

The treatment of the Proto-Slavic falling tone in the Resian dialects of Slovene

Willem Vermeer

[Note on the 2009 version. This article first appeared in *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 10, 1987, 275-298. Its purpose was to investigate the reflex of the falling tone of Proto-Slavic in the extreme north-west of the Slovene linguistic territory. The present text is virtually identical to the printed version. Two typos have been corrected (in Ziljski examples given on the original p. 286). The endnotes of the original edition (pp. 296-297) have been changed to footnotes. The page numbers of the original edition have been added, according to the following model: “the bulk of |276| Slavonian”, meaning that “the bulk of” are the last words of p. 275 and “Slavonian” the first word of p. 276. Where words were originally printed partly on one and partly on another page, page numbers have been put after them rather than in the middle, as in “unproductive |292|” instead of *“(un)produc-|292|tive”.]

To the memory of Jakob Rigler

1. The Proto-Slavic falling tone in Slovene and Serbo-Croat.

1.1. Slovene versus Serbo-Croat: a deceptive dichotomy.

It is a more or less generally accepted tenet of Slavic accentology that late Proto-Slavic distinguished between two tones, one of which is traditionally designated as falling, the other as rising (cf. Stang 1957: 20-55). As is well-known, the Western South Slavic dialect area (as represented by Slovene and Serbo-Croat) has retained more information about the Proto-Slavic tone contrast than other dialect areas. At first sight the reflexes of the Proto-Slavic falling tone are distributed in a way that expresses a clear dichotomy opposing Serbo-Croat to Slovene:

- (1) In Slovene every falling vowel has ceded the stress to the following syllable, which has come to carry a falling tone which is always long, irrespective of the original quantity of the vowel involved, e.g. **ǫko* ‘eye’, **bŷlo* ‘be’ (*l*-participle neuter sg.), **ǫblǫkъ* or **ǫblǫkъ* ‘cloud’ are reflected as *okô*, *bilô*, *oblāk*, etc. This familiar phenomenon will be referred to as “the progressive stress shift”.
- (2) The most archaic dialects of Serbo-Croat have retained the Proto Slavic place of the stress in all positions. However, the tone contrast has persisted in the case of long reflexes only and even in case of length retention of the contrast is limited to certain western dialect areas (much of čakavian and kajkavian, the bulk of |276| Slavonian štokavian). Elsewhere the distinction has been completely eliminated, notably in the neoštokavian dialects whose accentuation underlies the normative system.

1.2. Complications I: The progressive shift from weak jers.

The dichotomy that was described in the preceding section (shift equals Slovene; absence of shift equals Serbo-Croat) is evidently too simple to be realistic. Several types of complications are known to exist.

In Serbo-Croat the lengthening of the originally posttonic short vowel which is so striking a characteristic of the progressive stress shift is quite common if the originally stressed vowel was a weak jer. As far as I know two variants of the phenomenon have been attested:

- (a) In kajkavian any stressed weak jer which originally carried a falling tone seems to have imparted a long falling tone to the vowel of the following syllable, giving rise to such cases of alternation as Prodindol *vèčer* ‘evening’ vs. *zvêčera* ‘in the evening’ (Rožić 1893-94 I: 107, III: 60), Brezova kod Začretja *po vòdu* ‘in order to fetch water’ vs. *h vûodu* ‘into the water’ (with $h < *v$; Junković 1972: 200), Ozalj *òko* ‘eye’ vs. *v ôko* ‘into the eye’, *zèmlju* ‘earth’ (Asg.) vs. *v zêmlju* ‘into the earth’ (Težak 1981: 241, 261, 264).¹
- (b) In čakavian and štokavian a similar lengthening is restricted to monosyllabic forms ending in a vowel, cf. *dnê* ‘day’ (archaic Gsg.), *stô* ‘hundred’ vs. *dnò* ‘bottom’, *gdjè* ‘where’.²

This can be explained by the assumption that in fact the progressive stress shift started to take place in Serbo-Croat the same way it did in Slovene, but that it never got beyond an early stage, perhaps because the phonetic preconditions necessary for it to take place were undermined by the changes in the realization of the tones which were ultimately to lead to the loss of the tone contrast on short vowels in Serbo-Croat (cf. Vermeer 1983: 468f.). As usual kajkavian is intermediate between Slovene and čakavian/štokavian, but closer to the latter than to the former. |277|

1.3. Complications II: Bednja.

The dichotomy according to which the presence of the progressive stress shift equals “Slovene” and its absence “Serbo-Croat” fails to provide room for at least one dialect of which a good description is available. The kajkavian dialect of Bednja as described by Josip Jedvaj clearly shows the effects of the shift in such examples as *eblâok* ‘cloud’, *gelôub* ‘dove’, *kekÿeš* ‘hen’, *vesâl* ‘cheerful’, *pečâl* ‘begin’ (*l*-participle), *syšêit* ‘dry’ (supine), *nojÿepok* ‘upside down’ (1956: 283, 286, 288, 296, 303, 305, 310, 320, 329; the letter *y* has been accented in accordance with Jedvaj’s rule, p. 279). This rather striking fact was first commented on by Pešikan (1963-64: 558, 560).

¹ Since in the case of the problems treated in the present paper the facts are not disputed, the examples that will be given are purely illustrative.

² In ordinary types of čakavian and štokavian the form *dnê* proves nothing because there the Gsg. ending *-e* is always long; however, the *-e* of *dnê* is even long in those dialects where the ending is otherwise short, e.g. in Omišalj on Krk, contrast Gsg. *zemjè* ‘earth’ (my material).

In other respects there is nothing particularly Slovene about the Bednja dialect. Some examples:

- (1) The dialect has not carried through the otherwise general Slovene stress retraction onto pretonic syllables containing a long vowel (**dūšà* > *dúša*) and, possibly in connection with this, it has retained contrastive quantity in pretonic syllables, e.g. *fāōliti* ‘thank’ vs. *platiti* ‘pay’, cf. the retained final stress in such examples as *gespedāōrū* ‘gentleman’ (Dsg.), *vēinē* ‘wine’, *rōūkò* ‘hand’, *prādà* ‘he/she is spinning’ (Jedvaj 1956: 295, 299, 300, 310, 315, 316).
- (2) The vowel system of the dialect can easily be derived from the common kajkavian system posited by Ivić (1968: 57). This is another way of saying that Bednja has participated in several innovations that separate kajkavian from Slovene, e.g. the raising of the Proto-Slavic nasal vowel **ǫ* (cf. Rigler 1963: 29) or the chain of developments that led to the typically kajkavian merger of the reflex of **ě* with the reflex of the jers in strong position (see further Vermeer 1983: 450-458).
- (3) Compared with Slovene, Bednja has carried through the progressive shift in a limited set of environments; the Proto-Slavic place of the stress seems to have been retained in several types of cases, in particular (a) whenever the next syllable originally contained a weak jer and (b) in those cases where Serbo-Croat has a long reflex, e.g. *nāobrol* ‘gather’ (*l*-participle), *vēyžgot* ‘kindle’ (supine) (contrast the examples *pečāl* and *syšēit* given above), *sēino* ‘son’ (GAsg.), *sīene* ‘hay’, *ljēydi* ‘people’ (Npl.), *mōuža* |278| ‘husband’ (Apl.), *līepe* ‘nicely’ and similar examples (Jedvaj 1956: 288, 299, 312, 317, 321, 323, 324, 326; for a complete list of examples, with discussion, see Vermeer 1979: 366-372).

