

umetniški jezik nekateri vnašajo narečnice, arhaične prvine, ki jim pomenijo pestrost, bogatost, nekateri so do pojavnosti ironični, drugi upajo na nastanek novega, neobremenjenega v jeziku, a se to ne zgodi. Prispevek *Kratka proza Slovencev v Avstriji* predstavlja literarna dela že omenjenih literatov z vidika kratkoproznega ustvarjanja, pri čemer avtorica ponovno poudarja njihovo raznolikost in pestrost tako v tematiki kot tudi v jezikovno-slogovnih posebnostih. Študija je zastavljena primerjalno, tako bralec npr. izve, da je zelo pogosta tema J. Messnerja, F. Lipuša, A. Hudl, K. Močilnika, V. Ošlaka ostra kritika katolištva. Oblasnost, nadvladje pa je tematizirana tudi v prozi Leva Detele.

Predzadnji prispevek *Avstrijska književnost v Sloveniji in slovenska v Avstriji* prinaša vpogled v prevodoslovje, torej avstrijske književnosti v slovenščino in slovenske v nemščino, pri čemer avtorica izpostavlja predvsem majhen delež prevedene slovenske dramatike v nemščino. Prav tako pa je izredno zanimiva razprava tudi zato, ker poudarja, da kriterij za določevanje identitete neke literaturi ni le jezik, npr. nemški ali slovenski, prav tako tudi kraj rojstva in bivanja ne, temveč je treba problem razumeti širše. Ob tem navede vrsto literarnih ustvarjalcev, ki potrjujejo tej tezi, npr. E. Canetti, I. Bachmann idr., a veljata za avstrijska avtorja. Zadnji prispevek predstavlja znanstvenoraziskovalno delo avtoričinih kolegov na Oddelku za slovanske jezike in književnosti Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Mariboru, in sicer tistih, ki se ukvarjajo z literarno zgodovino.

V znanstveni monografiji *Književne študije* Silvije Borovnik vidimo preplet večdisciplinarnosti, npr. sociologije spolov, zgodovine, biografije, prevodoslovja, ki se s književnostjo palimpsest-

no povezujejo. Tako zbir avtoričinih znanstvenih prispevkov ponuja bralec večplastno gledanje na (sodobno) slovensko književnost, s tem pa odpira nova vprašanja.

Avtorico v znanstvenoraziskovalnem delu zanimajo *bele lise*, nepoznana, neraziskana področja v slovenski književnosti, kar je nedvomno odlika ne samo te monografije, temveč tudi celotnega doprinosa Silvije Borovnik h književni znanosti.

*Janja Vollmaier Lubej*

*Janja.v@windowslive.com*

**FREDERIK KORTLANDT: SELECTED WRITINGS ON SLAVIC AND GENERAL LINGUISTICS.**

Rodopi, Amsterdam/ New York, NY 2011, 470 pp.

Scholars working in Indo-European and Balto-Slavic linguistics will welcome this new book with selected papers by Frederik Kortlandt (hereafter K), the main proponent of the so called “Leiden Accentological School.” The book is a free-standing sequel to other volumes which thematically present K’s papers: *Italo-Celtic origins and prehistoric development of the Irish language* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007), *Baltica & Balto-Slavica* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009) and *Studies in Germanic, Indo-European and Indo-Uralic* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2010). The aim of all these books is to make K’s scientific work since the early 1970s more accessible to a wider public. This is a very praiseworthy

thy attempt, even if a potential reader can download many of K's papers from his web page.

K's contribution to Indo-European and especially to Balto-Slavic linguistics cannot be ignored, especially if one wants to study the development of Balto-Slavic accentuation. K's background originates from the work of Christian Stang in 1957, V. M. Illič-Svityč, as well as from works by V. A. Dybo. While the Moscow accentological school (centered around Dybo) developed its research mainly on the synchronic state of Balto-Slavic, Baltic and Proto-Slavic, K deals mainly with the relative chronology of changes. His conception can now be considered as the most complete description of accentual changes from PIE to the separate Baltic and Slavic languages. Although it is not generally accepted, the main reason for refusing K's theories is mainly the lack of information and difficulty in reading K's papers. A reader is very often discouraged by the apparent unintelligibility of K's texts, which require a broad context of knowledge: both the narrow topic of accentology as well as the context of some of K's other papers. The latter is the main problem for scholars who are often discouraged after they read one or two of K's papers. One must study K as a whole and keep in mind the results of his individual papers to grasp his whole theory. Then scholars can see how detailed and elaborate K's theory of accentual development from Proto-Indo-European to separate Slavic languages is. So what a scholar needs is both the sum of K's important papers (which the volume reviewed partially supplies) as well as a short and clear introduction to the "Leiden mode of thinking," which is still missing. Both

would help with broader familiarity and acceptance of K's theories.

