

Danila Zuljan Kumar

ZRC SAZU, Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian language, Ljubljana

Word Order in Slovene Dialectal Discourse

Prispevek se osredotoča na posebnosti stalne stave v govornem narečnem diskurzu glede na pravila stalne stave v slovenskem knjižnem pisnem diskurzu, pri čemer poskuša ugotoviti, ali za nekatere besednoredne značilnosti lahko trdimo, da veljajo za slovenski narečni diskurz na splošno (v primerjavi s slovenskim knjižnim pisnim diskurzom). Podrobneje bodo analizirana le izbrana pravila stalne stave, in sicer stava ujemalnega pridevniškega prilastka, samostalniškega prilastka in predložne zveze v samostalniški besedni zvezi, stava prostih naslonk v izreku in njihovo zaporedje v naslonskem nizu, stava modalnega glagola v izhodišču, stava glagola ali njegovega dela v zloženi glagolski obliki, besedni red v izreku, ki ga uvede prislovno določilo ali členek, ter stava poudarnega členka in prislovnega določila.

The aim of this paper is to determine the differences in fixed word order between Slovene dialectal discourse and Standard Slovene written discourse, with a particular focus on whether we can claim that some word order characteristics are present in Slovene dialectal discourse in general (in comparison with Standard Slovene written discourse). We will focus on only selected sentence elements that are subject to fixed word order rules, specifically, on the word order variant of adjective modifiers in agreement with the noun and noun/prepositional phrase modifiers in a noun phrase, the position of clitics in an utterance, the order of clitics in a clitic cluster, the initial position of a modal verb in an utterance, the position of the verb or its part in a compound verb form, the word order characteristics of the utterance introduced by an adverbial or particle and the position of a stressed particle and an adverbial.

1. Introduction

There has been little discussion of word order in Slovene to date, even though the first extensive study of clitics and their position in a sentence in Slovene, published in two parts by Matija Murko and titled *Clitics in Slovene* and subtitled *Morphology and syntax* and *Part II: Syntax* was published in 1891–1892 in the Yearbook of the Slovene Society. In the introduction to the paper the author mentions that the knowledge on clitics is closely connected to stress, about which we know little,

and adds, “we know even less about stress in sentences, which is the soul of the expression of our thoughts” (Murko 1891: 5), by means of which Murko in fact already anticipated the phenomenon of the functional sentence perspective, as the Czech linguist Vilem Mathesius¹ more than forty years later called the arrangement of elements with respect to the functional role that they perform in the sentence, or the rule of free word order, as the Slovenian linguist Anton Breznik called it in his article “Word order in speech” almost twenty years after Murko (Breznik 1982). The majority of articles in Slovenian linguistics on word order in the past were based on an analysis of word order in literary texts (cf. Breznik 1982: 237–239, Toporišič 1982: 161–181). Only in the past fifteen years have there been discussions of word order in spoken discourse, i.e. in children’s speech (see Kranjc 2004) and urban speech (see Krajnc 2007), while little has been written about word order in Slovene dialects, or else these discussions focus only on particular dialects (see Zorko 1994, 1995, 1998; Steenwijk 1992; Zuljan Kumar 2002, 2003, 2014, 2016; Škapin 2014). The first attempt at a description of some word order characteristics in several Slovene dialects and a very loose comparison of the specific features of particular dialect groups was contributed by Zuljan Kumar (2007). This article is based on the aforementioned study and offers some new insights.

2. Word order in spoken dialectal discourse

The aim of this paper is to determine the differences in fixed word order between Slovene dialectal discourse and Standard Slovene written discourse, with a particular focus on whether we can claim that some word order characteristics are present in all Slovene dialectal discourse in general (in comparison with Standard Slovene written discourse). A second aim is to determine whether the selected word order variants that the author of the article analyzed in texts from the Littoral dialectal group² (see Zuljan Kumar 2002, 2003) also appear in texts from other Slovene dialects. If they do, we are further interested in whether their use is

¹ V. Mathesius 1939: O tak zvaném aktuálním členení vetném. *Slovo a slovesnost* 5. 171–174. Otherwise the principle of functional sentence perspective was partially recognized by Henry Weil as early as in 1844, in his article *De l’ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes comparées aux langues modernes*, in which he compared word order in ancient and modern languages and found that word order in sentences is influenced by mutual relations between ideas (Beaugrande, Dressler 2002: 24).

² Specifically, the Torre Valley, Natisone Valley, and Brda dialects.

merely sporadic and they appear due to the short planning time³ that the speaker has at their disposal in spoken discourse, which prevents the deliberate structuring of utterances,⁴ or whether this is an established and perhaps also preferential use that in fact represents the dialectal word order variant. As part of the latter we will also check the possible influence of contact with a foreign language on the emergence of the word order variant.

We will focus on only selected sentence elements that are subject to fixed word order rules, specifically, on the word order variant of adjective premodifiers and noun/prepositional phrase post-modifiers in noun phrases, the position of clitics in an utterance, the order of clitics in a clitic cluster, the position of the verb or its part in a compound verb form, the word order characteristics of the utterance introduced by an adverbial or particle and the position of a stressed particle and an adverbial. We will examine the word order variants in question in texts from all Slovene dialect groups.⁵

2.1 The position of the adjective modifier in agreement with the noun (NOUN > ADJ.MOD in agreement with the noun)

In stylistically neutral word order the adjective modifier in agreement with the noun in Standard Slovene discourse is located in front of the head of the phrase,⁶ whereas in spoken dialectal discourse it can also be placed after the head. We found this kind of position in all the texts analyzed and can therefore assume

³ This is the time that a speaker needs in order to think about what they are going to say. In written discourse the planning time is much longer.

⁴ Typical of unprepared spoken discourse are interpolated lexemes and structures, false starts, interruptions, self-corrections and also flexible word order.

⁵ In the collection of texts entitled *Slovene Dialects* by Tine Logar and in the texts by the following recorders: Tjaša Jakop (Central Savinja dialect, Styrian dialect group; Inner Carniolan dialect, Littoral dialect group), Karmen Kenda Jež (Cerkno, Rovte dialect group, and Gail Valley dialect, Carinthian dialect group), Mihaela Koletnik (Slovene Hills dialect, Pannonian dialect group), Vera Smole (Lower Carniolan dialect), Matej Šekli (Natisone Valley dialect, Littoral dialect group), Jožica Škofic (Upper Carniolan dialect of Kropa), Peter Weiss (Upper Savinja dialect, Styrian dialectal group), Melita Zemljak (Lower Sava Valley dialect, Styrian dialect group), Zinka Zorko (Styrian, Pannonian and Carinthian dialects) and Danila Zuljan Kumar (Brda, Torre Valley and Natisone Valley dialects, Littoral dialect group). For more see the references section of the paper.

