

NADA ŠABEC
University of Maribor

Fields of research: dialectology, sociolinguistics, contact linguistics.

MIHAELA KOLETNIK
University of Maribo

Fields of research: dialectology, sociolinguistics, contact linguistics.

HERITAGE LANGUAGE AND DIALECT MAINTENANCE AMONG SLOVENE IMMIGRANTS AND THEIR DESCENDANTS IN NORTH AMERICA

Slovėnų imigrantų ir jų palikuonių Šiaurės
Amerikoje paveldėtosios kalbos ir tarmės
išsaugojimas

ANNOTATION

The article focuses on Slovene-English language contact in North America. The general linguistic situation in two Slovene American/Canadian communities (Cleveland, Vancouver) is described, emphasizing the relationship between the degree of mother tongue/heritage language maintenance of the immigrants and their descendants on the one hand and their sense of ethnic identity on the other. The historical, social and cultural aspects of Slovene immigration to the USA and Canada are addressed. This is followed by a detailed linguistic analysis of the data obtained through tape-recorded interviews from individual informants belonging to three generations. We are particularly interested in the social varieties of Slovene used by the informants (dialect, regional colloquial language, Standard Slovene) as well as the presence of English in their speech (manifested either

as borrowing, code switching or in the form of deviations from the Slovene norm on the phonological, morphological and syntactic levels). The role of dialect as a factor in ethnic identification is discussed.

KEYWORDS: immigration, heritage language, mother tongue, dialect, Slovene-English language contact

ANOTACIJA

Straipsnyje analizuojami slovėnų ir anglų kalbų kontaktai Šiaurės Amerikoje. Aprašoma bendroji kalbinė dviejų Amerikos ir Kanados slovėnų bendruomenių (Klivlando ir Vankuverio) situacija, pabrėžiant imigrantų ir jų palikuonių gimtosios / paveldėtosios kalbos išsaugojimo ir tautinio tapatumo santykį. Aptariami istoriniai, socialiniai ir kultūriniai slovėnų imigracijos į JAV ir Kanadą aspektai. Straipsnyje pateikiama išsami trijų kartų informantų į diktofoną įrašytų interviu duomenų lingvistinė analizė. Ypatingas dėmesys skiriamas socialinėms informantų vartojamoms slovėnų kalbos atmainoms (tarmei, regioninei šnekamajai kalbai, bendrinei slovėnų kalbai) bei anglų kalbos vartojimui jų kalboje (skoliniams, kodų kaitai ar nukrypimams nuo slovėnų kalbos normos fonologiniame, morfologiniame ir sintaksiniame lygmenyje). Aptariamas tarmės kaip tautinio identiteto faktoriaus vaidmuo.

ESMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: imigracija, paveldėtoji kalba, gimtoji kalba, tarmė, slovėnų ir anglų kalbų kontaktai.

1. INTRODUCTION

Language is an essential part of one's identity, which is why the relationship between the two presents an interesting topic to explore on both individual and societal levels. This applies to ordinary circumstances, but even more so to special contexts such as immigration, where the two may interact in relatively complex and intriguing ways. According to Berry's acculturation theory (1990), immigrants may adapt to the new environment through four alternative strategies: assimilation, marginalization, separation and integration. The first three involve either a complete abandonment of one's original culture or adherence to it to the point of being completely isolated from the mainstream society. A far more successful strategy, which best describes the Slovene experience, however, is integration, whereby the immigrants did everything in their power to succeed in the New World by adopting the culture and the language of the dominant society, while at the same time managing to maintain elements of (or at least a positive attitude towards) their heritage.

It is our purpose therefore to explore the degree to which mother tongue has been preserved among early Slovene immigrants (heritage language in the case of younger generations). This depends on a number of factors, ranging from the size of the immigrant community to the ways in which the language is transmitted from generation to generation, resulting either in language maintenance, language shift or even language extinction. For obvious reasons, the ways in which English influences their language are also presented. Borrowing and code switching, as two distinct types of bilingual discourse typically used by different generations, are examined, as are English-influenced deviations from the Slovene norm in the Slovene sections of the data. All varieties of Slovene are considered, but in accordance with the topic of this article, our main focus remains on the presence of various features of regional and local dialects of Slovene detected in the informants' speech.

2. A BRIEF HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL OUTLINE OF SLOVENE IMMIGRATION TO NORTH AMERICA

With the exception of some individuals, the majority of Slovenes migrated to the USA in two large migration waves: the first between the turn of the 19th century and 1924¹ as economic immigrants, and the second after WWII as political ones. They settled in various parts of the States, with the largest community forming in Cleveland, OH². In terms of size, its Canadian counterpart is Toronto³, ON, where most immigrants settled after WWII. More economic arrivals came to both countries in the 1960s and 1970s, but largely in insignificant numbers. The early immigrants lived in segregated communities, where they established a network of ethnic organizations that served both as mutual help agencies and cultural activity centers. Outside of work, they were for the most part able to function in Slovene: their children, however, who benefited from the American/Canadian educational system, learned English, progressed socially and economically and subsequently moved out to the suburbs. This

¹ In 1924 the US passed the Immigration Act, which greatly restricted the number of new immigrants.

² Census data for 1910 listed 14,332 Slovenes in Cleveland, making it at the time the 3rd largest Slovene city in the world (after Ljubljana and Trieste). Today Cleveland has approx. 50,000 people who claim Slovene heritage.

