

REPORTS AND BOOK REVIEWS

DISCOURSE – INTELLECTUALS – SOCIAL COMMUNICATION

The issue of intellectuals, their social position and their role, their potentials and opportunities, their troubles and challenges in the contemporary world is highly relevant and up-to-date and in combination with such topics as discourse and social communication it could provide a very attractive opportunity for inspection from various standpoints: philosophical, psychological, sociological or whatever. Actually, these are three independent topics, which are, however, linked together this way or another.

The issue of intellectuals raises a whole range of questions, such as: do intellectuals have a business of their own? If so, what is this business like? How do contemporary changes and even crises affect the position and the role of intellectuals? What are the reasons to change or to sustain the traditional concept of the intellectual stemming from the Enlightenment or even from the Greeks? What expectations does society have towards intellectuals and which of them can be fulfilled? Should intellectuals rule and lead or rather serve and give advice? Should they enter the world of politics and if so, should they do it on the global or on the local level? How do intellectuals communicate among themselves and with all others? What are the basic prerequisites for the work of intellectuals and what should the institutions they desire to work for be like?

These and other questions were the focus of attention of the Conference DISCOURSE — INTELLECTUALS — SOCIAL COMMUNICATION (with English as the conference language) which took place on July 9–11, 1996 in Bratislava, Slovakia under the auspices of the *President of the Slovak republic, Michal Kováč*, with the participation of the *Chairman of the Slovak Academy of Sciences Štefan Luby* and other leading representatives of the Slovak Academy of Sciences and increased attention from the mass media. The Conference was organized by the Department of Social and Biological Communication of the Slovak Academy of Sciences (SAV) in cooperation with the Slovak Philosophical Association and the Slovak Psychological Society. Almost 50 contributions were presented, more than a half of them by participants from abroad (USA, Great Britain, Australia, India, Malaysia, Poland, Czechia).

The prominent guest was **Richard Rorty** (USA), one of the world-famous contemporary philosophers. In his contribution he gave a concise picture of the contemporary American leftist intellectual scene together with an outline of the socio-economic problems of the poor in the USA. According to Rorty, the Platonic dilemma whether philosophers should return to the cave, whether they should take part in public life, or whether they should commit themselves to contemplation or to practical activities, is today obsolete since the Platonic understanding of knowledge as an attempt to get in touch with something eternal is obsolete. Nowadays it is replaced by Bacon and Dewey's understanding of knowledge as part of the solving of the problems of the day. Therefore, there is nothing general and philosophical to say about the relations between intellectuals and politics and only the situation of particular intellectuals in particular historical situations should be dealt with. Rorty defines a leftist intellectual as anybody who reads quite a lot of books and who thinks that there is a lot of unnecessary human suffering which can be relieved through political means. Some academic disciplines (law, history, economics) can be relevant to political practice whereas there is not much relevance in other disciplines (e.g. microbiology, chemistry or philosophy). Rorty sees the problem of the poor or the fact that the poor are getting poorer and the rich are getting richer as the principal socio-political problem of the contemporary USA. He says that nobody, not even the leftist intellectuals has offered any solution. Invited lectures were delivered by **Robert C. Solomon** (USA) who spoke about the university and the future of philosophy and **Antony Flew** (Great Britain) who focused on academic freedoms, objectives, and duties. Philosophy is, according to Solomon, the core of education which should convey wisdom and shape the students' feelings, not only transform information or knowledge. Both university and philosophy should teach not only how to think but also how to live – they will soon have to work towards this mission again, if they want to have any future. This is because the market mentality is very aggressive and attacks even the university milieu: ideas, teachers, and students are for sale and efforts to

change the former “ivory towers” into “money machines” predominate. The author criticizes social risks following from it, especially the fact that a university is neither a corporation nor a trade school. He resolutely encourages a return to the original mission of the university, namely education, life-long not just for short-term purposes of the profession. The conflict between the long-term and short-term education, between (seemingly meaningless) education for life on the one hand and the (meaningful) education for job on the other is, however, a manifestation of a more serious disturbance of values and concepts, philosophy itself, which is the cornerstone of culture. The primary idea of A. Flew’s contribution was that if there is anything special about academic freedom, it should be based on the distinctiveness of academic activities, and if there are any moral claims to this freedom, it has to correspond to academic duties. The aim of the academic is, in his opinion, knowledge (truth) and each freedom of investigation, thought or expression has to be based on critical (and self-critical) rationality, on the proofs and competence of the academic. The academic, who does not follow this, who asserts only his/her opinion, or disparages the opinion of the other, disqualifies his/her moral rights to academic freedom.

