

SURRENDER TO SYMBOLIC DOMINATION, OR RESISTANCE: PATTERNS OF LANGUAGE-USE AMONG SLOVENE-SPEAKERS IN TWO CARINTHIAN COMMUNITIES

Tom M.S. Priestly

1. Introduction*

A great deal has been written about language-use in the Slovene-German bilingual part of Carinthia: my aim is to add something useful to this body of work, not so much by revealing any new facts (although there is surely much that remains to be revealed), but by establishing a framework for treating what is relevant. In this attempt I stand at an advantage, and for three reasons: one, because of the richness of the available literature on the subject;¹ two, because most of the literature has addressed the Carinthian minority-language problem from one or another particular standpoint—historical, political, sociological, economic, etc.—rather than with a multidisciplinary approach; and three, because some of the recent advances in what I shall call psycho-sociolinguistics have, overall, not been applied to the Carinthian situation, and it is precisely a combined attention to the societal and the personal which, in my view, will make for progress in our attempts to describe and explain this state of affairs.

I emphasize at once that the linguistic situation must be both described and explained. This means that it is not enough, in my opinion, for us to describe (however perfectly) what Carinthians say, and in which language or dialect, when, where, to whom, and under what other external circumstances they say it; but that we must also explain what linguistic choices there are, and—above all—why they are made.

Rather than try to embrace the whole of Carinthia in this ambitious attempt, I limit my paper to a comparison of the language-situation in two communities. These two locales, although geographically very close, exemplify two very different linguistic situations, and this comparison should serve to demonstrate the usefulness of the approach and the framework which I adopt.

2. The Two Communities

The two communities to be compared here are the town of Borovlje/Ferlach and the village of Sele/Zell Pfarre. Both are geographically located between the provincial capital, Celovec/Klagenfurt, and the Slovene border: Borovlje is a short distance to the east of the main highway between Celovec and Ljubljana, being about 15 km from the former and 65 km from the latter; Sele is 12 km to the south-east of Borovlje.

2.1. Borovlje is a compact town with an attractive central square, many modern buildings, a large school, and several small suburbs.² As TABLE I shows, its population has grown dramatically in the last century and a half, from about 1500 to close on 10,000 today. The whole area around Borovlje had during the middle ages supported iron industries, and by the late 1700s the town was monopolizing the production of firearms for the Austrian army. During the second half of the 1800s the local gunsmiths developed a specialization in hunting rifles; this industry became concentrated in the town and some nearby villages, while the surrounding village foundries were gradually abandoned. Borovlje is still famous as a centre for hunting rifles. In addition, it slowly developed into a regional administrative and market centre: in 1848 the first administrative offices were

opened here; in 1910 it was granted the status of 'Marktgemeinde' and in 1930 became officially a 'Stadtgemeinde.'³ In the last two decades it has further developed economically, being the nearest Austrian town to Ljubljana with multiple shopping outlets; during this time, many visitors from Slovenia have been coming to Borovlje on shopping trips.

2.2. Sele is an extended village, some 14 km from one end to the other, consisting of three valleys high in the Alps (some 500 m/1640 ft. higher than Borovlje); the houses and farms are mostly widely separated from each other, although there are four localities which may be labelled hamlets.⁴ As TABLE I shows, the number of its inhabitants exhibits little net change over the last 150 years. Until World War II, the population was for the most part divided between a few large farms and a sizeable number of smallholdings; the inhabitants of the latter worked as hired hands for the owners of the former, or as laborers in private forest estates; since the War, more and more villagers have found employment as commuters in Borovlje or even further afield.⁵

TABLE I: CENSUS DATA FOR BOROVLJE AND SELE

	BOROVLJE		SELE	
	total population	proportion "Slovene*"	total population	proportion "Slovene*"
1846	1549	100%	988	100%
1880	1894	61%	1027	100%
1890	2307	60%	1070	100%
1900	2543	43%	1007	99%
1910	3194	10%	1027	99%
1923	4714	30%	971	99%
1934	4786	22%	1025	93%
1971	7552	11%	835	92%
1976	8483		868	

* "Slovene": see paragraph 2.3.

Sources: Grafenauer 1946: 155, 166, 198; Unkart & alii 1984: 277; Wieser 1984: 141; Moritsch 1992a.

2.3. Census data on ethnicity: TABLE I also shows, in the two columns headed "Slovene," the data from the various censuses that bear on the ethnic composition of the two localities. (These data involve a range of measures and labels, and include variations on the "Windisch" label.⁶) It can not be stressed enough that some of these reported figures are very misleading. This unreliability can be easily demonstrated; for instance two proofs: (1) the percentages of Slovene-speaking schoolchildren in Borovlje at the beginning of their schooling (quoted from Moritsch 1992b) are in serious disagreement with the data from the censuses, viz., for 1900: 65%, 1910: 44%, 1923: 42%, 1934: 17%; and (2) in 1910, the year when—according to the *official* census—10% of the 3194 Boroveljčani [inhabitants of Borovlje] were "Slovene," a privately-conducted survey (which, apparently, included some relatively small neighbouring villages as well as Borovlje proper) concluded that 93% of the 3147 inhabitants were "Slovene."⁷ Even allowing for some

skewing because of the additional population, this particular instance of disparity is unusually wide, but differences between what should (if reliable) be comparable reports are quite normal. Clearly, the various pressures that interfere, world-wide, with the reliability of self-reported information about ethnicity and language-loyalty, have also at times been in effect in Borovlje; and it is likely that they have been (to a lesser extent) effective in Sele also. My own estimate of the proportion of the present-day inhabitants of Sele who speak the local Slovene dialect as their mother tongue is 98%; the proportion who would admit to this on an official census form is now probably higher than the 92% officially noted for 1971, but yet not as high as the number who will admit the fact privately.⁸

3. Sources of Data.

My data are from a number of sources, both published and unpublished, and include impressionistic as well as more objectively-collected information.

3.1. Borovlje: To the very restricted observations I have personally made in Borovlje, I add the extremely useful information provided by the first reports from the "E.S.F." project of the University of Vienna (which includes case studies of Celovec, Borovlje and five Carinthian villages),⁹ plus the results of a postal questionnaire that I sent to a small sample of Borovlje townspeople who are known to be ethnically-conscious Slovenes.

3.2. Sele: My data come exclusively from personal observations and conversations with villagers, conducted over a number of extended visits to Sele since 1973, totalling some twelve months' residence in the village.¹⁰

4. The Problem

It is clear from the census data given in TABLE I that the proportion of "Slovene-speakers"—whatever this term may be taken to mean precisely—has over the last 150 years dropped off remarkably in Borovlje, and has hardly dropped at all in Sele. The problems that I wish to address here uses these data as their starting point.

The first question concerns the factors involved in these developments. As I will show, the possible factors are very numerous, and it is easy enough to list them; but how can they all be reconciled? Which have been the most important, and when? Have any been decisive? These are problems which, as far as Carinthia is concerned, have not really been addressed—other than impressionistically—, and ones which are not easy to address (cf. Moritsch 1992b).

The first question presupposes a second: namely, what is the best method of determining the proper framework for ranking all these possible factors? Not only is the linguistic situation in Carinthia complex, but we are dealing with phenomena—language choice and nationality choice—which of themselves are extraordinarily difficult to explain; while the relationship between these two 'choices' (cf. Moritsch 1992b) is even more elusive.

5. The Ideal Framework

5.1. Introduction. In Carinthia four kinds of language-variety are in use: the two standard languages, Standard Literary Slovene and Standard [Austrian] Literary German; and the dialects corresponding thereto, *koroščina* and *Kärntnerdeutsch*. In the province as a whole, the varieties of Slovene are in the minority, and the use of local Slovene dialects has greatly diminished over time; in the overall picture, Borovlje is thus typical, and Sele atypical. In this paper, which is concerned above all with the replacement of varieties of

Slovene by varieties of German, I concentrate on the Slovene *vs.* German distinction, and only mention the choice of standard *vs.* dialect where it is relevant.

It has been recently pointed out (Giles, Leets & Coupland 1990) that the study of minority language situations has tended to be fragmented and parochial: "Despite valiant attempts... we [minority language specialists] are probably too locked into local peculiarities for our own theoretical, and perhaps even practical, good... [N]ow we need a consensually agreed set of ground rules which establish the parameters of our field so that we can address our local concerns within the context of the larger-scale enterprise."

