

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.

Jarnik was born in 1784 in the village of Potok/Bach in the Zilja valley and died 60 years later near Celovec. He worked as a village priest; most of his original poetry, and of his translations of German poetry into Slovene, date to the years 1809-1813. In the 1830s and 1840s he published important works in linguistics and history. The volumes under review present and analyze only his poetic writings.

The three volumes differ physically and by content. Volumes 1 and 2 are the common 6" x 8" size and are printed; Volume 3 is in duplicated format, and is an unwieldy 10" x 8" size: it is indeed awkward to fit the third volume on the normal bookshelf. As to content: Volume 3 derives from a computer printout of alphabetized collocations and word-lists; Volume 2 comprises a linguistic analysis of vocabulary; and Volume 1 is a textological-literary analysis. Volume 3, which was published earlier than Volumes 1-2, comprises the data upon which they are based. As stated above, the trio neatly combine Prunč's linguistic and literary interests; this combination may be unusual, but demonstrates the importance of a multidisciplinary approach in this kind of endeavor.

The first volume, *Critical Edition of the Poems and Translations*, is an important contribution to Slovene literary history for a number of reasons. A brief introduction (9-25) is followed by a critical edition of all 58 of Jarnik's known poems (and poetic fragments) and all 5 of his poetic translations (27-320). A bibliography is followed by a number of indices.

Prunč makes some interesting points in this Introduction. Not least, he points out that hitherto there have been *no* critical editions, in the precise sense of the term, of any of the works of Slovene literature — that is, editions which establish the original text on the basis of all known manuscript variants — in spite of the alphabetical inconstancy of, especially, the 18th and 19th centuries. Kidrič's authoritative edition of Prešeren (1936), for example, imposes a number of 'modernizations' on the orthography. Clearly, no full scholarly understanding of any writer's oeuvre — particularly, poetry — can be achieved unless that oeuvre can be considered in the form in which it was originally written; given, also, as Prunč further emphasizes, that the only 18th century Slovene writer to have been included in the *Zbrana dela slovenskih pesnikov in pisateljev* is Linhart, and that no 19th-century Slovene poet before Prešeren is included in this series, the study of the development of Slovene poetry can apparently only be pursued in a partial vacuum. In this respect, Prunč's critical edition of Jarnik may be considered a methodological milestone.¹ Also included in the Introduction is a survey of previous textual editions of Jarnik and of previous scholarship; a short biography of the poet; a selected bibliography of Jarnik's publications; and, not least, two pages which specify the precise manner in which this critical edition was constructed. The basic algorithm was as follows. Texts extant in the original handwriting present no problem. For texts actually printed during Jarnik's lifetime, the latest such

¹ Tekstološka raziskava Jarnikovega pesništva je torej zares morala začeti od začetka..." Pogačnik 1989-90: 188.

text is chosen. Texts only extant in secondary sources (thus especially those first printed in Janežič 1859) are reconstructed according to explicit procedures.¹ In all instances, every textual variant is listed chronologically. Both bohoričica and metelčica (which latter was used for the printed version of only one of Jarnik's poems) are transliterated into modern orthography according to schemes presented explicitly here; this means that on the one hand the poems are immediately accessible to a modern audience, while on the other the original spelling can be reconstructed unambiguously.

The bulk of this volume, namely the critical edition, first presents the original poems (29-111) and the translations (115-141). Another important feature of this publication comes to the fore in this section: fifteen of Jarnik's poems are published here for first time; in other words, Prunč has added a whole third to the number of poems that were previously known to be written by this poet. The text of each individual original poem is followed by a commentary establishing the selected text (as sketched above) and the chronology of both it and all its variants. At times, this is a painstaking business: the six-stanza poem *Damon Meliti* from 1811, for instance, takes ten pages of argumentation; and the 3-stanza poem *Mir* from 1809 requires no fewer than 37 pages. The commentary on each poem ends with a cross-reference list of the words² occurrent therein that are discussed in Volume 2. It is immediately apparent that a very limited selection of words has been made to this end: at the end of the commentary to *Damon Meliti*, a poem which consists of about 100 actual words, for example, the cross-reference is to just four words: "ali, daleč, ki, podati" (see further below).

Most of the second volume, *Lexical analysis*, is taken up with a 'Lexicographical listing and lexicological analysis of Urban Jarnik's vocabulary,' (26-202). This is preceded by an introduction (5-7), a survey of previous research (9-13), and an explanation of the methodology (14-25); it is followed by some statistical data (203-235), a brief conclusion (236-237), and bibliographies and indices (238-269).

