

Mate Kapović\*

# The Position of Kajkavian in the South Slavic Dialect Continuum in Light of Old Accentual Isoglosses

<https://doi.org/10.1515/slav-2017-0038>

**Summary:** All South Slavic languages, from Bulgaria in the South-East to Slovenia in the North-West, are part of a dialect continuum. This paper outlines the position of what is traditionally called Kajkavian in that continuum in light of old accentual isoglosses. Kajkavian shares several old prosodic-phonological isoglosses with Slovene (such as the rise of the neocircumflex), while on the other hand it is connected with Western Štokavian and Čakavian through some morphological-categorial accentual isoglosses (like the innovative accent of the infinitive and *l*-participle).

**Keywords:** Kajkavian, South Slavic, Slovene, accent, Slavic accentuation, isoglosses, Neocircumflex

## 1 Introduction

It is well known that all South Slavic dialects constitute a single dialect continuum<sup>1</sup>. Political, ethnic and (since the nineteenth century) national borders cross-cut these dialectal borders and isoglosses, often in an irregular fashion. The

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. e.g. Ivić 2001: 19–28; Kapović 2015: 63–66. All Slavic languages were part of a continuum prior to the later hegemony of German in present-day (eastern) Austria, the coming of the Magyars and subsequent spread of Hungarian, and the dominance of Romanian in the North-East Balkans.

---

**Note:** This paper is complementary to the detailed accentual analyses laid out in the monograph Kapović 2015. The specific details of the accentual changes and processes (such as the rise of the neocircumflex) are dealt with extensively in the monograph (together with the discussion and appropriate references) and are therefore not repeated here, where the focus is on the position of Kajkavian in the South Slavic dialect continuum (in view of the oldest prosodic changes) and not on the exact details of the accentual processes themselves.

---

\*Corresponding author: Prof. Dr. Mate Kapović, Filozofski fakultet, Ivana Lučića 3, 10 000 Zagreb, E-Mail: mkapovic@ffzg.hr

linguistic varieties themselves are regularly named after ethnic units (e.g. the “Slovene language”). Even linguistic names are necessarily determined politically – thus, the “Kajkavian dialect group” (the term “Kajkavian” itself is a bookish, not a folk, term, originating from the interrogative/relative pronoun *kaj* ‘what’) is determined principally by the fact that there was some sort of political border for more than ten centuries between the present-day Kajkavian and Slovene territory (which does not at all imply that there were no cross-border contacts and influences<sup>2</sup>). This border resulted in present-day Kajkavian speakers identifying nationally as Croats<sup>3</sup> and living in the same state as most of the speakers of Čakavian and the majority of the Catholic Štokavian speakers, with whom they share a religion and a ten-century history of belonging to more or less similar state formations<sup>4</sup> (which were separated from present-day Slovenian territory). If history had developed differently, and if the political borders had formed a different shape, the names themselves, the number of official languages and their relation to certain linguistic varieties would be different, even if the dialectal situation on the ground had been the same or similar (although, of course, political borders do have an influence on languages).

Today, the rural Kajkavian dialects (many urban dialects on what was originally Kajkavian turf have now become heavily Štokavized) clearly structurally differ from Štokavian and Čakavian. Old transitional isoglosses to Western Štokavian do exist, but the transitional dialects mostly disappeared in the subsequent Neo-Štokavian migrations<sup>5</sup>. Kajkavian and Čakavian have an obvious link – a dialect of Prigorje (*prigorski dijalekt*), south-west of Zagreb – which has a clear transitional nature. The link between Kajkavian and Slovene is quite perceptible even today, while many differences are of a later origin (e.g. the lengthening of all non-final syllables in most Slovene dialects).

---

2 One example would be the so-called Croatian-Slovene peasant revolt in 1573.

3 It is important to note that many Kajkavian speakers (or those born on Kajkavian turf), like Janko Drašković (1770–1856) from Zagreb or Ljudevit Gaj (1809–1872) from Krapina, played very significant roles in constructing Croatian (but also the less successful “Illyrian”, as a precursor to later Yugoslavian) national identity in the nineteenth century.

4 Not all the time and not all the territories, of course. For instance, the Istria Čakavians lived mostly in different state formations from the rest of Čakavians, while most parts of the Štokavian territories (and some Kajkavian and Čakavian ones as well) were under the rule of the Ottoman Empire for centuries. Many parts of Dalmatia and the coast were under Venice, etc.

5 For some remnants of the old isoglosses see e.g. Kapović 2008: 125–126<sup>(53)</sup>, 130, 144–145.

## 2 Kajkavian and Slovene

The close relationship between Kajkavian and Slovene dialects is beyond dispute<sup>6</sup> and is, in any case, not unexpected given the geographical position of Kajkavian. One can start with obvious correspondences such as the use of the interrogative-relative pronoun *kaj* (which is a non-trivial innovation<sup>7</sup> and a unique case among Slavic languages<sup>8</sup>), continue with phonological innovations such as the intervocalic \*ř > rj (e.g. *morje* ‘sea’), in opposition to a different innovation in Štokavian/Čakavian \*ř > r<sup>9</sup>, or morphological tendencies (such as the generalization of the \*bḡdḡ + l-participle type for the future tense), and finish with accentual phenomena such as the rise of the neocircumflex (which also appears in North Čakavian, but only in a limited number of categories).