5.2. The External Context. In this sector of sociolinguistics, it was *the external context* that was first seized on for the description of minority language situations, and held sway for two decades, from Ferguson (1959) at least through Brown & Fraser (1979).¹¹ My own first attempt to analyze the factors involved in the choice of German *vs.* Slovene language varieties by the villagers of Sele (Priestly 1989) followed this tradition, and was based on the Brown & Fraser situational taxonomy. When analysts have used this kind of framework, they have adduced developments in the external context which impinge on the life of the minority group—historical developments in politics, in economics, in societal relationships, and in education—wherever these have appeared relevant to the components of the situation which influence language choice, *viz.*, the '*setting*' of the conversation, its '*purpose*', and its '*participants*'. It should be noted, however, that these components include considerations that are quite clearly not capable of taxonomic definition using external criteria (see Giles & Hewstone 1982: 193-94). In particular, many of the relevant subcomponents of '*participants*' involve psychological information of one kind or another: the "individual qua individual" with his/her "moods, emotions, attitudes;" the "individual as a member of a social category" with often self-defined variables such as "class, ethnicity, etc.;" and "relationships between participants," involving such extremely personal matters as "liking, knowledge, etc.."

5.3. The Internal Context is, therefore, as has been argued by a number of specialists, of at least equal and perhaps of paramount importance:

"... given that *personal* decisions are being made and *individual* strategies enacted..., we feel that language-maintenance theory would be enriched by a social psychological input. As such, and in the context of language maintenance being an *intergroup* phenomenon... cognitive processes relating to social categorization, identity, comparison, attitude formation, attribution, and second-language acquisition... have an important part to play..." (Giles & Johnson 1987: 69).¹²

In my own attempts at analysis of the factors involved in the choice by Carinthians between speaking their native dialect and speaking Standard Slovene, I tried to pay attention to the psychological factors, especially in my study of part of the historical development, and the impact, of the so-called "Windischentheorie" (Priestly 1990). In general it is unfortunately true to say that other components of the psycho-sociology of Carinthians remain (to a great extent) scientifically unexplored; and the widening of focus to include psychological as well as external sociological considerations makes the venture extremely difficult.¹³

6. Factors

I now present a list of the major circumstances which may be assumed to have played an influential role in the contrasting sociolinguistic developments referred to above. These

are assumptions: not every circumstance may have acted as a factor in the developments, let alone been decisive. I present them under a number of headings in an attempt to impose a taxonomy, in the realization that many of the categories overlap each other.

6.1. Demographic: The gross population data in TABLE I show not only that Borovlje's population has grown tremendously over the last 150 years, but also that the growth has generally accelerated over time. In Sele, on the other hand, there has been a small net decrease, with minor fluctuations (see Wieser 1984 for details). As argued by some authorities (cf. 6.2. below), the difference between thriving town and (relatively) sleepy village in the bilingual region of Carinthia is paralleled by a number of economic, sociological, and linguistic differences.

The relative isolation of Sele can be gauged from the fact that, according to oral-historical sources in Sele, before World War I the average Selan [inhabitant of Sele] living in Sele-Cerkev or to the east of this district would make the journey to Borovlje no more than 3 or 4 times a year, and would restrict these journeys to essential visits, e.g., to the doctor's (there was no dentist available in Borovlje until 1934). The average Zgornjekočan [inhabitant of Sele-Zgornji Kot], being that much closer, might make this journey as much as twelve times a year.

One specific general Carinthian demographic development must be singled out, for it probably affects the two localities contrasted here as much as any in the province. Between 1934 and 1951, mainly as a result of deliberate National-Socialist policies, Carinthia had a 17% increase in population: many Germanophones were resettled in Carinthian cities from, first (before 1943), areas such as the Kanalska dolina/Kanaltal/Val Canale (since 1919 part of Italy) and Kočevje/Gottschee (in Slovenia) where, according to 'master-race' ethnic policies, they should not have been living; and, second (after 1944 and to a much lesser extent) from such areas as the Baltic States, Eastern Prussia and the Sudetenland whence they were forced to emigrate. The latter immigrants to Carinthia, it may be noted, were often strongly prejudiced against ethnic Slavs. It has been estimated (Barker 1984: 244) that there were 130,000 new settlers, throughout the province, in this second category; this is probably an over-estimate.

6.2. Economic: Borovlje has become much involved in commerce and shows signs of industrialization, while Sele has been almost totally isolated from economic change.

For example, in the 1981 census, the percentages of three major socioeconomic classes in the two localities were as follows (Borovlje / Sele): white collar workers, 44.3% / 33.0%; blue collar workers, 52.0% / 37.0%; and (most tellingly) farmworkers, 2.3% / 22.6% (Reiterer 1986: 101-03). Of the Sele villagers with white- and blue-collar jobs, many commute to them: cf. the comparative statistics of average daily commuters in the two communities (Fischer 1980: 110): in 1976, nobody commuted into Sele but 183 commuted to work outside; in the same year, 916 people commuted out of Borovlje, while 608 commuted into the town (many of this latter number being Sele villagers travelling to and from Borovlje by car and bus to their jobs in the hunting rifle workshops, banks, stores, and so on).

As mentioned above, the urban *vs.* rural opposition is considered to embody a number of more fundamental societal distinctions:

"The contrast between the Slovene countryside and the German city had become especially marked from the last third of the nineteenth century on. That was the time when Carinthia began to experience a very serious economic crisis as a consequence of the decline of the older forms of the mining industry... The Catholic clergy organized a kind of peasant self-help movement by means of

agricultural cooperatives.... Opposing positions became clearly defined. "Slovene" became increasingly synonymous with the adjectives "clerical," "conservative", "small-farmer" or "hayseed," "backward" and "culturally inferior"; "German", on the other hand, was equated with "liberal," "progressive," "middle-class" and "culturally superior," (Moritsch 1986: 16).¹⁴

Moritsch goes on to argue that it was these contrasts that resulted in ethnic conflict between the Germanophone and the Slovenophone populations: the Slovene self-help movements were linked to Ljubljana and these links were strengthened in the political and cultural domains; the German Carinthians, fearing (rightly or wrongly) that their property and even their existence were threatened, reacted both psychologically (by becoming prey to what Moritsch calls the *Urangst*, i.e., an artificially-created 'primitive' fear of the other ethnic group) and practically (by creating organizations to counteract these (real or imagined) threats). Already by the end of the 1910s, therefore, —and exacerbated by events at the end of the first World War and the circumstances of the 1920 Plebiscite, cf. below— the interethnic conflict, which previously had been negligible, escalated into something extremely discordant.

Furthermore (Moritsch 1986: 17), this all occurred within a political-philosophical framework which considered the "people" (identified with the nation-state—or at least, perhaps—the province) as a "biological unity, an organism," from which "[it] followed naturally that minorities were regarded as alien bodies within the national organism," to be either controlled or destroyed.

Moreover, with the modernization of the Carinthian economy, and concomitant changes in personal and family earning patterns, the twentieth century in general has been marked—here as elsewhere in industrial societies—by (a) extensive commuting, as exemplified above, and (b) by large-scale population movements.¹⁵ As far as the contrast between Borovlje and Sele are concerned,

"The chief way for most Slovene-speaking people to climb the ladder of material success [...] remains commuting to or settling in the metropolitan core" [i.e., Celovec] "or the one important subsidiary industrial complex of Ferlach/Borovlje... In most cases this is tantamount to Germanization, if not sooner, then later, because there is a natural environmental compulsion," (Barker 1984: 262).

If the economic distinction between town and village was of fundamental importance in the escalation of inter-ethnic tensions after World War One, then the further demographic and economic developments that resulted from World War Two were equally influential. The immigration of Germanophones from outside Austria at the end of the war (see 6.1. above), and the later influx of more Germanophones from the richer parts of Carinthia and other parts of Austria, broke up much of the ethnic homogeneity there had been previously (Barker 1984: 240-46). Even Sele, isolated as it is, has witnessed the purchase of old houses and farmsteads as vacation homes for what are thought of as "foreigners."

It should not however be thought that economic factors have worked only in favour of the Germanization of Borovlje. Developments both within Carinthia and beyond its borders have shown signs of the reverse; for example, the establishment of a Slovenophone Savings-and-Loan Bank (the *Posojilnica Borovlje*), on the one hand, and on the other the parlous state of the Slovene and overall Yugoslav economy (as compared with that of Austria) in the 1970s and 1980s which made it worthwhile for Slovenes to come—in spite of currency and customs restrictions—to Borovlje (the first major shopping centre north of the Austro-Yugoslav border) for various personal and commercial reasons.

Nor have economic developments always strengthened the urban *vs.* rural distinction as it effects Sele: for, even if it does contain within its borders the last farmhouse in the whole of Austria to be linked to the common electric network, Sele is not by any means totally isolated from the influences of late-twentieth century industrialization and mass communications. Not only the many villagers who commute to Borovlje and Celovec, but virtually all their fellow Selani too—who typically travel to Borovlje for groceries and for visits to doctor and dentist—, have been gradually importing many external symbols of urban life. The early-twentieth century distinction between “backward hayseed” and “progressive townspeople” is, at least, not easily observed from outward appearances such as everyday clothing or brand of automobile; sociolinguistic behaviour, however, may still betray the urban *vs.* rural difference.

6.3. Historical: There are interesting historical differences between these two localities, even though they are geographically so close. The 1910s appear to be the critical period when ethnic conflict became an influential part of everyday life, but Moritsch (Moritsch 1992a, 1992b; Moritsch-Baumgartner 1992) traces some crucial precursors of these developments back to 1850, with an upsurge in Germanophone nationalism in the 1900s. My survey of the major incidents will begin with World War One.

