

Slovenski jezik  
Slovene Linguistic  
Studies

8  

---

2011

POSEBNI ODTIS – OFFPRINT

Tijmen Pronk. *The Slovene Dialect of Egg and Potschach in the Gailtal, Austria*. (*Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*, vol. 36). Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi, 2009. Index, Maps, x + 334 pp.

The Gailtal dialect (*ziljsko narečje*) is part of the Carinthian dialect group (*koroška narečja*) and is located on the extreme northwest periphery of the Slovene language area. The previous literature contains relatively little information on this dialect, and the detailed description offered here is valuable for several reasons. Because of its geographical isolation, the Gailtal dialect exhibits both archaisms and innovations that distinguish it from other dialect groups. Data from the Gailtal are therefore important for Slovene dialectology as well as historical Slavic linguistics more generally. Due to the pervasiveness of German in the daily lives of the inhabitants of this region and the low level of prestige accorded to the local Slovene varieties, these data can also be useful for the study of contact-induced change. Finally, the Gailtal dialect is in danger of extinction so it is important to preserve as much information as possible while there are still fully competent speakers; according to Pronk (4) the majority of the speakers are over 50 and virtually no children are acquiring the dialect.

As indicated by the title, Pronk's work focuses on the sub-dialect of Egg (Brdo) and the neighboring settlement of Potschach (Potoče). His principal informant was born and raised in Egg and after her marriage moved to Potschach, where she has lived for over 60 years. In the main text Pronk generally refers to the specific sub-dialect as Potschach, although it appears that all of the villages in the immediate vicinity of Egg exhibit the same dialect features (see p. 12). The book consists of an introduction, which provides historical and sociolinguistic background information; separate chapters describing the synchronic phonology, morphophonology, nominal and verbal morphology; more limited notes on syntax and semantics; dialect texts; a chapter on historical accentology; three appendices (irregular verbal inflection, verbal prefixes, and local toponymy); a lexicon; and finally, an index of standard Slovene cognates of dialectal forms to help readers find particular words in the lexicon (the latter is particularly useful for a dialect such as this one, where for example the form corresponding to standard Slovene *globok* 'deep' is *brbwǎk*, and the cognate of *pivo* 'beer' appears as *û* in the N sg.). Since the main goal of the work is to provide a synchronic description of the Potschach dialect, Pronk offers only limited commentary on historical phonological developments. While some of this information is available elsewhere (e.g., Grafenauer 1905, Logar 1981, Greenberg 2000:

168-9), it would have been helpful to provide at least a short sketch for those who are not specialists in Slovene.

The phonology of the Patschach dialect is covered in Chapter 2. The dialect has eight vowels (*i*, *e* [e], *e* [ɛ], *a*, *o* [ɔ], *o* [o], *u*, and *ə*; the latter is always short) and four diphthongs (*iə*, *jə*, *uə*, *wə*) in stressed syllables. In broad historical terms, \**e* and short \**ě* fell together as *e* (*žěnšči* ‘female’, G sg. *čəbėka* ‘person, man’), \**e* > *e* (*mėso* ‘meat’), \**o* > *o* (*kőža* ‘skin’), \**o* > *o* (*zōb* ‘tooth’). The long diphthongs *iə*, *uə* reflect long \**ě*, \**ē* and \**ō* (*zbiəzda* ‘star’, *pīəč* ‘stove’, *būəg* ‘god’), while the short diphthongs *jə*, *wə* are the result of the retraction of the accent from short final syllables onto a preceding short *e* or *o* (*žjəna* ‘woman; wife’, *kwəza* ‘goat’). The jer vowels are reflected as *e* when lengthened, otherwise as *ə* (*dėn* ‘day’, *pəs* ‘dog’). In pretonic syllables the vowel system is reduced essentially to *a* and *ə*, with *i*, *u*, *e*, *o* occurring only in a limited number of forms. In non-final post-tonic position we find *i*, *u*, *a*, *ə* and rarely *e* and *o*. Five vowels occur unstressed in absolute final position (*i*, *e*, *a*, *o*, *u*); here *i* and *u* are phonetically somewhat lower and more centralized, but still distinct from other vowels. Unstressed vowels have been lost entirely in some environments, and mergers of stressed vowels have also occurred. In this dialect the sonorants *r*, *l*, *m*, *n* can also function as syllable nuclei. With respect to its consonantism, the dialect has a number of features found in other northwestern dialects: preservation of voicing oppositions in final position, lenition of \**b*, \**d* > *β*, *ð* in some environments, partial replacement of \**v* by *β* (otherwise, \**v* is realized here as *w*; e.g., *bino* ‘wine’, but *witi* ‘to wind’), secondary palatalization of velars before front vowels, and lenition of \**l* > *w* before back vowels (*švapanje*).

