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Gailtal Slovene in Urban Jarnik’s Letters to Primic and Kopitar, 1811–1814

The paper presents the dialectal data from the Gailtal in Carinthia that Urban Jarnik discusses in his letters to Primic and Kopitar. Jarnik’s discussions of his native dialect in these letters could be regarded as the first serious treatment of Slovene dialectal material. The first part of the paper is devoted to a philological and phonological analysis of Jarnik’s data. The second half gives a glossary of all the Gailtal Slovene words in Jarnik’s letters. Many dialectal words that Jarnik gives are not attested in later literature.

Urban Jarnik was a Slovene priest, linguist, poet, and ethnologist, born in Bach (Potok) near Sankt Stefan (Šteben) in the Gailtal in 1784. Jarnik is often considered to be the first Slovene dialectologist. In 1811, he wrote a number of letters to Janez Nepomuk Primic about his native dialect of Slovene, spoken in the Gailtal in what is now Carinthia, Austria. Primic, born in 1785 in Zalog near Škofljica in what is now Slovenia, founded the Slovene Chair at the Graz Lyceum (earlier and later the University of Graz), which he was the first to occupy. Primic was a key figure in the so called “Slovene rebirth” (preporod) movement of the late 18th and early 19th century. Jarnik’s letters to Primic about the Gailtal dialect were all written in 1811 as part of a series of letters, exchanged between the two. In 1934, a total of twelve letters from Jarnik to Primic that are kept in the National and University library in Ljubljana have been collected and published by France Kidrič. In a few of the letters that are not primarily dedicated to the Gailtal dialect, Jarnik also occasionally tells Primic something about his native dialect. Jarnik’s letters to Primic are mainly known for the fact that they contain some of Jarnik’s early poetry (Prunč 2003: 21). Primic sent copies of Jarnik’s letters to the librarian of the Court Library in Vienna, Jernej (Bartholomäus) Kopitar. Kopitar, born in 1780 in Repnje near Vodice in what is now Slovenia, was a well-known Slavist, author of the first modern Slovene grammar, and published the first edition of the first text of the Freising Fragments. Kopitar was keenly interested in what Jarnik had written about the Gailtal dialect and got in touch with him. A correspondence between Jarnik and Kopitar arose. Eighteen of Jarnik’s letters to Kopitar have been published by Erich Prunč in five articles in Anzeiger für slavische Philologie between 1970 and 1983. Letter no. 8 (of 1 December
is especially interesting with regard to the dialectal material Jarnik provides. Other letters to Kopitar occasionally contain information about the Gailtal dialect as well.

The purpose of this article is to present the dialectal Slovene material as described and written down by Jarnik in his letters in such a way, that the reader becomes aware of the linguistic value of these forms. The focus will be on the phonology of Jarnik’s dialect, as it can be abstracted from his (often varying) spelling and numerous remarks in the letters. The lexicon, at the end of the article, comprises the lexical information provided by Jarnik. The material he provides will be set out against the dialectal material published by Grafenauer (1905), Paulsen (1935), Logar (1968, 1981), and against data I collected in the village of Potschach (Potoče) in the Gailtal between 2001 and 2004. The differences between Jarnik’s material and that of later sources are minor. There are two later important sources of data about the Gailtal dialect by Jarnik himself, viz. his 1842 article on Carinthian Slovene dialects and Pletersnik’s dictionary. In the article, Jarnik treats several characteristics of the dialect. Compared to the letters, however, the number of forms he gives is limited, and the characteristic features of the dialect he discusses, are also discussed in the letters. Pletersnik’s dictionary, on the other hand, contains 127 lemmata marked Zilj.-Jarn. (Rok.), i.e., found in the manuscript Wörter, die im Gaillthale (na Žilsu) gebrauchlich sind, or Besede nabrane po Ziljski Dolini (Pletersnik 1893–1894: xiv), written by Jarnik in 1815. The forms in the manuscript are transcribed in much the same way as the dialectal material in Jarnik’s letters. Pletersnik normalized them to fit in his dictionary. A remarkable difference with the material in Obraz slovenskoga narčja u Koroških, Versuch eines Etymologikons, and Jarnik’s letters is the fact that most of Pletersnik’s forms have tones written on them, even if a word is only attested in Jarnik’s manuscript. Like the letters, the manuscript does not contain contrastive tonal accents. Pletersnik leaves a few words that are not attested outside the Gailtal unstressed, e.g., hota ‘pig’ and lis ‘lazy, indolent’. In other cases, Pletersnik writes an accent that is based on historical or comparative evidence. He writes, for instance, sanen ‘sleepy’ for Jarnik’s jänen. This is evidently wrong. The Potschach form sənən shows initial stress. Pletersnik recognizes the suffix -en and writes it with the falling accent on the suffix we normally find in standard Slovene (notice that the accent in adjectives of this type is always retracted in the Gailtal [e.g., Potschach lesan ‘wooden’ < lesen etc.]). This means that we should be careful in accepting the accents in other Gailtal words Pletersnik cites as well, e.g., in the word prίšaštnik ‘announcer of public works’ (Jarnik prίšaftnik), in which the acute accent on the -i- does not necessarily indicate stress, let alone pitch (see below).

These have been discussed briefly in Karničar 2003. We also find scattered comments on the Gailtal dialect in Jarnik’s Versuch eines Etymologikons, but these will be left out of the discussion here. In 1822, Jarnik wrote Kleine Sammlung solcher altslawischer Wörter, welche im heutigen windischen Dialekte noch kräftig fortleben (Ein Beytrag zur Kenntnis der hoch-slovenischen Büchersprache), published in Klagenfurt. I have not seen this book, and hence do not know whether it contains any specific information about the Gailtal dialect.

In about 15 lemmata Pletersnik gives an example, set word combination, or expression from the manuscript. The manuscript itself consists of about 20 pages of dialectal information and is kept in the National and University Library in Ljubljana.
Although Jarnik’s material provides an interesting and early source of the Gailtal dialect, it is important to be aware of a number of issues that complicate the use of Jarnik’s data. To begin with, Jarnik does not always state whether the words he discusses are from the Gailtal, from other parts of Carinthia, or from other Slovene dialects. Due to the standardization Jarnik employs in his spelling, it is often impossible to identify the provenance of a word. A good example of this is a letter to Primic from the middle of 1811 (Kidrič 1934: 97ff.). Jarnik analyses several Slovene words. Some of these seem to be from Carinthia (e.g., *perfedlo), but it is difficult to determine whether these words were also used in the Gailtal. Other words Jarnik discusses cannot be from any Carinthian dialect (e.g., *zhés, *kadilo). Words like *pogorįfhzhe are either from the Gailtal, or from more central Slovene dialects, but not from other Carinthian dialects, where the cluster would be simplified and one would expect *pogorįfhe. In this study, only those words have been incorporated that are either specifically said to be from the Gailtal (also Oberkärnten), as well as those that show features that are specific to the Gailtal dialect. I am aware that, by incorporating the latter group, the picture we get of the Gailtal dialect as it was spoken by Jarnik is somewhat distorted, and it looks more aberrant than it is in reality.

Further, the material Jarnik provides is by no means complete. The most striking feature that is missing from his data is the pitch-accent. It is also clear that his notation is not always consistent. The German alphabet does not allow Jarnik to notate all phonological distinctions, but several remarks in his letters show that he was aware of certain distinctions that remain obscure in his transcriptions most of the time. In spite of their limitations, Jarnik’s discussions of his native dialect in his letters can be regarded as the first serious treatment of Slovene dialectal material (cf. the overview in Toporišič 1962: 385–386). In the letters, there is a relatively large number of elsewhere unattested words. These are probably the most important contribution of Jarnik’s letters to our knowledge of the Gailtal dialect. The number of elsewhere unattested forms is relatively large, because Jarnik wrote the letters for the express purpose of pointing out in which respect his dialect differed from the rest of Slovene. His focus is for a large part on lexical and ethnological curiosities, rather than on phonological or grammatical features. He gives linguistic information on a few occasions, and on these occasions his notation of the dialect is clearly closer to the phonetic reality. The following phonological and grammatical differences from standard Slovene or the other Carinthian dialects have been observed by Jarnik in his letters:

1. Palatalization of $h$ and $k$ to $ʃh$ ($š$) and $zh$ ($č$) respectively before front vowels. Jarnik does not mention the palatalization of $g$ to $ʃ$, which he writes in e.g., $drujega$.