Most of the First World War passed this corner of Austria by; although seriously-affected areas were sometimes uncomfortably close (as, for example, the engagements at Kobarid/Caporetto), the inhabitants remained largely untouched before 1918 (Barker 1984: 90-102). However, during this final year of the war there was a sudden escalation of events, when troops from the new Kingdom of the SHS made repeated incursions and the Carinthians were involved in what is now referred to by Germanophones as the *Abwehrkampf* [resistance campaign] against what is felt to have been a ‘Serbian’ horde. On both sides, tellingly, mythological heroes were created for future generations; and on both sides, atrocities were committed for immediate remembrance (Barker 1984: 102-109, 336). It is to be recalled that this is precisely when demographic and economic factors had created the setting for the escalation of interethnic tensions; one might almost suspect a conspiracy of historical forces, working to permanently disturb the Carinthian tranquillity.

The 1920 Plebiscite results in these two localities are also of interest. Sele (which in the 1910 census was reported as 99% “Slovene”) voted 96.8% to 3.2% for union with Yugoslavia. The voters of Borovlje, in contrast, voted 72.5% to 27.5% against union with Yugoslavia; here it must be recalled that in 1910 only 10% were officially reported as “Slovene,” but that the private census found that 93% were “Slovene;” this only emphasizes that the statistics are unreliable and that the influences on the voters were many and complex;¹⁶ in addition, they were often localized. More important, perhaps, than the actual plebiscite result is the bitter atmosphere which this event created (cf. Moritsch 1992b). Already on May 1, 1920 (five months before the plebiscite) the annual May-Day celebration in Borovlje had turned into a noisy pro-German demonstration which decided to march out of town towards Trata/Tratten, a strongly Slovenophone village a short distance north-east of the town (Pleterski 1984: 36). Following the plebiscite, seventy workers in the Borovlje iron foundries—those known to have voted for union with Yugoslavia—were summarily dismissed (Zorn 1984:42); many of these would have been relatively recent immigrants from surrounding rural areas.

Moving ahead to World War Two, mention should first be made of the deportations of active Slovenophones to concentration camps—917 individuals, belonging to some 171 families—in mid April of 1942 (Haas-Stuhlpfarrer 1977: 85-86, Barker 1984: 195-96, Nećak 1985: 9-12). Apparently, although details are not easy to ascertain, these affected

both Borovlje and Sele more or less equally as far as actual numbers are concerned.¹⁷ However, it is clear that the deportation of say half-a-dozen families from a village of about 1000 persons would be more noticeable, and felt more deeply, than the deportation of a like number from a town of 5000.

It may be noted, also, that specific Nazi reprisals against Slovenophone individuals seem to have been especially violent against Selani as contrasted with Boroveljčani. The most infamous incident, the *Klagenfurter Volksgericht* of the spring of 1943, involved 37 arrestees, nearly all of whom were born in and/or lived in Sele (namely, over half of them) or in villages to the east of Sele, viz., Obirsko/Ebriach and Bela/Vellach. Of the 13 condemned to death and beheaded in Vienna on April 28, 1943, nine were born in Sele (Škerl 1946: 515, Kattinig 1978).

Partisan anti-Nazi operations were, correspondingly, much more intimately connected with Sele than with Borovlje. In general the Carinthian partisan movement was a rural, not an urban-based, guerilla movement, and depended on the impenetrability of the deep woods and the mountain terrain (Nećak 1985: 13, Barker 1990). Many Selani were related to, or at least were personally acquainted with, some of the leading partisans, especially Ivan Županc-Johan (from Obirsko) and Karel Prušnik-Gašper (from Lobnik/Lobnig). One of the vital early partisan successes occurred, on August 25, 1942, at Robež/Robesch (Barker 1990: 17), a few kilometres north of Sele, close to Apače/Abtei, which was one of the places to which Selani made a yearly pilgrimage. It is known that a number of Selani, conscripted into the *Wehrmacht*, deserted and joined the partisan movement in the summer of 1943 (Barker 1990: 24); at a later stage in the war the woods behind Sele served as a kind of primitive field hospital for them; and Sele was one of five partisan bases in Carinthia which received the appellation *pokrajinski odbor Osvobodilne fronte* ('Local Liberation Front Committee') (Stergar-alii 1984: 235).

Prušnik-Gašper, indeed, was moved in his memoirs of the partisan operations (1981: 288-309) to call the region around Sele the *Selska republika*, described by Barker (1990: 45) as follows:

"A well-furnished arboreal quarters along the old border, [Sele] was an ideal spot for a field-dressing station. Its sobriquet, if something of an exaggeration ..., did denote a distinctive quality. The township that gave its name to the ... martyrs of 1943 was a genuine hotbed of opposition to Naziism. The physical isolation resulting from extreme elevation and its concomitant strong ethnic identity surely explain the relatively sophisticated partisan logistical infrastructure..."

It may therefore be said that there were great opportunities in Sele for passive opposition to the Nazi presence to be transformed into active resistance, which could later be recalled in individual acts of defiance by Sele villagers.

The town of Borovlje was, of course, involved in resistance and the partisan operations, but much less so; only a few times do the historians mentioned specific actions by Boroveljčani, e.g., when young local women clandestinely carried partisan mail across the Drava river (Škerl 1946: 548-49), or when local Slovenes sent hunting weapons (presumably, stolen ones) to the partisans (Barker 1990: 21).

The fact that the penultimate battle of the World War in Europe was the Battle for Borovlje (May 10-11, 1945) is therefore perhaps to be considered more of an historical accident than a significant occurrence in the framework of the relations between the majority and the minority populations. Borovlje may be said to have found itself in the wrong place at the wrong time: when the remnants of various unpleasant military units,

united in two more or less opposing groups, each found the other in its way. The battle through the streets of Borovlje did however result in numerous casualties on both sides. We may perhaps accept this event as a telling, if accidental, symbol of the continuing conflict (Škerl 1984: 61, Barker 1990: 70-72).

There are necessarily many postwar events in the Borovlje and Sele areas which must have affected the relationships between the two ethnic groups; most of these are however minor, and were eclipsed by parallel events elsewhere in Carinthia. The *Ortstafelsturm* of 1972, when many of the Slovene place-name signs that were (finally, after much vacillation) erected in selected localities, only to be torn down by wrathful Germanophones and their sympathizers, did not have a great impact upon Sele (which the Germanophones did not visit for this purpose) or in Borovlje (which did not qualify demographically to have the signs). Similarly, almost all of the other overt anti-Slovenophone actions by extreme German nationalists—defacing memorials, scrawling graffiti on buildings, and so on, see, e.g., Barker 1984: 195, Nećak 1985: 141-50—seem to have taken place in other parts of Carinthia.

One incident is however very important in this context. During the ‘special kind of census’ of 1976, when a mostly abortive attempt was made by the authorities to obtain statistics on linguistic adherence in bilingual Carinthia, some Selani were moved to express their extreme dissatisfaction with the process (which had a number of serious flaws) by seizing and destroying the ballot-boxes—a virtually unprecedented political action in this generally law-abiding community (Barker 1984: 379).

6.4. Political: The pervasive nature of anti-Slovenophone sentiment in Carinthia, at least since the 1930s, is well known: hence Federal Chancellor Kurt von Schuschnigg’s famous remark, “Put a barbed wire fence around [Carinthia] and you will have built an internment camp for Nazis,” (quoted in translation in Barker 1984: 11); and the speech by Nazi leader Hugo Herzog in Borovlje on 14 July 1932, when he forecast the destruction of the Slovenophones when the Nazis came to power (Stergar-alii 1984: 223) may have been unusually explicit, but typifies the attitude of many German nationalists in the interwar period.¹⁸ Barker (1984: 183-91) describes the polarization and politicization of majority-minority relations in the 1920s, and concludes (1984: 187) that “by the end of the decade German nationalist sentiment had hardened to the point where even minor concessions were impossible.” (See also Moritsch 1986: 18, Haas & Stuhlpfarrer 1977: 39-74). Details of specific political events, movements and sentiments in Borovlje are not yet available (cf. Moritsch 1992b), but clearly any escalation of inter-ethnic conflict would have been much more noticeable in a larger, geographically centralized and ethnically mixed community like Borovlje than in a homogeneous and relatively remote village such as Sele.

Evidence of a continuation of the anti-Slovene sentiments in Carinthia since World War II is not lacking either, as the extensive documentation in Galanda-alii (1981: 94-97, 270-80, and passim) clearly shows, and as has been mentioned above. At the same time, the Slovenophone community has (especially with the development of the *Slovenska gimnazija*, see below) become much more politicized: a development which might have had more beneficial consequences for the minority population, had there not been important divergences in political opinion, especially the disagreements between the *Narodni svet Koroških Slovencev* [NSKS], a Catholic Church-based organization on the one hand, and on the other the *Zveza slovenskih organizacij na Koroškem* [ZSO], a more socialist-based group (see Barker 1984: 219-221, Nećak 1985: 77-106 and especially 103-06, on these developments and their connections to pre-existing and other co-existing political

groupings.) No details are however available on the effects of these developments on individual Slovenes in individual locations such as Borovlje and Sele. It is possible that political currents would swirl more strongly in a town than in a rural backwater, but further data are required.

