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

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

1. Introductory remarks

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

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

The dialect possesses a combination of two traits which characterizes it as ‘Central Čakavian’ (see Vermeer 1982:289–290):¹²

1. an üe-variant reflex of Proto-Slavic *ę according to Jakubinski’s law (see Jakubinski 1925), e.g. čelo ‘work’, vrime ‘time’;
2. absence of neocircumflex in the present of verbs with e-conjugation and fixed stem-stress, e.g. pliche PR3sg ‘cry’, potěže PR3sg ‘pull’, růžete PR2pl ‘cut’, búže PR3sg ‘bump’.¹³

2. Accentuation and vowel inventory

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

¹¹ As I have tried to show in an earlier publication, Čunski is the northernmost village on Cres-Lošinj where Central Čakavian is spoken. The dialect of Nerezine (the second village north of Čunski and the northernmost village on Lošinj) is Northwestern Čakavian, as are all dialects on Cres. The dialect of Sveti Jakov, the first village north of Čunski, is transitional between Central and Northwest Čakavian (1984–85:889).

¹² In the following, I shall often compare the data from Čunski with those from other Čakavian dialects spoken on Cres-Lošinj, especially from the dialect of Orlec, on which I wrote a monograph. When reference is made to material from Orlec without any bibliographical information, the forms in question can be found in the lexicon of Houtzagers 1985 (pages 204–407).


2.1. Stressed final syllables; lengthening before tautosyllabic resonants

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

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{long} & \text{short} & \\
\hline
i & ā & i \\
ū & ū & ě \\
ů & ů & ě \\
\end{array}
\]

Diagram 1: stressed word-final syllables


The long vowels in diagram 1 reflect not only ‘originally’ long vowels, but also the results of lengthening before tautosyllabic resonants, e.g. žentil LPm ‘marry’ (cf. žentil LPplm, ušení ‘fall asleep’ LPm (cf. ušání LP), tosari ‘donkey’ (cf. tosari Gpl, stulí ‘table’ (cf. stolá Gpl)).⁶

There are three sets of instances of long monophthongal ā in stressed final syllables: (1) the lexeme vráň ‘devil’; (2) the Lpl ending -ďu, e.g. nogáń ‘foot’, rukáň ‘hand’; (3) forms ending in -arč (where R is r or l, C is one or more consonants and ā is a word-boundary), e.g. párš ‘finger’, dárľ Gpl ‘firewood’, vář ‘top’, kárľ ‘blood’, Tářtr ‘Trieste’, sář ‘sickle’, pláľ ‘complexion’, pláľi ‘snail’, báľ Gpl ‘flea’.

⁶ Lengthening before tautosyllabic resonants has taken place over a very wide area, including all dialects of Cres-Lošinj (cf. Houtzagers 1984–85:889).

⁷ The phonological status of ā in the instances under (3) is not clear, since I have not attested any forms in -arč or -arč. The monophthong ā in the instances under (1) and (2) is phonemically distinct from or, cf. iopadk ‘string’, I have no instances with -ah. It is very well possible that the monophthongal quality of the vowel in vráň is distinctive, as it is in the same word in many Čakavian dialects that usually diphthongize (or round) originally long ā, e.g. Ham-—Hraste-Guberina 1986:104, Houtzagers 1987:68, Budovskaja-Houtzagers 1994:95, Jurjič 1973:233, Steinhauser 1973:288, Vermeer 1973:141.
2.2. Stressed non-final syllables; the Lengthening Rule

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diphthongal</th>
<th>Long</th>
<th>Monophthongal</th>
<th>Short</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iē</td>
<td>iē</td>
<td>û</td>
<td>û</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oā</td>
<td>oā</td>
<td>ũ</td>
<td>ũ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>ē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ā</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram 2: stressed non-final syllables

As in many other dialects, it must be noted that there has been a lengthening of originally short e, a and o in stressed non-final syllables. In the following I shall refer to this lengthening as the ‘Lengthening Rule’.8 Monophthongal ē, ā and ō in diagram 1 reflect the results of the Lengthening Rule. Examples: poglēdat ‘look’, susūda Gsg ‘neighbour’, vēli ‘big’, rāne ‘shoulder’, šūnce Gsg ‘straw’, zrāli L.PPm ‘know’, ēdar ‘good’, kānjī Npl ‘horse’, nōge Npl ‘leg’.

