

EARLY DIALECTAL DIVERSITY IN SOUTH SLAVIC I

FREDERIK KORTLANDT

1

The large majority of the isoglosses which can be established in the South Slavic dialectal area date from the time of the disintegration of Common Slavic and from more recent periods (e.g., Ivić 1958: 25ff). The isoglosses have often shifted in the course of the centuries, so that their original position cannot always be determined. In this study I shall concentrate upon the dialectal differences which originated before the 10th century. At that time, Slavic was still a largely uniform language, though it was certainly not completely homogeneous. The most important dialectal differences were the following (cf. Furdal 1961):

1. The second palatalization yielded different results in West Slavic and in the other languages, e.g. $x > š/s$, $sk > šč/sc$, $kv > kv/cv$. This divergence is apparently due to an innovation of South and East Slavic.
2. Dental stops were lost before *l*. This development did not reach West Slavic and marginal dialects of Slovene and Russian.
3. Clusters of consonant plus *j* yielded different reflexes in East Slavic, West Slavic, Serbo-Croato-Slovene and Bulgarian, e.g. $tj > č/c/ć/št$. The innovating languages appear to be Bulgarian and West Slavic.
4. Voiced affricates became fricatives, e.g. $dz > z$. This development took place several times. It affected the whole Slavic territory after the first palatalization, did not reach Lechitic* after the second palatalization, did not reach Polish, Slovak, and South Slavic after the rise of new affricates from clusters with *j*, and did not affect marginal dialects of South and East Slavic under various conditions.
5. The metathesis of liquids was anterior to the rise of the new timbre distinctions in South Slavic and Czecho-Slovak, and word-initially also in the other languages, while between consonants it was later in Sorabian and Lechitic and did not take place at all in East Slavic and under certain conditions in the northern dialects of Lechitic.
6. The rise of syllabic resonants in South Slavic and under various conditions in West Slavic did not reach the East Slavic languages.

* Lechitic = Polish + Pomoravian + Polabian.

7. Vowels were labialized before a tautosyllabic *l* in East Slavic and in the northern dialects of Lechitic.
8. Initial *e* and *ü* became *o* and *u* in East Slavic.
9. Postconsonantal *ě* was raised from *ä* to *ie*. This development did not take place in Bulgarian and Lechitic.
10. The development of the nasal vowels gave rise to several dialectal differences (cf. Kortlandt 1979). The low nasal vowels *än* and *aN* were raised to *eN* and *yN* in South Slavic. The rounded nasal vowels *ön* and *oN* were raised to *üN* and *uN* in Serbo-Croat, Sorabian, Czech-Slovak, and East Slavic. The denasalization affected these languages earlier than Bulgarian and Slovene.
11. The voiced velar stop *g* became a fricative in the southern dialects of West and East Slavic and the westernmost dialects of South Slavic.
12. The inst.sg. ending of the *o*-stems *-a*, which has been preserved in *въчера* 'yesterday', was replaced with the newly created ending *-омь* in South Slavic and with the ending of the *u*-stems *-змь* in the other languages.
13. Consonants became distinctively palatalized before front vowels. This development did not reach Serbo-Croato-Slovene and affected Czech to a limited extent.
14. The jers merged in Serbo-Croato-Slovene, Czech, and Lechitic.
15. Front vowels were retracted before hard dentals in a part of the West Slavic dialects. This development affected Sorabian and Lechitic in the case of *br* and *bl*, Lechitic in the case of *ě* and *eN*, and the Polish and Pomorian dialects of Lechitic in the case of *e* (cf. Dejna 1973: 59ff). There are traces of a similar development of *ě* in South Slavic (e.g., Jakubinskij 1925).
16. Several accentual and morphological innovations can be added to this list.