The Patschach dialect exhibits the general Slovene lengthening of short stressed vowels in non-final syllables (e.g., *bāba* ‘woman (pej.); godmother’), but this occurred prior to the retraction of the stress from final syllables (e.g., *žjəna*). The dialect subsequently shortened long vowels before consonant clusters in non-final syllables (e.g., *rəsti* ‘grow’), but in some forms the length was restored by analogy (e.g., *pāsti* ‘herd, graze’). As a result, the Patschach dialect has quantitative oppositions in both final and non-final syllables. The stress can fall on any syllable, and pitch is distinctive on both short and long stressed syllables. According to Pronk’s analysis, which is apparently based solely on auditory impressions, the pitch distinctions in this dialect are realized primarily as a low tone vs. high tone on the accented syllable, rather than rising vs. falling pitch contours on this syllable (18); this agrees with previous descriptions of Gailtal and other Slovene dialects (see particularly Neweklowsky 1973, who made acoustic measurements of the Gailtal accents). A low tone in non-final position is accompanied by a high pitch on the following syllable, if this is the last syllable in the word, and otherwise on the second following syllable (e.g., *mėso* [mɛ<sub>L</sub>:sɔ<sub>H</sub>] ‘meat’, *žėgmanega* [žɛ<sub>L</sub>gnanɛ<sub>H</sub>ga] ‘blessed’, 18). This realization of the rising accent was noted already by Grafenauer (1905: 221–2), who described it as a “double accent” (e.g., *bābā*, *skākatė*; see also Logar 1981: 184). Although the traditional rising/falling labels are therefore inaccurate for this dialect, I will use these terms in the remainder of this review to facilitate comparison with other dialects.

The historical phonological developments particular to this dialect result in a large number of segmental alternations in the inflection of nouns, adjectives, and verbs; e.g. *b(j)əlak* ‘big’, m. N pl. *bliči*; *dlōg* ‘long’, f. N pl. *dlōwe/dlōje*; *krāa* ‘cow’, DL sg. *krābi*, G

pl. *kráw*; *méti* ‘have’, l-ptc. m. sg. *mõw*, f. sg. *méja*, m pl. *méli*; *trwǎk* ‘child’, L sg. *trõku*, G pl. *trúak*, etc. Many of these alternations are no longer phonologically predictable, due to analogical levelings and the introduction of loan words after the relevant phonological changes ceased to be active, so they must now be described as morphologically or lexically conditioned. A few nouns retain alternations due to the second palatalization of velars before certain endings; e.g., DL sg. *nóze* ‘leg’, N pl. *trwǎci*. These and other alternations are described in detail in Chapter 3.

Chapter 4 treats the morphology of nouns, adjectives, pronouns and numerals. Nouns and adjectives are classified into different synchronic accentual types. In addition to the inflectional morphology, Pronk also provides some discussion of the derivation of nouns and adjectives.

The inflection of nouns shows certain changes in the distribution of the inherited endings across declensions as well as leveling within paradigms. Distinct NA dual endings are preserved but the oblique cases have been replaced by plural forms, except in two feminine nouns that are attested with the I du. ending *-ama*. Neuter nouns have adopted the a-stem NA pl. ending *-e*, feminine i-stems have mostly adopted the masculine G pl. ending *-ǝw*, and the a-stem D, L, and I pl. endings *-an*, *-ah*, *-ami* have been generalized to almost all nouns of the remaining declensions (the D pl. *-an* could also reflect the original m./n. ending *\*-omъ*; compare m./n. I sg. *-an*). The m./n. L sg. endings *-e* and *-u* and the a-stem L sg. endings *-i* and *-e* appear to be in free variation. The a-stem D sg. also occasionally has the ending *-e* (beside normal *-i*), and i-stems sometimes have the a-stem ending *-e* in the GDL sg. and NA pl.

