original scientific paper
received: 2002-07-10

UDC 811.163.6'282(497.4-14 + 450.361 Križ pri Trstu)

FROM DIALECT TO LANGUAGE: DIALECTOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN KARST AND SLOVENE ISTRIA

Rada COSSUTTA
Science and Research Centre of the Republic of Slovenia, SI-6000 Koper Capodistria, Garibaldijeva 18
e-mail: rada.cossutta@zrs-kp.si

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the roads and pathways into dialectology that the author, a researcher into Karst and Slovene Istrian speech, has travelled up to the present day: from the initial SDLA-Ts (1987), the first Slovene Dialectological Lexical Atlas of Trieste Province, to the recent SDLA-Kp, a pioneer dialectological lexical atlas of Slovene Istrian speech, available on CD, and the recent publication, A Dialectal Profile of Križ near Trieste, which represents a complete monographic review of the author's native Križ speech.

Key words: dialectological lexical atlases, Karst and Slovene Istrian speech, Križ near Trieste speech

DAL DIALETTO ALLA LINGUA: RICERCHE DIALETTOLOGICHE SUL CARSO E NELL'ISTRIA SLOVENA

SINTESI

*L'articolo illustra l'*iter *dialettologico che l'autrice, una ricercatrice dei dialetti sloveni del Carso e dell'Istria slovena, ha percorso fino ai giorni nostri: dall'iniziale SDLA-Ts (1987), il primo Atlante lessicale dei dialetti sloveni della Provincia di Trieste, al recente SDLA-Kp, un pionieristico atlante lessicale dei dialetti istriani sloveni, disponibile su CD, fino ad arrivare all'ultima pubblicazione, ossia il Profilo dialettale di Santa Croce presso Trieste, che comprende una rassegna monografica completa della parlata natia della ricercatrice.*

Parole chiave: atlanti lessicali dialettali, dialetti del Carso e dell'Istria slovena, parlata di Santa Croce presso Trieste

1.1 SDLA-Ts

My journey into dialectology started 30 years ago when I was a student at the Faculty of Arts at Trieste University. Linguistics Professor Mario Doria suggested that my degree thesis could be based on the theme of local dialect. That is the origin of my first dissertation, ***Parole d'origine slava nel dialetto triestino*** (Trieste, 1973), which offers an etymological analysis of Slavic, but mostly Slovene, borrowings in the Italian Trieste dialect of that time.

After that I became professor of literature, Latin and Greek at the France Prešeren secondary school in Trieste where I stayed for 20 years. Teaching offered me a great deal of satisfaction but a wish in my heart did not cease to live: to research the speech of my native village – Križ near Trieste. Despite feeling close to it, the speech of Križ held many secrets which could only be unveiled through detailed dialectological study and research. I shared my thoughts with Professor Franco Crevatin who accepted my ideas with enthusiasm and suggested devising a research plan for Trieste hinterland vernaculars. My work could only be feasible if preceded by detailed preparation work. This was the starting point for my master's degree thesis, written under the supervision of Professor Tine Logar. Ten Slovene vernaculars, equally distributed throughout the Slovene Trieste surroundings, were chosen. These were the vernaculars of the villages of Medja vas, Mavhinje, Samatorca, Križ, Prosek, Repen, Trebče, Gročana, Mačkolje and Korošci. One of the aims of my work was to write a supplement to the Friulian linguistic atlas, the ASLEF, which covers the whole Venezia Giulia territory where Friulian dialects are present, including the whole of Trieste Romance territory, which from the dialectological point of view used to be Friulian. In the ASLEF, however, only two Slovene vernaculars can be found (3a Zgonik, 9a Žavlje) and these cannot offer a complete picture of the dialectal variety of Slovene speech found in the surroundings of Trieste. For this reason I decided to make a detailed analysis of this area, using an adapted version of the ASLEF questionnaire and carrying out field investigation in 10 villages in the Trieste hinterland. I wanted to bring Professor Logar's and Professor Crevatin's ideas to life, which meant producing the first Slovene dialectological lexical atlas of the Trieste region. In this I succeeded and SDLA-Ts was released in 1987 and published by the School of Modern Languages in Trieste.

