

On the History of the Dual in Slovene and Russian

Although the Slovenes are proud of the dual, a grammatical category that some consider a superfluous archaism and others an enrichment of the expressive possibilities, it is odd that no Slovene linguist has dedicated an extensive, synthetic work to the problem. The definitive work on the dual in Slovene was written by a Frenchman, Lucien Tesnière, who undertook the task with the encouragement of his teacher, A. Meillet. In his research Tesnière used the method of linguistic geography, the result of which is his well known work, *Les formes du duel en slovène*. This work is accompanied by a linguistic atlas that presents the spread of individual dual forms within the Slovene territory. Aleksandar Belić in his monograph *O dvojini u slovenskim jezicima* attempted to describe the historical development of the dual in Slovene within the larger framework of the Slavic languages. In the last twenty years several questions in connection with dual have been treated by F. Jakopin, R. Lencek and V. Nartnik. In the present study I would like to add a few additional considerations to the dual in Slovene, particularly with respect to the history of this category in Russian.

Let us first examine some general thoughts on the dual. The grammatical category of number is in a relatively simple manner connected with extra-linguistic reality. In count-nouns it indicates the number of counted units. In terms of oppositions, languages that have the category of dual number distinguish first between singular and non-singular and then, within the non-singular, between plural and non-plural (i.e., dual). The dual is doubly marked and exceptionally concrete (Jakopin 1966: 99). The dual can never be used in place of the singular or plural, while the plural, as the historical development shows, may be used in place of the dual. Various opinions exist on the question of the Indo-European source of the dual. Some linguists link the rise of the grammatical category of the dual with particular sets of collective nouns, which they have termed "paired organs," e.g., Old Church Slavic *roce* 'hands', *noze* 'legs', *oci* 'eyes', *usi* 'ears'. These organs are so characteristic of man that their special feature – pairedness – was expressed also in the linguistic structure of their corresponding nouns. From this point the special forms of the dual would have spread to other nouns and other parts of speech in agreement with nouns, thus becoming incorporated into the grammatical category of number. This opinion about the source of the dual was held by Delbrück, Brugmann, Belić, and Dostál, as well as Iordanskij (1960: 4-5). Meillet, on the other hand, believed that the dual arose as a grammatical marker of any two entities. Both he and Cuny, who studied the dual in Greek, held that the loss of the dual was a typical process reflecting the progress of human thought, the passage from less abstract to more abstract thought (Iordan-

skij 1960: 5). We find such an explanation of the loss of the dual in several Russian historical grammars (Kuznecov, Borkovskij 1963: 204; Gorškova, Xaburgaev 1981: 158; Ivanov 1983: 287-288). Dostál rejected this thesis as being too simplistic. He asserted that precisely Old Church Slavic, Sorbian and Slovene, Slavic languages that have not lost the dual, cannot be considered less developed than others. Moreover, he connected the preservation and even the partial revival of the dual in Old Church Slavic as a tendency towards intellectualization (Dostál 1954: 25-26). A similar opinion is held also by Iordanskij (1960: 7).

Regardless of whether the source of the dual is to be found in special forms for paired objects of the type *ročě, nožě*, or in combinations with numerals of the type *dva brata* 'two brothers (NAdu)', we are dealing with a category belonging to the noun. From the noun, agreement is copied onto the other parts of speech: adjectives, participles, adjectival pronouns and verbs. Personal pronouns in this connection play a special role. Although they have the function of a noun in the sentence, only the third person of personal pronouns refers to nouns, while the first and second persons express other meanings specific to the human speech act: first person means the speaker, second person means the addressee. The third person makes up the third member of this set and means either a person who is not a participant in the conversation or can refer to any other noun, in this way creating a bridge between nouns and personal pronouns (Benvenist 1975: 169ff). Since the personal pronoun is so closely tied to the speech act and the speech act is characterized by duality, i.e., the relationship between the speaker and the addressee, in other words, since the personal pronoun is a category that is expressly personal, human, and the distinction between two and three people is far more essential than the distinction between two and three things, then we might assert that the dual in personal pronouns (and in verbs that copy number from personal pronouns) is not as superfluous as in nouns, where the numeral indicates what number of objects is in question. Therefore pronominal and verbal dual number is more important for the specific human situation than the nominal dual.

