

Emil Tokarz, *Nomina actionis we współczesnym języku słoweńskim* [= Prace naukowe Uniwersytetu Śląskiego w Katowicach nr. 864]. Katowice, Poland: Uniwersytet Śląski, 1987. 100 pp..

This monograph consists of two sections. The first (pp. 11-38) deals with the morphological structure of Slovene *nomina actionis*, and has the following subdivisions with respect to suffixal derivations: genetically common (Slovene and Slavic) formants; and formants of general origin (on the terminological confusion, cf. below). The second (pp. 39-78) is devoted to semantic-syntactic analysis, and deals with (1) semantic categories of the verb, (2) the function of nouns of action in the sentence, and (3) questions of government of nouns of action. This is followed by a list of the nouns mentioned in the text (pp. 79-95), a bibliography (pp. 96-99), and summaries in Russian and French (p. 100).

The following may be stated about the author's acquaintance with the basic literature on the subject. Although in his bibliography he cites three Polish monographs on this derivational category (those by Puzynin, Dulewiczowa and myself) he does not mention, either in this list or in the text, the book by Doroszewski, whose syntactical interpretation of Slavic derivation comprised, to a greater or lesser extent, the theoretical basis of those three monographs. Nor is there any mention of the synthesizing and very readable handbook by Grzegorzczkova (1972), or of the Slovene-based and also diachronic treatment of derivational theory in the study by Vidovič-Muha (1984). The name of this latter author (a leading specialist in this field) does not appear at all in the bibliography, although Tokarz does cite four typewritten Slovene studies (Bull, Dular, Kunst-Gnamuš, Novak), not one of which deals directly with Slovene derivation.

With respect to the way that the literature was used by the author, I have two comments, both concerning my own work. First, he makes what amounts to a global citation: in nine different places he cites various pages from my monograph of 1966 which, when strung together, total the whole text of that work (with the exception of its introduction, concluding remarks and bibliography) — i.e., much more than just the pages where I write about the Slovene language. This 'global' kind of citation applies also to authors other than myself; it gives rise to suspicions that the author borrowed more than he might care to admit. Second, a comment about Tokarz's idiosyncratic and arbitrary terminological (and contentive) reinterpretation of the literature: he is fascinated by the most current terminology, collects it wherever he can find it, and applies it in a hit-or-miss fashion. He therefore (and also because he quite certainly did not read my monograph) allows himself to acknowledge my work: "Najpełniejszy opis wybranych typów nominów actionis w ujęciu konfrontatywnym dała H. Orzechowska, 1966," (p. 7, fn. 7). I need hardly point out that "confrontational" linguistics did not come into fashion in Europe until 1970 (cf. Corder 1979: 148-49, 292, 375-381, and note that the terms 'kontrastywne' and 'konfrontatywne językoznawstwo' were unknown to Gołąb, Heinz & Polański 1968!) I myself, as the author in question, am still very much aware what methodology I used: it was a traditional, diachronic-philological and comparative methodology, even if the conclusions were more of a structural nature; but I used no kind of "confrontational" or "contrastive" methods, and did not even mention them! As for the most basic linguistic terminology, Tokarz is unfamiliar with that; cf. his remark (p. 71, footnote 10): "W języku słoweńskim łączliwości (*vezlivost*) poświęcali uwagę: . . ." [followed by a list of citations, including] "Orzechowska 1974, 1979: 43-63. . ." In these two works, I wrote about **government** (Pol. *rekcja*, Sln. *vezava*); the term and concept expressed by Pol. *łączliwość* and Sln. *ve-*

zljivost — note Tokarz's misspelling — is, in my opinion, merely a 'relaxation' of the good old precise Latin term *rectio*, Pol. *rekcija*, which wipes out the boundary between syntax and phraseology, and indeed also some of the boundaries between linguistic units and processes. Two of the other books cited in the same footnote, viz., Bajec, Kolarič & Rupel 1964 and Vincenot 1975, were much more traditional with respect to the term and concept of **government** than Tokarz represents them; thus the former used the term *vezava* only with reference to prepositions, and rarely at that; while the latter, on the pages cited by Tokarz, also used the terms in a traditional way, e.g., "verbes gouvernants le génitif."