My research work consisted of several different phases. First, I thoroughly studied the ASLEF questionnaire. It is mostly lexical and very demanding, requiring from both the researcher and his or her informants a deep insight into the material and spiritual culture of the researched area. The questions it poses are very specific and offer a tool for research into the following aspects: 1) natural phenomena and environment; 2) flora; 3) animals; 4) hunting; 5) domestic animals, sheep-breeding, apiculture; 6) parts of the human body and diseases; 7) family and children at play; 8) social life; 9) house and its objects; 10) farm tools, crops, work in fields and stables; 11) garden plants and trees, work involved; 12) viticulture; 13) jobs and housework; 14) cattle-breeding and milk production; 15) forestry and wood production.

The original ASLEF questionnaire consists of 816 questions. Some of these were removed, being connected to activities not present in the Trieste region. Thus, the number of questions was reduced to 740.

In the second phase, villages to be researched were defined. Beyond doubt, the location of some of these is more than exceptional. Let me only mention two lying on the extremities of the Trieste territory: Medja vas in the West and Gročana in the East. These are two clustered agrarian villages with only one road leading to each and ending at each. Meeting the villagers, one cannot avoid the impression that time there had stopped. Every person is marked with individuality, reflected in their speech, which cannot be found anywhere else on the Karst where numerous traces of urbanisation and, of course, linguistic interference can be noticed.

Third, suitable informants had to be found. After the completion of field investigation in my native Križ and neighbouring Prosek, relatives and acquaintances helped me make contact with inhabitants of other villages. A chain reaction was triggered and it resulted in a number of people who were not only eager to cooperate but who also introduced me to other people, many of whom were unique. A conversation with the oldest farmer in the village, a witty Karst man, a bit roguish in his speech, was an unforgettable experience. An equally unique character was a blacksmith who showed me miniature models of all his carts. I was offered valuable recollections of people who today are no longer with us. A list of all informants, a real gallery of characters, who made my work feasible, would be too long. I will never forget with what friendliness and enthusiasm they embraced me, a Karst woman among Karst people. A Karst person is a specific type of person: on the outside he may seem as rough as his soil which he had to scratch from Karst rocks, "mysterious statues, motionless, standing and staring at the Karst rocky soil" in the words of a Karst poet. The genuine tie with their soil is also reflected in their love towards their native speech, confronting Romance interference in the everyday struggle for survival.

In the fourth phase, informants' testimonies were tape recorded and later transcribed using phonetic script according to the OLA-transcription. To make it accessible to a wider public, a table detailing the international phonetic script was added to the review of vocalism and consonantism. On the basis of the materials collected,

the atlas was divided into lexical lists and 177 mostly lexical maps, in some instances showing phonetic differentiation in the analysed dialectal territory in the Trieste hinterland. Maps are presented in written form and therefore have no graphic symbols. The phonetic spelling of the words in question can be found near the number of the researched village. Words in question which did not show a relevant lexical differentiation are only recorded if offering a dialectologist an opportunity to come to numerous phonetic and morphological findings.

Phonetic analysis reveals the interaction of 4 Slovene dialects in the speech of the Slovene Trieste territory: the Karst, Venetian-Goriška Brda, Notranjska and Istrian dialects. The strongest element is that of the Karst, evident in the dominance of the Karst vocalism **(ě:> *ie*; *ô:* > *uo/uə/u*; *l:* > *u*; *ę:* > *ie*; ǫ*:* > *uo/uə/u*; - *ę* > *ə*; -ǫ > *u*)** in the Western part of the territory. ***a* < *ę:*** in Mavhinje, Samatorca, Križ and Prosek is of Venetian-Goriška Brda origin. Specific to the Solkan-Lower Vipava Valley is ***ə* < *a***: followed by **n/m** in Trebče. Typical of the Western Karst also is ***u* < *u***: in Medja vas, Mavhinje, and Samatorca, while everywhere else the Notranjska ***y* < *u:*** is used. ***u* < *o:*** is of Notranjska origins, too: in Prosek, Repen and Gročana. It is also present in some vernaculars of the Karst dialect but it only appeared after the monophthongisation of ***uə, uo***, while ***u* < *o̯u̯*** is of Notranjska origins; however, it is not surprising that the Karst monophthongisation ***uo, uə* > *u*** was caused by the contact between the Notranjska ***u* < *o̯u̯* < *ô:*** and the Karst ***uo* < *ô:***. Furthermore, Notranjska dialectal elements are also ***e* < *ě:*** spoken in Prosek, Repen and Gročana. This can only be explained if developed from a diphthong ***e̯i̯* <*ě:***, **-o** , or ***-o̯u̯o* < -ǫ** in Trebče, Gročana, Mačkolje and Korošci, ***-u* < *-o*** in Gročana, which also appears as ***-o***, typical of all other villages but Prosek, where ***-o̯u̯o*** is used, and Križ where ***-o̯u̯ä< -o*** is used. Specific from the etymological point of view probably is also the Notranjska-Northern Istrian ***-o̯u̯ä < -o,*** used in the speech of Križ, Prosek, Trebče, Gročana, Mačkolje and Korošci, while ***-o/-o̯u̯ä*** is used in Mavhinje and Medja vas, and the monophthong ***-o* < *-o*** in Samatorca and Repen. The origin of the softening of velars before frontal vowels is the same. This is typical of the speech of Trebče, Gročana, Mačkolje and Korošci, while the phenomenon is not present in the speech of the other villages.