The problem of the relationship between Slovene and Kajkavian is in many ways not at all a question of linguistics and dialectology but of politics, ethnicity and identity. While the speakers of the varieties we today call “Slovene” (many sharing certain common old isoglosses) have their own national state (which itself is the reason the concept of “Slovene” exists), the speakers of the varieties we now call “Kajkavian” (sharing some significant isoglosses with Slovene dialects) are a part of the modern Croatian national corpus, together with all the speakers of Čakavian and a number of speakers of Štokavian, which are histori-

**6** If the present-day Kajkavian territory had for some reason ended up being in Slovenia, there is no doubt that nobody would claim that they were not “Slovene” dialects. Similarly, if Prekmurje or Prlekija (or any part or the whole of Slovenia for that matter) had ended up in Croatia, there is no doubt that they would be characterized as “Kajkavian” dialects.

**7** Though this form is very salient in linguistics (the dialect group itself being named after it) and also in folk linguistics (with one group of speakers always noticing which interrogative pronoun other groups of speakers use), one could convincingly claim that it is not very important for genetic affiliation, since it is only one word/form (disregarding *nekaj* ‘something’, *kaj god* ‘whatever’ and similar forms), basically being just a single lexical innovation. The other point challenging the importance of *kaj* might be that it may not be very old, since cases are attested of the secondary spread of the interrogative-relative pronoun, e.g. the spread of *što/šta* in coastal Čakavian or the appropriation of *kaj* in the kajkavized, originally Čakavian, dialect of Lower Sutla (*donjosutlanski*). However, there seem to have been no sociolinguistic conditions for such a later spread in Kajkavian (or Slovene), unlike in the two mentioned cases.

**8** Čakavian *ča* ‘what’ is less significant because it is a retention of Proto-Indo-European origin (PIE \*k<sup>w</sup>id). Štokavian (and wider Slavic) *što* is identical, but with the additional *to* ‘that’ (cf. OCS *čb-to* ‘what’), while Kajkavian-Slovene *kaj* derives from \*ka-jb, where \*ka is a form of the same pronominal stem found in, for instance, OCS *kč-to* ‘who’ (PIE \*k<sup>w</sup>os) – cf. the other forms and etymology of *kaj* in Bezlaž’s and Snoj’s etymological dictionaries and Kapović 2017: 88 for the PIE origins of these interrogative forms.

**9** Cf. Lončarić 1996: 87; Greenberg 2000: 95–96; 2002: 107–108.

cally and structurally rather distinct from Kajkavian,<sup>10</sup> though originally connected through a common dialect continuum. In an ideal world, such political realities should not affect linguistic analyses of the dialectal positioning of certain varieties, but in practice this is not the case. For instance, in some works one gets the distinct feeling that the most important task, even if rarely explicitly admitted, is to prove that Kajkavian “belongs to the Croatian language”.<sup>11</sup> This is the case in spite of the fact that Kajkavian dialects (considering their geographical position,) exhibit exactly what one would expect – a transitional nature between “Slovene” characteristics on the one hand and Štokavian-Čakavian (“Croatian”) on the other (cf. also Ivić 1966: 383), though the isoglosses are often of a different type, and though genetically speaking, at least in accentuation, the dominant isoglosses are the ones that connect Kajkavian dialects with the North-West of the South Slavic territory, i.e. with what we call “Slovene” today.

### 3 The oldest accentual isoglosses

If one examines the oldest accentual isoglosses, occurring roughly in the period of the fall of the old weak yers (\*ъ and \*ь), the situation is rather clear.<sup>12</sup> Slovene

**10** Assuming that the differences between Kajkavian, Štokavian and Čakavian are generally deeper than the differences (in the majority) of Slovene dialects.

**11** A case in point is Junković 1972 – a book on the origin of Kajkavian which was very well received in Croatian linguistics (not least because there was nobody doing historical accentology, even less Kajkavian historical accentology, at the time). It was well received because it “proved” what Croatian specialists wanted to hear, despite the fact that its whole quasi-historical “structuralist” methodology and conclusions are completely invalid (cf. Kapović 2015: 286<sup>1064</sup> for one example). In modern analyses of the origin of Kajkavian there would actually be no need to even mention Junković’s work (and it is usually not mentioned), were he not still cited and highly revered, even in recent works, by Croatian language experts from Croatia. Cf. Kuzmić 2016 (: 113<sup>3</sup>, 120–121), where it is claimed that Junković’s “diachronic explanation of the origin of the Kajkavian dialect group is accepted by everyone”, which is very troubling. Junković’s (1972: 214) conclusion that Kajkavian is genetically closer to Štokavian than Slovene is completely wrong, an observation which is quite clear already from the basic prosodic analyses dealt with in this paper. Cf. also Lončarić 1996: 32–33 for including Kajkavian in the supposed “Proto-Central-South-Slavic” (i.e. “Proto-Serbo-Croatian” in pre-1990 terminology), though the only reasons for assuming “Central South Slavic” (a new, “politically correct”, term for the older “Serbo-Croatian”) as a single language in the first place are present-day national borders, while there are no linguistic reasons at all to reconstruct its separate proto-language. For a critique of the existence of “Central South Slavic” as a valid genetic node cf. also Matasović 2008: 66<sup>(99)</sup>–67.

