This paper addresses the problem of defining the notion of mixture in languages and dialects as used by Jan Baudouin de Courtenay (1845 - 1929). Focussing on the types of interference which were formulated on the basis of observations of the dialects of the Slovene language (5), the paper deals primarily with those Baudouin’s theoretical positions (4), observations and deductions (5.1) which are today part of a theory of linguistic interference.

The article is an English version of a paper, presented at the Eighth International Congress of Slavists which was held in Zagreb from the 3rd to the 9th September 1978.

Razprava je posvečena predstavam mešanja jezikovnih elementov v jezikih in dialektih, kot jih je razvil Jan Baudouin de Courtenay (1845 - 1929). Razprava se osredotoča na tipih interference, ki jih je Baudouin formuliral na osnovi opazovanj dialektov slovenskega jezika, in v prvi vrsti obravnava one Baudouinove teoretične postavke (4), opažanja in dedukcije (5.1), ki so nam danes del teorije o lingvistični interferenci. Članek predstavlja angleško verzijo predavanja, ki je bilo na sporedu Osmega mednarodnega slavističnega kongresa v Zagrebu, od 3. do 9. septembra 1978.
The purpose of this paper is to define what Jan Baudouin de Courtenay (1845-1929) understood by the notions "vopros smešannyx jazykov," "smešenie jazykov, narečij i govorov," and "dialekčeskie skreščenija;" to determine the place of these notions in his general linguistic theory, and to show how they are related to his study of contemporary Slovene dialects. While these questions have retained much of their actuality, they have not yet been treated adequately in the current literature on Baudouin.

1 Baudouin de Courtenay discusses the problems of "mixed" languages and dialects particularly in: BdC 1871, 1875, 1875a, 1876, 1877, 1878, 1881, 1895, 1897, 1900, 1901, 1902, 1904, 1905, 1910, 1930.

For his term "smešannye jazyki," "smešenie govorov," Baudouin found vernacular equivalents in the dialects of Resia and Ter. Thus one reads, e.g., in a text from Osojane (Italian: Oseacco) in Resia: žmijšan langač (BdC 1895, text No. 855), or in the Ter dialect: žmiešan jezik (BdC 1904, text No. 567). Another text from Resia (Niva, Sul Prato) contains an interesting popular interpretation of interdialectal mixing, which in Baudouin's German translation reads as follows: "Wir haben eine gemischte Sprache in Lipovaz. Man spricht meistentheils gnivaisch und sangiorgisch, ein wenig oseaccisch und stolvizzisch und zwar deswegen weil wir in der Mitte von Resia wohnen, weil wir den Hauptort von Resia bilden. Dorthin zu uns kommen alle: die Stolvizzer, die Gnivaer, die Oseaccer, die San Giorger und die Ucceer. Darum haben wir eine gemischte Sprache: Man wandert in der Welt herum bald hier, bald dort" (BdC 1895, text No. 1162).

2 Baudouin’s contributions to Slovene dialectology have been adequately evaluated in Slovene scholarship in RAMOVŠ 1935: XXIII, 30-41. More recent discussion of this topic (TOPORIŠIČ 1952, JAKOPIN 1972, JEVNIKAR 1974), however, are based on BEZLAJ 1946, whose biased criticism of Baudouin’s work is, to say the least, objectionable in the light of contemporary evaluation of his share in modern linguistics.

In Italian scholarship Baudouin’s hypotheses on Slovene dialects in Venetian Slovenia and Resia, in particular the thesis on the "dialetti misti di croato e sloveno" in the area, have been uncritically repeated and exploited till recent time. Cf., even in CRONIA 1950 and FRANCESCATO 1969; otherwise MARCHIORI 1963 and PELLEGRINI 1968. In popular pseudo-scholarship Baudouin’s hypotheses are more frequently adduced; cf., e.g., L. Ciceri in Sot la nape, 28, No. 1 (Udine, 1976), 92-93.

3 Cf., STANKIEWICZ 1972: 3-48.
It is appropriate that we return to them exactly one hundred years since he himself presented them on an international forum, at the Fourth International Congress of Orientalists in Florence in September, 1878.  

1.0 There was a time when it was fashionable to speak of "mixed" languages and "mixed" dialects. As early as 1836 Wilhelm von Humboldt posited the "Mischung der Nationen" as "das mächtigste Princip in der Veränderung der Sprachen;" half a century later Hermann Paul used the term Sprachmischung in the title of a special chapter in the Principien der Sprachgeschichte (1886), whereas the term was even earlier used by such linguists as William D. Whitney (1867, 1882), Baudouin de Courtenay (1870) or Hugo Schuchardt (1874). The ambiguity of the metaphor of "mixture," designating now the process now the product of this process, and carrying with it some misunderstandings about languages and their evolutions, eventually caused the term to fall into disrepute.

---

4 As it is known, for this Congress Baudouin prepared his report: "Note glottologiche intorno alle lingue slave," which contained a first systematic presentation of his theory of linguistic diffusion (BdC 1881). We should like to correct here an error in BEZLAJ 1946:114; the Fourth International Congress of Orientalists in Florence did not meet in 1881 but in 1878. Baudouin's paper was scheduled for presentation on September 17, in a session presided by G.I. Ascoli. Cf., Bollettino del quarto congresso internazionale degli orientalisti in Firenze, Settembre 1878 (Florence, 1878), 22.


