The Slovene Neo-Circumflex

F. H. H. KORTLANDT

I

In his classic monograph on Slavonic accentuation, C. S. Stang concludes that the so-called neo-circumflex intonation is not Common Slavonic.¹ I think that this is correct and that we have to date the rise of the neo-circumflex after the dissolution of the Slavonic linguistic unity. Elsewhere I have put forward my views on the development of Slavonic accentuation from Indo-European times up to the end of the Proto-Slavonic period.² In this article I intend to discuss the chronology of the subsequent accentual developments in Slovene and the conditions under which the new long falling vowels originated. Unlike H. Jaksche,³ I think that in the majority of cases the neo-circumflex arose phonetically. Indeed, I consider it a major source of information about post-tonic quantity in Slavonic.

II

As I have pointed out in my study of Proto-Slavonic accentuation, the lengthening of short falling vowels in monosyllables, e.g. bóg, and the shortening of vowels under the old acute intonation, e.g. brát, are Common Slavonic developments and must be dated before the dissolution of the Slavonic linguistic unity.⁴ The former development was evoked by the loss of distinctive pitch on short vowels in polysyllabic words as a result of Dybo's law, and the latter must be

¹ C. S. Stang, Slavonic Accentuation, Oslo, 1957.
⁴ Kortlandt, op. cit., sections 2.3, 3.5–3.6.
viewed in connection with the loss of the Indo-European laryngeals in Slavonic. The original situation has been obscured by the shortening of long falling vowels and the lengthening of short rising vowels in some of the Slavonic dialects. Another Proto-Slavonic development is the retraction of the stress from final jers, which must be dated before Dybo's law (ibidem). The retraction of the stress from non-initial long falling vowels which is known as Stang's law is the last Common Slavonic accentual development and must be dated to the ninth century.

The oldest specifically Slovene accentual development is the progressive shift of the stress from a falling vowel on to the next syllable. The newly accented vowel was lengthened and received falling pitch, e.g. okô. At this stage, weak jers in medial syllables had already lost their stressability, cf. the gen. sg. nohtô of nohtôt. At the same time, an epenthetic vowel had already developed in such forms as vozôt, rebôr. Unless we admit the simultaneous existence of two phonemically distinct falling intonations on non-initial syllables, we have to assume that the progressive accent shift is posterior to Stang's law. Since the internal evidence is in accordance with what one would expect on the basis of the comparative evidence, this chronology is hardly open to doubt. The progressive shift can be dated to the tenth century.

The rise of the neo-circumflex must be dated after the progressive accent shift for two reasons. On the one hand, a new long falling vowel does not lose the stress to the following syllable: the converse chronology would therefore require the simultaneous existence of two phonemically distinct falling intonations on initial syllables. On the other hand, the neo-circumflex results from the lengthening of an originally short rising vowel. The fact that the lengthening yields a falling vowel suggests that there was no pitch opposition on short vowels at that time. This situation had been reached after the progressive shift.

III

The neo-circumflex originated from the lengthening of a stressed short vowel before either a non-final weak jer, which was lost, or a following long vowel, which was shortened. One is tempted to regard the development as compensatory lengthening in both cases. The same holds true for the past tense form sêdol and for nouns like misôl, kâzôm if we assume that a final jer after a cluster consisting of obstruent plus resonant was treated like a non-final weak jer. Other final jers had probably already been lost at this stage. The difficulty in this interpretation is that the progressive accent shift presupposes
the development of an epenthetic vowel at an earlier stage, cf. above. Perhaps we have to assume the existence of doublets with and without an epenthetic vowel during a certain period, cf. Dutch *melk* [melk] or [melak], but *billijk* only [bulak]. The neo-circumflex in *trėsl* has arisen on the analogy of the one in *sėdel*. The latter cannot be analogical because there was no model for it.

