

ferentiated vowels as unimportant for the beginner. In that the misuse of the vowels under question could lead to ambiguity or outright error, one cannot accept these as insignificant for language learners. What justification is there for perpetuating errors in pronunciation which will be more difficult to rectify at a later stage? With regard to the translations, English examples are not always happy ones—phrases such as “may I get the menu” (30), “this goes on my nerves” (251), “many a person asked where you were” (403), or “I don’t have any luck today” (411) are either stilted or inaccurate for contemporary American English.

On balance, *SLM* only partially fills a serious gap in Slovene textbooks in North America since its audience seems to be primarily non-academic. The graduate student, specialist, or researcher in the Slavic area will have to wait for a more suitable text.

William W. Derbyshire, Rutgers University

Крум Тошев. Стушкиот говор (според некои материјали од XIX век). (Институт за македонски јазик Посебни изданија, книга 12.) Скопје: Институт за македонски јазик “Крсте Мисирков”, 1979. 115 стр.

The dialect of Struga is of special significance for the study of Macedonian because it is unusually well attested in nineteenth-century sources. While it was not one of the dialects which served as the basis of the modern literary language, being spoken to the southwest of the west-central region, it was the native dialect of the brothers Dimitar and Konstantin Miladinov, who were two of the principal figures in the spread of Slavic literacy in Macedonia during the early nineteenth century and thus influenced the ultimate formation of literary Macedonian. The work under consideration here was left in manuscript form by the late Krum Tošev and prepared for publication by Blaže Koneski. The chief sources of material were folksongs from the Struga region in the collection first published by the Miladinov brothers in Zagreb in 1861 under the title *Bolgarski narodni pëśni*. Additional data was supplied by Dimitar’s correspondence, a manuscript collection of prayers (*Molitvenik*) translated by him from the Greek for use in the Ohrid diocese, and Konstantin’s collected works as edited by Nikola Tabakov and published in Sofia in 1939. Tošev was also able to make use of a schoolboy’s notebook dated 1839 in which the pupil, probably one Petros Kavajas, wrote down Ancient Greek texts which he was studying with Modern Greek and Macedonian (clearly Struga dialect) translations in parallel columns. Unfortunately, Koneski was unable to locate the manuscript, which might otherwise have been published as a valuable appendix to the study. One source which Tošev was unable to consult was a forty-page pamphlet on the Uniat Church in the Ukraine translated from the Russian by Konstantin Miladinov and published in Moscow in 1858, as this work only became readily available upon its photo-reproduction in *Makedonski jazik* (1962/63, XIII-XIV, 17-31+41) by Haralampie Polenakovič. According to Koneski, the lack of this source did not materially affect Tošev’s work, however.

The analysis is almost equally divided between phonology and inflectional morphology, with additional brief sections on syntax, derivational morphology, and lexicon. The section on phonetics is limited to evidence of those historical developments of greatest significance for differentiating the Struga dialect: the *jers*, the *juses*, vocalic *r* and *l*, *a*, *i*, *o*, vowels in direct contact, the loss of *x*, the developments of *dz*, *k*, *g* *l*, *ń*, the simplification of consonant clusters, loss of intervocalic consonants. The section on morphology focuses on the remnants of declension in the nominal system and gives a thorough inventory of tense, mood, and person markers in the verbal system as well as commentary on prefixation, stem classes, and the formation of iterative, durative, and nonfinite forms. This section also contains brief inventories of adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, and particles. The section on syntax describes such phenomena as the use of substantives as attributes, agreement, reduplication of objects, inversion of attribute

SLAVIC and EAST EUROPEAN JOURNAL

VOLUME 24, NUMBER 4 WINTER 1980

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

and substantive, possessive use of dative enclitic pronouns, omission of the definite article and use of the deictic article in *-n-*, imperfective aorists, the use of imperatives as iteratives, the future in *ke da*, the use of the verbal adjective (historically, the past passive participle), and the use of certain conjunctions and prepositions, e.g. *iz* with the meaning 'along, across' rather than 'from.' Two and a half pages are devoted to the most common suffixes used in deriving substantives and to the formation of compound substantives. An additional page and a half long section treats neologisms of Greek and Slavic origin introduced by the Miladinovs during the early nineteenth century. The study is completed by a fourteen page dictionary of words occurring in Tošev's corpus which are now archaic or rare in the Struga dialect.

All of this material is copiously illustrated by carefully labeled examples from the corpus. There are, however, a number of difficulties inherent in this type of historical dialectology which Tošev had to deal with. First of all, the graphic systems used were inconsistent, and in the case of those manuscripts using the Greek alphabet, inadequate, so that it cannot always be determined with certainty which sound is actually being represented. Secondly, it is not always certain whether or not a typographical error or slip of the pen may be the cause of some unusual or unexpected forms. Thirdly, the material written by the highly educated Miladinov brothers occasionally displays forms which are presumably the result of Russian or Bulgarian influence. Finally, influxes of settlers from the Debar and Ohrid regions as well as from the villages in the region of the city of Struga itself are known to have occurred in the nineteenth century, and their dialects may also be reflected in unexpected or unusual forms. Nevertheless, Koneski's edition of Tošev's work is a valuable contribution to the field of historical dialectology and to the study of nineteenth century Macedonian and the roots of the literary language. It is to be hoped that similar historical studies of other Macedonian dialects will be forthcoming in the future.

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

Thomas A. Sebeok. *Spoken Hungarian*. Ithaca, New York: Spoken Language Services, Inc., 1977. xii, 496, (paper).

A series of more than thirty language textbooks which grew out of the Intensive Language Program during WW II has now been reprinted. *Spoken Hungarian* is one of the books in the series, and as the title indicates, the emphasis is on Hungarian as it is spoken. The book is intended to be largely self-teaching, although ideally one should also have access to a native-speaking consultant. A pattern of five units of new material followed by one of review, repeated five times to make a total of thirty units, constitutes the structure of the book. True-false, multiple choice, and oral translation exercises in units one through twelve have answers provided, but even though these exercises continue in the remaining units, no answer key is given for them. Four hours of recordings are supposedly available as a companion to the book, but I did not have access to them. Additionally, my review copy of the book was marred by having thirty-one pages missing (427-58).

Unit one commences with useful words and phrases (greetings, directions, foods, prices, time). From here through unit five one finds, besides English equivalents for the material to be learned, two Hungarian versions, one in quasi-phonetic transcription and one in conventional spelling. The second and succeeding units each begin with a series of basic sentences formed into a dialogue, followed by simple grammar explanations. Next comes a review of basic sentences, followed by recombination dialogues (with no English equivalents given), then conversation sections providing situational cues in English so that one can practice the basic sentences. The unit then concludes with a list of the new vocabulary introduced therein. The arrangement of material strives to induce overlearning, which is a pedagogically sound technique of language teaching.