The documentation of the data in Tokarz's book is on the same low scholarly level as his use of the literature. In his introduction we read, "Podstawę materiałową rozprawy stanowią zdania wybrane ze współczesnych tekstów literackich, źródeł publicystycznych, oraz języka mówionego (informatorzy — słoweńscy slawiści. . .)", followed by a list of names which I will not cite out of kindness (p. 8). But there is no list of these "contemporary literary Slovene," or other Slovene, texts in the book. When individual examples are cited (words in Section 1, sentences in Section 2) there is no notation as to where they were recorded. As for the words used in the first section, the globally cited sources (Orzechowska 1966, Bajec 1950, Sławski 1974, Pleteršnik's dictionary) are to some extent satisfactory; but when the reader reaches the sentences and their transformations in Section 2, he never knows—since references to sources are lacking—what the original usage was, or what the transformation ("transpozycja") consists of. For each group of examples Tokarz indicates one single direction of transformation, using right-facing or left-facing arrows, but we find transformations of sentences on **both** sides of the arrows. This demonstrates linguistic errors in transformation; e.g., one example (p. 68) reads *Dekletu ni dosti do plesa ← Dekletu ni dosti da bi plesala*. Given the direction of the arrow, the left hand side should be a transformation of the sentence on the right; but this is impossible, since the sentence on the right hand side is incorrect, and would have read (if a real contemporary Slovene text had been the source) *Dekletu ni dosti do tega, da bi plesala*; in the form printed here, the sentence means "Dekletu ne zadostuje da bi plesala (ne zadostuje plesanje), ampak. . .", and the basic form is therefore on the **left**, in spite of what the arrow indicates. Similarly, (p. 64): *To, da sva sprta, si sama kriva → Sama si kriva najinega spora*: the sentence on the left hand side, which should (because of the arrow) be the basis for the transformation, can not be taken from a Slovene source, since it contains a serious error in its government: the correct version would be *Tega . . . si sama kriva*: for *biti kriv* governs the genitive. And there are dozens of disgraceful errors of this kind in the second section. From them we learn that the transformations were not performed 'in the direction' that is indicated, but that the author manufactured them by supplying forms on whatever side of the arrow suited him. The investigation is, therefore, not an investigation, but rather a high-school level enumeration of data, contrived to exemplify propositions taken from the literature about this question (and indeed from literature about completely different questions). Since the bases for the transformations, and the transformations themselves, contain numerous mistakes, it is apparent that Tokarz resorted to extending the modest data that he had by devising his own examples.

This criticism applies not only to the syntactical section, but to the derivational (or rather, the lexical) section too, where it appears that the meanings of words depend on Tokarz's arbitrary interpretations and never on contextual factors; given his incompetence in Slovene, this is dangerous. The following are surely the author's linguistic mistakes rather than misprints: *omdlevica, omdlevati* for *omedlevica, omedlevati* (pp. 17, 88), cf. Pol. *omdlenie*; *atak* (m.) for *ataka* (f.) (pp. 67, 79), cf. Pol. *atak* (m.); and invented

expressions like *Grizem se nemožnostjo* (there can be no Sln. noun in the instrumental without a preposition) for . . . *z nemožnostjo* or perhaps . . . *zaradi nemožnosti*.

The principles of classification in both sections, like the terminology employed, are heterogeneous and inconsistent, and betray a lack of independent judgment. From the relationship between subheading 1.1. (*Derywacja sufiksalna*) and the sub-subheadings thereunder listed (*Formanty rodzime, formanty obcego pochodzenia*) it is clear that Tokarz does not distinguish the narrower term **suffix** from the wider term **formant** (= Sln. *obrazilo*). This is apparent in the two summaries (p. 100), which include the phrases: “iz zaimstvovannyx derivatov vydeleny nezaimstvovannye,” and “on a détaché les dérivés de souche des dérivés d’origine étrangère.” From them it is clear that Tokarz treats “derivatives” not only without regard for the history of their derivational structure in Slovene, but also without regard for their synchronic derivational (morphological) motivation in the system of the contemporary language.

Moreover, Tokarz does not differentiate between suffixes and formants on the one hand and arbitrarily-segmented word-endings on the other. This is quite clear from his list of data. Let us exemplify this point by considering some of his examples of the nouns in *-ina*. Under *-anina* we find *ožganina* (p. 82); under *-(e)nína*, *vezenina*, *nočnina* (p. 85); under *-ina*, *bolečina*, *poklina* (p. 89); under *-lína*, *opeklina*, *ozeblina* (p. 90); under *-nina*, *naročnina*, *voznina*, *prenočnina* (p. 91); and under *-vščina*, *davščina*, *odpravčina* (spelled wrong!), *svatovščina* (p. 95). Thus *nočnina* and *prenočnina* are categorized differently; and the same applies to *opeklina* and *poklina*. The author is not worried by the fact that in all these examples the derivational bases are different but the suffix (and here the ‘formant’ too) is one and the same. We know that this does not worry him since in the actual text, where these forms are all dealt with together (pp. 18-19), we find a quotation (without quotation marks!) from Sławski, and a list of the same nouns, but no analysis of any kind. In any case, half of the nouns listed here are not *nomina actionis* — not even from a semantic point of view — thus, *naročnina*, *oteklina*, *spečenina*, *vezenina* and others. To be included in this book, they should have been demonstrated to be *nomina actionis* both structurally and semantically, with authentic contextual examples.

