

including two reprints during the Soviet era (1936–40 and 1957). Some statements made by Miss Duddington show her to be an outsider to the field of folklore. For example, her statement, “Much [folklore] material has been gathered and published, but probably much still remains as oral tradition,” is devoid of any sense. Inferences about the Russian national character—the Russians’ wonderful staying power, their great fortitude in facing suffering and death, and their nonresistance—made on the basis of certain tales of magic, have hardly any validity, since these tales are international. It is true that folklore can illuminate certain national traits, but the clarification of such insights requires painstaking comparative research, as Miss Duddington herself finally admits.

FELIX J. OINAS  
Indiana University

THE DICTIONARY OF EXCEPTIONS TO RULES OF RUSSIAN GRAMMAR. By *Sigrid Schacht*. New York: American Elsevier Publishing Co., 1968. xxvi, 196 pp. \$9.50.

This dictionary is intended to relieve the reader of having to memorize the “irregular” forms of the twenty thousand most frequently occurring words in Russian. “Irregular” forms or “exceptions” are taken to be those forms manifesting any sort of alternation that might frustrate identification with the dictionary form. Thus ХОЖУ, ОЦА, ВЕЛ, and ВЕДУ are considered “irregular” in the face of “regular” forms such as ХОДИТЬ, ОТЕЦ, and ВЕСТИ. The reader is advised to memorize the “regular” basic paradigms and to rely on the book for the rest.

From a linguistic point of view such a notion of irregularity is absurd; there are perfectly good general rules governing transitive softening (Д ~ Ж, Т ~ Ч, С ~ Ш, etc.), fleeting vowels, and consonantal substitution or truncation, and these are mentioned in most modern handbooks and grammars. This book, however, is designed neither for linguists nor students, the author’s recommendations notwithstanding. Rather it is intended for the linguistically naïve reader with a scanty knowledge of Russian grammar who is interested only in reading, not in speaking or producing actual forms.

For such a reader the author is probably correct in segmenting nominal, verbal, and adjectival endings from an orthographical rather than phonological perspective. Her basic paradigms contain “hard,” “soft,” and “mixed” declensions, the last concerned with the written representation of vowels after velars, hushings, and the affricate Ц. Linguists, of course, recognize a single set of endings underlying each of the traditional declensions of nouns and adjectives. The vowel at the beginning of an ending can be represented orthographically by “hard” or “soft” vowel letters indicating the hardness or softness of the preceding paired consonant, for example, *kómnat-a* / КОМНАТА, *nedél-a* / НЕДЕЛЯ. It is probably easier for the reader under discussion to learn two sets of endings, “hard” and “soft,” since it facilitates segmentation into stem and ending. But the author only confuses the unsuspecting reader by mixing orthographical and phonological segmentation and thereby produces a motley and inconsistent set of paradigms.

The stem for ‘week’ is given (p. xiii) as НЕДЕЛ], to which the soft feminine nominal endings are added, thus nominative singular НЕДЕЛ]Я, accusative singular НЕДЕЛ]Ю, and so forth. Inexplicably the genitive plural stem is given as НЕДЕЛ]Ь with a zero ending instead of the expected НЕДЕЛ]Ь. Schacht’s presentation is char-

acterized by a vacillation between the two kinds of segmentation: nom. sg. БИОГРАФИЯ, gen. pl. БИОГРАФИИ, but gen. sg. МУЗЕЯ, nom. sg. МУЗЕЙ; gen. sg. ЧАСТИ, but inst. sg. ЧАСТЬЮ. And how does the author justify including the soft sign with the stem in ЧАСТЬЮ, but with the ending in РЫБЬЯ (p. xviii)?

Schacht is incorrect in saying that ТРЕТИЙ (p. vii) and adjectives like РЫБИЙ (p. xviii) decline like soft adjectives. They inflect according to the pronominal pattern in which the nominative and nonoblique accusative (acc. ≠ gen.) take the short (nominal) endings and the oblique cases take the long (adjectival) ones. A fleeting vowel, namely *i*, is manifested in the adjectives when the ending is Ø; see the masculine singular examples below:

NOM.	trɛtʲj+Ø	ТРЕТИЙ	riβj+Ø	РЫБИЙ	čej+Ø'	ЧЕЙ
ACC.	↓		↓		↓	
GEN.	trɛtʲj+ovo	ТРЕТЬЕГО	riβj+ovo	РЫБЬЕГО	čj+ovo	ЧЬЕГО

In her attempt to eschew morphological rules, the mastery of which would render unnecessary most of the "irregular" forms in the book, Schacht has not entirely freed herself from linguistic considerations, and therein lies the inconsistency of her analysis. She would do well in a second edition to reshape the system upon which the book is based according to strictly orthographical principles, thus ensuring a consistent picture for the intended audience of linguistically untrained users.

MICHAEL S. FLIER

*University of California, Los Angeles*

## SYMPOSIA

AMERICAN CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE SIXTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF SLAVISTS, PRAGUE, 1968, AUGUST 7-13. Vol. 1: LINGUISTIC CONTRIBUTIONS. Edited by *Henry Kučera*. Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, 80. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1968. 427 pp.

CONTENTS: Robert Abernathy, "The Slavic Liquid-Metatheses." Henrik Birnbaum, "Obščeslavianskoe nasledie i inoiazyczne obraztsy v strukturnykh raznovidnostiakh staroslavianskogo predloženiia." Paul L. Garvin, "Russian Lexical Units in the Light of Machine Translation Research." Zbigniew Gołąb, "The Grammar of Slavic Causatives." Gerta H. Worth, "Rol' tserkovnoslavianskogo iazyka v razvitii russkogo literaturnogo iazyka." R. Jakobson, "Voprosy sravnitel'noi indoevropskoj mifologii v svete slavianskikh pokazanii." D. Barton Johnson, "Toward a Typology of the Slavic Verb: The Verbs of Body Position." Henry Kučera, "Some Quantitative Lexical Analyses of Russian, Czech and English." Rado L. Lencek, "The Theme of the Greek Koine in the Concept of a Slavic Common Language and Matija Majar's Model." Thomas F. Magner, "Post-Vukovian Accentual Norms in Modern Serbo-Croatian." Ladislav Matějka, "On Translating from Latin into Church Slavonic." Lew R. Micklesen, "Impersonal Sentences in Russian." Michael Shapiro, "Zametki po udareniiu zaimstvovannykh slov v sovremennom russkom iazyke." C. H. van Schooneveld, "On the Opposition Determinate-Indeterminate in the Contemporary Standard Russian Verb." Edward Stankiewicz, "The Accent Patterns of the Slavic Verb." Kirill Taranovsky, "Formy obščeslavianskogo i tserkovnoslavianskogo stikha v drevnerusskoi literature XI-XIII vv." Dean S. Worth, "'Surface Structure' and 'Deep Structure' in Slavic Morphology."