

the victories of 1914, then the reverses of 1915 and the retreat to the Adriatic, followed by the years of frustration in exile, the triumphant return, and the unification with other South Slavic lands to form the Yugoslav state. The editors have organized the material chronologically under appropriate chapter headings, and they have furnished an introduction for each chapter and an explanatory note for each document. A preface and two epilogues supply further context and pay tribute to Serbian heroism and self-sacrifice.

The book can be opened to almost any page and read with interest, since most of the documents are short, necessarily episodic, and have the authenticity of firsthand accounts. It is the kind of book a patriotic Serb might enjoy having on hand for occasional browsing. But as a research tool it is less satisfactory. Since the book contains only a small fraction of the material in the official history, a scholar who wishes to make a detailed study of Serbia's "Great War" will inevitably feel he must consult the original thirty-one volumes, difficult as they are to find today.

JOHN CLINTON ADAMS  
*Dartmouth College*

ARHIVSKA GRAĐA O VUKU KARADŽIĆU, 1813–1864. By *Golub Dobrašinović*. Izdanje Arhiva Srbije. Belgrade: Štampa Grafičko Preduzeće Slobodan Jović, 1970. 819 + 30 pp. plates.

Golub Dobrašinović, together with his collaborators in the Arhiv Srbije, has brought together in this volume more than three hundred documents pertaining to Vuk Karadžić. The materials—all from Yugoslav holdings—date from 1813 to 1864, the year of Vuk's death. This book does not contain Vuk's own correspondence, published more than fifty years ago by Ljubomir Stojanović (and currently being republished by Prosveta in its new complete edition of Vuk's works), nor does it include documents and letters from foreign archives. These materials have already appeared in various scholarly publications, the most noteworthy of which are Vatroslav Jagić's *Briefwechsel zwischen Dobrowský und Kopitar (1818–1826)* and Aleksa Ivić's *Arhivska građa o srpskim književnim i kulturnim radnicima, 1740–1880*, which contains nearly two hundred documents pertaining to Vuk, culled from the Austrian Imperial Archives.

Dobrašinović's edition will be of lasting importance to scholars of Serbian history, particularly since many of these documents have never been published before. The editor has served the historian well by using a chronological format. He does make one important deviation from chronological order, however, by grouping all documents concerning a particular subject (such as the 1826 edition of *Danica* or the 1847 publication of the New Testament) under the first item on that subject.

In addition to the main text, this book has an introduction, a prefatory index with a summary of each document, an appendix containing some fifty related documents, an appendix describing the holdings of both foreign and domestic archives, still another appendix giving a bibliography of previous editions of "Vukovština" and a summary of each document published, and both a name and a geographical index.

This work, truly a labor of love, is also provided with detailed footnotes giving

pertinent background information for individual documents. The editors have faithfully preserved the original language and script of the materials, a feature which scholars interested in the history of the Serbian literary language will greatly appreciate.

THOMAS J. BUTLER  
*University of Wisconsin*

HRVATSKI KNJIŽEVNI JEZIK I PITANJE VARIJANATA. Posebno izdanje časopisa "Kritika," vol. 1. Zagreb, 1969. 246 pp. 45 new dinars, paper. Available from Matica hrvatska.

RJEČNIK JEZIKA, ILI JEZIK RJEČNIKA? VARIJACIJE NA TEMU VARIJANATA. By *Dalibor Brozović*. "Kritika," vol. 2. Zagreb, 1969. 93 pp. 28 new dinars, paper. Available from Matica hrvatska.

STANDARDNI JEZIK. By *Dalibor Brozović*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1970. 180 pp.

The Serbo-Croatian language in its standardized form has been characteristically marked by the normative effort of Vuk Karadžić, who a century and a half ago decided to use a generalized version of certain Hercegovinian dialects as a basis for a common Serbo-Croatian literary language. For a long time Vuk's effort was remarkably successful. With the help of the schools, Vuk and his followers managed to impose a uniform set of norms upon a speaking community which had been highly differentiated dialectally. In fact, the product of that effort has survived to the present time in the textbooks, grammars, and linguistic studies as Standard (Literary) Serbo-Croatian.

Today, however, the majority of speakers of Serbo-Croatian live outside Vuk Karadžić's dialectal base and naturally deviate in many significant ways from the expected standard. Although the differences cannot cause any misunderstanding in communication, and in fact do not consistently distinguish the Serbs from the Croats, they nevertheless underlie the current desire of some language planners in Yugoslavia to replace the concept of a single Serbo-Croatian standard language by the normative concept of two literary languages—Croatian and Serbian—forever released from their hyphenated bondage.

As a matter of fact, most of the differences which at present seriously threaten to wreck Vuk's dream of Serbo-Croatian linguistic unity cannot be defined in purely linguistic terms and have to be approached as complex cultural phenomena encompassing religious, social, and economic factors and, in some areas, even a growing awareness of ethnic or tribal distinctiveness. Some of these complexities are deeply rooted in the past. Among them certainly the most fatal is the stubbornness of two alphabetic traditions which are traceable to the ancient distinction between Serbian and Croatian versions of Church Slavic: Serbian Church Slavic used the Cyrillic alphabet in the tradition of the Eastern Church, and Croatian Church Slavic used the Glagolitic and later the Latin alphabet in the tradition of the Western Church.

On the other hand, some aspects of the present linguistic crisis in Yugoslavia are best understood as a metamorphosis of political tensions between the two major cultural and industrial cities: Belgrade, the capital of Yugoslavia and the center of Serbian statism, and Zagreb, the center of Croatian separatism and during World War II the capital of an autonomous Croatian state.