

Uspořádali

PhDr. Zbyněk Holub, Ph.D., Mgr. Ing. Roman Sukač, Ph.D.

Recenzenti

Prof. RNDr. Václav Blažek, CSc.
PhDr. Ondřej Šefčík, Ph.D.

ISBN
978-80-7248-773-8

Obsah

Úvod.....	6
Dialekty nebo mikrojazyky?	7
A Balkanism in Central Europe? Realis vs. irrealis in subordinate clauses in Prekmurje Slovene	8
<i>Marc L. Greenberg</i>	
Leopold Geitler's Contribution to Lithuanian dialectology: geolinguistic aspect	19
<i>Danguolė Mikulėnienė</i>	
Kashubian as language and dialect in view of early northern West Slavic isoglosses	28
<i>Tomasz Wiśniewski</i>	
Obecné otázky dialektologie, metodologie a mezioborové vztahy	40
Zmeny v stavbe, vývine a fungovaní nárečia v súčasnej jazykovej situácii (na príklade spišského nárečia)	41
<i>Gabriela Múcsková</i>	
Sociolingvistické otázky nárečového výskumu na strednom Slovensku.....	56
<i>Tomáš Bánik</i>	
Současný stav nářečí na jihovýchodním Plzeňsku a připravovaný výzkum mluvy mládeže v západočeském pohraničí	70
<i>Jana Nová</i>	
Současný dialektologický výzkum	78
Regionální nářeční slovník a problémy jeho zpracování (na materiálu z Podkrkonoší)	79
<i>Jarmila Bachmannová</i>	

Slovník slovenských nářečí a nářečový korpus.....	88
<i>Katarína Balleková</i>	
Selected issues from research on evaluative vocabulary in local dialects (on the basis of The dictionary of the local dialect of Zakopane and the area by Juliusz Zborowski).....	94
<i>Monika Buława</i>	
K věcněvýznamovému zpracování slovní zásoby v nářečích slovníků	106
<i>Hana Golářová</i>	
The Lithuanian dialects nowadays: changes and their causes.....	116
<i>Asta Leskauskaitė</i>	
Místní a pomístní jména z Českého koutku v nářečí a mimo nářečí.....	124
<i>Jarosław Malicki</i>	
Dialectal and ethnographical regions of Lithuania: affinities and differences	136
<i>Violeta Meiliūnaitė</i>	
Jazykovězeměpisné aspekty mluvených korpusů Českého národního korpusu.....	144
<i>Martina Waclawičová</i>	
Specifické otázky dialektologie	156
Nadnárodní jazykové atlasy a česká dialektologie.....	157
<i>Martina Ireinová</i>	
Onymický a dialektový areál: paralelnost či identičnost?.....	164
<i>Stanislava Kloferová</i>	
K několika nářečím pojmenováním živočichů v pomístních jménech.....	173
<i>Hana Konečná</i>	
K jazykové situaci na pomezí českého, polského a původního pruského Slezska (na modelu tzv. prajzského nářečí v obci Chuchelná)	182
<i>Petra Neubertová, Zbyněk Holub</i>	

Sotak prosody reconsidered (Part one).....	192
<i>Joseph Schallert</i>	
K problematice nářeční terminologie	209
<i>Jarmila Vojtová</i>	
Závěrem.....	216
Summary	220
Literatura	222
Adresy autorů	243

Úvod

Vážení čtenáři, vážené kolegyně, vážení kolegové,

soubor statí, který otvíráte, charakterizuje mnohé rysy současné dialektologie slovanských jazyků.

Viděno úhlem geografickým – lze zjistit, že dialekty slovanských jazyků – jako jeden ze zdrojů poznání a pochopení stavu současného – zajímají stále nejen Slovany samy, ale že zůstávají středem zájmu mnohých slavistů zahraničních, dokonce i mimoevropských.

