

Innovations in the kajkavian dialect of Bednja

W. R. Vermeer

[Note on the 2009 version. This article appeared in Jan M. Meijer (ed.), *Dutch Contributions to the Eighth International Congress of Slavists*, Lisse: Peter de Ridder, 1979, 347-381. Layout apart, the present version reproduces the printed text faithfully, but a handful (appr. 15) of obvious typos and minor infelicities have been tacitly corrected and one or two inadequate glosses of dialect words have been replaced with others. In addition the page numbers of the original edition have been added, as in the following example: “not |352| state”, meaning that “not” is the last word on p. 351 and “state” the first on p. 352. Where words were originally printed partly on one and partly on another page, page numbers have been put after them rather than in the middle, as in “unattested |104|” instead of **“unatte-|104|sted”*.

0. Introduction

Jedvaj’s description of the dialect of Bednja is by far the richest kajkavian dialect grammar to have appeared in this century (1956, henceforth referred to as “BG”). So far no attempts have been made to interpret Jedvaj’s material historically, apart from remarks by Pešikan (1963-4: 565-61), Ivić (1968: 59f, 62, 66f) and Junković (1972: 200, 209f). In this article I shall try to reconstruct part of the changes the vowel system and the accentual system of the dialect underwent in the period between the break-up of the Proto-Slavonic unity and the moment fixed by Jedvaj. In order to forestall possible misunderstandings I would like to point out that this article is not meant to contribute anything to the discussion on the controversial problem of the “origin of kajkavian”; facts from other kajkavian dialects will be adduced only if they cast light on the development of the Bednja dialect.¹

1. Vocalic features and stress in the Bednja dialect

1.0 Introduction

As is customary in Croat dialectology Jedvaj’s transcription is not phonemic. Whereas on the one hand it expresses some features that can hardly be distinctive, there are on the other hand features that, although distinctive according to Jedvaj, are not expressed by it.² However, since Jedvaj, who is (or was) a native speaker of the dialect, uses his transcription in a very consistent way, I shall assume that there is a one-to-

¹ I am much indebted to prof. dr. C. L. Ebeling, prof. dr. F. Kortlandt and Miss J. Gvozdanović for their critical remarks on two earlier versions of this paper, finished in March and June 1976 respectively.

² For some other criticism of BG see below, sections 1.3 and 2.2. This criticism should not obscure the obvious fact that BG is a magnificent achievement, directly comparable with the very best products of the golden age of Croat dialectology (1880-1916).

one correspondence between his symbols and the vowel phonemes of the dialect, unless there are indications to the contrary.³ The system one arrives at in this way is shown in Fig. I (diphthongs and long vowels) and Fig. II (short vowels). Deviations from Jedvaj's transcription and other problematical points are treated in the remainder of this section. |348|

| | ROUNDED + BACK | ROUNDED + FRONT | SPREAD |
|------------|----------------|-----------------|--------|
| HIGH | ū | ȳ | ī |
| HIGH → LOW | ye | | ie |
| MID | ō | | ē |
| LOW | ā | | |

Fig. I. Long vowels and diphthongs.

| | ROUNDED + BACK | ROUNDED + FRONT | SPREAD |
|------|----------------|-----------------|--------|
| HIGH | u | y | i |
| MID | o | | ɛ |
| LOW | a | | ɛ̇ |

Fig. II. Short vowels (the third *e* has not been included).

1.1 Stress, quantity, tone

Jedvaj uses diacritics to indicate quantity, tone and the place of the stress. As his use of these diacritics is consistent and in general accordance with the traditions of Serbo-Croat dialectology, there is hardly any room for misunderstandings. The main aberrant features of the transcription are described succinctly in a footnote: “Zbog nedostatka nekih znakova akut (˘) na *y* štampan je znakom ´. Duljina na diftonzima ispred naglašenoga sloga označena je sa dvije crtice (na svakom vokalu napose) mjesto jedne crtice preko oba vokala. Dugi silazni akc. (˘) nalazi se samo na prvom dijelu diftonga, a na *y* nije uopće naznačen. Ni duljina na *y* nije naznačena. Prema tome, ako se u riječi nalazi *y*, a ta riječ nije označena akcentom, znači, da je ˘ na *y*” (BG: 279).

Leaving aside for the moment the various combinations of the grapheme *y* with diacritics, we can say that the place of the stress (which is distinctive) is indicated by means of ˘, ˆ or ˜. Length is implied by ˘, ˜ or ˘, shortness by ˘ or the absence of any diacritic.

Short vowels, long vowels and diphthongs do not occur freely in all positions (cf. BG: 283, Pešikan 1963-4: 557). Three possibilities have to be distinguished:

³ Like most dialect descriptions, BG has its share of obvious printer's errors. Indeed, these are so numerous as to add some uncertainty to the interpretation, because they cast doubt on the correctness of a number of deviant forms that, although they may be authentic, could also be explained as straightforward printer's errors. I shall draw attention to such cases in the notes. It is curious that printer's errors are much more frequent in the second part of BG (from p. 309 onwards) than in the first part.

- (1) No restrictions, i.e., short vowels as well as long vowels and diphthongs are possible. This situation prevails in two positions, viz. (a) |349| in stressed syllables, and (b) in unstressed syllables immediately preceding the stressed syllable, provided the latter contains a short vowel and is not final.
- (2) Only long vowels occur. This situation is characteristic only of unstressed syllables immediately preceding the stressed syllable, provided the latter contains a short vowel and is final (contrast the situation described under (1b)).
- (3) Only short vowels occur. This possibility is found in all other positions, viz. in all unstressed syllables apart from those immediately preceding a stressed syllable containing a short vowel.

There is a pitch opposition on long vowels and diphthongs in stressed syllables; $\hat{\text{}}$ denotes the falling pitch, $\tilde{\text{}}$ the rising pitch.

As regards the grapheme *y*, there are only three possibilities, viz. $\grave{\text{y}}$, $\acute{\text{y}}$ and the absence of any diacritic. There is no reason to suppose that $\grave{\text{y}}$ when combined with *y* has other than its usual value. As for $\acute{\text{y}}$, as we have seen, Jedvaj states explicitly that it means the same thing as $\tilde{\text{y}}$. When no diacritic is printed over *y*, there are three possibilities: it may have to be read $\hat{\text{y}}$ (stressed, with a long falling accent), $\bar{\text{y}}$ (unstressed and long) or *y* (unstressed and short). According to Jedvaj it has to be read $\hat{\text{y}}$ in forms that carry no diacritics at all. In these cases, which are very frequent, *y* is always the first part of the digraph *ye*, e.g. *ryeg* (297) ‘horn’, *petyeki* (295) ‘brook’ (ins. pl.),⁴ which should be read *rŷeg*, *peŷyeki*.⁵ An ambiguity arises only in unstressed syllables, because we do not know whether to interpret unstressed *y* as $\bar{\text{y}}$ or as *y*. In this position *y* occurs either by itself (*y*) or as part of the digraphs $\bar{\text{e}}\text{y}$ and $\bar{\text{y}}\bar{\text{e}}$. Jedvaj’s words leave no doubt that in the digraphs we have to read $\bar{\text{y}}$: $\bar{\text{e}}\bar{\text{y}}$ and $\bar{\text{y}}\bar{\text{e}}$. Now, the other high vowels *u* and *i* are nearly always short in unstressed syllables unless they form part of the digraphs $\bar{\text{e}}\bar{\text{i}}$, $\bar{\text{i}}\bar{\text{e}}$, $\bar{\text{o}}\bar{\text{u}}$, in which they are always long. There are no examples of unstressed $\bar{\text{i}}$. I have found only one example of unstressed $\bar{\text{u}}$, viz. *dvonŷstŷm* (327) ‘twelve’ (dat.); it is probable that in this example there is a connection between the appearance of unstressed $\bar{\text{u}}$ and the fact of its being followed by $\bar{\text{i}}$ (cf. below, section 1.2). Therefore, if *y* behaves like the other high vowels, it should always be read *y* rather than $\bar{\text{y}}$ in unstressed syllables (unless, of course, if part of a digraph), with the possible exception of those cases in which it is followed by $\bar{\text{i}}$ (or *j*), e.g. *pyŷtŷti* (293, 315) ‘to let go’.

1.2 o/ao/au, u/ou, y/ey, i/ei

In Jedvaj’s material a number of long monophthongs are in complementary distribution with diphthongs, except when followed by *j* (or $\bar{\text{i}}$). |350| The monophthongs ap-

⁴ Bracketed numbers refer to the corresponding pages of BG. Glosses are translations of Jedvaj’s standard Serbo-Croat glosses of the Bednja forms he gives. Unless stated otherwise, lists of examples are not meant to be exhaustive.

⁵ This rule obviously does not include clitics, i.e. I assume that the form *vy vŷyhe* (327) ‘into the ear’ should not be read **vŷ vŷyhe*, just as it is *no mŷste* (329) ‘onto the place’ rather than **nŷ mŷste*. The preposition *vy* ‘in, into’ is the only clitic that contains *y*.

pear under the rising tone, the diphthongs under the falling tone and in unstressed syllables. There are four such pairs, viz. *o/ao* (or, in nasal contexts, *au*, for examples of which cf. below, section 1.4), *u/ou*, *y/ey* and *i/ei*. Examples: *pekōžam* (285, 325) ‘I show’, *mlōdi* (285, 305) ‘young’ (long form) vs. *pekāōzđti* (311)⁶ ‘to show’, *mlāod* (285, 305) ‘young’ (short form); *rūk* (300) ‘hand’ (gen. pl.) vs. *rōūkđ* (284, 300, ‘id’ (nom. sg.), *rōuku* (300) ‘id’ (acc. sg.); *slýg* (286) ‘farm-hand’ (gen. pl.), *hýdi* (286, 305) ‘bad’ (long form) vs. *slēygđ* (286, 321) ‘farm-hand’ (nom. sg.), *hēyd* (286, 305) ‘bad’ (short form); *pīlo* (285, 313) ‘having drunk’ (fem. sg.), *mīto* (285) ‘bribe’ (nom./acc. pl.) vs. *pēil* (285, 313) ‘having drunk’ (msc. sg.), *mēitē* (285, 99) ‘bribe’ (nom./acc. sg.). Since the diphthongal character of *ao* (*au*), *ou*, *ey* and *ei* is predictable, I assume that it is not distinctive, so that in a phonemic transcription we could write /pekōžam, mlōdi, pekōzđti, mlōd, rūk, rūkđ, rūku, slýg, hýdi, slýgđ, hýd, pīlo, mīto, pīl, mītē/.⁷ In this interpretation the dialect has only two real diphthongs, viz. /ye/ and /ie/, cf. *myest* (286, 97, 320) ‘bridge’, *kýelo* (286, 99) ‘wheel’ (nom./acc. pl.), *ryēsđ* (286, 302) ‘dew’; *vīetre* (295) ‘wind’ (loc. sg./pl.), *pīeklu* (287) ‘hell’ (loc. sg.), *pīēsđ* (286) ‘sand’ (gen. sg.). I shall not go into the question as to whether or not these sounds have to be interpreted as sequences rather than unit phonemes; they will be treated as unit phonemes in the sequel.

When *j/i* or a cluster containing *j/i* follows, the situation is different. In this position we find *u* rather than *ou* even under the falling tone, cf. *jedenūist* (309) ‘eleven’ (and other examples of numerals in *-nūist* on the same page), *bedlūjnski* (292) ‘Bednja’ (adj.), *gibūnjico* (283, 301) ‘kind of cake’, *Štefūnjke* (281) ‘Štefanko’ (proper name).⁸ Since *ou* does not occur in this position these examples do not force us to regard *u* and *ou* as representing two different phonemes. Examples of unstressed *ū/ōū* in the relevant position are very rare, cf. *dvonūistīm* (327) ‘twelve’ (dat.) vs. *Štefōūnjēc* (281) ‘Štefanec’ (proper name), *nogōūnjđti* (317) ‘to pursue’, *nogōūnjđl* (328) ‘having pursued’. These forms provide insufficient evidence for assuming an opposition /ū/ vs. /ou/, because of the uncertainties connected with them: (1) the clusters *nj* and *ist* may not have the same influence on the realization of a preceding /ū/, (2) *ōū* could be a realization of the “heavy archiphoneme” /ō/, cf. below, section 1.4, (3) *dvonūistīm*, being isolated, could be a printer’s error instead of **dvonōūistīm*.

As regards the pair *o/ao* the situation is more complicated. Under the falling tone *o* is most frequent, cf. *nōj* (310, 22, 25-30) ‘let’ (particle with the meaning of standard *neka*), *kōj* (308, 20, 22-30)/*kđj* (312, 23) ‘what’, *kōjti* (320, 25-8, 30) ‘because’, *zōjec* (296, 327-8)/*zđjec* (288) ‘hare’, *zōjco* |351| (328) ‘id’ (gen./acc. sg.), *zōjcu* (328) ‘id’

⁶ The form *pekāōzđti* (285) is probably a printer’s error, cf. also *kāōzđti* (322), *pekāōzđli* (325).

⁷ The form *kōkti* (320) ‘as’ (the only example in which a long falling *o* is not followed by *j/i* or a cluster containing *j/i*) must be a printer’s error. It is better attested with a short *o*: *kđkti* (325 2x, 326), cf. also the short vowel in *kđk* (322 5x, 326, 328 2x) ‘how, as, than’.

⁸ *Bedljūnčun* (292) ‘man from Bednja’ should probably be read **Bedljūjñčun*, cf. its more modern synonym *Bednjujñčum* (324) (nom. pl., judging by the gloss ‘Bednjančani’), a form that in its turn contains two obvious printer’s errors and should be read **Bednjūjñčuni*.

