

passed since his English-language debut in Miłosz's *Postwar Polish Poetry*. (Unfortunately, an earlier volume, *Faces of Anxiety* [Rapp & Whiting, 1969], prepared by Różewicz's able British translator Adam Czerniawski, barely made it across the Atlantic.) With the publication of these latest collections (the other is *Selected Poems*, translated by Adam Czerniawski [Penguin, 1976]), Różewicz is sure to attract the attention of young American poets lately in search of a "naked poetry." The editors/translators of the volume under review were undoubtedly aware of this past neglect, and they show this in a variety of ways: in the deliberate breadth and quality of their selections, in the high seriousness they bring to their discussion of his poetics and to the translations themselves, and in the somewhat exuberant claims made for his preeminence as a postwar Polish poet and playwright.

Różewicz is a deceptively easy poet. His "anti-aesthetic" and "anti-poetic" stance can distract too easily from what is paradoxically a richly layered and at times even mannered style. Krynski's and Maguire's translations, accompanied by the originals *en face*, are a model of painstaking fidelity, both visually and verbally. Taking the word as the basic strategy of this poetry (though one might also argue that it is the pause, the sudden breaking off into silence), the translators have achieved a literalness that at times misses the cadences of the original but is always severely Różewiczian in its haiku-like limpity. The Polish phrases come off well in English, deliberately rough and unpolished when called for, though the ellipses that are natural in Polish sometimes make for slightly more ambiguity. Wherever possible, Różewicz's word order and line divisions have been scrupulously followed. On several notable occasions, however, the English inversions dissipate the force and irony gained by the poet's deferring of a stanza's stress words to final position (as in the first and final stanzas of "The Survivor," the first stanza of "It Was January, II," and the final stanzas of "Lyrical Classified Ads" and "For Some Time Now").

Except for underestimating the role played by the Second Vanguard in shaping the new poetry after the war, the introduction is as workmanlike and conscientious as the translations. Best of all, it never flinches from the submerged complexity of Różewicz's work. One can even excuse the use of such aggrandizing phrases as "most influential poet," "most important playwright," and "most important living Polish poet" (the latter found on the dust jacket) as a sign of understandable favoritism.

LOUIS IRIBARNE
University of Toronto

POSITION OF OBJECTIVE PERSONAL PRONOUNS: A STUDY OF WORD ORDER IN MODERN RUSSIAN. By *Dag Svedstedt*. Translated into English by *Christopher Grapes*. Stockholm Slavic Studies, 9. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1976. iv, 191 pp. Sw.kr. 49.50, paper.

The subtitle of this small paperback, "A Study of Word Order in Modern Russian," is, to say the least, misleading. In fact, the scope of the book is so narrow that one wonders why it was ever published as a book; the findings could well have been printed in an article of reasonable length. The author limits his study essentially to two permutations: SPO (subject-predicate-object pronoun) and SOP (subject-object pronoun-predicate). In his sample of about 5,000 clauses examined, these two types of word order were found to be equal in usage (SPO, 2,503 and SOP, 2,532).

Unlike most Soviet grammarians, who consider the two orders to be stylistically unmarked and in no way unusual, Svedstedt's study shows that the choice of permutation is determined by prosodic considerations. Thus, if S is marked intonationally,

O is placed enclitically after it, giving SOP order. If S is not so marked, then O is placed enclitically after P, giving SPO. This is unquestionably an important finding and to a great extent justifies the detailed, dissertation-like process leading to it in the exposition of the book.

The translation is no more than adequate, with occasional clumsy sentences, such as the one on page 4: "That the rule quoted from *Grammatika ruskogo jazyka* concerning the position of O compared with that of the noun object is more free we have no reason to doubt as far as clauses included in this study are concerned." The book is rife with typographical errors: in addition to an errata list of about fifty items there were others that went unnoticed, such as "whith" for "with" (p. 5, n. 6) and one nonsentence: "This can of course lead to that such an ordering of the components is regarded as typical . . ." (p. 172).

CLAYTON L. DAWSON

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

ORAL LITERATURE AND THE FORMULA. Edited by *Benjamin A. Stolz* and *Richard S. Shannon, III*. Ann Arbor: Center for the Coördination of Ancient and Modern Studies, University of Michigan, 1976. xviii, 290 pp. \$4.00, paper.

This book is a collection of papers, commentaries, and discussions presented at the conference on "Oral Literature and the Formula" held in Ann Arbor, in November 1974. The conference was devoted to discussion of the theory of formulaic technique in folklore, advanced by Milman Parry and developed and finalized by Albert Lord. Altogether eight high-level papers were given and discussed.

Albert B. Lord's paper, "The Traditional Song," which opened the conference, is one of the most fascinating in the collection. Lord finds that the basic patterns of some South Slavic epic songs suggest mythic and ritual depths. The patterns of the initiary and the dragon-slaying hero of these songs have their counterparts in the Homeric epics. In his paper Joseph A. Russo argues that Homer's formulaicity is not necessarily a sign of oral composition, and that scholars have not even succeeded in defining Homeric formulaicity properly. Paul Kiparsky stresses that the difference in stability between Finnish and Serbo-Croatian epic songs is dependent upon their function in their respective cultures. Since the Finnish songs have strong elements of myth and ritual, changes are avoided, as opposed to the Serbo-Croatian songs geared for storytelling and entertainment. Ruth Finnegan in her provocative paper argues, on the basis of African material, that oral literature is not a single category, as opposed to written literature, and that oral composition is not one kind of process, but can take a number of different forms. Gregory Nagy, linking the study of oral poetry with linguistics, redefines the formula in terms of traditional theme rather than meter. Paulène Aspel discusses the formula in the Fulani poetry, and John M. Foley deals with formula and theme in old English poetry.

FELIX J. OINAS

Indiana University