6.5. Educational: I have suggested elsewhere (1989: 90-91) that Slovene language maintenance in Carinthia rests on three pillars: continued use of Slovene in the home, continued religious usage, and bilingual education. Details of developments in education are extremely complex; note, however, that Borovlje is the educational centre for its surrounding villages, and the *Hauptschule* (secondary school) for the district is located here.¹⁹

As Fischer (1986) has in part explained, the term *utraquistic* was a label for a variety of Carinthian educational patterns that were in use since before 1870-71, few of which involved properly bilingual education.²⁰ However imperfect the system was, it was destined to become worse; for during the first four decades of the present century the contribution of this schooling to the pupils' knowledge of Slovene sharply diminished, especially just after the 1920 plebiscite (Rožman 1925) and, thereafter, with increasing Germanization through the 1920s and 1930s (Barker 1984: 181-83). Everywhere in Carinthia German was the sole language in all grades from 1939 to 1945 (Barker 1984: 193). In 1945 compulsory bilingual education was introduced for the whole of the Slovene/German Carinthian area, with mother-tongue instruction in grades 1-3, and transition to German occurring in the fourth grade (Nećak 1985: 35, Barker 1984: 217-18). However, in the 1958 'Reform' parents were allowed to withdraw their children from Slovene lessons (Barker 1984: 234 ff; Nećak 1985: 117 ff), and under the enormous social pressures of the time the number of pupils in bilingual education fell from just under 13,000 to about 2,500 (Fischer 1986); and from 1959 on, parents had to opt for Slovene education for their children. There has now been, for about 4 years, extreme pressure from German-nationalist political groups for a strict separation of pupils into German- and Slovene-language schools, a policy with serious potential consequences for the minority,²¹ in spite of recent hopeful trends.

Sele had one primary school in its geographical centre, in the Sele-Cerkev sub-district, from 1849; from 1895 on, it was officially *utraquistic*, but here the term seems to have meant a preponderance of Slovene instruction until 1916, when the school was closed. When it reopened in 1919, it was still official 'utraquistic' but now the more normal Carinthian system was in place, with Slovene-language teaching concentrated in the first two grades.²² Since World War II, the primary school in the Cerkev sub-district has for the most part provided bilingual education in all grades, with much of the instruction in Slovene; and since 1953 a second primary school, in the Sele-Zvrhnji Kot sub-district, has been in operation, with the same instructional system. As TABLE II shows, the proportion of Sele children participating in Slovene-language education has remained at a very high level. However imperfect the instruction may or may not have been in the two Sele primary schools during the 45 years since the war, at least it has been offered within an effective bilingual framework, and has generally helped to maintain the use of the Slovene language.

Apart from the fact that already by 1887 all four teachers in the Borovlje school were Germanophones (Moritsch 1992a) data on the extent and availability of 'utraquistic' and other bilingual schooling in Borovlje were not available for this study (but cf. Moritsch 1992b). After 1945, here as elsewhere, bilingual primary schooling was (re-)established; but, as TABLE II shows, after the 'Reform' of 1958 the participation of Borovlje children in bilingual education was generally low.

TABLE II. PARTICIPATION IN SLOVENE-LANGUAGE EDUCATION (grades 1-3)²³

	58-9	76-7	77-8	78-9	79-0	80-1	81-2	82-3	83-4	87-8
Borovlje	7.4	20.4	19.6	18.6	16.9	24.2	20.1	18.5	17.0	25.0
Sele	98.3	96.1	93.5	87.8	92.5	100	100	96.3	95.0	100

Figures are percentages.

Sources: Unkart-alii 1984: 123-24; Fischer 1980: 207; Pohoryles-Rögl 1985: 50; Devetak-alii 1988: 236-37.

After primary school, nearly all children from Sele and Borovlje attend the secondary 'Hauptschule' in Borovlje. Here, it has been common practice in recent decades for Slovenophone children to experience extremes of peer pressure from their schoolmates, directed towards their giving up their talking in Slovene in the playgrounds and hallways. There is, to be sure, instruction in Slovene language as an optional subject, but this has not been, generally speaking, a popular option.

Post-primary Slovenophone children may also attend the *Slovenska gimnazija* in Celovec (founded in 1959), if their parents are willing to pay for their board and the extra transport involved, and if they are prepared to see their offspring only at weekends during term (a considerable hardship on some farms where there are occasional periods of labour-intensive activity, e.g., at hay-harvesting time). The *Gimnazija* has had an enormous impact on the cultural life, and a great impact on the political life, of Carinthian Slovenes; for my purposes, its relevance lies in comparing the attendance at this school of students from the two communities contrasted here. Complete data were not available, but in 1972 there were 6 *gimnazisti* from Borovlje and 20 from Sele (Malle 1974: map 10); and of the about 1000 graduates from the *gimnazija* in the first 25 years of its operation, 109 were from Borovlje and 140 from Sele. Given the fact that the total of Slovenophones in the two communities has been, very roughly, the same during this period, these numbers are significant: they show that 28% more young men and women came from ethnically-conscious (*zavedni*) families in Sele than in Borovlje.²⁴

It is difficult to separate, in these data, the figures which relate to education as a dependent variable (and thus, as in the last example, provide a measure of something else, in this case ethnic allegiance) and those whereby education is an independent variable, potentially influencing language maintenance or language loss. The information is in this latter respect no more than suggestive.

6.6. Religious: As mentioned above, the Church has acted as one of the bastions of Slovene language maintenance in Carinthia, sometimes separately from, and usually linked to, political and nationalistic considerations (see Priestly 1989).

It should also be pointed out that, in one respect, the Church has (unwittingly) done a severe disservice to the cause of Slovene language retention. In its striving to further Slovene ethnic loyalty, the Slovene religious authorities encouraged the use of Standard Slovene in all religious and cultural matters (thus, the founding of the *Mohorjevo društvo* in 1852) and thereby furthered the attitudinal position according to which any Carinthian Slovene dialect was something to be ashamed of. This played into the hands of the later proponents of the "Windischentheorie", cf. Priestly (1990) and Moritsch (1992a), Moritsch-Baumgartner (1992).

In the interwar years the politicization of the ethnic problem very clearly involved religious issues: the Church in the bilingual area began this period under strong Slovenophone leadership; but under their new Germanophone bishop, Adam Hefter, German-speaking priests were installed in many parishes: 28 Slovene-speaking priests were dismissed, and another 30 were transferred to parishes outside the bilingual zone (Barker 1984: 188-89). It appears to be not entirely coincidental that the area of Carinthia where these replacements were the most extensive, the Zilja Valley, is the area which has been most decisively Germanized. The reduced number of Slovenophone priests remaining in the bilingual area became isolated symbols of Slovene ethnic allegiance, with a concomitant hardening of extreme attitudes (i.e., of "us" vs. "them") among their parishioners.

For most of the present century the Parish Church of St. Urh in Sele was administered by one priest, Alojzij Vauti. Born 1887 in Šmihel nad Pliberkom, a village in Eastern Carinthia, Vauti was appointed to the parish in 1916 and symbolized the ethnic pride in their Slovene heritage for which the Sele villagers became known. With a hiatus during the Nazi period, when he was interned in a concentration camp, Vauti continued in office until 1979, and died in 1982. At least since 1945, the normal language of public service in Sele has been Slovene.

Apparently there were Slovenophone priests in office at the Church of St. Martin in Borovlje in the 1880s, but they were inactive in promoting Slovene language use (Moritsch 1992a). Since 1945 (and for at least some of the interwar years) mass has been celebrated in Slovene, at a different hour from services in German, once a week. A newly-appointed Slovenophone priest instituted the practice, at 'minor' German-language celebrations of mass in the mid-1980s, of repeating the Lord's Prayer in Slovene immediately after its recitation in German (see Priestly 1989: 89); the fact that this was considered unusual (indeed, inflammatory!) shows how much linguistic apartheid was an assumed fact of life in the religious sphere.

6.7. Administrative: The bureaucratic machinery that began to move into Borovlje in the second half of the 19th century was thoroughly Germanophone. Over time, it became considered something automatic, taken for granted, that administrative matters had to be transacted in German, the 'High' language (Moritsch-Baumgartner 1992a). Slovene was actively prohibited in administrative matters in 1938, but had hardly ever been available. In Sele, on the other hand, administrative interchanges have been in Slovene (see Priestly 1989); and the equality of German and Slovene in Village Council proceedings was officially formalized in June 1966 (Veiter 1970: 626).

