arises whether one can even speak of a purely "economic theory" of socialist planning in a situation where administrative directives predominate. Can one really ignore political and social factors?

The book, which is based on long experience with East European countries, is well presented and offers an important contribution to our knowledge of economic calculation and to the theory of planning in "command" economies.

EUGÈNE ZALESKI
Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris

STUDIES IN SLAVIC LINGUISTICS AND POETICS IN HONOR OF BORIS O. UNBEGAUN. Edited by *Robert Magidoff* et al. New York: New York University Press. London: University of London Press, 1968. x, 287 pp. $12.50.

This homage volume is the joint work of thirty-one scholars, twenty-one of them from the United States, nine from England, and one from Canada. The articles are written in English, except for two in German and one each in Russian, Slovenian, and French. Unfortunately, the editing is somewhat uneven, and the proofreading is not completely satisfactory.

Two contributions deal with poetic devices of Boris Pasternak, namely, Robert Magidoff's "The Recurrent Image in *Doctor Živago*" and Gleb Struve's "Some Observations on Pasternak's Ternary Metres." Magidoff shows Shakespearean influence, similarities being especially pronounced in a comparison with *Romeo and Juliet* and *Antony and Cleopatra*. However, there is a clear difference in the use of imagery. Whereas Shakespeare uses his figures of speech for good and evil subjects or objects alike, Pasternak reserves them almost exclusively for what he cherishes as beautiful and life-giving, deliberately refusing to dignify evil and ugliness with the aura of imagery. His imagery concerns itself primarily with inanimate nature, and secondly with Lara, the heroine of the novel. Magidoff states as a fact (p. 86) that Pasternak's stylistic devices underwent very little change in the course of nearly half a century of creative work. It is Struve's contention that the omission of stresses in Russian ternary meters is by no means such a rare phenomenon as is often thought. The most striking illustration of frequent and conscious deviations from the metrical scheme in ternary meters is to be found in Pasternak's poetry, and Pasternak should be regarded as an outstanding renovator of Russian ternary verse.

Oleg A. Maslenikov, "Disruption of Canonical Verse Norms in the Poetry of Zinaida Hippius," shows Hippius's attempt, in the period of 1893–1910, to free Russian verse from traditional metrical norms. She played a major role in that "Modernist rebellion of the Platinum Age." Kiril Taranovsky, "Certain Aspects of Blok's Symbolism," examines the occurrence of color symbolism in Blok's poetic work in the three periods of 1897–1904, 1904–8, and 1907–21. After 1904 Blok's colors become increasingly dark. The fact that the percentage share of white remains relatively stable is explained by a change in the symbolic value of the color white. Taranovsky takes issue with those literary scholars who detected in Blok's poetic practice a gradual evolution from symbolism to realism. L. Rzhevsky, in a stylistic analysis, describes the image of the narrator in Solzhenitsyn's *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*. William E. Harkins, "The Symbol of the River in the Tale of *Gore-Zločastie*," is absolutely right in rejecting any inter-

pretation of the river symbol that would connect it with marriage, good fortune, or escape from ill fortune. The river here is a symbol of death, as is well established by the author.

Riccardo Picchio, "On the Textual Criticism of Xrabr's Treatise," makes a strong case for the need of a new study of the textual variants in the more than thirty codices of the *Apology* of the "monk Xrabr," a designation of authorship which may not even refer to a single person. None of the extant manuscripts goes farther back than the thirteenth or fourteenth century; a manuscript of the year 1348 enjoys the highest reputation, not completely justified, according to Picchio. In his study "The Ermolinskij Chronicle and the Literary Prelude to 'The Tale of the Murder of Mixail of Tver','" John L. I. Fennell comes to the conclusion that the text found in the Ermolinsky Chronicle was not the source of any of the Russian chronicle accounts compiled before the first half of the fifteenth century and that the immediate source of the Ermolinsky Chronicle was a story compiled between 1448 and 1472.

In an article written in German, the result of minute and extremely painstaking research, Gerta H. Worth presents twenty-nine examples of Old Russian Church Slavic phraseology and figurative usage, translated from Greek originals, and still surviving in modern Russian. These locutions are more or less universal today, appearing also in Latin, English, French, and German, and could therefore be considered modern borrowings (calques) from Western languages. However, Mrs. Worth makes it clear that they originated in the earliest period of Church Slavic, which they entered from Greek sources.

