

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/355369593>

# A further look at the progressive acute-accent shift in the Tersko dialect of Slovene

Chapter · January 2020

CITATIONS

0

READS

12

1 author:



Janoš Ježovnik

Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts

19 PUBLICATIONS 29 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



The Franček Portal, the Language Counselling Service for Teachers of Slovenian, and the School Dictionary of Slovenian  
[View project](#)

SONDERDRUCK/OFFPRINT

*vácāṃsi miśrā kṛṇavāmahai*

Studien  
zur historisch-vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft

Herausgegeben von  
Harald Bichlmeier und Velizar Sadovski

Band 17

# *vácāṃsi miśrā kṛṇavāmahai*

Proceedings of the international conference  
of the Society for Indo-European Studies and IWoBA XII,  
Ljubljana 4–7 June 2019,  
celebrating one hundred years of Indo-European  
comparative linguistics at the University of Ljubljana

Akten der Arbeitstagung  
der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft und des IWoBA XII  
vom 4. bis 7. Juni 2019 in Ljubljana  
aus Anlass der Hundertjahrfeier der dortigen Indogermanistik

edited by  
Luka Repanšek, Harald Bichlmeier & Velizar Sadovski

baar  
Hamburg 2020

Baar-Verlag

Hamburg

URL: <http://baar-verlag.com>

E-Mail: [info@baar-verlag.com](mailto:info@baar-verlag.com)

*Bibliographische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek*

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliographie; detaillierte bibliographische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

© The authors, the editors and Baar-Verlag 2020

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Druck und Verarbeitung: SOWA, Piaseczno.

Umschlaggestaltung: Linda Sophie Gableske (5°sued), Dresden.

All rights reserved. This publication may not be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Printed and bound in Poland.

ISBN 978-3-935536-26-4

ISSN 2192-0133

# Contents

LUKA REPANŠEK – HARALD BICHLMEIER – VELIZAR SADOVSKI	
Vorwort der Herausgeber	9
VELIZAR SADOVSKI	
Opening address delivered at the plenary session of the <i>Ljubljana</i> conference	11
LUKA REPANŠEK	
Zur Geschichte des Lehrstuhls für vergleichende indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft an der Universität Ljubljana	15
I. Proceedings of the International conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies	23
ROBERTO BATISTI	
Some putative Greco-Armenian sound laws and the role of the accent	25
ANNA BAUER	
All, many, some and more: Non-Numerical quantification in Anatolian	49
HARALD BICHLMEIER	
Das Ghostword aksl. <i>seštъ/seštъ</i> ‘klug, weise’ – oder: der lange Schatten des Franz Xaver (Ritter von) Miklosich (Miklošič)	67
VÁCLAV BLAŽEK	
Latin <i>aqua</i> and its relatives	83
FILIP DE DECKER	
An overall analysis of the augment in epic Greek and applied to some longer passages	103
MICHAEL FROTSCHER / CORINNA SCHEUNGRABER	
From ditropic clitics to prefixation. On the historical development of Germanic preverbs * <i>ga-</i> , * <i>bi-</i> , Goth. <i>dis-</i> , OHG <i>zar-</i> and Goth. <i>du-</i> , OHG <i>za-</i>	127

## METKA FURLAN

- The origin of the Anatolian alternation *keššar* : *kiššeran*  
and the Balto-Slavic alternations of the type *akmuō/kamy* : *ākmenī/  
kamenb* revisited 143

## JOSÉ LUIS GARCÍA RAMÓN

- Anatolian and Greek infinitives: Continuity of Indo-European  
morphosyntax vs. areal development 163

## RICCARDO GINEVRA

- Gods who shine through the millennia: Old Norse *Baldr*,  
Celtic *Belinos*, Old Irish *Balar*, and PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>elH-* ‘be white, shine’ 189

## FEDERICO GIUSFREDI / VALERIO PISANIELLO

- Grammatical categories in contact: Gender assignment criteria  
in Hittite borrowings from the neighbouring languages 209

## BJARNE SIMMELKJÆR SANDGAARD HANSEN

- Minimum standards for acceptable sound laws.  
Some alleged root nouns in Proto-Norse 235

## EUGEN HILL / SIMON FRIES

- On personal endings of thematic verbs in Proto-Indo-European 255

## STEFAN HÖFLER

- Vedic *mahá-* ‘large’ and Lithuanian *māžas* ‘small’.  
The emphatic reading of possessive derivatives 285

## SAMPsa HOLOPAINEN

- Criticism of some Indo-Uralic sound-correspondences 293

## MATE KAPOVIĆ

- The genitive plural ending in Proto-Indo-European and Slavic 321

## NIKOLAI N. KAZANSKY

- Conglutinate suffixes in Indo-European languages  
and PIE reconstruction problems 347

## GÖTZ KEYDANA

- Accentual mobility in Vedic 355

## WERNER KNOBL

- Minimal change: New comments (2) and (3) on RV 10.129 367

## PETR KOCHAROV

- The etymology of Arm. *amp* ‘cloud’ 385

DANIEL KÖLLIGAN	
Seething anger: Latin <i>furor</i>	399
KONSTANTIN G. KRASUKHIN	
Accent-ablaut paradigms vs. the ablaut-accent paradigm	415
ROSEMARIE LÜHR	
Raumkognition auf dem ehemaligen Gebiet der „Alteuropäischen Hydronymie“	433
MAREK MAJER	
The Indo-European prehistory of the Albanian word for ‘sister’	455
LAURA MASSETTI	
‘The light of truth, the wage of rightness, the remedy of excellence.’ On three inherited collocations of Greek ἀρετή, Vedic <i>ṛtá-</i> , Avestan <i>aša-</i>	467
WOLFGANG MEID	
How not to interpret Old Irish texts. <i>Táin Bó Cúailnge</i> . The final verbal exchange between Medb and Fergus	481
STELLA MERLIN	
“Pre-Greek” between theories and linguistic data. Examples from the Anatolian area	487
ALJOŠA MILENKOVIĆ	
Between semantics and phonological theories. The origin of PSl. <i>*jǐstb</i> ‘that, the same’	507
BIRGIT ANETTE OLSEN	
Insiders and outsiders. The etymology of Slavic <i>*vъnukъ</i> ‘grandson’	527
GEORGES-JEAN PINAULT	
Going home in Proto-Indo-European	539
VELIZAR SADOVSKI	
Indo-Iranian <i>*HamHa-</i> and the fighter’s ‘ <i>Sturm und Drang</i> ’, in compound epithets, personal names, and poetical phraseology from the Veda, Avesta and Ancient Persia (Ritual Formulae and Ritual Pragmatics in the Veda and Avesta, IV)	557
ANDREA SANTAMARIA	
The Greek evidence for an alleged PIE <i>*√sekh₂-</i>	581



