

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.

The general layout of the book prompts some suggestions. Although the type is clear and easy to read, the use of only one size of type sometimes leads to confusion when tables and figures are interspersed with the text. A typical example of this problem occurs on pp. 77-80. One must skip from the end of p. 77 to the middle of p. 80 for the continuation of the regular text, since pp. 78-9 and the first half of p. 80 are devoted to a discussion of the map in figure 5 on p. 78. After finishing p. 77 the reader has some difficulty in determining exactly where to proceed, since the material relating to the figure is not set off from the regular text. This situation is repeated each time a figure or table is used. This problem of layout detracts from the appreciation of the excellent set of isogloss maps which are immensely useful in graphically illustrating an admittedly complex dialect situation. A use of smaller type in figures and tables would seem to solve this problem.

Another difficulty is occasioned by the arrangement of entries in the bibliography. These entries are arranged by chapter, which is quite reasonable in view of the self-contained nature of the different chapters of the book. However, within the bibliography of each chapter there are several groups of entries, each alphabetized separately and with no indication as to what each group of sub-entries represents. Thus, on pp. 335-40, devoted to synchrony, there are four separate alphabetical listings of bibliographical entries. When reading the chapter on synchrony, the reader is faced with the dilemma of having to check four lists of entries to find the required source. This problem could be solved by having either a single bibliography for the whole book or, at least, a single alphabetized bibliography for each whole chapter.

Now let us discuss those aspects of the book which occasion suggestions as to possible improvements in future editions. Chapter two compares Slovene with Russian, Serbo-Croatian, Czech, and Slovak. There may be some profit in extending the comparison to other Slavic languages, especially Polish and Bulgarian, since Slovene shares some pertinent linguistic traits with these languages. For example, the Slovene formation of the future with *bom* plus the *l*-participle, as well as the presence of nasal vowels in dialects seem to call for comparisons with Polish. One may compare the presence of a stressed *schwa* vowel in Slovene with the same phenomenon in Bulgarian phonology.

In comparing the prosodic systems of Slovene and Serbo-Croatian on p. 55, it would seem useful to the reader to state that Serbo-Croatian rising stress comes only from recent retraction while in Slovene this is not always the case (cf. Slovene *králj* vs. Serbo-Croatian *králj*). In table 5 (p. 75) *ključb*, *ključa* are both referred to

as “a case of the neoacute evolution.” This term should only be applied to the first form, with retraction from a jer-vowel. The retraction in *ključa* is phonetically the same as that of *duša*, *zvezda*.

In chapter three, on the history of Slovene, we read on p. 77 that Common Slavic had “a short falling accent,” with examples given in both initial and final position. It would be more accurate to say that it was a short accent with no distinctive pitch feature, since the short accent was falling when initial and recessive in cases such as *slovo*, but phonetically rising when final and non-recessive in such cases as *końa*, *ključa*, *ok no* (Jakobson 1963:159). Still on p. 77, we read that the late Common Slavic prosodic system “is still common to all western dialects of the South Slavic linguistic continuum.” The reader may wonder how this can be so in those dialects of Slovene and Serbo-Croatian which have lost distinctive pitch. On p. 81 the change of *bogъ* > *bôg* is described as “lengthening of closed syllables under stress.” However, the absence of lengthening in *grah*, *brat* shows that the length in *bôg* must be linked to falling pitch in addition to stress.

In several instances there is a lack of distinction between the terms *palatal* and *palatalized*. Palatal should refer to a place of articulation, analogous to labial, dental, and velar, while the term palatalized should refer to a supplementary articulation overlaid on a labial, dental, etc. On p. 84 the author refers to the products of the third velar palatalization as “palatal dentals *č*, *ž*, *š*.” This should be changed either to *palatalized dentals* *c'*, *z'*, *s'* or palatals *č*, *ž*, *š*. The way it now stands it is impossible to tell whether the author feels these were dentals or palatals in their primary articulation (modern evidence points to these sounds having been the palatalized dentals *c'*, *z'*, *s'*). The same use of the term *palatal dental č* appears on p. 106. Also on this page the *tj* reflex is referred to as palatalized dental *t'*. Comparative evidence, however, indicates that the *tj* reflex probably derives from a *palatal* stop (cf. Trubetzkoy 1936:93). On p. 131 soft *r'*, *l'*, *n'* are set up as “old palatal dental consonants,” but earlier, on p. 125, the consonants *l'* and *n'* were called “palatalized.” As products of the original jot palatalizations, it seems preferable to treat them as *palatal r'*, *l'*, *n'*.

In speaking of the general avoidance of phonemic palatalization in Slovene on p. 89, it would be useful to relate this fact to Slovene's feature of prosodic tonality as an alternative to consonantal tonality, as established by Jakobson (1929:51).

