

## The accent of Slavic \*ja(zǫ) ‘I’

MATE KAPOVIĆ

### Introduction<sup>1</sup>

The aim of this article is to deal with the accentuation of the Slavic first person nominative singular personal pronoun \*ja(zǫ). Before examining the accentuation itself, we will analyze the material and try to resolve the question of the two forms in Slavic, which is related to the problem of the accentuation.

### Material

First we shall adduce the forms for ‘I’ in the Slavic literary languages: OCS *azǫ*, Bulgarian *a3*, Macedonian *jac*, Croatian *jā*, Slovene *jāz*, Czech *já*, Slovak *ja*, Lusatian *ja*, Polabian *jo*, *joz*, Polish *ja*, Kashubian *ǰω*, Slovencian *jǎu*, Russian/Ukrainian/Byelorussian *я*.

### Old Church Slavic

OCS shows a form without the initial *j*- (*azǫ*), unlike all the other Slavic languages except Bulgarian. This is usually the only form mentioned in OCS grammars;<sup>2</sup> however, *jazǫ* is a hapax in *Codex Marianus*,<sup>3</sup> which could be due to the influence of the dialect area in which the text was written.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 This article was originally a part of my PhD dissertation (Kapović 2006).

2 Cf. Vondrák 1912: 459, Leskien 1922: 109, Rosenkranz 1955: 96, Bielefeldt 1961: 146-147, Горшков 1963: 135, Trubetzkoy 1968: 150, Kurz 1969: 76-77, Hamm 1970: 133-134, Lunt 1974: 65, Damjanović 2005: 95 etc.

3 *SP*, Diels 1932-4: 77, Słoiński 1950: 84, Nandriš 1959: 104. According to Đorđić (1975: 105), *jazǫ* occurs a number of times after the conjunction *i* – *i ězǫ* (in Glagolitic script), *i jazǫ* (in Cyrillic script). In fact, even the occurrence of *jazǫ* (i.e. *ězǫ*) in *Codex Marianus* is in this position: *vǫprošǫ i ězǫ* (Mar. 162, 6-7). Weingart (1937-8: 200) considers this to be a sandhi variant of *azǫ* in a hiatus.

4 The origin of *Codex Marianus* is disputed. According to Jagić (1883), judging by the sporadic changes *o* > *u*, *y* > *i*, *vǫ* > *u*, *e* > *e*, the manuscript could have been written in Croatian or Serbian speaking area (i.e. Štokavian, judging by *vǫ* > *u*). Hamm thinks that the vocalization of the *jers*

In Croatian and Russian Church Slavonic, there is the same form as in OCS (CCS *azъ/azь*, RCS *azъ*).<sup>5</sup> In *Psalterium Sinaiticum* (Ps. 38, 13), the OCS form *a* is found. Diels (1932–4: 214) and Nandriš (1959: 105) take this form to be a mistake, but it probably represents the OCS *j*-less pendant of the form *ja* in other Slavic languages.<sup>6</sup>

### Bulgarian

The Bulgarian form is also *j*-less, in accord with OCS. Dialectally, besides *аз*, one also finds the forms *азека*, *азекана*, *азкана*, *я*, *язе*, *язка*, *язекана* (ESSJ), *ас*, *ѣа*,<sup>7</sup> *яз* (Vasmer 1950–8), *язека*, *яска*, *азу*, *азе*<sup>8</sup> etc. The Bulgarian *j*-less form *аз* must be of the same dialectal origin as OCS *azъ*. For the attestation of *яз*, *я* and *аз* in Bulgarian dialects, cf. БДА I: 160. The form *аз* is attested in southeastern Bulgaria, the form *я* is attested not only in the west of Bulgaria, but also in the southeast.<sup>9</sup> The form *я* could be attributed to the Serbian influence in some cases.<sup>10</sup>

### Macedonian

The Macedonian literary form *јас* shows an initial *j*-, thus differing from OCS and literary Bulgarian. In dialects, one also finds *ја* (SP) – for instance in North-West Macedonia, *јаска* (Maџecki 1934), *ас*, *аска*, *јазека* (ESSJ) etc.

### Croatian

The Croatian literary form is *ја̂* (*n̂ ĵā*, *ì ĵā* with a Neo-Štokavian retraction of accent). Most dialects have a *z*-less form, except for some of the North-West Čakavian and a few Kajkavian dialects (in Štokavian, there are no forms with the final *-z* anywhere). Two types of accentuation exist – the most common variant with the neo-acute (*̂*), or with *̂ < ̃* in the dialects that do not preserve *̃*, and the rarer variant with the short falling accent (*̆*). Again, the latter is non-existent in Štokavian dialects; it occurs marginally in Kajkavian and regularly in North-

---

(*ѣ > а*, *ѣ > е*) and the loss of epenthetic *l* could point to Macedonian origin (Damjanović 2005: 18). Judging by *јазъ* it could be both (Croat. *ја̂*, Maced. *јас*).

5 According to Mihaljević (in press), in Croatian Glagolitic fragments from 12th and 13th century only the forms *azъ/azь/az* appear. There is no attestation of native *ja* or even *jaz* in these texts.

6 This would not be the sole occurrence of an unusual feature in *Psalterium Sinaiticum*. This text is for instance the only OCS source which preserves the *\*s* of Proto-Slavic *\*u(s)tro* ‘morning’ in the adverb *zaustra*, which had disappeared elsewhere.

7 Стойков 1993: 90, 250.

8 Мирчев 1963: 163.

9 SP, Харалампиев 2001: 108.

10 Бернщейн 1948: 325–326.

West Čakavian. In Štokavian for instance: Posavina *jā*,<sup>11</sup> Neo-Štokavian *jâ* (everywhere).

In Čakavian, as already said – there is a neo-acute in the South and Central Čakavian: cf. Vrgada *j<sup>o</sup>ā*, Hvar *jō* (Jurišić 1973), Blato (Korčula) *jā* (personal data), Pag *j<sup>o</sup>ā* (no neo-acute, Kustić 2002), Rivanj *jâ* (no neo-acute, Radulić 2002), Murter *jā* (personal data), Senj *jā* (Moguš 1966: 78) etc. In the North, there is a short falling accent here: Novi *jā* (Белић 1909: 199), Istra *jā* (but also *jās*, *jâ*) (Jurišić 1973), Cres (town) *jā* (Tentor 1909: 172, 1950: 75), Bejska Tramuntana (Cres) *jā* (Velčić 2003), Orlec (Cres) *jā* (Houtzagers 1985), Tometići (near Kastav) *jās* (but only when by itself, Skok 1971–4), Kastav *jāz*, Silba *jāz* (*Bezljaj*), but Orbanići *jā(s)* (Kalsbeek 1998) etc. In Istra, the form *jaz* was attested already in 1454 (*Bezljaj*).