These isoglosses divide the South Slavic area in a number of ways. Though several developments affected the western dialects of the area to an unequal extent (2, 10, 11, 15, 16), the most important bundle of isoglosses runs between the Serbian and the Bulgarian dialects (3, 9, 10, 13, 14). The shared innovations of Bulgarian and Serbo-Croat are partly common to East Slavic (1, 2, 4) or Czech-Slovak (4, 5, 6) and partly limited to the South Slavic languages (10, 12). It is the task of comparative Slavic linguistics to establish the chronological order in which the separate developments reached various parts of the area and gave rise to dialectal differentiation. Here I shall present a tentative chronology of the innovations in the Proto-Slavic consonantal system C against the background of what I have written earlier on the development of the vocalic system B (1979) and the accentual system A (1975). It must be emphasized that the uncertainties in the relative chronology of the consonantal developments are greater because the number of possible alternatives is larger.

It has been argued that the bundle of isoglosses which separates Bulgarian from Serbo-Croat was the result of an early split in the South Slavic dialectal area and that the transitional dialects originated from a later mixture of Serbian and Bulgar-

ian dialects when the contact between the two languages had been restored. This point of view has perhaps most clearly been stated by Van Wijk, who concludes his analysis of the relationships as follows (1927: 109).

“Podczas okupacji półwyspu Bałkańskiego przez Słowian oraz w pierwszych stuleciach, które nastąpiły później, Bułgarzy nie graniczyli bezpośrednio z grupą serbo-chorwacko-słoweńską. Wynika to, po pierwsze, z porównania języka bułgarskiego z serbskim, po drugie, z analizy gwar przejściowych, po trzecie, z danych etnograficznych i dziejowych. Gwary przejściowe rozwinęły się z narzecza czystoserbskiego, które posunęło się na wschód i południe aż do terytorjum bułgarskiego, a potem rozwinęło się dalej razem z językiem bułgarskim. W Macedonji język serbski wywierał silny wpływ nawet na gwary pierwotnie bułgarskie, wskutek czego te gwary obecnie już nie mają charakteru czysto bułgarskiego. W okresie odleglejszym, kiedy przodkowie Słowian południowych zamieszkiwali jeszcze dalej na północ, języki ich tworzyły prawdopodobnie jedną grupę, na co wskazuje ogólnie południowo-słow. *ra-*, *la-* z *or-*, *ol-* oraz końcówka *-ę* (*dušę*) z *-ens*.”

Indeed, it seems probable to me that the whole area between the Morava and the Isker continued to be Romance territory for centuries after the arrival of the Slavs. This hypothesis is compatible with the general view that the speakers of the dialects which were going to develop into Bulgarian and Serbo-Croat crossed Moldavia and Pannonia, respectively, before arriving in their present territories. If it is correct, we have to date the shared innovations of Bulgarian and Serbo-Croat to a period when the dialects were still spoken in the original Trans-Carpathian homeland of the Slavs.

Elsewhere I have proposed the following periodization of the prehistory of Slavic (1979: 262f). The dates which have been added here must be taken as a rough approximation. A discussion of the absolute chronology would go far beyond the limits of the present article. The relative chronology refers to the starting-points of the separate developments, not to their period of operation or date of completion. Thus, the absence of metathesis in OCS. *алкати* ‘starve’ and *алдин* ‘boat’ does not prove that the metathesis was a recent development: it simply did not reach some of the Bulgarian dialects. The stages A1-22, B1-15, and C1-12 refer to the chronologies given elsewhere (1975: xii, 1979: 264ff) and below.

I. Proto-Indo-European (3000-2500 B.C.).

II. Dialectal Indo-European (2500-2000 B.C.).

III. Early Balto-Slavic (2000-1500 B.C.). This stage corresponds with A1-4. Here belong the narrowing of final *-om* to *-um* and the replacement of the nom.acc.sg.-ending of oxytone neuter *o*-stems with the corresponding pronominal ending.

IV. Late Balto-Slavic (1500-1000 B.C.). This stage corresponds with A5-6. Here belong the merger of the barytone neuter *o*-stems with the masculines, the loss of the syllabic resonants, and Winter’s law.

V. Early Slavic (1000-0 B.C.). During this period, Slavic developed along the same lines as the West and East Baltic sister languages. It corresponds with A7-8 and B1-5. To this stage belong the rise of nasal vowels, the merger of *a*, *ā* with *o*, *ō*, and the rise of *x*.

