

NOTES ON THE HISTORICAL ACCENTUATION OF THE ČAKAVIAN DIALECT OF BLATO ON KORČULA: ACUTE POSTTONIC LENGTH, SLAVIC *ā*-STEM LOCATIVE PLURAL AND OTHER ISSUES

Mate Kapović

Introduction

This paper deals with certain aspects of accentuation of the Čakavian dialect of Blato on the island of Korčula from a historical and wider dialectological perspective. The material in the paper is based completely on a recently published dictionary – Milat Panža ([2014]) (for the overview of other descriptions of the Korčula dialects cf. the bibliography in Milat Panža ([2014]: 496-498). The author is a native speaker and not a professional linguist, but the dictionary is mostly reliable (the errors are usually not difficult to spot). In any case, the data in the dictionary show a few interesting archaic features and other points worth discussing.

Accentual system

The dialect of Blato has an archaic accentual system – both phonetically and paradigmatically – with no phonetic stress retractions (e.g. *voda* ‘water’) and with preserved pretonic (e.g. *rūka* ‘arm’) and posttonic length (e.g. *vāvik* ‘always’). Like some other South Čakavian (Brač, Hvar and Vis) and South Štokavian dialects (Konavle – south of Dubrovnik, Montenegro) it preserves, at least in some cases, the old acute posttonic length (e.g. *dīgnūt* ‘to rise’ compared to *dignūt* elsewhere), which we shall discuss later. Preresonant lengthening occurs under accent and posttonically (probably also pretonically in specific cases) – cf. *zelên* ‘green,’

zboǵōn ‘goodbye.’ The long syllabic *r* is shortened (*čr̄n* ‘black’). The long *ā* is closed and marked as such in the dictionary (we have omitted this in this paper).

Although posttonic length is preserved in most positions in the dialect, it does tend to shorten in some positions. It regularly shortens after the neoacute: *čārān* ‘I bewitch,’ *grādīn* ‘I build,’ etc. There are some exceptions (if these are not mistakes), cf. *cībněn* ‘I sneeze’ (perfective) but *cīhjēn* ‘I sneeze’ (imperfective). Definite adjectives seem to preserve length after the neoacute at all times, cf. *mlādī* ‘young.’ This is probably due to analogy to forms like *nōvī* ‘new.’ Posttonic length also disappears in auslaut when not following the stressed syllable immediately, cf. *dīlajū* ‘they hack’ but *čārājū* ‘they bewitch.’

Acute posttonic length

The acute posttonic length is the vowel length that in some cases appears after the stress (e.g. **čīstīti* ‘to clean’), but not in final open syllables (which is a special case), while having the old acute stress in others (e.g. **lovīti* ‘to hunt’). For the overview of the problem cf. Kapović 2015: 516-525. In many dialects, the acute posttonic length is generally not preserved – cf. literary Neo-Štokavian *čīstīti* (and expected *lōvīti*) or Czech *čistiti* (like the expected *loviti*). This is different from non-acute posttonic length, cf. Proto-Slavic gen^{sg} **mēsēca* ‘month’ > Neo-Štokavian *mješēca*, Czech *měsíce* (cf. Kapović 2015: 502-512 for details). However, certain Štokavian and Čakavian dialects do preserve at least some of those acute posttonic lengths and thus have forms like *čīstīt* (not *čīstīti*). The problem with such dialects, which preserve numerous cases of acute posttonic length, is that they often exhibit a wide range of secondary long posttonic vowels that must be analogical. Thus, in Montenegrin dialects we find secondary posttonic long vowels, structurally imitating originally posttonic acute long vowels, like *vēsēla* ‘happy’ (feminine), *nā mjēsto* ‘to the place,’ *ōlōvo* ‘lead,’ etc. (cf. Kapović 2015: 524 for more examples and references). The same thing is found in Selca, the only Čakavian dialect on the island of Brač that preserves posttonic length, cf. secondary forms like *jānāc* ‘lamb,’ *pūpāk* ‘bellybutton’ or *bōlēstan* ‘ill’ (Šprljan 2015: 58, 256). These secondary long vowels are unfortunate because they obfuscate original patterns

and developments, which makes historical analysis much more difficult. Luckily, there are some dialects that do not have such secondary long vowels but preserve original length (both acute and non-acute). The dialect of Blato is one such case. We shall now see what happens with acute posttonic length in Blato.