In Kajkavian, the form with the neo-acute (or long falling if  $\hat{ } < \tilde{ }$  in the final syllable or in general) and with no *-z* is the most frequent by far: Samobor *jâ*, *jâ sem* (no neo-acute in the final syllable, Šojat 1973c: 53), Ozalj *jâ* (no neo-acute there, Težak 1981), Turopolje *jâ* (no neo-acute in the final syllable, Šojat 1982), Repušnica, Varaždin *jâ* (no neo-acute in the final syllable, Brlobaš 1999, Lipljin 2002), Cerje *jâ* (no neo-acute in the final syllable, Šojat 1973b), Brdovec (today Kajkavian, but genetically Čakavian) *jā/jâ* (Šojat 1973a: 42). However, in Bednja (Jedvaj 1956), we find *jōz* (older and more frequent), *jō* (younger), Štuparje *jās* (older people), *jā* (younger people) (personal data). A similar thing is found in Gregurovec Veternički: *jās* and *jâ* (Jembrih & Lončarić 1982–3: 41).<sup>12</sup>

Until the beginning of the 17th century, *jaz* was common in Kajkavian texts – for instance in Pergošić's language. In his *Decretum* from 1574, *jaz* occurs only four times (pages 5, 6, 147, 187), due to the legal nature of the text. Out of these four times, *jaz* was written 1× as <iaz>, 2× as <iaaz> and 1× as <iâz> which strongly suggests that it was indeed *jāz* (or *jâz*). According to Šojat (1970: 89), the form *ja* became the main one from the beginning of the 17th century under the influence of the spoken dialects. However, already in Vramec's *Postilla* from 1586, apparently only *ja* appears (for instance, on pages 8, 9, 12 – 3×, 13 – 3×, 14 – 3×, 180 etc.). It is interesting that Vramec always writes <ia> for *ja*, which might point to *jā* rather than *jâ/jâ*, considering that Vramec often indicates the length by doubling the vowel.<sup>13</sup> However, since the doubling of the vowel is inconsistent, one cannot be certain. According to Šojat (1970: 89) and Junković (1972: 125), in the 16th century

11 Ivšić 1913, II: 34 or 1971: [373].

12 The authors dub the form *jās* older and the variant *jâ* younger. The form *jâ* is more frequent, especially if before a word beginning with a consonant, while *jās* is used before words beginning with a vowel (e. g. *jās ōnda velīm*, *jās idēm*). It is interesting to note the long falling accent in *jâ*, in spite of the fact that this dialect preserves the neo-acute in all positions, cf. *bik*, *pōt*, *stōp*, *strīc* etc. (Jembrih & Lončarić 1982–3: 32). That could perhaps indicate there we are dealing with a loanword from another Kajkavian dialect here.

13 For instance: *znaam* 'I know', *kluucz* 'key', *kraal* 'king', *daal* 'gave', *deen* 'day', *deel* 'part', *zaam* 'alone' etc. However, this is not consistent, cf. *glaz* 'voice'.

works of Antun Vramec one finds both *ja* and *jaz*. I was not able to verify that on the material of *Postilla*, as already said. The form *jaz* is also found, for instance, in *Pavlinški zbornik* from the year 1644 (Šojat 1992: 26).

In Štokavian, the form *ja* is attested from the earliest times, for instance in *Povelja Kulina bana* from the year 1189 (*ARj* IV: 378) and elsewhere. Petar Budmani in *ARj* claims that the form *jaz* (*jazb*), as well as *az/azb*, is not native but taken from OCS. He provides two Štokavian examples of *jazb* from 1186 and 1198–9. However, it is not clear if these examples are undoubtedly OCS loanwords (as *azb* certainly is).<sup>14</sup> Budmani also considers the Kajkavian example *jas* (or *jaz*?) from the year 1587 a Slovene loanword, but that seems an unnecessary assumption.

### Slovene

The Slovene literary form is *jáz*. Snoj also adduces the younger variant *jâz*.<sup>15</sup> Cf. *iaz* already in the Freising Monuments and the forms *Jas*, *ya*, *ye* in the 16th century texts of the protestant writer Krelj (*Bezljaj*). In Središče, both *jaz* and *ja* exist.<sup>16</sup> Pleteršnik adduces *jâ* for Eastern Styria and Bela krajina,<sup>17</sup> cf. also *jâ* for Bela Krajina (and elsewhere) in *Bezljaj*. In the dialects one also finds *jèst* (< \**jâst*) in Cerčno (*FO* 1981: 70), *jêst* in Hrušica (*FO* 1981: 114) etc. Forms with a final *-st* appear already from the 15th century (*Bezljaj*).

According to de Courtenay (1929: 228), the Slovene dialect of Rezija distinguished forms *jaz*, used by males, and *ja*, used by females. However, Steenwijk (1992: 119) claims that the forms are just free variants and not gender-related, the form *jas* being more “authoritative”.<sup>18</sup>

### Czech

The literary form in Czech is *já*. In Old Czech, there was also *jáz*. The form *já* occurs from the beginning of the 14th century.<sup>19</sup> Since there are no earlier attestations of this pronoun at all, this means that both forms were used from the very

14 For *ja/jaz* in Croatian and Serbian old texts, cf. also Даничић 1874: 215.

15 This accent is found in Snoj only. The change *jáz* > *jâz* is due to the very recent sporadic lengthening of the final short vowels in Slovene. This change is the part of a tendency to eliminate the quantitative oppositions in Slovene. Cf. also *bât* > *bâ*, *mâk* > *mâ*, *krâs* > *krâ* etc. (Šekli 2003: 33).

16 Rigler 2001: 361.

17 The attestation of *jâ* in Bela krajina is not so important since that dialect is in fact genetically Croatian, not Slovene.

18 In *Bezljaj*, the forms *jás*, *jâs* and *jâ* are adduced for Rezija.

19 It occurs, for instance, already in *Alexandreis*, which could in fact stem not from the beginning of the 14th, but from the end of the 13th century (each form, *jáz* and *já*, occurs seven times in the text).

beginning of Old Czech literary tradition. The form *jáz* was used in Czech as up until the end of the 15th century.<sup>20</sup>

As for some other attestations of Old Czech *jáz* and *já*, cf. for instance *Dalimila*, which dates from sometime between 1308/1310 and 1314, where *jáz* is found only eight times (each time at the beginning of the sentence) and *já* 27 times; in the Old Czech text *Katonova dvojverší* (found in 6 manuscripts – one from the second half of 14th century and 5 from 15th century), we find both *jáz* (“*jáz pomyslí*”) and *já* (“*naučím já tě*”) (58b); in *Závišova píseň* (*Jižť mne vše radost ostává*) from the end of 14th century one finds only *já* five times; *já* is found also in the 14th century Czech translation of the Bible (SBDO, e. g. page 293) and in the 14th century epic *Vévoda Arnošt* etc.

### Slovak

The Slovak literary form is *ja*. Since the real beginnings of the Slovak literary language are not older than the end of the 18th century, it is hardly surprising that there is no attestation of final *-z* in Slovak.<sup>21</sup> The fact that the modern Slovak dialects do not show the final *-z* anywhere is in accord with the same fact in modern Czech. If Slovak were attested earlier (not just in traces in Czech texts), we would probably also find the final *-z* there, as in Old Czech (cf. however Old Polish with only one doubtful attestation of the *z*-form). The Slovak literary form *ja* differs from the Czech form *já* in length only on the surface. The length was originally there in Slovak as well (as it still is in dialects), but one cannot see it in Central Slovak because there *já* > *ja* regularly (cf. Czech *voják*, Croatian *vòjāk* but Slovak *vojak*). Thus, Slovak *ja* stems from an earlier form *já* still attested in dialects. Older form still, also attested in dialects, is *jǎ*.<sup>22</sup> The form *jǎ* is attested in Central and Eastern Gemer (North-West Slovakia) and Lower Orava (South-East Slovakia), in Central Slovak dialects which had no diphthongization *ǎ* > *ja*, and in Western Liptova. The form *já* is attested in the South-West of Slovakia and in Central Orava (where *ǎ* > *á*), cf. also SSN, Orlovský 1982 (Gemer), HSSJ. In Central Slovak, in North West Slovak and in East Slovak, the form *ja* occurs.<sup>23</sup> In Central Slovak, this form is explained via the diphthongization of *ǎ* > *ja* according to which the old *jǎ* yields *jja*, which then results with a form *ja*, due to the change of *jĵ* > *j*. In East Slovak, the form *ja* is due to shortening (*jǎ* > *já* > *ja*). In East Novohrad, *ǎ* > *eĵ* (thus the forms *jeĵ* and *eĵ*).<sup>24</sup>

20 Gebauer 1896: 524, Gebauer 1903–1916, Trávníček 1935: 335 etc.

21 Stanislav 1958: 290, Pauliny 1990: 150.

22 In Slovak, \**ǎ* after soft consonant yields *ǎ* which then yields *ia* > *ja*.

23 Pauliny 1990, *ibid.*, Stanislav 1958, *ibid.* For *já*, cf. for instance Ripka 1975: 146.

24 Pauliny 1990, *ibid.*

### Lusatian

In Lusatian, only the form *ja* is attested, including older texts and dialects.