The native invited lecturer **Štefan Markuš** delivered the lecture entitled “Contemporary values versus scientific research”. He pointed to the contemporary tension between the values of the politicians and the values of the scientists in our country. He sees the way out of all the risks and threats in the return to traditional values, whose foundations were laid by Saints Cyril and Methodius. In the interest of this, Slovak intellectuals will have to fight another spiritual battle.

Discussions held in parallel sections were crucial for the success of the Conference. Ten to fifteen valuable contributions were heard in each of them. Participants of the first section (*Discourse: Thinking and theory*) concentrated on contemporary currents of thought in the intellectual area, the second one (*Intellectuals: Academy and Education*) focused on internal institutional problems and processes of the conveyance of intellectual heritage and the third (*Social Communication: Culture and Society*) on the ways of communication between intellectuals and the wider community and their share in culture creation. **Ján Horecký** (Slovak Republic) spoke about the effectiveness of discourse, **Miroslav Popper** (SR) about universality and particularity in discourse, **Simon Locke** (Great Britain) about the character of scientific and common discourse, **Jarmila Chovancová** (SR) about linguistic games in postmodern philosophy, and **Antonia Soulez** (France) about the relations of language, philosophy and society. The concept of transdisciplinarity was the topic of the contributions by **Malcolm Quinn** and **Steven D. Brown** (both Great Britain). **Wendy Staiton Rogers** and **Rex Staiton Rogers** (Great Britain) together with **Gabriel Bianchi** (SR) dealt with diagnosis of the contemporary diseases of academies and the dynamics of their transformations. The key role of the academic, the tasks of social philosophers and the search for new jobs in the contemporary rapidly changing world were mainly discussed by the Australian participants: **Ian Lowe**, **Greg Heath** and **Michael (Booth) Eveline**. **Jozef Piaček** (SR) focused on the role of intellectuals in creating cultural dialogue. Several contributions were devoted to paradigmatic changes in contemporary psychological theory and practice (**David J. Nightingale** and **Garth Rennie** from Great Britain, **Mária Bratská** from the SR, and **Lubomír Kostron** from the Czech Republic) and to experiences from communication in the process of education (**Kamaruddin bin Yaakub**, Malaysia). Some contributions analysed various aspects of particular social situation of intellectuals or tried to reflect it theoretically (**Tatiana Sedová**, **Juraj Podoba**, **Jana Plichtová**, **Elena Brozmanová** from the SR and **Albert Bopegamage** from India). **Marina Čarnogurská** (SR) spoke about the need for the global synthesis of the intellectual heritage of different civilizations and the possibility of a synergistic effect. She says that while all the substantial mysteries of nature have already been uncovered by man, in the spiritual and social domains of human life, humans are still paralysed by various ideologies which endanger their survival and their future and, while in the domain of the knowledge of nature people (scientists) are able to agree, in their personal lives they are able to act in contradiction with their scientific conviction. There are still various dogmas, traditions and religious intolerance in the opinions of the arrangement of human life – those who are not fit for the “Procrustean bed” established by one ideology or another, are pursued. The final consequence might be the extermination of all life, whose fascinating creation was at the beginning of human existence. The topic concerned with intellectuals and social communication is therefore, according to the authoress, very significant today.

