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Multiple Causation in the Spread and Reversal of a Sound Change: Rhotacism in South Slavic

Prispevek obravnava spremembo ẑ > r ("rhotacizem") v južnoslovanskih jezikih. Zaradi zapletene razvrstitve spremembe tako po jezikovni geografiji kot po besednih vrstah se zdi, da se je ne da razložiti z enim samim vzrokom. Ugotovlja se namreč, da je sprememba nastala zaradi vrste glasovnih in analognih vzrokov; umikanje inovacije proti zahodu pa so očitno povzročili sociolinguistični dejavniki.

The paper treats the change ẑ > r ("rhotacism") in the South Slavic languages. Its complex distribution both in its linguo-geographical dimension and parts of speech suggests that its development cannot be explained in terms of a single cause. It is found that a combination of phonological and analogical factors must account for the initial change and its spread; sociolinguistic factors apparently account for its retreat towards the west.

0 Introduction

0.1 In Ivič's map phonological isoglosses in the W-SSI dial area (= the dials corresponding to the Sn, Cr, Bs and Srbs standard languages), the isogloss of the form može > more 'can' (3rd pers sg) stands as a representative of the change ẑ > r (Ivič 1958: 31). The isogloss, which roughly bisects the area mentioned, seems clear cut, though, in fact, the change is much better represented in the W part of this territory than the E part. Nor is it clear whether the change is a phonetic or a morphological one. The complications with regard to this sound change are many and there is no consensus on the details of its development. To illustrate, the change occurs regularly in the form mentioned, but does not occur as might be expected in, for example, oženiti se 'to wed'. It occurs also in forms in which the phonetic motivation is either absent or isolated, for example, morati : mora 'must' (inf : 3rd pers sg). From the point of view of linguistic geography, the forms in which the change has occurred become sparser to the east as one approaches the može > more isogloss, yet forms such as morati extend beyond the isogloss. Within a given dial there may be variation, for example, both može and more are attested in the dials of NW-Bs (Vujčić et al. 1979: 146) and in E-Slavonian localities that are transitional to the Šumadija-Vojvodina dialect (Ivič 1990: 87–89, 93). The change and the peculiarities of its distribution have been explained by some scholars as a result of phonetic change and by others through morphological analogy. In this paper it will be shown that neither of this forces can be discounted in accounting for the results of this change – not only are both explanations essentially correct (though with some amendment) – but they both must have worked together to give rise to the particular pattern of change in part of the areal (Sn, Cr). It will also be suggested that the reversal of this change in part of the areal (Srbs, Mac, Bg) can be accounted for by
considering sociolinguistic factors. In the continuation, the results of the change will be referred to as “r-forms,” in order to avoid prejudging the motivations for the change.¹

0.2 The distribution of the change is restricted to a small number of lexical items and categories, as sketched here:²

0.2.1 The present tense of the verb moči ‘to be able’: morem, moreš, more, as well as prefixed forms pomoči : pomore ‘to help’, premoči : premore ‘to overcome’; the form morda ‘perhaps’ (< *moze do). The area of the this change includes Sn, Ča, Kaj as well as Što Ikavian, most of Ijekavian and W-Ekavian, including the environs of Novi Pazar.

0.2.1 In Sn and Cr/Br/Srb in the verb morati : moram, moraš, mora ‘to be obligated, must’, apparently a derivative of moči.

0.2.3 Complementizers and adverbs built with the enclitic particle -ie, e.g., Sn kakor (< *kako-ž(e)) ‘as’, kdor (< *kado-ž(e)) ‘who, whoever’; vendar (< *vem-da-ž(e)) ‘however’; it appears in Što in the form jer ‘because’.

0.2.4 Time expressions in some Sn dialects, e.g., nocor ‘tonight’ (Istria), nicor ‘idem’ (Styria).

0.2.5 The adv. bore ‘pitifully, poorly’, presumably built from the vocative of bog ‘God’, cf. boremi ‘my God!’; the adj. derived from this, boren ‘poor’. This is found in Sn and Cr dialects.