Since very little is known about the dialects spoken near the Slovene/Croat border it is likely that other aberrant systems have hitherto escaped detection. The dialect of Brezova Gora, near Bednja, but somewhat closer to the border, could be an example. Here we find shifted stress even in *žrēbiē* ‘foal’ (Kolarič 1964: 398), but the vowel system, with its *ie* and *uo* reflecting long **ě* and **o*, looks quite different from any known eastern Slovene system, as is rightly pointed out by Kolarič (o.c.: 397). For a responsible evaluation of the matter more reliable data are necessary.

1.4. The subject of this article.

The facts adduced in the preceding sections show that the familiar identification of shifted stress with Slovene nationality (and, complementarily, retained stress with Croat or Serbian nationality) is unrealistically crude. Hence it should be possible to discuss the treatment of the Proto-Slavic falling tone in the Western Balkan Slavic area without fear of coming into conflict with those who feel that somehow historical dialectology should seek to explain the nationality of the present speakers of the dialects involved. The progressive stress shift, though superficially linked to nationality, is in reality a much more complex phenomenon. This article is about the problem as to whether or not the progressive shift from falling vowels took place in the Resian dialect group of Slovene.

2. The Resian problem: retention or restoration?

2.1. The place of the stress in Resian.

Compared with most other Slovene dialects, Resian has been described in unusual detail. Jan Baudouin de Courtenay's well-known *Opyt* (1875) and *Teksty* (1895) constitute a mine of information. After the Second World War the experienced Slovene dialectologists [279] Tine Logar and Jakob Rigler have repeatedly conducted field-work in Resia; several illuminating, if concise, descriptions have resulted, e.g. Logar (1962-63: 5 = 1965: 159; 1963: 119-120; 1972; 1981a), Rigler (1963: 71-72; 1972: 116, 118-119, 121-125). These are only the most important publications in which Resian linguistic data have been reported; I trust they will suffice for the purposes of the present article.

This wealth of descriptive data cannot conceal the fact that quite a few central issues of synchronic and diachronic Resian phonology have not been properly clarified, beginning with such basic points as the number of vowels that can be distinguished in the various relevant positions or the precise reflexes of early Slovene short vowels in stressed final syllables (cf. now also Steenwijk's contribution to this issue of *SSGL*). As a consequence, discussion of seemingly quite straightforward diachronic processes involving some of the vowels can be a hazardous undertaking (for some discussion see further Vermeer forthcoming, sections 2-4).

Nevertheless, the data provided by Baudouin show quite clearly that modern Resian reflexes of forms that had a falling tone in Proto-Slavic stress the same syllable (the initial one) they did in Proto-Slavic times. This fact, which has been confirmed by Rigler (1972: 118-119) and Logar (1981a: 40) is not disputed. What is disputed is how best to account for it: did Resian simply fail to undergo the progressive stress shift (e.g. because of its geographically marginal position with respect to the Slovene linguistic area as a whole) or did it carry through the shift, only to restore the original place of the stress at a later stage as a consequence of a secondary stress retraction? Although the latter solution may seem perversely complicated, it has to be recalled that there are several Slovene dialect areas where just this seems to have happened.

2.2. Bajec, Ramovš, Rigler, Stankiewicz.

As is well-known, it was Ramovš's view that Resian accentuation is to be attributed to a secondary stress retraction (e.g. 1935: 33). Ramovš never discussed the evidence in detail (cf. Rigler 1972: 115-116), apparently because he thought the final word on the problem had been said by Bajec (1921-22), who had investigated [280] the material and had concluded that Resian did in fact undergo the progressive stress shift (and therefore presumably also a secondary stress retraction).³ Bajec's view turned into a

³ Bajec's brief article is a summary of his (unpublished) doctoral dissertation (see Kranjec 1972: 3). Neither Bajec's article nor Ramovš's early study of Resian (1928) has been available to me. I assume that Rigler quotes Bajec correctly and interprets him charitably; as regards Ramovš, Rigler (1972: 115-116) states explicitly that he "imel premik cirkumfleksa v rezijanščini in zilščini za dokazan" (it is the secondary stress retraction that is referred to) and never publicly reevaluated the facts.

piece of unproblematical background knowledge, or, as Rigler summed up things fifty years afterwards: “... danes o tem nihče več ne dvomi” (1972: 116). Rigler was evidently uneasy about this and in his contribution to the Bajec issue of the *Slavistična revija* he undertook to do the following things:

- (1) He reevaluated the evidence adduced by Bajec in favour of the assumption that Resian underwent the progressive stress shift. Rigler’s conclusions can be summed up as follows: though part or the evidence is to be rejected, it remains true that several points are best explained on the assumption that the progressive shift did take place in Resian.
- (2) He attempted to formulate the conditions of the retraction that restored the Proto-Slavic place of the stress. Contrary to what had tacitly been assumed at earlier stages in the development of Slovene historical linguistics this is no trivial problem: a formulation has to be found which makes it possible to account for the fact that long falling tones resulting from neocircumflex lengthening never lose the stress to the preceding syllable, e.g. *ba'sida* ‘word’, *ko'lina* ‘knee’ (NApl.).⁴ After some discussion of the facts Rigler concludes that the stress was regularly retracted from final syllables and that for other cases of retraction analogical processes must have been responsible.

The point was taken up by Stankiewicz (1984-85), who drew attention to the initial stress on prepositions found in such examples as *pod večer* (Baudouin 1895: 135) ‘towards (the) evening’, implying that Rigler’s stress retraction fails to generate this kind of accentuation, and concluded: “The simplest hypothesis which accounts for the initial position of the circumflex in Resia is, consequently, the one which sees it as a reflex of the inherited Common Slavic accentuation” (1984-85: 723).