Traces of original accentual and quantitative alternations can be observed, but these have been obscured to a significant extent by various phonological changes and analogical levelings. For example, in the a-declension original type (a) stems and type (b) stems with a long vowel have fallen together; as in the standard language they have a rising accent in most case forms that alternates with a falling accent in the I sg. and G pl. (e.g., *lípa* ‘linden tree’, L sg. *lípi*, I sg. *lípo*; *zbiǎzda* ‘star’, N pl. *zbiǎzde*, G pl. *zbiǎzd*). In the Potschach dialect the falling (neocircumflex) accent of the I sg. has been generalized to the I pl., as well as to the only I du. form that is attested for this type. Words with an inherent neocircumflex accent on the stem have preserved this as a fixed falling accent in all forms, although the long vowel was subsequently shortened before a consonant cluster (e.g., *hrǔška* ‘potato’, *bǎsǎda* ‘word’); many loanwords follow the same pattern (e.g., *flǎša* ‘bottle’). The dialect has developed a new accentual type with a falling accent in the I sg., the NA du., and all plural forms (representing the generalization of a long circumflex or neocircumflex accent), and a rising accent in the rest of the singular; this small group includes nouns originally belonging to all three inherited types; e.g., *pǎlica* ‘shelf’, NA pl. *pǎlice*; *méja* ‘pasture’, NA pl. *mêje*; *sǎrwǎta* ‘orphan’, NA pl. *sǎrǔǎte*. Original type (c) nouns have otherwise preserved evidence of the original alternating accentual pattern; e.g., *gwǎra* ‘mountain’, A sg. indicating direction *gǔǎro* (< *\* (v̆) gōrō*) vs. A sg. *gwǎro* (< *\*gorō*), I sg. *gǎró*, NA pl. *gwǎre*, G pl. *gǔǎr*, L pl. *gwǎrah*. The same synchronic type includes the original (a) stem *kráa* ‘cow’ and several short-vowel (b) stems; note, however, that no directional accusative forms are attested for these, so they may not be fully assimilated into this type. Nouns of the other declensions similarly tend to

have overlapping synchronic accentual patterns for original type (a) and (b) stems, with limited alternations, and more complex patterns for at least some of the original type (c) stems. Many nouns in the data cannot be classified into Pronk's synchronic accentual types because the crucial forms are not attested.

The declension of adjectives similarly exhibits certain simplifications. As in standard Slovene the indefinite and definite adjectives have the same endings except in the masculine N(A) sg. The masculine and neuter L and I sg. endings have fallen together as *-an*, the feminine and neuter both have the ending *-e* in the NA pl., and the oblique plural endings for all genders are identical to the noun endings: GL *-ah*, D *-an*, I *-ami*. This dialect has a large number of indeclinable adjective forms, mostly borrowings from German. As in other varieties of Slovene, the indeclinable particle *tə* normally precedes definite forms. Original type (a) and (b) stems have a falling accent in the definite forms. Generally the only difference between these two types is in the accentuation of the masculine N(A) sg. indefinite of monosyllabic adjectives (e.g., *stār* 'old' vs. *črn* 'black'); otherwise the indefinite forms all have a rising accent. Original type (c) adjectives typically preserve a long falling accent in the masculine N(A) sg. indefinite form and have a rising accent in all other forms (definite and indefinite). The formation of the comparative is largely unpredictable synchronically, and a number of periphrastic comparatives with *bwəɫ* 'more' are attested. The synthetic comparative always has a falling accent.

The inflection of verbs is treated in Chapter 5. As in standard Slovene, there are three tenses: present, past, and future, the latter two of which are formed periphrastically with the present and future forms of the verb 'to be' plus the l-participle. In addition to the indicative, imperative, and present conditional moods, the Gailtal dialect also has a past conditional not found elsewhere in Slovene, formed by the past conditional of the verb 'to be' (*běsn*, *běsi*, etc.) plus the l-participle. Non-finite forms are the infinitive, supine, and past passive participle; a present (imperfective) gerund is attested for only four verbs. The formation of the l-participle is not always predictable from the forms of the present tense and vice versa (100), and a verb can have as many as four different stem forms (e.g., *stōr-i* 3sg. pres. 'do', *stūər-u* m. sg. l-ptc., *stwər-i* 2sg. imp., *str-ija* f. sg. l-ptc., 99), which makes the analysis of the verbal system quite complex. As elsewhere, Pronk gives a strictly descriptive account based on the surface forms, which causes him to set up 10 inflectional types (plus additional subtypes) for the present tense and 11 types (plus subtypes) for the l-participle, which do not correspond directly to the present-tense types; for example, verbs belonging to Class VII in the present tense have l-participles in classes I, V, and VIII. Although this approach allows for an accurate and complete account of the conjugational system, it is not particularly helpful for those wishing to use the Potschach data for comparative purposes (however, Pronk does give a list of correspondences between the present and l-participle classes on 133–4).

