THE SLOVAK LANGUAGE AS A SOURCE FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE PROTO-SLAVIC ACCENTUAL SYSTEM

Abstract. Slovak is not generally thought of as a rich and informative source for the reconstruction of the Proto-Slavic accentual system. In addition to the well-known fact that Slovak, unlike Czech, exhibits no traces of the Proto-Slavic acute, this view is also due to at least two peculiarities of its development: 1. quantity is often neutralised by many later phonological processes, such as the Rhythmic Law and the shortening of front diphthongs after j; 2. Slovak is more prone to analogical levelling and generalisation than any other West Slavic language, affecting, among other things, the development of quantity, whether through the generalisation of length in a particular grammatical category (such as in the genitive plural) or through analogical intrusion of quantitative patterns in derivation. Nevertheless, Slovak does offer some valuable data for the reconstruction of the Proto-Slavic accentual system, such as consistent length in the nominative singular of short root vowel nouns belonging to the b accentual paradigm (bôb, kôl, stôl...). Still more valuable data is contained in the rich Slovak dialectal material, which is neither sufficiently well-known nor sufficiently accessible to international scholarship. This paper offers guidelines for researching quantity in the Slovak dialectal material, as well as shows how the Slovak dialectal material can contribute to the reconstruction of the Proto-Slavic accentual system.
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Within the framework of West Slavic languages Slovak is not generally considered a rich source for the reconstruction of the Proto-Slavic accentual system, especially in comparison to the extinct Slovincian. This can be ascribed – in addition to the fact that Slovak has a fixed stress and that, unlike Czech, it does not exhibit indirect traces of the Proto-Slavic acute – to at least two peculiarities of the development of Slovak: 1) the neutralisation of quantity as a result of later phonological processes, and 2) the analogical levelling that obscures the original distribution of quantity. Nevertheless,
Slovak linguistic material includes some unique relics which are of value in the reconstruction. The paper will highlight what Slovak linguistic data can tell us about the accentual system of Proto-Slavic and what should be particularly taken into account when using Slovak dialectal data in the reconstruction of the accentual system of Proto-Slavic.

Like almost all West Slavic languages (with the exception of the extinct Polabian, and Pomeranian), Slovak has fixed accent on the initial syllable; however, this accent has been entirely preserved only in West Slovak dialects. In East Slovak dialects (apart from Sotak) the accent is consistently placed on the penultimate syllable, as a result of the later influence of Polish (at the earliest in the 16th century). It would seem that the isoglossal wave of accent transfer from the initial to the penultimate syllables affected Central Slovak idioms as well, but the process was never completed. As a result, in Central Slovak the accent wavers between the initial and the penultimate syllable (Stanislav 1967, 693), with the occasional appearance of the Doppelakzent in words with more than three syllables (Petřík 1937/1938, 80). Very similar situation can be observed in Podhale dialect of the Polish language (Stieber 1973, 73). In all probability, the unfinished process of transferring the accent to the penultimate syllable in Central Slovak idioms is the cause of what is known as retracted length in the dialect of southwest Gemer1 where length is transferred from the final long syllable to the short penultimate syllable, e.g.: nůžik < nožík ‘knife (diminutive)’, dvěří < dverí ‘door (gen. pl.)’, vájca < vajce ‘eggs’, žení sa < žeňí sa ‘he gets married’, xodín < xodín (-m# > -n# in the Gemer dialect; Štolc 1994, 79) ‘I walk’, hrušok < hrušyok ‘pear (gen. pl.)’ (Tóbik 1957, 91).

Since the transfer to the penultimate syllable brings about the loss of quantity, as both Polish and East Slovak developments indicate, Stanislav

---

1 The Gemer dialect is labelled as 18 on Map 2. 
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(1967, 695) even relates the rise of the Rhythmic Law to it, associating the incomplete transfer of accent with the incomplete loss of quantity, which is what the Rhythmic Law essentially is. In spite of the fact that the two phonological features roughly match chronologically, it should be noted that the Rhythmic Law operates (at least initially) in any sequence of two syllables, regardless of the position of the syllable in the word, what makes Stanislav’s hypothesis less plausible.

