

lub swobody absolutnej (Faust i Mefisto, Kain i Lucyfer). Interesujące są również rozważania wskazujące na swoiście rosyjską realizację orientalizmu romantycznego, której wyrazem było sięgnięcie po bohaterów i wydarzenia zlokalizowane na Kaukazie, Krymie czy w Mołdawii. Przypominają się przy tej okazji uwagi W. Kubackiego o podobnie komplementarnej roli Ukrainy w realizacji orientalizmu w romantyzmie polskim (Malczewski, Goszczyński).

Ciekawe są także wnioski Kšicovej dotyczące odmienności rozwoju epickiego poematu romantycznego w Czechach i w Rosji. Podczas, gdy w Rosji w drugiej połowie XIX wieku miejsce powieści poetyckiej zajmuje proza realistyczna, w Czechach mamy do czynienia z „łagodnym” przejściem od epickiego poematu romantycznego do szczytowego okresu rozwoju tego typu twórczości w latach osiemdziesiątych (Čech, Vrchlický, Zeyer), kiedy to dochodzi do kontaminacji pierwiastków romantycznych i neoromantycznych. I w rosyjskiej literaturze końca XIX wieku poemat nie zanika zupełnie, przechodzi natomiast wyraźną metamorfozę. Z dostrzeżonych zmian Kšicová wysuwa na plan pierwszy ograniczenie fabuły na rzecz wzmocnienia pierwiastków lirycznych i alegorycznych. Zmienia się również bohater poematu: pozbawiony wielkości i postępowości ukazywany bywa jako człowiek słaby i pasywny lub silny i demonicznie destruktywny. Zanik fabuły prowadzi do tego, że jako swoiste poematy bywają odbierane cykle wierszy lirycznych.

Zgodzić się też wypadnie z autorką, że momentem szczytowym w rozwoju rosyjskiej powieści poetyckiej było osiągnięcie konkretności historycznej i terytorialnej bohaterów i zdarzeń. Słuszny także wydaje się pogląd autorki, iż poemat romantyczny osiągnąwszy ten punkt szczytowy mógł dalej rozwijać się jedynie w dwu kierunkach: symbolicznym (i taką właśnie postać zyska w neoromantyzmie) oraz realistycznym. Potwierdzają to również doświadczenia polskie

i to zarówno negatywne (nieudany utwór Goszczyńskiego *Kościelisko* po ciężącym ku konkretności historycznej i terytorialnej *Zamku Kaniowskiemu*), jak i pozytywne: historiozoficzne, genezyjskie, wizjonerskie eposy Słowackiego, komponowane malarsko i muzycznie, swą surrealistyczną architekturą i metaforyką prekursorskie nie tylko wobec liryzowanego, symbolicznego poematu doby neoromantyzmu, ale i wobec poezji XX wieku.

Na uwagę zasługują wreszcie w omawianej książce komparacje charakteru interdyscyplinarnego (studia *Lermontov a Nietzsche*, *Secesní motiv v tvorbě Alexandra Bloka a Velemíra Chlebnikova*, *Secese v české a ruské poémě*, *Hudební princip „Symfonií” Andreja Bělého*). Stanowią one w książce istotny element strukturalny rozważań o synestezji omawianego gatunku, nie zaś pozbawiony funkcjonalności ornament erudycyjny.

Krystyna Kardyni-Pelikánová, Brno

Wanda Krzemińska, BOHATER MITYCZNY W POWIEŚCIACH POLSKICH I FRANCUSKICH XIX W. (Mythical hero in the Polish and French 19th century novel), Warszawa 1985.

A survey of the Polish afterwar literary studies concerned with the forms of the novel would show that anthropological themes related with the so called literary personology occur in them very rarely. (It is different in the research in poetry whose overwhelmingly subjectified reality is necessarily determined by the concept of the lyrical I-speaker). The ignoring of “personal” problematics in the above-mentioned literary research (the awareness of which omission was brought forth during the 19th Literary Conference sponsored in 1980 by the Institute of Literary Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences, and voiced in the ensuing publication entitled “Author—Literary Subject—Character”) seems to be a derivative of the processes occurring both in research methodologies

and literature itself in its highest, world-scale achievements. The standpoint that unifies the two planes of reference (i.e. those of the language and metalanguage of literature) is in this case a preassumed antipsychologism which, on the one hand, has manifested itself through a specific "panstructuralism" in literary theories and, on the other, through a crisis of the traditionally viewed literary character (especially in the nouveau roman fiction). The structuralist model of literary analysis embraced, first of all, the construction of plot patterns and their semantics and syntax (where the influence of W. Propp, the author of the morphological method of literary analysis, can easily be detected). The anti-psychologism of the avant-garde novel is a more complex phenomenon. What is negated in it is the character's mode of existence (popularized by the psychologically-oriented, 19th century realistic novel) rather than his existence as such. The 20th century development of the study of man, represented mainly by anthropology (which nowadays seems to replace philosophy) and psychoanalysis (with its momentous discovery: subconsciousness) could leave untouched neither the technique of character presentation in the modern fiction nor (speaking in most general terms) the model of the humanistic reality. The literary character, devoid of his/her "exterior", multifariousness and roundness (cf. "flesh and blood" characters in the classical novel)—which features he used to draw from an equally "fleshy" picture of the life in an epoch—began to push toward an isolated, plain psychicism, or frequently, toward "pronominal" existence determined solely by an interplay of conscious and unconscious elements. The commonplace literary competence of an average 19th century reader was no longer sufficient for its proper comprehension. The psychologically novel version of the protagonist could not appeal to common understanding.