### Polabian

In Polabian, one finds *jo* and *joz* when accented, and *ja* and *jaz* when unaccented.<sup>25</sup> According to Schleicher (1871: 259), the forms *joz*, *jo* are more frequent. The form *jo* occurs in front of verbs, for instance in *jo jis* < \**ja jesmь*.

### Polish

The modern Polish literary form is *ja*. However, in Polish dialects which preserve *ǫ* < \**ā*, one finds the form *ǫ̃* with the attested length, as in Czech. Cf. also Kashubian *ǫ̃* (*ω* < \**ā*) and Slovincian *ǫ̃u* (*SP*). In Old Polish, the form *jaz* is attested only as a hapax in 15th century in *Psalterz floriański* 108, 3.<sup>26</sup> However, according to some authors,<sup>27</sup> this is in fact a Czech loanword. The shorter form *ja* is attested in Polish already in 13th century.

### East Slavic

Modern East Slavic languages all have the form *я*. This form appears already in Old Russian, as early as the year 1130 in *Мьстиславова грамота*, together with the longer form *язь* and the OCS form *азь*, without any noticeable difference between these three forms – “се азъ Мьстилавъ”, “а язъ даль”, “а се я Всеволод”.<sup>28</sup> Kiparsky (1967: 130-131) says that this only supports the conclusion that the forms *я* and *яз* were used in Russian for a long period without any significant stylistic difference. This is confirmed by Гадолина (1963) who gives clear examples of how both *я* and *яз* in Russian occurred in the emphasized and in the non-emphasized position. According to Черных (1962: 218), *яз* was still a very usual form in the first half of the 16th century in Moscow (although it was not the only existing form). According to Черных, both forms co-existed in Russian until the 17th century. However, Сосрон (1962: 133) and Гадолина (1963: 26) claim that the form *я* was the only possible form already in the 17th century. Interestingly, the forms *яз* and *яз-to* were found in *былина* songs up to the 19th century (Черных, *ibid.*).

In Ukrainian, the form *я* is attested from 1322 and *язь* from 1341 (*ССМ*).

25 Cf. Lehr-Spławiński 1929: 185, Селищев 1941: 440, *PED*.

26 Łoś 1927/III: 159, *SS*, *SP*.

27 Klemensiewicz, Lehr-Spławiński & Urbańczyk 1955: 321.

28 For attestations of these forms in Old Russian, cf. Срезневский 1893–1903, *СДЯ* and *СДЯ 2*.

## Overview

### 1 Standard languages

**Only z-forms:** Bulgarian, Macedonian, Slovene

**Only z-less forms:** Croatian, Serbian, Slovak, Czech, Polish, Upper Lusatian, Lower Lusatian, Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian

### 2 Modern dialects

**Only z-forms:** –

**Only z-less forms:** Štokavian, Czech, Slovak, Polish, Kashubian, Slovincian, Upper Lusatian, Lower Lusatian, Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian

**Z- and z-less forms both:** Bulgarian, Macedonian, Čakavian, Kajkavian, Slovene

### 3 Historical attestations<sup>29</sup>

**Only z-forms:** –

**Only z-less forms:** Štokavian (?), Slovak, Lusatian

**Z-less and z-forms in the past:** Bulgarian, Čakavian, Kajkavian, Slovene, Czech, Polish (?), Polabian, Russian

## The final *\*-zv* in Slavic

Traditionally,<sup>30</sup> it has been taken as obvious by most linguists that the form *\*(j)azv* with final *-z(v)* is the original one. The form *\*ja* was always considered somehow secondary, as a result of some sort of secondary dropping of the final *-z(v)*. This supposed dropping of the final *-z(v)* in Slavic has been explained in many ways. Here, we shall mention a few of those and discuss them briefly.

One of the explanations is that the *-z(v)* was dropped because of the sandhi positions like *jaz sam* or *jaz znam*<sup>31</sup> (Solmsen as quoted in *ARj* for instance). As already noted very sharply by Budmani in *ARj*, the case of *jaz sam* can hardly prove anything, since the only two modern Slavic languages that have only the shortened *s*-initial forms of the 1st person singular present tense of the verb 'to be' are exactly the only two modern Slavic languages which have preserved the final *-z* (Slovene and Bulgarian). The collocation *jaz znam* is more convincing, but it is hard to imagine that this would be so frequent that it would cause the *-z* to be dropped completely.

<sup>29</sup> For some of the languages, like Kashubian and Slovincian, there is almost no historical data. In the case of East Slavic languages, the histories of Russian, Byelorussian and Ukrainian are not easily discernable. The same is true of Bulgarian and Macedonian and Czech and Slovak.

<sup>30</sup> Although it is difficult to speak of tradition when so many different theories exist.

<sup>31</sup> We shall take the Croatian form as an example here.

An explanation similar to this is one which states that the supposed shortening of *jaz(ь)* to *ja* is simply an *allegro* process.<sup>32</sup> This is possible but still *ad hoc*.

Another explanation is that *jaz(ь)* is shortened by analogy to *ty* (and *my* and *vy*)<sup>33</sup> because in this way all the nominatives of the personal pronouns are monosyllabic and end in a vowel. This explanation seems perfectly possible.

Yet another explanation, similar to the previous one, is that *ja* was created as an unaccented monosyllabic variant of bisyllabic *jazь* so that *ja* – *jazь* would function in the same way as *mi* – *mьně*, *mę* – *mene* etc. (Jakobson, cited from Трубачев 1974 – accepted by Gluhak 1993 for instance).

Vaillant (1958: 443),<sup>34</sup> for instance, believed that both *\*ja* and *\*jazь* originate from an older *\*jaz* in the same way that the original *\*ot* produced the form *otь* (with an unetymological final *jer*) besides the expected *ot-* and *o-*. Thus, according to this explanation, *ja* would be a regular, expected form and *jazь* would have an unetymological *jer* which has risen to stop the dropping of the final *-z*, while being in accord with the law of the open syllables. However, since Slavic *\*-ь* can be derived directly from the attested IE *\*-om*,<sup>35</sup> there is no need to assume that it is a secondary development. Also, the case of *otь* (and *izь*) is not quite same as the case of *jazь*. In the first case, we have a preposition (used also as a verbal prefix) and in the second one we have a pronoun form. In the case of *ot* > *otь* and *iz* > *izь* (cf. Lithuanian *at-*, dial. and older *iž*), the reason for the introduction of the unetymological *-ь* was to prevent the making of the variants *ot-* and *o-*, which would lead to semantic confusion (cf. the preposition/prefix *ob-/o-*). Thus, *-ь* was introduced to prevent verbs like *\*ot-nesti* ‘take away’ becoming *\*o-nesti*, while having *\*ot-iti* ‘go away’ in the same time. There is also a possibility that the final *-ь* here was introduced by analogy to the prepositions *kь*, *vь*, *sь* (Gluhak 1993). In the case of *\*jaz*, there is no reason whatsoever to introduce an unetymological *-ь*. The proto-form *\*jaz* would simply yield *\*ja* and the final *\*-z* would be gone forever, just like the final *\*-s* that disappeared in the *o*-stem nominative singular ending *\*-us* > *-ь*. Moreover, if *\*ja* were the only original form, one would expect the acute here as the result of Winter’s Law – *\*jǎ* < PIE *\*éǵ*. However, in that case it would be impossible to explain the neo-acute accentuation that also appears in

