

Moravian dialect would use more Common Czech features was not confirmed.

Another issue which Wilson's research addresses is whether there is a hierarchy according to which some linguistic variables are assimilated better and sooner and others less and/or later, and what possible factors may be responsible. The research confirmed the author's prediction that the most territorially widespread and socially acceptable features are the most readily assimilated. Yet the interplay of social and intra-linguistic factors remains an area of speculation and ambiguity. Some researchers in dialect contact use the term 'salience' for the features that are accommodated better and quickly, but they have not arrived at an agreed definition. 'Salient' features are those which are the most frequent in a variety and/or are particularly well-known within a given community; the salient features of the old dialect are given up first and the salient features of the new one are accommodated first in any dialect contact situation. But the same forms could be socially stigmatised as well, which may bar them from being assimilated easily.

Wilson's monograph poses a kind of challenge to Czech sociolinguistics: it has filled, if only partially, a gap in our knowledge of the Czech sociolinguistic situation, but it raises even more questions. First, the second part of the contact hypothesis should be tested. That is, is it possible that native speakers of Common Czech, having moved to Moravia, do not behave as most migrants in dialect contact situations, that is, they do not assimilate local forms? Second, what differences in linguistic accommodation might there be between university students or graduates and blue-collar workers? And further, what role does a speaker's age play in dialect assimilation? Wilson could not address this question because all his informants are of the same age cohort. But might there not be something like a 'critical age' for the accommodation of a second dialect? What differences might

there be between the accommodation of Moravians who have moved to Prague already as university graduates or later in life, or are, say, married to another Moravian and so forth? Perhaps this, certainly only partial, list of further issues is evidence that the book under review provides ample food for thought, especially in the range of social parameters that might be examined next.

Kamila Mrázková,  
Institute of the Czech Language  
AS CR, Prague  
mrazkova@ujc.cas.cz

#### References

- Sgall, Petr and Jiří Hronek. 1992. *Čeština bez příkras*. (Czech Laid Bare) Prague: H&H.  
Trudgill, Peter. 1986. *Dialects in Contact*. Oxford and New York: Blackwell.

**Luděk Sýkora (ed.): *Rezidenční segregace***  
Prague 2010: Univerzita Karlova, pp. 143

*Rezidenční segregace* (Residential Segregation) is a short book resulting from a number of research projects commissioned by the Czech government, including the Ministry for Regional Development, in order to provide an initial overview of the extent of residential segregation in the Czech Republic. The editor, an urban geographer, is also the author of most of the chapters, which consist of short overviews of the phenomenon of residential segregation in other countries, especially the United States, and equally short case studies from the Czech Republic. The booklet comes across as a cross-over between a commissioned report and a syllabus aimed at undergraduate students. It makes no contribution to theory, and its scholarly value is diminished by the absence of even a single reference to publications—Czech or foreign—about the phenomenon under investigation.

In spite of these limitations this work provides some interesting empirical insights into the state of residential segregation in present-day Czech society. As Sýkora mentions repeatedly, the post-socialist era has brought about an unprecedented degree of socio-economic differentiation, leading to the breakdown of the largely homogenous residential pattern favoured by the communist regime. Nowadays, members of different social classes drift towards, or are involuntarily assigned to, increasingly nucleated neighbourhoods. So, for example, even the paragon of socialist social engineering, the uniformly monotonous and ugly housing estates that can be found all the way from Prague to Vladivostok (in the Czech Republic they still constitute a surprising 40% of the entire housing stock), have undergone significant transformations, as affluent residents move to more desirable locations, leaving behind people with fewer choices. In this context, Sýkora and his collaborators devote attention to the growing isolation and segregation of Czech Roma, which has resulted in the appearance of classic ghettos—often in urban housing estates vacated by ethnic Czechs.

The flight of urban elites from residential districts seen as undesirable or prob-

lematic—in the Czech Republic often associated with the presence of Roma—has favoured the development of new enclaves set aside for affluent people who cherish privacy, security, and an upper middle-class lifestyle. The book contains some intriguing examples, accompanied by interesting photos, of the growing popularity of ‘gated communities’, some of which, perhaps uniquely in Europe, include private streets. One of the contributors, Tomáš Brabec, provides the startling information that of all the new housing built in Prague in 2008 15% ought to be classified as gated communities. Correspondingly, by 2009 the capital city was dotted with fifty-nine such developments.

The contributors point out the negative consequences of the growing prevalence of residential segregation and mention counter-measures enacted in other countries. They identify weaknesses in Czech policies (such as the absence of a state-level affordable housing strategy or the lack of coordination between state and municipal-level agencies dealing with housing issues), but the suggestions for redress are not articulated very well.

David Z. Scheffel  
Thompson Rivers University  
dscheffel@tru.ca