

ca weneckiego, *Dwóch panów z Werony*, *Wieczór trzech króli*, *Miarę za miarę* oraz *Burzę*. Podsumowując swe szczegółowe obserwacje na temat wystawionych komedii autor stwierdził, że w Teatrze Szekspirowskim wysoki poziom sztuki teatralnej utrzymuje się niezmiennie od lat, mimo iż realizatorzy muszą liczyć się dziś z koniecznością zaspokojenia wymagań widzów – turystów, których należy nie tyle zachwycić, co rozbawić. Znakomitą pozycję teatr utrzymuje dzięki zachowaniu tradycji strاتفordzkich, wysokiej reputacji, konceptualnemu podejściu do dramaturgii klasycznej i wysokiej kulturze aktorskiej.

Ostatnia rozprawka poświęcona jest Grigorijowi Kozincewowi jako interpretatorowi Szekspira w teatrze, krytyce literackiej i przede wszystkim w sztuce filmowej. Kozincew zrealizował dwa wybitne filmy według dramatów Szekspira: *Hamleta* w 1964 roku i *Króla Lira* w 1970 roku. Porównując poetykę obu dzieł reżysera Sokolyansky podkreślił aktualność koncepcji reżyserskiej każdego z nich dla współczesności, wyczucie czasu i zmian, jakie towarzyszyło reżyserowi w ciągu drogi twórczej, jego otwartość na nowe wpływy estetyczne, umiejętność krytycznego spojrzenia na własne dokonania i rozumienie zmian w stylistyce filmowej. Inne pomysły reżyserskie Kozincewa poddyktowane duchem przemian pozostały niezrealizowane z powodu przedwczesnej śmierci artysty, lecz jego filmy zajęły trwałe miejsce w światowej kinematografii poświęconej dziełom Szekspira.

Książka Sokolyansky'ego jest pozycją godną zauważenia nie tylko przez znawców i miłośników Szekspira. Nie podejmuje ona problemów podstawowych w dziedzinie szekspiologii. Wnosi natomiast wiele nowych informacji szczegółowych, zapelnia białe plamy, prostuje błędy wynikające z niewiedzy bądź lekceważenia podstawowych zasad dyscypliny naukowej jaką jest literaturoznawstwo. Autor

zatroškany jest każdą zauważoną nieścislnością, domaga się uczciwości i kompetencji od tych, którzy spuścizny wielkiego Anglika dotyczą swą myślą i piórem. Wszystkie teksty zawarte w zbiorze przeniknięte są ideą o nieśmiertelności dzieł dramaturga, ich inspirującej roli dla twórców każdej epoki i aktualności ich przesłania w każdym czasie.

Lucja Kusiak-Skotnicka

O. M. ФРЕЙДЕНБЕРГ
 ПОЕТИКА СЮЖЕТА И ЖАНРА,
 Москва, „Лабиринт” 1997, с. 448

Olga Michailovna Freudenberg (1890-1955) is an outstanding Soviet scholar, a professor of Ancient literature in the Leningrad University. A cousin of Boris Pasternak, she had to undergo many hardships in her life because of her "radical" views on mythology. Although her doctoral work "The Poetics of Plot and Genre" (Поэтика сюжета и жанра) was printed as a book in 1936, she was not allowed to publish anything from that time – the complex reasons of that are fully explained by N. Braginskaja in the edition of the book we review here. In fact, N. V. Braginskaja prepared the first edition of Freudenberg's famous work which answers all scholarly standards – appendixes to the author's text include about 150 pages and they consist of two essays, references (more than 1000 items), indexes, etc. Other works of Olga Freudenberg are also printed from the 70-s, for example, "Myth and Ancient Literature" (1978) („Mir i literatura drevnosti") and the Russian readers at least have a possibility now to give the first evaluation of the scholar's place in the history of cultural anthropology and philology. The task is rather difficult

because the circumstances of her work were quite contradictory. On the one hand, Freudenberg got a mighty impulse from the works of the famous Cambridge school - Jane Hamson, A. Cook, Fr. Cornford, etc., from James Fraser's "The Golden Bough" - as well as from Russian academic tradition which embraced such names as academician A. N. Veselovsky, A. Potebnja. On the other hand, she was influenced in the 20-30-s by the Marxist doctrine in general and by the "new teaching" of N. Marr who was an "enfant terrible" in philology of that period boldly and waywardly mixing deep insights into semantics of ancient languages and its material objects (the field of the "signified") with absurdly construed pseudo-marxist schemes.

