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Abstract
The first part of the paper provides basic information on the genesis, distribution, and division of the Kajkavian dialect. The most typical linguistic features of Kajkavian speech are then presented at the phonological, morphological, and syntactic level. The second part deals with the Kajkavian lexicon, its origin, and the current state of interference from the Croatian standard language (pseudo-analogy and the latest semantic adaptations) and the latest trends in research (Kajkavian dialectal lexicology and the development of different dictionaries). The author concludes that the Kajkavian dialect will survive, but the specificities of certain groups and local speeches with permanently preserved ‘solid parts’ will disappear.
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Introduction
In genetic-linguistic terms, the Croatian language is a system of three dialects: Štokavian, Kajkavian and Čakavian. The names of the Croatian dialects are derived from the archaic form of the interrogative pronoun which read kъ and later passed into čь. In Čakavian the semivowel was vocalized and passed into a (and there are other combinations: če, ca, ce, ća, će...). In Štokavian the pronoun čь connected with to produced čьto (something similar also occurred in Russian). The semivowel later disappeared, leaving čto, which for the sake of simplification became što (and other combinations appeared: šta, šta, što, što...). In Kajkavian the archaic form of the pronoun kъ combined with jь, and the change of the first semivowel to a and the loss of the second led to the creation of kaj (and other combinations appear: kej, ke, ka...).

Today the Kajkavian dialect is spoken north of the Kupa River, in the Zagreb, Varaždin and Bjelovar-Križevci counties, in one part of Gorski Kotar and in Međimurje. The Kajkavian dialect is spoken outside the borders of Croatia in parts of Slovakia (Hrvatski Grob) and Hungary (Pomurje Croats, Umok, Vedešin), or rather where the Kajkavians took refuge during the Ottoman conquests. There are also Kajkavian enclaves in overseas countries; the best known are in Kansas City in USA (its western suburb of Strawberry Hill at the confluence of the Kansas and Missouri rivers - mostly originating from Gorski Kotar and arriving at the end of the 19th century), and Mildura in Australia (a winegrowing settlement in inland Australia, the northwestern part of the state of Victoria – mostly originating from the eastern part of lower Međimurje and arriving before World War II). Kajkavian micro-communities from the post-World War II immigrants among the overseas communities are innumerable.1

Dissemination
Before the Ottoman conquests, the Kajkavian dialect extended to a much larger area than today. The Ottoman conquests caused large migrations of the population to the north and west, and the population which later replaced it was mainly from the area of the Štokavian dialect. It is still

1 In February 2018, the author visited such Kajkavian micro-communities in Melbourne, Canberra, and Sydney to collect extensive material for this article.
unclear how far the Kajkavian region extended to the east in Slavonia, where it lost most of its territory, and where it borders with old western Štokavian, or rather Šćakavian speech, that is, how far it stretched to the south of the Sava River or the confluence of the Una River into the Sava. Until the 16th century the Kajkavian region in Slavonia assumedly extended beyond the Požega Mountains to Donji Miholjac and Valpovo, where there were a great number of Štokavian-Kajkavian idioms for which it is impossible to say with certainty which system they belonged to (the difference in the continuers of the syllabic and/or posterior nasal, the difference in the reflex Schwa, etc.). There are also many features in common between variants of the Slavonian Štokavian dialect and Kajkavian (individual examples of the transition of the palatal *r′ before a vowel into the set rj; identical genitives and accusatives for masculine nouns of inanimate meaning, toponyms ending in -ovci; the instrumental of means with the preposition s; the transition of the intervocalic -ž- into -r- in the present tense of the verb moći; hruška and jalsa throughout Slavonia instead of kruška and joha, etc.). The border with the Štokavian region in the south, or rather in the southeast, probably corresponded to the border of Slavonia and Bosnia. That is, it went along the Sava River. In the wider area of the middle course of the Una River was the Kajkavian-Štokavian-Čakavian tri-border point. I have also recently found features characteristic of Kajkavian in some Bosniak language idioms in northwestern Bosnia (Skokovi, Velika Kladuša): the supine, an open e similar in sound to that of many Kajkavian idioms, no sibilarization in many cases, the old hard endings in the I(nstrumental) sg. for masculine A-declension nouns, the preposition od + G often in place of possessive adjectives, etc.

As regards the spread in the west and northwest, there is the matter of contact with the Slovenian language and borders in the natural linguistic continuum, which is not easy to determine for the period during the Middle Ages as there was no border at that time between Croatia and Slovenia nor nations in the contemporary sense of the word. For that reason, there were attempts to proclaim the Kajkavian dialect as a part of the Slovenian language, especially in the second half of the 19th century, when it was classified by Slovenian linguists Jernej Kopitar and Franc
Miklošić among the Slovenian dialects. There were no serious scholarly works on Kajkavian dialect back then. Their thesis was accepted by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić and his successor Đuro Daničić, who as the first editor of the great Dictionary of the Croatian or Serbian language of the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts did not allow Kajkavian words to be entered into the work. This was only corrected in 1963 when the Yugoslav (now Croatian) Academy of Sciences and Arts began working on the Dictionary of the Croatian Kajkavian literary language (13 volumes have been published so far - the most recent in 2014). It was not until the 1930s that Aleksandar Belić and Stjepan Ivšić published linguistic works in which Kajkavian was classified among the Croatian dialects. Belić divides Kajkavian according to the reflexes of Proto-Slav(on)ic sounds t’ and d’. He also describes Kajkavian as a mixed dialect, with the Eastern variants originating from Old Šćakavian, the southwestern from Chakavian, and the northwestern from Slovenian. Ivšić, refutes Belić by establishing a basic Kajkavian accentuation of 3 accents, thereby proving that the dialect is not a mixture. He found that accentuation was characterized by the existence of metatonic, new (Proto-Slavonic) accents - acute and circumflex in certain grammatical and formation categories. He distinguished Kajkavian idioms into four groups according to accent features: two with the older accent (Zagorje-Međimurje and Lower Sutla River-Žumberak) and two with the younger accent (Turopolje-Posavina and Križevci-Podravina). Conservative variants therefore preserve the older accent system (ˇ, ′, and ˇ), and innovative variants in many ways demonstrate a departure from that system.

The work of Zvonimir Junković is also important as he irrefutably proved that the Kajkavian dialect belongs to the Pannonian group and the Slovenian dialects to the Alpine, and that Kajkavian genetically belongs to the Croatian language. Moreover, he believes that some of today’s Slovene idioms (Prlekija, Prekmurje and some Styrian idioms) have evolved from Kajkavian. These idioms are unaware of the old Slovenian accent changes - the progressive shift of the circumflex, the

---

2 Many Slovenian laymen will still say in ‘coffeeshop talks’ that Kajkavian is ‘distorted Slovenian’. Some even call it ‘bezjački’ language.
3 Ivšić (1936).
lengthening of the non-terminal short syllable, and the abolition of the unstressed lengths. The most important criterion for him is that there was no shortening of the Slav(on)ic acute in the Alpine group. Slovenian Prekmurje idioms, as well as other Slovenian Pannonian idioms (‘Pannonian base idioms’) are affected in vocalism by a phenomenon that is characteristic not only of Kajkavian speech but most of the Croatian language, which means that etymological e is identical with the anterior nasal ɛ. Pannonian Slovenian idioms did not capture the general Slovenian lengthening of accented non-terminal syllables. There are o-type endings (dobroga, dobromu, etc.) in the adjective declension of the Prlekija dialect, and the semi-vowel is identical with etymological e and the anterior nasal ɛ, as in western Međimurje.

There was a linguistic transition in Gorski Kotar in the Middle Ages: Kajkavian-Čakavian-Slovenian. Migrations later separated the Gorski Kotar Kajkavians from the Kajkavian main body. After the situation settled, the population from Slovenia moved in larger numbers than other currents, and so today most of the western Gorski Kotar sub-dialect shows basic Slovenian development. Among the other Gorski Kotar idioms, some show early Slovenian progressive metataxis (oko > okô) and others a regressive shift (okô > ŏko). In upper Pokuplje the Kajkavian dialect borders with the Čakavian and Štokavian dialects.

In addition to the extension of the Kajkavian region to the north, there is the question of the relationship between the West Slav(on)ic and South Slav(on)ic languages. That is, there was uninterrupted linguistic continuity before the arrival of the Hungarians in Pannonia, but it is unclear where the boundary between the two linguistic groups was. Popović thought that the Slav(on)ic language in present-day Hungary belonged to the South Slav(on)ic language community.4 Today’s mid-Slovak dialect has many very important South Slav(on)ic features (the change of tl, dl into t, d: Cro. stnd. šilo / Cro. stnd. šilo / Čak. šidlo, Cro. stnd. salo / Čak. sadlo; the transition of ũ to z and not to dz, the shortening of accented vowels, the development of secondary vowels in l-participle, the use of the suffix-ovice and inđce in toponyms according to West Slav(on)ic -vice, etc.). After the interruption of the Slav(on)ic language continuum in Pannonia and the separation of mid-Slovak

4 Popović 1960.
speeches from their South Slav(on)ic matrix, these speeches were exposed to the influences of the West Slav(on)ic majority area and further developed in that direction.

From the 16th to the mid-19th century, there was a common literary language in the northwestern part of Croatia, where Zagreb was the main political and cultural center. The more recent professional literature has used more than one name for the linguistic system to which the works of older Kajkavian authors belong (the Kajkavian literary language, the Kajkavian standard language, the Kajkavian literary type, the literary language styled on the Kajkavian base, etc.), and the creators of that language referred to it differently (horvatski, ilirski, ilirički, ilirijanski, etc.). The basis of this language was the Zagreb city speech, i.e. the Kajkavian of the educated strata, influenced by contact with speakers of other Kajkavian dialects and the language of non-Kajkavian literary works. The strong influence of the Latin language was especially evident in the syntax. At all levels of the Kajkavian literary language, there was a choice between different Kajkavian features (eg. meda / meja), or inclusion into the Kajkavian literary language, in addition to the more frequent Kajkavian linguistic features and features that are of a non-Kajkavian character (eg. gde / kade / kadi, etc.). In her work on the standardization of the Kajkavian literary language, Stolac concludes:

Such a literary-linguistic superstructure, as a set of linguistic and stylistic features at all levels, testifies to that language as a supra-territorial, suprasocial system, a system by which all communication needs could be met.5

The most important creative names of this period are Juraj Habdelić, Ivan Belostenc, Tituš Brezovački, Antun Vramec, Ivan Pergošić, Juraj Mulih, Ana Katarina Frankopan, etc. The second phase of the literary Kajkavian language came in the 20th century in the works of Dragutin Domjanić, Antun Gustav Matoš, Ivan Goran Kovačić, Fran Galović, Nikola Pavić, etc. The most recent, valuable works written in Kajkavian are those of Božica Jelušić, Ernest Fišer, Željko Funda, Božica Brkan,

Vid Balog, etc. The current bestsellers are novels (and theatrical performances based on them) by Christian Novak. These are mostly written in the Kajkavian of the St. Martin group of the Međimurje dialect (Crna mater zemlje; Ciganin, ali najljepši).

