

the Spree, and the Hudson, at the confines of China, and in the remote places of Africa, Latin America, and Australia. The bibliography encompasses the works of giants (such as Nabokov), of luminaries of varied importance, and of quite a few less fortunate authors who sought refuge from the drab everyday life away from the homeland in the world of fantasy and print. The successful funding of this avalanche of print strikes one as an act of heroism on the part of the Russian emigration, especially if one remembers that even such a seemingly secure publication as the *Sovremennyya Zapiski* of Paris had to overcome substantial financial difficulties (see the reminiscences of its editor Mark Vishniak).

It is not surprising that many of Dr. Foster's entries belong to the category of literary criticism. The Russian emigration can be especially proud of the contributions made by its most distinguished members—to give only a few examples—to the structural analysis of *Slovo o polku Igoreve*, to the study of the literary heritage of Dostoevsky, Gogol, and Pushkin, and to the critical and unfettered evaluation of literary developments back home in the Soviet Union. But it is debatable whether the celebrated Dmytro Chyzhevsky, proud of his Ukrainian ancestry, would not frown at being listed among the Russian émigré savants.

The book is bound to become a vade mecum for everyone interested in the literary achievements of the Russian emigration. But to derive full benefit, the more than casual user will have to make some accommodations. Dr. Foster herself deemed it necessary to explain the somewhat unusual organization of her material in more than twenty pages of methodological introduction, which, indeed, every person interested in her bibliography will be well advised to study carefully. A work of such magnitude cannot be entirely free of errors, but these should not detract from the fundamental merits of this extremely useful research and reference aid.

SEGIUS YAKOBSON  
Library of Congress

LANGUAGE AND AREA STUDIES: EAST CENTRAL AND SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE, A SURVEY. Edited by *Charles Jelavich*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1969. xix, 483 pp. \$11.50.

EAST CENTRAL EUROPE: A GUIDE TO BASIC PUBLICATIONS. Edited, with a preface, by *Paul L. Horecky*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1970. xxv, 956 pp. \$27.50.

SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE: A GUIDE TO BASIC PUBLICATIONS. Edited, with a preface, by *Paul L. Horecky*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1970. xxiv, 755 pp. \$25.00.

When Nikita Khrushchev denounced Stalin in 1956 and consequently aided Sovietologists in penetrating Kremlin mysteries, the Joint Committee on Slavic Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council decided the moment opportune to assess the state of Russian studies in the United States. That assessment appeared in 1959—*American Teaching About Russia*, edited by Cyril E. Black and John M. Thompson (Indiana University Press). Six years passed before Paul L. Horecky's guide, *Russia and the Soviet Union: A Bibliographic Guide to Western-Language Publications* (University of Chicago Press), appeared to complement the former study (reviewed by Fritz Epstein, *Slavic*

*Review*, June 1966, pp. 370–72). In the same year (1965) the M.I.T. Press issued *The State of Soviet Studies* edited by Walter Z. Laqueur and Leopold Labedz (a reprint of two issues of *Survey*), which added an Atlantic Community dimension to Sovietology. Students of *Zwischeneuropa* lost little time in initiating analyses and publications about their neglected area. The Joint Committee, concerned with equal time, created the Subcommittee on East Central and Southeast European Studies (SECSES) “to examine the state of American scholarship on the countries and cultures [of the region between Germany and Russia] and to provide leadership in planning the stimulation and development of such studies.” The subcommittee’s chairman, Charles Jelavich, undertook the challenging task of determining which countries would be surveyed. At length the *cognoscenti* agreed upon Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, and European Turkey; this scope was not determined without considerable division among the group.

