The verbal suffix *-nǫ-/-ny- in western South Slavic dialects

Pronk, T.C.

Tijmen Pronk
Leiden University Centre for Linguistics
Reuvensplaats 3-4, NL-2311 BE Leiden
t.c.pronk@hum.leidenuniv.nl

THE VERBAL SUFFIX *-*NǪ*-/-*NY*-
IN WESTERN SOUTH SLAVIC DIALECTS

The verbal class which is characterized by a suffix *-nu-* in the infinitive and *-ne-* in the present shows considerable dialectal diversity in Croatian and in the other western South Slavic languages. In many dialects, verbs belonging to this class have a suffix *-ni-* in the infinitive, aorist, participles and/or present. The aim of this paper is to explain how these dialectal forms and the relevant dialectal isoglosses have arisen. It argues that the allomorph *-ni-* < *-*ny*- was originally found in the infinitive, while *-nu-* < *-*nǫ*- used to be restricted to the aorist.[1]

1. Introduction

The verbal class which is characterized by a suffix *-nu-* in the infinitive and *-ne-* in the present[2] shows considerable dialectal diversity in Croatian, but also in the other western South Slavic languages. It is well-known that in many dialects verbs belonging to this class have a suffix *-ni-* in the infinitive stem, and sometimes also in the present stem. Overviews of this variation have been given by Peco (1979, 1982: 160–163) and Lenček (1984/1985) on the basis of the existing literature, and by Menac-Mihalić and Celinić (2014, 2016, 2017) on the basis of the Croatian data collected for the Croatian linguistic atlas and the Common Slavic linguistic atlas. Variation is also found in the suffix of the past passive participle, which has three main variants: *-nut-*, *-nit-* and *-njen-*. In dialects in which the aorist is preserved, its suffix is either *-nu-* or *-ni-*, like in the infinitive,

---

[2]   Traditionally referred to as the II. conjugation (but as the III. conjugation in the Serbian tradition since Belić).

but there are some dialects in which the infinitive has *-ni-* while the aorist has *-nu-*. The relevant data will be presented below.

In two previous papers (Pronk 2013: 126–128, 2021: 23–24), I have argued that in Proto-Slavic the allomorph *-ni-* < *-ny-* was found in the infinitive, while *-nu-* < *-nǫ-* was found in the aorist. The aim of the present paper is to support this reconstruction with additional dialectal data and to explain how the present day dialectal isoglosses may have arisen.

2. The *-nu-*/*-ni-* isogloss

The suffix *-ni-* in the infinitive and *l*-participle is found in dialects in the north-western half of western South Slavic, northwest of the line that runs approximately from Kikinda in the Serbian Banat to the Croatian coast just north of Dubrovnik, see the map in Lenček (1984/1985). The isogloss in the Banat is illustrated in more detail by the map in Ivić et al. (1997: 220) and the distribution of the allomorphs *-ni-* and *-nu-* in Croatia is nicely illustrated by the map in Menac-Mihalić and Celinić (2014: 70, 2016: 96). In Bosnia, the isogloss appears to run more or less east-west through northern Bosnia[3] to Lika, after which it is located close to the border between Dalmatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina towards the south (Halilović 1996: 194–195), although *-ni-* is also found in the Ikavian dialects of western Herzegovina (Peco 1986). The dialects northwest of the isogloss do not all have *-ni-*: there are many smaller and larger areas where the suffix has the shape *-nu-* (or *-no-*). To the southeast of the isogloss, all dialects have *-nu-*. The allomorph *-ni-* has been generalized in Ikavian Štokavian dialects and in Slovene, except in its eastern Styrian, Pannonian and western Resian dialects. Elsewhere, *-ni-* is less frequently found. According to Peco (1982: 161), *-ni-* is found »u onim ijekavskim govorima koji se nalaze u blizini ikavskih govora«. These include dialects spoken in Lika, Slavonia, Sarajevo (Rešetar 1907: 206) and western and northern Bosnia (Peco 1982: 161, 1985: 296–297 with a map), but many Jekavian dialects in Bosnia have only *-nu-* (cf. Baotić 1983: 137). Of the Ekavian Štokavian dialects, the dialects in the north and west of the Vojvodina and the dialect of the Galipoli Serbians have *-ni-* (Popović 1968: 25, 199; Nikolić 1964: 355; Ivić 1957: 274–275). Most Kajkavian dialects have a reflex of *-nǫ-*, with the exception of some Bilogorski and Sutlanski dialects and the dialects of Gorski Kotar. In Čakavian, *-ni-* is found on, e.g., Dugi Otok, Zlarin and Lastovo

---

3   From the central Bosnian dialects described by Peco (1990), he adduces only a few forms with *-ni-*, all from the northern periphery of this area: inf. Strojice *lȅgniti* (also *lȅći*, *lȅgnuti*), aor. Bojmunte *dȉgnišē*, Paklarevo *pȍgini* (Peco 1990: 225, 234, 235). In this respect it is interesting to note that forms with *-ni-* have also been reported from Sarajevo by Šurmin (1895: 203): *potŕniti*, *povèniti*, *spoméniti*. For the Sarajevo dialect a century later, Halilović (2009: 33) also adduces the form *spomeniti*, but only for Orthodox speakers, while Muslim speakers use *spomenuti*.

(also -nu-) as well as in many mainland Čakavian dialects. For a recent overview of the distribution of -ni- and -nu- in Istria see Vranić (2017).

