

# Language Variety Translation as a Factor in Maintaining Minority Identity

*Mihaela Koletnik, Alenka Valh Lopert,  
Melita Zemljak Jontes*

University of Maribor

## Povzetek

V prispevku je osvetljen pomen medzvrstnega prevajanja kot dejavnika ohranjanja narodnostne identitete pri pripadnikih slovenske manjšine v Porabju na Madžarskem. Slovenščina je v Porabju manjšinski jezik, na katerega opuščanje močno vplivajo družbenopolitični in demografski vzroki, jezikovna zmožnost in jezikovna raba ter odnos posameznika in skupnosti do jezika. Naše razmišljanje je posvečeno vlogi literarnega ustvarjanja v Porabju, ko narečje prevzame vlogo, sicer namenjeno knjižnemu jeziku, z namenom preseči temeljno oviro – težave pri razumevanju in sprejemanju slovenskega knjižnega jezika, kar posledično ovira pristno povezovanje Slovencev v Porabju z narodno matico.

V prispevku se osredotočamo na enojezični prevod, tj. prevod znotraj zvrsti istega jezika. Obravnavamo (1) prevod zapisanega knjižnega besedila v pisani narečni jezik v zbirki kratke proze *Srebrni breg/Srebrni brejg* avtorjev Ferija Lainščka, Milivoja Mikija Roša in Milana Vincetiča ter (2) prevod zapisanega narečnega besedila v pisani knjižni jezik v *Andovskih zgodbah/Andovskih prpo-vejstih* Karla Holeca. Posebnost obeh zbirk je njuna dvojezičnost; črtice v *Srebrnem bregu* so napisane v knjižni slovenščini z vzporednimi prevodi avtorjev samih v prekmursko narečje, kot se govori v Porabju, črtice v *Andovskih zgodbah* pa so napisane v narečju z vzporednimi prevodi v slovenski knjižni jezik; ti so delo pisatelja Milana Vincetiča.

Ugotavljamo, da se avtorji, ki dobro poznajo jezikovni sistem lastnega narečja in ki narečje tudi uporabljajo (tako v govorici kot zapis), pri medzvrstnem prevajanju ne držijo togo izvirnika; v drugo jezikovno zvrst ne prevajajo besede za besedo, ampak ob glasoslovnih in oblikoslovnih razlikah med knjižnim jezikom in narečjem upoštevajo tudi dejstvo, da imajo narečja od knjižnega različne sisteme na vseh jezikovnih ravninah, tudi na ravnini povedne in besedilne skladnje. Primerjava knjižnega in narečnega besedila kaže na izvirne narečne izrazne možnosti, zato je narečna podstava veliko bolj ekspresivna kot knjižnostandardna. Ob prenosu narečnega besedila v pisani knjižni jezik se navadno izgubi del njegove prvotne sporočilnosti, kar ima za posledico opuščanje narečnega in približevanje knjižnemu jeziku.

**Ključne besede:** slovenski jezik, socialne zvrsti slovenskega jezika, prevajanje jezikovnih zvrsti, slovenska manjšina v Porabju, manjšinska identiteta

## 0 INTRODUCTION

The paper focuses on the importance of intralingual translating as a factor in maintaining the national identity of the Slovene minority members in the Porabje region in Hungary.<sup>1</sup> The Slovene language in the Porabje region is the minority language; it has been strongly influenced by socio-political and demographic factors, by language competence and use, as well as by the attitudes of individuals and communities towards it. In the past, the Slovene Porabje region was linguistically, culturally and economically isolated from the mother country and external Hungarian influences; for these reasons, the ethnic identity of the minority has been preserved in terms of regional and local belonging rather than in relation to the common Slovene identity. The economic, cultural and linguistic isolation from the mother country and the aggressive, more or less covert, assimilation policy of the majority is reflected in the minority group's poor communication ability in terms of the first (minority) language. This is because the minority language was superseded by the majority language in all spheres of public life (in the past, Hungarian language policy did not give Slovene a place in public life), and lately has also been superseded out of families (Bernjak 2006: 141; 2012: 104).

However, according to linguistic indicators of ethnicity, the majority of Porabje Slovenes are beginning to turn away from the majority language, while a decline can be seen in the insufficient proficiency levels of Standard Slovene, which has not evolved in Porabje. The reason for this can be found in the Hungarian government's neglect of the Slovene language, and in the poor knowledge of the dialect, which a large part of the younger generation no longer masters (Bernjak 2004: 32). Today, the revitalisation of the minority's culture and language is particularly associated with the strengthening of the perception of identity of ethnic belonging in this group (in terms of origin, culture, social norms and values, mainly language), which strongly correlates with the understanding of its position and that of the minority group, and simultaneously correlates with the perception of the majority group with whom the minority has direct contact.

