

Latin verb, the result is anything but a description of either Russian or Church Slavonic; the insights into the state of Russian Church Slavonic in the sixteenth century, skilfully excavated by Professor Worth, are totally inadvertent.

As the full title of the book indicates, and as the author freely admits, this is a preliminary study, and though much of the material might appear unpromising, there is clearly scope for further research and for more far-reaching conclusions. In the meantime Professor Worth is to be congratulated for making the material available in this form and for his painstaking editorial and exegetical work.

Papers in Slavonic Linguistics I, edited by F. E. Knowles and J. I. Press. Department of Modern Languages, University of Aston in Birmingham, 1982. 225pp., £3.50 (postage included). ISBN 0 903807 97 1. Reviewed by Greville Corbett.

This is an important publication not only for the papers it contains but also for the way in which it came to be published. Slavonic linguistics in Britain had become fragmented, with some scholars working in relative isolation. In an attempt to improve this situation, the first Slavonic Linguistics Seminar (SLS) was organised in 1979. Further meetings were held in 1981, 1982 and 1983. They have been very successful in fostering contacts and in stimulating the production of worthwhile papers. Most of the articles included in this volume were read at the first two meetings of SLS; two were read at a BUAS conference. The editors, Professor F. E. Knowles and Dr J. I. Press, deserve great credit as much for setting up and organizing SLS as for successfully editing and producing the first volume of papers.

The contents are as follows: Jan Čulik, 'The Glottal Stop in Educated Czech and in Standard English'; John A. Dunn, 'The Nominative in Old Russian and the Question of Analiticity'; Nigel Gotteri, 'Morpho-semantics -- the Reality of Synchronic Motivation in Russian and Polish'; David Guild, 'A Comparison of Two-case Systems in Bulgarian and Romanian'; David Kilby, 'A Functional Approach to Case in Russian'; Francis E. Knowles, 'The Russian Language and the Computer' and 'The Contrastive Analysis of Russian and Israeli Hebrew'; C. Mary MacRobert, 'The Balkan Type of Linguistic Contact'; Peter Mayo, 'The Byelorussian Language: its Rise and Fall and Rise'; J. Ian Press, 'Dating the terminus ad quem of Common Slavonic'; Terence Waight, 'The Phonological Implications of the Pronunciation of Words of Foreign Origin'; Kenneth Whibley, 'On Prefix-Preposition Combinations with Russian Verbs of Motion'. Of the twelve articles, half deal wholly or in part with Modern Russian, while the other half are concerned with other Modern Slavonic languages and with historical problems.

It is not possible in a review of this length to comment on each paper individually and it would be unfair to single out papers. As a whole, the collection shows great diversity; it ranges from instrumental phonetics to theoretical syntax, from traditional philology to computational linguistics. There is a healthy lack of dogma, and a concern to confront data which do not fit into particular theories. The book is fittingly dedicated to the memory of Professor Anne Pennington.

The camera-ready format combines a completely satisfactory presentation at a very attractive price. With our thanks to the editors for this worthwhile publication, we now look forward to the second volume of Papers in Slavonic Linguistics, which is reported to be on the way.

New Perspectives on Nineteenth-Century Russian Prose, edited by George J. Gutsche and Lauren G. Leighton. Slavica Publishers, Columbus, Ohio, 1982. 146pp., \$9.95. ISBN 0 89357 094 X. Reviewed by Robert Russell.

This book is a collection of articles on nineteenth-century Russian prose by former students of the eminent scholar J. Thomas Shaw at the University of Wisconsin. The first four articles, by Lauren Leighton, Gerald Mikkelson, George Gutsche and Gary Jahn, are grouped under the heading 'Russian Writers and the Cultural Context', and in general they seek to link an author or a work to a cultural influence or affinity. For example, Jahn's contribution explores the relationship between Tolstoy and Kant. The remaining five essays, by Roberta Reeder, Gary Rosenshield, Pierre Hart, Gene Fitzgerald and Linda Ivanits, are devoted to individual works by Pushkin, Dostoevsky and Turgenev.

The influence of J. Thomas Shaw may perhaps be seen in the prominence of Pushkin in this collection, for Shaw himself is best known as a Pushkin specialist. Unfortunately, however, while the sound methodology and meticulous research underlying these papers are a testimony to the beneficial influence of Shaw, this reviewer must admit to having found the collection somewhat dull. Only in a minority of cases does the size and importance of the problem tackled fully justify the article. An instance where it undoubtedly does is Gene Fitzgerald's piece on the narrator in Dostoevsky's The Devils, which represents a significant step in the critical discussion of this most problematical novel. It would be invidious to single out other articles from the collection in order to measure them against Fitzgerald's. They are all sound, but they do not all persuade this reviewer that they needed to be written.