

Gero Fischer, *Das Slowenische in Kärnten. Bedingungen der sprachlichen Sozialisation. Eine Studie zur Sprachenpolitik*. Klagenfurt/Celovec: Slowenische Informationscenter/Slovenski informacijski center, 1980. 314 pp.

In attempting to review this interesting, annoying, informative and confusing book, this reviewer has to admit to mixed feelings. Any linguist who gets involved, as he has, with a minority linguistic community (like the one in Carinthia) which is on the defensive against encroachments from the majority language in its area, is bound to have his sympathies attracted to both the minority language and its speakers, and indeed to those who campaign for its retention, however extreme some of their views may be. It is difficult, therefore, not to sympathize with an author such as Fischer [henceforth: GF] who, although stating that his aim is “[diesen] Sprachkonflikt möglichst umfassend zu beschreiben” (14-15), is clearly a proponent of the minority viewpoint and therefore partial. On the other hand, given the extremes of opinion that affect the Carinthian linguistic situation, one has to regret the rhetoric that characterizes parts of this book, the rhetoric that accompanies much of the available writing on the subject (cf. Thomas M. Barker’s remark, “Until roughly two decades ago . . . polemics . . . predominated. Indeed emotional overtones still creep into serious studies,” 1979:125.) GF clearly set the tone for his book by beginning his *Einleitung* (16) with the tendentious (and hardly pertinent) question: “Im Jahre 1943 feierte Kärnten seine 1200-jährige Eingliederung ins Reich, 1976 hatte es gerade seinen 1000-jährigen Geburtstag geschafft. Wie alt wird dann wohl Kärnten in 100 Jahren sein?” (16).—In the present-day Carinthian situation, we probably must simply accept the fact that dispassionate studies are the exception, that partiality is necessarily the rule. It is in this context, then, that we accept GF’s statement that his purpose is an objective one: “ich setze mir in dieser Arbeit zum Ziel . . . die Realität aufzuspüren, oder zumindest ihr näher zu kommen” (17).

In addition, this reviewer must admit to being an outsider, who might require perhaps six years’ residence to begin to understand the complexities of this very complicated situation, but has spent less than six months all told in Carinthia; a linguist with none of the training (in law, history, sociology or political science) that is essential to that task, who has been immersed in dialectal fieldwork and has deliberately avoided political involvement; a foreigner who may never be able to share in the profound emotions that characterize this “language conflict”; a reviewer, therefore, who must restrict his criticism of GF’s book to those pages that treat strictly linguistic matters. Everything that is political must be left to others.

The book itself is, indeed, much more *sprachpolitisch* (and simply *politisch*) than it is *sprachwissenschaftlich*. The 302 pages of actual text fall into two parts: GF's own composition (11-187) and the *Anhang* (188-309). The latter, after a brief introduction by the author, consists entirely of documentation (whose representativeness this reviewer can not assess): the texts of various federal Austrian and provincial Carinthian laws and ordinances, or memoranda and open letters, of school curricula, and so forth. The first part of the book, too, contains a wealth (a superabundance, indeed) of illustrative material: very lengthy quotations, tables, lists, pictures, reproductions of correspondence, maps, and a bibliography, totalling some 85 pages. This leaves about 90 pages that were actually written by GF; and it is just some of these that discuss matters of direct linguistic interest.

Before addressing these matters, however, one awkward question must be resolved. Informed readers of the above paragraphs may have noticed a deliberate avoidance of a label for the minority language in Carinthia. The reason is that two labels are current, and the adoption of either is immediately interpreted by many Carinthians as a symbol of political allegiance. It may also be said that "to label is to libel." The naive outsider who uses the term "Carinthian Slovene" for the simple and traditional reason that an unstandardized language-variety is identified by the term applied to its geographically closest standard, does not at first realize that, by so doing, he labels himself (in the view of many Carinthians) as any or all of the following: a supporter of the cause of retention for the minority language; an opponent of the unity of Carinthia; a proponent of closer links, and/or cultural unity, and/or political unification with Slovenia; even a "Tito-Kommunist." The only current alternative to this label is also extremely "loaded," namely, the term "Windisch." One of GF's most useful sections, for this reviewer, is the short passage headed *Exkurs: Die Windischtheorie(n)* (39-41), where he concisely yet convincingly traces the semantic development of this word, particularly its elaboration into a politically tendentious term in the 1930's. Many speakers of the minority language-variety consider the term pejorative, since it, similarly, labels the person who uses it as being some or all of: a supporter of Carinthian unity; a proponent of German-speaking nationalism; a person who believes that the minority language-variety is something quite "different" from Slovene; even, a "renegade" who, though a native speaker of this language-variety, deliberately speaks German to other native speakers.

