

KOSTURSKIIAT GOVOR: PRINOS KŪM PROUCHVANETO NA IUGOZAPADNITE BŪLGARSKI GOVORI. By *Blagoi Shklifov*. Sofia: Bŭlgarska akademiia na naukite, 1973. 170 pp. Maps. 1.87 lv.

Monograph descriptions of Bulgarian dialects are among the routine output of the dialectological section of the Bulgarian Academy's Institute for the Bulgarian Language. Short on interpretation and (sometimes) long on data, studies of this sort are of interest to a fairly limited number of specialists in Bulgarian or Slavic linguistics. *Kosturskiiat govor* (*The Dialect of Kostur*), however, is likely to attract somewhat more attention for several reasons: first, because it preserves a dialect on the verge of extinction, situated not in Bulgaria but in Greece; second, because the dialect is marked by at least one feature which is extremely important for Slavic historical phonology; and third, because of its attempts, largely unsuccessful, at some sort of interpretation and analysis.

In recent years, Bulgarian dialectologists have tried to record what remains of the Slavic dialects of northern Greece before they finally disappear, as now seems inevitable. The first major undertaking of this sort was Iordan Ivanov's *Bŭlgarski dialekten atlas: Bŭlgarski govori ot egeiska Makedoniia* (Sofia: BAN, 1972), which treats dialects in the part of Greece located just south of the Bulgarian border. Shklifov's study, which describes the dialects of northern Greece around Lake Kostur, is the second. In both cases, political circumstances played a great role in determining the authors' methodology and put a clear stamp on the final results. Because of the Greek government's unwillingness to allow Bulgarian linguists of any origin to do field work among what is left of the Slavic population in Greece, Ivanov and Shklifov were constrained to base their descriptions on the speech of émigrés, interviewed in Bulgaria and, in Shklifov's case, in Hungary and Rumania as well. Together with the fact that both authors limited their work to informants of the older generation in order to minimize interference from the émigré environment, this procedure assures that the final results are *reconstructions* of what the Slavic linguistic geography of these areas might have been some thirty–sixty years ago. Because there is no way of knowing how this picture relates to the present state of affairs, the results are largely of historical significance.

Every aspect of the grammar of the Kostur dialect, except derivational morphology (to follow later), is described here in an orderly, traditional, and taxonomic fashion. The features that define the dialect are general to East Balkan Slavic or shared with various of its dialects, particularly in Macedonia and western Bulgaria; for example, $e < \text{ĭ}$, strong $o < \text{ъ}$ and $e < \text{ѣ}$, $\text{šč}/\text{ž} < *tj/dj$, loss of x (with mixed results: f/v , j , ø , compensatory vowel length), penultimate stress, single definite article in t (masculine $-o$), vocative noun forms, analytic comparison of adjectives, analytic syntax, complex verbal system (with aorist past and imperfect past forms, without "renarrated" forms), future with auxiliary *ke* plus present tense, perfect with auxiliary "have" and neuter past passive participle (*imam pisano* "[I] have written"). By far the most important feature of the dialect, however, is one which it shares only with other remote, peripheral dialects in Albania and eastern Greece: the preservation of Common Slavic nasal diphthongs in certain limited circumstances. In general, it is (or was) common throughout the Kostur area for these sequences to be reflected as nonhigh back vowel (\hat{a} , \hat{o} , ѣ) or front e plus m/n (depending on whether the original vowel was a back vowel or front vowel) before voiced and sometimes voiceless stops; for example, *zâmp* "tooth," *zâmbi* "teeth," *rênt* "row," *rêndo* "the row." Otherwise, the nasal consonant is absent: *păt* "path," *dete* "child" (pp. 28–31). Already noticed in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, this phenomenon is adequately described here for

the first time, and it is very important for our understanding of the historical development of the nasal diphthongs in South Slavic and elsewhere.

The straight descriptive portions of this grammar, which comprise its largest part, are sound and successful: the facts are clearly presented and readily accessible. However, where the book departs from simple description, problems arise, and the presentation is often superficial and generally unsuccessful. This applies to almost all of the interpretive sections, which are devoted largely to historical considerations found in chapter 2, "Phonetics" (pp. 15–56), and the sample texts transcribed from informant interviews (pp. 143–62). The latter include Shklifov's views on the phonemic status of [ɣ] and [ɣ̃] (p. 22), the development of ѣ (p. 27), the development of ѣ̃ (pp. 27–28), the preserved nasal diphthongs (see above), *tj/dj (pp. 31–34), чрѣ/чрѣ̃ (p. 34), and what he calls the metathesis of vowels and consonants (p. 46). What is troublesome here is not so much that one can easily find fault with Shklifov's interpretations or that they are generally superficial, ad hoc, and unsubstantiated, but rather that, in these cases, Shklifov appears to be bending over backwards to find "easterness" in the Kostur dialect and/or to repudiate "foreign" (read "Serbian") influences on the dialect. The suspicion of tendentiousness is unhappily encouraged by the subject matter of the sample texts. (Émigrés from Kostur, one might conclude, are largely preoccupied with their Bulgarian nationality and Greek persecution.) The historical relationship between Bulgarian and Serbian is a serious linguistic issue, as is the place of a dialect such as the Kostur dialect in the South Slavic linguistic world. Either one could be the subject of a separate monograph. Neither one, in my opinion, is served very well by Shklifov.

Kosturskiiat govor would be a much better piece of work had it been limited to description per se and had the sample texts been chosen differently. Ironically, in doing this, Shklifov would still have accomplished admirably (perhaps even better) the simple goal he set for himself in the introduction (p. 6): "to preserve it [the Kostur dialect] for future generations" against "the danger of its disappearance as a result of the mass emigration of its speakers and their assimilation."

ERNEST A. SCATTON

State University of New York at Albany

RUSSIAN REALIST ART: THE STATE AND SOCIETY: THE PEREDVIZHNIKI AND THEIR TRADITION. By *Elizabeth Valkenier*. Studies of the Russian Institute, Columbia University. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1977. xvi, 251 pp. Illus. \$7.50, paper.

Valkenier's book is the first monograph in English to describe the Realist school of painting in Russia during the second half of the nineteenth century, although Russian literature and music of that period have already received much scholarly attention in the West. This study, therefore, is a pioneering effort and it merits particular acknowledgment.

The author has divided her book into seven chapters, which are devoted to the general development of Russian Realist art from its formation in the 1850s and 1860s through its pinnacle of achievement in the 1870s and 1880s, and to its phase of change and degeneration from the 1890s onward. Valkenier places the movement within the context of its relationship to the 1917 Revolution and to the evolution of Socialist Realism in the late 1920s and early 1930s. She gives particular attention to the derivation of the Russian Realist idea by discussing the general effect on Russian art of the genre painters of the 1840s (principally Fedotov), the influence of the new generation of