³ Toronto has approx. 10,000 people of Slovene descent.

trend intensified with the younger generations; linguistically, as a consequence, we have observed a typical three-generation cycle, during which Slovene was largely displaced by the dominant English. The one generation that is still (at least partly) bilingual is thus the second one, while younger generations possess either an extremely poor or no knowledge of their heritage language. Regardless, the extensive research carried out in Cleveland, Washington, DC, Laguna Niguel, CA, Toronto, ON, and Vancouver BC (Šabec 1995, 1997, 2006, 2011, 2016; Šabec, Koletnik 2017) shows that, at least on a symbolic level, language continues to play an important role in their ethnic identification. The same is true of culture, as the majority perceive themselves to be Americans/Canadians, but profess pride in their Slovene roots.

3. RESEARCH DESIGN

In accordance with the goal of our research, we decided to compare the spoken discourse of informants originating from various parts of Slovenia, i.e. those speaking different dialects. Slovene is an extremely heterogeneous language (Toporišič 2000). It contains standard and non-standard varieties, the former including the codified formal literary variety referred to as Standard Slovene (used on the national level, especially in writing) and a standard colloquial one, the latter consisting of regional colloquial varieties and local dialects. There are more than fifty different dialects spoken in Slovenia, and ideally our study would encompass all of them. It is possible, although unlikely, that our ongoing research might yield such comprehensive data, however, our research strategy was to analyze whatever dialect our randomly selected subjects spoke. In order not to exceed the scope of this article, and yet to present the dialects which we feel display the most marked differences we chose those spoken in Prekmurje, Styria, Rovte, Notranjska and in Maribor. Our aim was to determine which of the dialects chosen is best preserved and, specifically, which dialectal features prevail in the informants' speech. We also sought to include members of different generations and to carry out our research in two settings: Cleveland as the largest Slovene American community, and Vancouver⁴ as one of the smallest Canadian ones. The purpose was to gauge the importance of the communities' size/vitality on the language behavior of the individuals participating in this study, and to establish the extent to which the language of these

⁴ There are approximately 2,000 Canadians of Slovene descent in Vancouver, 400 of whom are active members of their only ethnic organization – the Slovenian Society of Vancouver.

individuals is a reflection of the communities' ethnolinguistic vitality (Giles, Bourhis, Taylor 1977; Ehala 2009).

The data for our analysis were obtained through tape-recorded interviews and narratives; their interpretation is supported by participant observation during the fieldwork carried out in the fall of 2016. The interviews consisted of questions related to the subjects' immigration, their socialization patterns and ethnic activities as well as to their language use and attitudes (talking about various topics, with various interlocutors and in formal vs. informal settings).⁵ They were semi-structured so as to allow the subjects to elaborate on individual topics, sharing their personal experience more freely. While a larger number of subjects would provide a more comprehensive sociolinguistic picture of the communities under investigation⁶, we decided, in the interest of a more detailed linguistic analysis, to examine only the data collected from seven individual speakers (who, however, seemed to be fairly representative of their communities). Nineteen hours of material were tape-recorded, the average length of the interview being 2.3 hours. Findings are presented according to generation (three) and dialect. In all cases, the dialectal features identified are presented alongside their Standard Slovene (SSL) equivalents. The emphasis is on phonology, partly on morphology and syntax, and also on the various ways in which English influences the Slovene of our informants.

4. LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE DATA COLLECTED

4.1. 1st generation immigrants

Of the four informants belonging to the 1st generation, one lives in Cleveland and speaks the Prekmurje dialect, while the other three are from Vancouver, two speaking the Rovte dialect and one the regional colloquial language of the city of Maribor. All are economic immigrants and came to the US/Canada in the late 1950s and early 1960s.

⁵ Similar to the questions from the questionnaire in the Cleveland study (Šabec 1997).

⁶ The Cleveland study (Šabec 1997), for instance, was based on the data collected from 200 subjects.

4.1.1. The Prekmurje dialect

Our informant came to Cleveland with very little formal education in Slovene (elementary school), but continued her education in the States, earning a High School Equivalency Diploma. She is now retired, but in the past worked as a secretary in a private business. She is still very active in the ethnic life of the community and has many social contacts with other Slovenes, primarily those speaking the same dialect as her.

The Prekmurje dialect belongs to the Pannonian dialect group and is spoken in easternmost Slovenia. In addition, it is also used in some villages east and north of Radgona in Austria, and along the Raba river (the so-called Porabje region) in Hungary. This dialect, which in the past helped preserve the Slovene character of the region along the Mura river, is firmly rooted among the people and is the most salient symbol of the Prekmurje identity⁷. It thus comes as no surprise that it is the best preserved dialect among Slovene immigrants in Cleveland. The following dialect features were identified in the interview with our informant: (1) typical dialectal placing of stress with all stress retractions (e.g. *záčne* ‘it begins’, SSL. *začnè*) and short vowels which may occur in any word syllable (e.g. *ràzmiš* ‘you understand’, SSL. *razúmesš*);⁸ (2) the presence of all vowels typical of the Prekmurje dialect along with the dialectal diphthongs [eĭ] instead of the Proto-Slavic yat (e.g. *sveĭt* ‘world’) and [ou] instead of the Proto-Slavic long /o/ (e.g. *šoĭla* ‘school’) and nasal /ǫ/ (e.g. *soĭsit* ‘neighbor’); dialectal [ü] instead of /u/ (e.g. *drügi* ‘other’, [ö] instead of /u, i/ when adjacent to a sonorant /r/ (e.g. *vöra* ‘hour’, *šörki* ‘wide’) and [u] developed from the vocalic /ĭ/ (e.g. *puno* ‘full’, *vuk* ‘wolf’), (3) the Proto-Slavic long /a/, which in the dialect remains open (e.g. *dva* ‘two’), while the short /a/ is labialized (e.g. *brât* ‘brother’).