In the introduction to this second volume, Prunč explains where he lays the blame for the unsatisfactory state of previous research into the historical development of the Slovene lexicon: the often subjective viewpoints both of Slovene and non-Slovene researchers, limited as they were by concerns of language planning, by language politics, by ideology, and even by partiality. Under these circumstances, the development of an objective methodology for diachronic lexicology was, he states, all the more urgently required (6-7). Prunč's survey of previous research exemplifies these concerns: for example, Ivan Grafenauer's assessment (1946:325) of Jarnik's language ("Jezik pa je manj zadovoljiv: hoče biti književen, pa je nekaka zmes kranjskega pismenega jezika s pesnikovim ziljskim narečjem,

¹ "Kombinacija [tekstoloških premis] je logična posledica stanja v Jarnikovem opusu, saj bi bilo kakršno koli drugo načelo ... gola spekulacija," Pogačnik 1989-90: 189.

² Here and in what follows, the more precise term "lexeme" is to be understood for every instance of the term "word."

nekoliko preveč pretkan s starimi nemškimi izposojenkami”) was based on a subjective evaluation of some 30% of Jarnik’s total poetic output, and was colored by Grafenauer’s own presuppositions about the nature and function of the literary language (9). Indeed, all previous writers on the subject of Jarnik’s language have used *the contemporary Standard Literary Slovene* [henceforward, *SLS*] as a yardstick; this point of departure can presumably explain the impression that Jarnik’s poetry has on the modern reader, but is far from justified as a method for placing his poetry in its historical context (10). Also discussed in this section, but (unfortunately) without much in the way of critical comment, are studies such as those by Breznik, Orožen and Pogorelec into Jarnik’s influence on the development of the Slovene lexicon in the 19th century. Prunč’s conclusion to this short section is that, although incomplete, the lexicographic tools — dictionaries and so on — that are required for an objective analysis of Jarnik’s vocabulary are indeed to hand.

It is of course essential that the second chapter, in which Prunč sets out his lexicographic aims and methods, be all-inclusive and absolutely clear. It is both. Indeed, Prunč goes to unnecessary lengths (14-16) to explain why he restricts his analysis to the lexicon: how many more volumes would there have been, after all, if he had also analyzed the phonology and the grammar? His aims (16) are, with respect to Jarnik’s poetic lexicon: 1, to assess its place and function in the history of Slovene; 2, to make possible an analysis of its contribution to the development of SLS; 3, to assess the proportion of standard, regional, and idiolectal elements in it; 4, to define the meaning of the non-standard words in it; and thus 5, to assist modern readers in their esthetic reception of Jarnik’s poetry.

To these ends, a careful choice of words for study was vital: it would have been self-defeating to attempt a lexicographical analysis of all 1,916 words that occur in Jarnik’s poetry, at least to the painstaking extent that the 481 items actually chosen for study have been analyzed. To take *Damon Meliti* as an example once more: the words in the first stanza (“Slaba je svitloba lune, / Njo oblaki skrivajo, / Žalostno na citrah strune / V moje srce glas pojo;”) all belong to that unmarked (in Prunč’s term, ‘neutral’) portion of the Slovene (and SLS) lexicon which has not changed over 200 years; they are thus lexicographically quite uninteresting. However, *ali*, *ki* and *podati (se)* — both in Jarnik’s poetry and in Carinthian Slovene in general — possess partly different meanings from what they have in SLS; and *daleč* is semantically very different, in that it means “further” in Carinthian (and in Jarnik), and “far” in SLS; these four words are therefore subject to careful analysis.

Prunč’s algorithm for separating the interesting from the uninteresting lexicon (16-17) I find admirable, as also his methodology for determining the meaning of each word (17-21). His procedure for making what may be called a ‘sociolinguistic classification’ of the words (21-22) may however be open to criticism.

The first-named task — choosing the words for analysis — is based on their occurrence in Pleteršnik (1894), in the *SSKJ* (volumes I-IV only, of course), and in the 1962 *Pravopis*: if Pleteršnik cites them as occurring only after 1800, they are analyzed here; if they have a pre-1800 citation in Pleteršnik they are only included in the analysis if the other sources mark them as non-standard; and if they occur in none of these three sources, they are also included in the analysis. (Prunč does not mention the fate of potential items that do not occur in Pleteršnik but are glossed in, e.g., the *SSKJ*; presumably, there are none such).

