

P. Hendriks. *The Radožda-Vevčani Dialect of Macedonian: Structure, Texts, Lexicon*. (PdR Press Publications on Macedonian, 1.) Lisse, The Netherlands: Peter de Ridder Press, 1976. 309 pp. (paper).

Dialectology shows us the real possibilities of a linguistic system. Essential for the study of language typology and historical linguistics, thorough dialect studies lead us to a more complete understanding of a linguistic system. Hendriks' book is a genuine contribution to this field.

The dialect examined in this work is that of the villages of Radožda, Vevčani, and Mali Vljaj — which are located at the Albanian border, near Struga, in southwestern Macedonia. The dialect is also spoken in the village of Lin, which is now in Albania, but the author had to restrict his study to the three villages in Yugoslavia. The dialect is interesting for a number of reasons. The three villages are discontinuous, populated entirely by Orthodox Christian Slavs (except for a few Arumanians who recently moved to Vevčani) as opposed to the mixed Christian/Moslem and Slavic/Albanian populations of neighboring villages, and this dialect represents the furthest extent of continuous Slavic linguistic territory in this particular direction. The dialect also possesses a phonemic distinction between low (open) [ē], [ō] and high (closed) [e], [o] (Hendriks' transcription), which is not found elsewhere in Macedonian.

The book contains seven chapters: (I) Introduction, (II) Phonology, (III) The Stress System, (IV) Morphology, (V) Notes on Syntax, (VI) Texts, (VII) Lexicon. The introduction gives a thorough background of these dialects (both linguistic and nonlinguistic), the author's fieldwork methods, and some comments on Macedonian dialect studies in general. There are twenty pages of copiously annotated texts, and the lexicon contains approximately 3,500 words. In addition, the book contains a 33½ r.p.m. phonograph record on which one of the author's informants narrates two of the texts. This is especially welcome in view of the unusual phonological system of the dialect.

The chapters on phonology and stress are detailed and thorough. The author begins the second chapter with a lengthy excursus on phonological theory and a justification of his own approach, which is basically structuralist. His major criterion is *consistency*, as opposed, for example, to the *economy* or *simplicity* of the generativists — that is, the criteria chosen and their application must be consistent, with no mixing of criteria or levels. His description of the phonemes of the dialect includes detailed phonetic material and copious examples. This material will be particularly useful for anyone studying this dialect, or the phonology of Macedonian or the languages of the Balkans in general. His treatments of [1] vs. [1̣], [i] vs. [j], and the problem of <x> are careful and convincing. He treats the affricates as sequences of stop + fricative rather than as distinct phonemes. He argues that the treatment of these sounds as single units is influenced by orthography and based on phonetic or distributional criteria. Since only the criterion of distinctiveness is employed, Hendriks argues for a biphonemic interpretation. He goes on to say that the existence of phonetic sequences of the type [t] + [s] with a more "open" transition does not contradict his analysis, since the more open sequences occur only across morpheme boundaries and he has chosen the morpheme, rather than the word, as his basic unit of description. The second chapter closes with a description of the vowel sequences and consonant clusters of the dialect, a distributional classification of the phonemes, and a description of the automatic alternations.

The chapter on stress is particularly useful. As in the preceding chapter, the beginning is devoted to a theoretical introduction and a discussion of the basic elements of the system. The main stress rule is the same as that of the other central and western Macedonian dialects — namely that stress is generally bound to the antepenultimate syllable — but there are exceptions, and clitics and word groups functioning as accentual units can affect its placement.

The chapter on morphology treats only the inflectional system, although the author does occasionally remark on derivation. The first half of the chapter treats the nominal system (with

one half-page on adverbs), and the second half describes the verbal system, the approach being based on the Item-and-Process (IP) model. While the author's treatment of the morphology is as scrupulous and comprehensive as his treatment of phonology, and he still takes the trouble to discuss theoretical justifications, his attitudes towards grammatical categories and justification of solutions to morphological problems does not appear to be quite as strong as his attitudes in the preceding chapters. Thus, while the overall approach is still characterized by the primacy of consistency, he also invokes economy and elegance in solving specific problems (175-76). These are insignificant points, but labeling the imperfect/aorist opposition as temporal rather than aspectual is controversial and unexpected in so careful a work (152-53). The author does not justify this classification, or his characterization of the opposition as contemporaneous/noncontemporaneous. Many scholars consider durativity rather than contemporaneousness to be the main (invariant) meaning of the imperfect, and the author should either have justified his choice or mentioned both possibilities. This is not a particularly important criticism, however, since the author's main concern in this chapter is the presentation of the principle inflectional morphemes and the demonstration of how they combine with lexical items and with each other, and the precise nature of the grammatical categories involved is not of great significance.

Chapter V, Notes on Syntax, contains an exhaustive discussion of the use of prepositions, illustrated by many examples, and a detailed discussion of the definite article in which the author offers much that is interesting and original. The last section is devoted to the meaning and use of verb forms. Up to this point, the author is careful to describe the dialect in its own terms rather than depending on comparisons with the literary language. Here, however, he accepts the definitions of literary Macedonian verbal categories given by Horace Lunt in his *Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language* (Skopje, 1952). Henriks' observations in this section are most intriguing, for example, the use of 'be' + past passive participle has a transitive meaning with a number of verbs: *ja su žnien ptšejntsa* 'I have reaped wheat' (226). The apparent use of the particle *tja* (corresponding to the literary *ke*) with the present for habitual action (237 and *passim*) and a number of other features could have been discussed, but since the author's prime concern is the phonology and morphology, he cannot be held to account for limiting the section on verbal usage to a few remarks. What he does say is well illustrated with examples.

To conclude, while the author does adhere to a strictly synchronic description, he mentions historical facts when they are of interest or when they can help the reader to understand the genesis of a particularly puzzling form (70-71, 93). This book is an extremely valuable contribution to the field of Slavic linguistics and to the study of dialectology. The author is scrupulous, impeccable, and thorough in his presentation and discussion of the data, and the dialect is an especially interesting one.

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

Румяна Радкова. «Неофит Рилски и новобългарската култура». София: Наука и изкуство, 1975. 227 стр., лв. I.46.

Rumjana Radkova, senior research associate in the Bulgarian Academy's Historical Institute, specializes in the intellectual and cultural history of the Bulgarian *vŭzrazhdane*, or national rebirth, with special interest in the formation of the Bulgarian intelligentsia and its Russian connections. She is author of *The Rila Monastery during the National Revival* (Sofia, 1972). Neofit Rilski (1793-1811) was the most prominent resident of this monastery since its tenth-century founder, Ivan Rilski.

The author makes unnecessary excuses for Neofit's religious outlook and stresses democratic and progressive elements. Indeed, it is noteworthy that along with his lifelong at-