

problems cannot be solved through the theoretical approach alone, and he proposes to find the solution through a systematic analysis of Crnjanski's novels *Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću*, *Seobe I*, and *Seobe II*.

An elaborate analysis of Crnjanski's three novels occupies the second part of the book (pp. 63–244). It provides a keen insight into the creative methods and artistic qualities of Crnjanski's prose, yet its relevance to the solutions discussed in the first part of the book is overstated. In the third part (pp. 245–59) the author presents his conclusions, supposedly derived from his analysis of Crnjanski's novels. A number of his conclusions are merely generalizations, which may explain why the problems that in the first part of the study seemed complicated and difficult to solve now appear rather simple and easy to untangle. An example of such generalized and arbitrary conclusions is the following: "Serious literary prose is the true abode of metaphysical qualities. In this fact one should, in our opinion, look for the solution of the seemingly insoluble problem of the monistic and pluralistic interpretation of literature" (p. 255).

The author has not solved the theoretical problems discussed in his study, but his work represents a significant contribution to literary scholarship, because it offers an excellent analysis of Crnjanski's three novels and presents an elaborate review of the previous abortive attempts to solve the problem of the function and nature of literature.

MATEJA MATEJČIĆ
The Ohio State University

HRVATSKI LATINISTI. 2 vols. Edited by *Veljko Gortan* and *Vladimir Vratović*. Zagreb: "Zora," "Matica hrvatska," 1969–70. Vol. 1: 742 pp. Vol. 2: 1024 pp.

In the famous collection *Pet stoljeća hrvatske književnosti* (*Five Centuries of Croatian Literature*), which is being published jointly by "Zora" and "Matica hrvatska," the Croatian Latinists are now included. The first volume covers those who wrote during the Renaissance, and the second contains the work of those Latinists who excelled from the seventeenth until the beginning of the nineteenth century.

During the Croatian national revival—the so-called Illyrian movement in the middle of the last century—a great interest was shown in the Croatian literary and cultural past, but this interest focused almost exclusively on vernacular works. The well-known collection *Stari pisci hrvatski* (*Old Croatian Writers*) was devoted to authors who wrote in Croatian. The scholars and literary critics paid attention to those who had chosen to write in their mother tongue, and hardly mentioned the others.

Toward the end of the last century, however, a certain concern was manifested for those authors who wrote also in Latin or only in Latin. After World War II the Yugoslav Academy (Zagreb) began to publish systematically the Croatian Latinists. The first volume contained the lecture that Vinko Pribojević delivered in his native town of Hvar in 1525 about the origins and history of the Slavs (*De origine successibusque Slavorum*, Venice, 1532, and Zagreb, 1951). The later volumes included the poems (*Elegiae et epigrammata*, Zagreb, 1951) of Ianus Pannonius (Ivan Česmički), who worked at the court of Matthias Corvinus, and the elegies of Juraj Šižgorić from Šibenik, who lamented the Turkish onslaught on his countrymen (*Elegiae et carmina*, Venice, 1477, and Zagreb, 1966). The last significant

baroque poet, Ignjat Đurđević, was also published in this collection (*Poetici lusius varii*, Zagreb, 1956). Šižgorić, Pannonius, and Đurđević were translated by Nikola Šop, whose translations excel not only in exactness but also in the craftsmanship of a poet who knew how to render the spirit of the original. Veljko Gortan translated Pribojević and Krčelić, whose *Annuae* (Zagreb, 1901, 1952) are an important source of information about the history of northern Croatia in the middle of the eighteenth century. Vitezica translated Vlačić's (Matthias Flacius Illyricus) *Catalogus testium veritatis* (Basel, 1556, and Zagreb, 1960), in which this reformer from Istria mentioned all those who in the past had objected to the papal authority.

These six authors are now represented by judicious excerpts. The work of thirty-one other writers is also included, most of it translated for the first time. Besides Šop's poetic and Gortan's and Vratović's prose translations, there are superb renderings by Professors Ivšić, Torbarina, and Katičić. Tomislav Ladan, a versatile "humanist" (who recently translated into his mother tongue the difficult *Cantos* of Ezra Pound), proves to be a first-rate connoisseur of Latin and Croatian poetry.

