

Kordatos's study of the Greek labor and socialist movements was the first of its kind. Although the book purports to be a history of the labor movement, two-thirds of it is devoted to the origins and development of the early Greek socialist movement. Kordatos endeavors to merge the two movements, but this is hardly acceptable, because they developed to a great extent independently, even though the socialists themselves did appeal to the workers in an effort to project the socialist movement as the political arm of labor. Kordatos begins his study with the early labor stirrings in the 1870s and then examines the nascent radical groups with anarchist and utopian socialist tendencies that appeared at the same time in port cities such as Patras, Piraeus, Pyrgos, Kalamata, and in Cephalonia. There are no traces of Marxism until the turn of the century. The book ends with the unification of the labor and socialist movements and the establishment of the General Confederation of the Workers of Greece and the Greek Socialist Labor Party in the fall of 1918. The entire story is an up-hill struggle of the small socialist groups not so much to assert themselves—together with the more radical workers—as political entities as to secure recognition of a legitimate existence. The effort of the socialists to imbue the workers with a class consciousness that would enable them to assert themselves collectively and challenge the legitimacy of the existing social structure was less successful. To be sure, one could hardly expect a different outcome when confronted with such insurmountable cultural, socioeconomic, and political obstacles as those encountered by the Greek Left. When one considers the conditions of the workers and the fact that the new forces had to operate in an oppressive cultural and political environment inimical to melioristic social and philosophical concepts that could be a threat to the established order, it is indeed surprising that they accomplished as much as they did. In the end, the limited successes of the Greek socialists in 1918 can be understood only within the context of a convergence of circumstances emanating from the world crisis of 1914–18. The history of the Greek labor and socialist movements remains to be written.

GEORGE B. LEON

*Memphis State University*

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SLAVIC DICTIONARIES, 4 vols. 2nd revised and enlarged edition. Compiled by *Richard C. Lewanski*. The Johns Hopkins University Bologna Center Library Publications, no. 7. World Bibliography of Dictionaries. Bologna: Editrice Compositori, 1972–73. Vol. 1: POLISH. viii, 197 pp. Vol. 2: BELORUSSIAN, BULGARIAN, CZECH, KASHUBIAN, LUSATIAN, OLD CHURCH SLAVIC, MACEDONIAN, POLABIAN, SERBO-CROATIAN, SLOVAK, SLOVENIAN, UKRAINIAN. xii, 352 pp. Vol. 3: RUSSIAN. xl, 386 pp. Vol. 4: SUPPLEMENT. vi, 409 pp.

The background and plan of this second edition have to be deduced by comparison with the first edition, since Lewanski is not helpful in this regard; he simply reprints earlier introductions without any overall explanation. A mystery of minor proportions is the relevance of the cuneiform inscriptions on the covers; could it be that the Italian printer confused Slavic and Sumerian? The first three volumes of this work appeared originally as publications of the New York Public Library: Volume 1, Polish, in 1959; volume 2, Slavic languages other than Polish and Russian, in 1962; volume 3, Russian, in 1963. In this edition volume 1 has been updated (for example, item 1360 on page 129 describes a Polish-Russian chemical

dictionary published in 1970), volumes 2 and 3 are essentially the same as before, and volume 4, the supplement, is new, giving details of recently published dictionaries for all the Slavic languages except Polish. In order to help the potential user wend his or her way through these volumes, let me suggest the following scheme: if you are interested in citations for Polish dictionaries, volume 1 is sufficient; for Russian use volume 3 with supplementary material in volume 4; for any Slavic language other than Polish and Russian use volume 2 with supplementary material in volume 4.

In listing dictionary aids Lewanski casts his net wide, and that is all to the good in a work of this sort. Thus, though I was surprised to find Harkins's *Dictionary of Russian Literature* listed (he is probably surprised, too), I was impressed by Lewanski's thoroughness in the entry after that on Harkins: a textbook on oceanography which happens to contain a nine-page glossary of "ice terms" in Russian and English. The typical entry has the usual bibliographical information along with specification about the language used for entry forms and the language(s) used for glosses. Cyrillic titles are transliterated in what I assume is the NYPL system—for example, *Kratki anglo-ruski leksikon tehničkih nazvanii*. Under a language the first listings are of monolingual dictionaries categorized by subject matter, such as abbreviations, dialects, slang, sport and recreation; then come the bilingual dictionaries listed alphabetically by the second language, which for Russian ranges from Abazinian to Yiddish; finally the polyglot dictionaries subdivided into trilingual, four-lingual, five-lingual, and so forth, and multilingual (more than eight). Some of these latter terms (such as four-lingual) are far from euphonious; if "quatuor-lingual" seems too contrived, why not the simple "four language (dictionary)"? The numbering of each entry in conjunction with an author index and a subject index makes it easy for the user to locate items of interest.

