saussure's Law as a progressive stress movement to acute syllable (refuted by Stang) or the obscure concept of metatonies which explain various shortenings and lengthenings of words. Concerning the RL, Stanislav observes that the first records of RL come from the late 16th century (but the quantity was not recorded till the 15th century).

According to Stanislav, RL is a recent phenomenon. Central Slovak dialects have stresses on the first syllable and on penultima together with the RL. And the existence of two stresses can be the cause of the RL. The loss of quantity in Central Slovak dialects lead to the stress shift to penultima: *trávníček* > *tráv'niček*. Stanislav thinks that the penultima stress is secondary (which definitely is, if we compare it with East Slovak, Polish or Czech Silesian dialects). Otherwise, the expected form would be \*\**travníček*.

The exciting prosodic feature known from the dialectology and mentioned by Stanislav is the **Law of the Shifted Length** observed in Gemer dialects. The length from ultima is retracted to penultima: *nožík* > *nóžík*, see also the contrast between shifted and unshifted versions: *vájca* × *vajcia*; *kor:éňa* × *korenie* etc.<sup>13</sup>

The most important contribution to the origin of RL was made by Krajčovič (1975). According to Krajčovič (1975, 63), at the end of Proto-Slavic, there were long and short syllables (*víno*, *chvála*). New lengths were created by contraction and probably due to the loss of yers. The original pattern of long syllable–short syllable became “a principle” in Central Slovak. Therefore, new lengths from the con-

13 This remarkable phenomenon needs further studies in the context of West Slavic quantity patterns.

traction (which are mostly at the final syllables) were shortened, e.g. \**mōdrъjь* > \**mūdry̆* > *mūdry*. What is quite interesting here is the fact that Krajčovič's explanation predates the observation of Bethin (1998). Krajčovič's "principle" is the rise of rhythmicity, although the causes which both authors come from are different. Krajčovič relates the development of new quantity patterns to the chronology of contraction and yer loss. In West Slovak and East Slovak dialects, the contraction should have operated before the yer loss. Therefore, \**mōdr̆y̆* (new lengths) coexisted together with *vīno*, *chvāla* (old lengths). According to Krajčovič, the "principle" long syllable-short syllable has not been phonologized. Therefore, there is no RL in these dialects. West Slovak developed a distinctive quantity as the main prosodic feature; in East Slovak, the stress fixation on penultima lead to the loss of quantity (as in Polish and Czech Silesian dialects).

On the other hand, RL is in Central Slovak also because of the double position of stress, as mentioned by Stanislav. **The existence of RL is connected with the clash of two stress positions.**<sup>14</sup> According to Krajčovič, RL is not a recent phenomenon, but it is connected with sound changes in the 10th century.<sup>15</sup>

Diachronic conditions of Slovak RL were also explained by Feldstein (1990) who is the most quoted outside-Slovakia scholars in the works on the origin of RL because his paper was published in the local *Slavica Slovaca*.

Feldstein's conception of RL is a part of his general theory about the origin of neoacute and different areal developments of quantity opposition. Feldstein backs heavily on the outdated Jakobsonian approach to the development of Proto-Slavic accentuation. So Feldstein stands out of the mainstream of modern accentology, and it must be taken into account.

Feldstein thinks that when contraction operated, length and stress had a culminative role. If stress and quantity are culminative, the rhythmicity prevents the emergence of the potential ictus syllable (FELDSTEIN 1990, 4). It means that the stress itself was not independent of quantity – otherwise, there would be no reason to shorten the following syllable. Now there is a clear connection between the origin of neoacute and contraction. The question is why neoacute occurred. Feldstein answers that yers were not able to bear phonological stress in word-final position. According to Feldstein, neoacute is the result of a stress retraction. Prosodically, acuted (APa) and circumflexed (APc) o-stems merged and all stressed root vowels

14 "In the part of Central Slovak in which rhythmical law operates, quantity and stress may be regarded as prosodic means which are balanced and subordinate to a rhythmical (alternating) factor" (KRAJČOVIČ 1975, 134). It appears that RL rose due to the interaction of the quantity with the stress on the first and penultimate syllable. **It is a splendid explanation of why the RL has not appeared elsewhere.**

15 Habijanec (2018, 69–71) misunderstood Krajčovič (1975). Habijanec thinks that Krajčovič only copies Pauliny. But as we have seen, Krajčovič is very innovative in his explanation of the origin of the RL. Habijanec also claims that Krajčovič (1988, 80–81) follows the steps of Stanislav. It is entirely wrong. Stanislav considered RL a recent phenomenon while K. connects it with the Late Common Slavic sound changes.

(acute or circumflex) were shortened in Slovak area > *dým* (APa) and *syn* (APc). So Slovak merged both APa + APc (which resulted in shortening) in contrast to oxytone (APb) *štít* where rising pitch was lengthened. In Feldstein's conception, Slovak lost pitch distinction before quantitative redistribution. Otherwise APa and APc would not have merged in contrast to Czech, where both APa + APb merged and retained length (*dým*, *štít*) as opposed to short APc (*syn*). Feldstein refers to an idea of Jakobson, who posited a theory that distinctive stress and distinctive quantity are unstable. Quantitative opposition means the mora difference  $\mu \times \mu\mu$ , while distinctive feature means stress-ability of a mora. But if the language system has both free stress and long vowels, it also means that the system must have a tonal opposition (FELDSTEIN 1990, 7). Such a combination is rare, so stress is going to be fixed. Only one feature is distinctive – stress or quantity. West Slavic opted for a quantitative distinction and therefore has fixed stress, which means the elimination of word-final stress (esp. in Gpl).

