

BOOK REVIEWS

Jože Toporišič. Glasovna in naglasna podoba slovenskega jezika. Maribor: Obzorja, 1978. 343 pp.

In the twenty-year period 1957-1978 Jože Toporišič published at least one hundred books and articles on the structure of the Slovene language. The book under review is a selection from his articles on phonetics, phonology, morphophonology and stylistics. In all, 29 articles are (wholly or partly) reproduced here; six of these are printed in two separate excerpts, resulting in a total of 35 items (actually, only 34 are given in the kazalo, 342-43: a one-page item on the sound /dž/, p. 73, is omitted). The items range in length from one-page pieces to those which cover 38 pages.

This is a book for the specialist rather than the general reader: the latter will probably find the corresponding section of Toporišič's Slovenska slovnica (Maribor: Obzorja, 1976), viz., pp. 31-88: "Glasoslovje," quite enough to cope with; there are, however, some five pieces here which are aimed at the non-specialist, appearing as they originally did as radio broadcast transcripts (Jezi-kovni pogovori II, Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 1967). The specialist will usually own or have access to the journals in which most of these items first appeared, namely Jezik in slovstvo (10 items), Slavistična revija (7 items), etc.; some very important items are however welcome, since they first appeared in sources of less easy access (e.g., "Vokalizem moščanskega govora v brežiškem Posavju," Dolenjski zbornik, Novo mesto, 1961), or because their source may have escaped the specialist's attention (e.g., "Razločevalna obremenitev slovenskih prozodičnih parametrov," to appear in a collection of papers from a conference in Prague in 1977). Moreover, two items are translated from Serbo-Croatian, and two from German. All in all, the specialist will surely be very glad to have all these materials brought together in one language and in one place.

The collection is arranged as follows: first, 18 articles on segmental(morpho-)phonology ("Glasovna podoba slovenskega knjižnega jezika (in moščanskega govora)"). 7-178; next, 15 on suprasegmental (morpho-)phonology ("Naglasna podoba slovenskega knjižnega jezika," 179-320); finally, two pieces on language codification ("Norma in predpis,"

321-338.) In a short concluding spremna beseda Toporišič provides a few summary views, which could better perhaps have served as an introduction to the book. The author's comments in this spremna beseda form a useful framework for a review of the book, which must necessarily be dealt with here in toto rather than article by article. He has five important comments.

First, he regrets the exclusion from this collection of substantial work in three fields: orthography; suprasegmental morphophonology in many grammatical areas; and sentence phonetics/phonology. I would suggest that he is a little too self-critical here: these matters are discussed --albeit not extensively--in many of the articles.

Second, Toporišič emphasizes the importance of those aspects of his articles which have been critical of widely-held views, especially the views of many of the standard authorities; and points out that his criticisms have been both theoretical and practical. This aspect of his writings is of great historiographical interest, since they span the period from when his criticisms could almost be termed iconoclastic to the present, when his authoritativeness is widely recognized. In this context, it is interesting to compare his articles of the late 50's and early 60's, where he criticizes the recognized grammars, pravopisi, etc., of the day (especially the Slovenska slovnica by A. Bajec, M. Rupel and R. Kolarič of 1956), with his later works: the former mostly involve lists of officially promulgated inaccuracies, vaguenesses and errors, whereas the latter can afford the space for comments of substance and depth. In "Pretnes glasoslovja tradicionalne slovnice" (7-13, first published in 1962) for example, he deplores the lack of linguistic progress since Breznik, even since Škrabec; if we consider his own and other linguists' writings of recent years, however, we can see how much this state of affairs has been remedied. In "Predvidljivost razvrstitve glasov ..." (88-103, first published in 1965) he wrote, "... iz tega prispevka se vidi, kako veliko problemov je v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku še nerešenih, kolikšne naloge čakajo redke sloveniste ..."; the fact that some of these problems are nearer their solution fifteen years later is due in no small part to his efforts.

Third, Toporišič points out the great importance which he gives to data-orientation and to a reliance on factual statistical bases. This emphasis is excellently illustrated

in two of the articles in the book: "Ankete za določitev kolikosti in kakovosti naglašene samoglasnika" (74-82, first published in 1969), and "Naglas pogovornega nedoločnika" (201-03, first published in 1966). In both, he attacks these 'unsolved problems' by recourse to factual material, since it is clear that theoretical arguments and reference to older authorities will not provide a solution. It is quite apparent that Toporišič makes every effort to balance the demands both of prescription and of description--a task which, in the context of Standard Slovene, is extremely daunting.

Fourth, he expresses his gladness that his work in these areas over twenty years can be seen to fit together, "kamen na kamen," to provide a total picture of the phonology of Slovene, and without any substantive corrections even to his works of the late 50's. I can find no fault with this assessment, but would only point out that some of the building blocks in this pictorial edifice are of much greater significance than others--in particular, his work on experimental phonetics: "Samoglasniški formanti slovenskega knjižnega jezika" (122-40, first published 1975) and "Liki slovenskih tonemov" (263-99, first published 1968) are especially noteworthy, and form a remarkable complement to his work on morphophonology and to his excellent critical histories of earlier work (e.g., especially, "Pojmovanje tonemskosti slovenskega jezika" [225-62, first published 1967]).