The strife between modern and postmodern was a subtext of several contributions (**John Kaye**, Australia). According to **Rachel Russell** (Scotland), new current conditions do not allow intellectuals to play their roles without expressing their ethical attitude; postmodern intellectuals have to not only tolerate and respect but also support and strengthen the otherness of people. According to **Richard M. Clewett** (USA) an increasing tension has occurred in the consciousness of contemporary intellectuals (at least in the USA) between the concept of the academic professional and the concept of the intellec-

tual; this means pointing out that the academic professional actually ceases to be an intellectual, i.e. a moral authority expressing his/her opinion on “broad questions”, and is merely interested in his/her narrow professionalism. **Václav Černík** and **Jozef Viceník** (SR) agree with Lyotard’s opinion that there is no necessity of telling grand emancipatory stories “which should be implemented”, but they disagree with the idea that the cause of the global crisis is metaphysics; they say that it is rather the socio-economic character of contemporary society, which leads to the “irrational use of reason” and thus also to the ideas of meta-narratives; according to them, tendencies towards the future can be understood through analysis and the authors identify some of them. The crucial philosophical prerequisite is, however, the defeat of the traditional understanding of the relation between identity and difference, unity and diversity. According to **František Novosád** and **Emma Nežinská** (SR) modern culture is the regimentation of the spontaneous based on rationalization, discipline, regulation, gradation of the consciousness of reflexivity; modern reason observes the principle “Divide et impera”; the culture of principles is the culture of homogenization, standardization and unification; but in the world, where particularity reached legitimacy, it will be skills that will play a leading role – skills as capabilities to apply situational, contextual, local (sometimes even primitive) knowledge and experiences or the knowledge inseparable from the particular situation of the particular agent of action.

Finally, part of the contributions reflected the situation of an intellectual-philosopher today. **Egon Gál** (SR) spoke about the problem of the relations between the identity and otherness as applied to the politics of democracy and **Lubomír Zaorálek** (CR) about the issue of the consciousness of the intellectual. **Marek Kwiek** (Poland) concentrated on the issue of freedom and accountability of the philosopher in postmodern era; according to him, the traditional Platonic philosopher wanted to show the way to others, to give them advice on what to do, since philosophy itself secured him (as it was believed) the deepest knowledge and wisdom – he was an authority because philosophy itself was authority; he had, in a sense, a privileged place in culture. Such a type of philosopher-intellectual will probably disappear together with modernity. But the question what type of intellectual is being shaped instead, or what type is the “postmodern intellectual” has by far not been elucidated, one can even ask whether the term “postmodern intellectual” is not an inner contradiction. There is, however, a special problem concerning the role of intellectuals in contemporary Central Europe during its massive transformation; there is even a possibility that the situation in Central Europe is so different from that in the West and in the USA that the accountability of intellectuals/philosophers might still be very significant and valuable for managing social transformation precisely here. The contribution of **Emil Višňovský** dealt with the search for the identity, place, and authentic role of intellectuals in the contemporary world; according to him, one of the traditional expectations towards intellectuals (not only) here and now is that they will provide and communicate a (more or less) clear understanding of their era. The author defined intellectuals as persons with strong inner intellectual needs (passions) who cannot live without devoting themselves to certain intellectual activities like reading, writing, researching and “discoursing”. Intellectuals are feeling and thinking creatures able to reflect their experiences, activities, states (positions); and in that sense each of us is an intellectual to some extent. What has always been changing, however, is the social context of the intellectual work: and a question concerning its social value started to be posed at least during modernity. The author differentiates between the professional (academic, cultural) and social (civic, political) roles and responsibilities of the intellectual.

The Conference DISCOURSE — INTELLECTUALS — SOCIAL COMMUNICATION raised a number of pressing, in our country so far little discussed questions, bringing many new stimuli and inspirations to the given topics, rich and open inter-cultural exchange of experiences. The participants agreed that it was a useful event and agreed on the necessity of similar events in the near future, as well as on the fact that it was not only a social event but also an intellectual asset. One of the possible conclusions can be: the primary role of intellectuals in society is the cultural, educational and ethical role (which does not eliminate the economic and political role); therefore, a society whose concern is the development of its culture, education and morals, should naturally also be concerned with the possibilities of the development of its intellectual potential. A society (and politics) that does not care about all this, does not care about its intellectuals either. Although, paradoxically enough, it is again the role of intellectuals to look for their audience, their routes towards society and ways of becoming aware of this and especially how to find effective steps towards their support.

