

tween *PSRL* 1 and *PSRL* 2, which contains the Hypatian family of manuscripts of the chronicle. Location listings represent not only occurrences in *PSRL* 1 but also occurrences in *PSRL* 2 at corresponding locations, even if the word is not found in *PSRL* 1 itself. Thus, the concorded text includes both Laurentian and Hypatian manuscripts and their variant texts.

Head words are listed in normalized dictionary form, followed by basic grammatical information and German and Greek correspondences as appropriate. This is followed by a list of occurring forms (for inflected words) and spelling variants, with grammatical identification and occasional commentary. Textual locations are listed at the end of the entry.

The volumes have been carefully executed; there are only rare errors, such as occasional inconsistencies in the way pleophonic forms are listed. I have not found any typographical errors.

Unfortunately, however, the concordance has not been planned with an eye toward utility. As I have indicated in a review of earlier volumes of the *Handbuch*, the organization of the entries for inflected words fails to associate particular forms with their locations; instead, all occurrences of all forms of a word are listed together. The same organizational principle leads also to all orthographic variants being given together, so that, for example, the several hundred occurrences of *s''* are listed without regard for their spelling as *s''*, *z*, *so*, and so on; notation of orthographic variants at each location would, of course, have been an enormous task, in view of the large number of manuscripts represented. Keying all occurrences to just one manuscript would seem to preclude offering an easily readable listing of all spelling variants for all manuscripts, and the choice made by Gröber and Müller is a compromise.

It is harder to explain the editors' treatment of polysemy. Thus, for example, the preposition *s''* occurs with three different cases in the concorded texts, but the listings for *s''* do not differentiate these different classes of occurrence. Similarly, all occurrences of the same name (e.g., *Rostislav''*) are listed together, even when they refer to different people; this is a step backward from the indexes provided in *PSRL*, which, on the whole, will continue to be of greater use to the historian than will this concordance.

EMILY KLENIN
Pacific Palisades, California

WIENER SLAWISTISCHER ALMANACH. Band 11. Edited by Aage A. Hansen-Löve and Tilmann Reuther. Vienna: Gesellschaft zur Förderung slawistischer Studien, 1983. 443 pp. Plates. Illustrations. Tables. DM 28/\$12.00, paper.

The journal *Wiener slawistischer Almanach* was founded in the late 1970s by a group of younger Austrian Slavists to provide an alternative publication outlet. In subsequent years, it has proved to be both innovative and excellent. The issue reviewed here is dedicated to the linguist and Slavist Igor' A. Mel'čuk, now of Montreal and formerly of Moscow, on his fiftieth birthday. The range of topics offers the reader a delightful collection of articles about Mel'čuk himself and his ideas, as well as a chance to get acquainted, or reacquainted, with his theories.

The volume is divided into four sections; the first contains reminiscences about the young Mel'čuk by two old Moscow friends, Iurii K. Shcheglov—now of Montreal—and A. K. Zholkovskiy—now of Los Angeles—that allow us to see the development of some of Mel'čuk's interests and provide a personal view of the man. There follows a set of fourteen articles on various topics that cover the range of Mel'čuk's scholarly interests. The broad scope of these articles shows us the extent of his influence on the field. The section on morphology includes papers by Leonard Babby on causatives in Russian and

Turkish, Felix Dreizen on verbal nouns, and Dean Worth on the rules for choosing *-á* as the nominative plural ending in Russian. In syntax there are papers by Ju. D. Apresjan about syntactic markings of attributive constructions and Wim Honselaar on Russian word order in noun phrases. In poetics Svetlana El'nitskaia continues her series of articles about Marina Tsvetaeva while Shcheglov continues his investigation into Anna Akhmatova's poetic universe.

Petr Sgall's thoughtful review of various approaches to language typology echoes Mel'čuk's interest in this area. The related fields of semantics and lexicology are treated in five articles, the largest number devoted to any area. Here the emphasis is on the question of "Meaning ↔ Text," which is an ongoing interest of Mel'čuk's. Semiotics is also the subject of an excellent article by Alexander Zholkovskiy.

The next part of the volume is made up of an extensive bibliographic survey by Klaus Hartenstein and Peter Schmidt of the literature dealing with the "Meaning ↔ Text" model and a review by Werner Hehfeldt of Mel'čuk's *Towards a Language of Linguistics: A System of Formal Notions for Theoretical Morphology* (1982). The final section contains the English translation of a Mel'čuk article about the shift of meanings of the French verbs *embrasser*, *baiser*, and *foutre*. This illustration of Mel'čuk's theories suffers from having the joke beaten almost to death by taking the subject too seriously. The final piece in the Mel'čuk Festschrift, an article by Iskander Islahi (also known as Viktor D. Levin) on a "phonetic paradox" in Russian, was about the pronunciation of the word initial *i* in Russian, which had attracted Mel'čuk's attention as well. We are told that he also participated in the research, which involved correlating the number of grams of vodka consumed with attempts at pronunciation.