The old acute posttonic length is found in the following cases in the dialect of Blato:

1. in infinitives: *čistīt*, *dignūt* ‘to pick up,’ *glēdāt* ‘to watch’
2. in *l*-participles: *kūpīla* ‘she gathered,’ *primīstīli smo se* ‘we moved,’ *dignūla* ‘she picked up,’ *plākāla* ‘she cried’
3. in the adjectival *-ast* suffix: *lūdāst* – *lūdāsta* – *lūdāsto* ‘ill-advised, reckless,’ *stūpāst* ‘fibrous’
4. in the adjectival *-av* suffix: *kīlāv* – *kīlāva* – *kīlāvo* ‘bad, weak,’ *mūtāv* ‘hard of hearing’

Cf. literary Štokavian *čistīti*, *dignūla*, *lūdāst* ‘silly,’ *kīlāva* ‘incapable, slow,’ etc. There is no length in:

1. the nominal *-ica* suffix: *krāvica* ‘pinecone,’ *kūćica* ‘little house’ (cf. Kapović 2015: 523)
2. the nominal *-ina* suffix: *dr̥dina* ‘big/strong man,’ *dažjēvina* ‘rainy weather’
3. the secondary *-ama* nominal ending: dat^{pl} *košūjama* ‘to shirts’
4. the rare nominal *-ilo* suffix: *prūdilo* ‘branch with thorns used to dry fish’ (cf. Neo-Štokavian *vòzilo* ‘vehicle’ for **-ilo*)
5. the rare nominal *-uh* suffix: *spāzuh* ‘armpit’ (cf. *trbūh* ‘stomach’)

As is obvious from the data, the dialect of Blato had analogical levellings of brevity as well, albeit in less forms than most other Čakavian/Štokavian dialects. Unlike many other dialects that preserve instances of posttonic acute length, Blato did not experience a secondary spread of length, which makes its forms with the preserved acute length more reliable.

The length alternation in *(na)činīt* ‘to make’ – *načīnēn* ‘made’

The historical interchange of length, stress and paradigmatic shifts in the old a. p. *c* *i*-verbs is very complex in Čakavian and Štokavian (cf. Kapović 2011: 228-231, 2015: 476-488). The Blato dialect seems to have one remarkable archaism in the a. p. *c* verb *činīt* ‘to do, make.’ The verb *(na)činīt* has the usual a. p. C with the generalized short stem vowel in almost all forms: *načinīn* ‘I do’ – *načinīmō* ‘we do’ (the stress is not stem-fixed in verbs with prefixes) – *načinīla* ‘she did’ – *načinī!* ‘(you) do!’, etc. However, in the past passive participle the Blato dialect remarkably has length, cf. sg. *načīnēn* ‘done, made’ – *načīnēnā* (fem.) – *načīnēnō* (neut.) – pl. *načīnēni* (masc.) – *načīnēnē* (fem.) – *načīnēnā* (neut.). This length must be archaic, i.e. phonetically preserved, in the masc. sg. form *načīnēn* (cf. Kapović 2015: 442-454 for the preservation of pretonic length in this position), with the subsequent preresonant lengthening in the stressed syllable. The original length was then generalized in all forms of the past passive participle, like *načīnēnā*, etc. In other forms, as we have seen, we find the shortened stem – both in forms where that is expected (like *načinīn* – *načinīmō* – *načinīla*) and where it is not (in *načinī!*). The opposition of *načinīn* and *načīnēn* is what is fascinating in Blato and what points to an old pattern of short/long stem alternation, that subsequently disappeared almost everywhere. Other Čakavian (and Štokavian) dialects usually have the short vowel in all forms in this and similar verbs, cf. e.g. in Orbanići (Kalsbeek 1998) *činīt* – *činīn* but also *načīnīēn* (with a variant with secondary stress position: *načīnēn* – cf. Ivšić 1911: 165 for such variance in stress position in *en*-participles).