**12** Cf. the complete discussion in Kapović 2015: 621–638.

and Kajkavian are connected by an old prosodic-phonological<sup>13</sup> innovation – the rise of the neocircumflex (the type *vidiš* ‘you see’ < Proto-Slavic \**vīdišb*, etc.) in very specific and complex conditions.<sup>14</sup> Somewhat similar to the neocircumflex is the lengthening of the Slavic short neoacute (the type *sēla* ‘villages’ < Proto-Slavic \**sēla*, etc.), which also occurs in complex conditions in Kajkavian – as well as originally in Slovene,<sup>15</sup> where it subsequently mostly gave way to the general lengthening of all non-final syllables in most Slovene dialects.<sup>16</sup> The neocircum-

---

**13** Here we use “prosodic-phonological” for regular accentual/prosodic changes that occurred in specific phonologically and prosodically (or rather prosodologically) determinable conditions, e.g. in all forms with a certain accent, with a certain number of syllables, etc. (as opposed to changes that cannot be determined simply prosodologically and phonologically, but demand that morphological and other conditions be accounted for). Usually, both phonology and prosodology need to be mentioned together because accentual changes most often occur not only in prosodological terms (e.g. type of accent and other supra-segmental characteristics), but often depend on phonological, or at least non-prosodic, conditions as well (such as vowel length, closed or open syllables, number of syllables, the position of the syllable in a word, etc.). The terms “prosodology” and “prosodological” are used here for supra-segmental level as a parallel to “phonology” and “phonological” for segmental level.

**14** For a detailed overview with references cf. Kapović 2015: 272–362.

**15** Pronk (2016: 22) thinks that in Slovene, unlike Kajkavian, there was no neoacute lengthening and that the Slovene \**è* and \**ò* remained originally short. However, this forces him to assume many analogies in cases where traces of the old length are preserved (: 17–21), which are often not very convincing, e.g. that Lower Carniolan loc. pl. *kújnəh* and instr. pl. *kújnə* ‘horses’ result from an analogy with gen. pl. *kújn* (: 18), the interesting thing being that these “analogical” forms are “accidentally” found regularly in accentual paradigm B, where Kajkavian also has a lengthened vowel. See the next footnote for Pronk on Kajkavian. Likewise, the outdated assumption found, for instance, in Šekli 2013 (: 16, 18) that the lengthened short neoacute is always analogical (appearing in cases where there is a neocircumflex in a. p. *a*) is completely unconvincing – that would be a very strange kind of analogy (why would \**˘* yield \**ˆ* because \**ˆ* yields \**˘* in similar cases?). In any case, forms like gen. pl. \**kòňb* > \**kõňb* ‘horses’ (found also in Čakavian/Štokavian!) are not of the same type as instr. pl. \**kòňi* and nom. pl. \**rěbra* ‘ribs’ as Šekli (2013: 17) claims, the gen. pl. forms obviously being due to the long yer (cf. Kapović 2015: 365–366), not only in a. p. *b* but also in a. p. *a* and *c*.

**16** For a detailed analysis of neoacute lengthening cf. Kapović 2015: 377–399. In summary, the short neoacute lengthens before a dominant (+), originally preserved length in the open final syllable (*sēla* ‘villages’ < Proto-Slavic \**sēlā*, including cases like *lōnec* ‘pots’ [genitive plural] < \**lōnъcъ* with an intermediate yer), before a contractional length (*nōvi* ‘new’ [definite adjective] < \**nōvŷ* < Proto-Slavic \**nōvъjъ*), originally probably longer (superlong) than a regular, non-contractional length, and before a medial weak yer in resonant-first and *j*-second clusters (*pěrce* ‘little feather’ < Proto-Slavic \**pěrcе* and *grōbje* ‘graveyard’ < Proto-Slavic \**grōbъje*) (Kapović 2015: 380). Pronk (2016: 16–17), in considering the Kajkavian neoacute lengthening, looks only at Ivšić’s classical categories, thus missing the categories that Ivšić did not notice and important forms such as *kōcka* ‘dice’ < Proto-Slavic \**kōstъka* ‘little bone’. He is also forced to assume an unnecessary supposition that the accent in the short accentual paradigm *b* present forms like Kajkavian *nōsim*

flex also appears marginally in very limited separate categories<sup>17</sup> – morphological, not phonological-prosodic – in the North of the Čakavian territory (only in the types *gîneš* ‘you die’ < Proto-Slavic \*gŷnešь and *čistī* ‘clean’ < Proto-Slavic \*čistъь [definite adjective]<sup>18</sup>). The lengthened neoacute, which also only appears in specific morphological categories, appears outside of Kajkavian and Slovene as well – in the analogical types *neběsa* ‘sky’ [nominative plural] and *iměna* ‘names’<sup>19</sup> (in Čakavian possibly also in the type *gōli* ‘naked’ < Proto-Slavic \*gōlъь [definite adjective] but very marginally<sup>20</sup>) in the North of the Čakavian dialect and in the Old Štokavian dialects in Podravina and (Croatian) Baranja.<sup>21</sup> An important innovation – one that occurs in almost all Slovene dialects and some border Kajkavian and Čakavian dialects, is the progressive shift of the Slavic old circumflex, as in *oblāk* ‘cloud’ < Proto-Slavic \*ōbvolkъ (cf. *ōblak* with no shift in the

---

‘I carry’, *nōsiš* ‘you carry’, *nōsi* ‘carries’, etc. is analogical – supposedly to the now non-existent forms like \*nošŷ ‘I carry’ < Proto-Slavic \*nošŷ and imperative forms like *nošimo!* ‘let us carry’ < Proto-Slavic \*nošimo with the accent on the second syllable. This would be highly unlikely (the present forms with \*nōs- are too numerous) even if one could imagine a strange process of 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. \*\*nōsiš → \*nōsiš by analogy to the 1<sup>st</sup> sg. \*nošŷ (why would the supposed \*ō change to \*ō by analogy to an unaccented \*o?).

