

René Wellek and Interwar Czechoslovakia:

the Roots of Structural Aesthetics

Ivo Pospíšil and Miloš Zelenka

< 著者紹介 >

『文明研究』に発表されたこの著作の著者は、両者ともチェコ共和国のブルノに所在するマサリク大学の出身である。イヴォ・ポスピシル博士は、現在マサリク大学の準教授(スラヴ研究科)であり、ミラン・セレンカ博士は、1931年よりプラハで発刊されているスラヴ文献学の国際的機関誌である、『スラヴィア(SLAVIA)』の編集長である。セレンカ博士はまた、チェスケー・ブデヨヴィツェの南ボヘミア大学(パドワイズ大学)において、チェコ語及び文学の準教授として教鞭を取っている。この両者はこれまでも共著で、特に構造的美学の歴史的概念に関する文献を多数出版している。現存するテキストについての彼らの学識豊かな分析は、戦前のチェコスロバキアにおける構造主義の発展が(一例として、イエール大学のヴィクター・エルリックによって論じられているように)ロシアの組織主義者(Formalists)の影響を受けているのみならず、通常、チェコ機能的組織主義者(Formists)と呼ばれるチェコの思想家達による影響もまた強く受けていた事を明示している。以前マサリク大学の教授であり、後期の美学者であったオレグ・ススは、トーマス・G・ウィナー(ブラウン大学教授)やレネ・ウェレク(イエール大学教授)と共に、チェコ構造主義の先駆者達についての概念分析に対する修正主義における先駆者であった。これはまた、レネ・ウェレクとトーマス・G・ウィナーがポスピシル及びセレンカの著作の中で中心的課題とされていると考えられる理由でもあるが、この具体例としてはポスピシルとセレンカの共著による『リーン・ウェレクと両大戦間のチェコスロヴァキア』(ブルノ マサリク大学出版局 1996)が挙げられるであろう。ウェレクの研究史及び、比較文学研究に対する構造主義の適用における彼の中心的役割についてのこの将来性のある著作の中で、彼らはジャン・ムカジョヴスキー(プラハのカレル大学教授)によって提示されたように、美学の機能性のコンセプトが基本的にチェコに起源するものであり、哲学的には、(特にドイツ、イギリス、イタリアにおいて19世紀末に形作られた)西ヨーロッパの模範的思想により依存しているという点に関して、説得力のある議論を行っている。以下の論文は、主として、先進的なチェコの学術界で過去30年担われてきた構造的美学における、現在の研究焦点である基本的な傾向と論点を素描するものである。

文明研究教授 ジョセフ・N・ロスティンスキー博士

The Czech aesthetician Oleg Sus (1924-1982) wrote a study which was originally prepared for publication at the end of the sixties (it was, however, published only in 1992) in which he argues with V. Erlich's book on Russian formalism: "The mentioned genetic line, Russian formalism - Czech structuralism' does not take into account the complex of developmental connections. It leaves out an important and inevitable participation of the school of Czech formism in the rise of structuralism in Prague Linguistic Circle."¹ O. Sus mentions the works of Josef Durdík (1837-1902) and Otakar Hostinský (1847-1910). In

Erlich's conception the direct link between Russian formalism and Czech structuralism has been embodied by Roman Jakobson; though it was based on correct facts and presuppositions, the space of Central European mentality should not be forgotten. At that time the interwar Czechoslovakia became the cross-roads of various theoretical concepts linking the East with the West and the North with the South. The personal links of Prague and Brno with the Slavonic South, the German roots of Russian formalism and Czech formism have caused certain cultural waves which could not allow to think about the separation of methodological entities and contradictory or contrastive scholarly methods. The detailed study of these literary schools and currents manifests the mutual permeation of the so-called autonomous (formalist, structuralist) and sociological and psychological methodology. The omitted importance of the interwar Czechoslovak Republic has been associated with the postwar political development, but from this point of view it is the ignorance of the key-factor in the formation of world literary criticism, especially if we take into account all the significant personalities connected with East and Central Europe who left for Western Europe or the U.S.A. (Roman Jakobson, René Wellek, Peter Demetz, Lubomír Doležel and others). A similar view was expressed by Roman Jakobson's disciple Thomas G. Winner (born 1917), honorary doctor of Masaryk University in Brno.² René Wellek (1903-1995) points out that the presence of the so-called Czech roots was in Mukařovský's structuralism only weak, and he sees its main sources - apart from Russian formalism - in modern linguistics and phenomenology. Wellek's ideas are also present in the context of the Czech effort of that time to formulate a new cultural orientation which would detach the Czech thought from the direct dependance on German models (T.G. Masaryk, K. Čapek, O. Vočadlo et al.). R. Wellek reflected this situation in a different way in his discussions with Peter Demetz.³