2. The loss of $v$ ($w$) between two non-front vowels. Although Jarnik mentions this development, he hardly ever writes it: $sdrava$, $kravarîza$, $dobrava$, but $fiāâ$ and $fišli̯hââ$ in his first letter to Kopitar.

3. $v$ for $l$ before non-front vowels and consonants. This dialectal feature is often omitted from the notation, e.g., $planîti$ with $l$ occurs beside the l-plc.f.sg. $pvanuva$ (for *$planinuva$?) with $v$. Cf. also $pölzha$ ‘weeds’, which is pronounced as $povzha$.

---

3 Jarnik himself observes “Někakovo (da tako kažem) pěvanje u izgovaranju” (1842: 46), but he clearly did not distinguish phonemic tones.
8. The use of the prefix \( \text{wi-} \) where Standard Slovene has \( l \) (and \( dv \) before non-front vowels), e.g., \( \text{kridvo} \) ‘skirt’, pl. \( \text{kriddle} \). We also find standardized \( \text{krilo} \).

9. The conditional auxiliary \( \text{bé} \), derived from the aorist of ‘to be’, with inflected forms and a few examples of its use.

10. Ablaut of the type \( \text{brieg} \), \( \text{bręgu} \), \( \text{frésti je} \), \( \text{me je friedu} \), \( \text{frédva} \), \( \text{riehz} \), \( \text{réchi} \), \( \text{piezh} \), \( \text{pęzhi} \), \( \text{Bųg} \), \( \text{Bogu} \), \( \text{ruęg} \), \( \text{rogu} \), \( \text{fțųg} \), \( \text{fľogu} \). Remarkably enough, Jarnik writes the closed \( o \) of \( \text{Bogu} \), \( \text{rogu} \), \( \text{fľogu} \) without an acute, unlike the closed \( e \) in \( \text{bręgu} \), \( \text{frésti je} \) etc.

Some aspects of the phonology of Jarnik’s language are obscured by the fact that the German alphabet does not provide a straightforward way of presenting them. Jarnik had to use the five vowels \( a \), \( e \), \( o \), \( i \), and \( u \) to describe a system with eight vowels (\( a \), \( e \), \( o \), \( e \), \( a \), \( o \), \( i \), and \( u \)), distinctive vowel length, and four diphthongs (\( je \), \( wo \), \( io \), and \( uo \)). To be able to distinguish between these vowels, Jarnik at times uses acute and grave accents to indicate vowel quality and/or length. He does not, however, use the accents regularly. The accuracy with which the accents are employed varies per letter. The accents Jarnik employs are specifically not used to denote stress or pitch. Since most quality distinctions are found in stressed position only, the net result is
that in most cases the stress will be on the vowel which is written with an accent over it.

One of the aspects of the Gaital dialect that turns up in the linguistic literature is the fact that the falling stress of original mobile words generally lies on its Proto-Slavic place, i.e., on the first syllable of a word, rather than on the following syllable, as in the Slovene standard. There are only a few indications for this in Jarnik’s material, mainly because the place of the accent is not indicated directly. We do find reflexes of initial stress in néhti, rëzhi, and pëzhi. Néhti ‘someone’ should probably be derived from *něk̑to > *nehtu > *nèhto > *nèhti (with -i from pronouns like *tisti, *oti, etc.). These forms must be initially stressed, since pretonic -e- would become -o-, which is always written without an accent.

The difference between è and ê, and between ó and ò is generally that between a closed and an open vowel respectively. We find e.g., dróshje, sgöni, bëfn, néhti, feděa with a closed vowel, and môsh, samôkel, gredò, jërek, and shênzh with an open vowel.⁴ The e is also used to write a schwa. As already mentioned, an e that stands for ò is never written with an accent. The distribution of è, ó, ê, and ò is, however, not as straightforward as it may seem at first glance. Not only does Jarnik often omit the accent, he also sometimes uses it for the notation of diphthongs. The open diphthongs, je and wo, are sometimes spelled with a grave: (jjè, ò (wò would be expected, but it is not attested), e.g., in šálīkshêne, zherjêlo, and môra. Similarly, and more often, the closed diphthongs iò and wo are spelled è and ó, e.g., in zêla, viļètatì, gnòj, and fpòvad. A number of times, Jarnik writes an acute over è and ó before tautosyllabic j, e.g., in kój (also kofj), nèkéj (also nêkej), and mèjhta. This is a result of the raising of *ò before tautosyllabic j. This is confirmed by examples adduced by Grafenauer and Logar, such as srèjščě (Grafenauer) and pejčê (Logar, loc. sg.). Before heterosyllabic j, e, and ó are apparently also closed (è and ó), and Jarnik employs the acute accordingly: feděa and tèa. In this respect, my own field material differs from that of Grafenauer and Logar. Where my data are in accordance with Jarnik’s data (soděja, têja), Grafenauer and Logar have an open vowel (Grafenauer dôzêa, méa, Logar prêjâ, kandê:iâ). Once, Jarnik uses a grave where one would expect an acute and once vice versa, viz. in drèse and kônj. Perhaps the infinitives viézhì and wîtēzhì also show a wrong acute (in two separate letters), but it should be noted that the present day dialect of Potschach has tèjĉi. If Jarnik had the same form, one would probably expect *tøjžhi, with an acute because of the following j. The omission of post-vocalic j in Jarnik’s notation -tēzhì can be ascribed to influence from the standard language.

The use of accents on the other vowels appears to serve a slightly different purpose than the accentuation of e and ó. Not much can be concluded about the accentuation of u, since it occurs only three times (viz. in bûzati, gertûne, and vapúza, all

---

4 Three times a 3rd person plural present ending with a grave is attested, viz. gredò, fedò, and vidijô, all in letter no. 13 to Kopitar. Elsewhere Jarnik writes -o.

5 According to Paulsen, the reflex of an *o that was lengthened through brata-lengthening merged with the reflex of the nasal vowel *ø in the Ponegovca area, where Jarnik was born (1935: 65f.). Jarnik’s material shows that this was either a very recent development, or that things were more complicated than Paulsen thought.
in letter no. 15 to Primic). Accented \( i \) is much more frequent. It seems that acute \( i \) indicates an accented \( i \). However, it can be argued that the reason why Jarnik places an accent over the \( i \) is either the length or the quality of the vowel, rather than the fact that the \( i \) is stressed. In the present day dialect, phonetic [i] occurs virtually only in stressed position. Unstressed \( i \) became \( a \), except in final position. In final posttonic position, the \( i \) became more centralised, but remained phonemically distinct from \( a \) (see Grafenauer (1905: 197), who writes \( e \) for unstressed \( i \) in final position). According to Paulsen, \( i \) is reduced to \( a \) in final position in Sankt Štefan, the birthplace of Jarnik (1935: 110), as well, a development that may well have taken place before Jarnik’s period.

An \( i \) with a grave is only used by Jarnik in letter no. 36 to Primic, and once in letter no. 8 to Kopitar (bômi). In the letter to Primic, \( i \) has been attested in the following words: dat.sg. \( ti \) (also \( tî \)), \( popîti \), \( wîfîlî \), and in the prefix \( wî- \) in a large number of words. In my opinion, \( i \) is an etymological spelling for \( a \). If one focuses on the prefix \( wî- \) and on bômi, one might get the impression that \( i \) is distinct from \( i \) and \( i \) and reflects Proto-Slavic *y. This is exactly what Jarnik suggests when he writes “Pârvo lice u viâšbrojniku na mo mësto na mo, n. p. damy, delamy, widìmy itd. mësto: damo, delamo, widìmo itd.” (1842: 55). Further on, Jarnik writes: “Nêkoliko ženskih samostavnih imade u viâšbrojniku \( i (y) \), n. p. bukw (knjige), ziby (u broju II. bukle, buklice)” (ibidem). Elsewhere in his article, Jarnik also uses the letter \( y \) in the prefix \( wy \). These all appear to be etymological spellings. As dat. sg. \( ti \), and, even more, \( wîfîlî \) seems to indicate, \( i \) was at least in some cases used for \( a \). In the 1842 article, there is evidence that Jarnik’s \( y \) in \( wy- \) and in the feminine pl. ending reflects a front vowel. With regard to the plural ending Jarnik writes “imade u viâšbrojniku \( i (y) \)”. Also, the fact that, both in bukw and in the prefix \( wy- \), Jarnik writes \( w \) instead of \( v \) (as in e.g., bêsva [1842: 56]) points to a front vowel, considering “što izgovaraju Ziljani \( v [...] \), kad sLEDi pošle njega \( i \) ili \( e \), izgovaraju kao nêmački \( v \)” (idem: 54). This corresponds to present day Potschach, where we find the prefix \( b动工, \) not \( *w动工 \). It follows that in these cases \( y \) reflects (earlier) \( i \).