Deviations from the dialect in the direction of Standard Slovene are fairly rare and include occasional use of the following: monophthongs instead of

⁷ After a brief period of independence under Slovene Prince Kocelj, the Prekmurje Slovenes lived under Hungarian rule (874–1919). They were also exposed to the Croatian-Kajkavian influence. Despite very difficult historical circumstances, they managed to preserve their ethnic and linguistic identity and today even have literature written in the Prekmurje dialect. The treaty of Trianon (1920) assigned the larger part of the territory between the Mura and Raba rivers to Slovenia, while 9 villages along the Raba remain in Hungary.

⁸ Standard diacritic marks are used: the acute (´), the breve (˘) and the circumflex (ˆ) mark the place of stress. In addition, the acute marks the length and the closeness of *e*- and *o*, the breve – the shortness and the openness of *e* and *o*, and the circumflex – the length and the openness of *e*- and *o*. The semi-vowel is written as *ə*.

dialectal diphthongs (e.g. *to* ‘this’ instead of dialectal *toɥ*, *snek* ‘snow’ instead of dialectal *snejk*), the unrounded instead of rounded pronunciation of *u* (e.g. *tu* ‘here’ instead of dialectal *tü*), and the Standard Slovene place of stress (e.g. *lepó* ‘nice’, *samó* ‘only’ instead of dialectal *léipo*, *sàmo*). Consonants are, as a rule, pronounced dialectally; the only exceptions are occasionally found with /x/, /v/ and /m/. In the dialect, /x/ is either silent or replaced by /j/, but is at times pronounced as in Standard Slovene (e.g. *xodili* ‘they walked’, *strax* ‘fear’ instead of dialectal *odili*, *straj*). /v/ before a non-sonorant consonant loses its sonority, but may, in rare cases, remain sonorant as in Standard Slovene (e.g. *vküp* ‘together’ instead of dialectal *fküp*). As for /m/, this is replaced by /n/ in the dialect, but is at times pronounced the same way as in Standard Slovene (e.g. *tam* ‘there’ instead of dialectal *tan*).

In all cases we observe the use of dialectal inflectional patterns. This applies to declensions, conjugations and to the comparison of adjectives. Deviations are found in singular masculine nouns in the locative case, where the Standard Slovene *-u* ending is occasionally used instead of the dialectal *-i* (e.g. *v doumu* ‘in the home’ instead of dialectal *v doumi*). The same is true of singular feminine nouns in the instrumental case, where the dialectal ending *-of* (< *-ov*) is occasionally replaced by the Standard Slovene *-o* (*z materjo* ‘with mother’ instead of dialectal *z materjof*). The dialect has preserved all three genders as well as the use of the dual.

Among typical dialectal features are also particle constructions, exclamatory sentences, interjections, original dialectal adverbs (e.g. *ednok* ‘once’, *gnes* ‘today’, *nikaj* ‘nothing’, *prle* ‘before’, *rano* ‘early’, *sigdar* ‘always’, *zajtra* ‘in the morning’), particles (e.g. *šče* ‘still’, *ve(j)* ‘but’), and conjunctions (e.g. *ka* ‘that’, *dokič* ‘until’, *da* ‘when’). Similarly, we encounter repetitions of all kinds and rich Pannonian vocabulary (e.g. *belice* ‘eggs’, *betežen* ‘ill’, *deca* ‘children’, *gučati* ‘to talk’, *iža* ‘a house’, *obit* ‘lunch’, *znati* ‘to know’). It is interesting that some Standard Slovene lexemes such as *komar*, *koruza*, *tukaj* are replaced not only by their dialectal equivalents, such as *sumič*, *kukrca*, *eti*, but occasionally also by Germanisms. These were borrowed into the Prekmurje dialect as early as the Old and Middle High German periods (e.g. *cuk* ‘train’ ← Germ. Zug, *cuker* ‘sugar’ ← Germ. Zucker, *gvišno* ‘(for)sure,’ ← MHG. *gewiss*, *janka* ‘a skirt’ ← Germ. *Janker* ‘a kind of garment for men or women’, *kufer* ‘suitcase’ ← Germ. Koffer, *lager* ‘camp’ ← Germ. Lager, *penezi* ‘money’ ← OHG *pfenni(n)g* ‘coin’, *probat* ‘to try’ ← Germ. *probieren*, *žlahta* ‘relatives’ ← OHG *slahta*, MHG *slahte*, *slaht* ‘tribe’.

4.1.2. The Rovte Dialect

The Rovte dialect is spoken in an expansive hilly, wooded area located west of the capital Ljubljana. At the time of Slavic settlement, this was a relatively scarcely populated area. Our two informants are husband and wife. They speak the local dialect of Vrhnika, which is part of the Horjule dialect, one of the six somewhat diverse dialects that make up the Rovte dialectal group⁹. The Horjule dialect has preserved tonemic and qualitative contrasts. It is similar to Standard Slovene in that its vowel system consists of monophthongs; the only exceptions are the diphthongs [je] and [va] used instead of the long and open /e/ in /o/. Both informants speak the Central Slovene colloquial variety intertwined with elements of their native dialect. This was to be expected since, prior to immigration to Canada, one of them graduated from high school and the other from a college in Ljubljana. They worked as a medical technician and a certified accountant respectively, but are now retired. They have some Slovene friends, but do not make any special effort to engage in ethnic activities. While they have lost the dialectal tonemic features, they have preserved the qualitative ones. In their speech there are no dialectal diphthongs; instead, they pronounce Standard Slovene monophthongs such as *kosa* ‘scythe’ (dialectal *kvasa*), and *sestra* ‘sister’ (dialectal *sjestra*). Simplified syntax as well as the reduction of stressed short vowels into semi-vowels is typical of their regional colloquial language (e.g. *jəs* < /I/, *təm* ‘there’, *bəl* ‘more’), as is the loss of unstressed vowels (*zlo* ‘very’, *tko* ‘so’, *človk* ‘a man/human being’) and the use of colloquial Germanisms (e.g. *familja* ‘family’, *penzija* ‘retirement’, *pajzel* ‘a shabby room’).

