

and the specialist will be disappointed by their brevity. In a way, the same can be said about the whole book. One may only add that in retrospect the author appears to have been much too optimistic regarding the degree of decentralization introduced (or even presaged) by the Soviet economic reform of 1965. At this writing it is fairly clear, at least to the reviewer, that the reform's effects on the systemic features and efficiency of the Soviet economy have been very close to zero.

GREGORY GROSSMAN

University of California, Berkeley

SOVIET ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. By *Raymond Hutchings*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971. xiii, 314 pp. £3.25, cloth. £1.50, paper.

Mr. Hutchings's book covers much of the same material as previous text surveys of the Soviet economic system and its development, but is different in being more chronological and less analytical than most, relying more on the telling detail than on the judicious generalization to develop its message. Indeed, it is a distinctly idiosyncratic book. The concept seems to be to describe some phenomena, illustrate with a few data, flavor with arcana and a little exotica (the errata have been well controlled), and that will convey what is important about the Soviet economy. Some chapters (those on geography and history, for instance) succeed much better than others (those on investment planning and ideology, say). The book is well written, and raises a number of interesting points, but it gives somewhat the impression of a collection of asides to the main flow of discourse in our research efforts on the Soviet system. On one important and complicated problem—the ambiguities in the measurement of growth—the points it makes are unexceptionable, but its treatment of the capital intensity controversy and Soviet practice in this area is badly garbled. There is relatively little reliance for results and analytical approaches on the research done by those outside the USSR, in favor of Soviet assertions and views. This makes it more authentic in a certain sense, but less solid and conclusive than one would like in a book to be used as a text.

ROBERT W. CAMPBELL

Indiana University

ANNUAIRE DE L'INSTITUT DE PHILOGIE ET D'HISTOIRE ORIENTALES ET SLAVES, vols. 18 and 19. Dedicated to Boris Unbegaun. Brussels: Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1968. Vol. 18: xxxii, 516 pp. 750 fr.b. Vol. 19: 282 pp. 350 fr.b. Set, 1,000 fr.b.

This two-volume Festschrift, with all but four of its forty-seven contributions from fifteen countries written in French, German, or Russian, represents a happy division of labor with two university presses of the English-speaking world. A companion volume, *Studies in Slavic Linguistics and Poetics in Honor of Boris O. Unbegaun*, with contributions from thirty-one American, British, and Canadian scholars, was published in 1968 by New York University Press and the University of London Press (reviewed in the *Slavic Review*, March 1971). The present collection is prefaced with a biographical note and a bibliography of Professor Unbegaun's scholarly publications from 1923 to 1967; its continuous page numbering and single table of contents indicate that the two volumes (international contributions and Belgian contributions) should be considered one work.

Half of this double volume is devoted to literature. One of the most significant contributions is P. N. Berkov's study of Russian neo-Latin and Greek literature since the seventeenth century. Maximilian Braun uses an unknown reader's marginal notes in a copy of Merezhkovsky's first collection of poems (1888) to produce an entertaining, if statistically limited, study of the reaction of the Russian reading audience to the first bewildering signs of Symbolism. In an essay covering the whole span of Leo Tolstoy's literary production Leone Pacini Savoj takes another look at Tolstoy's use of dreams and daydreams and his treatment of the theme of loneliness. Frank Seeley follows up Viktor Shklovsky's well-known 1928 study of Tolstoy's use of history in *War and Peace* with further observations along the same line. Jurij Striedter discusses Griboedov's Sophie as a historical type derived from the sentimentalism of the late eighteenth century—but a type that evolves and becomes more individual in the course of Griboedov's comedy. Robert Triomphe, in a detailed study of Lermontov's imagery as the key to his poetic universe, provides much material of interest, culminating in a discussion of the mountain in Lermontov's imagery; but he does not quite take us to the mountain top from which we might have had a *vue d'ensemble* of Lermontov's imagery in its Romantic context. I. S. Vakhros studies Tiutchev's translations from Heine, particularly in relation to metrical developments in Tiutchev's own poetry. Claude Backvis's study of Odoevsky is the longest and one of the most important contributions in the book. Starting with a felicitous comparison of Odoevsky to a stationmaster who occupies a position of first rank not because of the intrinsic importance of his town but because his town happens to stand at the junction of several important railway lines, Backvis goes on to place Odoevsky within a major network of ideas and influences that link him up with such important points on the literary map of Russia as Pushkin, Gogol, the theme of Petersburg, and the early utopian novel.

