

ism, faithlessness, hate, and frequent ugliness of the romantic hero. This observation shows a sharp capacity for literary perception and generalization, and it is verified by Goethe himself at the end of *Faust*. In short, the structural terminology enables Lotman to state elegantly a fact already stated poetically. We can often look upon Lotman's work, to use his own terms, as a re-encodement of what is already accessible. This comment in no way deprecates Lotman's theoretical or practical work with literature. He is a major figure in both areas, but at this early stage in its development his structural theory has brought him few critical insights which his evident literary acuity would not have produced by older means.

For this reason, Lotman's book should attract two separate groups of readers—those concerned with literary theory and those concerned with the poets and prose writers Lotman treats. The latter group may share my only objection to the excellent reprint by Thomas Winner and the Brown University Press: no index has been added.

ROBERT L. BELKNAP
Columbia University

ELEMENT ORDER. By *R. Bivon*. Studies in the Modern Russian Language, vol. 7. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1971. 86 pp. \$5.50.

This small book contains in part 1 an outline of M. A. K. Halliday's grammatical theory, preceded by a survey of the three functions of element order (contextual, grammatical, and stylistic). Part 2 contains a description of the "order of clauses," the "order of clause elements," and the "order of words in the nominal group." Halliday's theory was selected because it is a system "in which all the sections of the analysis are related to each other" (p. 11). It does provide a basic framework rather propitious for the description of element order, considering the degree of generalization arrived at in its statements. Halliday's approach in studying the "order of clauses" has generally not been used in connection with element order.

Bivon's study relies on a dichotomy of contextual characterization: "given" and "new." "New" is either "essential" or "nonessential." If this is meant as an interpretation of topic/comment articulation, it must be pointed out that the distinction between topic and comment cannot be derived from the distinction between "given" and "new," as J. Firbas and P. Sgall have clearly demonstrated. If chosen independently, these notions, especially the bipartition "essential" and "nonessential," could hardly be shown to be sufficient and explicit enough to determine the order of elements. The bulk of information in the book is statistical, and statistical and deterministic statements are juxtaposed without connection. Emphasis is taken as a function of frequency (p. 9) without further specification, such as contrastive. The structure of nonstatistical statements is this: if a certain contextual situation (defined by the terms mentioned) is given, the element order is such and such. But often observations or rules are stated the other way round, for example: "When following P [predicator], C [complement] has one of three contextual roles" (p. 35).

Much of the book is a running commentary on the many examples. Although it contains highly interesting raw material and some ingenious observations, it presents an overly simplified approach to element order in modern Russian. Works by Soviet scholars, especially I. I. Kovtunova and O. A. Lapteva, should have been taken into consideration much more than they were, as well as those by Kurt Buttk

(*Gesetzmässigkeiten der Wortfolge im Russischen*, Halle, 1969) and A. V. Isačenko. The fundamental study *Poriadok slov v sovremennom russkom iazyke* (Prague, 1966), by P. Adamec, is prematurely dismissed as "restricted to a small number of isolated grammatical structures" (p. 5).

RUDOLF RŮŽIČKA
Karl-Marx-Universität, Leipzig

RUSSIAN FOR SCIENTISTS: A NEW APPROACH. Vols. 1, 2, 3, 4. By Y. Gentilhomme. Translated by J. F. Hendry. Preface by Jean Train. Paris: Dunod, 1970. Vol. 1: xiv, 163 pp. Vol. 2: viii, 165–345. Vol. 3: viii, 347–507. Vol. 4: vi, 659. Paper.

It was with a great deal of pleasure that I approached the task of reviewing M. Gentilhomme's work, because I devoted many years to teaching scientific Russian to students and faculty of various science disciplines at the University of Washington, using very much the same approach. However, I must give much credit to M. Gentilhomme, since my own text was based for the most part on the sciences of physics and chemistry, while his four volumes are based on many more scientific fields, and his treatment of Russian grammar is much more detailed. This work is one of the few serious treatments of Russian language study *purely* for a science student, and because of its completeness it should be welcomed and highly recommended.

The first volume begins with the alphabet, and consists of ten chapters treating various parts of Russian grammar. In volume 2 (chaps. 11–17) we find articles to be read and translated. The articles are from various scientific fields, and emphasize certain grammatical uses, such as numbers, adjectival forms, and the prepositional case. The third volume (chaps. 18–22) continues with articles to be translated, this time demonstrating the verb system, also dative and instrumental cases. The fourth volume (chaps. 23–25) continues discussion of verbs, with more articles for translation, followed by a table of units, a bibliography of recommended grammars, readers, and many dictionaries pertaining to specific fields of science, such as mathematics, nuclear physics, chemistry, and electricity. Concluding this final volume are grammatical, lexical, and subject indexes.

The four volumes contain much information which if followed as the author suggests will equip the student with adequate knowledge to translate most articles in the various scientific journals coming from the USSR. I completely agree with the author that "the use of grammatical terminology is unavoidable." Moreover, he dwells only on those forms that are "strictly necessary."

The sheer amount of material and the extended and detailed approach to grammar, which may be easily grasped by a serious student, make the work a most valuable contribution to a part of Russian language teaching that is not as yet sufficiently comprehensive, and still awaits further serious efforts of M. Gentilhomme's caliber. My praise of these four volumes gladly extends to J. F. Hendry's competent translation.

NOAH D. GERSHEVSKY
University of Washington (Emeritus)