The materials collected also direct us to a lexical differentiation proceeding in two directions:

a) differentiation of Slovene dialectal expressions in comparison with standard Slovene (c.f. SDLA-Ts, maps 39, 108, 129, 264, 289, and 304);

b) differentiation of Slovene dialectal expressions in comparison with Romance borrowings, which are a result of a lifelong symbiosis, inter-dialectal contacts and interference, and the influence of the urban environment on Slovene and Romance speech in this area (c.f. SDLA-Ts, maps 169, 289, and 299).

Some phonetic phenomena in Romance borrowings prove that in ancient times Friulian and not an Italian Venetian dialect was spoken here. A typical Romance influence is evident in the loss of intonation and quantitative oppositions in stressed Slovene syllables, and a distinctively Romance word and sentence intonation.

Professor Logar, who wrote the foreword to the SDLA-Ts, confirmed that the collected material is invaluable for both Slovene and Italian dialectology. It is invaluable for the Slovenes because it evidently shows in which areas of the material and spiritual culture of this Slovene linguistic territory in Italy the Slovene lexis has changed most due to centuries-long interference between Slovene and Italian-Friulian dialects. On the other hand, it is also of undisputed value for the Italians because with its 177 new maps it represents a significant supplement to the ASLEF.

1.2 SDLA-Kp: The Slovene Dialectological Lexical Atlas of Koper Province

A few months ago the Slovene Dialectological Lexical Atlas of Trieste Province (SDLA-TS) was followed by the Slovene Dialectological Lexical Atlas of Koper Province (SDLA-Kp) with a supplement for agricultural and viticultural terminology (SDLA-Kp Supp.) which represents a continuation of the SDLA-Ts, since it is based on the same questionnaire and criteria. At this moment it is available only on CD, but I hope it will be published soon.

In the framework of my doctoral study I started, with the help of three of my students (Kukanja, Paclich and Počkaj), to work on the SDLA-Kp. The work was divided into various phases. First I had to reanalyze the ASLEF questionnaire which, as mentioned above, is mainly lexical and quite demanding, because it delves deep into the material and spiritual culture of the territory in question. In the next phase, I divided the SDLA-Kp also into the following areas:

1) natural phenomena and environment; 2) agriculture; 3) animals; 4) hunting; 5) domestic animals, apiculture; 6) parts of the human body and diseases; 7) family and children at play; 8) social life; 9) house and its objects; 10) farm tools, crops, field and barn work; 11) garden crops, trees and work involved; 12) viticulture; 13) jobs and housework; 14) cattle-breeding; 15) forestry and wood production.