Viděno pohledem dialektografickým – ukazuje se, že i po vydání obdivuhodného souborného díla o dialektech češtiny, po vydání Českého jazykového atlasu, zůstává mnohé, co je potřeba zaznamenat, popsat a vyhodnotit. Zasvěceným je patrně zbytečné zdůrazňovat, že dialekt je živý, byť se to zdá v době masivní globalizace téměř všech úrovní společenského života téměř neuvěřitelné. Dialekt je součástí života, je často dokonce podmínkou života tam, kde jsou jiné sociokulturní determinanty, ty, jež posilují vědomí identity člověka, oslabené.

Viděno úhlem badatelským – je zřejmé, že na rozdíl od generací předchozích má dialektolog k dispozici mnohem spolehlivější, obsáhlejší, variabilnější technické prostředky jak pro snímání výchozího textového (lépe – řečového) materiálu, tak pro jeho zpracování. Elektronický způsob zachování dat umožní kvantitativní charakteristiky zdokonalovat a zpřesňovat do stupně, o němž nebylo ještě v nedávné minulosti vůbec možné uvažovat, kvalitativní metody tak mohou být ve svých východiscích vydatně posíleny.

Ukazuje se, že komplexní analýza řečových projevů je jednou z cest, kterou se snad moderní dialektologie může vydat. Řeč je prostředím k myšlení, prostředím pro život. Zdá se, že je nutné zabývat se nejen tím, za jakých podmínek a do jaké míry se struktura dialektu a jeho výrazové formy uchovávají či neuchovávají, ale zejména tím, jak dialektové výrazové postupy a prostředky vrůstají do proměnlivých útvarů tvořících pásmo mezi dialekty či interdialekty a spisovným jazykem, jak se chovají k cizím vlivům, jak se přizpůsobují novým komunikačním nárokům.

Eva Höflerová

Dialekty nebo mikrojazyky?

A Balkanism in Central Europe? Realis vs. irrealis in subordinate clauses in Prekmurje Slovene

Marc L. Greenberg

Abstract

The paper examines the distinction between realis- and irrealis-marking complementizers (*ka* vs. *da*) in the Prekmurje (Pannonian) dialect of Slovene and compares the phenomenon to the same distinction observed in Balkan *Sprachbund* languages (Albanian, Bulgarian, Modern Greek, Macedonian, Romani, Romanian). Though the phenomenon is indeed synchronically parallel, historically the distinction in Prekmurje arose as a result of retentions on the periphery (partially shared with the Carinthian dialects) and not as a result of (erstwhile) contact with languages of the Balkan *Sprachbund*.

Keywords

subordination, complementizers, complementation, dialectology, Slovenia, Slovene language, Balkan languages, Indo-European languages, language contact

Ammann and van der Auwera (2004: 300) claim for South-East European languages two language types, whereby languages in group A distinguish complementizers for realis/irrealis and languages in group B make no such distinction. Group A includes Modern Greek (*óti/na*), Albanian (*se~që/të*), Macedonian (*deka~oti/da*), Bulgarian (*če~deto/da*), Balkan Romani (*kaj/te*), Romanian (*că/să*), Southern Italian dialects (*ka/ke~ku~mu*); Group B includes BCS (*da*), Slovene (*da*), and French (*que*):

Group A

- (1a) *Znam, če idva.* ([Bg] Scatton 1984: 379)
know-1-SG COMP/FACTUAL come-3-SG-IMPF
'I know that s/he is coming.'
- (1b) *Iskam da doйда* ([Bg] Scatton 1984: 378)
want-1-SG COMP/POTENTIAL come-3-SG-PF
'I want to come.'
- (2a) *El spune că citește o carte.* ([Ro] Noonan 1985: 52)
he say-3SG-PRES COMP/FACTUAL read-3-SG-INDIC a book
'He says that he is reading a book.'
- (2b) *El vrea să citească o carte.* ([Ro] Noonan 1985: 52)
he wants COMP/POTENTIAL read-3-SG-SUBJUNCT a book
'He wants to read a book.'

