

## CONFERENCES AND MEETINGS

*Papers on Slovene Topics*

The Third Polish-American Semiotics Colloquium was held in Warsaw and Puławy, Poland, September 23-26, 1980, co-sponsored by Brown University, Indiana University, Yale University and the University of Warsaw and the Marie Skłodowska-Curie University in Lublin. Among the papers delivered was one utilizing specifically Slovene materials in exemplifying "The Segmentation of Ethnic Culture Texts, the Interpenetration of Verbal and Visual Spheres" by Irene Portis Winner. The ethnic texts discussed were based upon the author's fieldwork in Slovenia and primarily upon recent work in Cléveland among Slovene Americans. The methodological and theoretical focus of the study was provided by an interpretation and application of Lotman's theories of narrative visual-verbal texts such as exist in film, and their segmentation, as well as upon Peirce's concept of the human sign.

The papers of the Conference will be published in a conference volume edited by Professors Pelc, Stankiewicz and T. G. Winner.

From September 25 to 27, 1980, in the main lecture hall of the Universität für Bildungswissenschaften in Klagenfurt, Austria, a conference to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the Carinthia plebiscite (Symposion Kärntner Volksabstimmung 1920/Simpozij Koroške plebiscit 1920) took place. The following papers were presented:

Nationalismus und Nationalismusforschung. Problemstellung und Lösungsansätze. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Monika Glettler  
Columbia University New York-Universität München.

Die südslawische Frage als Prüfstein der inneren Stabilität und der außenpolitischen Aktivität der Habsburgermonarchie. Univ.-Doz. Dr. Istvan Diószegi/  
Ungarische Akademie der Wissenschaften Budapest.

Die Slowenen und die jugoslawische staatliche Einigungsbewegung vor und während des Ersten Weltkrieges. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Janko Pleterski/Universität Ljubljana.

Deutschtum und Deutschnationalismus in Österreich vor 1918. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Jiří Kořalka/Tschechische Akademie der Wissenschaften Prag.

Die nationalen Bestrebungen der Kärntner Slowenen bis zum Zerfall der österreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie 1918. Dr. Auguštín Malle/Slovenski znanstveni inštitut Klagenfurt.

Die jugoslawische Frage auf der Pariser Friedenskonferenz. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Fritz Fellner/Universität Salzburg.

Die Verwaltung in den Abstimmungszonen und die alliierte Kontrolle. Dr. Claudia Fräss-Ehrfeld/Klagenfurt.

Die Haltung der Belgrader Regierung und der jugoslawischen Friedensdelegation zur Kärntner Frage 1919/1920. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Andrej Mitrović/Universität Belgrad.

Jugoslawien und Österreich als Faktoren der italienischen Außenpolitik 1918-1920. Univ.-Ass. Wolfgang Altgeld/Universität Passau.

Der Stellenwert des österreichisch-slowenischen Grenzkonfliktes für die Wiener Regierung 1918-1920. Univ.-Ass. Dr. Arnold Suppan/Universität Wien

Die wirtschaftliche und soziale Lage der Kärntner Slowenen und deren Einfluß auf die Volksabstimmung. Univ.-Ass. Dr. Andreas Moritsch/Universität Wien.

Die Propaganda der "Freien Stimmen" anlässlich der Wahlen und der Kärntner Volksabstimmung. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Vasilij Melik/Universität Ljubljana.

Die Kärntner Volksabstimmung von 1920 im Kontext der österreichischen Nationalitätenstatistik 1880-1934. Dr. Emil Brix/Institut für Österreichkunde Wien.

Volksabstimmungen in Österreich nach 1918 außerhalb Kärntens. Dr. Gottfried Köfner/Internationales Forschungszentrum Salzburg.

Die politischen Kräfteverhältnisse in Kärnten und die politischen Parteien in ihrer Haltung zu den Kärntner Slowenen nach 1920. Univ.-Doz. Dr. Hanns Haas/Universität Salzburg.

Deutsche Volkstumspolitik in Kärnten nach der Volksabstimmung. Univ.-Ass. Dr. Karl Stuhlpfarrer/Universität Wien.

Die Folgewirkungen von Abwehrkampf und Volksabstimmung auf die österreichisch-jugoslawischen Beziehungen seit 1920. Univ.-Doz. Dr. Manfred Rauchensteiner/Heeresgeschichtliches Museum Wien.

Die Kärntner Volksabstimmung im Lichte der neueren Forschung. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Bogo Grafenauer/Universität Ljubljana.

Kärnten 1918-1920: Bilanz der wissenschaftlichen Diskussion zwischen zwei Jubiläen 1970/1980. Dr. Alfred Ogris/Kärntner Landesarchiv Klagenfurt.

