Another problem faced by the compiler of such a work concerns which expressions include since, practically speaking, there is no way to include everything without duplicating the whole lexicon. Thus, Borkowski lists 94 entries under glaz (there may be more for which glaz not the catchword), having noted in his introduction that the seventeen-volume Academy dictionary has 93 and Molotkov's Frazeologicheskii slovar' russkogo izazyka has 138. But he gives no indication of his method of selection.

However, there are apparently two major categories of exclusions. In the first place, expressions consisting of only one word are almost totally ignored (idët! "it's a deal" is an exception). For example, such ubiquitous expressions as blesk and its opposite, marazm, find no mention here. Secondly, there is no mention of swear words, although both bardak and bljad' mentioned in comments on style and notation. (Incidentally, the consistent use of style notes based on Academy sources is a laudable feature of the book.)

Borkowski's fastidiousness also shows up in his translations, which present a variety minor but aggravating problems. I suppose it is inevitable that a book on idioms published Great Britain would be at least partially aimed at speakers of British English, but it is disturbing not to understand translations rendered in one's own native tongue. As a corollary, verbatim translations are often missing, although they are the first to come to an American mind: krovaviaa baniia "blood bath," probiny balon "trial balloon," pakhmet bedoi "it seems like trouble," and teplichnyi tsvetok "hothouse plant/flower" are some examples. With regard fastidiousness, I will cite but one example: ne znat' ni aza is translated as "not to know from cheese," whereas in the language of my students (if not, perhaps, of my colleagues) the most appropriate translation undoubtedly is "not to know one's ass from one's elbow." My British students don't use such language, but I doubt it. In any event, compilers of idioms should not fear ostracism for using the style most appropriate to their task.

Despite these minor irritations, however, The Great Russian-English Dictionary of Idiom and Set Expressions is an extremely good work, more complete than its predecessors a surprisingly free of random typographical errors. Its cost (approx. $13.50 US) prohibits widespread classroom use, but should not deter serious students of Russian, who will find a wealth of useful information arranged with salutary precision. One might wish only that a subseq...

Although few will be able to afford it, American Slavists can take pride in this volume. The articles are genuine “Contributions”; many will evoke disagreement from specialists: none, I would guess, rejection. (I can judge those in Polish only from the resumes: Tyszynowski traces the legendary horseman-hero through several centuries of Polish literature; Intraub’s conclusions, even in summary, add an invaluable perspective to our comprehension of French intellectual history; Eekman’s demonstration of Lemontov’s role as Byron to many of the Slavs is interesting.)

I recommend unreservedly Edgerton’s profoundly brilliant article, Belknap’s lapidary citation to his unprecedented mosaic of Brothers Karamazov, Garrard’s scholarly and seminal thesis, Jackson’s reinterpretation (which almost convinces me), Debrenczy’s multifarious insights, Delaney’s fresh information and sardonic concision. Kodjak and Vickery offer impressive, convincing scholarship; I couple them because each article ends tantalizingly, just as is prepared for a major illumination of Pushkin’s prose or verse style. The studies by Semer and Lee also seem to “pair off”: the material is generally familiar to readers of Garshin and Tolstoi—the linkage being that Lee’s young Tolstoi can easily be subsumed under Semer’s broad and rather bland definition of “impressionism”. The contributions by Brown, Mersereau demand special comment. Brown provides an entrancingly Mozartian analysis of the material—until one reads his article elicits only restrained admiration and interest. Mersereau takes us to the major question confronting students of nineteenth-century Russian prose, the transition from Romanticism to Realism. Readers like myself, who see the word “normative” reach for a detective story, should persist. The norms are less intensely debateable (e.g., did Romanticism, whose founding work is Rousseau’s Emile, really neglect psychological character development?) Nevertheless the comments on the Abbe’s article are on the best of gifts: a coherent portrayal of a talented, neglected poet; a “new” old work of greatness.

Moving into recognizably but less familiar territory, I notice another contradictory ring: the articles by Erlich and Foster. The reasoned elegance of Erlich’s argumentation winces me that Poland did have her own Symbolist movement. As to countervail Erlich’s broadening, Foster meticulously narrows the definition of Surrealism, but the result is less persuasive. Breton may have spoken the first word on Surrealism, but why must we accord him last? (Indeed, movement from the literary works toward terminological-theoretical aspirins seems always more convincing than movement in the opposite direction.) Baer’s article parallels Delaney’s in its stress on turn-of-the-century neo-Romanticism. I found Berent even more Romantic than Baer did, since the Nietzschean citations have a distinctively Schillerian g. Czezewski’s encyclopaedic study is full of interesting quotations; I was disappointed only the lack of confrontation between the “Absurd” as existential protest and the “absurd” as otidian reality in Eastern Europe. Kadić is also encyclopaedic, making available in English a quarry of new information. Picchio and Pope give answers and ask questions which will repay specialists for decades; it is pleasant to report that for a non-specialist their contributions make comprehensible, often fascinating reading. TALVJ, that most remarkable Mrs. Binson, is accorded justice long overdue—another step, one hopes, in the appreciation (rather than devotion) of North American Slavists by their progeny. Finally, the folklore studies. In all its interest, Arant’s article seems to hedge too much on the question of influence and to reflect too much the question of intrinsic demands of the oral genre. Perkowski’s article should be retitled “...in North America”, since all the sources seem Canadian. The persistent scholar’s p here must be honored despite the depressingly low aesthetic level (at least in translation) of folklore uncovered.

One cannot but be struck by the Romantic emphasis in this volume. Could Zhukovskii in wildest fantasy have imagined hundreds of American scholars emplaining for Warsaw to cuss, of all things, his poor little “Mar’ina roshcha”? Could Rider Haggard have dreamed that

* In my copy pp. 64-74, approximately the second half of Brown’s fine essay, are missing. I hope that readers of this volume (which cost them or their libraries about $75.00!) will insist that Mouton supply the missing pages.