The Lengthening Rule has caused length alternations in such paradigms as Črēs Tov, Gsg Črēsa; logāt ‘rich’, Nsg logāta kāMJōt ‘skirt’, Npl kāMJōtī.

The long monophthongs ē and ō show a tendency to maximize the phonetic difference between themselves and the diphthongs iē and oā: they are often realized as closing diphthongs [ei], [ou]. The degree of monophthongization varies.

Short ē, ā and ō in diagram 2 represent vowels on which the expected length is not found.9 Examples: dēset ‘ten’, sēwōma PR1pl ‘call’, nājī- (superlative prefix), nāji ‘each’, dōma ‘(at) home’ (but pūdōma ‘on the way home’), dōsta ‘enough’, sūdā ‘money’. The monophthongs i and ā and the diphthongs iē and oā reflect vowels that were already long before the operation of the Lengthening Rule. Examples: bēfīg ‘shop’, pītē PR2sg ‘ask’, zūda Gsg ‘wall’, pīstīmo PR1pl ‘let’, rūda Asg ‘hand’, žūtū Asg ‘yellow’, bēlō Nsgn ‘white’, ūtēko Nsgn ‘rare’, ūtēzete PR2pl ‘tie’, mīoādī Nsgn

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

9 About the question of the exceptions to (or restoration after) the Lengthening Rule see 2.6.

2.3. First pretonic syllable

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diphthongal</th>
<th>Monophthongal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iē</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oā</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram 3: first pretonic syllable


8 Of course the lengthening before tautosyllabic resonants discussed in the preceding section has taken place in non-final syllables as well, e.g. bōnēcē, DINT of bonēcē ‘pan’, studeēnēcē ‘well’ Lsg, studeēnēcē Tov (cf. studeēnacē ‘well’ Nsg), mōrēcē ‘March’ Gsg (cf. Nsg mōrēcē); ūtēko, DINT of pōlō ‘smout’.

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

Examples of monophthongs in the first pretonic syllable: imit ‘have’, letila kamnije ‘stones (collective)’, hodiš ‘walk’, umiraju PRp ‘die’.

2.4. Other unstressed syllables

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

\[ i \quad u \quad a \]

Diagram 4: other unstressed syllables


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

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

3. Historical development of the vowels

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

13 The list contains only forms that were attested at least three times, each time without doubt as to the shortness of the stressed vowel.
14 Shortness in the same words is found in Orlec.
15 Shortness in this prefix is generally found in the dialects on Cres-Lošinj north of Ćunski (see Houtzagers 1984:85-892).
16 The dialect of Susak also has shortness in sédan and děset (see Vermeer 1975:141).
17 Shortness in these endings is generally found in the dialects on Cres-Lošinj north of Ćunski (see Houtzagers 1984:85-892). The dialect of Susak has shortness in děma ‘we shall’ (see Vermeer 1975:141).
18 The dialect of Susak also has shortness in pōčen, dōma, pōši (see Vermeer 1975:141).
19 The dialects on Cres-Lošinj north of Ćunski also have shortness in the verb pōnet (see Houtzagers 1984:85-892). Orlec has shortness in hōma and hōte.
The ordering of these rules is relevant in the following cases:

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

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

There have been no stress shifts, so that the place of the stress – as one can expect in a Čakavian dialect – is in principle the ‘old’ one, e.g. glavá ‘head’, ruká ‘hand’. Two exceptions that I found in my material are důška ‘board’ and dåržal ‘hold’ LpFn (cf. PR3pl daržija).

4. Reflexes of *at

In 1 above it was already said that the dialect has an ille-kavian reflex of *at according to Jakubinskij’s law (see 1925: 381-382). This means that, in principle, the reflex is a mid front vowel (e, ě, ě or ie) before a ‘hard dental’ (d, t, z, s, n, r, l not followed by j or a front vowel) and a high front vowel (i, i or i) in other environments.26

Within inflexional paradigms we usually do not find alternating reflexes of *at, but the reflex we expect in part of the forms is generalized throughout the paradigm, e.g. rizat ‘cut’ after PR3sg ríže, Npl besëde ‘word’ after besëda Nsg, bièle Apl after non-attested *biž (short form masculine).26

If words show a derivational relationship the picture is less clear. Sometimes the reflex of *at in a derived form is adopted from the word from which it is derived (proměstit after město, vresina ‘certain shrub’ P-A after vříše), sometimes not (from the

