

Ethnogenesis of the Slovaks from the Linguistic Aspect

ANTON HABOVŠTIAK, Bratislava

1. One of the important tasks of Slovak linguistics is to contribute to an elucidation of several issues relating to the earliest period of our national past. It is generally accepted that language as a social phenomenon is closely connected with the life of a society and is thus also one of the witnesses of our remotest history, whose knowledge has also been partly promoted by the most recent results of linguistic geography obtained in researches in 1947–1952 and 1965–1971 and finally processed in the Atlas of the Slovak language I–IV (1968, 1978, 1984).

It clearly appears that a geographical spread of individual linguistic peculiarities is not a matter of chance, but a reflection of historical circumstances in which the life of our forefathers developed. In the light of the results of the linguistic Geography it is also possible to modify the existing views on the earliest dialectical specification of Slovak and to point to a linguistic differentiating characteristic of the earliest period connected with a dialectical differentiation of Proto-Slavonic PSI. Data on the dialectical specification of the Slovak language are of specific significance also because they have ultimately come to be a rare evidence of the developmental stages of this language from the earliest times. Some results of our researches (particularly those obtained in our research on the vocabulary) will be dealt with presently.

2. Like in other Slavonic languages, so also in Slovak, there is a considerable layer of words that are not broken down geographically (or only minimally) and which point to a unique base of Slovak and to a common evolution of all Slovak dialects. Such words are, e.g. *krava* (cow), *hus* (goose), *buk* (beech), *dub* (oak), *slama* (thatch), *olovo* (lead – Pb), *zima* (winter – cold) and many others.

In our research and processing of Slovak dialects we noted that from a historical point of view, a group of the so-called minimally differentiated words deserve special attention – words that from a dialectal aspect, divide the Slovak territory into two approximately equal regions, viz. southwest-Slovakian and northeastern-Slovakian region (a so-called binary division). The former com-

prises dialects of erstwhile Bratislavan and Nitran "stolitsa" (comitat ordistriel), the lower half of Trenčín "stolitsa", usually also Turiec, Hont, part of Novohrad and Zvolen stolitsas. The northeastern-Slovakian region includes the dialects of Orava, Liptov, part of Zvolen stolitsa, Novohrad and Gemer and the whole of Eastern Slovakia.

A more detailed study of the vocabulary from a geographical point of view has also revealed a division of Slovak dialects in an opposite transversal direction, viz. into a northwestern and a southeastern region. Iso-glosses running in the opposite direction transversally connect, on the one hand, Western Slovakia with northern Middle Slovakia (Orava, Liptov, Turiec, Tekov, Hont and Zvolen – however, at one time part of Zvolen belonged to the eastern group), and on the other hand, Eastern Slovakia with Gemer, part of the Zvolen stolitsa and Novohrad.

In addition, Slovak dialects may also be described from a lexical aspect on the basis of lexical specificities of three groups of Slovak dialects, traditionally delimited, namely on the basis of the group of West-Slovakian (WSI) Middle-Slovakian (MSI) and East-Slovakian (ESI) dialects; a noteworthy feature here is the remarkable mutual interconnection of these three dialectal groups. This interconnection is manifest in the existence of two basic lexical units occurring on two, territorially unequally large regions, as a consequence of which the following dialectal patterns are set up: a) West-Slovakian dialects against the Middle-Slovakian region; b) Middle-Slovakian and West-Slovakian dialects against the East-Slovakian ones; c) Middle-Slovakian and East-Slovakian dialects against the West-Slovakian dialects.

Specificities of the various three groups of Slovak dialects may be demonstrated in the vocabulary also by the existence of three different equivalent lexical units in the three dialectal regions.

3. The division into two regions – Southwest-Slovakian and northeastern-Slovakian is indicated by a bond of isolexes formed on the basis of a differentiation of several words. True, individual isolexes and isosemes do not overlap consistently, for some of them shift now to the northeastern, now to the southwestern region, nonetheless, they pass through the Middle-Slovakian dialectal territory to western Slovakia, combining in a relatively compact bond of isoglosses.

A division into two macro-complexes, i.e. southwestern-Slovakian and northeastern-Slovakian, is indicated by these groups of words:

a) names of cereals and several designations from the botanical area, e.g. *raž/žito* (in the meaning of *Secale*); *žito/pšenica* (in the meaning of *Triticum*); *jačmeň/jarec* (in the meaning of *Hordeum*); *klas/riasa* (ear of grain); *borovica/sosna* (*Pinus silvestris*);

b) names from the animal area: *sliepka/kura* (hen); *moriak/puľka* (turkey),

jazvec/borsuk (badger), jalovica/jalovka (heifer), jalovička/telička (diminutives of preceding), červ/červík (worm – at Gemer bobák), and likewise červivý, červavý (wormy-against chrobační (at Gemer bobáčni); paprč, paprčka/ratica (paw), plznuť/lieniť sa (to moult), driapať/párať (to strip goose feathers), brko/pero (goose feather, quill).

c) names from the domain of nature: kalní/mútni (turbid – of water), zapadať/zachodiť (to set – of sun), oblak (old Slovak also mračno – cloud), chmára, zlý čas (old Sl. also pľušť) pľuta (bad weather), kaluž and barina/mláka (pool, bog), studený/zimný (cold – of water), vlažný/letný (lukewarm, tepid);

d) names of things: ohreblo/potiesk or potisk – in Orava tiesk (an implement for raking mud, manure etc.), praslica/kúdeľ (distaff), duchna/perina (a feather-filled quilt);

e) names relating to man's social and biological life: prst/palec (finger; palec meaning thumb is common in the whole of Slovakia), plešina/lisina (bald patch), špina/brud (dandruff), žobrák/ďad (ďad in Eastern Slovakia – beggar), vrstovník/rovesník (a contemporary), hľadať/ískať (search for fleas in hair), krívať/chrámať (to limp), horní/višní (upper end of village);

f) some adverbs – akurát/práve (exactly), naspäť/nazad (back).

Given in the first place are terms used in the southwestern half of Slovakia (e.g. raž-rye, sliepka-hen, kalní-turbid), in the second place those characteristic of the northeastern territory of Slovakia (the corresponding terms žito, kura, mútni). From the documents it is evident that they include especially words of the so-called earlier layer.