The founder of Croatian literature usually is considered to be Marko Marulić, from Split, who wrote in Croatian an epic poem entitled *Judith* (1501); he was better known in his time for his numerous Latin works, and particularly for his epos *Davidias*, which was recently discovered in Turin and published in two successive editions (1954, 1957).

In this voluminous anthology of Croatian Latinists, Marulić is preceded by his seniors, Šižgorić and Česmički, both from the fifteenth century. Šižgorić extolled the native folk songs and lamented the devastation and deportation of youth caused by the Turkish hordes. Česmički (Pannonius), who accompanied Matthias Corvinus on his military expeditions, presented an eyewitness narrative of the Turkish conquest of Bosnia in 1463. Both poets were aware of the Turkish military discipline and western disunity, and their poems express despair.

These Latin poets from northern Dalmatia and Pannonia were more conscious of their Croatian allegiance than were those from the republic of Dubrovnik, who enjoyed relative freedom. While Karlo Pucić depicted the irresistible beauty of Agnes (who tormented him more than sickness), Ilija Crijević (the famous Aelius Lampridius Cervinus) evoked his enchantment and disappointment with the seductive but unfaithful Flavia. Jakov Bunić, on the contrary, was more cerebral than emotional, and in his epic poems he celebrated first Hercules's descent to the Inferno, and then Christ himself (1526, nine years before Girolamo Vida's *Christias*).

During the baroque period the poets who wrote in Croatian (for example, Ivan Gundulić, Ivan Bunić, and Junije Palmotić) were superior to those who continued to write in Latin. But at the end of the seventeenth century a poet appeared—Ignjat Đurđević—who left finely chiseled verses in both languages. He was also the first to compile biobibliographical information about the prominent men of letters from Dubrovnik (*Vitae illustrium Rhacusinorum*). He was followed in this labor by Saro Crijević, whose *Bibliotheca Ragusina* is a primary source for the Dubrovnik writers who lived until the middle of the eighteenth century.

Among the Croatian Latinists, the historians occupy a worthy position. Although Pribojević with his lecture on the origin of the Slavs and Orbini with his book on the vastness and might of Slavdom (1601) are better known, there were other Croatians of much greater critical acumen who left works without which it

would be hard today to grasp the ancient Croatian and Balkan history. Thus, Marulić translated into Latin the early medieval Croatian chronicle; Ludovik Crijević (Tubero) wrote the commentary on his time (*Commentaria de temporibus suis*, from the death of Matthias Corvinus to that of Leo X), in which he depicted the courage and moral correctness prevailing among the Turks and the depravity of the Roman Curia (particularly of Alexander VI); and Antun Vrančić, in his various letters to illustrious contemporaries and in his travelogues to Constantinople, gave accurate descriptions of Suleiman the Great's conquests of several strongholds in central Europe. The greatest historian was Ivan Lučić, from Trogir, whose fundamental book *De regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae* was published in Amsterdam (1666). Though lacking stylistic elegance and at times biased in favor of the Venetians, Lučić's work generally shows a thorough knowledge of medieval documents and a scholarly approach. The other noteworthy historians, all from northern Croatia, were less scholarly but more patriotic than Lučić. Juraj Ratkaj published *Memoria regum et banorum regnorum Dalmatiae, Croatiae et Slavoniae* (Vienna, 1652), which should be considered a reliable source only on the events in which the author participated. The most patriotic of all, Pavao Vitezović, a forerunner of the Illyrian movement and the Croatian nationalism of Ante Starčević, had deep affection for his unfortunate homeland, begged the gods to be finally merciful to the Croatian people ("convertat gratia vultum in populum vestrum vestramque Croatiam," in *Plorantis Croatiae saecula duo*, 1700), and made ambitious plans to unite all South Slavs under the Croatian name. The last significant historian from northern Croatia was Baltazar Krčelić, whose *Annae* describe the political and economic situation in Croatia in the middle of the eighteenth century, when peasants rebelled against their feudal lords. From this local history several writers (for example, August Šenoa and Josip Tomić) took material for their novels.

