



VOLUME 30, NUMBER 3 FALL 1986

# SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN JOURNAL

Published by the American Association  
of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages  
AATSEEL of the U.S., Inc.

languages of Slavic nationalities are still "untouchable symbols" of their national consciousness; second, the value-/myth-orientation in language is a relative concept, gravitating toward implementation of linguistic realities.

Friedman examines the Macedonian language-society complex. The subtitles of the paper: Demography, Historical Overview, The Macedonian Dialects, History of Standardization, Implementation of Standardization, Macedonian and Other Languages, reveal the extent of its coverage. Friedman's methodology is traditional, but solid; his information is well researched and reliable. Coming a quarter of a century after Horace Lunt's account of "The creation of Standard Macedonian" (*Anthropological Linguistics* 1 [1959]), it is timely and most welcome.

Byron treats the cultural and linguistic shift among the Albanians of the Kosovo Province in Yugoslavia. Before 1968, Albanian intellectuals of the region promoted the development of a literary Albanian based on a variety of Albanian spoken locally; after 1968, they opted for the Standard Albanian of the People's Republic of Albania. In the author's estimation, the spread of this norm into Yugoslavia is now firmly entrenched and irreversible, making Albanian in Yugoslavia a minority language with an outside standard.

Kalogjera's treatment of the attitudinal problems of the Serbo-Croatian language community towards the language and its varieties is limited to two aspects of this dimension of modern sociolinguistics. The first part of the paper deals with attitudinal conflicts between Serbo-Croatian dialects (with the gamut of prestige relations between urban kajkavian and štokavian in Zagreb, and with the urban vs. rural čakavian on the island of Korčula). Its second part treats the function of nonstandard dialects and their linguistic material as a resource of literature in the standard language.

Specialists in sociolinguistics may find that this issue of *IJSL* does not contain enough discussion of the core questions of the institutional linguistics of Yugoslavia today, or certain central problems of its broader national language communities, their attitudes toward their standard—in particular those defined in terms of the sociolinguistic functions which the standard language performs in society. However, for their data, the individual papers will be of interest to sociolinguists and political scientists, observing the evolution of language in southeastern Europe.

*Rado L. Lencek, Columbia University*

Martin Camaj. *Albanian Grammar*. Trans. and collab. Leonard Fox. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1984. xvii, 337 pp., DM 98 (cloth).

Albanian is one of the least commonly taught European national languages, and reference and teaching materials for it are correspondingly rare. Martin Camaj's work is a welcome addition to a field in need of English-language studies. The plan of this handsomely produced book is very ambitious: it attempts to be a reference grammar, a teaching grammar, and, to some extent, a historical-dialectological grammar.

The work is divided into three major sections—phonology (9pp.), morphology (223pp.), and syntax (24pp.)—followed by a key to the exercises, an annotated chrestomathy (31pp.), glossaries to the exercises, and a subject index. The section on phonology gives most of the basic information, but lacks some detail. The section *Phonemic changes* (i.e., alternations; 4-5) makes no mention of final devoicing and treats regressive assimilation of voicing atomistically. The description of stress (8) does not clearly formulate those rules and exceptions which could have been presented. On the positive side, the text consistently marks stress on all words where it is not penultimate (except *këtë* 'this, acc.' and *ai* 'he'); this has the effect of (a)

emphasizing how often Albanian stress is penultimate, and (b) calling nonpenultimate stress to the student's attention.

The section on morphology is essentially a traditional reference grammar broken up into sections by exercises with vocabularies. While rich in information, there is sometimes a lack of generalization typical of the traditional approach. Thus, the presentation of declension is more complicated than need be, and the rules for the definite plural leave out information. Various syncretisms among nominative and accusative forms and among dative, genitive, and ablative forms are not pointed out; this oversight, combined with the presentation of the cases in the traditional order nom.-gen.-dat.-acc.-abl., obscures the relative simplicity of Albanian declension. Similarly, the rules for the formation of the definite nom.-acc. plural state that the suffix *-it* is added to indefinite plurals in *-ës* and *-as* (26), whereas in fact there is a broader generalization: indefinite plurals ending in unstressed closed syllables or stressed syllables closed by more than one consonant will take the definite marker *-it*, e.g., *prëndërit* 'the parents', *pëshqit* 'the fish', *mësuesit* 'the teachers', as well as *nëpunësit* 'the officials', *tiranasit* 'the Tiranians'. The rule for the nom.-acc. definite plural marker *-ët* (after *-t*, e.g., *netët* 'the nights', and sometimes after *-sh*, e.g., *deshët* but also *deshhtë* 'the rams') is not given at all. The section on syntax is traditional in its approach and rich in data.