While the phonetic character of the neo-circumflex in such words as *bitka* is hardly ever questioned, the phonetic origin of the neo-circumflex before an originally long vowel in the following syllable is not generally accepted. Jaksche, who does not recognise the latter rule, presents a morphological explanation of the majority of relevant cases, leaving the isolated instances unexplained. His reasoning, which reminds one of Kuryłowicz's, is often questionable. In particular the principle according to which an opposition in one paradigm can arise on the analogy of a different opposition in another paradigm, on which Jaksche's explanation of the neo-circumflex in such forms as *stāri*, *lēta*, *māžeš*, *sēdel*, *lipo*, *brātu*, *pisāla* is based, is unacceptable to me. The alleged generalisation of the accusative singular accentuation in trisyllabic feminine nouns like *zabāva* also raises more problems than it solves, especially because such words do not display accentual mobility in other languages and because it does not account for the timbre of the stressed vowel in words like *osnūva*. Besides, this type is also found in the kajkavian dialect of Serbo-Croat, where the progressive accent shift did not operate. As long as nobody has managed to refute Dolobko's forceful argument that no source for an analogical development of the neo-circumflex in the isolated form *lētos* can be produced, I think that we have to stick to the old phonetic rule of Baudouin de Courtenay and Valjavec. The same argument applies to the adverbial forms *jūtri* and *drēvi*, for which Bulachovskij has drawn attention to the long ending attested in Slovincian *lonji*, *dravi*.

As I have pointed out elsewhere, the metatony cannot result from an analogical development in the feminine singular form of the *l*-participle either. It is essential that *e*-verbs do not, as a rule, show metatony in Slovene. This peculiarity can only be explained by the assumption of a deep-rooted phonetic difference. I think that we must look for a single origin of the neo-circumflex in trisyllabic words like *ženāmi*, *pisāla*, *zabāva*, *osnūva*, *telēta* (nom. pl.). It is remarkable that all of these words betray the stress shift referred to as Dybo's

---

6 M. Dolobko, 'Noč'-nočes', osen'-osenes', zima-zimus', leto-letos' (Slavia, 5, Prague, 1927, p. 602).
8 Kortlandt, op. cit., section 1.7.
law. In my study of Proto-Slavonic accentuation I put forward the thesis that the Indo-European laryngeals were lost earlier in pretonic and post-post-tonic syllables than under the stress and in the first post-tonic syllable (ibid.). This chronological difference led to a quantitative difference between the endings of polysyllabic nouns with fixed initial stress and the endings of other nouns. The difference is reflected in Slovene as metatony in trisyllabic word-forms where Dybo’s law operated. Wherever we find metatony in the l-participle of ďverbs or in the root syllable of an l-participle, this must be attributed to analogical extension of the model, e.g. želēla, mīšila, vīēla next to želēla, mīšila, vīēla (on the dialectal distribution of these variants see the recent work by J. Rigler9). The neo-circumflex in the trisyllabic forms of the imperative must of course be explained differently.10

The hypothesis that stressed short vowels were lengthened before an originally long vowel in the following syllable yields a straightforward explanation of the neo-circumflex in such cases as lipjo, māžeš, mīšiš, gineš, stāri. It also accounts for the neo-circumflex in the loc. sg. brātu and in the inst. and loc. pl. brāti, brātih, where the long vowel is reflected in the retraction of the stress in kōnju, kōnji, kōnjih and attested in Slovincian bēgū, Slovene bōgǐ, možēh. The extension to the dative singular after a preposition is analogical and results from the homophony of the dative and locative endings after the loss of post-tonic quantity. In the paradigm of the word nit the neo-circumflex is phonetic in the instrumental and locative singular and in the genitive, instrumental and locative plural forms and analogical in the genitive-dative singular and dative plural forms. The neo-circumflex was analogically introduced in the instrumental singular and oblique plural forms of the word lūč.

Another instance of phonetic neo-circumflex is the root vowel in krāja, prēja, grīža, kōča, where the post-tonic long vowel originated from the simplification of a consonant cluster (Van Wijk’s law).11 These words correlate with vīōja, kōža, tēža, ćēja, Polish ciąża, żądza, as māžeš, gineš with pišeš, tymeš. The neo-circumflex in the passive participle mázan is also phonetic, cf. brān, ćesān. Finally, we have to consider the neuter plural paradigm. I think that the long ending in the nominative-accusative plural arose phonetically in polysyllabic barytone forms as a result of the same development which gave rise to the neo-circumflex in zabāva, pisāla, ćenāmi, and was then generalized to disyllabic barytone forms. It must be remembered that the nominative-accusative plural of consonant stems was never disyllabic

10 See P. S. Škrabec, Jezikoslovni spis 1, Ljubljana, 1916, p. 95 ff.
11 See Kortlandt, op. cit., section 3.5.
and that neuters were particularly frequent among the nouns belonging to this flexion type. The analogical extension, which took place in the period between Van Wijk’s law and Dybo’s law, did not reach stressed endings because acute vowels were indifferent with respect to quantity at that time, so that the short ending in *drvà* is regular. The long ending betrays the same original distribution in Posavian and appears under various conditions in čakavian and Slovak. Thus, I conclude that the neo-circumflex arose phonetically in the nominative-accusative, instrumental and locative plural forms of the neuter paradigm. The neo-circumflex in *vîna* is analogical and dates from the fourteenth or fifteenth century (see below).

