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

1. Introduction
Comparative historical study of Slavic accentuation has resulted in a
generally-accepted reconstruction of the accentual system of Slavic nouns
and verbs (Stang 1957; Illič-Svityč 1963; Dybo 1963; Garde 1976;
Kiparsky, Halle 1977; Dybo 1981). Stang (1957) was the first to
reconstruct three nominal accentual paradigms for Proto-Slavic underived
nouns, the accentual paradigms (AP) A, B, and C (Table 1). AP-A had
consistent barytonic (root stress) stems; AP-B had consistent oxytonic
(post-stem stress) accentuation; and AP-C had a mobile pattern in which
the stress alternated between the first syllable and the ending. Proto-Slavic
pitch intonations are reconstructed based on South Slavic intonations, East
Slavic ictus position, and West Slavic quantities. AP-A was characterized by
a root accent with an old acute intonation (˝). The mobile paradigm, AP-C,
was reconstructed with circumflex root intonation (ˇ) in Common Slavic,
which was so realized when the root was accented. As for the intonation
pattern of AP-B nouns, some forms have neo-acute intonation on the stem
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in contemporary Serbo-Croatian (SC) dialects. In Čakavian, for example, this neo-acute appears as a rising intonation, *dvôr*₁ ‘courtyard’. Following Ivšič 1915, Stang hypothesized that these neo-acute forms are the result of stress retraction from *jers* and certain other endings. Table 1 illustrates Stang’s reconstruction of the three nominal accentual paradigms.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AP- A</th>
<th>AP- B</th>
<th>AP- C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>masc.</td>
<td><em>gâdъ</em></td>
<td><em>bobъ</em></td>
<td><em>sâdъ</em> - <em>sady</em> (instr. pl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem.</td>
<td><em>băba</em></td>
<td><em>bêdâ</em></td>
<td><em>vodâ</em> - <em>vôdô</em> (acc. sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neut.</td>
<td><em>tûtro</em></td>
<td><em>vinô</em></td>
<td><em>nêbo</em> - <em>nebesâ</em> (nom.-acc. pl.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

---

₁ Ivšič (1915) designated the Čakavian neo-acute with the same symbol as the Lithuanian circumflex, due to their phonetic similarity (they are both rising).
accented (dominant) roots. On the other hand, AP-C consisted of inherently unaccented (recessive) roots. Table 2 presents the Balto-Slavic (BSl) accentual nominal system, following Dybo et al. 1993 and Dybo 2000; it combines the intonations (acute and circumflex) with the dominant / recessive roots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IE</th>
<th>Barytone</th>
<th>Mobile-Oxytone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long / Short</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSI</td>
<td>1 (dominant)</td>
<td>2 (recessive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acute / Circumflex</td>
<td>Acute / Circumflex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acute</td>
<td>Circumflex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobile   &lt; SL</td>
<td>Mobile + SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slav</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acute, Barytone</td>
<td>Oxytone &lt; DL / SL,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neo-acute &lt; BSI Circumflex²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

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

³ BSl circumflex is a rising intonation and should be differentiated from the Slavic circumflex, which is a falling intonation.
but in the genitive and in the nominative-accusative plural they have characteristics of AP-B (Hamm et al. 1956, 106). Consider the following examples (Illič-Svityč 1963, 119).

a. “Mixed” paradigm

Susak: γrȃt, gen. γrådȁ; zȗp, zūbȁ; rȗwàn, røyù

Istra: grȃd, gen. grādȁ; lȗk, lūkȁ; snȇg, snēgȁ; cȅp, nom-acc. pl. cēpȋ; vlȃs, nom.-acc. pl. vlāsȋ

