

the author for the first time. Among all the monographs and papers dealing with the Slovene dialects of Carinthia, Karničar's description of the Obirsko dialect is not only the most extensive, but also the most original.

Gerhard Neweklowsky, University of Klagenfurt.

NOTE

1. Titles of sections, chapters, etc. are here all translated into English.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviation: ÖAW = Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Hafner, Stanislaus, & Erich Prunč. 1980. *Lexikalische Inventarisierung der slowenischen Volkssprache in Kärnten*. Graz: Institut für Slawistik.

Jarnik, Urban. 1842. "Obraz slovenskoga narčja u Koruškoj," *Kolo* 1: 41-57.

Pleteršnik, Maks. 1894. *Slovensko-nemški slovar*, 2 vols. Ljubljana [reprint: Ljubljana, Cankarjeva založba, 1974].

Prunč, Erich, Stanislaus Hafner & alii. 1982a. *Schlüssel zum "Thesaurus der slowenischen Volkssprache in Kärnten"*. Vienna: Verlag der ÖAW.

-----, -----, & alii. 1982b. *Thesaurus der slowenischen Volkssprache in Kärnten. Band I*. Vienna: Verlag der ÖAW.

-----, -----, & alii. 1987. *Thesaurus der slowenischen Volkssprache in Kärnten. Band II*. Vienna: Verlag der ÖAW.

Ramovš, Fran. 1935. *Historična gramatika slovenskega jezika. VII. Dialekti*. Ljubljana: Učiteljska tiskarna.

Heinz-Dieter Pohl, *Kleine Kärntner Mundartkunde mit Wörterbuch*. Klagenfurt: Heyn, 1989. 174 pages; maps, tables. ISBN 3-85366-545-4.

Heinz-Dieter Pohl's *Concise Carinthian Dialect Study with Dictionary* is of interest to scholars concerned with the Slovene language for three reasons. First, the historical development of Slovene (as spoken in most of the Slovene lands) has necessarily, because of the political and social circumstances, been a history involving contact with, influence from and reaction to varieties of Germanic, and especially the Bavarian dialects which have Kärntnerisch (Carinthian German) as one of their modern offshoots: the better we know how these dialects' history and structure, the better we can assess the contact, the influence and the reaction. More important, second, linguists working in Carinthia must necessarily face the complex results of the much more extreme forms of this linguistic contact that have been imposed, especially in recent times, on the Slovene dialects there, and for this an understanding of Kärntnerisch is essential; and the literature on this dialect has not been extensive, and additions to it are welcome. Third, there are two sections in the book of direct relevance to Slovene linguistics. This review will discuss those sections only.

In section 1.4 (pp. 16-22), "Exkurs: Zum Kärntner Slowenischen," Pohl treats three aspects of Carinthian Slovene.

First, he discusses the territorial extent of Slovene, both in former times and today, and describes the extent to which German has replaced Slovene in the province. His presentation is clear, his data well-chosen, his map of the historical extent of Slovene striking (if

far too small), and his formulations generally objective and beyond reproach. In one instance, however, issue must be taken with his choice of words. Having correctly¹ described the development in Carinthia of the German term “Windisch” from the general meaning ‘the Slavic language spoken by Slovenes’ to the more specific meaning ‘the non-literary language-varieties spoken by Slovenes,’ he states (17): “It is quite defensible (*vertretbar*) to use the term “Windisch” for the indigenous Carinthian Slovene dialects, but is incorrect to wish to see in “Windisch” a language that is different from Slovene” [my translations here and below, TMSP]. Of these two statements, the second is unexceptionable; but the first is unfortunate. However objective German-speakers may think they are when they use the term “Windisch” for Carinthian Slovene dialects, indeed however well-meaning they may be, the fact remains that nowadays very many Carinthian Slovenes feel that the term is pejorative; and it is also sadly true that in the speech of some Germanophones the term is indeed utilized in order to deliberately disparage. Given this fact, all German-speakers who do not use the term derogatorily have no choice, in good conscience, but to accept that it can be understood as derogatory, and hence to renounce its use; this use may be logically, but is not morally, defensible. Elsewhere (e.g., 1982, 1990), Pohl has shown commendable fairness in his writings on Carinthian Slovene and the term “Windisch;” this lapse is uncharacteristic. —In another instance, Pohl reports as a fact what is really unproven: having correctly pointed out that the diminution in Slovene language-use has been caused by Slovene speakers’ conversion to German rather than by any real reduction in their numbers, he states (21) that this conversion has been caused “less by ‘assimilatory pressure,’ as is always asserted, than by the decline in the rural population...” This remains, however, to the best of my knowledge, a hypothesis which remains to be demonstrated; and, in any case, presupposes that the two factors are competing, whereas, surely, assimilation affects urbanized Slovenophones as well as non-urbanized ones. Also, the two maps that are included to show the extent of German vs. Slovene origin of place-names in Carinthia (19-20) are not only confusingly captioned, but seem to be identical.