**Division**

The most recent and thorough division of the Kajkavian dialect is that of Lončarić. He based it on several criteria (accentuation - whether the initial circumflex is preserved, whether defects in tone and quantity are abolished, whether metatonia has occurred, whether there has been progressive metataxis of intensity, whether there has been fixation of intensity site; the the reflex relationship of the syllabic / and the posterior nasal, the the reflex ratio of the jat and the semi-vowel; and Čakavian base). He divided the Kajkavian dialect into 15 dialects through the reflex relationship of the syllable-forming / and the posterior nasal in this way:

1. središnjozagorski [central Zagorje] (˘ = ¯; ĵ = q ≠ u)
2. samoborski [the town of Samobor] (˘ = ¯; ĵ = q = u)
3. varaždinsko-ludbreški [Varaždin-Ludbreg region] (˘ = ¯, ĵ = q = o)
4. međimurski [Međimurje region] (abolished opposition according to quantity, ě ≠ ǝ in the above sub-dialect)
5. gornjosutlanski [Upper Sutla River region] (opposition according to quantity abolished)
6. plješivičkoprigorski [Plješivica/Prigorje region] (ě ≠ ǝ, ˘ = ¯)

---

8. The diphthong /qû/ can always be realized as a diphthong in which a is in the first place instead of o: [kˈojuː] / [kˈuː]. Most likely this diphthong first appeared in place of the old posterior nasal, and then by analogy extended to all the reflexes of the long o. Interestingly, the tendency to reflect the Proto-Slavic posterior nasal vowel as a or towards a still exists in some marginal idioms towards the Slovene language. In 1984 Lončarić, while researching the speech of Hum on the river Sutla, i. e. the Croatian Kajkavian of the Upper Sutla group, found among some speakers a vowel in positions with a special phonological value. This was not properly recognised for another 20 years, when Anita Celinić researched this idiom in detail; see Celinić (2011).
9. One of the fundamental features that distinguishes Kajkavian from other Croatian dialects is that in most speeches (except those in Plješivica / Prigorje and western Međimurje) the development of jat is associated with the development of a semi-vowel. Both are in most idioms identical with closed e-vowels (ě = ǝ → e), and it is different from the development of Old Croatian vowels e i ę (ē = e → ę) which in Kajkavian mostly gave more open e -vowels. A thorough overview of this topic can be found in Lončarić-Zečević (1999).
Fundamental features

As there are many Kajkavian phonological systems, most examples related to most Kajkavian dialects will be written in the system corresponding to the monophthongic one with ten units in the stressed position and four in the unstressed one (as is characteristic of many Međimurje and Ludbreg dialects). Deviations from this will occur when the graphics are not important or when the peculiarities of a local speech are emphasized. Such a principle is necessary because of the intention to describe the essence of the problem of the Kajkavian dialect in a short article like this, thus it is not possible to present all its phonetic diversity.

From phonology

It is very important for speakers of other Croatian dialects to be aware of the minimal phonological pairs between different identical vowels of the o- or e- category in some Kajkavian speeches (p’čel - p’čel; sv’eti ‘svet’ – sv’četi ‘svijetliti’), t’ěst ‘test’ – tˇěst ‘tast’, drˇček ‘izmet’ – drˇček ‘the mobile side of a ladder-shaped cart used for transporting corn, hay ...’, bˇok ‘bok’ – Bˇok ‘Bog’, stˇonˇqi (N. sg. of stˇon ‘stan’) – stˇunˇqi (imp. 2. pers. sg. of stˇatˇi ‘stati’).

The syllabic ι in many speeches is not removed from the system and appears as a sequential vowel (most often ι, less frequently a) + r (kˇrųv / karv ‘krv’). In some idioms this phenomenon only occurs in an unstressed position where, instead of ι or a along with r, the
accompanying sound similar to semi-vowel can be pronounced \( (k\text{̈}rv′\text{̈} \text{̈}\text{̈}v)\).

In some dialects (the Međimurje dialect and most of idioms of the Upper Sutla dialect), the opposition in quantity is lost (in the Međimurje dialect and by modulation). In order to compensate for the distinctive features that exist in idioms where there are contradictions, there was a prefonologization of prosodic suprasegmental features into segmental ones, that is, of vowel quantities into their quality. Therefore, vowel inventories in the stressed position in these idioms have ten to thirteen units. P. Ivić referring to the elimination of quantity in Slav(on)ic languages, which mostly affected the east of the Slav(on)ic north and the east of the Slav(on)ic south and Polish and Lusatian languages, along with certain dialects of Czech, Slovak, Slovenian, Croatian and Serbian, states that this process is accomplished in two ways: either the long vowels were equated with the short ones (as in the Russian language) or significant differences in the tone of the vowels appeared, “at first as concomitant phenomena, and then the burden of contrast shifted to those differences.”

This phenomenon is called pochylenie in Polish.

In some idioms, the transition of open e- and o- vowels into closed ones has been recorded under the influence of nasal consonants (črl’eni → črl’eni, žena → ˇžena, s’om → s’om ‘sam’, hr’oniti → hr’oniti). The vowel i passes before r into ‘secondary jat’ (i.r > e.r), eg. kalamp’er ‘krumpir’, pap’er, vod’er ‘kravlji rog u kojem kosac nosi vodu za vlaženje brusa’, of’erati ‘udvarati djevojkama’, sek’erati se ‘segirati se’, toč’er ‘lijevak’, pal’er ‘poslovođa u poljskim i građevinskim radovima’, ofjec’er, špance’erati se ‘šetati se (najčešće besposleno)’, klav’er ‘klavir’. The exceptions are usually in the first syllables: t’irati ‘tjerati’, m’iren, s’irek, š’irm ‘širom’, c’irka. The sound obstructors in the final position before the absolute pause switched to their soundless counterparts, eg. smr’ot ‘smdar’, d’op ‘dob’, l’et ‘led’, Sv’et’i ˇž’urč ‘Sveti Juraj’, vr’ok ‘vrag’, gr’jes’griz’, p’oš ‘puž’.

The phoneme v in the distribution can have the properties of both the sonant (before the vowel and after the consonant), and the sound obstructor with the consonant f as a silent pair (in all other positions), eg. r’espraf ‘rasprava’, g’otof, k’rf, črf, ‘olafka, ‘ofca, l’af ‘lav’. The liquid.

---

l is consistently kept at the ends of words in most idioms. Exceptions are some western speeches whereas part of the suffix which forms the masculine singular of the active past participle turns into a semi-vowel ŭ (b’iû / b’iô, št’êû / št’êô, kr’âû / kr’âo). In some idioms in the vicinity of Varaždin, this morpheme is facultatively read v in one-syllable verbs, eg. b’iv, št’ev, d’ev, č’uv. In these forms, the v is often muted so that b’if, d’ef and č’uf can also be heard. In some idioms immediately adjacent to the Slovenian border, l as part of the continuation of the masc. gender sg. a. p. p. becomes o, but unlike the Štokavian dialect, it avoids the hiatus (d’elo, fkr’o, gl’edo).

In some idioms, instead of l before u we find ū, eg. ūšnušti, pl’uča, sl’učaj, pl’učuk, Ž’udbrek, sl’uga, Ž’uka (personal name), ūpišti, ūuk (‘onion’), gl’uihi, pysl’ušnušti, ūujster, ūplenica, ūufi, ūukia – ‘hole’, ūp’ina, žl’undra, naľ’uknušti se, naľuk’ovatši se, ūp’ina, bl’uza. In the abolition of palatal opposition in liquids some new loanwords are exceptions. In the words l’uk (‘arrow-pointing weapon’) and l’ud (‘mentally ill’), l remains to avoid unnecessary strain on the semantic system (ľ’uk and Nom. pl. of noun č’ovek: l’uďi). Vermeer believes that there has been an increase in low diffuse u into ŭ throughout the Kajkavian dialect.¹¹ Lončarić believes that this was only the case in the western peripheral part of the Kajkavian area, which continues into the Slovenian language in the north and southwest (in Međimurje and Gorski Kotar), and that the old value u was later restored:

“This can be deduced from the development behind l, where ŭ was deconstructed into two elements: high (front), which palatalizes the preceding l, and low (back) u, and so, today we usually have ljú, eg. ljuk, sljuga, but also nutri, bukva. ū in many idioms is often lexicalized where it would elsewhere be l, especially in Germanisms. The value ū / ŭ in some modern Kajkavian idioms is the result of later developments, except perhaps in Podravina.”¹²

In many speeches, especially in Germanisms, ū in many idioms is often lexicalized where it would elsewhere be l: p’ult, c’oful (adv.


In the Lower Drava basin, the Međimurje dialect is consistently palatalized before front vowels and in a pronounced and unstressed position, eg. m’čľin ‘mlin’, g’rľica, l’čči sľ ‘leći’, pl’eča, kl’čča, beč’ikľin, řk’oľi ‘około’, p’oťľi ‘poslje’, j’člen. In the idiom of Kalnik, palatalization of l occurs only before i and e of jat and semivowels. In many Zagorje dialects, dialects along the Slovenian border and many trans-Drava dialects, the basic l is replaced by l, example are words such as l’udľ ‘ljudi’, kr’oľ ‘kralj’, p’ole ‘polje’, hm’el ‘hmelj’, k’apla ‘kapija’, z’čmlja ‘zemlja’. Ń is unchanged in most eastern Kajkavian speeches, and often becomes the nasal i in western ones, less frequently n, and in rare cases the nasal and j sequence, that is, with independence, phonologization of the palatal element, in the form j, and with anticipation j, therefore, into the sequence jn (trjne ‘trnje’, svijna ‘svinja’). In many western idioms, the sequence jn is disassembled in the initial position by inserting, through metathesis, the next vowel, eg. ň’eľga > j’eľga (3rd person singular of the pronoun ‘on). Secondary sets of labials with j remain unchanged in collective nouns (snopje, grobje, grmjje, zdravje) and adjectives with ending -ji: divji ‘divlji’, babji ‘bablji’. In some idioms, the vowel i is inserted between the labial consonants and the word-forming morpheme -j-, eg. gr’obije, gr’rmije, zdr’avije, sn’opije.