3. Variation in the aorist and participle forms

In order to understand the origin of the variation between -ni- and -nu-, we have to take into account not only the infinitive, but also the aorist, l-participle and past passive participle.[4] When we combine data about the infinitive and the past participle, it emerges that there are five main types (Table 1).[5]

	1	2	3	4	5
infinitive	-nu-	-nu-	-ni-	-ni-	-ni-
present	-ne-	-ne-	-ne-/-ni-	-ne-	-ne-
past participle	-nut-	-njen-	-njen-	-nit-	-nut-

Table 1. The five main types of verbs with a nasal suffix in western South Slavic

The following is a brief overview of where each type is found, based on Lenček (1984/1985) and existing dialect descriptions that were available to me.

- Type 1 is found in the southeastern part of Štokavian, in some southern Čakavian dialects (Brač, Vrgada[6]) and in the dialects of Vedešin/Homok in Hungary and Pajngrt in the Burgenland in Austria.
- Type 2 is found in northwestern Čakavian and some central Čakavian dialects (e.g., Metajna, Kali, Rivanj), southwestern Istrian dialects, the majority of Kajkavian, and the neighbouring Pannonian Slovene.
- Type 3 is found in Šaptinovac and Bizovac in Slavonia, in Gorski Kotar (both Ikavian Štokavian and Gorski Kotar dialects), in Ikavian dialects along the lower Sutla and in the majority of Slovene dialects, including the Slovene standard language.[7]

---

[4]   This illustrates the need to collect as many different forms of verbal paradigms as possible. Most descriptions that were made on the basis of a predefined questionnaire turned out to be of little use for this paper, because the questionnaire apparently did not include the relevant passive participle forms.

[5]   Dialects that have a suffix -na- or -no- instead of -nu- or -ni- due to phonetic processes are here regarded as belonging to the corresponding type with -nu- or -ni- in the infinitive. Variation between -ne- and -ni- in the present is not used as a criterion for setting up types, because presents with -ni- are a recent innovation that is only found in some dialects in which the infinitive also has -ni-. See Lenček (1984/1985: 398–399) for the geographical distribution of -ne- and -ni- in the present.

[6]   An exception is the imperfective verb tonȉti, which has generalized -ni- (Jurišić 1973: 217). In the dialect of the island of Vis 'tonit is also the only verb with -ni- (Menac-Mihalić and Celinić 2014: 64, fn. 10, 11). This is probably an archaism (see below), unless -ni- is analogical to ronȉti.

[7]   The Slovene dialectal verb minúti, standard miníti, which is attested since the 16th century

- Type 4 is found in Žumberak, in Posavian dialects in Slavonia and in Bačka.
- Type 5 is found in the northern Banat, the Dalmatian mainland and Lika and probably also in western Bosnia.

The *l*-participle and aorist (when preserved) have the same suffix as the infinitive, except in some dialects belonging to the fifth type. We will therefore discuss the distribution of the morphemes in this type in more detail.

In the northern Banat the situation is as follows (Ivić et al. 1997: 219–222): the infinitive ends in *-niti*, the *l*-participle is attested with both *-nu-* and *-ni-*, the past passive participle always has *-nu-*, the few attestations of aorist forms have *-nu-*, e.g. Mokrin *zogŕniti se*, *naŕniti*, *òtkinila se*, *prìtisnilo*, *krénili*, *mánili*, *máno* (< *manul*), *prìdenūt*, Padej *mánićedu* (fut.), *stêgnuto*, *prằćnu* (aor.).

In the Jekavian dialects of Lika, the following distribution is found (Dragičević 1986: 84, 164, 172): *-ni-* is found in the infinitive and, with a few exceptions, in the *l*-participle, except in the masculine singular form which preserves *-nō* < *-nuo*. The aorist has *-nu-* in the singular, but *-ni-* in the third person plural. The past passive participle always has *-nu-*. E.g., Birovača *okréniti*, *pòkisniće* (fut.), *zȉnila*, *skȉnila*, *mȑdnila*, but *svànulo*, *pòginō*, *spoménō*, but *brȉnijo se*, *pòdignūt*, *smàknūt*, *zavŕniše*, *mȅtniše*, Frkašić *stȉgniti*, *pòginō*, but *pòginijo*, *jâ se dȉgnu*, *skȉnū*, *pòginiše*.

For the neighbouring Ikavian dialects of western Bosnia, Peco observes that while the infinitive often has *-ni-*, he only heard aorists with *-nu-*, e.g. Bihać *kréniti* but *òkrenū se*, Ostrožac *skȉniti*, but *namàknušē*, *primàknuše* (Peco 1982: 145–146, 167).

