

ASPECTS OF OF LINGUISTIC EQUALITY IN SLOVENIA

Silvo Devetak

1. INTRODUCTION

The nations and the nationalities (i.e., ethnic minorities) which compose Yugoslavia have eighteen languages and several different scripts in official use, at different levels and to different degrees. The federation has no 'official state language': in a constitutional sense, at least, equality in official use is enjoyed by the five languages of the nations (Macedonian, three variants of Serbo-Croatian, Slovene) and, for most purposes, also two nationalities' languages (Albanian and Hungarian). The languages of the nations are 'state languages' in the individual republics and provinces. In addition, the languages of the ten nationalities, and to a lesser extent of two ethnic groups,¹ have equality in 'official use' at commune level,² depending on the demographic composition of the community involved.

The federal constitution and laws contain only basic principles concerning the use of languages.³ The practical application of these principles is governed by republican and provincial constitutions, laws, and other acts, and especially by commune statutes; in them are specified which of the officially-recognized languages are recognized in 'official' or 'public' use at the level concerned; they also specify the manner in which equal rights are to be realized. Specific language-use in the locality or area is regulated by various acts that govern the work of the agencies, collectives and other organizations.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. Demography of Slovenia

In the 1981 Census of Slovenia, 90.52% of its population (total: 1,891,864) reported themselves as Slovene; the others defined themselves as members of other nations or nationalities.⁴ The Italian (0.12%) and Hungarian (0.50%) nationalities living on the international borders are autochthonous ethnic communities. The bulk of the remainder (6.46%) regarded themselves as belonging to Yugoslav ethnic groupings other than Slovene, the mother-tongue of 6.05% being Serbo-Croatian, that of 0.17% being Macedonian, while 0.10% came from the Albanian language area. Speakers of other languages were even fewer in number.⁵

The increase in the numbers of non-Slovenes resident in Slovenia—mainly Croats, Serbs and Muslims—in the last two decades is marked: from 4.35% in 1961 through 5.97% in 1971 to 9.48% in 1981. This is mostly the result of internal migration, made possible by the imbalanced structural development of the Slovene economy.

2.2. The general legal status of language

The official state language in Slovenia is Slovene. Article 212 of the constitution of the republic specifies that all government and other agencies, self-management organizations, collectives and individuals that perform a 'government service' in Slovenia, should function in Slovene. In the areas with Italian and Hungarian nationalities, those languages have equal rights with Slovene (article 250). More detailed regulations with respect to the equal use of Italian and Hungarian are contained in the statutes of the communes where the two nationalities live: Izola/Isola, Koper/Capodistria and Piran/Pirano (Slovene/Italian),

Murska Sobota and Lendava/Lendva (Slovene/Hungarian).⁶ Further regulations specify the equal use of each language with Slovene: over fifty acts govern various aspects of public life from education to place-names. This applies also to commune decrees and to the 'self-management acts' by which cultural, economic and other organizations govern their daily business.

In view of the demographic composition of Slovenia today it is relevant to ask: what is the public legal status of languages other than Slovene, Italian and Hungarian? — There are general regulations in the Slovene constitution with respect to equal language rights within Slovenia for all Yugoslav nations and nationalities; but there are no specific legal provisions, except for republic legislation that provides for the education of members of these national groups in their own language.⁷ On the basis of the general specifications of equal language rights it can be assumed that members of these groups resident in Slovenia (in addition to 'autochthonous' Slovenes, Italians and Hungarians) may in principle use their mother tongue in their contacts with state and other agencies and organizations having public functions. There are however no precise data available that would confirm this practice.