The only Slovak dialect with a free accent is Sotak, situated at the very margins of the West Slavic linguistic area. The Sotak accent was recorded already by Broch (1899) in his description of the idiom of the eastern Slovak (then in the Kingdom of Hungary) village of Koromlaya, which exhibits a considerable influence of neighbouring Rusyn/Western Ukrainian idioms. However, notwithstanding the numerous publications on that dialect, we still do not have a complete, clear and detailed picture of its distribution, due for the most part to an almost complete lack of interest in questions of accentology on the part of Slovakia-based linguists. In more than a century after Broch’s work, which “still remains by far our most detailed study of any Sotak dialect” (Schaller 2011, 192) only Lipták’s (1969) publication provides relevant prosody data. It should be stressed that the Sotak dialect does not exhibit a uniform accent; rather, from the west and moving eastwards it gradually changes from (1) a fixed stress on the penultimate syllable (under the influence of the neighbouring, and dominant, Zemplín dialect), via (2) a free immobile stress, with the accent sometimes appearing on closed final syllables, to (3) a free immobile stress, with the stress sometimes appearing on open final syllables as well. This distribution has been attested in both, geographically non-contiguous, areas of the Sotak dialect – Humenné Sotak (Liška 1944, 54–55) and Sobrance Sotak (Lipták 1969, 20–21). The free stress of group (2) has frequently been explained by the ictus becoming bound to the first length in the word. This can account for most examples, but not all, and completely fails in the case of the stress on open final syllables of group (3). Since this type of stress (on the final open syllable) appears in

---

2 By this term is meant the stress that can fall on any syllable, but does not alternate within a paradigm.

3 Humenné Sotak is labelled as 34 and Sobrance Sotak as 35 on Map 2. The Sobrance Sotak dialect has more frequently been called the Uh dialect (Slovak: užské nárečie), for instance in Lipták 1969 and Štolc 1994.
easternmost idioms of both areas, the East Slavic influence cannot be entirely excluded, but it is not clear to what extent it could influence the rise of the Sotak stress, since it seems to be the product of an original development.\(^4\)

Since tone distinctions probably disappeared very early in Slovak (as in all West Slavic languages), quantity remains the only phonologically relevant prosodic feature in the language. Slovak has five long vowels: á, é, í (orthographically i or ý), ó, and ú, as well as two long syllabic sonorants: r, and l, the latter being unique among Slavic languages. The marginal Central Slovak idioms of Orava\(^6\) and Gemer in addition have the long vowel ā, which is a descendant of the Proto-Slavic long front nasal vowel,\(^7\) an allophone of the long á after a soft consonant,\(^8\) or the result of a contraction,\(^9\) and which should be reconstructed for Slovak as a whole. In most dialects it diphthongised into ja, while in southern West Slovak it merged with á. In addition to long vowels, Slovak has four diphthongs: ķa (orthographically ia), ķe (ie), ķu (iu), and yu (ó). While ia, ie, and ó are the result of the diphthongisation of the long vowels ā, é and ó, the diphthong iu appeared later by intra-paradigm analogy. Hence it is attested exclusively as a case ending in the adjectival and uje declinations [e.g. božiu ‘god’s (acc. sg. f.)’, zdraviu ‘health (dat. sg.)’], and does not appear, as could be expected, as a counterpart of ú after a soft consonant: klúč ‘key’, lúbiť ‘to love’, majú ‘they have’. It should be stressed that the juxtaposition of a high and mid/low vowel does not automatically

---

\(^4\) As S callert’s (2011) detailed analysis has indicated, the Sotak stress demonstrates some unique features, such as the accent on final open syllables in a.p. c (do l’es’a, do voz’a, drev’o, ok’o).