For the Ikavian dialects of mainland Dalmatia, the following data show that *-ni-* is found in the infinitive and *l*-participle, but *-nu-* in the aorist (when preserved) and past passive participle: Bibinje *dȉgniti*, *dȉgnija* (also *dȉga*), *dȉgnut* (also *dȉgnjen*) (Šimunić 2013: 91–92); Kruševo *kréniti*, *pòginila*, *òkrēnu* (Tomelić Ćurlin and Anić 2012: 359); Bitelić *brȉnit*, *brȉnio*, *brȉnila*, *zbrȉnūt*, *pòdignit*, *pòdignūt* (Ćurković 2014: 253); Studenci *prìkinit*, *prìkinilo*, *prìkinūt* (Bašić 2008: 362). In the Ikavian dialect at the mouth of the river Neretva (Komin, Rogotin), *-ni-* is found in the infinitive and *l*-participle, the past passive participle has *-nū-*, and in the aorist both *-ni-* and *-nu-* are used (Perina Vukša Nahod, personal communication). The same distribution is found in the neighbouring Jekavian dialect of Slivno Ravno and Zažablje, e.g. Slivno Ravno *skȉnⁱt*, *skȉnio/skȉnō*,

---

(Krelj), cannot easily be traced back to *minǫti*, which would be expected to have produced *minoti*. It probably somehow obtained its *-u-* from the cognate verb *-minovati*, *-minujem* (Oblak 1890: 196; Ramovš 1936: 179). The latter is known from older texts (Trubar has *preminouati*), but has been replaced by *minévati* in modern Slovene.

skȉnūt (Vukša Nahod 2017: 229). The Ikavian dialect of Molise in Italy, which was originally spoken somewhere northeast of the Biokovo mountain range (Ivić 1958: 265), has *-nut* next to *-njen-* in the past passive participle: *'badnit*, *l*-ptc. *'badnijᵃ*, ppp. *'badnut/'badnjen* (Breu, Piccoli and Marčec 2000: 420). The Ikavian Čakavian dialect of Kaštel Stari likewise has *-nit* in the infinitive and *-nūt-* in the past passive participle, e.g. *bȁdnit*, *bȁdnūt* 'to plant, stick, poke' (Baldić-Đugum 2006: 21).

The conclusion of this overview must be that the oldest situation in dialects of the fifth type is that *-nu-* was found in the aorist, past passive participle and *l*-participle, and *-ni-* in the infinitive. In some dialect the element *-ni-* spread to *l*-participle forms. It is conceivable that the third person plural of the aorist originally had *-ni-* as well, as is the case in Lika Jekavian.

4. Local innovations

There are several dialects that do not fit into any of the five main types mentioned in the preceding section. Examples of such dialects are those of Ozalj, Pitve and Zavale, and Bizovac in Croatia, the dialect of the Galipoli Serbians and the Slovene dialect of Resia in Italy. The paradigms that we find in these dialects are all the result of local innovations.

In the dialect of Ozalj and the surrounding area, the infinitive stem obtained an analogical *-a-* after verbs with an infinitive in *-ati* and a present in *-e*: *krénati*, pres. *krênem*, *l*-ptc. *krénal*, ppp. *krênjen*, ipv. *kréni* (Težak 1981: 230, 292).[8] Forms with *-na-* have also been reported from Domagović, just east of the area investigated by Težak (Menac-Mihalić and Celinić 2014: 62, 2016: 103).

---

[8] There is no reason to believe that *-na-* is the phonetic reflex of *-nǫ-* in the Ozalj dialect, in which case it would belong to type 2. This makes the situation in Ozalj different from that in other dialects in which the suffix is attested as *-na-*, e.g. in northern Istria. In Istria, there is a distinction between the dialect around Buzet, where *a* is one of the reflexes of *ǫ*, and the villages Boljun, Lupoglav, Kaldir and Kaštelir further south, where *ǫ* is otherwise never reflected as *a* (Menac-Mihalić and Celinić 2014: 62, 2016: 103; Vranić 2017: 290–291). The fact that the two areas are adjacent nevertheless suggests that the allomorph *-na-* developed phonetically from *-nǫ-* in both dialect groups. The exact phonetic condition under which this happened are now difficult to establish, but the preceding nasal, stress and position in the word may all have played a role. There are also a few dialects with *-na-* in northern Kajkavian dialects (Kalnik *p'rignal*, Maruševec *šap'nati*, *'vugnaų*, *f'čegnaų*, Menac-Mihalić and Celinić 2014: 62, 2016: 103, Rijeka Voćanska *zạkľ'ẹnạti*, *pugînạti* etc., Celinić 2015: 54). These are clearly due to a phonetic change *-nǫ- > -na-*, like in Istria (Celinić 2015: 53–55). Menac-Mihalić and Celinić (2017: 102) also mention the Slovene dialect of Slovenske Gorice, where unstressed *-na-* is found in the *l*-participle of some verbs in the dialects of Zgornja Ščavnica and Ceršak (Koletnik 2001: 176). Here, too, *-na-* appears to be a regular phonetic reflex, viz. in the m.sg. *-na < *-nəų < unstressed *-nylъ*, from which *-na-* spread to the other *l*-participle forms in some but not all verbs, see the verbal forms collected by Koletnik (2001: 163–164).

In Pitve and Zavala on the island of Hvar, the past passive participle obtained *-e-* from the present stem and the imperative obtained *-u* from the infinitive: *maknȕt*, pres. *môkne*, *l*-ptc. *mãka*, ppp. *môknet*, ipv. *maknȕ* (Barbić 2011: 43–44). The past passive participle also has the suffix *-net* in Ložišća in the west of the island Brač (*pȕknet*, Galović 2013: 194) and on the island of Čiovo (Ante Jurić, personal communication).

The dialect of Bizovac in Slavonia actually belongs to type 3, *maknȉti/mȁći*, pres. *mȁknem*, *l*-ptc. *maknȉo*, ppp. *mȁknjen*, ipv. *mȁkni/maknȉ-*, but a number of verbs generalized *-e-* from the present stem: *planȅti*, *svanȅti*, *posanȅti*, *odlanȅti* (Klaić 2007: 114).

