

YU ISSN—0352—5724/UDK 801(05)

ЗБОРНИК
МАТИЦЕ СРПСКЕ
ЗА ФИЛОЛОГИЈУ И ЛИНГВИСТИКУ

XXX/1

НОВИ САД

1987

PHONOLOGICAL REMARKS ON THE KAJKAVIAN DIALECTS OF HIDEGSÉG AND FERTŐHOMOK*

H. P. HOUTZAGERS

1.1 Hidegség and Fertőhomok (henceforth also „H” and „F”)¹ are two villages near Sopron (Ödenburg) in the north-west of Hungary. They form part of a large group of villages in the Burgenland (Austria) and adjacent areas in Hungary and Czechoslovakia which, as a result of migrations since the sixteenth century, have a Serbo-Croatian-speaking population². With the exception of H and F, all varieties of Serbo-Croatian spoken in the Burgenland and surrounding areas are generally regarded as belonging to the Čakavian and Štokavian dialect groups³. The dialects of H and F are usually considered Kajkavian or partly Kajkavian.

1.2 There are two problems one soon comes across when reading and comparing the available literature on Hidegség and Fertőhomok:

- (a) The vowel systems of the dialects.
- (b) The origin of the dialects. Are they Kajkavian? If so, to which type of Kajkavian do they belong? Are they intermediate between Kakavian and Čakavian (and perhaps Štokavian)?

Ad (a): None of the authors explicitly mentions having had any difficulty with the vowels, but the fact that there is a problem becomes evident if one reads the unusually complicated descriptions by Kolarič (1973, . . . 1976) and Brozović/Lisac (Ivić et al. 1981: 349—358) and compares their inventories of vowel phonemes both with each other and with Neweklowsky's (1978: 187—188). To give only one example: in Neweklowsky's analysis, the dialects of H and F have ten vowel phonemes in stressed syllables (the five „classical” vowels, which can all be either long or short). Kolarič comes up with thirteen vowel phonemes in stressed syllables for H (1976: 347) and ten for F (1973: 371—372). He heard no distinctive length in H and F, and in his description the oppositions are based on timbre differences and the presence or absence of diphthogization. Brozović and Lisac (Ivić et al. 1981: 349) distinguish fourteen vowel phonemes in F (four degrees of openness and distinctive length). It is clear that these different analyses of the same dialects cannot all be correct at the same time.

* The field-work in Hungary on which the present article is based was financed by the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (ZWO).

¹ Serbo-Croatian-speaking inhabitants of H and F call their own villages /vadaš'i:n/ (or /hadaš'i:n/) and /h'omok/, respectively (/h/ is not velar but laryngeal).

² For an introduction to the dialects of the „Hrvatska dijaspora” see Ivšić 1971: 723—771, Neweklowsky 1969: 94—115 and Neweklowsky 1978.

³ Vážný (cf. 1926 passim) regarded the dialect of Chorvátsky Grob (Czechoslovakia) as Kajkavian, but his view is not shared by other authors (cf. Ivšić 1971: 748, 750, 762; Brabec 1982: 81—84; Neweklowsky 1978).

Ad (b): The problem is acknowledged in all publications on H and F⁴. Kolarič's (1973, 1976) starting-point is different from that of the others: after Ivić (1961—62: 122N, map between pp. 128 and 129), he assumes that the dialects are of Slovene origin and wonders what kind of Slovene they are. Ivšić (1971: 763) says that he has too little material to draw any definitive conclusions, but suggests that the inhabitants of the two villages might come from between the Drava and the Mura, i.e. the north-east of the area where Kajkavian dialects are spoken nowadays. Lončarić (1982) does not mention H and F in the main text of his article, but, to witness his dialect map, is of the same opinion. All authors find Čakavian and otherwise un-Kajkavian elements in the dialects of H and F, and various explanations are given: Brabec (1970: 500; 1982: 81) suggests that the population of the two villages might be of „mixed” Kajkavian and Čakavian origin. In Neweklowsky's theory, the inhabitants of H and F came from a transitional area between Kajkavian, Čakavian and Štokavian, which he locates in the neighbourhood of Novska, i.e. east of the south-eastern angle of the present-day Kajkavian-speaking area. He has not only linguistic, but also historical reasons for his assumption (1978: 279—281, 1982: 258).