Although I think Stankiewicz is basically right, the matter cannot be left as it stands. Too many loose ends are lying about. First, if it is true that the progressive stress shift did not take place in Resian, an explanation will have to be found for those properties of the dialect that have been regarded as providing evidence for the assumption that the dialect did undergo the shift. |281| Second, just as in Bajec’s case, not all of the evidence adduced by Stankiewicz has the force he would like it to have, so we shall have to evaluate Stankiewicz’s argumentation as well. Third, if it is true that Resian did not participate in the progressive stress shift, the question has to be faced as to how it was possible that Resian, which shared a large part of its stormy early development with neighbouring Slovene dialect areas (in particular Koroški), escaped an early Slovene innovation.

⁴ Examples quoted by Rigler (1972: 119). Since no useful purpose would be served in reproducing all intricacies of Baudouin’s transcription (or rather transcriptions) I quote all Resian forms in the transcription employed by Tine Logar in his description of Solbica phonology (1981a).

3. Evidence in favour of a progressive stress shift.

Before turning to those parts of the evidence that Rigler adopts, we shall take a brief look at those he rejects:

- (1) Bajec adduces a few examples “v katerih je ohranjen naprej premaknjeni cirkumfleks” (Rigler 1972: 116) and which therefore might be regarded as relics that somehow survived the later secondary retraction that restored the Proto-Slavic place of the stress. Rigler shows convincingly that in fact these examples contain no information pertaining to the progressive stress shift. Rigler would have been even more convincing if he would not have limited the discussion to the examples given by Bajec. Scattered among Baudouin de Courtenay’s material there are a few examples of mobile *l*-participles with non-initial stress, in particular *u'mir/u'mar/u'mor* (*Opyt*: 63) ‘die’, *po'čel* (*Opyt*: 92) ‘begin’. Now even apart from the obvious fact that not every single example given by Baudouin can be expected to be in all respects reliable I do not think that these forms can shake the overwhelming evidence showing that initial stress is the phonetically regular accentuation in such forms. In *u'mar* etc. we may find the disturbing influence of the non-syllabic prefix **v*-; as regards the second example there is also evidence of initial stress, e.g. *počala* (*Opyt*: 54), which presupposes a msc.sg. form with initial stress.
- (2) Bajec argues that in some cases Baudouin’s indications of vowel length and posttonic vowel timbre contain information that can best be explained by assuming a progressive shift. However, according to Rigler (who, it must be recalled, had first-hand knowledge of the dialect) Baudouin’s indications are unreliable and probably do not contain any relevant information at all (1972: |282| 124-125). I agree with Rigler that in the present state of our knowledge it is best to disregard Baudouin’s indications about quantity and posttonic vowel timbre. However, in view of the persistent uncertainty of investigators in determining the number of Resian vowels, the issue cannot be regarded as closed; in the end we may have to return to Baudouin.⁵

3.1. The alternation involving PSl. **o* In Resian *'bōha/z' buhon*.

The first type of evidence has to do with the Resian reflexes of Proto-Slavic **o*. We find *o* in those cases in which **o* was stressed in Proto-Slavic and carried a falling tone, whereas we find *u* in those cases in which the **o* was posttonic and received the stress from a weak jer in the initial syllable. (The distinction between *o* and *u* is not among those that have caused trouble.)

The phenomenon is well illustrated by the alternation in *'bōha* (e.g. *Opyt*: 48) ‘God’ (GAsg.) vs. *z' buhon* (*Opyt*: 35) ‘with God, farewell’, reflecting Proto-Slavic **bōga* vs.

⁵ Two examples. Logar has twice given the vowel inventory of Solbica Resian (1963: 120; 1981a: 35). The second time the system contains a shwa that is not there the first time. Several authors, beginning with Logar (1962-63: 5) and Rigler (1972: 116n.) have voiced doubts about the contrastiveness of the difference between *ę* and *o*. (See further the discussion of other cases in Vermeer, forthcoming, sections 2.2, 4.5-7, cf. now also Steenwijk’s contribution to this volume of *SSGL*.)

*s \check{b} bogom \check{b} . Other examples: g'noja/h'noja/'noja 'dung' (Gsg.)⁶, 'kolo 'wheel', 'oči 'eyes', 'g \check{o} lup/'h \check{o} lup 'dove', etc. (all examples *Opyt*: 48-49) vs. z'huda (*Opyt*: 29, 40, 76) 'early' (reflecting *s \check{b} goda), s'puvet, Gsg. s'puvada (*Opyt*: 128) 'confession', 'tub 'dule (*Opyt*: 31, cf. 86) 'in the valley' (reflecting *v \check{b} dol \check{e}).

The view that examples like z'huda provide evidence for the progressive stress shift presupposes that modern Resian *u* is the regular reflex of falling **o* (in all positions) and that therefore the \check{o} we find in examples like 'b \check{o} ha has to be attributed to a secondary development: the secondary stress retraction.

Now surely it should have been obvious all along that these examples do not in fact prove what they are thought to prove: they show merely that modern Resian *u* is the regular reflex of posttonic **o* in those cases where it received the stress because a weak jer in the initial syllable became unstressable (and was subsequently lost). In other types of examples modern Resian *u* and \check{o} are the regular reflexes of long and short **o* respectively, e.g. 'du 'who', s'tu 'hundred', 'buk/'buh/'bu 'God' (Nsg., cf. also note 6), ot'ruk 'child' (Gpl.) vs. 'n \check{o} vi 'new' (long form), 'd \check{o} bar 'good', 'k \check{o} žica 'skin, hide', etc. (*Opyt*: 48-50, Logar 1981a: 37-38). Hence modern [283] Resian 'b \check{o} ha vs. z 'buhon reflects earlier *'boga vs. *z 'b \check{o} gom. The resemblance with kajkavian examples of the type z \check{e} mlju/v z \check{e} mlju is obvious (cf. above, section 1.2.(1)). Nobody would think of regarding such forms as evidence that kajkavian underwent the progressive stress shift from all falling vowels.

Similarly, Resian forms like z 'buhon do not need the assumption of a progressive stress shift from all falling vowels in order to receive a simple explanation: it has merely to be assumed that in Resian as in kajkavian originally posttonic vowels were lengthened when they received the stress from a preceding weak jer. The change can be regarded as a very limited manifestation of the progressive stress shift.

It goes without saying that a direct connection between Resian and kajkavian is out of the question: the similarity is caused by the fact that both dialects are geographically marginal with respect to the area that carried through the progressive shift in its complete form.