ANDREY SHATSKOV	
Mixture of <i>hi-</i> and <i>mi-</i> conjugation forms in Hittite	599
ZSOLT SIMON	
Die luwischen Wörter für ‚Dolmetscher‘. Stammbildung und Etymologie	607
MARKO SNOJ	
<i>Morem, moram, maram</i> – A flash of insight into the Slovenian national character	617
TOBIAS MOSBÆK SØBORG	
Sieving the sources of <i>s</i> -extended verbs in Hittite	621
MIGUEL VILLANUEVA SVENSSON	
Osthoff’s Law in Balto-Slavic	645
II. Proceedings of the International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology (IWoba) XII	663
JANOŠ JEŽOVNIK	
A further look at the progressive acute-accent shift in the <i>Tersko</i> dialect of Slovene	665
MATE KAPOVIĆ	
Accentual paradigm D on Susak: New data	679
VYTAUTAS RINKEVIČIUS	
Prosodic marks in the Old Prussian <i>Enchiridion</i> revisited	707
Contributor contact information	725

# A FURTHER LOOK AT THE PROGRESSIVE ACUTE-ACCENT SHIFT IN THE *TERSKO* DIALECT OF SLOVENE

Janoš Ježovnik, Ljubljana

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

*Tersko*<sup>2</sup> is an endangered dialect of the Slovene language spoken by an aging population in western parts of the mountainous Slovenian-Italian border region of *Beneška Slovenija/Slavia Veneta* (locally also referred to as *Benečija* in some areas) in the Autonomous Region of Friuli – Venezia Giulia in the north of the Republic of Italy.<sup>3</sup> *Tersko*, the westernmost dialect of Slovene, synchronically forms part of the *Primorska (Littoral)* dialect group and diachronically belongs to the *Beneško-Kraška* dialect base (Rigler, 1963).

## 2 Existing research

Šekli (2006) and Zuljan Kumar (2010; 2018), analysing the *Tersko* local variety of Subid/Subit, report a peculiar state of affairs in regard to acute-stressed syllables: in cases where an acute accent on (at least) the penultimate syllable is expected, one instead finds stress on the following syllable, e.g. *ju'žanca*, *pra'vāca*, *kra'vāca*, *ža'lostan*, *du'hatə* [sic], *spra'vətə*, *vi'dətə*, *vie'dətə* (Zuljan Kumar 2018: 42), and

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper was financed within the research programme P5–0408 and is based on research results obtained within the research programme P6–0038. Both research programmes are financed by the Slovenian Research Agency.

<sup>2</sup> Note the following abbreviations and conventions used throughout the paper: CSln. = Common Slovene; Dial. Sln. = Dialectal Slovene (pertaining to the *Tersko* dialect); *l*-ptc. = past active participle, *l*-participle;  $\check{V}$  = PSln. “old” acute;  $\hat{V}$  = PSln. long neoacute / CSln. long acute / Dial. Sln. acute tone;  $\breve{V}$  = PSln. short neoacute / CSln. short acute / Dial. Sln. circumflex tone;  $\tilde{V}$  = PSln. long circumflex / CSln. circumflex;  $\tilde{\breve{V}}$  = PSln. short circumflex;  $\tilde{V}$  = CSln. neocircumflex;  $\acute{V}$  = CSln. “young” acute.

<sup>3</sup> According to the view traditionally held in Slovenian dialectology, a few local varieties spoken in the town of Breginj and its surroundings in the Republic of Slovenia (historically closely tied with Beneška Slovenija) are considered part of *Tersko* as well.

*vi'datə/vi'da:tə, zɪ:mà/zi:'ma* (Šekli, 2006: 168f.), instead of the expected *\*jú:žəncə, \*prá:vəca, \*krá:vəca, \*žá:lostan, \*dú:xatə, \*sprá:vətə, \*ví:datə, \*viédətə*, and *\*vi:datə, \*zɪ:ma*, respectively. Šekli (2006: 173) also notes that the reflex of the latter *zɪ:mà/zi:'ma* (< PSln. *\*zimà* (a.p. c)) differs from the reflex of *ní:ya* (< PSln. *\*níva* (a.p. a)), where original stress placement is retained. He regards the synchronic state as the result of two possibly connected advancements: 1) a progressive shift of the PSln. “old” acute from (at least) the antepenultimate syllable, and 2) a progressive shift of the CSln. “young” acute<sup>4</sup> from the penultimate syllable (ibid.). While there can be little doubt of the first proposed accent shift, Kapović (2015: 84) considers the type *zi:'ma* an archaism, which reflects the supposed absence of the regressive accent shift from the final short syllables onto the pretonal long ones.

### 3 Introductory remarks on prosodic features of *Tersko*

Local varieties which, according to the established view, belong to the *Tersko* dialect, as a rule retain CSln. end-stress before historically short syllables<sup>5</sup> (e.g. in the local variety of Ter: *ze'ha*, G.sg. *ko'ha*, *če'lo*, N.sg. fem., neut. *do'ra do'ro*, inf *re'ci*) unless affected by analogy, e.g. *nó:a* (following A.sg. *nó:u*, N.pl. *nó:e*, etc., where stress placement is the result of circumflex retraction).<sup>6</sup>

The whole of *Tersko* underwent the so-called *brata*-lengthening early (by the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> century at the latest, cf. Ramovš 1950: 18–19), which is most evident from the merging of reflexes of CSln. long stressed *\*ě* and CSln. short (acute) (< PSln. “old” acute and short neoacute) *\*ě*: CSln. *\*besěda, \*oběla* ≠ *\*rěpa, \*strěxa* > Dial. Sln. (Ter) *bešěda, obiěla* = *riěpa, striěxa*.

Šekli (2018: 327) lists circumflex retraction and acute advancement as two of the dialectal features that delimit *Tersko* from the adjacent *Nadiško* dialect. This was found to be inaccurate, owing mostly to the lack of dialectal data available at the time of his writing: while in most of the surveyed local varieties circumflex retraction from final syllables has indeed occurred (but not from non-final syllables, e.g. Dial. Sln. (Ter) *orkùøta, dabrùøta, šlepùøta*; N.sg. neut. *nebè:šno*; l-ptc. sg. neut. *drobi:lo, šusi:lo, ubi:lo, uci:lo, žvoni:lo*), the easternmost local varieties of Prosnid/Prossenico, Mažerole/Masarolis, Breginj, and Robidišče

<sup>4</sup> The term “young” acute in this paper denotes the acute-tone prosodeme that arose as the result of the CSln. regressive accent shift from final short syllables onto pretonic long syllables of the type PSln. *\*mòkà* (a.p. b), *\*golvá* (a.p. c) > CSln. *\*mòka, \*gláva*.