The present paper will therefore discuss only the realization of constitutional specifications of the official use of Slovene as the 'state language' of Slovenia, together with problems that arise in relation to the equal use of Italian and Hungarian in situations envisaged in the constitution and in other acts. The findings are illustrated, with respect to Hungarian, with data from the International Yugoslav-Hungarian Research Project conducted by the Institute for Ethnic Studies in Ljubljana and colleagues from Budapest in 1984-85 in the contiguous areas of Porabje (Hungary) and Prekmurje (Slovenia), where there are Slovene and Hungarian minorities.⁸ In this project we made a special analysis, from different viewpoints, of two similar, ethnically-mixed villages: Gornji Senik/Felsőszölnök (Porabje) and Dobrovnik/Dobronak (Prekmurje). Dobrovnik (which provides the data for discussion in this paper) had about 1,000 inhabitants in 1984, of whom over two-thirds were Hungarians, the remainder being of Slovene and (in a few cases) of Romany ethnic origin. In our sample we chose 94 (one-third) of the households, and collected general data (sex, place of birth, education, profession, &c.) on 352 persons; of these, 141 responded personally to the 'individual' questionnaire. In addition we conducted special interviews with children aged 6 through 14. Pertinent results are set out in Tables I-V below. We also conducted open-ended interviews with persons who were especially knowledgeable in important areas, in particular with Father F. Krampač, parish priest in Dobrovnik.

3. LANGUAGE RIGHTS: VARIOUS ASPECTS

3.1. Political assemblies

The code of conduct of the Assembly of the Republic of Slovenia specifies that it, and its working bodies, function in the Slovene language. Translations into Slovene are to be made of discussions in Hungarian, Italian, and in the languages of the other Yugoslav nations (of which no actual case has been recorded).⁹ In the work of the Assembly Commission for Nationalities the use of the three languages is now virtually established: oral presentations by commission members, materials, agendas, minutes and other records are provided in Slovene, Hungarian and Italian. Speeches by delegates of the two nationalities are translated only exceptionally, thus when the realization of the rights of the

nationalities are under discussion, or when a special request for translation is made; in which case, translation into all three languages is provided.

The equal right of use of Italian and Hungarian in the assemblies of the five nationally-mixed communes is governed in more detail by their respective statutes and by-laws. Delegates may freely use Slovene and, respectively, Italian or Hungarian in the work of their assemblies.¹⁰ Equal rights also apply to the activity of the councils of the relevant self-management communities.¹¹

The non-existence of special self-management and related terminology in the nationality's languages is a linguistic problem which is a major obstacle to the normal development of bilingual practices; the realization of the principles of bilingualism in social life (and in private life also) requires an improvement in linguistic competence that, in turn, requires a more structured and organized system of access to the work of the assemblies.

3.2. Administration

Article 15 of the 1978 federal law concerning general administration states that "the administrative process is conducted in the languages of the nations and nationalities of Yugoslavia," and that members of the nations and nationalities who are Yugoslav citizens have the right to use their own language in this process.

If the administrative process is not conducted in the language of the party concerned, it must be made possible for him to follow it in that language. As with the courts in legal processes (cf. 3.3.), agencies which conduct administrative business must also inform the participant of his language rights, and place this on record together with a statement by him.

If, through no fault of his own, a participant in the administrative process has not been given the possibility of using his own language, this can be cited as a reason for the renewal of the process, after all regular legal means have been exhausted (articles 249, 250).¹²

Largely as the result of different environments, individual republics and provinces differ with respect to legislation. In Slovenia the law on state administration specifies that the administrative agencies function in Slovene,¹³ in nationally mixed regions, however, administrative agencies "function, conduct the administrative process and issue regulations" also in Italian and Hungarian, if the party concerned speaks either of the two. In these cases, higher (appeal) agencies also issue regulations in Italian and Hungarian (article 16).

Workers employed in the administrative agencies in nationally mixed regions must also master Italian or Hungarian in addition to Slovene.¹⁴ This is specified as a job requirement in the self-management acts concerning working conditions. A worker employed in a position in which bilingualism is required receives a financial supplement to his salary.¹⁵ Practically all forms and documents in use by commune administrations (excluding some civil defence documents) are bilingual, including, e.g., identity cards. Agencies are obliged to use actual surnames.¹⁶

The actual use of a minority language may be illustrated by data from a questionnaire administered in the village of Dobrovnik, in 1984. Table I¹⁷ shows that Hungarian is used much more than Slovene in formal 'verbal contact'. The high percentage response for the use of both languages demonstrates that organizations (those that work with clients, especially) tend to employ bilinguals in 'official positions'. The data in Table II, on the written use of Hungarian, is less encouraging.