Despite Tubero's criticism of the papacy and the fact that most of these writers, though priests and church dignitaries, were more concerned with secular and personal affairs than religious issues, they remained within the Catholic Church. The exceptions are two well-known church historians: Matthias Flacius Illyricus (Matija Vlačić) and Marcus Antonius de Dominis (Gospodnetić). Flacius moved to Germany, was associated with Luther, quarreled with Melancthon, and was rejected even by Protestants for his unorthodox teachings concerning original sin. His Latin works, particularly his *Catalogus testium veritatis* (Basel, 1556), in which he tried to prove that the papal primacy is without any biblical or historical foundation, are of great value for students of the Reformation. De Dominis had a broader education and wrote better Latin than Vlačić; he was sincerely interested in the reformation of the church, though he (like Erasmus) never became a Protestant. In his voluminous *De republica ecclesiastica* (whose first four volumes were published in London in 1617, and four others subsequently in Germany) de Dominis insisted that the bishops were successors of the apostles, that church authority should be limited to spiritual matters, and that a spirit of tolerance should be the supreme law among various Christian groups. Though these ideas prevail today, de Dominis died a prisoner in Castle San Angelo and his body was burned.

Among the Croatian Latinists there were several philosophers, astronomers, and physicists. Franjo Petrić (Patricius) was bitterly opposed to Aristotle and scholastic peripatetic philosophy, for he was convinced that Plato's ideas are closer to Christian teaching (*Nova de universis philosophia*, Ferrara, 1591). Benedikt Stay, sometimes called the "second Lucretius," expounded in elegant verses both

Descartes's philosophy ("Gallus homo nobis ea mente animoque sagaci omnia pervidit") and Newton's cosmic theory. The most famous among the Croatian philosophers and physicists, whose teachings about matter, space, and movement are appreciated by present-day atomic scientists, was Ruđer Bošković, whose basic work (*Philosophiae naturalis theoria*, Vienna, 1758), was published several times and enjoyed two editions in English translation (by J. M. Child, 1922 and 1966).

One should mention some excellent translators into Latin: Marulić rendered the first canto of Dante's *Inferno*; Brno Džamanjić translated from Croatian the comic song *Radonja* (V. Menčetić) and only thirty-six lines from the fifth canto of *Osman* (Ivan Gundulić). The same Džamanjić became well known for his rendering of Homer's *Odyssey*, but his teacher, Rajmund Kunić (Cunichius), still enjoys fame as the best translator into Latin of Homer's *Iliad* (Rome, 1776). Though the editor, Vratović, greatly appreciates Kunić's satirical epigrams and love songs to Lyda, it seems to me, as to many other literary historians, that Vittorio Alfieri was correct when he regretted that such a brilliant Latinist wrote nonsense ("Che peccato di sì bella latinità spreca in tanti niente").

From the times of the humanist Šižgorić, who translated the folk proverbs into Latin, until the end of the eighteenth century, during the so-called preromantic period, there were Latinists who showed a great interest in folk poetry. The most deserving among them was Đuro Ferić (1739–1820), who in his Epistle to Johannes Müller (Dubrovnik, 1798) included his translations of thirty-seven folk poems, one of which ("Asan-Aginica") became world-famous thanks to Alberto Fortis (*Viaggio in Dalmazia*, Venice, 1774). Ferić left in manuscript form (kept in Cavtat) the work *Slavica poematia Latine reddita*, which included translations of lyrical and epic folk poems and also translations from Kačić's Pleasant Discourse (*Razgovor ugodni*). Ferić was an enthusiastic admirer and collector of folk poems, which he called "pure gold" (*purum aurum*) in an Epistle to Bajamonti, who stressed the similarity between them and Homer. Vratović should have mentioned another collector of folk poems, the French consul Marc Bruère (Bruerović), who eagerly listened to and copied the songs of the Bosnian peasants. Bruère was one of the last Croatian Latin poets.