4. Many of the above lexical phenomena reach beyond the Slovak borders into neighbouring and more remote Slav areas. For instance the isolex already referred to “bor“ from PSI. bor, bór, búra, bóra, byora, borovica, bórica, borovic (in the southwest half of Slovakia), against sosna (*Pinus silvestris*); it has its continuation in the northeastern half of Slovakia and in neighbouring Slav territories (cf. Czech borovice, Slovene, Serbian, Croatian, Macedonian, Bulgarian “bor“; Polish “sosna“, Byelorussian “sasna“, Ukrainian “sosna“, Russian “sasna“; Vasmer I., 1964, p. 193).

The isolex raž/rež, réž, rež (Atlas I, 1968, map No, 38) reaches by its terms from the PSI “r žo“ from southwestern Slovakia to Moravia, the Balkan (into Slovene, Serbian, Croatian, Macedonian and Bulgarian dialects; the sporadically occurring more recent Yugoslav names of cereals, such as čegala, zimnica, zimica, are not important) and into a considerable part of Russian dialects, while the term “žito“, characteristic of the northeastern group of Slovak dialects, is to be found also in Ukrainian, Polish, Byelorussian, Lusatian and Czech dialects (Obščeslavianskij lingv. atlas 1971, map. No. 18).

As evident from the above material, this dichotomic division of Slovak dialects into a southwestern and northeastern area is especially related to an older

layer of words in which terms of home (PSI) origin, extended also to the remaining Slav territories, prevail.

The dichotomic differentiation of Slovakia into a southwestern and a north-eastern territory may be illustrated by several examples from the domain of phonology, morphology and word formation; these have not been pointed out as yet in past linguistic literature, nevertheless, detailed researches of Slovak dialects for cartographic purposes have brought striking evidence of the existence of this dichotomy.

From the phonological aspect Slovak dialect is divided into two prominent halves e.g. by the isogloss which differentiates the pronunciation of the preposition "k" "ku" (to) in the connection e.g. *idem k otcovi* (I'm going to my father). Characteristic of the southwestern half is the pronunciation "g occovi" (*k otcovi*) (assimilation) in the northeastern half only the vocalized form "ku/gu ocovi" is used (Atlas I. 1968, map. No. 66). The pronunciation of the preposition "ku" is about equally spread in its connection "ku mne" (to-towards – me); characteristic of the west-Slovakian dialect is the pronunciation "ke mne" and in the southwestern part of the Middle-Slovakian dialects it is "ko mne", individually only also *ku/gu mne* (Atlas I, 1968, map No. 65). The pronunciation "ko mne" preserves the old "yeri o", while the vowel u (i.e. the pronunciation *ku* and *gu mne*) is of a different yeri origin (Pauliny, 1963, p. 83). The form *ku* is old, i.e. older than the sound *ko* and was already known in Old Russian, Old Byelorussian, Old Polish and Old Czech. At present it has survived solely in Polish and Lower Lusatian. However, it is widespread in dialects, namely in Moravia in Lach dialects, in Ukrainian and Byelorussian dialects, and sporadically also in some Serbo-Croatian dialects (Kopečný, 1975, p. 100). The sound *ku/gu* in the northeastern half of Slovak dialects is connected with the pronunciation of this preposition also in the remaining Slavonic languages.

Similarly spread are also terms relating to *baza* (elder – *Sambucus nigra*). Common in the southwestern half is the form *bez* (in Western Slovakia) and *baza*, *bieza*, *béza*, *biez*, *būza* (in the majority of Middle-Slovakian dialects). In the northeastern half only the form *chabzda* is in use. In the case of the term *baza*, O.N. Trubachov assumes, in contrast to current explications, the PSI forms *buz* – *buzina* and *b z*, also *baz* (cf. the Russian dialect *baz*, Ukrainian *baznik* and Lower Lusatian *baz*; Trubachov 1974; quoted according to Ondruš, 1976, p. 300). In Ondruš's view (1976, p. 300) we may assign among these forms also the Slovak "baza" although the traditional explication of the yeri vowel for the original "b z" is admissible.

The form *chabzda* (cf. also Old Czech *chbedie*, *dhvedie*, *chevdie*, Polish (*c/ hebd*, Slovenian *hebet*, *hebat*, Serbian-Croatian *habat*) is not quite clear from an etymological point of view. V. Machek (1975, p. 55) considers this word to be "pre-European" which means that the sound *baza* (< PSI. *baz7*, not *b7z7*) and

that of *chabza* are old forms, perhaps older than are the results of vocalization of the *yeri* vowels. The linguistic geography lends unequivocal support to it.

In this transversal direction, Slovak dialects are divided into two halves also by the vowel "e" in the word *šťastie* (PSI s7čest6je). In the southwestern half the common sound is that of the vowel "a", that is *šťastie*, *ščascie*, *šťascŷ*; in the northeastern half, it is the vowel "e": *šťastie*, *šťestŷia*, *šťesce* (Atlas I, 1968, Map No. 94).

As regards a dichotomic division of Slovak dialects into southwestern and northeastern, from the domain of morphology we may adduce as example the isomorph formed by plurals ending in *-ce*, *-ence* (of the type *teľce* – calves, *húsence* – goselings) common in the southwestern half, as against the forms in *-atá* (of the type *teľatá*, *husatá*) used in the northwestern half of Slovakia. The southwestern forms in *-ce*, *-ence* has a continuation in Czech and in south-Slavonic languages: in Serbo-Croatian (Majtán, 1962, p. 108) and marginally also in Macedonian and Bulgarian dialects (Buffa, 1973, p. 153). The northeastern Slovak complex of forms in *-atá*, reaches out into Polish, Ukrainian and Russian, According to V. Machek (1949, pp 87–98), the forms *-ce*, *-ence* are old, deriving from the Proto-Slavonic period.

In the domain of word formation, Slovak dialectal territories are transversally divided by pronouns with the particle *da-*, as against words with the particle *nie-* and *voľa-*. Words with the particle *da* (*daktorý* – someone, *dajaký dakto* – someone, *dakte* – somewhere) occur in all the east-Slovakian and in most of Middle-Slovakian dialects, viz. in Orava, Liptov, in the eastern part of Turiec, the Zvolen district, Gemer, Novohrad and Hont. In the rest of the territory, i.e. roughly in the southwestern part of Slovakia the forms with the particle *nie-* and *voľa-* are used (*niektorý*, *voľaktorý*, *niekto*, *voľakto* etc. – someone).