Freudenberg's mentality strikes us as a grotesque mixture of penetrating thoughts, of observations, which run in parallel with some of M. Bakhtin's ideas (unluckily both scholars had no possibility to exchange views with each other) and of some Marxist standpoints, which could but hinder her development. We may say that the genre of her main book is a good illustration of Bachtin's theory on the fight between two layers of culture: the "serious" official one (it is presented here by the vulgarized Soviet Marxism of the 20-s) and the "carnival" which breaks the rules of the dogmatic shallow official Structures. The irony of the situation is here multiplied by the fact that Freudenberg did not consciously want any conflict with the authorities. We may suppose that she saw some incongruities in her work but left them untouched in order to have an official "cover" for her doctoral thesis. But the "carnival" element in the book was too conspicuous not to be noticed by "wardens of the law". And she was attacked furiously by a Party critic Cecil Leiteisen in 1936. "The Poetics of Plot and Genre", according to the critic, was a mess of gross blunders d

political errors-classical Ancient Literature was vulgarized and reduced to the level of "primitive mythology" and "idealistic" mysticism. Other accusations: Freudenberg "denounces" world classics (!), acclaims erotics and eroticism (the fertility cults are here meant) and oh! she calls the beautiful Helen of Troy a "dog"! She calls the noble Odyssey a "horse"! And so on. So it was very dangerous at that time to delve into "abysses" of mythology and carnival culture...

Now we see clearly that Freudenberg's book can be criticized from quite another point: the scholar tried to harmonize her deep scientific observations with Marxist dogmas thus damaging her own theory. Her ostensible aim was "to fight against the last kind of idealistic poetics", that is against Russian formalism (p. 10) (the number in brackets denotes a page in Freudenberg's book). She wants "to reconstruct the dead "poetics" in all its ramifications-Hegelianism, positivism, Kantianism, etc. and to work out a new Marxist "Literaturwissenschaft" which would show the real trends of literary development as "phenomena of social consciousness" (p. 12). And her second aim issues forth from the first one: it is "the thought of conventionality of genre classifications, of genre border-lines" (p. 13). Only stubborn dogmatic can object against the latter statement; but Freudenberg pays too much attention to her verbal fight against all forms of "bourgeois poetics, "reactionary idealists" and so on. She is right in asserting that "the pattern of literary forms runs parallel to the pattern of the life forms, for both are products of the same Being and thinking" (p. 217). But this assertion is marred by a savage attack against the "contemporary bourgeois reality" which is "primitive and conventional" (p. 217). One could ask the author - was the Soviet Union in the 30-s not so "primitive" as the USA, Germany or England? And what

can be said about Freudenberg's last section of the book, devoted to the "vulgar realism" which - if we believe our scholar - permeates all stages of Ancient literature as well as European literature of Middle Ages, the Renaissance and up to the XIX century? Well, the text is a mess of acute observations and mistaken opinions based upon the dogmatic notion of realistic method. Olga Freudenberg is sure that "one cannot speak about realism" in classical Attic drama (p. 261), because Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides as "conservative aristocrats" had an "antihistorical" outlook, they "created systems, inimical to the dynamics of social processes" (p. 266). Nothing can be further from the truth. The scholar does not want to see that these Ancient authors DID show the social processes of their epoch - albeit they did it not in the forms of verisimilitude, but in mythological images. In fact, Freudenberg narrows the notion of realism, reducing it to "naturalistic" descriptions. And this - clearly anti-historical - standpoint allows her to accuse all Ancient, mediaeval and Renaissance prose writers, such as Lucian, Petronius, Rabelais, of being "low", "vulgar", "obscene" painters of darker sides of reality: slums, brothels, circus acrobats, thieves, gluttons, etc. She asserts, e.g., that the main hero of "Satyricon" is in reality not a young vagabond, but his phallus (p. 281). This statement allowed V. Kozhinov to say that "Satyricon" is not a novel in genre, but a piece of rude farce (see his book on the origin of the novel: В. Кожин, Происхождение романа. Москва, 1963).

One could speak at length about Freudenberg's other mistakes and drawbacks caused by her Marxist positions, but let us better to look upon the main part of her book which is quite alien to the author's class evaluations and slogans. It is curious to note that she

manages not to give any citations from Marx in her work(!), and she finds something valuable in S. Freud instead. Of course, she tries to be careful in speaking about this "bourgeois" scientist with his naive "Oedipus complex", but she is bold enough to state directly: Freud declared "the principle of ambivalence of main human feelings, of chief mythological persons and their emotions" (p. 28). This gives to our author a good possibility to penetrate into the dark depths of primitive mythology, which stood at the roots of human culture in general, of literary genres in particular. Freudenberg is happy in dealing with this material and she seems to forget about her Marxism for a long time when she talks on such complicated topics as the contradictions between "grotesque" genres of Ancient literature and the historic reality of Ancient Greece and Rome. Or when Freudenberg deals with the origins of primitive language and thought, of fertility rituals. There are two main sections in her book - the first dealing with embryonic forms of plot and genre patterns and the second devoted to literary forms of them. And the first section is twice as large as the second. This means that our scholar is occupied mainly with the ORIGINS of literary genres. What are they according to Olga Freudenberg?