- (3a) *Ti mendon, se ka shkuar kot tërë ajo punë që është bërë këtu?*
([Albanian] Newmark et al. 1982: 305)
You think-2-SG-PRES-IND COMP/FACTUAL go-PCPL futile all this work
COMP/FACTUAL aux-3-sg do-PCPL here
'Do you that all of the work that has been done her was in vain?'
- (3b) *Leksi deshi të përgigjej, po s'pati kohë.*
([Albanian] Newmark et al. 1982: 82)
Alex wish-AOR COMP/POTENTIAL reply-SUBJUNCT but not have-AOR
time
'Alex wanted to reply, but did not have time.'

Group B

- (4a) *Kaže da čita knjigu.* (BCS)
say-3-SG COMP read-SG-PRES-IND book-ACC
'S/he says s/he is reading a book.'
- (4b) *Želi da čita knjigu.* (BCS)
wish-3-SG COMP read-SG-PRES-IND book-ACC
'S/he wants to read a book.'
- (4a) *Pravi, da bere knjigo.* (SS)
say-3-SG COMP read-SG-PRES-IND book-ACC
'S/he says s/he is reading a book.'
- (4b) *Želi, da bi brala knjigo.* (SS)
wish-3-SG COMP COND read-PCPL-F-SG book-ACC
'S/he wants to read a book.'

In the Prekmurje dialect of Slovene (PKM, see Figure 1), however, the situation is more complex. On the surface, it would seem that PKM matches with BCS and Standard Slovene if one takes an isolated example from Pavel's unpublished grammar of Slovene (1942), as in examples 5a-c:

- (5a) *Došao sam kod tebe da ti pomognem* (BCS)
(5b) *Prišel sem k tebi, da bi ti pomagal.* (SS)
(5c) *Priso szam k tebi, da bi ti pomágo.* (Standard PKM: VN §423)
came-M-SG AUX-1-SG to you-DAT-SG COMP COND you-DAT-SG
help-MASC-SG
'I came to you so that I can help you.'

The situation is not so clear-cut. VN in fact allows two possibilities for the choice of COMP, *da ~ ka*, in cases such as (6) and (8), the less preferred

variant (following Pavel's indications) appearing in parentheses, whereas Standard Slovene (7), (9) permits only *da*:

- (6) *Zavêszť, da (~ka) szkoro ozdraví, ga je neszkoncsno razveszelíla.* (VN §437)
 awareness-N-SG-F COMP soon recover-3SG-PF him-ACC AUX-3SG to-no-end-ADV pleased-F-SG
 'The notion that he would soon recover pleased him to no end.'
- (7) *Zavest, da bo kmalu ozdravel, ga je neskončno razveselila.* (SS)
 'The notion that he would soon recover pleased him to no end.'
- (8) *Pravo mi je, ka (~da) mi zavszema zavüpa.* (VN §436)
 Said-M-SG me-DAT AUX-3SG COMP me-DAT fully-ADV trust-3SG-IMPF
 'He told me that he completely trusts me.'
- (9) *Rekel mi je, da mi popolnoma zaupa.* (SS).
 'He told me that he completely trusts me.'

Figure 1. Map of Slovene with Prekmurje in the north-east



Pavel points out that in cases such as (1) the variants *ka* or *ka bi* would be incorrect, as intentionality cannot be signaled with *ka*, only with *da* (§445)¹ and that *da* is used more restricted instances where the proposition is potential ('teljesülhető') rather than asserted ('valódi'), which we will refer to in the continuation with the labels *irrealis* and *realis*, respectively. The option of using one or the other complementizer is possible in cases such as (6) and (7) where, according to Pavel, the main clause contains a verb expressing an emotion, though *da* is in this case preferred: *Trno me veszelí, da (~ka) szí zse pá zdrav* 'I am very pleased that you are healthy once again' (§444). In (8), however, *ka*

1 The point is evidently normative. Compare example (8).

is preferred over *da* in assertions, i.e., where the main clause does not contain a modal verb. It follows therefore that in contrast to Standard Slovene, which lacks this option, not only does the VN standard language possess more than one complementizer, but that *da* is marked for irrealis, as in the South-Eastern European languages adduced by Ammann and van der Auwera.

