

nonetheless continues. Her study helps us to understand why this is so, and to appreciate it as a fundamental characteristic of the nation's literary profile.

Henry R. Cooper, Jr., Indiana University

Snoj, Marko. *Slovenski etimološki slovar*. Ljubljana: Mladinska Knjiga, 1997. xxv + 900 pp., 13,850 SIT (= \$82.25) (cloth).

This review shall consider the above new etymological dictionary as it might be used by a Slavic linguist outside Slovenia. Although this would seem to be a bit different than its intended audience, the Western scholar who is interested in Slovene will surely be attracted by this new one-volume work.

In addition to the expected listing of Slovene words and etymologies, the dictionary consists of a fifteen-page introduction, a three-page glossary of terms, a clear illustration of a sample entry, and a comprehensive 180-page Slovene word index, which facilitates the location of Slovene words that are discussed within entries, but do not appear as head words themselves.

Because Slovene also has a more complete etymological dictionary, the Bezlaj work, which is in four volumes, I considered the possible advantages and disadvantages of using the more compact one-volume work by Snoj. Upon reading Snoj's introduction, I saw that the author is very forthright and clear about the pros and cons of his etymological work. He points them out very precisely, so my first conclusion is that Snoj's introduction represents an excellent and objective review and summary of what is actually contained in his work. In the remainder of this review, I shall highlight these points, citing several of those made by Snoj himself and adding a few additional considerations to them.

Snoj's most important comment about his work is that it has only "limited scholarly ambitions" (iii), since these are already served by the Bezlaj dictionary. Most of the other points result from the fact that the Snoj dictionary makes no attempt to be the latest word in the field of

Slovene etymological scholarship. It does not contain as large a database of entries as possible, eliminating the discussion of some rare and archaic words. Yet, because the resulting volume is about as hefty a one-volume as one could conveniently use, one might conclude that its author has attempted to condense the full scholarly database down to the maximum content that could fill a single volume. Therefore, insofar as the reader would prefer to use a single volume, due to considerations of cost and portability, this would be the Slovene etymological dictionary of choice.

Besides the decrease in the database of entries, the smaller size has led to some other consequences. Controversial etymologies present a minimal amount of argumentation and documentation; that is, it is a good place to either obtain basic information or to start looking, but this volume will not give the reader the last word on the subject. The author has the guideline of usually presenting no more than two competing theories, giving three as an absolute maximum. Of course, a true scholarly work of this type would impose no such *a priori* limit.

In spite of its limited size and scholarly ambition, however, the author has provided accentual information for each entry, including indications of rising and falling pitch as well as the open and closed values of *e* and *o*. The only thing a non-Slovene might have desired is an indication of when orthographic *e* has a phonological value of *schwa*, such as in the word *pes*; in such instances, only the orthographic *e* is presented in the dictionary, probably due to the fact that it is intended for native speakers of Slovene rather than foreigners. In fact, the pitch indications may have been included because the pitch opposition is optional for native speakers.

Rather than take the genetic perspective of treating those words that can be traced back to either Proto-Indo-European or Proto-Slavic, this work takes the approach that the reader may want to know the history of any relatively common word that occurs in contemporary Slovene. Therefore, foreign loan words as well as original Slavic words are prominent. For example, such a recent loan as *hipi*, from English *hippie*, is included with an explanation of how the English word arose in the first place. In this sense, the dictionary is not just a condensed version of Bezlaj's scholarly one, but adds a dimension of its own, especially useful for the student of the contemporary language, or

perhaps the less sophisticated user, who is not aware of which words are loans.

Therefore, the dictionary can be recommended to those who would like a compact, one-volume source of Slovene etymologies, which is clearly up-to-date in terms of recent vocabulary and loan words. The scholar who is seeking a comprehensive treatment of Slovene etymologies can use this volume as a first start, before moving on to more specialized works.

Ronald Feldstein, Indiana University

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bezljaj, France. *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika. I. A-J. II. K-O.* Ljubljana: SAZU, Inštitut za slovenski jezik, 1977, 1982.

Bezljaj, France, Marko Snoj, and Metka Furlan. *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika. III. P-S.* Ljubljana: SAZU, Inštitut za slovenski jezik, 1995.

Bernard Nežmah. *Kletvice in psovke.* Ljubljana: Nova revija, 1997. 183 pp., 2990 SIT (= \$17.75) (paper).

This is an entertaining but rather disappointing book; a demonstration of considerable erudition, yet haphazardly put together. The author, a well-known journalist, was trained in several disciplines, including sociology, literature, linguistics, and classical philology, and these several backgrounds are apparent in the book, a reworking of his doctoral dissertation. The study of verbal abuse is a subject that is awkward to treat scientifically for two reasons: first, it is difficult to describe one of its very typical components, namely, obscenities, in non-dysphemistic tones and terms; and, second, the subject requires a good knowledge of several disparate disciplines. It is difficult to fault Nežmah on the first count: the book is easy to read, but does not descend to gratuitous ribaldry. On the second count, he succeeds in general, but there are omissions of information that would complete the picture; although he wrote the book for both the "humanistični izobraženec"