Dialect Topics

Karmen Kenda-Jež
Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language, Ljubljana

STRUCTURALISM IN SLOVENIAN DIALECTOLOGY[1]

This paper outlines the introduction and formalisation of forms of structural description in Slovenian dialectology. Its main focus is on the concept of phonological description, which is the current dominant model for the phonetic analysis of the accent of Slovenian micro-dialects.

Članek je predstavitev uvedbe in formalizacije oblik strukturalnega opisa v slovenski dialektologiji. Osrednja pozornost je namenjena vprašanju zasnove fonološkega opisa, danes prevladujočega modela glasovne razčlembe slovenskih govorov.

Key words: structuralism, phonetics, phonology, phonological description, Slovenian dialectology
Ključne besede: strukturalizem, glasoslovje, fonološki opis, slovenska dialektologija

0 Of all the new linguistic tendencies, only structuralism has, since the Second World War, made a complete breakthrough into European dialectology; this is due to its analytical nature (Coseriu 1992: 171–172). Generative dialectology was either restricted to single excursions, particularly in the field of German and Serbian phonology (Niebaum – Macha 1999: 72; Ivić 1998: 63–69), or virtually unknown, as in Polish and Slovenian philology (Dunaj 1996: 26; Neweklowsky 1999: 24).[2] The first structural descriptions of single micro-dialects appeared in the 1930s (Niebaum – Macha 1999: 66); these included Isačenko's 1939 description of the micro-dialect of the village of Sele.[3] However, structuralism only really took off in dialectology in the 1950s and 60s, following Weinreich's[4] concept of the »diasystem« and Moulton's[5]

---

[1] This paper has been adapted from a chapter entitled 'Methodology of Slovenian Dialectological Research in Relation to the Development of Modern Dialectology' in *Cerkljansko narečje: Teoretični model dialektološkega raziskovanja na zgledu besedišča in glasoslovja* ('The Cerkno Dialect: A Theoretical Model of Dialectological Research Using the Example of Lexis and Phonology') (Ljubljana 2002), a thesis written under the supervision of Tine Logar.

[2] Because of this, generative dialectology procedures were not used in wide-ranging projects. See Ivić's argument for the decision to opt for a structural survey of linguistic material in the *Fonološki opisi*/Phonological Descriptions (FO 1981: 5–6): »The purpose of the book [...] is to present the facts in such a way as to ensure that the work is used as widely as possible. It has therefore been necessary among other things to discontinue the generative approach to the material, which would distance the book from the majority of linguistic experts in Yugoslavia, where its usefulness in the future would depend on the fate of a certain school of linguistic thinking.«

[3] See Vidovič Muha 1996: 82. It appears that earlier examples of the use of the phonological method in dialectology were closely linked to Trubeckoj's influence (see Weijnen 1982: 190). I am leaving to one side here the methodological aspects of L. Tesnière's papers published in the inter-war period – M. Orožen (1994: 170) considers him to be one of the first synchronic structuralists – because he did not directly influence the subsequent development of Slovenian dialectology (Orožen 1994: 172).

[4] U. Weinreich: 'Is a Structural Dialectology Possible?', *Word* (New York) 10 (1954), pp. 388–400.

[5] W. G. Moulton, 'The Short Vowel Systems of Northern Switzerland: A Study in Structural Dialectology', *Word* (New York) 16 (1960), pp. 155–182.

use of initial patterns (Chambers – Trudgill 1994: 39, 44; Niebaum – Macha 1999: 67) as an (abstract) comparative link that allowed a (structural) comparison to be made between individual (sub-)components of a diasystem – in the period, therefore, in which this tendency had reached its peak and had come to an end (Milner 2003: 160) as a »research programme«, so that one can therefore talk primarily of methods of use of its research procedures and tools.

1 Structuralism in dialectology redirected attention away from extralinguistic to intralinguistic issues of spatial linguistic analysis, finally freeing up description (in phonetics in particular) as the goal of dialectological research. At the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century, one of the main tasks of dialectology, along with that of positivist historical linguistics (Coseriu 1992: 40–41), was, in addition to an overview of the linguistic situation, the extra-linguistic explanation of linguistic facts, particularly the detection of direct links between dialectal and geographical/historical boundaries.

