

Mate Kapović

ORCID: 0000-0001-7938-4323

University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social
Sciences, Croatia

kapovic@gmail.com

On archaic oxytonesis in Slovene Ter dialect

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/15.1.04>

Slovenski jezik / Slovene Linguistic Studies 15/2023. 75–87.



ISSN tiskane izdaje: 1408-2616, ISSN spletne izdaje: 1581-127
<https://ojs.zrc-sazu.si/sjls>

Mate Kapović (ORCID: 0000-0001-7938-4323)

University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Croatia
kapovic@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/15.1.04>

ON ARCHAIC OXYTONESIS IN SLOVENE TER DIALECT

The paper discusses the oxytonic *mokà* ‘flour’, *bradà* ‘beard’ type accent in the central Prosnid–Porčinj–Subid belt of the Ter dialect base on the material from Janoš Ježovnik’s 2022 monograph. The author discusses various problems concerning the oxytonesis and concludes that these marginal Slovene dialects preserve the old Slavic final accent even after the originally long root.

KEYWORDS: Ter dialect, Tersko dialect, accent, accentology, oxytonesis

Prispevek obravnava oksitonski naglas *mokà* ‘moka’, *bradà* ‘brada’ v osrednjem prosnidsko–porčinjsko–subidskem pasu terskega narečja na podlagi gradiva iz monografije Janoša Ježovnika (2022). Avtor obravnava različne probleme v zvezi z oksitonezo in ugotavlja, da ta obrobna slovenska narečja ohranjajo stari splošnoslovenski končni naglas tudi po prvotno dolgem korenu.

KLJUČNE BESEDE: tersko narečje, tersko narečje, naglas, akcentologija, oksitoneza

1 INTRODUCTION

Šekli (2006: 168, 173) published the material where he shows different reflexes of Proto-Slavic **nǐva* and **zīmá* in the local dialect of Subid, a part of the Slovene Ter dialect (*tersko narečje*). The words in question are *ńúva* ‘field’ and *zímà/zīmà* ‘winter’.¹ Unlike Šekli, who interpreted the *zímà/zīmà* type accent as an innovation (thus **zīmà* > **zíma* > *zímà/zīmà*), Kapović (2015: 84) on basis of this very scant evidence cautiously proposed that *zīmà* is actually an archaism, i.e. the old preserved final accent. Recently, Ježovnik (2020 and especially his 2022 monograph) provided much more material from Ter dialects which have the same type of accentuation –

¹ Unlike Šekli (2006) and Ježovnik (2020, 2022), in this article I write the Slovene tonemes in the traditional manner: “ – short (falling), ^ – long falling, ‘ – long rising.

however, not from Subid but from neighboring dialects of Porčinj and Prosnid, which exhibit the *travǎ* ‘grass’ < *trāvǎ, *bradǎ* ‘beard’ < *bordǎ type accent with the apparently preserved old final accent. Ježovnik (2020: 673–675, 2022: 377–382, 391) provides a thorough and very balanced overview of both possibilities – one being that the *bradǎ* type accent is archaic and the other that it is an innovation. However, he surmises (2020: 674) that “each is near impossible to prove conclusively” (of course, this can be said of everything in historical linguistics) and gives preference to the traditional *communis opinio* in Slovene dialectology (Ježovnik 2022: 377) that *bradǎ* type accent is an innovation (due to a progressive shift from the earlier retracted *bráda). This is clear, among other things, already from the title of his 2020 paper (“progressive acute-accent shift”) and the actual reconstructions he gives in Ježovnik 2022, e.g. Proto-Slovene *zi:ma (his transcription) for Porčinj *zimǎ* (: 286). It also has to be said that though one can indeed find certain arguments to try to argue for the *zīmǎ > *zíma > *zimǎ* type process (as Ježovnik does), there is in reality no real factual reason in the Ter dialect why one should even try to look for those (except for reluctance to stray away from the traditional suppositions on accentual development in Slovene historical linguistics) and not just take the attested factual material at face value. In this paper, I shall shortly discuss the very valuable material presented by Ježovnik and argue for the interpretation of words like *zimǎ* as archaisms and not innovations. Most of the problems have already been well discussed by Ježovnik in his two works, but I shall try to add my perspective and interpretation to it, as well as to discuss certain additional examples (like the accent of the infinitive).

