

UC Berkeley

UC Berkeley Previously Published Works

Title

The Circumflex Advancement in Prekmurje Slovenian and Bednja Kajkavian

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9vp597r1>

Journal

Zeitschrift für Slawistik, 60(1)

ISSN

0044-3506

Author

Beguš, Gašper

Publication Date

2015-04-01

DOI

10.1515/slawn-2015-0003

Peer reviewed

Gašper Beguš

The Circumflex Advancement in Prekmurje Slovenian and Bednja Kajkavian

Summary: The circumflex advancement is usually dated after the loss of the weak jers. However, this chronology has been questioned by Vermeer (1979) and Greenberg (1992, 1993), who claim the opposite: that the weak jers were lost after the advancement. They further propose the “non-advancement rule”, by which the circumflex does not advance if a weak jer follows. Their evidence comes almost exclusively from the *l*-participles of the accentual paradigm c, which have the initial accent in the two dialects. The article presents new data that argue against this proposal. It is shown that the circumflex regularly advances in words outside the category of *l*-participles despite the presence of a subsequent weak jer. Moreover, a new explanation is given for the initial accent in *l*-participles that better captures the data.

Keywords: circumflex advancement, Slovenian, Kajkavian, Balto-Slavic accentology, Slavic dialectology

DOI 10.1515/slav-2015-0003

1 Introduction

Circumflex advancement is, according to Rigler (1986), one of the rare Common Slovenian (Comm. Slov.) phenomena that can distinguish Slovenian from Kajkavian. The advancement is usually dated after the loss of the weak jers (Ramovš 1995) on the basis of examples such as Comm. Slov. nom. sg. *nohât* for PSl. **nǫgъtъ* vs. Comm. Slov. gen. sg. *nohtâ* instead of ***nohâta* for PSl. **nǫgъti*.¹ This chronology, however, has been questioned by Greenberg (1992, 1993), who proposes that the weak jers still survived at the time of advancement, at least in the Prekmurje dialect. Moreover, Greenberg (1992, 1993) claims that no advancement

¹ For a recent discussion on the circumflex advancement in Slovenian, see Pronk (2011) and Šekli (2013).

Gašper Beguš: Department of Linguistics, Harvard University, Boylston Hall, 3rd Floor, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA, E-Mail: begus@fas.harvard.edu

occurred at all when the circumflex was followed by a weak jer. He draws evidence for this claim from Vermeer's (1979) discussion of Bednja (Bed.) Kajkavian, where the rule for non-advancement of a circumflex preceding a weak jer was first observed and described.

Vermeer (1979) proposes a rule for the Bednja local dialect whereby an old circumflex is not advanced if it is immediately followed by a jer in weak position, e.g. Bed. *nâobro*² < PSL. **nâ-b̃ralb̃, zâozvol* < **s̃b̃-z̃valb̃* vs. *pečâl* < **p̃b̃-č̃elb̃, zopêr* < **zâ-p̃rlb̃* (examples from Jedvaj 1956); Greenberg (1992, 1993) extends this rule to the Prekmurje (Pkm.) dialect. It is true that, in Prekmurje, the circumflex in *l*-participles is not advanced in situations where a jer historically followed, e.g. Pkm. *'na:bro* < PSL. **nâ-b̃ralb̃, 'na:zvo* < **nâ-z̃valb̃, 'na:spo* < **nâ-s̃palb̃*; however, it turns out that the circumflex is likewise not advanced in situations where no jer followed, e.g. Pkm. *'doubo* < **d̃b̃-b̃ilb̃, 'na:p̃iu* < **nâ-p̃ilb̃*. Moreover, as my survey shows (see Beguš 2012), in most Prekmurje local dialects, all originally circumflexed prefixed *l*-participles take initial stress, regardless of whether the initial syllable was historically 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 the rule proposed in Vermeer (1979) and Greenberg (1992, 1993). The majority of the examples offered by these authors are limited to a single morphological category, i.e. the *l*-participles of accentual paradigm c. The only two examples provided from outside this category are adverbs of manner, e.g. Pkm. *'läiko* < PSL. **l̃g̃b̃ko*. These adverbs, however, are not really relevant to the discussion: they possess accentual variants,³ which were probably employed to distinguish between the adverb of manner and the nominative form of the neuter adjective. This variation can be seen within the Prekmurje dialect itself, e.g. Pkm. *'leipo* and *li'pou* for PSL. **l̃epo*.⁴

