ON THE PHONOLOGY OF THE ČAKAVIAN DIALECT OF ĆUNSKI ON THE ISLAND OF LOŠINJ

This article deals with the phonology of a Central Čakavian dialect, both from a synchronic and diachronic perspective, and is based on the author's fieldwork material. First the author presents a synchronic analysis of the vowel system (including accentuation), then he proposes a reconstruction in the form of a series of rules which led from late dialectal Proto-Slavic to the present-day state of affairs. Special attention is given to the reflexes of jat. The article concludes with observations on the development of the consonants.

1. Introductory remarks

The material presented in this article was collected more than fourteen years ago, during two weeks of field-work in Ćunski in the summer of 1989. In that same year I made a preliminary analysis of the data, but until now I did not find the time to publish the results.

It was a lucky thing that I did not decide to visit Ćunski much later, because already in 1989 the number of potential informants was very small. Most houses in Ćunski were either uninhabited or owned by people from other parts of Croatia and used as weekend and holiday residences. For many decades, the 'original' population of Ćunski had been leaving the village for good, chiefly to the United States. As far as I could make out, only four families who had been living in Ćunski for at least
a couple of generations were still living there. Most members of these families were relatively young and not in full command of the local Čakavian dialect, but I was able to find five older dialect speakers (all over eighty years of age), four of whom were willing to spend a few hours with me, answer questions about their dialect and have themselves recorded. My material consists of nine hours of recorded speech.

The dialect possesses a combination of two traits which characterizes it as ‘Central Čakavian’ (see Vermeer 1982:289–290):1,2

1. an i/e-kavian reflex of Proto-Slavic *ē according to Jakubinskij’s law (see Jakubinskij 1925), e.g. dēlo ‘work’, vrime ‘time’;
2. absence of neocircumflex in the present of verbs with e-conjugation and fixed stem-sh’ess, e.g. plāče PR3sg ‘cry’, potēže PR3sg ‘pull’, rižete PR2pl ‘cut’, bižme PR3sg ‘bump’.3,4,5

2. Accentuation and vowel inventory

The dialect shows no phonemic tone opposition (‘rising’ vs. ‘falling’), but there is a length distinction on stressed vowels. As we shall see in 2.5 below, the feature ‘long’ is in some cases optional.

1 As I have tried to show in an earlier publication, Čunski is the northernmost village on Cres-Lošinj where Central Čakavian is spoken. The dialect of Nerezine (the second village north of Čunski and the northernmost village on Lošinj) is Northwest Čakavian, as are all dialects on Cres. The dialect of Sveti Jakov, the first village north of Čunski, is transitional between Central and Northwest Čakavian (1984–85:885).

2 In the following, I shall often compare the data from Čunski with those from other Čakavian dialects spoken on Cres-Lošinj, especially from the dialect of Orlec, on which I wrote a monograph. When reference is made to material from Orlec without any bibliographical information, the forms in question can be found in the lexicon of Houtzagers 1985 (pages 204–407).


4 Long ā and ē reflect originally short (not neo-circumflexed) vowels (see 2.1 below).

5 Strictly speaking, neocircumflex should also be absent in adjectives. If this criterion is applied, such Čunski forms as modli Nsg m ‘small’ and stoari Nsg m ‘old’ (with neo-circumflex) present a problem, but so does the absence of neocircumflex in stari in the (otherwise Northwest Čakavian) dialect of Orlec on Cres. Presence or absence of neocircumflex in adjectives does not seem to be a useful criterion for the distinction between Central and Northwest Čakavian on Cres-Lošinj.
2.1. Stressed final syllables; lengthening before tautosyllabic resonants

In stressed word-final syllables (including monosyllables) we have a five vowel system with a length opposition. All long non-high vowels but one are diphthongs. The only non-high long monophthong (á) has a limited distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>long</th>
<th></th>
<th>short</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>û</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ië</td>
<td>ûô</td>
<td>è</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oâ (á)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ò</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram 1: stressed word-final syllables

Examples: apriel 'April', unmić 'die', žil Gsp 'root', famiğ Gsp 'family', ziće 'hare', šezdesët '60', jenoår 'January', špoôh 'rope', znoån PR3sg 'know', Buôh 'God', muôre 'sea', nuôh Gsp 'leg', poberû PR3pl 'gather', kljûč 'key', kûç Gsp 'house', šufit 'attic', telecîc 'call' DIM, živit 'live', dešpêt 'damage', zêt 'son-in-law', zerë PR3sg 'eat (of animal), stolà Gsp 'table', fermàt 'stop', svenûc 'louse', póp 'priest', dobrô adverb 'good', bôp 'broad beans', krûh 'bread', paršüt 'ham', tloñu Lsg 'floor'.

