

Marko Juvan. *Domači Parnas v narekovajih: parodija in slovenska književnost.* Ljubljana: Literarno-umetniško društvo Literatura, 1997. 299 pp 3750 SIT (= \$22.25) (paper).

This is a comprehensive, cumulative study of parody in Slovene letters that draws upon the author's work, some of the results of which have been published in Slovenia and Croatia, throughout the 1990s. *Domači Parnas v narekovajih* demonstrates the broad view frequently taken in Slovene literary scholarship; indeed it is evident in the development of the author's widening approach since his first, fundamental study of intertextuality in *Imaginarij Krsta v slovenski literaturi: medbesedilnost recepcije* (1990). The definition and recognition of parody, states the author (14), is his main aim; the question of parody's function after the tides of modernism and postmodernism, his primary motivation (21). The former appears to dictate the historical description in chapters 2 ("O parodiji nekoč") and 3 ("O parodiji danes"), which, with the central pages dedicated to Mikhail Bakhtin's (and other Russian Formalists') views (51–77), shifts nicely in chapter 4 into theoretical considerations of parody's evolutionary role in Slovene literature, first posited by Boris Paternu (93 ff.), and differentiation of parody from other types of intertextuality (chapter 5) and a catalog of parody types (chapter 6). Chapters 5 and 6 together, followed by a ten-page description of the Slovene literary canon, and chapter 7, which unites parody, the canon, and literary development, are the two longest and key sections of the book.

Juvan does not adopt Bakhtin's thought wholly and uncritically—he has elsewhere pointed out incongruities in the Russian's writings on parody—and uses adequate Anglo-American and German studies published during the past several decades (a bibliography would have been a welcome supplement to the excellent footnotes). The cornerstone of Bakhtin's view, that parody is part and parcel of an increasingly heterogeneous, diverse world, is of most importance here. Whether or not parody always plays a centripetal role is another matter. In general, Juvan concludes (46), parody's "marginal" position in the constellation of post-Renaissance literary genres changed in large part thanks to the Formalist concept of center and periphery and their attention to "lower" genres. Some final comments on sources: the author appears to cite them as confirmation of rather than necessarily origins of his ideas. For this reason, I would

surmise, the sources are less numerous (about two dozen for the theoretical sections) and more prominent. In a very few instances—let us only consider Russian—more recent (e.g., of A. A. Morozov's work) or other (e.g., O. M. Freidenberg or V. I. Novikov) sources might have been chosen. In fairness, though, it must be recognized that the vast majority of parody studies pertain to a single author or at most a specific literary period. The synthetic work that Juvan has accomplished is unique.

For Slovenists the application of these observations to the faint stirrings of awareness of parody in nineteenth-century Slovenia (chapter 4) and the interweaving of examples from poetry and prose in chapter 5 are probably most interesting and instructive. Flisar, Jesih, Levstik, Mencinger, Milčinski, Rob, Rupel, Tavčar, Župančič—the list goes on—provide just a sampling of the varied material Juvan employs. He shows that since the 1960s Slovene parody has become, for historical reasons alluded to above, like other European and North American parody. Juvan is not unaware that theoretical considerations, though valuable, may weary some readers, as he humorously comments: "V nekoliko dolgi in dlakocepski prolegomeni v teorijo parodije kot medbesedilne vrste smo določili obseg parodije tako v razmerju do pojavov ... kot ... do drugih medbesedilnih vrst in žanrov ..." (131). On the other hand, this conclusion is buried exactly in the middle of chapter 5, as is a succinct statement of his thesis and its relation to Bakhtin's historical poetics (133). So, too, readers might either appreciate or wonder at the return to basic elements of the argument at different points throughout the book; for example, the definition of parody (105, 110, 131, 133, and elsewhere) and the delineation of two basic parodies, stylistic and thematic (135, 175, 214–15).

Juvan considers stylistic parody, in which the referent text or genre is syntactically deformed in a new context, to be the more significant of the two (175). Readers will quickly understand the distinction by his leading example of this type of parody, Levstik's "Mrtvi žabi" (1882). Further argumentation effectively shows the difference between this type of parody and thematic parody, or travesty.

Parody's function, literary processes, and cultural history come together neatly at the end of the book, in particular in the survey of modernism to postmodernism (271–92). The brief, intriguing

discussions of parody of national “myths” in this section and elsewhere would seem to indicate an area of further research. Juvan characterizes the Slovene practice as “essential archaism” in the spirit of Heidegger (283). This is an example of a promising lead thought made possible by the extensive groundwork Juvan has laid with this book; it shows the author, having answered the questions “What?” and “How?,” wrestling with “Why?”

Timothy Pogacar, Bowling Green SU