She is sure that all genres spring from ONE common source thus stressing the unity of everything in Cosmos as the chief principle of life in general. This source is, according to her, the foundation of all plots, all kinds of folklore and literary genres. It is the main mythological unit ("мифологема" in Russian) of "Life-Death-Rebirth" which comprises all important actions, all necessary movements of Nature and of men. Or, to be more exact, this unit appears to be the first generalized notion of the primitive humanity which contained germs of all future modes of thought, of all human

cultures in itself, approximately as the tiny particle of the cosmic protomatter gave birth - after the "Big Bang"- to the infinite Universe. And what does Freudenberg mean by mythology? She defines myth as the image - bearing idea or a set of ideas having a diffused form of several interconnected "pre-metaphors". These pre-metaphors are also diffused notions which combine freely elements of abstract thought, emotional feelings, "direct" observations and of multi-coloured tropological images. All these aspects are interlaced inseparably and they exist simultaneously for an indefinitely long period of time. There is no logical causality in the structure of these pre-metaphors: such basic notions as space and time, e. g., are here only locally organized and mostly undetermined: there is no difference between subject and object, man and cosmos, one and many, etc.

The transition from primitive society to the slave-owning system which lasted for thousands of years brought a radical, if unnoticed, change into man's thinking. Different folklore genres appeared and it was quite difficult or simply impossible to separate them one from another. For they were still slight variations of the predominant mythological "Life-Death-Rebirth" unit. As Freudenberg shows, this pre-literary stage of Art was characterized by a loosely array of pre-genre formations which later could give birth to any literary genre. This is clearly seen when she talks about the plot as the first nucleus of a genre structure. The system of plot in antiquity is characterized by its ANTIcausality and may be called an ANTIplot for that. If the scholar was not restricted by Marxist rules at her time, she could add that this ancient stage of Art unwittingly foresaw and foreshadowed our century with its modernist and postmodernist literature where the genre of ROMAN NOUVEAU was borne as well as different experiments with plot,

system of images, etc. The order of motives in ancient folklore and early literature, as the author shows, had neither consistency, nor strict sequence - that is from OUR logical point of view. It had its own principle - that of apposition (not to mix it with an opposition!), of gathering as many motives as possible in one stream - we can remember the principle of bricolage here formulated later by Claude Levi-Strauss.

The principles of metaphorical thinking, taken by our author from Fr. Nietzsche, and of the ambivalence of men's emotions enabled Freudenberg to make a great scientific discovery - simultaneously with M. Bakhtin and independently from him. They both found out that primitive people were, so to say, instinctive dialectic thinkers. Or, to put it in other words, the primitive tribe thought and felt as one person, an instinctive genius. It (he, she) saw itself and the world as one heing gigantic creature existing in rythmis of life-death-rebirth. Thanks to endless chains of magical forces every action, every thing in this organism is interconnected with everything. As Freudenberg puts it: an image (or, rather, a symbol) in such a system of thought functions as a sign of identity, "this is a system of understanding the world in the forms of equations and repetitions" (p. 51). Man feels himself as if he IS the sun, the sky or the earth, his life IS the almost literal repetition of cosmic processes. So all man's actions: his daily toil, sexual act, eating, etc. - are at once "high" and "common" actions, they are magic, godlike and just simple deeds.

This mythological thinking also means that everything is considered by primitive people as containing a dialectical opposition within itself. Thus, e. g., the food is not only a means of appeasing hunger, it is a sacred thing, a god - and eating it becomes a liturgy, a high mystery, a drama of the food-god or gods. It is the beginning of different religious and

literary genres. Freudenberg finds great relish in showing us how farcical, comical and satirical genres are born from within ancient rites of preparing and eating "farse" as a kind of primitive mixture of beans, meat and so on. But not only "low" genres were connected with eating. High tragedy was also a kind of "food drama" in origin for it included an element of a bloody sacrifice into its inner structure - hence the role of killings in Attic tragedies.