---

25 An entirely different reflex is found in *gnězd- and *něd- (see below).

26 For an exception, see under *dé- below.
root *vēd/- we have poviđat ‘tell’ imperfective after *poč- perfective PR3sg, but also nevidja ‘bride’).\(^27\)

Even if we leave aside cases of analogy like those discussed in the last two paragraphs, the reflexes of jat in 1/e-kavian dialects never fully agree with Jakubinški’s law. The picture is different for each dialect. Below I shall give a list of forms attested in Čunski in which reflexes of jat are present, alphabetically ordered according to the root, prefix or suffix in which they were attested.

\*bēg- bēžat ‘run’, běž FR3sg, běžalo LPm;
\*běl- bišla Nsg ‘white’, bišla Nsg, bišla Npl; bišica ‘certain variety of figs’; Beljic Tog (I have assumed here that this toponym is derived from *bět-);
\*běši- běšat ‘earmark on sheep’;
\*bēšē- bešēda ‘word’;
\*brij- brijat ‘boundary between parcels of land’, briž Npl;
\*brij- brika ‘certain kind of grass’; brišnjak ‘certain burry shrub’;\(^29\)
\*bršmen- brščine ‘load’;
\*čēd- čedla ‘stream’ LPm, čedli PR3sg;
\*čēl- čeli ‘whole’;
\*čēnu- čēnu ‘cheap’ (uninflected);
\*čēp- čepat ‘graff’, PR3sg čep;
\*čest- česte Gsg ‘road’ (with initial č, as in Orlec);
\*črko- črko ‘church’, črkoča Dm;
\*čvēt- čvēk Npl ‘flower’;
\*čvoč- čvoč ‘human being’;
\*dē nađat ‘put (a thread into a needle)’, naděnё PR3sg;\(^30\)
\*dē drugeč ‘elsewhere’, dēd ‘where’, dadeč ‘wherever’, nigdeč ‘somewhere; nowhere’; ordē ‘there’; orděča ‘there’ (also unđe, unđeka), ordě ‘from here’ (also unđe), etc.;
\*dēl- (1) dlinjica ‘small piece of land’; dělti ‘divide’ PR3sg, razdili LPm;\(^31\)

\*dēl- (2) děla ‘work’ PR3sg, děala LP; dělo ‘work’; nedžiju Ass ‘Sunday’;
\*dēč- dēč ‘child’, dēća Gsg; děč ‘children’, děčina T-č, děčina (diminutive-pejorative); děčko young man’;
\*děvo- divuška ‘girl’;
\*dōč dōč ‘two (fem.)’, děč SL, děčto ‘200’;
\*č (2) (productive case ending); čkrt ‘church’ Dsg, živini ‘livestock’; Dsg, bizgić ‘shop’ Lsg, gueziv ‘head’ Lsg, v lešeti / ‘in summer’, meni T D;
\*č(i) bollo ‘hurt’ LPm; gorila ‘burn’ LP; imit ‘have’, imili LP pls; leti ‘fly’, letila LP; oťi ‘want’ LPm, otili LP pls; sedili ‘sit’ LP; unam ‘be able’ PR1sg, umila LP; curtul ‘turn’ LPm, curtula LP; vič ‘see’, vidili LPm, vidilo LP; živlo ‘live’, živolo LP;
\*č (1) jatil ‘eat’, j pri PR3sg, jil LPm, jìli LPm, jofda PR3sg;
\*č (2) jedila ‘become angry’; jilin ‘angry’;
\*č (1) jatro ‘sail’;
\*čj bogatić ‘rich’; sironačni ‘poor’ (both comparative Nsgm);
\*č (1) jroč ‘noazlo’;
\*čkšči- čkšča Npl ‘tongs’;
\*č (1) kolčen ‘knead’;
\*č (1) kserić ‘kind of sickle’; kserača ‘kind of chopping-knife’;
\*č (1) kudilja (spinning term);
\*č (1) dokle ‘until’, dokleč ‘until’, zdokle ‘from where’, pıkle ‘after’ (conjunction);
\*č (1) līha ‘strip of land’; Lčk Tog;
\*č (1) likoćar ‘doctor’;
\*č (1) lččina ‘lazy person’;
\*č (1) lipo ‘beautiful’ Nsgm;
\*č (1) prćipć Npl ‘limpet’;
\*č (1) lčo ‘summer’, leti ‘in summer’;
\*č (1) jnju ‘left’ Nsg;
\*mēh- mih ‘bag made of sheepskin’;