0.2.6 The present tense of the verb gnati ‘to drive (cattle.’ The present tense form renem is found in Inner Carniola, as well as a new infinitive built on this stem reniti (attested in Inner Carniola, Kras and Upper Carniola); the prefixed forms odren, prerene, proren, prorenio are attested in the late 16th c. from Upper Carniola. A blend of gnati and renem is found in the forms γreni : γrenem (Kras) (Ramovš 1924: 295, Bezlaj 1977: 175). NW-Bs dialects have izrenuti, n2 more (Vujeičić et al. 1979: 52, 97). Skok finds that the Romanian form “porni nije od porinerti nego je pognati = pornati (14. v.), kako se vidi iz porni oile ‘tjerati ovce’, Mihai porni cete spre a lua in goan pe dușman ‘Mihalj je poslao Eete da u potjeri zauzmu neprijatelja’. Odatle porneal2 (Skok I: 575).

0.3 The majority opinion is that the source of the change is phonetic. Ramovš explains the change in articulatory terms: “prehod ž > r (znan tudi shr. v bolg.) doživi le intervokalični ž, če mu sledi vokal e, ki je tvoren s pridvignjenim delom jezikove ploskve proti sprednjemu trdemu nebu…” (1924: 294; Vondrak 1924: 459–460). Following this formulation, Bezlaj assumes that the form renem (Inner Carniola) arose under the conditions stated: “do rhotacizma je prišlo v sintagmah tipa krave žene” (1977: 175). Similarly, Cvetko Orešnik finds that “der Rhotacizmus geraale bei tere begann”, the form attested in the FF and simultaneously the earliest attestation of the phenomenon (1987–88: 439). It is generally assumed that the change resulted in the alternation ž/r, and that this r spread in word formation (see

¹ I am grateful to Andrew Corin (UCLA), Bill Darden (University of Chicago), Marko Snoj, Metka Furlan (Inštitut za slovenski jezik, ZRC SAZU), and an anonymous reviewer for helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

² A thorough review of the evidence is found in Cvetko Orešnik 1987–8. I therefore limit my statement of the facts to the minimum necessary for the purposes of the present paper.
Cvetko Orešnik 1987–88: *passim*. A further condition, that the segment appear in an unstressed syllable, has also been claimed (Cvetko Orešnik 1987–88: 434).

0.3.2 A fundamentally different scenario is presented by Ivančev, who claims that rhotacism was not a phonological change at all, but was caused by analogical spread from the relative adjective *kateri*. In the summary of his article he says: “Imajući u vidu da je domen pojave u leksičkom pogledu krajnje ograničen, možemo smatrati da su reči s *r* iz *ž* u slovenačkom i srpskohrvatskom jeziku slučajevi leksičke grade pri kojoj zamena *ž* sa *r* ne bi mogla da se obrazloži delovanjem nekog fonetskog procesa kako se to obično tumači. Pretpostavlja se da je u uslovima semantičko-funkcionalne jednakosti leksičke grade, -*že/-ž u većini odnosnih reči, po uticajem analogije zamijenjen sa -*re/-r*. To je prvenstveno bilo u rečima *kateri*, eventualno *kater*-,-*a*,-*o*” (1981). This view assumes the metanalysis of *kater-* into pronominal (*kate-* and relativizing (*-r*) morphemes. The new relativizing suffix then spread and overtook relativizing constructions in -*že* (e.g., *iže*). While such a development is a possible explanation for forms of the conjunctions and complementizers of the type *kar*, *kdoor*, Ivančev’s theory fails to provide a plausible mechanism for virtually all of the remaining types. Nor does it deal with the difficulties of motivating the spread even in the category he addsuces. This theory is stretched the furthest in attempting to explain forms such as *bori*, *boren*, *more*, *žen*- as due to the same mechanism (ibid.: 25); in these cases there is no model for analogy. The author concedes: “makar će nešta tuk ne sa osobeno jasni” (loc. cit.). It is obvious that Ivančev’s theory cannot be accepted as stated. However, with some qualifications, we shall demonstrate that there is a place for part of this analogical explanation in the fuller picture of the rhotacism phenomenon.