Slovenian dialectology, as initially planned by Fran Ramovš in the 1930s, also followed this trend. Ramovš was, by scientific inclination, primarily a linguistic historian – one who perceived, »in today's living speech of the people« (Ramovš 1924: I), the »youngest« level of linguistic development, and in dialectology the geographical-linguistic development correlative of linguistic history. This meant that he was more connected with the neo-grammarian pole of the Germanic linguistic area from which he came (Orožen 1994: 172, note 11) than with the linguistic geography pole. In his dialectological works however, particularly the *Dialektološka karta slovenskega jezika*/ʻDialectological Map of the Slovenian Language' (Ramovš 1931: 23) and the *Kratka zgodovina slovenskega jezika*/ʻShort History of the Slovenian Language' (Ramovš 1936), his use of a term such as *promet*/ʻtraffic' (see Grober-Glück 1982: 98; Weijnen 1982: 199) – in the sense of »any type of natural or social connection between a town or province and its surrounding area« (Ramovš 1936: 98) – probably also reflects the procedures of German linguistic geography and cultural morphology (Grober-Glück 1982: 93) in the isogloss/areal phonetic maps and in the method of cartographic presentation of settlement centres, »dialect [developmental] centres«, directions of expansion, natural obstacles and barriers, the oldest church parishes and historical transport links (Ramovš 1931, 1936), alongside Tesnière's cartographical model and Bartoli's areal linguistics.

Taking extra-linguistic factors into account was, according to Ramovš, an obligatory part of dialectological work. His *Dialekti* (1935) is a consistent realisation of these principles, with the geographical and historical framework forming a basic structural element of the »introductory paragraphs« (Ramovš 1935: XXXII) to the linguistic and linguistic-geographical descriptions of individual dialect groups or dialects woven throughout the text. The methodology of this type of dialectological research – the combination of fieldwork with the continuous assessment of relevant, primarily historical extra-linguistic factors – was developed in the 1950s alongside the linguistic geography work carried out for the *Slovenski lingvistični atlas*/ʻAtlas of the Slovenian Language' (SLA), and crystallised in Tine Logar's early work on dialectology.

Topographical names showing demographic structure or demographic movements in an area under examination have remained obligatory up to the present day, although

they are more or less separate from linguistic discussion in monographic presentations of individual dialects and micro-dialects which are, in terms of their structure, close to the classic form of dialect grammar and characteristic chiefly of Master's and doctoral study in Slovene dialectology.

2 Slovenian structural dialectology, which in the 1960s replaced Ramovš's classic model of dialect survey (phonetic) with a structural description (of the sound system), did not lag significantly behind developments in Europe at the outset (Rigler 1960 [publ. 1963b], 1963a; Toporišič 1961, 1962; Logar 1963).[6] It drew from two sources.

2.1 Diachronic structural dialectology was a continuation, critique and re-evaluation of Ramovš's research into the historical development of dialectal phonetics. It enabled a new, denser inventory to be drawn up of dialect material (for the SLA) from the 1950s, as set out by Jakob Rigler in his paper 'Pregled osnovnih razvojnih etap v slovenskem vokalizmu'/'Review of the Basic Development Stages in Slovene Vocalism' (Rigler 1963b), in which he also justified his decision to use the structural method (Rigler 1963b: 25–26).

This 'Review', and the later 'Pripombe k pregledu [...]'/'Notes on the Review' (Rigler 1967), outlined plans for a historical phonology[7] of the type that appeared in other Slavonic languages in the 1960s and 70s.[8] In this period, as the head of the Dialectology Section of the Institute of the Slovenian Language at SAZU, Jakob Rigler also attempted to formulate research plans and to determine the composition of research groups in a way that enabled diachronic dialectology to develop equally alongside the predominantly synchronically oriented linguistic geography (Archive 26-16/76). Unfortunately, owing to the priorities of the Institute at the time, which drew Rigler away from the Dialectology Section, these plans did not even begin to be realised, so that the two above-mentioned papers represent the summit of Slovenian diachronic dialectology in central Slovenia.

