



LiVeS Journal
July 2017 / 11

LiVeS Journal
/Liberty, Verity, and Spirit/

Leto VIII julij 2017
shtevilka 11

Izdajatelj revije

REVIJA SRP

i.a: <http://www.livesjournal.eu>

e.m: urednistvo@revijasrp.si

e.m: editors@livesjournal.eu

Naslov

Revija SRP, Prazhakova 13, 1000 Ljubljana,
Slovenija

UREDNIŠTVO

Peter Amalietti

Ivo Antich

Lev Detela

Damir Globochnik

Rajko Shushtarshich

LIVES JOURNAL je slovenska revija, ki nadaljuje in na novem nivoju povzema projekt Revije SRP: gre za nadaljevanje posebne publikacijske prakse (v tisku in na spletu) kot radikalno naravnane preizkusa možnosti neodvisne umetnishke, esejistichne, znanstvene refleksije v geohistorichnem kontekstu in oblik identitete v njem, ter gre za inovacijo zlasti v smislu vzporednega slovensko-angleshkega zapisa, ki se odpira sledovom slovenstva kjer koli po svetu. Usmeritev publikacije s svojo obliko in s pomenskimi razsezhnostmi nakazuje tudi ime: zacetni chrki obeh besed sta kratica za Ljubljano (LJ), v angleshki besedi LiVeS pa so simetrichni soglasniki zacetnice istih treh vodilnih pojmov kot v slovenski besedi SRP (Svoboda – Resnica – Pogum / Liberty – Verity – Spirit).

ISSN 1855–8267

LiVeS Journal
/Liberty, Verity, and Spirit/

Year VIII July 2017
number 11 (in preparing)

Publisher of review

REVIJA SRP

i.a: <http://www.livesjournal.eu>

e.m: urednishtvo@revijasrp.si

e.m: editors@livesjournal.eu

Address

Revija SRP, Prazhakova 13, 1000 Ljubljana,
Slovenia

EDITORS

Peter Amalietti

Ivo Antich

Lev Detela

Damir Globochnik

Rajko Shushtarshich

LIVES JOURNAL is a Slovenian review which continues on a new level and summarizes the project of Review SRP: a continuation of the special practice of publication (in print and online) as a radical examination of the possibilities of an independent-oriented art, essayistic, scientific reflection in geohistorical context and its forms of identity, and the innovation especially in the sense of parallel Slovenian-English writing, which is opened to the traces of Slovenian identity anywhere in the world. The orientation of publication is also suggested by the name with its form and dimensions of meaning: the initial letters of both words are an abbreviation for Ljubljana (LJ), and in English word LiVeS symmetrical consonants perform the initials of the same three leading concepts such as in Slovenian word SRP (Svoboda – Resnica – Pogum / Liberty – Verity – Spirit)

Vsebina

Karel Smolle	Molk pa she diha	6
Lev Detela	Beseda iz zemlje	10
Ivo Antich	(H)ister (Dva triptiha)	14
Matjazh Jarc	Prizmat, nova pesnisha oblika	20
Rajko Shushtarshich	Endofazija I	38
Likovna priloga		
Damir Globochnik	Harmonichna likovna ubranost	96
Peter Abram	Likovna dela /slike/	102
Za zgodovinski spomin		
Damir Globochnik	Parishki fotograf Venó Pilon	112
Iz zgodovinskega spomina		
Henrik Tuma	Zemljepisno-jezikoslovni zapisi	118
Davorin Zhunkovich	Starodavnost Slovanov v Evropi (Zachetna poglavja iz knjige Slovani, praljudstvo Evrope)	146
Vprashanja		
Peter Amalietti	Poskus povzetka geneze slovenskega naroda	180
Dokumenti		
Rajko Shushtarshich	Pritozhba, ki ni pritozhba (Pa saj to ne more biti res?)	190

Index

Karel Smolle	But silence still breathes	7
Lev Detela	The word from earth	11
Ivo Antich	(H)ister (Two triptychs)	15
Matjazh Jarc	Prizmat, a new poetic form	21
Rajko Shushtarshich	Endophasia I	39
Art supplement		
Damir Globochnik	A desire for harmonious order	97
Peter Abram	Artworks	111
For historical memory		
Damir Globochnik	Parisian photographer Veno Pilon	113
From historical memory		
Henrik Tuma	Geographical-linguistic notes	119
Davorin Zhunkovich	Ancient provenance of Slavs in Europe (The opening chapters from the book <i>Slavs, a European Protonation</i>)	147
Questions		
Peter Amalietti	An attempt at the synopsis of the Slovenian nation's genesis	181
Dokuments		
Rajko Shushtarshich	An appeal that is not an appeal (This cannot be?)	191

Karel Smolle

MOLK PA SHE DIHA

MOJI DEKLICI

in kar ne krozhi
v utrinku zgori
in sled se koncha
ob zacetku poti
in Bog je tam
kjer ga ni

NASHA BRATEV

moji kostanji lezhijo
na rumenih tleh

vse bomo mi otroci
zbrali
in kostanj
bo ovca
bo konjichek
bo skoro vse
pozimi

kostanj
si ti sem jaz
oba sva orjavela
ko padava
globoko se zarijeva
v rumeno zemljo

ROKE SO

opiljene letvice ograd
prsti
bodichaste naelektrene zhice

telesa so odvrгла obraze
veter je dusham odnesel strehe

Karel Smolle

BUT SILENCE STILL BREATHES

FOR MY GIRLFRIEND

that which doesn't move in a circle
burns immediately
and the traces end
at the beginning of the path
and God can be found
where he can't be found

COLLECTING

my chestnuts lie
on the yellow ground

we children
will collect them
and a chestnut
will become
a lamb
a pony
or anything we like
in the winter

the chestnut
is you is me
we become ripe together
and after we fall
we sink deep
into the yellow earth

HANDS ARE

jagged railings
fingers
electrically-charged barbed wire

bodies have shed their faces
the roofs of souls have been blown away

v ploho nabrani oblaki prshijo
 v zidovje drobovja
 kri je prepojena z vodo

TIHOZHITJE

rjavi pajcholan nochi
 je obvisel
 na vejah gora
 na zvokih miru
 na obokih teme

ura udarja v bron
 z barzhunastim zvokom
 nekdo zajechi

molk pa she diha

KMECHKI POGREB

eden gre drugi pride
 tako nam je usojeno

she na jesen sva tod orala
 zdaj – Bog mu daj dobro

chrni svatje so sipali
 nekaj spominov v grob
 in odshli

KAREL SMOLLE (1941, Celovec), slovenski pesnik in politik v Avstriji (Koroshka); matura na Zvezni gimnaziji za Slovence (Celovec), pravna fakulteta na Dunaju; sodni prevajalec, poslanec v avstrijskem zveznem parlamentu, predsednik Narodnega sveta kor. Slovencev. Poleg lirike je objavljajal politichno-zgodovinske eseje. Edina zbirka pesmi *Ujeti krik* (Celovec, 1965, pod psevd. Mishko Machek – prim. ironichna asociativnost psevdonima: slovensko-koroshki pesnik kot »plen in lovec« v eni osebi). Minimalistichna lirika, ki s formalno skrajno preprostim izrazom tenkochutno skicira zastrto zagatnost osebne in socialne bivanjske identitete koroshkega slovenstva (naslovna sintagma »ujeti krik« v sozvochju z verzoma »nekdo zajechi / molk pa she diha« nakazuje »tihozhitje« pridushenega vztrajanja v depersonalizaciji: »telesa so odvrgla obraze«).

(Op. ur. I. A.)

storm clouds spray
into the walls of intestines
blood is saturated with water

STILL LIFE

the brown net of night
gets caught
in the mountain forests
in the sounds of silence
in the vaults of darkness

the bell tolls
almost muffling
a moan

but silence still breathes

PEASANT FUNERAL

one has gone – another has come
that's the way it is

last autumn we still plowed here
but now – may God gave mercy on him

black-clad mourners throw
a few memories into his grave
and go off

Translated by Herbert Kuhner (with Feliks J. Bister, Zdravko Inzko, Peter Kersche, Milena Merlak)

KAREL SMOLLE (1941, Klagenfurt), Slovenian poet and politician in Austria (Carinthia); Baccalaureate at the Federal High School for Slovenians (Klagenfurt), Faculty of Law in Vienna; court translator, member of the Austrian federal parliament, the President of the National Council of Carinthian Slovenians. In addition to poetry, he was publishing political-historical essays. The only collection of poems *Caught cry* (Klagenfurt, 1965, under pseud. Mouse Cat – cf. ironic associativity of the pseudonym: Slovenian-Carinthian poet as »the prey and the hunter« in one person). Minimalist poetry, which with an extremely simple formal expression sensitively sketches the veiled quandary of personal and social identity of Carinthian-Slovenian existence (the title syntagma »caught cry« in concord with the two verses »someone moans / but silence still breathes« indicates a »still life« of deadened insistence in depersonalization: »bodies have shed their faces«).

(Note by editor I. A.)

Lev Detela

BESEDA IZ ZEMLJE

NA KOPNEM IN NA MORJU

te besede
chez kamenje in pesek

kaplje in pljuski
iz vedra v korito

curki vode iz pipe
preliti po modrini neba
v veter in dezh

nekaj pada
zelo močno pada
nekaj pada v srce

voda se preлива
globoko v mojo dusho
zhejen sem

nekaj iz zemlje je voda
nekaj iz zemlje je beseda iz zemlje
potopljene na morsko dno

nekaj iz zemlje je pod vodo
nekaj iz vode me odnasha na sredo morja
obala je utonila v megli

THE WORD FROM EARTH

ON LAND AND SEA

Words words so many words
on stone and sand

drops and foam
from bucket and trough

and a jet of water from the faucet
sprays over the blue of the sky
in wind and rain

something plummets
from earth to water
something falls in to the heart

water flows
in my soul
I am thirsty

water has come from earth
the word has come from earth
which sank to sea-bottom

that which came from earth is immersed
that which came from earth impels me
to the center of the sea
the coast sank in darkness

POHOTNI BOG

Včeraj je stal pri vratih
najine spalnice
z vrčem medicine v levici

Ni bil še popolnoma pijan
čeprav je govoril zelo hitro
in brez repa in glave

S sabo je imel
golo žensko
s hrepeneche razprtimi ustnicami

Prevrnil jo je na posteljo
in med poskochno glasbo iz starega gramofona
ljubkoval po napeti zadnjici in stegnih

Potem je zapichil oči
v naju v temi
na drugi strani postelje

Jutri pride sodni dan
je rekel
zato uzhivajta to zadnjo noch

Nashe zhivljenje je le kratka senca
pred veliko vechnostjo nicha

THE WANTON GOD

Yesterday he stood on the threshold
of our bedroom,
with a full pitcher of honey schnapps
in his left hand.

He was not completely drunk yet,
although he spoke and sang
haltingly and erratically.

There was a naked woman
with sensual parted lips
at his side.

He pushed her onto the bed,
and caressed her
to the strains of seductive music.

Then he transfixed both of us
with his eyes,
as we sat on the other side
of the bed,

Tomorrow is Armageddon,
so enjoy this night
before the coming of the void!

Our lives are only a small shadow
on the vast eternity of the void.

Translated by Herbert Kuhner

Ivo Antich

(H)ISTER
(Dva triptiha)

OGENJ PUM
(Triptih)

PUMA UMA

V chrni dzhungli srebrna zhival. V srebrni dzhungli chrna zhival. Puma-guma, skok in bes. Raztreshchi les, preseka vrat. Shviga v snov, odpira rov. Vbije blisk, vtolche dan, zarije dlan. Palma: gola plan. Misel, shvist. Jeklen presev. Ploshcha med zobmi. Gnjl kamen, vonj vina, penast brizg, odtekanje trpljenja, kachji vzlet do vidnosti, jastreb v soncnem psu, ki bevske: »Upam!«

SLADKI PLODOVI VOJNE

V veliki vojni je poklal mnogo bitij, ki so pol chlovek, pol puma. Potem pa nagrade: slava, bogastvo, moch. A ubijalec zmeraj postane podoben ubitemu. Moch je obsedel strah: »Kaj che v meni zavohajo pumo?« Postal je glasnik miru in ljubezni. Brata je ubil, ko mu je ta rekel: »Kakshen mir? Vse, kar si, ti dala je vojna!«

(H)ISTER
(Two triptychs)

FIRE OF PUMAS
(Triptych)

PUMA OF MIND

In the black jungle silver animal. In the
silver jungle black animal. Puma-gum,
jump and rage. It crashes a wood,
intersects a neck. Flicks into the stuff, opens a shaft.
Inculcates a flash, inserts a day, incuses a palm.
Palm-tree: bleak plain. Thought, swish. Steely
shining through. Plate between teeth. Rotten stone,
the smell of wine, foamy squirt, outflow
of suffering, snaky flying-up to the visibility,
vulture in a sunny dog, which yelps: »I hope!«

SWEET FRUITS OF WAR

In the great war he slaughtered many
beings that are half man, half puma.
Then rewards: fame, richness,
power. But a killer always
becomes similar to person killed. The man
was possessed of fear: »What if they smell
a puma inside me?« He became a harbinger
of peace and love. He killed his brother
when that said to him: »What
a peace? All your essence is a gift of war!«

HOLOKAVST

Za cerkvijo travnik, za travnikom
gozd. V cerkvi nikoli nikogar ni,
a vendar vчасih zvoni. V požharu
krashki travnik po pumah zadishi:
padajo dlake, ki jih trizob ko-
si. Tudi gozd je travnik, le bilke
so vechje. Biblos, papirus, knjiga
iz trave. Liber, vino svobode.
Trava poje, ko umre. V njej morje
shumi. Vrata trav, pechi. V ognju dar.

HISTRIONOVA GUMA UMA
(Triptih)UMAG
(beli boksit)

Gor, animus! Naprej, dol! Vase, ven!
V zmajski reki dvozenichno oko:
morasto bela ladja rine skoz
chrno testo, posuto s kozjimi
rozinami, ki so storzhaste. Krog
jo zhre, potico iz gume. Guma
zhre sama sebe, trda kot beton:
bel val se pod chrnim nebom zakri-
vi, dvigne se in pade ta giljo-
tina, prech je chesherika stika.

HOLOCAUST

Meadow behind the church, forest
behind the meadow. In the church never anyone,
yet sometimes it rings. In conflagration,
a karst meadow smells of pumas scent:
falling shag mowed by the trident.
Also the forest is the meadow, only the blades
are greater. Byblos, papyrus, a book
of grass. Liber, wine of freedom.
The grass sings when it dies. The sea murmurs
in it. Door of grasses, of stove. The fire-gift.

HISTRION'S GUM OF MIND

(Triptych)

UMAG

(White bauxite)

Up, animus! Forward, down! Into self, out!
In the Dragon River twopupils-eye:
nightmarish white ship pushes through
black dough sprinkled with goat
raisins which are cone-shaped. The circle
devours it, that cake of gum. The gum
devours itself, it is hard as concrete:
white wave bends itself under the black
sky, this guillotine lifts and dropps,
the pineal gland of contact is off.

GUMA
(chrni boksit)

Dol, anima! Nazaj, gor! Ven, vase!
V zmajski reki dvozenichno oko:
morasto chrna ladja rine skoz
belo testo, posuto s kozjimi
rozinami, ki so sluzaste. Krog
jo zhre, potico iz gume. Guma
zhre sama sebe, trda kot beton:
chrn val se pod belim nebom zakri-
vi, dvigne se in pade ta giljo-
tina, prech so krize hipofize.

MAGU
(rdechi boksit)

Trias, Istra, satir! Terra rossa,
fosili shchitoglavcev, zarota
zvezd, kovancev, shkoljk. Pozhar polti. Ne-
shteto gnojnih oblik, histerichen
ples bicha v kavi krvi, migota-
nje skoz spiralno gumo, zabito
v betonski kvader burje. Luch molka
vseka govor v tême, kuzhno seme
iz glave gre v pero, papir budi
shkude upa. Mag si, krt sanskrta!

Hister / Ister (gr. Istros) – antichno ime Donave (Hölderlin: pesem *Der Ister*), argonavtske »zveze« med Chrnim morjem in Istro; histrión iz lat. histrio (iz etrurskega) – igralec, plesalec pantomime (v Rimu so bili prvi igralci Etruski, vechkrat osvobojeni suzhnji); cf. gr. hystéra – maternica; za Donavo tudi (trashko? skitsko?) ime Mataos (mati) ali Matoas (srechenosec); Istri – pleme Ilirov, po njih im. Istra, lat. Histria (po Pliniju so nekateri Iliri imeli ubijalski pogled: »dve zenici v vsakem ochesu«; po nekaterih virih tudi kanibali); cf. jama Isturitz (baskovski toponim, JZ Francija), izjemno paleolitsko nahajalishche (stenske slike, pishchali iz kosti itd.). (Op. avt.)

GUM
(Black bauxite)

Down, animal! Back, up! Out, into self!
In the Dragon River twopupils-eye:
nightmarish black ship pushes through
white dough sprinkled with goat
raisins which are pituitary. The circle
devours it, that cake of gum. The gum
devours itself, it is hard as concrete:
black wave bends itself under the white
sky, this guillotine lifts and dropps,
the crises of hypophysis are off.

MAGUS
(Red bauxite)

Trias, Istria, satyr! Terra rossa,
fossils of stegocephalia, conspiracy
of stars, coins, shells. Fire of complexion.
Numberless purulent forms, hysterical
dance of whip in the coffee of blood, twinkling
through the spiral gum riveted
in a concrete block of bora-wind. Light of silence
hews a speech into the apex, infectious seed
from the head goes into the pen, paper wakes
escudos of hope. You are a magus, a mole of sanskrit!

Hister / Ister (Greek: Istros) – the ancient name of the Danube (Hölderlin: the song *Der Ister*), argonautic »union« between the Black Sea and Istria; histrión from Latin *histrio* (from Etruscan) – actor, pantomime dancer (the first actors in Rome were Etruscans, frequently freed slaves); cf. Greek *hystéra* – matrix, uterus; the Danube was also named (in Thracian? Scythian?) *Mataos* (mother) or *Matoas* (bringer of luck); *Histri* – a tribe of Illyrians, after it n. Istria, Latin *Histria* (according to Pliny, some Illyrians had a killer view: »two iris in each eye«; according to some sources, even cannibals); cf. cave *Isturitz* (Basque toponym, SW France), exceptional location of Paleolithic (wall paintings, flutes of bones, etc.).

(Note by a.)

Translated from Slovenian by author

Matjazb Jarc

PRIZMAT, NOVA PESNISHKA OBLIKA

1. Malo o pesnjenju nasploh

Moj izhodishchni problem je preprost: pesniki ustvarjamo v chasu, ko zna le she redkokdo lochevati med prozo v verzih in poezijo v prozi. Nekateri menijo, da je oboje poezija, drugi oboje pojmujejo kot prozo.

Mnogi pesniki, predvsem pa literarni teoretiki¹ se sprashujejo o tem, kaj je spricho bliskovitega razvoja knjizhevnosti v zadnjih dveh stoletjih sploh she ostalo od pojma *poezija*. Odgovor je preprost – nastala je velika, teoretichno utemeljevana zmeda, v kateri je literarna teorija samo sebe zakomplicirala tako zelo, da se je znashla v nepremostljivi krizi in se hkrati ustolichila na Parnasu samem, tik ob poeziji.

Zanimivo pri tem je, da se literarni teoretiki izrazhajo v izbrushenem jeziku, da so njihova stalishcha globoko premishljena in ustrezno zapletena; sistematically se navezujejo drug na drugega in so dejansko ustvarili zavidljivo trden literarni podsistem. She bolj zanimivo oziroma kar zelo pomenljivo pa je, da se teoretichne interpretacije poezije zhe od nekdej, pa tudi danes, med sabo pomembno razlikujejo: razlike med posamezno pesmijo in njenimi shtevilnimi razlagami so namrech vechne. Da bi vsaj deloma premostili te razlike, bi morali literarni teoretiki tudi sami postati poeti.

»... *Ko bi na primer dobili v roke Taufferjevo karnevalizirano pesem Povzdigovanje, bi se 'iz nje same' le stezhka odlochili, da bi jo brali kot sonet. Zaradi njene uvrstitve v knjigo Sonetje pa njenih petnajst metrichno nehomogeniziranih verzov, ki niso niti chlenjeni v kitice, labko prepoznamo kot primer posmehljive idiosinkrazije 'stalne oblike' soneta, kot repati sonet:*

*ne gre kristus
ne more
od mrtvih vstati
vsakih pet
minut ...«²*

Dejstvo je, da zgoraj omenjeni avtor trenutno velja za enega pomembnih slovenskih pesnikov tudi zaradi tovrstnih domislic eminentnih literarnih kritikov.

Matjazb Jarc

PRIZMAT, A NEW POETIC FORM

1. A few overall words about writing poetry

My primary issue is simple: we poets are creating at a time when very few can tell versified prose apart from prose poetry. Some believe that both are poetry, others view both as prose.

In view of the rapid development of literature in the course of the last two centuries, many poets, and especially literary theoreticians¹ wonder what is left of the concept of *poetry*. The answer is simple – we are left with a great theoretically founded mess wherein literary theory obfuscated itself to such an extent that it now finds itself in an unsurpassable crisis and simultaneously enthroned itself on Mount Parnassus alongside poetry.

It is interesting that literary theoreticians express themselves in sophisticated language, their positions are deeply deliberated and correspondingly complex: they systematically tie into each other and have in fact created an enviably strong literary sub-system. It is even more interesting, or truly and deeply meaningful that theoretic interpretations of poetry have always profoundly differed from one another and continue to do so: the differences between individual poems and their numerous explanations are eternal. In order to at least partially bridge these differences, literary theoreticians would need to become poets themselves.

“... Were they to get their hands on Taufer’s carnavalized poem ‘Raising’, observing it ‘by itself’ would hardly lead us to view it as a sonnet. Since it is included in the book titled Sonnets, its fifteen metrically non-homogenized verse, which are not even divided into stanzas, we can recognize it as an example of derisive idiosyncratic take on the ‘regular sonnet form’, i.e. tailed sonnet.

*Christ does not go
He cannot
from death be rising,
every five,
minutes ...”²*

It is a fact that the above-mentioned author is currently valued as a significant Slovenian poet in part also due to such ingenuities by eminent literary critics.

Che bi ugotavljali razloge oziroma povode za nastajanje teh domislic, bi med drugim verjetno naleteli na politične, ideološke, institucionalne in njim sorodne okolishčine, s katerimi ni pogojena samo recepcija pesnika z njegovimi stvaritvami vred, ampak tudi teoretika, ki o njih razpravlja. Oba se znotraj tako imenovanega družbenega konteksta ne uklanjata samo duhu časa in avtoritetam, od katerih izhajajo družbeni imperativi in argumentacijska podlaga njenega dela, temveč tudi lastni nemochi, da bi se odrekla svoji sladki nevednosti in socialni ranljivosti. Naj ne bo pomote: teoretikova nevednost je s strokovnega vidika dejansko vredna vsega sposhovanja, izbrusena je skoraj do popolnosti, bogato razvejena in vsestransko argumentirana, učenja in gostobesedna, vendar zhal odvracha pogled od najpreprostejših resnic, ki jih spregleda zaradi preobilne učenosti in svoje pragmatične umeshčenosti v aktualni literarni podsistem. Pesnik pa s preluknjanimi jadrji jezdi valove časa daleč stran od poezije: z uvrstitvijo proze v verzih oziroma poezije v prozi med sonete namrech ni degradiral genialne pesniskhe oblike, ampak sebe.

Zdi se mi, da za uvod v predstavitev svoje pesniskhe ideje najbrzh nisem poiskal najbolj drastichnega primera pesniskhe (in posledichno literarno-teoretske) zablode; mogoche je she bolj opisen znani poskus Shalamunovega prenosa komentarija nogometne tekme v tako imenovane verze s pripadajochimi aklamacijami teoretikov in njim sledeche publike.³ Medtem ko politichni in literarno-družbeni sistem bogato nagrajujeta in propagirata tovrstne pesniskhe dosezhke, bi jaz prav po pesniskho rekel, da tu »pesnishtvo« s pesnishtvom nima vech posebne zveze, ampak se je skotalilo v brezno dosezhkov slavne francoske revolucije in se nato iz njenega kozmichnega jajca skotilo v nove chase. Priche smo uvodu v poezijo, ki se je – podobno kot umetnost nasploh – znashla v novi razvojni fazi: na koncu njene destrukcije je odprla dostop vase dalech shirshemu krogu ustvarjalcev, kot je bil prej krog intelektualne in v nashem primeru literarne elite. Razshirjeni krog pesnikov seveda she ne obvladuje tradicionalnih pesniskih veshchin, je pa na dobri poti, da se tega nauchi v prihajajochem chasu. V bistvu so literarni destruktivisti te veshchine nevede izrinili iz poezije zato, da bi v perspektivi omogochili pesnjenje prav vsakemu sleherniku.

In prav to se dogaja. Na točki, kjer se je v duhu časa poezija konchala, se pravzaprav shele zachenja dogajati v svojem polnem obsegu. Zdaj imajo mnozhice dostop do znanj, ki so bila pred omenjeno revolucijo dostopna zgolj izbrancem, in očitno jih bodo osvajale z veliko hitrostjo. Kot pesnik vidim, da se bo zato poezija zhe v stoletju ali dveh iz individualnega kreiranja razvila v nachin mnozhichnega komuniciranja. Iz nje bo izrinjena ekonomska motivacija, ki zdaj she narekuje zapiranje tako imenovanih vrhunskih pesnikov v zaprte kroge, temu pa bo sledilo odprtje prostora za veshche in prosto pretakanje pesniskhe govorice.

If we would try to determine reasons or triggers for the creation of these ingenuities we would, among other things, probably come across political, ideological, institutional and related circumstances which serve not only as the basis for the reception of the poet with his creations, but also that of the theoretician discussing them. Within the so-called social context they both bow to the spirit of the times and authorities, which are the source of social imperatives and the basis for the argumentation behind their work, and also succumb to their own inability to deny their sweet ignorance and social vulnerability. To be clear: in terms of expertise, the theoretician's ignorance in fact merits all due respect, it is honed almost to perfection, richly diversified, and broadly discussed, learned and verbose, but unfortunately distracting from the simplest truths, which it overlooks due to overabundant erudition and its pragmatic integration in the relevant literary subsystem. Meanwhile the poet rides the waves of time with perforated sails, far from poetry: by counting versified prose or prose poetry as sonnets he did not degrade the genius of this poetic form but rather – himself.

It appears to me that I have not sought the most drastic example of poetic (and fitting literary-theoretical) misconception for the introduction to illustrating my poetic idea; perhaps the renowned Shalamun's attempt at transforming soccer match commentary into so-called verse, along with the obligatory accompanying acclamation on the part of the theoreticians and the audience following them, would be more poignant.³ While political and literary-social systems richly reward and promote these types of poetic achievement, I would very poetically state that here "poetry" has little to do with poetry, it has plummeted into the abyss of the achievements brought by the famous French Revolution and thence hatched from its cosmic egg into a new era. We bear witness to the introduction to poetry, which – like art in general – finds itself in a new evolutionary phase: at the close of its destruction it became accessible to a larger circle of creators than previous intellectual and in our case literary elites. The widened circle of poets is of course not yet proficient in traditional poetic skills, but it is well on the way of learning them in the coming times. In essence, literary destructionists unwittingly thrust these skills out of poetry to eventually enable the writing of poetry each everyman.

And this is exactly what is taking place. At the point where, in keeping with the times, poetry ended, it has only just begun to arise in its full extent. Now multitudes have access to knowledge that was, before the mentioned revolution, reserved exclusively for a select few, and apparently they will gain it with great speed. As a poet I see that in a mere century or two poetry will have evolved from a matter of individual creation into a mode of mass communication. It will be stripped of economic motivation, which currently continues to dictate the so-called outstanding poets to close ranks into closed circles; this will be followed by a newly created space for skilled and freely flowing poetic speech.

Seveda pa ne gre pozabiti na pomembno vlogo pesnikov, ki so zadnje chase v bolj ali manj gosti senci postmodernistov trmasto vztrajali in she vztrajajo pri tradicionalnih pesniskih oblikah, gojijo ritme, ustvarjajo glasbo besed in se kosajo s starodavnimi pravili, ki jih je postmodernizem tako zelo revolucionarno pohodil. Jaz jim rečem: borci za ravnovesje med vsebino in obliko. Dobro je sicer vedeti, da se nobena pesem ne more otresti oblike, pa che so njeni verzi she tako zelo svobodni, neritimchni in neenakomerni. Celozgoraj omenjeni Tauferjev 'sonet' jo ima, le da she zdalech ni sonetna. Kajti: »... *pesniskba oblika s svojimi pravili – ritmom, razvrstivijo rim, verzov in katic – ustvarja svojevrstno in edinstveno glasbeno kompozicijo, ki vzbuja posebno chustveno razpolozhenje in upesnjuje svet na sebi lasten nachin, ki je z drugimi oblikami neposnemljiv in neizrekljiv* ...«. ³

Che se torej za hip vrnem k zgoraj citiranemu repku Tauferjevega 'soneta', lahko ugotovim, da ima naslednjo obliko: ⁴

U – – U
 U – U
 U – U – U
 – U –
 U –

Oblika se mi zdi chudna in ne ustreza niti Novakovim kriterijem, saj je neritimchna in nemelodiozna. Je pa zagotovo posnemljiva; zlahka se namrech dá analizirati katero koli pesem, napisano v svobodnih verzih, in njeno obliko zakolichiti za vse vechne chase. Che bi nekoliko ironiziral she revolucionarno vsebino citiranega repka, hkrati pa bi njegovo obliko posnel natanchno in brez posebnih pesniskih tezhav, bi se repek glasil takole:

<i>marshal tito</i>	<i>ne gre kristus</i>
<i>chez Hades</i>	<i>ne more</i>
<i>bi rad se vrnil</i>	<i>od mrtvih vstati</i>
<i>a vesla</i>	<i>vsakih pet</i>
<i>zaman</i>	<i>minut</i>

Ta pesniskba oblika torej potrebuje le she pesnike, ki bi se je lotili in v njej pisali pesmi, a sem zhal doslej to storil samo jaz, zato se verjetno ne bo prijela, kot se je prijel sonet. In zato vedi: nich hudega, jo bomo zhe prezhiveli.

Nobena skrivnost ni, da nastane pesem v prvi vrsti zaradi vsebine, ni pa to njeno izkljuchno hotenje. Pesem hoche biti tudi lepa in/ali mochna. Rada bi zapela, zato mora pesnik imeti posluh: obchutiti mora harmonijo, melodijo in ritem besed, ki podajajo vsebino. To pa ni kar tako kot v prozi. Pesnjenje zahteva od pesnika posebna znanja.

Of course one should not disregard the significant role played by the poets who have in recent times, in the variously thick shades of the postmodernists, remained stubbornly steadfast and who to this day insist on traditional poetic forms, cultivate rhyming, create the music of words and take on ancient rules, which postmodernism so revolutionarily trampled. I call them: fighters for the equilibrium between content and form. It is good to keep in mind that no poem, no matter how free, arhythmical and uneven its verse, can discard form. Even Taufer's 'sonnet' above has one, although it is far from sonnet form, for "... *poetic form with its rules – rhythm, distribution of rhymes, verses, stanzas – creates a distinctive and unique musical composition, which stirs a certain emotional state and poeticises the world in its own individual way, which inimitable and unexplainable through other forms...*"³

If I return for a moment to the above-cited tail of Taufer's 'sonnet', I can maintain that it has the following metrical structure: ⁴

U – – U
 U – U
 U – U – U
 – U –
 U –

The structure seems strange to me and does not even fit Novak's criteria, being that it is arhythmical and non-melodious. It is, however, certainly imitable, since every poem written in free verse can easily be analysed and its form fixed for all time. If I were to ironically approach also the revolutionary content of the cited tail and simultaneously precisely and with no particular difficulty copy his poetic form, the tail would sound like this:

*marshall Tito
 through Hades
 would come from yonder
 but he rows
 in vain*

*Christ does not go
 He cannot
 from death be rising,
 every five,
 minutes*

Therefore all this poetic form needs are poets to tackle it and write poems utilising it; unfortunately, so far I was the only one to do so, and so it will probably not catch on like the sonnet did. And so keep in mind: it is no matter, we'll survive it.

It is no secret that a poem's inception stems primarily from content, but this is not its only desire. A poem also wants to be beautiful and/or powerful. It wishes to sing, which is why poets must have an ear for music, feel the harmony, melody, and rhythm of words transmitting the content. This is not the easy feat it is in prose. In order to write poetry, a poet must possess a particular skill-set.

Menim celo, da je lahko prav izkazovanje pesniskih veshchin merilo za razlikovanje med tem, kdo je pesnik, kdo pa naj se raje preskusha z verzi v prozi ali pa s prozo v verzih. »... *Sploh moram poudariti, da sem pri raziskovanju pesniskih oblik in spopadanju z njihovimi težavnimi zakonitostmi intenzivno doživljal, kako je **pesem najmlajša hči plesa in glasbe**, desetnica, ki ob iskanju pomena po vesoljnem svetu pogosto pozabi, kdo sta njena starša ...*«³

V Sloveniji danes sploh ni malo pesnikov. Nasprotno, mnogo nas je, ki se spopadamo s tradicionalnimi oblikovnimi zakonitostmi in nam to kar dobro uspeva, a nas – razen redkih izjem, kot sta na primer Milan Jesih in Andrej Capuder – etablirani literati in teoretiki praviloma obravnavajo kot zaviralce razvoja, chesh da smo zazrti v preteklost, medtem ko oni podirajo prav te stare zakonitosti v imenu napredka, inovacije in svobode. Zhe prav, fantje in dekleta, ampak saj ste zhe tako rekoch vse podrli! Kaj pa zdaj?

No, in tu se mi je posvetila drobna ideja, o kateri tukaj pravzaprav pishem: napredovati se dá tudi s konstruktivnim posodabljanjem in izumljanjem novih pesniskih oblik, ne samo z njihovo destrukcijo in izključenjem. Pravzaprav ta ideja sama po sebi ni nich novega, pred mano so jo uresnichevali zhe mnogi drugi, vendar ne na enak nachin. Jaz sem si namrech izmislil preprosto novo obliko in napisal v njej nekaj pesmi. Najbolj od vsega pa me je pri tem malem podvigu razveselilo dejstvo, da sem se vkljuchil v razvojni proces s konstrukcijo oblike, ne pa z njenim rushenjem. In mislim, da je tako prav.

2. Prizmati

Beseda *prizmat* je v slovenshchini nova, izpeljana iz besede *prizma*. Sklenil sem jo uporabiti kot ime pesniskhe oblike, v kateri sem zhe doslej, gotovo bom pa she kdaj, napisal nekaj pesmi. Nastala je spontano, kar naenkrate se je pojavila pred mano pesem, napisana v tej formi, in bila mi je tako ljuba, da sem sklenil napisati she eno, oblikovano na enak nachin, a z drugo vsebino. Potem se je zgodilo (kot se dogaja, ko se poezija sama narekuje pesniku), da je nastalo devet pesmi. Ker so bile pri vseh uporabljene enake oblikovne zakonitosti, so si zdaj vsi ti prizmati navzven skoraj povsem enaki: do sredishcha pesmi se verzi krajshajo, nato pa se postopoma spet razshirijo, kakor da se vrh navzdol obrnjenega trikotnika prekriva z vrhom spodnjega trikotnika, ki je pokonchen. Najprej me je ta podoba spominjala na peshcheno uro, zhe pri tretjem ali chetrtem prizmatu pa me je zachela spominjati na prizmo. Zagotovo tudi zaradi vsebine: znotraj te oblike so se namrech pomeni prelamljali kakor zharki, ki svetijo skozi prizmo: iz izbranih besed se je izoblikovala chista poezija.

I even believe that the very demonstration of poetic skill can gauge the difference between a poet and those better suited to test their wit with prose or versified prose. "... I must particularly emphasise that in researching poetic forms and tackling their difficult rules, I deeply experienced that the **poem is the youngest daughter of dance and music**, the tenth daughter (by former folk custom the tenth child was to leave the homestead and make their own way - trans. n.), which in her search for meaning in the universal world often forgets, who her parents are..."³

True poets are not rare in Slovenia today. On the contrary, many of us take on traditional poetic form with some success, but established literary authors and theoreticians – with rare exceptions such as Milan Jesih and Andrej Capuder – view us as obstructing progress, fixated on the past while they tear down those same rules in the name of progress, innovation, and freedom. This is well and good, boys and girls, but more or less everything is torn down already! What now?

Well, here a tiny idea occurred to me, which is what I am in fact writing about here: progress can also be achieved through constructive modernisation and invention of new poetic forms, not merely through their destruction and abolishment. This idea is in itself actually not new, it has been realized by many before me, though not in the same way. Namely, I made up a simple new form and wrote a few poems utilising it. Most of all, I was pleased in this little endeavour that I entered the developmental process through construction of form and not its destruction. And I think this is how it should be done.

2. Prizmati

The word *prizmat* is a new Slovenian word derived from the word *prizma* (prism, trans. n.). I resolved to use it as the name for my poetic form, which I used in writing poems before, and which I am sure to use again. This poetic form came about spontaneously, appearing to me out of the blue in this form and grew so close to my heart that I resolved to write another in the same form but with different content. And then it transpired (as it does when poetry dictates itself to the poet), that nine poems were created. Since the same rules of form were applied to all of them, all these *prizmati* are nearly identical in appearance: up to the centre of the poem the verses grow ever shorter and then gradually ever longer again, as though the top of the triangle aimed downward overlaps with the top of the triangle below facing upward. First this image reminded me of an hourglass, but already by the third or fourth *prizmat* it began to remind me of a prism. Surely this was also tied to content: within this form the meanings broke like rays of light shining through a prism: from select words pure poetry was formed.

Rdeche

*ẓbarecha ptica léta nad sinjino
 ko siv oblak nebo prekriva
 razliva skož koprne
 rdeche vino
 kot kri iz bozhje vene
 kapljá ẓ neba in se preliva
 ẓ modrino rek, ki tečejo v dannino*

V mlajših letih nisem maral razlag poezije, vsako she tako bistroumno tolmačenje sem dojemal kot siromashenje obravnavane pesmi. Zlasti v sholi, kjer so na primer pri Kosovelovih pesmih nadržtno poudarjali njihov ideoloshki naboj, ki ga jaz v njih sploh nisem videl, ampak sem to dojemal povsem drugache. V zrelih letih pa se mi zdi tudi analiziranje pesmi nadržve zanimivo; v bistvu gre za svojevrstne prevode iz poezije v prozo, in naletel sem zhe na kar nekaj mojstrov, ki so to nalogo odlično opravili. Kljub temu she zmeraj jasneje dojemam neposredno govornico poezije same, nadržve rad pa se ukvarjam z analizo oblike, v kateri je ovekovečena. Glasbenik to dobro razume: oblika pesmi je podobna notnemu zapisu: slednji vedno nepreklicno določi metrum, harmonijo in vse druge lastnosti glasbe, ki naj bi se uresnichile z izvedbo. Pri vsakem resnem glasbenem delu (tu ne mislim na *free-jazz* in postmodernistichne eksperimente, ki se do bista glasbe – tako mislim zaradi svojega precej konservativnega in pretežno konstruktivno naravnane uma – praviloma vedejo destruktivno) je vnaprej določeno shtevilo taktov, ritem je definiran do zadnje sinkope, splet melodij voden po natanchno določenih poteh itd., itd. S tem se nikakor nochem povzdigovati nad obchutek svobode, ki ga vzbuja improvizacija, vendar ta zelo hitro utone v pozabi, che ni natanchno zapisana oziroma zabeležhena in s tem na veke vekov definirana v tochno določeni formi, ki jo je oblikovala. Improvizirana glasbena linija je kot prosti verz; ko je ta zapisan, dobi obliko, iz katere se ne more vech izmuzniti.

Toda ali je prosti verz zato vklenjen, mu je svoboda odvzeta? – Moj odgovor je: ne. Vsaka umetnishka vsebina ima namrech tako naravo, da je nobena oblika ne more vkleniti vase. In to pomeni, da v pesnishtvu she celo sonetna ali pa katera od she bolj zapletenih oblik – umetnishke vsebine ne omejuje. Razlika med prostim verzom in verzom soneta je samo v tem, da je prvi nastal spontano, tako rekoč po nakljuchju, drugi pa je bil vnaprej izbran in skrbno obdelan. Mogoche je na mestu primerjava med nebrushenim in brushenim diamantom: v prvem se svetloba igra sama s sabo, v drugem pa se z njo igra diamant.

Red

*An ardent bird does fly above the skyline
when clouds of grey conceal the heavens
and pours out through the billow
ruby grape-wine
like God's own flowing blood flow
from the sky on high it falls and leavens
all rivers blue, that flow back down the timeline*

When I was younger I did not like poetry. No matter how clever its interpretation, I saw it as impoverishing the poem in question; particularly in school, where for example Kosovel's poems were purposefully presented as predominately demonstrating some ideological fervour, which I myself never saw, perceiving the poems in a completely different way. As I grew more mature, I also began to find poetic analysis exceedingly interesting; in essence it is a particular sort of translation from poetry to prose, and I have come across quite a few masters who executed this task excellently. Still, I understand the direct communication of the poems themselves better; and above all I enjoy analysing the form in which said communication is immortalized. Musicians understand this well: poetic form is similar to written music, which always and inalterably defines metre, rhythm, harmony and all other characteristics of the music, which are to be realized through performance. Every serious musical piece (I exclude free jazz or postmodernist experimentation, which – as I believe due to my conservative and largely constructive mind set – on the most part have a destructive effect) has a predetermined number of bars, its rhythm is defined down to the last syncope, the weave of melodies follows precisely defined progressions etc. I in no way wish to degrade the sense of freedom attainable through improvisation; it however quickly falls into oblivion if it is not very precisely documented or noted down, which would define its form for a very long time. An improvised musical theme is akin to free verse, once it is committed to writing it receives a form it can no longer escape. But, does this fetter free verse and rob it of its freedom? - I say no. It is the nature of all artistic content that it can be tied down by no form. This means that in poetry even sonnet structure – or even more complex forms – does not hinder artistic content. The difference between free verse and sonnet structure is only in their inception: the former's was spontaneous almost accidental, while the latter's was pre-selected and carefully fashioned. Perhaps they can be compared with either a cut or uncut diamond, in the former the diamond plays with light while in the latter the light plays by itself.

Bela

*iz golega občutja je privrela
 bleshchecha od lepote dneva
 na licu je obstala
 zadržtela
 negibna zaplesala
 v objemu belega odseva
 se posušila in okamenela*

In zdaj k oblikovnim zakonitostim prizmata. Zhe na prvi pogled lahko vidish, da ima sedem verzov in da se prvi ter zadnji verz rimata z osrednjim verzom. Ko najdesh te tri rime, ni težko odkriti še ostalih. S podrobnejšim pregledom pa lahko nato preshtejesh shtevilo zlogov v vsakem verzu ter jih razdelish na poudarjene (–) in nepoudarjene (U). Tako dobish oblikovno strukturo, shemo, nachrt prizmata, ki izgleda natančno takole:

1. verz: U – U – U – U – U – U (rima se s 4. in 7. verzom)
2. verz: U – U – U – U – U (rima se s 6. verzom)
3. verz: U – U – U – U (rima se s 5. verzom)
4. verz: – U – U (rima se s 1. in 7. verzom)
5. verz: U – U – U – U (rima se s 3. verzom)
6. verz: U – U – U – U – U (rima se z 2. verzom)
7. verz: U – U – U – U – U – U (rima se s 4. in 1. verzom)

Vsebina je in mora ostati svobodna, oblikovne zakonitosti je ne smejo omejevati.

Poezija se seveda dosti raje vrti okrog vsebine, kot okrog oblike. Ko se je pred par stoletji, zlasti pa v tretjem tisočletju, dostop do izobrazbe in umetnosti postopoma tako razširil, da lahko zhe skoraj vsakdo pishe poezijo v prozi ali prozo v verzih (in se s tem pogloblja vase ter tako vnasha v svoje zhivljenje pa tudi v zavest chasa razsezhnost duhovne ustvarjalnosti), je svet prelila apokaliptična povodenj svobodnih verzov. Vendar pa je to shele zacetek nove dobe, v kateri bodo ljudje, che se ne bodo prej pogubili, komunicirali med sabo z umetnostjo.

Tako sem razmishljal, ko sem zachel pisati prizmate, in vizija me je tako razvnela, da sem jih – prav kot so pesniki pred mano pocheli s soneti, rubajati itd. – najprej spletal v kratke venchke, nekoch pa jih bom mogoche spletel v obsezhen venec. K temu me je seveda ves chas gnala potreba po tem, da nekaj izrazim, povem. Che pogledam nazaj, lahko torej ugotovim, da je bila doslej moja motivacija za ustvarjanje prizmatov dvojna: najprej izraziti vsebino in jo nato izbrusiti do te mere, da se bo umestila v natančno predvideno obliko. In povem ti, zame skorajda ni vechjega uzhitka.

White

*From pure emotion to the light delivered
 Resplendent in the striking daylight
 upon the cheek in leisure
 quickly quivered
 in stillness danced a measure
 embraced by rays of brilliant bright-white
 it dried while turning into stone and withered*

And now for the rules of the “prizmat” poetic form. As is immediately evident it comprises seven verses; the first, central and last verse rhyme. Once these three rhymes are identified, the rest are easy to find. A closer look reveals the number and combination of stressed (–) and unstressed (U) syllables in individual verses. This defines the structure of the form, the schematic plan of the prizmat, which looks exactly like this:

verse 1: U – U – U – U – U – U (rhymes with verses 4 and 7)
verse 2: U – U – U – U – U (rhymes with verse 6)
verse 3: U – U – U – U (rhymes with verse 5)
verse 4: – U – U (rhymes with verses 1 and 7)
verse 5: U – U – U – U (rhymes with verse 3)
verse 6: U – U – U – U – U (rhymes with verse 2)
verse 7: U – U – U – U – U – U (rhymes with verses 1 and 4)

Content is and must remain free, it must not be limited by the rules of form.

Poetry of course much rather focuses on content than form. A few centuries ago and particularly in the third millennium, education and artistic creativity grew so widely accessible that almost anyone can write versified prose or prose in verse (so self-reflecting and thereby introducing the dimension of spiritual creativity into their lives and the consciousness of the era). With this the world plunged into an apocalyptic deluge of free verse. However this is only just the beginning of a new era when people, if we don’t destroy ourselves first, will communicate through art.

This was my reasoning when I first started writing prizmati and this vision got me so animated that I weaved them into short wreaths – just as the poets before me did with sonnets, ruba’is etc. – and one day I may perhaps weave them into a comprehensive wreath. I was, of course, driven throughout by a need to express myself or communicate something. Looking back, I can ascertain that up until now my motivation to create prizmati was twofold: first to express content and then to polish it to such a degree that it will fit into a precisely defined form. And let me tell you, for me there is almost no greater pleasure.

Vsebine

*nekoč se bodo chrčke razbežhale
 in mi pustile le vsebine
 ki so se pod vrstice
 zapisale
 kot chudezhne cvetlice
 nevidne, chrste korenine
 iz mojih pesmi vame so pognale*

*in največ, kar mi bo po njih ostalo
 bo le občutek tibe sreče
 da so spregovorile
 kot za shalo
 mi dusbo pomirile
 in me pobozhale ljubeče
 ker jih srce v praznini je zaznalo*

Morda se ti bo ravno zaradi tega zazdelo, da sem trosil nesmisle, ko sem zgoraj pisal o tem, kako bodo otroci novega chasa z umetnostjo (in torej tudi s poezijo) komunicirali med sabo in je ne bodo vech ustvarjali zaradi socialnega prestizha ali celo zaradi denarja. Toda dejstvo je, da pesniki prek poezije komuniciramo zhe dolgo chasa. Poglej samo, koliko je bilo napisanih sonetov: ali ni na primer Presheren s svojimi soneti komuniciral s Petrarco, Dantajem, Byronom ...? In nikar me ne poskushaj zatreti, da so bili to veliki umetniki, ki so imeli toliko talenta in pesnishkega znanja, da se mnozhica nikoli ne bo mogla primerjati z njimi! Moja vizija je drugachna: zachenja se obdobje, ko se vedno vech ljudi zaveda nesmiselnosti zastarelih politichnih, ekonomskih, geostrateshkih in njim sorodnih zablod chloveshtva. Mozhnost učenja ustvarjalnih veshchin umetnosti je odprta vse vechjemu shtevilu ljudi in zhe danashnji chas lahko pokazhe, da te veshchine precej uspešno mirijo agresivne nagone v chloveku. Tudi komunikacija med zhivechimi umetniki zhe poteka in ni povsem izključeno, da bo potekala tudi s pisanjem prizmatov. Pravzaprav se je tudi to zhe zachelo:

Breda Konjar – Koni: Hlad (prizmat 6)

*prepibana od vetra rdijo lica
 prebladni so za maj domovi
 spiralast dim se vije
 kot meglica
 ki tu in tam zakrije
 turobnost krajev za plotovi
 od koder se raztezja hladna zhica*

Content

*One fine day the letters will all scatter
And they will finally surrender
beneath the lines now showing
hearts of matter
like magic flowers growing
so strong, with roots unseen surrender
my poems' sense to me with not a letter*

*and when they've gone at most they will have left me
in joyful quiet contemplation
that they have ever spoken
outright simply
allayed my spirit broken
caressed with loving consolation
since my heart sensed them in vacuous empty*

Perhaps due to all this it may appear to you that I was spewing nonsense before when I wrote the children of a new age will communicate with each other through art (and therefore also through poetry) and no longer create for social prestige or even money. But it is a fact that poets have long used poetry to communicate. For example, just look at how many sonnets have been written: Was Presheren not communicating through his sonnets with Petrarca, Dante, Byron...? And please do not try to quell my train of thought by saying these great artists with talent and poetic knowledge will never be matched by the masses! My vision is different: We are witnessing the dawn of an era when ever more people are becoming aware of the absurdity of mankind's out-dated political, economic, geostrategic and related errors. The ability to acquire the creative skills of art is becoming accessible to an increasing number of people, and even the present day can attest that these skills are relatively successful in assuaging human primal instincts. The communication between living artists is already taking place and it may well be that this process will include prizmati. As a matter of fact also this has already begun:

Breda Konjar – Koni: Cold (prizmat 6)

*Blown through, the wind has set my cheeks afire
too soon this May the cold commences
In spirals smoke is reeling
mists up higher
from time to time concealing
the gloominess behind the fences
from whence spreads out into the world cold wire*

*za bregom prekipeva od bridkosti
od vretja moč sovrashtva klike
in jezga nad trdoto
te norosti
z razgaljeno grdoto
ujeto v zgodbo, ki se vije
po dolgi blatni cesti brez hitrosti*

Kolikor vem, so se doslej s to obliko spoprijeli samo štirje pesniki; Breda Konjar je bila prva, ki se je soočila z njo in jo le z nekoliko truda nepreklicno osvojila.⁵ Zdaj nam skozi sporočila vsebine v maniri visoke poezije, jaz pa z veseljem ugotavljam, da ta pesniška oblika ni vech samo del mojega zhivljenjskega monologa. Njen shesti prizmat je izvrstno ponazoril dejstvo, da lahko v to obliko zajamesh katerokoli vsebino in da je glede tega narava prizmata primerljiva z naravo svobodnega verzca.

Lidija Brezavshchek – Kochijazh: Zaspi sedaj (prizmat 3)

*Zaspi sedaj, zeleni rob obzorja!
Zardele chrte migotajo,
zastri mrki liki
plapolajo
s prepoznimi odmiki,
saj tvoje pesmi ne poznajo.
V bel Nich potuje vsa sinjina morja ...*

*Odvedi sence, blede luh medlecha!
V kanjonu tvoja sled pochiva
in migota zaledje
kakor svecha,
ko v mrk temni sosedje
vsega, kar vem; kot vzbrst varljina
gre v prst, pepel lepota, she debtecha.*

Lidija Brezavshchek je napisala kar nekaj prizmatov, ta je njen tretji.⁵ Na spletishchu, kjer ureja in objavlja zlasti oblikovno poezijo, igra pomembno vlogo: s svetovanjem in tudi pouchevanjem tradicionalnih pesniških veshchin osmishlja idejo o priblizhevanju literarne umetnosti shirshemu krogu ustvarjalcev, zlasti tistih, ki so se zhe preskusili v kovanju svobodnih verzov in bi zheleli storiti korak naprej ter pridobiti she katero od znanj, ki nam zhe mnoga stoletja svetijo s Parnasa in s kakshne she vishje vzpetine. Zanimivo je, da je Lidija zhe na zachetku svojega potovanja v svet prizmatov sprozhila njihov razvoj in odkriva mozhnosti, kako jim z majhnimi spremembami oblikovnih pravil omogochiti shirshi vsebinski domet.⁶

*behind the banks the anguish's overflowing
 now simmering in detestation
 the thickness flows inanely
 this mind-blowing
 ugliness caught plainly
 within meandering narration
 down the long and muddy roads slow-going.*

As far as I know, thus far only four poets have tackled this form: Breda Konjar was the first to face it and outright conquer it with little in the way of effort.⁵ Now she uses it to communicate content to us in the manner of high poetry and I am happy to learn that this poetic form is no longer only a part of my life's monologue. Her sixth prizmat superbly demonstrated that any content can be captured in this form and that in this the nature of prizmat is comparable to the nature of free verse.

Lidija Brezavshchek – Coachman: Now go to Sleep (prizmat 3)

*Now go to sleep, oh green horizon's threshold
 the blushing ardent lines are lighting,
 obscured forbidding outlines
 flail unrolled
 their motion missed the deadline
 they know not your poetic writing
 with whiteness fuses all of blue-green sea-fold ...*

*Oh, haul away the shade, light ever dimmer!
 Your traces resting in the grotto
 illuminate the background,
 candle's glimmer
 eclipses darkness inbound
 engulfs my all, as earth will swallow,
 and ash, the buds' false gorgeous fragrant shimmer.*

Lidija Brezavshchek wrote quite a few prizmati, this being her third.⁵ The website, where she edits and publishes predominately versified and rhythmic poetry hold particular significance: through counselling and instruction about traditional poetic skills she lends meaning to the idea of bringing literary creativity into the realm of a wider circle of creators, especially those who already tried themselves in their ability to coin free verse and are now ready for the next step, to gain one of the skills for centuries shining from Mount Parnassus and perhaps even on higher. It is interesting that Lidija already in the initial stages of her journey into its world initiated development of the prizmat and is uncovering how small changes to the rules of its poetic form affords them a wider contentual scope.⁶

Razvoj vsake pesniskhe oblike je nekaj samo po sebi umevnega, tako so se na primer izoblikovale različne vrste sonetov; vendar pa je postmodernizem (ki mu jaz včasih, ko me kateri od njegovih podvigov preveč razhudi, rečem kar destruktivizem) v teh smereh zhe močno presegel mero, o chemer pa sem nekaj malega povedal zhe v prvem delu tega kratkega zapisa.

Skratka, che povzamem: nekoch bo umetnost nachin sporazumevanja med ljudmi. Zanimivo bo iz onostranstva opazovati, kako se bo chloveshtvo postopoma razvilo do te faze in kakshen bo tedaj svet. Umetnikom se ne bo vech treba (niti ne bodo chutili te potrebe) prepirati za denar in med sabo intrigrirati za nagrade, se boriti za prestizh in družhbeni ugled, saj bodo tedaj ugledni in eksistenchno preskrbljeni vsi ljudje, njihovo poslanstvo in poklic pa bo ustvarjalnost. Glede na to, da chas v onostranstvu ne mineva, sploh pa ne pochasi, nam na ta dejstva ne bo treba dolgo chakati.

In che moj gornji odstavek dojemash kot skrajno naivno in nerazumno shalo, vedi, da sem jaz zhe zdaj itak samo pesnik. V dokaz dodajam she en prizmat in te lepo pozdravljam!

Ptica

*nekoch bom svetil vate iz daljave
 podoben bom srebrni zvezdi
 imela bo obliko
 moje glave
 vsebino raznoliko
 kot ptica bom, ki v luchi gnezdi
 in drobec peska v nedrjih pushchave*

*neslišno pesem ptica bom zapela
 za zvenom kozmichne globine
 ljubezen iz svetlobe
 bo drsela
 po stenah tvoje sobe
 kjer ti bosh sanjala spomine
 vse bolj ljubecha, srechna in vesela*

¹ Che lahko literarni teoretiki izvajajo svoje teorije iz poezije, in jo v strokovnem jeziku obravnavajo samozavestno, s tem pa prek individualnih refleksij sovplivajo na njeno percepcijo v chasu in prostoru, lahko jaz kot pesnik samozavestno razpravljam o literarni teoriji in njenem dometu.

² Marko Juvan, *Vezji besedila* – LUD Literatura, 2000

³ Boris A. Novak, *Oblike srca* – Modrijan, 1997

⁴ Morebitni pesniskhi laik naj ve, da z znakom U oznachujem nepoudarjeni, z znakom – pa poudarjeni zlog.

⁵ Vse to in she vech se dogaja na pesniskem spletishchu www.pesem.si, na katerem pesniki s poezijo komunicirajo zhe deseto leto.

⁶ Glej npr. peti verz prve kitice v povezavi s prvim in zadnjim (nato pa she z drugim in predzadnjim) ter povezavo primerjaj z osnovno oblikovno shemo!

Evolution of every poetic form is self-evident; for example various types of sonnets have evolved. However, in this direction postmodernism (which I sometimes simply dub *destructivism*, when one of its exploits angers me a bit too much) has treaded too far over the line, which is something I touched upon already in the first part of this short text.

In short, if I may reiterate, one day art will be a mode of communication between people. It will be interesting to observe from the next world how humanity will gradually evolve to that stage and how the world will be at that point. Artist will no longer have to (or feel the need to) quarrel about money and cause intrigue about mutual awards, fight for prestige and social reputation, as all men will be reputable and provided for existentially, while their mission and calling will be creativity itself. Since time does not pass in the next world, and it particularly doesn't do so slowly, we won't even need to wait very long to witness this.

And if you see the above paragraph as an extremely naïve unreasonable jest, know that I am already but a poet. As proof of this, I add one final prizmat and send you my kindest regards.

Bird

*Some day I'll shine on you from distant spaces
As though a star of silver lightness
its shape and iridescence
my head traces
though not the same in essence.
Like a bird I'll nest in brightness
and like a sand-grain which the waste embraces*

*I, bird, will sing a silent song thereafter
beneath the sound of endless spaces
and love will forth in star-streams
ever after
bathe your walls in light-beams
and so you'll drift in memories' embraces
with growing affection, contentment and laughter*

¹ If literary theoreticians can develop their theories based on poetry, discuss them confidently in their language, and so through individual reflection co-influence its perception in time and space, than I as a poet may confidently discuss literary theory and its scope.

² Marko Juvan, *Vezi besedila* – LUD Literatura, 2000.

³ Boris A. Novak, *Oblike srca* – Modrijan, 1997.

⁴ Potential lay poets should know that “U” denotes an unstressed and “_” the stressed syllable.

⁵ All this and more goes on at the www.pesem.si website, where poets are now communing with each other for the tenth year in a row.

⁶ See for example verse 5 in stanza 1 in connection to the first and last (and then second and the one before last), and compare the connection to the scheme of the primary poetic form.

Rajko Shushtarshich

ENDOFAZIJA I

*Tole tu je nek samogovor,
pogovor samega s seboj,
ki se tako ves chas dogaja,
le da ga vechinoma ne slishimo vech,
kot otroke so nas poduchili,
da ni spodobno,
glasno se pogovarjati s seboj.*

Kako se je pravzaprav zachelo in zapletlo to z Revijo SRP?

Ko se to vprasham, si moram rechi, da odgovor ni enostaven. Sechi bo treba nazaj k nesojeni reviji *Bilten SSHP*, cheprav ni nujno, da ukinitev ene revije potegne za seboj rojstvo druge, chetudi z desetletno zamudo. Potemtakem se je torej vsaj meni porodila ideja o *Reviji SRP* z (rojstvom) izbruhom nove demokracije v dezveli Sloveniji. Pa spet vem, da odgovor ni chisto pravi, nekoliko ga je treba dopolniti. Zachelo se je potemtakem z mojo iluzijo o demokraciji v samostojni Sloveniji. In revija ima sodelavce, ki smo od samega zachetka snovali in rojevali *Revijo SRP*. In tako smo spet na zachetku in ta zachetek je tudi za vsakega od sodelavcev chisto oseben, njegov. In ta zachetek sezhe dalech nazaj, ko smo se nekako po igri vlog ali usode, kakor hochete, srechali v krogu, ki mu sedaj lahko rechemo krog sodelavcev *Revije SRP*. A tudi taka oznachitev je zhe izrabljena in se mi upira. Ta zachetek ima torej toliko zachetkov, kot nas je sodelavcev, in s tem poskusom, da bi dolochil zachetek, bom kar konchal; prevelik zalogaj je to zame, predvsem pa upam, da ta zachetek she ni konchan.