Chapter 6 offers a brief description of word order, negation, and the use of various grammatical forms, focusing on points where the dialect differs from the standard language. To mention just a few of these, the auxiliary must always precede the l-participle, so this may force the occurrence of a clitic in initial position when a conjunction or subject is omitted or the subject is moved towards the end of the sentence for emphasis; e.g., *So prišle pəd pōdan*. '[They (the mice)] came under the floor.'; *Je òbnar prišu...*

‘The stove fitter came...’. Similar examples are also found in the present tense; e.g., *Se ti sanjá?* ‘Are you kidding?’ (146). Multiple clitics occur in a fixed order, which is somewhat simpler than in standard Slovenian. This dialect has developed a form of strong negation with the particle *nčə* (from the contamination of *nə* ‘not’ with *nčč* ‘nothing’); this particle also occurs in synthetic negated forms of ‘to be’ and ‘to have’; e.g., *nčlāsni* ‘I am not at all’, alongside the regular *nīāsni* ‘I am not’. Although not discussed explicitly here by Pronk, the dialect uses *nə* (which I assume is cognate with standard Slovene *en* ‘1’) as an indefinite article (*Mədwā məsta nə šišo?* ‘Do the two of you have a house?’; 145).<sup>1</sup> Phonological developments have apparently led to the complete loss of the preposition *\*v̂*, so that the locative case is used alone to express the meaning ‘in’ and the accusative to express a destination ‘(in)to’ (abbreviated A dir. by Pronk); e.g. *Pətóčah* ‘in Potschach’, *Trze* ‘in Hermagor’, *pwəjči* ‘in the stove’ vs. *nə pwəjči* ‘on the stove’; *Pa stěj je šwa Kánado...* ‘And now she’s gone to Canada...’.<sup>2</sup> The 19 pages of dialect texts in Chapter 7 provide additional examples of syntactic structures; however, the texts are not glossed or translated so it would be difficult for anyone who does not know Slovene well to extract information from them.

The title of the final chapter, “History of the Gailtal Accentuation,” is somewhat misleading since it focuses on evidence for the advancement and subsequent retraction of the circumflex accent in the Gailtal and Resia dialects, rather than giving a broader discussion of the historical phonological developments and the patterns of alternations in different accentual types of stems. Although circumflex advancement is one of only a few developments potentially common to the entire Slovene language area, some have questioned whether it took place regularly in the westernmost dialects (Gailtal and Resia), except in forms where the loss of a weak jer in the initial syllable left no other possibility. Pronk demonstrates convincingly that the Gailtal evidence supports the hypothesis that the circumflex accent regularly shifted to the following syllable (e.g., A pl. *sərūate* ‘orphan’), from which it then retracted in most forms, yielding a rising accent (e.g., A sg. *\*nōgō* ‘leg’ > *\*nogō* > *nōgo*). Given the fact that the Gailtal and Resia shared other early developments it is likely that the same processes took place in Resia as well, as argued by Pronk, although the evidence is less clear (181-184).

Greenberg (2000: 91, 105ff.) explains the advancement of the circumflex accent as the result of a reinterpretation of the place of stress based on relative syllable weight (‘CVCVV/CVCVC > CV’CVCV/CV’CVC’); this process was fed by the shortening of long circumflex vowels and the compensatory lengthening of the following syllable (*\*rōkō* ‘hand’ > *\*rōkō̄* > *\*rokō̄*). He interprets the Gailtal rising accent in place of the original circumflex as a “partial realization of the forward shift of the Common Slavic falling pitch” (112), i.e., as a shift of the pitch peak with the place of stress remaining the same, and not as the result of circumflex advancement followed by retraction. As Greenberg notes (107), if one assumes that circumflex advancement took place here, the retraction

<sup>1</sup> Notice that the nominative forms of the 1 du. and 2 du. personal pronouns are homophonous: *mədwā/mədbīə* ‘we two, you two’.