6 The American linguist William D. Whitney's essay "On Mixture in Language" was published in the eighties (WHITNEY 1882). His earlier book, Language and the Study of Language (1867), raised the problem of mixture of languages even before that; its Italian translation by F. D'Ovidio appeared in 1876; in the same year a German translation of the book was published in Leipzig. Baudouin was acquainted with Whitney's works already in 1876; cf., e.g., BdC 1878a: 3; BdC 1881a:126. - It is interesting that H. Paul discusses Sprachmischung for the first time only in the second edition of his Principien der Sprachgeschichte (Halle, 1886), 337-349.
In a general shift of interest from historical to descriptive linguistics, the linguists of the second half of this century replaced the metaphor of "mixture" altogether with a neutral descriptive term "languages in contact". Hence we speak today of the alternate use of two languages at the contact of two speech areas, or of bilingualism; about the deviations from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, or interference. The interference phenomena, then include the entire gamut of aspects of linguistic interaction between two or more languages, mutual borrowing and modelling in all forms of human speech, whether they are the result of a common heritage or a convergent development, between the "languages," "dialects of the same language," or "varieties of the same dialect," and on all levels of a linguistic structure - phonetic, grammatical, and lexical (WEINREICH 1953: 1-2). Furthermore it has been recognized that conceived in these terms, linguistic interference may lead to deeper changes in the structure of a language which may eventually result in a language shift (WEINREICH 1953: 68-69, 107-110). How these deeper changes operate and how they induce language shifts, are questions which still remain to be answered since Humboldt's times. Prejudiced as we still are in favor of linguistic synchrony, we are interested above all in the synchronic and structural aspect of the investigation of language contact (i.e., of the situation of two languages in contact) and interference (i.e., of the results of a situation of two languages in contact). On the other hand, the linguists of yesterday concerned themselves primarily with the problem of language fusion as such, i.e., with questions of the process from contact to interference, which we conceive as the diachronic aspect of the problem. Baudouin's interest in "mixed" languages and dialects belonged to the latter frame of reference.

2.0 It was in the wake of W. von Humboldt's emphasizing the "Mischung der Nationen" as a factor in the continuous process of language change that the notion of ethnic substratum generated interest in the study of dialects and linguistic geography. Graziadio I. Ascoli (1829–1907) stands at the very beginning of this evolution: in the fifties he formulated his theory of the "reazioni allogene," or of "substrati etnici,"7 Since 1861, when he held the chair of Comparative Grammar at the Milan "Accademia

7 Cf., CATTANEO 1842, ASCOLI 1846, BIONDELLI 1856.
Scientifico-Letteraria" and especially since the publication of the first volume of his Archivio glottologico italiano (1873), the new ideas found their way across the Alps. At a time when the Neogrammarians seemed to be winning the day, Ascoli's theory begged for consideration of linguistic fusion as a factor which might refine their postulate on the "exceptionlessness of the sound laws." 8

In the seventies, the Schleicherian genealogical tree theory entered a serious crisis. In 1870, H. Schuchardt in the name of the Sprachkreutzung seriously questioned the value of genealogical classification of languages in general; 9 in 1872 in Berlin, Johannes Schmidt's Wellentheorie negated the usefulness of any classification of languages. 10 In this atmosphere, the study of the historical development of the Romance languages prepared the ground for the theory of ethnic substratum as we know it today. In 1873 Ascoli's Saggi Ladini appeared, 11 in the eighties were published Schuchardt's "Kreolischen Studien" (1882-1890), and Slawodeutsches und Slawo-italienisches (1884), dedicated to Franz Miklosich. The investigation of linguistic fusion and mixed languages suddenly captivated linguists of the fin de siècle.

8 Cf., ASCOLI 1861, Cf., also the "First Letter" to Francesco D'Ovidio, in which Ascoli finalized his theory of the "motivo etnologico" of linguistic evolutions; Rivista di filologia e d'istruzione classica, 10 (1881-82), 1-71.

9 I.e., Schuchardt's inaugural lecture in Leipzig, published only in 1910 under the title: "Klassifikation der romanischen Mundarten"; see SCHUCHARDT 1928: 166-188.

10 Cf., J. Schmidt, Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse der indogermanischen Sprachen (Weimar, 1872).

11 Ascoli's monograph Saggi Ladini represents the first volume of a new Ascoli's journal dedicated to Italian dialectology: Archivio glottologico italiano (Rome, Torino, Florence, 1873 —).
In 1872, Baudouin de Courtenay visited the Slovene lands for the first time. In the Spring of the following year, he paid a visit to G. I. Ascoli in Milan, in the Autumn to A. Leskien in Leipzig. Next year, in 1874, he defended his dissertation in which he advanced his hypothesis on the mixed character and origin of the dialects of Venetian Slovenia and Resia (BdC 1875).

3.0 Even though the question of linguistic fusion and mixed languages was definitely not central to Baudouin’s research, it certainly was one of the most persistent components in his linguistic thought, to which he harked back again and again.

In his inaugural lecture at St. Petersburg University (1870), Baudouin already contrasted the internal and external history of languages and linked their evolution to their geographic contacts and to the ethnographic fate of their speakers (BdC 1963, I:69). His first field trip of 1872 was to the "mixed" dialects in Slovene lands where he would be returning year after year until the outbreak of World War I, nine times in all (TOLSTOJ 1960: 75). In his doctoral dissertation (BdC 1875) he already proposed his first generalizations on linguistic diffusion. Three years later, he presented them at the Congress of Orientalists in Florence (1878; BdC 1881); in 1899 at the Congress of Historians in Cividale-Čedad (BdC 1900); in 1910 at the Congress of German Philologists in Graz (BdC 1910).