17 We do not include here the special and more widespread case of the genitive plural of the accentual paradigm *a* (cf. the specifics in Kapović 2015: 274–276).

18 Cf. the specifics with references in Kapović 2015: 289–292, 330–331.

19 The stress position is obviously secondary here, cf. Proto-Slavic \*nebesā (a. p. c) and \*ъмена (a. p. c – but cf. Dybo, Zamjatina & Nikolaev 1990: 31, 210 for a. p. *a* and remarks in Kapović 2011b: 137<sup>72</sup>) and Neo-Štokavian *neběsa*, *iměna*.

20 In Senj, this kind of accent could also be of later, analogical, origin, but this is unlikely in Križanić’s case (Kapović 2015: 388–389). However, Križanić’s dialect is right on the Čakavian-Kajkavian border (see the next footnote) so it is not a typical representative of a Čakavian dialect with certain Slovene-Kajkavian isoglosses.

21 Cf. Kapović 2015: 384, 389 for details and examples. An interesting case is the transitional seventeenth century Čakavian-Kajkavian dialect of Juraj Križanić (the most recent study of Križanić’s accentual system is Oslon 2009). He was originally from Obrh near Lipnik, right on the (traditionally supposed) Čakavian-Kajkavian border. Križanić’s dialect has the Kajkavian-style lengthened short neoacute in a number of positions, while the neocircumflex is completely missing except for in a few less than certain positions (cf. Kapović 2015: 378<sup>(1384)</sup> for details). On the other hand, in the nearby Kajkavian Prigorje dialects of the Ozalj region, the neocircumflex is found in all the usual Kajkavian categories (Težak 1981: 240–243). Težak 1996, unfortunately, does not provide a great deal of data on the neoacute lengthening, but mixes examples like *dōbri* < \*dōbri ‘good’ [definite adjective] and *věsla* < \*vēsla ‘oars’ with completely different examples such as *ūho* ‘ear’ (which is simply an old circumflex, changed in many Štokavian dialects to the more recent *ūho* by analogy with the gen. pl. *ūšijū* and dat/loc/instr. pl. *ūšima*, where the brevity is expected – cf. Kapović 2015: 471<sup>1701</sup>, 744<sup>2759</sup>) and *krāvji* ‘cow [adjective]’ (which is indeed the Kajkavian neocircumflex position, but this length is not necessarily of the neocircumflex origin in Križanić’s case and may be analogical).

majority of Kajkavian dialects).<sup>22</sup> An old phonological-prosodic innovation that would encompass Kajkavian together with Štokavian and Čakavian is the shortening of the old long circumflex, as in *mùško* ‘male’ < Proto-Slavic \*môžьsko,<sup>23</sup> but this change also occurs in the border Pannonian dialect of Slovene,<sup>24</sup> which did not participate in the later Slovene lengthening of all non-final syllables and in which the progressive shift of the old circumflex was only partial. In the rest of Slovene, it is impossible to say whether the asserted shortening had occurred at all, since all (short and long) circumflexes were shifted forward. Whether the progressive shift happened after or before the shortening, we cannot know, which means that this Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian common isogloss should be taken into account conditionally – the absence of the forward shift is a retention<sup>25</sup> and it is, as such, genetically much less valuable than innovations or even completely irrelevant.<sup>26</sup>

Kajkavian (with the exception of the Upper Sutlan/*gornjosutlanski* dialect) is connected to Western Štokavian and Čakavian by certain morphological accentual isoglosses (which are, it seems, not present in Slovene) – a non-phonological/non-prosodological “retraction”<sup>27</sup> of the accent in the infinitive (Kajk. *pěći* ‘to

22 Cf. the detailed discussion with references in Kapović 2015: 251–272.

23 Cf. Kapović 2015: 242–250. For the shortening of the old long circumflex in general cf. also Kapović 2011a.

24 Cf. Kapović 2015: 250–251.

25 The Kajkavian shortened circumflex in cases like *mlàdost* ‘youth’ is a retention in the sense that there was no progressive shift of the old circumflex here (as in the more innovative, mostly Slovene, dialects). The absence of this shift is what most of the Kajkavian dialects have in common with Čakavian/Štokavian (unlike most Slovene dialects), but the absence of the shift in all three may just be a coincidence. Of course, the shortening of the Proto-Slavic long circumflex in \*môldostь ‘youth’ is also an innovation taken by itself. It is not impossible that this shortening never occurred in Slovene and that the Slovene *mladôst* derives directly from the older \*mlàdost and not from a middle phase \*mlàdôst. However, if this is an innovation that has originally encompassed the whole of the present-day Slovene territory, then that tells us nothing of the connections of Kajkavian to Štokavian/Čakavian. In that case, it would just be another prosodic isogloss that encompasses Slovene just like Kajkavian, Štokavian and Čakavian – just like the common Western South Slavic changes in the types *bôg* ‘god’ < Proto-Slavic \*bôgь, *stô* ‘hundred’ < Proto-Slavic \*što, *kràva* ‘cow’ < Proto-Slavic \*kôrva (cf. the details in Kapović 2015: 216–217, 231–236, 621–627, 631–632).

26 As already mentioned, retentions can be independently preserved in dialects/languages (cf. e.g. Ringe & Eska 2013: 256). On the other hand, the chances of identical independent innovations in different dialects/languages are much slimmer. Of course, in the case of highly complex phonological-prosodic changes in a continuous territory, like the rise of the neocircumflex, independent innovations are not an option.