All in all, this volume of *Wiener slawistischer Almanach* is very much like the man himself—serious if sometimes whimsical. Having read the articles written in his honor and the pieces by Igor' Aleksandrovich himself, I want to join the editors in wishing him *sto lat* and say that I look forward to seeing what the next fifty years hold for him and us.

KENNETH E. NAYLOR
Ohio State University

ISTORIIA NA B'LGARSKIIA EZIK. TOM P'RVI: A. OBSHTA CHAST. TOM VTORI: A. OBSHTA CHAST. B. SPETSIALNI CHASTI. By Ben'o Tsonev. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1984. Vol. 1: xi, 467. Illustrations. 5.82 lv. Vol. 2: 556 pp. 6.44 lv.

There are three criteria for evaluating such a reprint as these first two volumes of Tsonev's three-volume history of the Bulgarian language: historical significance, modern value, and efforts at updating. Historically, Tsonev's work is a classic, the first attempt at a comprehensive history of Bulgarian. (Volume 1 appeared in 1919 and was republished, edited by Stefan Mladenov and Kiril Mirchev, in 1940. Volumes 2 [1934] and 3 [1937], edited by Mladenov, were published after Tsonev's death in 1926.) Tsonev was the first to publish many observations, and his work can be used to document changes (or the lack thereof) in Bulgarian linguistics. Tsonev was the first to observe the admirative use of the Bulgarian perfect and its similarity to uses of the Turkish *miş*-past. He advocated orthographic reform (which was implemented in 1944) and opposed the artificial nominative-oblique distinction in the masculine definite article (which is still being taught).

Tsonev's work is of less value in a modern context, but it is still a useful source of data. Two-thirds of these volumes are taken up by four topics: sources, dialectology, contacts with other languages, and historical phonology and morphology. The chapter on sources is an exhaustive documentation of all the information available by 1919, and Mladenov added references to works published by 1940. The chapter on dialects contains

phonological and morphological data for Macedonian and most of south Serbian (Torlak), as well as for Bulgarian, and can thus be a source of data on Balkan Slavic at the beginning of this century. The chapters on contacts with Romanian, Hungarian, and Turkish, and those on historical phonology and morphology supply useful data, if the researcher remains aware of subsequent scholarship. The remaining chapters, for example those on the principles of general linguistics or the boundaries of Bulgarian speech and nationality, are obsolete or only of historical interest.

Stoian Stoianov provided minimal updating for this reprint: an essay on Tsonev's life and work (volume 1), introductions summarizing the contents with occasional corrections and other references (both volumes), errata lists (both volumes), an index of place names changed since 1940 (volume 1), a full index (volume 2; volume 1 already had an index), and a fragmentary bibliography of relevant works, mostly Bulgarian, published since 1940 (volume 1). Although Stoianov has left a number of Tsonev's inaccuracies uncorrected (see Horace Lunt's excellent article in *Language and Literary Theory, Papers in Slavic Philology*, 5, University of Michigan, 1984), he is justified in saying, "Some of [Tsonev's work] . . . has retained its scholarly value to this day. Other parts, although outdated, are significant as stages through which Bulgarian linguistic thought has passed" (vol. 2: xvi).

VICTOR A. FRIEDMAN
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

VELKÝ ANGLICKO-ČESKÝ SLOVNÍK. Vol. 1: A-G. By Karel Hais and Břetislav Hodek. Prague: Academia, 1984. 955 pp. Kčs 125.

The publication of a large bilingual dictionary with English as one of the two languages is not customarily an event of special significance, but it is so in the case of the *Velký anglicko-český slovník* [The large English-Czech dictionary], hereafter referred to as VAČS. This new work, expected to be completed by 1987 with the publication of the third volume, has been sorely needed. The only other English-Czech dictionary comparable to VAČS in scope was compiled by Václav Alois Jung and published in Prague in 1911; it managed to serve Czech-speaking users in its second edition (n.d.) until World War II, by which time it had already become outdated. The medium-sized one-volume English-Czech dictionary compiled by Antonín Osička and Ivan Poldauf, published in 1948 and reissued with a sizable addenda section in 1970, was never altogether satisfactory, particularly when judged by the standards of bilingual reference dictionaries published by post-war Czechoslovakia for French, German, and Russian.