3.2. The short reflex of long falling * \check{e} in Resian 's \check{e} no.

Resian differs from most of its neighbours in having lost the Proto-Slavic tone contrast. Since like most Slovene dialects Resian seems to have undergone the well-known lengthening of short vowels in stressed non-final syllables (*bràta > bráta), almost all information about the distribution of length in non-final syllables has been obliterated. Fortunately there are two types of cases in which the length contrast is continued as a timbre contrast: **o* ("long" *u* vs. "short" \check{o}) and * \check{e} ("long" *i* vs. "short" \check{e}). Since **o* reflects an Indo-European short syllabic nucleus whereas * \check{e} continues a whole array of long syllabic nuclei, Resian has retained at least some information

⁶ The difference between the three forms exemplifies the well-known inner-Resian variation with respect to the reflex of Proto-Slavic *g*, which is a stop in the west (Bela), a fricative in the center (Njiva and Osobjane/Učja) and zero in the east (Solbica).

about the behaviour of both types of syllabic nuclei. We have seen in what way *o is reflected in positions relevant to the problem of the Proto-Slavic falling tone. Although the case of *ě is quite different, it has also been interpreted as providing evidence in favour of the progressive stress shift.

The reflex of *ě is short (e) in disyllabic forms which in Proto-Slavic times had a long falling tone, e.g. *b'reha* 'hill' (Gsg.), *l'esa* 'wood' (Gsg.), *'sęno* 'hay', *l'ępo* 'nicely', *S'tęna* |284| 'name of a hill' (with the accentuation of the A sg., on which see Baudouin, *Opyt*: 74-76, Rigler 1972: 120-121, Stankiewicz 1984-85: 721-722) (all examples *Opyt*: 86, cf. Logar 1981a: 38). Examples like *'sęno* (rather than ***'sino*) indicate that before Resian lost contrastive vowel quantity the regular reflex of Proto-Slavic falling length was stressed brevity.

The stressed brevity of Resian contrasts strikingly with the long reflexes we find in Serbo-Croat, e.g. čakavian (Novi Vinodolski) *sęno*, *lipo* etc., cf. also the consistently long stem vowel in the paradigm of *vlās*, e.g. Gsg. *vlāsa* (Belić 1909: 184, 185, 209). This difference between Resian and Serbo-Croat can be considered evidence in favour of the progressive stress shift to the extent that it receives a natural explanation if one assumes that first the progressive shift caused long falling vowels to lose the stress to the second syllable, after which the originally stressed vowels (which were now pretonic) were shortened, so that when eventually a secondary stress retraction restored the original place of the stress, it was a short vowel that now became stressed, e.g. **vlāsa* yielding **vlāsā* (with progressive stress shift), yielding **vlāsā* (with shortening of pretonic length), yielding **vlāsa* (with secondary stress retraction and shortening of posttonic length).

As evidence for the progressive stress shift this is weak, because a plausible explanation not involving the shift can easily be devised: the shortening of long falling vowels in disyllabic forms may have been very early.

It is well-known that the Proto-Slavic long falling vowels have short reflexes in all daughter languages in at least some types of cases. In West Slavic shortening was even universal: there long falling vowels were shortened in all positions. Though in Serbo-Croat, too, shortening was quite normal, two important types of forms have length:

- (a) Monosyllabic forms, with the proviso that there the reflexes of the short falling vowels are also long, so that in this position, too, the contrast has been obliterated, e.g. čakavian (Novi Vinodolski) *dān* 'day', *vōz* 'cart', *vlās* 'hair', etc.
- (b) Disyllabic forms, where the contrast between long and short falling vowels was maintained, e.g. *vlāsa* 'hair' (Gsg.) with length, contrasting with brevity in Gsg. *vōza* 'cart' (and with a lost weak jer in *stō* 'hundred'). (The examples are given by Belić |285| 1909: 209-210, 223, 237.)

So, the familiar length alternations we find in such cases as *mōst/mōsta/mōstovi* and *grād/grāda/grādovi* illustrate the regular reflexes of falling length in Serbo-Croat. Since Resian has long reflexes in monosyllables, but short reflexes in disyllabic forms, the dialect occupies a position exactly midway between Serbo-Croat and West Slavic, which is not strange, considering its geographical position: it can be supposed that in

Resian the late common Slavic shortening of long falling vowels affected disyllabic forms, unlike what happened in Serbo-Croat. In fact, it has been conjectured by Kortlandt on more general grounds that shortening of long falling vowels in disyllabic forms was a common Slovene innovation which set off Slovene from Serbo-Croat at a stage before the progressive stress shift took place (1975: 33). Hence, speaking in terms of the example given earlier, it can be assumed that at some relatively early moment (at the latest not long after Stang's law) Gsg. **vlāsa* was shortened to **vlāsa*, after which the short vowels that resulted from this development were treated like all other short vowels in stressed non-final syllables ("acute" and "short neoacute"). Since this solution is simpler than an explanation involving the progressive stress shift, it follows that the quantity reflected in the stem vowel of examples like Resian *'seno* provides no evidence in favour of the shift.

3.3. The treatment of the falling tone in Ziljski.

The third piece of evidence Rigler adopts does not involve Resian directly, but has to do with the Ziljski dialect group of Koroški. It consists in the fact that in the Ziljski dialect di- and polysyllabic forms reflect the Proto-Slavic falling tone as a long rising tone which scholars attribute to a stress retraction (Rigler 1972: 125), e.g. *sé:no* (Logar 1981b: 187) 'hay', with a rising tone presupposing a retraction from an earlier form **sěno* which betrays the effects of the progressive stress shift. At first sight this may seem somewhat far-fetched, because, after all, Ziljski is Ziljski and Resian is Resian. However, the two dialects are so closely related that I think Rigler is right in drawing attention to the point. |286|

The close relationship between Resian and Ziljski was first noticed, as far as I know, by Baudouin de Courtenay (1875: 121-122). Baudouin's impression, which was based on his own knowledge of Resian and on the Ziljski data in Jarnik (1842), was confirmed by later research, e.g. Ramovš (1935: 33) and Rigler (1963: 68-72); I have argued elsewhere (forthcoming, section 6.1., cf. also section 8.1.) that the Resian vowel systems do not necessitate the assumption of specifically Resian innovations until after the lengthening of short vowels in stressed non-final syllables (**brāta* > **brāta*) and the loss of nasality, in other words: the development of the vowel systems presupposes a period of common Resian-Ziljski development which must have lasted several centuries.

Nevertheless it has to be admitted that as evidence for the assumption that Resian underwent the progressive stress shift this point is not compelling either. It is quite possible for dialects that differ in certain respects to carry through common innovations, so the fact that there was a period of common Resian-Ziljski innovations does not prove absolute identity of the two dialects at the time when the common innovations were taking place. Moreover, as we shall see in a few moments, there are interesting connections between the Resian and the Ziljski reflexes of the Proto-Slavic falling tone.