About the amount and reliability of the material used by the different above-mentioned scholars the following can be said. Ivšić is not the only author who admits that his material is scanty: so do Neweklowsky (1978: 190) and Kolarič (1973: 370, 381). It is certain that Kolarič's visit to H and F was very short (1973: 269). Brabec does not inform his readers whether the few data he gives in his two articles on the subject are his own or whether they were taken from other publications. Brozović and Lisac's description of Fertóhomok is based on material gathered by I. Mokuter in 1974 (cf. Avanesov et al. 1978: 117). It is not clear whether they ever heard the dialect themselves.

2.1 In the summer of 1985 I spent a few weeks in the neighbourhood of Sopron and visited both villages several times, Hidegség somewhat more often than Fertóhomok. My main informant in Hidegség was Anna Baumgartner (Baumgartner Józsefné), aged eighty-five. The other informants in H and F varied between 55 and 75 years. All informants were born in H or F. In both villages I spoke with women as well as men. My material consists of 12 hours of tape-recorded conversation (9 ½ from H and 2 ½ from F).

2.2 The Serbo-Croatian dialects of H and F are rapidly dying out and within fifty years they will probably have disappeared altogether. As far as I can judge from my own experiences in the two villages, only the inhabitants older than approximately fifty years are still fully bilingual. They know the dialect very well, though sometimes — especially in the case of the men — a certain „diminished fluency” can be observed. This might be due to the fact that there are fewer and fewer situations in which Serbo-Croatian can be spoken: the younger generations do not speak and often do not even understand the language. Even older people among themselves now and then switched to Hungarian in the middle of a conversation⁵. When addressing me, they were forced to speak Serbo-Croatian only and it occasionally took some effort before they would hit upon the right word. Inhabitants of H and

⁴ Brozović and Lisac (1981) do not mention it, but the issue is beyond the scope of the dialect atlas for which their description was written.

⁵ In the local public houses I did not hear any other language than Hungarian.

F under the age of twenty speak and understand Hungarian only. For the generations in between (20 to 50 years), the situation is individually different. Of the two thirty-year old men I met in Hidegség, one, Anna Baumgartner's grandson, had a good—though imperfect—active command of the dialect, for the other it was very much like a foreign language of which he knew a hundred words.

2.3 In the following I shall deal only with the vowel systems (issue „(a)“ of § 1.2), and mainly with that of H. Issue „(b)“ of § 1.2 will be briefly touched upon in § 4.2. For a meaningful discussion on the origin of the dialects, which would involve much more than the vowel systems only, my material must be further analysed and probably extended.

3.1 In my analysis, the dialect of Hidegség has the vowel phonemes as shown in diagram A⁶ (see).

For examples the reader is referred to § 4.1.

There are no distinctive tones. Vowel quantity is not distinctive in pre- and posttonic syllables. Unstressed vowels are always phonetically short. Stress will be indicated by an accent mark (´). In combination with long vowels and diphthongs, the accent mark is redundant. The vowels /jɛ eḡ uo ou a/ are labeled after their most frequent allophones. They show a considerable allophonic variability⁷. As I shall try to show in § 3.3, the distinctive features of the diphthongs are complex (in this respect diagram A is a simplification)⁸.

3.2 The phonetic length of stressed /a/ varies between short and long. In most cases it is half-long. The timbre varies between [ɛ] and [a]⁹. When stressed, the most frequent allophone is [a], a very open [ɛ]. When it is not stressed, [ɛ] is much more frequent than [a], except in word-final position, where [a] is more frequent than [ɛ].

Examples:

/s'alu/ „village“ → [s'alu]
 /və z'a mlji/ „in the earth“ → [vəz'a mlji]
 /dʉv'a zli/ „brought“ (pl) → [dʉv'a zli]
 /t'ažək/ „heavy“ → [t'ažək]
 /'uogə nj/ „fire“ → [ʰuogə nj]
 /d'uošə l/ „came“ → [d'uošə l]
 /zə l'eḡ nu/ „green“ (neu) → [zə l'eḡ nu]
 /'idə/ „goes“ → [ʰidə]
 /st'eḡ nə/ „walls“ → [st'eḡ nə]

Before a /j/, /a/ is pronounced [a] when stressed and [ɛ] when unstressed.