In the rest of this paper, I will present data from both Prekmurje and Bednja that cause further difficulties for Greenberg's and Vermeer's assumptions. For Prekmurje, I draw data from Zorko (1991, 1992, 2009), Greenberg (1992, 1993, 1994, 1999), Rajnar (1998), Raščan (2008), Ficko (2002), Ivanšek (2009), Mulaosmanović (2001), Lukač (1997), Mukics (2006), Huber (2003), Kolarič (1956) and Pavel's *A vashidegkúti szlovén nyelvjárás hangtana* (from the translation in Jakop 1998); for Bednja, I rely on Jedvaj (1956) and Vermeer (1979). Although trisyllabic words with a weak jer in the second syllable and original circumflex accentuation

² In this and subsequent examples, I follow the transcription conventions of the original cited works.

³ Such variants (**br̃id̃ko, *kórt̃ko*) are widespread in the dialects and in the standard language.

⁴ Moreover, we would not expect the weak jers to be preserved so late in any dialect, although of course this expectation is not in and of itself a definitive reason to reject the proposals above.

are rare, I will provide ample evidence to illustrate that Vermeer's and Greenberg's assumptions cannot be maintained in their original forms. I conclude the paper by proposing a new explanation that, in my opinion, better captures the data.

2 The Data

2.1 Words with Advancement in Prekmurje

There are (at least) two words in the Prekmurje dialect with the Proto-Slavic structure *Ū-ъ/ь-V that have not yet been discussed in the literature:⁵ PS. **sŕdbce* and PS. **lŭdbe*. All examples of these two words in the Prekmurje dialect show circumflex advancement and concomitant final-syllable stress, e.g. Polana *sər'cie* (Greenberg 1993: 471), Cankova *sŕ'ce*: (Greenberg 1993: 474), Martinje *sər'cei* (Greenberg 1993: 477), *sŕ'ce*: (Rajnar 1998: 23), Gornji Senik *sar'ce*: (Mukics 2006: 12), Haloze *sŕ'ce*: (Zorko 1991)⁶; Martinje *li'd'ei* (Greenberg 1993: 485), Turnišče, Lipovci *lid'je*: (Raščan 2008: 18; Ficko 2002: 11), Gornji Senik *lŭd'ge*: (Mukics 2006: 12), Haloze *lid'je*: (Zorko 1991: 56).⁷ The behavior of these two lexical items provides two clear examples of circumflex advancement in a circumstance where Greenberg's assumption predicts non-advancement. Moreover, it is unclear how these two accentuations could be explained analogically. We can therefore conclude that the sole presence of a weak jer in the second syllable is not a sufficient impetus for non-advancement of the circumflex in Prekmurje.

It is possible, of course, to argue that circumflex advancement in **sŕdbce* and **lŭdbe* is a result of sound change. Two related facts would support such an analysis: first, both these examples end in an open syllable, whereas the *l*-participles always end in a closed syllable unless another syllable follows; second, in Bednja, the circumflex only advances to closed syllables. One could thus argue that circumflex advancement in Prekmurje, as in Bednja, was initially limited to closed syllables, and that this original limitation coincided with the

⁵ Kapović (forthcoming, 204) briefly discusses **lŭdbe*.

⁶ Novak (2006: 695) reports an alternative form in which stress occurs on the first syllable, but I cannot find an example that confirms this claim. At least, the accent is never marked on the first syllable, whereas it is often marked on the final syllable; this pattern is apparent from the earliest attestations on, e.g. *Cor Srczé* from the Mikloš Küzmič's *Szlovenszki silabikár* (1780). Out of nine attestations of the nominative singular form, only two are unmarked for accent, while the rest have an acute diacritic (´) on the final syllable.

⁷ Cf. also Škofic (2011: 308, 322).

period during which the weak jers were still preserved. In such a situation, the circumflex would be prevented from advancing to a following jer, due to the openness of the syllable. Thus, the available structural configurations would be $*\hat{V}.\text{ə}.V(C)$, $*\hat{V}.V$ and $*V.\hat{V}C$. After the loss of the weak jers, circumflex advancement would spread to open syllables as well, but would cease to operate on closed syllables, producing the desired $*V.\hat{V} < *\hat{V}.\text{ə}.V$ in *sr'ce*: vs. $*\hat{V}.VC < *\hat{V}.\text{ə}.VC$ in *'na:bro*. Whatever appeal this explanation may hold, however, it must be rejected on the basis of typology; positing a phase during which the circumflex ceased operating on closed syllables and instead applied only to open syllables would be very unusual.

