

On the principal sources for the study of Čakavian dialects with neocircumflex in adjectives and e-presents

Willem Vermeer

[Note on the 2009 version. This article appeared in *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 2, 1982, 279-340. It grew out of sustained efforts (beginning in 1974) to determine what was known at the time about the north-western periphery of the Serbo-Croatian linguistic area from the point of view of Slavic accentology, notably against the background of the evidence adduced by Vladislav M. Illič-Svityč suggesting that a particular Proto-Slavic archaism had maintained itself in the Čakavian NW.

Minor matters having to do with lay-out apart, this version reproduces the printed text faithfully with very minor exceptions:

- Due to a mistake I made in the camera-ready copy I delivered to the editors back in 1982, the final lines of four of the original pages (289, 291, 321, and 323) are absent from the printed version. They have been restored here.
- A handful of obvious typos and potentially confusing infelicities have been tacitly corrected.
- In two cases the original text has “west” where “east” was intended; these have been put right and indicated as such in square brackets.
- The endnotes of the original edition (pp. 327-333) have been changed to footnotes.
- The page numbers of the original edition have been added, as in the following example: “from |280| sight”, meaning that “from” is the last word on p. 279 and “sight” the first word on p. 280. However, where words were printed partly on one and partly on another page, page numbers have been put after them rather than in the middle, hence “Lovljanov |291|” instead of “Lovlja-|291|nov”.]

0. Introduction.

It is well-known that in north-western Croatia spectacular dialect differences are found (e.g. Ivić 1961: 191). The causes are not disputed: owing to relatively recent migrations, most of which are ultimately connected with the Turkish presence on the western part of the Balkans from the fifteenth century onwards, dialects of quite different origins have become juxtaposed in ways that make for startling transitions one cannot help noticing when passing from one village to the next.

In this article I shall try to characterize briefly the descriptive literature devoted to one of the most interesting groups of dialects spoken in north-western Croatia: those “čakavian” dialects that differ from the rest of čakavian/štokavian in having “neocircumflex” lengthening in forms like *stârî* and *gîne*, and from kajkavian and Slovene in not having neocircumflex in many more types of cases.

Foreigners studying the dialects of Serbo-Croat usually do so without having been exposed to a training based on the traditions that have grown to dominate the field. The drawbacks of this are obvious. However, one important advantage should not be lost from |280| sight: traditions tend to contain elements that were useful in the past but have turned into so many burdens and have only stayed around as a consequence

of educational inertia. Obviously outsiders are in a better position to spot such obsolete elements than are those whose training involved the unquestioning acceptance of all of the tradition. In such cases it is the outsider's task to draw attention to elements of the tradition he or she feels to have become a nuisance. In approaching as an outsider the dialects of north-western Croatia one soon becomes aware of the way in which progress has been hampered by two aspects of the tradition that do not deserve to be retained:

- A. The view that the Serbo-Croat dialects both can and have to be classified into three allegedly "basic" groups: kajkavian, čakavian and štokavian.
- B. The view that in searching for remnants of the Proto-Slavonic tone distinction it is sufficient to look for long vowels that more or less sound like the čakavian or Posavian "acute" as described by Belić and Ivšić.

It is hardly possible to talk about the dialects of north-western Croatia without briefly discussing these two points.¹

1. Why "kajkavian", "čakavian" and "štokavian"?

Almost anybody who knows some Serbo-Croat is familiar with the traditional classification of its dialects into three basic groups: kajkavian, čakavian and štokavian. Textbooks intended for teaching foreigners the rudiments of the language nearly always mention the traditional classification or even contain a dialect map based on it (Subotić and Forbes 1918, Schmaus 1960, Babić 1964, Partridge 1964, Dmitriev [281] and Safronov 1975, Drilo s.a. etc.) On the other end of the scale we find that in the recent book on the phonological systems of the Yugoslav dialects incorporated into the *OLA* (Ivić et al. 1981), kajkavian, čakavian and štokavian are listed separately almost as if they were three distinct languages. As a result the suggestion is maintained that the traditional classification is somehow basic and corresponds to ascertainable features of reality. However, nothing could be further from the truth and little would be lost if the traditional classification would be discarded altogether.

An investigator faced with a large variety of facts is almost forced to operate with all kinds of rough preliminary classifications of those facts before he or she can even begin to look for explanatory theories that will ultimately render all classifications superfluous. The dialectologist constitutes no exception and it is only natural that Serbo-Croat dialectology when still in its infancy adopted a rough classification of the language into three basic dialect groups: "kajkavian", "čakavian" and "štokavian". The classification corresponded to popular feelings about dialect differences, seemed not to be contradicted by the facts of the spoken dialects as long as virtually no such facts were known and accounted to some extent for the properties of the different varieties of written language that had been in use prior to the adoption of neo-štokavian as the basis of the new Standard Language.

¹ The problem of the traditional classification will be dealt with in section 1, that of the tone distinction in section 3.3.

However, as soon as the data started piling up it became clear that the classification embodied a grossly oversimplified view of reality. Dialects combining properties originally thought to be characteristic of different basic groups turned out to be the rule rather than the exception and the criteria [282] by which a given dialect was “assigned a place” were progressively watered down until by the end of the nineteenth century the concepts “čakavian” and “štokavian” had become almost empty, cf. Rešetar (1891: 108f).² Given this situation it is difficult not to agree with Jagić when he states: “es ist falsch (...), von einem einzigen što- und einem einzigen ča-Dialect auszugehen; es gibt vielmehr eine stufenweise sich ablagernde Pluralität von Dialecten” (1895: 67).³ In the same period the delimitation of “čakavian” and “kajkavian” started to give trouble (e.g. Milčetić 1894), which it has continued to do up to the present day (e.g. Težak 1981).

Under the circumstances one would have expected that dialectologists would have abandoned the traditional classification and would have developed new classifications more suitable for accommodating the facts. However, this was not what happened and as a consequence the traditional classification has become a burden for Serbo-Croat dialectology, in particular because it is a source of useless controversies about problems that are in the last resort terminological. There are several reasons why it would be better to do away with the traditional classification.

1.1. Absence of generally accepted criteria.

The basic character of the three Serbo-Croat dialect groups has not been questioned seriously by anyone since Jagić (but cf. note 3). One would expect there to be a set of clear-cut criteria by which a newly-discovered dialect can be put into the group where it belongs. Surprisingly enough, however, there is no such set of clear-cut criteria everybody agrees on. This absence of generally accepted criteria leads to pointless

² The enormous list of “typically čakavian characteristics” proposed in the earlier literature are reduced by Rešetar to a mere ten, all of which are objectionable because they concern features the distribution of which does not correspond with that of the dialects traditionally labelled “čakavian”: 1. the isogloss between *đ* (“štok.”) and *j* (“čak.”) from PSl. *d'* has not been drawn (forms with *j* are common-place in western štok. dialects whereas *đ* occurs all over čak., cf. also below, section 3.4 on Veprinac), 2. *šč* is very common in štok., whereas *št* is normal in Istrian ikavian, 3. many čakavian dialects have *što* or *kaj*, 4. *a* < *ę* has different isoglosses in different words, some of which have *a* in numerous štok. dialects, 5. contracted forms like *ma* ‘moja’ are rare even in čak., and have been attested in Posavian and kajk., 6. in čak. the *ā*-stem instr.sg. ending is more often *-um* or *-om* than *-u*, 7. the paradigm *bim, biš, bi, bimo, bite, bi* is very far from being generally čak., 8. the use of a feminine adjective with a neuter noun in the nom./acc.pl. (like Omišalj *zelēnē perā*) is rare even in čak., 9. the allegedly čakavian use of the perfective present with future reference, if it occurs at all, is at best exceedingly rare in living čak. dialects, and the same holds for 10. the use of the imperative in dependent clauses.

³ One of the very few modern scholars to wholeheartedly agree with Jagić is Ivić: “Neuere Untersuchungen zeigen immer mehr, wie sehr V. Jagić im Recht war, als er im *AfSlPh* XVII die Theorie von der Dialektkette im südslavischen Sprachgebiet proklamierte” (1958: 67). (The only major modification of the traditional scheme to enjoy any popularity is Rešetar’s division of the štokavian block into štokavian proper on the one hand and “Torlak” on the other, which has been accepted by such scholars as Ivić and Brozović, but is still far from being general, cf., e.g., Peco 1978.)

discussions about such non-problems as |283| whether to call a given Istrian dialect “čakavian” or “štokavian”. Since evidently the outcome of enquiries into problems of the sort depends on the choice of criteria and since different investigators choose different criteria it is usually the case that everybody is right in his own way. In most cases it is evident that investigators take care to select those criteria that will enable them to arrive at the result they like best.

1.2. Stammbaum thinking lurking in the background.

The traditional classification suggests a naive and implausible theory about the development of Serbo-Croat (indeed, it is often tacitly assumed to be identical with such a theory): it suggests that at some moment in the past Serbo-Croat split up Stammbaum-wise into three distinct branches and that the difficulties dialectologists experience when trying to classify a given dialect are largely the outcome of mutual interference between representatives of the three branches after contact between the branches had been reestablished.

It is evident that this view, if interpreted loosely, can accommodate all facts, in particular if one assumes (as is sometimes done) that for some reason štokavian is particularly good at “influencing” other dialects. One can almost always attribute the absence of a “trait” one expects in a given dialect to the influence of dialects of another branch. Indeed, it is hardly an exaggeration to say that “štokavian influence”, used as an explanatory principle of well-nigh universal applicability, has often served as the *deus ex machina* of Serbo-Croat dialectology.

I shall give an example of this. In the ekavian dialect of Cres (cf. below, section 3.5), *ā*-stem nouns |284| usually have *-i* in the gen.sg. and *-e* in the dat./loc. sg., e.g. *ženì* (gen.) vs. *ženè* (dat./loc.) (Tentor 1909: 170). Somewhat more to the south, e.g. in Mali Lošinj and Susak, the reverse is the case: *ženè* (gen.sg.) vs. *ženì* (dat./loc.) (Hamm, Hraste and Guberina 1956: 110). Now, as is well-known, the Susak/Lošinj distribution is also found in neo-štokavian (not of course in all of štokavian because there are quite a few Slavonian and Kosovo/Resava dialects with a dat./loc.sg. in *-e*). To Hamm these facts suffice for saying that the Cres system is the originally čakavian one and that therefore the Lošinj system must be the result of secondary štokavian influence on a dialect that originally had the Cres distribution (1965: 26). He is not bothered by the fact that there are no reasons for assuming the presence of (neo-)štokavian dialects in the vicinity of the Lošinj dialect at any moment in the past, and that there is no corroborating evidence of strong (neo-)štokavian influence on the dialect.⁴

⁴ Even if Hamm’s theory (Hamm, Hraste and Guberina 1956: 11) about the continental origin of the Lošinj/Susak dialect is correct, as I think it is, the dialect must have left the mainland long before (neo-)štokavian started arriving there. (Note that some scholars use the term “štokavian” with a threefold ambiguity. The term can refer to one or more of the following three things: *a.* all štokavian dialects (which have very little if anything in common) opposed as a whole to the rest, *b.* the neo-štokavian dialects (which share the neo-štokavian stress retraction and quite a few other features), and *c.* the modern

I shall give another example, just to show that Hamm's explanation is not an isolated oddity. In the čakavian dialect of Senj the third person plural of the present tense always ends in *-du*, e.g. *pijědu*, *kradědu*, *kòljudu*, *gorīdu*, *bācidu*, *krepādu* etc. (Moguš 1966: 85ff.). Belić attributes the presence of this ending to the influence of the ikavian neo-štokavian dialects that are spoken near Senj by the "Bunjevci" (1951-2: 127), although he must have been aware of the fact that the Bunjevci have retained the older endings *-e* and *-u*.⁵

In fact it is difficult to apply the Stammbaum view to Serbo-Croat at all because there have always been innovations that spread from one of the allegedly "basic" dialect groups to the others or affected only part of one. This suggests on the one hand that there [285] never was a separation between, say, čakavian and štokavian (or čakavian and kajkavian, or kajkavian and štokavian), and on the other that the three groups never constituted homogeneous unities. By way of illustration I shall mention a few old innovations the distribution of which can be accounted for only in an artificial way if one sticks to the Stammbaum view of the history of Serbo-Croat:

1. In most of čakavian and štokavian short vowels have been lengthened before syllable-final resonants, e.g. *stārca* or *stārca* from earlier *stārca* (with a short stressed vowel). This development will be called "*starca*-lengthening" in the sequel. *Starca*-lengthening is usually regarded as typical of čakavian and štokavian in the sense that it is held to be an innovation common to čakavian and štokavian on the one hand and absent from kajkavian on the other. This creates a number of artificial problems, such as that of having to account for the absence of lengthening in a number of čakavian and štokavian dialects (Weingraben, East Bosnia, Piperi) and its presence in the north-eastern dialects of kajkavian, where it cannot be recent (Fancev 1907: 364).⁶ As is well-known, *starca*-lengthening is found in different dialects under different conditions. The Stammbaum view forces the investigator to regard all these differences as recent and robs him of the opportunity to explain at least some of them as the consequence of earlier innovations which affected only part of the area, cf. below, section 3.1.

Standard Language (which, though based on neo-štokavian, is by no means identical with any living neo-štokavian dialect and should be kept carefully separate from the dialects.)

⁵ For some reason Belić attributes all major differences between Novi and Senj to Bunjevački influence on the latter dialect, although in most cases the Bunjevački facts do not support him, cf. Moguš's discussion (1966: 55-60). (I do not want to suggest that there may not have been *some* Bunjevački influence on the Senj [328] dialect.)

⁶ In the north-eastern dialects of kajk., lengthening is found precisely in those positions in which it occurs in Slavonian štokavian (as distinct from neo-štokavian, which has a different distribution). This looks very much like an innovation which part of kajk. and part of štok. carried through at a moment when migrations had not yet removed the transitional dialects (cf. also Vermeer 1979: 373f.). The fact that kajkavian makes the impression of being clearly distinct from the rest of Serbo-Croat is due at least in part to the disappearance of most of the transitional dialects between kajk. on the one hand and Posavian štok. and central čak. on the other.

2. The second example also concerns *starca*-lengthening. In stressed syllables the development did not everywhere produce the same tone: it is well-known that the area where we find it is divided roughly into a western part (with a rising tone: *stārca*) and an |286| eastern part (with a falling tone: *stârca*). A rising tone is found in most of čakavian (exceptions: Central and South Dalmatia, Žumberak); Posavian štokavian, on the other hand, has a falling tone, except in the extreme west: Siče and Magića Mala. The geography of the isogloss is quite unproblematical until one tries to interpret it with the help of the Stammbaum theory because then one is forced to assume that Posavian originally had a unified reflex (a falling tone) and that the rising tone of Siče and Magića Mala is somehow secondary:

“Zbog svega toga ja smatram da je ovaj proces preživio *ceo* posavski govor, tako da je ono što u Sičama i Magića Mali nahodimo njemu strano. Zato ja i mislim da je pomenuta crta govora Siča i Magići Male čakavskog porekla i da se sačuvala pod uticajem ostataka čakavskih govora zapadne Bosne koji su ušli u pojas ili na teritoriju posavskog govora. Tim ne mislim reći da je i danas stanovništvo pomenutih mesta čakavsko; ne, ono je uvučeno potpuno u život posavskog štokavskog govora; ali ovo je u njemu ostatak od dijalekta čakavaca kojih je u tim mestima nekada bilo ili od čakavskih uticaja ma s koje strane” (Belić 1935: 11, *Belić’s italics*).