\(^27\) For more information on and more examples of reflexes of jat in 1/e-kavian dialects see Belić 1909:184-187, Jakić-Cestaric 1957 and Vermeer 1984:278-279.
\(^30\) This form has been attested only once. One would expect the root-vowel to be long (see also mih and anih).
\(^32\) I have assumed here that these lexemes are related to brošinja (see Skok 1971-74-I-206), which is not necessarily true.
\(^33\) Here we find different reflexes of jat within one paradigm.
\(^34\) Here the simplex and the compound verb show different reflexes of jat.
*měn- (preminut) 'change clothes';
*měř- (měru) 'weight' Asg;
*měsíc- (měsíc) 'month';
*měši- (unisit) 'knead';
*město- (město) 'place', pravěši 'move', przechůzit;
*měšiř- (měšiř) 'mix';
*mil- (milič) 'grind', měče PR3sg, mili LPm;
*milč- (milč) 'milk'; milisi 'milk', pomils;
*mír- (unířit) 'die';
*mírč- (mírk) 'milk'; Npl 'net';
*měř- (with indefinite meaning: nějak/nigde ' somewhere', něčiš 'something', niku 'sometimes', niki 'somebody');
*něždr- (o něždr) Apl (put) under one's coat' (cf. *gněžd- above);
*orč- (orč) 'walnut';
*pěč- (pěč) 'cook';
*pěče- (pěče) Npl 'chaff', pěřine VP-A;
*přeč- (přeč) 'too much';
*před- (na před/na předě 'forward' (also na prit); spři*prida 'in front (of)', spredě 'in front'; přiša 'earlier (than)';
*přek- (prýk) 'over' (prep,adv.);
*rěč- (řeč) 'thin' (not dense) Nsgn;
*rěp- (riča) Podričká TOP (assuming that this toponym is derived from *rěp-);
*rěč- (rizat) 'cut', růž PR3sg;
*sé- (sé) 'sit' 'sow', sěje PR3sg;
*séd- (posedě 'sit down'; sedlì 'sit' LP-Lpm; suslì 'neighbour' Npl;
*síč- (síč) 'cut', síž PR3sg, sílí LP-Lpm; síkra 'axe';
*semén- (steme) 'seed';
*séna (sína) 'hather';
*sér- (pěcin) 'shadow';
*sérk- (sérk) 'sorghum';
*síč- (síč) 'blind';
*sme- (smě) 'be allowed';
*směř- (smířat) 'laugh', smíři se LP-Lpm;
*smírk- (smírk) 'juniper; smírk' 'juniper-berry';
*směř- (směř) 'snow';
*srěč- (nasrč 'in the middle (of)';
*srěč- (srč) Nsg 'happy';

---

The dialect form that corresponds with the standard Croatian verb lići is polit 'pour', PR3sg polije, imperfective poliješ (cf. Orlec polje, polje, polevot). Standard Croatian obči 'dress' is običi (cf. Orlec običi). The frequentative suffix is -ina: večerjaž 'tie', brustuljavox 'roast', sruša PR3sg 'bother', parčina PR3sg 'prepare' (cf. Orlec večerzu, etc.).

As in many other Čakavian dialects *e is reflected i in vičerja 'this evening', vičerja Asg 'dinner', vičerjeno PR1pl 'have dinner'. The word for 'bed' is postija, Asg postija, cf. postija in Orloc. Original *e is reflected iče in kamnije/kamenije (cf. Orlec kamnije) 'stones (collective)'; the latter Čunski variant is less frequent.