⁶ The notation of the vowel timbres adopted here agrees with Ivić et al. 1981 (cf. 19–23).

⁷ I think that this is one of the main causes of the confusion about the vowel systems of H and F.

⁸ In the following, many statements will be made of the type „in position A, realization X of phoneme N is more frequent than realization Y“. In such cases, not only different words or word-forms, but also different realizations of the same word or word-form have been compared with each other.

⁹ The word /v'aliki/ „large“ is often realized [v'øliki] or [v'üliki] (cf. Kolarič 1970: 349 under „3b“). I think that this is due to (nondistinctive) phonetic rounding under influence of /v/ and /l/.

Examples:

/kr'ajut/ „wing” → [kr'ajut]
 /kaj/ „what” → [kaj]
 /pusl'ušaj/ „listen!” → [pusl'ušej]
 /z'ā:kaj/ „why” → [z'ā:kej]

When /a/ is in word-final position and the word contains more than one syllable, it is often pronounced [a] and the phonetic quantity is long.

Examples:

/vuč'ā/¹⁰ „they learn” → [vuč'a:]
 /lāt'ā/ „they fly” → [lēt'a:]

Before a tautosyllabic /r/ the most frequent realization is [ɛ] (both stressed and unstressed), but [ā] is also heard. Especially in this position, stressed /a/ is often heard long.

Examples:

/n'utār/ „inside” → [n'uter]
 /v'aržam/ „I throw” → [v'e:ržem]
 /m'arskā/ „ugly” (fem) → [m'e:rskā]
 /t'argādu/ „they vintage” → [t'ergādu]
 /p'aršin/ „parsley” → [p'aršin], [p'eršin]

3.3 As could be seen in § 3.1, the vowel inventory of the dialect contains four diphthongal phonemes: two opening diphthongs (/i̯e u̯o/) and two closing ones (/e̯i ou̯/). The vocalic element of /i̯e/ and /u̯o/ is realized as [e] or [ɛ̣], i.e. it is always more closed than the most closed variant of /a/, which is [ɛ̣].

The prominence of the glide in /i̯e/ and /u̯o/ is variable. There are three main variants:

- (1) The glide sounds almost as a full vowel: [ie], [ou]. When the diphthongs are pronounced in this way, the phonetic quantity is long or at least half-long.
- (2) The phoneme is realized as glide + vowel: [i̯e], [u̯o]. Phonetic quantity: half-long or short.
- (3) The glide is realized very weakly or not at all: [i̯e], [u̯o], [e], [o]. Phonetic quantity: short.

The variability between (1) and (3) is a „gliding scale”: all intermediate possibilities are heard. The most frequent allophones are those described under (2).

In the speech of many informants (not of my main — and oldest — informant Anna Baumgartner), the closing diphthong /e̯i/ is sometimes realized without its glide element: [e]. When [e̯i/ and /ou̯/ are realized as diphthongs, they are mostly half-long. When /e̯i/ is realized as a monophthong, it is always long. In this way it is always possible to distinguish between the phonemes /e̯i/ and /i̯e/. If they are realized as diphthongs, the opposition is „closing” vs. „opening”; if they are realized as monophthongs, the opposition is „long” vs. „short”. One could say that /e̯i/ has the distinctive feature „closing or long”, and /i̯e/ „opening or short” (see diagram B)¹¹.

¹⁰ In these endings one would expect /e̯i/ (< *ɛ̣:): /a/ usually reflects short or unstressed *ɛ̣ or *e (see 4.1). Cf. /dunās'u:/ „they bring”, /znād'u:/ „they know” (< *ɔ̣:), in which the final vowel has the timbre (not the quantity) normally found in reflexes of short or unstressed *ɔ̣. In adjectival and nominal inflexional endings things are as one expects, e.g. stressed /čist'ou̯/ „clean” Asg f, /vud'e̯i/ „water” Gsg, unstressed /dr'ugu/ „other” Asg f, /ž'anā/ „woman” Gsg.

¹¹ On the possibility of pluridimensional oppositions between two phonemes see Ebeling (1960: 31–37).

I have attested no monophthongal realizations of /ou/, so that for the back mid vowels the situation is as shown in diagram C (see).

One could imagine that a long [o] would be interpreted as /ou/, in other words that the empty compartment in diagram C belongs to the phoneme /ou/, but this cannot be said with certainty¹².