These two types of dual – the nominal and pronominal – have been treated by Humboldt in his work *Über den Dualis*. Here Humboldt evaluates the pronominal dual as an enrichment of language which can express relationships that are important for man. In connection with this he asserts that "only in the union of another and I, expressed by language, can arise all the deep and noble thoughts that inspire man, such as friendship, love and any spiritual bond that elevates and deepens the relationship between two individuals" (Humboldt 1985: 400). We cannot forget here the citation of Mencinger that Tesnière used as the motto for his work: "Uganila sta celo, da je slovenski jezik kakor nalašč prijateljski jezik, ker ima posebne oblike za pogovore v dvojini" (They two have even guessed that Slovene is precisely a language of friendship, since it has special forms for

conversation in the dual), which despite Tesnière's skeptical attitude to Humboldt's idea (Tesnière 1925a: 316) is nevertheless in harmony with it. It is interesting that Humboldt in his study on the dual either did not know about or at least did not mention its existence in Slovene.

An interesting contribution to our topic is Lencek's study, which deals with the poetic possibilities of the dual in Slovene and emphasizes exactly the importance of the pronominal-verbal dual for the expression of poetically relevant meanings. It is clear that, for example, in expressing love relationships the dual is a far stronger and expressive means than the more neutral plural. An interesting composition is that of Dane Zajc, which Lencek appends to his article. This points up, among other things, the interesting consequences of the known property of grammatical categories, which, if they do exist in a given language, must be used. In Slovene this leads to an occasional breach or avoidance of the norm when the narrator wishes to use the plural in place of the dual to remove the intimacy of a given act (Lencek 1982: 212). This phenomenon is well known to young people, who prefer to use expressions such as *smo šli v kino* 'we [pl] went to the movies' instead of the incriminating *sva šla v kino* 'we [du] went to the movies' when they wish to avoid the unpleasant interrogation of their parents.

Besides the division between pronominal and nominal there exist also other ways of classifying the dual. Belić, who devoted a special monograph to the dual in Slavic languages, divides the types of dual in the following way:

1. Free dual, i.e., the dual with paired organs or items of two symmetric parts, e.g., *ročé, oči, uši*.
2. Bound dual, i.e., the dual with the numeral two, e.g., *dva brata* 'two brothers', *dve sestre* 'two sisters'.
3. Anaphorical dual. This is used when the text refers to two entities that have been introduced in the text with a bound dual, e.g., *Dva brata sta šla v gozd. Ko sta prišla do razpotja, ju sreča volk*. 'Two brothers went into the woods. When they (du) came to a fork in the path, a wolf was awaiting them (du)'.
4. Syndetic dual, i.e., the dual referring to conjunctions of the type 'Peter and Paul', 'Adam and Eve', etc. Belić includes here also personal pronouns, since *midva* 'we two' means *jaz in ti* 'I and you' or *jaz in on* 'I and he', etc.

Belić explicitly rejects the division of the dual into nominal and pronominal-verbal types, which are, according to him, but two sides of the same phenomenon (Belić 1932: 66ff).

From these initial, general thoughts about the dual let us now turn to some facts in connection with the history of the dual in Russian and Slovene. Iordanskij has devoted a monograph to the history of the dual in Russian. He classified the types of dual similar to Belić and came to the following conclusions: in regard to the existence of the dual in Old Russian (or East Slavic) we may discern two

periods. In the first period in Old Russian the following types of dual were weakened:

1. Free dual, e.g., from the tale *Skazanie o Borise i Glebe* "Slava ti xriste iže napravi na pravyy putъ mirny nogy moja 'Glory to you, Christ, who has put my calm legs on the proper path'. But this does not mean that the forms of the free dual were quickly lost from the language. Some were still used for a long time and, as modern Russian tells us, they also survived, albeit with a plural meaning.

