

Lexical Specialization in Russian. By R. D. SCHUPBACH. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica. 1984. 102 pp. \$8.95.

Grammatical Function and Syntactic Structure: The Adverbial Participle of Russian. By GILBERT C. RAPPAPORT. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica. 1984. 218 pp. \$17.95.

These two books, Volumes 8 and 9 in the UCLA Slavic Studies series, are both interesting, but in very different ways. R. D. Schupbach starts from an original and ambitious idea, namely, to investigate the history, present situation, and future prospects of two noun categories of Russian — the neuters and the feminines of the third declension. There are interesting parallels between them; for example, both depend heavily on a single productive source (*-nie* for the neuters and *-ost'* for the third declension feminines). The major parallel, however, is the conclusion that both are in the process of being lost.

In documenting this decline, Professor Schupbach has to rely heavily on secondary sources. This is natural enough, but he sometimes quotes percentage figures giving the sample size only in a footnote, while elsewhere there is no indication of sample size (pp. 24, 35). He distinguishes 'paradigmatic frequency' (the frequency of, say, the neuter gender relative to the other genders in the lexicon, the latter represented for practical purposes in dictionaries) from 'syntagmatic frequency' (frequency in some level of speech, as represented in frequency dictionaries based on corpora). The evidence collected on the neuter shows that it is the weakest gender numerically, both paradigmatically and syntagmatically, that it is stylistically specialized, and dominated by a single derivational model (p. 34). Of course, syntagmatic and paradigmatic frequency may be different for a given group of items; one of the most interesting parts of the book is the discussion of what can be predicted from discrepancies between the two (pp. 73–74). It is claimed, for example, that a syntagmatic frequency significantly exceeding paradigmatic frequency in high-frequency words suggests that the category in question is non-productive.

The concluding chapter also includes an account of markedness theory; this is not particularly illuminating and is insufficiently related to the factual material presented earlier. There are other flaws too; at the most basic level, there are too many typographical errors (at least eighteen) for a book of this length. But these weaknesses should be set against the originality of the basic idea and the interest of the questions raised as to the nature of diachronic change.

Gilbert Rappaport considers the adverbial participle (traditionally the gerund) of Russian. He pays particular attention to the difference between detached adverbial participles (e.g. *pridja domaj, ja vstretil ego*) and non-detached ones (e.g. *on usel prostivsis'*); they are distinguished intonationally. He shows that the traditional view, that the understood subject of an adverbial participle is the grammatical subject of the main clause, is inadequate, and links the problem to similar complications with reflexivization. Detached adverbial participles allow more types of deixis, or, put another way, show greater autonomy as regards subject deixis than do non-detached adverbial participles. Professor Rappaport finds eight such autonomy properties. Some, like subject deixis, are syntactic in nature, while others are semantic. For example, non-detached adverbial participle clauses are 'presuppositionally transparent' while detached ones are not. That is to say, detached adverbial participle clauses need not become part of a focal presupposition when another part of the sentence is focused (p. 103).

The eight properties are illustrated with numerous examples from texts or from informants, and some sections include very neat diagnostic tests. Having demonstrated the existence of the eight autonomy properties (constituent expansion, subject deixis, temporal deixis, adverbial subcategorization, aspectual usage,

matrix predicate subcategorization, P-function scope, and presuppositional opacity), Professor Rappaport attempts to provide a formal description of them. He does so in the last chapter, broadly within the government and binding framework. The structure of the work is such that the valuable data are readily available to those working in other frameworks. The book is not easy reading in places, but there are helpful summaries and 'signposts' at regular intervals. The development is from careful observation and analysis to the linking of properties (both different properties of adverbial participles and properties which they share with other constructions) and finally to attempts at general explanations for these properties. The book is a fine example of competent mainstream work in syntax.

Both these very different books contribute to the understanding of Russian and of the nature of language in general.

GREVILLE G. CORBETT

UNIVERSITY OF SURREY

Boris Pasternak v tridsatyye gody. By LAZAR' FLEYSHMAN. Jerusalem: Magnes Press. 1984. 444 pp. \$30.00.

Reviewing Ronald Hingley's *Boris Pasternak* on these pages a year ago (*MLR*, 79 (1984), 1005–07), I asserted that with regard to certain problematical aspects of the poet's life, most notably his relations with the Soviet authorities and their all-powerful leader during the 1930s, not much more of substance could conceivably be added to Dr Hingley's account until certain Soviet archives were opened. The second volume of Lazar' Fleyshman's already monumental narrative — the first, *Boris Pasternak v dvadtsatyye gody* ('Boris Pasternak in the 1920s') was published in 1981 — has demonstrated how incautious this statement was. What Professor Fleyshman has done here is to write the first treatment we have had of Pasternak's career in the 1930s that uses contemporary Soviet publications, above all newspapers, as its fundamental material. Some Western scholars, most notably Gleb Struve in his *Russian Literature under Lenin and Stalin* (London, 1972), have made use of these sources as background for the overall history of Soviet literature of the period, but nobody has yet used them with Fleyshman's degree of insight and the sheer intensity of his coverage. It goes without saying that this material is so saturated with unmentionable persons, events, and ideas that no literary historian publishing in the USSR can make honest use of it. In addition to Soviet sources, Fleyshman has diligently and with unflagging acuity quarried two other major bodies of contemporary material: the Russian-language émigré press, and Western memoirs. Some of these sources are hard to find, and almost nowhere is it possible to study them all in a single repository; consequently, the generous space that has been allowed here for quotation is most welcome. Since not even the tiniest pebble is ever left unturned, this narrative and its dense array of footnotes is very demanding on the reader. But the author has given us the most important specialist study that has yet been written of the relationship between a Russian writer and Soviet politics during Stalin's time, and his book sets a new standard of sophistication for literary scholars in the interpretation of published Soviet documents.

Professor Fleyshman traces the story of his hero between two cruel and crucial episodes in the history of Soviet literature and society: the machinations of 1929–31 preceding the appearance of that archotypically Stalinist organization, the Union of Soviet Writers, and the Yezhov terror of 1937–38. The book is formally divided into eleven chapters, but in fact it is a continuum, with the chapter headings giving only the broadest general idea of the actual contents. Fortunately, there is an index of names, and specialists interested in such key figures as Gor'ky, Pil'nyak, and many others will find a good deal of enlightenment. However, although this book could lay