What makes this work attractive is not only the information and the scholarly discussion given, but the draftsmen-like hand-drawn illustrations provided to show the construction and name of the individual parts of a given product—for example, a kozolec—and the many photographs, both black-and-white and in color. Moreover, the book is handsomely produced, with a hard cover, and with clear printing on quality paper. There are lengthy summaries in English (almost seven closely-printed pages) and in German (over eight such). All in all, Bogataj’s book is a must for anyone interested in Slovene culture.

Joseph L. Conrad, University of Kansas.


The dedication of this book reads: “očetu in vsem, ki so sli na tisto pot / to my father and all who took the same route”—that is, the route from Slovenia to the United States, *via* Ellis Island. Bergles’ father returned twice to his native land, and it was there that he told the young Ciril about the country “čez veliko lužo.” The first twenty poems treat the major themes arising from the link between Slovenia and the United States, and what each country means to Slovenes living in the other. A typical example, in its straightforward appeal to simple imagery and in its equally straightforward language, is “Chicago” (32-33):

“S trudno roko / I / nam je razkril / svoj zaklad. / Dvoje orumenelih slik / domačije nekje / na Dolenjiskem, / očeta v irhastih hlacah / in matere v kučamajki. / Nekaj pisem iz stare dežele, / napisanih z okorno roko. / Droben žitni klas is laza. / Nekaj zrn domače prsti. / In tisti list / z Ellis Island, / ki pravi, / da Zaitz John / lahko v tej deželi / živi, / dela in umre.”

The translation typifies the quality that Žohar achieves throughout the book, too: in general it is acceptable, but there are one or two passages that spoil the overall impression:

“With his tired hand / I / he showed us / his treasure. / Two yellowed pictures / of a homestead somewhere / / in Dolenjska, / of his father in wash-leather trousers / and of his mother / in her dress of yester-year. / Few letters from old homeland, / written by a clumsy hand. / A tiny ear of corn. / Few grains of native soil. / And the piece of paper / from Ellis Island, / which says / that Mr. John Zaitz / may in this land / stay, work / and pass away.”

The errors are few in number, and some of them—e.g., (1) the omission of *iz laza*, which would indeed be awkward: “A tiny ear of corn from the overgrown forest clearing”?! or (2) the evasion of the problem posed by *kučamajka*; or (3) adding the gratuitous “Mr.”—are arguably excusable. However, here, as in too many other poems, we find expressions that are just not correct English: especially, *Nekaj pisem* and *Nekaj zrn* demand translation as the positive “A few letters” and “A few grains” rather than the negative “Few.”

Turning to the collection as a whole, it must be pointed out that, occasionally, Žohar’s errors are serious. …*je kot navček / ihtelo* is very different from “… it sounded / like a gentle requiem” (“Lipoglav,” 12-13). In “Dolenjsko” (28-29), *V očeh sem ji videl / tisto dolenjsko kajžo* is surely not be translated as “In her eyes I saw / that dear old cottage,”
which evokes quaintness, not simplicity. *Govori in razklada, / po naše, / po ameriško suffers badly: “He talks and explains / in our, / in American slang” (“Star Route,” 36-37). Finally, ... vel v vejah dreves / in tople sonce is unjustifiably expanded into “… wind in the trees, / warm sun on the cheeks” (“Lake Isabel,” 40-41).

The second and longer part of the book (48-121) deals with Bergles’ travels around the United States; it is rather artificially subdivided into two sections: one labelled “Sears Tower,” which roams far from Chicago, and the other “Death Valley,” which does stay mostly in California but finishes up in Tucson. Here, as in the first section, Žohar spoils what are normally quite successful translations with enough errors for them to be obvious and hence to detract from the value of all his successes. Some instances: Interpolations, e.g.: *Usoda vseh tekačev se je zgoščalo / v njegovih nogah becomes “The fate of runners, all deceased [sic], was getting thicker in his legs” (“Eric Lauro je prvi pretekel Death valley,,” 118-19). Omissions, e.g., in “Sears Tower” (54-55): *Bronasti Indijanci is rendered as “The Indian”, and *V jekleno ptico na trgu se bo jutri / zagrizel čas as “Tomorrow into the steel bird / time shall bite.” Plain mistakes, e.g.: Z odprtimi usti “With our mouths closed” (“Thorndike,” 105-06); *Vrni mi moč, da se bom boril / s časom, ki teče skozi nas / in nas odaša “Give me back my power to fight / the time which is passing through me, / carrying me away” (“Molitev starega Indijanca,” 92-93).

Moreover, the English style is too frequently unacceptable. I count over 20 instances of incorrect articles, and as many other grammatical and lexical errors, thus: *Edino John Paul Scott / je napravil pravi zalet as “Only John Paul Scott / took a right run,” (“Alcatraz,” 66-67). In Od nekje pride krotka žival. / Prepozna mojo stisko. / Leže k mojim nogam in mi lže roki we have an accumulation of omissions and a lexical error: “From somewhere comes a beast and lies down at my feet,” in the (mis-spelled!) “Rapsody in Blue” (82-83). Apart from spelling errors like this, the proof-reading is generally poor: there are even, seemingly, whole lines omitted from the Slovene original.

