

wakischen literarischen Historiographie, doch hat sie Hvišč mit weiteren faktographischen und mit einigen neueren biographischen Angaben über M. Czajkowski komplettiert.

Die Bedeutung der Prädominanz der ideell-thematischen Komponenten in Kalinčiaks Rezeption des Czajkowskischen Werks dokumentiert der Autor durch die Vergleichung der Ausdrucksmittel der beiden Autoren. Als Ergebnis dieser Vergleichung erscheint keineswegs eine Integration der einzelnen künstlerischen Vorgänge, wie dies auf den ersten Blick angenommen werden könnte. Im Gegenteil — es resultiert daraus eine Unterschiedlichkeit der künstlerischen Vorgänge ihrer Konstruktionsmethode, wobei sich diese Unterschiedlichkeit aus den spezifischen Funktionen in der Entwicklung der heimatlichen Literaturen ergibt. Es scheint jedoch, daß auch wenn die Beziehung Kalinčiaks zu Czajkowski noch so intensiv und markant war, sie allein determinierte nicht die Genese der Entwicklung der Kalinčiakschen historischen Novelle und auch nicht die Entwicklung der Erzählung in der slowakischen Literatur. Neben den heimatlichen Entwicklungstraditionen, die hier zweifelsohne eine determinierende Rolle gespielt haben, wird dieses Problem auf dem Hintergrund breiterer, europäischer Zusammenhänge interpretiert werden müssen. Indirekt überzeugen uns diesbezüglich auch die literaturhistorischen Analysen in J. Noges Monographie *Slovenská romantická próza (Slowakische romantische Prosa — Bratislava 1969)*, und dies auch trotz der Bestrebung des Autors, die Entwicklung der Kalinčiakschen Prosa vor allem auf die eigene Tradition der slowakischen Literatur zurückzuführen zu wollen. Eine komplexe Erörterung dieser Frage der slowakischen Literaturgeschichte setzt einen nicht nur inner-, sondern auch einen interliterarischen Kontext voraus.

Somit muß der objektive Charakter der Monographie Hviščs sowohl auf dem literaturgeschichtlichen Gebiet als auch in seiner Bestrebung um eine methodologisch progressive Lösung des Problems der Erforschung der interliterarischen Beziehungen und Zusammenhänge erblickt werden. In bezug auf den literaturgeschichtlichen Aspekt bringt seine Arbeit

neue Erkenntnisse auf dem Gebiet der slowakisch-polnischen literarischen Beziehungen des in Rede stehenden Zeitalters; auf dem Gebiete der Epik stellt sie einen soliden Ausgangspunkt für weitere Forschungsarbeiten dar; in zahlreichen Fragen ergänzt sie die bis jetzt durchgeführten Forschungsarbeiten. Hviščs Versuch um die genologische Klassifikation der slowakischen romantischen Epik trug auch zur Klärung von Fragen der literarischen Slowakistik bei.

In methodologischer Hinsicht erweist sich die Arbeit Hviščs dadurch als wertvoll, daß er die Wichtigkeit der genologischen Erforschung als eines integrierenden Bestandteils der komparativen Literaturforschung hervorhebt, und zwar tut er dies nicht nur in bezug auf theoretische Betrachtungen, sondern auch auf deren literaturhistorische Anwendung. Im Rahmen der programmatischen Entwicklung der slowakischen komparatistischen Theorie stellt daher Hviščs Monographie in vielem sozusagen eine Anweisung dar, welche dahingehend instruiert, wie die bis jetzt applizierten komparatistischen Forschungsarbeiten erweitert und bereichert werden sollen.

Dionýz Ďurišin, Bratislava

Stanisław Lem, *FANTASTYKA I FUTUROLOGIA*, Kraków 1970, vol. 1, 292 p., vol. 2, 458 p.