Ponovno sem prebral in premislil vse dokumente – prispevke in odgovore (vechinoma pa neodgovore) nanje, ki so bili poslani vodstvu, svetu institucije mochnega medija RTVS. V nekaj primerih pa bom moral sechi she dlje nazaj v zgodovinski spomin medija in sistema (njegovega stvarnika). Sedaj bom povzel iz njih le nekatere bistvene ugotovitve, jih soochil s svojim danashnjim gledanjem. Od jubilejne shtevilke *Revije SRP* 1/2, 10/1993, ki govori o tezhavah in mukah pri ustanavljanju oziroma ozhiviljanju neke revije, do *Revije SRP* 9/10, ki sem ji bil she odgovorni urednik.

Tako na hitro in na grobo gledano je sedanje stanje zadeve natanko tako, kot je bilo, ko sem pisal premislek oziroma pomislek *O nemozhnosti komunikacije ali Tri razlage o ozhiviljanju in mrtvichenju neke revije*. Problem nemozhnosti komunikacije med ljudmi in institucijami, med chlovekom in sistemom, se ni premaknil niti za pet pedi.

Rajko Shushtarshich

ENDOPHASIA I

*This here is a sort of monologue,
a talk with oneself,
which occurs all the time anyway,
except we no longer bear it
having been taught as children,
that it is not proper
to talk aloud to ourselves.*

How everything actually started and went sideways with the SRP journal?

When I ask myself this question, I must find there is no simple answer. We must return to the doomed *Bilten SSbP*, although cancelling one journal may not necessarily result in the birth of another, even with a ten-year delay. Therefore, I had my personal idea for the *SRP* journal (Eng. = LiVeS, transl. n.) in the wake of the (birth) outbreak of new democracy in the land of Slovenia. Again, I know this answer is also not entirely accurate and needs further emendation. It therefore all began with my delusion of autonomous Slovenian democracy. Also, from the very start, *Revija SRP* was devised and born of collaboration. And so we return to the beginnings as personal and particular to each contributor. These date back to when we met through some distribution of roles, or twist of fate if you will, to form what we may now call the *Revija SRP* circle, though this designation also seems to me worn and abhorrent. So, the start has as many beginnings as there are contributors. I must conclude my attempt to define a start having bitten of more than I can chew, above all, in the hope that the beginning is not yet finished.

I have re-read and re-thought all documents – contributions and responses (but mostly non-responses) sent to the leadership, the body of the power institution of RTV Slovenia. In some cases I will need to go further back in historic memory of the medium and system (its creator). Here, I will summarize only a few of its essential findings and confront them with my current views, covering issues from the Jubilee edition of *Revija SRP* 1/2, 10/1993, which addresses the difficulties and pains of founding or reviving a certain journal up until issue 9/10, of which I was still managing editor.

A quick and rough appraisal of the current state of things reveals that all is exactly the same as it was when I was writing my thoughts reflection or second thoughts on *The Incapacity of Communication or Three Explanations of the Revival and Stifling of a Journal*. The issue of incapacity of communication between people and institutions, between men and the system has not changed.

Prav lahko bi tudi danes rekel, da je to *problem različnega govora v istem jeziku ali pa zgolj problem pomanjkanja strpnih prevajalcev ali celo samo problem strpnosti pri prevajalcih treh nivojev resničnosti.*

Ne bi bil rad ne skrivnosten ne patetichen, vendar menim, da je nash chas – stanje zavesti nashega mi-stva, reviji, kot je bila zamishljena, tako zelo nenaklonjen – neprimeren, da me je ves chas preganjala nepotrebna in škodljiva misel, da je nasha pobuda prezgodnja, da je duh dejanske demokracije in z njo potrebne shirine in tolerance za kritichno, celo ekstremno kritichno mishljenje in pisanje she nekje pred nami, ali pa ga sploh nikoli ni bilo in ga nikoli ne bo in je bilo torej vse to le neka moja utvara in obenem utvara ali pomota volunterskih sodelavcev – individuumov svoje volje Revije SRP? Občasno malodushje je zapisalo takle stavek: *Eno je gotovo, na silo tudi Revije SRP ni mogoche izdajati. Vendar upam, da bodo sodelavci skusali prebroditi tudi to krizo na svojski nachin; chas bo pokazal svoje; che ne, pa ne, pa kdaj drugih ali pa kdo drug; vendar seme je (bilo) vseeno posejano.*

Sedaj bom kratko povzel glavne razloge – dejstva, ki so botrovala moji odlochitvi, da je moje nadaljnje urednikovanje zame nesmiselno, za revijo pa verjetno zhe škodljivo ali vsaj neprimereno:

Zhe v Uvodni utemeljitvi Revije SRP (19.7.1993) je bilo zapisano, Revija SRP bi lahko bila ekstremno kritichna revija, taka, ki bi raziskovala, razkrivala, razgaljala skrite in prikrite probleme medija na svojstven nachin, avtonomno, neodvisno od mochi strank in neodvisno od institucionalne mochi medija. Predvsem pa bi revija te probleme predochila raziskovalni in drugi javnosti, ki jo problemi mas medija(ev) zanimajo ali prizadevajo. Taka bi lahko bila, na preizkusnji je le tolerance v instituciji medija.

Bila je taka in she vedno je! Vse to smo pocheli, kolikor smo mogli in zmogli, vendar nasprotovanje mogochno institucije z veliko mochjo in shirokim ozadjem (osenchjem dolgih senc) je prevech prikrito, da bi ga lahko javno in nedvoumno jasno razkrinkali. Tako pa so stvari take, da bi nam skorajda lahko rekli, kdo pa vam kaj hoche, niste pomembni, ni vas. Pa tega le ne reko, ker bi zhe to pomenilo priznanje, da vseeno smo, da Revija SRP vseeno je. Tolerance v instituciji medija in v sistemu torej preizkushnje ni opravila. Vendar danes menim nekoliko drugache, bolj malodushno, da revija, ki si je nakopala na glavo nejevoljo mochnega medija – prodajalca slave in imagea »who is who«, in si poleg tega ne zheli pokroviteljstva nobene od strank niti najmanjshe med njimi, niti take, ki bi se morda shele zhelela ustanoviti, dandanes pri nas kratkomalo ne more dostojno prezhiteti.

Cheprav je bila osnova moje akcijske strategije in taktike ravno vedenje, da ni nobenega institucionalnega ukrepa, ki bi ne omogochal fleksibilnejshga protiukrepa, pa se nam sodelavcem vendarle vedno znova zastavlja vprashanje (saj ne gre za prezhivetje za vsako ceno) o utemeljenosti smisla neke nemogoche komunikacije? En sam reflektiran (premishljen) negativni odgovor zadoshcha za temeljni in ponovni razmislek, ki koncha z navidez malodushnim dejanjem – odgovorom: »*Che ne, pa ne, pa kdaj drugih ali pa kdo drug*«.

I could just as easily say today that this is the *problem of different speech in the same language or merely the lack of patient translators, or the very issue of patience among the translators of the three layers of reality.*

I wish to be neither mysterious nor piteous, but I believe that our time – state of consciousness of our us-ness, is so very disinclined to the journal as it was conceived – so unsuitable, that I was hounded throughout by the unnecessary and noxious thought that our instigation comes too soon, and that the spirit of actual democracy with breadth and tolerance needed for critical or even supercritical thought and writing lay ahead, never was, will be, or is, merely my delusion and simultaneously the delusions or error of my voluntary co-workers – free-thinking individuals of *Revija SRP*. Occasional dejection gave rise to this thought: *What is certain, even Revija SRP cannot be published by force. I hope, however, that contributors will try to conquer even this crisis in their own way; time will tell; If it won't be done, it won't, or it will, but another time, or by someone else; the seed is (was) sown no matter what.*

I will now quickly recapitulate the main reasons – facts that resulted in my decision that further editing on my part is senseless for me and probably even harmful or at least inappropriate for the journal:

Already the *Introductory reasoning of Revija SRP (19.7.1993)* stated *Revija SRP could be an extremely critical journal, researching, unveiling, baring hidden and concealed problems of the media in its unique way, autonomously independently of the power of parties and independently of the institutional power of the media. Above all, the journal would present these issues to the researchers and other audiences interested in, or affected by the problems of mass media. This is what it could be like, all that is tested is tolerance in the institution of the medium.*

This is how it was, and how it remains! We did all this to the best of our capacity and ability, but opposition of the greatly powerful mighty institution and its wide background (the shadow system of long shadows) is too hidden to unmask plainly publically and unambiguously. As it is, they could all but say: »who wishes you harm anyway? You are insignificant, you don't exist.« But they don't, because saying this would itself stand as acknowledgment that we are, that *Revija SRP* exists after all. The tolerance of the institution of the medium and system therefore failed the test. However, today my view is slightly changed; I think with a tad more despondence that the journal that brought upon itself the annoyance of a powerful medium selling fame and determining who is who, and which wants no patronage from political parties, not even the tiniest, nor such as would wish yet to be founded, today and here, simply cannot survive decently.

Though I based my strategic tactical action plan on knowing that there is no institutional measure, which would not enable a more flexible countermeasure, we contributors continue to face the question (as to us it is not about surviving at any cost) of the validity and sense of some impossible communication. A single reflected (thought-out) negative response suffices for fundamental and renewed consideration ending in a seemingly despondent act – reply: *»If it won't be done, it won't, or it will, but another time or by someone else«.*

Revija bi lahko bila po vseh pravilih taktične administrativne obdelave (predvsem z ignoranco in finančnim prikrasbanjem) konec koncev onemogočena. Kaj pa če se to v našem primeru vseeno ne bi obneslo? Potem je tu še neko skrivno orožje, ki ga ni mogoče dokazati. Zhe sama misel, da bi bilo kaj takega v danasnji demokraciji mogoče, je paranoidna. Revijo boste unichbili le, če boste zastrashbili njene sodelavce, ustvarjalce v redakcijah Radiotelevizije Slovenija. In moram reči, da za sedaj ta taktika rojeva uspehe, nekaterih že najavljenih prispevkov ni, bodisi zamujajo, bodisi so premalo kritično pogumni. Kdo od ustvarjalcev bo ogrozil svojo službo na RTVS, če se mu uradno namigne, da je revija problematična in bogokletna, to je, nemalikovalska v odnosu do hierarhov in poltronov sistema, in v medijski hierarhiji in mimo njih.

Ves čas je ta sicer pričakovani odnos institucije medija, mrtvichenje in zastrashevanje (zmotno rečeno) *Srpa*(shev), rojeval v svojih (proti)uchinkih neke vrste (zopet pričakovane) uspehe. Zhe res, da takega odnosa nismo radostno sprejemali, ker potem, ko je dozhivet ni vech zgolj taktična postavka, ampak zhivo občutena resničnost, deloval pa je ta odnos na možne oz. mogoče, a nam ne neznane sodelavce, ki zato niso hoteli ali si upali pisati v to nesramno *Revijo SRP*, prav zato smo uspeli pritegniti k sodelovanju le take nove sodelavce, ki so se odrekli honorarju in presegli strah pred mogočo sankcijo medija. Ti so pogumni, svobodni in brez dlake na jeziku pishochi sodelavci. Preostali bomo le tisti in taki, ki ne pishemo niti zaradi denarja niti slave, revija pa je res nasha, saj jo s tem v največjem (najpomembnejšem in najdrznejšem) deležu sponzoriramo tudi mi sami. Lahko bi rekel, da so nas te institucionalne sankcije prechesale in prechistile ali da sta institucija in sistem v tem primeru izvedla za nas pozitivno selekcijo. Vsak nov sodelavec je pomenil okrepitev in osvezhitev ali drugache rečeno, spontano sproshchanje vrednotne orientacije – vsebinske usmeritve revije, ki bi jo sicer lahko ogrozila rigidnost in dogmatizacija njene lastne vrednotne orientacije.

Redko boste nashli nasprotnika, ki vam bo sproti navajal dejstva (ukrepe in dejanja), ki so ga najbolj prizadela. Vendar jaz to moram, tako je to po pravilih vrednotne orientacije revije in tako to sledi iz zhelje, da bi bila raziskovalna odisejada (avtorefleksija) zhiva in she javno razvidna, zapisana za zgodovinski spomin institucije M.M. in nashega Mi(stva).

Naj jih nekaj najpomembnejših ponovno navedem, cheprav je njihova tezha chisto osebna, in ta naj ostane osebna, in najbrzh ni treba reči, da je pri ostalih sodelavcih drugachna, svojska za vsakega njih.

Lahko bi rekel, da je moje upanje za svobodno revijo postalo oprijemljivejshe na nekem chudnem kraju, nekdanjem sedežu CK-ja. Ni to dober kraj za zachetek nechesa novega in res se je kmalu izkazalo, da je temu tako.

After all, through all stipulations of tactical administrative treatment (mainly ignorance and financial deprivation) the journal could be incapacitated. What if this would still not work in our case? Then there exists another improvable secret weapon. The very thought that this sort of thing would be possible in our democracy is paranoid. The journal will only be destroyed by terrorising its contributors, the creators in the editorial offices of Radiotelevizija Slovenija. And I must say that for now these tactics are proving unsuccessful, certain announced contributions are lacking, either late or insufficiently critically courageous. Who among creators is willing to jeopardize their employment with RTV Slovenija, after receiving an official intimation that the journal is problematic and blasphemous, that is, non-idolatry in relation to functionaries and poltroons of the system, both within the hierarchy of the medium and outside it.

Throughout, this to-be-expected attitude of the institution of the medium, stifling and terrorising (erroneously stated) of *SRP*(ians), was giving rise in its (counter)effects to a sort of (again expected) successes. It is true that this attitude was not happily received because once experienced, it ceases to be a tactical category and becomes a vividly felt reality, but this attitude worked with our potential or possible collaborators, who were not unknown to us, who consequentially did not want or dare write for this impudent *Revija SRP*, which is exactly why we were only able to attract contributors who were willing to forgo payment and who conquered the fear of mighty sanctions by the medium. These are brave, free, and direct writers. Those of us who will remain, write neither for money or glory and the journal is truly ours as we donate our work and so sponsor it ourselves in its main part (most important and most valuable). It could be said these institutional sanctions combed and purified our ranks, or that the institution and system in this case executed a positive selection for us. Each new contributor strengthening and refreshing, or to put it another way, spontaneously relaxing the direction of our values – refocusing the content of a journal that would otherwise be threatened by the rigidity and dogmatism of its own value orientation.

You rarely come across an adversary who will concurrently list reasons (measures and actions), which caused them the most damage. Nevertheless, this is what I need to do, such are the rules of the direction of the journal's values and this is what follows from the desire to keep our explorative odyssey (self-reflection) alive and manifest to the public, recorded in the historical memory of the M.M. institution and our Us(ness).

Allow me to re-list the most important few, though their weight is, and should remain, entirely a matter of personal perception; it is also probably not necessary to state that it is different for other contributors, particular to each of them.

I could say my hope for a free journal became more tangible in an odd place, the former seat of the Central Committee. This is no space for the birth of something new, which soon became evident.

Prav na Tomshichevi 5 je bila dana neka za bodočo *Revijo SRP* pomembna DEMOS-ova neformalna obljuba o izpolnitvi morda navidez moje obrobne zhelje: vrnitev statusa raziskovalnega oddelka quo ante, kar je vključevalo tudi vrnitev ukinjene revije *Bilten SSbP*. To naj bi bilo del plachila »prevratnikom« – upornikom od Nje – same Spomenke Hribar, ki je bila takrat, po mojem mnenju seveda, na samem vrhu DEMOS-ove mochi, za nash sindikat KUU RTVS pa odločujoča koordinatorka v boju za medij RTVL/S. Obljuba je bila seveda nichna. Ona je pach ni utegnila izpolniti. Moje nepotrebno vprashanje je, che jo je sploh hotela ali nameravala? Lahko pa bi jo uresnichila njena takratna strankarska somishljenika: Rudi Sheligo, kasnejshi predsednik Sveta RTVS in Misho Jezernik, od nje dolocheni, a nesojeni vodja SRP (Sluzhbe za raziskovanje programov RTVS) in kasnejshi Sheligov predsednik Sveta za nacionalne programe TVS. Pa sta ravno onadva najvech storila za spregledanje, iznichevanje oz. nevtralizacijo tako revije kot avtonomnega kritichnega in vsaj metodoloshko korektnega raziskovanja in razgrinjanja prikritih, a bistvenih problemov v mediju RTVS in njegove vloge v sistemu.¹

– Predsednik Sindikata KUU RTVS (Kulturno umetnishkih ustvarjalcev) Anton Mito Trefalt je potem, ko je presedlal iz sindikalnega konja na trojko institucionalnih funkcij (ekonomske, managerske in nadzorne), je najprej povsem diskreditiral nash sindikalni boj za kulturnonacionalno radiotelevizijo (svoj program je najprej skomercializiral chez vsako mero okusa, kasneje mu dodal she manjkajočo politizirajočo komponento). Za mene pa je bilo zopet alarmantno nekaj drugega, namrech tisto drugo dejanje, ko je prekorachil mejo ali po moje prekrshil »*Arhimedov zakon*«:

NOLI TURBARE CIRCULOS MEOS! (+)²

Takrat in s tem je raziskovanje ogrozil v njegovi avtonomni utemeljenosti, ogrozil she strokovno in metodoloshko korektnost raziskovanja na RTVS, bolj odkrito recheno pa ga je skorumpiral in napravil kar se da uporabno manipulabilno zanj, za raziskovanje pa nestrokovno in nesmiselno. Revije ni mogel ogroziti neposredno, pach pa posredno preko destrukcije raziskovanja na TVS in posebej raziskovalnega *Projekta SRP*.

Podprl in dopolnil ga je v Politichno-informativnem programu nash nekdanji sindikalni protezhiranec za mesto odgovornega urednika PIP Lado Ambrozich. Avtonomnost javnomnenjskih raziskav (natanchneje meritev oz. anket) Sluzhbe za raziskave programov je kompromitiral za lep chas, raziskovalce pa ponizhal v politichne manipulante s podatki, ki ne sluzhijo vech raziskovanju javnega mnenja, ampak kreiranju le tega.

Right at Tomshicheva 5, DEMOS made an informal promise significant for future *Revija SRP*, granting what may have seemed at the time, my side wish: the return of the research department status quo ante, which also included the reinstatement of the abolished *Bilten SSbP*. This was to be a part of the payment to »insurgents« – rebels by Her – Spomenka Hribar herself, who was then, in my opinion of course, at the very top of DEMOS's power, and for our syndicate KUU RTVS the deciding coordinator in the struggle for the RTVL/S medium. The promise was of course void. She never got around to fulfilling it. It is my insignificant question whether she ever intended to at all.

It could, however, have been realized by two of her then co-partisan adherents: Rudi Sheligo, later chairman of the Council of RTVS, and Misho Jezernik, her named but never-to-be leader of SRP (Service for the Research of Programming) and later chairperson of the Council for national programming at TVS under Sheligo. Yet it was they who most contributed to the disregard, annulment, or neutralisation of both the journal and the autonomous critical or at least methodologically correct research and disclosure of hidden though essential problems of the RTVS medium and its role in the system. ¹

- The chairman of KUU (Cultural and Artistic Creators) union RTVS Anton Mito Trefalt, having switched from the union track to the three institutional functions (economic, managing, and supervisory), initially entirely discredited our syndicated struggle for a cultural-national radio-television (at first he commercialised his programming beyond all taste and latter supplemented it with the missing political component). I, again, found something else alarming, namely that second act, when he crossed the line or, as I phrase it, broke »*Archimedes' law*«.

NOLI TURBARE CIRCULOS MEOS! (+) ²

Then and thereby he compromised the research in its autonomous foundation, endangering expert and methodological accuracy of research at RTVS, or more candidly, he corrupted research and made it as easy to manipulate as he could, rendering it inexpert and pointless. He couldn't endanger the journal directly but rather indirectly, through destroying research at TVS and particularly the *SRP* research project.

– It was supported and amended within the Politically-Informative Programming by our former unionist protégée for PIP managing editor Lado Ambrozich. He long compromised the autonomy of public opinion research (i.e. measuring and polling) in the programming research services, reducing researchers to political data manipulators, no longer for public opinion research but its creation.

Njegova udarnica, novinarka Rozvita Pesek pa je v TV dnevniku 2, dne 23. aprila 1994, v svojem komentarju takih rezultatov tel. anket sluzhbe pogromashko prezirljivo napadla nekega »njihovega« raziskovalca, ki mu seveda ni bilo vredno omeniti imena, tako kot bi, a komaj verjetno, to storili le v chasu najvechjega totalitarizma v dezheli Popitovega rezhima. Da se je to tako primerilo v chasu domnevne slovenske demokracije in demokratizacije medijev, me ni prevech presenetilo, ampak bolj to, da so me znanci sprashevali, kdo je ta raziskovalec, si to ti? Malo jih je bilo, ki so pogledali v *Revijo SRP*, kjer se vidi prava plat medalje. Nihche pa ni pripomnil, da je tak pogrom na nacionalnem mediju zhe nekoliko deplasiran. Očitno she ni bil. *Revije SRP* nisem zhelel posebej uporabljati za razgaljanje tega incidenta in dolgovezno razglabljanje o njem, vzrok zanj pa je bil tako in tako zhe poprej objavljen (to pot izjemoma tudi v M.M. Dnevniku in Delu, v vsakem po nekaj od celote) v celoti pa v *Reviji SRP*. Vendar moram rechi, da taka negativna publiciteta in enako negativno reagiranje nanjo kljub spushchenemu nivoju polemike ali pa ravno zaradi njega pripomore k publiciteti revije, vsaj opozori shirsho javnost, ki sicer ni ciljna publika revije, da *Revija SRP* vseeno je.

Zhe v chlankih *Aktualni dogodki v luchi vrednot* (v reviji Dialogi, 1988 leta) in v chlankih *Igre sistema, O sistemu v luchi sistemske teorije in malo drugache*, in *Spoved sistemu* (v reviji Likovne besede, 1988), sem se prostodushno zavzemal za Janeza Jansho in njegove tovarishe, celo v zapor sem mu v izraz solidarnosti, che zhe ne privrzhenosti, poslal te chlanke (takrat she vroche akcijske dokumente), preden so bili objavljeni in za namecek she chlanek *Iz zgodovine lincha*, ki naj bi mu bil v moralno oporo, che bi le morda to mojo priporočeno prichevanje nekako nekoch dobil. Sicer pa je takrat tako izzivanje sodilo v igro s sistemom, izzivanje njegovih tajnih sluzhb, che sem le hotel obchasno vzpodbuditi njegovo premajhno chujechnost – pozornost do nekega individuuma – mogochega razrednega sovrazhnika za sistem.

Pa se je zopet zgodilo, da sva na razlicnih bregovih reke in vech, da so ravno nekateri najozhji chlani sedaj njegove SSDS postali skupaj z nekaterimi nekdanjimi vnetimi komunisti najbolj gorechi grobarji – umrtvicharji *Projekta SRP (raziskovalne naloge in revije)* na RTVS. Institucionalni okvir pa so dobili v Jezernikovem programskem svetu za spremljanje TV nacionalnih programov. In zopet se nisem mogel sprijazniti z ideoloshko vlogo predsednika tega sveta prof. dr. Misha Jezernika, mojega nekdanjega profesorja sociologije na Filozofski fakulteti Univerze v Ljubljani in kasneje (she trikrat) mojega kolega na ISU (Socioloshkem inshtitutu Univerze), she manj pa z njegovo protiraziskovalno dejavnostjo. Kako je mogel postati predsednik (po moje) inkvizicijsko ideoloshke komisije, ki je na nam nekoch dobro znan nachin hotela obrachunati z (zopet po mojem mnenju) takrat najboljsho oddajo informativnega programa TVS *Tednikom* Darka Marina?

On 23 April 1994, on TV Dnevnik 2 news programme, his »udarnica« (super worker), journalist Rozvita Pesek, in a commentary of such phone polling results, attacked one of »their« researchers, whose name was naturally not worth mentioning, with such pogrom-like zeal as would scarcely befit the severest totalitarianism in the land of Popitov's regime. I wasn't too surprised that this would happen in a time of supposed Slovenian democracy and democratisation of the media, I was more surprised at my acquaintances asking me who this researcher was, if it was me. Few looked to the *SRP* journal, to see the other side. Yet no one added that such pogroms seem a tad out of place on modern national media. Apparently this was not the case. I had no wish to use the *SRP* journal specifically to expose this incident and its long winded discussion, being that its causes have already been publicised (this time exceptionally also by M. M. Dnevnik and Delo, each baring a part of the whole) and in its entirety in the *SRP* journal. I must, however, say that such negative publicity as well as the reactions it triggers, in spite of the lowered standards of polemics or because of them, adds to the journal's publicity, at the very least it informs the general public, though this is not the journal's target audience, that *Revija SRP* actually exists.

Already in the articles under the heading translated as *Relevant Occurrences in the Light of Values* (in the *Dialogi* journal, 1988) and *Games of the System, on the System in the Light of System Theory and a Bit Differently*, and *The Confession of a System* (in journal *Likovne besede*, 1988), I openly supported Janez Jansha and his comrades. As an expression of solidarity, even if not support, prior to their publication I even sent him these articles (then still fresh action documents) to prison, and also the article titled *From the History of Lynch*, intended as moral support, if he ever somehow did receive these registered postal testaments of mine. Generally such provocation was part of the game with the system, taunting its secret services, if I only wanted to occasionally incite its lacking vigilance – attention to an individual – the System's mighty class enemy.

And it occurs yet again that we stand on opposite sides of the river, that a few of the closest members of now his SSDS party along with a few former most ardent communists have become the most avid gravediggers – stifling *Projekt SRP* (*research and journal*) at RTVS. They got their institutional frame in Jezernik's Programme Council for the observation of national TV programmes. Again, I was unable to accept the ideological role of that Council's chairman, prof. dr. Misho Jezernik, my former sociology professor at the Faculty of Arts of the University of Ljubljana and later (three times) my colleague at ISU (University Institute of Sociology), and less still his counter-research activities. How was he able to become chairman of (what I view as) ideological inquisition-commission that wished to, in ways we once knew well, dispose of the then best informative TV show, Darko Marin's *Tednik* (weekly review)?

In kako je mogel v celoti podpreti Trefaltovo vizijo in uporabo manipuliranega raziskovanja in mu dodati še svoje neizmerno nagnjenje k krizhanju gledalcev brez mere (to je krizhanje gledalcev po kategorijah: spolu, starosti, izobrazbi, ne oziraje se na premajhne vzorce, ki kazhejo le chudno in nesmiselno razredchene gledalce in njihove ocene oddaj), kar je po moje strokovno zelo vprashljivo (che ne tudi nedopustno) pochetje ali zhe kar sharlatanstvo stroke, ki sluzhi le administrativnemu (ali gospodinjskemu) raziskovanju in she bolj njegovi uporabi? Danes menim, da je zhe javna objava chlanka *Problem Tednika* in s tem razkritje povsem drugachnih, za oba sveta nesprejemljivih pogledov na avtonomijo TV ustvarjalnosti, zadoshchala, da se je je zachela neizprosna, a ne prevech odkrita institucionalna pogrebna svechanost tako za *Revijo SRP* na RTVS kot tudi za raziskovalni *projekt SRP* in za avtonomno raziskovanje na mediju seveda tudi. Zhe res, da ta revija za Njih ni pomembna rech, pomembna je le toliko, kolikor jim dela politichno shkodo. A tako je to od nekdej v zrenju zacharane politichne zavesti – strankarsko poenotenege in razosebljenega mishljenja, ki sezhe najvech do pragmatichnega nivoja zavesti.

Konflikt je bil torej neizbezhen, rezultat pa vech ali manj predvidljiv, saj se na RTVL/S kar naprej ponavlja, v minimalni variaciji. Naglavni greh *Revije SRP* je bil, da je enostransko objavljala upor zoper to manipulacijo in motila in razkrivala »ideoloshko-inkvizicijske« ukrepe. Enostransko zato, ker druga stran ni hotela ali mogla ali pa sploh ni imela za potrebno in dostojno polemizirati z avtorji v *Reviji SRP*, to je v reviji, ki je za njih sploh ni, in ima poleg vsega she to napako, da ni sistemsko obvladljiva in ni urejana in cenzurirana niti po kljuchnih eminencah institucionalne hierarhije niti po njenih komisijah in telesih ne. Politichno gledano je vpliv revije zanemarljiv, njena ciljna publika je v glavnem zhe preprichana in nanjo je komaj mogoche vplivati. Vendar strah ima velike ochi in primerjava z mochjo vpliva mas medijev je tako rekoeh stvar navade mochnih in politichno misleehih. Po drugi strani je zopet res, da institucionalni vpliv na svojsko orientacijo revije najbrzh sploh ne bi bil mogoch, vendar poskusili bi vseeno lahko. Odlochujochi v instituciji so imeli vso mozhnost sovplivanja na orientacijo in razvoj revije, takoj, ko je bila dana pobuda zanjo. To je bilo mogoche zhe takrat, ko se je zachela domnevna demokratizacija sistema in s tem prichakovana tudi v instituciji, ali pa vsaj, ko je bil konchan naskok na radiotelevizijo, takrat imenovano *bastilja komunizma*.³

Tako pa ostaja vpijoche dejstvo neke civilne pobude – pobude za ustanovitev *Revije SRP* – namrech, da ga rigidna institucija reshuje zhe chetrto leto (medtem ko revija izhaja zhe tretje leto). Drugache kot vsiljive, take pobude s strani institucije seveda ni mogoche videti. Che pa hochem reflektirati najgloblje vtise, tiste, ki jih nikakor ne morem zanemariti in morda tudi ne presechi, cheprav so spremembe v taktiki in delovanju od nekdanjega akcijskega raziskovalca do sedanje vloge odgovornega urednika kar precejsnjhe, so nekatera dozhivetja le neizbrisna; individua zaznamujejo za vselej.

And how could he wholeheartedly support Trefalt's vision and use of manipulated research and add his own immeasurable propensity for boundless mixing of audiences (that is mixing categories such as gender, age, education, with little care that the samples were too small thus demonstrating only a weirdly and senselessly diluted audience and their appraisals of the programmes), which I believe to be very questionable (if not unacceptable) professional conduct, or even full blown fraud within the discipline, which only serves administrative (or household) research and in particular its use? Today I think that the publication of the *the Problem of Tednik* article and accompanying disclosure of entirely different views on the autonomy of TV creativity, unacceptable to either of the two worlds, was enough to start an unrelenting though not overly honest institutional burial ceremony for both the SRP journal at RTVS and the SRP research project, of course along with research autonomy within the medium. It is true that They do not find the journal important, to them it only holds significance insofar as it may cause them political damage. But so it has always been in the sight of bewitched political consciousness – unified partisan and depersonalised thinking, which reaches only as far as the pragmatic level of consciousness.

Conflict was therefore unavoidable and the result more or less predictable, being that it still consistently and with minimum variation recurs at RTVL/S. *Revija SRP*'s grave sin was that it unilaterally publicised resistance to this manipulation and agitated and disclosed »measures of ideological inquisition«. Unilaterally, because the other side either had no desire, capacity, or thought it unimportant and indecent to debate with *Revija SRP*'s authors, of a journal, which to them doesn't even exist, which also suffers from being uncontrollable by the system and is not edited or censored by key eminences of institutional hierarchy nor through their committees and bodies. Politically, the journal's influence is negligible; its target audience is mostly convinced and can scarcely be influenced. However, fear magnifies, and to the powerful and politically sentient drawing parallels with the power of mass media is practically habitual. On the other hand, it is also true that institutional influence of the journal's particular orientation would in all probability prove impossible anyway, but they could at least try. The people in charge of the institution had every chance to co-influence the journal's orientation and development from its first instigation. It was possible already when the purported democratisation of the system first began and was expected to take place within the institution, or at least with the conclusion of the charge on radio-television, then known as the *Bastille of Communism*.³

As it is, it remains a blaring fact of some civil initiative – to found *Revija SRP* – that it is already being rescued by the rigid institution for four years (while the journal is published already for the third year). Of course the institution can see such initiatives as nothing but intrusive. If I wish to reflect on my most profound impressions, those which I am entirely unable to neglect and perhaps also to overcome, even though my tactics and roles have changed considerably through my various professions from former action researcher to current managing editor, some experiences remain inerasable; they impact an individual forever.

Dovolite mi, da potemtakem sezhem she nekoliko nazaj in navedem najbolj melodramatichen odlomek iz svojega takratnega utemeljevanja smisla akcijskega delovanja in pisanja:

V zacasnem zakljuchku raziskave iz leta 1986 je torej pisalo: V vechini mojih prizadevanj je akcija blokirana in vse kazhe, da se bo tak tretma res nekoliko neobichajnega raziskovanja nadaljeval in stopnjeval.

Nobenih ukrepov ni, ki bi ne omogochali protiukrepa in tako je tudi z metodologijo akcijske raziskave. Mozhnost komuniciranja, javnega delovanja, publiciranja, sodelovanja s sorodnimi raziskovalnimi organizacijami, raziskovalci, ki vidijo in chutijo podobno raziskovalno vzdushje, je bila, milo recheno, neutralizirana. Inshtitut za sociologijo Univerze, moja nekdanja maticbna institucija, se je tem ukrepom pridruzil, onemogochal to minimalno zunanje institucionalno sodelovanje. A to she zdalech ni bilo vse. Socialna izolacija je tisto osnovno občutenje, ki ga kot akcijski raziskovalec nisem mogel spregledati. Vprashanje, ki sem si ga zastavljal, je bilo le: ali ni morda zhe chas za spremembo metodologije akcije? Ni namrech nobenih ukrepov, ki ne bi omogochali fleksibilnejsbega odziva.

Takratna, a kasnejsha opomba: Sledil je she kljub vsemu ekspresivno depresiven opis stanja individualne zavesti »razrednega sovrashnika«, vendar energija she ni bila izchrpana in akcija se je nadaljevala, raziskovalec pa se je zapletel v nevarna razmerja.

Sedanja opomba: V tem primeru mi je priskochil na pomoch sam sistem. Ko sem zhe skoraj obupal nad njim in njegovo usodo, se je kar sam zrushil, sesul. No, ne ravno chisto sam, malo smo mu le pomagali, vsak po svojih mocheh, vsak v svojem delokrogu v svoji instituciji mochi. In tako so ta nova razmerja odlochilno vplivala na tok dogodkov tudi na mediju mochi RTVL/S. Dandanes se na mediju tega sploh ne spominjajo vech, zato pa jim mora ravno *Revija SRP* obchasno obujati zgodovinski spomin.

Vendar ta izolacija ostane za vedno in prav to me dandanes she najbolj ovira, da bi lahko vzpostavil sproshcheno komunikacijo z nekdanjimi kolegi sociologi in she komunikologi. Pa ni ta ovira samo pri meni, je tudi pri njih, vedno se me bodo, che se le da, izogibali, vzbujam jim, in sem zanje neprijeten spomin. Ravno to pa ovira dobro opravljanje moje urednishke vloge, tudi sam chutim, da nisem sposoben vzpostaviti komunikacije s tistimi, ki bi jo moral najprej.

Prav zato zhelim tudi ob tej prilozhnosti mochne in mogochno netaktno (tega se zavedam) spomniti, da je akcijska raziskava *Vrednotne orientacije avtonomne propagande znanosti* vsebovala tudi razmeram primerno *Analiza vojne propagande* medija v vojni in je bila tako tudi neposredno udelezhena v moji osebni ali privatni antipropagandni vojni (proti) JNA. ⁴

Che si navedem samo en eklatanten primer, ker o tem se ne govori: kako chudno je vchasih ob desetdnevni vojni za slovensko osamosvojitve reagirala TVS. Ne najbolje, ko je shlo za odlochilno opredelitev in preseganje njene nepristranskosti porochanja v vojni za Slovenijo.

Allow me to therefore reach even further into the past to cite the most melodramatic excerpt from my substantiation of the purpose of action activities and writings:

The temporary conclusion of the study from 1986 therefore stated: The action of most of my endeavours is blocked, and it appears that such treatment of truly somewhat unusual research will continue and increase.

There are no measures that would not enable countermeasures and the same goes for methodology of action research. The capacity of communication, public activity, publishing, cooperation with related research organisations, researchers who see and feel a similar exploratory atmosphere, was, to put it mildly, neutralised. The University Institute of Sociology, my former parent institution, joined in these efforts, thwarting this minimal external institutional cooperation. But this was far from all. Social isolation is that basic feeling I could not overlook as a researcher. The question I asked myself was: is it perhaps not time for a change in the methodology of action? Being that there are no measures that would not enable a more flexible response.

A note from a later point in that period: In spite of everything, there followed an expressively depressive account of the state of individual consciousness of the »class enemy«, but the energy was not yet depleted and action continued whilst the researcher got tangled in dangerous relationships.

Present day note: In this case it was the system itself that came to my aid. When I all but gave up on it and its fate, it collapsed all on its own. Well perhaps not entirely on its own, we did help a little, each as we could, each in our field, in our institution of power. And so these new relations had a defining effect on the sequence of events also in the medium of power, RTVL/S. These days there remains no memory of this at the medium, which is why it is precisely *Revija SRP* that has to occasionally recall historical memory.

However, this isolation remains forever and now hinders me most in establishing a relaxed mode of communication with my former fellow sociologists as well as communicologists. This barrier is not only mine but also theirs; they will always avoid me if possible. I am their unpleasant reminder and memory. This is precisely what hinders me from performing my editorial duties well, I myself also feel I am unable to establish communication with those I ought first have done.

Precisely for this reason I wish to take this opportunity to tactlessly (of this I am aware) remind the powerful and mighty that the action research study *Value Orientations of Autonomous Scientific Propaganda* also contained fitting *Analysis of War Propaganda* of the medium in war and was so directly part of my personal or private anti-propaganda war (against) JNA (Yugoslav National Army).⁴

To give only one obvious example, because this is not talked about: how strange TVS's reaction to the ten-day war of Slovenian independence was at times. Not the most appropriate, at a time when a pivotal position was at stake along with exceeding its impartiality in reporting on the war for Slovenia.

Ali pa bi lahko rekel drugache, da je bilo porochaje RTVL v njeni zgodovinski preizkushnji vchasih le prevech zmedeno in chudno. Tako she danes ni pojasnjeno, kako je lahko Mihajlo Terzich (shef za psiholoshko propagandno vojno JNA) v chasu vojne razlagal svoje poglede in poglede svojih sodelavcev preko ekranov slovenske televizije? To je bila tako huda napaka, spodrsrljaj ali izdaja, da je sploh nisem hotel navesti, niti kot primer v *Analizi vojne propagande*. (To je torej le neljubi primer, ki je po mojem tako hud spodrsrljaj, da je bil delezhen moje avtocenzure.)

Prava institucionalna intervencija pa je akcijska raziskava postala v *Boju za nacionalno radiotelevizijo* (raziskovalna in sindikalna inachica porochila). Nikakor pa ne morem sprejeti očitkov, ki nikakor in nikoli ne pojenjajo, ker so del zheleznega repertoarja ključnih kadrov na mediju, da so raziskave neuporabne. Che ta ni bila uporabna in uporabljena s strani takratnega vodstva, si je to lahko pripisalo k posledicam, vsaj k neustreznemu odzivu na bistvene spremembe v sistemu, na katere se vodstvo samo ni znalo in ni moglo odzvati.

Njihovi nasprotniki (moji zachasni zavezniki) pa bi takrat le tezhko zanikali njeno uporabo. Danes je seveda drugache, hlastanje po zaslugah hitro pripomore k brisanju tudi novejšega zgodovinskega spomina. Zato pa je te teoretske in tudi praktichne (akcijsko interventne) raziskovalne teze, dognanja in razkritja s pridom uporabil Sindikat KUU RTVL/S. To, kar mi je bilo malo nerazumljivo, je, da so tudi nova vodstva RTVS tako slabega spomina, da tudi Oni skushajo tako hitro in tako očitno zabrisati vsako sled zgodovinskega spomina, ki ni ravno njihov ali pa njihovi podobi ustrezen ali jih v vsem ne velicha. Po nekem zheleznem scenariju se je tudi v tem primeru zgodilo, da se v igre sistema vpleteni ponovno srechamo, a na nasprotnem bregu. Oni so bili sedaj chlani v Sheligovem svetu ali pa za njim. A kaj pomeni en chlan sveta ali stranke ali celo predsednik v primeri z vojvodo?

Nedvomno pa je bila Sheligova vloga tista, ki je bila odlochilna za pogrebni odnos institucije do *Revije SRP*. Pri tem mi nikdar ni shlo v glavo dejstvo (cheprav je to tako po determinizmu vlog v institucijah nujno, in vse moje izkushnje v instituciji mochi so mi tako govorile), da se bo prav to nujno moralo zgoditi. Ko pa se to vendarle zgodi, pa sem kot chlovek (ne kot raziskovalec) vsakich znova prizadet, da ne rechem shokiran. Kako more nekdanji in sedanji priznani in slavni pisatelj, borec za svobodo misli in pisanja sedaj sam zatirati to isto rech, namrech svobodo misli in njeno javno izrazhanje v reviji drugim, sedaj očitno drugache mislechim od njega. In kako more kot nekdanji profesor statistike sedaj sprejemati in tolerirati tako manipulacijo s podatki, kot se je primerila nam na RTVS? O vsem tem in nas protagonistih sem veliko premishljeval in pisal, in to je bil nedvomno moj doslej najbolj nezaslishan napad na sedaj nedotakljive. She vedno menim, da je bil povsem upravichen in stoji tako, kot je bil zapisan.

Or I could phrase it another way and say that RTVL's reporting during its historic trial was sometimes too confused and peculiar. And so it remains unexplained how Mihajlo Terzich (JNA's head of propaganda psychological warfare) was able to explain his and his colleagues' views on Slovenian TV during the war. This error, lapse, or treason was so great that I did not even want to state it, not even as an example in the *Analysis of War Propaganda*. (This is then merely an undesirable example, which in my opinion amounts to a lapse so great that it was self-censored by me.)

The action research study truly became an institutional intervention in the *Fight for a National Radio-Television* (an exploratory and syndical version of the report). But I can in no way accept that the study is useless, reproaches to that effect never and in no way cease because they are part of the standard repertoire of those holding key positions at the medium. That it was not useful to and used by the leadership at the time can account for the consequences, at least the inadequate response to key system changes to which leadership was incapable and unable to respond.

But their adversaries (my temporary allies) would then hardly be able to negate its usefulness. Today things are, of course, different; clutching at recognition quickly helps to erase even later historical memory. And so theoretical as well as practical

(action intervening) research theses, findings, and discoveries were used to good effect by the Union of KUU RTVL/S. What I found slightly perplexing was that the new RTVS management's memory is equally poor; that They also quickly and obviously try to erase all traces of historical memory, which is not exactly theirs nor fits with their image, but fails to aggrandise Them completely. According to some iron scenario it recurred that we – who were part of the system's game met again, but on opposite banks. They were now part of Sheliga's Council or behind it. But what is a single Council or party member or even chairman to a duke?

There is, though, no doubt that Sheliga's role determined the Institution's funerary attitude towards *Revija SRP*. I was never able to grasp that this will necessarily need to occur (though necessity is clear due to determinism of roles in institutions and in keeping with all my experience in the institution of power). Every single time it nevertheless occurs, I am as a man (not as a researcher) hurt or even shocked. How can a former and current noted writer, fighter for the freedom of thought and written word now turn and suppress the same, i.e. freedom of thought and its expression in a journal, of others now clearly of different mind than he. And how can he, a former professor of statistics now tolerate such manipulation of data as we have witnessed at RTVS? I considered all this and wrote at length about it as well as all of us protagonists, and this was doubtless my thus far most outrageous attack on the presently untouchable. I maintain that it was entirely justified and stands as it was written.

Cheprav gre za daljši povzetek, zhe kar manjši traktatek, se mi zdi tako nepogreshljiv v tem poročilu, da ga bom ob tej prilozhnosti vseeno povzel, pa tudi zato, ker je bil kljub moji tvegani »nesramnosti« in ne zaradi nje, kot bi rekli prestrasheni in lojalni, vseeno v celoti ignoriran. Pisalo je torej:

**»Svoboda, to je svoboda rechi, da je dva in dva shtiri.
Che je to mogoche, potem vse ostalo pride samo po sebi.«**

(Winston Smith je to v svoj dnevnik napisal z občutkom, da je formuliral pomemben aksiom.)

Samo zato so pravi odstotki tako prekleto pomembni, pa naj bodo politiki in mediju she tako neljubi. Samo zato vodimo to navidez tako malenkostno in nepomembno vojno za prave – neponarejene rezultate ali vsaj proti evidentni pristranosti »fejst rezultatov«. In zato v Reviji SRP v skladu z njeno vrednotno orientacijo ne poznamo cenzure in autocenzure, cheprav bi bilo včasih taktno in za revijo koristno, che bi kako formulacijo v soglasju z avtorjem omilili ali celo izpustili. Vendar tega ne delamo, ker dobro vemo, da bi bil to zacetek, ki nima konca oziroma ima tak konec, da revija zataji svojo vrednotno orientacijo in namesto nje uveljavlja: relativizem resnice, sprijenost svobode in odsotnost poguma. To pa so vrednotne orientacije, znachilne za posttotalitarizem ali preprosteje recheno za nasho »podaljshano preteklost.

Raziskovalna sluzhba na slovenski radioteleviziji SRP je izgubila avtonomijo in z njo verodostojnost rezultatov. Poglavitni ukinjevalci te avtonomije pa so bili management RTVS in Svet RTVS. Med njimi pa so se izkazali predvsem nashi nekdanji prijatelji in sobojevniki v boju za nacionalno Radiotelevizijo Slovenije, nekdanji somishljeniki ali podporniki Sindikata KUU RTVL/S, tisti torej, ki so po tem boju prevzeli kljuchne položaje (vloge) na RTVS. (Konkretno: Rudi Sheligo – predsednik Sveta, dr. Misbo Jezernik – preds. programskega sveta za nacionalne programe TVS, z njim she chlani tega sveta: Niko Grafenauer, dr. Janko Prunk, Jozhe Snoj, Rafko Valenich, Franc Zagorben, Milan Zver. Institucionalno operacionalno in vodilno vlogo na tem področju pa sta nedvomno opravila Lado Ambrožich – odgovorni urednik inf. programa TVS in Mito Trefalt – odg. urednik razvedrilnega programa TVS – nekdanji predsednik Sindikata KUU RTVS. Na moje najvechje razočaranje pa se jim je pridruzhil she najvechji up nashega sindikata za nacionalno-kulturno radiotelevizijo gen. dir. Zbarko Petan.) Kako naj si to razlagam, che ne z determinizmom vloge. Vechkrat sem zhe pomislil, da che bi po neki nesrechi postal chlan sveta RTVS, bi potem najbrzh ukinjal samega sebe kot raziskovalca in odg. urednika Revije SRP. Naj ponovim opis nashe temeljne izkusnje z Njimi ob ozhivljanju in mrtrichenju neke revije, to je, o nemozhnosti komunikacije: Hochem povedati, da njihov jezik, v katerem zdaj govore in pishejo, ni vech isti. Sedaj govore in pishejo tudi v Novoreku. Sedaj so bili Oni tisti, ki revije lahko tolerirajo, subvencionirajo ali pa ukinjajo, prepovedo ali drugache onemogochajo. Temu rechejo sociologi determinizem vloge, ker vloga dolocha pretezni del chlovekovega ravnanja, znachaj pa le njegov neznatni del.

*Revija SRP pa kljub vsemu ni izgubila avtonomije, ker je sploh ne more izgubiti, le sebe lahko izgubi. Belezhi dogajanja na RTVS in okrog nje, taka, ki jih medijska stvarnost izkljuchuje, kot da jih ni in jih nikoli ni bilo; trudi se, da jih obrani zgodovinskemu spominu. Zato imamo posebno rubriko **Za osvezhitev zgodovinskega spomina institucije RTVL/S.***

Though this is a longer recapitulation, a near treatise, I find it so substantial to this report that I will nevertheless reiterate it here, also because it was entirely ignored in spite of my risky »impudence« and not because of it, as the frightened and loyal would say. It therefore stated:

**»Freedom; that is the freedom to say two and two is four.
If this is possible than everything else follows by itself.«**

(Winston Smith wrote this in his diary, feeling he formulated an important maxim.) This is the only reason real percentages are so damned important, no matter how abhorrent to politics and the medium. This is the only reason we wage this seemingly so petty and insignificant war for real – unfabricated results or at least against evident bias of »nice results«. And this is why we at Revija SRP, in keeping with its value-orientation, know neither censorship nor self-censorship, even though it may sometimes be tactful and advantageous for the journal if, in agreement with the author, certain formulations were softened or even omitted. But we don't do this because we know well it would mark the beginning without end, or which in its end denies its own value-orientation and instead fosters: relativism of verity, distortion of liberty, and lack of spirit. These are values typical of post-totalitarianism or, simply put, of our »prolonged past«.

Research services at the Slovenian radio-television, SRP, lost their autonomy and thereby credibility of their results. The foremost abolishers of this autonomy were the management of RTVS and the Council of RTVS. Among them our former friends and brothers in arms in the fight for a Slovenian National Radio-Television have proven themselves above all others, former adherents of the Union (Namehly: Rudi Sheligo – Council chairman, dr. Misbo Jezernik – chairman of TVS Programme Council for National Programming, as well as members of said Council Niko Grafenauer, dr. Janko Prunk, Jožbe Snoj, Rafko Valenčič, Franc Zagozben, Milan Zver. The institutional operational and leading role in this area was doubtless played by Lado Ambrožič – managing editor of TVS news programme and Mito Trefalt – managing editor of TVS entertainment programme – former chairman of the KUU RTVS Union. To my utmost disappointment, the greatest hope of our union for national-cultural radio-television, director general Zbarko Petan joined them as well.) How else am I to make sense of this if not through role-determinism. I imagined several times that if, by some accident, I became an RTVS Council member, I would probably abolish myself as researcher and managing editor of Revija SRP. Let me reiterate the description of our fundamental experience with Them in relation to the revival and stifling of a certain journal, that is, inability to communicate: I want to say that their language, which they now speak and write, has changed. They now also speak and write in Newspeak. They have the power to tolerate, subsidise, or abolish, forbid or in other ways obstruct journals. This is what sociologists call determinism of the role because the role defines a large part of a person's actions, while character is merely its minor part.

*Still, Revija SRP never lost its autonomy. It cannot, it can only lose itself. It records occurrences at RTVS and around it, excluded from the reality of the medium, as though they don't exist and never did; it strives to preserve them in historical memory. This is why we publish a special segment **To Refresh the Historical Memory of the RTVL/S Institution.***

Revija SRP je trn v peti vsem, ki so na odgovornih in pomembnih položajih, tem, ki zgodovino ustvarjajo. In ravno ti ljudje so bili iz kroga Nove revije ali pa so ji bili vsaj blizu in ravno ti individuumi, ki so bili nekdanji soborci za **svobodo misli in pisanja**, so se znasli v vlogi (zdaj, ko so na potezi in položaju močnih in mogočnih), da počno z nami to, kar so nekoč počeli z njimi. Ukinjajo in onemogochajo revijo, ki žheli biti avtonomna. Iz nekdanjih šrtev rezhima so se Oni prelevili v rablje, postali so tisti, ki ne tolerirajo drugache mislečnih, zatiralci svobode misli in pisanja. So pa izjeme, kot povsod, in najslabshe je to, da jih nikakor ne morem dovolj izpostaviti, le medvedjo uslugo bi jim storil.

Samo zato smo sodelavci Revije SRP, ki se zavzemamo za svobodo misli in pisanja, tako zelo občutljivi za raznotere oblike manipulacije, smo proti cenzuri in predvsem avtocenzuri in ravno zato smo močnim in odločujočim trn v peti.

Vendar vseeno mislimo, da bi na RTVS eno revijo, ki ne strizhe tekstov, vseeno labko prenesli. (V Ljubljani, avgusta 1994) ⁵

Povzetek je malo dolg, zato se opravičujem, ne pa zaradi njegove vsebine, menim, da je v njem zaobjeto bistvo in konkretizacija našega razhajanja, vse do imen. Najbrzh boste rekli, da sem s tem presegel vsako dopustno mero in morda menite, da sem si z njim podpisal dokončno obsodbo. Sam menim, da sem to storil zhe davno poprej. Kdorkoli samo preleti uradne dokumente – pobude, vloge in proshnje Revije SRP in uradne odgovore institucije RTVS (najprej za ustanovitev, potem soustanovitev in minimalno priznanje in končno vsaj za toleranco) mu je jasno, da tu ni kaj pričakovati, da se ni smiselno kakorkoli slepiti (samozaslepljevati). Ta igra, je kot vse kazhe in kot se vidi zhe z aviona, zhe zdavnaj zaigrana. Vendar tako je to bilo zhe na samem zacetku, in sploh nikoli nismo trdili, da jo moramo (tako igro) dobiti. Zato to ne more biti odločujoč razlog, da bi sodelavci od revije odstopili. Njena vrednotna orientacija bo verjetno postala drugachna, z drugimi poudarki, tezhko pa se bo odrekla vrednotam *pogumu, svobodi, resnici*. Seveda niso bile mishljene neke abstraktne in absolutne vrednote, ampak le taka ali tista resnica, ki jo lahko vidimo, pa je nochemo videti; ne absolutna svoboda, ampak svoboda individuumu v odnosu do sistema (nekako tako, kot jo pojmuje Étienne de La Boétie: rechi ne! hierarhom in katerimkoli idolpokloniteljem lojalnosti, tem institucionalnim odjemalcem svobode chloveka; skratka, to je svoboda, ki si jo moramo vzeti sami, le s svojim lastnim pogumom, namesto samoomejevanja, avtocenzure in prostovoljnega suzhenjstva, prostovoljne neustvarjalnosti).

In tem je bilo vedno treba dodati she svobodo od venomer grozeche lastne institucionalizacije – dogmatizacije v vrednotni orientaciji, ker priznati je treba, da vsaka, tudi nasha orientacija, potem ko je izreчена, kaj rada zazveni v nam dobro znanem ideoloshko novorek-tonu (jeziku) posebej, ko je nash duh vaju take in predvsem take godbe.

Revija SRP is a thorn in the side of those in responsible and important positions who create history. These very people formed the circle of Nova revija or at least stood nearby, these individuals, formerly our combatants in the fight for the **freedom of thought and writing**, are now in a position to inflict onto us that which they once suffered at the hands of others (now that they hold power and might). They abolish and obstruct a journal, which wishes to be autonomous. Once regime's victims, they turned executioners, intolerant of dissenting views suppressing freedom of thought and writing. As always, there are exceptions, and the worst is that I can in no way properly expose them, I would only be harming them.

Only for this reason, we contributors to Revija SRP, standing for freedom of thought and writing, are so very sensitive to various forms of manipulation, opposing censorship and especially self-censorship; this is why we are thorns in the decision-makers' side.

*However, we still believe RTVS could withstand a single journal that doesn't cut up texts.
(Ljubljana, August 1994) ⁵*

The summary was a bit long, for which I apologise, but not for its content; I believe it captures the essence and concretisation of our differences complete with names. You may say this surpasses any acceptable limit and think I just signed my final sentence. I think I did so long ago. Whosoever merely glances over official documents – *Revija SRP's* initiatives, applications, and requests and RTVS institution's official replies (first founding, then co-founding with minimal recognition, and finally at least tolerance), will realize there is nothing to expect here, that there is no point in pulling the wool over one's eyes (self-delusion). This game, as everything points and as can be seen from space, has been lost long ago.

However, this has been the case from the very beginning, and we never maintained that this (game) must be won. And so this cannot be the determining reason for the journal's collaborators to step down. Its value orientation will probably change, have different emphases, but it will be hard for it to relinquish *Liberty, Verity, and Spirit*. Of course these values are not abstract and absolute but only such or that truth, which we can but do not wish to see; not absolute liberty, but the liberty of the individual in relation to the system (roughly as imagined by Étienne de La Boétie: to say no! To hierarchs and any idol-givers of loyalty, these institutional consumers of the freedom of man; in short, it is the liberty, which we must take for ourselves, only through our own courageous spirit, in place of self-limitation, self-censorship, and voluntary slavery, voluntary non-creativity). And to these it was always necessary to add the freedom from the constant threat of our own institutionalisation – dogmatisation within the value orientation, since it must be acknowledged that even our orientation, once worded, happily rings in a familiar ideological Newspeak-tone (language), particularly, as our spirit is used to such and mostly such music.

She o (ne)moznosti moje komunikacije

Posebej pa bom izpostavil she naslednje novejshe dogodke:

Glede nemozhnosti komunikacije ⁶ med *Revijo SRP* in odlochujochimi na mediju se ni nich spremenilo ali premaknilo na bolje, cheprav je bilo mogoche katero potezo novega sveta tudi tako razlagati. Dve pismi novemu Svetu RTVS, ki jima dvakrat sledil neodgovor, tudi posameznih chlanov Sveta RTVS (pismi sta bili sochasno tudi apel posameznikom – individuumom, lahko bi tudi rekel, da sta bili pismi klic v sili – utaplajajoche se pobude), sta po mojem mnenju razblinili tudi to iluzijo. Vse pobude *Revije SRP* se namrech zanesljivo utope v administrativni poplavi uradnega gradiva institucije in ministrstev sistema. Tak neodgovor je seveda mogoche razlagati le na en nachin, namrech, da je to, kar je za nas tako pomembno, za nagovorjene povsem nepomembno. Očitno je tudi novim chlanom sveta in posameznikom (individuumom) v njem revija in raziskovanje programov povsem in chisto odvech. Vedno pa se najde kaka izjema. V našem primeru je ta izjema – predstavnik Univerz v Svetu RTVS, dr. Bruno Cvikl – njegova zasluga je bila tudi, da raziskovanje medija(ev) doslej she ni izpadlo iz statuta RTVS. Sedaj bi moral nashteti she vse tiste chlane sveta, za katere menim, da revijo kljub njeni svojskosti vseeno dopushchajo, vendar to sodi k javnemu lobiranju, se torej ne spodobi, pa she malo zgodaj je za to, ne bi se rad prevech ushtel.

– ***Vsebinska izhodishcha*** *za program dela SRP TVS* (zamishljena je tudi bodocha (morda nekoch mogocho) Sluzhba za raziskave programov RTVS) pa so meni zhe nekaj dobro znanega, iz zheleznega repertoarja smernic, izhodishch in usmerjanj institucije medija mochi. Ne morem jih zaobiti kar tako mimogrede. Ko namrech prebiram ***Vsebinska izhodishcha*** *za programe dela sluzhb raziskovanja programov in obchinstva*,²⁶ (ki niso vsebinska, ampak so izhodishcha za raziskovalni program brez vsebine in raziskave brez razlag: »le she objavlanje podatkov brez razlag«), ki so nastala v radijski raziskovalni enoti, nepodpisana, sicer pa v znanem slogu vodje te enote gospe Vide Shrot, in ki so bila poslana dir. RA programov Andreju Rotu, se skoraj zgrozim. Hkrati pa nekoliko bolj razumem, odkod in od koga vse so sugerirana ali svetovana taka pogromashka stalishcha in napotki za izlochanje *Revije SRP* in kritichnega raziskovanja medija in medijev, kot jih goji *Katalog problemov – projekt SRP*.

Na mnenje gospoda Rota je v reviji kar se da vljudno odgovoril gl. urednik Franci Zagorichnik. Sam nikoli ne bi zmozel, tako nezhno in elegantno zhe ne, odgovoriti na vse kategorichne imperative – zato je gospoda direktorja RAS. She posebej ne, ker gre A.H. Rot dlje od preizkushenih machkov na RTVL/S, kratkomalo nas *SRP*-ashe izobchi, porine izven sistema. Zhe res, da ga ne ljubimo, vendar kakorkoli nas sistem obracha, she vedno smo v njem.

Mnenje o nekem mnenju o Reviji SRP, glavnega urednika Francija Zagorichnika je tudi zgleden primer, kako lahko komunicira urednik revije z mochnimi, mogochnimi in uglednimi reprezentanti institucij.⁷

And on my (in)ability to communicate

I will specifically reveal the following newer developments:

Nothing changed or improved regarding the inability of communication⁶ between *Revija SRP* and decision-makers at the medium, even though some actions of the new Council could also be interpreted this way. Two letters to the new RTVS Council followed by two non-replies, also by new RTVS Council members (the letters were simultaneously also appeals to individuals, I could also say that the letters were calls for help – of a drowning initiative), in my opinion dissolved this illusion as well. Namely, all *Revija SRP*'s initiatives are sure to drown in a flood of administrative materials from the institution and ministries of the system. Such failure to reply can of course only be explained one way, namely, that what we find so significant is entirely unimportant to those addressed. Obviously the Council's new members and individuals find the journal and research it contains entirely redundant. But there is always an exception. In our case said exception is the representative of Universities on the RTVS Council, dr. Bruno Cvikl – thanks to him, medium (media) research has thus far not been deleted from the RTVS statute. Now I should list all Council members who, in my opinion, allow the to journal persist, but this amounts to public lobbying, and is therefore inappropriate; it would also be a bit too early and I wouldn't want to misjudge too greatly.

