

In her introduction, Professor Pachmuss states that Hippius's diaries are "a valuable, highly artistic personal confession." Unfortunately, the artistic quality she speaks of must have been lost in translation. She also states that the diaries "have great historical and literary significance . . . because they re-create the spiritual atmosphere of St. Petersburg . . . , reveal the nature of life in Poland after the October Revolution, and the activities of 'Russian Paris' in the third and fourth decades of the century." The first two assertions are greatly exaggerated, the third is simply not true. Perhaps Professor Pachmuss—who has devoted her life to the study of Hippius's life and works, and whose scholarly efforts are aimed at restoring "Zinaida Hippius to her rightful place in the history of Russian literature" and at rescuing "from obscurity the influences of this most unique and colorful figure upon her contemporaries"—did see all these features in the diaries in this volume. I am afraid, however, that readers, who do not possess her profound knowledge of everything connected with Hippius, will fail to do so.

GLEB ŽEKULIN
University of Toronto

CYPRIAN NORWID. By *George Gömöri*. Twayne's World Author Series, 305. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1974. 162 pp. \$7.95.

Gömöri's book is a descriptive analysis of Norwid's life, career, and work, with the emphasis clearly on the work. Gömöri has traveled into new territory—this is the first full-length study of Norwid in English—and returned to make a sober and, as he terms it in his preface, "modest" report. Though it is unfair to require that travelers return with colorful tales of exotic artifacts, it is not unfair to require them to transmit a sense of the place visited, its peculiarities, its charms, its dangers, and its use. Obviously, Norwid is abstract country, and any reports must necessarily resemble their subject, but I believe that this book has certain shortcomings which rob it of some flavor.

First, the matter of quotations, which are always exhibit A when making a case for a poet. The translations here are poor and weak (though the two-volume selection of Norwid's writings to be published by the University of Iowa may yet improve matters). Further, the translations are not accompanied by the Polish originals. This is unfortunate, because most of the book's prospective readers will probably have some knowledge of Polish. The original lines and a summary translation would have been ideal. A second shortcoming is the author's extensive use of cultural discussion (for example, Wallenrodian romanticism). Although he uses this approach well, it does have a clogging effect on the work as a whole. Finally, it must be remembered that, for English readers, Polish literature has long been a hermetic world inaccessible to the uninitiated, and for this reason Polish literature both expresses and reinforces Poland's uneasy sense of not being quite an integral part of the civilization to which it knows it truly belongs. Books such as Gömöri's should strive to aid reintegration. Thus, comparisons with European writers that are subsequently shown to be non-comparisons (unlike Hugo, unlike Baudelaire) raise my suspicions that the reflex ritual is being performed and communication is being inhibited. At this stage of the game, the judicious analogy is much to be preferred.

Despite these criticisms, Gömöri has gone a good way in exploring Norwid's thought, his spiritual travail, and his response to his age. Gömöri has blazed the trail and pointed the way; in time others will follow.

RICHARD LOURIE
Russian Research Center, Harvard University

RUSSIAN AND THE SLAVONIC LANGUAGES. By *W. J. Entwistle* and *W. A. Morison*. Reprint of second edition. The Great Languages Series. London: Faber and Faber, 1974 [1949, 1964]. 407 pp. Maps. \$15.00. Distributed by Humanities Press, Atlantic Highlands, N.J. 07716.

Entwistle, a professor of Spanish (who died in 1952), and Morison, an employee of the BBC, put this work together under difficult conditions during the 1940s, and it appeared in print in 1949. A detailed review in *Language* (vol. 27 [1951], pp. 82–94) found it old-fashioned, inconsistent, imprecise, and incoherent—of no help to the specialist and “positively dangerous in the hands of the unsuspecting student.” The last prediction was fully confirmed during the 1950s; but reprints of older works in Russian plus a flood of new (that is, post-1940) publications in many languages, including English, meant that by 1960 even a fairly naïve student could quickly recognize that this book was merely donnish chatter and a waste of time. In 1964 it was republished, with a few corrections, but a review in the *Slavic and East European Journal* (vol. 10 [1966], pp. 485–87) reported that this “second edition” was “in no important respect a more acceptable textbook or reference work than was the first.”

One can appreciate the wartime spirit which originally inspired the authors to try to provide something in English about the exotic Slavic languages. Yet even in 1949 it was hard to condone either their ignorance of the material and scholarly literature on the subject, or their lack of method. In 1964 it was surprising that a publisher would reprint such an outdated and dilettante work without drastic revisions. In 1975 one can only speculate as to why the publisher is not ashamed to reissue, without change, such an embarrassingly bad book.

HORACE G. LUNT
Harvard University

SLAVIC TRANSFORMATIONAL SYNTAX. Edited by *Richard D. Brecht* and *Catherine V. Chvany*. Foreword by *Horace G. Lunt*. Michigan Slavic Materials, no. 10. Ann Arbor: Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Michigan, 1974. vi, 261 pp. Paper.

The editors of this collection of articles have succeeded admirably in their dual aim of providing Slavic material of theoretical interest to general linguists, and of making recent theoretical developments in general linguistics accessible to Slavicists already familiar with the data.

The first two articles by Roland Sussex and Emily Klenin give an overview of recent work on syntax in the transformational-generative model (broadly speaking) in the USSR, Eastern Europe, and in the West, supplemented with ample bibliography. The next four articles comprise a section entitled “Early Papers,” and they are most welcome not only for their intrinsic interest and historical importance in