

REVIEWS

* MAUREEN NEWMAN and PHILIP STRATFORD. *Bibliography of Canadian Books in Translation: French to English and English to French – Bibliographie de livres canadiens traduits de l'anglais au français et du français à l'anglais*. Ottawa: HRCC/CCRH 1975. Pp vi, 57

La publication de cette bibliographie viendra combler des attentes au moment où les éditeurs multiplient les œuvres en traduction et où les traducteurs littéraires s'associent. La plus exhaustive parue à ce jour, la bibliographie contient au delà de 435 titres d'œuvres traduites dans l'une ou l'autre des deux langues officielles, et touchant au domaine du roman, de la poésie, du théâtre, des lettres, rapports et relations de voyage, des essais. S'ajoutent un index des noms d'auteurs et de traducteurs. Nous devons ce travail à Maureen Newman et à Philip Stratford grâce au concours financier prêté par le Conseil Canadien de Recherches sur les Humanités à la demande de son comité de traduction.

La préface révélatrice de Philip Stratford dégage un certain nombre de constatations fort intéressantes: le nombre des traductions est en nette progression dans les dernières années; l'essai et le roman tiennent la première place tandis que la poésie et le théâtre intéressent moins les éditeurs; pour le roman, 70% des traductions en français ont été publiées en France et le tiers des traductions en anglais, en Angleterre et aux États-Unis; la moitié des romans traduits en français tournent autour de 3 auteurs et le tiers des romans traduits en anglais autour de 4 auteurs; le nombre de traductions vers l'anglais double celui des traductions faites vers le français.

Si nous relevons avec plaisir que les éditeurs canadiens s'intéressent de plus en plus à la traduction des œuvres grâce au concours des organismes gouvernementaux, nous prenons conscience aussi que plusieurs domaines restent peu couverts: la poésie et le théâtre, l'histoire, les études critiques de littérature, sans parler d'autres secteurs des lettres et des sciences humaines pour lesquels les relevés restent à faire. On devra élargir le choix des romanciers, rééditer plus de cent œuvres déjà épuisées, et enfin accroître le nombre des traducteurs littéraires au Canada. Nous pouvons souhaiter la continuation de la bibliographie dans le domaine des lettres et des sciences

humaines. Le Conseil Canadien de Recherches sur les Humanités s'occupe de la distribution de la brochure. (ANTOINE SIROIS, UNIVERSITÉ DE SHERBROOKE)

*GEORGE O. SCHANZER. *Russian Literature in the Hispanic World: A Bibliography*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1972. Pp xlvii, 312. \$20.00

The bibliography deals with the rather unorthodox subject of Hispano-Slavic literary relations – an area of study that has commanded little attention on the part of the scholarly community. The fundamentally different cultural and historical milieus in which the Slavic and Hispanic literatures have developed may be at the root of the relative lack of interest in their relations. Fortunately, such pioneering bibliographical works as the one produced by Professor Schanzer should be conducive to further research and study in this area.

The wealth of completely new data and the resulting conclusions about Russian literature in Spanish-speaking countries as to the genres, authors, titles, intermediaries in trans-cultural relations, geographical centres of diffusion, etc., brought to light by a methodical compilation of more than 3,700 items, is indeed remarkable. Thus, the overall picture presented by the bibliography has led to a revision of some of the conventional notions about the dissemination of Russian literature in the Hispanic world. We learn, for example, that Russian literature entered Spain half a century earlier than assumed (ie, in 1838) with a Spanish adaptation of G. Derzhavin's poem 'Ode to the Supreme Being', that the focal points of initial diffusion were Barcelona and Santiago de Chile, rather than Madrid and Buenos Aires, that besides the novel, Russian short stories and theatre also enjoyed a large measure of popularity in the Hispanic world, and that pre-Soviet Russian literature, particularly the classics, still command the attention of the Hispanic reader.

A look at the table of contents of this work, reveals another of its distinguishing traits. Out of a total of 312 pages comprising the bibliography, 82 pages consist of twelve different indices with pertinent statistical data, providing useful and enlightening material as to the centers of diffusion, chronology, publishers, etc. The 'Introduction: Literary Observations,' the 'Description of the Bibliography,' the bibliographical listings, and the 'Indices' constitute a well-integrated whole, fully covering the various aspects of the dissemination of Russian literature in the Hispanic world. In particular the indices qualitatively enhance the value of this work as a research tool. Yet, this is not its only merit. What is equally important are the questions of strict literary nature that are also posed by the data compiled in this bibliography. One such question worthy of consideration is the

impact of the Russian literary diffusion on the host Hispanic literatures.