TABLE I: "Which language(s) do you speak. . .?" (N = 141)

	H	H/S	S	N/R
in shops	52.5	35.5	7.1	5.0
in inns	42.6	42.6	5.7	9.2
officially	27.0	48.9	22.0	2.1

TABLE II: "Which language(s) do you write. . .?" (N = 141)

	H	H/S	S	N/R
letters to friends	36.1	29.1	10.6	24.1
letters to relatives	48.2	24.8	12.1	14.9
in official correspondence	12.4	19.6	16.5	51.5

3.3. Courts of law

Yugoslavia's first law governing court proceedings specified that the "process is conducted in the language of the federal unit or province in which the court is situated," and that "all persons have the right to address the court in their mother tongue."¹⁸ The development of equal language rights in court proceedings paralleled the overall development of the equal rights of nations and nationalities with respect to languages and scripts. Today's relevant federal laws contain basic specifications of equal language rights in criminal and civil proceedings and in those relating to economic and petty offences.¹⁹ In all legal proceedings the languages and scripts of the Yugoslav nations and nationalities have equal rights.

Costs of translations incurred by adherence to these legal requirements are borne by the own resources of the courts involved.

By an opinion of the Yugoslav Supreme Court, 8th November 1967, failure to conform to equal language rights requirements represents a breach of the regulations governing proceedings.²⁰ A partial infringement is deemed to have occurred if a court (or other relevant body) does not advise participants who are Yugoslav citizens of their linguistic rights; and an absolute infringement, if the court fails to provide a translator upon demand.

Republic and provincial laws with respect to court procedures provide more detail about linguistic rights. There is some local variation, especially with respect to the actual languages concerned in the various regions. The laws governing courtroom procedure in Slovenia specify the use of Slovene for verbal proceedings and written judgements; and, in the areas (see above) specified as bilingual, Italian or Hungarian is also specified, in instances where that is the language spoken by any of the parties concerned. If such proceedings are continued in higher-level courts, these must issue summonses with Italian or Hungarian translations provided; and if such a court holds hearings, the relevant nationality language must be used.²¹

Rules of courtroom procedure in Slovenia give more detail of the execution of linguistic rights at various stages of legal proceedings.²² In the 'nationally-mixed regions' legal hearings may be conducted in Italian or in Hungarian, or in a combination of one of the two

and Slovene; and courtroom signs and notices and legal stamps and seals must also be bilingual. These courts use bilingual forms also.

3.4. Public signs

According to the constitution, all public signs in Slovenia must be in Slovene. In the nationally-mixed regions, the following signs must be bilingual (Slovene-Italian or Slovene-Hungarian): place-names, streets, names of firms and public announcements and warnings.²³

The Italian and Hungarian self-managing communities concerned in education and culture participate in the naming procedure: by article 8 of the law on topography, the relevant bodies jointly decide “on the naming, re-naming, amalgamating [and] separating . . . of communities and streets” and jointly determine the “areas of settlement.” The nationalities are thus involved not only in the choice of names, but also in determining the urban characteristics of the residential areas; and, hence, ‘the majority’ can not arbitrarily decide on matters of external appearance that may characterize the ethnic mixture of an area. This has a positive influence on the inter-ethnic relations concerned. Evidence of the consistency with which bilingualism is realized is seen, e.g., in the Slovene Republic telephone book sections for the nationally-mixed areas; and official maps of these regions also show place-names bilingually.

