

1. PRZEGLĄDY

IVO POSPIŠIL

Brno

SOME COMMENTS ON CONTEMPORARY CZECHOSLOVAK
SLAVONIC GENOLOGY

The methodology of literary scholarship has not been the centre of scholars' activity for a long time. During the twenties and thirties of this century methodological problems became a natural focus of several polemics between Marxism, the sociological approach, structuralism, freudianism, etc.; later the substance of the discussions moved to the narrower sphere of literary essayism and political writings concentrated on various topical problems. The most important question asked by many theorists of art is the real existence or non-existence of general categories; the discussion is sometimes called — using the terms of medieval philosophy — a controversy between realists and nominalists. General categories, however, have consequences: we can easily identify artistic schools and specify the substance of particular works of art. General categories manifest, therefore, not only archetypes and morphological principles determined a priori, but also a complex of common qualities and types which reflect the artistic processes of denotation and connotation.

The theory of literary genres — called in Paul van Tieghem's famous article "genology" — has always been very sensitive to shifts in the field of literary methodology. It can easily be observed in the article written by J. Trzynadlowski¹ in which the author analyses the art of literature from the point of view of human communication, in studies influenced by the concept of pragmatic linguistics, or in conceptions stressing the importance of genre transformations (e.g. translation²). All this shows that the relations of literary kinds and streams and the evolution of oral genres are closely connected with the historical roots of literature in general, which have been studied by hermeneutics and French and American deconstructivism. The most important figures of modern genology have lived in Poland — J. Kleiner,

¹ Jan Trzynadlowski, *Information Theory and Literary Genres*. Zagadnienie rodzajów literackich, IV, z. 1, Łódź 1961, pp. 3-48.

² Karel Horálek, *Rodzaje literackie z punktu widzenia problematyki przekładowej*. Zagadnienia rodzajów literackich, VII, z. 1, Łódź 1964, pp. 5-13.

S. Skwarczyńska J. Trzynadlowski, Z. Szmydtowa and others. They have contributed a great deal to the development of genological conceptions in general³. One stream of modern genology widens its background and context, while the other goes back instead to the essence of its research and asks questions concerning the structure of literary genres and their functions. During the sixties some American theorists and historians of literature started to publish "Genre", a literary quarterly, and in fact the second journal in the world devoted to genology (after „Zagadnienia rodzajów literackich"). Its distinctive supplement could be represented by the genological study written by P. Hernadi⁴. Although the studies published in "Genre" have not been methodologically unified, a certain common tendency can be seen: literary genres are depicted as a point of orientation in the process of literary communication. The literary genre is traditionally understood as a structure consisting of a hierarchy of various genre elements. To discover the competence of the structure means to reveal relatively completely the relations existing between singular literary elements. Genre is shown both as an entity existing in reality and a model of real literary works. Let us mention some of the most typical examples of the method. A. Hennesey Olsen compared the genre model of hagiography with real hagiography and drew the conclusion that there are at least two varieties: the orthodox and the non-orthodox (the exemplary life of the saint on the one hand and the individual way of man to Good containing some elements of modern biography on the other)⁵. William E. Gruber analysed the polarization of tragedy and comedy with the intention of showing the shifts of the genres from the periphery to the centre; Laura Brown showed that the decline of the drama and the increased prominence of the novel in 18th century England was not caused by the political and ideological impact of the Puritans alone but also by the inner tension within the genres themselves. A similar methodological orientation is represented in the American publication *Theories of Literary Genres*⁶ with its noetic skepsis (A. Matrino⁷) and with its understanding of literary genres as convenient models (C. Guillén⁸).

Besides the Polish and The American contributions to genology, it is necessary to mention another element of the international context in which Czechoslovak genology exists; possibly the most important genological book

³ See S. Skwarczyńska, *Wstęp do nauki o literaturze*, t. III. Warszawa 1965; J. Trzynadlowski. *O zjawiskach międzygatunkowych w utworach literackich. Zagadnienia rodzajów literackich*, Łódź 1962, z. 1, pp. 147–150; J. Kleiner, *The Role of Time in Literary Genres. Zagadnienia rodzajów Literackich*, t. II, z. 1, Łódź 1959, pp. 5–12.

