Preparation of a register, list, or inventory on a topic is the first step in a research project. The field of literary studies examines literary works of individuals, secondary sources, literary periods, genres of literary works, and particular literary components (e.g., chief themes and motifs, literary works’ structures, manner of textualization, verse forms and meaning, compositional features, etc.), among other things. Research requires an exact blueprint describing the object of study, which in turn generates a bibliography that ensures a work’s comprehensiveness. In addition, a bibliographic list frequently points up things of evolutionary significance, such as intervals between literary works, a concept changing through a writer’s works, the rate of recurrence of some phenomenon, and so forth.
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The pioneers in literary and cultural affairs demonstrated that a bibliographic basis is essential to fundamental insights into a subject. In 1561, Primož Trubar prepared a list of his books in print and made plain his productivity: *Register und summarischer Innhalt der windischer Bücher*. In 1689, in volume 6 of *Die Ehre des Hertzoghtums Crain*, Janez Vajkard Valvasor published a survey of fifty-seven Carniolan writers and their works, including eleven Slovenes. In Vienna in 1803, Marko Pohlin published *Bibliotheca Carnioliae* (the expanded bibliography appeared in Ljubljana in 1862) in *Catalogus bibliographicus librorum [...] academiae Theresianae*. Matija Čop’s (posthumous) expanded list, *Slovenische Literatur*, came out in Šafařík’s *Geschichte der südslawischen Literatur* in 1864.

Štefka Bulovec’s *Bibliografija slovenskih bibliografij* (A bibliography of Slovene bibliographies 1976) systematically presents bibliographies published in Slovenia between 1561 and 1973. Since then, there has not been a similarly concise accounting of bibliographic activities, at least in book form. There are, however, the annual bibliographic lists that the library journal *Knjižnica* publishes and makes available on the Internet using the same methodology. Scholarship has the urgent task of concisely presenting (in book form or on the Internet) the post-1974 bibliographies. This would seem to be a very necessary aid, although it takes but a few moments to ascertain on the Internet whether a bibliography has been published on a particular field or person. The *Bibliografija slovenskih bibliografij* contains the most varied kinds of bibliographies that have been done or are yet being compiled in Slovenia. The theoretical systematization of bibliographies is found in Janez Logar’s *Uvod v bibliografijo* (Introduction to bibliography 1970); Maks Veselko’s handbook, *Osnove bibliologije in bibliografije* (The fundamentals of bibliography and bibliography); Jože
Munda’s *Knjiga* (The book 1983); and Miran Hladnik’s *Praktični spisovnik ali šola strokovnega ubešedovanja* (A practical manual of style or a course in scholarly writing 2002). At different times there have been national and regional bibliographies, bibliographic periodical indices, scholarly bibliographies, bibliographies of publishing houses, genre and sub-genres, translations, and so forth. Bibliographies for individuals are abundant.

Once published and in general use bibliographies are probably most consulted for citing authorship or source. Databases like Cobiss and dLib at the National and University Library in Ljubljana are intended for the same general use. The reasons and occasions for compiling bibliographies vary—they may be professional (scholarly) or personal (due to a predilection for different bibliographic topics, in particular individual writers’ works). Bibliographies without a direct connection to the study of a topic are quite numerous. Such bibliographies have general informational intent: they enable searches for individual publications; data on authors and works; data on the existence of similar publications; on the range of editions; and studies and articles on given works, phenomena, and features. The student of a subject and the related bibliography are closely connected when a bibliography is the source of content and data web for a research project or study in progress, there not previously having been a fundamental examination of the subject. There are a great many examples of this in literary studies.

When France Kidrič studied pre-modern Slovene literature, he prepared the bibliographic basis for the Reformation and Counter-Reformation studies: He presented the printed works and manuscripts of 1600–1764 in *Bibliografski uvod v zgodovino reformacijske književnosti pri južnih Slovanih v XVI. veku* (A bibliographic introduction to the history of Reformation literature among the South Slavs in the sixteenth century 1927, lithograph) and *Opombe k protireformacijski (katoliški) dobi v zgodovini slovenskega pismenstva* (Notes on the Counter-Reformation [Catholic] period in the history of Slovene letters, ČJKZ 1921/1922). These were followed between 1929 and 1938 by the volumes of *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva: Od začetkov do Zoisove smrti* (A history of Slovene literature: From the beginnings to the death of Zois). Other literary historians of the older generation (Ivan Prijatelj, Ivan Grafenauer, and later France Koblar) and their followers (Anton Slodnjak, Mirko Rupel, Marja Boršnik, and Anton Ocvirk), as well as certain younger literary historians and researchers followed Kidrič’s example.