6.8. Cultural: Another component factor in the maintenance or non-maintenance in Slovene may be termed 'cultural,' i.e., the availability of institutional support for Slovene activities such as choral concerts, drama groups, public lectures, and so on. Nowadays, every ethnically-conscious Slovene community in Carinthia has its *Krščansko prosvetno društvo* [KPD] or *Slovensko prosvetno društvo* [SPD]. Unfortunately, detailed information on the history of the KPD 'Planina' in Sele was not available for comparison with the information in Verdel (1985) and Kuhar, Oberdammer & Wiltner (1992) concerning the SPD 'Borovlje'. The latter society dates from 1905, but had antecedents going back to 1870; its Sele counterpart is a much more recent creation. The cultural lead shown in this context by Borovlje before 1940 was reversed during the postwar years; from 1950 to 1975 there was very little activity in Borovlje, and the KPD 'Planina' in Sele, relatively speaking, maintained a much higher level of cultural activity than the SPD 'Borovlje'. The contrast between the two localities can be traced back to the early 1900s, when the Slovene clergy in the rural areas around Borovlje began to actively recruit Slovenophones into

cultural organizations as a counterweight to the increasing Germanization of Borovlje itself (Moritsch 1992a). Given the lack of data and the variation over time, no conclusion is drawn here as to the relative influence of cultural organizations in the two communities.

6.9. Summary: It is clear from the preceding sections that there is no scarcity of factors that may have furthered the relatively fast Germanization of Borovlje as contrasted with the non-Germanization of Sele. With respect to the last factor considered the evidence is incomplete, and under all six preceding headings circumstances can be seen to favor language maintenance in Sele rather than in Borovlje. Indeed, there appears to be an overload of assimilatory influences in Borovlje, so much so that it can hardly be surprising that Slovene is reported as being spoken so little there.

Given this overload, the relative weighting of all these factors is clearly difficult. This specific question is discussed with reference to Carinthia as a whole by, e.g., Barker (1984: 264-69) and Krašovec (1987). Barker (restricting himself to the strictly political context) considers the efforts of Germanophone activists (throughout the twentieth century, and especially in the 1920s and the late 1950s) to accelerate assimilation to be paramount, and especially the concentration of their activities in three areas: the maintenance of the assimilatory school system; the consolidation of monolingual bureaucratic structures; and electoral gerrymandering. The authors in Krašovec draw particular attention to the economic and educational factors.

Moritsch, with reference to Borovlje, concludes that the key factor is the economic one: in his view, urbanization resulted in Germanization, especially under the added impetus of political polarizations (with the parties most attractive to the new urban workers being the ones which were most inclined towards German-nationalism) and given the particular policies of the major industrial concerns in Borovlje at the time (see Moritsch 1992a).

Moritsch and Baumgartner (1992), with reference to other localities including Medborovnica and Obirsko (and the latter must parallel Sele in many respects), however, make much of the religious and educational factors.

As a consequence of the effects of all the factors enumerated above, it is clear that, on the one hand, Borovlje is the location of numerous locales where—for various reasons—German is the expected medium of communication, such as schools, administrative offices, commercial establishments, auto repair shops, rifle works, and so on; whereas in Sele the expected medium of communication in virtually every activity is Slovene (for the rare exceptions, see Priestly 1989).

7. Questionnaire Results.

As stated above, questionnaires were sent to a sample of Slovenophone inhabitants of Borovlje who were known to be ethnically conscious. 30 questionnaires were mailed; six were returned. Two of the more interesting sets of responses from this small sample are reported here, because the results are suggestive for further research.

7.1. Public Language Use. The subjects were asked: “Govori se, da je v zadnjem času na boroveljskih ulicah slišati več slovenščine kot v sedemdesetih letih. Mislite, da to drži?” and “Če je to res, zakaj menite, da je do te spremembe prišlo?”

Of the six, four answered in the affirmative to the first question, one replied in the negative, and one did not respond. The reasons given were as follows: (1) the influence of the *Slovenska gimnazija* in Celovec [one respondent]; (2) a heightened ethnic consciousness among modern Slovenophone youth [two respondents]; and (3) the great increase in visitors from Yugoslav Slovenia on shopping and banking expeditions [three respondents].

Commentary: These responses confirm my own impressions and those of other Carinthi-

ans with whom I have discussed the question, a point of view mentioned in 6.1. above.

7.2. Attitudes to Dialect. The subjects were asked whether the local Slovene dialect in Borovlje (*boroveljščina*) was suitable for use in five different situations. The situations, and affirmative / negative responses, were as follows (here, conditional and uncertain responses are counted as 'half'):

(1) Prayer? Yes 3, No 3.

(2) Poetry? Yes 3.5, No 2.5.

(3) Public announcements by the local *Slovensko prosvetno društvo*? Yes 0.5, No 5.5.

(4) Humorous pieces in Slovene weekly newspapers? Yes 5.5, No 0.5.

(5) Serious articles in Slovene weekly newspapers? No 6.

Commentary: As explained elsewhere (Priestly 1988, 1990), many Carinthian Slovenes have a very negative attitude towards their own dialects, and a corresponding positive attitude towards Standard Slovene. The contribution of these attitudes towards the process of Germanization, which I argue in those articles (see also 6.6. above), is there related to Carinthia as a whole; I suggest now that the six responses from *zavedni* Boroveljčani are typical of Carinthian Slovenes: the dialect may (in their opinions) only appear in printed form when something unimportant such as a humorous article is involved, and serious articles require the Standard language; only one respondent allows for the use of dialect in cultural contexts, and then grudgingly; and the respondents are divided with respect to the use of dialect in prayer and in poetry. The questionnaire must now be extended to a greater number of Boroveljčani, and must also be administered to a sample of Selani, who (I predict) will not have quite such negative attitudes towards their dialect (the dialect of "Selska republika").

8. Analysis

Given that 150 years ago Borovlje and Sele were more or less equally Slovenophone (viz., Sele totally so; Borovlje almost totally so, except for some use of spoken German in the rifle workshops), the overall development can be summarized as follows. In Borovlje, it was a process which resulted in a far-reaching change in the use of Slovene: viz., from being the accepted majority behavior to being a style of behavior contradictory to the norm. In Sele, in contrast, whatever fluctuations may have occurred in the interim (as at the height of the Nazi period, when extremes of probably atypical linguistic behaviour were required for survival) there has been an overall minimum of change.

As explained in 5. above, it is a premise of my approach that the external factors must be analyzed with reference to their psychosociological concomitants. One kind of specific case history will emphasize the necessity for this combination of psychological and sociological: namely, instances where individual Carinthian Slovenes will exhibit different linguistic behaviour in Borovlje from what they exhibit in Sele under otherwise identical circumstances:

The peer pressure on Sele schoolchildren at the Borovlje *Hauptschule* has been referred to in 6.5. above. The effect is that, when speaking to their fellow Sele classmates in public, they will use Slovene dialect in Sele, and German dialect in Borovlje.

An extreme case of an adult Selan is also pertinent, related in Priestly 1989: 84: "On each occasion that he and the author met in [Sele], they always talked in Slovene; whenever they met in [Borovlje], they always talked in German, *however close any possible listeners might be.*"

Also note that, for most of the present century, it has taken much more courage in Borovlje than in Sele to admit to being 'Slowenisch' or even 'Windisch.'

Individual choices can therefore depend on the context. The nature of the context, however, is not always sufficient to explain the linguistic choices made. Therefore, the analyst must first describe the context, then analyze the psychosocial factors involved in the choice of language-variety.

The psychosocial attitudes of individual speakers and of groups of individuals can then be seen to be grouped under one important system of beliefs: the extent to which they identify themselves with the Slovenophone ethnic group. This approximates to what Minnich (1988) has called 'collective self-identification' and, in the terms used in Howard Giles' and his colleagues' writings on ethnic identity theory, the 'overall ethnic vitality' of the speakers in the minority group.²⁵ There are data which bear on the question of 'self-identification' in Carinthia, namely the distinction made in self-reporting censuses where a choice was given to the Slovenophones: in the 1951 census, for example, they were given the choices "Deutsch", "Deutsch-Windisch," "Deutsch-Slowenisch," "Windisch", and "Slowenisch". Extensive study is required to determine whether the choices made have any correlation with 'ethnic vitality,' but I suggest that the *gross* data from this kind of evidence may be informative; if census respondents choose any label other than "Slowenisch" they may be assumed to reflect, at least to some extent, a lower degree of 'ethnic vitality' than those who do not so choose. Note now that in the 1981 census, of the total 872 Boroveljčani who declared themselves as non-Germanophones under one label or another, as many as 194 (22.3%) chose a label other than "Slowenisch;" whereas in the same census the figures for Selani are, respectively, a total of 762, and only 15 (2%) who chose a label other than "Slowenisch."²⁶

For a key to placing the psychological within the societal, I turn to St. Clair's interesting view of minority language-use as a form of *deviance*. The approach is based on "the root metaphor of social stigma in which the mere act of defining an act as deviant by isolating its members from the remainder of society and punishing them as rule breakers creates and perpetuates a community of outsiders" (St. Clair 1982: 166), which—I suggest—concisely and precisely describes the general attitudes of majority linguistic groups in Carinthia towards their minority linguistic neighbours, and the general attitudes of many members of the minority towards themselves.²⁷

In this light, some of the actions by Germanophone activists, and some of the reactions by Slovenophones, can be (I suggest) very profitably reviewed.