2 MATERIAL

Here, we shall shortly present some of the relevant material (word-forms with original length and accent on final open syllable) from Ježovnik 2022 (a short list of the relevant forms is available in Ježovnik 2020: 670 as well), without going into all the details (e.g. we will not list all types of nouns/adjectives/verbs that have the oxytonesis in some form, we will not discuss all obvious analogies at length, we will not adduce all examples from the monograph from both villages, etc.). Unfortunately, Ježovnik’s material is not comprehensive and certain

possibly interesting forms with original oxytonesis are missing, e.g. accentual paradigm *c* locative singular *o-*, *ā-* and *i-*stem forms, a. p. *c* imperative forms, etc. (while e.g. neuter nominative forms are rare because of the demise of the neuter).

1) *ā*-stem singular (a. p. B & C): Porčinj/Prosnid *mokà* ‘flour’ – acc^{sg} *mokù*; *trauà* ‘grass’ – Porčinj acc^{sg} *trauǔ*²; *bradà* ‘beard’, *zimà* ‘winter’³ etc. (cf. the original initial accent in *kràva* ‘cow’, *lìpa* ‘linden’, *nìva* ‘field’⁴; Porčinj *žéja* ‘thirst’⁵; Porčinj *kóža*⁶).

2) *o*-stem gen^{sg} (a. p. B): Porčinj/Prosnid (*y*)*riexà* ‘sin’, Porčinj *kjučà* ‘key’, *krížà* ‘cross’, *klabukà* ‘hat’, etc.⁷ (cf. the original initial accent in Porčinj *siéra* ‘cheese’, *zéta* ‘son-in-law’⁸)

3) neuter *o*-stem (a. p. B): Prosnid *y**niēzdò* ‘nest’ – gen^{sg} *y**niēzdà*, Porčinj/Prosnid *mliēkò* ‘milk’ – gen^{sg} *mliēkà*, *vinò* ‘wine’ – gen^{sg} *vinà*⁹ (cf. the original initial accent in Porčinj *liēto* ‘summer, year’, Prosnid *sìto* ‘sieve’¹⁰)

4) adjective (a. p. B & feminine singular a. p. C): Porčinj/Prosnid *bielà* ‘white’ (feminine) – Prosnid *bielò* (neuter)¹¹, Porčinj/Prosnid *liepà*

² Ježovnik 2022: 282–283 (cf. Croatian dialectal *mūkà*, *trāvà*). The word *zviezdà* ‘star’ shifts to a. p. C in Prosnid (acc^{sg} *zviezdò*) with a progressive shift of the circumflex) – in Porčinj, the circumflex is then regularly phonetically retracted in the accusative and generalized, thus yielding Porčinj innovative *zviēzda* – acc^{sg} *zviēzdu*.

³ Ježovnik 2022: 286 (cf. Croatian dialectal *brādà*, *zimà*). The word *bradà* shifts to a. p. B in both Porčinj and Prosnid (secondary acc^{sg} *bradù*); *ylauà* ‘head’ and *zimà* remain a. p. C in Prosnid (acc^{sg} *ylauò*, *zimò*), while *lauà* and *zimà* shift to a. p. B in Porčinj (secondary acc^{sg} *lauù*, *zimù*); *petà* ‘heel’ and *rokà* ‘arm’ remain a. p. C in Prosnid (acc^{sg} *petò*, *rokò*), while the accusative form with the regular phonetic retraction of the circumflex is generalized in Porčinj (thus *péta*, *ròka* – acc^{sg} *pétu*, *ròku*)

⁴ Ježovnik 2022: 277 (cf. Croatian *kràva*, *lìpa*, *nìva*).

⁵ Ježovnik 2022: 281 (cf. Croatian dialectal *žéja*).

⁶ Ježovnik 2022: 282 (cf. Croatian *kòža*).

⁷ Ježovnik 2022: 296–298 (cf. Croatian dialectal *grìxà*, *kļučà*, *krížà*, *klobükà*).

⁸ Ježovnik 2022: 290 (cf. Croatian *sìra*, *zéta*).

⁹ Ježovnik 2022: 311 (cf. Croatian dialectal *gñīzdò* – *gñīzdà*, *mliēkò/mlēkò* – *mliēkà/mlēkà*, *vīnò* – *vīnà*).

¹⁰ Ježovnik 2022: 309 (cf. Croatian dialectal *lìto/lèto/lèto*, *sìto*).

