

concerning the productivity of a certain stress pattern in third declension nouns, are open to question. In some cases his approach leads to unexpected results. Thus certain masculine nouns having mobile stress are analyzed as being stressed on the ending in the nominative singular; *port*, for example, is derived from {port +  $\phi$ }.

In my opinion, this work does not demonstrate very convincingly that iconic relationships are of fundamental importance in the assignment of word stress in Russian. Nevertheless the treatment of stress presented here is entirely original and merits careful study by linguists interested in Slavic accentuation.

HERBERT S. COATS  
*University of Washington*

IGNACY KRASICKI. By *David J. Welsh*. Twayne's World Authors Series, 78. New York: Twayne, 1969. 150 pp.

To write a book in English on an eighteenth-century Polish writer who is practically unknown to the world and not very exciting to contemporary readers in his own country is not an easy task. David Welsh on the whole has done a creditable job in writing a factual, dependable account of the historical and literary background and in discussing the work of this Polish representative of the Enlightenment. Krasicki was familiar with the principal intellectual attitudes of the time and was a skillful, competent master of the period's main artistic genres and techniques. The fact that the account is somewhat dry is not entirely the author's fault.

The background chapter, "Poland's Augustan Age," gives the reader a good idea of the atmosphere of that time. So deeply is Welsh absorbed in the problems of Poland's "Augustan" era that he sometimes seems to think they were almost unique. Such is the case with his elaborate answer to a question on page 13, which, given the period and its intellectual and artistic inclinations (in Poland and elsewhere), should hardly be considered so "puzzling": "How could the essentially Christian and Catholic society of Stanislas Augustus reconcile its faith with the secular paganism of ancient Rome?"

In his presentation of Krasicki's works Welsh combines chronology with an arrangement by genre: mock epic, fable, satire, novel, comedy, epistolary form, and so forth. Authors of this kind of survey often limit their accounts to the major works. Yet to speak of Krasicki's "debut" as having occurred in 1775 with the completion of *Myszeidos* (*The Battle of Mice*) seems inappropriate. The author's actual debut was the publication of his fine short poem "O miłości ojczyzny" ("On Love of the Native Country") in *Zabawy przyjemne i pożyteczne* in 1775. In the poem, which is often quoted as the first example of "enlightened lyrics" in Poland, the author rationalizes the feeling of patriotism as something associated with the right kind of "mind." The poem was recited on various official and unofficial occasions and amusingly travestied by the author himself in his *Monachomachia*.

Welsh's analyses of Krasicki's main works are brief and illuminating. Of course, he has to resort to summaries, since these works are unavailable in English; but the summaries are not too heavy and are interwoven with appropriate stylistic comments. Probably a better case could have been made for Krasicki's first novel, *The Adventures of Nicolas Doświadczyński* (1776), as worthy of a more prominent

place in world literature. But then even this reviewer, who is familiar with David Welsh's great capacity as a translator, does not have the heart to appeal to him to translate Krasicki's *Adventures* into English.

ZBIGNIEW FOLEJEWSKI  
*University of British Columbia*

CHESHKO-RUSSKIE I SLOVATSKO-RUSSKIE LITERATURNYE OTNOSHENIIA (KONETS XVIII-NACHALO XX V.). Edited by Mikuláš Bakoš et al. Moscow: "Nauka," 1968. 475 pp. 1.80 rubles.

This book is a collection of twenty-seven articles written by Czech, Slovak, and Russian scholars for publication in July 1968. It arose "as a result of the friendly cooperation of Soviet and Czechoslovak literary scholars."

The title of the book is a misnomer, for although the rubric is supposedly stated in the title, no less than seven of the articles are devoted to problems of the theory of comparative literature in general. Only one article deals with the eighteenth century, while another substantial work concerns Dostoevsky in Slovak criticism to 1945. Furthermore, it would be misleading to assume that the book covers in any real fashion the reception of Czech and Slovak literature in Russia. Two of the twenty-seven articles ostensibly touch on this problem, but one is almost entirely concerned with why so little of Czechoslovak literature was known in eighteenth-century Russia, while the other explores Pavel A. Rovinsky's experiences in Bohemia and Moravia. Neither of these articles has any direct connection with Czech-Russian or Slovak-Russian literary relations. Both should have been included in a study on cultural relations.

For the student of comparative literary theory the articles by Jan Mukařovský, Mikuláš Bakoš, and Karel Krejčí are of special interest, although they cannot be said to shed much new light on the problems comparatists face. Mukařovský, one of the most prominent of the Czech structuralists, discusses the "dialectic" he observes in the relationship between national literatures and between literature and the other arts. He suggests that a study of non-European literatures and newly emergent national literatures may offer the possibility of discovering the basic "laws of literary life."

Some of the articles devoted to Czechoslovak-Russian literary ties are of marginal interest, to say the least. Among these is Ema Panovová's article on Juraj Maro.

If this particular collection has any value taken as a whole, it is to present to the Russian reading public a few glimpses of Czechoslovak-Russian cultural contacts in the nineteenth century. Some of the individual articles are important for the factual evidence they present, but as the editors of the book admit, the whole question of the relationships between the various Slavic literatures awaits systematic exposition. While the gaps left by this collection in the total picture of Czechoslovak-Russian literary relations are greater than the contributions, this volume may help to prepare the ground for a future study.

JACK V. HANEY  
*University of Washington*