2.2 The beginnings of the synchronic structural treatment of individual dialectal idioms were stimulated by changes to the methodology of research into the standard language[9] – an awareness that the »old dialectological method alone could not comprehend dialect to the extent demanded by the modern science of language« (Toporišič 1961: 203) – and by more thorough contact with other Slavonic dialectology centres, enabled in the 1960s by collaboration in the international 'Slavonic Linguistic Atlas' (OLA) project. Among other basic tasks, Logar's programme paper mentioned »the

---

[6] German (Weijnen 1982: 190) and Polish (Dunaj 1996: 25) structural dialectology began around the same time.

[7] In the 1960s, monographs on the development and state of Slovenian vocalism were among the basic tasks of the Dialectology Section of the Institute of the Slovenian Language (Archive 26/1964 – unnumbered).

[8] The first discussion of this type did not appear until the end of the century (Greenberg 2000).

[9] For the beginnings of Slovenian structural phonology at the end of the 1950s and its links with the principles of the Prague Linguistic Circle, see Vidovič Muha 1996: 81.

preparation of a new Slovene dialectology that should present Slovenian dialects from a phonologically structural aspect, while also taking into account the premises of historical development of course«, giving special emphasis to the importance of a presence in modern Slavonic dialectology trends (Logar 1962/63: 1).

The gradual introduction of structural methods into Slovenian linguistic geography is evident from both the method of Rigler's 1961 re-arrangement of the grammatical section of Ramovš's questionnaire (Benedik 1999: 17) and from the reports on the field research work carried out for the SLA in the early 1960s, although a declarative statement on the »structural approach« in linguistic geography research only appeared at the beginning of the 1980s (Archive 21-257/82).

The following features are characteristic of the first Slovenian structural descriptions of phonology:

(a) the consistent separation of linguistic papers into synchronic and diachronic sections (Rigler 1960;[10] Toporišič 1961; Zdovc 1972, etc.);

(b) the demonstration of phonemicity with illustrative material for minimal vocal pairs, which after the publication of Toporišič's paper on the Mostec micro-dialect (Toporišič 1961: 204, 206, 208) was more or less only characteristic of the Vienna and Graz schools of dialectology (Zdovc 1972; Sturm-Schnabl 1973; Karničar 1979; see also Steenwijk 1988), while this procedure was commonly deployed in central Slovenia only in relation to individual unclear cases (e.g. Logar 1966: 73; Smole 1988: 28, 44);

(c) the explanation of phonetic development using the parameters of the structural phonology school (Ivić 1998: 10), such as the principles of the symmetry, differentiation, concision, load and balance of phonological systems and the functional load of their elements (Toporišič 1961; Logar 1963; Rigler 1963b, etc.).

3 In addition to these classic procedures of structural dialectology, the direct influence of linguistic geography research carried out for the OLA, particularly the theoretical and methodological work of the former OLA Commission for the Yugoslav Inter-Academy Committee for Dialectological Atlases,[11] which collaborated very actively in the formulation of premises for the analysis of dialect material across the whole of the Slavonic area (Ivić 1981: 2–3), was also of fundamental importance for the further development of dialectology in Slovenia.

3.1 Slovenian national (or more precisely, Ramovš's) transcription began to change in the 1960s with the gradual phonologisation of dialect recordings and under the influence of the phonetic transcription deployed for the OLA. Although the term »OLA transcription« is commonly used in professional literature for new (national) transcription such as that put forward by Tine Logar in his work in the mid-1970s, this merely involves the assumption of individual transcription elements, particularly

---

[10] Rigler's paper ´Karakteristika glasoslovja v govoru Ribnice na Dolenjskem' ('Characteristics of Phonology in the Micro-Dialect of Ribnica in Dolenjska'), written in 1952, should also be mentioned here.

[11] The central figures in this commission were Pavle Ivić, Dalibor Brozović and Božo Vidoeski.

those that enable separation of the phonological value of quantity (V : Vː) from the phonological value of stress (V : ˈV) or pitch (V : V̀ : V́).