The vocabularies and exercises which break up the morphology and syntax sections have four shortcomings from a pedagogical point of view. Firstly, Camaj believes that omitting some words from the vocabulary preceding the exercises and using words from the examples in the body of the grammar in the exercises without repeating them in the vocabulary—thus forcing students to refer to the glossary or search through the lesson—has the effect of "encouraging active memorization of the words employed" (ix). On the basis of my teaching experience, I would disagree. The purpose of a vocabulary is to enable students to concentrate fully on assimilating a vast quantity of material in manageable pieces. Active mastery of vocabulary is achieved by using words, not by hunting for them. Omitting items from the vocabulary may distract the students' attention from the task at hand and engender a sense of frustration. A second, related problem is the fact that the vocabulary entries are not given in any discernible order; neither in alphabetical order, nor in order of occurrence in the exercises. A third problem comes from the fact that the lessons are based on the sequence of a reference grammar. Thus, for example, verbal conjugation is not introduced until lesson 15 (126), and verbal paradigms in various tenses are given in the preceding lessons as vocabulary entries, as are other unexplained phrases and grammatical constructions. When such information is introduced as vocabulary without explanation of the principles of formation, students are deprived of the chance to generalize patterns and are forced to learn a huge amount of data by rote. This leads to the fourth problem, namely the shortness of the exercises and the lack of repetition of the vocabulary used in them. For example, at the end of a fifteen-page lesson (13) there is a forty-four entry vocabulary (113) for exercises consisting of seven Albanian sentences, four English sentences, a thirty-seven-word poem, and a four-line wedding song. It is inconsistent to give students large vocabularies for memorization without equally large exercises to promote that memorization.

The chrestomathy contains twenty-three selections of poetry and prose, ranging from the earliest extensive Albanian text (the missal of Gjon Buzuku, 1555) to post-war writing from Albania, and including Geg (North Albanian), Tosk (South Albanian), and Arbëresh (Italo-Albanian) writers. This brings us to the treatment of Albanian dialects and linguistic history in the body of the grammar. Albanian has three major literary traditions: the Arbëresh, which developed outside of Albania; the Geg, which was dominant in Albania until 1944-52 and in Yugoslavia until 1968; the Tosk, which is the basis of the modern Albanian standard. Although a knowledge of the current standard is sufficient for all recent publications from Yugoslavia and Albania, serious students must be familiar with Geg in order to read older and some émigré publications. Camaj has attempted to familiarize students with both Geg and Tosk by giving Tosk forms after Geg forms, when they differ, in grammar and vocabulary (although

glossary entries are often alphabetized only by the Geg form). He also supplies notes throughout the grammar on older and dialectal (including Arbëresh) phenomena. While these notes do not constitute a complete outline of Albanian dialectology or Arbëresh grammar, they do highlight some of the most important differences between standard Geg and Tosk and the older and dialectal varieties, which students who read widely are bound to encounter.

Camaj's grammar attempts to be all things to all people. It is intended to be of use to beginning students, to experienced scholars, and to children of émigrés. The grammar comes close to fulfilling these ambitious goals. While it would make an excellent second-year text, I would not recommend it to the complete beginner for two reasons. The first is the pedagogical difficulties discussed above. The second is the fact that, in my experience in teaching introductory Albanian, while students can be made aware of the existence of different norms from the beginning, they learn best by concentrating on a single norm. Only after they have a sound grasp of that norm should others be introduced. The combined presentation of Geg and Tosk in this work will be confusing for students not already familiar with Albanian. In addition to being a good second-year text—and thus filling what has, until now, been a total lacuna in Albanian teaching materials—this grammar can be used with profit by anyone with some familiarity with Albanian. It systematically reviews the grammar, presents both the important norms of twentieth-century Albanian, and gives rich historical and dialectological information. The exercises and readings will reinforce and broaden the knowledge of anyone who has studied Albanian in school or heard it spoken at home. Leonard Fox's translation is readable and accurate, although an occasional awkward phrase has slipped by. This grammar can be highly recommended to all those seriously interested in expanding their knowledge of Albanian.

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

Anne Volokh with Mavis Manus. *The Art of Russian Cuisine*. Macmillan, 1983. 632 pp., \$24.95 (cloth).

Serving seven years as food writer for the Sunday edition of *Izvestija*, Volokh possesses the credentials to co-author one of the most complete volumes on Russian cuisine to date. With fifteen chapters, an ample index, and anecdotal information on the history of various dishes, this collection contains a broad selection of recipes of both Russian and non-Russian origin. Volokh traces the influence of European cuisine and includes data on regional "staples" of the Russian diet (such as pilaf) of non-Russian origin. Where needed, illustrations clarify problems of food preparation.

Chapters titled "Pickles and Preserves," "Blini and Blinchiki," "Breads," and "Beverages" (including *kvas*) fill a lacuna sometimes present in Russian cookbooks. In fact, the fascinating chapter on breads allows for the preparation of items such as *borodinskij xleb*, *moskovskij xleb* (the dark rye type) as well as *zakvaska* (sour dark rye) in the American kitchen. Helpfully, the authors indicate where items difficult to find in this country can be obtained, and carefully describe necessary pre-paration.

The sections on meat, fish, poultry, and soups are rich indeed, containing everything from *kotlety po kievski* to kidneys in Madeira sauce. Those interested in the Russian language as well as Russian cuisine will be pleased to find transliterated Russian recipe titles as well as English translations.

A pleasure to use and to browse through, this volume is a must for the devoté of the culinary arts.

*Kenneth L. Nalibow, University of Vermont*