27 This means that the accent was not retracted because the accent was such and such (falling, rising, etc.), and the syllables/vowels were such and such (open/closed, short/long, etc.), as is the

bake', cf. Proto-Slavic \*pekti and Neo-Štokavian *pěći*) and the *l*-participle (Kajk. *pěkla* 'baked', *brāla* 'picked', *lovīla* 'caught', cf. Proto-Slavic \*peklā, \*bьralā, \*lovilā).<sup>28</sup> This tendency was the strongest and most consistent in Kajkavian, and one can perhaps assume that the tendency itself arose in Kajkavian territory and then spread to the East and South (to Western Štokavian and Čakavian), where it does not always encompass all (local) dialects and all categories.<sup>29</sup> The accent in the type *vōla* 'will' < Proto-Slavic \*vōla is often maintained as a unique Kajkavian development,<sup>30</sup> but it is just one very specific accentual type of not completely clear but likely analogical origin, also found in some Slovene dialects and forms, with a few exceptions in Kajkavian itself as well<sup>31</sup>.

## 4 Political borders and dialects

Although the present-day border of Croatia and Slovenia is for the most part very old,<sup>32</sup> dating from the ninth century,<sup>33</sup> it is interesting that there is no old phonological-prosodological accentual isoglosses that follow that border (though one has to take into account that there are not a lot of old phonological-prosodological accentual isoglosses in general) – the isogloss of the progressive shift of the old circumflex goes partly along the border,<sup>34</sup> but it is also found in the present-day

---

case in phonological-prosodological retractions like the Neo-Štokavian retraction or the Slovene accent retraction. Instead, the accent was "retracted" only in very specific morphological categories (infinitives, *l*-participles and present verbal adverbs in *-ći*), due to what was probably a morphological tendency (a kind of generalization) to restrict the end-stress in the mentioned categories.

**28** Cf. details with references and discussion in Kapović 2015: 633–638. Lončarić (1996: 42–43) also adduces the Kajkavian *trěsti* 'shake', *brāla* 'picked up [fem. sg.]', *orāla* 'plowed [fem. sg.]', *lovīla* 'caught [fem. sg.]' as a special type, but with no real contextualization and explanation (he does not even mention that the same accentual types in the *l*-participle also occur in Western Štokavian and Čakavian, but, when considering Standard Slovene *pěkla* < \*peklā 'baked' [fem. sg.], not in Slovene).

**29** The variable and inconsistent presence of this phenomenon (together with its probable non-phonological/non-prosodic nature) in Čakavian and Western Štokavian makes it a less reliable isogloss than the Slovene/Kajkavian neocircumflex, which is much more consistent and is a complex phonological/prosodic change.

**30** Ivšić 1936: 71; Lončarić 1996: 45.

**31** Kapović 2015: 396–397.

**32** With exceptions in the Bela krajina region and near the river Sutla, where the border shifted to the advantage of what is present-day Slovenia (HPA: 136–137).

**33** Cf. HPA: 117ff.

**34** Cf. the map in Kapović 2015: 624.



Croatian territory in the South-West (Istria, Gorski kotar) and the North-East (approximately north of Klanjec), while the territory where a partial progressive shift of the old circumflex occurred (i.e. a territory where the shift occurred but not in all conditions) encompasses the whole of the northern Kajkavian territory with the shift, as well as the Slovene Pannonian dialect.<sup>35</sup>

## 5 The nature of the isoglosses

Another noticeable phenomenon is that the isoglosses themselves (except those on the more recent dialect borders resulting from later migrations and where the old transitional dialects have disappeared) are actually “continuum-like”, i.e. they are weaker in the margins of the territory they encompass. Thus the progressive shift of the circumflex weakens in the South<sup>36</sup> and the East<sup>37</sup>, where it no longer occurs in all phonological-prosodic conditions as in the majority of Slovene dialects<sup>38</sup> (e.g. the circumflex shifts only to closed syllables and not to open ones<sup>39</sup>). On the other hand, the neocircumflex isogloss on the margins of its territory weakens in another way – when entering the North of Čakavian, it becomes a morphologically conditioned (and not phonologically-prosodologically<sup>40</sup>) isogloss that only encompasses certain morphological categories (the present tense of *e*-verbs and the definite form of adjectives in the old accentual paradigm *a*). These linguistic changes are interesting from a theoretical point of view as well – changes that start phonologically-prosodologically but then become limited to just certain morphological categories could be dubbed “cate-

---

**35** Cf. the map in Kapović 2015: 254.

**36** For the Čakavian dialect of Buzet cf. the short discussion in Kapović 2015: 252. However, more data is needed since in some forms with no progressive shift there is always the possibility that what is at hand is actually a generalization of the old prepositional accent (e.g. forms like \**měso* ‘meat’ can have the analogical accent of the original \**za\_měso* ‘for the meat’, which has the progressive shift from the original Proto-Slavic \**zâ męso*).

**37** Cf. Kapović 2015: 252–272.

**38** For a possible absence of the shift in the extreme West in Resia, see the references and examples in Kapović 2015: 83<sup>(219–221)</sup>. The weakening of innovations in marginal territories is usual in the process of the spread of linguistic changes – compare also the weakening of the Neo-Štokavian retraction in marginal dialects.

**39** Typologically, this can be compared to different complex retractions in Štokavian, which in Old Štokavian dialects can also depend on open/closed syllables, length, etc.