The dialect of the Galipoli Serbians was originally spoken somewhere along or close to the river Velika Morava in eastern Serbia (Ivić 1957: 420), i.e. south of the present day Serbian dialects with *-ni-*. It has *-ni-* in the aorist and *l*-participle, but a passive part participle in *-net-*, *-nēt-* with analogical *-e-* from the present (Ivić 1957: 246, 275), like in the Croatian Pitve and Zavala dialect. Two petrified forms, *omâjnut* and *bȉnut* 'ripe' (from *bȉti*), show that the dialect originally had a passive part participle in *-nut-*. Together with the forms with *-ni-* this points to an earlier system similar to that of our type 5 dialects.

In the Resian dialect of Slovene, the passive part participle has the shape *-nṳ́t-* when stressed, *zadinṳ́t*, f. *zadinṳ́ta*, but *-nẹn-* or *-nan-* when unstressed, *natégnẹn*, f. *natégnana* 'pulled' (Steenwijk 1992: 154, 299).[9] The stressed variant *-nṳ́t-*, which is also found in some infinitives (*zadinṳ́t*, *spomanṳ́t*, *zasanṳ́t*), cannot be very old, because stressed *-nǫt-* should have produced *-nót-* in Resian. The vowel *-ṳ́- < *-ú-* must have been introduced from verbs which have unstressed *-nu- < *-nǫ-* in the infinitive and *l*-participle. The unstressed passive part participle forms with *-nan-* should be interpreted as variants of *-nẹn-* (Steenwijk 1992: 73, 142), which means that the Resian unstressed suffix reflects *-nen-*. Apparently, the stem with a nasal was introduced into the original participle in *-en-* in analogy to verbs with a thematic present like 3sg.pres. *stúlčẹ*, ppp. *stulčanọ* 'to knock off'.

5. The origin of the *-nu-*/*-ni-* variation

Of the five types established above, type 4 (inf. *-nit(i)*, aor. *-ni-*, ppp. *-nīt-*) is clearly derived from type 5 (inf. *-nit(i)*, aor. *-nu-*, ppp. *-nūt-*) by generalization of *-ni-*. This also makes sense geographically, because type 4 is found in elongated area that stretches from west to east between Žumberak and Bačka, directly north of dialects that have type 5. How type 5 relates to the other types depends on the origin of the suffix *-ni-*, which is debated. Two explanations have been proposed:

---

[9] In Pronk (2021: 24), I mistakenly cited Resia *wgῠ́snẹn* in this connection and adduced it as a reflex of *-njen-*. This form is in fact the 1sg present of this verb (Steenwijk 1992: 326).

the first sees -ni- as an innovation, modelled on verbs with an infinitive in -iti, the second regards it as an archaism.

Ivić (1957: 274–276), followed by Peco (1979, 1982: 163) and Halilović (1996: 195), explained the infinitive with -ni- as due to analogy with verbs of the type *zabraniti*, where the analogy would be based in the identical shape of the imperative ending: *zabrani = pokreni*. The analogy would have taken place independently in various places: »njeno rasprostiranje ne može [se] objašnjavati širenjem iz istog žarišta, već samo paralelnim odvojenim razvojem«. There are three problems with this explanation. The first is that the number of verbs with a stem ending in -ni- (e.g., *braniti, hraniti, činiti, kloniti se, ženiti se*) is much smaller than that with a stem in -nu-/-ne-, which makes it doubtful that it would manage to structurally influence the *nu*-verbs multiple times and in various ways.[10] The second problem is the distribution of the dialectal variation. Generally speaking, the areas that show variation preserve archaisms, whereas areas that show a single reflex – in this case the allomorph -nu- – are the result of generalization of a single variant. Here the opposite would be true if we accept Ivić's explanation. The third problem is that it remains unclear why in many dialects the imperative should influence the aorist/infinitive stem but not the present, with which it is normally more closely associated. It follows that Ivić's explanation is unlikely to be correct.

An alternative explanation that also sees the suffix -ni- as an innovation assumes that the first step in the shift from -nu- to -ni- was the change of the passive participle to -njen- (Schuyt 1990: 286–287, building on earlier observations by Vaillant 1966: 120, 259). This explanation fails because it cannot account for dialects in which the infinitive ends in -nit(i), but the passive participle has the morpheme -nit-, e.g. Posavian *mȅtnit, mȅtnīt*, or -nut-, e.g. Molise *b'adnit, b'adnut* (i.e., our types 4 and 5).