3.2 Following the publication of the *Fonološki opisi srbohrvaških/hrvaškosrbskih, slovenskih in makedonskih govorov, obravnavanih v Slovanskem lingvističnem atlasu/* 'Phonological Descriptions of Serbo-Croatian/Croato-Serbian, Slovenian and Macedonian Micro-Dialects in the Slavonic Linguistic Atlas' (FO 1981), phonological description using a characteristic three-part scheme (system – distribution – origin) was adopted in the 1980s as the model for the structural analysis (Ivić 1998: 600) of dialect phonology.

Because of its precisely prescribed structure (Ivić 1981: 6–8) and its focus on systemic linguistic features, phonological description is a tool that enables comparisons to be drawn between dialects, therefore laying the ground for the synthetic presentation of the phonology of a larger number of micro-dialects. In Slovenia as well it began to assert itself as a method with efforts to (re-)arrange the SLA dialect collections; however, it has since developed primarily as a fairly independent method (in monographs as well) of presenting the phonology of single micro-dialects. The basic scheme of the textual structure is otherwise preserved while individual descriptions differ (in scope of material presented, terms used and method of analysis) to such an extent that direct comparison of results is no longer possible in all cases.

In addition to the lack of uniformity, which stems from the very concept of the Slovenian phonological descriptions for FO 1981, the further development of phonological description in Slovenia brought discrepancies in the understanding of the initial pattern, either from the fact that this was adjusted to encompass all dialects in the area of the former Yugoslavia, for the requirements of the OLA – one can certainly include here the lack of analysis contained in the chapter on vowel loss, which even in the FO 1981 was not tackled in a uniform manner – or from the different methodological premises of Slovenian researchers, for example in the treatment of accented and non-accented short vowels[12] or in the use of different terms for, for example, reflexes of vowels stressed after stress retractions or advancements.[13]

The initial pattern is an abstract, pre-agreed system – the last development stage of the proto-structure on whose basis it is still possible to explain in its entirety the current synchronic dialect »picture« – and one that is supposed to enable the most economical comparison to be drawn between dialects. The initial all-Slovenian vowel system, as formulated by Tine Logar for FO 1981 (FO 1981: 29), rests on Ramovš's findings on the development of Slovene vocalism (1936: 147–148), and particularly

---

[12] In some phonological descriptions of micro-dialects that attest quantitative contrast (OLA 6, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 147), all short vowels are dealt with together, regardless of whether they are stressed or unstressed. In others, stressed and unstressed vowels are presented in separate sub-sections (OLA 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, 15, 146, 148–149).

[13] Compare: the (Slovenian) stress-shift from the final short syllable/vowel – secondarily stressed V – V in the syllable/position before the short-stressed final syllable (Logar); the stress-shift from the final short syllable (Benedik, Lipovec – Benedik, Novak, Rigler); the (later) jump of the stress from the final short syllable (Orožen); the shift of the stress from the final short syllable (Toporišič).

on the »dependence of vocal quality on quantity«, or on the re-phonologisation of prosodic contrasts as vowel quantity and quality contrasts« (Greenberg 2000: 78). It is based therefore on contrast by quantity (Vː – V), which is the result of the parallel development of circumflected, neo-circumflex-stressed and (originally extended or extended at an early date) long neo-acute-stressed vowels or pre-stressed long vowels before a short final accented syllable on the one hand, and old-acute-stressed, short neo-acute-stressed and unstressed vowels (except long vowels before a short final stressed syllable) on the other (FO 1981: 30–32). Hypothetically speaking, notes on the pitch of the initial phonological units, or further Vː/V sorting in relation to pitch in surveys of the origin of vowels, should therefore be unnecessary, except (as far as Slovenian is concerned) in relation to the special development of vowel structure in the Mostec micro-dialect (FO 1981: 150–153), stress retraction from long circumflected vowels (FO 1981: 37–39, 97, 168, 186–188, 205–207) and in cases of exceptional development, for example the Horjul -*òː* > *uː* versus the usual *oː* > *ǫː* (FO 1981: 82), the shortness of the circumflected *o*, *e* in open syllables in Dragatuš (FO 1981: 135–136) or the new pitch-accent system in the Poljane dialect (Benedik 1989: 32–33).