**40** I.e. it does not operate in specific, definable phonological-prosodic conditions (e.g. in all syllables with the old acute before a contractional length in the following syllable, etc.) but in morphologically defined conditions (e.g. in the present tense forms with the thematic vowel *-e-*).

gorial diffusion” (analogous to “lexical diffusion”<sup>41</sup>), the mechanism of which is not completely clear. Another example of the weakening of originally phonological-prosodological sound change into a categorial-morphological change can be seen in the short neoacute lengthening when crossing into Čakavian and Old Štokavian territory (see above).

In genetical terms, purely phonological-prosodological isoglosses (like the rise of the neocircumflex in the North-West area of South Slavic territory) would seem to carry more weight than categorially/morphologically weakened pseudo-phonological innovations (like the morphologically limited neocircumflex in the North of Čakavian), which appear on the margins of the territory where a certain phonological-prosodological change had spread. They would also carry more weight than purely morphologically motivated accentual innovations (such as the – locally often diverse and variable – innovative accent in infinitives and *l*-participles in Kajkavian, Čakavian and Western Štokavian<sup>42</sup>). The nature of the last change (the innovative accent of infinitives and *l*-participles) is most likely analogical,<sup>43</sup> unlike the second mentioned change (the North Čakavian neocircumflex), which at least has its origins in a purely phonological-prosodological change.

## 6 Unity and diversity

As can be seen, the only kind of unity concerning old prosodic changes exists in the (Slovene-Kajkavian) North-West.<sup>44</sup> However, while this territory is connected by the important phonological-prosodic isogloss of the neocircumflex (and also originally by the short neoacute lengthening), it is also divided by the progressive shift of the circumflex (which does not encompass, at least not in the same way, even the whole Slovene territory – the exceptions being the Pannonian dialect and perhaps Resia). Most of the Slovene dialects participate in this innovation (even if the change does not occur in all conditions), but only a minority of

<sup>41</sup> For the concept of “lexical diffusion” cf. Labov 1994: 421–544.

<sup>42</sup> This type of morphologically conditioned and limited accentual change, e.g. the innovative accent *rèkla* ‘she said’ instead of the older *reklà*, can more easily be considered a younger change spread by dialect contact (and not an actual internally driven phonological-prosodic change), while complex changes like the rise of the neocircumflex presume a common early innovation, driven by phonological and prosodic conditions – it is practically impossible for them to be just mechanically borrowed from a neighboring dialect.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. the details and discussion in Kapović 2015: 637–638.

<sup>44</sup> Kapović 2015: 65<sup>147</sup>, 633.

Kajkavian dialects do (just those on the border with Slovenia), and they never undergo the shift in all conditions<sup>45</sup> (as is the case in most Slovene dialects). On the other hand, Kajkavian, Western Štokavian and Čakavian are connected by the earlier mentioned morphological accentual tendency in infinitives and *l*-participles. Štokavian and Čakavian have no old prosodic isoglosses whatsoever in common, neither together nor internally. Furthermore, Čakavian is itself split from the beginning – in the North by the categorial neocircumflex and in the South by the *did* ('grandfather') type compensatory lengthening before voiced consonants (on the islands of Brač, Hvar, Vis, and probably Šolta originally as well) after the fall of weak yers (Proto-Slavic \*dědъ, cf. Neo-Štokavian *djèd* with no lengthening)<sup>46</sup>. In general, it is clear that the North-Western territory of South Slavic, with its rise of the neocircumflex and short neoacute lengthening (and with the progressive shift of the circumflex over a large part of the territory), is the most innovative.<sup>47</sup> Čakavian only exhibits the earlier mentioned local processes, while Štokavian has no innovations at all, except perhaps the pre-sonant lengthening, where it is unclear whether or not this is an old phenomenon, and which, in any case, also encompasses most of Čakavian and is very diverse locally.<sup>48</sup>

## 7 Dating the changes

As concerns the period when common Slovene-Kajkavian old innovations occurred (like the neocircumflex, \*kajъ 'what', \*ř > *rj*, etc.) it would be reasonable to assume that it was during a period of political unity of the present-day Slovene and Kajkavian territories. The neocircumflex in Slovene/Kajkavian, judging by the type *hrûška* 'pear' < Proto-Slavic \*krûšъka, originated in the period of weak yer loss.<sup>49</sup> In the old Slovene dialect of the Freising monuments, their loss was already in progress by the end of the tenth century.<sup>50</sup> The loss of the weak yers is usually dated to the eleventh century for the dialects based in Croatia.<sup>51</sup> Thus, if we date the origin of the Slovene/Kajkavian neocircumflex (and by analogy of the

45 Cf. the table in Kapović 2015: 271.

46 Cf. Kapović 2015: 624 for the map and 584–587 for the change.

47 This is valid when speaking of the South Slavic dialects that preserved pitch accent. The Macedonian-Bulgarian South-East of South Slavic, with its complete loss of tonal and quantitative distinctions, is certainly more innovative if one takes into consideration the whole of South Slavic.

