Paul-Louis Thomas and Vladimir Osipov. *Grammaire du bosniaque, croate, monténégrin, serbe*. Paris, Institut d'études slaves, 2012. 621 pp. [*Collection de grammaires de l'Institut d'études slaves*, 8.]

Reviewed by Ronelle Alexander

Whatever one's opinions about the breakup of Yugoslavia, the corresponding breakup of its major language, Serbo-Croatian, has provided linguists specializing in the region with unparalleled opportunities for linguistic and sociolinguistic analysis, with the happy result of a number of detailed, insightful, and valuable linguistic studies. What might seem obvious to the outside layman—that just as the federation we knew as Yugoslavia was replaced by separate named states, so was its common language, Serbo-Croatian, replaced by separate languages bearing the names of these new states (Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin)—does not bear up to serious linguistic analysis, since languages cannot be created by political fiat alone. At the same time, Serbo-Croatian was always a polycentric language, with a generally accepted subdivision into variants that correspond roughly to the new "languages." To what extent, then, can each of these now be treated as a separate language? Does the single language embodying their common core—what used to be called Serbo-Croatian—still exist, and if so, what should it be called? Finally, how can the answers to these questions be put into practical use?

One of the first Western scholars to address these questions was Paul-Louis Thomas, who posed the first of them directly in Thomas 1994, whose title reads "Serbo-croate, serbe, croate…, bosniaque, monténégrin: Une, deux…, trois, quatre langues?", and which I still consider to be one of the best scholarly treatments of the relevant issues. Now Thomas has joined forces with Vladimir Osipov to produce a full-length grammar of what they call "le bosniaque-croate-monténégrin-serbe" (23). The book's Introduction (23–48), a thoughtful essay addressing the questions posed above, is followed by a full-length, highly detailed reference grammar brimming with examples accompanied by clear, sometimes even elegant, prose commentary. It is a masterful job, a reference

grammar that belongs on the shelf (and in the hands) of everyone with any serious interest in the language(s).

The introductory essay is essential, of course, since any book of this sort must set forth its stance at the outset. After a brief but clear survey of the variants (where special care is taken to debunk the popular—but clearly mistaken—equation of Serbian with ekavian and Croatian with ijekavian [32]), the authors isolate four criteria which must be addressed in answering the question of whether we have to do with "une ou plusieurs langues" [one language or several]. With respect to the first two criteria, the structural and the genetic, the answer is clearly that we are dealing with a single linguistic system. This is also the case with the third criterion, that of mutual intelligibility. As proof, the authors cite the obvious absence of bilingual dictionaries or translations. They note, quite correctly, that the several "differential dictionaries" which have appeared are very unsatisfactory due to the fact that actual usage simply cannot be described in black and white terms (40). In other words, we have to do with a single language structurally, historically, and communicatively.

It is in the fourth criterion, however, the axiological (or "value-bearing") that one finds the separation. Here what matters is the symbolic function of identity. The authors point out that each of the national-ethnic groups in question has felt a strong need to articulate an identity which is markedly different from the others, and it follows naturally (for them, anyway) to infer from this that its language is also markedly different from the others. This, the authors claim, is what has led politicians and linguists working with them both to assert that each of the languages is separate and to find various means to highlight this separateness. Examples of such means (well known to anyone with an interest in these topics) are the Croatian move to cleanse its lexicon of perceived Serbisms and to replace them with "pure" Croatian words, a similar (though less radical) Bosniak move to focus upon Turkish-derived vocabulary and spelling elements, and the Serbian move to insist on more frequent use of Cyrillic (and exclusive use of that alphabet in official contexts).

The "axiological" section concludes with a survey of the wide range of variation among speakers themselves in regard to the question of "one language or more than one." The situation is particularly acute in the case of Montenegrin, where there is still a standoff between those who wish to maintain the status quo and those who wish to carry out distinct reforms to establish the separateness of Montenegrin linguis-

tic identity, reforms so radical as to embrace the addition of three new letters to the alphabet. The problem is the more extreme in that there is also a standoff within the status quo side, between those who consider the language they speak to be Serbian (though exclusively ijekavian) and those who consider it to be Montenegrin. The acuteness of the problem is highlighted by the fact that the language taught in the schools is not named, but simply referred to as *maternji jezik* 'mother tongue' (45).

And then there is the question of what to call Bosnian—the well-known dilemma whereby the term "Bosnian" is preferred by the Bosniak codifiers (who have introduced traits reinforcing an Islamic, specifically Bosniak cultural base) while non-Muslim inhabitants of Bosnia reject the use of the broader term "Bosnian" and insist that the language codified by Bosniaks should bear the name "Bosniak." Here, the authors take care to point out the terminological distinction between "Bosnian" (inhabitant of Bosnia) and "Bosniak" (member of the national-ethnic group marked by adherence to Islam). As an aside, it is intriguing to note the difference between French and English usage in this regard. In each instance, there is one term in common parlance with the meaning "Bosnian"—which is why the distinction must always be pointed out. But while the unmarked term in English is *Bosnian* (which as a noun corresponds to *Bosanac* and as an adjective to *bosanski)*, the unmarked term in French is *bosniaque*. Just as we have attempted to educate the public about the difference by introducing the term *Bosniak*, with the exclusive religious-cultural meaning (which as a noun corresponds to *Bošnjak* and as an adjective to *bošnjački*), so have French scholars attempted to educate the public by introducing the term *bosnien* (with the exclusive geographical meaning). But things have become more complex in France, where some—in the belief that *bosniaque* should continue to be the neutral, general term—have introduced the term *bochniaque* (the French spelling of *bošnjak*) in the exclusive religious cultural meaning. These lexical relations are depicted in a small chart on p. 44.