As far as the 1pl. pres. ending \(-mi/mi, my \) is concerned, there is reason to believe that it does not reflect \( *my \). In the present day dialect of Potschach, the 1pl. pres. ending is \(-mu \).

Jarnik’s ending \(-mi/mi, my \) matches this ending, when one takes into consideration Paulsen’s observation that final \(-u \) had become \(-o \) in Sankt Štefan by 1935. When we combine this with the spelling \( wîfîlî \) for (*ba)sasáli, and with the fact that \( wy-/wi- \) reflects (earlier) \( *vi- \), it becomes plausible that Jarnik’s \( y \) in his 1842 article and \( i \) in his letters simply reflect \( a \). The spelling \( popîti \) (cf. wipîti), and, conversely, \( wîfîlî \) is a mistake for \( *wîfîlî \) (cf. wîfîlî). Once we find unaccented \( i \) for \( a \), viz. in \( fim \) ‘am’, in a folk song which Jarnik wrote down for Kopitar. In the same song we also find the variant \( fem \), and in one of his other letters Jarnik writes \( fen \).

In four cases, Jarnik uses a circumflex accent instead of an acute or a grave, once

---

* The origin of the ending \(*-mu \) is unclear. Possibly it resulted from raising of \(*-o \) to \(*-o \) in forms with an accented ending \(*-mô \). There are indications that accented short \(*-o \) in final position was raised, e.g., in the demonstrative \( tôti \) ‘that’ < \( *tô + -tî \). Final \(-u \) and \(-o \) merged in the Gailtal dialect.
on an o (bomi), and three times on an u (Rufila, fhú, prezvetujafh, in two different letters). Again, the accent does not denote tone. Although one would expect a falling tone in bomi, fhú, and prezvetujafh, a rising tone would be expected in Rufila. All of the 150 odd nouns with a stressed suffix -uļja listed in Pleteršnik have a rising tone. It seems Jarnik’s use of the circumflex instead of an acute is purely decorative.

In a few of his letters to Kopitar, Jarnik uses the apostrophe as a distinctive symbol in the notation of several words. We find the apostrophe in the following words: lip’za, lub’zo, sad’, běf’n, p’rmaknia, t’něaka, r’sbieňhat, in the prefix p’- in p’tép (next to potép), p’tieplfh, p’beri, p’ledan, p’fuev, and in the prepositions k’, v’ and s’ (also ’s). In most of these cases, the apostrophe stands for -ə- in unstressed position. The use of the apostrophe with the prepositions only seems to indicate that they should be taken together with the following word, not that they are pronounced ending in a -ə. The notation of p’rmaknia, r’sbieňhat, and the forms with p’- indicate that vowels in pretonic position were already reduced and had merged into ə in Jarnik’s times. Vowel reduction in posttonic position is also clearly reflected in a number of forms. Reduction of post-tonic e or o to a is reflected in savershanik and obrank, and in the verbal endings of saděnaš, prezvetujafh etc. Posttonic i is reduced to ə in the suffix -iza: lip’za, lub’zo, prahezo. In a few cases, Jarnik writes the i anyway: vidlize, jamizo. When the ə is preceded by a resonant, it is syncopated: merselza, kobilza. Before v, the unstressed ə becomes u: pvamuva. All these features are also found in the present day dialect.

A problem Jarnik is presented with, when spelling his language with the German alphabet, is the notation of syllabic resonants. It has been demonstrated above that Jarnik had a syllabic n in his dialect, which was written en or n. Syllabic m does not occur in the words which Jarnik uses, and syllabic l occurs too infrequently to provide a solid basis for analysis of its notation. On the basis of the twentieth-century material from the Gailtal, one can also posit vocalic /ɾ/ as a separate phoneme, which is pronounced as [əɾ]. Jarnik does, however, differentiate between er (also ‘r) and re (also r’). He writes er in words like saperva, terdno, widerl, merselza, and savershanik, where -er- reflects a sequence *-rə- or *-ɾə-. He also writes p’rmaknia and perdirjati, with -er- from reduced *-ɾi-, and gertúne, which Pleteršnik regards as a variant of the elsewhere attested gratúne. Other sequences of -ɾ- plus a reduced vowel are, however, reflected as -ɾe-: wifreliši, bressoben, gredò, fprehújati, and in the prefixes rex- (esp. r’sbieňhat) and pre-. I think these cases must be regarded as etymological spellings for phonetic [əɾ]. The fact that Jarnik spells per, p’rmaknia, and perdirjati with -er-, rather than with -re- must be motivated by a desire to separate it from the prefix pre- < *pré-. In the case of gertúne, Jarnik probably did not know that the word also existed in other dialects, and hence he could not know that the vowel originally followed the -ɾ-. I conclude that Jarnik only had a sequence [əɾ], which can phonemically be interpreted as a vocalic /ɾ/.

Finally, Jarnik uses the letters v, b, and w to write phonemes that reflect earlier *v. Of these three, v is the most common and seems to be the default choice. Above, I cited Jarnik 1842: 54, where he states that there is a phonetic difference between v before the vowels i and e and v in other positions. Before i and e, v sounds “kao němački w”. In fact, Jarnik writes w before i or e instead of v on several occasions.
We find widati next to vidijò, Wiprija next to Viprijani, and also sap ’wiedov, fvêt, fvét, nowega, hliewe, and the prefix wi-. In shiwljenje, w is attested before a resonant followed by a front vowel. Once, w is attested before o, viz. in wishoworiti. This corresponds to present day Potschach žəbrîti, with b from *v before -ri- (cf. žablênje), without an intermediate -o-. The second -o- of wishoworiti seems to be etymological, rather than real. Before a and u, w never occurs. The same distribution is found for b in those few cases where it reflects earlier *v. We find shoboriti, ’r ’zbiefhat (cf. Pletteršnik razvëšiti), and bêlban (from German wëlben), in three separate letters. In the present-day dialect, *v and *b have merged before *i, *e, and *ê. Evidently, this had already happened in Jarnik’s time, which is why he writes b in these cases. The fact that we often find v where we would expect b or w is due to Jarnik’s efforts to standardize his spelling, a desire we have come across before in this paper.

It has already been pointed out that the focus of Jarnik’s discussions of his own dialect was at least as much ethnological, as it was linguistic. On several occasions, he gives grammatical or phonetic details about the dialect, but for the most part he is interested in providing Primic and Kopitar with interesting dialect vocabulary, sayings, folklore, and songs. In order to show to what extend Jarnik edited his language to look more like the central Slovene dialects, I have included the following folk song. This song was written down by Jarnik in his letter to Kopitar from 12 Feb. 1814 (Prunč 1974: 79–80).

```
,Sem bila štara šedem lét
Bêšte me djali v ‘ Kloģter lép!
Ko fhe niešim vedala
Kaj je lubëšen póboylka.

5 Sdej šim bila štara šêftnajst lét
,Ste me džali v ’ Kloģter lép;
,Šim še dobro vëdala,
Kaj je lubëšen póboylka.

Mlada Neshza v ’ navishej lënzï štojï

10 V ’tej lënszi Kloģterfkej,
Vidila je na ravno pole
Je vidila nje lubeja,
Ki ora s ’dvema volişama.
Kaj je pa reklæ Mlada Neshza

15 K ’tej višhi Nuni Kloģterfkej
Odprite mi vi vrâte gre;
Kar pa bom berzagala!
Kaj je pa reklæ višhi Nuna Kloģterfka:
Këri je Kloķhtri odgovori, (?)

20 Te nikoli vezh van rëžhen nie.
V’kloķhti k ’mejhi vkap sgoni,
Vfe Nune k ’mejhi gredo,
Kej je pa mlâda Neshiza,
Ki je vfelej ta perva bla;

25 Sdaj je she te sadnje k ’nie!
```
The standardization this song had undergone seems to have been employed quite regularly. This is a good example of the understanding Jarnik had of the phonological differences between his native dialect and the central Slovene dialects. The diphthong -ie- is only used in the dialectal forms nie, niefo, and niešim, elsewhere Jarnik writes -é-: lét, lép, shé (she), lubésen, and bélo. Jarnik consistently writes l where the dialect has w for an etymological *l: bila, vedala, mlada, vidila, rekli, bélo, and berzagala. In word-final position, we find -m where the dialect has -n for etymological -m: fędem, niešim, fim. Examples like fém bila and bóz berkagala are ambiguous, because, in the present-day dialect, a word-final -n is realised as [-m] before a following b-. The form fšeťnajst probably replaces dialectal fšeťnějst, with raising of *a to é before tautosyllabic j-. Similarly, Jarnik uses standardized sdat next to dialectal sdej. Completely adapted is odgovori for odšewri vel sim. (cf. showoriti). Lexical influence from central Slovene dialects can probably be seen in ko, for which Jarnik writes ki in a previous letter to Kopitar (letter no. 8, Prunč 1971: 102), nowadays kə, and in kaj for koj (although Jarnik uses both koj and kaj as dialectal forms in letter no. 8, idem: 102–103). Further use of standardized forms can neither be proven, nor ruled out; a form like všeje is not attested in any later data from the Gailtal, but it cannot be ruled out that it was used in the Gailtal dialect in Jarnik’s days.