"The Illyrian Movement in Croatia," American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, November 6, 1980, Philadelphia, PA.

*Henry R. Cooper, Jr., Northwestern University, "Illyrianism and Slovenia: Prešeren's Role."*

This paper, which is an excerpt from the author's forthcoming monograph, *France Prešeren* (Twayne, 1981), concerns the dual nature of the Illyrian movement in Slovenia during Prešeren's time. On the one hand, the Illyrians' support of national development, vernacular poetry and ethnographic research contributed significantly to Prešeren's own sense of and participation in the Slovene revival. On the other hand, attempts to limit particularly Slovene features in the hope of forging a common South Slavic literary language and culture frustrated and angered him. His later outspoken opposition to Illyrianism and its Croatian promoter, Ljudevit Gaj, was instrumental in the development of an independent Slovene literary tradition.

"Topics in Slovene Linguistics," The American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, November 7, 1980, Philadelphia, PA (sponsored by the Society for Slovene Studies).

Chair: David F. Stermole (Indiana-Purdue/Fort Wayne)

*William W. Derbyshire, Rutgers University, "Foreign Borrowings as Homonyms in Contemporary Slovene"*

This paper constitutes a preliminary investigation into the question of lexical items which have entered Slovene as borrowings from a number of languages and which form homonyms in Slovene. Sources employed include the Academy dictionary, Bezljaj's etymological dictionary and Bunc's dictionary of foreign words. The author concludes that foreign borrowings which become partners of homonymic pairs (1) for the most part enter the language as nouns and (2) form homonyms primarily among themselves rather than with native Slovene words, i.e. homonyms both of whose partners are of Slovene origin tend to result from phonetic neutralizations.

*Herbert Galton, University of Kansas, "The Specific Position of Slovene in the Slavic Verbal Aspect"*

The applicability of a binary morphological opposition along privative lines, transferred from couples like lev - levica to grammatical categories, is specifically denied and the need for new terminology to replace "perfective - imperfective" is not admitted. Semantic and morphological characterization are paralleled. Certain uses like the future meaning of the pv. aspect cannot be explained on the basis of such an alleged opposition, but make good sense if the pv. aspect is taken to render the concept of temporal succession (implying point after point on the time axis, each filled with a different "content"), while the ipv. aspect dialectically reflects the foil or counterpart of this--unchanging states (or repetition, with the same basic characteristic). Various uses of the pv. present like the exemplary, potential and consecutive leave the way open to the future meaning, but not vice versa. The pv. present is inherited from Indo-European only qua present tense form, not with an aspect; this came into being when the imperfectives had been derived.

Slovene occupies a position which is specific in part in that it can use the pv. present not only for typical, recurring events, but also in the (almost) coincidental function discussed previously; furthermore for chapter headings and stage instructions (but the last one occurs also in Czecho-Slovak and Serbo-Croatian). The pv. past can be used to refer both to a single event and to a repeated one, with the proper contextual safeguards, and in this Slovene differs from a number of other Slavic languages. Finally, the bom + l-form, in both aspects, represents a specific Slovene development out of the inherited future perfect, whereas all the other South Slavic languages in this respect share the feature of the Sprachbund, i.e. volitional verb + infinitive.

*Radmila Gorup, Columbia University, "Slovene and Serbo-Croatian Place Systems"*

This paper examines the distributions of those Slovene and Serbo-Croatian case forms which in combination with prepositions participate in messages from which we infer various place relationships. The comparison of these distributions shows certain differences in exploitation of relevant signals. The traditional treatment in terms of government cannot shed any light as to the reason for these differences. According to the rule of government the choice of the case form is automatic, dependent on the presence of a certain preposition in the utterance.

However, in order to answer the question what makes Slovene and Serbo-Croatian different, we have first to answer the pertinent question: What motivates distribution of cases and prepositions? We are not asking why certain cases co-occur with certain prepositions but why certain combinations of case and preposition turn up where they do?

This paper proposes that the distribution of cases and prepositions together, as well as that of cases vis-à-vis prepositions is semantically motivated. The Serbo-Croatian Place System is presented, evaluated both qualitatively and quantitatively and then compared to the Slovene situation. On the basis of this evidence, it is concluded that the distribution of cases and preposition is not arbitrary, as the analysis in terms of government would predict, but motivated. The exploitation of signals stands in direct relationship to messages being communicated.

Slovene and Serbo-Croatian were found to be similar in terms of the semantic substance in which they invest their meanings and in the manner they divide that substance. They differ in precision of these meanings relative to each other.