What I miss in the "axiological" section is any mention of the concrete content of the idea of "value-bearing," any discussion of the extraordinarily strong bond between language and identity in this region. (See my review of Greenberg 2004, a book which purports in its title to discuss "Language and Identity in Balkans" but instead focuses on the politics of language planning in the breakup of Serbo-Croatian [Alexander 2006a], and my own lengthy attempt to address properly

the issue of language and identity in the region [Alexander 2013].) Critical to each group's sense of its identity is the fact that its language transmits and keeps alive cultural values that are embedded in each group's historical memory of its unique past, dating back to medieval states in which they take pride and continuing through to the present, especially during the last two centuries of nation-building. Croat and Serb identities thus date back to their medieval kingdoms, referred to by the authors as a *royaume* 'kingdom' for the Croats and an *État puissant* 'powerful State' for the Serbs (27), and are bolstered through the centuries by religious identification, Roman Catholicism in the case of Croats and Eastern Orthodoxy in the case of Serbs. This latter fact is certainly relevant to the recent insistence by Serbs on an active return to the Cyrillic alphabet, which is strongly associated with Orthodoxy, as well as the recent active resistance on the part of Croats both to that alphabet and to words or expressions felt to express "Serbianness" in any way. Bosnian identity is more complex. The idea of Bosnia as a unit also dates back to a medieval kingdom. But the authors' statement simply that Bosnia *eut un roi* 'had a [single] king' in the second half of the 14th century (27) is greatly understated, since medieval Bosnia had first a number of governors and then a series of kings. The Bosnian sense of its culture is bound up, at least on the part of Bosniaks, with its rich Islamic/Ottoman heritage. Furthermore, the idea of "Bosnia" as a place is all the stronger since there has been a political unit with that name in continuous existence (except for the period 1929–45), whereas both Serbia and Croatia ceased to exist as independent political units after the medieval period, only regaining this status in the modern period. All these historical facts are relevant to the recent insistence by Bosniaks both that their language be called "Bosnian" and that it incorporate more Turkish-derived forms.

Montenegro by contrast does not have a history of a clearly defined medieval kingdom, nor does it have a separate religious identity. The fact that it shares with Serbia not only adherence to the Eastern Orthodox faith but also much of its history is relevant to the current turmoil in Montenegro, where all are united in the belief that they are ethnically Montenegrin but bitterly divided as to exactly what their language is—other than simply their "mother tongue". It is for this reason that many on the outside hesitate to expand the current tripartite reference to the common core and replace it by a quadripartite one. At the same time, one cannot of course deny the existence of the present-day Montenegrin state nor the concerted efforts to establish a Montenegrin lan-

guage. The most appropriate label at this point would really be something like "BC(M)S," acknowledging Montenegrin but also indicating that it is not yet at the level of codification or communal acceptance as the other three. But this is admittedly unwieldy. Thus, while recording my own reluctance to accept a neutral quadripartite term, I continue in the remainder of this review to use without comment the label chosen by Thomas and Osipov, BCMS.

Thus, having concluded that we have to do with *une langue en tant que système linguistique, quatre langues en tant que standards* [one language in terms of (its) linguistic system, and four languages in terms of (their) standards] (46), and having given a brief survey of possible names for this one language, the authors opt for the choice that seems most common (and neutral) these days, namely to refer to the separate standards by their full names but the underlying common single language by an acronym composed of the first letters of each of these names, listed in alphabetical order. This is the same choice made by two other grammar writers from the West, of whom I am one (see Mønnesland 2002 and Alexander 2006b—neither of which is listed in the book's bibliography, which limits itself to BCMS authors). It is interesting to note that all of us were faced with the same dilemma concerning titles and chose the same graphic solution. The current set of official names—besides the publishers' need to provide a title consisting of words that are easily searchable—forced each of us to list the several component names separately in the title, thus denying us the possibility to indicate in the title our common belief that the underlying language is a single system. The graphic resolution each of us chose was to design the cover in such a way that the three (or four, in the case of the book under review) names appeared in a vertical list with their initial letters forming a column, allowing the first letters of each name to be read vertically—and then to request the publisher to highlight these three (or four) letters in some highly visible manner. Thus, even though the catalog description gives separate names, the cover illustration stresses the underlying message (a message conveyed throughout the presentation one finds inside each book)—that the object of description is a single system named by an acronym: BKS in the case of Norwegian, and BCS / BCMS, in the case of both French and English.