32 Cf. for instance Meillet 1934: 452, *SP*, Boryś 2005.

33 Cf. for instance Гадолина 1963: 14, Иванов 1983: 295.

34 Accepted for instance in Aitzetmüller 1991: 107–108, Bańkowski 2000 etc.

35 The evidence for the reconstruction of PIE *\*eǵHóm* with final *\*-óm* is not as firm as is usually presumed. The attestation of *\*-om* in Indo-Iranian is not very relevant since this *\*-om* is practically omnipresent in personal pronouns. However, the agreement of the accent of Vedic *ahám* and Slavic *\*jǎzь* (see § 13) points to the PIE *\*-óm* and is highly indicative. It is possible that the proliferation of *\*-óm* in Indo-Iranian started from this form. Greek *éγών* almost certainly reflects this *\*-óm* indirectly and at least some of the Germanic forms can probably be derived from *\*eǵHóm*. The strongest case for the reconstruction of PIE *\*-óm* comes from Slavic *-ь*, since this cannot be explained as secondary as Vaillant wants to. Thus, in spite of the difficulties, it seems that the reconstruction of PIE *\*eǵHóm* is founded.

this form (see § 13). Thus, Vaillant's idea has to be rejected, since the cases of *otv* and *jazv* are not comparable and since the accentual data cannot be explained by his hypothesis.

As we have seen, some of these explanations are indeed possible. However, there is another possibility – to presume that both of these forms, both \**ja* and \**jazv*, are original and thus derived directly from Indo-European forms \**éǵ* and \**eǵHóm*. This idea is not new,<sup>36</sup> in spite of the fact that it was never very popular. This may strike us as a little bit odd, since it was clear for quite some time that there were at least two forms of this pronoun in IE, which would in Slavic yield exactly the forms we have attested – *ja* and *jazv*. Thus, it is strange that so many linguists have gone at such trouble to explain the mysterious supposed disappearance of the final *-z(v)*, when there was no need to assume any disappearance in the first place. One can imagine that one of the, probably unconscious, reasons for this is the fact that in OCS only the form with the final *-zv* is attested.<sup>37</sup> Thus, because of the false unconscious prejudice that OCS is for all practical purposes identical to Proto-Slavic, many linguists were probably prone to reject any possibility of *ja* to be old, since it did not appear in OCS.

There is more than one explanation as to why there is only one example<sup>38</sup> of the short form in OCS. The simplest explanation would perhaps be that this alternative form was lost in the dialect that was the basis of OCS. That can hardly be considered impossible since there are quite a number of such cases – it is not always true that OCS forms are the oldest, in spite of the fact that OCS is the first attested Slavic language. Thus, for instance, OCS has the ending *-tv* in the 3rd person singular of the present tense, which is, according to the comparative IE evidence, apparently secondary to the ending *-tv*, attested in Old Russian and Old Polish. To name another example, in OCS, the ending of the *n*-stem dative plural is the obviously secondary *-anьmъ*, with the final *-vmъ* taken from the *i*-stems, while in Old Croatian (in *Povelja Kulina bana* from 1189) one finds the ending *-am* which represents the original ending. The same goes for the OCS ending of the instrumental singular of *i*-stems where we find the ending *-bjǫ* (taken from *ā*-stems and there from the pronouns), while in modern Croatian we find a variant *-i* which is the reflex of the original IE ending \**-ih<sub>1</sub>*. One can think of other reasons why there was no short form in OCS texts – for instance, the longer form \**jazv* (i.e. *azv* in OCS) could have been regarded as a solemn form in opposition to *ja*, which could have been regarded as a colloquial or intimate variant. This is of course speculation, but it is nonetheless possible.

36 Cf. for instance Kluge 2002, Якубинский 1953: 200, Schmidt 1978: 27. Others have also accepted the two forms already in Proto-Slavic, even if they did not attribute them directly to IE heritage, cf. for instance Lehr-Splawiński & Bartula 1954: 51 and Arumaa 1985: 159.

37 Although this is also not completely true, since, as we have seen, the form *a* is also attested in OCS, if only as a *hapax* in *Psalterium Sinaiticum*.

38 Or none, if one does not accept the form *a* of *Psalterium Sinaiticum* as relevant.

The question to be asked is – why should we presume the existence of two forms, *\*ja* and *\*jazv*, at all? What are the reasons to consider this theory at all? There are a couple of good answers to this question, some of which have already been mentioned:

Firstly, the simple fact is that both *\*ja* and *\*jazv* can be derived very easily from Indo-European and Balto-Slavic. In fact, no one really doubts that the form with the final *\*-zv* is old,<sup>39</sup> and this form is very well attested outside Balto-Slavic (Vedic *ahám*), while the form *ja* (from *\*jaz* in pre-law-of-the-open-syllables Slavic) has a direct correspondence in Baltic.<sup>40</sup> If there is a short form attested in Baltic, why should we assume that this short form had disappeared in Slavic just to be resurrected again via some irregular *allegro* process or analogy? Thus, if one can explain both forms easily by deriving them regularly from IE, there is no point in struggling to explain *ja* in a different fashion.

Second reason for the assumption of the two original forms is the fact that, as was already seen (cf. the section Material), in many Slavic languages, the *z*-less forms occur rather early. For instance:

- in Štokavian only *ja* occurs already from the 12th century
- in Kajkavian texts, *ja* and *jaz* seem to occur at the same time
- in Old Czech, the *z*-less form occurs together with the longer one from the very beginnings of the literary tradition
- in Polish, the *z*-less forms is practically the only one since the first texts
- in Russian both forms occur together from the earliest times

Thus one has to take into consideration the option that Proto-Slavic had both the form *\*ja* and *\*jazv*, and that only later one of these forms was generalized in various Slavic languages – the form *\*ja* was usually more successful.

The third reason is that, like the two variants of the same pronoun that exist in Slavic, two types of accent can also be found. This has up until now, to my knowledge, never been taken as an archaism. These two types of accentuation must be related to these two different forms – it can hardly be a coincidence that there is evidence not only for two different forms, but for two different accents of the same pronoun. The existence of the two types of accentuation provides an independent indication that there were two different forms for ‘I’ in Slavic. If there had been only one form, there would be no reason for it to have two different accents.

<sup>39</sup> Except Vaillant, see above.

<sup>40</sup> Except for the fact that the final consonant is devoiced there, which also solves the disagreement in the vocalism.

**The accent of \*ja(zǝ)**

As we have already seen in the chapter Material, two types of accentuation are attested in the 1st person nominative singular pronoun in Slavic. Most languages point to the neo-acute (\*jǎzǝ): Old Štokavian *jǎ*, Neo-Štokavian *jâ* (*i jâ*), South and Central Čakavian *jǎ*, Kajkavian (most dialects) *jǎ*, Czech *já* (Old Czech *já(z)*),<sup>41</sup> Slovak dial. *já*, Polish dial. *jǎ*, Kashubian *jw* and Slovincian *jǎu*. On the other hand, Slovene *jàz* (dial. also *jà*), North Čakavian *jǎ(z)* and Kajkavian *jǎ(z)* (in some dialects) point to the old acute (\*jǎzǝ). In Old Russian, язѣ is an «ЭНКЛИНОМЕН»<sup>42</sup> (which points to the old circumflex), but this must be due to the analogical influence of the other personal pronouns *мы*, *мы*, *вы* in which this is expected<sup>43</sup>. Here is an overview of the reflexes in Slavic:

<b>Neo-acute</b>	Štokavian, South/Central Čakavian, Kajkavian (most dial.), Czech/Slovak, (Old and dial.) Polish, Kashubian, Slovincian
<b>Acute</b>	Slovene, North Čakavian, Kajkavian (marginally)
<b>Circumflex</b>	Old Russian <sup>44</sup>

The problem of two kinds of accents is obviously very interesting. It is a stunning fact that it was, to my knowledge, never treated in the literature in more than a couple of sentences.

