pate in the heritage of Russian song and chant, Swan slights their part in the formation of a secular art music tradition.

In describing the emergence and development of Russia's self-conscious national identity in music, Swan rightly emphasizes the place of chant along with folk song in the formulation of that identity, correcting the tendency (especially noticeable in Soviet studies) to make folk song alone the seminal source.

Swan's narrative ends in effect with World War I and the Russian revolutions, although references to later developments appear. Thus it dovetails neatly with two other Norton books—Stanley Krebs's Soviet Composers and the Development of Soviet Music (1970) and Boris Schwarz's Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia, 1917–1970 (1972). Swan's book lacks the detail found in the other two studies, but his information is accurate and the overview balanced. Taken together, these three Norton publications supersede all earlier books on Russian music in English.

MALCOLM H. BROWN Indiana University

MAKING PROGRESS IN RUSSIAN: A SECOND YEAR COURSE. By Patricia Anne Davis and Donald Vincent Oprendek. Lexington, Mass., and Toronto: Xerox College Publishing, 1973. Illustrated. xvii, 518 pp.

A good textbook of Russian reasonably ought to be clear, concise, correct, and "civilizing." This second-year text by Davis and Oprendek is not fully acceptable on any of these counts, and to some degree it falls short of the aims stated by its authors in their preface. There are many examples of poor Russian style, faulty grammar, awkward word order, and incorrect punctuation. There are also lexical errors, some misspellings (even in bold print and in a chapter heading), and misplaced stress marks. There is not a single reference to problems of intonation. A number of the readings will certainly do little to broaden the average American student's appreciation of modern Russian and Soviet life, and such adaptations as the one from Paustovsky ("Molitva Madam Bove") may well mislead him completely.

This is not to say that the text is without any merit at all. On the contrary. An experienced teacher with native or near-native contemporary Russian will find much that is useful. The text is in most respects organized in a logical manner throughout its eighteen chapters. It is preceded by a thorough grammar review and concludes with two good review chapters. Each of the eighteen units contains a relatively short reading selection, an extensive grammar presentation, and a set of varied exercises. Each lesson has an excellent word-building section, a translation exercise, and a language practice section composed of thematic groups of words, related exercises, questions, and some pictures, cartoons, and crossword puzzles. There is systematic reviewing of important material throughout the book.

The reading selections are followed by explanatory notes that not only give information but also ask the student to analyze the structure of new words and expressions. The choice of vocabulary in the text seems to these reviewers to be judicious, and the explanations of many of the problem areas in Russian morphology and syntax are treated thoroughly and accurately.

Unfortunately not all of the explanatory material is clear and correct, and the placement of each unit's grammar exercises after as many as fourteen pages of

Reviews

presentation may be disconcerting both to students and teachers. It is not always clear which exercises are to be performed at which point in the study of the lesson or, indeed, whether the exercises are to be performed only after the entire unit has been mastered.

There are apparently no tapes to accompany the text, which is a distinct disadvantage to many non-native speakers who might wish to use it. Yet if the authors of this book were to correct and revise it, one could recommend it almost without reservation. As it is now, however, anyone who uses *Making Progress in Russian* will want to check and recheck the text for inaccuracies.

> JACK V. HANEY AND NORA HOLDSWORTH University of Washington

SRPSKI NAROD I NJEGOV JEZIK. By *Pavle Ivić*. Belgrade: Srpska književna zadruga, 1972. 327 pp. 3 maps. 60 dinars.

These essays on the language of the Serbian people are first-rate popularization. "Our Ethnic History and Our Language" (pp. 7–82, selected bibliography pp. 83– 89) sketches the areas and political formations involved, noting salient details of linguistic differentiation. "Our Dialects and the Modern Era" (pp. 90–106) outlines the kinds of complex relations that now obtain among various linguistic styles in the village, the city, and broader regions. "The Fate of Our Language as an Instrument [*orudje*] of Culture" is a cultural history of the language, subdivided into the long period from the beginning to Vuk (pp. 107–73), from Vuk to today (pp. 173– 220), and the "present moment" ("Aktuelni trenutak," pp. 221–28; selected bibliography pp. 229–37).

The title and chapter headings neatly avoid naming the language, so that the prickly questions raised by the terms "Serbocroatian" and "Croatoserbian" and *slovinski* and various other possibilities can be dealt with in a careful manner in clearly structured contexts that ought to—but surely will not—soften the polemic reaction of nationalist-minded critics of various colors. Ivić is a thorough and judicious scholar, and he has deftly threaded his way through a jungle of controversial matters in a way I find remarkably evenhanded and fair. Opposing views are dealt with briefly, firmly, and, for the most part, civilly, although occasionally Ivić's irritation at the silly amateurishness of certain alleged linguistic scholars shows through clearly.

Ivić takes it for granted that his readers know the geography and the general political and cultural history of Yugoslavia. The non-Yugoslav may well find this skillfully condensed work too laconic; many names and allusions will lack meaning. One hopes for an expanded version that will provide much more detail for an international audience.

The final essay, "On Vuk's *Srpski rječnik* of 1818" (pp. 238–327), accompanied a 1966 photo-reproduction of this first landmark of modern Serbo-Croatian. This slightly revised version is a masterful analysis of the dictionary and of Vuk's work in general, and should be required reading for anyone interested in the history of Yugoslav culture or, in fact, in the theory of standard languages.

HORACE G. LUNT Harvard University