The precise meaning of each word in Jarnik's language cannot of course be reconstructed with absolute certainty; but Prunč leaves no stone unturned in his search for information: he refers to 27 dictionaries (from Megiser to the present day), he uses the secondary literature, and of course his knowledge of Carinthian dialect vocabulary is first-rate. Particular attention is of course paid to information from the early 19th century, especially Murko's and Jarnik's own lexicographic works, and Jarnik's other writings (including his correspondence with Kopitar and Primic). All of this information is brought to bear with due regard to the meaning of each word in its poetic context. Incidentally, Prunč demonstrates how diachronic Slovene lexicology can optimally operate, since he uses data from five different chronological periods (20-21): the Protestant era; 1770-1810; 1810-1835 (the Jarnik period); 1835-end of 19th century; and modern SLS.

What I here term 'sociolinguistic classification' involves, first, the specification of various kinds of "regional Standard Slovene" which constitute "relatively independent, elastically-stable (sub)systems" (17) and which are to be contrasted with SLS, and, second, the categorization of individual words as belonging to one or another of these variants; Prunč emphasizes that this is no more than a heuristic method and does not assume the *a priori* existence of any specific "regional standards;" such an existence would require confirmation from analysis at all linguistic levels, and could not be based on lexis alone (18). — Each word is thus labeled (implicitly, see below!) with a sociolinguistic *Qualifikator*, to distinguish the following categories: (0) neutral (i.e., unmarked) in SLS; (1) neutral in Jarnik's time; (2) archaisms in Jarnik's time; neologisms from Jarnik's time but introduced by other writers which (3) became part of SLS and (4) did not enter SLS; Carinthianisms which did not enter SLS, subdivided into (5) those belonging to the 'Carinthian regional standard' and (6) 'Carinthian dialectisms;' (7) Carinthianisms which Jarnik introduced into SLS; Jarnik's own neologisms, subdivided into (8) those which entered SLS, and those which did not become part of SLS, with the latter group further sub-divided into (9) those used by non-Carinthian authors and (10) those which were used only by Carinthian authors; and, finally, (11) Jarnik's idiolectisms. A twelve-way classification of this nature was certainly thorough, and probably too ambitious; this reviewer is unqualified to check, in the 177 pages of (very clearly laid-out) lexical materials, whether the aim was indeed immodest. From a methodological standpoint, at least, ambitiousness

cannot be faulted. Readers for whom this classification is of interest should however be warned that the twelve 'Qualifikatore' are not cited under each lemma in the lexical listing, and that there is no easy method of looking up which word belongs under which label. True, in section 4.2. (205-232), "The diachronic-linguistic and regional provenance of the vocabulary," these lists are provided; but they are difficult to find — of the 13 words in group (4), for instance, five are mentioned in a paragraph on p. 215, and the remainder three paragraphs later on p. 216.

I have a potentially serious reservation to make at this juncture. First, Prunč's procedure for distinguishing between these different 'sociolinguistic category' labels is not as clearly described as the rest of his methodology; and, second, the procedure which he does follow strikes me as too arbitrary. Let us take, as an example, the two categories (5) 'Carinthian regional standard' items and (6) 'Carinthian dialectisms.' To begin with, in order to accept that this distinction is a valid one, we have to accept the possibility that 'relatively independent ... regional subsystems [and specifically a relatively independent Carinthian subsystem] of the Common Slovene Standard' obtained in the early 19th century, or at least that this hypothesis is a useful heuristic device; the former possibility is somewhat dubious, but the latter is acceptable. Next: given the existence of two lexical extremes of 'Standard Carinthian' and 'Localized Dialect Carinthian,' we should surely insist that individual words are categorized as one or the other according to some useful criteria; but the methods are, in my opinion, unsatisfactory. As already mentioned, first, Prunč's explanation (217-218) is somewhat unclear: "As a criterion for delimiting [the Carinthian regional standard] from the Common Slovene Standard on the one hand and [Carinthian] dialectisms on the other hand use was made of (exclusive) verifiability in printed, functionally standard-language texts and lexicographic sources from the Carinthian Slovene language area. Where glosses from lexicographic sources were concerned, in addition, consideration was taken of every [lexicographic] qualifier and also the relative degree of standardization and abstractness in comparison with sociolinguistically and diachronic-linguistically easily comprehensible synonyms." Much more important, second, the arbitrary nature of his procedure can be illustrated as follows. We find that *naviš* 'upwards' and *naštimate* 'to arrange' are categorized, respectively, as a 'dialectism' (218) and as a 'regional standard' word (221). Under the two relevant lemmas in the 'Vocabulary Analysis' we read that *naviš* (108) and *naštimate* (107) are both common in the Carinthian Slovene dialects; but that, whereas the latter does not figure in any dictionary, the former does occur in Pleteršnik. The only difference, then, between a Carinthian 'dialectism' and a Carinthian 'standard' word is that Pleteršnik glosses the latter; but yet, the *only* citation given by Pleteršnik is to the phrase "na viš se vzdigovati" cited in Jarnik's botanical publication *Sadjereja* of 1817. The two glosses of *naviš* in Jarnik's poetry (as we can easily find in Book 3) are from his poem *Ostrvica nepremagana*, written in 1824 but not published until 1971; the sentence being "Na viš! na viš se vzdignüte!"