⁶ A stylistically marked adjective modifier in agreement with the noun in Standard Slovene can be located after the head of the phrase, for example in interjections (*strela gromska!* – lightning thunderous ‘hell’s bells!’ (exclamation), *bog nebeški* – god heavenly ‘god of the heaven’, *prijatelj moj dragi* – friend my dear ‘my dear friend’) or as a poetic figure (*Vida lepa* – Vida beautiful ‘beautiful Vida’) (Toporišič 1982: 55). Beautiful Vida is a Slovene myth (comm. DZK).

that this is a general feature of Slovene dialectal discourse, but with an important distinction: by far the greatest number of examples of post position were in Littoral texts, where there is contact with Italian and Friulian, both of which display both word order variants (cf. for example Dardano Trifone 2001: 202, 450–453 and Faggin 1997: 71),⁷ whereas in texts from the remaining dialect groups the word order variant NOUN > ADJ.MOD in agreement with the noun was far less frequent. Based on this difference we assume that in Littoral dialects this position is established – the two word order variants can appear together in the same utterance (ex. 2) – and in some cases even preferential,⁸ while in other dialects it is more the result of the short planning time available to the speaker for creating the utterance. This assertion is supported by Zorko, who states that the word order variant NOUN > ADJ.MOD in agreement with the noun appears in Styrian, Carinthian, and Pannonian dialects but that in such phrases the adjective modifier is perceived as an addition (Zorko 1998: 37).⁹

- (1) Litt.: Usak dan sò je jedlo župu v vržotovu (Zuljan Kumar 2003: 63).¹⁰
every day REFL AUX_{3SG} ate soup cabbage
'Every day cabbage soup was eaten.'
SLS: Vsak dan se je jedlo ohrovtovo juho.
- (2) Litt.: Kostanj ima deblo debelo an puno velikih varhi (Zuljan Kumar 2003: 63).
chestnut has trunk thick and many high peaks
'Chestnut has a thick trunk and many high peaks.'
SLS: Kostanj ima debelo deblo in veliko visokih vrhov.
- (3) Litt.: Je odrezala kruh v flete debele an jih je zmočila tu mleko an tu jajca strepetane (Zuljan Kumar 2003: 63).
AUX_{3SG} cut_{3SGF} bread to slices thick and them_{ACC} AUX_{3SG} soaked_{3SGF} into milk and into eggs whipped
'She cut the thick slices of bread and soaked them into milk and whipped eggs.'
SLS: Odrezala je debele rezine kruha in jih namočila v mleko ter v stepena jajca.

⁷For example in Friulian *un vistit gnûf* means the same as *un gnûf vistit* 'new clothes/dress'.

⁸In the Brda dialect in certain cases its use is more established than the word order variant ADJ.MOD > HEAD (e.g. *župa vržotova* 'ohrovtova juha' – soup cabbage 'cabbage soup', *kuhnja sirkova* 'koruzna juha' – soup corn 'vegetable corn soup', *njoki čiešpovi* 'slivovi cmoki' – dumplings plum 'plum dumplings').

⁹The speaker in spontaneous discourse often creates utterances according to the principle of addition, i.e. of first stating the most important information and then describing it further (Zuljan Kumar 2007: 43). The thesis that the adjective modifier is perceived as an addition can be supported by the fact that the recorder sometimes placed a comma between the head and the adjective modifier, which means that the speaker paused there.

¹⁰Whenever a feature applies to dialectal texts from all dialect groups, due to space limitations we will not cite examples from all dialect groups. But we have marked all examples in the texts in order to compare the frequency of use. Due to the small selection of texts we of course cannot generalize the finding.

- (4) Pann.: Starši moji bi ja skrbi meli za mene (Koletnik 2001: 255).
parents my COND yes care have for me
'My parents would of course be worried about me.'
SLS: Moji starši bi ja imeli skrbi zame.
- (5) Low.Carn.: Je pāršu kje, na Drenk, pär strici tuoyme /.../ (Smole 2007: 381).
AUX_{3SG} came_{3SGM} there, to Drenk, to uncle your
'He came there to Drenik to your uncle.'
SLS: Prišel je tja na Drenik k tvojemu stricu.
- (6) Upp.Carn.: /.../ tut svedra ciermanska so klele delal /.../ (Škofic 2007: 218).
/.../ also drills carpenter's AUX_{3PL} there made_{3PLM}
'They also made carpenter's drills there.'
SLS: Tukaj so delali tudi mizarske svedre.

2.2 The position of the noun modifier/prepositional phrase (NOUN MOD/PREP. PHRASE > NOUN)

In Standard Slovene discourse the noun and prepositional phrase modifiers are located after the head of the noun phrase (Toporišič 1982: 172), while in dialectal discourse they can also be positioned in front of the head.

- (7) Low.Carn.: Ja, lih tule sa gaurle! Lih tist dan zutrej de sa ga abesil, na Valentina dan (Smole 2007: 282).
yes, right that AUX_{3PL} spoke_{3PLM}! Just that day morning that AUX_{3PL} him_{ACC} hung_{3PLM}
on Valentin_{GEN} Day.
'Yes, that's what they were talking about! That just in the morning of that day they had hung him, on the Valentine's Day.'
SLS: Ja, ravno tole so govorili! Ravno tisti dan zjutraj, da so ga obesili, na Valentina dan.
- (8) Low.Carn.: /.../ je biu tam en muj stric, ne, ad matere stric, ne, ad matere stric, ad mujie mame stric /.../. je biu /.../ od matere žlahta (Smole 2007: 386).
/.../ AUX_{3SG} was there one my uncle, no, of mother_{GEN} uncle, no, of mother_{GEN} uncle,
of my mother_{GEN} uncle. /.../ AUX_{3SG} was /.../ of mother_{GEN} relative
'There was one of my uncles there, right, mother's uncle, right, mother's uncle, my mother's uncle /.../ he was /.../ my mother's relative.'
SLS: Tam je bil en moj stric, ne, od matere stric, od matere stric, od moje mame stric /.../ bil je /.../ od matere sorodnik.
- (9) Low.Carn.: Martinou mat sa mat pravə, kaku sa wad mater mat anu nuč slišel zyanə u Gulč (Logar 1993: 36).
Martinova's mother AUX_{3PL} mother_{DAT} told_{3PLM} how AUX_{3PL} of mother_{GEN} mother_{NOM}
one night heard_{3PLM} to ring in Gulč
'Martinova's mother told my mother, how she heard her grandmother one night to ring in Golič.'
SLS: Martinova mati so pravili, kako so od matere mati eno noč slišali zvoniti v Goliču.

Examples of this kind of position of noun/prepositional phrase modifiers were rare in the texts analyzed, with most of them being found in texts in the Lower Carniolan dialect. Zorko also found them in Styrian, Carinthian, and Pannonian dialectal texts but she also finds this position to be rare (Zorko 1994: 49). In this case it seems to be an established though not frequently used word order variant in Slovene dialectal discourse, alongside the word order variant of NOUN > NOUN/PREP.PHRASE MOD, and not a sporadic feature of spoken discourse that arose due to short planning time.