<sup>5</sup> Most notably pretonic syllables with reflexes of CSln. *\*e, \*o*, and *\*a*, but also those with reflexes of PSln. long vowels which underwent regular shortening, e.g. PSln. *\*jězykъ* > *\*jězykъ* > CSln. *\*jězik* > Ter. *j'zik* (cf. also Std. Sln. *jězik* and not *\*jězik*, exhibiting a formerly short pre-tonic vowel).

<sup>6</sup> Some non-crucial phonetic features have been omitted in the transcription of dialect data, e.g. the marking of retracted sibilants in the local variety of Prosnid (*č, š, ž, ě, ž, ž*).

do not exhibit the retraction (the local variety of Čanebola has both examples with circumflex retraction and, to a lesser degree, those without, indicating that the change might still be underway, e.g. A.sg. *brá:do*, *lá:yo*, *pá:to*, *rá:ko* but *ɣadòr*; G.sg. *lá:sa*, *liěsa*, *zá:ba* but *možà*; *má:so*, *sá:no* but *blayùo*, and G.sg. *sá:na* as well as *senà*).

#### 4 Acute advancement in *Tersko*

Acute advancement was found to have occurred only in the local varieties of Porčinj/Porzus, Prosnid/Prossenico, and Subid/Subit, while it is apparently absent in the rest, which limits it to a considerably smaller area within the dialect than previously thought.<sup>7</sup>

For the purposes of analysis we assume *a priori*, basing our assumptions on the findings of Šekli (2006: 173), that the reflexes of the CSln. long acute and the (lengthened) short acute differ from the reflexes of the CSln. “young” acute<sup>4</sup> in penultimate syllables (although such an assumption is not at all unproblematic – cf. 4.3). To emphasize the differentiation, from this point on in the paper this hypothetical prosodeme is denoted as \* $\acute{V}$ : and not as \* $\acute{V}$  as per tradition. The chosen notation explicitly denotes length and stress, but it is also safe to say that it must have had a rising tone.

Out of 4 informants – one speaker of the local variety of Porčinj and 3 speakers of the local variety of Prosnid – only the eldest informant from Prosnid, a woman over 90 years old, pronounced (originally stressed) pretonic vowels as phonetically long, and even then her pronunciation was inconsistent.<sup>8</sup> All such pretonic vowels are therefore marked as short for consistency; but it goes to show that originally pretonic vowels must have been long following acute advancement.

##### 4.1 Acute advancement from antepenultimate syllables

While the CSln. long acute and the CSln. short acute retain their original positions in penultimate syllables, they shift in antepenultimate syllables:

	Penultimate syllables	Antepenultimate syllables
<i>a</i> -decl.	<b>Po</b> krá:ua, lí:pa, ní:ua    kó:ša, kó:ža, sté:ja, tá:šča    ó:šča, <sup>9</sup> žé:ja <b>Pr</b> krá:ua, lí:pa, ní:ua    kǒóša, kǒóža, sté:ja, tá:šča    ɣǒóšča, žé:ja	<b>Po</b> ju'žəna, pá:lca <b>Pr</b> ja'ɣotca, ju'žəna, <u>krá:fca</u> , ku'xəna, pá:lca, pra'vəca

<sup>7</sup> Possibly also in the local variety of the small village of Malina/Forame in close vicinity to the other three villages, which does not differ from the local variety of Porčinj according to an informant from that village. Acute advancement has thus taken place only in the local varieties of 3, possibly 4 villages in the eastern part of the dialect.

<sup>8</sup> The exception being pretonic diphthongs *iě* and (in the lone case of *nuǒš*, G.sg. *nuǒžə*) *uǒ* which are consistently phonetically longer than the monophthongs.

<sup>9</sup> < CSln. (=PSl.) \**ǵóšča*.

	Penultimate syllables	Antepenultimate syllables
masc. o-decl.	<b>Po</b> já:uər, ká:man    (G.sg.) brá:tra, kú:pa, Lá:xá, siéra, zě:tě (!)    (G.sg.) boží:ča, izi:ka, peteli:na, šlovička    (G.sg.) pató:ka <b>Pr</b> ýá:ber, já:uer, ká:men    (G.sg.) brá:tra, ká:šja, kú:pa, si'éra    (G.sg.) boží:ča, človička, ježí:ka, peteli:na    (G.sg.) petqóka, prestqóra	<b>Po</b> (G.sg.) ja'uorja; N.pl. ka'meně  <b>Pr</b> (G.sg.) ya'berja, ja'uerja, ka'mena
neut. o-decl.	<b>Po</b> árlo, liěto    cedi:lo, koliěno, želiězo    feminized bé:dra (← pl. *bèdra), ré:bra (← pl. *rèbra) <sup>10</sup> <b>Pr</b> li'ěto, sí:to    cedi:lo, želi:ězo <sup>11</sup>    feminized rěbra	<b>Po</b> ja'buko, zviě'ralo  <b>Pr</b> <u>si:ěršče</u>
i-decl.	<b>Po</b> lá:kot, pá:met, stá:rost, trá:pot <b>Pr</b> pá:met, stá:rost, žá:lost	<b>Po</b> la'kotě, pa'metě, tra'pote <b>Pr</b> pa'met, ža'lost
praes. (I)	<b>Po</b> mó:re, otpě:ne, začě:ne <b>Pr</b> mlě:je, užá:meš, žá:ňe, uótpěneš, zá:čne	<b>Po</b> mo'reta, otp'e'neta, zač'e'neta <b>Pr</b> mle'jemo, uža'mete, ža'ňete, uótp'e'nete, zač'nemo
praes. (II)	<b>Po</b> potě:ne, otklě:ne, uorne <b>Pr</b> potěýne, uó:rne, uóklěne	<b>Po</b> otkle'neta, uor'neta <b>Pr</b> poteý'nete, uór'nemo, uókle'nete
praes. (IV)	<b>Po</b> xúá:lě, kú:pě, nó:sě, (se) žě:ně; (anal.) sú:šě, ú:čě <b>Pr</b> xúá:l, kú:p, noós, uóžěén	<b>Po</b> xua'lěmo, ku'pěte, no'sěmo, (se) že'neta; (anal.) u'čěmo, su'šěmo <b>Pr</b> <u>xuá:lte</u> , kú:pmo, <u>noósmo</u> , uóže'note
praes. (V)	<b>Po</b> miěša, um'i:uan, plě:še <b>Pr</b> pomi'ěše, umi:ue, čěse, lá:že, pleěše, pi:še	<b>Po</b> miě'sata, um'i'uamo, ple'seta <b>Pr</b> pomiě'semo, umi'ujete, če'sete, la'žemo, ple'sete, pi'sete