b. “Regular” mobile paradigm

Susak: γlȃs, gen. γlȃsa; mȉx, mȉxa; xȗt, xȍda

Istra: glȃs, gen. glȃsa; mȅh, mȅha; hȇd, hȍda; plȅn, plȅna

Additional traces of the original distinction were found in the East Slavic zone, e.g., in the west Ukrainian dialects and in the Kriviči dialects, which include northwest Russian and northeast Byelorussian dialects (Nikolaev 1988; 1989; 1991). These findings led to the formulation of another accentual paradigm, AP-D (Bulatova et al. 1988; Dybo et al. 1990; 1993), which is argued to constitute an archaic remnant of the original IE masculine orthotonic nouns (i.e., dominant stressed roots) with BSI circumflex intonation. In Slavic these nouns should have yielded an exclusively oxytomic accentuation similar to AP-B, but for reasons that remain unclear the intonation of the nom.-acc. forms of these nouns became recessive, with the oblique cases retaining the accentuation of the original dominant roots. This metatony of the nom.-acc. created a “mixed” paradigm characterized by enclinomena forms in the direct cases and oxytone forms in the oblique cases.\footnote{A phonetic explanation of tone change from dominant (high) to recessive (low) in nom.-acc. sg. is of a typological character. Dybo and Nikolaev (1993) assume that the disappearance of final -\*s in these forms created metatony, similar to processes of tonogenesis reconstructed for the development of Old Chinese.} The mixed paradigm was probably the reason that the whole paradigm became mobile in most of the Slavic dialects, as paradigmatic alternations were marked for the originally mobile paradigm with recessive roots, the AP-C.

Some linguists (Langston 2006, 260; Vermeer 1984, 359) believe that some of the evidence for AP-D, for example in Čakavian, should be dismissed because the material was not recorded properly or is ambiguous.
Regarding the Susak dialect, which provided some of the first evidence for the AP-D accentual paradigm, this argument may have some validity. The description of Hamm et al. (1956) has no recordings that would serve to back up their findings. Also, there are only 13 forms with “additional” oxy-tone accents in their description, and some of these forms are mentioned later in their description as having the regular barytonic accent in oblique forms. In addition, as was mentioned above, in the 1950s there was a massive exodus from Susak Island, which is now largely inhabited by newcomers. Thus, the peculiar accentual features of the Susak dialect were hard to verify.

2. The Current Study

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

2.1. Methods

The recordings were made during two fieldtrips to New Jersey and New York. The first trip was in December 2007; recordings were made by Martina Martinović and Miriam Shrager in a church in Manhattan and in a private house. The second field trip was taken in March 2010; the recordings were made by Elena Boudovskaja and Miriam Shrager in two Susak clubs in New Jersey. The data were collected through recording direct and contextual elicitations onto audio tapes and digitally onto a laptop computer. The recordings contain narrative texts and specifically elicited words. The list of words for the interviews was based on a questionnaire elaborated by Vladimir A. Dybo, Sergej L. Nikolaev, and other scholars working within the basic theoretical framework of the Proto-Slavic accentual reconstruction established by Stang (1957). This questionnaire is designed to elicit the maximum amount of information on the accentual behavior of the inherited Proto-Slavic lexicon in all morphological categories. Thus, for example, for masculine nouns we primarily tried to elicit the forms of the sg. nom., gen., and instr., and the pl. nom., which are relevant to AP-D reflexes. Of course, other forms were produced by the speakers and recorded as well.
The main informants for this study were two women (J., M.) and three men (B., K., N.), all aged 60–75 years, whose recordings contain narrative texts and elicited noun forms. Recordings of other speakers, men and women ages 60–85, consist primarily of texts.

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

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

- ` – long rising
- ′ – short rising
- ’ – stress (short)
- ~ – long falling
- ` – short falling
- ” – old acute

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

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

---

⁵ A thorough phonological description exceeds the scope of this paper, and is the subject of a future project.
⁶ In this paper we use “standard Croatian” for Neo-Štokavian.
Stressed vowels often lengthen in closed syllables. When they lengthen before sonorants they can be rising, as happens in other northern Čakavian dialects (Langston 2006, 12).

There is vowel lengthening in non-final open syllables; in AP-A nouns it seems to be conditioned by the stem vowel (see AP-A word list below).

In Susak, unlike some other Čakavian dialects, we did not find many instances of the neo-acute (long rising) accent in AP-B words in the nominative singular. It seems to be conditioned by the syllabic structure and not by the accentual paradigms. Thus, the long rising accent can occur either in open syllables or in syllables closed by a sonorant (e.g., nasal in the instrumental case) in all accentual paradigms. The neo-acute occurred in AP-B words twice in the nominative when the target word was followed by a copula je (see AP-B word list below).

In certain grammatical endings $m > n$, as in other Čakavian dialects. In this paper it is seen in the instrumental ending.

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

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

Variation between Susak and standard forms is also found in phonology and accentuation. On occasion, speakers would produce a mixture of
standard Croatian and Susak forms while declining a noun. At other times our informants themselves would point out the differences between standard and Susak accentuations, especially for AP-D nouns, where they would comment, “in Croatian it is nōsa, but in Susak we say nosā.”