– **Content foundations** for *SRP TVS's work procedures* (future (perhaps someday possible) RTVS research services were also envisaged) are very familiar to me from the standard repertoire of foundations, guidelines, and directions of the institution of the medium of power. I cannot circumvent them in passing. I am in fact almost horrified, when I read the **Content foundations for the work procedures of programme and audience research services** ²⁶ (not about content but foundations for research procedures without content and explanations: »merely publication of data with no explanation«), which were produced at the radio research unit, unsigned but otherwise in the known style of the unit's leader Vida Shrot, and which were sent to the director of radio programming Andrej Rot. At the same time I get a slightly better understanding of whence and by whom are suggested or advised all such pogrom-like positions and instructions for the elimination of *Revija SRP* and critical medium and media research as are cultivated in the *Catalogue of Problems – project SRP*. Mr Rot's opinion was, as civilly as possible, addressed in the journal by chief editor Franci Zagorichnik. I would never have been capable, not in such a gentle and elegant way, to address all Mr RAS director's categorical imperatives – 'therefores'. Particularly because A. H. Rot goes further than the tried RTVL/S veterans, simply banishing *SRPians*, pushing us out of the system. It is true that we have no love for it, but no matter how the system subverts us, we are still its part.

The opinion about a certain opinion about Revija SRP by chief editor Franci Zagorichnik can also serve as a model example of how a journal editor can communicate with powerful, mighty, and esteemed representatives of institutions. ⁷

Sedaj pa se lahko vrnem k izhodishchem, ker ta shtejejo na RTVS vech kot vse dosedanje javne pobude skupaj, objavljene v *Reviji SRP*. Prvo in temeljno izhodishche pravi takole:

»Na raziskovanje programov in obchinstva gledamo kot na strokovno zbiranje informacij, ki jih uporabljamo v procesih programskega nachrtovanja in ocenjevanja realizacije programov in oddaj. Cheprav je zahtevana optimalna uporaba znanja druzhboslovnih znanosti, v glavnem ne pride do izsledkov in tez, ki bi imele raziskovalni pomen. Analiziranju obchinstev in programov so dostikrat postavljali nalogo, da naj bo chim bolj kritichno, a s tem je bila dosezhena prej ignoranca kot pa uporaba podatkov. Urednike in redaktorje je treba podpirati v samostojnosti odlochanja, ne pa jim sistematically postavljati nasproti delavcev, npr. raziskovalcev v vlogi kritikov.«

(Nadaljevanje izhodishch je dokaj podrobna operacionalna izpeljava navedenega uvoda v konkreten opis sedanje dejavnosti radijskega raziskovalnega oddelka.)

Taka naj bi bila njihova in Njegova (radijska) izhodishcha za program dela SRP, komentiral pa jih bom v samointervjuju ali samogovoru, zato ker me ne zadevajo kot vsebinska, ampak kot interesna izhodishcha. Naj pojasnim, problem izhodishch (za sklepanje o dejavnosti in morda celo usodi raziskovanja na RTVS (usoda je tu pojmovana kot politika), je zhe v napachnem naslovu ali pa nasprotno, v njemu neustreznem tekstu. Vsebinska izhodishcha za raziskovanje se po pomenu tichejo ali vsaj dotikajo ali vsaj razpravljajo o **vsebini** raziskovanja medija in na mediju (ali kot navadno rechemo, celotnega komunikacijskega procesa, ali pa tako kot to nakazuje vechkrat omenjena Carigrajska deklaracija (ki priporocha javnim TV ustanovam tudi kvalitativne raziskave in analize socioloskih uchinov televizije).

Nadalje, vsebinska izhodishcha niso zadeva le nekega trenutka v institucionalnem dogajanju, kot je na primer reorganizacija RTVS. Vsebinska izhodishcha raziskovanja so in imajo svojo lastno zgodovino, evaluacijo, obstajajo torej od same ustanovitve SShP, DERPO, SRP (Sluzhbe za shtudij programa, Delovne enote za raziskovanje programov in obchinstva, Sluzhb za raziskavo programov na RTVL/S.)

Ne nazadnje jim dolocha okvir tudi stroka: komunikologija, filozofija, sociologija, sociologija kulture in druge. Vsebinska izhodishcha ves chas na primer povzema in obuja v zgodovinski spomin ravno *Revija SRP*, njena vrednotna orientacija vsebuje tudi mogoche poglede na vsebinska izhodishcha raziskovanja medija in medijev v sistemu. Drugache povedano, vsebinska izhodishcha opredeljujejo vrednotne orientacije raziskujochih raziskovalcev. Ena od mogochih vsebinskih orientacij (izhodishch) je natanko taka, kot jo mediju, stroki in zainteresirani javnosti razgrinja zopet ta nesrechna *Revija SRP* (in *Projekt SRP*) in kot so jo prej druge publikacije omenjenih, neprestano reorganiziranih raziskovalnih enot ali oddelkov. Citirana *Vsebinska izhodishcha* RAS torej niso in ne morejo biti vsebinska izhodishcha za raziskovanje na RTVS, so le izraz tezhnje po ohranitvi sedanjega stanja in izhodishcha za manipulacijo z raziskovanjem.

Now I may return to the foundations, for these count more at RTVS than all previous public initiatives, published in *Revija SRP* combined. The first and fundamental point states:

»We view programme and audience research as expert gathering of information, which we use in the processes of programme planning and evaluation of the realization of programmes and broadcasts. Although optimal use of knowledge of social sciences is required, on the most part no results or theses are attained, which would hold research value. The analysis of audiences and programmes has often been tasked with being as critical as possible, but this sooner resulted in ignorance than in the use of data. Editors and redactors need to be supported in their autonomy of decisions and not systematically faced against workers, such as for example researchers in the role of critics.«

(Subsequent points are a fairly detailed operational development of the foreword above into a specific description of radio research department's current activities.)

This is what their and His foundations for the (radio's) SRPO work procedures were supposed to be, which I will comment in a self-interview, or monologue, because they do not impact me as related to content but rather to interests. Allow me to explain; the problem of the foundations (in forming conclusions about the activity and perhaps even fate of research at RTVS – fate is here viewed as politics), lay already in the wrong title, or the reverse, in its non-corresponding text. Content research foundations concern or at least touch upon, or at least discuss the **content** of the research of or at the medium (as we usually say, the entire communication process, or as it is framed by the often mentioned Istanbul declaration (which recommends that TV institutions also conduct qualitative research and analyses of sociological influence of television).

Also, content foundations are not just a matter of one moment in institutional activities, such as RTVS reorganisation. Content foundations for research are and have an individual history, an evaluation, and so exist from the very founding of SShP, DERPO, SRP (Services for Researching Programme, working unit in charge of researching programme and audience, Research Services at RTVL/S) onwards. After all, their framework is co-defined by communicology, philosophy, sociology, cultural sociology, etc. Content foundations are, for example, constantly mentioned and recalled to historical memory by *Revija SRP* itself, its value orientation also holds potential views of the content foundations for researching the medium and media within the system. In other words, content foundations define value orientations of researching researchers. One among mighty content orientations (foundations) is exactly as this wretched *Revija SRP* (and *Project SRP*) discloses it to the medium, disciplines, and concerned public, and as previously revealed by other publications of the said constantly reorganised research units or departments. The cited *Content foundations* of RAS therefore are not and cannot be content foundations for researching RTVS, they are mere expressions of the penchant to preserve the status quo and foundations for manipulating research.

Taka, kot so, naravnost klichejo po vsebinskih (vrednotnih, ne pa ideoloških) izhodishchih za orientacijo raziskovanja. Odlochanje o raziskovalnih projektih, raziskavah, o javnosti raziskovanja, skratka o zhe omenjeni usodi raziskovanja je seveda mogoche brez vsebinskih izhodishch in mimo njih. Vendar tudi tako odlochanje vseeno temelji na nekih (cheprav neekspliciranih) vsebinskih oziroma vrednotnih izhodishchih. Naloga javnega raziskovanja pa je tudi ta, da te skrite in prikrite rebuse razreshuje, razkriva in objavlja svoja mnenja o njih. Tudi to je pochela in she počenja *Revija SRP* in zato je trn v peti usode.

Tudi nash nekdanji najvechji up Sindikata KUU RTVS v boju za avtonomno nacionalno RTVS Zharko Petan, ki ima sedaj najvechjo moch v hierarhiji institucije RTVS, je s to svojo vlogo postal (natanko tako, kot sem prichakoval in mu tudi napovedal) glavni naslednik – grobar *Projekta SRP* (raziskave in revije). Pa ne da bi me to (kot raziskovalca) posebej presenetilo, ker je to nujno po podedovani vlogi institucije RTVL v sistemu. Ali drugache recheno, podaljšhana preteklost medija je predvsem v personalni kontinuiteti nekaterih neminljivih nespremenljivih svetovalcev in minljivih in menjajochih se generalih (direktorjih predsednikih) RTVL/S. (Nekateri med njimi so prezhiveli zhe vech kot deset gen. dir. in preds. skupshchin oz. svetov). Njihova usoda je vnaprej dolochena s strani politike, politika jih prinese in politika jih odnese, svetovalci pa pripravijo vse, kar je potrebno, za konchno izvedbo rituala odstavitve in nastavitve generalov. Najbolj tragichno v njegovi usodi pa se mi zdi sprejetje in nepreprichljivo igranje vloge intendanta (civilne drzhe) v proklamirani politichno neodvisni in javni radioteleviziji v izmishljenem scenariju danashnje slovenske desnice. Ta igra naravnost izziva k razkrivanju, ki se mu revija s tako vrednotno orientacijo, kot jo ima, ne more izogniti. Seveda vem, da ne meni ne drugim avtorjem v *Reviji SRP*, ki smo to pocheli, ne bo nikoli odpushcheno.

Ni hudo, da tako menim, pach pa, da svoje mnenje javno izpovem, da Petanova ne prevech zadržhana javna angazhiranost za Njihovo politichno opredelitev ni združljiva z vlogo generalnega intendanta neodvisne nacionalne radiotelevizije, pri chemer je zhalostno to, da medija she zdalech ne obvladujejo toliko, kot mislijo, tragika Zharka Petana kot osebe pa je v tem, da je to cena, ki jo mora plachati za zavezo, brez katere bi nikoli ne mogel biti gen. dir RTVS.

Vsakich, ko o tem razmishljam, me znova presenecha vedno nizhji nivo obrachuna z avtonomnim raziskovanjem na mediju in javno kritiko v zagotovo politichno neodvisni *Reviji SRP*, ki ni masovni medij in zato ne more biti politichno shkodljiva, vsaj ne tako, kot se Njim na M.M. in tistim, ki ga obvladujejo, zdi. Kljub mnogim izkushnjam pa me she vedno prizadene ignoranca, vzvishenost in le she (sprva in v samem zachetku) tudi njegova razlaga mojega razhoda ali bolje razkola s Trefaltom oz. »trefaltizmom« in tako tudi z Njim. Ta meni zhe od prej znani redukcijonizem (osiromashena razlaga) socialnega konflikta in totalna ignoranca socialnih dejstev in dejstev zavesti, sta prekinila vsakršno nadaljno mogocho komunikacijo med nama, razen seveda strogo uradne, ki je povsem v njegovi domeni. Kakshna je, bomo kmalu videli.

As they are, they downright call for content (ethical not ideological) foundations for the orientation of research. Decisions about research projects, research, the availability of research, in short, about the above mentioned fate of research, is of course possible without content foundations and outside them. But even such decisions are based on some (though unspecified) content-related or value-related foundations. Public research must also resolve these hidden and covert rebuses, disclose them, and publish its opinions about them. This also was and is done by *Revija SRP*, for which it is now a thorn in the side of fate.

– Also our KUU RTVS Union’s former utmost hope in the fight for autonomous national RTVS, Zharko Petan, who now holds the greatest power in the hierarchy of the RTVS institution, through this role became (just as I expected and foretold) the main successor – gravedigger of the *SRP project* (research and journal). Not that this really surprised me (as a researcher), for it is a necessary consequence of inheriting a role in the RTVL institution within the system. Or, in other words, the prolonged past of the medium is mainly personal endurance of certain intransient unchanging advisors and transient and changing generals (directors, chairmen) of RTVL/S. (Some survived over ten man. dir. and assembly or council chairmen). Their fate is predetermined by politics, politics installs them and politics removes them, while advisors prepare everything needed to finally execute the ritual of dismissing and appointing generals. What I see as the most tragic part of their fates is their acceptance and unconvincing enactment of the role of commissary (of civil position) in the declared politically independent and public radio-television in the invented scenario of the current right wing. This game downright begs to be exposed, which the journal with its current value orientation cannot avoid doing. I of course know, that neither myself, nor other *Revija SRP*’s contributors who do so, will never be forgiven. What is severe is not my believing this, but rather my publically proclaiming how Petan’s public championing of Their political option is irreconcilable with the role of general commissary of an independent national radio-television, whereby they sadly don’t have nearly the control of the medium they think. The tragedy of Zharko Petan as a person is this was the cost of the pledge without which he could never be general manager of RTVS. Each time I ponder this, I am amazed by the ever-worsening treatment of autonomous research at the medium and public criticism within the definitely politically independent *Revija SRP*, which is no mass medium and can so inflict no political damage, at least appreciable by Them at the M. M. and those controlling it. With all my experience, I am still hurt by His ignorance, haughtiness, and lastly (first and foremost) His explanation of my parting, or more precisely, rift with Trefalt or »trefaltism« and so Him. This familiar reductionism (impoverished explanation) of social conflict and utter ignorance of social facts and facts of consciousness disrupted any possible further communication between us, except of course in a strictly official capacity, which is entirely his domain. How this works will soon be apparent.

Menim, da je dosežena točka, ko pristna komunikacija med nama ni vech mogocha, ni smiselna, ni dostojna. Posredovanje pobude *Revije SRP* na RTVS lahko prevzame kdo drug. Če pa je bilo to le del teatralnega scenarija in nachina vodenja z emocionalnim shokom (po modelu gledalishke obrekovalnice), potem je Zharko Petan dosegel zheleni rezultat, a ostane le she estetsko vprashanje *kako?*

Gen. dir. RTVS Zharko Petan se je zelo nejevoljno odzval na pobudo dir. TV programov Janeza Lombergarja. (Lahko rechem, da je on med odlochujochimi hierarhi na RTV eden redkih, ki ne podlegajo determinizmu vloge brez preostanka, ostal je she ustvarjalec s svojim videnjem problemov, ki ve, kakshen je dolgorochnejshi pomen kritichnega mishljenja in svobodnega izrazhanja.) A kot recheno, ni dobro, da mu pojem slavo, da ga hvalim prevech, previdnost mi govori da bo klonil (determinizmu vloge) tudi on, prej ali slej. Kompromisni predlog o *vsebinskih izhodbishchih in programu dela ter organizacijskih vprashanjih delovanja SRP* (Sluzhbe za raziskave programov) v letu 1995 in s tem *Projekta SRP* in odnosa do *Revije SRP* bi lahko sprejeli; she posebej, ker je vse kazalo, ali pa se je meni zdelo tako, da je predlog zhe dokaj usklajen tudi s sedanjim predsednikom Sveta RTVS Vojkom Stoparjem. Tako pa zopet vse kazhe na staro pesem, program dela in financhni nachrt za letoshnje leto ne bo sprejet, v najboljšem primeru bo sprejet prepozno, in tako to v nedogled leta in leta, ne glede na stranko(e), ki so na oblasti in ki obvladujejo institucijo mochi – RTVL/S in ne glede na to, kdo je generalni intendant institucije mochi. O tem odlochajo nizhji nivoji, to pa so eni in isti, ki se na te rechi spoznajo in she preden se kak gen. dir. ali predsednik skupshchine/sveta dvakrat ozre po svoji hierarhiji navzdol, zhe ima institucionaliziran konflikt, ki je seveda podedovan in takoj nereshljiv, ker njemu najbolj lojalni so lahko karkoli, samo kritichni niso nikoli. In tako bodo »vsebinska izhodbishcha gospodinjskega raziskovanja« zopet edino sprejemljiva za raziskovanje na mediju, razen v primeru, che bi le ne ugotovili, da je she to prevech zapletena in sploh nepotrebna rech. Personalno pa je uveljavljanje teh stalishch seveda veliko bolj preprosto in zopet nich novega na mediju, a tudi o tem bom spregovoril malo kasneje, v samopogovoru.

Tako se pobuda *Revije SRP* (revija in raziskovalni projekt) v instituciji izgublja in levi iz seje v sejo, iz zapisnika v zapisnik, da je razpoznati ni vech mogoche. Skratka, reshuje se in reshuje, medtem ko revija vsemu navkljub izhaja, zhe tretje leto, in kazhe administraciji, da je to za institucijo po bistvu nereshljiv problem. Recimo temu tako, da je to veliko priznanje za revijo in njene sodelavce – ustvarjalce. Za odgovornega urednika revije pa je signal, da je zhe chas, da odstopi v vsakem primeru, pri chemer bi bilo sprejetje pobude she bolj tehten razlog za to, nevarnost kompromisa bi bila po vseh teh opisanih izkushnjah za *Revijo SRP* pogubno breme, ne bi ga mogel nositi.

– Pismo ministru za kulturo (kulturnemu reprezentantu sistema), gospodu Sergeju Pelhanu in njegov odgovor, to je seveda zopet neodgovor na pismo: na kar se da vljudno vprashanje, zakaj je *Revija SRP* diskriminirana zhe tretje leto svojega izhajanja?

I think at this point true communication between us has become impossible, pointless, indecent. *Revija SRP* at RTVS's initiative can be mediated by someone else, and if this was part of some dramatic scenario and way to lead with emotional shock (modelled after theatrical gossip), Zharko Petan achieved the desired result, but what remains is the aesthetical question of *bon?*

The gen. man. of RTVS Zharko Petan very reluctantly responded to the initiative of TV programme man. Janez Lombregar. (I can say he is one of the rare deciding RTV hierarchs, not to yield to determinism of roles without remnants; he remains a creator with his own views on issues, who understands long-term importance of critical thinking and freedom of expression.) But as I said, I better not commend him or praise him too much, providence states that he also will sooner or later buckle (under the determinism of the role). We could accept the compromise of suggesting *content foundations and plan of operation and questions concerning organisational operation of SRP* (Services for Researching Programmes) in 1995, and thereby *Project SRP* and attitude towards *Revija SRP*, particularly because it appeared, at least to me, that the suggestion was largely coordinated with the then RTVS Council chairman Vojko Stopar. As it stands, everything again points to the same old song, this year's plan of operation and budget will not pass; best case it will pass too late. And so it goes year in year out, irrelevant which party(-ies) are in power and control of the RTVL/S institution of power and no matter who is the general commissary of the institution of power. This is decided at lower levels, and there it is always the same people, who know these things, and even before any gen. dir. or some assembly's/council's chairman looks twice down their hierarchy, they already have an institutionalised conflict on their hands, which is of course inherited and immediately unsolvable, because his most loyal followers can be anything but critical. And so »content foundations of home economics research« will again be the only acceptable for the research at the medium, except if it was discovered that even that much is too complicated and useless.

Imposing these views with personnel is of course much simpler and again nothing new to the medium; this will also be addressed a bit later, in the self-discussion.

So the *Revija SRP* initiative (journal and research project) grows lost and changed from session to session, from transcript to transcript, becoming unrecognizable. In short, it keeps saving itself but in spite of everything the journal keeps coming out for its third year, showing the administration that it is in essence a problem unsolvable by the institution. Let us view this as great acclaim for the journal and its contributors – creators. To the journal's managing director it signals it is time to step down in either case, whereby accepting the initiative would be the more valid reason. Considering all the above described experience, the danger of compromise would prove a fatal burden for *Revija SRP*, one it could not bear.

– Of the letter to the cultural minister (cultural representative of the system), Mr Sergej Pelhan and his reply, of course again lack thereof, to asking as politely as possible, why *Revija SRP* has been discriminated against for three years of its publication.

Minister ni odgovoril, ne bo odgovoril, če pa bi se vseeno zgodil chudezh, bi tako nanj odgovoril kak njegov svetovalec, kar samo po sebi ni nich nenavadno, in bi bil odgovor natanko tak, kot ga ne zelimo, to je, formalen odgovor in ne vsebinska utemeljitev – mnenje individuuma – o nastalem problemu. In takega odgovora nam sploh ne bi bilo težko izsiliti, če bi nashe javno vprasanje (odprto pismo) objavili v nekem M.M. Vendar tudi ministri se bodo nekoch navadili, da v demokraciji, kakršnakoli zhe je, vsaj vljudnost zahteva odgovor, neodgovor na javni apel pa je groba zavrnitev in she izkazan prezir do revije, avtorjev in bralcev.

– Povsem nasprotno in neprichakovano izkustvo je *Revija SRP* s strani institucij dozhivela le she od glavnega sponzorja: Zavoda za odprto družbo – Slovenija. Sponzoriranje Open Society Fund – Slovenia je reshilo revijo iz najhujshih finančnih težhav, pomembnejsha od tega pa je bila za nas moralna podpora, konkretno izkustvo, da je vsaj she neka fondacija, ki tolerira svobodo misli in pisanja v Sloveniji, pa cheprav bi nas hoteli zato prikazati kot glasnike Sorosheve vzhodne politike.

Sklepni komentar pa bi lahko bil odkrito priznanje največje težhave *Revije SRP*, njene Ahilove pete, ki jo tako lucidno razgali Simon Kardum:

»SRP, *Revija Sluzhbe za raziskavo programov (od tod kratica) RTVS*, ki to she ni oziroma to najverjetneje tudi nikoli ne bo postala, revija, ki se, paradoksalno, sklicuje na svojo drugacherojenost (alternativnost), hkrati pa pričakuje institucionalno in javno pripoznanje, revija, ki je anabroidna v svojem zhanrskem in slogovnem manierizmu, anarhoidna pa v svoji vsebinski in statusni drzhi, revija, katere tvorci se she niso odlochili in ovedli (ko pa se bodo, bo kajpak prepozno), revija, neodvisna in dobra okleschena seveda, ki bi lahko pomembno sooblikovala inshtitucijo, ki si jo je vzela na piko (tudi v programskem smislu, kar pa jo za zdaj očitno she ne zanima – zanimajo jo ontolosbka vprasanja, manj fenomenologija predochenega), revija torej, ki se manifestativno sklicuje na 'tri vrednotne orientacije individua', Svobodo, Resnico in Pogum (tudi od tod kratice, od kantovskih svobodoljubnih, razsvetljenskih in transcendentalnih postulatov), taka kot je, s skrbnim in nesklepanim srpom v roki, ni usposobljena ne za zhetev, ne za rezanje glav. To je dejstvo. To, da ne ve, komu je namenjena in ji je bralstvo shpanska vas, poseljena z infantilnezhi, pa je zhe problem, ki se tiche najstva.« (Simon Kardum, Slovenske novice, 10.3.1995, in zaradi pomembnosti ugotovitev ponatisnjeno v *Reviji SRP* 9/10.)

Poglavitni problem revije naj bi bila ciljna publika, kot jo pojmujejo Slovenske novice in njeni sodelavci. Kje je in kdo je ciljna publika *Revije SRP*?

Ni je! Ali skoraj je ni! Vendar ciljna publika *Revije SRP* ni ista kot za SL. novice. To je elitna publika, dovolj dolochno opisana v vrednotni orientaciji revije, predvsem pa ta publika shele nastaja, trajnejsha je od tiste, ki jo tako trzhno uspesno animira rumeni tisk. Potencialni ali mogochi bodochi sodelavci pa so torej tisti, ki jih she ne poznamo, vendar vseeno mislimo, da so.

The minister did not and will not reply, but if a miracle were to occur, the response would come from one his advisors, which is in itself not unusual, and the reply would be exactly what we want – formal, rather than an argumentation of content – an individual's view of the problem which arose. It would not be difficult for us at all to force such a reply if our public question (open letter) would get published by some M. M. Still, even ministers will one day accept that in a democracy, whatever it be like, at least courtesy dictates a response, while failure to respond to a public appeal constitutes rude rejection and previously expressed contempt for the journal, authors, and readers.

– *Revija SRP* had a single completely reverse and unexpected experience on the part of institutions with its main sponsor: The Open Society Institute – Slovenia. Sponsorship from their fund – pulled the journal from the worst of its financial straits, but what we find more important, offered moral support – tangible proof that there is at least one fund in Slovenia that tolerates freedom of thought and writing, even if we get depicted as heralds of Soros's eastern policy.

The closing commentary can serve as an admission *Revija SRP*'s greatest problem, its Achilles' heal, which is bared so lucidly by Simon Kardum:

»SRP, the journal of the services for the research of programming (hence the abbreviation) of RTVS, which it is not yet or will probably never be, a journal that paradoxically claims its birth-distinction (alternativeness) while simultaneously expecting institutional and public acknowledgment, a journal anachronistic in its genre and stylist mannerism and anarchoid in its stance on content and status, a journal whose creators have not yet decided and become aware (and when they do, it will of course be too late), a journal, independent and of course well trimmed down that could significantly co-shape the institution, which it is targeting (also in terms of programming, something it is not interested in for now – it is interested in ontological issues, less phenomenology of the evident), a journal therefore that manifestly invokes the 'three values of the orientation of the individual', Liberty, Verity, and Spirit (also hence the abbreviation, with Kant's postulates for love of freedom, enlightenment, and transcendence), such as it is, holding a dull and unsharpened sickle (trans.n. – sickle = Srp), has no capacity neither for harvest or forbeheading. This is a fact. And that it does not know who it is intended for and its readership is an unknown frontier populated by juveniles is a problem that pertains to intent.«

(Simon Kardum, Slovenske novice, 10. 3. 1995, and due to the importance of its findings reprinted in *Revija SRP* 9/10.)

The journal's chief issue is supposedly its target audience as perceived by Slovenske novice and its collaborators. Who and where is *Revija SRP*'s target audience?

There is none! Or nearly none! *Revija SRP*'s target audience is not like that of Sl. novice. It is an elite, adequately defined in the journal's value orientation; above all this audience is only just being formed, it is longer-lived than the one animated with such great economic success by yellow press. Its potential or possible future contributors we don't yet know, but nevertheless believe to exist.

Pa naj nasprotniki poreko: »Ni jih!« Ali, da jih je očitno premalo! Kritična masa svobodomiselnih intelektualcev s tega področja je zaenkrat zanemarljiva, pouzihle so jih stranke, prestrahili ali pa tudi kupili so jih mogochnezhi! Vendar vse to očitno ne bo zadostovalo, da bi se utihala (zadushila) svoboda misli svojskih sodelavcev, nje izražanje na svojski način, ne glede na močne in mogočne institucije in lože v njih. Kakšna toleranca in kakšno pojmovanje demokracije je to (čeprav se simptomatično pojavlja pri najradikalnejših mislecih institucij sistema), da se institucionalna kritika takoj diskvalificira in izključuje iz sistema?! Predvsem pa vrednost *Revija SRP* (čeprav ima ceno 900 Sit) ni v njeni kurantnosti na trgu blaga in storitev niti ni njen namen iskanje minimalnega deleža *masovnega bralstva*, pač pa ima le tolikšno vrednost, kolikor živih vrednot ji uspe ozhiviti v duhu svojih sedanjih in prihodnjih, pa čeprav redkih bralcev (ciljni publiki), pa še ta *koliko* ni toliko pomemben, kot *kako*. Prodajalcem, menjalcem in odjemalcem blaga: knjig na metre, časopisov na kile, programov na ure in minute, seveda ni dojemljiva.

Nekaj pa je vseeno treba priznati, da nas ta prikrita gonja do neke mere dolocha. Bolje kot bi bilo treba se pustimo obremenjevati z njo, vse zaradi zgodovinskega spomina, zato da bo vsaj v enem primeru ta postopek dokumentiran, ohranjen za tiste, ki bi se nekoč neizbežno srečali s čim podobnim. Vendar menim, da je sedaj tega le malo preveč in da bi lahko v prihodnje rubriko *Dokumenti* radikalno zmanjšali na samo najbolj nujne uradne zadeve ali uradne umotvore, take, ki jih je potrebno temeljito obdelati in osvetliti še z drugega zora.

Let our adversaries say they don't exist, or that there are obviously not enough! The critical mass of freedom-loving intellectuals is currently negligible, consumed by parties or scared off and bought by the mighty!

However, all this will apparently not suffice to silence (stifle) the freedom of thought of distinctive contributors, its expression in a distinctive way, irrelevant of powerful and mighty institution and its lodges. What sort of tolerance is this and what conception of democracy (though it occurs symptomatically to the most radical thinkers of the system's institutions), where institutional criticism immediately gets disqualified and excluded from the system?! Above all, the worth of *Revija SRP* (though priced 900 SIT) lies not in its price on the market of goods or services, nor is it its intent to look for a minimum share of *mass readership* but holds only as much worth as there are living values it succeeds in reviving in the spirit of its current and future readers (target audience), scarce though they be; and even *how much* is not as important as *how*. Of course this is incomprehensible to merchants, exchangers and consumers of goods: books by the metre, newspapers by the kilo, and programmes by the hours and minutes.

Still, it bears admitting that this covert pursuit defines us to some degree. We allow it to impact us more than necessary, all for historical memory, so that at least in one case this procedure is documented, preserved for those, who will one day inevitably come across something similar. But I think that there is now too much of this, and that in future we could radically reduce our *Documents* section to only the most urgent issues or official contrivances such as need to be fundamentally worked and illuminated from another angle.

ENDOFAZIJA I – drugi del

Samogovor ali samointervju (v pogovoru samega s seboj)

Po vseh neodgovorih, ko je vsaj nekaj odgovor najbolj zheljno prichakovan, boste gotovo soglashali, da tu nikakrshna chloveshka niti uradno institucionalna komunikacija ni mogocha, ali pa vsaj smiselna ni. Za mene pa predvsem ni vech dostojna, presega namrech prag, ki she dopushcha neko, cheprav varljivo podobo samosposhtovanja in dostojanstva. Preostane mi torej le pogovor s samim seboj, nas samih med nami in tistimi, ki nas she hochejo brati, in tistimi, ki nas bodo morda nekoch vendarle brali, samo zato, ker jih bo vendarle zanimalo, kaj smo hoteli rechi o institucijah mochi in sistemu, zhivim individuumom, le takim, ki jih institucije in sistem niso upognili in ne chisto pouzhili.

Che bi ne bilo kritichnega raziskovanja medija RTVL, che bi prav nich od tega javno ne publiciral ali vsaj skushal publicirati ali vsaj ohranjati v internih raziskavah za »Zgodovinski spomin institucije medija«, bi odlochujochi nepogreshljivi chlani lozh uspeli zabrisati vsako sled svojega trudapolnega prizadevanja na mediju od krichanja *Krichacha* naprej in kljub njemu, do kratkega stika *RTV STIK-a* in do mimohoda *TV Sopotnika*. V vseh uradnih publikacijah, kronoloshkih zapisih, zgodovinskih ali obletnishkih izdajah spominov je toliko hvale, dosezhkov, razvojnih uspehov (no, da ne bom krivichen, tudi sem in tja kakshen manjsi spodrseljaj ali pa vljudna dobronamerna ali konstruktivna kritika), da se chloveku stori milo pri srcu in ves srechen je, da je imel chast, biti v sluzhbi na taki ustanovi, ali bolje, ji sluzhiti. V odmevih nanje se vchasih slishi shepet po hodnikih, da kdo le ni bil dovolj izpostavljen in pohvaljen za svoje zasluge ali pa nasprotno, morda celo pogosteje, da je bil nekdo drug prikazan kot prevech zasluhzen, pomemben in slaven in nepogreshljiv. Zachuda pa v vseh teh shtevilnih medijevih rednih in jubilejnih pisnih publikacijah ne boste nashli tega, da je bil ta medij pravzaprav trobilo v rokah partije, najbolj ljubo in ljubljeno trobilo totalitarnega sistema, zato pa temu primerno strogo vodeno in nadzorovano. Vendar tako to ne gre, dragi moji! Kako je mogoche tako temeljno dolochilnico in vodilo M.M., to v nebo vpijoche dejstvo, she danes, po toliko letih demokracije, spregledati?

Kritichno raziskovanje je na mediju bilo in ne gre ga kar tako odpraviti. Bilo je javno, kolikor je pach bilo to takrat mogoche. Tveganje je bilo veliko in tudi rezultati niso zanemarljivi. Ravno zato ima *Revija SRP* pomembno vlogo za obujanje in osvezhitev spomina instituciji RTVS in sistemu RS tudi danes in celo posebno rubriko imamo v ta namen in njen moto je:

*Institucija brez spomina je
kakor podjetje brez knjigovodstva,
mochni in mogochni v njej
pochno, kar jih je volja,
ker vse, kar pochno, utone
v pozabljivi zravesti chasa.*

ENDOPHASIA I – part two

Monologue or Self-interview (in discussion with myself)

After all these non-replies, when any answer is most eagerly desired, you will surely agree that human or officially institutional communication is impossible or at least pointless. I find it chiefly indecent as it crosses the threshold of at least some, however misleading image of self-respect and dignity. I am therefore left to talk to myself, we to ourselves or to those who still want to read us, and to those who will one day perhaps read us in spite of everything, if only because they may want to learn what we had to say about institutions of power and system, living individuals, only those who are not completely bent or consumed by institutions.

If there were no critical medium research at RTVL, if I publicised or at least tried to publish or at least preserve in internal research for »The Historical Memory of the Institution of the Medium« none of this, the deciding indispensable lodge members would succeed in erasing all traces of their tenacious efforts at the medium, starting with the screaming of *Kričabč* (Screamer, yeller, trans. n.) and in spite of it, the short circuit (= kratek stik) of RTV *STIK* and the parade of TV *Sopotnik* (= co-traveller). All official publications, chronological records, historical and anniversary memoirs contain such praise, achievements, developmental successes (in fairness, also a tiny slip here and there or polite, well-intentioned constructive criticism), that one begins to feel emotional and delighted one ever had the honour of working, or better serving at such an institution. After, there is sometimes whispering in the halls about someone not receiving due recognition and praise of their merits or, perhaps even more frequently, the reverse, that someone else was portrayed as too deserving, important, famous, or indispensable. Surprisingly, you will find nowhere in all the medium's numerous regular and anniversary written publications how this medium was in fact the mouthpiece of the communist party, most loved and beloved mouthpiece of a totalitarian system and fittingly strictly lead and controlled. However, this will not do, my dear readers! How is it possible, after so many years of democracy, to overlook such a fundamental determinant and guideline of M. M., this plain-as-day fact?

There was critical research at the medium and cannot simply be swept away. It was public, as much as it could be at the time. The risk was great and the results are not negligible. This is exactly why *Revija SRP* to this day retains an important role in recalling and refreshing RTV institution's memory and that of the system of the Republic of Slovenia, with even a specific section to that effect and its motto is:

*An institution without memory is
Like a company without bookkeeping,
Its strong and mighty
Do whatever they please
Because everything they do drowns
In the forgetful consciousness of time*

Che se ne bosta vodstvo in svet RTVS nekega dne resno vprashala, kaj je res vsaj na metodoloshkih pomislekih in kritikah nestrokovnega merjenja poslušnosti ali gledanosti ter ocenah oddaj in programov medija, bo to storila konkurenca, dovolj je zhe mochna za ta korak. In konec koncev, kaj mediju pomagajo sumljivo optimistichni podatki o narashchanju ali vsaj ohranjanju delezha gledalcev, poslušalcev, che pa je resnichnost očitno bolj kruta? Samo she upadanje gledalcev in poslušalcev lahko medij rachuna, pravilno izrachuna in prichakuje. Na koncu mu preostane le samoprevara, ki se hudo mashčuje. Ne recite, da tisti, ki to pochno, zhele mediju le dobro ali da ga tako ljubijo kot svojega otroka, da ne vidijo, da ga bodo s svojo ljubeznijo zadushili, prej ko slej bi se to zgodilo po sami logiki minevanja mochi institucij.

Vprashanje: Kaj sicer lahko she pomeni graditi programske sheme, programsko nacrtovanje in ocenjevanje (sem sodi she sumljivo utemeljena in kar se da zamolchana selekcija ustvarjalcev, ki jim je padla tako chudno izmerjena glednast ali ocena oddaje)?

Pomeni kratkovidnost in krivichnost ali z eno besodo: samozaslepljenost. In che she malo podrobneje razchlenim citirano generalno vsebinsko izhodishche kot vrednotno orientacijo neavtonomnega in nestrokovnega raziskovanja na mediju, tega ne bom storil prvich. Vsakich, ko moram to storiti, se spustim na nivo, ki mi ni ljub, a tako to mora biti, ker sicer komunikacija med nami ni mogocha. To je bilo nichkolikokrat izkazano in venomer se ponavlja in izrazha v obliki nepomirljivega konflikta.

Kako je mogoche utemeljevati reorganizacijo M.M. RTVS na zgreshenih podatkih in zato v temelju zgreshenem predvidevanju ohranjanja ali povechanja gledalcev RTVS (kot je to v primeru ekspertize reorganizacije, ki jo je naredil svetovalec slovenske TV Justin Dukes)?

Medij, ki se noche seznaniti z dejstvi, dejanskim stanjem, je nesposoben reagirati na spremembe v sistemu, skratka, je medij, ki se ne more odrechi lazhne podobne o sebi in svoji mochi. Zato najraje ishche nasvete, se zanasha na pomoch pri svetovalcih-gurujih, nepoznavalcih slovenske radiotelevizije.

Kako zelo pomemben je Justin Dukes za slovensko nacionalno radiotelevizijo, kazhe pripravljenost (grozhnja) gen. dir. Zharka Petana, da bo RTVS izstopila iz Slovenske znanstvene fondacije, che ta ne bo sofinancirala »Dukesovega projekta«. Ta razvojni projekt RTVS pa je po mnenju *projekta SRP* strokovni in nacionalni shkandal, in ker je mnenje Matjazha Hanzhka javno objavljeno v *Reviji Srp* 5/6, terja torej javni odgovor, nekoga nekoch. Ta nesrechna reorganizacija RTVS je za nadaljnjo usodo medija mochi tako pomembna, da bo she naprej eden ključnih problemov v *Katalogu problemov – projekta SRP* in tudi v rubriki *Zgodovinskega spomina institucije RTVL/S* je ne bo mogoche izpustiti (izbrisati). Na javno kritiko je treba javno odgovoriti (dobro je in spodobi se odgovoriti z argumenti na argumente), pa cheprav sta jo javno izrekla, kolikor vem, le dva raziskovalca, Matjazh Hanzhek v *Katalogu problemov*, v *Reviji SRP*⁸ in Breda Luthar v Sobotni prilogi Dela (*Channel 4* je nekaj drugega, *Svetovanje slovenski TV*, Delo, 14. maj 1994)²⁵

If RTVS leadership and council never duly examine the merit of methodological reservations and criticisms of inexpert gauging of listenership or viewership and rating broadcasts and programmes at the medium, its competition will do so; it has grown strong enough for this step. After all, what use is suspiciously optimistic data about a growing or at least steady share of viewers, listeners to a medium, if reality is obviously crueler? A medium can now only assess, correctly calculate, and expect a declining number. In the end it is left with nothing but self-delusion, which can be very costly. Don't tell me those who do so so only want the best for the medium and love it as their child, that they don't see their love will smother it faster than the same would inevitably happen according to the principles of passing of the power of institutions.

Question: *What can it otherwise indicate to build programming schemes, programme planning and evaluation (including suspiciously founded selection of creators kept as quiet as possible, of those broadcasts whose so strangely measured viewership or appraisal have dropped)?*

It indicates shortsightedness and injustice, in a word, self-delusion. And if I were to further analyze the cited general content foundation as a value orientation of non-autonomous and inexpert research at the medium, this would not be the first time I have done so. Each time I am forced to do it, I stoop to a level I don't care for, but this is how it must be, otherwise no communication between us is possible. This has proven the case time and again, and keeps recurring and expressing itself in the form of irreconcilable conflict.

How is it possible to found the reorganisation of M. M. RTVS on misinformation and fundamentally misguided predetermination of preserving or enlarging RTVS's viewership. (as is the case with the reorganisation expertise by the advisor of Slovenian TV, Justin Dukes)?

A medium that does not want to learn the facts of the actual state of facts is unable to react to changes in the system; in short, it is unable to relinquish its false view of itself and its strength. This is why it prefers to seek advice and counts on assistance from guru-advisors, non-experts in Slovenian radio-television.

How very important Justin Dukes is for Slovenian national radio-television is clear from the willingness (threat) of gen. dir. Zharko Petan to extract RTVS from the Slovenian Scientific Fund, if the latter refused to fund the »Dukes' project«. This developmental RTVS project, in the opinion of project SRP, is a professional and national scandal, and since Matjazh Hanzhek's opinion is published in *Revija Srp* 5/6, it demands public response, from someone at some point. This wretched RTVS reorganization is so important for the future of the medium of power that it will stay one of the key problems in the *Catalogue of Problems of Project SRP* and will also not be possible to be left out of (erase) the section on *Historical memory of the RTVL/S Institution*. Public criticism needs to be addressed publically (it is good and appropriate to respond to arguments with arguments), even though it was publically expressed, as far as I know, by only two researchers, Matjazh Hanzhek in the *Catalogue of Problems, Revija SRP* ⁸ and Breda Luther in *Sobotna priloga, Delo (Channel 4 is something else, advising Slovenian TV, Delo, 14. Maj, 1994)* ²⁵

Kdo (to) gleda tako (na raziskovanje) kot na strokovno (?) zbiranje informacij?

Raziskovalec zhe ne, ker to zbiranje informacij, te meritve, so shele zachetek vsakega raziskovanja. Che ni interpretacije, metodoloshkega preverjanja podatkov, je to le zachetek nekega domachega gospodinjskega raziskovanja, predvsem pa podrejeno raziskovanje zhe nich kolikokrat omenjenim programskim interesom.

Zato pa tisti, ki tako gledajo na raziskovanje, lahko postavljajo *Vsebinska izhodbischa za programe dela sluzhb raziskovanja programov in obchinstva*, podtikajo *Osnovne smernice za delo sluzhbe* in sodelujejo v neprestanih reorganizacijah oz. prestrukturiranjih institucije RTVL/S.

In v prvem dokumentu med drugim pishe tudi tole: »Z natanchnega pisnega interpretiranja podatkov iz anket smo preshli na sistematically hitro objavlanje podatkov brez razlag. Pismene razlage podatkov so imele malo bralcev zaradi sploshnega hitrega tempa dela v radiu, ko je vsak podatek hitro zastarel ob tem, da dnevno oddajamo nove vsebine. Podatkov tudi ni vedno mogoche enoznachno razlagati, saj tudi tendence v urednishtvih in nazori glede sploshne programske politike niso enotni. Ubrali smo politiko chimboljshe formulacije vprashanj za poslushalce in sistematically obchasnega ponavljanja vprashanj z objavo primerjav. Ker uredniki in novinarji v dobrshni meri dolochajo teme vprashalnikov za obchinstvo, vchasih tudi sami bolje kot izvajalci anket poznajo cilje ugotavljanja mnenja.« V drugem pa pishe tole: »Sluzhbe za raziskavo morajo poskrbeti za strokovno zbiranje informacij in sploshno raziskavo programov. Obdelava zbranih podatkov pa mora biti strokovno opravljena, ob uporabi znanstvenega instrumentarija, ki je na voljo ustrezni sluzhbi.«

Za zgodovinski spomin sem davno nekoche, v kulminaciji tega istega konflikta, a she v prejsnjem rezhimu, zastavil javno vprashanje: »Od kod izvira taka moch Vide Shrot?«

Odgovor je bil: »Iz preprostega dejstva, da je (bila) zhena pomochnika gen. direktorja (po nepotizmu torej)«. (Gen. dir. oziroma »vrhovni administrator« pa je bil takrat Ferdinand Luzhar.)

Citirano: »Posebna moch nashe kolegice V. Shrot je ves chas poudarjena. Njena 'ekspertna' in njena 'samoupravna' moch sta primer heteronomnega izvora mochi, sta posledica preprostega dejstva, da je zhena pomochnika generalnega direktorja.«
Iz: *Raziskave o raziskovanju*, podnaslov: *Ali je raziskovanje komunikacijskega procesa v instituciji mnogobichnega medija mogoche?; Kako unichiti vsako ustvarjalnost v raziskovalni enoti?*⁹

Che si danes zastavim to isto vprashanje? ...

Odgovor je le malenkost drugachen: »Iz preprostega dejstva, da je zhena (bodochege ali medtem zhe ustolichenega) pomochnika direktorja radijskih programov Jozheta Shrota (po nepotizmu torej)«.

Who can view (this) (such research) as expert (?) gathering of data?

Not a researcher, because such data collection, such measurements, are just the beginning of any research. Without interpretation, methodological data proofing, this is nothing but a start of some domestic household research and above all else, research subordinate to the numerous mentioned programme interests. This is why those viewing research in this way can set *Content Foundations for the Work Procedures of Programme and Audience Research Services*, plant *Fundamental Guidelines for the Operation of Services*, and collaborate in constant reorganisations and restructurings of the RTVL/S institution.

The first document also states: »We went from exact written interpretation of survey data to systematic fast publication of data without explanations. Written explanations of data had few readers due to the generally fast-paced work at the radio broadcasting daily fresh content whereby data quickly grew obsolete. Data can also not always be explained unambiguously, not unlike the tendencies in management and views of general programming policy. We chose the policy of the best possible formulation of questions for the listeners and systematic occasional repetition of question with the publication of comparisons. Since editors and reporters substantially co-define themes of questionnaires for the audience and are sometimes themselves better acquainted with the goals of determining the views.« Another states: »Research services must ensure expert gathering of information and general research of programmes. The collected data must be processed expertly, using scientific instrumentation available to the relevant services.«

Once, in the culmination of this same conflict but in the previous regime I asked a public question for historical memory: »Whence does the power of Vida Shrot stem?«

The reply was: »From the simple fact that she is/was the wife of the assistant to the gen. director (through nepotism then)«. (the gen. dir. or »top administrator« at the time was Ferdinand Luzhar.)

Quoting: »Our colleague V. Shrot's special power is emphasized throughout. Her 'expert' and her 'self-management' authority are examples of a heteronomous source of power, consequences of a simple fact that she is the wife of the assistant to the general director.« From *The Research about Research*, subtitle: *Is Research of the Communication Process in the Institution of a Mass Medium Possible? How to Destroy any Creativity in a Research Unit?*⁹

If I ask myself the same question today? ...

The answer is only slightly different: »From the simple fact that she is the wife (of the future or meanwhile already sitting) assistant to the director of radio programmes Jozhe Shrot (therefore, through nepotism)«.

In tako so postala *Vsebinska izhodišča za programe dela služb raziskovanja programov in občinstva*, ki to niso, ki so nastala v radijski raziskovalni enoti, nepodpisana, (kmalu bomo videli zakaj), iz pripisane opombe pa je razvidno, da jih je dala (oz. so jih dali) dir. RA programov gospodu Andreju Rotu gospa Vida Shrot, vodja radijske raziskovalne enote, evidentno so vsebovana tudi v edinem preostalem uradnem gradivu za razpravo o raziskovanju za 10. redno sejo Sveta RTVS. Naslov dokumenta je *Služba za raziskavo programov* (podnaslovi: *Osnovne smernice za delo službe, Organizacija služb in vmeshčenost v organigram RTVS, Objektivnost in neodvisnost služb za raziskovanje, Dostopnost raziskav, Teze za razpravo o raziskovanju programov RTVS*). Dokument pa sta, hochesh nochesh, podpisala direktorja programov TVS (radijskih in televizijskih) Andrej Rot in Janez Lombergar in je tako postal tudi edino uradno izhodišče za razpravo na deseti seji Sveta RTVS (29.6.1995) o prvotni uradni in javni pobudi *Revije SRP* instituciji vodstvu in svetu RTVS. Naravnost neverjetno, boste rekli, pa ni, ker tako se to dela na instituciji RTVL/S, in tole tu je le en primer pravega personalnega pristopa h ključnim problemom medija. In naslednje vprasanje je potem tole:

Chemu raziskovanje, saj problemov vendar ni, chemu javne pobude, saj Oni zhe itak vedo tako za rezultat, kot tudi, kako se stvari strezhe, mar ne?

Odgovori so to pot zhe vsebovani v vprasanjih. (Drugache recheno, vprasanja so sugestivna, kar je sicer osnovna znachilnost medijskih vprasanj.)

Kdo to lahko reche in za kaj tako reche in za koga to velja, »da v glavnem ne pride do izsledkov in tez, ki bi imele raziskovalni pomen«?

Tisti, ki izvajajo zgolj meritve, zbirajo informacije in ne raziskujejo in ne posredujejo svojih izsledkov strokovni javnosti, to poreko, preroko in pravzaprav neprestano očitajo raziskujochim. Skratka tisti, ki so za tajne in interne »raziskave«, očitajo tistim, ki raziskave, raziskavalna porochila posredujejo strokovni in drugi javnosti, da izdajajo poslovno tajno, cheprav vedo, da jih stroka zavezuje k javnosti raziskovanja in da je RTVS javna institucija.

Kdo so bili tisti odlochujochi na mediju, ki »so analiziranju obchinstevev in programov dostikerat postavljaljali nalogo, da naj bo chim bolj kritichno«?

Malo je bilo takih. Eden redkih je bil Ante Novak, dopushchal je to tudi dr. Janez Jerovshek. Vendar je bil Ante Novak to zato, ker ni bil le nosilec funkcije in funkcij. (Preden je bil preds. skupshchine RTVL, je bil dir. znanstvene institucije ISU EK (Inshtituta za sociologijo Univerze Edvarda Kardelja v Ljubljani), she prej pa dir. nekdanjega jugoslovanskega Zveznega zavoda za statistiko (to je resnico YU-sistema v shtevilkah), po vojni pa zanesljiv partijski kader, eden ozhjih sodelavcev Borisa Kidricha. Kljub temu pa je zagovarjal kritichno raziskovanje, govoril je celo, da mora to postati ogleдалo in vest institucije. Tudi dr. Janez Jerovshek je bil nekoch na tem istem znanstvenem inshtitutu, lahko rechemo, da se je tam zachela njegova znanstvena pot, da je od tam izshel.

And so it occurred that *Content Foundations for the Work Procedures of Programme and Audience Research Services*, which they are not, created at the radio's research unit, were unsigned (we will soon see why); from the added note it can be discerned that Mrs Vida Shrot, head of radio's research unit, has (or the heads have) given them to dir. of RA programmes Andrej Rot; evidently they are also included among the only other official materials for discussion of research at the 10th regular session of RTVS Council. The document title is *The Programme Research Service* (subtitles: *Fundamental Guidelines for the Operation of Services, Organisation of Services and Inclusion in the Organisation Chart of RTVS, Objectivity and Independence of Research Services, Accessibility of Research, Theses for the Treatise on Researching RTVS Programming*.) No matter their preference, TVS programme directors (for radio and television) Andrej Rot and Janez Lombergar signed the document, making it the only official basis for discussion at the 10th RTVS Council session (29. 6. 1995) of initial official and public *Revija SRP*'s initiative to the institution's leadership and RTVS Council. Downright incredible, I hear you say, but it is not, for this is how things are done at the RTVL/S institution, but one example of actual approach to medium's key issues through the workforce. It therefore begs the question:

Why research if there are no problems? Why public initiatives if They already know their result as well as how things are done, isn't that right?

This time the question holds the replies. (In other words, questions are suggestive, which is also generally the basic characteristic of media questions.)

Who can state this and why, and for whom is it true, »that there are mostly no findings and theses that would contain research significance«?

This reproof is stated, overstated, and in fact repeated by those content to execute measurements, collect information, and neither research or relay their findings to the expert public. In short, those who favour secret and internal »research« reprove those who share their research and reports with expert and other public for allegedly divulging business secrets, though they know they are professionally bound to conduct research openly and that RTVS is a public institution.

Who were the deciding factors at the medium, who »frequently tasked the analysts of audiences and programmes to be as critical as possible«?

Such were few. One was Ante Novak; dr. Janez Jerovshek also allowed it. However, Ante Novak was able to do so, because he was not a mere holder of function or functions. (Before, he was Chairman of RTVL Assembly, a director of the scientific institutions ISU EK (Institute of Sociology of the University of Edvard Kardelj in Ljubljana), earlier he was director of former Yugoslav Federal Institute for Statistics (i.e. truth of the Yugoslav system in numbers), and after the War, he was a dependable Party man, one of Boris Kidrich's close co-workers. Still, he advocated critical research, even saying it must become the Institution's mirror and conscience. Dr Janez Jerovshek was also once at that same scientific institute, we could say his scientific journey began there, he was hatched there.

Kljub svoji izpostavljeni vlogi v stranki SSDS, sedaj Janshevi SSDS, je bil v odnosu do kritičnega raziskovanja drugachen, dopushchal ga je in celo podpiral. Morda pa izhaja okuzhba ravno od tega nesrečnega inshtituta, ali pa je le zadeva osebnosti. Takratni rezhim je zhe vedel, zakaj ga je ustanovil in zakaj ukinjal, in koga vse je ukinjal.

In ni mogoče spregledati, da sta ravno onadva zagreshila vsak vsaj po eno bistveno ali ključno porochilo za razumevanje medija RTVL/S, hkrati pa **Njim** nesprejemljivo, neodpustljivo raziskovalno porochilo.

Ante Novak je s svojo analizo naročnine zhe leta 1978 (*Utemeljitev predloga za ukinitvev RTV naročnine in uvedbo prispevka za RTV*) razkrinkal, da naročnine za RTV ni, da je to v bistvu prikrita oblika drzhavnega davka. Dr. Janez Jerovshek pa je v svojem enkratnem *Primopredajnem porochilu* razgalil problem lozh na RTVL/S, to pa je ključni problem za razumevanje dogajanja »igre mochi« na tej instituciji. Oba prispevka sta bila v celoti objavljena v *Zgodovinskem spominu institucije RTVL/S, Revije SRP*.^{10,11}

Oba prispevka reshujeta nek pomemben problem, sta tudi nepogreshljiva v *Katalogu problemov, Projekta SRP*, prispevek k razreshevanju ključnih problemov medija RTVL/S. Brez Novakove analize naročnine pa bil nemozhen (nemogoch) tudi moj prispevek k razreshevanju problema *Legitimnost naročnine za radiotelevizijo in vrednotna orientacija medija*.¹²

No, bilo jih je gotovo she nekaj takih, ki so se resno zavzemali za avtonomno in kritično raziskovanje medija in na mediju, a bolj potihlo, ali pa niso imeli odlochujoče mochi. Vechinoma pa je bilo najbrzh tako, da so se za to zavzemali le deklarativno in celo normativno. Konec koncev je raziskovanje v RO (raziskovalnih oddelkih) opredeljeval Zakon o raziskovalni dejavnosti in po dejavnosti in strokovni orientaciji so bili izenacheni s samostojnimi znanstvenimi inshtituti. (Iz ISU sem prishel na DERPO RTVL v letu 1979. Pomembno je bilo zame, da je ta enota takrat imela izenachen status s samostojnimi RO in celo boljše pogoje za javnost raziskovanja kot so bili na ISU, pa se je kmalu pokazalo, da sem se ravno glede tega hudo ushtel.) (Glej: ^{9,1} *Uvertura v pogrebni ritual* Biltena SShP, *Ukinjanje javnosti raziskovanja, Revija SRP 7/8, 1995*)

Da pa je z vzpodbujanjem (v resnici dopushchanjem) kritičnosti v raziskovanju medija »bila dosezhena prej ignoranca kot pa uporaba podatkov«, bi skoraj drzhalo, ker je bila ignoranca res glavno orozhje ali orodje za obrachunavanje z kritičnim raziskovanjem in raziskovalci (pred in po neposrednem obrachunu). In res me ta ignoranca vse prevech boli, prevech se ubadam z njo. Vendar se je vselej pokazalo, da ko ta odpove, odpove za nazaj. Predvsem pa raziskovanje ni le servisiranje s podatki! Tudi to je bilo na RTVL na kompetentnih mestih vechkrat izrecheno, sprejeto! (V deklarativnem pomenu, seveda.)

Kdo naj urednike in redaktorje podpira v samostojnosti odlochanja in kako je treba to storiti, da bodo ti v odlochanju samostojni?

In spite of his exposed position in the SSDS party, now Jansha's SSDS, his approach to critical research differed, he allowed and even supported it. Perhaps infection stems from this wretched institute, or is merely a matter of personality. The regime of the time knew well why found or close it, and whom it closed down.

And it cannot be overlooked that it was these two men who perpetrated one report each, fundamental or key for understanding the RTVL-S medium, while at the same time a research report **They** found unacceptable and unforgivable.

Already in 1978, Ante Novak's analysis of subscription (*Argumentation of the Proposal to Abolish RTV Subscription fees and Introduce Contribution for RTV*) revealed there is no such thing as RTV subscription, that it was essentially a covert form of state tax. In his one of a kind *Handover Report* Dr Janez Jerovšek exposed the issue of lodges at RTVL/S, which is a key issue for the understanding of the »game of power« at said institution. Both complete contributions were published in the *Historical Memory of the RTVL/S Institution, Revija SRP*.^{10, 11}

Both contributions solve an important issue and are indispensable in the *Catalogue of Problems of Projekt SRP*, a contribution to the resolution of key issues at the RTVL/S medium. Without Novak's analysis of subscription my contribution to the resolution of the issue *Of the Legitimacy of Subscription Fees for Radio-Television and Value Orientation of the Medium* could also not exist.¹²

Well, there were surely a few more, who seriously advocated autonomous and critical research of the medium and at the medium, but not as loudly, or did not possess deciding power. On the most part they only advocated it by declaration or even norm. After all, the research in the research departments (RO) was defined by the Law on Research Activity, and by activity and expert orientation RO were equated with autonomous scientific institutes. (I transferred from ISU to DERPO RTVL in 1979. It was important to me that at the time that this unit was equated in status with independent RO and offered even better conditions concerning public availability of its research than ISU, but it soon became apparent that this was a considerable error on my part.) (See: ^{9,1} *Overture to a Burial Ritual of the Bilten SSbP, Abolition of Public Accessibility of Research, Revija SRP 7/8, 1995*.)

However, it could also be true that stimulating (in reality allowing) critical research of the medium »sooner resulted in ignorance than use of data«, because ignorance truly was the main weapon or tool in engaging critical research and researchers (before and after direct confrontation). And truly, the said ignorance is all too painful for me, I pay it too much mind. Still, it always turned out that, when it fails, it fails for the past. Above all, research is not merely servicing data! This also was frequently stated and accepted in competent positions! (in the sense of a declaration, of course.)

*Who should support editors and redactors in the autonomy of their decisions and how this **must** be done, in order for them to be autonomous in their decisions?*

Pa saj uredniki in uredniki na RTVL (razen res redkih izjem) po tradiciji niso bili niti niso zheleli biti samostojni in neodvisni, bili so odvisni in zasvojeni od partije ZK, sedaj pa od strank!

Nikoli nihche na RTVL/S pa ni postavljala kateregakoli kritichnega raziskovalca, she posebej sistematically ne, nasproti urednikom in urednikom. To sta namreč na instituciji M.M. neprimerljivi kategoriji. Sploh pa, katerokoli kritiko slabo prenasajo, she posebej pa so netolerantni do kritichnega raziskovanja medija. In kritichni raziskovalec je v primeri z uredniki na instituciji M.M. niche (ne shteje nich), razen v svojih stvaritvah (chlinkih, knjigah) a tudi ta na M.M. ne shtejejo nich!

In she to, raziskovalec, che je res iskalec, je v vsakem primeru tudi v vlogi kritika, (ko raziskuje, ima kritichni vrednotni pristop) in enako je kritichen v afirmativni raziskovalni vlogi, z vnaprej opredeljenim, utemeljenim in tako izrechenim afirmativnim pristopom (tak je na primer moj pristop v knjigi *Janezovo razodetje ali o treh vrednotah*). Che pa to ni, je zgolj apologet. Moti pa se tisti, ki misli, da ob takem, skrajno afirmativnem pristopu ni odkrite refleksije in samorefleksije. Poznavalci to zhe vedo in opazijo, in rezultat je natanko tak kot, ko gre za ekstremno kritichni pristop, le (inkvizicijske komisije se zamenjajo) inkvizitorji so drugi.

Carigrjsko deklaracijo o medijih v demokraticnih druzhbach pa bodo na RTVS vseeno nekoč morali ponovno temeljito preuchiti in si ob tej prilozhnosti odgovoriti: je bila kdaj she katera norma, napotek, deklarativna orientacija, na katero bi se odlochujochi na RTVS bolj nepravicheno in zmotno sklicevali zoper kritichno in kompleksno raziskovanje na mediju RTVL/S v sistemu, kot so se to ravno v primeru (ne)uporabe te nesrečne Carigrjske deklaracije?

Mislím, da ne! Skratka, mislim, da bo *Revija SRP* she naprej raziskovala mediju neprijetne a bistvene probleme, jih razgrinjala javnosti, opozarjala na dejstva, ki jih Medij noče vedeti, ne videti; njen osnovni predmet zrenja in kritichnega motrenja pa je sistem (kljub videzu, da nas zanima samo medij), vчасih smo mu rekli druzhba in antagonizem med chlovekom in sistemom se je kar stopil v idili samega izraza »druzhbe«.

Naj se na koncu tega samospashevanja she enkrat vprasham, kot sem se v Poteh in stranpoteh SSD (samoupravne socialistichne druzhbe):

Kaj je tisto, kar mi ne da miru, da venomer brskam po zgodovinskem spominu in obujam neprijetne dubove in njih vzdushje?