Notwithstanding the merits of Professor Schanzer's bibliography, it only covers one of the two major aspects of Hispano-Russian literary relations. The other equally important aspect is the diffusion of Hispanic literatures in Russia. Although there are some bibliographies (both Russian and Western) that deal with this subject, they are either limited to only one author or incomplete. At present we lack a comprehensive bibliography on this aspect of Hispano-Slavic literary relations that would complement Professor Schanzer's effort.

The above, however, does not exhaust the possibilities of bibliographic and literary research into Hispano-Slavic literary relations. The diffusion of Hispanic literatures (Spanish literature in particular) in countries such as Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Ukraine, and their impact on the host literatures, has so far been insufficiently probed.

It should go without saying that Professor Schanzer's bibliography will function as a kind of 'measuring stick' to evaluate all further bibliographical endeavours in this field for a long time to come. (OLEH ROMANYSCHYN, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO)

*JEAN-PIERRE ANDREOLI-DE VILLERS. *Futurism and the Arts: A Bibliography 1959-73*. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1973. Pp xiv, 190. \$17.50

The spectacular growth of literature on Futurism during the last two decades is the best evidence of the importance of this once badly mistreated and still often misunderstood movement and its role in the development of modern art. What is emerging from the steadily increasing body of book-length studies, anthologies, essays, encyclopedia entries, bibliographies, and catalogues of retrospective art exhibits is a gradually sharpening picture of Futurism as a genuinely 'global' phenomenon. While the prevailing common notion has been that Futurism was limited to Italy and possibly Russia, it is now recognized that not only in many countries on the European continent but also in the Western hemisphere, especially in Latin America, the futurist ideas played a significant role in the development of a number of avant-garde movements.

The idea of preparing an international bibliography of Futurism was an excellent one. Since the publication of the first volume of *Archivi del futurismo* (1958) and the works by Falqui (1959) and Carrieri (1961) there has not been much general bibliographical research done, although quite a few works on individual countries, artists, and problems contain valuable bibliographical information.

The fact that Andreoli-de Villers's work contains almost two thousand

entries (1835 to be exact) speaks for itself. The work covers a period of fifteen years, which means that, on the average, more than a hundred items directly or indirectly bearing on Futurism were published every year. The bibliography is quite inclusive, in that it covers not only items specifically concerning Futurism but also materials on other avant-garde phenomena which, in one way or another, were related to the Futurist ideas. The bibliography is partly (though not quite consistently) annotated, which greatly helps in determining the relative value of individual items with respect to the various aspects of investigation.

The only serious criticism must be on the point of completeness. Had a word of caution, such as 'tentative,' been included either in the title or in the introduction, this objection would have been averted. As it is, the bibliography is assumed to have full coverage. What makes things worse is that the publisher flatly states that the bibliography 'lists everything of importance that has been published on Futurism.' Unfortunately, too many 'things of importance' are missing to warrant such a claim. The author mentions in his introduction the possible importance of Futurism 'in Poland, in Hungary, in the USA, and especially in Germany,' but there is hardly any trace in the bibliography of even the existence of Futurism not only in 'exotic' places such as Czechoslovakia or Slovenia but also in countries like Portugal and the entire Latin-American world, where there is ample bibliographical evidence of the significant role of the movement. There are also serious gaps concerning Italian and Russian Futurism. The largest number of omissions in Andreoli-de Villers's book is for the year 1973. This is easy to understand, knowing how slowly European publications reach the North American continent. But it would have been better, perhaps, not to include 1973 at all than to cover it so fragmentarily.

It is not too surprising that practically no Slavic materials are included (except for a few items on Russian and Polish Futurism). The author was aware of this. Somehow, in the world of learning sources in Slavic languages are still considered exotic and either entirely excluded from bibliographies or covered in a haphazard way. This latter 'solution' is actually most unfortunate, since it gives the impression that what is included is all that matters.

In reviewing the Baldensperger-Friederich *Bibliography of Comparative Literature* (YCGI (1968) 105-7), I made the following observation, which I would like to quote here, not in application to the bibliography under review, but as a general comment on the need for more international co-operation in our work: 'Frankly speaking, the prediction by Sigmund Skard that this bibliography will serve generations to come does not make one very happy. I hope instead for the realization of Skard's suggestion for a truly international co-operative venture which would result in a fully comprehensive bibliography ... Only a world-wide cooperation can lead to satisfactory results.'