The long vowels in diagram 1 reflect not only 'originally' long vowels, but also the results of lengthening before tautosyllabic resonants, e.g. ženûl LPm 'marry' (cf. ženîli LPplm), usnûl 'fall asleep' LPm (cf. usnûla LPf), tooôår 'donkey' (cf. tooâra Gsp), stuôl 'table' (cf. stolà Gsp).6

There are three sets of instances of long monophthongal â in stressed final syllables: (1) the lexeme vrâh 'devil'; (2) the Lpl ending -âh, e.g. nogôh 'foot', rukâh 'hand'; (3) forms ending in -âRC# (where R is r or l, C is one or more consonants and # is a word-boundary), e.g. párst 'finger', dárf Gsp 'firewood', vârh 'top', kâř 'blood', Târst 'Trieste', sârp 'sickle', pâlt 'complexion', pâlš 'snail', bâlh Gsp 'flea'.7

---

6 Lengthening before tautosyllabic resonants has taken place over a very wide area, including all dialects of Cres-Lošinj (cf. Houtzagers 1984-85:886).

7 The phonological status of â in the instances under (3) is not clear, since I have not attested any forms in -âRC# or -oâRC#. The monophthong â in the instances under (1) and (2) is phonemically distinct from oâ, cf. špoôh 'string'; I have no instances with -âh#. It is very well possible that the monophthongal quality of the vowel in vrâh is distinctive, as it is in the same word in many Čakavian dialects that usually diphthongize (or round) originally long a, cf. Hamm-Hraste-Guberina 1956:104, Houtzagers 1987:68, Budovskaja-Houtzagers 1994:95, Jurišić 1973:233, Steinhauer 1973:288, Vermeer 1975:141.
2.2. Stressed non-final syllables; the Lengthening Rule

In stressed non-final syllables the number of phonemic oppositions is greater than in stressed final ones. As can be seen in diagram 2, long non-high vowels cannot only be diphthongal, but also monophthongal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>diphthongal</th>
<th>long</th>
<th>monophthongal</th>
<th>short</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>īě</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oá</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram 2: stressed non-final syllables

As in many other dialects in the area, we must assume that there has been a lengthening of originally short ē, ā and ē in stressed non-final syllables. In the following I shall refer to this lengthening as the 'Lengthening Rule'. Monophthongal ē, ā and ū in diagram 1 reflect the results of the Lengthening Rule. Examples: poglědat 'look', susēda Gsg 'neighbour', věli 'big', rãme 'shoulder', slâme Gsg 'straw', znâli LPplm 'know', dōbar 'good', kõnji Npl 'horse', nōge Npl 'leg'.

The Lengthening Rule has caused length alternations in such paradigms as Crēs TOP, Gsg Crēsa; bogat 'rich', Nsgf bogatã; kanižot 'skirt', Npl kamižoti.

The long monophthongs ē and ā show a tendency to maximize the phonetic difference between themselves and the diphthongs īě and uō: they are often realized as closing diphthongs ([ěi], [oːi]). The degree of diphthongization varies.

Short ē, ā and ū in diagram 2 represent vowels on which the expected length is not found. Examples: dëset 'ten', zověno PR1pl 'call', năj- (superlative prefix), svâki 'each', dōma '(at) home' (but pud dōme 'on the way home'), dōsta 'enough', šolđi 'money'.

The monophthongs ī and ū and the diphthongs īě and uō reflect vowels that were already long before the operation of the Lengthening Rule. Examples: butiţa 'shop', pitaš PR2sg 'ask', zída Gsg 'wall', pūstimo PR1pl 'let', rîku Asg 'hand', źütu Asgf 'yellow', biělo Nsgn 'white', rětko Nsgn 'rare', viěže PR2pl 'tie', mlođi Nsgm

---

8 The Lengthening Rule has also operated in Sveti Jakov and Nerezine on Lošinj and in all dialects spoken on Cres (see Houtzagers 1984–85) and on Susak (see Vermeer 1975: 175–176). One can also argue that it operated in Kali on the island of Ugljan (see Budovskaja-Houtzagers 1994:95-96).

9 About the question of the exceptions to (or restoration after) the Lengthening Rule see 2.6.
'young', stroáha Gsg 'fear', vroáta Gsg 'neck', muore 'sea', uzguora 'from above', gruôzje 'grapes'.

Short i and û reflect originally short i and u. Examples: dimi PR3sg 'smoke', diçina 'children (r-A)', koliko 'how much', drugi Nsgm 'second', çûla LPf 'hear', kûhat 'cook'. Short i and û (both in final and nonfinal syllables) are sometimes realized lower than their long counterparts. The frequency of these lower realizations is different for each speaker and the degree of lowering varies as well.