Smisel te detektivske zgodbe je, da se individuum vprasha, kaksben smisel ima prevelika institucionalizacija? Mislím, da je to vprashanje: kaksbne razdiralne posledice za smisel institucionalnega raziskovanja in ustvarjanja je imelo in jo she ima to nesrečno pokroviteljstvo mochi. Predominacija (politicne) mochi, cenżura in avtocenżura so nerazdružbne, prezhemajo se med seboj, posledica pa je izgubljeni smisel in char avtonomnega ustvarjanja.

Vendar tako sprashevanje in splošne ugotovitve sploh niso problematichne, pa tudi smiselne ne, che jih vprashovalec ne pripelje do konkretnih nosilcev z imeni in priimki, vsaj za primer. To pa je res problematichno in s tem se zachne kraval mochnih in mogochnih, vse dokler ...

Actually, redactors and editors at RTVLS (except for truly rare exceptions) traditionally didn't even want to be autonomous and independent, they were dependent on and addicted to the Party, League of Communists, and now parties!

Never has anyone appointed any critical researchers at RTVL/S, particularly not systematically, opposite redactors and editors; as it is these are two incomparable categories at the M. M. institution. At any rate, they take any criticism poorly and are particularly intolerant of critical medium research. And compared to editors, a critical researcher at the M. M. institution is no one (counts for nothing), except in their creations (articles, books), but at the M. M. these also count for nothing!

In addition, a researcher, if truly a searcher, in every case has the role of critic (approaching their research critically, based on values) and is likewise critical in the affirmative research role, with a predetermined, well-founded and so-expressed affirmative approach (as for example my approach in my book *Revelation to John or On Three Values*). If they are not critical, they are merely apologists. But it would be wrong to think that such an extremely affirmative approach does not include open reflection and self-reflection. This is something specialists know and notice, and the result is exactly the same as in the case of extremely critical approach, except with other inquisitors (inquisition commissions change).

Some day, RTVLS will need to deeply study the Istanbul Declaration on media in democratic societies and at that point ask: was there ever a norm, direction, declarative orientation against the critical and complex research at the medium, which the decision makers at RTVLS called on more unjustifiably or falsely than is the case with (non-)use of this wretched Istanbul Declaration?

I think not! In short, I think that *Revija SRP* will continue to research important matters unpleasant to the medium, divulge them to the public, and point out facts the medium would rather not know or see; the essential object of its observation and critical assessment is the system (though it appears we are only interested in the medium); formerly we called it society and the antagonism between man and system simply melted away in the idyll of the very term »society«.

Allow me to end this self-examination by again asking, as I did in the Paths and Blunders of SSS (self-governing socialist society):

What is it that allows me no peace, so that I constantly peruse historical memory and rouse unpleasant ghosts and their atmosphere?

The meaning of this detective story is for the individual to ask what point there is to overly extensive institutionalization? I think it is the question: What disruptive consequences did and still does this wretched patronage of power have for the meaning of institutionalized research and production? Predominant (political) power, censorship, and self-censorship are inseparable, they permeate each-other; they result in the loss of meaning and magic of autonomous creativity.

However, such examination and general conclusions are not problematic at all, nor are they meaningful if the interviewer does not introduce the tangible category of names, at least as examples. This is truly problematic and leads to commotion among the powerful and mighty, right up until...

Naj ponovim: dokler je sprashevalcev tako zelo malo in she ti niso vedno dovolj drzni, pa lahko tisti, ki pravilno gledajo na raziskovanje in celotno ustvarjanje na instituciji, kot sem skushal raziskati in razkriti, lahko postavljajo *Vsebinska izhodishcha za programe dela sluzhbb raziskovanja programov in obchinstva* in pishejo *Osnovne smernice za delo sluzhbe* snujejo *Dramo reorganizacije* in zapovedo *10 Njegovih zapovedi* (glej: *Gurujsko navdabnjeni predlog reorganizacije in Upravljanje RTV Slovenija v obdobju do leta 2000: Prestrukturiranje RTVS in Komentar k Njegovim desetim zapovedim*).

In ta zmagoviti pohod urédnikov zadev, sezhe vse tja do normiranja navodil gledalcem, pisanja predgovorov, kako je treba pravilno gledati in razumeti posamezne medijske stvaritve kot npr. v omenjeni TV nadaljevanki (*Poti in stranpoti SSD – (samoupravne socialistichne druzhbe)*, *Problemi v ustvarjanju TV nadaljevanke na instituciji RTVL in umetnishke smeri SSR – (samoupravnega socrealizma) v Jugoslaviji iz konca 70 let.*)

Che sedaj na koncu malo zashpekuliram in morda neupravicheno komentiram, po vtisu, ki se she ni polegel, le nekatere (meni) ljube in instituciji neljube prispevke, take, ki shtejejo na instituciji RTVS za nesprejemljive zaradi svojskih pogledov na probleme medija in sistema, pri katerih pa se ne bi niti za hip pokolebal v svoji urednishki odgovornosti, med njimi pa se bom omejil predvsem na tiste in take, ki sem jih sam zagreshil, in she nekatere, ki sodijo v raziskovalni projekt *Katalog problemov* in sem bil zanje javno odgovoren kot (odgovorni) urednik in sem se pri avtorjih in v urednistvu prizadeval za njihovo objavo, in ne nazadnje, tudi take, za katere se mi je zdelo, da so bili za revijo in raziskovalni projekt *SRP* tvegani (to je, v afektirani politichni scenografiji medija v sistemu politichno spotakljivi, motechi, nezaslishani), vendar nepogreshljivi, bi danes rekel takole:

Podpora Darku Marinu in Tedniku, predvsem pa kritika kritike ideoloshke komisije, njene ideoloshke vloge (Programskega sveta dr. Misha Jezernika) je izkopala bojno sekuro mochi, in zachel se je pregon!

Kritika »trefaltizma« – personalne legitimitete in nepotizma na primeru Razvedrilnega programa je bila dojeta kot nezaslishan napad na osebo in druzhino, ne pa npr. kot kritika nepotizma in vrednotnega sistema enega – v malem.

Kritika manipulacije z javnomnenskimi anketami (raziskovanje javnega mnenja se sprevrzhe v produkcijo le tega) v Informativnem programu Lada Ambrozehicha je bila razumljena kot očitno provladna uslužnost, liberalna zarota.

Kritika nemozhnosti komunikacije s preds. sveta RTVS Rudijem Sheligom ni bila razumljena vsaj kot razgaljanje tihotapljenja »orwellizma« (konkretnje, prepovedi svobode mishljenja in pisanja na mediju in shirshe) in to ravno od nekdanjih prvoborcev za svobodo misli in (svojega) pisanja, ampak prej in bolj kot nedopusten napad na velichino in avtoriteto prvega in najvishjega v medijski hierarhiji. Ali pa se morda motim in je v tem primeru celo bila prav razumljena, le da se tega na RTVS nihche niti chrhiniti ni upal.

If I may repeat: while so very few ask questions and even they are not always bold enough, those with the right view of research and all production at the institution, as I tried to research and uncover, can set *Content foundations for the work procedures of programme and audience research services* and write *Basic Guidelines for the work of the services* devise *Drama of Organisation* and decree *10 of its Commandments* (see: *Guru-style Inspired Proposal of the Reorganisation and the Management of RTV Slovenia in the time up to the year 2000: Restructuring of RTVS* and *The Commentary of its Ten Commandments*).

This victorious march of editors of matters, goes as far as regulating viewers, writing forewords stating how individual mediums' creations should be correctly watched and understood, e.g. the said two TV series (*Paths and Blunders of the SSS – (self-governing socialist society)*, *Problems of Creating a TV Series at the RTVL institution and artistic direction of the SSR – (self-governing socialist realism) in late 1970's Yugoslavia*).

If I am to speculate a bit here at the end, with this impression fresh in my mind, and perhaps untenably comment on just a few (of my) dear contributions, disliked by the institution, considered unacceptable by the RTVS institution because they express particular views on issues at the medium and system, which would not give me a moment's pause as an editor; I focus on those among them and their like, which I perpetrated myself, as well as a few, which belong in the *Catalogue of Problems* research project and were my public responsibility as (responsible) editor, and for the publication of which I campaigned with authors and the editorial board, and not least those, which, though indispensable, in my view posed a risk to SRP journal and research project (i.e. politically tricky, trying, outrageous on the unnatural political scene of the medium in the system); I would now comment:

Support for Darko Marin and Tednik and especially the ideological commission's criticism of the criticism of its ideological role (on the part of Dr Misho Jezernik's Programme Council) was a declaration of war for power, prosecution followed.

Criticising »trefatism« – the legitimacy of personnel and nepotism concerning The Entertainment Programme was viewed as an outrageous attack on his person and family, and not as criticism of nepotism and a micro-value system of one.

Criticising public opinion survey manipulation (public opinion research perverted to become its production) in Lado Ambrožič's news programme was viewed as a clear-cut case of counter-governmental service, a liberal conspiracy.

The very former leading champions in the struggle for the freedom of thought and (their) writing did not view the criticism of inability to communicate with RTVS Council chairman Rudi Sheligo as at least disclosing the smuggling of »Orwellism« (specifically – prohibition of freedom of thought and writing at the medium and wider), but rather as an intolerable attack on the greatness and authority of the first and topmost in the medium's hierarchy. Or, I am mistaken and in this case criticism was understood correctly, but no one at RTVS dared peep to this effect.

Kritika Dukesovega projekta reorganizacije RTVS Matjazha Hanzhka je bila odpravljena kot poskus nasprotovanja evropeizaciji in svetovljanstvu medija RTVS, skratka kot kritika s pozicije ozkosti slovenskega provincializma, ne pa ravno nasprotno, razkrivanje te provincialne slabosti, nekritične zaupljivosti slavnim gurujem (z eksotičnimi iskushnjami) v tako pomembnih rečeh, kot je reorganizacija slovenske nacionalne radiotelevizije, in she manj kot strokovna, čeprav shele uvodna kritika prve faze reorganizacijskega projekta, saj ga vendar podpira in sofinancira tudi Ministrstvo za znanost in tehnologijo RS.

Intervju mag. Cirila Galeta z Borutom Shukeljetom (v *Reviji SRP 7/8, 1995*) je bil zachuda ravno tisti intervju, ki je bil kratko-malo razumljen kot jasen dokaz paktiranja z nekdanjimi političnimi nasprotniki. Mislim, da zadeva ni shla kar tako mimo intervjuista, ni se srečno končala ne zanj ne za nas. Kot za vechino tega in takega sankcioniranja pisane besede tudi za to ni dokazov, ostane torej moja domnevna shpekulacija in dejstvo, da Ciril Gale ne dela vech intervjujev za *RTV STIK* (glasilo sluzhbe za stik z javnostjo) in tudi za *Revijo SRP* ne vech.¹³

Vsi trije sestavki, ki zadevajo novega gen. dir. Zharka Petana: od prispevka Tarasa Kemaunerja *Ob Petanovi dramatik*,¹⁴ do *Odklonilnega ločenega mnenja sodnika Matevzha Krivica*,¹⁵ in končno mojega prispevka k nesprejemljivosti neobvladljive revije *Personalna legitimiteta medija v sistemu*,¹⁶ so bili razumljeni kot osebni napad na nesporno evropsko uveljavljenega kulturnika razumnika, uveljavljeno osebnost Zharka Petana in njegov pravichni boj za neodvisno civilno radiotelevizijo Slovenije, lahko bi celo rekli, da je bila *Revija SRP 7/8, 1995* posvečena prav Njemu.

Morda nekoliko manj zholčno je po hodnikih RTVS odmeval prispevek Petra Bozhicha *Tulechi dervish*,¹⁷ čeprav ne vem zakaj? Saj so novinarji na RTVS res nesporna posebna kasta – nameshchenci prvega reda in prav lahko bi se chutili napadene in razzhaljene v svoji nedotakljivi velichini. Morda pa so se ga le bali?

Objava *Primopredajnega porochila* odstopljenega gen. dir. dr. Janeza Jerovshka (posebej poglavje o lozhah na RTVS) je vzburila vse strani, levo desno in srednjo. To si lahko razlagam, da so konvertiti v levih in desnih lozhah in vmes ali pa da se sedaj lozhe med seboj v poglavitnih rečeh mochi kar dobro razumejo in sporazumejo. Ena redkih radikalnih kritik nashe najnovejshe politichne dramaturgije je dodobra razgaljena v prispevku Tarasa Kermavnerja *Samozaslepljeni, zlomljeni heroji* v *Reviji Srp 9/10*.¹⁸

Z objavo mojega *Chetrtega premisleka o mochi*, (*Moch sama po sebi, Demokracija mochi – Slovenske volitve 1992*) prav gotovo nisem pozhel niti najmanjshega odobravanja pri katerikoli pomembni stranki.¹⁹

Za levo, nekdanjo levo, natanchneje pa nekdanjo rezhimsko elito v mediju in (najbrzh analogno v sistemu) pa si seveda ne delam iluzij, da bi mi lahko odpisali (odpustili) mojo vpletenost v boju za bastiljo komunizma in she manj pisanje o Izgubljeni bitki in o Njih v rubriki *Iz zgodovinskega spomina*.

Matjazh Hanzhek's critique of Dukes' RTVS reorganization project was dismissed as an attempt to oppose Europeanization and Worldliness of the RTVS medium, in short as criticism from the position of narrow Slovenian provincialism rather than the contrary, exposing provincial weakness of uncritically trusting celebrity gurus (of exotic experience) in matters as important as the reorganization of Slovenian national radio-television, let alone expert, though merely introductory criticism of phase one of the reorganization project; after all it is supported and co-financed by the Slovenian Ministry of Science and Technology.

Surprisingly, *Mag. Ciril Gale's interview with Borut Shukelje* (*Revija SRP* 7/8, 1995), was the one viewed as clear evidence of alliance with former political opponents. I think the interviewee was not left unscathed; there was no happy ending for him or us. Most of this and similar sanctions of the written word left no proof, what is left is my purported speculation and the fact that Ciril Gale no longer conducts interviews for *RTV STIK* (the public relations office bulletin) nor for *Revija SRP*.¹³

All three compositions concerning the new dir. gen. Zharko Petan: from the contribution by Taras Kermauner *With Petan's Dramatics*,¹⁴ to Matevzh Krivic's *A Judge's Unfavourable Separate Opinion*¹⁵ and finally my contribution to the immutability of an uncontrollable journal *Personal Legitimacy of a Medium in the System*,¹⁶ were viewed as personal attacks on the undisputed Europe-wide established cultural intellectual, a noted personality Zharko Petan and his just fight for an independent civil Slovenian radio-television, we could even say *Revija SRP* no. 7/8, 1995 was dedicated to him.

Peter Bozhich's contribution, *Tulechi Dervish*,¹⁷ perhaps echoed with slightly less bile in the halls of RTVS, though I don't know why. RTVS journalists are indubitably a special caste – appointees of the first order and could easily feel attacked and offended in their untouchable greatness. Perhaps they feared him after all?

The publication of the *Handover Report* by the stepped down dir. gen. Dr Janez Jerovshek (particularly the chapter on lodges at the RTVS) excited all sides, the left, the right, and the middle. I can read this as proof there are converts in left and right lodges as well as in-between, or that these days, lodges can get along reasonably well and come to mutual understandings. A rare radical criticism of our newest political dramaturgy has been thoroughly exposed by Taras Kermauner's contribution, *The self-delusional Broken Hero* n *Revija SRP* 9/10.¹⁸

I certainly never received the slightest approval from any notable party for my publication of *The Fourth Consideration of Power, (Power in Itself, the Democracy of Power, Slovenian Elections 1992)*.¹⁹

Of course I am not deluding myself that my part in the fight of the Bastille of Communism let alone my writing o the Lost Battle and about Them in the section *From the Historical Memory* could ever be erased (forgiven) by the left, the former left, or more precisely, the former regime's elites.

Domnevam, da pri njih ne more vzbuditi posebnega razumevanja niti moje ponovno objavljane in komentiranje *Iger sistema*,²⁰ in *Proces-a*, (*Predlog za obnovo in revizijo procesa, Delovnemu in socialnemu sodišču in Vrhovnemu sodišču RS*), Janeza Premka,²¹ tudi ne brskanje po oddaljenejšem zg. spominu *Poteb in stranpoteb SSD – (samoupravne socialistične družbe), problemih dramske redakcije v ustvarjanju TV nadaljevanke na instituciji RTVL in umetniskbe smeri SSR – (samoupravnega socrealizma) v Jugoslaviji iz konca 70 let.*²²

Na tem mestu gotovo nisem nashtel vseh prispevkov, ki so najbolj vzburili tiste, ki posebej prezhe na prilozhnost, da izrazijo svoje zgrazhanje nad nelojnostjo instituciji, njenim poltronom. Za vse niti ne vem, predvsem pa moram poudariti, da to zgrazhanje ne pomeni kaj dosti za samo tehtnost in tezho navedenih in drugih nenavedenih prispevkov v *SRP-u*, vendar je za kasnejši zg. spomin *Revije SRP* le potrebno zabeležiti tudi tak shpekulativni samogovor, ravno zaradi odsotnosti pogovora ali bolje, pisne polemike, pa mi kaj drugega ne preostane.

Nasploh se mi zdi, da so bili zunanji sodelavci (chim dlje so bili od medija, tudi fizichno) za hodnishko obrekovalnishko obdelavo manj spotakljivi. Tako to velja tudi za Leva Detelo, njegova prispevka *RTV med krizo in vzponom* in *Z/a/meshane oblike sodobnih televizjskih strategij*,^{23,24} Tarasa Kermavnerja *Politika, pravica, vest /Ob Petanovi dramatikii/*, Matevzha Krivica *Locheno mnenje sodnika*. Ali pa bo zopet veljalo, da se upognjenci na mediju nekaterih zunanjih sodelavcev bolj boje, jih bolj respektirajo.

Tudi nochem rechi, da ni vzbujal hude krvi in institucionalnega zgrazhanja prvi literarni del revije (che pogojno pristanemo na tako delitev, ker mi sodelavci tega ne pochnemo). Literarni prispevki so vsebinsko dopolnjevali in sproshchali vrednotno variacijo orientacije revije (zopet pogojno strokovni pa se niso odrekli nekaterih literarnih prijemov in izraznih tehnik). Za afirmacijo ustvarjalnosti in ustvarjalcev je pomembno, za institucijo pa pouchno, da smo objavljali, na primer, tudi pomembne in dobre radijske in televizjske stvaritve, take, ki jih je institucionalna selekcija zavrgla ali pa jih ni uposhchevala tako kot jim to pritiche. Vendar je literatura le urednishka domena glavnega urednika Francija Zagorichnika in she celotnega urednishtva revije. Che bi sedaj poskushal shpekulirati in komentirati tudi literarne prispevke, po svoje seveda, bi hitro preseigel delokrog moje zadolzhitve – dogovorjene pristojnosti odgovornega urednika. Vseeno pa bi lahko rekel, da je za prenekatero medijeve eksperte metaforichni pesnishki govor-jezik she bolj nedostopen, nedojemljiv, kot to velja za bolj ali manj polemichni (razpravni in razpravljajochi) del revijalnih sporochil.

Uradno pa revija tako in tako ni odmevna in je sploh ni. Vendar se mi mochno zdi, da je bila taka obchasna pozhivitev z nekompromisnim kritichnim mishljenjem in izrazhanjem v – svojo moch samozaverovani – instituciji potrebna. In enako ali she bolj potrebna sistemu, ki se dovolj ne zaveda mochi – svojega najmochnejshenga – medija (ministrstva za resnico), in takrat, ko ga jemlje dovolj resno, she kako potrebna.

I assume that my renewed publication and comments of the *Games of the System*,²⁰ and Janez Premk's *Process*, (*Proposal for Renewal and Revision of the Process, for the Labour and Social Court, and Supreme Court of the Republic of Slovenia*),²¹ also doesn't incite particular understanding, the same goes for perusing more remote hist. memory of *The Paths and Blunders of the SSS – (self-governing socialist society)*, *Drama Redaction's Problems in Creating TV series at the RTVL institution and SSR – (Self-governing Socialist Realism) artistic movement in late 1970s Yugoslavia*.²²

I have here certainly not listed all contributions that most excited those, who lay in wait for the particular opportunity to express their dismay with lack of allegiance to the institution, its poltroons. I don't even know all of them, but above all else I must emphasise that this dismay has no particularly bearing on the cogency and gravity of the mentioned and other *SRP* contributions, however such speculative monologue is worth recording for *Revija SRP's* future hist. memory; it is due to this very absence of discussion, or better, written debate, that I have no other option.

I generally think that external contributors were less invocative of hallway gossip (the further from the medium they were, also physically). This is the case with Lev Detela's contributions *RTV Between Crisis and Rise* and *Mixed (up) Forms of Modern Television Strategies*,^{23, 24} Taras Kermauner's *Politics, Justice, Conscience / With Petan's Dramatics*, Matevzh Krivic's *A Judge's Separate Opinion*. Or, it will again turn out that bent-backs at the medium fear, and respect, some external collaborators more than others. I am not saying that no bad blood and institutional dismay were incurred by the first, literary section of the journal (that is, tentatively accepting such a division, which we contributors are not). Literary content supplemented and relaxed the variation of the journal's value orientation (again tentatively, being experts, we adhered to certain literary methods and expressive techniques). It is significant for the affirmation of creativity and creators, as well as instructive for the institution that we also published, for example, important and good radio and television creations, which were discarded in institutional selection or insufficiently acknowledged. However, literature is in the purview of chief editor Franci Zagorichnik as well as entire Journal's editorial board. If I were now to speculate and, of course in my own way, attempt a commentary on literary contributions, I would quickly overstep my assignment – chief editor's pre-set dominion. I can, however, say that to more than a few medium's experts, metaphorical poetic diction-language is even more inaccessible and incomprehensible than the more-or-less polemical (discussion and discussing) part of the journal's content.

Anyway, officially the journal is not notable, and does not exist. Though I strongly suspect that the institution – entrenched in its power – needed such occasional rejuvenation through uncompromising critical thinking and expression. And it was likewise, if not more, needed by the system, which is sufficiently ignorant of the power of – its strongest – medium (ministry of truth), and when taking it seriously well needed indeed.

Vseeno pa se mi močno zdi, da tega ne pochnemo, ne pishemo zaradi Njih, ampak bolj zase in za tiste redke individuume, ki jih zanima sistem zato, da bi se obranili njegove prebogosto pretirane skrbi za dobrobit chloveka.

Che se tako videne probleme (kot jih vidi interno institucionalno mnenje v instituciji RTVS) sploh da mileje (omiljeno), lepshe (olepshano), in tako rekoch neproblematično priobchiti, tega ne vem. Morda kdo drug. jaz tega ne znam, in tudi che bi se mi kaj podobnega le posrechilo, bi bil tak prispevek zame nezshivljenjski, od mrtvinchenja mrtev.

Tako se mi kazhe problematičnost mojega urednikovanja danes. Zhe sedaj pa moram rechi, da tako gledanje ni odvisno samo od mene. Dolocha ga tudi vladajoča politična klima na mediju in v sistemu. Makiavelistična miselnost parvenijev na oblasti pa je sploh nagnjena k prepričanju, da tichi v ozadju vsakega resnega oponiranja neka politična zarota. S primernim enostransko sistematičnim izborom citatov res ne bi bilo tezhko dokazovati, ne pa dokazati, da *Revija SRP* obstaja smo zato, da bi napadla po vrsti vse ključne nosilce (predvsem desne) domnevne demokratizacije medija in t.im. desno civilno družhbo. A ne pozabimo, Oni so obvladovali medij in po mojem mnenju so to pocheli dokaj nespretno. Zato pa jim je bila posvečena nasha posebna hvalezhnost in pretirana pozornost, res so imeli posebno prioriteto. In moram priznati, da se kazhe bralcu, ki se ne poglablja in je prezhet z navado visokega politiziranja, taka, in samo taka namera. Ko pa bo na sporedu zopet menjava ključnih vlog na oblasti, bodo ti in taki prispevki na mediju morda celo tolerirani, a zamenjali jih bodo drugi, predvsem tisti iz rubrike *Za osvezhitev zgodovinskega spomina institucije RTVL/S*. In zopet bi nekdo lahko dokazoval, ne pa dokazal, da *Revija SRP* obstaja samo zato ali predvsem zato, da bi revanshistično obrachunavala z (ne)nasledniki **KP** in tvorci **SSD** (to pot pomenijo kratice Komunistično partijo in Samoupravno socialistično družhbo). Lucidnejshi politični misleci (po danashnje pojmovane) ekstremne leve in desne politične scene pa so zhe sedaj soglasni (morda celo edino edini v tem), da take revije, kot je *Revija SRP*, chisto nich ne rabijo in se sploh lazhje sporazumejo med seboj, kot pa z vechnimi oponenti, ki po njihovem niso niti toliko ozaveshčeni, da bi si resno prizadevali priti k oblasti ali se vsaj sporazumeti z njo. Kot je dejal Simon Kardum, saj ne vedo kaj delajo (»revija, katere tvorci se she niso odlochili in ovedli (ko pa se bodo, bo kajpak prepozno)«). Moj komentar je: da zanj she ni prepozno, zhelim mu veliko ustvarjalnega sodelovanja z institucijo RTVS (»tudi v programskem smislu«), prenekateremu smo zhe pomagali, vsaj tako, da se je potem, ko se je, ali pa so ga, soochili z grozodejstvi in nichevostmi, ki jih razgrinja *Revija SRP*, veliko lazhje izrazil svojo lojalnost in razumevanje močnim institucijam sistema in mogochnikom na njih.

Kritika pa na mediju RTVS seveda ni zalegla nich, tega najbrzh ni potrebno posebej navesti. Nadaljna orientacija revije bi morda lahko presegle pretirano ukvarjanje le z enim, cheprav najmočnejshim medijem v sistemu (RTVS).

I still strongly suspect that we do this, write this, not for Them, but rather for ourselves and those rare individuals interested in the system so they may defend against its often excessive concern with the wellbeing of man.

Whether such visible problems (as seen by the internal institutional opinion of the RTVS institution) can even be more mildly (mollified), pleasantly (placated), and almost non-problematically publicized, I do not know. Perhaps someone else can, I cannot, and even if I succeeded in such a feat, the resulting contribution would seem to me inanimate, stifled to death.

This is how I see the issues of my being editor today. I must now say, that such a view is not entirely up to me. It is also defined by the medium's and system's ruling political climate. The Machiavellian mentality of the ruling parvenus is particularly given to the belief that any serious opposition must stem from some sort of political plot. Assembling a suitable one-sided selection of quotes could demonstrate, but not prove, that *Revija SRP* exists solely to attack all key proponents of the purported (especially right-wing) democratisation of the medium, and so-called right civil society. But let us not forget, it is They who controlled the medium, and, in my opinion, did so rather unskilfully. This is why they were afforded our special gratitude and excessive attention, they were particularly prioritised. And I must admit that a reader, inattentive to details and infused with the habit of haut-polemics, is shown such, and only such intent. Once changes of key positions of power recur once again, these and such contributions may perhaps even be tolerated at the medium, but will be replaced by others, chiefly from the section *To Refresh the Memory of the RTVL/S Institution*. And again it could serve to demonstrate, but not prove conclusively, that *Revija SRP* existed with a single or predominant purpose of revanchist settling accounts with (non)successors of the Communist Party and the Self-governing Socialist Society. Sharper political thinkers of the extreme left and right of the political scene (in today's sense) already agree (perhaps even unanimously) that they have no use whatsoever for a journal such as *Revija SRP* and find it easier to come to agreements amongst themselves than with eternal opponents, who in their opinion don't possess the awareness to make serious grabs for power or at least some agreement with it. As Simon Kardum stated, they know not what they are doing (»a journal whose creators have not yet decided and become aware (and when they do, it will of course be too late«). I comment that it is not yet too late for him, I wish him much creative collaboration with the RTVS institution (»also in terms of programming«), we helped more than a few, at least in so far as, once faced with atrocities and nullities displayed by *Revija SRP*, they more easily expressed their loyalty and understanding to powerful institutions of the system and its mightly.

It probably goes without saying that criticism, of course, accomplished nothing at the RTVS medium. The journal's further orientation could perhaps overcome excessive focus on a single, though most powerful medium of the system (RTVS).

To pa je bilo po svoje zopet dobro izhodishche za osvetlitev ključnih problemov sistema. Bolje je bilo za zacetek poglobljeno obdelati enega, takega, ki ga najbolj poznamo, kot pa da bi se lotili vseh medijev površno. Vendar ta eden ni edini in tudi sistem se bo v kratkem radikalno spremenil. Potem bo to Evropa in ne vech Republika Slovenija in slednja bo le podsistemček v velikem sistemu in to je natanko tista klima, ki smo je vajeni in v njej tako pridno funkcioniramo. Svoboda, cheprav institucionalno sistemska svoboda, je breme, ki ga Slovenci nismo vajeni prenashati.

Srp-ashev pa ta velika drama institucionalizacije ni mogla fascinirati, cheprav je zanje skrajno zanimiva kot predmet zrenja, refleksije. Revija bo lahko ostala svoja, svojska, ne mudi se ji v Evropo, pa ne zato, ker je zhe v njej, ampak zato, ker se individuumi ne zhele udomachiti v nobenem sistemu. Ko je na strani individua, je zoper sistem institucij, zoper njih mrtvilo. Tu se res nimamo chesa sramovati, v Evropi ne. Konchnega izida antagonizma med individuumom in sistemom, med chlovekom in le njegovo vlogo, med svobodo in mochjo, ne bo dolochil, definiral ali podaril noben sistem, nobena institucija.

Za konec tega poglavja v smiselno-nesmiselnem prizadevanju odg. urednika *Revije SRP*, naj zopet dodam she svoj dvom, ki me neprestano muchi, tudi takrat, ko zhe mislim, da sem ga dokonchno razreshil ali presegel. Kaj che sem se v tej samorefleksiji – samozrenju sebe kot posameznika o svoji vlogi raziskovalca in nesojenega odgovornega urednika revije v instituciji M.M. in (nje) sistemu in v vsej tej dejavnosti v temelju in osnovi motil, dasiravno venomer delam in ponujam temu nasproten (prepogosto suveren) videz? To je namrech kar pogost ochitek hierarhov mojim pisnim izdelkom, pa tudi konkretnemu vedenju v institucijah sistema. Che je temu tako, potem se je pach zmotil le nek konkreten individuum z imenom in priimkom, to najbrzh ni tako huda rech. Huje je, che se ne motim tako pogosto, kot menijo mochni in lojalni, vsaj v osnovnih tezah in trditvah ne. She huje pa je, ko uveljavijo svoj prav ravno taki, ki pravijo, da se v tem odnosu nasploh praviloma moti individuum, da ima praviloma prav institucija in sistem in da za njihovim mnenjem, ki ni njihovo, stoji institucija – sistem. Ta zgodba pa nam je zhe znana od prej, le da se je prej reklo, da ima družhba vedno prednost pred posameznikom. Kako se je zadeva konchala in kdo je imel prav, pa smo videli prav pred kratkim. Ne glede na odgovor na zastavljeno vprashanje, pa moram ugotoviti, da je moja strategija v odnosu Srpa-a do RTVS v prizadevenju za vsaj minimalno sobivanje dozhivela popoln neuspeh. Chas je za osvezhitev pobude ali pa njeno spremembo v prozhnejsho inachico. Moja vloga odgovornega urednika in neuspelega pogajalca mora prenehati, vloga glavnega urednika Francija Zagorichnika, che on hoche, in morda celotnega urednistva, kdor to hoche, pa vechati. Drugache recheno, chas je za moj odstop, v skladu s tradicijo to naredim premishljeno, kolikor je to v moji mochi in pisno, kakor pach znam.

Dovolite mi le she, da v propagandne namene ponovim samo she apel iz uvoda k *Igram sistema v SRP-u 9/10*, le v majhni variaciji:

It served as a good starting point in illuminating key problems of the system. It was better to start off with an in-depth discussion of one medium we know well, than several conducted imprecisely. However this is not the only medium and the system is also about to undergo a radical change. Then this will be Europe and no longer the Republic of Slovenia, a mere sub-system of a large system, which is exactly the climate we are used to and in which we function best. Freedom, even if institutional-systemic freedom, is a burden to which we Slovenians are unused.

SRP-ians could not be fascinated by this great drama of institutionalization, though we find it extremely interesting as an object of observation, reflection. The journal will be able to stay its own individual self, in no rush to get to Europe; not because it is already there, but because no individual wishes to be domesticated in any system. The side of the individual stands opposite institutions and their stifling. We truly have nothing to be ashamed of here, not in Europe. The end result of antagonism between individual and system, man and merely his role, freedom and power, will not be determined, defined, or gifted by any system or institution.

At the close of this chapter in a sensible-nonsensical attempts of the man. ed. of *Revija SRP*, allow me to restate my doubt, constantly nagging even when I think I conquered or surpassed it entirely. What if I was consistently fundamentally wrong throughout my self-reflection – observation of myself as an individual, my role as researcher and never-to-be managing editor of a journal within a M. M. institution and (its) system and in all these activities, although I always give and project the opposite (too-often sovereign) impression? This is, in fact, a fairly frequent criticism on the part of the hierarchs of my written work as well as actual conduct in the institutions of the system. If this is the case, than the blunder was committed by a tangible individual with a name and last name, this is probably no terrible thing. It is worse if I am not wrong as often as the strong and loyal think, at least in my basic theses and statements. It is all the more terrible, when those very people have their way, who say that typically in this relationship the individual is wrong, and the institution and system are right, and that their opinion, which is not theirs, is the institution's, the system's. This story is familiar to us from before, except it was then said that society always comes before individual. Fairly recently we saw how that ended and who was right. Irrelevant of the answer to the posed question, I must maintain that my strategy in *SRP's* relation to RTVS, attempting at least minimal cohabitation, failed completely. It is time to refresh the initiative or transform it into a more flexible version of itself. My role as managing editor and failed negotiator must cease, and the role of chief editor Franci Zagorichnik, if he so desires, and perhaps the entire editorial board, whosoever wishes, expand. In other words, it is time for me to resign; in keeping with tradition I do this with due consideration, as much as I am able, and in writing, as well as I know how.

Allow me only, for reasons of propaganda, to restate the appeal from the introduction to the *Games of the System in SRP 9/10*, only in slight variation:

Vendar tako je to sbe dandanes, da hierarhi, diplomati in vsi idolopoklonitelji politični mochi zelo dobro (kot uchbenik) poznajo in razumejo »Vladarja« – enega in edinega; induviduumi pa ne vedo za »Razpravo o prostovoljnem suzbenjstvu«. In tudi sporočila močnega medija poznajo (kot molitvenik), brez ugovora zaupajo edino njemu, za Revije SRP pa ne vedo, za njena sporočila niso vech dojemljivi, v tej intonaciji zhe ne, pa tudi che bi jih poznali, bi jim ne verjeli, v tej melodiji, ne!

V Ljubljani, 1. julija 1995

Opombe

¹ (Glej: *Pisma programskemu svetu I - VII*, Revija SRP 1/2, 1993 in dokumente o pobudi Revije SRP v sht. 1/2 do 7/8)

² (Glej: *Arhimedov zakon, Traktat o svobodi ali Vrednotni sistem*, knjiga, Založba LUMI, 1992, Ljubljana; *Iz Arhimedovega zakona*, Revija SRP 1/2, 1993)

³ (Glej: *Izgubljene iluzije raziskovalca – v boju za nacionalno radiotelevizijo*, Revija SRP 5/6, 1994)

⁴ (Glej: *Vrednotne orientacije vojne propagande, Traktat o svobodi ali Vrednotni sistem, knjiga, Založba LUMI, 1992, Ljubljana*)

⁵ (Glej: *Televizijske manipulacije z javnomnenskimi anketami razveljavljajo svobodo*, Revija SRP 5/6, 1994)

⁶ (Glej: *O pobudi Revije SRP Svetu RTV Slovenija, O nemožnosti komunikacije ali Tri razlage o ozbiljanju in mrtvičenju neke revije*, Revija SRP 3/4, 1994)

⁷ (Glej: *Mnenje o nekem mnenju o reviji SRP, Franci Zagorčnik*, Revija SRP 7/8, 1995)

⁸ (Glej: *Upravljanje RTV Slovenija v obdobju do leta 2000, Problem reorganizacije Radiotelevizije Slovenija; Analiza poročila 1. faze razvojnega projekta, Poročilo o prvi stopnji razvojnega projekta z naslovom: Prestrukturiranje RTV Slovenija, ki sta ga finančno podprla, Ministrstvo za znanost in tehnologijo ter Ministrstvo za kulturo*, Matjazh Hanzhek, Revija SRP 5/6, 1994)

⁹ (Glej: *Raziskava o raziskovanju, Ali je raziskovanje komunikacijskega procesa v instituciji množičnega medija mogoče?*, Bilten SSHP 51, 1983, knjiga – Tiskarna RTVL, Ljubljana, p 83)

^{9.1} *Uvertura v pogrebni ritual Biltena SSHP, Ukinjanje javnosti raziskovanja*, Iz Raziskave o raziskovanju, Bilten SSHP 51, Radiotelevizija Ljubljana, SSHP, marca 1983; (v rubriki *Za osvežitvev zgodovinskega spomina institucije RTVL/S*), Revija SRP 7/8, 1995

¹⁰ (Glej: *Utemeljitev predloga za ukinitvev RTV naročnine, (in uvedbo prispevka za RTV)*, Ante Novak, RTVL, poročilo 1978, Revija SRP 3/4, 1994)

¹¹ (Glej: *Primopredajno poročilo Svetu RTVS, dr. Janez Jerovšek*, Revija SRP 3/4, 1994)

¹² *Legitimitnost naročnine za radiotelevizijo in vrednotna orientacija medija*, Revija SRP 3/4, 1994)

¹³ *Intervju: Ciril Gale z Borutom Shukeljtom, Na vojno smo bili pripravljenev*, Revija SRP 7/8, 1995)

¹⁴ *Politika, pravica, vest / Ob Petanovi dramatikii/, Taras Kermauner*, Revija SRP 7/8, 1995)

¹⁵ *Svoboda slovenskega radia in televizije na Ustavnem sodishchu Slovenije, Ob »nepotrditvi« Zbarka Petana in razveljavitvi zakonske podlage zanjio; Odlochba Ustavnega sodishcha v »zaderev Petan«; Odklonilno lochenev mnenje sodnika – Matevzha Krivica*, SRP 7/8, 1995)

¹⁶ *Personalna legitimiteta medija v sistemu, Primer gen. dir. RTVS Zbarka Petana na vrhovnem in ustavnem sodishchu in institucionalne vrednote medija v legitimiteti sistema in Poseben propagandni dodatek – O neposrednih dejstvih zavestii*, Revija SRP 7/8, 1995)

¹⁷ (Glej: *Tulechi dervish, Reorganizacija Radiotelevizije Slovenija in usoda Revije SRP*, Peter Bozhich, Revija SRP 7/8, 1995)

¹⁸ (Glej: *Chetrti premislek: Moch sama po sebi, Demokracija mochi – Slovenske volitve 1992*, Revija SRP 1/2, 1993)

But so it is to this day that hierarchs, diplomats, and all idol-givers to political power very well know (like textbooks) and understand the – one and only – »Ruler«, while individuals do not know about the »Discourse on Voluntary Slavery«. And they also know the messages of the powerful medium (like a breviary), only it do they trust without objection, unaware of SRP journals, no longer perceptive to their messages, not in this tone, and even if they knew them, they would not believe them, not in this melody!

Ljubljana, 1 July, 1995

Notes

¹ (See: *Pisma programskemu svetu I - VII*, Revija SRP 1/2, 1993 and documents about the initiative of Revija SRP nos. 1/2 do 7/8).

² (See: *Arhimedov zakon, Traktat o svobodi ali Vrednotni sistem*, knjiga, Založba LUMI, 1992, Ljubljana; *Iz Arhimedovega zakona*, Revija SRP 1/2, 1993).

³ (See: *Izgubljene iluzije raziskovalca – v boju za nacionalno radiotelevizijo*, Revija SRP 5/6, 1994).

⁴ (See: *Vrednotne orientacije vojne propagande, Traktat o svobodi ali Vrednotni sistem, knjiga*, Založba LUMI, 1992, Ljubljana).

⁵ (See: *Televizijske manipulacije z javnomnenjskimi anketami razveljavljajo svobodo*, Revija SRP 5/6, 1994).

⁶ (See: *O pobudi Revije SRP Svetu RTV Slovenija, O nemožnosti komunikacije ali Tri razlage o ozbiljanju in mrtvičenju neke revije*, Revija SRP 3/4, 1994).

⁷ (See: *Mnenje o nekem mnenju o reviji SRP, Franci Zagorichnik*, Revija SRP 7/8, 1995).

⁸ (See: *Upravljanje RTV Slovenija v obdobju do leta 2000, Problem reorganizacije Radiotelevizije Slovenija; Analiza poročila 1. faze razvojnega projekta, Poročilo o prvi stopnji razvojnega projekta z naslovom: Prestrukturiranje RTV Slovenija, ki sta ga finančno podprla, Ministrstvo za znanost in tehnologijo ter Ministrstvo za kulturo*, Matjaz Hanzhek, Revija SRP 5/6, 1994).

⁹ (See: *Raziskava o raziskovanju, Ali je raziskovanje komunikacijskega procesa v instituciji množičnega medija mogoče?*, Bilten SShP 51, 1983, knjiga – Tiskarna RTVL, Ljubljana, p. 83).

^{9.1} *Uvertura v pogrebni ritual Biltena SShP, Ukinjanje javnosti raziskovanja*, Iz Raziskave o raziskovanju, Bilten SShP 51, Radiotelevizija Ljubljana, SShP, marca 1983; (in the section *Za osvežitvev zgodovinskega spomina institucije RTVL/S*), Revija SRP 7/8, 1995.

¹⁰ (See: *Utemeljitev predloga za ukinitvev RTV naročnine*, (in *Uvedbo prispevka za RTV*), Ante Novak, RTVL, poročilo 1978, Revija SRP 3/4, 1994).

¹¹ (See: *Primopredajno poročilo Svetu RTV/S*, dr. Janez Jerovšek, Revija SRP 3/4, 1994).

¹² *Legitimitet naročnine za radiotelevizijo in vrednotna orientacija medija*, Revija SRP 3/4, 1994).

¹³ *Intervju: Ciril Gale z Borutom Shukljatom, Na vojno smo bili pripravljenev*, Revija SRP 7/8, 1995).

¹⁴ *Politika, pravica, vest / Ob Petanovi dramatici/*, Taras Kermauner, Revija SRP 7/8, 1995).

¹⁵ *Svoboda slovenskega radia in televizije na Ustavnem sodišču Slovenije, Ob »nepotrditvi« Zbarka Petana in razveljavitvi zakonske podlage zanj; Odločba Ustavnega sodišča v »zadevi Petan«; Odklonilno ločeno mnenje sodnika – Materzba Krivica*, SRP 7/8, 1995).

¹⁶ *Personalna legitimiteta medija v sistemu, Primer gen. dir. RTV/S Zbarka Petana na vrhovnem in ustavnem sodišču in institucionalne vrednote medija v legitimiteti sistema in Poseben propagandni dodatek – O neposrednih dejstvih zvesti*, Revija SRP 7/8, 1995).

¹⁷ (See: *Tulechi dervish, Reorganizacija Radiotelevizije Slovenija in usoda Revije SRP*, Peter Bozhich, Revija SRP 7/8, 1995).

¹⁸ (See: *Chetrti premislek: Moch sama po sebi, Demokracija mochi – Slovenske volitve 1992*, Revija SRP 1/2, 1993).

- ¹⁹ *Igre sistema, Spoved sistemu, O sistemu v luči sistemske teorije in malo drugache, Traktat o svobodi ali Vrednotni sistem*, knjiga, Založba LUMI, 1992, Ljubljana; in *Igre sistema (komentar)*, Revija SRP 5/6, 1995; *Igre sistema*, Revija SRP 9/10, 1995)
- ²⁰ *Proces, Predlog za obnovo in revizijo procesa, Delovnemu in socialnemu sodišču in Vrhovnemu sodišču* R.S. Janez Premk, Revija SRP 9/10, 1995
- ²¹ *Poti in stranpoti SSD – (samoupravne socialistične družbe), Problemi v ustvarjanju TV nadaljevanke na instituciji RTVL in umetniške, smeri SSR – (samoupravnega socializma) v Jugoslaviji iz konca 70 let*, Revija SRP 9/10, 1995, (*Poti in stranpoti II, Analiza odmevnosti na nadaljevanke Poti in stranpoti*, Bilten SSHP 31, 1979, Ljubljana; *Poti in stranpoti, Izstopajoča staljšča o nadaljevanke kot indikator družbenih protislovij ali družbenih problemov z vidika komunikacijskega procesa*, članek, revija: Bilten SSHP, sht. 1,2, 1979, Ljubljana; *Kvalitativna analiza vsebine kritičnih zapiskov in mnenj o nadaljevanke »Poti in stranpoti« v slovenskem tisku*, članek, revija: Bilten SSHP, sht. 3, 1979, Ljubljana)
- ²² *RTV med krizo in vzponom, O prihodnosti slovenske televizije*, Lev Detela, Revija SRP 5/6, 1994)
- ²³ *Z/a/ meshane oblike sodobnih televizijskih strategij ali Od objektivne informacije do absolutnega srečelova*, Lev Detela, Revija SRP 7/8, 1995)
- ²⁴ *Samozaslepljeni, zlomljeni heroji*, Iz cikla *Od bratovstva k bratomoru II / Ob Mrakovi dramatikii /*, Taras Kermauner, Revija SRP 9/10, 1995)
- ²⁵ (Glej: Breda Luthar, *Svetovanje slovenski TV, Channel 4 je nekaj drugega, Delo, Sobotna priloga, 14. maj 1994*)
- ²⁶ *Vsebinska izhodišča za programe dela služb raziskovanja programov in občinstva* so nastala v radijski raziskovalni enoti, nepodpisana, iz opombe razvidno, da so bila poslana dir. RA programov Andreju Rotu od gospe Vide Shrot, vodje radijske raziskovalne enote (evidentno pa so vsebovana tudi v gradivu za razpravo o raziskovanju na Svetu RTVS *Služba za raziskavo programov Osnovne smernice za delo službe*)²⁷.
- ²⁷ Naslov dokumenta je *Služba za raziskavo programov* (podnaslovi: *Osnovne smernice za delo službe, Organizacija služb in vmesbenost v organigram RTVS, Objektivnost in neodvisnost služb za raziskovanje, Dostopnost raziskav, Teze za razpravo o raziskovanju programov RTVS*). Dokument sta podpisala direktorja programov TVS (radijskih in televizijskih) Andrej Rot in Janez Lombergar in je tako postal uradno izhodišče za razpravo o raziskovanju na Svetu RTVS (29.6.1995, 10. redna seja).
- Zaključna opomba: Nismo se torej razumeli, govorimo vsak svoj jezik, če pa bi se tisti, ki odločajo o mediju v sistemu in v mediju samem le malo potrudili, bi lahko nashli v raziskavah o mediju in še posebej v *Reviji SRP* kakšno misel o neizogibni usodi medija, ki jo sami soustvarjajo, ne da bi to vedno vedeli, med njimi tudi kako tako, ki jim sploh ne pride na misel. Nekaj o tem je v posebej za to shtevilko izbranem prispevku za rubriko: *Iz zgodovinskega spomina, Medij noče vedeti (Propad mastodontka ali le kriza nacionalnega medija)*.

[Endofazija I, II, III, objavljeno v: Revija SRP 11/12, 1995; 29/30, 1999; 109/110, 2012; el. knjiga: Rajko Shustarshich, ENDOFAZIJA, Pogum Revije SRP 2012/3; http://www.revijasrp.si/knevsvrp/pogum2012-3/endo_40.htm v angl.: Endophasia II, Lives Journal 7, 2013; Endophasia III, Lives Journal 8, 2014]

¹⁹ *Igre sistema, Spoved sistemu, O sistemu v luči sistemske teorije in malo drugache, Traktat o svobodi ali Vrednotni sistem*, knjiga, Založba LUMI, 1992, Ljubljana; and *Igre sistema (komentar)*, *Revija SRP* 5/6, 1995; *Igre sistema*, *Revija Srp* 9/10, 1995).

²⁰ *Proces, Predlog za obnovo in revizijo procesa, Delovnemu in socialnemu sodišču in Vrhovnemu sodišču* R.S, Janez Premk, *Revija SRP* 9/10, 1995

²¹ *Poti in stranpoti SSD – (samoupravne socialistične družbe), Problemi in ustvarjanju TV nadaljevanke na instituciji RTVL in umetniške, smeri SSR – (samoupravnega socializma) v Jugoslaviji iz konca 70 let*, *Revija SRP* 9/10, 1995, (*Poti in stranpoti II, Analiza odmevnosti na nadaljevanke Poti in stranpoti*, *Bilten SSHP* 31, 1979, Ljubljana; *Poti in stranpoti, Izstopajoča stalishča o nadaljevanke kot indikator družbenih protislovij ali družbenih problemov z vidika komunikacijskega procesa*, članek, revija: *Bilten SSHP*, nos. 1, 2, 1979, Ljubljana; *Kvalitativna analiza vsebine kritičnih zapisov in mnenj o nadaljevanke »Poti in stranpoti«* v slovenskem tisku, članek, revija: *Bilten SSHP*, sbt. 3, 1979, Ljubljana).

²² *RTV med krizo in vzponom, O prihodnosti slovenske televizije*, Lev Detela, *Revija SRP* 5/6, 1994).

²³ *Z/a/ mešane oblike sodobnih televizijskih strategij ali Od objektivne informacije do absolutnega srečelova*, Lev Detela, *Revija SRP* 7/8, 1995).

²⁴ *Samozaslepljeni, zlomljeni heroji*, From the cycle: *Od bratorstva k bratomoru II /Ob Mrakovi dramatik/*, Taras Kermauner, *Revija SRP* 9/10, 1995).

²⁵ (See: Breda Luthar, *Svetovanje slovenski TV, Channel 4 je nekaj drugega, Delo, Sobotna priloga, 14. maj 1994*)

²⁶ *Vsebinska izhodišča za programe dela služb raziskovanja programov in občinstva* were created at the Radio's research unit, unsigned, from the note it is clear they were sent to the dir. of RA programmes Andrej Rot by Mrs Vida Shrot, the chief of the Radio's research unit (evidently they are also included in the materials for the treatise on the research at the RTVS Council *Služba za raziskavo programov Osnovne smernice za delo službe*).²⁷

²⁷ The document's title is *Služba za raziskavo programov* (subtitles: *Osnovne smernice za delo službe, Organizacija služb in vmesbenost v organizirani RTVS, Objektivnost in neodvisnost služb za raziskovanje, Dostopnost raziskav, Teze za razpravo o raziskovanju programov RTVS*). The document was signed by TVS directors of (Radio and Television) programmes Andrej Rot and Janez Lombergar, making it the official starting point for RTVS Council's discussion (29. Jun1995, 10th regular session).

Concluding remark: We failed to understand each other, speaking different languages, but if the system's decision-makers about the medium would make even the slightest effort they could find in the research about the medium and particularly in *Revija SRP* a thought or two about the medium's inevitable fate, which they co-create, not always consciously; a few of these thoughts perhaps never occur to them. There is more about this in the contribution selected specifically for this issue for the section: *Iz zgodovinskega spomina, Medij noče vedeti (Propad mastodontka ali le kriza nacionalnega medija)*.

[Endofazija I, II, III, published in: *Revija SRP* 11/12, 1995; 29/30, 1999; 109/110, 2012;

e-book: Rajko Shustarshich, ENDOFAZIJA, Pogum Revije SRP 2012/3;

http://www.revijasrp.si/knrevsrp/pogum2012-3/endo_40.htm

Eng.: Endophasia II, *Lives Journal* 7, 2013; Endophasia III, *Lives Journal* 8, 2014]

Translated from Slovenian by Jaka Jarc

Damir Globochnik

HARMONICHNA LIKOVNA UBRANOST

Peter Abram je ustvarjalne vzgibe za oblikovanje skulptur, slik in del na papirju tesno prepletel z zhivljenjskim utripom, z notranjim ritmom, z razgrinjanjem osebnih izkustev in dozhivljanja vsakdanje resničnosti. Risanje ali slikanje je vselej intimno odslikavanje motiva in svojevrstna pot navznoter. Likovni proces je tesno povezan z odkrivanjem notranjih impulzov in z iskanjem ravnovesja. Abramove risbe, grafike, slike in kamnite skulpture so nastale kot umetnikov intimni dialog s samim sabo. Omenjeni vsebinski poudarki so pomembnejši od ekspanzivne, s sodobnim medijskim trenutkom uglaslene likovne realizacije, zato Peter Abram praviloma posega po tradicionalnih načinih likovnega izražanja, njegove razstave pa so vselej skrbno načrtovane.

Tovrstni način likovnega izpovedovanja je mogoč samo z uporabo zgoščene likovne govornice. Pri risbah je to izrazna črta, pri akvarelu subtilna poteza chopicha, ki zachrta konture in sledi bistvenim značilnostim motiva. Risba s svinčnikom je praviloma rahla. Z njo Peter Abram zajame temeljne oblike motiva, oblike telesa pa lahko ponazori na primer tudi s koprenastim skupkom črt. Podoben pristop srečamo pri akvarelih. Podobnost z motivom je ohranjena, vendar so nezhne, presojne barve in povzemajoče poteze chopicha, ki nikoli ne zasedejo vechine slikovne površine, povezane v novo, harmonično celoto. Na prvi pogled preprosta slikarska gesta ali zaris s svinčnikom sta rezultat velike koncentracije in zapletenega ustvarjalnega sistema, pri katerem ni možno popushchanje bližnjicam. Zato se Peter Abram k nekaterim motivom vracha tudi v daljšem časovnem obdobju. Namesto o kronološkem zaporedju oziroma o nizanju motivov v časovnem redu bi lahko govorili o razvojni kontinuiteti Abramovega ikonografskega univerzuma, ki kljub različnim likovnim postopkom tvori nelochljivo celoto.

Ustvarjalni postopek, ki ga je izbral Peter Abram, je seveda težko ubesediti. Morda bi lahko dejali, da obliko, ki jo vidi chloveshko oko, umetnik zaznava intuitivno in jo ponotranji – na podlagi vtisa se rodi chustvo, nezavedna misel, ki vodi roko in sooblikuje ustvarjalni proces. Likovnik na ta način vselej zajema iz lastne izkushnje, ki se je zgostila in odrazila ali morda kar utelesila v likovnem delu.

Ustvarjalni utrip je vselej povezan z avtorjevo zhivljenjsko ubranostjo in s kontemplativnim pristopom. V enaki meri kot belezhenje formalnih značilnosti motivov, ki je značilno za studiozno akademsko risanje, od katerega se je Peter Abram zavestno odmaknil, so pomembni avtorjevi mentalni procesi na zavedni in nezavedni ravni

Damir Globochnik

A DESIRE FOR HARMONIOUS ORDER

Peter Abram's creative pulse in making sculptures, pictures and works on paper stems from his pulse of life and inner rhythms by disclosing his personal experience and his take on day-to-day reality. Drawing or painting is always an intimate act of illustration and a peculiar inward journey. Visual expression is strictly related to the discovery of inner motives and a search for balance. Abram's drawings, paintings and stone sculptures are born out of the artist's intimate dialogue with himself. Emphasising content is far more important than creating expansive visual works that are in tune with the ever expansive media moments and therefore Peter Abram prefers resorting to traditional visual expression with carefully planned exhibitions.

Visual expression of this kind can only be created by using a dense visual language. In drawings, force shows in expressive lines, in watercolour by subtle brush strokes tracing the contours and following the subject's defining traits. Pencil strokes are usually delicate and Peter Abram uses them to catch the subject's main shapes, while body forms can, for example, be created by a fine web of lines. His approach to watercolour is not much dissimilar. Although preserving the features of the subject, tender, translucent colours and summary traits of the brush not covering the entire surface contribute to conjuring up a new and harmonious piece. A seemingly simple trait of brush or pencil is a result of a considerable amount of concentration and a complex creation method allowing no shortcuts. It is exactly for this reason that Peter Abram is often returning to some subjects over longer periods of time. Instead of chronological order or a sequence of subjects on a straightforward time line, we can talk about a developing continuum of Abram's iconographic universe, which forms a consistent unity in spite of the wide range of methods he uses.

The creative procedure chosen by Peter Abram is rather difficult to be put to words. We could say that the form, as seen by the human eye, is intuitively perceived and internalised by the artist and the consequent impression generates a feeling or a subconscious thought that leads the artist's hand and contributes to the process of creation. Thus, the artist always draws from his intimate experience, which is condensed and expressed or even embodied in the piece of art.

The creative pulse is always linked to the artist's way of living and his contemplative approach. Peter Abram has firmly decided to abandon the academic approach of recording the formal features of subjects and is focusing on his own conscious and subconscious mental processes.

Avtorjeva izkushnja se lahko prenasha tudi na dojemljive gledalce, ki v Abramovih delih – seveda v skladu z lastno zhivljenjsko ubranostjo – lahko intuitivno zachutijo poetichnost, pomirjujocho noto, likovno in sporočilno nevsiljivost, bistveno simboliko ali mozhnost meditacije.

Tudi vedute, figuralni in drugi motivi, naslikani v oljni tehniki na platnu, niso mimetichni posnetki ali približhki videnega. Prej bi lahko govorili o motivih kot ogledalih notranjih občutih in odrazih avtorjeve težnje po harmonični ubranosti. Pri slikarstvu ga je posebej pritegnilo razmerje med motivom, likovnim poljem in svetlobo. Z izjemno barvno občutljivostjo, s pretehtano gradnjo barvnih razmerij, z nekaj temeljnimi, skrbno izbranimi in položhenimi potezami chopicha na površino belega ali rahlo obarvanega platna slika motive, za katere ne vemo, ali so prevzeti iz zunanje resnichnosti ali so plod avtorjevih domishljjskih predstav. Bolj kot narativna shirina motivov ali njihova spretna stilizacija in estetizacija avtorja zanima emocionalni naboj motivov. Zdi se, da komajda so se motivi izoblikovali iz barvnih madezhev, zhe zachenjajo izginjati v intenzivni svetlobi. Svetloba, ki razkroji materialni temelj motiva, je uporabljena v metaforicnem smislu.

Pri izdelavi grafik je Peter Abram posegel po dveh na prvi pogled malone nasprotnih tehnicnih postopkih – po lesorezu in rachunalnishi grafiki. Postopek je samo pripomoček, potreben za oblikovanje tankochutnih, ponotranjenih oblik in drobnih likovnih simbolov, ki jih umetnik lahko uporabi tudi pri likovni opremi knjig. Pri lesorezu ob odtiskovanju barve z lesene matirce uporablja tudi reliefni tisk. Motivi so vselej položheni v sredishche lista. Grafike so praviloma odtisnjene v majhnih nakladah.

Peter Abram, ki je dokazal mojstrsko obvladovanje zakonitosti razlicnih nachinov slikarskega izraza, se enako intenzivno in poglobljeno posvecha kiparstvu, ki se temeljito razlikuje od hipnega risarskega zapisa, odtiskovanja grafik ali slikanja kompozicij, sestavljenih iz bistvenih, tankochutnih potez. Za izdelavo kipov iz marmorja ali brashkega kamna je potrebno veshche in dolgotrajno rochno delo (klesanje, brushenje, poliranje), ki lahko zaradi te lastnosti dobi tudi meditativen znachaj. Vendar je med Abramovim slikarstvom, risbo in kiparstvom vech povezav, kot bi se morda na prvi pogled zdelo. Tudi pri kiparstvu je prisotna težnja po iskanju duhovnih vsebin v likovnosti, tj. vsega, kar presega fizichno pojavnost. Eden od umetnikovih namenov je: vdahniti kamnu zhivljenje, sporočilnost, ki presega njegovo materialnost. Na težnjo po likovni sublimaciji nas opozarja skrbna obdelava kiperske povrshine, ki pa she vedno ostaja sestavni del rustikalnega, na prvi pogled neobdelanega kosa »kamna«.

Videz kamnitih skulptur je preprost, prvinski. Ravnotezhje med na prvi pogled neokrnjenim, grobo obklesanim naravnim kamnom in skrbno izklesanim motivom ni vezano samo na golo chloveshko figuro. Na ohranjeni stik z naravo kot izvorom navdiha nas opozarjajo stilizirane rastline. Na kipih intimnega formata zasledimo tudi imaginarna znamenja, magichne znake, simbole, ideograme.

The author's experience can therefore be conveyed to sensitive viewers, who are able to intuitively feel the poetic and soothing notes in his works of art, their non-invasive communicative force, their substantive symbolic value combined with an invitation to meditate.

His vedutas, figures and other subjects painted with oil on canvas are not faithful or approximations to what is usually seen. His subjects are better compared to mirrors of his internal feelings and expressions of the author's desire for harmonious order. What particularly seems to attract the artist is the relation between the subject, the visual space and light. His extraordinary sense of colour, the carefully built colour relations and the few selectively chosen and thoughtfully applied brush strokes on the white or delicately coloured foundation sets the subject in a way that it is hard for us to decide whether they have been taken from the external reality or the author's imagination. The artist is more interested in the emotional charge of the subject than in their narrative width or his own ability to depict them. The subjects seem to fade in intense light as soon as they take shape out of the primordial stains of colour. The light, which apparently disintegrates the material foundations of the subject, is used in a metaphoric way.

