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1 Introduction

The circumflex advancement is, according to Rigler (1986), one of the rare Common Slovenian (Comm. Slov.) phenomena and can be employed for distinguishing Slovenian from Kajkavian. The advancement is usually dated after the loss of the weak jers (Ramovš 1995), which is shown by examples such as Comm. Slov. nom. sg. noh" at for PSl. *n' og t vs. Comm. Slov. gen. sg. noht" a for PSl. *n' og ti. This chronology, however, has recently been questioned by Greenberg (1992, 1993), where it is proposed that the weak jers were still preserved at the time of advancement, at least in the Prekmurje dialect. Moreover, Greenberg (1992, 1993) claims that no advancement occurs if the a weak jer follows. The basis for such an assumption comes from the discussion of Bednja (Bed.) Kajkavian in Vermeer (1979), where the rule for non-advancement of the circumflex before a weak jer has first been observed and described.

Vermeer (1979) thus proposes a rule for Bednja local dialect whereby the old circumflex is not advanced if jers in weak position immediately followed, e.g. Bed. n" aobrol < PSl. *n' a-b~ral, za¢vol < *s' a-z¢val vs. pe¢al < *p' o¢-¢rl, zap¢ < *z' a-parl (examples from Jedvaj 1956). Greenberg (1992, 1993) claims the same rule for the Prekmurje (Pkm.) dialect as well. It is true that in Prekmurje the circumflex in l-participles is not advanced if jers followed, e.g. Pkm. "na:bro < PSl. *n' a-b~ral, "na:zvo < *n' a-z¢val, "na:spo < *n' a-s~pal. However, the circumflex is likewise not advanced where no jers followed, e.g. Pkm. "doubo < *d' o-bil, "na:p¨ uu < *n' a-p~il. In fact, as my survey has shown (see Beguš 2012), all originally circumflexed prefixed l-participles in the most of the Prekmurje local dialects are stressed initially, regardless of whether the initial syllable was followed by a weak jer or not. To be sure, the latter group could be explained as analogical to the first group. However, there are further problems with such an assumption. The majority of the examples in Vermeer (1979) and Greenberg (1992, 1993) are limited to one morphological category only, i.e. the l-participles of the accentual paradigm c. Although some examples from other categories are given, they are problematic. For example, Pkm. l" aiko < PSl. *l' ~e ko is not relevant, since adverbs of manner show accentual variants within the Prekmurje dialect itself, e.g. Pkm. leipo in li' pou for PSl. *l' e po. Moreover, we would not expect the weak jers to be preserved so late in any dialect, but this of course cannot be the decisive reason to reject the proposals above.

In the following, I will discuss the data from both Prekmurje and Bednja that brings further problems to Greeberg’s and Vermeer’s assumptions. The source for my investigation were the descriptions in Zorko (1991, 1992, 2009), Greenberg (1992, 1993, 1994, 1999), Rajnar (1998), Raščan (2008), Ficko (2002), Ivanšek (2009), Mulaosmanović (2001), Lukač (1997), Mukies (2006), Huber (2003), Kolarić (1956) and the translation of Pavel’s A vashidegkiši szlovén nyejvársz hangtana in Jakop (1998) for Prekmurje and Jedvaj (1956) and Vermeer (1979) for Bednja. Although the trisyllabic words with weak jers in the second

\*This presentation is based on my Master’s thesis at the University of Ljubljana, cf. Beguš (2012). I would like to thank my advisors Vera Smole and Matej Šekli as well as Jay Jasanoff for useful comments and help. However, all mistakes are entirely my responsibility.

1. For a recent discussion on the circumflex advancement in Slovenian, see Pronk (2011) and Šekli (2013).
2. I follow the transcription from the original works.
3. Such variants (*bríšako, *kortško) are wide-spread in the dialects and in the standard language. They were probably employed for distinguishing between the adverb of manner and the nominative forms of the neuter adjectives.
syllable and original circumflex accentuation are rare and the data does not show a clear picture, I will show that Vermeer’s and Greenberg’s assumption cannot be maintained in their original forms. Instead, I will propose a new explanation that, in my opinion, better captures the data.