Pavel's rules are at odds with the MVRS spoken dialect of today, where the modal *da* is rarely, if ever, encountered in everyday speech.² It might be surmised that the form was borrowed from Standard Slovene for the purpose of standardization and never entered the spoken language. If this is the case, then the borrowing entered the written tradition long before VN. For example, it is found in Franc Temlin's *Mali Katechismus* of 1715 (Temlin [1986]: 13): *Szpomeníŕze cslovecse, da den szobotni prefzvetís* 'Remember, man, that you must sanctify the Sabbath day'; and Števan Küzmič's *Vöre krsztsánszke krátki návuk* of 1754: *pomágajmo, da ŕze vŕza nyegova obdr'zijo* 'let us help so that all his (...) may be sustained' (quoted in Novak 2007: s.v.). It might be surmised that *da* could have been re-borrowed by Pavel from central Slovene dialects through the intermediary of the contemporary Slovene standard language, with which Pavel was thoroughly familiar. If this is the case, it would mean that Pavel invented a model for the distribution of *da* vs. *ka*, a distinction that is not available in either the central dialects or the Slovene standard language. While this is possible, it does go against Pavel's prevailing practice of basing his normative grammar on actual spoken usage of his day while removing narrowly local variation.

Once we look at speech collected around the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, however, we in fact find the variation in speech that is reflected in VN. Thus in Pavel's *Cankova tales* (1917, 1918), we discover on the very first page an example in which *da* may occur according to VN after a verb of potential (irrealis) proposition:

- (10) *ädänövomi sta si sã zalúbíla, ka ädän övoga nìgdár ná pov žãta.*F³F
 (165–166)
 one-another-DAT-SG-M AUX-2SG self-DAT promise-PAST-DU COMP REFL
 one another-ACC-SG never not spurn-3DU-PF
 'They promised each other that they would never spurn one another.'

2 I base the observation on my own field notes and am grateful for confirmation of this point by a native speaker from the area, Mojca Horvat (ZRC SAZU), as well as an anonymous reviewer and his/her named informant Tadeja Hercog, born 1980, from Cankova, Pavel's native village. Logically, the lack of the distinction today cannot demonstrate its earlier non-existence.

3 The stress markings from Pavel's transcription are to be read as follows: the grave sign over a vowel designates a short-stressed vowel, the acute sign a long-stressed vowel. For typographical reasons (and because they are irrelevant to the present discussion) some details of the transcription are left out, such as the reduction of unstressed *i*, marked by a dot placed under the letter.

Conceivably, here *ka* might be contrasted with temporal *da* (see below), which occurs in the next sentence of the narrative: *Da jä pojbár ädändväsäti lëjt star gráto, mògo jä iti na štèlingo* (166–167) ‘When the boy became twenty-one years old, he had to go for his military service.’ A similar effect of triggering the less expected possibility may be seen in example (11), where the dependent clause can be seen as a factual instantiation framed by a (negative) hypothetical proposition. Alternatively, the hypothetical antecedent may trigger a temporal reading, just as it does in English, which admits either *when* or *that*:

- (11) *Kà bi näbi büü žàlostän – právi srmák – da san tòu dèjtäcä òudo!*
(175)

How NEG-COND was-M-SG sad-M-SG say-3SG-IMPF wretch-NOM-SG
COMP AUX-1SG this-ACC-SG-N baby-ACC-SG-N sold-M-SG

‘How would I not be sad,’ said the wretch, ‘when/that I have sold this baby!’

Prekmurje grammar and Slovene/BCS contrast in that Prekmurje Slovene uses the complementizer *da* with the meaning ‘when’, as illustrated in (12), which normally is rendered in Standard Slovene with *ko* (13).

- (12) *Te pridi, da mo te zvali.* (VN §439)
then/at-that-time come-IMP-2SG COMP fut-AUX-1PL you-ACC call-M-PL
‘Come when we call you.’

