

Thus in all four examples which Mr. Neal selected, he has wrongly presented materials in the book in an effort to show how the author "like many of Eastern European origin" has failed to come up to the "requirements of American scholarship."

D. A. TOMASIC
Indiana University

To the Editor:

In his review of my book, *Titoism in Action*, Mr. Ivan Avakumovic states "His claim about 'the more liberal and humanized psychology of the Yugoslav leaders which sets them apart from their erstwhile comrades across the Danube' would have been more convincing but for the death sentences passed in post-Cominform Yugoslavia on workers and employees accused of theft and embezzlement."

It is true that there have been death sentences *passed* for theft and embezzlement, but I know of no instances in recent years in which these sentences have been *actually carried out*. I am now engaged in completing another book about Yugoslavia. If Mr. Avakumovic has any contrary information, either from his own observations in Yugoslavia since 1951 or from a source of acceptable reliability, I shall be more than happy to include it.

Mr. Avakumovic also states that rather than the tax burden on private peasants being eased after abandonment of collectivization, just the opposite was the case. I should also be happy to include in the new book any facts that he may have which would bear out this contention.

Sincerely yours,

FRED WARNER NEAL
Claremont Graduate School

To the Editor:

May I be allowed to make one or two comments on some of Professor Ferrell's criticisms of our book *Russian Syntax* contained in his review in your February, 1960, issue?

Point 4, p. 127: Your reviewer attributes to us a much more categorical statement than we in fact make. I would have thought that in the examples given the imperfect imperative definitely conveys a request or invitation.

Point 7, p. 141: We do not in fact translate "pokachalsya" as "gave a shudder or two" but as "shuddered once or twice." I would agree that "gave a shudder or two" would be odd if it in fact appeared in the text. Perhaps "lurched once or twice" would be better. Ushakov defines "pokachatsya" as "povesti nekotorye vermya, kachayas." Our method of translating this seems to me to be good, natural English.

Point 9, p. 144: I do not think exaggerated our statement that the use of the present participle passive is restricted by the fact that it can be formed from a comparatively small number of verbs. This seems to me no more than a statement of fact.

Point 10, p. 147: "Kolykhnut" is not a very good example. Ushakov states that its use as a synonym of "kolykhnutsya" is rare. I readily concede "povernut"—could Professor Ferrell give further good examples?

Point 11, p. 152: The use of "xotet" with the infinitive provided both verbs have the same subject is an elementary fact of Russian grammar and we were not concerned with such facts.

Point 13, p. 182: I wonder if Professor Ferrell has heard Russians now resident in the Soviet Union use past imperfective gerunds. Galkina-Fedoruk is quite definite on this point. "V proizvedeniyakh pisateley XIX veka vstrechaayutsya deeprichastiya nesover-

shennovo s suffiksami -shi, -v, i -vshi, *sosem neupotrebitelnye v sovremennom zhivom yazyke*" (Sovremenny Russky Yazik, Vol. I, p. 366.)

Point 14, p. 184: The example given seems to me to illustrate exactly the point made.

I would be grateful to know what exactly Professor Ferrell means in points 6 and 15. I take his point in criticism 5, p. 130.

Yours sincerely,

F. M. BORRAS
University of Leeds

To the Editor:

I beg to draw your attention to a strange inaccuracy which makes confused reading of a book review in your recent issue (Vol. XIX, No. 1, February, 1960, pp. 140-41), which has, unfortunately, only just come to my hands. The reviewer is evidently quite unaware that Vivian Pinto (compiler of the book and Lecturer in Bulgarian, School of Slavonic Studies, London University U.K.) and Professor V. de S. Pinto (Head of Department of English Literature, Nottingham University U.K.) are *not* one and the same person. A simple check on the obvious difference between signature of Christian names would have revealed to him that the work of Professor Pinto has been concerned with English literature and, I believe, some original poems and verse translations, whereas Vivan Pinto's work has been devoted exclusively to Bulgarian studies (*viz.*, *Selection of Bulgarian Verse and Prose*, a doctoral thesis, and various articles in the London Slavonic Review).

For myself, I am not greatly disturbed by this as I find it—and I think readers generally will find it—typical of a generally distorted and inaccurate review, but I think Professor Pinto (address in Nottingham as above) deserves some apology for any damage to his reputation, since mention of him here is totally irrelevant and due solely to the reviewer's ignorance.

The publication of an apology and corrigendum would be in keeping with the high standards of your journal and a reference to it in your annual index would likewise help readers being misled by Mr. Kadić's carelessness.

Yours faithfully,

VIVIAN PINTO
Lecturer in Bulgarian
London University, U.K.