In contradistinction to the large majority of cases discussed so far, the neo-circumflex cannot be phonetic in the genitive plural, e.g. *krável, lip, lêt*. As I pointed out in my study on Proto-Slavonic accentuation, I assume that length arose phonetically in mobile paradigms, e.g. *gôr, čakavian glâv, Polish râk,* and spread analogically to other paradigms which did not have an acute vowel in the last syllable, e.g. *kôň, čakavian kên.* Acute vowels could not be affected by the lengthening because they were neutral with respect to quantity at that time. After the dissolution of the Slavonic linguistic unity, when the old acute had become a short rising intonation, the analogical extension operated again in Slovak, Slovene, and Serbo-Croat, including čakavian, but generally not elsewhere, cf. Czech *krável, dôl,* Polish *pêt, blôt,* Slovincian *lât, cielát.* The matter has been obscured by the lengthening of short vowels before word-final voiced consonants in the latter languages. The Slovenian lengthening can be dated to the same period as the rise of the phonetic neo-circumflex.

The main argument against phonetic lengthening before an originally long vowel at this stage is the absence of the neo-circumflex in such words as *pâmêt, klâdivo, jâblan, lâbod, sâmrák,* genitive singular *krâvè,* where post-tonic length is attested in Serbo-Croat *pâmêt, klâdivo, jâblân, lâbâd, sâmrák, krâvè.* I think that the Serbo-Croatian evidence is deceptive in these instances and that the development of post-tonic length is secondary here. Indeed, the West Slavonic evidence points to a short vowel, e.g. Czech *pâmêť, klâdivo, jabloně,* labuť, soumrak, Polish *pamięć, łabędź.* When the latter languages show a long vowel, we find the expected neo-circumflex in Slovene, e.g. *mêsíc, pênez, jastreb, pâjek,* Czech *mêsíc, peníz, jestřáb, pouvak,* Polish *miesiąc, pieniądze, jastrząb, pająk.* Elsewhere I have explained the difference between long and short post-tonic vowels by an earlier

12 Ibid.
13 Kortlandt, *op. cit.*, section 2.3.
14 Jaksche, *op. cit.*, p. 28.
difference between fixed and mobile stress,\textsuperscript{15} cf. Czech holub, žalud, oblast, Polish genitive singular golębia, żołędzi, Russian genitive plural golubój, żeludiej, oblastej, and Serbo-Croat nominative plural sjeliva. The short post-tonic vowel reflected in pámět is also found in čakavian\textsuperscript{16} and Posavian.\textsuperscript{17} The absence of metatony in the genitive singular kravě is regular because unstressed final nasal vowels were phonetically short. The long vowel in Serbo-Croat kravče has been taken from the mobile type, cf. glávě, accusative plural gláve. Nasal vowels were neutral with respect to quantity before the accent shift referred to as Dybo’s law. When length had become phonemic, Serbo-Croat generalised the long vowel in all cases of paradigmatic quantitative alternation.

It will be clear from the preceding discussion that I regard Slovene as our main source of knowledge about post-tonic quantity in Proto-Slavonic. This opinion is not challenged by the metatony in bdbin, ribič, where Serbo-Croat băbin, ribić point to a short vowel, because the required length is attested in Czech kravin, Serbo-Croat mladić, genitive singular mladiča. The coexistence of the two types is apparently Common Slavonic.