¹¹ Ježovnik 2022: 332 (cf. Croatian dialectal *bìlà/bēlà* – *bīlò/bēlò*).

‘beautiful’, *mladà* ‘young’, Porčinj *suxà* ‘dry’¹² (feminine) (cf. the original initial accent in Prosnid *dúya* ‘long’ – *dúyo*, *stàra* ‘old’ – *stàro*¹³)

5) *l*-participle: Porčinj *treslà* ‘shook’¹⁴

As can be seen from these and other examples, the difference of the original oxytone forms (like *bradà*) and original forms with an initial old acute (like *lìpa*) or neo-acute (like *žéja*) is systematic and regular, in spite of a few analogies and later secondary developments.

3 DISCUSSION

In this section, we shall discuss certain issues concerning the oxytonic forms and their origin, some of which were already discussed by Ježovnik (2020, 2022). The *communis opinio* in Slovene dialectology/ accentology is that the retraction of the short accent in final open syllables (e.g. *trāvà > tráva) is old and that it encompasses all Slovene dialects – cf. e.g. Greenberg 2000: 120 (though Greenberg’s wording is not completely clear – in any case, this monograph was written before the new data from the Ter dialect was published), Šekli 2018: 152–153 (thus after and in spite of the data in Šekli 2006). From this follows that the data from the Ter dialect of the *bradà* type is considered to be secondary (cf. Ježovnik 2020: 673, 2022: 377). As we shall see, this traditional view has to be corrected.

¹² Ježovnik 2022: 335 (cf. Croatian dialectal *lìpà/lēpà*, *mlādà*, *sūxà*).

¹³ Ježovnik 2022: 327 (cf. Croatian dialectal *dūga* – *dūgo*, *stàra* – *stàro*). Porčinj has an innovative C-end-accent in feminine *màrzlā* ‘cold’, *slabā* ‘weak’, *rusā* ‘red’, *starā* ‘old’ – cf. Prosnid original and expected *màrzla*, *rúsa*, *stàra*. Prosnid *sīta* ‘fed up’ is secondary just like Porčinj *sīta* and *slāba*, probably due to analogy with the original long/definite forms (the same analogical accent occurs also in Porčinj *dūa* ‘long’ – cf. the expected accent in Prosnid *dúya*). The end-stress in Porčinj forms like *starā* was probably enhanced due to neuter forms like *stàro*, where the rising accent (originally stemming from the old acute) can be misanalyzed as the rising accent originating in the regular retraction of the circumflex in Porčinj.

¹⁴ Ježovnik 2022: 343 (cf. Croatian dialectal *trēsłā*). In other *l*-participle forms, one or another kind of analogy occurred, e.g. Porčinj *strēslo* is an innovative C-form, *vrástla* is analogical to the infinitive and other forms, *zacčēla* ‘begun’ is analogical to the (already analogical to non-prefixed forms) neuter form (Ježovnik 2022: 343–44), etc.

While Subid, Prosnid and Porčinj¹⁵ have a final accent in *mokà* type words, which used to have length in the root (and still do to an extent – see below), all the Ter local dialects have a final accent in the *kozà* ‘goat’ type (cf. Croatian dialectal *mūkà* but *kozà* for the original presence of root brevity/length), e.g. Porčinj *sestrà* ‘sister’, *tetà* ‘aunt’, *ženà* ‘woman’, Prosnid *meylà* ‘fog’, *temà* ‘darkness’, etc.¹⁶ While words like *bradà* are usually interpreted as secondary by Slovenian dialectologists, nobody doubts that forms like *kozà* are old. Looking from a perspective of the Ter dialect itself and general historical Slavic accentology, this does not make much sense – why would *kozà* be old while *bradà* would not? Why not take the data simply at face value? Why try to imagine complex hypotheses in order to avoid a simple archaism?