A second difficulty with this analysis arises from examples of trisyllabic words (outside the *l*-participles) that exhibit an original circumflex followed by a weak jer and stress on the final, closed syllable. Consider, for instance, Središče *dužnōst* (Greenberg 1994: 99) for PS. $*d\hat{e}l\check{z}bnost\bar{b}$ and Radomerščak *e'nq:k* (Zorko 1992: 472), Cankova *ed'nouk* (Greenberg 1993: 473) for PS. $*\check{e}dbnok\bar{b}$. Both examples are somewhat problematic: the specific semantics of the first example make it possible that its accentuation was borrowed from the standard language; as for the latter example, it is not completely clear how the Proto-Slavic word itself was accented. It seems likely, however, that it bore an initial circumflex. The presence of a long stressed vowel, in particular, speaks strongly in favor of reconstruction with the circumflex, and consequently against the non-advancement rule.

Circumflex advancement despite a following weak jer can be observed even within some participles, although the examples are problematic. Consider for example Radomerščak *op'rq:mi* (Zorko 1992: 470) for PS. $*\check{o}-p\bar{r}ani$, which argues against the non-advancement rule. However, it is possible that the accentuation here is secondary, with an old acute or a neo-acute accent (Šekli 2005: 54). Likewise, at least one *l*-participle in Cankova shows advancement despite a following weak jer: Cankova *od'gouvoro* for PS. $*\check{o}t\bar{b}-govoril\bar{b}$.⁸ There is even an *l*-participle in Radomerščak with a *'poubro*-type structure that shows advancement in the context of a weak jer: *od'prja* for PS. $*\check{o}t\bar{b}-p\bar{r}il\bar{b}$.

There are, to be sure, some examples that seem to conform to Greenberg's assumption, but they are most likely analogical. For instance, Središče has

⁸ Note that the jer in the preposition $*ot\bar{b}-$ was retained late enough to yield the regular reflex in strong position throughout the Prekmurje dialect, e.g. Cankova *o'de:gno* (Zorko 2009: 275), Pertoča *'q:dāgnālj* (Huber 2003: 23) for PS. $*ot\bar{b}gn\bar{n}\bar{a}l\bar{b}$, $*ot\bar{b}gn\bar{n}\bar{a}li$, Središče *podžgāti* (Greenberg 1999: 158) for PS. $*pod\bar{b}žg\bar{a}ti$.

odkot (Greenberg 1992: 84)⁹ and Dolinsko has 'otket for PSL. *ðtʰ-kqðě.¹⁰ Note, however, that in Radomerščak we have ot'kot, ot'cɔt and in Ravensko ot'keic. The short vowel in Dolinsko indicates that accentuation here is analogical.¹¹ There is, to my knowledge, only one additional example in which the circumflex appears not to advance: Dolinsko 'negdɛ, Radomerščak 'nɛgi, 'nigi (Zorko 1992: 472) for PSL. *ně/i-kɔde. Note, however, that the initial stress here is probably analogical to other indefinite/negative pronouns, e.g. Radomerščak 'negda, 'nekan, Selo 'nikdā (Rajnar 1998: 71), Haloze 'nikan, 'nikdar (Zorko 1991: 65), Martinje 'nigdar (Rajnar 1998: 71) for PSL. *ni-kɔdā-že. Again, the presence of the initial short syllable in Dolinsko speaks in favor of the assumption that the adverb has analogical accentuation. Non-advancement is also attested in Števan Sijarto's *Sztarisinsztvo i zvac-sinsztvo* from 1807 – *du'snofzt* (Novak 2006: 74) – but the word is likely a borrowing (cf. the advanced version from Središče above).

To sum up, the new data from Prekmurje presented above shows the regular advancement of the circumflex despite the presence of a subsequent weak jer, which speaks against the “non-advancement rule”. The most straightforward examples are sr'ce: and lid'je:: however, also examples with the closed final syllable (like *ed'nouk*) point in the same direction. The few examples that seem to conform to the rule are most likely analogical, as is indicated by unexpected short vowels. The explanation with sound change is also untenable for typological reasons. Let us now turn to the data from Bednja dialect.