1 Phonological factors

1.1 As we have seen above, the question of whether the *r*-forms can be considered a result phonological or morphological change in SSI is fraught with ambiguity. Since the descriptive facts do not point to a definitive answer, it is reasonable to ask whether the possibility of phonetic change is systemically motivated. Andersen, noting the parallel between the change *r’ > r* in WSI and the W-SSI *ž > r* change, views each of these as natural changes in consonantal and vocalic languages, respectively. With respect to the *ž > r* change, “since both stridency and voicing shift the acoustic structure of a consonant towards that of a vowel, it is easy to understand how learners of a language might evaluate voiced, strident, continuous obstruents as realizations of liquids” (1978: 6). Thus the parallelism arises when the marked value of the feature + vocalic is replaced by the unmarked value, as in Table 1.
This simplification is a specific example of the general tendency by which, according to Isačenko, "[v]okalische Sprachen weisen die Tendenz auf, Konsonanten zu vokaliseren" and "die konsonantischen Sprachen entwickeln nicht nur keine sonantischen Konsonanten, sondern sie unterdrücken sogar die natürliche Sonorität der Konsonanten" (1939–40: 72, 73). Thus the change parallels other changes that have increased the number of vocalic contrasts in Sn and Cr/Bsl/Srb (connection with intensive contact with Romance dialects) in contradistinction to the reduction of such contrasts in N-S1. This explains why the change is not found in WSI, although it probably occurred at a time when the connection between WSI and SSI had not yet been completely interrupted. For these reasons it seems plausible to assume that the change has a phonetic component.

1.2 To the extent that the change is phonetic, the chronology of -VZe- > -Vre- must be later than the first palatalization of velars (6th c) and perhaps earlier than the merger of the result of this change with the reflex of *z' from deiotation (8th c), since the latter remain unaffected. The change must have also preceded the writing of the FF, where the change is first attested. The FF attest to a stage in which fluctuation between i- and r-forms could still occur, e.g., tere ‘also’ (2x), ise ‘which’, rnosern ‘I can’ (2x), tornuge ‘to this very’ tige (= [tiie]) ‘these same’.

1.2.1 It is not clear whether stress played a role in the change, as we find Sn dialect vre ‘already’ (cf. StSn ike), which contradicts the notion that stresslessness in the syllable is a precondition of the change. It may be, however, that in this instance the r-form was an extension from other temporal expressions (see 2.3).

2 Morphological factors

2.1 Verbs

2.1.1 In the case of gnati : rene, the source of the change is ambiguous, since there is the possibility of contamination with the verb *rinoti ‘to push’. However, unless the r-forms of -zenet(ts) were already in place, there would not have been a formal match to pave the way for analogy. Alternatively, one might argue that the \( \tilde{z}/r \) alternation existed elsewhere in the lexicon and so the possibility of its extension to any morpheme containing \( \tilde{z} \) was opened. However, since the number of lexical items in which the alternation participated is so restricted, this scenario seems unlikely. Therefore it seems more likely that the identification with *rinoti arose after the phonetic change had taken place in compounds of the type dorene. This led to an alternation between the simplex \( \tilde{z}ene \) and the compound dorene. From this alternation, the distribution could have given rise to three logical outcomes: (1) the alt-
ernation could have remained; (2) \( \varepsilon n e \) could have been generalized, effectively reversing the change; or (3) \( \varepsilon o r e n e \) could have been generalized. In the western areas (Kras, Inner Carniola, Ča, parts of Što), outcome (3) occurred, where the simplex morpheme was replaced by analogy to \( r e n e \). This regularization may be reinforced by identification with \*\( r h o n t i \). Elsewhere outcome (2) occurred.