By decree, all state agencies, labor organizations, self-management units, collectives and private businesses in the nationally-mixed regions must display bilingual signs. Linguistic equality must be ensured by the signs having the same appearance in both languages. Federal law requires that federal administrative agencies (e.g., customs offices) also display bilingual signs.²⁴

The obligation to use both official languages in these regions also applies to announcements, warnings, and other public notices. This obligation is more or less consistently adhered to by state agencies and other publicly-authorized bodies and political organizations; but inconsistencies occur in public signs displayed by associated labor organizations, local societies, and the like.

One characteristic external manifestation of a nation’s equality in a particular territory is seen in the showing of national flags. This is, clearly, a politically sensitive question, since a flag is the expression of a state’s identity. In the nationally-mixed communes, the right to fly the nationality’s flag is confirmed by statute; e.g., the statutes of the commune of Lendava, article 234, specify that “the Hungarian nationality has its own symbol, a red-white-and-green flag with a red five-pointed star in the center, which symbolizes the participation of Hungarian nationals in the national liberation struggle.” These communes have the right to fly the Italian or Hungarian flag alongside the Slovene flag; and the procedure for flying the flags is governed by the regulations of the commune assembly.²⁵

Commune inspectors ensure compliance with the regulations concerning bilinguality in all the topographic categories mentioned here; and procedural details for ensuring compliance are specified in them. Moreover, commune regulations also provide for financial penalties for the violation of all these ‘public bilinguality’ statutes.²⁶

3.5. Territorial defence

Territorial defence is the responsibility of the republics and provinces. The civil defence law of Slovenia and other acts state that all the administrative work involved and all the military lectures and commands shall be executed in Slovene.²⁷ A Slovene military

dictionary is available, also a multilingual specialist dictionary of army terminology (Serbo-Croatian/Slovene/Macedonian/Hungarian/Albanian). Three specialist army journals are published in Slovene: *Naša obramba*, *Vojaški glasnik* and *Obramba in zaščita*. *Naša vojska*, the journal of the Ninth Army Region (based in Ljubljana), publishes some of its articles in Slovene.

The civil defence law of Slovenia provides for the introduction, by special regulation by the Republic Secretary for Civil Defence, of the use of Italian and Hungarian for military lectures and commands in the local territorial defense units. There has been no example of this regulation being put into practice. We believe however that, where there is a majority of members of one of the nationalities in a defence unit, both that language and Slovene are used in oral military commands. All the administrative activities (call-up notices, announcements of military courses, etc.) are bilingual. In the Lendava commune all the administrative literature used in military defense (with the exception of registration booklets and a few other items) are in both languages. Lectures given on topics of general civil defence in the nationally-mixed regions are also in both languages.

We may add that the question of introducing Italian and Hungarian into the functioning of territorial defence units, in the spirit of the civil defence law regulations of Slovenia, is a complex one, and will require more attention in the future; as also will other questions of language use in this sociolinguistic area.

3.6. Associated labor

The federal law on associated labor contains two decrees that apply to language rights.²⁸ In one (article 417, paragraph 6) it specifies that the name of a labor organization must not contain expressions that are foreign to the language used for the public announcement of that name. The other (article 425) decrees that the name must be made available in all the nation and nationality languages of Yugoslavia, and that the official name should be in the language of the area in which the organization's headquarters is located.²⁹ The same principle applies to companies with business units located in nationally-mixed areas.

The federal law on standardization states that technical directions for the use of a product must be provided in the languages and scripts of the nations of Yugoslavia (article 48).³⁰ In practice, nationality languages are also used, especially Albanian and Hungarian. The 1977 Slovenia merchandise law also governs the language of instructions for those goods sold retail that require special handling by the user: by this law, the instructions must be written in Slovene, and—in the nationally-mixed regions—also in Italian or Hungarian.³¹

It is important for the realization of linguistic equality that a citizen can use his own language in contacts with organizations of associated labor that carry on public business, such as those in education, health, municipal activities, transport, post and telecommunications, culture, banking, etc.. The conditions for the realizations of these rights must be determined in the general self-management regulations of these units.

