

At the very end of the volume we find the farewell article "Slovo od *Traditiones*," by its editor, Marija Stanonik, with her thanks for cooperation on her issues of the journal: *Naš Živi Jezik* (*Traditiones* 23 [1994]), *Slovstvena Folklor* (*Traditiones* 24 [1995]), *Besede in Reči* (*Traditiones* 25 [1996]), and *Res Slovenica - Quo Vadis?* (*Traditiones* 26 [1997]).

Rado L. Lencek, Columbia University

Gerd Hentschel, ed. *Über Muttersprachen und Vaterländer. Zur Entwicklung von Standardsprachen und Nationen in Europa*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1997. x + 297 pp., \$44.95 (paper).

This collection of thirteen essays, originally delivered in 1995 as papers in a lecture series at the University of Oldenburg, deals with the relationship between the nation state and the standard language, especially in the light of the redrawing of the political map of Europe over the last decade: the reunification of Germany, the centripetal forces within the European Community, the velvet divorce of the Czechs and Slovaks, the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the aftermath of the demise of Yugoslavia. Although the essays cover an impressive geographical range from the Netherlands to the Caucasus, I shall limit my comments to those few that have direct bearing on the Slovenes, their language, and their homelands.

In his contribution entitled "Sprachen und Nationen des südslavischen Raums" (241–63), the well-known German Slavist, Werner Lehfeldt, devotes three pages (242–45) to the Slovenes. He stresses that in the nineteenth century the drawing of the linguistic divide was equivalent to the marking of national boundaries. As an example he offers the status of the Slavic speakers of Styria, whose dialects were quite close to the Croatian kajkavian written language. The natural consequence, Lehfeldt maintains, would have been to classify these dialects and their speakers as Croatian. When in the 1830s written Croatian kajkavian was supplanted in Zagreb by the neo-štokavian favored by Ljudevit Gaj and his associates, the attempts to bring these people into the Croatian fold were likely to founder with the result that, in his view, the only remaining option for the Slavic speakers of Styria—and here Lehfeldt would add Carinthia too—was the

Slovene standard language and, with it, Slovenian nationhood. This thesis is all a little simplistic and, quite surprisingly, ignores two other options that Slavs in these two provinces have considered and, in some cases, adopted at various times over the last century and a half—to say nothing of the very real possibility of assimilation to the dominant German culture (for which, see below).

The first of these was the “Illyrian” concept, the idea of a common language and nationhood for all the South Slavic peoples. This concept reached its apogee in Zagreb but originated from Gaj’s contact with the Styrian Stanko Vraz when they were both students together in Graz in the early 1830s. Indeed, Vraz himself like many other intellectuals from Styria—far from adopting the Slovene option—continued to ally himself with the Illyrian cause and championed the use of the newly introduced štokavian, the basis of the modern Croatian standard. The second was the recognition that one spoke a local dialect, designated in German as *windisch*, that had nothing in common with Carniolan and that, largely because of the large number of German loanwords it contained, was regarded by many as some sort of German-Slavic hybrid. This label and the concept behind it, so ruthlessly exploited by German nationalists, still prevails—*nolens, volens*—to this day.

There is still another problem with Lehfeldt’s bald assertion: there was as yet no Slovene standard—in the modern sense of the word—to which these Slavic-speaking Styrians and Carinthians could turn. This only developed from the middle of the nineteenth century with the cementing of the dialectal base, compromises in morphology towards the Styrian and Carinthian dialects, and large-scale Slavization of the intellectual lexicon, which was until then hopelessly impoverished, through the wholesale introduction of puristically motivated loanwords from Czech, Russian, Croatian, Serbian, and Church Slavic. This national language did not come without some baggage attached. First, from the 1920s onwards there has been a pronounced negative attitude to the profusion of Croatian and Serbian elements in the Slovene standard. Second—and, arguably, more importantly—its compromised mixture of dialects, its purification, and its Slavization meant that the standard was not close to any of the spoken dialects. In Lehfeldt’s view, this renders the learning of the pronunciation, spelling, and grammatical norms of the standard language particularly difficult and ensures that the standard language is

not used as the everyday means of communication for Slovenes. In its place a common Slovene koine, differing from both the dialects and the standard language, has shown signs of developing. Clearly, more research on this form of language needs to be done, but we can all surely join Lehfeldt in wondering how this situation will play out in a newly independent Slovenia.