VI. Early Middle Slavic (0-300 A.D.). The developments of this period form part of the trend toward rising sonority and synharmonism within the syllable. It corresponds with A9-10, B6-10, and C1-5. To this stage belong the palatalizations, the rise of distinctive tone, and the loss of final *-s*.

VII. Late Middle Slavic (300-600 A.D.). During this period, in which the trend toward simplification of the syllable structure reached its culmination, the earliest dialectal divergencies developed. It corresponds with A11-14, B11-15, and C6-9. To this stage belong the metathesis of liquids, the rise of the new timbre distinctions, and the loss of /j/ as a phoneme.

VIII. Young Proto-Slavic (600-750 A.D.). At this stage, the redundancies which the trend toward rising sonority had created evoked a reaction, which eventually led to the disintegration of the prosodic system and to the rise of new closed syllables. To this period, which corresponds with A15-18 and C10-12, belong the early contractions, the retraction of the stress from final jers, and Dybo's law.

IX. Late Proto-Slavic (750-900 A.D.). This is the last stage of common innovations. To this period, which corresponds with A19-22, belong the loss of the acute intonation, the shortening of long falling vowels, and Stang's law.

X. Disintegrating Slavic (900-1200 A.D.). This is the stage of parallel but not identical developments in the separate languages. To this period belong the rise of the palatalization correlation, the loss or merger of the nasal vowels, and the loss of the jers.

	Le	ESl
Sor		
Cz	Slk	
Sln	SCr	Bu

2

Several of the consonantal developments which differentiated Slavic from the other Indo-European languages were anterior to the chronology given below. The loss of the aspirated stops, the retraction of *s* after *i, u, r, k*, and the depalatalization of palatovelars before resonants were dialectal Indo-European developments. The loss of final *-t/d*, the elimination of the labiovelars, and the dissolution of the PIE glottalic stops into a laryngeal and a buccal part can be dated to the Balto-Slavic period (cf. Kortlandt 1977: 322). The rise of nasal vowels, the loss of final resonants, and the rise of *x* belong to the Early Slavic period. The most important subsequent changes were the following.

C1. First palatalization of velars: *k > č, g > dž, x > š* before *e, ē, i, ī, j*. The opposition between *e, ē* and *a, ā* was neutralized after palatals.

C2. Spirantization of the voiced affricate: *dž > ž*. This development was determined by the absence of a voiced counterpart to *š* in the earlier system. It was blocked by a preceding *z*.

C3. Palatalization of dental fricatives: *s > š, z > ž* before *j, č, dž*. This development was probably posterior to C2 because it introduced *ž* from another source and thereby eliminated the motivation for the spirantization of *dž*.

C4. Second palatalization of velars: *k > ć, g > dž, x > ś* before the new front vowels *ē* and *ī* which had arisen from the monophthongization of *ai* and *oi*, and after the high front vowels *i, ī, iN* unless followed by a consonant or by one of the high back vowels *u, ū, uN* (cf. Kortlandt 1979: 266, Vaillant 1950: 53f). The clusters *sk* and *zg* became *ść* and *ždž* before the new front vowels. This development restored the opposition between *ē* and *ā* after palatals, e.g. *вьсь* 'all', f.sg./n.pl. *вѣса*, gen.-loc.pl. *вѣтъхъ*. It was posterior to C3 because *š* and *ś* did not merge.

C5. Rise of geminated affricates: *tj > tć, dj > ddž*. The clusters *stj* and *zdj* became *śtć* and *ždžž*, respectively. This development has a modern parallel in Ukrainian, e.g. *žyttjá* 'life'. It was probably posterior to C4 because otherwise the gemination would hardly have been preserved. The cluster *kt* yielded *tć* before high front vowels. Phonemically, the geminated affricates can be written /tj/ and /dj/ at this stage.

C6. First simplification of palatals: *ć > c, dž > dz*, in South and East Slavic also *ś > s, ść > sc, ždž > zdz*. The resulting dentals continued to be palatalized for some time. This change was motivated by the abundance of palatals which the previous developments had created. It was probably posterior to C5 because the geminated affricates were preserved.

