

Parandowski is in the offing—now or in the foreseeable future. In Poland, Parandowski is respected (despite harsh treatment at times by critics, one of whom went so far as to call him only a “popularizer of literature”), but he commands no great following.

Intellectually remote from the central concerns of most contemporary European and American literature—a writer really of another era—Parandowski is not likely to attract new foreign readers. If translation is any measure of interest, Parandowski the novelist, essayist, and translator—as distinguished from Parandowski the P.E.N. luminary—is destined to remain known in the English-speaking world just as the author of *The Olympic Discus* (a second edition of the 1939 English translation appeared in 1964), unless, of course, George Harjan is willing to let his admiration and enthusiasm carry him further. Until then, his survey of Parandowski's life and career provides an adequate introduction to an able Polish writer of rather narrow appeal.

HAROLD B. SEGEL  
Columbia University

PERFECTION OF EXILE: FOURTEEN CONTEMPORARY LITHUANIAN WRITERS. By *Rimvydas Šilbajoris*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1970. vii, 322 pp. \$8.50.

The fourteen essays that constitute this introduction to contemporary Lithuanian literature seem to have been conceived as separate studies rather than an organic whole. A brief survey of Lithuanian letters since the eighteenth century has been added. The work presents a unilateral view: as the title indicates, only writers living and creating in exile are considered. The rich and varied work of their counterparts—the authors of Soviet-occupied Lithuania—is left in abeyance. One hopes that a similar study of their work will be published soon. This division precludes a fully synthetic presentation.

Šilbajoris is one of the few Lithuanian critics of the “middle” generation who is capable of successfully undertaking a study of this dimension. Numerous articles of his (mainly in *Metmenys* and *Lituanus*), on both exile and resident authors, testify to his thorough acquaintance with all literature being published in the Lithuanian language. On the other hand, his works on Russian poetics and the aesthetics of Tolstoy confirm his competence as a literary critic beyond the Baltic area. This book received and deserved an honorable mention by *PMLA*.

It would be difficult to define the main purpose of the book or to say for what kind of reader it is intended. The lack of a fully detailed bibliography of the works discussed or of any reference works hardly allows one to consider it a truly scholarly publication. Yet the discussion of some authors goes far beyond the level of a popular work. It is more than a simple introduction, and will give the English-speaking reader a good idea of the present status of Lithuanian literature on this side of the iron curtain.

The approach to the works of art discussed in these essays resembles that of a Russian Formalist or a New Critic. The analytic method prevails. At times the author seems to run the risk of getting lost in the details of an *explication de texte* or plot summaries, but this is remedied by including at the end of each chapter an evaluative summary of the most characteristic traits of the author under discussion.

Not all of these discussions are totally objective. In some (Brazdžionis, Katiliškis), the value judgments are clear; in others, it would have created a truer image to pinpoint some defects of the author, such as Baronas's often careless structure and rather pedestrian use of language.

The essays that stand out are those on Škėma, Mackus, and Landsbergis, who show certain affinities. In these essays both ideology and structure are examined with acute perception and great dedication. The short essay on Mekas is also a full-fledged contribution. Paradoxically, full justice is not done to the work of Nyka-Niliūnas (the outstanding literary critic of his generation)—it needs to be presented within a broader context of literature and thought. The essays on Nagys and Nyka-Niliūnas remain incomplete without some indication of the possible influences of the German poets on the one, and the French on the other. The failure to investigate each author beyond the limits of his own work is a characteristic trait of New Criticism, not always satisfactory.

There are a few minor details that might be changed in a second edition. The essays are generously illustrated with quotations from the authors' works, but the reader is at a loss to know who should receive the praise for the translations. Several titles of Mekas's books show commas where none exist in the original. Among Vaičiulaitis's works no mention is made of his *Italijos vaizdai* (Stuttgart, 1949). The glaring cover, in the colors of the Lithuanian flag, is not an aesthetic achievement.

The imperfections are greatly outweighed by the positive qualities of this book—the first to present a serious, thorough study of the greater part of Lithuanian authors in exile. Its intellectual level does not allow for patriotic sentimentality or false values. *Perfection of Exile* opens the door to a rich world of a previously little-known literature, with its "small people and their great questions."

BIRUTĖ CIPLIJAUSKAITĖ  
University of Wisconsin

THE CZECH REVOLUTION OF 1848. By *Stanley Z. Pech*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1969. ix, 386 pp. \$10.00.

Pech's book is an important work. Not only is it the sole account in English, but it is also the only scholarly monograph with critical apparatus that covers the entire revolution in any language. It is based on documents the author collected in several archives in Prague, a large number of contemporary newspapers and other published contemporary sources, and studies of various aspects of the revolution by Czech and other historians. Chapters 1–9 deal with the background of the revolution and the revolutionary era from March 1848 to May 1849; chapter 10 treats the relations between the Czechs and the Slovaks; and chapters 11–14 deal respectively with the role of the peasants, workers, students, and women. In a final chapter the author brings together his main conclusions.

Pech makes it clear that the revolution in Bohemia bore little resemblance to those in Moravia, Silesia, and Slovakia. He discusses at length the basic differences between the revolutionary programs and courses of action of the middle-class liberals and the radical students and workers, and the growing tensions that developed between them as the revolution progressed. He also stresses the increasing hostility between the Czechs and the Germans, which reached such intensity that in June