Conference materials and conclusions will be published in the Proceedings by the Publishing House of the Slovak Academy of Sciences VEDA.

Emil Višňovský

Department of Social and Biological Communication,
Slovak Academy of Sciences, Dúbravská cesta 9, 842 06 Bratislava, Slovakia

LEXICON GRAMMATICORUM. Who is Who in the History of World Linguistics.
Ed. by H. Stammerjohann. Tübingen, Max Niemayer Verlag 1996. XXVII + 1047
pp.

The German linguist Harr Stammerjohann is primarily known in our country as the editor of the remarkable handbook *Handbuch der Linguistik* (Hamburg 1974 – cf. our review in *Jazykovědné aktuality* 13, 1976, pp. 39–40); but recently another comprehensive compendium has appeared under his direction this time devoted to personalities from world linguistics. This extensive encyclopedic work *Who is who in the History of World Linguistics* deserves our attention as well because of its uniqueness not only in its arrangement but also the breadth of coverage.

The obvious goal of the editors of *Lexicon Grammaticorum* was to provide an overview of world linguistic thought from its beginning until today by presenting the most outstanding representatives of linguistics of all times with the exception of living authors. We are thus facing an attempt to gather encyclopedic data on world-renowned linguists whose work has been closed already but who still have an impact on current activities in linguistic sciences.

As we learn from a short introduction, the original ambition of the authors was to provide this magnificent international project with one thousand large two-column pages with space for entries on 1,000 personalities. One entry was thus reckoned with for one page of the encyclopedia on the average. But as things usually go in such case, some authors did not strictly keep within the limits prescribed and often prepared entries much longer than expected; they even proposed new entries. The number of entries increased so that the text of the encyclopedia expanded by an additional 50%. The compilers had to face the task of gaining enough space in the book and maintain the number of pages fixed for publisher's reasons. The decision to preserve the whole text was correct since, as we see after looking through the text, we hardly find an entry which could easily be given up. This certainly compensates for a sort of discomfort when reading the encyclopedia mainly caused by the use of numerous abbreviations.

In the preparatory phases of the encyclopedia the linguistic world was divided according to the areas and partly also periods into 19 sections with one chief coordinator, each of whom was given approximately the same space. Since this division has its indispensable impact on biographical and bibliographic approach as well as on the "sound" of the encyclopedia, particular data concerning the division might be interesting. The following authors became coordinators: 1. S. Aurox (Paris), who was responsible for the francophone countries, 2. T. De Mauro and D. Di Cesare coordinated the entries on ancient Greece, Rome, and Italy, 3. E. P. Hamp (Chicago) was responsible for Northern America, 4. C. Harbsmeier (Bergen) for China, 5. C. C. Henriksen (Copenhagen) for Scandinavia, 6. M. Kontra (Budapest) for Hungary, 7. A. M. Lewicki (Lublin) for the Slavic countries, 8. B. Lewin (Bochum) for Japan, 9. J. Mindak (Warsaw) the southern Slavic countries, 10. J. Noordegraaf (Amsterdam) the Dutch speaking countries, 11. G.-J. Pinault (Paris) for India, 12. I. Rosier (Paris) the Middle Ages, 13. A. Sabaliauskas (Vilnius) for the Baltic states, 14. P. Salmon (Oxford) for Britain and Ireland, 15. R. Sarmiento (Madrid) for Spanish and Portuguese speaking countries, 16. W. Sasse (Hamburg) for Korea, 17. S. Stati (Bologna) for Rumania, 18. K. Versteegh (Nijmegen) for the Arabian-speaking world, and 19. D. Cherubim (Göttingen) for German speaking countries.