2.2 Words with Advancement in Bednja

In Bednja, only words that show the circumflex followed by a weak jer and a closed syllable are relevant to the proposed rule; in words with a final open syllable, advancement never occurs, even if no jer follows. I have found one example in which advancement has occurred despite the weak jer: *jednāoke*, probably for PSL. *ědɔnako. Although it is not entirely clear how the original word was accented, the long falling tone on the second syllable in Bednja strongly suggests that it had a circumflex on the first syllable. On the other hand, the initial accent in *ětkud* for

⁹ The situation in Središče is problematic for establishing the circumflex advancement rules. The political structure of the village changed significantly in 1681–82 because of the plague, and reports say that the majority of houses were emptied until the new migration to the area from Medjimurje, Hrvaško, and Mursko polje (Kolarič 1956: 163).

¹⁰ Thanks to Mojca Horvat for providing the forms for me from Dolinsko and Ravensko.

¹¹ In the *l*-participles 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. *pɔ-bɔrɔbɔ.

PSl. **òtv-kǝdǝ* speaks in favor of the non-advancement rule. However, even if we take *ǝtkud* as evidence for non-advancement, we should expect it to be long, not short, according to Vermeer's assumption.¹² Note also that prefixed adverbs often show irregular accentuation (e.g. Bed. *nǝkok* for PSl. **nǝ-kako*), and *ǝtkud* could easily be explained along these lines.¹³

It is also important to note that analogical accentuations are not rare in either the nominal or the verbal system. Thus, we have *pyemeč*¹⁴ for PSl. **pǝmoč* (analogical to **na pǝmoč*), *gyever* for PSl. **gǝvorǝ* and another thirteen examples in Vermeer (1979). Moreover, analogical accentuation is found throughout the verbal system. Prefixed verbs may be accented by analogy with the non-prefixed ones and vice versa: *degevyerili*, *eslebyedili* (PSl. **dǝ-govorili*, **ǝ-svobodili*), *roščemâril*, *blogeslyevil* for the first group, and *plâotil* (analogical to **na-plâtil*),¹⁵ *mêyd'il*, *mêyd'ile*, *hyed'il* for PSl. **plâtilǝ*, **mûdilǝ*, **mûdilo* for the second group. There are even two examples of analogical accentuation in verbs with the structure prefix-C(C)-suffix-*l*: Bed. *prâdol* and *dyebil* for PSl. **prǝ-dalǝ* and **dǝ-byǝl*.

Nevertheless, the data from Bednja conform to Vermeer's assumption much better than the data from Prekmurje do, at least for *l*-participles with the structure prefix-C(C)-suffix-*l*. With the exception of the two examples above, the rule rightly predicts *nâobrol*, *zâobrol*, *zâozvol*, *vêyžgol*, *vêyžgole*, *nâovčil*, *prêičil* for PSl. **nâ-bǝralǝ*, **sǝ-bǝralǝ*, **sǝ-zǝvalǝ*, **vǝ-žǝgalǝ*, **vǝ-žǝgalo*, **nâ-učilǝ*, **prǝ-učilǝ* vs. *rozdêr*, *pedêr*, *zopêr*, *pečâl*, *pečâli*, *zočâl* for PSl. **ǝrz-dǝrlǝ*, **pǝ-dǝrlǝ*, **zâ-pǝrlǝ*, **pǝ-čǝlǝ*, **pǝ-čǝli*, **zâ-čǝlǝ* (Vermeer 1979: 368–369). The same distribution is found in supines as well, e.g. *vêyžgot* vs. *syšêit* (Vermeer 1979: 368–369) for PSl. **vǝ-žǝgatǝ* and **sûšitǝ*.

2.3 Length in Bednja

There is another fact about Bednja that speaks strongly against the non-advancement rule: the uncharacteristic length of the stressed syllable. We know that the circumflex shortened in trisyllabic words prior to the loss of the weak jers after the

¹² The adverb has also a variant *etkūd* (Jedvaj 1956: 319).

¹³ Bednja shows other words where the circumflex does not advance despite a subsequent closed syllable, but Vermeer (1979: 369–372) explains these as borrowings from Kajkavian: *vûgljen*, *êleve*, *mlǝdest*, *v mlǝdesti*, *zǝpeved*, *vřemeno*, *dâvat*, *dâsat*, *jâzere*.