3.4 Most of what was said about H holds good for F, too. The vowels of the F dialect are: (stressed) /i: i je e: u: u ɔ o ɔ̃: ɔ̃/, (unstressed) /i e u o ɔ̃/. The phoneme /e/ corresponds to H /a/. It is seldom realized [a] and never [a]. Even in such words as /vuč'e/ it sounds [e:] (cf. § 3.2). The phonemes /ɔ̃: ɔ̃/ are not always rounded: sometimes they are pronounced [a]. In unstressed position there is one phoneme more than in H, to wit /o/ (in H, unstressed *o became /u/). In unstressed syllables one often hears /u/ when one expects /o/. Whether this is a matter of phonemic optionality or of doublets is a question I cannot answer at this moment¹³.

3.5 My description of the vowel systems of H and F (§§ 3.1—3.4) has more in common with Neweklowsky's (1978: 186—193) than with those of Kolarič (1973, 1976) and Brozović/Lisac (Ivić et al. 1981: 349—358).

Neweklowsky distinguishes ten vowels in stressed syllables (/i i: u u: e e: o o: a a:/) and five in unstressed syllables (/i u e o a/), for H as well as for F. His /e e: o o:/ correspond to my /je e: ɔ̃ o ɔ̃/. The main differences between Neweklowsky's analysis and mine are:

- (1) He has one vowel less in stressed syllables, viz. /a/, (F /e/), which he regards as an allophone of /e/ (in my notation: /je/).
- (2) He has one vowel more in unstressed syllables in the dialect of H, viz. /o/.
- (3) In his view, /e:/ (in my notation: /e:/) has a free allophone [i:], with which I do not agree.

The differences with the descriptions by Kolarič and Brozović/Lisac are too many for a detailed comparison. Therefore I will only make a few general remarks:

- (1) They have more vowel phonemes, especially Kolarič, who distinguishes six degrees of closure in F and seven (!) in H.
- (2) Brozović and Lisac assume a great number of optionalities, allophones and doublets, especially where the mid vowels are concerned. The reader would almost believe that every mid vowel can be realized in any imaginable way.

4.1 In the present section I shall give some examples of Hidegség vowels. The examples are ordered according to the vowels which are generally assumed to have been present in the words in question in late dialectal Proto-Slavic.

Accented:

- *i > i /k'lita/ „branch”, /čist/ „clean”, /v'lidilə/ „saw”, /prəm'isli/ „think!”
 *i: > i: /si:n/ „son”, /spi:l/ „drunk”, /b'li:lu/ „was” (neu)
 *u > u /kr'uħə/ „bread” (Gsg), /č'udim sə/ „I am surprised”, /dr'ugač/ „other-wise”, /r'uskə/ „Russian” (Npl fem)

¹² Note that in words taken from Hungarian, original *ó* is reflected /ou/, e.g. /pouɾ/ „farmer” (Hung. *póρ*), /tənit'ou/ „teacher” (Hung. *tanító*).

¹³ Another yet unsolved problem (for H as well as F) is that of /a:/ before nasal consonants, such as in /dā:n/ „day”. In such positions /a:/ can sound as [a], [ou], and realizations in between are also heard ([au], [aʊ]). This is the type of problem for the solution of which a number of attestations of each combination of the phonemes in question is needed (cf. Houtzagers 1982: 125; 1985: 30).