Marja Boršnik was my model in bibliographic studies. She developed the bases for monographs on Anton Aškerc, Fran Celestin, and Ivan Tavčar from bibliographies. Boršnik compiled a bibliography on Aškerc and published it in volume 4 of *Časopis za zgodovino in narodopisje* (The journal of history and folklore) for 1935. It was the most complete bibliography on an individual to that time. She collected a detailed data set on the contents of Aškerc’s works, which was the basis for her research into the poet’s life and works and for *Aškerc: Življenje in delo* (Aškerc: His life and works 1939). Similarly, she based the book *Fran Celestin* (1951) on her bibliography *Kazalo Celestinovega objavljenega dela* (An index of Celestin’s published works, p. 317–326). The third author for whom a bibliography paved the way to a book was Ivan Tavčar; however, she only wrote the first part of the monograph on him, *Ivan...
I undertook my first bibliography during my student years (1955–56), as an inspired student of Anton Slodnjak and Marja Boršnik. It was on the prose writer Ivo Šorli, who lived in Kranj at the time, residing in an attic apartment in the Arniškova house on Tomšičeva Street. We became acquainted and I visited him often. I conceived of a study, an article or at least a note on this interesting contemporary of the Moderna and his narrative prose. The writer helped me with data, recollections, and unknown facts about his works. A part of the bibliography—perhaps it should be called the objective part—I made by going through Ljubljanski zvon, Slovan, and other periodicals of that time. Yet the most valuable thing was the opportunity to check the data with the writer and ask him where he had published and under what names (pseudonyms, cryptograms). This turned out to be the chief advantage of direct contact with the author, and the bibliography was close to encompassing all or the great preponderance of what he had published. The writer had a sharp memory for his age. This was especially evident when we were determining who had written what about his books. I was thus able to expand the review sections attached to individual publications. France Dobrovoljc generously came to my aid on the third part, translations, and the bibliography was readied for print and for my studies. In 1957, the writer celebrated his eightieth birthday, and the magazine Gorenjska (Miloš Mikeln was the editor), which wanted to honor Šorli as a Slovene writer and citizen of Kranj, published my bibliography with the note, “On 18 April of this year, the writer Dr. Ivo Šorli turned eighty. He has lived in Kranj as a notary and then a retiree for the past decade (he now lives in Ogulin). Our magazine remembers him on this important anniversary by including a bibliography of his works.” I did not use the set of bibliographic data that I had then prepared until 2000, when I published a long study on Ivo Šorli’s short prose in Kranjski zbornik. A comprehensive consideration of his works remains for me to do.

The conceptual basis for the elite series Zbrana dela slovenskih pesnikov in pisateljev (The complete works of Slovene poets and prose writers) is certainly to blame for the fact that it does not contain comprehensive bibliographies on the writers. Exceptions are Slavko Grum, Alojz Gradnik (a bibliography of translating work in volume 5, 2008), Miran Jarc, and Vladimir Bartol (the latter with lists of sources in vol. 1, 2012). This lacuna is perpetuated in monographs, such as mine on Kersnik (2011), although I prepared biographical date and a bibliography before the book, and published it in Zbornik občine Lukovica (2004) under the title “Janko Kersnik (Krsnik) 1852–1897: Življenjepisna skica kot podlaga za monografijo” (Janko Kersnik (Krsnik) 1852–97: A biographic sketch as the basis for a monograph). I strictly followed the data set in writing the book.
Bibliographic indices of scholarly and academic serial publications in Slovene studies are useful for orienting oneself in the scholarship. A bibliographic index for the journal *Slavistična revija* for 1948 to 1977 was published in the journal in 1977 (compiled by Jože Munda), and in 1993, one was published for the period 1978–92 (compiled by Martin Grum). There is no longer a burning need for a post-1993 bibliographic index, because since then the journal has been digitalized and its archive is accessible from Digitalna knjižnica Slovenije (dLib, The Digital Library of Slovenia). In 1985, on the thirtieth anniversary of the journal *Jezik in slovstvo* (1955/56–84/85), there was a special issue with an index (compiled by Jože Munda), and in 1995, there was a special issue with an index for the years 1985/86–94/95 (compiled by Alenka Logar Pleško). *Jezik in slovstvo* has also been digitalized. Advanced internal text searches of these journals is not yet possible. The two journals are the main repositories for individual bibliographies of literary historians, which have appeared on important anniversaries (although some have appeared elsewhere, such as in the journal *Primerjalna književnost*). The literary historians are France Bernik, Marja Boršnik, Darko Dolinar, Helga Glašič, Matjaž Kmecl, France Koblar, Gregor Kocijan, Jože Koruza, Janko Kos, Dušan Moravec, Boris Paternu, Dušan Pirjevec, Jože Pogačnik, Tone Pretnar, and Franc Zadravec. They are especially useful for the period before Cobiss became operational, when there was no accurate capture of bibliographic data on literary studies publications scattered through periodicals yet.

