

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

CESHKO-RUSSKIE I SLOVATSKO-RUSSKIE LITERATURNYE OTNOSHENIYA (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