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

3.2. The reflexes of CSI accentual paradigms in Susak

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

3.2.1. AP-D

The typical reflexes of AP-D, the “mixed paradigm,” have a root circumflex in the nominative and oxytone stress in the oblique cases. Some words have generalized the AP-B accentuation, i.e., a short falling accent on the root in the nominative and oxytone stress in the oblique cases. However, we found many instances of oscillation between barytone and oxytone forms in the oblique cases. There are three types of variations found: 1) between different cases within the paradigms, e.g., gen. vrâga, instr. vrąγon,
2) accentual doublets of the same grammatical case, e.g., gen. grōda, grōdā (more so in the genitive than the instrumental), and 3) accentual variation across speakers of a given word, e.g., J. gen. prōxa, M. prōxā. We address this issue in the Discussion and Conclusions section below.

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

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

**TORT**

1) *brěgъ – Cr. brijēg, brijēga ‘hill’
   Sus. J. brēx, gen. briyā, loc. na briyū, instr. briyōn, N., B. brīx, gen. od briyā, loc. na briyū
2) *gordъ – Cr. grād, grāda ‘town’
   Sus. B., K., N. grōt, gen. grōda, grōdā, instr. grōdon, pl. grōdi, J. grōt, gen. grōda, instr. grōdon, pl. grōdy, yrōdov
3) *moltъ – Cr. mlāt, mlāta ‘flail; big (wooden) hammer’
   Sus. B., K., N. mlōt, gen. mlōta, instr. mlōtōn, pl. mlōti
1) *porxъ – Cr. prāh, *prāha ‘powder, dust’
   Sus. J. prōx, gen. prōxa, M. prōxā, instr. s prōxon, K. prōx, gen. prōxa, instr. sa prōxon
4) *xoldъ – Cr. hlād, hlāda ‘shade’
   Sus. J. xlōt, gen. xlōdā, instr. pod xlōdōn, B., N. xlōt, gen. xlōdā, dat. po xlōdū, instr. xlōdōn
5) *vorgъ – Cr. vrāg, vrāga ‘devil’
   Sus. B., N. vrāx, vrōx, gen. N. vrāya, B. vrāga, instr. vrayōn, vrāgon, vrayōn, vrayūn, pl. vrāzi; J., M. vrāx, gen. vrāya, instr. z vrāyōn, pl. vrāzi, vrāgovi
6) *vortъ – Cr. vrāt, vrāta ‘neck’
**Tъ/бRT**

7) *čьргъ – Cr. ĉrv, ĉrva ‘worm’
   Sus. B., K., N. ĉárv, gen. ĉárvā, instr. ĉárvon, ĉarhōn, pl. ĉárvi, J. ćârv, ćârva, ćârvon, pl. ĉârvo

8) *vьrxъ – Cr. vȓh, vȓha ‘up’ (-ŭ-stem)
   Sus. B., N. vȃrx, gen. varxā, instr. varxon, loc. na varxū ‘peak; top of the mountain’, J., M. vârx, gen. M. vrxā, J. vřha, instr. vârxon, pl. vârxi

**Ű-stems**

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

9) *bokъ – Cr. bȇk, bēka ‘hip’
   Sus. J. buȇk, gen. bokā, instr. bōkon, pl. bōki, bokī, B., K., N. bök, gen. bokā

10) *listъ – Cr. list, lista ‘leaf; sheet of paper’

11) *nosъ – Cr. nōs, nōsa ‘nose’
   Sus. J. nuōs, gen. nosā, instr. z nōson, pl. nōsi, nōsi, nōsovi, B., K., N. nuōs, gen. nosā, instr. z nosōn pl. nōsi

12) *plodъ – Cr. plōd, plōda ‘fruit or any product’
   Sus. J. plōt, gen. plōda, plōdā, instr. plōdon, pl. plōdi, plōdovi, B., K., N. plōt, gen. plōda, instr. plōdon, pl. plōdi, plōdovi

13) *rędъ – Cr. rēd, rēda ‘line, row; order’
   Sus. J. rēt, loc. na redū, B., K., N. rēt, gen. rēda, instr. rēdon, pl. rēdi