The Ter dialect is the westernmost Slovene dialect and marginal dialects very often preserve archaisms that are lost elsewhere – thus, it is not strange at all that *bradà* type accent could be preserved there. The problem of the Slovene dialectology is that it looks at Slovene dialects as one isolated whole and thus finds it problematic that final accent is lost everywhere in Slovene except in a part of the Ter dialect (though this is also not true – see below). However, modern national borders of Slovenia and modern political unity of Slovene dialects do not really have much meaning in historical linguistics and accentological isoglosses, especially if we keep in mind that the whole of South Slavic linguistic area is one huge dialectal continuum. The fact that there is no oxytonesis e.g. in *glava* and *brada* in Prekmurje (in the far north-east of Slovenia) should not really be more important than the fact that Croatian/Čakavian central Istra¹⁷ does have oxytonesis in those words – in fact, Istra Čakavian is geographically closer to the Ter dialect than many eastern Slovene dialects are. Buzet Čakavian dialects, indeed, show certain traits in common with Slovene dialects (e.g. progressive shift of the circumflex) and do mostly preserve the

¹⁵ Also perhaps Malina/Forame in that area (Ježovnik 2020: 667⁷).

¹⁶ Ježovnik 2022: 283–285, 287–288 (cf. Croatian dialectal *kozà*, *sestrà*, *tetà*, *ženà*, *maglà*).

¹⁷ Here I use the Croatian (and Slovene) name *Istra* and not the Italian version *Istria*, which is otherwise more frequent in English.

final accentuation (except certain dialects near the Slovenian border) – cf. now Klarić 2022: 129. If Istra Croatian Čakavian could preserve old accentuation in words like that, the same can be true for the Ter dialect of Slovene, the modern national identities notwithstanding. In fact, the Ter dialect preserves other archaisms, just like Čakavian does (and most of Slovene dialects do not) – for instance, the opposition of *č* and *ć*.¹⁸ What is more, Ježovnik (2020: 675, 2022: 381) adduces some other instances of preservation of the old *bradà* type accent in other Slovene dialects, of which Breznik’s examples like *rokà* ‘arm’, *zimà* ‘winter’ from Kobarid (a *Nadiško* dialect just east from the Ter dialect) are the most relevant. This would point to the preservation of the old final accent as a feature of a wider territory in the westernmost Slovene dialects up until recently.

The whole idea that old **brādà* yielded first **bráda* (while *kozà* remained unchanged), and then later changed again to *bradà* is possible theoretically but is completely unnecessary – Ježovnik (2022: 380) admits himself that the archaism is more probable according to the Ockham’s razor principle. Considering the contemporary differences of *zimà* and *lípa*, one would also have to assume that the supposedly retracted **zima* had a long rising accent that was somehow different from the long rising accent in *lípa* (Ježovnik 2020: 674, 2022: 378, 391) because only one of those eventually shifted to the right again.¹⁹ Having two different rising tonemes is not impossible (cf. e.g. Old Štokavian Croatian dialects in Posavina which have both *sūša* ‘drought’ with the neo-acute, which can be phonetically rising, and *rúka* ‘arm’ with a Neo-Štokavian long rising accent), but is not very likely and there is no independent evidence for that – except for the apparent unwillingness of some Slovene dialectologists to consider the possibility that marginal dialects can indeed preserve archaisms that are not usual in non-marginal dialects. Ježovnik (2022: 381) argues that one could find a parallel for the supposed possible **brādà* > **bráda* > *bradà* in Common Slavic process of the rightward shift of Dybo’s law and then

¹⁸ Ježovnik 2022: 194.

¹⁹ The difference cannot be in the original brevity in *lípa* because there is no forward shift in the *žéja* type either (which is originally long).

subsequent leftward shift of Ivšič's (Stang's) Law. However, it must be said that Stang's law is highly dubious in Slavic, one of the arguments being that it is unnecessary to suppose first the rightward and then later the leftward shift in order to get the same form as in the beginning.²⁰ Ježovnik's (*ibid.*) point that we find a forward and then backward shift of the circumflex in some Slovene dialects, including some of the Ter dialects (like Porčinj), is not a good parallel because in case of the development such as **mêso* > **mesô* > **méso* we do not posit such a right-left development simply because it is assumed that all Slovene dialects must first have a progressive shift of the circumflex – Porčinj *mêso* indeed has a rising (!) accent and, for instance, Prosnid still has the older long falling accent in *mesûo*.²¹ Thus, in case of that right-left shift there are plenty of independent evidence for such a process – in case of the *bradä* type Porčinj/Prosnid accent there is no such thing.