In spite of the standardization Jarnik employs, the song still contains quite a few dialectal features. Most dialectal features that have been preserved are lexical, and the phonological differences with the central dialects are mostly obscured by the standardization. A phonological feature that Jarnik did not standardise is the use of plain l where standard spelling has lj: pole, lubésen, lubeja (cf. present day Asg. lûbija), and kaple. As a result, Jarnik does not differentiate between the reflexes of PSl. *l and *l’ here. This difference is generally retained in Slovene and its dialects, either through an opposition l vs. lj, or through an opposition w vs. l. The fem. loc. sg. ending -ej in najvishej (najvišhej?) and in Klofterkej is a dialectal grammatical feature, as is the use of the conditional béť. Some other dialectal forms are: fim for fem, vrate for vrata, gre for gor, sgoni for svoni, drujeva for drugega, ko for kot, nje for njen, kej for kje (cf. in the Obir dialect qé:j). Also dialectal, if not merely a metrical variant, is bla for bila, but with standard l instead of w. The use of the definite article in ta perva, te sadnje, and tej vilji Nuni is also a feature of the Gailtal dialect.

It can be concluded that the dialectal phonological features of those words and texts that Jarnik presents as dialectal can in most cases only be identified with the help of later sources. Jarnik consciously attempts to spell his dialect so that it is easy to read for Primic and Kopitar. He does this by standardizing the spelling. As a result, many of the dialectal features become obscured. However, the variation between standardized and non-standardized spelling provides us with information about the phonology of Jarnik’s dialect. The picture we get of the dialect corresponds to data
from later sources in almost every detail. The contribution of Jarnik’s material to the knowledge of the Gailtal dialect is therefore mainly lexical.

Lexicon

This lexicon compiles all words that have been labeled by Jarnik as being used in the Gailtal in one way or another (see above for discussion of the problems related to the selection of the material). The sources for the lexicon are Jarnik’s letters to Primic and Kopitar. The letter in which a word is attested is indicated between brackets with a P for Primic or a K for Kopitar, followed by the number of the letter in the respective collection. Specification of the meaning of words that are in some way related to the Gailtal costume is obtained through citation from an article by Jarnik in the “Vaterländische Blätter für den Österreichischen Kaiserstaat” of 1813 (which I did not have access to) by Makarovič and Dolenc 1992: 20–21. Forms from later sources have been added for comparison. Graf. stands for Grafenauer 1905. Paul. stands for Paulsen 1935. I have used those forms from Paulsen that are said to be either the same in all subdialects of the Gailtal (i.e., those marked as “gemeinGl.,” or as “glt.”), or specific to the Pogórcja area (i.e., the area in which Jarnik’s native village, Sankt Stefan, lies). Log. stands for Logar 1968, Log. stands for Logar 1981. The notation in Logar’s two publications vary only marginally. Unmarked forms are from my own fieldwork data in what Paulsen 1935 calls the Egg- Görtschacher dialect, a subdialect group neighbouring Jarnik’s native dialect. Forms from Paulsen’s dissertation are only added if they provide information that is not available from other sources, because Paulsen is generally less reliable than Logar, and certainly less reliable than Grafenauer. I am aware that some scholars use Paulsen’s data, albeit with care (cf. Priestly 2005: 179). In my view, this care is certainly justified. The problematic nature of some of Paulsen’s material could well be due to the way in which he presents his material, rather than to sloppy work, such as is the case in Gumperz’s work (ibidem). It is certainly preferable to use Grafenauer’s data instead of Paulsen’s data whenever possible until a thorough review of Paulsen’s work has been given. The abbreviations that have been used in the lexicon are the following:

---

7 An example of an archaism is kvobafa, which seems to indicate that [w] had not yet disappeared between a consonant and an unstressed a, as in present day kobasa, Logar kobasà. Other dialectal features, like the development of *sl to sl (e.g., in fhiljhaa), have been attested in later sources as well.

8 A lexicological research of Jarnik’s poetry has been undertaken by Erich Prunč in his three-volume work Urban Jarnik (1784-1844). Textologische Grundlagen und lexicologische Untersuchung seiner Sprache. According to Prunč, the number of dialectisms in Jarnik’s poetry is very low. The words that can be attributed to Jarnik’s native dialect with any certainty are faca, niri, planinicica, poljubiti, poljubovati, and toti. For phonetic reasons, gniva and razgnetiti can be added to this list (Prunč 1988: 221f.).
A accusative
adv. adverb
D dative
dim. diminutive
du. dual
f feminine
G genitive
I instrumental
ipf. imperfect
ipv. imperative
L locative
l-ptc. l-participle
m masculine
N nominative
n neuter
pf. perfect
pl. plural
PN personal name
ppp. past passive participle
pres. present tense
sg. singular
TN toponym=