René Wellek's position between Germans and Czechs after the rise of the independent Czechoslovak Republic in 1918 was a specific one. He was born in Vienna, the capital of Austro-Hungary, as the oldest of the three children of Bronislav Wellek (1872 - 1959), Bedřich Smetana's biographer and a translator of Jaroslav Vrchlický and Josef Svatopluk Machar into German. He was a Czech, but otherwise René Wellek's ancestors from maternal side came from Poland, Prussia, and Switzerland; in the family Czech, German, but also English, French and Italian were spoken. René Wellek's American biographer depicts the cultural environment in the following way: "As a boy, René Wellek read voraciously. He and his brother developed 'crazes' for science, religion, literature, military campaigns. Familiar with Viennese opera, René Wellek also took piano lessons. At school he and his brother spoke German, but often encountered anti-Czech feelings. At home and on vacations in the river valleys and primewoods of Bohemia, the brothers spoke Czech. A month after he became ten, René Wellek started Latin lessons, and for eight hours a week for eight years he read much of Livy, Cornelius Nepos, Caesar, Cicero, Ovid, Virgil, Horace, Catullus, and Tacitus."⁴ In 1918 his patriotic father with the whole family moved from Vienna to Prague, four years later R. Wellek started to study at Charles University, in 1926 he became doctor of philosophy and since 1927 he has been a postgraduate student in Princeton. After leaving the U.S.A., where he was also employed as a lecturer of German, for Prague in 1931 he became a *Privatdozent* and published his English monograph called *Immanuel Kant in England: 1793-1838*.⁵

This very book reflects the main principles of his methodology. The subject is unexpected and surprising. It brings the discovery of "the other England", a hidden Platonic trend which opposed to the empirical, rational model. At the same time, Wellek tried to apply the method of the contact and genetic comparative criticism and the analysis of comparative background, i. e. the readiness of the perceiving environment to accept a new phenomenon. Kant would not have been able to find his place in England if

it had not been prepared before. The similar models of dual thinking (a model of "two traditions") were later applied by R. Wellek also in the sphere of Czech literature. From the comparison with Ingarden's stratificative understanding of the artifact⁶ and Russian formalism it is obvious that Wellek was moving between different methodologies. Especially Russian formalism which he has not fully accepted, contains some other nuclei than the pure technological approach and the adoration of the "priyom" as a methodological tool. There are also strong philosophical elements (B. Eichenbaum)⁷ and the researchers who aim at a synthetic analysis of the artifact (V. Zhirmunsky, Yu. Tynyanov).⁸ The key-role was played by Boris Tomashevsky's *Theory of Literature* which was highly appreciated by R. Wellek, especially in his and Warren's famous textbook. As the connection with Tomashevsky is confirmed by Wellek himself, the link to the more complicated development of Boris Eichenbaum (1886-1959) remains more or less aside in spite of the fact that it has represented an important context: from philosophy to formal studies (literary technology) as a wider, more universal concept which also includes extratextual relations of the artifact.⁹

A specific position among structurally oriented scholars in Czechoslovakia between the two world wars is represented by the work of Frank Wollman (1888-1969), at that time professor at Masaryk University in Brno who transformed the impulses provided by A. N. Veselovsky (1838-1906), by Russian formalists and the domestic sources into a concept of "eidology" or literary morphology applying it in the sphere of Slavonic literatures.¹⁰

A direct relation to phenomenology which is known especially thanks to the polemic between René Wellek and Roman Ingarden (1893-1870) about the concept of the *Theory of Literature*, has been increased by typological connection with Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1975) and his methodology based on philological medieval studies of his Odessa university lecturer Sergii Vilinsky (1876-1950), later professor of Masaryk University in Brno¹¹, and by an ethic and religious trend represented by Alois Augustin Vrzal (1864-1930), a Czech translator from Russian and a literary historian, the author of the first Czech history of Russian literature.¹²

The roots of René Wellek's methodology lie in the twenties and the thirties when he communicated with the lively traditions of Czech and German literary scholarship, especially with his university professors Vilém Mathesius (1882-1945) and Otokar Fischer (1883-1938), the former Anglist oriented on functional and structural approach, the latter Germanist connected with literary psychology and *Geisteswissenschaft*. René Wellek's first meeting with Otokar Fischer took place in Fischer's seminar of German studies in Veleslavínská Street in Prague in October 1922. At that time O. Fischer ordered Wellek to write a paper on Heine's best collection of poems *Romanzero*. It was Wellek who appreciated in O. Fischer his practical connection of "great art" with "serious scholarship". R. Wellek's correspondence with O. Fischer contains 20 bibliographical items (16 letters and 4 postcards going back to 1923-1935) The correspondence expresses Wellek's private views of a wide range of things and phenomena, his contacts abroad and his visits to various universities. In June-July 1923, R. Wellek made acquaintance with a famous Germanist Friedrich Gundolf (1880-1931) who attracted Wellek by his contradictory personality unifying the character of a poet with the philosophical orientation of a literary historian dealing, by the way, with Dante, Shakespeare and Goethe. René Wellek found the similar features in Otokar Fischer's method and in his approach to arts. Wellek - like Otokar Fischer - was moving between poetry and scholarship; Wellek's specific and in a way peculiar position in the Prague Linguistic Circle could be explained and interpreted by O. Fischer's influence at the beginning of the twenties. His seminar colleagues were V. Jirátk, K. Polák, E. A. Saudek and others. Wellek's first attempts at literary scholarship were, therefore,

