

Gašper Beguš

Faculty of Arts, Ljubljana

The Relative Chronology of Accentual Phenomena in the Žiri Basin Local Dialect (of the Poljane Dialect)

The Žiri Basin local dialect within the Poljane dialect evinces several special features in its structure and development. Based on the system described in Stanonik (1977), the author elucidates the system's accentual changes from Common Slovene to the present state, and also presents some new discoveries concerning the system itself that help explain the phenomena more precisely. This description helps establish a relative chronology of the accentual phenomena, the resulting model of which is compared and contrasted with other explanations. Finally, the relative chronology of accentual changes is placed in the larger context of the development of Slovene.

0 The source¹ for my investigation of accentual phenomena in the Žiri Basin local dialect was the description of this dialect in Stanonik (1977), which includes a description of accentuation and quantity and proves something previously unknown: that there are tonemic oppositions in the Žiri Basin local dialect, at least in long final and penultimate syllables.² Elsewhere neutralization occurs. Stanonik leaves open the question of tonemic oppositions in short syllables.³ In addition to a synchronic description of ictus and tones, Stanonik also explains the accentual changes diachronically from Common Slovene to the state of the Žiri Basin dialect. Accentual changes caused the system of this local dialect to become quite variegated.⁴ This paper establishes a relative chronology of these accentual changes.

1 The accentual system of the Žiri Basin local dialect

1.1 Retractions

In the Žiri Basin local dialect stress is retracted from originally final short acute syllables to (1) pretonic short syllables (the type *žena*, *koza*), (2) schwa (the type *məgla*), and (3) shortened syllables (the type *život/širok*). The newly stressed syllable is short with the exception of retraction onto *e* and *o*, which show long acute stress.⁵ Furthermore, retraction occurs from primarily open long circumflex syllables. The newly stressed syllable is again short. A special feature of the Žiri Basin local dialect is retraction from closed final long circumflex syllables and from internal long circumflex syllables. As I argue below, the retraction also occurs from antepenultimate circumflex syllables. The stress is on the newly accented syllable, whereas the originally accented syllable remains long with a tone according

¹ This text was written using the font ZRCola (<http://ZRCola.zrc-sazu.si>), which was developed by Peter Weiss at the ZRC SAZU Research Centre, Ljubljana (<http://www.zrc-sazu.si>).

² “V slovenski dialektologiji je bilo doslej utrjeno mnenje, da ima v rovtarski narečni skupini tonemska nasprotja samo horjulski govor, drugod pa da poznajo le jakostni naglas in kvantitetna nasprotja. Toda zadnji terenski zapisi govora v Žirovski kotlini in na njenem obrobju odkrivajo, da pozna v dolgih zlogih tonemska nasprotja vsaj še žirovski govor, če ne tudi ostala poljanščina, kot pričajo primeri ob meji z njo” (Stanonik 1977: 296).

³ “[V]prašanje na hipotezo, da bi utegnili biti tonemska nasprotja tudi v kratkem vokalizmu, zaenkrat ostaja še odprto” (Stanonik 1977: 302).

⁴ The number of accentual possibilities is high, which is shown by Greenberg (1987: 183) with the formula $5S - 2$ for one- and two-syllable words and $(S - 3) + 13$ for words with three or more syllables, in which S = the number of syllables; for example, 'V, V̇:, V̇: for one-syllable words, 'VV, V̇:V, V̇:V, V̇V, V̇V̇:, V̇V̇:, 'V̇V̇:, 'V̇V̇: for two-syllable words, and so on.

⁵ In words with final *-nəc*, however, *e* and *o* have circumflex stress. For details, see section 2.4.

to the position in word: in final (and, as I propose, probably also in antepenultimate⁶) syllables it is circumflexed, whereas in penultimate syllables it is acuted. After reduction in word-final position, this distribution remains and consequently becomes phonemic. The retraction also occurs if a proclitic precedes; for example, *'ta pra:u* (Stanonik 1977: 295–299). The following scheme with examples represents the retractions systematically:

$\check{V}\check{V} > 'V\check{V}$	<i>məglà > 'maɣla</i> ⁷
$e/o\check{V} > é:/ó:V$	<i>ženà > žé:na</i>
$-e/on\grave{a}c > -è:/\grave{a}:nc$	<i>kon\grave{a}c > kà:nc</i>
$V\hat{V} > 'V\check{V}$	<i>okô > 'aku</i>
$V\hat{V}C > 'V\check{V}:C$	<i>večêr > 'večiè:r</i>
$V\hat{V}V > 'V\check{V}:V$	<i>večêra > 'večié:ra</i>
$V\hat{V}VV > 'V\check{V}:VV$	<i>kupûjemo > 'kapù:iema</i>

1.2 Metatony

Distinct tones occur only in final and penultimate syllables; elsewhere, neutralization occurs (Stanonik 1977: 297). According to this description, in antepenultimate syllables only one tone would be possible.⁸ The phonetics of this tone would be closer to acute, which is confirmed by the fact that if, after reduction, this tone ends up on a phonologically relevant penultimate or final syllable, it becomes acute. However, in my opinion, distinct tones are not limited to final and penultimate syllables because retraction also occurs from antepenultimate circumflex syllables; for example, *'kapu:iema*, Instr. sg. *z 'ablę:kam*; see section 2.6. How exactly the long syllable is accented in this case needs to be measured, but I hear a circumflex⁹ and, in any case, a length more similar to that in *'večiè:r* than in *'večié:ra*.