The bulk of the book comprises a descriptive grammar of this single language "en tant que système linguistique." The presentation is very thorough and includes hundreds of examples. Each example is rendered in the single "language" BCMS, and the significant differ-

ences between the component standards are marked according to a notation which takes some getting used to but which in the end is quite efficient. One of the most basic differences, the ekavian / ijekavian one, is rendered in most instances as it generally is in books of this sort, by placing brackets around [j] or [ij] within the word.

(1) trî l[ij]épe d[j]èvojke (226)
'trois belles jeunes filles' [three pretty girls]

With other formal differences such as accent, however, the forms are separated by a backward slash.

(2) dvê \ dvȉje vèlike kȕće (226)
'deux grands maisons' [two big houses]

(3) Žíveo \ Žívio krâlj! (279)
'Vive le roi!' [Long live the king!]

Distinctions between "standards" are usually marked by a forward slash separating the elements, in which the left-hand side represents "western" usage, specified by the authors as Croatian and sometimes also Bosnian (47), while the right-hand side represents "eastern" usage, specified by the authors as Serbian, Montenegrin, and sometimes also Bosnian (48). When necessary, further specification as to which "standard" uses what is noted separately (usually in a footnote). For example:

(4) Ako tkȍ / kȍ znâ, neka kâžē. (210)
'Si quelqu'un sait, qu'il le dise.'
[If someone knows, let him say so.]

(5) Hàjdemo u kíno / u bȉoskop! (334)
'Allons au cinéma!' [Let's go to the movies!]

(6) Brôd je pȍčeo tònuti / da tȍnē. (318)
'Le bateau commença à sombrer.' [The boat began to sink.]

(7) Ako bùdēte dírali màčku, ògrepst će vas! / ogrèba[t]će vas! (347)
'Si vous touchez le chat, il vous griffera!'
[If you touch the cat, it'll scratch you!]

The latter example illustrates a new convention introduced by the authors (340, n. 3) in a spirit of economy, the intent being to convey in a single form the two different conventions for spelling forms of the future tense, one Croatian and Bosnian (*písat ću, písat ćeš,* etc.) and the other Serbian and Montenegrin (*písaću, písaćeš,* etc.)

Finally, doublets (with no specific localized marking) are noted by a vertical bar. For example:

(8) Vàma | Vâs nìšta nè smētā? (466)
'Il n'y a rien qui vous dérange?'
[There isn't anything bothering you?]

(9) Pònosīm se njíme | njîm. (127)
'Je suis fier de lui.' [I'm proud of him.]

(10) Ôn je ìstō tolìko dòbar kao ì tī | kolìko ì tī | kao što si tî. (183)
'Il est aussi bon que toi.' [He's just as good as you are.]

The authors are not always consistent with this usage, however. Sometimes they seem to use the vertical bar simply to economize by collapsing two possible sentences together, as in (11) below, and sometimes these two meanings are conflated, as in (12) below, where the doublet in the original is between the two ways of expressing the "than X" portion of a comparison but in the translation between two ways of translating the idea expressed by the comparison. For example:

(11) Mî smo Francúzi | stùdenti. (126)
'Nous sommes Français | étudiants.' [We are French | students.]

(12) Òvo prèdgrāđe je sigùrnijē od Paríza | nego Pàrīz. (182)
'Cette banlieue est moins dangereuse | plus sûre que Paris.'
[This suburb is less dangerous | safer than Paris.]

Frequently these several marks are combined, forcing the reader to concentrate a bit. However, the economy of presentation is quite admirable. For example:

(13) Tô se dogòdilo | dèsilo dvádeset šêstōg òžūjka / màrta. (237)
'C'est arrivé le vingt-six mars.' [It happened on March 26th.]

(14) Ôn se ròdio prê \ prȉje trȉsto / trȉsta gȍdīnā \ prȉje trî stȍtine gȍdīnā. (232)
'Il est né il y a trois cents ans.'
[He was born three hundred years ago.]

As can be seen by the above, all examples in the book are accented using the traditional four-accent system. Numerous accentual doublets are marked using the above system, and the authors even go to the trouble of marking accentual differences between standards. Many of the latter concern the presence versus absence of accent shift onto a preposition, the phenomenon known as *skakanje* ('jumping'), as in (15) below. These are normally marked as exhibiting an east/west differentiation, an assumption which is a considerable oversimplification of the facts, since the only speakers who readily shift the accent in this manner are Bosnians, who are in fact neither "east" nor "west."

(15) Čȅkājte nȁ rēd / na rêd ! (193)
'Attendez votre tour!' [Wait your turn!]

Others are marked simply as doublets. For example:

(16) vènuti | vȅnuti (290)
'se faner' [fade]

The grammar itself is thorough and comprehensive. It is organized according to the same format as standard reference grammars in the region. The section on the alphabet, phonetics, and phonology (including accent) is relatively brief (51–67); those on morphology and syntax are quite detailed. The morphology section is arranged by grammatical categories: first nouns (71–121), then pronouns (123–53), adjectives (154–220), numerals (223–55), verbs (259–427), adverbs (429–38), particles

(439–43), and finally interjections (444–46). The syntax section discusses first the syntax of cases (448–90), and then that of clauses—coordination (493–96) followed by subordination (497–574). The authors decline to include a section on word formation, claiming this would entail an entire separate work (69). They do, however, rename the morphology section "morphologie—morphosyntaxe," pointing out that they discuss not only the forms but also their usage (ibid).