and the only occurrence of *naštimate* in Jarnik's poetry is in the sentence "Tam po skednjah pokotanje / Sliši se naštimano" in the poem *Jesen*, published in *Carinthia* in 1812. — Thus, the only criterion for pigeon-holing these two words differently, is the fact that Pleteršnik had found one, but not the other, in his reading of Jarnik. I would suggest, first, that the three-generation gap between Jarnik and Pleteršnik makes the determination of any synchronic 'Standard' insecure; second, that it is — as far as the 'standardization' of Carinthian Slovene is concerned — beside the point, indeed misleading, that Pleteršnik relied on Jarnik's prose but not on Jarnik's poetry, thus including one word and excluding another; and third, that Pleteršnik's sole reliance on Jarnik in this instance results in circular, and hence dubious, argumentation. — This extended example is presented to suggest that, indeed, Prunč may have been too ambitious in aiming at a classification into 12 different 'layers' in Jarnik's lexicon.

This fourth section in book 2 is, nevertheless, in many respects the most interesting in all three volumes; for Prunč contrasts and discusses the different lexical layers in Jarnik's poetic language in great detail; even if some of the items may be arbitrarily categorized, the overall discussion is fascinating. Two summary tables are of interest: they show the relative proportions of different words [i.e., types] (Table 2, 206) and of the actual total words [i.e., tokens] (Table 3, 207) in the corpus, according to which 'sociolinguistic category' they have been assigned to. It is thus easy to see, for example, how many Carinthianisms appear in these poems (categories 5, 6 and 7: a total of 5.38% of the words, and of 2.14% of the actual words); part of Grafenauer's criticism, cited above, can now be re-evaluated. Another valuable datum: an approximate 20% of the total words do not occur in normal SLS (note however, that many of them appear seldom in the corpus: only 10% of the actual words in Jarnik's poems are non-SLS); i.e., the modern reader might at first glance be expected to not understand 1/10 of the total text, and 1/5 of the vocabulary used. However, as Prunč emphasizes (210), many readers are otherwise acquainted with 'archaic' lexis, and in any case many meanings can be derived from the context. The function of the different lexical layers, both as seen by contemporary readers and as must have obtained in Jarnik's own time, are exhaustively discussed in these pages. Of particular interest is the discussion (224-232) of Jarnik's neologisms (categories 8, 9, 10) and of his idiolectisms (category 11), i.e., words that have only ever appeared in Jarnik's writing. Of Jarnik's neologisms, 23 still obtain in SLS; 13 were used in the 'Common Slovene Standard' of the 19th century; and another 3 were used in the 'Carinthian regional Standard' (cf. above). One incidental conclusion (228) is that "the Carinthian regional Standard in the second quarter of the 19th century comprised a linguistic variety that was (at least lexically) unproductive, and that at this period the centripetal forces had begun to dominate." Most surprising, perhaps, no fewer than 89 different words — over 4% of Jarnik's total — are only found in his poetry (and in Jarnik 1832). Prunč explains why these items were 'unproductive:' some, again, were sociolinguistically

unattractive, others were derivationally unusual, and so on. The unattractiveness of some of these Carinthian neologisms is not, according to Prunč, contradicted by the contemporary importance of Carinthian authors and publicists such as Majar-Ziljski, Janežič and Einspieler or the significance of the foundation of the Društvo sv. Mohorja in 1852; for these writers and activities were Carniolan-oriented, i.e., 'centripetal.'

In the face of such a wealth both of material and of analysis, it may be unjust to complain about what is lacking; however, given Grafenauer's characterization of Jarnik's language as "... nekoliko preveč pretkan s starimi nemškimi izposojenkami," I miss a discussion of this aspect. At least six of the 'sociolinguistically categorized' groups of words include loans from German (viz., groups 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 and 11: examples, respectively, *doktar*, *kunšten*, *gmajna*, *naštirati*, *žalik* (*žena*), *žvepen*); there does however not appear to be any preponderance of loans from German, be these old or new.

