

who would not let him sleep during interrogations, and those who had said loathsome things about him while they were being interrogated, those who had said repulsive things about him at meetings and assemblies, those who had renounced him, those who had stolen his camp bread, those who had beaten him—all of them, in all their weakness, rudeness, crudeness, malice, had not done him evil because they really wanted to." Grossman's final *profession de foi*, the guiding inspiration of his little novel, is an ineradicable belief in the *humanity* of human beings. He sees freedom as man's greatest blessing, and a longing for it as one of his most permanent characteristics.

Mr. Whitney's English version reads well. But it is regrettable that he did not retain the Heraclitean flavor of the Russian title and render it exactly as *Everything Flows*.

GLEB STRUVE

University of California, Berkeley (Emeritus)

STRUKTURA KHUDOZHESTVENNOGO TEKSTA. By *Iu. M. Lotman*. Introduction by *Thomas G. Winner*. The Brown University Slavic Reprint Series, 9. Providence: Brown University Press, 1971. x, 381 pp. \$6.00, paper.

As a prophet of semiotics, Iurii Lotman has received much honor abroad, but in his own country has usually been isolated at the University of Tartu. His work has played an important part in the recent efforts to find objective ways to describe literature. He takes as his metaphors not the mirrors or the lamps or the growing things of earlier critics, but language itself, or any simpler instrument of communication. Like so many earlier metaphors for literature, this modern one works excellently. The theoretical chapters of Lotman's book establish the bases for the analogy between a work of literature and a language. These bases lie in the simplest model out of which communication theory grows: a sender who encodes a message for transmission through a channel to a receiver who reconstitutes it. But just as a single sound of the human voice or a single movement of a telegraph key conveys no meaning except in relation to other signs, so the meaning of any literary sign resides in a structured series of relationships, which may be re-encoded using other signs, as a musical text may be presented audibly or graphically.

In this book Lotman deals most frequently not with the relations between signs in a code, but with those between the signs that constitute a text. These relations may be observed on different scales; a line of poetry may be a sign whose meaning resides in its structured relationships, not only grammatical and linguistic ones, but artistic ones within a poem, patterns of repetition, identity, or opposition; or relationships outside the poem, reminiscences, parodies, elaborations of other poems or of whole literary traditions. But a line of poetry may also be a text, a phonetic and semantic structure of smaller units, letters, morphemes, or syllables, depending on the code under consideration.

In using linguistic terminology to describe relationships on all these scales, Lotman has made ingenious critical applications of theoretical work being done all over the world. With examples that range from Derzhavin and Lermontov to Mayakovsky and Okudzhava, he uses his terminology to describe patterns of poetic repetition, metrical variation, sound effects of all sorts, but also of literary relationships on a much larger scale. He describes, for example, the structural opposition between the harmony, faith, love, and beauty of a romantic heroine, and the demon-

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