The clusters *kv, gv, xv* remained unchanged at the time of the first palatalization, which did not affect clusters, but became *kǃv, gǃv, xǃv* before front vowels as a result of the second palatalization (Vaillant 1950: 55f). The palatalized velars were the archiphonemes of *k, g, x* and *ć, dž, ś* in this position. When the system of palatals was simplified at stage C6, the archiphonemes joined the new dentals in South and East Slavic and were depalatalized in West Slavic (cf. Van Wijk 1924:

11). The earlier presence of *k* and *g* before *n* plus front vowel is evident from the palatalization of *n* after velars in Serbo-Croat, Slovene, and Czech (Trubetzkoy 1930: 392).

Another change which can be dated to stage C6 is the loss of *t* and *d* before *l* in South and East Slavic. In my conception, this development was anterior to the metathesis of liquids in South Slavic. As in the case of *śc* and *kv*, West Slavic preserved the original cluster while the syllable structure was changed in the other languages.

C7. Simplification of geminates: *tć* > *śc*, *ddź* > *źdź*, also *śtć* > *śc*, *źddź* > *źdź*. This development was limited to Bulgarian. It was posterior to C6 because the new *śc* and *źdź* did not merge with the earlier *śc* and *źdź*. The simplification of the ungeminated palatals at stage C6 had eliminated the reason for the existence of the geminated affricates.

For the other languages I assume that the length shifted from the first, occlusive element of the geminate to its second, fricative element: *tć* > *ćś*, *ddź* > *dźź*. Chronologically, this development can be identified with the general assimilation of *j* to a preceding consonant: *čj* > *čš*, *šj* > *šš*, *žj* > *žž*, *nj* > *ńń*, *lj* > *ļļ*, also *pj* > *pļ*, *bj* > *bļ*, *mj* > *mļ*. This assimilation did not change the phonemic make-up of the clusters because their second components can be regarded as the realizations of the phoneme /j/ in the respective environments. As a result, the geminated affricates were rephonemicized as clusters of *c* and *dz* with the phoneme /j/.

C8. Spirantization of the ungeminated voiced affricate: *dz* > *z*. This development did not reach Lechitic and a part of the Bulgarian dialects. It was probably posterior to C7 because we would otherwise expect the degemination of the voiced affricate *ddź* rather than its parallelism with *tć*. It was certainly posterior to C6 because the final outcome of the second palatalization of *g* in Czecho-Slovak is *z*, not *ž*. The spirantization of the velar stop *g* in the central dialects of Slavic was probably not much later than this development, perhaps even earlier (cf. Trubetzkoy 1925: 292).

C9. Loss of /j/. Long consonants were shortened with complementary lengthening of the following vowel (cf. Kortlandt 1975: 30, 1979: 270). This was the culmination of the law of open syllables and marked the end of the Middle Slavic period. It was obviously posterior to the rise of long consonants at stage C7. It was also posterior to C8 because the spirantization did not take place before /j/ in Slovak and Serbo-Croat. As a result of this development, a new series of palatal phonemes emerged: *ć*, *dź*, *ń*, *ļ*, *ŗ*.

C10. Merger of palatal fricatives: *ś* > *š*, also *śc* > *šč*, *źdź* > *ždź*. As a result of this development, the West Slavic reflexes of the first and the second palatalization of *x* are identical. The merger was probably posterior to the elimination of long consonants at stage C9 because *ćś* and *čš* did not merge.

C11. Merger of palatal clusters: *šč* > *śc*, *ždź* > *ždź*. As a result of this development, the reflexes of the first palatalization of *sk* and *zg* merged with the reflexes of the

second palatalization in West Slavic, with the reflexes of *tj* and *dj* in Bulgarian, and with the reflexes of *stj* and *zdj* in the whole Slavic territory. The merger was provoked by the merger of the fricatives at stage C10.