(dat. sg.), *zôjcem* (328) ‘id’ (ins. sg.), *zâjca* (324) ‘id’ (acc. pl.),⁹ *lôjbec* (296) ‘waist-coat’, *skrôjnjico* (301) ‘pokrajna daska na krevetu’ (Jedvaj’s gloss), *krôju* (328) ‘end’ (loc. sg.), *tkôj* (318) ‘weave’ (imp.), *dôj* (317) ‘give’ (imp.), *dôjta* (317) ‘id’ (imp. pl.), *dôjma* (317) ‘let us give’, *trôjoti* (316) ‘to last’, *tokôj* (320) ‘also, too’, *rôjši* (322) ‘rather’, *zôdnji* (304) ‘last’, *nozôdnje* (320) ‘in the end’, *zôdnjico* (301) ‘back side’. However, there are a few examples with *ao*, cf. *krâojo* (293) ‘theft’, *krâojen* (312) ‘stolen’, *svâojo* (293, 301) ‘quarrel’, *pesvâojen* (293, 312) ‘on bad terms’, *mlâoji* (293, 306) ‘younger’. There are two curious things about this. Firstly, fluctuation within one form does not occur, despite the large number of examples. This practically rules out the idea that *o* and *ao* are in free variation when followed by *j*. Secondly, *ao* is found only if the *j* it precedes reflects Proto-Slavonic **d’* (< earlier **dj*) and is immediately followed by a vowel, whereas *o* occurs in all other cases, e.g. if it precedes the reflex of **j*, but also if it precedes the reflex of **d’* if the latter is not followed by a vowel, cf. *rôjši* and perhaps *tokôj*. In other words, the distribution of *ojV* and *aojV* appears to reflect the distinction between **ajV* and **ad’V*. Either there is an opposition between /*ō*/ and /*ao*/ or there are two *j*-like phonemes, each with a different influence on the realization of a preceding /*ō*/. This can only be solved with the help of a native speaker of the dialect. I shall assume quite arbitrarily that the latter possibility (two *j*-like phonemes) is true.¹⁰ In pretonic syllables most examples have *ao*, cf. *nopāōjōti* (317) ‘to water (cattle)’, *vzgāōjōti* (317) ‘to bring up, rear’ (with *j* < **j*) *shāōjōti* (318) ‘to come down, set’, *vgāōjōti* (293) ‘to satisfy, please’, *pesāōjān* (312) ‘planted’ (with *j* < **d’*). There is one example with *ō*, viz. *jōjcè* (299) ‘egg’. The *ō* of this example can be ascribed to its position before a cluster beginning with *j* (rather than a single *j* as in the other examples, cf. the case of *rôjši* discussed earlier in this section).

1.3 The grapheme *e*

As Jedvaj states unambiguously, the grapheme *e* expresses three different sounds (BG: 283). Firstly, there is an *e*, pronounced “kao štokavsko” (my /*e*/), which reflects Proto-Slavonic **ě* or stressed *jer* in strong position. Secondly, there is an “otvoreno” *e* (my /*e̝*/), which reflects Proto-Slavonic **e*, **e̝* or **o* and has developed as an epenthetic vowel before early Serbo-Croat syllabic **r*.¹¹ Thirdly, there is a “kratak” *e* “bez

⁹ The *a* in *zâjca* is probably a printer’s error (instead of **zôjca*), in view of the fact that all other examples of this word have *o*.

¹⁰ Even if there is now a distinctive opposition between /*ao*/ and /*ō*/ before *jV*, this situation must have been preceded by one in which there were two *j*-like phonemes. Belić has reported the existence of a čakavian dialect with two *j*-like phonemes, the one reflecting **j*, the other **d’* (1914: 235). This report has never been checked. Yet another interpretation is possible. It is remarkable that some Bednja examples with *j* < **d’* have alternative forms with *đ*, e.g. *pesvâođen* (293), *mlâođi* (293, 306), cf. also *těyji/těyđi* (293) ‘somebody else’s’. Maybe *aojV* is simply a realization of /*ōđV*/, in which case both *mlâoji* and *mlâođi* are phonemically /*mlôđi*/, whereas *krôju* is phonemically /*krôju*/.

¹¹ On p. 312 Jedvaj three times uses the symbol *ę*, each time in the nt. sg. ending of the *l*-participle: *epōļę* ‘having fallen’, *pōslę* ‘having grazed’, *grīzļę* (312) ‘having bitten’. Elsewhere this ending is always written *-e*, e.g. *epōle* (311), (*pre*)-*grīzle* (312), *sēkle* (313) ‘having chopped, hewn’ and many other examples. I assume that in these forms *ę* has the same value as *e*, viz. /*e̝*/. |378|

jasne glasovne kvalitete” (some kind of [ə]?), which reflects Proto-Slavonic strong *jer* (or epenthetic *jer*) in unstressed suffixal syllables (“u sufiksnom nenaglašenom slogu”). This description is insufficient in two respects. Firstly, it does not [352] state clearly enough in which forms this third *e* occurs, because the term “suffixal syllable” can be interpreted in more than one way. Secondly, it fails to account for unstressed strong *jer* (whether epenthetic or not) in stem syllables (as opposed to suffixal syllables), e.g. *deskā* (286) ‘plank, board’ (gen. sg.), *nyefet* (291) ‘finger-nail’.

It is tempting to interpret this [ə] (if it is one) as not a phoneme at all. In the Bednja dialect there is a tendency towards the elimination of the “fleeting *e*” in nominal paradigms, e.g. *tèrk* (290, 97) ‘Tuesday’, *yevc* (287) ‘sheep’ (gen. pl.). One might assume Jedvaj’s third *e* to be a non-phonemic [ə]-like sound, inserted in clusters that would otherwise be difficult to pronounce, e.g. *mlōdenjec* (294, 296) ‘bridegroom’, phonetically [mlōdenjɛç], phonemically /mlōdenjɛ/ (or perhaps /mlōdenɛ/, cf. below, section 2.2). However, this solution runs into difficulties when confronted with the facts. Bednja nouns with the suffixes corresponding to standard *-ovac* and *-ivac* invariably end in *-vec*, e.g. *tergyevc* (296, 322) ‘merchant’, *ložlêivec* (296) ‘liar’ etc. On any interpretation of Jedvaj’s rule these forms should contain the third *e*, which, however, can hardly be non-phonemic here, because it is perfectly possible for a Bednja word to end in *-vc*, cf. the form *yevc* quoted just now. It is obviously impossible to solve this problem without the help of a native speaker of the dialect; I am going to disregard Jedvaj’s third *e* in the sequel, because its properties are so imperfectly known that any attempt to account for it either synchronically or diachronically would be speculative.¹²

1.4 *o* and *u* in nasal contexts

The nasal consonants *m* and *n* tend to affect the opposition between preceding *o* and *u*. If Jedvaj’s material is representative, the situation is rather complex. Three cases have to be distinguished, depending on tone, quantity and stress.

- (1) Rising *o* does not occur in the position before a nasal. We find *u* instead, even when we expect **o* on historical grounds (as the reflex of **a*), e.g. *brūnja* (285, 99) ‘harvest’, *stūne* (285) ‘dwelling, home’ (loc. sg.), *strūn* (285) ‘side’ (gen. pl.), *slūno* (285) ‘salt’ (adj., short form fem. sg.), *srūmni* (285) ‘disgraceful’ (long form), *lūni* (320) ‘last year’, *lūjnski* (294)/*lūjnski* (304) ‘last year’s’, *klūnjec* (295) ‘rift, fissure’ (gen. pl.),¹³ *klūncev* (295) ‘id’, *Cigūn* (296) ‘gipsy’, *dūm* (317) ‘I give’, *dūn* (317) ‘given’, *predūn* (311) ‘sold’, *zvūn* (311) ‘called’, *brūnim* (316) ‘I defend’ etc. I as-

¹² There are several other kajkavian dialects with a deviating reflex of strong *jer* in those positions in which it alternates with *zero*, e.g. (a) Virje: ь or *zero* vs. the regular reflex *e*, cf. Fancev 1907: 316-20, (b) Gornja Stubica: ə or *zero* vs. ɛ or *e*, cf. *ōtac* (Jakoby 1974: 38) ‘father’, *dōužan* (o.c. 40)/*dōužn* (o.c. 40, 47) ‘indebted’, alongside forms with *e*, cf. *ōtɛc* (o.c. 40, 43)/*ōtɛc* (o.c. 237) (Jakoby’s transcription has been slightly simplified in these examples), (c) Prodindol: *a* vs. the regular reflex *e*, cf. Rožić 1893-4 I: 72f. This phenomenon merits a closer investigation.

¹³ The form *klūnjec* must be a printer’s error instead of **klūnjec*. It is the only example in which the diacritic ´ appears on another vowel than *y*, cf. above, section 1.1.

sume that the opposition between /ō/ and /ū/ is neutralized in this position and that the archiphoneme is realized [ū].

- (2) Under the falling tone and in pretonic syllables the situation is |353| different. The regular reflex of **q* and syllabic **l* is *ou* (/ū/), cf. *čōūmèti* (314) ‘to be ill’, *bōum* (307, 10, 11, 20, 24, 25, 29) ‘I shall’, *bōuma* (310, 11, 22) ‘we shall’, *žōūnð* (289, 302) ‘woodpecker’, *pōuni* (289) ‘full’ (long form), *kōūnām* (289, 310, 13) ‘I am swearing’, *sōunce* (289, 99, 326) ‘sun’, *vōūnð* (289) ‘wool’, *Hōum* (289) (micro-top.). The reflex of **a* is less unified. Many examples have *au*, e.g. *stāun* (285) ‘dwelling, home’, *slāun* (285) ‘salt’ (adj. short form), *sāūmèc* (285) ‘bachelor’, *srāum* (285) ‘shame’, *znāum* (285, 310) ‘I know’, *imāunja* (285) ‘possession, property’, *pāumuk* (291) ‘spider’, *zāu ma* (306) ‘for me’, *sāum* (308, 22) ‘alone, oneself’, *kāūnīti* (316) ‘to intend’. However, *ou* is just as frequent, cf. *dlōun* (303) ‘palm (of hand)’, *predōūnð* (311) ‘sold’ (fem. sg.), *srōūmèti sa* (314) ‘to be ashamed’, *brōūnīti* (316) ‘to defend’, *mōūmīti* (316) ‘to bait, lure’, *tōūncðti* (316) ‘to dance’, *nopōumet* (320) ‘by heart’. In some cases both *au* and *ou* are attested, cf. *strāun* (285, 326)/*strōun* (303) ‘side’, *klāūnjèc* (294)/*klōūnjèc* (295) ‘rift, fissure’, *dāūmā* (317)/*dōūmā* (310) ‘we give’, *Frāunc* (324)/*Frōunc* (297) ‘Francis’ (proper name), cf. also *hrōūnīti* (316, 23) ‘to feed’ but *xrāūnīli* ‘having fed’ (msc. pl.) in Ivšić’s short Bednja text (1936: 86).¹⁴ It is clear from this that the opposition is not completely neutralized. If it were we could expect examples with *au* < **q* or syllabic **l*, e.g. **sāunce* ‘sun’ (the absence of such examples can hardly be due to chance). On the other hand the examples suggest that *au* (/ō/) can be replaced by *ou* (/ū/). I assume therefore that the feature MID, which differentiates /ō/ from /ū/, is optional in the position under consideration, so that /ō/ is, in Ebeling’s terminology, a “heavy archiphoneme” (1967: 136).
- (3) In short syllables the situation is again different. Nearly all examples have *u*, even when we expect *o* on historical grounds (as the reflex of **a*), e.g. *slūmo* (284, 301) ‘straw’, *jūmo* (284, 301) ‘pit, hole’, *kūmen* (284) ‘stone’, *sūme* (284, 320, 22, 24, 26-9) ‘only’, *rūma* (285) ‘shoulder’, *rūno* (301) ‘early’, *vrūno* (285, 301) ‘crow’, *pītunja* (285) ‘question’, *Ēivūn* (285, 98) ‘John’ (proper name), *pūmet* (288, 303) ‘common sense’, *kūm* (290, 319, 27, 29) ‘where’ (implying a direction), *Kròpinčun* (296) ‘man from Krapina’, *žgunjīco* (294, 301) ‘alcoholic drink’, *-ūm/-um* (300) ‘dat. pl. ending of *ā*-stem nouns’, *vūm* (306) ‘you’ (dat. pl.), *-ūmi/-umi* (300) ‘ins. pl. ending of *ā*-stem nouns’, *vūmi* (306) ‘you’ (ins. pl.), *pesīejuno* (312) ‘sown’ (fem. sg.), etc. We find *o* only in *pōmučino* (291) ‘cobweb’, *stonyvōti* ‘to live, dwell’ and (frequently) in the present tense endings *-om* and *-oma*, e.g. *kēpom*, *kēpoma* (310, 16) ‘I am/we are digging’, alongside a few examples with *u*, viz. *dīeluma* (286) ‘we are working’, *spemīnuma sa* (286) ‘we are talking’, *nēmum* (290, 323, 29) ‘I have not’, *nēmuma* (290) ‘we have not’. (However, the *u* of *spemīnuma* and *nēmum(a)* is probably due to the |354| preceding rather than the following nasal, cf. below,

¹⁴ I have simplified Ivšić’s transcription. For the uncertainties connected with examples like *klōūnjèc* cf. above, section 1.2.

end of this section.) If we assume that the opposition is optional, with /o/ as a “heavy archiphoneme”, then it is curious that *o* predominates in one particular type of examples, while being virtually absent elsewhere. It is more likely that the opposition used to be neutralized in the past and was restored only a comparatively short time ago. In that case the *o* of *kěpom(a)* is due to levelling within the paradigm, cf. the other forms of the present tense *kěpoš*, *kěpo*, *kěpota*, *kěpoju* (310, cf. 316). The *o* of *pòmučino* and *stonyvòti* can be attributed to the /ō/ of *pâumuk* (291) ‘spider’ and *stâun* (285) ‘dwelling, home’.