This revitalisation is also associated with the preservation of the Slovene minority language in the autochthonous region in the Porabje region (*ibid.*: 31). Dialectal literary activity, which has a long tradition of two hundred years, plays an important role in this. On the one hand, it raises the cultural level of the minority

1 The Slovene Porabje (Slovensko Porabje) is located in the west of Hungary, south of the town Monošter in Železna županija (a South Slavic administrative subdivision). The Porabje region has been a bilingual region for more than a thousand years; it covers 94 km<sup>2</sup>, and is geographically and linguistically part of the Prekmurje Goričko region. Approximately 3000 Slovenes live in the Slovene villages of Gornji Senik/Felsőszölnök, Dolnji Senik/Alsószölnök, Slovenska ves/Rábatótfalu, Sakalovci/Szakonyfalu, Števanovci-Ortkovci/Ápátisvárfalva, Verica-Ritkarovci/Kétyölgy and Andovci/Orfalu, and almost 600 more live in the town of Monošter, the economic and cultural centre of the Slovene Porabje region.

community and preserves the primeval (dialectal) Slovene language. Namely, the dialect, with all its linguistic rules, assumes the role otherwise intended for literary creation in the Porabje region, in which the dialect has assumed the role of Standard language in order to overcome basic problems, i.e. difficulties in understanding and accepting the Slovene Standard language, which, in turn, hinders any genuine integration of the Slovenes in Porabje with their national counterparts. On the other hand, it also awakens a sense of belonging to the Slovene language community, since certain dialectal literary texts have been translated into Standard Slovene.

This paper thus focuses on intralingual translation i.e., the translation between varieties of the same language in the bilingual short prose collections of *Srebrni breg/Srebrni brejg*, written by Feri Lainšček, Milivoj Miki Roš and Milan Vincetič, and in *Andovske zgodbe/Andovske prpovejsti* by Karel Holec. The short prose collection *Srebrni breg/Srebrni brejg* was written in Standard Slovene with the authors' immediate translations into the Prekmurje dialect as spoken in Porabje, and the short prose collection *Andovske zgodbe/Andovske prpovejsti* was written in a dialect with parallel translations into Standard Slovene by Milan Vincetič.

## 1 *SREBRNI BREG/SREBRNI BREJG AND ANDOVŠKE ZGODBE/ANDOVŠKE PRPOVEJSTI – LANGUAGE VARIETY TRANSLATION*

In addition to various other texts, the literary texts for the national community in the Porabje region have a wider ethnic-cultural-linguistic meaning, since the difficulties in understanding and accepting the Standard Slovene language represent the most important obstacle to achieving a genuine connection with the national base.

The collection of short stories *Srebrni breg/Srebrni brejg* (1995) represents the turning point in the Porabje literary programme “Words for Porabje”,<sup>2</sup> which refers to the planned literary production of authors from their native country, and the Prekmurje region in particular, getting as close to the dialect of the addressee as possible (Just 2003: 169). In practice, the idea was realised by printing literary texts in the dialect of the Porabje region and in Standard Slovene at the same time. This paper focuses on intralingual translation of the written Standard language into the written dialect in the short prose collection *Srebrni breg/Srebrni brejg* (1995), and the translation of the written dialect into the written Standard

2 The beginnings of the literary programme can be traced back to the 1980s.

language in *Andovske zgodbe/Andovske prpovejsti* (2003), issued as the sixth book in the collection *Med Rabo in Muro/Between Raba and Mura*.<sup>3</sup>

According to Smole (2003: 152) and Matičetov (1973: 23), transferring language from a dialect to the Standard language and vice versa counts as translation, since transcoding from one language system to another occurs and the translator is obliged to master both systems. This is entirely comparable to translation from one language to another, that is, from one system to another (Smole 2003: 152).<sup>4</sup>

## 1.1 The translation of the written Standard language into the written dialect

The short story collection *Srebrni breg/Srebrni brejg* consists of 11 short stories;<sup>5</sup> what makes the short stories unique is their bilingualism, as every story appears in both Standard Slovene and Prekmurje dialect as spoken in the Porabje region. The paper presents the findings of a linguistic comparison of the parallel writing of Standard Slovene and the Slovene dialectal texts.

The written translation into dialect features no diacritics, thus a prosodically correct reading can only be provided by an autochthonous/native speaker of the Prekmurje dialect. Rare exceptions are the acute of the long *e* and *a* in a mixed accent noun type: *roké* ‘hands’, *brgá* ‘the hill (Gen. Sg.)’; pronoun: *sebé* ‘myself’, *za tebé* ‘for you’; or verb: *vlečé* ‘to drag’, *obrné* ‘to turn’ is used. The acute is also written to mark the adverb *pá* ‘again’ and *prlé* ‘before’. The quality and quantity of the vowels are not indicated.