The scholar shows how such bloody actions were necessary for the formation of plots in ancient literary genres. And we may add that they still play a very important role in modern literature. Take Hemingway's "The Old Man and the Sea" where Santiago fights with his "brother-fish" and kills him although the old fisher is full of brotherly feelings to his prey... This is also a "food drama" (fish is being caught for eating) as well as an ever-lasting drama of Man.

Freudenberg could not read M. Bakhtin's first draft of his future famous work upon Fr. Rabelais and she foresaw his formulations on the phenomenon of the carnival culture when she wrote: "death in the mentality of the primitive society is a birth-giving principle; the earth as the hell, grave is simultaneously the earth-mother" (p. 63). Here she could cite not only her colleagues in anthropology, but Shakespeare as well whose hero, wise Friar Laurence from "Romeo and Juliet" says:

The earth that's nature's mother is her tomb;

What is her burying grave that is her womb.

This crucial point of mythological dialectics allows our scholar to sort out and to explain numberless devious and entangled ways of "pre-metaphorical" thinking in which magics and "direct" observation

of reality was mixed freely with poetic images, with "real" metaphors. Freudenberg has much to say on the semantics of the main images in the antique society which were closely connected with the multiplying rows of dual forms. The comparison between Bakhtin and Freudenberg is here quite appropriate. Speaking about the Rabelasian chronotope, Bakhtin mentions seven special "rows" of images: 1) row of the human body... 3) row of the food... 5) row of sexual intercourse 6) row of death 7) row of excretion ("Forms of time and chronotope in the novel. Essays on historical poetics") Well, Freudenberg also talks much on the metaphors of the food, of the death, of the sex and so on. And all these semantic metaphorical groups (= rows) or clusters of images are, according to her, "future forms of plots and genres" (p. 109).

The scholar pays much attention to the first stages of the formation of literature when it was very difficult, if impossible, to separate the written word from oral speech, from men's actions and gesticulations. The future literary genres were, so to say, one with the "oral genres" (Bakhtin was preoccupied with them), with genres of the life itself (The modern historians study the genres of history now, they view History as a kind of in-terminable text). And speaking about these "primitive" stages, Freudenberg could not evade a talk about "the semantics of the act of speaking" (p. 119). Oral speech was a sacred matter to our ancestors, a great miracle. "What does it mean "one is speaking?" "One is living". "is giving light". The act of "speaking out" is an act of death being defeated, of darkness being driven away" (p. 121). The famous "Thousand and one night", analysed from this standpoint, is a gigantic effort to sustain the cosmic light = to defeat death by oral "breath-taking" stories. The chain of tales can and MUST be enlarged ad infinitum here. Thus forming

a special "epical" genre including as many small different genres as possible in itself. Freudenberg here formulates a very important general conclusion which was later reformulated by Y. Lotman. She writes: "There is only one collective general "I" for the primitive man (we = I). All the world is his autobiography. He moves and sings, but this a story about himself, forever directed to himself" (p. 127). As for Lotman, he speaks on the problem of autocommunication: "the culture itself may be considered as a sum of communications which are sent by different agents to each other... as well as ONE communication sent by the collective "I" of the humanity to itself" (Lotman Y. *Universe of the mind*. N. Y., 1990). Evidently, Lotman knew Freudenberg's book and her thought on the "super-genre" of the primitive art stimulated his speculations on the problems of communication.

Jane Harrison's "Themis", a brilliant study in the social and mythological origins of Greek religion and culture, draw Freudenberg's attention to the vital ancient notion of the Year Cycle which served as the central organizing principle to practically all forms, all genres of ancient art. Bloody sacrifices, religious feasts, agonistic competitions of all kinds, theatrical performances - everything was subdued to the Year Cycle unwritten rules because this was the sacred foundation of Life-Death-Rebirth universal pattern. The scholar deals in detail with variable and variegated generic forms which were produced thanks to this Cycle, thus establishing the common origin of literary genres, however different they are from each other in ancient literature already.

Freudenberg sees clearly two opposing trends in the historic evolution of the genre system. The first is a tendency for the fusion of different genres: tragedy in Ancient Greece went together with comedy, lyrics was inseparable from epic

forms, etc. The second trend is directed to the contrary, for a fragmentation of genres, for separating them from each other. And this contradictory process is still at work in the world literature. It cannot be otherwise because genres are like living organisms or, rather, live archetypes of Art and life and they are in constant need of change, but of a change which would simultaneously keep the stable kernel of this genre principle safe.