The decision to produce a large English-Czech dictionary was taken by the presidium of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences in 1966. The overall lexicographic direction was entrusted to Ivan Poldauf, widely known for his contributions to both Czech and English linguistics. The compilation itself was carried out by two lexicographers, Hais and Hodek, both with expert knowledge of Czech as well as English. Unfortunately, the long delay in the appearance of the first volume prevented Poldauf from seeing in print the work which he guided from its inception; he died in the summer of 1984.

Although designed to facilitate the understanding of English texts of the present century, the VAČS includes English words from as far back as the end of the 1700s. Considerable emphasis has been placed on expressions that defy word-for-word translation, as well as on colloquial usage and slang. Altogether, the three volumes will contain about 100,000 entries.

Why was British rather than American usage made the basis for the English lexical material of the dictionary when the cultural influence of the United States in East European countries is at least as strong as that of Great Britain? Evidently, the authors have

chosen to follow the tradition of European lexicography by preferring the British spelling of *anaemia*, *centre*, *cheque*, *colour*, *furor*, and *oedema*, and using the hyphen to what by American standards would be an excessive degree, as in *centre-fold*, *day-time*, *eye-tooth*, and *first-hand*.

On the other hand, the authors have made a commendable effort to include many words and senses limited in use to a specific part of the English-speaking world. The regional labels of the dictionary refer to Australia, Britain, Canada, New Zealand, India, Ireland, Scotland, South Africa, and, most frequently, to America (that is, the United States). In some cases where the American pronunciation is at striking variance with the British, the user is so informed (as after *advertisement*), but not in all. One also wonders why the dictionary's entries include such rarely encountered words as *A'asia* (abbreviation for Australasia), *babacoote*, *babiroussa*, *badmash*, *bagwash*, *caballer*, *cymar*, *daks*, *ecbatic*, and *gallinazo*. The inclusion of these items is surprising since a number of more commonly used words or expressions were omitted, among them *abalone* (1850), *acre-foot* (1900), *Afro* (1966), *antebellum* (ca. 1847), *blue jay* (1709), *boysenberry* (1935), *brain death* (1968), *cattleguard* (1843), *cinder block* (1926), *counterproductive* (1962), *Dow-Jones average* (1922), *ekistics* (1958), *fatso* (1944), *flight attendant* (1956), *flight bag* (1943), *fourth world* (1974), and *Grammy* (1958; *Emmy* is included).

Occasionally, the material in lightface type that follows the entry word is incomplete or imprecise: the philatelist will miss an important sense under *cachet* and the ethnologist, under *gatherer* and *gathering*. The Czech equivalent of F, the failing grade in the United States, is *pětka*, not *šestka* (F usually follows D); *gal* in the sense of "girl, woman" is not obsolete; the formulation concerning the use of the indefinite article in the form of *an* would have profited by the phrase "vowel sound" in Czech rather than simply "vowel"; and not all of the items listed in the alphabetic survey of productive English affixes are strictly speaking affixes. Misprints are relatively few—for example, some missing virgules, *weekley* (under *allowance*), and incorrect alphabetic order between *cattiness* and *catty*.

While the above examples could be multiplied, they represent only a bucket of shortcomings in a sea of reliable lexicographic information. True, VAČS is not perfect and could have benefited in its manuscript stage from a close review by an outside specialist. Despite all these shortcomings, it is an excellent work: the coverage of the English lexicon is extensive and probably about as up-to-date as publishing conditions in Czechoslovakia allow; the Czech equivalents, especially for colloquial and slang expressions, are quite appropriate; and the idioms of English are well represented. Once the remaining two volumes have been published, the dictionary will become an indispensable tool for all those who work with the two languages and will no doubt serve for at least a generation. Finally, a caveat for those who procrastinate: secure your copies now—in a country where the publishing industry is not necessarily motivated by profit and where paper is in short supply, this excellent work will soon be out of print.

ZDENEK SALZMANN
University of Massachusetts at Amherst

KINO-EYE: THE WRITINGS OF DZIGA-VERTOV. Edited by Annette Michelson. Translated by Kevin O'Brien. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1984. lxi, 344 pp. Photographs. \$35.00.

"Kino-eye" was proclaimed by Dziga Vertov (Denis Kaufmann, 1896–1954) in the early 1920s to be the means of discovering truth. Components of the theater (actors, scripts, decors) applied to film techniques merely hampered the film audience in the quest for truth, he asserted. In the mid-1920s, many directors (including Sergei M. Eisenstein) applied some of Vertov's external theories of the Kino-eye to their own films, but he was