2.3 Initial position of a clitic or a clitic cluster

Concerning the position of clitics in a sentence, Standard Slovene, like the majority of Slavic languages (except Macedonian), follows Wackernagel's law¹¹ according to which clitics occur in second position in the utterance after the strong, i.e. non-enclitic accented word (Franks and King 2000: 219; Siewierska 1988: 31, 32; Priestly; Šekli 2018: 71). In compound tenses or in verbal phrases compound consisting of a verb + a verb complement a clitic is placed after the participle (ex. 10) or modal verb (ex. 11) (Toporišič 2000: 676).

- (10) SLS: *Prinesli mu bomo darilo.*
 bring_{1PLM} him_{DAT} FUT.AUX_{1PL} present
 'We'll bring him a present.'
- (11) SLS: *Moram ti prinesiti darilo.*
 have_{1SG} to you_{DAT} bring present
 'I have to bring you a present.'

Clitics can be located in the initial position (thus functioning as proclitics) of the sentence only in cases of ellipsis of an accented non-enclitic word (ex. 12, 13) or the interrogative particle *ali* (ex. 14) (Toporišič 2000: 676, cf. Žele 2017: 378) and when answering a question or referring explicitly to something in the preceding question or sentence and therefore implying a certain amount of emphasis on the pronoun (ex. 15) (De Bray 1969: 428; Franks and King 2000: 40–43).

- (12) SLS: *Se vidimo! (Jutri se vidimo!)*
 REFL see_{1PL}! (Tomorrow REFL see_{1PL})
 'See you!' ('See you tomorrow!')
- (13) SLS: *Le naj se pazi! (Alenka naj se le pazi!)*
 ADV PART REFL watch_{3SG} out (Alenka PART REFL ADV watch_{3SG} out)
 'She'd better watch out!' ('Alenka had better watch out!')

¹¹ The placement of clitic clusters in syntactic second position in the sentence after the first stressed sentence constituent or after its first part (Wackernagel's law) was inherited by Proto-Slavic from Indo-European (Šekli 2018: 71).

- (14) SLS: *Boš jutri prišel? (Ali boš jutri prišel?)*
 FUT.AUX_{2SGM} tomorrow come_{2SGM} (INTERR.PART FUT.AUX_{2SGM} tomorrow come_{2SGM})
 ‘Will you come tomorrow?’
- (15) SLS: *Bom prišel, kdo pravi, da ne bom.*
 FUT.AUX_{1SG} come_{1SGM} who says that NEG FUT.AUX_{1SG}
 ‘I will come, who says that I won’t.’

However, in Slovene dialectal discourse clitics can be located in the initial position in utterances. This position of clitics is a feature of Slovene dialectal discourse in general as we can observe it in all the dialectal texts reviewed. We can even find confirmation for this thesis from Murko, who raises the question of where this position of clitics in spoken Slovene comes from, given that this is an unusual occurrence in other Slavic languages. However, he does not believe it is due to the influence of the neighboring Germanic language but rather that “our language has equally independently developed in this regard as Russian has, which went to the other extreme, having lost even those clitic forms that were Proto-Slavic, and some sort of *ga* or *mu* simply did not develop at all” (Murko 1892: 85).

In Slovene dialects an utterance can thus be initialized by:

2.3.1 The auxiliary verb *biti* ‘to be’

- (16) Litt.: *Je* bluo šele tamavu, kar je paršu ho na Štupco (Logar 1993: 69).
 AUX_{3SGN} was already dark, when he came up to Štupca.
 ‘It was already dark when he arrived up to Stupica.’
 SLS: *Bilo je že temno, ko je prišel gor na Stupico.*
- (17) Styr.: *Sn* reku: »*Sn* ja dau, če sn glix pəršu damu.« *Sn* dau kuojim jist, /.../ po sn pa zaspau (Jakop 2001: 378).
 AUX_{1SG} said_{1SGM} AUX_{1SG} yes gave_{1SGM} if AUX_{1SG} just came_{1SGM} home. AUX_{1SG} gave-_{1SGM} horses to eat /.../ then AUX_{1SG} ADV fell_{1SGM} asleep
 ‘I said, of course I gave, if I just came home. I fed he horses and then I fell asleep.’
 SLS: *Rekel je: »Sem ja dal, če sem ravno prišel domov.« Dal sem konjem jesti, /.../ potem sem pa zaspal.*

2.3.2 A pronominal clitic

- (18) Litt.: *Ju je merku an sə je obliəzawu šobe* (Logar 1993: 71).
 her_{ACC} AUX_{3SG} observed_{3SGM} and REFL AUX_{3SG} licked_{3SGM} lips
 ‘He was observing her and was licking his lips.’
 SLS: *Opazoval jo je in si oblizoval ustnice.*

- (19) Litt.: *Mu-j dau kaso zlata /.../* (Šekli 2007: 422).
 him_{DAT} AUX_{3SG} gave_{3SGM} chest of gold /.../
 ‘He gave him a chest of gold /.../’
 SLS: Dal mu je zlato skrinjo.
- (20) Low.Carn.: *Jeh je bu mal* (Smole 2007: 379).
 them_{GEN} AUX_{3SG} was_{3SGM} few
 ‘There were few of them there.’
 SLS: *Bilo jih je malo.*
- (21) Styr.: */.../ jih nič nei strašlu* (Logar 1993: 93).
 them_{GEN} nothing NEG.AUX_{3SG} scared_{3SGN}
 ‘Nothing scared them.’
 SLS: *Nič jih ni strašilo.*

2.3.3 A reflexive personal pronominal clitic

- (22) Styr.: *Si je pa suosət žienu* (Zemljak 2001: 360).
 REFL AUX_{3SG} ADV neighbor got_{3SGM} married
 ‘A neighbor was getting married.’
 SLS: *Se je pa sosed ženil.*
- (23) Carint.: *Se bomo že stəsnəle* (Logar 1993: 75).
 REFL FUT.AUX_{1PL} PART huddle_{1PLM}
 ‘We will huddle together somehow.’
 SLS: *Se bomo že stisnili.*
- (24) Upp.Carn.: *Se i užgau pa pogoreu use* (Škofic 2007: 221).
 REFL AUX_{3SG} caught_{3SGM} fire and burnt_{3SGM} all
 ‘It caught fire and was burnt to the ground.’
 SLS: *Vse se je vžgalo in pogorelo.*

2.3.4 A modal verb

In Littoral dialects, in contrast to Standard Slovene, an utterance can also be initialized by a modal verb as well as by clitic forms. The modal verb is placed before the infinitive.