Accent in the locative plural of *ā*-stems (accentual paradigm C)

Classical modern accentology reconstructs **-āxǝ* (Stang 1957: 61-63, Дыбо 1981: 33, 38, 2000: 60) in the locative plural of the *ā*-stem a. p. *c*, which correlates to the *dat*^{pl} **-āmǝ* and *instr*^{pl} **-āmi* (Carlton 1991: 189, differing from the mainstream, reconstructs **-axǝ*, but also less convincing *dat*^{pl} **-amǝ* and highly unlikely *instr*^{pl} **-ami*). This is based on reflexes such as Slovene *gorāh* or Novi Vinodolski Čakavian (Белић 2000: 162) *gorāh* ‘on mountains.’ However, there are some data that do not fit into this picture – cf. Czech/Slovak *loc*^{pl} *-áčh* (that cannot stem from the

original old acute), e.g. *horách*, and in Čakavian remnant forms like *gorôh* in Dračevica on Brač (Hraste 1940: 43, Šimunović 2009: 40 – in both synchronic a. p. C and a. p. B), *rukôh* ‘in hands’ in Pitve/Zavala on Hvar (Barbić 2011: XXXIV, XXXVI), *nogâ* ‘on feet’ in Brinje in Lika (Šimunović 2011: 229). The Blato Čakavian dialect is one of those dialects that does not point to the old *-*ǣxъ* (the island of Korčula is geographically close to the islands of Brač and Hvar, though the accentuation of Korčula is rather different in some, even very old, respects from that of Brač/Hvar). In Blato, what one finds in the a. p. C loc^{pl} *ā*-stem forms is the neo-acute, cf. *gorāh*, *rukāh* ‘in hands,’ *nogāh* ‘on legs’ (Milat Panža [2014]: 15). Cf. also *vālāh* ‘in bays’ for feminine a. p. A and *stanēh* ‘in cottages,’ *gradovēh* ‘in townns,’ *jajēh* ‘in eggs’ for masculine/neuter (with a strange *-eh* instead of the expected *-*ih* from *-*ěxъ*).

So how to interpret the Czech/Slovak and Čakavian forms that would point to *-*ǣxъ* and not the usually reconstructed *-*ǣxъ* in loc^{pl}? The obvious parallel is Lithuanian loc^{pl} *-osė* (dialectal also *-āsū*) from the original *-*āsū*. Stang (1957: 62-63) supposes that Slavic *-*ǣxъ* is analogical to the original a. p. *b* accent (due to the rightward stress shift to the acute *-*ā*- in a. p. *b*) and that the original a. p. *c* form was *-*ǣxъ* < *-*axǫ* (due to the comparison with Lithuanian). However, he does not mention Czech/Slovak and Čakavian forms that may point to the supposed original *-*ǣxъ* (unlike Carlton 1991: 191 who mentions Czech/Slovak but not Čakavian).

There is one more case where the same variants in loc^{pl} can be found: in personal pronouns. In loc^{pl} (and gen^{pl}) Proto-Slavic **nāsъ*, **vāsъ* ‘on us’ is usually reconstructed (Дыбо 1981: 34-35, 2000: 62-63, Kapović 2006: 91). The reconstruction is based on Czech *nás*, *vás*, Slovene (and Kajkavian) *nās*, *vās*, and North Čakavian (Novi Vinodolski – Белић 2000: 167; Криквенца – Иванčić Duser & Bašić 2013: 25; Grobnik – Lukežić & Zubčić 2007: 39; Orbanići – Kalsbeek 1998: 162 for gen/acc^{pl}, etc.) *nās*, *vās* (in dialects with the neocircumflex in the present tense and definite adjectives). Such an accent, but for the gen/acc^{pl} form (see below) is found also in southern Štokavian (Dubrovnik and Old Štokavian Montenegro) – cf. Dubrovnik (Budmani 1883: 173, Rešetar 1900:

144) *nās, vās*, Ozrinići and Prčanj (Rešetar 1900: 144) *nās, vās*, Piperi (Стевановић 1940: 78) *nāc, vāc*, etc. – but cf. Piva and Drobñjak (Вуковић 1940: 265) in the Neo-Štokavian part of Montenegro with the usual Neo-Štokavian (see below) *òd nāc, òd vāc*. The forms *nās, vās* are also found in Molise Croatian in Italy (Rešetar 1911: 212). However, the classical reconstruction does not take into account the following data. First of all, Slovak also has *nās, vās*, which would, together with the Czech forms, point rather to **nās̄, *vās̄* with the neoacute (if the Slovak forms were not to be interpreted as some kind of Czech influence), presumably from the older **nas̄ō *vas̄ō* (as in the case of the nominal form above). Secondly, (Neo-)Štokavian regularly has (gen/acc^{pl}) *nās, vās*, with the reflex of the old acute seen only in possessive *nās̄* ‘ours,’ *vās̄* ‘yours.’ Neo-Štokavian *nās, vās* is most probably not a neocircumflex (as claimed by Stang 1957: 96 and Дыбо 1981: 35, 2000: 63) in the light of the Old Štokavian *nās, vās* (cf. in Posavina – Ivšić 1913/II: 35). More Southern Čakavian (cf. already Senj gen/acc^{pl} *nās, vās* – Moguš 1966: 78) has *nās, vās* as does Štokavian – cf. *nās, vās* in Blato as well (but only in gen/acc^{pl}; at present loc^{pl} has the old dual form *nāma, vāma* in Blato). As can be seen, there is an old synchretism of gen^{pl} and loc^{pl} here (in both *nas̄ō* and *vas̄ō*) due to historical development (Proto-Indo-European **-su* and **-sōm* both yield Slavic *-s̄ō*). Later the gen^{pl} form becomes also the acc^{pl} one in many dialects. The accentuation of the Čakavian/Štokavian gen^{pl}/acc^{pl} *nās, vās* seems to stem from the original loc^{pl} variant forms **nās̄ō, *vās̄ō* (cf. the Old Prussian gen^{pl} *noūson* ‘of us’ for the initial accent). The dialects with *nās, vās* have either the accent of the loc^{pl} variant **nās̄ō, *vās̄ō* or the accent of the gen^{pl} **nās̄ō, *vās̄ō* (with short **-ō*). Usually the same accent is generalized in *nīh/nīh* ‘them’ as well.

The traditionally reconstructed old acute in loc^{pl} **-āx̄ō* and loc^{pl} (and gen^{pl}) **nās̄ō, *vās̄ō* is in accordance with dat^{pl} **-ām̄ō* (though Czech/Slovak again have *-ām* here), **nām̄ō, *vām̄ō* (but Czech/Slovak have *nām, vām*) and instr^{pl} **-āmi, *nāmi, *vāmi*. The acute in **-āx̄ō, *nās̄ō, *vās̄ō* is based on the Proto-Indo-European forms with laryngeal/long vowel: **-eh₂su, *nōs-, *wōs-* (the last two plus secondary **-su*, cf. Kapović 2006: 130). Other stems and pronominal forms have no acute (i.e. no laryngeal/long vowel in Proto-Indo-European) and desinential stress, cf. *o*-stem **-*

ěxǔ, *i*-stem **-bxǔ*, *u*-stem **-ǔxǔ* and **těxǔ* ‘of those,’ **jixǔ* ‘of them’ (Дыбо 1981: 36, 2000: 62) and Proto-Indo-European **-oysu*, **-isu*, **-usu*, **toysu*, **eysu* (cf. e.g. Kapović 2017: 65, 67, 72, 74, 83, 86-87 for the Proto-Indo-European reconstructions). The obvious explanation for this kind of distribution would be Hirt’s law (cf. Дыбо 1981: 39), though not all is clear (Дыбо 2000: 64), which is not unusual for this law (cf. the overview of the issues and examples of analogical levellings concerning Hirt’s law in Kapović 2015: 176-193).