The distinctive quantity had the redundant word stress, so Nsg \**ščítb* > \**ščítb*, Gsg \**ščítá* > \**ščíta* (FELDSTEIN 1990, 8) is also supported by shortening of final syllables. The previous situation – one long vowel per word – remained until contraction. Contraction produced long vowels, which meant that in one word, two long vowels could appear. Central Slovak had quantity in pretonic syllables which attracted final stress (\**šč'tb* - \**šč'ta*). These two processes are common to the whole of West Slavic (FELDSTEIN 1990, 9). Still, Central Slovak had also instances of compensatory lengthening in originally short vowels before the final stressed yer), i.e. types \**bobb*, \**kolb*, \**stolb*, \**koňb*, \**košb*, \**nožb* > *bôb*, *kôl*, *stôl*, *kôň*, *kôš*, *nôž*. Lengthening is the regular development because in WS, we observe it as conditioned by the quality of consonants.

Feldstein's interpretation of RL is that Central Slovak eliminated the second long vowel, which came to origin after contraction. The reason for it was to exclude the second ictus syllable. Feldstein claims that in other Slovak dialects and the rest of West Slavic, the stress and length were not mutually dependent because former APc substantives with initial default stress served as a model for independent stress and quantity patterns. Stress was automatically assigned on the initial syllable; quantity could be distinctive and present in any syllable. When contraction operated, the length was distinctive and culminative in Central Slovak but only distinctive in the rest of West Slavic (FELDSTEIN 1990, 12). Feldstein does not agree with Pauliny's conception of the relative chronology of changes leading to the RL. Pauliny thought that differences in intonation were transformed to differences of quantity after the fall of yers. Feldstein agrees with Jakobson that the reevaluation of intonation to quantity differences was triggered by the loss of final yers, not the loss of all yers.

The historical explanation of RL was also a topic of Pukanec's papers (2016a, 2016b). Alas, Pukanec wrongly interprets data as well as shows a lack of knowledge of modern scholarly literature. He still comes out of the classical accentology conception of Proto-Slavic intonation (long acute, long circumflex, neocircumflex,



neoacute), even if he himself backs on Stang's revolutionary book *Slavonic accentuation* (1957/1965<sup>2</sup>) who showed that neocircumflex is a specific intonation in Slovene only. Moreover, acute can be interpreted as glottalization (KORTLANDT 1975). Pukanec (2016a) lists the Proto-Slavic nouns with *-ār̥* suffix (only etymons without their accentual patterns!), supposing that the length automatically continues to Slovak. Then he postulates the **Regressive RL**, according to which the Proto-Slovak suffix *-ār* should trigger the shortening of the preceding syllable of the accentual paradigm *b*, resulting in *pisár*, *hverzdár*, *koniar*, *nožiar* and further spread by analogy to other forms. Pukanec even thinks that such Regressive RL operated before the fixation of the stress on the initial syllable in Slovak and before the Rhythmic Law itself (PUKANEC 2016a, 48). But how and why the original Proto-Slavic pattern transformed into Proto-Slovak free-stress, free-quantity design leading to rhythmicity remains enigmatic in Pukanec's conception. The numerous counterexamples like *bábkar*, *hádkár*, *sánkar* etc. are explained as the consonant coda blockage. The original root ending in consonant *bábka* should prohibit the operation of RL. Pukanec's theory lacks any phonetic explanation and even elementary knowledge of the syllable behaviour. Only the moraic coda would shorten the original root syllable.

Curiously, Pukanec (2016a, 48, 2016b, 161) thinks that even Czech had RL, at least at words *štítář*, *písař*, *lékař*, *mlékař*, *moukař*. Why just these words of the original accentual paradigm *b* "long" root is unexplained.<sup>16</sup> According to Pukanec, the RL could not operate in the roots from the original acute and circumflex paradigms (APa, APc), which, according to Pukanec, were short. Skipping the question of why long acute and long circumflex should have shortened without any apparent reason at the end of Proto-Slavic, there are many counterexamples to Pukanec's claim. Words like *kravař*, *mísař*, *hlinař*, *rybář* from the original acute bases which, surprisingly, have different quantity pattern in Czech: *kráva*, *hlína* (but also the original acute *slina*), *ryba* (but South Bohemian *rejba*). Pukanec mixes the Czech quantity allomorphs *-ař/-ář* with Slovak long-form *-ār* only and handles them with the idiosyncratic explanation of accentual phenomena. According to Pukanec (2016b, 162), the RL can be explained by Stang's Law, which, he thinks is the West Slavic stress fixation (sic!).<sup>17</sup>

16 Pukanec must have misunderstood the operation of Dybo's Law. See further.

17 Dybo's Law and Stang's Law are the two most important accentual laws. After the breakup of Balto-Slavic, there existed the two original Proto-Slavic accentual paradigms: a paradigm with the fixed stress on the root (API) and a paradigm with mobile stress in case forms (APII). There were two subtypes in API – a paradigm with acute e.g., *\*lápa*, and a circumflex paradigm, e.g. *\*žēna*. Both subtypes also existed in the mobile paradigms in Baltic. However, in Proto-Slavic, the original acute mobile paradigms in (APII) were neutralised to short rising intonation. Such intonation spread analogically to API where the original circumflex paradigms of *\*žēna* type were neutralised: *\*žēna* > *\*žēna*. Then, stress moved to the right *\*žēna* > *\*ženà*. This is Dybo's Law. Due to the Dybo's Law, the original paradigm API with constant stress on the root split into two new paradigms: the paradigm APa with constant acute root and the new APb paradigm created by Dybo's Law with stress on final syllable and probably short rising intonation. Dybo's Law not only formed the new accentual paradigm but also restored the quantitative contrast in

I agree with Habijanec (2018, 58–59), who, referring to Kralčák (2007), takes many of the Pukanec's counterexamples as the modern words without any "thousand-year-old" heritage and without any influence of the Late Proto-Slavic prosodic changes. Although the number of reconstructed derivatives with \*-arъ suffix can be more or less thirty-forty, the real distribution is different. Old Church Slavic records only 8 -arъ derivatives. The Old Czech (recorded in Old Czech Dictionary) has several tens of -ař/-ář derivatives; the number rises in the Middle Czech and rapidly increases to several hundreds of -ař/-ář words in modern times (HMČ: 255–257); Tsč (1967).<sup>18</sup> Of course, any reason to connect the word-formation productivity pattern to Proto-Slavic accentual features misses the point. But even if Habijanec (2018, 59–60) correctly criticises Pukanec's conception of two different rhythmic laws and continuation of the long -ár suffix from Late Proto-Slavic to Slovak, he explains the long -ár as a Proto-Slavic phenomenon.