$[V]\acute{V}VV > [V]\acute{V}:VV$	<i>jágoda > já:ɣada</i>
$\hat{V}VV > \acute{V}:VV$	<i>dêlamo > dé:łama</i>
$\acute{V}VVV > \acute{V}:VV(V)$	<i>jágodica > já:ɣatca</i>
$\hat{V}VVV > \acute{V}:VV(V)$	<i>pâzduhami > pá:sxam</i>

In addition to the neutralization, the Žiri Basin local dialect shows metatony in penultimate syllables, which causes words with an original acute to become circumflex and words with an original circumflex to become acute (Stanonik 1977: 295–299). An example of this metatony within one paradigm is N. sg. *krà:wa* vs. Instr. sg. *s krá:wa*.

⁶ For an explanation, see section 1.2.

⁷ In front of the Common Slovene forms no asterisk (*) is written because these forms are not reconstructions, but rather schematic projections that facilitate the representation of dialect forms. The symbols used are: ´ acute on long syllables, ˘ acute on short syllables, ˆ circumflex, V-V combination of a proclitic and a one-syllable word, (V) syllable that can be lost after reduction, and [V] arbitrary syllable; forms from the Žiri Basin local dialect are given in the new OLA-style Slovene phonetic transcription.

⁸ The description in Stanonik (1977: 297) that different tones can only occur in final and penultimate syllables can be misleading because one could assume that stress is not retracted from antepenultimate circumflex syllables. Forms such as *'kapu:iema*, *z 'ablę:kam* speak against this assumption. However, the possibility of analogy cannot be excluded in such four-syllable forms. Stanonik agrees with my assumption that stress is retracted from antepenultimate syllables as well. I am grateful to her for all of her help and her linguistic field data from the Žiri Basin dialect.

⁹ Stanonik agrees with this assumption.

[V]V̂V > [V]V̂:V *polěno* > *palè:n*

V̂V > V̂:V *mâčka* > *má:čka*

In final syllables the acute and the circumflex merge in favor of the circumflex. In the case of an original circumflex, the word must be monosyllabic because otherwise the stress is retracted (according to 1.1). My recent field recordings have shown that in combinations of one-syllable words and proclitics the stress is retracted to the clitic only from original circumflex syllables, which yields the opposition *'za urà:t* vs. *do urà:t*. Likewise, the stress is not retracted in words with two or more syllables with an original acute on a final long syllable; for example, *iunà:k* < *junák*. This is of great importance for determining the relative chronology.

V̂ > V̂: *grěh* > *grè:x*

V̂ > V̂: *nôč* > *nò:č*

VV̂ > VV̂: *kováč* > *kawà:č*

V-V̂ > V-V̂: *do dvěh* > *da dvè:x*

V-V̂ > 'V-V̂: *že nôč* > *'že nò:č*

One-syllable words with original acute on a short syllable remain short and stressed because no retraction is possible; for example, *'brat*, *'kap*, *'krax*. However, in combinations with proclitics the stress is retracted even in these cases; however, this phenomenon is not described in Stanonik (1977); for example, *'na kap*. If the proclitic contains *e* or *o*, they still remain short and do not show an acute; for example, *'pa krax*.

V̂ > 'V *krùh* > *'krax*

V-V̂ > 'V-V *po krùh* > *'pa krax*

Thus, following the description in Stanonik (1977) combined with my new recording, one obtains the inventory of accentual changes that operated from Common Slovene to today's Žiri Basin local dialect. In the next section I order these changes chronologically.

2 Relative chronology

2.1 The retraction from closed final long circumflex syllables happened before reciprocal metatony in penultimate syllables. This can be proven by examples such as *palè:n*. Namely, if *polěno* had first undergone metatony, this would yield **palè:n(o)*, and from here the stress would have been retracted to **'palè:no* because of the retraction from penultimate circumflex syllables. Likewise, *večêr* and Gen. sg. *večêra* would yield **večié:r* and **večié:ra* after metatony, which would mean that no retraction could occur because the forms would have already been stressed with the acute. The examples above show that first the retraction occurred, and only after that metatony. Thus, *polěno* retains the stress and yields *palè:n* after metatony. On the other hand, *večêr* and Gen. sg. *večêra* yield *'večiè:r* and **'večiè:ra* after retraction.¹⁰

Of course it could be argued that metatony preceded retraction if it is assumed that the stress was retracted from acute and not from circumflex syllables¹¹ and that it concluded with the

¹⁰ The reason why I give the reconstructed form with posttonic circumflex length is explained below.

