
UDK 082.1:821.163.6.09

Igor Kramberger

Düsseldorf

THE SERIES THE COMPLETE WORKS OF SLOVENE POETS AND PROSE
WRITERS

(An inspirational assessment)

*In memory of Evald Koren
1913–2013*

The point of departure for this study is a booklet by Matija Ogrin, the third editor-in-chief of the series *Zbrana dela slovenskih pesnikov in pisateljev* (The Complete Works of Slovene Poets and Prose Writers), which he prepared as an aid to editors of individual volumes. In certain instances, I indicate the history of evaluating and selecting writers for the series. I also point out the changed status of editors of such publications. This is the basis for a proposal to compile a handbook containing the analytical suppositions of books published in the series, as well as details on the materials in the commentaries and their arrangement—in short the scholarly apparatus of each book.

Key words: author, editor, complete works, book series, the Complete works of Slovene poets and prose writers, evaluation

1 Scholarly literature on the series

Composing a scholarly article begins with a review of publications on the topic. Once the picture of existing knowledge is clear, it is possible to mount the shoulders of the giant of accumulated knowledge and make a scholarly contribution on the topic (Merton 1965). This article is devoted to a series that is known as fundamental scholarly series, The Complete Works of Slovene Poets and Prose Writers. It thus seemed logical to begin with a search of articles in *Slavistična revija*, the leading academic journal in Slovene language and literary studies, and with articles on the series in order to evaluate the relationship between editorial and publishing work and scholarship on Slovene literature. I first began twenty years ago. I employed a bibliography of the journal that Jože Munda had published in 1977, and I went through the issues up to volume 40 (1992). I was surprised by how few articles I found: only six, plus one related to the publication of Janez Trdina's *Spomini* (Recollections), though devoted to another topic. Two articles were reviews of individual books, one was an addition to the bibliography in an edition of France Prešeren, and three by Marja Boršnik were detailed supplements to an edition of Ivan Tavčar. I found substantially more (nine) articles for the period 1955–92 in the journal *Jezik in slovstvo*. Editors' reports were most numerous, but there were also thoroughgoing reviews of editorial work. During this search, I wanted to verify the inkling that most publications devoted to individual books or the series as a whole in this period came out in the biweekly *Naši razgledi*. Jože Pogačnik

authored most of them. His first ones appeared in the journal *Naša obzorja*, but then he published them for twenty-five years quite regularly in *Naši razgledi*. This was also the reason that the editors¹ accepted a feuilleton describing the contents and importance of the series for the celebratory issue number 1,000 of *Naši razgledi*. The series' importance was shown using the articles I found in *Naši razgledi* and elsewhere.

In preparing this article, I have availed myself of the *Slavistična revija* materials now available in digital form. I discovered yet more reviews published in *Naši razgledi* in Jože Pogačnik's 1993 bibliography. Most surprising was how many publications there were in different genres after 2001, from programmatic ones to reviews. Darko Dolinar inserted the bibliography into his exhaustive overview which was of a programmatic nature. The bibliography confirmed my observations and at the same time recommended a more detailed survey of the Slovene press. The bibliography contains only a selection of articles by the first and second editors-in-chief of the series, Anton Ocvirk and France Bernik. Dolinar had published a longer description a year before in the collection *Znanstvene izdaje in elektronski medij* (Scholarly editions and the digital medium): five of Ocvirk's pieces had appeared in a variety of forums, from the newspaper *Delo* to a jubilee collection, and five of Bernik's had come out in *Delo*. We can conclude that the series, at least in the first decades, had received more attention in the public at large than among scholars. I can interject the hope that more precise documentation of publications will show continued public interest to complement increased scholarly involvement in the series and editorial work in general during the past twenty years.

The finding that there were few publications in *Slavistična revija* that were closely connected to the series Complete Works is telling as concerns the journal's origins. In the first, double issue, which came out in 1948, the contributions confirm what Anton Ocvirk predicted in his programmatic introduction, "Slavistična revija in literarna zgodovina" (*Slavistična revija* and literary history): the journal would contain literary history and poetics, and social science research on Slovene literature. Had it not been dedicated to Rajko Nahtigal, there would have been no mention of linguistics in the issue. The emphasis on connecting research on Slovene literature with research on other Slavic literatures seemed a fitting justification for the journal's title. However, there was no explanation of why the title had been changed and the journal's original function modified. On 19 March 1946, the newspaper *Slovenski poročevalec* had announced an academic journal in the state publishing house's plan:

"The series of Slovene poets and prose writers will be accompanied by the *Časopis za literarno zgodovino* (Journal of literary history), which will provide documentary materials on the history of our literature. The journal editor is Dr. Anton Ocvirk" (Program državne založbe 1946: 6).