Siniša Habijanec stepped out of the beaten track a bit. His two papers (2008, 2012) are commentaries to Pauliny's theory of RL in connection with the chronology of Post-Proto-Slavic yer loss and contraction. His (2008) paper together with the shortened English version (2012) represents a thorough and useful analysis of including dialectal data, which were often neglected in previous analyses.<sup>19</sup> But Habijanec brings nothing new. He even leaves the question of the genesis of RL open. But the origin of RL is the topic of one chapter in his (2018) book. Although most of the chapter is formed by his (2008) article, Habijanec also brings a new and fruitful summary of the various approaches and contributes to his criticism. Although Habijanec mostly criticises other authors, he has not brought any coherent and reasonable theory. Nevertheless, Habijanec is the first author who works with some works of modern Slavic accentology (e.g. ДУБО 1981). Habijanec also knows some of my works (SUKAČ 2011a, 2013b), which, however, he fiercely attacked as a "series of the grave methodological mistakes" (HABIJANEC 2018, 61). Before replying to his objections and defending my approach of the RL genesis, another theory needs to be briefly mentioned.

---

pretonic syllables. Stress could move to the right either from the short or long root syllable resulting in Slovak *tráva, krúpy, lieska, diera* in contrast to *žena, koza, ruda*, similarly in Czech *tráva, kroupa, líska, díra* versus *žena, koza, ruda*; see also Šefčík (2017). During the operation of Dybo's Law the target syllable could have been long and if such a syllable obtained ictus, it had the falling intonation. In Kortlandt's formulation of Stang's Law (KORTLANDT 1975, 14, KORTLANDT 1983, 17), stress was retracted from long falling vowels in final syllables, e.g. \*wo'lā > \*wòlā (Rus. dial. *vólja*, Cz. *vůle*, Slovak *vôla*, Slov. *vólja*, S-Cr. *vólja*.) The original long syllable was shortened apart from the Lechitic group where Old Polish still reflects length in *wolā*. The target syllable, which obtained stress, developed a rising tone. Stang's law caused the accentual alternation typical for the Late Proto-Slavic APb. Therefore, stress retraction is not the same as stress fixation, as Pukanec thinks.

18 The more updated version of the development of -ař/-ář derivatives (deverbatives only) can be found in Nejedlý a kol. (2019, 67).

19 Alas, still in progress is *Slovník slovenských nářečí*, which so far has appeared in two volumes (1994, 2006).

## 5 New view: Bethin's theory and disyllabic, maximally three-moraic domain

Slavic prosody, in general, was studied by Bethin in several important works (BETHIN 1998, 2003a, 2003b). Bethin tried to explain the development of Slavic prosodic patterns changes in the context of other sound changes. Her key concept is **the rise of rhythmicity**.

Rhythmic Law in the conception of Bethin (1998) is a trochaic structure. Bethin thinks that should quantity be a basis for metrical rhythm in Slovak; we would expect iambic rhythm. Because it is not, it confirms Bethin's theory that North Central Slavic developed a trochaic metrical foot. But the problem remains how to distinguish RL and trochaic type *biely* and iambic type *rybár* just because it does not meet the proposed trochaic rhythm.

Anyway, if we have a look at the cognates in Czech, we will observe interesting behaviours of quantity, which has long been known but hardly any considered similar to the Slovak RL. Bethin (2003a, 2003b) showed that modern Czech has a regular distribution of quantity in two subsequent syllables. Bethin called such effect a **disyllabic domain**. This domain can be observed in certain derivative categories, e.g. nomina agentis *mléko*–[*mlékař*]<sup>20</sup>, *mlýn*–[*mlynář*]; hypocoristics *Kateřina*–[*Káťa*]–[*Katka*]<sup>21</sup>, prefixed deverbal nouns: *příplatit*–[*přípla*]tek, *nahodit*–[*náho*]da. Quantity in the disyllabic metrical foot must not exceed three moras and its distribution operates inside the disyllabic domain with the following structure: [ $\sigma_{\mu\mu} \sigma_{\mu}$ ], [ $\sigma_{\mu} \sigma_{\mu}$ ] or [ $\sigma_{\mu} \sigma_{\mu\mu}$ ].<sup>22</sup>

As to denominatives with *-ař/-ář* suffix, Modern Czech shows **the tendency to the asymmetrical distribution of quantity**. It means that quantity in a syllable is not fully determined by the quantity of the neighbouring syllable. It pertains to the disyllabic forms with where the current trend generalises short variant *-ař* without reference to root quantity: *výška*–*výškař*, *sít*–*sítař*, *věčko*–*věčkař*, *droga*–*drogař*, *data*–*datař*. The original condition “long/short root + *-ař*, short root + *-ář*” has been transformed to the condition “*-ař* + long/short root”. **What is critical is not the root quantity but the quantity of a suffix**. Nevertheless, the change of quantitative conditions does not have any influence on the existence of domain that remains functional. The structure [ $\sigma_{\mu\mu} \sigma_{\mu\mu}$ ] almost never appears (exceeds three moras), and [ $\sigma_{\mu} \sigma_{\mu}$ ] is not preferred, so there are no forms *\*\*dosář*, *\*\*výškář*, *\*\*věčkář*, *\*\*datář*. The quantitative distribution is restricted to disyllabic forms because the two

20 Brackets show the domain in a word.

21 Bethin (2003a, 2003b). Root brevity in *Katka* contrasted with *Káťa* is due to the **closed syllable effect**, which causes a coda consonant to be moraic. So the first syllable *Kat-* is taken as long. This phenomenon is marked only in certain derivatives. Generally, Czech does not have moraic consonants.

22 Bethin (2003b).

syllables are connected with the metrical foot, apart from the mono- and polysyllables that is what Bethin (2003b) observed.