\(^5\) In Central Slovak dialects as well as in Standard Slovak it appears only in loanwords (analógia, chlór, kópia etc.), as original Old Slovak *ō had been diphthongised into ó (uo).

\(^6\) The Orava dialect is labelled as 11 on Map 2.

\(^7\) Examples: păďesăt ‘50’ < *pętę desętъ, robă ‘they do’ < *orbętъ in Orava (H abovšt iak 1965, 44), prăţa ‘yarn’ < *prędja, svătŏk ‘saint’s day’ < *svętъkъ in Gemer (O rlovský 1975, 73), the standard forms being: pădesiăt, robă, priadza, svătŏk.

\(^8\) Examples: păľă ‘field (nom. pl.)’, koňăr ‘groom’ in Orava (H abovšt iak 1965, 43), vračăm să ‘I’m coming back’, vajcă ‘egg (nom. pl.)’ in Gemer (O rlovský 1975, 74-75), the standard forms being: polia, koniar, vračiam sa, vajcia.

\(^9\) Examples: lăţ ‘pour’ < *Išjati, brăţă ‘brothers’ < *bratęja in Orava (H abovšt iak 1965, 43-44), zdrăvă ‘health (gen. sg.)’ < *sędorvęjă in Gemer (O rlovský 1975, 74), the standard forms being: liăt, brăția, zdrăvia.
result in a diphthong – in other words, that Slovak makes a clear distinction between diphthongs and corresponding two-phoneme groups. Moreover, minimal pairs can be found: *hostia* (two syllables) ‘guests’ ~ (three syllables) ‘sacramental bread’, *kúria* (two syllables) ‘they heat’ ~ (three syllables) ‘Curia’, *razia* (two syllables) ‘they mint’ ~ (three syllables) ‘raid’. It should also be stressed that the Slovak sequence *ou* [ou], appearing, for instance, in the instrumental singular feminine ending (e.g. *ženou*), is (unlike in Czech) not a diphthong, and therefore does not indicate a reflex of the old length, as the *ú > ou* diphthongisation is not found in any Slovak dialect.  

Diphthongs are typical for Central Slovak dialects, and, since they served as the basis for the standardisation of Slovak, they are also a characteristic feature of Standard Slovak phonology. They are also present in northern West Slovak dialects, which have been under great influence of Central Slovak. In East Slovak dialects all the long vowels became short, and *ia* is the sole diphthong, appearing exclusively as a reflex of the long front nasal vowel after a labial. In most East Slovak idioms the *ie* and *uo* diphthongs monophthongised (probably via an interim *í, é* phase) into *i, u*, preserving an alternation of quantity that was revalued as quality: *kuň* ‘horse’ – gen. sg. *koňa, šňix ‘snow’ – šňehu*. In Southwest Slovak dialects the *ie, uo* diphthongs likewise monophthongised into *i/é* and *ú/ó* respectively.

Both Proto-Slavic tones, the acute and the circumflex, are reflected in Slovak as shortness: (a.p. a) *dym* m. ‘smoke’, *had* m. ‘snake’, *hrach* m. ‘pea’, *juh* m. ‘south’, *mak* m. ‘poppy’, *pluh* m. ‘plough’, *prah* m. ‘threshold’, *baba* f. ‘old woman’, *hlina* f. ‘clay’, *hnida* f. ‘nit’, *hriva* f. ‘mane’, *hruda* f. ‘clod’, *huba* f. ‘mushroom’, *husle* f. pl.t. ‘violin’, *chrasta* f. (*korsta*) ‘scab’, *krava* f. ‘cow’, *lipa* f. ‘linden’, *mreže* f. pl.t. ‘bars’, *mucha* f. ‘fly’, *rana* f. ‘wound’, *sila* f. ‘strength, force’, *slina* f. ‘saliva’, *vrana* f. ‘crow’, *žaba* f. ‘frog’, *žila* f. ‘vein’, *dlaň, -i* f. ‘palm’, *med’, *-i* f. ‘copper’, *myš, -i* f. ‘mouse’, *blato* n. ‘mud’, *leto* n. ‘summer’, *maslo* n. ‘butter’, *radlo* n. ‘plough’, *sadlo* n. ‘fat’, *sito* n. ‘sieve’; (a.p. c) *dub* m. ‘oak’, *dlh* m. ‘debt’, *hlas* m. ‘voice’, *hnev* m. ‘anger’, *hrad* m. ‘castle’, *klas* m. ‘ear’, *kvet* m. ‘flower’, *les* m. ‘forest’, *list* m. ‘leaf’, *mech* m. ‘sack’, *muž* m. ‘man’, *rad* (*řed*ř) m. ‘line; queue’, *rub* m. ‘reverse’, *smrad* m. ‘stink’, *sneh* m. ‘snow’, *strach* m. ‘fear’, *sud* m. ‘barrel’, *syn* m. ‘son’, *vek*  

