

The subject matter is made doubly attractive by well-chosen illustrative plates that provide as much insight as the author's text. Another helpful feature is his summary of the opera plots, especially welcome to English readers. The detailed comparative analysis of the five versions of "The Bartered Bride" will satisfy the most demanding scholars, while less specialized readers will not fail to augment their understanding and sympathy for Bedřich Smetana's work. For all this we are much indebted to Mr. Large.

EDITH VOGL GARRETT
Brookline, Massachusetts

SLOVAK-ENGLISH PHRASEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY. Compiled by
Jozef J. Konuš. Passaic, N.J.: Slovak Catholic Sokol, 1969. viii, 1,664 pp.
\$22.50. Distrib. by Reference Book Publishers, 305 Alwood Road, Clifton, N.J.

In the last two decades the universities of this country have produced an impressive number of Slavists equipped with both a sound practical knowledge of Slavic languages and an up-to-date theoretical training in linguistics. One would expect a Slovak-English dictionary published in 1969 to reflect this general level of competence. The dictionary under review, however, does not. Since we also now possess the excellent five-volume dictionary of the Slovak Academy of Sciences (1959-65), it would seem only obvious and not difficult to select at least the most representative and useful body of the current Slovak vocabulary. But the author fills column after column of the book with irrelevant, esoteric, obsolete, and simply nonexistent words, too often reflecting not the present-day, but the long-forgotten usage of the 1939-45 era. The author quotes *ablegácia* (a word which is not attested even in the five-volume Academy dictionary), *dial'kozvedný letúň* 'long-range reconnaissance plane' (the first word nonexistent, the second misspelled for obsolete *letún*) or *jednotky dopravné vzduchom* 'airborne units' (*dopravené* and not *dopravné* is correct), a paraphrase which probably never existed as a term, but he ignores the correct modern terms *výsadková jednotka* and *paradesantná brigáda* 'airborne unit.' The author adduces abbreviations such as *ÚSOD* (*Ústredie slovenských ochotníckych divadiel*, an obscure, short-lived organization), but he does not give the abbreviations *ČSM* (Czechoslovak Youth Union), *SAV* (Slovak Academy of Sciences), *ÚV* (*Ústredný výbor* 'Central Committee'), *KVN* (*Krajský národný výbor* 'Regional National Committee'), *ZO* (*základná organizácia* 'base organization'), which often appear in newspaper articles. The author has evidently only a faint remembrance of what once was his mother tongue, although he could have filled in the gaps by reading modern prose and by studying modern dictionaries.

He translates the phrase *absolvovať vojnu* as 'to finish, complete, perform a war,' although *vojna* means here 'military service' and the phrase means 'to complete one's military service.' Realia of present-day life such as *obrazovka* 'TV screen,' *ľadnička* 'refrigerator,' *občiansky preukaz* or *občianka* 'identification papers,' *dial'kové štúdium* 'correspondence study,' *dial'kar* 'correspondence student,' and hundreds of other important terms are not included. The author cites *Škodovka* 'Škoda Steel Works,' but ignores *škodovka*, the Czechoslovak compact car, as well as its models *sparták*, *feliccia*, *oktavia*, *embečko* (*MB*). But we find the enigmatic entry *Ilýr* 'a Yugoslav, a South Slav.' The author must have heard something about the Illyrian movement after the Napoleonic Wars. We do find *luxácia* 'luxation,' a rare medical term, but we do not find the common verb *luxovať* 'to vacuum.' As to "phraseological" units, we are led to believe that there exists in Slovak an expression

jest mi tam allegedly meaning 'when do we laugh?', and that the adjective *jenský* means 'pertinent to Jena (University)'; the phrase *jenské sklo* is the name of a heat-resistant glass (originally manufactured in Jena).

The level of grammatical information (or rather the sheer lack thereof) is pathetic. The terms perfective/imperfective are unknown. Instead, imperfective verbs are called "progressive." Gender is not given even in those cases where it is not possible to guess it—for example, *úroveň* (f) 'level,' *obyczaj* (f) 'custom.' And there is no way for the reader to discover that *miezd* is the Gpl of *mzda* 'wage, pay,' *hier* the Gpl of *hra* 'play, game,' *tehál* the Gpl of *tehla* 'brick,' or that *odtne* is a form of the verb *odt'at'* 'to chop off.' These forms are given, but under the corresponding nominatives and infinitives.

The dictionary contains numerous personal and place names. Some Slovak villages are cited (e.g., *Slažany*), other, more important ones are omitted (*Abelová*, *Istebník*, *Brodzany*). Incidentally, *Roháče* is not a 'village' but a mountain chain.

It does not pay to continue. The Slovak Catholic Sokol would have better served its members and the general public in this country by having financed a smaller dictionary, but one that would have been reliable, professional, and up to date. The price of the book is a ridiculous one to pay for 1,664 pages of printed paper.

ALEXANDER ISAČENKO

University of California, Los Angeles

TRIESTE, 1941–1954: THE ETHNIC, POLITICAL, AND IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE. By *Bogdan C. Novak*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1970. xx, 526 pp. \$16.50.

This review is of a particular kind. Its author in fact wrote, several years before Professor Novak, a book treating exactly the same subject (J. B. Duroselle, *Le conflit de Trieste, 1943–1954*, Brussels, Institut de Sociologie, Centre Européen de la Dotation Carnegie, 1966, 647 pp.). The two authors ignored each other, Novak using my book only for the last chapter (pp. xviii and 418–71). With the exception of the theoretical essay I included, we followed the same path, and I am happy to report that our conclusions are very similar.

The Trieste dispute involved—between the destruction of Austria-Hungary in 1918 and the Italian peace treaty in 1947—the entire region which the Italians call Venezia Giulia and the Yugoslavs the Julian March. From 1947 to 1954 the dispute was confined to the zone of the Free Territory of Trieste, which was created by the treaty but could not be put into operation, for the Allied powers could not agree on the choice of a governor. Zone A, administered by the British and Americans, could never be unified with Zone B, administered by the Yugoslavs. Despite the tripartite French–British–American declaration of March 20, 1948 (which, without consulting the USSR, for reasons connected with the forthcoming elections promised the entire Free Territory to Italy), Tito held firm. His rupture with Stalin helped him to improve his standing in Washington's eyes. Every device was suggested: mediation, condominium, partitions of different kinds. And finally the most logical solution was reached. In October 1954 Yugoslavia received Zone B, with minor changes; Italy, Zone A.

The big dispute (1918–47) and the little one (1947–54) were passionate because they involved nationalism. Peasant peoples, the Slovenes and the Croats considered that the cities—oases of Italian population in a Yugoslav hinterland—ought