The compendium was created with the international cooperation of more than 400 authors. To mention just some of them – G. Altmann, the author of the entry about K. Zipf and L. Đurovič, who prepared the entries on A. V. Isachenko and P. Doležal. All the other Slovak (and Czech) entries were prepared by Anna J. Bluszc (Lublin) and only exceptionally in tandem with the coordinator of the Slavic section Andrzej Lewicki. The peculiarity of this encyclopedic handbook is that no nationality is given next to individual personalities. The editors probably understand the authors as a community of world linguists where the countries they come from are irrelevant. But in most cases (if not in all) the nationality of the author is identifiable from the places of birth or death or the author's works. The following Slovak linguists were included in the encyclopedia: *Vavrinec Benedikt* (1555–1614), *Pavol Doležal* (1700–1778), *Anton Bernolák* (1762–1813), *Ludovít Štúr* (1815–1856), *Martin Hattala* (1821–1903), *Ján Stanislav* (1904–1977), and *Eugen Pauliny* (1912–1983). I think we have the right to mention in this connection *Wolfgang von Kempelen* (1734–1804), born in Bratislava, and the founder of the Russian school *Alexander V. Isachenko* (1910–1978), who are also referred to here. The introduction of most of the Slovak linguists from the northern ("Polish") perspective of A. J. Bluszc is

fairly balanced. The entry on Vavrinec Benedict recalls not only his Czech grammar but also his activities in the field of poetry, mathematics and music. The entry on Ludovít Štúr ends with the sentence: *In Slovakia, he is considered to be one of the greatest linguists*. But it was L. Novák who pointed out that it is valid within broader (not only “Slovak”) connections and contexts. The denotation of Martin Hattala as a codifier of the grammatical system of the Slovak language of L. Štúr is little imprecise: modifier would be a better definition. However, the entry describing Eugen Pauliny cannot be left without comments. If A. J. Bluszcz introduces him merely as a phonologist and language historian, his picture is rather flattened. This prominent Slovak linguist was founder of many other currents in several fields of the linguistic research in Slovakia. His work *Štruktúra slovenského slovesa* (The structure of the Slovak verb) published in 1943 actually anticipated the development of world linguistics in the area of semantic syntax and inspired the Czech syntactic thought.

It is a shame that some other Slovak linguists have not been included in this compendium, like Samo Czambel (1856–1909), who is well known for his significant contribution to the completion of the modern form of Slovak and is also the author of the popular theory about Yugoslavisms in central Slovak, Henrich Bartek (1907–1986), another significant codifier of the Slovak language, or Jozef Ružička (1916–1989), and some others. We should not be immodest, however. We should be happy that it was not like with the *English Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Birmingham 1994 in ten volumes, where there is no Slovak linguistic name; neither the fact that the it was indeed a gigantic encyclopedia did help us. The absence of at least two names in the compendium is absolutely inexcusable, namely *Pavol Jozef Šafárik* (1795–1861) and *Ludovít Novák* (1908–1992). The absence of the entry on P. J. Šafárik, although he is mentioned twice in the entry on M. Hattala, can only be explained either by inattention or by accidental omission. It is difficult to imagine that it would be necessary to give a special explanation that this linguist, ethnographer, historian, and writer belongs to such an encyclopedia by recalling his participation in solving theoretical questions of quantitative prosody or his pioneering Slavic works like *Geschichte der slawischen Sprache und Literatur nach allen Mundarten* (1826) or other works. We should at least note here that one of his elementary works *Slovanské starožitnosti* (Slavic antiquities) were translated into Russian, German, Polish, French, and Serbian, which itself should speak for their values. The absence of the entry devoted to P. J. Šafárik is still more conspicuous against the background of the entry on the Slovene Slavist Jernej Kopitar, his greatest scientific opponent.

We can remember Ludovít Novák as founder of the Slovak phonology and orthoepy, creator of the structural phonological and morphological history of the Slovak language as an independent language, the author, who definitely resolved mysteries of the varied development of *yers* in Slovak and other problems in central Slovak and whose solution was accepted by Slavists in general, he was also discoverer of the Mediterranean linguistic union, a distinguished author in the field of linguistic politics, etc. Possibly, this author was not included in the encyclopedia because the news of his death in 1992 did not reach the compendium editorial office in time, although there are some authors in the encyclopedia, whose work was concluded in the same year as that of L. Novák: Jelling Z. Harris (1909–1992), Samuel I. Hayakawa (1906–1992), Dwight Bolinger (1907–1992), etc.

