

(5) The fruit of happy collaboration between one University of Ljubljana professor, Boris Paternu, and two professors from the University of Klagenfurt, Rudolf Neuhäuser and Klaus Detlef Olof, On the Green Roof of the Wind is an anthology of postwar Slovene lyric poetry. The Slovene texts on the even-numbered pages are faced with accurate, inventive German translations on the odd-numbered pages. At the end of the volume are: a bilingual essay by Paternu on the modern Slovene lyric, bilingual biographies of all the poets represented in the volume, and a bibliography of their works and translations into various languages, not only German. The volume, which was handsomely produced in Klagenfurt, promises to be the first of a series of bilingual publications of Slovene literature.

The selection of poets, by Paternu, seems to include the most important names (they total twenty-four). The number of texts per poet ranges from one to half-a-dozen; again the selection seems to have focused on the most outstanding works (though sometimes just an excerpt of these works). Happily those Slovenes living in Austria and Italy were not forgotten; several selections demonstrate clearly that they are an integral part of the central tradition and in no way émigré writers. Finally the essay on contemporary Slovene poetry, also Paternu's, focuses on the history and role of poetry in postwar Slovene society; grouping poets together by generations, Paternu discusses the characteristics of their works with insight and grace. For those who seek a clear, balanced and complete picture of the state of the poetic art in Slovenia, this book will certainly suit them admirably.

Henry R. Cooper, Jr., Indiana University

R. G. A. de Bray, *Guide to the South Slavonic Languages*
 (= *Guide to the Slavonic Languages, Third Edition,*
Revised and Expanded, Part I). Columbus, OH:
 Slavica Publishers, 1980. \$24.95

O. De Bray's Guide is now 29 years old. When I reviewed the second edition (Priestly 1973), I regretfully concluded that "our 'old friend' has now tried to turn over

a new leaf; but he has not succeeded. We must still admit him only by the back door, and ignore him in public." --What, then, of the third edition? If the first (1951) was easy to condemn, and the second (1969) not much better, can we now unabashedly recommend the third as the "standard reference work" that it purports to be (p. 7)?

In this review, I shall, first, survey the individual subsections of the Slovene section (Section 5 of the volume, pp. 309-99); second, recapitulate the disadvantages of the earlier editions, and see if they have been expunged; and finally, provide an answer to the question just posed, with respect to this one-twelfth part of the whole Guide. The question of its representativeness I leave to others.

1.1. I should first refer to the Preface to the Third Edition (10-12) and the Bibliography (25-33; "Slovenian," 31-33). The former lists scholars consulted by de Bray, and consists of an impressive list of East European academics. Unfortunately both Jože Toporišič and Janez Zor have been moved by the author from Ljubljana (where their colleagues Jurančič, Rigler, Bajec, Tomšič and Legiša are still located) to Bratislava. In this Preface, de Bray says that he has "attempted to revise and bring up to date all the chapters that had not been thoroughly revised for the second edition"; since this includes the Slovene section, the author's misplacement of Toporišič and Zor seems to bode ill for the reader. Turning to the Bibliography, however, we are (by and large) reassured. True, Breznik's Slovnica of 1934, and the two Breznik-Ramovš Pravopisi of 1935 and 1937 are surely unnecessary, and one is startled to see Pečnik's Praktisches Lehrbuch (first edition, 1890; sixth edition characterized as "very out of date" by de Bray in 1951). On the other hand, standard works of the seventies--Toporišič, Logar, the SAZU dictionary, etc., are included.

1.2. De Bray's sections on the languages' Phonology were easy to criticize ten years ago: he assumed a knowledge of the IPA, but no grasp of the phoneme; he presented his data in a haphazard and gradual manner; and the many inconsistencies and errors must have been very confusing for the uninitiated. In the third edition, things have improved; but, alas, there are still many faults. The information is still disorganized; and, again, though basically correct in

the main, it must surely confuse. The disorganization comes from the fact that the same (or, too often, slightly dissimilar) information is repeated in three or more places: for vowels, e.g., we have to flip from "The Alphabet" to "Pronunciation: Vowels" to "Pronunciation: Accents" to "Comparison of Slovenian and Serbo-Croatian Accents" to "Slavonic Characteristics Preserved" to "Features Characteristic of Slovene." Cross-references are few, while inconsistencies are not hard to find; and, while de Bray seems to have most of the facts straight, there are indeed errors.