Forms with the particles *da-*, as against *nie-* and *voľa-* do not constitute a firm bond of isomorphs, but the diagonal divisional of Slovakia is evident. The forms with the particles *voľa* and *da-* (*voľakto*, *dakto*) are typically Slovak, those with the particles *nie-* (Czech *ně-*, Polish *nie-*) and *si-*, are known in Czech and Polish. Ukrainian has only the form with *-soi* (Buffa, 1966, p. 135).

Further examples from the domain of word formation pointing to the indicated dichotomic division of Slovakia are words derived by means of the word-forming affix *-ica* in the southwest (e.g. *ližica* – spoon – *lužica*, *užica*, *fežica*, *ložica*), or *-ka* in the northeast (e.g. *liška* – fox – *loška*, *laška*; Atlas I, 1968, Map No. 41). The forms in *-ica* have their pendants in Czech, Lusatian, and in languages on the Balkan (Czech *lžice*; dialectically also *žička*, *žlička*, *žica*, *lužica*, *ližica*; Upper-Lusatian, *lžica*, Lower Lus. *lžyca*, Slovenian *žlica*, Serb. and Croat. *lažica*, *ložica*, *žlica*, Maced. *lažica*, Bulg. *lažica*), the form in *-ka* in Russian, Byelorussian, Ukrainian and in Polish (Russ. *ložka*, dialectically also *lýžka*, Ukrain. *lyžka*, Byelor. *lýžka*; Kopečný, 1963, p. 227).

The dichotomous division of Slovak dialects into a southwestern and a north-eastern area, which came out specifically in our mapping of Slovak dialectal vocabularies, especially of words of the basic Slovak fund from ancient Slavonic store and which also have certain parallels from the domain of phonology, morphology and word formation, is characterized by such phenomena as had already been dialectally differentiated in ancient Slavonic. The linguistic territory of present-day Slovakia is cut by the boundary of certain old Proto-Slavonic dialectal differences. Its existence is conditioned by a two- or multi-stream arrival of ancient Slav tribes into the Carpatho-Danubian basin.

5. A division of Slovak dialects in the opposite transversal direction, i.e. in a division into a northwestern and southeastern region which we have also defined geographically, gives rise on the basis of mapping, to a relatively younger layer of vocabulary. From a lexicographic aspect, a division of Slovak dialects into a northeastern and a southwestern region is indicated by

a) isolexes of home words such as *hladní/lační* (hungry), *pršať/padať* (to rain), *hádzať/rúcať* (in east Slovakia *rucac* – to throw/*mnoho, moc/veľa, veľa, veľie* (much);

b) isolexes of more recent origin, principally loan words, e.g. *veža/turňa, tureň* (from Germ. *Turm* and this from Latin *turnus* – tower), *koberec/pokrovec* (carpet), *bocian/góľa* (cf. also Hung. *gólya* – stork), *pastier/gondáš* (Hung. *gondás* – shepherd), *fajka/pipa* (Hung. *pipa* – *pípa* pipe), *tabak/dohán* (Hung. *dohány* – tobacco) and others.

The first term is from the northeastern, the second one from the southwestern part of Slovakia.

From phonological phenomena, a northwestern-southeastern division of Slovak dialects is indicated by a dispalatization of *ě* > *a*, which has been partially realized in southeastern Slovak dialects (e.g. *bľadý* from PSI. *blěd*; Atlas I, 1969, Map No. 134). This phonological alteration took place in a varying extent and was not carried out consistently in any one dialect (Pauliny, 1963, p. 116). In some of the words we must also expect changes of a more recent origin.

As regards morphological phenomena, mention might be made of forms of the genitive plural of nouns *tehla* (brick) and *karta* (card): in the northeastern half, the genitive is extended with the insertion of vowels (WSl. *tehál, tehel* – of bricks; –MSl. *tehál, tehyol, tehiel; karát, karȳot, kariet*); in the southwestern region use is made of the forms *tehloch/-of, tartoch/-of*, in Hont Novohrad and parts of Gemer *kartou/-ov* (Atlas I, 1968, Maps Nos. 72, 73), hence, forms taken over from the genitive plural *mask* (of masks). But not even with nouns do we find everywhere the same condition. Forms of the genitive plural feminine are diversified, testifying to an uneven development and at a different time.

As this dichotomous division of dialects comprises also chronologically younger phenomena (signs of dispalatization of *ě*, *a*, analogous forms in the genitive

plural feminine a newer lexical layer taken over especially through Hungarian), we assume these two macrocomplexes to be of a younger origin. A starting point for this differentiation may also have been the outlined earlier dichotomic division of Slovak dialects. More recent changes took place as a consequence of historico-political and socio-economic changes after the fall of Great Moravia and of subsequent migratory movements of the population in Slovakia and the concomitant interlinguistic contacts.

6. The dichotomic lexical differentiation appears also in the occurrence of two different equivalent lexical units in two dialectal areas of unequal size, where one lexical unit occurs in only one part of the trichotomically divided Slovak dialects, while the other is common in the remaining two dialectal areas.

These cases are of interest especially because they provide proof of the common development of two dialectal areas in different periods, viz. in the earliest developmental period they testify to a common development of the West-Slovakian and East-Slovakian dialects, then at a later date to the integrating force of the Middle-Slovak dialects, which was manifest, on the one hand, in a common development of Middle- and West-Slovakian dialects as against the East-Slovakian dialects, on the other hand, to the common development of Middle- and East-Slovakian vs West-Slovakian dialects. This mutual connection in the development of Slovakian dialects (except that between West- and East-Slovakian dialects) has not been adequately set off thus far (particularly in the explanation of phonological and morphological specificities); stress was laid rather on the strikingly divergent signs of the three basic Slovakian dialectal groups.

7. A common development of West- and East-Slovakian dialects in the domain of vocabulary is documented by a group of words, especially of ancient Slav origin, lexically differentiated in relation to the Middle-Slovakian groups. It is made up of words (WSl. and ESl.) such as *kameň* (stone), PSl. *skala* (rock); WSl. and ESl. *tieň*, (shadow), PSl. *tuŋa*; WSl. and ESl. *tlstí* (tlustí, *tustí* – fat), PSl. *tučnǐ*; WSl. and ESl. *dedo* (dzedo – grandfather) PSl. *starǐ otec*. Here belong also words of a more recent origin taken over from foreign languages, e.g. WSl. and Esl. *kolíska*, (cradle), PSl. *belčov* (from Hun. *bölcsö*), WSl. and ESl. *plajbas* *klajbas* (From Ger. *Bleiweiss*), PSl. *céruza* (from Lat. *cerussa*-pencil), etc.

