

graphical representations tend to pose. By offering insights into the conditions on the ground, Hupchick and Cox make the point that similar maps have been (and still continue to be) used to justify benighted nationalistic myths and political hate-speech in the Balkans.

But maps are merely simplified representations of much more complex and colorful pictures (a point made brilliantly by rendering the maps in two- rather than full-process color). The short essays which accompany each map in both volumes serve as a kind of compass as well as key to its understanding. In this way, Hupchick and Cox compile an exceptional summary of the history of Eastern Europe and the Balkans. Both *Atlases* are handy and comprehensive tools for studying the diversity of these regions and are excellent references for further explorations.

These are only few of the main points made in Ramet's *Balkan Babel* and Hupchick and Cox's *Historical Atlases*. It is always a pleasure to read books that are written so intelligently and with such scope. At the same time, reviewing and especially condensing their wisdom has not been an easy task and is bound to overlook some of their finer points. These volumes would be of great value and use both to the experienced student and the neophyte of European history in general and in particular to those interested in contextualizing the post-Cold War developments in the eastern part of the continent.

Emilian Kavalski, Loughborough University, U.K.

Radovan Lučić, ed. *Lexical Norm and National Language: Lexicography and Language Policy in South-Slavic Languages after 1989*. Series: Der Welt der Slaven Sammelbände, vol. 14. München: Otto Sagner, 2002. 192 pp., 30 Euros (cloth).

The dissolution of the former Serbo-Croatian into three or four official languages or norms (Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian plus/minus Montenegrin; henceforth BCS) is a process that concerns scholarship, policy, and everyday practice. Based on a conference entitled "Language Policy and Lexicography in Slavic Languages after 1989," held in Amsterdam in 2000, this collection contains a majority of articles (sixteen out of twenty-one) concerned with BCS and makes valuable contributions to understanding the complexities of the break-up. Some essentialize events as natural or inevitable, whereas others confront the challenges of the situation in a spirit of critical inquiry.

Raymond Derez's introduction (11–18) gives a theoretical overview. The author correctly points out that Ijekavian was the dialect agreed upon by those who supported a unified BCS standard in the nineteenth century, but misses the fact that the 1850 Vienna Literary Agreement did specify an Ijekavian variant, albeit the formulation was by example rather than rule. Also, his formulation that Macedonian was standardized "in a way to make it as different as possible from Bulgarian" (16) is misleading. Relative distribution of dialectal features trumped differentiation as a motivating factor, e.g. the standard Macedonian third singular present tense ending is zero (as in Bulgarian and Serbian) rather than *-t* (a feature limited to the Ohrid-Prespa region). The author's description of the political factors determining the relationship between Flemish and Dutch is enlightening, especially in its analogy to current debates taking place among Albanians over whether or not to reinstate Geg or Geg elements in the Albanian standard.

Sigrid Darinka Völkl gives a useful general overview of the current situation of Bosnian. Characteristic Sarajevo slang processes such as creating neologisms by reversing syllables (e.g. *zdravo* > *vozdra*, 34) deserve more attention from sociolinguists.

Miloš Okuka (38–48) focuses on the question of Montenegrin versus Serbian and, after

giving a useful list of features differentiating Montenegrin, Bosnian, and Serbian varieties of Neo-Štokavian, concludes, "the Montenegrin language today does not exist as a separate (independent) language." The salient issue that he does not address, however, is why the proposed Montenegrin standard uses the Neo-Štokavian diasystem rather than the distinctive Zeta dialect of southern Montenegro, which is specifically Montenegrin. A similar question can be posed for Croatian and Bosnian as well: given that Croatian has the uniquely Croatian Čakavian dialects, and given that the Ikavian Štokavian dialects are particularly characteristic of Bosnian Muslim speech, why do all the elaborations take basically the same Neo-Štokavian Ijekavian promulgated since 1850 as their base?

The articles by Maja Draženović-Carrieri (49–52) and Biljana Šljivić-Šimšić (55–59) relate the authors' personal experiences. Draženović-Carrieri, in her treatment of language practices at the Hague War Crimes Tribunal, offers a moving evocation of what is happening on the ground in the international arena. Her piece is, from the viewpoint of potential classroom discussion, one of the most useful works in the collection. Šljivić-Šimšić discusses the decisions that had to be made in her collaboration with Morton Benson on Cambridge's Serbo-Croatian/English dictionary. The role of economic resources in limiting lexicographic thoroughness and the potential of on-line technology to overcome the divisive and problematic limitations come out especially clearly.

Radovan Lučić's article "Infeasibility of a Lexicographic Amalgamation of Croatian and Serbian in a Bilingual Dictionary" is a clear presentation of the unwieldy and expensive nature of achieving complete parity in a lexicographic representation of BCS in a hard copy format. His conclusion is actually the opposite of his title: Given modern technology, a computerized dictionary integrating data bases is not only feasible, but would provide a methodology whereby "the Croatian and the Serbian languages can be peacefully, equitably and harmlessly united in a single language community" (70). Jelica Novaković-Lopušina's article (71–76) makes a similar point.