On the twenty-fifth anniversary of the collection *Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture* there was a summary bibliographic index (1989), which Alenka Logar Pleško and Tone Pretnar assembled. The 1994 collection contained an index for the intervening years, and the 2004 issue contained an index for 1995–2003 (compiled by Anka Sollner Perdih). The decision to publish a thirty-year anniversary bibliography for the series *Odobba* (1980–2011) as a supplement to number 30 (compiled by Anka Sollner Perdih) was most welcome.

The lists of books by Taras Kermauner have a special place among bibliographies of individuals’ works. They have been published on dust covers, in the back material of his books, and on the Internet. The number (122 books in the series Rekonstrukcija in reinterpretacija slovenske dramatike alone, twenty-six of which are on the Internet), and the quantity of Slovene dramas he treats (approximately 780), calls for listing and making a subject index, which students in the Slovene program at Ljubljana University have begun. They have as models some complete subject indices for certain other literary history monographs in the Wikiproject Romani (Novels).

Since 1992, the journal *Jezik in slovstvo* has not been publishing annual bibliographies of Slovene literary studies, which enabled a quick rundown of new developments in literary history. Anka Sollner Perdih (2010) published a bibliography of literary studies titles for the years 2000–2009 on the recommendation of Gregor Kocijan (2010), who had written commentaries on the abundance of the publishing in literary studies (208 monographs and eighty-six collections). Only one-tenth of the collections of articles and one-sixth of the monographs had been reviewed in the academic press, which attests to poor networking in scholarship and the questionable resonance that publication of research results has.
Public access to large bibliographies and collections of texts on the Internet is responsible to a great degree for the changed literary studies paradigm. Awareness of the possibility of empirical and quantitative (statistical) approaches, which are at core of a new paradigm, has had a reverse effect on the expansion of existing databases and the formation of new ones. The differences between bibliography and the library are being gradually erased, because a click on a bibliographic entry now often leads to the full text. The national bibliographic service, Cobiss, is falling behind (the options for e-access are available for only a few percent of titles), making dLib, the Digitalna knjižnica Slovenije ever more relevant. The planned linkage between Cobiss and dLib will make literary studies materials more searchable and accessible.

Literary studies publications based on thorough bibliographic descriptions are not standard in Slovene literary scholarship. Gregor Kocijan’s (1983, 1988, 1996, 1999, 2012) analyses of short narrative prose are examples of such an approach. He has compiled approximately 13,000 titles of short prose works from 1850 to 1941. In his first book, the bibliography was a concluding, supplemental section, which then became an independent publication, which after some years (thirteen years passed between bibliography and synthesis) evolved into a synthetic analysis. The second half of the last period covered by the bibliography (1930–41) awaits synthesis.

Today’s discussions of short prose and its definition, which derives from the entire production, are more authoritative and reliable than before, because they are not limited to so-called prominent writers. A study of a large number of texts often reveals the constructed character of literary historical descriptions, which assign a given model primary or central importance. There is a constant drive towards innovation in short prose that is reflected in its naming: in place of standard names (sketch, novella, tale, etc.), quite a few authors have used unique genre terms in subtitles. 65% of short narratives during the Moderna period, and 84% between the WW I and WW II, were without genre classifications. There is not yet a post-1945 bibliography, but it ought to be easier to make one than in previous decades thanks to Cobiss. The statistical approach that Alenka Žbogar (2013) applies to contemporary short prose offers hope for a quantitative analysis of short prose.

Miran Hladnik (1979–82) use catalogued collections of texts in his project “Marxism in Slovene Literature.” He followed Kocijan’s model in analyzing the Slovene rural tale. The bibliography of 234 lengthier texts in this genre between 1859 and 1945, which was the starting point, was published in a chapter at the end of his book (Hladnik 1990). It later appeared as an Internet database (Hladnik and Jakopin 2000). His monograph on the Slovene historical novel (2009) was similarly conceived: a bibliography of 310 lengthier texts in the genre between 1845 and 2008 was published as a chapter (Hladnik 2009). It appeared as an Internet database considerably earlier (Hladnik and Jakopin 1999).

