

instance, she notes that the history of the folk tale "is perhaps as complex as that of the human race or as that of language" (p. 37). Curiously enough, she finds the narrative pattern of the folk tale also in stories about the American Wild West or "in the recurrent plot of the humble secretary who marries her boss" (p. 41). The dragon fight is, according to her, "intimately linked with the age-old motif of the search for the elixir of life" (p. 142). Her remark that "the hero has . . . to solve the riddle as a result of which they [his mother and his bride] were bound or imprisoned" (p. 91) is incomprehensible. The motif in which the hero warns his brothers that if blood let from his finger turns dark they will know that he is dead has, contrary to the author's assertion (p. 68), nothing to do with sworn brotherhood. *Simurg* is not "a bird well known in Russian chronicles" (p. 119), but (in the form of *Simar'gl*) an idol set up by Prince Vladimir. The derivation of *Buyan* from the name of the island *Rügen* (p. 53), considering the present state of linguistic science, is simply amusing. When the author speaks of combination of motifs (p. 40), she actually means tale-types. For her discussion of the supernatural figures, she could have found much important material in Jiří Polívka's *Slovanské pohádky* (1932).

One-fourth of the book (the appendix) is taken up by English translations of eight Russian folk tales. Their purpose is not clear, since the work is intended for readers who know Russian well. Throughout the study are many lengthy quotations in Russian, as well as a great number of individual Russian words, which break up the English text. Even such everyday words as "witch" and "mother-in-law" are given in Russian (p. 139).

It is inexcusable for a scholarly study not to give page numbers in footnote references to sources. This happens frequently. On one occasion (p. 13) the author has copied literally Roman Jakobson's translation of a passage (*Selected Writings*, 4 [1966]: 85–86), but in the footnote she refers to the Russian original of 1781 without mentioning Jakobson.

The work has many mistakes and misprints; a curious one is giving Uno Holmberg-Harva's first name regularly as U.N.O. (pp. 118, 234). The study does not contribute to our knowledge of the folk tale.

FELIX J. OINAS
Indiana University

A RUSSIAN CHURCH SLAVONIC KANONNIK (1331–1332): A COMPARATIVE TEXTUAL AND STRUCTURAL STUDY INCLUDING AN ANALYSIS OF THE RUSSIAN COMPUTUS (Scaliger 38B, Leyden University Library). By *A. H. van den Baar*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1968. 303 pp. 74 Dutch guilders.

Among the manuscripts belonging to the Joseph I. Scaliger collection, now housed in the University of Leiden library, there are nine in Russian Church Slavonic. A. H. van den Baar has prepared a study of one of these, a *Kanonnik*, which Sreznevsky dated "fourteenth century," and which van den Baar ingeniously shows was copied between March 31, 1331, and April 19, 1332.

The manuscript is defective. Van den Baar assumes that six folia of an original forty-eight have been lost. These presumed contained the calendar of saints for the months of March and April, missing from the extant manuscript, which would have occupied four folia, and two additional folia whose contents are unknown.

The manuscript now contains a calendar of saints without March and April, five Offices and Kanons, and a computus.

Van den Baar's description of the manuscript includes a paleographic study and remarks on the phonology, morphology, and syntax. His method of reproducing the text is excellent. He provides the reader with the original text of each of the five formularies, the Greek text (where known), the current Church Slavonic version, and an English translation. He managed to find only about half the formulae corresponding to those of the manuscript. It should be noted that the Greek text, and hence the modern Church Slavonic and English versions, does not always correspond exactly to the manuscript.

Van den Baar's study of the paleographic features of the manuscript is more than adequate. He discovered no unusual or unexpected features. An appendix of some twenty pages of photographs affords one the opportunity for closer study. As regards the linguistic phenomena of the manuscript, he correctly states that such ecclesiastical texts as Scaliger 38B rarely are reliable sources from which one may draw conclusions concerning the language of the scribe or copyist, or the time of copying. He has noted a great many instances where the language of the text deviates from that which is generally considered the norm for Russian Church Slavonic of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. He nonetheless concludes that phonological features reflected in the manuscript "may be considered as transitional for the area between Moscow and Pskov."

It is in his study of the computational elements in the manuscript that van den Baar was faced with the greatest problems. Such information is notoriously difficult to decipher, and there is frequently little information to be gained from the computus which will aid the scholar in dating the manuscript. The Scaliger *Kanonnik*, however, did contain the elements necessary for him to date the manuscript with considerable accuracy. His study was centered on the *Tabula Paschalis*, and the account of his efforts to decipher the code is clearly written and makes fascinating reading.

This study will be of considerable interest to linguists, paleographers, and students of ecclesiastical literature. It is not without certain mechanical faults, chiefly transliteration and translation errors, misspellings, and one or two un-English expressions. There is a good bibliography attached. One hopes that this work will result in more attention being paid to the other manuscripts in the Scaliger collection.

J. V. HANEY
University of Washington

THE PHONETICS OF RUSSIAN. By Daniel Jones and Dennis Ward. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. xi, 308 pp. \$9.50.

Detailed analyses in English of the phonetic system of Russian are few indeed. The standard works available in this field have been S. C. Boyanus's *Russian Pronunciation* and *Russian Phonetic Reader* (Cambridge, Mass., 1955), which is a re-writing of the earlier *Manual of Russian Pronunciation*, and M. V. Trofimov and Daniel Jones, *The Pronunciation of Russian* (Cambridge, Eng., 1923). Among the works by Russian scholars, undoubtedly the best known are those by R. I. Avanesov—for example, his *Russkoe literaturnoe proiznoshenie* (Moscow, 1964) and *Fonetika sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo iazyka* (Moscow, 1956). To the preceding we must add the very impressive *Prakticheskaiia fonetika i intonatsiia russkogo*