

Darko Dolinar and Marko Juvan, eds., *Kako pisati literarno zgodovino danes? Razprave* (Ljubljana: Znanstvenoraziskovalni center SAZU, 2003), 396 pp.

Likewise, Darko Dolinar and Marko Juvan, working in cooperation with the Slovenian Comparative Literature Association, have assembled nineteen scholarly papers from a 2002 international conference held in Ljubljana on the issue of literary history and how (and *not* whether!) it might be written in the present day. Contributors to the present volume come from Slovenia (nine), the Czech Republic (three), Italy and Austria (two each), Croatia, Slovakia, and Poland (one each). Their papers are in Slovene (thirteen), German (four), and English (two), and once again (very thoughtfully, for the international audience), each paper is equipped with abstracts in both Slovene and English, as well as longer résumés in English (when the papers are in Slovene) and Slovene (where the papers are in English or German). The territory covered includes both theory and praxis, with a particular focus on Slovene literary history and its Central European context. As Dolinar proclaims in his introduction (in Slovene at the beginning of the volume and in English translation at the end): “While the differences in viewpoints are expected, it should be pointed out that the one standpoint shared by all the authors [included in the volume] is that, notwithstanding a number of problematic aspects, the historical approach to literature is still possible and relevant, perhaps even necessary, for cognitive reasons” (369). Definition, scope, fundamental concepts, issues of literature and historiography, schools and methods, are all addressed in this weighty volume, which is also equipped with a thorough bibliography of works on Slovene literary history, beginning with Ivan Prijatelj’s ground-breaking essay in 1919 to works published in 2002 (345–66). I have been given to understand that an English translation of *How to Write Literary History Today?* is being planned, and I for one am greatly pleased at the prospect: not only will these insightful and informative papers be made known to a much broader readership, but also Slovene literary texts and Slovene literary history will become the common property of all those interested in the study of literature. Such international exposure can only benefit all parties. It is truly a healthy sign of Slovenia’s emergence in the world. Once again, the editors and contributors should be congratulated for what might well constitute a major advance in our appreciation of literary history.

*Henry R. Cooper, Jr., Indiana University*