Vlado Đukanović's article (77–84) exaggerates the differences between Croatian and Serbian by avoiding generalizations and by using raw word counts rather than assigning each lexical item a single value, e.g. counting every occurrence of *tko* vs. *ko* ('who'), as a word difference. Danko Šipka (96–101) makes the opposite point based on his colloquial dictionary, observing that "only slightly over 5% of the one-word units and just over 11% of the multiword units can be identified as belonging exclusively to a certain ethnic group or territory" (99). Ethnic group and territory in this formulation are not isomorphic, itself indicative of the highly problematic nature of attempts to differentiate Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian outside the prescriptive norms of recent publications.

Damir Kalogera's (111–19) trenchant critique of recent Croatian lexicographic ideology is an excellent overview, while Dubravko Škiljan (126–33) demonstrates that the so-called differential dictionaries of Serbian and Croatian are actually monolingual, given that "the only 'pure' Serbian words that are quoted concern archaisms, colloquialisms and words from slang or dialects [. . .] which ought to be explained too in a dictionary of Serbian standard language and furnished there by some standardized substitution" (128). By contrast, Branka Tafra and Maja Bratanić's article (134–41) is a clear articulation of the principles of the separatist Croatian elite, and Mario Grčević's (150–63) on recent lexical changes in Croatian is rich in data.

The articles by Ranko Bugarski (145–49) and Milorad Radovanović and Nataša Bugarski (164–70) continue their theoretical studies of language planning and modify their models in light of the fate of BCS. Nikola Rašić's (173–82) discussion predicts that BCS linguistic policies will become more convergent as economic relations between the ex-Yugoslav republics strengthen, especially as publishers seek larger markets for their products, although mutual isolation can also be a factor (191).

Three articles deal with North Slavic lexicography (René Genis 87–95, Wim Honselaar 102–08, and Jiří Marvan 183–92) and one each with Macedonian and Bulgarian. Mira Nančeva-Mavranová's article on the "Great Bulgarian Dictionary of Foreign Words" before and after 1989 (120–25) is an enlightening analysis of the politics of classifying a word as "foreign," particularly the position of Russian vis-à-vis Bulgarian. The author observes that the policy of excluding Turkisms did not affect the pre-1989 dictionary, but she could also have noted the resurgence of Turkisms in the popular press since 1989, i.e. the association of political pluralism with Turkisms in written discourse.

Olga Mišeska Tomić's article on Macedonian (21–27) is a competent survey of Macedonian lexicography, although it contains some factual errors. There is one coincidence between Macedonian political and dialectal borders: the boundary between the Tikveš-Mariovo and Lower Vardar dialects is defined by Mounts Nidže and Kožuf, which also mark the Macedonian-Greek political border (*pace*, 22). Words like *tek* 'flow' use a zero suffix, not *-ek* (*pace*, 23). The spelling of the regressive assimilation of voicing is not blocked for voiced stops at all morpheme boundaries, so 'performance' should be spelled *prestava* not *predstava* (*pace*, 25–26). Misirkov's first name was Krste not Kosta (27). Of the seven phonemes whose representations were the focus of Macedonian orthographic debates, five are described incorrectly (24): according to the norm, the sounds represented by Cyrillic *ќ* and *ѓ* represent (dorso-) palatal stops, not palatalized velars; *љ* represents a clear liquid, not a palatalized one (see section 53 of Koneski's normative grammar); *š* represents a dental affricate, not a palatal plosive; and the voiced affricate represented by *џ* should have been specified as an alveo-palatal.

The break-up of BCS is spectacularly problematic for lexicography precisely because the overwhelming weight of differentiation rests on the lexicon. Moreover, since the linguistic break-up of BCS is intimately associated with the political break-up of former Yugoslavia, this collection is of interest beyond the boundaries of lexicography or even linguistics. Any scholar in the social sciences or humanities with an interest in Southeastern Europe or in theoretical issues of language ideology, national consciousness, or identity formation will find useful material in this book.

Victor A. Friedman, University of Chicago

Josef Fronek. *Velký česko-anglický slovník/Comprehensive Czech-English Dictionary*. Prague: Leda, 2000. 1597 pp., 950Kč (cloth).

Learning Czech as a foreign language has traditionally meant making do with materials intended for another purpose, in a language few native speakers ever expected anyone to learn. Nowhere was this clearer than with dictionaries. For thirty years, the standard Czech-English dictionary was Poldauf's *Velký česko-anglický slovník*. Intended for native speakers of Czech working with or learning English, it frustratingly fails the non-native speaker of Czech at crucial junctures, lacking the signposting an Anglophone needs to choose the correct phrasing or word. The dictionary was given a minor overhaul by Sinclair for the 1996 edition, which resulted in an overlay of new Americanisms on top of the original British English and a dollop of new slang and computer terminology added to the 1970s vocabulary base. Nonetheless, adepts of Czech thirsted for something more: a modern dictionary that was written from the ground up with the needs of the non-native speaker in mind.

With Josef Fronek's new series of dictionaries, we have come tantalizingly close to this lexicographic ideal. The *Comprehensive Czech-English Dictionary* is Fronek's third major dictionary in recent years, following a large English-Czech dictionary, and a student Czech-English/English-Czech dictionary. This latest effort is a pleasure to use in all senses of the