Nasal consonants do not in general seem to affect the opposition between following (rather than preceding) *o* and *u*. There is one solitary example of fluctuation, viz. the long form of the adjective meaning ‘small’: *mâuli* (285) (nom. sg. msc.) and *mâula* (326) (acc. pl. msc.) with /ō/ vs. *môuli* (305, 25) (nom. sg. msc.) and *môula* (326) (gen. sg. fem.) with /ū/. Furthermore, there are some examples of *u* instead of *o* as the reflex of **a* preceded by a nasal consonant, viz. *mûl* (305) ‘small’ (short form, nom. sg. msc.), *mûle* (284, 85, 321) ‘id’ (short form, nom./acc. sg. nt.), *premûle* (320) ‘too little’, *èruk* (290, 320) ‘in that way’, *gnûti* (285, 94) ‘to chase’,¹⁵ *znûti* (285, 310, 17, 27) ‘to know’, *nã znu* (282, 322, 27) ‘he/she/it does not know’, *znûli* (322) ‘having known’ (nom. pl. msc.), *ïmuš* (330) ‘you have’, *ïmu*, *ïmuju* (327) ‘he/they has/have’, *nèmu* (290, 328) ‘he has not’, *nèmuš*, *nèmuta*, *nèmuju* (290) ‘you (sg. /pl.)/they have not’, *nôuze* (319, 21, 25, 28-30) ‘back’ (adv.), *dvonûist* (309, 27) ‘twelve’, *dvonûistu* (327) ‘twelfth’ (acc. sg. fem.). In this position *o* is the more frequent reflex of **a*, cf. *mòti* (284, 300, 02) ‘mother’, *žânò* (285, 300) ‘woman’, *slûmo* (284, 301) ‘straw’, *vrûno* (285, 301) ‘crow’, *věinò* (321) ‘wine’ (gen. sg.), *vrèmeno* (298) ‘time’ (gen. sg.), *vremâno* (298) ‘time’ (nom./acc. pl.), *nòs* (306) ‘us’ (gen./acc./loc.), *prî nos* (311) ‘with us, in our house’, *nòš* (307) ‘our’, *mō* (307) ‘my’ (gen. sg. fem. and nom./acc. pl. nt.), *štîmoti* (293, 316) ‘to think’, *speměinòti sa* (317, 23) ‘to talk’, *mâoči* (294) ‘pertaining to a cat’, *mòsle* (299) ‘rendered butter’, *zmâuzun* (304) ‘dirty’, *nōruča* (294) ‘embrace’, *nâobrol* (321) ‘having gathered’, *nògnuti* (314) ‘to bend’, *no-* (313-29 passim) (verbal prefix),¹⁶ etc. It is not easy to determine whether the examples with *u* < **a* point to neutralization in a very restricted set of contexts (e.g. neutralization of the opposition /o/ vs. /u/ after clusters ending in *n*, between *m* and *l*,¹⁷ etc.) or constitute the remnants of earlier neutralizations that have been lifted. I shall assume that the latter is the case, and that the long form of the adjective meaning ‘small’ is a doublet: /môli/ alongside /mûli/. |355|

¹⁵ As far as segmental phonemes are concerned, Proto-Slavonic **gьnati* ‘to chase’ has become homonymous with **gьnōti* ‘to bend’, cf. *nògnuti* (314) ‘to bend’.

¹⁶ The form *naprâovi* (324) ‘he makes’ must be a printer’s error, cf. *nopròviti* (315, 21, 27, 30) (inf.), *nopròvil* (326, 29) (msc. sg. of *l*-part.), *noprâovila* (328) (fem. sg. of *l*-part.), *noprâovljen* (320) (ppp, msc. sg. short form).

¹⁷ This may not be as *ad hoc* as it sounds, cf. the *u* in *dîeluma* (286) ‘we are doing’ vs. *o* in *dîelo* (322) ‘he is doing’, *kěpoma* (310) ‘we are digging’.

2. The development of the Bednja vowel system

2.0 Introduction

The kajkavian dialects appear to have quite a bit in common with respect to the development of the vowel system. In recent years reconstructions of the development of the kajkavian vowel systems have been presented by Ivić (1968), Junković (1972: 202-10), and Jakoby (1974: 116-31). Since Jakoby restricts himself largely to repeating Ivić's views, I am not going to refer to him separately. As for Junković, he has built his reconstruction on the foundation of a very unorthodox theory of linguistic change, a discussion of which falls outside the scope of this paper.¹⁸ I shall refer to him only in so far as his reconstruction admits of an interpretation in terms of a more classical approach.

2.1 A few mergers

The following mergers are fairly straightforward and do not require a great deal of comment:

- (1) The mergers of **y* with **i* (> /i, i/, cf. BG: 285) and strong **ɨ* with strong **ɨ* (> /ɛ, ie/, cf. BG: 286f.). Both mergers must be due to the loss of the opposition FRONT vs. BACK in combination with the feature SPREAD. If the merger **ɨ* = **ɨ* in all respects parallels the merger **y* = **i*, then its product must have been a spread vowel, probably (in view of the later developments) higher than **e* and lower than **i*. Strong **ɨ* and **ɨ* did not merge after word-initial *v-*, cf. *vīes* (303) 'village' vs. *vēyš* (287, 90, 303) 'louse', cf. below, section 2.5.¹⁹
- (2) At some moment **ě*, which originally must have been lower than **e*, turned into a vowel higher than **e* and merged with the product of the merger of strong **ɨ* and **ɨ* (cf. BG: 288). Ivić (1966: 379) and Junković (1972: 204) imply that the product of the merger of strong **ɨ* and **ɨ* first turned into a mid central vowel **ə* and only then merged with the reflex of **ě*. This is unnecessary. Indeed, the assumption that the strong *jer* remained a spread vowel right up to the time when **ě* was narrowed provides a motivation for the merger, viz. the simultaneous presence of two spread vowels between **i* and **e*. The development of strong *jer* into a central

¹⁸ The main difference between the traditional approach and the one Junković adheres to concerns the concept of sound law, which Junković is inclined to reject: "Slijepa sila glasovnih zakona ne objašnjava promjene u fonemskom sustavu. Njena je učinkovitost još manja na području akcenata" (1972: 183). For a detailed critical evaluation of certain aspects of Junković's monograph I refer to Rigler 1976.

¹⁹ In a few examples strong *jer* is reflected as if it were **a*, cf. *tāost* (287) 'father-in-law', *lāov* (287) 'lion', *lōvev* (287) 'id.' (gen. pl.), *lāož* (287, 303) 'lie', *logōti* (287, 318) 'to tell lies', *čāost* (287) 'honour', *čōščū* (287) 'id.' (ins. sg.). Most of these forms occur elsewhere in kajkavian, too, cf. Ivić 1968: 58. They have never been explained. Not only are they few in number, but at least two of them refer to bookish concepts ("lion", "honour") and could be borrowings, which renders the task of accounting for the others even more difficult. There are also a few examples in which strong *jer* is reflected as if it were **ɛ* or **e*, e.g. *stāblĕ* (287) 'tree-trunk' (which can have been influenced by its synonym *dāblĕ* (299)), *lāihki* (305) 'light' (long form). These forms will not be taken into consideration here.

vowel **a*, which took place not only in čakavian and the central dialects of Slovene, but also in the westernmost kajkavian dialects (Krašić, Severin na Kupi, Draganići, cf. Ivšić 1936: 62, Ivić 1961: 197, 1968: 58) may very well be the product of a tendency to avoid the merger of the strong *jer* with the reflex of **ě*.²⁰

- (3) The merger of **o* with syllabic **l* (> /u, ū/, cf. BG: 288f.), cf. below, [356] section 2.4. In word-final position we find /u/ as the reflex of **u* (which in all other positions is reflected /y, ŷ/, cf. BG: 286). The material is rather limited, cf. (a) the ending of the *o*-stem dat. sg., e.g. *kyēnjū* (295) ‘horse’, *sālū* (298) ‘village’, (b) the ending of the *u*-stem loc. sg., e.g. *kýenju* (295) ‘horse’, (c) the ending of the dat. sg. in the adj. and pron. declension, e.g. *dýebremu* (304) ‘good’, *njàmu/mu* (307) ‘him’, *tèmu* (308, 25) ‘that’, *kèmu* (308, 28) ‘who’ and countless other examples,²¹ (d) the adverb **tu* ‘here’, if in *tŷj* (326) ‘here’ and *tuzdāoke* (319) ‘just now’ (< **tu-s-da-kaj*) we find the analogical introduction of the form regular in “unprotected” position, cf. the reverse phenomenon in *tŷ* (319) ‘here’ with the *y* regular in *tŷj* (319, 23, 927) ‘here’.²²

2.2 **e*, **ę* and **o*

Proto-Slavonic **o* is reflected as /ye/ or /e/, depending on quantity, cf. BG: 283, 285f; **e* and **ę* are reflected /a/, /ā/ or /ę/. Two problems arise in connection with these reflexes.

Firstly, if Jedvaj is taken literally, there is sometimes an optional distinction between **e* and **ę*. After stating that in some positions the regular reflex of **ę* is *a*, he writes: “Iza toga *a* čuje se kod nekih riječi *i* glas, ali ne redovno, jer ga isti čovjek u istoj riječi jedamput izgovara, a drugi put ga izostavlja” (BG: 288). This is to some extent supported by the material, in which we find **ę* often reflected as *a* when followed by a dental or (more rarely) velar consonant (or a homorganic dental or velar cluster) which in its turn is followed by /i/ or /ę/, e.g. *vzāiti* (287)/*zāiti* (287, 90, 313)/*zāiti* (329) ‘to take’, *priāiti* (288) ‘to receive’, *zočāiti* (288) ‘to begin’, *pečāiti* (313) ‘to begin’, *trāisti* (288)/*trāsti* (288, 312) ‘to shake’, *nopāiti* (313) ‘to stretch’, *klāiti* (310, 13, 28) ‘to curse’, *māihki* (305) ‘soft’ (long form), *žāiti* (288, 313) ‘to reap’, *māihk* (305) ‘soft’ (short form), *glāid’ēti* (288)/*glād’ēti* (310, 14) ‘to look’, *jāizŷk* (288, 98, 326) ‘tongue’, *svāitĕk* (288, 98) ‘saint’s day’, *pāitĕk* (288, 98) ‘Friday’, *pečāitĕk* (298, 328) ‘beginning’, etc. In the same context **e* is often reflected *a*, cf. *jāden* (309, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29) ‘one’, *lātĕl* (31 1, 14, 26) ‘having flown’, *šāstĕm* (309) ‘six’ (dat.). However,

²⁰ The development of the syllabic **l* in the čakavian dialects of the Quarnero archipelago suggests the existence of an **a* from strong *jer* (cf. Vermeer 1975: 155f.). In all those western dialects (whether Slovene, kajkavian or čakavian) in which the short strong *jer* has yielded **a*, the long *jer* has merged with **ā*.

²¹ The form *dýebremy* (304) can hardly be anything but a printer’s error; not only is it isolated, against a large number of examples with *-u*, but Jedvaj even gives *dýebremu* (with *-u*) elsewhere in the same paradigm (ib.).

²² The same phenomenon occurs in the dialect of Trebarjevo, according to Radić, *ZbNŽO* 6 (1901), p. 187, as quoted by Aleksić 1937: 31.

a few examples with $a\grave{ı} < *e$ contradict Jedvaj's rule, viz. *trǎiti* (293)/*trāti* (293) 'third', *Pǎiter* (324)/*Pāiter* (296) 'Peter' (proper name). Moreover, there are independent reasons for questioning the distinctiveness of the graphic opposition between a and $a\grave{ı}$ in the position in which it appears in these examples. Jedvaj frequently indicates some kind of palatal element before or after dental or velar consonants (or clusters) that are preceded and/or followed by front vowels. There are countless examples, e.g. *neisiti* (284, 93, 315) 'to carry', *zȳiti* (289) 'to take |357| off (footwear)', *jüingel* (290) 'angel', *reiditi* (293, 94)/*rediti* (315) 'to give birth to', *mëitiko* (293)/*mëjtiko* (301) 'hoe', *ëisem* (287, 93, 309) 'eight', *heiditi* (293, 94)/*hediti* (284, 315) 'to go', *nyiditi* (293)/*nyditi* (286, 89, 315) 'to offer', *pyistiti* (293, 315) 'to let go', *čyiditi sa* (293) 'to be surprised', etc. This palatal element is expressed in a number of different ways, and may be absent, cf. *vëidim* (325, 26)/*vëidim* (314) 'I see', *ëisendesāt* (291) 'eighty', *fčinjiti* (292) 'to do', *ljëte* (288)/*lëte* (299) 'summer', *istinjo* (284, 94) 'truth', *sënj* (286) 'dream', *soditi* (294, 315) 'to plant', *dëjsti* (320)/*dëjsti* (326, 30) 'enough'. These examples suggest that this non-etymological palatal element, rather than representing a separate phoneme or feature, forms part of the realization of the feature FRONT of (one of) the vowel(s) preceding and/or following the consonant or cluster involved. Now, examples of $\grave{a}\grave{ı} < *e$ (and $*e$) are found exclusively in those positions in which this non-phonemic palatal element tends to occur. Since, firstly, there exist counterexamples to Jedvaj's rule, and, secondly, the graphic opposition between $a\grave{ı}$ and a probably does not reflect a separate phonemic distinction in the positions involved, I do not think there are sufficient grounds to assume that Proto-Slavonic $*e$ and $*e$ are still optionally distinct in the Bednja dialect, cf. also *mānji* (294, 306, 11) 'me' (dat.), *mānje* (306) 'id.', *sād'em* (287, 309) 'seven', *sād'endesāt* (291) 'seventy', in which a non-etymological palatal element is indicated in the consonant following an $a < *e$.²³

The second problem concerns the reflex of the product of the merger of $*e$ and $*e$ in its relation to the reflex of $*o$. There are some positions in which both $*o$ and the product of the merger of $*e$ and $*e$ are reflected / e /, cf. above, section 1.3. In discussing the reflex of $*e$, Jedvaj states: "Taj glas prelazi u a , ako je naglašen ili ako je dug. Ako u promjeni oblika izgubi akcent ili duljinu, vraća se u vrlo otvoreno e " (BG: 285) and he describes the distribution of the reflexes of $*e$ as follows: " E dolazi u kratkim nenaglašenim slogovima, a u ostalim slučajevima (pod naglaskom i duljinom) dolazi a " (BG: 288). These statements are not quite correct. True, / a / and / \bar{a} / are the regular reflexes of $*e$ and $*e$ in stressed and long pretonic syllables, cf. *šāst* (285, 309, 21) 'six', *zālja* (285) 'cabbage', *pāč* (285) 'oven', *māse* (288) 'meat', *rād* (288, 97) 'row', *rukā* (300) 'hand' (gen. sg.), *žātvo* (288, 301) 'harvest', *jātvo* (288) 'liver', *plāsti* (285) 'to knit', *pëijām* (285) 'I am drinking', *svākervo* (301) 'mother-in-law', *včäre* (287, 319,

²³ Ivić (1968: 66) rightly points out that Jedvaj's own description of the matter (BG: 293) cannot be correct. Nevertheless, he takes Jedvaj's remarks concerning $*e$ at face value, which involves him in a serious contradiction: if in the Bednja dialect $*e$ and $*e$ have remained distinct (if only in certain positions), then the Bednja vowel system cannot be a linear descendant of the proto-kajkavian vowel system he has just reconstructed, because in that system $*e$ and $*e$ have merged in $*e$ (Ivić o.c. 66, 57).