- (25) Litt.: *Čən nərđit təkua, ku paše mene* (Zuljan Kumar 2003: 69).
 want_{1SG} to do so as suit_{3SG} me_{DAT}
 ‘I want to do the way it suits me.’
 SLS: *Narediti hočem tako, kot ustreza meni.*
- (26) Litt.: *Moreta vprašat novice tudi tiste žene, ki skarbijo za te potriebne ljudi doma.*
 can_{2PL} ask news also those women_{ACC} that take care for these needed people at home
 ‘You can ask about the news those women who take care of people who need help at home.’
 SLS: *Lahko vprašate za novice tudi tiste ženske, ki skrbijo za pomoči potrebne na njihovem domu.*

The word order variant MOD.VERB > INF is possible in all Slovene dialects,¹² but it is established only in Littoral dialects, where it is preferential (compared to the word order variant INF > MOD.VERB), which leads us to the assumption of the influence of Italian and Friulian, both of which have only the word order variant MOD.VERB > INF. However, in this case we cannot attribute it to language interference, i.e. the borrowing of word order variant from Romance languages, but rather the contact Romance languages influenced only the frequency of the use of this word order variant.

2.4 Relative ordering of clitics in a clitic cluster

A clitic cluster in Standard Slovene can be enclitic, dependent on a previous stressed word (ex. 27), or it can be proclitic, dependent on the next stressed word (ex. 28). Both types of clusters can follow each other (ex. 29).

- (27) SLS: Smejál se mi je.
 laughed_{3SGM} REFL me_{DAT} AUX_{3SG}
 'He laughed at me.'
- (28) SLS: Se mi je smejal?
 REFL me_{DAT} AUX_{3SG} laughed_{3SGM}
 'Did he laugh at me?'
- (29) SLS: Povedal sem mu, da so se mi še smejali.
 told_{1SGM} AUX_{1SG} him_{DAT} that AUX_{3PL} REFL me_{DAT} PART laughed_{3PLM}
 'I told him that they still laughed at me.'

The relative ordering of clitics in a clitic cluster in Standard Slovene is as follows:¹³ C (in dependent clauses) > PART *naj* > COND *bi*/AUX¹⁴ > REFL > PRONOM clitic_{DAT} > PRONOM clitic_{ACC} > PRONOM clitic_{GEN} > FUT.AUX/*je* > NEG *ne* (Toporišič 2000: 671). The example below of the realization of a clitic cluster, for instance, is cited by Franks and King (2000: 45):

- (30) SLS: Prosi, da naj bi se mu ne smejali.
 Ask_{3SG} that PART COND REFL him_{DAT} NEG laugh_{PLM}
 'She/He asks us not to laugh at him.'

¹² Information about this was obtained through an oral survey of coworkers at the Dialectological Section of the Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language at the Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts (ZRC SAZU).

¹³ The clitic cluster is not always realized in its entirety, but the order of elements always remains unchanged (exceptions are found only in the cases of *ne bo*, *ne bi*, *ni*) (Toporišič 2000: 671).

¹⁴ Except *je* 'is', which always goes last in the clitic cluster in the same slot as the future auxiliary (Franks and King 2000: 45).

Specific features in the clitic cluster of dialectal discourse in comparison to Standard Slovene relate to the different position of the clitic form of the personal pronoun in the dative case and the different position of the negative particle *ne*.

2.4.1 Pronominal dative clitic after the clitic of the verb *biti* ‘to be’

(AUX (cop) *biti* > PRONOM clitic_{DAT} > VERB)

In standard Slovene discourse the pronoun in the dative form is placed before the clitic of the verb *biti* ‘to be’. In spoken discourse it can come after. We found examples of this in several dialectal groups, and Murko has also reported this position, having found it in Carinthian, Lower Carniolan, and Rovte texts (Murko 1892: 77).¹⁵ In view of this we could conclude that it is a general feature of spoken discourse. However, we did not find many examples and so we assume that this word order variation is not established and hence cannot interpret it as a dialectal word order rule, but that it occurs due to short planning time in spoken discourse.

- (31) Low.Carn.: Je muoglò neikej bet, zatu ke vaš oče je vam pərpoudvau /.../ (Smole 2007: 383).

AUX_{3SG} had_{3SGN} something to be, because your father AUX_{3SG} you_{DAT} told_{3SGM}
‘Something had to happen, because your father told you.’

SLS: Nekaj je moralo biti, ker vam je vaš oče pripovedoval.

- (32) Rovt.: Pa i pəršla Šuscawa Marije, de beižwa nad jazuca, ka bo nam šou vos sirk (Logar 1993: 47).

And AUX_{3SG} came_{3SGF} Šuscawa Marija, that go_{IDU} over badger, because FUT.AUX_{3SG} us_{DAT} go_{3SGM} all corn

‘And Šuscava Marija came to tell us to chase badger, otherwise it will eat all the corn.’

SLS: Pa je prišla Šuscava Marija, da pojdiva nad jazbeca, ker nam bo pojedel vos koruzo.

¹⁵ Murko cites examples from Carinthian and Rovte dialects:

- (1) Carin.: de je ga vidil
that AUX_{3SG} him_{ACC} saw_{3SGM}
‘that he saw him’
SLS: da ga je videl

In this case also the accusative clitic is placed after the auxiliary. I have not found any other such example in the analysed texts.

- (2) Carin.: de je mu dal
that AUX_{3SG} him_{DAT} gave_{3SGM}
‘that he gave him’
SLS: da mu je dal
- (3) Rovt.: se j mu že wadtorȳa glawa prwč (Murko 1892: 77).
REFL AUX_{3SG} him_{DAT} already tore_{3SGF} head off
‘His head was already torn off.’
SLS: Glava se mu je že odtrgala proč.

- (33) Litt.: Ma Sonja ja jən poviedla, də nimi ki xodit če /.../ (Zuljan Kumar 2003: 73).
 But Sonja AUX_{3SG} them_{DAT} told_{3SGF} that NEG.AUX_{3PL} what to walk there /.../
 ‘But Sonja told them not to go there /.../’
 SLS: Ampak Sonja jim je povedala, naj ne hodijo tja.

2.4.2 The order of clitic forms of the pronoun after the verb

(VERB > PRONOM clitic_{DAT/ACC})

The clitic form of the pronoun can be placed after the verb. We found examples of this in Littoral texts, and Zorko has also reported this order: in describing special characteristics of word order in the speech of Ojstrica (a Carinthian dialect group) she cites instances of the clitic form of the personal pronoun frequently appearing after the verb, at the end of the utterance (Zorko 1995: 143). We did not find many such examples in dialectal texts so we can therefore say that this position of the personal pronoun in dialectal discourse is possible (more in some dialects than in others, for example, in Carinthian dialects) but not frequent and therefore not well established.