Of course, we do not miss only Slovak names. Taking into account the Czech situation, the Prague linguistic circle is well represented, but entries devoted to the representatives of the world-known Czech phonetic school with names like e.g. *Antonín Frinta*, *Josef Chlumský*, *Bohuslav Hála*, *Milan Romportl* are completely missing. We failed to find the Russian names of the outstanding *Boris Aleksandrovich Serebrennikov* (1915–1989), *Aleksandr Khristoforovich Vostokov* (1781–1864), and others.

As we have already mentioned, some entries are rather extensive. The longest entry is devoted to the old Indian Panini, covering seven full two-column pages which equals 25 to 28 manuscript pages. Large entries are also devoted to many other authors: Plato, Aristotle, Aristophanes, Dionysius of Thrace, Marcus Terentius Vavro, Thomas Aquinas, Dante Alighieri, James Burnett Lord Monboddo, John Wallis, Henry Sweet, Alessandro Manzoni, Graziado A. Ascoli, Giambattista Vico, John R. Firth, Daniel Jones, Roman Jakobson, and some others. The entries on Ferdinand Saussure, Nikolai Sergeievich Trubetzkoy, Filipp Fedorovich Fortunatov, or Jan Baudoin de Courtenay are surprisingly short.

It is correct that there is a special entry not only on the “ill-famed” N. J. Marr but also on his critics Evgenii Dmitrievich Polivanov (1891–1938) and Arnold Stepanovich Chikobava (1898–1985), “man under the shadow of Stalin”, and that a place was also found for the excellent Slavist *Stjepan Ivšić* (1884–1962) although this author published hardly anything in languages other than his native Croatian. We also appreciate that the encyclopedia contains such names as Aristarchus, Cicero, Niccolò Machiavelli, Albertus Magnus, St. Augustine, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Jan Hus (John Huss),

Antonio Gramsci, Paolo Pasolini, Karl Kraus (omission of René Descartes is surprising), who were not professional philologists but their influence on the shaping of the language or linguistics is undeniable. The coverage of such names seems to us rather unusual but fully legitimate. Looking at the Slovak Encyclopedia of Linguistics of 1993 from this point of view, for example, the entry on Martin Kukučín is then lacking.

Thanks to the coordinators' network mentioned above, the encyclopedia offers an unusually large space for linguists from ancient Greece and Rome, for the linguistic authors from the period of the Middle Ages as well as for linguists from China, Japan, India, Korea, and from the Arabic-speaking world, a fact which overcomes the everlasting Eurocentrism of compendia of this type. By and large, however, it holds that the division of the individual "spheres of influence" can probably never be proportional. Some countries were assigned a particular native coordinator, which is probably connected with the preparation of entries in "domestic workshops", others are covered from the "outside", where both the coordination and the authorship are concerned. In the latter case, this may lead to some imprecisions mentioned above.

The subjects of *Lexicon Grammaticorum* are personalities, although sometimes anonymous (cf. Anonymus of 1555, Anonymus of 1559), entries covering whole schools being only exceptional: Alexandrian grammarians, ancient Greek lexicographers, Stoicism, ancient Greek dictionaries, Greek and Latin rhetoric, ancient Greek etymologies, and some others. It is evident at first sight that the composition of the entries is uniform and lucid. Each entry consists of a) the biographical part, b) the analytical part, where the work of the particular personality is analysed and its significance for the history of linguistics is formulated, and c) the bibliographic part which is rather extensive in each entry and also includes the literature on the particular person. The formal side of the compendium is well worked out as well.

The aim of our comments was evidently to advance our attitude to the compendium, as the editors ask in the introduction to the encyclopedia. It is definitely beyond doubt a significant work of German linguists, whose effort to introduce world linguists was successful beyond measure. We appreciate the fact that the authors paid particular attention to the appearance and layout of the book because they were certainly aware of the fact that the formal side of the scientific book is not just a "formal" matter. *Lexicon Grammaticorum* will be an invaluable and wanted addition to every public library and to private bookshelves if not their ornament.