In his graphics, Peter Abram is resorting to two technical approaches that seem to contradict each other at first sight – woodcut and computer graphics. The technical procedure, however, is only a tool used for creating delicate and intimate shapes, small visual symbols, which the artist may also use for decorating books. In addition to printing colour pictures using a wood block, he also relies to embossing. The subjects are always placed in the centre of the sheet. His graphics are usually printed in limited edition.

Peter Abram, who has proven to master the laws of a range of graphical techniques, has been equally spending efforts to sculpting, which is substantially different from the momentary actions of drawing, printing and painting of compositions made up of a few essential and delicate strokes. Carving sculptures from marble or stone from the Island of Brach requires skilled and continuous work (carving, grinding and polishing) which, as an activity, can become meditative in itself. Abram's painting and drawing, however, are much more connected to his sculpting as it may appear. His sculpting also bears his quest for spirituality in arts, a search for everything that transcends mere physical appearance. One of the artist's purposes is to inspire life and meaning to a piece of stone and thus go beyond its material nature. Visual sublimation can be sensed in the careful elaboration of the sculptures' surface, which nevertheless remains a constitutive part of the rustic and seemingly raw piece of stone.

His stone sculptures appear simple and primordial. The balance between the seemingly untouched, roughly carved natural stone and the carefully engraved subject is not strictly related to nude human figures. Stylised plants also remind us of his oneness with nature as a source of inspiration. There are imaginary signs, magic symbols and ideograms to be discovered on his smallish sculptures.

Te plastike bi lahko oznachili za nadčasovne arhetipe. Nekateri kipi nas spominjajo na podobe predklasičnih božanstev, na arhaične toteme, ki so se po nekem naključju fragmentarno ohranili do našega časa. Vedeti moramo, da se umetnik pogloblja tudi v duhovnost in religijo. Simbolika kiparskih del uchinuje univerzalno, a je najbrž pogojena z duhovnim in materialnim izročilom Krasa. Z izborom kamna kot likovnega gradiva in z nekaterimi abstraktnimi motivi se je Peter Abram sposhljivo poklonil tudi krashki tradiciji oblikovanja kamnoseshkih in drugih izdelkov ter nasploh krashki skromnosti, preprostosti in zhlavosti. Čeprav gre za dela manjšega formata, zaradi motivike in njene interpretacije kipi Petra Abrama praviloma uchinujejo monumentalno.

Likovni opus Petra Abrama je po formalni plati raznolik, po vsebinski plati pa iskren in avtentičen. Likovnik je vselej ostal zvest samemu sebi, saj njegova likovna dela v polni meri odražajo avtorjevo percepcijo sveta, odnos do sveta in bivanja. Nikoli ni podlegel namigom o konjunktornosti aktualnejših oziroma agresivnejših in medijsko prepoznavnejših likovnih praks in procesov sodobne umetnosti, ki dopushchajo zunajumetnostne uchinke. V vech kot treh desetletjih kontinuiranega ustvarjalnega dela smo lahko bili priche premishljenemu likovnemu razvoju, ki je kljub različním vsebinskim in interpretativním poudarkom ohranil intimen značaj.

They might be called trans-chronological archetypes. Some of the sculptures remind us of pre-classical images of gods, archaic totems that have been preserved--by chance and in fragments--up until our times. We have to know that the artist is very interested in spirituality and religion. The symbolic appeal of his sculptures may be universal, but most probably conditioned by the spiritual and material heritage of the Karst. Choosing stone as a material for his artwork, alongside with a few abstract subjects, Peter Abram has rendered an artistic homage to the Karst stonecarving tradition and to the traditional modesty, simplicity and sturdiness of the locals. In spite of their modest size, Peter Abram's sculptures usually appear monumental works, probably due to the subjects and the interpretation given to them.

The visual works of Peter Abram may be varied from a formal point of view, but they are substantively sincere and authentic. The artist has always wanted to remain true to himself and his works fully exude the author's perception of the world, as well as his approach to the universe and to existence in general. He did not allow himself to be lured away by more topical or more aggressive visual practices and processes of modern art that might enjoy the limelight from time to time and generate effects beyond art itself. In his more than three decades of continuous creative endeavours, we have had the privilege of witnessing a well-pondered artistic development, which managed to maintain a sense of intimacy in spite of a variety of substantive accents.

Translated from Slovenian by: Peter Szabo, Helena Biffio, Neville Hall

Peter Abram

LIKOVNA DELA / REPRODUKCIJE/

1. Cvet, kamen, 11 x 44 x 44 cm
2. Prehajanja, kamen, 59 x 18 x 9 cm
3. Jaldaboath, kamen, 67 x 28 x 16 cm
4. Brez naslova, kamen, 25 x 17 x 11 cm
5. Brez naslova, kamen, 33 x 25 x 15 cm
6. Vrata, lesorez, papir, 25 x 17 cm
7. Tihozhitje, lesorez, papir, 25 x 35 cm
8. Jutro, lesorez, papir, 25 x 35 cm
- Naslovnica
- 9 Krona, kamen, 20 x 24,5 x 6,5 cm

Fotografije: Fotoatelje Pavshich Zavadlav

PETER ABRAM

Slikar, kipar, ilustrator in likovni pedagog. Rojen je bil leta 1956 v Kobjeglavi. Sholal se je na Akademiji lepih umetnosti v Benetkah in nadaljeval podiplomski študij na ljubljanski likovni akademiji. Za njim je prek 50 samostojnih in 40 skupinskih razstav ter zbirka likovno opremljenih knjig, med katerimi je najbolj znana vechkrat ponatisnjena uspešnica pisatelja Jeana Gionoja *Mozh, ki je sadil drevesa*, ki jo je Peter Abram opremil z barvnimi lesorezi. V motiviki iz narave ostaja najbolj zvest Krasu, v simbolih in portretih pa starodavnim izročilom. Izraziti tisto, kar je brezčasno in brezkraino, je izziv v vseh letih njegovega ustvarjanja. Svoje likovno podrochje pogloblja z raziskovanjem izvornih vzgibov, iz katerih nastajajo oblike pojavnega sveta, na chemer temeljijo tudi nachela geometrije, starodavnih arhitekturnih znanj in odnosa do okolja, soodvisnosti med chlovekom in stvarstvom.

Zhivi in ustvarja v vasici Pedrovo nad Branikom.

www.peterabram.si

















Peter Abram

ARTWORKS

1. The Flower, stone, 11 x 44 x 44 cm
 2. Passages, stone, 59 x 18 x 9 cm
 3. Jaldaboath, stone, 67 x 28 x 16 cm
 4. Untitled, stone, 25 x 17 x 11 cm
 5. Untitled, stone, 33 x 25 x 15 cm
 6. Doors, colour woodcut, paper, 25 x 17 cm
 7. Still Life, colour woodcut, paper, 25 x 35 cm
 8. Morning, colour woodcut, paper, 25 x 35 cm
- Na naslovnici:

Cover:

- 9 The Crown, stone, 20 x 24,5 x 6,5 cm

Photos: Fotoateljé Pavshich Zavadlav

PETER ABRAM

Painter, sculptor, illustrator and art teacher. Peter Abram (born in 1956, Kobjeglava) studied at the Accademia di Belle Arti in Venice and continued his post-graduate education at the Academy of Fine Arts and Design in Ljubljana. He holds over 50 individual and 40 collective exhibitions on record, alongside a series of book illustrations, including the famous and continuously re-printed Jean Giono's *The Man Who Planted Trees*, which Peter Abram embellished with colour woodcuts. In depicting nature, he remains committed to his native Karst in symbols, portraits and heirloom. His main challenge along all the years of creation continues to be to express everything that is timeless and beyond all boundaries. Peter Abram continues to deepen his sense of creative arts by exploring the primordial forces that are creating the forms of the manifest and dictating the principles of geometry, ancient architecture and man's approach to nature, as well as the intertwined faith of man and creation.

Damir Globochnik

PARISHKI FOTOGRAF VENO PILON

Veno Pilon (1896–1970) velja za sooblikovalca slovenskega likovnega modernizma, za enega osrednjih predstavnikov ekspresionističnega slikarstva in grafike v dvajsetih letih 20. stoletja. Pilonova galerija v Ajdovshchini hrani umetnikovo zapuščino, med katero je tudi večje shtevilo fotografij, ki dalj časa niso naletele na večjo pozornost umetnostnozgodovinske stroke, čeprav je ta zhe nachenjala vprasanje povezave med Pilonovim slikarstvom in fotografijo. Kot fotografa je Pilona prvich celoviteje predstavila razstava *150 let fotografije na Slovenskem 1919–1945* (II. del, 1990). Leta 1992 je Pilonova galerija v Ajdovshchini pripravila razstavo umetnikovih fotografij in izdala monografijo *Parishki fotograf Veno Pilon* (besedilo Stane Bernik). Na mednarodni razstavi *Evropa, Evropa (Das Jahrhundert der Avantgarde in Mittel- und Osteuropa, Kunst- und Ausstelunshalle der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Bonn, 1994)* je cheshki poznavalec fotografije Antonin Dufek predstavil Pilona kot modernističnega fotografa. Ob retrospektivni razstavi Vena Pilona v Moderni galeriji v Ljubljani leta 2001, ki je zajela tudi izbor fotografij, je umetnikov sin Dominique Pilon podaril galeriji večje shtevilo fotografskih negativov. Nekaj Pilonovih fotografij se je ohranilo pri sorodnikih in znancih.

Pilonova fotografija je za domovino vedno pomenila dokajshnjo neznanko. Ker je nastajala v drugachnem kulturnem miljeju, se ni navezovala na prevladujocho piktorialistično in lirichno usmeritev ali na primere socialne angazhiranosti medvojne domache, »umetnishke« fotografije. Zato je avtor razstave in shtudijske obdelave v katalogu ajdovske razstave dr. Stane Bernik zhelel tako zagotoviti Pilonu relevantno mesto v okvirih sodobne slovenske fotografije kot tudi opozoriti na njegov prispevek v okvirih sochasnih fotografskih dogajanj v Parizu, kjer velja iskati Pilonove vzornike.

Veno Pilon je slikarstvo shtudiral v Pragi (1919) in Firencah (1920–1921). Na Dunaju je obiskoval grafichno sholo in se izpopolnjeval v večernem shtudiju akta. Kot prvi slovenski umetnik se je leta 1924 udelezhil Beneshkega bienala. Jedro njegovega slikarskega opusa (portreti, vedute) je nastalo v kratkem chasovnem obdobju na zacetku dvajsetih let. V tem chasu se je zachel ukvarjati s fotografijo. Na zacetku dvajsetih let je kupil, najbrzh v Trstu, svoj prvi fotografski aparat – Zeissov Reflex, zhe pred tem pa je poskusil snemati z amatersko filmsko kamero Pathé-Baby za ozki film. Okrog leta 1926 je fotografiral za neuresnicheni krajevni album Primorske. Fotografije imajo dokumentaren znachaj.

Damir Globochnik

PARISIAN PHOTOGRAPHER VENO PILON

Veno Pilon (1896-1970) is deemed a co-creator of Slovenian modernism and one of the main representatives of expressionist painting and graphic arts of the 1920s. Pilon Gallery in Ajdovshchina stores the artist's inheritance, which includes a sizeable collection of photographs. These have long remained overlooked by art historians, even after they began examining possible links between Pilon's painting and his photography. *150 let fotografije na Slovenskem [150 Years of Slovenian Photography] 1919-1945 (Part II, 1990)* was the first more comprehensive exhibition of Pilon's photography. In 1992, Pilon's Gallery in Ajdovshchina put on an exhibition of the artist's photographs and published the monograph *Pariski fotograf Veno Pilon [Parisian Photographer Veno Pilon]* (Written by Stane Bernik). At the international exhibition *Evropa, Evropa (Das Jahrhundert der Avantgarde in Mittel- und Osteuropa, Kunst- und Ausstellungenhalle der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Bonn, 1994)* Czech photography aficionado Antonin Dufek described Pilon as a modernist photographer. At the occasion of Veno Pilon's retrospective at Ljubljana's Modern Gallery in 2001, which also included a selection of photographs, the artist's son Dominique Pilon gifted the Gallery several photographic negatives. A few Pilon's photographs were preserved by his relatives and acquaintances.

Pilon's photography has always been somewhat unknown in his native land. Created in a different cultural milieu, it was untethered to the prevailing pictorialist and lyrical directions or examples of social engagement typical of the local "artistic" photography between the World Wars. This is why dr. Stane Bernik, the author of the exhibition and accompanying academic analysis in the Ajdovshchina's exhibition catalogue, wished to ensure Pilon's place in the frame of modern Slovenian photography as well as draw attention to his contribution in the context of contemporaneous photographic happening in Paris, where Pilon's role models are to be sought.

Veno Pilon studied photography in Prague (1919) and Florence (1920-1921). He frequented the school of graphic arts in Vienna perfecting his skill in night nudes. In 1924, he was the first Slovenian artist to take part in the Venice Biennial. The core of his painting opus (portraits, vedute) was created in a short time span in the early 1920s. He started practicing photography at the same time. He probably purchased his first camera in the 1920s – it was aReflex by Zeiss; he previously attempted filming with the Pathé-Baby amateur narrow-film camera. Around 1926 he took photographs for a never-realized album of Littoral Settlements; these are of a documentary nature.

V letih 1926 in 1928 je študijsko potoval v Pariz, kjer se je za stalno naselil na zacetku tridesetih let. Po neuspehlih trgovinskih in poslovnih podvigih si je fotografijo izbral za vir zaslužka in na Montparnassu odprl svoj atelje. Fotografiral je umetnisha dela za objave, izdeloval fotografske portrete, ukvarjal se je tudi z uporabno in propagandno fotografijo. Uporabljal je fotografski aparat Rolleifleks.

Fotografije naj bi predstavil samo na dveh razstavah v Parizu, ki je med vojnama veljal za eno od svetovnih fotografskih sredishch. Zdi se, da je vsaj v zacetku zhelel ohraniti stike s fotografskim dogajanjem v domovini. Tako je leta 1932 sodeloval na I. jugoslovanski umetnishi razstavi v Ljubljani. Kritiki *Jutra* je tedaj zapisal: »Nasbega odličnega slikarja Veno Pilona spoznavamo na razstavi kot prvovrstnega fotografa – portretista. Ne pazi sicer dosti na chistoto tehnike, zato je pa v karakteristiki in slikovitosti neprekosljiv. Njegovi fotografirani portreti, zlasti portret igralka Vike Podgorske in renesančni 'Montparnasse' so dela velikega slikarja, ki je pa topot uporabil namesto chopicha kamero. Prava umetnost ima svojo ceno ne glede na tehniko in material.«¹ Pilonove fotografije so bile istega leta na ogled tudi na fotografski razstavi v Mariboru. V reviji *Ilustracija* je bil leta 1931 objavljen Pilonov portret violinista Karla Rupla (*Ilustracija*, 1931, sht. 19, str. 301).

Pilon kot »umetnishi« fotograf v Parizu ni dosegel vechjih javnih uspehov, za kar sta bila najbrzh kriva pretirana skromnost in pomanjkanje samozavesti, ki sta mnogo prezgodaj verjetno zakljuchila tudi Pilonovo slikarsko ustvarjanje. Vendar mu priznanj prijateljev iz pariskih umetniskih krogov ni manjkalo. Vrsta portretnih fotografij znanih osebnosti (Olga de Bozanska, Girogio de Chirico, Leonor Fini, André Lhote, Filippo de Pisis, Ossip Zadkine) pricha, da si je znal pridobiti zaupanje narochnikov. Slikar in teoretik André Lothe je dal Pilonu priporochilo za Picassa in druge umetnike, a si Pilon »ni upal potrkati pri njih«. Nadrealistichni pesnik Paul Eluard pa je na razstavi v pariski galeriji Carrefour ob Pilonovi fotografiji pritrdil svojo dolgo pesnitev.²

V Franciji si je Pilon na fotografskem podrochju pridobil vsaj she eno zaslugo, saj je v pariski reviji *Verve* predstavil enega izmed pionirjev francoske fotografije, lastnega tasta, lekarnarja Louisa Guicharda.

Tudi jedro Pilonovega kreativnega fotografskega delovanja je vezano na kratko chasovno obdobje (1930–1935). Ohranjene fotografije prichajo o ustvarjalcu, ki je zhivel s fotografijo in od fotografije. Vechina Pilonovih po narochilu izdelanih fotografij je najbrzh izgubljena. Ohranjen je referenchni album z naslovom *Vzroci – Industrijske profesionalne fotografije*, ki vsebuje izbor vzorchnih fotografij (reprodukcije likovnih del, posnetki arhitektur, interjerjev, izdelkov, nakita, portretna in reportazhna fotografija, fotomontazhe). V »kreativnem« sklopu Pilonovega fotografskega delovanja prevladujejo fotografije izrazito intimistichnega znachaja: posnetki zhene Anne-Marie in sina Dominiqua (mapa 36 fotografij sina Domija, 1937), utrinki iz vsakdanjega okolja, posnetki prijateljev in znancev, ki nam razkrivajo Pilonov odnos do portretiranih oseb.

In 1926 and 1928 he took educational trips to Paris and then settled there at the start of the 1930s. Following initial failed commercial and business ventures he chose to make a living as a photographer and opened an atelier on Montparnasse. He took artistic photographs for publication, photographic portraits, and practiced practical and advertisement photographs. His camera of choice then was Rolleiflex. He supposedly only presented his photographs at two exhibitions in Paris, a city considered one of the world's centres of photography between the World Wars. At least initially, he seems to have wanted to maintain a connection with photographic activities in his native land; in 1932, he collaborated at the 1st Yugoslav art exhibition in Ljubljana. At the time, a critic at the *Jutro* journal wrote "Our excellent painter Veno Pilon is presented at the exhibition as a first rate portrait photographer. His technique is not pure, but he is peerless in character and picturesqueness. His portrait photographs, particularly the portrait of actress Vika Podgorska and his renaissance 'Montparnasse' are works of a great painter that chose this time to use a camera in place of a brush. True art is valuable irrelevant of technique or material."¹ The same year, Pilon's photographs were also exhibited in Maribor. In 1931, the *Ilustracija* journal published Pilon's portrait of Violinist Karl Rupel. (*Ilustracija*, 1931, no. 19, p. 301).

Pilon never achieves great public acclaim in Paris as an "art" photographer, which was probably due to his excessive modesty and lacking confidence; these were also the cause of the early end of his painting creativity. Still, there was no shortage of recognition on the part his friends from Parisian artistic circles. He was able to attain the trust of his clients, as is attested by a number portrait photographs he took of famous people (Olga de Bozanska, Girogio de Chirico, Leonor Fini, André Lhote, Filippo de Pisis, Ossip Zadkine). The painter and theoretician André Lothe gave Pilon a recommendation for Picasso and other artists, but Pilon "never dared knock on their doors". The surrealist poet Paul Eluard appended his lengthy poem next to Pilon's photograph in the Parisian Carrefour Gallery.²

Pilon gained at least one more photography-related credit in France, namely he presented one of the pioneers of French photography, his father in law, apothecary Louis Guichard in the Parisian *Verve* magazine.

The core of Pilon's creative photography activities was also the fruit of a relatively short time period (1930-1935). Judging by the preserved photographs he was the kind of creator who lived with and from his photography. Most of Pilon's custom ordered photographs are probably lost. A reference-album entitled *Vzorci – Industrijske profesionalne fotografije* [Exemplars – Professional Industrial Photographs], which contains a selection of photographic exemplars (reproductions of paintings, photographs of architecture, interiors, products, jewellery, portrait and news photography, photo-montages) is preserved. The creative portion of Pilon's photography is dominated by photographs of a distinctly intimist nature: pictures of his wife Anna-Marie and son Dominique (a folder with 36 pictures of son Domi, 1937), excerpts from his everyday environment, pictures of friends and acquaintances that reveal Pilon's attitude to the subjects of the portraits.

Tudi na slikarskih kompozicijah je upodabljal samo ljudi, ki so mu bili blizu ali jih je dobro poznal. Da se je Pilonu v Parizu uspelo vključiti v izredno zhivahno fotografsko sceno tridesetih let, pricha tudi vrsta eksperimentalnih fotografij in vech nekonvencionalnih fotografskih posnetkov utripa pariskkega boemskega in umetnishkega zhivljenja. Pri nekaterih fotografijah je mogoche opaziti očitne vplive nadrealizma (tihozhitje z boljshjega sejma v Parizu, tihozhitje s steklenima predmetoma, dve maski). Vrsta fotografij je primerljiva s fotografijami Pilonovih mnogo bolj znanih sodobnikov Brassaiä, Andréa (Andorja) Kertésza, Dore Maar, Mana Raya, Mauricea Tabarda, Rogera Parrya, Henrija Cartier-Bressona idr.

Stane Bernik je postavil domnevo, da naj bi bil »ogrski prijatelj G.« v Pilonovih spominih *Na robu*, kateremu naj bi Pilon »v svoji zacetni dobi dal prvi pouk v fotografiji«, ³ romunski Madzhar Gyula Halász (1899–1984), ki je v javnosti nastopal pod psevdonomim Brassai. Ta je leta 1921 v Berlinu shtudiral kiparstvo; tedaj je to mesto obiskal tudi Pilon, ki je bil leta 1926 v Parizu, kjer se je najbrzh okoli leta 1930 Brassai pod vplivom Kertésza odlochil za fotografijo. ⁴

Pilon se je po drugi svetovni vojni občasno ukvarjal s slikarstvom, grafiko in fotografijo (shtudije izlozhhb v nočni svetlobi na barvnih leica diapozitivih, portreti znancev med obiskom Pariza).

¹ Ante Gaber, »Shetnja po razstavi lepih fotografij«, *Jutro*, 1932, sht. 223.

² Po: Veno Pilon, *Na robu*, Ljubljana, 1965, str. 98–99.

³ Veno Pilon, prav tam, str. 112–113.

⁴ Po: Stane Bernik, *Parishki fotograf Veno Pilon*, Pilonova galerija Ajdovshchina, 1992, str. 41.



Brez naslova, okrog 1930, fotografija na zhelatinsko srebrobromidnem papirju, 30 x 23,4 cm (Pilonova galerija v Ajdovshchini)

His painting compositions also only depict those close to him or those he knew well. Pilon succeeded in entering an extremely lively photography scene of the 1930s; this is evident from numerous experimental photographs and several unconventional photographs of the pulse of Parisian bohemian and artistic life. Some photographs contain evident influences of surrealism (still life from a flea market in Paris, still life with two glass objects, two masks). Many of his photographs can compare to photographs by Pilon's much more famous contemporaries Brassai, André (Andor) Kertész, Dora Maar, Man Ray, Maurice Tabard, Roger Parry, Henri Cartier-Bresson and others.

Stane Bernik stipulated that the "Hungarian friend G." from Pilon's memoirs *Na robu* [*On the Edge*], to whom Pilon supposedly "gave in his early stages the first lesson in photography"³ was the Romanian Hungarian Gyula Halász (1899–1984), who appeared in public under the pseudonym Brassai. In 1921, Brassai studied sculpting in Berlin right at the time when Pilon visited Berlin; in 1926 Pilon was in Paris where Brassai, probably influenced by Kertész, decided for photography.⁴

After World War II, Pilon occasionally practiced painting, graphic arts, and photography (studies of display windows in night illumination on colour leica diapositives, portraits of acquaintances during his visit to Paris).

Translated from Slovenian by Jaka Jarc

¹ Ante Gaber, »Shetnja po razstavi lepih fotografij«, *Jutro*, 1932, no. 223.

² After: Veno Pilon, *Na robu*, Ljubljana, 1965, pp. 98–99.

³ Veno Pilon, *ibid.*, pp. 112–113.

⁴ After: Stane Bernik, *Parishki fotograf Veno Pilon*, Pilonova galerija Ajdovshchina, 1992, p. 41.



Untitled, circa 1930, photograph on gelatin silver bromide paper, 30 x 23,4 cm (Pilonova galerija v Ajdovshchini)

Henrik Tuma

ZEMLJEPISNO-JEZIKOSLOVNI ZAPISI

KRAJEVNO IMENOSLOVJE

(Odlomki)

(...)

Slovenci nimamo narodne zgodovine. Nashe kmetsko in pastirsko ljudstvo je zhivelo samo zase od vekov, revolucijonarna burja l. 1848 ga je shele prichela prebujati. Pred nekaj desetletji se je ljudska masa jela zavedati svoje posebnosti in skupnosti v smeri tvoritve naroda.

Zgodovina je enim potek dogodkov ljudstev, drugim je popisovanje del in zhivljenja velikih mozh, kraljev in junakov. Vsak dogodek znachi premembo, gibanje. Kjer ni preseljavanja in naseljavanja, kjer ni krizhanja plemen z boji, s trenjem in tekmovanjem, kjer ni pod- in nadredja enega plemena nad drugim, tam ni vidnih prememb v zhivljenju ljudstva, ni vidnega gibanja, tam ni vojskovodij in carjev, tam ne more biti zgodovine. In nasprotno, kjer ni bilo gibanja, ni bilo vidnih dogodkov, tam je mirno zhivljenje s prirodo od vekov. Zgodovina krajev, kjer bivajo in so bivali Slovenci, nam pripoveduje o naseljavanju in prihodu Fenichanov, Grkov, Romanov, Ilirov, Keltov, Germanov in Uraloaltajcev (Sarmatov, Hunov, Obrov, Madjarov, Kumanov), o njih pohodih in vladanju, njih vojnih chetah in vojskovodjih. Ne ve pa nichesar o **Slovenih** samih (rabim ime Slovene splošno za vse stare Slovane), tudi ne o malem plemenu Slovencev. Le nekatera imena dopushchajo domnevo, da so bili Sloveni razshirjeni kot mirno pleme po celi Evropi od Venetov ob Baltishkem morju do Venetov ob Atlantskem oceanu, od Venetov ob Adriji pa do Venetov ob Chrnem morju. Slovenci smo od nekdej sosedje jadranskih Venetov. Zgodovina koroshkega knezhtva, Kocelinove Muzhske grofovine (Muzhac = Moggio v Karniji), Valjhuna, sina Kajtimira na Gorenjskem – ni zgodovina slovenskih vladavin. Vemo le, da je sledila velikanski ljudski vojski Longobardov po prehodu v Italijo mala bojna cheta Slovenov-Hrvatov, ki je zasedla rodovitne plane kraje Koroshke, Gorenjske in solnchnega gorovja Karnije ter tam ustanovila male drzhavice. Slovenskega kralja in kneza, slovenskih junakov pa ni bilo nikdar. Noben pisec nam ne poroča, kedaj bi slovensko ljudstvo prishlo v te kraje, kjer danes prebiva, odkod in kako se je selilo, kako si je priborilo grudo, katero she danes prekopava.

Henrik Tuma

GEOGRAPHICAL-LINGUISTIC NOTES

THE LOCAL ONOMASTICS

(Fragments)

(...)

We Slovenians do not have a national history. Our people of farmers and shepherds lived unto themselves from time immemorial and it was only the storm of revolution in January 1848 that began to awaken them. Several decades ago, the body of people slowly became aware of its particularity and what it had in common to move in the direction of forming a nation.

For some people history is the series of events that happen to peoples while for others it is recording the works and lives of great men, kings and heroes. Every event represents a change, some kind of movement. Where there is no movement or settling, where there are no clashes between tribes, no friction and competition, where there is no domination or subordination of one tribe over another there are no visible changes in the life of the people, no visible movement, no military leaders or tsars, there can be no history. And on the other hand, where there was no movement, where there were no visible events, there life has been in age-long peaceful harmony with nature. The history of places that are inhabited and have been inhabited by Slovenes tells us about the settling and arrival of Phoenicians, Greeks, Romans, Illyrians, Celts, Germanic tribes and Ural-Altai peoples (Sarmatians, Huns, Avars, Magyars, Kumans), about their marches and their rule, their regiments and their leaders. However, it knows nothing about the ancient Slavs, or about the small tribe of Slovenes. Only some names allow the assumption that the Slavs were spread throughout Europe as a peace-loving tribe from the Veneti living by the Baltic Sea to the Veneti living beside the Atlantic Ocean, from the Veneti by the Adriatic Sea to the Veneti by the Black Sea. Slovenes have since time immemorial been the neighbours of the Adriatic Veneti. The history of the Carinthian principality, Kazelin's county at Moggio (Slov. Muzhac) in Carnia, Valjhun son of Kajtimar in Upper Carniola – is not the history of Slovene rule. We only know that after the mighty people's army of the Longobards crossed over into Italy they were followed by a small army of Slovenes-Croats, which occupied the fertile plains of Carinthia, Upper Carniola and the sunny mountains of Carnia where it founded small countries. But there were never any Slovene kings, princes or heroes. No writer ever mentions when the Slovene people arrived in these parts where they now live, where they came from and how they moved, how they gained the land they cultivate to this day.

Zgodovinska vest, da so prishli Slovenci v VI. stoletju v kraje, kjer she danes prebivajo, je pravljica. Menda slovenski učenjaki sploh ne vedo, kdo jo je izumil, kvechjemu da se sklicujejo na kako staro, nerazumljeno kroniko ali pa na sklep prevernega jezikoslovca. Zgodovina sama tega ne ve. Odkar je Ljubor Niederle priobchil svoje »Slovenske starozhitnosti«, bi moralo biti za kolichkaj pouchenega chloveka nedostojno prezhvekovati bajko o prihodu slovenskega naroda v VI. stoletju po Kristusu. Kolikor se da sploh po zgodovinski metodi znanstveno dokazati, je Niederle dokazal, da so Sloveni prebivali zhe v II. in III., che ne zhe v I. stoletju po Kr. v krajih, kjer so danes. Da so tja prishli shele takrat, tudi on ni dokazal, niti ni skushal, a tudi ne bi mogel dokazati. V najnovejšhem delu »Povod in pouchetki zapadnih Slovanov« (Praga 1919) pa Niederle celo dopushcha ne le možnost, ampak vso verjetnost, da so bili vsaj zapadni Sloveni prastanovalci. Niederlejevi sklepi, v kolikor zapushchajo stroga zgodovinska tla in se opirajo na germansko in od nje deloma zasuzhnjeno slovensko jezikoslovje, so očitno napachni ter predvidevam, da jih Niederle, ko svoje ogromno delo dokoncha, sam ovrzhe, ovrzhejo jih pa gotovo njegovi uchenci. Nashega slovenskega gospodarsko-krajevnega imenoslovja Niederle ni poznal in menda nikdo. Slovenci pa stanujemo ob zadnji jezikovni meji Slovenov, brez nas torej konchno sklepanje ni možno.

Kjer ni gibanja ne dogodkov, ni zgodovine. Na kraju pa, kjer mirno ljudstvo obdeluje zemeljsko grudo, je lahko polno cvetochega zhivljenja, le da zgodovina ne ve nichesar o njem. Opisov davnega ljudskega zhivljenja na rodni grudi nimamo she. Ne vemo, kdo je pahal zemljo in sadil trte pod starimi Grki in Rimljani, vemo le, da so to bili premaganci, suzhnji brez pravice, brez zgodovine. Le iz njih suzhenjstva in pa da o njih ne govori noben pisec, vemo, da je vsa njih zgodovina podjarmljenje po bojevitem tujem plemenu. Zhivljenja chloveka v prirodi in s prirodo v davnih chasih ni nikdo popisaval, chetudi je dotika chloveka s prirodo, zavladanje prirode po chloveku, ustvarilo vso kulturo, saj pomeni beseda kultura v bistvu: delo na zemlji. A res je, da je kultura prishla do svojega pomena v zgodovini shele takrat, ko se je bojno pleme polastilo bogastva, znanja in chuvstvovanja poljedelskega plemena. Tedaj je shele nastala civilizacija, t. j. oblast chloveka nad chlovekom in shele s tem nadredjem je postala vidna tudi kultura t. j. oblast chloveka s svojim delom nad prirodo. Sloveni so zhe davno pred Grki in Rimljani zavladali evropsko orno grudo, ustvarili so prvo starodavno kulturo, ki ni mogla vzrasti nego iz dela na tezhki grudi in iz zhitja po logeh in solnchnih planinah.

The historical information that the Slovenes arrived in the region they presently inhabit in the VI century is a fairy tale. Apparently Slovene scholars do not even know who invented it, at best they refer to some old, misunderstood chronicle or the conclusion of an over faithful linguist. History itself does not know this. Ever since Lubor Niederle published his »Slavic Antiquities«, it should be deemed improper for any moderately educated person to even contemplate the myth about the arrival of the Slovene people in the VI century after Christ. As far as it is possible to scientifically show using the historical method, Niederle showed that the Slavs were living in the places they now inhabit already in the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD and possibly already in the 1st century AD. He did not prove or even attempt to prove that they arrived there only this late and indeed there is no way he could have proved this. In his latest work entitled: »The Cause and Beginnings of the Western Slavs« (Prague 1919) Niederle even allows for not only the possibility but the probability that at least the western Slavs were aborigines. Niederle's conclusions, insofar as they depart from strict historical foundations and are founded on Germanic linguistics (of which Slovene linguistics is partially a slave), are obviously incorrect and I expect that Niederle, once he has finished his great work, will himself reject them, and they will certainly be rejected by his pupils. Niederle was never acquainted with our Slovene economic-krajevna nomenclature and presumably no-one else was either. We Slovenes live at the furthest linguistic limits of the Slavs so without us no final conclusion may be reached.

Where there is no movement or events there is no history. And in the end, where the peace-loving people are tilling the earth there may be an abundance of flourishing life only history knows nothing about it. We do not as yet have any ancient records of the life of the common people on our native soil. We do not know who cleared the land and planted vines under the ancient Greeks and Romans, we only that they were the ones who had been defeated, the slaves without rights, without a history. It is only from their slavery and from the fact that no historian mentions them that we know that all their history consists of being subjugated by belligerent foreign tribes. The life of a man in nature and with nature in ancient times was never recorded by anyone even if man's contact with nature, man's domination over nature, created all culture as the word culture itself means: working the land. But it is true that culture only gained its significance in history after the warring tribe had seized the riches, skills and sentiment of the farming tribe. Only then did civilisation arise, i.e. the authority of one man over another and it was only through this system that culture too became evident, i.e. the authority of man over nature through his work. The Slavs reigned over the European arable land a long time before the Greeks and the Romans, they created the first ancient culture which arose from work on the stubborn earth and from life in the woods and the sunny meadows.

Priroda je ustvarila prvo razliko med chloveshkimi plemeni, zato ne more biti zgodovine brez zemljepisja in zemljeslovja. Shirna stepa je rodila neizmerne chrede nomadov, skitanje po stepi, chuvanje chred in boje za njih ohranitev je ustvarilo bojeviti um nomadov. Solnchna rodovitna brda so zbirala družhine stalnih poljedelcev in pastirjev, porajajocha priroda z vechnimi in vrachajochimi svojimi premembami jim je odprla poznanje lastnih sil, dala ustvarjajochi um. Vse bogastvo ustvarja in je ustvarjala priroda in delo chloveka med prirodo. A shele, ko se je polastil bojeviti nomad bogastva poljedelca z orozhjem v roki, ko je svojega vojskovodjo izklical za kralja nad bojevniki in suzhnji ter dal zakone, je nastala drzhava in komaj v njej je prishla kultura do veljave. Zato pripisuje zgodovina vso vidno kulturo zmagujochim plemenom. Zato je ostalo temno nashe zhitje in bitje v zgodovini. Edine svitle zharke na prvo nashe zhivljenje, na prvo ustvarjanje kulture nam mechejo imena v prirodi in v boju s prirodo, med katero je bivalo in delalo nashe poljedelsko ljudstvo. Grki in Rimljani imajo bogato zgodovino bojev in vojskovodij, temna pa so in nerazumljiva njih krajevna imena, ali pa tlé pod njimi vserod in vselej tuja in nepoznana imena. Nashe krajevno imenoslovje pa je opis nashega davnega ljudstva in njegovega prirodnega zhivljenja. Iz tega opisa shele utegnemo razumeti tudi zgodovino plemen, ki so vladala nad nami. Iz tega opisa utegnejo razumeti tudi nad nami vladajochi narodi shele prav svojo zgodovino in kulturo.

Slovenska krajevna imena nam pravijo, da je Slovenec od veka vekov pastir in poljedelec na grudi, katero obdeluje. Njegove chrede so se pasle, kjer so bile zavetne doline in solnchna varna brda za daljnih vekov. Dalech na sever do Donave, dalech na zahod do shvicarskih planin in na vzhod do ronkov gorovja v ravnine je segalo slovensko planinsko pleme. Sledove nam kazhejo krajevna imena. Ne kazhejo nam pa le mej nashih bivalishch, govore nam tudi o tvorbi zemlje, na kateri smo zhiveli, govore nam o nashi dotiki s prirodo, o nashem prvotnem gospodarstvu. Odkar se je oglasila zgodovina tujih plemen nad nami, umolknila je vest o nashem zhivljenju, povest tujih, bojevitih, gospodujochih plemen je prekrstila in popachila nasha stara imena in jih preplavila s svojimi poznejshimi. Le she mal otoček velikega planinskega plemena Slovencev nam je ostal v Julijskih Alpah. Zato nam morajo biti nashe Alpe izhodishche pri preiskovanju krajevne imenoslovja.

(...)

Plinius nam je zapisal glavne reke Karnije in Venetiae; Silis – Zila, Lipientia = Livenza, Alsa = Olsha, Natisio cum Turo = Nadizha s Terom, vse pristno slovenske besede.

Nature created the first differences between the human tribes so there can be no history without geography and geology. The wide steppes gave birth to infinite herds of nomads and wandering the steppes, watching their herds and struggling to preserve them created the combative mind of the nomads. The sunny and fertile hills became the permanent home to families of famers and shepherds and the burgeoning nature with its eternal and returning needs made them aware of their own strength and gave them a creative intellect. All riches were created and are created by nature and the work of man in nature. It was not until the belligerent nomad had seized the famer's riches with armed force, proclaimed his leader to be king over the warriors and the slaves and proclaimed laws that the state was created and only then did culture come into being. That is why history ascribes all visible culture to the victorious tribes. That is why our life and existence in history remained in darkness. The only rays of light on our most ancient life, on the first creation of culture are shed by names in nature and in the struggle with the nature in which lived and worked our farming people. The Greeks and Romans have a rich history of battles and military leaders but their names of places are dark and incomprehensible, or they harbour the glimmer of foreign and unknown names. But our krajevno nomenclature describes our ancient people and their natural life. It is only from this description that we may also understand the history of tribes that reigned over them. From this description the nations that rule over us may also begin to understand their true history and culture.

Slovene place names tell us that the Slovene has since time immemorial been a shepherd and farmer on the land he tills. Our herds grazed where for ages there have been sheltered valleys and safe, sunny hills. Far to the north to the Danube, far to the west to the Swiss mountains and to the east where the hills slope down to the plains lived the Slovene mountain tribe. Their traces are indicated by the place names. However, they do not only show us the limits of our abodes, they also tell us of the formation of the earth on which we used to live, they tell us about our contact with nature, our original economy. Ever since the history of foreign tribes began to be heard over us, the news of our life has gone quiet, the story of foreign, militant, domineering tribes has rechristened and deformed our old names and flooded them with its more recent names. Only a small island of the great mountain tribe of the Slovenes has survived in the Julian Alps. That is why our Alps must be the starting-point for exploring the local onomastics.

(...)

Plinius recorded the names of the main rivers of Carnia and Venetia; Silis – Zila, Lipientià = Livenza, Alsa = Olsha, Natisio cum Turo = Nadizha with the Ter, all genuine Slovene words.

Nedvomno slovenski besedi sta **Socha** in **Nadizha**, lashki Isonzo in Natisone. Dovolj je, da imamo to dvojje imen, pa imamo tudi jasen in nedvomljiv dokaz, da je slovensko pleme stanovalo tam, kjer je danes, zhe za chasa Rimljanov in tudi pred njimi. Latinski besedi sta na sebi nerazumljivi in tudi nerazlozhljivi, razlaga iz keltskega je naravnost otrochja. Obe slovenski imeni pa imata stvaren, predmetu odgovarjajoch pomen. Socha je reka, ki se v ovinkih izsuče izza gorovja. Nadizha je voda, ki s silo privrè na dan. Nadizhi imamo dve: eno kot izvir korenske Save, globoko skrito v skalovju zatishne planine pod Jalovcem in Strugom, drugo kot izvir slovensko-furlanske Nadizhe – Natisone, skrito v gorovju pod Jalovcem 1615 m v Stolovi skupini za Kobaridskim kotom. Jezikovna korenika **deg** je bogatega pomena. Pletershnik ima: degmati se, kregati se, ne pozna pa pomena **degati se**, krave se degajo = gonijo; digavchek (primula), po kateri se krave pojajo, ker njih sok razgreje, goni: kri. Degniti toliko kot suniti. Poleg tega dezhe, kvasice, ki dvigajo testo, dizhen = bujno rastoča rastlina, ki se rabi kot zhensko zdravilo, ker pospeshuje dizho t. j. mesečno chishchenje. Te malo znane, slabo tolmachene prastare slovenske besede pomenijo gnati sok, kri, vodo na dan. Treba le videti izvir korenske Save in Nadizhe v debu pod Brezjem, da se razume pomen: voda, ki s silo zhene na dan.

Socha, po starem z nosnikom, ki v rushchini prehaja v **u**, ima vzporedne besede istega pomena povsodi po slovenskih tleh. Such, Suchava itd. = voda, ki se suche, ruski suchit istega pomena, suk = chvrzh, zavita grcha. Geografi in filologi seveda kazhejo tudi na Isona, Salzach ter se trudijo vsled tega podlozhiti keltshchino. No, Salzach je onemu, ki jo zemljepisno pozna, tudi zvjajochja se reka ter je smeshno razlagati nje vodo od soli, saj je bistra alpska reka! Isona Sontina kazhe, da je bila tudi Salzach Socha in je nemshka beseda spakedranka. Razlagi Nadizha – Natisa, Socha Sontius sta tako jasni, a tudi tako vazhni, da se je chuditi, da se ni she nihche izmed nashih filologov resno bavil z njima. Seveda prinasha moja razlaga v dosedanjo zgodovino Slovencev celo zmedo, saj trdim, da so Slovenci bili v teh krajih she **pred** Rimljani. Rimljani so slovenski imeni »Socha« in »Nadizha« docela prozorno prilagodili svojemu jeziku. Brzh ko sprejmemo to resnico, postane stara nasha zgodovina jasna. Imamo pa she drugo ime, ki isto potrjuje. Rimljani so imeli potem, ko so Karne v gorovju premagali, glavno pot iz beneshke ravnine skozi Karnijo in na Koroshko, ne po zaporedni dolini Bela-Fella, ampak po suhem mimo jezera Cavezzano, po polozhnem solnchnem pobochnju, ki vede chez »Klanec« v Tumech (Tolmezzo) in preko Zuglio (Julium Carnicum) chez Krishki prelaz (S. Croce) v Ziljsko dolino.

The **Socha** and **Nadizha** are undeniably Slovene words (Isonzo and Natisone in Italian). It is enough for us to have these two names and we have clear and unquestionable proof that the Slovene tribe lived where it lives today at the time of the Romans and also before them. The Latin words are incomprehensible and also unexplainable; the Celtic explanation is simply childish. Both Slovene names have a realistic meaning, which suits the subject. The Socha is a river which winds out from behind the mountains. The Nadizha consists of water which surge up to the surface. We have two Nadizhas: one is the source of the Sava, hidden deep in the rocks of the quiet mountain below Jalovec and Strug, and the other is the source of the Slovene-Friulan Nadizha – Natisone, hidden in the mountains below Jalovec 1615 m in the Stol group behind Kobarid. The linguistic root »deg« is rich with meaning. Pletershnik's dictionary (Slovene-German, 1894-1895) has: *degmati se, kregati se* [Eng. to quarrel] but he does not know the meaning of *degati se, kerave se degajo = gonijo* [Eng. to be in heat, cows in heat], *digavchek* (primula; Eng. primrose) which cows eat and then mate because the juice of that heats their blood. *Degniti* means the same as *suniti* [Eng. to push]. Besides also: *dezhe* = leavens which raise a dough; *dizhen* = ranky growing plant which is used as women medication because it hastens a *dizha* – i. e. menses.

These little known and poorly interpreted ancient Slovene words mean to propel juice, blood, water to the surface. It is enough to see the source of the Sava near Podkoren and the Nadizha in the narrow valley below Brezje to understand the meaning: water that comes up to the surface with force.

Socha, pronounced in the olden days with a nasal sound and which becomes a »u« in Russian, has related words with the same meaning all over Slovenian territory. Such, Suchava etc. = water that spins around (Slovenian: se suche), the Russian *suchit* has the same meaning, *suk* = turned wooden gnarl. Of course, geographers and philologists also draw attention to Isonta, Salzach, and try in this way to show Celtic roots. Well, the Salzach is for whoever knows where it lies, also a winding river and it is ridiculous to say its water is being salty as it is a pure Alpine river! Isonta Sontina – this form shows that Salzach was also formerly Socha and that the German word is a distortion of Socha. The explanations for Nadizha – Natisa, Socha – Sontius are so clear and also so important that it is surprising that none of our philologists have yet seriously dealt with them. Of course, my explanation brings a whole load of confusion into the existing history of the Slovenes as I claim that the Slovenes were here before the Romans. The Romans adapted the Slovene names »Soch« and »Nadizh« quite clearly to their language. As soon as we accept this truth, our ancient history becomes clear. And we have another name that proves the same. After the Romans defeated the Carni in the mountains, their main route from the Venetian plain through Carnia and on to Carinthia did not lead through the parallel valleys Bela-Fella, but over dry land past Lake Cavezzano, along the gentle sunny slope that leads across »Klanec« [Eng. slope] to Tumech (Tolmezzo) and past Zuglio (Julium Carnicum) across »Krishki prelaz« (S. Croce) to Zila valley.

Rimljani niso gradili cest po debrih, ampak po bregovih, varnih pred povodnji, ne po produ Bele-Fella, ampak po varni solnčni poti skozi danashnji furlanski Cesclans – lat. Cesclanium. Ne vem sicer, kako ucheni keltologi in lashki filologi tolmachijo to besedo, vem pa, da so arheologi nashli gotove sledove rimske ceste (Bollettino sociale geografico italiano, 1894) in turist, ki ima iz visoke Amariane 1906 m nad Tumechem pregled sveta pod seboj, kar vzklikne: tod gre pot iz furlanske ravnine »chez klanec« v dolino gornjega Tilmenta (Tagliamento).

Rimljanske legije so toraj brodile Nadizho in Socho ter mahale chez Klance.

(...)

Ako vidimo, da so domacha krajevna imena pristno slovenska, ako vidimo, da postajajo imena Furlanov in Ladinov, chim dalje sezremo v preteklo dobo, vedno bolj slovenska, moramo pach rechi, da so tu bili Slovenci zhe od pamtiveka in da se je furlanshchina stvorila iz dveh elementov: davnega slovenskega, na katerega se je vcepila latinshchina rimskega veterana-kolona, poslanega v Oglej. Ko so Huni razrushili mesto, je bezhal latinski kolon v gozdove in mochvirja, ko so pa nastopili mirni chasi, se je shiril med Slovence ter jih pod zashchito tujega plemstva izpodrinil. Stari zgodovinarji in zemljepisci porochajo, da je bila vechina prostora Furlanov zaprodna od hudournikov, zablachena proti morju, pokrita s shirnimi gozdovi. Obljudeno je bilo le solnčno grichevje. Povsodi pa, kjer je grichevje, dobimo jasne sledove nekdanjega slovenskega prebivalstva. Sledove slovenskih imen najdemo v vishjem gorovju po vseh gorskih zatishjih, ki niso bila izpostavljena poplavam in hudournikom in kamor niso prihajale roparske chete. Prav znachilna krajevna imena nas vedejo dalech na zahod, vedno v skrita zakotja ali visoko gori na solnčne pologe. Krajevne lege, kjer alpinist naleti na brez dvojbeno slovenska imena, so chesto krasni kotichki alpske prirode.

(...)

Imam Slovence za evropske prastanovalce. Naselili so se iz vzhoda, polagoma hodech ob solnčnih grichih, ki so bili po ledeni dobi edini pristopni chloveku in delu, v dveh jatah proti vzhodu – juzhnozapadni Slovenci, stari Veneti in Traki, ki so zasedli Balkan, Podunalje, Podkarpatje, Podsudetje, Alpe, juzhno Nemchijo in srednjo Francijo ter severno-zapadni in severni Slovenci, Polabci, Poljani in Anti.

Doline rek in nizhine so bile od prihodu zaprodene in zablachene. Prva selishcha so bila solnčna brda. V dezhelah rodovitnega brdja se je osnovala prva kultura, dobimo je na Panonskem-Moravskem in Severnoogrskem, ter Luzhici. Obe ti stari kulturi, izkazani po arheologiji, sta praslovenski.

The Romans did not build roads through deep and narrow valleys but on slopes that were safe from flooding, not on the gravel of Bela-Fella, but on the safe and sunny path through the present-day Friulan Cesclans – lat. Cesclanium. I do not know how the learned Celtologists and Italian philologists interpret this word, but I do know that archaeologists have found the certain traces of a Roman road (*Bollettino sociale geografico italiano*, 1894) and the tourist who sees the world at his feet from the 1906 m high Amariana 1906 m above Tumeche, exclaims: this is where the road leads from the Friulan plain »across the slope« into the valley of the upper Tilmont (Tagliamento). The Roman legions therefore waded across the Nadizha and the Socha and marched across Klanec.

(...)

If we can see that the local names are genuinely Slovene, if we see that the names of the Friulians and the Ladins become increasingly Slovene, the further back we go in history, we must admit that Slovenes have lived here since time immemorial and that the Friulian language arose from two elements: the ancient Slovene one onto which the Latin of the Roman veteran-colonist sent to Aquileia implanted itself. When the Huns destroyed the city, the Latin colonus fled into the forests and marshes, then when there was peace again he spread amongst the Slovenes and ousted them with the support of foreign nobility. Past historians and geographers wrote that most of the Friulian territory was covered by gravel from torrents, muddy towards the sea and covered with extensive forests. Only the sunny hills were inhabited. Wherever there are hills we come across clear traces of the former Slovene population. We may find traces of Slovene names in the high mountains in sheltered spots which were not exposed to floods and torrents and where bands of robbers did not venture. Typical names of places lead us far to the west, always to hidden nooks or sunny slopes of high mountains. Localities where mountaineers come across undoubtedly Slovene names are often beautiful corners of Alpine nature.

(...)

I consider the Slavs to be European aborigines. They came from the east, slowly walking along the sunny hills that were the only places accessible to man and could be cultivated after the Ice Age, in two swarms towards the east – the southwest Slavs, the ancient Veneti and Thracians who occupied the Balkans, the Danube Basin, Subcarpathia, Subsudetia, the Alps, southern Germany and central France and the north-west Slavs, Polabian Slavs, Poljani and Anti.

When they arrived, the river valleys and plains were filled with gravel and mud. Their first settlements were on sunny hills. In the fertile lands hill-lands, the first culture was established, we can see traces of it in Pannonia-Moravia and northern Greece, and Lushica (Lusatia). Both these ancient cultures, shown by archaeology, are ancient Slav.

Prasloveni so prishli zgodaj do takozvane luzhichko-panonske kulture. Bili so v kulturni in trgovski dotiki s srednjemorsko kulturo predgrške dobe. Imamo sledove trgovske poti od Chrnega morja in preko Marsilje chez Rodan in Ren do severa in nazaj.

Ruska, ogrska, nemška in padanska nizhina so bile ob prihodu Praslovenov brez prebivalstva. Prasloveni so na tem prostoru bili chisti. V Italiji (v Apeninih) so zadeli na novo pleme Evrazijcev in staro pleme Evrafrikancev, tako jih deli antropolog Sergi. Latinski jezik nam je amalgam nekdanjega srednjemorskega jezika z jezikom Praslovenov, krizhanje obojih plemen je dalo Italijane, she danes lochene po krvi in kosti: severne Italijane, med katerimi prevladuje slovenska sestavina in juzhne Italijane, med katerimi prevladuje evrafrikanska sestavina.

Prvo preseljevanje plemen, kakor pravijo zgodovinarji, je premenilo evropsko civilizacijo. Povod preseljevanja je mogla biti edinole prememba v prirodi vsled znizhanje topline na severu, vishanja topline v centralni Aziji. Moral je priti naval azijskih plemen iz vzhoda, skandinavsko-germanskih plemen iz severa. Pot Germanov je bila v bojnih družinah, Gefolgschaften, preko Danske, Wesera in Rena. V bojnih družinah so zasedle germanske nizhine in pregnale Slovene med mochvirja in pragozdove. Zhivele so od plena in lova. Ena velika družina je krenila v I. tisočletju pred Kristom chez Ren, si razdelila Galijo, kjer so bivali v sredini Sloveni do armorishkih Venetov, na jugu Iberi, na severu Kelti. Ustanovila je prvi germanski fevdalni sistem civilizacije. Zmes plemena je dal stare Galce, pozneje s Franki in Ladinci Francoze.

Ko se je bila stara Galija ustanovila in prenapolnila, izselile sta se dve močni družini: ena »Sigovesa«, ki je krenila chez Ren nazaj preko Bavarske, Cheshke in se izgubljala med Poljani. Deli te družine so ustanovili srednjeevropsko-keltske drzhave med Vindelici na Bavarskem, med Boji na Cheshkem, ki so segale do pod Karpat. Maloshtevilne chete so utonile v slovenskem jezikovnem morju. Druga galska cheta »Belovesa« je krenila preko jezerskih Alp juzhne Francije v Italijo do Rima. V Gornji Italiji je ustanovila italsko-keltske drzhavice, ki so bile v stoletnih bojih z Rimljani premagane, njih taborishcha razdejana in premenjena v latinska mesta, bojna mladina unichena ali prepodena. Taki italski Galci, iskaje novih selishch, so se po malem naselili po odprtih dolinah Alp ter krenili preko njih na Kras in na Balkan; zadnja cheta Galoitalcev je zatonila v Mali Aziji. Bile so bojne chete malokulturnega ljudstva. Izginile so skoro brez sledu, le maloshtevilna imena njih taborishch so sledovi njih zgodovine.

The ancient Slavs reached the so-called Lusatian-Pannonian culture early on. They had cultural and trading ties with the Mediterranean culture of the pre-Greek period. There are traces of the trade route from the Black Sea via Marseille across the Rhône and the Rhine up to the north and backwards.

When the ancient Slavs arrived, the Russian, Hungarian, German and Padan plains were unpopulated. The ancient Slavs in these areas were pure. In Italy (in the Apennines) they came across the new tribe of Eurasians and the old tribe of Euro-Africans; as categorised by anthropologist Sergi. Latin is an amalgamation of the former Mediterranean language with the language of the Ancient Slavs, the mixing of both tribes produced Italians who can to this day be distinguished by bone and by blood: the northern Italians with the dominant Slav component and the southern Italians with the dominant Euro-African component.

The oldest migrations, as the historians say, changed European civilisation. The cause of the migration must lie only in the change in nature that followed a fall in temperatures in the north and a rise in temperatures in central Asia. There must have been a rush of Asian tribes from the east and Scandinavian-Germanic tribes from the north. The Germanic tribes advanced in fighting groups known as *Gefolgschaften* across Denmark, the Weser and the Rhine. These fighting groups ceased the Germanic lowlands and drove the Slavs into the marshes and forests. They lived by hunting and looting. One large group crossed the Rhine in the 1st millennium BC and carved up Gaul which was inhabited in the centre by the Slavs, as far as the Armorican Veneti, in the south the Iberians and in the north the Celts. They founded the first Germanic feudal system of civilisations. A mixture of tribe gave the old Gauls, with Franks and later Ladini French.*¹

After Gaul was founded and overfilled, two powerful families emigrated: one, the »Sigovesa« ventured over the Rhine and back across Bavaria, Czech and vanished among the Poljani. Members of this family founded the central-European Celtic states among the Vindelici in Bavaria and Boii in Czech. These states extended to the foot of the Carpathians. The small numbers of their troops drowned in the sea of Slavic languages. The second Gallic troop of »Belovesa« made their way across the lakes of southern French Alps into Italy as far as Rome. In upper Italy they founded Italo-Celtic states, which were later defeated in the centuries of battles against the Romans. Their camps were demolished and transformed into Latin towns and their bellicose youth either destroyed or driven out. In search of new settlements these Italic Gauls in parts settled open Alpine valleys and ventured beyond into Karst and to the Balkans; the last troop of Gallo-Italics disappeared in Asia Minor. These were the troops of a low-cultured people. They disappeared nearly without a trace, but for the few names of their camps, which testify to their history.

Radi tega je v italijanskem jeziku ostalo komaj sledu keltshchine. Romanist Dietz jo skoraj izključuje kot sestavino italijanshchine, rekoch: »Nje najvazhnejshi stari jezikovni ostanki prihajajo od starodavnih Oskov. Etrushchina ne pride v poshtev (Etruski so zhiveli le v mestih, katera so ali razdejali ali zasedli Rimljani, radi tega so tudi docela iztrebljeni). Ker je v italijanshchini mnogo besednih debel, katerih ni v francoshchini in shpanshchini, moramo domnevati, da se je italijanski jezik izpopolnjeval iz ljudskih narechij in ne naravnost iz latinshchine. Kljub temu je italijanski jezik med romanskimi jeziki ohranil največ latinshchine, kar velja posebno za srednjelashka narechja.

Juzhna italijanshchina kazhe vech tujih elementov iz grshchine z nekoliko arabskimi primeski. A ko se pa prouchuje narechja preko stare Italije, t. j. takraj Apenin, se zdi chloveku, da je postavljen v drug jezikovni svet. V padanski dolini latinshchina ni mogla premagati vpliva barbarshkih jezikov. Pritisk germanskih jezikov je razumljiv (to posebno vsled zasedenja po Longobardih), kdor pa ishche keltskih ostankov, se skoro razochara: celokupno italijansko ozemlje jih kazhe le malo. Pismeni jezik vsebuje komaj eno samo keltsko besedo, ki bi tudi ne bila drugod v romanshchini. Skrbna etimologichna preiskava narechij ob Alpah ali pa po Alpah, bi prinesla zgodovini jezika bogatega dobichka«.

Trditev filologa romanista Dietza, da v italijanshchini skoraj ni keltshchine, odgovarja tudi zgodovini. Kakor so bili Etruski, preko morja priseljeni Semiti, bivajochi le v mestnih kolonijah, iztrebljeni od Rimljanov, tako so tudi Gali, kot priseljene bojne chete, bivali le v mestih in taborishchih, od koder so jih iztrebili ali prepodili Rimljani. Morali so izginiti brez sledu. Severnih predalpskih in alpskih narechij pa do danes ni she nihche preiskaval, zato je filologom neznan novejsi jezikovni zaklad slovenshchine v lashchini. Poleg tega so se filologi, ki so dosedaj prouchevali lashchino, malo ali nich ozirali na slovenshchino, iz enostavnega razloga, ker je niso poznali. Lahko trdimo, da je stara latinshchina nastala iz jezikov srednjemorcev in Praslovenov. Latinshchina je bila chista le v rimskih municipijih. Rimski koloni se niso selili po gorah in gozdovih, pustili so zhiveti inorodna pastirska plemena nemoteno, zhivela so she dolgo v srednji vek. Iz teh narechij je chrpala nov besedni zaklad pozna latinshchina, ki je z asimilacijo germanshchine (Longobardov) postala od XI. stoletja naprej nasha moderna lashchina.

Imenoslovje nashih Alp nam to potrjuje. V Alpah so dalech v srednji vek in po gorskih zatishjih zhiveli Slovenci. Do konca starega veka so Rimljani v Alpah zasedli le taborishcha in postojanke ob vojashkih cestah in prehodih. Napad barbarshkih plemen je naglo izchistil vzhodne Alpe, kjer so bila rimska taborishcha itak nasejana. Ostali so tam le prastanovalci, ki zhive kompaktno ondi she danes, potisnjeni od Germanov-Bavarcev na jug. Pred napadi Germanov od severa in po Padanski nizhini so se umaknili latinski koloni juzhne Germanije in begunci severne Padanske nizhine v Alpe.

As a result, there is scarcely a trace of Celtic in the Italian language. The linguist of Romance languages Dietz mostly excludes it as a part of Italian stating: »The most significant old linguistic remnants come from the ancient Osci. Etruscan plays no part (Etrusci had only lived in towns, which were demolished or occupied by Romans, which is why they are entirely extinct). Since many Italian word stems have no parallels in French or Spanish, we must assume that Italian evolved from popular dialects rather than directly from Latin. Nevertheless, out of all the Romance languages, Italian preserved the most Latin elements, which is particularly true of central Italian dialects.