Since we are dealing with a rather wide range of reflexes pointing to neoacute variant forms (**-āxǔ*, **nāsǔ*, **vāsǔ*) besides the usually reconstructed acute ones (**-ǎxǔ*, **nǎsǔ*, **vǎsǔ*), it does not seem likely that the neoacute is the result of some very late or local innovation (cf. Kapović 2006: 58 for such an explanation when it comes to pronominal forms). However, though it is tempting to reconstruct the neoacute variants already for Proto-Slavic (whether they are indeed genetically related to Lithuanian or independent developments), their exact status is murky since a number of different scenario’s are possible: **-āxǔ* can be either the original form, later supplanted by **-ǎxǔ* due to analogy with dat^{pl} **-āmǔ* (and instr^{pl} **-āmi*), or it can be an old dialectal/variant innovation due to analogy with **-ěxǔ*, **-bxǔ*, **-ǎxǔ*. In any case, the data from Blato are a useful piece of the puzzle.

Preposition + pronominal clitics of the *za me* ‘for me’ type

The Blato prepositional pronominal forms *zā mě* ‘for me,’ *zā tě* ‘for you’ (Milat Panža [2014]: 26) are very interesting. They attest that the very south of Čakavian agrees with Neo-Štokavian in this regard – cf. Neo-Štokavian *zá me*, *zá te*. This kind of accentuation appears also in South-West Istrian Čakavian, a migrational dialect with influences of Štokavian – cf. there *zā me* < **zā mě* (Mandić 2009: 90). It seems that already a bit to the north of Korčula, on the island of Brač, there is the beginning of a large central Čakavian territory where we have forms with the neoacute (of unclear historical origin): Selca on Brač (Šprljan 2015: 261-263, Šimunović 2009: 853) *nā te* ‘on you,’ *ū se* ‘in ...self,’ Vrgada (Jurišić 1966: 85) *ū me* ‘into me,’ *z’ā se* ‘for ...self,’ Senj (Moguš 1966: 79) *pō me* ‘for me,’ *ū se*. In North Čakavian (the dialects with the neocircumflex in *e*-presents and definite

adjectives) we find the circumflex everywhere (which was not shortened – Kapović 2015: 241): Novi Vinodolski (Белић 2000: 167) *zâ me*, *zâ te*, Crikvenica (Ivančić Dusper & Bašić 2013: 110) *nâ me* ‘onto me,’ Orlec on Cres (Houtzagers 1985: 102) *zâ te*, *vâ me* ‘into me,’ Grobnik (Lukežić & Zubčić 2007: 583) *zâ se*, Orbanici (Kalsbeek 1998: 164, 322-323) *nâ me*, *nâ te*, etc. The North Čakavian accent agrees with Slovene (if literary Slovene *nâme* with no progressive circumflex shift is to be historically interpreted by analogy with the original **ni nâ me*), Kajkavian (cf. e.g. *zâ me* in Gornja Konjščina – Gudek 2013: 77-78) and the majority of Posavina Old Štokavian (Ivšić 1913/II: 36). Cf. the provisional table (the migrational and mixed dialect of South West Istria is left out):

dialect group	territory	accent	agrees with
far south of Čakavian	Korčula	<i>zā mě</i>	Neo-Štokavian
south and central Čakavian	from Brač to Senj	<i>zā me</i>	
North Čakavian (“neocircumflex Čakavian”)	north of the Lošinj-Novi Vinodolski line	<i>zâ me</i>	Slovene, Kajkavian, Posavina Štokavian

Other issues

Here, we shall take a look at some of the other accentual characteristics and aspects of Blato Čakavian.

Many Čakavian dialects have stem stress in pluralia tantum neuters like *vrāta* ‘door’ (or semi-pluralia tantum like *črīva* ‘intestines’), cf. Kapović 2015: 130-133. Blato, like Neo-Štokavian, does not – cf. *črīvā*, *vrātā*, *jūstā* ‘mouth,’ *klīščā* ‘pliers.’