There are no major problems with respect to the use of Slovene. It is clear from the information available, however, that the use of Italian and Hungarian does not, in practice, meet legal and statutory obligations or follow the self-management regulations. Our research (see 2.2.) has indicated that very few organizations of associated labor specify the equal use of Italian or Hungarian in their statutes.

The answers to a questionnaire administered in Dobrovnik provide field confirmation of the unsatisfactory situation, cf. Table III.

TABLE III: "Which language(s) is/are used at work? (N = 141)

	H	H/S	S	O	N/R
conversing with fellow workers	2.8	16.3	15.6	1.4	63.8
conversing during free time	5.0	9.9	20.6	0.7	63.8
addressing superiors	2.1	26.2	6.4	0.7	64.5
addressed by superiors	0.0	28.4	4.3	2.1	65.2

3.7. Religion

Besides the great majority of devout Slovenes, who are Roman Catholics, there are smaller religious groups; in some instances Hungarian and Italian are used in these religious groups alongside Slovene. (Note in passing that the population influx into Slovenia from the south and east has brought an increase in the number of adherents of Serbian Orthodoxy and Islam; these congregations normally speak Serbo-Croatian in their services.)

As an example of bilingualism in the religious life of Slovenia, we present the situation in the Lendava and Murska Sobota communes. Hungarian is used to varying degrees in the services of the three religious denominations surveyed, as follows.

Hungarian and Slovene have complete equality in the *Evangelical* churches. Holy Communion is served at least once a month in each language; the other services are conducted in one or the other language, or bilingually, at the wish of the parishioners. Bibles and prayer books are available in both languages, and Sunday School is also conducted in both. The local Evangelical newspaper and calendar are bilingual also.

All services of the *Calvinist* church are conducted in Hungarian, since all the Calvinists in the area belong to the Hungarian nationality.

In the *Catholic* parishes of Lendava and Dobrovnik, whose populations are mostly Hungarian, services are generally bilingual. Some religious texts are only available in Slovene; but hymnals, prayer-books and other liturgical texts in Hungarian, from Vojvodina or from Hungary, are used; and the Hungarian-language journal *Hitelet* ('Religious Life'), published in Novi Sad, is also available. Materials in Hungarian are prepared in parish offices. At the Theological Faculty in Maribor those seminarians who intend to work in nationally-mixed regions learn the Hungarian language: since 1969, sixty students have attended the lectures on Hungarian, which are held for one or two hours per week. In the past forty years only one member of the Hungarian nationality has become a priest; all the rest were Slovenes, who have learned Hungarian as required.

We asked the parish priest of Dobrovnik, Father Franc Krampač, to describe his parish. The following summary of his reply reflects his opinions.

The parish, which numbers 2100, consists of Dobrovnik and the villages of Genterovci/Göntérháza, Kamovci/Kámaháza, Radmozanci/Radamos and Zitkovci/Zsitkoc. Some 99% of the parish inhabitants are Roman Catholics, the remainder Evangelical or Calvinist. The majority (70-80%) are of Hungarian nationality. Further, most of the inhabitants of the Slovene village of Strehovci (which belongs to the parish of Bogojina, but is only 3 km. from Dobrovnik) also attend mass in Dobrovnik, and send their children to Sunday School there. About 1,500 parishioners attend mass with a regularity of twice a month or more; this is the result of certain traditions.

The results of our survey of language use in religious life in this community can be seen from Tables IV and V.

TABLE IV: "In what language do you pray?" (N = 141)

	H	H/S	S	N/R
Together with family	57.4	3.5	7.1	31.9
When alone	56.0	4.3	13.4	26.2

TABLE V: "How many hymns do you know?" (N = 141)

	1-10	11-20	20+	N/R
Hungarian respondents	42.6	9.9	12.1	31.9
All respondents	46.1	12.6	14.2	27.0

These tables are to be interpreted as follows: there are no significant differences in the use of the two languages, either in prayer or in the knowledge of hymns. The use of Slovene in each case is less than is to be expected according to the demography of the village; but note that we were unable to identify ethnic affiliation among those villagers who did not respond to the questionnaire.