In the present volume all of K's important works, which can be taken as "canonical" for his theory, are reprinted. The original and revolutionary book *Slavic accentuation*, which includes the important chapter 3, "The loss of the Indo-European laryngeals," is now presented with revised phonemic symbols. A simplified version of K's early theories can also be found in his book *On the History of Slavic Accentuation*. A reader of the book will also find there the famous paper on the detailed chronology of all accentual changes (on the background of other sound changes) from Proto-Indo-European to Slavic and also the paper on the complex history of West Slavic accentuation. K's important contribution to Polabian accentuation as well as the development of nominal paradigms are also reprinted in the volume.

Although readers will welcome the selected papers of K as a scholar who cannot be ignored, it is still doubtful whether the *Selected papers...* as well as other collections of his papers will help readers to understand his theories better. There are several deficiencies that might discourage potential readers. First, the papers are not reprinted with the original paging. K refers to the original quotations in the cumulative references at the back of the volume, but it is of no help. If a reader wants to work with a page from, e.g., the "Early Dialectal Diversity of South Slavic I," he or she must either quote the original paper published in 1982, or the text reprinted in the *Selected papers...* The cumulative list of references in the back of the book is also very impractical because one cannot follow the references to the original individual papers.

Adopting this policy, one also cannot be sure which version of the paper one should actually use, e.g., *West Slavic Accentuation* has been published three times: originally on K's web site in 2009, then in *Selected papers...* and finally in *From present to past and back: Papers on Baltic and Slavic accentology* (Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang, 2011). Each time the paper has been published with different pagination. One is also puzzled by the original publishing dates and K's own reworked version; e.g. the important paper "From Proto-Indo-European to Slavic," originally published in 1994, also has a 2002 internet version (apart from the version published in the *Selected papers...*). So which version should one use for references?

Apart from the short Preface, the *Selected papers...* should be thematically arranged into blocks and accompanied with a short introduction with the aim of explaining to the reader the brief results of the papers. It would help to orient the reader in K's theories and would even broaden their popularity. For a person who is not familiar with the history of accentuation, the book represents another kind of jungle and he or she will not be able to follow the main points of K's theory, which is not good, alas. At least we have another accessible book with papers of Leiden guru, but the user-friendly introduction and explanation of the main points are still hanging in the air.

**Roman Sukač**

*Silesian University, Opava*

**ISTVÁN SZÉPFALUSI, OTTÓ VÖRÖS, ANIKÓ BEREKSZÁSZI, MIKLÓS KONTRA: MADŽARSKI JEZIK V AVSTRIJI IN SLOVENIJI.**

Založba Gondolat – Imre Samu Nyelvi Intézet (Jezikovni zavod Imre Samu) – Zavod za kulturo madžarske narodnosti, Budimpešta – Alsóór (Untertwart). Lendava 2012, 351 str.

Pričujoča izdaja je četrta iz zbirke *A magyar nyelv a Kárpát-medencében a XX. század végén – Madžarski jezik v Karpatskem bazenu ob koncu XX. stoletja*. Prva knjiga *A magyar nyelv Ukrajnában (Kárpátalján) – Madžarski jezik v Ukrajini (Zakarpattju)*, delo Istvána Csernicskója, je izšla leta 1998. Leta 1999 je sledila izdaja *A magyar nyelv Jugoszláviában (Vajdaságban) – Madžarski jezik v Jugoslaviji (Vojvodini)*, katere avtor je Lajos Göncz. Tretja knjiga omenjene zbirke z naslovom *A magyar nyelv Szlovákiában – Madžarski jezik na Slovaškem* je izšla leta 2000 izpod peresa Istvána Lanstyáka. Četrta knjiga je na objavo čakala 12 let, kar urednik zbirke Miklós Kontra v predgovoru pojasnjuje z nenadno smrtjo enega od avtorjev, in sicer Istvána Szépfalusija leta 2000, ter ovirami, ki so se pojavljale v okviru uredništva (22). Na koncu sta terensko delo Istvána Szépfalusija v Avstriji in Ottója Vörösa v Sloveniji, opravljeno v letih 1996/97, s teoretično podlago podprla Anikó Beregszászi in Miklós Kontra (22–23). Delovna skupina, oblikovana v sklopu sociolingvistične konference *Élőnyelvi Konferencia*, je obravnavala različice madžarskega jezika v zamejstvu po enotnih kriterijih, raziskavo pa dopolnila s kontrolno analizo madžarskega jezika na Madžarskem. Cilj je bil znanstveni vpogled v jezikovni položaj z namenom oblikovanja realne jezikovne politike. Poleg