Table 1

As shown by some of the forms listed in the third column (underlined), the dropping of word-medial *\*i* blocks the shift – this occurs sporadically in both local varieties, more frequently so in the local variety of Prosnid: **Po** & **Pr** *pá:lca*, **Pr** *krá:fca*, *si:ěršče*, *xuá:lte*, *kú:pmo*, *noósmo* (cf. **Ter** *pá:lřca*, *krá:viča*, *šięřišče*, *xvá:lřta*, *kú:přmo*, *nó:šřmo*). The shift is however not blocked by the dropping of word-final *\*i* (which typically occurs in the local variety of Prosnid but more rarely in that of Porčinj), as best exemplified by the distinction (**Pr**) N.sg. *pá:met*, *žá:lost* : G.sg. *pa'met*, *ža'lost* (cf. **Ter** G.sg. *pá:metř*, *žá:loštř*) as well as infinitive forms of a.p. *a* verbs, e.g. (**Pr**) *uzdiý'nět*, *zmərž'nět*; *vi'det*, *viě'det*; *miě'ršt*, *pra'vřt*; *diě'let*, *yle'det*; *uódrě'zet*, *klř'cet* (cf. **Ter** *uždi:nřtř*, *žmá:rzniti*; *viědatř*; *miěřtř*, *prá:vřtř*; *diělatř*, *lě:datř*; *riěžatř*, *klř:čatř*).

<sup>10</sup> The accent of the listed feminized examples is assumed to have originated from plural forms as singular forms would have been end-stressed, as exemplified by the cases of non-feminized (Po, Pr) *če'lo*, (Ter) *če'lo* (< \*čelò) 'forehead' and of the feminized (Pr) *ved'ra* (< sg. \*bedrò).

<sup>11</sup> Beside the feminized doublet *želi:ěza*.

While there are no recorded examples of the CSln. circumflex in this position,<sup>12</sup> the CSln. neocircumflex does not shift from antepenultimate syllables. This is most evident from minimal pairs distinguishing different morphological categories of original a.p. *a* lexemes, such as the accusative and instrumental singular forms of *a*-declension nouns (e.g. (Po) A.sg. *ju'ženu* : I.sg. *jù:ženu*, (Pr) A.sg. *ju'žəno* : I.sg. *jù:žəno*)<sup>13</sup> or the infinitive and supine forms of class V verbs (e.g. (Pr) inf. *diē'let*, *γle'det*, *kli'cet*, *ku'xet* : sup. *dì:ēlet*, *γlèdet*, *kli:cet*, *kù:xet*).

A similar antepenultimate acute shift is attested in some Carinthian (*Koroško*) dialects of Slovene (cf. Šekli 2018: 314), where it is presumably connected to *brata*-lengthening having occurred later in antepenultimate syllables than in penultimate syllables or, in some areas, not at all (Rigler 1977). Thus, the reason for the mentioned shift in Carinthian dialects is the brevity of antepenultimate syllables. This cannot be said of the antepenultimate shift in *Tersko*, as the quality of originally stressed syllables is proof of their original length. Originally stressed syllables differ from originally unstressed ones by:

- absence of reduction: \**i*, \**u* > (originally stressed) (Po, Pr) *i*, *u* : (originally unstressed) (Po) *ε*, *u*; (Pr) *ə*, *ə*,
- absence of colouring: \**a* > (originally stressed) (Pr) *a* : (originally unstressed) *e*,
- diphthongal reflexes: \**ě* > (originally stressed) (Po, Pr) *iε* : (originally unstressed) (Po, Pr) *e*.

The reflexes of originally stressed vowels are thus the same as the reflexes of long (and historically lengthened) vowels that retain their stress, but different from originally unstressed ones.

## 4.2 Acute advancement from penultimate syllables

The reflex of the CSln. short acute (the merged reflex of the PSln. “old” acute and the PSln. short neoacute) does not, per rule, shift from the penultimate syllable, while the reflex of the CSln. “young” acute seems to do so.

<sup>12</sup> A CSln. circumflex on the antepenultima would only occur in the case of PSln. quadrisyllabic or longer forms with word-initial PSln. circumflex which were relatively rare.

<sup>13</sup> The case of CSln. \**jāgodica*, a common lexeme throughout the dialect denoting ‘strawberry’, is peculiar in this aspect: while in the local variety of Prosnid we find a shifted acute in all forms (i. e. not only in forms with an original acute – e.g. N.sg. *ja'gotca*, A.sg. *ja'gotco*, N.pl. *ja'gotce* –, but also in forms with an original (if analogical) neocircumflex, e.g. I.sg. *ja'gotco* and G.pl. *ja'goc*; the state can be attributed to accentual levelling), most other research points exhibit secondary reflexes in all forms with a circumflex \**o* and various degrees of lexical change; judging by the quality of the stressed vowels, this state is more recent rather than older, e.g. (Porčinj) N.sg. *jò:dēca*, (Ter & Zavarh) *ajò:djca*, (Plešišča) *jaγò:dēca*, (Tipana) *jeγò:djca*, (Viškorša) *jaōdēca* (last example attested in Logar 1965), etc. The expected reflex is attested only in Čanebola (N.sg. *ja:γatca*, I.sg. *ja:γatco*). In Mažerole, the lexeme, a continuant of CSln. \**jāgoda*, also exhibits this peculiar accent (N.sg. *jaγò:da*, I.sg. *jaγò:do*), while in Breginj and Robidišče we again find the expected result of this CSln. lexeme [(Breginj) N.sg. *jā:yoda* (also attested in Logar 1951a, as *jaγxoda*), I.sg. *ja:γodo*; (Robidišče) *jaγoda* (Logar 1951b)].

