

ROMANOSLAVICA, vol. 16: REFERATE ȘI COMUNICĂRI PREZENTATE LA CEL DE-AL VI-LEA CONGRES INTERNAȚIONAL AL SLAVIȘTILOR (PRAGA, 7-13 AUGUST 1968). Asociația Slaviștilor din Republica Socialistă România. Bucharest, 1968. 465 pp. 36 lei.

Volume 16 of the review *Romanoslavica* is a collection of twenty-two papers presented by Rumanian Slavists at the Sixth International Congress of Slavists held in Prague in August 1968. The papers are presented under three headings—linguistics, literature, and history. There is also a special contribution by G. Mihăilă devoted to the history of Slavic studies in Rumania.

The main focus of the ten papers that deal with linguistic and philological problems is the various aspects of the influence of the Slavic languages upon Rumanian and vice versa. The late Emil Petrovici's short study on Rumanian place names derived from Slavic is based on his earlier work in this field. I. Pătruț examines the period during which Rumanian was first influenced by Slavic, and G. Ivănescu presents an interesting account of regional variations in Slavic loan words in Rumanian. For example, from Slavic *zapadu* 'fall' comes Rumanian *zăpadă* 'snow,' that is, by specialization 'that which falls from the sky.' This particular Rumanian word is used in Wallachia, whereas in Moldavia and Northern Transylvania we find *omăt* 'snow' derived from Ukrainian *omet*. The emphasis is placed, however, on words of Slavic origin found only in the Banat, the Apuseni Mountains, and in Maramureș.

South Slavic and Hungarian loan words in Rumanian are the subject of a paper by Alexandru Rosetti, but much of the material presented here has already appeared in his *Istoria limbii române* (Bucharest, 1968, pp. 285-330 and 417-22). The longest contribution in this section is by a group of scholars and deals with the influence of Rumanian on the vocabulary of various Slavic languages. The complexity of this problem, owing to the different periods in which Rumanian came in contact with the respective languages and the intensity and duration of that contact, must be borne in mind when evaluating any conclusions drawn. A useful bibliography of studies on this particular question as well as a comprehensive list of probable Rumanian loan words in the different Slavic languages are also given.

Of the remaining papers in this section the most interesting are A. Vraciu's comparative structural approach to the study of the syntactic functions of the accusative case in the Slavic languages and the contribution by L. Djamo-Diaconiță to the lexical elements of a Slavic dialect spoken at Bobeșčica in Albania.

Among the articles on literature, aspects of the literary links between the Slavs and the Rumanians are given prominence. Popular ballads in Slavic and Rumanian literature are surveyed briefly by Ion Chițimia, one of the outstanding scholars in this field in Eastern Europe, although a more detailed analysis of this question is presented in the introduction to his work *Cărțile populare în literatura românească* (Bucharest, 1963). Also on the subject of the popular ballad is P. Olteanu's contribution concerning *Fiori di Virtù* and the Slavic versions translated from Rumanian.

Although entitled "Problèmes soulevés par les premières traductions roumaines du slavon," the article by Maria Zdrenghea in fact deals with one particular interlinear Slavo-Rumanian manuscript from Ieud in Northern Transylvania and the problems raised by a parallel study of the Slavic and Rumanian texts. Later Slav-Rumanian contacts are represented by C. Velichi's paper on Gheorghe Peșacov, a minor poet of the early nineteenth century, who may be claimed by both Bulgarian and Rumanian literature, and a contribution to the study of Russo-Rumanian literary links in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries by Tatiana Nicolescu.

The first of the three historical papers analyzes Czech contributions to Rumanian historiography, in particular those made in support of the Rumanian thesis that argues the uninterrupted presence since Roman times of a Latin-speaking people in the area of former Dacia. M. Comşa traces the influence of Roman civilization on that of the Slavs, principally in pottery design. The final study in the volume is a brief survey of the part played by the Rumanian army in the defeat of the German forces in Czechoslovakia during World War II.

The short history of Slavic studies in Rumania presented by G. Mihăilă will be of interest to all Slavists, more especially because it highlights the fact that the culture of Rumania between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries was predominantly a Slavic culture and one that has been unfortunately neglected by Western scholars.

DENNIS DELETANT  
*University of London*

A BULGARIAN LITERARY READER. By *Albert B. Lord* and *David E. Bynum*.  
The Hague: Mouton, 1968. 200 pp. 25 Dutch guilders.

For those who deal with East European languages, the appearance of any materials suitable for classroom use is always welcome. The present volume is evidently a part of, or the same as, the Harvard 1962 pair of volumes I have seen reference to but have never been able to procure. It is obvious, both from their selection of items complete in themselves and from the excellent glossary provided at the end, that the compilers have had considerable experience with language pedagogy. Students are more likely to enjoy and discuss a complete story or poem than excerpts from longer works.

The glossary, with its concise introduction, is excellent. It provides not only meanings but all the grammatical information a student needs: accents, plurals for nouns, verbal conjugations, phonological alternations, and so forth. I strongly second the recommendation that the student should begin early with Bulgarian dictionaries in Bulgarian, but at this stage a glossary is still necessary. The fact that the glossary takes up seventy-five pages and the Bulgarian texts only eighty-five should sufficiently indicate the thoroughness of its coverage.

Two other pedagogical items should be noted. First, the authors, since they provided such a fine glossary, must have information about the size of the vocabulary in each selection. Although it is said in the preface that each teacher must choose for himself and that vocabulary is not the sole criterion, it is a shame that the authors did not see fit to add a statistical note to prospective teachers that would make the ordering of the selections for classroom use a bit easier when the teacher is in doubt. Second, some footnotes to the more colloquial expressions in the texts would have been useful, even though there is an attempt in the glossary to specify the range of usage of each word.

The introductory essay provides a capsule background of Bulgarian literature up to the time of Khristo Botev and Ivan Vazov, where the selections begin. Each selection is preceded by a brief biographical sketch in English. The introduction and sketches are quite good, although they become quite brief toward the end. It would have been interesting to know more about Bagriana and Stanev—how, for instance, they adapted to the new literary norms of the postwar period.

The lack of glosses for titles of literary works and some literary-historical terms in the introduction is troubling. A student still learning will have difficulty, for in-