

passage in a Macedonian dialect. This sudden burst of detail seems out of place, particularly since it is not matched by discussions of the status other Slavic-speaking territories outside the political boundaries of the individual nations (Slovenes in Hungary, Austria and Italy; Serbs in Turkey, Romania and Hungary; Croats in Hungary, Austria; Ukrainians in Slovakia, etc.).

Two Slovene maps are given, one detailed, the other simplified. The Slovene dialect map proper (380) is outdated, taken from Ramovš 1931, without any citation there or in the Bibliography. The non-Slovene student would have a headache trying to relate the anglicized place names used in the text (Upper and Lower Carniola, Styria, Carinthia, etc.) to those given in Ramovš's map or Carlton's "Simplified Version" of it (381) (Gorenjsko, Dolenjsko, Štajersko, Koroško, Belokrajinsko [sic]). Rezija is missing entirely from the latter map.

To conclude, Carlton's book is a handy guide to the general outline of the phonological history of the Slavic languages. As such, it is excellent as a refresher course for the scholar who has become a little rusty on the general facts of historical Slavic phonology. Students new to the topic will need to use the book in conjunction with other materials, where the phenomena described in Carlton's book are more fully exemplified. More advanced students will wish to view the details with more than the usual care, since the presentation occasionally misses the mark. Nevertheless, Carlton is to be commended for filling a lacuna in the English-language material on the history of the Slavic languages. Perhaps a second edition, with some of the bugs worked out, will become available to us in the next few years.

Marc Greenberg, University of Kansas

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Greenberg, Marc L. 1987 Prozodične možnosti v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku in slovenskih narečjih. *Slavistična revija* 35(2): 171-186.
- Kondrašov, N. R. 1962 *Slavjanske jazyki* (2nd ed.). Moscow: Prosveščenie.
- Mel'nyčuk, O. S., ed. 1966 *Vstup do porivnjal'no-istoryčnogo vyvčennja slovjan'skyx mov*. Kiev: Naukova dumka.
- Ramovš, Fran 1931 *Dialektološka karta slovenskega jezika*. Ljubljana.
- Shevelov, George Y. 1965 *A Prehistory of Slavic: The Historical Phonology of Common Slavic*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Timberlake, Alan 1983 Compensatory Lengthening in Slavic, 1: Conditions and Dialect Geography. *From Los Angeles to Kiev. Papers on the Occasion of the Ninth International Congress of Slavists, Kiev, Sept. 1983* (ed. by V. Markov and D. S. Worth). Columbus: Slavica. Pp. 207-235.
- Trofymovyč, K. K. 1960 *Praktykum z porivnjal'noji hramatyky slovjan'skyx mov*. Lvov: Vyd. I'vivs'koho universytetu.
- Winter, Werner 1978 The Distribution of short and long vowels in stems of the type Lith. *ésti*: *vèsti*: *mèsti* and OCS *jasti*: *vesti*: *mesti* in Baltic and Slavic languages. *Recent Developments in Historical Phonology* (ed. by J. Fisiak). The Hague: Mouton. Pp. 431-446.

Marija Dejanova, *Podčineni izrečenia sŭs sŭjuz 'da' v sŭvremennia slovenski knižoven ezik (v sravnenie s bŭlgarski)*. Sofia: Bŭlgarskata Akademija na naukite, 1985. 137 pp..

Subordination using the conjunction *da* is an old South Slavic syntactic feature. The book discussed here has only descriptive, synchronic purposes,

and the author does not deal with the historical development of Proto-Slavic **da*, although (see below) she does treat its functional expansion.

The status of *da* has been a controversial question in contemporary South Slavic linguistics. In her work Dejanova considers *da* to be a conjunction in all embedded sentences; this is debatable from the generative point of view. In a study published in 1986 — one year after Dejanova's book — Catherine Rudin argues that *da* is not a complementizer in modern Bulgarian, but is most likely to be an auxiliary. And indeed, Dejanova makes an observation which supports Rudin's claim: "There is a general difference with respect to the position of the conjunction in the two languages [Bulgarian and Slovene]. *Da* is obligatorily preposed to the verb in Bulgarian, and it has consequently lost the role of marker of the beginning of the sentence." (54) This idea did not however become a theoretical basis in the study under review. The author does not use the tests and classifications of generative syntax, but works with more or less traditional functional grammar, according to which subordinate clauses are related to the functions of the words in the main clause. Dejanova does, however, point out some weaknesses of this classification. In order to avoid them, she classifies complex sentences in the following three types: relative, explicative, and adverbial. The first type is not relevant to this study.