It turns out that the suffix -ni- cannot be explained as analogical and it must therefore be an archaism. This was argued for by Trubačev (1968: 374), Schuster-Šewc (1977) and Andersen (1999), see also the summary of the debate in Menac Mihalić and Celinić (2014, 2016). These scholars point to the existence of a suffix *-ny- instead of *-nǫ- in a number of West Slavic dialects: the old Catholic texts in Sorbian (Wittichenau) and the modern Upper Sorbian standard,

---

[10] We do, however, sometimes find analogical influence in the opposite direction in individual verbs. Milanović (1955) has shown that the perfective *ni*-verbs *promeniti, zameniti, izmeniti* etc., *okaniti se* and *oskvrniti* are often found with the suffix -nu-/-ne- in written sources: *prominuti* (Mikalja), *-menuti* (Vojvodina), *okanuti se* (Belgrade), *oskvrnuti* (in texts from Dalmatia, Hrvatsko Primorje and Zagreb, first attested in Menčetić's work; this is the standard Croatian form). Popović (1968: 199) mentions examples of *klònuti, -ménuti* and *-kánuti* with -nu- instead of expected -ni- from Bačka, and *-ménuti* is also found in Srem (Nikolić 1964: 356). Cf. also Kaniža (Posavina) *rȍdūt* 'born' for older *rođen* (Ivšić 1913: 193).

the Polabian *Vocabularium Venedicum* (1711, Henning von Jessen) and Silesian Polish dialects in the east of the Czech Republic. The suffix *-ny- regularly produced -ni- in South Slavic. Although Trubačev, Schuster-Šewc and Andersen argued for a Proto-Slavic dialectal difference between dialects with *-ny- and dialects with *-nǫ-, the South Slavic dialectal evidence, especially our type 5 (inf. -nit(i), aor. -nu-, ppp. -nūt-), demonstrates that *-ny- originally coexisted with -nu- < *-nǫ- within the same paradigm. In order to reconstruct the complete Proto-Slavic paradigms of verbs with a present in -ne- we will have to take a look at the Old Church Slavonic situation.

6. The Proto-Slavic paradigms

In Old Church Slavonic, three groups of verbs can be distinguished that have a present in -ne- (Schuyt 1990: 10–14):

1. perfective verbs with a root ending in a vowel and -nǫ- in the aorist and infinitive stems;
2. imperfective verbs with a root ending in an obstruent and -nǫ- in the infinitive and supine only; and
3. perfective and imperfective verbs with a root ending in an obstruent and -nǫ- also in the aorist stem.

Groups 1 an 2 preserve the Proto-Slavic situation, except in the infinitive (table 2). The third group is largely the result of a shift of verbs from group 2 to group 1 (Stang 1942: 54–55). The past passive participle of group 1 had the suffix -noven- (e.g. *minovenъ*), that of group 2 the suffix *-en- (e.g. *dviženъ*).

	group 1	group 2
inf.	*minyti*	*dvigti*
3sg.pres.	*mine(tъ)*	*dvigne(tъ)*
2sg.ipv.	*mini*	*dvigni*
3sg.aor.	*minǫ*	*dviže*
ppp.	*minovenъ*	*dviženъ*

Table 2. The two types of Proto-Slavic verbs with a present suffix *-ne-

The major innovation of Old Church Slavonic (and of many other Slavic languages) was the introduction of an infinitive in -nǫti, which, as the South Slavic dialectal data show, replaced older *-nyti in group 1 in analogy to verbs with the pattern aor. -a, -ě, -i, inf. -ati, -ěti, -iti. The infinitive ending -nǫti subsequently replaced older *-ti in group 2 in analogy to group 1.

The semantic distribution between groups 1 and 2 that we find in Old Church Slavonic is probably older than the phonotactic one. Apparently, perfective verbs with a present in -ne- (but not those with a nasal infix) had an aorist stem that was characterized by the element -nǫ-. In Old Church Slavonic, -nǫ- spread to the infinitive of all verbs with a present in -ne- (except the verb *stati*), and sometimes also to the aorist-stem. There may be some perfective verbs with a root ending in an obstruent where -nǫ- is old in the aorist stem (e.g. OCS *drъznǫti*, Schuyt 1990: 176), but due to the productivity of perfective -nǫ-/-ny- in all Slavic languages this is difficult to establish.

The productivity of the -nǫ-/-ny-class across Slavic was largely motivated by phonotactic considerations. Verbal roots that lost their root-final obstruent before an *-n- as a result of sound change joined the -nǫ-/-ny-class, e.g. Cr. *ski(d)nuti*, *ve(d)nuti*, *vr(t)nuti*, *to(p)nuti*, *gi(b)nuti*, *sti(d)nuti*. In western South Slavic, most verbs with a *ne*-present joined this group. The main exception are verbs with a root ending in a velar, because velars were preserved before -n-, e.g. *maći/mak-nuti*, *dići/dignuti*. Also in other Slavic languages, infinitives and participle forms without -nǫ-/-ny- are especially frequent with roots ending in a velar, e.g., Russian -stíč, Polish *biec*, Ukrainian *tjahtý* etc. Traces of the Proto-Slavic second group are otherwise found in aorist and participle forms of individual verbs, especially in older texts and in dialects, as well as in petrified formations, e.g. Cr. *pògibe* to *pòginuti*, *ògrezao* to *ògreznuti*, *ùveo* to *uvènuti*, *zdénac* 'well' < *stъd-en- to *stínuti* 'to freeze' etc. Another phonotactic motive that played a role in the spread of -nǫ-/-ny- is avoidance of forms that would otherwise be monosyllabic: Cr. *vȅnuo*, *ùveo*, Pol. *marznął*, *przemarzł*, Rus. *mólknul*, *zamólk* (Schuyt 1990: 186–187).

