

In conclusion, *The Slovene Dialect of Resia. San Giorgio* is an excellent book that illuminates many aspects of an important Slovene dialect that have heretofore not received sufficient attention. Because of its wealth of minute detail, it would be best used as a reference-work and source of data by linguists at the graduate level and beyond.

Raymond H. Miller, Bowdoin College.

----- ◇ -----

Kurkina, Ljubov' Viktorovna. *Dialektnaja struktura praslavjanskogo jazyka po dannym južnoslavjanskoj leksiki. Narečna struktura praslovanskega jezika v luči južnoslovanske leksike.* [= *Slovenska Akademija Znanosti in Umetnosti. Razred za filološke in literarne vede. Classis II: Philologia et litterae. Dela 38.*] Ljubljana: SAZU, 1992. 260 pp.

The aim of this study is to shed fresh light on dialectal variations within Proto-Slavic by treating in great detail part of the lexical structure of one of its segments, namely the one represented by Slovene and neighboring dialects of Serbo-Croatian. Its author, L.V. Kurkina [henceforward, LVK] is a member of the research team in the Russian Academy of Sciences which since 1974 has, under O.N. Trubačev, been engaged in publishing a new etymological dictionary of the Slavic languages, LVK's responsibility being for the Slovene evidence and its interpretation. The book under review is a synthesis of work published by her in several previous articles and of new materials. SAZU is to be commended for taking the unusual but sensible step of publishing this text in Russian; this means that it will bring the results of this research to a wider reading public. Franc Jakopin describes (8) the difficulty of computerizing and publishing this text, given the problems of staying in contact with the author and the political discontinuities in both countries concerned; the collaboration must be judged fruitful.

As Jakopin points out, this study breaks new ground by reconstructing early strata of the Slovene lexicon and contrasting them, and linking them, with proto-dialectal lexical elements in other parts of Slavic. The basic data are from Pleteršnik (1894-1895) but many other Slovene sources were used: not only the

better-known "standard" studies by Bajec, Baudouin de Courtenay, Bezlaj, Gutsmann, Jarnik, and Štrekelj, but also dialectal materials from, e.g., Koroška (Karničar, and even a manuscript by Šašel housed in SAZU), Notranjska (Rigler) and Prekmurje (Novak). This wide view was essential, since proto-dialectal links not only with other South Slavic language-varieties but also with West Slavic were expected (and are shown) to be significant.

It should however be emphasized that this book does *not* deliver exactly what its title indicates. Although the title speaks of the South Slavic lexicon as a whole, the book treats data primarily from Slovene and Kajkavic and Čakavic (the areal grouping called "West South Slavic," hereafter *WSSL*.) More important, only three portions of the lexicon (described below) are treated; a reader interested (for example) in the words comprising specific semantic fields will be disappointed; and there seems to be an over-emphasis on nouns as opposed to other parts of speech. Rather than "the South Slavic lexicon," therefore, a more informative title would have specified "sectors of the Slovene lexicon." LVK explains (46-47) why she limits her analytical approach, and the limitations have some justification; but the title is misleading nonetheless. — This review will emphasize the methodology and conclusions; comments on individual etymological data are left to specialists.

In her first chapter, "Introduction. The problem of the dialectal origins of the South Slavic language group"⁷ (11-25), LVK very neatly summarizes the inadequacies in the traditional tripartition of the Slavic languages, based as it was on a restricted number of phonological and morphological criteria which, in any case, have been shown to very poorly divide Proto-East from Proto-West Slavic, or Proto-North (where "North" equals "East" plus "West") from Proto-South Slavic. In general, her arguments may be said to demonstrate very eloquently the extent to which the convenient fiction of referring to separate East, West and South Slavic language-groups is now acknowledged to be indeed fictitious, and how much the existence of variation within Proto-Slavic must be assumed (variation which, given that Slavic was a real means of communication spoken by real people, we can only expect it to have exhibited). If only on the geographical axis, there must have been a complex heterogeneity of varieties, with