There is a bit of confusion with regard to the long *jat'* and nasal vowel reflexes in Slovene dialects. On p. 99 we read the correct statement that long *ě* reflexes are of a “closed variety in the northwest as compared to . . . an open variety in the southeast.” However,

the map at the top of p. 102 shows the opposite pattern, $\check{e} > e$ in the northwest and $\check{e} > e$ in the southeast. In table 7 there is a similar contradiction, where we first read that in the southeast "the phonetic value of long \check{e} . . . must have been a narrow \bar{e} " and that in the northwest "long \check{e} . . . must have been an open \bar{a} ." In the next paragraph we read that northwest dialect reflexes of \check{e} derive from closed and southeast reflexes of \check{e} from open \bar{a} . This confusion stems from an unusual fact of Slovene evolution, as elaborated by Rigler (1963). It is assumed that late retention of nasals always means a low *jat'* value, as in Polish and Bulgarian, while early loss of nasals means a high \check{e} as found in East Slavic, Serbo-Croatian, and Czechoslovak. This led Rigler to postulate an original low *jat'* for northwest Slovene (where nasals vowels either still occur or were lost late) and high *jat'* for southeast Slovene which had an early loss of nasal vowels. Unfortunately, the modern *jat'* reflexes in Slovene dialects are precisely the opposite of the expected values set up by Rigler for early Slovene. Professor Lenček's book should mention the contradiction between Rigler's hypothesis and the actual dialect data.

On p. 102 it is stated that the "structural pairing" of \check{e} and o is "unknown to Serbo-Croatian." However, Ivić (1958:10) sets up paired e and o in Štokavian jekavian, where o results from l and also in Kajkavian, where o results from o (1958:9).

On pp. 120 and 148-9 the change of $o > a$, known as *akanje*, is treated as a change "from tenseness to laxness." This seems a somewhat unusual formulation, since *a* is generally treated as tense vs. *o* which is lax in Slavic, originating from the old quantitative difference between \bar{a} and \check{o} .

In chapter four, on Slovene dialects, the reflex of "long \check{e} " in Carinthia is given as $i\bar{a}$ (p. 140). It should be pointed out that Carinthia, in contrast to most other dialect zones of Slovene, has two long \check{e} reflexes, depending on whether the vowel goes back to an original circumflex ($i\bar{a}$ or i) or other length (e) (Ramovš 1936: 119).

In chapter five, on the synchronic system of Slovene (p. 166), there is an incomplete listing of non-phenomic voiced allophones, where only the voiced counterparts of *c*, \check{c} are given. It seems that the voiced pair of *x* should also have been listed, i.e. the allophone [ɣ]. Perhaps some definite rule should be stated for the inclusion of allophones, since Toporišič has calculated a total of 37 "important" allophones of the 22 Slovene consonant phonemes (1978:19), a figure far higher than we find listed on p. 166.

In a discussion of gender on p. 181, we read that Slavic gender is "inherent in substantives, inflected in adjectivals, not expressed in pronouns." Obviously, pronouns here are understood as the first and

second person type only, which should be made more explicit to avoid misunderstanding.

Only a few comments need to be made on points of style. On the whole the book is written in clear, understandable language. On p. 54, line 12 the word "and" should be changed to *but* since Russian and Slovene are being contrasted as to the predicate instrumental. On pp. 197 and 210 accentual variants are referred to as "alternations." In order to avoid confusing these cases, such as *râkov râkov*, with real paradigmatic alternations of accent, it is perhaps better to call them *variants*.

The number of misprints is minimal, considering the huge task of setting a book which requires so many diacritics and citations from many different languages. On p. 76 the citation *Ramovš 1963* should read *1936*. On p. 104, line 9 from the bottom, *ě/o* should appear as *ě/ǫ*. On p. 111, line 13 from the bottom, gen. sg. *brad* should be gen. pl. On p. 142, line 22, "limes" should be changed to *lines*. There are four instances of *e* used in place of *ǣ*: on p. 147, line 10 *bret* should be changed to *brǣt*; on pp. 164-5 the phonetic transcriptions "*čerta, verba, verbo*" should all have *ǣ* instead of *e*. On p. 192, line 19 from the bottom, auxiliary is spelled with one too many. On p. 237, line 15 from the bottom, the word parentheses has an *a* in place of its first *e*. Lastly, on p. 277, line 22, the first name of Fran Ramovš appears incorrectly as *From*.

All of the points we have mentioned in our review of *The Structure and History of the Slovene Language* in no way detract from the overall merit of Professor Lenček's book, which represents a great step forward both in the study of Slovene and in the available reference materials for the use of Slavists. In view of the book's moderate cost, great accuracy and depth, as well as its interesting style, it is a truly indispensable find for Slavic (and general) linguists and graduate students of Slavic languages.

Ronald F. Feldstein, Indiana University

REFERENCES

- Ivić, Pavle. 1958. "Osnovnye puti razvitija serboxorvatskogo vokalizma." *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, pp. 3-20.
- Jakobson, Roman O. 1929. *Remarques sur l'évolution du russe comparée à celle des autres langues slaves*. (TCLP 2) Prague.

- Jakobson, R. O. 1963. "Opyt fonologičeskogo podxoda k istoričeskim voprosam slavjanskoj akcentologii." *American Contributions to the Fifth International Congress of Slavists*. The Hague.
- Ramovš, Fran. 1936. *Kratka zgodovina slovenskega jezika*. Ljubljana.
- Rigler, Jakob. 1963. "Pregled osnovnih razvojnih etap v slovenskem vokalizmu." *SR* 14, pp. 25-78.
- Toporišič, J. 1978. *Glasovna in naglasna podoba slovenskega jezika*. Ljubljana.
- Trubetzkoy, N. 1936. "Die altkirchenslavische Vertretung der urslavischen *tj, *dj." *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie*, 13.