For instance: his explanation of the pronunciations for lj and nj is inconsistent, faulty, and (if one follows Toporišič) oldfashioned. We read that in preconsonantal and word-final positions, lj "can be a clear 'medium' l" (320), and "is pronounced [as] a palatalized l [lj]" (321). Are we to understand that the one is possible, but the other always occurs? As for nj, only the palatalized [nj] is given for these environments (321); there is no mention of a "possible" [n]. As for prevocalic position, respectively [lj] and [nj] (sic) are given (320-321)--is the latter a typo? It is repeated on p. 337! It should be noted that Toporišič, in his "Stilna vrednost glasovnih variant ..." of 1973 (1978:173-178) states that the palatalized pronunciations for these consonants "imata ... narečni prizvok."

Turning to l, we read that it is to be pronounced [ɫ] "finally ... or usually before other consonants" (321). Not only should examples be provided of the unusual occurrences, but--much more important--the word usually should precede finally too: cf. not just š^holski, gas^hilca, but also skál, zoboból, alkohól, all with [l].*

The description of voicing assimilations is inexact: "... final voiced consonants ... become unvoiced ..." (319) Toporišič recommends such a pronunciation in word juncture also when the following word begins with a voiced

*For consistency, I keep throughout to de Bray's system of marking vowel-quality, vowel-quantity and pitch.

consonant or even with a vowel ..." (320). The examples provided, mlād mīc and mlād órel, do not contradict de Bray's statement, but consideration of e.g. mlād brāt, mlād gòst shows that final voiced consonants are not "unvoiced" in word juncture when the next word begins with a voiced obstruent. De Bray's statement, then, should refer to resonants only. As for the word "even" ("with a vowel") this is spurious, since vowels behave--as expected--like resonant consonants in this environment. The reference to Toporišič is unfortunate, since this scholar's first published work (1957-58, see 1978:26) clearly set out the pronunciation of the word dàž in all the relevant environments: [dàš'opêre], [dàš'lfje], [dàž'gré], [dàš'pršf].

Vowels and accentology are dealt with, on the whole, very well. De Bray used Pleteršnik's system in the earlier editions, but has now replaced it with "the modern one used for the tonemic variety of the language in the new Academy dictionary" (318). He explains the relationships between the various conventions succinctly, and his choice of the "Old Norm," showing the pitch distinctions that characterize central dialects, is wise: one can always derive the "New Norm" from the "Old Norm," but not vice versa. I would however have liked to see even greater emphasis on the relative unimportance of these distinctions, especially for the foreign learner.

The pronunciation of "o's" before written v and l, and of "e's" before j, is not dealt with at all successfully. It is clear from Toporišič (1978:118-119, first published 1973) that this is a complex matter, involving long as well as short stressed vowels, and two kinds of neutralization of the open vs. closed distinction in each case. De Bray only mentions short stressed ò and è; he states that they have a closed pronunciation (Toporišič stipulates mid-vowels); and, for o, only mentions the position before final l (Toporišič: any final or preconsonantal v or l = [w]). In the grammar section, therefore, we find e.g. doklèj (368) and jèj (387): the subscript dot being phonemically unnecessary and phonetically incorrect (while precèj (368) and ndv (361) should, for consistency's sake, have had the subscript dot!).

One questionable generalization: "In the masc. sing. Past Participle Active, spelt with final -l, the

diphthongs [eɥ, iɥ, oɥ] can be reduced to [u] in colloquial speech" (326)--since stressed vowels are not excluded, this allows for e.g. both pei and pii to be pu in colloquial speech--at best, uncommon pronunciations.

1.3. Over two-thirds of the whole section on Slovene is devoted to grammar; proportionally speaking, I have fewer criticisms (and this is all to the good, since it is the ease of grammatical look-up that makes de Bray's Guide so useful). Below I list eighteen of the more outstanding infelicities and inaccuracies, in the order they occur.