They do indeed. Facts about usage abound in this book, and it is a treasure trove both for the linguist and the language aficionado. The first and most immediately obvious instance of this is the sheer number of examples. Sometimes the amount seems even overwhelming. For instance, the section on clitic ordering provides 62 sentences illustrating the order of pronoun object clitics (133–35). This may overwhelm the language learner, but linguists—who can never get too many examples of clitic ordering—will revel in it. Such lists also include interesting and helpful commentary such as the following set (135) which illustrates the (relatively rare) sequence of genitive and accusative clitic pronouns, a sequence which is potentially problematic since (except for the 3rd singular feminine) the accusative and genitive forms are identical.

(18) Bôg nas ih sàčūvāj!
'Que Dieu nous preserve d'eux!' [God preserve us from them!]

vs.

(19) Bôg ih nas sàčūvāj!
'Que Dieu les preserve de nous!' [God preserve them from us!]

Similarly, the section on aspect pairs presents 37 pages of examples of aspect derivation, first by prefixation (281–301) and then by suffixation (301–16). Most are simply lists of paired verbs, but some instances are illustrated by sample sentences as well. The following set (291), for example, illustrates not only the usage of both aspects but also of two different prefixed forms.

(20) Klèo je svòju sùdbinu.
'Il maudissait son destin.' [He cursed / was cursing his fate.]

(21) Ne kùni!
'Ne blasphème pas!' [Don't swear!]

(22) Kùnēm se da ću govòriti sȁmo ȉstinu.
'Je jure de ne dire que la vérité.'
[I swear to tell nothing but the truth.]

(23) Zakùnite se da je svȅ kàko ste rèkli.
'Jurez que tout est comme vous l'avez dit,'
[Swear that everything is as you said it was.]

(24) Pròkleo sam dân i čȁs kada smo se srȅli.
'J'ai maudit le jour et l'instant où nous nous sommes rencontrés.'
[I cursed the day and the hour that we met.]

Two other lists stand out by their length and complexity, though it is perhaps only the layman who will be overwhelmed since again, linguists can never get enough good examples. Indeed, not only are the examples on each list well chosen, but each list also adds a column of "extra value," so to speak. The list of nouns with the singulative suffix *-in* (as in *građanin*, pl. *građani* 'citizen' or *Srbin*, pl. *Srbi* 'Serb') includes 83 examples spanning four pages (86–89). It gives not only the singular and plural forms, but also the base word from which each form is derived. An example from p. 86):

	singulier	**pluriel**	**formé d'après**
(25)	*préčanin*	*préčani*	*preko* 'par-delà [beyond]'
	'habitant d'outre Danube, Save, Drina… [trans-Danube, -Sava, -Drina inhabitant]'		
(26)	*malògrađanin*	*malògrađani*	calque international:
	'petit-bourgeois'		all. [Gm] *Kleinbürger*

The other remarkably long list is found in the section on forms of the aorist tense, which gives the conjugational forms for 132 different verbs, a list which spans 15 pages (395–409). The authors go to this extent partly to back up their assertion that, despite certain claims to the contrary, the aorist is far from moribund—see (47) below—and partly

to help readers see the parallels and congruences between the most frequently encountered form of the aorist (3rd singular) and the corresponding form of the present. This is particularly helpful because the context in which one is most likely to encounter aorist forms—the narration of past events in sequence—is also one in which the historical present is also very frequently used. As in many other parts of the morphosyntax section, sentence-length examples are frequently provided.

In this extensive chart, examples are listed by verb class. Because the final slot concerns an issue of form, the entry is the same for all verbs of that class; for that reason I cite examples from different verb classes to better illustrate the structure of the list (I have omitted the verb type numbers). The wording of the final column heading is also to be noted: by its focus on the written form alone, it seems to indicate an expectation that aorist forms will be encountered more in written contexts than in spoken ones. Yet a large number of the examples appear to be drawn from spoken contexts.

	infinitif	**aoriste 1re pers.sg.**	**aoriste 2e–3e pers. sg.**	**présent 3e pers. sg.**	**homographie aoriste-présent 3e pers. sg.**	
(27)	*ugásiti* 'eteindre' [extinguish]	*ugásih*	*ȕgāsī*	*ùgāsī*	oui	(396)
	Ti nè ugāsī vàtru kad smo pòšli? 'Tu n'as pas éteint le feu quand on est partis?' [You didn't put out the fire when we set out?]					
(28)	*slàgati* 'mentir' [lie (tell falsehood)]	*slàgah*	*slàga*	*slȁžē*	non	(397)
	I ȍpēt me slàga, bezòbraznīk jèdan! 'Il m'a encore menti, cet effronté!' [He lied to me again, that jerk!]					
(29)	*òbūći* 'vêtir' [dress]	*obúkoh*	*ȍbūče*	*obúče*	oui	(404)
	Što ȍbūče tê stârē hlȁče / pantalóne? 'Pourquoi as-tu mis ce vieux pantalon?' [Why did you put on those old pants?]					