2.3. First pretonic syllable

In unstressed syllables the length distinction was lost. In the first pretonic syllable originally long e, a and o are reflected as diphthongs, their originally short counterparts as monophthongs. This suggests that the loss of the length distinction in the first pretonic syllable took place after the diphthongization of originally long e, a and o:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diphthongal</th>
<th>Monophthongal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ie</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oa</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uo</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram 3: first pretonic syllable

Examples of diphthongs: cvietki Npl 'certain variety of fig', pieta 'heel', stiegnò 'hind-quarter', striesè PR3sg 'shake', viezât 'tie', zietac 'cask in which cheese is made', zoabila LPf 'forget', broadâ 'chin', buhoaça Gsg 'Dalmatian pyrethrum', pokovažat 'show', ploatit 'pay', proascâ Gsg 'pig', dvuirò (also dvorî) Lsg 'yard', guospû (also gospû) Asg 'Assumption of the Virgin Mary', kuogot 'anyone', nuorî (also morî) Lsg 'sea'. As one can expect on historical grounds, pretonic oa is quite common and ie and uo are relatively rare (resp. 10 and 4 different lexemes). The fact that in three out of four at-

10 Of course the lengthening before tautosyllabic resonants discussed in the preceding section has taken place in nonfinal syllables as well, e.g. luôncî, DIM of lonac 'pan'; studiencu 'well' Lsg, Studîncî TOP (cf. studênc 'well' Nsg); moâća 'March' Gsg (cf. Nsg mârac); rîlêcô, DIM of rîlo 'snout'.

11 Vermeer reports about Susak that '/i/' and '/u/' are not only shorter, but very often considerably lower than their short counterparts (1975:143). I have also had the opportunity of hearing the dialect of Susak and I think that both dialects show the same tendency towards lowering of i and u, but in Susak the lowering seems stronger and less sporadic.
tested paradigms with pretonic ŭo monophthongs occurs along with diphthongs suggests that pretonic ŭo is gradually disappearing.

Examples of monophthongs in the first pretonic syllable: imit ‘have’, letila kaminje ‘stones (collective)’, hodit ‘walk’, umira ju PR3pl ‘die’.

2.4. Other unstressed syllables

In other unstressed syllables than the first pretonic no trace of vowel length is left:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>i</th>
<th>u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram 4: other unstressed syllables

Examples: (pretonic) cimiturij ‘churchyard’, očgerili LP3plm ‘remove sheep-ticks from’, zaškuro lo se ‘become dark’ LPn, osušilo LPn ‘dry’, učinit ‘make’; (posttonic) zikvi Lsg ‘cradle’, time ‘crown (of head)’, varila LPf ‘turn’, gorilo LPn ‘burn’, dicu Asg ‘children (collective)’.

2.5. Problems with the length distinction on non-high vowels

The opposition between ‘short’ and ‘long and monophthongal’ on non-high vowels (i.e. ē – ĕ, ā – ā, ď – ď) in stressed nonfinal syllables (see 2.2) is not unproblematic. Numerous forms have been attested with doublet length and the number of forms that have been attested only short is very small. One could wonder if it would not be realistic to give up the idea of an opposition and assume not more than three non-high non-diphthongal vowels with free (or positionally motivated) variation in phonetic length. However, of the few forms that consistently have short ē, ā and ď (in spite of the Lengthening Rule) some have been attested relatively often and some agree with forms with unexpected shortness found in other dialects. I thought that this could hardly be a coincidence and therefore I chose to maintain the opposition in question in my description. I assume that the phonemes ē, ā and ď show variation in phonetic length (and can be realized long, half-long and even short) and that ě, ā and ď are realized only short. In phonological terms one can say that on ě, ā and ď the feature ‘long’ is optional or that there exists a ‘one way opposition’ (jednosmjerna opozicija, see Brozovič 1968:27–33) between ě, ā and ď vs. ē, ā and ď.

12 This is in fact what Budovskaja and I proposed for Kali on Ugljan (1994:94).
2.6. Forms that do not show the results of the Lengthening Rule

Forms with è, à and ò in nonfinal syllables (see 2.2 and 2.5) do not show the expected results of the Lengthening Rule. We must assume that either the forms in question were exceptions to the Lengthening Rule, or shortness in these forms was restored after the operation of the Lengthening Rule. There is no proof in favour of either alternative (exceptions or restoration). In 3 below I arbitrarily chose the second alternative (restoration of shortness after the Lengthening Rule). It is not clear why exactly these forms do not show the expected length while almost all others do. Here is a list of forms in which the expected length is not found:¹³

1. (forms of) svaki ‘each’, svakakove Npl ‘all kinds of’;¹⁴
2. the superlative prefix naj;¹⁵
3. zabijka ‘certain garment’;
4. the numerals ‘seven’ to ‘ten’: sédan, ósan, dèvet, dèset;¹⁶
5. the present endings -èmo, -ète, -èju;¹⁷
6. the words mèsto ‘place’, zemlja ‘earth’, tèško ‘difficult’, mètla ‘broom’, pulètkovat ‘pick the grapes that were left during harvest’;
7. present and LP forms of pòčnen ‘start’ PR1sg, pòčelo LPn; the words dòma ‘at home’, pòslì ‘after’, dòsta ‘enough’, šòldì Npl ‘money’ and the IMP forms hòmo 1pl and hòte 2pl ‘go’.¹⁸