The form for 'quickly' presented by Skok under 'list' (1971-74 II: 306) is lěši (cf. Orlec lěši/n). There are many Italian loanwords which have an i-like vowel in Čunski and an e-like vowel in Orloc: bandira 'flag', butěga 'shop', děcímbar 'December', děiferénto 'different' Nsgn, děžigrčiu Asg 'handicap', mullia 'grill' (cf. Orloc bandirču Asg, butěga, děcímber/děcímbar, děiferéncia/diferéncia, děžigrčiu, mullia). Compare also Čunski tarlji 'plate' and Orloc tarš.
5. Reflexes of vocalic *f


In a minority of the cases vocalic *f first changed into "sl and is reflected in the present-day dialect as sl: hālē ‘leak’, gēlēša ‘deep’ Nsgf (cf. Skok 1971:74 L 451), Hālmāc TOP, jāhalka ‘apple’. In all attested instances where the relevant vowel is stressed, it is long (āl), either because of the Lengthening Rule or because of its position before -Ck (where C stands for one or more consonants and k is the word-boundary, see the last paragraph of 2.1 above): dālē ‘far’, Kālka Lsg TOP, obāktal ‘dress’ L Prn, ošnē ‘wool’, pātē ‘complexion’, pātē ‘snail’, bālē Gpl ‘flea’.

One would perhaps expect originally long vocalic *f – when it is not reflected as ā – to appear as *ōf (reflex of long ūr f). However, such reflexes are not found. We must assume that long vocalic āl, if not reflected as long ūr, merged with short vocalic ā into short *sl.

6. Reflexes of vocalic *r

Vocalic *r is consistently reflected as ar. In all attested instances where the relevant vowel is stressed, it is long (ār), either because of the Lengthening Rule or because of its position before -Ck (where C stands for one or more consonants and k is the word-boundary, see the last paragraph of 2.1 above). Examples: darō ‘piece of firewood’, tarā ‘belly’, dārān Npl, gārō ‘throat’, umārō ‘die’ L Prn, čārō ‘worm’, darē Gpl, pārē ‘finger’.

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

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

Comparison of markodāk Npl ‘malignant sourcer’, parātes ‘bring’, šumpē ‘sulphur’, Gsg šāmpara, with the corresponding words in the dialect of Orlec suggests that we must derive present-day ar from *sr. In Orlec short and unstressed *s > e, the corresponding Orlec words are merkodāl, persēt, sūner, Lsg sūnferon.27,28

7. The consonants

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

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

The dialect is not ‘Čakavian’, i.e. there is no neutralization of the opposition palatal – dental. There are some words, however, in which Čunska s and ž correspond to Orlec š and ž respectively: ržina ‘rust’, ržavo ‘rusty’ Nsgn, slūsa ‘school’, skrējina ‘trunk’ p–s, skrōsp ‘skin’ (of milk), žmırac ‘north’, žālē (Orlec ržina, ržovo Nsgn, šūla, šrēkina, škrsp, šmrč mp, žālē (s–u)).

In Orlec, s and ž optionally become palatal when followed by a palatal fricative or affricate within the same word and not separated from it by more than one vowel, e.g., suškūša ‘drought’, suškūnū ‘know’ PR2sg, sečom sečom ‘cut’ PR1pl (see Houtzagers 1985:28). This is probably also the case in Čunska. My material contains the following examples: slēsēnjo ‘sew together’ PPNsgn, šus ‘dry’, došētse ‘reach’ PR2pl (cf. INF dosē), śčē ‘cut’ PR3sg (cf. PR3pl posūt), posūtaj samūš ‘listen’ PR3pl/IMP2sg, smiršēšmiršē ‘juniper berry’ Npl, strūžōžirōžō ‘cut’ PR3sg/PPNsgn, Sūčenja/Sūčeni ‘inhabitant of Susak’ Npl.

Like in Orlec, s and ž became palatal in sēnja ‘sixteen’ and sēnješet ‘sixty’ (Orlec šenja, šenjēšet).

Distinctively voiced consonants are devoiced in word-final position, e.g. tovā ‘broad beam’ Gsg, bōj Nsg; darō ‘piece of firewood’, dāf Gpl; grīšē ‘beam’ Npl, grīē Gpl; obrūč ‘face’ Lsg, orvē Nsg; pūzē ‘snail’ Npl, pūžē Nsg. The final dental of pod ‘under’ was attested voiceless before vowels in pot ‘lodžu ‘under Italy’ and pot ‘Austria ‘under Austria’ (i.e. in the days of Italian/Austrian rule). Word-final v is

---

27 The declined forms of šampar isūnfer are given in order to distinguish this word from loans with a fleeting vowel like frētar ‘fratri’. Npl fretdri, Orlec frētar, Npl frētī (in which the fleeting vowel is always equal to the reflex of *s).