¹⁴ Since Jedvaj (1956) does not mark the circumflex on *y*, for the purpose of this data set, whenever an accented word does not have any accentual marks, it should be assumed that there is a circumflex on *y*.

¹⁵ There is also a regular variant *plotêil*.

Proto Slavic period (cf. Kapović 2005); we also know that the circumflex does not lengthen in Bednja unless it advances, e.g. *kěle* for PS. **kǫlo*. We should therefore expect the circumflex to be short (***nǎbrol*, ***vǔžgol*) instead of long (*nǎobrol*, *věyžgol*) for PS. **nǎ-bǫralb* < **nǎ-bǫralb*, **vǔ-žbgalb*.

Vermeer (1979: 372) accounts for this discrepancy by proposing that a process of compensatory lengthening accompanied the loss of the jers. He gives the example *nyefet* for PS. **nǫgǫti*, and claims that the resulting neo-circumflex is analogically transferred from the ‘unattested’ oblique cases. However, even if we set aside the inherent difficulties with this explanation,¹⁶ there are at least three examples that contradict Vermeer’s account. The first of these examples shows clearly that the loss of the jers cannot have caused the lengthening: *sěrcę* for PS. **sǫrdǫce* < **sǫrdǫce*.¹⁷ The other two examples are more problematic, but could nevertheless be taken as counterevidence: Bed. *lǎihke* (if it goes back to the circumflex in the first syllable of PS. **lǫgǫko*) and Bed. *pěkle* (if it goes back to PS. **pǫ-tǫ-lě*). Likewise, a following long vowel cannot have caused lengthening, e.g. *děmo* for PS. **dǫma*.

3 A New Proposal

The discussion above illustrates that it is untenable to maintain the assumption that the circumflex in Prekmurje fails to advance in the presence of a following jer in weak position, precisely because of the examples such as *sř'cę*, *lid'jer*, *e'nǫ:k*, *op'rǫ:ni*, *od'gouvoro*. Moreover, even if we try to capture the data by sound change, we arrive at a situation in which the circumflex advances to open syllables and not (anymore) to closed ones (see 2.1), which is very unlikely. I have also provided evidence that the sole presence of the weak jers is not the reason for non-advancement in Bednja either, although the counterexamples to this hypothesis are less numerous: *jednǎoke* is the most compelling instance. Moreover, almost all the examples of non-advancement provided by Vermeer and Greenberg

¹⁶ The accentuation here would have to be derived by analogy from the ‘unattested’ genitive singular (or other oblique) form ***nyefto* for PS. **nǫgǫti*. This is, in my opinion, a very weak idea; furthermore, given the fact that the examples above show no lengthening and the fact that Bednja has numerous examples of unexpected accentuation that are analogical to examples initially preceded by a preposition (e.g. *nǎbe* for PS. **něbo* and fourteen others), it is straightforward to explain *nyefet* as part of this latter group. Also, the neo-circumflex usually arises from the old acute and not from the old circumflex.

¹⁷ Note that in disyllabic words where the circumflex does not get shortened, the sequence jer + *r* remains long as expected, e.g. *gěrde*, *děrle*.

are *l*-participles; this fact suggests that the data are likely the result of some process of analogy. The fact that, in Bednja, the *l*-participles show an unexpected length indicates that the circumflex in this case is already advanced (most likely from some preceding particle). Finally, analogical accentuations, where the accent is transferred from forms with prepositions to other forms, are frequent in both Prekmurje and Bednja (e.g. *pyemeč* for PSl. **pōmoť*, analogical to **na pōmoć*, and at least sixteen other examples in Bednja, cf. Vermeer 1979: 371–2).

On the other hand, any new proposal will have to account for the fact that, in Bednja, we find the following distribution: *nâobrol*, *zâobrol*, *zâozvol*, *vêyžgol*, *vêyžgole*, *nâovčil*, *prêičil* vs. *rozdêr*, *pedêr*, *zopêr*, *pečâl*, *pečâli*, *zočâl* and *vêyžgot* vs. *syšêit*.¹⁸ In the final section of this paper, I provide a new account for the data presented above.