Besides that, the scholar takes into consideration the pressure of social forces, of class society especially and the radical changes in people's *Weltanschauung*, when evaluating the evolution of genres in ancient literature. The relations between literature and art in general, on the one side, and the society, on the other, become much more complicated and contradictory in the class state system, than they were in "communistic" primitive order of life. Freudenberg shows at length how "primitive" literary genres begin to lose their direct links with the Year Cycle pattern, thus enabling the "alien" images and ideas to penetrate into the old stable art structures. For example, this Year Cycle is reduced to the role of a moving landscape in Longo's "Daphnis and Chloe" although the details of this natural scenery retain rich semantics of mythological "primitive" imagery. And numerous efforts of writers, musicians, painters who try - through thousands of years - to revive the original implications of the Year Cycle, testify to the virility of this "primordial" universal genre's pattern. And if we take the "death" element from the triad of Life-Death-Rebirth structure, it loses much of its vitalizing force and becomes either a tragic end of a play or an artificial trick in an ancient novel of adventures, the trick which is used effectively in numerous modern films, plays, books.

Besides all these valuable observations, Freudenberg's work is full of acute

and profound analytical studies devoted to mythological semantics of separate things: trees, cosmic bodies, houses, tables, cloths, etc. These details help us to understand better the origins of numerous literary genres, not only in the European, but also in the Asian literature.

Olga Freudenberg's contribution to the Literaturwissenschaft and the field of cultural anthropology is great - the more so that she was tremendously hindered in her work by the circumstances of her life. It is a question of honour for Russian as well as for foreign scholars to prepare for the print and to publish a full collection of her scientific works.

Vladimir Vakhrushev

FRANTIŠEK ČERNÝ:
PRÉMIÉRY BRATRŮ ČAPKŮ.

Památce Josefa a Karla Čapkových a českých divadelních kritiků, kteří jako první recenzovali jejich hry a premiéry, Nakladatelství Hynek, Praha 2000, s. 495.

Autor książki *Prapremiery braci Čapků* jest wybitnym czeskim teatrologiem, redaktorem naukowym wydanych w latach 1968-1983, czterotomowych dziejów teatru czeskiego (Dějiny českého divadla), napisanych z głębokim znawstwem sztuki Terpsychory i opartych na bogatych studiach materiałowych, co sprawiło, że mimo upływu czasu i zmiany terminologii i ideologicznych premis, zachowały one po dzień dzisiejszy wartość dzieła fundamentalnego. Černý przedstawił w nich także wyniki swoich osobistych badań nad teatrem XIX i XX wieku. Opublikował również na łamach czasopism

krajowych i zagranicznych setki prac własnych o aktorach, reżyserach i dramaturgach teatru czeskiego, w tym także książki (m.in. *Hana Koapilová, Hraje František Smolík*).

Spuścizną braci Čapkůw interesował się od początku lat pięćdziesiątych i w tych odległych czasach zaczął już zbierać pierwsze materiały do swojego opus magnum.

Profesor Černý jest także dobrze znany na polu międzynarodowym. W latach 1967-71 był prezydentem Międzynarodowej Federacji Badań Teatralnych, zaś od 1994 jest prezydentem honorowym tej organizacji. Często też bywa w Polsce. Na międzynarodowej konferencji zorganizowanej w Warszawie w 1990 roku, a poświęconej Karolowi Čapkowi i problemom świata współczesnego zwrócił uwagę czapkologów swoją ciekawą koncepcją roli „człowieka osaczonego” w twórczości autora *Rozbójnika*. W publikacji tu omawianej rozwinął ją jeszcze i wzbogacił pokazując, iż towarzyszące przez całe życie Karolowi Čapkowi poczucie zagrożenia wynikające z faktu osaczenia człowieka w XX wieku przez wrogie mu siły, ideologie, stadne napaści tłumów itp. legło u podstaw jego twórczości dramatopisarskiej.

Od czasu swego przejścia na emeryturę w 1992 aż do niedawna prof. Černý był przewodniczącym Społeczności bratří Čapků (Stowarzyszenie Braci Čapkůw), organizacji w całym tego słowa znaczeniu elitarnej i niezależnej, której członkowie, połączeni kultem Karla Čapka i całej przedwojennej masarykowskiej demokracji zajmowali się badaniem dorobku braci, wydawaniem biuletynu Stowarzyszenia, organizowaniem odczytów i uroczystości oraz utrzymywaniem kontaktów z czapkologami zagranicznymi a także informowaniem czeskiego społeczeństwa o powoływanych do życia stowarzyszeniach zagranicznych braci Čapkůw, jakie znajdujemy w wielu krajach świata m.in. w Ja-