Parallels to a common development of West- and East-Slovakian dialects in the domain of phonology and morphology are well known from pertinent literature. They include especially diacritic signs in virtue of which Middle-Slovakian dialects were specified in V. Vážný's studies (V. Vážný, 1934, p. 261). Mention might be made of at least the group *rot-*, *lot-* from PSl. *ořt-*, *ořt-* in West- and East-Slovakian dialects (pronunciation *rokita*, *rožeň*, *lokeť*), as against the Middle-Slovakian state with *rat-*, *lat-* (pronunciation *rakita*, *ražeň*, *lakeť* – *sallow*, *spit* – for roasting meat, *elbow*). Further peculiarities are the WSl

and ES₁. -dl-, -tl-, as against PS₁. dl, tl (sadlo>salo, ometlo>omelo) pronunciation of the group šč in words ešče, ščasní in the West- and East-Slovakian dialects as against šč (ešte, ščasní) in Middle-Slovakia; the 3rd personal plural oni sú/sa (they are) in the West- and East-Slovakian dialects, against oni sa in Middle Slovakia; the genitive singular od gazdi/od gazdu; the instrum. singular fem. of the type s tú dobrú ženu/s tou dobrou ženou (with that good woman), etc. The fact is generally known that some of these signs are considered as so-called Yugoslavisms in Middle Slovakian.

Phonological and morphological signs common to the West- and East-Slovakian dialects had given rise to the view that most of Slovak dialects are Czech by origin. This theory was repeated even in the past decade (Horálek, 1967, p. 134). Critical well-grounded objections have been raised against it in Slovak linguistics (Ružička, 1968, pp. 131-134; Krajčovič, 1974, pp. 17-18).

To our view, the concordance of West- and East-Slovakian dialects illustrated until lately solely on examples from phonology and morphology, most recently supported cartographically also in the vocabulary, constitutes one of the characteristic, though not essential traits of the development of Slovak lexicon. A research into Slovak dialects by the method of linguistic geography has revealed that also earlier isoglosses occur in Slovakia than those which separate the Middle- from the West- and the East-Slovakian dialects. Such are, for instance isolexes separating the southwestern half of Slovakia from the northeastern one (see § 3). We shall justify our statement in the conclusion of this study on the basis of a confrontation of certain linguistic data with the results of studies of our historians.

8. A common development of Middle- and West-Slovakian dialect in the vocabulary is supported by a numerous group of words spread in these regions, lexically different from the East-Slovakian dialects. Such are words like PS₁. and Wst. svedomie, ES₁. sumeňe (conscience); PS₁. and Wsl. aspoň, ES₁. choľem (at least); PS₁. and WSl. pekní. ES₁. šumní (pretty); PS₁. and WSl. pitvor, ES₁. prikľet (vestibule), etc. Among words typical of Eastern Slovakia we find fairly often also words of a foreign origin, e.g. ES₁. lenča/ľanča (from Hung. lencse PS₁. and WSl. oje (thill); ES₁. valal (loanword from Hung; Sima, 1969, p. 36), PS₁. and WSl. dedina (dzedzina) (village).

A common development of Middle- and West-Slovakian dialects may further be supported with linguistic material from the domain of phonology and morphology. While only the sibilants s, z (and that also in cases of the type sestra – sister, zima – winter) and the pronunciation of the syllabic r e.g. vrch, (hill), vrba (willow) are characteristic of Middle- and West-Slovakia, East-Slovakian dialects have in addition also the sibilants ś ź (hence, śestra, źima (but the syllabic r is absent (ES₁. verch, virch, verba, vierba, virba; Atlas I, Maps Nos 270, 271; 204, 207).

In the domain of morphology, characteristic of East-Slovakian dialects is a case syncretism, e.g. the gen. and locat. pl. take the suffix -och in all genders (e.i. forms of the type bratoch, ženoch, mestoch; the dat. pl. in all genders ends in -om, i.e. bratom, ženom, dzefčedom). This case syncretism is not characteristic of the Middle- and the West-Slovakian dialects.

The complex of isoglosses spoken of above, met with on the borders between the Middle and Eastern Slovakia, is an outcome of a more recent linguistic development. For instance, the syllable-forming r began to disappear from East-Slovakian dialects only after the 13th century.

9. A common development of Middle- and East-Slovakian dialects in their vocabulary is pointed to by a somewhat less numerous group of words spread on this territory and lexically different in relation to the West-Slovakian dialectal region; at the same time, West-Slovakian dialects also comprise words of foreign origin, as against Middle- and East-Slovakian words of home origin. This involves such differences as – PSl and ESl. mačka, WSl. kočka (cat); PSl. and ESl. brechať, WSl. ščekat/c (at Záhorie blafkat – to bark); PSl. and ESl. oblok (in the East-Slov. dialects in the form of oblak), WSl. okno (window); PSl. and ESl. chorí, WSl. nemocní (sick); PSl. záušnice, ESl. zaušničky, WSl. oringle (from Germ. Ohr-Ringe – ear-rings); PSl. and ESl. fievik, WSl. tracher i trachtár (from Germ. Trichter – funnel); (See Atlas IV, Maps pp. 126, 127, 194, 269, 319).

A common development of Middle- and East-Slovakian dialects may further be supported with examples from the domain of phonology and morphology. In the development of yeri umlaut (especially $\text{y} > \text{o}$, $\text{e} > \text{i}$, or also other yeri, such as a, uo, i) we observe a closer relationship between Middle- and East- than between Middle- and West-Slovakian dialects. The former dialects have the vowel o (in words like von/out), voš or fša/flea), but also o, a, or i, e.g. PSl. cesnak, cesnok, česnok, ESl. cesnok and cesnik (garlic); PSl. dážd (džožď), ESl. diždž (rain) (Atlas I, 1968, Maps Nos. 24, 25, 32, 48). West-Slovakian dialects consistently use e, é in these cases (ven, cesnek, déžd).