In phonological descriptions since 1981, reference has been made without exception to the initial all-Slovenian system in the survey of the origin of consonants (see e.g. Smole 1988: 64; 1998: 83; Jakop 2001: 375) and synchronic accent relations (e.g. Škofic 2000: 151; Smole 1998: 84), while in the determination of the origin of vowels, a combination of quantitative and pitch definitions of original vowels has been used despite reference to the initial pattern (e.g. Smole 1998; Škofic 1999, 2000; Zemljak 2000; Koletnik 2000, 2001; Jakop 2001).[14] This is in all likelihood (see the table below) the result of contact with the tradition of recording the initial sounds, as put forward by Jakob Rigler in his basic diachronic paper (1963b: 35, note 16). His recording method is otherwise based on pitch-accented contrasts, but he only takes account of them when they are relevant to the development of phonology in Slovene dialects. The model of phonological description using a combined method of recording initial sounds takes account of the pitch of the original short sound in today's (central Slovenian) long vowels; with short vowels, only their quantity is usually given. This method of presentation can be very misleading with micro-dialects in which there has been no systemic lengthening of acuted vowels in the non-final word syllables, since it creates the impression that two categories of vowels that were once acuted existed in this area as well according to their position in the word.[15]

---

[14] The descriptions in Benedik 1989, Škofic 1997, Kenda-Jež 1999, Nartnik 1999, Koletnik 1999 and Weiss 2001 (for example) were produced in accordance with the FO 1981 model.

[15] However, this type of apparent division can also occur with the use of uniform terminology. See e.g. the phonological description of the Črešnjevci micro-dialect (SLA 368), where the accented *i* originates from both the old-acute-stressed *i* in the non-final word syllable and from the same *i* in the final word syllable (Koletnik 2001: 62).

Development of the all-Slovenian initial system

(a) Scheme for presentation of the origin of phonemes from stressed corner vowels*

Logar (prior to FO 1981)	Rigler 1963b		Logar (FO 1981)		FO after 1981
old (long) i/ī in long Slovenian syllables)	etymologically long i	Slovenian etymologically long i (ī)	i:		(etymologically) long i /i:/ī
	psl. (long) old-acute-stressed-i	old-acute-stressed i in NFS (í-)	old-acute-stressed i	unstressed i in NFS	stressed i	old-acute-stressed i/í
-ì(t)** (in short Slovenian syllables)		old-acute-stressed i in FS (-í)		stressed i in FS		short stressed i/ì

NFS = non-final word syllable
FS = final word syllable
* The right half of each column shows information that applies to micro-dialects which have not seen the lengthening of acuted vowels
** = (psl = Proto-Slavic) sound under Slovenian short stress

(b) Scheme for presentation of the origin of phonemes from accented *e, *o, *ə

Logar (prior to FO 1981)		Rigler 1963b		Logar (FO 1981)		FO after 1981
(psl.) ȅ/ falling e		lengthened original short-circumflected e (ē)		e:		long circum-flected e/e:/etim. ē/ etymologically long e (?!)
(psl.) ȅ /psl. (short) neo-acute-stressed e	(psl.) ȅ /psl. (short) neo-acute-stressed e	neo-acute-stressed e in NFS (ȅ-)	neo-acute-stressed e (ȅ)	stressed e in NFS	accented e	neo-acute-stressed e/ stressed e in NFS
(psl.) -ȅ(t)		neo-acute-stressed e in FS (-ȅ)		stressed e in FS		short stressed e

Only a concept of phonological description based entirely on Slovenian linguistic development issues will enable a comprehensive (structural) comparison of Slovenian sound systems to be properly carried out, alongside a final decision to opt for a uniform initial system that would, if used consistently, allow automatic data processing.

4 It would be difficult to argue that Slovenian dialectology has been completely structural since the 1960s; and in any case, it is the interweaving of classic dialecto-

logical procedures with those of the new linguistic tendencies that has characterised European dialectology as a whole. The structural method of presenting material has to a greater or lesser degree penetrated the (otherwise predominant) treatment of phonology, although no research has yet been done on the extent to which they are really structural dialect descriptions of other linguistic levels, particularly morphology,[16] since they are in most cases synchronic contrastive dialect-standard analysis whose presentation is usually based on the model of presentation of linguistic structures in the standard language.[17]

Structurally based descriptions of the grammatical structure of single micro-dialects forms the core of modern Slovenian dialectology. The first forays by linguistic geography and dialect dictionary production, which has only begun to be intensively developed in central Slovenia in the last 20 years, are for now primarily an enlargement of the dialect data corpus.