48 Cf. the details and discussion with references in Kapović 2015: 554–583, 628–629.

49 Kapović 2015: 628, 630–631.

50 Greenberg 2000: 98–99, 2002: 111.

51 Jurišić 1992: 46; Malić 1997: 605; Mihaljević 2002: 209–210; Matasović 2008: 155.

short neoacute lengthening, considering the similarities of the two processes) to the tenth-eleventh century, that would place it in the period when the present-day Croatian-Slovene border (with minor differences) was already established as the border of East Francia (and of the later Holy Roman Empire) and Slavonia (a region that was first part of Croatia and then part of Hungary).<sup>52</sup> Therefore, it seems that linguistic contact between Slovene and Kajkavian territory was strong despite the already present political border – stronger than the contact of Kajkavian with Čakavian and Western Štokavian, with which Kajkavian shared a state. This is probably a consequence of the fact that Pannonia/Slavonia (i.e. its western, Kajkavian part) and Dalmatia (i.e. the southern part of Croatia) were unified as parts of a Croatian state only since the first half of the tenth century, having been separate before that.<sup>53</sup> It is possible that this kind of development is a consequence of the fact that it is only in the North-West of the Western South Slavic territory that this type of widely spread and largely uniform prosodic innovations occur – as already mentioned, there were no such innovations in the more conservative Čakavian/Štokavian central part of the Western South Slavic territory.<sup>54</sup> However, the closeness of Slovene and Kajkavian is nonetheless surprising, considering that the Kajkavian territory has long been separated from the Slovene territory (since as early as the ninth century<sup>55</sup>), while sharing a state with most of Western Štokavian and a large part of Čakavian territory almost continuously since the tenth century.<sup>56</sup> There is no doubt that the present-day perception of dialectal heterogeneity and of the South Slavic dialect continuum has been affected by the migrations which occurred after Ottoman invasions, which have

---

52 HPA: 124–131; Goldstein 2013: 81, 84.

53 HPA: 114–124. “Croatian society both in Pannonia and Dalmatia will not be strong enough to unite both regions for a long time. Only Croatian rulers in the second half of the eleventh century will succeed in that, which was, actually, the only period in the early medieval history of Croatia when it will significantly expand and stretch from the Adriatic Sea to the river Drava: this is a unification of two rather big regions that have, due to many centuries living separately, necessarily been politically and economically mostly independent.” (Goldstein 2013: 82 [my translation, M.K.]).

54 This is also slightly unusual since innovations usually appear in (more) central areas and not in the periphery. However, one must bear in mind that just one narrow aspect of linguistic changes (prosodic changes) is under discussion here. A wider review of the problem would also have to take into consideration all phonological, morphological, syntactical, lexical and other changes.

55 Cf. HPA: 118ff.

56 Compare here the unusual unity of the present-day Štokavian dialect group (though this unity was significantly built up by the migrations after the Ottoman invasions through linguistic convergence and innovations that went with these migrations), in spite of the fact that Štokavian territory has been – from the beginning – politically and (since the Schism of 1054 and the arrival of the Ottoman Empire) religiously divided and was never in the same state prior to 1918.

almost completely annihilated the old Kajkavian-West Štokavian and Kajkavian-Čakavian transitional dialects (the latter not completely), while the Kajkavian-Slovene border was mostly untouched. Still, the simple fact remains that Slovene and Kajkavian do share old phonological-prosodological innovations, which simply do not exist in the case of Kajkavian and Štokavian/Čakavian.<sup>57</sup>

## 8 Conclusion

The South Slavic continuum should be researched as a whole – there is no point in researching Kajkavian as if Slovene does not exist and vice-versa. Trying to define what “real” Kajkavian is also makes no sense, nor do attempts to strictly decide where the dialectal borders lie in conditions of the original dialect continuum. One has to be aware of the fact that dialectological units wider than local dialects are always, generally speaking, abstractions and simplifications of complex realities.<sup>58</sup> The political ideologies developed in the nineteenth century (nations and nation states), which have been a burden on historical and geographical linguistics from the very start, should not impact on research in historical linguistics – unfortunately, this is still not the case. An important task for South

---

57 Matasović (2008: 65), when discussing phonological and morphological innovations, correctly points out that there are no common “Central South Slavic” (i.e. Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian, i.e. what used to be called “Serbo-Croatian”) innovations, just as there were no common Čakavian ones. There are also no common Štokavian innovations, even at later dates, that would encompass all Štokavian and only Štokavian dialects (cf. the list in Lisac 2003: 17–18). For Kajkavian Matasović refers to “the characteristic accentual changes” in “the basic Kajkavian accentuation” (according to Ivšić and Lončarić), but, as is shown in this paper, no such unity and no Kajkavian-only accentual processes exist either. Matasović (2008: 65, 157–158) on the other hand claims that there indeed was a Proto-Western-South-Slavic language and even reconstructs its phonological system. But this system was certainly not homogenic in accentuation. At that time, when common Western South Slavic accentual isoglosses occurred (due to the fall of the weak yers) – namely the lengthening in the types *bōg* ‘god’ < Proto-Slavic \*bŏgъ and *stō* ‘hundred’ < Proto-Slavic \*sъto (Kapović 2015: 231–238, 625–627) – other processes occurred as well, as also discussed in this paper (cf. Kapović 2015: 628–631), that divide the Western South Slavic territory.

58 Cf. also Vermeer 1982: 280–289. Things are only slightly more complex in the case of the *zapadnogorski* (Western Gorski kotar) dialect (near to towns such as Delnice and Čabar), which is identified as Kajkavian due to its location and national self-identification of its speakers, although it would structurally and historically, due to a recent migration (Finka 1974: 32; Lončarić 1996: 54), rather be a Slovene dialect (i.e. a dialect that is in structural accord with the dialects we today call “Slovene” and which are mostly spoken in present-day Slovenia) – cf. also Kapović 2015: 45<sup>101</sup>.