We also asked Father Krampač to describe the use of the two languages in his work. His written response included the following:

"There are two or three masses in church on Sundays and designated holidays. The first, at 8 o'clock, is in Slovene, and the second, at 10 o'clock, in Hungarian. If we have a third holy mass, in the afternoon, both nationalities are present and the mass is bilingual, and is arranged like this: the beginning is always in Hungarian (since the majority present are Hungarian); the second part is in Slovene. In the first part we have the Gospel in Slovene (both Testament readings are in Hungarian) and, in addition to the sermon in Hungarian, a short homily in Slovene. In the second part we usually say the Lord's Prayer in Hungarian; and we have, of course, announcements in both languages as required.

It is similar at marriages: if one of the couple to be wed is Slovene, the mass, sermon and actual ceremony are in Slovene (the first part of the mass is in Hungarian, as was mentioned above).

Funerals are held in the language of the deceased, but always with Slovene or Hungarian additions because of the presence of the mourners. It may be of interest to mention that the relatives of the deceased are aware of the question of language, since they warn me beforehand of the need for bilinguality (because of the presence of the fellow-workers or of other relations of the deceased.)

We also try to hold Christmas Midnight Mass and Easter Processional Mass in both languages. It may also be of interest to mention that the singing, which is led by the organist (a Hungarian), proceeds in both languages, sung alternately. The song 'Holy Night' is sung so that singers sing one verse in Slovene, the next in Hungarian, and so on. The singing of other songs that are international in character on similar holidays takes place in the same way.

Religious education is also bilingual. All the children have books and other materials in Slovene, but the language for assignments is optional, and they always take advantage of the option. Questioning also takes place in both languages. The children have to learn prayers in both languages, so that the two co-exist in a unique way.

I should mention that people in bilingual regions have got used to a way of life like this. It is certain, also, that many things could be improved, and I hope this will be seen in the future.”

4. CONCLUSIONS

Bearing in mind that Slovene is the state language of Slovenia and thus has at its disposal all the usual political, legal and professional resources, we do not see any great problems with respect to its use within the republic from the points of view discussed here (except for the socio-linguistic problems mentioned in various studies). There are however a number of associated strategic questions to which it will be necessary to find suitable practical answers during coming decades. It is a fact that in recent years Slovenia has changed its image from that of a homogeneous ethnic, linguistic and cultural community. It has not been our intention here to examine the reasons for this change, nor to come to any conclusion about the most rational course of action for the future. We do, however, have our own opinions on this matter, which we present instead of a conclusion. Proceeding from current realities, we wish to sound a warning about the dilemmas and associated tasks which must be faced in planning for the linguistic future in Slovenia. The necessary tasks are as follows:

To invest greater efforts than hitherto to ensure that the Slovene language will keep in step with the concurrent development and international role of other European languages, especially the less widely-spoken ones. This is linked with the overall development of Slovenia in economic, technological and other fields which mark the ‘progress’ of a nation in the contemporary world and the openness of its relations with the world;³²

To establish an effective strategy to affirm that Slovene is an equal language at the federal level in Yugoslavia, taking into consideration, *inter alia*, that two-thirds of the Yugoslav population belongs to a single linguistic group, that of Serbo-Croatian-speakers;³³

To work consistently towards linguistic and cultural equality within Slovenia with respect to the Italian and Hungarian autochthonic nationality groups and also with respect to members of other nations and nationalities that have in one way or another found their home and happiness in Slovenia. The concept of a ‘melting pot’ is certainly not an expedient solution in this instance;

Finally, to demonstrate more imagination in finding a suitable path for the preservation and affirmation of the Slovene language in the diaspora. This will, among other things, have the effect of destroying the quite unjustified complex, typical for Slovenes, of inferiority and weakness, a complex that frequently paralyzes our contemporary national progress.

