have -u (p. 25), or when he explains the distinction between primary and secondary prepositions. His handling of the distinction between ty and ry (p. 44), of the translation of Eng. it (p. 44), of the use of avoj or the omission of the possessive pronoun in Russian (p. 48), of the problems of tenses and tense sequence (54-55), of conditions (p. 60), of the modal use of by and by by (p. 70), and of comparatives (p. 81) are all models of common sense and brevity. Sometimes, however, it would take a minor change to transform a very solid explanation into a truly first-rate one, as when Philip provides a useful generalization about the fixed nature of the stress in the long forms of the adjective (p. 25) but fails to add that stress may be fixed either on the stem or on the endings. Similarly, in what is otherwise an excellent analysis of the use of the long and short forms of the adjective (76-80), Philip fails to see that the use of the short form to indicate excessive ness is all part of the notion of delimitation by a complement and does not need to be treated separately. In a very solid discussion of the use of moko and related words (p. 95), a note on the aspect distinctions with melisja would be welcome. The brief appendix of paradigms (p. 99-108) is useful, but its effectiveness would be enhanced if the occasional references to it throughout the text carried a page notation rather than simply "See Appendix." In the section of the appendix treating numerals (105-108), a short note about related forms such as dečka would be helpful because of the frequency with which such forms occur. The statement about the instrumental case of tajača (p. 106) should include mention of the distinction between tajača'-ju and tajača'-je. 

I noted only the following typographical errors: p. 2, line 1, delete "entire"; p. 30, line 18, for obo veam read obo veam; p. 33, sec. A, for dobišťja read dobišťja; p. 40, line 1, tâkkâ has been omitted; p. 40, line 5 of sec. C, for mano read dom; p. 46, line 17 up, on snajl šljapà; p. 56, third paragraph of sec. B, for dobišťja and dobišťja read dobišťja and dobišťja; p. 57, line 8, for "intransitively" read "intransitively"; p. 60, line 15, sobrdikja; p. 88, line 15, torpèj; p. 87, line 26, for "second" read "second."

There are several reasons why this textbook, if used with care until its major blanks are corrected, may serve rather than conspire to hinder progress in the classroom. First, it may be used at just about any level above the elementary: for review and/or the presentation of new material at the intermediate level; for remedial work when needed at advanced levels; and even for individual use by those students whose study of Russian has been interrupted for a period of time. Second, it can be used in the classroom in a variety of ways: as the basic textbook over a short period of time; as a supplement to other materials over a longer time span; in sequence either of the two preceding situations, or by assigning only certain sections for "troubleshooting" purposes. Third, those of us who still believe in the value and efficacy of English-Russian translation as a means of gauging student progress will appreciate the author's selection of material. Unlike most authors of translation exercises, Philip provides connected texts (even though the sentences are numbered separately), thus sparing us the persistent ambiguities that accompany translations deprived of context. Furthermore, the translation exercises are as light and as natural as possible, and the occasional lapses into artificiality or silliness can be forgiven in the light of what is generally a very effective means of checking and elucidating the material under discussion in the sections preceding these exercises. Fourth and most important, Philip has combined a sound analysis of the material and notable problem spots with some effective translation and other exercises, and has presented this to us in a short, handy, and inexpensive textbook.

Maurice I. Levin, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Hitechick has attempted to provide a student handbook as outlined by Edgar H. Lehman in “Needed: American ‘Handbooks’ for Masterpieces in Russian” (SEEJ, 13 [1969], 363–74); rather than merely an annotated reader, and for the most part he succeeds in making Gogol's work more accessible to intermediate and advanced students of Russian. The study aid includes an authoritative text (photo-offset from vol. 3 of N. V. Gogol', Polnoe sobranie sochestvi [M., L.: AN SSSR, 1938], 193–214), annotated by Katrina Dulbe. Short introductory sections on the life and literary career of Gogol', textual analysis, and linguistic commentary summarise for the student material available in a variety of sources. A half-page bibliography lists a few standard works on grammar and one on Gogol' in English. The desire to be brief and concise may account for oversights such as the failure to identify Vjazemskij and Mickiewicz (names normally not familiar to an audience of Russian literary neophytes) or to mention, at her first appearance, that Madge is a dog.

Copious notes and a comprehensive vocabulary make up the core of the work. The notes on the whole contain many valuable comments on linguistic peculiarities and explanations of historical and cultural references. But some are inaccurate or cryptic. For example, in the note to the phrase “u ile bo desjat’,” we read (p. 57): “When the head-word is a numeral or a fraction governing a noun denoting a unit of time, the past tense is in the ntr. sg., regardless of [sic] of the gender of the numeral or fraction (desjat’ is a f.).” Comparison with “bilo polovinu pervogo,” used later in the story (p. 38), suggests that the construction is impersonal and desjat’ is in the accusative. The note to “u papa v kabinete” (p. 73) states: “The oblique case of the appropriate pers. pron. in Russ., with or without a prep., may idiomatically render the Eng. poss. pron.-adj.” The example contains no personal pronoun. More serious is the failure to give sufficient explanation of grammatical difficulties, such as “uzlyavova govorjašču,” where we are told only that the participle is “bookish” (p. 59), and the phrase “velčinju s balavčinju golovku” (p. 79). The vocabulary, based on Wheeler’s Oxford Russian–English Dictionary, occupies almost one-half of the text (91–167). Its value is marred by inaccuracies and omissions. For example, nouns found in the plural in the text, such as zapiski, have no gender indicated, and besrassudnost’ is identified as an adjective. Although Hitechick provides a glossary of abbreviations, he invents new ones such as “n. det.” (for his “non-det.”). Photo-offset from typewritten copy, the work is dotted with visible overstrikes. The appended Errata seem to contain less than half of the misprints, false entries, inaccuracies, and omissions. In spite of these limitations, one can only hope that the author and others will not be discouraged from undertaking the preparation of similar useful tools.

Thomas R. Beyer, Jr., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign


The memory of grappling with my first Old Russian reading (“многож усачоju vs sinopii . . .”) predisposes me to a warm reception of a simplified introductory manual of Old Russian. It is all the more disappointing to find a book as badly flawed as this one, published with the support of the Canada Council. The author's purpose