---

10 Synchronically it can also be interpreted as the biphonemic sequence /ov/ – since in Slovak /v/ is realised as [u] in the syllable coda (Jakobson 1962, 223). Thus, from the phonological point of view *ženou* and *domov* ‘home’ end identically.
The isogloss dividing the long and the short reflexes of the Proto-Slavic acute does not follow the linguistic boundary between Czech and Slovak. Instead, it passes through Moravia close to the Bohemia-Moravia borderline (Bělič 1972, 16), and in the south turns east separating the Záhorie region (an area in the extreme west of Slovakia between the Czech-Slovak border and the Malé Karpaty mountain range) from the remainder of the Slovak linguistic territory, making the Záhorie dialect the only Slovak dialect to have long reflexes of the acute in two-syllable words: kráva ‘cow’, suáma ‘straw’ (Krajčovič 1988, 209). However, it should be stressed that the Záhorie dialect exhibits numerous language features that are typical of Czech, and that it should therefore in the context of comparative-historical linguistics be considered as a transitional Czech-Slovak dialect. Outside the Záhorie dialect only secondary traces of the acute can be found, for example in the quantity of some derived nouns that belong to accentual paradigm a, such as diminutives derived by the suffix *-ъk-: baba – babka, lípa – lipka, mucha – muška, rana – ranka, žila – žilka, sito – sitko (all a.p. a), compare with (a.p. b) žena ‘woman’ – žienka, pero ‘feather’ – pierko; (a.p. c) hlas– hlások, hrad–hrádok, klas – klások, kus (*kòsъ) ‘piece’ – kúsok, mech– miešok, vlk– vĺčok, hlava– hlávka, noha ‘leg’ – nôžka, ruka – rúčka, kost ‘bone’ – kôstka, telo – tielko etc. There are also exceptions with a length, the most frequent being: mráz, mrazu m. ‘freeze, frost’, vietor, vetra m. ‘wind’, chlieb, chleba m. ‘bread’, miera f. ‘measure’, viera f. ‘belief’, miesto n. ‘place’, dielo n. ‘work’ (see the discussion in Nonnenmacher-Pribić 1961, 78–80).

Shortness as the reflex of the acute is something that Slovak has in common with Polish and Lower Sorbian; however, it would be a mistake to connect this feature with the so-called South Slavicisms in Central Slovak, since, as we have seen, shortness as the reflex of the acute is by far more widespread in the West Slavic area and dates to before the formation of Slovak as a distinct Slavic language.