Stang (1942: 57) and Vaillant (1966: 230) convincingly argued that the Slavic suffix *-nǫ- must have originated as an imperfect to athematic presents with the suffix *-neu-/-nu- as found in other Indo-European languages. When the Indo-European imperfect and aorist merged into a single paradigm in Slavic, the imperfect, which apparently had the suffix *-nǫ- < *-nu-n-, was generalized. The nominal forms also contained the same suffix *-neu-/-nu-. The infinitive ended in -nyti < *-nuHtei, with analogical length and acute intonation from infinitives in -ati < *-aH-tei and -ěti < *-eH-tei. The past passive participle in -noven- < *-neuen- was preserved in Old Church Slavonic, but replaced with different formations in the other Slavic languages. The south-eastern part of western South Slavic replaced *-noven- with *-nǫt- on the basis of the aorist. In north-western South Slavic, the participle has the suffix -njen- in analogy to the pattern inf. -iti, ppp. -jen. The only potential argument in favour of the hypothesis that these dialects also had the suffix *-nǫt- at an earlier stage is the fact that in the Slovene Resia dialect the past passive participle has the suffix -nút- when stressed, e.g.

zadinȗt 'taken on one's shoulders', but, as I have argued above, the vocalism of this suffix shows that it cannot be old. As far as I am aware, there are no traces of *-nǫt-* in petrified formations in the westernmost dialects. The Slovene noun *trenȏtək*, adduced by Schuyt (1990: 286) as a derivative from an archaic past passive participle in *-nǫt-*, is a rare variant of the common *trenȗtək*. The latter, first attested in the 19th century, must be a loanword from Croatian *trenútak*, in spite of the reservations made by Snoj (2016). The variant *trenȏtək*, which is found in Pleteršnik's dictionary, is in all likelihood a slovenicized form of *trenȗtək*.[11] Similarly, the adjective *trenȏtən*, that is found in a few lexicographical works from the second half of the 19th century is clearly a slovenicized form of Cr. *trènūtan*. Summarizing, in north-western South Slavic, Proto-Slavic *-noven-* was replaced directly by *-njen-* without an intermediate stage in which these dialects had the suffix *-nǫt-*.

7. Conclusion

We have seen that western South Slavic has five main types of paradigms of verbs with the suffix *-ni-/-nu-* in the infinitive, past passive participle, *l*-participle and aorist. The dialectal evidence shows that Proto-Slavic verbs with an aorist in *-nǫ-* used to have an infinitive in *-nyti* instead of the usually reconstructed *-nǫti*. This original distribution is preserved in some western South Slavic dialects (type 5 in section 3). A number of analogical innovations that affected the *-ni-/-nu-*verbs created isoglosses that run across the western South Slavic dialect area and that rarely coincide with the borders between the traditional dialect groups.

The oldest isogloss is probably the one that cuts western South Slavic in two halves: north-western dialects with a past passive participle in *-njen-* and south-eastern dialects with a past passive participle in *-nut-* (the Slovene Resia dialect appears to fall outside these groups). Apart from the large continuum in the north-western part of South Slavic, *-njen-* is also found in the dialect of Imotska krajina and Bekija (also *-nīt-* and *-nūt-*, Šimundić 1971: 157) and in the Molise dialect (also *-nit-*), that used to be spoken in approximately the same area in the past. It is unclear to me whether this is an archaism that has now disappeared in the dialects between Imotska krajina and Čakavian dialects where *-njen-* is found (e.g. in Bibinje near Zadar) or a more recent formation that has arisen independently in analogy to verbs in *-iti*.

---

[11]   Pleteršnik refers to Janežič's 1867 *Deutsch-slovenisches Taschenwörterbuch* (second edition), which gives *trenutək* and *trenotək*. The first edition of this dictionary and Janežič's other dictionaries only have the variant *trenutək*.

The second important isogloss arose when the dialects with a past passive participle in *-nut-* introduced *-nu-* in the infinitive as well. This innovation failed to reach the dialects in the northwest of this area, i.e. those of the northern Banat, Bačka, the Posavina, Žumberak, western Bosnia, Lika and the Dalmatian mainland (types 4 and 5 in section 3), which all preserve the older infinitive in *-nit(i)*. These dialects are located between the two early isoglosses. Of these dialects, the northern ones eventually substituted *-nit-* for *-nut-* in the past passive participle.[12]

In Serbia, the *-ni-/-nu-* isogloss has shifted towards the north over time. This is shown by the fact that the dialect of the Galipoli Serbs, which used to be spoken in an area south of the Danube where today only *-nu-* is found, has generalized *-ni-*, as well as by traces of older *-ni-* in the south-eastern part of the Vojvodina which now has only *-nu-* (Popović 1968: 199–200). Also further to the west, the area in which the infinitive ended in *-nuti* may originally have been smaller and have expanded since the late Middle Ages. This is perhaps suggested by the attestation of forms with *-ni-* in Sarajevo (see footnote 2), although these could also be due to later movements of speakers with *-ni-*. The fact that there are no traces of *-ni-* in the Torlak dialects of southern Serbia could be due to the general loss of the infinitive there.

In those dialects in which the past passive participle has the suffix *-njen-* there was a split between, on the one hand, archaic dialects in which the infinitive in *-niti* is preserved, e.g. in Sali on the island of Dugi Otok and in most Slovene dialects, and on the other hand a band of dialects stretching from the Zadar archipelago and Istria to Kajkavian and eastern Slovenia in which the infinitive in *-niti* was replaced by *-nǫti* > *-noti/-nuti* on the basis of the aorist and perhaps the *l*-participle in *-nǫl-*.