Although the precise character of the solution proposed by Belić remains somewhat vague it is obvious that he regards the Siče/Magića Mala reflex as un-Posavian and therefore in need of an explanation in terms of secondary developments. The problem is an artificial consequence of the Stammbaum approach to the history of Serbo-Croat.⁷

3. In most of čakavian and štokavian the product of the merger of the long jers has merged with *ā*, e.g. *dān*. We find the same innovation in the extreme southwest of kajkavian and in the western and central dialects of Slovene. Since these dialects cover a continuous area no problems arise until one adopts the Stammbaum approach: then one has to assume either that the merger took place independently in Slovene and |287| čakavian/štokavian or that one of these dialect groups received it only secondarily from the other; one further has to assume that the south-western kajkavian dialects are “really” čakavian or Slovene (which is awkward because the accentuation of these dialects is “typically” kajkavian), etc.

4. Fronting of *u* (> *ü* etc.) is found in Istria in dialects that have been labelled “čakavian” or “kajkavian” (cf. below, section 4.2), in most of the southern and eastern dia-

⁷ The Stammbaum approach to the history of Serbo-Croat forces Belić to adopt an extremely loose view of what can be accomplished by dialect mixture, cf. his theory of the rise of kajkavian: “Ja smatram da je simbioza čakavskog, štokavskog i jednog slovenačkog ili, bolje da rečem, kajkavskog dijalekta koji se već vrlo rano, u X veku, ili, možda, još ranije, odvojio od ostalih kajkavskih dijalekata – učinila da se od tih dijalekata, naročito u vreme neprestanog pomeranja stanovništva od kraja XV-og do kraja XVII veka od Slovenačke do Vojne Granice i natrag, – stvori poseban srpskohrvatski dijalekat – hrvatski kajkavski” (Belić 1935a: 242, cf. also p. 245). In reading passages like the preceding one, one is forced to agree with Trubeckoj’s evaluation of Belić’s work: “Теория Белича [this refers to Belić’s accentual theory, W.V.] есть методологический монстр, – как, впрочем, и почти всё, что пишет эта белградская знаменитость” (Jakobson 1975: 91).

lects of Slovene, and in a number of kajkavian and Posavian dialects. This is a coherent area, so that a natural interpretation of the phenomenon is possible, unless one adheres to the Stammbaum approach (cf. Vermeer 1979a: 175n.).

5. In most of čakavian and štokavian long-stem (c)-stressed *i*-presents have become (b)-stressed, e.g. *platī* ‘he/she pays’ has been replaced with *plātī*. It is well-known that the innovation did not reach kajkavian (cf. Bednja *plotī*, Jedvaj 1956: 315), a fact that is sometimes regarded as highly significant from the point of view of the traditional classification. However, as Ivšić noticed almost seventy years ago (1913a: 82f.), the innovation failed to reach the western-most dialects of Posavian štokavian (Orubica and Magića Mala).⁸

One could go on like this for quite some time, cf. also the awkward areas covered by the following innovations:

- a. The various reflexes of *ě*.
- b. The reflex *a* < *ę* after palatal consonants.
- c. The reflexes of *ĭ*.
- d. The reflex *-re-* < *-ra-* (Ivić 1964).
- e. The rise of *ei*-like and *ou*-like diphthongs from *i*, *ū* (the northern part of continental čakavian, isolated western points of kajkavian, some štajerski |288| points, cf. also the south-western Slovene development of *ei* and *ou* from *ě* and *ō*).
- f. The reflex of *d'*.
- g. Stem-stress with a rising accent in the fem.sg. of the *l*-participle of mobile verbs (*dāla* instead of more normal *dālā*, found in the triangle Bednja/Slavonia/Hvar, cf. Ivšić 1951: 369f.).
- h. Split of the (c)-stressed *e*-presents into two sub-types, depending on the quantity of the stem vowel, e.g. Piperi *pečē/pečēmō* vs. *krādē/krādēmō* (Stevanović 1940: 149, 152). This is found in much of štokavian, but also elsewhere, e.g. in Žumberak čakavian.
- i. The various stress retractions.
- j. Loss of *-h* in the endings of the loc.pl.
- k. General loss of *h*.
- l. Loss of the old tone distinction.

The list is far from complete. The view that Serbo-Croat first split up Stammbaum-like into three identifiable branches which then underwent a series of common “kajkavian”, “čakavian” and “štokavian” developments while being isolated from innova-

⁸ The development is not general in čakavian either. It failed to reach a number of central čakavian dialects (e.g. Žumberak) and the dialects spoken in northern Istria. To Belić all this was so awkward that he chose to ignore it in his treatment of Posavian accentuation (1935). It is intriguing to speculate on how Belić would have solved this very knotty problem. After all, it would have been unattractive to state that Magića Mala is “really” kajkavian just a few pages after having developed the view that the dialect is not “really” štokavian but a čakavian relic.

tions that took place in the other groups, creates insurmountable problems and explains nothing.

1.3. Further drawbacks.

The traditional classification has a few further disadvantages which, though in themselves insufficient to justify rejection, can hardly be considered positive assets:

- A. The terms “kajkavian”, “čakavian” and “štokavian” suggest a criterium (the form of the interrogative pronoun meaning ‘what’) which is not actually used or is used selectively: numerous “čakavian” dialects have *što* or *kaj*. A strict use of the criterium would have absurd consequences because there are dialects |289| where men and women use different pronouns (Skok 1911: 363f.).
- B. The traditional terms have extra-linguistic (ethnic and cultural) connotations. This explains the acrimonious character of so many of the discussions on such issues as the problem of what label to use to designate a given Istrian dialect. One of the minor disadvantages of this fact is the lack of freedom one has for using the labels because one has to take into account the feelings of the speakers; indeed, several linguists have pleaded for appealing to the intuitions of the speakers in the case of border-line problems, which robs the traditional terms of any linguistic content they may still have (Hraste 1966: 22, Težak 1979: 38, 1981: 180).⁹

For all these reasons I think it would be better to abandon the traditional classification altogether and to replace it with different classifications oriented towards different problems and capable of evolving together with the growth in understanding of the problems involved. In this article I shall stick to the label “čakavian” because its use has become traditional. However, it must be understood that the “čakavian” dialects, just like those called “štokavian” have nothing significant in common except the label linguists use to refer to them.

2. Three groups of “čakavian” dialects.

For the purposes of this article I shall classify the dialects traditionally called “čakavian” into three groups:

- I. North-west čakavian (“NWČ”), characterized by the presence of neocircumflex lengthening in such forms as *Novi gîne, stârî*.
- II. Central čakavian (“CČ”), characterized by the |290| absence of neocircumflex and at the same time an “i/e-kavian” reflex of PSl. *ě* according to “Jakubinkij’s law”:

⁹ Of course Serbo-Croat dialectology has come a long way since the middle of the nineteenth century, the time when “čakavian” was equated with “Croat”, “štokavian” with “Serbian” and “kajkavian” with “Slovene”. Rešetar, writing many years later, characterizes the atmosphere of the period as follows: ““štokavisch” und “čakavisch” wurden zu zwei politischen Losungsworten und verloren ihren ursprünglichen philologischen Sinn” (1907: 4). By Rešetar’s time the narrowly ethnic interpretation of the main dialect groups of Serbo-Croat had been abandoned by serious investigators. Echoes of it linger on in popularizing works (Hamm 1967: 9) and as a consequence it can still be met with among educated laymen.

the reflex of PSl. *ě* is *i*, except before dental consonants which are not in their turn followed by a front vowel (Jakubinskij 1925).

III. South-east čakavian (“SEČ”), characterized by an ikavian or (in the case of the dialect of Lastovo) a jekavian reflex of PSl. *ě*.¹⁰

The purpose of this classification is the purely practical one of making the facts manageable. I would like to avoid the suggestion that any one of these three groups ever constituted a “unity” opposed as a whole to the other groups, to kajkavian, or to the various groups one can distinguish among štokavian dialects. One must keep this in mind while reading the short characterizations of the three groups that follow now.

2.1. North-west Čakavian (NWČ).

In part of the dialects spoken in Istria, the Hrvatsko Primorje and on the islands of Cres/Lošinj and Krk we find “neocircumflex” (secondary lengthening of a short stressed vowel resulting in a falling tone) in two sets of forms:

- A. Stem-stressed *e*-presents, e.g. Novi *gîneš*, *stâne*, *plâče*, *kupûješ*, *ubîje*, *čûje* (Belić 1909: 242-245).
- B. Stem-stressed adjectives in the definite form, e.g. Novi *stârî*, *mâlî* (op.cit.: 233), *Zvoneće dûgî*, *mîlî*, *pûnî*, *slâbî* (Belić 1914: 19).

As far as is known at present we find neocircumflex in the same two sets of forms all over NWČ. The precise membership of the two sets seems however to differ from dialect to dialect. Here and there a few stem-stressed *e*-presents lack neocircumflex, cf. Novi *bûdeš* (Belić 1909: 252), Boljun *nadene*, *nadeno* (Lovljanov |291| 1949: 126).¹¹ On the other hand there are dialects with lengthening even in unstressed syllables, e.g. Omišalj *vèrûje*, *prèdiče* (inf. *prèdikat* ‘preach’, Vermeer 1980: 457f.). Among the adjectives, neocircumflex seems to be much more frequent in the immediate surroundings of Rijeka than elsewhere (cf. Belić 1914: 20). All differences that have so far been described are explicable as the outcome of different analogical developments having as their starting-point an identical original distribution. Moreover, on the basis of the available data “možemo zaključiti da se izoglosa *stârî/stârî*, ukoliko je sačuvana, poklapa s izoglosom *gîne/gîne*” (Ivić 1981: 73). Bundles of isoglosses have to be explained. This one can be explained by assuming that in both types of cases

¹⁰ I avoid the terms “north čakavian” and “south čakavian”, which have been used for a variety of things. Most commonly they have referred to the position of a dialect with respect to the *stârca/stârca* isogloss. The two classifications do not interlock neatly. “North čakavian” corresponds to all of NWČ, most of CČ and those |329| SEČ dialects that are spoken in North Dalmatia and the Burgenland; “south čakavian” refers to part of CČ (Žumberak) and Central and South Dalmatian SEČ. Owing to secondary loss of tone quite a few dialects cannot be classified.

¹¹ In Lovljanov’s text the reflex of long *ě* would be written *ie*, e.g. *zariežo*, *odriežo*, *razrieže* etc. (cf. below, section 4.1.).

neocircumflex is due to a single mechanism, cf. the explanation proposed by Kortlandt (1976: 9).¹²

Neocircumflex of the NWČ type has been attested or is likely to be attested in part of the dialects spoken in Istria and the Hrvatsko Primorje, and on the islands of Krk and Cres/Lošinj. Neocircumflex has not been found in the dialects spoken in the Burgenland, in the Croat Interior, and to the south and south-east [the original text misleadingly has “south-west” here, WV 2009] of a line running from half-way through Lošinj to the coastal area between Novi Vinodolski and Senj. In the sequel this line will be referred to as “the line Lošinj-Novi”.¹³ In the north of Istria there is a fairly clear boundary-line between NWČ on the one hand, and dialects that have carried through the early accentual innovations of Slovene on the other. The linguistic boundary corresponds roughly (but not perfectly) to the administrative boundary between Slovenia and Croatia. Besides NWČ many other dialects have been found in the area between the Slovene border and the line Lošinj-Novi: not only various kinds of ČČ and SEČ, [292] but also ikavian neo-štokavian of the “Bunjevački” variety (near Novi), and “Zeta-Lovćen” štokavian spoken in the Istrian village of Peroj by settlers from Montenegro. However, the presence of all these non-NWČ dialects can be attributed to recent migrations usually recorded in historical documents and/or folk traditions and always inescapable on the basis of the dialectal facts. NWČ must be regarded as the oldest layer of Slavonic dialects spoken in the area.¹⁴

The presence of neocircumflex shows that at a fairly early date NWČ was capable of carrying through specific common innovations. The same is suggested by facts like the following:

- A. In personal pronouns NWČ has end stress both in the dat./loc.sg. and in the gen./acc.sg., e.g. Omišalj *meni/meně*. Most other Čakavian dialects have stem stress like Senj *měni/měne* (Moguš 1966: 78), or have the alternation attested in Susak *meni/mêne*, Dugi Otok *meni/měne* (Finka 1977: 123) Zarečje/Marečići *meni/me'ne* (Ivić 1961: 205f.), Baumgarten-Pajngrt *měni/mjěne* (Koschat 1978: 98).
- B. Nearly all of NWČ has lost the *u*-stem gen.pl. ending *-ov*: the usual NWČ gen.pl. endings are $-\emptyset$ and *-i* (which has been replaced here and there with the loc.pl. ending, e.g. in Novi). On the other hand all dialects surrounding NWČ (both Slovene and ČČ) have considerably extended the ending *-ov*.¹⁵
- C. All of NWČ has generalized brevity of the thematic vowel in the present tense of *e*-verbs, e.g. Omišalj *perəm, perěš, perè, peremò, peretè*. ČČ and most (but not all) of SEČ have either retained the original alternation (e.g. Žumberak *plijěš, plijê, plī-*

¹² If one regards classification as the main task of dialectology one is tempted to put matters upside down: to look upon bundles of isoglosses as the normal thing and on gradual transitions as problematic phenomena.

¹³ There is no solid evidence that the dialects of Susak and Senj ever had neocircumflex in its NWČ distribution (Vermeer 1975: 150).

¹⁴ In addition a number of Romance languages have been attested in the area (Vegliote, Romanian and Italian).

¹⁵ The ČČ dialects spoken in NWČ surroundings (Istria and Krk) all seem to have lost the ending *-ov*.

jěmo, plijěte, Skok 1912: 345) or generalized length, e.g. Senj *pijěn, pijěš, pijě, pijěmo, pijěte, pijědu* (Moguš 1966: 89). NWČ shares this innovation with all of Slovene [293] (except for the eastern-most dialect group: Prekmurski), all of kajkavian, and a number of western štokavian dialects.¹⁶

2.2. Central Čakavian (CČ).

The remaining čakavian dialects lack neocircumflex, like all of štokavian. They will be divided here into two groups, on the basis of the reflex of PSl. *ě*: Central Čakavian, which is i/e-kavian according to Jakubinskij's law, and South-East Čakavian, which has reflexes of *ě* also found in western štokavian dialects (*i* or *je*).