## 6 Rhythmicity and trochee constraints

My analysis of the Old Czech material confirmed Bethin's observation (SUKAČ 2011a). I analyzed the corpus of tens recorded *-ař/-ář* nouns with the following result: Quantitative asymmetry can be observed regularly and the number of moras in the disyllabic domain never exceeds three: *košťák*, *hvězdář*, *neckář* [ $\sigma_\mu \sigma_{\mu\mu}$ ]; *blanař*, *knihař*, *skotař* [ $\sigma_\mu \sigma_\mu$ ]; *básnař*, *cínař*, *vládař* [ $\sigma_{\mu\mu} \sigma_\mu$ ]. In the secondary derivatives, the disyllabic domain shifts to the left: [*kovář*]-*ko*[*vařík*], [*kramář*]-*kra*[*mařík*], [*rybář*]-*ry*[*bařík*], [*křížmář*]-*kříž*[*mařík*], [*hřebík*]-*hřě*[*bikář*], [*nožík*]-*no*[*žikář*], [*rybník*]-*ryb*[*nikář*], [*perník*]-*per*[*nikář*], [*řěbřík*]-*řěb*[*řikář*]. Modern Czech is missing the domain here: *hřebíkář*, *nožíkář*, *rybníkář*. The similar existence of domain also existed in the Old Czech verbal substantives with *-ánie* suffix. In my 2011a paper I also adduced tens of regular examples. Let's take two examples: *dělati* > *děláníe* contra *dávati* > *dáváníe*. The final suffix *-nie* obviously triggers the existence of the domain in which the number of moras does not exceed three. The quantity of the stem suffix depends on the quantity of the root: [*dělá*]*nie* × [*dáva*]*nie*. So it is the root quantity which decides on the shortening of the subsequent syllable and the movement is progressive. Modern Czech lost the existence of the domain due to the rising productivity of the existence of such verbal substantives, so now we have *dávání*, *dělání*. It is obvious that the *-ání* has been extracted as a separate morpheme. But we find the rest of the domain in Moravian dialects. When antepenultima is long, penultima is short: *kázání*, *pálení*, *trápení* (BARTOŠ 1886 I, 8). The rests of rhythmicity were also recorded with the lemma “*kázání/kázání*” in ČJA 5 (2005, 260), which shows “*kázání*” in whole Morava and SWCz area (Strakonice, Prachatice).<sup>23</sup>

Moreover, me and my colleagues (SUKAČ – ŠEFČÍK – DUFGOVÁ 2014), showed that the rhythmicity is also connected with the quantitative opposition of the Old Czech infinitive and supine forms (*něsti* × *nest*).

23 Nejedlý et al. (2019) described the same phenomena without even knowing Bethin's works or my papers. So they “observe” that concerning *-ař/-ář* deverbatives: monosyllables are always long (*lhář*, *žhář*), disyllables end in *-ař/-ář* with uncertain distribution together with the polysyllables (*počítář* × *popísář*) (NEJEDLÝ et al. 2019, 48, n. 128). The same “observation” has been done for *-nie* deverbatives (NEJEDLÝ et al. 2019, 215–217): the stem suffix lengthens at the derivatives from the 6th infinitive class of verbs (*malováníe*) and from the 5th infinitive class with the original short root (*konáníe*). Nejedlý et al. do not bother with the explanation of the quantity behaviour. Bethin published her paper in 2003 and my paper on the Old Czech *-ař/-ář* and *-nie* derivatives comes from 2011. From the more than a hundred references included in the Nejedlý's handbook, none of it concerns Slavic accentology. No wonder that due to the dismal ignorance and the lack of willingness to read the relevant literature, the authors “rediscover” what has already been known and explained.



When we compare the rhythmicity in Czech *-ař/-ář* derivatives with Slovak forms, we will find the similar distribution of quantity as in Old Czech: *drôt*–[*drotár*], *stól*–[*stolár*], *krúžok*–[*krúžkar*], *párky*–[*párkar*], *lúka*–[*lúkar*]<sup>24</sup>. We can also observe the domain shift by secondary derivation: [*cukřík*]–*cu*[*krikár*], *gombík*–*gombikár*, *košík*–*košíkár*, *perník*–*perníkár*. There is no difference between Czech *ryba*–[*rybář*]–*ry*[*bařík*] and Slovak *ryba*–[*rybár*]–*ry*[*bárik*] because what we observe here is **the same principle with a different result – distribution of length in disyllabic, maximally three-moraic domain**. The distinction can be explained by the different morpheme dominance – in Czech, the final suffix is dominant and generates the domain. In contrast, in Slovak, dominance is a typical feature of a non-final syllable. And that is the principle of the Rhythmic Law, which has always been considered a Central Slovak only phenomenon. Slovak scholars were never willing to accept the existence of a similar phenomenon elsewhere.

When Habijanec blames me for the “grave methodological mistakes”, he should explain why we find the similar principle of rhythmicity in Slavic languages, which have or had in older stages the fixed stress and distinctive length. The rest of the disyllabic domain can also be found in Old Polish *lekarz*, *piekarz*, *lichviarz* with the tendency to lose it in *lékárze*, *piekárze*.<sup>25</sup> Upper Sorbian *kruwař* proves that rhythmicity or at least its tendency must be reasoned to the whole West Slavic territory. It would be absurd to claim that among West Slavic languages, only Slovak (limited to central dialects) shows the rhythmic law. Moreover, an analysis by Šekli<sup>26</sup> shows that the similar rhythmicity in the disyllabic domain is present in South Slavic languages, e.g. Slovene [*krâvar*], [*konjár*], [*pečár*]<sup>27</sup>, S-Cr. [*krävâr*], [*kònjâr*], [*pèčâr*].