2.1.2 The verb \( m o \varepsilon e l m o r e \) lacks an alternation between \( \varepsilon \) and \( r \) in the present tense and therefore the possibility of the change being reversed due to leveling can be ruled out. In contrast to \( -g n a t i - \varepsilon n e \), the environment in question is non-alternating and this may in part account for the fact that the change is found over a much wider area for more than \( -r e n e \).

2.1.3 If we contrast the outcome in each of these verbs we find that the greater areal of \( m o r e \) in contrast to \( -r e n e \) is in accord with the principle that “change develops earlier in uniform environments because they represent the context for change more consistently than alternating environments” (Timberlake 1978: 326; see also 1981). See Table 2.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>uniform</th>
<th>alternating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( m o r e n e , -e )...</td>
<td>( \varepsilon n e n e , -e )...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( d o r e n e , -e )...</td>
<td>( \varepsilon n e n i t i \ se ; \ *o r e n i t i \ se )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.4 The verb \( m o r a t i \) occurs over an even greater area, including those areas of Što that have \( m o \varepsilon \). The reason for this appears to be that the verb was derived directly from \( m o r e \) and then imported from the W dialects E-wards. The formal model for the derivation is unclear, though its semantic motivation is apparently due to language contact, cf. OHG \( m u o z a n \) ‘can/must’ > MoG \( m ü s s e n \) ‘must’ (see further Musić 1923; Ramovš 1924: 294; Grubor 1925–26; Snoj 1997: 354). This active construction replaced nominal constructions of the type R \( j a d o l \varepsilon n \) ‘I must’ in a parallel fashion to Cz \( m u s i m \), a direct borrowing and adaptation of G \( m ü s s e n \). Lexical innovation seems to be an additional factor in the retention of the change (see 3.4.2, 4.1).

2.2 Pronouns and conjunctions

2.2.1 The possibility of analogy proceeding from the relative pronoun, proposed by Ivančev, cannot be ruled out. However, the analogy is hardly as straightforward as Ivančev suggests and a number of things need to be explained before such a proposal can be considered. The first major difficulty is that the forms as they appear today – Sn \( k d o k d o , k a t e r i \); Cr \( t k o , k o j i \); Srb \( k o , k o j i \) – do not match and as such cannot have given rise to analogy. This raises the question of the shape of the forms in question at a time early enough to have preceded the change \( \varepsilon > r \). The comparative evidence suggests fairly unambiguously that the CSI input must be \*\( k t o \) (< IE \*\( k t o - s + t o d \)): R \( k t o \), Uk, Br \( x t o \), Po \( c t o \), Cz \( k d o \) (OCz \( k t o \)), Srb \( k o \),
Bg, Mac ko, US što, LS čto. Although it is tempting to connect Cz kdo, Sn kdó and assume these to be a common innovation, the Sn dialect evidence suggests that the -d- arose in independently in both territories, e.g., Rož htú, Zilja tů, Prekmurje štō. In C-Sn the -d- from the temporal and spatial interrogatives (*kt(b)jkdaj, kde(kje) is thought to have spread to *k(b)jo (Bezlaj 1977: 27). This innovation cannot have preceded the change of ż > r as we see in the form níchče 'no one' (< *ni-kštő-že, cf. Po nikt 'idem'), a form common to both Sn and Kaj.