My own bibliographical notes on Futurism, which make no claim to completeness, include about fifty book-length items and about fifty articles on Futurism published during the period 1959–73 that are lacking in the bibliography under review. Many of them are of prime importance. On the other hand, it is only fair to state that the bibliography contains quite a few sources of interest and importance which I did not have in my notes. I hope the following list of sources for the years 1959–73, directly or indirectly related to Futurism, will be of some use as a supplement to the valuable volume by Andreoli-de Villers. He deserves credit and thanks for his work. (ZBIGNIEW FOLEJEWSKI, UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA)

WESTERN SOURCES

- Azevedo Filho. Leodegário Amarante, de. *Poetas do modernismo*. Edição comemorativa de cinquentenário da semana de arte moderna. Brasília 1972
- Barooshian, V.D. 'Russian Futurism in the Late 1920's: Literature of Fact.' *Slavic and East European Journal* 15 (1971) 38–46
- Borum, Poul. *Poetisk modernisme; en kritisk introduktion*. København 1966
- Calvesi, Maurizio. 'Il futurismo russo.' *Arte Moderna* 5, No 1 (1967)
- Coelho, Jacinto do Prado. 'Futurismo.' *Dicionário de literatura*. Porto 1969, pp 355–56
- Cordié, Carlo. 'Appunti su Gian Pietro Lucini e la Russia.' *Filologia e letteratura* 14 (1968) 31–88
- Eruli, B. 'Preistoria francese del futurismo.' *Rivista di letterature moderne e comparate* 23 (1970) 245–90
- Folejewski, Zbigniew. 'Novelty and Convention in the Poetics of Russian Futurism: Alliteration.' *Actes du IV^e Congrès de l'Association Internationale de Littérature Comparée*. The Hague 1966, pp. 1301–16
- Franca, Jose Augusto. 'No Cinquentário do Futurismo em Portugal.' *Coloquio* No 44 (1967)
- Galhoz, Maria Aliete Dore, ed. and Intro. *Orpheu*. Lisbon 1971
- Goretti, Maria. *Poesia della macchina: Saggio di filosofia del futurismo*. 2d ed., Bologne 1962; 1st ed., Rome 1932
- Holthusen, H.E. *Avantgardismus und die Zukunft der modernen Kunst*. Munich 1964
- Humesky, Assya. *Majakovskij and his Neologisms*. New York 1964
- Jensen, Kjeld Bjørnager. 'Marinetti in Russia 1910, 1912, 1913, 1914?' *Scandoslavica* 15 (1969) 21–6
- 'War Marinetti 1910 in Russland?' *Die Welt der Slaven* 17 (1972) 298–307
- Kozloff, Max. *Cubism/Futurism*. New York [1973]
- Lista, Giovanni, ed. *Futurisme: Manifestes, proclamations, documents* [Lausanne, 1974]

- Lombardo, D.M. 'Futurismo italiano e futurismo russo.' Diss. Catania 1973
- Mackworth, Cecily. *Guillaume Apollinaire and the Cubist Life*. London 1961
- Markov, Vladimir. 'Predislavie.' Pp. v-xii in V.V. Khlebnikov, *Sobranie sochineniy* 1. Munich 1968 (Nachdruck der Ausgabe Moskau 1928-40)
- Martins, Wilson. *The Modernist Idea: A Critical Survey of Brazilian Writing in the Twentieth Century*, trans. J.E. Tomlins. New York 1970
- Michelis, Cesare G. de. *Il futurismo italiano in Russia 1909-1929*. Bari 1973
- Mignani, Rigo. 'Futurism.' *Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. Princeton 1963, p 303
- Morosini, D. 'Balla: Futurismo e oggettività.' *Paese Sera*, 8 January 1972
- 'L'uomo robot de Depero.' *Paese Sera* 28 October 1972
- Nazzaro, Gian Battista. 'Il credo estetico di Boccioni.' *Altri termini* No 1, 1972
- *Introduzione al futurismo*. Naples 1973
- Neves, João Alves, das. *O movimento futurista em Portugal*. Porto 1966
- Nist, John. *The Modernist Movement in Brazil*. Austin, Texas 1967
- Patetta, Luciano. *L'architettura in Italia 1919-1943*. Milan 1972
- Pomorska, Kristina. 'Teoreticheskie vzglyady russkikh futuristov.' *Annali. Istituto Univ. Orientale, Sezione Slava*. Naples 1967, 10, 119-35
- Ripellino, A.M. 'Futurismo.' *Almanacco letterario Bompiani*. Milan 1960
- Scholz, F. 'Die Anfänge des russischen Futurismus.' *Poetica* 2 (1968) 477-500
- Simões, João Gaspar. *História do movimento do 'Presença': Seguida de uma antologia*. Coimbra 1958
- Steegmüller, Francis. *Apollinaire: Poet Among the Painters*. New York 1963
- Stepanov, N. 'Tvorchestvo Velimira Khlebnikova.' Preface to V.V. Khlebnikov, *Sobranie sochineniy* 1. Munich 1968, pp. 31-64
- Strada, V. *Tradizione e rivoluzione nella letteratura russa*. Turin 1969
- Tallarico, L. *Verifica del futurismo*. Rome 1970
- Terapyano, Yuri. 'Bor'ba za slovo.' *Russkaya mysl'* 29 October 1971
- Tessari, Roberto. *Il mito della macchina*. Milan 1973
- Tynyanov, Yuri. 'O Khlebnikove.' Pp. 17-30 in V.V. Khlebnikov, *Sobranie sochineniy* 1. Munich 1968
- Vallier, Dora. 'L'art abstrait en Russie: Ses origines. Ses premières manifestations, 1910-1917.' *Cahiers d'art* 35 (1960) 259-85
- Verdone, Mario. *Prosa e critica futurista*. Milan 1973
- Weisstein, Ulrich, ed. *Expressionism as an International Literary Phenomenon*. Paris-Budapest 1973
- Whyte, I.B. 'The Lesson of the Futurist Utopia.' *Architecture East Midland* No 37 (1971)