⁷ My translations from the Russian here and below, TP.

much less coincidence of isoglosses than used to be traditionally assumed. LVK succinctly but clearly summarizes the phonological and morphological evidence that links various South Slavic areal entities severally with each other and with Czech and Slovak; she gives prominence to the reconstructive theories of Ivić and Ramovš,⁸ but cites several other linguists to demonstrate how complex is the picture based on this evidence alone, and concludes that “the linguo-geographic study of Slovene using phonological and morphological data leads to the conclusion that in the system of the Proto-Slavic there existed a community of closely-related, territorially varying dialects... [involving] a persistent linguistic unity and some kind of [localized] development... [This] needs to be tested using lexical data.” (25)

The bulk of the work is an attempt to answer this need, with specific reference to WSSI, and with long lists of words in Slovene (and Kajkavic and Čakavic) with their cognates elsewhere, according to apparently pre-selected geographical categories (North Slavic, East Slavic, Czech and Slovak, Bulgaran,⁹ and so on; conspicuously absent, for the most part, is Štokavic, see below). LVK does not state explicitly here whether she claims to list *all* the available dialectisms under each heading, or only a *selection* of them; in her summary chapter, however, she does admit that her lists are incomplete, given unavoidable obstacles. These include the obvious gaps in available descriptions; the lack of information as to what vocabulary has been lost over time; the difficulty of establishing relative chronology; and the possibility of interference from other languages. (She should have added another: the unknown but surely great number of dialects which must have been lost over the centuries.) Therefore, the lists “remain open,” and may be changed by future discoveries. They are however very extensive, and it is clear that this is more than a casual sample.

⁸ Unfortunately, her references are in some instances much too dated; for example, she refers to Ivić (1958) rather than the amended Ivić (1972); and when she describes the Slovene dialect divisions, the most recent of her references is thirty years old — at the very least, the map by Logar and Rigler (1986) should have been cited.

⁹ LVK tends to speak of “Bulgarian and Macedonian” but most of her data are from Bulgarian. Given the unusual history of Macedonian, and the possibility that its dialects should not all be treated as genetically equal, I refer here to “Bulgarian” only.

Nevertheless, one question must be asked: since this demonstration of early linguistic links in the WSSl. area (and beyond it) depends to a great extent on the *length* of the lists of words and reconstructed roots, are there statistical criteria, or is there at least a statistical approach? (I use the term *statistics* rather loosely, of course). For example, she cites eight WSSl. derivations in *-ad* (113-14) and concludes that this is less typical of WSSl. than of Štokavic, where the suffix became productive in the 17th century, and this conclusion is beyond reproach; but it begs the question: how meaningful is the number 8? What number would have sufficed to justify this suffix being considered a WSSl. “dialectism?” Another example: in Chapter One LVK lists instances of lexical links which complicate the traditional tripartition, and among them cites three Slovene-Lusatian Sorbian pairs of cognates (40), which she labels “isolexes:” does this mean that she denies the possibility of the simple retention of archaic features at the geographic periphery, and/or of simple coincidence, neither of which would be evidence of *any* kind of genetic connection? Admittedly, the use of the term *isolex* does not presuppose genetic connection, but LVK in the same paragraph refers to “links” which does assume some kind of connection. Clearly, a large number of such links (better, correspondences) would give more weight to a genetic argument — but how large would this have to be? A third example: LVK describes the Slovene lexicon (41) as archaic, and in some respects this is surely true; but to characterize it as *more* archaic than (some) other Slavic languages again requires some kind of numerical criterion: for almost every Slavic dialect comprises *some* archaic elements. — LVK does offer an answer, but it is vague: “... We use as our starting point the position that only regularly recurrent and not single, but mass isolexes can be reliable indicators of linguo-ethnic relationships, isolexes which can be discovered only by a wide treatment of the whole lexicon.” (47) She then argues that the limited study of separate portions of the lexicon allows an exhaustive treatment of these portions, but admits the disadvantage: that the evidence is quantitatively impoverished. Hence, the importance (see below) of choosing lexical elements that undeniably belong to the oldest part of the vocabulary.