To summarize, many but not all dialects extended the allomorph *-nǫ-* from the aorist to the participles and infinitive, but which of those nominal forms were affected differed per dialect and in some dialects the analogy went in the other direction, from the infinitive to the other nominal forms and sometimes even the aorist.

---

[12] E.g. Žumberak inf. *dȉgniti*, ppp. *dȉgnit* (Skok 1956: 346), Ikavian/Jekavian Posavian inf. *mȅtnit*, ppp. *mȅtnīt* (Jozić 2004: 42).

References

Andersen, Henning. 1999: The Western South Slavic contrast Sn. *sah-ni-ti* // SC *sah-nu-ti*. *Slovenski jezik - Slovene Linguistic Studies*, 2, Ljubljana, 47–62.

Babić, Ivan. 2008. *Studenački rječnik*. Studenci: Župni Ured.

Baldić-Đugum, Radojka. 2006. *Beside kaštelanske*. Kaštela: Bijaći.

Baotić, Josip. 1983. Ikavskošćakavski govor u okolini Dervente. *Bosanskohercegovački dijalektološki zbornik*, 4, Sarajevo, 7–208.

Barbić, Ante. 2011. *Rječnik Pitava i Zavale*. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje.

Breu, Walter; Piccoli, Giovanni; Marčec, Snježana. 2000. *Dizionario croato molisano di Acquaviva Collecroce. Dizionario plurilingue della lingua slava della minoranza di provenienza dalmata di Acquaviva Collecroce in Provincia di Campobasso. Dizionario, registri, grammatica, testi*. Campobasso.

Celinić, Anita. 2015. Fonologija Rijeke Voćanske i voćanskoga kraja (na sjeveru Hrvatskoga zagorja). *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik*, 19, Zagreb, 25–77.

Ćurković, Dijana. 2014. *Govor Bitelića*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Rijeka: Sveučilište u Rijeci.

Dragičević, Milan. 1986. Govor ličkih jekavaca. *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik*, 32, Beograd, 7–241.

Galović, Filip. 2013. Jezične osobitosti mjesnoga govora Ložišća na otoku Braču. *Fluminensia*, 25/1, Rijeka, 181–198.

Halilović, Senahid. 1996. *Govorni tipovi u međuriječju neretve rijeke dubrovačke* (= *Bosanskohercegovački dijalektološki zbornik* 7). Sarajevo: Institut za jezik.

Halilović, Senahid. 2009. Sarajevski govor do kraja XX stoljeća. *Govor grada Sarajeva i razgovorni bosanski jezik*. Ed. Senahid Halilović, Ilijas Tanović, Amela Šehović. Sarajevo: Slavistički komitet, 9–66.

Hraste, Mate. 1963. Refleks nazala *ǫ* u buzetskom kraju. *Ivšićev zbornik.* Ed. Mate Hraste; Ljudevit Jonke; Milan Ratković. Zagreb: Hrvatsko filološko društvo, 129–135.

Ivić, Pavle. 1957. *O govoru galipoljskih Srba.* Beograd: Naučna knjiga.

Ivić, Pavle. 1958. *Die serbokroatischen Dialekte. Ihre Struktur und Entwicklung.* 's-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co.

Ivić, Pavle; Bošnjaković, Žarko; Dragin, Gordana. 1997. *Banatski govori šumadijsko-vojvodanskog dijalekta. Druga knjiga: morfologija, sintaksa, zaključci, tekstovi* (= *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* 43). Beograd: SANU.

Ivšić, Stjepan. 1913. Današnji posavski govor. *Rad JAZU*, 196, Zagreb, 124–254.

Jozić, Željko. 2004. Glagolski sustav ikavskojekavskih posavskih govora. *Filologija*, 43, Zagreb, 31–54.

Jurišić, Blaž. 1973. *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade uspoređen s nekim čakavskim i zapadnoštokavskim govorima. II. dio: rječnik.* Zagreb: JAZU.

Klaić, Adolf Bratoljub. 2007. *Bizovačko narječje*. Bizovac: Matica hrvatska.

Koletnik, Mihaela. 2001. *Slovenskogoriško narečje*. Maribor: Slavistično društvo.

Lenček, Rado L. 1984/1985. Is there a *ni* : *ne* isogloss in the South Slavic speech area? *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku*, 27-28, Novi Sad, 395–403.

Menac Mihalić, Mira; Celinić, Anita. 2014. Usporedba glagolskih sufiksa *nǫ/*ny u hrvatskim govorima u Mađarskoj i u Hrvatskoj. *A Magyar tudomány napján elhangzott idegennyelvű előadások: 2014*, Ed. Tóth Sándor Attila. Baja: Eötvös József Főiskolai Kiadó, 55–72.

Menac Mihalić, Mira; Celinić, Anita. 2016. Glagol'nye suffiksy *nǫ/*ny v Xorvatii. *Trudy Instituta russkogo jazyka im. V. V. Vinogradova* 8, 95–114.

Menac Mihalić, Mira; Celinić, Anita. 2017. Poveznice i razdjelnice u srodnim jezičnim sustavima. *Jezikoslovni zapiski*, 23/1, Ljubljana, 93–105.

Milanović, Branislav. 1955. Glagoli na *-niti* s oblicima promene *-nu-/-ne-* osnova. *Naš jezik*, 7/3, 4, 87–106.

Nikolić, Berislav. 1964. Sremski govor. *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik*, 14, Beograd, 201–413.

