

for Bin Gorion.

However, the greatest achievement of the abridged and annotated edition is in the headnotes—the real contribution of Ben-Amos to this historical project. The annotations are based on the original notes of the author and the additions of his son, Emanuel. Originally they included mainly the direct sources from which the tales had been extracted. These references are also the basis for the present annotations. But the distance between them is as big as the distance of time that elapsed between the two editions. Ben-Amos made every scholarly effort to make these annotations the definitive, up-to-date, reference to the tales. They include accurate references to sources, variants, variants in international folklore, the background (historical and cultural) of every story, the up-to-date scholarship published on each tale, and the literary works that were inspired by them. The annotations are written in a clear and precise way, so that they can be understood by the interested general reader, and are indispensable for the scholar.

It seems to me that the publication of this annotated edition of the *Mimekor Yisrael* is a major contribution to the study of Jewish narratives of the middle ages, a field much neglected until lately. From now on it will be impossible to do any work in this field, or in Jewish folklore in general, without consulting this important book.

REFERENCES CITED:

GINZBERG, Louis

1909–1938 *The legends of the Jews*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication of America. 7 volumes.

1955 *On Jewish law and lore*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication of America.

GRUNWALD, Max, editor and major contributor

Mitteilungen zur jüdischen Volkskunde [Communications concerning Jewish folklore]. Since 1900.

Jahrbuch für jüdische Volkskunde [Yearbook of Jewish folklore]. Since 1923.

NOY, Dov

1982 The place of Sh. Anski in Jewish folkloristics. *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Folklore* 2: 94–107. (In Hebrew)

STEINSCHNEIDER, Moritz

1872 Über die Volksliteratur der Juden [On Jewish folk literature]. *Archiv für Literaturgeschichte* 2: 1–21.

Eli YASSIF

Ben-Gurion University

Beer Sheva, Israel

RUSSIA

HANSEN-LÖVE, AAGE A. *Der russische Symbolismus: System und Entfaltung der poetischen Motive. I. Band: Diabolischer Symbolismus* [Russian symbolism. System and development of poetic motifs. Diabolic symbolism]. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 544. Band. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1989. 561 pages. Bibliography, indices of names and of German and Russian concepts and motifs. Paper Sch490.—; ISBN 3–7001–1645–4. (In German)

Among the recent books on Russian Symbolism, this one deserves special attention. The reason is that it may soon become part of perhaps the most extensive and exhaustive study so far published on the paradigmatic function of poetic motifs in Russian Symbolism. That is, on condition that all five volumes of the entire study materialize, as the author promises in the Introduction. Be that as it may, the first volume sufficiently demonstrates to what extent the approach delineated in Hansen-Löve's work has been effective in approximating the objective of textual analysis. It also shows the author's immense erudition in handling a vast corpus of data collected meticulously from the writings of such major representatives of Russian Symbolism as Z. N. Gippius, A. Blok, and V. J. Brjusov, as well as from the marginal texts of such minor authors as P. A. Florenskij, K. M. Fofanov, et al.

All the examples cited in Hansen-Löve's study have been assorted into a series of ideational contexts, each of which stands for a paradigmatic motif characteristic of a particular stage of Russian Symbolism. Contrary to the commonly accepted periodization, Hansen-Löve postulates three stages in the development of the Russian Symbolist movement. These are then subdivided into two dialectically opposed phases whose dominant thematic paradigms become their paramount distinctive feature. Put in concrete terms, Hansen-Löve's periodization model resembles that of I. P. Smirnov (30-31) with the exception, however, that Hansen-Löve dwells on the paradigmatic aspect of the textual semiotic processes and examines the semantic function of the Symbolist text. What is usually described by more orthodox literary critics as the decadent period of Russian Symbolism is classified by Hansen-Löve as Symbolism I and partly as Symbolism II (the initial phase referred to as positive mythopoeics). The later, religious period encompasses Hansen-Löve's stage II (negative mythopoeics) and Symbolism III, which is called the grotesque-carnival stage (17). This periodization model is preceded by the period of Presymbolism and concluded by the period of Metasymbolism, forming the contextual framework of the concept proper.

Both in the Introduction as well as in Chapter One ("The Two Programs of the Early Symbolism and the Satanic Discourse"), the author makes every effort to get across the seminal idea of the semiotic approach employed in the complex analysis of the text. The explanation is at times so thorough that it occasionally slips into a level of technicality that exposes it to the danger of becoming incomprehensible, especially to those unfamiliar with the semiotic canon. However, the actual analysis of salient motifs typical of the satanic period of Symbolism makes for substantially "easier" reading. For one thing, many a student of Russian literature will find it a familiar territory to tread. The following eighteen chapters deal with such constituent motifs as duality, estrangement, passion, loneliness, ennui, emptiness, whispering, etc. They all are structured within the ideational contexts of aestheticism (SI/1) and pan-aestheticism (SI/2), combined in the union of satanic discourse ("der diabolische Diskurs"). Such key terms of the entire Modernist movement as paradox, juxtaposition, oxymoron, etc., are discussed with relation to the Symbolist poetic system. The examples quoted in Russian have been well chosen and adequately support the author's argument as to the polysemantic function of textual paradigms. The codification of symbols constituting satanic discourse is also treated in the study, and special attention is paid to the semantic shift, as it occurs across the boundaries of Symbolist ideational contexts.

Although Hansen-Löve's study does not aim at exploring the interpretational possibilities of the Symbolist text, thus leaving the pragmatic function outside his focus, it does inevitably enhance better understanding of Russian Symbolism by systematizing the hitherto dispersed concepts and notions of motifs and rhetoric devices. That is

why this first volume of the author's ambitious work is more than welcome as an excellent contribution to comparative studies of Symbolism, and, in particular, of its Russian version. It should also be noted that the book contains an extensive bibliography as well as name and subject indexes. The two subject indexes are provided in German and Russian, respectively, and include all the key concepts and motifs.

Joseph N. ROSTINSKY
Tōkai University
Tokyo

* * *

Corrigendum:

on page 258 of Vol. 50 (1) of *Asian Folklore Studies*, in her review of *Oral Epics in India* Paula Richman credited the introduction to Stuart H. Blackburn. This introduction was written, however, by both Stuart H. Blackburn and Joyce B. Flueckiger, and Dr Richman wishes to apologize for the oversight.