SLAVIC SOURCES

- Bakoš, Mikuláš. *Avantgarda 38: Štúdie, články, dokumenty*. Bratislava 1969
- Brzękowski, Jan. *Wyobraźnia wyzwolona: Szkice i wspomnienia*. Warsaw [1966]
- Budagova, Lyudmila N., ed. *Razvitie zarubezhnykh slavyanskikh literatur v xx veke*. Moscow 1964
- Choma, Vasil. *Od futurizmu k literatúre faktu*. Bratislava 1972
- Choma, Vasil. 'Z problemov ruskeho futurizmu.' *Slavica Slovaca* No 4 (1969) 321–34
- Chvatík, Květoslav and Zdeněk Prešat, eds. *Poetismus*. Prague 1967
- Denisova, I. V. *Revolutsiya – lyubov: Novatorskie printsipy posledneyabr'skoy liriki Mayakovskogo*. Moscow 1963
- Kalinin, N. I. *Slovo i vremya: O poeticheskom masterstve Mayakovskogo*. Moscow 1967
- Lam, Andrzej. *Polska awangarda poetyka: Programy lat, 1917–1923*. Krakow 1969
- Mathauser, Zdeněk. *Umění poezie: Vladimír Majakovskij a jeho doba*. Prague 1964
- Nevrlí, Mikuláš. 'Tri fazy ukraïnskogo futurizmu.' *Slavica Slovaca*, No 4 (1969) 344–55
- Nezval, Vítězslav. *Manifesty, eseje, a kritické projevy k poetismu (1921–1930)*. Dilo xxiv. Prague 1967
- Peterajova, L. *Futurismus*. Bratislava 1966
- Pertsov, V. C. *Mayakovsky i problemy novatorstva*. Moscow 1965
- Pollakówna, J. *Formiści*. Wrocław 1972
- Prokop, Jan. *Z przemian w literaturze polskiej lat 1907–1917*. Wrocław 1970
- Rod'ko, Mykola D. *Ukrainska poeziya pershykh pozhovtnevykh rokiv*. Kiev 1971
- Selivanovsky, A. 'Futurizm.' A. Selivanovsky *V literaturnykh boyakh*. Moscow 1959
- Slawiński, Janusz. *Koncepcja języka poetyckiego awangardy krakowskiej*. Wrocław 1965
- Stern, Antaol. *Poezja zbuntowana: Szkice; wspomnienia*. Warsaw 1964
- Strohsová, Eva. *Zrození moderní*. Prague 1963
- Zadravec, Franc, ed. *Pot skozi noč: Izbor iz slovenske futuristične in ekspresjonistične lirike*. Ljubljana 1966

*A. ILIĆ, V. JANKOVIĆ, L. JEREMIĆ, J. LUKIĆ, T. MARSENIĆ, B. RADOVIĆ, V. RIBNIKAR, D. NEDELJKOVIĆ, eds *Zbornik radova nastavnika i studenata. Povo-dom stogodišnjice osnivanja i dvadesetgodišnjice obnavljanja katedre za svetsku književnost na beogradskom univerzitetu*. Beograd 1975. Pp 558

Usually published to celebrate a scientific discovery, to express recognition for a great scholar's work, or to commemorate anniversaries of important cultural institutions, jubilee publications do not always equal the lofty intentions of their editors. They sometimes tend to be rather heavy reading, at once tiring and boring; by their very exclusiveness, they often blur the social importance of the anniversary which is to be celebrated.