- *u : > u: /su:h/ „dry”, /lɨ'u:di/ „people”, /d'u:šə/ „soul”
- *e > a /d'l̥aʂat/ „ten”, /r'l̥ači/ „say!”, /ž'l̥ana/ „women”, /nɨ'l̥amu/ „him” (D), /l̥laɣal/ „lied down”, /l̥l̥ada/ „ice” (Gsg), /z'l̥amju/ „earth” (Asg)
- *e : > eɨ /leɨt/ „ice”, /čejr/ „daughter”, /vuš'eɨsa/ „ears”, /puč'eɨsamu/ „we comb”
- *ě > ie /l̥i'ietu/ „year”, /tr̥i'etə/ „third” (fem), /n̥i'iegda/ „some time”, /s̥i'iestra/ „sister”, /sm̥i'ejə/ „laughs”, /ub̥i'iedal/ „lunched”, /d̥i'iecu/ „children” (A), /l̥i'iepča/ „nicer” (Npl fem), /sus̥i'iedi/ „neighbours”, /d̥i'ielət/ „do”, /k̥ad̥i'e/ „where”
- *ě : > eɨ /dr̥'eɨvu/ „wood”, /leɨt/ „year” (Gpl), /dveɨ/ „two” (fem), /mr̥'eɨli „died” (pl), /jeɨs/ „eat”, /b̥eɨlit/ „whitewash”, /vr̥'eɨma/ „time”, /jeɨ/ „eats”, (Npl) /st̥'eɨna/ „wall”, /v̥ə teɨm/ „in that”, /bleɨt/ „bleat”, /teɨ/ „those” (fem), /sveɨt/ „world”, but: /li:p/ „nice” (cf. F /leɨp/)
- *ə > ie /v̥ies/ „whole”, /st̥i'iezə/ „path”, /sn̥i'iehə/ „daughter-in-law”, /d̥i'ienəʂ/ „to-day”, /z̥i'emədu/ „they take”, /m̥i'ieglə/ „fog”, /ž̥i'enjaš/ „you mow”, /t̥i'enək/ „thin” (/t̥i'enək/ also attested), but: /l̥i'əžə/ „he/she lies”, /m̥o'ounjə/ (also F) „less” (from *a: see note 13)
- *вѣ > vu /v̥'uʒam/ „Easter”, /v̥'uni/ „outside”, /vu/ F „in” (but H: /va/), /vu:š/ „louse”
- *o : > a: /d̥a:n/ „day”, /t̥ə:st/ „father-in-law”
- *a > a /kr̥'əvə/ „cow”, /zn̥'l̥alə/ „knew” (fem), /br̥'ati/ „brothers”, /pl̥'akalə/ „cried” (fem), /n̥'l̥ə v̥ət/ „into the garden”, /z̥'abit/ „forget”
- *a : > a: /m̥'l̥ə:li/ „small”, /m̥'l̥ə:də/ „young” (fem), /j̥'l̥ə:ku/ „very”, /pl̥'l̥ə:čadu/ „they pay”, cf. before tautosyllabic /j/: /m̥'l̥əjkə/ „mother”, /k̥aj/ „what” /d̥aj/ „give!”, /p̥at̥n̥'ajst/ „fifteen”, /z̥'akaj/ „why”, /pus̥l̥'ušaj/ „listen!”
- *o > uo /guv̥'uoɾit/ „speak”, /m̥'uoɾar/ „wet”, /m̥'uoɾal/ „was able”, /b̥'uoɾu/ „God” (Dsg), /sir̥'uoɾəh/ „poor”, /v̥'uoɾə/ „water”, /kr̥uof/ „roof”
- *o : > ou /koʊs/ „bone”, /poʊl/ „half”, /boʊk/ „God”, /z̥ b̥'ouɾum/ „with God”, /koʊ/ „who”, /noʊš/ „knife”, /t̥'ouɾə/ „of that”
- *e > a /gl̥'adaɬ/ „look”, /l̥at̥'l̥ə/ „fly”, /v̥aj'l̥ə/ „they say”, /t̥'l̥əšku/ „heavy” (neu), /z̥at̥/ „father-in-law”
- *e : > eɨ /m̥'eɨsu/ „meat”, /zeɨt/ „take”, /ž̥'eɨdn̥ə/ „thirsty” (fem), /ž̥'eɨdu/ „thirst” (Asg), /vud̥'eɨ/ (Gsg of /v̥'uoɾə/ „water”), /p̥adaš'eɨt/ „fifty” (/p̥adaš'i'et/ also attested), /n̥aš'eɨ/ „our” (Gsg fem)
- *o > u /k̥'uočə/ „house”, /m̥'ukə/ „trouble”
- *o : > ou /m̥'oukə/ „flour”, /moʊš/ „husband”, /v̥ə l̥'ouɾi/ „in the wood”, /s̥'ouʂat/ „neighbour”, /s̥'ouɾi/ „barrels”, /r̥'oukə/ „hand”, but: /pu:t/ „road”, /ku:č/ „house” (Gpl), /dun̥əʂ'u:/ „they bring”, /zn̥əɬ'u:/ „they know”
- *l̥ > u /b̥'uhə/ „flea”, /d̥'ugu/ „long”, /p̥'unu/ „much”, /z̥ap̥'unidu/ „fill”
- *l̥ : > ou /put̥'oukli/ „knocked” (pl), /t̥'ouʂtə/ „fat” (fem), /ž̥'ouɬ/ „yellow”, /s̥'ouɾn̥ə/ „sun”, /č̥'ouɬ/ „boat”, /doʊk/ „debt”, /d̥'oužəɾn̥/ „indebted”, /n̥ə g̥'ouɬi/ „on the neck”