2 The data

2.1 Words with advancement in Prekmurje

I have found two words in the Prekmurje dialect with the Proto-Slavic structure *V- /L-V that have not yet been discussed in the literature: PSL. *ťrdlčec and PSL. *ľďnje. All examples of these two words in the Prekmurje dialect show the advancement of the circumflex and are thus stressed on the final syllable, e.g. Polana srčie (Greenberg 1993, 471), Cankova srčec (474), Martinje srčeci (477), srčec (Rajnar 1998, 23), Gorunj Senik srčec (Mukics 2006, 12), Haloze srčec (Zorko 1991) and Martinje lvďeči (Greenberg 1993, 485), Turnščec, Lipovci lidje: (Raščan 2008, 18; Ficko 2002, 11), Gorunj Senik lidge: (Mukics 2006, 12), Haloze lidje: (Zorko 1991, 56).5 We thus have two clear examples of the circumflex advancement, although we would expect non-advancement according to the Greenberg’s assumption. Moreover, it is unclear to me how these two accentuations could be explained analogically. We can therefore conclude that the sole presence of weak jers cannot be the reason for non-advancement in Prekmurje.

It is, however, true that both examples above end in an open syllable, whereas the l-particulates always end in either a close syllable or another syllable follows. We also know that in Bednja the circumflex is advanced only to closed syllables. We could thus argue that the advancement in Prekmurje first occurred to closed syllables (just like in Bednja) at the time when the weak jers were still preserved. This would cause the non-advancement to the following jer, because the syllable would be open. Thus, we would have *VoV(C), *VV and *VV ĉ. After the loss of weak jers, the advancement would spread to open syllables as well, but would cease to operate to closed syllables, which would give the desired *VV < *VoV in srčec and *VV < *VoVC in *nachro. This explanation, however, has to be rejected for two reasons. First, it would be very unusual that the circumflex would at some point advance only to open syllables, but not to closed syllables. To my knowledge, no such system exists. Second, the assumption that the circumflex does not advance to the weak jers because of the openness of the syllable is also problematic. In Bednja the circumflex advances to closed syllables and to open word-internal syllables, e.g. Bed. ekyelu6 for PSL. *ňoko. If we want to parallel the Prekmurje development with that of Bednja, we would have to assume that the advancement was prevented because of the nature of the weak jer and not because of the openness of the syllable.7 In this case, we would have to assume that in the beginning the circumflex in both Prekmurje and Bednja advanced to closed final syllables and to word-internal syllables (regardless of the openness), except if weak jers followed. Later, after the loss of jers the circumflex would in Prekmurje advance to open final syllables only, whereas it would again cease to advance to closed final syllables. This assumption is even more problematic than the previous one.

Moreover, I have found some examples of trisyllabic words with original circumflex followed by a weak jer and a closed final syllable that are stressed on the final syllable. This could show that the circumflex in Prekmurje advanced also to closed syllables despite the fact that a weak jer followed. However, these examples are less certain. Thus, we have Središče dužněst (Greenberg 1994, 99) for PSL. *džněst, and Radomersčak e’noč (Zorko 1992, 472), Cankova ed’noü (Greenberg 1993, 473) for PSL. *čeřnoč. The first is problematic because the accentuation could easily be borrowed from the standard language because of the specific semantics.8 The latter is problematic because it is not completely clear how the Proto-Slavic word was accentuated. Most probably, however, it had initial circumflex, but the possibility of neo-acute is not completely excluded, although it is much less likely. The fact that the stressed vowel is

4. Novak (2006, 695) gives an alternative with the first syllable stressed, but I cannot see an example that would confirm this. At least the accent is never marked on the first syllable, whereas it is often marked on the final, from the earliest attestations on, e.g. Cor Srčac from the Mikloš Kuzmič’s Šlovenska slovnik (1780). Thus, out of nine attestations of the nominative singular form only two are unmarked for accent, the rest have all acute-sing (‘’) on the final syllable.


6. Jedvaj (1956) does not mark the circumflex on y, which means that whenever an accented word does not have any accentual marks, there is a circumflex on y.