*Eric P. Hamp, University of Chicago, "Remarks on Bezljaj's Etimološki slovar"*

After outlining the contents of Vol. 1 (1977, A-J), the author of this paper, which comes from an expanded commentary on the Slovar, Vol. 1, under preparation, notes that the Uvod is brief, without specification or discussion of the etymological method employed. The bibliographic basis (in Slavistic, IE, and area--e.g., Friulian--linguistic literature)

is broad and rich, and the citations in articles, despite their severe compression, reflect this. Many articles constitute new and fundamental summations of knowledge and much detail is carefully sifted even where no new solutions are offered. Any criticism must not detract from our basic gratitude; Bezljaj has provided a principal step in Slovene etymology, and scholars impatiently look for the sequel in alphabetical order.

Of all extant dictionaries, Bezljaj's invites comparison with that of Sławski. Some shortcomings, however, can be noted: there are headwords (referred to in article texts) that are lacking (e.g., čésati); exact datings for attestations not singled out for special citation are deficient, by comparison with good European etymological tools. But one should not dwell on omissions.

From etymologies one gets many specimens of cultural semantics and history; there are abundant examples of this in Bezljaj. But, at least equally important, an etymological dictionary is also an index--perverse<sup>ly</sup> alphabetized--to historical grammar. This aspect is underexploited by Bezljaj. The author cites examples of his contention.

There are times when Bezljaj has failed to exploit the unique riches of Slovene which hold the key to basic Slavic and far-reaching solutions. An example of this (which the author expounds in detail) is the entry čētvr̂r̂, the collective numeral, deficiently explicated by Berneker, Trautmann, and Endzelins inter alios, attested archaically in the sixteenth century (Krelj) zhetuero. Here, and only in Slovene, one finds distinctively the exact equivalent of Skt. catvāram (v. Meillet Introduction, p. 411), the reflex of IE (k<sup>w</sup>etuero-m, which is in fact just the formation which one would predict by rule for an IE thematic derived from a numeral (or non-verb)--in this case the cardinal (nom.) \*k<sup>w</sup>etuor-es.

Discussant: Rado L. Lencek, Columbia University

"Twentieth Century Slovene Political and Social Development,"  
The American Association for the Advancement of Slavic  
Studies, November 8, 1980, Philadelphia, PA (sponsored by the  
Society for Slovene Studies)

Chair: Bogdan Novak, University of Toledo

*Carole Rogel, The Ohio State University, "Some Preliminary Thoughts on Writing About the Career of Edvard Kardelj"*

Edvard Kardelj's political career in Yugoslavia spanned four turbulent decades. A Slovene communist, he was a close associate of Tito's during the Partisan resistance and the confrontation with the Cominform in 1948/49. Some of the key policy decisions made at the time had significant input from Kardelj. He held a variety of important positions in the government until his death in 1979 but no doubt his greatest contribution to post-World War II Yugoslavia was as theoretician. The leading components of Yugoslav socialism are "self-management" and "non-alignment" in foreign policy; both concepts are defended and developed in a voluminous corpus of writings by Kardelj.

This paper outlines the kinds of themes that might be pursued in relation to Kardelj's career. It also discusses sources, some of them only recently published, e.g. Štefka Bulovec, Bibliografija Edvarda Kardelja, Založba Komunist, 1980, which will be indispensable to the Kardelj scholar. The paper also notes that there is still little of a scholarly nature written about Kardelj -- the most important exceptions being evaluations by Slovene historians of Kardelj's book, Razvoj slovenskega narodnega vprašanja (see Zgodovinski časopis, Vol. 24, 1970, pp. 312-33; Zgodovinski časopis, Vol. 33, no. 4, 1979, pp. 531-570).

*Mary Molek, Dover, Delaware, "Louis Adamic: Political Activist"*

The pro-Titoist sentiment in a faction of American Slovenes can be attributed in large part to the political activities of Louis Adamic. He was first introduced to American Slovenes by Ivan Molek, editor of the Chicago Slovene daily, Prosveta, by reprinting Adamic's translation of Yugoslav Proverbs, published by E. Haldeman-Julius, of Girard, Kansas. Adamic early showed a flair for hyperbole and a fascination for the far Left in politics, and an indifference to accurate documentation. Laughing in the Jungle, Dynamite, Struggle, "The Bohunks," were some of his titles, implying approbation of this pejorative in the latter against the Slavs. He falsely substituted himself as hero in some incidents of Slovene homeland heroism by a namesake.

Adamic's penchant for sensationalism found fertile ground with the advent of Hitler's nazism and Stalin's

communism. Of a sudden, Adamic began to muster enthusiasm in promoting organizations of American Slovenes in the interests of Titoism, through the columns of their press and by telegrams to American Slovene leaders. Adamic became the pivot in numerous Slav organizations which he flooded with Stalinist and Titoist propagandistic material, especially after the split between Tito and Mihailovich. He called meetings, wrote, and gave speeches in Slovene, after many years of disclaiming that he had forgotten the language completely. An initial organization, S.A.N.S., presaging cooperation between clerical and non-clerical factions, long separated by rifts, disintegrated under the militant actions of Adamic, its honorary president.