closely connected with his fascination by the conflict between art and science.¹³ R. Wellek's effort to synthesize the psychological interpretation with functionalist doctrine at the break of the twenties and the thirties was manifested by his interest in the positive evaluation of the specific feature of literary scholarship as a scientific system *sui generis*, as a complicated way from the empirical and psychological tradition towards modern linguistics with its exact terminology and a limited cluster of scholarly problems linked, for example, with the Cambridge Group of literary theorists he informed about in the Prague Linguistic Circle.¹⁴

In the twenties, René Wellek found himself in an acute personal crisis based on the conflict of the artistic and the scholarly aspirations and on his reflections concerning the position of the Czech Germanist: Wellek's conception of Czech - German mutual relations in that period can be deduced from his review of O. Vočadlo's monograph *V zajetí babylónském* (Prague 1924) and that of F. V. Krejčí's *České vzdělání* (Prague 1924) dealing with the Czech cultural orientation after 1918. René Wellek sharply criticised O. Vočadlo's theses of the harmfulness of German influence. Writing about Krejčí's book, he came to the conclusion that for the development of Czech - German relations it was irrelevant to speak about the dichotomy of "major" and "minor" literatures, but rather about the cultural milieu of the providing and of the receiving cultural entity. Wellek's reflections about the Czech - German mutual relations concerning the danger of national and cultural isolationism with the help of English and American parallels were connected with the reorientation of the Czech Germanic and English studies after 1918. René Wellek's attempts to function as a cultural bridge linking the Czech and German communities in interwar Czechoslovakia were a mere illusion; he saw it even at Charles University itself where the Czech and German part were nearly absolutely separated (R. Wellek was, for example, one of the few students who attended both the Czech and German lectures in the departments of Germanic studies of the Czech and German Charles University). Therefore, R. Wellek chose **the third way**: English literature, especially Romanticism which he devoted his doctoral thesis to; it concerned Carlyle and German Romanticism (*die deutsch Romantik*).¹⁵ At that time it became obvious that Wellek decided his dilemma between art and scholarship in favour of the latter, especially English and comparative studies and the theory of literature (theory of literary history) in which he could be more useful even for Czech literature attempting to be more open towards different stimuli from the outer world. Wellek's systematic efforts leading toward the more exact methodology of literary scholarship which would understand the artifact as an autonomous phenomenon were influenced by phenomenological aesthetics. It is widely known that phenomenology with its antipsychologism provided some valuable impulses to literary scholarship including that cultivated by the members of the Prague Linguistic Circle (R. Jakobson's and J. Mukařovský's interest in the work of Edmund Husserl). The conflict between structuralist and phenomenological methodologies as well as the earlier contrast of formalism and psychologism have often been regarded as a completely different approach to the artifact which later led to some misunderstandings between R. Wellek and Roman Ingarden.¹⁶ In the thirties, however, René Wellek who participated in the 8th International Philosophical Congress in Prague (2-7 September 1934) was fascinated by both approaches represented by Jan Mukařovský's and Roman Ingarden's papers.¹⁷ It is also probable that literary scholars in the Prague Linguistic Circle - especially J. Mukařovský (1891-1975) and R. Wellek - were closer to Husserl's and Ingarden's phenomenology than their friends linguists.

Wellek's interest in the comparative conception of German and English Romanticism was based on numerous reviews of special literature in which he evaluated the potency of comparative method.¹⁸ In

this sense, René Wellek was influenced by Paul van Tieghem's differentiation of "littérature générale" and "littérature comparée", though there was also an interesting Czech - German debate concerning Konrad Bittner's monograph and Otokar Fischer's conception of world literature.¹⁹ Also the connection of René Wellek's concept of literary history with Benedetto Croce's (1866-1952) aesthetic views was extremely important, especially if Croce's earlier contacts with O. Fischer are taken into account (R. Wellek could be acquainted with Croce's conception thanks to the Czech translation published in 1907 under the title *Aestetika vědou výrazu a všeobecnou lingvistikou*.²⁰ All these stimuli Wellek met with in interwar Czechoslovakia later appeared in his habilitation dissertation on Kant in England.