The informants’ colloquial features are mixed with dialectal ones. Thus, the stressed short /i/ and /u/ in closed syllables and /i/ are pronounced as semi-vowels (e.g. *nəč* ‘nothing’, *kəp* ‘a heap’, (so) *blə* ‘they were’). Also, they engage in so-called »akanje«, i.e. the transition of the unstressed /o/ into /a/ (e.g. *sašolci* ‘school mates’, *z bratam* ‘with brother’). Other dialectal features include the loss of the syllable-final /i/ in plural participles in -l and in the nominative case of plural adjectives (e.g. *začel* ‘they began’, *poslal* ‘they sent’, *dobər* ‘good’), the syllable-final -el, -il and -ev pronounced as [u] (e.g. *reku* ‘he said’, *kupu* ‘he bought’, *cerku* ‘a church’), the reduction of unstressed /a/ after a stressed syllable (e.g. *bogət* < *bogat* ‘rich’), and the palatalization of palatal consonants (e.g. *pelala* < *peljala* ‘she drove’, *zamenal* < *zamenjali* ‘they changed’).

In morphology, the dialectal influence accounts for the masculinization of neuter nouns (e.g. (vsak) *let* < (vsako) *leto* ‘(every) year’), the loss of the dual (e.g. to sta *ble* obedve *lepe punce* ‘they were both pretty girls’), and the use of short

⁹ The dialects were named after the German word *reuten*, meaning *to cut down woods*.

infinitival forms (e.g. *moram rečt* ‘I have to say’, *smo hoteli ustvart* ‘we wanted to create’).

4.1.3. The Maribor regional colloquial language

We should note that the language spoken in the city of Maribor is not a dialect but rather a regional northern Styrian colloquial language. It is in fact a supradialectal variety, performing functions similar to those of Standard Slovene on the national level. It is the result of the direct intersection of the Styrian and Pannonian dialect groups, the former being in contact with Maribor in the south and west and the latter in the north and east.

Our informant was born in Maribor, where she also graduated from high school. In Canada, she enrolled in college and worked as a freelance interior designer prior to retirement. She is very active in the social and ethnic life of the community. Her data show the following features typical of Maribor colloquial language:

(1) recent (dialectal) stress retractions (e.g. *láhko* ‘easily’, *prêveč* ‘too much’, *príšla* ‘she came’ instead of SSL. *lahkó, prevèč, prišlà*) and double stress in complex words (e.g. *obrátoVódja* ‘foreman’, SSL. *obratovódja*); (2) the loss of qualitative contrasts and variation in the vowel quality, where the stressed *e* and *o*, pronounced as open phonemes in Standard Slovene, are pronounced as very close vowels; (3) even though Standard Slovene and the Maribor speech contain only monophthongs, due to the influence of the dialects in close contact with Maribor, our informant occasionally uses diphthongs as well as monophthongs and diphthongs interchangeably (e.g. *res* – *rejs* ‘really’, *šola* – *šoula* ‘school’, *leto* – *lieto* ‘year’, *dobro* – *duobro* ‘well’).

In unstressed vowels we notice some modern vowel reduction, while the consonant system shows dialectal reflexes in the case of the palatal /l'/ (e.g. *posla* ‘bed’, *prijatl* ‘friend’ instead of SSL. *postelja, prijatelj*). The consonant /nj/ is not palatalized in the dialect but pronounced the same as in Standard Slovene (e.g. *z njimi* ‘with them’, *žiolenje* ‘life’). The sonorant *v* before non-sonorant consonants and in word-final positions is pronounced as [f], similar to northern Styrian and Pannonian dialects (e.g. *fse* ‘all’, *fsaki* ‘every’). The same is true of the dialectal pronunciation of unstressed *-l* in masculine participles (e.g. *reko* ‘he said’, *oženo* ‘he married’ instead of SSL. *rekel, oženil*).

Plural neuter nouns are feminized (e.g. *jabolke* ‘apples’, *okne* ‘windows’ instead of SSL. *jabolka, okna*). There is also a tendency to use the feminine ending *-a* in masculine declensions even though these are used interchangeably with the Standard Slovene *-i* endings (e.g. *v bazenih* ‘in the pools’, *po domovah* ‘in the homes’). Similarly, we observe the co-existence of dialectal and standard

endings in the dative and locative case of singular masculine nouns and in the instrumental case of plural masculine nouns, i.e. standard endings *-u* and *-ov* are used side by side with the dialectal *-o* (*na vrho* ‘at the top’ – *proti koncu* ‘toward the end’; *šest tedno* ‘six weeks’ – *šest mescof* ‘six months’). In the last example of *ov* > *of* we observe the loss of sonority. We also notice the loss of the dual (e.g. *Midve pa sma nemško govorile* < *Midve pa sva nemško govorili*. ‘The two of us spoke German.’), the regional non-standard short infinitives, the 1st person verbal ending *-ma* instead of *-va* (e.g. *delama* instead of SSL. *delava* ‘us two are working’), the expression of volition through verbs of ability, the doubling of demonstrative pronouns and of the negative particle (e.g. *tota* ‘this’, *nena* ‘not’ instead of SSL. *ta, ne*), and the replacement of the relative pronoun *ki* by the conjunction *ko* (e.g. *To je pa tisti človek, ko je nas appikal* ‘This is the man who picked us up’ instead of SSL.) or by the interrogative pronoun *kaj* (e.g. *Tisto, kaj je dobila, je nam dala* ‘What she got, she gave us’). Furthermore, we notice the use of the temporal adverb *gda(j)* instead of temporal conjunction *ko* (e.g. *To sn lahko oporablala, gdaj sn kaj delala* ‘I could use this when working’) and the occasional use of some other regional adverbs and pronouns (e.g. *not* ‘inside’, *pol* ‘then’, *par* ‘some’, *najprvo* ‘first’, *večgdo* ‘many a person’).