C12. Second simplification of palatals: $\acute{c} > c$, $d\acute{z} > dz$ in West Slavic, and subsequently $dz > z$ in Czech and Sorabian; $\acute{c} > \check{c}$, $d\acute{z} > d\check{z} > \check{z}$ in East Slavic. The clusters $\acute{s}\acute{c}$ and $\acute{z}d\acute{z}$ were reduced to $\acute{s}t$ and $\acute{z}d$ in Bulgarian and the eastern dialects of Serbo-Croat, and later in Czecho-Slovak. Similarly, the clusters *sc* and *zdz* became *st* and *zd* in a part of the Bulgarian dialects. The reduction of palatal series was probably posterior to the merger of the clusters at stage C11 because the two types of cluster were treated alike in all Slavic languages.

3

The chronology presented here differs in several respects from the one proposed by Trubetzkoy (1930). It does not seem necessary to discuss the differences in detail. Writing TA-TE for the stages which Trubetzkoy lists on p. 388, we can identify them as follows: TA = C3/5/7/9, TB = C4/6, TC = C3/10, TD = C7/9, TE = C6/12. The shift of the syllable boundary, which plays an important part in Trubetzkoy's analysis, can be dated to the stages C6-9 of my chronology, i.e. to the Late Middle Slavic period. Unlike Trubetzkoy, I assume that the epenthetic *l* after labials developed regularly in the whole Slavic territory and was subsequently eliminated in West Slavic, as it was in Bulgarian (cf. Vaillant 1950: 69, Furdal 1961: 71).

Several developments which have not been discussed here will be taken up on another occasion. The retraction of initial *e*, *ü* to *o*, *u* in East Slavic was probably anterior to the rise of the new timbre distinctions. I am inclined to date the raising of the low nasal vowels *aN*, *āN* to *yN*, *eN* in South Slavic to the stage between the rise of the new timbre distinctions (B14) and the loss of /j/ (B15 = C9), i.e. toward the end of the Middle Slavic period (cf. Kortlandt 1979: 269f). Since *ě* became the counterpart of *ō* in Slovene, Sorabian, Czecho-Slovak, and East Slavic, I date its raising from *ā* to *ie* to the Young Proto-Slavic period. The raising of the rounded nasal vowels *oN*, *ōN* to *uN*, *ūN* was probably posterior to the fronting of *u* to *ü* in the northern dialects of Serbo-Croat (Vermeer 1979) and can therefore be dated to the Late Proto-Slavic period. I date the replacement of the inst.sg. ending *-a* with *-омь* in South Slavic to the Early Middle Slavic period because it seems to require the continued existence of the nom.sg. ending *-os*, and its replacement with *-омь* in the other languages to the Young Proto-Slavic period because it was apparently motivated by the merger with the gen.sg. ending *-a* (cf. Kortlandt 1975: 32). Most probably, the new ending *-омь* was originally introduced in the whole Slavic area in polysyllabic words with initial stress, where the gen. and inst. endings had merged in Early Slavic (ibidem: 11), and was subsequently generalized in South Slavic and replaced with the ending of the *u*-stems in the other languages. The ab-

sence of palatalization before a soft jer in Serbo-Croat, Slovene, and Czech suggests that the transfer of the palatal feature from a front vowel to the preceding consonant was anticipated by the loss or merger of the jers in these languages, whereas the converse chronology holds for Lechitic. I think that the rise of the palatalization correlation spread from the north-west to the south-east while the loss of the jers spread from the south-west to the north-east, and date the palatalization before front vowels in Lechitic and the merger of the jers in Serbo-Croat-Slovene and Czech to the Late Proto-Slavic period.

Thus, I find no evidence for common innovations of South Slavic which were posterior to the end of the Middle Slavic period. At that time, the major dialect divisions of Slavic were already established. The entire process of dialectal differentiation took place within a few centuries. West Slavic obtained its identity at stage C6, Bulgarian at stage C7, Lechitic at stage C8, and East Slavic and Czecho-Slovak at approximately the same time. At the end of the Middle Slavic period, the dialects can schematically be characterized as indicated in the table below. It must be emphasized that the isoglosses did not generally coincide. After the end of the Middle Slavic period, Serbo-Croat and Slovene shared the raising of *ě* with Sorabian, Czecho-Slovak, and East Slavic, and Serbo-Croat shared the raising of the rounded nasal vowels in these languages. Both Serbo-Croat and Slovene shared the early merger of the jers in Czech. It is clear that the epicentre of the innovations shifted gradually from the south-east to the west of the Slavic territory in the course of the centuries. The reduction of the clusters *šč*, *ždž* to *št*, *žd* may have been posterior to the time of Cyrillus and Methodius. It may have spread northward at a slow rate and reached the Czecho-Slovak area in historical times.

