

## BOOK REVIEWS

Peter Scherber. *Slovar Prešernovega pesniškega jezika*. Maribor: Obzorja, 1977. xxi + 407 pp.

This slovar is a concordance and frequency list of Prešeren's total poetic output, based on Janko Kos's two-volume edition of his collected works.<sup>†</sup> The work was completed at the University of Göttingen, under Klaus Quassowski. There is a very clear introduction, in both Slovene and German; the concordance takes up 341 pages, and the frequency-list the remainder.

The concordance is largely composed of those Slovene words in Prešeren's poetry that are not proper names; non-Slovene entries (i.e., 13 Latin words) and proper names (i.e., all words printed in the Kos edition with capital letters) are listed separately. For each lemma, or major heading, every form of the word in question is listed, with not only the page-number in the Kos edition, but also the poem-number, verse-number and line-number. In addition, the whole of the line in which the form occurs is cited. Moreover, each separate word in the original is given a separate entry; hence, to take Prešeren's best-known poem as an example, under the lemma upati we find

upal            1 1 1 1    Sem dolgo upal in se bal

and under the separate lemma for the noun up we find, inter alia,

up              1 1 1 4    Nazaj si up in strah želi.

upu             1 1 1 2    slovó sem upu, strahu dal;

Within its self-imposed limits, then, this concordance is not only complete, but is so arranged that the interested scholar can use it to go beyond these same limits. In this reviewer's own case, for example, the lack of grammatical information is a distinct disadvantage; but the layout allows for a simple (though, of course, laborious) run-through for the purpose of noting and calculating relative frequencies of different parts of speech, different case-forms, and so on.

Scherber omits all of the poet's German poetry, and also his translation work. This is done quite deliberately: any attempt at a 'complete' concordance would have brought with it

"veliko število nadaljnjih znanstveno težko rešljivih problemov" (ix): in particular, the problems inherent in the fact that there is no complete historical-critical edition of the non-Slovene poetry. The concordance is thus in this sense a limited one, but complies with the very reasonable requirement that a homogeneous text should form the data-base. A German concordance of Prešeren would in any case have been best printed separately, rather than having Slovene and German lemmas intermingled: the German part (which would be extremely valuable, of course) will, one hopes, be produced eventually.

As indicated above, the various declensional and conjugational forms of each word are entered under the usual 'dictionary look-up form': nominative singulars for nouns, infinitives for verbs, and so on. There appears, however, to be one inconsistency: the medial and reflexive verbs are sometimes entered separately, sometimes entered under their non-reflexive counterparts. Thus we find separate lemmas for držati and držati se, and for hladiti and hladiti si; but whereas napravi si is to be found under napraviti se/si, napravi se is under napraviti.

The problems which arise because of differences between Prešeren's spellings and the modern Standard Slovene orthography, and because of the occasional even wider grammatical discrepancies involved, are quite neatly solved by means of a compromise: in certain often-recurring instances, the lemma entry is modernized, thus besedišče for original besediše, komaj for komej, celó for clo, and so on (in each case, the original form is given in the second column); in others, original and modern are listed as the lemma, thus čreda/čeda, ino/in, mlatev/mlatva. The system followed is clearly described in the introduction.

Homonyms are distinguished only if there are grammatical clues to semantic differences. Thus bili, the past of 'to hit,' is found under biti, bijem; and bili, the past of 'to be,' under biti, sem. On the other hand, klop in its two meanings is not differentiated since both belong to the lemma klop, klopi. This approach has its shortcomings, but any attempt at semantic distinction would have opened the lexicographical floodgates; and in any case, the presence of the line of verse allows for identification of obvious homonyms.

In this way, all 3,161 stanzas of Prešeren's poetry are covered, giving 2,822 distinct lemmas and 16,878 different

word-forms. Within the limitations mentioned, then, the concordance is virtually perfect.

The frequency-list (pp. 345-403) gives each lemma and the number of word-forms occurring therefor. The top of the list is taken up with biti/sem (1,426 word-forms), followed by the expected common pronouns, particles, prepositions and conjunctions. A quick look at the most frequent nouns shows srce with 112, dan (81), Bog (58), čas (57), ljubezen (52), pesem (47), etc.; and, after biti/sem, peti (57), dati (54), vedeti (51), priiti (47), videti (45), imeti (39), etc., for verbs. The high frequency of such "romantic" items as srce, ljubezen, pesem, peti is of course not unexpected, but immediately suggests a thematic comparison with frequency lists of (especially) the German poets contemporary to Prešeren, and of Prešeren's successors in Slovene poetics. Since this type of concordance plus frequency list is popular in German-speaking computational stylistic circles, the first kind of comparative study is presumably already possible; it is to be hoped that the same kind of slovar will be produced for other Slovene poets, and for Slovene prose works.

The book is produced from a computer-operated typewriter, and the type, although small, is easy to read. The 60-odd pages of frequency listing are very rich in blank paper: fitting two or three columns to each page would surely have reduced the book's cost.

*Tom M. S. Priestly, University of Alberta*

---

† France Prešeren, Zbrano delo, ed. J. Kos (Ljubljana: Državna Založba Slovenije, 1965-66).