The i/e-kavian reflex of the *ě* links CČ to the eastern-most sub-group of NWČ (the Novi-like dialects, cf. below, section 3.1) and the extreme south-west of kajkavian: the Ozalj dialect.¹⁷

Central čakavian dialects are found in the following areas:

- A. The Croat Interior, in an almost unbroken belt from the surroundings of Otočac in Lika north-ward to the point where the Sava enters Croatia; moreover Vrbovsko and surrounding villages in the Gorski kotar and possibly (in traces) around Slunj and elsewhere.
- B. To the south and south-east of the line Lošinj-Noví: the town of Senj and a number of islands. The southern-most CČ points are found in North Dalmatia on the island of Dugi Otok (Finka 1977: 87f.).
- C. To the north and north-west of the line Lošinj-Noví in NWČ surroundings: *a.* a largish area in the north of Istria, straddling the Slovene border (e.g. Mune), *b.* an area in central Istria, wedged in between NWČ dialects (e.g. Sv. Ivan i Pavao), *c.* the western part of the island of Krk (e.g. Njivice and "Dubašnica"), *d.* the village of [Donja] Draga, only a few kilometers removed from the center of the city of [294] Rijeka (Ivić 1961a: 404).
- D. The "Burgenland" (Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia), cf. Neweklowsky (1978).

The present position of the dialects spoken in the Burgenland (*D*) and to the north of the line Lošinj-Noví (*C*) is obviously due to recent migrations, and the same holds for the northern dialects of *A* (Žumberak). The same may hold for other parts of *A* and for part of *B*. However, the central and southern parts of *A* and much of *B* make the impression of being the oldest layer of dialects attested in the area. The dialects of *A* are generally regarded as the remnants of a much larger CČ area which was consider-

¹⁶ In NWČ brevity is general in (c)-stressed verbs (verbs with consistent end stress in the present tense), whereas there is some uncertainty about verbs with a stem-stressed present tense. In Novi and Omišalj brevity is general. In accented material from the Kastavština and Dobrinj brevity predominates, but there are too many examples of length to be explained away as errors, e.g. Brešca *zřlězě* alongside *světuje, mđre, pđčne* (Ribarić 1940: 127), Marčelji *čřjě, pđčně, kupřjě, mđrě* (Moguš and Pavešić 1957: 300, 385f.), Dobrinj *pđšne*: (Brozović 1981: 245).

¹⁷ The Ozalj dialect is remarkable in that it has *i* in a considerable number of examples that have *e* in normal i/e-kavian dialects, e.g. *besřda, blřt, cřl, cřna, cvřt, đřl, sřt, řelřzo* (Teřak 1981a: 227).

ably reduced in size as a consequence of the migrations and which will have to be reconstructed on the basis of the combined data from all of CČ.¹⁸

The CČ dialects have a considerable number of innovations in common, most of which they share with one or both of their closest neighbours: kajkavian in the north and SEČ in the east. Examples:

1. All CČ dialects have lost distinctive quantity in post-tonic syllables. This links CČ to kajkavian. It is worth-while to consider the possibility that the loss of post-tonic length in CČ preceded the rise of the neocircumflex in kajkavian and NWČ and that that was the reason why the neocircumflex failed to spread further southward than Ozalj and further eastward than Novi.
2. The CČ dialects have lost the hard \bar{a} -stem gen.sg. and nom./acc.pl. ending *-i*, like Slovene, kajkavian, SEČ and štokavian, but unlike the bulk of NWČ, where the ending is quite common.
3. The CČ dialects have extended the *u*-stem gen.pl. ending *-ov* to the majority of msc. nouns with a stem in a consonant and have specialized the gen.pl. ending |295| *-ī* for use after words expressing a quantity. Both innovations are also found in kajkavian and in more easterly dialects, cf. also note 15.

Despite these and other common innovations there is considerable local variation within CČ, in particular with respect to accentuation.

2.3. South-east čakavian (SEČ).

SEČ is characterized by reflexes of \check{e} also found in the western dialects of štokavian: SEČ is ikavian, except for the dialect of the island of Lastovo (near Dubrovnik), which is jekavian. The question as to whether these dialects are čakavian or štokavian is of an academic nature. There is an entire range of organic transitions between, say, the dialect of Stinatz-Stinjaki in the Burgenland (which is very closely related to CČ), the Vrgada dialect (which, were it not spoken on a North Dalmatian island, would be considered Posavian), the dialects of southern Istria (which have undergone several “typically štokavian” innovations, such as the rise of a gen.pl. in *-ā*), and the various neo-štokavian dialects with an ikavian reflex of the \check{e} . Similarly there is little point in separating the Lastovo dialect from the aberrant neo-štokavian dialects of Mljet and Dubrovnik.

We find SEČ dialects in the following areas:

- A. Dalmatia.
- B. In NWČ surroundings in three places: *a.* the entire south and west of Istria (cf. also below, section 4.4), *b.* a small area in the north of Istria, straddling the Slovene border (e.g. Vodice), *c.* the village of Klana, some fifteen kilometers to the north of Rijeka, near the Slovene border (Ivić 1961-2: 119n., Rigler 1963: 13).

¹⁸ This is generally accepted. It constitutes the basis of all reconstructions that have so far been published (e.g. Brozović 1963, Neweklowsky 1978: 264ff. etc.).

- C. Three small areas or isolated villages in the |296| neighbourhood of Zagreb, wedged in between kajkavian and Slovene dialects: *a.* an area on the east bank of the Sutla, between (“kajkavian”) Rozga and the Sava (e.g. Marija Gorica), *b.* three villages half-way between Zagreb and Karlovac (Horvati, Gornja Zdenčina, Donja Zdenčina), *c.* the village of [Lijevo] Sredičko, to the south-east of *b.* Cf. Ivšić (1936: 74ff.), Brabec (1961: 330, 1966: 327f.), Šojat (1972, 1973).
- D. The southern part of the Burgenland.
- E. A few villages in Italy (Molise), cf. Ivić (1958: 248-269) on the relationship between the Molise dialects and those of southern Istria.

The existence in the Burgenland of SEČ dialects with very clear CČ affinities (Stinatz-Stinjaki) points to the original presence of SEČ dialects in the Croat Interior or in western Bosnia (as the eastern neighbours of CČ), as do the similarities between such North Dalmatian dialects as Vrgada on the one hand, and Posavian of the Magića Ma-la type on the other.¹⁹

3. Non-Istrian NWČ.

There are a few old differences between the NWČ dialects of Istria proper (to the west and south-west of the Učka mountain) and the rest of NWČ (the extreme north-east [the original text confusingly has “north-west” here, WV 2009] of Istria, the Hrvatsko Primorje, Krk, and Cres/Lošinj). Non-Istrian NWČ shares the raising of PSl. *o* (> *u*) with the rest of Serbo-Croat (and with a number of other Slavonic languages), and the palatalization of *l* and *n* between velar consonants and mid front vowels (Novi *zakljēl*, *pokljěknūt*, *gljěda*, *ńāzlō*, etc.)²⁰ with much of CČ and SEČ. With respect to both phenomena Istrian NWČ is archaic, which is explicable on geographical grounds.

The non-Istrian NWČ dialects can be subdivided further into what I shall call “Novi-like”, “Kastav-like” |297| and “Cres-like” dialects. The “Novi-like” dialects are i/e-kavian, like CČ. The “Kastav-like” and “Cres-like” dialects are both ekavian, but differ in a number of important respects, so that there is little point in treating them together.

3.1. Novi-like i/e-kavian dialects (“NNO”).

An i/e-kavian reflex of PSl. *ě* according to Jakubinskij’s law is found not only in CČ, but also in a number of eastern NWČ dialects. NWČ dialects with an i/e-kavian reflex of *ě* are spoken in the following areas:

1. The “Vinodol” and the coast from Ledenice and Novi [Vinodolski] northward up to and including Kraljevica, Bakarac, Hreljin, Zlobin, and perhaps Benkovac [Fužinski]. In this area the town of Crikvenica is known to be ekavian, cf. below, section 3.4.

¹⁹ Most of the similarities between Vrgada and Posavian are due to common retentions.

²⁰ Belić 1909: 194.

2. The “Grobinština”, a small area immediately to the north of Rijeka (e.g. Grobnik, Jelenje, Čavle, Cernik [Primorski]).
3. Part of the island of Krk: Omišalj, the Dobrinjština, Vrbnik (with a few surrounding villages), Punat, and perhaps the southern part of the island (Stara Baška, Baška, Draga Bašćanska), about which very little is known.

Although there is considerable variation among the Novi-like dialects, they do seem to have a few specific things in common:

1. The *o*-stem instr.pl. ending *-i*, as far as it is attested, is always short, whereas it is long in all other Serbo-Croat dialects that have retained it.²¹
2. In the *l*-participle of verbs in *-ěti* (> *-it*), *e* has been generalized, e.g. Omišalj *viđē, viđela, viđelo, viđeli*; in ČČ generalization of *i* is next to general, although there are a few exceptions, notably |298| among the dialects spoken around Ogulin and Vrbovsko.²²
3. *Starca* lengthening has not affected vowels followed by *-v*, except in clusters like *-vl-*, cf. Novi *krðv, takðv, ofcã* but *čãvla* (Belić 1909: 206). In all likelihood *v* had become fricative before *starca* lengthening took place. This distribution of *starca* lengthening has not been found elsewhere.²³

There is much more literature on the Novi-like dialects than on the other subgroups of NWČ.

The Novi dialect itself is known on the basis of what is at present the only satisfactory grammar of any NWČ dialect: A. Belić’s rightly famous “Zamětki po čakavskim govoram” (1909), cf. Steinhauer’s analysis (1973: 137ff.).²⁴ On the other hand very little is known about the remaining Vinodol dialects.²⁵

As is well-known, the Novi dialect has the most archaic inventory of prosodic features attested anywhere in Serbo-Croat: it has retained the PSl. tone distinction on

²¹ The ending is short in Omišalj, Novi and (I think) Dobrinj. It is long in the dialects of the Kastavština. There is little or no information on the intervening dialects. (I have listed this point merely to highlight a complex of problems that does not get enough attention in existing descriptions: the distribution of quantity in endings.)

²² Cf., e.g., Ivić 1961 (200-202) on Generalski Stol and Bosiljevo.

²³ But cf. the long vowel in Sv. Jakov/Jadranovo *Jãkõv* (Belić 1914: 10). In the dialects of the Kastavština lengthening takes place before word-final *v*, but fails to do so in other positions, e.g. *Kastãv/kastãfci* (Moguš and Pavešić). In Omišalj lengthening has failed to take place before word-final nasals (Vermeer 1980: 443).

²⁴ There is some further information on the Novi dialect in those sections of Belić’s *Akcentatske studije* (1914) in which čakavian material is adduced, and in articles by Ivšić (1931), Hamm (1956, cf. also below, section 3.2), Naylor (1970), Steinhauer (1973a) |330| and me (Vermeer 1980: 448, 471).

²⁵ Primarily Belić (1909: 182, 187, 1912, 1913, 1914: 10f. and passim), Ivšić (1911: 139, 1913: 168, 1931), Ivić (1959, 1961a), Barac (1963), Brabec (1969: 423), cf. also the interesting dictionary by Turina and Šepić-Tomin (1977), who unfortunately do not separate their NNo material of the area around Bakarac from their NKa material of the area around Škrljevo. Lončarić-Papić’s texts in the Selce dialect (1933), despite their literary character, make a highly idiomatic impression and reveal a dialect that differs in interesting ways from that of nearby Novi.

long vowels and has distinctive quantity not only under the stress but also in pretonic and post-tonic syllables; like the rest of NWČ (and unlike Slovene and much of CČ) it has not undergone any stress retractions. The only čakavian dialects with a similarly archaic system are those spoken in the Grobinština (also NNo) and a few SEČ dialects spoken in North Dalmatia (e.g. Vrgada, cf. Jurišić 1966, 1973). The dialects of the Kastavština come close to being equally archaic (cf. below, section 3.4). However, not all NNO dialects of the Vinodol are as archaic as Novi. Although some of them are (e.g. Selce), simplification of the system has been attested in several areas:

- a. The north (e.g. Kraljevica, Šmrika, Hreljin) has lost distinctive quantity in post-tonic syllables (Belić 1912: 360, Ivić 1959).
- b. Bribir (in the south-east, quite near Novi) has [299] lost the tone distinction (Ivšić 1911: 139).²⁶

The Vinodol dialects appear to differ considerably among themselves with respect to the system of nominal endings. This becomes clear if one compares Belić's data on Novi with the data provided by Lončarić-Papić's texts in the Selce dialect (five km. to the north of Novi). There are the following differences:

- I. Gen.pl. of msc. nouns with a stem ending in a consonant. Alongside the original *o*-stem ending -Ø Novi uses the loc.pl. ending *-ih*. Selce has *-i* (of course alongside -Ø, e.g. *križi* (7), *brodi* (11), *beči* (13), *soldi* (22), *kusi* (24).
- II. Gen.sg. of nouns in *-a*. Novi has *-ē*. Selce has *-i* or *-e*, depending on the final consonant of the stem, e.g. *ponjavi* (8), *dlaki* (14), *zori* (19), *gurli* (23) vs. *kuće* (7), *divice* (14), *šenice* (19), *rakije* (25).
- III. Nom./acc.pl. of nouns in *-a*. Novi has *-e*, with the exception of *rūki*, *nđgi* and *srēdi*. Selce has *-i* or *-e*, depending on the final consonant of the stem, e.g. *besedi* (11), *školi* (14), *slivi* (15), *ženi* (23), *čeli* (30) vs. *maše* (10), *ofce* (15).
- IV. Remnants of the *ū*-stems. Novi has *crikva*. Selce has *criki* (15) alongside the normal form.²⁷

In all four respects Selce is more archaic than Novi. The same may hold for Bribir: "I ako je bibrirski govor ekavsko-ikavski, kao i svi drugi koji se nahode dublje na kontinentu, on pokazuje mnogo više starih crta (naročito među oblicima) nego ostali ekavsko-ikavski vinodolski govori" (Belić 1912: 364).

About the dialects of the Grobinština we know little more than that they exist and that they have retained a complete (Novi-like) accentual system, with tones and with

²⁶ If Belić's account of Bribir accentuation is taken at face value (1912: 365), the dialect is in the process of carrying through stress retractions. However, the description is both vague and confused, and may show no more than that Belić spent too little time in the village to enable himself to perceive the underlying system. Belić's rather similar description of Dobrinj accentuation (1931: 187) is undoubtedly incorrect, because there is no trace of stress retractions in Jelenović's numerous accented works.