The development of d’ in the Kajkavian dialect is twofold. In the Eastern speeches, d’ passes into the palatal affricate đ (m’čja, ž’čžen, br’čja, s’aže, pr’čja, ven’ožati, puľ’ožati se, gl’čč (imp.), p’oveč (imp.), puľ’užati se, puľ’ožati se, r’ožen. The exceptions are the forms -jš- in comparatives: slajši, mlajši, rajši). In western idioms, as in the Slovenian language, it is identical with j. In some of the Lower Međimurje idioms, both reflexes may coexist in the same word (pr’eja / pr’eđa, m’čđa / m’čja). Prosthetic consonants are among the most characteristic features of Kajkavian speech in general. This is an
inherited trait from Old Slav(on)ic where there was a phonotactic rule according to which the word could not begin with some vowels and for that reason j- and v- were systematically added to Proto-Slav(on)ic words with initial vowels prosthetic consonants (eg. according to Old Lithuanian esmu ‘jesam’ we have in Old Slav(on)ic jesmu ‘jesam’ and based on Sanskrit udrā we have Old Slav(on)ic vydra ‘vidra’). In almost all Kajkavian idioms, v comes before u and o, which originates from the old Slav(on)ic posterior nasal (vura, vusnica, vože ‘uže’, voski ‘uzak’). There is also a prosthetic j before o in a large number of idioms, which does not originate from the posterior nasal (joko ‘oko’, jogenj ‘oganj’, josa ‘osa’). There are also individual examples before a: Janica, japa (<hung. apa), japat’ćka ‘apoteka’. There are many examples with prosthetic h, eg. hyb ’got ‘obad’, h’amar ‘ambar’, hr’okati, and in Prelog I have noted one example with prosthetic g: gyt’ova ‘otava’.


The sequence of rj in place of the Proto-Slavo(on)ic palatal r’ is confirmed in the following nouns: m’orje, v’čerjek ‘sprava za odvajanje pljeve te loše pšenice i kukuza’, več’erja, žg’orjavića ‘žgaravica’, žerj’gofka ‘žeravica’; in the passive participle of the 4th type formed with the -en- morpheme, eg. puč’v’orjen, vm’orjen, ţdm’orjen, nat’orjen, zav’arjeni, zak’urjen, zacm’orjen, prev’arjen, zaž’orjeni ‘zažaren’, naduđ’erjeni ‘ohol’, natuv’arjen, puy’orjen ‘poparen’, ras’orjen ‘rasparan’; in verbs of the 5th type with -rjati in all forms, eg. duš’orjati ‘dogorijevati’, zagyv’orjati, n’adv’orjati ‘dvoriti’, nav’orjati ‘nagovarati.
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neclo na neslo los’, pretv orjati se, putv orjati ‘tajno neclo optuzivati’, uc orjati se ‘obrecati se’, zam orjati se ‘zamjerati se’; in the present and imperative of the verb urati and hmr orjati: ‘orjemi, hmr orjem’ (pres.); ‘orji, hmr orji’ (imp.). There is no rj in the declension of nouns ending in r (as in Slovenian): kalamp orˇ ra, pap orˇ ra, gysyd ora (G sg.).

In Kajkavian idioms along the Hungarian border and among Pomurje Croatians, dissimilation of liquid consonants is frequent with many examples in both directions: r > l and l > r. This phenomenon is extremely common in the Hungarian language.13

The change r > l I in the following examples: : pr’iluć ‘drška’, luq’or ‘pletena torba od rogoza’, kalamp or ‘krumpir’, Katal orje ‘blagdan svete Katarine’, kvart or ‘podstanarstvo’ (od ‘kvartir’), suh orje ‘suho drvo za potpalu’ (od ‘suharak’), lym or ‘ormar’ (Podturen, Belica, Sivica), nahel aj ‘nahero’, n’ostil ‘nastor za stoku’ (Orehovica, Prelog) l n’ostil (Podturen); lev’orver ‘revolver’, c’ofylt ‘odmah’ (Prelog, Gorici, Orehovica - od njemaˇckog so fort), vel’estjvaˇne ‘noˇcno bdjenje nad mrtvacom’ (od mad. ‘virraszt’). The change l > r I in the following examples: ši ni or ‘šinjel’ (Prelog, Donja Dubrava, Draškovec), fari ngast ‘koji ima neki tjelesni nedostatak’ (Lopatinec - in most other speeches fal or gasti, presniv ‘pljesnjiv’ (Putjane, Nedelišće). For Germanisms of the ‘das Rohr’ model, I noted both transitions: l’or (Belica) and r’ol (Strigova, Sveti Martin) ‘cijev za odvod dima iz peći u dimnjak’. In most of the Kajkavian dialects it is r’or.

From morphology

The supine is preserved as a grammatical category. It occurs with imperfective verbs after the verb of motion, and it always differs from infinitives in that there is no final -i, and in some verbs also by alternation of the base or by changing the place of stress (Moram delati // Idem delat, Moram spati. // ‘Idem spot; Moram se vuˇciti. // ‘Idem se v’uˇcit.). This Old Slav(on)ic grammatical category is still preserved in the Slav(on)ic and Lusatian-Serbian languages. There are only six grammatical cases,

as there is no particular form for the vocative. ‘Isuș, B’ok, k’aij se pr’ipetilj? ‘Isuđe, Bože, što se dogodilo?’, J’ezuš Mar’ija! J’ezuš Kr’istuš! In some idioms the forms K’atu, Maru! B’oru! M’ilu! are recorded in an address intended to be as kind as possible.

The grammatical category of the dual has disappeared. In some speeches, the remainder of the dual is a morpheme -e in construction with numbers 2, 3, and 4 in the NA of nouns of the neuter gender (according to the jat with the ending f the NAV of the Dual-Slavonic nonpalatal base), eg. įbedv’i įkš’ene, tr’i s’ele, št’irj m’este. The remnant of duality is also the form ‘oči’ congruous with ‘oku’. There is only a short plural: b’ogi, m’ostij, vr’ogi, č’ikj ’opušci’, p’oži, v’oki, d’uhj. In masculine gender nouns there is a contrast between the living and inanimate the use of prepositions (D’eni t’o na k’ona. i D’eni t’o na st’olec.) This phenomenon is called Slavonism. These distinct forms are not found without prepositions (K’upil sam s’i k’ona. i K’upil sam s’i st’olca.). In the Međimurje dialect, morphological categories are expressed by vowel alteration as well as suffixes, eg.

inf. nat’akati
pres. nat’očem
imp. nat’ači

a. p. p. nat’akal, nat’okala, nat’akalj
pl. nat’akalj, nat’akale, nat’akala

p. p. nat’okan

sup. nat’akat

j’esti
j’em
j’ec
j’el, j’ela, j’ely
j’eli

In some nouns the alternation occurs only in L sg., eg. N šp’ajs, l’agef, dr’ac, kr’aij, v’oda, p’ostelja L v šp’ožju, v l’ogju, v dr’ožju, v kr’ožu, v ū v’odi, v p’ostelji.

In some nouns, alternation only occurs in G pl, eg. N kr’ava, b’aba, ž’aba, g’ače G pl kr’qef, b’qep, ż’qep, g’qec. The vowels in positive and comparative adjectival forms may vary, eg. gl’adek – gl’očki, b’ogat – bug’oči, sl’adek – sl’očki, p’ijan – pij’ončij, r’at – r’očši, sl’adek – sl’očši, ml’očji – ml’ačši. In most Kajkavian idioms, the difference between the definite and indefinite forms of adjectives is neutralized, that is, in the Nominative sg. m. g. the definite form is always used. The exceptions are adjectives that have fleeting e (betžen ‘boleslan’, l’ačen ‘gladen’, tr’uden ‘umoran’). In oblique cases, the forms of the former definite adjective are always used.
Adverbs ending in vowels often take an optional mobile consonant, eg. 
d'oma / d'omaj, sk'upa / sk'upaj, v'unž / v'unžk, d'ostị / d'ostık, sk'orụ / 
sk'orụn, č'ista / č'istam.

From syntax
Atonic words, or word forms, can either be only proclitic or 
proclitic/enclitic. The only proclitics are atonic conjunctions and 
prepositions, and the enclitics/proclitics may be verbal forms or 
pronouns. These verbal forms may arbitrarily go before or after the tonic 
word: Vidim ga. / Ga vidim; Došel je. / Je došel; Vidli se bomo. / Bomo 
se vidli. Interrogative sentences transferring the verb to the beginning of 
the sentence are formed without the adverb "li", eg. Je 'on d'ošel?, 
V'idiš?, 'Očeš t'o naprajti?. The infinitives of reflexive verbs may also 
go at the end of a sentence. And it has a slight stylistic feature, for 
example: T'i bij št'el s'am 'igrati se.

The use of the ethical dative, especially the reflexive pronoun 
s'èbe, for example: P'imù t'oga vam je n'opak v m'oji h'iži; P'oječ sì 
n'èkaj! Prd'ènхи sì t'o cv'èje!, Sp'ij sì v'odü!, Zas'f'ùžil sam sì n'èkaj, 
'Idem sì br'ata pygl'èdati. The instrumental of means regularly takes the 
preposition z, for example: M'èše s pap'èr'ima. The preposition z also 
takes indirect objects in the instrumental, eg. B'ovì se s s'ahùm. The 
widespread syntagm za + infinitive, for example: T'i sì dober za vùč'itì 
se; T'o je za bnùr'etì. A syntactic calque is also used: za p'itì, za j'estì, eg. 
T'o je v'oda za p'itì; T'o je f'ìnì za j'estì.

The particles j'èga and n'èga are used to confirm the existence or 
non-existence of someone or something and are followed by a noun in 
the genitive, eg. J'èga kr'ua; N'èga p'imù l'udì. J'èje is used to confirm 
a fact, eg. J'èje z'išel hr'm'ok!, J'èje c'uk d'ošel! These forms always go at 
the beginning of a sentence. Substantivization is a common occurrence, 
for example, M'rette bij se zb'udìl., D'ošel je st'orì d'imù., Ml'odì sù d'ènes 
za n'išt; B'èdast tì m'ore v'èč z'à napr'ajtì n'èk sp'ameten. The German-
language calque 'ohne dass' has also been confirmed, for example, 
D'išel je b'ez da je 'ikaj napr'aj. The connection between k'aj and za is 
also confirmed, for example, Kaj je t'o za d'èčka? Kaj je t'o za p'osel? 
There are several reflexive verbs that do not have this feature in the 
standard language, for example, Kr'ave se p'osejì; Tr'èba se pykl'èkntì 
v c'irkvi; K'aj se pl'öčeš? V'učìm se c'ile dn'evi; Š'èje se!
Vocabulary
In addition to lexemes that can be found in every organic Slav(on)ic idiom, there are a large number of lexemes in Kajkavian dialects that are found anywhere else in the Slav(on)ic world: a) foreign words from the surrounding languages that only entered Kajkavian; b) new creations, compounds and derivatives formed from Old Slav(on)ic material that can be found in a very limited area, even in a single local dialect; c) Old Slav(on)ic lexemes that have only been preserved in Kajkavian (archaisms). In all Kajkavian idioms, there are many diminutives / hypocoristics for all sorts of words. It is often difficult to determine the boundary between these two formative categories, that is, whether it means diminishing in size / quantity / intensity or preciousness / affection. These forms are often used to express tenderness or family affection, and especially when addressing children. Any diminutive can be hypocoristic, but not the other way around. Pure hypocoristics can be animal names, eg. c'icek HYP. < m'ačkeć; č'učka DIM. HYP. < č'uča; p'ajećek HYP. < sv'iča. Hypocoristics have also been noted in some adverbs: m'ačkenw / m'ačkw HYP. < m’alų. ★ P’oječ m’ačkenų; naglav’ęc HYP. < nagl’ofce. ★ D’ete je naglav’ęc p’alų z p’osteše.