Three solutions are possible here – the first one is to assume that the acute is the original accent; the second one is that the neo-acute is original; and the third one is that both accents are original, i.e. that neither is secondary.

The first possibility is taken up by Kortlandt<sup>45</sup> who claims, very shortly, that the acute, preserved in Slovene *jàz* (as well as in the neighboring Čakavian dialects), is the original (Balto-)Slavic accent. Kortlandt believes that Old Štokavian *jǎ* and South Čakavian *jǎ* are the result of the later secondary lengthening.<sup>46</sup> A similar claim is made by Vaillant (1958: 443) who says that the Štokavian *jâ* is the result of a compensatory lengthening and that (North) Čakavian *jǎ(z)* represents the

41 Czech *já(z)* could theoretically be derived from \*jǎzǝ as well but in the light of Slovak dial. *já*, this seems highly unlikely, and the Czech form should also be derived from \*jǎzǝ.

42 Зализняк 1985: 143.

43 Cf. a typological parallel in Štokavian, where *tī*, *mī* and *vī* have the neo-acute by analogy to the form *jǎ* where this is expected.

44 The innovative Slovene form *jâz* (cf. § 5f) has no connection to this form.

45 Cf. for instance Kortlandt 1997: 29 and 2007.

46 It must be noted, however, that Kortlandt bases his theory on the subject on his own doctrine of Slavic accentuation, many postulates of which I do not accept. Thus, his views on the subject are hardly explainable in the non-Kortlandt doctrine – for instance, in Kortlandt 2007, he says that Czech and Slovak have preserved the original short reflex of the acute in *ty*, *my*, *vy*. However, according to my view, and to the view of the most Slavic accentologists, the original reflex of the acute is long in Czech and short in Slovak. This is one of the reasons why Kortlandt's theory cannot really be accepted by accentologists who are not working within the framework of the Leiden doctrine.

original Proto-Slavic form. Kortlandt and Vaillant aside, there are several reasons why the theory of the original acute cannot be correct. First of all, the proposed lengthening is completely *ad hoc* and there is no real explanation for it (except, of course, the ever present *allegro* change, which is not impossible, but still not very convincing). Secondly, if we were to suppose that the acute is the original accent here, we would have to assume a secondary *ad hoc* lengthening not only in Štokavian and South/Central Čakavian, but also in Kajkavian, Czech, Slovak, Polish and Slovincian. Somehow, this possibility does not strike me as very economical.

The second possibility is to assume that the neo-acute is the original accent here, and that the short reflexes in Slovene, North Čakavian, and marginally in Kajkavian are secondary and due to an *allegro* shortening.<sup>47</sup> However, this view, in spite of the fact that it is more economical than the former, because it supposes *allegro* shortening only in three neighboring dialects (and not in seven or so widely spread ones), is again troubled by the fact that yet again one must subside to the help of the mysterious *allegro* changes and *ad hoc* developments. It is unclear why *jā(z)* would be shortened to *jǎ(z)*, while there was no shortening of *tî, mî, vî* anywhere.

Thus, as already said, the deficiency of both of these approaches, in spite of the fact that these kinds of irregular secondary lengthening and shortening in short forms like these ones are theoretically possible, is that they presume *ad hoc* lengthening and shortening, not attested elsewhere in these languages. For instance, there is no parallel for the change of *jǎ > jā* elsewhere in Štokavian. Kortlandt's theory is even more unbelievable since it includes, among other things, lengthening in Slovene *tî*, but the absence of it in *jǎz*.<sup>48</sup>

The third approach, however, seems more reasonable. If we have established that there were probably two forms of the pronoun in question already in Common Slavic, *\*ja* and *\*jazъ*, and since we already know for sure that there were at least two different forms of this pronoun in PIE,<sup>49</sup> why not assume that there were two types of accent in Slavic, if this is what the material points to? Why not assume that somehow both the old acute and the neo-acute are original in Slavic? Since we already have two forms – *\*ja* and *\*jazъ*, why should we not relate these two forms to the two different kinds of accentuation that the material seems to point at? The logical thing to do would be to assume that the old acute is the original accent of the shorter form *\*jǎ*, and that the neo-acute is the original accent of the longer form *\*jǎzъ*. In this way, Common Slavic *\*jǎ* could be derived from

47 This is the view of Bulcsú László (personal communication).

48 Kortlandt (1997: 29) believes that the falling tone in Slovene *tî, mî, vî*, but the rising one in Posavina southern Čakavian points to the secondary lengthening of an originally short vowel (i.e. the reflex of the old acute). However, he provides no reason for this supposed “secondary lengthening”.

49 *\*éǵ* as attested in Old Lithuanian *eš*, and *\*eǵh₂óm* as attested in Slavic *jazъ* or in Vedic *ahám*.

PIE \*éǵ with the acute as the result of Winter's law. The absence of the acute in Lithuanian àš is easily explained if we derive Lithuanian àš and Old Lithuanian eš from a PIE \*éǵ,<sup>50</sup> a sandhi variant with the devoiced ending, which was generalized in Baltic and in front of which, logically, there was no Winter's law and hence no acute. Common Slavic \*jāzv̅ is to be derived from the older \*jāzv̅,<sup>51</sup> with the neo-acute as the result of Ivšić's Rule.<sup>52</sup> It is only natural to relate a neo-acute to a form that has two syllables, because the neo-acute demands an extra syllable (i.e. a weak *jer*) in order to be explained convincingly. Slavic \*jāzv̅ can also be directly derived from the PIE form \*eǵHóm (Vedic *ahám*) with the final accent.<sup>53</sup> The lengthening in Slavic can be explained here also via Winter's law.<sup>54</sup> Here, Winter's Law has produced the acute pretonic length. In Slavic, the acute has been lost in unaccented positions,<sup>55</sup> and when the stress was finally retracted via Ivšić's Rule, the syllable received the usual neo-acute intonation.

PIE \*éǵ > Slavic \*jǎ

PIE \*eǵHóm (Vedic *ahám*) > Slavic \*jāzv̅ > \*jāzv̅

Thus, as we have concluded, there were two forms originally in Slavic – \*jǎ and \*jāzv̅ < \*jāzv̅. What has happened after Common Slavic period? These two forms must have mixed, probably from an early age. Thus, the forms \*jǎ and \*jāzv̅ (cf. Slovene dial. *jà* and standard *jàz*) have emerged, as well as \*jāzv̅ and \*jǎ (cf. Old Czech *jáz* and *já*). Various languages/dialects have generalized one of the two accents in both forms, and that is what we see now in modern Slavic forms. First, there were two forms and two accents, then two forms and one accent, and finally one form and one accent. The generalization of the accent had finished before the disappearance of the two different forms. In the small area consisting of Slovene, part of Kajkavian and North Čakavian, the acute was generalized in both forms

50 For this reconstruction, cf. also Bańkowski 2000, who takes it as a dialectal IE form.

51 In the Slavic nominal system, \*-v̅ in the nominative-accusative (< IE \*-os, \*-om) could not be accented before Дыбо's Law. Slavic had an initial accent in the nominative-accusative of the a. p. c, having thus lost the \*-ós of the IE *o*-stem oxytones (which were the source of Slavic a. p. c). In \*jāzv̅, however, the original place of the accent was preserved. This is not surprising, since the pronominal system often behaves differently from the nominal one – cf. Lithuanian forms like *anàs* (the nominative *-as* cannot be accented in the nominal declension).

52 The retraction of the accent from a weak *jer*.

53 Ivšić (1911: 194) first proposed this explanation.

54 Cf. the closed syllable, which is necessary according to Matasović's interpretation of Winter's Law (see for instance Matasović 1995). For the development \*ǵ- > \*ja-, cf. Kapović 2006.

