

načerpývat', and so forth (secondary imperfectivization no obstacle, [38]). Surely the ipv. cannot belong to a different *Aktionsart* from the pv. if both have the same meaning? Or, to take one of her examples, *on napísal ej kratkuju zapisku*, but representing the same action iteratively, *on ej písal každýj god kratkuju zapisku*, is the action because of that less complexively represented in the ipv. aspect? With certain exceptions iterativity requires the ipv. aspect in Russian even more than in Slovak. No amount of "complexivity" or "processuality" can explain this. Only an aspectual theory proceeding from the nature of time itself can accomplish this. It is incomprehensible that in the description of an habitual past event in Slovak, *Chýrny zbojník. . . kradol voľy* "the notorious robber. . . stole oxen" (V. Gašpariková, *Povesti o zbojníkoch* [Bratislava, 1979], p. 204), the ipv. verb should render a process devoid of an "internal limit." To the contrary, the ipv. aspect is used because time entails no change in a repeated event. Pace Avilova, iterativity is above all an aspectual, not a lexical feature, certainly in Russian.

More care should have been taken with the Russian illustrations. *Dobit' sja do čego* is wrong (it has no preposition; the meaning is, incidentally, *do* = to get somewhere, by means of *bit* figuratively), and so are pv. *sbežat' v magazin* (both actual applications have the correct *sbežat'*, [66], also "intensive" *ražbežat' sja, razletet' sja razojtis'* (correct *ražbežat' sja, razletat' sja, rasxodit' sja*), denoting the beginning and subsequent full intensity of the action.

Whether the apparently strange future ipv. meaning of Czech *půjdu* and so forth is secondary as compared with Russian or not, is a matter of opinion. Sekaninová prefers to ignore arguments which are in favor of seeing an original imperfective formation here, preserved in Czechoslovak.

All in all, this is a promising first specialized treatment of a difficult subject. In time (and with a proper understanding of the aspect based on time) it can be much improved. A valid perspective on what prefixation does to a verb would help, as would an allowance for the important iterativity for which Sekaninová's approach to the aspect cannot account. Similarly, she might attend to other matters such as the emphasis on an agent: *Ten sad sázel ještě nebožtik dědeček* "grandfather still planted this orchard" (internal limit of the action not reached, had to wait for full growth?). This book should be studied by everyone interested in problems of Slavic prefixation and West-East Slavic linguistic correspondences. Errors in the Russian examples should be eliminated.

Herbert Galton, The University of Kansas

Stavro Skendi. *Balkan Cultural Studies*. (East European Monographs, 72.) Boulder, CO: East European Quarterly, 1980. x, 278. [Dist. Columbia Univ. Press.]

These papers, previously published in various journals and collections by one of the senior scholars of Balkan studies, cover a wide variety of themes and can be read with profit by both the beginning student and experienced scholar due to the broad range and clear and careful treatment of the topics considered. The work is a collection of seventeen papers divided into four sections: *Language, Folklore, History, and Two Prominent Balkanologists and Their Work*. Three of the papers represent surveys of other work, viz. those on Alois Schmaus and Philip Mosley, which constitute the fourth section, and the one on

cretism in general. Although Skendi mentions a large number of crypto-religious and converted groups in the Balkans, he makes no mention of the Macedonian-speaking Moslems around Sar Planina (the so-called *Torbes*, although this term is no longer viewed favorably, the forms *Muslimani* or *Gorani* being used instead), unless his reference to *Pomaks* on p. 240 is intended to include them, although this term appears to have been restricted to what is now Bulgaria and Northeastern Greece. A reference to the *Dönme*, Sabbatian Jews who outwardly converted to Islam as part of their religious beliefs, and who still had significant communities in major Balkan cities before World War Two and maintained contacts with the Bektashi dervishes as did, perhaps, some Crypto-Christians (249-50, cf. Scholem in *Numen*, 1960, Vol. 7, 93-122), would have been a useful and appropriate addition at least in a footnote (cf. page 234 and page 252, note 2).

As Skendi himself points out (ix), there is a certain amount of overlap and repetition in the book due to the fact that these papers were prepared as independent entities. Nevertheless, this collection of a variety of Skendi's work gives us an assembly of facts and analyses which render a diverse, coherent, and fascinating picture of both general and specific areas in Balkan studies. It will contribute to the knowledge and broaden the horizons of both Balkanists and others interested in the Balkans.

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

Moshé Altbauer. *Der Älteste Serbische Psalter* (Slavistische Forschungen, Band 23). Köln-Wien: Böhlau, 1979. xxxi, 446.

A psalter is a collection of psalms taken from the 150 lyric poems of the Old Testament's Book of Psalms. The psalm most familiar to Americans is the 23rd which is used frequently in funeral services: "The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want./ He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; he leadeth me besides the still waters. . ." Among the early Slavic Christians the psalms, along with the Gospels of the New Testament, played a central role in the liturgy.