As before with SDLA-Ts, I eliminated some of the original ASLEF questions since they were connected to activities that are not present in Istria. In the end there were 740 questions left. After that I had to choose localities and suitable informants. The first field investigation engaged a chain of people who not only wanted to cooperate but also to introduce other people who were

in many respects unique. That was precious help from people I will never forget because of their kindness and the enthusiasm with which they cooperated. All their answers were taped and later transcribed in using phonetic script according to the OLA- transcription. On the basis of the collected material I divided the atlas into 740 maps that are mostly lexical but in some cases it is possible to notice the phonetic differentiation of the analyzed dialectal territory of Slovene Istria. The maps are in written form with no graphical symbols. There is only the phonetic spelling of the words in question near the number of the investigated locality. There are 21 localities investigated in Slovene Istria: 1. Malija, 2. Padna, 3. Krkavče, 4. Gažon, 5. Šmarje, 6. Koštabona, 7. Pomjan, 8. Boršt, 9. Marezige, 10. Trebeše, 11. Belvedur, 12. Pregara, 13. Sočerga, 14. Movraž, 15. Osp, 16. Dekani, 17. Črni Kal, 18. Potok, 19. Kubed, 20. Hrastovlje, 21. Gračišče.

The second part of the SDLA-Kp, the SDLA-Kp Supp.[1], which is the supplement of the atlas, consists of material taken from my doctoral dissertation 'Agricultural and Viticultural Terminology in the Dialects of Slovene Istria' (Faculty of Arts, Ljubljana 1994) which is a continuation of Professor Logar's and Professor Crevatin's project to investigate the marginal Slovene dialects in Slovene Istria near the Italian border in relation to agricultural and viticultural terminology (almost half of the questions common to the SDLA-Kp are in the first part of the atlas). I collected the Slovene Istrian dialectal material from 1988 to 1990 under the mentorship of Professor Logar on the basis of a field investigation of 10 localities equally distributed over the entire area (1. Malija, 2. Padna, 3. Krkavče, 4. Gažon, 5. Šmarje, 6. Koštabona, 7. Pomjan, 8. Boršt, 9. Marezige, 10. Trebeše). I used a special questionnaire in the investigation based on ALI (Italian Linguistic Atlas), ASLEF (Historical-Linguistic-Ethnographic Atlas of the Friuli-Venezia Giulia) and SLA (Slovene Linguistic Atlas). There are 978 questions which I divided into seven chapters covering various aspects of agriculture:

I. Tools, work in the fields and in the barn
II. Garden and orchard
III. Viticulture
VI. Certain plants and trees and operations connected with them
V. Animal husbandry
VI. Beekeeping
VII. Oil production

It is difficult to estimate how many answers were given to those 978 questions since all of them were not always answered and I was quite often given synonyms. Anyway the total number of answers is not much lower than the theoretical one which is 9780. The answers to approximately 470 questions are exclusively Slovene terms. While for 150 questions the answers are only Romance borrowings. The Slovene terminology is rooted in the names for traditional agricultural tools and work, cereals, animals, domestic fruit and other trees with the exception of those typical of Istria as a Mediterranean country.

Under the guidance of co-mentor Professor Alenka Šivic-Dular I treated the collected material linguistically by choosing 554 Romance borrowings from the sectors of agriculture, gardening, viticulture, beekeeping and oil production.

The time period for the entrance of Romance borrowings into Slovene Istrian dialects varies. Some of them were adopted during the rule of the Patriarchate of Aquileia, while the majority of them were adopted during the period of the Republic of Venice. In the present, borrowings come from the Trieste dialect and standard Italian. Romance influence is common in the sector of viticulture, in botanical terms, especially for Mediterranean fruit trees, tropical fruit, the cultivation of grapevines, vegetables, olives, and spices; as well as, in the sector of many agricultural and viticultural tools.

A detailed etymological analysis of the Slovene Istrian Romance borrowings reveals several layers of Istrian romanization: a Latin, a Friulian, a Venetian, an Istrian Italian, a Trieste Italian and an Italian layer.

1. **Latin layer**

This is the most difficult layer to define since the Slovenes settled in Istria in the 6th -7th century when Latin words were no longer used. Some of the borrowings are related to the 'Latinitas' of Aquileia, others were created with the addition of the Slovene diminutive suffix (for example: *mej'γatca* 'Pail with a handle'). Most of them became part of the standard Slovene language and became cultural words with no synonyms (for example: *vino* 'wine'*; ocet* ' vinegar'...).