All of these implications of the use of the terms are based on a number of presuppositions, very few of which are demonstrable.

For example, “Carinthian Slovene” is, implicitly, not only an extension of the Slavic dialect continuum that extends northwards from Ohrid, but also, in some fashion, “based” on Standard Literary Slovene [SLS]; in GF’s words, “die schriftsprachliche Basis der Kärntner Slowenischen [ist] identisch mit der der Republik Slowenien” (88). This supposes that any dialect has some kind of “natural” basis in a standard, whereas it is closer to reality to say that every standard is artificially (and often arbitrarily) imposed—for practical and political reasons—on a selection of dialects. Of course, Carinthia and the areas to its south were for a very long time politically unified, and the role of Klagenfurt/Celovec as a cultural centre for the Slovenes in the 1850’s was a natural one (pointed out by GF, 73). Of course, too, the only standardized literary language available to the Carinthian minority-speakers is SLS (although a standardized *koroško* is theoretically not impossible, cf. the attempt at a standardized *podjunsko* in Messner 1974). Nevertheless, to say that SLS is the literary basis of “Carinthian Slovene” subordinates linguistic science to political aims (however laudable these may be in themselves), and is a first-class example of the confusion of linguistics with politics (cf. Fishman 1972).—Similarly, “Windisch” is, implicitly, a “different language” from Slovene: this is another implication that is linguistically meaningless except in the trite sense that all language-varieties differ to some extent; it supposes that dialect-difference such as those between *koroško* and *gorenjsko* can in fact be objectively measured, when no such measure exists. Incidentally, some proponents of this viewpoint label “Windisch” with a word that also, alas, has pejorative connotations: “Mischsprache.” Here we have another term that has no objective linguistic definition, other than (perhaps) the definition by Bailey (1973), who insists that *every* language is a “mixture”; and nobody has ever explained how such a term could possibly be pejorative (an idea which this reviewer, as a native speaker of an obviously “mixed” language, English, takes objection to).

Carinthians, then, are forced by circumstance to choose one of the two terms and thus betray their own inclinations. This reviewer, although believing that the use of the term “Carinthian Slovene” does not necessarily imply linguistic “identity” with Slovene (no more than that the use of the term “Windisch” necessarily implies linguistic “non-identity”), will use the former term for the traditional, geographic reason mentioned above, i.e., arbitrarily, and without any implied political overtones.

Turning to GF’s book, we find a half-dozen sections that involve strictly linguistic matters. One is mentioned above, the discussion of the term “Windisch.” One small criticism may be raised here: GF

states that this term already had a noticeable pejorative meaning at the beginning of the 19th century; is there any hard evidence of this? Was this a real connotation that escaped the attention of Dobrovský when he listed as one of the branches of Slavic "die Windischen in Kärnten und Steyermark" in his *Altslawische Grammatik* of 1822? Or is it just an assumption, based on the usual experience (cf. Priestly 1979) that ethnonyms are rarely, if ever, affectively unmarked?

In his historical chapter (*Zur Geschichte*, 30-64) GF makes interesting use of the conclusions derived from Kronsteiner's recent onomastic research with reference to early Slavic settlements in Carinthia. This research, which was a necessary corrective to some of the German-nationalist conclusions arrived at by Kranzmayer in the 1940's and 1950's, now deserves to be complemented by up-to-date work on German onomastics in Southern Austria, for the complete picture to emerge. It may be added that this linguistic archeology, although essential for the early history of the languages in the area, is surely of little or no relevance to the present-day situation.—The remainder of the chapter this reviewer found rather confusing. After four pages on prehistory, we find one of the period from the 15th through the 19th centuries, and then another four on the early 20th century; then three on the "Windischtheorie," followed by a further 18 on recent developments. Well and good: but the Reformation and Counter-Reformation are postponed until the succeeding chapter (*Sprache und Schrifttum*, 65-96). This separation of cultural from political history results in serious lacunae in both chapters. GF's "Kulturhistorischer Überblick" (65-74) thus devotes only two pages to the 19th and 20th centuries. It is followed by a biobibliographical listing of prominent post-war Carinthian Slovene literary figures; the few lines of critical summary provided by GF could surely have been expanded, perhaps along the lines of Vida Obid's recent slim volume (1979).