It must be noted that the rising tone of Ziljski does not in itself prove a retraction, because short vowels lengthened in stressed non-final syllables (**brāta* > **brāta*) have also yielded a rising tone and Ramovš observes quite correctly: "Oni vokali, ki so do-

bili nov poudarek zaradi akcentskega premika *okô* > *òko* so enakšne narave kot nekdanji novo- oziroma staroakutirani vokali ...” (1935: 8). A few examples of forms reflecting a Proto-Slavic falling tone: *ú:me* ‘name’, *sú:na* ‘son’ (Gsg.), *lú:de* ‘people’ (Npl.), *ú:xo* ‘ear’, *lé:san* ‘wooden’, *pé:paū* ‘ashes’ (Nsg.), *kó:ran* ‘root’, *mó:žγanę* ‘brains’, *mé:so* ‘meat’, *zó:ba* ‘tooth’ (Gsg.), *mó:žę* ‘man’ (Npl.), *zwá:to* ‘gold’, *wá:sę* ‘hair’ (Npl.), *ná:rabe* ‘the wrong way round, topsyturvy’, cf. the reflexes of short stressed vowels in such examples as *lí:pa* ‘lime-tree’, *sé:me* ‘seed’, *bré:za* ‘birch-tree’, *pé:kø* ‘bake’ (l-participle), *kó:ža* ‘skin, hide’, *télé:ta* ‘calf’ (Gsg.), *á:bako* ‘apple’, etc. (Logar 1981b: 186-189). So the rising tone of Ziljski *sé:no*, though quite easily understandable on the basis of a secondary retraction, can also reflect earlier |287| stressed brevity and hence a Proto-Slavic falling tone, on the assumption (supported by Resian) that the Proto-Slavic falling tone was shortened in Slovene in all positions except monosyllabic forms (cf. above, section 3.2.).

Nevertheless all known varieties of Ziljski must have undergone the progressive stress shift in at least some types of cases:

- (1) In the familiar type of Ziljski spoken in the extreme west of the Zilja valley in Austria only a single example with shifted stress has been reported in the literature: *sərũ:to* ‘orphan’ (Asg.), contrast the Nsg. *sərò:ta* (both forms Grafenauer 1905: 205; Logar 1981b would have written **sərũ:əto*, *sərwóta*). The timbre and tone alternation in the second syllable faithfully reflects the Proto-Slavic stress alternation in **sirotà* vs. **sìrotø*. Since it is difficult to envisage a secondary origin of the alternation the example, isolated though it is, virtually proves that Zilja Ziljski underwent the progressive stress shift in polysyllabic forms. It goes without saying that this fact does not prove in turn that in Zilja Ziljski the shift took place in other types of cases, too: we have seen that in this respect the evidence is ambiguous.
- (2) The type of Ziljski spoken in the Kanalska Dolina, in between Resian and Zilja Ziljski, has shifted stress in disyllabic forms with a closed second syllable, e.g. *abù:əd* ‘frame’, *lasè:n* ‘wooden’, *dasè:t* ‘ten’, *gaò:b* ‘dove’ (Logar 1971: 117-119; I have slightly simplified the transcription of the consonants in these examples). Rigler (1972: 120) draws attention to the fact that this constitutes an evident obstacle to any attempt at simply equating Resian and Zilja Ziljski as far as the historical development of the accentual system is concerned.
- (3) The type of Ziljski spoken in Rateče, in the area where Ziljski shades into Gorenjski, has shifted stress in all conceivable types of cases, even in such examples as *kaû* ‘wheel’, *masû* ‘meat’, etc. (Logar 1954: 146).

Now whatever the Ziljski facts, they cannot, I think, be regarded as proof that Resian underwent the progressive shift. What they rather suggest is that some types of Ziljski failed to carry through the shift in certain types of cases and shortened the vowels involved, in accordance with what we find in Resian. |288|

3.4. Summary of the evidence in favour of the progressive shift.

We have seen that the evidence that has been adduced to support the idea that the progressive stress shift took place in Resian does not prove anything of the sort. It

shows merely that there are one or two things that can be explained naturally on the assumption that the shift affected Resian. I have argued that alternative explanations can easily be devised.

However, given this result, it would still be too rash to conclude that therefore Resian cannot have undergone the progressive stress shift: it is quite possible that the stress was shifted, but that it was retracted at a later stage without leaving detectable traces. After all, the traces one expects in cases like this crucially involve tonal phenomena and/or the results of vowel reduction and it so happens that Resian has no tone contrast and is (as Slovene dialects go) singularly conservative as far as vowel reduction is concerned. So now we have to look at the other side of the matter: is there compelling counterevidence?

4. Secondary stress retraction.

If one opts for the view that Resian underwent the progressive stress shift, one is stuck with the consequences: it has to be assumed that subsequently a secondary stress retraction restored the Proto-Slavic place of the stress. It has proved difficult to determine the conditions under which such a retraction took place.

There is a straightforward reason for this difficulty. The progressive stress shift generates long falling tones in non-initial syllables, e.g. *oblāk*, Gsg. *oblāka*. The retraction will have to be formulated in such a way that these long falling vowels lose the stress to the preceding syllable. Now it so happens that in Slovene there is a second source of stressed long falling vowels, to wit the so-called “neocircumflex”.⁷ It is not disputed that Resian, too, has neocircumflex, although of necessity the direct evidence is limited to those forms that have the reflex or **ě* or **o* in the stressed syllable, cf. the alternation in such examples as *striho* ‘thatched roof’ (Isg.), *dilan* ‘I am doing’ (with *i* reflecting an earlier long **ě*) vs. Nsg. *streha*, Inf. *dēlat* (with [289] *ē* reflecting earlier short, i.e. non-neocircumflex **ě*) (Baudouin, *Opyt*: 83). The problem of establishing the conditions of the secondary stress retraction is caused by the fact that in Resian all examples of the type *oblāka* have initial stress, whereas there is not a single example of retracted neocircumflex. This distribution is unproblematical if one adopts the view that the progressive stress shift never took place in Resian. However, at the moment we are investigating the consequences of the view that the shift did take place, so that a retraction has to be formulated. I see at least three possible solutions:

- (1) It could be supposed that the stress retraction took place before the neocircumflex arose. As far as I know, this possibility has never been seriously contemplated. It is not attractive because it separates Resian from the remainder of Slovene at a stage when common Slovene innovations were taking place, so it presents no gain

⁷ Scholars disagree about what it was that gave rise to neocircumflex length. Since its existence is not contested, this absence of consensus does not affect the discussion about the treatment of the Proto-Slavic falling tone in Resian. I adhere to the view that neocircumflex length was caused by compensatory lengthening accompanying the elimination of posttonic length or a posttonic [297] non-final weak jer (Stang 1957: 26-31, cf. also Kortlandt 1976: 3-6, Vermeer 1985: 366-380).

with respect to the assumption that the progressive stress shift never reached Resian at all.