In forms like *gūvno* ‘threshing floor,’ *proklēstvō* ‘imprecation,’ *badān* – gen^{sg} *bādna* ‘vat,’ *rūčāk* – gen^{sg} *rūška* ‘brunch,’ etc. Blato (Korčula) acts like Brač/Hvar/Vis and a few other Čakavian dialects (cf. Kapović 2015: 422-425) and generalizes the accent of the dominant root derivatives (Дыбо 1981: 146-147, Brozović & Ivić 1988: 18). There are a few exceptions with the *-ac* suffix:

gen^{sg} *těňcā* ‘werewolf,’ *horcā* ‘snout,’ *mrcā* ‘deadman’ (the usual type is *dolāc* – gen^{sg} *dōca* ‘valley,’ *kēňāc* – gen^{sg} *kēnca* ‘boor,’ *grotāc* – gen^{sg} *grōca* ‘wooden vessel,’ etc.).

In the genitive plural, we often find the Neo-Štokavian ending *-ā*, e.g. gen^{pl} *gōrā* ‘of mountains,’ *kōzā* ‘of goats,’ etc. The circumflex is probably due to a historically false contact interpretation of (Dubrovnik area) Neo-Štokavian *gōrā*, *kōzā* as Čakavian *ō-ā* and not *ō-ā* (as is the case, for instance, in Old Štokavian Posavina). This proves that this ending must be secondary in the dialect (cf. the original gen^{pl} *dasāk* ‘of boards’ together with younger *dasākā*). Cf. the preserved neoacute in cases like 3^{pl} *rěstū* ‘they grow’ (Milat Panža [2014]: 24-25).

As usual in Čakavian (cf. Kapović 2015: 588-593) the suffixes *-je* and *-stvo* are lengthened (with a circumflex when stressed in the South), cf. Blato *grōzjē* ‘grapes,’ *lozjē* ‘vineyard,’ *gospostvō* ‘lordliness,’ etc.

As usual in Čakavian (cf. Kapović 2015: 191-192) the suffix *-ić* can have the *-iĉ* and *-iĉ* (gen^{sg} *-iĉā*) variant. In Blato, there is no apparent trace of a pattern connected to the accentuation of the original noun (the meanings of the derivatives are usually metaphorical in the following examples), cf. *nožić* ‘a type of billhook,’ *soviĉ* ‘little owl’ and *golīĉ* ‘small bird without feathers,’ *popīĉ* ‘waterbug (oriental cockroach)’ from a dominant stem (a. p. *b*), and *golubiĉ* ‘garlic clove,’ *miĉić* ‘small bellows’ and *lozīĉ* ‘wren,’ *lukīĉ* ‘billhook’ from a recessive stem (a. p. *c*).

The nominal suffix *-ina* is short (cf. Kapović 2015: 185-186) as in neighbouring Brač, cf. *dajinā* ‘distance’. The adjectival *-in* (Kapović 2015: 186-188) is short, except when stressed, cf. *gūjīn* – *gujinā* – *gūjino* ‘snake’s,’ *gospinā trāvā* ‘common Saint John’s wort,’ *kūrbina* ‘whore’s,’ etc.

Unlike the Čakavian on Brač/Hvar/Vis, Korčula dialects (like the neighbouring Dubrovnik Štokavian area) preserve the old end stress in forms like *rěslā* ‘she grew,’ *ispeklā* ‘she baked,’ etc. (cf. the forms in Milat Panža [2014]: 24-25).

Like Neo-Štokavian, the dialect show a curious opposition of the regular 2^{sg} *hōćeš* ‘you will/want’ and an interrogative *hōćeš dōc?* ‘do you want to come?’ (Milat Panža [2014]: 28).