An exhaustive discussion of the 750 pages of Lem's book is far beyond the scope of the present review, the more so that the problems raised by the book in question fall into a great number of distinct categories. Lem himself professes to be chiefly interested in exposing the prophetic qualities of fantastic literature and he tries to reach this aim by adopting at least three different methods of approach.

The first volume of his work is almost entirely devoted to an attempt at a structural (in what Lem understands to be structural) synthesis of certain theoretical aspects of science fiction. Having suggested that the method is not satisfactory, the author examines several problems of the modern fantastic literature in England and the USA which are connected with sociology. Lem presents and interprets

such phenomena as SF fandom, the helplessness of literary criticism in discussing fantastic literature, the influence of the commercially minded editors upon the publishing policy, the intellectually destructive interest of the most famous writers in humbug projects and pseudosciences (psionics), the literary ignorance and artistic impotence of "the New Wave" in SF. He is particularly careful to stress the importance of the separation of SF from other kinds of "serious" literature.

The second volume of the book employs the more traditional methods of studying literature, viz. those dealing with the thematic strata of SF and the related kinds of fantastic literature; this is accomplished by dividing them into books about robots, catastrophes, utopian and anti-utopian projects or prophecies along with attempts to discuss such problems as sex, superman and experiments as seen in SF.

Each part of the book brings its own conclusions though the tenor of the whole is fairly uniform: instead of being an objective, historical or theoretical research, Lem's study is a critique of fantastic literature. The conclusions following the first part of the book, however, are directed more against the given method of research (i.e. structuralism) than against the literary texts themselves. But both the sociological approach to SF and its thematic survey result in rejecting the artistic values of fantastic literature as well as of intellectual abilities of its authors.

Such conclusions are determined by the ultimate aims of the study and by the analytic means of examination. As it has been already observed, the book is not a historical or theoretical study of fantastic literature. Lem's study of SF and related genres has attempted to shed light on the existing possibilities of imagining future, and literature then seems to be only a convenient set of examples, providing fixed, registered and unchanging instances of particular visions of the future worlds. It is not literature, in its synchronic or diachronic aspect, that interests Lem. The term "genre" itself appears to be utterly meaningless to the author who limits the study of literature to the problems of denotation (cf. vol. 1, p. 63). Hence there follow attempts to define fantasy

in relation to the shape of the empirical world or to the reader's knowledge. Lem's understanding of fantasy disregards the internal laws of the given literary genre and he makes a careless use of the terms "Horror Story", "Fantasy", "Weird Tale", "Science Fiction". Among others, this can be observed in his synthesis of R. Bradbury's works (vol. 2, pp. 234–247). While praising the author for using different conventions in a single work, he evidently takes them to be sets of historically unchangeable rules. Moreover, this carelessness is connected with an attempt to classify fantastic literature according to thematic layers only. Almost all of the analyses (read: summaries and paraphrases) in the second volume of his study seem to confirm this statement. Consequently, what can be observed is negligence in applying various methods (structuralism, philosophy, sociology) to the study of literature, and lack of precision in using different languages, both of the above mentioned branches of knowledge and of cybernetics (to say nothing of the private, highly individualized and pseudoscientific, literary language of Lem — the writer).

Lem is known in Poland mainly as a SF writer. After a volume of essays and reviews, he published three books in recent years that escape attempts at a general classification. *Summa technologiae* is a digressive essay of some 500 pages on the future possibilities and limitations of technology. *Filozofia przypadku* is equally thick but a far more daring excursion into the field of literary research, methodology and theory of literature. *Fantastyka i futurologia* is the third book of, more or less, the same kind. Being the product of the author's extensive private reading and broad interests, it poses itself to be a monograph addressed to the specialist. The impression is confirmed by the titles of the chapters, at least in volume one. But if the reader is a literary researcher, he will certainly disagree with Lem's presentation of structuralism. It should be borne in mind that the so-called "French structuralists" (Todorov, Barthes, Lévi-Strauss), though perhaps the most fashionable, can hardly be the most representative for the school and its name. Remembering even the most general postulates

of the Prague Linguistic Circle, one might doubt whether structuralism means a quest for one pattern structure in the whole of literature (cf. vol. 1, p. 197), or, whether literary research should aim at an intellectual or even aesthetic evaluation of the work in question (cf. vol. 1, p. 196).