2.2.2 With regard to the relative adjective, the situation is complicated at the CSI level as well as in Sn and Kaj (the form apparently disappeared in Medieval Srb). The SI languages point to a number of CSI variants: *koterš (OCS koter-yi, Sk koter-yi), *kotorš (R kotoryj), *koterš (Cz který), *kotorš (Po kóry); *katerš (StSn kateri). Of these, only the first can be connected directly with the IE material, Gr poτerος, Li katrās, katarās (Vilnius), Skt katarāh. The StSn form is the most narrowly localized of these variants and may have its origins either in akanye or the influence of the pronoun kák 'what kind', cf. kateri (Trubar, 16th c), kateri, ketiri (Dalmatian, Megiser 16th c), katir (Pohlin, 18th c), kateri (Gutsmann, 18th c) (Bezlaj 1977: 23). The form *koterš survived as a relic in the compound neikoteri 'certain ones' alongside nekateri in the language of Trubar, though as a pronominal adjective the form kateri is used exclusively (Ramovš 1920: 274–275, 1952: 97; Rigler 1968: 185; Hamps 1980: 98) and is known also in Ča and Kaj koteri (Belostenec, Habdelić, Voltiglii, Stulli, Budinić, 16–18th cc) (Skok: 1977: 113). The forms UC kér, kérga (nom, gen sg), Pkm šěr, Kaj šēr (Bednja) indicate a starting point in *kšěrš, which may have arisen under the influence of *kšto. Of the three forms that are common to Sn and Cr/Bs/Srb, the one that gained widespread productivity by the 9th c appears to be *kšěrš. If Ivančev's proposal is to be accepted, then the starting point for the spread of -r from the relative adjective originates in the analogy that must have developed from the juxtaposition of (the now archaic forms) *kštőš.
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2.3 Time expressions

2.3.1 One may be tempted to assign to the Sn dialect form nocôr 'tonight' (De-
kani pri Kopru níčiar, Škofje níčiar, Vodnik (Sty, 19th c) nizor (Šivic-Dular 1982: 415)), the same type of formation that arose in other temporal adverbs, such as Sn dànás, Cr/Bs/Srb dànás 'today' (< *dônîhr ≤ *dônî + sn), Sn nocôj,8 in which the elements *-sb, *-jb added a temporal deictic function to the base form. On this view the r-element is regarded as an enrichment to the list of deictic particles used to build temporal adverbs. Such a proposal would not be without merit in light of the semantics of ţe in N-Sl, where the meaning can be deictic (cf. R on ţe 'the very same one (masc.)'. However, this meaning is not characteristic in SSl. Instead, this -r may be an extension of the model built from *věčerô, in which the r-element is original (Gr hêsperos, Lat vesper, Lit vâkaras). This word developed two different meanings in SSl dialects, one a noun meaning 'evening' and the other an adverb meaning 'in the evening', which after the fall of the jers became differentiated by accentuation: *věčerô vs. *vô věčerô, preserved in Pkm Sn věčer 'evening' vs. věčer 'in the evening' (StSn věčer with both meanings). That this -r was interpreted both as a stem ending and as a deictic marker is evidenced by its removal in Što věčer, as well as jûčê 'yesterday' (< *vnsčerô) (Skok 1973: 570) (see below on factors in the re-
versal of the change). The temporal deictic meaning of -r- may have been enriched further by identification with both older *ťôtro 'morning' (StSn jûtôro, Pkm vûtôro, Cr/Bs/Srb jûtôro) and newer Sn osovôj 'at this time, at this hour' (< *ob seji urê < Lat hôra, Sn dialect osorô, osavrô, oservôj (Bezlaj 1982: 258)). Thus it is as likely that the -r in nocôr is a result of the spread of -r marking temporal deixis from words like *vô věčerô as from -r(e) < *ţe.

2.4 Other

2.4.1 The preservation of the form bore, and its derivatives, may have retained
its shape due to taboo. Skok observed that "Kako je krščanstvo tabuiralo riječ bog prema židovskom uzoru da se Jahveh ne upotrebljava nego jehova, često se ne upotrebjava bog u potpunoj fonetici nego se g zamjenjuje sa r. Mjesto bôgme govori se bôrne, tako ti bora mjesto boga; aj ti bora ti; za bora milogi" (Skok I: 191). This
notion is confirmed by the Pkm usage, in which börme 'my God!' is a more polite

3 Reversal of the change

3.1 An intriguing factor in the development of r-forms is that its areal in the
Medieval period was much more widespread than it is today. In StCr/StBs/StSrb the

