

Bahovec is a man who seems never to have sat still. He returned to Ljubljana for the first time in 1960. That trip was made from Montréal, via Edinburgh, London and Paris; and his return to the U.S.A. was by freighter from Genoa. His subsequent travels in the sixties were to Egypt, and then to Yugoslavia again; Central Europe, then Turkey and Iran; then the Black Sea and Moscow. Another voyage took him through the Indian Ocean to Bombay, then to New Delhi, Singapore, Hong Kong and Japan. In 1967 he sailed around the world, and in 1972 he visited East Africa. In 1979 he returned to the Philippines for the first time in 70 years; in 1980 he again toured South and East Asia. And—at the very end of his autobiography—he says that he still wants to see northern India and Siberia!

The volume was edited by Janez Bogataj, Janez Fajfar, Mojca Ravnjanič and Nives Sulič; the last-named provided the extensive English summary (105-10). The body of the prose is supplemented by numerous photographs taken from the turn of the century through 1984. Finally, there are notes (111-19) to explain to the Slovene reader many of the place-names and historic events in faraway Alaska. Unfortunately, the print-run was of 800 copies only.

The combination of Fred Bahovec's very readable narratives, the generous English descriptions and clarifying notes, plus the photographs and the two maps of Alaska (indicating the specific places mentioned in both parts of the book), makes this little volume come alive. An exciting look back at early nineteenth-century development of the far Northwest, it instils in the reader an appreciative pride for the energy and commitment to an extra-full life shown by this venerable Slovene adventurer.

Joseph L. Conrad, University of Kansas.

Joža Mahnič, ed. *Jernej Kopitar v Vukovem letu: Govori in referati s študijskih dni in simpozija, podatki o življenju, izbor bibliografije*. Ljubljana: Kulturna skupnost Ljubljana Šiška, 1987. 72 pp.

Though small, this volume of papers outlining Jernej Kopitar's contribution to Slovene, Serbian and European culture makes a significant addition to the body of recent literature which seeks to redirect common but erroneous opinions about the Slovene scholar into more positive paths. Designed as an accompaniment to the festivities surrounding the dedication of a memorial room in Kopitar's birth house in Repnje (now in the Šiška section of Metropolitan Ljubljana, hence the publisher), "Jernej Kopitar during the Vuk Commemorative Year" offers tangible evidence of the new view that Kopitar must stand with Matija Čop and Francè Prešeren as the three greatest spirits of modern Slovene culture.

Three speeches open the volume, each by a noted Slovene scholar. Jože Toporišič equates Prešeren's poetic nurturing of the Slovene soul (*duša*) with Kopitar's development of the Slovene scholarly mind (*duh*), which two components together yielded a Slovene spirituality (*duševnost*) that gave the nation its character. Štefan Barbarič outlines the growing appreciation of Kopitar since the first centennial of his birth in 1880. Finally, Jože Pogačnik summarizes Kopitar's role in elucidating the cultures of Southeastern Europe and bringing them to the attention of nineteenth-century Europe.

Four papers of a more scholarly nature follow. Alenka Šivic-Dular investigates the origin of the so-called Pannonian Theory in Kopitar's thinking, and concludes that at least in Kopitar's mind it was not a theory at all, but a point of view involving non-linguistic (cultural and political) elements. Its two basic premises involved the identification of Moravia with Pannonia and of Slav with Slovene. In Kopitar's defense she notes that

neither he nor Josef Dobrovský (the Czech who fathered the opposing point of view, that Old Church Slavic was of Macedo-Bulgarian, not Pannonian, origin) were absolutely certain of their ideas, but that Kopitar was the better defender and propagator of his theories, which led to their initial acceptance by serious scholars and increased their impact on the development of the modern Slovene language.

Matjaž Kmecl contrasts Kopitar's understanding of the cultural and linguistic maturation of a nation with Čop's (and by extension, Prešeren's). In Kopitar's view, development is the result of a natural, collective, spontaneous process originating among the peasants (who alone had preserved a true Slovene) and leading to a genuinely popular culture. Čop and Prešeren felt, on the other hand, that Slovene peasant culture offered nothing of the magnitude of Serbian folk literature, and that therefore cultural norms would have to be adopted from the very best that the élite cultures of Europe had to offer. It lay with future generations, says Kmecl, to reconcile and fructify these very divergent points of views.

Finally, Janez Rotar speaks of Kopitar's indefatigable sponsorship of Vuk Karadžić and his work, and Boža Krakar-Vogel of the perception of Kopitar conveyed in Slovene school texts. The volume is rounded out with several photographs, a chronology of Kopitar's life and a bibliography. It may be noted in conclusion that the editor and some of the authors write with enthusiasm about the work that American scholars have done in promoting the re-evaluation of Jernej Kopitar's reputation.

Henry R. Cooper, Jr., Indiana University.

Janko Kos, *Primerjalna zgodovina slovenske literature*. Ljubljana: Znanstveni inštitut Filozofske fakultete; Partizanska knjiga, 1987. 265 pp.

Had Janko Kos written his comparative history of Slovene literature in English, he might well have entitled it "Slovene Literature in its European Context." Each of his thirty-nine chapters casts its net far and wide, from Scandinavia to Iberia, from Russia to America, so that the reader catches in each period, movement or development of Slovene literature, the literary models from which Slovene texts at least in part derived. Kos's erudition is impressive. Clearly a whole lifetime has gone into assembling the data, drawing the parallels, elucidating the connections, clarifying the definitions and establishing the termini a quo and ad quem within his study. The result is a cogent, unambiguous statement of the relationships between Slovene and European writers from the advent of modern Slovene literature in 1770 up to about 1970.

The reader should be warned, however, that this is not a book for neophytes. No mercy is shown to those who may not be familiar with any of the hundreds of works (poems, plays, novels, short stories) cited within. No plot summaries are offered, no lists of characters or indeed any details beyond what is absolutely necessary in order to make the connection between texts and context. As a matter of fact—though it is a small point—even first names are consistently omitted throughout the book (and in the index as well). The style, adequate as it is to the task at hand, does begin to get a bit dry after a while, despite a "hydrophilic" bent in the terminology, which constantly refers (probably of necessity) to "currents," "streams," "fluidity," "drying up," and the like. Still it must be said in the book's defense that it was assembled from many of Kos's previous studies of comparative issues in Slovene literature (hence the occasional repetitiveness in the style), and that it is certainly not meant to be read like a monograph, from cover to cover, but rather consulted