	“Old” acute or neoacute in penultimate syllables (a. p. <i>a</i> )	“Young” acute in penultimate syllables (a. p. <i>b</i> and <i>c</i> )
<i>a</i> -decl.	(cf. Table 1)	<b>Po</b> (N.sg., A.sg.) mo'ka mo'ku, tra'ua tra'uu, zviězda zviězdu (a. p. <i>b</i> )    bra'da bra'du, la'ua la'uu, pě:ta pě:tu, rō:ka rō:ku, zi'ma zi'mu (a. p. <i>c</i> ) <b>Pr</b> (N.sg., A.sg.) mo'ka mo'ko, tra'ua trauōo, zviěz'da zviězdōo (a. p. <i>b</i> )    bra'da bradōo, ɣla'ua ɣlauōo, pe'ta petōo, ro'ka rokōo, zi'ma zimōo (a. p. <i>c</i> )
masc. <i>o</i> -decl.	(cf. Table 1)	<b>Po</b> (G.sg.) xliě'ua, kju'ča, klabu'ka, kokošar'ja, kua'ča, kri'za, nuo'za, rie'xa, šu'sa (a. p. <i>b</i> ) <b>Pr</b> (G.sg.) ɣrie'xa, xliě'ua, kekošar'ja, kju'ča, klebu'ka, kri'za, kua'ča, nuo'za, su'sa (a. p. <i>b</i> )
neut. <i>o</i> -decl.	(cf. Table 1)	<b>Po</b> niez'do, mliě'ko, vi'no (a. p. <i>b</i> ) <b>Pr</b> ɣniez'do, <sup>14</sup> mliě'ko, vi'no (a. p. <i>b</i> )
adj. <sup>15</sup>	<b>Po</b> (N.sg. fem., neut.) boá:ta (N.pl. masc.) boá:te, dú:a dú:o, <u>mərz'la</u> , mərzlo, pijá:na pijá:no, <u>ru'sa</u> ru:so, si:ta si:to, <u>slà'ba</u> slá:bo, <u>stà'ra</u> stá:ro, <u>veli'ka</u> veli:ko <b>Pr</b> (N.sg. fem., neut.) boyà:ta boyá:to, dú:ɣa dú:ɣo, mərzla mərzlo, pjá:na (N.pl. masc.) pján, rú:sa rú:so, si:ta si:to, slà:ba slá:bo, stà:ra stá:ro, veli:ka veli:ko	<b>Po</b> (N.sg. fem., neut.) biě'la <u>biělo</u> , čər'na čər'no (a. p. <i>b</i> )    ɣər'da ɣərdo, ju'xa jú:xo, liě'pa liěpo, lo'ba lō:bo, mla'da mlá:do, su'xa sú:xo, tər'da tərdo (a. p. <i>c</i> ) <b>Pr</b> (N.sg. fem., neut.) biě'la biě'lo; čər'na čər'no (a. p. <i>b</i> )    ɣər'da ɣərdù:ɔ, ɣju'xa ɣjuxù:ɔ, liě'pa liěpù:ɔ, mla'da mladù:ɔ, su'xa suxù:ɔ, tər'da tərdù:ɔ (a. p. <i>c</i> )

Table 2

The acute advancement is best exemplified by a.p. *b* masc. and neut. nouns of the *o*-declension, although the latter ones are rare as the category is in decline. Especially in the local variety of Porčinj the situation is a bit more blurred by levelling and analogies in other paradigms, as discussed below.

As in the case of acute advancement from antepenultimate syllables, the reflexes of originally stressed vowels are the same as the reflexes of long (and historically lengthened) vowels that retain their stress, but different than originally unstressed ones, implying original length.

#### 4.2.1 Accentual levelling in the *a*-declension

The majority of original *a*-declension nouns belonging to a.p. *b* had passed into a.p. *c* in Slovene. This is evident already from the listed examples of such nouns in the local variety of Prosnid, where only the lexeme *mo'ka* shows signs of its original paradigm. Šekli (2007: 136, 138) provides a similar account for the adjacent *Nadiško* dialect. More end-stressed nouns are attested in the local variety

<sup>14</sup> Also feminized *ɣniez'da*, A.sg. *ɣniezdōo*.

<sup>15</sup> Some seeming counterexamples in the local variety of Porčinj, particularly a.p. *a* fem. adjectival forms, are underlined and discussed below (cf. 4.2.1).

of Porčinj but one can assume that these are due to levelling and are not reflexes of the original a.p. *b*. While in the local variety of Prosnid, circumflex was not retracted from final syllables, this accentual change did occur in the local variety of Porčinj.

In this local variety, root stress in forms in which one would expect end stress due to acute advancement (e.g. in *pé:ta*, *ró:ka*, *zviézda*) is thus most likely due to levelling of stress from the forms with original circumflex that have undergone circumflex retraction (e.g. A.sg. *pé:tu*, *ró:ku*, *zviézdū*); inversely, end stress in forms in which one would expect root stress due to circumflex retraction (e.g. in A.sg. *bra'du*, *la'uu*, *mo'ku*, *tra'uu*, *zi'mu*) is the result of levelling of accent of forms that have undergone acute advancement (e.g. *bra'da*, *la'ua*, *mo'ka*, *tra'ua*, *zi'ma*):

- 1) PSI. *\*røkà* *\*røkq* (a. p. *c*) > CSIn. *\*rò:ka* *\*røkq̃* > Dial. Sln. *\*ro'ka* *\*rò:ku* ⇒ *rò:ka* *rò:ku*
- 2) PSI. *\*bordà* *\*bôrdq* (a. p. *c*) > CSIn. *\*brà:da* *\*bradq̃* > Dial. Sln. *\*bra'da* *\*brá:du* ⇒ *bra'da* *bra'du*

No nouns of a hypothetical type *\*\*bra'da* *\*\*brá:du*, i. e. belonging to a possible mobile paradigm which theoretically could have arisen as a result of both accent shifts, were recorded.

Examples of levelling of the first type are more than abundant also in other local varieties of the dialect in which circumflex retraction has occurred. In fact, in these local varieties they represent the main reflex of a. p. *b* and a. p. *c* nouns of the *a*-declension. This is perhaps most evident in nouns with originally short pretonic root vowels, where one would expect retention of end stress in some forms and instead finds root stress in all, e. g. in the local variety of Ter (N.sg., A.sg.) *dá:ška* *dá:šku*, *má:xla* *má:xlu*, *nó:a* *nó:u*, *ó:ra* *ó:ru*, *zé:mja* *zé:mju*, etc. In the local variety of Porčinj, end stress in such a.p. *b* nouns is regularly retained only in the case of pretonic *\*ə* (*ma'la* *ma'lu*, *to'ma* *to'mu*) and in rare few other cases (*ko'za* *ko'zu*, *sest'ra* *sest'ru*, *te'ta* *te'tu*, *že'na* *že'nu*). No cases of levelling of the second type were recorded in original short-root a.p. *c* nouns (unless one presupposes a previous switch from a.p. *b* to a.p. *c* as mentioned above – cf. *mey'la* *meylò*, *te'ma* *temò* in the local variety of Prosnid), which indicates that acute advancement indeed acted as a trigger, but the analogy was probably reinforced by an already existing, if unproductive, accentual paradigm.

