

searched, despite the initial impression that may be given by an introduction that relies a little too much on secondhand generalizations. Some caution is required, however, in reading Mr. Rice's account, because he is inclined to exaggerate both the originality of Briusov's contribution to Russian Symbolism and his impact on the wider literary scene of his day. To describe Briusov at any stage in his career as "the arbiter of Russian literary taste" is surely to overstate his importance, and in a later chapter Mr. Rice himself implicitly negates this description by pointing out how slowly Briusov achieved even a moderate degree of acceptance among his contemporaries. Likewise, the claim that Briusov's views placed him "in a position diametrically opposed to that of the other leading figures of Russian Symbolism" as early as 1899 is excessive, and, in any case, is contradicted a page later when "the real beginning of his break with Symbolism as it was then known" is set at 1905.

In fairness it should be noted that the short conclusion is more balanced and admits some reservations about Briusov's role. Ardis is to be congratulated on producing another inexpensive but attractive volume without typesetting, but attention should be drawn in this case to the typographical and editorial mistakes which are numerous enough to be irritating.

JAMES WEST
University of Washington

BARATYNSKII: A DICTIONARY OF THE RHYMES AND A CONCORDANCE TO THE POETRY. By *J. Thomas Shaw*. Wisconsin Slavic Publications, 3. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1975. xxxii, 434 pp. \$36.95. (Available from Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.)

BATIUSHKOV: A DICTIONARY OF THE RHYMES AND A CONCORDANCE TO THE POETRY. By *J. Thomas Shaw*. Wisconsin Slavic Publications, 2. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1975. xxxii, 358 pp. \$31.95. (Available from Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.)

While engaged in the project that led to *Pushkin's Rhymes: A Dictionary* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1974), Professor Shaw decided to obtain comparative data by also investigating the rhymes of Batiushkov and Baratynskii. The result is a pair of volumes which are similar in format to the book on Pushkin, although the latter does not contain a concordance. The introductory material is a little more extensive in *Pushkin's Rhymes* than in the two subsequent works, but otherwise—except for obvious differences in the statistics—the explanatory sections in all three books are virtually identical. Thus, once the would-be user has mastered the intricacies of deciphering the entries in any one of the volumes, he can turn to the other two with little difficulty.

Each rhyme dictionary actually consists of two parts: a lexicon of endwords and a concordance of rhymes. Since the methodology is the same, the strengths and weaknesses of the Batiushkov and the Baratynskii volumes are the same as for the Pushkin dictionary. The amount of information provided is admirable. The lexicon offers grammatical information about each endword and shows the frequency of its occurrence. The concordance not only lists each of the rhymes—arranged alphabetically by rhyming segments, with separate lists for masculine, feminine, and dactylic rhymes—but also manages to describe in detail the grammatical and syntactic characteristics of each endword. Furthermore, the arrangement of each entry makes it easy to spot such features as homonym and repetend rhymes, consonant enrichment, the size of rhyme sets, and differences in the rhyme elements of a set. There is a great deal of

discussion in the introduction about the grammar-syntax contrast within rhyme sets. While the figures that Shaw derives to illustrate this contrast may be useful for describing poems or groups of poems, the overall statistics for all three poets are remarkably similar. In other words, at the moment these figures do not appear to offer a useful criterion for comparing poets, and the effort that must have gone into deriving them may have cost more than the results are worth. In general, Professor Shaw's phonological analyses of rhyme segments are less complete than his grammatical and syntactic descriptions. More statistical tables would have been welcome; the data already on tape could have provided more information about enrichment and other topics mentioned in the introduction. Nevertheless, whatever refinements these dictionaries may lack, they still provide the most thorough descriptions of individual poets' rhymes currently available and will be a useful reference tool for all those interested in nineteenth-century Russian poetry.

The concordances that appear in the Batiushkov and Baratynskii volumes were by-products of Professor Shaw's main effort. Most of the drudgery in preparing a concordance by computer involves putting all the lines of poetry on tape. Since this process had already been completed for the rhyme dictionaries, it was only necessary to write special computer programs in order to create concordances as well. However, the products are not quite on the level of other computerized concordances which have appeared during the past few years. In particular, Demetrius Koubourlis's *A Concordance to the Poems of Osip Mandelstam* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974), the first computerized concordance for a Russian poet, includes a number of features that would have been useful here as well. For example, Shaw's concordances lack an index that would list words in their order of frequency and thus enable the user to tell at a glance how often a given form appears. Yet a word frequency index might not have been completely reliable; Professor Shaw makes careful efforts to distinguish among homonyms in his lexicon of endwords, but no such attempt was made in the concordances. Consequently, not only are various grammatical forms that happen to be spelled the same way grouped together (a problem in all concordances produced to date), but even words with completely different meanings are lumped under the same entry. Thus, in the Batiushkov concordance under "*vina*" one may find both the nominative singular form of *vina* and the genitive singular of *vino*; under "*sel'*" appear both the masculine past tense of *ses'* and the genitive plural of *selo*; and the entries under "*o*" include its use both as a preposition and as an interjection. Nor is any effort made to bring together grammatical forms of a single word that may be spelled quite differently. *Ves'* is a good distance from *vse*, *pit'* a good distance from *p'et*. In addition, these concordances do not quote the individual occurrences of the more common function words. Shaw mentions ten such words in his explanatory notes, but at least three others (*k*, *na*, and *no*) are treated in the same way. Finally, the need to refer to an index in order to identify the source of each line does not make the volumes all that convenient to use (although both this arrangement and the omission of quotations for function words could be justified on the basis of saving space).

Despite some reservations regarding format and methodology, these rhyme dictionaries and concordances can only be welcomed, for they provide future students of Russian verse with tools that were never before available. Now that many of the necessary programs have been developed, it is not unreasonable to hope that computers will be able to help create even more complete aids to the study of other nineteenth and twentieth-century Russian poets.

BARRY P. SCHERR
Dartmouth College