The concerted policy of Germanophones (mentioned in 6.2. above) to treat Slovene-speakers as second-class nonconformists—"Above all, the aim was to isolate the incorrigibles..." (Moritsch 1986: 17; see also Moritsch 1992a on "marginalization")—amounts to branding them as sociolinguistic deviants. The general contrasts (see the quotation from Moritsch in 6.2.) between 'urban' and 'rural,' between 'progressive' and 'conservative,' between 'German' and 'Slovene,' between 'standard [language]' and 'dialect,' between 'High' and 'Low,' all involve the ostracization of those who adopt the second of each alternative, and the ostracized are treated as (and think of themselves as) 'deviant.'

The deportations and acts of atrocity committed during World War Two by the Nazi authorities (see 6.3.) can be seen as not affecting the psychosocial climate in Borovlje, where the crucial change into a society with a majority of conformist Germanophones and a minority of nonconformist (deviant) Slovenophones had already taken place: the minority was too small for overt reactions, and any reactions that minority members may have had must have been shared privately. The same acts would also not change the psychosocial climate in Sele, which remained strongly Slovenophone and ethnically conscious, but would have only strengthened this climate and consolidated this sense of ethnic allegiance.

The active participation of Sele villagers in the partisan operations is thus seen to be part of the overall 'deviant' behavior, and would remain as part of the shared memories in the village; the behavior (which is in many ways equally 'deviant' in the whole provincial context) of the Selani who seized and destroyed the ballot boxes in the 'Special Census' of 1976 was thus a reversion to open political defiance and deviance.

9. Conclusion

For Carinthia, as (surely) elsewhere, membership in one of the two groups—the majority of "insiders" and the minority of "deviant outsiders"—depends on the community under consideration (See Giles & Johnson 1987: 69-70). If we wish to broadly categorize the contemporary situation, we may state the following:

On the one hand, macroscopically, in the town of Borovlje as a general rule, and in most parts of Carinthia, it is the Germanophones who conform to the majority norms, and the Slovenophones who are deviant. On the other hand, within a small community such as the village of Sele—and also, incidentally, within individual households in Borovlje where Slovene is spoken—it is the Slovene-speakers who conform to majority norms, and the Germanophones who are deviant.

Gal (1987) has analyzed patterns of language-usage among Italians in West Germany, Hungarians in Austria, and Germans in Romania. She considers that the differences among these patterns "reveal different forms of consciousness: they are symbolic responses to the ways in which the ethnic communities are differentially situated. . .;" she argues that "patterns of language use are not simply a reflex of the group's political and economic position. They are part of the group's actively constructed and often oppositional response to that position. . . In the face of hostile public discourses. . . that diminish or challenge the group's language and identity while celebrating the dominant language and culture, each of these groups has constructed a linguistic strategy that can be read as symbolic resistance." If we apply this view to Carinthia, and specifically to Borovlje and Sele, we can see that (in the terms used in this paper's title) many Carinthians, and many Boroveljčani, have surrendered to the symbolic domination of Austrian German language and culture by conforming to the majority behavior;²⁸ those who have resisted are considered socially and sociolinguistically deviant. In Sele, the external factors have (so to speak) conspired with the result that the local majority behavior has been a resistance to that symbolic domination. By conforming to sociolinguistic behavior in the local context, however, they count as sociolinguistic deviants in the wider context.

The relative status of Slovene-speakers in the two communities—as deviants in Borovlje, and as conformists in Sele—is more than adequately explained by reference to the historical, economic, political, religious, educational and cultural developments in the two communities. The problem of ranking these factors, and deciding which have been most crucial and when, remains to be solved.²⁹ The approach adopted here provides a useful way at looking at the linguistic behavior of Carinthians Slovenes: the exigencies of the external situation determine whether specific language-choices will be *deviant* or not; and psychological factors are involved in the choice between deviant and non-deviant behavior. Borovlje and Sele—if not two extremes—at least exemplify, respectively, surrender and resistance to symbolic domination; and they exemplify, respectively, a societal environment where speaking Slovene is deviant, and one where it is the norm. Perhaps this framework and approach can usefully serve for the further sociolinguistic analysis of all of the bilingual region of Carinthia.

NOTES

- * The author hereby expresses his appreciation to his many informants in Sele and Borovlje; and his gratitude to the discussant at the World Congress session, Thomas Luckmann, for his helpful criticisms, and in particular to Andreas Moritsch for his invaluable assistance. All faults remain the author's.
1. For sample bibliographies of the voluminous literature, see Fischer 1980: 296-309; Flaschberger & Reiterer 1980: 108-113; Liška & alii 1984: 300-18; Barker 1984: 383-96; Nećak 1985: 197-205.
 2. Note that the German name for the town was Oberferlach until 1910. This contrasted with Unterferlach/Medborovnica, cf. below.
 3. Sources: Singer 1934, Moritsch 1992a, Moritsch 1992b, Kuhar, Oberdammer & Wiltner 1992.
 4. Sele/Zell Pfarre is administratively divided into six districts: Zgornji Kot/Oberwinkel, Srednji Kot/Mitterwinkel, Sele Cerkev/Zell Kirche, Borovnica/Freibach, Šajda/Scheide, and Hmelše/Homölich. The last-named is linguistically separate, and is excluded from my descriptions, here and elsewhere. Inhabitants of the first-named district have, relatively speaking, a rather tenuous contact with the other inhabitants of Sele: their sub-dialect is relatively idiosyncratic, and they often attend church and visit the inn in the village of Bajtiše/Waidisch, situated on the road leading down the valley to Borovlje.
 5. Sources: Singer 1934; personal reminiscences by Sele villagers.
 6. On this construct, see Priestly 1990 and the extensive references there. One example of the use of this label: in 1939, the self-reported statistics for Borovlje were: 'slovenisch' 291, 'deutsch-slovenisch' 131, 'windisch' 226, 'deutsch-windisch' 67 (Moritsch 1992b). Note also that much of what has been written on the term "Windisch/vindiš" treats its use as uniform throughout Carinthia, whereas in fact the understanding and usage of the term has varied extensively over time and space. In parts of the the Zilja valley, for example, the term is still not felt to be pejorative (Moritsch, personal communication).
 7. Grafenauer 1946: 177, Moritsch 1992a; see Moritsch 1992b for census data for Borovlje and Medborovnica considered together.
 8. To take one generally acknowledged measure of ethnicity, namely, first language: all published statistics with respect to "native Slovene-speakers," even when not affected by the influences that can skew self-reporting, may reflect anything from the number of people who *have only a passive knowledge of Slovene* to those who *not only can speak Slovene, but will openly do so*. The two extremes may differ a great deal; I heard, for instance, the following estimate for the (surely not atypical) village of Šmarjeta na Rožu/St. Margarethen im Rosental: total population, 1150; people with passive knowledge of Slovene, 800; people with active knowledge of Slovene, 500; people willing to speak Slovene openly, 80. Note also that census data differ enormously from estimates given by "ethnically conscious" Carinthian Slovenes, and from more objective measures too: cf. Flaschberger & Reiterer 1980: 73-75, where according to a scholarly survey 75% of the population of Velikovec/Völkermarkt admitted to understanding "some Slovene", and 55% admitted to "understanding Slovene well." This is to be compared with official figures of the 1971 census, in which only 7.6% of the population of Velikovec/Völkermarkt were reported as "Slowenen"; and of the 1981 census, with only 3.1% of the total admitting to being speakers of Slovene or "Windisch" (Unkart, Glantschnig & Ogris 1984: 106-107). Also significant is the fact that between 1976 and 1982, the proportion of schoolchildren in Velikovec schools who were registered for Slovene instruction ranged between 1.3% and 2.4% (Unkart, Glantschnig & Ogris 1984: 125). For general considerations on self-reporting language and ethnicity in censuses, see de Vries 1985; for a survey of the 1971 and 1981 Carinthian census results, see Barker 1989.
 9. "E.S.F." = European Science Foundation. See (a) Moritsch 1992a, which includes data from individual studies of the political and social history of Borovlje and its environs by Tomaschek, Oberdammer, and Wiltner; (b) Moritsch & Baumgartner 1992, which cites data from Wiltner's case study of Medborovnica/Unterferlach, now a suburb of Borovlje; and (c) Moritsch 1992b, which includes the very valuable comparison of developments in Borovlje with those in Eisenkappel/Železna Kapla by Kuhar, Oberdammer and Wiltner (1992). Note that recent sociological and sociolinguistic surveys of the bilingual area have indeed been performed, but whether the interviews were conducted in localities that excluded Borovlje and Sele (thus Flaschberger & Reiterer 1980) or included them (thus Filla, Flaschberger, Pachner & Reiterer 1982), the results are presented without any breakdown according to locality.