The contemporary revival of the interest in Friedrich Nietzsche's work has been usually connected with postmodernist discourses in which the German philosopher and poet has been regarded as one of the first critics of rationalism in modern thought. But the link leading from F. Nietzsche (1844-1900) to postmodernism must have touched the phenomena also expressing the modernist vision of the world. The interest in Nietzsche was striking in Slavonic cultures in which he was being received between 1890-1930 in spite of the strong opposition in the circles of Czech intellectuals influenced by T. G. Masaryk's (1850-1937) rational and realistic approach.²¹ Nietzsche's individualism reflecting the contradiction of the epoch influenced a number of artists, critics and scholars, among others Otokar Fischer, Arne Novák (1880-1939), František Xaver Šalda (1867-1937) and also the young René Wellek.

The philosophical roots of Wellek's thought can be deduced from the strong neoidealist current which appeared at the end of the 19th century in the form of W. Dilthey's (1833-1911) *Geisteswissenschaft*, intuitivism and the Neokantian Baden School which influenced Wellek's structural theories of literary history; they are quite different from Mukařovský's rationalism and objectivism.²² The neoidealist orientation corresponds - though it may seem rather paradoxical at first sight - to Wellek's interest in Nietzsche's antipositivist criticism of petrified historicism. At the beginning of the twenties, Wellek understands Nietzsche through Otokar Fischer's conceptions; O. Fischer was one of the first Czech propagators of Nietzsche in the Czech cultural environment and thought. M. Bucco in his monograph mentions Wellek's nearly sentimental attitude toward Nietzsche as to his beloved philosopher whose works he read through completely.²³ O. Fischer accentuated in Nietzsche his free spirit, not his *Wille zur Macht* and the superman (*Übermensch*) philosophy.²⁴ This humanistic conception was also very close to Wellek's own approach to Nietzsche's stimuli which appeared in Wellek's correspondence with O. Fischer (see his commentaries on *Die Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Musik*, etc.). Even in his and Warren's *Theory of Literature* Wellek paid great attention to the problem of genius and of the creative individuality based on Nietzsche's criticism of the positivist mechanical gathering of historical documents and facts.²⁵ In his *Theory of Literary History* (1936) René Wellek similarly asserts that literary history has not only had objective, but also interpretative and axiological aims defined by the creative subject's intentions. R. Wellek as a sceptical thinker was rather critical and sceptical about Nietzsche's emotionality and spontaneity, he admired Nietzsche's discourse and his verbal expression of the substantial problems of aesthetic thought. It also appeared in Wellek's interest in fiction, invention and artistic imagination; the term "fiction" R. Wellek borrowed from Hans Vaihinger (1852-1933).²⁶ Thanks to Otokar Fischer's neoidealism, René Wellek of the twenties was oriented on the antipositivist, neoidealist trend of German *Geisteswissenschaft*. In this sense, the Czech aesthetician Oleg Sus regards Dilthey's structural psychology together with Husserl's phenomenological antipsychologism as a substantial impulse for the application of philosophical structuralism in the sphere of poetics.²⁷ René Wellek's conception, however, underwent certain changes. In

1926, he asserts that single methods of interpretation must lead to the understanding of "the mysterious uniqueness of the poet"²⁸; later he criticises J. V. Sedlák (following W. Dilthey's doctrine) for his mechanical connection of the level of creative process with that of the poet's personality.²⁹ Sedlák's theoretical work was closely associated with the concepts of H. Cysarz. Sedlák's conceptions were sharply criticised nearly by all the members of the Prague Linguistic Circle; on the other hand, Miloš Weingart - after leaving the Circle - often referred to them; a compromising position was held by O. Fischer at the First Congress of Slavonic Philologists in Prague (1929). In his paper, he warned against the danger of strictly applied methodology accentuating, at the same time, a wider scale of modern literary scholarship which should functionally combine literary sociology, psychoanalysis, biographical and ideographical methods with the approaches and results of formalist (autonomous) schools.³⁰ The close analysis of the roots of Wellek's aesthetic thought reveals the inconsistency of the critical boundary between the psychological and structural-technological traditions in Czech literary scholarship.

In the middle of the thirties, the first sketches of the project *A History of Modern Criticism 1750-1950 (I-VIII, 1955-1992)* appeared. Wellek regarded the structural thought together with Marxist sociologism represented in interwar Czechoslovakia by Bedřich Václavěk (1897-1943) as the two new currents the objectivism of which could overcome both the abstract character of theoretical conclusions and the positivist lack of interest in more general methodological questions. Wellek's position among the other members of the Prague Linguistic Circle was specific and unique. On the one hand, he participated in the polemics concerning Jan Mukařovský's attempt at the structural history of Czech literature³¹ on the side of the "pure" structuralists against Miloš Weingart's (1890-1939) criticism³² in the context of sharp debates on Antonín Grund's (1904-1952) book on the Czech poet Karel Jaromír Erben (1811-1870)³³, on the other, he appreciated the role of older positivists in the integration of auxiliary disciplines into the concept of literary research. Besides sociology, textology and literary psychology, it was, above all, the concept of comparative studies going back to A. Veselovsky and then via Czech folklore studies (J. Polívka, V. Tille etc.). Among the two trends in the Prague Linguistic Circle represented by N. Trubetzkoy (1890-1938) and R. Jakobson (1896-1982) on the one side (with structural and systematic understanding of poetic language), and by Vilém Mathesius and Bohuslav Havránek (1893-1978) oriented rather on the analyses of the function of the elements inside the system on the other, René Wellek represented a younger generation of researchers who tried to overcome rather reserved attitudes of the Prague Linguistic Circle towards the possibilities of the comparative method. In Wellek's case, it was even connected with the widening of the role of diachronic approach in the system of structural research.³⁴