- (34) Lit.: Samo sən rekla mu, də če lohno γram u stranišče (Zuljan Kumar 2003: 72).
 Only AUX_{1SG} told_{1SGF} him_{DAT} that if can go_{1SG} to toilet
 ‘I only asked him, if I could go to the toilet.’
 SLS: Sem ga samo vprašala, če lahko grem na stranišče.
- (35) Carin.: Je pa powiedwa mi, kejko jaic marm uzet.
 AUX_{3SG} ADV told_{3SGF} me_{DAT} how many eggs have_{1SG} to take
 ‘But she told me how many eggs I had to take.’
 SLS: Povedala pa mi je, koliko jajc moram vzeti.
- (36) Carin.: So pa rekli mu /.../ (Zorko 1995: 144).
 AUX_{3PL} ADV told_{3PLM} him_{DAT} /.../
 ‘But they told him /.../’
 SLS: So mu pa rekli /.../

2.4.3 Special characteristics of the position of the negative particle *ne*

2.4.3.1 The clitic form *bi* in front of *ne*

(COND *bi* > PRONOM clitic_{GEN/DAT/ACC} > NEG *ne*)

In Standard Slovene discourse pronominal clitics in the accusative case (*me*, *te*, *ga*, *jo*, etc.) are placed before *bi*, if the sentence is negative.

- (37) SLS: *Za noben denar ga ne bi prodal.*
 for no money him_{GEN} NEG COND sold_{1SGM}
 ‘I wouldn’t sell it for any money.’

The word order COND > PRONOM clitic_{GEN/DAT/ACC} > NEG is possible, but considered a lower colloquial form. However, in western Slovene dialects this word order variation is neutral and used more frequently than the word order variation PRONOM clitic_{GEN/DAT/ACC} > NEG > COND. Zorko has also reported this for eastern Slovene dialects (Zorko 1998: 230), as has Murko, who notes “that in the west *bi* has already separated completely from the negative particle *ne* and that in the east as well the first stressed word draws it increasingly closer” (Murko 1892: 73). However, after analyzing texts we cannot say that this word order variation is established in Slovene dialects apart from Littoral ones, since we have found very few examples in other dialects. For this reason we cannot count it among the general features of Slovene dialectal discourse, but we can consider it as an established word order variation in Littoral dialectal discourse.

- (38) Litt.: *Za noben sud bi ga na prodal.*
 for no money COND him_{GEN} NEG sold_{1SGM}
 ‘I wouldn’t have sold him for any money.’
- (39) Litt.: *Duā bi je na poznu, ki jā bla zmerān okuāle.*
 who COND her_{GEN} NEG knew_{SGM} because aux_{3SG} was_{3SGF} always around
 ‘Who wouldn’t have known her, as she was always around.’
 SLS: Kdo je ne bi poznal, ker je bila vedno naokrog.

2.4.3.2 NEG *ne* is not placed directly before the personal verbal form

In Standard Slovene the negative particle *ne* is placed directly in front of the personal verbal form whose verbal action it is negating. In Littoral dialectal texts, however, we have found instances where some other word has been inserted between the two. We did not find this word order variation in the examined texts of other dialect groups.¹⁶

¹⁶ But we cannot attribute this phenomenon to the Romance influence on the western Slovene dialects, because such word order variants are not probable in the contact Romance languages. I am grateful for the discussion on this topic and the following examples to dr. Giorgio Cadorini.

Litt: Duo je ne še pozna?
 Who AUX_{3SG} NEG PART know_{3SG}?
 Who hasn’t known her yet?

LITERARY ITALIAN:

Chi lo non ancora conosce? – impossible
 Chi non lo ancora conosce? – impossible
 Chi non ancora lo conosce? – possible but improbable
 Chi non lo conosce ancora? – usual
 Chi ancora non lo conosce? – less usual

- (40) Litt.: Ženitve pa me nei ut tizbuot nekul vieč umeinla (Logar 1993: 56).
 wedding_{GEN} ADV me_{DAT} NEG.AUX_{3SG} from that time never more mentioned_{3SGF}
 ‘From that time on she has never ever mentioned the wedding.’
 SLS: Ženitve pa mi od takrat nikoli več ni omenila.
- (41) Litt.: Ti na nobedən drek uzame (Šekli 2007: 422).
 You_{DAT} NEG nobody shit take_{3SG}
 ‘Nobody would take shit.’
 SLS: Nihče ti dreka ne vzame.

2.4.4 Characteristics of word order variation in compound verbal form

A particular feature of the word order variation of compound verbal forms in dialectal discourse compared to Standard Slovene discourse is the former’s word order variation of the past participle of the main verb and the infinitive and infinitive of purpose at the end of the utterance. I found these sentence structures, which Reindl calls “brace constructions” (Rahmenkonstruktion) (Reindl 2015: 188), in all dialectal texts, but not equally frequently in all of them: they were least frequent in Littoral texts. We can thus assume that this word order variant is established in all Slovene dialects, but is only sporadic in littoral dialects.¹⁷ In Pannonian dialects also the past participle of the verb *biti* ‘to be’ is often placed at the end of the utterance (ex. 49, 50). We found many such examples in the analyzed texts from the Pannonian dialect group and we can therefore assume that this word order variation is established and even preferential in these dialects, whereas in the analyzed texts of other dialect groups we found few or no instances. Breznik has already written about the word order variant of the verb at the end of the utterance, and argues that this word order variant is not a Germanism, since it is a feature displayed by other Slavic languages when the meaning requires it (Breznik 1982: 252).¹⁸

TRIEST VARIANT OF VENETIAN DIALECT

Chi lo no ancora conossi? – impossible

Chi no lo ancora conossi? – impossible

Chi no ancora lo conossi? – impossible

Chi no lo conossi ancora? – usual

Chi che ancora no lo conossi? – less usual

FRIULIAN

Cui lu no ancjemò cognossial? – impossible

Cui no lu ancjemò cognossial? – impossible

Cui no ancjemò lu cognossial? – impossible

Cui no lu cognossial ancjemò? – usual

Cui che ancjemò no lu cognossial? – less usual

¹⁷ Cf. Zorko who believes that the shift of the verb to the last position in the utterance, also in the present tense form, is a general tendency of northeastern Slovene dialects (Zorko 1998: 229).

¹⁸ Moreover, as noted by Breznik, Slavic word order for the verb is free (Breznik 1982: 252).

2.4.4.1 Position of the main verb at the end of the utterance

- (42) Carin.: Sm zvečer notər pršwa (Zorko 1995: 144).
 AUX_{1SG} in evening inside came_{1SGF}
 ‘I came inside in the evening.’
 SLS: Zvečer sem prišla noter.
- (43) Rovt: /.../ če j ta γaspadar /.../ dawaliu, de mu boda meje pasikal (Kenda-Jež 2001: 312).
 /.../ if AUX_{3SG} that farmer /.../ allowed_{3SGM} that him_{DAT} FUT.AUX_{3PL} bouderies cut_{3PLM}
 ‘/.../ if that farmer allowed that they would cut his land bouderies.’
 SLS: Če je ta gospodar /.../ dovolil, da mu bodo posekali meje.
- (44) Low.Carn.: Pozim, op štirih, pol štirih, po sneigi, učas do kolena gazla (Smole 2007: 379).
 in winter at four at half past three in snow sometimes to knee trudged_{1SGF}
 ‘Sometimes in the winter at four, half past three I trudged through the snow that was up to the knees.’
 SLS: Pozimi, ob štirih, pol štirih, po snegu sem včasih gazila do kolen.