<sup>2</sup> These examples are taken from various places in the text; Pronk does not discuss the loss of the preposition *\*v̂* in the syntax chapter. Note also that the verbal prefixes *\*v̂-* and *\*u-* have mostly been lost without a trace, but are reflected as infixes in some verbs; e.g. *bīti* ‘hit’ vs. *bwīti* ‘kill’ (143).

of the shifted circumflex accent must have occurred prior to the retraction of the accent from short final syllables because of the differences in vowel quality. In the Potschach data, forms with an original circumflex have the same reflexes as an original neoacute (e.g., *oko* 'eye', G sg. *lésa* '(piece of) wood' like pres. 3sg. *nósi* 'carry', *žéni se* 'marry'), while the retraction from a short final syllable yields a diphthong (e.g., 2 sg. imp. *nwəsi*, 1-ptc. m. sg. *žjěnu se*).

The connection of the accent shift with syllable weight is plausible and is supported by evidence from dialects where the advancement is limited to certain environments (Greenberg 2000: 106).<sup>3</sup> However, the lengthening of a syllable in compensation for the shortening of a preceding vowel, as proposed by Greenberg, appears to be typologically unusual, if not unique; I am not aware of any similar examples in the phonological literature on compensatory lengthening processes. Pronk (187–8) objects to Greenberg's explanation on the grounds that many forms with the shift had a short vowel to begin with (e.g., *\*oko* > *okō*), and that some dialects have length oppositions in initial circumflex syllables in some forms beside a shifted accent in others (e.g., Središče *'oko*, *'mε:so*, *gol'o:p*, *sus'i:lo*), which shows that the shift cannot be linked to the shortening of initial circumflex syllables. Pronk prefers Kortlandt's (2008: 6) formulation of the circumflex advancement as a spreading of the high tone to the right: "HL > HH in *kōst* and HLL > HHL > LHL in *okō*, *mladōst*, *rokō*," which resulted in a shift of stress to the second syllable and lengthening of the vowel. Pronk explains the Gailtal reflexes in the same way: "In the Gailtal, and possibly in Val Canale and in Resia the high tone continued to spread to the right: LHL > LHH > LLH, thereby merging tonally with reflexes of the acute and the neoacute (*okō* > *oko*, *kràva* > *kráa*, *vòla* > *óla*). The H is indeed reflected as a high tone in posttonic or post-posttonic syllables in these three types. This situation must have led to the reinterpretation of the position of the stress." (188) With respect to the neocircumflex, Pronk assumes that it arose when the advancement of the H tone was already in progress: "The short rising accent LH, both from acute and neoacute, was lengthened to LHH when posttonic long vowels were shortened and posttonic weak jers were reduced,<sup>4</sup> eventually becoming HH > HL and thus merging with the advanced falling tone. This scenario does, however, imply that the advanced falling tone and the neocircumflex were phonetically distinct for a while." (189)

<sup>3</sup> Bethin (1998: 136–7) also offers a quantity-based explanation for circumflex advancement, although in different terms; she suggests that the identification of quantity as the marker of prominence in circumflex forms led to a generalization of iambic (W S) metrical structure.

<sup>4</sup> Pronk thus accepts the common explanation of neocircumflex lengthening as compensatory in origin; elsewhere in the chapter (174–5, fn. 72) he criticizes an alternative hypothesis proposed in Langston (2007). As Pronk observes, this article does question the phonological naturalness of the specific lengthening process assumed in the traditional explanation, but it also cites data from čakavian dialects where the neocircumflex occurs in forms in which either the following syllable remains long or evidence for its original length is lacking. His objection to my proposed explanation on the grounds that "the old acute was never long" is based on Kortlandt's reconstruction of the development of the Common Slavic acute, which is not a proven fact. However, the intent of Langston (2007) is primarily to point out the inherent weaknesses of the compensatory lengthening explanation for the neocircumflex, and the alternative outlined there is admittedly tentative (2007: 91). Pronk's objections should be taken into account, but the compensatory lengthening explanation has its own shortcomings.