al (K8; P22) ‘if, whether’ = al
bandérar (P15) ‘flag bearer at a wedding’
bélbano (K1) {fAsg.} ‘vaulted’, cf. bêlb ‘vault’
bélo (K10) {fAsg.} ‘white’
bejedovati (P15) ‘to speak at a wedding; be wordy’
berzagala (K10) {l-ptc. fsg.} ‘to loose hope, become desperate’
béfn, běfi, bèfmo, běfe, bèfo, běfva, bèfia (P15; K8; K10) {123sg., 123pl., 1(2)3du.} irrealis ‘would be’ = běšn etc.
bi (K8) conditional auxiliary verb = bɔ
biv (K8) {l-ptc. msg.} ‘to be’ = bǐw
bívesh (P15) ‘spring’, cf. zbíwaža ‘in spring’
bjedra (P15) ‘barrel of a certain size (containing “7 MaǎB”)’
bla (K10) {l-ptc. fsg.} ‘to be’
bôm, bofi, bode (bo), bômi (P22; P29; P36; K8; K10) {123sg., 1pl.} future ‘will be’ = bóň, bóš, bóde, bómo
brésa (K8) {PN} name of cow or goat with white stripes, cf. bréza ‘birch tree’
bressoben (P15) ‘toothless’
 bressobniza (P15) ‘toothless woman’
brieg, brêgu (K8) {Nsg. Dsg.} ‘slope’ = brięg, brêgu
Buģ, Bogu (K8) {Nsg. Dsg.} ‘God’ = bûəg
bunka, bunke (P15) {Npl.} ‘double bass’
bunkati, bunkajo (K8) {pres. 3pl.} ‘to play the double bass’
bunkavz (P15) ‘double bass player’
buntara (K8) meaning unknown
búzati (P15) ‘to stab’
buzhize (P15) ‘straw made of pine wood fibers’
dar (K1) ‘when (rel.)’ = dr
de (K8) ‘that (conj.)’ = da
délavzi (P36) {Npl.} ‘worker’ = Log.b
dé:wòuc
délnik (P36) ‘heir’ (?) (djevnik)
den (K8) ‘day’ = dèn
deno (P36) {Asg.} ‘bottom’, Log.a, Log. b dònò
dernza (P15) ‘nit’
derzha (P15) ‘an enormous mountain giant’
dezhva (K1) {Nsg.} ‘girl’ = dęčwa, Graf. dęčła
dievan (K1) {pres.1sg.} ‘to make, do’ = dîwan
dirjati (P15) ‘to trot’
djáfi (K8) {pres. 3sg.} ‘to smell’ = daši
djali (K10) {l-ptc. mpl.} ‘to put’ = dijáti
dofenzhi (K8) ‘to reach’ = dosénči
dôb (K13) {mNsg.} ‘oak’ = dôb, Log. b dô:b
dober, dobro (K8; P36; K10) {mNsg., adv.} ‘good’ = dóbër, dwóbro, Graf. dóbër, dô brô, Log. b dô:brô, duô:brà {fNsg., Paul. dôbár, dôbra
dobrava (P36) ‘forest’ = dórbaa, Graf. dórbaa, Log. b dô:braá, Log. a dô:braá
doma (K8) ‘at home’ = dôma
drèse (P15) ‘crampoon’
dro (K1) ‘indeed’ = dro
dróšhje (P15) ‘yeast’ = drô:brô, Log. a đô:brô, đô:brā,
dobrava (P36) ‘forest’ = dórbaa, Graf. dórbaa, Log. b dô:braá, Log. a dô:braá doma (K8) ‘at home’ = dôma
drèse (P15) ‘crampoon’
dro (K1) ‘indeed’ = dro
dróšhje (P15) ‘yeast’ = drô:brô, Log. a đô:brô, đô:brā,
dobrava (P36) ‘forest’ = dórbaa, Graf. dórbaa, Log. b dô:braá, Log. a dô:braá doma (K8) ‘at home’ = dôma
drèse (P15) ‘crampoon’
dro (K1) ‘indeed’ = dro
dróšhje (P15) ‘yeast’ = drô:brô, Log. a đô:brô, đô:brā,
ke, ki, k’ (K1; K8; K10) ‘who (rel.)’ = kə
kervi (K10) {Gsg.} ‘blood’ = kribi
kloftker, kloftri (K10) {Asg., Lsg.} ‘monastery’
kloftkerška, kloftkerškej (K10) {fNsg., fDsg.} ‘of the monastery’
ko (K10) ‘when’ = kə
ko (K10) ‘than’ = kə
kobílza (P15) ‘fever’
kolavtra (P29) “Person oder Sache, die eine radförmige Bewegung macht”
koleda, kolede (P30) {Npl.} ‘someone who sings monotonously’
koleduvanje (P30) ‘singing in a choir’
koleduvati (P30) ‘to sing in a choir’
kòrat (P15) ‘pagan mythical figure, who is seen in the relief of the moon and who causes the moon to wax by pouring water from a jug’
koróruvanje (P30) ‘singing in a choir’
koróruvati (P30) ‘to sing in a choir’
kosha (P36) ‘skin’ = kọža, Log.
koshuh (P23) ‘sheep-skin that reaches to the calves’ = kwóžə, Log.
kot (P36) {ApL.} ‘corner’ = kót
kravaríza (K8) ‘cow-girl’
krèshel (P15) ‘collar of a chemise’
kréshel (P15) ‘collar of a chemise’
krevati (P15) ‘to rebuke, blame’
krídvo, kridlo, kridle, v’kridli (K8; P29) {Nsg., Npl., Adu.?} ‘wing’, Paul. kridço, Graf. kridlo
kròg (K13) ‘around’ = króg
kruh (K8) ‘bread’ = krúha
kteri (K10) ‘which (relative)’
kúhinje (K8) {Gsg.} ‘kitchen’ = s kúhonje, Log.a kú:xonà {Nsg.}, Log. b kú:konà
kujnza (K8) {Asg.} ‘horse (dim.?)’, cf. kwōyn
kumej (K8) ‘hardly’ = kúmej
kvobaja (K8) {Nsg.} ‘sausage’ = kobása, Log.a kobá:xà
le (K1) ‘only’ = le