10. See Priestly 1989, 1990.
11. See Giles & Johnson 1982, Giles & Hewstone 1982.
12. See Gudykunst & Schmidt 1987, Giles, Leets & Coupland 1990.
13. This is not to dismiss the valuable work of Flaschberger & Reiterer 1980, Filla, Flaschberger, Pachner & Reiterer 1982, and Reiterer 1986; but they worked elsewhere and/or present their results as generalities.
14. See Moritsch 1992a; Moritsch dates the rise of these oppositions to the late 19th century. For extensive socioeconomic argumentation, see Reiterer 1986. See also Moritsch-Baumgartner 1992, where the particular developments in Medborovnica are described: this suburb of Borovlje exemplifies the contrast between urban and rural in that it was here that a strong Slovene, conservative, Catholic-led farmer's association came into being, as a fierce reaction to the rise of liberal urban German nationalism in Borovlje.
15. The internal migrations appear, also, to have had far-reaching consequences of a strictly linguistic kind, in that the differences among neighbouring dialects appear to be in the process of fading, cf. Priestly 1988.
16. See Vodopivec 1986 and the references to the political vs. economic explanations proposed by Pleterski and Moritsch respectively.
17. Incidentally, the oldest deportee (Luka Dovjak) was from Sele.
18. Although not apparently pervasive until the 1910s, these National-Socialist attitudes and policies were formulated in the nineteenth century, see Galanda-alii 1981: 272-73, and indeed had their philosophical roots in the eighteenth, see Domej 1988.
19. Primary school is for children aged 6:6 to 10:0 (or sometimes more). At age 10:0 most Carinthian children graduate to the nearest *Hauptschule* and, after 4 years there, move on to either a *Mittelschule* or a specialized technical school. The *Slovenska gimnazija* (see below) takes children from ages 10:0 to 18:0.
20. See Haas-Stuhlpfarrer 1977: 14-24 and Moritsch-Baumgartner 1992 on the assimilatory educational policies of the Habsburg Empire, and Domej 1988 for an excellent analysis of educational policies in the 1774-1848 period. Moritsch 1992b concludes that the utraquistic system was an essential instrument of Germanization. See also Moritsch-Baumgartner 1992 on the political opportunism of many of the teachers: this shows that specific details about each locality and personality are required for an analysis, for attitudes may depend on individual personalities as much as on educational systems. Yet another, normally incalculable, factor must be considered, too: the amount of direct and indirect pressure exerted on the choices made by parents at any one time and in any one place; see Barker's report (1984:331) of a 1956 interview with a retired school inspector, who said that before World War One "Slovene workers in Borovlje who refused to send their children to the [German] kindergarten lost their jobs."
21. The first official proposal was made in May 1986. On details of the developments, see CEDRI 1985; Fischer 1986; Devetak-alii 1988; Barker 1989: 193-94.
22. Some details: 1895-98 one class, utraquistic; 1898-89 two classes, utraquistic; 1899-1919 one utraquistic class and one Slovene-only class, taught simultaneously (?!) (Singer 1934: 342); from 1902, Slovene language classes in all primary grades, other subjects taught in German from grade 3 (Stergar-alii 1984: 194-95); 1919-20, two classes, all in Slovene; 1920-34 (with one short break) two classes, utraquistic (Singer 1934: 342).
23. Barker 1984: 236-37 presents a map showing 'proportion of pupils who applied for bilingual or supplementary Slovene instruction' in 1970-71, with 100% for Sele (an acceptable figure) but zero for Borovlje, which does not fit the pattern of Table II.
24. See Zwitter 1984, Klemenčič 1984 for reviews of the first 25 years of existence of the *Slovenska gimnazija*.
25. See Allard & Landry 1986, Giles & Johnson 1987, Giles, Leets & Coupland 1990; and note that much of the whole problem depends on the precise definition of terms such as 'narod,' 'Volk,' 'ethnic group,' etc..
26. The complete breakdown is exemplified by the data for Medborovnica (Moritsch-Baumgartner 1992): of a total of 977 respondents, 515 were (according to self-reports) "German;" 279 "German-Windisch;" 82 "German-Slovene;" 50 "Windisch;" and another 50 "Slovene." Note also that the term 'group' must be allowed to vary: if different social classes show assimilation at different rates (Moritsch-Baumgartner 1992) then the different social classes must be analyzed separately. —Note also that "Slowenisch/slovenski" will bear different connotations in different environments: where Slovenes are in the majority, as in Sele, the connotations will be more prestigious; where they are in the minority, as in Borovlje, the connotations will lack

- prestige. (For this point I am grateful to Rado Lencek, who has noted similar differences in different parts of Italian Slovenia).
27. St. Clair bases his approach to deviance on the work of Becker (1973).
 28. Note that, sociolinguistically speaking, domination by the superior group may vary according to the external context (home *vs.* street, for example) and also varies according to the psychological effect (choice of expression: *sotto voce vs.* aloud, written *vs.* oral).
 29. See Moritsch 1992a for further discussion. What is really required—something that will need extensive fieldwork—is an application of the model recently proposed by Giles, Leets & Coupland (1990); a model meant as “a blueprint which recognises outcomes and processes beyond [minority language] survival, captures the intergroup arena of minority language situations by attending also to dominant group dynamics, acknowledges that outcomes are not frozen endstates but rather part and parcel of ongoing changes, attends to the ‘cognitive climate’ as a potentially important of minority language status, and grounds the whole in interactional contexts.” This model requires the provision of extensive information; a thorough application of this model therefore requires much more data than is available for Borovlje and Sele.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allard, R. & R. Landry. 1986. “Subjective ethnolinguistic vitality viewed as a belief system,” *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 7: 1-12.
- Barker, Thomas M. 1984. *The Slovene Minority of Carinthia*. Boulder CO: East European Monographs.
- . 1989. “The ethnic evolution of Austria’s Carinthian Slovenes,” *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism* 26: 189-96.
- . 1990. *Social Revolutionaries and Secret Agents: The Carinthian Slovene Partisans and Britain’s Special Operations Executive*. Boulder CO: East European Monographs.
- Becker, H.S. 1973. *Outsiders: Study in the Sociology of Deviance*. New York: Free Press.
- Brown, Penelope & Colin Fraser. 1979. “Speech as a marker of situation,” 33-62 in K.R. Scherer & H. Giles, eds., *Social Markers in Speech*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- CEDRI = Comité Européen pour la défense des Réfugiés et Immigrés, 1985. *Gemeinsam oder getrennt? Die Situation der slowenischen Minderheit in Kärnten am Beispiel der Schulfrage*. Basel: Atelier Populaire International.
- Devetak, Silvo, Majda Šulc & Boris Jesih. 1988. *Šolstvo za Slovence na Koroškem - sožitje ali ločevanje?* Ljubljana: Inštitut za narodnostna vprašanja.
- de Vries, John. 1985. “Some methodological aspects of self-report questions on language and ethnicity,” *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 6: 347-368.
- Domej, Teodor. 1988. “Slowenisch als Unterrichtssprache in der Frühzeit des Kärntner Pflichtschulwesens,” *Wiener slawistischer Almanach* 22: 333-44.
- Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. “Diglossia,” *Word* 15. 325-40.
- Filla, Wilhelm, Ludwig Flaschberger, Franz Pachner & Albert F. Reiterer. 1980. *Der tägliche Abwehrkampf. Kärntens Slowenen*. Vienna: Braumüller.
- Fischer, Gero. 1980. *Das Slowenische in Kärnten. Eine Studie zur Sprachenpolitik*. Klagenfurt: Slowenische Informationscenter.
- Fischer, Roland. 1986. “The bilingual school of the Slovenes in Austria,” *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 7/2: 187-197.
- Flaschberger, Ludwig & Albert F. Reiterer. 1980. *Der tägliche Abwehrkampf. Kärntens Slowenen*. Vienna: Braumüller.
- Gal, Susan. 1987. “Codeswitching and consciousness in the European periphery,” *American Ethnologist* 14: 637-53.
- Galanda, Brigitta, & alii. 1981. *Rechtsextremismus in Österreich nach 1945*. 5th ed., Vienna: Österreichischer Bundesverlag.
- Giles, Howard & Miles Hewstone. 1982. “Cognitive structures, speech, and social situations: Two integrative models,” *Language Sciences* 4/2: 187-219.
- & Patricia Johnson. 1981. “The role of language in ethnic group relations,” 199-243 in J.C. Turner & H. Giles, eds., *Intergroup Behaviour*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- & ----- . 1987. “Ethnolinguistic identity theory: a social psychological approach to language maintenance,” *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 68: 69-79.