NOUNS: the treatment of "consonantal-stem nouns" is weak: they hardly deserve a separate classification (except on diachronic grounds, but this is not de Bray's criterion in noun morphology); once mentioned, they are dismissed very cursorily (341). --We do not learn how to decline masculines such as komité, komitéja, taksí, taksíja; the addition of -j- to the stem dož is mentioned, but is it unclear whether or not this extends beyond the genitive (344); and the statement about nouns in -r which add -j- is inexact ("Most polysyllabic nouns in -ar, -ir, -or and -ur insert j before the endings" (344)--this suggests that polysyllabics in -er, and all monosyllabics in -r, never add the j, which is untrue: cf. car, škar, režisér, akušér). Page 344 fails again with reference to the insertion of -ev- "after j" in the Dual and Plural of most monosyllabic nouns,--according to Toporišič (1976:216) no stems ending in "soft" consonants make this insertion. On the next page, the "fill-vowels" are given as schwa "as well as ordinary e"; the latter, unknown in this capacity to this reviewer, should have been exemplified, while a (in dan, Jákac) and o (blagor, Níxon) could have been mentioned. --Various nouns are given as having nom. plurals in -je (on three pages! 340, 344, 346), without a hint concerning the fact that these are alternative endings to the more regular -i (Toporišič 1976:218). --The accentuation of góra-type nouns, and the accentuation and vowel-quality of steža-type nouns (342-343), does not agree with Toporišič (1976:226). --The traditional kind of formulation given to explain which i-stem nouns insert the vowel -i- in instrumentals (Nouns which have the neutral vowel in their final syllable," 340) works well for e.g. mísel, but fails miserably for pluralia tanta, of course: there is no evidence of a schwa in jásli, but its instrumental must be jáslimi not *jáslimi. The only solution

is to refer to the type of consonants involved, cf. Toporišič again. --One of my criticisms of the second edition was that information was repeated too often: an extravagance in so large and costly an undertaking. The same still holds: why, for example, does de Bray explain at least two accentuation rules (paraphrased, "most nouns have no pitch/length variations; learn the exceptions" and "short falling nom. sing. means long vowel in oblique") three times (340; 342-43; 345)? --And, finally: the "consonantal-stems" are presented satisfactorily, but why give only two examples of -t- nouns, only one of -n- nouns, but seven of -s- nouns? Toporišič (1976) has eleven, ten and fourteen, respectively; and a very interesting characteristic of Slovene, the fact that -t- extensions are productive, is left unsaid.

NUMERALS: I have noticed two inadequacies. First, re stô: we read that it is "declined like pêt" (349) and "sometimes declined like pêt" (350)--this apparent inconsistency is resolved (one presumes) by a footnote "The modern tendency is not to decline numerals" (349)--but nowhere do we have an indication as to how it declines. If pêt goes pêtih, pêtim, pêtimi, what can one do with stô? Anxious students will presumably reject *stîh, stîm, stîmi; if they know both synchronic Slovene phonology and one other Slavic language, they may hazard a guess that a fill-vowel is involved, and that schwa is unlikely, hence *sâtih, sâtim, sâtimi. They are unlikely to guess the correct stôtih, stôtim, stôtimi! Second, only the masculine nominative (and not the accusative) of trîje, štîrje are given (349).

PRONOUNS: I have only two small points here. The formulation "óná (dva)" (354) is ambiguous: does this mean "óná or ónádva," or "óná or óná dva"? The former is correct, but the spacing suggests the latter. Also, nîkdo (which Toporišič lists as "archaic or dialectal," 1976:247) is given first as the word for "no one," and the normal nîhče is listed as "an alternative to nîkdo" (357).

ADJECTIVES: This is a very good section: de Bray's presentation is not tied (as is his section on nouns) to the historical framework. He falters just once: in treating the definite vs. indefinite distinction. Not only are the data (typically) scattered (under "Declensions," 360, and under "Accentuation," 362), but we read that máli has "no

indefinite or predicative form" (360), and, immediately following, "The predicative form of máli is mājhen!"