REFERENCES

Abbreviations: ULDFJ = Uradni list, DF Jugoslavija; ULSFRJ = Uradni list, SFR Jugoslavija; ULSRS = Uradni list, SR Slovenija; ULSRSb = Uradni list, SR Srbija.

1. The provincial and autonomous provincial constitutions include principles of 'the free use of the languages of ethnic groups', although their realization is not governed by regulation. Some experts have suggested the necessity of making the situation of the Gypsies and Wallachians equal to that of the nationalities.
2. In Vojvodina and Kosovo, at provincial level.
3. See S. Devetak, "Esame dell' assetto istituzionale-giuridico della partita linguistica in Jugoslavia." paper, Second Catalanian Congress, Barcelona, 14-18 Apr. 1986 [unpub. ms., Ljubljana, 60 pp.]
4. Source: *The Statistical Yearbook of SR Slovenia 1983* (Ljubljana: Zavod SRS za statistike, 1983). Note that over 2% of respondents can not be ethnically classified (nationality not stated; non-affiliated; 'Yugoslav'; etc.).
5. Namely, Czech, Bulgarian, Rumanian, Rusin, Slovak, Turkish, and Ukrainian; and see note 1 re. Gypsies and Wallachians.
6. Note: bilingual place-names within Slovenia are given in both languages when first cited, with the Slovene first; if mentioned subsequently, they are cited in Slovene only.
7. See Sonja Novak-Lukanovič, "Language and the educational system in Slovenia." Paper, Seminar on Languages and Education in Europe, Barcelona, 10-13 June, 1986.
8. See *The Slovene and Hungarian Nationalities: the Factor of Co-existence and Co-operation on the Yugoslav-Hungarian Border* [text in Slovene and Hungarian], to be published by Kommunist for The Institute of Culture, Budapest, and the Institute for Ethnic Studies, Ljubljana. For information on the situation in Piran, see James W. Tollefson, *The Language Situation and Language Policy in Slovenia* (Washington, DC: UP America, 1981).
9. *URSRS* 38 (25 Dec. 1981) 2247-2292, arts. 13, 23.
10. See, e.g., the local statutes: *Uradne objave* 37, Lendava (12 Nov. 1981) and *Uradne objave*, Murska Sobota (9 May 1980); also the regulations of the respective Assemblies: *Informacije Hirado*, Lendava 6 (13 Sep. 1982) and *Uradne objave* 18, Murska Sobota (22 Jun. 1978).
11. The Yugoslav state does not administer public matters such as education, culture, health, social security; these are administered by the so-called self-management communities of interest, which have their own financial resources and their own administration by assembly and executive; the users and agents of the public services elect delegates to the assemblies.
12. *ULSFRJ* 32 (16 Jun. 1978) arts. 15, 249, 250, 252.
13. See: *ULSRS* 24 (26 Jul. 1979) 1353-1384, arts 16, 157; and *ULSRS* 28 (17 Nov. 1980) 1417-1432, art. 14.
14. E.g., *ULSRS* 8 (7 Apr. 1980) 559-563, art. 25 (law on professional examinations of administrative workers).
15. E.g., the self-management agreement on the bilingual organization of the administrative agencies of the Lendava Commune Assembly, 1977, Arhiv INV, D III 3/a, 1332; the regulation on the systematization of work and tasks for the department of general administration of the Lendava Commune (Lendava Commune Assembly, 17 Jan. 1984); and the regulations on bilingual organization and measures for the increase of wages for workers who work bilingually in the courts of Murska Sobota (Murska Sobota Primary Courts, 4 Apr. 1979).
16. See *ULSRS* 29 (1979) art. 4a (on identity cards); *ULSRS* 28 (1980) (on personal names); *ULSRS* 28 (1980), art 2 (on registration booklets).
17. Abbreviations in tables: H = Hungarian, S = Slovene, O = Other, N/R = No response. All data are in percentages.
18. *ULDFJ* 67 (4 Sep. 1945).
19. *ULSFRJ* 4 (14 Feb. 1977) 145-212, arts. 5-9 (on penal proceedings); *ULSFRJ* 4 (14 Jan. 1977) 212-262, arts 6, 102-105 (on judicial proceedings); and *ULSFRJ* 4 (14 Jan. 1977) art. 56, *ULSFRJ* 26 (9 Jun. 1956) art. 52, and *ULSFRJ* 10 (7 Mar. 1986) (on misdemeanors).
20. For the text of the Supreme Court opinion, see *The Nations and Nationalities of Yugoslavia* (Belgrade: Medjunarodna politika, 1974) 439-445.
21. *URSRS* 10 (7 May 1977) 529-539, arts 18, 25 (on self-management courts); see also: *ULSRS* 23 (18 Jul. 1979) 1323-1333, art. 3 (on legal aid); *ULSRS* 10 (7 May 1977) 539-545, art. 11 (on the public prosecutor's office); *ULSRS* 25 (1983) art. 64 (on misdemeanors).