According to Habijanec (2018, 60), the Serbian-Croatian data reflect “hl’bšie areálové súvislosti” which explains nothing. Moreover, Slovene data contradict his claim that the original long *-ár* generally shortened.<sup>28</sup>

Referring to my conception, Habijanec raises the correct objections but altogether leaves aside the fact that they are explained in my papers, which he quotes (esp. 2013b article about the paradigmatic and derivative length). I even doubt he has read it:

a) Habijanec asks why the RL operated inconsistently in Czech and why it does not operate in other derivatives like *poutník*. The answer is quite simple – the rhythmicity

24 Discussions of Slovak linguists about the codification *krúžkar/krúžkár* type according to the common usages only witnesses the gradual asymmetry of the domain with its subsequent loss.

25 DUNAJ, B. 1966. *Wzdłużenie zastępcze w języku polskim*. Kraków, p. 22.

26 ŠEKLI, M. 2004. Naglas izsamostalniških izpeljank s priponskim obrazilom *-ar(j)-* v (knjižni) slovenščini. *Jezikoslovni zapiski* 10 (2), 47–72.

27 Slovene still reflects the original accentual paradigms of bases.

28 As a curious fact, it was already Krajčovič (1988, 80–81) who observed phenomena similar to RL in other languages, e.g. in S-Cr. dialects. Habijanec (2018, 60) on the one hand, sweeps it away as a groundless connection between S-Cr. dialects and Central Slovak. On the other hand, he greedily accepts the Croato-centric theory of Kapovič (see below) as a model for the development in Central Slovak.

is limited to certain derivation categories only. It is not surprising that a language has some regular features limited to certain categories, e.g. Latin's Lachmann's Law, where a short vowel in the original Proto-Indo-European root ending in media obstruent is lengthened before participle suffix *-to-* (*legō* but *lēctus*).

b) Habijanec objects that if the Czech suffix *-ář* was shortened after the long root syllable *mlékař*, *písař*, why would be the long *-ář* shortened after the short roots, like *kravař* or *pekař*. The answer is in Sukač (2013b, 92), in the whole chapter in my paper, which Habijanec has in his list of references but is obviously not familiar with it. So, my explanation of his objection is as follows:

Trying to answer the question of why *hlína* has a short derivate *hlinař* and not *hlínař* or *hlinář*, which are theoretically possible, we must have a look at the moraic structure of the derivate. It is moraic quantitative-sensitive trochee **LL**<sup>29</sup> because Czech is a trochee system (as shown by BETHIN 1998). One would wonder why there are derivatives like *mísař* < *mísa*, although the forms *misář* and *misař* could also be possible. In *mísař*, we observe another moraic trochee **HL**. It should be postulated that *rybář* has a metrical structure **LH**; we now see that we can easily explain why there are different quantitative patterns of derivatives – because of the **different ranking of metrical structures (different trochees)**:<sup>30</sup>

*mísař*: **HL** >>**LL**, **LH**

*rybář*: **LH** >>**LL**, **HL**

*hlinař*: **LL** >>**HL**, **LH**

Because the distribution of quantity is asymmetrical here, we can determine only the ranking of constraints (trochees) in a particular noun. That is important. **There is no exact rule which would describe the synchronic dependence of quantity in derivatives on the quantity of a base** (as it is in the accentual reliance in Slovene and Serbian-Croatian). What we observe here are several competing processes and all of them lead to a possible result. The disyllabic, maximally three-moraic domain still exists, but there is no rule saying that from the original acute stressed nouns, we obtain derivatives with short root and suffix.

Synchronically we may observe some dependence, e.g. root quantity in a derivate may copy the root quantity of base (*fréza*–*frézař*), but the recent generalisation of the short allomorph *-ař* without any respect to the root quantity fails to formulate any precise rule, even if the domain is still alive. We can only state that disyllabic *-ař/-ář* derivatives prefer the metrical structure **HL** but only if the root in of the base is long. But it is not transparent why short roots attach either a long or short suffix. **The domain here is quantitatively opaque.**<sup>31</sup>

29 "L" means light syllable, bold **L** is the light stressed syllable. **H** is heavy stressed syllable.

30 Sukač (2013b, 92).

31 In the peer-review process of the preliminary version of the present paper, the question was raised if the *disyllabic domain* is not the *deus-ex-machina* process which can reduce the different language phenomena to a common principle. Actually, the disyllabic domain is an observable feature supported



It is puzzling why Habijanec even does not discuss this proposal of mine and limits himself on the vague statement that “*príčiny skracovania prípony -ár v češtině sú oveľa komplexnejšie, no v žiadnom prípade ich nie je možné vysvetlovať pôsobením ‘rytmického zákona’, tobôž nie stredoslovenského typu*” (HABIJANEC 2018, 62). The previous paragraphs clearly showed that the behavior of the Czech *-ár* suffix is by no means complex but that the Slovak RL and Czech RL or rhythmicity have the same principle only.

c) Habijanec (2018, 59–60) tries to explain the “quantity resistance” of the Slovak *-ár*<sup>32</sup> as a generalization of the Proto-Slavic pattern of the APb (*\*volārjь*) type with reference to the works of Kapović (2015)<sup>33</sup>.

First, Habijanec silently adopted the Kralčák’s conception of the inherent quantitative stability of the *-ár* suffix from the Late Proto-Slavic, completely ignoring the fact that in Czech there are also “quantity resistant” suffixes recorded from Old Czech without quantitative alternations: like *-ík, -ák, -áč, -ýš*. They should have a generalised length from some Late Proto-Slavic accentual pattern, which might be accurate, but it does not explain why they shorten in the process of secondary derivation, e.g. *sedlák–sedlačik* but *sedláček*. The suffix *-ík* does not shorten itself but is a part of the disyllabic maximally three-moraic domain. Habijanec, as well as most Slovak authors, would consider Czech *sedlačik* and Slovak *sedliačik* as two different processes. At the same time, it is more understandable to consider them as a different behaviour of one disyllabic domain.

Second, Habijanec does not take the productivity pattern into account. The original number of *\*-arь* substantives in Late Proto-Slavic was meagre and rose rapidly since then. But Habijanec simply adopts some examples taken from Serbian-Croatian and Slovene and tries to explain the vast bulk of modern data following the steps of Kapović (HABIJANEC 2018, 60–61).