14 Etymological dictionaries of individual Slav(on)ic languages are mostly limited to the modern standard language, omitting historical and dialectal material where the most interesting data are often preserved. This is especially pronounced in the Croatian language, whose dialects differ not only in phonetic and grammatical features, but also in lexicon, both to those not inherited in the form of loanwords from neighboring languages, and to the reflections of Proto-Slav(on)ic lexemes which are often confirmed only in one or two of the three Croatian dialects. Unlike the Štokavian and Čakavian material to which more attention was paid, the lexicon of Croatian Kajkavian dialects is marginally represented in the existing etymological dictionaries of the Croatian language. Articles by the Polish Slavist Wiesław Boryś (1982; 1986) are dedicated to the Kajkavian legacy lexicon, in which the author offers an etymological review of selected Kajkavianisms such as nuče ‘obojci’, lap ‘komad platna’, zden ‘hladan’, hlud ‘motka’, drbatî ‘dirati’, nedoležen ‘nespretan’ and skolek ‘daščica’. Thus, the topic of Proto-Slav(on)ic heritage in Kajkavian has only just begun. The development of dialectology and dialect lexicography in recent times has made it possible to find hitherto unknown reflections of Proto-Slav(on)ic lexemes in Kajkavian and to establish isolexes that connect Kajkavian and Slav(on)ic dialects with West Slav(on)ic languages, Krmpotić (2015): 57-58.

15 Wiesław Boryś calls archaisms those Kajkavian lexemes that are not found in other dialects of the Croatian or Serbian language area but are in other Slav(on)ic languages (1982): 70-71.
Germanisms
There are large number of Germanisms in Kajkavian idioms. These are mostly borrowings from Austrian and South Bavarian dialects and have come from numerous contacts with German immigrants. The first German colonization in northern Croatia began in the 13th century, after the Tatars ravaged these areas. The Hungarian King Bela IV invited Germans to inhabit them and gave them special rights. The arrival of German craftsmen was very important. Thanks to them complete technical terminologies were formed in most trades. These are for the most part still used today. In the 18th and 19th centuries, the more educated people in Zagreb, Varaždin and Osijek mostly communicated in German. It is logical that the semantic fields of Germanisms from rural local idioms differ from those of larger cities.

I will present the most important semantic fields covered by Germanisms in rural local idioms, based on the corpus of the Međimurje dialect.
- plants: fl’onec ‘biljka za rasad’ (Pflanze), h’imper ‘malina (samo ona koja se umjetno uzgaja u vrtu pa je zato puno deblja od prirodne maline)’ (Himbeere), l’orbek ‘lovor’ (Lorbeer), petr’ožul ‘peršin’ (Petersel), prep’elcați ‘presaditi sadnice’ (pelzen) (PO), p’ušpań ‘šimšir, zelenika’ (Buchsbbaum)
- holidays and customs: f’ašńek ‘poklade’ (Fasching), kl’encnerica ‘djevojčica koja je u svadbenoj povorci išla za mladenkom’ (Kranzfräulein), kr’ispán ‘božićno drvice’ (Christus + Baum), p’uška ‘grančica koja se nosi na Cvjetnicu u crkvu’ (PO) (Busch)
- eating and drinking: type of food, food preparation, meals, food supplements, utensils: b’uh(f)tlín ‘napuhnjača’ (Buchtel). c’ukýr ‘1.
šečer 2. bombon’ (Zucker), cv‘ibýk ‘dvopek’ (Zwieback), ‘escajk ‘pribor za jelo’ (Eßzeug), f’oňek ‘uštipak’ (Kotoriba) (Pfannkuchen), r‘ibeš ‘trenica’ (reiben), p‘ocýngµa ‘rasol od octa, vode i češnjaka u koji se stavlja nasoljeno meso prije sušenja ili kuhanja’ (beizen), šm‘orlínŋ ‘jaja s brašnom i mljekom’ (Sveti Martin) (schmoren ‘polagano peći’, ‘pržiti’), šn‘ita ‘kriška kruha ili kolača’, špr‘icer ‘vino pomiješano sa sodom’ (spritzen), št‘anglín ‘vrsta dizanog kolača u obliku prutica’ (Stange), št‘erce ‘kukuruzno brašno poparenom vrelom vodom’ (Sterz), t‘ěh ‘čaj’ (Tee), t‘emfαţi ‘pirjati’ (dämpfen), tr‘ahtar ‘lijevak’ (Trichter), źm‘ah ‘okus’ (Geschmack), ź‘emľa (Semmel)
- human traits: mental traits, physical traits, derogatory names: c‘artavŋ (zärteln), f‘alíčen ‘s tjelesnim ili psihičkim nedostatkom’ (fehlen), h‘aklík ‘osjetljiv, probirljiv’ (heikel), harlek‘in (Harlekin)16, hamr‘il ‘jača osoba niže inteligencije’ (Hammel), k‘ėk ‘ponosit, uznosit (pejor.) ‘ (keck), k‘ušten ‘spretan za posao’ (Kunst), l‘affar ‘mladić koji se skiće po krčmama’ (schleifen), l‘ampeš ‘brbljavac’ (Lampe), n‘or’ ‘luđ’ (Narr), p‘aŋkret ‘vanbračno dijete; klipan’ (Bankart), pić‘ajźiln ‘sitničav čovjek’ (Filzlaus), prešিকιেঁ ‘gizdav’ (PO) (schick), p‘uklavec ‘grbavac’ (Buckel), š‘ajtravec ‘čovjek koji ima noge u obliku slova o’ (Scheit), šl‘ankan ‘mršav’ (schlang), šm‘oǰhlaltį̄ ‘se ulagivati se’ (scheicheln), š‘oc ‘ljubavnik’ (Schatz), šp‘ajsên ‘neugoden na riječima’ (Spaise), špìčiën ‘šminker’ (Sv. Martin) (spitzen), šp‘ičtį̄ se ‘praviti se važan’ (spitzen), šp‘uravį ‘izbirljiv’ (Nedelišče) (spüren), št‘aten ‘hirovit’ (stattlich), š‘uf ‘obješenjak, corpulalica’ (Shuft), tr‘otłín ‘nespretnjaković’ (Trottel), tručľi ‘inatljiv’ (trotzen), t‘umpastį ‘glup’ (tump), v‘andravec ‘lutalica’ (wandern), zǐher‘oš ‘onaj koji ide na sigurno’ (sicher), źm‘ukleš ‘škrtica’ (schmuggel)
- medicine: ferb‘ant ‘zavo’ (Verband), fl‘ajšer (Pflaster) ‘ljepljivi ovoj za rane’, šv‘icatį ‘znijiti se – u bolesti’ (Schweis), recip‘is ‘liječnički recept’ (Rezepisse)
- clothes: clothing, footwear, fashion accessories, fabrics, finishing: b‘iksatį ‘laštiti cipele’ (wischen), c‘iferšľų ‘patentni zatvarač’ (ziehen + Verschluss), f‘olda ‘nabor na odjevnom predmetu’ (Falte), f‘ertuf ‘pregača’ (Vortuch), h‘ozentrebbe ‘naramenice’ (Hosenträger), k‘angar ‘tkanina od češljane vune’ (Kammgarn), kr‘aglín ‘okovratnik’

16 This noun is also used by old people who have no knowledge of theatrology.
(Kragen), l’ajbik ‘prsluk’ (Leibchen), mašlin ‘traka koja svezana u petlju služi kao ukras na odjeći’ (Masche), nah’ezdek ‘bez stavljanja ruku u rukav – kod oblačenja kaputa (PO) – nah’endek (PR) (Hand), š’il ‘obod šešira’ (Schild), šl’afryk ‘kućna haljina’ (Schlaf + Rock), šl’ic ‘prorez na hlačama’ (Schlitz), š’os ‘suknja’ (Schloß), špič’ok ‘vrsta šiljatih cipela’ (Spitze), šp’ilhože ‘hlače s naramenicama’ (D.Vidovec) (spielen + Hose), š’tučlin ‘ćarapa koja pokriva listove na nozi’ (Stutzen), štr’uʃp’alšl ‘podvezica’ (Strumpfband), š’urc ‘prostija pregaća’ (Schurz), źni’erat ‘vezati cipele’ (schnüren) - business and trade: c’[Q] ‘račun’ (Zeche), f’al ‘jeftin’ (feil), c’ubak ‘više nego po dogovoru’ T’o tį ‘d’om na c’ubak. (PO) (Zubau ‘dogradnja’), št’ant ‘improvizirano prodajno mjesto na tržnici’ (Stand) - housing: parts of the house, furniture and objects in the house: filjunga ‘okvir unutar vratiju oko kojega dolazi prozor’ (Füllung), gal’ender ‘naslon na balkonu ili stubištu’ (Geländer), g’an’k ‘hodnik’ (Gang), l’uʃteńek ‘zračnik u kuhinji’ (Luft), r’uʃt ‘drvena konstrukcija krova’ (Gerüst), šp’ajs ‘ostava, smočnica’ (Spaise), šp’igel ‘zrcalo’ (Spiegel) - technical terms related to various trades: br[Q]znat ‘kočiti’ (bremsen), cv’ek ‘postolarski klinac’ (Zwecke), dr’oksat ‘tokariti’ (drechseln), feʃšat ‘zanositi se u stranu’ (fälschen), fl’ah ‘vodoravna površina’ (Fläche), gl’ihaʃ ‘izravnavati’ (gleichen, glich, gegliechen), gr’uʃt ‘građevinska skela’ (Gerüst), g’us ‘odljevak’ (Guß), kl’inga ‘oštrica’ (Klinge), l’eṭva ‘uska dugačka daska’ (Latte), l’oker ‘klimav, labav’ (locker), l’ọtati ‘lemiti’ (lören), n’croft ‘zakovica’ (Niete), p’anlin ‘metalna naprava o koju se vješaju vrata; šarka, zglibnik’ (Bandel), p’enlţl ‘veći sobosljaralski kist’ (Pinsel), r’odlin ‘željezna kolica u skladištima’ (Rodeln, šv’osat ‘variti’ (schweissen), š’olati ‘postavljati oplatu od dasaka’ (schalen), šm’irgľi ‘papir premazan smirkovim prahom’ (Schmirgel), šn’aʃc’ajk ‘sprava za izrezivanje navoja’ (schneiden + Zeug), šp’aʃiľn ‘mala lopatica za struganje žbuke’ (Spachtel), špr’ajk ‘podupirač’ (Spreize), špr’ic ‘završni sloj na fasadi koji se stavljao na sjevernu stranu kuće’ (spritzen), špr’il ‘sačma’ (Sprüh), šr’otati ‘krupno mljeti kukuruz’ (schröten), št’imati ‘dupsti dlijetom, obijati zid’ (stemmen), št’oŋga ‘metalna poluga’ (Stange), št’emajšl ‘dlijeto’ (Stemmeisen), št’eŋp ‘prošav’ (Steppstich), št’iʃ ‘držak’ (Stiel), š’yber ‘poluga za regulaciju dovoda zraka u štednjak’
(Schuber), šv’os-apar’at ‘aparat za zavarivanje’ (schweissen), t’iplin ‘učvršnica’ (Dippel), uđštekatį ‘izvaditi utikač iz utičnice’ (stecken), v’ekerica ‘budilica’ (wecker), v’inklīn ‘pravi kut’ (winkel), v’eksloš ‘skrenica’ (wechsel), v’oser-v’oga ‘libela’ (wasserwaage), tr’egger ‘nosač na biciklu’ (Träger), zac’ožhatį ‘označiti olovkom kako bi se znalo gdje piliti ili bušiti – o stolaru’ (zeichnen), zgli’ihatį ‘izravnati neku površinu’ (gleichen, glich, gegliehen), ż’oga ‘pila’ (Säge), žl’ajdernica ‘debela žica’ (bav. austr. Schleuder), żv’inga ‘vezna greda neke drvene konstrukcije’ (Zwinge)