**O-stems**

Some of the words in the list below have typical AP-D reflexes, while others have in Susak reflexes of AP-B (e.g., krōf, gen. krovā, strōp, gen. stropā).
14) *brodъ – Cr. bród, brôda ‘ship’
   Sus. B., N. broût, gen. brodã, loc. na brodû; J. loc. na brodû
15) *sêrъ – Cr. cijép, cijêpa ‘flail’
   Sus. J., M. cîp, gen. cipã, instr. s cipôn, pl. cîpi; B. ciêp
16) *cvēť – Cr. cvijét, cvjêta ‘flower’
   Sus. B., K. N. cviêt, on grapes: gen. cvietã, cvîta, pl. cvîeti; of fig tree, gen. cviêta, pl. cviêti; J. cviêt, cvît (of fig tree), gen. cviêta / cvêta, cvîta, instr. cvîton, cvîti
17) *grobъ – Cr. grób, grôba ‘grave’ (AP-B/D)
   Sus. J. yrôp, gen. yrôba, yrobû, instr. yrôbon, yrobôn, pl. yrobì, yrobítiny, yrobovi, B., K., N. yrôp, gen. yrobû, instr. yrobôn, loc. na yrabû, pl. yrobì, yrobovi
18) *kljumъ – Cr. kljûn, kljûna ‘beak’
   Sus. B., N. kljûn, gen. kljunã, instr. kljunôn
19) *krojъ – Cr. krôj, krôja ‘pattern’
   Sus. B., K., N. krôj, gen. B. krojã; N. krôja, krôja, instr. krôjen, pl. krôji, J. krôj
20) *krovъ – Cr. krôv, krôva ‘roof’
   Sus. J. krôf, gen. krovã, instr. krovôn, pl. krôvi, B., K., N. krôf, gen. krovã, instr. krovôn, loc. na krovû, pl. krôvi
21) *měxъ – Cr. mijêh, mijêxa ‘bag made of animal skin’
   Sus. J. mîx, gen. mixã, instr. mixôn, pl. mîsi, B., K., N. mîx, gen. mîxa, instr. mixôn, loc. v mixû, pl. mîsi
22) *plotъ – Cr. plût, plûta ‘fence’
   Sus. J. pluôt, gen. plôta, plotã, instr. plôton, pl. plôti, B., N. pluôt, gen. plôta, instr. plôton, pl. plôti
23) *podъ – Cr. pôd, pôda ‘floor’
   Sus. B., K., N. pôt, gen. podã, instr. s pôdon, pl. podî
24) *prûtъ – Cr. prût, prûta ‘whip’
   Sus. J. prût, gen. prutã, prûta, instr. sa prûton, pl. prûti, B., K., N. prût, gen. prûta, prûta, instr. sa prûton, pl. prûti
25) *rêpъ – Cr. rêp, rêpa ‘tail’
   Sus. J. riêp, gen. riêpa, bez riepã, instr. s riepôn, pl. riêpi, B., K., N. riêp, gen. repã, instr. repôn, repôn, pl. riêpi
26) *rogъ – Cr. róg, rōga ‘horn’
   Sus. J. ruóx, gen. rōya, roya, instr. s roγôn, pl. rōzi, rōgovy, B., N. rōx, gen. roya, instr. roγôn, pl. rōzi
27) *strorъ – Cr. stróp, strópa, pl. stròpovi ‘ceiling’
   Sus. B., N. stróp, gen. stropâ, instr. stropôn, pl. ströpi
28) *zidъ – Cr. zîd, zîda ‘wall’
   Sus. J. zît, gen. zîda, zîdâ, prez zîdâ, instr. zîdon, pl. zîdi, B., N. zît, gen. B. bez zîda, instr. zîdon, pl. zîdi, gen. zîdi
29) *znakъ – Cr. znâk ‘sign’
   Sus. B., N. znɔ̱k, gen. znɔ̱ka, dat. po znɔ̱kû, po... znɔ̱ku, instr. sa znɔ̱kon (?)
30) *zɔbъ – Cr. zûb ‘tooth’
   Sus. B., N. zûp, gen. zubâ, instr. zubôn, pl. zûbi, J. zûp, gen. zûba, instr. zûbon, pl. zûbi (zûbi?)