---

8 The mysterious -c- in this form is a matter of some debate: Šivic-Dular finds this to be a relic of WSl infiltration (1982); Furlan assumes the form results from the simplification of a diminutive *not'bsô from *nôt'ôs (1993: 220–2). She points out that an older explanation, deriving the base from an already deictic *not'ôsbô is untenable in light of Istrian najco, in which -jc- could not have arisen from *-t'bsô (ibid.).
relics of the change are few, which essentially reflects the fact that Ča and Kaj literary traditions were abandoned in favor of Sto. The relics include the conjunction *jer*, which is connected with the older formation from complementizers built from *j- (related to OCS *iše ‘that, which’ masc sg, *ješe neut sg) that became replaced by those built on *češo and *kohb, a process that was underway in the 14th–15th cc (Grčkat 1975: 287); the verb *morati; and the word *takoder ‘also’ (alongside the alternant *takode*). The evidence in Bg and Mac is sparse, but the phenomenon is known there, too, e.g., Bg *dori ‘even’ (< *do-že), Mac *duri ‘up to, until’, Bg (dialect) *dordërdoro ‘until’ (< *do-že-dë), Bg *tere ‘and’, Bg *bar/lbär/berämbarim ‘at least’ (< *ba-že) (examples from Miklošič, Vondrák, Lavrov, cited in Cvetko Oregnik 1987–1988: 435–436). As mentioned above, it was borrowed (from Bg?) into Romanian from the present tense of *pușnati, attested in the 14th c (Skok 1971: 575). One can agree with Cvetko Oregnik and her predecessors that “man muss bei diesen Beispielen besonders vorsichtig sein” (loc. cit.), as they may well have been the result of infiltration from Serbian usage. Nevertheless, it is clear that at a certain point in the high Medieval period, r-forms were on the wane in the E. Not only did they cease to be productive, but they also seem to have become systematically removed from the lexicon.

3.1.1 It is not surprising that the polarization of productivity is found in the conjunctions. As Ivči has observed, “od gramatičkih reči najviše razlika između praslovenskog stanja i danasnje srpskohrvatskog pokazuju veznici. Objašnjenje moramo tražiti u činjenici da su od svih tih reči veznici, narčito oni u podređenim rečenica-ma, najzavisniji od stepena razvijenosti apstraktnog mišljenja, što znači i od opšte kulturnog nivoa sredine” (Ivči 1991: 316). One does not have to look far to realize that in Slavic writings of the 10th–14th cc there is a striking variety in the forms that replace older subordinating structures (such as the dative absolute or “dative of subordination,” on which see Andersen 1970). But why do the r-forms prevail in Sn and Cr and recede in Srb, Mac and Bg? As a working hypothesis, let us assume that in the formation of new complementizers, r-forms gained a high prestige value in a W milieu and a low prestige value in the E milieu, i.e., corresponding to S-Slavs under the influence of Rome vs. Constantinople.9 If this hypothesis proves correct, it helps explain why the development is more pervasive in Sn and Cr and undergoes attrition in Srb (and, to the extent that they are relevant to the picture, Mac and Bg).

3.2 It is unfortunately very difficult to trace the details of the development in Sn, because there is a gap in the textual evidence in precisely the time frame under investigation. However, for the beginning and end points of the development, the picture is fairly clear, so that it is possible to surmise with a reasonable degree of assurance what occurred in the dark period. In the 10th c the FF attest to the beginnings of a competition between r-forms and ž-forms. The conjunction *tere ‘and, also’ occurs twice; but other forms show unchanged ž, e.g., *ise ‘which’, *mošem ‘I can’ (occurs twice), tomuge ‘to this very’ *tige, *choiseih ‘which’ gen pl (< *ky-že + ixn).10 The number of examples here is too small to conclude anything except that r-forms

---

9 The situation is reminiscent of Labov’s famous study of r(less)-forms in New York City (that the segment in question is r is, of course, entirely fortuitous). Rather than class distinctions, however, the values would have been assigned to religious-ethnic communities (see Labov 1972).