All these negative characteristics of this genre were happily avoided by the editors of the *Zbornik radova nastavnika i studenata*, published recently on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of the founding, and the twentieth anniversary of the re-institution, of the Department of Comparative Literature at the University of Belgrade. They have succeeded by taking two proper measures. First, they have included contributions from both an older generation of professors, who still remember the past, and from the younger generation, among whom some are still studying but at the same time trying to take their first steps in independent investigation of literature. Second, the authors represent all walks of life: some of them work in cultural and educational institutions such as radio, television, and libraries, others on editorial boards of journals, in schools, and so on. The oldest participant was born in 1898, the youngest in 1954. The result is a book of unusual life and colour that represents various artistic and critical approaches to literature. It reveals not only the achievements of a scholarly institution but also its manifold ties with the everyday life of the country.

The beginnings of comparative literary studies in Serbia go as far back as the first half of the nineteenth century. The first lecturer of literature in Belgrade High School, which became the nucleus of the future University of Belgrade, was Matija Ban (1818–1903). He was succeeded by Aleksa Vukmanović (1826–1859), and later by the well-known philologist Djura Daničić (1825–1882), who proposed the separation of literature into an independent department. This happened in the beginning of the seventies. In 1873 Svetomir Nikolajević was appointed assistant professor at Belgrade High School, in charge of general history of literature 'with special responsibilities for the literature of the Slavs and the Serbs.' This date is considered to be, as Ivo Tartalja indicated in his article, 'A Survey of the History of the Department of General Literature and Literary Theory,' the beginning of the Department of Comparative Literature in Belgrade. Three years later, in 1876, a further division of the Department was made: Stojan Novaković became professor of Slavic and Serbian literature, whereas Svetomir Nikolajević continued as the head of a separate Department of General Literature, with the task of acquainting students with the highest achievements of world literature and literary theory. After his long tenure (he remained in this position for twenty years), the chair went to a talented scholar and great critic, Bogdan Popović. For over forty years he was the leading and most prominent personality in the Department and its activities,

exercising a strong influence on Serbian literary life. For longer or shorter periods of time, other scholars associated themselves with the Department, among them Milan Bogdanović, the Russian émigré E.V. Aničkov, Vinko Vitezica, M.T. Ibrovac, V. Čajkanović, M. Marković, Vido Latković, and others.

As a result of the second world war the normal activity of the Department was disrupted for some time. In the beginning of the fifties, however, after Vojislav Djurić became professor and chairman of the General Literature Department, the future development of Comparative Studies took on a more positive direction. Without his effort, talent, and organizational skills, there would probably be no Department of Comparative Literature at the University of Belgrade today. The Department gained its full strength after Raško Dimitrijević was offered a readership in general literature and a number of promising young scholars were appointed to specialize in different language groups and aspects of literary theory.

During its long history, professors who taught in the Department displayed various methodological approaches in their research. This jubilee book relates directly to these traditions: it reflects both methodological and thematic richness in its investigation, typical of contemporary Serbian and Yugoslavian scholarship. The included contributions represent both the views of critics and the creative efforts of prose-writers and poets. The book is divided into three sections: literary scholarship and criticism, prose, and poetry. I would like to concentrate my attention on the first.

The criticism section contains articles devoted to theory of literature, to modern Yugoslavian and world literature, folklore and comparative literature *sensu stricto*. Specially valuable are articles written by D. Nedeljković, N. Bogdanović, M. Vlajčić, Y. Delić, M.V. Dimić, Gv. Eror, J. Janićijević, V. Janković, L. Jeremić, I. Kovačević, Z. Konstantinović, V. Kostić, D. Kiš, V. Ognjenović, M.B. Pavlović, M. Trenković, P. Džadžić. It is disappointing, to say the least, that among the names of 109 contributors we cannot find some of the most distinguished scholars associated with the Department, such as Zoran Gavrilović, Nikola Milošević, and Vladeta Košutić.

The article by Gv. Eror is an attempt to present hermeneutics as a means of literary interpretation. The author shows convincingly the degree to which such interpretation is conditioned by both subjective and objective factors and rightly notes that to achieve a full 'exactness' in the explanation of a literary work of art is impossible. Especially timely seems to be Eror's remark that one should avoid an automatic classification of 'un-communicative' works of the avant-garde type as masterpieces of literature, and in so doing to downgrade those works which are relatively easier to understand.

As far as oral literature is concerned, our attention is drawn by Milan

Dimić's erudite article on the motif of the angel wounded in the place of a popular hero. This article leaves no doubt how valuable comparative studies are in the area of folklore. Through the applications of this method a seemingly unimportant motif takes on an international significance.