Ocvirk mentions representative writers in his introduction in the course of enumerating tasks for literary history and poetics. He limited himself to the most familiar names on a list that *Slovenski poročevalec* had printed on 19 March. It is disappointing that he did not link these tasks with writers who were new to the list of classics: Linhart, Mencinger, and Kosovel. The journal sections *Zapiski in gradivo* (Annota-

¹ The chief editor was Marko Crnkovič.

tions and materials) and Knjižna poročila in ocene (Book news and reviews) contained items that show that the original function had to a great degree been maintained in the new journal. In the first issue, Marja Boršnik, who had edited the first volume of Anton Aškerc's works in 1946, published and commented on letters from the poet to Fran Vidic. The opening of France Dobrovoljc's bibliographic article plainly affirms the journal's initial direction: "I am publishing several corrections and additions to Cankar's bibliography, found in the jubilee book *Ivan Cankar, Voice of Our Times* (SKZ 1946), for the purpose of facilitating the work of future editors of a new edition of Cankar's complete works" (DOBROVOLJC 1948: 122). In 1951, Boris Merhar began editing Cankar's *Izbrana dela* (Selected works) in ten volumes, in collaboration with Dobrovoljc. Cankar's works only began appearing in the series Complete Works in 1967. Dobrovoljc published critical commentaries on the volumes in *Naši razgledi*. The first issue of *Slavistična revija*'s slow composition is evident in the last item. Alfonz Gspan wrote a long review of Anton Slodnjak's publication of France Prešeren in December 1946, and in April 1948 he added an addendum to it (GSPAN 1948: 137).

I will conclude this description of publications about the series with a booklet that was printed in many copies, yet somehow has never actually existed, because it was not entered into Cobiss or the annual bibliography of the Institute of Slovene Literature and Literary Studies of ZRC SAZU. Matija Ogrin prepared the twenty-four-page booklet in A5 format. The editor Dušan Voglar refers to it indirectly in the commentary to volume 2 of Primož Kozak:

In conformity with expanding the editorial plan for the whole series Complete Works... Kozak's drama texts are outfitted with running footnotes...

In conformity with recent editorial principles for the series Complete Works... the "Notes"² contain insights into basic literary historical and theater history materials. In the

² The standard section "Notes" also includes an introduction on the genesis, publication, and reception of each work. The "Notes" contain more than just commentaries on and elucidations of the text and its parts. The "Notes" resemble those in the so-called Studienausgaben in German and the Œuvres complètes part in the French La Pléiade series. On the other hand, the "Notes" do not include certain standard parts of back matter, such as bibliographies.

A historical view may help clarify the contents of back matter in the series: Ivan Prijatelj developed a concept for a series to be called Slovenski pisatelji (Slovene writers) in 1917. According to Prijatelj, an author's work(s) in each volume ought to be complemented by two kinds of texts by the editor—an "Editor's Introduction" at the beginning of book (so titled in all volumes without further indication of contents), and "Editor's Notes" at the end, after the author's work(s).

Anton Ocvirk decided that introductions were not appropriate for these scholarly editions. For this reason he placed the contents of Prijatelj's introductions immediately before the "Notes." The introductions now contained more detailed and better documented information on the genesis, publishing, and reception of each literary work. Because the book was now clearly divided into the first part, with the author's works, and second part, with notes, he could omit the word "editor's." The result of his changes was that editor offered the reader scholarly assistance: He adumbrated the author's texts with his own explanations to facilitate further research and interpretation. He also directed attention to specific relations between the person of the author, his production, and final achievements. The "Notes" as a title can be understood in this context as defining editor's texts as a supplementary, subordinate contribution. The smaller font size can be seen as a typographic means of underlining this unpretentious relationship. One could argue that the decision to use the title "Notes" (Opombe) was a mistake on Ocvirk's part, but also that he wished to stress the author-editor relationship I am describing.

introductory comments to the publication of drama writings there are observations first on the place of drama in Kozak's works, then on Kozak's motivations for writing dramas, as found in his unpublished and published writings...