2. **Friulian layer**

This is a heterogeneous layer which extends from the medieval (represented by the Tergestin and Muglisan borrowings) to the modern period (influenced by the languages of Bisiacco and Friuli). It stands out from the phonetic point of view because of its preserved consonant group **pl/bl** which is not an exclusively Friulian characteristic since it is also preserved in the Istrian Venetian dialects: example SDLA-Kp Supp. 548 *flaš'kǫn*' wicker-bottle', from the Friulian synonym *flas'ciòn* (NP

1 This part of the atlas is published now in the monograph Cossutta, 2002.

323), even though it could derive from the Karst term *flaška* 'bottle' created with the addition of the Romance augmentative suffix but this term is not used in the Slovene Istrian dialects.

3. **Venetian layer**

This layer is the one most represented in the Slovene Istrian dialects, most probably because of long Venetian rule in this territory and in Dalmatia from where Slovene Istria took some Romance borrowings. With the help of numerous dialectal dictionaries I discovered that most of these Venetian borrowings are present in almost all Venetian dialects and they cover various agricultural sectors. The morphological characteristics of the Slovene Istrian Venetian borrowings are:

a) **assumption of the Slovene diminutive suffixes** (example: SDLA-Kp Supp. 851 *fə'sålić* 'drain in the barn', SDLA-Kp Supp. 977 *'koɣəmca* 'container for pouring oil');

b) **adaptation of the infinitive and participle forms of verbs to the Slovene norms with the addition of typical verbal suffixes** (example: SDLA-Kp Supp. 389 *nə'käriɣət / u'kəriɣat* 'to load');

c) **Romance adjectives with the addition of Slovene suffixes** (example: SDLA-Kp Supp. 209 *'yobəst* 'bent', SDLA-Kp Supp. 958 *'måžni* 'pressing', SDLA-Kp Supp. 609 *'tǫndəst* 'round');

d) **appearance of metaplasm which is sporadic** (example: SDLA-Supp. 500 *'fǫla / 'fǫlo* 'hand machine used for sulphurization').

4. **Istrian Italian and Trieste Italian layer**

This layer includes terms that entered Slovene Istrian dialects from the nearby Italian Istrian environment. Most of them can be also found in the Trieste dialect. Because of their geographical position the Italian Istrian dialects influence the Slovene Istrian dialects more directly than the Trieste Italian dialect even though we can not overlook the fact that at least 18 terms are taken directly from the Trieste Italian.

The Istrian Italian and Trieste Italian borrowings have the same characteristics as the Venetian borrowings.

5. **Italian layer**

This layer includes 114 terms that were taken directly from the standard Italian with, for the most part, no phonetic or morphological changes. A limited group of Italian borrowings have characteristics that are typical of the Slovene Istrian Romance borrowings, such as:

a) **diminutives with Slovene suffixes** (example: SDLA-Kp 81 *bə'rętca* 'the cup of an acorn', SDLA-Kp Supp. 438 *'čimca* 'plant', SDLA-Kp Supp. 564 *'dǫyica* 'front stave');

b) **adjectives with Slovene suffixes** (example: SDLA-Kp Supp. 906 *š'telast* 'piebald (of a horse)', SDLA-Kp Supp. 875 *'maɣər* 'skimmed (cheese)';

c) **verb infinitives with Slovene prefixes and suffixes** (example: SDLA-Kp Supp. 192 *konči'merat* 'to fertilize').

Great semantic ramification is shown by the Italian borrowing (295, 334, 363, 593, 638, 955) *š'korcå* which can mean 1) 'nut husk', 2) 'nutshell', 3) 'pea husk, 4) 'bark', 5) 'cup of an acorn', 6) 'olive skin'.

The etymological analysis of Romance borrowings is not used only to discover multiple layers and the ramification of Slovene Istrian agricultural terminology. In fact the results of this research clearly show the relation between different layers: the Venetian layer represents 40% of all Romance borrowings in this territory, followed by the Istrian Italian and Trieste Italian layer (30%), the Italian layer (20%) while the smallest part belongs to the Friulian and Latin borrowings (10%).