We know that the circumflex advances only to closed syllables in the final position in Bednja (regardless of the vowel quantity),¹⁹ e.g. *kêle* for PSl. **kōlo* vs. *gelôub* for PSl. **gōlōbb*. We can assume that at the earliest stage of circumflex advancement, the circumflex in both Prekmurje and Bednja advanced only to closed syllables, both word-finally and word-internally. This is quite a likely assumption, as we know from typology that closed syllables tend to attract stress earlier than open syllables; in fact, this is very similar to the system that is preserved in Bednja even today. We can also assume that by the time of early

18 It may seem to the reader that such a distribution must be a result of sound change. However, at least one dialect description provides a distribution that seems to indicate precisely the opposite shift. Thus, we find the circumflex advanced only in *l*-participles with a weak jer, whereas it does not advance in contexts where no jer follows. This set of examples comes from the transcription of a recording of Ms. Terezija Prkič (born 1932) from Bakovci, reported in Ivanšek (2009: 43–104): *zb'rá:li*, *zap'rá:li*, *pôb'rá:u*, *pôz'vá:li*, *nab'rá:li*, *pôb'rá:li*, *nab'rá:li*, *zap'rá:li* (three times), *pôz'vá:li*, *pôb'rá:li* (three times) vs. *'dô:ubó*, *'dô:ubili* (twice), *'dô:ubilä*, *'napili*, *'dô:ubili*, *'ô:udäli*. Occasionally, we find advancement in the latter group (e.g., *dô'bi:li*), which is probably influenced by the interviewer, and always with verbs of the structure *-*Cvrlb*: *ô'drli*, *ô'dró:u* (twice), *za'prlô*), but the pattern here is clearly the opposite of the situation identified in Bednja. Of course, it is possible that this dialect situation has arisen secondarily – but it also opens up the possibility that it is the Bednjan pattern that is secondary. Moreover, we could assume influence from the standard or neighboring dialects, but there is evidence against this. First, it would be strange for the standard language to influence only the first group (*pôb'rá:u*), but not the second (*'napili*). Moreover, Bakovci *zap'rá:li* in the meaning ‘wash’ does not correspond to the standard *oprâli*. Other descriptions from Bakovci include examples both with the advanced circumflex preceding a weak jer (*zâs'pâo* for PSl. **zâ-svpatb*) and without it (*'po:uzvâli* in Mulaosmanović 2001).

19 In word-internal position, advancement to both closed and open syllables occurs. For a thorough treatment of the circumflex and a proposal that the circumflex advances only from short syllables, see Kapović (forthcoming: 194 ff.).

advancement to closed syllables, the weak jers were already lost; again, this assumption is quite probable (see the argumentation in section 1).

Now, we have to take into consideration an important feature of the Bednja and Prekmurje verbal system – the negation. Both the Prekmurje and Bednja dialects have developed a special kind of negation (the so-called “Pannonian negation”)²⁰ in the past tense, which gives the structure AUX + **ne* + *l*-participle. Note that the auxiliary verb ‘to be’ and the negative particle **ne* do not form a single word in this structure, and that the particle immediately precedes the participle. In Prekmurje, such negation applies to conditionals as well. Thus, we have Selo *sân* ‘*nej* *piĩtq* ‘I have not asked’ (Rajnar 1998: 83), Martinje *kā bi vān* ‘*rāt* ‘*nej* *prāvq* ‘that I would not like to tell you’ (ib.), Bed. *jō sym go ĩzde nĩe vĩel* ‘I have not seen him yet’ (Jedvaj 1956: 322).²¹ This type of negation is not a recent phenomenon; it is attested as early as 1771, in the foreword to the *Nouvi zákon*:²² *kĩbi* [...] *obrnouti nemogao* ‘who would not be able to turn’.

Thus we can conclude that the circumflexed *l*-participles often had double accentuation that varied according to whether the sentence was positive or negative, e.g. PSl. **pǫbьralь* and **ně pobьralь*. If we assume that the circumflex first advanced to closed syllables only (as is very nearly the case in today’s Bednja) we would get the following distribution:

PSl.	pre-Prekm.
<i>*zāčęlь</i>	<i>*začęl</i>
<i>*pǫbьralь</i>	<i>*pobrāl</i>
<i>*ně zāčęlь</i>	<i>*ně za.čęl</i>
<i>*ně pobьralь</i>	<i>*ne pōb.ral</i>

Thus, we get the frequent variants **pobrāl* and **pōbral* within the system, but **zāčęl* and **začęl* (in the latter type the circumflex did not advance from the clitic because of the openness of the syllable). 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 such generalization could not occur because the *l*-participle was not stressed at all when preceded by **ne*. It is also fairly easy to see why the *pōbral*-type was more regularly generalized than other