- hair styling: b’ožhatį ‘svijetleti kosu’ (bleichen), kufert’alu ‘pletene na zatiljku isprepletene na poseban način i učvršene ukošnicama’ (Kopf), nabr’ėnati ‘vrucim škarama napraviti uvojke’ (brennen), š’uraf ‘nepočešljan’ (Schur ‘striženje ovaca’) (St. Martin), v’ikler ‘naprava od lima ili plastike i gume za pravljenje kovrča’ (wickler), str’igatį ‘šišati’ (pej.) (strigeln)

- exclamations/shouts: c’ofylt ‘uzvik tjeranja u komunikaciji s djecom’ (sorfot), cyr’ik ‘uzvik u značenju natrag’ (zurck)

- entertainment: music, card games, pub, football: adyt’ėratį ‘bacati adute s ciljem da izada iz igre oni aduti koji su kod protivnika’ (aduttieren), ‘encai se (ein), fuč ‘crta u igri bacanja kamenom’17 (Kami’ena m’oraš hi’iţţį pr’ičk fuča.) (futsch interj. ‘propalo, ode’) (Goričan), fuł ‘promašaj’ (Fehl), hi’re c’serce u kartanju’ (Herz), j’unfer ‘gol dobiven kroz noge; prolazak lopote između nogu’ (Jungfer), l’amfer ‘lovac u šahu’ (Läufer), r’ingišp’il ‘vrutljak’ (Ringelspiel), r’unda ‘narudžba pića za cijelo društvo’ (Runde), šp’ilatį se ‘igrati se jednostavnih igara na sreću, npr. pismo-glava’, š’t’opatį (stopfen) ‘zaustavljati loptu’, š’t’op ‘sposobnost zaustavljanja lopote’ (stopfen) (D’obruga št’opa ima.); š’t’oplīn (stopfen) ‘ćepić na kopačci’, š’t’ucliņį (Stutzen) ‘štītnici za listove na nozi nogometaša’, t’oncai ‘iplesati’ (tanzen), v’iža ‘arija’ (srvnem. wise), trumb’entinga ‘truba’ (Trompete), žv’eqla ‘frula’ (Schwegel)

- occupations: h’antlar ‘pokućarac’ (handeln), m’olar ‘soboslikar’ (Maler), k’oršmįt ‘veterinar’ (Kurschmied), p’ēk ‘pekar’ (Bäcker), p’intar ‘bačvar’ (Binder), puć’aj (Polizei), s’otler ‘sedlar’ (Sattler), šl’osar ‘bravar’ (Schlosser), št’olv’ortar ‘konjušar’ (štala + wärter),

17 The phrase b’iťį zv’um fuča ‘biti izvan događaja’ was also recorded.
štr’čkar ‘radnik na pruzi’ (Strecke), t’išlar ‘stolar’ (Tischler), tr’ajbar ‘gonič stoke’ (Treiber), v’urm’uhar ‘urar’ (Uhrmacher).

In more urban Kajkavian idioms, such as that of old Zagreb, Varaždin, Križevci, Karlovac, Osijek, etc. there are an even greater number of Germanisms, many of which have suppressed the already existing Slav(on)ic words, eg. šprehati ‘govoriti’ (sprechen), ašnbeher ‘pepeljara’ (Aschenbecher), taubek ‘golub’ (Taube), fruštuk ‘doručak’ (Frühstück), beamter ‘službenik’ (Beamte), klangovati ‘naricati’ (klagen), henkar ‘krvnik’ (Henker), galge ‘vješala’ (Galgen). Neki su vezani i za društveno ophođenje viših slojeva društva: kistijant (< küß die Hand), pitšen (< bitte schön), haptak < (habt Acht), bubikopf ‘kratka ženska frizura sa šiškama’ (Bubi + Kopf), eklhaften ‘odvratan’ (ekelhaft), flajš mašina ‘stroj za mljevenje mesa’, gebis ‘zubalo’ (Gebuss)\(^{18}\), herclihi ‘srdačno’ (herzlich).

**Hungarisms**

There are not as many Hungarisms as there are Germanisms because the Croatian and Hungarian languages are both genetically and typologically very distant and attempts at Hungarianization of the population (which was strongest in Međimurje) have never produced significant results. In rural local idioms, the number of Hungarisms is far greater than in urban Kajkavian idioms. I will present the most important semantic fields covered by Hungarisms in the local dialects of Međimurje, where they are by far the most numerous, because Međimurje was part of Hungary for a long time and was only permanently annexed to Croatia as a part of Yugoslavia in 1945.

- disease and human conditions: b’etek ‘bolest’, bet’eqen ‘bolestan’, betežn’ica ‘bolesnica’, betežn’ik ‘bolesnık’, betež’uvatí ‘bolovati’ (sve od beteg ‘bolestan’), g’ingaf (gyöngf ‘slab, osjetljiv, nježan’) ‘teturav u hodu zbog iscrpljenosti od bolesti’, gymb’oc (gombóc ‘valjušak’) ‘ćir na stražnjici koji se dobije uslijed lošeg držanja higijene; posebice je to bilo

\(^{18}\) In rural dialects the Zubalo would simply be z’qby as pluralia tantum: D’ny sy z’qbe v č’ašw.
prije kad su ljudi često umjesto toaletnog papira upotrebljavali okomke od kukuruza’ – derogacija; heiŋovati (benyé ‘jenjavati, prestajati’) ‘jenjavati, prestajati – o fizičkoj bolii’ – suženje značenja, hitv’olen (hivtelen; hitvány ‘sramotan, nečastan; jadan’) ‘slabo razvijen, bolestan, i to od rođenja’ (v. biljke), k’ehła (keh ‘kašalj’) ‘guša’, k’ehlavec/k’ehlafka (keh ‘kašalj’) ‘čovjek / žena koji boluje od guše’, mar’oden (marodi ‘boležljiv’)19 ‘iserpljen od bolesti’, p’ëlda (példa ‘primjer; simbol; slika; kip’) ‘netko tko izgleda bolesno i iscrpljeno’, v’eteš (vetés ‘sjetva; usjev’) ‘ovulacija’ – proširenje značenja, , zbet’ężati (beteg ‘bolestan’) ‘oboljeti’
- numbers: j’ezerű (ezer) ‘tisuća’
- cart/car parts: dr’ěk ‘stranica kola’ (derék, stariji oblik drék ‘struk; stranica kola’)
- bearing/posture: nažez’erem (gyönyörü ‘radostan; živahan, junačan’) ‘žustar, nažez’eriti se (gyönyörü ‘radostan; živahan, junačan’) ‘tijelom zauzeti prkosan stav’
- tobacco: b’aga (bagó) ‘duhan za žvakanje’, ket’ěs (kötés ‘zavežljaj; pletivo’) ‘mjera za duhan’
- speech: berl’onduvati (bolond ‘lud, budalast’) ‘ludo, besmisleno govoriti’; ‘govoriti bez stanke tako da nitko drugi ne može doći do riječi’ – smanjenje pejorativnosti, čal’ören (csalárd ‘varljiv’) ‘šutljiv, ali oštrog jezika kad progovori – o ženama’ – suženje značenja, m(e)rg’otati20 (morog) ‘gundati, mrmljati; režati’
- food: b’oči (gombóc ‘valjušak’) ‘krpice od tijesta koje se stavljuj u juhu’, čig’er (esiger ‘loše vino’) ‘ocat napravljen od vina’, fal’at (falat ‘komad’), ‘komad nečeg jestivog’ – suženje značenja, fal’atat (falat) ‘komadati – o nečem jestivom’ – suženje značenja, g’ulaš (gulyás ‘tipično mađarsko jelo od govedine i krumpira koje su obično konzumirali čuvari stada’) ‘jelo od komadića mesa u umaku’, gymb’oči (gombóc ‘valjušak’) ‘okruglice od griza koje se stavljuj u juhu’ (v. bolest i ljudska stanja), jes’enec (eszencia ‘srž, bit; ekstrakt’) ‘vrsta jakog octa’, t’urűs (túró ‘svježi sir’) ‘sušeni sir s paprikom’