1.3 SDLA-Ts : SDLA-Kp (A dialectal lexical comparison)

I am mostly interested in the terminology of dialects situated at the crossroads of the Romance and Slavic world with strong Germanic influence. For this reason they are submitted to mutual interference. By comparing both atlases we can sketch basic characteristics of this phenomenon giving particular importance to Romance and Germanic elements as well as the Slavic component which is usually geographically determined. Let's take a look at some examples taken from the chapter about viticulture:

574. **Grapevine, vinska trta, ceppo di vite;** Q. ASLEF 519:

Slovene Karst and Istrian territory is homogeneously covered by the Slavic term *'tərta*.

576. **Espalier, latnik, pergola;** Q. ASLEF 525:

In the whole Karst territory the terms *'latnik* and *'latńək* are present. The first also covers homogeneously the eastern part of Istria (point 14-21), that is one third of all Istria, while in the rest of Istrian territory we find the Romance borrowing *'periɣola* which can also be found in the whole of the Venetian area (Boerio 492; GDDT 450; Rosamani 762; Tomasi 141; Vascotto 206), with the variant *'periɣula* (point 7, 8) which relates to the Bisiacco and Muglisan borrowing *pergula* (DDM 118; Domini 332).

580. **Sort of grapevine, vrsta trt, filare di viti;** Q. ASLEF 524:

We can find the Romance borrowings *p'lanta* (to compare with the Friulian term *plànte)* and *rə'ɣada* (to compare with the Italian term *riga*) in the whole of northern and central Karst, while the southern part uses *pə'riet* (to compare with the Istrian Italian synonym *parè*, Rosamani 736; Trieste Italian *paredo*, GDDT 435) which is the same Romance borrowing used in the major part of Slovene Istria. The Slovene Istrian word in

point 1 *lə'rańa*, which is also a Romance borrowing, remains isolated (to compare with Istrian Italian (Piran) *liragna* (Rosamani 545).

581. **A bunch of grapes, grozd, grappolo;** Q. ASLEF 526:

The Slavic term *γ'rost*, which saw different phonetic reflexes, covers homogeneously the whole of Slovene Istria and Karst. Only the Slovene Istrian term in point 1 *rə'ćela* meaning 'a small bunch of grapes' relates to the Italian Istrian term *ricèla* 'id.' (Rosamani 878) which can be interpreted from the etymological point of view in different ways (GDDT 525). Also the Karst term in point 5, '*rapla* 'a small bunch of grapes', reflects a Romance borrowing (to compare with the Friulian *rap,* NP 849; Trieste Istrian Italian *rapo* (GDDT 511).

589. **A press, stiskalnica, strettoio da vino;** Q. ASLEF 534:

Comparison of Karst and Istria shows that the whole northern and central part of the Karst area adopted the term *p'reša,* which can also be found in the Trieste Italian and Istrian Italian term *pressa* which is a deverbal form of the verb *pressare,* while Zamboni (Zamboni, Romanismi 589) interprets it as a Germanic borrowing (< Ancient High German *pressa* 'press'). Sporadic (point 8) is *'vinta* (from Middle High German Bavarian *winte,* from German *Winde*, Snoj 719). The whole southern part of Karst and a great part of Slovene Istria use the Slavic term *s'tisk*. In Slovene Istria the Romance borrowings *p'reša, št'renta* and *št'ruk,* felt by the speakers to be modern terms, are sometimes used as synonyms.

594. **Willow tree, vrba, vermena di salcio;** Q. ASLEF 539:

In the whole of the Karst region only the term *'bieka* is used (in locality 1 *'baka)* of unknown origin (Bezlaj I 16). In western Istria we find the Romance borrowing *'venka*, which is an example of metaplasm of the Trieste Italian and Istrian Italian term *vénco,* while in the whole of eastern and southern Istria the Slavic term *'beka* is used.

602. **Brandy, žganje, acquavite;** Q. ASLEF 546:

The Germanic borrowing *š'nopc* (from German *Schnaps)* prevails in the whole of Karst with the exception of locality number 10 where the Romance borrowing *t'rapa* is used as a synonym. In the major part of Slovene Istria the Slavic term *ž'γańe* is used. Only localities 11 Belvedur, 12 Pregara and 13 Sočerga use the Serbo-Croatian borrowing *ra'kija* which has Turkish origin (Snoj 522). In the eastern part we can find the Romance borrowing *t'rapa, pe'teš* and the Germanic borrowing *š'nops*, all of them used as modern synonyms for *ž'γańe*.