V angleščino prevedel
Joel Smith.

References

Arhiv = Arhiv Inštituta za slovenski jezik ZRC SAZU: 21 (1948–); 26 (1958–) – arhiv Lingvistične oz. Dialektološke sekcije. (Typescript, manuscript.)

Francka Benedik, 1989: *Fonološki opis govora vasi Bukov Vrh*. Zbornik razprav iz slovanskega jezikoslovja: Tinetu Logarju ob sedemdesetletnici. Ed. Franc Jakopin. Ljubljana: SAZU. 31–44.

– – 1999: *Vodnik po zbirki narečnega gradiva za Slovenski lingvistični atlas (SLA)*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC (ZRC SAZU).

J. K. Chambers – Peter Trudgill, 1994: *Dialectology*. Cambridge: University Press (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics).

Eugenio Coseriu, ²1992: *Einführung in die Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*. Tübingen: Francke Verlag (Uni-Taschenbücher 1372).

Bogusław Dunaj, 1996: Przedmiot i kierunki badań dialektologicznych. *Studia dialektologiczne* 1. Eds. Bogusław Dunaj – Jerzy Reichan. Kraków: Polska Akademia Nauk – Instytut Języka Polskiego (Prace Instytutu Języka Polskiego 97). 21–29.

FO, 1981: *Fonološki opisi srpskohrvatskih/hrvatskosrpskih, slovenačkih i makedonskih govora obuhvaćenih opšteslovenskim lingvističkim atlasom*. Ed. Pavle Ivić. Sarajevo: Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine (Posebna izdanja LV, Odjeljenje društvenih nauka, Knjiga 9).

---

[16] One might also mention here, for the purposes of illustration, the issue of the classification of nouns by gender in micro-dialects that have not retained all three genders. The presentation occasionally follows contrastive principles (Smole 1994: 111–117), with the structural relations being mentioned in the abstract (253).

[17] In recent decades, models from Jože Toporišič's *Slovenska slovnica/*'Slovene Grammar' and *Nova slovenska skladnja/*'New Slovene Syntax' have been used for comparisons with the standard language in relation to morphology, word formation and syntax, and with the syntactical features of the »general« colloquial language. When dealing with the verb, the classification of material is usually based on the traditional grammar – »after Dobrovský and Miklošič« and the grammar of four authors (Bajec – Kolarič – Rupel – [Šolar], 1956) – and in the most recent monographs on Rigler's scheme for the dynamic accent and morphology from the *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika* ('Dictionary of Standard Slovene'). The classification of dialect words in individual semantic groups follows the division proposed in a paper by M. Hanjšek Holz (1989).

Marc L. GREENBERG, 2000: *A Historical Phonology of the Slovene Language*. Heidelberg: Universitätverlag C. Winter (Historical Phonology of the Slavic Languages 13).

Gerta GROBER-GLÜCK, 1982: Kulturmorphologie im Rahmen dialektgeographischer Interpretation. *Dialektologie: Ein Handbuch zur deutschen und allgemeinen Dialektforschung*. Eds. Werner Besch – Ulrich Knoop – Wolfgang Putschke – Herbert Ernst Wiegand. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 1.1). 92–113.

Milena HANJŠEK HOLZ, 1989: Narečne prvine v Slovarju slovenskega knjižnega jezika. *Zbornik razprav iz slovanskega jezikoslovja (Tinetu Logarju ob sedemdesetletnici)*. Ed. Franc Jakopin. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU – Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša. 79–100.

Tjaša JAKOP, 2001: Fonološki opis govora Ložnice pri Žalcu (SLA 324). *Jezikoslovni zapiski*: *Zbornik Inštituta za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU* 5. 207–234.

Ludwig KARNIČAR, 1979: *Die Mundart von Ebriach/Obirsko in Kärnten: Inauguraldissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde an der Philosophischen Fakultät der Karl-Franzens-Universität in Graz*. Graz.

