

Business Russian is a superior reference work for very advanced students working in a classroom situation or independently. Each of the twenty-five lessons contains explanations of business documents and procedures, correlated exercises, Russian texts specifically designed for *pereskaz*, and challenging translation exercises. No English is used in explanations of the chapter material, but the vocabularies in each lesson are excellent. (As with *Russian For Business*, there is no general vocabulary at the end of the book.) Related and cognate words as well as idiomatic and phraseological expressions are included with the main entries. The conversations and readings in lessons one through ten are not overly difficult and provide an insight into the workings of the COMECON "business world." Beginning with lesson eleven the going gets very difficult for all but the most advanced students, and the complexity of the material presented and the exercises versus the simplicity of the dialogues are definite shortcomings. The material intended for oral practice in these lessons is completely unnecessary (as are the morphology exercises throughout the book) and illustrates the weakness of the effort as a whole: anyone proficient enough to formulate business correspondence fluently does not need the dialogues (which are fine insofar as they promote understanding of the text but not very practical for conversational purposes). The book does contain a key to the exercises and an abundance of commercial documentation between firms in the GDR and their Soviet liaison organizations. The former are probably of very little value to the American student, other than as a guide to format. The American editors should have provided documentation from American firms where possible and should have included a section or lesson on transliteration.

Business Russian is too long, too dry, and too difficult to be readily adapted for general classroom use, since the author presupposes an advanced level of preparation and considerable familiarity by both student and teacher with the specifics of the world of international (read: COMECON) business.

Russian For Business and *Business Russian* are illustrations of a yet unresolved problem for the American teacher: to whom are we teaching "Business Russian"? At what level and with what tools? At a time when we must adapt ourselves to the needs of students at various levels and from various disciplines, *Russian For Business* can provide a sound general introduction to the world of commercial Russian, while *Business Russian* adds depth and scope for the more advanced student.

Sam Orth, *The University of Connecticut*

Birgitta Englund. *Yes/no-questions in Bulgarian and Macedonian*. (Stockholm Slavic Studies, 12.) Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1978. 144 pp.

The subtitle of this book is *Form*, and the author states that a functional analysis of the material is to appear in a forthcoming publication. The work comprises six parts: an introduction containing definitions and sources; three chapters of material with some commentary; a summarizing chapter with conclusions; and an appendix consisting of seven tables giving statistical breakdowns of the number and percentage of each of the seven main types of yes/no-questions in each of the twelve Bulgarian and sixteen Macedonian authors whose selected works served as the corpus for this book. These tables correspond to seven tables in the main body of the text which give statistical breakdowns of the number and percentage of types of word order for each type of yes/no-question in Bulgarian and Macedonian.

In the introduction, the author quite reasonably demonstrates that the most basic terms—namely, *question* and *yes/no-question*—ultimately must be accepted as intuitively understood (9-15). In her list of question particles (QPs), however, Englund has consulted three works for Bulgarian and one for Macedonian, but apparently did not check any dictionaries or

SLAVIC and EAST EUROPEAN JOURNAL

VOLUME 23, NUMBER 3 FALL 1979

PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF TEACHERS OF SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN LANGUAGES
AATSEEL OF THE U.S., INC.

more extensive sources (16). Thus although *čunki(m)* and *belki(m)* are mentioned as Bulgarian QPs, Englund does not point out that both words also occur in Macedonian, and *čunki(m)*, at least, can be used as a QP. Another Macedonian QP which was omitted is *adžaba* (Bulgarian *adžeba*). While these omissions are not of great importance, they nevertheless detract from the comprehensiveness of the work. Although Englund specifies that in selecting authors she based herself on the principle of finding authors born in different dialect areas, she does not specify these respective areas in her list of sources (21-22). On several occasions she refers to the possible dialectal basis of some feature in her material (87, 102, 117-18, 128-30), and in the course of these observations she gives the places of origin of eleven of the Macedonian authors and mentions that three of the Bulgarian authors are from the western dialect region. Given her occasional attempts at making dialectal generalizations on the basis of her corpus, however, it would have been useful had Englund given the place of origin next to each author's name in the list of sources.

The next three chapters are taken up primarily with a catalogue of the types of word order occurring in Macedonian and Bulgarian yes/no-questions with numerous examples. The classification into types and subtypes is based on the order and occurrence of the subject (S), the predicate (P), objects and adverbials (X), presumptive expressions (for example, *sigurno* 'surely'), subordinating conjunctions, and the disjunctive conjunction *ili* 'or' (Y), and, in the second two of the three chapters, the QP. The first of these chapters is devoted to questions formed without a QP, of which there are five types divided into a total of eighteen subtypes. The second chapter describes the word order in questions with an orthotonic (accented) QP. There are four principal QPs: *dali* (5 types, 12 subtypes), *nima/zar (em)* (6 types, 14 subtypes), *nali/neli* (6 types, 18 subtypes), and *a* (5 types, 11 subtypes). In addition, there are twelve occurrences of *ne* (all in Macedonian, in final position, and divided into 5 types), one of *da* (in Bulgarian, also final), five of *ili* (2 Bulgarian, 3 Macedonian, all final), three of *ali* (all Macedonian), eight of *migar* and one of *čunkim* (all Bulgarian). Apparently there were no questions ending in *ili ne* in Englund's corpus. The third chapter is devoted to the non-orthotonic (unaccented) QPs *li* (6 types, 17 subtypes), and *da* (4 types, 10 subtypes).