Besides, Lem seems to be misled by his understanding of the term "structure". It does not denote the skeleton pattern existing in almost all the literary works. Nor can the term be taken to imply that the whole is merely the sum of its component parts. The additional qualities in a structure seem to be created by various possible relations among the particular components as well as by the interaction between the whole and its components. In other words, contrary to Lem's opinion, denying the ability of structuralism to see a literary work as a unique phenomenon, the functions of a particular component in a given work are understood as changeable and the analyses of them can help a researcher describe and interpret the uniqueness of the work.

The doubts, concerning both Lem's theory and practice, will grow in number as the reader fails to find any hierarchy of structures or discover their function in particular analyses in the book. The summary of plots and some pieces of information about the thematic stratum or about the inversion and conversion of the motifs exhaust the possibilities of Lem's analytical procedures.

The effects of the narrow theoretical understanding of the term "structure" are best seen in Lem's troubles with the analysis of the novels by van Vogt (vol. 1, pp. 249–252). Failing to use "the structural instruments" and evidently not being conscious of his own lack of technique and skill, the author easily dismisses the methods with which he alleged himself to be familiar. The results are rather depressing: Lem returns to the ways of subjective criticism, explaining the "aesthetic" values of van Vogt's books by their "charm" and the "talent" of the author. Similarly, to censure J. Ballard's novels Lem is forced to resign from his "structural" methods and apply the philosophic ones (cf. vol. 1, pp. 144–146). In both examples (and in many others, it seems)

the interpretation depends more on the critic's ability to understand the text than on the real meanings the text carries (as in the case of Ph. Farmer's story *Son* — vol. 1, p. 217 — where at least one part of the analysis is nullified by Lem's ignorance of the fact that the word "ship" is always associated with "she" in English).

The fascination with the quest for the great sociological problems in literature together with the limitation of "summary-and-theme" approach (particularly evident in the second volume) more than often mar the critical perspectives in particular analyses. The observations upon Lem's own *The Return from the Stars* (vol. 1, pp. 193–194) may serve as the best illustration here. The problem of the "annihilation of evil" could hardly be considered of major importance; what Lem calls "a twisted romance-like story of an enamoured pilot" is in fact the basic theme there and the feelings of the narrator himself who is confronted with the complicated issues of the adjustment to the foreign culture and society constitute the dominant element of the novel, the shape of the foreign culture being one of the secondary elements of the setting. In this case the most important meanings, created by the novel, belong simply to a different sphere of human experience than the one Lem is trying to suggest.

There is no use in multiplying the examples which would point to the subjective character of Lem's critical essays. While allowing for an intelligent play of the author's mind and making the study an exceptionally interesting reading for an educated non-expert, the subjectivism vitiates the real value of the study as the whole.

Nevertheless, it is an equally interesting and stimulating book for a literary historian or theoretician, particularly in those parts where Lem discusses the inversion or conversion of literary motifs, the authors' economic and social conditions, or where he attempts to define fantasy, brilliantly elucidating the remarks of Roger Caillois's. The book is also valuable for the great amount of bibliographic and biographic data.

Lem's critical intuition should be mentioned here as well. Though lacking in the technique

and operational skill while handling the researcher's instruments, Lem can often fascinate the reader with his ingenuous insight into literary phenomena (cf. the functions of conventions in R. Bradbury's works or the process of decoding literature by the reader, e.g. vol. 2, pp. 254–263). His spontaneous intellectual response to literature exerts an enormous influence upon the reader; the latter, even when at variance with the author's statements, can still appreciate the critique itself. In other words, the observations in particular analyses seem often sound, though neither complete nor well substantiated.