- (13) *Pridi takrat, ko te bomo poklicali.* (SS)
come-IMP-2SG then/at-that-time COMP you-ACC fut-AUX-1PL call-1PL
‘Come when we call you.’

The temporal *da* is etymologically distinct from the modal *da*, the former being a reduction of *gda* < **k̂da*, as seen in 18th century PKM (14a–b):

- (14a) *Vzemi me, gda fze ti vidi fztoga fzevjta.* (KŠ 1754: 256)
take-IMP-SG when REFL you-DAT seem-3-SG-PRES from this-GEN-SG
world-GEN-SG
‘Take me from this world when you see fit.’

- (14b) *Neznamo gda merjemo.* (SŠ 1796: 91)
not-know-1-PL-PRES-MPF when die-1-PL-PRES-IMPF
‘We don’t know when we are to die.’

The modal *da* comes from a lative particle originating in a demonstrative pronoun (< IE **doh*₂) (Kopečný et al 1980: 148–149; Snoj 2003: 94); the temporal *da* is connected with the particle from which temporal adverbs have been built, e.g., OCS *sada* ‘now’, BCS *sada* ‘now’ (Kopečný et al 1980: 149–151, 623–624; Snoj 2003: 643), presumably < IE *d’oH*, cf. OHG *dō*, OE *þā* ‘then’.

To get a sense of the distribution of the use of *da* and *ka* in its three functions, temporal (‘when’), irrealis, and realis, a small collection of transcribed tales published by Pavel (1917, 1918) were scanned, yielding 118 total instantiations of subordinate clauses introduced by one or the other of the two complementizers (others, such as the optative *naj* and temporal *ar* ‘up until’ were ignored—these accounted for just a few tokens). The results are summarized in Figure 3. It may be the case that this distribution represents a usage that was in place at the beginning of the twentieth century, but that has now become obsolete, though the point remains to be verified. As mentioned above, the distribution appears to have shifted a century later to temporal *da*, with *ka* introducing non-temporal subordinate clauses. The results adduced here would thus demonstrate a tendency towards these absolute targets, where 84.9% of the temporal readings are rendered with *da*, and 96.6% of the realis readings are rendered with *ka*. Irrealis readings are almost evenly split, with *da* used for 44.4% and *ka* for 55.5%. As can be seen in Figure 3, the functions of each are distributed in inverse proportion, with the likelihood of *da* being temporal > irrealis > realis and *ka* being realis > irrealis > temporal. Of the two, *da* is marked, occurring in roughly a third of all instances and *ka* occurring in the remaining two thirds.

Figure 2. Distribution of *da*, *ka* in Pavel 1917, 1918 (n = 118)

	da				ka			
	number of da tokens	as % of da	as % of da + ka	as % of function	number of ka tokens	as % of ka	as % of ka + da	as % of function
temporal	28	66.6%	23.7%	84.9%	5	6.6%	4.2%	15.1%
irrealis	12	28.6%	10.2%	44.4%	15	19.7%	12.7%	55.5%
realis	2	4.8%	1.7%	3.4%	56	73.7%	47.5%	96.6%
Total	42	100.0%	35.6%		76	100.0%	64.4%	

Towards an explanation

The situation elaborated for PKM should not surprise us, as it is clear from the wider Slavic context that the particle *da* started out its life as a marker of optative propositions, as in ex. (15):

- (15) *vъdite i molite sę da ne vъnidete vъ napastъ*
 ‘Watch and pray that you may not enter into temptation.’

It is generally assumed that in BCS and Slovene *da* spread from potential to assertive (indicative) propositions as its modal semantics weakened (Grickat 1975: 73–78). It is thought that the spread progressed from west to east, a process that Grickat terms a ‘Balkanism in regression’ (*ibid.*: 74), presumably on the basis of the attestations of this usage in the early eleventh century Freising Folia, as in ex. (16):

- (16) *Tose uueruiu u Bog uzemogoki, i u iega Zin, i u Zuueti Duh, da ta tri imena <sunt> edin Bog ...* (FF III)

‘I also believe in God almighty and his Son and in the Holy Ghost that these three names are one God ...’