- *r̥ > ar /parst/ „finger”, /ub^oarnul/ „turned”, /s^larça/ „heart”, /m^larvu/ „a little”
- *r̥: > ar /sarp/ „sickle”
Unaccented:
- *i > i /praṃ^lisli/ „think!”, /k^luosit/ „mow”
- *u > u /raṣum^li:/ „he understands”, /vuč^li:/ „he learns”
- *e > a /sm^lieja/ „he laughs”, /l^liepča/ „nicer” (neu), /dunaš^u:/ „they bring”
/^lumra/ „he dies”, /ziz bl^la:gam/ „with livestock”
- *ě > a /s^loušat/ „neighbour”, /praṃ^lisli/ „think!”, /č^luovak/ „mar”, but:
/dir^liči/ „little children”, /dic^lej/ „children” (Gsg) (but /dec^lej/ F),
/dic^lu:m/ (Isg) (but /dec^lu:m/ F), /ž^livila/ „lived”, /v^lidili/ „saw” (pl),
/biž^li:/ „he runs”, /v^la l^ouḡi/ „in the wood”, /na st^liezi/ „on the path”
- *o > a /d^lienas/ „to-day”, /t^lejaṣan/ „week”, /l^laḡal/ „lied down”, /m^luokar/
„wet”, /m^luogal/ „was able”, /p^lejvac/ „cock”, but: /kisn^lija/ „later”,
/kađ^lie/ „where”, /zibr^la:li/ „gathered” (cf. z^liebrat, F zebr^la:li)
- *a > a /zr^lala/ „knew”, /raṣum^li:/ „understands”, /l^lađa/ „ice” (Gsg), cf.,
before tautosyllabic /j/: /pus^luša/ „listen!”
- *o > u /vul^liku/ „that much”, /dr^lejvu/ „wood”, /g^luv^luorit/ „speak”, /dunaš^u:/ „they bring”,
/put^loukli/ „knocked” (pl), /n^likur/ „nobody”, /z b^louḡum/ „with God”, /sa buji:/ „is afraid”, /p^luo puji/ „in the field”, /kur^litu/
„trough”
- *e > a /sa/ „myself, yourself, etc.”, /ž^lana/ „women”, /lj^lu:da/ „people” (A)/
/d^lašat/ „ten”
- *o > u /sus^liedi/ „neighbours”, /d^liecu/ „children” (A), /tr^lavu/ „grass” (Asg),
/s^liesnut/ „suck”, /mušk^lou/ „male” Nsg n, /ruk^lu:m/ „hand” Isg,
/kup^loujn/ „trough”
- *l̥ > u /j^la^lbuka/ „apple” (no other examples attested)
- *r̥ > ar /ḡarm^li:/ „thunders”, /ḡarm^lilu/ „thundered”

4.2. Some of the reflexes presented in the preceding section deserve special attention:

- (1) those of *ě and strong jer
- (2) those of *o and *l̥

Ad (1) A generally accepted common Kajkavian feature is the merger of the reflex of *ě with that of strong jer (see Ivić 1957: 403, Vermeer 1983: 440—441). In H *ě and jer have indeed merged when short and stressed (> i^e) but not if they were long and stressed (ě: > /ej/ and long jer > /a:/). For unaccented *ě and jer the situation is slightly more complicated: unaccented *ě is reflected as /a/ or /i/, unaccented jer as /a/ (one instance with /i/, two with /a/).

Ad (2) The reflex of short stressed (and unstressed¹⁴) *o and *l̥ merged with that of short *u (> u), whereas long stressed *o and *l̥ merged with long *o (> ou).

¹⁴ For unstressed *o and *l̥ there was no other possibility, since there is no unstressed o-like phoneme in the dialect of H.