References to criticism and various scholarly treatises... conform to the generally amended bases of the "Notes" in the Complete Works, as expanded by editor-in-chief dr. Matija Ogrin. This means that in the "Notes" we avoid extensive and full quotations of criticism, essays, and parts of monographs, and instead cite a concise encapsulation of thoughts and opinions. (KOZAK 2, 2011: 195f)

The brochure recalled an old notion, which I will attempt to place in historical context. The theme is one of the aspects of the relationship between editor and author—that is, between one who acts in the sphere of reception in the literary system and one who acts in the sphere of production. "Although a comprehensive breakdown into all possible elements and relations between them furnishes tools for describing literary communications, I divide the fundamental components into three subsets" (PERENIČ 2008: 127). Here I employ another view for connecting the persons from different spheres or subsets—that is, the editor as comprehensive compiler and systematizer of authorial efforts, labor, and creativity, as well as the published achievements—all crowned by public access to the literary works and related writings. Perenič attributes consummate value in the literary system to the publication of a literary work in book form (PERENIČ 2008: 124–28; 2010: 171–80). The editor of a scholarly edition's function might be poetically described as spanning two categories: Barthes's *Writing Degree Zero* and Foucault's answer to the question of "What is an Author?"—and the sociological view of this study might be described with these philosophical statements.

2 The selection of writers

The booklet's contents can be divided into a justification of editorial principles with technical guidelines for preparing a text, a retrospective, and a forecast of changes and innovations. By the time of its appearance, Ogrin had already devoted ten years to preparing electronic scholarly editions of fiction. For this reason the brevity with which he links the two activities is surprising:

The series Complete Works should gradually begin to come out in digital form on the Internet... There is a plan for preparing test editions of the Complete Works volumes in electronic form... Digital publication is also seen as a technical solution for publishing large opuses. In such cases, the central part of the opus could come out in printed book form, and the entire opus in digital form. (OGRIN 2011: 6f)

This view pertains only to the future: It appears that only authors included in the series for the first time will be published in this way. It is unclear whether electronic publication will be introduced for books by authors whose complete works are already coming out (some for decades) but have not been published in their entirety. Related to this is the question of how it will be determined what belongs to the central part of an opus and what is peripheral. The series concept, right from the beginning

in 1946, was based on uniting two kinds of texts by an author: literary works and all related public and private writing, from literary and political essays to letters, and including autobiographical (not always published prior) texts. Will the central texts in both groups be published as books, or will the division be made differently in light of the opus's significance and the preservation of individual genres of selected authors, or will only the main works of fiction be available in book form? Will those be ones that authors themselves published, or will possibly unpublished and unfinished works have priority? Editions in this series are decidedly documentary and in part archival in nature; therefore, it must be determined which medium guarantees longer life and at the same time access. Perhaps a radical transition to electronic publishing would be logical. Publication of individual, selected works or texts in book form could be left to other publishing houses, including those that consider commercial gain. In this case, the source edition of the text would have to be indicated, and links supplied to digital scholarly resources on the literary work, such as the philological apparatus and annotations on the text.

Besides authors whose publication in the series is not yet complete, we have a range of complete works that have been done for decades. Two questions come to mind in this regard. The first is whether a new, different edition of some of these might be needed, regardless of whether the first edition is available in large numbers in Slovene libraries (initial runs of 5,000 have been reduced to 320, even for a prominent author like Vladimir Bartol, whose books sell well). A new edition would be logical if additional, previously unknown texts were included. For some authors, a better arrangement of the works would be possible, since sometimes editors discovered previously unknown works during the course of publication over many years. The main issue here is whether the judgments Lino Legiša made in 1951 apply sixty years later. The result was that among the first authors in the series were those whose value is not quite convincing and whose works no longer attract many readers. Conversely, it could be that opinions of them have changed and they speak to us in another way, in our time as well.

It is another question whether all previously published volumes in the series ought to be digitalized. Two options are technically inviting. The first is to follow the examples of several prominent projects for preserving books in pdf format, thus keeping the pagination of book editions and current forms of citing places in the text. This could be done under the umbrella of the Digitalna knjižnica Slovenije (Digital Library of Slovenia). Another way would be to transfer all of the texts into the electronic format used by the Project Gutenberg. The collection of Slovene texts on Wikivir, initiated by Miran Hladnik, uses this model. The selection of technical option also has a symbolic dimension, just as when books come out in a particular series.

Quite another projection involves the list of authors for whom an edition of complete works will be prepared. Seven names are given without any justification. The Principles only record that "The collection ought to preserve the basic conceptual features that were determined at the very beginning; however, possible unevenness in content should be eliminated, including in pre-modern periods of Slovene literature" (OGRIN 2011: 1). The selection of authors has been pushed back to the middle of the eighteenth century with the inclusion of Janez Damascen Dev. Whether this