Perhaps more difficult was limiting the total range of the survey. This task was admirably accomplished by the Jelavich volume, which surveys graduate training and needs in the United States, analyzes the present state of undergraduate programs, and reveals the current “state of the art” in at least fifteen disciplines. The able contributors to the survey and their chapter assignments were Charles Jelavich (graduate training and research needs), Lyman Legters (undergraduate instruction), Charles and Barbara Jelavich (history), John C. Campbell (international relations), Paul E. Zinner (political science), Nicolas Spulber (economics), Paul Demeny (demography), George W. Hoffman (geography), Irwin T. Sanders (sociology), Conrad M. Arensberg (anthropology), Kazimierz Grzybowski (law), George L. Kline (philosophy), William E. Harkins (literature), Albert B. Lord and David E. Bynum (folklore), Miloš Velimirović (musicology), Edward Stankiewicz (linguistics), Howard I. Aronson (West and South Slavic languages), and Kostas Kazazis (non-Slavic languages). The final product is described by its editor as a consensus survey, because copies of each chapter were distributed to members of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies at its second annual meeting in Washington in April 1967, and suggested modifications were evaluated by the subcommittee prior to the editing of the final copy.

Superior in all respects to its very modest predecessors (Ornstein, Manning, Horna), the Jelavich survey nevertheless appears at a dismal time. Throughout the exciting accounts of what has been accomplished in area studies during the past quarter-century runs the urgent plea for more funding to fulfill the goals set by the contributors (and by Jelavich in his eloquent article, “East Central and Southeast European Studies in the United States,” *ACLS Newsletter*, 19, no. 7 [1968]: 1–11). The appearance of the article simultaneously with the accession of the present national administration was certainly a coincidence, but the timing was ominous for the disciplines involved. As is now so acutely realized within the profession, the probability of increased funding for activities urged in the survey (such as the creation of at least three academic institutes to encourage more study of the region, regular summer language institutes here and abroad, summer area studies institutes to which East European scholars could be invited, preparation of vital teaching aids and materials, cooperative projects with European scholars, increased academic exchanges, international conferences, graduate and faculty fellowships, surveys of library holdings, training of four hundred Ph.D.’s by the end of the 1970s) and more, very expensive projects requiring support which only the federal government can provide (if it could or would) appears most remote during this period of intellectual

austerity. Tragic cuts in educational appropriations are affecting most academic activities. Three years after the auspicious revelation of the Jelavich project, a mournful dirge was uttered by Marshall D. Shulman (director of Columbia University's Russian Institute), who called for courageous acceptance of retrenchment at the 1970 meeting of the AAASS in Columbus ("The Future of Soviet Studies in the United States," *Slavic Review*, September 1970, pp. 582-88). Whereas the Black and Thompson survey contributed to encouraging more Russian studies, the Jelavich volume may well become an historical review of what was once and "briefly Camelot."

Convincing evidence of the high quality and great quantity of published materials (and proof of munificent concern by the U.S. Office of Education, which partly subsidized the effort) is certainly apparent in the two bibliographies edited by Mr. Horecky to complement the Jelavich survey. The costly price of each volume may discourage private purchase (Horecky's 1965 bibliography cost a mere \$8.95), and these two indispensable references will not find their way into the private libraries of all students of the region. Nevertheless, the two weighty tomes will long be considered the most authoritative guides to "basic" (whatever that signifies) publications in all European languages. The first, *East Central Europe*, covers Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, and the Sorbians (Lusatians) and Polabians (the latter are treated to eleven pages listing fifty-two items!). About sixty specialists contributed approximately thirty-five hundred entries in European languages. The second, *Southeastern Europe*, covers Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Rumania, and Yugoslavia. More than fifty experts submitted sections containing about three thousand entries. A considerable number of the contributors are natives of the regions about which they write but which they no longer inhabit. The only evidence of collaboration with native scholars is credit extended to three Yugoslavs still resident in their homeland. Whether Horecky attempted to enlist more native cooperation is not clear, but such an effort would have enhanced intercultural understanding as well as improved exchanges of printed materials, especially since many items are in scant supply here and others are available only in overseas libraries. Jelavich appealed for such cooperation in the survey; a beginning could have been inspired by making the Horecky volumes an international endeavor.