2.4.4.2 Position of the infinitive and infinitive of purpose at the end of the utterance

- (45) Styr.: Ača nəso smeeli več progā prestopit (Zorko 1995: 288).
 father NEG.AUX_{3PL} could_{3PLM} more threshold to cross
 ‘Father wasn’t allowed to enter the house anymore.’
 SLS: Oče niso več smeli prestopiti praga.
- (46) Styr.: /.../ si mag žviino napast (Jakop 2003: 125).
 REFL had_{2SGM} livestock to feed
 ‘You had to feed the livestock.’
 SLS: Moral si napasti živino.
- (47) Pann.: /.../ tak je trmasti, ka neče doktori iti (Koletnik 2001: 293).
 so AUX_{3SG} stubborn that NEG.AUX doctor_{LOC} to go
 ‘He is so stubborn that he does not want to go to the doctor.’
 SLS: Tako je trmast, da noče iti k zdravniku.
- (48) Carin.: Pa je zea /.../ koaso pa je šwa futər siəč (Logar 1993: 73).
 and AUX_{3SG} took_{3SGF} scythe and AUX_{3SG} went_{3SGF} grass to cut
 ‘And she took a scythe and went to cut the grass.’
 SLS: Pa je vzela koso in šla kosit travo.

2.4.4.3 Position of the past participle of the AUX *biti* ‘to be’ at the end of the utterance

- (49) Pann.: F šolo pa smo mogle tak bežati, ka smo vedno zadje bile (Zorko 1994: 50).
 To school ADV AUX_{1PL} had_{1PLF} so to run because AUX_{1PL} always last were_{1PLF}
 ‘We always had to run to school because we were always the last.’
 SLS: V šolo pa smo morale tako hiteti, ker smo bile vedno zadnje.

- (50) Pann.: Te pa smo gledale, ot kerega vogla bi še gdo priša, ka ne bi same bile (Zorko 1994: 50).
 then ADV AUX_{1PL} watched_{1PLF} from which corner COND PART who came_{3SGM} that
 NEG COND alone were_{1PLF}
 ‘Then we watched if anybody would come around the corner so we wouldn’t be alone.’
 SLS: Potem pa smo gledali, izza katerega vogala bi še kdo prišel, da ne bi bile same.

2.5 The position of adverbials

With respect to the position of adverbials in dialectal discourse, two things should be noted relative to their order in Standard Slovene: their position at the end of the utterance and the word order in the utterance that is introduced by the adverbial.

2.5.1 Adverbial after the verb

We found examples in the analyzed dialectal texts in which the adverbial came immediately after the verb, whereas in Standard Slovene discourse it comes before the verb.

- (51) Pann: Tiste snoupe smo kup povezali leipo (Zorko 1994: 51).
 those sheaves AUX_{1PL} together tied_{1PLM} nicely
 ‘We tied those sheaves firmly.’
 SLS: Tiste snope smo lepo povezali skupaj.
- (52) Low.Carn.: Se-j pa dolnuotər pər Seleh znajdu zutrej (Smole 2007: 381).
 REFL AUX_{3SG} ADV down there by Sele found_{3SGM} in morning
 ‘In the morning he appeared down there by Sele.’
 SLS: Se je pa zjutraj znašel dol pri Selah.
- (53) Litt.: J-jau, boš boyat seda (Šekli 2007: 422).
 AUX_{3SG} said_{3SGM} FUT.AUX_{2SG} rich now
 ‘You will be rich now, he said.’
 SLS: Dejal je, zdaj boš bogat.

Similarly as with the word order in which the modifier is placed after the word modified in non-Littoral dialects, we assume the speaker operates according to the principle of addition, which is one of the principles of spoken discourse in general, and we can therefore say that this word order arises due to the short planning time of the speaker, and not that it is an established word order variant.

2.5.2 Word order in an utterance in which the adverbial of time/place is in initial position

In Standard Slovene discourse the rule applies that word order in an utterance that describes an action in the past or future tense changes if it is introduced by an adverbial. The word order SUB > VERB > OBJ > ADVERB thus changes to the sequence ADVERB > AUX clitic > SUB > main VERB > OBJ.

- (54) SLS: Toninac je srečal beračico po poti.
 Toninac AUX_{3SG} met_{3SGM} female beggar on way
 ‘Toninac met a female beggar on the way.’
- (55) SLS: Po poti je Toninac srečal beračico.
 On way AUX_{3SG} Toninac met_{3SGM} female beggar
 ‘On the way Toninac met a female beggar.’

However, in spoken dialectal discourse this rule does not always apply, since the word order SUB > VERB > OBJ > can be preserved even if an adverbial is placed in front. This word order variant is most frequent in Littoral dialects, where in some dialects it is the only one possible (for example, in the Natisone Valley and Torre Valley dialects) and is thus an established dialectal word order rule.¹⁹ We also found five instances in the texts of other dialectal groups, e.g. Pannonian, which indicates non-established use as a feature of spoken discourse.

- (56) Litt.: Do po pot Toninac je sreču nu petjarcu (Logar 1993: 68).
 down PREP way Toninac AUX_{3SG} met_{3SGM} one female beggar
 ‘Down the way Toninac met a female beggar.’
- (57) Pann.: Po vojni človek je straxi živeja.
 after war man AUX_{3SG} in fear lived_{3SGM}
 ‘After the war a man lived in fear.’
 SLS: Po vojni je človek živel v strahu.

2.6 Particle position

With regard to particles we will limit our discussion to stressed particles only, where the difference in their position in Standard Slovene and in dialectal discourse is the greatest (cf. Zuljan Kumar 2002). The basic feature of stressed particles in the analyzed dialectal texts is that their position is not necessarily restricted to the place immediately in front of the word, word phrase, or part of the utterance they modify, as is the case for Standard Slovene discourse.

¹⁹ Since this pattern of construction is familiar from Italian and Friulian, this probably influences the frequency of this word order variant.

However, in this case it is a general feature of spoken discourse as such, which does not allow a long planning time, and not established word order variants in Slovene dialects.

- (58) Styr.: V jutro smo začeli ob treh mlotiti že (Zorko 1998: 232).
 in morning AUX_{1PL} started_{1PLM} at three to thresh already
 ‘In the morning we started to thresh already at three.’
 SLS: Zjutraj smo začeli mlatiti že ob treh.
- (59) Low.Carn.: K-je at celga sveta vedu, mände (Smole 2007: 382).
 that AUX_{3SG} of entire world knew_{3SGM} probably
 ‘That probably knew about the entire world.’
 SLS: Ki je menda vedel o vsem svetu.

