

period was more extensive than it really was. He identifies a linguistic feature, such as *akan'e*, and produces a series of examples from a number of authors. In addition to the author's impressive compilation of data, the work includes a lengthy bibliography of works which are relevant to this particular period in the history of the Russian language.

The book is well written. Grannes defines his terms and genres, discusses sources, and then undertakes a discussion of phonetic features appearing in dialectal and non-standard Russian. After this he tackles morphology, examining each part of speech separately. There is also an index listing words discussed in the section on morphology. One of the problems which Grannes does not explain sufficiently is the question of judging the language of one period from a synchronic point of view. There also exists in this reviewer's mind some doubt as to whether or not a number of quoted forms actually represent Ukrainian or Belorussian, rather than Russian. These, however, do not constitute a serious shortcoming, and the work is a valuable reference source for future study.

WILLIAM W. DERBYSHIRE  
Rutgers University

CONTEMPORARY CZECH. By *Michael Heim*. Michigan Slavic Publications. Ann Arbor: Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Michigan, 1976. xii, 363 pp. \$5.00, paper.

Michael Heim's *Contemporary Czech* is the first Czech textbook written for English-speaking students to appear in several years. The textbook is designed for a two-semester college course and consists of a grammar section and a series of review lessons. The book reads well (Mr. Heim has a good ear for Czech), looks good (although the ink in my copy is a bit faded), and is reasonably priced (363 pages for \$5.00). The goal of the text is to give the student a "solid working knowledge" of Czech, yet one wonders whether basic vocabulary items are sufficiently threaded in and out of the exercises and whether the kinds and numbers of drills are equal to the task of reinforcing the vocabulary given.

Czech may be manifested as a written, literary language, as an everyday spoken language, or as various combinations of the two. A major problem for any textbook author, therefore, is to decide what to present, since he cannot ask a student to learn two vocabularies as well as two sets of morphological and phonological rules. The author presents a good mixture of colloquial and literary forms, although not always consistently: he teaches the colloquial first-person singular (-*ju*) and third-person plural (-*jou*) verb endings unless otherwise specified, but gives the written prepositional masculine/neuter singular noun ending (-*ě/-e*) unless otherwise specified.

Although the author evaluates his presentation of declensions and conjugations as "purely pedagogical," "simplified" or "practical" might have been more accurate. For example, rather than give a more complicated grammatical rule, he gives a simplified rule plus a list of deviant forms. Thus, the masculine prepositional singular ending for inanimate nouns is given as \*-*e*: *mostě*; a rule for choosing the alternant -*u* is given, plus a list of thirty-nine nouns not covered by the rule (14.313). By chance, *hotel* is not among them, and is not included in the glossaries, so that a student would expect the correct prepositional form to be *hotele*. Most Czechs would say *v hotelu* (although some might say *v hotele*), but none would say or write \**o hotele*, or for that matter \**o mostě*. Such oversimplifications are frequent: the author identifies etymological *ě* with etymological *e*—sometimes (14.321, first half of appendix B) but not always (second half of appendix B); and the "generally" of note 1 (p. 127) and

14.81 is misleading: a small number of high frequency verbs have a *t/c* alternation in the past passive participle (*platit/placen*). The author's semantic equivalents are often in the form of a single gloss buoyed by syntactic usage. Thus *vědět* is glossed "to know" (p. 73) when used in conjunction with *to*, as in *to vím*, but a counterexample—*to znám (ze školy)*—is perfectly acceptable as well. Both examples could be accounted for if the student had been told that *vědět* expresses knowledge in terms of awareness or consciousness, *znát* in terms of facts or data.

The insertion of Russian examples, presumably added to eliminate interference from Russian look-alikes, often struck this reviewer as curious. Some are certainly to the point, others seem gratuitous (the connection between Russian *gorazdo* and Czech *o mnohem*, given the absence in Czech of *\*horazd-*). At other times Russian look-alikes are not given when they might have been, as the Russian *dolgii*, "long"—which refers to temporal coordinates only—versus Czech *dlouhý*—which refers to temporal as well as spatial coordinates.

LAWRENCE W. NEWMAN  
Columbus, Ohio

ASSOTSIIATSIIA KHUDOZHNIKOV REVOLIUTSIONNOI ROSSII  
"AKhRR": SBORNIK VOSPOMINANII, STATEI, DOKUMENTOV.  
Compiled by *I. M. Gronskii* and *V. N. Perel'man*. Moscow: "Izobrazitel'noe iskusstvo," 1973. 503 pp. Illus.

The publication of these documents is not an unmixed blessing for historians who rejoice in the appearance of primary sources. Reading through this collection of manifestoes, memoirs, and reviews is as instructive about the 1920s as it is about cultural politics in the Soviet Union today. It is in connection with the latter, contemporary, aspect that misgivings set in.

The Association of Artists of Revolutionary Russia (AKhRR) was formed in 1922, and signaled, in part, a return to easel painting and the figurative forms of art after the bold experimentations of the early revolutionary years. The AKhRR, dedicated to documentary realism, was the least adventuresome and least creative of the numerous neorealist groups that surfaced with the onset of the NEP. Yet, this group claimed that its "heroic realism" was a new departure which had nothing in common with the style and ethos of the *Peredvizhniki*, the socially concerned realists of the nineteenth century. Within an astonishingly short time, this small band of untested talent became the largest artistic and exhibiting society in the Soviet Union. It remained so until 1932, when it was dissolved, together with all the other associations, to give way to the single nationwide artists' union.

Before 1932, a storm of controversy was created by the conservative pictorial language of the *Akhrovtsy*, by the munificent patronage they secured from the trade unions and the army, as well as by their efforts to claim recognition as the official style of the Soviet state. Their maneuverings and the responses they aroused are fascinating to follow because they reflect the unresolved issues of Soviet cultural life in the 1920s: how to combine pluralism with state patronage, how to make possible the coexistence of elite and mass cultures.

The anthology under review does not represent these issues objectively. Its editors have personal reasons to plead a cause: V. Perel'man was one of the founders of AKhRR, and I. Gronskii, as editor of *Novyi mir*, was prominent in the 1930s among those who attempted to give Socialist Realism a narrow, chauvinist, and political interpretation. Nor was the attempt to gain for AKhRR recognition as proponents of the art which had the party's support limited to the 1920s: the more politically controlled the art scene became, the greater the attempt to distort the history of art