Business Russian is a superior reference work for very advanced students working in a classroom situation or independently. Each of the twenty-five lessons contains explanations of business documents and procedures, correlative exercises, Russian tests specifically designed for perseverance, and challenging translation exercises. No English is used in explanations of the chapter material, but the vocabularies in each lesson are excellent. (As with Russian For Business, there is no general vocabulary at the end of the book.) Related and cognate words as well as idiomatic and phonological expressions are included with the main entries. The conversations and readings in lessons one through ten are not overly difficult and provide an insight into the workings of the COMECON "business world." Beginning with lesson eleven the going gets very difficult for all but the most advanced students, and the complexity of the material presented and the exercises versus the simplicity of the dialogues are definite shortcomings. The material intended for oral practice in these lessons is completely unnecessary (as are the morphology exercises throughout the book) and illustrates the weakness of the effort as a whole. Anyone proficient enough to formulate business correspondence fluently does not need the dialogues (which are fine indeed as they promote understanding of the text) but not very practical for conversational purposes). The book does contain a key to the exercises and an abundance of commercial documentation between firms in the GDR and their Soviet liaison organizations. The former are probably of very little value to the American student, other than as a guide to format. The American editors should have provided documentation from American firms where possible and should have included a section on business correspondence.

Business Russian is too long, too dry, and too difficult to be readily adapted for general classroom use, since the author presupposes an advanced level of preparation and considerable familiarity by both student and teacher with the specifics of the world of international (read: COMECON) business.

Russian For Business and Business Russian are illustrations of a yet unresolved problem for the American teacher: to whom are we teaching "Business Russian?" At what level and with what tools? At a time when we must adapt ourselves to the needs of students at various levels and from various disciplines, Russian For Business can provide a sound general introduction to the world of commercial Russian, while Business Russian adds depth and scope for the more advanced student.

Sam Orth, The University of Connecticut


The subtitle of this book is Form, and the author states that a functional analysis of the material is to appear in a forthcoming publication. The work comprises six parts: an introduction containing definitions and sources; three chapters of material with some commentary; a summarizing chapter with conclusions; and an appendix consisting of seven tables giving statistical breakdowns of the number and percentage of each of the seven main types of yes/no-questions in each of the twelve Bulgarian and sixteen Macedonian authors whose selected works served as the corpus for this book. These tables correspond to seven tables in the main body of the text which give statistical breakdowns of the number and percentage of types of words ordered for each type of yes/no-question in Bulgarian and Macedonian.

In the introduction, the author quite reasonably demonstrates that the most basic terms—namely, question and yes/no-question—ultimately must be accepted as intuitively understood (1-15). In her list of question particles (QPs), however, England has consulted three works for Bulgarian and one for Macedonian, but apparently did not check any dictionaries or
more extensive sources (16). Thus although tank’tam and bel’tam are mentioned as Bulgarian QPs, Englund does not point out that both words also occur in Macedonian, and tunk’tam, at least, can be used as a QP. Another Macedonian QP which was omitted is adželbu (Bulgarian adeželb). While these omissions are not of great importance, they nevertheless detract from the comprehensiveness of the work. Although Englund specifies that in selecting authors she based herself on the principle of finding authors born in different dialect areas, she does not specify these respective areas in her list of sources (21-22). On several occasions she refers to the possible dialectal basis of some feature in her material (87, 102, 117-18, 128-30), and in the course of these observations she gives the places of origin of eleven of the Macedonian authors and mentions that three of the Bulgarian authors are from the western dialect region. Given her occasional attempts at making dialectal generalizations on the basis of her corpus, however, it would have been useful had Englund given the place of origin next to each author’s name in the list of sources.

The next three chapters are taken up primarily with a catalogue of the types of word order occurring in Macedonian and Bulgarian yes/no-questions with numerous examples. The classification into types and subtypes is based on the order and occurrence of the subject (S), the predicate (P), objects and adverbials (X), presumptive expressions (for example, sigurno ‘surely’), subordinating conjunctions, and the disjunctive conjunction ili ‘or’ (Y), and, in the second two of the three chapters, the QP. The first of these chapters is devoted to questions formed without a QP, of which there are five types divided into a total of eighteen subtypes. The second chapter describes the word order in questions with an orthotonic (accented) QP. There are four principal QPs: dal’ (5 types, 12 subtypes), nima’/zar (em/k types, 14 subtypes), nali/neli (6 types, 18 subtypes), and a (5 types, 11 subtypes). In addition, there are twelve occurrences of ne (all in Macedonian, in final position, and divided into 5 types), one of da (in Bulgarian, also final), five of ili (2 Bulgarian, 3 Macedonian, all final), three of ali (all Macedonian), eight of migar and one of zunkim (all Bulgarian). Apparently there were no questions ending in ili ne in England’s corpus. The third chapter is devoted to the non-orthotonic (unaccented) QPs 2 (6 types, 17 subtypes), and da (4 types, 10 subtypes).