lédik, ledik (K1) ‘bastard’ = lédək, this word is not inflected in the present-day language
len (K8) ‘flax’ = lén
lép (K10) {mNsg.} ‘beautiful’, cf. liapa {fNsg.}
lesha (K8) ‘lie’
lésha (K8) ‘lying’
leshajo (K1) {pres. 3pl.} ‘to lie’
léta, lét (K8; K10) {Gsg., Gpl.} ‘year’ = létə, sec: k’lētì.
léva (P15) ‘a kind of small wall stove, used for illumination rather than for heating’
ležho mejo (K8) ‘veal’
liepo, liepe (K1; K8) {fAsg., fApL.}, lépo (P36) {adv.} ‘beautiful’ = liapo, lipe
lieta (K8) {pres. 3sg.} ‘to run’ = liáta
lietas (K8) ‘this year’ = liátas
linzi (K10) {Lsg.} ‘dormer (?)’
lip’za, lip’zo, lipzo (K1) {Nsg., Isg.} ‘lime-tree (dim.)’, cf. lipa
lif (P15) ‘lazy’
lub’zo, lub’ze (K1) {Asg., Gsg.} ‘sweetheart’
lubeja (K10) {Asg.} ‘sweetheart (masc.)’ = lubija
lubésen (K10) ‘love’ = lubžən
lud (K8) {Nsg.} ‘the people’
man, mafh (K1; K8) {pres.1sg., 2sg.} ‘to have’ = mán, màš
mánko, manko (P15; K8) {adv.} ‘at least’
méjšta (K8) {Nsg.} ‘porridge (of maize or potatoes)’ = mëjšta
mèkez (P15) ‘bruise’
menie (K1) {Dsg.} ‘me’, möne, Graf. mòné
mersetza (P15) ‘fever’
mersle (K10) {fGsg.} ‘cold’, cf. mëzle {fApL.}
mefo (K8) ‘meat’ = méso, Log.a, Log. b mé:só
mefhi (K10) {Dsg.} ‘mass’
mez (P36) {Asg.} ‘sword’
mi (K1; K10) {Dsg.} ‘me’ = mi
mithen (P15) ‘small’ = mihn
miken (P15) ‘small’ = mikn
misenza (P15) ‘table-drawer’
mizken (P15) ‘tiny’
mizkenòſt (P15) ‘littleness’
mlada (K10) {fNsg.} ‘small, little’ = mladina
moje (K1) {mApl.} ‘my’ = moje
moš (K13) ‘husband’ = mož
motovidlo, motovidvo (P29; K8) ‘windlass’ = moš
movka (K1) {adv.} ‘home’, cf. mòvje ‘home’
mozhido (P29) ‘quagmire, puddle’
Mozhidle, mozhile (K8; P15) {TN}, a marshy spot near a mountain, where the water cannot flow away.
mreás (K8) ‘cold’ = mreás
najffpo (K8) {Asg.} ‘attic’
nafo, nam (P36; K8) {A, D} ‘us’ = nas, nan
naņjhekaa (K8) {l-ptic. fsg.} ‘to milk’ = ščoka
nagelni (K8) {Npl.} ‘carnation’ = nagelni
nahjati (P15) {ipv.} ‘to find (something lost)’
naji (K8) ‘to find (something lost)’ see: obrenzhi
najvšeif (K10) {fl.sg.} ‘highest’, cf. najbši {mNsg.}
napajat (K8) {sup.} ‘to be watered’
nafhte (K10) {l-ptic. fpl.} ‘to find’
navaa (K1) ‘use, custom’ = navada
ne (P15; P22; P36; K1), na (K8; K10) ‘on’ = na
nefjet (K1) {pres.2sg.} ‘to carry’ = naseš, Log.b nasešn
něhí, nehti (P15; P29) ‘some-one’ = něhí, Graf. nehte (sic!)
nejzhen (K8) {pres. 1sg.} ‘to want not’ = něže, Graf. něže
někej, někej (P15; P29) ‘something’ = někej
nie, niefo (K10) {pres.3sg., pres.3pl.} ‘to be not’
nikoli (K10) ‘never’
nemaf (K1) {pres.2sg.} ‘to have not’ = ničmaš
niešim = niejen, nieš, nie, niefo (P32; K10; K1; K8) {pres.123sg. 3pl.} ‘to be not’ = ničmaš etc.
nizh (K1) ‘nothing’ = nič, Log.a, Log.b nič
nje (K10) ‘her’ = njé
njemu (P36) {Dsg.} ‘him’ = njému
njin (K1) {Dpl.} ‘them’
no (K10) {Asg.} ‘a’ = no
nowega (K8) {Nsg.} ‘new’ = nobega, Log.b nò:va {Nsg.}, Graf. nò:va
nuna, nuni, nune (K10) {Nsg., Dsg., Npl.} ‘nun’ = nuna {Nsg.}
obhajati (P15) ‘to administer the Holy communion’
obrank (K8) ‘hoop’ = obranči {pl.}, Graf. obranč, Log.b obranč
obrèť (K8) ‘find’ (?), see: obrenzhi
obrèťi (K8) ‘to find, meet, come across’ see: obrenzhi
obrenzhi (K8) ‘to find, meet, come across’
oďgovori (K10) ‘to obey (?)’
odi, odprite (K10; K10) {ipv.2sg., 2pl.} ‘to open’ = wićri
oče (K10) {Npl.} ‘they’
oray (K10) {pres.3sg.} ‘plough’, cf. očran
{pres.1sg.}
ojepizhaa (P15) ‘pockmarked’
ojide (K8) {pres. 3sg.} ‘to leave’
ozhi (P36) {Apl.} ‘eye’ = oti, Log.a o:će {Npl.}
pınev (K8) {l-ptic. msg.} ‘to skim’ = pasnič
p’beri (K8) {ipv. 2sg.} ‘to pick up’ = bjeri, pbrati
p’bivajo (K8) {pres. 3pl.} ‘to hit’ = pabíwoo
p’ledan (K8) {pres. 1sg.} ‘to look’ = pélédan
p’rmeeknia (K8) {l-ptc. fsg.} ‘to move’ = Graf. prımoknó, Paul. pormoknu {l-ptc. msg.}
p’tieplafi (K8) {pres. 2sg.} ‘to tramp about’ (?)
pa (P15; P22; K1; K10) ‘and’ = pa
pálico (P36) {Asg.} ‘pole’ = pláca
péjdi (K8) {ipv. 2sg.} ‘go!’ = pòjdi
peketáti (P15) “in Karrier reiten”
per (K8) ‘at’ = pr
perdirjati, perdirjali (P15; K8) {l PtC. mpl.} ‘to come trotting’
pertizh (P15) ‘tablecloth; cloth made of linen’, cf. pȑt ‘cloth made of linen’
pertóšek, pertóṣek (P15; K10) ‘chopper, hatchet “abgehauene Nadelholzäste zur Viehstreu klein zusammen zu hacken’” = prtôšak
piškati, pišzhi (P29) {ipv. 2sg.} ‘to play the flute’, cf. pìščala
piezh, pézhi (K8) {Nsg., Dsg.} ‘stove’ = pîəč, pẹ́či, Log. a, Log. b pì:əč
pikez (P36) {Asg.} ‘point’
pižhiza (P15) ‘pip, stone’ = pîčəce {Npl.} ‘pumpkin seeds’
planiniti, planinuva {inf., l-ptc. fsg.} (P15; K8) ‘to keep and herd cattle on the mountain, “auch das Melken, Butter und Käsé machen wird darunter verstanden”’
planinžhan (P15) ‘alpine herdsman’
planinzhiza, planinžhiza (P15; K8) ‘milkmaid’ = Graf. planinčaca
plešīhe, plešǐzhze (P15) ‘dance floor; dance group’
pletėtina (P15) ‘carpet’
ple̱tėti (P15) ‘to weed’
pòbovfka (K10) {Nsg.} ‘of guys’ (?)
pòsthe (P15) ‘after’
pòstarn, pòftarn (P36) ‘elderly’ = pūastarn
pòfvēiti, pòfvētil (P22) {l-ptc. msg.} ‘to chase away’
pòfsadvo, pòfsadlo (K8; P29) ‘virile member of animals’
pod (K1) ‘under’ = pad
pogazha (P15) ‘special kind of bread baked in the harvest period, leavened bread (?)’
pogazhiza (P15) “der große Frauentag” (15 August) (pogazhenza)
poheno (K8) {fAsg.} ‘full’ = pōheno, Log. b pōx, Log. a, Log. b pōx
pojdaft (K8) ‘to go’ = pójdamo {pres.1pl.}
pojden, pojdeft (K8; P22) {pres. 1sg., 2sg.} ‘to go’ = pójdo (pres.3pl.)
pole (K10) {Asg.} ‘field’ = polje
poljivniza (P15) ‘watering can’
pólsha (P15) ‘weeds’ (povzha)
po̱pitī (P36) ‘to finish (a drink, a glass)’, cf. pìti
poftelzo (K10) {Asg.} ‘bed’
potēp, p’lép, potepuh (P15; K8) ‘vagabond’
potoze (K8) {Lsg.} ‘brook’ = cf. pwótak {Nsg.}, Log. a, Log. b pwó:tak, Graf. potoka {Gsg.}
powédati (P36) ‘to tell’ = pšédati
pratnafe/mejnafe kroglize (K8) {Npl.} ‘German sausage’
právlo (P15) introduces direct speech
prèrokuvale (P15) {l-ptc. fpl.} ‘to prophesy’
presvetu̱jan, presvetu̱jaft (K1) {pres.1sg., 2sg.} ‘to start to blossom’
príʃhaʃtnik, príʃhaʃtnik (P15; K8; K10) {Nsg.} ‘announcer of public works in a district’
príʃhaʃtniza (P15) ‘female príʃhaʃtnik’
príʃhaʃtvāti (P15) ‘to be a príʃhaʃtnik’
príʃhaʃtvo (P15) ‘the office of príʃhaʃtnik’
príshel, príšha, príšli, príšle (P15) {l-ptc. msg., mdu., mpl., fdu.} ‘to come’ = Log. a, Log. b prí:šọ {l-ptc. msg.}
priden (K8) {mNsg.} ‘good (of a person)’ = prídn
priedi (K1) ‘in front’ = príedi
príklad (P15) ‘ecclesial term, probably for an amount of money to be paid to the church regularly, “Kollektur”’
prízhen (K8) {mNsg.} ‘fresh’ = prîčn
ptíza (P36) ‘bird’ = təč, Log. aćica
puebi (K8) {Npl.} ‘boy’ = pûəbi
puebizh, puebizhan (K1) {Nsg., Dpl.} ‘boy (dim.)’
pukſho (P36) {Asg.} ‘gun’
putov, a, o (P15) ‘lame, disabled’
rađala (P29) {l-ptc. fsg.} ‘to dance’ = râjati
ražnišar (P22) ‘uncastrated stallion’
ražnja (P15) ‘uncastrated stallion’
ráspraſnjani (K8) {ppp. mNpl.} ‘to unfold, cause to tear’ (Jarnik 1832: raspraſniti ‘to unfold’, Pleteršnik 1893-1894: razprásniti ‘to cause to tear’ [citing Jarnik])
raźno (K10) {nAsg.} ‘flat’, cf. râwna
rejfh (P22) ‘fast, quickly’ = rějš
reklá, réžhen (K10) {l-ptc. fsg.?, ‘to say’ = rjékwa
rëpo (P36) {Asg.} ‘turnip’ = rëpo
resdžatí (P15) ‘to spread’ = rsdjatí
reshálen (P15) ‘to disappoint’, cf. ržálati
rétnja (P15) ‘bottomless waterhole’
riebifh fe (K8) ‘to refrain from’, cf. riešn
{pres.1sg.}
riezh, rézhi (K8) {Nsg. Dsg.} ‘thing’ = ríč, réči
rok, v’rozea (P36; K8) {GPL., LSG.} ‘arm’ = rôće {LSG.}
roshe (P36) {Apl.} ‘rose’ = rwòže {Npl.}
Rufúla (K8) {PN} name of a cow (Jarnik 1832: rufúla “rothbraune Kuh”), cf. rús ‘brown’, Log. zú:s
rúag, roug (K8) {Nsg. Dsg.} ‘horn’ = rúag, Log. zú:ag
ś, s’ (K8; K10) ‘with; from’ = s/z
ś pervenja (P15) ‘initially’
sa (K1) ‘for’ = zə
safhifhi (K1) {pres.3sg.} ‘to get to hear’, cf. šliši ‘hears’
sad’ (K1) ‘backward’ or ‘at the back’ = zád(i)
saděnafh (K8) {pres. 2sg.} ‘to cause (harm etc.)’, cf. děnáš
samôkel, la, to (P15) {adj.} ‘hoarse’ = zomóku
sap’wiedo (K8) = psbédaw ‘to tell’, cf. pbbion {pres.1sg.}
saperva (K1) {l-ptc. fsg.} ‘to close’ = zapřva
savvershanik (P15) ‘outcast, “Auswürfling unter den türkischen Waitzschurtschen [= Maiskolben]”’
sbierat (K8) {sup.} ‘to collect’ = zbírati
{inf.}
sdej, sdaj (K10) ‘now’ = sëj
sdrrav, sdrara, sdravi, sdrave (P15) {mNsg., mNdu., mNpl., fNdu.} ‘healthy’ = zra, zráa, zrábi
sgóni, sgoni (P15; K8; K10) {pres. 3sg.} ‘to ring (a bell)’ = zgoni
Silani (P23) ‘in habitants of the Gailtal’ = Ziláni
skokama dirjati (sic! P15) ‘to gallop’
slóbek (P15) ‘devil’
slóbin (P15) {pres. 1sg.} ‘to rage’
sleubasen (K8) {Nsg.} a term of abuse, cf. zlûodej ‘evil-doer’
sleuam (K1; K8) {Nsg., Asg.} ‘devil’, cf. zlûodej ‘evil-doer’
sleuamcov (K8) {mNsg.} ‘of the devil’
smah (K8) {adv.} ‘quietly’ = zmáhan
svegali (K1) {l-ptc. mpl. pf.} ‘to lie’ “st. slagali”, cf. Log. wogou {l-ptc. msg. ipf.}
shálíkhšène, shalíkhšene (P15; K4) ‘mythical women, resembling the sibyls, who lived in caves and used to scream at people when and what to sow’

