

previously known, Magajna has now substantiated them with documents. She has also indicated that the above complaints were the same as the ones which caused the Liberals and the Catholics to break with the Slovene Liberation Front some two years earlier.

Among other activities of the SDZ, the SKSZ, and the *Neodvisni Slovenci* which Magajna describes are their efforts for the defense of the FTT and their demands for the recognition of Slovene national rights as guaranteed in the Permanent Statute of the FTT. While the SDZ and the SKSZ presented the Slovene National List, supported by both parties for the elections of 1949, the *Neodvisni Slovenci* remained uncommitted though in sympathy with the *Slovenska narodna lista*.

Many valuable data are to be found in numerous and extended footnotes. The bibliography and an index of personal names also come in handy.

Magajna must be congratulated for her detailed research, critical analysis of the archival material, and an objective presentation of a very complicated and sensitive subject.

*Bogdan C. Novak, University of Toledo*

France Novak, *Poslovni in uradovadni jezik*. Ljubljana: ČGP Delo—TOZD Gospodarski vestnik, 1980. 135 pp. 240 Dinars.

This book on the Slovene language is the first systematic attempt to present a business and official style of contemporary Slovene. The purpose of the book is “to improve [the use of] the language . . . in business and administrative activity” (5) and that “activity” certainly covers a lot of ground, from different economic enterprises to various sociopolitical and cultural organizations and societies.

In the first part of the book (7-15), F. Novak defines the “business and administrative language” (*poslovni in uradovadni jezik*) as the “use of the literary language” in human activities. The adjectival form, *uradovaden*, is of a fairly recent derivational vintage (*urad* “office, bureau,” *uradovati* “to work, be on duty [in an office]”) and its meaning is easily recognizable as is that of *posloven* (*posel* “business,” etc.) which has been in use for a long time. The author also suggests an even more descriptive term for such language style, namely, *uradni delovni jezik* “an official (standard) language [used] at work” (8), “work” indicating here any formal or official human



interaction. Novak also makes it clear at the very beginning that the Slovene linguistic system (the phonology and grammar) is the same as that in the other styles or varieties of the Standard, only its use being different. He lists some 89 different text titles using this style, from *akreditiv* "credentials; letter of credit" to *zavarovalna polica* "insurance policy."

In the main section of the book, Novak describes the peculiarities of this style and its current state in Slovene. He points out an interesting sociolinguistic situation, namely, that there are still vestiges of a tradition among the general public not to have a very high opinion of business language or "officialese." In fact, not too long ago people frequently cited the texts of the business style as examples of bad and unacceptable writing (20). Novak makes it clear that all the peculiarities of business language are of stylistic nature and that they do belong to the Slovene linguistic system. Whatever does not exist in the linguistic system, even as an exception, cannot be an element of style, but is a mistake (21). Perhaps another reason for the rather slow standardization of this style has been an apparent tendency on the part of some Slovene business enterprises and institutions to communicate with their own Slovene customers in another language, most often in Serbo-Croatian (21), thus reducing the functions of their native Slovene language. This is quite interesting, because Slovenes in the Socialist Republic of Slovenia are under no formal constraints from the outside not to use their own language in whatever human functional interaction they desire.

Under "Morphology," the author discusses a dozen areas with the most frequent and most typical mistakes in the business style, e.g. *opravljati delo za sebe* "to (do) work for oneself" instead of the "correct" *opravljati delo zase*. That is, according to the general rule, in several instances, after a monosyllabic preposition, the short, rather the long form of the pronoun is to be used (*za sebe* → *zase* ← *za se*) (43). Nevertheless, if more and more speakers and users of this speech style do use the long form (after a preposition), would that not become a regular feature acceptable in this style? The use of the long form does appear to me somewhat emphatic, perhaps more formal.

Under the category "Lexicon," Novak gives a very useful semantic analysis of the use of the terms *potrošnik* "consumer," *uporabnik* "user; beneficiary" and their synonyms. Finally, Novak also discusses briefly some general aspects of texts such as clarity of arrangement, conciseness and, concerning the more specific linguistic feature, the relatively infrequent use of modal expressions. While he does give examples of particular grammatical and semantic features treated in the book, he could also have included



at least a few samples of actual texts of this stylistic variety of Slovene.

The book also contains a bibliography, a subject index and a word index. It is certainly an innovative and a very useful text, a textbook on spoken and written business Slovene and "officialese," a stylistic variety of Slovene traditionally neglected by Slovene linguistic scientists.

*Joseph Paternost, The Pennsylvania State University*