The texts are written with the simplified vocal system of the Prekmurje Goričko subdialect, with a straightforward character system that can be easily written by the author and also easily read by the reader. The following forms are used: both dialectal diphthongs: *ej* and *oulau*: *brejg* ‘hill’, *povejn* ‘I tell’; *Boug* ‘God’, *stenau* ‘to the wall’ (instr. sing. femin.), dialectal *ü*: *drügi* ‘the second’, *vüplen* ‘I dare’, *u*, derived from the vocal *l*: *dugo* ‘long’, *sunce* ‘sun’, *ö*, derived from *e* before *n* or *r*: *vö* ‘outside’, *vörvo* ‘to have believed’, and *e*, derived from the pre-Slavic semi-vowel: *meša* ‘mass’, *meknoli* ‘to put away’. The labialised *a* is usually not specifically marked – in individual words it is written as *o*, which indicates a strong roundness

3 On the initiative of Ernest Ružič, the book collection *Med Rabo and Muro* was introduced to the publishing programme of Franc-Franc publishing house from Murska Sobota in cooperation with the Union of Slovenes in Hungary. In the book collection, published from 1998 until today, 20 prose works, printed in both dialectal and standard language, were published.

4 The dialectal language system is even more complete than the standard language system, because it is being sustained and developed by naturally developing inner language laws in contrast to the highly negotiated language laws of the standard language, which necessitates the existence of normative manuals (Smole 2003: 152).

5 F. Lainšček is the author of four short stories, M. Roš the author of two and M. Vincetič the author of five.

in the speech: *zakoj* 'why'. Eg.: *-ir-* → *-er-*: *nemer* 'restlessness', *v paperaj* 'in the papers'. The text also features a rare dialect vowel reduction: *kak* 'how', *tak* 'this way', *velko* 'a lot'.

As far as pronunciation is concerned, the sonorant *j* is written as *g ali dj*: *getra* 'liver', *mordje* 'sea', *h* is completely reduced: *lače* 'trousers', *odo* 'to have walked' or written as *j* in word endings and the intervocal position: *sploj* 'at all', *streja* 'roof'. The final *-l* transforms into *o* or *u*: *gledo* 'watched', *smejau* 'laughed', *lj* hardens and is written as *l*: *plünola* 'she spat', *lidi* 'people', *nj* is maintained: *z njin* 'with him', *ogenj* 'fire'. The consonant *m* in word endings is consistently written as *-n*, as it is spoken: *spomnin*, *tan*. The final *-v* or *v* ahead of voiceless consonants is written as in the Standard language and not as *-f* as it is spoken: *od mlajšov* 'from the younger', *vsigdar* 'always'. *V* in the word beginning appears to be a prosthesis: *vüja* 'ear', *vüpo* 'dared'. The following dialectal changes in consonant groups are written as: *dn* → *gn*: *gnes* 'today'; *kt* → *št*: *šteri* 'which'; *bn* → *vn*: *drouvna* 'small/thin'; *šč* → *šk*: *prgiške* 'handful'.

All the morphological patterns for declination, verb-form patterns and gradation are written in a contemporary dialectal manner with the exception of the ending *-ouf* (← *-ov*) for feminine, singular, instrumental sporadically being written as *-ou*. All three genders are preserved, while the dual is regularly used. Diphthongs in the texts note where the words are stressed when the mixed stress pattern is being reviewed (*za rokou* 'holding hands', *v glavou* 'inside one's head'). The declension of adjectives is mostly of the following type: *nouvoga* 'new'. The text features in the verbal dual conjunction preserved the morpheme for person *-va*, the reduced form of the verb *biti* 'to be' when used in the future tense (*mo* ← *bom* 'I will', *de* ← *bode* 'would', *va* ← *bova* 'we will'; *ta* '(the two of) you will', *te* 'you will (Pl.)', *do* 'they will') and the old infinitive suffix, derived from *-nq-* for contemporary Standard *-ni-*: *obrnoli* 'turned'.

The text is rich in dialectal adverbs, particles and conjunctions, replacing the Standard Slovene ones, eg.: *danes* → *gnesden* 'today', *enkrat* → *egnotuk* 'once', (*za*) *gotovo* → *gvüšno* 'for sure', *kasneje* → *sledi* 'later', *nekje* → *nindri* 'somewhere', *od kod* → *od kec* 'from where', *po strani* → *venkraj* 'sideways', *sem* → *es* 'here', *takoj* → *včasi* 'right now', *zelo* → *trnok* 'very', *zmeraj* → *vsakšo pout* 'always'; *kajne* → *geli* 'isn't that so', *ravno* → *ranč* 'at this very time', *res* → *rejsan* 'true', *saj* → *vej* 'right', *seveda* → *ka pa te* 'of course', *še* → *ešče/eške šče*, 'still', *vendar* → *gelibar* 'but'; *čeprav* → *če gljij* 'even though', *da/kar/ker* → *ka* 'for', *dokler* → *dokeč* 'so long', *ko* → *kda/gda* 'when'.