Preceding section 4.2. is one short but fascinating section (203-204) in which Prunč points out that, in comparison with seven other Slovene authors (including Prešeren and Levstik), Jarnik uses the most highly differentiated vocabulary: the mean lexical frequency in Prešeren, for example, is 5.98, while in Jarnik it is 3.43 (in other words: in any given text, the same word will recur on average nearly 6 times in Prešeren, and only three and a half times in Jarnik). The lexical corpora for these analyses are not of the same length, but even so the data are striking.

Not of least importance, in this fourth chapter, is the concluding section 4.3., in which Prunč reflects on the different stylistic functions of synonyms in Jarnik's work; his conclusion being that Jarnik did not use too many dialect words, but that — on the contrary — he was too lacking in self-confidence to rely on Carinthianisms, and oriented himself much more towards a Carniolan "Common Slovene." (235)

Any writer using Slovene in Jarnik's time had immense linguistic problems to wrestle with: as Prunč expresses it in his "Summary of results," (236-237), the context was a "coexistence of historical-linguistic and geographic-linguistic heterogeneous elements," and the potential contradictions were many. Prunč succeeds in showing how Jarnik was able to integrate the various lexical strands in his work. Not only is the proportion of Carinthianisms less than believed according to the previous consensus; but also Jarnik was already, in the 1810s and 1820s, following a policy of what might be called the 'Carniolization' of the literary language. In addition, Prunč concludes that Jarnik, being a "successful creator of numerous neologisms and mediator of intra-Slavic borrowings," made a creative and lexicographic contribution to SLS which has hitherto been imperfectly studied and much underrated. (237)

The bulk of the third volume, *Concordance of the Poems and Translations*, comprises a printout (1-438) showing every occurrence of every word in Jarnik's poetry. The words are printed in the center of each page, and the contexts likewise printed so that each word is centered and is

preceded and followed by a string of over 30 characters long. The contexts are thus immediately available for study. It is followed by five indices: an alphabetical list of words in the concordance (439-463), a frequency list (464-504), a reverse-alphabetical list of the words (505-544), and two alphabetically-ordered word-lists showing the frequency of each word, one with capitalized words listed separately (545-589), the other with capitalizations neutralized (591-630). More could not be asked.

It should be clear that my criticisms of Prunč's three-volume work are very minor and that my admiration for it is very great. Returning to his aims, as set out earlier in this review, it should also be clear that he has fulfilled them all; and not just adequately, but brilliantly.¹

Tom Priestly, University of Alberta.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Grafenauer, Ivan. "Slovensko slovstvo na Koroškem, živ člen vseslovenskega slovstva," 284-344 in Bogo Grafenauer, Lojze Ude & Maks Veselko, eds., *Koroški zbornik*. Ljubljana: Državna založba, 1946.
- Janežič, A. "Urban Jarnik," 112-115 in Etbin H. Costa, ed., *Vodnikov spomenik. Spisi od 86 pisateljev in štirimi na kamen tiskanimi dokladami. Vodnik-Album. Mit Beiträgen von 86 Verfassern und vier lithographirten Beilagen*. Ljubljana: Kleinmayr & Bamberg, 1859.
- Jarnik, Urban. *Versuch eines Etymologikons der Slowenischen Mundart in Inner-Oesterreich. Nach verlässlichen Quellen bearbeitet*. Klagenfurt: Kleinmayr, 1832.
- Kidrič, France. *Prešeren. I. Pesnitve, pisma*. Ljubljana, 1936.
- Kos, Janko & Ksenija Dolinar, eds. *Slovenska književnost (Leksikon Cankarjeve založbe)*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 1982.
- Pleteršnik, Maks. *Slovensko-nemški slovar. Prvi del: A-O. Drugi del: P-Ž*. Ljubljana: Knezoškofijstvo.
- Pogačnik, Jože. "Strokovno vzorno slavistično delo," *Jezik in slovstvo* 35 (1989/90) 7-8: 188-190.
- Pravopis* = Slovenski pravopis. Ljubljana: SAZU, 1962.
- Prunč, Erich. *Tihožitja*. Klagenfurt/Celovec: Hermagoras/Mohorjeva, 1965.
- SSKJ* = Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika. I - IV. Ljubljana: Državna založba, 1970, 1975, 1979, 1985.

¹ Pogačnik's conclusion (1989-90: 190) is that Prunč's most important contributions are (1) opening up so much material from the Slovene Pre-Romantic period, (2) producing work that is methodologically exemplary, and (3) establishing the importance of Urban Jarnik as a poet.