The introductory lecture to his course on "Comparative Grammar of the Slavic Languages" in the Autumn 1900 was dedicated to the problem of linguistic diffusion; it appeared under the title: "O smešanom xaraktere vsex jazykov" (On the mixed character of all languages; BdC 1901). Baudouin’s understanding of linguistic fusion and interaction is here given a maximal parameter; by insisting that interaction and mixing are two fundamental processes of linguistic evolution in general, he gives the notion such a wide application that its value for characterizing individual languages would seem to be greatly reduced. His premises, however, are valid and sound: Mixing is the beginning of all life. It takes place in the development of individual language, early in childhood, in marriages, in every social

12 Our references are to the original editions of Baudouin’s works, and to the Russian edition of his selected works: BdC 1963, I; and BdC 1963, II. Whenever an original edition of a Baudouin’s paper was not available, we quote after BdC 1963.
interaction. The contact of tribes and nations leads to interaction and mixing of dialects, linguistic groups. The clinically pure languages about which linguists speak do not exist. Hence, the "comparative grammar" should not halt with the assumption of uninterrupted linguistic evolutions; it should not ignore the problems of interaction and mixing of languages in territorial and chronological, in social and cultural contacts (BdC 1963, I: 362-372).

In this central period of his activity, Baudouin published three volumes of ethnographic and linguistic materials which he had collected in Resia and Ter dialects (BdC 1895, 1904, 1913). On the other hand, Baudouin’s entire Slovenica, some forty units in his bibliography (TOLSTOJ 1960: 67), is devoted to the problem of linguistic interference; he compared the conditions of Slovene dialects with the fate of the Kashubian language (BdC 1897), and included his observations on Slovene mixed dialects in textbooks and programs of lectures which appeared regularly until the end of the World War I (BdC 1877, 1881, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912, 1914, 1917).13

In one of his last studies devoted to the problems of linguistic affinity, published posthumously (BdC 1963, II: 342-352), Baudouin once more spoke about language mixture. Once again he restated the observations on Slovene mixed dialects which he had made some sixty years earlier, corrected some of his previous statements; in the main, however, he insisted on his basic thesis: Linguistic fusion is a fundamental principle of evolution of languages; it conforms to the evolution of social communities in which a language is spoken, and to the evolution of social communities’ interrelations. This premise ultimately underlies Baudouin’s hypothesis de evolutione linguarum terrestrium, in which he posited a continuous and steady process of disintegration and mixing and fusing of languages proceeding in a continuous evolution of integration, amalgamation and reduction of diversity between languages (BdC 1963, II: 349-352).

4.0 While Baudouin’s hypothesis on the evolution of continuously changing languages only partially pertains to the language interference nexus, his notion of "smešenie jazykov" covers two different phases of linguistic interference: a narrower one of our "languages in contact" model, and a broader one, based on the interference in broader socio-cultural settings and broader convergent developments in societies. One aspect of the latter

is acutely present in contemporary socio-cultural pressures in multilingual societies, conducive to and actually promoting the process of language shifts, the final act of language interference (WEINREICH 1953: 68-69). While this broader aspect of Baudouin's theory goes beyond the scope of our discussion, we should like to note that its basic proposition still remains valid as a premise for our understanding of the past and future evolutions of languages. To understand it correctly, we have to place this proposition in the conditions of the time in which it was formulated. As is known, Baudouin used it as a methodological memento against nineteenth century evolutionism: he himself told us this in a retrospect: "I have criticized the one-sidedness of the genealogical tree and wave theories in my Petersburg doctoral dissertation, Opyt fonetiki rez'janskix govorov, and I have emphasized the importance of linguistic mixture for any comparative characterization and classification of languages in my various later works (for example, in: "O smešannom xaraktere vsex jazykov") and papers at scholarly conferences. In this I was able to refer to the concurring views of such outstanding scholars as Hugo Schuchardt and G.I. Ascoli." (BdC 1963, II:343).

The link retrospectively drawn between his theory and G.I. Ascoli gives us the context in which Baudouin's interest for dialects -- the legacy of I. I. Sreznevskij (1812-1880), his teacher -- led him to search for ethnogenetic factors in their study. The substratum theory might help him to explain the dialect features which the traditional comparative grammar was unable to account for. It was this aspect of possible ethnogenetic "mixtures" which triggered Baudouin's theory of the fusion of languages and dialects. Baudouin does not aim to investigate linguistic interference in the synchrony of dialects in linguistic contact; primarily he examines the problems of linguistic migrations and contacts of dialects on a prehistorical and early historical level. This explains why Baudouin's term "smešannye govori" in its application to a number of Slovene dialects has had an essentially diachronic connotation from the very start. This fact is unfortunately too easily forgotten by many who today argue with Baudouin's terminology.

---

14 Baudouin's criticism of J. Schmidt in Podrobnaja programma lekcij v 1876-1877 učebnom godu, is taken directly from his Opyt fonetiki rez'janskix govorov (BdC 1875).
The theoretical positions of Baudouin's initial concept of the fusion of languages do not only contain a criticism of A. Schleicher's and J. Schmidt's classificatory schemes. On the positive side, they represent an attempt at a first typology of possible interrelations between languages and dialects, genetically related or unrelated, and of possible interactions between territorially contiguous dialects and languages in their earliest movements through space and time. For example, in his 1878 formulation:

"Nell' analizzare le relazioni mutue fra le lingue affini, cioè nel classificarele dal punto di vista genetico, si trascuravano quasi affatto le seguenti circostanze, secondo la mia opinione, assai importanti:

1. La possibilità degli incrociamenti dialettali al tempo delle migrazioni dei popoli . . . . . . .;

2. La necessaria influenza mutua delle lingue geograficamente avvicinate, benché anche totalmente diverse nella loro origine . . . . . . .;

3. La possibilità dell' influenza delle lingue e dialetti di altra schiatta, che già cessarono d'esistere e sono stati assorbiti da una data lingua . . . . . . ., o . . . . la possibilità del reflesso delle lingue sparite non solamente nel lessico . . . . ma anche in alcune loro proprietà fonetiche e generalmente grammaticali" (BdC 1881: 28–29).