- names: Bal’oš (Baláš), ‘Ilka (Ilike), Jandr’oš (András), K’orči / K’aryl (Károly), Mih’oš (Mihály), Ž’oša (Zsófia)
- institutions: ’ovyđa (óvoda) ‘dječji vrtić’
- irony: c’eg (csiga ‘kotur na zdencu’) ‘nešto što je tako loše napravljeno da će se odmah srušiti’
- character traits: čal’oren (csalárd ‘varljiv’) ‘podmukao i prijetvoran’ (v. govor)
- house/home: b’olta (bolta ‘svod; dućan’) ‘svod od opeke’
- relationships: ald’uvat (áld ‘žrtvovati’) ‘oprostiti nekome dug’, , b’otruyi (bátórit) ‘bodriti, hrabriti’, k’etyš (kettős ‘suradnik, drug’) ‘suradnik’ (v. ponašanje – negativni oblici), ket’uši se (kettős ‘suradnik; drug’) – ‘suradivati’ (v. ponašanje – negativni oblici), pajd’oš (pajtáš ‘prijatelj’) ‘prijatelj’; ‘drug, kolega (bez dublje intimne povezanosti)’ – suženje značenja
- smell: v’etes vetés ‘sjetva; usjev’) ‘miris po vlazi u neprozračenoj prostoriji’ (v. bolest i ljudska stanja)
- money: jezer’oča (ezer ‘tisuća’) ‘novčanica od tisuću jedinica’
- clothes and shoes: b’očkšor (boskor ‘opanak’) ‘stare iznosene cipele koje su oblače isključivo za polje ili blato’, g’omp (gomb) ‘dugme’, kep’ček (kőpónyeg) ‘vojnički plašt’, s’ora (szár ‘dugački, ravno stojeci dio raznih predmeta, biljki, odjeće…’) ‘gornji dio čizme’
- deceased: c’intur (cintorom) ‘groblje’, vel’estuvati (virraszt, verraszt ‘bdjeti; stražariti’) ‘bdjeti uz mrtvaca’ (v. ponašanje – negativni oblici)
- behavior (negative forms): hal’ositi (halászat ‘ribariti’) ‘krasti voće u tuđim vrtovima’, kertuš (kettős ‘suradnik; drug’) ‘ortak; ljubavnik’ – derogacija, kertušti se (kettős ‘suradnik; drug’) ‘suradižiti u nekom sumnjivom poslu; održavati zabranjenu ljubavnu vezu’ – derogacija, l’opuf (lópó) ‘lopop’, vel’estuvati (virraszt, verraszt ‘bdjeti; stražariti’) ‘negdje se predugo zadržavati’ – derogacija
- superstition: k’uta (kutya ‘pas’) ‘izmišljeno strašilo kojim se plaše djeca’, p’ölduvati (példa ‘primjer; simbol; slika; kip’) ‘raditi nešto opasno što će vrlo vjeroljubno urodit lošim posljedicama’
- surnames: Heged’uš (Hegedűs), Mar’odj (Marudi), Sab’ol (Szábó)
- transport: kűč’ija (kocsi ‘kola’) ‘kočija’, kűč’i’őş (kocsi ‘kola’) ‘kočijaš’, kűč’ika (kocsi ‘kola’) ‘kolica u kojoj majke voze najmanju djecu’
- nature: f’orguf (forgó) ‘vir’
- kinship names: j’apa (apa ‘otac’) ‘otac’, japica (apa ‘otac’) ‘djed’
- technical terms: c’ines (szín ‘boja’) ‘debela olovka u boji koju koriste stolari’, j’urek (furkó) ‘trupac’, k’ipek (kép ‘slika; lice; obraz; vid’) ‘fotografija’, kyr’m’on / krm’on (kormány ‘kormilo, upravljač; vlada’) ‘vulan’; ‘upravljač bicikla’ – suženje značenja, kyr’mónit / krm’ónit (kormány ‘kormilo, upravljač; vlada’) ‘upravljači biciklom’, na’ég ‘u obliku karike’
- body parts: č’ökél (csáklya ‘čaklja’) ‘prst’; ‘prst’ (u pejorativnim iskazima), č’onta (esont ‘kost’) ‘kost’; ‘životinjska kost’
- cloth: *saga* (szag ‘vonj’) ‘tkanina koja je uslijed duge upotrebe toliko istrošena da se kroz nju vidi’

- toponyms: *P’erlak* (top.) (Perlak), *Š’imek* (Sümeg) ‘mjesto u Mađarskoj na Balatonu’

- the market/trade: ‘ajendek (ajándék ‘dar, poklon’) ‘nagrada koja se daje nekome za pruženu pomoć u nekom poslu iako on nije tražio ništa’, *nar’qdus* (ráadás) – prilog koji se javlja samo u frazemu *dyb’iti nar’qdus* ‘prilikom kupovine veće količine nečeg dobiti nešto badava’, *p’ijac* (piac) ‘tržnica’

- exclamations in interpersonal communication: *J’ezuš Kr’istuš!* (Jézus Krisztus), t’eremt’ete (teremtette) ‘uzvik blagog neodobravanja’


---

21 The unusual shift in meaning was probably due to the fact that unpleasant odors spread more easily through worn-out and extremely worn-out clothing. For Pomurje Croats, this noun has the same meaning as the Hungarian model: ‘Imaš s’ogy. ‘Smrdiš.’; *H’udy s’ogy ‘ima t’o m’esu*. ‘To meso ima loš miris.’

22 The change *f* > *x* is frequent in Goričan and Prelog, eg. *l’eksj† / l’efk†, m’eksj† / m’eefk†, žm’ekf† / žm’efk†, ž’osk† / ž’ofk†.
Old Kajkavian vocabulary in contemporary local idioms is experiencing different semantic adaptations in order to survive alongside equivalents from the Croatian standard language. The survival of this vocabulary is also endangered by the fact that many aspects of the former way of life are disappearing. On the example of Germanisms and Hungarisms, I will show how the old Kajkavian vocabulary is fighting for survival in the contemporary context. There are seven types of modern semantic adaptations by which the old lexicon seeks to survive and retain its functionality.

**Derogation with narrowing of meaning**

Geschäft: š'eft, š'eftät, š'eftar, š'eftarka - In older respondents, the meanings of these replicas are related to trade without negative connotations. In the case of younger respondents, the meanings have significantly derogated, and they are moving in the direction of gaining benefits in suspicious and infamous jobs: N'iščići s t'ošm n'a m'el p'osla 'ak n'ćena š'efta. ‘Nitko neće s tobom imati posla ako nema korist.’ S'am gled’i k’ak b’i š'eftal. ‘Samo gleda kako bi stekao materijalnu korist.’ In the case of younger respondents, the meanings have significantly derogated, and they are moving in the direction of gaining benefits in suspicious and infamous jobs. The noun b’ota (bot ‘štap, batina’) in older respondents means ‘svaki duži okrugli komad drveta, bez obzira je li obrađen ili slučajno naden u prirodi’. In younger respondents, this Hungarism narrowed its meaning to ‘duži okrugli neobrađeni komad drveta slučajno naden u prirodi’. The noun št’ap is used for a longer, round, processed piece of wood. Older people would say H’oda z b’otym. ‘Hoda sa štapom.’; Z b’otym na r’it dyb’iš! ‘Batinom ćeš dobiti po
stražnjici!’, and younger people H'oda s št'apum; S št'apum te pu r'iti
naľ'upľem! The respondents do not use the noun batina.

Derogation with extension of meaning

**Jungfrau:** *j'unfer* - In the football terminology of village boys, the
meaning of this noun has expanded from the noun ‘djevac’ (‘on tji je du
kr'aja živ'ota b'il j'unfer.) and ‘djevičnjak’ (Sk'inuľ jį je junfera.) na ‘gol
dobiven kroz noge’: G'olman je d'obil j'unfera; Nap'elfal mju je j'unfera.
- č'iga (csiga) ‘kotur na zdencu’; č'ega ‘nešto tako loše napravljeno da
če se odmah srušiti’ The pejorization of the č'iga was accomplished by
change *i* > ‘ć.23 This new form is confirmed in the phrase č'ega d'ća
‘ironični komentar nekome tko slaže nešto za što je vidljivo da će se
srušiti - uludo gubiti vrijeme’. This phrase is also used by younger
respondents.

Derogation without narrowing and extending meaning

**werkstatt:** *v'ěštet* - The noun v'ěštet is no longer used for a real
workshop, but for an inconspicuous corner of the household where tools
are being kept and minor repairs are performed (PO). **Speck:** šp'ćk / 
šp'ćh – Slanina has still not suppressed the Germanism šp'ćk, but
pejorization is evident in the optional form šp'ćh with the consonant *h* in
place of *k*. Respondents only use this form when mockingly saying that
someone is very fat: K'akvuga šp'ćha 'ima t'q ž'ena. When it comes to
food, only the form with *k* is confirmed: T'ćšp'ćk je j’oku f'iniž za j’ěštj.
The optional replacement of *k* with *h* probably occurred due to the
amplification of the onomatopoeic oscillation.
- *j'apatića (apáca ‘časna sestra’) – In a positive and neutral context, an
adjective referring to a noun will be used: č'asna. The Hungarism
j'apatića is exclusively used today in a negative context: D'išla je med
j'apatiće. ‘Otišla je u samostan’ (the respondent reacted negatively to a
specific example); Drž' i se k'aj j'apatića. (a phrase meaning ‘pravi se
poština, a nije’), V'ęč i j'apatiće v'ozįžų 'aũta. (automobili se ispitiku
čine nečim neprikladnim za povučeni život redovnica).

---

23 In the speech of Goričans, there are several other pairs of similar lexemes that differ
in phonemes and *i* / ‘ILL: v'inec ‘pogrebnii vijenac’ / v’ILL nec ‘ukrasni vijanac u sve
druge svrhe osim pogrebne’; t'iraty “tjerati” / t’ILL raty “utjerivati dugove.”
Amelioration with the extension of meaning

**Fremde**24: *fr’ent, fr’entati, fr’entar, fr’entarica* from (Fremde) - The meaning of these replicas is related to the wandering and vagabonding of people from the fringes of society. Younger respondents only use it in the context of school: ‘neopravdano izostajati s nastave’ (Fr’entali smy s št’rtyga s’ata. ‘Pobjegli smo s četvrtog sata.’). The noun *fr’ent* is also used in an almost negligible negative sense: ‘Iti vu fr’ent, for example, does not mean wandering aimlessly but simply going to neighbor’s place for coffee.

- *hįtv’qlen* (hivtelen; hitvány ‘sraman, nečastan; jadan’)25 – Hadrovics says that this adjective is only recorded in the Croatian language by Pergošić, in the sense of moral corruption (*na steguvanje i pokaranje hudih diel hitvâlnih ljudi* Perg 21), and this meaning is also confirmed in the idioms of Pomurje Croatians. Older respondents from Goričan did not confirm usage in the context of moral depravity but only poor physical development in humans, animals, and plants (*Hįtv’qlna d’eca su se skr’ivala v hi’zi*. ‘Bolesna su se djeca sakrivala u kući.’ – Misli se na djecu s osobitim potrebama od rođenja; ‘Ak je t’ele biju hįtv’qlmų, pr’odalį smų ga. ‘Ako je tele bilo bolesno od rođenja, prodali smo ga.’; ‘Ak su su n’c pybr’ale zl’at’ice, kalamp’c je b’iy hįtv’qlen. ‘Ako se nisu pokupile krumplir zlatice, krumir je bio vrlo sitan.’). For younger respondents, this adjective is limited to agricultural contexts.

Amelioration without narrowing and expanding the meaning

**sroft**: *c’ofyl (PR) / c’afyr (PO, ŠT)* - This form of command is also only used today to communicate with children, i. e. to gently push or hasten them in a manner that resembles babbling: *C’ofyl d’imų! D’ost se se įgr’ali. ‘Odmah idite kući! Dosta se igrali!’* In the past, this form of command was used for stricter orders as well as communication with children.

---


- *berl'onduvatí* (bolond ‘lud, budalast’) - This verb is derived from the Hungarian adjective and noun *bolond*, which is of Slav(on)ic origin.\(^{26}\) Younger respondents use it to mean ‘govoriti bez stanke’ (*St’olny je berl’onduvala ka sam n’ě m’ogla d’oji du r’čči*). This constitutes a decrease in pejorativeness from the verb’s meanings in Hungarian and the confirmed usage of older respondents, which describe the madness and meaninglessness of what is being said. Secondary *r* as an enhancer of onomatopoeia also exists in this verb in Prelog, while in the middle subdialect (eg. Podturen, Vratišinec) there is a more common form that preserves the root from the Hungarian language: *buł’onduvatí*.