²⁷ Numbers refer to the corresponding pages of Lončarić-Papić (1933).

quantity distinctions in all positions (Belić 1912: 358, 1913, 1914, Ivić 1961a: 404, Lehiste and Ivić 1973). |300|

Much more is known about Krk. There is information on most or all of the NWČ dialects of the area in Milčetić (1888, 1895)²⁸, Oblak (1894, 1894a, 1896) and Ivić (1959), and in Meyer's (1928: 26-48) and Maćecki's (1929, 1963) dialect maps.²⁹ The following works enable one to get a fairly complete impression of the Omišalj dialect: A. A considerable body of accented toponyms by Jelenović (1959), from which conclusions about nominal inflexion can be drawn because the author gives inflected forms of the toponyms he adduces³⁰, B. a number of reasonably idiomatic but unaccented texts by Turato (1970, 1975)³¹, C. a description of segmental phonology and verbal inflexion by me (Vermeer 1980).³² Most of what we know about the dialect of the Dobrinština is due to Jelenović, who is the author of a number of accented texts (1962, 1972, 1975) and a monumental collection of accented toponyms (1973); he also furnished the material for Brozović's short account of the segmental phonology of the dialect (1981), and together with Deanović published the Klimno data for the *Lingvistički atlas Mediterana* (Deanović and Jelenović 1958).³³ The Vrbnik dialect is known primarily on the basis of Ivan Žic's texts (1899 etc.), which, though unfortunately not accented, are among the most important contributions to NWČ dialectolo-

²⁸ Milčetić's classical (or rather pre-classical) "Čakavština Kvarnerskih otoka" (1895) is primarily a description of the CČ dialect of Dubašnica (Milčetići), with copious remarks on the "archaic" NWČ dialects of Krk (Omišalj-Dobrinj-Vrbnik) and scattered notes on the other Krk dialects (Punat etc.), Cres-Lošinj, a number of smaller islands and the mainland (in particular the Hrvatsko Primorje). The accentuation of Milčetić's Omišalj material is not in all respects reliable: the place of the stress is almost always correct (exception: gen.pl. *jüdi*, p. 123), the quantity of stressed vowels is sometimes incorrect (e.g. *napeñiije* - 106 -, *ženüm* - 120, 122-), and unstressed long vowels are usually left unmarked (numerous examples).

²⁹ Meyer's observations are almost inconceivably unreliable, cf. Belić's corrections of Meyer's Omišalj material (1935c: 218), which in their turn contain at least one mistake (*vól* should be *vô*). Maćecki is much better, but his accentuation is faulty and must be disregarded, e.g. Belić (1931b: 212). Jelenović's translation of Maćecki's article on the Krk dialects is valuable because it contains corrections (1963).

³⁰ Jelenović's material, however valuable, is incorrect in a number of respects: 1. the soft *a*-stem gen.sg. ending *-e* is always short in the Omišalj dialect; forms like *Knežijē* (18) do not exist, and have undoubtedly been influenced by Jelenović's native dialect, 2. in Omišalj *starca* lengthening has not taken place before word-final nasals; Jelenović incorrectly indicates length in cases like the msc./nt. instr. sg. endings *-ēm* and *-ōm* (passim) or in words like *Krivōnjīn* (21), *Sēpēn* (23); here, too, I suspect Jelenović's native dialect to have influenced his perception of the Omišalj facts, 3. with all toponyms Jelenović gives the preposition *va* 'in'; in reality quite a few of them always occur with *na* 'on'. (Jelenović's lack of reliability with respect to |331| Omišalj quantity (in particular in post-tonic syllables) may explain why he notes post-tonic long vowels in his Dubašnica material as well (1959: 25ff.). If the dialect really had post-tonic quantity distinctions, it is inconceivable that Milčetić, who was a native speaker and was aware of the post-tonic long vowels of Omišalj and elsewhere, would not have said anything about it.)

³¹ The last time I was in Omišalj (in September 1978) mr. Turato told me another text by him had been accepted for publication by the *Krčki zbornik*. It has certainly appeared by now.

³² I am working on a description of the nominal morphology of the dialect.

³³ Of less importance are Belić's confused remarks on Dobrinj accentuation (1931: 186f., 1935b: 151f.), another text (this time not accented) by Jelenović (1949) and the unaccented lexical material reported by Zajceva (1967).

gy because they cover much of the vocabulary and are written in an exceptionally idiomatic style.³⁴ The main sources on the Punat dialect are unaccented texts by Mrakovčić (1949, 1975) and Bonifačić Rožin (1953), and the answers to the questionnaire of the *Lingvistički atlas Mediterana* published by Deanović and Jelenović (1958). About the dialects of the southern part of the island hardly anything is known.³⁵

All Krk dialects seem to have lost the tone distinction |301| (cf. in particular Ivić 1959). On the other hand, post-tonic quantity distinctions have been retained, which is the more remarkable because in pretonic syllables there is a clear tendency towards shortening of long vowels. The tendency seems to be coming from the south: Deanović and Jelenović (1958: 137n.) note that in Punat pretonic length has been lost, in Vrbnik Ivić observes “snažan proces skraćivanja predakcenatskih dužina” (1959: 397), and although Dobrinj and Omišalj have retained pretonic length, it is my impression that at least in Omišalj pretonic long vowels tend to be realized appreciably shorter than, say, in Novi.

There are considerable differences between Punat on the one hand and Omišalj/Dobrinj/Vrbnik on the other. The most striking of these differences concerns the reflexes of syllabic *l̥* and the product of the merger of the strong jers. Whereas in the majority of the examples Punat has the reflexes found in most of čakavian and štokavian (*u* and *a* respectively), the other dialects have unusual reflexes: the product of the merger of the strong jers has only merged with *a* if it was long (e.g. Om. *dân*, gen.pl. *sestâr*); if short it has yielded *e* (Omišalj/Vrbnik) or *o* (Dobrinj). Syllabic *l̥* has either been retained as such (a few points near Vrbnik) or has developed into a reflex that is evidently connected with the reflex of the jers when short: *-el-* (Vrbnik), *-e-* (Omišalj) or *-o-* (Dobrinj).³⁶

Similar unusual reflexes of the syllabic *l̥* and the product of the merger of the strong jers have been found in two other groups of dialects which, though spoken in the area, do not seem to be particularly closely related either to each other or to Omišalj/Dobrinj/Vrbnik: A. the ekavian NWČ dialects of Cres and the northern half of Lošinj (cf. below, section 3.5) and |302| B. the CČ dialects of the southern half of Lošinj and of the surrounding islands, e.g. Susak. In a small number of examples aberrant reflexes of syllabic *l̥* have also been found in Punat and in the dialects of the south-eastern part of Krk. It is not unlikely that these dialects are relative new-comers to the area and that examples with unusual reflexes of *l̥* are traces of a substratum.

³⁴ Scattered remarks by Belić (1909: 195, 219, 225) and Hamm (1956) are not very informative.

³⁵ The best source is perhaps Maček 1929a: 17f. on Baška. However it should be noted that Maček's accentuation is unreliable: his Omišalj material on p. 33 contains impossible things like *čevjên*, *nevêsta*, *razdîlîli*, *ňazlô*, *rîzat*, *ďžela*, *žlibëc* (instead of *čevjên*, *nevêsta*, *razdîlîli*, *ňazlô*, *rîzat*, *ožělà* – or at best *ďžela*, which I have not heard but which may exist – *žlibëc*) and even one undialectal intrusion from the standard language (*nasmîjala* instead of *năsmēla*); Maček incorrectly distinguishes between a rising and a falling accent.

³⁶ Cf. Oblak 1894a: 209, Vermeer 1975: 155.

The NWČ character of the Punat dialect is indicated by the neocircumflex in such forms as *kalûje* (Deanović/Jelenović: 138) and corroborated by the fact that the dialect has retained quantity distinctions in post-tonic syllables, which would be without parallel if the dialect were CČ. The available information on the dialects of the south and south-east of Krk (Baška etc.) does not reveal whether they are NWČ like Punat or CČ like Senj, Rab or the western part of Krk.³⁷

3.2. Hamm's doubts about Belić's reliability.

Belić's description of the dialect of Novi Vinodolski is the only grammar of any NWČ dialect to give a reasonably complete picture of the morphology, including accentual and quantitative alternations, and for that reason it occupies a central place in Slavonic accentology. However, its reliability has not remained unchallenged. J. Hamm has repeatedly argued that Belić's work cannot in all respect be relied on. He has treated the subject at least on three occasions.

In his description of the phonology of the Susak dialect Hamm is particularly concerned with the presence or absence of a surface contrast between a falling and a rising tone in sentence-final position. After stating that in the Susak dialect sentence-final stressed long vowels always become falling he writes: "Slično se stanje može utvrditi i za Novi, premda on |303| (možda i iz melodijskih razloga) uzlazne intonacije čuva bolje od ostalih" (Hamm, Hraste and Guberina 1956: 93, Hamm's italics). On the next page Hamm states that it is still exceptional for a rising tone to become falling in sentence-final position. It is evident that at this moment the differences between Hamm and Belić were slight. However, in an "Izvještaj" that appeared in the same year as the Susak study Hamm went further:

"Ispitujući pritom i neke odlike, koje su značajne za susački akcenat, pošao sam u Vrbnik (na o. Krku) i u Novi (Vinod.), da ondje u starijega svijeta utvrdim, je li Belićevo bilježenje (...), na koje su se i on i drugi toliko pozivali (i na koje se neki i danas pozivlju) u svemu pouzdano (osobito kada se radi o akutu na ultimi u otvorenom slogu). Vidio sam, da se on nije dovoljno obazirao na cirkumfleks, i da bi bolje bilo, da je na novljanski akcenat gledao onako, kako je gledao na kastavsko naglašivanje (samo što se ja s njime u nekim pitanjima prioriteta jedne ili druge akcentuacije ne bih mogao složiti)" (Hamm 1956: 382).

Although Hamm's formulations are too hazy to enable the reader to reconstruct exactly what separates him from Belić, it is clear that he now considers the "Zamětki" to be a thing of the past. A few years later Hamm went still further: "And when will the Serbocroatian dialectologists stop quoting Belić's "Zametki" of 1909 (with their notorious inadequacy concerning some prosodical patterns) for the dialect of Novi" (1964: 125n.).

Hamm's criticism cannot be accepted, not only because it is couched in terms of such vagueness as to be largely untestable ("da se on nije dovoljno obazirao na cirkumfleks", "notorious inadequacy concerning some prosodical patterns"), but also

³⁷ The forms *sřjemo* and *verùjes* (Maćecki 1929a: 17f.), though suggestive, are not conclusive because Maćecki's accentuation is unreliable. (I have slightly simplified the transcription of these forms.)

because it is false precisely in the one respect in which a test is possible: the problem of the existence of a tonal contrast in sentence-final position.

In 1973 and 1974 I made extensive tape recordings of a number of Novi speakers of different generations. |304| Although the language of most of these speakers betrays the influence of the Standard Language (in varying degrees), I found that the prosodic inventory is still intact even in the case of very young speakers with a highly imperfect command of the dialect. The tonal contrast is unmistakable even in sentence-final position.³⁸

The difference between Belić's and Hamm's perception of the same facts is remarkable and requires an explanation. I think that the reason why Hamm came up with incorrect results has something to do with the traditional approach to the problem of the description of tones in western Serbo-Croat dialects.

3.3. "Čakavian acute" vs. "tonal opposition".

As is well-known many western Serbo-Croat dialects have a surface contrast corresponding to the PSl. distinction between rising and falling long vowels. Since in most other Slavonic dialects the distinction has been lost and since there are important differences between different dialects as far as the distribution of the two tones is concerned, it is obviously a matter of considerable interest for Slavonic accentology and Serbo-Croat dialectology alike to establish exactly where the opposition has been maintained and where it has been lost. Unfortunately there is a lot of uncertainty about the matter, which I think is mainly due to the fact that field-workers tend to approach the problem of the retention of the tone distinction in a way that is bound to lead to the wrong results. More specifically, the problem is usually simplified in three different but related ways:

- I. Attention is focused on the rising tone, to the exclusion of the falling tone.
- II. It is assumed uncritically that the rising tone, |305| if there is a distinction, will conform to traditional ideas about what the "čakavian acute" is supposed to sound like.
- III. It is assumed uncritically that the rising tone will sound the same in all positions.

In other words: dialectologists, instead of searching for a surface contrast between tones, tend to look for long vowels that sound more or less like the "canonical" čakavian acute, the realization of which is assumed to conform to Ivšić's description of the old rising accent in Posavian štokavian (1911: 147ff.). In doing so, dialectologists run several risks, e.g.:

- A. In investigating dialects that lack a tonal distinction they run the risk of describing tones if stressed long vowels sometimes happen to be realized in a way that resembles the canonical čakavian acute. The classical example of such a descrip-

³⁸ I agree with Moguš (1977: 30) that there is no longer a distinction between long and short vocalic *r*. In Belić's time the opposition was only operative in pretonic syllables and probably optional.

tion is of course Hamm, Hraste and Guberina's treatment of the Susak dialect (1956, cf. Ivić 1959a: 177, Steinhauer 1975, Vermeer 1975: 143).³⁹

- B. In investigating dialects that have a tonal distinction dialectologists run the risk of not noticing the tones if the rising tone happens to be realized in a way that differs significantly from the canonical čakavian acute. This has happened to several investigators of the Cres dialects (cf. Houtzagers's article elsewhere in this volume).
- C. In investigating dialects with a tonal distinction investigators will run the risk of incorrectly indicating a falling instead of a rising tone if the rising tone happens to be realized like a canonical čakavian acute in part of the cases only. This is the case of Hamm's description of the Novi dialect. It may also clarify a number of contradictions present in the literature, of which I shall mention one example: |306| Moguš, in his short description of the CČ dialect spoken in the neighbourhood of Otočac in Lika, describes the accentual inventory as follows: "Može se reći da je upotreba triju akcenata napuštena i da lički čakavci spadaju danas u govore s dvoakcenatskim sistem[om] (˘ i ˙). To, naravno, ne znači da se pokadšto neće čuti i treći akcent (˙) bilo kao relikv *divōjka, s ramēni, dvorišće, lišće, smetlišće* bilo u enklizi *bojīn se, zovē me*" (Moguš 1963: 293). From this passage the reader will get the impression that in the dialect the rising tone is optional. However, Ivić, in his more detailed description of the same dialect, consistently distinguishes ˘ from ˙ and notes explicitly that "˘ ima melodijsku liniju štokavskog" (1964a: 127). A similar explanation will probably account for some of those descriptions in which the čakavian acute is stated to exist in a given dialect, but no longer "kao sistem" (e.g. Hraste 1967: 65).

It is odd that the problem of how to find tone distinctions in čakavian has been simplified in this way, on the one hand because this approach gets the investigator into predictable trouble precisely at the moment when things start getting interesting, and on the other because it has been known for quite some time that the realization of the reflex of the PSl. rising tone is not the same all over čakavian. Examples:

1. Tomljenović's classical description of the neo-štokavian ikavian dialect of the Bunjevci living around Senj (1911) contains a few interesting remarks by an "ur." (lvšić?) on the čakavian dialects of the Hrvatsko Primorje. In one of them the "ur." states that the acute is identical with Vuk's ' (i.e. realized like a neo-štokavian rising tone) "od Rijeke do Kraljevice", whereas in the dialects of the Vinodol and the Grobinština the rising tone is realized in a way that resembles the rising tones of Posavian štokavian (p. 409). It is striking that the geographical dis-

³⁹ Hamm, Hraste and Guberina's great example was Belić's description of the Dobrinj dialect (cf. note 33). Of course it is not only čakavian dialects that sometimes get described in terms of a richer prosodic system than they actually have, cf. Alexander's comments on Barjaktarović's work on Torlak: "In a dialect which has been proven by numerous investigators to distinguish no other prosodic features than place of stress, Barjaktarović perceives a complicated system of tone and length oppositions "in development". He apparently does not distinguish phonetic variation from phonemic opposition" (Alexander 1975: 23).

tribution |307| of the two realizations distinguished by Tomljenović's "ur." is almost the same as the geography of the reflexes of the *ě*: the i/e-kavian dialects have Posavian-like realizations of the rising tone, whereas in the ekavian dialects it tends to sound neo-štokavian-like.

