

(which has been shown to be too indefinite and wide to be adequately covered by any combination of positive characteristics). It simply opposes the imperfective negatively to the single positive meaning of the perfective . . ." (p. 11). This cavalier treatment of the imperfective aspect forces Forsyth into tortuous interpretations in attempting to explain such contrasts as *Kto podavliial vosstanie?* "Who crushed the rebellion?" and *Kto podavil vse vosstaniia rabochikh?* "Who (has) crushed all the workers' risings?" Here it is obvious that the imperfective form *podavliial* is not simply a pale reflection of the positively-charged perfective form *podavil*, but rather that it competes with *podavil* on its own terms quite successfully. There is no room here for further defense of the maligned imperfective aspect except to say that the attribution to it of various meaning possibilities (continuous action, repetition, even single action) may make for an untidy definition, as Forsyth contends, but it will be a definition capable of covering the sometimes untidy operation of imperfective usage.

One important matter touched on only lightly by Forsyth is the phenomenon of biaspectuality—the existence of many verbs, such as *telefonirovat'* 'to telephone', which have both imperfective and perfective aspect, or (put another way) have no aspect. In her recent (March 1971) doctoral dissertation at the University of Minnesota, "Biaspectual -ovat' Verbs in Russian," Adele Donchenko points out the startling fact that of the 1,642 Russian verbs ending in *-ovat'* in the seventeen-volume Academy dictionary, 766 are biaspectual (p. 14)! Donchenko concludes that such "I/P verbs show no marked trend toward assimilation into the morphologically-marked binary 'aspectual pairing.' Not only does the acquisition of new borrowings extend the phenomenon of biaspectuality, but the paths taken by verb forms already adopted do not appear to be making any significant inroads on aspectual 'anomaly'" (p. 103).

THOMAS F. MAGNER
Pennsylvania State University

ARTS OF RUSSIA: 17TH AND 18TH CENTURIES. By *Abraam L. Kagano-
 vich*. Translated by *James Hogarth*. Cleveland and New York: World, 1968.
 173 pp.

SPLENDORS OF MOSCOW AND ITS SURROUNDINGS. By *Vladimir
 Chernov* and *Marcel Girard*. Translated by *James Hogarth*. Cleveland: World,
 1967. 216 pp. \$29.95.

For the public interested in Russian art (which must be considerably larger than it was a generation ago, now that tourists may travel within the USSR), the publication of sound and sensible books on Russian art and art history would seem to be a worthy cause as well as a sound investment. Unfortunately all too often the venture falls between the horns of the familiar coffee-table dilemma: Which comes first, the text or the pretty pictures?

Not having had an opportunity to compare these volumes with the original texts, I cannot tell whether the clip-clop pace of the prose is the translator's or not. Probably not, if the texture of ideas, or what passes for them, has been faithfully conveyed. What is one to make—or what would anyone seeking artistic enlightenment make—of these statements about the baroque altarpiece in the Cathedral of Saints Peter and Paul in the Fortress at Leningrad (I mention this monument because it is probably the most sumptuous altarpiece that English-read-

ing tourists in the Soviet Union will ever see): "The iconostasis in the Cathedral, carved by Ivan Zarudny, is a magnificent and very typical example of Petrine architecture. The richness of the modeling and the profusion of carved figures combine with the painted icons and the brightly colored paintings under the dome to create an effect of great elegance and splendor. The pictures in the Cathedral were mostly painted by Russian artists." Words, just words, sliding away from imperative problems of style, technique, and historical and cultural significance.

If Kaganovich's text is devoid of practical criticism, Chernov's and Girard's is festooned with provocative statements. Here is one: "In the eyes of Western historians the style of the Kremlin is not really Russian. . . ." Well, as Gertrude Stein might have said, "If it isn't Russian, what is it?" Later on we are told that in the Tretyakov Gallery "there is too much to see: the visitor who can afford only a single day may well feel discouraged." In the first place there really isn't *that* much to see, and certainly having much more to see hasn't prevented millions of people with only a day to spare from visiting the Louvre, the British Museum, our own Metropolitan Museum, or the Hermitage in Leningrad for that matter, and getting something out of the experience. What a pity it would be if travelers in Moscow were deterred by such irresponsible remarks from having at least a glimpse of the magnificent icons—to say nothing of the absorbing display of nineteenth-century painting—in the Tretyakov!

In *Arts of Russia* the color plates, which are tipped in, range from poor and indifferent to good and very good. The best of them show examples of the decorative arts and occasionally odd or unexpected views of familiar buildings, thereby at least enlarging the illustrative documentation of Russian architecture, which needs it. But the illustrations must be handled with caution, because there are occasional slips, such as two views of the Church of Saint Nicholas in Suzdal, one of which must be reversed.

The illustrations in *Splendors of Moscow* are even more erratic. They are at their worst when coping with great works of art (surely there has never been a poorer color reproduction of *The Virgin of Vladimir*, that most delicate of icons), and are best when dealing with less significant situations. There is a fine view of Gogol's grave in the Novodevichi Monastery, and a lively one of the Belorussian Railway Station. The color plates were made in Paris, but since the books were printed in Geneva, one may regret that the plates could not have been made by Swiss craftsmen.

GEORGE HEARD HAMILTON
Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute
and Williams College

ZARUBEZHNAIA ROSSIIA: ISTORIIA I KUL'TURNO-PROSVETITEL'-
NAIA RABOTA RUSSKOGO ZARUBEZH'IA ZA POLVEKA (1920-
1970). By P. E. Kovalevsky. Paris: Librairie des Cinq Continents, 1971. 347
pp. \$5.50.

In this book Kovalevsky, professor emeritus of Russian history and the history of literature at the Sorbonne, writes a history of émigré cultural activities in many of which he himself took part. In his introduction he divides the Russian Diaspora into three periods: 1920 to World War II, the war years, and since 1945. He considers only the first period as "Russia Outside of Russia," because during those