615. **Cooper, sodar, bottaio;** Q. ASLEF 561:

Besides the generally used Germanic borrowing *'pintər* and the sporadic Slavic borrowing *so'dar* a very interesting phenomenon can be found in the extreme northern and the extreme southern localities of the Karst area where *bu'tier / bo'ter* are used. These are terms related to Trieste Italian and Istrian Italian *botèr* / Istrian Italian *butier* that covers all the Venetian area and western Slovene Istria. We can also find here the Romance borrowing *mərən'γon* which has questionable origins and the Serbo-Croatian *'bačvar* (from *'bačva* 'barrel'). The eastern part of Slovene Istria co-ordinates the Slavic borrowing *so'dar* with a whole series of Germanic borrowings *('pintər, 'tišlər, 'majstər)* and the above mentioned *bo'tier.*

From the given examples we can conclude that the Istrian Germanic-Romance interference is one of the most important characteristics of these dialects. The existence of an exclusive usage of Slavic terms is rare (for example: grapevine, a bunch of grapes) or it does not exist at all. The Romance and the Germanic borrowings can be defined exactly in the Karst and Slovene Istrian area, so that a continuity between Karst and Istria is created and sometimes interrupted by a Germanic or Romance borrowing in the demarcation locality. It is also very interesting that the speakers themselves feel that the Germanic and Romance borrowings are modern terms that have slowly supplanted previously well rooted Slavic words. They even try to use them as synonyms, but you get the feeling that especially the Romance influence is so strong that the speakers use the borrowing more than the genuine Slovene term.

Such is the present situation of Slovene Istria and Karst. We must not overlook the lexical wealth of this area which is well seen in its dialectal ramification and multilingualism.

1.4 Dialectal Profile of Križ near Trieste *(Narečna podoba Križa pri Trstu)*

My recent monograph, published by the Science and Research Centre of the Republic of Slovenia, Koper, *Narečna podoba Križa pri Trstu* (Cossutta, 2001) is a synthesis of a prolonged dialectological research which I began in 1986 in my native village of Križ (S. Croce) near Trieste, when collecting material for the Slovene Dialectological Lexical Atlas of Trieste Province using the ASLEF questionnaire in ten villages of the Trieste hinterland. Through the SLA questionnaire I also gathered a great amount of material about the domestic idiom of Križ, which eventually became the scientific background for my further dialectological studies. Thus the book grew up which is, in its first part in fact, a description of my native village's spoken language at different levels: phonetic, morphological, lexical and partially syntaxical. I also added a dialectal text as presented to me by my father, while in the synthesis I summed up my findings with the assessment that the speech of Križ is indeed a language of Karst, although with a high degree of interaction between the phonetic features of four Slovene dialects spoken in the regions of Goriška Brda, Karst, Notranjska and Istria. At the lexical

level, frequent Romance and Germanic interference is reflected in it, which is the fundamental feature of the language and a proof of the centuries-old symbiosis of people of different nationalities in this area.

In its second part, the book brings two onomastic dialectological discussions, i.e. *Old names of generally known local places at Križ* and *House names of Križ*. In my first contribution, I collected a fair amount of the names of the village's generally known local places and ascertained, on the basis of their etymological analysis, the former structure of the village and some of the activities which have totally disappeared. In my contribution covering the village's house names I attempted, on the other hand, to extract the morphological and lexical elements that reveal not only Križ's past but are also a means to ascertain the multifold Križ language from the aspect of its features which intertwine with those of the neighbouring Romance and Germanic environments.

OD NAREČJA DO JEZIKA: DIALEKTOLOŠKE RAZISKAVE NA KRASU IN V SLOVENSKI ISTRI

Rada COSSUTTA
Znanstveno-raziskovalno središče Republike Slovenije Koper, SI-6000 Koper Capodistria, Garibaldijeva 18
e-mail: rada.cossutta@zrs-kp.si

POVZETEK

Prispevek osvetljuje dialektološko pot, ki jo je avtorica, kot raziskovalka kraških in istrskoslovenskih govorov, prehodila do danes, začenši s SDLA-Tsom (1987), prvim slovenskim dialektološkim leksikalnim atlasom Tržaške pokrajine, ki prinaša bogato gradivo, zbrano v desetih raziskovalnih točkah v zaledju Trsta po vprašalnici za furlanski lingvistični atlas ASLEF. Rezultat glasoslovne analize tega narečnega izrazja izpričuje v govorih slovenskega tržaškega ozemlja prepletanje narečnih glasoslovnih pojavov štirih slovenskih narečij (kraškega, beneško-briškega, notranjskega in istrskega), njegova leksikalna razčlemba pa razkriva tudi diferenciacijo kraškega besedja in pojav interference s sosednjimi romanskimi govori.