As the German community played a prominent role in Maribor’s political, cultural, economic and everyday life,¹⁰ it is not surprising that the language of our informant is also marked by the influence of German. This is manifested in the frequent use of the adverb + verb combinations (e.g. *vun vlekli* ‘they pulled out’, Germ. *ausziehen*; so *vun poslali* ‘they distributed’, Germ. *aussenden*) as well as in loanwords (e.g. *bana* ‘battub’, Germ. *Wanne*; *koštati* ‘to cost’, Germ. *kosten*; *špricati* ‘to spray’, German *spritzen*) and calques (e.g. *sem delala na tisti sliki* ‘I was working on that painting’, Germ. *I habe an diesem Bild arbeiten*; *On mi je vedno vse težko naredo* ‘He always made it difficult for me’, Germ. *Er hat mir immer alles schwer gemacht*).

4.2. 2nd generation

4.2.1. The Styrian dialect

Our informant was born in a village near Celje, graduated from high school and immigrated to Canada, where she continued her education at a college and university level. She is a lawyer, has some contact with Slovenes, but is not

¹⁰ In the period 1864–1946 both German and Slovene ethnic communities lived in Maribor. With WWII, the German population lost its majority status.

particularly active in the ethnic community, mostly due to the lack of time. Her dialect belongs to the Styrian dialect group, more specifically to the Savinja dialect. Compared to the 1st generation immigrants, the data of our American-born informant living in Cleveland in an ethnically mixed marriage shows a higher level of English interference (syntax, vocabulary, code switching). Her Slovene, which she learned from her parents, however, shows the following dialectal features: the loss of qualitative contrasts (e.g. *jáz* 'I', *věč* 'more', *splóh* 'at all' instead of SSL. *jáz*, *věč*, *splòh*) and dialectal stress retractions (e.g. *ròjena* 'born', *sámo* 'only', *těžko* 'hard' instead of SSL. *rojěna*, *samó*, *težkó*), both of which are typical of most Styrian dialects; a well preserved dialectal diphthong [iɛ] used in place of the old acute Proto-Slavic vowel yat (e.g. *cięsta* 'road', *lięto* 'year', *smo mięli* 'we had'); some occurrences of modern vowel reduction (e.g. *mela* 'I had', *učitlca* 'a teacher', *tak* 'so' instead of SSL. *imela*, *učiteljica*, *tako*), dialectal reflexes for the palatal /l'/, /n'/ (e.g. *prijatl* 'friend' instead of SSL. *prijatelj*, *knigica* 'small book' instead of SSL. *knjigica*) and unstressed word-final -l in masculine participles (e.g. *prišu* 'he came', *reku* 'he said' instead of SSL. *prišel*, *rekel*).

Plural neuter nouns are feminized (e.g. *lete* 'years' instead of SSL. *leta*), and the dual is being lost. She typically uses the dialectal -i ending in the locative case of masculine nouns (e.g. *v Celji* instead of SSL. *v Celju*), short infinitives (e.g. *hočem govorit* 'I want to talk'), adverb + verb combinations and the indefinite article *en* with nouns. The last two can be attributed to the contact with German (e.g. *ven skočiti* 'jump out', Germ. *ausspringen*; *pride en pater* 'then comes a father', Germ. *ein Priester kommt*). Dialectal adverbs are also well preserved (e.g. *fčeri* 'yesterday' instead of SSL. *včera*, *prvo* 'firstly' instead of SSL. *najprej*, *tuki* 'here' instead of SSL. *tukaj*). *Gdaj* is used instead of the Standard Slovene temporal conjunction *ko* (e.g. *Gdaj* *smo bili v šoli* 'when we were at school'). In addition, the dialectal vocabulary is interspersed with Germanisms (e.g. *fabrika* 'a factory', Germ. *Fabrik*, *šparali* 'they saved', Germ. *sparen*, *štrudl* 'apple strudel', Germ. *Strudel*).

4.3. 3rd generation

4.3.1. The Notranjska (Inner Carniola) dialect.

The dialect spoken in the Notranjska (Inner Carniola) region is one of the nine dialects that belong to the broader Littoral (Primorska) dialect group. It is spoken in the westernmost part of the Slovene ethnic territory. The dialects in question show traces of contact with the neighboring Romanic languages, especially in syntax, vocabulary and prosody.