Two phenomena could be due to a more recent reduction of the number of mid vowels¹⁵ (e.g. *o: = *o: and *e: = *e:), to wit the facts that:

- (a) *o: and *i: have the same reflex as *o:, and
 (b) *e: has the same reflex as *e: and *e:.

Institute of Slavic Languages
 University of Groningen

DIAGRAMS

diagram A

	stressed		unstressed			
	long	short	long	short	front	back
high	i:	i	u:	u	i	u
opening	ie		uo			
mid						
closing	ei		ou			
low	a		a:	a	a	a
	front		back		front	back

diagram B

	long	short
opening	ie	
mid	monophthongal	
closing	ei	

diagram C

	long	short
opening	uo	
mid	monophthongal	
closing	ou	

¹⁵ Cf. the situation in unstressed syllables, where mid vowels have disappeared altogether.

REFERENCES

- Avanesov, R. I. et al.
1978 *Obščeslavjanskij lingvističeskij atlas. Vstupitel'nyj vypusk. Obščie principy, spravočnye materialy*, Moskva.
- Brabec, I.
1970 „Hrvati uz Muru i Dravu te u Vedešinu”, *Ljetopis JAZU* 74, 495–500.
1982 „Kajkavci u dijaspori”, *HrvDZb* 6, 77–84.
- Ebeling, C. L.
1960 *Linguistic Units*, The Hague.
- Houtzagers, H. P.
1982 „Accentuation in a Few Dialects of the Island of Cres”, *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 2, 117–129.
1985 „The Čakavian Dialect of Orlec on the Island of Cres”, *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 5, I–XX, 1–415.
- Ivić, P.
1957 „Izveštaj o terenskom dijalektološkom radu u severnoj Hrvatskoj i južnoj Dalmaciji u leto 1957 godine”, *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 2, 401–407.
1961–62 „Prilog rekonstrukciji predmigracione dijalekatske slike srpskohrvatske jezičke oblasti”, *ZbFL* 4–5, 117–130.
- Ivić, P. et al.
1981 *Fonološki opisi srpskohrvatskih/hrvatskosrpskih, slovenačkih i makedonskih govora obuhvaćenih Opštleslovenskim lingvističkim atlasom*, Sarajevo.
- Ivšić, S.
1971 „Hrvatska dijaspora u 16. stoljeću i jezik Hrvata Gradišćanaca”. *Izabrana djela iz slavenske akcentuacije*, 723–798, München.
- Kolarič, R.
1973 „Govor dveh slovenskih vasi na Madžarskem ob Nežiderskem jezeru”, *JF* 30/1–2, 369–381.
1976 „Govor dveh slovenskih vasi na Madžarskem ob Nežiderskem jezeru; b) Hidegség”, *Zbornik radova o A. Beliču*, 347–357.
- Lončarić, M.
1982 „Prilog podjeli kajkavskoga narječja”, *HrvDZb* 6, 237–245.
- Neweklowsky, G.
1969 „Die kroatischen Mundarten im Burgenland. Überblick”, *WSLJb* 15, 94–115.
1978 *Die kroatischen Dialekte des Burgenlandes und der angrenzenden Gebiete*, Wien.
1982 „O kajkavskim osobinama u nekajkavskim govorima Gradišća”, *HrvDZb* 6, 257–263.
- Vážný, V.
1926 „Ikavismy a ekavismy v kajkavském charvatském nářečí Horvátského Gróbu na Slovensku”, *Sborník Matice Slovenskej* 4, 65–70.
- Vermeer, W. R.
1983 „The Rise and Fall of the Kajkavian Vowel System”, *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 3, 439–477.

H. P. Hautzagers

FONOLOŠKA ZAPAŽANJA KAJKAVSKIH DIJALEKATA

Rezime

Ovaj rad sadrži:

- 1) kratku diskusiju postojeće literature Hidegséga i Fertőhomoka o srpskohrvatskim dijalektima u severozapadnoj Mađarskoj (1.2)
- 2) nekoliko opštih zapažanja o trenutnoj lingvističkoj situaciji u dva sela i moj terenski rad u njima (2.1–2.2)
- 3) analizu samoglasničkog sistema dva dijalekta (3.1–3.4)
- 4) poređenje moje analize s postojećom analizom drugih autora (3.5)
- 5) primere i dijahronijsko posmatranje (4.1–4.2)