In a discussion of "Russian Participles," Sunray C. Gardiner displays the development from Russian Church Slavic to modern literary Russian. The participial system was the only Church Slavic morphological and syntactic feature to be used without a break in continuity. The author first shows that Russian Church Slavic had several participial constructions which are not found in modern Russian. A point where the Russian Church Slavic tradition and the living Russian language meet is to be found in the language of the historical and other non-ecclesiastical genres, especially that of the diplomatic correspondence with Western powers. In this connection, Gardiner examines texts of the seventeenth century.

Anne E. Pennington's "Some High-Style Elements in Seventeenth-Century Russian," one of the most valuable contributions, is based on the nonliterary work of Grigorii Kotoshikhin's *Account of Russia* (1666–67). A list of lexical, morphological, and syntactic features regarded as high style is presented. The author's discussion of the dative absolute construction (pp. 135 ff.) modifies a statement made by Sunray C. Gardiner (p. 52) to a certain degree. Miss Pennington, wondering (p. 136) about the genitive of the direct object after the affirmative *čtuči*, as well as the construction *učit' svějskogo jazyku*, may be interested to learn from my Lithuanian grammar (*Handbuch der litauischen Sprache*, vol. 1: *Grammatik* [Heidelberg, 1966] §§ 828–40) that similar constructions are regular in Lithuanian, where Slavic (but not necessarily Polish) influence is obvious. Thus, Lith. *išmókti* 'to learn' and *išmókyti* 'to teach something' take the accusative or the genitive as object case, but the use of the genitive occurs already in the first Lithuanian print of 1547.

John E. Allen III, in a study entitled "The T:ŠČ, D:ŽD Alternations in the Russian Verb," using a tremendous and costly array of computerized material (1,356,528 Russian words in sentences), comes to the conclusion that "Shevelov's list of roots is exhaustive. . . . In the final analysis, it is necessary to agree with

Shevelov that there seems to be no criterion or set of criteria whereby the *d:žd* vs. *d:ž* types can be delineated by exhaustive rule." Thus, computerization has failed in this case to improve on the traditional methods of research. The study suffers from the traditional belief that the perfectivizing power lies in the prefix, while actually the "perfective" or "imperfective" character of a verb is not determined by a formative element but by its meaning, as I have pointed out in § 998 of my Lithuanian grammar. As to Russian, see §§ 643–663 of my Russian grammar (first published by R. D. Cortina Co., Inc., New York, 1951, under the title *Cortina's Russian Conversaphone*; later the title was changed to *Russian in Twenty Lessons*).

Michael Samilov, "*Kartavoe R* in Russian," deals with a problem of Russian pronunciation. In a discussion of the accentuation of the instrumental singular of the Russian third substantive declension Dean S. Worth comes to the conclusion that B. O. Unbegaun was quite correct in stating that *ljubóv'* has fixed final stress. His own contribution consists in showing that forms like *ljubóv'ju* need not be considered irregular and that solutions can only be attained by putting aside a certain amount of contradictory evidence. W. F. Ryan's essay, "Some Observations on the History of the Astrolabe and of Two Russian Words: *astroljabija* and *matka*," is an exercise in word definition on the basis of *realia* (i.e., descriptions given in encyclopedias and professional publications). Edward Stankiewicz, "The Etymology of Common Slavic *skotъ* 'cattle' and Related Terms," suggests an explanation for which, according to his own note 4, he found a confirmation in Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*, 4:605–6. Henrik Birnbaum, "On Deep Structure and Loan Syntax in Slavic," leans over backward in an attempt to find something useful for Old Church Slavic in the methods of transformational-generative grammar. The positive value of his article is his very clear discussion of Greek and Hebrew influence in Old Church Slavic syntax. James O. Ferrell, "The Phonology of East Slavic at the Period Preceding the Loss of the *Jers*," finds a need for additional studies to determine how deeply the process of palatalization affected the phonology and morphology of the "Balto-Slavic" languages. A rather complex etymological problem, without a clear solution, is presented by Grigore Nandriş in his contribution "Moldova—The Name of the River and the Country." In an article written in German, Karl H. Menges discusses three quite complicated etymological problems of Slavic words which go back, or seem to go back, to Oriental origin.

