of secondary sources. In the introduction to his short bibliography of secondary sources, incidentally, the author disparages most of them, although it is clear that he has used them extensively.

For the most part, the critical judgments in the volume are sound, informed, and informative. They are so numerous that one is bound to take issue with at least some of them. The author is a bit too generous, I think, in suspending an opinion on the artistic merits of *August 1914* until the appearance of its sequels: the novel has obvious and serious defects, regardless of the volumes that may follow. It is incorrect to say that the female characters in *The First Circle* are not of great importance. And the character Vadim in *Cancer Ward* is seriously misinterpreted. But these are matters of opinion; in the main, this study will hold up very well for many years to come.

DEMING BROWN
University of Michigan

ANDREI SINIAVSKII AND JULII DANIEL': TWO SOVIET "HERETICAL" WRITERS. By *Margaret Dalton*. Colloquium Slavicum, Beiträge zur Slavistik, no. 1. Würzburg: Jal-Verlag, 1973. 190 pp. DM 26, paper.

The author's express intention in this study is to provide a "literary interpretation" of works which, she believes, have been "heavily distorted" by overemphasis on their political aspects at the expense of their literary content. The volume contains, in addition to discussions of the two writers' fiction and of Siniavsky's essay on socialist realism and *Mysli vrasplokh*, a brief biographical sketch of each writer.

Professor Dalton begins with Siniavsky's essay, which, in her opinion, "laid the theoretical groundwork for his subsequent artistic work," a view that provides the only, and rather tenuous, unifying theme for the part of the book dealing with Siniavsky (understandably, the bulk of the study is devoted to him). In the following pages she describes each of the remaining works in a straightforward and unpretentious manner, prudently refraining from arbitrary or strained interpretations; identifies, often without elaboration or explanation, possible literary influences or affinities; and lists, rather casually and incompletely, salient literary devices and characteristics. If any conclusion emerges (it is perhaps significant that the book has no concluding chapter), it would seem to be that Siniavsky is a practitioner of that "phantasmagoric art" mentioned in the famous closing passage of his essay and that Daniel is something more of a "traditional realist." The study offers the attentive reader of Siniavsky and Daniel little more than he is likely to observe for himself, and something less than a full "literary interpretation"; ironically, he may well leave the book with a better sense of the political than of the literary significance of the two writers.

HAROLD SWAYZE
University of Washington

THE RUSSIAN ARTIST: THE CREATIVE PERSON IN RUSSIAN CULTURE. By *Tobia Frankel*. Russia Old and New Series. New York: Macmillan, 1972. 198 pp. $5.95.

This is a well-written, well-organized history of the arts in Russia from the first Kievan dynasty to the present day. Although designed for students and others new

https://doi.org/10.2307/2494805 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to Russian culture, the book will, because of its clarity and concreteness, encourage readers to plunge in more deeply. The arts surveyed include woodworking, icon making, architecture, poetry, literary criticism, theatrical design and direction, music, ballet, and cinema.

Mrs. Frankel has a theme. From 1475, when Italian architects were first imported to work in the Moscow Kremlin, to the early 1960s, when Italians were brought in to help build the Kremlin's Hall of Congresses, the "wide respect for foreigners undermined the morale of Russian artisans." Again, Russia's window on the West "had a screen" from the time of the building of St. Petersburg in 1713: "The government encouraged cultural imitation to promote learning and technology without allowing in the freer political ideas that might have let the arts take root and flourish" (p. 26). But Mrs. Frankel also portrays the originality and richness of talent that were there all along, and which came to the surface in the short, brilliant period after 1890 when Russia in turn was an exporter of art to the West.

The author's years in Moscow during the late 1950s and early 1960s as wife of a *New York Times* correspondent—and author of articles in her own right—contribute to the book's sense of place. Drawn mainly from secondary sources, the book is divided evenly between the Soviet and pre-Soviet periods. The tone is unemotional and very fair.

PRISCILLA JOHNSON MCMILLAN
Cambridge, Massachusetts

RUSSIAN SURNAMES. By *B. O. Unbegaun*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972. xviii, 529 pp. $27.25.

There are colleagues we admire for their work, and there are colleagues we admire for their character. The late Professor Unbegaun was that rare person whom many Slavists (including myself) admired for both. It is thus a pleasure for me to be able to say that the book under review, apparently Unbegaun's last published work, is a superb one, and a fitting memorial to the finest Slavist of our generation.

Like all of Unbegaun's publications, this one is distinguished by lucidity, erudition, and modesty. "The aim of the present book," writes Unbegaun in the preface (p. v), "is to discuss the modern system of Russian surnames in both its morphological and its semantic aspects. . . . [It] has not the slightest pretension to be a history of Russian surnames." Yet this book with its simple title is both the best description and the best history to date of Russian surnames. In fact, it is the best all-around treatment in any language of Russian names, whether baptismal names, nicknames, or surnames. Since many members of non-Russian nationalities in and around the Russian Empire were ultimately Russianized, Unbegaun found it useful to give brief sketches of naming systems in certain other Slavic languages (Ukrainian, White Russian, Polish, Serbian, Bulgarian, and Czech); in other European languages (Yiddish, German, Rumanian, Hungarian, Greek, Lithuanian, Latvian, Finnish, Estonian); and in some non-European languages (Armenian, Georgian, Turkic, Iranian, Mongolian).

Unbegaun describes how the Russian surname system developed out of the relatively fluid use of patronymics in *-ov*, *-in*, and the nominal extension of *-ov*, that is, *-ovich* (fem. *-ovna*). Starting in the middle of the sixteenth century, the

https://doi.org/10.2307/2494805 Published online by Cambridge University Press