Karmen KENDA-JEŽ, 1999: Fonološki opis govora kraja Cerkno (OLA 6, SLA 166). *Jezikoslovni zapiski*: *Zbornik Inštituta za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU* 5. 207–234.

Mihaela KOLETNIK, 1999: Fonološki opis voličinskega in črešnjevskega govora. *Slavistična revija* 47. 69–87.

– – 2000: Fonološki opis govora v Radencih. *Jezikoslovni zapiski*: *Zbornik Inštituta za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU* 6. 155–165.

– – 2001: Fonološki opis govora pri Sv. Ani na Kremberku v Slovenskih goricah. *Jezikoslovni zapiski*: *Zbornik Inštituta za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU* 7. 381–392.

A. V. ISAČENKO, 1939: *Narečje vasi Sele na Rožu*. Ljubljana: Učiteljska tiskarna.

Pavle Ivić 1981: Uvod. FO 1981. 1–10.

– – 1998: *Celokupna dela* 10/1: *Rasprave, studije, članci*: *O fonologiji*. Ed. Dragoljub Petrović. Sremski Karlovci – Novi Sad: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića.

Tine LOGAR, 1962/63: Današnje stanje in naloge slovenske dialektologije. *Jezik in slovstvo* 8. 1–6.

– – 1963: Sistemi dolgih vokalnih fonemov v slovenskih narečjih: Referat za mednarodni slavistični kongres v Sofiji 1963. *Slavistična revija* 14. 111–132.

– – 1966: Prispevek k poznavanju nadiškega dialekta v Italiji. *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* (Novi Sad) 9. 73–75.

Vladimir NARTNIK, 1999: Fonološki opis govora Vnanjih Goric (SLA 226). *Jezikoslovni zapiski*: *Zbornik Inštituta za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU* 5. 197–205.

Gerhard NEWEKLOWSKY, 1999: Iz zgodovine klasifikacije slovenskih narečij na Koroškem in nove naloge slovenske dialektologije. *Logarjev zbornik: Referati s 1. mednarodnega dialektološkega simpozija v Mariboru*. Eds. Zinka Zorko – Mihaela Koletnik. Maribor: Slavistično društvo (Zora 8). 16–26.

Herman NIEBAUM – Jürgen MACHA, 1999: *Einführung in die Dialektologie des Deutschen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag (Germanistische Arbeitshefte 37).

Jean Claude MILNER, 2003: *Strukturalizem: Liki in paradigma*. Ljubljana: Krtina (Knjižna zbirka Krt).

Martina OROŽEN, 1994: Le consonantisme de Ramovš dans l'optique structuraliste de Tesnière. *Mélanges Lucien Tesnière = Linguistica* 34. 165–179.

Fran RAMOVŠ, 1924: *Historična gramatika slovenskega jezika* II: *Konzonantizem*. Ljubljana: Učiteljska tiskarna (Znanstveno društvo za humanistične vede v Ljubljani, Dela I).

– – 1931: *Dialektološka karta slovenskega jezika*. Ljubljana.

– – 1935: *Historična gramatika slovenskega jezika* VII: *Dialekti*. Ljubljana: Učiteljska tiskarna (Znanstveno društvo za humanistične vede v Ljubljani, Dela I).

– – 1936: *Kratka zgodovina slovenskega jezika* I, Ljubljana: Akademska založba (Akademska biblioteka 3).

Jakob Rigler, 1960: *Južnonotranjski govori – Akcentska in glasoslovna analiza južnonotranjskih govorov med Snežnikom in Slavnikom: Disertacija*. Ljubljana. (Typescript.)

– – 1963a: *Južnonotranjski govori*. Ljubljana: SAZU (Dela Razreda za filološke in literarne vede 13, Inštitut za slovenski jezik 7).

– – 1963b: Pregled osnovnih razvojnih etap v slovenskem vokalizmu. *Slavistična revija* 14. 25–78.

– – 1967: Pripombe k pregledu osnovnih razvojnih etap v slovenskem vokalizmu. *Slavistična revijai* 15. 129–152.

Vera Smole, 1988: *Govor vasi Šentrupert in okolice: Glasoslovje in naglas – Magistrsko delo*. Ljubljana. (Typescript.)