The task of the reviewer should be something other than the exemplification of unnecessary errors. It would have been far more rewarding to discuss interesting problems: thus, whether Slovene poetry should be translated into British English or North American English; here, the British English does appear somewhat out of place, especially in poems entitled (for example) “Arlington National Cemetery,” “Las Vegas,” or “Harlem;” thus, in “Colorado” (14-15), where *Hočem videti / tisto deželo. Praw vse hočem videti. / Staro reko Arkansas in prerijo / in tiste ulice in vse concludes with a Britishism: “I want to see / that land. To see it all. / The old river Arkansas, the prairie, / those streets and the lot:” “the lot” to North American readers will surely sound like a place to park their cars... Also, of theoretical importance are questions such as the following:

Does the translator choose the impersonal “it” or the personified “she” when referring to “the earth” and to “death”? In “Napis na Berglesovo farmo v Wausaukeeju” (34-35), for instance, the original is *Ta zemlja / je postušala / slovenske besede. / Ta zemlja / je pila / slovensko kri. / V kasnih večerih / so jo božale / slovenske roke: and I think Žohar has made the correct choice here, “This land / was listening to / Slovene words. / This land / was drinking / Slovene blood. / In late evenings / she was caressed / by Slovene hands,” rather than “… it was caressed...” I am also in agreement with his giving the same treatment to “death” in “Death Valley” (100-101): *Smrt je tu tik za petmi. / Skriva se v tvoji senci. / Moral se boš / navaditi nanjo. / Brez nje si nič... / Moral se boš / pogavarjati z njo / in jo ljubkovati rendered as “Death is here, dogging your footsteps, / hiding in your shadow. / You will have to / get used to her. / Without her you are nothing. / You will have to / speak to her / and cuddle her.” These instances do however raise the question:
how far does one go with this kind of personification? And what do translators do when the gender does not fit?

A problem specific to few languages that provide poetry for translation into English is posed by the Slovene dual. “Empire State Building” (50-51) is a case in point: what non-Slovene-speaker, reading the following translation: “It was pouring / while we were standing / on the Empire State Building. / All was grey and / we did not see a thing...,” will realize that only two people are referred to: Dež je lil, / ko sva stala / na Empire State Building. / Vse je bilo v sivem / in nisva videla ničesar? And what of the contrast between the first stanza, with its repetitions of duals, and the second, which begins Potem smo govorili...? Is the contrast to be lost? Or are translators to keep peppering their translations with words like “both”: “It was pouring / as we both stood there ... / All was grey and / neither of us saw a thing...,” to be contrasted (perhaps) with “Then we all spoke ...”? The book is completed by a very instructive (although at times intense, over-dense) afterword in Slovene, by Andrej Blatnik: “Kodeljevo, Amerika” (125-131), with two sections: “Amerika, Kodeljevčani in jaz” and “Amerika, Slovenci in Ciril Bergles.” This is followed by a translation of the afterword into English by Anne Čeh; and (cf. my criticisms of Čeh as a translator in Slovene Studies 10/1 (1988) 96-66) these translations are—apart from one or two Britishisms, which I consider out of place in this particular book—excellent. Mrs. Čeh is also listed as the “recenzent prevoda,” however; and it does appear that the series editors did not allow her to do this (very necessary!) task. When translators are not fully bilingual (and so few are!) it is absolutely imperative that their work be checked; and now that so many more translations of Slovene literature are being published, this point has become crucial.

To conclude on a more positive note: although Jože Žohar’s translations, together with the lack of editing and the poor proofing, result in too many errors, let it not be thought that there is nothing here for the English-speaking reader. Much of Bergles’ poetry does come across successfully, and at times the translations are a great success; as, for example, in the last three lines of “Lake Isabel” (40-41): ...

Tom Priestly, University of Alberta.


Janez Rotar, a professor of Serbo-Croatian literature at the Filozofska fakulteta v Ljubljani, has published an authoritative study on the Slovene Protestant reformer Primož Trubar (1508-86) and his role and share in the organization of the South Slavic Bible Institute in Urach-Tübingen in the Duchy of Schwaben-Württemberg, Southern Germany, and of that Institute’s Croatian and Cyrillic book production in the years 1557-63. The basic facts of this venture are known from, e.g., Kostrenčič (1874), Elze (1879), Prijatelj (1908), Kidrič (1923, 1927, 1929-38), Murko (1927), Rupel (1956, 1965), Slodnjak (1954), Franičevič (1983) and Rajhman (1982, 1986), and, to a somewhat less reliable degree, from, e.g., Bučar (1910), Mirković (1960), Georgijević (1969), Franičević (1960, 1974), Šicel (1982), and Frangeš (1987). In brief: in 1560 the Carinthian Baron Hans Weissenhof Ungnad (1493-1564), the first commander of the military border in Croatia,