4.1 The type of language mixture which seems to have most fascinated Baudouin was the geolinguistic diffusion of genetically related dialects during migration, or, as he put it, the 'possibility of the earliest mixing and crossing of genetically related dialects at the time of their migrations'. He formulated it in his doctoral dissertation, and reformulated it in his Florentine paper. As far as we can judge today, this thesis represents his contribution to the revision of the exaggerated phylogeny theories in linguistics, and was an important corrective to A. Schleicher's and J. Schmidt's diagrams of Slavic languages evolution. We give it in translation from his Florentine paper with our Diagram "A":

"The possibility of dialectal crossing at the time of the migration of peoples. Suppose, for instance, that a group of related dialects: "A", "B", "C", and "D", at one point consisted of, e.g., subdialects "a", "a1", "a2", "a3", etc., in dialect "A"; subdialects "b", "b1", "b2", "b3", etc., in "B"; subdialects "c", "c1", "c2", "c3", etc., in "C"; and so forth. Suppose that after this initial state the speakers of these dialects, i. e. the
DIAGRAM "A"
tribes which spoke them, by virtue of historical circumstances, that is migrations, changed their geographic locations. Migrations caused distancing and perhaps separation of the formerly closest ties. Hence, for instance, the subdialects "a" and "a2" of the dialect "A", separated from the subdialects "a1" and "a3", and came in closer territorial contact with the subdialects "b1" and "b3". In the same way the subdialects of the dialect "B" did not stay together: they were separated, for example, into three groups: (1) "b", (2) "b1" and "b3", (3) "b2" and "b4", etc. Hence the subdialects "a" and "a2" on one side, and the subdialects "b1" and "b3" on the other, having settled next to each other and entered into direct contact, began to participate in a common evolution and underwent the same or almost the same modifications, whereas their former closest relatives, "a1" and "a3" on one side, "b" and "b2" on the other, at this point contiguous with other dialects, must have participated in an entirely different internal evolution" (BdC 1881: 28-29).

Such was Baudouin's first conception of dialect mixing with which he presumably tried to suggest an explanation of some "unexplainable" features in the dialects of Venetian Slovenia and Resia, strikingly resembling the Čakavian dialects of the Serbo-Croatian language (BdC 1975:125, 1881:75; 1902:97-98; cf. also LENCEK 1978). The value of such a hypothesis was, of course, primarily methodological and typological.

At the time when historical linguistics still operated with simplistic linear differentiation diagrams, Baudouin recognized the need for a classification of linguistic diffusion phenomena and to hypothesize with more complex evolutionary processes for reconstructing past history. The comparative grammar of Indo-European languages and in particular of Slavic languages today concur with this essentially heuristic methodology. 15 France Bezlaj's exploration of the traces of "a Common Slavic mixture" (praslovanska mešanica; Baudouin would say smešanie govori), created by the

"drifts of a Common Slavic diffusion in the Alpine and Pannonian Slavic dialects" (tokovi praslovanske razselitve v alpski in panonski slovanščini) (BEZLAJ 1967: 102-111), is perhaps the best example of the point.\textsuperscript{16}

The practical application of Baudouin’s geolinguistic diffusion hypothesis to the concrete linguistic situation in the westernmost Slovene dialects as we know them today, on the other hand, proved to be unsustainable (LENCEK 1977, 1978). Baudouin’s theoretical premises are still valid: the absence of documentation of internal evolution which would explain dialectal traits, warrants searching for diffusion explanations; the parallelism in related dialects which might have been part of the same migrational stream may be used as a valid basis to infer linguistic fusion caused by migration. However, today it is obvious that at his time Baudouin did not and very probably could not possess the whole truth on the character of the Venetian Slovene and Resian dialects. Had he had a better knowledge of the entire Slovene and Čakavian speech areas, and consequently had he understood better the evolutionary tendencies of the Western branch of the South Slavic languages as we understand them today, he would not have needed to resort to prehistoric geolinguistic migrational diffusion to explain their parallel evolutions.

4.2 Two of Baudouin de Courtenay’s types of language interference are linked with contact between genetically non-related languages and dialects: one on the axis of spatial contiguity, contact between speakers of different dialects and languages living in adjacent areas; and one on the axis of ethnogenetic symbiosis, contact between speakers of different languages in symbiotic contact, substratum theory. The dialects of the Slovene speech area offered to Baudouin good examples for both interference types, though his treatment of Slovene material would indicate that he was, against all expectations, less interested in linguistic problems of language interference along the axis of contiguous spatial contact.

The basic model of Baudouin's theory of linguistic fusion between genetically non-related languages in symbiotic contact was the one he encountered in actu, as he used to say, during his first visit of Slovene lands of Goriška and Kranjska.\textsuperscript{17} "Na našix, tak skazat', glazax," writes Baudouin, "proizošla okončatel'naja slovenizacija neskol'kix obščin nemeckix vyselencev, ili kolonistov, v Krajne i Gorice (v gorickom grafstve): Nemeckij Rout (Nemški Rovt, Deutschruth), Korytnica (Koritnica), Steržišče (Stržišče) i.t.d. Ešče v pervoj polovine XIX stol. žiteljam 'etix dereven' byl svojstven svoeobraznyj južnorneckij govor, nasodjaščijsja v bližajšem rodstve s govorami tirol'skim; v semidesjatyx godax odni tol'ko stariki mogli ešče ob"jasnjat'sja na 'etom govore; ix deti, ljudi srednego vozrasta, ponomali, pravda, 'etot govor, no uže im svobodo ne vladeli; samomu že molodomu pokoleniju bylo chuždo daže ponimanje jazyka ego pradegov. Mestnym obščim govorom togo vremeni był govor slovinskij, zaimstvovannyj u bližajšix sosedej, iskonnyx slovincov, no i v fonetike, i v morfologii, i v sintaksise soxranivšij javnye i neosporimye sledy nemeckogo proisxoždenija ego nositelej. Slyšannyj na izvestnom rasstojanii, 'etot govor proizvodil vpečatlenie govora nemeckogo - do takoj stepeni nemeckoju byla ego fonetika. Konečno, vposledstvii, pod vlijaniem školy, propovedi i obščenija s sozednimi 'čisto slovinskimi' derevnjami, 'etot nemecko-slovinskij govor dolžen był vse bolee lišat'sja svoego nemeckogo otpečatka, no polnoe isčeznovenie 'etogo nemeckogo otpečatka edva li vozmožno (BdC 1901; cf., BdC 1963; I:368-369).