2. Belić (1935b: 153) describes the realization of the rising tone in the Kastav dialect as follows: "Čakavski akut izgovara se kao pravi akut kada je u rečenici i kada je na njemu *silā govora*, kada se *dosta ističe*; kada se *u rečenici* taj akcentat ne *ističe*, on postaje neka vrsta *ravnog akcenta*" (Belić's italics).⁴⁰
3. Ribarić devotes to the problem an extremely perceptive passage. In describing the accentuation of the Mune dialect he writes: "O svojstvu ovoga uzlaznog akcenta mogu reći, da interval uzlaza dosiže kadgod jednu kvintu, da se glas ne diže – čini se – u skoku, nego se jednoliko penje od početka do svršetka sloga, a snaga ekspiracije raste prema svršetku izgovora dotičnoga sloga. Takova je po prilici priroda staroga uzlaznoga i sekundarnoga uzlaznog akcenta također u Liburniji [i.e. in the Kastav-like dialects, W.V.], zbog čega bi trebalo obzirnije postupati u identifikaciji "čakavskoga", i "posavskoga", (kako ga Ivšić opisuje u Radu 187.) ili bi barem trebalo čekati, dok se složi više pozvanih istraživača o karakteru "posavskoga" i "čakavskoga" (staroga) uzlaznoga akcenta" (Ribarić 1940: 38).⁴¹
4. As we saw a moment ago Ivić identifies the realization of the rising tone in Lika čakavian with that in (neo-)štokavian.
5. In the CČ dialects of the northern and central parts of the Burgenland falling vowels tend to be appreciably longer than vowels under the rising tone (Neweklowsky 1978: 67, cf. also Koschat 1978: 72 on Baumgarten-Pajngrt).

There is every reason to believe that the čakavian acute has different realizations in different dialects, cf. also Houtzagers's and Kalsbeek's articles elsewhere |308| in this volume.

Belić, in his description of the Novi acute, distinguishes two positions: final and non-final position. According to him the realization of the acute is not the same in both positions. On the basis of my own observations I cannot but agree with Belić. In non-final position the acute often conforms well enough to the Posavian ideal (although there is considerable variation). In final position, however, it is always falling. This does not mean that the opposition is neutralized. Quite to the contrary, Belić is right when he states that the acute is realized "особенно типично в конце слов и в односложных словах" (1909: 204). There are three clues that enable one to distinguish the tones in final position:

⁴⁰ Belić's description is partly based on observations by Ante Dukić.

⁴¹ The date of publication of Ribarić's work (1940) is misleading. We first come across Ribarić in Belić's Istrian *Izveštaj* (1914a: 255). According to Rončević (1967) Ribarić finished his manuscript for the first time in 1916 in German, then translated it into Serbo-Croat and submitted it to the JAZU for publication in one |332| of their journals. For reasons that cannot have had anything to do with quality the JAZU did not publish it, and during the next twenty years Ribarić's work was known only to those who had managed to get hold of a copy of the manuscript (e.g. Belić and Tesnière, but apparently not Mačeki).

- a. *Melody*. The fact that in final position both the falling and the rising tone are falling does not mean that they have the same melody: in the case of the acute the fall starts later than in that of the falling tone. One has the impression that the falling tone starts falling off as soon as it is physically possible for it to do so. As a consequence it sounds very abrupt and differs in that way from the most common realization of the falling tone as pronounced by Standard speakers with a neo-štokavian background, which is much smoother. This abrupt character of the Novi falling tone is noticeable in all positions.
- b. *Loudness*. As far as it is possible to separate loudness from melody in cases like this I quite agree with Belić's description: whereas in the acute loudness seems to increase up to a certain point and to fall off very rapidly after this point has been reached, the falling tone falls off almost immediately after the onset. Probably as a result of this the falling tone when in final position makes the impression of being |309| somewhat shorter than the acute, in particular in open syllables (e.g. *smî* vs. *spî*). I do not think that the falling tone is shorter in an absolute sense; the impression that it is may be a consequence of the fact that the second part of a falling vowel in final position is pronounced very softly. In non-final position there do not seem to be any quantitative differences between the two tones.
- c. *Voice timbre*. In sentence-final position the rising tone almost invariably develops a laryngeal "creak" towards the end of its realization. This "creaky" realization of the acute may be the consequence of a tendency to combine the impression of increasing loudness with an actual decrease in breathforce which is natural at the end of a sentence. I have noticed the same "creaky" realization of the rising tone in two other dialects that maintain the tone distinction in final position: Selce (5 km. to the north of Novi) and Senj (CČ, 15 km. to the south).⁴²

If one approaches the accentuation of the Novi dialect with a preconceived idea about what a čakavian acute should sound like, the only thing one can do is conclude that the rising tone is becoming falling in final position (and therefore merging with the falling tone). However, as soon as one tries to see whether there is a tone distinction in final position one has to conclude that there is one and that there is no question of a merger. The traditional way of approaching the problem of the čakavian tone distinction forces the investigator to come up with an incorrect description of the Novi dialect.

3.4. Kastav-like ekavian dialects ("NKa").

A group of dialects closely related to NNo but with an ekavian reflex of PSI. *ě* are spoken in the following |310| three areas:

- A. The north-eastern part of Istria (the part to the east and north-east of the Učka mountain): the coast approximately from Zagore or Brseč north-ward to quite

⁴² The fact that Moguš does not mention this in his description of the Senj dialect (1966) may simply be due to the fact that as a native speaker he is not aware of it.

near the Slovene border: Rupa, Lipa, Škalnica, Breza and Studena seem to be the northern-most Kastav-like points. Šapjane, Veli Brgud and Mali Brgud are CČ (in all likelihood related to nearby Mune), Lisac is Slovene (Rigler 1963), Klana is SEČ (cf. above, section 2.3B). The center of this area is the “Kastavština”.

- B. The old town districts of Rijeka and the “Hrvatsko Primorje” south-eastward up to the point where NNo takes over. The southern-most ekavian point is Meja [-Gaj], less than half an hour’s walk from i/e-kavian Hreljin.
- C. The town of Crikvenica, isolated among the Novi-like dialects of the i/e-kavian part of the Hrvatsko Primorje.

Our knowledge of NKa is fragmentary.

The principal sources on the dialects of A (which are unanimously reported to differ only minimally from each other) are remarks by Belić dealing mainly with the prosodic inventory and the accentuation of the adjective (1913, 1913a, 1914, 1914a, 1931, 1931a: 203f., 1935b, 1936), and an extensive collection of well-written and probably very idiomatic texts by Jardas (1957, cf. also 1962), a small portion of which was accented by Moguš and Pavešić. The remaining literature adds very little to this.⁴³

About B we know even less. The prosodic inventory of the dialects of the area is described by Belić (1914a: 359), cf. also the information in Belić (1913, 1914). The Bakar dialect is partly known on the basis of scattered remarks by Ivšić in all his major works (1911, 1913, 1913a, 1931, 1936: 66n.) and a short but **[311]** extremely informative sketch by Ivić (1959). Bujan’s notes on the Praputnjak dialect (with remarks on Krasica and Bakar), though evidently the work of an amateur, contain interesting information on both linguistic and non-linguistic matters (1937, 1938). The extensive description of the Rijeka dialect by Strohal (1895) is of doubtful reliability. Belić has the following to say about it: “Naročito je slab rad R. Strohalo o rečkom govoru. Sa koliko je malo ozbiljnosti R. Strohal radio te poslove, vidi se baš dobro iz toga njegovog rada (...). On je na pr. u svima paradigmama glagola prosto stavio akcente koje je utvrdio prema Vukovu rečniku (iako o tome ne govori!), a ne prema onome kako se na Reci izgovara” (1931a: 197f.). This may very well be true. Strohal is known to have been unreliable at times (cf. Rešetar 1902) and there is much in his description that is odd. The oddest thing is perhaps the fact that his material does not contain a single instance of neocircumflex in the present tense of the verb, cf. *cùjê* (175), *lègnê* (176), *kàpjê* (184), *kàjê* (186), *kazùjê* (187).⁴⁴

About the Crikvenica dialect next to nothing is known (Belić: 10-38 passim, Brabec 1969: 423).

A is among those rare čakavian dialects that not only have retained the tone distinction but also have quantity oppositions in both pretonic and post-tonic syllables.

⁴³ Examples: Małecki (1929a: 8, 40, 1930: 54-60), Ribarić (1940: 23-26, 38, 127), Moguš (1977), Turina and Šepić-Tomin (1977), Peco (1978: 142f., 147), Barac-Grum (1981).

⁴⁴ Cf. also Leskien (1881), Bujanović (1896), A. Glavan (1896), Ivković (1921), V. Glavan (1928-9, in particular 132), Małecki (1929a), Ivić (1961a), Turina and Šepić-Tomin (1977).

The system is however disintegrating. The distinction between the tones is lost in sentence-final position and unstressed long vowels are shortened “u izvesnim prilikama” (Belić 1935b: 153). The dialects of *B* have carried through shortening of all unstressed long vowels, but may have retained the tone distinction somewhat better than *A*.⁴⁵

Little is known about internal differentiation within NKa. The dialects of *B* seem to have more words |312| with *i* < *ě* than those of *A*. In the towns (e.g. Bakar, Kastav, Rijeka) the distinction between palatal and alveolar fricatives (and affricates) has been lost wholly or in part (“čakavizam”).⁴⁶ In Veprinac (*A*, to the south of the Kastavština) the PSl. distinction between *d'* and *j* seems to have been retained as one between a fricative and a frictionless *j*-like sound (Belić 1914a: 135, cf. also Małecki 1930: 58 on Zatkan, near Veprinac).⁴⁷ The extreme south of *A* (to the south of Mošćenice) looks like a transitional area that leads imperceptibly from NKa to the Istrian dialects spoken around Labin: a number of otherwise general NKa innovations did not reach the area, which on the other hand seems sensitive to innovations coming from Istria. The dialect of [Sv.] Jelena, immediately to the south of Mošćenice, has retained the prefix *vi-* (without replacing it with *zi-*) and the cluster *-čm-* (without changing it into *-šm-*); Brseč, to the south of Sv. Jelena, has developed a labialized realization of *ā*; Zagorje, to the south of Brseč, has developed a more strongly labialized (and diphthongized) realization of *ā* and has carried through a general shortening of posttonic long vowels (Belić op.cit.: 226, Małecki op.cit.: 55-58).

Although NNo and NKa strongly resemble each other it is not easy to find specifically NNo/NKa innovations. Examples:

1. The prefix *vi-* has been replaced with *zi-*. The innovation is not found to the south of Mošćenice and has also taken place in part of CČ.⁴⁸
2. The *ā*-stem instr.sg. ending *-u* has been extended with *-m*, e.g. Omišalj *rukūm*. The innovation did not reach the Punat dialect, which has *-u* (according to most investigators), and it has taken place in several Istrian and CČ dialects. |313|
3. In word-initial position and after palatals PSl. *ě* is reflected as *a* in those positions in which in i/ekavian dialects it is otherwise reflected as *e*: before dental consonants which are not in their turn followed by a front vowel, e.g. Omišalj *ńāzļǫ*,

⁴⁵ The Crikvenica dialect has retained quantity in both stressed and unstressed (pretonic and post-tonic) syllables. On the other hand the tones have either been lost or have a realization that differs from that of the Novi tones.

⁴⁶ In some dialects characterized by “cakavizam” the feature that differentiates *š* from *s* is optional (cf. Steinhauer 1975 on the Susak dialect), which may explain why investigators differ so often in their observations on the presence or absence of “cakavizam” in such-and-such dialect.

⁴⁷ Cf. also the following intriguing remark by Jagić: “ (...) es wäre unrichtig zu behaupten, das aus *đj* durch das Medium von *d'* hervorgegangene *j* sei überall gleich einem gewöhnlichen *j*; ich behaupte vielmehr, dass wenn man genauere Beobachtungen anstellte, man zwischen *j* im Worte *moja* und dem *j* im Worte *meja* wenigstens hier und dort einen merklichen Unterschied entdecken würde” (Jagić 1891: 391).

⁴⁸ Milčetić's data (1895: 130) suggest that in the nineteenth century *vi-* was more widespread in NKa and NNo.

jäla (van Wijk 1937). The innovation is also found in CČ and in the Istrian dialects spoken to the north of Labin.

4. Non-syllabic prepositions in some cases lengthen the initial vowel of a following word, e.g. Omišalj *ofcà/k òfcàm*, *iglà/s iglùm*, *òko/v òko*, *ùsta/z ùst*, *utòrek/v ütòrek*, Novi *òko/vòko* (Belić 1909: 220), Dobrinj *ùha* (gen.sg.)/*v ùho* (Jelenović 1962: 231f.), Marčelji near Kastav *ogânj/v ôgânj* (Moguš and Pavešić 1957: 385).

3.5. Cres-like ekavian dialects (“NCr”).

NWČ dialects with an ekavian reflex of PSl. *ě* but otherwise very different from NKA are spoken on the island of Cres and in the two northern-most points on the island of Lošinj (Nerezine and [Sv.] Jakov).

The available information on NCr is fragmentary:

1. Scattered remarks on all of NCr can be found in Milčetić (1895) and Hamm, Hraste and Guberina (1956: 44-51).
2. Bortulin’s texts in the Beli dialect, though short, are valuable because they are partly accented and make the impression of being idiomatically-written (1898, 1903, 1921/4).⁴⁹
3. The dialect of the town of Cres is the main subject of three works by Tentor (1909, 1925/6, 1950), cf. Belić’s review (1909a).⁵⁰ The phonemic system of the Cres dialect has recently been described by Šojat (1981).
4. The prosodic inventory of the dialect of the village of Orlec (near Cres) is the subject of an |314| article by Houtzagers elsewhere in this volume. The article also touches on the accentuation of other NCr dialects than Orlec.
5. Hamm’s remarks on the dialects of Lošinj and surrounding islands contain information on Nerezine and Sv. Jakov (Hamm, Hraste and Guberina 1956: 186-213).⁵¹

The basic problem posed by NCr is that of its prosodic system. Cres accentuation has been felt by most investigators to be vague and it has proved difficult to determine whether or not NCr has retained tonal and quantitative distinctions in stressed syllables. The history of the problem (which is in a number of ways highly instructive) is treated by Houtzagers. He concludes that the only publication so far to have given a correct picture of the prosodic inventory is Bortulin’s second text (1903) and that Cres accentuation can be described as follows:

- a. The PSl. tone distinction has been retained.
- b. Short *a*, *e* (< *e/ę/ě*) and *o* have been lengthened in stressed non-final syllables, yielding a long rising tone.

