

passing through, came to listen. He was able to draw from visitors and students alike questions and comments that he skillfully wove into the fabric of his discourse, effectively welding the audience together as participants in his creative act of teaching. Whether speaking to a small group of friends in an informal academic circle, giving a regular lecture to students, or delivering a summary report on the current state of knowledge about some topic to a crammed auditorium at an international conference, he invariably held his audience spellbound. He always brought in the latest ideas, but even when he was presenting absolutely traditional views found in standard textbooks, his intense concern made every point seem dazzlingly new.

Jakobson believed that scholarly writing should be “maximally non-redundant” — every word, every phrase must be fully endowed with precise meaning finely calculated to communicate the complete and exact meaning required. He compressed into minimal space brilliant new theories and explanations of vast bodies of facts; not every reader was able to follow his drastically condensed argumentation. His 118-page *Remarques sur l'évolution phonologique du russe comparée à celle des autres langues slaves* of 1929 is at the same time a radically innovative view of language structure and concomitant theory of historical phonology and an exemplification of the new approach. Its remarkable new insights into Russian and Slavic linguistic history escaped many readers and became known and appreciated only very slowly.

Jakobson's major contributions to general linguistic theory were illustrated by Slavic examples. Students of Slavic linguistics thus found themselves learning the basic facts of Slavic languages in terms of entirely new theory, while non-Slavists found it valuable to learn Slavic in order to understand just what Jakobson was doing. His students were automatically in the vanguard of new ideas as linguists, Slavists, and analysts of the structural problems of linguistic art.

A list of Roman Jakobson's principal fields would include general phonology, all aspects of Russian, comparative and historical Slavic linguistics, metrics and poetic form, folklore and mythology (with special reference to epic), along with special areas such as Old Czech literature, the *Slovo o polku Igoreve*, and Paleo-Siberian languages. Many of his important contributions do not fit neatly into any of these slots. Five volumes of his *Selected Works* have appeared, and the last two are nearly ready for publication. His students — and their students — at scholarly institutions all over the world will long continue to ponder and elaborate Jakobsonian concepts of structure and patterning in language and other domains of human communication and social organization.

HORACE G. LUNT
Harvard University

ARCADIUS KAHAN, 1920–1982

Arcadius Kahan died on February 26, 1982 at the age of sixty-two. At the time of his death he was professor in the departments of economics and history and in the College of the University of Chicago. He came to the University of Chicago in 1955 as a research associate. His entire academic career was spent at Chicago, though he held visiting appointments at the London School of Economics, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Helsinki University, and École des Hautes Études.

He was born in Vilno, Poland and studied law and economics at the Stefan Batory University and at the Free University of Warsaw. His graduate work in economics was at Rutgers University, where he received his M.A. degree in 1954 and his Ph.D. in 1958.

Arcadius was the author of numerous articles about Soviet agriculture and the agricultures of Eastern Europe. He also contributed significantly to a variety of other subject matters, including the history of famines in Russia and the history of prices based

on Russian archives. He brought powerful insights to his studies of the economic history of the Jews. At the time of his death his major work, "The Economic History of Russia, 1869 to 1914," was almost complete, lacking only an introduction and minor editorial changes.

What follows is a highly personal statement that I prepared for delivery at the Memorial Service held in Breasted Hall of the University of Chicago on May 3, 1982.

While I have long since forgotten the name of the hotel in Washington where I first met Arcadius, I remember well the substance of that meeting more than twenty-seven years ago. At the time I was searching for someone to work with me on a project on Soviet agriculture. I needed an individual who could compensate for my weaknesses; I neither read nor spoke Russian and thus had limited access to many relevant materials. Because of his familiarity with almost everything international, I asked Bert Hoselitz if he had any suggestions. I learned only recently that Bert in turn asked Alexander Erlich for advice. It was that chain of events that brought Arcadius and me to a meeting in Washington.

At that time Arcadius was nearing the end of his Ph.D. program at Rutgers. While his English left something to be desired, something about this immigrant from Poland led me to suggest a relationship of mutual work that was to last for twenty-seven years. At the time I suspect neither of us thought our work together would last more than two or three years, but in his remarkable and quiet way Arcadius won his way onto the faculty of the university from his position as research associate in the department of economics. Arcadius never left the university, except for a number of visiting appointments. There were very few years out of the twenty-seven in which Arcadius and I were not engaged in some joint study of the Soviet Union or Eastern Europe. In the course of those years I requested his help innumerable times, and he never failed to respond generously and fully. And when he knew that I was engaged in writing about Soviet agriculture, he often brought to me, without having been asked, material that he thought would be helpful to me.

I believe it is not immodest of me to suggest that the collaboration we maintained for more than a quarter of a century was a fruitful and productive one. Our joint and separate work on Soviet agriculture came to have an important place in the literature, and both of us were frequently called upon to present our ideas at congressional hearings or to respond to questions from various departments of the federal government. I suspect that Arcadius could have accomplished most of what he did without the collaboration with me, but I know that the converse is not true.

But Arcadius had interests that were far more extensive than Soviet agriculture. In fact, if one were to be at all critical of the way Arcadius organized his life, it was that he had more interests and concerns than there was time to pursue. At any one time he would have three or four different types of work underway. His interests ranged from work on the trade in agricultural products between Russia and the rest of Europe in the eighteenth century, using data culled from the tsarist archives in Helsinki, to a study of the effects of the agro-industrial complexes in the Soviet Union upon the seasonal employment of agricultural workers and from an application of the theory of international trade to the circumstances of the Jews in the ghettos in Eastern Europe to work on the incidence of famine in Russia from the seventeenth to the early twentieth century. These and numerous other important topics beckoned him to use his time and effort to try to understand them better.

At the same time that he was pursuing his own work, he always encouraged his students and took great pride in their work. On numerous occasions he discussed with me the research his students were engaged in. In this sense, as well as in many others, he was a true teacher — he gained satisfaction from the accomplishments of those who chose to work with him.

Now at the end, let me return to the beginning of my relationship with Arcadius. What I saw in Arcadius at our first meeting was fully borne out in the years ahead. Although his command of the English language then left something to be desired, he impressed one as an intellectual in the best sense of the word. His breadth of interest, of knowledge and of understanding was evident even at our first meeting. My appreciation of the breadth and depth of his learning grew over the years. Far too few people are now reared in a setting in which as great an emphasis is given to the intensity of learning and the value of learning and of ideas as in the society and culture from which Arcadius came. The world is a poorer place because far fewer such settings exist than before 1940. There were some things about Arcadius that I could not put into words then or since or at this time. As significant as his accomplishments were in terms of his writing, his ideas and intellectual impact upon those with whom he was associated, one can only wonder how much more he might have accomplished if the cruel hand of fate had not diverted a decade of his life from learning, teaching, and the advancement of knowledge.

D. GALE JOHNSON
The University of Chicago