

France Papež. *Dva svetova*. Buenos Aires: Slovenska kulturna akcija, 1985. Layout, illustrations and introductory essay by France Papež. 98 pp. [= Slovenska kulturna akcija, vol. 122].

The "two worlds" of France Papež's title are the old and the new, the former homeland and the new homeland(s), Slovenia and the Americas, and all those things that define them: language, poetry, history, houses, lands, family. Each of his sixty-seven very brief lyrics, and all four of his illustrations, deal in a very direct way with some aspect of his homesickness. For those who may share this feeling, *Dva svetova* will be an appealing book.

The poetry, as poetry, is of the most basic kind: unrhymed, unmetered, it consists of lines of varying length held together by syntax and by very simple images or equally uncomplicated thoughts. The vocabulary is limited, there are no tricks of style or technique (at least, as far as I could perceive them). In many ways Papež's verse is the very antithesis of poetic practice in Slovenia these days, and is quite divorced from any modern school in general. If it lacks mystery or profundity, however, his verse has at least the virtue of clarity. It should appeal to those readers who dislike the ironic tones of today's poetry but enjoy in their literary fare apparent sincerity and limpid expressiveness.

*Henry R. Cooper, Jr., Indiana University*

Stanislaus Hafner and Erich Prunč, comp., *Thesaurus der slowenischen Volkssprache in Kärnten*, Band 1: A- bis B-. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1982. 221 pp.

Stanislaus Hafner and Erich Prunč, comp., *Schlüssel zum "Thesaurus der slowenischen Volkssprache in Kärnten"*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1982. 111 pp. + map.

The *Arbeitsgruppe für Slowenistik* at the University of Graz has for many years now been toiling away at a number of projects involving the Slovene dialects spoken in Carinthia. In 1980, they published a preliminary study, *Lexikalische Inventarisierung der slowenischen Volkssprache in Kärnten*, which laid out all their plans in this research area (cf. my review in *Folia Slavica* 6/1-2 (1983) 83-92); much of that publication is repeated in the *Schlüssel* reviewed here, with corrections and the necessary up-dating (e.g., another 10 publications were added to the corpus).

If and when it is complete (see below), the *Thesaurus* will bring together in one multi-volume series all the published information available about the Carinthian dialects of Slovene, from the earliest sources (Primic, Jarnik) through 1981. This is not only a valuable undertaking, but also an ambitious one (the list of sources comprises 96 items), and called for a great deal of linguistic expertise. Fortunately, this was not lacking: I find both the *Schlüssel* and the first volume of the *Thesaurus* difficult to fault.

The *Schlüssel* is absolutely indispensable for anyone who wishes to use the *Thesaurus*. So many critical decisions had to be made with respect to methods of standardizing the information from the various sources and of transliterating these sources' heterogeneous orthographies, that a close reading of these sections is



invaluable (and, incidentally, demonstrates the linguistic virtuosity of the research team). Further, so much information had to be summarized under each dictionary entry that a system of abbreviations and esoteric symbols was found necessary; without the *Schlüssel*, the reader will be at a loss.

I now exemplify the layout, the comprehensiveness, and the usefulness, of the *Thesaurus*. Entries run from the minimal (one line, e.g. the place-name *Blata*) to the exhaustive and exhausting (e.g., *biti*, five pages in length). Each entry consists of the following, wherever relevant:

The headword, standardized according to a rigorous system, with indications of homonymy and polysemy, grammatical particulars, phonetic data where required, and also a 'Qualifikator' attached. This latter, a superscript numeral, gives an indication of the word's stylistic use (e.g., whether it is a normal part of Carinthian Slovene, a potentially adaptable German loanword, a 'nonce-word', and so on, cf. below);

semantic glosses, often very extensive (thus, *birenj* is provided with six interpretations); here, the various sources' varying approaches often required careful editing;

references to cognates within Carinthian Slovene (e.g.: *birma* - *firma*, *firinga*);

references to related forms of verbs in other aspects (e.g., *birmati* - *birmovati*);

information on derivation of other parts of speech (with semantic restrictions, if any);

lists of synonyms;

citations from the literature; here, again, exhaustiveness prevails: *all* the forms in the literature are cited, and the reader can see at a glance, for each form, (a) its grammatical categories, (b) which dialect-point it belongs to, and (c) which author it is cited from;

selected textual quotations, demonstrating whatever has to be demonstrated with respect to the semantics of the word;

phrases in which the word occurs, e.g. *blizu koj* "almost" for *blizu*, *križ božij* for *božij*;

reference to the word's occurrence in seven lexicographic works (Bezljaj, Gutschmann, Jarnik, Megiser, Pleteršnik, the 1962 *Pravopis* and the Academy Dictionary);

cross-references to other pertinent entries.

The wealth of detail necessitated a complex system of abbreviations and symbols (hence the indispensability of the *Schlüssel*); in my opinion all of this information is not just valuable, but necessary. The order in which it is presented is logical, and the reader will quickly become familiar with the system employed.