An interesting methodological question comes to mind. Granted, the political history of the Slovene-Serb-Croatian area

suggests that Slovene dialects remained more isolated and were less influenced by their Slavic neighbours, for (outside Rovtarsko) there is none of the 'patchwork quilt' effect which, further south, resulted primarily from the Turkish invasions and the resulting movements of refugees; and, by the same reasoning, Kajkavic and Čakavic are more pristine than Štokavic (as LKV points out, 41). Hence, assuming the WSSl. grouping to be an *a priori* "archaic" area does appear justified. Nevertheless, could there not be some independent approach which would demonstrate this fact?

Chapter One (26-51) is a discussion of "Lexical isoglosses as one of the criteria for a dialectal division of Proto-Slavic." LVK correctly claims contemporary priority for lexical reconstruction, given that phonological and grammatical reconstructive possibilities have been "exhausted" (26), and given the recent progress in Slavic dialect descriptions (27). The bulk of this chapter is a demonstration of the counter-evidence that shows how inexact are the traditional Slavic divisions; so we have lists of, e.g., South Slavic cognates of lexica traditionally limited to "North Slavic," and North Slavic cognates of traditional "South Slavisms." If the traditional divisions are misleading, how then should we view the lexical patterns within Proto-(South-)Slavic? LVK quite properly writes that "the key lies in the most archaic layers of the lexicon;" (41) but this begs another question: how can we be sure that any given word is "archaic?" Words borrowed from non-Slavic sources are (probably) not archaic, and are excluded. Her methodological approach is set out in detail (47-48), but none of her five steps fully answers this question. (The steps are: inventorizing "regional," i.e., WSSl. lexical items; analyzing their derivational and then their morphophonological structure; ascertaining links with other Slavic and other Indo-European languages; and sorting out the specific WSSl. dialectal lexica.) LVK argues that if a WSSl. word fits into one of the three categories described in Chapters Two and Three, and if it has a *limited* number of cognates outside WSSl., then it is considered archaic. I accept the reasoning in general, but doubt the reliability of the procedure in every particular; more important, I suggest that a great deal of vocabulary that is equally archaic will be omitted.

Chapter Two (52-110), a description of "The structural and genetic features of West South Slavic lexical dialectisms," has two main divisions. The first deals with "lexical dialectisms whose

structure is not motivated by systematic Proto-Slavic relations;" that is, words which (1) are primary (not derived from others), (2) have no alternations of the root-vowel, and (3) have cognates in Indo-European outside of Slavic. These are LVK's criteria (which, see above, I accept) for categorizing lexical items as "archaic." The second, much longer part of this chapter (66-110) catalogs all the lexical units that feature vowel-alternations in their root. Given the role played by these alternations in Indo-European, this is not a severe numerical restriction; but the total number of lexical connections thus established is only 67. How many more would there be if vowel-alternation were not a criterion?

Chapter Three (111-97) is a listing of the "Lexico-derivational dialectisms of the West South Slavic area." It lists derivations according to consonantal suffixes, followed by non-suffixal and prefixal derivations. This area of diachronic research is fraught with obstacles; LVK is suitably cautious in trying to identify the oldest correspondences between WSSL and other areal groups. Thus the suffix **-bba*, which became so distinctively productive in Slovene, is only cited as relevant in *four* instances.