7. Alternatively, we could retain the assumption that the circumflex advances to closed syllables only and assume that the advancement of the type Bed. ekyelu on open medial syllables was an independent and later development.

8. Note, however, that Greenberg (1994, 94) assumes dužněst not to be a borrowing: “There is no reason to suspect that these everyday words are borrowings.”
long would strongly speak in favor of the reconstruction with the circumflex. 9

Furthermore, there is a n-participle with the advanced circumflex despite the following weak jer: Radomersčak op'rožni (Zorko 1992, 470) for PSl. *ot'-pranji. Note, however, that the accentuation here can be secondary with an old acute or a neo-acute (Šekli 2005, 54). Additionally, there is also a l-participle that shows advancement despite the following weak jer: Cankova od'govorovlo for PSl. *ot'-govoril. 10 There is even a l-participle in Radomersčak with the same structure as the ‘poubro-type that shows advancement despite the weak jer: od'prja for PSl. *ot'-paril.

On the other hand, there are some examples that would nevertheless speak in favor of Greenberg’s assumption, but they are far from clear. There is an adverb Središčke od'kot (Greenberg 1992, 84) for PSl. *ot-k-jed and Dolinsko ’otketo. 11 Note, however, that in Radomersčak we have ot Kot, ot cot and in Ravensko od kecic. Also, the short vowel in Dolinsko would speak in favor of the assumption that we have an analogical accentuation. Moreover, the Središčke dialect is problematic for other reasons as well. 12 There is, to my knowledge, only one more example that might show non-advancement: Dolinsko ’negdi, Radomersčak ’negi, ’nigi (Zorko 1992, 472) for PSl. *nêj/-k-je. Note, however, that the initial stress here can as well be analogical to other indefinite/negative pronouns, e.g. Radomersčak ’negda, ’nekan, Selo ’nka (Rajnar 1998, 71), Haloze ’nikan, ’nka (Zorko 1991, 65), Martinje ’niglar (Rajnar 1998, 71) for PSl. *n-i-ka-je. Moreover, the fact that in Dolinsko the first syllable is short would again speak in favor of the assumption that the adverb has analogical accentuation. 13 There is also an attestation of non-advancement in Stevan Sijarto’s Sztarisinsztvo i zvacinsztvo from 1807 dušnofat (Novak 2006, 74), but the word can easily be a borrowing (cf. the advanced version from Središče above).

2.2 Words with advancement in Bednja

In Bednja, only words with the circumflex followed by a weak jer and a closed syllable are relevant for investigating the proposed rule. In words with final open syllable the advancement never occurs, even if no jers followed. This makes the situation there even more problematic. I have found one example with the advancement: jediške, probably for PSl. *ednako. Although it is not entirely clear how the original word was accentuated, the long falling tone on the second syllable in Bednja strongly suggests that it had a circumflex on the first syllable. Another, also problematic example would, however, speak in favor of Vermeer’s assumption, etkud for PSl. *ot-k-ked. The adverb has also a variant etkild (Jedvaj 1956, 319). Note that prefixed adverbs often show irregular accentuation, e.g. Bed. nikok for PSl. *ni-kako. 14

Note also that analogical accentuations are not rare both in the nominal and in the verbal system. Thus, we have pyeneč for PSl. *pômof (analogical to *na pômoč), gyever for PSl. *gôvörs and another thirteen examples (Vermeer 1979). Moreover, there are also analogical accentuation in the verbal system. We can either have prefixed verbs analogical to the non-prefixed ones and vice versa: degeyerili, eslebyedili (PSl. *dô-govorili, *ô-svobodili), rošcémarih, blogeslyevil for the first group and plāotil (analogical to *na-plātit), 15 meydil, meydirle, hyedil for PSl. *plātil, *mûdîl, *müdilo. 

There are even two examples of analogical accentuation in the verbs with the structure prefix-C(C)-suffix- that are in Prekmurje always accented analogically: Bed. prâdol and dyebil for PSl. *prô-dâhl and *dô-byhl.