South Italian language demonstrates more foreign elements predominately from Greek with some Arabic additions. But when studying dialects across old Italy, i.e. this side of the Apennines, one feels as though immersed in a different linguistic world. In the Po Valley, Latin could not surmount barbaric linguistic influences. The pressures of Germanic languages are understandable (particularly in view of the Lombard occupation), and if one were to look for Celtic remnants, one would be in for a disappointment; the entire Italian territory displays little. The written language has barely one single Celtic word, which is exclusive to Italian. Careful etymologic examination of dialects at the foot of the Alps or in the Alps would richly profit the field of linguistic history.«

Philologist and Romance linguist Dietze's contention that Italian contains almost no Celtic also fits with historical evidence. Like the Etruscans – Semites who populated town colonies after having migrated across the sea – were exterminated by Romans, so too the immigrant battle troops of Gauls only settled in towns and camps whence they were later driven out or eradicated by the Romans. They had to have disappeared without a trace. The northern subalpine and alpine dialects are yet to be researched, which is why Philologists remain ignorant of the newer Slovenian linguistic treasure buried in Italian. Furthermore, Philologists researching Italian took little to no notice of Slovenian for the simple reason that they did not know it. We can state that ancient Latin derives from the languages of the Mediterranean peoples and proto-Slavs. Pure Latin only existed in Roman municipia. Roman coloni did not settle in mountains and forests, but allowed the indigenous herdsmen to live undisturbed, which they did well into the Middle Ages. Their dialects introduced new words to late Latin, which in the 9th c., having assimilated Germanic Lombardic, became modern Italian.

Toponymy of our Alps confirms this. Late into the middle ages, they were populated by Slavs. By the end of Antiquity, the Alps were only populated by Romans in sporadic camps and posts by military roads and passages. The assaults of barbarian tribes quickly cleared eastern Alps, where Roman camps were already sporadic. Only the ancient inhabitants remained, who still persist there in condense settlements now, having been driven south by the Germanic Bavarians.

The Latin coloni of southern Germania and fugitives from the northern Po Valley fled the Germanic incursions from the north into the Alps.

Shele ob preseljevanju bojnih čet koncem starega in prichetkom srednjega veka so se severne in juzhne Alpe poitalijanchile. V severnih Alpah, kjer je bil latinski element redkejshi, so ga Alemani v Shvici in Bavarci na Tirolskem kmalu ponemchili, v juzhnih Alpah je latinski element ostal – t. j. danashnja ladinschchina.

Ladini so polagoma tekom srednjega in she prva stoletja novega veka polatinili slovenske alpske pastirje. Zato she nosijo alpski vrhovi slovenska imena »lasta«, »polica – pala«, »meja – meli«, »tamar«, »kuk«, »lanezh – lana«, »kalishche«, »chrche« in dr. Po listinah in ustnem sporočilu se da dolochiti glavni naval od XI. stoletja dalje. Severna Italija je do takrat unificirala svoj jezik in svoje ljudstvo. Fevdalizem je bil zasedel plodno zemljo. Kakor so ob tem germanski kmetje silili na jug, tako so lashki koloni silili na sever. Ker je bil germanski naval mogočne nemshke drzhave silnejshi, je posegel preko Brennerja dolu do blizu Tridenta in zanesel velike gorske kolonije na Sette comuni in Asiashko planoto ob juzhnem pobochnu Alp.

Pod nemshko kolonizacijo od severa, pod ladinsko od juga so izginili Slovenci iz Tirolskega in juzhnih Predalp, njih zadnji sledovi v gorskih samotah, po mojem mnenju shele tekom XVII. in XVIII. stoletja. Ostala je od nekedanjih Karnov – Slovencev le Gorishka in beneshka Slovenija. Furlani so poseben jezikovni element. Po zgodovinskih virih je bila Furlanija polna gozdov, produ in mochvirja. Prastanovalci brd in gor so bili Slovenci. Ko so Rimljani odbili napade bojevityh Ilirov in Galcev ob severnovzhodni meji, so ustanovili veliko taborishche in sredishche latinske kulture v Ogleju. Oglej je bil jezikovno in kulturni otok med obdajajochimi Slovenci. Iz oglejskega ager (polje), odkazanega latinskim veteranom, se je shiril polagoma kolon, kakor so rimski vitezi shirili svoje latifundje. Huni so Oglej razrushili, latinski begunci so se naselili po zatishjih in med Slovenci. She ko so navalili na Furlane Longobardi, je morala biti dezhela skoro celoma slovenska. She IX. stoletja, ko je prishel drugi germanski naval, so nemshka imena bila stvorjena na podlagi slovenskih in ne latinskih. Longobardsko in nemshko plemstvo se je polatinilo v VIII. in X. stoletju. Shele od takrat in she bolj po padcu Oglejskega patriarhata v XV. stoletju se je naglo shiril med Slovenci latinski element. A she v XIV. stoletju se je govorilo v Vidmu mnogo slovenski. L. 1694 »Account of some travels« je prvi turist v teh krajih, anglezh Brown konstatiral, da sega slovenski jezik do Vidma. Manzoni porocha za dobe oglejskih patrijarhov o Vidmu: »Il linguaggio slavo era assai più usato nei villaggi di quello della favella friulana, allora incolta e d'un ingrato suono«.

Only after the migration of battle troops at the close of Antiquity and start of the Middle Ages were northern and southern Alps Italianised. The scarcer Latin element in the northern Alps was quickly Germanised by the Alemanni in Switzerland and Bavarians in Tirol; in the southern Alps the Latin element was preserved, i.e. present day Ladin language.

Through the Middle Ages and the first centuries of the Modern Age the Ladini gradually Latinised Slovenian alpine herdsmen. This is why Slovenian peaks still bear name elements »lasta«, »polica – pala«, »meja – meli«, »tamar«, »kuk«, »lanezh – lana«, »kalishche«, »chrche« et alia. Judging by documents and oral tradition, the main drive occurred from the 11th century onward. At this time northern Italy unified its language and its people. Feudalism spread over the fertile soil. And so, like the Germanic farmers pressing due south, the coloni pressed due north. Because Germanic pressure of the mighty Germanic state was greater, it extended downwards across Brenner to the vicinity of Trident, planting large alpine colonies on the southern Alpine slopes in Sette Comuni and Monte Zebio.

Under Germanic colonisation in the north and Ladine in the south, Slovenians vanished from Tirol and the southern Sub-Alpine area, the final remnants disappearing, in my opinion, as late as in the 17th and 18th centuries. The previously indigenous Carni – Slovenians were limited to Gorizia and Slavia Friuliana. Friulian is a particular language element. According to historical sources Friuli was filled with forests, gravel, and marshes. Ancient hill- and mountain dwellers were Slavic. When the Romans repelled the bellicose Illyrians and Gauls attacking their north-eastern border, they founded Aquileia, a large encampment and centre of Latin culture. Aquileia was a linguistic and cultural island surrounded by Slavs. From the Aquileian agri (fields) bestowed to Latinate veterans, coloni slowly spread out as the Roman knights expanded their latifundia. The Huns demolished Aquileia and the Latin fugitives settled in sheltered areas and among the Slavs. Even later, when Lombards stormed Friuli, the land must have still been mostly Slavic. Even during the second Germanic wave in the 9th century the German toponyms were derived from Slavic rather than Latin. Lombard and Germanic nobility was Latinised in the 8th and 10th centuries. At this time, and even faster after the fall of the Aquileian patriarchate in the 15th c., the Latin element quickly spread among the Slavs. As late as the 14th century, much Slavic was still spoken in Videm. In 1694, an Englishman by the name of Brown established in his »Account of Some Travels« that Slavic language extends to Videm. »Il linguaggio slavo era assai più usato nei villaggi di quello della favella friulana, allora incolta e d'un ingrato suono«.

Zgodovina kazhe gibanje bojnih chet, ustanavljanje drzhav po zmagi in zavladanju, ki dviga iz mnozhice kralje in junake. Krajevno imenoslovje pa nam kazhe, da so zemljo obdelovali in obljudovali po srednji Evropi mirne družhine slovenskih pastirjev. Evropsko civilizacijo so ustvarile ogrske, latinske in germanske drzhave, poleg njih madjarska, bolgarska, hrvatska in srbska, po germanskem vzgledu in vplivu cheshka in poljska drzhava. Evropska kultura pa je bila ustvarjena iz poljedelstva Praslovenov. Prvo veliko prvotno evropsko kulturo nam je opisal filolog Krek, premalo poznan in sposhtovan. Nima tako pristne in krepke ne Grk, ne Rimljan, ne German. Njih zmagovite chete so se okoristile z bogastvom, znanjem in chuvstvovanjem slovenskega poljedelca, le tako je bila mogoča vishja kultura. Kajti kultura ne more biti drugega nego plod zveze chloveka s prirodno v delu. Zato je gotovo, da hrani jedro evropske kulture v sebi tudi slovenske prvine! (*Jadranski alamanah*, za leto 1923; Nasha zalozhba v Trstu)

SLOVENSKA IMENA V LADINSKEM IN BAVARSKEM NARECHJU

I.

Nekaj zheleznishkih postaj nad Bolzanom (Bozen) prej Juzhne Tirolske, sedaj Trentinske Benechije ali »Visoke Adizhe« (Adige) se dviga nad dolino Isarca (Jezer[ni]ca?) – Eisack (305 m) gromada Schlern-a 2546 m, najbolj na zahod potisnjene gore Dolomitov nad podoljem (Talzug) Isarca – Adige (Eisack – Etsch). Po svoji precej osamljeni legi se nudi s Schlerna obshiren in velelep pogled in pregled po sedaj italijanskem Tirolskem: na sever snezhniki Oetzthalskih do 3741 m in Zillerthalskih Alp do 3523 m, med njimi Brennerjeva zareza do 1370 m ter Visoke Ture z Venedigerjem 3660 m; na zahod Ortler 3902 m, Adamello 3524 m in Brenta – Tosa 3155 m – 3176 m; na jug Weisshorn 2316 m in Schwarzhorn (Cima di Rocca) 2440 m ter Latemar 2864 m.

Najkrasnejshi je pogled proti vzhodu na prave Dolomite: skupina Rosengarten do 3001 m, ledenik Marmolade 3344 m, Boe 3152 m, Langkofel 3178 m, Ghardenaccia 2670 m, Puez 2915 m, Sas Rigais 3027 m. Odtod proti zahodu, na sever pred Schlernom je dolgi, zeleni hrbet Raschötzeralpe, ladinsko: Rascieza, do 2308 m, pod njo Grödnertal (Val Gardena), v prednjem delu germanizirana, v svoji kotanji (Schlusstal) ladinska.

Schlern je pristopen od vseh strani, najlzhje od postaje Waidbruck (471 m) po vozni cesti ali po stezi mimo gradù Trostburg (621 m) grofa Wolkensteina na Kastelrut (1090 m), dosedaj sedežh okrajnega sodishcha; odtod po poljskih voznikih do kopalishcha Ratzes 1207 m po lepi stezi skozi gozd in po severnovzhodnem poboehju v vijugah na travnato, sem in tja mochvirnato planoto Schlerna. Iz Kastelruta do Schlernhäuser je okoli 5 ur hoda.

History describes troop migrations, kings and heroes rising victorious from the crowd, establishing a rule, and founding states. Toponymy, however, reveals that the Eastern European land was tilled and populated by peaceful families of Slavic shepherds. European civilisation was shaped in Hun, Latin, and Germanic states, joined by Hungarian, Bulgarian, Croatian and Serbian and also Czech and Polish states of the Germanic type. European culture, however, arose from Proto-Slavic agriculture. Philologist Krek, deserving more recognition and respect, described the first great culture of Europe; The Greek, Roman, or Germanic cultures can match its authenticity and strength. Their victorious troops profited from riches, knowledge, and emotion of the Slavic farmer. Only so was a sophisticated culture possible, as no culture can exist but as fruit of the working relationship between man and nature. So it is certain that the core of European culture also contains Slavic elements!

(Jadranski alamanah, za leto 1923; Nasha zalozhba v Trstu)

SLAVIC NAMES IN LADINE AND BAVARIAN DIALECTS

I.

A few railway stations above Bozen formerly in southern Tirol presently Venetian Trentino or »Alto Adige«, the mountain of Schlern (2546 m) extends above the valley of the river Isarco (Jezer[ni]ca? / 'of a lake', trans. n.) – or Eisack (305 m). Schlern is the westernmost peak of the Dolomites above the (Talzug) lowlands of Isarco – Adige (Eisack – Etsch). Due to its relative remoteness, Schlern offers a magnificent and broad view of presently Italian Tirol: the snowy peaks of the Oetzthal and Zillertal Alpine ranges in the north reaching 3741 m and 3523 m respectively, and the Brenner Pass reaching 1370 m and High Tauern with the Venediger group 3660 m; in the west Ortler 3902 m, Adamello 3524 m, and Brenta–Tosa, 3155 m–3176 m; in the South Weisshorn 2316 m and Schwarzhorn (Cima di Rocca) 2440 m, and Latemar 2864 m.

The most beautiful sight extends due east featuring the true Dolomites: the Rosengarten group reaching 3001 m, the Marmolada Glacier 3344 m, Boè 3152 m, Langkofel 3178 m, Ghardenaccia 2670 m, Puez 2915 m, Sas Rigais 3027 m. Due west, in the north before Schlern, extends the long green back of Raschötzeralpe, known as Rascieza in Ladin language, reaching 2308 m; beneath lay Grödnertal (Val Gardena), its front is Germanised and its vale (Schlusstal) Ladin.

Schlern is accessible from all sides, most easily from the Waidbruck station (471 m) via the road or path past Count Wolkenstein's castle Trostburg (621 m) to Kastelrut (1090 m), currently the seat of the district court; from here by cart tracks to the Ratzes baths 1207 m, following a beautiful forest trek and then winding paths of the north-western slopes to the grassy and here and there marshy Schlern plain. It is about a 5-hour walk from Kastelrut to Schlernhäuser.

Ime Schlern velja med pastirji-volarji le za močvirnato planoto pod pečnatim vrhom. Schlern je alpska dialektična beseda. Schmeller, etym. bayr. Wörterbuch, ima »Schlier – Lehm, in Oesterreich, Mergel«; beseda odgovarja glenastemu in muzhatemu svetu. Po Schlernu pasejo vole in jalovino, ker je previsok in prevetren za planino (Alm). Nad prostranim, glenastim Schlernom, okoli 2300 – 2400 m, se stopnjuje suha travnata gredina (Terrasse), na robu katere stoje Schlernhäuser 2451 m, pach najbolj obiskovano turistiško zatochishche na Tirolskem, pravcat hotel, v dobri oskrbi prej Bolcanske sekcije nemshkega alpskega drushtva. Postelj je 82, poleg tega za silo še 25 sklopnic. Pred vojno je bilo za nedelje in gotove praznike v prostrani dvorani do 300 ljudi pri kosilu. Od hotela je po slozhni stezi do vrha dobrih sto metrov, polagoma 20 minut, a zlahka 15 minut hoje. Temen je grizha, razbito, raztreseno, krshno kamenje apnenca, na zadnjem vrhu pechevje. Iz Schlernove planote od vzhoda sem pa je vidna na Schlern bela pechina (Felswand) z razločnim vrhom, morfološko prava pech.

Pletershnik ima ad 2) »pech« Fels, Felsenstück, pechi, Felsgegend, za Rezijo pech, Stein, pecha Felsenhöhle, pechevje Felsgegend, pechevina Felsengrund, pechina Fels, Felsenhöhle, pechinka Grotte, pečnato felsig. Gorishki gorjani morfološko precej točno lochijo: pech = kompakter Fels, skala = Felsstück, rob = Felsrand, rov = das abgestürzte Felsstück, pechina = Felswand, pechevje = Felsmasse, pechevina = Felsboden. Mikloshich ad »pek« navaja besedo »pech« kot splošnoсловansko, litavski pechius, madjarski pest, romunski pesht, narechje nemshko-tirolsko: Pötsche, Höhle unter dem Felsen. Mikloshich dostavlja: die ursprüngliche Bedeutung ist Ofen, kar se mi ne zdi prav, vsaj ne v pomenu gebauter Ofen. Pomen pech za Fels je samostojen; gorskemu pastirju je pech, ker v popoldanskem solncu zhehti od vročine. Pech kot lastno ime je razshirjeno povsodi, kjer bivajo Slovenci po gorah. V Julijskih Alpah so posebno znane: Bela Pech (Biela Peit) 2143 m nad Nevejo; Monte Cimone (2380 m) je bil do nedavno Stermapeit – Strma Pech. Pechi so nad Kaninom in Prestreljenikom, Pechi so od Vogla do Rodice; »Na Pèchah (plur. tantum fem.)« nad Bovcem ob poti na Kanin; Pechje = rob pod Polovnikom, Maklena Pech pod Vrshichem nad Trento. Na Krasu je Pechínka, vrshich 291 m, znana bojna točka izza velike vojne med Opatjeselom in Kostanjevico. Peche, vas pri Krki; Peche = Pöckau pri Podkloshtru itd. itd. Taler navaja za Tirolsko: Pötsch. Na juzhni Avstrijsko-Salzburshki meji stojé ob cesti: die Petschen. V skupini Fervala (Preval?) je Pezinerspitze. Schiber, Zeitschrift des deutsch-osterr. A. V. 1902 pozna dokumentarichno Petsch za Ampezzo. To ime je tvorjeno kakor »Na gori« – Langoris v Furlaniji pod Korminom iz »Na Pechi«. Drug Ampezzo je v gorenji Tilmetski dolini. Oboje sta znani letovishchi. Pa tudi staro ime za pečnati nasad, ki moli iznad močvirnatoga Schlerna je Pech, a dejanski in morfološko je prava, bela, gola pech nad zelenim drnatim Schlernom. Nemci drzhe to staro ime Pech za ladinsko besedo. Ladini jo izgovarjajo prav kakor Slovenci s trdim ch, po pomenu jelka. Furlani govore pezz = pinus, picea, dochim je pin = bor, pinus silvestris, laris, macesen Lärche.

The term Schlern is an alpine dialectal word used by the ox-herds for marshy plains under rocky summits. Schmeller, etym. Bayr, Wörterbuch gives »Schlier – Lehm, in Oesterreich, Mergel«; the word denotes gravelly and marshy areas. Schlern is too steep and windy for good pasture (Alm) so oxen and non-dairy cattle are grazed there. Above the vast gravelly Schlern, circa 2300 – 2400 m, lay a dry grassy terrace and by its edge the 2451m Schlernhäuser, the most visited tourist shelter in Tirol, a true hotel in excellent care of the former Bozen section of the German Alpine Society. It offers 82 beds and 25 additional folding beds. Before the war, up to 300 people dined in the spacious hall on Sundays and certain holidays. From the hotel to the summit is a good 100 m, 20 minutes of slow walking, easily cut down to 15. Its face is devoid and rocky with spread out broken limestone rubble and a rock slab at the top. In the east, the Schlern plain beholds a white rock-face (Felswand), with a clear peak, morphologically a true »pech«.

Pletershnik gives 2) »pech« - Felsenstück, pechi, Felsgegend for Režija pech, Stein, pecha Felsenhöhle, pechevje Felsgegend, pechevina Felsengrund, pechina Fels, Felsenhöhle, pechinka Grotte, pechnato feslig. Gorizia's highlanders make a reasonably exact morphological distinction; pech = kompakter Fels, rock = Felsstück, edge = Felsrand, tunnel = das abgestürzte Felsstück, pechina = Felswand, pechevje = Felsmasse, pechevina = Felsboden. Mikloshich for »pek« cites the »pech« as a generally Slavic term, Lithuanian pechius, Hungarian pest, Romanian pesht, Tirolan dialect of German: Pötsche, Höhle unter dem Felsen. He adds: die ursprüngliche Bedeutung ist Ofen, which does not strike me as right, at least in the sense gebauter Ofen. The sense pech for Fels is autonomous; the mountain herdsman sees it as a pech, because he is scorched by the afternoon sun. Pech as personal name is used by all Slovenians living in mountains. Particularly notable in the Julian Alps are: Bela Pech (Biela Peit) 2143 m above neveja; until recently Monte Cimone (2380 m) was Stermapeit – Strma Pech. Pechi appear above Kanin and Prestreljenik, from Vogel to Rodica; »Na Pèchah (plur. tantum fem.)« above Bovec by the path to Kanin; Pechje = edge under Polovnik, Maklena Pech under Vrshich above Trenta. There is a Pechínka in Kras, a hill of 291 m, a known battle point of the great war between Opatjeselo and Kostanjevica. Peche, a village by Krka, Peche = Pöckau at Podklošter etc. Taler cites for Tirol: Pöntschen. On the road at the southern Austria-Salzburg border stand die Petschen; in the Fervala group (Preval?) the Pezinerspitze. Schiber, Zeitschrift des deutsch-österreich. A. V. 1902 knows of sources using Petsch for Ampezzo. This name is composed, in a similar vein as »Na gori« giving Langoris in Friuli under Kormin, from »Na pechi«. Another Ampezzo exists in upper Tagliamento Valley, both are known resorts. Pech is also the old name for rocky undergrowth protruding from the marshy Schlern in fact and morphologically the proper sense is the white, naked rock-side above the green Schlern grasslands. Germans view Pech to be a Ladin word for fir tree. Ladin pronunciation equals Slovenian, with a hard ch. Friulian pezz=pinus, picea, whilst pin=pine, pinus silvestri, larix, Larch = Lärche.

Karnski Furlani rabijo tudi od nemških kolonistov prevzeto Dane, očitno Tanne. Pomen: ladinski pech = smreka ali jelka (za pravcato morfološko pech) za pechnati nasad ob 2500 m nad glenasto planoto Schlerna ob 2400 je nemogoch. Od slovenskih Julijskih Alp chez Karnijo in Tirolsko pa do Zahodnih Alp je vse polno Pechi in Pez, Puez, Pezze, Pezes itd. Dochim pa je slovenska Pech kakor nemška Pöntsche, Petschen, nedvojnega pomena, je treba furlanske-ladinske in severmolashke dialektične besede ločiti morfološko na Pechi = Felsen in pezes = smrečje, jelovje. Morfološko tipična Pech - Fels pa je nad Schlernom.

Enako zmeshane so tudi besede pekel, pecol. Pekel 2106 m pod Triglavom, je turistom znan; v Reziji »Na pékale« in dalje na zahod morfološko »Pecol« v vishavi pomeni splošno-slovenski pekel. Pecol in Pocol furlanski pa često znachi pe = noga, col = brdo, gora, pecol; torej: Podbrdo, Podgora, Pocol (post – col) pa: Zabrd, Zagora. Pod visoko Civetto je vas Pecol, nad njo pa 1813 m Crep di Pecol t. j. Krepa nad Podbrdom. Besedo Pecol splošno napachno razlaga Meyer-Lübke (Etym. rom. Wörterbuch) iz latinskega pediculus. Res pecoll furlanski pomeni peduncolo, a Pironov furlanski slovar stakne vse skup – pecóll, peduncolo in piede di mobiglio, t. j. pecelj, ter somita, in cima di un colle, t. j. pekel.

Slovenska beseda »Pech« na Schlernu ni osamljena. Ko so vitezi Wolkensteinci okoli XII. stoletja sezidali svoj gradich v kotanji Grodenske doline pri vzhodu Langental, so imeli njive po ronku skupine Cheri, Tschierspitzien 2592 m, in planine in staje pod La Pizza (Shpica 2498 m) Stevia- ali Stava-alpa.

»Pod Nivabize« so hishe Sot Nives. Ker je latinski nix-nivis, ladinski neif = sneg in so se po zgodovini Ladini v Grodenski dolini naselili shele v poznem srednjem veku, Nivabize, po mojem, ne more biti ne od latinskega nives, ne od ladinskega neif. »Biza« morda nemški Wiese, »niva« pa slovensko njiva. »Stevia« in »stava« ladinski sploh ni umljiva, pach pa slovenski staja ali pristava. Wolkensteinci bi torej imeli kot prve tlachane Slovane, pozneje so se naselili Ladini, imeni Niva in Stava pa sta obe ohranjeni do danes. Prehod Kukovo sedlo = Sella Cuca.

Ladinski gorski vodniki so mi pravili, da so Ladinci, ko so se naseljevali po Grodenski dolini, nashli visoko v gorah stare prebivalce, ki so med seboj obchevali po gozdnih stezah, in she danes se imenuje ena takih stezâ pod planino Rascienza, Raschötztal pach Rashica, »Troi dei pajans« = steza poganov.

V vzporedni dolini na sever, v sedaj germaniziranem Vilmösstalu, je she ohranjenih precej chisto slovenskih livadnih imen: Praprot, Ravn, Chnidoj (dol), Got = kot, Gost = gozd, Trebe, Trebich.

V ladinski obchini Ortisei, St. Ulrich, je Lip pach = lipa in Rona pach Ravna. V obchini Selva – Wolkenstein pa je Lepotza, nedvojno Lepocha, karakteristično ime za zhivinski kal po slovenskih planinah.

Tod so torej chista slovenska imena.* Jezikoslovci so jih prezrli, ker se tuji niso nauchili spridoma slovenshchine, kakor tudi ne furlanshchine in ladinschchine.

Karn Friulians borrow Dane from Germanic coloni, obviously Tanne. Sense: The Ladin pech = spruce or fir (for the true morphological pech) for a rocky growth at 2500 m above the marshy plain of Schlern at 2400 is impossible. The area from Slovenian Julian Alps, across Karnia and Tirol up to the western Alps is filled with Pech, Peza, Pueza, Pezze, Pezes etc. Meanwhile Slovenian pech, like German Pönts, Petschen has a single sense only, the Friulian-Ladin and northern Italian dialect two senses must be distinguished: pech = Felsen and pezes = spruce, fir. The morphologically typical Pech – Fels rises above Schlern.

The words pekel, pecol are likewise mixed. Pekel 2106 m, under Triglav is known among tourists; in Resia »Na pékale« and further westward the morphological meaning of the steep »Pecol« is Slovenian pekel = hell. Pecol and Friulian Pocol frequently denote pe = foot, col = hill; the Pecol mountain is therefore a foothill, while Pocol (post-col) means hinter-hill. Beneath the steep Civetta, lay the village Pecol, above it extends the 1813 m Crep di pecol, Krepa nad Podbrdom (above the foothill, trans. n.). Meyer-Lübke (Etym. rom. Wörterbuch) misinterprets the word to stem from the Latin pediculus. In fact pecoll in Friulian means peduncolo, but Piron's Friulian dictionary combines both: pecóll, peduncolo in piede di mobiglio, i.e stem, and somita, in cima di un colle, i.e. hell.

Slovenian »Pech« in Schlern is not an exception. Circa 7th century, when knights Wolkenstein built their small castle in the hollow of the Groden Valley east of Langental, their fields were on the slopes of the Cheri, Tschierspitzien group 2592 m, and pastures and pens under La Pizza (Shpica 2498 m) Stevia- or Stava-alpa.

»Pod Nivabize« are houses Sot Nives. Since latin nix, nivis and Ladin neif = snow and history attests that Ladins settled the Groden Valley only in the late Middle Ages, Nivabize, can in my opinion stem neither from latin nives nor Ladin neif. »Biza' perhaps the German Wiese, »niva« Slovenian njiva = field. »Stevia« and »Stava« are unknown in Ladin, however Slovenian has staja or pristava (pen, admin. building). Wolkensteins could have had Slovenians as their first thralls; later Ladins immigrated but the names Niva and Stava remain preserved to this day. The Kukovo Sedlo pass = Sella Cuca. Ladin mountain guides told me that Ladins settling the Groden Valley, came upon old settlers high in the mountains, who had relations with each-other on forest trails and to this day a trail under the Rascenza pasture is called Raschöztal, Rashica, »Troi dei pajans«, trail of Pagans.

In the parallel valley to the north, in presently germanised Vilmösstall several purely Slovenian meadow names are preserved: Praprot (fern, trans. n.), Ravni, Chrindoj (dale), Got = corner, Gost = wood, Trebe, Trebich.

In the Ladin Ortisei municipality, St. Ulrich, are Lip = lipa (lime tree, trans. n.) and Rona = Ravna (streight, trans. n.). In municipality Selva-Wolkenstein are Lepotza, indubitably Lepocha, a characteristic Slovenian alpine name for watering hole.

Here, therefore, pure Slovenian names* are found, overlooked by linguists, because they never properly learned neither Slovenian, Friulian nor Ladin.

II.

Kakor Pech, tako je po Tirolu ladinskega in bavarskega narechja vse polno slovenskih lastnih imen. Romanisti niso posebno skrbno predelali lashkega ozemlja, pach pa imajo bogato zbirko lastnih imen **tirolski Nemci**. Le da niti eden med njimi ni zmožen slovenshchine; zato vsi besede neznanega pomena tolmachijo iz raznih keltskih, ilirskih in drugih ideologij.

Tako Tarneller »Hof u. Burgnamen in Meran« etc. stavlja med ladinske ali predrimске t. j. veneto-ilirske besede na pr. sledeče: **Perval** = Perfl = Pirbler – očitno slovenska **Prevala**, v Zadlazu pri Tolminu tudi pokvarjeno v Pirbla. **Kanzen**, kanz, konz, kunz – očitno **konec**. V »Koncu« je pogosto ime za dolinske koti.

Gichl am **Grèben**, iz l. 1694, ne potrebuje tolmachenja.

Troier, ladinski troi, ni iz trivium, ampak iz slovenskega **utro**, t. j. utrta tla, beseda široko razširjena po slovenskih planinah.

Tel, Töll = dol.

Loch = Gebüsch, Sald, očitno: **log**. Schmeller (za bavarski) ima »**Lo, Loh, Logen**, Lohen, besonders in Zusammensetzungen.«

Pletzenbauer pach ni srednjenemshko Streifen Landes, ampak gre k **Pleche**, pogosto ime za gorske pomole.

Küchelberg je kakor Salzburshki **Kuchel** morfološko slovenska **kukla**. Tarneller opisuje: »langgestreckter Hügelrücken, der plötzlich abflält«, t. j. strmi sklon daje morfološko obliko kukle, kakor na pr. Kukla v Trenti etc.

Lazins so **Lazne**.

Brizsche, dokum. iz l. 1311, so **Brishche**, vse polno enakih imen po Gorishkem in Beneshkem; kratica iz **brdishche**.

In **der Laner**, d. i. Bergmahd, je očitno **Lanezh**, gora s senozhetni, po katerih raste divji lan. Po Julijskih Alpah je vse polno Lanezhev.

In **der Gande**, d. i. Boden mit grobem Schutt. Schmeller ima bavarski **Gund, Gunten**, »Luftloch«. Slovenski in latinski k prehaja v tirolshchini navadno v *g* in *t* chesto v *d*. Oboje je po glasu in pomenu nasha »**konta**« v Julijskih Alpah. **Kuntner** je tudi slovensko lastno ime, osebno in gorsko, **Kuntar** k konta. Primerjaj vech imen Kuntar v Julijskih Alpah, gor, ki stoje poleg konte.

Gatsche, in der Gatsche – pogosto slovensko ime **Gache**, Zwiesel; Gachnik, Gachnikar, der Zwieselbauer.

Táber pach ni od nemshkega taub, ampak bo nash tabor.

Pöntsche – pech.

Tamasseg, dokumi. iz l. 1560, Tamerseg, razširjena planinska beseda **tamar**.

Marling, iz l. 1290 she **Mernig**, za mero; pach slovenski **mernik**.

II.

Like Pech, there is a plethora of Slovenian proper names throughout Tirol of Ladin and Bavarian dialects. Romance linguists did not carefully examine this area, Tirolan Germans, however, have a rich collection of proper names. Though not a single one knows Slovenian and so they search for words of unknown origin in Celtic, Illyrian and other ideologies.

So Tarneller »Hof u. Burgnamen in Meran« etc. for example counts as Ladin or pre-Roman i.e. Veneto-Illyrian words the following words: **Perval** = Perfl = Pirbler – obviously Slovenian **Prevala**, also corrupted in Zadlax by Tolmin to Pirbla. **Kanzen**, kanz, konz, kunz – obviously **konec** (**end**, trans. n.). »Konec« often appears as the name of valley ends.

Gichl am **Grèben**, from 1694 needs no interpretation (greben = »ridge«, trans. n.).

Troier, Ladin *troi* does not derive from trivium but rather from Slovenian **utro**, i.e. cleared ground, a word widely used in Slovenian hills.

Tel, Töll = dol (dale, transl. note).

Loch = Gebüsch, Sald, obviously: **log** (marsh, trans. n.). Schmeller (Bavarian) gives »**Lo, Loh, Logen**, Lohen, besonders in Zusammensetzungen.«

Pletzenbauer is not middle German Streifen Landes, but corresponds with **Pleche**, a frequent designation for mountain ledges.

Morphologically **Küchelberg**, like Salzburg's **Kuchel** is Slovenian **kukla**.

Tarneller describes »langgestreckter Hügelrücken, der plötzlich abfläht«, i.e. the steep incline lends the morphological shape of *kukla*, like p. ex. *Kukla v Trenti* etc.

Lazins are **Lazne**.

Brizsche, documented in 1311, are **Brishche**, frequent name in Gorishka and Venetian areas, a shortened form of **brdishche** (brdo = hill, transl. note).

In **der Laner**, d. i. Bergmahd is obviously **Lanezh**, a mountain with meadows of wild flax. There are numerous Lanezhs in the Julian Alps.

In **der Gande**, d. i. Boden mit grobem Schutt. Schmeller gives the Bavarian **Gund, Gunten**, »Luftloch«. Slovenian and Latin *k* in Tirolan usually mutates to *g* and *t*, and often *d*. Both match in sound and meaning »**konta**« in our Julian Alps. **Kuntner** is also a Slovenian name, personal and alpine, **Kuntar** with *konta*. See instances of *Kuntar* in the Julian Alps, hills next to a *konta* (sinkhole, trans. n.).

Gatsche, in *der Gatsche* – frequent Slovenian name **Gache**, Zweisel; Gachnik, Gachnikar, *der Zwieselbauer*.

Táber is in fact not derived from German *taub*, but our *tabor* (camp, trans. n.).

Pöntsch – *pech*.

Tamasseg, doc. in 1560 as *Tamerseg*, widespread alpine word **tamar** (cattle pen, trans. n.).

Marling, in 1290 and **Merning**, for measure, Slovenian **mernik** (bushel, trans. n.)

Ursinig, dokum. l. 1380 **Virshinich**, je kakor dokum. furlanski **Verzegnis**, slovanska beseda **Vrshich**.

Zoche, dokum. iz l. 1580, **Zouch** je **Suha** kakor Zouch = Suha ob Chrni Prsti. Schmeller ima bavarski **Zauch**.

Tisens, dok. iz l. 1259 **Tisna**, l. 590 domnevna trdnjava Tesena, za katero so se bojevali Franki in Longobardi, morda slovenska **Tesna**.

Lass, Laas; Tarneller razlaga iz »die Lass«, t. j. drcha, »durch die Lass wird Holz getrieben.« To bi veljalo za gore, a Laas, velika vas v dolini nad Meranom, so pach slovenske **Laze**.

Shiroko razširjena povsodi, kjer bivajo Nemci, po Schmellerju bavarski, frankovski in avstrijski, je beseda **Werd, Werder, Wert**, »erhöhter Ort«, smatram jo za sorodno z našim **brdo**.

Zelo razširjena je tudi beseda **Rang, Rank, Rangen, Rung**, Rungen. Schmeller ima frankovski Rang, fortlaufender Bergabhang, t. j. morfološko točno furlanski **ronc**; Slovenci imamo **ronek**, obronek.

Pri Schmellerju najdemo sploh vse polno naših besedi. **Gosse** (Sennhütte) = kocha, die **Grappen** = grapa, Graus (Greuss, Gros, **Gries**) = Grizha.

Lam, Erzgrube im bayrischen Wald, je slovenska beseda **Lom**; glej V Lomeh pod Vrshichem v Trenti.

Lus (Morast) = **Luzha**.

Lewer, Leberberg (Hügel) = slov. léb, lebanja.

Sedelkot je pach **sedlo** in **kot**.

Filologi bodo našli v Tarnellerju, Schmellerju in dr. še cel zaklad starih slovenskih, proti severozahodu pa starih cheshkih besedi.

Od prvega stoletja po Kristu se je latinilo podolje Etsch – Eisack in odprta rodna Inska dolina; v V. in VI. stoletju pa so germanski Bajuvari potiskali Latine od severa dol. Kdo je takrat in v nastopnih stoletjih bival po visokih planinah in alpskih zakotjih – tega nam kroničarji niso sporočili. Shele od XII. stoletja dalje je nastopila kolonizacija gorovja in zakotij, od severa Bavarcev, od juga Ladincev.

(*Planinski vestnik*, leto 1926, sht. 7; izdajatelj: Slovensko planinsko drushtvo v Ljubljani)

* Po svoji priselitvi so Slovenci prodrli tudi v te kraje, a so polagoma izginjali v tujem zhivlju, ostavivši pa v njem nedvomne sledove svojega jezika. – **Urednishtvo**.

(Zvezdica s pripadajočo opombo ni Tumova, temveč jo je vrnilo urednishtvo *Pl. vestnika*. – Op. ur.)

Ursinig, docum. in 1380 as **Virshinich** is akin to the documented Friulian **Verzegnīs**, the Slavic word **Vrshich**.

Zoche, documented in 1580, **Zouch** is **Suha** as Zouch = Suha ob Chrni Prsti. Schmeller gives Bavarian **Zauch**.

Tsiens, docum. in 1259 as **Tisna**, in 590 the supposed Tesena fort, the object of fighting between the Franks and Lombards, perhaps Slovenian **Tesna**.

Lass, Laas; Tarneller proposes »die Lass«, i.e. timber slide »durch die Lass wird Holz getrieben.« This could be true in the mountains, but the large village of Laas above Meran is Slovenian **Laze**.

The word **Werd, Werder, Wert** is widely attested wherever Germans are found, according to Schmeller Bavarian, Frankish, and Austrian, »erhöhter Ort', I believe it to be related to our **brdo** (hill, trans. n.).

Rang, Rank, Rangen, Rung, Rungen is also widespread. Schmeller gives Frankish Rang, fortlaufender Bergabhang, i.e. morphologically apt Friulian **ronc**; Slovenians have **ronek**, obronek (rim, edge, trans. n.).

Schmeller features several Slovenian words. **Gosse** (Sennhütte) = kocha, (die **Grappen** = grapa, Graus (Greuss, Gros, **Gries**) = Grizha (**hut, gorge, barren land** – respectively, trans. n.).

Lam, Erzgrube im bayrischen Wald, is the Slovenian word **Lom**; see V Lomeh beneath Vrshich in Trenta.

Lus (Morast) = **Luzha**.

Lewer, Leberberg (Hügel) = Slovenian léb, lebanja.

Sedelkot is simply **sedlo** and **kot** (**saddle** and **corner**, trans. n.)

Philologists will find a treasury of old Slovenian, and due north-west Czech, words in Tarneller, Schmeller and others.

Since the 1st century A.D. the Etsch - Eisack lowlands and open fertile Inn valley were Latinised; in the 5th and 6th centuries Germanic Baiuvari pushed Latins south. The chroniclers do not say who at the time and in the following centuries settled steep hills and alpine backwoods. Bavarians from the north and Ladins from the south only colonised these areas from the 12th century onwards.

(*Planinski vestnik*, 1926, no. 7; publisher: Slovensko planinsko drushtvo v Ljubljani)

* After their immigration Slovenians also entered this space but gradually disappeared among other residents leaving clear remnants of their language. – **Editorial board.**

(The asterix and appended note were not added by Tuma, but by the editorial board of *Planinski vestnik* – editor's note.)

HENRIK TUMA (Ljubljana, 1858-1935), politik, publicist, alpinist. Rojen v predmestju Krakovo (oče Matija chevlar, priseljenec iz Prage, mati r. Ana Vidic), najprej učitelj, nato na Dunaju promoviral pravo, zhivel vech let na Primorskem (Trst, Gorica), kjer se je tudi porochil (Marija Gianola, z njo deset otrok), po prvi sv. v. odvetnik v Ljubljani. Spochetka v liberalni stranki, nato socialdemokrat in avstromarksist; erudit v razlichnih strokah (zgodovina, psihologija, literatura), preuceval imena slovenskih gora in s tem podpiral tezo o avtohtonosti Slovencev v Alpah; urednik revije *Nashi zapiski* (kot naslednik A. Dermote spremenil prejšnji podnaslov »socialna revija« v »socialistichna revija«, 1913).

Tukaj je predstavljen z dvema spisoma (prvi, ki je izjemno obsezhen, le v odlomkih, drugi v celoti) od tistih, v katerih je razvijal svoje lingvisticzne poglede; uradna stroka jih je sicer zavrachala, vendar iz njih, kljub morda kakshni vprashljivi podrobnosti, izhaja shirsha, solidno utemeljena razlaga toponomastichnih sledov v zemljepisno-zgodovinskem alpskem kontekstu v luchu slovenske (slovanske) etimologije. Tako se tudi po Tumi slovenshchina s svojimi narechji nakazuje kot relikv verjetno prve migracije (ok. 3000 pr. n. sht.) Indoevropcejev iz evrazijskega severovzhoda na zahod v Evropo vse do Atlantika; kasnejshi dotok bolj vojashko organiziranih plemen (istega indoevr. porekla) je te pastirsko-poljedelske predhodnike skozi stoletja z vseh strani zozheval v manj dostopne in z gorami zashchitene predele, njihovo izvorno toponimijo pa predeloval in brisal na vsakrshne nachine.

Izbor in opomba o avtorju Ivo Antich

*1 Prevedel Marko Petrovich (do tretjega odstavka strani 111)

*1 Prevedel Jaka Jarc (od tretjega odstavka strani 111)

HENRIK TUMA (Ljubljana, 1858-1935), politician, journalist, mountaineer. Born in the Krakovo suburbs of Ljubljana (father Matija cobbler, immigrant from Prague, mother Ana, nee Vidic), at first teacher then received his doctorate in law in Vienna, lived in Primorska (Littoral) for several years (Trst, Gorica), where he also married (to Marija Gianola, they had ten children). After World War I, he was a lawyer in Ljubljana. At first a member of the Liberal Party, he later became a Social Democrat and Austro-Marxist; erudite in various disciplines (history, psychology, literature), he studied names of Slovenian Mountains in support of the thesis of Slovenian autochthony in the Alps; editor of the *Nasbi zapiski* periodical (as A. Dermota's successor, he changed its previous subtitle from »social magazine« to »socialist magazine«, 1913).

Here he is featured through two essays (only excerpts of the first, which is extremely lengthy, the second is given in its entirety) from among those containing his linguistic opinions; the official field negated their validity, however in spite of a few perhaps questionable toponymical details, it is possible to follow his solid argumentation to a wider explanation of toponymical traces of the geographic and historical alpine context in the light of Slovenian (Slavic) etymology. And so also according to Tuma, Slovenian with its dialects is outlined as a relic of probably the first migration (c. 3000 B.C.) of Indo-European peoples from the Eurasian north-east westward into Europe all the way to the Atlantic; a later influx of more militaristically organised tribes (of the same Indo-European origin) pressed these herdsmen and agricultural predecessors from all sides through the centuries, pushing them into remote areas protected by mountains, while their original toponymy was transformed and erased in various ways.

Selection and note about the author by Ivo Antich

*1 Translated by Marko Petrovich (up to paragraph 3, p. 111)

*1 Translated by Jaka Jarc (from paragraph 3, p. 111)

Davorin Zbunkovich

STARODAVNOST SLOVANOV V EVROPI

(Zachetna poglavja iz knjige *Slovani, praljudstvo Evrope*)

Predgovor k peti izdaji

V shtirih prejšnjih izdajah je imelo to delo naslov: *Wann wurde Mitteleuropa von den Slaven besiedelt!* (Kdaj so se Slovani naselili v Evropi).

Doslej veljavna mnenja glede predzgodovine Slovanov in njihove kulturne manjvrednosti se bodo morala zdaj diametralno spremeniti, chetudi po ovinkih. Ne da bi se ozirali na sistemske utesnitve in popachene podmene, se bomo posluževali samo tistih dejavnikov, ki razvoj predzgodovinske kulture utemeljujejo s preprostimi in lahko razumljivimi dognanji. Znanost naj bo splošna dobrina in she tako neprijetna resnica naj zavzema prvo mesto! Naravnost neverjeten napredek dosejata tehnika in zdravstvo; skoraj ni dneva, da ne bi prebrali vesti o novih odkritjih, toda v nasho prazgodovino ne posezhe noben zharek svetlobe, saj so osvetlitev prepRechili s papirnatimi dogmami, praznimi navedbami in puhlimi frazami.

Narodopisne in imenoslovne raziskave vodijo k vse bolj jasnemu prikazu prastare evropske kulture, o katere velichini pa najbolj ucheni strokovnjaki nimajo najmanjshega pojma. Namen mojega pisanja je, da bi dosedanje etnografske podmene podkrepil na bolj poshten in bolj zanesljiv nachin. S pomocjo jezikovne in naravi ustrezne analize zhelim bralcu priblizhati prvobitni nachin mishljenja starega ljudstva, hkrati pa tudi pojasniti razvoj zapletenih oblik nashega danashnjega izrazhanja. Preprichan sem, da moremo le tako razreshiti vprashanje svoje narodne preteklosti. V tej pozitivni znanosti, ki obsega in omejuje pojme chasa, prostora in vzrochnosti, mora imeti glavno besedo samo svet nashih chutov, ne pa fantazija, mistika in pobozhne zhelje! – *Upam, da bo to delo prispevalo k iskanju resnice!*

Kromeřiž, novembra 1909.

Predgovor k shesti izdaji

Razveseljivo zanimanje, ki ga je bila delezhna prejšnja izdaja mojega dela pri vseh slojih izobrazhenega sveta, zahteva ponovitev, ki naj bi popestrila prejšnje prikaze s presenetljivimi novimi odkritji.

Davorin Zbunkovich

ANCIENT PROVENANCE OF SLAVS IN EUROPE

(The opening chapters from the book *Slavs, a European Protonation*)

Foreword to the fifth edition

In its previous four editions, this work was titled *Wann wurde Mitteleuropa von dem Slaven besiedelt!* (When was Europe Settled by Slavs).

The foregoing opinions on the topic of Slavic prehistory and cultural inferiority will need to be fundamentally altered, even if indirectly. Without adapting to the confines of the system and skewed assumptions, we are going to make use only of those factors, which base the development of prehistoric culture on simple and easily comprehensible inferences. Science ought to be a commonly accessible commodity and even the most unpleasant truth must take preference! Engineering and medicine are making truly unbelievable headway; barely a day passes without news reporting new discoveries, while our prehistory receives not a single ray light, its illumination obstructed by dogmatic paper doctrines, empty statements, and hollow phrases.

Ethnographic and genealogic research is leading towards ever-clearer depictions of prehistoric European culture, the greatness of which remains entirely unknown to the most learned of experts. My writing aims to support current ethnographic assumptions in a fairer and more reliable manner. Assisted by linguistic analysis fitting the nature of the issue I aim to acquaint the reader with the ancient people's primordial mode of thinking, while simultaneously explaining the evolution of the complex forms of our present-day expressions. I am certain that this is the only way to solve the issue of our national past. This positivist science, which encompasses and delineates the concepts of time, space, and causality, must be ruled solely by the world of our senses rather than fantasy, mysticism, and wishful thinking! – *I hope that this work will contribute to the search for the truth!*

Kromeríž, November 1909.

Foreword to the sixth edition

The delectable interest roused by the previous edition of my work among all the tiers of the educated world calls for repetition, which should enliven the previous interpretations with surprising new discoveries.

Imenoslovje (toponomastika) se je razmahnilo, odkar se mu je pridružilo tudi primerjalno jezikoslovje. Razširitev govornih območij prinasha vsak dan nove spodbude in nove obrazložitve prastarih zakonitosti.

Z veseljem ugotavljam, da se zato marsikatera beseda ne omejuje vech na pomen, ki ji je odrejen v knjigah, ampak vsaj delno obnavlja tudi tistega, ki ga je imela v času in okolju svojega nastanka. Ob prizadevanjih, da bi postopno ugotovili nastanek tako starih kot sodobnih besed in jih osvetlili vsestransko, gradimo tudi temelje jezikovne prazgodovine in utiramo pot do bolj pretehtanega spoznavanja skupne jezikovne zibelke.

Lahko pa se chudimo, da se prav tisti krogi, ki nimajo akademske izobrazbe, najbolj zhivo zanimajo za odkritja v zvezi z zgodovino starih Slovanov. Vsaka duhovna znanost se razvija toliko bolj zhivahno, kolikor bolj je chutiti tezhnjo dobrega k boljšemu. Samo tam, kjer duh avtoritete vlada z vzvishenega prestola, ostaja vse pri starem. Vendar prav slavistika, ki temelji pravzaprav na eni sami avtoriteti, tista veja znanosti, ki se je pred pol stoletja svojeglavo odrekla celotni staroslovanski kulturi in zgodovini, she dandanes ucheno razlaga ena in ista pravila. **Svoje trhle dogme je zaprla v formalnostni obroch, da bi jim s tem zagotovila nadaljnji obstoj** [poudaril prevajalec]. Ampak takshna okamenela znanost ne bo vech dolgo delezhna zaupanja in maliki vsiljene veljave bodo pozabljeni, saj zhelja po odkrivanju neznanega ne more ostati na veke potlachena. To pa je glavni namen mojega pisanja.

Kromeřiř, na Novega leta dan 1911.

UVOD

Prvo, chesar se je treba zavedati, kadar dokazujemo, da so Slovani eno od najstarejših ljudstev Evrope, mora biti zahteva po odstranitvi vseh prepek, s katerimi uradna znanost in politichne stranke ovirajo pot do raziskav. Pri tem se ne smemo ozirati na morebitno uzhaljenost katerékoli akademije ali vesele drushchine. Z vso gotovostjo smemo dopovedovati tisto, kar je zhe dolgo chasa znano: *Dokler bodo bajke, pravljice in bedastoche veljale kot zgodovinski dokaz, se ne moremo pogovarjati ustvarjalno. Dokler bodo ljudje verjeli, da je preseljevanje ljudstev kdajkoli obstajalo in da so se Slovani naselili ravno v odrejenem času, ne more biti niti govora o uspehu v raziskavah o etnografski prazgodovini Evrope. Dokler se ne bodo z vso resnostjo lotili preuchevanja evropskega prajezika, tj. prvih nashih jezikov, bo raziskovanje nashe najbolj zgodnje kulture temeljilo na majavih tleb.*

Takshnega razbijashkega delovanja sem se lotil z vsemi mochmi. Prishel sem do sklepa, da pripovedke o nashi preteklosti, ki smo jih vajeni poslushati, v nobenem primeru ne morejo zdrzhati resnih protidokazov. Zavedam se, da je zanikanje trditve o samoniklosti Slovanov ena izmed najhujshih zmot oziroma znanstvenih ponaredkov, kar jih je kdaj bilo.¹

Ever since it was joined by comparative linguistics, toponymy has grown more popular. The expansion of language zones brings daily new inspirations and explanations of ancient principles.

I am happy to find that, as a result, several words are no longer limited to senses as defined in books, but have been at least partially renewed to the senses they held in the era and place of their inception. Through efforts to gradually find the origin of both ancient and modern-day words and illuminate them from all angles, we are also constructing the fundamentals of linguistic prehistory and breaking new ground towards a more balanced understanding of our common linguistic cradle.

We can, however, marvel at the fact that it is those without academic education, who are most vividly interested in discoveries concerning the history of ancient Slavs. Any science of the mind advances all the more lively when there is a sense of aspiration to move from good to better. It is only where the spirit of authorities rules from an elevated throne that everything remains the same. Yet it is Slavic studies, that are actually based on a single authority, the branch of science that half a century ago obstinately denied entire ancient Slavic culture and history, which to this day learnedly expounds the same old rules. **It locked its three dogmas in a ring of formality to ensure their continued existence** [emphasized in the Slovenian translation]. However, such fossilized science will not retain confidence for long and idols of forced validity will fade because the desire for discovery cannot remain forever suppressed. And this is my writing's main objective.

Kromeříž, New Year's Day 1911

INTRODUCTION

The first thing to keep in mind when proving that Slavs are one of Europe's oldest peoples, must be the necessity to remove all barriers that are erected by official science and political parties with a view to hinder the path to research. In this we mustn't take notice of potentially offending any academy or happy company. We can, with complete certainty, state that which has been known for a good long while: *As long as fables, fairy tales, and stupidities are counted as historic proof there can be no productive debate. While people believe that there ever existed such a thing as migration of peoples and that Slavs settled exactly in the defined period, there can be no trace of successful ethnographic research of European prehistory. Until there serious efforts are made to research European protolanguage, i.e. the primary elements of our languages, the research of our earliest culture will stand on shaky ground.*

I have pursued such disruptive efforts with all my might. I have reached the conclusion that fables about our past, which we are accustomed to hearing, can in no instance withhold serious scrutiny. I am aware that opposing the notion of Slavic autochthony is one of the gravest blunders or scientific falsifications there ever existed.¹

Vztrajanje na dosedanjih temeljih znanstvene ureditve povzroča velikansko škodo, ker se ljudje samo s strahom lotevajo revizije kategorij, kot so predzgodovina, preučevanje starih kultur, antropologija, bajeslovje in jezikoslovje, ker to utegne povzročiti družbene, kulturne in politične spremembe. Najprej je treba prestopiti mrtvo točko, nato pa pochasi in premišljeno uveljavljati radikalna stalishča; v naglici bi utegnili vreči na isti kup smeti, kar je še vrednega. Ko bo zadeva stekla, ne bomo smeli pozabiti pravila: *Kolikor močnejša je sila, ki zavrta resnico, toliko bolj uničuje bo ta udarila na dan, ko se bodo utrgale verige, ki jo uklepajo!*

Toda zadrževanje resnice je zhe povzročilo neizmerno škodo, saj je bila vsiljevana skozi dolga stoletja znanost prepletena z lazhmi. Cele knjižnice so napolnili z deli, ki bi prishla prav kvechjemu preučevalcem chloveshkih zmot. Samo domnevamo lahko, kolikshni jezikovni in narodopisni zakladi so bili uničeni, che vzamemo v obdelavo samo krajshe chasovno obdobje. Koliko naših sheg, navad, nosh in narechij je izginilo za vselej? Zdaj jih lahko ishchemo le v megli domnev in fantazije. Zato smo dolzhni, da reshimo pred pozabo jezikovne zaklade, ki bi se sicer izgubili za vselej. Dela se lotimo ob izkljuchitvi nacionalistichnih pristranosti! In ne pozabimo, da se z vsakim dnevom vecha izguba dragocenega osnovnega kapitala, tezhje postajajo raziskave in izgublajo se she zadnji obrisi nashe resnichne preteklosti.

Delo, ki nas chaka, je veliko in mnogostransko, vendar pestro in ustvarjalno, vneslo pa bo tudi mnogo svezhine v politichno dejavnost. V miselnost ljudi bo vneslo bolj popoln, bolj kozmopolitski svetovni nazor, ki jim bo razshiril obzorja. Iz tega dela mora izhajati tista moralna, idealna strpnost do drugache govorechih in drugache mislechih, pomanjkanje katere dandanes boleche občutimo. V nas mora sprozhiti dojemanje tistih naravnih sil, ki spodbujajo kulturni razvoj vseh ljudstev. Poleg tega bo pomagalo vzgojiti generacijo, ki si bo ustvarila svoje mnenje tako o sedanosti kot o preteklosti. Ustvaril se bo shtab uglednih arheologov, etnografov, zgodovinarjev in drugih strokovnjakov, ki bo sposoben uposhtevati pomen raznih pokrajin, krajev in poimenovanj ter ponuditi razsodnemu opazovalcu obilico shtudijskega materiala. Ampak treba je zacheti! ²

Bralec bo zhe iz te knjige spoznal, kakshni jezikovni in kulturni zakladi se she skrivajo neizrabljeni med ljudstvom. Jaz sem svoje raziskave zasnoval na slovenskem jeziku. Shtevilni znaki namrech kazhejo, da je treba Slovence obravnavati kot najbolj ohranjeni ostanek evropske predzgodovine. Pri tem sem v prvi vrsti namenil pozornost izvoru in zatem pomenu topografskih imen. Nadalje sem pretehtal, kaj je v nashi najstarejshi zgodovini naravno, kaj je resnichno in kaj pesnishka domishljija. Zato menim, da bo poshten raziskovalec ob podobnih predpostavkah tudi pri spreminjajochi se jezikovni podlagi mogel vsaj v glavnem potrditi pravilnost mojih sklepov.

Zaradi vechje preprihljivosti pa je bilo najbolj potrebno razreshiti tiste jezikovne, kulturne in zgodovinske uganke, ki preprechujejo, da bi zavrgli okamenele dogme.

Upholding current foundations of scientific establishment causes immense damage, because fear accompanies any revision of categories such as prehistory, study of ancient cultures, anthropology, mythology, and linguistics, because these might cause social, cultural, and political changes. First this impasse must be broken, after which radical positions must be introduced slowly and with careful consideration; haste might result in throwing out the valuable with the rubbish. Once the whole matter is started, we will need to keep in mind the following imperative: *The more powerful the force suppressing the truth, the more destructively it will break free once the chains keeping it down give!*

But keeping the truth down has already caused immeasurable harm for it was accompanied by centuries of forcefully fostering science ridden with lies. Entire libraries were filled with works that would at best be useful to a student of human errors. We can only speculate how many linguistic and ethnographic treasures have been destroyed, even if we focus our attention on a short time period. How many of our customs, traditions, costumes, and dialects are gone forever? Now we can only look for them in the fog of assumptions and fantasy. This is why it is our responsibility to save from oblivion linguistic treasures, which would otherwise be lost forever. We must undertake this effort while excluding nationalist bias! Also, let us not forget that with each passing day the loss of valuable base capital grows greater, the research grows harder, and last traces of our true past are being lost.

The work awaiting us is vast and multifaceted though diverse and creative; it will also introduce much freshness to political activities. It will induct a more complete and cosmopolitan worldview into public thought, widening the horizons of the members of the public. This work must serve as the source of that ideal moral acceptance of differing statements and views, which are so sorely lacking today. It must rouse within us the comprehension of those natural forces, which incite cultural development of all peoples. It will also help to foster a generation capable of forming its own opinions both about the present as well as the past, creating an assembly of esteemed archaeologists, ethnographers, historians, and other experts comprehending the significance of various regions, towns, and nomenclatures in offering prudent observers abundant study materials. But we need to begin!²

This very book will itself enable the reader to comprehend what hidden linguistic and cultural treasures remain untapped among the people. I based my research on Slovenian language for there are numerous indications that Slovenians must be viewed as the best-preserved remnants of European prehistory. In this I have paid particular attention to the origin and meaning of topographic names. Further, I weighed what is natural in our earliest history, what is true and what poetic imagination. This is why I believe that even with the changing linguistic base, a sincere researcher taking into consideration similar postulations will be able to at least generally confirm the correctness of my conclusions.

For greater plausibility it was most necessary to resolve those linguistic, cultural, and historical riddles that prevent us from discarding fossilised dogmas.

Razmishljanja sposobni del chloveshtva mora ustvariti duhovno ozrachje, ki bi pometlo zastarela izhodishcha. Pred ochmi moramo imeti predvsem naslednje predpostavke:

- a) Nekoch je obstajal enoten evropski prajezik, katerega elementi so she zaznavni, danashnjim slovanskim idiomom pa oblikovno in pomensko blizhji kot romanskim in germanskim.
- b) Najstarejsi pisni spomeniki Evrope, *rune* [dandanes tej pisavi pravimo *venetska* – op. prev.] so slovanskega izvora v sodobnem jezikovnem pomenu; njihova vsebina, kolikor jo je bilo zhe razbrane, pa je razumljiva predvsem Slovanom.
- c) Pretezhni del starejsih topichnih imen – che se jih pozneje ni dotaknila etimoloska metamorfoza – je razumljiv samo s pomocjo slovanskih jezikov; glavni povod za nastanek topichnih imen pa je she vedno dolochanje meja, ker chlovek zhivi s sovrstniki zmeraj kot sosed ob sosedu.
- d) Slovani ne morejo biti v Evropi kot priseljenci, kajti preseljevanja ljudstev nikoli ni bilo; ako je kateri narod v Evropi avtohton, so to v prvi vrsti Slovani.
- e) Nomadov, kakor jih nekateri pojmujejo, v Evropi ni bilo, pach pa so znane vsakoletne selitve chred zaradi pashe [op. prev.: ital. *trasumanze*].
- f) Najstarejsa druzhbena ureditev je bila patriarhalno-alodialna; vojashka obveznost je bila zhe v davnni sploshna; izvirala je neposredno iz zhelje po osebni varnosti in nemotenem gospodarjenju. To je utrdilo sploshno varnost s kar se da tehnicno popolno in okrepljeno obrambo meja. V tistih chasih so se zacheli pojavljati tudi zarodki plemstva in meshchanstva.
- g) V prvotnih verstvih je bil chlovek pred bogovi; v druzhbeno razchlenjeni skupnosti so bile priznane posebne pravice najstarejšemu, ki je bil tudi varuh skupnosti; vsa nadaljnja transcendenchna povishanja temeljijo na postopno razvijajochem se vojashko-druzhbenem stanu; zadevni nomenklaturi pripada tudi mnozhica hishnih imen in raznih nazivov.
- h) Do razdelitve skupnih zemljishch je moralo priti, vsaj v srednji Evropi, zhe pred nastopom Rimljanov.
- i) Med jezikom in raso ni nikakrshne medsebojne odvisnosti; na jeziku ali rasi slonecha rasna teorija je nesmisel.
- j) Razni kulturni spomeniki, ki jih imajo za ponaredke, kot so npr. »barbarski«
novci, mnogi runski napisi, Kraljedvorski rokopis itn., niso ponarejeni, ker so jih za take razglasili samo zaradi domneve o slovanski kulturni manjvrednosti.
- k) Na neko ustaljeno obmochje vezana kultura menja geografsko stalnost, kakor ji to narekuje zaporedje letnih chasov.