⁴⁹ Other works by Bortulin (1906, 1914, 1949) are not in dialect; they do contain some dialect material, however. On the title page of his two earliest contributions Bortulin’s name is spelt with an *a*: Bartulin.

⁵⁰ Tentor’s “Leksička slaganja ...” (1950) contains much information on other dialects (besides Cres).

⁵¹ Cf. also Milčetić (1895), Belić (1909a), Ivšić (1911: 141, 152-154, 163), Mačeki (1929a: 35), Hraste (1954), Jurišić (1956), Jurišić et al. (1956), Marković (1973).

- c. The other short vowels (*i*, *u* and the product of the merger of the strong jers) have not been subjected to lengthening.
- d. There are several groups of unexplained exceptions to lengthening.
- e. Unstressed long vowels have been shortened in all positions.⁵²

NCr is typical of the older dialects of Krk and Cres/Lošinj in that it has unusual reflexes of the product of the merger of the strong jers (when short) and reflects the syllabic *l̥* in a way that is clearly connected with the reflex of the jers. The center of the area (e.g. Cres, Orlec, Lubenice, Belej) has *e* (-*el*-), whereas we find *a* (-*al*-) in the north (e.g. [315] Beli, Predošćica, Vodice) and in the south (e.g. Ustrine, Punta Križa, Nerezine, Sv. Jakov). There seems to be considerable variation with respect to the vowel systems, not all of which conform to the “classical” five-vowel pattern that is general or next to general in NNo and NKa (Hamm, Hraste and Guberina 1956).

4. Istrian NWČ.

The defining characteristic of “Istrian NWČ” is the presence of examples of *o* < *ȯ*. We have seen that as one travels southward along the NKa-speaking part of the Istrian east coast one notices a transitional area that starts immediately to the south of Mošćenice: Sv. Jelena, Brseč, Zagorje (section 3.4). Examples of *o* < *ȯ* start appearing if not in Plomin or surrounding settlements immediately to the south of Zagorje, then in any case in the surroundings of Nedeščina/Sv. Nedelja [Labinska] and on the Ripenda peninsula (e.g. [Ripenda-] Kosi, Gornji Rabac). These dialects are in a number of respects transitional: in them the reflex *u* < *ȯ* predominates and they have palatalization of *l* and *n* between velar consonants and mid front vowels, cf. Kosi *ńo:zlo'*, Prklog *kl'e'knula*, *gl'e'dala*, *hl'ep*, Kranjci (Kranjsko Selo) *ńázlo* alongside *gńizlò* (Ivić 1961: 207, 209, Małecki 1930: 66).⁵³ It is possible that the dialects to the south of Labin are more characteristically Istrian (Belić 1914a: 239, 1931a: 204).

Istrian NWČ does not constitute a geographical unity: there are four patches of NWČ in Istria, separated from each other by CČ (and in places SEČ). On the basis of the reflex of PSl. *ȯ* they can be divided into two major groups:

- A. Central Istrian NWČ (“NCI”) in which *ȯ* has merged with *o*, cf. section 4.1. For practical reasons I include the transitional dialects spoken to the north [316] of Labin in this group.
- B. North Istrian NWČ (“NNI”), in which *ȯ* has merged with *a*, cf. section 4.2.

In the north of Istria there seems to be a fairly sharp boundary-line between NWČ and Slovene (cf. section 4.3).

Although not enough is known about Istrian NWČ to be sure about anything it is likely that the following innovations are more or less general:

⁵² Lengthening of stressed non-high short vowels in non-final syllables has also taken place in a number of CČ dialects (Susak and most of the Burgenland).

⁵³ In the Prklog examples the transcription has been simplified.

1. Loss of length distinctions in post-tonic syllables (like NCr and Slovene, but unlike the NKa dialects of the east coast).
2. Devoicing of voiced consonants in final position (like NCr and Slovene).
3. Rise of the reflex of a long vowel in positions where one expects the reflex of a “short neo-acute”, e.g. Lupoglav nom./acc.pl. *riébra* (Ivić 1961: 203), Blatna Vas gen.pl. *siástar* (Ivić 1963: 229). There appears to be considerable variation with respect to the sets of forms in which one find this phenomenon, for which there is no parallel in NWČ, but which occurs in several CČ dialects.

4.1. Central Istrian NWČ (“NCI”).

Istrian NWČ with $\varrho = o$ in at least some examples is spoken in four areas separated from each other by speakers of (mainly) CČ dialects:

- A. The area around Labin (the “Labinština”): approximately everything to the east of the Raša river from Koromačno north-ward to the area around Nedeščina/ Sv. Nedelja [Labinska] and Plomin. The northern part of the Labinština and perhaps all of it constitutes a transitional area between NCI proper and NKa (cf. above). Just to the north of Sv. Nedelja points like Šumber, Kršan and Kozljak are CČ. |317|
- B. The town of Žminj and a small number of villages in the immediate neighbourhood (e.g. Debeljuhi, Orbanići). The area is probably small, but it is not known precisely how small.
- C. The area around Pazin (the “Pazinština”): roughly speaking all points inside the triangle Novaki [Motovunski]-Tinjan-Pićan. In the east (the surroundings of Pićan) the boundary between NWČ and CČ is unclear; it may have been obliterated as a result of dialect mixture (cf. the suggestive remarks on the Škopljak dialect in Belić 1914a: 239).
- D. The area around Boljun (the “Boljunština”): (very roughly speaking) everything within the triangle Paz-Vranja-Semić.

Our knowledge of NCI does not amount to much. The principal sources are:

1. Short notes on several NCI dialects by Belić (1914a), Maček (1929a: 42-45, 1930: 60-68) and in particular Ivić (1961: 202-210).
2. A grammar of the Žminj dialect by Zgrablić (1905, 1906, 1907). According to Belić, who knew the dialect, Zgrablić describes it “prilično, ali sa tačke gledišta akcentuacije netačno” (Belić 1914a: 239n.).
3. A description of the phonemic system of the Žminj dialect by Šimunović (1981).
4. A description of the phonemic system of the dialect of Orbanići, near Žminj, by Kalsbeek (elsewhere in this volume).
5. A short but informative text in the Boljun dialect by Lovljanov (1949). Although the text is not accented certain conclusions about accentuation can be drawn on the basis of it because it writes the diphthongized reflexes of the long mid vowels

differently from the short mid vowels (which have not been diphthongized): *ie/uo* vs. *e/o*.^{54 55} |318|

The tone distinction has been retained in a number of points, if not everywhere. However, there is much uncertainty about the matter. Belić tantalizingly writes that the Sv. Nedelja dialect (Labinština) resembles NCr “u izgovoru akcenata” (1914a: 241). Ivić notes in the Pazinština a tendency towards Cres-like lengthening of short stressed non-high vowels, which, curiously enough, is “odsutna u Labinštini” (1961: 203). The dialects of the Labinština, the Žminjština and the Pazinština are ekavian (like NKa and NCr). In at least part of the dialects of the Boljunština short *ě* has been retained as a separate phoneme (Ivić op.cit. on Semić and Lupoglav, Kalsbeek on Vranja). In the Boljunština, the Pazinština and the Žminjština the long mid vowels *ē* (< *ē/ĕ/ě*) and *ō* (< *ō/ŏ*) have been diphthongized > *ie, uo*. In the Labinština more radical transformations of the vowel system seem to have taken place, with considerable local variation.

4.2. North Istrian NWČ (“NNI”).

Almost immediately to the north of NCI we find a fairly large and geographically coherent area with dialects characterized by the merger of *q* with *a*. NNI is separated from Pazinština NCI by a narrow strip of SEČ (Karojba-Kaldir-Kaščerga-Grdoselo-Kršikla) in the west and a slightly more massive ČČ area in the east (Zarečje, Novaki [Pazinski], Cerovlje, Golgorica). Between the northern-most Boljunština dialects (Semić) and the south-eastern corner of NNI (Roč, Blatna Vas) no dialects of non-Istrian provenience intervene. The western-most NNI points lie (roughly speaking) on the line Brkač-Livade-Oprtalj-Pregara (in Slovenia). In the north and north-west the boundary between NNI-like and Slovene-like dialects is not quite clear. There may be no clear-cut boundary (cf. below, section 4.3). |319|

The main sources on NNI are:

1. Scattered remarks on a number of NNI dialects by Maček (1929-30: A36-A45, 1930: 90-101) and Hraste (1963).
2. A few short sketches of the dialects of individual villages: Ribarić (1940: 19-21 on [Sv.] Martin [pri Buzetu] = Drašćići), Ivić (1961: 198-200 on Draguč, 1963 on Nugla, Blatna Vas, Veli Mlun = Veliki Mlun, [Sv.] Donat, with remarks on a few other points), Šimunović (1970 on Nugla, Sv. Martin and Račice).⁵⁶

All of NNI seems to have lost the tones. In the extreme south (Draguč) quantity has been retained in stressed and pretonic syllables. Elsewhere quantity has been lost.

⁵⁴ According to the editor's introduction Lovljanov's manuscript contains more information about prosodic matters than the printed text.

⁵⁵ Cf. also Belić (1913, 1931a), Maček (1930a, 1930b, 1931), Ribarić (1940: 23-26), Zajceva (1967). The abundant data in Nemanić (1883 etc.) are not localized and therefore largely uninterpretable. |333|

⁵⁶ Cf. also Rešetar (1891: 170-172), Belić (1914a: 254).

However, in a number of cases the old quantity distinctions are continued as timbre distinctions, so that information about the original distribution of long and short vowels is still available, cf. the typically NWČ distribution of the neocircumflex reflected in Blatna Vas *dělat/dělan* vs. *řezat/rížen* (Ivić 1963: 229). There are considerable local differences, since no two NNI villages seem to have the same vowel system. In the north general lengthening of stressed vowels in non-final syllables seems to have taken place prior to the loss of length distinctions. As a consequence the vowel systems of these dialects allow no conclusions about quantity in non-final syllables.

The typically NNI merger of *o* with *a* has obviously caused the acc.sg. of *ā*-stem nouns to merge with the nom.sg. As a more or less natural consequence the well-known rule about the selection of the case form for the acc.sg. in msc. nouns (gen. or nom. depending on animateness) has been extended to fem. nouns, so that in Sv. Martin the acc.sg. of *vōda* (which has taken the stress from the acc.sg.) is also *vōda*, whereas the |320| acc.sg. of *ženā* is *ženě* (Ribarić: 20f.).⁵⁷ In most if not all NNI dialects PSl. *ě* has remained a separate phoneme at least in certain positions (cf. the dialects of the Boljunština).

4.3. NNI vs. Slovene.

In the north of Istria transitional dialects between NWČ and Slovene are to be expected. Immediately to the north of the Slovene border we find representatives of two clearly distinct groups of Slovene dialects:

- A. Notranjski, on which cf. Logar (1955, 1961-2), Rigler (1960, 1963). Notranjski can be regarded as a highly innovative branch of Dolenjski: it has carried through all Dolenjski innovations but has gone beyond Dolenjski in eliminating the tones and usually also the length distinctions.
- B. “Šavrinski” (= Mažeki’s “Pomjanski”), cf. in particular Logar (1961-2), Orožen (1981). In part of Šavrinski lengthened short *o*, instead of merging with the reflex of *o*, has merged with the reflex of long *ō*. This opposes at least part of Šavrinski to all other western and central dialects of Slovene (including Notranjski and those Šavrinski dialects that have the normal reflexes). It is unfortunate that so little is known about Šavrinski.

In the present state of our knowledge one cannot hope to reach definitive conclusions about the relationship of NNI and Slovene. However, there are at least two areas of the language in which it is possible to go at least slightly beyond speculation: the history of the vowels and that of the prosodic system. It is instructive to see which of the major changes of the Slovene prosodic system were shared by NNI:

1. Progressive stress shift from vowels with a falling intonation: NO. |321|
2. Rise of neocircumflex before weak jers (*bítka*): NO.

⁵⁷ I assume it is this Belić has in mind when he refers to these dialects as “sa interesantnim gubljenjem oblika deklinacije” (1914a: 254).

3. Rise of neocircumflex before post-tonic long vowels (*vīdi*): PARTLY (the NNI distribution of neocircumflex does not seem to differ significantly from the normal NWČ distribution, so that this is not a specific NNI-Slovene link).
4. Loss of length in post-tonic syllables: YES (but also in the other Istrian NWČ dialects and in NCr, so that this is not a specific NNI-Slovene link).
5. Stress retraction onto long vowels in the penultimate syllable (*dúša*): NO.
6. General lengthening of short stressed vowels in non-final syllables (*bába*): PARTLY (only in the north of the area).
7. Retraction of the stress onto short vowels in the penultimate syllable (*žéna*): NO.
8. General loss of phonemic quantity: YES (but not in the south).
9. Loss of the tones: YES.

The resulting picture is fairly clear: the accentual innovations shared by NNI and Slovene dialects are in the main relatively recent. It is characteristic for this that NNI took part in those innovations that differentiated Notranjski from Dolenjski. This refutes Brozović's theory of the rise of NNI: "Tu je, iako se i u osnovi radi o prelaznom tipu, osnovica govora slovenska, a nije hrvatskosrpska, nego je tek naknadno serbo-kroatizirana" (1960: 80).

If we look at the vowel system the picture becomes more complex. There are two important innovations NNI shares with (part of) Slovene:

- I. Fronting of *u* ($> \ddot{u} > \ddot{o}$), followed by raising of \ddot{o} ($> \ddot{u}$). In the south of NNI (Draguč) fronting of *u* is not found, which may be due to a recent reverse development [322] $\ddot{u} > u$ (parallels for which have been found all over the area where fronting of *u* took place).
- II. The rise of labialized reflexes of *a* (common to Šavrinski and NNI) occurs only sporadically in the other western and central dialects of Slovene. It is on the other hand common in NCI (Boljunština, Floričiči in the Pazinština, the Labinština). It may have been a change common to Šavrinski on the one hand and Istrian NWČ on the other. If we assume that NNI constituted the epicentre of the development, then not only the geographical distribution but also the uniquely NNI merger of *a* with ϱ finds a natural explanation.

