

THE SECOND PROTO-SLAVIC PALATALISATION IN SLOVENE
DIALECT MORPHOPHONOLOGY AND THE ETYMOLOGY OF ŠPIK
'MOUNTAIN TOP'

Druga praslovanska regresivna palatalizacija je povzročila morfofonološke menjave v slovenski sklanjatvi ter spregatvi. Menjave tipa *otrok* : *otroci* najdemo v I in M mn. *o*-jevskih osnov ter v nekaterih velelnikih. V slovenskih narečjih jo najdemo tudi v M ed. *o*-jevskih in *a*-jevskih osnov ter v pridevniški sklanjatvi. Članek namerava obravnavati ohranitev in razdelitev omenjenih menjav v slovenskih narečjih. Zato nudi gradivo iz vseh narečnih skupin in ga vrednoti. V zvezi s tem bo predlagana nova etimologija besede in toponima *špik*. Avtor dokazuje, da je *špik* lahko retrogradna tvorba na osnovi neizpričanega M ed. **špice*, sposojenke iz nem. *Spitze* 'špik'. Beseda *špik* je izpričana v narečjih, kjer je druga praslovanska palatalizacija ohranjena v vsaj nekaj *o*-jevskih osnovah.

slovenska narečja, regresivna palatalizacija, etimologija, morfofonologija

The second Proto-Slavic regressive palatalisation resulted in morpho-phonological alternations in nominal and verbal inflections in Slovene. We find alternation stems of the type *otrok* : *otroci* in the nom. and loc.pl. of *o*-stems and in imperatives. In dialects, it is also attested in the loc.sg. of *o*- and *a*-stems and in the adjectival declension. The present article discusses the preservation of these alternations and their distribution in Slovene dialects. Material from all dialect groups is evaluated. In relation to this, a new etymology of the word *špik* 'mountain top' is proposed. It is argued that *špik* is a back-formation from an unattested loc.sg. **špice*, which is itself a borrowing from the German *Spitze* 'mountain top'. The word is attested in dialects where the second Proto-Slavic palatalisation is preserved in the loc.sg. of at least a few *o*-stems.

Slovene dialects, regressive palatalisation, etymology, morphophonology

The second Slavic regressive palatalisation, often simply referred to as the "second palatalisation", palatalises the velars **k*, **g* and **x* to **č*, **dž* and **š* respectively. In Slovene, they are reflected as *c*, *z* and *s*. The palatalisation took place in the late common Slavic period and was phonemicised after the Slavs had settled in the areas where Slovene is spoken today. The evidence that the palatalisation was still taking place at the time is provided by toponyms like *Zilja* < **gīl*-, cf. German *Gail*, and *Celje* < Lat. *Celeia* (see Greenberg 2000: 72f.). When the velar was in root-final position, paradigmatic alternations between forms with a velar and forms with a

palatal could arise. These alternations were often levelled out in Slovene. The standard language only preserves traces of the palatalization in the nom.pl. *otróci*, loc.pl. *otrócih* to *otròk*, and in the imperatives *réci*, *téci*, *péci*, *vléci*, *obléci*, *sléci*, *séci*, *tólci*, *lézi*, *sézi*, *-prézi*, *strézi*, *strízi*, *vřízi*, and archaic *pomózi*. In the older literature, the number of categories retaining the palatalisation is considerably larger (cf. Ramovš 1924: 289ff.). The main categories where one finds reflexes of the palatalisation are:¹

1. The nom. and loc.pl. of masculine *o*-stems, e.g. *vólci*, *trízih*, *otróci*, loc.pl. *otrócih*, sometimes also analogically in the ins.pl.: *otróci* for *otróki*.
2. The loc.sg. of masculine and neuter *o*-stems (usually with the endings *-e* or *-i*, which are originally the endings of the *o*- and *ǰo*-stems, respectively): *potóce* (to *pótok*), *blázi* (to *blagô*), *grése* (to *gréh*).
3. The loc.sg. of feminine *a*-stems: *nóze*.
4. Before the adjectival endings m./n.gen.sg. *-iga*, m./n.dat.sg. *-imu*, m./n.loc(/ins.?).sg., dat.pl. *-im*, m.nom.pl. *-i*, gen./loc.du./pl. *-ih*, ins.pl. *-imi*: *drúziga*, *drúzimu*, *drúzih*, *drúzim*, *drúzimi*.
5. Imperatives of the type *réci*, *vřízi*, *pomózi*.