When first reporting on this "mixed" subdialect, today integrated in the dialect of Tolmin and in the dialectal group of Rovte (RAMOVŠ 1935: 82-105), Baudouin promised a special treatment of this German-Slovene speech (BdC 1877: 32). He never fulfilled this promise, however,\textsuperscript{18} although he

\textsuperscript{17} This was between April and September 1872 (BdC 1877: 20-35).

\textsuperscript{18} As far as I know, Slovene dialectology has not investigated these problems. Ramovš's note on the speech habits observed in Nemški Rut, Stržišče, Podbrdo, is based on MALECKI 1929: 71-77 (cf., RAMOVŠ 1935: 86). M. Mačecki was probably the only linguist who studied this dialect in the field. Some isolated idiosyncrasies of the dialect are also discussed in: S. Rutar, "Nemški rut na Goriškem", Kres, 2 (Celovec, 1882), 524-529; J. Koštial, "Deutschruth, Übersicht der noch zugänglichen Angaben über das Schwinden des dortigen Deutschums", Deutsche Erde, 12 (Munich, 1913); H. Schuchardt, Slawo-deutsches und Slawo-italienisches (Graz, 1884), 67 and passim.
referred to it whenever he made inferences on language fusion processes (BdC 1876; 1881; 1901; 1930). In a typical example he uses it to draw a methodological deduction, viz.: "No dopustim čto upomjanute mnoju oslavjanivšiesja Nemcy okruženy, na podobie Rez'jan, neprexodimymi gorami, čto v nix net školy, čto svjaščeniki propovedajut im i obučajut ix na ix rodomnareči, ili že na kakom libo inoplemennom, polozhim Ital'janskom ili že Furlanskom jazyke. S drugoj storony, možno sebe predstavit' slučaj, čto podobnye oslavjanivšiesja Nemcy, usvoivšie sebe onemečennyj Slavjanskij jazyk, ili vyseljavutsja na kakij nibud' ostrov, ili že malo-po-malo okružajutsja inoplemennikami, ne-Slavjanami. Ne podležit somnenju, čto vo vsex podobnyx slučajax oni soxranili by svoj novo-razvivšijsja jazyk, kotoryj čerez kakix nibud' 500 let, s izčeznoveniem istoričeskogo predanija o kogda-to soveršivšejsja  etnografičeskoj smesi, sdelalsja by nastojaščeju zagadkoj dlja izsledujuščix ego lingvistov" (BdC 1876: 335-336).

As one can easily understand the methodological significance of such an illustrative case of observed symbiotic contact between languages in contact in Baudouin's concern with the typology of mixed languages, one must only regret that Baudouin did not seem to be interested in linguistic interference data in this contact as such. To observe a linguistic fusion in symbiotic contact in actu, namely meant that there were no variables left to assumption and hypothesis. One may wonder why here Baudouin's interest stopped at the threshold of the real linguistic problem in the solution of which he might have tested the hypothesis of linguistic fusion.

4.3 We may assume that Baudouin de Courtenay must have known the theory of substratum before his arrival to the Slovene lands. He acquainted himself with it full well in the Spring of 1873 during his visit with Ascoli in Milan (BdC 1877: 37-44). BIONDELLI 1857, ASCOLI 1846, and in particular ASCOLI 1873 which in Italian linguistics extended the notion of a pre-Romance substratum at the very edge of the speech area of Baudouin's "Italian Slavs of Northeastern Friuli," must have been a factor influencing his hypothesis on an early "Turanian substratum" in the Resian dialect. 19

---

19 The term "Turanian" was used to cover the Ural-Altaic languages; the Turanian dialect in question is the language of Avars (BdC 1876), a people of undetermined language and origin who led the South Slavic migrations over the Balkans and into the Eastern Alps, and mysteriously disappeared in history.
In addition, the earliest references to substratum theory with the definition of its influence on languages - as "the influence of non-native, extinct or absorbed languages and dialects not only in the lexicon of a language but primarily in its phonetic and morphological structure" (BdC 1875:125; 1876: 331–332), definitely points directly to Ascoli’s "reazioni etniche" (ASCOLI 1846). The theoretical argument he adduces in support of his "Turanian theory," for which he himself sensed that it might have been overstretched, although he did not consider to revise it till the year before his death (LENCEK 1977:13), is not original his, yet it is still valid.

An ethnogetic contact of speakers of a language at an earlier stage of its evolution is indeed one of possible factors of linguistic diffusion (MEILLET 1928: 89-92). Such an explanation, formulated as a hypothesis, -- and Baudouin never neglected to indicate that his hypotheses on Resian, Kashubian, Polish dialects, are nothing but hypotheses (BdC 1876: 334) -- may, however, as it has been formulated by the Prague school, point to the possibility of an innovation triggered by a substratum in a language

20 Note how uncertain Baudouin still was about his hypothesis in the introduction to his Materialien, I. Resianische Texte (1895): "Xotja v moix sočinenijax ... ħto vlijanie, možet byt’, i značitel’no preuveličeno, no tem ne menee ego nel’zja otricit’ nikoiom obrazom" (BdC 1895: I-II).