K. H. Mách's anniversary (1936) led to the publication of the books, one of which was prepared and written by the Prague Linguistic Circle (*Torso a tajemství Máchova díla*, Praha 1938, edited by J. Mukařovský), the other by the Literárněhistorická společnost (*Karel Hynek Mácha: Osobnost, dílo, ohlas*, Praha 1936, edited by A. Novák). It has been, however, known that Wellek was the dominant figure of the preparations of the former (*Torso a tajemství*); together with its editor Jan Mukařovský he even negotiated with F. Borový about the publishing of the book. It is even more interesting that *Torso a tajemství*, though contained methodologically similar studies connected with the doctrine of the Prague Linguistic Circle, the authors of which were "poststructuralist sympathizers" (F. X. Šalda, O. Fischer), the structuralist "kerel" (D. Čyževský, B. Havránek, R. Jakobson, J. Mukařovský) and a sociologically oriented critic (Bedřich Václavěk) was not quite consistent from the methodological point of view. It was especially Wellek's position in the scale of views which was evaluated rather contradictory because of his positive approach to comparative method.³⁵ Wellek's position was that of a compromise or synthesis: on the one

hand, he rejects the exaggeration of subjective and emotional factors in literary scholarship closely connected with various psychological and ideographical approaches, on the other hand, he asserts that it is impossible to ignore *Ideengeschichte* and the creative potentials hidden in the artifact. His *Theory of Literary History* (1936) - together with the theses of Roman Jakobson and Yuri Tynyanov and some of the works of Jan Mukařovský - belongs to the crucial attempts at the formation of the theory of structural history of literature. There are, of course, close link between these early studies of Wellek and his mature work, eg., his co-authorship of *Theory of Literature* (1949) and of his huge project finished in 1992 (*A History of Modern Criticism 1750-1950, I-VIII, 1955-1992*). In the *Theory of Literature* the compromising and synthetizing character of René Wellek's literary thought is reflected in the famous antinomy "extrinsic" - "intrinsic." *A history of Modern Criticism* reflected Wellek's profound application of a diachronic approach in the frame of structural history of criticism. Thus, Wellek's reflections concerning the theory of literary history became the starting point of the trend of development leading to the projects of Josef Hrabák (1912-1987), Mikuláš Bakoš (1914-1972) and, above all, to the programmatic study of Felix Vodička (1909-1974).³⁶

René Wellek's comparative inspiration was also expressed in the process of his habilitation at Charles University in which both of his teachers - Otokar Fischer with his psychological roots connected with *Geisteswissenschaft* - and Vilém Mathesius with his structural-functional approach - participated together with the philosopher Jan Blahoslav Kozák (1889-1974) who appreciated Wellek's philosophical education.

René Wellek's dilemma between art and scholarship which was finally decided in favor of the latter was not removed completely: the art, at least the art of translation, remained present in his work because of his close relationship to Otokar Fischer's school of modern translation. The family presuppositions including his father Bronislav Wellek's activity were already mentioned above as well as René Wellek's linguistic milieu, his knowledge of languages and his position between the Czech and German cultures. It is, however, not widely known that René Wellek himself translated from Czech into German. His translations of two Otokar Fischer's poems - *Mystika krve* - *Mystik des Blutes* - and *Troilus* are not well done which might support the opinion that even the bilingual knowledge need not be the presupposition of a good translation. Compared with his brother Albert (1904-1972) who translated the Czech symbolist and impressionist poet Antonín Sova in *Prager Presse*, René was more rational and antiromantic. The translations of J. V. Sládek's poem *Polní cestou* (*Übers Feld*) - though much better than the preceding two - and Albert Wellek's of O. Fischer's poem *Norderney* have only a marginal importance. More important, however, was René Wellek's activity as a critic of translation and translating: in his criticism he expresses modern functionalist views.³⁷ His sharp criticism of some translations provoked a polemic with professor František Chudoba (1878-1941), a famous Czech student of English philology.³⁸