2. In combinations of two nouns linked with a conjunction: "Mitropolitъ blagoslovjaše knjazě Izjaslava i Vsevoloda". 'The Metropolitan blessed the princes Izjaslav and Vsevolod' (also from *Skazanie o Borise i Glebe*).

3. In the nominative of first and second personal pronouns: "Poistinė vy cesarja cesarjemъ i knjazja kņjazemъ" 'Truly you are kings (du.) of kings and princes (du.) of princes' (*Skazanie o Borise i Glebe*). Nevertheless, in the following period the nom.du. third person pronoun *ona* is preserved in primarily anaphoric usage.

This process began even before the first written documents. The dual in conjunction with *dъva, dъvѣ*, that is, with the bound dual, and with the anaphoric dual were still consistently used in the 11th and 12th cc. True, there are certain difficulties with the material for the study of the East Slavic dual in these first centuries. In the first period, when the dual was – according to Iordanskij – still alive, there are few lengthy East Slavic texts. The material that Iordanskij used (*Skazanie o Borise i Glebe*, chronicles, *Žitie Feodosija Pečerskogo*) is written in Church Slavonic of Russian redaction and is therefore only conditionally reliable for the study of linguistic processes in East Slavic (Isačenko 1983: 413). Despite this, we shall rely on Iordanskij's findings. It is interesting that Iordanskij did not use, probably because of its controversial origin, the material in *Slovo o polku Igoreve*, which has the dual well preserved and is otherwise in accordance with Iordanskij's findings. Namely, the dual is used with *dъva dъvѣ*, while there are deviations with the free and syndetic dual, as well as to some extent with the anaphoric, which was supposedly consistently used in the 12th c. This fact was used by Isačenko in one of his older works to prove the authenticity of the *Slovo* (Isačenko 1976: 34-49). In the 13th c., however, according to Iordanskij's findings, the bound and anaphoric duals also begin to disappear. Of course, this does not mean that dual forms disappeared from texts (in Church Slavonic texts, on the contrary, they were preserved for a very long time, while they relatively quickly disappeared from East Slavic texts), but their relatively correct usage more weakened. In place of the anaphoric dual the plural form begins to be used more frequently, e.g., from 1229: "Ta dva byla posłъmъ u Rізѣ iz Rіgy exali na Gočkyi berъgo..." 'These two were (du.) emissaries in Riga; from Riga they went (pl.) to G. b...' Examples for the loss of the dual in the bound construction: "A pisali sija knigi dva kalugera..." 'Two monks wrote (pl.) these books...' (postscript to

Taktikon Nikona, 1397). The process of the loss of the dual progressed without hindrance. For the 16th c. Unbegaun finds that the dual in Russian practically no longer existed (Unbegaun 1935: 18ff), but only a few formal remnants were left, though without the dual meaning. Such remnants are: *roga* 'horns', *rukava* 'sleeves', *oči* 'eyes', *uši* 'ears', *kolěni* 'knees', *očima* 'eyes (instr.)' and some others, e.g., oblique cases of cardinals *dva*, *dvě* 'two' with which the noun is always in the plural. It is known that the form of the nom.-acc. du.masc. with the numeral *dva* did not disappear, but was spread to *tri* 'three' and *četyre* 'four'. Today these represent special forms (usually referred to as *paucals*) used with numerals and are considered genitive singular, e.g., *dva, tri, četyre brata, goroda, sela* 'two, three four brothers, towns, villages'. This development was not linear and took place in various areas of East Slavic in different ways. It began, it seems, in the 13th c. in feminine nouns and ended in the 18th c. (Iordanskij 1960: 77ff).

In modern Russian there are, therefore, several forms that are formally tied to the old dual: plural forms of the type *roga* 'horns', *rukava* 'sleeves', *uši* 'ears', *kolěni* 'knees', which are originally old free duals: masc. and neut. noun forms that are combined with the numerals *dva, tri, četyre*, the forms of which are derived from old nom.-acc. du. masc. nouns. In the same way the dual declension influenced the declension of the numerals *tri, četyre*, and the dual endings have to this day left traces in some dialectal forms of the inst.pl. of the nominal declension (Iordanskij 1960: 124ff and 173ff). But in all these traces we are dealing with remnants of the nominal dual.