- *ščapiti* (csap ‘udariti’) - In older respondents *ščapiti* and *vđdr’iti* are synonyms (*M’oraų si feįst ščapiti pu dr’evi ka se rask’olila*). In younger respondents the verb *ščapiti* still means ‘udariti’, but very mildly, and in a more humorous context (*Ščapila sam ga pu r’okį duķ me št’eų p’etai*. ‘Udarila sam ga po ruci kad me htio dirati.’; *Ščapitu ih je kleh’oikum duķ sų ga s’rdili*. ‘Udario ih je štapom kad su ga ljutili.’). For hitting ‘seriously’ the verb *vđdr’iti* is used.

**Narrowing of meaning without derogation or amelioration**

**Schweis**: *šv’ic, šv’icati, zašv’icati, prešv’icati* - Replicas from the *Schweis* model have narrowed their meaning to sweating due to illness: *Šv’ic me prijai i ‘unda je vruč’ina p’ola*. ‘Kad sam se oznojio, temperatura je pala.’; *Idi v p’osateľ ka zašv’icaš*. ‘Idi u krevet da se preznojiš.’ *D’obry šv’icam pak mi v’ę b’ò b’ole*. ‘Dobro se znojim pa će mi sada biti bolje.’ For the meaning of sweat from hard work or heat, the Croatian lexeme *zn’oj* suppressed the Germanism *šv’ic*: *S’ę me zn’oj t’ira k’ak feįst d’člam*. ‘Oblijeva me znoj od naporna rada’. The oldest respondents do not use the verb to sweat but the phrase *b’iti m’oker*. *V’ęs sam m’oker k’ak feįst d’člam*. ‘Sav sam mokar od naporna posla.’

- *heĩ’ovati* (henyél ‘jenjavati’) – The meaning of the verb ‘jenjavati,’ which was once used in all contexts (*Sn’čk hen’ovle; P’osele r’ata je b’ių v’elkį gl’ot, a ’unda je p’um’alį ’ipak heĩval.’), was narrowed to the

---

abatement of only physical pain: Z’op pum’alǐ heǐ’ovle. ‘Zubobolja polako prestaje.’; Gl’ova heǐ’ovle. ‘Prestaje glavobolja.’

Extension of meaning without derogation or amelioration fest: f’ejst - The German adjective and adverb was adapted in MD also like an adjective and adverb. The meaning of the indeclinable adjective expanded from ‘čvrst, tvrd’ to ‘poželjan’ (F’ejst p’ucu ‘ima.’; privlačan’ (T’o je f’ejst z’ Egyptian. ‘jače tjelesne grade’ (Pr’evčeč st f’ejst. M’oral bi zmrs’aveti. ‘Predebeo si. Morao bi smršavjeti.’) i ‘kvalitetan’ (F’ejst si je ‘alta k’upil’.) The meaning of the replica, which is an adverb, extended to ‘mnogo’: F’ejst se vuč’si. F’ejst s’uži. ‘Mnogo zarađuje.’
-h’oluf (háló ‘mreža’) - In the idiom of the Goričans, h’oluf is the place in the barn where hay is kept before being placed, if necessary, in a manger: Dn’esì s’òny f h’oluf. Kr’ave su l’očne. ‘Odnesi sjeno u spremnik. Krave su gladne.’ In Serdahelj, the meaning from the Hungarian language is confirmed: Z vel’kim h’olufum hal’osj r’ibe. ‘S velikom mrežom lovi ribe.’ There is large number of indeclinable adjectives borrowed from the German language. These are all mostly unadapted replicas, eg. ‘ajnc ‘a savršen; savršen’ (eins), d’upliť ‘dvostruk’ (D’upliť p’eneje je zal’uži.) (doppelt), š’al ‘jeftin’ (F’al c’pele sam sì k’upiła..) (feil), F’ejst ‘čvrst; naočit’ (F’ejst z’ënu ‘ima; F’ejst d’al.) (fest), gl’ot ‘jednobojno; bez šara’ (Pl’otnju je na gl’ot.) (glatt), gl’at ‘ravan – o kosi’ (l’mal gl’at l’osji.) (glatt), k’ek ‘ponosit, uznosit (pejor.)’ (keck), n’açgeričk ‘radoznao’ (neu + gierig), pas’ent ‘pogodan, što dobro pristaje’ (passend) (Na n’oj je s’ę b’ili pas’ent.), šl’ank ‘mršav’ (schlang), z’iher ‘siguran’ (sicher). The replica h’aklik (heikel) was also unadapted, although the ending from the model was replaced by another ending of German origin.

Pseudoanalagonomy
Contemporary research into pseudo-analagonomy (‘false friends’) between Kajkavian local dialects, and between individual Kajkavian

---

27 In most European languages, the term ‘false friends’ is common, while the term ‘pseudoanalagonomy’ is used by German linguists Karlheinz Hengst and Daniel Bunčić. In this paper, I use both names because I believe that both are necessary for precise expression in scientific discourse: I call the phenomenon pseudoanalagonomy, and the examples “false friends.”
dialects and the Croatian standard language, is also important. This phenomenon in Croatian linguistics has so far been investigated in several short papers where it is exemplified in pairs with one word from the Croatian standard language and another from another standard language, most often in the context of translation errors.

The application of the results of such research (especially small dictionaries of ‘false friends’) within the Croatian language is also valuable in Croatian language teaching as there are numerous interferences in the colloquial language, of which the following stand out: a) between standard language and local speech b) between standard language and interdialects c) between different local dialects. In such interferences, situations constantly arise where a misunderstanding is possible, especially where a poor connoisseur of a system thinks that in translation from one system to another it is always sufficient to make only a phonological and morphological adaptation. Such a poor connoisseur of a language system mistakenly generalizes this partial equivalence as equivalence on all or most levels. There are many misunderstandings in daily communication among speakers of most Kajkavian local dialects, especially the less educated whose knowledge of the standard language is not particularly good.

Since such research involves large number of diverse phonological systems, it is quite understandable that before such research a list of compromises should be made in which it would be defined what differences between the two systems compared can be ignored, and that similar words be classified as ‘false friends.’ The main criterion in determining the compromise in most cases are phonological and morphological adjustments which, when translating from their local dialect to standard, work or are quite realistically assumed to be working by speakers of a Kajkavian local dialect.

The appearance of pairs of ‘false friends’ occurred for the following reasons:

a) One of the pairs gained another meaning in the dialect through semantic adaptation, eg.
b’ougatı̆ impf. slušati. ★ D’eca słu b’ougal ‘oca ḳ m’ater. D’elała słu s’ę k’aj słu īm rűd’itelj r’eklį. ḳ’d m’alýga słu īįh prįv’oučalj na d’ęlu. // b’ogatı̆ impf. brinuti se o kome. ★ Št’o vas b’o b’ogal dąk bute st’orį!

b) One of the pairs is a loanword from non-Slav(on)ic languages that coincides phonologically with another word, eg. p’ucatı̆ (Gmn. putzen) does not mean 1. ‘kršiti se, lomiti se’ 2. ‘gađati iz vatrenog oružja’ 3. ‘udarati loptom’ but ‘čistiti’; b’ọba (Hung. baba ‘lutka’) does not mean 1. ‘starą żena’ 2. ‘očeva ili materina majka’ but ‘lutka’; j’ezery (Hung. ezer) does not mean ‘prirodna ili umjetna udolina na kopnu u kojoj je voda stajačica bez veze s morem’ but ‘tisuća’.

c) Both pairs are borrowed from non-Slav(on)ic languages, and one of the pair has a special semantic adaptation, eg. inkviž’iṭyr does not mean ‘član inkvizičeskog suda’ but ‘policija istražitelj’, p’ọstyr does not mean ‘protestantski župnik’ but ‘čuvar vinograda’. P’uška is not a firearm or a hunting weapon in the Upper Međimurje dialects but a small bouquet of flowers carried to church on Palm Sunday. (Na Cvetn’icu n’esemų p’uškų na pysv’ečaie, a dýk d’emų d’imų, se prekr’ižimų ḳ h’iṭimu jų na kr’of.)

d) A pair from Kajkavian has or had ‘true friends’ in other languages, often Slav(on)ic ones, but their counterparts in the standard language do not have them, eg. d’ęlu does not mean ‘rezultat ili proizvod rada’ but ‘posao (ali ne kao stalno zanimanje)’; k’ọzatı̆ does not mean ‘izraziti riječima’ but ‘pokazivati’; nar’ugatı̆ se does not mean ‘izvrgnuti ruglu’ but ‘nabratı se, zguživati se – o tkanini’.

koje označuju granicu dopuštene ispaše stoke’ (Vid:iš da je zapičena m:ajga, t:u ne sm:eš na p’ašu.) II m‘ojga ‘majsko drvo’ (Za P’rvi m‘aj s:u nav’išk d‘eli m‘ojgu i fl‘ušu n‘o šu.)

f) By transphonemization of the a-, e- and o-vowels according to the pattern of the standard language, the word from the Kajkavian local idiom became similar to a word in the standard, eg. m‘omica is not hypocoristic for ‘mama’ but ‘nesvjestica, obamrlost’; st‘ečji does not mean ‘vlastitim radom privrijediti’ but ‘izaći tekući’, k‘oštatj does not mean 1. ‘imati trgovačku cijenu’ 2. ‘imati troškove, štetu, loše posljedice’ but ‘probati’.

g) Different words from two comparable systems are formed through the same creative means that have different meanings, eg. prevideti does not mean ‘propustiti zbog nedovoljne pažnje’ but ‘uvidjeti’; pij‘onka is not ‘zabava na kojoj se opija’ but ‘žena koja se opija’.

h) One pair is of onomatopoetic origin and coincides with a word from another system, eg. t‘utkatj in Mursko Središće does not mean ‘lijepiti posebnim ljepilom dobivenim od životinja’ but ‘piti iz boce (pej.)’. In Prelog the verb cvyk‘otalj has the common meaning (Dv‘ič v‘ure sam cvyk‘otal na z‘imij.), but in Mursko Središće it unexpectedly means ‘cvrkutati’ (Na dr‘ejvi l‘enju cvyk‘očeju ši‘iči.). I have noted several interesting instances of enantiosemia between pairs. The meaning of these in some idioms (not the whole dialect!) went in opposite directions: lag‘oden ‘nekvalitetan’ (Kotoriba, Mursko Središće) (Hit‘ jkr‘aj t‘o lag‘odnjy kyr‘uzj.) – lagodan ‘koji se odvija bez poteškoća’ sp‘ornj ‘brzo’ (Cirkovljan, Štrigova) (Viš k‘ak sp‘ornj d‘išla, i t‘i b‘i t‘ak m‘oral.) – spōorno ‘na sporan način, dvojbeno’

The next two examples are partial enantiosemia because both meanings coexist in the same speech: the ‘normal’ and the opposite. z r‘oke ‘pogodno’ (M‘om p‘em pugl‘edati m‘amicy. T‘o miji je r‘on z r‘oke đšk p‘em v štač’un.) – z roke ‘nepogodno’ (Z r‘oke miji je d‘enes d‘ojtij k t‘ej. P‘uny p‘osla ‘imam.) (Sveti Đurd) od kr‘aja ‘od početak’ (K‘opaj yd kr‘aja. ‘Kopaj od početak.’; M‘om je yd kr‘aja b‘il n‘orj. ‘Odmah od početak bio je lud.’) – otkraja ‘od kraja’ (recorded in most of the Kajkavian dialect).