Third, as a curious fact, Habijanec completely ignores my thorough criticism of Kapović’s *modus operandi*, which I adduced in the same paper (SUKAČ 2013b) which Habijanec criticises. As I dealt with Kapović Croato-centric views published in his 2005 paper and I do not want to delve into his recent works because it is not the topic of my paper; I refer the reader to the relevant paragraphs in (SUKAČ 2013b,

by data. The fact that in Czech it is reduced into certain paradigmatic (e.g. *kráva–kravách*) and derivative categories while Slovak (or to be precise – Central Slovak) broadened it more in the grammar system, has nothing to do with some ad hoc explanation. Moreover, the disyllabic domain is not my invention and I think that Bethin (1998) put the original idea into a very coherent explanation.

32 Habijanec (2018, 39) thinks that the Slovak long *-ár* comes from neacute which is only ad hoc explanation coming back to Kralčák (2007). According to Habijanec (2018, 37–39), this “lengthening” did not reach the *Záhorie dialect*, where the quantity in *-ár* derivatives is more the less the same as in Czech: *pekar, hrobar, búdar, ribár, kovár* etc. However, the form *jágar* being borrowing from the German *Jäger* does not require the allomorph *-ar* in the dialect, as Habijanec thinks. The word is pronounced with the final reduced syllable /ə/ which is automatically pronounced short *jágar* or reduced *jágr*. I do not see any reason why the speakers should prolong it to *jágár*. The long suffix form must be secondary.

33 *Povijest hrvatske akcentuacije*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.

97–99). Concerning our topic of *-ář*, I adduced that: “...while *pekař* would agree with the theory<sup>34</sup> (we have *masař*, *vodař*), the situation with former APa is different because *rybář* is absolutely anomalous with its long suffix because *ryba* is short in Czech (but according to Kapović’s theory of acute length preservation it should be long), we have *kravař*, *hlinař* but also *sítař* (where neuter is long *síto*) and *mydlář* (where *mýdlo* is also long)” (SUKAČ 2013b, 99).

## 7 Acute and the Kortlandt’s lengthening rule

Habijanec rests in the conception of classical accentology, which claims that Late Proto-Slavic acute and circumflex were long, and the West Slavic languages neutralised tone distinction (HABIJANEC 2018, 25, 80) together with the “phonotactic quantity neutralisation”. It should be reflected as RL. Habijanec even works with metatonies, even if they were refuted by Stang (1957/1965<sup>2</sup>).

Late Proto-Slavic acute is not any long intonation or tone, as Habijanec thinks, because it would mean that all acute lengths would be shortened on most of the Slavic territory for unknown phonetic reasons.<sup>35</sup> The Late Proto-Slavic acute was glottalization which developed into short rising intonation (KORTLANDT 1983). And due to the above-mentioned rule, the initial acute syllable was lengthened in some Slavic dialects only (Czech, Upper Sorbian). The length from “acute” is therefore secondary, the primary is brevity, as in Slovak and elsewhere. **Length as the reflection or development of Proto-Slavic acute is therefore secondary.** This is the anticipation advocated by Kortlandt, who advocates the hypothesis since 1975. According to Kortlandt (1975, 19), “a short rising vowel in an open first syllable of disyllabic words is lengthened unless the second syllable contains a long vowel”. It was Stang (1957/1965<sup>2</sup>, 25, 35), who first thought about the secondary lengthening of a rising vowel<sup>36</sup> but since it is fully applied and used by Kortlandt. It is therefore known as the **Kortlandt’s lengthening rule.**<sup>37</sup> Kortlandt’s lengthening rule explains the behaviour of the former acute syllables in the process of Late Proto-Slavic prosodic transformation into Czech and Upper Sorbian. But it did not create RL; it is only one source of length.<sup>38</sup>

34 According to Kapović, the form *pekař* cannot be archaic because one would not expect mobile accentuation if the *\*-arъ* derivatives.

35 See Sukač (2015b) for the thorough discussion of the nature of Proto-Slavic acute.

36 “In Czecho-Slovak, in the first syllable of an old disyllabic word, acute appears as long and circumflex as short. But it is possible that this may be due to a secondary lengthening of a rising vowel”.

37 Surprisingly, neither Habijanec nor other hereto mentioned Slovak scholars do not know the important paper by Verweij, who presented his paper on the Bratislava Congress of Slavists and who dealt with the quantity patterns in Czech and Slovak. (VERWEIJ, Arno. 1994. Quantity patterns of substantives in Czech and Slovak. In: *Dutch Contributions to the Eleventh International Congress of Slavists. Bratislava, Linguistics*. Rodopi, 493–567.)

38 Habijanec is quite puzzled about the development of Proto-Slavic accentual patterns. In his other-

## 8 Where has the text brought us to?

The development of the Late Proto-Slavic accentual patterns into individual languages is much more complex and beyond the topic of my paper.<sup>39</sup> The central question is: What is RL, and how was it created? The following proposals can be postulated:

1. Rhythmic Law is a narrow term within the frame of rhythmicity. Two adjacent syllables cannot have the same quantity regardless of the position. Rhythmicity arises as a natural product of the interaction of fixed stress and a distinctive length. RL appeared in Central Proto-Slovak as a clash of fixed stress on the first and penultimate syllable with the free length.<sup>40</sup> Dialects with fixed stress on the first syllable and free quantity developed rhythmicity only in certain circumstances (Czech and Moravian). Dialects with fixed stress on penultima lost the distinctive quantity and developed strong dynamic stress (East Slovak, Polish, Silesian dialects in the Czech Republic).

2. In spite of the free length, Czech (and Slovak) have specific constraints on the distribution of quantity in certain prosodically well-defined circumstances. The context is a disyllabic domain (BETHIN 2003b, 19). The distribution of quantity within a disyllabic domain ranges from asymmetry (Czech) to symmetry (Central Slovak)<sup>41</sup>, but only in two-syllable words. Some Slovak derivatives with default length (-ár) suffix have a tendency to shorten preceding syllable in the domain. In the secondary derivation, the disyllabic domain shifts to the right and the suffix with default length causes shortening of the following syllable: *rybár* > *rybárik*. The Czech *rybář* > *rybařík* shows the opposite situation: the suffix -ář has no default length apart from -ík which does not shorten. The position of suffix also influences the distribution of length, e.g. OCz *rybník* > *rybnikář* × *kovář-kovařík*.