Chapter Four (198-215) is: "The basic isogloss characteristics in their chronological and spatial distribution. Pannonia as one of the centers of Slavic migration." Much of the chapter summarizes the correspondences adduced in the preceding 150 pages according to the areal groupings thus "linked" to WSSL. Since there is no "statistical" summary, and because LVK's selection of three parts of the lexicon (whatever other advantages and disadvantages it may have) surely results in a representative sample, I now provide a rough count of these "links." (1) WSSL and all or part of North Slavic: 104; (2) WSSL and East Slavic: 46; (3) WSSL and all of West Slavic: 25; (4) WSSL and Czech and Slovak: 28; (5) WSSL and Bulgarian: 13; (6) WSSL, West Slavic and Bulgarian: 10. These listings are followed by lists of correspondences with Indo-European outside Slavic, and then (a selection of) those within Slavic which *exclude* WSSL. — Here, the point made above (that LVK does not make separate listings for WSSL-Štokavic correspondences) re-emerges with striking clarity. In all other respects, the overall picture of what may be called the "proto-lexical proximity" of WSSL with other parts of the Slavic (and non-Slavic) world is represented; but in this (Štokavic) respect, it is not. It is, indeed, unclear whether this is a deliberate

methodological step, or whether there happen to be few or no such correspondences; and this is important, for it has implications for the linguistic and especially the non-linguistic conclusions which follow in the second half of this chapter.

It is obvious from the above numerical summary that Slovene (with Kajkavic and Čakavic) have many more correspondences than the traditional partition of Slavic would imply with, first, non-South-Slavic languages and especially Czech and Slovak, and, second, Bulgarian. As the chapter's title implies, LVK's main non-linguistic conclusion involves Pannonia; in her view (and she summarizes much of the non-linguistic evidence) Pannonia was, after the Slavs' dispersal from their original homeland, the location of an enormous re-organization and re-formation of the ethnolinguistic links among the early Slavic tribal groups. involving, in particular, close linkages between the pre-Slovenes (and their immediate southern neighbors) with the pre-Czechoslovaks and the pre-Bulgarians. She thus reinforces some of the ideas originally proposed by Kopitar and Miklošič, and her conclusions underline the significance of the Freising Fragments. Here (again), she is cautious. She writes that her inferences do not run counter to the now much-accepted view that the South Slavs migrated to their present-day homes in two waves, one through Pannonia and one much further to the east, resulting in a division of South Slavic into two regions along the Vidin-Osogov line made famous by Ivić; it is clear, however, that close lexical links between Slovene and Czechoslovak and Bulgarian point to some kinds of revisions to this view. Indeed, LVK emphasizes the theory that the South Slavic territory should be viewed in terms of centre (most of Štokavic) versus periphery (the rest), which is very different from Ivić's model. It is, also, thus probably incorrect to speak of a "Proto-South-Slavic;" and the theories of East Slavic involvement in the early history of Slovene, proposed by Ramovš and Bezljaj, are seen to be poorly-founded.

This is a specialist's book, and even those who work with the diachrony of Slovene will find much of it more useful for reference than for careful perusal. The criticisms above must not be understood as detracting from its overall value. A great deal of trouble was taken in its writing, and a great deal more in its production in Ljubljana; this trouble was worthwhile, for the book contributes a great deal to our understanding of the correspon-

dences, and by inference the prehistoric links, between Pre-Slovene and its neighbors. Eventually, when the Proto-Slavic vocabulary can be analyzed as a whole, linguists will see how these "archaic" parts of the puzzle fit in with the rest.

Tom Priestly, University of Alberta

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ivić, Pavle. 1958. *Die serbokroatischen Dialekte. Ihre Struktur und Entwicklung*. The Hague: Mouton.
- . 1972. "Balkan Slavic migrations in the light of South Slavic dialectology," 66-86 in H. Birnbaum and S. Vryonis (eds), *Aspects of the Balkans. Continuity and Change*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Logar, Tine and Jakob Rigler. 1986. *Karta slovenskih narečij*. Ljubljana: Geodetski zavod SRS.
- Pleteršnik, Maks. 1894-95. *Slovensko-nemški slovar. I-II*. Ljubljana: Knezoškofijstvo.

