

Ein philosophischer Denker ist unter anderem auch dazu verpflichtet, präzise zu unterscheiden, was er dem spekulativen Material („von seinem Inneren her“) abverlangen darf und was er ihm eben a priori aufzwingt. Weicht er, aus welchen Gründen auch immer, dieser Verpflichtung aus, so läuft er Gefahr, überall dort, wo es sich um die wirklichen philosophischen Probleme handelt, nicht mehr gesprächs- und damit kritikfähig zu sein.

Stuttgart

Milan Daňhel

*Stolz, Benjamin A. / Titunik, I. R. / Doležel, Lubomír (Eds.): Language and Literary Theory. In Honor of Ladislav Matejka.*

Ann Arbor, Michigan 1984, VII + 643 p. (Papers in Slavic Philology 5).

It is impossible adequately to review a *Festschrift* consisting in thirty-nine essays of varying length and complexity. No such volume could be uniform in scholarly value or in general-reader interest. The breadth of subject matter, from birchbark texts to Góngora and Švejk testify to the breadth of Matějka's concerns. And your reviewer is hardly qualified to write about the scholarly importance of such papers as "The Diaspora Children's Serbo-Croatian" by Đurović, Mareš's "Dvojí písmeno a na Baš-čanské ploči" or Worth's tantalising "Mirror Reversals in Novgorod Paleography".

Indeed your reviewer can only attempt an amateur assessment of a volume in which he found a great deal to stimulate him and a fair amount to bore him. One notices straightaway that old-fashioned Structuralist theory and an old twentieth-century area of scholarly perusal usually called linguistics predominate. Even old Wellek himself has now rejected literary critical pseudo-objectivity and called for judgement. Linguistics has become a province for those stuck either in the rut of a Beatlesque rejection of philology or in the slippery furrow of believing that literary criticism can be as exact a science as nuclear physics. Physicists tend to believe in the unknown and potentially unknowable. Sixtiesish literary scholars still tend to believe in the knowable.

I cannot in two pages review this far from tedious volume in any other manner than by picking out individual essays or views. Todorov's "Dialogisme et schizophrénie" tackles a social problem which the author finds particularly that of expatriates returning to their native country. A foreigner like me finds that the social situations he describes are as awkward for a foreigner as they are for an expatriate. Central and east Europeans do tend to complain about the same things as any "Westerner", but it is difficult for the Westerner to say: but it is the same for me. Praising and pitying are equally difficult for the sensitive human being. The "Easterner" does not realise where he has let himself be vulgarised by a pseudo-Westernism, just as the "Westerner" fails to appreciate what the Easterner conceives of as basic social justice. An "Eastern" woman who joins in on a trick to have an uneducated masseur acquaintance offer a male intellectual friend "vaginal massage" (that ist an authentic event in a certain socialist country) does not realise she is debasing herself and her own sexuality.

Eagle on Kundera debases the sensitive Eagle. He fails to see the journalism in the Czech writer. Doležel and Gaifman both provide useful approaches to Švejk, but

never explicitly doubt the worthiness of Hašek for serious literary criticism. Actually, one suspects Doležel does doubt, but he still is not explicit. Several papers on Bakhtin, especially when they point out the Russian's inconsistency, manifest the importance of the suave, generalising, dandyesque approach to literature.

If one believes in the computer, Van Campen's essay on the use of the chip in teaching Slavonic languages is important. It is a well written essay, though it suggests someone who actually credits modern technology with some sort of sensitivity of language and human perception. The fear of the spiritual pervades except in such essays as those of, say, Schmid, Winner, Mignolo and Hammarberg.

The reader will find important theories in the volume like Hammarberg's that Realism could be defined as "a period or movement where the prose function overshadows the poetic function overall. In transitional periods or movements the prose function and the poetic function would be struggling for hegemony, and such forms as the 'poem in prose' or the 'novel in verse' and parodies both in prose and verse would be prominent." (p. 395) That would appeal to anyone concerned with the Decadence.

Doležel's statement that, "Švejk's encounter with history is fully determined by the fact that he is unable and unwilling to accept its obligations", for all its automatic acceptance of Hegelianism, is a sound and productive idea. The reader will conclude that Doležel has omitted his final sentence, "Švejk is an anti-historicist novel." If, however, Doležel made that statement, he would have to begin considering Czech historicism – and thus devote the whole volume to himself.

Any academic Slavicist reader with a handy xerox machine will find something in *Language and Literary Theory*. She or he will also find inspiration for her or his own thoughts. This volume is, then, useful, not only as a statement of how things look, but also as a stimulus to how things might look.

London

Robert B. Pynsent

*Mácha, Karel: Glaube und Vernunft. Die Böhmisches Philosophie in geschichtlicher Übersicht. Teil 1: 863–1800.*

K. G. Saur, München-New York-London-Paris 1985, 166 S.

Der tschechische Exilphilosoph Karel Mácha veröffentlichte den ersten Teil seines geplanten monographischen Überblicks über die Geschichte der böhmischen Philosophie. Der Inhalt des Buches verspricht auf den ersten Blick viel: Nach Vorwort und Einführung ist der gesamte zweite Teil („Traditionen“) der philosophischen Analyse der alten böhmischen Legenden gewidmet. In sieben Unterkapiteln beabsichtigt der Autor, beide Zweige der böhmischen Legendentradition zu charakterisieren – die lateinische wie die slawische. Es bleibt aber meist bei neuen Umschreibungen des Bekannten. Der eigentliche Aussagekern des Buches findet sich dann im dritten Teil – fünf Unterkapitel – wobei es leider tatsächlich nur um den nackten Kern geht. Auf bloß 64 Seiten erstehen sechs Jahrhunderte böhmischer Gedankengeschichte: „Am Anbeginn der philosophischen Kultur“, „Die Blütezeit der geistigen Kultur in Böhmen des 14. Jhs.“, „Böhmische Frage des 15. und 16. Jhs.“ und „Die böhmische Philosophie des 17. Jhs.“ sowie „Die böhmische Philosophie im 18. Jhd.“.