The history of the dual in Slovene has been dealt with mainly by Tesnière and Belić. Tesnière used the method of linguistic geography and excerpting of historical and dialectological material to study the spread of certain dual forms in the Slovene linguistic territory. He discovered how the dual is gradually disappearing in the Slovene dialects. Namely, this takes place in the following order:

1. In case forms the locative disappears first, followed by the genitive, dative, instrumental and finally the nominative and accusative.

2. The dual disappears first in the feminine, then in the neuter and finally in the masculine.

3. In parts of speech the dual is lost first in the adjective, then in the demonstrative pronoun, the noun and the numeral. Tesnière finds that the personal pronoun and verb have their own special development. It seems that at first the dual in these two parts of speech rapidly disappeared. However, at a certain point the language reacted in the opposite direction. The dual has been preserved in these two parts of speech to the extent that today the character of the Slovene dual is pronominal-verbal. Tesnière knew and cited Humboldt's idea about the special character of the pronominal dual, but asserted: "Il faut d'ailleurs se garder d'exagérer la valeur de la distinction entre le duel nominal et le duel verbal. Il

n'est pas sûr qu'il s'agisse là d'un développement fortuit auquel il n'y a pas lieu d'attacher d'autre importance" (Tesnière 1925a: 423).

Tesnière's maps treat individual forms and only exceptionally syntagms. He himself mentions that it would be necessary to do a syntactic study of the use of the dual. Let us examine which forms and syntagms cover the greatest territory. These are:

1. *dva brata* 'two brothers' (map 10).
2. *midva* 'we two', *onadva* 'they two', *medve* 'we two (fem.)', (*vedve* 'you two [fem.]', *onidve* 'they two (fem)' (maps 41-44).
3. *naju* 'us two (acc.)' (map 46), *najin* 'our two (masc.)', *vajina* 'your two (fem.)' (map 47), (*z*) *nama* 'with the two of us' (map 52).
4. *mlada* (in the context *moja dva brata sta mlada* 'my two brothers are young') (map 55).

5. *midva piševa* 'we two are writing', *vidva govorita* 'you two are talking', *onadva pišeta* 'the two of them are writing' (maps 65-68). These dual forms cover nearly all of the Slovene territory, while plural forms are found on the periphery.

Tesnière did not wish to interpret his material ("Ce sont des constatations, non des explications"; 1925a: 425). But in his monograph devoted to the dual in Slavic languages, Aleksandar Belić made use of Tesnière's rich material. Belić in his description of the history of the dual in individual Slavic languages introduces the previously mentioned free, bound, anaphoric and syndetic duals and also always makes note of the use of the dual in the sentence. In his description of the history of the dual in Slovene he emphasizes that the Slovene dual is not the direct descendant of the proto-Slavic dual. He bases this assertion on the following:

1. His principle evidence for this is the fact that Slovene no longer employs the free dual, but replaces it everywhere with the plural, e.g., *noge me bolijo* 'my feet hurt', *njegove oči so modre* 'his eyes are blue' (Lusatian Sorbian, another Slavic language that possesses the dual, retains the use of the free dual). The reason for the replacement of the free dual with the plural is, according to Belić, the following: the expression *roce Petra* 'the hands (du.) of Peter' means the same as *roky Petra* 'the hands (pl.) of Peter'. From this point it is only one more step to the confusion of these two forms and the victory of one over the other. In Slovene the plural replaced the free dual even before the Protestant writers, since in their texts the situation with few exceptions is already like that of modern Slovene, i.e., the plural replaces the dual everywhere.

2. According to Belić, further evidence that in Slovene the dual is not a true dual is found in the fact that the dual is lost in the oblique cases, particularly in the locative and genitive, where we have in modern Slovene plural endings, though in the Protestant writers we occasionally find an old dual form, while in the dative and instrumental the dual forms are still partly retained in the dialects (and in the standard language they are the norm).