Avtorica je pravkar dokončala tudi SDLA-Kp, Slovenski dialektološki leksikalni atlas koprske pokrajine, trenutno na zgoščenki, ki navaja odgovore po že omenjeni vprašalnici ASLEF v enaindvajsetih vaseh slovenske Istre. Drugi del atlasa pa je osredinjen na istrskoslovensko poljedelsko in vinogradniško terminologijo, zbrano po obsežni vprašalnici (978 vprašanj) v desetih vaseh slovenske Istre. Ta del je zdaj izšel tudi v knjižni obliki v monografiji Poljedelsko in vinogradniško izrazje v slovenski Istri (Knjižnica Annales, 26) z razpravo o jezikovni večplastnosti tega območja, ki jo avtorica utemeljuje z novim pristopom v odkrivanju šestih jezikovnih plasti (latinske, furlanske, beneške, istrskoitalijanske, tržaškoitalijanske in italijanske). Na osnovi obeh atlasov se avtorica loteva primerjave istrskoslovenskega in tržaškoslovenskega gradiva, opirajoč se na natančno etimološko razčlembo, iz katere je razviden pojav interferenčnih vplivov z romanskim in germanskim okoljem.

Atlasa dopolnjuje tudi knjiga Narečna podoba Križa pri Trstu (Knjižnica Annales, 25), v kateri je obdelala rodni križki govor na različnih ravninah (glasoslovni, oblikoslovni, leksikalni in delno skladenjski ravni). V monografijo je vključila tudi narečno besedilo in dve razpravi o križkem imenstvu, in sicer Križka ledinska imena in Križka hišna imena, ki sestavljata mozaik križke preteklosti z vidika romanskih in germanskih interferenčnih vplivov.

Ključne besede: dialektološki leksikalni atlasi, kraški in slovensko-istrski govori, govor Križa pri Trstu

REFERENCES

BEZLAJ - Bezlaj, F. (1976, 1982, 1995): Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika, I (A-J), II (K-O), III (P-S). Ljubljana.

BOERIO - Boerio, G. (1856): Dizionario del dialetto veneziano, II ediz. Venezia.

Cossutta, R. (2001): Narečna podoba Križa pri Trstu. Knjižnica Annales, 25. Koper.

Cossutta, R. (2002): Poljedelsko in vinogradniško izrazje v slovenski Istri. Knjižnica Annales, 26. Koper.

DDM - Zudini, D., Dorsi, P.P. (1981): Dizionario del dialetto muglisano. Udine.

DOMINI - Domini, S., Fulizio, A., Miniussi, A. & G. Vittori (1985): Vocabolario fraseologico del dialetto 'bisiàc'. Bologna.

GDDT - Doria, M., Noliani, C. (1987): Grande dizionario del dialetto triestino. Trieste.

NP - Pirona, G. A., Carletti, E., Corgnali, G. B. (1977, impression of the original edition: 1935): Il nuovo Pirona. Vocabolario friulano. Udine.

ROSAMANI - Rosamani, E. (1958): Vocabolario giuliano. Bologna (1st impression: Trieste, 1990).

SNOJ - Snoj, M. (1977): Slovenski etimološki slovar. Ljubljana.

TOMASI - Tomasi, G. (1983): Dizionario del bellunese arcaico (actually a dictionary of the archaic Belluno dialect from the Revine village). Belluno.

VASCOTTO - Vascotto, A. (1987): Voci della parlata isolana nella prima metà di questo secolo. Imola.

ZAMBONI - Zamboni, A. (1991): Romanismi e altri strati linguistici nella Slavia triestina. Quaderni Patavini di linguistica. Monografie, 8 per Giovan Battista Pellegrini. Padova.