- Laura Leets & Nikolas Coupland. 1990. "Minority language group status: A theoretical conspexus," 37-55 in Durk Gorter & alii, eds., *Fourth International Conference on Minority Languages. Volume I: General Papers*. Clevedon, England: Minority Matters.
- Grafenauer, Bogo. 1946. "Narodnostni razvoj na Koroškem od srede 19. stoletja do danes," 117-248 in Grafenauer-alii 1946.
- , Lojze Ude & Maks Veselko, eds. 1946. *Koroški zbornik*. Ljubljana: Državna založba.
- Gudykunst, William B. and Karen L. Schmidt. 1987. "Language and ethnic identity: An overview and prologue," *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 6/3-4: 157-70.
- Haas, Hanns & Karl Stuhlpfarrer. 1977. *Österreich und seine Slowenen*. Vienna: Löcker und Wögenstein.
- Kattinig, Franz. 1978. *sämtlich Slowenen. Versuch einer Dokumentation*. Klagenfurt/Celovec: Slowenische Informationscenter/Slovenski informacijski center.
- Klemenčič, Vladimir. 1984. "Ob petindvajsetletnici zvezne gimnazije za Slovence v Celovcu," 92-94 in Liška 1984.
- Krašovec, Stane, ed. 1987. *Pri slovenski manjšini v Avstriji in Italiji. Poročilo o študijskem potovanju po Avstriji in Italiji zaradi proučevanja problemov v zvezi s slovensko manjšino. Slovene Minorities in Austria and Italy*. Ljubljana: SAZU.
- Kuhar, Brigitte, Peter Oberdammer & Thomas Wiltner. 1992. "Nationale Differenzierung als Ausdruck 'ungleicher Entwicklung' in den urbanen Siedlungen Eisenkappel/Železna Kapla und Ferlach/Borovlje," in Moritsch 1992b; pagination not available.
- Liška, Janko, et al., eds. 1984. *Koroški Slovenci v Avstriji včeraj in danes*. Celovec: Drava.
- Malle, Augustin, ed. 1974. *Die Slovenen in Kärnten. Slovenci na Koroškem. Gegenwärtige Probleme der Kärntner Slovenen. Sodobni problemi koroških Slovencev*. Borovlje/Ferlach: Drava.
- Minnich, Robert G. 1988. "Speaking Slovene - Being Slovene: Verbal codes and collective self-images. Some correlations between Kanalska dolina and Ziljska dolina," *Slovene Studies* 10: 125-147.
- Moritsch, Andreas. 1986. "German nationalism and the Slovenes in Austria between the two world wars," *Slovene Studies* 8: 15-20.
- . 1992a. "'Slovenes' and 'Germans' in Klagenfurt and Ferlach in Southern Carinthia 1830-1940," to appear in *Comparative Studies on Government and Non-Dominant Ethnic Groups 1850-1840* 7; pagination not available.
- , ed. 1992b. *Von Ethnos zur Nationalität. Fallstudien aus Kärnten und dem Burgenland* [= Wiener Beiträge zur Geschichte der Neuzeit, 20]; pagination not available.
- & G. Baumgartner. 1992. "The process of national differentiation within rural communities in Southern Carinthia and Southern Burgenland 1850-1940," to appear in *Comparative Studies on Government and Non-Dominant Ethnic Groups 1850-1840* 8; pagination not available.
- Nečak, Dušan. 1985. *Koroški Slovenci v drugi avstrijski republiki*. Ljubljana: Borec.
- Pleterski, Janko. 1984. "Koroški Slovenci in plebiscit," 34-39 in Liška 1984.
- Pohoryles, Ronald & Heinz Rögl. 1985. "Benachteiligung durch Zweisprachigkeit? Einige empirische Argumente zur Auseinandersetzung um den zweisprachigen Schulunterricht in Kärnten," *Demographische Informationen* (Vienna) 1985: 49-55.
- Priestly, Tom. 1988. "Accelerated grammatical change in Carinthian Slovene: Dialect mixture, or 'linguistic decay'?" *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 30: 62-80 [= Canadian Contributions to the X International Congress of Slavists, Sofia 1988].
- . 1989. "Cultural consciousness and political nationalism: language-choice among Slovenes in Carinthia (Austria)," *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism* 16/1-2: 79-97. [= "Kulturna zavednost in politični nacionalizem. Determinante jezikovne izbire na avstrijskem Koroškem," *Nova revija* (Ljubljana) 69/70: 233-48, Jan.-Feb. 1988].
- . 1990. "'Our dialect sounds stupid': The importance of attitudes to so-called sub-standard language codes as a factor in the (non-)retention of Slovene in Carinthia, Austria," 135-48 in Durk Gorter & alii, eds., *Fourth International Conference on Minority Languages. Volume I: General Papers*. Clevedon, England: Minority Matters.
- Prušnik-Gašper, Karel. 1981. *Gamsi na plazu*. Ljubljana: Borec.
- Reiterer, Alfred F. 1986. *Doktor und Bauer. Ethnischer Konflikt und sozialer Wandel: Die Sozialstruktur der slowenischen Minderheit in Kärnten*. Celovec: Drava.
- Rožman, Gregor. 1925. "Sedanji položaj koroških Slovencev," 142-146 in Valentin Rožič, ed., *Boj za Koroško. Spominska knjižica ob 5-letnici koroškega plebiscita*. Ljubljana: Jug.
- St Clair, Robert N. 1982. "From social history to language attitudes," 164-174 in E.B. Ryan & H. Giles, eds., *Attitudes towards Language Variation*. London: Arnold.

- Singer, Stephan. 1934. *Kultur- und Kirchengeschichte des unteren Rosentales. Dekanat Ferlach. Kappel [= Železna kapla]: Selbstverlag.*
- Stergar, Janez, et alii. 1984. "Kronološki pregled zgodovine koroških Slovencev 1848-1983," 175-283 in Liška 1984.
- Škerl, France. 1946. "Koroška v boju za svobodo," 493-603 in Grafenauer-alii 1946.
- . 1984. "Koroška v narodnoosvobodilnem boju," 50-62 in Liška 1984.
- Unkart, Rolf, Gerold Glantschnig & Alfred Ogris. 1984. *Zur Lage der Slowenen in Kärnten. Die slowenische Volksgruppe und die Wahlkreiseinteilung 1979 - eine Dokumentation.* Klagenfurt: Kärntner Landesarchiv.
- Veiter, Theodor. 1970. *Das Recht der Volksgruppen und Sprachminderheiten in Österreich.* Vienna: Braumüller.
- Verdel, Melhior, ed. 1985. *80 let kulturnega delovanja v Borovljah in okolici. 115-letnica Slovenskega katoliško-konstitucionalnega društva v Borovljah.* Borovlje: Slovensko prosvetno društvo.
- Vodopivec, Peter. 1986. "Commentary: The 1920 Carinthian plebiscite," *Slovene Studies* 8: 21-25.
- Wieser, Feliks. 1984. "Zavedati se moramo celovitosti razvoja naše narodnostne skupnosti," 136-45 in Liška 1984.
- Zorn, Tone. 1984. "Koroški Slovenci v prvi avstrijski republiki," 40-46 in Liška 1984.
- Zwitter, Franci. 1984. "Slovenska gimnazija v Celovcu - najžlahtnejši sad borbe koroških Slovencev," 85-91 in Liška 1984.
- Zwitter, Mirt. 1951. "Izselitev," 17-26 in *Koroška v borbi. Spomini na osvobodilno borbo v Slovenski Koroški.* Celovec: Zveza bivših partizanov Slovenske Koroške.

POVZETEK

VDAJA PRED SIMBOLOM MOČI, ALI ODPOR? KAJ SE DOGAJA Z JEZIKOM DVEH SLOVENSKO GOVOREČIH KOROŠKIH SKUPNOSTI?

Razprava predstavlja poskus kontrastiranja dveh slovenskih manjšinskih krajevnih skupnosti na Koroškem, jezikovne skupnosti vasi Sele, hribovskega naselja kakih 1000 duš, in skupnosti naselbinskega jedra mesteca Borovlje, sosednjega nižinskega centra s kakimi 10,000 prebivalci. Nasprotje je očitno: Seljani, ki po veliki večini govorijo slovensko, so znani po svoji sorazmerno močni manjšinski zavesti, medtem ko je slovensko govorečih meščanov Borovelj komaj 5% celotnega števila prebivalcev, kraj sam pa slovi kot nemško-govoreča skupnost, v kateri so Slovenci prej izjema kot pravilo. V članku avtor razčlenjuje demografske, ekonomske, zgodovinske, vzgojne, upravne in kulturne faktorje, ki pospešujejo ta razvoj in ugotavlja: Okoliščine, ki so prispevale k sorazmerno nagli germanizaciji Borovelj so številne in raznolike, vendar je izredno težko pokazati na one, ki so bile odločilne v tem razvoju. Do točnejših rezultatov bi po avtorjevem mnenju utegnile voditi le podrobne socio-psihološke analize posameznih manjšinskih krajevnih skupnosti na Koroškem in njihovih razvojnih procesov.