¹¹ Thus, after metatony, *polěno* would yield **palè:n* and the stress would not retract because it would have a circumflex tone; after metatony in the last syllable, *večêr* and Gen. sg. *večêra* would yield **večié:r* and

retraction of the acute onto *e* and *o*.¹² Two main arguments against this assumption are areal and typological. It is less likely that a dialect would show retraction from closed final and penultimate long acute syllables after already showing retraction from open final circumflex syllables, which, moreover, is a common phenomenon in the area.¹³ Besides, one would have to assume that metatony operated in final and penultimate syllables, whereby the first would later merge in the last syllable with the circumflex.

Another retraction, but involving short syllables,¹⁴ has to be determined chronologically; namely, the retraction from final open circumflex syllables of the type *'aku*. It is justified to assume that this accent change is the oldest because it occurs in the broader area: in addition to the Žiri Basin, the Črni Vrh dialect also shows this retraction. According to the wave theory, older phenomena are also more widespread. In the Poljane dialect, the tendency of retraction from circumflex syllables thus spread to the circumflex in final closed syllables and in internal syllables. Therefore retraction occurs from all relevant circumflex syllables with the exception of first syllables and monosyllables, where retraction is not possible. Because this spread of retractions is an innovation of the Poljane dialect, it can also be assumed that it is more recent than the retraction of the type *'aku*. Another piece of evidence in favor of this assumption is the fact that after the retraction of the type *'aku* the originally stressed syllable is shortened,¹⁵ whereas in the case of retraction from closed final and internal long circumflex syllables the originally accented syllable remains long and preserves the tone.

2.2 If one therefore assumes a typologically more plausible explanation—that the retraction occurred from circumflex syllables and not from acute syllables—one must posit the operation of reciprocal metatony in second place. Thus, N. sg. *kráva* yields *krà:wa* and Instr. sg. *s krávo* yields *s krá:wa*. Noteworthy is the fact that posttonic long vowels also show different tones according to the position in the word: in final and antepenultimate syllables the tone is circumflex, whereas in penultimate syllables it is acute.¹⁶ In my opinion, this distribution can be explained sufficiently only by assuming that reciprocal metatony also operated on posttonic long vowels. Thus, *večêr* and Gen. sg. *večêra* yield *'večìè:r* and **'večìè:ra* after retraction. Later, reciprocal metatony also operated on posttonic long vowels, which regularly yields Gen. sg. *'večìé:ra*. Words with an original circumflex on antepenultimate syllables that regularly undergo retraction show that metatony operated only in the penultimate syllable because the posttonic length remains circumflexed in this case;¹⁷ for example, *'kapù:žema*. In final syllables, metatony probably does not occur; however, this is impossible to prove. Theoretically *nôč* could yield **nô:c*¹⁸ and after merger in final syllables

**večìé:ra*, and the stress would be retracted from acute syllables in **'večìé:r* and *'večìé:ra*. After merger in final syllables, the result would be *'večìè:r*.

¹² The presumed retraction from acute syllables would have to be concluded by the time of the retraction onto *e* and *o* because otherwise the stress would have to be retracted from the already retracted syllables as well, which means one would get *pêtelin* > *peté:lŋ* > **'peté:lŋ*, but this does not happen.

¹³ In addition to the Poljane dialect, this retraction is also attested in the Črni Vrh dialect of the Rovte dialect group.

¹⁴ The newly stressed syllable is short.

¹⁵ If one assumes the shortening of circumflex syllables before retraction, it would mean that these syllables would merge with the circumflex syllables from the original acute syllables (as described in Ramovš 1929). This would further mean that originally acute syllables would also have to undergo retraction. However, this does not happen, or does happen later but with a different outcome. To assume two different tones for this stage, of which one would undergo retraction and the other would not, is methodologically less justified because it would be necessary to deal with a minor acoustic difference.

¹⁶ It is already stated in Stanonik (1977: 299) that phenomena on posttonic long vowels resemble other accentual phenomena in the Žiri Basin local dialect: “Tonemska nasprotja ponaglasnih dolžin se pojavljajo po dokaj podobnem načelu kot pri naglasih.”

¹⁷ See section 1.2.

¹⁸ After metatony, original acute syllables would yield a circumflex, which, after the merger in final syllables, would remain circumflex; for example, *kováč* after metatony > *kawà:c* and after merger > *kawà:c*.

nò:č because the retraction occurs before the merger. Similarly, combinations with proclitics would yield *že nôč* > **ʒe nò:č*, after metatony **ʒe nò:č*, and after merger *ʒe nò:č*.

The circumflex tone is attested on posttonic long vowels in final syllables because of the merger in word-final position; for example, *ʒečì:r*. Thus, the evidence for the question of whether metatony operated in final syllables or not is blurred. However, metatony must have operated on posttonic long vowels in penultimate syllables, resulting in the tonemic opposition of posttonic long vowels according to the position in the word, which later becomes phonemic.