Altbauer, an Israeli scholar, has previously published a facsimile edition of *Psalterium Sinaiticum, an 11th century Glagolitic Manuscript from St. Catherine's Monastery, Mt. Sinai* (1971) and has collaborated with Horace G. Lunt in the production of *An Early Slavonic Psalter from Rus'* (1978). Most of the work (434 of 446 pages) under review consists of the photo-offset reproduction of Slavic Codex No. 8 which rests in the Slavic collection at St. Catherine's. The manuscript, written in Cyrillic about the year 1240, is a Church Slavic translation in Serbian redaction of the Book of Psalms, beginning (part of the manuscript is missing) with psalm 37 and ending with 151 [the Masoretic or traditional Hebrew text contained 150 psalms, though others exist]. In addition, there are three canticles: "The First Song of Moses (Exodus)," "The Second Song of Moses (Deuteronomy)," and a fragment of "The Song of Hannah (Samuel)."

The language of the manuscript is, as Altbauer points out in his Introduction, clearly the Serbian variant of Church Slavic. What were originally the nasal sounds ϵ and q are represented here by the letters e and u respectively; the jers \bar{b} and \bar{b} appear only as b , signifying that they had merged, or by the letter a , pointing to the common reflex of the

studies of Balkan Slavic language, literature, and history in the Soviet Union from 1947 to 1957, which, while placed with *Language*, is thematically closer to the last two papers. The remaining three sections are each unified by themes of varying degrees of generality.

The other three papers of *Language* treat the historical development of the Balkan literary languages, concentrating on the nineteenth century, the period after World War II, and the role played by literary languages in the emergence of national identity. These papers are interesting and useful surveys collecting a wide variety of facts and juxtaposing them to one another in such a manner as to highlight the similarities and differences in individual national developments. It is only to be regretted that the treatment of Macedonian in the two more recent papers is rather misleading: "If I have left out Macedonian Slavic from this linguistic picture of the Balkans, it is because this language is a post-World War II creation. [. . .] In this instance the reverse process occurred: first the state was formed and then followed manifestations of national identity." (37). "Before the end of World War II such a language [Macedonian, V.F.] did not exist" (46). While it is certainly the case that Macedonian was not officially recognized as a literary language until 1944, manifestations of national identity and attempts to create an independent Macedonian literary language began during the nineteenth century (for example Gorgi Pulevski's textbook of 1875, cf. page 111 of the edition published in Skopje, 1974), and the call for a Macedonian literary language based on the West-Central dialects was published by Krste Misirkov in 1903 (*Za Makedonckite Raboti*, v. page 145 of the photo-reproduced edition, Skopje, 1974) in a language strikingly close to the current literary norm. During the period after the partition of Macedonia in 1913, literature continued to develop in Macedonian in Yugoslav Macedonia, so that the proclamation of 1944 was really the confirmation of an already existing *status quo* (cf. Lunt in *Anthropological Linguistics*, Vol. 1, No. 5, p. 23). It should also be noted that the first booklet with the title *Makedonski Pravopis* 'Macedonian Orthography' was published in 1945, while the work referred to by Skendi (46), which also contained a spelling dictionary, appeared in 1951 (not 1957), although its official date of publication based on its acceptance by the Ministry of Education is 11 December 1950.

The second section contains five essays on folk poetry and works inspired by it. All of these papers involve some consideration of the South Slavic oral epics or heroic songs. Two of the papers treat the relationship between the Bosnian and Albanian epic cycles about the brothers Mujo and Halil, and Skendi convincingly demonstrates that these songs came to Albania from Bosnia via Hercegovina and The Sandzak rather than through Montenegro. He also explains both formal and thematic phenomena resulting from this example of cultural-contact. A third paper compares the contribution of two literary epics, Kacic's *Razgovor* . . . and Fishta's *Lahuta e Malcis*, to the national awakenings of the South Slavic and Albanian peoples. The last two essays treat the historicity of heroic songs: one compares those about Greek *klephts* and Serbian *hajduks* (brigands), showing their chief value to be literary rather than historical, while the other discusses the historical facts behind the South Slavic epics.

The third section contains six essays, five of which treat political, religious, and linguistic factors in the history of Albanian national consciousness, while the sixth discusses the fascinating and little-studied problem of Crypto-Christianity in the Balkans under the Ottomans. The essays on Albanian national development taken as a group demonstrate the importance of the linguistic unity of the Albanian people in opposition to the oscillating imposition of conflicting Eastern and Western political and religious interests over the course of the centuries. The article on Crypto-Christianity, which treats the practice of Christianity by groups ostensibly converted to Islam, is an important survey of this phenomenon. It brings together numerous historical facts and it raises theoretical questions on the definition and practice of crypto-religion and religious syn-