#### 4.2.2 Analogy in the adjectival accent paradigm

A great majority of the attested adjectival (N.sg. masc., fem., and neut.) forms in the local variety of Porčinj belong to an accent paradigm, characterized by end stress in fem. forms and root stress in masc. and neut. forms regardless of their original PSI. accent paradigm or root-syllable length (the exception being short-root a. p. *b* adjectives, cf. Table 3 (row 3) and footnote 17).



a. p.	Examples
a. p. <i>a</i>	<u>s'tar</u> sta'ra stá:ro, s'lap sla'ba slá:bo, 'rus ru'sa rú:so, ve'l'ek veli'ka veli:ko, zd'ru zdra'ya zdrá:yo
a. p. <i>b</i> (Ṽ), a. p. <i>a</i> <sup>b16</sup>	<u>biěu</u> biě'la biělo, <u>krá:tak</u> krat'ka krá:tko, rá:yan rau'na rá:yno, uő:zak uő's'ka uő:sko
a. p. <i>b</i> (Ṽ) <sup>17</sup>	<u>dó:bār</u> dob'ra dob'ro, mó:kār mok'ra mok'ro; šč'rok ščero'ka ščero'ko, vč'sok včso'ka včso'ko, ze'len zele'na zele'no
a. p. <i>c</i> (Ṽ)	<u>mlā:t</u> mla'da mlā:do, jū:x ju'xa jú:xo, liēp liē'pa liēpo, lō:p lo'ba lō:bo, sū:x su'xa sú:xo
a. p. <i>c</i> (Ṽ)	<u>bó:lan</u> bou'na bó:yno, būos bo'sa bó:so, lá:xan lax'na lá:xno, <sup>18</sup> nō:u no'ya nō:yo, ó:rak or'ka ó:rko, tē:žak teš'ka tē:ško
a. p. <i>a, c</i> (* <i>r</i> )	mārzu mār'za mārzo (a.p. <i>a</i> ), γər't γər'da γərdo, tər't tər'da tərdo (a. p. <i>c</i> )

Table 3 (Typical examples used in the discussion below are underlined)

Variants of the paradigm differ only by prosodic features of masc. forms (and only in the case of adjectives with root *\*r*, listed in the very last row, by tone in neut. forms), which seem to all be results of regular accentual development: brevity in adjectives of the type *s'tar* is due to lack of lengthening in word-final syllables, and length in the type *dó:bār* is due to *brata*-lengthening after secondary polysyllabicity was induced by the epenthesis of schwa; the circumflex tone in *mārzu* is due to regular neocircumflex metatony before word-final *\*CR*-consonant clusters (*mārzu* < CSln. *mřzəl* < PSln. *\*mřzrlb*); acute accent in disyllabic forms of the type *bó:lan* is due to circumflex retraction – cf. e.g. *bolà:n*, *γorà:k*, *težà:k* in the local variety of Prosnid; and root (not suffix) stress in type *krá:tak* is either due to analogy following earlier acute advancement (PSln. *\*kortbkb* > CSln. *\*krátək* > Dial. Sln. *\*kra'tak* ⇒ *krá:tak*) or due to an even earlier levelling of the neoacute from other forms (PSln. *\*kortbkb* (≠ *\*kórtbka* *\*kórtbko*) ⇒ *\*kórtbkb* > CSln. *\*krátək* > Dial. Sln. *krá:tak*) – in either case, the same apparent absence of acute advancement can be found in the local variety

<sup>16</sup> I. e. Dybo's derivative a.p. (*акцентный тип производного*) *D* (Dybo 2000: 97–98).

<sup>17</sup> All short-root a.p. *b* adjectives except one behave as would be expected with respect to regular accentual development and differ from the discussed accentual paradigm by end stress in neut. forms; the same accentual curve is attested with the originally long-root a.p. *b* adjective *čār'an čār'na čār'no* (cf. *čār'n čār'na čār'no* in the local variety of Prosnid). The retention of end stress might have to do with the brevity of pretonic syllables (cf. Table 4 for a comparison of accentual curves). The only attested a.p. *b* adjective with a monosyllabic root, *'ol ó:la ó:lo* exhibits unique characteristics which can be attributed to analogy. Prosodically, one would expect *\*'o'la* *\*'o'lo* in fem. and neut. forms, respectively – in those forms, the adjective instead shows the expected regular reflexes of a.p. *a*, which just as a.p. *b* also features short stressed masc. forms. The word-final *\*l* in the masc. form should also have given *ʎ* and consequently raised *\*o* to its allophonic variant [o], yielding *\*'oʎ*. The latter is not at all problematic: within the same dialect, in the local variety of Ter we find doublet masc. forms *'ol* and *'oʎ*, of which the former is more frequent in use (however root stress in fem. and neut. forms was not attested in any other local variety).

<sup>18</sup> Secondarily part of a.p. *c*, cf. *Pr laxà:n lax'na laxnùo*.

of Prosnid, e.g. *krá:dek*, *rá:ȷen*, *ȷó:zek*. Other masc. forms require no special explanation.

End stress is regular in fem. forms of the types *dob'ra*, *bo'sa*, and *bol'na* due to the absence of retraction of stress from final short syllables onto pretonic short syllables, and in the types *biě'la*, *mła'da*, *ȷər'da* due to acute advancement. In other types (*sta'ra* (≠ CSln. *\*stàra*), *krat'ka* (≠ CSln. *\*krátka*), *mərz'la* (≠ CSln. *\*mȷzla*)) it is analogical, since the reflex of the CSln. short acute does not shift rightward in comparable positions in other morphological paradigms (cf. Table 2) – also cf. e.g. *stá:ra*, *krá:tka*, *mərzla* in the local variety of Prosnid. Curiously, an original neocircumflex in a.p. *a* seems to have blocked the change; thus, *boà:ta*, *dù:a*, *pijà:na*, *sì:ta*, *trù:dna* retain their stress placement.<sup>19</sup>

In neut. forms, excluding the short-root a.p. *b* type already discussed above, we find original root stress in the types *stá:ro*, *krá:tko*, and *mərzlo*, and root stress as a result of regular accentual development (circumflex retraction) in all types originally belonging to a.p. *c* (*młá:do*, *bó:so*, *bó:ȷno*, and *ȷərdo*, *tərdo*); the tone of examples with root *\*ȷ* is, however, secondary in all cases, possibly originating from masc. forms, where the circumflex is expected – in the case of the a.p. *a* adjective, the same type of levelling can be found to have occurred in the local variety of Prosnid in both fem. and neut. forms: *mərzu mərzla mərzlo* (because of the lack of circumflex retraction in that local variety, the other two examples are of course end-stressed: *ȷərdu:ȷ*, *tərdu:ȷ*). The type *biělo* seems to be the only one out of place, as one would expect end stress due to acute advancement – cf. *biě'lo* in the local variety of Prosnid.