3.2.2. AP-A

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

1) *bratъ – Cr. brât, brâta ‘brother’
   Sus. J. brât, gen. brâta, instr. z brâton, pl. brâti, B., N. brât, gen. brâta, z brâton, brâti
2) *dědъ – Cr. djȅd, djȅda ‘grandfather’
   Sus. J., B., N. dȅt, gen. dȉda, instr. dȉdon, pl. dȉdovi
3) *dymъ – Cr. dȉm, dîma ‘smoke’
   Sus. J. dȉm, M. dîm, gen. od dîma; B., K., N., dîm, dîm, dîma
4) *jugъ – Cr. jȗg ‘south’
   Sus. J., B., N. jȗg, instr. z jȗgon ‘south’
5) *krajь – Cr. krȃj, krȁja (reflex of AP-C) ‘edge, region’
   Sus. J., M. krȃj, gen. krȃja, M. krȃja, instr. s krȃjen, loc. na krȃju, pl. krȃjevi, B., N. krȳj, gen. krȳja, instr. s krȳjen, loc. na krȳju, pl. krȳjevi
6) *kruhь – Cr. krůx, krůxa ‘bread’
   Sus. J., M., krůx, gen. krůxa, instr. krůxon
7) *lukь – Cr. lůk, lůka ‘onion’
   Sus. J., M., B., N. lůk, gen. lůka, instr. z lůkon
8) *mækь – Cr. màk, màka ‘poppy’
   Sus. J. màk, M. màk, J. gen. smàka, smàka (?), instr. z màkon, B., N. màk, mòk, gen. mòka, instr. z màkon
9) *morzь – Cr. mràz, mràza ‘frost’
   Sus. J., B., N. mròz, gen. mràza, instr. z mràzon
10) *myšь – Cr. mìš, mìša ‘mouse’
    Sus. J., M., B., N. mìš, gen. od mìša, instr. sa mìšon, s mìšon pl. mìši
11) *oglь – Cr. õgalj, õglja ‘coal’
    Sus. J., M., B., N. (ugalj), gen. õgla, pl. õgli, õgli
12) *plačь – Cr. plȁč, plȁča ‘crying’
    Sus. J., M., B., N. plȁč, gen. plȁča, instr. sa plȁčon

3.2.3. AP-B

The typical reflexes of AP-B in Susak have oxytone forms in oblique cases, with a variant specific to these dialects of long rising on the instrumental ending. Sometimes there is lengthening of originally short stem nouns, e.g., dvõr, nuõž, põst. Among the list of AP-B words there are only a few with accentual doublets or variations. Among the long stems we found only in words denoting religious terminology (gen. prȉxa, prȉxȁ, gen. krȉža, krȉžȁ, instr. krȉžon, krȉžõn), indicating interference from standard Croatian. Among the short stems, variations were found only in two words (dvor and grozd), the latter most likely an AP-D word.

I) Long Stems

Unlike other Čakavian dialects, in Susak we did not find the neo-acute in the nominative on the long stems (except půt), but instead we have long falling, the circumflex, which is probably an innovation. However, in two instances below, in (3) and (7), the neo-acute appeared in fast speech in a sentence in which the target noun was followed by the copula je. It is possible that neo-acute is being replaced by the standard Croatian circumflex, especially in closed syllables (dvõra, põsta, põston) and in combination with other words in a sentence
(dvör, but dvör je…). Among long stem nouns, there are some that have reflexes of AP-C, either as the only form or as a variant, e.g., prǐšt, prǐšta; γrǐx, γrīxa / γrīxā.

1) *grěxъ – Cr. grijěh, grijěha ‘sin’
   Sus. B., N. γrǐx ‘sin’, gen. γrīxa, γrīxā, instr. γrīxon, pl. γrīsi

2) *ključь – Cr. kljūč, kljūča ‘key’
   Sus. B., N. kljūč, gen. kljūčen, ključem, pl. kljūči

3) *krȍlъ – Cr. krȃlj, krȃlja ‘king’
   Sus. B., N. kröl (but: krōlj je), gen. krölā, pl. krolī

4) *križь – Cr. krȋž, krīža ‘cross’
   Sus. B., N. krīž, gen. krīža, križā, instr. križon, križōn, loc. na kržȗ

5) *pǫtь – Cr. pȗt, púta ‘road, way’
   Sus. B., N. pũt, gen. pũta, instr. pũton, pl. pūti

6) *pryščь – Cr. prǐšt, prǐšta ‘furuncle, boil’
   Sus. B., N. prǐšt, gen. prǐšta, pl. prǐšti

II) Short Stems

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

7) *dvorъ – Cr. dvŏr, dvór ‘palace, court’
   Sus. B., N. dvŏr, (but dvŏr je…), gen. dvŏra, dvorā, sprid dvorā, loc. na dvorȗ, instr. sa dvorōn, dvorōn, pl. nom. dvŏri, dvŏri, dvŏri; J. gen. dvŏra ‘back/front yard’