21) ‘yesterday’, *sàzoti* (288) ‘to try to reach’, *storešēinà* (300) ‘chief’ (gen. sg.), *telàto* (298) ‘calf’ (gen. sg.), *kyēnjà* (295) ‘horse’ (acc. pl.), *žānò* (285, 300, 25) ‘wife’, *rešātè* (285, 99) ‘sieve’, *mātām* (285) ‘I am sweeping’, *pāčām* (285) ‘I am baking’, *tālà* (288, 98) ‘calf’, *prādām* (310, 12) |358| ‘I am spinning’, *vāzòti* (288, 318) ‘to bind’, *pātò* (302) ‘heel’, *grādò* (302) ‘beam’, etc. The only exceptions are: *lēicè* (299) ‘face’, *jōjcè* (299) ‘egg’, *vōūžè* (290, 99) ‘rope’. In these examples the “hard stem” ending *-e* < **-o* has been carried over analogically to nouns in which we would expect the “soft stem” ending *-a* < **-e*, cf. *sālè* (298) ‘village’. However, contrary to Jedvaj’s description, short /a/ is quite frequent in unstressed syllables. Three positions have to be distinguished:

- (1) In absolute final position *a* is the normal reflex, cf. *žòba* (300) ‘frog’ (gen. sg., nom./acc. p.), *pyelja* (299) ‘field’, *vēy sa* (287) ‘into himself’, *brèma* (288) ‘burden’, *mōuža* (288) ‘husband’ (acc. pl.), *vāža* (310) ‘he binds’, *dvyēja* (309) ‘two’ (with *pluralia tantum*), *mēisla* (310) ‘they are thinking’. We find *e* only in *sōunce* (289, 99, 326) ‘sun’ and *sèrce* (289)/*šèrce* (299) ‘heart’.²⁴ These examples can be explained in the same way as *lēicè*, cf. the regular ending *-a* in *myerja* (299) ‘sea’, *tēsja* (299) ‘grape-vines’ (coll. pl.), *vyleča* (287, 99) ‘spring (season)’.
- (2) The reflex *e* is regular in posttonic syllables, absolute final position excepted, cf. *pūmet* (288, 303) ‘common sense’, *mòter* (300, 24) ‘mother’ (acc. sg.), *zōjčev* (328) ‘a hare’s’ (adj.), *pèsteljo* (301) ‘bed’, *jāzere* (309) ‘thousand’, *nò sebe* (306) ‘on himself’ (loc. sg.), *prāden* (312) ‘spun’, etc.²⁵ There are three types of cases in which we find *a*, viz. (a) The present tense of *e*-verbs, e.g. *vāžam*, *vāžas*, *vāžama*, *vāžata* (310) ‘I/you (sg.)/we/you (pl.) bind’, cf. BG: 285. This is probably a matter of analogy; *a* is regular in the third person singular *vāža* (310) and in all forms of those verbs that have end-stress in the present tense, e.g. *prādām* etc. (310, 12) ‘I am spinning’. (b) The numerals *dāvāt* (309) ‘nine’ and *dāsat* (285, 309, 21, 30) ‘ten’. I do not understand these forms. The *a* may be due to the (unattested) ordinal numerals **devāti* ‘ninth’ and **desāti* ‘tenth’, and to forms like *čaterdesāt* (309) ‘forty’, cf. also below, section 3.5 (c) The isolated form *čāž njago* (293) ‘through him’. This is due to the regular *a* in *njāgo* (307) ‘him’ (gen./acc.). However, it is more probable that *čāž njago* is a printer’s error; it is isolated, whereas *njago* is frequent in this position, cf. *èd njego* (326, 28) ‘from him’, *zù njego* (326) ‘for him’, *vỳ njego* (287) ‘into him’.
- (3) In short pretonic syllables *e* is the most frequent reflex of **ę* and **e*, cf. *mesōr* (297) ‘butcher’, *veseljōk* (297) ‘cheerful person’, *česòti* (318) ‘to comb’, *večārjo* (294, 301) ‘dinner’, *ležòti* (314) ‘to lie’, *težōk* (288) ‘farm labourer’, cf. especially the graphic alternation in *bādost* (282, 305) ‘foolish’ (short form) vs. *bedāosti* (305)

²⁴ The form *šèrce* is perhaps a printer’s error. The only other example of *š* in a position in which one expects **s* occurs on the same page: *v šālu* ‘in the village’; it is probably a printer’s error, because the word *sālè* ‘village’ has always an *s* elsewhere, e.g. in the paradigm BG: 298.

²⁵ The isolated form *pāčan* (313) ‘baked’ must be a printer’s error instead of **pāčen*. Elsewhere this ending, if unstressed, always has *e*, e.g. *krāojen* (312), *nāšen* (312), *pāošen* (312), *dēignjen* (313), *petāgnjen* (314), etc.

‘id.’ (long form), *nà mram* (290, 321) ‘I cannot’ vs. *ne vèrjam* (322) ‘I do not believe’, *lātèl* (311, 14, 26) ‘having flown’ (msc. sg.) vs. *letèlo* (311, 14) ‘id.’ (fem. sg.), However, there |359| are some examples with *a* in this position, and there are also instances of fluctuation between *e* and *a*, cf. *matòti* (318) ‘to put’, *svatìti* (315) ‘to consecrate’, *valjòti* (316) ‘to be valuable’, *spajìti* (315) ‘to notice’, *padesāt* (309, 25) and the fluctuation in *pradāmà*, *pradātà* (310) vs. *predāmà*, *predātà* (312) ‘we/you (pl.) are spinning’, *našān* (312) ‘carried’, *pradāno* (312) ‘spun’ (fem. sg.) vs. *pečān* (313) ‘baked’, *čaterdesāt* (309) ‘forty’ vs. *četìri* (309) ‘four’, *jasāni* (307) ‘autumn’, *jazeròčo* (309) ‘thousand’, *Jasenjā* (323) ‘Jesenje’ (top.) vs. *jesānjski* (304) ‘pertaining to the autumn (or to Jesenje)’, *jezeròčo* (309) ‘thousand’, *jezār* (309) ‘id.’ (gen. pl.).²⁶ Since in this position there are no examples of *a* < **o*, it seems most natural to suppose that in pretonic syllables the feature BACK, which differentiates /a/ from /e/, is optional in combination with the features LOW and SHORT, in other words, that pretonic /a/ is a heavy archiphoneme, cf. above, section 1.4. Ivšić’s Bednja material supports this interpretation (1936: 86). As pointed out by Junković (1959: 190), Ivšić appears to distinguish between pretonic *e* < **o* and *ä* < **e*/**e*, cf. *kesī* ‘he is mowing’ vs. *šānīca* ‘wheat’ (gen. sg.), *šānēična* ‘pertaining to wheat’ (gen. sg. fem.), *tāžāōkò* ‘farm labourer’ (gen. acc. sg.), cf. in BG *kejsīti* (315) ‘to mow’, *pšenjīco* (301) ‘wheat’ (nom. sg.), *pšenīca* (323, 30) ‘id.’ (gen. sg.), *težāōkò* (329). Ivšić’s *ä* can be explained as a realization of the heavy archiphoneme /a/, which removes the most important contradiction between Ivšić’s and Jedvaj’s material.²⁷

The results of this section can be summarized as follows: Proto-Slavonic **e* and **e* have merged in all positions. The product of the merger of **e* and **e* has merged with the reflex of **o* in posttonic syllables, absolute final position excepted; the opposition has recently been restored (*vāžama*, *dāsāt*). In pretonic short syllables the distinction between the reflex of **o* and the product of the merger of **e* and **e* is optional (the heavy archiphoneme /a/ vs. /e/). In all other positions the opposition has been maintained, with /a/ or /a/ reflecting **e* and **e* vs. /e/ and /ye/ reflecting **o*.

2.3 **uò*

For the final phase of Proto-Slavonic Kortlandt reconstructs an opposition between a diphthong **uò* (from an earlier pretonic **o*, which became stressed as a consequence of “Stang’s law”) and a short monophthong **ò* (from an earlier stressed **o*, which had carried the ictus all along or had received it as a consequence of “Dybo’s law”), cf. Kortlandt 1975: 13-9. This **uò* seems to be reflected in three different ways:

²⁶ The forms *zaprieti* (313), *zapevīe* (325), *zapevīeta-do* (310) and *zagrēinjōti* (317) may be printer’s errors, cf. *zoprīeti* (287), *zopevīēdōti* (323), *zopevīe-do* (310) and countless |379| other examples of the prefix *zo-* (e.g. 317, 325-30 passim, etc.). On *naprāovi* (324) cf. above, note 16.

²⁷ The other contradiction, Jedvaj’s *pšenīca* (with *pš-*) vs. Ivšić’s *šānīca* (with *š-*), may not be as bad as it looks either, cf. in Jedvaj’s material the comparable doublet *vzāiti* (287)/*zāiti* (287, 90, 313)/*zāiti* (329) ‘to take’. (In the examples from Ivšić 1936 the transcription has again been simplified.)

- (1) /ye/ with rising tone. This is found in the stem-stressed forms of |360| “type b” nouns and in the long form of “type b” adjectives, cf. *kýenju* ‘horse’ (loc. sg.), *kýenjev* ‘id’ (gen. pl.), *kýenji* ‘id.’ (ins. pl.), *kýenje* ‘id.’ (loc. pl.) (all forms 295), *stýelec* (295) ‘chair’ (gen. pl.), *dýebri* (304) ‘good’ (long form).
- (2) /ye/ with a falling tone. This is found only in stem-stressed *ā*-stems in which “van Wijk’s law” applied, e.g. *vyeljo* (301) ‘will’.
- (3) /e/. This occurs in the stem-stressed forms of “type b” verbs and in the remnants of the short form of the comparative, cf. *měraš* (292) ‘you can’, *sělim* (315) ‘I am salting’, *sěljen* (315) ‘salted’, *bělja* (306, 22, 26) ‘more’ (adv.).

This distribution is general in kajkavian (Junković 1972: 182, cf. Ivšić 1936: 72).

If we assume that **u̇* merged with **ō* (retaining its rising tone) then the other reflexes can be explained as the products of analogy and levelling. The falling tone in *vyeljo* can be attributed to the influence of the other stem-stressed *a*-stems, in which any **o* was long falling after the shortening of posttonic long vowels (neocircumflex, cf. below, section 4.0), cf. *slyego* (301) ‘agreement, good understanding’, *esvyero* (301) ‘beam or shaft connecting the front and hind part of certain four-wheeled horse-drawn vehicles (German ‘Langbaum’ or ‘Langwied’, SCr ‘srčanica, svora’); the productivity of the falling tone on **o* in stem-stressed *o*-stems is demonstrated by the fact that it is common in borrowings, cf. *škyelo* (301) ‘school’, *kemyero* (301) ‘room’. The short vowel we find in the verb is regular in the compounds. On the basis of Kortlandt’s theory we expect **su̇òli* vs. **posòli* (< **solī* vs. **posòli* prior to Stang’s law, < **sòli* vs. **pòsoli* prior to Dybo’s law), **su̇òljen* vs. **posòljēn*. Bednja *sělim*, *sěljen* may then continue the accentuation of the compounds, carried over into the simple verb. On the other hand, the fact that we do not find neocircumflex in these forms points to the generalization of the short endings regular in the simple verb as a consequence of Stang’s law (Kortlandt *o.c.* 18). The short vowel in *bělja* will have to be explained in the same way as the short vowel of čak. *věše* (Kortlandt *o.c.* 40), cf. Bednja *věša* (319) ‘higher’.

2.4 The development of the vowel system

As a starting-point, common to the majority of kajkavian dialects, Ivić reconstructs the system shown in Fig. III (1968: 57). In this system **u*, **o* and **a* continue the corresponding Proto-Slavonic vowels, whereas the other vowels are the product of mergers: **ȯ* < **ȯ* = **l̇*, **e* < **e* = **e*, **ė* < **ě* = *ь* = *ь*, **i* < **y* = **i*. Ivić gives no arguments why these mergers preceded the subsequent changes that befell his system. As regards the merger of **ȯ* and syllabic **l̇* arguments can be found. The product of this merger has |361| developed in many different ways. It has merged with **o* in some dialects and with **u* in others; in those dialects in which it has not merged with any other vowels there are many possibilities: in some dialects the original situation has been retained (Gornja Stubica, at least in the system of short stressed vowels, Jakoby 1974: 39), in some **u* has been fronted and **ȯ* has turned into a high vowel (Bednja), in some **o* has been diphthongized and **ȯ* has turned into a mid vowel (Ključ), in some both **o* and **ȯ* have been diphthongized (Tuhovec and Svibovec near Varaždinske

Toplice, Junković 1972: 34), cf. Ivić *o.c.* 59 and esp. “karta 1”. Despite all these differences **ɔ* and syllabic **l* have merged everywhere, and it is difficult to envisage how this could have come about unless the merger had taken place before local differentiation set in.

| | ROUNDED/BACK | SPREAD/FRONT |
|----------|--------------|--------------|
| HIGH | u | i |
| HIGH-MID | ɔ̣ | ɛ̣ |
| LOW-MID | o | e |
| LOW | a | |

Fig. III. Starting-point (following Ivić 1968: 57).