The presence of yeri umlauts in Slovakia dialects is, however, a more recent phenomenon, resulting from the development after the fall of Great Moravia. These are changes that took place in the 10th and 11th century (Pauliny, 1963, p. 77).

In the development of umlauts with e , PSl. and ESl. dialects are likewise mutually closer in the ä umlauts – ä, e in Middle and e in East Slovakia; West-Slovakian dialects have a: Middle-Slovakian – mäso/meso, ESl. meso, WSl. maso (See Atlas I, 1968, Map. No. 84).

Most of Middle-Slovakian dialects differ through contrast in l-f and the entire complex of East-Slovakian dialects differs from the West-Slovakian dialectal region in that it has only l or ɹ (See Atlas I, 1968, Map. No. 225 and 226).

Despite several congruent phenomena in the Middle- and East-Slovakian dialects, their mutual relations may be said to be less close than those between Middle- and West-Slovakian dialects, i.e., a more striking bond of lexical isoglosses exists at the dividing line between Middle- and East-Slovakian, than between Middle- and West-Slovakian dialects. The less manifest bond between Middle and East Slovak is documented also by an inadequacy of a parallel development in morphology and word formation.

10. Besides the implied dichotomic division of Slovak dialects (known in existing and past Slovak linguistic literature solely as an opposition of the Middle-Slovakian to West- and East-Slovakian dialects) there also exists a trichotomic division of Slovak dialects into a West, a Middle- and an East-Slovakian group.

A whole series of examples could be adduced from the vocabulary in support of this trichotomy: PSl. *zákruta*, WSl. *zátačka*, ESl. *ker, kiera* (turn, bend in the road); PSl. *bochňík*, WSl. *peceň*, ESl. *chleb cali, okruhli* (loaf of bread); PSl. *klinček* (*Dianthus* – pink), WSl. *hrebíček*, ESl. *hvozdík* (in Spiš also *nagfik* from Germ. *Nagel*); PSl. *ústa*, WSl. *huba*, ESl. *gamba/gemba* (mouth); PSl. *črieda*, WSl. *stádo*, ESl. *guľa, faľka, šarak, kupa* (herd).

In the area of phonology this trichotomic division of Slovak dialects is also indicated by the development of the value – quantity of vowels: while in the Middle-Slovakian dialect a characteristic feature is the validity of the so-called rhythmic law excluding the immediate sequence of two long syllables in a word, the West-Slovakian dialects do not respect this law, in consequence of which long syllables occur in succession more frequently than in the Middle-Slovakian dialects. In the East-Slovakian dialects, long syllables have disappeared altogether.

In the past, Slovak dialects used to be divided into smaller dialectal regions in virtue of phonological and morphological peculiarities. When lexical material for the Atlas of the Slovak Language IV is processed, a more detailed differentiation of Slovak dialects can be documented also with examples from lexicology.

A lexico-semantic research of Slovak dialects with methods of linguistic geography has revealed that also another division is characteristic of the vocabulary, as has been found on the basis of phonology and morphology. We consider as important the finding that the earlier layer of words is often uniform for all the dialects and that these words have shown but a minimal geographico-dialectal alteration. A characteristic feature of such words is that isoglosses delimiting a given phenomenon in Slovakia, usually cross over to another Slavonic language. Data on the differentiation of these phenomena are of importance, for they graphically illustrate the relations of our language towards the other Slavonic languages (Stanislav, 1956, p. 142). Simultaneously they help

us to elucidate several aspects regarding the origin of Slovakian dialects and their development since the coming of the Slavs to our territory.

The results of our cartographic processing of the vocabulary suggested to us the idea that also a different division of Slovak dialects has to be assumed for an earlier period (i.e. before the 10th century) than the one into a West- a Middle- and an East-Slovakian dialectal area (the so-called trichotomic division). Researches have shown that the isolexes dividing Slovakia into two halves (i.e. a southwestern and a northeastern area – the so-called dichotomic division) may reflect an earlier developmental state than is a setting up of the three basic macro-complexes. This latter division is viewed as being younger than the above dichotomic one and is already related to the coming of the ancestors of Present-day Slovaks on the Slovak territory.

11. The outlined differentiation of Slovak dialects based on results of linguistic-geographical research for the Atlas of the Slovak Language, particularly for its lexical section, had been conditioned by several linguistic but also extralinguistic factors. In explanations of the dialectal division generally, special stress used to be laid primarily on the course of the earliest settlement of the territory of Slovakia (Stanislav, 1956, pp. 100–102, Pauliny, 1963, pp. 17–20). R. Krajčovič (1988, pp. 14–17) pointed to three factors that are of significance to explanations of the origin of the Slovaks. They are: 1. the geographical (the so-called geomorphological) factor; 2. the course of settlement of Slovakia in the earliest period; 3. the economic-political development of the ancient Slav society on our territory; 4. the manner of the earliest ethnic development in the Carpathian-Danube region. However, in dealing with the question of the origin of the Slovak language, the most weighty factor appears to be the course and progress of settlement of the Carpathian-Danube area by Slovak tribes.

When dealing with the character of this settlement, historians and linguists concur in their view that the Slavs proceeded to Slovakia along two main streams. One ran along the eastern side of the Carpathian arch through Moldavia towards the lower Danube, and reached even before the mid-6th century the area of the Murzija lake. Side streams forked out from it into Transylvania and – according to J. Dekan (1977, p. 33) – probably also to Eastern Slovakia. The southeastern drive of Slav expansion headed especially for the Balkan peninsula. A second wave of the Slavs into Central Europe, however, came from the northeast through the Transcarpathian region towards the Elba and the Saale rivers, its side streams occupying Bohemia, Moravia and Western Slovakia. E. Pauliny assumes that part of the Slavs penetrated into our territory through the Moravian Gate and together with the Moravian Slavs settled in Western Slovakia (Pauliny, 1963, p. 17).

Historical, but particularly archaeological data show that Slovak settlement was densest in the fertile plains of western and eastern Slovakia. In western

Slovakia it was the lowland area above the Danube in the environs of the confluents of the Váh, the Nitra, the Žitava and the Hron, in eastern Slovakia the entire East-Slovakian lowland, viz. above the upper arch of the Tisza river (Krajčovič, 1974, p. 29). The third settlement area was that to the south of the present-day Middle Slovakia and the area further south about the Blatenské jazero (Balaton lake) and the territory between the Danube and the territory between the Danube and the Tisza. Subsequently, from these lowland areas colonizing streams began to penetrate also upstream – against the course of rivers into the hilly country. Of importance is the finding that settlement of three extensive geographical areas was already completed before the Avar incursion. The chronology of the Slavs arrival before the first half of the 6th century corresponds to the historically supported advance of the Slavs in the lower Danube area, as well as with the departure of the Lombards from Moravia and Lower Austria to Pannonia in 526–527 (Dekan, 1976, p. 33).