A comparison of the Standard and dialectal texts shows the originality of the dialectal expressions; the dialectal form is far more expressive than the Standard Slovene. When forming the Prekmurje dialect, the structure of a simple sentence

is usually the same as in the Standard language – the starting point, the passage, and the core follow one after the other. Some word-sequence specific features are notable but without semantic changes:<sup>6</sup> (1) the starting point, the passage, and the core changes: /.../ sem takrat vprašal očeta /.../ → / san te očo pito /.../ (I asked my father then) – /.../ so bili skoraj vsak dan pri vodi /.../ → /.../ so bili pri vodej skur vsikši den /.../ (they were at the water almost every day) – (2) the anaphoric particle *pa* is written after the semantically empty verb *biti* ‘to be’ in the present tense and after the free verbal morpheme *se*: Morda *pa ste* imeli kdaj doma svinje /.../ → Mogouče *ste pa* meli doma svinjé /.../ (You may have really had pigs at home /.../) – Saj *pa se* vendar razume, da nič. → *Vej se pa* tak pa tak razmi, ka nika. (But it is understood, however, that it is nothing.)

In addition to inversion, which gives the message more emphasis and also colours it emotionally, the translation into dialect features:

- (1) The dialectal use of a personal pronoun at points where, in Standard Slovene (because of stylistic marking), nothing is pronounced: /.../ natanko takrat, ko sem se rodil /.../ → /.../ gljij te, kda san se *ge* naroudo /.../ (exactly when I was born) – Kljub vsemu sem jo požiral z očmi. – *Ges* san jo pa vseeno požiro z očami. (Nevertheless, I devoured her with my eyes.)
- (2) Adding (a) particles and/or adverbs where it is superfluous in contextual terms in Standard Slovene: To najverjetneje zato /.../ → Tou *pa* gvüšno zatok /.../ (That’s probably because /.../) – /.../ tukaj v omari /.../ → /.../ tü *notri* v omarini /.../ (/.../ here in the closet /.../) – /.../ je rada zahajala k mlinu. → /.../ ja *tak* rada ojdlá *ta* k mlini (/.../ she liked to go to the mill) – (b) the adjectival modifier to the left of the headword: /.../ imam že dolga leta spravljená okna. → /.../ man že duga lejta tadjana *ena* oukna. (/.../ I’ve had those windows for years.) – Vasi se je namreč hudo mudilo na breg. → *Cejloj* vesi se je midilo *ta* na brejg. (The whole village was in a hurry to the hill.) – (c) directional adverbs to the verb: *podrli* → *doj* *podrli* (to pull down), *zamenjali* → *vözamenili* (to exchange), *iztrgala* → *vkraj* *cuknola* (to tear).
- (3) Replacement (a) of a noun non-prepositional modifier in the genitive with the prepositional one: zvonik *kapele* → türen *od kapejle* (belfry of the chapel) – (b) adjectival modifier with noun (prepositional) modifier: *mlinsko* kolou → kolou *na mlin* (grinding wheel), *kartonast* zavojček → paklec *iz kartona* (cardboard pack).
- (4) The replacement (a) of a non-personal verb form with the personal verb form: Samo počakati je še treba. → *Počakajte malo*, pa te vidli. (We just

<sup>6</sup> Sentence and word order rules are set out in Jože Toporišič’s *Slovenska slovnica* (2000: 667–687).

need to wait.) – (b) non-stressed (clitical) and referential form of personal pronouns with their accentuated forms: vido *jih* je → vido *njij* je (he saw them). – Pusti jo, ona ni *zate!* → Pusti jo, ona je nej *za tebé* (Leave her, she's not for you.) – (c) word-formatted lexemes with non-word-formatted forms: *desnica* → *prava roka* (right hand), *kolovoz* → *blatna cesta* (cart track), *oblaček* → *oblak* (cloud), *prstanček* → *prstan* (ring); *našibati* → *nucati šibo* (to whip), *oživeti* → *dobiti dušo* (to revive). – (č) reported speech with direct speech: Če pa se je kateri le ojunail vprašati Franceka, mu je le-ta na kratko odvrnil, da bodo že videli. → Če pa je šteri vüpo pitati Franceka, je pravo samo: »*Vej te pa vidli.*« (If, however, anyone complained about Francek, he briefly replied that they would see what happens.) – (d) one clause sentences with multiple-clause sentences: Vsi so le bolščali v zares nenavadno oblečenega Franceka. → *Vsi so gledali prouti Franceki, šteri je biu rejsan čüudno oblečeni.* (Everyone was staring at the very unusually dressed Francek.)