As regards the other mergers the situation is less favourable. Even if we assume, for instance, that **ɛ̣* lost its nasal feature at the same time as **ɔ*, we have no right to suppose that it immediately merged with **e*, since it may have persisted for some time as a spread oral vowel distinct from **e*, as it still does in some near-by Slovene dialects (Logar 1955: 62f.). Nevertheless, I shall take the system reconstructed by Ivić as a starting-point, because it contains the minimal number of features needed to account for the vowel system of the Bednja dialect (apart from Jedvaj’s third *e*, about which cf. above, section 1.3). In order to arrive at the present system we have to assume the following three successive changes in the feature composition of the vowels:

- (1) The earliest change took the forms of a “chain”, comprising four links: (a) **u* turned into a rounded front vowel *y*; (b) **ɔ̣* filled the gap by turning into a high vowel *u*, which meant that **ɛ̣* now lacked a back counterpart; (c) **o* became the back counterpart of **ɛ̣*, leaving **e* without one; (d) **a* became the back counterpart of **e*, which changed the feature composition of **a*, **e* and **ɛ̣*: **a* became distinctively back, **e* exchanged its tongue-height feature LOW-MID with LOW, **ɛ̣* became mid rather than |362| high-mid. In all probability these changes took place simultaneously.²⁸ The result was a vowel system with only three degrees of tongue height (Fig. IV). In this system **o* was neutral as to the opposition BACK vs. FRONT and it is not unlikely that it could be realized in different ways: [o ~ ö]. This is suggested by the actual existence of this phenomenon in living kajkavian dialects (Ivić 1968: 61f) and by the later development of the short **o* into a spread front vowel /*ɛ̣*/.

²⁸ It is not necessary to assume that the lopsided intermediate system reconstructed by Ivić (1968: 58) ever existed in the Bednja dialect, although it may have existed in those kajkavian dialects in which **u* was not fronted.

| | ROUNDED + BACK | ROUNDED + FRONT | SPREAD |
|------|----------------|-----------------|--------|
| HIGH | u (< *o) | y (< *u) | i |
| MID | | o | ɛ |
| LOW | | a | e |

Fig. IV. After the chain initiated by *u being fronted.

- (2) When this had happened the long mid vowels *ō and *ē were diphthongized, which resulted in the system of Fig. V (both long and short vowels are shown). This chronology is dictated mainly by considerations of simplicity. On the one hand the diphthongization is unlikely to have preceded the rise of the system shown in Fig. IV, because it was only then that *o and *ɛ received the same tongue height feature. On the other hand it probably preceded the development of *ā into a mid vowel, because if it did not, it is unclear why the reflex of *ā has not been diphthongized as well.

| | ROUNDED + BACK | ROUNDED + FRONT | SPREAD |
|------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------|
| HIGH | u, ū | y, ȳ | i, ī |
| HIGH → LOW | | ye (< *ō) | ie (< *ē) |
| MID | | o | ɛ |
| LOW | | a, ā | e, ē |

Fig. V. After the diphthongization of *ō and *ē.

- (3) After the diphthongization of the long mid vowels the phonemes *o, *e/*ē and *a/*ā were affected by a number of changes that again form a chain, this time comprising three links: (a) *a and *ā became mid (> o, ō); (b) *e and *ē lost the feature SPREAD; the long *ē (> ā) remained [363] neutral with respect to the opposition ROUNDED vs. SPREAD, whereas the short *e (> a) turned into a distinctively rounded vowel; (c) *o lost the feature ROUNDED (> ɛ), but rather than merging with *ɛ, with which it had shared until now the same tongue height feature, it filled the gap left open by *e by turning into a low vowel. The non-phonemic epenthetic vowel that may be assumed to have developed in front of syllabic *r, merged with the new e when short (cf. BG: 283); when long it provided ɛ with a new long counterpart (ē).²⁹ These changes resulted in the modern vowel system (Fig. I and II).

²⁹ The phoneme /ē/ occurs only (a) in the reflex of syllabic *r̄, e.g. *sērp* (297) ‘sickle’, (b) in a few interjections, e.g. *hěk* (320), (c) in the adverb *tē* (319, 22, 25, 27) ‘then’ (which may or may not be connected with čak. *tr* ‘you know, in that case’).

2.5 Morpheme-initial *u-, *v̥- and *v̄-

The treatment of morpheme-initial *u-, *v̥- and *v̄- forms a separate problem. The following facts have to be accounted for:

- (1) Strong *v̄, and *v̥ have not merged when preceded by *v-: *v̄- yields vy-, whereas *v̥- yields v̄e-, v̄ie-, cf. vy (291, 327)/v̄ȳ (287, 90)/v̄ey (287) ‘in, into’, vyžgōti (317) ‘to light’, Věýzmù (323) ‘Easter’ (dat. sg.),³⁰ v̄eyš (287, 90, 303) ‘louse’, v̄eypoti sa (291) ‘to hope’ vs. v̄es (287, 91, 308) ‘all, the whole’, v̄ies (303) ‘village’.
- (2) Morpheme-initially *v̥- and *u- have merged and are both reflected v-/zero or vy-. The distribution of v-/zero and vy- is not in all respects clear. In the reflex of *v̥- the result seems to depend on whether the *v̥ was strong or weak (as indeed one would expect), cf. vn̄yk (286, 97) ‘grandson’,³¹ v̄j̄eytre (319, 21, 28) ‘in the morning’, v̄č̄are (287, 319, 21) ‘yesterday’, vz̄āiti (287)/z̄āiti (287, 90, 313)/z̄āiti (329) ‘to take’, dȳev̄ec (290) ‘widower’, s̄āoki (290, 91, 308, 27) ‘every’, v (322-30)/zero (291) ‘in, into’.³² All exceptions are explicable. In V̄eyz̄em (290) ‘Easter’ instead of *(v)z̄em the form of the oblique cases has been generalized; v̄n̄je (287, 319, 25) ‘out of doors’ (implying rest), v̄yz̄emlico (292) ‘Easter bonfire’ and v̄yš̄eivec (290) ‘lousy fellow’ (rather than *(v)n̄e, *(v)z̄emlico, *(v)š̄eivec) are derivations built on forms in which vy- is regular. As regards *u-, it is surprising that the same principle (“strong” vs. “weak” position) seems to explain the opposition of v̄dr̄iti (289, 315) ‘to hit’, v̄ýjdam (293) ‘I run away’, v̄eyjec (286, 96) ‘uncle’ (with generalization of the form of the oblique cases) vs. vr̄āi (307, 11)/vr̄āj (320) ‘already’ (< *uže-j), the reflex of the prefix *u- in vm̄r̄eti (286, 310, 13, 22) ‘to die’, vkr̄āosti (329) ‘to steal’, vb̄iti (286) ‘to kill’, vm̄iti (313) ‘to wash off’, vgos̄iti (286) ‘to extinguish’ and the reflex of the verb stem *uč̄i- ‘to learn’ in nov̄č̄iti (322) ‘to learn’, n̄āov̄čil (324) ‘having learned’, edev̄č̄iti (321) ‘to unlearn’, pr̄eiv̄čil (321) ‘having grown accustomed’. There is one exception, viz. v̄yč̄iti (290, 315) ‘to learn’ (and its derivative v̄yč̄itel (292) ‘teacher’). |364| Long *ū- is reflected /vy/ in v̄eyhe (290, 99, 327) ‘ear’ and v̄eyr̄ek (286, 90) ‘the Evil Eye’.

These examples can be explained in a fairly simple way. At a moment prior to the merger of strong *v̄ and *v̥ morpheme-initial *u- and *v̥- merged into a phonemic sequence, the first element of which was identical with *v, while the second element must have been the archiphoneme of *u and *v̥. Like *v̄ it could be “strong” or

³⁰ V̄ěýzmù is an example of a printer’s error (an incorrect accent mark on an y in an unstressed syllable) that does not occur before BG: 309 but is quite frequent from there on, cf. d̄ýéd̄i-do (310), k̄ěýr̄ile (311), c̄ěýr̄eti (314), hr̄ěýp̄eti (314), b̄ěýhn̄iti (314), s̄ýěl̄it (315), s̄ýěl̄il (315), b̄ýel̄el (323), ḡýēr̄e (324). If this denoted a particular accent pattern we could expect examples with other vowels than ey and ye. Incidentally, Jedvaj describes the intonation of pretonic long vowels and diphthongs as falling (BG: 284).

³¹ The isolated form vn̄iki (292) may be a printer’s error instead of *vn̄yki.

³² The distribution of the various alternants of the preposition meaning ‘in, into’ is complicated. It occurs stressed only in combination with pronouns, e.g. v̄y ve vr̄iema (290) ‘at this time’, v̄y menje (287), v̄ey nju (ib.) ‘into her’; unstressed vy is found in free variation with zero before words beginning in v-, e.g. v̄eiv̄e/vy v̄eiv̄e (291) ‘into the wine’. All other examples have v.

“weak”. In strong position it had changed into **u* by the time strong **b* and **b* merged in all other positions, When weak it behaved like any weak *jer*: it prevented the progressive stress shift (cf. below, section 3.4) and was subsequently lost. This does not explain *vyčiti*, for which we would expect **včiti*. This form is especially remarkable because of the alternation *vyčiti* vs. *novčiti*, *edevčiti*, which we find also in the dialect of Prodindol, cf. *vučiti* (Rožić 1893-4 I: 83, III: 60) vs. *povčiti* (III: 81).³³ A possible explanation is suggested by the dialect of Gornja Stubica, where we find *vùmer* (Jakoby 1974: 182, 231) ‘having died’ (msc. sg.) vs. *vmřla/vmřla* (o.c. 182) ‘id.’ (fem. sg.) < **ùmřl* vs. **umřlà*. This suggests that the second element of the sequence into which morpheme-initial **u-* was decomposed may have been treated as strong whenever it was stressed, so that *vyčiti* represents the form of the stem in forms with a stressed initial syllable, e.g. the first person sg. of the present tense in **-q*,³⁴ the second/third person sg. of the aorist and most forms of the *l*-participle, cf. Gornja Stubica *vùčile* (nt. sg.), *vùčili* (msc. pl.) (both forms o.c. 182, 226) vs. *vučila* (o.c. 226) (fem. sg.), *vučiti* (o.c. 38) (inf).³⁵ In the compounds there were no forms in which we would expect the stress to fall on **u-*, hence Bednja *novčiti*, Prodindol *povčiti*.³⁶

Junković explains the facts treated in this section differently. If I understand him correctly, he assumes the following sequence of events:

- (1) The merger of strong **b*, and **b* in all positions.³⁷
- (2) The development of **vbC* (with weak *jer*) into **uC*, merging with original **uC*.
- (3) The change of word-initial **u-* into the sequence **vu-*. This results in alternations like **veš* (with *e* the product of the merger of the strong *jer*s) vs. **vuši*, **ven* vs. **vuie*, **vuzem* vs. **vezma*.
- (4) In all instances of alternation **vu-* is generalized, so that we get *vuš*, *vun*, *vuzma* (Junković 1972: 36).

Now, up to this point Junković’s reconstruction is quite acceptable in principle, although for two reasons rather awkward. Firstly, the intermediate forms with **ve-* < **v* + strong *jer* are not attested. In Bednja *věs*, *vies* the **e* can be explained as the regular reflex of **b* (it should be noted [365] that these forms are nowhere reflected **vūs*, **vūs*). Secondly, Junković is forced to postpone the development of **u-* > **vu-* until after the loss of the weak *jer*s (unless he assumes the development **vbC* > **uC* to have preceded the fall of the weak *jer*s). This is unsatisfactory, because now the “prothesis” cannot be connected with the open syllable structure of kajkavian prior to the fall of

³³ In the sequel the three parts of Rožić 1893-4 will be referred to as “Rožić I” etc.

³⁴ Both the ending and, if Kortlandt’s analysis (1975a: 409) is correct, the accentuation are attested in the Freising Fragments, which must be roughly contemporaneous with the changes treated in this section.

³⁵ Elsewhere Jakoby gives a fem. sg. form with *vu-*: *vumřla* (1974: 58). Since Jakoby does not provide this form with an accent mark and does not comment on the discrepancy, its status is unclear.

³⁶ In the Slovene (prekmurski) dialect of Vashidegkút/Cankova the same alternants occur, although in a different distribution: *fčiti sã* (Asbóth 1910: 191) ‘to learn’, *načči* (o.c. 195) ‘he learns’, *vùčãni* (o.c. 191) ‘learned’.

³⁷ Although Junković does not state this, it is implied unambiguously in the examples he gives.

the weak *jers*. At this point Junković goes on as follows: “Tako se stvara odnos *v*: *vu*-, *vzeti* : *vuzmem*, gdje je *v*- osnovni oblik a *vu*- varijanta za izbjegavanje nedopustivih skupova *v* + *C*: *v grât*, ali *vû te*, *vu ñem* (usp. štokavsko s tobom, sa mnom)” (ib.). This fails to produce the right facts. According to the chronology Junković sketched a moment earlier **vbC* can never yield the sequence *vC*, so that his “tako” suggests a connection that does not exist. Instead of *vzeti* vs. *vuzmem* (the actually attested forms)³⁸ his theory predicts **vuzeti* vs. **vezmem* (stage 3) and **vuzeti* vs. **vuzmem* (stage 4). Junković does not tell us how the regular but unattested form **vuzeti* (which has to serve as a model for **vuzmem*, which replaces the unattested but allegedly phonetic form **vezmem*) developed into the only attested form *vzeti*.