3. Historical development of the vowels

As a point of departure for the reconstruction I assume the following earlier vowel system:

¹³ The list contains only forms that were attested at least three times, each time without doubt as to the shortness of the stressed vowel.
¹⁴ Shortness in the same words is found in Orlec.
¹⁵ Shortness in this prefix is generally found in the dialects on Cres-Lošinj north of Ćunski (see Houtzagers 1984-85:892).
¹⁶ The dialect of Susak also has shortness in sédan and dèset (see Vermeer 1975:141).
¹⁷ Shortness in these endings is generally found in the dialects on Cres-Lošinj north of Ćunski (see Houtzagers 1984-85:892). The dialect of Susak has shortness in èmo ‘we shall’ (see Vermeer 1975:141).
¹⁸ The dialect of Susak also has shortness in pòčnen, dòma, pòslì (see Vermeer 1975:141). The dialects on Cres-Lošinj north of Ćunski also have shortness in the verb pòšnet (see Houtzagers 1984-85:892). Orlec has shortness in hòmo and hòte.
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Diagram 5: earlier vowel system

Origin of the vowels in diagram 5: long and short *i < *jb, *i, *ĕ;19 long and short *u < *u, *о, vocalic l;20 long and short *e < *e, *ĕ; short *b < short jer; long and short *о < *о; short *bl < vocalic l;21 short *br < vocalic r;22 long and short *a < *a and long jer.

The present-day situation can be reconstructed from the system in diagram 5 when we assume five major changes:

I. Lengthening of vowels (except *b) before tautosyllabic resonants;23
II. Diphthongization of long *e, *a, and *о;
III. Loss of distinctive length in the first pretonic syllable;
IV. *b > *a;24
V. The Lengthening Rule: lengthening of short *e, *a and *о in stressed nonfinal syllables;
VI. Restoration of shortness on part of the results of the Lengthening Rule (see 2.6);
VII. Rise of the freedom with respect to phonetic length of the long monophthongs ě, ď and ā, leading to the somewhat blurred opposition between ě, ď, ā on the one hand and ě, ď and ā on the other in the present dialect (see 2.5).

---

19 *ĕ > *и or *е according to Jakubinsij's law, cf. 1; see also 4 below.
20 The reflexes of vocalic l show some complications (see next note and 5 below).
21 As far as we can judge from the present reflexes, long vocalic l, if not reflected as long u, merged with short vocalic l into short *bl (see 5 below).
22 The reflexes of vocalic r show some complications. As far as we can judge from the present reflexes, long vocalic r merged with short vocalic r into short *br (see 6 below).
23 Like in other Čakavian dialects there are also cases of lengthening in other closed syllables than before tautosyllabic resonants: běšak 'wood', Gsg buška; frátor 'friar', Npl froatri; lăčan 'hungry', Nplm ločni; větar 'wind', Npl viérti; poněšal 'bring' LPm, purnišli LPpl m; rékal 'say' LPm, ričla LPf. The lengthenings do not present a coherent picture. See also Houtzagers 1987: 69 and the references given there.
24 Short *b is reflected e (not a) in čě 'what', čeště 'something'. 
The ordering of these rules is relevant in the following cases:

- I before II and II before V: the results of I are diphthongized according to II while the results of V are not;
- II before III: we have diphthongs in the first pretonic syllable;
- II before IV: a from short jer is never reflected as a diphthong;
- IV before V: a from *a is subject to V in the same way as any other a;
- V before VI: this needs no explanation;
- V before VII: an explanation for VII could be the small functional load of the opposition े, े, े vs. े, े, े after V and VI (if VI operated before VII), or the absence of that opposition after V (if VI operated after VII).

There are no traces of length in other unstressed syllables than the first pretonic, so that we can assume that there the loss of the length distinction took place before II. The loss of the tonal distinction can have taken place at any stage.

There have been no stress shifts, so that the place of the stress – as one can expect in a Čakavian dialect – is in principle the 'old' one, e.g. gloavă 'head', rikă 'hand'. Two exceptions that I found in my material are dăska 'board' and dăržal 'hold' LPm (cf. PR3pl daržiju).