- (5) The abandonment of conjunctions, adverbs, particles, interjections, which in the context of dialect function as superfluous, unnecessary: *In kaj bodo z njim?* → *Ka do z njin?* (And what will happen to him?) – *Otepal se je in brcal, pa je vseeno ni zadel.* → *Mlato se je in brso, pa je nej zadeno.* (He was trembling and kicking, but he did not hit it anyway.) – */.../ zakaj sem jih privlekel v stanovanje, in pa seveda, kaj sploh bom z njimi.* → */.../ zakoj san je es prvlejško pa ka mo z njimi? (/.../ why did I drag them to the apartment, and of course, what will I even do with them?)* – *Ojej, ena sama velikanska žalost!* → *Edna sam velka žalost.* (O, one great grief itself.)
- (6) Pannonian denial – a form of denying the verb *biti* 'to be' in the present tense becomes *sem ne*: *Tudi ni nihče nikoli sedel, kjer mu je bila pač volja.* → *Tüdi si je nej nišče nikdar dojsesu, gé me je bila vola.* (No one was ever sitting where he wanted.) – *Ni me razumela.* → *Nej me je razmila.* (She didn't understand me.)
- (7) Expressing the future with the present tense: *Vsi bomo šli.* → *Idemo vsi.* (We'll all go.)
- (8) Modification (widening or narrowing) of the Standard syntactic pattern: *Njene škorenjške sem skrbno očistil /.../.* → *Njene črejšve pa sandale /.../ san vsakič spuco, ka so se svejštili kak sunce.* (I cleaned her shoes very carefully.) – *Hčerka si je bila zašelela, da bi ob bošiču okrasila drejšček nekako drugače, kot smo pač to pošeli vsa tista leta doslej.* → *Čij je ščela za bošič napraviti malo ovakši krispan, kak smo ga meli minouča lejta.* (My daughter wanted to decorate the Christmas tree in a different way than we had done for all those years.)



On the lexical level, the translation also attempts to remain close to the dialect. Thus, dialectal Pannonian-Slovene words prevail, e.g. *broditi* 'premišljovati, tuhtati; to think', *čeden* 'moder, pameten; wise', *črejlvi* 'škornji; boots', *gučati* 'govoriti; to speak', *posvejt* 'luč; a light', *reč* 'beseda; a word', *šteti* 'brati; to read', *videti* 'zdeti; to seem', *žitek* 'življenje; life', *zlodej* 'vrag; the devil'; some Germanisms are also noted, e.g. *cug* 'vlak; a train', *drou* 'žica; a wire', *kufer* 'kovček; a suitcase', *najgeri* 'zvedav; curious', *penez* 'denar; money', *šift* 'ladja; a ship', *taška* 'torbica; a purse', *tören* 'zvonik; a belfry'; along with some Hungarianisms, e.g. *alomaš* 'postaja; a station', *kep* 'podoba, slika; an image, picture', *saga* 'vonj; a smell', *varas* 'mesto; a town, city'; while Romanisms are rare, e.g. *blanja* 'deska; a board'.

The phrases are either transferred from the Standard language to the dialect or translated with the dialectal equivalent: */.../ pa mi že stara navijala uro. → /.../ pa mi je stara že navijala võro.* (She gave me a clip round the ear.) – *Vrag naj me vzame. → Vrag naj me buje.* (I'll be damned.) Often, they are replaced by verbal phrases, resulting in an even greater expressivity of the translated dialectal in the texts: */.../ si popravila krilce in brezglavo stekla. → /.../ si popravila kiklo in zbejžala kak zavica.* (*/.../ she fixed her skirt and fled like a scared rabbit /.../*) – */.../ sem sprva le zardel /.../ → /.../ san grato rdeči kak küjani rak /.../.* (*/.../ I went red as a beetroot /.../*) – *Vrnila se je bleđa /.../ → Nazaj je prišla blejda kak stejna /.../* (*She came back as white as a sheet /.../*)

## 1.2 The translation of the written dialect into the written Standard language

The translation of the spoken variety (in our case the written one) into Standard written Slovene is a challenge for Slovene ethnic regions, due to the unusually large number of Slovenian dialects and speeches. When translating the primary spoken dialect into the written Standard language, a large part of its original expression and meaning is usually lost, since the dialect does not only differ on phonological, morphological and lexical levels, but also in the syntax of clause and text (Škofic 2006: 174).

The result is most often the abandonment of the dialect and approximation of the Standard Slovene, which is also noticeable in *Andovskih zgodbah/Andovskih prpovejstih* by Karl Holec.

Holec has produced ten tales of the suffering and resilience of Slovene farming life; set on the outer fringes of the Hungarian landscape, they are characterised by lively dialogue couched in humour, all in the Porabje dialect, with parallel translations into the Standard Slovene language by writer Milan Vincetič.

The linguistic comparison of the dialectal and Standard versions of the texts shows the differences between the written dialectal and written Standard texts on all linguistic levels.

All the dialectal phonemes are written in a Standard manner (with the Standard language letters according to Standard orthography).

The morphology of the Standard Slovene is not equivalent to the dialectal form; all verb-form and morphological patterns are also translated into Standard Slovene, which means that the morphological picture of the book version is inauthentic.