The only Proto-Slavic tone to be consistently reflected in Slovak as length is the neoacute: diel m. ‘part’, hriech m. ‘sin’, chliev m. ‘pigsty’, klát m. ‘beam’,
Another Slovak peculiarity (in Central Slovak and most West Slovak dialects) is the lengthening of short stems that belong to the Proto-Slavic accentual paradigm \(b\): \(bôb\), -\(u\) ‘bean’, \(dážd\)’, \(dažd’\)‘rain’ (\(děšč\) in West Slovak), \(kôl\), \(kola\) ‘ile, stake’, \(kôň\), \(koňa\) ‘horse’, \(kôpor\), -\(pru\) ‘dill’ (< *kopřь), \(kôš\), \(koša\) ‘basket’, \(nôž\), \(noža\) ‘knife’, \(pôst\), -\(u\) ‘fast’, \(stôl\), \(stola\) ‘table’, \(vôdor\), -\(dرا\) ‘hay-loft’ (< *odrь), \(vôl\), \(vola\) ‘ox’. The final syllable of two-syllable words is also lengthened: \(koniec\), -\(nca\) m. ‘end’, \(hrniec\) ‘pot’, \(čepiec\) ‘bonnet’, \(veniec\) ‘wreath’ (in Standard Slovak also the toponym Turiec and the old Germanism nebožiezec ‘auger’), \(chrbát\), -\(bta\) ‘back’. In the dialects the number of such examples is much higher. First mention should be given to the noun \(otiec\) ‘father’, which is widespread in West Slovak and Central Slovak dialects (South-West Slovak dialects have \(otéc\), and the Topoľčany dialect has \(otíc\)), but Standard Slovak has \(otec\), taken from the 19th-century urban idiom of Liptovsky Mikuláš, upon which L. Štúr based his standard language. In the Topoľčany dialect area numerous examples of the lengthening of the -\(ьcь\) suffix have been attested, and have yet to be studied: \(zvońíc\) ‘doorbell’, \(stolíc\) ‘chair’, \(krajíc\) ‘slice’. In dialects the form \(živôt\) ‘life’ – the normal form in Štúr’s language – is almost ubiquitous as well, and the form \(tvarôh\) ‘curd cheese’ is also attested (comp. with Russ. \(творóг\), -\(á\)/-\(ý\)).

11 To this list should be added \(kotol\) ‘kettle’ (< *kotьlъ), which in most Central Slovak dialects has length in the second syllable: \(kotál\) in most North Central Slovak, \(kotôl\) in South West Central Slovak and \(koťεų/kotέų\) in the Gemer dialect (cf. SCR. \(kòtao\), Russ. \(komёл\)).

11 For instance, in locations: Suľ’ov Veľká Bytča, Poluvsie Prievidza, Horné Pršany Banská Bystrica.
The original distribution of quantity described above has been disturbed by numerous later phonological processes, in particular the phonotactic neutralisation of quantity. The best-known such process is undoubtedly the so-called Rhythmic Law – the usual albeit not particularly well-chosen term for the progressive neutralisation of quantity in a disyllabic sequence. Should two originally long syllables be juxtaposed as a result of inflection or derivation, the second syllable is shortened, e.g. in krátky ‘short’ compared with dobrý ‘good’ This rule holds only in Central Slovak dialects, from which it was co-opted into the standard language. The origins of the rule are unclear, however, it should be kept in mind that its oldest reliable attestations date to the end of the 16th century (Habijanec 2012, 466). In today’s Standard Slovak the rule has many exceptions, arising through the generalisation of quantity in some grammatical categories, for example in the present tense 3rd person plural ending of ľ-conjugation verbs: držia ‘they hold’, robia ‘they work’, but also súdia ‘they try’, kúpia ‘they will buy’, or in the genitive plural -í ending: vôňa ‘odour’ – vôní (gen. pl.), čakáreň ‘waiting room’ – čakární etc.

Less well-known and still insufficiently researched is the so-called chain neutralisation of quantity, whereby in some categories the long syllable shortens the two immediately following syllables on a surface level. For example, in iterative verbs the long syllable of the root shortens not only the iterative suffix -áv-, but also the grammatical ending that follows it: chytat’ ‘catch’ – chytám, chytávat’ – chytávam (with the regular Rhythmic Law), získat’ ‘obtain’ – získam (with the regular RL), but získavať – získavam (< *získávám). Similarly, the diminutive suffix -ík is shortened after a long syllable: šuhaj ‘lad’ – šuhajík, sedliak ‘peasant’ – sedliácik (with the regular RL), but also in vojak ‘soldier’ – vojačík, zajac ‘rabbit’ – zajačík. Those cases can be explained by a two-stage derivation whereby on a deep level the long syllable shortens the following long syllable, and is then itself shortened either through the Rhythmic Law or through phonotactic shortening as in vojak, zajac (more on this below). Historical language sources point to this sequence having a diachronic background as well (Habijanec 2011, 174).