4. Reflexes of jat

In 1 above it was already said that the dialect has an *ile-kavian reflex of jat according to Jakubinskij's law (see 1925: 381-382). This means that, in principle, the reflex is a mid front vowel (e, è, े or ie) before a 'hard dental' (d, t, z, s, n, r, l not followed by j or a front vowel) and a high front vowel (i, í or i) in other environments.25

Within inflexional paradigms we usually do not find alternating reflexes of jat, but the reflex we expect in part of the forms is generalized throughout the paradigm, e.g. ริซัต 'cut' after PR3sg, ริ้ง, Npl besède 'word' after besèda Nsg, บิ่วล Apl after non-attested 'biel (short form masculine).26

If words show a derivational relationship the picture is less clear. Sometimes the reflex of jat in a derived form is adopted from the word from which it is derived (premistit after mesto, vresina 'certain shrub' P-A after vriëš), sometimes not (from the

25 An entirely different reflex is found in *gnězd- and *nědř- (see below).
26 For an exception, see under *dè- below.
root *ved- we have povidat ‘tell’ imperfective after *povit perfective PR3sg, but also neviesta ‘bride’).

Even if we leave aside cases of analogy like those discussed in the last two paragraphs, the reflexes of jat in ile-kavian dialects never fully agree with Jakubinskij’s law. The picture is different for each dialect. Below I shall give a list of forms attested in Ćunski in which reflexes of jat are present, alphabetically ordered according to the root, prefix or suffix in which they were attested.

*bëg-
   bižat ‘run’, biži PR3sg, bižalo LPn;
*bél-
   bielo Nsgn ‘white’, biðla Nsgf, biðle Nplf; beljica ‘certain variety of figs’; Betelj TOP (I have assumed here that this toponym is derived from *bēl-);
*bēlēg-
   belēh ‘earmark on sheep’;
*besēd-
   besēda ‘word’;
*brēg-
   brith28 ‘boundary between parcels of land’, brizë Npl;
*brēk-
   brika ‘certain kind of grass’; brišnjak ‘certain burry shrub’;29
*brēmen-
   brince ‘load’;
*cēd-
   cidala ‘stream’ LPf, scidī PR3sg;
*cēl-
   cieli ‘whole’;
*cēn-
   cienu ‘cheap’ (uninflected);
*cēp-
   cipat ‘graft’, PR3sg, cipa;
*cēst-
   česte Gsg ‘road’ (with initial č-, as in Orlec);
*crēkva-
   crkva ‘church’, crkvica DIM;
*cvēt-
   cvetki Npl ‘flower’;
*čovēk-
   čovik ‘human being’;
*dē-
   nadit ‘put (a thread into a needle)’, nadene PR3sg;30
*đđ-
   drđgor ‘elsewhere’, kadē ‘where’, kadegōt ‘wherever’, nigdir ‘somewhere; nowhere’, onđē ‘there’, onđēka ‘there’ (also undē, undĕka), ovđe ‘from here’ (also uvđe), etc.;
*dēl- (1)
   dilnjica ‘small piece of land’; dieli ‘divide’ PR3sg, razdilili LPplm;31

27 For more information on and more examples of reflexes of jat in ile-kavian dialects see Belić 1909:184-187, Jakić-Cestarić 1957 and Vermeer 1984:278-279.
28 This form has been attested only once. One would expect the root-vowel to be long (see also mih and snih).
29 I have assumed here that these lexemes are related to brekinja (see Skok 1971-74-I:206), which is not necessarily true.
30 Here we find different reflexes of jat within one paradigm.
31 Here the simplex and the compound verb show different reflexes of jat.
*det- (2) *det-* *det-*
*dete'child', *deteta Gsg; *dica 'children', *diciina p-A, dicićina (diminutive-pejorative); *décko 'young man';
*dèo-* *dèo-*
*divođka 'girl';
*dvè *dvè *dvè
*dvā 'two (fem)', *dvih GL; *dvəsto '200';
*če (1) *če (1) *če (1)
(in lexicalized case forms) *gore, *goreka 'above', *dole 'below', *lošii 'last year', *ništri 'in, inside', *polsi 'afterwards', sometimes *polsle;
*če (2) *če (2) *če (2)
*če(t) *če(t) *če(t)
*bolilo 'hurt' LPn; *gorila 'burn' LPf; *imit 'have', *imili LPplm; *letit 'fly', *letila LPf; *otli 'want' LPm, *otili LPplm; *sedili 'sit' LPplm; *umün 'be able' PR1sg, *umila LPf; *varit 'turn' LPm, *vartiila LPf; *vīt 'see', *vidili LPplm, *vidilo LPn; *živit 'live', *živilo LPn;
*čèd- (1) *čèd- (1) *čèd- (1)
jis(t) 'eat', *ji PR3sg, *jimo PR1pl, *jil LPm, *jili LPplm, *pojida PR3sg;
*čèd- (2) *čèd- (2) *čèd- (2)
*jedila se 'become angry'; *jidan 'angry';
*čèdr- *čèdr- *čèdr-
*jidro 'sail';
*če *če *če
*boqatiji 'rich'; *siromašniji 'poor' (both comparative Nsgm);
*glæzd- *glæzd- *glæzd-
*njoazlò;
*klèst- *klèst- *klèst-
*klišća Npl 'tongs';
*kolèn- *kolèn- *kolèn-
*kolèno 'knee';
*kosèr- *kosèr- *kosèr-
*koserić 'kind of sickle'; *koserica 'kind of chopping-knife';
*kuðelī- *kuðelī- *kuðelī-
*kudilja (spinning term);
*le- *le- *le-
*dokle33 'until', *doklegòt 'until', *zdokle 'from where', *pokle 'after (conjunction)';
*lèh- *lèh- *lèh-
*liha 'strip of land'; Liški TOP;
*lèk- *lèk- *lèk-
*likoár 'doctor';
*lèn- *lèn- *lèn-
*lièncina 'lazy person';
*lèp- (1) *lèp- (1) *lèp- (1)
*liplci Npl 'limpet';
*lèt- *lèt- *lèt-
*leto 'summer', *leti 'in summer';
*levo-* *levo-* *levo-
*fova 'left' Nsgf;
*mèh-* *mèh-* *mèh-
*mih34 'bag made of sheepskin';