9. We could still argue for some sporadic accenting if we assume an original neo-acute, but this is less likely.

10. Note that the jer in the preposition *ot'- was retained late enough to yield the regular reflex when in strong position through the Prekmurje dialect, e.g. Cankova o'degno (Zorko 2009, 275), Pertoča o'digãli (Huber 2003, 23) for PSl. *ote’a-nâlõ, *ote’a-nâlili, Središče podôzgâti (Greenberg 1999, 158) for PSl. *podôzgâši.

11. Thanks to Mojca Horvat for providing the forms for me from Dolinsko and Ravensko.

12. The situation in Središče is problematic for establishing the circumflex advancement rules. The structure of the inhabitants in the village changed significantly in 1681–1682 because of the plague and reports say that the majority of houses were emptied until the new migration to the area from Medjimurje, Hrvško, and Mursko polje (Kolarič 1956, 163).

13. In the l-participle where it is assumed that no advancement occurs, the syllable is long even in examples with the original short vowel, e.g. ‘poubro for PSl. *pô-bralh.

14. Bednja has other words where the circumflex does not advance despite the following closed syllable, but Vermeer (1979, 369–372) explains them as borrowings from Kajkavian: vûglen, êele, mlôdest, v mlôdesti, zûpeved, vêremeno, dôvat, dûsast, jazere.

15. There is also a regular variant plotêl.
2.3 Length in Bednja

There is another problematic fact about Bednja that could speak against Vermeer’s assumption, namely, that the stressed syllable is long. We know that the circumflex shortens in trisyllabic words before the loss of weak jers after the Proto Slavic period (cf. Kapović 2005). We also know that the circumflex does not lengthen in Bednja unless it advances, e.g. kēle for PSl. *kōlo. We would therefore expect the circumflex to be short (**nā-brāh, *vī-zāgatū**, *sūsītū). Vermeer (1979, 372) assumes a compensatory lengthening to yield the neo-circumflex because of the loss of the jers. However, I have found three examples, of which at least one clearly shows that the loss of the jers does not cause the lengthening: sērce for PSl. *sērndāc < *sērndāc. The other two are more problematic, but could nevertheless be taken as counter-evidence: Bed. lāhke if it goes back to the circumflex in the first syllable PSl. *lēgako and Bed. pēkē if it goes back to PSl. *pō-tu-lē. Note also that the following long vowel can either not be the reason for lengthening, e.g. dēno for PSl. *dōma.

Note also that usually the neo-circumflex arises from the old acute and not from the old circumflex. There is, however, an example that could, according to Vermeer (1979, 373), show lengthening because of the loss of a weak jer: nyefēt for PSl. *nōgūtē. The accentuation here would have to be analagical from the unattested genitive singular form **nyefōto** for PSl. *nōgūtī. This is, in my opinion, very problematic and given the fact that the examples above show no lengthening and the fact that Bednja has numerous examples of unexpected accentuation that are analagical to examples where a preposition preceded, we could explain nyefēt as a part of the latter group.

3 A new proposal

The data above shows that the situation in Prekmurje and Bednja is much more complicated than previously thought. It is thus, in my opinion, untenable to maintain the assumption that the circumflex in Prekmurje does not advance if a jer in weak position (followed by a full vowel) follows, precisely because of the examples such as srčē, līdī, e′nuč, op′rozī, od′gouvoro. Moreover, even if we try to capture the data by sound change, we get a situation that is hard to believe, whereby the circumflex would advance to open syllables and not (anymore) to closed ones (see 2.1). Likewise, there is evidence that the sole presence of the weak jers might not be the reason for non-advancement in Bednja either, although the examples are less numerous: jednākō. Moreover, the fact that almost all examples of non-advancement are l-participles might suggest that the data is the result of some analogy and the fact that in Bednja the l-participles show an unexpected length might indicate that the circumflex in this case in fact already advanced (from some preceding particle).