21 "Nekotorye lingvisty otricajut podobnoe, fonetičeskoe vlijanie odnih jazykov na drugie, i vse inostrannoe vlijanie na izvestnyj jazyk svodjat počti izključitel’no k zapasu slov ... No tem ne menee te že lingvisty ves’ma oxotno dopuskajut vlijanie ... klimata, počvy, pišči, i.t.d. ... Vo vsjakom slučae, gorazdo neobxodime dopustit’ suščestvennoe fonetičeskoe i morfologičeskoe vlijanie na izvestnyj jazyk drugih jazykov, ili sosednix emu, ili že zamennennyx im, vsledstvie etnografičeskogo pogloščenija govorivšix na nix plemen plemenem, kotoromu svojstven imennno izvestnyj, v dannoe vremja izsleduemyj jazyk. Ved’ jazyk i jazyk predstavljajut veličiny gorazdo bolee sorazmernye, neželj jazyk i pš’e piva, ili že jazyk i obitališče naroda v gorax ili že v dolinax. A čem sorazmernee izvestnye veličiny, tem ležče i tem verojatneee ix vzaimodelstvie i obusloviivanje odnoj vlijaniem drugoj" (BdC 1876: 331–332).
only under two conditions: one, that the innovation in a given language cannot be explained by the internal evolution of the language itself; and two, that such an innovation agrees with the regularity of the system and with the internal evolution of the language in question (Jakobson 1931, 1938). In his hypothesis on the "Turanian substratum" in Resian dialect, misconceived as it was, Baudouin considered both conditions. His Humboldtian understanding of language as an "organic" whole with an "internal" form, was, to start with, much closer to our own concept of language as a system with its internal structure, than one could claim for any of his contemporaries (cf., BdC 1963, I:68-69).22

There were two phonemic features of the Resian dialect which with everything that contemporary dialectology knew about the Slovene language at the time, seemed to disagree with the regularity of its system and its internal evolution. The first one concerned the phonetic opposition of clear and dark vowels, the second, the role of this opposition in the word structure in the dialect. Since there are no similar features known in the structure of any of the Indo-European dialects, whereas they characterize the Ural-Altaic languages, the conjecture with a hypothetical "Turanian substratum" seemed to be plausible. To satisfy the second condition, Baudouin suggested that it was quite possible that the principle of vowel harmony regulated by the marked syllable in a word may have different application in languages of different structure: in Turanian languages the marked syllable is always the first syllable in a word; in Resian (as in Slavic languages in general) - the marked syllable is the syllable under stress which, however, is mobile. The regrettable faux pas of a great scholar to posit an Avar substratum in Resia to explain what was later described as a vowel reduction and vowel assimilation tendency of Slovene dialects consistent with the evolution of Slovene language (RAMOVŠ 1918-1920; LENCEK 1977: 13-15), was, however, made on the basis of correctly posited methodological propositions.

5.0 Baudouin de Courtenay's theoretical positions on mixed languages and dialects in general, as well as in their application to Slovene dialects,

22 Cf., e.g., the following Baudouin's formulation in one of his 1910 papers: "Dejstvitel'nye zakony, zakony pričinnosti, skryty v glubine, v zaputannom uzle samyx različnyx èlementov. Zakony suščestvujut, no ne tam, gde ix iščut" (BdC 1963, II:208).
are intimately related with the following historical circumstances. Above all, they are linked with the fact that Baudouin as a twenty-seven year old docent of comparative grammar at St. Petersburg University departed for a field-work expedition to the "Slavic dialects on the Austro-Hungarian-Italian boundary" and that he was guided to the study of the living dialects by that I.I. Sreznevskij who was the first dialectologist of the Slovene language. That's why the Baudouin's basically diachronic ("dynamic") approach to languages is inseparably intertwined with his interest for the synchrony ("statics") of a language (STANKIEWICZ 1972: 41). Hence his infatuation with the dialects and -- as it has been shown -- his special interest for the problems of linguistic interference. However, in all his concern with "mixing" of dialects and languages, "mixing before our own eyes" as he used to say, Baudouin's interest lay not so much with the analysis of the problems of dialects and their structures in the very moment of diffusion, as with the typology of the process leading from linguistic contact to interference, or, to use Baudouin's language, with the type of mechanics of language mixing (BdC 1876). As it has been already stressed Baudouin's interest in linguistic interaction and interference should be understood as his reaction to the overemphasizing of the importance of genealogical classification and Schmidt's negation of any classification of languages. This may in part explain Baudouin's bias in favor of diachronic aspect in language diffusion problems, as well as his special interest for the evolution of the genetically related languages and dialects. In this light the contact with G.I. Ascoli becomes more fortuitous than sought and Ascoli's influence on Baudouin perhaps less significant than one would be inclined to suggest (cf., STANKIEWICZ 1972:9). Two additional qualifications of Baudouin as a scholar should be stressed: as a dialectologist he was in the first place a recorder of linguistic and ethnographic data, as a general linguist primarily a theoretician paving the way to modern linguistics. It is this fact which helps us to understand his fascination with the Slovene dialects.

5.1 As a linguist-dialectologist Baudouin gave us excellent descriptions of a number of Slovene dialects in contact, notably of Resia and Ter (Italian: Resia, Torre); as a linguist-theoretician, he gave us quite a few formulations of principles and deductions on the theory of linguistic fusion. Some of these latter, based on his observations of "mixed" German-Slovene and Friulian-Slovene dialects, are today part and parcel of a theory of linguistic geography and linguistic diffusion. Thus, one can trace back to Baudouin such propositions as:

(a) Mixing is the beginning of all life. There are no such clinically pure languages and dialects as those posited by linguists. The so-called comparative grammar must investigate languages in their
diachrony, as well as in their spatial, social, cultural contacts, and in their typology (BdC 1876).