- (2) There may have been a phonetic difference between the falling tone caused by the progressive stress shift and the one associated with the label of “neocircumflex”. If that was the case the problem disappears: it can be supposed that the former tone ceded the stress to the preceding syllable, whereas the latter retained the stress. Nevertheless Rigler rejects this possibility, “saj je celo problematično, če sta se oba cirkumfleksa sploh kdaj razlikovala” (1972: 119). I agree with this: as long as there is no corroborative evidence for the assumption of the existence in early Slovene of two distinct falling tones, this solution is ad hoc and therefore unattractive.
- (3) A phonetic stress retraction which affected only part of the cases in which the progressive shift had taken place, may have been followed by analogical processes which retracted the stress in the remaining cases. This is the approach chosen by Rigler (1972: 119-124). He assumes that the stress was retracted from final syllables carrying a falling tone (e.g. **oblāk* > **ðblak*, with, say, Gsg. **oblāka* staying unchanged), after which the stress was retracted analogically in those words that had retracted the stress in at least some forms. In this way **oblāka* was analogically replaced with **ðblaka* (on the model of **ðblak*), whereas we find retained stress in, say, *ba'sida* ‘word’, which has neocircumflex [290] (the example is given by Logar 1981a: 39). Since falling tones in final syllables are nearly always attributable to the progressive stress shift, Rigler’s formulation yields a distribution which goes some way towards explaining how it was possible that the only falling tones that were retracted (phonetically or analogically) were those that had been produced by the progressive stress shift. Nevertheless the solution is in several respects problematical. Counterevidence has been adduced by Rigler himself and the entire conception has been criticized by Stankiewicz (1984-85: 723-725). All this requires some discussion.

4.1. Some invalid criticism.

Before turning to serious counterevidence I would like to discuss briefly two points that have been adduced to refute Rigler’s solution but that do not in fact prove what they are intended to prove:

- (1) Stankiewicz (1984-85: 722) argues: “the retraction of stress from a final long (falling) syllable presupposes a similar and prior shift of stress from a final short syllable” and since Resian has retained final stress in cases like *pača'na* ‘baked’ (PPP., fem.sg.) (Logar 1981a: 38), Rigler’s retraction is impossible on general grounds. This is not at all compelling: the falling tone of the syllables involved rather made them prone to undergo retraction. There is a typological parallel in kajkavian, where after the rise of the neocircumflex long falling tones in whatever syllable lost the stress to preceding long vowels (**zābāva* > *zābava*), whereas short stressed vowels kept the stress, giving rise to such alternations as Bednja *zībolo* vs. *zēibòle* (Jedvaj 1956: 311) ‘rock’ (l-part. fem.sg. vs. neut.sg.); in Turopoljsko-

Posavski (Ivšić's "Type III") long falling vowels lost the stress even to pretonic syllables containing short vowels. (See on all this Ivšić 1937: 185, 188; 1936: 80-81, cf. also Vermeer 1979: 375-377).

- (2) Stankiewicz (ibid.) argues: "the retraction of stress from a long (falling) medial syllable presupposes a similar and prior retraction of the stress from a final long syllable". I am inclined to agree with this, but since Rigler assumes a phonetic retraction from final syllables only, it is irrelevant. |291|

4.2. The initial stress of examples like Resian *'povodań*.

The most compelling type of counterexample is (quite characteristically) adduced by Rigler himself, who never succumbed to the modish habit of suppressing relevant counterevidence. After arguing that in examples like Npl. *'kòkòši* 'chicken' an analogical explanation is possible, he states: "Težje je pri *'bėčula*, *'ėzerò*, *'mòžd'ane*, *'otrabe*, *'povodań*. Tu kaka posplošitev naglasa, npr. pri nekaterih primerih iz gen. pl., ni posebno verjetna, pri vseh pa niti take možnosti ni" (1972: 122). Rigler's "težje" is an understatement. The words he quotes lack even a single form in which retraction is to be expected and which could trigger analogical retraction in the remainder of the paradigm. The upshot is that Rigler's theory fails to produce the attested initial stress of examples like *'ėzerò* and *'povodań*. These very same examples are quite unproblematic on the assumption that Resian failed to undergo the progressive stress shift.

4.3. The initial stress of examples like Resian *'na spovet*

A second type of counterexample is adduced by Stankiewicz, who draws attention to the stressed prepositions found "in various petrified, adverbial constructions", e.g. *'naprit* 'forward', *'pod večer* 'towards (the) evening', *'pò svete* 'in/around the world', *'za strahon* 'for fear' (1984-85: 723).

Now it has to be realized that Rigler's formulation of the retraction quite correctly generates stressed prefixes in the case of monosyllabic forms (e.g. *'naprit* < **napríd*). Hence it is not completely ruled out beforehand that prefixal stress spread from there to disyllabic forms, more or less in the way that the initial stress of **òblak* is held to have spread to **oblāka*, which then became **òblaka*. Although this is not excluded, I think it is at best awkward, among other things for the following reasons:

- (1) Rigler's retraction yields a clear-cut distribution: it predicts stressed prefixes in the case of monosyllabic nouns only. The material, such as it is, shows no trace of this distribution.
- (2) The facts of other Slavic languages show a clear tendency for prefixal stress to disappear or to become limited to unproductive |292| formations; in this context the spread of prefixal stress that would have to be assumed for Resian is something quite out of the ordinary. For these reasons I agree with Stankiewicz that Rigler's theory accounts poorly for the accentuation of examples like *'na spovet*. An alternative solution that does not give rise to this difficulty is clearly preferable.

5. Conclusions.

5.1. Summary of the evidence.

In the preceding sections I have tried to assess two assumptions that have been put forward in order to account for the Resian reflex of the Proto-Slavic falling tone.

The view that Resian has retained the Proto-Slavic place of the stress has been felt to have two principal disadvantages: (1) it divorces Resian from neighbouring Slovene dialects with which it is otherwise intimately connected and (2) it entails the additional assumption that the Proto-Slavic long falling tone was shortened in disyllabic forms.