(30) *nàpasti* 'attaquer' *nàpadoh nàpade nàpadnē* non (404)
[attack]
Nàpade me ni kríva ni dúžna.
'Il s'en est pris à moi qui ne lui avais rien fait.'
[He got after me for no reason at all.]

Useful examples abound. One learns to read the footnotes very attentively, as many very significant facts about usage—important for linguist and learner alike—are buried in footnotes. For instance, in the section on collective numbers (*zbirni brojevi*), examples are given of this numeral preceded by a personal pronoun in genitive plural. But it is only in the footnote that one learns there is a difference in meaning signaled by word order, that is whether the pronoun precedes or follows the collective. The distinction articulated in the footnote (summarized below) is certainly significant, and one wishes it could have been worked into the main text somehow.

(31) nâs trȍje
'nous trois' [the three of us (i.e., a collective unit)]

vs.

(32) trȍje nâs
'trois d'entre nous' [three of us (i.e., a selection)] (239, n. 3)

Even more such notes are found in footnotes scattered throughout the long verbal section, of which I shall cite just one example. Within their discussion of aspect usage the authors present examples of verbs where the prefix *po-* imparts the added meaning "action over a limited period of time." One of these examples is the following:

(33) Pòstajao[1] je nȅkoliko trènūtākā | trenútākā. (324)
'Il est resté debout quelques instants.'
[He stood for a few moments.]

The tiny footnote number after the verb form refers one to the small print at the bottom of the page where one is told that the verb in question is the perfective *pòstajati, postòjīm*, which is not to be confused with

the imperfective verb whose infinitive is homonymous with it, *pòstajati, pòstajēm* 'become' (whose perfective is *pòstati, pòstanēm*), nor with the verb *pòstojati, pòstojīm* 'exist'. Since this set of verbs is both so important in the language and so rife with potential confusion even for those who know the language well (not to speak of learners), it would really have helped if such information could have been more foregrounded.

The problem of course is that the goal of the grammar is to explicate (and exemplify) the norms according to the standard rubrics within "morphology(—morphosyntax)" and "syntax," and that many of these facts of usage are marginal. Not, of course, marginal in the sense that they are less important (far from it!), but in the sense that they sit on the margins of analytic categories. Overall the authors have perhaps done the best they could, but I kept wishing that information such as that cited above—and there are many more similar examples—could have been integrated into the text more smoothly.

The book is valuable in yet another dimension: the authors convey not only the normative facts of grammar but also discuss numerous instances of actual usage that contravene the norms in various ways. Some of this information is again buried in footnotes, such as the quite remarkable statement in (34). This sentence contains two participial constructions (underlined by me) which function as clear binary opposites, thus underscoring nicely the frequent dilemma one meets when trying to describe "usage." The form in question is the nominative-accusative *svȍ* 'all', a backformation on the model of the genitive *svògа* and the dative-locative *svòmu*. Normative grammars reject this form, stating clearly that the correct nominative-accusative form is *svȅ*.

(34) Particulièrement répandue, la forme svȍ est unanimement condamnée par les ouvrages normatifs. (207, n. 2)

[Especially widespread, the form *svȍ* is unequivocally condemned by normative works.]

Another instance of widespread usage which is rejected by normative grammars is the conjunction *bez da*, which (serendipitously for French speakers) corresponds literally to *sans que*; the English equivalent is *without* followed by a gerundial form. The presentation gives first the quoted usage, marked with the asterisk indicating its ungrammaticality, followed by the sentence containing the construction advocated by normative grammars, *a da* + negated verb form. The relationship

between the two sentences is emphasized by the arrow, whose rather obvious meaning is "replace by…". For example:

(35) *Ne mògu da nàpravīm kòrāk bèz da me prȁtīš. (548)
→ Ne mògu da nàpravīm kòrāk a da me nè pratīš.
'Je ne peux pas faire un pas sans que tu me suives.'
[I can't take a step without you following me.]

In their accompanying prose, the authors state clearly that the disallowed form "se rencontre dans la langue parlée" [is encountered in the spoken language] even as it is "rejetée par les normes" [rejected by the norms]. Indeed, the authors appear quite struck by the presence of this "rejected" construction, since they mention its occurrence twice more in the book, once in the section on pronominal adjectives (in the context of the phrase *bez ikoga* 'without anyone' [213]), and once as part of a discussion of the different subordinate clauses which can be used to express the same meaning as the present gerund (387). In each instance the basic message is the same: normative grammars reject it, but speakers use it frequently. In the first two instances, the use of *bez da* is "rejected," but in the third it is "fermement condamnée" [strongly condemned]. The agents also differ: in the latter two instances it is a singular "norm" which does the refusing or condemning, but in the first it is the plural "norms" (the authors fail to specify whether it is "all" the norms or only some of them).