Elsewhere I have argued that the language of the Kiev Leaflets is a transitional dialect between South and West Slavic (1980). It follows from the chronological analysis that this dialect shared all the South Slavic innovations of the Middle Slavic period and joined the Czecho-Slovak developments at the stage which I have labelled Young Proto-Slavic: *ś* > *s*, *dl* > *l*, raising of the low nasal vowels, also dissimilation in dat.pl. *ⱮⱮⱮⱮ* ‘strange’, cf. Slk. *cudzí*, a development which was most probably anterior to the loss of /j/, but dental reflexes of *tj* and *dj* (cf. stage C12 above), inst.sg. ending of the *u*-stems *-ⱮⱮ*, also preservation of the jers. The text was evidently anterior to the reduction of *šč*. Unlike Serbo-Croat and Czecho-Slovak, the dialect of the Kiev Leaflets apparently did not share the raising of *ě*. This is an archaism which is also found in scattered dialectal forms of Serbo-Croat, e.g. *gnjāzdò* ‘nest’ (Rab), *njāzlò* (Novi). The distinct character of the variety of Slavic which is represented in the Kiev Leaflets is also clear from the use of *ⱮⱮ* for *ⱮⱮ* ‘we’ (6x), an innovation which is repeated in Bulgarian 200 years later.

University of Leiden

	–/+	Bulg.	SCr-Sln.	Cz.-Slk.	Sorab.	Lech.	East Sl.
(1a)	ś/s	+	+	–	–	–	+
(1b)	kv/cv	+	+	–	–	–	+
(2)	tl/l	+	+	–	–	–	+
(3)	ć/šć	+	–	–	–	–	–
(4)	dz/z	–	+	+	+	–	+
(5)	or/ra	+	+	+	–	–	–
(8)	e-/o-	–	–	–	–	–	+
(10)	äN/eN	+	+	–	–	–	–
(11)	g/γ	–	±	+	±	–	±
(12)	-a/-omь	+	+	–	–	–	–

REFERENCES

- Dejna, K.
1973 *Dialekty polskie*. Wrocław, etc.
- Furdal, A.
1961 *Rozpad języka prasłowiańskiego w świetle rozwoju głosowego*. Wrocław.
- Ivić, P.
1958 *Die serbokroatischen Dialekte I: Ihre Struktur und Entwicklung*. Haag.
- Jakubinskij, L.
1925 “Die Vertretung des urslav. ě im Čakavischen”, *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 1, 381-396.
- Kortlandt, F.
1975 *Slavic accentuation: A study in relative chronology*. Lisse.
1977 “Historical laws of Baltic accentuation”, *Baltistica* 13/2, 319-330.
1979 “On the history of the Slavic nasal vowels”, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 84, 259-272.
1980 “Zur Akzentuierung der Kiever Blätter”, *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 41, 1-4.
- Trubetzkoy, N.
1925 “Einiges über die russische Lautentwicklung und die Auflösung der gemeinrussischen Spracheinheit”, *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 1, 287-319.
1930 “Über die Entstehung der gemeinwestslavischen Eigentümlichkeiten auf dem Gebiete des Konsonantismus”, *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 7, 383-406.
- Vaillant, A.
1950 *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves I: Phonétique*. Lyon-Paris.
- Vermeer, W.
1979 “Proto-Slavonic *u in Kajkavian”, *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 22/1, 171-177.
- Van Wijk, N.
1924 “Remarques sur le groupement des langues slaves”, *Revue des études slaves* 4, 5-15.
1927 “O stosunkach pokrewieństwa między językami południowo-słowiańskimi”, *Prace filologiczne* 11, 94-112.