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

References

- Barbić, Ante 2011. *Rječnik Pitava i Zavale*. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje.
- Brozović, Dalibor & Ivić, Pavle 1988. *Jezik, srpskohrvatski/hrvatskosrpski, hrvatski ili srpski*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenski leksikografski zavod 'Miroslav Krleža.'
- Budmani, Pero 1883. Dubrovački dijalekt, kako se sada govori. *Rad JAZU* 65, 155-179.
- Carlton, Terence R. 1991. *Introduction to the phonological history of the Slavic languages*. Columbus OH: Slavica Publishers, Inc.
- Gudek, Vedrana. 2013. *Opis govora Gornje Konjščine*. Zagreb: University of Zagreb, BA-dissertation.
- Houtzagers, H. Peter 1985. *The čakavian dialect of Orlec on the island of Cres* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 5). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Hraste, Mate 1940. 'Čakavski dijalekat ostrva Brača.' *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* X, 1-66.
- Ivančić Dusper, Đurđica & Bašić, Martina 2013. *Rječnik crikveniškoga govora*. Crikvenica: Centar za kulturu Dr. Ivan Kostrenčić.
- Ivšić, Stjepan 1911. 'Prilog za slavenski akcentat.' *Rad JAZU* 187, 133-208.
- Ivšić, Stjepan 1913. 'Današnji posavski govor.' *Rad JAZU* 196 (I), 124-254; 197 (II), 9-138.
- Jurišić, Blaž 1966. *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade*. I dio, *Uvod*. Zagreb: JAZU.
- Kalsbeek, Janneke 1998. *The Čakavian Dialect of Orbanici near Žminj in Istria* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 25). Amsterdam – Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Kapović, Mate 2006. *Reconstruction of Balto-Slavic Personal Pronouns: with Emphasis on Accentuation*. Zadar: University of Zadar, PhD dissertation.
- Kapović, Mate 2011. 'The Accentuation of *i*-verbs in Croatian Dialects.' In: Tijmen Pronk & Rick Derksen (eds), *Accent matters: papers on Baltic and Slavic accentology* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 37). Amsterdam – New York: Rodopi, 109-233.
- Kapović, Mate 2015. *Povijest hrvatske akcentuacije: fonetika*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Kapović, Mate 2017. 'Proto-Indo-European Morphology.' In: Mate Kapović (ed.), *The Indo-European Languages*. London – New York: Routledge, 61-110.
- Lukežić, Iva & Zubčić, Sanja 2007. *Grobnički govor XX. stoljeća (gramatika i rječnik)*. Rijeka: Katedra Čakavskog sabora Grobnišćine.
- Mandić, David 2009. 'Akut u jugozapadnim istarskim govorima.' *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 15, 83-109.
- Milat Panža, Petar [2014]. *Rječnik govora Blata na Korčuli*. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje.
- Moгуš, Milan 1966. 'Današnji senjski govor.' *Senjski zbornik* 2, 5-152.
- Rešetar, Milan 1900. *Die serbokroatische Betonung südwestlicher Mundarten*. Wien: Alfred Hölder, K. u K. Hof- und Universitäts-Buchhandler.
- Rešetar, Milan 1911. *Die Serbokroatischen Kolonier Südditaliens*. Wien: Alfred Hölder.
- Stang, Christian S. 1957. *Slavonic accentuation*. Oslo: I kommisjon hos H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard).
- Šimunović, Petar 2009. *Rječnik bračkih čakavskih govora*. Zagreb: Golden marketing–Tehnička knjiga.
- Šimunović, Petar 2011. *Čakavska čitanka. Tekstovi – prikazbe – priručni rječnik – bibliografija*. Zagreb: Golden marketing–Tehnička knjiga.
- Šprljan, Nataša 2015. *Opis govora Selaca na Braču s posebnim naglaskom na akcentuaciju (u usporedbi s okolnim mjestima)*. Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet, PhD dissertation
- Белић, Александар 2000 (1909). 'Белешке о чакавским говорима.' *О дијалектима (Изабрана дела А. Белића* 10). Београд: Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства, 136-186.
- Вуковић, Јован Л. 1940. 'Акцентат говора Пиве и Дробњака.' *Српски дијалектолошки зборник* X, 185-417.

HISTORICAL ACCENTUATION OF THE ČAKAVIAN DIALECT OF BLATO

- Дыбо, Владимир А. 1981. *Славянская акцентология. Опыт реконструкции системы акцентных парадигм в праславянском*. Москва: Издательство 'Наука.'
- Дыбо, Владимир А. 2000. *Морфологизированные парадигматические акцентные системы. Типология и генезис*. Том I. Москва: Языки русской культуры.
- Стевановић, Михаило С. 1940. 'Систем акцентуације у пиперском говору.' *Српски дијалектолошки зборник X*, 67-184.