There are no Slovene dialects in which every one of these variants occur, but all dialects preserve some traces. I collected examples of the five types described above from dialect descriptions that were available to me. To these, dialect examples adduced by Ramovš (1924: 291, 1935) and Greenberg (2000: 73) have been added. It is obvious that the overview will not be exhaustive due to this *modus operandi*; it merely intends to show the variation and the distribution of dialect forms.² Since descriptive linguists are naturally more likely to note exceptional or alternating forms than forms showing no deviations whatsoever, descriptions of dialects that do not preserve a large number of the paradigmatic alternations under investigation often contain little evidence to prove this. The discussion of the southern and eastern dialects of Slovene, where the palatalisation is less well preserved, is thus necessarily much briefer than that of the northern and western dialects. This state of affairs hardly reflects the choice of dialect literature that has been consulted. In addition to the literature mentioned in the bibliography, I scanned Rigler and Logar's collected papers, the Slovene contributions to *Fonološki opisi* (1981) and most dialect descriptions that appeared in *Slavistična revija* for relevant material.

¹ All examples have been 'standardized'.

² The unpublished materials of the *Slovenski lingvistični atlas* should provide more evidence, as the questionnaire contains the loc.sg. of *trebuh*, the whole paradigm of *otrok*, and the forms *na noze*, *na roce*, *na potoce*, *oresi*, *drugega/-zega*, *takega/-cega*, *visokega/-cega*, *suhega/-sega* (Benedik 1999: 28, 53, 71). Imperatives of the type *réci* are not in the questionnaire. Neither the data for the *Slovenski lingvistični atlas*, nor dialect material published in *Jezikoslovni zapiski* were available to me.

Carinthian

Carinthian is one of the dialect groups that preserves the reflexes of the palatalisation relatively well. The material from Slovenian Carinthia is rather limited. For Remšnik, Ramovš adduces the toponym *u Mârpærzi* 'in Maribor' (1935: 29), and for Mežica he gives *na ràcɿ*, next to *na ràkɿ* (1924: 291).

For the Podjuna dialect, Zdovc (1972: 146f., forms from Rinkolach) gives nom.pl. *utròci* (Grafenbach *utr'ocə*, Ojstrica *otròci*), analogically also ins.pl. *z utrũci* (Ojstrica *otrúacmi*, but loc.pl. *otroókəh*), *o*-stem loc.sg. *ml'ci* (Grafenbach *mlíacə*), *iǰrmaci* 'fair', *trāunci*, also in the toponyms *Blóci* 'Villach', *Plibærci* 'Bleiburg', *Mórpærzi* 'Maribor', *Rěxpærzi* 'Rechberg', *Trǰbærzi* 'Dravograd', *a*-stem loc.sg. *ràci*, analogically also loc.pl. *ràcex*, but the imperatives *pèci*, *strǰzi*, Ojstrica *rèci* generalised the root-final consonant of the present tense.

The Obirsko dialect preserves palatalisation in the following forms (Karničar 1990: 55f.): in Ebriach nom.pl. *utróc*, *o*-stem loc.sg. *mlé:c*, *swǰà:c* 'pigsty', *wóə:z* 'grove', in the toponyms *w Putò:c* and *w Qužlá:c*, and the *a*-stem loc.sg. *ró:c*, in Trögern *o*-stem loc.sg. *w trí:psə* 'belly'.

The Rož dialect preserves reflexes in nom.pl. *uouci* (Ramovš 1935: 13), Breznica nom.pl. *wotrocə*, Kostanje *o*-stem loc.sg. *u potó:ce*, *a*-stem loc.sg. *na ró:cə* (< **rɔci*³), but *na nó:ǰə* (< **nogi*), Sele *a*-stem loc.sg. *róac* (Isačenko) < **-i*, analogically introduced in the gen.sg. *ró:ci* (Karničar) < **-e*, also gen.sg. *mwá:ci* 'puddle', further *o*-stem loc.sg. *wóə:z* 'grove' and in toponyms: *Plì:bærc* 'Bleiburg', *Blá:c* 'Villach', *na Hú:mpærc*.