The syntactical clause structure is altered (taking the sentence element and sentence structure into consideration), thus the dialectal syntax is lost. In the translation of the written dialect into the written Standard language, the following elements are omitted:

- (a) Different repetitions of words or word phrases: »*Nej trn, nej trn, baba, vretino sam najšo /.../*« > »*Kakšen trn neki, izvir sem našel /.../*« (Not a thorn, I found a spring.) – »*Jaj, Baug moj, Baug moj, pomagaj nam grejšnikom!*« > »*Jaj, moj Bog, pomagaj nam grešnikom! /.../*« (Oh, my Lord, help us sinners!).
- (b) Personal pronouns that are unnecessary in Standard Slovene: »*Dobro, vej go dja vöpotegnem.*« > »*Prav, pa mu jo potegnem ven.*« (All right, I will pull it out for him.) – »*Kak tau vi vejte?*« > »*Kako to veste?*« (How do you know that?).
- (c) Some adverbs, particles and modifiers: »*Ka pa, tebi se je vcejlak zmejšalo! /.../*« > »*Se ti je zmešalo ali kaj?*« (Have you gone crazy or what?) – »*Brž, bodni go notra v zemlau!*« > »*Brž, zapiči jo v zemljo!*« (Quick, drive it into the ground!) – »*Popoldneva smo go že vösprobali tö.* > »*Popoldne pa smo jo že preizkušali.*« (We already tested it out in the afternoon.) – »*/.../ v rokej z urbovo šibov /.../ > /.../ s šibo v rokah /.../*« (with a switch in his hands).
- (d) Appositions and verbal addresses: »*Nauri si ti, stari, kak bi ti stüdenec kopo /.../*« > »*Se ti je zmešalo, ti bi kopal studenec /.../*« (Have you lost your mind, you want to dig a well /.../) – »*Vejš ka, baba, ti si butasta. /.../*« > »*Raje daj jezik za zobe, baba zmešana. /.../*« (Hold your tongue, you stupid woman!).

The linguistic phenomena 'onikanje', i.e., the honorific form of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural form for one person, still preserved in dialect, is consistently omitted in Standard Slovene: »*Tupin Imrec so sploj koražni človek bili ešče na stara lejta tö.* > »*Tupinov Imrec je bil pravi dedec tudi na stara leta.*« (Even in his old age he was a real man.)

In Standard translation, non-derived lexemes are replaced by derived ones: liter > *literček* 'litre', oblak > *oblaček* 'cloud', nominal and verb phrases are replaced by derived (one-word) lexemes: spodnje lače > *spodnjice* 'underpants', napraviti ograjo > *ograditi* 'to put up a fence', narečni prislovi in vezniki s knjižnimi: zranja > *zjutraj* 'in the morning', gnauk > *nekoč* 'sometime', *rano* > *zgodaj* 'early', *es* > *sem* 'I am', *vrkar* > *zgoraj* 'up/above'; *liki* > *temveč* 'but' and nominal modifiers with adjectival forms: sveti andjaldje *v nebesi* > angeli *nebeški* 'heavenly angels'. Particles and interjections are often added: Tak je bilau. > Tako je *tudi* bilo. (And so it was.) – »Baba, baba, poj pa garico notrapüsti, ka ne morem tavö! Baba, glöjpa si?« > »*Hej*, baba, stopi po lestev, ker ne morem ven! *Hej*, si gluha ali kaj?« (Hey, old crone, go and bring a ladder, for I cannot get out! Hey, are you deaf?) and unexpressed predicators in speech: Gda nazaj prišo /.../. > Ko se je *vrnil* /.../. (When he came back /.../.) – Spodkar vrkar vse od njega odišlo. > Tako spodaj kot zgoraj mu je *uhajalo*. (It was coming out of both ends.)

In the Standard translation of the text, specific features of the dialectal word order do not appear, as the word order has been changed and as such is stylistically unmarked – it corresponds to Slovene Standard language criteria: »V štrti ali pet klas sam odo.« > *Obiskoval sem četrti ali peti razred*. (I attended the fourth or fifth grade.) – »Potisni nazaj notra v zemlau šibo!« > »*Šibo porini nazaj v zemljo!*« (Push the switch back into the ground.), some syntactic structures are changed (contracted/reduced or extended): Gda so v tjünjni na stauli vidli, ka je večerdja tam ostala, ništje nej djo, te so se že zbojali. > Ko pa je v kuhinji videla nedotaknjeno večerjo, jo je spreletel srh. (But when she saw the untouched dinner in the kitchen, she shuddered.) – »/.../ Eden stüdenec si skopam tü doma na dvaura.« > »/.../ Najbolje bo, da si vodnjak izkopljem kar na dvorišču.« (It's best if I dig a fountain right here in the yard.)