Both retraction from circumflex syllables and metatony in penultimate syllables occur before the full reduction of word-final vowels. Otherwise, the Dat. sg. *xčì:r* would have a circumflex tone because of its word-final position. In addition, metatony would not occur or the acute would merge with the circumflex in final syllables. Likewise, metatony must have occurred before the full reduction of word-final vowels because otherwise there would not be the opposition of the acute in penultimate and circumflex in final syllables, but one would instead expect N. sg. *ʒečì:r*, Gen. sg. *ʒečì:ra* and Dat. sg. **ʒečì:r* instead of *ʒečì:r*.

2.3 The merger of the acute and the circumflex in final syllables is later than the retraction from final closed and internal circumflex syllables. This can be proven by *kováč* > *kawà:č*. If the merger were older than the retraction, this would yield *kováč* > *kawà:č* and then retraction would occur, yielding **kawà:č*. On the other hand, the opposition of retraction vs. non-retraction is also found in combinations with proclitics. Retraction occurs only from original circumflex one-syllable words, but not from originally acute one-syllable words. This yields the opposition *ʒa urà:t* and *do urà:t*, which is also interesting from the synchronic perspective. In the Žiri Basin local dialect, one-syllable words with a long vowel can have an acute (e.g., Dat. sg. *xčì:r*) or a circumflex (e.g., *vrè:x* and *nò:č*). Furthermore, in some of these circumflex one-syllable words retraction to the proclitic occurs (e.g., *ʒa nò:č*) and in others no retraction occurs (e.g., *že vrè:x*). This distribution is synchronically completely unpredictable.

2.4 Forms such as *žé:na* with the acute prove that metatony no longer operated at the time of retraction onto *e* and *o*. Specifically, it is less probable that after retraction newly accented *e* and *o* would have a circumflex and, after metatony, an acute tone. The phonetics of this retraction in other dialects is described by Ramovš (1950: 18), who assumes first the change of acute to circumflex in final syllables and then the transfer of intensity peak towards the beginning of the syllable (Ramovš 1950: 18). After the retraction the result is short acute *è* and *ò* (Ramovš 1929: 50). The newly accented short syllables are lengthened (Ramovš 1929: 21), which created an acute tone on long syllables in most dialects. For the Žiri Basin local dialect it is also justified to assume that in this case the system followed the accentual changes attested in other dialects, and that the acute was the original result of this retraction. This would mean that retraction onto *e* and *o* is more recent than metatony. The lateness of this retraction can also be proven by the fact that *o* is already reduced to *a*¹⁹ and by areal distribution because it is known that in the Horjul dialect and in the Cerknò dialect newly accented *e* and *o* remain short. Thus, the relative chronology matches the geographical arrangement of the dialects. Early retraction from final open circumflex syllables of the type *ʒaku* is common to the Žiri Basin local dialect and to the Črni Vrh dialect, whereas lateness of retraction from final short syllables onto *e* and *o* is common to the Žiri Basin local dialect, the Cerknò dialect, and the Horjul dialect.

¹⁹ Pretonic reduction of *o* to *a* thus occurs before retraction onto *e* and *o*. The Žiri Basin local dialect also shows the same reduction in short stressed syllables (e.g., *kaš* < *kòš*) but not in long stressed syllables. Therefore the reduction of *o* to *a* must have preceded the retraction to *e* and *o*.

The chronological relation between retraction from final acute syllables onto *e* and *o* and merger in favor of the circumflex in final syllables cannot be determined because the first phenomenon is related to short vowels and the latter to long vowels. On the other hand, the opposition *kà:nc* vs. *ká:sc* is of crucial importance for determining the end of operation of the merger in final syllables. In both cases, the stress is retracted from final syllables onto *e* and *o* and schwa was consequently found in weak position. In words with final *-nəc*, schwa was lost earlier than in other positions, which caused the word to be monosyllabic and merger consequently occurred. Schwa in *ká:sc* or *é:n*: ‘one’ was lost later (i.e., after the operation of the merger) because otherwise one would also expect the circumflex. Of course, one must assume the earlier reduction of schwa not only in *-nəc* sequences but after other sonorants as well because otherwise the argument is implausible. In Stanonik (1977: 298) only words ending in *-nəc* are listed that show the circumflex tone after the retraction onto *e* and *o*. However, my data²⁰ also show that at least words ending in *-rəc* have the circumflex on *e* and *o*, although evidence is sparse (e.g., *nà:rc*, *ná:rca*, *kà:rc*, *ká:rca*, *škà:rc*, *šká:rca*). For other sonorants I found no examples. However, forms with original circumflex on penultimate and at the same time first syllables that after metatony show acute tone and end in *-r/nəc* would speak against this assumption. Namely, one would expect a circumflex because after the reduction of schwa words would become monosyllabic (e.g. *člé:nk*) and the merger would have to apply. However, in this case schwa was in the sequence *-nək*, which would yield word-final *-ŋk*. Schwa could thus be lost later because *-ŋk* in word-final position would be more difficult to pronounce. Moreover, it seems as though the word is more recent and was integrated into the Žiri Basin local dialect later on the model of other words with an original circumflex penultimate syllable. Other words with this accent also seem to be of more recent origin (e.g., *bó:rc*).

