

divided into seven subject headings: general, cultural, economic, historical, juridical, political, and social. The *Dictionary* has about 400 entries, ranging from a few sentences to three pages in length, and approximately seventy-five items that are cross-listed. The first entry is Academia Operosorum (1693–1725), the first society of intellectuals in Ljubljana, the last is Oton Župančič (1878–1949), one of the most important representatives of the Slovene *moderna*. In between one finds entries on history, geography, politics, economy, culture, population, and political developments. Given the fact that Slovenia became independent only in 1991, it is understandable that the bulk of the entries would deal with the twentieth century—that is, the Yugoslav movement, interwar Yugoslavia, the Tito era, and finally the dynamic events that led to Slovenia's independence. In no way, however, does this imply that Slovene history has been slighted. Entries provide us with information on the settlement of the Slovenes in their current homeland and the adoption of Christianity, with its subsequent influence on all aspects of Slovene life and culture. The long association with the Habsburg empire is amply documented. Slovene intellectual activity in the early modern period (1500–1800), especially the eighteenth-century Enlightenment, which served as the prelude to nineteenth-century nationalism, is well represented. The Slovenes' spirited defense of their language, which perhaps did most to preserve their national identity, can be found in linguistic, literary, and political entries. The contributions on Slovenia's experiences first in interwar Yugoslavia and then under Tito's national communism help one understand how the Slovenes skillfully exploited the political unrest of the eighties and the emergence of pluralism to achieve their independence. There is enough information in this excellent historical dictionary to serve as a source for a sound, short history of modern Slovenia, something we desperately need in our field.

Charles Jelavich, Indiana University

Károly Gadányi. *The Evolution of Vocabulary in Literary Slovene.* Melbourne: Melbourne Academia Press, 1996. vi + 322 pp. (cloth).

Hungarian Slavists bring a unique perspective to the study of the Slavic standard languages of East Central Europe. While they remain outside

any of the nationalistically tinged debates about questions of interference or indebtedness (except, naturally, those that involve Hungarian), they are able to appreciate—perhaps more fully than anyone else—the process of renewal (enrichment, standardization, and purification) that a language of the region faced if it was to become a polyvalent, nationally representative idiom. A book such as the one reviewed here, by Hungary's most eminent Slovenist, Károly Gadányi, is therefore especially welcome, particularly since it deals with the lexicon, a much neglected field in Slovene scholarship.

The opening chapter (1–56) sets the study in a firm theoretical framework. Firstly (1–4), Gadányi—in keeping with his Ukrainian colleague and collaborator V. E. Moiseenko—rightly situates the evolution of standard Slovene within the “Austro-Slavic Culturo-Historical Area.” Next (5–34), he deals in impressive detail with inter-Slavic borrowing and problems of attribution of source, so crucial to an understanding of the development of the Slovene lexicon. Then Gadányi embarks on a characterization of Slovene “as a complex linguistic phenomenon” (34–40), a section that bears an uncanny resemblance (even down to the title) to an article by Dalibor Brozović already familiar to readers of this journal.¹ The final part of this chapter deals with theoretical questions concerning standard languages. Chapter 2 (57–103), which deals with the cultural and historical background to the development of written Slovene, offers little new information, certainly little that would not already be known, for example, to readers of Rado Lencek's *The Structure and History of the Slovene Language*,² a work that, like Henry Cooper's *Francè Prešeren*,³ is inexplicably absent from the otherwise extensive, 972-item bibliography.

These preliminaries over, we come to the kernel of Gadányi's study, Chapters 3, 4, and 5, which deal respectively with (i) the structure and origin of the lexicon of standard Slovene, (ii) the phonological, orthographic, and morphological adaptation of Slavic loanwords, and (iii) questions of word-formation. The author begins by

¹ Dalibor Brozović, “Contemporary Standard Slovene: A Complex Linguistic Phenomenon,” *Slovene Studies* 10.2 (1988): 175-90.

² (Columbus: Slavica, 1982) 251-293.

³ (Boston: Twayne, 1981).

rightly asserting the importance of xenophobic purism in guiding Slovene (and Croatian) to prefer calques, neologisms, and Slavic loans to internationalisms in the formative phase of its development. The bulk of Gadányi's treatment (110–27) is devoted to a comparison and contrast of the Slovene material with the corresponding Croatian and Serbian compilations for the 1853 trilingual, state-produced administrative and juridical terminology, much of it based on the acknowledged contributions of the Croatian scholar Mile Mamić. Gadányi concludes from the evidence that in 1853 Slovene was the least resistant of the three languages to internationalisms and suggests "that in the early 1850s Slovenian was not yet subject to rigidly puristic attitudes and that it begins to evolve into the most 'puristic' of the three languages approximately two decades later" (120). In that case, this extreme puristic phase must have been very short-lived for, as Gadányi himself reports (117), this resistance was already being relaxed by 1880, to judge by Matej Cigale's *Znanstvena terminologija* of the same year,⁴ which explicitly repudiated the excesses of Šulek for Croatian and Šafařík for Czech. Admittedly, when we encounter Cigale's remarks on the subject again later (134), it is to find that the completion of the quotation has him softening, if not actually contradicting, this stance with a full acceptance of loans from Czech in the field of chemical terminology. Indeed, Bohemianisms constitute not only the single most important source of new words in nineteenth-century Slovene (e.g., 450 basic units plus 1100 derivatives in Pleteršnik's dictionary of 1895)⁵ but are represented in all lexico-semantic spheres, their distribution being very much like native Slovene lexemes. The debt to Czech is not confined to loanwords but also includes suffixes and word-formational models (151–76). A short, rather general set of conclusions (177–81) rounds out the volume.