The *Sprache und Schrifttum* chapter is rounded off with a section "Stellung der Kärntner Slowenischen Dialekte im Rahmen der slowenischen Dialektologie." This consists of a listing of the main features of all the Slovene dialects (why all? to show that the Carinthian ones are not unusual in their "distance" from SLS? GF does not explain); this listing appears oversimplified, occasionally misleading, and surely, for the non-linguist, baffling abbreviated. The comments that precede it are however informative and useful. We learn of the different attitudes that speakers have towards speakers of other dialects, for example; although attitudinal analysis has hitherto been impressionistic, and attitudes to standard languages affect the overall picture (see Priestly 1983a), these comments are useful; and GF also delineates the policy of the German nationalists

in Carinthia, whose campaign for the “Windischtheorie” has been complemented by a series of actions designed to emphasize the differences among *ziljsko*, *rožansko* and *podjunsko*. Their support for the SLS-language Gymnasium in Klagenfurt/Celovec is considered in this light, together with the outcome that this action “back-fired,” in that the students at this school are now developing a supradialectal *koine*.

Perhaps the most interesting section for the linguist comes right at the end of GF’s writing, as part of his *Schlussbemerkungen* (184-197).

Basing himself on Prunč 1978 (sic; a better reference would be Prunč 1979, but none of Prunč’s work is cited in the bibliography), GF lists examples of German “interference” in Carinthian Slovene as it affects the lexicon and the syntax. This reviewer can find no fault with his listing, nor in his statement that “Morphologie und Phonetik zeigen die geringste Reflexe der Zweisprachigkeit” (186). He wonders, however, why GF restricted his reliance on Prunč’s work to the German influence on Slovene, and is silent about the influence in the other direction, which Prunč well demonstrates; and also why no mention is made of German influence on Slovene dialects (and even SLS) south of the border. GF also mentions the theoretical possibility of linguistic symptoms of “Destabilisierung,” i.e., of the early stages of what is now becoming known as “language death,” and—in passing—proposes three examples: “Beispiele dafür wären etwa der Gebrauch der bestimmten/unbestimmten Formen der Adjektiva, Divergenzen im Aspektgebrauch, Ausgleich morphologischer Kategorien” (186). It is regrettable that he does not expand on these suggestions (couched, it will be noted, with a subjunctive verb). This reviewer’s own dialectal research has resulted in uncovering extremely little in the way of the neutralization of morphological categories. The dialect of Sele Fara/Zell Pfarre, although furnished with the logical impetus for the loss of some case-distinctions in nouns (i.e., the elision of many word-final vowels), has maintained, like SLS, a complete system of six cases; and the one obvious example of the loss of a category in this dialect, the virtually complete eradication of the neuter gender, can hardly be considered a symptom of “language destabilization” (unless Indo-European languages such as French that have also lost this gender are considered to be in a state of decay). A great deal of serious study needs to be undertaken before symptoms of “Destabilisierung” can be properly identified; Carinthian Slovene territory would appear to be an excellent location for this kind of work, since what GF calls “Glottophagie” is clearly at work here.