32 The reflex of *jat in this word is often *a in *le-kavian dialects (see Milčetić 1895:103, Jakić-Cestarić 1957:414, Houtzagers 1984–85:885 note 2, Budovskaja-Houtzagers 1994:103). See also *njêdr- below.
33 This form was attested only unstressed.
34 This form was attested several times. One would expect the root-vowel to be long (see also *brih and *snih).
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*men-* *preminit* 'change clothes';
*mër-* *mër* 'weight' Asg;
*mésec-* *mísec* 'month';
*měši-* *umíšit* 'knead';
*měšt-* *město* 'place', *preněstit* 'move', *premešćivat*;
*měša-* *míšat* 'mix';
*měl-* *mlit* 'grind', *měje* PR3sg, *mlil* LPm;
*mělk-* *mliko* 'milk'; *mlist* 'milk', *pomlils*;
*mrě-* *umrět* 'die';
*mrěž-* *mrže* Npl 'net';
*ně-* with indefinite meaning: *njédir/njéder* 'somewhere', *ničniš* 'something', *nikat* 'sometimes', *niki* 'somebody';
*njédr-* v *njođra* Apl '(put) under one's coat' (cf. *gnézd-* above);
*oréh-* *orih* 'walnut';
*pě-* *pěteh* 'cock';
*plěv-* *pleve* Npl 'chaff', *plève* P-A;
*prě-* *previš* 'too much';
*prěd-* *noapret/noapreda* 'forward' (also *noapret*), *sprit35/sprida* 'in front (of)', *spride* 'in front'; *prija* 'earlier (than)';
*prěk-* *priko* 'over (prep./adv.)';
*rěd-* *riěko* 'thin (not dense) Nsgn;
*rěp-* *riěpa*; Podrippišća TOP (assuming that this toponym is derived from *rěp-*);
*rěz-* *rizat* 'cut', *riže* PR3sg;
*sě-* *sijat* 'sow', *sije* PR3sg;
*sěđ-* *posiěs* se 'sit down'; *sedili* 'sit' LPplm; *susědi* 'neighbour' Npl;
*sěk-* *sič* 'cut', *sıcı* PR3sg, *siki* LPplm; *sikira* 'axe';
*sěmen-* *sime* 'seed';
*sěmo* *šeno* 'hither';
*sěn-* *pócin* 'shadow';
*sěrk-* *sirák* 'sorghum';
*slep-* *slip* 'blind';
*sme-* *smilo se* LPn 'be allowed';
*smět-* *smijat se* 'laugh', *smili* se LPplm;
*smrěk-* *smrika* 'juniper'; *smrniška* 'juniper-berry';
*sněg-* *snlh36* 'snow';
*srěd-* *nasrět* 'in the middle (of)';
*srět-* *srično* Nsgn 'happy';

---

35 This form was attested only unstressed.
36 This form was attested twice. One would expect the root-vowel to be long (see also *brih* and *mih*).
The dialect form that corresponds with the standard Croatian verb *lit* 'pour', PR3sg poliđe, imperfective polišvat (cf. Orlec polot, polej, polevat). Standard Croatian *obući* 'dress' is obiđe (cf. Orlec obiđe). The frequentative suffix is -iva-: veišvat 'tie', brusćivat 'roast', sekiva PR3sg 'bother', parićiva PR3sg 'prepare' (cf. Orlec većevat, etc.).

As in many other Čakavian dialects *e* is reflected i in vičeräš 'this evening', vičeru Asg 'dinner', vičeramo PR1pl 'have dinner'. The word for 'bed' is postija, Asg pustijiju, cf. pustija in Orlec. Original *e* is reflected ile in kaminjelkamenje (cf. Orlec kamänje) 'stones (collective)'; the latter Čunski variant is less frequent.

The form for 'quickly' presented by Skok under *lisP* (1971-74 TI: 308) is lešto (cf. Orlec lišto(n)).