In the western part of the Zilja dialect, the palatalisation is preserved in the nom.pl. *trwàci*, and loc.pl. *trúacəh* 'child', in the *o*-stem loc.sg. *mlíace*, *sírce* 'corn', *píasæce* 'sand', *krúse*, *làbrase* 'forest property', and in the toponyms *Baláce* 'Villach', *Pũdnce* 'Mount Poludnig' and *Třze* 'Hermagor', as well as in the *a*-stem loc.sg. *róce* and *nóze* (also dat.), where the palatalisation spread to the gen.sg. *róce* and *nóze*. In the loc.sg. *zásače* < **zasěķě* the **c* has been replaced by *č* on the basis of the gen.sg., where the velar was affected by a later, dialectal palatalisation: *zásače* < **zasěķe*. The imperatives *rějci*, *pějci* and *tějci* (*řčě*, *páčě* and *táčě* in Grafenauer 1905: 209) have generalised the affricate from the present tense. Ramovš further adduces the *o*-stem loc.sg. *wâc* 'train', *otóc*, *tráwənc* and *a*-stem loc.sg. *muác* 'puddle', which must come from the eastern part of the Zilja dialect in view of the apocope of the ending. In Kanalska dolina one finds nom.pl. *tró:cę* and the *a*-stem loc.sg. *na ró:cę*, *u mó:cę* 'flour', but *na nó:ję* < **nogě*.

Podjuna and Obirsko have the *o*-stem and *a*-stem loc.sg. endings *-i*, which cannot be the regular reflex of **-ě* in view of Podjuna *iũtre* 'tomorrow' < **jutrě* and Obirsko *təmlɛ* < **tam-lě* and must thus reflect **-i*. In the Zilja dialect, both endings

³ Ramovš (1935: 16) cites Rož *róceę* (< **-ě*).

are $-e < *-\check{e}$ (pace Ramovš 1952: 57). Rož has o -stem loc.sg. $-e$, but a -stem loc.sg. $-i$. In the whole of Carinthia, the o -stems have an alternative loc.sg. ending $*-u$, which is, however, never found after the palatalised velars.

The Littoral

For the Resia dialect, Steenwijk (1992: 67f. and 237ff.) adduces the following examples: nom.pl. *utrucǎ*, from which the palatalisation spread to dat.pl. *utrúcęn*, ins.pl. *utrúci*, o -stem loc.sg. *mlíce* (also *mlíku*), *kúlce* ‘hill’, *patóce* (also *patóku*), (*j*)*azíce*, *sridnice* ‘outside toilet’, *jármare* ‘fair’ (cf. Podjuna *ǰǫrmaci*), *tribúse*, *worsé* ‘top’, the toponym *Kalvársę* and one example of palatalisation in the adjective *drúzaga*. He also gives the imperatives *ricí* (also *ričǎ*) and *tacǎ* ‘go!’, but 2pl. *zawǎršte* ‘throw away!’. Ramovš gives a few more forms: nom.pl. *ǫrásy* (Steenwijk *woréjavi*), o -stem loc.sg. *tárze*, loc.pl. *terzih*, the toponyms *Bláccę* ‘Villach’ and *Pǫlǫzǎ* and the imperative *specę* (Steenwijk only *spičǎ*).

In the Ter, Nadiža and Soča dialects, the palatalisation is preserved mainly in the nominal forms: Ter has o -stem loc.sg. Podbela *tu tré:bus*, *tu bí:rtos*, *na brì:tosi* ‘cemetery’ (cf. Bovec *brì:toh*), Borjana *na pató:c*, a -stem *na ró:c*.⁴ The lost ending is probably $*-i$ in view of *zú:ne*, *dá:be*, *dré:be* $< *-\check{e}$.

The Nadiža dialect is equally archaic: Osgnetto nom.pl. *o'troc* (also in Livek), loc.pl. *otruócęx*, the m.nom.pl. adjectival form *dúz* ‘long’, o -stem loc.sg. *potó:ce* (but cf. the Livek hydronym *Pató:ke*, Šekli 2008: 165), San Pietro al Natisone *trebú:se*, and in the toponym loc.pl. *Palù:ozęx* (also *Palù:ogax*, idem: 107).

