de la Foi (Society for the Propagation of the Faith), the organization that supports Roman Catholic missions.

*From Hand to Hand* also features a directory of book artists that will be of considerable value to collectors and other craftspeople, but copies of the catalogue will now be hard to obtain. Printed in an edition of 1,000, it was sent to members of The Alcuin Society as the Spring 1986 issue of *Amphora*. At that time fewer than 100 copies remained available for sale.

JOYCE BANKS

(Joyce Banks is Rare Books and Conservation Librarian at the National Library of Canada.)


James de Mille's *A Strange Manuscript Found in a Copper Cylinder* was published posthumously in 1888, some eight years after the author's death. That fact, more than any other, determines the editorial treatment it must receive at the hands of any textual scholar. Knowing it, the editor of a critical edition can, with certainty, say that the manuscript, if it has survived, will be the most authoritative version and that each subsequent version must of necessity be less reliable as a copy-text. But when, in fact, the editor learns that there is no manuscript, the editorial task is considerably simplified: forced to acknowledge that here is a text without authority, without any authoritative transmission (either monogenous or polygenous), without authorial revision and therefore with no authoritative variants, an editor has no choice but to adopt the first printed version — that published in *Harper's Weekly* in 1888 — as his copy-text and to emend it only where there is overwhelming evidence of compositorial error.

Malcolm Parks, the editor of this CEEC edition, has, quite obviously, understood the limitations imposed by this text, and has sensibly produced what is, to all intents and purposes, a virtual reprint of the *Harper's Weekly* text. The only editorial intervention has been the 'silent emendation' of a few minor typographical errors in the copy-text and the explicit emendation of about eighty-four readings considered by him to be of a more substantive nature. Little more than that has been done because, from a textual point of view, little more can be done. There are, in effect, no textual cruxes, no matters to engage the editor's skill — indeed, very little at all to excite any textual scholar. This is not to undermine the vast amount of diligent collation necessary to arrive at such meagre textual results, but it is to suggest that such results might have been predicted very easily in advance by the very nature of the text and, more importantly, it does mean that editing *A Strange Manuscript* has been a safe and slightly dull occupation, resulting in a textual apparatus that is dull as well.

Not only dull, but seemingly laboured. It seems — though perhaps I am wrong in
this – that the editor, facing few textual challenges, has tried to bolster what was promising to be a rather empty textual apparatus. He has, as I have already mentioned, offered a list of approximately eighty-four emendations (in addition to those made ‘silently’). And we must assume that, given the usual purpose of such a list, these are considered to be substantive changes – ones that, in W.W. Greg’s words, ‘affect the author’s meaning or the essence of his expression.’ Many of them take their authority from the non-authoritative second edition (Harper, 1888) and the rest are based on the reasoned judgement of the editor. That is all very well. But, when one discovers that included in this list are such corrections as ‘every one’ to ‘every-one’ (ten times), ‘any one’ to ‘anyone’ (twelve times), ‘some one’ to ‘someone’ (nine times), ‘Circle’ to ‘circle’ and ‘further’ to ‘farther,’ one wonders if such an apparatus can be taken seriously, for only about a dozen readings are what might be considered truly ‘substantive.’ Adding to that misgiving is the fact that some ‘silent’ emendations seem to be more substantive than those listed; at 6.26, for example, the editor has inserted a comma after ‘England,’ a reading which is supported by no other text and which, originating as it does in the editor’s mind, seems to indicate poor judgement.

One other instance where the editor has laboured to compensate for – or perhaps deflect attention from – a dull textual apparatus is his attempt to offer textual evidence from a completely different source. In the textual note (pp. xlv-liii) there is a long discussion of the ‘Ashdod Webster’ manuscript – a manuscript that has survived of a work never published – and it is offered as concrete evidence of how the manuscript of A Strange Manuscript – which has not survived – might have been treated by the printers. To me this seems perverse and of no credibility. Speculation is the ruination of many a fine edition. And in this case, since the speculative evidence is used to support the Harper’s Weekly text, it is quite unnecessary because there is no need to defend the choice of copy-text – it is the only logical choice.