Our two informants, who live in Vancouver, are brother and sister and have a very limited knowledge of Slovene. They are both students in their twenties. As children they danced in a folklore group, but gave it up due to the lack of time. They speak English, and the little Slovene they have was learned from their grandmother, a speaker of the Notranjska dialect, and by attending Slovene language classes when they were younger. The most salient dialectal features are found in their pronunciation and include the following: the monophthong /u/ instead of the Proto-Slavic fixed long /o/ (e.g. *kaku* ‘how’, *lepu* ‘beautifully’), the dialectal long close /e/ instead of SSL. long open /e/ (e.g. *žéjna* ‘thirsty’ instead of SSL. *žéjna*), the word-final /g/ pronounced as sonorant velar [ɣ] (e.g. *boγ* ‘God’), modern vowel reduction, short infinitives, and the loss of the dual (e.g. *dve hčerke* ‘two daughters’). Occasionally, they resort to Romanic sentence structure (e.g. *Kličem se Marija* ‘I call myself Marija’ instead of SSL. *Ime mi je Marija* ‘My name is Marija’). Features of Standard Slovene are seen primarily in the qualitative contrasts of vowels, the replacement of dialectal diphthongs /ie, uo, ie, uo/ with Standard Slovene monophthongs,¹¹ the bilabial pronunciation of the sonorant /v/ and the preservation of the palatalized /l, n/ (e.g. *Ljubljana, njiva* ‘field’). In most cases, however, /l/ is pronounced as [lʲ] under the influence of English (e.g. *hvala lepa* ‘Thank you very much’).

Their vocabulary contains both dialectal and colloquial lexemes (e.g. *južna* ‘lunch’, *korajža* ‘courage’, *brihten* ‘clever’), but also Standard Slovene words (e.g. *čaj* ‘tea’, *dober dan* ‘good day’, *družina* ‘family’, *hvala* ‘thank you’, *lahko noč* ‘good night’, *prosim* ‘please’, *stara mama* ‘grandmother’) and, naturally, English.

4.4. The influence of English

Naturally, the language of all informants is influenced by English as the dominant language of the environment. The degree to which this is present in the speech of individual informants varies as does the form in which it occurs. The main criterion for this variation is the generational membership of the informants, which is why we do not present illustrative examples for each of the examined dialects but according to the type of discourse identified in the data. In cases where Slovene and English are used in direct contact, these are

¹¹ Exception is the dialectal pronunciation of [uɔ] instead of /o/ in the word *napuoti*, ‘in the way’.

primarily borrowing and code switching¹². Parts of the discourse spoken entirely in Slovene, however, may also show traces of English influence. While the former affect mostly vocabulary, the latter have more to do with syntactic and morphological deviations from the Slovene norm.

4.4.1. Borrowing

Borrowing is typical of the 1st generation immigrants, especially the older ones, who came to North America with no knowledge of English and were at the beginning only able to function in their mother tongue. In cases, however, where they encountered phenomena for which they did not have their own word or in cases of very frequently used words, they simply borrowed English lexemes and furnished them with Slovene affixes. Such combinations, phonologically and morphologically adapted to Slovene, did not stand out and in fact functioned as any other Slovene word.

Examples:

- (1) In tam sem se tudi potem *retajrala*, you know. (*retire* + *-ala* marking past participle, sg. fem.) ‘And there I also *retired*.’
- (2) An interesting twist in this fairly common process is the following example in which the constituent parts of the phrasal verb *pick* and *up* are used in reverse order to form a single verb *appik*. To je pa tisti, ki nas je *appikal*. (*pick up* > *up pick* + *-al* marking past participle, sg. masc.) ‘This is the one who *picked* us *up*.’
- (3) Another interesting case involves a false friend, *krem(a)*, which is used for Slovene *smetana*. Slovene uses the word *krema* in the more general sense of *cream*, but not for the dairy product used with coffee referred to in the following example. Tle maste pa *krem*. O, *krema* si pa le natočte. (*cream* > *krem*; *krem* + *-a* marking sg. masc. gen.) ‘Here is the cream. Go ahead, help yourself to the *cream*.’
- (4) Finally, it is not unusual to come across calques, word-by-word translations from English such as the one below. Jaz sem pred leti *vzel kurs* o kanadski zgodovini. (instead of Sem *obiskoval tečaj* o kanadski zgodovini. – I *attended a course* on Canadian history). ‘Years ago I *took a course* on Canadian history.’

¹² Bilingual discourse has been the topic of numerous studies and its specific forms have been defined in various ways, depending on the approach taken (e.g. social, pragmatic, functional, structural), hence resulting in frequently contradictory, inconsistent and/or overlapping definitions and terminology. In our case, we adopted Poplack’s (1981) concept of borrowing and code switching. For a comprehensive discussion of the issue, see Šabec’s chapter on Code-Switching in Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems (EOLSS) publication (2009: 312–327).

4.4.2. Code switching

Code switching is more typical of 2nd and younger generations. It involves the interchangeable use of Slovene and English either intrasententially or intersententially. There is no adaptation as with borrowing, i.e. the two languages remain discrete.

Examples:

- (1) (1) In na letališču. mednarodnem letališču, ne, je ta Reed? *What, what is his first name?* (intersentential code switching with one sentence in Slovene and the other in English) 'And it is at the airport, the international airport, isn't it, at Reed? What, what is his first name?'
- (2) Jas nisem *perfect, but I try my best.* (intrasentential code switching within a single sentence). 'I'm not perfect, but I try my best.'
- (3) *And zdej mam rada, da poznam žlahte tukej, da to we continue this.* (intrasentential code switching; also a calque *mam rada* – I like it instead of SSL. *mi je všeč*). 'And now I like it that I know my relatives here, so that we continue this.'

4.4.3. The influence of English on exclusively Slovene discourse

This refers primarily to syntax and morphology, where we notice the frequent generalization, oversimplification and/or omission of Slovene inflectional patterns, English-like word order, the redundant use of subjective personal pronouns, the wrong use of adverbs, prepositions and the like.

