ticular reflection in his works of two plots from the myth of Heracles and the myth of Dido, as well as a presentation of the circumstances surrounding the "battle of pamphlets" between Kochanowski and Desportes (secretary to Henry of Valois, who reigned briefly as king of Poland).

Weintraub's book, written over a period of years and treating a variety of topics, is not by any means an accidental collection of studies. Rather, it gives the impression of a thoughtful approach from various angles to both important general problems and particular details of the work of Kochanowski in order to ascertain the most essential qualities of his genius and his unusual personality. The studies are unified by a method in which the starting point for broad generalizations is based on scrupulous analysis of the text, of an expression (often of a single word), of the use of *topoi* or myths. The analyses are then projected on a comparative background in the broadest sense, on comparisons with phenomena contemporary to the poet and with their development throughout subsequent centuries.

SAMUEL FISZMAN
Indiana University

ANGOL EREDETŰ ELEMEK A MAGYAR SZÓKÉSZLETBEN. By *László Országh*. Nyelvtudományi értekezések, 93. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1977. 176 pp. 32 Ft., paper.

This is a painstaking study of English loan words in Hungarian by Professor Országh, whose name has become inextricably linked with English-Hungarian dictionaries, over a million of which are in print. The term "English" is used in a broad sense to include words from all over the English-speaking world in addition to such exotic words that became known in Europe and in Hungary via the British or Americans (for example, *tájfun, mahagóni*); it also includes semantic borrowings (such as *békebíró, füstköd*). Words are discussed chronologically (the earliest English word being *parlament* from 1612, and the latest, *kvark* from 1975), and the history of their usage in Hungarian is briefly sketched. Spelling variants are duly noted. The number of borrowings in the first period—up to the 1820s—is negligible, with less than a hundred words noted. In the past one hundred and fifty years, over nine hundred words became standard elements of the Hungarian lexicon, mainly as scientific or sport terms. Most of these words can also be found in nearly all of the major languages. In the nineteenth century, words traveled via France or Germany, but in the past twenty years they have almost exclusively been borrowed directly. Following the historical survey, a separate part of the volume is devoted to the general phonemic, morphemic, and semantic process of the assimilation of English words into Hungarian. In his conclusion, Professor Országh addresses himself to the purists who are concerned over the specter of "Hunglish." He claims and demonstrates that the number of English loan words in Hungarian is negligible—the language is able to absorb the influx of English words by assimilating them. The book is supplemented with an index of words, names, and conceptual categories, and a bibliography. It is a welcome addition to the reference shelves of lexicographers.

LÓRÁNT CZIGÁNY
London

THE MOST IMPORTANT ART: EAST EUROPEAN FILM AFTER 1945. By *Mira Liehm* and *Antonín J. Liehm*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977. viii, 467 pp. Illus. $23.50.

The book under review is written as if it were striving to become the Mirsky of East European film, that is, it pontificates without always backing up its claims. The difference is that Mirsky was good enough to get away with it, while the Liehms

are not really in that class. A typical example is found on page 314, where we read that in Stanislav Rostotsky's 1972 production, *A zori zdes' tikhie*, "the director's attitude towards this melancholy literary story of a woman's unit on the Soviet front turned it into a socialist-realist disaster." I saw the film and beg to differ. In my opinion, it is not overly tendentious as war films go and it is noteworthy for its acting, its human interest, its conveying of emotions, its incorporation of folkloric elements, and its moments of humor. The authors have every right to disagree, but their product suffers from being overly cramped. The subject they have chosen is huge, and they have tried to squeeze too much material into too little space, thereby precluding justification of their claims in every instance. A further comparison with Mirsky comes to mind: whereas the distinguished literary critic could handle English admirably, the Liehms and their translator, unfortunately, cannot. One has the distinct feeling when reading the book that it was written by a foreigner, as it indeed was. In their introduction, the Liehms tell us that they wrote the book in Czech and that it was translated into English by Káča Poláčková-Henley. The English renderings are irksome rather than disastrous, but they mar the final product and bother the careful reader nevertheless.

On the positive side, it must be said that the authors approach their subject with obvious enthusiasm. Although their claim to have seen 90 percent of all the films mentioned in the book may be dubious, one can easily believe that they have seen many of them and that they have done a good bit of research in an area about which little has been written in English. Western film critics habitually harbor the notion that East European film consisted of and died with Eisenstein; they would do well to have a look at this volume and discover otherwise. Eastern Europe has given us more than Pola Negri, and the rich detail of its heritage can be found in this compendium. The book may not be the final authority, but it is a good reference work for those who can afford it. The illustrations are well chosen throughout and make one want to view the films. An appendix on Socialist Realism and a short but useful bibliography follow the text.

EDGAR L. FROST
University of Alabama

LETTER

TO THE EDITOR:

I have read with interest the article "SOE and British Involvement in the Belgrade Coup d'État of March 1941" by David A. T. Stafford in the September 1977 issue of *Slavic Review*. May I be allowed to say that I was one of the organizers of the said coup d'état. Winston S. Churchill in his book *The Grand Alliance* mentions me as well as my brother Živan L. Knežević. I see from Dr. Stafford's article that "in the SOE's view, it was Knežević [myself] who took the initiative in fomenting a coup, and his were "the brains behind the conspiracy" (p. 412, footnote 48). This judgment no doubt has been taken from the June 24, 1941 report of the SOE's activities in Yugoslavia written by Colonels Taylor and Masterson, now found among the Dalton Papers at the London School of Economics and Political Science. Therefore, I feel all the more obliged to make some remarks about Dr. Stafford's article.

I concur heartily with his conclusion: that "whatever persuasion the British exercised, it is still clear that the initiative came from the Yugoslavs, and only by a stretch of the imagination can the British be said to have planned or directed the coup d'état" (p. 419).