In the 'literary criticism' section, we should mention articles written by Sl. Glišić on 'Peščanik' Danila Kiša and J. Delić's 'Parodija spasenja' (on the novel *The Parody of Salvation* by R. Bratić). Delić notes that in contemporary written literature there takes place a process of 'depatetizacija' or devaluation of the pathos of the traditional hero of the popular epic.

Lack of space does not permit a discussion of all those contributions which deserve more attention. I should mention, however, that some of the articles or certain parts of them create reservations. It is difficult, for example, to agree with the opinion of the author who says that the lack of interest in comparative studies in Eastern Europe is caused mainly by the fear of being accused of cosmopolitanism. One should rather say that, irrespective of political climate, in some of these countries the idea of comparative studies never caught the imagination of scholars. On the contrary, in such countries as Poland (in spite of its very close and manifold cultural ties with France) they were always treated with reservation. In none of the many universities of this country has there ever been established a Department of Comparative Literature. In general, we can venture the opinion that those countries which developed comparative studies (France, Yugoslavia, USA) lagged behind in developing strong interests in theory of literature (contemporary French structuralism is nothing more than making up for arrears), and, vice versa, countries which have long traditions of developing literary theory (Russia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Germany) have never gained a comprehensive understanding of Comparative Literature.

Irrespective of polemics, which can of course be engaged in with some authors, all critical works published in this volume are of high intellectual quality. Almost all articles either bring up new problems or contribute something new to the solution of old questions. In spite of the hundred years of tradition, there is nothing of the atmosphere of a jubilee in this book, and everything points to the intellectual vitality and modernity of the Serbian cultural *milieu*. Therefore, we can congratulate our colleagues from Belgrade on a job well done and a very interesting publication. One can only regret, finally, that some of the articles included in this volume, as well as some previous publications produced by the members of the Department, are not available in English translation (E. MOŽEJKO, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*HUBERT F. BABINSKI. *The Mazeppa Legend in European Romanticism*. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1974. Pp 164

Professor Babinski has amassed and commented upon an impressive number of primary and secondary sources in his study of the life of Mazeppa and its reflection in romanticist art, primarily in literature but also in painting and music. Inasmuch as there was little solid historical data on Mazeppa available to the European romantics, particularly those in Western Europe, Babinski justifiably concentrates on the manifestation in art of this Ukrainian hetman, whom nationalist fervour may or may not have caused to betray Peter the Great by joining forces with Sweden's Charles XII against Russia. Of particular interest to Western writers were the circumstances of Mazeppa's banishment from the court of the Polish king Jan Kazimierz, where he served as a page. Allegedly, a Polish nobleman discovered Mazeppa's tryst with his wife and as punishment ordered Mazeppa to be stripped and carried off bound to a wild horse. The tumultuous and nearly fatal ride that carried Mazeppa to the Ukraine and ultimately to the hetmanship there understandably appealed to the romantic imagination. Babinski carefully traces the literary genesis of this legend, the major landmarks of which were: Voltaire's *Histoire de Charles XII* (1731), André Dorville's novel *Mémoires d'Azéma* (1764), Byron's narrative poem *Mazeppa* (1819), V. Hugo's poem of the same name from *Les Orientales* (1828), K.F. Ryleev's narrative poem *Voinarovskij* (1825), A.S. Pushkin's narrative poem *Poltava* (1829), and J. Słowacki's drama *Mazeppa* (1839). For the literary works as such, Babinski provides detailed analyses and interpretations directed both at understanding them intrinsically and relating them to each other where influence seems possible. In this respect Byron's *Mazeppa* was especially instrumental in popularizing the Mazeppa legend, whose peregrinations in sophisticated literature took a West-East direction. Babinski's monograph brings out an important distinction between the western and eastern treatment of Mazeppa. In the West Mazeppa was not associated with indigenous nationalist political issues. Thus, in addition to providing good story material, Mazeppa's adventures were used to raise questions of a more universal nature: in Byron the failings of personal ambitions and, according to Babinski's interpretation, a symbolic 'death-in-life experience' based on Mazeppa's agonizing ride; in Hugo the same ride, as analogous to the artist bound to the fury of inspiration. On the other hand, in the East, especially in Russia, Mazeppa was closely linked to nationalist historico-political concerns, such as Ryleev's use of Mazeppa to elicit favour for nationalist political movements in the struggle for freedom from autocratic rule and Pushkin's *demythifying* and vilifying of Mazeppa in favour of the grandeur of the conquering Peter. Słowacki's treatment of Mazeppa, although linked by implication to the national plight of Poland vis-à-vis the Russian Empire, is interpreted by Babinski as an essentially metaphorical treatment of the Mazeppa theme, which transcends geographical boundaries.