55 This is the only logical assumption. That is clear from the fact that the old mobile acute paradigm has remained mobile, which points to the conclusion that the accent was not retracted to the acute pretonic vowel, as could be presumed, or the old mobile acute nouns would all get a fixed old acute on the root (thus, Lithuanian a. p. 3 would be related not to Slavic a. p. c, but to Slavic a. p. a). The old acute pretonic long vowels behave just like the old non-acute pretonic long vowels, which must mean that the acute has just disappeared if it was not accented.

(cf. North Čakavian *jǎ* and *jǎz*). In the rest of the Slavic languages (excluding the unclear East Slavic), the neo-acute was generalized in both forms (Old Czech *já* and *jáz*). Thus, the generalizing of the accent, as already said, occurred earlier than the generalization of one of the two forms and is therefore independent of it.

### Slavic *\*jǎ* and Meillet's Law

The paradigms of Slavic personal pronouns, including the 1st person singular personal pronoun, are clearly mobile (cf. Зализняк 1985: 143 who puts all the personal pronouns into Old Russian a. p. c). We find the familiar traits of a. p. c here: absolute initial accent – *\*mĕne*, *\*mĕ* (like *\*gōrdъ* ‘town’, *\*gōlvъ* ‘head’) and final accent – *\*mъ/ъnĕ*, *\*mъnojĕ*<sup>56</sup> (like L. *\*golvĕ*, *\*golvojĕ*, *\*gordomĕ*). Of course, the mobile paradigm of the personal pronouns has its own special peculiarities, just like the verbs have theirs, adjectives theirs, just like the *i*-stems are different from the *o*- and *u*-stems etc.

In the nominative-accusative of the personal pronouns, we find the forms with the circumflex in Slavic<sup>57</sup>, i.e. unaccented words or the words with the absolute initial accent: *\*mĕ*, *\*tŷ*, *\*tĕ*, *\*mŷ*, *\*nŷ*, *\*vŷ*, *\*vĕ*, *\*nâ*, *\*vâ*. Forms like Old Prussian *toū*, *ioūs* or Latvian *jūs* point to the Balto-Slavic acute in these forms. The discrepancy of Baltic and Slavic is easily explained – since the paradigm is mobile in Slavic, Meillet's Law<sup>58</sup> operates and the forms with an initial acute get a circumflex instead of it.<sup>59</sup>

A question appears – if the new circumflex forms came into existence via Meillet's Law in the nominative and accusative forms of the personal pronouns, how are we then to explain the preserved acute in one of the nominative 1st person singular forms – *\*jǎ*? Here the explanation as in *\*nāsъ* etc. certainly cannot be correct. But there is also a simple answer to this question. Meillet's Law is not really a mechanical, strictly phonetic sound change. It is rather a complex morphophonological process – in the mobile paradigms, the tendency appears to stretch the accent either to the absolute last syllable, or the absolute initial syllable of the word. How can we then explain the absence of the Law in *\*jǎ*, when it has clearly worked in *\*tŷ*, *\*mŷ* and *\*vŷ*? The answer is rather banal. In order for Meillet's Law to work, one has to have a paradigm – a mobile paradigm. Now, the 1st person singular is a clear case of mobility, cf. *\*mĕne*, *\*mъnĕ*. Yes, the mobility is

56 The instrumental accentual variants *\*mъnĕjъ* and *\*tobĕjъ* can be regarded as a special trait of the pronominal mobile paradigm, cf. Kapović 2006.

57 Kortlandt's doctrine that all the personal pronouns in Slavic had an unchanged original acute (cf. for instance Kortlandt 1997: 29) is unsubstantiated in the material. All the forms point to the original circumflex in *\*tŷ*, *\*mŷ*, *\*vŷ* – Kortlandt's hypothesis is thus completely *ad hoc*.

58 For Meillet's Law, cf. for instance Kapović *forthc*.

59 Cf. also Дыбо 1981: 37 for the explanation of *\*tŷ*, *\*mŷ*, *\*vŷ* via Meillet's Law.

indeed there, but where is the paradigm? That the forms \*nâgǝ 'naked', G. \*nâga or \*golvá, A. \*gólǝ belong to the same paradigm is quite clear. That the forms \*tǝ, \*tǝbe, \*te/obǝ, \*tǝ, \*tobojǝ belong to the same paradigm is not quite so clear because this paradigm is irregular, but still, all these forms are similar enough to be considered a paradigm, although a far less prototypical one than the first two mentioned. Thus, the operation of Meillet's Law in \*tǝ and \*tǝ is not surprising, since these two forms belong to a mobile paradigm. It is the same with \*vǝ, \*vâsǝ, \*vâmǝ, \*vâmi, which also make an "irregular" paradigm, but a paradigm still. The case of \*mǝ, \*nǝ, \*nâsǝ, \*nâmǝ, \*nâmi is not such an obvious paradigm. Here, the nominative form stands out because of its initial \*m-. However, one could hardly expect Meillet's Law not to work in the form \*mǝ, when it operated in the accusative \*nǝ, which is similar enough to the rest of the forms to be making a paradigm with them, and when it also operated in \*tǝ and \*vǝ which rhyme with \*mǝ. The same reason is behind the operation of Meillet's Law in the 1st person dual – \*vǝ. This form clearly stands out from the other forms: \*nâ, \*nâju, \*nâma, but since Meillet's Law operated in the accusative \*nâ, in the 2nd person dual nominative and accusative (where both \*vǝ and \*vâ are similar to \*vǝ in the fact that all the forms have an initial \*v-) and in the nominative forms of the plural \*mǝ, \*vǝ, the influence was simply far too great for it not to work in \*vǝ. But in the case of the 1st person singular, it was not so. In this case, we had a form which was completely isolated in a number of ways. Firstly, its nominative forms (\*jâ and \*jâzǝ < \*jâzǝ) were completely different than the rest of its "paradigm". Secondly, the 1st person nominative singular forms are also special because there are two of them – which is not the case anywhere else. Thirdly, the form \*jâ was not similar to any of the other nominative or accusative forms in any visible way (neither in the initial consonant, nor in the final vowel, unlike for instance \*vǝ). Thus this form was simply not a part of the same paradigm as the forms \*mǝne, \*mǝnǝ, \*mǝ, \*mǝnojǝ. The form \*jâ was an isolated form (\*jâzǝ as well), not a part of a mobile paradigm,<sup>60</sup> and thus, logically, Meillet's Law did not operate in it and the form managed to preserve its acute.<sup>61</sup>

60 A suppletivity of completely unrelated (or very different) forms is thus not regarded as the same paradigm, but as two (or more) different forms. One can set a provisional hierarchy of the prototypical paradigms – the most prototypical ones would be those that make a clear paradigm, the so-called regular words like Croatian *kǝnj, kǝnji* or English *horse, horses*. The less prototypical paradigm would be that of the irregular words, like Croatian *tǝ, tǝbe* or English *man, men*. The least prototypical, i.e. not really a paradigm, is a case of synchronic suppletivity like Croatian *čǝvjek – ljǝdi, dǝbar – bǝljǝ* or English *good – better*. Traditional grammars may teach us that the form *better* is a comparative of *good*, but one should know better – especially when talking about what really is in a native speaker's mind and not in grammar-books.

61 In the form \*jâzǝ, the acute was, as already said, eliminated in the pretonic (unaccented) syllable.

## Conclusion

In this article, I have tried to show that the two forms of the Slavic first person nominative singular personal pronoun, \**ja* and \**jazъ*, are related to the two different accents attested in Slavic – the neo-acute (for instance in Štokavian dial. *jā*, Czech *já*) and the old acute (for instance in Slovene *jàz*, North Čakavian *jă(z)*). Originally there were two forms in Slavic – \**jǎ* and \**jāzъ* < \**jāzǎ*. One of the accentual variants was generalized in specific Slavic dialects, thus leading to the present situation. The form \**jǎ* is to be derived directly from PIE \**éǵ* (Lithuanian *àš*, Avestan *azə*) with the acute as the result of Winter's Law. The form \**jāzǎ* is to be derived from PIE \**eǵHóm* (Vedic *ahám*) with the final accent, and the length is to be explained as the result of Winter's Law with the subsequent elimination of the pretonic acute in Slavic. The form \**jǎ* did not undergo the operation of Meillet's Law, in spite of the mobile paradigm (\**mēne*, \**mь/ъnē*, \**mē*), because the stems in question were obviously suppletive (\**ja*- : \**m*-).