ADVERBS: Some 80 new adverbs have been added to those listed previously. Unfortunately, this has been done in higgledy-piggledy fashion: e.g., dáleč has been added, but not alongside the previously-listed blízu. Also, there are still too many inexplicable gaps: one looks in vain for domā, domóv, notri, ven, góri, dóli, poléti, pozími, and too many negatives are still missing, e.g., nikjêr, nikāmor. Some are misspelled (nêkoč for nekôč, nenehoma for nenêhoma), and some are still listed under numerals (drúgič, mnógokrat, dvākrat) and under adjectives (various renderings of "as soon as possible"). However, some important gaps have been filled (lêtos, zvečêr, lè, mnógo, rávno, kajně, and so on). --Adverbs are categorized as "place, time, manner, degree, causal" and "interrogative"; the last-named category, however, cuts across the others (kjê and kdáj, for example, being interrogative adverbs of place and time respectively), but other cross-categories ("relative," "negative," etc.) are not employed. Slovene adverbs present a welcome opportunity for tabular presentation: one can set out kjê, kjêr, nekjê, nikjêr, drúgjê ..., and in the next row (or column) kām, kāmor, nêkam, nikāmor, drugām ..., and so on. Such tables, which use space efficiently, make items easy to find and learn, and also (which is important) show up gaps in the system (e.g., following the table just suggested, kdáj, kādar, nêkdaj, nikdar/nikôli, but not *drugokdaj, a gap similar to the one in English, which does not have *elsewhen)--such tables are eschewed by de Bray.

CONJUNCTIONS: About 30 new ones are added, including the ubiquitous oziroma: good.

PREPOSITIONS: These are listed according to the case they govern. It is not, however, emphasized that several take more than one case: readers have to tease out this information. Further, while the possible pronunciations of v are given once and then mentioned (when v come up again) in a cross-reference, the alternation s/z/ž is explained twice: under "Gen." and under "Instr." (371-72).

VERBS: I can find little to criticize in this lengthy section (373-92): but listing moods, gerunds, participles and verbal nouns under the heading "Tenses"

(374-76), and then giving the future and pluperfect tenses under "Tense and Mood endings and formation," is confusing; as is the system of numeration used for the verb-categories--when first presented, the five classes are labelled with small Roman numerals (i)-(v); the subdivisions are listed, à la Leskien, under capital Roman (I)-(V); and the examples of conjugations are numbered with Arabic (1)-(5)! Attention to detail, here as in so many places, would have made the "Guide" not just much better, but perhaps immeasurably so.

1.4. WORD ORDER WITH ENCLITICS: This is the only section devoted specially to syntax, as in previous editions. As far as this part of syntax is concerned, the presentation is acceptable, although de Bray omits any statement concerning the fate of the conjunction da and the optative naj, and of sentences with either or both of these at their head. There are, of course, many other interesting points of Slovene syntax other than "word order with enclitics"; some of them are mentioned, but randomly in the various morphology sections; others are omitted. The fact that the instrumental case never occurs without a preposition is to be found under "Nouns," and is (only) implicit under "Prepositions." The idiosyncratic "Orphan Accusative" is mentioned under "Adjectives" (and the whole story is not told: what about its use with neuters, cf. Perlmutter and Orešnik 1973?). The avoidance, or the regular nonoccurrence, of personal pronouns with verbs is at best implicit (re the conditional, 375; word-order in the past, 379; the section on enclitics, 392-95) and is nowhere spelled out, as it clearly should be since so many English-speaking students come to Slovene from Russian. Among the points not mentioned, one can suggest the unusual construction of e.g. pizza za iznésti; or the fact that predicative expressions have the past auxiliary in the neuter not only for the expected "adverbial-looking" lepó, vróče, čúžno, etc., but also for such words as zamán, práv, rës, všëč, dólgčas, mraz and tómã. --If de Bray did not wish to get involved in what might have been an open-ended section entitled "Syntax," he could at least have mentioned major points of interest such as these under his section labelled "Features Characteristic of Slovenian." The only syntactic point in that section is #23, "Freer use of the Infinitive than in Serbocroatian or Bulgarian," which is not very meaningful to a student whose only other Slavic language is the usual Russian.

2. I can now turn to my criticisms of the 1969 edition, and check them against this one.

First, the second edition involved correction of individual pages only: no new pages were set. The results were sometimes sad. In the third edition, the whole text has been newly-typed: mammoth work, with generally excellent results; we can put up with not having justified right margins, and with the occasional poorly-reproduced accent mark (see e.g. 326, foot), since lower costs result.