(b) The interaction and mixing of languages is determined not only by geographical and territorial contact along the spatial axis, but also chronologically by the contact between generations and between the languages of different periods along the temporal axis (BdC 1901).

(c) The effects of language mixing are twofold: on the one hand, they enrich a given language with elements of another language; and on the other, they weaken the distinctions peculiar to the given language (BdC 1901, 1930).

(d) Language mixing accelerates simplification of the structure of a given language. When two languages mix in such a contact and interaction, that language which is marked by easier, simpler and more "rational" linguistic forms and structures, prevails (BdC 1930).

(e) The interaction and interference of two languages or dialects "A" and "B" does not lead to a new language or dialect "AB". Language mixing presupposes that language "A" will change into language "A_{Bx}^n", and language "B" into language "B_{Ax}^a". Each of these languages preserves its individual inherited properties only so long as the stronger of the two "wins" over the weaker (BdC 1881).

5.2 Among the dialects of the Slovene language which Baudouin at one time or another treated as "mixed", are: the dialects spoken in Resia, in the Ter valleys, in Venetian Slovenia in general, in some respects all Western Slovene dialects, and the German–Slovene speech of the Nemški Rut region of one of the Western Slovene dialects (Tolmin). In each and every one of these dialects Baudouin identified a different type of "mixing", interference: in Nemški Rut the evolution of a "mixed" German–Slavic dialect on a Slovene base, or a type of substratum in the final phase of assimilation; in Resia the traces of a linguistic assimilation of a genetically unrelated Ural–Altaic (Turanian) language into a Slavic base, or a type of a classic substratum; in Resia, Ter and in the rest of Venetian Slovenia – a linguistic contact between two contiguous genetically unrelated speech areas; in Ter and the rest of Venetian Slovenia the traces of an early linguistic mixing of genetically related dialects, a type of dialectal diffusion at the time of migration of genetically related tribes; in Venetian Slovenia, except the area of the Ter dialect – a linguistic contact with the educated language of the contiguous Slovene area, a type of cultural diffusion between the dialects of the same language.
Except for the problem of vowel harmony in the Resian dialect, Baudouin did not devote to any of these types more than a formulation of the basic relation of the interference process. It is interesting that while he formulated these relations during his first research trip to the Slovene lands, subsequently, throughout the rest of his life, he used to repeat them in his papers, consistently, often even word for word. The fact that he was willing to retract his hypothesis on the "Turanian influence" in Resia is known to us from a letter to Carlo Tagliavini written only one year before his death (MARCHIORI 1963: 41-42); the fact that he was prepared to concede the Slovene provenance of the Ter dialect can only be deduced indirectly from his posthumously published paper on the "Zagadnienia pokrewieństwa językowego" (BdC 1963, II:347; LENCEK 1978: 216). These two "corrections," however, do not entail so much a revision of the scholarly argument as much as they involve a revision of theoretical speculation and interpretations of posited expectations. Finally, Baudouin's terminology, his use of the terms "mixed," "mixing," "mixture," especially in reference to the dialects of Resia and Ter, should be understood in the context of his time and of the state of linguistic science in the nineteenth century. In this context, however, the linguistic interference is understood primarily as diachronic evolutionary process. Hence, when Baudouin discusses the problems of "smešannye govori," he discusses the problems of linguistic fusion in diachrony. To attribute something else to these terms and their usage in his writing would be to totally misread his work on Slovene dialectology.
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POVZETEK

BAUDOuinov koncept "mešanja" jezikov in dialektov

V razpravi nam gre za to, da ugotovimo, kaj je Janu Baudouinu de Courtenayu pomenilo "smešenje jazykov, narečij i govorov", kako je razumel "vopros smešannx jazykov," in kaj si je predstavljal pod "dialektičeskim skreščenjem" (BdC 1875, 1876, 1901, 1930); da pokažemo mestoto tega aspekta Baudouinovega zanimanja za jezik v njegovih splošnolin- 
gvističnih gledanjih; in slednjič, da povemo, kako je razumeti Baudouino- 
vo učenje o mešanih jezikih in govorih v odnosu na slovenski jezik in nje- 
gove dialekte.
1.0 Sodobno jezikoslovje ne govori več o "mešanju" jezikov in dialektov, kot je govoril Baudouin in njegov čas. Vendar so Baudouinove formulacije tega vprašanja ostale aktualne in relevantne; še posebno v etnično prizadetih področjih, kjer se terminologija in koncepti Baudouinovih teoretičnih postavk mnogokdaj sprejemajo preveč ali premalo kritično.

Ko danes razpravljamo o vprašanjih "mešanja jezikov", uporabljamo drugačno terminologijo. Danes govorimo o jezikih v kontaktu, o alternativni rabi dveh jezikov v govoru ljudi, ki žive na stiku dveh jezikovnih območij, ali o bilingvalizmu; o odklanjanju od norm enega ali drugega jezika, do katerih prihaja v govoru bilingvalnih govorcev kot posledica jezikovnega kontakta, interference. Pod interferenčnimi pojavi razumemo jezikovni in kulturni vpliv enega jezika na drugega, prevzemanje (borrowing) elementov enega jezika v drugega, in posnemanje (modelling) enega jezika po drugem, v vseh formah človeškega govora, med jeziky genetično skupnega izvora ali med dialekti istega jezika ali med govoristi istega dialektalnega področja in vseh ravninah jezikovne strukture - v fonetiki, morfologiji, sintaksi in leksikonu. Na drugi strani pa je treba poudariti, da pri preučevanju jezikovnega kontakta (to je situacije dveh jezikov v kontaktu) in interference (to je rezultatov te situacije v jezikih v kontaktu) lingvista našega časa predvsem zanima sinhronični in strukturalni vidik problema, medtem ko so v prejšnjem stoletju bila v osredju predvsem vprašanje procesa mešanja, vprašanja poti od kontakta do interference, to je diahronični vidik problema. Baudouinovo zanimanje za jezikovno mešanje je rastlo iz te starejše usmerjenosti.