Accentual curves of adjectives and their development are schematically presented in Table 4.

### 4.3 Archaism or innovation?

*Communis opinio* within Slovenian dialectology is that in some local varieties of *Tersko* a progressive acute-accent shift has occurred. As we have shown, we are actually dealing with two separate, but possibly connected, accent shifts: 1) an advancement of any type of acute accent from (at least) antepenultimate syllables onto posttonic syllables (regularly within original a.p. *a* and *b*), and 2) an advancement of the CSln. “young” acute from penultimate syllables onto final syllables (regularly within original a.p. *b* and *c*).

There can be little doubt of the first accent shift; however, with regard to the second, Kapović proposes that “[u] terskom dijalektu [...] nije, izgleda, bilo

<sup>19</sup> The neocircumflex is related to the retention of length in final open syllables in polysyllabic words under certain conditions, followed by a subsequent spread to other positions (cf. Kapović, 2015: 527–531 et passim). In the case of *trù:dna* the (neo)circumflex is itself secondary, but this analogy is wider and surpasses the dialect, cf. Std. Sln. *trūdna*.

pomaka naglaska na dužinu sa zadnjeg sloga” (2015: 84), treating the synchronic state as an archaism.

Both hypotheses have considerable implications and each is near impossible to prove conclusively.

1) If an **accent shift did occur**, it encompassed only those CSln. syllables that obtained their stress by a previous retraction from final short syllables onto long pretonic syllables and no other type of the CSln. acute accent, analogy excluded. It necessarily follows that such syllables must have retained some sort of a differentiating prosodic quality and not merged with the reflex of CSln. long acute, as is commonly accepted (e.g. Ramovš 1950: 21, 22; Logar 1981: 33). This is the prosodeme we have *a priori* assumed, as is stated at the beginning of section 4. A tentative case can be made in favour of this hypothesis. Original a.p. *a* nouns of the neut. *o*-declension regularly undergo neocircumflex metatony in plural forms (e.g. PSln. \**lěto*, N.pl. \**lěta* > CSln. \**lěto*, \**lěta*). In SW Slovene dialects which underwent *brata*-lengthening early the neocircumflex was introduced into plural forms of a.p. *b* nouns (e.g. PSln. \**gnězdò*, N.pl. \**gnězda* > CSln. \**gnězdo*, \**gnězda*) as well by way of four-part analogy (Šekli 2013: 138):

\**lěto* : \**lěta*

\**gnězdo* : X = \**gnězda*

Although rare, as neut. *o*-declension is not productive and is in decline, such examples are found in both of the local varieties in question with corresponding reflexes: (Porčinj) *liěto*, N.pl. *liěta*; *niěz'do*, N.pl. *niězda*; (Prosnid) *li:ěto*, N.pl. *li:ěta*; *ɣniěz'do*,<sup>20</sup> N.pl. *ɣniězda*. We can therefore assume that *niěz'do/ɣniěz'do* was once root-stressed since it was able to facilitate the analogy, even if not identical by tone. Pluralia tantum (Porčinj) *urá:ta*/(Prosnid) *urá:te* and (Porčinj) *plě:ća*, as well as the plural form (Porčinj) *rě:bra*<sup>21</sup> have not been changed by analogy precisely because there were no appropriate singular forms to facilitate the analogy – the first example had no singular forms to begin with, and potential singular forms of the second two lexemes would have been end-stressed (\**plě'će* and \**reb'ro*, respectively).

2) If the synchronic state is the result of the retraction of accent from final short syllables onto pretonic long syllables **not having taken place**, it would be necessary to assume that pretonic length had been preserved until the present day in

<sup>20</sup> Beside the feminized form *ɣniěz'da* (A.sg. *ɣniězdò*).

<sup>21</sup> In the local variety of Prosnid this noun is already fully feminized (N.sg. *reěbra*, A.sg. *reěbro*, N.pl. *reěbre*) while in Porčinj the singular is formally feminized but is still used with the neut. form of the indefinite article: N.sg. *no ré:bra*, G.sg. *dna ré:bre* (: N.pl. *rě:bra*). As discussed in footnote 8, one could argue that the accent of such feminized singular forms hints at the accent of original plural forms.

this position and this position only. Logar states that from the 11<sup>th</sup> century onward unstressed lengths were shortened except for pretonic lengths immediately preceding short final stressed syllables (1996: 333) – but he assumes this precisely on the basis of the afore-mentioned regressive shift, which makes it a circular argument. Furthermore, given that the reflexes of synchronically pretonic vowels in such positions exhibit length-related quality (i. e. absence of reduction in the cases of *\*i*, *\*u* in both local varieties in question, absence of *\*a* > *\*e* colouring in the local variety of Porčinj, and diphthongal reflexes of *\*ě* in both local varieties), one would have to assume that the preserved pretonic long vowels developed in exactly the same way as stressed ones. This calls into question, or perhaps for reformulation of, Ramovš's "law" of the causal effect of vowel quantity on vowel quality, mediated by, in Ramovš's words, the "intensity peak" (1951: 4); that is to say: stress. That actual phonetic pretonic length should be lost only now, with the youngest generations of speakers after having persisted for a thousand years (as opposed to perhaps persisting through a few generations, if it is a remnant of original stress), seems a sad historical coincidence – but given the sociolinguistic situation and rapid language shift not all that surprising.

