

AN INTRODUCTION TO OLD CHURCH SLAVIC. By *William R. Schmalstieg*. Cambridge, Mass.: Slavica Publishers, 1976. xi, 291 pp. \$7.95.

Five English grammars of Old Church Slavonic are now available to the American graduate student: R. G. A. deBray's "Old Slavonic" in his compendium, *Guide to the Slavonic Languages* (1969), H. G. Lunt's *Old Church Slavonic Grammar* (1974), G. Nandriš's *Old Church Slavonic Grammar* (1959), P. Regier's *A Learner's Guide to the Old Church Slavonic Language* (1977), and finally the volume under review. The grammars of deBray, Nandriš, and Schmalstieg clearly derive from the diachronic tradition established by the neo-grammarians A. Leskien in his *Handbuch der altbulgarischen (altkirchenslavischen) Sprache* (1962).

Professor Lunt's grammar is a very solid and comprehensive structural analysis of O.C.S., supplemented by an intriguing, succinct generative phonology. Professor Regier's guide is an attempt at an all-out generative approach and the result is tragically unique. Of the five grammars mentioned, Regier's is the only one designed in a school grammar format with "practical" exercises. A typical English to O.C.S. sentence follows: "Let us grind the bones of mice, in order that the fields may blossom and the beasts may eat" (p. 111). Nowhere in the book are there references to the canonical O.C.S. texts, nor are asterisks placed before any of the numerous hypothetical forms. This is, therefore, not a grammar of O.C.S. in the generally accepted sense of the term.

In his foreword Professor Schmalstieg states that the text is designed to meet the needs of four different types of students: those concentrating in Russian literature, historical linguistics, Baltic languages, and South Slavic languages. He thereby justifies heavy emphasis on Indo-European, Baltic, and South Slavic. In addition to the foreword, there are nine chapters (introduction, historical phonology, adjective and pronoun, noun, verb, participles, ablaut, numeral, and cases), readings, a glossary, indexes, a bibliography, and footnotes.

In format the text is a paperback composed in cold type, and herein lies its most serious drawback. One can well understand and sympathize with the author's efforts to economize, and, surely, at \$7.95 this text will appeal to the penurious graduate student. However, the purchase and use of two or three additional IBM typewriter elements would have greatly enhanced the utility of the text. As it now stands, not only are the O.C.S. forms not typed in Cyrillic, but they are typed in the same type style as the commentary. Thus, the morphological charts, which are fragmented among the pages, do not stand out and are difficult to use. This defeats the pedagogical aim of the book. The grammatical facts should have been presented in boldface, and the historical data and argumentation in a smaller sized and lighter typeface. This could have been taken even a step further and all of the Baltic material could have been presented in its own typeface. If this system had been followed, the student would be able to tell at a glance which data are pertinent to his special needs.

All of the readings are typed in Latin transliteration. Surely it would have been appropriate to include at least one photocopied page of Cyrillic from a Jagić edition. Ideally the readings should have been typed with the IBM O.C.S. typewriter element. Irksome to the teacher and misleading to the student in these readings is the universal omission of *tilla* over the abbreviations, even though the abbreviations are listed separately in the glossary. The very choice of texts is somewhat puzzling. The Marianus and Zographensis excerpts are certainly relevant, but why include the controversial Freising fragments and the fifteenth-century Life of Constantine?

As a teacher of Old Church Slavonic I find the text interesting, informative, and provocative. Throughout the grammatical presentation there appear interesting bits of argumentation centering on various problems in proto-Indo-European and proto-

Slavic. (The wealth of Lithuanian material is of particular interest.) I must question, however, the utility of this argumentation for all of the groups of students for whom this work is intended, the one exception being the historical linguists, who presumably come to the work with a background in Indo-European and Common Slavic. Yet even for them contentions such as the unsubstantiated repudiation of laryngeals in proto-Indo-European phonology (p. 41) seem out of place. These polemics only serve to confuse the beginning graduate student whose goal is a practical grasp of O.C.S. grammar. On the other hand, the synchronic data are pertinent and accurate and there are very few misprints.

The mixture of students in Professor Schmalstieg's classes is probably unique and this text is undoubtedly the most suitable for them. For the remaining two hundred and fifty-odd American students who study Old Church Slavonic each fall I can recommend this book only if they have already taken a course in Indo-European, Common Slavic, or comparative Slavic linguistics.

JAN LOUIS PERKOWSKI  
University of Virginia

AGREEMENT IN CONTEMPORARY STANDARD RUSSIAN. By *Dina B. Crockett*. Cambridge, Mass.: Slavica Publishers, 1976. iv, 456 pp. Paper.

This is an exhaustive treatment of grammatical agreement in Russian. The author states that "manifestations of agreement are, roughly, any endings which match features of sentence constituents other than the ones which bear them" (p. 1). Thus, adjective endings match the features of the head noun—*belyi* (masculine adjective ending) *stakan* (inherently masculine noun), "white glass," or *Tam stoyal* (neuter verb ending) *kreslo* (inherently neuter noun), "There stood a chair." The features that trigger agreement are gender, number, person, and animacy. Interesting problems of agreement arise when the head of the construction contains more than one noun stem, when quantifiers play a role in the sentence, and when the copula serves as the main verb. There are many ways in which two or more nouns can show up as the head of a construction—as a compound (*plashch-palatka*), a composite (*shkola-internat*), a conjunctive combination (*khleb-sol'*), and so forth. The problem is, in part, to specify with which of the two stems an adjective or verb agrees.

The book is not, however, a mere compendium of variations or exceptions to the straightforward agreement conventions of Russian. On the contrary, at every point the attempt is made to provide an adequate linguistic explanation. The author convincingly shows that apparent variation or nonagreement can be accounted for by deep syntactic relations which are obscured in the surface forms. For example, take the sentence, *Druzei* (genitive plural) *u menia bylo* (neuter) *vsego odna* (nominative feminine) *podruga* (feminine) ("As for friends, I had only one girl friend"): on the surface the nominative feminine form seems to be the subject, but the neuter verb does not agree with it; the syntactic role of *odna podruga* is, however, that of a quantifier phrase, not subject, and the neuter form is therefore the expected one. Crockett provides an explicit formal account of this relationship in terms of generative semantics and demonstrates its relevance to current theoretical problems that relate to quantifier phrases in English, a language in which the lack of morphological endings further obscures syntactic relationships.

The excursus on copulative verbs (chapter 5) illustrates a theme that runs through the entire book: differences in patterns of agreement are not, in general, variants of the same underlying structure, but rather reflect different structures having different meanings. The so-called "backward agreement," as in the example, *Kabinet* (masculine)