On the other hand, any new proposal will have to account for the fact that in Bednja we have the following distribution: nāooblō, zāooblō, zāozvol, vēyžgōl, vēyžgolē, nūovīl, prēčīl vs. rozdēr, pedēr, zopēr, pečāl, pečāl, zočāl and vēyžgōt vs. syēsīt. In the following, I will give a new account for the

16. Thus, even if we would take ētkud as an evidence for non-advancement, we would, according to Vermeer’s assumption, expect it to be long and not short.
17. Note that in disyllabic words where the circumflex does not get shortened the sequence jer + r remains long as expected, e.g. gērde, dēre.
18. There are fifteen examples with long non-advanced circumflex that are explained in Vermeer (1979, 371) as analogy to the junction with prepositions, e.g. nābe for PSl. *nēbē.
19. It may seem as if such a distribution cannot be due to any other reason but sound change. However, I have found a dialect description, where the distribution seems to be precisely the opposite. Thus, we have the circumflex advanced in the l-participles with the weak jers, whereas it does not advance in no jers followed. The examples are from the transcription of the recording of Ms. Terezija Prkič (born 1932) from Bakovci in Ivanšek (2009, 43–104): zbrāčī, zāp′rāčī, pōb′račy, pōz′rāčy, nab′rāči, pōb′rāči, nab′rāči, zāp′rāč (3x), pōz′rāči, pōb′rāči (3x) vs. dōgbō, dōgbilī (2x), dōgbilī, napilī, nāpilī, dōgbilī, ūznīlī. Occasionally we find advancement in the latter group (dōbilī, which is probably influenced by the interviewer and always with the verbs of the structure *-dōblē: ūznīlī, ūznīlī (2x), saţpōlī), but the pattern is quite clear here: just the opposite as the situation in Bednja. It is true that such a situation can be secondary, but this also means that the situation in Bednja can potentially be secondary. Moreover, we could assume influence from the standard or neighboring dialect, but there is evidence against this. First, it is strange that the standard language would influence only the first group (pōb′rači), but not the latter (napilī). Moreover, Bakovci zāp′rāč in the meaning ‘wash’ does not correspond to the standard oprāli. Other descriptions from Bakovci also include examples with the advanced circumflex. I have found one: zāp′rālī for PSl. *zā-sa-pālī; however, there are also examples with non-advancement where a weak jer
data presented above.

We know that the circumflex advances only to closed syllables in the final position in Bednja (regardless of the vowel quantity), e.g. *kôle for PSl. *kôlo vs. *gelôub for PSl. *gôlôub. Now, we can assume that at the earliest stage of the circumflex advancement, the circumflex in Prekmurje and Bednja advanced only to closed syllables as well, both word-finally and word-internally. This is a quite probable assumption, as we know from typological perspective that closed syllables tend to attract stress earlier than open syllables and in part this is exactly the system that is preserved in Bednja even today. We can also assume that at the time of this early advancement to closed syllables, the weak jers were already lost. This too is quite probable, since at the time of the advancement we would generally not expect the jers to be preserved (see the argumentation in the section 1).

Now, we have to take into consideration an important feature of the Bednja and Prekmurje verbal system—the negation. Both dialects in Prekmurje and in Bednja have developed a special kind of negation (the so-called ‘Pannonian negation’) in the past tense with the structure AUX + *ne + l-participle, which means that the auxiliary verb ‘to be’ and the negative particle *ne do not form a single word, which further means that the particle immediately precedes the participle. In Prekmurje, such negation applies to conditionals as well. Thus, we have Selo sán ‘nej pišto ‘I have not asked’ (Rajnar 1998, 83), Martinje ká bi vân ‘rait nei ‘prâvo ‘that I would not like to tell you’ (ib.), Bed. jô sym go ize de nie viel ‘I have not seen him yet’ (Jedvaj 1956, 322). That this type of negation is not a recent phenomenon is proven by the attestation in 1771 in Foreword to the Nouvi zákon: kôbi [...] obrnouti nemogo ‘who would not be able to turn’, here written even as one word.