2.0 Ko skušamo razumeti in ovrednotiti Baudouinovo učenje o mešanih jezikih na splošno in v odnosu na slovenske dialekte, moramo upoštevati sledeče: Najprej dejstvo, da je sedemindvajsetletni Baudouin odhajal študirat "slovanske govore na avstroogrško-italijanski meji" kot lingvist-historik - komparativist, in da ga je vodilo na to pot zanimanje za žive dialekte tistega I. I. Sreznevskega, ki velja za prvega dialektologa slovenškega jezika. Od tod to, da se v Baudouinovskem gledanju na jezik že na samem početku njegovega raziskovanja v lingvistikih sinhronija srečuje z diahronijo; od tod pa tudi to, da se Baudouin ne ukvarja toliko z vprašanjem slovenskega jezika kot takega, kolikor z njegovimi dialekti in govorji, in -- kot smo že videli -- da se mu ob njihovem študiju razvija poseben interes za pojave vzajemnega vpliva med njimi, jezikovno interakcijo. In naj poudarim: pri vsem ubađanju z živimi mešanimi dialekti Baudouina ne zanimajo toliko vprašanja jezikovnega kontakta kot takega, vprašanja privzemanja tujih jezikovnih prvin v nekem govoru, kot pa pot od kontakta do interference, z Baudouinovsko terminologijo, proces "jezikovnega mešanja"; to je proces difuzije jezikovnih pojavov v nekem jeziku, kar pa v bistvu

2.1 Najprej je treba poudariti, da je prav ob opazovanju slovenskih govorov, zlasti še govorov v kontaktu vzdolž slovensko-furlanske jezikovne meje, rastla Baudouinova teorija "mešanih" govorov, jezikovne interakcije in interference, ki so danes del splošno-lingvistične teorije o jezikih v kontaktu. Šem spadajo predvsem teoretična spoznanja in načela, ki so danes splošno sprejeta, a za katera malokdo vê, da izhajajo iz Baudouina in iz njegovega preučevanja slovenskih govorov. Naj jih navedem:

(a) Mešanje je načelo vsega, kar živi. Klinično čisti govori in jezik, o katerih govore lingvisti, ne eksistirajo. Primerjalna gramatika naj ne preučuje jezikov le po zgodovinskem razvoju, ampak tudi v vzajemnih odnosih v geografskem, socialnem in kulturnem kontekstu, tipološko (BdC 1876).

(b) Do križanja in mešanja jezikov prihaja ob teritorialnem-geografskem kontaktu vzdolž prostorske osi, med govor raznih generacij, kakor tudi med jeziki raznih obdobij vzdolž časovne osi (BdC 1901).

(c) Mešanje jezikov se giblje v dveh smereh; z ene strani gre za vnašanje značilnih elementov enega jezika v drugega, z druge strani za slabljenje moći in stopnje distinktivnosti, ki je značilna za posamezne strukturne plasti nekega jezika (BdC 1901, 1930).

(d) Jezikovna interferenca pospešuje simplifikacijo strukture nekega jezika; v mnogih primerih v takem mešanju zmagujejo lažje, preprostejše in racionalnejše forme in strukture onega jezika, katerega vpliv končno zmaga (BdC 1930).

(e) Rezultat interference dveh jezikov ali dialektov "A" in "B" ni nekakšen jezik ali diaklet "AB"; jezikovno mešanje predpostavlja spreminjanje jezika "A" v "A_{B}^{a}" in jezika "B" v "B_{A}^{a}". Vsak zase
tak jezik še dalje ohranja svoje individualne podedovane posebnosti, vendar samo tako dolgo, dokler ne pride do zmage močnejšega med njimi (BdC 1881).

2.2 Če odmislimo splošno tezo o mešanem značaju vsakega govora, vseh jezikov in dialektov, v katero se je končno izostrilo Baudouinovo učenje o jezikih (BdC 1901), so Baudouinu med slovenskimi dialekti veljali za mešane gledeči govori: rezijanski, terski, ostali beneškoslovenski, v nekem oziru vsi zahodno-slovenski dialecti, in nemško-slovenski govor tolminskega dialektta. V vsakem od njih je Baudouin našel drugačno vrsto interferenc: v Nemškem rutu primer jezikovnega utapljanja genetsko-nesorodnega nemškega govora v slovenski dialekt v procesu - ali tip substratuma v končni fazi asimilacije; v Reziji sledove jezikove asimilacije genetsko-nesorodnega turanskega govora v slovanskem dialektu - ali tip klasičnega substratuma; v Reziji, Teru in ostalih beneškoslovenskih govorih primer pravega jezikovnega kontakta v prostoru dveh genetsko-nesorodnih jezikovnih področij; v Teru in ostalih beneškoslovenskih govorih sledove zgodnjega jezikovnega mešanja med genetsko-sorodnimi govorji - ali tip dialektalne difuzije ob preseleovanju plemen istega rodu; v beneškoslovenskih govorih (brez terskih govorov) - primer jezikovnega kontakta s slovenskim jezikom - ali tip kulturne difuzije med dialekti istega jezika.
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