

had undergone and the broken ribs he had suffered for defending a woman he once saw being beaten. Suddenly the obituary breaks off the account of Gorky and continues with a much longer discussion of Chaliapin's sense of Western music. Does this sudden change of subject corroborate the legend of Chaliapin's egotism? Was he incapable even in an obituary of writing about his friend without discoursing twice as long about himself? Rather the editors are at fault for having added with no identification an inexplicably truncated excerpt from "Mask and Soul" (Paris, 1932), another autobiographical work by Chaliapin. From the text of the obituary itself they have omitted Chaliapin's explicit disavowal of the two men's "early life together." True, Chaliapin describes their common experience in the full text of the Soviet anthology, from which we quoted initially. Did the editors suppress the passage so as not to detract from "togetherness"? On the contrary, it enhances the remarkable coincidence of the two lives.

When the dissimilarities begin, the translators have not faced moot questions like true scholars and critics. The only evaluation of Chaliapin's art occurs in an article by Stanislavsky, which is shortened from its greater length in the Soviet anthology. The impact of Chaliapin's communication of Russian music to the West, especially during Diaghilev's fabulous Paris seasons, is not assessed. Nor is Chaliapin's repertoire and achievement evaluated as a whole, though a partial list of his opera roles is given—a small percentage of the factual information included in the Soviet anthology. Even the illustrations of the American volume cannot for once compare with the greater wealth, especially of color reproductions, offered in the Soviet anthology. Finally, the question of Chaliapin's political commitment is never put. Yet his political role began to haunt him from the time of the "famous kneeling incident," which is referred to, though not fully explained, in the American introduction. The exchange of letters with Gorky relative to it is given out of order in the American translation, so that Gorky's curt request after the incident, "Do not come to see me," makes no sense until two letters later. Most serious of all, no judgment is ventured on the seeming opportunism with which Chaliapin returned to Russia after 1917, but then in 1922 remained in the West on tour without any clear decision apparently to emigrate.

In sum, once the translators found their research superseded by the publication of the Soviet anthology, they should have gone on to provide a truly critical introduction to their interesting collection. They have, however, produced, if not a scholarly, at least a popular anthology with more material on Chaliapin than has hitherto been available in English.

MARJORIE L. HOOVER
Oberlin College

THE RUSSIAN FOLK-TALE: SOME STRUCTURAL AND THEMATIC ASPECTS. By *Maria-Gabriele Wosien*. Slavistische Beiträge, vol. 41. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner, 1969. 237 pp. Paper.

This is one of the least meritorious studies on the Russian folk tale published for years. Its emphasis is on tales that include the journey of the hero—his departure, obtaining a miraculous helper, the battle with an adversary, attainment of the goal, and his return. However, the discussion of various problems of the magic tale contains little that has not been revealed by V. Ia. Propp and other folklorists.

Wosien makes numerous vague, queer, or outright erroneous statements. For

instance, she notes that the history of the folk tale "is perhaps as complex as that of the human race or as that of language" (p. 37). Curiously enough, she finds the narrative pattern of the folk tale also in stories about the American Wild West or "in the recurrent plot of the humble secretary who marries her boss" (p. 41). The dragon fight is, according to her, "intimately linked with the age-old motif of the search for the elixir of life" (p. 142). Her remark that "the hero has . . . to solve the riddle as a result of which they [his mother and his bride] were bound or imprisoned" (p. 91) is incomprehensible. The motif in which the hero warns his brothers that if blood let from his finger turns dark they will know that he is dead has, contrary to the author's assertion (p. 68), nothing to do with sworn brotherhood. *Simurg* is not "a bird well known in Russian chronicles" (p. 119), but (in the form of *Simar'gl*) an idol set up by Prince Vladimir. The derivation of *Buyan* from the name of the island *Rügen* (p. 53), considering the present state of linguistic science, is simply amusing. When the author speaks of combination of motifs (p. 40), she actually means tale-types. For her discussion of the supernatural figures, she could have found much important material in Jiří Polívka's *Slovanské pohádky* (1932).

One-fourth of the book (the appendix) is taken up by English translations of eight Russian folk tales. Their purpose is not clear, since the work is intended for readers who know Russian well. Throughout the study are many lengthy quotations in Russian, as well as a great number of individual Russian words, which break up the English text. Even such everyday words as "witch" and "mother-in-law" are given in Russian (p. 139).

It is inexcusable for a scholarly study not to give page numbers in footnote references to sources. This happens frequently. On one occasion (p. 13) the author has copied literally Roman Jakobson's translation of a passage (*Selected Writings*, 4 [1966]: 85–86), but in the footnote she refers to the Russian original of 1781 without mentioning Jakobson.

The work has many mistakes and misprints; a curious one is giving Uno Holmberg-Harva's first name regularly as U.N.O. (pp. 118, 234). The study does not contribute to our knowledge of the folk tale.

FELIX J. OINAS
Indiana University

A RUSSIAN CHURCH SLAVONIC KANONNIK (1331–1332): A COMPARATIVE TEXTUAL AND STRUCTURAL STUDY INCLUDING AN ANALYSIS OF THE RUSSIAN COMPUTUS (Scaliger 38B, Leyden University Library). By *A. H. van den Baar*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1968. 303 pp. 74 Dutch guilders.

Among the manuscripts belonging to the Joseph I. Scaliger collection, now housed in the University of Leiden library, there are nine in Russian Church Slavonic. A. H. van den Baar has prepared a study of one of these, a *Kanonnik*, which Sreznevsky dated "fourteenth century," and which van den Baar ingeniously shows was copied between March 31, 1331, and April 19, 1332.

The manuscript is defective. Van den Baar assumes that six folia of an original forty-eight have been lost. These presumably contained the calendar of saints for the months of March and April, missing from the extant manuscript, which would have occupied four folia, and two additional folia whose contents are unknown.