On the other hand, the complementizer *ka* originates in a lative or instrumental pronominal form IE **k^heh₂*, cognate with Latin *quā* ‘in what manner’ (Snoj 1996: 190–191; Sihler 1995: 268).⁴ Indeed, the sense ‘in what manner’ is included in the semantic range of Prekmurje pronominal *kā*. The form is attested with various semantic developments, as in exx. (17) and (18):

- (17) *ka ta idziesz* ([Polish dialect] Kopečný 1980: 325)
 ‘where are you going’,
 (18) *ka smo to čuli, taka go kazvame* ([Bg] Kopečný 1980: 325)
 ‘as we heard it, so we tell it’.

It is moreover presumed to be the basis for the formation of the Slovene and Kajkavian pronoun *kaj* ‘what’ < **ka-jъ* (Snoj 1996). The relic form *ko*, glossed as ‘what’, is also found in Carinthian Slovene fossilized phrases (19):

- (19) *Ko pa jē? Ko pa bč̃? Ko pa sə rēkli?* (Zdovc 1972: 109)⁵
 ‘What is it?/What’s the matter?’, ‘What will happen?’, ‘So what did they say?’

which have direct correlates in Prekmurje, cf.

4 As Sihler points out, it is impossible to determine whether Lat. *quā* (and, consequently, Slavic **kā*) continue the IE instrumental or ablative, as both have the same reflex in the desinence (*loc. cit.*).

5 The peculiarities of Zdovc’s transcription are preserved here.

- (20) *kā gé?* (Mukič 2005: 143)

‘What is it?/What’s the matter?’

However, in contrast to Carinthian, in Prekmurje Slovene (stressed) pronominal *ka* is the normal form for ‘what’. There is good reason to think that this is the identical form in both Carinthian and Prekmurje Slovene. As I have pointed out in Greenberg 2000, rounded **a* was preserved longer in Carinthian and Pannonian dialects of Slovene, at least until post jer-fall, as these two areas failed to merge strong jers with the reflect of **a*.⁶

Figure 3. Carinthian, Pannonian vs. Standard (Central) jer reflexes

Common Slavic	Carinthian	Pannonian	Standard Slovene
<i>*dъnbъ</i>	<i>den</i>	<i>den</i>	<i>dan</i>
<i>*makъ</i>	<i>mak</i>	<i>mak</i>	<i>mak</i>

Synthesis and conclusion

Common Slavic inheritance

- Subordination with participles (dative absolute, etc.)
- Competition with subordination strategies with complementizers, some innovative **že* ‘focus, relativizing’, **da* ‘optative’, **kъda* ‘temporal’, **kъdē* ‘locative’...

Early Slovene, Kajkavian

- Reinterpretation of lative **ka* ‘whither’ → ‘what-NOM/ACC’

Early Northeastern Slovene (Carinthian, Pannonian)

- Reinterpretation of construction transitive → pseudo-intransitive

6 This interpretation differs from Zdovc’s (*loc. cit.*), who assumes that the form is derived from an earlier **kō*, though points out that this instance of final stressed *-ō* is unique (31). The development becomes understandable if one assumes that the form derives from **kā* and that labialized **a* was inherited rather than innovative (Greenberg 2000: 113).

*Vidimъ (Vid' q?) ka dělajęši.	*Vidimъ (Vid' q?), ka dělajęši.
see-1-SG-PRES what-ACC do-2-SG-PRES	→ see-1-SG COMP do-2-SG-PRES
I see what you are doing.	I see that you are doing (something), i.e., working

South Slavic

- Reinterpretation of *da*-clauses from optative → general subordination/complementation
- Spread of *da*-clause innovation fails to affect NE Slovene, which had already developed general subordination

Prekmurje Slovene with respect to complex constructions belongs to a type that is divergent from Slovene and BCS, but also includes complexities that have been attributed to the Balkan *Sprachbund*. The claim here is of course not that Prekmurje belongs to the Balkan *Sprachbund*, but that it both reflects an earlier stage of the spread of *da* from irrealis to realis that otherwise is reflected in Slovene and BCS as well as had its own particular development of a contrast between temporal *da* and realis *ka*. It is thus a divergent type that is worth including in the typology of Slavic subordination. In historical perspective, Prekmurje Slovene shows us a peripheral case that indicates complexities that have disappeared in the more innovative center.