Slavomír Ondrejovič

Ludovít Štúr Linguistics Institute, Slovak Academy of Sciences,
Panská 26, 813 64 Bratislava, Slovakia

KOVAČIČOVÁ, E. – SCHLENKEROVÁ, K.: Bibliografia almanachov, ročeniek a zborníkov na Slovensku 1945–1965 (Bibliography of Almanacs, Annuals, and Collections in Slovakia between 1945 and 1965). Martin, Matica slovenská 1995. 430 pp., illustrations.

The bibliography is another output of systematic research into the Slovak national retrospective bibliography aimed at compiling and assessing the knowledge on all types of writings published in Slovakia as well as writings on Slovakia published abroad and making them accessible. This is the third meritorious work of the Department of Retrospective Bibliography of the Bratislava University Library following the Bibliography of Slovak and other language calendars from 1701 to 1965 (Martin, MS 1984) and Bibliography of almanacs, annuals, and collections in Slovakia from 1919 to 1944 (compiled by Kovačičová, E. and Štvrtecký, Š., Martin, MS 1991). It fulfils, like the preceding bibliographies, in addition to heuristic functions, also bibliographic and information functions and is one of the first orientation source for percipients interested in these types of documents.

The structure of the bibliography is parallel to the preceding works, containing:

A methodical introduction bringing the subject-matter closer to the reader. The subjects of bibliography are: periodical almanacs (mostly of a literary character), survey annuals (devoted to individual sections of a particular field or specialization), statistical yearbooks (of various institutions), annuals

of associations, cooperatives, and universities, periodical collections of scientific works, collections which were published during repeated congresses, conferences. The authors eliminated single jubilee almanacs, annuals such as yearly reports of particular organizations, schools, firms (they will be prepared as parts of partial bibliographic lists), books published annually (telephone directories), timetables, lists of published literature, calendars, collections published on particular occasions (belong to book bibliographies), periodical collections of scientific works or scientific periodicals that were published more than 4 times a year.

The bibliography registers documents from the two points of view of the Slovak studies: a) linguistic (almanacs, annuals and collections in Slovak published or printed on the territory of the former CSR or ČSSR); b) territorial (almanacs, annuals and collections published or printed on the territory of Slovakia between 1945 and 1965 in languages other than Slovak).

The essence of the bibliography is the bibliographic descriptive part with a List of abbreviations used, a List of abbreviations of press-marks and a List of bibliographic sources and literature followed by the historic and survey study which outlines the cultural, political, and economic development of Slovakia in 1945–1965. The types of particular pseudoperiodicals are characterized against this background. In spite of the fact that the pseudoperiodicals at issue are from the recent past, the authors had to face numerous unexpected difficulties during their processing (they could obtain some of them only from private collections, others could only be prepared from secondary sources – catalogues and library, museum and archives registers). In the descriptive part the material is arranged alphabetically and by title. Each series of almanacs, annuals, and collections has its serial number (247 in total) and the individual records are prepared according to the existing norms for bibliographic (documentation) and catalogue record (consisting of the periodical title, volume, subtitle, publication data, place of publication, publishing house, then there is the format in cm, number of pages, library signs and press-marks). The bibliographic description ends with a bibliographic note which contains additional significant data (brief annotation of the publication, information on whether the document was also published beyond the period of preparation, notice on differences in titles, imprint, gaps in editions, etc.).

The bibliographic-descriptive part also contains the apparatus of indexes: of names (containing the names of compilers, authors, editors, illustrators, and others), local index of publishers, printers and printing houses, and subject-chronological (based on International decimal classification). Thanks to such an extended registration-documentation description (with four-language résumés and illustrations) it is easy to orient oneself in the bibliography, which considerably facilitates the work of the user.

Bibliography of almanacs, annuals, and collections in Slovakia in 1945–1965 presents a new, so far not much mapped out source materials not only for further research into the history of book culture but also for the political, economic, and cultural history of Slovakia.

Helena Trísková
Institute of Historical Studies, Slovak Academy of Sciences,
Klemensova 19, 813 64 Bratislava, Slovakia