IV

After the rise of the neo-circumflex, various other accentual developments took place in Slovene. The oldest of these is the retraction of the stress from a short vowel to a preceding long vowel, e.g. dāša, zvězda. The retraction is posterior to the loss of weak jers in medial syllables because it also operated in cases where the long vowel did not immediately precede the stressed syllable, e.g. genitive singular stlpeca. Consequently, it is posterior to the rise of the neo-circumflex in bīṭka. This retraction, which is the last Common Slovene accentual development, can be dated to the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{18}

At a later stage stressed short vowels in non-final syllables were lengthened, e.g. brāta, vōlja, cf. Serbo-Croat brāta, vōlja. The new long vowels received a rising intonation. This development did not reach the dialects of Prekmurje and Prlekija.\textsuperscript{19} The Northern dialects display an opposition between the original long vowel in zvězda and the new long vowel in brīža, which again proves that these date from different periods.\textsuperscript{20} The lengthening in brīža cannot have

\textsuperscript{15} F. H. H. Kortlandt, op. cit., section 3.5.
\textsuperscript{16} See A. Belić, ‘Zametki po čakavskim govoram’ (Izvestija Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti, XIV, 2, St Petersburg, 1909, p. 230).
\textsuperscript{17} See S. Ivšić, ‘Današnji posavski govor’ (Rad, 197, Zagreb, 1913, p. 27).
\textsuperscript{18} F. Ramović, ‘Relativna kronologija slovenskih akcentskih pojavov’ (Slavistična revija, 3, 1950, p. 20).
\textsuperscript{19} F. Ramović, Kratka zgodovina slovenskega jezika I, Ljubljana, 1936, p. 190.
\textsuperscript{20} T. Logar, ‘O dialektizaciji slovenskega jezika’ (Prace filologiczne, 18, 2, Warsaw, 1964, p. 404f.)
preceded the retraction in žvězda because the latter word shows the regular reflex of long ě under the stress. Moreover, we would otherwise have to assume that quantity was neutralized in non-final stressed syllables at a time when pretonic length was still phonemic. The lengthening in brêža can be dated to the thirteenth or fourteenth century.

As pointed out above, the neo-circumflex in the nominative-accusative plural form of the neuter paradigm arose phonetically in leta, but not in vîna. The metatony in the latter word was obviously introduced on the analogy of the former. This analogical development requires the identity of the two paradigms in the singular at the time when the neo-circumflex was generalised in the plural. Since the identity was a consequence of the lengthening in ľeto after the retraction of the stress in vîno, the analogical introduction of the neo-circumflex must have been posterior to these two developments. The same holds true for the metatony in trēsîl, which presupposes the phonetic neo-circumflex in šdol, the retracted stress in trēsîa, and the long vowel in šdîla.

The accentuation of the nominative-accusative plural polja has a different origin. Since the singular of this word is not characterized by a rising accent, we cannot simply attribute the long falling vowel in the plural to the same analogical development. It seems more appropriate to derive the accentuation from the singular, where the early Slovene progressive accent shift had yielded doublets with initial stress after a preposition and final stress elsewhere, e.g. nominative singular polî, locative singular polju. The stressed vowel was long and falling in both sets of forms. The rise of root-stressed plural forms in this type may have taken place relatively early because it is also found in the čakavian dialect of Novi. The timbre of the o can be derived either from the singular or from the genitive plural form, where it was regular. It is unnecessary to assume any influence from other paradigms in this case.

After the introduction of the neo-circumflex in vîna and trēsîl the stress was retracted from a final short vowel to a preceding ě or o in the majority of dialects, e.g. žêna, gôra. This retraction cannot have preceded the analogical spread of the neo-circumflex because it would otherwise remain unclear why the latter did not affect paradigms with a short root vowel, cf. sêla, ôkna, plêsl. The absence of metatony in these forms requires the preservation of final stress in sêlo, ôkno, plêsla at the time when the neo-circumflex was introduced in vîna and trēsîl. The retraction, which can be dated to the 15th or 16th century, was later extended in most dialects under various conditions. Thus, we arrive at the following relative chronology of accentual

\[21\] See Belić, op. cit., p. 220f.
developments in Slovene after the dissolution of the Slavonic linguistic unity. The lengthening in bog, the shortening of the old acute intonation, and the retraction of the stress from final jers are not included because they belong to the Proto-Slavonic period.

1. Progressive accent shift in okb.
2a. Rise of the neo-circumflex in bitka.
3. Retraction of the stress in dûša.
4. Lengthening of the stressed vowel in lêto.
5. Introduction of the neo-circumflex in viña.
6. Retraction of the stress in žêna.