3. In Belić's opinion the dual as a syntactic category (this expression means for Belić, it seems, the situation where the dual in nouns is expressed also in parts of speech in agreement) was lost before the Protestant period. The proof of this he finds in examples from Trubar, where we find some examples of dual subjects with plural predicates.

The construction that in Belić's opinion kept the Slovene dual alive and served as the spark for the renewal of the category is the syndetic dual, i.e. the construction of the type *Peter in Pavel govorita* 'Peter and Paul are talking (du.)' This construction was to influence the reinforcement and retention of the verbal dual in all persons and thereby save the construction *dva brata govorita* from the influence of the plural. But as was already mentioned, for Belić such a dual is not a real dual. Belić feels that the dual cannot be divided between nominal and pronominal-verbal, but is rather in all languages a morphological-syntactic unit. Only when the dual loses its true syntactic meaning do we find an occasional relic of the dual of either a verbal or nominal nature (Belić 1932: 66-67). With this frame of reference it is, of course, understandable that Belić no longer sees a true dual in Slovene. At any rate, we no longer have a dual such as that which probably existed in proto-Slavic and as is attested in Old Church Slavic, in which there existed the free dual, while the nominal and pronominal-verbal dual were in equilibrium.

I myself have examined several works of the Slovene Protestants. It is true that the picture is somewhat obscured by the fact that the omission of the dual is sometimes influenced by the original source (Orožen 1986: 116). In general the dual here is so well preserved that we cannot speak of the demise of the category but only of its change. The vitality of the category is to some extent confirmed by explicit statements of the Protestant writers themselves, e.g., Trubar and Bohorič (Rupel 1934: 25; Bohorič 1584: DE VERBO 96), and the regular use of the category in Bohorič's grammar. Let us examine the state of the dual in Protestant texts in comparison with the findings of Iordanskij on the sequence of the loss of the various types of dual in Old Russian.

1. As Belić points out, we do not find the free dual in Protestant texts; practically everywhere it has been replaced by the plural not only semantically but also formally. (Exceptional are some forms of the instr. du. *ozhima* 'eyes', in which, however, the attribute is usually in the plural.) As we mentioned above, also in East Slavic texts the free dual was supplanted by the plural very early on, but at the same time certain dual forms lived on with a plural meaning. Iordanskij mentions that the coexistence of plural and dual forms with plural meaning had a destructive effect on the dual (Iordanskij 1960:18). Thus, the fact that in Slovene the free dual was so regularly replaced by the plural can be considered a reason that the breakdown of other types of dual was prevented.

2. We find still a further parallel between Slovene Protestant texts and East Slavic, namely the plural pronouns *mi* 'we' and *vi* 'you' instead of the old dual forms of the first and second persons. We find many examples of this in all of the texts and as the prescription also in Bohorič's grammar.

3. If we examine further examples in the Protestant texts, where we find the plural in place of the dual in the predicate, we cannot differentiate the bound, anaphoric and syndetic duals. In all of these types we occasionally find the plural. We do not observe a similar situation to the one that Iordanskij describes for Old Russian, namely that the dual is lost first in the syndetic type, and only later in anaphoric constructions and constructions with the bound dual. Perhaps in this sense Belić's supposition about the special role of the syndetic dual in the retention of the Slovene dual is valid. As opposed to East Slavic, the syndetic dual is no more replaced than the anaphoric our bound types. On the other hand it is necessary to say that it is also no less replaced than the other two types. It seems that these three types of the dual in the texts of the Slovene Protestants were not differentiated. Some examples of the plural predicate in place of the dual:

čez šularje inu čez vse, kir se tiga pisma modrusti vuče, so s. Katerina inu s. Gregor... 'for scholars and for all who study the wisdom of writing, they are (pl.) [the patrons] St. Catherine and St. Gregory' (Rupel 1934: 131) (syndetic construction);

...raunu kakor ne/fo dva Boguva, temuzh le en /am Bug. '...just as there are (pl.) not two Gods (du.), but only one God'. (Dalmatin 1584, *Gmain Predgvrvor*, I. OD BVGA:7 (no page nos.) (bound construction);

Sakaj Adamu inu Evi je tu v/je pred padzom bilu mogozhe. Potehmal pak ker /o ony skusi /voj padez...tako muzh sgubili... 'Thus, all this was possible for Adam and Eve before their fall. After that, because they had (pl.) by means of their fall...lost their power...' (Dalmatin 1584, *Gmain Predgvrvor*, I. OD POSTAVE, p. 12 (no page nos.) (anaphoric construction).