This unpleasant term, which may be rendered in English perhaps as glottophagia (and evokes images of languages, pac-man-like,

globbling up others), GF takes from the German translation of Calvet (1978). Inasmuch as it applies to the age-old process whereby one language supplants another in a community, through various stages of bilingualism, the term is presumably unobjectionable. There must have been innumerable languages in the world that have been swallowed up in this way, including a number of pre-Slavic languages in Southern Carinthia alone. Fischer, like Calvet, however, sees glottophagia as more than this—as a deliberate instrument of colonialism; indeed, the whole of the book under review can be considered as delineation of glottophagia at work in Carinthia, together with a plan of campaign—on the political, socio-economic and cultural fronts, as well as on the linguistic one—to counter its effects. To these efforts this reviewer has no objection, if only because the Carinthian Slovene dialects deserve to be maintained for their own intrinsic merits. GF has, however, some very harsh things to say about linguists, particularly in his *Einleitung*. The Carinthian German “glottophagic” tradition exemplified by linguists such as Wutte and Kranzmayer is first described. Turning to Slavists, GF reproves them for treating Carinthian Slovene as a curiosity: “Charakteristisch für diese Art von Sprachauffassung und die wissenschaftliche Tradition, in der die meisten Slawisten stehen, ist, Sprache—vor allem Dialekte—vorzugsweise als rare, oft romantisch verklärte Beobachtungs- und Forschungsobjekte—quasi als Reliquien—zu beschreiben, wobei allerdings die betreffenden Sprachgemeinschaften . . . in keinen wissenschaftlichen Zusammenhang mit der Sprache, Sprachentwicklung etc. gebracht werden. Sprachliche Sozialisation (sic) und die verschiedenen Abhängigkeiten von gesellschaftlichen Faktoren werden dabei einfach übersehen (oder nicht gesehen). . . .” (27) Slovene dialectologists (who seem to be the primary object of his scorn) are thus characterized as dabbling in “Antiquitäten- und Raritätenlinguistik.” GF is, of course, largely (but not entirely) correct, although he does not make it clear whether he would be satisfied with current Western sociolinguistics in its application to Carinthian Slovene (i.e., sociological research as a key to linguistics), or whether he really wants the reverse of this coin, what might be called linguistic sociology (i.e., linguistics as a tool for sociologists). It is of course unfortunate that he could not refer to Hafner & Prunč (1980) as an important step in the direction that he advocates—this book must have appeared just a few months after his own—but it is probable that even this work, with its close attention to sociolinguistic aspects (cf. Priestly 1983b), would not have softened GF’s disparagement of linguists: for, not content with pointing out the lack of sociolinguistic orientation, he goes further and denounces linguists, quite simply, for being linguists: “[diese Richtung] operiert auch vorwiegend entweder auf

der Basis des sprachlichen Materials oder auf der Abstraktionsebene der Strukturbegriffe" (26-27), and "Eine solche sprachwissenschaftliche Konzeption [i.e., which makes the interdependent complex of language and society the subject of study] wäre auch zweifellos von grösserer gesellschaftlicher Relevanz/Brisanz als die traditionelle 'Systemlinguistik' " (28). These remarks are extremely ill-advised: GF appears to believe that data-based structural linguistics on the one hand, and sociolinguistics on the other, are mutually exclusive, whereas the reverse is surely true: without a linguistic approach that *does* "operate on the basis of linguistic material," that *is* properly "founded on abstractional levels of structural concepts," and that *is* "systematic," any sociological linguistics will be quite vacuous, quite unsystematic itself. Without a thorough (and systematic!) description of the Carinthian Slovene dialects, for example, *and* of the Carinthian German dialects (which appear to be even less adequately researched), no investigation into any aspect of "interference" or "destabilization" can be fruitful or reliable.

This review has concentrated on just a small selection of the rich material in GF's book. As indicated above, a very great portion must be left to social science experts to criticize. This reviewer must however admit that, for the non-expert, the extensive *Anhang*, and the historical, politico-economic and legal chapters of the book are extremely useful. The section on the "*Volkszahlung besonderer Art*" von 1976 (123-130), for example, is very well done. The bibliography, and the listing of Carinthian Slovene newspapers and magazines, are very valuable. The book is well-produced but has quite a few misprints; and, although in general poorly planned, is always interesting to read.

What is needed now, in the Carinthian linguistic situation, is a series of investigations that will answer GF's more valid criticisms and will complement the work of the *Arbeitsgruppe für Slowenistik* in Graz (cf. Hafner & Prunč 1980). Very much in the forefront of the requirements are *objective* data on language-preferences and language-usage, which may begin to refute the extremes of opinion now current about language in Carinthia. This reviewer's recent impressions in the province (April/May 1982), where he heard very much more Slovene (both SLS and Carinthian) on the streets of major towns than was the case three years earlier, can hopefully be supplemented by actual research, also.

