

INTONATSIIA POVESTVOVATEL'NOGO PREDLOZHENIIA V RUSSKOM IAZYKE, vol. 1, part 1 (in two parts): PREDPOLAGAEMOE CHLENENIE PREDLOZHENII. By *Jaroslav Pavlík*. Odense University Slavic Studies, vol. 1. Odense, Denmark: Odense University Press, 1977. Part 1/1: 398 pp. Part 1/2: vi, 391 pp. (pp. 399–789). D.kr. 180, paper.

As every linguist knows, it is much easier to talk about intonation patterns than it is to write about them, because it is difficult to indicate the subtleties of the pitch patterns involved when one is limited to expressing them in terms of printed symbols and diagrams. Furthermore, intonation patterns appear to be influenced by other linguistic factors—semantic content, syntactic patterning, and rhythmic properties, to name just a few—causing variations within what should be one particular intonation pattern to become almost intractable. Hence, intonation has never been a very popular topic for formal linguistic study, although a certain amount of work for Russian of a “cut and try” nature has recently achieved pedagogical popularity in the Soviet Union. This situation is unfortunate, since not only do languages differ from each other in sentence intonation patterns, but even the dialects of one language show interesting divergences in intonation. Therefore, it is gratifying, at least at first glance, to see that someone has undertaken a serious and well-designed study of Russian intonation as represented by Pavlík's work.

This publication is the first of a three-part study of the intonation patterns of the emotionally neutral declarative sentence in Russian. The investigation was begun by the late Professor Karel Ohnesorg at the University of Brno in 1967 and was carried on by Pavlík after his emigration from Czechoslovakia to Denmark in 1969. The method of investigation is elaborate and impeccable in design. The sentences studied are all from technical literature and thus, although deadly dull in semantic content, they are excellent examples of emotional neutrality. The corpus of data consists of forty-four sentences studied as isolated structures and sixteen others studied in context. Each of these sixty sentences is subjected to a detailed linguistic structural analysis to include word order, syntagmatic structure, punctuation (important in itself as an analogue to intonation), semantic content, functional perspective (a particular emphasis of Czech linguistics), and, finally, rhythmic properties. The specification of each of the aspects of the sentences takes up all but fifty-six pages of the close to eight hundred pages of this publication. The remainder of the study, still unpublished, will contain a comparison of the above-mentioned properties with the intonation patterns of the sentences as read by three readers, along with general conclusions.

It is tantalizing to have just this early part of the investigation without the chief part of the study, the intonation patterns. If these patterns are analyzed with the same degree of detail as are the linguistic structures presented in this first part of the study, one can expect soon to have a much-needed and thoroughly objective study of the intonation patterns of the most common type of Russian sentence.

LAWRENCE G. JONES  
*Boston College*

THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE SINCE THE REVOLUTION. By *Bernard Comrie* and *Gerald Stone*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978. xii, 258 pp. \$24.95.

*The Russian Language Since the Revolution* is a sociolinguistic compendium of the Soviet Russian language. The book illustrates language change in progress and the divergence between prescriptive norms and actual usage. Best documented are the chapters on more traditional linguistic topics.

"Pronunciation" (chapter 1) primarily addresses the relationship between Old Moscow speech and contemporary standard speech. Chapter 2 shows analogy as the main cause for innovations in stress. The most palpable change in morphology (chapter 3) is attributed to the rise of "analyticity." Here the discussion of the increase in the usage of common gender (with the example *ty takaia bol'shaia neriakha* in reference to a boy) does not lead the authors to the next level of inquiry: (1) the boy is more offended by this than by *bol'shoi neriakha*, and (2) some children do not use these "illogical" forms and create *bol'shoi neriakh*. Chapter 5 deals with the lexicon, which receives full sociolinguistic analysis. Political, social, and economic institutions are shown to be prime factors in linguistic change. Chapter 8 gives a list of various orthographic reforms, from Peter I to 1956.

The remaining chapters are both intriguing and disappointing. For syntax, male/female linguistic distinctions, and language behavior, Comrie and Stone draw on the available spotty studies which often lack rigorous theoretical and methodological foundations. "Syntax" (chapter 4) treats a limited number of structures, with emphasis on variation and the growth of "analyticity." As an occasional last resort, the authors rely on the same unscientific approach that they criticized earlier: "Many speakers of Russian say X."

In chapters 6 (on sex/gender) and 7 (on speech etiquette), the writers show how power, prestige, literacy, education, and women's rights affect language change. Although Comrie and Stone note the unreliability of using texts as sources, they frequently turn to the written word in these chapters which, by their very nature, demand verbal data. Sex differences are analyzed only in terms of gender, reflecting the paucity of research to date. The argument on suffixes would be more forceful if Comrie and Stone had used words with equivalent roots, such as *sportsmenka* (high prestige) and *barmensha* (low prestige). The rich American English literature on this topic was not cited for possible parallels. Perhaps other phases of Russian communication patterns with sex as variable—for example, intonation and lexical usage—will soon attract scholarly attention. "Modes of Address and Speech Etiquette" opens with an exploration of second-person pronoun dyads of solidarity and power, summarizing the research of Brown and Gilman, Friedrich, and Nakhimovsky. The discussion of honorifics is commendable, but the chapter ends with an unarticulated shopping list of social formulas.

Many other topics would have fit well into this work, slang and kinesics, to name two. Obviously limits must be set, but it is disturbing that the authors do not define their parameters. There is no evidence of independent field research, no presentation of theory of language in the social context. As a result, Comrie and Stone lack assertiveness at the level of generalization and offer no overall conclusions. The authors have not made advances in analysis further than those found in the monumental *Russkii iazyk i sovetskoe obshchestvo*, edited by V. M. Panov (1968), the source of much of their data. Stress is marked only in the chapter on that topic, and glossing is inconsistent.

In sum, this book has its pluses and minuses, but as a pioneering effort in Russian sociolinguistics it deserves applause. Comrie and Stone should be read by all who have an interest in contemporary Russian language and society. This study offers nonspecialists crucial yet little-known information on speakers of Russian.

SUSAN WOBST

*University of Massachusetts, Amherst*