2.6 The treatment of word-final **-aj*

Word-final **-aj* is reflected in a number of different ways. When unstressed it is reflected *-e*, cf. *zðke* (310, 20, 22, 25) ‘why’, *pðke* (320) ‘why’, *nðke* (324, 27, 29) ‘something’, *kðme* (320, 25) ‘with difficulty’, *nðuze* (319, 21, 25, 28-30) ‘back’ (adv.), *vçäre* (287, 319, 21) ‘yesterday’, *izde* (320, 22, 24, 26) ‘still, yet, more’ and the imperative (if stem-stressed) of *aje*-verbs, e.g. *kðpe* (310, 16) ‘dig’, *çâoke* (310, 17) ‘wait’, *pîte* (317) ‘ask’, alongside forms in *-oj*, e.g. *kðpoj* (310, 16), *çâokoj* (310, 17), *pîtoj* (317), cf. Jedvaj’s description of the matter, BG: 310. It cannot be known on the basis of BG whether this *e* stands for /*ɛ̄*/ or /*ɛ̇*/. Stressed word-final **-aj* with short **a* is reflected as *-aj* (rather than **-oj*) in the only example *zdäj* (319, 21, 22, 25, 26, 30) ‘now’, *dyëzdäj* (319) ‘until now’; whenever the **a* was long it has become *o*, e.g. *kôj* ‘what’ (cf. the examples given above, section 1.2). The following chronology seems most plausible:

- (1) Word-final **-aj* > **-ej*, e.g. **zdäj* > **zděj*, **zäkaj* > **zäkej*; **-āj* remained **-āj*, e.g. **kâj*.
- (2) The developments **a* > *o*, **e* > *a*, cf. above, section 2.4 (3). It is for two reasons unlikely that the change *aj* > *ej* was later. Firstly, since this change is found elsewhere in kajkavian (Jakoby 1974: 32),³⁹ it is likely that it spread from dialect to dialect; but in that case the conditions for the change must have been the same as well. Secondly, a change *aj* > *ej* is phonetically more plausible than *oj* > *aj*. |366|
- (3) Neutralization of the opposition /*ɛ̄*/ vs. /*a*/ in posttonic syllables, absolute final position excepted (cf. above, section 2.2).
- (4) Loss of final *-j* in forms like **zðkej*, **kðpej* > *zðke*, *kðpe*. If this had happened earlier than (3) we would expect **zðka*, **kðpa* instead. There are a few other exam-

³⁸ I am not acquainted with any living kajkavian dialect in which the form *vuzmem* occurs; the normal form is derived from **(v)zëmem*, e.g. Bednja *zëmam* (313). Junković does not tell from which dialect his examples are drawn.

³⁹ In the dialect of Gornja Stubica this change has the character of a neutralization: the difference between /*a*/ and /*ɛ̄*/ is neutralized before /*j*/ and the archiphoneme is realized [e] (this is a phonemic interpretation of Jakoby’s rules, 1974: 37, 46, 84). In Virje this change has not yet got beyond the sub-phonemic stage: any short *a* is turned into *ä* before *j*, but this *ä* remains distinct from *ɛ̇* < **ɛ̇* and **e* (Fancev 1907: 315, 319).

ples of loss of final *-j after front vowels, e.g. *imîe* (317) ‘have’ (imp.). If this chronology is correct, the *e* in *zðke* etc. stands for /e̞/.

3. The progressive stress shift

3.0 Introduction

The accentuation of the Bednja dialect, although in many respects very archaic, is still far removed from the Proto-Slavonic system. In the remainder of this article I shall make a few remarks on part of the changes the Bednja dialect has undergone since Proto-Slavonic times. These developments have all been mentioned before, usually in connection with other kajkavian dialects or proto-kajkavian. However, they will be taken up again here, firstly because several aspects of them have never been noticed and, secondly, because we should not expect every kajkavian dialect to behave in every respect exactly like the ideal kajkavian dialect described by Ivšić (1936: 70-2).

In one respect the Bednja dialect differs radically from the other kajkavian dialects that have hitherto been described, viz. in the way it reflects the Proto-Slavonic falling tone. As Pešikan points out in his review of BG, the Bednja reflex of the falling tone is highly erratic (1963-4: 558, 560). In a number of forms the ictus has shifted forward in a way strongly reminiscent of Slovene, e.g. *eblâok* (286, 96) ‘cloud’ < **ðblākъ*.⁴⁰ Equally often, however, the ictus has retained its original position, in which case the stressed vowel, if originally short, has often been lengthened.⁴¹ In this chapter I would like to investigate whether it is possible with the help of Jedvaj’s material to separate regular from secondary reflexes of the Proto-Slavonic falling tone.

3.1 *sêino*

In forms with a long vowel in the stressed syllable the ictus has not shifted. There are many examples of bisyllabic forms with an open second syllable, cf. *sêino* (323) ‘son’ (gen./acc. sg.), *sêini* (295) ‘id.’ (nom. pl.), *glâosi* (295) ‘voice’ (nom. pl.), *grâodi* (295) ‘town’ (nom. pl.), *dâori* (295) ‘present’ (nom. pl.), *vrâogi* (292, 329) ‘devil’ (nom. pl.), *dêyhi* (292) ‘ghost’, *môuži* (295) ‘husband’ (nom. pl.), *ljêydi* (324, 26) ‘people’ (nom. pl.), *môuža* (288) ‘husband’ (acc. pl.), *zlâote* (299) ‘gold’, *mâse* (288, 99) ‘meat’, |367| *sîene* (288, 99) ‘hay’, *tîeste* (299) ‘dough’, *vêyhe* (290, 99) ‘ear’, *črîeve* (293, 99) ‘gut’, *drîeve* (289, 99) ‘tree’, *tîele* (288, 99), *vrîema* (288, 90, 98, 310, 27) ‘time’, *žrîeba* (288, 92) ‘foal’, *rôuku* (300) ‘hand’ (acc. sg.), *zêimu* (325, 29, 30) ‘winter’ (acc. sg.), *rôuka* (300) ‘hand’ (nom./acc. pl.), *dêyša* (288) ‘soul’ (nom./acc. pl.), *svêinja* (321) ‘pig’ (nom./acc. pl.), *rîeči* (302/3) ‘word’ (gen./dat. sg., nom./acc. pl.), *gêrde* (282, 320) ‘ugly’, *jâoke* (294, 321-6, 330) ‘very, very much’, *lîepe* (312, 26) ‘nice, beautiful’, *lîeve* (319) ‘to the left’, *hêyde* (320) ‘very; very much’, *drâoge* (320, 27) ‘expensive’ (all ex-

⁴⁰ Here and elsewhere I use the term “Slovene” in a narrow sense, in reference only to the classical literary norm as codified by Škrabec, Pleteršnik, Valjavec and others.

⁴¹ Pešikan adduces a few forms I have not been able to trace in BG, viz. *lovîl*, *lôvil*, *grâda*, *dôma*, *smejâl se* (o.c. 558), or, as they would have appeared in Jedvaj’s transcription, **levêil*, **lyevil*, **grâodo*, **dyemo*, **smejâol sa*.

amples nom./acc. sg. nt., used adverbially), *brâole* (318) ‘having gathered’, *pêile* (285, 313) ‘having drunk’, *dêrle* (313) ‘having torn to pieces’, *klâle* (313) ‘having sworn’, *dâolo* (317) ‘having given’ (all forms nt. sg.),⁴² *dâoli* (313) ‘having given’ (msc. pl.), *nâu ma* (306) ‘onto me’, *nâo ta* (306) ‘onto you’, *zâu ma* (306) ‘for me’, *zâo sa* (306) ‘for oneself’. There are only a few examples of bisyllabic forms with a closed second syllable, cf. *svîetem* (325) ‘world’, *mâsem* (325) ‘meat’, *drîevem* (327) ‘tree’ (all examples ins. sg.), *vrâogem* (329) ‘devil’, *rôukum* (300) ‘hand’ (both examples dat. pl.). There are, of course, no examples of polysyllabic forms.

3.2 *eblâok, ekyelu*

If the stressed syllable originally contained a short vowel, the matter is much more complicated. For the moment bisyllabic forms with an open second syllable will not be taken into account (they will be discussed below, section 3.6). In most other forms that originally had a short falling vowel in the first syllable the ictus has moved to the immediately following syllable. The syllable that has received the stress in this way carries a long falling tone, irrespective of the original quantity of the vowel it contains. Examples: *eblâok* (286, 96) ‘cloud’, *plovîen* (288, 91) ‘flame’, *gelôub* (288) ‘dove’, *ebâod* (296) ‘gad-fly’, *perôut* (303) ‘wing’, *kerân* (296) ‘root’, *kekyet* (283) ‘rooster’, *kecân* (296) ‘cabbage-stem’, *grebân* (283) ‘carding-comb’, *devâr* (288, 96) ‘brother-in-law’, *kekyeš* (283, 303) ‘hen’, *vesâl* (305) ‘cheerful’, *rozdêr* (287) ‘having torn to pieces’, *pedêr* (287) ‘having demolished’, *zopêr* (287, 325) ‘having closed’, *pečâl* (329) ‘having begun’, *zočâl* (325) ‘having begun’, *sod'êil* (294) ‘having planted’, *smud'êil* (294) ‘having scorched’, *plotêil* (315) ‘having paid’, *bejâol (sa)* (315) ‘having feared’, *erâot* (310) ‘to plough’ (sup.), *syšêit* (310) ‘to dry’ (sup.), *plotêit* (315) ‘to pay’ (sup.); *gelôubi* (295) ‘dove’ (nom. pl.), *kekyeta* (321) ‘rooster’ (dual),⁴³ *kekyeti* (321) ‘id.’ (nom. pl.), *siryeto* (286) ‘orphan’ (if in this form the accentuation of the dat. sg., acc. sg. and nom./acc. pl. has been introduced analogically), *pestâoti* (303) ‘small strip of land’ (gen. sg.), *jasâni* (307) ‘autumn’ (gen. sg.), *pečâli* (327) ‘having begun’ (msc. pl.), |368| *sod'êile* (294) ‘having planted’, *smud'êile* (294) ‘having scorched’, *plotêile* (315) ‘having paid’, *bejâole (sa)* (315) ‘having feared’ (all examples nt. sg.), *zomîenjil* (294) ‘having exchanged’, *zomîenjile* (294) ‘id.’ (nt. sg.), *epryeįstil* (322) ‘having forgiven’, *pegyed'ili (sa)* (327) ‘having agreed’ (msc. pl.), *rozlyežil* (315) ‘having taken to pieces’, *pripâitile (sa)* (325) ‘having happened’ (nt. sg.), *ekyelu* (286, 319, 26) ‘around’ (adv. and prep.), *nojyepok* (320) ‘upside down, the wrong way round’.

This shift, if regular, was probably early, because it presupposes a distinction between rising and falling short vowels. On the other hand it is unlikely to have preceded Stang’s law, for the same reason that makes it improbable that the Slovene progressive shift did: if one supposes the shift preceded Stang’s law, one is forced to

⁴² The form *dâolo* is probably a printer’s error instead of **dâole*; it is the only example of a nt. sg. *l*-part. in -o.

⁴³ The -a in the ending of *kekyeta* is strange; one would expect *-o.

assume the existence of two distinct falling tones in the (alleged) period between the shift and Stang's law (cf. Kortlandt 1976: 2).

3.3 Levellings

As in Slovene, a number of exceptions to the progressive stress shift can be explained as the result of analogical levelling, motivated by the fact that when prefixed or preceded by a preposition, forms affected by the shift must have received a different accent from the one they carried in all other positions, e.g. **pomôc* vs. **na pômoć*, **platil* vs. **naplâtil*. Outside the verb BG has only two examples, viz. *pyemeč* (303) 'help', *gyever* (282) 'speech' (but cf. below, section 3.6). The latter form has an exact parallel in Slovene *gôvor* (Valjavec 1897: 200). The *l*-participle displays such levellings in two directions:

- (1) Carry-over of the accentuation of the simple verb into the compounds, cf. *degevyerili* (*sa med syebu*) 'having agreed' (msc. pl.), *eslebyed'il* (315) 'having set free', *roščemârîl* (*sa*) (323) 'having become angry', cf. *blogeslyevîl* (315) 'having blessed'. The form *ebločêile* (*sa*) (326) 'having become cloudy' presupposes forms like **zplotêil*, with the accentuation of *plotêil* (315).
- (2) The reverse, cf. *mêyd'il* (289) 'having been late', *mêyd'île* (289) 'id.' (nt. sg.), *plâotil* (315) 'having paid', *plâotile* (315) 'id.' (nt. sg.), *dyebil* (326), cf. *hyed'il* (320) 'having gone'.

Like *gyever*, a number of these forms have exact parallels in Slovene, cf. *nagovôril*, *oslobôdil*, *oblačil*, *dôbil*; *mêyd'il* and *plâotil* have a parallel in *pûstil* (all examples Valjavec o.c. 206).

3.4 *nâobrol*

There are a few examples of *l*-participles in which the fact that the ictus has not shifted may be due to something else than the levellings discussed [369] in the preceding section: *nâobral* (321) 'having gathered', *zâobrol* (293) 'having chosen', *zâozvol* (293) 'having challenged', *vêyžgol* (317) 'having lit, kindled', *vêyžgole* (317) 'id.' (nt. sg.), *nâovčil* (324) 'having learned', *prêivčil* (321) 'having become accustomed'. These forms contrast with *rozdêr*, *pedêr*, *zopêr*, *pečâl*, *pečâli*, *zočâl* given above (section 3.2) in being all derived from verb stems starting in a consonant cluster in which a weak *jer* has dropped, cf. also the accentuation of *vêyžgot* (317) 'to light, kindle' (sup.) vs. *erâot*, *syšêit*. The only exception is *prâdol* (324) 'having sold' (instead of **predâol*).

This distribution is explained if we assume that the weak *jer* of the verb stem prevented the shift from operating; in that case *prâdol* is the result of analogy. If true, this narrows down our chronology considerably: the progressive stress shift must have taken place between Stang's law and the fall of medial weak *jer*s; it must be posterior to the dissolution of morpheme-initial **u-*, otherwise we would expect something like **novêyčil* rather than *nâovčil* (cf. above, section 2.5).