Meanwhile, GF's book, which was presumably written for a primarily Austrian public whose interest in "die Slowenenfrage" continues to be fed by events in Carinthia, is also very useful for linguists, for specialists in Slovene affairs, and for all those interested in minority language problems. It suffers, of course, from its lack of

impartiality; but this is nothing new. If we agree, as I suggest we must, with Lord Acton who wrote, in his *Essays on Freedom and Power* in 1862, that “. . . those states are substantially the most perfect which . . . include various distinct nationalities without oppressing them,” we can only welcome books, like *Das Slowenische in Kärnten*, which help to publicize “imperfections” of this kind.

Tom Priestly, University of Alberta

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bailey, C.-J. N. 1973. *Variation and Linguistic Theory*. Arlington, VA.
- Barker, T. M. 1979. “The Carinthian Slovene question in the light of recent German Austrian scholarship,” *Nationalities Papers* 7,2: 125-137.
- Calvet, L. J. 1978. *Die Sprachenfresser. Ein Versuch über Linguistik und Kolonialismus*. Berlin.
- Fishman, J. A. 1972. *Language and Nationalism*. Rowley, MA.
- Hafner, S., & Prunč, E. 1980. *Lexikalische Inventarisierung der slowenische Volkssprache in Kärnten*. Graz.
- Messner, J. 1974. *Iz dnevnike Pokržnikovega Lukana*. Klagenfurt/Celovec.
- Obid, V. 1979. *Die slowenische Literatur in Kärnten seit 1945*. Klagenfurt/Celovec.
- Priestly, T. M. S. 1979. “The fate of some ethnonyms in Czech,” *Maledicta* 2:71-78.
- . 1983a. “Attitudes to language among German/Slav bilinguals in Southern Austria,” in *Roots and Realities: Proceedings of the Conference on Central and East European Studies*. Edmonton (to appear).
- . 1983b. *Review of Hafner & Prunč 1980*, in *Folia Slavica* 6 (to appear).

Prunč, E. 1978. *Zum Problem sprachlicher Interferenzen im bilingualen Gebiet in Kärnten*. 1st ed., Klagenfurt/Celovec.

———. 1979. *Zum Problem sprachlicher Interferenzen im bilingualen Gebiet in Kärnten*. 2nd. improved ed., Klagenfurt/Celovec.

Rado L. Lencek, *The Structure and History of the Slovene Language*. Columbus, OH: Slavica, 1982.

This encyclopedic monograph on the historical, synchronic, and sociolinguistic aspects of Slovene is a major event in both Slovene and Slavic linguistics. The book fills a very serious void that has long existed, due to the absence of an adequate diachronic and synchronic structural presentation of Slovene in English. It is especially useful that such a wide range of topics is covered in one volume, which takes full account of both dialects and the standard language. Any serious study of Slovene will now require consultation of Professor Lenček's exhaustive study.

Beginning with an overview of the general historical background of the settlement of the Slovene lands, the book goes on to examine the language from a series of linguistic viewpoints. First comes a comparative study of Slovene, as contrasted to Russian, Serbo-Croatian, Czech, and Slovak. Next there is an historical sketch of Slovene linguistic evolution, dealing also with the complex questions of prosodic evolution. Following this there is a review of the major dialect bases of Slovene with a citation of the most significant features setting off the seven major zones. Next comes a concise structural sketch of Contemporary Standard Slovene phonology, morphophonology, and morphology, which utilizes the most up-to-date structural techniques of analysis, including Jakobson's notions of case meaning and his one-stem verbal system. This is followed by the concluding chapter on the history of the Slovene literary language and related sociolinguistic problems. As one can see even from this brief summary of the book's contents, it offers much more information than one usually can expect to find in either a language history or a synchronic grammar taken alone, since so many perspectives are combined into one whole. It is convenient to find so much useful information in one handy volume, which now can be considered an essential reference book for the Slavic linguist.