This same format (a "bad" example followed by an arrow sending us to the "good" example) is repeated in a number of other instances. One of these concerns the proper placement of a passive participle acting as modifier. The authors observe that the norm requires such forms to follow the modified noun, and that "les ouvrages normatifs rappellent constamment cette règle, en donnant des exemples qu'ils condamnent (relevés notamment dans des annonces publiques)" [normative works constantly remind [users] of this rule, citing examples (especially from public announcements) which they censure] (379). One of the examples cited is the following:

(36) *Kûpljenē kârte | kárte za večèrašnjū prêdstavu mȍgū se vrátiti na blàgājni. (379)
→ Kârte | Kárte kûpljenē za večèrašnjū prêdstavu mȍgū se vrátiti na blàgājni.

'Les billets achetés pour la représentation de ce soir peuvent être rendus à la caisse.'
[Tickets purchased for this evening's performance can be returned to the box office.]

Although the authors cite (35) and (36) above with an asterisk, indicating that they are uniformly considered ungrammatical (despite the fact that they are encountered frequently), not all instances of recommended usage are treated with this uniformity. Consider, for instance, the case of gerundial forms. The grammar rule in BCMS is the same as in English: the subject of the gerundial form must be the same as the subject of the sentence within which it occurs. Again as in English, speakers are disregarding this rule more and more often. Noting both that many educated speakers of BCMS consider sentences such as the first lines of (37) and (38) below to be perfectly grammatical and that such constructions are also found in the works of well-known writers (they cite examples from Ivo Andrić and Dušan Kovačević), the authors mark the "errant" usage with a question mark rather than an asterisk. They still mark the preferred form(s) following it with the arrow, however. As the examples below show, such sentences must sometimes be restructured more than slightly in order to conform to the rule (a fact well known to any teacher who has attempted to instruct students in the correct use of this construction in English!).

(37) ?Preglédajūći evidénciju, pȁo nam je ù oči / u ȍči vȅlikī brôj izòstanākā.
→ Dok smo preglédali evidénciju, pȁo nam je ù oči / u ȍči vȅlikī brôj izòstanākā.
→ Preglédajūći evidénciju, zàpazili smo vȅlikī brôj izòstanākā.

'En examinant les relevés, nouns avons observés un grand nombre d'absences (au travail, aux cours).'
[Examining the records, we noted a large number of absences.]

(38) ?Kàkva su iskústva stečèna grádeći òvō násēlje? (384)
→ Kàkva su iskústva stečèna dok se grádilo òvō násēlje?
→ Kàkva su iskústva stečèna u tijéku / u tóku grádnjē òvōg násēlja?

'Quelles experiences ont été acquises lors de la construction de se lotissement?'
[What experience was gained in the building of this settlement?]

The above examples concern the present gerund; a similar discussion, with similar examples, is given for the past gerund on p. 391.

The same format (whereby "errant" forms that are nevertheless frequently attested are followed by an arrow sending one to the "correct" form) is found in two more instances. Here, though, a distinction is drawn in each case between Croatian usage and that of other speakers—or, as the authors state somewhat colorfully elsewhere in the book, "dans le reste de l'espace serbo-croato-bosniaco-monténégrophone" (102, n. 2). One concerns the preposition *za* 'for' followed by the infinitive. The authors note that such constructions have met with systematic censure ("sont… condamnées systématiquement," 477) since the 19th century on the part of grammarians, who consider them an intrusion from the West. And indeed, these forms are more common in Croatia than in Serbia and are particularly condemned by Serbian grammars as Croatianisms. The authors give the following examples, marking with an arrow the replacements suggested/required by Serbian grammarians (the fact that the examples are cited using only ekavian forms underscores the regional marking of this grammatical judgment).

(39) Tô je za polúdeti. (477)

'C'est à devenir fou.'
[It's to go crazy (from).]

⟶ Tô je da čòvek pòlūdī.

'C'est à ce qu'on devienne fou.'
[It's what makes one crazy.]

(40) Tô je za nè verovati. (477)

'C'est à n'y pas croire.'
[It's not to believe.]

⟶ Tô je nĕverovatno.

'C'est incroyable.'
[It's unbelievable.]

(41) Jȅ li bùrek za óvde ili za pònēti?

'Est-ce que le feuilleté pour ici ou pour emporter?'
[Is the pastry for here or to take away?]

⟶ Jȅ li bùrek za óvde ili ga nȍsīte?

'Est-ce que le feuilleté pour ici ou vous l'emportez?'
[Is the pastry for here or are you taking it away?]

The authors note that the suggested/required replacements are not exact synonyms, either in terms of style or even in terms of meaning (478). Indeed, they continue, Croatian linguists have defended these constructions for just this reason, pointing out that they give more diversity to the language.

The other instance concerns passive transformations of sentences with active verbs, in which the object of the active verb becomes the subject of the passive verb. To take the example given by the authors (472), the subjects should be in the nominative case, as in (42) below, and not in the accusative, as in (43) below. More and more frequently, however, one hears the accusative in such sentences.

(42) *Kȕća* (nom.) *se grâdī.* | *Grâdi se kȕća*.
'La | Une maison se construit | est en train d'être construite | On construit une maison.' [The / A house is being built.]