is comparable to the shift from Valentin Vodnik to Anton Tomaž Linhart, which took place between Prijatelj and Ocvirk's choice of oldest author, is a question with an ambiguous answer. Interest in the Baroque period has been growing in recent decades, and especially in the way members of the aristocracy assembled, presented, and commented on a rich body of cultural materials. Less convincing and necessary is Urban Jarnik's inclusion, even if his works balance the image of the first half of the nineteenth century in Slovene literature. Jarnik is not on the list of Slovene poets and prose writers that Josip Stritar and Josip Jurčič published in *Slovenski glasnik* in 1866 as part of the announcement of the series *Klasje*. The list does include creative writers whose complete works have yet to be published: Jovan Vesel Koseski, France Cegnar, Fran Erjavec, Davorin Trstenjak, Lovro Toman, Matija Valjavec, and Miroslav Vilhar (and also those whose works have come out) (PRIJATELJ 4, 1961: 153). A selected anthology with all of these writers would be justified in the series *Kondor*, but from a contemporary critical standpoint, there is probably no reason to do more. The remaining five authors published in the twentieth century, the canon for which is not yet formed, making agreement on representative fiction writers impossible (DOLINAR 2006: 7). Two more limitations are important for a scholarly edition: authors' rights limit access to published works and archives, and the availability of accessory texts, especially letters and other autobiographical materials, without which the "Notes" in the series would be of much less value.

The addition of new authors ought fully to take into account all of the proposals and rejections through the decades. We might take as a founding criterion what Ivan Prijatelj wrote in 1917, when in view of the unique history of Slovene fiction he supplemented the aesthetic criterion with a culturological one: Writers "who spoke to the hearts and minds of Slovenes. . . Slovene writers, that is, who shaped our spirit in their artistic works, once beloved by our people and still important to Slovenes (PRIJATELJ 1917: 6ff.) It remains a question how we are to evaluate such an effect. What is more important or decisive for an edition of complete works—contemporaries' judgments, commercial success, or subsequent interpretation? The authors that Vlado Novak called classics in 1939 constitute the core list of Slovene classics, in reference to which it is worth judging all later additions. Novak did not mention Alojz Gradnik, who was at the time already established as an important poet by virtue of his inclusion in Josip Vidmar's anthology *Svetle samote*. Neither did he mention Ivan Pregelj, Fran Saleški Finžgar, or Slavko Grum. On the other hand, Zofka Kveder had to wait a long while to be included, while Fran Detela's works were published twice in full by Mororjeva družba, and Fran Erjavec was almost entirely forgotten (NOVAK 1939: 283ff.).

Anniversaries are occasions for summing up and making plans. On 28 November 1986 (in advance of the then state holiday), Melita Forstnerič-Hajnšek recorded statements by France Bernik and Kajetan Kovič, then the editor-in-chief of the *Državna založba Slovenije* publishing house, in the newspaper *Večer*: "Kajetan Kovič put it this way: 'The publishing house is quite supportive of the series and for continuing it with new authors. Ivan Pregelj, Juš Kozak, Ciril Kosmač, Miran Jarc, Anton Vodnik, Edvard Kocbek, and other writers are planned. Their works bring us right into the present'" (FORSTNERIČ HAJNŠEK 1986: 30). The prediction began to be realized with Juš

Kozak in 1988. Ogrin cites Kosmač and Jarc as authors of works that have received a new reception in the series Complete Works. The first volume of Jarc's complete works was presented at the start of 2013.

Differences in the pace of publication and amount of work are frequently connected with who is the editor—more exactly, whether the editor-in-chief was able to identify someone to assume the work. Some recent choices of authors can be explained by the enthusiasm of an editor. A good seven years after the article in *Večer*, Marjan Kunej published a conversation with France Bernik in the newspaper *Republika*, which he supplemented with statements from several editors. Dušan Moravec wrote:

When Professor Ocvirk began this work, he had the entire “first flight” of Slovene researchers by his side. Unfortunately, they are all long deceased. Later it was impossible to get certain people for his work/toil; one didn't want it, another was incapable—even this “craft” has to be learned, and to begin a career with this work is almost unheard of. It is worst with those (ill fated) editors who accept the work and sit on “their” author for a decade (thus blocking him), just sitting around before producing anything. (KUNEJ 1994: 21)

At the time, Bernik announced publication of three authors: “Next year we expect the first volume of Miran Jarc, edited by Igor Grdina. Some other classics are planned: Božo Vodušek, Izidor Cankar, Ivan Pregelj, Ciril Kosmač, and Miško Kranjec” (KUNEJ 1994: 20). Of the twentieth-century authors on Ogrin's list, the only new one is Vladimir Bartol; there were evidently complications with all of the other ones. It will hopefully come clear to what extent difficulty in finding an editor and impediments to obtaining materials were factors when the complete works of these authors next begin appearing. In principle, an objective account of editorial preparations, including any challenges, would be valuable to include in the introduction to the “Notes” of volume one—or, if not in the volume itself, then in a separate article. Since the first volume of Bartol's complete works came out when this article was being written, it was not possible to consider the 370 pages of editorial texts, which Tomo Virk wrote.