22. *ULSRS* 14 (8 May 1981) 1135-1155, arts. 23-30 (associated labor courts); *ULSRS* 26 (9 Dec. 1978) 2052-2088, arts. 26-34 (regular courts); *ULSRS* 28 (17 Nov. 1980) 1443-1444, art. 15 (court registers); and the regulations for the internal work of agencies for the processing of misdemeanors (under discussion).
23. *ULSRS* 28 (17 Nov. 1980) 1432-1440, art. 2; *ULSRS* 11 (1980), especially art. 25.
24. For a local regulation (on bilingual signs in the Lendava commune) see *Uradne objave* 1, Muska Sobota (23 Jan. 1986); for federal regulations, see *URSFRJ* (28 Apr. 1978), no. 23. (Data are from correspondence with Federal Customs Administration.)
25. See, e.g., decree on display of flags, Lendava commune, *Vestnik, Uradne objave*, Murska Sobota, 40 (1981).
26. Cf. note 19.
27. *ULSRS* (11 Oct. 1982) no. 35.
28. *ULSFRJ* 53 (3 Dec. 1976), arts. 417, 425.
29. See, e.g., *ULSRSb* 5 (4 Feb. 1978) 267.
30. *ULSFRJ* 38 (1977) art. 48.
31. *ULSRS* 21 (1977) art 27.
32. For further data and discussion, cf. Tollefson, *The Language Situation*; J. Toporišič, "A language of a small nationality in a multilingual state," *Folia Slavica* 1: 480-86 (1978), and "The social situation of the Slovene Literary Language in 1584 and 1984," *Slovene Studies* 6: 247-58 (1984).
33. For further discussion, see Devetak, "Esame dell'assetto."

POVZETEK

Avtor v uvodu podaja kratek pogled na demografsko sestavo prebivalstva Slovenije. Poleg večinskega slovenskega prebivalstva (okrog 90%) ter pripadnikov italijanske in madžarske narodnosti (okrog 0,62%), ki so 'avtohtono' prebivalstvo Slovenije, se v zadnjih dveh desetletjih povečuje število pripadnikov drugih narodov in narodnosti Jugoslavije (okrog 6,05%). V članku avtor analizira različne vidike družbenega položaja in rabe slovenskega jezika ter enakopravnosti tega jezika z jezikoma italijanske in madžarske narodnosti, ki živita ob mejah z Italijo oz. Madžarsko (v političnih skupščinah, na sodiščih, pri javnih napisih, v teritorialni obrambi, v 'združenem delu', pri delu verskih skupnosti). Na koncu podaja nekatere svoje poglede na možnosti za bodočo jezikovno politiko v Sloveniji in Jugoslaviji. Pri tem posebej poudarja nujnost, da se slovenski jezik enakopravno razvija z drugimi, zlasti manj razširjenimi, evropskimi jeziki. Po njegovem mnenju so te možnosti neposredno povezane z vsestranskim razvijanjem Slovenije in s njeno odprtostjo v svet.