---

wise very informative chapter on the *Záhorie dialect* (HABIJANEC 2018, 7–56) he wonders why the “acute length” gives different quantity results: *kráva, sláma, sádlo, máslo* but *vrana, rana, žaba, blato, hrach, mak, sila, slina*. Habijanec is also surprised that the original circumflex forms (which, according to the classical accentology theory, which he accepts) should give short reflexes are long: *níže, dálej, delší, krásše...*) For Habijanec it is “záhada svôjho druhu” (HABIJANEC 2018, 26). However, we find similar situation in Czech dialects and the solution is quite simple: the redistribution of the Late Proto-Slavic accentual paradigms into new quantitative paradigms (SUKAČ 2011b, 2011c, SUKAČ 2015a, SUKAČ 2015b)

39 See Sukač 2013a, 2013b or 2015b (for Czech readers).

40 It might have been caused by “quantity dissimulation” mentioned already by Stanislav (1967, 705) as an external sandhi phenomenon in Central Slovak dialects. But the recent detailed work of Bethin (2008) shows that it is also connected with the position of stress in words. Her paper deals with East Slavic dialects where the quality of the vowel in immediate pretonic position depends on the quality of the vowel under stress. In my opinion, this is just a modification of what could have happened in Central Slovak, where the penultimate stress could have caused the pretonic shortening. Such a pattern would have just developed into rhythmicity.

41 The existence of the disyllabic domain in West Slovak dialects is unknown. Because the official language policy pushed RL into the standard variant of Slovak and it has been over and over again repeated that West Slovak has no RL, the situation is probably similar to Czech. The rhythmicity can be limited to some cases of derivation morphology.

3. The rhythmicity in Czech is limited to certain circumstances of derivation morphology: hypocoristics, -ař/-ář derivatives, prefixed deverbal nouns, disyllabic infinitives and supine. In inflection morphology, the disyllabic domain appears as a doublet in certain paradigmatic cases: *kravách/krávách, kravami/krávami*.

4. Central Slovak has the disyllabic domain both in derivative as well as in paradigmatic morphology.

5. Rhythmic Law is not an exclusive Slovak phenomenon. It is probably just a general West Slavic prosodic effect. There are other fishers catching fish, and there are different species of kingfishers living outside Slovakia.

## REFERENCES

- BARTOŠ, František. 1886. *Dialektologie moravská I*. Brno: Nákladem Matice moravské.
- BETHIN, Christina Y. 1998. *Slavic Prosody. Language change and phonological theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BETHIN, Christina Y. 2003a. Metrical Quantity in Czech: Evidence from Hypocoristics. In: *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 11: The Amherst Meeting*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Materials, 63–82.
- BETHIN, Christina Y. 2003b. Prosodic Effects in Czech Morphology. In: *American Contributions to the Thirteenth International Congress of Slavists, Ljubljana 2003*. Bloomington: Slavica Publishers, 9–22.
- BETHIN, Christina Y. 2008. On Quantity Dissimilation in East Slavic. In: *American Contribution to the 14th International Congress of Slavists, Ohrid, September 2008. Vol. 1: Linguistics*. Bloomington: Slavica Publishers, 21–38.
- ČJA – *Český jazykový atlas 5*. 2005. Praha: Academia.
- ĐUROVIČ, Lubomír. 2006. K diskusiám o vlastnostiach „Rytmičkého zákona“. *Slovenská reč* 71 (4), 224–238.
- DVONČ, Ladislav. 1954. Skracovanie dĺžok pred dlhými sufixami a rytmičké zákon v slovenčine. *Jazykovedný časopis VIII*, 234–243.
- DVONČ, Ladislav. 1954a. Používanie prípon -ár a -iar v spisovnej slovenčine. *Slovenská reč* 19, 298–302.
- DVONČ, Ladislav. 1955. Rytmičké zákon v spisovnej slovenčine. Bratislava: SAV.
- DVONČ, Ladislav. 1956. Kvantitatívne zmeny pri odvozovaní substantív na -ár/-iar. In: *Jazykovedné štúdie 1. Spisovný jazyk*. Bratislava: SAV, 5–30.
- DVONČ, Ladislav. 1997. Najnovšie zmeny v oblasti kodifikácie rytmičkého zákona v spisovnej slovenčine. *Slovenská reč* 62 (4), 218–226.
- DVONČ, Ladislav. 1998. Rytmičké krátenie v spisovnej slovenčine. *Slovenská reč* 63 (5), 291–299.
- DVONČ, Ladislav. 1999. Znova o pravidle o rytmičkom krátení v spisovnej slovenčine. *Slovenská reč* 64 (5), 279–291, 64 (6), 345–354.
- FELDSTEIN, Ronald F. 1990. The Proto-Slavic prosodic background of the Slovak rhythmic. (English translation of: Praslovanské prozodické pozadie vzniku rytmičkého zákona v slovenčine. *Slavia Slovaca* 25 (1), 41–49.