Second, I bemoaned the number of "mistakes, misprints, ambiguities, archaisms, and inconsistencies." It is no longer true to say that these "abound": and while there are still too many, I do not consider that they detract overmuch from this section's usefulness. (Mistakes, ambiguities and inconsistencies have been exemplified above. Under misprints, I noted ŭćenȋc for ŭćenȋc (336) and letom for létom (347) [and see also under Adverbs above].) As for archaisms, the term guttural has been replaced with velar; vocalic r now reads syllabic r (except on p. 335); but chuintante survives--a very handy word, formerly; now not readily understood.

Third, I was very disappointed with the descriptions of the languages' sound-systems. As explained above, the phonology of Slovene, while handled better, is still weak.

Fourth, the lack of a separate section for morphophonology: the position is unchanged, with the result that a great deal of information is repeated too many times. This, again, I have exemplified.

De Bray's sections on Historical Phonology were found useful but poorly worded: it was not always clear whether a statement was meant to be diachronic or synchronic. Clarity has, unfortunately, not been achieved. We read, e.g., that "The 1st Palatalization is also common in Slovenian, k, g, h changing to č, ž, š before i, e, ə" (331). --This is inaccurate historically, since these changes took place before a set of front vowels which do not correspond to modern i, e and ə in every case; and it is inaccurate as a descriptive statement, since the sequences ki, ke, ko, gi, ge, go, hi, he, ho are freely occurrent. Similarly, we are

given the "Change of d to j before s and š" as a "Feature Characteristic of Slovenian" (337)--diachronically, the s or š had nothing to do with the change; and synchronically, the d/j alternation does not occur before every s or š!

Sixth, the amount of waste space in the second edition was disturbing--wasted through unnecessary repetitions, or wasted through paper being left blank. The latter fault is no longer of concern. The former, however, does still cause worry: careful organization would have saved a few pages, at least; and greater readability would surely have resulted.

Seventh, the waste space could have been put to good use: there were e.g. no maps, no sections on derivation, no discussion of the sources or treatment of loan-words. There are still none of these.

And eighth, in the texts provided, there was too much poetry; and too many texts were not marked for pitch/length/stress. This is still true! Why did not de Bray either persuade an expert in Slovenia to mark his texts, or replace them with ready-marked materials published elsewhere? And why so much poetry? I have no personal objections whatsoever to poetic texts, for their intrinsic merits; and one or two representative poems could not but be included. Poetic language can however not be offered as representative of everyday usage--and the average reader of the Guide will glance at the texts to see what the language normally looks like, not in the hope of cultural enrichment! (Excluding the texts from St. Luke, poetry outnumbered non-poetry in the four modern South Slavic Language sections by a ratio of 2.4 to 1, and in the Slovene section by 4 to 1!)

3. In sum: the section on Slovene in the Guide has, quite definitely, been improved. I do not think that it has been improved enough for a wholehearted recommendation; students must still, I fear, be warned that a small but important number of formulations and items of information are suspect, in some cases wrong; and they must be prepared to find some of the sections confusing, others rather misleading.

This is a great shame. The Guide has three outstanding advantages, which were present in earlier editions

but now deserve all the more to be advertised: once mastered, the layout is beautifully consistent, allowing great ease of look-up for countless facts; the historical and the descriptive are, in general, well-balanced and dove-tailed; and there is a fair balance between grammatical information on the one hand and lexical lists on the other. Were there a comparable book in the field, it is difficult to imagine that it would rival the Guide in these respects; and, of course, no such other book exists.

If, therefore, the sections on the other languages are comparable to the section on Slovene--a matter I must leave to specialists in these fields--the Guide, as a whole, must be assessed as coming extremely close to deserving its position as the "standard reference work" that it proclaims itself to be. Extremely close, but no further than that: my criticisms in section 1 above would surely be extended by a native Slovene specialist.

Our "old friend" has, after twelve more years, succeeded in turning over his new leaf: since he was difficult to replace, this is all to the good. On this evidence, we will still have to make allowances for vestiges of his earlier mistakes, but may now acknowledge him in public.

Tom M. S. Priestly, University of Alberta

Bibliography

- Perlmutter, D. M., and J. Orešnik. 1973. "Language-particular rules and explanation in syntax," 419-459 in A Festschrift for Morris Halle. NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Priestly, T. M. S. 1973. "Revised but not reformed: The new De Bray," Canadian-American Slavic Studies 7, 3:389-96.