This further means that the circumflexed l-particiles often had double accentuation, according to whether the sentence was positive or negative, e.g. PSl. *pôbra:u and *nê pôbra:u. If we assume that the circumflex first advanced to closed syllables only (as it is almost the case in today’s Bednja) we would get the following distribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSl</th>
<th>pre-Prekm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*zači:žl</td>
<td>*zači:l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pôbra:žl</td>
<td>*pôbra:l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*nê zači:žl</td>
<td>nê zači:l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*nê pobra:žl</td>
<td>ne pobra:l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, we got frequent variants *pôbra:l and *pôbra:u into the system, but *zači:l and *zači:žl. Just like numerous other examples from Prekmurje and Bednja, the initially stressed variant from the first group was later generalized, whereas in the latter group this could not happen because the l-participle was not stressed at all when preceded by *ne. It is also fairly easy to see why the pôbra:l-type was more regularly generalized than other sporadic analogical accentuations: the generalization could be reinforced by the analogy to all other l-participles of the structure prefix-C(C)-suffix-l (with old acute on the suffix) that later also show retraction in Prekmurje (and partly Bednja), e.g. m:³lôu versus semlo. Thus, we have a model for analogy m:³lôu : semlo = bra:u : x, x = zec:bro (examples from Rajnar 1998, 60).

Another, but less important source for the analogy could also be numerous examples in Prekmurje and Bednja with double prefixes, e.g. Radomerscâk z nôpili for PSl. *sl-na-pili. Note that the frequency of the double prefixed verbs in Prekmurje appears to be much higher than in other Slovenian dialects and there are many verbs, especially prefixed by s-po-, that do not exist in other dialects and are attested in Prekmurje from the earliest written sources (cf. Novak 2006). Moreover, we have pairs such as pobrati, spobrati or pozmati, spoznati from the earliest attestations in Kúzmič’s Nouvi zákon 1771: poberi vs. fepoberêjo or pozna: vs. fepozna: (445, 679, 518, 686).

Words outside the system of l-participles followed the regular rule of advancement to closed syllables, which yielded *ednôk < PSl. *ednok:žl.

The only step that we need to further assume is the spread of the circumflex advancement to word-internal open syllables in Bednja on the one hand and word-internal and word-final open syllables in

---

20. In word-internal position, the advancement occurs to both closed and open syllables.
21. Note that the negation particle then became secondarily stressed.
22. The author of the Foreword is Jožef Torkoš. I would like to thank Janik Ježovnik for analyzing the verbal system in the Foreword and letting me know about this form.
23. In Prekmurje, there are numerous other such examples, e.g. *g:re:u vs. *sâge:u or *sôu vs. *prôso. It is true that in Bednja, the ictus remains on the final syllable, but the preceding vowel gets lengthened and the length has a falling pitch. This length is thus very similar to the length of the original circumflex, e.g. ye:byl for PSl. *ob:bûh or nôpît vs. nôobrl.
Prekmurje on the other hand. Such a spread is also quite expected from the typological perspective. Thus, we have regularly Bed. *ekyelu for PSl. *ëkoë and kële for PSl. *këlo, but Pkm. sr'ce; for PSl. *sërdace.

The fact that in Bednja the stressed syllable on the prefix of the l-participles is long instead of short also speaks in favor of my proposal. The length here would be the consequence of the fact that the circumflex here in fact already advanced and therefore is regularly lengthened.24

4 Conclusion

It can be concluded from the discussion above that the advancement of the circumflex in Prekmurje and in Bednja is a much more complex phenomenon than previously thought. I have found data that has not yet been discussed in the literature and that clearly shows that at least Greenberg’s assumption cannot be maintained in its original forms. However, the data is less clear when the exact details of circumflex advancement need to be accounted for. I have proposed a new explanation that in my opinion best captures the data. I claim that the circumflex advanced after the loss of jers and that the situation in l-participles is the consequence of analogy with the forms preceded by the particle *ne or forms with double prefix such as s-po-. Both these features are characteristic of the two dialects and caused the rise of very frequent accentual variants in the systems of l-participles. My proposal better explains the examples with the advancement despite the following weak jers. Moreover, I explain why the stressed vowel both in Bednja and Prekmurje is long and why this analogical generalization is more regular than other numerous levelings in the two dialects. To get this analogy, however, we have to assume a stage when circumflex only advanced to closed syllables. This is not at all controversial, precisely because such a system is almost exactly preserved in Bednja today.
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