One might also suppose that the accentuation of *nâobrol* is due to the levellings discussed in the preceding section. This has two disadvantages. Firstly, it does not

explain the distribution of *nâobrol*-like vs. *pečâl*-like forms (which, however, may be accidental because of the small number of examples). Secondly, it presupposes a lot of analogical confusion. Whereas *plâotil* can be explained on the basis of frequent compounds like **zaplâtil*, **naplâtil*, *nâobrol* will have to be explained either on the basis of, say, **podnâobral*, a type of compound that can hardly have been very frequent, or directly on the basis of forms like *plâotil*, which have quite a different morphological structure. On the other hand, the accentuation of *prâdol* can very well be due to the example of *plâotil*; since **predðti* ‘to sell’ has a meaning that cannot be explained directly on the basis of the meaning of its component parts, it may have been felt like a simple verb.

3.5 *vùgljen*

Neither the levellings discussed in section 3.3, nor the original presence of an unstressed weak *jer* in the second syllable explains the following examples, in which the stress has not shifted forward and the stressed vowel has not been lengthened: *vùgljen* (290) ‘coal’, *èleve* (286) ‘lead’, *mlðdest* (303) ‘youth’, *v mlðdesti* (322) ‘id.’ (loc. sg., possibly continuing the accentuation of the stem-stressed gen. or dat. sg.), *zðpeved* (330) ‘order, command’, *vrèmeno* (298) ‘time’ (gen. sg.) (and other stem-stressed forms of the same word, ib.), *dâvat* (309) ‘nine’, *dâsat* (285, 309, 21, 30) ‘ten’, *jâzere* (309) ‘thousand’. |370|

I have found no really satisfactory explanation for these forms, and, indeed, none is likely to be found until more material becomes available. One might suppose that, whereas the progressive shift took place if the vowel of the second syllable was long, it failed to do so if it was short. This would dispose of all examples, provided we assume that the analogical lengthening responsible for the long vowel in štok. *ùgljēn*, *mlâdōst* (the influence of the alternation in *mōst/mōsta*, *pēc/pěci*) had not yet reached these words when the progressive shift took place, although by that time it had reached **kðren* (> **kðrēn*) and other words that show the effects of the shift (*kerân*, *kekyeš*, *kekyet*, *kecân*, *grebân*, *devâr*, *vesâl*).⁴⁴ This is unacceptable, because of the difficulties it introduces: we now need an explanation for the fact that the stress has shifted in a number of forms that originally can hardly have had a long vowel in the second syllable, e.g. *ekyelu*, *nojyepok*, *siryeto*, *epryeistil*; it also removes the explanation given above to account for *pyemeč* (section 3.3).

These examples might all be borrowings. A progressive stress shift comparable to the one that took place in Slovene did not penetrate far into kajkavian. Indeed, the absence of such a shift is sometimes adduced as one of the most important characteristics of kajkavian as opposed to Slovene (e.g. Jakoby 1974: 23f.).⁴⁵ In all probability

⁴⁴ Many čakavian-štokavian dialects that have not lost quantity distinctions in posttonic syllables reflect *devet* and *deset* with a short vowel in the second syllable. Vuk (second ed.) gives *dèvet* and *dèset* in brackets as possible alternatives (for some reason the ARj does not follow Vuk in this respect); *dèvet* and *dèset* occur in Omišalj (my material) and Vrgada (Jurišić 1973: 43f.). |380|

⁴⁵ The progressive shift has taken place in the Sutla-dialects, which differ from the rest of kajkavian in being closely related to the štajerski dialects of Slovene.

Bednja lies quite close to the isogloss. Jedvaj adduces the forms *kèket*, *kèkeš*, *gràban* as examples of the dialect of Rinkovec (BG: 283), which lies within the boundaries of the “bivša općina” Bednja (BG: 279). If these forms are representative, then the progressive stress shift did not reach Rinkovec. Consequently in the course of contact with speakers of other dialects Bednja speakers must have come across forms in which the progressive shift has not taken place. Moreover, Jedvaj attests the use in Bednja of the “opći kajkavski govor” (BG: 282), Ivšić’s “kajkavska govorna koinē” (1936: 62). Although the properties of the kajkavian spoken koinē are not very well known, it seems not too hazardous to assume that it does not reflect the accentual system of a dialect in which the progressive shift has taken place. Consequently, *vùgljen* and *èleve* can be explained as borrowings because of their somewhat technical character, *mlòdest*, *zòpeved* and *vrèmeno* because they refer to abstract concepts (*mlòdest* may also have been influenced by the accentuation of its antonym *stòrest* (303) ‘old age’). The remaining examples are all numerals. Now, the Bednja system of numerals is somewhat heterogeneous. The word for ‘four’, for instance, is a doublet: *štiri* (296, 309, 321)/*četiri* (309), cf. also *štirinūst* (309) ‘fourteen’ vs. *čaterdesāt* (309) ‘forty’; the word for ‘thousand’ is a doublet, too: alongside *jāzere* there occurs a form *jazeròčo/jezeròčo* (309). This suggests that |371| some borrowing has taken place and justifies the assumption that *dàvat*, *dāsāt* and *jāzero* have been influenced by the dialect of Rinkovec or by other dialects in which the progressive stress shift has not taken place, e.g. the kajkavian spoken koinē. Incidentally, this may explain the mysterious *a* in the second syllable of *dàvat* and *dāsāt* (cf. above, section 2.2). On the one hand it might be due to the phonetic peculiarities of a Rinkovec-like dialect, cf. the *a* in the second syllable of Rinkovec *gràban* (BG: 283); on the other it could be attributed to “sound substitution” in borrowings. According to Jedvaj speakers of the Bednja dialect have the habit of adapting borrowings to the phonetic evolution of the dialect, cf. *fošist* ‘fascist’, *nyermo* ‘norm’, *portizūn* ‘partizan’ (all examples 282); this adaptation is not always “correct” from a linguistic point of view, cf. *sobetər* (282) ‘saboteur’, *soldāot* (324) ‘soldier’, *evijyen* (282) ‘aeroplane’, instead of **sobetār*, **seldāot*, **ovijyen*.

3.6 *negōu*, *mādo*, *kèle*

In bisyllabic forms with an open second syllable and originally a short vowel in the first syllable there are again three types:

- (1) In a few examples the ictus has shifted: *negōu* ‘foot, leg’, *kesōu* ‘scythe’, *gerōu* ‘mountain’, *snehōu* ‘daughter-in-law’, *deskōu* ‘board, plank’ (all examples acc. sg., BG: 302), *nečēi* (308) ‘night’ (gen. sg.). Forms like *negōu* have doublets with stem-stress, cf. under (2).
- (2) In some examples the ictus has not shifted and the stressed vowel has been lengthened, cf. *mādo* (327, 28) ‘honey’ (gen. sg.),⁴⁶ *nābe* (285) ‘sky, heaven’, *jyeke* (290, 99) ‘eye’, *myerja* (294, 99) ‘sea’, *pyelja* (299) ‘field’, *pryese* (299) ‘millet’, *jyeči* (299) ‘eye’ (nom./acc. pl.), *vyedu* (291) ‘water’, *nyegu* (302) ‘foot, leg’, *kyesu*

⁴⁶ The form *mādo* (328) is an obvious printer’s error instead of **mādo*.

(302) ‘scythe’, *gyeru* (302) ‘mountain’, *diesku* (302) ‘plank, board’, *sniehu* (302) ‘daughter-in-law’ (all examples acc. sg.).

- (3) Some examples have neither a shifted stress nor lengthening of the stressed vowel, cf. *kěle* (286, 99) ‘wheel’, *ìma* (288), *děle* (319) ‘below, downstairs’, *děmo* (319, 23) ‘at home’, *skěre* (320, 29) ‘almost’.

Unfortunately the number of relevant examples is very small, so that it is difficult if not impossible to determine which of these three types shows the regular development. As it is, I think the type *kěle* is most likely to be regular, because if it were not it would be difficult to account for it in terms of secondary developments. The type *mâdo* can be explained along the same lines as *pyemeč*, viz. as the generalization of the form regular after a preposition. The type *negôu* may also be analogous. If *kěle* is regular, we expect an alternation **něgu* vs. **no nÿegu*, cf. *kěle* vs. *ekyelu* < |372| **kôlo* vs. **ò kolu*. As we have seen, forms like *nyegu* occur, but instead of **něgu* we find *negôu*, which may have replaced **něgu* on the analogy of **pomôc* vs. **na pômoč*.

3.7 *dnâvo*

In the first syllable of forms in which an originally stressed weak *jer* has been dropped we find a long falling vowel, cf. *zdyemo* (319) ‘from home, out of the house’, *dnâvo* (296, 325) ‘day’ (gen. sg.) (and other forms of the same word 296), *vjěytre* (319, 21, 28) ‘in the morning’ (cf. štok. *ÿjutro*), *vâčer* (291) ‘in the evening’, *spyeved* (303) ‘confession’, *stvyeril* (315) ‘having made’, *zlyežil* (329) ‘having laid down in one place’, *zvêřili* (327) ‘having finished’ (msc. pl.), *zïebrol* (293) ‘having chosen’, etc. The only exception is *sněči* (308, 19) ‘last night’, in which the short vowel regular in the gen. sg. **něči* may have been reintroduced analogically. We have to assume that vowels which became stressed as a consequence of the fall of a stressed *jer* in the preceding syllable received compensatory lengthening. This cannot have happened later than the progressive shift. This lengthening is regular in other kajkavian dialects, too. It explains the alternation we find in Prodindol *věčer* (Rožić I: 107) ‘evening’ vs. *zvêčera* (III: 60) ‘in the evening’, Brezova *po vòdu* (Junković 1972: 200) ‘in order to fetch water’ vs. *h vûodu* (ib.) ‘into the water’ < **vë vodq*, cf. also Prodindol *snôči* (Rožić III: 60) ‘last night’ with the long vowel that was analogically removed in Bednja *sněči*.

The fall of an unstressed *jer* in an initial syllable did not cause lengthening, cf. *vnÿk* (286, 97) ‘grandson’, *ftič* (297) ‘bird’, *ftico* (301) ‘id.’, *zrëk* (297) ‘cause’, *vněge* (321) ‘much’, *vbïti* (286) ‘to kill’, cf. also *žlïco* (301) ‘spoon’.

4. The neocircumflex

4.0 Introduction

A short stressed vowel has received compensatory lengthening whenever (1) a non-final weak *jer* (or a final *jer* if preceded by a cluster consisting of stop or fricative plus resonant, cf. Kortlandt 1976: 2) was lost in the following syllable or (2) a long vowel in the first or second posttonic syllable was shortened. Examples: *prâovdo* (301) ‘truth’, *hrêyško* (301) ‘pear’, *mêisel* (303) ‘thought’, *sîkel* (313) ‘having chopped,

hewn', *žâobu* (300) 'frog' (ins. sg.), *slâobi* (305) 'weak' (long form), *mîesto* (298) 'place' (nom./acc. pl.), *svîeklestmi* (303) 'light' (ins. pl.), *mîerilo* (315) 'having measured' (fem. sg.), *mâoterin* (304) 'a mother's' (adj.), *nâobrol* (321) |373| 'having gathered', *pâošnjak* (296) 'pasture', cf. also *nyefet* (291) 'fingernail', in which the long vowel of the first syllable must be due to generalization of the length that is regular in all other stem-stressed forms (which happen not to be attested), e.g. **nÿefto* (gen. sg.).⁴⁷

The rise of the neocircumflex must have been later than the progressive stress shift, because, whereas the progressive shift presupposes the retention of medial weak *jers* (section 3.4), neocircumflex involves their loss. Moreover, the progressive stress shift presupposes the retention of tone distinctions on short vowels, whereas neocircumflex results in falling vowels, irrespective of the original tone of the lengthened short vowel, so that it is reasonable to suppose that the tone distinction on short vowels was lost between the progressive stress shift and the rise of the neocircumflex.

4.1 Virje *jagodê*

According to Ivić there are reasons for believing that at least some post-tonic long vowels remained long in at least some kajkavian dialects: "(...) akcentuacija na krajnjem severoistoku pretpostavlja čuvanje posleakcenatskih dužina sve do tamošnjeg specifičnog prenošenja (*jăgodê* > *jagodê*)" (Ivić 1966: 376). The situation Ivić has in mind here has been described most completely for the dialect of Virje (Fancev 1907, cf. also Šojat's description in Herman 1973: 73f.). If Ivić were right, some serious difficulties would have to be faced. However, Fancev (followed by Ivšić 1936: 84) has clearly demonstrated that the accentuation of *jagodê* is analogical. He reconstructs the following chain of events:

- (1) Retraction of the ictus from final syllables containing a short vowel (Fancev *o.c.* 341).
- (2) The development of a rule according to which the ictus can fall only on one of the last two syllables of the phonological word (including clitics), cf. **jăgoda* > *jagôda*, **zemî mu ga* > *zemi mù ga* (*o.c.* 339) 'take it from him', cf. *o.c.* 338-46 and *passim*.
- (3) Generalization of final stress in all case forms that at this moment had final stress in "type b" or "type c". All *â*-stem nouns, for instance, have end-stress in the gen. sg. in *-ê*, ins. sg. in *-ôm*, dat. pl. in *-â°m* and loc. pl. in *-â°j*, cf. *nogê*, *nogôm*, *nogâ°m*, *nogâ°j* 'foot, leg', *kravê*, *kravôm*, *kravâ°m*, *kravâ°j* 'cow', *jabokê*, *jabokôm*, *jabokâ°m*, *jabokâ°j* 'apple' (all examples *o.c.* 359; I have slightly simplified Fancev's transcription).

For this chronology to explain all the facts the following has to be taken into account:

⁴⁷ This generalization is normal in Bednja, as it is in Slovene, cf. *zôjec* (296, 327-8) 'hare' alongside (once) *zôjtec* (288), *tergyevac* (296, 322) 'merchant', etc.