8) *dȕždjь – Cr. kiša, (dāžd, dāžda) ‘rain’
   Sus. B., N. dāš ‘rain’, gen. daž ‘à, instr. z dažōn, dažōn

9) *grozdъ – Cr. grȍzd, grōzda/grȍzda ‘cluster, bunch’
   Sus. B., N. yrōst, gen. od yrozdȕ, yrozdā, pl. yrozdī; J. gen. yrozdȕ

10) *ježь – Cr. jȅž, instr. jȅžom ‘hedgehog’
    Sus. B., N. jȅž, gen. jȅža, instr. jȅžen, pl. jȅži, gen. jȅžov

11) *konjъ – Cr. kȏnj, kȏnja ‘horse’
    Sus. B., N. kȏnj, gen. konjā, instr. konjōn, pl. kȏni, 2, 3 konī
12) *nožь – Cr. nôž, nôža ‘knife’
   Sus. B., N. nuž, gen. noža, instr. s nožën, pl. noži
13) *popъ – Cr. póp, pópa ‘priest’
   Sus. B., N. póp, gen. popa, instr. popon, pl. popi
14) *postъ – Cr. pôst, pôsta, pôsta ‘fast’ (AP-B/D)
   Sus. J., M. pôst, gen. pôsta, instr. pôston, B., N. póp, gen. popa,
   instr. popon, pl. popi
15) *pьsъ – Cr. ps, psa ‘dog’
   Sus. B., N. päs, fcina (f), gen. fcä, pl. fcë

3.2.4. AP-C

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

1) *bogъ – Cr. bôg, bôga ‘god’
   Sus. J., M., B., N. bôx / buôx, gen. bôga, instr. bôgon, pl. bôgovi,
   bogi
2) *drugъ – Cr. drûg, drûga ‘friend’
   Sus. J., M., B. drûx ‘partizan, comrade’, gen. drûga, instr. drûgon,
   voc. drûže moj, pl. drûgovi, drûzi
3) *duxъ – Cr. dûx, dûxa ‘ghost’
   Sus. J., M. dûx, gen. dûxa, dûxa, instr. dûxon, pl. dûxovi, B., N. dûx,
   gen. dûxa, instr. dûxon, pl. dûxovi
4) *dьnь – Cr. dûn, dûna ‘day’
   Sus. J., M., B., N. dûn, gen. dûna pl. dûni, dûnëvi
5) *gnojь – Cr. gnôj, gnôja ‘pus’
   Sus. J., B., N. gnôj, gen. gnôja, instr. z gnôjen
6) *goldъ – Cr. glâd, glâda ‘hunger’
   Sus. J., B., N. glôd, gen. ôd gloda, instr. glôdon
7) *jědъ – Cr. jêd, jêda, *jêda ‘bitterness’
   Sus. J., B., N. jût, gen. ôd jîda, ôd jîda, instr. z jîdon
8) *lojь – Cr. lôj, lôja ‘animal fat’
   Sus. J., B., N. lôj, gen. lôja, instr. z lôjon
4. Discussion and Conclusion

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

**AP-D:** brîx, gen. od briyâ; xlɔ̆t, gen. xlɔ̆dâ
**AP-B:** γrîx, gen. γrîxa, γrîxa; krɔ̆l, (but: krɔ̆lj je), gen. krɔ̆lâ

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

**AP-D:** buŒk, gen. bokâ; broŒt, gen. brodâ
**AP-B:** γröst, gen. od γrozdâ; kônj, gen. konjâ

Regarding the problem of accentual variations of AP-D words in Hamm et al. 1956 and in our work, it has been mentioned (Langston 2007) that
these variations constitute inconclusive evidence of the existence of AP-D. However, looking at the three types of variations mentioned in this work (p. 214), it is evident that they mostly occur in AP-D nouns, and there are almost no such variations in other paradigms. There are two possible explanations for this variation being almost exclusive to the AP-D class: It is possible that the speakers themselves are confused due to the mixed type of the AP-D, and it might be due to interference from standard Croatian (we did not find evidence of dialectal variation among Susak speakers of New Jersey). It must be mentioned that other Slavic dialects with the AP-D paradigm, e.g. Krivići dialects, also show accentual variations in AP-D nouns (Shrager 2007, 89). Thus, these variations might reflect archaic alternations native to the Susak dialect (and perhaps other Slavic dialects). Further comparative work will be needed to address this issue.

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

_Santrauka_
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