28 The case of seradora/saradora ‘relative’ Npl (not attested in Orlec) is less clear. Perhaps there was a doublet *serer. Even more mysterious are vēr ‘up, into the air’, kūšer ‘lizard’, Orlec vējar, kūšer ‘kūšer’, where the situation is the reverse from what one would expect. The form naprin ‘for instance’ (one attestation) could be a slip of the tongue.
not always devoiced before voiceless obstruents: in lôcvî `hunter', udôcvî `widower' and diêcvî `sheep' (all Npl) it was attested voiced (the latter form was also attested with voiceless f). Palatalized l (in my notation l)i did not change into j: ljûdî `people' Npl, tarîjî `plate', tarejî `plates' DIM Npl, sklûjî `slend', sklûjî `hole' (cf. Orlec jûtî, tarejî, tarîjî, sklûjî, sklûjî). It is also present in the comparative/superlative forms basîjî `low' Nsg, najrîjî `high' Nsgf (cf. Orlec basîjî Nsgn, najrîsî Nsgn), and in beiîc`a `certain variety of figs', basîjî `ivy', basîjî `certain kind of grass', gîjî `night' Npl, dîmîjak `chimney', sîjî `straw mattress' Asg (cf. Orlec beiîc, besîjî, gîjî (no parallels for the last two words)).

Epenthetic -lj- was attested in zînjî `take' PR3sg, najmîjî `take over' PR3pl, blagoslojîjî `bless' PPAsgf (cf. Orlec zînjî, blagoslojîjî Nsg m).

Palatalized n (in my notation nj) is present after initial g- in gînjî `rotten' Nsgn and gînjî `dung'.

Original *dj- is reflected j: rîjî `born' Nsg n, zagrâjîlî LPilm `fence in', sjûjî `plant' PPNSgn, sajînjî `plant', sjûjîjî `plants', sjûjîjî `pale' comparative Nsgn from hûtî `bad'.

Initial and word-initial g is realized either as a stop (the majority of cases) or as a fricative. Word-initial g alternates with word-final h, e.g. brâga `devil' Gsg, brâh Nsg. In pîvîc `cake' we find -vo- instead of expected -go-. Prothetic g- was often attested in gojî `air' and once in gojî `pulley' (for tackling boats out of the water), along with ojîjî, ojîjî.

After g and k the realization of v can be bilabial. Such realizations were heard in cîkîs `church' and its diminutive cîkîska, kûsî `square', sîmôvî `fig', zîkî `leg' Gsg `shade', smîkî `fire' Gsg `fire', gujî `war'.

In soi Gsg from pîs `dog', fîcî `DIM, fîma `A and fîkî `bird' DIM, original *p became fricative before a stop. In prîpîc Npl `limpet' it did not. In cîlî `bee' Npl it was dropped altogether.

Before initial i we very often hear prothetic j- e.g. jigre `play', Gag jîme `name', jîma `have' PR3sg, jîmiLPm, jîkî `look for', jîstîna `truth' (cf. without j-, also from Ćunsî: iglu `needle' Asg, ime, ima, imî, iskâta LPf, ihto `same' Nsgn).

Initial so- in soîka `each' Nsgt, soîkakove `all kinds of' Npf and the declined forms of `all, whole' (e.g. soî Nsgt, soî Nplm, Soî Stoûtî `All Saints') is not simplified to s- (as it optionally is in Orlec).

I have not yet systematically studied the internal sandhi phenomena of the dialect, but the few notes that I took about the subject remind of the situation in Orlec drop of the occlusive element in otåc talôjînski father-Italian Nsgn, g sklâ `from skâta (substance from which whey-butter is made)' and vêj ne znaômo `we don't remember' (instead of otåc, gî and vêj) (see Houtzagers 1985:37–39 under rules 1 and 9).
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O fonologiji čakavskoga dijalekta mjesta Ćunski na otoku Lošinju

Sažetak

Članak se bavi fonologijom središnjega čakavskoga dijalekta sa sinkronijskoga i diakronijskoga stanovišta, a za temelj članka poslužila je autorova građa s terenskoga istraživanja. Prvo se prikazuje sinkronijska analiza samoglasničkoga sustava (također s akcentuacijom), zatim se predlaže rekonstrukcija u obliku niza pravila koja vode od mladega dijalektalnoga praslavenskoga do današnjega stanja. Posebna se pažnja posvećuje odrazima jata. Članak završava napomenama u vezi s razvojem suglasničkoga sustava.
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