šité, she, shé (K8; P36; K10) ‘already’ = žia

shedvo (K8) ‘sting’ = Graf. žèdlő, Paul. žúdyó

shenšva (P22) ‘woman’ = žónštwa,
Graf. žónštwa

shena, shien (K8) {Nsg., Gpl.} ‘wife’ = žúna

shènžh (P15) ‘bad’ = žúnč

shikšh (P15; K4) ‘sting’ = Graf. žèdlő, Paul. žúdyó

shenštva (P22) ‘woman’ = žónštwa,
Graf. žónštwa

shena, shien (K8) {Nsg., Gpl.} ‘wife’ = žúna

shé (K8; P36; K10) ‘already’ = žúna

shie (K8; P36; K10) ‘already’ = žúna

shidvo (K8) ‘awl’ = Graf. ňídő

shétvo (K8) ‘sting’ = Graf. žèdlő, Paul. žúdyó

shenštva (P22) ‘woman’ = žónštwa,
Graf. žónštwa

shena, shien (K8) {Nsg., Gpl.} ‘wife’ = žúna

shizh (K1) {pres.3pl.} ‘are’ = súəmat

shitro (K1) {adv.?} ‘fast’ = Paul. šítro

shítro (K8) ‘saltatorial’

shíkam (P15) ‘snowless spot’

shíkamka (P15) ‘snowless spot’

shíshke (P15) ‘with snowless spots’

shlushbe (K8) {Apl.} ‘service’ = Paul. slížba {Asg.}, Graf. slížba {Nsg.}
(a borrowing from central dialects because of initial sl-)

fmókviza, fmokvíz (P15; K8) {Apl.} ‘strawberry’

frímat (K8) {sup.} ‘take from, lift from’ = sníomat

fo (P15; P36; K10) {pres.3pl.} ‘are’ = sódè {Apl.}

fpóvad (P32) ‘confession’ = spíbad

fprehájati (P15) ‘to walk’

frenzhi (K8) ‘to harness together, yoke together’

fragifzhhe (P15) ‘piece of clothing worn when collecting pig’s droppings’

frayza (P15) ‘shirt’

frenzha (K8) ‘luck’ = srènča, Graf. srènča

frenzhati (K8) ‘to meet’ = srènčati,
Log. srenčan {pres. 1sg.}

fsésti je, me je friedu, frédva (K8) ‘to meet’

frízhhe (K8) {Apl.} ‘shirt’ = sréjšče, Graf. sréjšče

ftanu (K1) {Gsg.} ‘state, situation’ (?)

fíra (K10) {fNsg.} ‘old’ = stář

flati. floti, fláá (K8; K10; K1) {inf., pres.3sg., l-ptic. fsg.} ‘to stand’ = státi, stí, stáa, Log. stář

fíe (P36; K8) {pres. 2pl.} ‘are’ = ste

fterm, ftermen (P22) ‘steep’ = stríbřn

ftolžhi (K8) {Lsg.} ‘stool’

ftrahota, ftrahòte {Nsg., Apl.} {P36}
‘fear’

fiug, fiug (K8) {Nsg., Dsg.} ‘rack for drying hay’ = stůug

fvate (K8) {Apl.}, in fvate sbéřati (P15)
‘to invite the wedding guests’

fveazhan, fvežhen (K8; P15) ‘(the time of) evening prayer’

fvinja (P15) ‘swine’ = sbínja

fwéi (P36) ‘world’ = sbít

fwé (P36) ‘advice’ or ‘holy’ (= sbět)