The preservation of the pre-oxytonic length, with the identical development of vowel quality in pretonic and stressed positions²² (cf. e.g. Porčinj *niezdô* and *koliêno* 'knee'²³), is not a typological problem. As Ježovnik (2022: 380) notes, a parallel process (the identical development of long pretonic and long stressed vowels), can be seen in Bednja Kajkavian, cf. e.g. Bednja²⁴ *zvîēzdô* 'star' = *črîēšno* 'cherry' (with the same diphthong in long pretonic position and under long falling accent). The same process can be seen e.g. in Orbanići Čakavian²⁵ *zvîēzdä* 'star' = *bîēli* 'white' (with the same diphthong in long pretonic position and under the long neo-acute). Here it also has to be mentioned that the preservation of pretonic length in *bradä* type words in the archaic part of the Ter dialect is not just a theoretical supposition. The oldest of Ježovnik's informants in Prosnid (and to a lesser extent some other, younger, informants) seem to preserve inconsistent pretonic length in the *bradä* type words (cf. Ježovnik

²⁰ Cf. e.g. Hendriks 2003, Kapović 2015: 103–134, 2017b: 391²², 2020a.

²¹ Ježovnik 2022: 315.

²² Ježovnik 2020: 675, 2022: 379.

²³ Ježovnik 2022: 310–311.

²⁴ Jedvaj 1956: 301–302.

²⁵ Kalsbeek 1998.

2020: 667, 2022: 380).²⁶ It may just be that pretonic length has started to disappear in that position only in the last couple of generations (Ježovnik 2020: 675).

One of the possible pro-innovation arguments Ježovnik (2020: 674, 2022: 378–379) uses is the circumflex in the nominative plural of neuter accentual paradigm B (oxytonic) nouns. For instance, in Porčinj we find the expected singular oxytonic *nięzdò* in a. p. B (as opposed to *lięto* in a. p. A) but plural *nĭęzda* (B:) = *lięta* (A). Now, Ježovnik thinks that this analogy could point to the original **gnięzdo* (with retraction) = *lięto*, which made the analogy in the plural possible. However, as he himself admits (Ježovnik 2020: 674, 2022: 379), the supposed retraction has to entail a different (!) rising tone, which makes the whole supposition improbable. In any case, presupposing a retraction and then a progressive shift is hardly necessary to account for the secondary *nĭęzda* type. First of all, this is basically just one example (there is also a morphologically secondary nom^{pl} *mlięke* from *mliękò*) and could have easily originate in a simple analogical spread of the circumflex in neuter nom^{pl} regardless of the accent in singular. One may even speculate that this might have also been helped via contact influence of other dialects with the retraction (cf. Breginj *ynięzdo* – nom^{pl} *ynĭęzda*). Analogies are often inconsistent so it is not strange that there is no secondary circumflex in pluralia tantum *uráta* ‘door’ and *pléca* (Porčinj). The form *rėbra* (Porčinj) also shifts (partially) to the feminine gender²⁷ so this may have had an influence as well. In any case, it is just one or two examples and a simple enough analogy – this is certainly not something that would prove the **brādà* > **bráda* > *bradà* process.

As for the progressive shift of the acute in propenultimate syllables that occurs in the area of Prosnid, Porčinj and Subid²⁸ (e.g. **jũžina* ‘lunch’ > Porčinj *južęna*²⁹), this is clearly a different process³⁰ (in which the old

²⁶ As a parallel for an inconsistent retention of prefinal length cf. e.g. the case of the Čakavian dialect of Susak in Croatia (Kapović 2020b: 509–510).

²⁷ Ježovnik 2022: 378²⁶⁷.

²⁸ Cf. the map in Ježovnik 2022: 384.

²⁹ For examples cf. Ježovnik 2020: 667–668, 2022: 278–279, 291, 309, etc. Additional examples for Subid are given in Zuljan Kumar 2018: 42.

³⁰ Acknowledged also by Šekli 2006, Ježovnik 2020: 666, 673, 2022: 377.

acute from the propenultima is shifted to a medial syllable, while the old acute does not shift from the penultima to a final open syllable in the *lípa* type), and one that is clearly young as apparent from it being blocked by the disappearance of internal *-i-* (e.g. Porčinj **pàlica* > *pálca*).³¹ While it is interesting that this innovative progressive shift occurs in the same area that preserves old oxytonic accent, this shift cannot be bundled together with the one that supposedly produced the *bradà* type.