Neither disadvantage is more than mildly annoying. The first implies the unwarranted assumption that dialects in order to be able to undergo shared developments have to be absolutely identical in every respect. Moreover, we have seen that Resian and Ziljski are linked by the remarkable fact that in disyllabic forms which have not undergone the progressive stress shift the long falling tone has the same reflex as the Proto-Slavic short rising tone. The second is not a disadvantage at all. Owing to the geographically intermediate position Slovene occupies between West Slavic and Serbo-Croat it is only to be expected that now and again we find that linguistically, too, Slovene is in the middle.

On the other hand, the view that Resian did carry through the progressive shift makes it necessary to formulate some kind of stress retraction which has to generate the actually attested stress. We have seen that Rigler's formulation (the only one to date) is problematical because it fails to produce an important group of attested forms. [293]

At this point we can choose between at least two options. We can revert to the idea that there was a phonetic difference between the falling tone produced by the progressive stress shift and the one associated with the label of "neocircumflex". We have seen that this option is explicitly rejected by Rigler and I quite agree: as long as the previous existence of two distinct falling tones is not confirmed by independent evidence from other sources, this assumption is ad hoc and therefore unattractive. Alternatively we can assume with Stankiewicz that the progressive stress shift never took place in Resian. I think that in view of the available evidence this is the most rational thing to do.

5.2. The rise of Resian accentuation.

The conclusion reached in the preceding section cannot be left hanging in the air. It has to be incorporated into a relative chronology that generates the attested accentual pattern of Resian Slovene, along the lines of the chronology proposed by Kortlandt (1976) to account for the accentual pattern of the classical norm.

I do not think it is necessary to assume any specifically Resian innovations prior to "Stang's law", the latest accentual development that was common to the whole of Slavic. After Stang's law operated, things must have gone on as follows:

- (1) General shortening of long falling vowels except in forms that were monosyllabic (not counting final jers), e.g. **mlâdostъ*, **sъnove*, Gsg. **vlâsa* > **mlâdostъ*, **sъnove*,

- *vlāsa*, but retention of length in Nsg. **vlāstь*, **mōstь*. This development may very well have been a common Slovene innovation differentiating Slovene from Serbo-Croat, which kept length in disyllabic forms ending in an open syllable: **vlāsa*.
- (2) Progressive stress shift from weak jers, e.g. **sǝ bogomь* > **stь bōgomь*. This development cannot have preceded the shortening of Proto-Slavic long falling vowels (1), because it gave rise to new long falling vowels which kept their length.
 - (3) At this stage the other Slovene dialects carried through the progressive stress shift from full vowels. In Resian the Proto-Slavic place of the stress was maintained, perhaps because by the time the shift reached the northwest, Resian had lost the tone [294] contrast on short vowels or modified their realization in such a way that the shift no longer made phonetic sense. Whatever may have been the case, the fact that Resian failed to carry through the progressive shift must not be interpreted as indicating that the dialect had lost touch with the Slovene hinterland, as later developments show.
 - (4) Three common Slovene innovations: (a) the rise of the neocircumflex, (b) the retraction of the stress in examples like **dūšā* > *dūša* (cf. already *Opyt*: 66-70), (c) lengthening of short stressed vowels in non-final syllables (**brāta* > *brāta*), e.g. **'seno*, **'leto* > **sé:no*, **lé:to* (by this time short *ě* and *e* had merged; short stressed vowels were neutral as to tone). For further discussion see Kortlandt (1976).
 - (5) Loss of the geographical contiguity of Ziljski and Resian (Ramovš 1935: 30-31).
 - (6) Period of independent Resian developments: (a) loss of distinctive tone; (b) elimination of distinctive vowel length giving rise to local differences within Resian (for discussion see Vermeer forthcoming, section 7.2.).

5.3. Six types of progressive stress shift?

I would like to end on a speculative note. We have seen (section 3.3.) that Resian is part of a larger complex of dialects which are peculiar with respect to the progressive stress shift; this larger complex also includes most varieties of Ziljski. In these dialects the progressive stress shift is found either not at all (Resian) or in a limited set of positions (Zilja Ziljski; Kanalska Dolina Ziljski). In those positions where we find retention or restoration of the Proto-Slavic place of the stress, the reflexes of vowels originally carrying the falling tone are identical to the reflexes of the corresponding short vowels (as was seen clearly by Ramovš). Now it must be obvious that for a more or less definitive solution we would have to know much more about Ziljski, in particular about the factors that cause neocircumflex or neocircumflex-like internal falling tones to be retracted to the preceding syllable, a retraction that does not seem to be phonetically regular, if Rigler's evaluation of the facts (1972: 123) is correct. [295] I would like here merely to draw attention to the picture of the early history of Resian and Ziljski that results if we assume that the rising tone of examples like *sé:no* is not due to a stress retraction, but to retention of early Slovene stressed brevity: the geographical pattern of shifted and retained/restored stress then turns out to make good sense in extra-linguistic terms.

The upper Sava valley provides the easiest (or rather: least difficult) road linking the Resian-Ziljski area with the Slovene hinterland. (I am referring to what is nowa-

days the road linking Kranjska Gora in Slovenia with Tarvisio/Trbiž in Italy.) If one assumes the progressive stress shift spilled over into the Resian/Ziljski area by this route while at the same time a strong tendency towards the elimination of the tone contrast on short vowels was at work in the area, one gets a simple explanation for the geographical pattern that troubled Rigler (see above, section 3.3(2)): the type of Ziljski spoken in Rateče, closest to the Slovene heartland, carried through the progressive stress shift in all possible positions; somewhat further away, in the Kanalska dolina, the tone contrast had been lost by the time it was the turn of disyllabic forms ending in a vowel; the position of the Kanalska dolina is in many ways analogous to that of Bednja. From there the progressive shift moved southward to Resia and northward to the Zilja valley. In the Zilja valley the tone contrast was lost when the shift had taken place in forms comprising three syllables (**s̃rot̃q* > **sirôtq*) and in cases like **s̃ bogom̃b*; in Resian it was only in the latter type of cases that the stress was shifted.⁸

This view presupposes that the progressive stress shift took place in stages depending on the shape of the forms involved, in the following order:

- (a) from weak jers onto open final syllables (*s̃tô*);
- (b) from weak jers onto following syllables in all other cases (*s̃ bogom̃b*);
- (c) from full vowels in polysyllabic forms (*sirôtq*);
- (d) from full vowels in disyllabic forms with a closed second syllable not containing a weak jer between the first and the second syllable (*oblâk̃b*);
- (e) from full vowels in disyllabic forms with a closed second syllable containing a weak jer between the first and the second syllable (*nab̃râl̃b*); |296|
- (f) from full vowels in disyllabic forms with an open second syllable (*oč̃i*).