10 Forms from the Freising Folia are quoted from Bernik et al. 1993.
were possible variants at this stage. By the early 14th c., as evidenced by the Celovec/Rateče Ms., the r-forms in subordinating conjunctions have been generalized: Otšca nafs kyr sy wnebessich... ‘Our father who art in heaven...’, odpusti nam dalve nafje kakor yno my... ‘forgive us our trespasses as we...’. Cf. also the 15th c. Stična Ms. žkemer ‘with which’ (2×), kakur ‘as’ (8×), kadar ‘when’ (3×), kygar ‘whom’ acc/gen sg.

3.3 In contemporaneous Cr documents, r-forms are general on an equal footing with those found in Sn, albeit combined with partially different material. For example, in the Cr Glagolitic Paris Codex (Split, 14th c) we find more (4×), morešb, premoreš ‘you overcome’, arevar ‘for’, jurejvar ‘already’, terešk ‘and’, niššare ‘nothing’, nikogare ‘nobody’ gen sg, nigrare ‘never’, nilšere ‘nowhere’, nigdarb ‘nobody’ (Malić 1972: 131). Examples of ž-forms in Cyrillic Cr works are numerous, though these are found in conjunction with other features of the OCS Cyrillic tradition, e.g., Povaljska listina (Brač, 1250) Tako jesm stišal da sije zemlje ježe vy držite... ‘Thus I have heard that these lands that you hold...’ (Moguš 1993: 25; Malić 1988: 38ff). In locally-colored texts r-forms abound, e.g., Š. Menčetić (Ca-Što koinè, 15th c): ozriv se jak jelin ter ončas pode tja, ter gorči ner pelin i čemer ostah ja (Vončina 1988: 82).

3.4.1 As was pointed out above in connection with the morphological motivation for r-forms in the relative adjective *ksterb, in Što there was a marked tendency to generalize other forms, in particular koi (≪ *koj- ≦ *kjo ‘which’) (Kopečný, Šaur and Polák 1980: 389). Subordinating pronominal forms built from *jo- (i.e., etc.) became replaced by the general complementizer *čto (što), which began in the 14–15th cc to compete with koi (Grickat 1975: 286–91). Since *ksterb failed to be selected as a relative marker, it had no chance of becoming a model for analogical developments (in contrast to the developments in Sn, Ča, Kaj, discussed above). However, this did not eliminate the subordinating conjunction jer(e) (≪ *ježe), which is a relic of the older layer of *jo-forms (Grickat 1975: 72). The survival of this form is apparently connected with the widening of its semantics: OCS ježe functioned narrowly as a complementizer indicating causative subordination, e.g., čjuždaaxo se jeze kščinjaše ‘they were surprised that (she) was late’, whereas MoŠrb jer ranges in function from strictly causatives meanings to (essentially para-
tactic) general, summarizing meanings, e.g., tako je bolje, jer šta bi ti radio ako bi slučajno saznao za tu nesreću! ‘it’s better this way for what would you do if you had found out about this misfortune!’ (Grickat 1975: 126, 134–5 and passim). The new functions are far removed from the original meaning (anaphora), indicating that jer was felt to be operating natively and independently in the system.

3.4.2 In Srb Što the process seems to have been reversed, leading to hypercor-
corrections of the type vččer > vččet, jucčer > jucče (Skok III: 570), in which the -r element was identified with -r ≦ -je. This gives some support to the notion that -r- became identified with a style that came to be felt as foreign to Što speakers. Note, however, that this applies only to productive types. This gives a plausible explanation for the reduction of the number of lexical items in which r-forms occurs in Što: they persist most consistently in those lexical items in which the r-element is

11 Forms from the Celovec/Rateče and Stična Ms. are cited from Mikhailov 1997: 101–102.
non-alternating and in which it has become lexicalized (morati, jer) and lost elsewhere.

