

gives detailed attention to the differences in source materials, highlighting variations between sections of manuscripts. She takes great care in interpreting the considerable body of data collected, to establish the conditions under which *ego* was most likely to appear. Her most significant conclusion is that there is 'no clear evidence connecting the anaphoric genitive-accusative with referential animacy' (p. 65). This conclusion constitutes a serious challenge to the usual functional view, outlined earlier. Unfortunately, Dr Klenin does not give statistics relevant to this point. It is in general regrettable that she does not give more statistical information, and particularly so here, since we cannot assess the evidence which is claimed to undermine a long-held position.

The remaining chapters are shorter but contain various points of interest. In Chapter 3 we learn that the personal pronouns acquired the genitive-accusative at dramatically different rates. In the discussion of nouns and adjectives (Chapter 4) Dr Klenin proposes the conditions that favoured the extension of the genitive-accusative during a period when the whole inflexional system was being restructured, conditions not identical to those pertaining to pronouns. In Chapter 5 she demonstrates an overlap between conditions favouring the genitive-accusative and those identified by Timberlake as prompting the choice of the accusative case for the direct object of a negated verb. In the final chapter the place of animacy in the gender system of Modern Russian is considered briefly. Dr Klenin stresses the role of morphological factors and gives little attention to 'the syntactic problems of animacy, such as agreement of adjectives. She also largely ignores previous formal studies of animacy. However, her clearly-stated intention is not to give a complete account, but to select areas in which she can make a contribution, and to be brief.

This book is a worthwhile contribution to a major area of research. Dr Klenin's detailed study of a large body of data enables her to challenge some of the basic assumptions about the motivation for the development of genitive-accusative syncretism. Whether or not they accept her views, future investigators will have to take them into account.

GREVILLE CORBETT

UNIVERSITY OF SURREY

Miscellanea Slavica: To Honour the Memory of Jan M. Meijer. Edited by B. J. AMSENGA, A. H. VAN DEN BAAR, F. SUASSO, and M. D. DE WOLFF. Amsterdam: Rodopi. 1983. 542 pp.

This memorial volume offers a veritable feast for Slavonic linguists, historians, and literary specialists. It spans the incredibly wide range of interests of the Dutch scholar Jan Marinus Meijer (1923–1980), from semantics and semiotics to Russian literature and Russian history, a testimony in English, Russian, and German of his multidisciplinary approach: learning from Jakobson and the Prague school, yet with an open eye to recent developments in semiotics in both the USSR and the USA, and constantly practical in the application of theory. Several pieces were written in response to or in consultation with the late Professor Meijer by scholars in or originally from the Low Countries, but also elsewhere: included is an illuminating contribution from the Soviet semiotician V. V. Ivanov on the function of naming in Dostoyevsky's *Brothers Karamazov*. It is only by a quirky alphabetical hiatus that this is followed by Wolf Schmid on the same novel, for the arrangement of articles by author does not generally permit the grouping together of subjects, such as the two most enjoyable pieces (by J. van der Eng-Liedmeier and V. N. Toporov) on Mandel'shtam and Akhmatova, which approach from different angles the poetic identity, generated through the inter-reference to existing literary texts, of two of Russia's persecuted modern writers. In addition to the Soviet censor, Isaak Babel'

prescriptions of the tracts discussed to the actual practice of contemporary writers, even where this might be of help in elucidating the texts themselves. As it is, the resources available allow us only tantalizing glimpses of oddities which appear to result from a conflict between the principles prescribed in a text and normal scribal practice, which only emphasizes our ignorance of how far theory affected tradition and vice versa. It is all the more to be hoped that the heightened awareness of the problem which this book must generate may inspire someone with access to the manuscripts to do the textological research which alone can reveal the actual historical impact (as seen in the totality of its MS tradition) of any of these works in Russia.

It is greatly to be regretted that the book lacks a bibliography. Even if, in accordance with the general scope of the book, no attempt were made to produce an exhaustive guide to the far from extensive literature on the subject, it would still have been extremely useful, and consistent with his aims, if Professor Worth had published a list of the relevant works he had come across, rather than restricting himself to those he cites, which are not always the most important contributions on the subject.

Finally, the reviewer must join with the author in congratulating the composers on the preparation of 'what must be the most difficult text ever to pass through the IBM composer'. Their achievement is masterly in terms both of the diversity of scripts used and of the layout of the book, and should serve as an example to us all and, let us hope, a model for the future.

R. M. CLEMINSON

OXFORD

Animacy in Russian: A New Interpretation. By EMILY KLENIN. (UCLA Slavic Studies, 6) Columbus, Ohio: Slavica. 1983. 139 pp. \$12.95.

Animacy is one of the most fascinating areas of study within the Slavonic language field. Genitive-accusative syncretism originated before the earliest texts and has become of major significance in the modern languages. The motivation for this syncretism of forms for animates has been generally agreed since Thomson's work of nearly eighty years ago. Given free word-order, when unambiguous accusative forms were lost in certain paradigms, confusion between subject and object could arise, if both were animate. Therefore animate direct objects were marked as genitive (since the genitive already marked certain objects, for example, those in negated sentences). The fact that some pronouns show accusative-genitive syncretism independently of animacy could be explained because they most frequently refer to animates.

Emily Klenin challenges all of this. She denies the need for a syntactic rule marking animate direct objects with the genitive case. She claims that 'the genitive-accusative represents, historically, a morphological reanalysis of genitive case objects, in environments where genitive rection was being lost' (p. 103). Thus the genitive-accusative did not replace the nominative-accusative in texts, but only in paradigms (p. 14). Her account is outlined in an introductory chapter, then Chapter 2 traces the development of the genitive-accusative in the anaphoric pronoun up to 1400. Chapter 3 is devoted to other pronouns, and Chapter 4 to nouns and adjectives. This first part of the book takes a diachronic approach. In the second part diachrony and synchrony are combined: the relationship of the genitive-accusative to case is considered in Chapter 5, and its relationship to gender in Chapter 6.

The most substantial chapter is Chapter 2, where the replacement of the masculine singular accusative pronoun *i* by the form *ego* is examined. Dr Klenin