Words with the original circumflex tone that exhibit an acute tone after metatony show that the merger in favor of the circumflex in final syllables is more recent than the reduction of schwa in the word-final sequence *-r/nəc*, but older than the reduction of schwa elsewhere and also older than the full reduction of other high vowels (e.g. *ó:sk*, *yuó:pc*, *ó:čk*, *xčié:r* [Dat. sg.]). Otherwise one would expect a circumflex. However, there are some confusing examples such as *ò:us*, *člò:uk*, *bà:šč*, and *nà:šč*. The first two examples can possibly be explained by earlier reduction after sonorants, whereas in the latter two one would expect the acute tone. Even assuming a later retraction in some words (see Ramovš 1929), one still cannot explain the circumflex tone. It is thus obvious that many words that soon became monosyllabic show many unexpected developments. This needs to be explained by analogy or by other special developments, or even by the fact that some words entered the system later than others. In any case, the high frequency of unexpected developments definitely implies that the operation of the merger in final syllables and the reduction of schwa were chronologically very close phenomena.

2.5 It is justified to assume that retraction of the type *'maɣla* and *'šerak* operated later than retraction onto *e* and *o*, or that the two phenomena were at least simultaneous, because there are dialects that undergo the latter retraction but lack the first. The assumption, on the other hand, that the retraction of the type *'maɣla* and *'šerak* was earlier is less justified because all dialects without retraction onto *e* and *o* also preserve oxytone accentuation in *məɣlâ*. Ramovš (1929: 59–60) also posits my proposed assumption for other dialects with both retractions. The newly accented syllable in the type *'maɣla* and *'šerak* remains short in the Žiri Basin local dialect. The tendency to retract is spread to combinations with proclitics, which yields *'pa*

²⁰ Stanonik (p.c.) confirmed my assumption. Greenberg (1987: 183) also speaks of the circumflex in one-syllable words after the reduced suffix *-əc*. However, no evidence is provided. Furthermore, the suffix is not limited to *-r/nəc*, which would be an insufficient explanation because in this case one would also expect *ká:sc* to have the circumflex tone.

krax. This retraction, however, must be later than the retraction onto *e* and *o* because the newly accented syllable remains short even if it contains *e* and *o*. Otherwise one would expect lengthening with the acute tone **pá:* *krax*.²¹ Thus, it is justified to assume that the retraction to the proclitic occurred either simultaneously or even later than the retraction of the type *'mayla* and *'šerak* because typologically retractions to proclitics can occur later than retractions within a word.

2.6 Neutralization in antepenultimate and other syllables accented further to the left is difficult to classify chronologically. It must have occurred before full reduction in word-final position because the original circumflex and the original acute syllables both have the acute tone after they appear in penultimate or final syllables after reduction. If the neutralization did occur after full reduction in word-final position, one would expect tone oppositions in those words in which the antepenultimate stress after reduction would rest on the penultimate or final syllables. Moreover, although the phenomenon is not described in Stanonik (1977), the stress is also retracted from circumflex antepenultimate syllables because there are forms such as *'kapù:žem* vs. *'kapù:žema*, and *'ablè:ka* vs. Instr. sg. *z 'ablè:kam*. These forms can be stressed analogically with three-syllable words of the same paradigm, but in this case one would expect an acute tone with posttonic length. In addition, the accentual system of the Žiri Basin local dialect does not show many analogies. Thus, forms such as *'kapù:žema* would indicate that neutralization occurred later than retraction from circumflex syllables. If neutralization had preceded retraction, one would expect **kapù:žema* and **z ablè:kam*.

2.7 The integration of new words into the accentual system of the Žiri Basin local dialect is also interesting. They also show retraction from circumflex syllables (e.g., *tele'vizi:ja* and *pa'mara:nča*). However, this must be analogical, based on the established features of the accentual system.

3 Other models

Greenberg (2003: 246) seems to explain the accentual phenomena in the Žiri Basin local dialect differently from the model proposed above. In his view, acute syllables become circumflex. In original circumflex syllables, on the other hand, the retraction occurs in order to prevent the merger with the new circumflex from original acute syllables.²² The original circumflex syllables preserve the circumflex tone. Considering this assumption, one should not posit the operation of reciprocal metatony, but rather only metatony of acute syllables. Although the author does not explain the development $\hat{V}V > \acute{V}:V$, it can be assumed, based on his explanation of other phenomena, that the circumflex becomes the acute because the stress cannot be retracted. Consequently, one would also have to assume $\hat{V} > \acute{V}$ and $\hat{V}V > \acute{V}V$, which would, however, not be obvious anymore because of the neutralization and merger in final syllables. This explanation is acceptable. However, by assuming metatony occurs only on acute syllables, one cannot explain the acute tone on the posttonic long vowels in penultimate syllables vs. the circumflex tone on posttonic long vowels in final syllables.²³ Furthermore, the author assumes the reduction of final syllables²⁴ to be the cause for the acute tone on posttonic long vowels in penultimate syllables, which means that this phenomenon could occur as late as the twentieth century. In my opinion this is an unjustified assumption because otherwise one would not expect forms with acute penultimate posttonic length and a

²¹ The reason for absence of an acute on the proclitic could lie precisely in the fact that combinations with proclitics can have their own special developments.