Taken in the large, Babinski's reading and linking of the works devoted to Mazeppa is usually sound. However, his close intrinsic analyses of the works (including possible interconnections between them) is frequently undermined by a failure to convince the reader that he is at ease with the various languages of the originals. This is particularly so in his working with French materials, where errors in citations are especially frequent. Hugo's 'Tout vacille et se peint de couleurs inconnues' becomes: 'Tour voile et se peint de couleurs inconnues'; Ernest Fouinet's letter to Hugo: 'Cela va droit à vous et je crois que vous admirerez' becomes 'Cela va droit à vous et je vous crois vous admirerez.' In just over six lines of this quotation there are ten errors, some of which make it meaningless or give it a different sense. In another instance Vigny is alleged to be referring to the composition and character of Byron when in fact he is referring to *Mazeppa* as a 'composition' and to its character. Babinski builds his reading of the French into an early example of an analogy between the poet's work (e.g. *Mazeppa*) and an artist's life, one that was to culminate in *Mazeppa* as a paradigm of the artist. While Hugo's rendition of *Mazeppa*'s experience allows this, the ties of antecedence with Vigny's statements are without foundation. Babinski's rendering of Russian likewise raises many doubts. 'Votšče v dušax kipit otvaga: / Nastal konec sviatoj bor'be' is rendered: 'There, in the soul, boils audacity. / Terror came with the struggle' (emphasis added); cf. 'No on dostoin ukorizny': 'No example will renew him' (emphasis added); cf. 'No nezavisimoy deržavoj / Ukrainje byt' uže pora: / I znamja vol'nosti krovavoj / Ja podymaju na Petra': 'But the independent power / Of the Ukraine will be a terrible time: / The bloody banner of freedom / I shall lift over Peter' (emphasis added), and so on. Such careless reading and/or rendering of the originals make suspect the close analyses and intertextual connections which Babinski offers his readers. Thus the merit of his study lies chiefly in carefully tracing the *Mazeppa* legend in western culture and in generally relating the main literary works embodying it to its national and international background. (ROBERT BUSCH, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*WILLIAM H. NEW *Among Worlds, An Introduction to Modern Commonwealth and South African Fiction*. Erin, Ontario: Press Porcupine 1975. Pp 287. \$6.95

About a hundred miles southeast of Montreal lies the little town of North Hatley, a human settlement dwarfed by the natural grandeur of Lake Massawippi and its surrounding mountains. In what is now called a resort area, North Hatley comes alive in the summer when the absentee rich, owners of sumptuous mansions strewn around the lake in secluded areas, come north after hibernating in Florida or the Caribbean. Otherwise, the

town belongs to the poor families of English and French Canadian settlers who eke out a living from the soil and the tourist trade, and it is also shared by an intellectual colony of full-time and seasonal residents.

In North Hatley, the idle rich do not mix with those outside their class; the English and French coexist in respective solitude; the intellectuals and artists among the English know that French counterparts are in their midst, but that is about the extent of their contact. Yet it is from within such a small, enclosed world that many analyses, interpretations, and celebrations of Canadian and Quebec societies have been produced – in privacy and relative isolation. North Hatley, William H. New would claim, is the Canadian microcosm: a metaphor that speaks to the ingrained regionalism of the Canadian experience.

Early in a chapter discussing Canadian literature, New quotes Robert Kroetsch and Robertson Davies to the effect that Canadian society might best be defined as Jungian rather than Freudian (p 107). Contrary to the United States, which is structured on the tension of opposites constantly struggling toward defeat of one of the polarities, Canada is a fusion of opposites, a frame where contraries run into one another. Robertson Davies goes on to add that Canada is 'a country torn between a very northern, rather extraordinary, mystical spirit which it fears and its desire to present itself to the world as a Scotch banker' (ibid.). New concludes his forays into the inner and outer wilderness of the Canadian psyche with the assertion that it is 'the visionary persuasion that constitutes the Canadian soul' (p 125). Two key concepts sustain the Canadian critical canon: the private and the visionary.

Canadian criticism comes of age in the sixties, when social and cultural changes coalesce in a willingness to affirm the privacy and isolation of a Canada no longer beguiled by imperial attachment to England but aware of the need to invent itself, to come to grips with its identity – all of which bespeaking the need for vision, the necessity to plumb uncharted depths. It should come as no surprise, therefore, that a number of critics of Canadian literature have argued out of the privacy of their regional roots interpretations of Canadian literature that are innovative, provocative, and strongly reliant on vision. D.G. Jones's *Butterfly on Rock* (1970) surveys the imaginary landscape and finds a people befuddled by self-imposed restrictions, yet in search of a promised land; looking for a Moses, yet holding him in distrust. Ronald Sutherland's *Second Image* (1971) is an affirmation of the organicity of the mythical experience informing the two cultures of Canada. Margaret Atwood's *Survival* (1972) demonstrates that the unwillingness on the part of Canadians to accept consciously their Jungian heritage has led to psychic and cultural divisions whose emblem is victimization. John Moss's *Patterns of Isolation* (1974), on the other hand, speaks to the variegated experiences of exile framing the Canadian imagination. My own *Caliban*