In the view of the above, Wanda Krzemińska's book necessarily causes

justifiable interest—it is an attempt at reinterpretation of the central category of the 19th century novel from the viewpoint of these of the contemporary disciplines that are characterized by anthropocentric and "personal" perspective of the protagonist could not appeal to and psychoanalysis in particular. Krzemińska's work is thus interdisciplinary by the very nature of its subject, which is additionally strengthened by the authorities it refers to: C. G. Jung, M. Mauss, M. Janion, M. Eliade, G. Bachelard, C. Baudouin, K. Dąbrowski, A. Kępiński, R. Caillois, J. Pépin, or B. Bettelheim. The author uses four popular novels as the material for analysis: A. Dumas' *Comte de Monte-Christo*; V. Hugo's *Les Misérables*; H. Sienkiewicz's *The Deluge*; and B. Prus' *The Doll*. On the ground of these novels, Krzemińska tries to explain the question of popularity of this literature, and she sees its specificity in the type of hero it created: "The 19th century in France and in Poland abounded in exquisite novels, realistic par excellence, which, however, have never won such a wide popularity as have the ones quoted here, or the like. Hence, the value of characters of such a type lies, for the reader, in their mythical quality [...]" (p. 131). Thus, an agreement between the author and the reader is determined not by the mimetic way of presentation, but by the existence of a hidden, ahistorical sphere of collective subconsciousness that parallel with the conscious acting conditions the semiotics of human behavior, particularly as regards man's reactions to art. As Lew Wygotski rightly observed in his *Psychology of Art* "[...] the immediate motives of artistic effect are hidden in subconsciousness".

According to Krzemińska, the subconsciousness of both the author and the reader of each of the analyzed novels evokes—through the symbol of its protagonist—"ancient images of an ideal man endowed with magical power" (p. 94): "images referred to as archetypes in Jung's psychoanalytical herme-



neutics. The personalities of Jean Valjean, Andrzej Kmicic, Count of Monte-Christo, and Stanisław Wokulski are, in fact, embodiments of the Good Father, the Brave Knight and the Faithful Lover, the Superman, and the Emperor who, having known the truth cannot, like Oedipus, look at the world any more" (p. 178). According to the final interpretation (echoing B. Bettelheim's theories), "an adult reading a popular novel with a mythico-realistic protagonist in it experiences (like a child presented with a fable) a catharsis: "he overcomes his latent fears, nourishes his hopes and satisfies his need for intense sensations [...]" (p. 190). This therapeutic quality, characteristic of certain literary works ("Sienkiewicz was an excellent psychotherapist in his times"), is, in Krzemińska's view (as in Jung's) a basis for their reevaluation. Krzemińska ascribes the highest value to the works that materialize the collective "I", which confirms their "psychological truth". As opposed to a stereotype (which is a dead language incapable of meeting the needs of the collective subconsciousness) an archetype determines literature's actual, social *raison d'être*, and constitutes the source of "the novel's appeal emanating toward an adequately disposed reader—the appeal whose nature cannot be specified, as it is just this appeal that gives meaning to the words out of which the whole work evolves" (p. 178).

Krzemińska's presentation of the selected characters of the 19th century novel is not, however, reduced to the symbolic aspect: they are also viewed from traditional branches of psychology i.e. physiognomics and characterology. Apart from the language of psychoanalysis ("within the hold of libido") the autor makes use of the notions of psychopathology ("Wokulski's neurotic personality") as well as of a strictly scientific typology of characters (endostatics and exostatics) derived from M. Mazur's *Cybernetics and Character*. Such measures—when applied to the novel's protagonist—may appear debatable, as their

naturalism collides with the protagonist's literary (i.e.e. figurative) status. Another target of criticism may lie in the author's occasional and specific psychogenetism, an example of which may be the dependence of the manner of space presentation (narrowing) on the writer's (Prus') agoraphobia. Drawbacks like these do not diminish the work's cognitive value to any considerable degree nor do they question its contribution to the methodologies of literary studies. And as far as literary history is concerned, Krzemińska's book throws new light on the novel's realism whose "ambiguity" was rendered perfectly by L. A. Fiedler (a representative of the western "mythopoic" school) who said that the main value of the theory of realism resides in the fact that with more refined writers it produces a beneficial naivety toward their own creative processes, owing to which the abundance of archetypes can easily saturate their works making them acceptable for readers who credit themselves with "scientific disposition" and are hostile toward anything that is inspired and mythical.

Maria Tarnogórska, Wrocław

Halina Kosętko, Z DZIEJÓW RECEPCJI „TRYLOGII” HENRYKA SIENKIEWICZA W DWUDZIESTOLECIU MIĘDZYWOJENNYM. Wokół polemik z Olgierdem Górką. (From the records of the reception of Henryk Sienkiewicz's "The Trilogy" during the interwar decades. On the polemics with Olgierd Górka). Kraków 1985. Wydawnictwo Naukowe WSP. Prace Monograficzne Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej w Krakowie. t. LXXI, ss. 260.

Henryk Sienkiewicz (1846—1916), an outstanding Polish novelist, 1905 Nobel Prize winner for *Quo Vadis?* (a novel of the days of the Emperor Nero), author of many historical novels which have been translated into numerous languages, is perhaps the best-known Polish writer abroad.

The historical novel has for years