- (a) Prior to (1) short vowels must have been lengthened before syllable-final [374] *-m* and *-j*, otherwise there would be no explanation for the final stress in *nogâ^om*, *nogâ^oj*, cf. also *volôm* (o.c. 364) ‘ox’ (dat. pl.). The development **-ah* > **-aj* in the loc. pl. of *ā*-stems in its turn antedates the lengthening; this change is widespread in kajkavian, cf. Bednja *rōūkđj*, *žđboj* (both examples 300). Lengthening of short vowels before syllable-final *l*, *l̥*, *r*, *m*, *n*, *ń*, *v* and *j* (Fancev o.c. 353) is an innovation the Virje dialect shares with Posavian (Ivšić 1913: 153).
- (b) The shortening of posttonic long vowels must have preceded (2). Fancev rightly argues that if it did not, there would be no explanation for the fact that the stressed vowel is short in forms like *na glāvō* (o.c. 346) ‘onto the head’ < **nā glavo* < **nā glāvo*.⁴⁸

4.2 Deviant cases

Although the cases in which neocircumflex occurs are to a large extent the same in Slovene and kajkavian, there are a few differences, e.g.:

- (1) The ins. pl. ending of *ā*-stems. Bednja has no neocircumflex, Slovene has, cf. Bednja *rukūmi* ‘hand’, *ženūmi* ‘wife’, *storešēinūmi* ‘chief’ (all examples 300), Slovene *gorāmi* ‘mountain’. This can be explained by the existence, in late Proto-Slavonic, of two different endings, viz. **-āmī* (type b) and **-āmi* (type c), of which Slovene generalized the first and the Bednja dialect the second (cf. Kortlandt 1975: 51). In the kajkavian dialect of Prodindol both endings still occur side by side, although the original distribution appears to have been lost, cf. *iglāmi* (Rožić I: 128) ‘needle’, *rukāmi* (I: 132) ‘hand’ vs. *sestrāmi* ‘sister’, *stenāmi* (I: 131) ‘rock’, *petāmi* (I: 132) ‘heel’ (unfortunately these are the only examples Rožić gives).
- (2) The infinitive of stem-stressed verbs in **-nōti*. Bednja has neocircumflex, Slovene has not, cf. Bednja *dēignuti* (313) ‘to lift’, Slovene *dvígniti*. The difference may be connected with the fact that Slovene has an analogical ending, cf. also the long vowel in Bednja *spemenūti* (314) ‘to mention’ (and a few other verbs in *-nūti*, ib.) and the optional retraction in *petāgnuti* (ib.) ‘to draw, pull’, alongside *petāgnūti* (ib.), with stress on the ending and a short *u*. The *l*-participle has a short vowel, *đignul*, *đignule* (313), *petāgnūl*, *petāgnūle* (314). Stem-stressed verbs show the same pattern in the dialect of Prodindol, e.g. *pārnati* ‘to die’, *pārnal*, *pārnalo* (Rožić III: 71).
- (3) The present tense of verbs in *-yvđti*, e.g. *glodyvđti* (319) ‘to be hungry’, *glodŷjam* (ib.) ‘I am hungry’, *kypyvđti* (ib.) ‘to buy’, *kypŷjam* (285) ‘I am buying’,⁴⁹ against Slovene *kupŷjem*, and also Prodindol *kaštigŷjem* (Rožić III: 102) ‘I am punishing’. This difference is undoubtedly connected [375] with the fact that the *e*-endings of

⁴⁸ In his clear understanding of chronological relationships Fancev was much ahead of his time. There is no justification for Junković’s sharp attack on Fancev’s treatment of the accentual system of the Virje dialect (1972: 19).

⁴⁹ Junković does not believe in the correctness of the form *kypŷjam*, without, however, giving reasons for this opinion (1959: 192).

the verb occurred both long and short in the last phase of Proto-Slavonic, as a consequence of van Wijk's law, Stang's law, and various other developments. The contrast of Bednja *-ŷjam* and Prodindol *-ŷjem* is the kajkavian equivalent of the capricious distribution of long, short and mixed *e*-endings in čakavian. Short endings are directly attested in Prodindol *mrëm, mrëš* (Rožić III: 66) 'I, you die'.

4.3 Prodindol *ðblak*

In Prodindol short falling vowels do not seem to have been lengthened, cf. *ðbad* (Rožić I: 81, 106) 'gad-fly', *ðblak* (I: 81, 91, 95, 106) 'cloud', *gðlub* (I: 81, 106) 'dove', *pðjstat* (I: 90)/*pðstat* (II: 123) 'small strip of land', *pèrut* (II: 123) 'feather', *zàprl* (III: 66) 'having shut', *pðčel* (ib.) 'having started', *bðjal* (*se*) (III: 76) 'having feared', *nàpit* (III: 67) 'having been drunk', *nèfta* (I: 74)/*nèkta* (I: 74) 'finger-nail' (gen. sg.), etc. There are several explanations, none of which is in all respects satisfactory:

- (1) Neocircumflex may have been regular, as in Bednja, but a short vowel may have been restored in mobile paradigms on the analogy of the end-stressed forms. This works well in the case of *nèfta*, which must have had a short vowel in, e.g., the nom. sg. **nðkʷt* and the loc. pl. **noktēh* and a long one in, say, the gen. sg. **nðkta*. In most of the other examples it is not very plausible. In forms like loc. pl. **golōbēh*, fem. sg. **bojālā* the vowel of the first syllable can hardly have been distinctively short, so that there was no alternation that could be removed by replacing **gōlob*, **bōjal* with **gðlob*, **bðjal*.
- (2) Compensatory lengthening may have occurred at a moment when the tone distinction had not yet been lost in short vowels and may have affected only short rising vowels, possibly because short vowels were still quantitatively neutral in the relevant positions. This is possible, but it is strange that lengthening of a rising vowel would yield a falling one.
- (3) The rise of the neocircumflex may have been posterior to the loss of the tone oppositions in short vowels, but some difference in the treatment of posttonic long vowels and medial *jers* may have arisen prior to the merger. In particular one may suppose that posttonic lengths and medial weak *jers* had been lost after a falling but retained after a rising vowel: **nðkta* vs. **prāv̄da*, **nāpit* vs. **slābī*, yielding **nðkta*, **prāv̄da*, **nāpit*, **slābī* at a moment prior to the rise of the neocircumflex.

4.4 Ivšić's retraction

The rise of the neocircumflex was followed by a phonetic retraction from a long falling vowel onto the preceding syllable if the latter contained [376] a long vowel, cf. *zōbovo* (301) 'amusement' < **zābāva* < **zābāvā*. A few other examples: *prīprovo* (301) 'preparation, cooking', *prīsego* (301) 'oath', *výtrepo* (290) 'intestines, entrails',⁵⁰ *nōhiža* (299) 'attic', *Zōgerja* (299) 'Zagorje' (top.), *prīvednjok* (296) 'leader of the wedding-guests', *sūsedi* (312) 'neighbour' (ins. pl.), *zībolo* (311) 'having rocked' (fem.

⁵⁰ The form *výtrepo* is strange; one expects **vūtrepo*.

sg.), *skērbelo* (314) ‘having cared’ (fem. sg.), *brūnilo* (316) ‘having defended’ (fem. sg.), *līzolo* (318) ‘having licked’ (fem. sg.), *kōzolo* (*sa*) (325) ‘having seemed, appeared’ (fem. sg.), etc.

The ictus was not retracted if the preceding syllable contained a short vowel, cf. *večârjo* (294, 301) ‘dinner’, *člevīeči* (294) ‘human’, *lesēiči* (294) ‘pertaining to a fox’, *pehēištvē* (299) ‘furniture’, *pedgyerja* (299) ‘piece of land at the foot of a mountain’, *pesôudo* (289, 301) ‘vessel’, *esvyero* (301) ‘pericardium’, *spedyebo* (301) ‘picture’, *želôudec* (296) ‘stomach’, *eplâčok* (296) ‘piece of clothing’, *begâotstve* (299) ‘wealth’, *petyeki* (295) ‘brook’ (ins. pl.), etc.⁵¹

There are three groups of examples in which we find retraction onto a syllable containing a short vowel:

- (1) The fem. sg. of the *l*-participle of verbs with stress retraction in the present tense, cf. *zoklânulo* (314) ‘having locked up’, *sělilo* (315) ‘having salted’, *kèpolo* (316) ‘having dug’, *lògolo* (318) ‘having told lies’, *glodÿvolo* (319) ‘having suffered hunger’. This is clearly due to the influence of those verbs in which retraction was regular, cf. *petāgnulo*, *kýrilo*, etc. The analogy has not reached *letĭelo* (311, 14) ‘having flown’ (which has end-stress in the present tense), despite the presence of a model in *skērbelo* from *skērbĕti*, *skerbĭm* (314).
- (2) A few prefixal derivations in *-o*, e.g. *pýedlego* (301) ‘basis, support’, *pýetrebā* (301) ‘need’, on the analogy of *zōbovo*. This analogy may have worked before or after the retraction.
- (3) The plural of a number of trisyllabic neuter nouns, cf. *kýelēno* (299) ‘knee’, *pýelēno* (ib.) ‘log’, *kýepito* (ib.) ‘hoof’, *kýerito* (286) ‘trough’, the nom./acc. pl. of *kelĕne*, *pelĕne*, *kepĭte* (299), *kerĭte* (286, 99). These forms are difficult to explain. They may show generalization of the accent of the gen. pl. **kōlĕn* < **kuòlĕnĭ*, cf. štok. *kòljĕnā*, Susak *kōlen* (Hamm, Hraste and Guberina 1956: 108).

The ins. sg. of *storešĕinò* (288, 300, 21) ‘chief’ is *storešĭnu* (300), obviously due to the same retraction as *zōbovo* and going back to a form **starĕšĭnô*, with the “type b” ending **-òjô*, as distinct from *rukū* (ib.) ‘hand’ (ins. sg.), with the “type c” ending **-ojô* (Stang 1957: 62). The Bednja dialect is very archaic in having retained the opposition between both endings, cf. also the two different gen. sg. endings *storešĕinà* (300) vs. *rukā* (ib.). In the [377] ins. sg. of **ženà* no retraction has taken place (because of the quantity of the stem-vowel), and it has taken over the “type c” endings *ženā* (ib.) (gen. sg.), *ženū* (ib.) (ins. sg.).

University of Amsterdam

⁵¹ This retraction was first described by Ivšić 1937: 188. It is general in kajkavian, or at least very widespread. Forms like Virje *vūtrōba* (Fancev 1907 : 355) show that it preceded the rise of the Virje “Zweisilbengesetz”, cf. above, section 4.1.

References

- Aleksić, R.
1937 "Prilozi istoriji kajkavskog dijalekta", *JF* 10, 1-98.
- Asbóth, O.
1910 review of Á. Pável, *A vashidegkúti szlovén nyelvjárás hangtana* (Budapest, 1909), *RSl* 3, 177-203.
- Belić, A.
1914 "Izveštaj Državnom savetu o pribiranju dijalektološke građe", *Godišnjak SAN* 26, 221-59.
- Ebeling, C. L.
1967 "Some premises of phonemic analysis", *Word* 23, 122-37.
- Fancev, Fr.
1907 "Beiträge zur serbokroatischen Dialektologie. Der kaj-Dialekt von Virje, mit Berücksichtigung der Dialekte Podravina's (Koprivnica-Pitomača)", *AfSIPh* 29, 305-89.
- Hamm, J., M. Hraste, and P. Guberina.
1956 "Govor otoka Suska", *HrDZb* 1, 7-213.
- Herman, J.
1973 "Prilog poznavanju leksičkog blaga u govoru Virja (Podravina)", *Filologija* 7, 73-99.
- Ivić, P.
1961 "Prilozi poznavanju dijalekatske slike zapadne Hrvatske", *GFFNS* 6, 191-211.
1966 "Fonološki aspekt genetičkog odnosa između štokavske, čakavske i kajkavske dijalekatske grupe", *Orbis scriptus* (München), 375-83.
1968 "Procesi rasterećenja vokalskog sistema u kajkavskim govorima", *ZbFL* 11, 57-68.
- Ivšić, Stj.
1913 "Današnji posavski govor", *Rad* 196, 124-254.
1936 "Jezik Hrvata kajkavaca", *Ljetopis JAZU* 48, 47-88.
1937 "Osnovna hrvatska kajkavska akcentuacija u Pergošića (1574)", *Zbornik u čast A. Belića* (Beograd), 183-95.
- Jakoby, W.
1974 *Untersuchungen zur Phonologie und Prosodie einer kajkavischen Mundart (Gornja Stubica)*. München.
- Jedvaj, J.
1956 "Bednjanski govor", *HrDZb* 1, 279-330 (in the text referred to as "BG").
- Junković, Zv.
1959 review of Jedvaj 1956, *Filologija* 2, 189-92.
1972 *Jezik Antuna Vramca i podrijetlo kajkavskog dijalekta* (= *Rad* 363). Zagreb. |381|
- Jurišić, Bl.
1973 *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade, II: Rječnik*. Zagreb.
- Kortlandt, F. H. H.
1975 *Slavic Accentuation*. Lisse.
1975a "Jers and nasal vowels in the Freising Fragments", *SIR* 23, 405-12.
1976 "The Slovene Neo-Circumflex", *TSEER* 54/1, 1-10.
- Logar, T.
1955 "Karakteristika štajerskih govorov južno od Konjiške gore in Boča", *Pogovori o jeziku in slovstvu* (Maribor), 61-5.
- Pešikan, M.
1963-4 review of Jedvaj 1956, *JF* 26, 556-80.
- Rigler, J.
1976 "Junkovićeva kajkavska teorija in slovenščina", *SIR* 24, 437-63.

- Rožić, V.
1893-4 "Kajkavački dijalekat u Prigorju", I, *Rad* 115, 68-136; II, *Rad* 116, 113-74; III, *Rad* 118, 55-115 (in the text referred to as "Rožić I" etc.).
- Stang, Chr.
1957 *Slavonic Accentuation*. Oslo.
- Valjavec, M.
1897 "Glavne točke o naglasu književne slovenštine", *Rad* 132, 116-213.
- Vermeer, W. R.
1975 "Problems in the synchronic and diachronic phonology of Susak čakavian", *ZbFL* 18, 139-59.