The first main chapter of the book (18-55) describes adverbial *da*-clauses. Detailed comparison of these sentences in Slovene and Bulgarian shows similarities in their structure and semantics, but differences in their functions. Corresponding to the ten subtypes of adverbial subclause in Slovene, there are only seven available subtypes in Bulgarian. Time adverbials, manner adverbials, and adverbials of consequence can not be embedded by the conjunction *da* in Bulgarian. Verbs in the Bulgarian subordinate clauses are exclusively indicative, while in Slovene indicative, conditional and imperative verbs occur.

The second main chapter (56-125) deals with explicative *da*-clauses. The grammatical restrictions just described also apply to this type of clause. Dejanova's analysis shows that the Bulgarian conjunction *da* is functionally restricted to modal explicative sentences, while in Slovene it is used with neutral clauses as well.

Considering these facts, Dejanova arrives at an interesting conclusion about the structural development of the two languages. Her comparative study offers evidence that there is no immediate interdependence between the loss of the infinitive and the functional expansion of the conjunction *da*, a phenomenon that was generally believed to hold true in South Slavic language development. In comparison to Bulgarian, the Slovene conjunction *da* has more functions, yet Slovene has never tended to lose the infinitive; and, in comparison to Slovene, the Bulgarian conjunction *da* has fewer functions, although the infinitive is lost.

Analyzing the two language structures has thus shed light on a phenomenon which, in the light of single language-developments, had seemed to be predictable; and this is Dejanova's contribution in the field of

comparative linguistics. Also, the contrastive analysis in her study provides teachers and translators with valuable knowledge about Slovene and Bulgarian syntactic structure.

Mariela Dakova, Sofijski universitet & University of Alberta

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Rudin, Catherine. *Aspects of Bulgarian Syntax: Complementizers and WH-Constructions*. Columbus OH: Slavica, 1986.

Erich Prunč. *Urban Jarnik (1784-1844). Textologische Grundlagen und lexikologische Untersuchung seiner Sprache. Band 1: Kritische Edition der Gedichte und Übersetzungen. Band 2: Wortschatzanalyse. Band 3: Konkordanz der Gedichte und Übersetzungen*. Klagenfurt/Celovec: Hermagoras/Mohorjeva, 1988 (Bänder 1-2), 1987 (Band 3). 352, 272, viii + 630 pp.. ISBN 3-85013-082-7, 3-85013-083-5, 3-85013-079-7.

Erich (Erih) Prunč, born 1941 in Celovec, is one of the leading Carinthian intellectuals of his generation. He has distinguished himself in many areas: as a poet (also under the pseudonym Niko Darle; see Prunč 1965); as a literary historian, with numerous articles on Carinthian Slovene literature; as a linguist, with important studies of linguistic contact phenomena, and with a vital hand in the *Grazer Forschungsprojekt* into Carinthian Slovene lexis; and as an academic, with teaching and administrative positions at the University of Graz and, currently, at the Institut für Übersetzer- und Dolmetscherausbildung in Graz. His study of Urban Jarnik, which was ongoing for more than a decade, combines most of his scholarly interests in one whole.¹ In the preface to Volume 1 (7-8), Prunč explains the impetus of the study: the evidence, from both his own upbringing (in Škocjan/St. Kanzian) and his later dialectological fieldwork, of the longevity of Jarnik's poetry in the folk memory of Carinthian Slovenes. He also sets out his overall aims: to commemorate the bicentenary of Jarnik's birth with a rehabilitation of his place in literary history; to do so by providing textological and diachronic-linguistic foundations for an objective assessment of that place; and, at the same time, to establish a "methodologically more adequate approach"² to the study not only of Jarnik's poetry, but of all pre-modern Slovene literature. Prunč's more specific aims are listed below.

Urban Jarnik can be considered a relatively underrated figure in Slovene literary history; in Kos & Dolinar (1982), for instance, there are at least 100 entries longer than that allotted to Jarnik; and Prunč can cite no more than seven books or articles published in the last 40 years that discuss him.³

¹ Since I received these volumes for reviewing purposes, the review by Pogačnik (1989/90) appeared. As Pogačnik's title shows, he is extremely positive about the work; see also "... Prunč pa za delo . . . celo oceno *magna cum laude*". Among other comments, Pogačnik points out that Prunč's background makes him the ideal person to undertake and complete a study of this kind.

² Here and throughout, my translation from the German, TP.

³ Pogačnik (1989-90: 188) considers, indeed, that Slovene literary history has never found an 'adequate perspective' for the study of Jarnik's poetry.