20 Thanks to Matej Šekli for reminding me of this type of negation.
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.

sporadic analogical accentuations: the generalization could be reinforced by analogy to all other *l*-participles with the structure prefix-C(C)-suffix-*l* (with old acute accent on the suffix) that later also show retraction in Prekmurje (and, to some extent, in Bednja), e.g. *m'lōu* vs. *'semlo*. Thus, we have a model for analogy: *m'lōu* : *'semlo* = *b'ra:u* : *x*, *x* = *'ze:bro* (examples from Rajnar 1998: 60).²³

Another important source for analogy could be the numerous examples in Prekmurje and Bednja with double prefixes, e.g. Radomerščak *z'nq:pili* for PSi. **sḃ-na-pili*. Note that the frequency of the double-prefixed verbs in Prekmurje appears to be much higher than in other Slovenian dialects. There are many verbs, especially those prefixed by *s-po-*, that do not exist in other dialects, but are attested in Prekmurje from the earliest written sources onwards (cf. Novak 2006). Moreover, we have pairs such as *pobratī*, *spobratī* or *poznati*, *spoznati* from the earliest attestations in Küzmič's *Nouvi zákon* 1771: *poberi* vs. *ŷpoberéjo* or *poznao* vs. *ŷpoznao* (445, 679, 518, 686).

Words outside the system of *l*-participles followed the regular rule of advancement to closed syllables, which yielded **ednōk* < PSi. **ēdnokъ*.

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 Prekmurje, on the other hand. Such a spread is also quite expected from the typological perspective. Thus, we have regularly Bed. *ekyelu* for PSi. **ōkolo* and *kēle* for PSi. **kōlo*, but Pkm. *sṛ'cē* for PSi. **sṛdḃce*.

The fact that, in Bednja, the stressed syllable on the prefix of the *l*-participles is long rather than short also speaks in favor of my proposal: this length is a direct result of the fact that the circumflex on this element has already advanced from a preceding clitic or prefix and is therefore regularly lengthened.

4 Conclusion

The new data presented in this paper show that the initial circumflex in *l*-participles is most likely not the consequence of the “non-advancement rule” proposed by Vermeer (1979) and Greenberg (1992). I have proposed a new explanation that I believe better captures the data. I claim that, pace Vermeer and Greenberg, the circumflex did advance after the loss of the jers, and that the

²³ In Prekmurje, there are numerous other such examples, e.g. *g'reu* vs. *'sāgreu* or *'sou* vs. *p'rišo*. 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. *yēbyl* for PSi. **ob-bŭltъ* or *nāōpŭt* vs. *nāobrol*.

superficially odd accentuation behavior of *l*-participles is the consequence of analogy with forms preceded by the particle **ne* or forms with double prefixes such as *s-po-*. Both these features are characteristic of the two dialects under review, Prekmurje and Bednja, and may well have caused the rise of very frequent accentual variants in the systems of *l*-participles. My proposal thus offers a straightforward explanation of the examples, in which circumflex advancement occurs despite the presence of a subsequent weak jer. Moreover, I explain why the stressed vowel in both 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, we have to assume a stage at which the circumflex only advanced to closed syllables. This assumption is not at all controversial, precisely because such a system is almost exactly preserved in Bednja today.

Acknowledgement: I would like to thank my advisors, Vera Smole and Matej Šekli, as well as Jay Jasanoff, Mojca Horvat, Janik Ježovnik, Mate Kapović, Tijmen Pronk, and the audience at the IWoba IX conference at the Juraj Dobrila University, Pula, Croatia. This paper is based on my undergraduate dissertation at the University of Ljubljana (Beguš 2012). All mistakes are, however, entirely my responsibility.