Considering how few studies there are of any kind, this anthology is both pioneering and unparalleled. For two months I spent my evenings leafing through its pages, and I am still seized by feelings of admiration, respect, and deep gratitude.

From their introduction, in which Gortan and Vratović discuss "the basic features of Croatian Latinism," through their erudite and succinct presentation of every writer, to the final pages in which they indicate "sources" (*fontes*) of texts and translations, everything is done with great care, logical exposition, and good judgment. Exhaustive indexes, in Croatian and Latin, of all persons and localities mentioned in texts and commentaries are included. The editors have chosen to present the most significant writers, and from their works those that are most characteristic, and finally those fragments which could best reveal literary qualities or fascinate the reader by unusual subject matter. They avoid monotony and give us polyphonic orchestration. Their main concern is to show how, in the continuum, with obvious ups and downs, the Croats produced rich literature both in the vernacular and in Latin. Those who wrote only in Latin did not forget their origin, but often acted as champions of their national interests.

The printing of these two volumes is almost perfect, and the illustrations are well executed. Their elegance gives one the impression of holding sacred books.

I hear that the Croatian translations will be replaced by English and that the entire selection will soon be published abroad. If this should happen, I have certain small suggestions. The bibliographies on the individual writers, particularly those better known in the West, should not be limited to research done in Croatian. When sources are mentioned, it should also be noted where the manuscripts are to be found and which libraries have copies of important rare books. Brlek's valuable guide (*Rukopisi knjižnice Male braće u Dubrovniku*, Zagreb, 1952) is sometimes mentioned, but Jurić's excellent handbook (*Opera scriptorum Latinorum natione Croatarum*, Zagreb, 1968) is not quoted in either the bibliographies or the "sources." These suggestions are only details in an otherwise flawless achievement.

ANTE KADIĆ
Indiana University

TRANSLATION IN MEDIEVAL BULGARIA. By *Ashit Chakraborty*. Calcutta: Indranath Mojumder, 1969. xiv, 80 pp. \$3.00.

This monograph is the only volume published so far of an ambitious series to be entitled *Theory and Practice of Translation Throughout the Ages*. The author's sole credentials for writing it would appear to be a "number of years" spent in Bulgaria and other East European countries.

One would have to be a great scholar to condense the essence of this large and controversial topic into less than eighty pages. Mr. Chakraborty, making no claim to scholarship, exudes the enthusiasm of the ill-informed. He would have done Indian scholarship and English-language literature more of a service by translating selections from some of his more germane sources than he has done by regurgitating them all, half-digested. Some of these sources, at least, are competent popularizations of philology by specialists in the field. It is difficult, however, to understand the pertinence of D. Blagoev's book *Contribution to the History of Socialism in Bulgaria* (an eyewitness account of events and political developments in late nineteenth-century Bulgaria) to the subject of medieval translations. Yet there are hundreds of basic books and articles that even a beginner should know about. That he lives and works in India is no excuse for Chakraborty's unawareness of bibliography. As a one-time student of the Bulgarian language in Bulgaria, he should have had access to B. Penev's four-volume history of Bulgarian literature, or in any case to the university textbook of Old Bulgarian literature by P. Dinekov and volumes 1 and 2 of the four-volume history of Bulgarian literature published by the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences in 1963 and 1966, respectively.

Chakraborty writes well in English and appears to have good intentions. His future work might be more praiseworthy if he were to limit himself to translation. As for *Translation in Medieval Bulgaria*, it is one of those books that should never have been written.

ILYA V. TALEV
University of California, Los Angeles

PAMETNA BITKA NA NARODITE. By *Bistra Tsvetkova*. Varna: Dürzhavno izdatelstvo, 1969. 292 pp. 2.10 lv.

One of the most complicated periods in Ottoman and Balkan history is the century between the Ottoman landing at Gallipoli (1354) and the conquest of Constantino-