The vocabulary has also been changed to the extent that it is no longer indicative of the dialect: non-Slovene dialectal words are most often of Germanic or Hungarian origin and rarely of Romanic. In Standard Slovene, they are mostly replaced by Standard terms: *glaž* > *steklenica* 'bottle', *koštati* > *poskusiti* 'to taste', *kromči* > *krompir* 'potatoes', *pisker* > *lonec* 'pot', *špilati* > *igrati* 'to play', *štil* > *toporišče* 'axe handle', *štjir* > *orodje* 'tool', *žmah* > *okus* 'taste'; *lugaš* > *brajda* 'vine trellis', *palinka* > *žganje* 'schnapps', *tanač* > *nasvet* 'advice'; *soldak* > *vojak* 'soldier'. The same applies to the written dialectal Pannonian lexicon and general Slavic terms, marked as expressive from the point of view of the Slovene Standard: *bot* > *palica* 'stick', *čarvou* > *trebuh* 'belly', *dvaur* > *dvorišče* 'courtyard', *dveri* > *vrata* 'door', *iža* > *soba* 'room', *mlajši* > *otroci* 'children', *pod* > *podstrešje* 'attic', *tikvi* > *buče* 'pumpkin', *vretina* > *izvir* 'source', *žuti* > *rumen* 'yellow'; pejorative *baba* > *ženska* 'woman', *vrajže andovske babe* > *vražje andovske ženske* 'devilish women'.

Dialectal phrases are translated with Standard Slovene equivalents: *Feri je tak leto, ka se je vse prašilo za njim* > *Feri je tekel, kar so ga noge nesle* (Feri ran as fast as his legs could carry him.); Standard phrases frequently replace dialectal verbal word phrases: *Telko tanačov je daubo, ka je ranč nej vedo, koga naj posluša.* > *Toliko nasvetov so mu natrosili, da ni vedel, kje se ga drži glava.* (He was given so much advice that he did not know where his head was at.) – »*Vi ste vsi nauri.*« > »*Vsi ste ob pamet.*« (You have all lost your minds.) Also dialectal curses are translated: *njegovoga vraga* > *hudiča preklemanega* (damn him, *prekleta vretina* > *preklemani izvir* (damn spring), *njegovoga kalavinskoga* > *hudiča zagananega* (damn him).

We can conclude that the Prekmurje and Porabje authors, who are well acquainted with the language systems of their own dialect and are fluent in its (oral and written) use, do not completely adhere to the original when translating. They do not translate into another language variety according to the “word for word” principle, but consider phonetical and morphological differences between the Standard language and dialect, also taking into account the fact that dialects differ from the Standard language systematically on all language levels (as well as on sentence and textual levels). A comparison of the Standard language and dialectal texts attests to the originality of the dialectal translations; thus the dialectal version of the texts is much more expressive than those of the Standard language. When transferring a dialectal text into a Standard one (Škofic 2006: 181) at least some of the original expressiveness is lost, leading to a loss of dialectal features and a move towards the Standard language.

## 2 CONCLUSION

The Slovenian minority in Hungary is a community that has been shaped in a border area under specific socio-historical circumstances. Bernjak (2004: 145) notes that the Porabje Slovenes, despite their separation from the linguistic development of their mother country, preserved natural language transfer in the past. Today, however, the preservation and development of language and identity awareness have been left to the minority education system, despite the fact that the school serving the Slovene community in Porabje is unable to fulfil its responsibilities in this regard. Therefore, it is important to be aware that the media in the minority language contributes greatly to the preservation and raising of the minority culture’s language level, and to the strengthening of national (self-) awareness. This is one of the key factors in its preservation and continuous national development. Literature in the Porabje region, written in Standard Slovene and then translated into the dialect or vice versa, on the one hand revives the

dialect and on the other hand develops the Standard language. With its acknowledgment it builds a bridge from the dialect to the Standard language, and thus a bridge between the two countries.