The segment of mankind capable of thought must create a spiritual atmosphere that would do away with obsolete views. The following assumptions must be kept in mind particularly:

- a) Once a unified European protolanguage existed, the elements of which remain perceivable and morphologically and contextually closer to present-day Slavic than Romance or Germanic idioms.
- b) The oldest European written monuments, *runes* [today we call this script *venetska* – Verbovshek's note] are of Slavic origin in the modern linguistic sense; their content discerned so far, is above all comprehensible to Slavs.
- c) The prevailing part of older topographical names – provided they were not subjected to subsequent etymological metamorphosis – is only comprehensible with the aid of Slavic languages; the main source for the creation of topographical names remains the designation of borders, since people always live alongside their peers as neighbour-by-neighbours.
- d) Slavs cannot be perceived as immigrants to Europe since migration of nations never existed; if any nation is indigenous to Europe, Slavs are surely first in line.
- e) Nomads, as imagined by some, never existed in Europe, though we know of annual migrations tied to the herding of cattle [note to Sl. Trans. Ital. *trasumanze*].
- f) The oldest social order was patriarchal-alodial; already in ancient times military service was conscripted; it was based directly on the desire for personal safety and uninterrupted governing. This strengthened general safety through technically perfected and fortified defence of borders. In those days precursors to nobility and bourgeoisie began appearing.
- g) In primordial religions man came before gods; in a socially differentiated community special rights were recognized for the oldest person, who was also the guardian of the community, all further transcendent elevations were based on a gradually developing militaristic social stratum; the relevant nomenclature also includes a multitude of house names and various designations.
- h) The distribution of common territorial units in central Europe had to have taken place already before the advent of Romans.
- i) There is no mutual dependence between language and race; race theory based on language or race is nonsensical.
- j) Various cultural monuments viewed as counterfeit, such as for example »barbarian« coins, many runic inscriptions, Kraljedvorski manuscript etc., are not counterfeit, but were proclaimed as such purely due to assumed Slavic inferiority.
- k) A culture tied to a permanent area alters geographic permanence in accordance with the sequence of seasons.

Opombe

1 – Če bi jih le rahlo podregnili, ne bi bilo uchina. – Ko je profesor dr. Niederle leta 1907 (Česky časopis hist., str. 101) ocenil moja stališča, je zapisal, da zdaj noben »pametnjak« ne verjame več v priselitev Slovanov. Pa se kljub temu ni nič premaknilo in obstali smo pri molku. Pri miru so pustili uchbenike zgodovine, da iz njih nemoteno chrpajo zavestne lazhi. Ta primer kaže, da celo katedrska beseda še dolgo ne bo mogla uveljavljati resnice.

2 – Katere podatke bo treba najprej zbirati, je povedano v besedilu knjige. Posebno pozornost pa velja nameniti:

a) topičnim imenom v vseh glavnih inachicah od najstarejših oblik naprej. Pri tem ne navajamo samo naselja, gorovje, vodovje itn., marveč tudi nazive mochvar, ledin, gmajn, njiv, travnikov, pashnikov, gozdnih parcel, jas, vinogradov, gorske predele, barja, studence itn.; v opombah navedemo tudi, če ime razumljivo odraža naravo objekta;

b) zgoščeni zgodovini naselja, cerkve, kapele, trga, rushevine, gradu in najstarejših stavb; nashtevanju plemishkih družin, ki v kraju bivajo, umetniskim objektom in zanimivim nagrobnikom; starim napisom; znamenitim osebam, ki so se tam rodile ali delovale; kratkemu opisu vsakršne zgodovinske znamenitosti;

c) naravnim znamenitostim; nahajališčem naravnih dobrin (rude, marmor, glina, kamen, nafta itn.); rudnikom; loncharstvu in barvarstvu; znamenitim drevesom;

d) krajem, kjer so stari grobovi in gomile pa kjer so nekoch stali zhrtveniki in vislice; predzgodovinskim nahajališčem napisov;

e) popisu vseh mest, ki so bila zajeta v obrambo;

f) porazdelitvi vashkih ledin s priložitvijo katastrskih izrisov;

g) zabelezhbi nenavadnih izrazov za hishe in gospodarska poslopja ter za domače kmetijsko in obrtniško orodje; poimenovanju oblachil in delov narodne noshe;

h) zapisovanju pripovedk in njihovih inachic, bajk, pravljic, legend in ljudskih zgodb; vrazhe v zvezi z rojstvi, porokami in smrtjo; opisu navad v zvezi z dnevi in letnimi chasi; zabelezhbam o nadzemeljskih pojavih, tavajochi nočni svetlobi, hishnih duhovih in charovnicah; zgodbam o pravici do prve nochi;

i) zapisovanju pregovorov, rekel, govornih figur, porogljivih izrazov ter besed neznanega pomena in izvora;

j) zabelezhbi še vedno poznanih in uporabljanih domačih zdravil, zdravilnih zelishch in drugih zdravilnih sredstev, kakor tudi boleznim in starim nachinom zdravljenja.

k) Znanstveni krogi bodo lahko našli v takshnih zapisih dovolj gradiva za izdajo monografij in strokovnih del.

Vsega obzhalovanja vredna je avstrijska zaostalost v znanstvenem vodenju narodopisja. Prav Avstrija, drzhava plurinacionalnih razumnikov, bi morala biti vzor drugim drzhavam pri iskanju odgovorov na vprashanja o izvoru svojih narodov. Nacionalni spori, ki jo zdaj razjedajo tako politično kot gospodarsko, izvirajo iz dejstva, da njeni narodi drug drugemu ostajajo tuji.

NASTANEK TOPICHNIH IMEN

Kot glavni dokaz za trditev, da so Slovani evropski staroselci in ne prishleki, rabijo krajevna imena na vseh konceh celine; vsem je skupen pomen, ki ga vsebujejo izključno le slovanski jeziki.

Notes

1 – Simply gentle nudges would have no effect. – When professor dr. Niederle evaluated my views in 1907 (Česky chasopis hist., p. 101), he wrote that now no »intellectual« believes in Slavic migration anymore. Yet nothing changed and we remain enveloped in silence. History textbooks are unchanged, sources for conscious lies. This example demonstrates that even the narrative from behind academic podiums is still far from being able to proclaim the truth.

2 – The content of the book defines which data needs to be accumulated first. However, special attention must be paid to:

a) topographical names in all their main forms starting with the oldest. Citations should not be limited to settlements, mountain ranges, bodies of water etc., but also designations of swamps, fallows, commons, fields, meadows, pastures, woodlands, clearings, vineyards, alpine areas, fens, streams etc.; notes should also clarify if names intelligibly reflect the nature of objects;

b) condensed histories of settlements, churches, chapels, squares, ruins, castles and the oldest structures; enumeration of noble families residing in the area; artistic structures and interesting headstones; old inscriptions; notable personalities born or active in the area, short descriptions of all manner of historical sights;

c) natural attractions, deposits of natural resources (ore, marble, clay, stone, oil etc.); mines; pottery and glazing; renowned trees;

d) locations of old graves and burial mounds and spaces where sacrificial altars and gallows once stood; sites of prehistoric inscriptions;

e) surveys of all towns included in the defense;

f) distribution of untilled village land with appended cadastral mappings;

g) records of unusual expressions designating houses and utility buildings as well as local farming and crafting tools, names for clothes and parts of folk costumes;

h) records of stories and their versions, fables, fairy tales, legends, and folk tales; superstitions concerning birth, marriage, and death; accounts of customs concerning days and seasons; records of supernatural events, wandering night lights, house ghosts and witches; tales of the right of first night;

i) records of proverbs, sayings, figures of speech, sneering expressions, and words of unknown meanings and origins;

j) records of preserved and still used home remedies, medicinal herbs and other medicines as well as maladies and old healing methods.

k) such records will provide scientific circles with enough materials to publish monographs and expert works.

Austrian out-dated attitudes towards the science of ethnography is lamentable. Austria, the land of multinational intellectuals should serve as an example to other countries in seeking answers to the question of the origin of its nations. National discord currently corroding it politically and economically stem from the fact that its nations remain foreign to one another.

FORMATION OF TOPOGRAPHICAL NAMES

Main proof that Slavs are indigenous Europeans rather than immigrants is contained in place names throughout the continent; these all share meanings contained exclusively in Slavic languages.

She dandanes prevladujejo glede nastanka in pomena topičnih nazivov mnenja, ki mejijo na norost. Nich chudnega ni to. Vsemu je krivo dejstvo, da so strokovnjaki izgubili občutek za nestvarno in nemogoče. Marsikateri zgodovinski dogodek je v nasprotju z logiko. Ob presoji niso bila vselej uposhtevana sredstva objektivne znanosti, temveč danost kapacitete, subjektivni fanatizem, she manj pa nekritičen pristop. Tako so chisto resno zapisali, da *Vindobona* pomeni »dobro obetajoch«. *Graz* (Gradec) naj bi izviral iz »Grazie«, cheshki *Znaim* (v cheshkem jeziku *Znojmo*) pa iz slovanskega glagola »znojiti se«. Romantichna s skalovjem posuta krajina Rosstrappe v gorovju Harz baje vsebuje v svojem imenu pomen sledi, ki naj bi jih zapustil za seboj konj drvečega Odina. *Slaven* naj bi pomenilo isto kot »Sklaven« (suzhnji) ⁽¹⁾. She in she bi mogli nashteti takih primerov. Z obzhalovanjem moramo rechi naslednje: *Chim vechja je osebna veljava razlagalcev imen, tem hujshe so njihove bedastoche*. Med njimi je mnogo vseuchilishchnih profesorjev, ki take nesmiselne razlage shirijo po svetu, ne da bi predlozhili dokaze. Pa tudi to je chisto logichno, kajti tistemu, ki pri raziskavah izhaja venomer iz istih stalishch, se prav rado pripeti kot onemu, ki je zashel v velikem gozdu: *zhivchen ishche izhod in bega v krogu namesto da bi splezal na visoko drevo in se z njega orientiral*. ⁽²⁾

Kdor zheli razlozhiti pomen topografskega naziva (h katerim jaz prishtevam tudi ljudske inachice), mora najprej ugotoviti njegovo najstarejsjo obliko, ker je le-ta bila naravi najblizhja in je bila she najmanj chasa podvrzhena izkrivljanju. Che kdo s pomocjo lastnega besednega zaklada potegne besedo, ki naj bi bila dala poimenovanju pomen, potrebuje she ogled kraja na lastne oči. Tedaj bo mogel ugotoviti, ali se jezikovno uveljavljeni naziv sklada s sedanjim domachim, cheprav to ne gre vedno brez zapletov. Po eni strani je namrech kraj v teku chasa utegnili izgubiti nekdanji pomen, po drugi pa so glasovne spremembe utegnile opraviti svoje. Zato je etimoloshko iskanje nekdanjega pomena zahtevno delo.

Kot primer lahko vzamemo nastanek imena *Zips*, ki je dobilo pri Madzharih zhe obliko *Szepes*. Dandanes ne pomeni nichesar onemu, ki ne ve, da je preko vech razvojnih stopenj nastalo iz besede, ki so jo zapisovali kot »Zübtz, Zueptzer, Zuppez« in da jo po njenem pomenu vsakemu Slovanu razumljiva kot »zhupa« ali »zhupica«. – Tudi razvoj imena *Saat* postane jasen, che spoznamo slovansko imensko obliko »Zhatec«, kajti »sad, sat« v slovanskih jezikih pomeni mejo (Grenze, granica). Torej smemo sklepati, da se je popacheno ime »Saaz, Satz« nekoch pravilno glasilo *Sadec, Satec*. Shtevilne izpeljanke, kot so npr. *Novi sad, Novosady, Neusatz* pomenijo kraj, kjer je potekala utrjena meja ali pa so se v njem dogovorili glede meje. Zaradi nekakshne nove nasaditve, prevedene s sodobnim »Novi sad«, pa se vendar ne bo spremenilo ime zhe obstojechemu naselju!

The prevalent explanations of the origins and meaning of topographical names, which persist to this day border on madness. This is no wonder. It is all due to the fact that experts lost the capacity to discern the immaterial and impossible. Many historical events defy logic. Their assessment did not always take into account objective scientific resources, but rather given capacities, subjective fanaticism, and particularly uncritical approach. And so it was written in all seriousness, that *Vindobona* stands for »promising«, *Graż* (Gradec – Sl. For small castle trans. note.) was connected to »Grazie«, and the Czech *Znaim* (in Czech *Znojmo*) to the Slavic verb meaning »to sweat«. The romantic rocky landscape of Rosstrappe in the Harz mountain range is supposed to contain in its name tracks left behind by speeding Odin's horse. *Slaven* is supposed to mean the same as »sklaven« – slaves ⁽¹⁾. And we could go on and on. We must lamentingly state: *The greater the renown of the named expert, the greater the stupidity of their explanations.* These include several university professors, who promote these inanities around the world without submitting proof. And even this is understandable, for he who always bases his research on the same views is likely to react akin to a person lost in a forest: *nervously searching for a way out, running in circles rather than climbing a tall tree to find his bearings.* ⁽²⁾

To explain the meanings of topographical designations (among which I include also popular versions), its earliest form must first be identified, because it is the closest to nature and was exposed to corruption for the shortest amount of time. If anyone uses a word from their own personal vocabulary to define a meaning of a name, they need to examine the location with their own eyes; then they will be able to determine whether the linguistically established designation coincides with the current popular one, although this rarely goes off without complications. On one hand the location may have lost its original meaning through time, on the other sound changes may have done their share. This is why etymological search for former senses is demanding work.

The origin of the name *Zips* can serve as an example of this. In Hungarian it has already acquired the form *Szepes*. Today it means nothing to anyone who is not aware that it formed through several stages from a word that was written as »Zübtz, Zueptzer, Zuppez« and that its meaning is understandable to any Slav as »zhupa« or »zhupica« – The evolution of the name *Saatz* also becomes clear if we recognize the Slavic name form »Zhatec«, as »sad, sat« in Slavic languages meaning border (Grenze, granica). Therefore we can conclude that the warped name »Saaz, Satz« once correctly sounded *Sadec, Satec*. Several derivatives, such as for example *Novi sad* (Latin name *Neoplanta*, transl. note.), *Novosady, Neusatz* stand for a onetime location near a fortified border or involvement in border negotiations. Some sort of new planting (sl. *Saditi* – to plant, transl. note) will surely not alter a name of an existing settlement!

Zaradi medsebojne odvisnosti med temeljno besedo in nazivom kraja pa je nadalje potrebno, da se raziskovalec spozna na vsa področja naravoslovja. Upoštevati pa mora tudi folklorne in druge kulturne ugotovitve ter zgodovinske podatke v zvezi z okoljem. Toda njegove oči morajo biti predvsem sposobne, da na prvi mah dojamajo izoblikovanost tal in njihovo primernost za obrambo. Vse nashtete dejavnike pa mora znati povezati v logično celoto. Dostikrat mora tudi brskati pod površjem tal, da bi poiskal kulturne ostaline, ki naj upravicijo ime kraja. Le s temi sredstvi, tj. s praktično etimologijo in avtopsijsko, je moč zanesljivo pojasniti tudi težje razumljiva topografska imena.

Zhupa – Ta samostalnik je zelo razširjen v shtevilnih inachicah, toda dandanes se je njegov pomen v glavnem skrčil na občinsko ali cerkveno skupnost. Predstavnik prve je bil zhupan, ki je lahko nacheloval tako majhnemu kraju kot celotni pokrajini. Iz tega etima so izpeljana imena, npr. imena: *Zips*, *Zhupanec* (skalnat osamelec z vasjo, na Slovashkem) in *Zhupanjac* (v Bosni klasični *Delminium*). Iz srednjega veka je znano vechkrat ponovljeno ime *Civitas Ziup*.

Pojem *zhupan* (ali tudi zhupnik, ki pa dandanes označuje le cerkvenega predstojnika), se je razvil zhe v davnini. Ponekod na Spodnjem Shtajerskem in na Gorenjskem ter na Beneshkem se predstavnik pashne skupnosti she vedno imenuje zhupan; naziv je zadnji pristni ostanek pradavne družbene skupnosti. Tudi na območjih, kjer so pridobivali sol, je beseda zhupan pomenila isto kot Salzrichter, slov. vodja solarske skupnosti.

Ker so mi poznane razmere v domovini, menim, da jih je vredno otehi pozabi. V občinah z lastnimi pashniki je skrbel za gospodarsko plat le-teh zhupan. Njegova funkcija je trajala samo eno leto in v istem chasovnem obdobju je bilo treba spet z glasovanjem potrditi pravice vsem uzhivalcem pashne skupnosti. Shtevilo pastirjev, ki jih je vsako leto izbral zhupan, je bilo sorazmerno shtevilu pashne govedi. Da pa ne bi kateri lastnik poslal na pasho prevech zhivine, je sporazumno z vsemi, dolochil zakupnino za pasho, odkazal gnoj, dolochil raboto (za izkope odvodnih jarkov ali vzdrzhevanje pregraj) in poravnal drzhavi zemljishki davek. Ob vseh svetih so se kot sosednja sestali vsi vashchani, ki so imeli pravico do uporabe skupnih pashnikov. Zhupan, ki je moral skrbeti tudi za gospodarsko stran pashne skupnosti, je prikazal obrachun svojega gospodarjenja v minulem letu. Pastir je takoj prejel plachilo v zhitu in delno v gotovini; plachilo je temeljilo na prirastku telet. Nato so obravnavali predloge, pritozhbe in tekoche zadeve, nazadnje pa so izbrali novo vodstvo, ki je moralo takoj prevzeti posle za naslednje leto.

S preucevanjem besednih osnov za zeleno mizo se redkokdaj pride do zanesljivih rezultatov, vendar so potrebne mnoge dopolnitve. Raziskovalci pri tem najvechkrat pozabijo na pravilo, da se mora ime ujemati z zunanjim, tj. geografskim videzom kraja.

Due to mutual co-dependency of the root word and place's designation it is further necessary that the researcher be familiar with all the fields of natural sciences. They must also take into account folklore and other cultural findings and historical data tied to the environment. Above all, they must be capable of perceiving the topography and the defensibility of the terrain and of tying all the above factors into a sensible whole. They must also often look under the surface to find cultural remnants that would fit the name of the place. Only through these means, i.e. through practical etymology and autopsy is it possible to explain even the more incomprehensible topographical names.

Zhupa – This noun is widespread, appearing in numerous forms, though its sense today is greatly reduced to municipal or ecclesiastic community. The representative of the former was called zhupan (mayor), who could head either a small town or an entire region. From this term derived names such as *Zips*, *Zhupanec* (rocky isolated hill and village in Slovakia) and *Zhupanjac* (in Bosnia, a classical *Delminium*). A known mediaeval name is the frequently occurring *Civitas Zinip*.

The concept of *zhupan* - mayor, (also zhupnik, though this term is today limited to the sense of church official) evolved already in ancient times. In parts of lower Shtajerska and in Gorenjska and Venetian regions the representative of a pasture community is still called zhupan; the designation is the last authentic remnant of ancient social community. Similarly, in areas where salt was obtained zhupan was synonymous with Salzrichter, the head of a salt producing community.

Since I am aware of the conditions in my native land, I believe this is worth saving from oblivion. In municipalities with proprietary pastures their commercial management was in the care of the zhupan. His term lasted a single year during which time everyone holding rights to pasture had to have these confirmed by a vote. The number of shepherds zhupan assembled each year correlated with the number of cattle. To prevent any owners from sending too many cattle to pasture, he set a pasture rent on which all parties agreed, allotted manure, set obligatory service (digging drainage ditches or upkeep of boundaries), and settled property tax with the state. On All Hollows all villagers of the common holding the right to use common pastures assembled. The Zhupan, who also minded the economic side of the pastoral community, presented the accounts of his management for the previous year. Shepherds were paid on the spot, partly in grain and partly in cash; their payment was based on the increase of the heads of cattle. Then they considered suggestions, complaints, and current matters, finally they selected a new leadership that was to immediately take over the duties for the following year.

By studying roots of words from behind a desk can rarely leads to reliable results, however many supplements are necessary. In this researchers often forget to check if there is correlation with the outwardly geographic appearance of the area.

Vsako topografsko ime je zgoshchen opis naravnih znachilnosti ozemlja. V imeniku krajev zato ishchemo samo uporabno in naravno osnovo imena. Razumljivo je, da morajo biti objekti enakega videza in pomena oznacheni z enakim imenom in da so shele geografi tisti, ki lokalna poimenovanja prenesejo na shirshe ozemlje. Prastaro ime lokalnega pomena se tako razshiri in ohrani. Poimenovanja so potrebna kmetovalcu zhe od nekdej. Omogochajo mu, da razlikuje posamezne dele posesti na preprost nachin in she to, da odlocha o njihovi uporabnosti. Navedel bom nekaj konkretnih primerov: *Danes bomo pokosili travnik »pri brastib«, potem »pri starih grobovih« in she »vlazhni travnik«; pastir je danes gnal k »jelsbam«, »na laz« in »v ograde«.* Sprva so bila takshna imena znana samo lastniku. Schasoma jih je zachel uporabljati she sosed z enako oblikovanim zemljishchem, zatem pa she drugi v okolici. Postala so sploshna, bila vneshena v kataster in na zemljevide ter tako bila »poshtempljana« za vekomaj. Kljub temu pa je imel samo prvi dajalec imena pravico do naravnega poimenovanja, npr. parcele »Pri starih grobovih«, o katerih najbrzh ne govori vech noben zunanji znak.⁽³⁾

V krajevnih imenih ni treba iskati skrivnostnega, bajeslovnega, simbolichnega ali genealoshkega pomena, pach pa le prvobitno danost, ki jo odrazha »govorica« zemljishcha. Vsa poimenovanja ledin, voda in vzpetin so nastala iz chisto preprostih, praktichnih in naravi ustrezajochih razlogov. Zato je razumljivo, da nosijo enako izoblikovani objekti enako zvenecha topichna imena. Seznam teh imen velja kot najbolj natanchna in najbolj zvesta kulturna in vojashka geografija nashega ozemlja. Tak in nich drugachen je bil nastanek topichnih imen. Rezultati lastnega opazovanja, ne pa abstraktna razmishljanja, so bili dejavniki, ki so odlochali o poimenovanju. Zato smemo imeti razlago o razvoju pomena, ki ga vsebuje neko topografsko ime, za resnici ustrezno samo takrat, ko neoporechno vzdrzhi katerokoli dokazno utemeljitev.⁽⁴⁾

Kot smo zhe omenili, je podlaga za topografsko poimenovanje najvechkrat zelo preprosta. Nich ne bo odvech, che opozorimo, da nas pri razlagi chudnega imena navidezna samoumevnost lahko zavede na stransko pot in izkljuchi potrebo po nadaljnjih dokazih. Zato se morajo preucevalci krajevnih imen – che zadevo jemljejo resno – zavedati dejstva, da razlaga brez ogleda na samem mestu, kakor tudi brez uposhtevanja nekdanjih nachinov kmetovanja, v vechini primerov ni zanesljiva. Raziskovalno delo v pisarni seveda zahteva manj truda, daje pa manj zanesljive rezultate!

Kot se kazhe v praksi, krajevna imena niso podvrzheni posebno zaznavnim spremembam: *v glavnem so jih prilagajali le fonetichno drugim govoricam, vchasih pa prevedli v jezik prishlekov.* Takih prilagoditev imena pa ni vselej moch zanesljivo ugotoviti, ker so vrinili, zamenjali ali izlochili kakshen glas in beseda je zadobila drugachen pomen.⁽⁵⁾

Each topographical name is a condensed description of an area's natural features. We therefore only search the place name directory for the useful and natural basis of the name. It is understandable that objects with the same appearance and meaning would have the same name and that geographers are the ones to expand the use of local designations to encompass wider areas. Thus ancient names of local significance are expanded and preserved. Naming has always been necessary to farmers. It allowed them to differentiate between various parts of properties in a simple way and also to define their usefulness. I will give a few specific examples: *Today we will mow the meadow »by the oaks«, then »by the old graves« and then the »damp meadow«, today the shepherd drove the cattle to »the alders«, to »the clearing«, and to the »enclosures«.* At first, these designations were only used by the owner. In time they began being used by a neighbour with a similarly shaped territory, and thereafter by others in area. The names came into general use and made their way to the cadastre and maps and so became imprinted forever. Nevertheless, only the first-comer held the right to bestow the natural name to the »Old Graves« plot, for example, to which probably no externally observable indication remains. ⁽³⁾

There is no need to look to place-names for any mysterious, mythical, symbolic, or genealogic meaning, but only a primary given, reflected by the »language« of the territory. All designations of uncultivated lands, waters, and elevations arose for entirely simple, practical reasons linked to nature. It is therefore understandable that similarly shaped objects carry equally sounding topographical names. A list of these names is regarded as the most precise and faithful cultural and military geography of our territory. Such and no different was the formation of topographical names. The results of personal observation rather than abstract thinking were the deciding factors in the naming process. Therefore we may only accept the explanations of the evolution of individual topographical name's meaning as true, when it withholds any burden of counterargument. ⁽⁴⁾

As we mentioned before, the bases for topographical names are mostly very simple. It is certainly worth noting that seemingly self-explanatory unusual place names can mislead us to feel that no further evidence needs to be examined. This is why place-name examiners, if they are serious about their research, need to keep in mind that explanation without in-situ inspection as well as without awareness of past farming methods, is most often unreliable. Researching in the office of course demands less effort but also yield less trustworthy results!

As practice demonstrates, place names are not subject to particularly perceptible changes: *they were mostly merely phonetically adapted to other tongues and sometimes translated into the language of the newcomers.* It is not always possible to reliably detect such adaptations because a sound may have been inserted or dropped here and there giving the word a new meaning. ⁽⁶⁾

Pragovorica tudi ni vsebovala pestrosti samoglasnikov, ki je lastna sodobnim jezikom. To značilnost odkrivamo še dandanes v govoricah primitivnih ljudstev. Najstarejshe besede so imele povsod dosti vech soglasnikov kot samoglasnikov. Vokalofilija je pridobitev kasnejshe vishje kulturne stopnje. Tesnejshi stiki z drugimi ljudstvi so namrech zahtevali glasovno prilagajanje njihovim govoricam, kar je bilo najlazhe dosechi z vrivanjem samoglasnikov v tezhko izgovorljive zloge. Jeziki z mnogimi soglasniki so zato starejshe, imajo pa tudi vech sklonov in glagolskih oblik kot njihovi naslednishki idiomi. Shele ob uposhtevanju tega dejstva je moch razreshevatii etimologijo tezhko razpoznavnih krajevnih imen v latinshchini, francoshchini in nemshchini. Isto velja tudi za prevedena imena. V tem so Nemci pravi mojstri. Prilagajanje je prishlo v navado na zachetku 12. stoletja, torej hkrati s prvim valom ponemchevanja slovanskih ozemelj. Nemci zatrjujejo, da so takshna imena Slovani sami shele kasneje prevedli v svoje jezike.

Vendar to ne drzhi. [Op. prev.: potem bi *Ljubljana* izviralala iz *Laibacha*.] Najstarejshe oblike so namrech ohranjene v zemljishkih knjigah in urbarjih. Sicer pa so nemshchini prilagojene slovanske oblike lazhe razpoznavne kot romanske, ki so jih bili prilagodili zhe celo tisochetje prej. Prvotna slovanska imena so ostala zhiva tudi med prebivalstvom in so se lazhe ohranila. V neshtetih primerih je glasovno prilagajanje pozneje povzročilo napachne pomenske razlage. Temu je krivo samo nashe nejasno in nemethodichno sklepanje: primarni vtis bi radi spravili v sklad z razumom. Seveda ljudje pri tem ne pomislijo, da kljub navidezno ustrezni obliki predelano ime izgubi motiviranost za svoj nastanek. Tako so npr. krajevno ime *Gastein* obrazlozhili s tujimi gosti v tamkajshnjih toplih vreclih. Ta razlaga sicer ni povsem tuja pravemu pomenu, je pa nesmiselna. *Gastein* je moral vsekakor pred gosti uposhtevati lastne prebivalce in s tem tudi svoje staro ime. Tedaj pa *Gastein* nima vech zveze s toplimi vreclci, marvech ohranja pomen za obrambo prikladnega ozemlja, slov. *Hostin* in she starejshe *Gastuna*. Pravilno ime za *Bad Gastein* pa je *Toplice*, ki je ohranjeno v spakedranki *Tobelbrisse*. [Op. prev.: »topli risk«?]

Nihche na svetu nima pravice, da bi smel rushiti pravno stanje, ki je vsebovano v rabi prastarih imen oziroma preperechevati izrazhanje jezikovne pripadnosti s pomocjo imen; zakonsko bi morali zashchititi zgodovinsko dokazana imena in preperechiti samovoljne predelave, ki izmalichijo pomen tistega, kar imena dolochajo. Ime v vsakem primeru vsebuje najstarejshe zgodovino z njim obelezhenege kraja in kazhe njegove bistvene značilnosti.

Skoraj pred sto leti je Wilhelm von Humboldt izrazil mishljenje, da »s pomocjo krajevnih imen, najstarejsih spomenikov, nam zhe zdavnaj izumrlo ljudstvo pripoveduje o svoji usodi; treba je samo prisluhnitik«. Treba se je tudi vprashati, che nam je njegova govorica ostala razumljiva. To govorico pa odkrivamo v nashem chasu. Che pa dandanes zheli kdo to odkrivanje preperechiti nasilno ali s sprenevedanjem, se loteva boja z mlino na veter. Resnica, ki ji je zagotovljen vechni obstoj, bo vedno zmagovala. Kar so do nedavnega imeli za privid fantastov, je postalo uposhtevanja vredna kategorija. Obchinske uprave bi se morale potruditi, da bi vsak kraj ohranil lastno zgodovinsko ime, kakrshnega imajo v vsakdanji rabi.

Protolanguage did not have the vowel diversity common to modern languages. This feature remains observable today in languages of the primitive peoples. The oldest words had considerably more consonants than vowels. Love of vowels is the product of a later, higher cultural level, when closer contact with other peoples and adaptation to their languages necessitated sound changes. These were most easily achievable by injecting vowels into hard to pronounce syllables (anaptyxis, trans. n.). Therefore, languages with many consonants are older but also contain more cases and verb inflections than their antecedents. Only with this in mind can we attempt etymologies of challenging place names in Latin, French, and German. The same goes for translated names. Germans are masters of this. Adaptation became habitual at the start of the 12th century, with the first wave of the Germanisation of Slovenian territories. Germans insist Slavs only translated these names subsequently. However, as attested by the oldest forms preserved in land registers and *urbaria* this is untrue [Verbovshek's note: *Ljubljana* would otherwise be derived from *Laibach*]. It is generally easier to identify Slavic forms adapted to German than Romance forms adapted a whole millennium earlier. Primary Slavic names also remained in use, which enabled easier preservation. In countless cases, adaptation resulted in false explanations of sense, purely through our own unclear and unsystematic inferring: we like to relate reasoning to our first impressions. In doing so, we forget that in spite of seemingly conforming form, the so-altered name no longer reflects its primary motivation. For example, place name *Gastein* was tied to foreign visitors of local thermal springs. This explanation is not entirely at odds with the true sense of the word, but is nonsensical. *Gastein* must have reflected local population before the advent of foreign visitors, as did its previous name. So *Gastein* does not denote thermal springs, but rather preserves the sense of defensible territory, Slov. *Hostin* and earlier *Gastuna*. *Bad Gastein* is actually called *Toplice*, preserved in *Tobelrisse*. [Verbovshek's note: *topli risi* = warm lynxes?]

No one in the world has the right to break down the natural order contained in the use of ancient names nor impede expression of linguistic association with the aid of names; historically verified names should be protected by law and arbitrary transformations distorting the meaning, which the names primarily expressed ought to be prohibited. Whatever its story, a name always encompasses the oldest history of the location it designates and points to its most defining characteristics.

Almost a hundred years ago, Wilhelm von Humboldt conveyed that »with the help of place names, these oldest monuments, a long since extinct people reports its fate; we need only listen.« We also need to ask ourselves whether their language remains intelligible to us. We are discovering said language in our times. If anyone wants to hinder these discoveries either through force or pretense, they are intent on tackling windmills. The truth, which is guaranteed eternal existence, will always prevail. Certain things, until recently viewed as delusions of irrational minds, have become noteworthy categories. Municipal administrations should try their best to have each place preserve its proprietary historical name, such as is used in everyday communication.

Najprej bi morali prepovedati rabo tistih krajevnih imen, ki izpostavljajo domachine posmehu. Marsikateri umsko omejen pisunchek pri zemljishkoknjizhni upravi se je lahko potrudil z izkazovanjem svoje duhovitosti pa je zapisal takshna imena: *Affental* (Opichja dolina), *Eselsdorf* (Oslovska vas), *Gaunersdorf* (Sleparska vas), *Lausheim* (Ushivo), *Ochsenburg* (Goveji trg), *Viehdorf* (Zhivinska vas) itn. Razpolozhljiva krajevna imena slovanskega izvora so potem z naslado prilagajali nemshkemu jeziku.⁽⁶⁾

Seveda je zdaj v shtevilnih primerih znanstveno tezhko ugotoviti pravo obliko starega imena.⁽⁷⁾ V dvomljivih primerih mora prevladati logika nad knjigozhersko uchenost jo.⁽⁸⁾

Pri raziskovanju svoje pradavne zgodovine na podlagi mitologije moramo paziti, da se strogo drzhimo obmochja, ki ga obravnavamo. Tuji zgodovinopisci so nam vrinili v rabo kup imen z dodanim pesniskim in bajeslovnim okrasjem, ki s pravo zapushchino starodavnih prednikov nima kaj opraviti. Okrashena topichna imena ne morejo imeti nobene veljave in gradivo takshne vrste smemo kratko malo imeti za balast. Tako se je npr. dr. von Peez ⁽⁹⁾ lotil obdelave na obmochju s krajevnimi imeni, ki ustrezajo germanski mitologiji. Na koshchku ozemlja med Spodnjo Avstrijo in Moravsko naj bi kar mrgolelo nemshkih bozhanstev in bajeslovnih junakov. Preprosti ljudje v davnnini pa niso bili tako ucheni, da bi posegali po fantazijskih predstavah profesorskih glav in jih uporabljali za krshchevanje svojih naselij in ledin. Prav tako niso chutili potrebe, da bi povprashali svoje zelo oddaljene germanske sosede, che jim dovolijo sechi po pisanem venchku njihovih bajeslovnih imen.⁽¹⁰⁾

V sedanjem chasu pride politiki vse prav. To pomeni, da se bomo tezhko znebili vpliva politichnih interesov na znanost, in to ravno v chasu, ko je obstoj naroda izpostavljen neshtetim pritiskom. S tujimi koristmi prezhete in vsiljevane razlage nimajo nich skupnega z znanstvenim odkrivanjem; te so zgolj orodje za uresnichevanje politichnih zhelj. Neodvisno in umirjeno raziskovanje pa v chasih prinese tudi razocharanje. Vedeti moramo, da se polezhe tudi navdushenje obiskovalca gledalishcha, ko odnesejo prelepe odrske kulise.

Znanost je velika svoboshchina, ki potrebuje samo odprtost. Ko bi se vsak raziskovalec ravnal po pravilu, da se mora pri delu izogibati osebnim zheljam, bi stali zhe zdavnaj na trdnih tleh in ne v pravljicharskem mochvirju. Edino pravilna pot pri odkrivanju zgodovinske resnice je induktivna: *nashe sklepanje mora voditi iz posameznosti na splošno, iz neznanega v znano, iz zhivega na izumrlo!*

Che je bila v pradavni Evropi vechina etnografskih nazivov ter imen gora, rek in krajev slovanskega izvora, so jih morali zatorej ustvariti le Slovani. To pa kazhe, da Slovani niso prishli na ta ozemlja shele v chasu »preseljavanja narodov«, temvech so zhe stoletja prej odlochilno vplivali na poimenovanja. In che imajo tudi druga ljudstva slovanska imena, pomeni, da so zhe pred njimi na njihovem sedanjem ozemlju bivali Slovani. Che pa bi se Slovani naselili pozneje, bi tam nashli zhe ustaljena imena in jih prevzeli, saj novih ne bi potreboval nihche. Niti Rimljani niti Nemci niso mogli vnashati bistvenih sprememb.

First the use of those place names should be forbidden, which expose locals to ridicule. Many-a narrow minded scribbler employed by the land registrar was able to apply their wit in recording names such as *Affental* (Ape Valley), *Eselsdorf* (*Ass Village*), *Gaunersdorf* (Charlatan Village), *Lausheim* (Lice-home), *Ochsenburg* (Cow Sq.), *Viehdorf* (Cattle village) etc. The available place names of Slavic origin were then slyly adapted to German.⁽⁶⁾

Of course it is now most often difficult to scientifically determine the right form of the old name.⁽⁷⁾ In dubious cases sense must outweigh bookish erudition.⁽⁸⁾

When we are researching our ancient history based in mythology it is important to remain strictly in the confines of the territory in question. Foreign historiographers introduced an abundance of names into our use along with added poetic and mythical ornamentation that has nothing to do with actual heritage of our ancient ancestors. Decorated topographical names cannot be taken seriously and such materials may freely be discarded as ballast. In this manner, for example, dr. von Peez⁽⁹⁾ undertook the process of examining place names in correlation with Germanic mythology. The piece of land between lower Austria and Moravia was supposedly teeming with Germanic deities and mythological heroes. Simple people of the olden times were, however, not so educated as to reach for fantastic imaginings of academic minds when christening their settlements and lands. They likewise felt no need to ask their very distant Germanic neighbours, whether they allowed them to make use of the colourful bunch of their mythical names.⁽¹⁰⁾

In modern times politics finds use for anything. This means that it will be difficult for us to rid science of political interests, particularly at a time when the endurance of the nation is facing countless pressures. Foreign interest-filled and imposed explanations have nothing in common with scientific discovery; they are merely tools used for the realization of political desires. Meanwhile independent and measured research may at times also lead to disappointment. We need to be aware that even the enthusiasm of a theatrical audience subsides once the gorgeous scenery is taken away.

Science is a great freedom, which needs only openness. If every researcher took care to follow the rule of avoiding personal desires during their work, we would long since be standing on solid ground rather than in a bog of fantasies. The only true path to discovery of historical truth is inductive: *our conclusions must lead from the individual to the general, from the unknown to the known, from the living to the extinct!*

If the majority of ancient European ethnographic designations and names of mountains, rivers, and settlements were of Slavic origin, they had to have been named by Slavs. This further indicates that Slavs did not settle these areas during the later »migration of nations period«, but that they significantly influenced the naming process centuries earlier. And if other peoples also use Slavic names, this means that before their arrival their current territories were inhabited by Slavs. If Slavs had settled later, they would have come upon already fixed names and adopt them, for nobody would have need for new ones. Neither Romans nor Germanic peoples were able to introduce significant changes.

Smemo rechi, da je naravnost neverjetno, kako lepo se je ohranjal prvotni pomen pri vechini imen!

Ampak kje so milijoni prej naseljenih ljudi, katere so Rimljani podjarmili, nato pa jim ob svoji drzhavnishki modrosti dovolili, da so ohranili lastno vero, jezik in shege? Koliko je verjetno, da so se po razsulu nepremagljive velesile mogle nenadoma pojaviti milijonske trume Slovanov in se naseliti na neizmernih ozemljih? Zagotovo vemo, da je stoletja trajajocha rimljanska navzochnost onemogochala velike in unichevalne spopade. Kdo naj bi torej iztrebil domache prebivalstvo? In kako naj bi mnozhice Slovanov v kratkem chasu nadomestile staroselce? Vsakrshen vechji pokol staroselcev, ki naj bi ga utegnili zakriviti slovanski prishleki, bi bil vsaj toliko zaznaven, da ga ne bi mogli spregledati rimljanski in grshki pisci, ki so znali zabelezhiti tudi dosti manj pomembne dogodke. Nikakor ni mogoche, da ne bi opazili odsotnosti prebivalstva, ki je zhivel na polovici tedaj znanega sveta. Razen tega pa iz zabelezhb o domnevni velikanski selitvi ljudstev razberemo zelo malo o Slovanih. Kdor zna razbrati neshteta zemljepisna imena s slovanskimi osnovami in se zaveda, da so pomensko ustrezna okolju ter da so bila v rabi zhe v chasu pred nashim shtetjem, ta lahko razume, da tisochere mnozhice krajevnih imen ne moremo obravnavati kot nakljuchje.

Primerov in razlag v tej knjigi ni konstruiral, iznashel ali si jih izmislil pisec. Najdemo jih v zhe v jezikih pa tudi v naravi, na prostem, kjer jih more preverjati kdorkoli. Vsa ta imena pa govorijo v pradavnem jeziku, ki je razumljiv predvsem le Slovanom.

Opombe

1. – Naziv *Sklave*, *Sclavus* je prishel v rabo shele v poznem srednjem veku in torej ne more imeti nikakrshne povezave z rimljanskimi suzhnji.
2. – Chas bi zhe bil, da sicer resni znanstveniki zhe pometejo z bedastimi razlagami, kot jih navajajo v raznih krajevnih imenih, kot so npr. *Chrastova*, katere prebivalci so krastavi, *Shalinci* zaradi shal, *Komen* zaradi kaminov (pechi za ogrevanje) in podobno. V tem smislu se posebno odlikuje dunajski knjigarnar Guido von List. Leta 1909 je izdal 4. zvezek svojih »epohalnih razkritij« z naslovom *Die Namen Völkerstämme Germaniens und deren Deutung* (Imena germanskih plemen in njihov pomen); vsa so »arijsko-germanska«.
3. – Na slovanskem obmochju vechkrat naletimo na ledinska imena, kot so npr. *u mrtvich*, *u groblju*, *u zhabiteho*, ki jih ne potrjujejo vech zunanji dokazi. Na ta imena se smemo popolnoma zanesti kljub temu, cheprav izkopavanja vselej ne dajo potrditve.
4. – Silno tezhko je pojasnjevati prastara imena. Tako npr. pomeni *Azija* kakemu Rusu *Zemlja tujcev*, saj pravi tujcu *asej*, *asejka*, *asov*. Na chnomorskih obalah je vech krajev, ki se imenujejo *Asia* (mejni kraj, mejno). Kar je Rusom pomenilo tujino, ozemlje onkraj neke meje, je preshlo v kolektivni naziv *Azija*. Vendar je ta razlaga dostopna v glavnem le Rusom.
5. – Znani zemeljski vdor *Macocho* na Moravskem je ljudska etimologija z macheho. Ljudska domishljija jo je bila nekoeh povezala s pripovedko in pri tem je ostal sedanji pomen. Che pa she uposhtevamo govorico narave, spoznamo, da gre najverjetneje za pomensko zvezo z glagolom *machi* s pomeni *pogrezniti*.
6. – Chudno je, da na nemshkih ozemljih zadostuje tudi she tako neumno in eno samo poimenovanje, na slovanskih pa morajo biti tudi po tri, da ohranjajo zmeshnjavo.

We can say it is flat out incredible, that the primary meaning of most names was so beautifully preserved!

But where are the millions of previously settled people, who were subjugated by Romans who then, in their administrative wisdom allowed them to preserve their religion, language, and customs? How probable is it that, after the fall of this invincible superpower throngs of millions of Slavs suddenly appeared and settled immeasurable territories? We know for certain, that centuries of Roman presence precluded large-scale destructive battles. Who was it then, that eradicated the local population? And how did the multitudes of Slavs manage to replace the indigenous peoples in such a short time? Any large-scale massacre of the indigenous inhabitants, which the Slavic newcomers are supposed to have committed would surely be too significant to have been missed by the Greek or Roman chroniclers, who are known to make note of much smaller occurrences. It is in no way possible that they would the absence of the population of half the known world would have gone unnoticed. In addition, records of the purported migration of nations make very few mentions of Slavs. Those proficient in reading countless place names rooted in Slavic languages, aware that their meanings correlate to their environment and that these names were in use already B. C. can understand that thousands of place names cannot be treated as mere coincidences. Examples and explanations in this book were not constructed, invented or conceived by the writer. They can be found already in languages and in nature, outdoors, where they can be tested by anyone. All these names communicate in an ancient language, comprehensible mostly only to Slavs.

Notes

1. – The designation *Sklave*, *Slavus* came into use only in the late middle ages and can therefore hold no connection with Roman slaves.
2. – It is high time that otherwise serious scientists discard certain foolish explanations of place names, such as p. ex. *Chrastova*, the inhabitants of which are scabby (*krastavi*), *Shalinci* due to jokes (*shala* = joke, transl. n.), *Komen* linked to *kamin*, (a type of fireplace), et. sim. A particularly prolific source of such explanations is the Viennese publisher Guido von Liszt. In 1909 he published a gathering of his »epochal revelations« titled *Die Namen Völkerstämme Germaniens und deren Deutung* (The Names of Germanic Tribes and their Meaning); all are »Arian-Germanic«.
3. – Slavic territory encompasses several landscape-names, such as *u mrtvich*, *u groblju*, *u zabitelju* (with senses tied to death or graves, transl. n.). We can thoroughly rely on these names, even though excavations do not always yield support.
4. – It is extremely difficult to explain ancient names. So, for example, *Asia* may be understood by a Russian as *Foreign Land*, for he calls foreigners *asej*, *asejka*, *asov*. And so there are several places on the Black Sea coasts called *Asia* (border place, march). What Russians took to be foreign, a territory beyond a certain border, received the collective designation *Asia*. However, this explanation is predominately accessible only to Russians.
5. – Known land subsidence *Macocho* in Moravia has the popular etymology tied to *macheha* (mother in law), peoples' imagination once tied it to a folk tale cementing the current meaning. If we take into account natural-scientific terms, we soon realize that it is related to the verb *machi* with the semantic range of *to cave in*.
6. – It seems peculiar that in German territories a single interpretation, no matter how stupid, suffices, while there need to be at least three Slavic opposing explanations to preserve confusion.

7. – Tako npr. doslej ni bilo moč sprejemljivo pojasniti imena Slovani.

8. – Gornja odkritja so motila tudi mene, ker sem izvornim imenom pripisoval sedanji pomen. Potem sem se preprical, da v takshnem načinu razlage ne bom nashel stalne logike in sem postal privesek keltomanov. Poglobitev v keltske podmene pa me je kmalu preprichala, da sem zashel tudi sam v jezikovno zmoto, ker so domnevno keltska imena vsebovala slovanska debila. Greshil sem pa she naprej, dokler se nisem zavedel, da je treba pri imenih, ki izrazhajo npr. izoblikovanost tal, uposhtevati tudi naravno danost. Kot chastnik, ki je bil neprestano na terenu, sem imel dovolj prilozhnosti, da sem lahko razbral pomen vechine takshnih imen.

9. – Dr. A. von Peez, Erlebt - Erwandert, Dunaj 1902.

10. – Dr. Peez se posluhuje nesprejemljivih dokazov. Tako naj bi cheshka mesta ustanovili Nemci. Mesta so se razvila iz mochno povechanih naselij in jih ni ustanavljal nihche po lastnem preudarku. In kje so dokazi, da so v pradavnini na Cheshkem bili naseljeni Nemci?

Etimologija krajevnih imen

Poglobljene jezikovne raziskave krajevnih imen nas vodijo k ugotovitvi, ki doslej ni bila uposhtevana nikjer: *vechino jih je moč obrazložiti s pomočjo slovanskih jezikov in ustrezno danostim narave*. Shele neslovanska poimenovanja kazhejo na sekundarno poselitev starejših ledin. To velja predvsem za slovanske predele, ki so jih iz politichnih razlogov zasedli Nemci, Francozi, Italijani, Romuni, Madzhari in Turki. Med tistimi krajevnimi imeni in na istem območju so seveda možna tudi neslovanska, vendar jih ostane vselej bore malo, ko jih skrbneje preuchimo. Kot primer navidezno neslovanskega imena lahko navedemo slikovito skalnato sotesko *Rosstrappe* v pogorju Harz, ki ni nesmiselna »konjska droplja«, marvech ozemlje, katerega povrshje je razdrapano. Potem: *kejerkoli naletimo na ime Slatina, vemo vnaprej, da tam izvira mineralna voda*. Kjer so *Toplice*, imajo izvire tople vode. Imen *Dobl*, *Tobel*, *Tobelrisse*, *Teplitz* in podobna je najti na tisoche, vsa pa izvirajo iz slovanskega pridevnika *topel*.

Toda krajevnih imen slovanskega izvora ne najdemo samo na nemshkih območjih Avstrije in v Nemchiji, marvech tudi v Shvici, Italiji, Shpaniji, Franciji pa na Nizozemskem in Danskem. Za znanost, predvsem za prazgodovino, bi bilo treba dolochiti zunanje meje območij, na katerih lezhijo kraji z imeni slovanskega izvora. To bi omogochilo odkriti nekdej s Slovani poseljena ozemlja, ki so bila gotovo bolj razprostranjena, kot so danashnja.

Mnogo je she nelogichno pojasnjenih oziroma nerazumljivih krajevnih in družhinskih imen. To npr. velja za cheshke in moravske družhine, ki so jih njihovi potomci zaradi modnih tezhenj zacheli germanizirati v 13. stoletju; v vechini njih je she moč odkriti prejshnje slovanske oblike. Pri slovenskih plemishkih nazivih pa je zhe dolgo tezhko razbrati, ker so njihov pomen prevedli v tekocho nemshchino. Tako je Turjashki postal *Auersperg* (-perg, -berg = breg) in *Ostrovrbar* = *Scharfenberg*.

Gospodje s Prueschenka so nekoch zhiveli na Prezhniku, ki ga dandanes verjetno prevajajo kot *Lauer*, *Lauerer* (slov. *Prezha*). Razni priimki kot npr. *Schinkowitz*, *Lugaster*, *Osternitz*, *Garrach*, *Jabornegg*, *Katzjaner* idr. v slovenskih zgodovini niso poznani, vendar jim s pomočjo etimologije moremo dolochiti jezikovno pripadnost.

7. – For example, until now it was not possible to acceptably interpret the name Slavs.
8. – The above discoveries bothered me as well, because I ascribed modern meanings to original names. Then I became convinced that these types of explanations will not provide consistent logic and became an adherent of the keltomani. Delving deeper into Celtic studies soon convinced me that I myself strayed into linguistic error, since purportedly Celtic names contained Slavic roots. I continued erring until I became aware that in examining names expressing, for example, relief of the terrain, natural features must also be taken into account. As an officer I was perpetually in the field, having abundant opportunities to discern meanings of most such names.
9. – Dr A. von Peez, *Erlebt - Erwandert*, Vienna 1902.
10. – Dr Peez makes use of unacceptable evidence. Czech towns were supposedly founded by Germans; they evolved from very enlarged settlements and not founded based by individual discretion. And where is his evidence that in prehistoric times Czech was populated by Germans?

Etymology of Place Names

In depth linguistic place-name research leads us to a previously unconsidered conclusion: *most can be explained through use of Slavic languages and corresponding natural features*. It is only non-Slavic names that point to a secondary settlement of older uncultivated lands. This is particularly true of Slavic areas settled for political reasons by the Germans, French, Italians, Romanians, Hungarians, and Turks. Among those place names non-Slavic are possible, but after an in depth study there are a precious few of these left. As an example of a seemingly non-Slavic name we can examine *Rosstrappe* in the *Harz* mountain range, which is not nonsensical »horse bustard« but the territory with a tattered (Sl. 'razdrapan', trans. n.) surface. Further: *wherever we come across the name element Slatina, we can predict the presence of a spring of mineral water*. Where there are *Toplice* (thermal spa, trans. n.), a thermal spring is present; there are thousands of instances of names such as *Dobl*, *Tobel*, *Tobelrisse*, *Teplitz*, and they all stem from the Slavic adjective *topel* meaning warm.

However, occurrences of place names with Slavic origin are not limited to Germanic areas of Austria and Germany, but also appear in Switzerland, Italy, Spain, France, the Netherlands, and Denmark. It would benefit science, particularly pre-history, to define the external limits of territories containing places with names of Slavic origin. This would enable the discovery of territories formerly settled by Slavs, territories certainly much greater than today's.

There are many poorly explained or incomprehensible place- and family names. For example Czech and Moravian families germanised by their 13th century successors due to fashion tendencies; the majority of these have identifiable previous Slavic forms. Slovenian noble family names are long since difficult to discern, with their meaning translated into fluent German. So *Turjashki* became *Auerspergs* (-perg, -berg = breg, Sl. for 'slope', trans.n.) and *Ostrovrbars* = *Scharfenbergs* (literal translation, sharp peaks, tras. n.). The lords of Prueschenk once lived in Prezhnik, which is currently probably translated to *Lauer*, *Lauerer* (Sl. *Prezha*, Eng. ambush, trans. n.). Various last names, such as *Schinkowitz*, *Lugaster*, *Osternitz*, *Garrach*, *Jabornegg*, *Katzianer* etc. are unknown in Slovenian history, but their linguistic provenance can be defined with the aid of etymology.

Pri vsem nam gre le za to, da bi dokazali obstoj slovanskih krajevnih imen, ki so bila znana in zabeležena zhe mnogo prej. Etimoloshko podkrepljena, postanejo najstarejši dokaz za nasho trditev, da so bili v teh krajih Slovani naseljeni zhe dosti pred svojo uradno domnevano priselitvijo. Samoumevno velja, da tudi imena, za katera nimamo pisnih dokazov, temeljijo na istem etnografskem in enakem topichnem pomenu, oziroma jim je moeh poiskati naravni pomen izkljuchno le v slovanskih jezikih ne glede na chasovno oddaljenost nastanka. Ljudje, ki so ustvarili starejsa poimenovanja, so potemtakem govorili isti jezik kot oni, ki so mlajšim imenom vtisnili svojo lastno jezikovno podlago, kar pa pomeni, da so kasneje nastala imena stara prav toliko kot pradavna, le da za takshno trditev ni pisnih dokazov.

Trenutno she ni izvedljivo, da bi vsa krajevna imena nanizali po abecednem redu in izgovarjavi ustrezno. Nadvse zahtevno delo bi pomenilo temeljni kamen za nekakshen »Splošni etimoloshki imenik krajev«. Zaradi velikanskega obsega takshnega dela bi bila najprimernejša razdelitev v veclje shtevilo posameznih monografij, ki bi jih kasneje dopolnjevali. Obravnavano gradivo bi zato najbolj nazorno prikazali po naslednjih pojmovnih razdelkih:

- a) zavarovanje pashnih povrshin;
- b) ozemeljske razmejitev;
- c) obramba pri predzgodovinskih ljudstvih – krajevna imena obrambnega izvora;
- d) krajevna imena drugachnega izvora.

ZAVAROVANJE PASHNIH POVRSHIN

Chudovit znanstveni rezultat nam je dala raziskava v zvezi z imeni, ki odražajo skrb za varovanje osebnih svobode in ohranitev sredstev za prezhivljanje. Oblike varovanja izkazujejo najzgodnejše elemente nashih ustavnih dolochil.

Zgodovina pravi, da so bili najstarejši prebivalci lovska, ribishka in pastirska ljudstva, ki kot nomadi niso bili stalno naseljena. Toda kdor bo zadevo preuchil globlje, bo spoznal, da ni vse tako preprosto in da ugotovitev ne drzhi povsem. Ribich se je lahko ustalil na bregu morja, ki mu je nudilo obilen ulov; chlovek ni kot zhival, ki stalno teka za plenom. She v nashem chasu so primitivna ljudstva, ki se prezhivljajo z ulovom in prodajo rib, pri tem pa morajo rachunati she na konkurencu. Ko odkrijejo bogatejshe lovishche, se ne odselijo tja, marvech ostanejo v starem selishchu. Isto velja za lov. V nova lovishcha z vech divjachine hodijo samo loviti, a družino pushchajo v stalnem naselju. To jim narekuje zakon o samoohranitvi. Nomadski lovec se nenehno giblje, pri tem pa lahko naleti na lovce iz tujih družin in se z njimi spopade. Konchno pa je chlovek moral skrbeti za hrano tudi v chasu, ko je bilo malo mozhnosti za ulov (v chasu neviht na morju, povodni ali snezhnih viharjev v gozdovih). Mar naj bi takrat zapustil domachijo?

In all this we merely aim to prove the existence of Slavic names, which were known and recorded long ago. Etymologically reinforced, they become the earliest proof of our assertion that Slavs inhabited these territories long before their officially alleged immigration. It goes without saying that equivalent names for which there is no evidence also stem from the same ethnographic and equal topographical meaning, or their natural meaning can be determined exclusively in Slavic languages, irrelevant of temporal remoteness of their inception. People who created older names therefore spoke the same language as those, who imprinted the younger names with their own linguistic base, which means that names of later inception are just as old as ancient ones, though there is no written proof for this.

It is currently not yet feasible to list all place names in alphabetical order in keeping with pronunciation. This exceedingly demanding work would stand as fundament for a sort of »General Etymological Directory of Places«. Due to the immense scope of such a work, it would be most suitable to apportion it into a number of individual monographs, which would later be revised. We would thus most clearly present the examined materials in the following conceptual sections:

- a) protection of pastoral surfaces
- b) territorial demarcations
- c) defense of the prehistoric peoples – place names stemming from defense
- d) place names of other origins

THE PROTECTION OF PASTORAL SURFACES

Research of names reflecting care for the defence of personal freedom and preservation of means of survival yielded marvellous scientific results. Forms of protection demonstrate the earliest elements of our constitutional provisions.

History states that the earliest inhabitants were nomadic hunters, fishers, and shepherds without permanent residence. But a deeper examination quickly shows that this is not entirely accurate. A fisherman could settle on the coast, which yielded an opulent catch; man is not a beast constantly chasing prey. Still today there are primitive peoples making a living fishing and selling fish whilst dealing with competition. In coming upon richer fishing grounds, they do not relocate but stay in their settlement. The same goes for hunting. They travel to hunt in new hunting grounds with better yield while leaving their families in their permanent settlement; this is dictated by the law of self-preservation. Nomadic hunters are constantly on the move, which puts them at risk of encountering hunters from other families and conflict with them. And lastly, men also needed to provide for food at a time, when a good return was not very likely (during sea-storms, floods, or snow storms in forests). Were they then to abandon their homestead?

Prepričani smo lahko, da tudi predzgodovinski chlovek ni mogel biti tako neroden. Zato arheologi odkrivajo kosti različnih zhivali na enem mestu: *lovci so prinashali plen na eno in isto mesto, v svoja bivalishcha.*

Zmotne so tudi navedbe zgodovinarjev o pastirskih ljudstvih, ki naj bi po njihovem bila nomadska. Justinus je npr. zapisal: »Skiti so dopushchali, da se jim je zhivina pomikala brez nadzora iz kraja v kraj in se niso bali, da bi je zmanjkalo, saj je za tatove veljala stroga kazen.« Ko bi hodili lastniki za zhivino, bi bila ta she bolje zavarovana. Samoumevno je torej, da so se chrede pasle na omejenem zemljishchu, sicer bi zhivali lahko odshle po svoji poti. She dandanes poznamo skupno pasho. Lastniki svoje zhivali oznachijo vsako posebej in z dogovorjeno barvo. Vendar se zadeva kazhe tudi v drugi luchi. Do neke mere so pastirska ljudstva lahko oznachena kot »nomadska«, vendar le glede na letne chase. Vsako pomlad so pastirji skupaj z družino zapustili zimska bivalishcha in pospremili zhivino do pashnikov, na katerih je trava zhe ozelenela. Tudi zaradi poletne sushe so jo odgnali na vishje in hladnejshe predele, npr. na alpske pashnike, toda jeseni so se vrachali v rodovna bivalishcha. Obchasnih selitev pastirskih ljudstev, ki so vsako leto odhajala na pasho in se pred zimo vrachala domov, ne moremo smatrati kot nomadsko znachilnost. V goratih dezhelah Evrope poznamo takshne nomade she dandanes. Na Gornjem Shtajerskem npr. odzhenejo zhivino maja do spodnjih planin, v juliju in avgustu jo pasejo na gornjih, nato se spustijo do spodnjih, sredi oktobra pa se vrnejo v dolino. Tako je poskrbljeno, da je zhival zaradi primernih podnebnih razmer vedno na dobri pashi. Izkorishchanje gorskih pashnikov in planin na Tirolskem, Solnograshkem, Norveshkem, v Italiji in Shvici je moch le delno opredeliti kot nomadstvo. Enako kot na Balkanu gospodarji ne vzamejo s seboj celotne družine, temvech samo najnujnejsho opremo in nekaj zhensk, za katere imajo pripravljena bivalishcha.



Sl.1a – Razprostrte roke opozarjajo:
»Samo do tukaj!«



Sl.1b – Kot mejni kamen upodobljen
mozg v Zahodni Prusiji. Na njem je
videti orodje za kaznovanje kershilcen.