The accentual paradigm *b* is rare in *i*-stems (cf. Kapović 2009). In Porčinj, **lũčb* ‘light’ (Czech *louč* ‘torch’ and Standar Slovene *lúč* – gen^{sg} *lúči/lúci*) shifts to *o*-stems (*lúč* – gen^{sg} *lučà*), while preserving the old a. p. B. However, in Porčinj *pót* ‘path’, we find the retracted accent in gen^{sg} *póte* – this must be due to analogy to the nom^{sg}, cf. in Čakavian (Vrgada³²) *pūt* – gen^{sg} *pūta* (instead of the original *pūtà*, attested in other Čakavian dialects). This kind of analogical accent is also found in Prosnid gen^{sg} *lúč*, *póót* (with the loss of the final vowel).³³

Finally, the accent of the infinitive has to be mentioned. In the archaic Ter area with the *bradà* oxytonic type, the short-stem infinitives preserve the old final accentuation, e.g. Porčinj *ponestě* ‘to carry with’, *pejčě* ‘to bake’³⁴ (cf. Neo-Štokavian *pěci* and younger *pěci*). However, in long-stem infinitives, only the retracted accent is attested: Porčinj *uzéte* ‘to take’ (cf. Neo-Štokavian dialectal *uzéti* but standard *úzěti*, dialectal *uzěti*), *ráste* ‘to grow’ (cf. Neo-Štokavian *rásti* and younger *rásti*, dialectal *rásti*), *tréste* ‘to shake’ (cf. Neo-Štokavian *trésti* and younger *trésti*, dialectal *trěsti*), *záčéte* ‘to start’ (cf. Neo-Štokavian dialectal *záčéti* but standard *záčěti*, dialectal *záčěti*), *otpéte* ‘to untie’ (cf. Neo-Štokavian dialectal *otpéti* but standard *òtpěti*, dialectal *otpěti*),

³¹ Ježovnik 2020: 668.

³² Jurišić 1973.

³³ The Ter forms are from Ježovnik 2022: 319.

³⁴ Ježovnik 2022: 347. In some Ter dialects, curious secondary forms like *ptì* ‘to be’ are found (Ježovnik 2022: 465). This must be due to a number of factors: the secondary differentiation from *bíti* ‘to hit’, the influence of short-root infinitives in *-tì* and perhaps due to influence to forms parallel to Standard Slovene <*bila*> *b(ə)lā* – <*bilo*> *b(ə)lō* (with the allegro reduction of the first syllable) or the like.

otpriéte ‘to open’³⁵ (cf. Neo-Štokavian dialectal *uprijéti* but standard *ùprijéti*, dialectal *uprijěti*). Thus, Porčinj points to an original **pečì* but **rásti* (from older **rāstì*). The second type could be taken as an example of the original retraction in the *bradà* type in general, however infinitives are hardly conclusive in this regard. In infinitives (and in some other forms), there is a tendency in Kajkavian, Čakavian and Western Štokavian – and now, as we can see, obviously in (at least part of) Slovene – to morphologically/non-phonetically unstress the ending (probably due to the fact that the infinitive *-ti is originally unstressed in most verbal classes). For this cf. Kapović 2015: 633–638, 2017a: 612–613, 615–616. Thus, the Porčinj opposition of *pejčě* and *rástě* would be like the opposition of *pèci* and *rāsti* in some Neo-Štokavian dialects (the details of this morphological process are very diverse dialectally. This old **rāsti* type (with the long neo-acute) may be quite relevant for the wider Western South Slavic dialectology and historical accentology because it points to this process being not only Kajkavian/Čakavian/Western Štokavian, as previously thought, but also Slovene as well (in most Slovene dialects, the original **rāstì* and **rāsti* cannot be distinguished – cf. the Standard Slovene *rāsti*). One must also note that in some Ter dialects, including Prosnid, the accent cannot even possibly synchronically be at the ending in the infinitive because it is lost – cf. Prosnid (Ježovnik 2022: 341, 343) *uzěét, rást*, etc. (the same is in Štokavian and Čakavian, where -ti is not always preserved). As for the *l*-participles, as we have already said, the old accent is preserved in Porčinj *treslà*, while in other forms it is innovative – Porčinj feminine *uzěla* is analogical to masculine *uzěu, zrástlo* and *strěslo* are secondary C-forms (with the retracted circumflex), etc.