Much of this, I think, is perhaps attributable to the fact that each text produced by the Centre for Editing Early Canadian Texts, must not only be, but must be seen to be, a ‘critical’ edition; must be seen to justify the time and expenditure of such a project. I have no doubt that Malcolm Parks is a fine textual critic, and he has, I think, provided an excellent evaluative introduction to the text. But, when that is said, we are left with the distinct impression that the textual effort, to say nothing of the cost, has not been worthwhile. In this case an editorial mountain has been made out of a textual molehill, and we are presented with a text which is little superior to that produced by R.E. Watters in the New Canadian Library edition of 1969. And that fact, given the well-known history of the text’s transmission, is one which could have been predicted with little difficulty and one which certainly need not have been obscured by unnecessary textual commentary.

Clearly, the Centre for Editing Early Canadian Texts, which is heavily funded by public money, must expect criticism from disgruntled scholars if this is the kind of text they continue to produce. And, inevitably, someone will adopt the role of an Edmund Wilson. For the choice of A Strange Manuscript is, when one considers the many important Canadian texts in need of critical editing, a ‘strange’ one indeed. When one adds to this seemingly poor judgement the often heard charge that the
Centre seems to believe that the term ‘Texts’ means ‘novels’ only, and that an inordinate amount of public money is being spent to achieve such unsatisfactory results, it is only natural to expect some harsh reactions. And that would be a pity because the project as originally envisioned was a good one.

R.G. MOYLES

(R.G. Moyles teaches textual criticism at the University of Alberta. He is the general editor of the forthcoming edition of E.J. Pratt: The Complete Poetry and has recently written a book on The Text of ‘Paradise Lost’ and several articles on editing, textual theory, and Canadian literature.)


Professor Paul Robert Magocsi of the University of Toronto has enriched Ukrainian bibliography with two important publications. His Guide to Newspapers and Periodicals (1983) has great importance not only for scholars abroad, but also for students of Ukrainian within the Ukraine. It covers 175 periodicals published between 1848 and 1918 which were and still are mostly banned in the Soviet Union. Branded mainly as nationalistic they were, with a few exceptions, simply unavailable even in the academic and other selected libraries of the Ukraine. Fortunately Professor Magocsi arranged to microfilm them in various western repositories such as the National Library of Austria, the Library of Congress, government archives, and private collections. Now these microfilms are part of the rich holdings at the University of Toronto’s John Robarts Library and are available to students and researchers.

Ucrainica at the University of Toronto Library, which consists of two huge volumes, is not an original compilation. It consists of catalogue cards, copied and grouped in some thirty chapters including reference aids, serials, geography, history, literature, sport, etc. These are subarranged alphabetically by author or title, and are thus readily accessible to the reader. The history of the Ukraine and related fields, for example, are subdivided into the headings ‘Archaeology and the Pre-Kievan Period’ and ‘History’ with the following subheadings: ‘Historiography and Bibliography,’ ‘General Surveys,’ ‘Kievan Rus’ [with references to other subheadings], ‘Lithuanian-Polish-Cossack Era,’ ‘Late 18th Century to 1914,’ and others including ‘Regional and Urban History’ [with alphabetical listings of the names of the cities and regions]. Similarly the alphabetically arranged subheadings in the chapter ‘Literature’ help to locate authors and their publications. Altogether this is an enormous and well prepared work.

The entries in the catalogue are written mostly in Ukrainian [transliterated], but many of them are in English, Russian [transliterated], Polish, German, and other languages, including, oddly enough, some items in Arabic and other exotic tongues. The practical usefulness of this catalogue should not be underestimated. Every advanced student of Ukrainian or researcher in the field must have this