Besides these forecasts, which remain partially unfulfilled and unfinished, a contrasting example must be noted. When the series publisher acquired the Maribor student publishing house Litera, the editor-in-chief there, Andrej Brvar, thought that it would be well to include authors of suitable quality and interest, and whose works pertain to parts of Slovenia underrepresented in literature. So he tried to find editors for some new authors to be included into the series, among them Ivan Potrč. Materials were gathered and the first volume was readied for print, when complications arose surrounding this issue. The author was even omitted in the booklet's list of upcoming editions, so Haloze and the adjacent plain³ were once again unceremoniously deprived of attention.

³ Haloze is a hilly region with many vineyards. Approaching from Ljubljana, one encounters a plain and the Drava basin, the Ptuj plain, and two rivers, the Drava and Dravinja. The region is regarded as one of the poorest in Slovenia. In 1969, a book entitled *Siti in lačni Slovenci* [Satiated and hungry Slovenes] was published, which contained a collection of impressions, essays, and reports by a group of Slovene writers after they visited Haloze. The book includes photos by Stojan Kerbler, who is today a famous photographer of Haloze and the Ptuj carnival tradition.

Choosing authors is like any kind of evaluation an ideological act. Therefore, from today's somewhat removed view, it seems totally logical that another publishing house includes in its plans authors that suit it and that they are published in editions of equivalent editorial quality to the editions in the series Complete Works. It is cause to wonder that such authors should have two sets of complete works when it is not possible to descry appreciable differences in content or editing. In a 1989 interview in *Večer* conducted by Marjan Kunej, France Bernik mentioned the publication of complete and selected works by Mohorjeva družba. He did the same in a 1994 conversation with Kunej for the newspaper *Republika*, and in a paper at the 2006 Slavic Congress in Zagreb: "For that reason, after the war Mohorjeva družba in Celje—as a sort of counterbalance to the complete works—began to publish and finished publication of selected works of what I might call Catholic tending writers: Ksaver Meško, Fran Detela, F. S. Finžgar, and Ivan Pregelj" (KUNEJ 1989: 30). Considering the bibliographic facts on the publication of these four editions, Anton Ocvirk's summary forecast in a 1965 anniversary article can be understood as a kind of answer. He expanded the list of authors to be included in the series: "And that is not all, because we also have in hand, from older periods, Valentin Vodnik (who was already in the list in 1946), and of modern writers Finžgar and Kraigher, and of the expressionists especially Miran Jarc and Slavko Grum, who will be included along with the most important poet of modern times, Srečko Kosovel" (OCVIRK 1965: 28). He thus used a series of names to list all of the genres, and with the full list he answered the question Andrijan Lah had put with the title of a *Jezik in slovstvo* article, "Na poti k torzu?" (And now the torso?) about a year prior. The realization of this prediction began only ten years later and was concluded in 2012.

From this standpoint, it is well to note a bibliographic detail that a Cobiss search reveals. The printing company Tiskovna zadruga that had since the end of WW I been releasing the series Slovene Writers, introduced an additional line in 1931, Contemporary Slovene Writers, which amounted to only three books by three writers. Later, the series Complete Works raised eyebrows for publishing the complete opus of the author of the second book, Srečko Kosovel.⁴ The complete works of the author of the first book, Juš Kozak, began coming out in 1988 and the editon is still not complete after thirteen volumes through 2003, including the 1931 novel *Šentpeter*. It is thus worth considering whether it would be well to prepare the complete works of the third author, Tone Seliškar, who in 1932 published the novel *Nasedli brod*.

⁴ The first edition of volume 1 of Srečko Kosovel complete works appeared in the year 1946. A substantially different second edition of volume 1 was published in 1964. Three years later, in 1967, a special edition of Kosovel's *Integrali* appeared in the series *Bela krizantema*. Before volume 2 of the complete works, including *Integrali*, was published in 1974, Alfonz Gspan initiated a controversy about the 1964 and 1967 editions in the journal *Prostor in čas*. This was at the end of 1973. Anton Ocvirk responded in the journal *Sodobnost* in 1974 and 1975. Gspan published all his articles as a separate booklet entitled *Neznani Srečko Kosovel* [The unknown Srečko Kosovel] in the year 1974. The special, 1967 edition of *Integrali* had a huge impact on Slovene poets. And the result of the heated controversy was uncertainty about the editorial quality of the complete works, even though this edition was the life work of its editor.