Englund’s principal conclusions can be summarized as follows. In general, Macedonian and Bulgarian yes/no-questions have the same word order as corresponding assertions, and the inversion of S and P is never a distinctive sign of interrogation. In those contexts in which inversion tends to predominate—namely, in Macedonian when an orthotonic QP occurs with a P containing the copula e ‘is’ or when the QP is non-orthotonic da (that is, da ne), and in both languages when ili is enclitic to P (more in Macedonian than in Bulgarian due to the application of Wackernagel’s law in the former)—the inversion is due to the accent patterns entailed by the cities rather than to the marking of interrogation. The differences between Macedonian and Bulgarian are the following: Macedonian yes/no-questions are formed more frequently without a QP or with dal’ while Bulgarian prefers ili; nima, migar, and zunkim occur only in Bulgarian, while zar(um), ali, and ne occur only in Macedonian (apparently there were no examples with Bulgarian zar in the author’s corpus; she also fails to mention here the one occurrence of stressed da in final position in Bulgarian, which is of precisely the same type as the eleven instances of stressed ne in Macedonian; Macedonian zar(um) is more common than its Bulgarian counterpart nima; the non-orthotonic QP da occurs in both negated and non-negated questions in Bulgarian (that is, as da+P and as da ne +P) but “almost exclusively in negated questions in Macedonian” (134) (there are no examples of da + P from Macedonian in the book).

While the importance of this work is undeniable, collecting as it does for the first time an enormous body of data on Macedonian and Bulgarian yes/no-questions, there is room for improvement. The approach is basically an atomistic one, and after reading such a detailed breakdown of possible word orders, one is left with the feeling that the conclusions could have taken this detail more into account by means of comparison of different types and analysis of
the whole. Due to the limitations of the corpus and sources and the apparent lack of native in-
formats for Macedonian (114, 118), the work does not seem to be as comprehensive as it
might have been. The fact that none of the examples are translated into English, while quite un-
derstandable in view of the fact that it would have significantly increased the number of pages
in the volume, nevertheless limits the usefulness of the book for those Slavists and linguists not
thoroughly familiar with Macedonian and Bulgarian. Despite these shortcomings, however, the
book constitutes a significant contribution to a somewhat neglected area, and the sequel will
also surely provide another valuable source of information.

Victor A. Friedman, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

B. M. Groen. A Structural Description of the Macedonian Dialect of Dihovo. (PDR Press
[Dist. Humanities Press, Atlantic Highlands, NJ.]

A Structural Description of the Macedonian Dialect of Dihovo is the published version of the
author’s doctoral dissertation. It is based on fieldwork in the village of Dihovo, which lies some
five miles west of the city of Bitola in the Macedonian Republic of Yugoslavia. The book is
organized into six chapters: an introductory chapter, chapters on phonology, morphology, and
syntax, a collection of twelve field texts, and a Macedonian-English lexicon. A résumé in Serbo-
Croatian is also given.

The chapter on phonology is concerned with the vocalic and consonantal phonemes of the
dialect and their sequences, distribution, and neutralizations and alternations. An entire section
is devoted to the opposition and neutralization of /t/ and /d/. A criticism of Groen’s analysis is his
treatment of the affricate /t/. Groen interprets it biphonemically, that is, as a sequence of /t/ and /f/.
Evidence for a monophonemic interpretation, however, is furnished by the fact that there are
only two initial four-consonant clusters, one medial five-consonant cluster, and one final three-
consonant cluster, each of which contains the sequence /t + f/. This anomaly should lead to some
suspicion as to a biphonemic interpretation of /t/.

The chapter on morphology accounts for approximately half of the book. Sections of this
chapter deal with morphophonology, inflexion, derivation, and accent. (Groen treats accent
under morphology because of the necessity of considering morphological data for the formula-
ton of stress rules). Groen’s transcription may be confusing to some. For example, in the form
rak /t 2 arm, hand/, /K/ represents a morpheme which has the realization /c/ in the plural
(singular raka, plural raki). Some readers may wish for a traditional phonemic transcription
when faced with forms such as grebino ‘kine’ /sin/ (standard phonemic transcription is used,
however, in the lexicon). Also, Groen uses /K/ to show that the historical second palataliza-
tion of velars is operative, /K/ for the first palatalization. Concerning Groen’s discussion of
morphophonemic alternations, he states that there are cases where there must be both derivation-
al and inflexional base forms. I am not convinced that this analysis is preferable to one in which
there is one basic form with anomalous forms handled by suppletion (one might also question
whether dogdulski ‘salamander’ is synchronically related to dot ‘rain’).

Groen admits that the chapter on syntax “claims to present no more than a very limited
survey of the syntactic word classes and of the formal and semantic aspects of the complex
tenses of the verb” (186). Sections here deal with prepositions, conjunctions, particles, interjec-
tions, and the complex verbal tenses (a section which could be given more detailed attention).
The final chapters consist of field texts (copiously footnoted) and a lexicon containing most of
the lexical items elicited during the investigation.

In summary, Groen’s book represents a high standard of scholarship. He accounts for an
enormous amount of data and his discussions are of high quality. He is familiar with the rele-