

The manuscript now contains a calendar of saints without March and April, five Offices and Kanons, and a computus.

Van den Baar's description of the manuscript includes a paleographic study and remarks on the phonology, morphology, and syntax. His method of reproducing the text is excellent. He provides the reader with the original text of each of the five formularies, the Greek text (where known), the current Church Slavonic version, and an English translation. He managed to find only about half the formulae corresponding to those of the manuscript. It should be noted that the Greek text, and hence the modern Church Slavonic and English versions, does not always correspond exactly to the manuscript.

Van den Baar's study of the paleographic features of the manuscript is more than adequate. He discovered no unusual or unexpected features. An appendix of some twenty pages of photographs affords one the opportunity for closer study. As regards the linguistic phenomena of the manuscript, he correctly states that such ecclesiastical texts as Scaliger 38B rarely are reliable sources from which one may draw conclusions concerning the language of the scribe or copyist, or the time of copying. He has noted a great many instances where the language of the text deviates from that which is generally considered the norm for Russian Church Slavonic of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. He nonetheless concludes that phonological features reflected in the manuscript "may be considered as transitional for the area between Moscow and Pskov."

It is in his study of the computational elements in the manuscript that van den Baar was faced with the greatest problems. Such information is notoriously difficult to decipher, and there is frequently little information to be gained from the computus which will aid the scholar in dating the manuscript. The Scaliger *Kanonnik*, however, did contain the elements necessary for him to date the manuscript with considerable accuracy. His study was centered on the *Tabula Paschalis*, and the account of his efforts to decipher the code is clearly written and makes fascinating reading.

This study will be of considerable interest to linguists, paleographers, and students of ecclesiastical literature. It is not without certain mechanical faults, chiefly transliteration and translation errors, misspellings, and one or two un-English expressions. There is a good bibliography attached. One hopes that this work will result in more attention being paid to the other manuscripts in the Scaliger collection.

J. V. HANEY  
*University of Washington*

THE PHONETICS OF RUSSIAN. By Daniel Jones and Dennis Ward. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. xi, 308 pp. \$9.50.

Detailed analyses in English of the phonetic system of Russian are few indeed. The standard works available in this field have been S. C. Boyanus's *Russian Pronunciation and Russian Phonetic Reader* (Cambridge, Mass., 1955), which is a re-writing of the earlier *Manual of Russian Pronunciation*, and M. V. Trofimov and Daniel Jones, *The Pronunciation of Russian* (Cambridge, Eng., 1923). Among the works by Russian scholars, undoubtedly the best known are those by R. I. Avanesov—for example, his *Russkoe literaturnoe proiznoshenie* (Moscow, 1964) and *Fonetika sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo iazyka* (Moscow, 1956). To the preceding we must add the very impressive *Prakticheskaia fonetika i intonatsiia russkogo*

*iazyka* (Moscow, 1963) by the young Soviet scholar E. A. Bryzgunova. Although most research to date has been concerned with phonetics and lately with intonation, some work, mostly in professional journals, has been devoted to problems of Russian phonemics. We have in mind here articles by Stankiewicz, Halle, Shaumian, Gvozdev, and others. More work in that area would be welcome, but the new book on phonetics by Jones and Ward is no less welcome.

*The Phonetics of Russian* is a substantial rewriting of the 1923 work by Trofimov and Jones. It is divided into two main parts: the first (21 pages) deals with the principle of phonetic theory and the transcription of phonemes, and the second (258 pages) treats in detail the phonetic system of Russian. In addition, there are appendixes and charts devoted to Russian orthography, Russian phonemes, and phonetic symbols. The work in general is well conceived and strikes a good balance between very narrow and extremely broad systems of transcription. Thus the authors avoid a needlessly detailed description of the language. One may argue that insufficient attention is given to phonemics, a fact which tends to render their analyses somewhat abstract and functionally less practical. It must be stressed that the authors do indeed distinguish between the two sciences and that they choose to limit their work to phonetic realities and related questions of intonation.

Ward and Jones have selected as their base a neutral brand of Russian, neither entirely Leningrad or Moscow nor (thank goodness!) the older and highly stylized stage pronunciation. Not everyone will agree in all respects with this standard (for example, with regard to the degree of *ikan'e*, the question of the palatalization of consonant clusters), but their usage is generally consistent and represents an acceptable standard. Each of the basic phonemes and diphthongs of Russian are subjected to analysis and presented in a number of possible positions. The chapter dealing with problems of similitude and assimilation is brief (18 pages) and not altogether satisfactory. More detailed examples of regressive consonantal assimilations, including possible variations among educated speakers of Russian, would be of interest here; and in the last section of the chapter, perhaps a clearer line should be drawn between certain spelling traditions (i.e., etymological spelling) and the phonetic reality of certain orthographic consonant clusters. Two particularly valuable sections are those concerning intonation (30 pages) and the selected passages for practice (34 pages). The latter includes the original texts in Cyrillic, transcription, and translation.

A minor distraction is that the authors draw their English examples mainly from British and English dialects of English, which will force the American users to make a number of adjustments and modifications in their comparisons. This and other criticisms, however, do not detract in a significant way from the work as a whole. *The Phonetics of Russian* can be used successfully at the undergraduate or graduate level, and as such is a welcome addition to the field.

WILLIAM W. DERBYSHIRE  
Rutgers University

HUNGARIAN CLASSICAL BALLADS AND THEIR FOLKLORE. By *Ninon A. M. Leader*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967. xii, 367 pp. \$12.50.

Recently many folklorists, particularly in Eastern Europe, have moved from heroic songs to the study of ballads, seeking to define the term, intensifying comparative research, and developing an international index. But few American and British