Examples:

- (1) Oni nimajo nič *otroci*. (SSL. Oni nimajo nič *otrok*. Noun in the nominative instead of genitive case). 'They have no children.'
- (2) *Ona je nas dala knjigo.* (SSL. *Dala nam je knjigo*. Noun in the genitive instead of the dative case; also, redundant use of the subjective personal pronoun – its use in Slovene, which is a pro-drop language, would be justified only if the pronoun was emphasized or expressing a contrast. This is not the case in this sentence; the use of *ona* is clearly used under the influence of English. Yet another trace of English influence is seen in the word order of *je nas*, which should be *nas/nam je* in Slovene). 'She gave us a book.'
- (3) *On je iz tukaj.* (SSL. *On je od tu(kaj)*. *Od* should be used instead of the wrong preposition *iz*). 'He is from here.'
- (4) *Ko smo prišli tam.* (SSL. *Ko smo prišli tja*. Wrong adverb denoting place instead of direction). 'When we got there.'

5. CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of the data shows how the degree and variety of Slovene preserved in the informants' speech depends primarily on their generation as well as on factors such as linguistic background, education and contact with other Slovene speakers. All four 1st generation (Slovene-born) informants are fluent in Slovene; the prevalent social variety of the language they speak is dialect. Of the three dialects examined, it is the Prekmurje dialect which has the best preserved features, a result of the cohesive and powerful identification role attributed to it by Slovenes from the area. It is also relevant that the mentioned informant lives in Cleveland, where she has far greater opportunities to interact with other speakers of her dialect than she would in a much smaller community of Vancouver. With speakers of the Rovte dialect, we notice an additional dimension – relatively strong elements of the central Slovene colloquial language and even some Standard Slovene features, which can be accounted for by their higher educational level and professed love of reading Slovene literature. Typical of the fourth speaker, on the other hand, is a degree of vacillation between Maribor colloquial language and the dialects surrounding the city as well as some archaisms of German origin.

The 2nd generation informant's Slovene is already weaker than that of the 1st generation. Her Slovene is the Styrian dialect learned from her parents, mixed with some Standard Slovene elements learned in a language course in her youth. Since she lives in a mixed-ethnic marriage, where the household language is English, she speaks English most of the time. During the interview, she frequently engages in code switching between the two languages (unlike the 1st generation informants who typically incorporate English lexemes into their discourse as loanwords); the influence of English is additionally manifested in phonological, morphological and syntactic deviations from the Slovene norm in sections of entirely Slovene discourse.

The proficiency in Slovene further declines with the two 3rd generation informants, for whom English is already the native language. Their narrative nevertheless contains some Slovene words and short phrases learned from their grandmother, a speaker of the Notranjska dialect, and from language classes taken in the Slovenian Society Hall of Vancouver. The Slovene they have is thus marked by vacillation between their grandmother's dialect and Standard Slovene as well as by the relative linguistic uncertainty of non-native speakers.

The described linguistic behavior of the informants in this study is largely reflective of the general linguistic situation of the two communities under investigation. It reveals the discrepancy between the actual situation, where Slovene is spoken only by older generations, and the more or less universally

proclaimed belief by all generations that the mother tongue/heritage language is an important ethnic identification factor. In reality, it is culture that actually fills this role, which Slovene Americans and Canadians perceive as enriching their lives and enhancing their positive self-image. The study thus provides a fascinating insight into the self-perception of Slovene immigrants and their descendants as well as into the complexity of the relationship between mother tongue maintenance and the feeling of ethnic identity. It also underlines the importance of the dialect as opposed to Standard Slovene, as it seems that for those who still speak Slovene, a dialect is a more authentic mode of expression.

LITERATURE

Berry John W. 1990: Psychology of Acculturation in Nebraska. – John J. Bremen (ed.) *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Vol. 37: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 201–235.

Ehala Martin 2009: An evaluation matrix for ethnolinguistic vitality. – Susanna Pertot, Tom Priestly, Colin Williams (eds.) *Rights, promotion and integration issues for minority languages in Europe*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 123–137.

Giles Howard, Richard Y. Bourhis, David M. Taylor 1977: Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. – Howard Giles (ed.) *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*. London: Academic Press, 307–348.

Koletnik Mihaela 2005: Mariborski pogovorni jezik. – *Časopis za zgodovino in narodopisje* 37, 245–254.

Logar Tine 1996: *Dialektološke in jezikovnozgodovinske razprave*, ed. Karmen Kenda Jež. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU.

Meško Katja 2004: *Ohranjanje prekmurskega narečja med slovenskimi izseljenci v Clevelandu*. Diplomsko delo. Maribor: Pedagoška fakulteta.

Plut Silva 2008: *50 let Slovenskega društva Vancouver/50 years of the Slovenian Society of Vancouver*. Vancouver: Slovenian Society of Vancouver.

Poplack Shana 1980: Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino en español: toward a typology of code-switching. – *Linguistics*, 581–616.

Rigler Jakob 1962: *Južnonotranjski govori*. Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti.

Šabec Nada 1995: *Half pa pu. The Language of Slovene Americans*. Ljubljana: ŠKUC, Studia Humanitatis.

Šabec Nada 1997: Slovene-English language contact in the USA. – *International Journal of the Sociology of language 124: Sociolinguistics of Slovene*, 129–183.

Šabec Nada 2006: Jezik, družba in kultura: slovenščina v stiku z angleščino. – *Slavistična revija 54/special issue*, 327–342.

Šabec Nada 2009: Code-Switching. – Vesna Muhvič, Lejla Sočanac (eds.) *Linguistics*, Oxford: EOLSS Publishers/UNESCO, 312–327.