Second, Pohl describes the major dialect divisions of Carinthian Slovene: the Ziljsko, Rožansko, Podjursko and Remšeniško dialect-groups (this latter being represented by Obirsko, see Neweklowksy’s review of Karničar above), and sketches their antiquity and some of their characteristic features. This section is very short and deserved a map in its own right (rather than both of the two just mentioned).

Third, he lists eight instances of Slovene ‘direct or indirect’ influence on Kärntnerisch (21). Given the traditional insistence on the German influence on both dialectal and literary Slovene, any presentation of data demonstrating that the centuries of language contact have resulted also in Slovene influence on German, especially in a German-language textbook, is welcome. Pohl’s is however a not altogether satisfactory list: it includes two phenomena which are (in my opinion) questionable; and it excludes some phenomena that are surely much more probably to be ascribed to Slovene influence. The two *questionable inclusions* are (a) the phonemic merger of /x/ and /h/, and (b) the loss of prepositions in expressions of direction and location.

Ascription of the former to Slovene influence may seem superficially plausible, given that some Carinthian Slovene dialects have only the fricative /x/ and not the aspirate /h/, and that in many of these and other dialects /x/ has [x] and [h] as allophonic variants in similar environments to Kärntnerisch [x]/[h] = /x/. Neweklowsky (1989: 207-08), however, ascribes the allophonic distribution in Carinthian Slovene to the influence of Kärntnerisch, i.e., to an effect in the opposite direction, and further states that Slovene influence

on the Kärntnerisch merger is possible (“... kann ... übernommen worden sein”) but no more. The question is a tricky one, especially because the precise distribution of these sounds in many of the Carinthian Slovene dialects remains to be properly described. Most important here is the fact that central (Rož) dialects also have a /h/-phoneme, and that they developed it (from */g/) early in the Middle Ages, probably not long after the main Germanic population influx into Carinthia; even though some of these dialects show neutralization of the /h/ : /x/ opposition, they could hardly have exerted enough influence on Kärntnerisch to effect a merger between these two phonemes; and note that Celovec/Klagenfurt, a probable centre for innovations, was formerly surrounded by Rož dialects. All in all, this particular (and typologically improbable?) instance of Slovene influence requires further demonstration, and should have been included in Pohl’s list (if at all) with a qualifier such as “perhaps.”

The second-named phenomenon, which is described in more detail on p. 64, also seems unlikely: granted, some early Slavic dialects/languages did have a prepositionless expression of *location*; but not only does there seem to have been no early Slavic prepositionless expression of *direction*, but the development of the contemporary system, whereby prepositions are obligatory with the locative case, was extremely early, especially in South-West Slavic.² On the other hand, later developments of prepositionless expressions of both location and direction have been noted, particularly in Sorbian (where some German/Slavic ‘interference’ may also be assumed).³ Nevertheless, the loss of prepositions in specific types of phrase in Germanic dialects under the influence of Slavic dialects which were presumably accruing prepositions in similar, but semantically non-identical types of phrase, is improbable and hence requires demonstration.

As for *important omissions* from the list: Pohl quotes Neweklowsky (1985), but Pohl’s list of Slovene elements in Kärntnerisch is much shorter than Neweklowsky’s. Three items, in particular, might have been added by Pohl: the masculinization of neuters; the use of the verb ‘to be’ with certain verbs in the preterite, e.g., *i’ pin k’šlafn*; and the use of *niks* rather than *nit* to mean ‘not.’ Further items could have been mentioned, cf. Neweklowsky (1985), Prunč (1979). Also of interest here are ‘convergent developments’, among which Pohl mentions the development of the interrogative particle *a* (but note that whereas on p. 21 this is listed as a result of Slovene influence, on p. 67 the Romance origin of the particle is given precedence).

The second section of interest to the Slovene linguist is the lexical one. Preceding the 71-page dictionary (84-155), which in itself is of much value for lexical stocktaking in Slovene dialects, Pohl has two smaller sections, one on Romance borrowings into Kärntnerisch (66-77), the second on Slavic ones (77-82); note that the former list is the longer one. The borrowings from Slavic are categorized into those from Slovene, those from Pre-Slovene and from other Slavic languages, and German-Slovene lexical hybrids. Further, each entry is furnished with symbols if it is archaic, not now understood, or in general use. This is an extremely informative and useful list.