René Wellek's activity as an accidental translator and a systematic critic of translation completed a wide range of his scholarly activity connecting the two poles of his creative personality: his sensitivity and empathy on the one hand, and his sense of exactness and structural thinking of the other. These qualities which came into existence in the Czechoslovakia of the twenties and the thirties developed in his later activity in the U.S.A. where he became a leading figure of comparative and Slavonic studies as well as a prominent literary theorist. His role in later years and his leading position as a world authority cannot be, however, explained and understood without the research of his Czechoslovak roots and all the cultural context of the interwar Czechoslovakia as the crossroads of philosophical and aesthetic thought.³⁹

Notes

- 1 O. Sus: *Geneze sémantiky hudby a básnictví v moderní české estetice*. K vydání připravili Ladislav Soldán a Dušan Jeřábek, původní studie Rudolf Pečman. Filozofická fakulta Masarykovy univerzity, Brno 1992, p.35 (see V. Erlich: *Russian Formalism: History - Doctrine*. 's-Gravenhage 1955). See also the following studies: O. Sus: *Sémantické problémy umění u Josefa Durdíka*. Z dějin české estetiky - formalismus a sémantika. Filosofický časopis 1960, 8. O. Sus: *Les traditions de l'esthétique tchèque moderne et du structuralisme de Jan Mukařovský*. Du "formisme" ou structuralisme. Revue de l'esthétique 24, No. 1, 1971. O. Sus: *Anfänge der semantischen Analyse in der tschechischen Poetik* (Josef Durdík und seine Theorie der dichterischen Sprache). *Zagadnienia rodzajów literackich* 7, 1964, z. 1, pp.52-53.
- 2 See *O structuralismu, Československu a Americe* s Thomasem G. Winnerem. TVAR 1996, 4, p.9 (Ivo Pospíšil).
- 3 P. Demetz, Yale University, *Cross Currents, A Yearbook of Central European Culture*, 9(1990), pp.135-145; 10(1991), pp.235-251; 11(1992), pp.79-92, edited by Ladislav Matejka.
- 4 M. Bucco: René Wellek, Boston 1981, p.18.
- 5 R. Wellek: *Immanuel Kant in England*. Princeton University Press 1931.
- 6 R. Ingarden: *Das literarische Kunstwerk*, Tübingen 1931.
- 7 See B. Eichenbaum: *Skvoz' literaturu*. Sbornik statej. Leningrad 1924, especially his studies on N. M. Karamzin and L. N. Tolstoy.
- 8 See V. Zhirmunsky: *K voprosu o "formal'nom metode"*, in: V. Zhirmunsky: *Teorija literatury. Poetika. Stilistika*. Leningrad 1977.
- 9 B. Eichenbaum: *Lev Tolstoj* (Kniga pervaja. Pjatidesjatyje gody. Leningrad 1928; Kniga vtoraja. Semidesjatyje gody. Leningrad 1931).
- 10 See F. Wollman's books *Slovesnost Slovanů* (Praha 1928) and *K metodologii srovnávací slovesnosti slovanské* (Brno 1936) and *Duch a celistvost slovanské slovesnosti* (Praha 1948).
- 11 See the item **Sergii Grigoryevich Vilinsky** in the supplement to *Slavica na Masarykově univerzitě v Brně* (Brno 1993, pp.252-253); the year of the emigration is, however, not correct (1917 instead of 1920). Besides several medievalistic studies published in pre-revolutionary Russia, he published two books in Brno (*O literární činnosti M. J. Saltykova-Ščedrina*. Spisy filosofické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity, Brno 1933; *Petko Jur. Todorov - Život a dílo*. Brno 1933). See also: I. Pospíšil: *Sergij Vilinskij an der Masaryk-Universität in Brünn: Fakten und Zusammenhänge*. Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch, Bd. 42, Wien 1996, pp.223-230.
- 12 See A. G. Stín (A. A. Vrzal): *Historie literatury ruské XIX. století. Velké Meziříčí 1891-1897*; A. A. Vrzal: *Nábožensko-mravní otázky v krásném písemnictví ruském*. Brno 1912. A. A. Vrzal: *Přehledně dějiny nové literatury ruské*. Brno 1926. On A. A. Vrzal see also: I. Pospíšil: *Alois Augustin Vrzal. A Catholic Vision of Slavonic Literatures*. Slovak Review 1992, 1, pp. 166-171; I. Pospíšil: *Alois Augustin Vrzal: Koncepce a dokumenty*. Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské univerzity, D 40, 1993, pp. 53-62. I. Pospíšil: *Srdce literatury: Alois Augustin Vrzal, 1864-1930*. Brno 1993 (see further literature there).