The Soča dialect of Bovec has an o -stem loc.sg. *trębù:sę*, but *mlięke* ($< *-\check{i}$, cf. *dà:be*), also in the a -stem loc.pl. *ró:cęhrüocęh*, *nó:zęh*, which are probably analogical after the unattested loc.sg.⁵ Similar forms are found in Robič, Kred: *n^o:zǎh*, *r^o:cǎh*, where we also find a toponym *Potüoc* ‘Potoki’.

Further south, the number of archaisms rapidly declines. In Kojsko, for example, only the o -stem nominative plural *utró:c* (*utró:k*) has a palatalised consonant, but in the locative singular, I find no traces of them: *na á:rk*, *na nó:γ*, *u trí:ępx*. Towards Istria, the reflexes of the second palatalisation in the locative singular have been replaced (or obscured) by the new, Inner Carniolan palatalisation of velars, which we find in, for example, Prešnica *na m'li:et'ę*, *'ru:ot'e*, Dekani *kli'bu:će*, *wa'ri:ęsé*, Podgorje *u t'ri:ępsię* (but Prešnica *u t'ri:ępx'í*), Hrušica *ro'cie*, *t're:ipši*. The older palatalisation is, however, preserved in the adjective in Komen *vǎ'li:zγa*.

⁴These forms come from Logar 1951 (= 1996: 137–147), where Logar refers to these villages as belonging to the Nadiža dialect, an opinion he apparently changed when composing the dialect map of 1983, where the villages belong to Ter.

⁵These forms come from Ivančič Kutin 2007; *trębù:sę* is marked as an accusative rather than as a loc., *dà:be* is probably a mistake for **dà:be*, which is actually mentioned in the same lemma as *dá:be*, the distribution between *ró:cęh* and *rüocęh* is not explained by the author.

In Inner Carniola itself, we find palatalisation in the nom.pl. Vrbovo *otruôci*, loc.pl. *pər otruôciχ*, Dolnje Vreme *vətruôci*, loc.pl. *pər vətruôciχ*, also secondary ins.pl. *z vətŕûci*, but Vrbovo *z otrûti* < *-ki (Rigler 1963: 174). The palatalisation is also preserved in the adjectival declension, »vendar redkeje kot v dolensčini« (Rigler 1963: 174), of which Rigler gives examples of the gen.sg.: Dolnje Vreme *drÿzγα, ūsâzγα, velîzγα, dôuzγα*. All these adjectives have alternative gen.sg. forms with the later palatalisation: *drÿiιγα, ūsâd'γα, velîzγα, dôuiιγα*. Finally, the imperative forms with the second Proto-Slavic palatalisation are abundant: Prem *rêci, têci*, Harije *tûci*, Kilovče *vərzj, ostrîz*, Vrbovo *dosîezi*, Pavlica *neprîezi, ūlîezi*, Dolnje Vreme *vəblêc*, marginally also Sušak *pomuôzi* (elsewhere *pomâyei*). Except for *rêci*, all forms also occur in one or more areas with a secondary č or ž.

Rovte

In the Rovte dialects the palatalisation is preserved relatively well (pace Ramovš 1935: 83), also in the loc.sg. Črni Vrh (cf. Tominec 1964: 24) has nom.pl. *ətrôc*, loc.pl. *ətrûaciχ*, analogically also ins.pl. *ətrûác*. The /ć/ in these forms arose through loss of *i after *c. Further one finds palatalised *o*-stem loc.sg. *ktəbûc, mlîác, u blâs* (*blago*), *pətûác*, perhaps also *pə təbâc*, with unclear meaning (tobacco?), and the palatalised *a*-stem loc.sg. *u rôc*, but also *rôik* and only *nə nôič*. The palatalisation is also attested in the toponym *nə mlâc* to *mlâka*.