We can be sure that even prehistoric man would not be this clumsy. This is why archaeologists find various animal bones in the same locations: *hunters brought their prey to a constant place, their dwellings.*

The statements of historians to the effect that pastoral peoples were nomadic, are also erroneous, Justinus for example wrote that »Scythians allowed their cattle to wander unchecked from place to place; they were not worried any would go missing since punishment for thievery was severe.« If owners followed their cattle, the latter would be all the better protected. It is therefore self-evident that herds grazed in a limited area otherwise they could wander away. We know common grazing to this day. Owners mark their beasts individually with a certain colour. However the matter can also be viewed in a different light; to a degree pastoral peoples can be defined as »nomadic« but only relative to the seasons. Each spring shepherds and their families left their winter residences and accompanied the cattle to first green pastures. Also, summer drought incited them to drive the cattle upwards, to colder areas, for example alpine pastures, but come autumn, they returned to their ancestral homes. Temporary migrations of pastoral peoples leaving each year to graze their cattle and returning home before winter cannot be viewed as nomadic. In the mountainous European lands such nomads remain known to this day. In upper Styria, for example, cattle is driven to lower hills in May, in July and August it grazes in the upper hills, then relocates to the lower hills, descending into the valley in mid October. This ensures that in spite of changes in climate the animals always receive good pasture. Exploitation of mountainous pasture and hills of Tirol, Salzburg, Norway, Italy, and Switzerland can be partially defined as nomadic. Similarly as in the Balkans, the masters do not take their whole family, but only the most necessary equipment and a few women, for which they have dwellings.



Im.1a – *Outstretched arms alert:*
»This is far enough!«



Im.1b – *A man-shaped boundary marker in West Prussia bearing visible tools for the punishment of offenders.*

Niti Ciganov ne smemo prishtevati docela k nomadskim ljudstvom. Tudi pri njih je navada, da hodijo po dezheli samo tisti družinski chlani, ki ishchejo zaslužek kot potujoči kovachi, krpachi kotlov in vedezhevalci, pa she ti v ustreznih letnih chasih.

Izraba skupnih pashnikov (ki so postali na zasedenih rimljanskih ozemljih ozemljih drzhavna lastnina, praedium) je pogosto bila vzrok za prepire in spopade.⁽¹⁾ Posamezne družine so imele dolga stoletja dedno pashno pravico, ki so jo znale braniti tudi s silo. Chrnogorci, Albanci in Turki so si bili vedno sovražni prav zaradi te družbene inshutucije, saj pashna pravica v tistih krajih s skopo naravo zagotavlja zhivljenjski obstoj. Iz strahu, da jih ne bi kdo spodrinil z rodne grude in jim odvzel možnost prezhivljanja, so bila pastirska ljudstva vsak hip pripravljena na obrambo. V tem vidim pojasnilo, zakaj v njihovem vedenju zelo ochiten bojvnishki znachaj.⁽²⁾ Zato so njihova pashna obmochja vzrok za nastanek obchudovanja vrednega, vendar povsem naravi ustreznega obrambnega sistema. To dejstvo zanesljivo pricha, da pastirska ljudstva niso mogla biti »nomadi«, ki bi vodili svoje chrede nenachrtno in na tuje pashnike. Takshne nomade lahko ishchemo le v pravljicah, v zgodovino pa ne spadajo.

Na tej podlagi se je v vsaki skupnosti, ki je imela v posesti pashno povrshino ali pa je na nevtralnih tleh uzhivala staro pashno pravico, utrdila naravna potreba, da jo navzven zastopa primerna oseba z vsemi pravicami in dolzhnostmi, ki ji je zaupana tudi obramba. Nich ni presenetljivega v tem, da besede, ki obelezhujejo tako najvidnejshe posameznike kakor tudi bozhanstva, izvirajo prav iz družbene ureditve pastirskih ljudstev. Tudi obrambne tochke so dobile svoji legi, uporabnosti in tehnicni opremljenosti ustrezno poimenovanje. Nazivi zanje so bili kar neverjetno raznoliki in dandanes le tezhko dojemamo nadvse subtilne razlike med njimi ...

Po mojem mishljenju so Baski ostanek tistih Slovanov [za nas raje *Slo-Venetov*, op. prev.], ki so v davnini bili naseljeni na Iberskem polotoku. Nekateri so mishljenja, da je bila njihova govorica keltska. Konec koncev je moglo biti tudi tako. Che je keltshchina slovanski jezik, je morala biti v rabi she dokaj pozno in zapustiti topografsko dedishchino. Ali ga je? Vprashanju niti nochejo najti odgovora. Zato pa se zdaj suchejo okrog te keltshchine kot machka ob vreli kashi, da bi dokazali njen neslovanski izvor. Vendar se krajevna imena kazhejo kot ostanek jezika nashih skupnih prednikov. To neizpodbitno velja tako za Dezhelo Baskov kot za ves Iberski polotok. Che pomislimo na zunani videz baskovskega ozemlja, je to she lazhe razumljivo. V gorati dezheli samostojno zhivechi prebivalci niso bili izpostavljeni vsestranski romanizaciji: v gorovju se promet tezhko odvija in naravne ovire so pomenile najboljsho obrambo pred raznarodovanjem. Pri gorjanih se tudi bolje ohranijo stare shege kot v ravninskih naseljih, kjer imajo domachini vech stika s tujci.

Even Gypsies cannot be counted entirely as nomadic. It is also their custom that only those family members travel the land, who make their living as travelling blacksmiths, potters and fortune-tellers, and even they only during suitable seasons.

The use of common pasture (which in the occupied Roman territories became *praedia* owned by the state) was often cause for conflict and fighting.⁽¹⁾ Individual families held century-long rights to pasture, an advantage they were prepared to defend by force. Montenegrins, Albanians and Turks were constantly at odds with each other precisely because of this social institution, since in places where nature is stingy the right to pasture ensures survival. In fear of being driven from their native land and robbed of the possibility to make a living, pastoral peoples were constantly ready for defence. I see this as an explanation of why their conduct displays a clearly evident militant character.⁽²⁾ This is why their pastoral territories caused the creation of the admirable while naturally suitable defence system. This fact reliably attests that pastoral peoples could not have been »nomadic«, driving their cattle without a plan and to foreign pasture. Such nomads can only be sought in fairy tales, and have no place in history.

Based on this, all communities that owned pasture surfaces or enjoyed the ancient right to pasture on neutral soil formed a natural requirement to be outwardly represented by a suitable person holding all pertinent rights and responsibilities who is also entrusted with defence. It is not at all surprising that words designating the most notable individuals as well as deities stem specifically from the social establishment of pastoral peoples. Points of defence also received names corresponding with their location, usefulness, and technical furnishing. Their designations were incredibly varied and it is difficult for us today to grasp the exceptionally subtle differences between them...

In my opinion Basques are the remnants of those Slavs [L. Verbovshchik's note: to us rather Slo-Veneti], which inhabited the Iberian Peninsula in ancient times. There were some who believed that their language was Celtic. In the end this could well have been the case. If Celtic is a Slavic language it had to have remained in use fairly late leaving a topographical heritage. Was this the case? They don't even want to look for an answer. This is why they are now dancing around this Celtic heritage to prove its non-Slavic origin. Nevertheless, place names stand as a remnant of the language of our common ancestors. This is irrefutable both for Basque territories and the entire Iberian Peninsula. If we add to this the landscape of Basque territory all becomes even clearer. Autonomous inhabitants of mountainous regions were never exposed to all-out Romanisation: hills impeded traffic and natural barriers were the best defence against de-nationalization. Alpine peoples are also better at preserving ancient customs than occupants of flatland settlements, where the local populace has more contact with foreigners.

Pozornost vzbuja tudi to, da prav najstarejshe besede iz dnevne rabe v jeziku Baskov kazhejo sorodnost s slovanskimi jeziki, posebno s slovenskim. Pomenske vezi so neverjetno tesne.⁽³⁾ V raziskovanje se tukaj ne nameravam spushchati, rad pa bi poudaril, da je na razpolago toliko primerov, da ne bi imel tezhkega dela, kdor bi se odločil za poglobljeno raziskavo, ki bi bila namenjena iskanju nashih sorodstvenih vezi. Primerjajmo samo nekaj tu pa tam izbranih baskovskih besed:

Bazca - *nem. Weideplatz, pashnik, sl. pastvo, pastvisko; lat. pascua*; **behia** - *nem. Weidevieh, slov. beka in bekati, chesh. becheti*; **cepois** Holzprügel, *slov. oklesb-ček, cep*; **choco** - *Winkel, slov. kot*; **derna** - *nem. Handfläche, slov. drn, boleche zbadanje v roki*; **err** - *nem. Ende, Spitze, slov. rt*; **ezcura** - *nem. Eiche, slovo brast, shura = Korkeiche*; **gar** - *nem. Flamme, zhar*; **garabia** - *nem. Hacken, slov. grabiti, grablje*; **gori** - *nem. brennen, slov. goreti*; **gora** - *nem. hinauf, auf der Höhe, slov. gor, gori*; **goren** - *nem. hoher Berg, slov. gorski kraji, Gorenjsko*; **goinerritar** - *nem. Gebirgsbewohner, Bergbewohner, slov. gorichar*; **heya gora!** - *slov. oj, gorjel*; **kukudatz** - *slov. kokodakanje*; **leka** - *nem. Hülse, Schote, slov. lecha*; **menast** - *nem. metall, slov. medeninast*; **palanka** - *nem. Stange, Stab, slov. planka = nem. Zaunpfahl*; **phuncella** - *nem. Mädchen, slov. devica, dekle, punca*⁽⁴⁾; **poistarika** - *nem. Bachstelze, slov. ptichka pastirica*; **picher** - *nem. Wassertopf = lonchen pisker za vodo, slov. pisker*; **pikarda** - *nem. scheckig, prim. slov. pikast*; **senar** - *nem. Ehemann, slov. zakonski mozg, soprog, prim. zhenar, zhenin*; **sopa** - *nem. Zimmer, soba*; **sama, zama** - *nem. Last, prim. slov. samar = Tragtier, tovorna zhival, samariti = voditi tovorno zhival*; **zamarra** - *nem. Bluse, hochgeschlossenes Kleid, chesh. chamara enako, del njihove narodne nosbe, slov. chamer = vodilni planshar, volnena chepica*; **zanko** - *nem. Franse, slov. franzha, resica*; **zapi** - *nem. Stück Leinen, slov. lanena krpa, capa*; **zapata** - *nem. Schuh, slov. chevelj (slov. copata = Flechtschuh)*.

Zaradi vpliva obeh romanskih sosedov (Francozov in Shpancev) je baskovski jezik umetno preobremenjen s samoglasniki. Njegovi slovarji zdaj uporabljane jezika niso delo ljudi, katerim bi ta bil materin jezik. Zato je tezhko izlushchiti etimoloshko jedro besed.⁽⁴⁾ Zgolj na nakljuchne reshitve se nikakor ne smemo zanashati in moramo zato zbrati chim vech primerjav.

It is also noteworthy that it is the oldest Basque words from everyday use, which are demonstrably related to Slavic languages, especially Slovenian. Their meanings are incredibly closely tied.⁽³⁾ I do not intend to delve into research here, but I would like to stress that there are enough examples available to make easy work for anyone who may decide to undertake an in depth research of our mutual affiliations. Let us compare a mere few Basque words taken here and there:

Bazca - Ger. *Weideplatz*, *pashnik*, Sl. *pastvo*, *pastvisko*; lat. *Pascua* - pasture; **behia** - Ger. *Weidevieh* (grazing cattle)¹, Sl. *beka in bekat* Czech *bečeti* – sheep, bleating; **cepois** *Holzprügel* (wooden club), Sl. *oklesh-čbek*, *cep* - branch; **choco** - *Winkel*, Sl. *Kot* -angle; **derna** - Ger. *Handfläche* (Palm of hand), Sl. *drn*, *boleche* *zbadanje v roki* - turf, pain of the hand; **err** - Ger. *Ende*, *Spitze* (end, point), Sl. *rt* - cape; **ezcura** - Ger. *Eiche*, Sl. *brast*, *shura* = *Korkeiche* / oak, cork oak; **gar** - Ger. *Flamme*, *zhar* – burn, flame ; **garabia** - Ger. *Hacken*, Sl. *grabiti*, *grablje* – to rake (also to grab); **gori** - Ger. *brennen*, Sl. *goreti* / to burn; **gora** - Ger. *hinauf*, *auf der Höhe*, Sl. *gor*, *gori* - up, above; **goren** - Ger. **hoher Berg**, Sl. *gorski keraji*, *Gorenjsko* – alpine places, mountainous; **goinerritar** - Ger. *Gebirgsbewohner*, *Bergbewohner*, Sl. *goričar* – hill-dweller; **heya gora!** – Sl. *oj*, *gorje!* - woe; **kukudatz** – Sl. *kokodakanje* - cackling; **leka** - Ger. *Hülse*, *Schote* (husk, pod, shell), Sl. *lecha* - lentil; **menast** - Ger. *Metallen* (metallic), Sl. *medennast* (made of brass); **palanka** - Ger. *Stange*, *Stab* (rod, pole), Sl. *planka* – board, plank = Ger. *Zaunpfahl* (also *planek* – trans. n.); **phuncella** - Ger. *Mädchen*, Sl. *devica*, *dekle*, *punca*⁽⁴⁾ - girl; **poistarika** - Ger. *Bachstelze* (wagtail), Sl. *ptička pastirica* –in Slovenian literally shepherd bird; **picher** - Ger. *Wassertopf* = *lonchen pisker za vodo*, Sl. *pisker* - pitcher; **pikarda** - Ger. *scheckig*, prim. Sl. *pikast* - spotted; **senar** - Ger. *Ehemann*, Sl. *zakonski možh*, *soprog*, prim. *zhenar*, *zhenin* / husband, (in Slovenian also referred to as 'zhenin' (adj. pf possession), from 'zhena' = 'wife' i.e. of the wife; **sopa** - Ger. *Zimmer*, *soba* - room; **sama**, **zama** - Ger. *Last*, prim. Sl. *samar* = *Tragtier*, *tovorna zhival*, *samariti* = *voditi tovorno zhival* – beast of burden, to lead a beast of burden; **zamarra** - Ger. *Bluse*, *hochgeschlossenes Kleid* (blouse, high-necked vestment), Czech *chamara* - *enako*, *del njihove narodne nosbe* (part of the Cz. national costume), Sl. *chamer* = *vodilni plansbar*, *volnena čepica* – head alpine farmer, woolen cap; **zanko** - Ger. *Franse*, Sl. *franzha*, *resica* – fringe, frazzle; **zapi** - Ger. *Stück Leinen*, Sl. *lanena krpa*, *capa* – linen cloth; **zapata** - Ger. **Schuh**, Sl. *chevelj* (Sl. *copata* = *Flechtschuh*) – shoe (slipper).

Due to the influence of its Romance neighbours, France and Spain, the Basque language is artificially overlaid with vowels. Dictionaries of the currently used language are not written by native speakers. And so it the etymological nuclei of words are difficult to discern.⁽⁴⁾ We must in no way depend on merely coincidental solutions and must therefore collect as many comparisons as possible.

¹ Where the German meaning was different from the Slavic terms I added an additional translation in brackets, where they coincide this was not necessary. (Translator)

Opombe

1 – Podobna ureditev še dandanes velja na Skandinavskem polotoku. Po razpadu zveze med Shvedsko in Norveshko je bil sklenjen meddržavni sporazum. Ena izmed petih konvencij je vsebovala tudi določila o pashni pravici za severne jelene Laponcev. V odrejenih mesecih so Laponci smeli seliti svoje chrede v sosednjo drzhavo, ne da bi bili obvezani vprashati posestnike zemljishch za dovoljenje. To je lep primer selitve s chredami brez zapustitve stalnih bivalishch.

2 – Grimm ima stare Nemce za oborozena pastirska ljudstva, kakor je o Germanih menil tudi Tacitus, ko je zapisal, da niti skupnih niti osebnih zadev niso obravnavali brez orožja v roki. Danashnja pravila so bistvena posodobitev. Ko so se Chrnogorci in Albanci odvadili nositi orožje s sabo, je bilo konec vsakodnevnih turshki vpadov.

3 – O tem je prvi pisal Joh. Topolovshek v svojem delu *Baske-slovanska jezikovna enotnost* (Dunaj 1894), ki je vzbudilo pozornost znanstvenih krogov. Svoje ugotovitve je pisec podprl z dokazi, ampak »znanstveniki« so se spravili nadenj ter ga ozhigosali kot fantasta in tepca.

4 – Luzhishke Sorbkinje se nekoč dobivale v doto *Punzengeld*. Tega izraza jezikoslovci še niso mogli pojasniti. [Op. pr.: »denar, ki ga je dobila punca v doto«].

Iz nemshchine v slovenshchino prevedel Leopold Verbovshek

Zgornje besedilo je posneto (z dovoljenjem založnika) po knjigi **Davorin (Martin) Zhunkovich – Leopold Verbovshek: V sencí zgodovine** (Ljubljana, Jutro, 1998). V tej dvoavtorski publikaciji je prvi del z naslovom *Slovanski temelji Evrope* prevod Zhunkovicheve knjige *Die Slaven, ein Urvolk Europas* (Dunaj, 1911), z dodatkom nekaj njegovih chlankov iz periodike. Drugi del je prevajalchev izvorni prispevek z naslovom *Resnica na dosegu*. Prichujocha zacetna poglavja iz Zhunkovicheve knjige so pod skupnim uredniskim naslovom; v prevodu so popravljeni le drobni pisni lapsusi, prevajalcheve opombe med besedilom pa so v oglatih oklepajih. (Op. ur. I. A.)

Notes

1 – A similar establishment is in force on modern-day Scandinavian Peninsula. After the union between Sweden and Norway ended, an international agreement was struck. One of its five conventions contained stipulations concerning the right of pasture for Lapponian caribou. In determined months Laponians were allowed to drive their herds into the neighbouring country without having to ask permission from the land proprietors. This is a good example of pastoral migration without abandonment of permanent residence.

2 –Grimm views ancient Germans as armed pastoral peoples, as seen by Tacitus, who wrote that they never settled neither common nor personal matters without holding weapons. Modern-day rules are considerably updated. After Montenegrins and Albanians fell out of habit of carrying weapons on their persons, daily Turkish raids ceased.

3 – This was first recorded by Joh. Topolovshek in his *Dise basko-slavishe Spracheinheit* (Vienna, 1894), which drew attention in scientific circles. The author supported his findings with evidence, but »scientists« attacked him branding him a fantast and idiot.

4 – Formerly Sorb women received dowry called *Punzengeld*. This term has yet to be adequately explained by linguists. [Verbovshek's note – »money as dowry for a girl (Slovenian – *punca*)«].

Translated from German to Slovenian by Leopold Verbovshek – and from Slovenian to English by Jaka Jarc.

The text above has been adapted (with the publisher's permission) from the book **Davorin (Martin) Zhunkovich – Leopold Verbovshek: V sencí zgodovine (Ljubljana, Jutro, 1998)**. This publication by two authors comprises part one titled *Slavanski temelji* (Slavic Foundations, trans. n.), a translation of Zhunkovich's book *Die Slaven, Ein Urvolk Europas* (Vienna, 1911), along with a few of his journal articles. Part two is the author's original contribution titled *Resnica na dosegu* (Truth in Reach, trans. n.). The above beginning chapters from Zhunkovich's book are here assembled under a common editorial title; in the translation only small lapses have been corrected, while Verbovshek's notes are in square brackets. (Editor's note I. A.)

(The notes of the English translator are in brackets marked separately as 'trans. n.')

Peter Amalietti

POSKUS POVZETKA GENEZE SLOVENSKEGA NARODA

Seveda vsak normalen chlovek dobro ve, da preteklosti ni mogoche spreminjati – kar je bilo, je pach bilo – vendar pa tudi tu velja enako, kot ko rechemo, ni pomembno, kaj se chloveku zgodi, temvech kako on tisto sprejme in kako se odzove na tisto, kar se mu je zgodilo. Rechi hochem, da ni mogoche spreminjati preteklosti, lahko pa in si jo tudi moramo drugache tolmachiti.

Vsak rod si mora zgodovino napisati na novo in jo razlagati v skladu s svojimi hotenji in potrebami in vem, da je zdaj naposled nastopil tisti chas, ko si moramo Slovenci natočiti chistega vina in si svojo lastno zgodovino (torej sodbo o nas samih in nashih prednikih) napisati znova. Vsak opis je namrech obenem tudi tolmachenje ali razlaga.

Pri nashi rekonstrukciji zakrite in zamolchane slovenske zgodovine she najbolj zaslepljuje bralca nepregledna kopica oziroma mnozhica imen ljudstev, plemen in narodov, katere sicer lahko prav vse shtejemo za nashe prednike. Kot je ugotovil zhe Jurij Venelin so ta imena lahko po kraju, poglavarju, prednikih ali pa so to celo tuja imena. To zmedo je zhe v svojem chasu povsem nachrtno shiril na primer Julij Cezar, ki je v svojih propagandnih porochilih iz galskih vojn svojim glasovalcem v Rimu pisal nekako takole: »Zjutraj smo premagali pleme Prulchanov, popoldne smo imeli veliko delo z odporom Trnovchanov, Shishkarji so bili trd oreh in tudi Bezhighrajchani, kljub njihovemu imenu.« [Op. avt.: Glej mojo knjigo *Ko lazib postane resnica*, pogovor z Marjetko Manfreda in Bojanom Vrechkom.]

Tezhave preshtevilnih imenovanj ljudstev in plemen lahko lepo ponazorimo s plemenskim imenom Pikt, za katere vemo, da so pred zachetkom nashega shtetja zhiveli v zahodni Franciji in so bili vindelicijski Slovenci, ki so jih starogrshki pisci imenovali Piktoni, vendar pa se je nato to ime Pikt pojavilo v tretjem ali chetrtem stoletju nashega shtetja med starorimskimi pisci, ki pa so ga uporabili za tiste severnjashke Brite, ki so zhiveli onkraj Hadrijanovega zidu, cheprav ni nobenih podatkov, da bi se pleme Piktov kdaj preselilo v Anglijo, kljub temu pa so s tem imenom zacheli oznachevati prav vse tiste Brite, ki niso zhiveli pod rimsko peto in so za stare Rimljane seveda bili divjashki barbari in pogani. Nekaj podobnega je nashe poimenovanje prachloveka – neandertalec, ki se je prijelo zgolj zato, ker so prvega chloveka izkopali v dolini Neanderthal in takshno ime ne sporoča prav nich drugega. Veliko vech pove izraz prachlovek, saj takoj vemo, da gre za chloveka pred sodobnim chlovekom.

Peter Amalietti

AN ATTEMPT AT THE SYNOPSIS OF THE SLOVENIAN NATION'S GENESIS

Any normal person is, naturally, well aware that the past cannot be changed – whatever happened happened – the same principle applies here; as when we say it is less important what happens to a person than how they respond and react to what befell them. I mean to say that the past cannot be changed but it can and should be interpreted differently.

Every generation must rewrite history and interpret according to their wants and needs, and I know that the time has final judgment of ourselves and our ancestors). Each description is simultaneously an interpretation and explanation.

In our reconstruction of the concealed and unspoken Slovenian history, a reader is most bogged down by the indeterminate mass of names denoting peoples, tribes, and nations, all of which could be considered our ancestors. As ascertained already by Jurij Venelin, these names can stem from place names, chieftains' names, ancestors' names, and some can even be foreign. This confusion was intentionally propagated already by Julius Caesar who wrote his propaganda reports on Gaelic wars for his voters in Rome in approximately this manner: »This morning we conquered the tribe from Prule, at noon we had a lot of work with curbing the resistance from Trnovo, the people of Shishka were a hard nut to crack, and so were the people from Bezhigrad, in spite of their name.« [Author's note: See my book *When a Lie Becomes Truth*, a talk with Marjetka Manfreda and Bojan Vrechek.]

The problem with countless peoples' and tribes' names can be illustrated by examining the name Picts; some of us know that in prehistoric times Picts lived in Western France and were in fact Vindelici Slovenians called Pictones by Ancient Greek writers. But the name Pict resurfaced among Ancient Roman writers of the 3rd or 4th century AD denoting northern Brits beyond Hadrian's Wall. Even though no data indicates the move of the Pictish tribe to England, the name began to denote all Brits not under Roman rule whom Romans of course considered wild barbarians and pagans. Similarly, our designation for archaic humans – Neanderthals – stuck simply because the first man was excavated in the Neander valley, even though this name as such does not tell us anything else. The term archaic humans tells us much more since we immediately know we are talking about a species that predates modern humans.

Kot dokazuje nash materni jezik in shtevilne stare legende in prichevanja, smo Slovenci neposredni potomci prvih ljudi, ki so po starogrshki mitologiji na Zemlji prvich pojavili v severni Anatoliji ob Chrnem morju in so se imenovali Pelazgi ali Pelagijci. Ti prvi ljudje na svetu so se s chasom razmnozhili in se razselili po vsej mali Aziji, grshkih otokih in celini, pri tem pa so eni she dolgo ohranili svojo prvotno ime, drugi pa so prevzeli imena po krajih, vladarjih ali pa Trojni Materi Boginji, ki so jo chastili Pelazgi in se je imenovala Kar. Pozneje so se Pelazgi v svoji maticni domovini preimenovali v Karce oziroma Karijce, sosednja plemena, prav tako Pelazgi, pa so se eni po prefriganemu Frigiju preimenovali v Frigijce, druge pa v Lidijce. Karci so prvi naselili tudi Kreto in pozneje Mikene. Na Atiki zhivechi Pelazgi so se preimenovali v Jonce. Do prihoda Helenov oziroma Dorcev na zachetku zhelezne dobe v vsej Grchiji ni bilo Grkov in se je ta zato she v bronasti minojski in mikenski dobi, dobi junakov, imenovala Pelazgija in tudi Paflagonija, Korint pa Karint. Ime Karija se je s chasom in po vech selitvah pri nas naposled preoblikovala v Karnijo, iz katere izvirajo imena Karantanija, Karintija in Korotan, pozneje pa tudi Kranj in Kranjci. Po trojanski vojni so se namrech shtevilni Karci preselili v severno Italijo in nashe kraje, kjer je zhe zhivelo kolishcharsko evgansko ljudstvo, ki pa je govorilo zelo podoben jezik. Starorimski zgodovinopisci so tiste migrantske Karce imenovali Veneti. [Op. avt.: Ime Evganci je najbrzh slabo zapisano ime Izhanci. Izhanci so bili prebivalci Iga, ki je bil osrednja evropska kolishcharska prestolnica.]

Vse to sem lahko ugotovil potem, ko sem si povsem neobremenjeno in nepristransko v zhivljenju she tretjih prebral vse stare antichne zgodovinarje s Herodotom na chelu. Shele za tem sem zachel prebirati stare slovenske avtorje, ki vsi uchijo podobno, in mnoge med njimi vam v tej skromni knjizhici tudi predstavljam s kratkimi navedki.

Sodech po prvi sicer skromni in ljubiteljski genetski raziskavi Slovencev¹⁰ Slovenci ne izviramo iz enega samega plemena, temvech smo velika meshanica najmanj treh ljudstev in she shtevilnih drugih. Kot vemo, je bil pri Slovencih zato vselej jezik tisti, ki je opredeljeval narodnost. Podobno lahko sklepamo tudi iz predstavljenih navedkov, v katerih kar mrgoli razlicnih imen razlicnih ali pa istih ljudstev, pri chemer prednjachi Valvazor, ki je obenem tudi najstarejsiha slovenska knjiga, ki jo tukaj predstavljamo, katera pa chrpa iz Schönlebna. Vendar pa sta o nashi pravi zgodovini enako uchila celo cesarjeva Slovenca na Dunaju – Kopitar in Mikloshich, da o vseh drugih v njunem chasu niti ne govorimo. Sicer pa tudi zdrava pamet in logika kazheta, da so bili ljudje v devetnajstem stoletju blizhe daljni preteklosti, kot so tisti v dvajsetem stoletju, ko je ideologija povsem prekrila vso zgodovinsko vednost in jo zmanipulirala.

Pri nachrtno prikriti zgodovini she toliko bolj velja, da che nisi videl celote, ne moresh razumeti niti njenih sestavnih delov. In to celostno sliko nam dogma uradne zgodovine zakriva, zato jo je treba odstraniti iz uma in se prepustiti nashim najvechjim in najbolj znamenitim Slovencem ter na novo pouchiti o nashi slavni preteklosti, o kakrshni v nashih sholskih uchbenikih zdaj ni niti govora.

As attested by our mother tongue and numerous old legends and testimonies, Slovenians are the direct descendants of the first peoples who, according to Ancient Greek mythology, first appeared in north Anatolia near the Black Sea and were called Pelasgians. These first people on Earth procreated and in time spread across Asia Minor, the Greek islands and mainland. In doing so some long kept their original names, while others took names of places, rulers, or the Triple Goddess Mother named Kar [Car] worshiped by the Pelasgians. Later, Pelasgians in their native land changed their name to Carians while some of the neighbouring Pelasgian tribes changed theirs into Phrygians after a cunning Phry, and others into Lydians; Carians were also the first to settle Crete and later on Mycenae. Pelasgians living on Attica changed their name to Ionians. Before the arrival of Hellenes or Dorians at the start of the Iron Age, there were no Greeks in Greece and hence the area was called Pelasgia and, during the Minoan and Mycenaean Bronze Age – the age of heroes, also Paphlagonia while Corinth was called Carinth. Eventually, through time and after extensive migrations, the name Caria in our area transformed into Carnia, giving rise to the names Carantania, Carinthia, and Carnuntum, and subsequently Kranj and Kranjci. After the Trojan war, many Carians moved to Northern Italy and our area, which was inhabited by a pile-dwelling Euganeic people who spoke a very similar language. Ancient Roman historiographers called those migrant Carians – Veneti. [Author's note: The name Euganeic is probably an erroneous spelling of the name Izhanci. Izhanci were the residents of Ig, which was Europe's main crannog metropolis.]

I reached all these conclusions after reading unburdened and impartial all Ancient historians for the third time, beginning with Herodotus. Only later, did I begin reading old Slovenian authors who all teach similar things and I have presented many among them through short excerpts in this humble booklet.

According to the first, albeit modest and amateur genetic research of Slovenians we stem not from a single tribe but are rather a melange of at least three peoples and many others. As we know, Slovenians always defined nationality through language. Similar conclusion can be drawn from the select excerpts, which are filled with names for different or the same peoples. This is most evident in Valvasor's book, the oldest among the Slovenian books presented here. It draws on Schönleben. However, our true history was taught in the same manner by the emperor's Slovenians in Vienna – Kopitar and Mikloshich, not to mention all their other contemporaries. Common sense and logic also indicate that people of the 19th century were closer to ancient past than those of the 20th century, when ideology completely covered and manipulated all historical knowledge.

When it comes to intentionally concealed history, it is all the more true, that if you cannot see the big picture you cannot understand its constituent parts. And it is precisely this big picture that the dogma of official history hides from us. Hence we must banish this dogma from our mind and let the greatest and most famous Slovenians guide us in our exploration of our glorious past that is absent from the history books of our time.

Valvazor se ne more motiti, niti Presheren napachno uchiti, Mikloshich ima vendar skoraj vselej prav, Trdina ni svojim bralcem nikoli lagal, Ashkerc pa je prepeval, kar je imel za resnico. Ko si bosh, dragi bralec, prebral izbrane navedke iz slavnih knjig slovitih Slovencev, pa si v duhu predstavlja tehtnico in na eno stran postavi vsa ta slavna in silna imena, na drugo pa anonimne »profesorje« zgodovine (od Hauptmanna do Shtuha) in se vprashaj: komu neki lahko bolj zaupam? Mar tistim, ki so se svojimi dejanji in deli izkazali kot pravi domoljubi in veliki Slovenci, ali pa nekim obskurnim pisunom, ki se skrivajo za svojo dogmo? Na katero stran se bo premaknil kazalček resnice, skoraj ni mogoče dvomiti.

Dobrodoshli torej v klub ljubiteljev zgodovinske resnice! Kot je jasno, da resnice ni mogoče spoznati in ne predati, pa je mogoče poustvariti zgodovinsko resnico in jo obnoviti, saj če je resnična, to ve genetski spomin naših prednikov, ki je v vsakem od nas nekje globoko v nezavednem. Zgodovinske resnice si ni namreč treba izmisliti ali si jo predstavljati, zadostuje le, da se je spomnimo. V našem kolektivnem nezavednem spominu namreč chaka, da jo prebudimo!

Kaj mislite, kako bi se pochutili, če bi vam bilo na primer sedemdeset let in se za prvih shtiriinshestdeset let sploh ne bi spominjali, kaj ste bili in delali? To je lahko znamenje starostne demence in tedaj takshna odsotnost ni zares huda stvar – seveda za bolnika, saj je ta namreč tudi pozabil, da je pozabil. Pri slovenski zgodovini je to drugache, saj v njej vlada kolektivna amnezija. Chlovek zares pozabi shele potem, ko tudi pozabi, da je nekaj pozabil. Shele tedaj gre tisto zares v pozabo. Uradna zgodovina uchi, da ni nichesar, kar smo Slovenci pozabili o svoji preteklosti, njena doktrina je zelo preprosta in jasna. Vendar pa dandanes zhe Rusi odkrivajo, da je Slovenija njihova matichna dezhela, iz katere namreč tudi izvirajo, kar potrjuje ne le nasha stara slovenska legenda o Lehu, Mehu in Chehu, temvech tudi najstarejsa ruska zgodovinska knjiga *Nestorjeva kronika*, ki prav jasno pove, da so se Rusi v svojo domovino preselili iz juzhnih obmorskih krajev (natanchneje iz okolice Krapine), ne omenja pa nobenega Zakarpatja. [Op avt.: Glej knjigo *Slovenska znamenja in legende* Andreja Shishke.]

Zhivo nasprotje slovenski zgodovini je na primer zgodovina Japonske, ki v svojih analih podrobno opisuje vsa dogajanja za vsako leto posebej ne le na dvoru, temvech tudi po dezheli zhe od petega stoletja naprej. V tiste listine nihche ne dvomi, ker za kaj takega tudi ni nobenega razloga. Seveda pa je Japonska samo ena in je tako in tako nekaj posebnega. A zakaj Japonci poznajo svojo zgodovino, Slovenci pa ne? Vse do leta 1945 ni Japonske zasedel prav noben tuj narod, Slovenijo pa so prav nasprotno neshtetokrat. In vsakich ko pridejo zavojevalci, najprej unichijo vse dragocene arhive podjarmljenega ljudstva in mu zgodovino sami napishejo na novo. To smo Slovenci v zadnjih tisoeh letih dozhivljali vedno znova in dandanes je nasha zgodovina podobna razbitemu ogledalu.

Valvasor cannot be mistaken, and Presheren cannot teach wrongly, Mikloshich is almost always right, Trdina never lied to his readers, and Ashkerc sang his truth out loud. When you, dear reader, peruse the select excerpts from the famous books of renowned Slovenians try to imagine a pair of scales and place all these famous and powerful names in one pan and the anonymous educated professors of history (from Hauptman to Shtih) in the other and ask yourself whom you can trust more – those whose actions and works marked them as true patriots, or some obscure hacks hiding behind their learned academic dogma? There is little which side the scales of truth should tip.

And so I welcome you to the historical truth lovers' club! It is clear that truth is impossible to know or impart, but it is however possible to recreate and restore historical truth. If it is true, it is known to the genetic memory of our ancestors, which dwells somewhere deep in the unconscious of every one of us. One does not need to fabricate or imagine historical truth, since we only have to remember it. It waits in our collective unconscious memory to be awoken!

Can you imagine how you would feel if you were for instance seventy years old and you would not remember who you were and what you did for the first forty years? That can be a symptom of age-related dementia, which is not very taxing for the patient since they forget that they do not remember. It is quite different with Slovenian history since it is ruled by collective amnesia. A person does not fully forget until they forget that they do not remember. Only then can a thing be truly forgotten. Official history teaches that Slovenians did not forget anything about our past, its doctrine is simple and clear. But today, even the Russians are discovering that Slovenia is their native land from which they also originate. This is corroborated not only by our old Slovenian legend of Lech, Czech and Rus, but also by the oldest Russian history book *The Primary Chronicle of Nestor* which clearly states that Russians migrated to their homeland from southern coastal towns (more specifically from the vicinity of Krapina) but does not mention Zakarpattia at all. [Author's note: See *Slovenska znamenja in legende (Slovenian Omens and Legends)* by Andrej Shishko.]

The history of Japan is in complete contrast to Slovenian history is– its annals minutely chronicle all events not only at court but around the country since the 5th century. No doubts those documents since there is no reason to do so. Of course, Japan is a singularity and as such something special. But why is it that the Japanese know their history while Slovenians do not? Up until 1945, Japan was never conquered by a foreign nation while, in contrast, Slovenia was invaded numerous times. Each time invaders come, the first thing they do is destroy all the invaluable archives of the subjugated nation and rewrite its history. In the last thousand years Slovenians were repeatedly subject to this and today our history resembles a broken mirror.

Cheprav sicer prav nobena trditve ni stoodstotno resnična, pa so nekatere trditve resničnejše od drugih. V zgodovini velja, da so resničnejše trditve tiste, ki jih potrjujejo – podobno kot na sodishchu – stvarni materialni dokazi. In teh se nam, ki grajamo uradno slovensko zgodovino, sploh ne manjka, medtem ko njeni zagovorniki mahajo z eno samo knjigo, pa še tisto je napisal velik judovski izdajalec in hinavec, pravi judezh, Jozhef Flavij.

Valvazor je nash velik junak preteklosti, prvi, ki je v svojem chasu shiril slavo Kranjcem in Kranjski. Njegova Slava vojvodine Kranjske nima premca v tedanji svetovni knjizhevnosti, njena izvirnost, lepota in temeljiti opisi so neprekosljivi, pred tem pa je zhe napisal Shtudijo o Cerknishkem jezeru, ki mu je pridobila chlanstvo v angleški Kraljevi znanstveni družbi, tedanji najvishji evropski akademski ustanovi, che drugih chasti ne omenjamo. Na ta njegov velik podvig mecheta temno senco le dve dejstvi, da je namrech Valvazor za to knjigo zhrtvoval skoraj vse svoje bogastvo, za nash narod in njegov kolektivni spomin pa je she huje, da so nam, Slovencem, pri prvem prevodu sprva prikriili oziroma izpustili njegovo prvo in peto knjigo, ki obravnavata zgodovino Kranjcev od vesoljnega potopa naprej in to z izgovorom, ki so ga opravichevali vsi od Grafenauerja do Kmecla, da ti dve knjigi vsebujeta prevech barochnih izmishljij, da bi jih bilo vredno prevesti in objaviti oziroma kot je v uvodu zapisal prevajalec te prve izdaje Fedor Rupel: »To pisanje (namrech prva knjiga) je nepomembno in brez vrednosti.« (sic!)

Ali pa Bohorich – vsi slovenisti ga visoko cenijo, obenem pa njegove zgodovinske trditve raje kar spregledajo, enako pa je tudi z Linhartom – vsi hvalijo njegovo *Zhupanovo Micko*, nihche pa ne uposhteva njegove knjige o slovenski zgodovini. Seznam nima konca. Podobne je pri Kopitarju in Mikloshichu – nashi jezikoslovci sicer kujejo oba v nebo, njune zgodovinske eseje pa ignorirajo, ker pach trdita enako, kot zhe prej omenjeni. Kljub veliki slavi pa vsi nashteti ne dosejajo vesoljne slave Franceta Presherna med slovenskim narodom. Le redko kdo pa ve, da je France Presheren svojo edino pesnishko zbirko izdal v samozalozhbi (mislim, da v manj kot shtiristo izvodih) in da jih za zhivljenja ni prodal niti dva ducata. Koliko jih je razdelil, tudi ni podatka. No, France je nash najvechji pesnik, njegova *Zdravica* je postala nasha himna, France zanima vse in o njem se ve skoraj vse, pa vendar se nihche od poklicanih ali pa za to plachanih ni she nikoli poglobil v pesnikove trditve, ki zadevajo slovensko preteklost in ki jih v njegovem sorazmerno majhnem opusu sploh ni malo. Naslednji nash veliki klasichni pesnik Anton Ashkerc v svoji bogati epski poeziji obdeluje vech zgodovinskih tem, utemeljenih na staroveshkih pogledih na zgodovino Slovencev, ko nihche ni govoril o kakshni selitvi juzhnih Slovanov.

Even though no claim is a hundred per cent true, some claims are truer than others. In history, it is accepted that claims supported by physical evidence – similarly as in courtrooms – are truer. We, who are critical of official Slovenian history, have such evidence at our disposal, while its proponents are waving around a single book, and even that was written by the great Jewish traitor and hypocrite, a true Judas, Flavius Josephus.

Valvasor is our great hero of the past, the first to spread the glory of Carniola and its inhabitants. His *The Glory of the Duchy of Carniola* was unparalleled in contemporaneous literature, its originality, beauty, and comprehensive descriptions are unparalleled. Valvasor's earlier study on Lake Cerknica earned him a fellowship at the English Royal Society, the most distinguished European academic institution of the time, not to mention other honours he received. This great endeavour was overshadowed by only two facts, namely that he sacrificed nearly all of his wealth for our nation and its collective memory, and even worse, that in the first translation we, Slovenians, were initially kept in the dark about his first and fifth books dedicated to the history of the Carniolan population from The Deluge onwards. The excuse for this omission, which was used by everyone, from Grafenauer to Kmecl, was that these two books contain too many baroque fabrications to merit translation and publishing. As the translator Fedor Rupel wrote in the Introduction to this first edition: »This writing (meaning the first book) is inconsequential and worthless.« (sic!)

Or Bohorich – whom all experts of the Slovenian language hold in high esteem but are readily willing to overlook his historical claims. The same goes for Linhart – everyone is full of praise for his *Micka, the Mayor's Daughter* but nobody is taking into consideration his book on Slovenian history. And the list goes on. The same can be said about Kopitar and Mikloshich – our linguists praise them both but ignore their historical essays, in which they claim the same as those mentioned previously. In spite of their great glory, all of those mentioned here do not receive universal acclaim, which the Slovenian nation grants France Presheren. However, there are but few who know that France Presheren self-published his only collection of poems (I think that in fewer than 400 issues) and sold less than two dozen copies in his lifetime. How many he distributed for free is unknown. Well, France is our greatest poet and his poem *A Toast* became our national anthem. Everyone is interested in France and almost every detail about him is known but none of the called upon or hired to do so have ever delved into the poet's claims touching upon Slovenian past of which there are quite many considering the reasonably small scale of his opus. The epic poetry of the subsequent great Slovenian classical poet Anton Ashkerc deals with several historical themes, which he grounds in ancient historical understanding on Slovenian history, from a time when nobody yet spoke of any migration of the Southern Slavs.

Ta staroveshki pogled na nasho zgodovino se v 19. stoletju izpostavljali in opisovali s številni pisci v revijah in časopisih, nekateri pa tudi v knjigah. Izbrane med njimi vam bom predstavil z nekaj navedki. V tej knjigi sem sklenil na enem mestu zbrati vedenje nashih domachih velikanov in che prikaze njihovih pogledov zachenjam s Herodotom, se nisem prav nich oddaljil od svoje prvotne zamisli, kajti Herodot je bil po ochetu sicer res Grk, vendar pa je bila njegova mati karskega rodu in tudi njegov rojstni kraj Halikarnas je bil karsko mesto. (Kot boste she videli, pa so Karci eni od nashih prednikov.) Herodot zato tudi malce odstopa od sicershne tradicije starogrshkih in rimskih piscev, saj svojega opisovanja ni dosledno omejili na zgolj zgodovino grshkega naroda, temvech veliko pove tudi o ljudstvih v stari Grchiji, ki so tam zhivela zhe veliko pred prihodom Helenov in tudi pozneje.

Poglavje iz knjige *Kje so tiste stezice*.

In the 19th century, this ancient historical understanding of our history was focused on and described by many magazine and newspaper writers, some of them also appeared in book form. I will present select examples through a few excerpts. I resolved to collect the knowing of our national giants in one place, in this book. And if I start the representation of their views with Herodotus I have not veered far from my original idea, since though Herodotus was Greek on his father's side, his mother was of Carian descent and his birthplace Halicarnassus was a Carian town. (As you will see, Carians are one of our ancestors.) Hence Herodotus deviates slightly from the common tradition of Ancient Greek and Roman writers; he did not consistently narrow his descriptions exclusively to the history of the Greek nation but also tells a lot about the peoples in Ancient Greece who had lived there considerably earlier than the arrival of Hellenes and also later.

A chapter from the book *Where are Those Paths*

* These are parts of Ljubljana; the example serves as a depiction of the minute nature of peoples which Caesar proclaimed individual tribes; b) the name Bezhigrad roughly translates as »the town of fleeing people«/ »escape town«

Translated from Slovenian by Jaka Jarc

Rajko Shushtarshich

PRITIOZHBA, KI NI PRITIOZHBA

(Pa saj to ne more biti res?)

RAJKO SHUSHTARSHICH
PRAZHAKOVA 13
1000 LJUBLJANA

ZAVOD ZA POKOJNINSKO IN INVALIDSKO ZAVAROVANJE
SLOVENIJE
ZPIZ

Območna enota Ljubljana, Kolodvorska ulica 15, 1000 Ljubljana

MARINA PETERKA

Vodja službe OE za pokojninsko zavarovanje

Zadeva: PRITIOZHBA

na odločbo ZPIZ, z dne 21-10-2016; vročena 25-10-2016

Sštevilka: 14 4066112

Ne dvomim o pravilnosti izrachuna na novo odmerjene pokojnine za mene – Rajka Shushtarshicha, po kateri se izplachuje zhe priznana starostna pokojnina le she v vishini 75 %.

Na zadnjo Odlochbo SPIZ-a¹ se potemtakem ne morem pritozhiti. Njena novost je zgolj v »specifikaciji domnevnega preplachila«, ta govori v shtevilkah to, kar je bilo zmotno odločeno v odlochbi ZPIZ, dne 6. junija 2016 (vr. 16-8-2016).² Na to odlochbo pa sem se zhe pritozhil. (Glej: – Pritozhba na odlochbo ZPIZ, 6. junij 2016 (vr. SPIZ-u 19-8-2016).³ Odgovora seveda nisem prejel, domnevam torej, da je odgovor zgolj zgoraj omenjeni izrachun na novo odmerjene pokojnine.

Uradnikom v mochnih institucijah sistema (v AJ PES-u, FURS-u, ZPIZ-u, in ne nazadnje na Okrajnem in Vrhovnem sodishchu v Ljubljani) bi rad pojasnil, da posebej v tej zadevi ne gre zgolj za zakonitost, utemeljeno v shtevilnih zakonih in she shtevilnejshih zakonskih chlenih; problem je dosti vecjji:

Vprashljiva je namrech upravichenost (legitimnost) vseb teh sodb, sklepon, odlochb, nalogov.

Menda ne mislite, da preganjate zgolj nekega nekdanjega »papirnatega direktorja«, ki niti to ni vech, in seveda she nekaj trudapolnih u-pokojencev (she ne pokojnih) kot krshiteljev, ali zgolj neki *Zavod* med mnozhico zavodov, tj. *Zavod za zalozhnishtvo SRP* ..., ki ga tudi ni vech; in da ves ta cirkus pochnete dobesedno za nich!

Rajko Shushtarshich

AN APPEAL THAT IS NOT AN APPEAL

(This cannot be?)

RAJKO SHUSHTARSHICH
PRAZHAKOVA 13
1000 LJUBLJANA

PENSION AND DISABILITY INSURANCE INSTITUTE OF SLOVENIA

PDII

Ljubljana Regional Unit, Kolodvorska ulica 15, 1000 Ljubljana
MARINA PETERKA
Chief of the OE Service for Pension Insurance

Re: Appeal
of the PDII decision made on 21 Oct. 2016, served 25 Oct 2016
Number: 14 4066112

I do not doubt that the correctness of the calculation of my, i.e. Rajko Shushtarshich's newly set pension, which has lowered my previously set old-age pension to 75% of its value.

Therefore I cannot appeal PDII's latest decision. It's novelty lay solely in the "specification of the alleged overpayment"; the latter puts in numbers that, which was already falsely decided in PDII's decision on 6 June 2016 (served 16 Aug 2016);² I have already appealed said decision. (See – Appeal of the PDII's Decision of 6 June 2016 (PDII was served on 19 Aug 2016).³ I of course received no reply and therefore assume the above mentioned calculation of my newly set pension itself is the reply.

I would like to clarify for the officials of the powerful institutions of the system (AJPES, FURS, PDII, and not least the Municipal and Supreme Courts in Ljubljana) that this matter is not limited to the legality according to numerous laws and their even more numerous articles; the issue is far greater:

What is questionable is the validity (legitimacy) of all these adjudications, resolutions, decisions, warrants.

You couldn't think you are persecuting just a former "director on paper" who is not even that anymore along with a few tired out retirees (who have not been entirely retired yet), or merely some *Institute* among many, i.e. The Publishing Institute SRP... which also no longer exists, and that this whole circus is about nothing!

Che specificiram: gre za 0,00 €. Vrednost zavoda, ki ga ni vech, je bila 0,00 €. Bil sem 50% delezchnik, tj. »polovichni delezchnik« (polovica od 0,00 € je she vedno nich).

Direktor nisem vech zhe skoraj sedem let – dejansko od 15. 1. 2010.

Od takrat in tudi veliko let poprej Zavod SRP ni imel nobenega dohodka in torej nikakršne osnove za plachilo davka. Vljudnim vabilom FURS-a,⁴ da se »samoprijavim« za plachilo prispevkov, nisem mogel ustrechi, ker ni nichesar, kar bi lahko prijavil. Na Zavodu SRP namrech nikoli ni bil nihche zaposlen, ne redno ne obchasno ne »prekerno«.4a

Nekaj let smo po nepotrebnem izpolnjevali formularje AJPES-u, DURS-u, kasneje FURS-u. Zakaj? Zgolj zaradi ljubega miru.

Preganjate torej nich za nich!

Pa najbrzh ni chisto tako. Druzhno preganjate nashi reviji-vzporednici: *Revija SRP* in *Lives Journal*. Preganjate svobodo misli in pisanja. Tu pa najbrzh ne gre za nich od nich. To je evidentno nelegitimno (nedvomno tudi neustavno) pouchetje.

Pritozhbo, ki ni pritozhba si lahko v shiršem kontekstu ogledate tudi v: *Dokument 1, Revija SRP 131/132, februar 2013* (revija je zhe na internetu kot shtevilka v pripravi: revijasrp.si/knrevsrp/revsrp131/index131.htm ; in v el. knjigi *Endofazija* posebej v pogl.: *Paralelna igra administrativni stvarnosti* ; ter v e. knjigi: *Zhigosana ustvarjalnost*. Ta el. knjiga je namrech pravi razlog, da se trudim (kakor in kolikor zmorem) z institucijami sistema in z njihovim vrednostnim sistemom.

Rajko Shushtarshich

V Ljubljani 31. oktobra 2016

Vrocheno naslovniku – neposredno, dne 2. 11. 2016

Revija SRP, Lives Journal in el. knjigi:

Revija SRP 131/132, februar 2017; revijasrp.si/knrevsrp/revsrp131/index131.htm ;

Lives Journal 10:

Rajko Shushtarshich, – Ivo Antich, *Birokratsko ukijnjanje neodvisne revije /Trije dokumenti iz Revije SRP* <http://www.livesjournal.eu/library/lives10/rajsh-ivoan10/likvidacija10g.htm>

v angl: Rajko Shushtarshich, – Ivo Antich, *Bureaucratic cancellation of the independent review /Three documents from the independent Revija SRP*

<http://www.livesjournal.eu/library/lives10/rajsh-ivoan10/liquidation10.htm>

E. knjiga: *Endofazija* : posebej v pogl.: *Paralelna igra administrativni stvarnosti* ;

<http://www.revijasrp.si/knrevsrp/pogum2012-3/Endofazija40.htm#PIAS>

E. knjiga: *Zhigosana ustvarjalnost* ; <http://www.revijasrp.si/knrevsrp/pogum2003-3/zhigo.htm>

To be specific: it is about 0.00€. The value of the no longer existing institute was 0.00€. I was a 50% stakeholder of one half of the stake of zero (which is still nothing). I have not been director for almost seven years –since 15 Jan 2010.

Since then, as well as several years prior, SRP Institute had no income and therefore no basis for the payment of taxes. I was unable to comply with the courteous invitations on the part of FURS,⁴ to apply for the payment of contributions, because there was nothing I could have declared, since the SRP Institute never had any employees, permanent, temporary, or precariously.^{4a}

For a few years we have filled out useless AJPES's and DURS's – later FURS's forms. Why? Simply to avoid complications.

You are therefore persecuting us for nothing!

Although this is possibly not the whole matter. You are jointly persecuting our parallel journals *Revija SRP* and *Lives Journal*. You are persecuting the freedom of thought and written expression. Here the matter does not simply amount to nothing. This is an evidently illegitimate (doubtless also unconstitutional) action.

The appeal which is not an appeal can be viewed in a wider context here: *Dokument 1, Revija SRP 131/132, februar 2013* (the journal is available online, an issue in preparation: revijasrp.si/knrevsrp/revsrp131/index131.htm ; also in the e-book *Endofazija* in a separate chapter titled: *Paralelna igra administrativni stvarnosti* ; and e-book: *Zhigosana ustvarjalnost*. In fact, this e-book is the real reason why I struggle (insofar and as much as I am able) with the institutions of the system and their value system.

Rajko Shushtarshich

In Ljubljana 31 October 2016

Served to the addressee – directly, 2 November 2016

Translated from Slovenian by Jaka Jarc

Revija SRP, Lives Journal and e-books:

Revija SRP 131/132, February 2017; revijasrp.si/knrevsrp/revsrp131/index131.htm ;

Lives Journal 10:

Rajko Shushtarshich, – Ivo Antich, *Birokratsko ukinjanje neodvisne revije /Trije dokumenti iz Revije SRP* <http://www.livesjournal.eu/library/lives10/rajsh-ivoan10/likvidacija10g.htm>

In Eng: Rajko Shushtarshich, – Ivo Antich, *Bureaucratic cancellation of the independent review /Three documents from the independent Revija SRP*

<http://www.livesjournal.eu/library/lives10/rajsh-ivoan10/liquidation10.htm>

E-book: *Endofazija* : separate chap.: *Paralelna igra administrativni stvarnosti* ;

<http://www.revijasrp.si/knrevsrp/pogum2012-3/Endofazija40.htm#PIAS>

E. knjiga: *Zhigosana ustvarjalnost* ; <http://www.revijasrp.si/knrevsrp/pogum2003-3/zhigo.htm>

Svojskost *LiVeS Journala – Revije SRP*

Vodilo *LiVeS Journala – Revije SRP* so tri vrednotne orientacije individua, tega ne nepomembnega drobca v sistemu institucij.

Te vrednote so: Svoboda, Resnica, Pogum. Pomembne so, vsaka od njih posebej, pomembno je prezhemanje teh vrednot.

Tak namen ima tudi uredništvo Revije SRP, ki izhaja v posodobljenem prvotnem slovenskem chrkopisu bohorichici, katere utemeljitev predstavlja *Zbornik 2001 Boborichica*.

Individuality of the *LiVeS Journal*

Guidelines of the *LiVeS Journal* are the three values of the orientation of the individual, that irrelevant shred in the system of institutions.

These values are: Liberty (freedom), Verity (truth), and Spirit (courage) Each of them is important in its separate way, the infusion of these values is important.

This is also the intention of the LiVeS Journal editorial board, which is published in an updated version of *Bohorichica* – the primary Slovenian alphabet, the argumentation behind which is presented in *Zbornik 2001 Bohorichica*.

Sama ustvarjalnost in avtonomija,
njuna utemeljenost v raziskovanju,
nachelno in splošno nista vprashljivi,
nihče, skoraj nihče ne bo nasprotoval
takim usmeritvam. Problem se pojavlja
shele na konkretnem nivoju, kot tak je
nerazviden in skrit ali zhe prikrit
in s tem tezhko reshljiv.

Problem ukinjanja ustvarjalnosti
(in avtonomije) se kazhe v shtevilnih,
a na videz nepomembnih malenkostih.
Lahko jih ne vidimo ali pa se moramo
spustiti na nivo konkretnosti, to je
na nivo ukvarjanja z malenkostmi
in postati malenkostni.

Institucija brez spomina je
kakor podjetje brez knjigovodstva,
mochni in mogochni v njej
pochno, kar jih je volja,
ker vse, kar pochno, utone
v pozabljivi zavesti chasa.

...

a ne gre za chas, ampak za dejstva zavesti,
kjer chasa ni, je samo trajanje,
obche vrednote so neposredna dejstva zavesti,
vsakomur dojemljive, preverljive,
nihče jih chloveku ne more ne dati ne vzeti,
ne sistem ne institucija ne propaganda, tudi kulturna ne,
samo che to sam hoche, jih bo nashel
le v sebi, sebstvu svojem.

Creativity and autonomy themselves,
their justification in research,
are in principle and generally not questionable,
no one, or next to no one will oppose
such an orientation. It is not until concrete action is undertaken
that the problem will occur, and it is therefore
unevident and hidden or even already concealed
and thus difficult to solve.

The problem of abolishing creativity
(and autonomy) presents itself in numerous,
but seemingly irrelevant details.

We can either leave them undetected or
drop down to the tangible level, in other words –
become preoccupied with trifles –
and grow petty.

An institution with no memory
is like a company without accounting,
its strong and its mighty
do what they please,
because all they do is doomed to drown
in the forgetful awareness of time.

...

but it is not a matter of time, but a matter of the facts of awareness,
where time does not exist, there is only length,
general values are direct facts of awareness,
understandable to all, verifiable,
no one can bestow them or take them away,
neither system, nor institutions nor propaganda – not even a cultural one,
only if one so desires, will one find them
only within oneself, in one's own self.

»Torej vsako bitje, ki občuti svojo eksistenco,
občuti zločin pokorjenosti in težki k svobodi;
če se še zivali, ki so udomachene za sluzhenje chloveku,
lahko podrede shele potem, ko jim zatro nasprotno zheljo,
kakshna nesrecha je to lahko za chloveka,
ki je edini resnichno rojen zato,
da zhivi svobodno.

Napravila ga je nenaravnega do te mere,
da je izgubil praspomin na svoje prvobitno stanje,
in na zheljo, da ga ponovno ozhivi ...
Vedno pa se najdejo eni, srechnejshi od drugih,
ti, ki so rojeni pod srechno zvezdo,
ki občutijo težho jarma in ne morejo vzdrzhati,
da bi ga ne stresli, ti, ki se nikoli ne navadijo na jarem ...

*Ko bi bila svoboda povsem izgubljena,
zunaj tega sveta,
bi jo ti ljudje ozhivili v svoji predstavi,
občutili bi jo v **svojem duhu** in jo she vedno uzhivali.*

Suzhenjstvo nikakor ni po njihovem okusu,
celo ko je to okrasheno, ne! ...«

Étienne de La Boétie

»So every being that feels its existence,
feels the crime of submission and strives for freedom;
if even animals that are tamed to serve man,
do not submit until their opposing desires are crushed,
what misfortune can this be for man,
who alone is truly born,
to live freely.

It made him so unnatural,
that he forgot the memory of his primeval state,
and the desire to again revive it ...
But you always find some who are happier than others,
the ones who are born under a lucky star,
who feel the weight of the yoke and cannot stop themselves,
from shaking it off, the ones who never grow accustomed to the yoke ...

*If liberty were to be completely lost,
out of this world,
then these people would revive it in their imaginations,
they would feel it in **their spirit** and continue to enjoy it.*

Servitude is by no means to their taste,
not even if it is adorned! ...«

Étienne de La Boétie

OPOMBA UREDNISHTVA

LiVeS Journal (in *Revija SRP*): <http://www.livesjournal.eu> (<http://www.revijasrp.si>)

Internetna uporaba *Revije SRP* je brez omejitev; enako velja za *LiVeS Journal*, ki mu je z vzporedno dvojezičnostjo namenjena širša dostopnost, tudi za izseljenske korenine. Predvideno je, da bodo med novimi sodelavci tudi prevajalci, ki bodo postopoma dodajali prevode iz *Revije SRP* v »globalnem jeziku« (za globalni zgodovinski spomin), danes v angleškem (britanskem ali ameriškem). Izvirnik vsakega teksta je avtorski unikat, prevodov pa je lahko vech, zato bo v internetni izdaji *LJ* kak prevod lahko tudi dodan k predhodnemu ali pa ga bo nadomestil.

EDITORIAL NOTE

LiVeS Journal (and *Revija SRP*): <http://www.livesjournal.eu> (<http://www.revijasrp.si>)

Internet use of *Revija SRP* is without limits; the same is valid for *LiVeS Journal*, for which the wider accessibility is intended by the means of two parallel languages, even to the roots of diasporas. It is expected that the new translators among the contributors gradually will add new translations of the texts from *Revija SRP* in the »global language« (for the global historical memory), today in English (British or American). Every original text is unique as a fact of authorship, but translations may be several, so in the Internet edition of *LJ* new translations also could be added to the preliminary ones, or those could be replaced.