3 A proposal

Series of complete works differ from other series primarily based on the fact that individual books do not form the edited whole, but individual sets of complete works, which are usually made up of many books. Their uniqueness rests on the selection of authors, not of individual literary works or kinds of texts. Because of their archival and documentary value, all works by an author are included in the complete works, regardless of their resonance or quality. It is important for full and especially scholarly editions of complete works that the texts they bring together differ on whether they were intended for publication or not: the measure of editions is how successfully editors collected all the writer bequeathed in the widest sense, especially letters and documents that make it possible to imagine the genesis of the literary works included, from conceptualization to publication.

The editor is to be credited with the fullness and thoroughness of an edition of complete works. For this reason the editor's name may at times become more important than the author's if we want to distinguish between editions of the same author. In Slovene literature, this is most necessary with Prešeren: there is Prešeren by Stritar-Levstik, Pintar, Aškerč, Žigon, Kidrič, Pirjevec (twice, first with Glonar), Slodnjak (four times), Rupel-Gspan, Kos (twice), and Paternu. This is the list of names that forms the core of Prešeren studies, although they represent only a portion of all the interpretations. These editors prepared quite different editions, from representative to scholarly, from those for leisure reading to those for study. Some of them are still being reprinted, and others became landmarks, even though they may not have been finished or their appearance and publication was influenced or even prohibited due to a range of factors, from the personal to the political. In addition, there have been announcements of editions that were not realized, yet whose concepts may have been models. A complete critical edition is still needed. It will have to take into account the achievements of all these editors and their solutions, while first deciding which individual editions are more influential according to editorial content: philological, literary historical, or educational. Such an analysis will enable researchers in other fields to select suitable editions for their research needs (cf. notes in Suhadolnik 1978, Novak 2004).

Under the editor's oversight, approaches and techniques proper to literary studies are joined with techniques of publishing, printing, and linguistics. Editorial philology was once more linguistic, but with the advent of educational editions, editorial work approximates literary studies: "In this way the members of the system and the system itself explicitly participate in a functionally differentiated web" (PERENIČ 2008: 125). In the sphere of reception, in the monograph the subset of literary scholars is expanded: the editor joins the literary historian and theoretician: this addition to the system of literature leads one to wonder whether it would be fruitful to consider yet other actors (PERENIČ 2008: 126f.; 2010: 179).

The reformation of the series Complete Works is observable in three details of Ogrin's booklet. They point to large, fundamental changes in evaluating texts by the editors: the placement of explanations is changed, a bibliography of works cited is required in the "Notes," including a list of sources, as is the inclusion of subheadings in

the table of contents. These lead to changes in the status of the “Notes” in two areas. The “Notes” in the series combine critical apparatus, the documented genesis of the work and its first reception, and explanations of selected parts of the text.

The first change is connected to additions to the commentaries: “In the back matter, as is customary, are among other addenda also, separately, a list of primary sources, works cited, appropriate indices, etc.” (OGRIN 2011: 6). In the first period, editors described the writer’s archive and materials they used to prepare the text for publication, but they did not list works cited in concise, bibliographic form at the end of the “Notes.” They inconsistently cited other scholarly works in the course of their historical essay and explanations. This could have been because there was at the time not much available; perhaps it was because the manner of writing scholarly texts was different then; and also because editors wanted to relate their findings but did not apprehend this as taking part in existing and accessible production of knowledge. What was once apparently less routine reliance on others’ knowledge is now customary, making a systematic listing necessary. The editor thus shows what scholars and sources have been relied upon in his or her work, on the shoulders of what and which knowledge he was able to do and finish his work..

At first glance, the second change would seem to be of a technical nature: “After the data must come a table of contents (chapters, subchapters, etc.), which is not done manually but is machine generated with a word processor” (OGRIN 2011: 15). This is the fifth and last technical guideline, and it probably applies to all kinds of books that comprise a set of complete works: books that combine authorial and editorial texts, as well as a scholarly monograph that concludes the complete works. At first the “Notes” were listed in the table of contents in different ways, and represented very meagerly: when multiple works by the author were contained in the volume, the table of contents usually only indicated where the commentary to an individual work began, but its contents were not listed or occasionally listed. From now on, editors must use titles and subheadings, without further detailing how a hierarchy is conceived and what elements of that belong in the table of contents: “The text must be divided so that the titles of major parts are denoted as Title 1, and the titles of subordinate units Title 2, and so forth” (OGRIN 2011: 15). The result of this guideline will undoubtedly be a steep increase in the number of lines referring to the “Notes.” The editor will thus illustrate for the reader what the book offers and its outline or basis, from which the reader can take up his study or interpretation of the author.

