

Volume 2 was published two years later. It contains, first of all, the proceedings of the 1966 conference, with papers on various aspects of the poet's work, on translation, on the place of Hungarian poetry in European literature, and so forth. The second section is a selection of poems by participants of the conference; the third contains Hungarian poetry with some essays on the poets; finally, there are excerpts from new French, Russian, and German translations of Imre Madách's *Tragedy of Man*, and some more essays. All this in a dizzying variety of languages.

The two volumes of *Arion* are a veritable gold mine for the student of language and poetry. I could not even attempt to comment on their rich contents in any detail; I can only offer a few subjective remarks. The reader gains a valuable insight into the translator's workshop, but comes away with the impression that there are as many good ways to translate as there are good poets who translate. Occasionally, among the many perceptive comments on poetry, one comes across some tedious rhetoric on the mission of the poet. The examples of poetic translation, so abundantly given, are naturally not all on the same level of excellence. I personally find Leonid Martynov's rendering of Hungarian poets in Russian, Zsuzsa Rab's Hungarian versions of Voznesensky, English translations of Attila József by Vernon Watkins and Kenneth McRobbie, Keith Botsford's adaptation of Miklós Radnóti, and Donald Davie's translation of István Vas remarkably beautiful, not to mention the major Hungarian poets' translations from Western languages. At the other end of the scale, A. Golemba's Russian version of József's *Ars Poetica* is shorn of the complexities of the original, and Edwin Morgan's work stands out as exceptionally poor. With regard to the latter, one example will prove the point. József's *Ode* ends with the following lines: "Sül a hús, enyhítse étvágyad! / Ahol én fekszem, az az ágyad." Jean Rousselot translates this into simple and appropriate French: "Si tu as faim, la viande est à chauffer. / Ton lit est toujours où je suis couchée." Morgan's English version says: "The meat is baked, end your hunger! / Well, your bed is where I linger." I submit that one does not normally "end his hunger" in English. And whence the "linger"? Well, the rhyme required it.

PAUL DEBRECZENY

University of North Carolina

INTRODUCTION TO RUMANIAN LITERATURE. Edited by *Jacob Steinberg*. Foreword by *Demostene Botez*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1966. xiv, 441 pp. \$6.95.

The elaboration of a Rumanian prose anthology is, of course, a difficult task. Five centuries of a literary history in which every event, every direction and school, was a peculiar synthesis of national traditions and various influences from European literature cannot be easily illustrated in one volume. The editor has succeeded in choosing some of the most representative prose works of modern Rumanian literature, and his anthology is a first step toward the understanding of an original literary phenomenon. All the writers included in the anthology are pre-eminent personalities of the Rumanian literature of the last hundred years; they were the ones who determined the new currents and the new aesthetic approaches, and their names are synonymous with the most important moments in the intellectual history of Rumania. The introductory notes to each short story draw convincing portraits of these writers, revealing the main characteristics of their work.

It goes without saying that such an anthology cannot be a complete florilegium

of the whole literature. Nevertheless, it is hard to understand why such important authors as Mihail Eminescu, Hortensia Papadat-Bengescu, Tudor Arghezi, and Alexandru Philippide were not included. The romanticism of Eminescu's *Cezara* or *Sărmanul Dionis* (*Poor Dionis*), the analysis of the psyche in Papadat-Bengescu's short stories, the vigor of Arghezi's pamphlets, and the expressionistic trends of Philippide would have added some very distinctive aspects to the wide spectrum of Rumanian literature represented.

I doubt that the fragments of novels that are included suggest the true literary art of Mihail Sadoveanu, Ion Slavici, Camil Petrescu, and George Călinescu. All of them have written valuable short stories, which, considering the dimensions of an anthology, would have offered a more precise picture of their art. Sadoveanu's *Povestiri de război* (*Tales of War*), Slavici's *Popa Tanda*, Călinescu's *Iubita lui Bălcescu* (*Bălcescu's Beloved*) are only a few examples.

But as a first approach to Rumanian literature this volume of prose selections may fulfill its editor's intention of providing "a literary introduction to Rumania and its people." Some of the major prose works created by this people, "the passions and thoughts of these varied writings," are well worth the attention of American readers. From this point of view Steinberg's work is particularly successful.

DAN GRIGORESCU
University of Washington

ROMANTIZMUT V BŪLGARSKATA LITERATURA. By *Krust'o Genov*.
Sofia: Izdatelstvo na bŭlgarskata akademiia na naukite, 1968. 565 pp. 4.19 lv.

This book undertakes a rehabilitation of romanticism in the history of Bulgarian literature. The first chapter, containing most of the theoretical discussion, is the least satisfactory, for the author moves entirely within the circle of Marxist literary theory, mostly as evolved in Bulgaria, the Soviet Union, or East Germany. As a result, he ends by distinguishing between only two kinds of romanticism: reactionary individualistic romanticism, which is bad; and progressive revolutionary romanticism, which is good. Genov's theoretical treatment is incapable of much more subtlety than this; moreover, he falls short in accurately defining the characteristics of the second type of romanticism. On the other hand, in the largest part of the book Genov does a valuable job of arguing that romanticism was the basic and quite legitimate literary method of a considerable amount of Bulgarian literature up to and beyond the liberation of Bulgaria from the Turks in 1877-78, that it permeates Bulgarian folklore as well as the work of such men as Paisii Khilendarsky, Sofronii Vrachansky, Dobri Chintulov, Petko Slaveikov, Georgi Rakovsky, Vasil Drumev, Liuben Karavelov, Khristo Botev, and to a lesser extent Ivan Vazov, and that it survives in "islands" even down to the present day. The Marxist Genov holds to the view that romanticism as a rule appeared in literature in the advanced Western countries only after their "bourgeois democratic revolutions," whereas in the backward countries under foreign domination it accompanied the struggle for national independence. Bulgaria, he says, furnishes one of the best examples of this "law" of historical development, and there is no reason to be ashamed of the fact. Genov thus takes clear issue with other Bulgarian scholars of the present day, who are in effect embarrassed when compelled to recognize the presence of nonrealistic elements in, say, the revolutionary Botev's poetry, but then try to play them down in order to classify him essentially as a