*University of Zagreb*

## References

- Aitzetmüller, Rudolf  
 1991 *Altbulgarische Grammatik als Einführung in die slavische Sprachwissenschaft*. 2nd edition. Freiburg.
- ARj  
 1881–1976 *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, sv. 1–97 [dijelovi I–XXIII], JAZU, Zagreb.
- Arumaa, Peter  
 1985 *Urslavische Grammatik: Einführung in das vergleichende Studium der slavischen Sprachen*, III. *Formenlehre*. Heidelberg.
- Bańkowski, Andrzej  
 2000 *Etymologiczny słownik języka polskiego*, I–II, Warszawa.
- Bezljaj  
 1977–82 France Bezljaj, *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika*, I–III. Ljubljana.
- Bielefeldt, Hans Holm  
 1961 *Altslawische Grammatik: Einführung in die slawischen Sprachen*. Halle (Saale).
- Boryś, Wiesław  
 2005 *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Kraków.
- Brlobaš, Željka  
 1999 “Kajkavski govor Repušnice”. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 25, 77–87.
- Cocron, Friedrich  
 1962 *La langue russe dans la seconde moitié du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle (morphologie)*. Paris.
- Damjanović, Stjepan  
 2005 *Staroslavenski jezik*. 5th edition. Zagreb.

- de Courtenay, Jan Baudouin  
1929 "Einfluss der Sprache auf Weltanschauung und Stimmung". *Prace filologiczne* 14, 185–256.
- Diels, P.  
1932–4 *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik I–II*. Heidelberg.
- Đorđić, Petar  
1975 *Staroslovenski jezik*. Novi Sad.
- ESSJ  
1980 *Etymologický slovník slovanských jazyků, Slova gramatická a zájmena 2*. Praha.
- FO  
1981 *Fonološki opisi srpskohrvatskih/hrvatskosrpskih, slovenačkih i makedonskih govora obuhvaćenih opšteslovenskim lingvističkim atlasom*, ANUBiH. Sarajevo, 1981.
- Gebauer, Jan  
1896 *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého, III/1. Skloňování*. Praha / Vídeň.  
1903–16 *Slovník staročeský, I–II*. Praha.
- Gluhak, Alemko  
1993 *Hrvatski etimološki rječnik*. Zagreb.
- Hamm, Josip  
1970 *Staroslavenska gramatika*. 3rd edition. Zagreb.
- Houtzagers, H. P.  
1985 *The Čakavian dialect of Orlec on the island of Cres* (= Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 5). Amsterdam.
- HSSJ  
1991 *Historický slovník slovenského jazyka, I*. Bratislava.
- Ivšić, Stjepan  
1911 "Prilog za slavenski akcenat". *Rad JAZU* 187, 133–208.  
1913 "Današnji posavski govor". *Rad JAZU* 196 (I), 124–254; 197 (II), 9–138.  
1971 *Izabrana djela iz slavenske akcentuacije* (*Gesammelte Schriften zum slavischen Akzent*), mit einer Einleitung sowie Berichtigungen und Ergänzungen des Verfassers herausgegeben von Christian Alphonsus van der Berk (Slavische Propyläen, Texte in Neu- und Nachdrucken 96). München.
- Jagić, Vatroslav  
1883 (see *Codex Marianus*)
- Jedvaj, Josip  
1956 "Bednjanski govor". *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 1, 279–330.
- Jembrih, Alojz & Mijo Lončarić  
1982–3 "Govor Gregurovca Veterničkoga". *Rasprave Zavoda za jezik Instituta za filologiju i folkloristiku* 8–9, 5–62.
- Junković, Zvonimir  
1972 "Jezik Antuna Vramca i podrijetlo kajkavskoga dijalekta". *Rad JAZU* 363, 1–229.
- Jurišić, Blaž  
1973 *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade, uspoređen s nekim čakavskim i zapadnoštokavskim govorima, II. Rječnik*. Zagreb.
- Kalsbeek, Janneke  
1998 *The Čakavian dialect of Orbanići near Žminj in Istria*. Amsterdam.
- Kapović, Mate  
2006 *Reconstruction of Balto-Slavic personal pronouns with emphasis on accentuation*, unpublished PhD dissertation.  
forthc. "Reexamining Meillet's Law".

- Kiparsky, Valentin  
1967 *Russische historische Grammatik, II. Die Entwicklung des Formensystems*. Heidelberg.
- Klemensiewicz, Z., Tadeusz Lehr-Splawiński, & S. Urbańczyk  
1955 *Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego*. Warszawa.
- Kluge, Friedrich  
2002 *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, bearbeitet von Elmar Seebold. 24th edition. Berlin / New York.
- Kortlandt, Frederik  
1997 "PIE. lengthened grade in Balto-Slavic". *Festschrift for Eric P. Hamp*, 11, 26–31.  
2007 "Miscellaneous remarks on Balto-Slavic accentuation". In Mate Kapović & Ranko Matasović (eds.), *Tones and theories: proceedings of the International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology, Zagreb, 1–3 July 2005*, 229–235. Zagreb.
- Kurz, Josef  
1969 *Učebnice jazyka staroslověnského*. Praha.
- Kustić, Nikola  
2002 *Čakavski govor grada Paga s rječnikom*. Zagreb.
- Lehr-Splawiński, Tadeusz  
1929 *Gramatyka połabska*. Lwów.
- Lehr-Splawiński, Tadeusz & Czesław Bartula  
1954 *Zarys gramatyki języka staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego na tle porównawczym*. 4th edition. Wrocław / Kraków.
- Leskien, August  
1922 *Handbuch der altbulgarischen (altkirchenslavischen) Sprache*. 6th edition. Heidelberg.
- Lipljin, Tomislav  
2002 *Rječnik varaždinskoga kajkavskog govora*. Garestin d.o.o., Varaždin.
- Łoś, J.  
1922–7 *Gramatyka polska, I–III*. Kraków.
- Lunt, Horace G.  
1974 *Old Church Slavonic grammar*. 5th edition. The Hague.
- Małecki, Mieczysław  
1934 *Dwie gwary macedońskie (Suche i Wysoka w Soluńskiem)*, 1. Teksty, 11. Słownik. Kraków.
- Matasović, Ranko  
1995 (1996) "A reexamination of Winter's Law in Baltic and Slavic". *Lingua Posnaniensis* 37, 57–70.
- Meillet, Antoine  
1934 *Le slave commun*. 2nd edition. Paris.
- Mihaljević, Milan  
in press "Zamjenice u hrvatskoglagojskim fragmentima 12. i 13. st."
- Moguš, Milan  
1966 "Današnji senjski govor". *Senjski zbornik* 2, 5–152.
- Nandriš, Grigore  
1959 *Old Church Slavonic grammar*. London.
- Orlovský, Jozef  
1982 *Gemerský nárečový slovník*. Rimavská Sobota.
- Pauliny, Eugen  
1990 *Vývin slovenskej deklinácie*. Bratislava.

## PED

1967 K. Polański & G. A. Sehnert, *Polabian-English dictionary*. The Hague / Paris.

## Radulić, Ladislav

2002 *Rječnik rivanjskoga govora*. Zadar.

## Rigler, Jakob

2001 *Zbrani spisi, I. Jezikozgodovinske in dialektološke razprave*. Ljubljana.