3. Conclusions

The question of word order in Slovene dialects is a very broad topic, deserving of thorough dialectological research. This article sheds light on just a small section of this question and indicates directions for further study. For a better insight into the word order characteristics of Slovene dialectal discourse, it would first of all be necessary to prepare a sufficiently representative corpus of texts of spontaneous dialectal discourse from all dialect groups. Secondly, the acquisition of more precise findings of a general comparative analysis of word order features of particular dialects would require the use of the methods of corpus linguistics, since otherwise the work is time-consuming and does not bring the same kind of results as does working with a corpus. Nevertheless, we can conclude the following: the analysis of dialectal texts presented here has shown that three groups of word order features can be distinguished in a study of word order in Slovene dialectal discourse. The first group of features, such as, for example, the initial position of clitics in an utterance, is characteristic of texts from all dialect groups, and is therefore a general word order feature of Slovene dialectal discourse. The second group includes word order characteristics that are found only in the texts of certain dialect groups, for example the separated position of the particle *ne* and the verb in Littoral dialects and the position of the past participle of the verb *biti* ‘to be’ at the end of the utterance in Pannonian dialects; these characteristics can be considered as specific features of particular Slovene dialectal discourses. The third group of characteristics are those that can be found in all texts but nevertheless differ in the frequency of their use, for example, the position of the adjective premodifier in agreement with the noun and noun/prepositional phrase post-modifiers in a noun phrase as well as the position of

the verb (past participle or infinitive) at the end of the utterance. The frequency of use in these cases is the criterion that shows whether the word order characteristic is well established and can thus be understood as an established word order variant in the dialect or rather a dialectal word order rule, or is sporadic and as such the result of a basic pattern in spoken language. i.e. short planning time, which does not allow for the deliberate structuring of utterances.

Abbreviations

ACC = accusative, ADJ.MOD = adjective modifier, ADV = adverb, ADVERB = adverbial, C = conjunction, Carin. = Carinthian, COND = conditional, cop = copula, ex. = example, F = feminine, FUT.AUX = future auxiliary, GEN = genitive, INF = infinitive, INTERR.PART = interrogative particle, It. = Italian, Litt. = Littoral, LOC = locative, Low.Carn. = Lower Carniolan, M = masculine, MOD = modal, N = neuter, NEG.AUX = negative auxiliary, OBJ = object, Pann. = Pannonian, PART = particle, PL = plural, PRONOM = pronominal, PREP = preposition, PREP.PHRASE = prepositional phrase, REFL = reflexive pronoun, Rovt. = Rovte, sg = singular, SLS = Standard Literary Slovene, Styr. = Styrian, SUB = subject, Upp.Carn. = Upper Carniolan

References

- Beaugrande, Robert de; Dressler, Wolfgang Ulrich; Derganc, Aleksandra; Miklič, Tjaša. 1992. *Uvod v besediloslovje*. Ljubljana: Park.
- Breznik, Anton. 1982. *Jezikoslovne razprave*. Ljubljana: Slovenska matica.
- Dardano, Maurizio; Trifone, Pietro. 2001⁵. *La nuova grammatica della lingua italiana*. Bologna: Zanichelli.
- De Bray, Reginald George Arthur. 1969³. *Guide to Slavonic Languages*. London: J. M. Dent&Sons LTD, New York: E. P. Dutton&Co.INT.
- Faggini, Giorgio. 1997. *Grammatica friulana*. Udine: Ribis.
- Franks, Steven; King, Tracy Holloway. 2000. *A handbook of Slavic clitics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jakop, Tjaša. 2001. Fonološki opis govora Ložnice pri Žalcu (SLA 324). *Jezikoslovni zapiski* 7, n. 1–2: 365–380.
- Jakop, Tjaša. 2003. Fonološki opis šentviškega govora. *Jezikoslovni zapiski* 9, n. 1: 113–127.
- Jakop, Tjaša 2013: Govor vasi Jelšane (T0156) na skrajnem jugu notranjskega narečja. *Jezikoslovni zapiski* 19, n. 2, 139–147.

- Kenda-Jež, Karmen. 1999. Med narečjem in knjižnim jezikom. In: Zorko, Zinka (ed.), Koletnik, Mihaela (ed.). *Logarjev zbornik: referati s 1. mednarodnega dialektološkega simpozija v Mariboru*. Zora 8, 304–315. Maribor: Slavistično društvo.
- Koletnik, Mihaela. 2001. *Slovenskogoriško narečje*. Zora 12. Maribor: Slavistično društvo Maribor.
- Krajnc Ivič, Mira. 2007. Besedilne značilnosti javne govorjene besede: na gradivu sej mariborskega Mestnega sveta. Maribor: Slavistično društvo, 2005.
- Kranjc, Simona. 2004. Besedni red, usvajanje prvega in učenje drugega/tujega jezika. *Jezik in slovnstvo*. 49, n. 3–4: 145–157.
- Logar, Tine. 1975. *Slovenska narečja*. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.
- Murko, Matija. 1891. Enklitike v slovenščini. Oblikoslovje in skladnja. In: Bartel, Anton (ed.). *Letopis Matice slovenske za leto 1891*, 1–65. Ljubljana: Matica slovenska.
- Murko, Matija. 1892. Enklitike v slovenščini. II del: skladnja. In: Bartel, Anton (ed.), *Letopis Matice slovenske za leto 1892*, 51–86. Ljubljana: Matica slovenska.
- Priestly, Tom. Word order patters with adverbial affixes and with short pronouns in a Slovenian dialect (manuscript).
- Reindl, F. Donald. 2015. Slovenian brace constructions and German separable-prefix verbs. In: Wölke, Sonja (ed.); Bartels, Hauke (ed.), *Einflüsse des Deutschen auf die grammatische Struktur slawischer Sprachen. Internationale Konferenz des Sorbischen Instituts Einflüsse des Deutschen auf die grammatische Struktur slawischer Sprachen 2011*, 188–197. Cottbus, Chóšebuz: Sorbisches Institut.
- Siewierska, Anna. 1988. *Word Order Rules*. London: New York, Sydney: Croom Helm.
- Smole, Vera. 2007. Šmarski govor. In: Müller, Jakob (ed.), *Šmarska knjiga: jubilejna monografija ob 500-letnici šolstva v Šmarju*, 369–392. Šmarje-Sap: Kulturno-raziskovalno društvo Turenček.
- Steenwijk, Han. 1992. *The slovene dialect of Resia: San Giorgio*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Šekli, Matej. 2007. Fonološki opis vasi Jevšček pri Livku nadiškega narečja slovenščine. *Merkurjev zbornik (Jezikoslovni zapiski* 13, n. 1/2): 409–417.
- Šekli, Matej. 2018. *Lingvogeneza slovanskih jezikov*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC.
- Škofic, Jožica. 2007. Terminologija izginjajoče/izginule obrti – sekirarstvo v Kamni Gorici na Gorenjskem. In: Jesenšek, Marko (ed.), *Besedje slovenskega jezika*, (Zora, 50), 214–234. Maribor: Slavistično društvo.
- Toporišič, Jože. 1982. *Nova slovenska skladnja*. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.
- Toporišič, Jože. 2000⁴. *Slovenska slovnica*. Maribor: Obzorja.
- Weiss, Peter. 2004. Sodobne jezikovne inovacije v govorih spodnje Zadrečke doline. In: Kržišnik, Erika (ed.), *Obdobja* 22, 371–382.
- Zemljak, Melita. 2001: Fonološki opis posavskega govora v Stržišču (Zabukovje). *Jezikoslovni zapiski* 7, n. 1–2: 349–363.
- Zorko, Zinka. 1994. Besedni red v severovzhodnih slovenskih narečjih. In Hladnik, Miran (ed.), *Zbornik Slavističnega društva Slovenije* 4, 47–55. Ljubljana: Zavod Republike Slovenije za šolstvo in šport.
- Zorko, Zinka. 1995. *Narečna podoba Dravske doline*. Maribor: Kulturni forum.
- Zorko, Zinka. 1998. Haloško narečje in druge dialektološke študije. Maribor: Slavistično društvo Maribor.