References

- Beguš, Gašper. 2012. *Pomik starega cirkumfleksa v prekmurskem narečju*. Undergraduate dissertation, University of Ljubljana.
- Ficko, Barbara. 2002. *Terminologija pletenja iz slame in nekaj vsakdanjega besedja iz Lipovcev v Prekmurju*. Master's thesis, University of Ljubljana.
- Greenberg, Marc L. 1992. "Circumflex Advancement in Prekmurje and Beyond". In *Slovene Studies* 14 (1): 69–91.
- Greenberg, Marc L. 1993. "Glasoslovni opis treh prekmurskih govorov in komentar k zgodovinskemu glasoslovju in oblikoglasju prekmurskega narečja". In *Slavistična revija* 41 (4): 465–487.
- Greenberg, Marc L. 1994. "Archaisms and Innovations in the Dialect of Središče (Southeastern Prelekija, Slovenia)". In *Indiana Slavic Studies* 7: 90–102.
- Greenberg, Marc L. 1999. "Slovarček središkega govora (na osnovi zapiskov Karla Ozvalda)". In *Slovenski jezik – Slovene Linguistic Studies* 2: 128–175.
- Huber, Damjan. 2003. *Govor vasi Pertoča na Goričkem v Prekmurju*. Seminar Paper, University of Ljubljana.
- Ivanšek, Aleksandra. 2009. *Leksika tradicionalnih in prazničnih jedi, običajev in kmečkih opravil v Bakovcih*. Master's thesis, University of Ljubljana.
- Jakop, Tjaša. 1998. *Pavlovo glasoslovje slovenskega cankovskega narečja (s prevodom vokalizma)*. Master's thesis, University of Ljubljana.

- Jedvaj, Josip. 1956. "Bednjanski govor". In *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 1: 279–330.
- Kapović, Mate. 2005. "Naglasak praslavenske riječi *sъrъdъce". In *Croatica & Slavica ladertina* 1: 125–133.
- Kapović, Mate. Forthcoming. *Povijest hrvatske akcentuacije: Fonetika*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Kolarič, Rudolf. 1956. "Središka govorica in spodnjeprleški govor". In *Slavistična revija* 9 (1–4): 162–170.
- Lukač, Jožica. 1997. *Prekmurski govor vasi Bakovci*. Master's thesis, University of Maribor.
- Mukics, Dusán. 2006. *Oblikoslovje gornjeseniškega govora v Porabju*. Master's thesis, University of Ljubljana.
- Mulaosmanović, Darinka. 2001. *Govor vasi Bakovci*. Master's thesis, University of Maribor.
- Novak, Vilko. 2006. *Slovar stare knjižne prekmurščine*. Ljubljana: Znanstvenoraziskovalni center SAZU.
- Pronk, Tijmen. 2011. "Narečje Ziljske doline in splošnoslovenski pomik cirkumfleksa". In *Slovenski jezik – Slovene Linguistic Studies* 8: 5–17.
- Rajnar, Suzana. 1998. *Prekmurski govori na Goričkem*. Master's thesis, University of Ljubljana.
- Ramovš, Fran. 1995. *Kratka zgodovina slovenskega jezika*. 2nd edition. Ljubljana: Znanstvenoraziskovalni center SAZU.
- Raščan, Ksenija. 2008. *Kuharska leksika v prekmurskem kraju Turnišče*. Master's thesis, University of Ljubljana.
- Rigler, Jakob. 1986. "Smeri glasoslovnega razvoja v panonskih govorih". In *Razprave o slovenskem jeziku*, edited by Franc Jakopin, Ljubljana: Slovenska matica: 116–128.
- Šekli, Matej. 2005. "Tonemski naglasni tip glagola v (knjižni) slovenščini". In *Jezikoslovni zapiski* 2 (2): 31–61.
- Šekli, Matej. 2013. "Zemljepisnojezikoslovna členitev kajkavščine ter slovensko-kajkavska jezikovna meja". In *Slovenski jezik – Slovene Linguistic Studies* 9: 3–53.
- Škofic, Jožica et al. 2011. *Človek (telo, bolezni, družina)*. Vol. 1.1 of *Slovenski lingvistični atlas*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC.
- Vermeer, Willem R. 1979. "Innovations in the Kajkavian Dialect of Bednja". In *Dutch Contributions to the Eighth International Congress of Slavists*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 347–381.
- Zorko, Zinka. 1991. "Vzhodni Haloški govori". In *Nemetközi szlavisztikai napok*, 4: 51–69. Szombathely.
- Zorko, Zinka. 1992. "Prleško narečje v Radomerščaku, rojstnem kraju F. Miklošiča". In *Miklošičev zbornik. Obdobja 13*, Ljubljana: SAZU: 463–476.
- Zorko, Zinka. 2009. "Oblikoslovje in leksika v Cankovskem govoru". In *Narečjeslovne razprave o koroških, štajerskih in panonskih govorih*, Maribor: Filozofska fakulteta: 272–284.