A reviewer can only hop, skip, and jump through the thousands of entries in these four volumes, checking entries at random. Lewanski lists only one volume for Vvedensky's *Entsiklopedičeskii slovar'* (no. 912, vol. 4, p. 95); I have two volumes on my shelf, the second of which goes from *Mas* to *Iaia*, has 736 pages, and was published in 1964. In the same volume the entry on Kalashnikov's pharmaceutical dictionary (no. 1048, p. 108) gives 527 pages; my copy has 596. Going backward in time, I note that my copy of Bellosztenecz's dictionary (no. 267, vol. 2, p. 217) has a publication date of 1711 on the title page, though it may actually have appeared in 1740 (Lewanski's date); it was published in Zagrabia not Zagabria; and it has an Illyrian (Serbo-Croatian) to Latin section in addition to the Latin to Illyrian part cited by Lewanski. Other such mistakes occur throughout the four volumes and are probably inevitable, given the mass of detail in this work.

In recent years Serbo-Croatian has been a sensitive area for dictionary makers (one can go to jail for "committing an incorrect dictionary"), and so it is not surprising that there are errors in Lewanski's compilation. For example, item 3025 (vol. 4, p. 296) has Ljudevit Jonke et al. as the compilers of four volumes of *Rječnik hrvatskosrpskoga književnog jezika*. Actually Jonke, as the chief editor for Matica Hrvatska, produced only two volumes (A–F, G–K) in 1967; in the same year two volumes (A–E, Ž–K) were produced in Cyrillic by Mihailo Stevanović and his collaborators for Matica Srpska under the title *Rečnik srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika*. For reasons too complicated to discuss

here the Croats pulled out of the dictionary project, while the Serbs went on to produce three more volumes (K–O in 1969, O–P in 1971, P–S in 1973) and may have already completed their sixth and final volume. In 1966 Miloš Moskvljević produced a handsome dictionary, *Rečnik savremenog srpskohrvatskog književnog jezika s jezičkim savetnikom*, which incurred the wrath of the authorities (among other things he forgot to include the word “Croat”) and ended up in some Belgrade shredder. Still, copies are extant (I own one), and the title should be included. Another victim of the recent nationality quarrels in Yugoslavia was *Hrvatski pravopis*, a 341-page orthographic dictionary published by Školska knjiga in Zagreb in 1971. This work, compiled by Stjepan Babić, Božidar Finka, and Milan Moguš, was judged to be a “nationalist act of sabotage” and was ordered destroyed; destruction is a relative concept in the Balkans, and so some copies found their way to London, where an émigré organization, Nova Hrvatska, financed a photo-offset reprinting in 1972. Though not offensive in any way, Kosta Grubačić’s *Enciklopedijski leksikon bibliotekarstva* (Sarajevo: Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika, 1964; 337 pp.) was overlooked. Another omission, closer to home, is Thomas F. Magner, *The Student’s Dictionary of Serbo-Croatian* (Singidunum Press, 1970; 201 pp.).

My colleague, Professor Joseph Paternost, suggests the following additions for Slovenian: under Orthography (vol. 4, p. 346) add Anton Bajec et al., *Slovenski pravopis* (Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije, 1962; 1,056 pp.); under Polyglot (vol. 4, p. 352) add Josip Pavlica, *Frazeološki slovar v petih jezikih* (Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije, 1960; 688 pp.).

These four volumes, though awkward to use, are a valuable reference and research tool. Lewanski has made a solid contribution in making accessible to us bibliographical information on the rather impressive lexical resources of the Slavic field.

THOMAS F. MAGNER

*The Pennsylvania State University*

RAZVITIE REALIZMA V RUSSKOI LITERATURE V TREKH TOMAKH.  
Vol. 1: PROSVETITEL'SKII REALIZM: UTVERZHDENIE KRITICHESKOGO REALIZMA. Edited by U. R. Fokht et al. Moscow: “Nauka,” 1972. 351 pp. 1.28 rubles.

This collective volume, the first of a three-volume (four-book) series, is not quite so uniformly dogmatic as its title and introduction may lead some readers to expect. True, one has come to look for better even on this topic, in view of recent excellent Soviet scholarly efforts in literary research. The sense of *déjà vu* is nonetheless at first overwhelming. As the old familiar footnotes from Lenin, Marx, and Belinsky accumulate through the long introductory chapter, one asks: do we—does anyone—really need another account of how all of Russian and even world literature culminates in socialist realism? Apparently someone does. The stated purpose of the new undertaking is to bring recent work dealing with literary structure to bear on the problem of literary evolution. If thoroughly done, this would indeed be a contribution. However, the first volume promises more than it delivers. This is not to say that there is nothing new here, though there is most certainly much that is old, if refurbished. The essays are of varying value, the most useful being the two by Iu. Mann, to be treated below.