The distribution of the locative endings in Črni Vrh requires some discussion. A final unstressed *-u* was deleted: *χmâl* < *kmalu*, *stârm* < *staremu*. This *-u* was deleted at a time when masculine *o*-stems of the type *kôjîn* (a.p. b) still had end stress in the dat.sg. (**koñu* > *kôjînu*), and the type *zît* (a.p. c) had end stress in the gen.sg. (**zidû* > *zêdu*), but apparently not in the dat.sg. (**zidu* > *zît*) (a similar explanation was already given by Rigler 1966: 106). The latter type has a dat.sg. zero ending without palatalisation of the stem-final consonant (*zît*), whereas the loc.sg. zero ending is characterized by palatalisation of the stem-final consonant (*zît'*) (see Tominec 1964: 29). Originally barytone paradigms of the type *brăt* (a.p. a) lost their final, unstressed *-u* in both dat. and loc.sg (both *brăt*). We find the same distributions with the neuter datives: nom.acc.dat. *lîet* (a.p. a), but nom.acc.sg. *mêsu*, dat.sg. *mîas* (a.p. c), whereas in both types the loc.sg. is palatalised *lîet', mîás*.⁶

The deleted loc.sg. ending which caused palatalisation in *mîás, lîat'* and *zît'* was either *-ě or *-i. There is no evidence that a final *jat'* would have been preserved, cf. *nətâr, drêj, jûtəq* < *-ě/-i. Final *-i* was also regularly lost: nom.pl. *ətrôc*, ins.pl. *ətrûác* < *-i. In Črni Vrh, the loc.sg. ending of masculine and neuter (*i*)*o*-stems was thus *-u for nouns with fixed root stress, and *-ě or *-i elsewhere. The old

⁶ The sometimes inconsistent notation of palatalisation throughout Tominec's work calls for prudence (cf. Rigler 1966: 99f. = 2001: 203f.), but the difference between a.p. a masculine and neuter locative endings appears to be real, cf. masc. *brăt, štânt, lûft, bəčk* vs. neut. *lîat', kullən', dîəl* (not ***dîət*).

palatalisation of velars in the loc.sg. has nothing to do with the palatalisation that the deleted ending caused in, for example, *mîás* and *zît'*, cf. loc.sg. *kl̥bûc*, but nom.pl. *kl̥bûjk'*. Word-final *-c* < **-ci/ě* in the locatives cannot be due to the new Slovene dialectal palatalisation that we find in, for example, Inner-Carniola. This is shown by *kîsu* < **kyselb*, which should have become **cîsu* if the dialect underwent the new Slovene dialectal palatalisation.

There are a large number of adjectival forms that preserve traces of the second palatalisation in Črni Vrh: *usâc̣γα*, *γr̥ĕĩńc̣γα* (*grenek*), *tĕĩńc̣γα*, *w̥s̥ōc̣γα*, *γl̥b̥ōc̣γα*, *γl̥ūẓγα*, *d̥ōūẓγα*, *dr̥ūẓγα*, *dr̥āẓγα*, *s̥ūẓγα*, *t̥īẓγα* (for *t̥īz'γα*), *t̥āciχ*, *dr̥āziχ*, *d̥ōūziχ*. The only type of palatalisation that is not attested in Črni Vrh is that in the imperative, e.g. *r̥ĕč*, *w̥āřš*, which is found further east in Horjul *tĕc* < **tecì* (for which Ramovš also adduces adjectival *gr̥ĕĩnẓγα*, next to *gr̥ĕĩnkiγα*).

Further north, in Žirovska kotlina, we find nom.pl. *atrá:c*, *o*-stem loc.sg. *na 'patu:oc* (a house name), *a*-stem loc.sg. *γruò:c* (*v roki*), and the adjectival forms *'suzγα*, *d'ruzγα* and *tá:zγα*.⁷

Upper Carniolan

In Upper Carniola the palatal alternation is »skoraj dosledno izravnan« (Ramovš 1924: 289), and partially replaced by the later dialectal Slovene palatalisation (cf. Ramovš 1935: 118f.). The dialectal material I could find that presents remains of the palatalisation is scanty: Kropa loc.pl. *μotr̥ó:c̣ax*, but *tá:ḳax*, adjectival *dRù:zga*. Adjectives with palatalisation are also found in Srednja Vas v Bohinju: *ta usò:žga*, *ta 't̥ənžga*, *ta ubó:žga*, as well as in other parts of north-western Upper Carniolan, e.g. Ramovš (1935: 117) *tadžgã*. In view of the fact that these forms display **č* instead of **c*, they are, however, more likely be due to the later Slovene dialectal palatalisation of *k* to *č*, which took place in these dialects. For Upper Carniola, Greenberg (2000: 73) further adduces the toponyms *μ Pot̥óc*, *pod Vr̥smí* and *Lesc̣è* < **lĕṣkĕ*.

