

repeated phraseology from one performance of a song to the next<sup>12</sup>; on p. 174 the name Ćor Huso Husein, the legendary singer about whom Parry was told, is twice misspelled; on p. 192 she omits the Orthodox singer from her portrait of the Yugoslav *guslar*; and so forth throughout.

All in all, *Oral Poetry* may serve a purpose as a reference volume, but its materials are so various, unorganized, and synthetically grouped that even that function may be called into question. As a beginner's book it would be at best unfortunate, since it misleads the non-specialist in many ways, as I have pointed out. As a "companion" to the study of oral literature for the specialist, it fails completely, never getting beyond the superficialities of translated texts and secondhand reports to the real substance and beauty of the poetries involved. The time is gone when an introductory survey like that of the Chadwicks is possible, even if Finnegan controlled the languages and general knowledge which they had mastered. And, since the appearance of Lord's *The Singer of Tales*, with its brilliant arguments and organization and its measured, modest scope, there is no longer need for a critical introduction. We now need works of a truly comparative sort, studies which treat oral poetry in depth studies which prescribe limits and standards on themselves and which are not based on translations, secondhand assessments, and tautologies. Translation and serious dependence on the observations of others may be necessary in presenting an explanation, but they are death to its original formulation. The rapidly evolving field of oral literature studies deserves a finer, more sensitive scholarship.

Emory University  
Atlanta, Georgia

JOHN MILES FOLEY

David MacKenzie, *The Lion of Tashkent. The Career of General M.G. Cherniaev*, University of Georgia Press, 1974, pp. xx + 267.

Perhaps the most colorful of all the Russian Panslavs was General M. G. Cherniaev. His exploits first in Turkestan in the 1860s and then in the Balkans during the Serbo-Turkish War of 1876 made him a hero to Russian conservatives and an anathema to Russian liberal reforms. Professor MacKenzie has produced here the first biography in any language of this important figure.

Distinctly unsympathetic toward Cherniaev, MacKenzie traces out a military career marked consistently by false pride and excessive vanity. In both Turkestan and Serbia Cherniaev advanced what he thought was Russia's imperial responsibility, but underlying all his actions was a deeper drive for personal glory and recognition. Roughly the first third of the book describes Cherniaev's intrigues and clashes in Central Asia and it offers an interesting supplement to works by Seymour Becker and Richard Pierce on Russian expansion in Central Asia, which deal largely with high politics and institutional developments.

MacKenzie reserves his harshest appraisal of Cherniaev for the discussion of the Serbo-Turkish War of 1876. In general, in these chapters (8-11), MacKenzie elaborates on themes present in his earlier work, *The Serbs and Russian Panslavism, 1875-1878* (1967). Cherniaev

---

12. The percentage repetition of lines, parts of lines, and passages varies a great deal from singer to singer, performance to performance, and song to song. Generalizations about the Yugoslav analogy which are unsupported by original language work must be dismissed.

as editor of the newspaper *Russkii Mir* was an energetic spokesman for Russian participation in South Slav liberation, but the Russian government remained aloof. Actually MacKenzie does not entirely clarify the origin of the *Russkii Mir*'s position. At times he suggests that Cherniaev, as the editor, ought to be held responsible for views expressed in the newspaper even though many of the articles MacKenzie quotes do not indicate authorship. At other times a certain Pisarevskii is mentioned as the author of the newspaper's editorials (pp. 112, 114-5). In any case, Cherniaev's nationalistic views expressed in other places certainly correspond to the position of the *Russkii Mir*. Leaving the newspaper, Cherniaev without approval departed Russia for Belgrade where he encouraged the Serbs by his presence and public pronouncements to expect Russian aid. Thus, he helped push Serbia into a war for which he knew she was badly prepared. As commander of the Serbian army Cherniaev continually interfered in Serbian politics to advance his conservative principles and especially to enhance his own prestige. Finally, he left Serbia in defeat and self-pity, blaming others for his own military incompetence.

MacKenzie, however, develops new issues as well. In Chapter 12 he discusses the importance of Cherniaev's adventurism in producing the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78. He concludes, rather conventionally, that Cherniaev's presence in Serbia and its heated coverage in the liberal and conservative press in the end damaged the liberal and peace forces in Russia more than the conservative, and this helped push Alexander II into war with Turkey. Chapter 13 ("The Serbian Railway") investigates Cherniaev's attempts in the 1880s to procure a Serbian railway concession for a Russian firm so that Serbia would not turn to an Austrian company and away from the Slavic East. This chapter is a novel contribution to literature on Russian Pan Slavism and it ought to be of interest to anyone concerned with Balkan railway building.

Biographies of Russian conservatives such as Cherniaev are especially welcome since so much of western historical research on tsarist Russia focuses on the intelligentsia, marxism and the revolutionary movement. Taken together these biographical studies provide valuable insights into the maladies and strengths of the gentry at a time of rapid social and economic change. MacKenzie concludes that Cherniaev was significant because he embodied ideals prized by Russians and Slavs abroad and he sought to implement those ideals. He satisfied Russia's need for heroes (pp. 243-44). This reader for one, however, would have welcomed a deeper probing of Cherniaev's career as typical or atypical of the gentry as a whole in the late nineteenth century; for example, how typical for the gentry was Cherniaev's interest in railroad building?, how typical was his repeated shifting in and out of government service?

The research is based on archival materials in Yugoslavia, western Europe and the U.S.S.R., and the above observation aside, the book makes a solid contribution to our knowledge of Russian involvement in the Balkans in the 1870s.

Macalester College  
St. Paul, Minnesota

PETER WEISENSEL

David Granick, *Enterprise Guidance in Eastern Europe; A Comparison of Four Socialist Economies*, Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1975, pp. 505.

Four East European economic systems are covered in this survey; Romania, Yugoslavia, the German Democratic Republic, and Hungary. Although I shall focus on the first