Another important case of neutralisation of quantity is the phonotactic shortening of diphthongs. Front diphthongs ia and ie are shortened into a and e, respectively, after j. As a rule, the long á does not appear after j, since after a soft consonant it regularly becomes ia and is shortened as a result; however, in some of the dialects that have diphthongs the sequence já can
appear, through the generalisation of length in some suffixes and endings. As a consequence of this rule, the original quantity of non-high vowels in post-\( j \) positions is reflected only in those dialects where the long \( ā \) was not diphthongised (primarily the southern West Slovak dialects). This rule is insufficiently well-known in comparative-historical Balto-Slavic accentology, as is obvious from no less a figure than Illič-Svitýč (1963, 121) stating about Slovak \textit{jadro}: “с трудно объяснимой краткостью” (in comparison with Czech \textit{jádro}).

Similarly, the diphthong \( ď \) is shortened after \( v \) when the latter follows another consonant: \( môj \) ‘my’ vs. \( tuoj \) ‘your’, \( stvora \) ‘creature’ (comp. with Cz. \textit{stvúra}), but \( vôl \), \( vôľa \) ‘will’, \( vôňa \). Consequently \( o \) after a consonant + \( v \) sequence exhibits the original quantity only in those dialects in which the long \( ď \) was not diphthongised: for example, in the case of \textit{dvor} ‘yard’, which belongs to accentual paradigm \( b \) (SCR. \textit{dvôr}, \textit{dvóra}, Russ. \textit{dvor}, \textit{dvorá}) and should therefore be lengthened (see above), in southern West Slovak dialects we find: \( po\, celén\, dvóre \) (Kostolné \textit{Myjava}), \( na\, dvóre \) (Šípkové \textit{Piešťany}), \( za\, dvórom \) (Modranka \textit{Trnava}), \( ze\, šeckých\, dvóröv \) (Lukáčovce \textit{Nitra}), \( po\, dvóre \) (Moravské Lieskové Nové \textit{Mesto nad Váhom}), even in Central Slovak dialects: \( v\, enom\, dvôre \) (Lešť \textit{Modrý Kameň}), \( na\, dvóre \) (Žaškov \textit{Dolný Kubín}), \( dvar \) (Brusník \textit{Revúca}; \( Źo \> va \) in the Gemer dialect, see Orlovský 1975, 28). It should be pointed out that the Orava examples \( zo\, dôra,\, na\, dôre \) given in Dybo et al. 1993, 188 do not unambiguously indicate the old length, as they are attested in dialects where \( v \) is always realised as \( ų: \textit{otuoriť, kraua} \) etc. (Habovštiak 1965, 87).

Another word of this kind is \textit{chvost} ‘tail’ (Russ. \textit{хвост}, \textit{хvosť}). In South West Slovak dialects we also can found length: \textit{xvóst} (Trakovice \textit{Hlohevec}; Vaďovce \textit{Myjava}; Lukáčovce \textit{Nitra}; Siladice \textit{Trnava}; Dobrá Voda \textit{Piešťany}), \textit{xvósti} (Modranka, Brestovany \textit{Trnava}; Dolná Súča \textit{Trenčín}), \textit{xóst} (Lapáš \textit{Nitra}).