The proposal with which I will conclude this study is related to both observations of what the first editions of complete works lacked in equal measure and the form that the guidelines now demand of editors. It would therefore be useful to list everything that is mentioned in past, older editions, and simultaneously outfit their “Notes” with subheadings. This would result in material for making a handbook for the entire series and honor the accomplishments of past editors. The footnotes could also mention all of the anecdotes and personal issues that have previously been too often foregrounded in polemical articles on and discussions of individual editorial activities. When I saw the list of books in the series contained in Ogrin’s booklet, I was struck by the fact that it might be conceived of in spreadsheet form.

Five columns would be sufficient to start: number, name and surname of the author, volume number in the complete works, and year of publication. Then I would add to the 248 existing lines more rows for reprints of individual volumes of Ivan Tavčar and Josip Jurčič. All data entered into a worksheet would make possible a different arrangement of rows—let us say, after the first volume of the complete works of an individual author, as is the custom in publishing letters. A further step would involve adding columns, with each one intended for a given type of information: I would begin with the names and surnames of editors, followed by the components of the “Notes.” Individual fields (cells) in the row would indicate the contents of each volume. The result would be an outline for making a handbook for the series, which would facilitate researchers’ future searches for information in individual sets of complete works. It would also indicate where individual complete works complement or duplicate each other, which would make it easier to join them when examining authors and periods.

I began this article by recalling an aphorism about a dwarf on a giant’s shoulders, comparing how an individual makes a contribution to the treasure house of human knowledge. From this comparison I derived that an editor is a dwarf when preparing a publication, and he provides others a roadmap when they find themselves in the same position. But this is not the only comparison that suggests itself when describing editorial work. Another is connected with sources and the editor’s desire to use his findings and texts to lead us to the original, tie works of fiction to other texts by the author, thus enabling the reader to compare his or her horizon of understanding in aesthetic reflection with the creative horizon of the author of a work of fiction. There is a third comparison. We can apprehend literary works published in books as the peak of an ice mountain. The editor uses the author’s texts and everything he includes in his own to draw the large lower reaches, as well as the unseen part of the ice mountain. Merton’s note on the aphorism is written in the style of Sterne. I read it when preparing this article along with the posthumously published book containing three studies on metaphor by Hans Blumenberg: on springs, streams, and ice mountains (Blumenberg 2012). The aphorism and the three metaphors in combination offered a perspective to understand the subject of this article.

WORKS CITED⁵

- Roland BARTHES, 1968. *Writing degree zero*. Trans. Annette Lavers and Colin Smith. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Hans BLUMENBERG, 2012: *Quellen, Ströme, Eisberge*. Ed. Ulrich von Bülow and Dorit Krusche. Berlin: Suhrkamp (Bibliothek Suhrkamp, 1469).
- France DOBROVOLJC, 1948: Popravki in dostavki k Cankarjevi bibliografiji (Corrections and additions to Cankar’s bibliography). *Slavistična revija*. 1/1–2. 122–25.

⁵ I would like to thank Jerneja Ferlež, a librarian at the University of Maribor library, for checking the bibliographic details, and Timothy Pogačar for the exchange of comments in an endeavor to bootstrap the differences between cultural backgrounds which became visible through the translation.