²² The system is described by Greenberg (2003: 246) thus: “[I]n original rising stressed words, the high tone moved one mora towards the syllable onset; at the same time, original falling tone stress became reanalyzed as rising stress in the preceding syllable as a means of avoiding merger with the ‘new’ falling stress.”

²³ For details, see sections 1.1 and 2.6.

²⁴ “[S]tressed syllables preceding final elided vowels become rising, e.g., *'kákó:f* ‘hen (GEN. SG)’” (Greenberg 2003: 246).

following full vowel (e.g., *'večié:ra*, *'imié:na*, *'pepié:la*, *'yaluó:bi*, *'paléna*, etc.). Even if the acute in *'večié:ra* were explained as being analogically transferred from the Dat. sg. *'večié:r*, in which the acute would indeed be the result of the loss of the final syllable *-u*, one would not be able to explain the acute tone on the posttonic length in N. sg. *'kašá:ra*. Furthermore, forms such as *'kapù:iema*, most probably with the circumflex on posttonic length, also speak in favor of the assumption that reciprocal metatony (and not only on acute syllables) also operated on posttonic long vowels and only in penultimate syllables.

Other phenomena are not chronologically discussed in Greenberg (2003: 246). Even if one assumed his explanation, the retraction from final short syllables onto *e* and *o* as well as the retraction of the type *'mayla* must be later than metatony and retraction from a circumflex syllable. Otherwise the acute tone on *e* and *o* would have to become circumflex after metatony. Furthermore, Greenberg's model also enables the assumption that the retraction from final open circumflex syllables (type *'aku*) preceded other accentual phenomena. Similarly, my proposed chronology of the operation of the merger in final syllables fits with Greenberg's model as well. The merger is thus later than the retraction from final closed and internal circumflex syllables and older than the reduction of schwa in unstressed sequences other than *-r/nəc*. If the merger had preceded the retraction, all final syllables (also original acute syllables) would have become circumflex. After that, according to Greenberg's assumption, retraction would have to occur in order to prevent merger with the original acute syllables after the metatony. Because this does not happen, the retraction must have preceded the merger. For an explanation of why the merger must be older than the reduction of schwa in unstressed sequences other than *-r/nəc*, see section 2.4.

Thus the models differ only in the sequence and properties of the operation of the metatony, the retraction from final closed circumflex syllables and internal circumflex syllables, and explanation of the origin of the tonemic oppositions on posttonic long vowels. The chronology of other phenomena, as I proposed, is also possible within Greenberg's model.

4 Relative chronology of accentual phenomena in the Žiri Basin local dialect compared with the relative chronology of other Slovene dialects

The absolute chronology of the Žiri Basin local dialect is difficult to establish. All accentual phenomena must have preceded full reduction in word-final position. However, it is difficult to determine when the reduction itself occurred. The Žiri Basin local dialect seems to have regularly undergone all accentual phenomena that occurred from Proto-Slavic to Common Slovene. In addition to these phenomena, retraction from final open circumflex syllables of the type *'aku* is also attested. Ramovš (1950) assumes the retraction operated no earlier than the eighteenth century. The retraction onto *e* and *o*, on the other hand, can be at earliest posited for the fifteenth century (Ramovš 1950), but in different dialects this retraction occurs chronologically very differently. As my proposed relative chronology has shown, retraction onto *e* and *o* in the Žiri Basin local dialect occurred after retraction of the type *'aku*, which means after the eighteenth century. Moreover, in the time between these two developments, which are attested in other dialects as well, retraction from final closed and from internal circumflex syllables and reciprocal metatony in penultimate syllables also occurred, which is clearly an innovation of the Žiri Basin local dialect. It is impossible to estimate how much time was needed for these two phenomena to occur; however, it is justified to assume that the retraction onto *e* and *o* is sometime later than the eighteenth century. Retractions of the type *'mayla* and *'šerak* are probably even more recent. Thus, considering the limitation of the retraction of the type *'aku* as proposed by Ramovš, one obtains a basic timeline picture of the operation of accentual phenomena. The Žiri Basin local dialect apparently preserved a conservative accentual system—that is, a Common Slovene system without changes, at least from the split to dialects until the eighteenth century. At that time in the broader area that