Fifth, Toporišič expresses the hope that his work will serve as a source for future published work in the area of Slovene phonology, and for writers of textbooks and students' manuals. The latter can certainly not ignore his work except at the risk of derisive results (cf. Toporišič's review of Vincenot's *Essai de grammaire slovène*, Ljubljana, 1975, published recently in *Slavistična revija* 27, 2 [1979], pp. 262-90). As for future work on Slovene phonology at the scholarly level, particular note must be made of the kinds of variation referred to in "Stilna vrednost glasovnih variant slovenskega knjižnega jezika" (173-80, first published 1973) and "Stilna zaznamovanost pri naglasu" (315-20, also first published 1973): in these short pieces, various styles are described--"innovative" vs. "archaic," "elevated" and "precious" vs. "colloquial" and "less cultivated," "artificial," "hypercorrect," "dialectal" and so on--without some attention to the problem of variation, future work will be all the poorer.

I have specific criticisms to make with respect to just two of the articles in this book. It is to be understood that in neither case is the article, as a whole, greatly disadvantaged by the one or two faults that I wish to point out.

First, "Vokalizem moščanskega govora v brežiškem Posavju" (141-63), although somewhat out of place because of its subject matter, is firm testimony to the pioneering worth of Toporišič's research, there being such a relative dearth of sound phonetic descriptions of individual Slovene dialects (this comment was especially true for the early 60's when the article first appeared). The author's aim is to provide an up-to-date description from both synchronic and diachronic viewpoints, and in the main his aim is fulfilled (although there is e.g. no synchronic statement concerning the lack of phonemic pitch). My criticism concerns his treatment of the two sounds [ö] and [ü]. First, in the synchronic section, he states that these are allophones of one phoneme, but (a) he gives no synchronic formulation of their distribution, and (b) he mixes diachronic and synchronic data together. Second, it is apparent that the two sounds are in fact virtually phonemic; and in the diachronic section, he provides the contrasting pair [kölku] vs. [žbülka]. It is true that this is not the exact minimal pair which would prove the phonemic status of the two sounds; and his formulation ("Navedeni odnos ... že nakazuje možnost fonemizacije obeh alofonov, čeprav čistega nasprotja ne morem navesti") is in itself unobjectionable. Nevertheless, the close environmental similarity of the two cited forms would be enough for most phonologists (those who admit the existence of phonemes, at any rate) to allot the two sounds phonemic status, since it can hardly be argued that the difference in quality between the two vowels is dependent on any phonetic elements in these environments.

Second, in "Samoglasniški formanti ..." I can, again, find no fault with the greater part of the article. I would however quarrel with his list of distinctive features for the vowel phonemes of Slovene (p. 139). These features, if tabulated in the normal way, would provide the following matrix:

	a	ə	ɔ	ε	o	e	u	i
compact	+	-	-	-				
diffuse		-			-	-	+	+
grave		-	+		+		+	
acute		-		+		+		+

The blank spaces on a matrix of this kind are understood to be such that they can be automatically filled in with plus and minus signs according to predictable measures. Indeed, for /a u i/ this requirement is satisfied, with the result that /a/ is -diffuse, -grave, -acute; /u/ is -compact, -acute; and /i/ is -compact, -grave. Further, for /ə/ there are no blanks to be filled in. When the mid vowels /ɔ ε o e/ are considered, however, one problem emerges: for the most reasonable labels which can be specified for these four vowels result in the following mini-matrix:

	ɔ	ε	o	e
compact	-	-	-	-
diffuse	-	-	-	-
grave	+	-	+	-
acute	-	+	-	+

The result: there is no difference in the specification for each of the phonemic pairs /ɔ o/ and /ε e/--a problem which can be solved only by the use of a fifth feature to make this distinction (e.g., the feature tense, as used by Rado L. Lencek in his Verb Pattern of Contemporary Standard Slovene, Wiesbaden, 1966, page 7; I find Lencek's specifications at fault in another particular--his /ə/ is incompletely specified).

An alternative approach, which would obviate the use of the fifth distinctive feature, would involve labelling /ɔ ε/ as +compact, to differentiate them from the obviously

-compact /o e/. Not only would this solution be somewhat at odds with the phonetic facts, however (and it is the phonetic facts that form the basis for the article in question), but in addition /a/ would have to be non-predictably specified as -grave, -acute to distinguish it, in turn, from /o e/. Of the solutions, the one involving tenseness (or a similar feature) is probably closer to the phonetic data; the choice of solution depends of course on the linguist's aim and on his theoretical standpoint.

These few criticisms are not to be considered in any way serious ones. Toporišič's book is eloquent proof of his contributions to the phonetics, phonology and morpho-phonology of Slovene over the twenty years in question. To conclude, I can do no better than quote from his own Slovenska slovnica of 1976 (p. 5): "Slovenski jezikoslovje je lahko tvorno le kot del vsega drugega jezikoslovja: vsi smo v tem enem." Glasovna in naglasna podoba slovenskega jezika only emphasizes the truth of the statement.

Tom M. S. Priestly
The University of Alberta

Materialien zum Curriculum der West- und Südslawischen Linguistik Nr. 3: Texte zur Geschichte der serbokroatischen und slowenischen Sprache, ed. G. Freidhof (Frankfurt am Main: Kubon und Sagner, 1979) (Slovene section, pp. 111-167).

This is a reprint of pp. 7-68 from Srednjeveško slovetvo (Jože Pogačnik, ed., Izbrano delo [Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 1972]); the only difference is that Pogačnik's translation of the Freising Fragments into Modern Slovene has been omitted. For the historical linguist, and for instructors of courses dealing with medieval texts, this is a great disappointment, since the texts in Pogačnik's collection are all in a normalized transcription: the necessity, the interest (and the fun) of reading the texts in the original spellings is thus lost. (Freidhof follows no consistent plan in these Materialien: half of his Polish texts are in their original spelling, virtually none of his Czech ones, and about one-third of his Serbo-Croatian ones).

Tom M. S. Priestly
The University of Alberta