But it is necessary to emphasize that in the great majority of cases we find the dual retained; the above examples are exceptional.

4. It seems that we find in the texts of Slovene Protestants a somewhat greater use of the plural in place of the dual in the first and second persons as opposed to the third person, and somewhat more often in clauses where the subject is feminine. This second fact is characteristic of Slovene today as well; and we can find parallels in the history of the East Slavic dual, where the generalization of the endings of nouns after the numerals 2, 3 and 4 began sooner in the feminine than in the masculine (Iordanskij 1960: 77ff). The dual with the subject in the feminine apparently has its own history, partly connected with the nondistinctive

opposition between soft and hard dual and soft and hard plural endings; in Slovene the history is further complicated by the special dual verbal endings in *-e*, which agree with the nominal plural endings. (We find such endings codified in Bohorič, both Trubar and Dalmatin used them, and they are alive in some dialects, though not in the standard language.) The plural, which is more frequent in the first and second persons than in the third person is apparently connected with the appearance of the personal pronouns *mi* 'we' and *vi* 'you (pl.)' in the function of dual personal pronouns. Namely, with these personal pronouns the verb may appear in the dual and, clearly, in the plural. An example of the dual:

Mojšter, my hozheva, de nama šturish, kar te bova pro/sila. On je k nyma djal: Kaj hozheta, de bi ješt vama šturil? Ona šta...rekla: Daj nama, de šediva...Jesus pak je k nyma rekla: vy neve/ta, kaj pro/sita...' Master, we want you to do for us what we bid. He said to them (du.): What do you (du.) want me to do for you (du.)? They said (du.): Let us sit (du.)...but Jesus said to them (du.): You do not know (du.) what you are asking...' (Dalmatin 1584, The Gospel According to Mark 10).

An example of the plural:

...my ieimo ta sad...sapouedall ye nam Bug...de ne ieimo inu se tiga ne dotagnemo, de my lohki ne vmeryemo, rekla ye pag ta Kazha h ti sheni, sh nikako smertyo ne vmeryete...bote ieilli...bodete koker Boguvi, bote veidili dobru inu hudu...Jnu kadar sta seshlishala...sta se skrilla...sta prishla. 'we eat this fruit...God has forbidden us...to eat and to touch it, so that we would not die; the Snake said to the woman: you will not die at all...if you eat this you will be like Gods, you will know good and evil...And when they heard (du.)...They hid (du.)...they came (du.)'. (Neweklowsky 1984: 3)

The above example is particularly characteristic: in the story of Adam and Eve we have the plural in the first and second persons, while we have the dual in the third person. We find a similar situation in the Dalmatin Bible in the third chapter of Genesis. If at this stage of development nothing had happened, the plural would have slowly supplanted the dual as was the case in Russian and the majority of other Slavic languages. But it seems that precisely on this weak point the language reacted and retained the dual. Namely the pronouns *mi* and *vi* appear also in the forms *midva, vidva*, forms which somehow forced these two forms back into the dual. With these two pronouns the dual verbal form always appears, as we would expect. The fact that this new form in the time of the Protestants was felt as optional is shown by Bohorič's grammar, where we find in the paradigm for the pronouns: "*mi, nos duo, duae, duo, addita voce numerali dva, duej, dvuja*", but "*vi, vos duo, duae*". In the texts we find, as we have

already mentioned: *mi, vi* and *midva, vidva*. An example of these two new forms:

Ia, mydva dobru moreva...vydva bota rejs ta Kelih pyla... 'Yes we can (du.) well...you two will truly drink (du.) this goblet' (Dalmatin 1584, The Gospel According to Mark 10).