The section on “formants of general (i.e., non-Slavic) origin” fares even worse. Here we find whole groups of lexical units which are (for Slovene) unmotivated derivationally and for which no verbal bases are (or indeed could be) given, e.g., nouns in *-us* (pp. 36, 95); nouns in *-ing*: *kliring*, *miting*, *doping*, *sparing* (pp. 34, 89). Here, even a purely mechanical classification according to “formants” becomes quite farcical. Note also the classification of borrowed words in *-a*, where the final vowel corresponds to French ‘e muet,’ as if the Sln. *-a* were a derivational “formant” (thus *manikira*, p. 29 — where it is lumped in with Slavic words in *-a*! — and p. 80; and, worse still, cf. *pedikira* which is misspelled *pedikura* and listed in a group with loanwords in *-ura*, viz., *avantura*, *bravura* etc., pp. 35, 94!).

One more example of Tokarz’s syntactic analysis. On pp. 72-73, under the heading “Predikaty jednoargumentowe,” he provides 24 examples that are meant to represent two types of ‘simple sentence’ for which the transformation is a *nomen actionis*, plus a third variant type; thus, for the first type, the sentence *Janez smrči* and its transformation *Janezovo smrčanje*; for the second type, respectively, *Fleši bliskajo* and *Blisk* (or: *bliskanje*) *flešev*. Aside from lexical errors, at least six sentences are (from the viewpoint of their syntactic structure) incorrectly included in these lists, having complements of a different type; they should have been included in the section headed “predikaty dwuargumentowe” (pp. 73-76). These are: in the first group, *Signalizirati z zvokom* / *Zvočno signaliziranje*

and *Špekulirati na borzi / Borzne špekulacije*; in the second, *Rediti prašiče / Reja prašičev*, *Roditi otroke / Rojstvo otroka*, and *Slediti divjad / Sledenje divjadi*; and in the 'variant' group, *Realizirati politiko / Politična realizacija, Realizacija politike*. We can see that all of these examples lack an explicitly expressed subject, and do not have "one argument" in their predicates.

This is not yet all, however. Tokarz goes on to 'deepen' his analysis and tells us (p. 72): ". . . składnik w Gen. w takiej konstrukcji odpowiada podmiotowi w jej parafrazach zdaniowych, tradycyjnie bywa nazywany *genetivus subiectus*" (Pol. *podmiot* = 'subject', Sln. *osebek*; Pol. *dopełnienie* = 'object,' Sln. *dopolnilo*.) Given this interpretation for the example *reja prašičev*, the reader can only stare in astonishment: for the transformed sentence in question contains a very distinctive **accusative** form, *prašiče*. The same is true, of course, for the sentence *realizirati politiko*, with its feminine accusative form.

The lexical index is so difficult to read as to be unusable. It is ordered according to the "formants" as described in the first section, but with the difference that alphabetization has been superimposed. Since the derivational segmentation in many of the examples in the first section—especially in paragraph 1.2.—is faulty (cf. examples given above), it is very difficult to find, in the index, individual words or suffixes, if the reader starts with some foreknowledge about Slovene, and even more so if he knows something about Slovene derivation. It would indeed have been better to list all the words alphabetically. Incidentally, it would have been useful also to identify, in passing, the odd non-Slovene nouns (Pol. *urodzaj, zwyczaj*, Russian *urożaj, svyčaj*) that turn up (p. 81) among the Slovene data and cause confusion, and which Tokarz must have copied from Orzechowska (1966) or Dulewiczowa (1976).

Mistakes—some of them misprints, perhaps—are legion. Here I cite only a few examples: *K.* instead of *F.* Jakopin (p. 8); *grizljaj* (p. 81) for *grizljaj*, spelled correctly on p. 12; *dopoljeval* for *dopolnjeval*, p. 53; *devaluacija* for *devalvacija*, p. 81 (Pol. has *dewaluacja*); *Njum* for *Njun*, p. 42; *se slišalo* for *se je slišalo*, p. 42. The bibliography is particularly hard hit: note *Ljubljana*, twice, and *Savistična revija* once, on p. 98; *Trubarjevi Cerkovni Ordingi* for *Ordningi*, p. 96 (note that this is not just ignorance of German: Pol. too has *ordynek*); the place of publication of the *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego* is given as Warsaw instead of the correct Kraków, p. 96; *Slovo a slovestnost*, for . . . *slovesnost*, pp. 96, 98; *Formativesand* for *Formatives and*, p. 96; *Bedentung* for *Bedeutung*, p. 96—German titles fare exceptionally badly, as does one German author: *Weisberg* for *Weinberg*, p. 99; and on and on.