- 13 Wellek's literary remains connected with his prewar activities are kept in several places, e.g. in Literární archiv Památníku národního písemnictví in Prague, the item Otokar Fischer and also in the Archives of Charles University in Prague. Wellek's correspondence is kept in the Central Archives of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic in Prague. See further: R. Wellek: Otokar Fischer jeho literární historik. *Dnešek* 1, 1930, No.1, p.9.
- 14 R. Wellek: Cambridžská skupina literárních teoretiků. *Slovo a slovesnost* 3, 1937, No.2, pp. 108-121; see also: J. Levý: Československý strukturalismus a zahraniční kontext, in: *Struktura a smysl literárního díla*, Praha 1966, pp.58-69.
- 15 R. Wellek's conception of the Czech-German relations and the necessity to be more open towards all stimuli including German ones was expressed in: *Germans and Czechs in Bohemia, German Life and Letters* 2, 1937, 1, pp. 14-24; in this sense, Wellek was close to V. Mathesius' term "cultural activism" (see: V. Mathesius: *Kulturní aktivismus. Anglické paralely k českému životu*. Praha 1925). The summary of Wellek's mentioned doctoral thesis was published in 1929 (See: R. Wellek: *Carlyle and Romanicism*, in: *Xenia Pragensia* Ernesto Kraus et Josepho Janko, Praha 1929, pp. 375-403).
- 16 See the Czech interview with prof. René Wellek: *Do Prahy jsem se vrátit nemohl...* TVAR 4, 1993, No.26, pp.1 and 4 (Miloš Zelenská and Lucie Běťáková).
- 17 See R. Wellek's commentary in: R. Wellek: *Meziúrodní kongres filosofický*. *Slovo a slovesnost* 1, 1935, No.1.
- 18 R. Wellek: *Erich Partridge: Eighteenth Century English Romantic Poetry* (Paris 1924). Logan Pearcall Smith: *Four Words: Romanticism, Originality, Creative Genius* (Oxford 1924): *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 12, 1926, No. 2, pp. 166-168; otherwise we refer to Wellek's bibliography, e.g. *Bibliography*, in: R. W.: *Essays on Czech Literature*, The Hague 1963, pp.11-16.
- 19 See K. Bittner: *Deutsche und Tschechen*. Praha 1936. K. Bittner: *Methodologisches zur vergleichenden germanisch-slavischen Literaturwissenschaft* (*Germanoslavica* 3, 1935); see further polemic responses: F. Wollman: *K methodologii srovnávací slovesnosti slovanské*. Brno 1936. F. Wollman: *Literárněvědné metody v Bittnerově knize "Deutsche und Tschechen"*. *Slovo a slovesnost* 2, 1936, No.2, pp.201-221. R. Wellek: *Konrad Bittner, Deutsche und Tschechen*, *Slavonic Review* 16, 1937, pp.481-484, and others. O. Fischer's conception was mentioned in his article *Světová literatura* (*Národní listy* 54, 1914, No.33, p.1, 4 February).
- 20 See the letter of Benedetto Croce to Otokar Fischer of 2 October 1910 (kept in Literární archiv Památníku národního písemnictví, fond O. F., sign. 19 D 30) concerning Fischer's invitation to the 4th International Philosophical Congress held in Bologna in April 1911 (O. Fischer admired Croce's permanently reconstituted humanistic unity of a poet and a philologist). See further Wellek's later study: R. Wellek: *Benedetto Croce: Literary Critic and Historian*. *Comparative Literature* 5, 1953, pp.75-82.
- 21 See J. V. Novák - A. Novák: *Přehledné dějiny literatury české*. Olomouc 1936-1939, p.1139 and further. See also E. Rádl: *Masaryk a Nietzsche*. In: *Sb. T. G. Masarykovi k šedesátým narozeninám*, 2nd edition, Praha 1930, pp.72-89.
- 22 See M. Zelenka: *Wellekova teorie dějin v kontextu české školy literární komparatistiky*. In: *Slavica in honorem Slavomír Wollman septuagenarii*, Praha 1955, pp. 207-216.
- 23 M. Bucco: *René Wellek*. Boston 1981, p.19. The spiritual atmosphere of Modernism in which René Wellek matured and which was favourable for Nietzsche's reception was reconstructed by A. Měšťan (*René Wellek a dědictví české a polské moderny*. *Slavia* 65, 1996, 1-2).