fhe (K8; K10) ‘still, yet’ = še

fšéstnejst (K10) ‘sixteen’ = šišteňst

flvdo (K8) ‘awl’ = Graf. šídő

flitro (K1) {adv.?} ‘fast’ = Paul. šitře

fhivan’za (P22) ‘needle’ = šíwanco

hiwle (P36) {Npl.} ‘seamstress’
škandelo (P36) ‘dish’ {Asg.} = šknděja {Nsg.}
šljifhā (K1) {l-ptc. fsg.} ‘to hear’
šmėnrji, šměnjarje (P15; K8) {Npl., Apl.} unknown type of food
špani, špane (K1) {Npl., Apl.} ‘friend’ = špân
šterlizà (P15) ‘syringe’
šterlinkati (P15) ‘to go about as a vagabond’
šterlinkave (P15) ‘vagabond’
štu, štu, štel (K8; P15), šhva (K1) {l-ptc. msg., fsg.} ‘to go’ = šāw, šwā, Log.b šāy
šhhekàti, našhekati (P15) {ipf., pf.} ‘to milk’
šte njeaka (K8) {Asg.} meaning unknown, prob. a kind of person
šarize (P36) {Npl.} ‘woman who scutches’ = šröce
ša perva (K10) {Nsg.} ‘the first’
šte sadnje (K10) {nNsg.} ‘the last’
šéa (K8) {l-ptc. msg., fsg.} ‘to want’ = šéja
terdnjo (K1) {adv.} ‘hard’ = šādu
ši (K1), še (K8; K10), ši, š (P22; P36; K1) {Nsg., Asg., Dsg.} ‘you’ = ši, še, ši
šo (K1), šej (K10) {fAsg., fDLsg., mDpl.} ‘that, this’
štrka (P15) {PN} ‘the wife of Tork or the War-god, a treacherous and vindictive woman’
štráypo (K8) {Asg.} meaning unknown
štri (K10) {fApl.} ‘three’ = štri
študej (K8) ‘also’ = šuděj
šva, švojo (K1) {Nsg., Asg.} ‘your (sg.)’ = švā, švō, Log.b švā:
šftnize (K4) {Npl.} ‘lips’ (?) = ţnstce
šhshenek (P15) ‘grumbling’
vľ, u (K1; K10; K8) ‘in’
švāha (K8) {TN, Apl.} ‘Italy’ = šo Wāšē ‘into Italy’
vajfenza (P15) ‘pillow’ = bējšnca
švani (K8) ‘last year’ = švāni
švare (P36) {ipv. 2sg.} ‘to watch out’
vávtar (P15) ‘door-leaf’
vbuje (K1) {Gsg.} ‘poor, pitiable’
vedala (K10) {l-ptc. fsg.} ‘to know’ = bēduwa
vef (K8) ‘village’ = bēs, Log.b wē:s
vezh (K10) {adv.} ‘more’
vīde, vidlize (K8) {pl.} ‘fork’ = bidlce, Graf. vidlčē
vif (K10) ‘you (pl.)’
vino (P36) ‘wine’ = Log.b bī:nò
vifh (K10) ‘higher’ = bĭši
vkup (K10) ‘together’
volzhama (K10) {Idu.} ‘ox’
vhprenzh (K8) ‘harness’ = prēnči
vrate (K10) {pl.} ‘gate’ (?)
vrench (K8) ‘warm’ = (w)rēnč
vsemi, vsev (K1; K8) {ipv. 2sg., l-ptc. msg.} ‘to take’ = zěmizi, zēw, Log. b zē:mę, zē:u
vje (K1), vjfa (P36), vjfo (P36), vjfe (P36), vjfan (K1), vje (K10) {nAsg., fNsg., fAsg., mApl., Dpl., fNpl.} ‘all’, Log.b sjē: {nNAsg.}
vjelej (K10) ‘always’
vtēzh (P36) ‘to escape’
vun (K10) ‘out’
wišíti, wibil (P36) {inf., l-ptc. msg.} ‘to beat out, smash’
wišvanje (P36) ‘beating out, smashing’
wišvati (P36) {ipf.} ‘to beat out, smash’
wiadati, wiđjom, wiđila (K8; K13; K10) {inf., pres.3pl., l-ptc. fsg.} ‘to see’ = bīdāti, bīdijo, biduwa, Log. b bī:dnę
{pres. 1sg.}
widělanje (P36) ‘finishing work’
widělati, widělali, widělan, widělana (P36) {l-ptc. mpl., ppp., fNsg.} ‘to finish work’
widěranje (P36) ‘pulling out’
widěhati, widerhal (P36) {l-ptc. msg.} ‘to pull out’
widrēti, widiram, widerl, widert (P36) {pres. 1sg., l-ptc. msg., ppp.} ‘to snatch away’
wigandanje (P36) ‘chasing away’
wiganjati (P36) {ipf.} ‘to chase away’
wigladiti,wigljena (P36) {ppp. fNsg.} ‘to chop all branches off a (pine) tree’
wignati, wijšenem, wignán (wignan) (P36) {pres. 1sg., ppp. fNsg.} ‘to chase off’
wigásti (P36) ‘to finish playing (an instrument)’
wigorim (P36) {pres.1sg.} ‘to burn down’
wigrebsti (P36) ‘to dig out, scrape out’
wìjéſti, wìjédli (P36) {l-ptc. msg.} ‘to finish eating’
wìjiskáti (P36) ‘to search through, ransack’
wìjushinati, wìjushináli (P36) {l-ptc. mpl.} ‘to finish lunch’
wìkáſhlati (P36) ‘to finish coughing’, cf. Log. bkašlan {pres. 1sg.} ‘to cough’
wìmíti (P36) ‘to wash completely, wash till clean’
wìmívanje (P36) ‘thorough washing’
wìmivati (P36) {ipf.} ‘to wash completely, wash till clean’
wìmréti, wìmerla (P36) ‘to die out’

wiglajena (P36) {ppp. fNsg.} ‘to chop all branches off a (pine) tree’

wìgnati (P36) {inf., l-ptc fsg.} ‘to put out, cut out (with a bill)’
wigkniti, wigüklniła (P36) {ppp.} ‘to finish cutting (a bill)’
wipipal (P36) ‘to pull out’
wipiti (P36) ‘to finish a drink’ (= ispiti, popiti)
wipleti (P36) ‘to finish weeding’, cf. pléti ‘to weed’
wirasti, wirafla, wiraflžhen (P36) {l-ptc. fsg., ppp.} ‘to complete growth, finish growing’, cf. rásti, Log. a rá:sté

wirediti, wírejen (wirejen) (P36) {ppp.} ‘die körperlich gute Erziehung vollenden’
wíresanje (P36) ‘engraving’
wíresati, wíresal, wíresan (P36) {l-ptc. msg., ppp.} ‘engrave, cut out’
wíshémanje (P36) ‘wringing out’
wíshémati (P36) {ipf.} ‘to wring out’
wíshéti, wíshét (P36) {ppp.} ‘to wring out’
wíshgati, wíshgan (P36) {ppp.} ‘to burn completely’
wíshwoworiti (P36) ‘to finish speaking’
wífekati (fe), wífekala fe, wífekan, wífekana (P36) {l-ptc. fsg., ppp., fNsg.} ‘cutting down trees until none is left’, - fe ‘be cut down completely’
wíferkanje (P36) ‘slurping out’
wíferkati (P36) {ipf.} ‘to slurp out completely’
wíferkniiti (P36) ‘to slurp out completely’
wíshívati, wíshívalje (P36) {l-ptc. fpl.} ‘to finish sewing’

wíshjava (P36) ‘height’
wíshžekáti (P36) ‘to finish milking’
wíšfáti, wíšfáti (P36) {l-ptc. mpl.} ‘to suck up completely’
wíšipati (P36) freq. ‘to fill in, bury’
wífkačati fe (P36) ‘to finish fooling around’
wíškožhiti (P36) ‘to jump away from’
wífok (P36) ‘proud’
Wiſprija, wiſprijani (P36) {TN} 'Weisprach
wiſtreliči, wiſtreliči, wiſtreliči (P36) {pf.: ipv. 2sg., l-ptc. msg.} ‘to shoot, fire a shot’
wiſtrēlanje (P36) ‘shooting’
wiſtut (P36) ‘fill in, fill up’
wiſzaťi (P36) ‘to urinate till empty’
wiſečniči, wiſečniči (P36) {l-ptc. msg.} ‘to put out, cut out’
wiſtergati (P36) ‘to tear out’
wiſečhi, wiſečko (P36) {l-ptc. nsg.} ‘to run out, pour out’
wiſlazhiči (P36) ‘to squeeze out intestines’
wiſreči, wiſterle (P36) {l-ptc. fpl.} ‘to finish braking (flax)’
wivertanje (P36) ‘perforation’
wivertati (P36) ‘to bore out, perforate’
wivohati (P36) ‘to nose through, get track of sth., find out’
wivuzhiči fe (P36) ‘to learn completely’
wizhefanje (P36) ‘finishing combing’
wizhefati (P36) ‘to finish combing’
wizhihati fe, wikihat fe (P36) ‘to finish sneezing’
zěla (P36) {fNsg.} ‘whole’ = civa, cf. cislej {fLsg.}
Zewloz (K8) {TN, Asg.} ‘Klagenfurt’
zězo hájati (P15) “das liebeswürdige Mädchen wiegen”
žuda (K8) {Nsg.} ‘miracle’ = čúda
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Ziljščina v pismih Urbana Jarnika Primcu in Kopitarju, 1811–1814


Gailtal Slovene in Urban Jarnik’s Letters to Primic and Kopitar, 1811–1814

The paper presents the dialectal data from the Gailtal in Carinthia that Urban Jarnik discusses in his letters to Primic and Kopitar. Jarnik’s discussions of his native dialect in these letters could be regarded as the first serious treatment of Slovene dialectal material. The first part of the paper is devoted to a philological and phonological analysis of Jarnik’s data. The second half gives a glossary of all the
Gailtal Slovene words in Jarnik’s letters. Many dialectal words that Jarnik gives are not attested in later literature.

The letters Urban Jarnik wrote to Primic and Kopitar at the beginning of the 19th century contain a wealth of linguistic information about the Carinthian dialects of Slovene, as well as of Jarnik’s native Gailtal dialect in particular. There is, however, a number of obstacles for the linguist trying to understand Jarnik’s data. Firstly, it is not always clear whether the forms Jarnik adduces are from the Gailtal or from other parts of Carinthia. Secondly, Jarnik’s spelling is by no means phonological. He tries to standardize his spelling so that Primic and Kopitar can relate the dialectal forms to words they know from the central dialects of Slovene. In spite of this, there is enough information to determine the phonology of Jarnik’s language in detail. Jarnik’s phonology can be described with the help of later descriptions of the Gailtal dialect, and on the basis of variations in his spelling. The phonological and grammatical information we can extract from the letters corresponds to what we know about the dialect from later sources. The main contribution of the letters to our knowledge of the Gailtal dialect is the large number of words Jarnik provides that are elsewhere unattested.