While these are also plausible processes in principle, it is difficult to evaluate these proposals fully because Pronk does not provide a formal autosegmental analysis, showing how tones are linked to specific syllables (or moras?), or any explicit discussion of the relationships between tone, stress, and quantity; instead, the reader is left to speculate about many of the details. Given the schematic representation of the final stage in circumflex advancement as LHL, we must assume that  $ok\hat{o} = o_L ko_{:HL}$ .<sup>5</sup> The subsequent change to LLH proposed by Pronk must then be represented as  $o_L ko_{:HL} > o_L ko_{:HH} > o_L ko_{:LH}$ . Since Pronk states that circumflex forms overlapped with the original acute, we must assume that a form like *krava* was also  $kra_L va_{LH}$  at this stage as a result of similar changes:  $kra_{LH} va_L > kra_{LH} va_H > kra_L va_{LH}$ . Note that the two processes of high tone spreading are not strictly identical, because the tones in question are not associated in the same way to the individual syllables at each stage, and the length of the final syllables would have also been different. The precise relationship between tonal features and stress is unclear. Kortlandt's formulation of circumflex advancement implies that stress is associated with the H tone, since the shift of the H tone to the second syllable results in a shift of stress. However, in forms like *krava* the advancement of the H tone to the second syllable does not cause a similar reinterpretation of the place of stress, as might be expected; rather, according to Pronk's analysis forms like *ok\hat{o}* with a stress on the second syllable become reinterpreted as *óko*, like *kráva* (> *kráa* in this dialect). But this does not explain why we have a different outcome in forms like I sg. *\*gor\hat{o}*, which would presumably be  $go_L ro_{:LH}$  in phonological terms and thus identical to  $o_L ko_{:LH}$  at the end stage of the posited H tone advancement, but which retains the stress on the second syllable: *gəró*.

The discussion of the neocircumflex is similarly imprecise in autosegmental terms. Pronk states that the short rising LH accent is "lengthened to LHH" without explaining why lengthening entails the addition of a H tone; indeed, in the rest of the sentence he goes on to say that the LHH eventually becomes  $HH > HL$ , with two tones on what remained a long vowel, implying that there is no necessary connection between length and the number of tonal features. It is also not clear from this precisely how the neocircumflex remained distinct from the advanced circumflex accent, since they would have been phonologically identical in this analysis, yet ultimately behave differently. Pronk assumes that the neocircumflex retracted regularly to a preceding long vowel, and examples where the neocircumflex retracted to a short vowel are analogical (e.g., *ótáa* < *\*otáva* plus a few other forms, vs. more numerous examples like *bəsîəda*), while the shifted circumflex retracted regularly to a preceding long or short vowel except in trisyllabic forms with an initial short high vowel, where Pronk assumes that vowel reduction blocked the retraction (180–181).

Although I would have liked to see a more explicit discussion in the final chapter to address these questions, this does not detract significantly from the overall strength of this fine work. Pronk has succeeded admirably in providing a thorough synchronic description of the dialect of Potschach, together with an informative discussion of specific historical developments in the Gailtal and Resia dialects. The book has been carefully produced and edited, and I noticed only a very small number of minor misprints (e.g.,

<sup>5</sup> I will use this type of shorthand notation in lieu of more explicit autosegmental representations in order to conserve space.

‘flee’ instead of ‘flea’ as a gloss for *bòwha* (36), or the discrepancy between the long vowel in the singular forms of *čèsta* in the paradigms on 67–8 and the entry for *čèsta* in the lexicon, where only forms with a short vowel are cited for the singular). This volume will provide a wealth of valuable data for specialists in Slovene as well as for Slavists in general.

### References

- Bethin, Christina Y. 1998. *Slavic Prosody: Language Change and Phonological Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grafenauer, Ivan. 1905. “Zum Accente im Gailthalerdialekte.” *Archiv für Slavische Philologie* 27, 195–228.
- Greenberg, Marc L. 2000. *A Historical Phonology of the Slovene Language*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 2008. “Rise and Development of Slavic Accentual Paradigms.” ms, available at: <http://www.kortlandt.nl/publications/art255e.pdf>
- Langston, Keith. 2007. “The Neocircumflex in Western South Slavic.” *Slovenski jezik/ Slovene Linguistic Studies* 6, 77–95.
- Logar, Tine. 1981. “Potoče (Potschach; OLA 146).” *Fonološki opisi srpskohrvatskih/ hrvatskosrpskih, slovenačkih i makedonskih govora obuhvaćenih opšteslovenskim lingvističkim atlasom*. Ed. Pavle Ivić. Sarajevo: Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, 183–191.
- Neweklowsky, Gerhard. 1973. *Slowenische Akzentstudien: Akustische und linguistische Untersuchungen am Material slowenischer Mundarten aus Kärnten*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Prispelo avgusta 2010

Received August 2010

Keith Langston  
University of Georgia