Abbreviations

ACC = accusative; AUX = auxiliary verb; Bg = Bulgarian; COMP = complementizer; COND = conditional; DAT = dative; dial. = dialect; F = feminine; FF = Freising Folia = Bernik et al. 1993; FUT = future; IMP = imperative; IMPF = imperfective; M = masculine; N = neuter; OCS = Old Church Slavic (quoted from Blagova et al. 1994); PF = perfective; PKM = Prekmurje Slovene (Prekmurje Slovene); PL = plural; Po = Polish; Ro = Romanian; SG = singular; REFL = reflexive; SS = Standard Slovene; VN = *Vend nyelvtan* = Pável 1942

References

AMMANN, Andreas and Johan VAN DER AUWERA. Complementizer-Headed Main Clauses for Volitional Moods in the Languages of South-Eastern Europe. Olga Mišeska TOMIĆ, ed. *Balkan Syntax and*

- Semantics (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, v. 67)*, pp. 293–314. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2004.
- BLAGOVA, È., et al. *Staroslavjanskij slovar' (po rukopisjam X–XI vekov)*. Moscow: Russkij jazyk, 1994.
- BERNIK, France, et al., eds. *Brižinski spomeniki. Znanstvenokritična izdaja*. Ljubljana: SAZU, 1993.
- GREENBERG, Marc L. Ágost Pável's Prekmurje Slovene Grammar. *Slavistična revija* 37, 1989, pp. 353–364.
- GREENBERG, Marc L. Glasoslovni opis treh prekmurskih govorov in komentar k zgodovinskemu glasoslovju in oblikoglasju prekmurskega narečja. *Slavistična revija*. 41, 1993, 4, pp. 465–487
- GREENBERG, Marc L. *A Historical Phonology of the Slovene Language (= Historical Phonology of the Slavic Languages, 13)*. Heidelberg: C. Winter Universitätsverlag, 2000.
- GREENBERG, Marc L. The Pannonian Slavic Dialect of the Common Slavic Proto-Language. *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, XLVI, 2004, 1–2, pp. 213–220.
- GREENBERG, Marc L. Dialect Variation along the Mura. *Croatica et Slavica Iadertina* 1, 2005, pp. 107–124.
- GREENBERG, Marc L. The Slovene Sound System Through Time. *Slavistična revija*, 54, 2006, (Posebna številka: Slovensko jezikoslovje danes / Slovenian Linguistics Today), pp. 535–543.
- GREENBERG, Marc L. *A Short Reference Grammar of Slovene (= LINCOM Studies in Slavic Linguistics 30)*. Munich: Lincom, 2008.
- GRICKAT, Irena. *Studije iz istorije srpskohrvatskog jezika*. Belgrade: Narodna biblioteka S. R. Srbije, 1975.
- KOPEČNÝ, František et al. *Etimologický slovník slovanských jazyků. Slova gramatická a zájmena, sv. 2. Spojky, částice, zájmena a zájmena adverbia*. Prague: ČSAV, 1980.
- MUKIČ, Francek. *Porabsko-knjižnoslovensko-madžarski slovar*. Szombathely: Zveza Slovencev na Madžarskem, 2005.
- NEWMARK, Leonard, Philip HUBBARD and Peter PRIFTI. *Standard Albanian. A Reference Grammar for Students*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1982.
- NOONAN, Michael. 1985. Complementation. Timothy SHOPEN, ed. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Vol. II. Complex Constructions*, pp. 42–140. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- NOVAK, Vilko. *Slovar stare knjižne prekmurščine*. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU, 2007.
- PAVEL, Avgust (PÁVEL Ágost). Vend szövegyűjtemény s az eddigi gyűjtések története. *Nyelvtudomány* 6, 1917, 3, pp. 161–187
- PAVEL, Avgust (PÁVEL Ágost). Vend szövegyűjtemény s az eddigi gyűjtések története (folytatás és vége). *Nyelvtudomány* 6, 1918, 4, pp. 263–282.