No reviewer should be so rash as to attempt a critical analysis of almost seven thousand annotated entries, or recklessly search for sins of omission and commission. One perhaps inevitable yet striking phenomenon does emerge, however, from reading the two guides. A kind of *Book Review Digest* effect is created by the various reactions of the annotators to the same book. This arrangement could have been obviated if the annotators had examined the entries of all the other contributors (a project which would have probably delayed publication until the next decade). Occasionally, the annotators all agree on a book. For example, entries regarding *Rumania: Political Problems of an Agrarian State* (Yale University Press, 1951; Archon Books reprint, 1969), by Henry L. Roberts, former editor of the *Slavic Review*, almost coincide in their estimates: "Excellent account . . . of political and socioeconomic developments"; "excellent, detailed analysis of Romania's political and economic development"; and "a penetrating treatment of the ideology of Romania's prewar political parties. . . . The bibliography is invaluable, though outdated." Not much dispute can be aroused by these comments, because the book has been a standard for two decades.

But what can the curious student derive from the following annotations on

one book? "A remarkable survey by a leading British scholar with a personal and varied acquaintance with Eastern Europe that is scarcely matched in the West. Written under trying conditions during the Second World War, this is not a scholarly book from the standpoint of detailed coverage or apparatus. Its greatest merit lies precisely in its being an informative synthesis of the important strands and forces in East European history"; "Written toward the close of the Second World War . . . this is a valuable study of interwar developments . . . by a distinguished British historian. . . . The author is somewhat overcritical of the internal policies of the interwar governments . . . "; "highly critical—at times too harshly so—of the governments of the countries in question. . . . The lapse of years has hardly diminished its value." Additional entries become more critical. Few experts will fail to identify this book as Hugh Seton-Watson's *Eastern Europe Between the Wars, 1918–1945* (Cambridge, Eng., 1946; Harper & Row reprint, 1969). The annotated comments are symptomatic of what will be found in the two Horecky volumes. This observation is not intended to be critical; it is stated to alert those who contemplate study in the profession so that they will realize that academia in the United States is populated by free thinkers who need not submit to consensus views.

All *Zwischeneuropa* specialists should hail the diligent and dedicated professionals who made possible these irrefutable proofs of enlightened progress.

SHERMAN D. SPECTOR  
Russell Sage College

#### ILLUMINATED MANUSCRIPTS IN HUNGARY: XI–XVI CENTURIES.

By *Ilona Berkovits*. Translated by *Zsuzsanna Horn*. Revised by *Alick West*. New York and Washington: Praeger Publishers, 1969. 110 pp. 47 black and white plates. 45 color plates. \$27.50.

#### HISTORICAL MONUMENTS IN HUNGARY: RESTORATION AND PRESERVATION. By *Dezső Dercsényi*. Translated by *Elizabeth Hoch*. Budapest: Corvina, 1969. 98 pp. text. 136 black and white plates. 16 color plates. 235 Ft.

The Berkovits volume, by an acknowledged authority on medieval manuscripts and illuminations, presents a factual and extremely readable account of the manuscripts examined. The book is printed on large folio pages, on glossy paper, with forty-seven black and white illustrations in the text and forty-five color plates (mostly full-page illustrations), one of which is a fold-out plate at the back of the volume. An extensive bibliography is also included. The lists of illustrations are very useful and are presented in a scholarly fashion. The color plates themselves are remarkably well printed, using only the recto side of the pages, and they reproduce outstanding examples of various important manuscripts from the eleventh to the early sixteenth century as well as two printed "missals" of 1498 and 1511 and a "writing pattern book" (1562) produced for King Ferdinand.

The manuscripts are from three famous Hungarian libraries, the National Széchenyi Library and the University Library (both in Budapest) and the Cathedral Library (Esztergom). By a curious coincidence, this reviewer had the privilege of seeing and handling some of these codices when he visited Hungary in May 1968.