4 Conclusion

4.1 To sum up, the phenomenon of rhotacism had a number of intersecting factors determining its spread and reversal. The change occurred, first, only under narrowly defined phonemic conditions, thus limiting it to a small part of the lexicon. It persisted best in uniform environments and tended towards reversal in alternating environments. Its chances of persistence were increased if a semantically similar form with -r was available (*k(ber)ter- ≥ kdo, kdor; rine ≥ rene; večer ≥ nocor). Forms that were high style (H) (conjunctions) were prestigious in the W and thus remained productive; the markedness was reversed in the E, and these correspondingly L forms tended to be removed, except for those that became integrated into the system in such a way that they were no longer identified as part of the same semantic field or level of prestige (jer, morati). The factors are summarized in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Favors retention?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternating</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H style</td>
<td>+ (W), − (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analogical</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possibility</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innovation</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 With respect to chronology, the following rough scenario may be proposed: (1) 7–8th cc. – phonetic innovation ẓ > r, (2) ca. 8–11th cc. enrichment of categories containing r-forms and E-ward expansion of lexical items containing r-forms; (3) 10–14th cc. attrition of productive r-forms spreading (E → W).

4.3 Further study, in the form of a survey of the appearance of r-forms in Medieval S-Sl texts, will be necessary to test the scenario put forth in this paper. One hopes that a more precise account of the paths of lexical enrichment and relative chronology would emerge from such a study. This should, in turn, shed light on the social value of the variants, which will help to illuminate another aspect of the society of Medieval S-Europe.

Abbreviations

Bg = Bulgarian, Bs = Bosnian, C = central, Ča = Čakavian, Cr = Croatian, E = east(ern), FF = Freising Folia, G = German, Kaj = Kajkavian, LC = Lower Carniolan dialect, Li = Lithuanian, LS = Lower Sorbian, Mac = Macedonian, Mo = Modern, N = north(ern), OCS = Old Church Slavic, OHG = Old High German,
Pkm = Prekmurje dialect of Slovene, Po = Polish, R = Russian, S = south(ern), SI = Slavic, Sn = Slovene, Srb = Serbian, SSI = South Slavic, St = Standard, Sto = Stokavian, Sty = Styrian dialect, UC = Upper Carniolan dialect, US = Upper Sorbian, W = west(ern), WSI = West Slavic
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Multiple Causation in the Spread and Reversal of a Sound Change: Rhotacism in South Slavic

The paper treats the change $\xi > r$ (“rhotacism”) in the South Slavic languages, such as that, e.g., found in the present tense of the verb *može(ť) $\rightarrow$ Sn mőre, Cr/Bs dialect mőre; complementizers, e.g., *kako $\rightarrow$ Sn kakor; in various adverb-
ial formations, e.g., *bože > bore; and, in some Sn and Cr/Bs dialects, the present
tense of the verb (*gmati:) *žene(t) > rene. The origin of the change has been
treated variously as a phonetic or a morphological (analogical) change, though neith-
er explanation can account for the limited realization of the change (i.e., it is re-
stricted to a small number of lexical items and grammatical categories) and the vast-
ly differing areals of the change for each item in which it occurs. The present paper
argues that the origin of the change is phonetic and follows from a tendency to fav-
or vocalic distinctive features (in contrast to N-SI developments), a notion that goes
back to a pre-War paper by Isačenko. Nevertheless, the spread of the change, and its
reversal, can be partially explained by morphological factors. One factor is that uni-
form environments (e.g., the present tense morem, moreš ...) favor its spread vs. alter-
ning environments (-žene/-rene) which have reversed or inhibited it. Another
factor is support for the spread of -r as a productive complementizer and temporal
marker on the models of metanalyzed forms *kšejo-r- 'which' and *veče-r 'evening',
respectively. Taboo seems to play an additional role in preserving r-forms in the in-
terjection borme 'my God!'. The reversal of the change in Štokavian may have been
due to stylistic considerations, where r-forms were felt to be distinctly western,
Catholic, in contrast to š(e) forms. This observations follows from the fact that
r-forms disappear in Štokavian in precisely the forms in which they were productive
in Čakavian, Kajkavian and Slovene, namely, the complementizers and temporal ad-
verbs. Finally, those forms which represent semantic innovations, such as morati
'must', jer 'for, because' are best preserved, even in Štokavian, where the r-forms
are lexicalized as such.