- PAVEL, Avgust (PÁVEL Ágost). *Vend nyelvtan*. Unpublished ms., Vashidegkut (Cankova) and Szombathely, 1942.
- SCATTON, Ernest. *A Reference Grammar of Modern Bulgarian*. Columbus: Slavica, 1984.
- SIHLER, Andrew L. *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- SNOJ, Marko. Kaj je kaj? *Škrabčeva misel II. Zbornik s simpozija '96*, pp. 187–192. Nova gorica: Frančiškanski samostan Kostanjevica, 1996.
- SNOJ, Marko. *Slovenski etimološki slovar*. Ljubljana: Modrijan, 2003.
- TEMLIN, Franc. *Mali Katechismus dr. Martina Luthra* [Facsimile edition]. Murska Sobota: Pomurska založba, 1715 [1986].
- ZDOVC, Paul. *Die Mundart des südöstlichen Jauntales in Kärnten. Lautlehre und Akzent der Mundart der "Poljanci" (= Schriften der Balkankommission Linguistische Abteilung XX)*. Vienna: ÖAW, 1972.

Leopold Geitler's Contribution to Lithuanian dialectology: geolinguistic aspect

Danguolė Mikulėnienė

Abstract

The article reviews the research into the Lithuanian language by the Czech linguist Leopold Geitler. His 1873 trip to the area of the Lithuanian language, which was under Imperial Russia at the time is dealt with. Judging by a reconstructed itinerary Geitler was most of all interested in the border of the two main dialects of the Lithuanian language, the Aukštaitian and Žemaitian. From the present point of view, Geitler was interested in those Aukštaitian dialects that were most removed from the Lithuanian dialects of Eastern Prussia and written Lithuanian of that time. Therefore, in Lithuanian linguistics he is first of all mentioned as a researcher into the Lithuanian dialects.

Keywords

geolinguistics, Lithuanian dialectology, Leopold Geitler, Lithuanian dialects.

0. Leopold Geitler (1847–1885) is little known in the history of Lithuanian linguistics. In Lithuanian encyclopaedias (LKE 184, VLE 491) he is introduced as a Czech linguist of the second half of the nineteenth century, who visited Lithuania and published texts in the dialects of Endriejavas, Zarasai, Šiauliai, and Panevėžys surroundings. He also published excerpts from the first Lithuanian book and was the first to publish the poem 'Anykščių šilelis' (The Grove of Anykščiai) by the poet Antanas Baranauskas (Geitler 1875). This especially deserves attention as the publication appeared at the time of the ban of Lithuanian press in the Latin letters in the area under Russia's jurisdiction (1864–1904) (for more see Zinkevičius 1990: 64–109, 1996: 259–262, Palionis 1995: 224–226, Dini 2000: 344–347).

Although Geitler wrote a work on dialectology (Geitler 1884; 1885²), while evaluating Geitler's contribution to Lithuanian linguistics the commonly accepted opinion is that because of the mistakes and inaccuracies and a mechanical link of facts of the Lithuanian language to the history of the Slav languages 'today this work does not have any greater value' (Sabaliauskas 1979: 145). This evaluation may be too categorical and should be applied first and foremost to the first attempts in Lithuanian phonology (Geitler 1873).

What is the real situation? Research carried out by contemporary geolinguistic methods enables us to make Geitler's contribution and importance to the history of Lithuanian linguistics, first of all, dialectology, more accurate.

1. Geitler's research into the Lithuanian language coincided with interest in the Lithuanian dialects, which grew in the second half of the nineteenth century. The appearance of grammars by August Schleicher (Schleicher 1856) and Fridrich Kuršaitis (Kurschat 1876) can be considered the beginning of a more