In addition, the research team has allowed itself another luxury: editorial comments. Whenever the information in a given source is insufficient, ambiguous, or downright wrong, this is pointed out. For instance, in Isačenko's *Narečje vasi Sele na Rožu* of 1939—other than dissertations, this is the only book-length study to date of an individual Carinthian dialect—as much as half of the data is misleading, and in many particulars is quite incorrect (as I myself found out, to my cost, when I tried to use the book to help me learn this dialect). It would have been irritating and delusory to present data of this kind as if they were reliable; so, when they require editorial comments, they receive them. For example, *bratrna*, glossed by Isačenko in his book as



a Sele word for a Church holiday, receives the comment “Trotz intensiver Nachfrage [in dem Ort] war es nicht mehr möglich, das Wort zu belegen und seine Bedeutung zu bestimmen” (*Thesaurus* 15); like so many other words in Isačenko’s book, *bratrna* is likely to have been either incorrectly noted down from a Sele informant, or collected from a speaker of another dialect (at least one such, from nearly 20 kilometres West of Sele, is known to have acted as one of his informants). Under these circumstances, the comment is quite mild in that it allows for this word to have been actually in use in the Sele dialect in the 1930s; as is pointed out in the *Schlüssel*, 15-16, this is in fact improbable.—All the editorial comments of this kind, which are as a rule laudably cautious, are identified with a special symbol, so that the reader can distinguish primary from secondary information.

One further comment is required. Even the most casual non-specialist who browses through the *Thesaurus* will note the large proportion of Germanisms, and the objection may spring to mind: if these had been omitted, would not the whole task (which is now in jeopardy, see below) have been much simpler, and less expensive, and less time-consuming? The objection has some validity: if we look at words beginning with the syllable *aj-*, for example, it seems difficult to justify the inclusion of such words as *ajfarsuht*, *ajgenšoft*, *ajndruk*, and *ajnšnit*, which are formally and semantically identical to German *Eifersucht*, *Eigenschaft* (as pronounced in Carinthia), *Eindruck*, and *Einschnitt*. Why then include them? The answer is clear: it is impossible to make that precise distinction between ‘unadapted’ and ‘adapted’ Germanisms which would be necessary if ‘unadapted’ ones were to be omitted. Words of German origin used by Carinthian Slovenes range from those which are identical in sound and meaning to their German originals, such as those cited above, to those which show so much phonological modification that their Germanic origin is quite opaque; and semantic modifications make the situation even more complex (thus, the Sele word /žliprqa/ “pig-trough” is no longer either phonetically or semantically identifiable with MHG /slegebrücke/ “trap-door”). Consideration of a few of the *aj-* words shows just how difficult it would have been to draw the line. Should one exclude *ajnkomen*, identical to *Einkommen*, but include the grammatically adapted form *ajnkomna*? If one is to include (as surely one must, since it is obviously adapted to the Slavic verbal model) the verb *ajfrati*, why exclude *ajfar* = *Eifer* from which it is derived, and why then exclude *ajfarsuht*? If *ajston* is not omitted, since it shows a modification of the original *also dann*, why then should one omit *also*? And such problems are, of course, legion. In any case, on theoretical grounds, any rigorous method for sorting out ‘excludable Germanisms’ begs the question of the competence of bilingual speakers. It is no easy matter to specify when a Carinthian Slovene uses a Germanism as part of his ‘native competence’, as opposed to ‘switching out’ of his native dialect. On both practical and theoretical grounds, therefore, it is necessary to put up with more Germanisms than, perhaps, we would wish. This necessary plethora is easily identified by the reader, who has only to refer to the ‘Qualifikatore’ to see which items are, in the editors’ opinions, more or less ‘excludable.’

The *Thesaurus*, whose second volume is now in press, is the realization of just one of the Research Team’s aims; the others comprise dialectal mapping of phonological and of lexical isoglosses, the analysis of semantic fields, and the recording of oral literature. The latest information to hand is that funding for the whole project is in jeopardy; this means that the remaining (dozen-odd?) volumes of the *Thesaurus* may not come to fruition, let alone the other four aims, which are (in my view) even more important than the *Thesaurus* itself. It should be obvious from this review that I



consider such a prospect to be great waste, both of the enormous amount of work so far accomplished (all the Thesaurus data are card-indexed ready for compilation), and of the talents of the *Arbeitsgruppe für Slowenistik* in Graz. The Slovene dialects in Carinthia are threatened by the tide of Germanization (and in certain areas, e.g. in the Zilja valley, will soon become what they are often derogatorily characterized as: 'the language one speaks to one's cows'). Their description is therefore a matter of great urgency; it is reassuring to know that the project is in such capable hands, but disheartening to realize that the same hands are held out, begging for support.

*Tom Priestly, University of Alberta*