To the main body of the work is appended a dictionary of 839 calques and loanwords together with their 2376 derivatives (234–313). The probable sources of 741 of these have been established by previous scholars; the remainder have been dealt with by Gadányi. For each lexeme, the word-form and meaning is given, the possible model(s) in other Slavic languages is provided together with the earliest attestation

⁴ (Ljubljana: Matica Slovenksa).

⁵ Maks Pleteršnik, ed., *Slovensko-nemški slovar* (Ljubljana: Knezoškofijstvo, 1894-1895).

and the source of previous etymological commentary where applicable. What is a little obfuscating about this table is that the attestations do not differentiate between Slovene and Croatian. Sometimes, only Slovene attestations are given, whereas on other occasions the earliest attestation is Croatian. This could be potentially confusing for readers who are not immediately familiar with the dictionaries in question. Similarly, the commentaries may refer to the source of the word in Slovene or Croatian. Another shortcoming of this listing is that it relies almost entirely on the evidence of dictionaries and word-lists. This is unfortunate because dictionaries used in isolation, particularly those from the nineteenth century, can be very misleading: some words are often used in print much earlier, whereas others appear in dictionaries only as artificial, paper forms. Nevertheless, used with extreme caution, this list can serve as a useful orientation point for Slovenists and Croatianists alike.

On the formal side, there are some perplexing features about this book which cannot be glossed over. Firstly, on page xiv there is a puzzling reference to "the authors of this work." Is this a simple error or is there an unnamed collaborator in this enterprise? Secondly, as the title would indicate, this volume is in English. However, as I can confirm from personal experience, the author speaks no English, yet there is no note about the fact of translation or the identity of a translator. I strongly suspect that this book has been translated from Russian, a fact that has unfortunately given rise to several problems in its presentation that many potential readers will find irritating. Nowhere is this more apparent than in—of all things—the transmission of Slovene personal names: *Franc Prešeren* (80), *Miklošič* (93), *Juri Dalmatin* (59), *E. Kopitar* (69, 71), *Matij Cigal* (101), *Maiar* (101). Slovene place names fare little better: for the usual English *Carniola* we have variously *Kranj* (66) or (more usually) *Krajna* (65); Trubar's birthplace is rendered as *Pashchitsa* (58) and *Raščic kod Velikih Lašča* (59). The names of Russian, Czech, and Slovak scholars are also mutilated on occasion: *Safárik* (80), *Gabovšt'aková* (49), *Paulini* (49), *Celakovsky* (81), but *Celakovski* (87), *Komenski* (68), *Kulakovski* (89). Even this reviewer is given the initial "D" in his name (109). Parenthetically, these examples show convincingly—if my above suspicion is right—how inadequate Russian Cyrillic is in rendering any Slavic idioms written in the Latin alphabet. Examples of faulty translation abound: *synchronic* for *synchronous* (59), *people's* for *peoples*

(73), *Chernogorians for Montenegrins* (96); another has the Slavs occupying "a vast territory from the North Sea to the Adriatic" (74). Some sentences make no sense at all: "With respect to the theme of our work, there are sound reasons for viewing Slovenian translations of the Bible as an objective and authoritative ethnocultural determinant" (64).

These formal inadequacies, the blame for which cannot in the absence of a named editor or translator be properly apportioned, are not only distracting and unattractive, but make it difficult to recommend the work to, say, a student of linguistics unfamiliar with Slovene—or for that matter the Slavic world in general. This is a great pity for several reasons. Firstly, this is, to my knowledge, the first published monograph in any language on Slovene lexicology apart from studies of loanwords (German by H. Striedter-Temps⁶ and Russian by Annalies Läg Reid⁷)—though mention should be made here of Erich Prunč's excellent study,⁸ which is missing from Gadányi's bibliography. Secondly, it puts the evolution of the Slovene standard lexicon firmly in the context of the common problems facing the Slavic standard languages emerging in the former Habsburg Empire. In particular, it properly emphasizes both the importance of Czech as the paradigm for lexical enrichment and purification in the region, and the substantial role played by Croatian as an intermediary for this influence. It is to be hoped that the publication of this book will prompt others—including scholars in Slovenia—to address such pressing lexicological problems as the relationship between the lexicons of standard Croatian and Slovene, and the extent to which the lexicon of the Slovene standard language is the product of a specific experience, during its formative years, of cultural, educational, and administrative life in the Habsburg Empire.

George Thomas, McMaster University

⁶ Hildegard Striedter-Temps, *Deutsche Lehnwörter im Slovenischen* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1963).

⁷ Annelies Läg Reid, *Die russischen Lehnwörter im Slovenischen; die in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts übernommenen Wörter* (Munich: Trofenik, 1973).

⁸ Erich Prunč, "Das innere Lehngut in der slovenischen Schriftsprache: Versuch einer Typologie der Lehnprägung im Slovenischen," Habilitationsschrift, U Graz, 1967.