Lower Carniolan

In Lower Carniola the palatalisation is abundant in adjectives, as is mentioned above (Rigler 1963: 174): Ribnica *dr̥ūzga*, *b̥ūōzga*, *t̥ácga*, *d̥óuzga*, *velíçga*, *us̥âçga*, *n̥āzga*, *n̥āçga*, further gen.loc.pl. *dr̥ūẓax* (also *dr̥ūg̣ax*), *n̥āẓax* (also *n̥āg̣ax*, *nag̣ãx*), doublets are also found in the ins.pl., loc.sg., dat.sg. (e.g. *dr̥ūzm̥*, *dr̥ūgm̥*), and to a lesser extend in the ins.sg. and dat.pl. (Rigler 1986: 360). The palatalisation is also found in the nom.pl. *otr̥óc̣ə*, *vouç̣iĕ* < **v̥lci* and in the imperatives *rec̣ə*, *tec̣ə*, *pec̣ə*, *v̥əẓə*, but not in the loc.sg., e.g. Nadanje Selo *na pr̥āγi*.

⁷ The second is my emendation for *d'ruz:γα*. The marking of vowel-length and the place of the accent in Stanonik 1977 look suspicious, but these should not affect the palatalisation.

Styrian

In Styria, I can find no evidence for palatalisation outside the nom.pl. **otroci*: Zadrečka dolina *ut'ruo:ce*, but loc.sg. *kə'rā:kə* (< *-u), 'tā:kex, Hoče *otruoci*, but *takiga*, *valkih*, Fram *ot'ru:oci*, but loc.sg. *f s'neigi*, toponym *f Ko'pi:yniki*, adjectival *d'ru:ugiga*, 'sa:kiga, imp. 'ri:eči, cf. also Oplotnica loc. *na 'rə:kī*, adj. 'ko:kīga.

Pannonian

As in Styrian, the palatalisation is restricted to the nom.pl.: Slovenske gorice *f'ru:oci*, Haloze *ot'ru:oci*, but 'päči, 'rāči, Kremberk *ot'ru:oci* (also *ot'ru:oki*), but *d'rüigiga*, 'pi:eči. Ramovš adduces Prekmurje *vucki*, *vrazgi* (with secondary *k*, *g* < **j*) with palatalisation (the word for 'child' is the archaic **děte* here, instead of **otrok*). The *o*-stem loc.sg. is not palatalised, e.g., Polana *f pot'oki*.

Conclusions

The palatalisation in the nom.pl. of the *o*-stems is common Slovene, although it is often only preserved in *otroci* 'children'. The palatalisation in the loc.pl. of the *o*-stems is preserved at least in Carinthian, Littoral, Rovte and Upper Carniolan. In some dialects, the palatalised variant of the root spread to some of the other plural forms of the word for 'child'.

The palatalisation in adjectives is limited to the central dialects of Upper, Lower and Inner Carniola, Rovte and Kras.

The palatalisation in the imperative is limited to Eastern Carinthian, Littoral and Lower (and perhaps Upper) Carniolan. In the other dialect areas, it was replaced by the affricate from the present tense.

The palatalisation before the loc.sg. endings is found in the northern and western dialects. Carinthian, (northern) Littoral and Rovte all preserve palatal consonants in both the *o*- and the *a*-stems. The palatalisation in the locative of *o*-stems has only been retained before the ending *-i* or *-e*, whereas introduction of the *u*-stem (or *o*-stem dative) ending *-u* usually went together with replacement of the palatal consonant.