The tendency to carry through a progressive stress shift from falling vowels was common to Serbo-Croat and Slovene. However, in čakavian and štokavian it was interrupted after stage (a), in normal kajkavian and in Resian after stage (b), in Zilja Ziljski after stage (c), in Bednja kajkavian after stage (d), in Kanalska dolina Ziljski presumably after stage (e), and in the remainder of Slovene (including Rateče Ziljski) it was carried to its natural limits.

Leiden University

References

- Bajec, Anton
1921-22 "O prvotnem slovenskem naglasu ^ v rezijanskem narečju", *Časopis za slovenski jezik, književnost in zgodovino* 3, 40-42. (Quoted on the basis of Rigler 1972.)

⁸ This view does not necessarily imply that at this early stage the precursor of Rateče Ziljski was actually spoken in Rateče (the historical facts seem to suggest that it was not, see Logar 1954: 145). It is sufficient to assume that the dialect was spoken somewhere between the western-most Gorenjski (or Proto-Gorenjski) points in the upper Sava valley and the Kanalska Dolina.

- Baudouin de Courtenay, Jan (= I. Boduën-de-Kurtenè)
 1875 *Opyt fonetiki rez'janskix govorov*, Varšava/Peterburg.
 1895 *Materialy dlja južnoslovjanskoj dialektologii i etnografii I: Rez'janskije teksty ...*, Sanktpeterburg.
- Belić, Aleksandar
 1909 "Zamětki po čakavskim govoram", *Izvēstija Otdělenija ruskago jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj akademii nauk* 14, 181-266.
- Grafenauer, Ivan
 1905 "Zum Accente im Gailthalerdialekte", *Archiv fur Slavische Philologie* 27, 195-228.
- Hafner, Stanislaus & Erich Prunč
 1982 *Schlüssel zum "Thesaurus der slowenischen Volkssprache in Kärnten"*, Wien (= *Schriften der Balkankommission. Linguistische Abteilung. Sonderpublikation*).
- Ivić, Pavle
 1968 "Procesi rasterećenja vokalskog sistema u kajkavskim govorima", *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 11, 57-68.
- Ivić, Pavle et al. (eds.)
 1981 *Fonološki opisi srpskohrvatskih/hrvatskosrpskih, slovenačkih i makedonskih govora obuhvaćenih Opšteslovenskim lingvističkim atlasom*, Sarajevo (= Posebna izdanja ANUBiH 55).
- Ivšić, Stjepan
 1936 "Jezik Hrvata kajkavaca", *Ljetopis JAZU* 48 (za godinu 1934-35), 47-88.
 1937 "Osnovna hrvatska kajkavska akcentuacija u Pergosića (1574)", in: *Zbornik u čast A. Belića*, Beograd, 183-195.
- Jarnik, Urban
 1842 "Obraz slovenskoga narječja u Koruškoj", *Kolo* 1, 41-57. (Quoted on the basis of Hafner & Prunč 1982: 94.)
- Jedvaj, Josip
 1956 "Bednjanski govor", *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 1, 279-330.
- Junković, Zvonimir
 1972 *Jezik Antuna Vramca i podrijetlo kajkavskoga dijalekta*, Zagreb (= *Rad JAZU* 363).
- Kolarič, Rudolf
 1964 "Haloški govor", *Prace filologiczne* 18/2, 395-401.
- Kortlandt, Frederik
 1975 *Slavic accentuation: a study in relative chronology*, Lisse (Peter de Ridder). |298|
 1976 "The Slovene Neo-Circumflex", *The Slavonic and East European Review* 54/1, 1-10.
- Kranjec, Marko
 1972 "Bibliografija Antona Bajca", *Slavistična revija* 20/1, 3-17.
- Logar, Tine
 1954 "Dialektološke študije I: Dialektična podoba zgornje Savske doline", *Slavistična revija* 5-7, 145-149.
 1962-63 "Današnje stanje in naloge slovenske dialektologije", *Jezik in slovstvo* 8, 1-6.
 1963 "Sistemi dolgih vokalnih fonemov v slovenskih narečjih", *Slavistična revija* 14, 111-132.
 1965 "Današnje stanje in naloge slovenske dialektologije", *Studia z filologii polskiej i słowiańskiej* 5, 155-160.
 1971 "Dialektološke študije XV: Govor Slovencev Kanalske doline v Italiji", *Slavistična revija* 19, 113-123.
 1972 "Rezijanski dialekt: (glasoslovna skica)", *VIII. seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture. Predavanja*, Ljubljana, 1-10.
 1981a "Solbica (Stolvizza; OLA 1)", in: Ivić et al. (1981), 35-40.
 1981b "Potoče (Potschach; OLA 146)", in: Ivić et al. (1981), 183-191.
- Pešikan, Mitar
 1963-64 review of Jedvaj (1956), *Južnoslovenski filolog* 26, 556-590.

- Ramovš, Fran
 1928 "Karakteristika slovenskega narečja v Reziji", *Časopis za Slovenski jezik, književnost in zgodovino* 7, 107-121. (Quoted on the basis of Rigler 1972: 115-6 and Stankiewicz 1984-85: 725.)
 1935 *Historična gramatika slovenskega jezika VII: dialekti*, Ljubljana.
- Rigler, Jakob
 1963 "Pregled osnovnih razvojnih etap v slovenskem vokalizmu", *Slavistična revija* 14, 25-76.
 1972 "O rezijanskem naglasu", *Slavistična revija* 20/1, 115-126.
- Rožić, Vatroslav
 1893-94 "Kajkavački dijalekat u Prigorju", *Rad JAZU* 115, 1893, 68-136; 116, 1893, 113-174; 118, 1894, 55-115.
- Stang, Christian S.
 1957 *Slavonic accentuation*, Oslo (= *Skifter utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, I. Hist.-Fil. Klasse* 1957/3).
- Stankiewicz, Edward
 1984-85 "The dialect of Resia and the "Common Slovenian" accentual pattern", *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 27-28, 719-725.
- Težak, Stjepko
 1981 "Ozaljski govor", *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 5, 203-428.
- Vermeer, Willem
 1979 "Innovations in the kajkavian dialect of Bednja", in: Jan M. Meijer (ed.), *Dutch Contributions to the Eighth International Congress of Slavists*, Lisse (Peter de Ridder), 347-381.
 1983 "The rise and fall of the kajkavian vowel system", *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 3, 439-477.
 1985 "On clarifying some points of Slavonic accentology: the quantity of the thematic vowel in the present tense and related issues", *Folia Linguistica Historica* 5/2, 331-395.
 forthc. "Reconstructing the evolution of the vowel systems of the Resian dialects", to appear (in Slovene translation) in *Slavistična revija*.