The semantic gender pair m‘oček – m‘očka is interesting. This refers to felis catus, ‘a domesticated beast from a subfamily of real cats that is kept in the house for hunting mice or as a pet.’ While mačka is the
sexually unmarked of the pair in the standard language, and mačak a sexually mature, adult male, it is the other way around in most Kajkavian dialects: m’oček is the term for a sexually unmarked animal, and m’očka is a sexually mature, adult female (M’očki j j h’odajy p u k’uhűj j n’ikaj j ne sm’eta. ‘Mačke joj hodaju po kuhinji i to joj ništa ne smeta.’; P’ok m’očka ‘ima ml’ode. ‘Opet mačka ima mlade.’). Therefore, m’oček and mačka are ‘false friends’.

The future of research on the Kajkavian lexicon
When we talk about Kajkavian lexicography, we should first mention the Rječnik hrvatskoga kajkavskoga književnog jezika (RHKKJ), which deals with and presents the linguistic wealth of the Kajkavian literary language, which was the common literary language of the northwestern part of Croatia from the 16th to the middle of the 19th century, with Zagreb as the main political and cultural centre. The idea of making RHKKJ dates back to the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts of the 1930s, because the selection of material for the Academy’s Large Dictionary included Štokavian and Čakavian written sources but not Kajkavian ones. The project is currently being carried out by the Institute of the Croatian Language and Linguistics. Fourteen volumes have been published so far (the most recent one ends with an entry for SELANEC). Kajkavian lexicography has been experiencing a renaissance over the last fifteen years. There are many amateurs who spend their whole lives collecting vocabulary. They leave their data’s processing to linguists and publish the work jointly.29 Fewer and fewer amateurs publish their material in a simple word-meaning format. The ideal situation is when an experienced scholar publishes a dictionary of his native local language.30

29 Apart from this dictionary, Večenaj & Lončarić (1997); Belović & Blažek (2009); Blažeka, Nyomárkay, Rácz (2009); Maresić & Miholek (2011) are also good examples of such cooperation. Blažeka & Rob (2014). Lipljin’s Rječnik varaždinskoga kajkavskog govora (Lipljin 2002) also falls into this category because Mijo Lončarić provided great professional assistance in the development of this valuable dictionary, although he is not listed as a co-author professional assistance in the development of this valuable dictionary, although he is not listed as a co-author.

30 Blažeka (2018).
There is a large number or body of completely original words in each idiom characterized by a different formation, special phonological feature or special nuance of meaning in related words in territorially and linguistically close idioms. Creating a complete scientific dictionary of a local idiom is a large and time-consuming task often associated with very real difficulties, such as finding funding to publish. Even when the resources to publish are found, the subsequent sale of the book is also difficult, for apart from the narrow scholarly and academic community the only potential ‘consumers’ are speakers of that local dialect, and most villages today are made up of elderly households. Therefore, in cases when a more extensive scientific dictionary of a local dialect has already been published, and more material has been collected from a relatively similar local idiom, a dictionary of differences, omitting those words that do not differ in any relevant way from identical words in the ‘main’ dictionary, would be more appropriate. In Blažeka 2013 I proposed a methodology for researching such lexical differences between individual local idioms.

a) Counterparts are formed by different creative means.

\[\text{glaz'or m staklar.} \quad \text{D'eca } su' pu't'ra gl'a's z l'optum.} \quad \text{M'oram 'it' glaz'oru.} \quad \text{M'oram 'it' glaz'oru.} \quad \text{// gl'ajzek m} \]

\[\text{'orel m orao.} \quad \text{// 'orlijn m}\]

b) A phonological change has occurred in one word of the pair: the loss, transition, metathesis, or appearance of a secondary phoneme. // In the second word there is no vocal change, loss, or transition of phonemes as in the first word, or the same phonological change did not occur as in the first.

\[\text{c'eler m celer.} \quad \text{// z'eler m}\]

\[\text{f'ahman m JARG. stručnjak.} \quad \text{* 'On je pr'ovj f'ahman za str'uj.} \quad \text{// f'akman m}\]

c) The counterparts are lexemes that are onomatopaeic with the same meaning but a different mode of expression.

\[\text{Šk'rmjatij impf. glasno mrviti hranu.} \quad \text{* N'ej t'ak šk'rmjatij zübm'i!} \quad \text{// ž'qumbati impf.}\]

\[\text{šl'ojdratij impf. teškom mukom probijati se kroz šljunak - o kotaču.} \quad \text{* Küt'qč šl'ojdra v š'udr.} \quad \text{// žl'ojdratij impf.}\]
d) One lexeme is used in one local idiom and another in another local idiom but with the same meaning.

\[ \text{bat'iga} f\text{klatno na zvonu.} \]
\[ \text{Bat'iga f'ezst t'ogoče.} // \text{c'amel} m \]
\[ \text{Zd'ignj c'amle na v'urj. D'u kr'aja s'op'ušć'enj. Nav'inj v'urj.} \]

\[ \text{f'erije} f\text{pl. t. školski praznici.} \]
\[ \text{D'a vam p'očnu f'erije?} // \text{ž'omen} m \]
\[ \text{D'ejca se f'ezst vesel'ijuž'omenju, 'unda se pju c'čelé dn'eve mor'ejju ĕgr'atj.} \]

e) The counterparts are in a relationship of partial or complete pseudoanalogonymy, that is, they are “false friends”.

\[ \text{k'urta} f\text{onaj koji je bez repa - u □ b'itj hm'qinj k'aj k'urta // k'urta} f\text{seoska zabava.} \]
\[ \text{Več'er na f'ašenj se 'išlju K'ašeku na k'urtju. Pļ'esalu se dúp'p'oglu n'očj, a unda je p'očela k'ur'izma.} \]

It would therefore be easier to follow the spreading and prevalence of various linguistic phenomena in the field of semantics and word formation, and not just the well-known linguistic isoglosses that mainly relate to phonology. I believe that this method will spread among younger dialectologists for these are the last moments for such research given the declining numbers of ideal respondents from the pre-information age.

**The current situation and perspectives**

Most descriptions of Kajkavian idioms still cited in the dialectological literature as a synchronic fact will very quickly become linguistic diachrony. There are fewer and fewer native speakers who would fully confirm the described situation, and there would soon be none left to survey. Even twenty years ago, when I started researching Kajkavian local dialects intensively, it was hard to find reliable respondents according to the criteria of scientific dialectology. Most respondents show signs of the process of speech erosion cited by Hagège, loss of essential differences that make up the most specific aspects of phonology, strong reduction of variations between forms, loss of recessive features; reduction of stylistic registers; forgetting procedures to intensify meaning, permanent fluctuation from phoneme to phoneme, from form to form; negotiated address, absence of transmission, etc.31 Respondents are largely unaware of these changes and are mostly still

convinced that they speak the original Kajkavian rather than an interdialect in which most of the specific features of their local dialects are reduced. What is encouraging about Kajkavian dialects is the fact that respondents have significantly reduced the association of Kajkavian with peasant life and the past, and so the process of losing prestige to the standard language has been halted. This is because there are almost no more farmers living and making a living the old-fashioned way, and so there is no danger of anyone being identified with them. I remember that boys in my twenties as a rule would switch to the standard language in conversations with ‘city girls’ to leave the best impression possible. Today, this tendency is significantly weaker.

There will be no ideal respondents in the foreseeable future according to the criteria of scientific dialectology. Dialectologists will then have to switch to intensive research into the colloquial language of respondents of different age and social groups in different speech situations. Dialectology will very soon have to replace the genetic-linguistic approach to local speech with a sociolinguistic approach. The ‘solid parts’ of the speech of most of today’s speakers of the Kajkavian dialect are mainly those features that are common to most of the speeches. The influence of the standard language can be seen in many aspects (realization of phonemes - loss of openness, closedness and diphthongization; the return of consonants lj and nj in consonant inventories; the loss of prosthetic consonants; the muting of consonants at the ends of words; the loss of the sequence rj in the place of the Proto-Slav(on)ic palatal ɾ; the loss of suffix diversity for DLI plurals in noun declensions and standard language syncretism; the supine is increasingly equated with the infinitive, the formula for expressing respect with 3rd p. pl. is lost in favour of 2nd p. pl.; the possessive adjective is much better attested than the preposition od with the possessive genitive, etc. Language traits that are characteristic of their speech only, or groups of speech, are resolutely sacrificed by young people. One of the oldest such

32 One of my forthcoming studies will be dedicated to the Kajkavian language of Croatian emigrants in Melbourne, Sydney, and Canberra. These are interesting individual mixtures of English, Kajkavian and the Croatian standard language. It is clear that such depictions cannot be made by the methodology of classical dialectological research, and the results of such research should not be highlighted as being part of any solid system.
adaptations is the transition of -u to -l as a suffix for masculine active past participles. Back in the 1990s, I encountered speakers of many Kajkavian idioms who remembered that suffix, but today it has almost without exception been replaced by -l. Such an interdialect has a very high degree of communicativeness and will be maintained for a long time to come. And there is a great possibility in such an idiom for combining different means of expression from local idioms with elements of the standard language. This, therefore, provides a wide range of expressive means of communication. Unlike younger speakers who combine elements of Kajkavian local dialects and standard language for the sake of expressiveness, older speakers for this purpose mix elements of older and younger speech in Kajkavian local dialects, especially with respect to vocabulary. I strongly believe that final result of these processes will not be the ‘death’ of the Kajkavian dialect, however, but rather the disappearance of specific features of individual groups and local dialects with permanently preserved ‘solid parts’.33
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33 I wrote about this in detail in Blažeka (2008) on the example of the Međimurje interdialect.


**Sažetak**

U prvom dijelu rada daju se temeljni podatci o genezi, rasprostiranju i podjeli kajkavskog narječja. Nakon toga se prikazuju najtipičnije jezične osobine kajkavskih govora na fonološkoj, morfološkoj i sintaktičkoj razini. Drugi dio rada govori o kajkavskom leksiku, njegovu podrijetlu i suvremenom stanju u interferenciji s hrvatskim standardnim jezikom (pseudoanalogonimija, najnovije semantičke adaptacije) te najnovijim trendovima u njegovu istraživanju (kajkavska dijalektna leksilologija, izrada razlikovnih rječnika). Zaključuje se da kajkavsko narječje neće doživjeti svoj nestanak, već će nestati specifičnosti pojedinih skupina i mjesnih govora s trajno očuvanim „čvrstim dijelovima”.