Bibliographic documentation of seminar activities goes back to the mid-1990s, when a collection of baccalaureate theses in literary studies in the Slovene program at Ljubljana University was ordered and put on the Internet (Hladnik and Jakopin 1998). Its 2,000 entries give insights into the dynamic of interests in literary studies after 1950 (Povalej 1988/89, Lovišček at al. 1995/96). Robert Jereb’s Struktura in funkcija literarne kritike (The structure and function of literary criticism 2009) and
Zoran Božič’s *Slovenska literatura v šoli in Prešeren* (Slovene literature in schools and Prešeren 2009) stand out among dissertations with clear bibliographic foundations. Jereb’s work is based on 877 reviews in the newspaper *Delo* in 1990; Božič excerpted the texts of 700 writers from all fifty-six Slovene Readings. Alenka Žbogar’s (2002) dissertation was based on an exhaustive bibliographic listing of collections of short prose, and Urška Perenič’s (2008) dissertation on the repertoire of all dramas staged in reading centers.

Literary studies in the context of library science have seen bibliometric research using bibliographic data, sometimes in Slovene studies as well (Jamborovič et al. 1999, Hladnik 2000, Močnik 2005, Dukič 2009 and 2011, Perko 2010, Perinović 2012). New are bibliographies that constantly update on the Internet, such as the bibliography for the research project “The Space of Slovene Literary Culture,” 2011–13, directed by Marko Juvan. The project is based on and combines collections of biographic, geographic, and bibliographic data. There is also the Seznam digitaliziranega leposlovja (List of digitalized fiction), containing 2,000 titles and links to full texts (Hladnik and Simonič 2012). Most of the texts are in the project Slovenska leposlovna klasika (Slovene classic fiction) on Wikisource (2007–), which is responsible for correcting scanned texts from dLib, the Internet Archive portal, and other Internet locations. The Ministry of Culture financed the project for five years in a row. Texts from other Internet collections are also included, such as eZISS, AHHLib, Digitalna knjižnica IMP, Zbirka slovenskih leposlovnih besedil, Beseda, and Nova beseda. Currently, old bibliographies are only in form of unsearchable digital images: Franc Simonič, *Slovenska bibliografija (1550–1900)* (A Slovene bibliography [1550–1900]), Janko Šlebinger, *Slovenska bibliografija za l. 1907–1912* (A Slovene bibliography for the years 1907–12), and Niko Kuret, *Slovenska knjiga: Seznam po stanju v prodaji dne 30. junija 1939* (The Slovene book: A list based on stock for sale, 30 June 1939).

The use of bibliographic collections on the Internet in literary studies is in its infancy. Still needed is a webization of the catalog of literary terminology at ZRC SAZU (The Academic Research Center of the Slovene Academy of Sciences and Arts), of a catalog of acronyms and pseudonyms at NUK (National and University Library), ongoing registration in Cobiss of new dLib digital works, and bibliographic handling of metadata for articles in scanned periodicals. Indices of original fiction in periodicals, especially long fiction, are developed in the context of seminar and baccalaureate theses, and are immediately accessible on Wikisource. Cobiss is an indispensable tool for literary history; therefore, its interface ought to be adapted or plainly written user guides provided, so that the literary historian need not seek assistance for every search from the few library experts familiar with the search criteria. Among the most frequent queries are, for example, a listing of the production in a given genre or period—let us say, of original Slovene novels of the last year for the Kresnik Prize competition (Hladnik 2010), or production in a particular language or region (Hladnik 2010b). The Cobiss listings of most read books (Najbolj brane knjige, Knjižnično nadomestilo), which give evidence on the borrowing of books by 17,000 live authors, are aids for contextualizing contemporary Slovene literature.
The index *Slovenska književnosti 1965–2015* (Slovene literature 1965–2015) on the platform Wikibooks displays a plan for processing genre corpora based on an exhaustive bibliographic description of the kind previous impossible due to bibliographic lacunae and difficulties accessing texts. Cobiss and dLib are ideal starting points for making special bibliographies, but because publication descriptions are incomplete or even erroneous, metadata for the collection will have to be entered manually, most probably in the context of literary history university seminars. The conclusions of a literary study that does not include an exhaustive bibliography on its subject when one is possible, but is founded on an *ad hoc* selection of sources, are subject to challenges of indiscriminate planning, and are more and more often viewed as arbitrary and of limited weight.
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