Englund's principal conclusions can be summarized as follows. In general, Macedonian and Bulgarian yes/no-questions have the same word order as corresponding assertions, and the inversion of S and P is never a distinctive sign of interrogation. In those contexts in which inversion tends to predominate—namely, in Macedonian when an orthotonic QP occurs with a P containing the copula *e* 'is' or when the QP is non-orthotonic *da* (that is, *da ne*), and in both languages when *li* is enclitic to P (more in Macedonian than in Bulgarian due to the application of Wackernagel's law in the former)—the inversion is due to the accent patterns entailed by the clitics rather than to the marking of interrogation. The differences between Macedonian and Bulgarian are the following: Macedonian yes/no-questions are formed more frequently without a QP or with *dali* while Bulgarian prefers *li*; *nima*, *migar*, and *čunkim* occur only in Bulgarian, while *zar(em)*, *ali*, and *ne* occur only in Macedonian (apparently there were no examples with Bulgarian *zer* in the author's corpus; she also fails to mention here the one occurrence of stressed *da* in final position in Bulgarian, which is of precisely the same type as the eleven instances of stressed *ne* in Macedonian); Macedonian *zar(em)* is more common than its Bulgarian counterpart *nima*; the non-orthotonic QP *da* occurs in both negated and non-negated questions in Bulgarian (that is, as *da + P* and as *da ne + P*) but "almost exclusively in negated questions in Macedonian" (134) (there are no examples of *da + P* from Macedonian in the book).

While the importance of this work is undeniable, collecting as it does for the first time an enormous body of data on Macedonian and Bulgarian yes/no-questions, there is room for improvement. The approach is basically an atomistic one, and after reading such a detailed breakdown of possible word orders, one is left with the feeling that the conclusions could have taken this detail more into account by means of comparison of different types and analysis of

the whole. Due to the limitations of the corpus and sources and the apparent lack of native informants for Macedonian (114, 118), the work does not seem to be as comprehensive as it might have been. The fact that none of the examples are translated into English, while quite understandable in view of the fact that it would have significantly increased the number of pages in the volume, nevertheless limits the usefulness of the book for those Slavists and linguists not thoroughly familiar with Macedonian and Bulgarian. Despite these shortcomings, however, the book constitutes a significant contribution to a somewhat neglected area, and the sequel will also surely provide another valuable source of information.

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

B. M. Groen. *A Structural Description of the Macedonian Dialect of Dihovo*. (PdR Press Publications on Macedonian, 2.) Lisse: Peter de Ridder, 1977. viii, 307, \$19.25 (paper). [Dist. Humanities Press, Atlantic Highlands, NJ.]

A Structural Description of the Macedonian Dialect of Dihovo is the published version of the author's doctoral dissertation. It is based on fieldwork in the village of Dihovo, which lies some five miles west of the city of Bitola in the Macedonian Republic of Yugoslavia. The book is organized into six chapters: an introductory chapter, chapters on phonology, morphology, and syntax, a collection of twelve field texts, and a Macedonian-English lexicon. A résumé in Serbo-Croatian is also given.

The chapter on phonology is concerned with the vocalic and consonantal phonemes of the dialect and their sequences, distribution, and neutralizations and alternations. An entire section is devoted to the opposition and neutralization of *i* and *j*. A criticism of Groen's analysis is his treatment of the affricate *č*. Groen interprets it biphonemically, that is, as a sequence of *t* and *š*. Evidence for a monophonemic interpretation, however, is furnished by the fact that there are only two initial four-consonant clusters, one medial five-consonant cluster, and one final three-consonant cluster, each of which contains the sequence *t + š*. This anomaly should lead to some suspicion as to a biphonemic interpretation of *č*.

The chapter on morphology accounts for approximately half of the book. Sections of this chapter deal with morphophonology, inflexion, derivation, and accent. (Groen treats accent under morphology because of the necessity of considering morphological data for the formulation of stress rules). Groen's transcription may be confusing to some. For example, in the form *raK₁-a* 'arm, hand', *K₁* represents a morphoneme which has the realization *c* in the plural (singular *raka*, plural *race*). Some readers may wish for a traditional phonemic transcription when faced with forms such as *greF₀niK₁* 'sinner' (standard phonemic transcription is used, however, in the lexicon). Also, Groen uses *K₁G₁* to show that the historical second palatalization of velars is operative, *K₂G₂* for the first palatalization. Concerning Groen's discussion of morphonemic alternations, he states that there are cases where there must be both derivational and inflexional base forms. I am not convinced that this analysis is preferable to one in which there is one basic form with anomalous forms handled by suppletion (one might also question whether *dožgjalnik* 'salamander' is synchronically related to *doš* 'rain').

Groen admits that the chapter on syntax "claims to present no more than a very limited survey of the syntactic word classes and of the formal and semantic aspects of the complex tenses of the verb" (186). Sections here deal with prepositions, conjunctions, particles, interjections, and the complex verbal tenses (a section which could be given more detailed attention). The final chapters consist of field texts (copiously footnoted) and a lexicon containing most of the lexical items elicited during the investigation.

In summary, Groen's book represents a high standard of scholarship. He accounts for an enormous amount of data and his discussions are of high quality. He is familiar with the rele-