There are a number of Italian loanwords which have an i-like vowel in Čunski and an e-like vowel in Orlec: bandira 'flag', butiga 'shop', diciembar 'December', differiänto 'different' Nsgn, dižgräciju Asg 'handicap', mulita 'grill' (cf. Orlec bandäricu Asg, butëga, decämber/dićëmber, deferëncal/diferëncä, dižgräciça, mulëta). Compare also Čunski tarilj 'plate' and Orlec tarëj.
5. Reflexes of vocalic *j

Vocalic *j is mostly reflected as u/u/u: duga 'debt', Gsg, mučat 'be silent', pün 'full', napūnit 'fill', stūp 'tree', sūze 'tear' Np!, sūne 'sun', tūsto 'fat' Nsgn, žuč 'bile', žūti 'yellow'.

In a minority of the cases vocalic *j first changed into *bl and is reflected in the present-day dialect as al: balha 'flea', galb8ka 'deep' Nsgf (cf. Skok 1971-74 I: 451), Halminc TOP, jābalka 'apple'. In all attested instances where the relevant vowel is stressed, it is long (āl), either because of the Lengthening Rule or because of its position before -C# (where C stands for one or more consonants and # is the word-boundary, see the last paragraph of 2.1 above): dalgo 'far', Kālku Lsg TOP, obākal 'dress' LPn, válna 'wool'; pālš 'complexion', pālš 'snail', bālš Gpl 'flea'.

One would perhaps expect originally long vocalic *j– when it is not reflected as ā – to appear as **oal (reflex of long jer + l). However, such reflexes are not found. We must assume that long vocalic ā, if not reflected as long ā, merged with short vocalic j into short *bl.

6. Reflexes of vocalic *r

Vocalic *r is consistently reflected as ar. In all attested instances where the relevant vowel is stressed, it is long (ār), either because of the Lengthening Rule or because of its position before -C# (where C is a consonant and # is the word-boundary, see the last paragraph of 2.1 above). Examples: darvo 'piece of fire-wood', tarbūf 'belly', dārva Npl, gārlo 'throat', umārlo 'die' LPn, čārf 'worm', dārf Gpl, pārst 'finger'.

The same that was said about vocalic l in 5 above can be said here: one would expect long vocalic r to be reflected as **oār, but this is not the case. We must assume that long vocalic r merged with short vocalic r into short *br.

For the well-attested paradigm of pārov 'first' my material contains many occurrences with phonetically short [a], and there are also numerous attestations with a schwa- or e-like vowel. I tentatively assume that what we hear in such attestations is an interconsonantal r, which in a restricted number of words can occur along with ar.

Comparison of markodlāci Npl 'malignant sorcerer', parniš 'bring', šūnp 'sulphur', Gsg šūmpara, with the corresponding words in the dialect of Orlec suggests
that we must derive present-day arch from *br. In Orlec short and unstressed *b > c; the corresponding Orlec words are merkodlak, pernésť, sunfer, Isg sunferon).37,38

7. The consonants

The dialect has the following consonant phonemes: p, b, v, f, t, d, z, s, c, č, ě, ž, š, k, g, h, m, n, j, l, r.

The palatal stop č is distinct from the sequence tj, which, in my material, is present only in netjědak ‘nephew’ and netjakiňa ‘niece’.

The dialect is not ‘Cakavian’, i.e. there is no neutralization of the opposition palatal – dental. There are some words, however, in which Ćunski s and z correspond to Orlec ď and ž, respectively: rūzina ‘rust’, rūzavo ‘rusty’ Nsgn, škula ‘school’, skrińina ‘trunk’ V-A, skorup ‘skin (of milk)’, zmorac ‘north’, zelězo (Orlec rūzina, rūzavo Nsgn, škula, (r)iškrińa, (š)korup, Žmrić T-O, Želězo (sic)).

In Orlec, s and z optionally become palatal when followed by a palatal fricative or affricate within the same word and not separated from it by more than one vowel, e.g. sūša/sūša ‘drought’, znāšiňaś ‘know’ PR2sg, sečeno/sečemo ‘cut’ PR1pl (see Houtzagers 1985:28). This is probably also the case in Ćunski. My material contains the following examples: zašijeno ‘sew together’ PPNsgn, suslt ‘dry’, dosěđete ‘reach’ PR2pl (cf. INF dosiēč), šiče ‘cut’ PR3sg (cf. PR3pl posikŭ), poslǔšaju/poslǔšaj ‘listen’ PR3pl/IMP2sg, smršiški/smriški ‘juniper berry’ Npl, striželoštriženo ‘cut’ PR3sg/PPNsgn, Sùščani/Sùščani ‘inhabitant of Susak’ Npl.

Like in Orlec, s and z became palatal in šešnáš’s ‘sixteen’ and šešdesiēt’s ‘sixty’ (Orlec šešnájs, šešdesēt).