With regard to the loc.sg. endings of the *o*-stems, the ending *-i*, which was originally the *io*-stem loc.sg. ending, is probably more widespread than is traditionally assumed. The ending *-i* occurs in Trubar's work and in the Podjuna, Kras, Inner Carniola and Pannonian dialects, as discussed by Ramovš (1952: 41), but also in Styrian (cf. Zorko 1998: 119, 130, 143, Povše 1988: 253),⁸ where *-i* cannot be from **-ě*, cf. Hoče *guore*, Fram, Oplotnica 'na:tre, and it is found in the Obir, Ter and Soča dialects, as observed above.

With regard to the retention of palatalisation, the areas in which the five types of morphophonemic palatalisation occur do not overlap. They are, however, found in

⁸Not from the *i*-stems, as Zorko (1998) suggests.

more or less continuous areas. This may partly be due to chance, but it is likely that the levelling which ousted the palatalisation was often a shared innovation of more than one dialect area. The loss of palatalisation in all but one category in Styrian and Pannonian, for instance, may well be due to a common development of those two dialect groups.

The etymology of *špik*

In the light of the second palatalisation in Slovene morphophonology, the etymology of the word *špik*, gen. *špika*, which Pleteršnik translates as 'Gebirgsspitze', should be reconsidered. Bezljaj et al. 2005, s.v., give a number of possible etymologies, the best of which seems to be the connection with the verb *pikati*, *špikati* 'to stab, prick', where the latter variant is assumed to be a secondary derivation of the former of the type *škropíti* next to *kropíti* (idem, s.v. *špikati* I). In my opinion, the initial sibilant could very well be due to influence from *špica* 'sharp point'. Similarly, in Czech the word *špice* 'sharp point, top of a mountain' may have influenced *špikovati* 'to pierce' (instead of the expected **pikovati*). This means that, if *špik* is a derivative of *špikati*, it must have been derived after the latter obtained its initial *š*-. The semantic derivation would presumably be something like 'to prick' > 'sharp point' > 'mountain top'. The second step is also observed in German *Spitze* < *spitz* 'with a sharp point'. However, the intermediate stage 'sharp point' is as far as I can see unattested in Slovene.⁹ I will propose an alternative etymology, which will account much better for the specific meaning of the word.

The aforementioned German *Spitze* has a general meaning 'sharp end, point', but is also used specifically to designate the top of a mountain and is therefore often found in mountain names ending in *-spitz* or *-spitze* (in Austria, e.g., *Säbelspitz*, *Granatspitz* etc.), or beginning with it (e.g., *Spitzegel*). Slovene *špik* is similarly mostly found in toponyms, but also on its own meaning 'top of a mountain'. The latter is attested in Zilja Carinthian *špə̀k* 'top (of a mountain); tow (of flax)', loc.sg. *špîku*, nom.pl. *špîci*. Further proof of the etymon I found consists of toponyms. There is the well-known mountain *Špik*, south of Kranjska Gora, the top of which is relatively sharp. Further, the word is found in the Livek (Nadiža) field name *Za špî:kam* (cf. the parallel *Za vər'xam*), also as the name of an elevation *Š'pik*, loc. *na Špî:ke* (Šekli 2008). Similarly, a coniform mountain near Črni Vrh (Rovte) is called *Špě̀k*, gen. *Špîka* (Tominec 1964: 215). Although I could not find other dialect or toponymic evidence of the word, there must be many other (dialect) toponyms derived from *špik*.

In view of the meaning of *špik* and its frequent use in toponyms, I propose to regard it as a borrowing from German *Spitze*. Because the word signified a place, the

⁹In the Zilja dialect, the word means both 'top (of a mountain)' and 'tow (of flax)'. The latter meaning may reflect the more general 'sharp point', if referring to the fibres, but cf. English *top of flax* (with *top* 'tuft, crest' < 'summit, uppermost point').

form *špice was interpreted as a locative. The root *špic- was reinterpreted as the palatalised variant of *špik-. As a result, a new nominative špik was built. The word was interpreted as belonging a.p. a (Pleteršnik špik, Zilja špǎk) like other borrowed *o*-stems with a root vowel *-i-* or *-u-*. The *-k-* was later introduced analogically in the locative in Zilja špiku (together with the ending *-u* and the circumflex tone) and Livek na špi:ke. It is interesting to note that the word is found in northern and western dialects, in those dialects where the palatalisation in the locative is preserved up to the present day¹⁰, and where the locative ending **-ě* is (and in the case of Črni Vrh may be) retained. German *Spitze* (OHG *spizza*) was also borrowed independently in the form špica ‘sharp point’, which reflects the more general meaning of *Spitze* and is attested as early as the 16th century (Bezljaj et al. 2005, s.v. špica II). *Spitze* is probably also reflected in the words špice ‘lace’ and in špic or špicelj ‘Pomeranian (dog)’.