- Darko DOLINAR, 2005: Znanstvene izdaje in literarna veda (Scholarly editions and literary studies). *Znanstvene izdaje in elektronski medij* (Scholarly editions and digital media). Ed. Matija Ogrin. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU (Studia litteraria). 155–66.
- , 2006: Kritične izdaje slovenskih tekstov v okviru slovanske filologije in nacionalne kulture (Critical editions of Slovene texts in the context of Slavic philology and national culture). *Slavistična revija* 54/1. 1–10.
- Melita FORSTNERIČ-HAJNŠEK, 1986: Dokaz visoke kulturne vitalnosti (Proof of great cultural vitality). *Večer* 28. 11. 30.
- Michel Foucault, 1977. What is an author? *Partisan Review* 42.4. 603–14.
- Martin GRUM, 1993: Bibliografija Jožeta Pogačnika ob šestdesetletnici. [Po avtorjevih podatkih priredil ...] (A bibliography of Jože Pogačnik at age sixty. [Prepared from the author's data ...]). *Slavistična revija* 41/2. 298–328.
- Alfonz GSPAN, 1948: Poezije doktorja Franceta Prešerna z dodatkom v Poezijah nepriljubljenih pesmi. Ob stoletnici Poezij slovenskemu ljudstvu posvečen in zanj prirejen ponatis. Uvod in razlago napisal A. Slodnjak. Ljubljana 1946 [ocena] (Dr. France Prešeren's *Poezije* with an addition of poems not included in *Poezije*. On the one-hundred year anniversary of Poezije dedicated to the Slovene people and published for them. Introduction and interpretation by A. Slodnjak [review]). *Slavistična revija* 1/1–2. 126–37.
- Primož KOZAK, 2011: *Zbrano delo. Druga knjiga – Dramski spisi I: Dialogi / Osnutki*. Uredil in opombe napisal Dušan Voglar (Complete works. Volume 2 – drama writings I: Dialogs/Drafts. Edited and notes by Dušan Voglar). Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU (Zbrana dela slovenskih pesnikov in pisateljev, 246).
- Igor KRAMBERGER, 1993: Pisateljjevo vstajenje (A writer's resurrection). *Razgledi* 3. 9. do 10. 12. 16–23 [999–1006]. Bibliografija v zadnji številki (With a bibliography in the last issue).
- Marjan KUNEJ, 1989: Imamo klasike, nimamo pa urednikov. Pogovor z dr. Francetom Bernikom (We have classics but not editors. A conversation with Dr. France Bernik). *Večer* 29. 12. 30.
- , 1994: Urednikov ni, najsi jih iščeš tudi z lučjo (There are no editors, even if you search with a flashlight). *Republika* 16 January. 20–21.
- Andrijan LAH, 1963/64: Na poti k torzu? (Towards the torso?). *Jezik in slovstvo* 9/7–8. 270–71.
- Lino LEGIŠA, 1951: Ob zbranih delih slovenskih pesnikov in pisateljev (On the Complete works of Slovene poets and prose writers). *Novi svet* 6. 1039–1048 and 1125–32.
- Robert K. MERTON, 1965: *On the shoulders of giants: A Shandean postscript*. New York. The Post-Italianate Edition, 1993. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

- Jože MUNDA, 1977: Bibliografsko kazalo Slavistične revije I–XXV, 1948–1977 (A bibliographic index of *Slavistična revija* I–XXV, 1948–1977). *Slavistična revija* 25/4. 491–527.
- Nina NOVAK, 2004: Uredniški popravki v izdajah Prešernovih pesmi (Editorial corrections in editions of Prešeren's poems). *Slavistična revija* 52/1. 89–102.
- Vlado NOVAK, 1939: Zapiski o slovenskih klasikih (Notes on Slovene classics). *Dejanje* 2. 278–85 in 342.
- Anton OCVIRK, 1965: Zbrana dela slovenskih pesnikov in pisateljev (The complete works of Slovene poets and prose writers). *Dvajset let Državne založbe Slovenije* (Twenty years of the State Publishing House of Slovenia). Ljubljana: DZS. 21–28.
- Matija OGRIN, 2011: *Zasnova in urejanje zbirke Zbrana dela slovenskih pesnikov in pisateljev* (The concept and editing of the series The complete works of Slovene poets and prose writers). Bibliografija. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU. Razmnoženo, 24 str. + ovitek.
- Urška PERENIČ, 2010: *Empirično-sistemska raziskovanje literature: Konceptualne podlage, teoretski modeli in uporabni primeri* (Empirical-systemic literary studies: Conceptual framework, theoretical models, and applications). Ljubljana: Zveza društev Slavistično društvo Slovenije (Slavistična knjižnica, 16).
- , 2008: Perspektive empirične sistemske teorije z vidika mlajše generacije – doslednost, odprtost, zanesljivost (The perspectives of empirical systems theory from the standpoint of the younger generation – consistency, openness, reliability). *Primerjalna književnost* 31/2. 113–35.
- Ivan PRIJATELJ, 1917: O izdaji naših klasikov (On the publication of Slovene classics). *Naša knjiga*. Priloga Ljubljanskemu zvonu 1/2. 5–7.
- , 1961: *Slovenska kulturnopolitična in slovstvena zgodovina: 1848–1895. IV. knjiga*. Uredil in literarnozgodovinske opombe napisal Anton Ocvirk. Političnozgodovinske opombe napisal Dušan Kermavner (Slovene politico-cultural and literary history: 1848–95. vol. 4. Edited and literary historical notes by Anton Ocvirk. Politico-historical notes by Dušan Kermavner). Ljubljana: DZS (Monografije k zbranim delom slovenskih pesnikov in pisateljev).
- Program državne založbe (The program of the state publishing house), 1946. *Slovenski poročevalec* 19. 3. 6.
- Stane SUHADOLNIK, 1978: P. Scherber, Slovar Prešernovega pesniškega jezika [ocena] (P. Scherber, A dictionary of Prešeren's poetic language (review)). *Slavistična revija* 26/3. 305–13.