The second contribution of particular interest to Slovenists is “Die Vertreibung der Mehrsprachigkeit am Beispiel Österreichs 1867–1918” (35–49) by the Viennese-based expert on the language element in educational policy in the western half of the former Habsburg Empire, Hanna Burger. Its principal thesis is that the politicization of education in Austria has led to a national segregation of the school system and to the demise of multilingual instruction.

The situation in the Slovene lands, however, provides a somewhat different picture. The number of Slovene-language primary schools was well below a level commensurate with the percentage of Slovene-speakers in the population. Nevertheless, during this period, the ratio of Slovene-language to bilingual (i.e., German-Slovene) schools went from 3:1 to 4:1. As Burger herself recognizes (42), multilingual schools were retained in those places such as Silesia and the Slovene-populated provinces, where there was a lack of political strength. As the tables on pages 48 and 49 show, in the school years 1872/73, 1881/82, 1893/94, and 1903/04 there was not one single Slovene-speaking gymnasium in the whole of the western half of the Habsburg Empire, although by 1913/14 there were two. Even the provision of bilingual German-Slovene gymnasia, which varied between two and six over the last half-century of the Empire’s existence, meant that access to secondary education for Slovenes was well below the state average. Burger (45) expressly commends the model for “*utraquist*” secondary schools developed by the Slovene J. Šuman for Maribor, Celje, and Novo Mesto, whereby some subjects were to be taught in German and others in Slovene.

Although Burger’s criticism of an education system that did not encourage pupils to study languages is surely justified, it is hard to agree with her that there was no compunction on the part of the citizenry to learn German. Indeed, seen from a Slovene perspective, one might argue that Slovene-speakers—especially in Carinthia and Styria—were being actively encouraged to assimilate to the German language and the

mainstream German culture. Even if Slovene-speakers had made it through the school system without a thorough knowledge of German, they must have known that such a shortcoming would have effectively barred them from any form of post-secondary education.

The peripheral treatment of matters Slovene in this volume is, of course, something that Slovenists have come to expect from publications dealing with East Central and South East Europe. Let us hope that a future generation of Slovenists will tackle the very interesting questions of ethnogenesis, paradigms of nationhood, and the impact of the contemporary Slovene standard language on the formation of the Slovene nation, to which this volume is unable to do full justice.

George Thomas, McMaster University

Ursula Rütten. *Im unwegsamen Gelände. Paul Parin—Erzähltes Leben.* Hamburg: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1996. 222 pp., DM 38.00 [= \$20.35] (cloth). Photos and maps.

The book at hand is an unorthodox, and at times rather nebulous, biography of the Swiss psychoanalyst and author, Paul Parin. The work was commissioned by the publisher on the occasion of Parin's eightieth birthday in 1996. Parin, who was born in Slovenia and returned to Yugoslavia to serve as a doctor with the Partisans during World War II (see reviews in *Slovene Studies* 13.2), has published a great deal on psychoanalysis, ethnopsychology, and wars in the former Yugoslavia. He has also written several volumes of fiction and memoirs. These varied publications serve as the source for numerous quotations, supplemented by interviews, which the biographer has assembled and linked with a running commentary to memorialize the life and work of Parin.

That the author, Ursula Rütten, is enthusiastic for her subject is patent in this description of Parin's "enviable life," which also serves as an overview of the book:

... childhood and youth in an idyllic region, well-supplied with material comforts, an excellent education, a career pursued out of conviction and inclination, a life partner who accompanied