4 CONCLUSION

From what we have seen, the easiest explanation for the attested material in the central dialects of Tersko (Prosnid-Subid-Porčinj + probably Malina as well) is that they preserve the old oxytonic accentual type *bradà, zimà*. This is the westernmost Slovene dialect and archaisms are to be expected in the margins and, in any case, if such an accentuation

³⁵ Ježovnik 2022: 341–346. For Štokavian, cf. Kapović 2018: 185, 188, 198, 201.

can be preserved in e.g. Buzet area of North Čakavian, some 150 kilometers away, there is no reason why it could not be preserved in the central Ter dialects. Ježovnik's (2020: 674) pessimistic conclusion that "[b]oth hypotheses have considerable implications and each is near impossible to prove conclusively" is not really useful (though he presents both sides of the arguments fairly). The fact of the matter is that the central belt of the Ter dialect shows the oxytonic accent in *bradà* type words and that we have no real reasons to presume that this is not an archaism.³⁶ The only reason why there is reluctance to accept forms like *mokà*, *bradà*, *zimà* as archaisms seems to be the reluctance of Slovene dialectology to give up on the long held notion that the retraction of **zīmà* > **zīma* is pan-Slovene and "Proto-Slovene" (even though the need to accept two different rising accents in "old central-Ter" would also change the traditional reconstruction and conceptions) and thus preserve the notion of the historical unity of Slovene. However, even in that regard this is not necessary since Slovene dialects share other important accentological isoglosses such as the neo-circumflex in a wide variety of positions. In any case, the argument that this kind of oxytonesis does not exist elsewhere in Slovene (though this is also probably not true, considering the Kobarid *zimà* type accent) is not a sustainable argument – it speaks more on tradition in Slovene historical linguistics than on the Ter dialect material itself. The final conclusion can be: if it looks like a duck, swims like a duck, and quacks like a duck, then it probably is a duck.

REFERENCES

- Greenberg, Marc L. 2000. *A Historical Phonology of the Slovene Language*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter.
- Hendriks, Pepijn. 2003. A Note on Stang's Law in Moscow Accentology. In: *Dutch Contributions to the Thirteenth International Congress of Slavists, Ljubljana, August 15-21, 2003: Linguistics*. 107–123. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004488366_005
- Jedvaj, Josip. 1956. Bednjanski govor. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 1: 279–330.

³⁶ Porčinj gen^{sg} *póte* can be a simple analogy and the infinitive *rástę* is akin to Čakavian non-phonetic *rāsti*, as we have shown – the rest of the forms which do not have the expected oxytonesis are also clear analogies.

- Ježovnik, Janoš. 2020. A further look at the progressive acute-accent shift in the *Tersko* dialect of Slovene. In: L. Repanšek, H. Bichlmeier, V. Sadovski. *Vácāṃsi miśrākṛṇavāmahai. Proceedings of the international conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies and IWoBA XII, Ljubljana 4-7 June 2019, celebrating one hundred years of Indo-European comparative linguistics at the University of Ljubljana*. Hamburg: Baar-Verlag. 665–677.
- Ježovnik, Janoš. 2022. *Glasovne in naglasne značilnosti terskega narečja*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/9789610506430>
- Jurišić, Blaž. 1973. *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade, uspoređen s nekim čakavskim i zapadnoštokavskim govorima. II dio, Rječnik*. Zagreb: JAZU.
- Kalsbeek, Janneke. 1998. *The Čakavian Dialect of Orbanići near Žminj in Istria*. Amsterdam–Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Kapović, Mate. 2009. Rising mobility in Slavic *i*-stems. In: R. Lühr, S. Ziegler (eds.). *Protolanguage and Prehistory. Akten der XII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, vom 11. bis 15. Oktober 2004 in Krakau*. 236–243.
- Kapović, Mate. 2015. *Povijest hrvatske akcentuacije. Fonetika*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Kapović, Mate. 2017a. The Position of Kajkavian in the South Slavic Dialect Continuum in Light of Old Accentual Isoglosses. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 62/4: 606–620. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/slaw-2017-0038>
- Kapović, Mate. 2017b. On shortening, lengthening, and accent shifts in Slavic. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje*, 43/2. 381–402.
- Kapović, Mate. 2018. Povijest glagolske akcentuacije u štokavskom (i šire). *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 44/1: 159–285.
- Kapović, Mate. 2020a. Stang’s Law. In: M. L. Greenberg (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Slavic Languages and Linguistics*. Leiden–Boston: Brill. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2589-6229_ESLO_COM_036054
- Kapović, Mate. 2020b. Notes on the Phonetics, Phonology and Prosody of the Čakavian Dialect of Susak. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 65/4: 498–534. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/slaw-2020-0024>
- Klarić, Alvižana. 2022. *Fonološke i morfološke značajke govora bužetskoga dijalekta*. PhD dissertation. Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru.
- Šekli, Matej. 2006. Tersko narečje v kraju Subid. In: M. Kožuh (ed.). *Terska dolina/Alta Val Torre/Val de Tor. Terska dolina v besedi, sliki in pesmi Viljema Černa*. Celje–Gorica: Celjska Mohorjeva družba, Goriška Mohorjeva družba. 161–173.
- Šekli, Matej. 2018. *Tipologija lingvogenез slovanskih jezikov*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/9789610501374>
- Zuljan Kumar, Danila. 2018. Tersko narečje/Il dialetto del Torre. In: B. Balloch, R. Dapit, L. Trusgnach, D. Zuljan Kumar (eds). *Lučice na oknah. Naš svet pouan naposebnosti/Il nostro mondo pieno di meraviglia*. Čedad/Cividale del Friuli: Kulturno društvo Ivan Trinko/ Circolo culturale Ivan Trinko. 38–49.