In the north-east things are different. Ribarić's (1940: 12-19) and Ivić's (1963: 234-236) descriptions of the Slum dialect reveal a prosodic system that is unambiguously Slovene (progressive stress shift, stress retractions). Slum also differs from NNI in that it has merger of ϱ with *o*. It is clear from this that between NNI and the Slum dialect there runs an important bundle of isoglosses. The exact course of this bundle of isoglosses cannot however be determined in the present state of our knowledge. For the time being it seems best to identify the boundary between NNI and non-NNI dialects with the isogloss separating dialects with stress retractions from dialects lacking them. According to Maček (1929-30: A37, 1930: 92) Slum, Brest and Klenovščak are characterized by the presence of stress retractions, whereas no retractions are found in Prapoče (= Praproče), Račja Vas, Podgače and Lanišče. Whether the Prapoče-like

dialects are strictly NNI in that they have merger of ϱ with a cannot be determined in the present state of our knowledge (although somehow it does not seem likely). |323|

4.4. Contact between NWČ and SEČ in Istria.

The dialects spoken in southern and western Istria are ikavian. Both the general properties of these dialects and what is known about the external history of the area points to an origin in Dalmatia or in the Dalmatian Hinterland. The exact history of Istrian SEČ has not yet been reconstructed. However, it would not be surprising if the history of Istrian SEČ would turn out to involve some contact with Istrian NWČ. Probably one of the clearest examples of the results of such contact is to be found in those ikavian dialects that have $o < \varrho$ in some examples. Mačeki (1930: 118), who discovered the phenomenon, found it in Kaštelir, Labinci (= Sv. Nedelja), the surroundings of Višnjan, and, to the north of the Mirna, around Brtonigla (e.g. Fernetiči and Marinčiči); Bošković (1954: 236 and passim) found it in Kaštelir, Labinci and Markovac (near Višnjan); Hraste (1967: 69) found it not only in Kaštelir and Labinci, but also in Tadini (contrary to Bošković), and, somewhat more to the east, in Karojba and Kaldir (contrary to Mačeki).

Interference between varieties of Istrian NWČ and the dialects of ikavian newcomers may also account for a number of other phenomena, e.g. the diphthongization of mid vowels found in the dialects spoken just to the north of the Limski Kanal, or the labialized reflexes of long \bar{a} and the use of the pronoun *kaj* characteristic of some of the dialects spoken to the north of the Mirna.

5. Appendix: some important NWČ points.

The dialectological literature contains remarks on a considerable number of NWČ towns and villages. In this appendix I shall try and give a list of NWČ points mentioned in the literature. The list is not intended to be |324| exhaustive. The place names are given in their official forms as listed by Korenčić (1979). It goes without saying that the official forms differ in some cases from the forms one comes across in the dialectological literature or the ones that would be preferred by the local people. In such cases I have tried to give alternative forms, using square brackets and other obvious devices.

NWČ dialects have been found in the following “općine”: Buje (the extreme east), Buzet, Cres-Lošinj, Crikvenica, Krk, Labin, Opatija, Pazin, Rijeka, Rovinj (the extreme east). There are a few NNI points in Slovenia (to the south of Sočerga). It is possible that there are NWČ points in one or more of the following “općine”: Delnice (scattered), Poreč (the extreme east) and Pula (the extreme north-east).

5.1. Novi-like dialects (NNo).

1A. (“Vinodol”): Bakarac, Bribir, Drivenik, Grižane, Hreljin, Jadranovo (= Sv. Jakov), Kraljevica, Ledenice, Mali Dol, Novi [Vinodolski], Selce, Šmrika, Zlobin. It is

unclear whether Donji Zagon and Povile are NNo or Bunjevački neo-štokavian.⁵⁸ The only point in the area known to be something else than NNo is ekavian Crikvenica. It may not be the only ekavian point. It is not excluded that in travelling inland from Zlobin one comes across a few dialects that are NNo or contain traces of having been NNo in the past. These dialects may be the remnants of some kinds of “bridge” between NNo and the varieties of ČČ spoken around Ogulin and Vrbovsko. Examples: Benkovac [Fužinski], Slavica, Brestova Draga, Sunger, Stari Laz, Begovo Razdolje.

1B. (“Grobinština”): Baštijani, Cernik [Primorski], Čavle, Drastin, Dražice, Grobnik, Ilovik, Jelenje [Donje], Kukuljani, Orehovica, Podhum, Soboli, |325| Trnovica, Zastenice.

1Ca. (northern Krk with *e* from short strong jer): Omišalj (isolated).

1Cb. (Dobrinjština); Čižići, Dobrinj, Gabonjin, Gostinjac, Hlapa, [Sv.] Ivan [Dobrinjski], Klanice, Klimno (= Kivna), Kras, Polje, Rasopasno (= Rosopasno), Rudine, Soline, Sužan, Šilo, Tribulje, [Sv.] Vid [Dobrinjski], Županje.

1Cc. (eastern Krk with *e* from short strong jer): Vrbnik, Garica [Gornja and Donja], Kozarin, Risika, Paprata.

1Cd. (area with normal reflex of strong jer): Punat (between the wars Aleksandrovo). Possibly also Baška [Nova], Batomalj, Draga [Bašćanska], Jurandvor, Stara Baška.

5.2. Kastav-like dialects (NKa).

2A. (Kastavština and Istrian coast): Brešca, Breza, Brseč (= Bršeč), Gornji Kraj (= Kraj Gorenji), Grabrova (= Grabova), [Sv.] Jelena, Kastav, Lipa, Lovran, Marčelji, Matulji, Mošćenice, Opatija, Rukavac, Rupa, Studena, Škalnica (= Skalnica), Vepri-nac, Viškovo (= Sv. Matej), Volosko, Zatkan, Zvoneće.

2B. (Bakar-Trsat dialects): Bakar, Kostrena, Kukuljanovo, Meja[-Gaj], Plosna, Podbežice, Ponikve [Kraščke], Praputnjak (= Praputnik), Škrljevo, Urinj. The town dialect of Rijeka as spoken in such old town districts as Trsat is also to be counted among the dialects of this group. The dialect of [Donja] Draga, nowadays incorporated into the town of Rijeka, is ČČ.

2C. (Vinodol ekavian): Crikvenica and possibly a number of other points in the same area.

5.3. Cres-like dialects (Her).

Belej, Beli, Cres, Dragozetići, Filozići, Grmov, |326| Ivanje, [Sv.] Jakov, Lubenice, Martinščica, Miholaščica, Nerezine, Orlec, Osor, Pernat, Predošćica, Punta Križa, Štivan (= Stivan), Ustrine, Valun, Vodice, Vrana.

5.4. Central Istrian NWČ (NCI).

4A. (“Labinština”): Diminići, Gornji Rabac (= Rabac Gorenji), Kranjci (= Kranjsko Selo), Letajac, Nedeščina (= Sv. Nedelja [Labinska]), Polje, Prklog (near Duga Luka),

⁵⁸ According to Finka and Moguš’s map (1977) Povile is “čakavian”.

Rabac Luka, [Ripenda-]Kosi, Skitača (= Sv. Lucija na Skitači), Vicani (= Vičani, near [Ripenda-] Kras). The boundary-line between NCI and the southern dialects of NKA is unclear (e.g. Zagore, Zagorje, Plomin etc.).

4B. ("Zminjščina"): Debeljuhi, Kršanci, Orbanici, Vlašići, Žminj.

4C. ("Pazinščina"): Beram, Bortuli (= Bortol), Floričići, Gračišće, Heki, Katun [Lindarski], Kras [Staro-Pazinski], Lindar, Novaki [Motovunski], Pazin, Pićan, Pilati, Pulići (near Zabrežani), Tinjan, Trviž, Velonov Breg (= Velanov Breg).

4D. ("Boljunščina"): Andrejevići (= Andrevići), Boljunsko Polje, Dolenja Vas, Lupoglav, Mandići, Paz (= Pas), Semić, Vranja.

5.5. North Istrian NWČ (NNI).

Blatna Vas, Brezovica, Brkač, Črnica (= Crnica), [Sv.] Donat, Draguč, [Gornja and Donja] Nugla, Gradinje, [Sv.] Ivan, Jurišići, Korelići, Krbavšići, Krkuš, Lanišće, Livade, Mali Mlun (= Mlum Mali), Marčenigla, [Sv.] Martin [pri Buzetu] (= Draščići), Oslići, Podgaće, Prapoće (= Praproće), Pregara, Račice, Račja Vas, Ročko Polje, Strana, Štrped, Veli Mlun (= Mlum Veli, Veliki Mlum), Zamask (= Zamašk), Zrenj, Žonti.⁵⁹

University of Leiden

References

- Alexander, Ronelle
1975 *Torlak accentuation*, München.
- Babić, Sl.
1964 *Serbo-Croat for foreigners*, Beograd.
- Barac, V.
1963 "Izveštaj o radu u Vinodolu", *LjJA* 69, 349.
- Barac-Grum, Vida
1981 "Rukavac (OLA 25)", in Ivić et al. (1981), 247-250.
- Bartulin, Andrija (cf. also Bortulin and note 49)
1898 "Cres: vjerovaña", *ZbNŽO* 3, 265-275.
1903 "Ukopano blago. Vjerovaña na otoku Cresu", *ZbNŽO* 8, 134-135.
- Belić, A.
1909 "Zamětki po čakavskim govoram", *IORJaS* 14/2, 181-266.
1909a review of Tentor (1909), *RSI* 2, 174-185.
1912 "Izveštaj Državnom Savetu o dijalektološkim ekskurzijama", *Godišnjak SKA* 25 za 1911, 353-368.
1913 "Čakavsko zi-vi", *JF* 1, 110-113.
1913a "Promene akcenata u praslovenskom jeziku", *JF* 1, 38-66.
1914 *Akcentatske studije, knj. 1*, Beograd.
1914a "Izveštaj o pribiranju dijalektološke građe, potpomognutom sredstvima iz 'Velimirijana'", *Godišnjak SKA* 26 za 1912.
1931 "L'accent de la phrase et l'accent du mot", *TCLP* 4, 183-188.

⁵⁹ I thank J. Kalsbeek and P. Houtzagers for their permission to quote the results of unpublished work (in sections 3.5 and 4.1).

- 1931a review of Małecki (1930), *JF* 10, 197-207.
 1931b review of Małecki (1929), *JF* 10, 207-212.
 1931c review of Meyer (1928), *JF* 10, 214-222.
 1935 "O čakavskoj osnovnoj akcentuaciji", *Glas SKA*, 168, 1-39.
 1935a review of Ivšić (1936), *JF* 14, 241-246.
 1935b "O rečeničnom akcentu u kastavskom govoru", *JF* 14, 151-159.
 1936 "O rečeničnom akcentu u kastavskom govoru", *JF* 15, 165-170.
 1951-2 "Iz srpskohrvatske akcentologije i dijalektologije", *JF* 19, 117-131.
- Bonifačić Rožin, Nikola
 1953 "Puntarska predaja i puntarske glagoljske matice", |334| *ZbNŽO* 37, 145-204.
- Bortulin, Andrija (cf. also Bartulin)
 1906 "Običaji u Belom na otoku Cresu", *ZbNŽO* 11, 149-155.
 1914 "Lov u Belom na Cresu", *ZbNŽO* 19, 321-340.
 1921-4 "Zabave (Beli na otoku Cresu)", *ZbNŽO* 25, 350-362.
 1949 "Beli (otok Cres)", *ZbNŽO* 33, 75-124.
- Bošković, R.
 1954 "O jednoj akcenatskoj osobini dijalekata zapadne i južne Istre", *Prilozi KJIF* 20/3-4, 1-31.
- Brabec, I.
 1969 "Mješoviti govori na sjevernoj periferiji hrvatskosrpskog jezika", *LjJA* 73, 421-425.
- Brozović, D.
 1960 "O strukturalnim i genetskim kriterijima u klasifikaciji hrvatskosrpskih dijalekata", *ZbFL* 3, 68-88.
 1963 "O rekonstrukciji predmigracionog mozaika hrvatskosrpskih dijalekata", *Filologija* 4, 45-55.
 1981 "Dobrinj (OLA 24)", in Ivić et al. (1981), 241-246 (together with Ive Jelenović, cf. p. 12).
- Bujan, Vinko
 1937 "Glavne osebne praputnjarskog dijalekta", *Vjesnik Etnografskog muzeja* 3, 23-48.
 1938 "Osebjunosti praputnjaraca i njihova dijalekta", *Vjesnik Etnografskog muzeja* 4, 38-71.
- Bujanović, J.
 1896 several short ethnographical notes on "Praputnik i okolica", *ZbNŽO* 1.
- Deanović, Mirko and Ive Jelenović
 1958 "Pomorski i ribarski nazivi na Krku, Korčuli i Lopudu", *Zbornik Instituta za historijske nauke u Zadru* 2, 133-171.
- Dmitriev, P.A. and G.I. Safronov .
 1975 *Serboxorvatskij jazyk (Učebnoe posobie)*, Leningrad.
- Drilo, Stjepan
 s.a. [1974?] *Kroatisch-Serbisch: Lehrbuch mit Grammatik für Anfänger*, Zagreb.
- Fancev, Franjo
 1907 "Beiträge zur serbokroatischen Dialektologie. Der kaj-Dialekt von Virje, mit Berücksichtigung der Dialekte Podravina's (Koprivnica-Pitomača)", *AfSIPh* 29, 305-389.
- Finka, B.
 1971 "Čakavsko narječje", *ČR* 1, 11-71.
 1977 "Dugootočki čakavski govori", *HDZb* 4, 7-178.
- Finka, B. and M. Moguš
 1977 "Karta čakavskoga narječja", in Moguš (1977a), 99-104.
- Glavan, Aug.
 1896 "Smrt (d): Sv. Jakov kraj Bakra u Hrvatskoj", *ZbNŽO* 1, 207-211.
- Glavan, Vjenceslav
 1928-9 "Kongruencija u jeziku starih čakavskih pisaca", *JF* 7, 111-159. |335|