V

In the preceding sections I have confined myself to the data of literary Slovene, as codified by Breznik, Pletersnik, and Valjavec. A similar analysis can be applied to any single dialect, provided that sufficient information is available. Not all developments spread over the same area. While the progressive accent shift was specifically Slovenian and marked the language off from the other Slavonic dialects, the rise of the neo-circumflex affected the kajkavian and north čakavian dialects of Serbo-Croat as well. Other developments took place more or less independently in a number of languages. West Slavonic shared the retraction of the stress on to a preceding long vowel, as the Slovincian evidence shows. Czech and Upper Sorbian shared the lengthening of short rising vowels. The štokavian dialect of Serbo-Croat shared both retractions mentioned above. It goes without saying that these developments did not evolve everywhere at the same time. I shall now discuss the neo-circumflex outside Slovene.

There is no evidence for a neo-circumflex in Czech or Slovincian. The alleged neo-circumflex in štokavian stari is an analogical neo-acute, as the Posavian evidence shows. Since the situation in the kajkavian dialect of Serbo-Croat does not differ significantly from the one in Slovene, we can restrict ourselves to the čakavian material. In the Novi dialect we find a neo-circumflex in ginên, brîšên, as opposed to будên, бavîn, пivân. I think that the absence of metatony in будên is very important because it supports the hypo-

22 Kortlandt, op. cit., section 3.7.
23 Ibid., section 2.5.
24 Stang, op. cit., p. 31ff.
26 S. Ivsïc, ‘Jezik Hrvata kajkavaca’ (Ljetopis JAZU, 48, Zagreb, 1996, p. 70f.).
thesis of phonetic lengthening before an originally long vowel. Indeed, the opposition between ginën and bûden can hardly be explained otherwise. The original situation has been obscured by the characteristic generalization of short vowels under the stress and long vowels outside the stressed syllable in this dialect, cf. ginûla, rodîlë vs. odahnila, pâlîla. The neo-circumflex has been preserved only in verbs with a distinct predesinential vowel in the present tense and in a few definite adjectives, e.g. stâri.27 If we assume for this dialectal area that the phonetic rise of the neo-circumflex was limited to the first syllable of disyllabic words, these are precisely the categories where we would expect traces of metatony. In the Kastav dialect the neo-circumflex has been generalized in the definite form of the adjective.

Slovene is more archaic than the Novi dialect in the preservation of accentual alternations within the paradigm. Though the latter dialect has preserved the place of the stress quite well, intonational differences in the root have been eliminated outside the genitive plural, where we find a long stem vowel in all paradigms, and the cases just mentioned. The original regularity was blurred by the phonetic lengthening of short vowels before a tautosyllabic resonant, which must have been posterior to the lengthening in the genitive plural, cf. prôgon, genitive plural prôgôn.28 While the earlier lengthening yielded a falling vowel, as in Slovene, the later one resulted in a rising intonation if the vowel was stressed. Wherever we find a rising vowel in the genitive plural, as in žên, it must be older than the spread of the neo-circumflex and cannot be due to the later lengthening. I conclude that there is no reason to separate the rise of the neo-circumflex in the north čakavian dialects from the same development in Slovene and that the discrepancies can be explained in terms of analogical levelling. The details differ from one dialect to another. In Cres the neo-circumflex spread to bûden,29 whereas vidin and hjûvan agree with the Novi material. On the other hand we find kâmik and kâvran here, as in Slovene.

Glossary

Slovene. babin old woman (adj.), bîka battle, bog god, brat brother, brati to read, breza birch, česati to comb, drevi this evening, drva firewood, duša soul, giniti to languish, gora mountain, griža dysentery, jablan apple-tree, jastreb hawk, jutri tomorrow, kamik stone, kavran raven, kazen punishment, kladivo hammer, koja cottage, konj horse, koža skin, kraja theft, krava cow, labod swan, leto year, letos this year, lipa lime-tree, luć light,

27 Belić, op. cit., p. 233.
28 Belić, op. cit., p. 213.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>mazati</em></td>
<td>to smear, mess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mesec</em></td>
<td>month, thought, misli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>misel</em></td>
<td>to think, nit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>neth</em></td>
<td>thread, noh(a)t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>oko</em></td>
<td>nail, okno window, oko eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>osnova</em></td>
<td>osnova base, polje field, preja yarn, rebro rib, ribič fisherman, selo settlement, sesti to sit down, slepec blind man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>somrak</em></td>
<td>twilight, star old, tele calf, teča weight, toniti to sink, tresti to shake, vidići to see, vino wine, volja will, vozal knot, zabava amusement, zvezda star, žeja, thirst želeti to wish, žena woman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Serbo-Croat.**  

**Czech.**  
dilo work, holub pigeon, jablon apple-tree, Jestřáb hawk, *kladivo* hammer, *kráva* cow, labuť swan, měsíč month, oblast region, paměť memory, pavouk spider, peníz coin, soumrak twilight, žalud acorn.  

