between PSRL 1 and PSRL 2, which contains the Hypatian family of manuscripts of the
chronicle. Location representatives not only occur in PSRL 1 but also occur in
PSRL 2 at corresponding locations, even if the word is not found in PSRL 1 itself.
Thus, the concordance text includes both Laurenian 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 occa-
sional inconsistencies in the way pleonastic 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 Handbueh, the organi-
zation 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 of-
fering an easily readable listing of all spelling variants for all manuscripts, and the choice
made by Graber and Muller 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 cited texts, but the listings for
s do not differentiate these different classes of occurrence. Similarly, all occurrences of
the same name (e.g., Rostrinu) 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 KLEINEN
Pacific Palisades, California

WIENER SLAWISTISCHER ALMANACH. Band 11. Edited by Age A. Hansen-Love
and Tilman Reuther. Vienna: Gesellschaft zur Förderung slawistischer Studien,

The journal Wiener slawistischer Almanach was founded in the late 1970s by a group
of younger Austrian Slavicists 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’chuk, 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’chuk 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’chuk by two old Moscow friends, Iurii K. Shcheglov—now of Montreal—and
A. K. Zholkovskii—now of Los Angeles—that allow us to see the development of some
of Mel’chuk’s interests and provide a picture of the man. There follows a set of
fourteen articles on various topics that cover the range of Mel’chuk’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
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Turkish, Felix Dreizehn on verbal nouns, and Dean Worth on the rules for choosing -d
as the nominative plural ending in Russian. In syntax there are papers by Ju. D. Aprejian
about syntactic markings of attributive constructions and Wim Homelna on Russian word
order in noun phrases. In poetics Svetlana El’istina continues her series of articles
about Marina Tsvetaeva while Shechegov continues his investigation into Anna Akhma-
tova’s poetic universe.

Petrs Sagil’s thoughtful review of various approaches to language typology echoes
Mel’chuk’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; this is an ongoing interest of Mel’chuk’s. Semiotics is
also the subject of an excellent article by Alexander Zhokhovskii.

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” and a
review by Werner Heffeldt of Mel’chuk’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’chuk article about the shift of meanings of the French
verbs embrasser, baiser, and foire. This illustration of Mel’chuk’s theories suffers from
having the joke broken almost to death by taking the subject too seriously. The final piece
in the Mel’chuk Festschrift, an article by Iskander Isalii (also known as Viktor D. Levin
on a “phonetic paradigm” in Russian, was about the pronunciation of the word initial i in
Russian, which had attracted Mel’chuk’s attention as well. We are told that he also par-
ticipated in the research, which involved correlating the number of grams of vodka con-
sumed 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 Alekseevich 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

ISTORIA NA B’LGARSIKA EIZIK. TOM P’RI: A OBSHITA CHAST. TOM
VTOR: A OBSHITA CHAST. B. SPETSIALNI CHASTI. By Bent’o Tsonov. Sofia:

There are three criteria for evaluating such a reprint as these first two volumes of Tsonov’s
two-volume history of the Bulgarian language: historical significance, modern value, and
efforts at updating. Historically, Tsonov’s work is a classic, the first attempt at a compre-
hensive 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 Tsonov’s death in 1926.) Tsonov was the first to publish
many observations, and his work can be used to document changes (or the lack thereof)
in Bulgarian linguistics. Tsonov was the first to observe the adjectival use of the Bulgarian
perfect and its similarity to uses of the Turkish mijpast. 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).

Tsonov’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, dialects, contact 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
phono logical 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).


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 VACS. 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 VACS 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 Oštík and Ivan Poldař, published in 1948 and revised with a sizable addenda section in 1979, was never altogether satisfactory, particularly when judged by the standards of bilingual reference dictionaries published by postwar 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 Poldař, 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 Poldař from seeing in print the work which he guided from its inception; he died in the summer of 1984.

Why was British English rather than American usage made the basis for the English lexicical 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 traditional of European lexicography by preferring the British spelling of anaemia, centre, cheque, colour, cure, and sedan, 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 surnames 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 Asia (abbreviation for Australasia), baboochote, babirousa, badmash, baghwash, caballer, cymar, daks, eche, 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), anebellum (ca. 1847), blue jog (1709), bousenberry (1935), brain death (1968), cantiguard (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 pětká, not setka (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. Missprints are relatively few—for example, some missing virgules, weekly (under allowance), and incorrect alphabetical order between cutines and catty.

While the above examples could be multiplied, they represent only a bucket of shortcomings in a sea of reliable lexicographical information. True, VAČS is not perfect and could have benefited in its manuscript stage from a close review by an outside specialis. 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 not doubt serve for at least another 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.


"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, sets, decor) 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