## References

- Bernjak, Elizabeta, 2004: *Slovenščina in madžarščina v stiku*. Maribor: SD Maribor. (Zora, 29.)
- –, 2006: Perspektive preživetja in razvijanja manjšinske materinščine pri slovenski manjšini na Madžarskem. Koletnik, Mihaela, Smole, Vera (eds.): *Diahronija in sinhronija v dialektoloških raziskavah*. Maribor: SD Maribor. 140–148.
- –, 2012: Etnolingvistična revitalizacija slovenske manjšine na Madžarskem. *Anali PAZU* 2/2. 103–107.
- Just, Franci, et al., 2001: *Slovensko Porabje*. Murska Sobota: Franc-Franc.
- –, 2003: *Besede iz Porabja, Besede za Porabje*. Murska Sobota: Podjetje za promocijo kulture Franc-Franc.
- Koletnik, Mihaela, 2008: *Panonsko lončarsko in kmetijsko izrazje ter druge dialektološke razprave*. Maribor: Mednarodna založba Oddelka za slovanske jezike in književnosti, Filozofska fakulteta, Univerza v Mariboru. (Mednarodna knjižna zbirka Zora, 60.)
- –, 2015: Prekmursko narečje kot identitetni dejavnik v popularni kulturi. *Časopis za zgodovino in narodopisje* 86 = 51/4. 25–45.
- Koletnik, Mihaela, Valh Lopert, Alenka, 2014: Neknjžne zvrsti slovenskega jezika in popularna kultura. Jesenšek, Marko (ed.): *Slovenski jezik na stičišču več kultur*. V Mariboru: Mednarodna založba Oddelka za slovanske jezike in književnosti. 198–211. (Mednarodna knjižna zbirka Zora, 102).
- Koletnik, Mihaela, Valh Lopert, Alenka, 2017: Dialectal imagery in Murske balade in romance (Ballads and romances of the Pomurje region). Kennedy, Victor, Gadpaille, Michelle (eds.): *Ethnic and cultural identity in music and song lyrics*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars. 126–140.
- Kozar Mukič, Marija, 1983: *Slovensko Porabje – Szloven Videk*. Ljubljana, Szombathely: ZI Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani in Muzej Savaria v Szombatheju.
- Matičeto, Milko, 1973: *Zverinice iz Rezije*. Ljubljana-Trst: Mladinska knjiga.
- Smole, Vera, 2003: Folklorist med prevajanjem in zapisovanjem. *Traditiones* 23. 143–154.
- Škofic, Jožica, 2006: Prevajanje govorenega narečnega besedila v pisani knjižni jezik. Koletnik, Mihaela, Smole, Vera (eds.): *Diahronija in sinhronija v dialektoloških raziskavah*. Maribor: SD Maribor. 174–182.

- Valh Lopert, Alenka, Zorko, Zinka, 2013: Skladnja v panonski narečni skupini. *Dialektološki razgledi (Jezikoslovni zapiski 19/2)*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC. 221–235.
- Valh Lopert, Alenka, 2015: Narečje kot izraz identitete na radijskih postajah v severovzhodni Sloveniji (Radio Ptuj, Radio Murski val, Radio Slovenske gorice). *Časopis za zgodovino in narodopisje* 86=51/4. 46–59.
- Valh Lopert, Alenka, Koletnik, Mihaela, 2017: Transfer of written Standard Slovene into dialectal speech realization on the stage. Jesenšek, Marko (ed.): *Med didaktiko slovenskega jezika in poezijo: ob 80-letnici Jožeta Lipnika = When Slovene language didactics meets poetry: Jože Lipnik's 80th anniversary*. Maribor: Univerzitetna založba. 152–164. (Mednarodna knjižna zbirka Zora, 119).
- Zemljak Jontes, Melita, Pulko, Simona, 2012: Dialectal awareness as identity in correlation to dialectal delimitation. Álvarez Pérez, Xosé Afonso (ed.): *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Limits and Areas in Dialectology (LimiAr), Lisbon, 2011*. Lisboa: Centro de Linguística da Universidade de Lisboa. 167–175.
- –, 2013: Dialectal awareness as identity. Carrilho, Ernestina (ed.): *Current approaches to limits and areas in dialectology*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 69–81.
- –, 2015: Narečno in osebna identiteta. *Časopis za zgodovino in narodopisje* 86=51/4. 112–125.
- Zorko, Zinka, 2003a: Prekmursko narečje v Porabju na Madžarskem. Lorber, Lučka (Ed.): *Družbenogeografska in narodnostna problematika slovenske manjšine v Porabju na Madžarskem*. Maribor: Univerza, Znanstveni inštitut za regionalni razvoj. 17–34.
- –, 2003b: Slovenska narečna književnost med Muro in Rabo (jezikovna analiza). In: Lorber, Lučka (ed.): *Družbenogeografska in narodnostna problematika slovenske manjšine v Porabju na Madžarskem*. Maribor: Univerza, Znanstveni inštitut za regionalni razvoj. 44–56.
- –, 2005: Prekmursko narečje med Muro in Rabo na vseh jezikovnih ravninah primerjalno z današnjim nadnarečnim prekmurskim knjižnim jezikom. Vugrinec, Jože (ed.): *Prekmurska narečna slovstvena ustvarjalnost*. Murska Sobota: Ustanova dr. Šiftarjeva fundacija Petanjci. 47–68.
- –, 2009: *Narečjeslovne razprave o koroških, štajerskih in panonskih govorih*. Maribor: Mednarodna založba Oddelka za slovanske jezike in književnosti, Filozofska fakulteta, Univerza v Mariboru. (Zora, 61).
- Zupančič, Jernej, 2009: Ob etničnem in državnem robu na slovenskem vzhodu. [http://www.drustvogeografov\\_pomurja.si/projekti/zborovanje/zbornik/bJernej%20Zupancic\\_T.pdf](http://www.drustvogeografov_pomurja.si/projekti/zborovanje/zbornik/bJernej%20Zupancic_T.pdf). 16–26. (Dostop 15. 3. 2017)