- 24 Otokar Fischer's letter to Arne Novák (21 May 1916). Quoted after Jarmila Mourková's study *K problematice osobnosti Otokara Fischera v letech 1908-1918*. In: J. M.: *Občané a buřiči*. Praha 1988, p.115.
- 25 R. Wellek: *The theory of Literary History*. Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague 6, Praha 1936, pp.173-191.
- 26 See H. Vaihinger: *Die Philosophie als Objekt*. Leipzig 1920; see also Hans Vaihinger to René Wellek (4 July 1931), kept in the Literary Archives (Památník národního písemnictví, Prague, item René Wellek).
- 27 O. Sus: *Geneze sémantiky hudby a básnictví v moderní české estetice (Dvě studie o O. Zichovi)*. Brno 1992, pp. 9-12; originally in: *K předpokladům vzniku české strukturalistické sémantiky a sémiologie: linie "duchovědná"*. *Estetika* 1, 1964, No.2.
- 28 See R. Wellek: *Osobnost Shelleyova v novější literatuře*. *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 12, 1926, No.3-4, p.260.
- 29 R. Wellek: *Rub literární vědy. Slovo a slovesnost* 1, 1935, No.2, pp.128-130; see J. V. Sedlák: *O díle básnickém*. Praha 1935; J. V. Sedlák: *Literární historie a literární věda*. Nový Bydžov 1929.
- 30 O. Fischer: *Nové směry v literární vědě. I. sjezd slovanských filologů v Praze 1929. Sekce I. These k diskusi*, No.9 (kept in Ústřední archiv Akademie věd České republiky v Praze, the remains of the Prague Linguistic Circle, carton No.3), A completed version was published under the same title in *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 20, 1934, pp. 45-53, 139-152, 283-293; in a separate book: O. F.: *Slovo o kritice*. Praha 1947, pp. 157-223. Similar views were shared by R. Wellek.
- 31 J. Mukařovský: *Polákova Vznešenost přírody. Pokus o rozbor a vývojové zařazení básnické struktury*, in: J. M.: *Kapitoly z české poetiky*, 2, 2nd edition, Praha 1948, pp. 91-176 (originally: *Sborník filologický* 10, 1934-35, No.1, pp.1-68).
- 32 See the discussion concerning Mukařovský's concept of literary history, e.g.: A. Bém: *Methodologické poznámky ke studii Jana Mukařovského "Polákova Vznešenost přírody"*, *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 21, 1935, No. 3-4, pp.330-334; R. Wellek: *"Dějiny českého verše" a metody literární historie. Listy pro umění a kritiku* 2, 1934, No. 19-20, pp. 437-445.
- 33 M. Weingart: *Úvaha o zkoumání českého individuálního jazyka, zvláště básnického, a o tzv. strukturalismu*. *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 22, No. 1, 1936, pp. 79-85; No. 4, pp. 365-370 (concerning Antonín Grund's monograph *Karel Jaromír Erben*. Praha 1935). See also: R. Wellek : *Rub literární vědy. Slovo a slovesnost* 1, 1935, No. 2, pp. 128-130; R. Wellek: *Slůvko o kritice*. *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 23, 1937, No.2, p.200; see Miloš Weingart's response: *Slůvko o kritice*. *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 3, 1937, No. 2, p. 200-201. See also: R. Jakobson: *Poznámky k dílu Erbenovu: I. O mythu; II. O verši*. *Slovo a slovesnost* 1, 1935, No. 2, pp. 152-164, No. 3, pp. 218-229 (see also: R. J.: *Poetická funkce*. Jinočany 1995, pp. 500-530).
- 34 R. Wellek: *The Literary Theory and Aesthetics of the Prague School*. Ann Arbor 1969, pp. 25-26. See further: K. H. Mácha a anglická literatura, in: *Torso a tajemství Máchova díla. Sborník pojednání Pražského lingvistického kroužku*, red. J. Mukařovský, Praha 1938, pp. 74-406.

- 35 K. Polák: Nová literatura máchovská IV, Naše veda 21, 1942, No. 5-6, p. 158. K. Polák: Torso a tajemství Máchova díla. Kritický měsíčník 2, 1939, No. 2, pp. 77-90. Rather critical approach to Wellek's article is also expressed by J. Mukařovský in his private letter to René Wellek (21 September 1936, kept in the Literary Archives of the Památník národního písemnictví in Prague, item R. W., without sign.).
- 36 F. Vodička: Literární historie, její problémy a úkoly, in: F. V.: Struktura vývoje. Praha 1969 (originally in: Čtení o jazyku a poezii, ed. by B. Havránek a J. Mukařovský, Praha 1942, pp. 307-400).
- 37 See the following critiques of his: Okleštěný Shakespeare. Kritika 1, 1924, No. 6-7, pp. 243-245. Překladačská pozůstalost Jaroslava Vrchlického. Kritika 1, 1924, No. 8-9, pp. 313-314. Sládkův překlad "Hamleta". Národní a Stavovské divadlo 2, 1924, No. 17, p. 4, and others.
- 38 See among others: F. Chudoba: O Hamleta dr. Wellka a Boh. Štěpánka. Rozpravy Aventina 2, 1926-1927, No. 11, pp. 128-129. R. Wellek: K odpovědi prof. Chudoby k překladům Hamleta. Rozpravy Aventina 2, 1926-1927, No. 11, p. 141.
- 39 A more detailed description of René Wellek's Czechoslovak roots see the following monograph: Ivo Pospíšil - Miloš Zelenka: René Wellek a meziválečné Československo. Ke kořenům strukturální estetiky. Brno, 1996.