The original distribution of quantity can also be obscured by analogical levelling and generalisation, to which Slovak is prone more than any other West Slavic language. That is primarily the case with genitive plural forms in \(-Ø\) where length has been generalized: (a.p. \( a \)) \textit{silă} – \textit{sil}, (a.p. \( b \)) \textit{žena} – \textit{žien}, \textit{brázda} – \textit{brázd}, (a.p. \( c \)), \textit{noha} – \textit{nôh}, \textit{hlava} – \textit{hláv}. Moreover, length has become such a strong morphonological signal for this grammatical form that even the phonotactic rule decreeing that \( ā \) should be shortened after \( j \) is
broken: *jama* ‘pit’ – *jám*, *jazda* ‘ride, drive’ – *jázd*. Consequently, that a noun belongs to a particular accentual paradigm cannot be reconstructed on the basis of vowel lengthening in genitive plural forms.

All of the foregoing should be kept in mind when using Slovak dialectal data in reconstructing the Proto-Slavic accentual system. Quantity in an attested dialectal form only becomes relevant for the reconstruction when surveyed in the context of the phonological system of the dialect to which the form belongs and the later processes that took place within it. Unfortunately, Slovak dialectological works, whether general surveys or descriptions of individual dialects, are very hard to come by outside of Slovakia and almost none are available in major world languages (*Lifanova* 2012 being a rare exception). Slovak dialectal data is most frequently gleaned from the Atlas of the Slovak Language, the concept of which is based on the great variety, but a limited number, of entries and information points, and which shows the distribution of features in a somewhat simplified way. During work on the Atlas the rich (and at that point incomplete) dialectological material from the internal collection of the Department of Dialectology of *Ľudovít Štúr* Linguistics Institute, now serving as the basis for the Dictionary of Slovak dialects (1: A–K, 1994; 2: L–P, 2006), was not taken into account. As the examples in the Dictionary were greatly reduced, for objective reasons, in comparison with their frequency in the corpus, and since they were understandably selected on geographical criteria, many interesting attestations relevant to comparative-historical accentology remained hidden from researchers’ eyes. This state of affairs should be changed by the above-mentioned project, the aims of which include analysing the rich material of Slovak dialects from an accentological standpoint and making it accessible to a wide community of researchers. This paper is the first step in that direction.
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Map 1. **Historical regions of Slovakia** (Pauliny 1963, 11)

Map 2. **Distribution of the Slovak dialects** (Štolc 1994, 179)
Santrauka

Slovakų kalba paprastai nelaikoma turtingu ir informatyviu protoslavų akcentinės sistemos rekonstrukcijos šaltiniu. Be gerai žinomo fakto, kad slovakų kalba, kitaip nei čekų, neišlaikė jokių protoslavų akūto pėdsakų, tam įtakos turėtų ir mažiausiai dvi jos raidos ypatybės: 1) kiekybės opozicijos dažnai neutralizuotos dėl daugelio vėliau vykusų procesų, pvz., ritminio dėsnio ar dvibalsių $ia$, $ie$ monofońiozuotos jų po $j$; 2) slovakų kalba labiau nei bet kurį kita vokų slavų kalbą linkusi į apibendrinimą ir analoginį išlyginimą, paveikusį, be kitų dalykų, ir balsių kiekybės raidą, plg. ilgumo apibendrinimą tam tikrose gramatinėse kategorijose (pvz., gen. pl.) ar kiekybinių modelių taikymą pagal analogiją vediniuose. Nepaisant to, slovakų kalba vis dėlto teikia vertingų duomenų protoslavų akcentinės sistemos rekonstrukcijai, pvz., nuosekliai pasitaikantis akcentinės paradigmos $b$ daiktavardžių šaknies balsio ilgumas nom. sg. formoje ($bôb$, $kôl$, $stôl$...). Dar vertingesnės informacijos randama turtingo slovakų tarmų medžiagoje, kuri tarptautiniam mokslui nėra nei pakankamai žinoma, nei lengvai prieinama. Straipsnyje siūlomos slovakų tarmų balsių kiekybės tyrimų galiai būti vertinga protoslavų akcentinės sistemos rekonstrukcijai.
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