On the other hand, Pleteršnik lists a number of end-stressed examples (either as headwords or as doublets) from non-peripheral Slovene dialects (mostly citing Valjavec's accentological studies as the source): *gubà*, *gubicà*, *iglicà*, *kunà*, *mamkà*, *mæglicà*, *stæzicà*, *trëškà*, *vrstà*.<sup>22</sup> In addition, in his phonological description of Mostec, Toporišič (1981: 154) mentions, when discussing reflexes of the retraction of stress from final short syllables onto pretonic long syllables, that "[l]e v redkih primerih je bil ta premik izvršen pozneje" and lists "sedu 'sedel', 'geba [presumably 'guba'], 'sekno 'sukno'" as examples. The first and the last example are not very hard to explain, but for the second, one would hardly expect anything other than *\*gu:ba* (same as *du:ša*, id.: 150). Out of the listed examples the derivatives could probably be explained with analogy, i. e. taking the accent curve of their motivating lexemes. As most of the non-derived nouns originally belonged to a.p. *c* (and *trëškà* to a.p. *b*, whose tendency to switch to a.p. *c* in the *a*-declension has already been mentioned), one could make an inconclusive guess toward a four-part analogy by way of short-root nouns of the same a.p. with end-stress in non-circumflex forms. Even today, these are not unheard of in the *Gorenjsko* dialect (cf. Škofic 2019: 111f.), where Valjavec's data cited in Pleteršnik presumably originates from. The problem, however, requires further research and a lot more dialect data.

<sup>22</sup> I sincerely thank Metka Furlan for bringing this to my attention.

CSln.	*stār	*bēl	*krātāk	*dōbər	*mlād	*bōs	*bolān	*mījəl	*gǣd
	*stāra	*bēla	*krātka	*dōb'ra	*mlāda	*bosā	*bolnā	*mījla	*gǣ'da
	*stāro	*bē'lo	*krātko	*dōb'ro	*mladō	*bosō	*bolnō	*mījlo	*gǣdō
Prior to analogical changes	s'tar	biēṽ	krātāk	dō'bər	mlāt	būos	bó:lan	mèrzu	ɣərt
	*stāra	biē'la	*krātka	dōb'ra	mlāda	bo'sa	boṽ'na	*márzla	ɣər'da
	stāro	*biē'lo	krātko	dōb'ro	mládo	bó:so	bó:ṽno	*márzlo	*ɣərdō
After analogical changes	s'tar	biēṽ	krātāk	dō'bər	mlāt	būos	bó:lan	mèrzu	ɣərt
	⇒ sta'ra	biē'la	⇒ krat'ka	dob'ra	mla'da	bo'sa	boṽ'na	⇒ mærz'la	ɣər'da
	stāro	⇒ biélo	krátko	dob'ro (!)	mládo	bó:so	bó:ṽno	(⇒) mærzlo	(⇒) ɣərdō

Table 4

## REFERENCES

- Dybo, Vladimir Antonovič. 2000: *Morfonologizovannye paradigmatičeskie aktsentnye sistemy 1: Tipologiya i genezis*. Moscow.
- Kapović, Mate. 2015: *Povijest hrvatske akcentuacije*. Zagreb.
- Logar, Tine. 1951a: *Breginj*. Fieldnotes. Stored by ZRC SAZU.
- Logar, Tine. 1951b: *Robidišče*. Fieldnotes. Stored by ZRC SAZU.
- Logar, Tine. 1965: *Viškorša (Monteaperta)*. Fieldnotes. Stored by ZRC SAZU.
- Logar, Tine. 1981: Izhodiščni splošnoslovenski fonološki sistem. In: Ivić, Pavle et al. (eds.): *Fonološki opisi srpskohrvatskih/hrvatskosrpskih, slovenačkih i makedonskih govora obuhvaćenih opšteslovenskim lingvističkim atlasom*. Sarajevo: 29–33.
- Pleteršnik = Pleteršnik, Maks. 2014: Furlan, Metka (ed.): *Slovensko-nemški slovar. Transliterirana izdaja*. Ljubljana.
- Ramovš, Fran. 1950: Relativna kronologija slovenskih akcentskih pojavov. *Slavistična revija* 3(1–2): 16–23.
- Ramovš, Fran. 1951: Osnovna črta v oblikovanju slovenskega vokalizma. *Slavistična revija* 4(1–2): 1–9.
- Rigler, Jakob. 1963: Pregled osnovnih razvojnih etap v slovenskem vokalizmu. *Slavistična revija* 14: 25–78. [Republished in: Rigler, Jakob. 2001: Smole, Vera (ed.): *Zbrani spisi 1: Jezikovnozgodovinske in dialektološke razprave*. Ljubljana: 19–57].
- Rigler, Jakob. 1977: K problematiki daljšanja starega akuta. *Slavistična revija* 25: 29–38. [Republished in: Rigler, Jakob. 2001. Smole, Vera (ed.): *Zbrani spisi 1: Jezikovnozgodovinske in dialektološke razprave*. Ljubljana: 302–315].
- SSKJ2 = auctores varii. 2014: *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika. Druga, dopolnjena in deloma prenovljena izdaja*. Ljubljana.
- Šekli, Matej. 2006: Tersko narečje v kraju Subid. In: Kožuh, Milena (ed.): *Terska dolina v besedi, sliki in pesmi Viljema Černa*. Celje, Gorica: 161–188.
- Šekli, Matej. 2007: Končniški in mešani naglasni tip samostalnikov *a*-jevske sklanjatve v nadiškem narečju slovenščine. *Slavistična revija* 55(1–2): 133–145.
- Šekli, Matej. 2013: Sklonidba i naglasak imena srednjeg roda o-sklonidbe. *Razprave. Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 39(1): 133–145.
- Šekli, Matej. 2018: *Tipologija lingvogeneze slovanskih jezikov*. Ljubljana.
- Škofic, Jožica. 2019: *Krajevni govor Kroke*. Ljubljana.
- Toporišič, Jože. 1981: *Mostec (OLA 17)*. In: Ivić, Pavle et al. (eds.): *Fonološki opisi srpskohrvatskih/hrvatskosrpskih, slovenačkih i makedonskih govora obuhvaćenih opšteslovenskim lingvističkim atlasom*. Sarajevo: 147–156.
- Zuljan Kumar, Danila. 2010: Subiške pripovedi z jezikovnega stališča. In: Balloch, Bruna / Dapit, Roberto / Trusgnach, Lucia / Zuljan Kumar, Danila (eds.): *Mala lipa. Pravāce domah narete*. Čedad/Cividale del Friuli: 27–32.
- Zuljan Kumar, Danila. 2018: Tersko narečje/Il dialetto del Torre. In: Balloch, Bruna / Dapit, Roberto / Trusgnach, Lucia / Zuljan Kumar, Danila (eds.): *Lučice na oknah. Naš svet pouan naposebnosti/Il nostro mondo pieno di meraviglia*. Čedad/Cividale del Friuli: 38–49.