Adamic's influence prevailed upon all the Slovene American press. He brooked no opposition to the Tito line, and crushed all opponents who opposed this viewpoint. This eventually also reached Ivan Molek, Prosveta editor for nearly thirty years, and forced his resignation. Adamic's activities were cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities, which also included the Slovene National Benefit Society, the largest Slovene fraternal organization (1949). Libel action was brought against the three official publications of S.A.N.S.: Enakopravnost, Prosveta, and Proletarec, settled after retraction and apology. Documentation of this material is detailed in Ivan Molek's memoirs, Slovene Immigrant History, 1890-1950.

Discussant: Joseph Velikonja, University of Washington

"The Slovene Economy in the Eighties," American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, November 8, 1980, Philadelphia, PA. (Sponsored by the Society for Slovene Studies)

Chair: Warren F. Mazek, Florida State University

*Toussaint Hocevar, University of New Orleans, "Structural Transformations in the Economy of Slovenia"*

This paper focuses on recent structural transformations within the manufacturing sector as measured by changes in employment in principal manufacturing industries. Service industries and energy supplies are examined from the point of view of their effects on the manufacturing sector.



Although Slovenia is relatively capital-endowed, her industrial specialization is in labor-intensive manufactures. However, the growth of labor-intensive production is being constrained by increasing costs of labor and by competition of low-wage developing countries in export markets. During the 1974-79 period the employment growth of principal manufacturing industries reflected a slight bias in favor of labor-intensive industries, but the main determinant of employment growth was value added per worker.

Reorientation toward technologically sophisticated product lines would necessitate an increased share of university graduates in the work force. The projection of the number of new university graduates based on existing university and gymnasium enrollment favors such development. However, current balance of payments problems may retard the transition from labor-intensive to technology-intensive production. Investment in modern highways and research and development is likely to have substantial positive effects on overall productivity, with negligible direct negative effects on foreign exchange reserves.

*Frank Orazem, Kansas State University, "The Role of Agriculture in the Slovene Economy"*

Postwar Slovenia's agricultural development did not follow the "natural economic path." The changes in postwar Slovenia were abrupt and were created by government fiat. The abruptness of change in postwar Slovenia's agriculture changed farming technology less than it did the number of people making a living in agriculture. In 1939 nearly 70% of the economically active population was engaged in agriculture, but the percentage dropped to 37% in 1965 and to less than 20% in 1980.

The large exodus of labor from agriculture was much more rapid than the inflow of capital needed to substitute for the labor. Thus in comparison with the needs and potentialities, improvements in land use in postwar Slovenia have been modest. While the performance of Slovenia's agriculture, judged by crop yields, shows considerable improvement because of new varieties, more intensive use of commercial fertilizers, and converting marginal arable land to grasses, pastures or leaving it idle, the same yields when placed in their European context appear less remarkable.

Although Slovenia is still predominantly a land of private farmers, policy and decision makers have continued

to believe that the socialized sector would in the near future triumph over the "obsolescent" private farms. But favoritism shown to the socialized sector may have been shortsighted. Unless the policies designed to raise the general level of the private agricultural sector are adopted and implemented rapidly, the farming sector may well impede the country's overall economic progress.

Agriculture remains the problem child of the Slovene economy. The governmental attitude and policies neglecting the farmer have in a sense demoralized agriculture. The government has rejected the "natural economic path" to agriculture's development in the belief that building up the private farming sector would strengthen capitalism. Continuation of present policies, however, may pose a greater challenge to the future growth and development of Slovenia's economy than the efforts directed to making private agriculture sector more economically viable.

Discussants: Anthony Stemberger, Pennsylvania State University  
Robert Raunikar, University of Georgia

#### *Future Conferences*

October 1981. The American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies will meet in Monterey, CA. The following panels have been proposed by the Society for Slovene Studies:

#### Problems in Slovene Medieval Historiography

"A Music Manuscript Fragment from Medieval Slovenia."  
Metod M. Milac (Syracuse University)

"The Controversy about Kosezi (Edling/er/s) in Slovene Historiography." Bogdan C. Novak (University of Toledo)

"The Concept of a 'Great Carantania' in Medieval Slovene History." Rado L. Lencek (Columbia University)

#### Slovenes in America -- The First 100 Years

Joseph D. Dwyer (Hoover Institute, Stanford University)  
Bogdan Raditsa (Fairleigh Dickinson University)  
Joseph Velikonja (University of Washington)