The book is extremely clearly laid out: phonology, morphophonology, morphology, syntax and lexis are in turn described lucidly and furnished with very useful examples and, where necessary, tables. Cross-references to relevant sections, and references to detailed descriptions of individual sections, are provided. Furthermore, following the dictionary Pohl provides a very interesting selection of texts (156-67), including the sentences and phrases that correspond to the so-called “Wenker-Sätze und -Phrasen”, which were collected in Carinthia in the interwar years for the *Deutscher Sprachatlas*.⁴ In general, and if the German data are reliable (which I cannot judge), Pohl’s book can be warmly recommended to any linguist who needs to know something about Kärntnerisch.

NOTES

1. See Lencek (1990).
2. The prepositionless locative of location occurs in Old Church Slavic, Old Russian and Old Czech, mostly with toponyms (which is, indeed, identical to the usage in Kärnterisch; but this is surely a coincidence, ascribable to independent 'local marking' perhaps) and very occasionally with nouns such as *město* 'place' (see Bauer 1963); I can find no reference to any early Slavic prepositionless accusative of direction. Of the earliest texts from South-West Slavic, the Codex Marianus has one dubious example of prepositionless locatives and the Glagolita Clozianus has no examples. As for the Freising Fragments, they contain no toponyms; there are three expressions of location in physical places, all in Fragment No. 2, namely "u circuvah" (in churches, 35), "utimnizah" (in prisons, 52) and "v vosich" (in chains, 54), all with the preposition /w/ (Pogačnik 1968).
3. Stone (1987) reviews the available evidence and concludes that a prepositionless locative, as a distinct morphological category, obtains extensively in both Upper and Lower Sorbian.
4. Questionnaires were sent out to schools with the request that the forty *Wenkersätze* be translated into the local dialect. The prime objective was to collect German data, but it happens that in a few cases the words and sentences were translated into local dialects of other languages. The materials in Slovene dialect collected in this way from twelve Carinthian-Slovene villages are now being prepared for publication, with commentary, by Stone & Priestly (in prep.).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bauer, Jaroslav. 1963. "Bespredložnyj lokativ v staroslavjanskem jazyke," 263-85 in Josef Kurz, ed., *Issledovanija po sintaksisu staroslavjanskogo jazyka*. Prague: Československá akademie věd.
- Lencek, R.L. 1990. "The terms 'Wende - Winde, Wendisch - Windisch' in the historiographic tradition of the Slovene lands," *Slovene Studies* 12/1: 99-97.
- Neweklowsky, G.N. 1985. "Slowenische Elemente im Kärntner Deutsch," *Die Brücke* (Klagenfurt) 1985/3: 33-38; = "Slovenski elementi v koroški nemščini," *Celovški zvon* 3/8 (1985) 17-24.
- , 1989. "Slowenisch und Deutsch in Kärnten: phonetische Gemeinsamkeiten," 203-11 in Franc Jakopin, ed., *Zbornik razprav iz slovanskega jezikoslovja Tinetu Logarju ob sedemdesetletnici*. Ljubljana: SAZU.
- Pogačnik, Jože, ed. 1968. *Freisinger Denkmäler. Brižinzki spomeniki. Monumenta Feisingensia*. Munich: Trofenik.
- Pohl, Heinz Dieter. 1982. "Linguistische Aspekte der Zweisprachigkeit in Kärnten," 35-53 in Willibald I. Holzer & alii [= Arbeitsgemeinschaft Volksgruppenfrage]. 1982. *Kein einzig Volk von Brüdern. Studien zum Mehrheiten-/Minderheitenproblem am Beispiel Kärntens*. Vienna: Verlag für Gesellschaftskritik.
- , 1990. "Die Slowenen in Kärnten," *Die slawischen Sprachen* 21: 115-40.
- Prunč, Erich. *Zum Problem sprachlicher Interferenzen im bilingualen Gebiet in Kärnten*. Klagenfurt/Celovec: Zveza slovenskih izobražencev.
- Stone, Gerald. 'Serbski lokativ bjez prepozicije,' *Lětopis Instituta za serbski ludospyt*, Rjad A - řešespyt 34 (1987) 11-18.
- Stone, Gerald & Priestly, Tom. "Carinthian Slovene data from the archives of the 'Deutscher Sprachatlas.'" to appear in *Oxford Slavonic Papers*.