– – 1994: *Oblikoglasje in oblikoslovje šentruperskega govora: Doktorsko delo*. Ljubljana, 1994. (Typescript.)

– – 1998: Fonološki opis govora vasi Šentrupert (SLA 262). *Jezikoslovni zapiski*: *Zbornik Inštituta za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU* 4. 73–88.

Han Steenwijk, 1988: Sestav naglašenih samoglasnikov v belskem govoru, *Slavistična revija* 36. 331–337.

Stanislava Katharina Sturm-Schnabl, 1973: *Die slovenischen Mundarten und Mundartreste im Klagenfurter Becken: Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades an der philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Wien*. Wien. (Typescript.)

Jožica Škofic, 1997: Fonološki opis govora Krope (SLA 202). *Jezikoslovni zapiski*: *Zbornik Inštituta za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU* 3. 175–189.

– – 1999: Fonološki opis govora Zgornje Gorje (SLA 198), *Jezikoslovni zapiski*: *Zbornik Inštituta za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU* 5. 183–195.

– – 2000: Jožica Škofic, Fonološki opis govora kraja Lom pod Storžičem (SLA 204), *Jezikoslovni zapiski*: *Zbornik Inštituta za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU* 5. 141–153.

Jože Toporišič, 1961: Vokalizem moščanskega govora v brežiškem Posavju. *Dolenjski zbornik*. Ed. Stanko Škaler. Novo mesto: Dolenjska založba. 203–222.

– – 1962: Ablösung des relevanten Wortintonationssystems durch den Quantitätsunterschied in einer slovenischen Mundart. *Scandoslavica* (Copenhagen) 8. 239–254.

Ada Vidovič Muha, 1996: Tvornost razmerja med slovenskim in češkim jezikoslovjem 20. stoletja. *Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture: Zbornik predavanj* 32. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta. 77–85.

Antonius A. Weijnen, 1982: Deutsche Dialektologie und europäische Dialektforschung: wechselseitige Wirkungen. *Dialektologie: Ein Handbuch zur deutschen und allgemeinen Dialektforschung*. Eds Werner Besch – Ulrich Knoop – Wolfgang Putschke – Herbert Ernst Wiegand. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 1.1). 190–202.

Peter Weiss, 2001: Fonološki opis govora kraja Spodnje Kraše (SLA 314). *Jezikoslovni zapiski*: *Zbornik Inštituta za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU* 7. 321–347.

Paul Zdovc, 1972: *Die Mundart des südöstliches Jauntales in Kärnten: Lautlehre und Akzent der Mundart der »Poljanci«*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1972 (Schriften der Balkankommision, Linguistische Abteilung 20).

Melita Zemljak, 2000: *Govor Zabukovja nad Sevnico – Glasoslovje in naglas: Magistrsko delo*. Ljubljana. (Tipkopis.)

POVZETEK

Do prehoda iz predvojnega Ramovševega klasičnega modela opisa diferenciacije narečnega glasovja, utemeljenega z zunajjezikovno razlago jezikovnih dejstev, v strukturalni opis glasovnega sestava je v slovenski dialektologiji prišlo na začetku šestdesetih let 20. st. To desetletje je prineslo tako zasnove za diahrono (Riglerjev Pregled Osnovnih razvojnih etap v slovenskem vokalizmu) kot za sinhrono strukturalno dialektologijo in uvedlo vrsto klasičnih fonoloških strukturalnih postopkov. Vendar se – kljub temu da zgodovinski vidik nikoli ni bil povsem opuščen – od sedemdesetih let naprej razvija predvsem sinhrona opisna dialektologija, njeno glavno orodje pa je od izida Fonoloških opisov srbohrvaških/hrvaškosrbskih, slovenskih in makedonskih govorov, obravnavanih v Slovanskem lingvističnem atlasu (FO 1981) fonološki opis s svojo značilno tridelno zasnovo (sistem – distribucija – izvor). Sprejeta je bila predvsem formalna oblika fonološkega opisa, ne pa tudi shema slovenskega izhodiščnega glasovnega sestava, ki bi omogočila učinkovito mednarečno primerjavo. Fonološki opis se je zato razvil predvsem kot način predstavitve posameznih govorov.