Oblak, Vatroslav. 1890. Doneski k historični slovenski dialektologiji. In: Anton Barel (ed.), *Letopis Matice slovenske za leto 1890*, 180–236. Ljubljana: Narodna tiskarna.

Peco, Asim. 1979. Glagoli tipa *kreniti-krenem* u srpskohrvatskom jeziku. *Južnoslovenski filolog*, 35, Beograd, 141–145.

Peco, Asim. 1982. Ikavskošćakavski govori zapadne Bosne (II dio: Akcenat, oblici, tekstovi). *Bosanskohercegovački dijalektološki zbornik*, 3, Sarajevo, 7–258.

Peco, Asim. 1985. Govori sjeverne i sjeveroistočne Bosne: morfologija. *Bosanskohercegovački dijalektološki zbornik*, 5, Sarajevo, 201–336.

Peco, Asim. 1986. *Ikavskoštakavski govori zapadne Hercegovine*. Sarajevo: ANUBiH.

Peco, Asim. 1990. Morfološke osobine govora u centralnom pojasu Bosne. *Bosanskohercegovački dijalektološki zbornik*, 6, Sarajevo, 125–247.

Pleteršnik, Maks. 1893/1894. *Slovensko-nemški slovar*. Ljubljana: Knezoškofijstvo.

Popović, Ivan. 1968. *Govor Gospođinaca u svetlosti bačkih govora kao celine*. Beograd: SANU.

Pronk, Tijmen. 2013. On the Development of *in, *im, *un and *um in Slavic. *Miklošičeva monografija. Ob dvestoletnici rojstva Franca Miklošiča*. Ed. Marko Jesenšek. Ljutomer: Gimnazija Franca Miklošiča, 117–140.

Pronk, Tijmen. 2021. The Early History of Western South Slavic. *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie*, 77/1, Heidelberg, 1–32.

Ramovš, Fran. 1936. *Kratka zgodovina slovenskega jezika I*. Ljubljana: Akademska založba.

Rešetar, Milan. 1907. *Der štokavische Dialekt*. Wien: Hölder.

Schuster-Šewc, Hinc. 1977. Zur Bedeutung des Sorbischen und Slowenischen für die slawische historisch-vergleichende Sprachforschung. *Slovansko jezikoslovje – Nahtigalov zbornik*. Ed. Franc Jakopin. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, 433–451.

Schuyt, Roel. 1990. *The Morphology of Slavic Verbal Aspect: A Descriptive and Historical Study*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Skok, Petar. 1912. Mundartliches aus Žumberak (Sichelburg). *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 33, Berlin, 338–375.

Snoj, Marko. 2016. *Slovenski etimološki slovar*. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU.

Stang, Christian S. 1942. *Das slavische und baltische Verbum*. Oslo: Jacob Dybwad.

Steenwijk, Han. 1992. *The Slovene Dialect of Resia, San Giorgio*. Amsterdam – Atlanta: Rodopi.

Šimundić, Mate. 1971. *Govor Imotske krajine i Bekije*. Sarajevo: ANUBiH.

Šimunić, Božidar. 2013. *Rječnik bibinjskoga govora*. Zadar: Matica hrvatska.

Šurmin, Đuro. 1895. Osobine današnjeg sarajevskog govora. *Rad JAZU*, 121, Zagreb, 186–209.

Težak, Stjepko. 1981. Ozaljski govor. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik*, 5, Zagreb, 200–428.

Tomelić Ćurlin, Marijana; Anić, Marija. 2012. Fonološki i morfološki opis kruševačkoga govora. *Croatica et Slavica Iadertina*, 8/2, Zadar, 349–362.

Trubačev, Oleg N. 1968. O sostave praslavjanskogo slovarja (problemy i rezul'taty). *Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie. VI. meždunarodnyj sjezd slavistov (Praga, avgust 1968 g.)*. In: Viktor V. Vinogradov; Samuil B. Bernštejn; Nikita I. Tolstoj (eds.). Moskva: Nauka, 366–378.

Vaillant, André. 1966. *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves. Tome III: Le Verbe*. Paris–Lyon: C. Klincksieck.

Vranić, Silvana. 2017. Refleksi *ǫ u istarskim čakavskim govorima zastupljenim u dijalektološkim atlasima. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik*, 21, Zagreb, 283–297.

Vukša Nahod, Perina. 2017. *Slivanjski govori: fonologija i morfologija*. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje.

Glagolski sufiks *-nǫ-/-ny- u zapadnojužnoslavenskim govorima

Sažetak

Druga glagolska vrsta, za koju su karakteristični sufiksi *-nu-* u infinitivu i *-ne-* u prezentu, pokazuje znatnu dijalektalnu raznolikost u hrvatskom jeziku i u drugim zapadnojužnoslavenskim jezicima. U mnogim govorima glagoli koji pripadaju ovoj vrsti imaju sufiks *-ni-* u infinitivu, aoristu, participima i(li) prezentu. Cilj je ovog rada objasniti kako su nastali dijalektalni oblici i relevantne dijalektalne izoglose. Pokazuje se da je alomorf *-ni-* < *-ny-* izvorno bio ograničen na infinitiv, dok je *-nu-* < *-nǫ-* bio ograničen na aorist.

Ključne riječi: dijalektologija, zapadnojužnoslavenski, izoglose, morfologija

Keywords: dialectology, western South Slavic, isoglosses, morphology