(43) *Kȕću* (acc.) *se grâdī.* (and presumably also *Grâdī se kȕću*.)

Proof that these forms are "far from rare," in the authors' opinion, is the fact that they are firmly rejected by the Serbian norm, which is captured by the authors again by the use of the arrow (473):

(44) Mòglo se nàvesti i drùgē slùčajeve (acc.)
→ Mògli su se nàvesti i drùgī slùčajevi (nom.)
'On pouvait citer aussi d'autres cas.'
[One could also cite other instances.]

As in the case of *za* + infinitive, however, the "offending" form here lacks any mark, which indicates that it is more acceptable in the West. Indeed, the authors state explicitly that the Croatian norm accepts such constructions as (44), i.e., where a modal *se*-verb is accompanied by a transitive infinitive. Thus, (45) is stated to be fully acceptable in Croatian:

(45) Bòrisa (acc.) se mòglo vȉdjeti svàkī dân u grádu. (473)
'On pouvait voir Boris chaque jour dans la ville.'
[You could see Boris in town each day.]

The construction is not fully accepted, however, even in Croatian, in which sentences like (46) also require the adjustment indicated by the arrow:

(46) Čȕjē se grȍmljavinu (acc.) tòpōvā.
→ Čȕjē se grȍmljavina (nom.) tòpōvā.
'On entend le grondement des canons."
[One can hear the roar of the cannons.]

I focus on these several instances (examples [34] through [46]) because of their particular value to linguists interested in the evolving state of the language. In terms of overall coverage, however, the discussion of such examples takes up relatively little space in the book. As it should be in the case of a reference grammar, the bulk of the book is devoted to a grammar which is both normative and descriptive, presented via well-written explanations accompanied by copious examples. Those whose French is up to it will profit from the clear and insightful explanations, but even without a knowledge of French one can gain a great deal. Those with sufficient knowledge of any Slavic language (let alone the one(s) in question here) will be able to orient themselves by the examples alone; and the fact that grammatical terms are Latinate in origin in both French and English will facilitate understanding. One possible exception to this is the term "pronominal verbs," at which En-

glish speakers who do not know French grammar will probably draw a blank. As becomes clear once one reaches the appropriate section in the grammar, these are what we know as "*se*-verbs"; they are called pronominal in French because the corresponding forms must be accompanied by a short-form object pronoun that agrees with the subject. Compare the conjugation of 'remember' in French, *je me souviens*, *tu te souviens*, *il se souvient*, etc., with that in BCMS, *ja se sjećam*, *ti se sjećaš*, *on se sjeća*, etc. This terminology is slightly cumbersome when it comes to speaking of different meanings of such verbs: for instance, the economical English phrase "*se*-passives" must be rendered in French by the much longer phrase "verbes pronominaux à valeur passive."

In one instance, the authors go somewhat beyond the requirements of a reference grammar and make an explicit effort to correct received assumptions. Thus, the section on the usage of the aorist begins:

(47) "Contrairement à une idée répandue et accréditée par certaines grammaires, l'aoriste reste une forme verbale très employee dans la langue moderne" (410)

[Contrary to an idea which has been expounded and affirmed by certain grammars, the aorist continues to be in frequent use in the modern language.]

Indeed, they note that the aorist has regained considerable popularity these days because of its brevity, which has made it consequently very useful in texting! I am especially pleased to see this rehabilitation of the aorist, since it has been traditionally downplayed in a number of grammars, including some from our own shores. It is true, as the authors note (412), that although it is frequent in literary texts and in the spoken language (as seen by examples [27–30] above), it is encountered rarely in the language of the media or other functional styles. They also observe (413) that it is more frequent in the south than in the north, thus in Montenegro, Herzegovina, and southern Serbia. However, this does not mean that it is absent in Croatian. I can cite from my own experience a remark by a Croatian colleague, who observed with some surprise (and not without pride) how well the language was suited to the modern age and with what alacrity the young had taken to using aorist forms in instant messaging. Clearly they could not have done so if the idea "répandue et accréditée par certaines grammaires"—that the aorist was close to moribund—had had any basis in actual fact.

I stand in awe of the amount of work that went into preparing this grammar. It is quite a feat to present the grammar in such detail and with so many examples, and still to maintain clarity of organization. Overall the balance between presenting an overview of the forms and providing a sufficient number of appropriate examples to illustrate the usage of such forms is well handled. Still, as mentioned above, one must peruse the footnotes very carefully if one is not to miss valuable and necessary information

There are only a very few slips in this admirable organization. One such occurs in the ten-page section on "les numéraux collectifs" (239–49). The first group to be presented are numbers of the type *dvoje, troje*, etc., with the usual copious examples. Embedded within this exposition is a single line, shown in (48), with no further commentary, after which the discussion of the *dvoje* series resumes.

(48) "[série en **-ica**] *vâs dvòjica, njîh tròjica, nâs petòrica, nâs dvádeset dvòjica* (seulement des hommes)" [only men] (240)

Only seven pages later does one find a section on "les substantifs numéraux" and a proper discussion of the formation and usage of the series in *-ica*. The lack of a cross-reference to this subsequent section is one of the few organizational faults, and it is particularly regrettable in that occurs within a section devoted to particularly tricky and complex forms.