- Hamm, J.
 1956 "Izveštaj o dijalektološkom ispitivanju (Susak, s okolnim otočjem i Novi)", *LjJA* 61, 382-383.
 1964 untitled contribution to the discussion, in H.G. Lunt (ed.), *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists (the Hague)*, 123-127.
 1965 "Nekotorye zamečanja k diaxroničeskim issledovanijam", *VJa* 1, 22-36.
 1967 *Kratka gramatika hrvatskosrpskog književnog jezika za strance*, Zagreb.
- Hamm, J., M. Hraste and P. Guberina
 1956 "Govor otoka Suska", *HDZb* 1, 7-213.
- Houtzagers, H.P.
 1982 "Accentuation in a few dialects of the island of Cres", *SSGL* 2, 117-130.
- Hraste, M.
 1954 "Ispitivanje akcenatskog sistema na Cresu", *LjJA* 59, 175-177.
 1963 "Refleks nazala q u buzetskom kraju", Ivšićev zbornik (Zagreb), 129-134.
 1966 "Govori jugozapadne Istre", *HDZb* 2, 5-27.
 1967 "Ikavski govori sjeverozapadne Istre", *Filologija* 5, 61-74.
- Ivić, P.
 1958 *Die serbokroatischen Dialekte; ihre Struktur und Entwicklung I: Allgemeines und die štokavische Dialektgruppe* ('s Gravenhage).
 1959 "Izveštaj o ispitivanju govora u Hrvatskom Primorju septembra 1959", *GFFNS* 4, 395-397.
 1959a review of Hamm, Hraste and Guberina (1956), *ZbFL* 2, 171-183.
 1961 "Prilozi poznavanju dijalekatske slike zapadne Hrvatske", *GFFNS* 6, 191-211.
 1961a "Izveštaj o ispitivanju govora u severnoj i zapadnoj Hrvatskoj", *GFFNS* 6, 403-405.
 1963 "Paralele poljskome "pochylenie" na srpskohrvatskom terenu", *Studia linguistica in honorem Thaddaei Lehr-Splawiński*, 227-243.
 1964 "Promena ra > re u srpskohrvatskim govorima", *Prace filologiczne* 43, 383-393.
 1964a "O govoru ličkih čakavaca (okolina Otočca)", *ZbFL* 7, 127-139.
 1966 [Pis'mo v redakciju], *VJa* 2, 166-168.
 1981 "Prilog karakterizaciji pojedinih grupa čakavskih govora", *HDZb* 5, 67-91.
- Ivić, P. et al.
 1981 *Fonološki opisi srpskohrvatskih/hrvatskosrpskih, slovenačkih i makedonskih govora obuhvaćenih Opšteslovenskim lingvističkim atlasom* (Sarajevo).
- Ivković, Miloš
 1913 "O zvučnim suglasnicima na kraju reči u srpskom jeziku", *JF* 1, 66-72. |336|
 1921 "Jedan čakavski izgovor", *Prilozi KJIF* 1/1, 59-64.
 1921a "Zadnje-lingvalno n u srpskohrvatskom", *Zbornik filoloških i lingvističkih studija A. Beliću povodom 25-godišnjice njegova naučnog rada* (Beograd), 113-115.
- Ivšić, S.
 1911 "Prilog za slavenski akcenat", *Rad* 187, 133-207.
 1913 "Današnji posavski govor", *Rad* 196, 124-254.
 1913a "Današnji posavski govor (svršetak)", *Rad* 197, 9-138.
 1931 "Glagol *morati* 'debeo' i imperfekt *morah* 'poteram'", *JF* 10, 166-170.
 1936 "Jezik Hrvata kajkavaca", *LjJA* 48, 47-88.
 1951 "Iz naše akcentuacije i dijalekatske problematike", *Zbornik radova Filozofskog fakulteta* 1, 359-377.
 1971 *Izabrana djela iz slavenske akcentuacije* (München).
- Jagić, V.
 1884 review of Nemanić (1883), *AfSIPh* 7, 490-491.
 1891 "Einige Bedenken, aus Anlass der vorhergehenden Abhandlung Dr. Rešetar's", *AfSIPh* 13, 388-397.
 1895 "Ein Kapitel aus der Geschichte der südslavischen Sprachen", *AfSIPh* 17, 47-87.

- Jakobson, R.
1975 *N.S. Trubetzkoy's letters and notes* (The Hague).
- Jakubinskij, L.
1925 "Die Vertretung des urslav. ě im Čakavischen", *ZSlPh* 1, 381-396.
- Jardas, Ivo
1957 *Kastavština* (Zagreb) (= *ZbNŽO* 39).
1962 "Ovčarstvo u Lisini na Učki", *ZbNŽO* 40, 213-220.
- Jedvaj, Josip
1956 "Bednjanski govor", *HDZb* 1, 279-330.
- Jelenović, Ive
1949 "Proljetni običaji u Dobrinju (otok Krk)", *ZbNŽO* 33, 141-146.
1959 "Toponomastika sjeverozapadnog dijela otoka Krka", *Filologija* 2, 13-29.
1962 "Etnološki prilozi iz Dobrinja na otoku Krku", *ZbNŽO* 40, 221-240.
1963 corrections of faulty accentuation in Mažecki (1963).
1972 "Mesopust u Dobrinju", *Krčki zbornik* 5, 231-241.
1973 "Mikrotoponimija dobrinjskog područja na otoku Krku", *HDZb* 3, 151-317.
1975 "Svirka (sopèli) u Dobrinjštini", *Krčki zbornik* 6, 173-177.
- Jurišić, Blaž
1956 "Opažanja o govornim osobinama zapadne Istre s otocima", *LjJA* 61, 396-407.
1966 *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade I: Uvod* (Zagreb).
1973 *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade II: Rječnik* (Zagreb).
- Jurišić, Bl. et al.
1956 *Toponimika zapadne Istre, Cresa i Lošinja* (Zagreb) (= *Anali Leksikografskog zavoda FNRJ* 3). |337|
- Kalsbeek, Janneke
1982 "O fonemskom sustavu čakavštine sela Orbanići kod Žminja", *SSGL* 2, 157-176.
- Korenčić, Mirko
1979 *Naselja i Stanovništvo SR Hrvatska 1857-1971* (Zagreb) (= *Djela JA* 54).
- Kortlandt, F.H.H.
1976 "The Slovene Neo-Circumflex", *SEER* 54/1, 1-10.
- Koschat, Helene
1978 *Die čakavische Mundart von Baumgarten im Burgenland* (Wien).
- Lehiste, Ilse and Pavle Ivić
1973 "Akustički opis akcenatskog sistema jednog čakavskog govora", *Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane* 3, 159-170.
- Leskien, A.
1881 "Ueber den Dialekt der "Narodne pripovietke iz hrvatskoga primorja", ges. von Fr. Mikuličić (Kraljevica 1876)", *AfSlPh* 5, 181-188.
- Logar, T.
1955 "Dialektološke študije VII: pripombe k obsegu in karakteristiki kraščine in notranjščine v Ramovševih Dialektih", *SIR* 8, 50-54.
1961-2 "Dialektološke študije XI: slovenski govori v Istri in njihova geneza", *SIR* 13, 88-97.
- Lončarić-Papić, Ivan
1933 *Pačuharije: crtice u čakavskom narječju* (Crikvenica).
- Lovljanov, Frane
1949 "Boljun (Istra): životne potrepštine", *ZbNŽO* 33, 125-133.
- Mažecki, M.
1929 "O podział gwar Krku", *Prace filologiczne* 14, 563-581.
1929a *Cakawizm z uwzględnieniem zjawisk podobnych* (Kraków) (= *Prace komisji językowej* 14).
1929-30 "Gwary Ciciów a ich pochodzenie", *Lud Słowiański* 1, A3-A48.
1930 *Przeгляд słowiańskich gwar Istrji* (Kraków) (= *Prace komisji językowej* 17).

- 1930a "Prasłow. ě w ikawsko-ekawskich dialektach Istrji środkowej", *Archivum neophilologicum* 1/1, 13-26.
- 1930b "Z geografji wyrazów serbsko-chorwatskich", *Archivum neophilologicum* 1/1, 26-30.
- 1931 "Još o razvoju ě > a u srpsko-hrvatskom jeziku", *JF* 11, 217-219.
- 1963 "O podjeli krčkih govora", *Filologija* 4, 223-235 (translation of Małecki 1929).
- Marković, Vladimir
- 1973 "Belehi' na Tramuntani", *Otočki Ljetopis* [1], 214-217. |338|
- Meyer, Karl H.
- 1928 *Untersuchungen zur Čakavština der Insel Krk (Veglia)* (Leipzig).
- Milčetić, I.
- 1888 "Das silbenbildende und silbenschiessende l im kroat. ča-Dialekte", *AfSIPh* 11, 363-367.
- 1894 "Je li stativsko narječje kajkavsko?", *NVj* 2, 94-96.
- 1895 "Čakavština Kvarnerskih otoka", *Rad* 121, 92-131.
- Moguš, M.
- 1963 "Izvještaj o ispitivanju čakavštine u Lici", *LjJA* 67, 293-295.
- 1966 "Današnji senjski govor", *Senjski zbornik* 2, 5-152.
- 1977 "Je li Nazorova čakavska poezija kastavska?", *Radovi ZSF* 15, 115-120.
- 1977a *Čakavsko narječje* (Zagreb).
- Moguš, M. and Sl. Pavešić
- 1957 accentuation of parts of Jardas (1957), cf. p. 6.
- Mrakovčić, Ferdo
- 1972 "Ribolov u Puntu", *Krčki zbornik* 5, 243-247.
- Mrakovčić, Vladimir
- 1949 "Životni običaji u Puntu (otok Krk)", *ZbNŽO* 33, 135-139.
- Mrakovčić Pavlić, Vladimir
- 1975 "Mladovanje u Puntu", *Krčki zbornik* 6, 185-188.
- Naylor, Kenneth E.
- 1970 "A Contribution to the Discussion on the Novi '", *ZbFL* 13/1, 252-255.
- Nemanić, D.
- 1883 "Čakavisches-kroatische Studien ...", *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 104 (Wien), 363-428.
- 1884 "Čakavisches-kroatische Studien ... (I. Fortsetzung)", *Sitzungsberichte ...* 105, 505-572.
- 1885 "Čakavisches-kroatische Studien ... (II. Fortsetzung)", *Sitzungsberichte ...* 108, 197-290.
- Neweklowsky, Gerhard
- 1978 *Die kroatischen Dialekte des Burgenlandes und der angrenzenden Gebiete* (Wien).
- Novljan, Franjo
- 1959 "O etnografskom radu u Boljunu u Istri", *LjJA* 63, 471-473.
- Oblak, V.
- 1894 "Die Halbvocale und ihre Schicksale in den südslavischen Sprachen", *AfSIPh* 16, 153-197.
- 1894a "Zum silbenbildenden l im Slavischen", *AfSIPh* 16, 198-209.
- 1896 review of Milčetić (1895), *AfSIPh* 18, 240-247.
- Orožen, Martina
- 1981 "Pomjan (OLA 11)", in Ivić et al. (1981), 103-109.
- Partridge, Monica
- 1964 *Serbo-Croatian: Practical Grammar and Reader* (New |339| York/London/Toronto).
- Peco, Asim
- 1978 *Pregled srpskohrvatskih dijalekata* (Beograd).
- Rešetar, M.
- 1891 "Die čakavština und deren einstige und jetzige Grenzen", *AfSIPh* 13, 93-109, 161-199, 361-388.

- 1902 review of R. Strohal, *Hrv. nar. pripovijedaka II ...*, *AfSIPh* 24, 586-588.
- 1907 *Der štokavische Dialekt* (Wien).
- Ribarić, J.
1940 "Razmještaj južnoslovenskih dijalekata na poluotoku Istri", *SDZb* 9, 1-207.
- Rigler, J.
1960 "O suponiranem slovenskem brkinskem dialektu", *RSI* 21, 27-35.
1963 *Južnonotranjski govori: akcent in glasoslovje govorov med Snežnikom in Slavnikom* (Ljubljana).
- 1963a "Pregled osnovnih razvojnih etap v slovenskem vokalizmu", *SlR* 14, 25-76.
- Rončević, Nikola
1967 "Dodatak studiji Tineta Logara 'Slovenski govori v Istri'", *SlR* 15, 335-336.
- Schmaus, Alois
1960 *Serbokroatisch in 100 Lektionen* (Beograd).
- Skok, P.
1911 "Mundartliches aus Žumberak (Sichelburg)", *AfSIPh* 32, 363-383.
- Steinhauer, Hein
1973 *Čakavian Studies* (The Hague/Paris).
1973a "On the contemporary (?) Novi dialect", *Dutch Contributions to the Seventh International Congress of Slavists*, 115-131.
1975 "The phonemic system of the Susak dialect", *Linguistics* 162, 17-39.
- Stevanović, M.S.
1940 "Sistem akcentuacije u Piperskom govoru", *SDZb* 10, 69-184.
- Strohal, R.
1895 "Osobine današnjega riječkoga narječja", *Rad* 124, 103-188.
- Subotić, Dr. and N. Forbes
1918 *Serbian grammar* (Oxford).
- Šimunović, P.
1970 "Dijalekatske značajke buzetske regije", *Istarski mozaik* 8/5 (Pula), 35-49.
1981 "Žminj (GLA 22)", in Ivić et al. (1981), 229-234.
- Šojat, Antun
1981 "Cres (OLA 23)", in Ivić et al. (1981), 235-240.
- Tentor, Mate
1909 "Der čakavische Dialekt der Stadt Cres (Cherso)", *AfSIPh* 30, 146-204.
1925-6 "Prilog Bernekerovu rječniku", *JF* 5, 202-214.
1950 "Leksička slaganja creskoga narječja i slovenskoga jezika protiv Vukova jezika", *Razprave SAZU* 1, 67-92.
- Težak, Stjepko
1979 "Sjeverni govori čakavsko-kajkavskog međunarječja u karlovačkom četveroriječju", *Radovi ZSF* 16, 37-51.
1981 "Dokle je kaj prodro na čakavsko područje?", *HDZb* 5, 169-200.
1981a "Ozaljski govor", *HDZb* 5, 203-428.
- Tomljenović, Gr. Bud.
1911 "Bunjevački dijalekat zaleđa senjskoga s osobitim obzirom na naglas", *NVj* 19, 335-348, 401-414, 483-499, 579-604.
- Turato[-Mešter], Ivan
1970 "O godišnjim narodnim običajima u Omišlju", *Krčki zbornik* 1, 445-462.
1975 "Fraj u Omišlju", *Krčki zbornik* 6, 179-183.
- Turina, Zvonimir and Anton Šepić[-Tomin]
1977 *Rječnik čakavskih izraza: Područje Bakarca i Škrljeva* (Rijeka).
- Vermeer, Willem
1975 "Problems in the synchronic and diachronic phonology of Susak čakavian", *ZbFL* 18/2, 139-159.

- 1979 "Innovations in the kajkavian dialect of Bednja", *Dutch Contributions to the Eighth International Congress of Slavists*, 347-381.
- 1979a "Proto-Slavonic *u in kajkavian", *ZbFL* 22/1, 171-176.
- 1980 "Die Konjugation in der nordwestčakavischen Mundart Omišaljs", *SSGL* 1, 439-472.
- forthc. "Raising of *ě and loss of the nasal feature in Slovene", to appear in *ZbFL*.
- Wijk, N. van
1937 "Zur serbokroatischen Entwicklung des slavischen Vokals ě", *ZSlPh* 14, 1-16.
- Zajceva, Svetlana
1967 "Specifična slovenska leksika u savremenim čakavskim govorima", *Prilozi proučavanju jezika* 3, 69-110.
- Zgrablić, Martin
1905-7 "Čakavski dijalekat u Sv. Ivanu i Pavlu te Žminju u Istri", *II. Program C.K. Velike državne gimnazije u Pazinu za školsku godinu 1904.-1905.* (Pazin/Pula, 1905), 3-27; *III. Program ... 1905.-1906.* (1906), III-XXIV; *IV. Program ... 1906-1907.* (1907), III-XXXIX.
- Žic, Franjo
1935 "Smokvica lopatica (Aleksandrovo na Krku)", *ZbNŽO* 30/1, 243.
- 1939 "Ubijanje staraca", *ZbNŽO* 32/1, 229-230.
- Žic, Ivan
1899ff. "Vrbnik na otoku Krku", *ZbNŽO* 4 (1899), 221-243; 5 (1900), 51-83, 201-252; 6 (1901), 1-52, 161-186; 7 (1902), 295-353; 15 (1910), 161-203; 20 (1915), 89-121, 254-284; 21 (1917), 17-45; 33 (1949), 5-74. |341|

Sketch showing the relative position of the various groups of čakavian dialects distinguished in the text