With all the drawbacks and merits of *Fantastyka i futurologia* in mind, one may perhaps hope that a critical, solicitous and accurate reading of Lem's study may become a long-awaited incentive for historians of literature to write a full-size, historical and theoretical monograph on SF or fantasy in Great Britain and the USA.

Andrzej Zgorzelski, Lublin

O SPÓJNOŚCI TEKSTU (DE LA COHÉRENCE DU TEXTE), Wrocław—Warszawa—Kraków 1971, 205 pp.

Les traités et les études contenus dans l'ouvrage que nous présentons ici font penser indirectement aux résultats obtenus par la célèbre école logistiquiste polonaise des années vingt. On l'appelait autrement école léopolovarsovienne, car un de ses fondateurs les plus éminents, Jan Łukasiewicz, fut d'abord professeur à l'Université de Léopol avant de l'être à Varsovie. «Il se consacrait à ce qu'on appelait le compte, le calcul des phrases (à la théorie de la déduction) [...]. Il a introduit la symbolique sans parenthèses du compte des phrases, appelée en Occident symbolique polonaise [notation logique]»<sup>1</sup>.

Cette remarque liminaire a pour but de rappeler les problèmes liés à la linguistique moderne, bien que ce ne soient pas ces problèmes linguistiques qui aient en vérité intéressé le grand savant polonais, ni non plus

la problématique de la prose artistique. Dans une certaine mesure cependant, ces problèmes ont pénétré la sémantique logique, la théorie de la déduction dans une linguistique moderne s'exprimant le plus souvent à l'aide de la méthode des formules et des modèles logistiques. Les travaux des savants russes, tchèques, anglo-saxons, polonais etc. du domaine de la sémantique logique ont développé les fondements linguistiques modernes qui, à leur tour, ont jeté les bases des recherches dans le domaine de la textologie. Les liens qui unissent la logique mathématique, la sémantique logique et la philosophie contemporaine sont généralement connus. Cela est visible dans l'extension de la problématique comme dans la méthode des travaux réunis dans le volume de recherches englobées par un titre commun — *Tekstologia* (Textologie). Ces travaux concernent principalement des essais de définir les termes de «texte cohérent» (*tekst spójny*) et de «texte incohérent» (*tekst niespójny*), et de définir certains phénomènes directement ou méthodologiquement liés à ces termes.

Nous trouvons des considérations au sujet de la cohérence du texte dans l'article clair et concis de Nina Leontieva ainsi que dans le travail d'Irena Bellert (*O pewnym warunku spójności tekstu — A propos d'une certaine condition de la cohérence du texte*), dans celui d'Olgięd Wojtasiewicz (*O pewnej interpretacji pojęcia spójności tekstu — A propos d'une certaine interprétation de la notion de cohérence du texte*), dans celui d'Andrzej Trybulec (*Topologiczna definicja spójności tekstu — Définition topologique de la cohérence du texte*), celui de Zygmunt Saloni (*Definicja spójności tekstu — Définition de la cohérence du texte*), et celui de Maria Renata Mayenowa (*Spójność tekstu a postawa odbiorcy — La cohérence du texte et l'attitude du récepteur*). Les travaux de Vilém Mathesius, un des pionniers de l'école de Prague (*O tak zwanym aktualnym rozczłonkowaniu zdania — A propos de l'articulation dite articulation actuelle de la phrase*), de Jelena Paduševa (*O strukturze akapitu — A propos de la structure du paragraphe*), d'Anna Wierzbicka (*Metatekst w tekście — Le métatexte dans le texte*), de Krystyna Pisarkowa (*Uwagi o dystrybucji i zakresie funkcji polskiego*

<sup>1</sup> *Wielka encyklopedia powszechna*, PWN, vol. 6, p. 726.