Other Belgian contributions include an illustrated article by Jean Blankoff on the frescoes of the Ferapontov monastery, a pedagogical article by J. P. Derscheid, and F. Gorlé's article on the development of the Russian penal code in the seventeenth century. Jean Lothe reviews the Russian language controversy of the 1820s between the "archaizers" and "innovators," taking issue somewhat with Tynianov's view of Katenin. In an article on Koltsov (to whom she repeatedly refers as "le poète paysan" despite his origin in the town of Voronezh as the son of a well-to-do cattle merchant), Anne Neuckens-Askenasi tries to fit him onto a Procrustean bed of classicism, which she assumes without explanation to be distinct from neoclassicism. Marie Onatzky-Maline discusses parallels in the poetic vision of Bagritsky and the Acmeists, notably Gumilev. In a study limited to French and Polish examples drawn from the poetry of Jules Laforgue and Bolesław Leśmian, Marian Pankowski discusses certain types of neologisms familiar to English readers of Lewis Carroll and James Joyce and to Russian readers of Nikolai Leskov and Andrei Bely.

Space limitations allow only the briefest mention of the linguistic contributions: Olga Akhmanova (homonymy); S. B. Bernstein (Old Russian texts of East Bulgarian origin); V. I. Borkovsky (incomplete sentences in Old Russian); M. Altbauer and M. Pavlović (translation problems in Old Russian); Paul Garde (accentology); P. S. Kuznetsov (Russian phoneme [f]); V. V. Ivanov (influence of *tsokanie* on Old Russian phonology); Jacques Veyrenc (Russian aspect); Arne Gallis (peculiar eighteenth-century use of animate accusative); etymological con-

tributions by V. V. Vinogradov, A. V. Isačenko, Nils Åke Nilsson, and others; two articles on Croatian documents in Hungarian archives; Dietrich Gerhardt's sparkling study of the interjection *ej, ej, ej*; Margarete Woltner's equally attractive study of dog names in Russian literature; Dmitrij Tschizewskij (Ukrainian astronomical onomastics); A. Rosetti (Rumanian neuter category); and two papers on Slovenia, one of which is unfortunately missing from the table of contents: Rudolf Kolarič, "Bemerkungen zur Frage der Kontinuität der Kultur in Slowenien," pp. 233–40.

WILLIAM B. EDGERTON
Indiana University

PUSHKIN: A COMPARATIVE COMMENTARY. By *John Bayley*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1971. vii, 369 pp. \$13.50.

It is a pleasure to see a book with an accurate title; this is indeed a *comparative* study of Pushkin. The author has read widely in Western literatures, knows particularly well his Byron and other European poets who were Pushkin's predecessors and contemporaries, and offers analogues to Pushkin's works whenever possible.

There are surprisingly few one-volume books about Pushkin; Mirsky's and Blagoy's spring to mind first of all. It is deplorable that nothing yet exists which would be comparable to the various Western "handbooks" or "guides" to various poets—with elucidations, glosses, and critical analyses of individual works. Bayley's book is not exactly such a guidebook either. What he does is comment on most of Pushkin's works (the lyrics are somewhat slighted), using mixed chronological and genre divisions of the subject. One wonders what readers he had in mind. There is no question about one audience: those who are seriously interested in Pushkin—students taking a course about him, amateur readers and lovers of Pushkin, and especially those whose vocation or avocation is the study of Pushkin—will all want to read Bayley's comments when they approach a particular work by the poet. However, the general reader—starved for help and illumination—may continue to turn to Mirsky. Bayley's book is a little too impenetrable. Its virtues are its handicaps. There are so many references and allusions to Western works that one loses the thread of his argument. In other words, the study lacks focus and emphasis. There is no clearly discernible thread of argument. The details obscure the outline. The central importance of Pushkin's works sometimes vanishes in the swarms of references to Schiller, Kotzebue, Mérimée—facts, dates, characters.

It is difficult to read the book from cover to cover; rather one hunts down discussions of individual works. When one asks oneself after finishing the book what one has learned about Pushkin, there is no one big thing, but one has learned a lot of little points. We must try not to quarrel with Professor Bayley's sometimes idiosyncratic choice of things to discuss (for example in his pages about *Eugene Onegin*) and his avoidance of the central and most important issues, but rather be grateful to the author for his plethora of information and detail.

GEORGE GIBIAN
Cornell University