Distinctively voiced consonants are devoiced in word-final position, e.g. bòba ‘broad bean’ Gsg, bòp Nsg; darvō ‘piece of firewood’, dârf Gpl; griěše ‘beam’ Npl, griěť Gpl; obrźu ‘face’ Lsg, obrźas Nsg; pâži ‘snail’ Npl, pâš Nsg. The final dental of pod ‘under’ was attested voiceless before vowels in pot Itoalju ‘under Italy’ and pot Àustriju ‘under Austria’ (i.e. in the days of Italian/Austrian rule). Word-internal v is

---

37 The declined forms of šùmpar/sùnfer are given in order to distinguish this word from loans with a fleeting vowel like frărar friar’, Npl frătrăr, Orlec frărer, Npl frătrî (in which the fleeting vowel is always equal to the reflex of *b).

38 The case of zermadońi/zarmadońi ‘relative’ Npl (not attested in Orlec) is less clear. Perhaps there was a doublet *br/er. Even more mysterious are vođier ‘up, into the air’, kùšcër ‘lizard’, Orlec vòjar, kùšcër/kùšcër, where the situation is the reverse from what one would expect. The form naprimar ‘for instance’ (one attestation) could be a slip of the tongue.
not always devoiced before voiceless obstruents: in lòvci ‘hunter’, udovci ‘widower’ and ovce ‘sheep’ (all Npl) it was attested voiced (the latter form was also attested with voiceless f).

Palatalized l (in my notation lj) did not change into j: ljúdi ‘people’ Npl, térlij ‘plate’, tareljici ‘plate’ DIM Npl, škuój ‘island’, škúlja ‘hole’ (cf. Orlec júdi, tarej, tarejíc, škoj, škuja). It is also present in the comparative/superlative forms baslij ‘low’ Nsgn, nájvišija ‘high’ Nsgf (cf. Orlec basjé Nsgn, nájvišë Nsgn), and in beljica ‘certain variety of figs’, baršijoán ‘ivy’, baršijinci ‘certain kind of grass’, glijste Npl ‘worm’, dímjlak ‘chimney’, sloâmljicu ‘straw mattress’ Asg (cf. Orlec belica, beršján, gjišt (no parallels for the last two words)).

Epenthetic -lj- was attested in zimlje ‘take’ PR3sg, najimlju ‘take over’ PR3pl, blagoslôlvjenju ‘bless’ PPAsgf (cf. Orlec zimje, blagoslówjen Nsg m).

Palatalized n (in my notation nj) is present after initial g- in gnjilo ‘rotten’ Nsgn and gnjúój ‘dung’.


Initial and word-internal g is realized either as a stop (the majority of cases) or as a fricative. Word-internal g alternates with word-final h, e.g. vrágá ‘devil’ Gsg, vráh Nsg. In pováča ‘cake’ we find -v- instead of expected -g-. Prothetic g- was once attested in goárija ‘air’ and once in guórzan ‘pulley (for tackling boats out of the water)’, along with oárija, uórgan.

After g and k the realization of v can be bilabial. Such realizations were heard in crikva ‘church’ and its diminutive crikvica, kváðri ‘square’, smokvina ‘fig’, zikvi Lsg ‘cradle’, smókov Npl ‘fig’, gôvêra ‘war’.

In fcá Gsg from pás ‘dog’, fcíc DIM, fcína P-A and ftić ‘bird’ DIM, original *p became fricative before a stop. In prilîpci Npl ‘limpet’ it did not. In cêle ‘bee’ Npl it was dropped altogether.

Before initial i- we very often hear prothetic j-, e.g. jígre ‘play’, Gsg jíme ‘name’, jíma ‘have’ PR3sg, jimil LPm, jiskát ‘look for’, jistina ‘truth’ (cf. without j-, also from Čunski: iglu ‘needle’ Asg, ime, ima, imil, iskâla LPf, isto ‘same’ Nsgn).

Initial sv- in sváka ‘each’ Nsgf, svâkakove ‘all kinds of’ Nplf and the declined forms of ‘vàs ‘all, whole’ (e.g. svá Nsgf, sví Nplm, Svi Sviëti ‘All Saints’) is not simplified to s- (as it optionally is in Orlec).

I have not yet systematically studied the external sandhi phenomena of the dialect, but the few notes that I took about the subject remind of the situation in Orlec: drop of the occlusive element in otás taljoânski father-Italian Nsgm, q sküte ‘from skuta (substance from which whey-butter is made)’ and vej ne znoámo ‘we don’t remember’ (instead of otáq, qít and već) (see Houtzagcrs 1985:37–39 under rules 1 and 9).
The same applies to such internal sandhi phenomena as in suftanilsuftani 'inhabitant of Susak' Npl (instead of šć) and rošćići 'horn' Dim Npl (from gć > hć) (see Houtzagers 1985:25–26).
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