As noted above, the grammatical explanations are excellent and insightful, and even those who know the language(s) very well will learn new things. The discussion of aspect usage is particularly useful, and the several syntax sections are very well done. There is very little to fault, in fact. One of the very few generalizations that is missed concerns the fleeting vowel in masculine nouns. The authors note that the *a* of the final syllable of the nominative singular "n'est pas toujours mobile" [is not always fleeting], and give as examples:

(49) *dân* 'jour' [day], Gsg *dâna* *jùnāk* 'héros' [hero], Gsg *junáka*

But these are not just random examples where the vowel fails to disappear, as the presentation suggests. Rather, the reason they are maintained is because they are long. The generalization which they miss is that long /a/ is never mobile.

With respect to misprints, the book is also amazingly clean. I noticed only two small editing errors and two misplaced footnote numbers (though it is always possible I could have missed some others). The first is in a chart illustrating the usage of the interrogative pronoun series *kòjī, kòjā, kòjē*, where a syllable is missing in the first example, given in (50). The second is apparently an editing glitch, where the identifier "(acc.)" should have been replaced by "nom" but was not, shown in (51).

(50) jī písac je dòbio nágradu òvē gòdinē? (197)
Kòjū d[j]èvōjku je upòznao na bálu?

(51) Nâgradu (acc.) ćе se prèdati sùtra. (473)
→ Nâgrada (acc.) ćе se prèdati sùtra.
'La recompense sera remise demain.'
[The prize will be awarded tomorrow.]

In addition to the excellent exposition, the wealth of examples, and the fascinating insights into usage that are evidence of change in progress, the book also contains a number of other charming nuggets of information, nearly all of them in footnotes. For instance, in the section discussing the fact that Serbian, Montenegrin, and Bosnian use both the Latin and the Cyrillic alphabets, we learn of a book published in 2008 called *Hamam Balkanija*, in which chapters are printed alternately in Cyrillic and in Latin and in which chapters are identified not by numbers in sequence but by alphabet letters in alphabetical order (51, n. 2). When one realizes that the order of the Cyrillic alphabet differs from that of the Latin alphabet, one recognizes the challenge posed to the reader—to say nothing of the eventual translator!

The use of the adjective *vòjnīčkī* is illustrated by the phrase *vòjnīčkī grȁh / pàsūlj*, which is glossed 'les haricots de l'armée' [army beans]. A footnote then identifies this particular bean soup as the favorite and best remembered dish of the Yugoslav national army (JNA), always served on special occasions such as when new recruits took the oath of service (158, n. 2).

At yet another point, the use of the imperfect tense is illustrated by a proverb:

(52) Kad se sinòvac žȅnjāše, ni stríca nȅ pītāše, a kad se ražénjāše i strînu pripitívāše.

'Quand un neveu se marie, il ne demande même pas à son oncle, mais quand il veut divorcer, il demande même à sa tante.' [When a nephew married, he didn't even ask his uncle, but if he wanted a divorce, he would even ask his aunt.]

(420; I omit the Bosnian version, with the Bosniak-marked kinship terms)

This example is followed by a lengthy discussion of Balkan kinship terms and the patriarchal society which they represent (as well as the fact that the words for "uncle" and "aunt" differ according to the lineal relationship). The relevance to the proverb is that the particular uncle it references is the brother of the father, thus a highly respected and very close male relation. The aunt who is referenced, however, is of considerably lower status not only because she is female, but also because she is related only by marriage and not by blood. The proverb itself refers to the rarity of divorce: if one even thought of undertaking it, one needed advice from every possible source, even the family member lowest on the totem pole.

In sum, this is a masterwork. Some speakers of the different standards may feel that more attention should be paid to certain differential points, but overall the balance is good. Furthermore, the complexity of the situation is such that it is impossible to note every possible difference in a manner with which everyone will agree. With respect to organization, clarity, and sheer amount of reliable language data, this book has no equal.

References

Alexander, Ronelle. (2006a) Review of Greenberg 2004. *Journal of Slavic linguistics* 14: 79–90.

———. (2006b) *Bosnian Croatian Serbian: A grammar with sociolinguistic commentary*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

———. (2013) "Language and identity: The fate of Serbo-Croatian". R. Daskalov and T. Marinov, eds. *Entangled Balkans.* Vol. 1. Leiden: Brill, 341–417.

Greenberg, Robert. (2004) *Language and identity in the Balkans: Serbo-Croatian and its disintegration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mønnesland, Svein. (2002) *Bosnisk kroatisk serbisk gramatikk*. Oslo: Sypress.

Thomas, Paul-Louis. (1994) "Serbo-croate, serbe, croate…, bosniaque, monténégrin: Une, deux…, trois, quatre langues?" *Revue des études slaves* 66(1): 237–59.

Slavic Languages and Literatures
6303 Dwinelle Hall #2979
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720-2979, USA
ralex@berkeley.edu

Received: March 2015