Historic monuments contain but sporadic data on the life of the ancestors of present-day Slovaks in the Carpathian-Danube basin from the pre-Great Moravian period. Archaeological finds, however, provide sufficient evidence of advanced farming and cattle breeding on this territory. Ancient Slavs cultivated wheat, rye, barley, oats, as well as peas, millet, hemp, flax, vine and several species of fruit trees. Well advanced were also certain types of popular crafts (e.g. weaving, certwright's and smith's trade). In line with these archaeological finds, this socio-economic life is corroborated also by the earliest layer of a panslavonic vocabulary which, from among all the other Slav nations, Slovak has preserved in relatively the greatest extent. This specific feature of Slovak has been underlined also by F. Kopečný (1964, p. 6) in his study of the panslavonic vocabulary. In his view, the ancientness of the Slovak vocabulary may be related to its central character within the framework of Slavonic languages.

Such a finding just compels us to assume that the remote ancestors of present-day Slovaks had already lived compactly in their original country, and this not on the periphery of that territory, but perhaps in its interior. The uniform basic layer of their vocabulary provides ample proof of it. Slovak acquired its present position, which is marginal rather than "central" from a geographical aspect, only after the arrival of the ancestors of present-day Slovaks to the territory on which they ultimately permanently settled.

12. It is today known of ancient Slovak that it had not been uniform even in its country of origin and that its vocabulary had already been divided in individualities in that remotest period. Its bearers took with them such a differentiated linguistic formation also to their new homes, which became also reflected in Slovakian dialects. In our opinion, a dichotomic division of Slovakian dialects into southwest-Slovakian and northeast-Slovakian is related to the arrival of Slav inhabitants in two principal streams, viz. from the northeast and the south-

east, as also to their settling down in the west-Slovak and the east-Slovak lowlands as early as the 5th and 6th century. These regions are differentiated by several phonological and morphological phenomena, hence, not solely by the vocabulary – such words as *raž/žito*, *kura/sliepka*, *prst/palec*, etc.

Testimony to the ancientness of this dichotomic division of Slovak dialects is also provided by archaeological finds from the territory of Slovakia and the part of Moravia directly adjoining Slovak territories. The majority of archaeological finds of Slovak origin come from the territory of Great Moravia and this from the times before its having been constituted. Many of them are also related to the southwestern half of Slovakia (Dekan, 1976, see map p. 128–129), i.e. to an area differentiated also by a bond of isoglosses (or isolex and isosemes) related to the vocabulary of the oldest layer. Comparisons with other Slavonic languages and dialects have shown the differentiation of the lexicon and of certain phonological and morphological phenomena on the Slovak territory to be evidently connected with that in the other Slavonic dialects.

A dichotomic division of Slovak dialects into macro-complexes – a southwest and a northeast-Slovakian macrocomplex (§ 3 above) – reflects the early differences between two colonizing streams of ancient Slavs, the ancestors of present-day Slovaks.

The second striking differentiation of Slovakian dialects manifest in common traits of west- and east-Slovakian dialects on the one hand, and of Middle-Slovakian dialects on the other, (see § 9) may likewise be interpreted as a result of a successive Slovak settling down in the Carpathian-Danube region. According to F. Pauliny (1963, p. 18) the ancestors of present-day Middle Slovaks (so-called “Proto-Slovaks”) were the first to move from their original country. However, they did not reach the present Middle-Slovakian territory directly, but had first settled to the south of the present Slovak territory. They were therefore in contact with ancestors of the inhabitants of present-day Yugoslavia which goes to explain also the so-called Yugoslavisms in Middle Slovak. Related to the southern settlement of the ancestors of present-day Middle Slovaks is also the contact of ancestors of present-day Western and Eastern Slovaks, supported from the linguistic aspect, by common traits of the west- and east-Slovakian dialects (see § 6).

13. But also the further division of Slovakian dialects into two and three geographical complexes has to be connected with the earlier developmental stage of Slovak, and this both with the two primary streams of the Slovaks’ arrival to the Carpathian-Danube basin, as also with the subsequent movement of the ancestors of present-day Middle-Slovaks from the south northwards, and to further population shifts. The dialectal and historical evidence goes to show that the dialectal isoglosses prevailing on the border lines of present-day West-Middle- and East-Slovakian dialects had been formed gradually and this prin-

cipally in consequence of nonuniform shifts of Middle-Slovak populations from the Transdanubian lowland areas and the plain between the Danube and the Tisza, into the hilly regions of Middle Slovakia. This penetration of inhabitants of Slovak origin from the south to the northern territory of Middle Slovakia was graphically illustrated and cartographically mapped by F. Pauliny (1963, p. 18, Map No. 5).

This shift of inhabitants of Middle-Slovakian origin was caused most probably by the Avars with whom our ancestors lived in direct contact. Their mutual relationships, however, were not equal. The Slovaks lived in this area in dependence on the Avars and thus they gradually moved away from them into the less densely populated Middle-Slovakian regions, as a natural reaction. This migration of the population into the hillier regions of Middle Slovakia was ultimately completed by the Magyars (as a secondary agent) who in the 10th century overran some areas of the Danube basin.

The penetration of Middle-Slovak populations into the less densely settled regions of Middle, but particularly the northern Middle Slovakia is clearly illustrated by numerous isoglosses which meet at the convergence points of the present-day three dialectal complexes. In comparison with a dichotomic division into two approximately equal macro-complexes, these are isoglosses which document a spread of newer phenomena. This is borne out not solely by lexical evidence (spread of words of a more recent origin and words from other languages), but also by evidence from phonology and morphology.