- HABIJANEC, Siniša. 2008. Paulinyho teória o vzniku rytmického zákona. *Slovenská reč* 73 (2), 75–88.
- HABIJANEC, Siniša. 2012. An example of the circulus vitiosus in diachronic linguistics: Pauliny's theory on the origin of the Rhythmic Law. In: JANYŠKOVÁ, Ilona – KARLÍKOVÁ, Helena, eds. *Theory and Empirism in Slavonic Diachronic Linguistics*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 465–472.
- HABIJANEC, Siniša. 2016. The Slovak language as a source for the reconstruction of the Proto Slavic accentual system. *Baltistica* LI (2), 341–353.
- HABIJANEC, Siniša. 2018. *Fonologické aspekty vývinu slovenčiny*. Bratislava, Veda.
- HMČ – LAMPRECHT, Arnošt – ŠLOSAR, Dušan – BAUER, Jaroslav. 1986. *Historická mluvnice češtiny*. Praha: SPN.
- KAČALA, Ján. 1998. Smerovanie rytmického zákona. *Slovenská reč* 63 (4), 230–237.
- KAČALA, Ján. 2008. Rytmický zákon a „vedecké zkršľovanie skutočnosti“. *Slovenská reč* 73 (2), 89–100.
- KORTLANDT, Frederik. 1975. *Slavic accentuation: A study in relative chronology*. Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press.
- KORTLANDT, Frederik. 1983. Linguistic theory, universals, and Slavic accentuation. *Folia Linguistica Historica* IV, 27–43.
- KORTLANDT, Frederik. 2009. West Slavic accentuation. [online] Available at: [www.kortlandt.nl](http://www.kortlandt.nl)
- KORTLANDT, Frederik. 2011. West Slavic accentuation. In: *From Present to Past and Back*. Papers in Balto-Slavic Accentology. Peter Lang Verlag, 86–107.
- KRAJČOVIČ, Rudolf. 1975. *A historical phonology of the Slovak language*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- KRAJČOVIČ, Rudolf. 1988. *Vývin slovenského jazyka a dialektológia*. Bratislava: SPN.
- KRALČÁK, Lubomír. 2007. O kvantitatívnej stabilite sufixu -ár (-áreň). *Slovenská reč* 6, 355–370.
- NEJEDLÝ, Petr a kol. 2019. *Slovotvorný vývoj deverbálných substantív ve staré a střední češtině*. Praha: Academia.
- POVAŽAJ, Martin. 1997. O kodifikácii slov utvorených príponou -ár, -áreň, resp. -ar, -areň. *Slovenská reč* 62 (4), 226–234.
- PAULINY, Eugen. 1957. Vznik rytmického zákona v slovenčine. In: *Studia linguistica in honorem acad. Stephani Mladenov*. Sofia, 317–320.
- PAULINY, Eugen. 1963. *Fonologický vývin slovenčiny*. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied.
- PECIAR, Štefan. 1946. Slovenská kvantita a rytmický zákon. *Slovenská reč* 12 (5), 137–152; 12 (6), 217–224.
- PECIAR, Štefan. 1968. Kvantita substantív na -ár/-iar a -áreň/-iareň. *Slovenská reč* 33 (5), 297–303.
- PUKANEC, Martin. 2016a. On the Rhythmic Law and the Suffix -ár. *Jazykovedný časopis* 67 (1), 45–51.
- PUKANEC, Martin. 2016b. K chronológii pravidiel o rytmickom krátení v slovenčine. *Slovenská reč* 81 (3), 160–173.
- RUBACH, Jerzy. 1993. *Lexical Phonology of Slovak*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- SABOL, Ján. 1977. Kvantita a rytmický zákon v slovenčine. *Kultúra slova* 11 (6), 193–197.

- SLOBODA, Marián – MOLNÁR SATINSKÁ, Lucia – NÁBĚLKOVÁ, Mira. 2018. Language planning in Slovakia: Nation-Building in the Context of European Integration. In: ANDREWS, Ernest, ed. *Language Planning in the Post-Communist Era*. Palgrave Macmillan, 261–286.
- STANG, Christian. 1957/1965<sup>2</sup>. *Slavonic accentuation*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- STANISLAV, Ján. 1967. *Dejiny slovenského jazyka. I. Úvod a hláskoslovie*. Bratislava: Slovenská akadémia vied.
- SUKAČ, Roman. 2011a. Old Czech rhythmic law. In: *Baltische und slavische Prosodie*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag, 141–152.
- SUKAČ, Roman. 2011b. Compensatory Lengthening in West Slavic. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 56 (4), 417–445.
- SUKAČ, Roman. 2011c. Moravian Accentual Paradigms. In: *From Present to Past and Back. Papers on Baltic and Slavic Accentology*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag, 194–200.
- SUKAČ, Roman. 2013a. *Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and Balto-Slavic Accentology*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- SUKAČ, Roman. 2013b. Fish and its Fisherman. Paradigmatic and derivative length in Czech. *Zeitschrift für Slavistik* 58 (1), 72–101.
- SUKAČ, Roman. 2015a. Prozodické rysy jihozápadočeských substantiv v kontextu české délky. In: *Genius loci českého jihozápadu, 2006, 2012*. Plzeň, 113–116.
- SUKAČ, Roman. 2015b. Praslovanský akut. *Bohemica Olomucensia* 7 (3–4), 8–21.
- SUKAČ, Roman. 2017. Is having rhythm a prerequisite for being Slovak? In: *Usque ad radices: Indo-European studies in honour of Birgit Anette Olsen*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 717–730.
- SUKAČ, Roman – ŠEFČÍK, Ondřej – DUFKOVÁ, Kristýna. 2014. K původu a fungování staročeského supina. *Linguistica Brunensia* 62 (2), 5–15.
- ŠEFČÍK, Ondřej. 2017. Dybův zákon. In: KARLÍK, Petr – NEKULA, Marek – PLESKALOVÁ, Jana, eds. *CzechEncy – Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny* [online]. [Retrieved: 20. 5. 2020]. Available at: [https://www.czechency.org/slovník/DYBŮV\\_ZÁKON](https://www.czechency.org/slovník/DYBŮV_ZÁKON)
- ŠTOLC, Jozef. 1994. *Slovenská dialektológia*. Bratislava: Veda.
- TSČ – DANEŠ, František – DOKULIL, Miloš – KUCHAR, Jaroslav. 1967. *Tvoření slov v češtině*. Praha: Academia.

### Roman Sukač

Institute of the Czech language and Library Science

Faculty of Philosophy and Science, Silesian University in Opava

Masarykova třída 343/37, 746 01 Opava

Czech Republic

roman.sukac@fpf.slu.cz



This work can be used in accordance with the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license terms and conditions (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode>). This does not apply to works or elements (such as image or photographs) that are used in the work under a contractual license or exception or limitation to relevant rights.