Prispelo oktobra 2022, sprejeto februarja 2023.

Received October 2022, accepted February 2023.

Prva različica prispevka je bila predstavljena 22. 9. 2022 na 4. Slovenskem dialektološkem posvetu v Ljubljani.

SUMMARY

ON ARCHAIC OXYTONESIS IN SLOVENE TER DIALECT

The paper discusses the oxytonic *mokà* ‘flour’, *bradà* ‘beard’ type accent in the central Prosnid–Porčinj–Subid belt of the Ter dialect based on the material from Janoš Ježovnik’s 2022 monograph. This type of accent is often interpreted in Slovenian accentology and dialectology as being innovative because the retraction of the short accent from a final open syllable to a preceding length is usually regarded as a Common Slovene innovation. This type of accent is found in the following types of forms: words like *mokà*, words like gen^{se} *kjučà*, words like *vinò*, adjectives like *mladà* and participles like *treslà* (the oldest speakers still seem to preserve inconsistent length in these forms). The progressive shift of the *jùžina ‘lunch’ > Porčinj *južèna* type is clearly a distinct process and the infinitival opposition of *pečì but *rásti (with the innovative accent in the second long-root type) is to be connected with a typical Kajkavian–Čakavian–Western Štokavian non-phonetic ‘retraction’ of accent in certain forms (such as the infinitive). The author concludes that central (Prosnid–Porčinj–Subid) Ter dialects (and some other Slovene dialects like Kobarid) preserve the old Slavic final accent in open syllables even after the originally long root.

O ARHAIČNI OKSITONEZI V SLOVENSKEM TERSKEM NAREČJU

Članek obravnava oksitonični naglas tipa *mokà* ‘moka’, *bradà* ‘brada’ v centralnem pasu terskega narečja, ki temelji na gradivu iz monografije Janoša Ježovnika (2022). Ta vrsta naglasa se v slovenski akcentologiji in dialektologiji pogosto tolmači kot inovacija, saj se umik kratkega naglasa iz končnega odprtega zloga na prejšnjo dolžino običajno šteje za splošno-slovensko inovacijo. Ta vrsta naglasa se pojavlja v naslednjih oblikah: besede kot *mokà*, besede kot gen^{se} *kjučà*, besede kot *vinò*, pridevniki kot *mladà*, in participi kot *treslà* (se zdi da najstarejši govorci še ohranjajo neskladno dolžino v teh oblikah). Progresivni premik tipa *jùžina ‘kosilo’ > Porčinj *južèna* je jasno ločen proces, in nasprotje infinitiva *pečì, vendar *rásti (s inovativnim naglasom v drugem obliku z dolgim korenem) je povezano s tipičnim kajkavsko-čakavsko-zahodnoštokavskim ne-fonetičnim »umikom« naglasa v določenih oblikah (kot je infinitiv). Avtor sklene, da centralni del (Prosnid–Porčinj–Subid) terskega narečja (in nekatera druga slovenska narečja, kot kobariško) še vedno ohranjajo stari slovanski končni naglas v odprtih zlogih tudi po prvotno dolgem korenu.