It is clear that the whole of this book is unreliable: the bibliography merely typifies the mistakes that occur throughout the text. Quite simply, both the author's level of scholarship and his knowledge of the Slovene language are seriously deficient. My remarks must reveal a strong measure of frustration. Tokarz's text is annoyingly superficial, negligent, even perfunctory. The most disturbing aspects of his treatment of *nomina actionis* in contemporary Slovene include: his lack of acquaintance with the recent relevant Slovene literature; the dubious nature of the data; the gross methodological errors in derivational analysis; and the extremely faulty terminology. The misprints, and the factual and linguistic mistakes, are much more frequent and much more serious than one expects from a serious Polish university press. Tokarz's monograph should only be used with the utmost caution.

Hanna Orzechowska, Warsaw.
Translated by Tom Priestly

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bajec, A., 1950. *Besedotvorje slovenskega jezika I*. Ljubljana.
- , R. Kolarič & M. Rupel, 1964. *Slovenska slovnica*. Ljubljana.
- Corder, S. Pit, 1979. *Introducing Linguistics*. London: Penguin Books.
- Dulewiczowa, I. 1976. *Nomina actionis we współczesnym języku rosyjskim*. Wrocław.
- Gołąb, Z., A. Heinz & K. Polański. 1968. *Słownik terminologii językoznawczej*. Warsaw.
- Grzegorzczkowa, R. 1972. *Zarys słowotwórstwa polskiego. Słowotwórstwo opisowe*, Warsaw (5th ed., 1982).
- Orzechowska, H. 1966. *Orzeczeniowe formacje odsłowne w językach południowosłowiańskich*, Wrocław-Warsaw-Kraków.
- , 1974. "Vezava glagolov *vedeti, *znati, *umeti v Dalmatinovi bibliji in današnji slovenščini," *Slavistična revija* 22: 129-49.
- , 1979. *O jeziku Dalmatinove biblije* [= Razprave II razreda SAZU, 10]. Ljubljana.
- Sławski, F., 1974. *Zarys słowotwórstwa prasłowiańskiego. Słownik prasłowiański I* Wrocław, 43-141.
- Vincenot, C., 1975. *Essai de grammaire slovène*. Ljubljana.
- Vidovič-Muha, A. 1984. "Tipološke lastnosti besedotvorne skladnje," *XX Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture. Zbornik predavanj*, Ljubljana, 305-19.

Tatjana Srebot-Rejec, *Word Accent and Vowel Duration in Standard Slovene. An Acoustic and Linguistic Investigation*. München: Verlag Otto Sagner, 1988. [= Slavistische Beiträge, Band 226]. xxi + 286 pp. DM 38.00

The well-known Munich-based monograph series *Slavistische Beiträge*, which covers all areas of Slavic literature, philology and linguistics, in its first 225 volumes included only three works on Slovene. The 226th is welcome, however, not only to help make statistical amends, but in its own right: for this book is likely to be considered a landmark publication in Slovene phonetics and phonology.

The book derives from Srebot-Rejec's doctoral dissertation research for the Universität für Bildungswissenschaften, Klagenfurt/Celovec, work which was carried out under two able linguists, Gerhard Neweklowsky and William Nemser, the former himself the author of a book on Carinthian accentology (Neweklowsky 1973). The Ljubljana-Celovec link, which features the exchange of instructors, joint colloquia and meetings, shared publications, and many other ventures, is thus seen to flourish in one more respect: for although Srebot-Rejec's project was supervised in Celovec, she used informants in Ljubljana and worked there with a sonograph and computers funded by the Pedagoška akademija, and as well was sponsored by the Filozofska fakulteta.

AIMS: Her list of aims (p. 11) takes up the whole page; and it is at once obvious that she set herself an enormous task: (1) to analyze vowel-duration, with respect to (a) its phonological relevance, (b) its relationship to stress, (c) its intrinsic and actual character, (d) the difference between stressed and unstressed vowels, and (e) the role of syllable structure; (2) to measure the intrinsic frequency of stressed vowels; (3) to analyze "accent" in a context-free environment; (4) to contrast the Academy Dictionary prescriptions with the perceptions of Ljubljana informants; (5) to analyze "accent" in context, i.e., in sentences of different kinds, with a more precise measurement of pitch-contours than hitherto, and also with attention to the role of duration; and (6) to study the perception of accents, to find answers to the questions (a) what is a "typical acute" and a "typical circumflex"? (b) which phonetic correlates are perceptually decisive? (c) how do these correlates vary from speaker to speaker, from listener to listener, and in other respects? and (d) why are some "accents" ambiguously perceived?