Šabec Nada 2011: Slovene-English language contact: teaching and learning Slovene as a mother tongue in the U.S.A. and Canada. – Sonja Novak-Lukanovič, Vesna Mikolič (eds.) *Slovenski jezik v stiku: sodobne usmeritve večjezičnega in manjšinskega izobraževanja*. Ljubljana: Društvo za uporabno jezikoslovje, 190–203.

Šabec Nada 2016: Language, literature and ethnic identity: the case of the Vancouver Slovene community. – *Annales Series Historia et Sociologia*, 26/1, 75–84.

Šabec Nada, Koletnik Mihaela 2017: The role of dialect in mother tongue retention of Slovene Canadians: a case study. – *DiG 25*, 51–67.

Štumberger Saška 2009: Nekaj značilnosti govornega jezika Slovencev v Nemčiji. – Vera Smole (ed.), *Slovenska narečja med sistemom in rabo*. Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete.

Thernston Stephan 1980: *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Toporišič Jože 2000: *Slovenska slovnica*. Maribor: Založba Obzorja.

Slovėnų imigrantų ir jų palikuonių Šiaurės Amerikoje paveldėtosios kalbos ir tarmės išsaugojimas

SANTRAUKA

Straipsnyje analizuojami slovėnų ir anglų kalbų kontaktai Šiaurės Amerikoje, pabrėžiant gimtosios / paveldėtosios kalbos išsaugojimo ir tautinio tapatumo santykį. Pateikiama istorinė, socialinė ir kultūrinė slovėnų imigracijos į JAV ir Kanadą apžvalga, daugiausiai dėmesio kreipiant į Klivlandą, kaip didžiausią Amerikos slovėnų bendruomenę, bei Vankuverį, kaip vieną iš mažiausių bendruomenių Kanadoje. Išsami kalbinės situacijos abiejose bendruomenėse analizė atskleidė perėjimo nuo slovėnų prie anglų kalbos procesą. Daugeliu atvejų tai įvyksta per tris kartas: pirmosios kartos imigrantai vis dar kalba slovėniškai, jų vaikai daugiausia yra dvikalbiai, o trečiosios kartos nariai jau nebekalba slovėnų kalba ar kalba ja tik išimtiniais atvejais. Vis dėlto slovėnų kalba, kaip

gimtoji / paveldėtoji kalba, užima labai svarbią vietą tautinio identiteto požiūriu (aukštesnę vietą užima tik kultūra). Aukštas Amerikos ir Kanados slovėnų gimtosios / paveldėtosios kalbos vertinimas, nors kai kuriais atvejais tik simbolinis, įrodo jų sėkmingą integraciją į visuomenę neapleidžiant savo tautinio identiteto.

Lingvistinės analizės dalyje daugiausia dėmesio skiriama informantų vartojamoms slovėnų kalbos socialinėms atmainoms. Dėl šios priežasties buvo pasirinkti įvairių tarmių bei regioninės šnekamosios kalbos atstovai, siekiant atskleisti nestandartinių kalbos atmainų ir bendrinės slovėnų kalbos santykį. Į diktofoną įrašytų interviu metu surinkti duomenys rodo, kad pirmosios kartos imigrantai sklandžiai kalba slovėniškai ir daugiausiai kalba tarmiškai. Prekmurjės regiono tarmė yra geriausiai išlikusi, o tai yra ryškiausias regiono tapatumo požymis. Antra vertus, Rovtės tarme bei Mariboro miesto šnekamąja kalba kalbančiųjų diskursas nėra grynas – jame randama kai kurių centrinės slovėnų šnekamosios kalbos ir netgi bendrinės slovėnų kalbos požymių. Antrosios kartos informantė jau nebekalba tik slovėniškai, bet kalbėdama pereina nuo slovėnų prie anglų kalbos. Jos slovėnų kalba yra iš tėvų perimtos Štirijos tarmės ir kalbos kursuose išmoktos bendrinės slovėnų kalbos mišinys. Du trečiosios kartos informantai anglų kalbą jau laiko savo gimtąja kalba, o slovėnų kalba jiems yra paveldėtoji kalba. Taigi jie kalba angliškai, tačiau į savo naratyvą įterpia tam tikrų iš savo Notranskos tarme kalbėjusios senelės bei vaikystėje lankytuose kalbos kursuose išmoktų žodžių.

Trijų kartų atstovų palyginimas rodo spartų slovėnų kalbos įgūdžių nykimą ir anglų kalbos įtakos augimą. Slovėnijoje gimusių informantų atveju tai pasireiškia kaip skoliniai, o Amerikoje ar Kanadoje gimusių tyrimo dalyvių atveju – kaip kalbos kodų kaita. Paskutiniuoju grupėje taip pat pastebimi ryškūs nukrypimai nuo slovėnų kalbos normos fonologiniame, morfologiniame ir sintaksiniame lygmenyje. Remiantis gimtosios / paveldėtosios kalbos išsaugojimo laipsniu, galime teigti, kad tarmė yra pagrindinė kalbos atmaina tiems tyrimo dalyviams, kurie turi geriausius slovėnų kalbos įgūdžius. Kitaip tariant, tarmė yra socialinė kalbos atmaina, kuri yra autentiškiausia tyrimo dalyvių išraiškos forma ir stipresnis etninio ir kultūrinio identiteto faktorius nei bendrinė kalba.

Įteikta 2017 m. rugpjūčio 29 d.

NADA ŠABEC

*Department of English and American Studies
Faculty of Arts, University of Maribor
Koroška cesta 160, SI-2000 Maribor, Slovenia
nada.sabec@um.si*

MIHAELA KOLETNIK

*Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures
Faculty of Arts, University of Maribor
Koroška cesta 160, SI-2000 Maribor, Slovenia
mihaela.koletnik@um.si*