The arrival of inhabitants from the southern areas to Middle Slovakia meant that not a static, but rather a very progressive and dynamic element came to be domiciled on this territory, one capable of creating an integrating bond with neighbouring West-Slovakian and East-Slovakian dialects. R. Krajčovič (1974, p. 370) intimated that West-Slovakian dialectal formations, by their development had begun to incline towards the centre of Slovakia even before the 10th century. The mutual bond between Middle- and East-Slovakian dialects is implicitly suggested also by groups of isoglosses, isomorphs and isolexes which set out peculiarities now characteristic of the Middle- and West-Slovak area in contrast to the East-Slovakia (see § 8), then again those typical of Middle- and East-Slovakian versus West-Slovakian area and thus help to support the integrating force and common development of Middle Slovak with the neighbouring regions. The outlined Linguistic specificities documenting a common development of Middle Slovak with neighbouring dialects are – as has already been observed – of a more recent origin, (e.g. outcomes of yeri vocalization, that of syllabic r, etc.).

The stratification of isolexes (isosemes and several isoglosses) at the boundaries of dialectal wholes did not come to an end through population shifts from the more densely settled regions into the sparsely inhabited hilly country. This

process went on for whole centuries after the fall of Great Moravia and practically persists in our days. Nevertheless, it is generally held that the formation of the basic traits of Slovakian dialects was completed in the 15th century (Pauliny 1963, p. 286; Krajčovič, 1974, p. 370). As regards particular details, the process of internal differentiation continued also after that period and has not ceased even in our times. The fundamental layer of the vocabulary, however, has resisted this differentiating pressure and that is precisely why contemporary dialects comprise far more words that are common to all our dialects, than such as separate them into smaller groups. The uniform vocabulary of Slovak, although characterized also by certain peculiarities differentiating it from the other Slavonic languages, speaks for its distinct, specific, selfdetermining development. At the same time, through several lexical elements, Slovak associates itself to Slavonic languages which constitute the West-Slovak linguistic complex, i.e. Czech Polish and Lusatian Serbian.

REFERENCES

1. BUFFA, F.: Atlas slovenského jazyka 3. Tvorenie slov. Časť prvá – mapy. Bratislava, 1978, p. 250. Časť druhá – úvod – komentáre, materiály. 1. vyd. Bratislava, SAV 1978, p. 248.
2. BUFFA, F.: Častice nie-, voľa-, da-, -si v slovenských nárečiach, Slovenská reč, 31, 1966, pp. 133–136.
3. BUFFA, F.: Formy plurálu typu húsence /húsata v slovensčine. Slovenská reč, 38, 1973, pp. 151–153.
4. DEKAN, J.: Veľká Morava. Doba a umenie. Bratislava, Tatran 1976, p. 283.
5. HABOVŠTIK, A.: Atlas slovenského jazyka 4. Lexika. Časť prvá – mapy, Bratislava, p. 464. Časť druhá – úvod – komentáre, materiály. 1. vyd. Bratislava, SAV 1984, p. 368.
6. HORÁLEK, K.: Filozofie jazyka. Praha 1967. Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Monografia 15.
7. KOPEČNÝ, F.: Etymologický slovník slovanských jazyků. Slova gramatická a zájmena. Svazek I., vyd. Academia, Praha 1973, p. 348.
8. KRAJČOVIČ, R.: Problém praslovanskej genézy slovenčiny. Slavia 42, 1974, pp. 268–377.
9. KRAJČOVIČ, R.: Slovenčina a slovanské jazyky I. Praslovanská genéza slovenčiny. Bratislava, Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo 1974, p. 328.
10. MACHEK, V.: Etymologický slovník jazyka českého a slovenského. 1. vyd. Praha, Nakladatelství ČSAV 1957, p. 512.
11. MACHEK, V.: Origine des thèmes nominaux en -et- du slave. I. Lingua Posnaniensis I. 1948. Ed. T. Milewski et al., pp. 87–98.
12. MAJTÁN, M.: Tvary na –ence v slovenských nárečiach. Jazykovedný časopis, 13, 1962, pp. 104–108.
13. Obščeslavianskij lingvističeskij atlas. Materialy i issledovanija. 1971, izd. Nauka, Red. R.I. Avanesov. S. B. Bernstein, S. K. Pozharitskaya, E. P. Filin. Moskva 1974, p. 108.
14. ONDRUŠ, Š.: Tti slovanské kompendiá. Slavia, roč. 45, 1976, pp. 296–303.
15. PAULINY, F.: Fonologický vývin slovenčiny. I. vyd. Bratislava, SAV 1963, p. 360.
16. SKOK, P.: Etimologijskij rječnik hrvatskoga ili srbskoga jezika. Knjiga treća, poni – Ž. Jug. akademija znanosti i umjetnosti. Zagreb 1973, p. 703.
17. RUŽIČKA, J.: Spisovný jazyk a jazyková kultúra v škole. Slovenská reč 33, 1968, pp. 129–137.

18. SIMA, F.: Východoslovenské valaly. In: Jazykovedné štúdie X. Štolcov zborník. Bratislava, vyd. SAV 1969, pp. 24–37.
19. STANISLAV, J.: Dejiny slovenského jazyka. I. Bratislava, SAV 1956, pp. 24–34.
20. ŠTOLC, J. – BUFFA, F. – HABOVŠTIK, A. a kol.: Atlas slovenského jazyka I. Vokalizmus a konsonantizmus. Časť prvá – mapy. Bratislava, 1968, p. 250. Časť druhá – úvod – komentáre – materiály. 1. vyd. Bratislava, SAV 1968, p. 100.
21. ŠTOLC, J.: Atlas slovenského jazyka. Flexia. Časť prvá – mapy. Bratislava, 1978, 250 p. Časť druhá – úvod – komentáre. 1. vyd. Bratislava, SAV 1978, p. 192.
22. VASMER, M.: Etimologičeskij slovar6 russkogo jazyka. Tom I (A–D). Moskva 1964; Tom II (E–Muž). Moskva 1967; Tom. III (Muza–Cjat). Izdatel'stvo "Progres". Moskva 1971, pp. 68–69.
23. VÁŽNÝ, V.: Nářečí slovenská. Československá vlastivěda 3. Jazyk. Praha 1954, pp. 219–310.
24. Základní všeslovenská slovní zásoba. Red. F. Kopečný. Ústav jazyku a literatur ČSAV. Etymologická pracoviště v Brne (1964). Litogr.