**Polish.**  
bloto mud, ciąża pregnancy, golęb pigeon, jastrząb hawk, labędź swan, miesiąc month, pajak spider, pamięć memory, pęta fetters, pieniądze money, ręka hand, żądza desire, żolądź acorn.  

**Slovingian.**  
břeg shore, cieľ calf, drávi at a trot, lato summer, lonji last year.  

**Russian.**  
golub' pigeon, oblast' region, želud' acorn.  

**Dutch.**  
bijk fair, melk milk.
mazati to smear, mesec month, misel thought, mistiti to think, mož man, nit thread, noh(a)ti nail, okno window, oko eye, osnova base, pajek spider, pamet intellect, penez coin, pisati to write, plesi to braid, polje field, preja yarn, rebro rib, ribić fisherman, selo settlement, sesti to sit down, slepec blind man, somrak twilight, star old, teža weight, toniti to sink, tresti to shake, videti to see, vino wine, volja will, vosal knot, zabava amusement, zvezda star, žefa, thirst želeći to wish, žena woman.

SERBO-CROAT. babin old woman (adj.), baviti se to stay, biti to be, bljuvati to vomit, brat brother, brisati to wipe, ginuti to perish, glava head, jablan poplar, kladivo hammer, krava cow, labud swan, mladić young man, odahnuti to recover one’s breath, paliti to burn, pamet intellect, piti to drink, progon path for cattle, ribić small fish, roditi to give birth, sjčivo blade, star old, sumrak twilight, vidjeti to see, volja will, žena woman.

CzeCH. dil o work, holub pigeon, jablon apple-tree, jestřáb hawk, kladivo hammer, kráva cow, kravin cow-shed, labuť swan, měsíc month, oblast region, paměť memory, pavouk spider, peníz coin, soumrak twilight, žalud acorn.

POlish. bloto mud, ciąża pregnancy, golub' pigeon, jastrzęb hawk, labędź swan, miesiąc month, pajak spider, pamięć memory, pęta fetters, pieniędze money, ręka hand, żądza desire, żołądź acorn.

SLOVINCIAN. břeg shore, cieľ calf, dravi at a trot, lato summer, lonji last year.

RUSSIAN. golub' pigeon, oblast' region, žalud' acorn.

DUTCH. billijk fair, melk milk.
mazati to smear, mesec month, misel thought, mlisti to think, moč man, nit thread, noh(a)t nail, okno window, oko eye, osnova base, pajek spider, pamet intellect, penez coin, pisati to write, plesiti to braid, polje field, preja yarn, rebro rib, ribič fisherman, selo settlement, sesti to sit down, srepec blind man, somrak twilight, star old, tele calf, teža weight, toniti to sink, tresti to shake, videti to see, vino wine, volja will, vozač knot, zabava amusement, zvezda star, žega, thirst želiti to wish, žena woman.

Serbo-Croat. babin old woman (adj.), baviti se to stay, biti to be, bijuwati to vomit, brat brother, brisati to wipe, ginuti to perish, glava head, jablan poplar, kladivo hammer, krava cow, labud swan, mladić young man, odahnuti to recover one’s breath, politi to burn, pamet intellect, piti to drink, progon path for cattle, ribić small fish, roditi to give birth, sjećivo blade, star old, sumrak twilight, vidjeti to see, volja will, žena woman.

Czech. dilo work, holub pigeon, jablon apple-tree, jestřáb hawk, kladivo hammer, krava cow, kravin cow-shed, labuť swan, měsíc month, oblast region, paměť memory, pavouk spider, peníz coin, soumrak twilight, zalud acorn.

Polish. błoto mud, ciąża pregnancy, goląb pigeon, jastrząb hawk, łabędź swan, miesiąc month, pajak spider, pamięć memory, pęta fetters, pieniędze money, ręka hand, żądza desire, żółędź acorn.

Slovinian. břeg shore, cieľa calf, dravi at a trot, lato summer, lonji last year.

Russian. golub' pigeon, oblast' region, želud' acorn.

Dutch. billijk fair, melk milk.