includes the Črni Vrh dialect, retraction from final open circumflex syllables of the type *'aku* started to operate. In the Poljane dialect or in the Žiri Basin local dialect the tendency spread further to other circumflex syllables. This means that in the Žiri Basin local dialect stressed circumflex syllables were not possible anymore, which yields retraction with posttonic long vowels. This causes the accentual system to become specific and distinct from other dialects. Furthermore, the cause of reciprocal metatony can be traced precisely in positions with the circumflex on the penultimate and at the same time first syllable in the word (also without proclitics), when retraction was not possible. Because of the tendency of eliminating stressed circumflex syllables, metatony of the circumflex to the acute started to operate in cases where retraction was not possible. This further caused the opposite reaction; that is, metatony of the acute to the circumflex. At some point, metatony spread to posttonic long vowels as well, which yielded the opposition *'večìè:r* and *'večìé:ra*. The main argument against this assumption, however, is that in this case one would have to assume that the metatony operated in final and antepenultimate syllables as well (where the stress could not be retracted from circumflex syllables), whereas it probably only occurred in penultimate syllables. On the other hand, because of the merger in final syllables and the neutralization in antepenultimate syllables that blurs the direct evidence, one cannot limit the operation of metatony to penultimate syllables. This means one could theoretically assume $\hat{V} > \acute{V}$ and after the merger $> \grave{V}$; further $\acute{V} > \grave{V}$; and after the merger $> \grave{V}$: because the retraction would not operate anymore. According to this pattern, *'večìè:r* could be explained by the merger in final syllables that would also operate on posttonic long vowels (*'večìè:r* < **'večìé:r* < **'večìè:r* < *večêr*). Likewise, metatony could have operated on antepenultimate syllables or on syllables accented further to the left because in this case the evidence of the operation vs. non-operation is blurred because of neutralization. Thus, $\hat{V}VV[V]$ would yield $\acute{V}:VV[V]$ and after neutralization $> \acute{V}:VV[V]$; $\acute{V}VV[V] > \acute{V}:VV[V]$ and after neutralization $> \acute{V}:VV[V]$. This theoretically means that metatony could have operated in all syllables, which would confirm the explanation of its origin given above. However, in that case forms such as *'kapù:žema* would have to be explained by analogy with singular forms of the same paradigm and forms such as *z 'ablè:kam* by analogy with other cases of the same paradigm. However, the circumflex in this case would still be unexpected. If the metatony had also occurred in antepenultimate posttonic long vowels, one would expect the acute tone just as in penultimate syllables. Thus, it would be necessary to exclude the operation of metatony in antepenultimate posttonic long vowels, which, however, could be justified by the fact that at that time antepenultimate syllables were already tonemically weak and by the fact that the posttonic long vowels themselves could be tonemically weaker. Consequently this would prevent metatony. However, this argumentation is at least questionable.

There is thus a possibility that metatony did not operate on all syllables. However, it is unjustified to assume with certainty that a possible phenomenon did indeed apply only on the basis of the theoretical explanation of another phenomenon. The explanation of the causes for metatony thus remains open and awaits further evidence to prove or disprove it.

The Žiri Basin local dialect also evinces retraction onto *e* and *o*, which is relatively late, considering the fact that in some other dialects this retraction already occurred around the fifteenth century. The lateness of this retraction is attested in the broader area. However, it is also possible that the retraction occurred independently in the neighboring dialects, especially because the accentual systems at that time were already different. Furthermore, the stress on the final syllable in the Žiri Basin local dialect at that time (before the reduction) is attested only in the original short acute and long acute syllables. Thus the retraction from final short acute syllables may well have occurred independently according to the general tendency of retracting from final syllables in the Žiri Basin local dialect. Words with original final long acute syllables remain stressed on the final syllable until the present. The retraction spread to pretonic schwa and supershort syllables (the types *'mayla* and *'šerak*). Examples such as *'pa*

krax show that in the Žiri Basin local dialect proclitics are closely connected to the stressed words.

All the retractions consequently cause the concentration of accentual phenomena and intensity to peak in the penultimate syllable. Furthermore, the last syllable is tonemically weakened, which is common in Slovene dialects. This further leads to the reduction of schwa and high vowels in final syllables, which happens in the scope of vowel reduction elsewhere and is relatively late. Considering the time needed for all the accentual phenomena to occur, it can be assumed that the reduction operated quite later than the eighteenth century. The reduction also led to many new accentual possibilities. After the reduction, tonemic opposition was also possible in final syllables, whereas the tones on posttonic long vowels become phonemic. Furthermore, tonemic opposition is also possible in antepenultimate syllables (e.g., *'kapù:ijema*). All these tendencies and phenomena from Common Slovene to the present state formed the accentual system of the Žiri Basin local dialect. The system evinces several special features in its development, but on the other hand many changes occur that are common to Slovene dialects. In any case, the local dialect and its system are also interesting from the typological perspective because synchronically it evinces several special features, both in relation to other Slovene dialects as well as in relation to other languages.