ETNOGENÉZA SLOVÁKOV Z JAZYKOVEDNÉHO HĽADISKA

R e s u m é

Jazyk ako spoločenský jav úzko súvisí so životom spoločnosti, a tak je zároveň aj jedným zo svedkom našej najdávnejšej histórie. Jej poznanie čiastočne umožňujú aj najnovšie výsledky lingvistickej geografie získané najmä v rokoch po druhej svetovej vojne. Geografické rozšírenie jednotlivých nárečových zvláštností nie je vecou náhody, ale odrazom historických okolností, za ktorých sa vyvíjal život našich predkov. Vo svetle výsledkov jazykového zemepisu možno modifikovať aj doterajšie názory o najstaršom nárečovom členení slovenčiny a poukázať na nárečovú diferenciáciu charakteristickú pre najstaršie obdobie, ktorá súvisí ešte s nárečovou diferenciáciou praslovančiny.

Údaje o nárečovej členitosti nášho jazyka sú osobitne dôležité aj preto, lebo sa nakoniec stali významným dokladom o vývinových fázach nášho jazyka v najstaršom období.

Ako v iných slovanských jazykoch aj v slovenčine sa vyskytuje značná vrstva slov, ktorá sa geograficky nečlení (alebo sa člení iba minimálne) a ktorá poukazuje na jednotnú bázu slovenčiny i na spoločný vývin všetkých slovenských nárečí (napr. slová jeleň, hus, buk, slama, zima a pod.). Pri výskume a spracúvaní slovenských nárečí sme zistili, že z historického aspektu si osobitnú pozornosť zasluhuje najmä skupina takzvaných minimálne diferencovaných slov, ktoré z nárečového hľadiska rozdeľuje Slovensko na dve približne rovnaké oblasti, a to na juhozápadoslovenskú a severovýchodoslovenskú oblasť (tzv. binárne členenie). Okrem toho možno charakterizovať slovenské nárečie z lexikálneho hľadiska aj na základe osobitostí jednotlivých tradične vymedzovaných troch skupín slovenských nárečia, a to na základe skupiny západoslovenských, stredoslovenských a východoslovenských nárečí, pričom je pozoruhodná vzájomná spätosť týchto troch nárečových skupín.

Dichotomické či binárne členenie slovenských nárečí na oblasť juhozápadoslovenskú a severovýchodoslovenskú, ktoré sa nám vyčlenilo pri kartografovaní slovenskej nárečovej slovnej zásoby, najmä pri slovách základného slovného fondu z praslovanskej slovnej zásoby a na ktoré sú aj isté paralely z oblasti hláskoslovia, tvaroslovia a tvorenia slov, je charakterizované napospol takým javmi, ktoré už boli v praslovančine diferencované. Cez jazykové územie dnešného Slovenska vedie hranica niektorých starých praslovanských nárečových rozdielov. Jej existencia je podmienená dvojprúdovým, resp. i viacprúdovým príchodom praslovanských kmeňov do karpatsko-dunajskej kotliny.

Výsledky kartografického spracovania slovnej zásoby nás privedli na myšlienku, že pre slovenské nárečia treba predpokladať v staršom období (t.j. skôr ako v 10. stor.) aj iné členenie, ako je rozdelenie Slovenska na západoslovenskú, stredoslovenskú a východoslovenskú nárečovú oblasť (tzv. trichotomické členenie). Výskumy ukázali, že izolexy rozdeľujúce Slovensko na dve polovice (t.j. na juhozápadoslovenskú a severovýchodoslovenskú oblasť; tzv. dichotomické členenie) môžu odzrkadľovať starší vývinový stav, ako je vyčlenenie troch základných makroareálov, t.j. rozdelenie na západoslovenskú, stredoslovenskú a východoslovenskú oblasť. Toto trichotomické členenie pokladáme zároveň na území Slovenska za mladšie, ako je spomenutá dichotomia na dve oblasti a súvisí už s príchodom predkov terajších Slovákov na územie Slovenska.

Pri charakteristike tohto osídľovania historici i jazykovedci zhodne konštatujú, že Slovania postupovali do terajších sídel v dvoch prúdoch. Jeden z nich smeroval po východnej strane Karpatského oblúka cez Moldáviu k dolnému Dunaju a ten ešte pred polovicu 6. storočia dosiahol Murzijského jazera.

Z tohto hlavného prúdu sa vyčlenili bočné prúdy do Sedmohradska a pravdepodobne aj na východné Slovensko. Juhovýchodný prúd slovanskej expanzie smeroval najmä na Balkánsky poloostrov. Druhý nápor Slovanov do strednej Európy však smeroval zo severovýchodu cez Zakarpatsko k Labe a Sále, pričom jeho bočné prúdy obsadili Čechy, Moravu a západné Slovensko.

V historických pamiatkach sú iba sporadické údaje o živote predkov terajších Slovákov v karpatско-podunajskej kotline z predveľkomoravského obdobia. Archeologické nálezy však dostatočne svedčia o tom, že na tomto území bolo už rozvinuté roľníctvo a chov domácich zvierat. Starí Slovania pestovali pšenicu, raž, jačmeň, ovos a z iných plodín aj hrach, proso, konope, ľan, hrozno i viaceré druhy ovocných stromov. Rozvinuté boli aj niektoré ľudové remeslá (napr. tkáčstvo, kolárstvo a kováčstvo). V súlade s archeologickými nálezmi dosvedča tento hospodársko-spoločenských život aj najstaršia vrstva všeslovanskej slovnej zásoby, ktorú si spomedzi ostatných slovanských jazykov práve slovenčina zachovala v relatívne najväčšom rozsahu.

Takéto zistenie nás priam núti predpokladať, že dávní predkovia dnešných Slovákov žili kompaktné už v pravlasti, a to nie na okraji tohto územia, ale azda v jeho vnútri. Jednotná, základná vrstva slovnej zásoby to výrazne potvrdzuje. Terajšie, z geografického aspektu skôr okrajové ako "centrálne" postavenie nadobudla slovenčina až po príchode predkov terajších Slovákov na územie, na ktorom sa napokon usídlili natrvalo.

Dichotomické členenie slovenských nárečí súvisí s príchodom slovanských obyvateľov v dvoch hlavných prúdoch, a to od severovýchodu a juhovýchodu, ako aj s ich usadením sa v západoslovenskej a východoslovenskej nížine už v 5. a 6. stor. Vyčleňujú ich napr. slová ako raž/žito, borovica/sosna, prst/palec a i., no aj viaceré hláskoslovné a morfológické zvláštnosti.