The title of George Y. Shevelov's essay, "On the Lexical Make-Up of the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle: An Experiment in the Comprehensive Study of Vocabulary Followed by a Few Remarks on the Literary Language of Old Rus'," is self-explanatory. It is, of course, done in a very competent way. Robert Auty supplements Boris Unbegaun's remarks (made in 1947) about the indeclinable nouns of Czech. The examples discussed by him seem to justify the belief that modern Czech shows a slightly greater tendency to retain foreign words in an unmodified form than was the case in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries —a sign of the "Europeanization" of the Czech literary language. Charles E. Bidwell, "The Adjective and Pronoun Systems of Bulgarian," presents pure grammar, though in part clothed in modernistic terminology, thus obscuring the presentation somewhat. The really interesting points are dealt with in the footnotes. In his distinction between "adjectives" and "pronouns," Bidwell is absolutely right; but he is fighting windmills when he states, "I classify as adjectives many words traditionally classified as pronouns." He seems to be unaware that American

scholars have done this for a long time. Some Europeans do still use the traditional classification, although most of them speak now of "pronominal adjectives." Rado L. Lenček discusses in detail the etymology of *čupa* and *čupus*, designations of a 'dugout canoe,' occurring both in Slovenian and in Russian. This article is written in the Slovenian language.

In his short article, "Some Problems of Belorussian Vocabulary," Victor Swoboda examines eight words which have no near cognates in the neighboring Slavic languages. Of special interest to this reviewer is *skljud* 'adze,' which, according to the author, originates from Lithuanian *skliùtas* 'adze.' Thomas F. Magner presents some notes on the native speech of the great Slavic scholar Vatroslav Jagić (1838–1923), who was born in the small Croatian city of Varaždin and spoke the local kajkavian dialect but, under the influence of the Illyrian movement, used štokavian for writing. Two kajkavian letters (with English translation) sent to Jagić by his mother (and a few other items from his brother) are included in this very interesting publication. Lawrence L. Thomas's article, "Toward a Contrastive Study of Word-Usage: Mickiewicz and Puškin," is a progress report on a research project. The noun *dar* is selected as an illustration of the methods employed. For both poets the basic range of meaning falls into three rubrics: (1) "simple gift," (2) "gifts of nature, fate, supernatural powers," (3) "talent, capability." The frequency with which the two poets used the word in these different meanings is roughly comparable. William R. Schmalstieg, "Labialization in Old Prussian," proposes that in Old Prussian consonants were labialized by following nonfront vowels. He may be right, although the great preponderance of velars in his examples is at best surprising. J. B. Rudnyckyj, in an article written in French and illustrated by two charts, talks about bilingualism in Canada and the special role of the Ukrainians in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. He distinguishes between "official bilingualism" (English-French or French-English) and "regional bilingualism." Anglo-Ukrainian is said to be the most individualized and clearest type of regional bilingualism in Canada. John S. G. Simmons presents a bibliographical list of homage volumes in Slavic linguistics.

ALFRED SENN
University of Pennsylvania (Emeritus)

THE SPIRIT OF RUSSIA, vol. 3. By *Thomas Garrigue Masaryk*. Edited by *George Gibian* with *Robert Bass*. Translated by *Robert Bass*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1967. xix, 331 pp. $8.00.

The book under review is the previously unpublished "conclusion" to Masaryk's two-volume *The Spirit of Russia*, an English translation of the original German edition of 1913. It is based largely upon Masaryk's manuscript written in German in 1912 and left unfinished. Later some of Masaryk's associates translated it into Czech and added some revisions and footnotes. The present editors have also made some changes which they indicate in the preface.

About one-half of the present book deals with Dostoevsky; the other part deals with Tolstoy and other Russian writers. All of them are belletrists; no publicists, journalists, or social critics are to be found. Thus the present work ignores some of the major figures of Russian intellectual history during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

This volume should have been published before the Great War. Many important political events which took place after 1912 and much scholarly research since then