Without Prospero (1974) yokes the seemingly extreme opposites of Quebec and Black literature for the purpose of exploring the commonality of cultures born in exile, asserting themselves against a European colonial background. And now W.H. New extends the landscape of the recent critical tradition to embrace the totality of the imaginative experience of the former colonies of Great Britain. It is as if New had asked himself a logical follow-up question: if indeed exile, isolation, fragmentation, the search for a homeland, are endemic concerns in Canadian literature, what of the literatures of the West Indies, Africa, Australia, South Asia, and New Zealand?

In New Zealand literature (as in Canadian), 'place has become a metaphor for intellectual isolation' (p 2); in East and West Africa, 'community dislocation' (p 2) characterizes the social experience; in South Africa, 'race rather than place creates the two worlds' (p 2); in the West Indies, 'the sense of wholesale transplantation and the accompanying sense of exile' (p 2) are the dominant cultural experiences; in Australia, the 'barren desert becomes an image of spatialized time' (p 3); while in India there reigns the 'laconic traditional acceptance of paradox' (p 3). The landscape surveyed by W.H. New is vast, encompassing no less than four continents, yet 'the recurrent structural patterns in each literature ... offer an approach to the underlying cultural sensibilities' (p 2) denoting fragmentation, uneasiness, isolation, dissociations of one kind or another.

W.H. New's approach is obviously Jungian in his constant weighing of polarities. It is derivative of the mythopœic tradition in Canadian criticism inspired by Northrop Frye's teachings. It is peculiarly Canadian in the pursuit of vision that illuminates a wide body of literatures, while it glosses over historical and social diversities. Considering the range of the material covered (I could think only of one major omission in the West Indian chapter: Claude McKay), the sheer scope of the enterprise, and the avowed aim, which is to introduce works of fiction from the Commonwealth and South Africa, *Among Worlds* stands in my estimation as a unique achievement. New's is the first attempt at comprehensive coverage of fiction from these countries. The design is comparative, but the method is not, not only because works in a single language are studied, but also because the questions raised and the attitudes surveyed are not compared in terms of cultural and historical differences. Basically, this is textual analysis. One might quibble about the designation 'Commonwealth,' an all-too-obvious political term with an implicit underlayer of cultural imperialism, much like its French counterpart, 'Francophonie.' New's style is on the whole clear, concise, and well-wrought, although the repetition of the term 'irony' achieves the level of incantation at times and occasionally the excessive use of cadence works at the expense of understanding: 'Because that possession implicitly involves change, and because the results of change are unpredictable, accepting the

uncertainty principle becomes a means by which to work out the creative anarchy that Canadian art, in order adequately to reflect the Canadian dichotomy between appearance and imagination, has recurrently engaged itself with' (p 127). But the book's value for an academic audience is enhanced by an exhaustive bibliography of primary and secondary material covering some forty-five pages. The addition of an index allowing the reader to refer rapidly to the authors and works discussed is further proof of the book's usefulness as a tool for research.

The single major drawback in *Among Worlds* might well lie in the approach: the extension of a Canadian critical tradition into a range of Commonwealth literatures. And this might reveal the possible limitations of a critical stance and of the culture from which it grows, its modes of response in terms of region and sense of self. That is to say, the very private and visionary posture of Canadian culture – much as we find it operating in North Hatley – may well be rooted in an ingrained indifference, bordering on complacency, to the existence of social and economic inequities against which, in fact, the garrison walls of privacy are built. Nowhere in New's book is literature discussed in the context of socioeconomic realities, which might well account for the patterns of isolation and fragmentation so insistently discussed in the literatures in question. Rather, there is the tacit understanding that those realities exist, but in worlds quite divorced from the realm of literature. Neither critic nor reader need explore these worlds, since there is an assumption that both share in a complicity of privacy. No doubt there is a residual British sense of decorum at work in New's approach. But to fault him for that is insufficient, if the intent is to refer to idiosyncrasy. New's approach in fact only reflects a basic constituent of Canadian culture. Only when the mental and social garrisons Northrop Frye speaks of are levelled off – and not reinforced in fear of Third World immigration – will the literary critical stance move from the private to the public, the cerebral to the visceral, the regional to the communal. (MAX DORSINVILLE, MCGILL UNIVERSITY)