References

- BEZLAJ, France, SNOJ, Marko, FURLAN, Metka, 2005: *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika š-ž*, Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU.
- GRAFENAUER, Ivan, 1905: Zum Accente im Gailthalerdialekte. *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 27. 195-228.
- GREENBERG, Marc, 2000: *A historical Phonology of the Slovene Language*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- ISAČENKO, Aleksandr V., 1939: *Narečje vasi Sele na Rožu*. Ljubljana: Učiteljska tiskarna.
- IVANČIČ KUTIN, Barbara, 2007: *Slovar bovškega govora*. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU.
- IVIĆ, Pavle (ed.), 1981: *Fonološki opisi srpskohrvatskih/hrvatskosrpskih, slovenačkih i makedonskih govora obuhvaćenih opšteslovenskim lingvističkim atlasom*. Sarajevo: Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine.
- KARNIČAR, Ludwig, 1990: *Der Obir-Dialekt in Kärnten. Die Mundart von Ebriach/Obirsko*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- LOGAR, Tine, 1996: *Dialektološke in jezikozgodovinske razprave*. Ed. K. Kenda-Jež. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU.
- LOGAR, Tine, RIGLER, Jakob, 1983: *Karta slovenskih narečij*, Ljubljana: Geodetski zavod SRS, Dopolna delavska univerza Univerzum.
- POVŠE, Ivana, 1988: Oblikoslovje v govoru Šmarja pri Jelšah. *Slavistična Revija* 36/3. 251–266.
- PLETERŠNIK, Maks, 1894–1895: *Slovensko-nemški slovar*. Ljubljana: Knezoškofijstvo.
- PRONK, Tijmen, 2009: *The Slovene dialect of Egg and Patschach in the Zilja, Austria*. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.
- RAMOVŠ, Fran, 1924: *Historična gramatika slovenskega jezika 2. Konzonantizem*. Ljubljana: Učiteljska tiskarna.

¹⁰I have no material from Kranjska Gora, but in view of the proximity of both Carinthian and Littoral dialects, it is likely that the dialect did retain the palatalisation up to relatively recently, or even that it still has it.

- RAMOVŠ, Fran, 1935: *Historična gramatika slovenskega jezika 7. Dialekti*. Ljubljana: Učiteljska tiskarna.
- RAMOVŠ, Fran, 1952: *Morfologija slovenskega jezika*. Ljubljana: Društvena založba Slovenije.
- RIGLER, Jakob, 1963: *Južnotranjski govori. Akcent in glasoslovje govorov med Snežnikom in Slavnikom*. Ljubljana: SAZU.
- RIGLER, Jakob, 2001: *Zbrani spisi 1. Jezikovnozgodovinske in dialektološke razprave*. Ed. V. Smole. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU.
- STANONIK, Marija, 1977: Govor žirovske kotline in njenega obrobja. *Slavistična revija* 25/2–3. 293–309.
- STEENWIJK, Han, 1992: *The Slovene dialect of Resia: San Giorgio*. Amsterdam, Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.
- ŠEKLI, Matej, 2008: *Zemljepisna in osebna lastna imena v kraju Livek in njegovi okolici*. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU.
- TOMINEC, Ivan, 1964: *Črnovrški dialekt. Kratka monografija in slovar*. Ljubljana: SAZU.
- ZDOVC, Paul, 1972: *Die Mundart des südöstlichen Jauntales in Kärnten. Lautlehre und Akzent der Mundart der »Poljanci«*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- ZORKO, Zinka, 1998: *Haloško narečje in druge dialektološke študije*. Maribor: Slavistično društvo.