

on *Barsuki*. She concludes with a minute and convincing analysis of the Semen-Anton encounter at the end of the novel, which, for all its merits, has nothing to do with Dostoevsky.

Many of the critics talk of Leonov's "artistic relationship with revolutionary reality," but they never care to examine exactly what this involves; a Soviet writer can at least hint, but Soviet critics can, apparently, only hint at a hint. Sometimes they misinterpret to the point of falsification. Thus the first critic in the book, V. P. Krylov, assumes that every time Leonov uses the word *russkii* in *Russkii les* he really means *sovetskii*, an equation that is made not by Leonov, but by Gratsiansky. A critic who cannot or will not see this point is not going to have much to say on the social relevance of the novel.

The critics of style and imagery are rather freer. V. G. Chebotareva's "Russkoe natsional'no-poeticheskoe nachalo v tvorchestve L. Leonova (*Russkii les*)" compares traditional Russian folklore about the forest with its refashioning by Leonov. N. P. Liulko in "Leonovskoe slovo (*Evgenia Ivanovna*)" starts with an impressive analysis of certain groups of words (e.g., *pyl'*, *pepel*, *prakh*) and their place in the overall design, but unfortunately later pages decline into a mere catalogue of literary devices. Both these critics, rather surprisingly, appear to find "laconism" a feature of Leonov's late style.

The Russians, especially K. S. Kurova, write in a style which betrays greater familiarity with Soviet bureaucratese than with literary Russian. It is a relief to get to the East European contributions and discover some independent minds and readable prose. The chapter on Leonov criticism in Yugoslavia is particularly interesting. The author, M. Babović, may seem to have devoted a disproportionate amount of space to his own contributions, but since he is one of the most illuminating of Leonov's critics, this is all to the good.

The volume ends with a bibliography of non-Soviet criticism of Leonov. The English-language section at least, is far from complete, omitting articles by Edmund Wilson, Victor Terras, and the present writer.

R. D. B. THOMSON  
University of Toronto

STANISLAVSKY'S PROTÉGÉ: EUGENE VAKHTANGOV. By *Ruben Simonov*. Translated and adapted by *Miriam Goldina*. New York: DBS Publications, 1969. x, 243 pp. \$6.95.

Ruben Simonov's title looks like an attempt to introduce a little-known name to the American public. In fact, it expresses Simonov's hope to legitimize Vakhtangov as the proper heir of Stanislavsky: "Vakhtangov led an irreconcilable fight with such pseudo followers of Stanislavsky, those preachers of naturalism. . . . In this respect, the art of Vakhtangov moves in the channel of the true development of the realistic traditions of Stanislavsky and Nemirovitch-Danchenko." Writing in Russia during the 1950s, Simonov fell naturally into polemics of this sort. He attempts no full biography of Vakhtangov. The Habimah Theater, for example, is hardly mentioned. Nor does Simonov's book compare with Nikolai Gorchakov's *Rezhisserskie uroki Vakhtangova* (Moscow, 1957, translated as *The Vakhtangov School of Stage Art*, Moscow, undated, approx. 1960) as a presentation of Vakhtangov at work. In contrast to Gorchakov's specific anecdotes, Simonov gives his readers long orations or tantalizing descriptive generalities: "Following Vakh-

tangov's instructions, I gave the actors exercises to develop the necessary scenic lightness, precision, rhythmicality, and ability to behave on stage to the accompaniment of music, the handling of stage costumes, etc." The subject is then dropped and we must turn to Gorchakov to learn what those exercises may have been.

The book is not a mere defense of Vakhtangov's orthodoxy. Simonov was very close to Vakhtangov, and was director of the Vakhtangov Theater for much longer than his master. In describing Vakhtangov's direction of Chekhov's *Wedding*, Maeterlinck's *Miracle of St. Anthony*, and Gozzi's *Turandot*, he gives some valuable reminiscences, a brief picture of the theater after its founder died, and a rather moving statement of his own credo as an actor and a director. A scholar seriously interested in Vakhtangov should begin with part 3, proceed to part 2, and ignore part 1 of this book. Miriam Goldina has cut large amounts of pretentious verbiage from many paragraphs, but the translation remains clumsy. Simonov was a good director, and I think a good man, but he wrote a weak book.

ROBERT L. BELKNAP  
Columbia University

RUSSIAN PHONETIC VARIANTS AND PHONOSTYLISTICS. By *Michael Shapiro*. University of California Publications in Linguistics, vol. 49. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968. x, 55 pp. \$2.00, paper.

ASPECTS OF RUSSIAN MORPHOLOGY: A SEMIOTIC INVESTIGATION. By *Michael Shapiro*. Cambridge, Mass.: Slavica Publishers, 1969. 62 pp. Paper.

In the first monograph Shapiro describes the old Moscow norm (OM), contemporary standard Russian (CSR), and two basic codes of the latter, the explicit code (EXC) and the elliptic code (ELC). He discusses in detail phonetic variants of essentially three types—those like [t, íx, ij]/[t, íxəj], which distinguish CSR from OM; those like [s, i<sup>ə</sup>č, ás]/[š, :ás], which distinguish EXC from ELC; and others like [Atl, ét]/[Atl, ót], which are not relevant to the main topic of this study. The monograph also contains an excursus on Czech phonostylistics. Transcriptions (containing several typographical errors!) of a short passage in OM, a neutral variety of CSR, EXC, and ELC are provided in an appendix. The problem of describing the relationship between EXC and ELC is a particularly interesting one, and Shapiro's informal but suggestive treatment of this problem should be of interest to all Slavists.

The notion of "iconic relationship" is crucial in Shapiro's second monograph. Related elements in language are *iconically* related if there is a factual similarity between them. For example, the maximally unmarked case is nominative, and the maximally unmarked vowel is *a*; therefore there is an iconic relationship between case and vowel in the nominative plural ending *a*. Shapiro believes that there is a tendency for iconic relationships to be established and maintained in language, and he cites the historical emergence of the nominative plural ending *a* in masculine nouns as an example of this tendency.

Shapiro discusses in detail several instances in which, in his view, word stress in Russian is iconically related to other parts of the grammar. His analyses are supported by data from the history of Russian and from contemporary standard and nonstandard Russian. I believe that some of these data, such as the past tense forms he cites for the verbs *plyt'* and *otplyt'*, and his assertions