Slavic dialectology would be to complete better and more precise research on the important isoglosses. As a good starting point, it would be important to establish:

- a) the precise territory and conditions of the progressive shift of the old circumflex in the Kajkavian, Čakavian North (primarily near to Buzet but elsewhere along the border as well) and the border Slovene dialects
- b) the precise territory and categories of the neocircumflex in the Čakavian North
- c) the precise territory and categories of the lengthened neoacute (of the Kajkavian type) in Western Štokavian (primarily Podravina and Baranja) and Čakavian North

Historical accentology has made significant advances in recent times. Now it is time for field dialectology to pick up pace in gathering data on the basis of the most recent accentological findings, which would then enable us to make even more precise historical and dialectological accentological analyses.

## References

- Bezljaj, France. 1976–2007. *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika* I-IV. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga – Založba ZRC.
- Dybo, V.A., G.I. Zamjatina & S.L. Nikolaev. 1990. *Osnovy slavjanskoj akcentologii*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo „Nauka“.
- Finka, Božidar. 1974. Gorskokotarska kajkavština u našem dijalekatskom mozaiku. In *Kajkavski zbornik*, Posebna edicija 'Dana kajkavske riječi'. 29–43.
- Goldstein, Ivo. 2013. *Hrvatska povijest*. Zagreb: Novi liber.
- Greenberg, Marc L. 2000. *A Historical Phonology of the Slovene Language*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter.
- HPA = Rogan, Krešimir (ed.). 2003. *Hrvatski povijesni atlas*. Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod "Miroslav Krleža".
- Ivić, Pavle. 1966. Fonološki aspekt genetičkog odnosa između štokavske, čakavske i kajkavske dijalekatske grupe. In *Orbis Scriptus*. Festschrift für Dmitrij Tschizewskij zum 70. Geburtstag, 375–383. München: Wilhelm Fink.
- Ivić, Pavle. 2001<sup>3</sup>. *Dijalektologija srpskohrvatskog jezika. Uvod u štokavsko narečje*. Sremski Karlovc i Novi Sad: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića.
- Ivšić, Stjepan. 1936. Jezik Hrvata kajkavaca. In *Ljetopis JAZU* 48. 47–88.
- Junković, Zvonimir. 1972. Jezik Antuna Vramca i podrijetlo kajkavskoga dijalekta. In *Dijakronijska rasprava. Rad JAZU*. 363.
- Jurišić, Blaž. 1992. *Nacrtr hrvatske slovnice. Glasovi i oblici u povijesnom razvoju*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Kapović, Mate. 2008. O naglasku u staroštokavskom slavonskom dijalektu. In *Croatica et Slavica Iadertina* IV. 115–147.

- Kapović, Mate. 2011a. The shortening of the Slavic long circumflex – one mora law in Croatian. In *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 57. 123–130.
- Kapović, Mate. 2011b. Naglasak imenica srednjeg roda u hrvatskom – povijesni razvoj. In *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 17. 109–146.
- Kapović, Mate. 2015. *Povijest hrvatske akcentuacije. Fonetika*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Kapović, Mate. 2017. The Proto-Indo-European Morphology. In Mate Kapović (ed.), *The Indo-European Languages*, 61–110. London & New York: Routledge.
- Kuzmić, Boris. 2016. Šezdeset i pet godina Katedre za dijalektologiju i povijest hrvatskog jezika na Sveučilištu u Zagrebu. In *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 20. 111–128.
- Labov, William. 1994. *Principles of Linguistic Change. Volume 1: Internal Factors*. Oxford & Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Lisac, Josip. 2003. *Hrvatska dijalektologija 1. Hrvatski dijalekti i govori štokavskog narječja i hrvatski govori torlačkog narječja*. Zagreb: Golden marketing – Tehnička knjiga.
- Lončarić, Mijo. 1996. *Kajkavsko narječje*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Malić, Dragica. 1972. Povijesne jezične promjene. In Eugeniya Barić, Mijo Lončarić, Dragica Malić, Slavko Pavešić, Mirko Peti, Vesna Zečević & Marija Znika, *Hrvatska gramatika*, 601–634. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Matasović, Ranko. 2008. *Poredbenopovijesna gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Mihaljević, Milan. 2002. *Slavenska poredbena gramatika. 1. dio: Uvod i fonologija*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Oslon, Mikhail Vladimirovič. 2009. *Akcentnaja sistema jazyka Jurija Križaniča*. PhD thesis. Moskva: Rossijskij gosudarstvennyj humanitarnyj universitet.
- Pronk, Tijmen. 2016. Early Slavic short and long o and e. In *Slavia Centralis* IX/1. 5–33.
- Ringe, Don & Joseph F. Eska. 2013. *Historical Linguistics. Toward a Twenty-First Century Reintegration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Snoj, Marko. 2003<sup>2</sup>. *Slovenski etimološki slovar*. Ljubljana: Modrijan.
- Šekli, Matej. 2013. Zemljepisnojezikoslovna členitev kajkavščine ter slovensko-kajkavska jezikovna meja. In *Slovenski jezik – Slovene Linguistic Studies* 9. 3–53.
- Težak, Stjepko. 1981. Ozaljski govor. In *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 5. 203–428.
- Težak, Stjepko. 1996. Naglasci Jurja Križanića i današnji naglasni odnosi na području Ribnika, Ozlja i Dubovca. In *Filologija* 26. 85–94.
- Vermeer, Willem. 1982. On the principal sources for the study of Čakavian dialects with neocircumflex in adjectives and e-presents. In *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 2. 279–340.