

the first time, and it is very important for our understanding of the historical development of the nasal diphthongs in South Slavic and elsewhere.

The straight descriptive portions of this grammar, which comprise its largest part, are sound and successful: the facts are clearly presented and readily accessible. However, where the book departs from simple description, problems arise, and the presentation is often superficial and generally unsuccessful. This applies to almost all of the interpretive sections, which are devoted largely to historical considerations found in chapter 2, "Phonetics" (pp. 15–56), and the sample texts transcribed from informant interviews (pp. 143–62). The latter include Shklifov's views on the phonemic status of [ɣ] and [ɣ̃] (p. 22), the development of ѣ (p. 27), the development of ѣ̃ (pp. 27–28), the preserved nasal diphthongs (see above), \**tj/dj* (pp. 31–34), чрѣ/чръ (p. 34), and what he calls the metathesis of vowels and consonants (p. 46). What is troublesome here is not so much that one can easily find fault with Shklifov's interpretations or that they are generally superficial, ad hoc, and unsubstantiated, but rather that, in these cases, Shklifov appears to be bending over backwards to find "easterness" in the Kostur dialect and/or to repudiate "foreign" (read "Serbian") influences on the dialect. The suspicion of tendentiousness is unhappily encouraged by the subject matter of the sample texts. (Émigrés from Kostur, one might conclude, are largely preoccupied with their Bulgarian nationality and Greek persecution.) The historical relationship between Bulgarian and Serbian is a serious linguistic issue, as is the place of a dialect such as the Kostur dialect in the South Slavic linguistic world. Either one could be the subject of a separate monograph. Neither one, in my opinion, is served very well by Shklifov.

*Kosturskiiat govor* would be a much better piece of work had it been limited to description per se and had the sample texts been chosen differently. Ironically, in doing this, Shklifov would still have accomplished admirably (perhaps even better) the simple goal he set for himself in the introduction (p. 6): "to preserve it [the Kostur dialect] for future generations" against "the danger of its disappearance as a result of the mass emigration of its speakers and their assimilation."

ERNEST A. SCATTON

*State University of New York at Albany*

RUSSIAN REALIST ART: THE STATE AND SOCIETY: THE PEREDVIZHNIKI AND THEIR TRADITION. By *Elizabeth Valkenier*. Studies of the Russian Institute, Columbia University. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1977. xvi, 251 pp. Illus. \$7.50, paper.

Valkenier's book is the first monograph in English to describe the Realist school of painting in Russia during the second half of the nineteenth century, although Russian literature and music of that period have already received much scholarly attention in the West. This study, therefore, is a pioneering effort and it merits particular acknowledgment.

The author has divided her book into seven chapters, which are devoted to the general development of Russian Realist art from its formation in the 1850s and 1860s through its pinnacle of achievement in the 1870s and 1880s, and to its phase of change and degeneration from the 1890s onward. Valkenier places the movement within the context of its relationship to the 1917 Revolution and to the evolution of Socialist Realism in the late 1920s and early 1930s. She gives particular attention to the derivation of the Russian Realist idea by discussing the general effect on Russian art of the genre painters of the 1840s (principally Fedotov), the influence of the new generation of

social thinkers such as Chernyshevskii and Dobroliubov on artistic awareness (which was appreciable, though not transformative, as Valkenier indicates), the decline of the Imperial Academy of Fine Arts in the mid-nineteenth century, the revolt of the fourteen students of the Academy in 1863, and the establishment of the Artel and then of the Association of Traveling Art Exhibits (the *Peredvizhniki*) in 1870. The book includes much archival data on the aesthetic and ethical principles of the foremost participants in the Realist movement—Kramskoi, Miasoedov, Perov, Repin, Savrasov, Shishkin, Surikov, and so forth.

Valkenier is a professional historian rather than an art critic, and she has examined her subject extrinsically, not intrinsically. Her sociopolitical approach makes good sense in the framework of Russian Realist art since it was linked inextricably to the “accursed problems” of the time, and because, when judged with hindsight and in an international context, it offered little formal and aesthetic novelty. Valkenier pays attention to both the private and the public careers of the Realist artists, and we discover, perhaps not unexpectedly, that Kramskoi and Repin, for example, although of humble origins, attained respectable social positions at the height of their fame and, in spite of their early positions as “dissident” artists, acquired the outward trappings of success like any member of the establishment. Perhaps this is a minor point, but it is symptomatic of the refreshing and, at times, iconoclastic procedure followed by the author. After the conventional Soviet interpretations of Realist art from the 1930s until the 1960s, it is a pleasure to encounter a more objective and more sober evaluation and to see through some of the mythology and legend that have surrounded the *Peredvizhniki*.

Valkenier’s examination of the changes in critical perception and interpretation of Realism is a valuable component of the book, and it gives a new perspective on the entire question of late nineteenth-century Russian art. The quotations from statements by nineteenth- and twentieth-century critics such as Prakhov, Shchekotov, and Stasov demonstrate how the moral and political force of Realism expanded—to the detriment of its aesthetic potential. Familiarity with these writings helps the reader to understand the curious evolution of Realist painting in Russia—from its radical stance, through its sentimental, salon style and censure by the members of the twentieth-century avant-garde, to its revival as an exclusive artistic system for Soviet society in the 1930s. Furthermore, Valkenier also identifies certain changes in response to Realist art even within the brief span of Soviet art criticism. In this respect, a more thorough discussion of the current Soviet attitude toward (and trend away from) Realism would have been productive.

Addenda include an extensive bibliography and documentary information on the program and intentions of the Artel and the Association of Traveling Art Exhibits. Reproductions are numerous but are of poor quality and cannot be used for formal, compositional analysis. A more substantial debate of the Russian Realists’ connections with, and attitudes toward, their Western counterparts (for example, Repin and Manet, Serov and Menzel) should have been provided. But, no doubt, Valkenier will supply this kind of comparative discussion (and maintain her very high level of scholarship) in her next book on Fedotov, Perov, and Repin.

JOHN E. BOWLT  
*University of Texas, Austin*