## Ripka, Ivor

1975 *Dolnotrenčianske nárečia*. Bratislava.

## Rosenkranz, Bernhard

1955 *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre des Altbulgarischen (Altkirchenslavischen)*. 's-Gravenhage / Heidelberg.

## Schleicher, August

1871 *Laut- und Formenlehre der polabischen Sprache*. St.-Petersburg.

## Schmidt, Gernot

1978 *Stammbildung und Flexion der indogermanischen Personalpronomina*. Wiesbaden.

## Šekli, Matej

2003 "Odrzi praslovanskih oblikotvornih naglasnih tipov samostalnikov moške o-jevske sklanjatve v (knjižni) slovenščini". *Jezikoslovni zapiski* 9/2, 29–50.

## Skok, Petar

1971–4 *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika, Knjiga prva: A–J. Knjiga druga: K–poni<sup>1</sup>. Knjiga treća: poni<sup>2</sup>–Ž. Knjiga četvrta: Kazala*. Uredili akademici Mirko Deanović i Ljudevit Jonke. Surađivao u predradnjama i priredio za tisak Valentin Putanec. Zagreb.

## Słoński, Stanisław

1950 *Gramatyka języka starosłowiańskiego (starobułgarskiego)*. Warszawa.

## Šojat, Antun

1970 "Kratka navuk jezičnice horvatske (Jezik stare kajkavske književnosti)". *Kaj* 3/2, 81–96.

1973a "Kajkavski ikavci kraj Sutle". *Rasprave Instituta za jezik* 2, 37–44.

1973b "O govoru Cerja kod Sesveta". *Rasprave Instituta za jezik* 2, 45–49.

1973c "Govor u Samoboru i njegovoj okolini". *Rasprave Instituta za jezik* 2, 51–72.

1982 "Turopoljski govori". *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 6, 317–493.

1992 "Kulturološko-jezične značajke Pavlinskog zbornika (1644)". *Kaj* 15/4, 21–28.

## SP

1961–2001 *Słownik prasłowiański*. F. Sławski (ed.), 1–8. Wrocław.

## SS

1953/5–1988/93 *Słownik staropolski, I–X*. Warszawa.

## SSN

1994 *Slovník slovenských nárečí, I*. Bratislava.

## Stanislav, Ján

1958 *Dejiny slovenského jazyka, II. Tvaroslovie*. Bratislava.

## Steenwijk, Han

1992 *The Slovene dialect of Resia San Giorgio*. Amsterdam.

## Tentor, Mate

1909 "Der čakavische Dialekt der Stadt Cres". *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 30, 146–204.

1950 *Leksička slaganja creskoga narječja i slovenskoga jezika protiv Vukova jezika, Razprave/Dissertationes, I*. Ljubljana.

## Težak, Stjepko

1981 "Ozaljski govor". *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 5, 203–432.

- Trávníček, František  
1935 *Historická mluvnice československá*. Praha.
- Trubetzkoy, Nikolaus S.  
1968 *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik. Schrift-, Laut- und Formensystem*, Herausgegeben von Rudolf Jagoditsch, Hermann Böhlaus Nachlf. 2nd edition. Graz / Wien / Köln.
- Vaillant, André  
1958 *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves, Tome II. Morphologie. Deuxième Partie: Flexion pronominale*. Lyon.
- Vasmer, Max  
1950–8 *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, I–III*. Heidelberg.
- Velčić, Nikola  
2003 *Besedar Bejske Tramuntane*. Mali Lošinj / Beli / Rijeka.
- Vondrák, Wenzel  
1912 *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik*. 2nd edition. Berlin.
- Weingart, Miloš  
1937–8 *Rukověť jazyka staroslověnského, I–II*. Praha.
- БДА**  
1964 *Български диалектен атлас*. Съставен под ръководство на Ст. Стойков и С. Б. Бернщейн (I), Ст. Стойков (II). София, 1964.
- Белић, Александар  
1909 “Замѣтки по чакавскимъ говорамъ”. *Извѣстия отдѣлення русскаго языка и словесности Академии Наукъ* 14: 181–266.
- Бернщейн, С. Б.  
1948 *Разискования в области болгарской исторической диалектологии, I. Язык валаишских грамот XIV–XV веков*. Москва / Ленинград.
- Гадолина, М. А.  
1963 *История форм личных и возвратного местоимений в славянских языках*. Москва.
- Горшков, А. И.  
1963 *Старославянский язык*. Москва.
- Даничић, Ђура  
1874 *Историја облика српскога или хрватскога језика до свршетка XVII вијека*. Биоград.
- Дыбо, Владимир А.  
1981 *Славянская акцентология. Опыт реконструкции системы акцентных парадигм в праславянском*. Москва.
- Зализняк, А. А.  
1985 *От праславянской акцентуации к русской*. Москва.
- Иванов, В. В.  
1983 *Историческая грамматика русского языка*. 2nd edition. Москва.
- Мирчев, Кирил  
1963 *Историческа граматика на българския език*. 2nd edition. София.
- СДЯ**  
1975–2002 *Словарь русского языка (XI–XVII вв.)*, I–XXVI. Москва.
- СДЯ 2**  
1988–2004 *Словарь древнерусского языка (XI–XIV вв.)*, I–VII. А. Аванесов (ed.). Москва.

- Селищев, А. М.  
1941 *Славянское языковедение, I. Западнославянские языки*. Москва.
- Срезневский, И. И.  
1893–1903 *Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка по письменным памятникам, I–III*. Санктпетербург.
- ССМ  
1977–8 *Словник староукраїнської мови XIV–XV ст., I–II*. Київ.
- Стойков, Стойко  
1993 *Българска диалектология*. 3rd edition. София.
- Трубачев, О. Н. (ed.)  
1974– *Этимологический словарь славянских языков*. Москва.
- Харалампиев, Иван  
2001 *Историческа граматика на българския език*. В. Търново.
- Черных, П. Я.  
1962 *Историческая граматика русского языка, краткий очерк*. 2nd edition. Москва.
- Якубинский, Л. П.  
1953 *История древнерусского языка*. Москва.

#### Sources

- Alexandreida*: Vaclav Važný, *Staročeská Alexandreida*. Praha, 1963 (2nd edition).
- Codex Marianus*: Vatroslav Jagić (ed.), *Quattuor evangeliorum versionis palaeoslovenicae codex Marianus glagoliticus*. Characteribus cyrillicis transcriptum V. Jagić (mit Anhang über Schreibweise und Sprache und einem erschöpfenden Index). Berlin / Sankt Peterburg, 1883.
- Dalimila*: Marie Bláhová & alii (eds.), *Kronika tak řečeného Dalmila*. Praha, 1977.
- Decretum*: Ivanuš Pergošić, *Decretum 1574, Hrvatski kajkavski editio princeps*, za tisak priredio i priloge napisao Zvonimir Bartolić. Čakovec, 2003.
- Katonova dvojverší*: Eduard Petrů (ed.), *Ezopovy bajky, Katonova dvojverší, Rada otce synovi*. Praha, 1999.
- Postilla*: Antun Vramec, *Postilla*. Zagreb / Varaždin, 1990.
- Psalterium Sinaiticum*: *Psalterium Sinaiticum* [reprint]. Graz, 1954.
- SBDO*: Vladimír Kyas (ed.), *Staročeská Bible Drážďanská a Olomoucká. Kritické vydání nejstaršího českého překladu bible ze 14. století, I. Evangelia*. Praha, 1981.
- Vévoda Arnošt*: Eduard Petrů (ed.), *Rytířské srdce majíce. Česká rytířská epika 14. století*. Praha, 1984.
- Závišova píseň (Jižť mne vše radost ostává)*: Jan Lehár (ed.), *Česká středověká lyrika*. Praha, 1990.