5 Conclusion

5.1 Based on the arguments presented in section 2, I propose the following relative chronology of the accentual phenomena of the Žiri Basin local dialect:

1. Retraction from final, primarily open circumflex syllables of the type *'aku*;
2. Retraction from closed final long circumflex syllables and from internal long circumflex syllables of the type *'večìè:r* and the formation of posttonic long vowels with tone;
3. a) Reciprocal metatony in the penultimate syllable that also occurs on posttonic long syllables;
b) Merger of the acute and circumflex in the final syllable in favor of the circumflex, which is more recent than the phenomenon in section 2, and concludes with the complete reduction of high vowels and schwa in final syllables with the exception of *-r/nəc*;
c) Neutralization in the antepenultimate syllable and in stressed syllables further to the left, whereby this phenomenon is more recent than the phenomenon in section 2 and older than full reduction in word-final position;
4. Retraction of stress from final short syllables onto *e* and *o*, lengthening of the vowel, and the formation of acute syllables;
5. Retraction of stress from short final syllables onto a schwa or supershort vowel and the retraction of stress from final short syllables onto the proclitic;
6. New words coming into the system receive analogical stress.

5.2 Schematically, the relative chronology is represented in the following table:

V̂V̂ > 'V̂V̂			
V̂V̂C > 'V̂V̂:C V̂V̂V > *'V̂V̂:V V̂V̂VV > 'V̂V̂:V(V)			
[V]V̂V̂ > [V]V̂:V V̂V̂ > V̂:V *'V̂V̂:V > 'V̂V̂:V		V̂ > V̂: V̂ > V̂: V̂V̂ > V̂V̂: V-V̂ > V-V̂: V-V̂ > 'V-V̂:	[V]V̂VV > [V]V̂:VV V̂VV > V̂:VV V̂VVV > V̂:VV(V) V̂VVV > V̂:VV(V)
e/oV̂ > é:/ó:V			
V̂V̂ > 'V̂V̂ V̂-V̂ > 'V-V̂			
Reduction in word-final position	Reduction of ə in -r/nəc		
	Full reduction		

References

- Greenberg, Marc L. 1987. Prozodične možnosti v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku in slovenskih narečjih. *Slavistična revija* 35. 171-186.
- Greenberg, Marc L. 2003. Word prosody in Slovene from a typological perspective. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 56/3. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. 234-251.
- Ramovš, Fran. 1929. O premiku akcenta v tipih zvezdã, ženã in mæglã v slovenskem jeziku. *Lud słowiański* 1a. 48–61. In *Zbrano delo. Razprave in članki. Book 2*. Ed. Jože Toporišič. Ljubljana: Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts. 1997.
- Ramovš, Fran. 1950. Relativna kronologija slovenskih akcentskih pojavov. *Slavistična revija* 3. 492-499. In *Zbrano delo. Razprave in članki. Book 2*. Ed. Jože Toporišič. Ljubljana: Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts. 1997.
- Stanonik, Marija. 1977. Govor Žirovske kotline in njenega obrobja. *Slavistična revija* 25/2-3. 293-309.

The Relative Chronology of Accentual Phenomena in the Žiri Basin Local Dialect (of the Poljane Dialect)

In addition to the phenomena described in the literature, the Žiri Basin local dialect evinces some other special features that have been discovered and described in this paper. Specifically, it is noted that accent retraction occurs from antepenultimate circumflex syllables, from which it follows that in such positions there is a tonemic contrast. Moreover, the microdialect displays a special feature in long monosyllables, whereby the ictus changes if the syllables were originally circumflex and preserves the place of stress if they were acute. Thus a stress retraction occurs onto the proclitic from original short acute syllables. On the basis of this and the previously described phenomena, the paper presents the following relative chronology of the accentual phenomena: 1. retraction from final, primarily open circumflex syllables; 2. retraction from closed final long circumflex syllables and from internal long circumflex syllables; 3. a) reciprocal metatony in the penultimate syllable; b) merger of the acute and circumflex in the final syllable in favor of the circumflex, which is more recent than the phenomenon in section 2, and concludes with the complete reduction of high vowels and schwa in final syllables with the exception of *-r/næc*; c) neutralization in the antepenultimate syllable and in stressed syllables further to the left, whereby this phenomenon is more recent than the phenomenon in section 2 and older than full reduction in word-final position; 4. retraction of stress from final short syllables onto *e* and *o*; and 5. retraction of stress from short final syllables onto a schwa or supershort vowel and the retraction of stress from final short syllables onto the proclitic. Other explanations are also considered, which, except for the chronology of 2 and 3. a) and the rise of posttonic length, allow the same relative chronology. The paper also places the resulting chronology into the broader context of the development of Slovene word prosody, which demonstrates that the system maintained a conservative accentual system for a longer time, which around the eighteenth century, because of the retraction of stress from circumflex syllables, began to change rapidly. Although the explanation of the causes for metatony are difficult to establish, it is possible that its origin is to be found in the operation of circumflex syllables, where stress retraction was impossible. In addition, the paper illuminates the operation of the remaining accentual phenomena that led to the particular configuration of the accentual system of the Žiri Basin.

Keywords: Relative chronology, Žiri Basin microdialect, accentology