- Zuljan Kumar, Danila 2002: Stava členkov v beneškoslovenskih govorih. In: Jesenšek, Marko (ed.); Rajh, Bernard (ed.); Zorko, Zinka (ed.), *Med dialektologijo in zgodovino slovenskega jezika* (Zbirka Zora n. 18), 98–107. Maribor: Slavistično društvo.
- Zuljan Kumar, Danila. 2003. Nekaj besednorednih posebnosti v nadiškem in briškem narečju. *Jezikoslovni zapiski*, 9, n. 2: 59–80.
- Zuljan Kumar, Danila. 2007. *Narečni diskurz: diskurzivna analiza briških pogovorov*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC.
- Zuljan Kumar, Danila. 2008. Besedni red v govorjenih slovenskih narečjih. In: Toporišič, Jože (ed.), *Škrabčeva misel VI: zbornik s simpozija 2007*. 121–135.
- Žele, Andreja. 2017: Narečje kot dobro izhodišče za spoznavanje in prepoznavanje nekaterih skladenjskih pojavov v lastnem jeziku. *Jezikoslovni zapiski*, 23, n. 2, 373–381.

Received April 2019, accepted June 2019.

Prispelo aprila 2019, sprejeto junija 2019.

Besedni red v slovenskem narečnem diskurzu

Besednemu redu se v slovenskem jezikoslovju v preteklosti ni posvečalo veliko pozornosti, čeprav je prva razprava na to temo izšla že v letih 1891–1892. Napisal jo je Matija Murko, ki je obravnaval besedni red pri naslonkah in naslonskem nizu. Večina razprav je v preteklosti analizirala besedni red v umetnostnih besedilih, šele v zadnjih petnajstih letih pa se na Slovenskem pojavljajo tudi razprave o besednem redu v spontanih govorjenih besedilih.

Pričujoči prispevek obravnava besedni red v govorjenem narečnem jeziku glede na pravila stalne stave v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku, pri čemer se osredotoča samo na izbrana pravila stalne stave. Analiza besedil iz vseh slovenskih narečnih skupin je pokazala, da besednoredne značilnosti slovenskih narečnih govorjenih besedil lahko razdelimo v tri skupine. Prva skupina značilnosti, kot npr. izhodiščni položaj naslonk v izreku, je značilna za besedila iz vseh narečnih skupin, zato lahko rečemo, da gre za splošno značilnost slovenskega narečnega diskurza. Druga skupina zajema značilnosti, ki jih najdemo samo v besedilih določene narečne skupine, npr. ločena stava členka *ne* in glagola v primorskih narečjih ter stava preteklega deležnika glagola *biti* na koncu izreka v panonski narečni skupini. Tovrstne značilnosti lahko razumemo kot posebne značilnosti posameznih slovenskih narečnih diskurzov. Tretja skupina značilnosti pa so tiste značilnosti, ki jih sicer najdemo v besedilih vseh narečnih skupin, vendar pa se razlikujejo v pogostosti rabe, npr. stava levega ujemalnega pridevniškega

prilastka in desnega samostalniškega prilastka in predložne zveze v samostalniški besedni zvezi ter stava osebne in neosebne glagolske oblike na koncu izreka. Pogostost rabe je v takih primerih tisto merilo, ki pokaže, ali je besednoredna značilnost ustaljena in jo zato lahko razumemo kot ustaljeno besednoredno različico v narečju oziroma narečno besednoredno pravilo ali pa je sporadična in kot taka rezultat osnovne zakonitosti govornega jezika, tj. kratkega načrtovalnega časa, ki ne dopušča premišljenega strukturiranja izrekov.

Word order in Slovene dialectal discourse²⁰

There has been little discussion of word order in Slovene to date, even though the first extensive study of clitics and their position in a sentence in Slovene by Matija Murko was published already in 1891–1892. The majority of articles in Slovenian linguistics on word order in the past were based on an analysis of word order in literary texts. Only in the past fifteen years have there been discussions of word order in spoken discourse. This paper discusses on the differences in fixed word order between Slovene dialectal discourse and Standard Slovene written discourse and word order characteristics of the Slovenian dialectal discourse focusing on only selected sentence elements that are subject to fixed word order rules.

The analysis of texts from all Slovene dialect groups has shown that three groups of word order features can be distinguished in a study of word order in Slovene dialectal discourse. The first group of features, such as, for example, the initial position of clitics in an utterance, is characteristic of texts from all dialect groups, and is therefore a general word order feature of Slovene dialectal discourse. The second group includes word order characteristics that are found only in the texts of certain dialect groups, for example the separated position of the particle *ne* and the verb in Littoral dialects and the position of the past participle of the verb *biti* 'to be' at the end of the utterance in Pannonian dialects; these characteristics can be considered as specific features of particular Slovene dialectal discourses. The third group of characteristics is made up of those that can be found in all texts but nevertheless differ in the frequency of their use, for example, the position of the adjective premodifier in agreement with the noun and noun/prepositional phrase modifiers in a noun phrase as well as the position of the verb

²⁰ This article has been supported by ARRS (program P6-0038).

(past participle or infinitive) at the end of the utterance. The frequency of use in these cases is the criterion that shows whether the word order characteristic is well established and can thus be understood as an established word order variant in the dialect or rather a dialectal word order rule, or is sporadic and as such the result of a basic pattern in spoken language, i.e. short planning time, which does not allow for the deliberate structuring of utterances.