Today these two forms are predominant in the Slovene linguistic territory (with various transformations, cf. Tesnière 1925a: 246ff). Thus developed the skeleton of today's pronominal-verbal dual. Why this happened is difficult to explain. Belić, as we have mentioned, felt that the construction *P. in M. pišeta* 'P. and M. write (du.)' influenced this. It seems, however, that we can find no confirmation of this in Slovene Protestant texts. The dual in the third person is well preserved also both in anaphoric and bound uses; on the other hand we find deviations with the syndetic dual. We can find support only for the first and second persons having been weakened first, and that they were then returned to this system in the same place.

We cannot assert that this occurred because the language needed to express two acting persons – there is no proof of this. On the contrary, if we consider the fact that in this light the first and second persons have even a special meaning, the history of the Slovene dual shows us that the dual was weakened first of all exactly in these two persons. But also exactly in this place – in the system of pronouns and verbs – the reaction that Tesnière mentions was carried out. This reaction created the character of the Slovene dual as it is today, i.e., pronominal-verbal. In Russian, on the other hand, the process of the loss of the dual operated linearly in the pronouns and verbs, without any reversal. In contrast the nominal dual left certain deep traces; we can speak of systemic movement in the system of enumerated forms (*dva, tri, četyre brata*); to a lesser extent perhaps also in the role that the old dual forms had in the spread of the ending *-a* in the plural of masculine nouns.

Whatever the reasons for the retention of the pronominal-verbal dual in Slovene, it seems that precisely the anthropological dimension helps keep the category alive: namely, it is not all the same if we are dealing with an event involving two persons or several people.

Literature

- Belić Aleksandar 1932. *O dvojini u slovenskim jezicima*. Beograd.
- Benvenist Emil 1975. *Problemi opšte lingvistike*. Beograd.
- Bohorič Adam 1584. *Arcticae horulae succisivae*. Mladinska knjiga & Rudolf Trofenik. Ljubljana 1970. (= Monumenta litterarum Slovenicarum 7).
- Borkovskij B.I., Kuznecov P.S. 1963. *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka*. Moskva.
- Dalmatin Jurij 1584. *Biblia*. R. Trofenik & Mladinska knjiga. München 1968. (= Geschichte, Kultur und Geistesleben der Slowenen III.).
- Dostál Antonín 1954. *Vývoj duálu v slovanských jazycích, zvláště v polštině*. Praha.
- Gorškova K. V., Xaburgaev G.A. 1981. *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka*. Moskva.
- Humboldt 1985 = Vil'gel'm fon Gumbol'dt, *Jazyk i filosofija kul'tury*. Moskva.
- Iordanskij A.M. 1960. *Istorija dvojstvennogo čisla v russkom jazyke*. Vladimir.
- Isačenko Aleksandr 1976. Dvojstvennoe čislo v "Slove o polku Igoreve", Beograd 1941. In: *Opera selecta*. München (= Forum Slavicum 45).
- Issatschenko Alexander 1983. *Geschichte der russischen Sprache*. 2. Band. Heidelberg.
- Ivanov V.V. 1983. *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka*. Moskva.
- Jakopin Franc 1966. Slovenska dvojina in jezikovne plasti. *Jezik in slovstvo*, 4: 98-104.
- Lencek Rado L. 1982. On Poetic Functions of the Grammatical Category of Dual. *South Slavic and Balkan Linguistics*. Amsterdam, 193-214.
- Nartnik Vlado. K obravnavi dvojine v povojnih slovenskih slovnica. To be publ. in *Obdobja* 8. Ljubljana.
- Neweklowsky Gerhard 1984. *Trubarjev katekizem 1550*. Ljubljana.
- Orožen Martina 1986. Vprašanja sintaktične interference v Dalmatinovem prevodu Biblije 1584. In: *Slovenci v evropski reformaciji šestnajstega stoletja*. 105-123. Ljubljana.
- Rupel Mirko 1934. *Slovenski protestantski pisci*. Ljubljana.
- Tesnière Lucien 1925a. *Les formes du duel en slovène*. Paris.
- Tesnière Lucien 1925b. *Atlas linguistique pour servir à l'étude du duel en slovène*. Paris.