⁴ Paul Hernadi, *Beyond Genre. New Directions in Literary Classification*. Ithaca –London 1972.

⁵ A. Hennesey Olsen, "De historiis sanctorum". *Generic Study of Hagiography*. Genre, XIII, n. 3, Fall 1980, pp. 407–429.

⁶ *Theories of Literary Genres*. University Park and London 1978.

⁷ A. Marino, *Toward a Definition of Literary Genres*, in: *Theories of Literary Genres*.

⁸ C. Guillén, *Toward a Definition of the Picaresque*, in: C. G., *Literature as System*. Princeton 1971.

book ever written in English — Alastair Fowler's *Kinds of Literature*⁹. According to Fowler, literature is by no means "the order of words" (Northrop Frye), but the bearer of tradition. It is formed by the central (stable) genres and different marginal forms: „According to the central conception, literature refers to a certain group of genres, whose exemplars are therefore by definition literary, at least in aspiration. These central genres comprise the poetic kind, the dramatic, and some of the prose kinds. The canon has varied a good deal, but has always included satire, for example, and fictional narrative. Round this nucleus spreads a looser plasma of neighbouring forms: essay, biography, dialogue, history, and others..."¹⁰ Fowler's literary genre represents the way of literature's existence; the increasing interest in the problem of genres is usually connected with the birth of great literature. Fowler speaks of the following genre categories: kind (lyric, epic, drama), mode (the way of presentation of the work of art, usually connected with concrete literary streams, e.g. romantic novels, etc.) and constructional types (e.g. Erziehungsroman). Like all Anglo-Saxon theorists, Fowler stresses the importance of the quantitative point of view. He further deals with the genre signaling and the genre strategy, with what he calls generic labels", with the death of the genre and with genre combinations (aggregation, macrology, counter-genre, inclusion, etc.).

Contemporary genological thinking is not limited to the synchronic viewpoint. On the contrary, the importance of genological diachrony is growing, which could be demonstrated in the works of the Russian theorist I. P. Smirnov¹¹. In Smirnov's conception of literary genres, the dominant idea is that of the unity of the work of literature and the literary process in general. From this standpoint he examines all common places (loci communes, topoi) in ancient and modern literary texts.

Czechoslovak genological thinking has also been shaped by the Soviet scholars who tried to reform genological systematics. G. N. Pospelov¹² and L. V. Chernets¹³ speak of "moral-depicting genres" in the system of literature, although it becomes evident that prose works in which the depiction of the social status (and not the social dynamics, movement) prevails are more typical of Russian 19th century literature. The German theorist W. Ruttkowski¹⁴

⁹ A. Fowler, *Kinds of Literature. An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Oxford 1982.

¹⁰ A. Fowler, *Kinds of Literature*, p. 5.

¹¹ I. P. Smirnov, *Chudožestvennyj smysl i evolucija poetičeskich sistem*. Moskva 1977. I. P. Smirnov, *Generativnyj podchod k kategorii tragičeskogo (na materiale russoj literatury XVII v.)*. Wiener Slawistischer Almanach 1979, Bd. 3, pp. 5–26. I. P. Smirnov, *Diachroničeskije transformacii literaturnych žanrov i motivov*. Wiener Slawistischer Almanach, Sonderband 4, Wien 1981.

¹² See his works *Problemy istoričeskogo razvitija literatury*. Moskva 1972. *Teorija literatury*, Moskva 1978. *Tipologija literaturnych rodov i žanrov*. Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta 1978, 4, pp. 12–18.

¹³ L. V. Černec, *Literaturnyje žanry*. Moskva 1982.

¹⁴ W. V. Ruttkowski, *Die literarischen Gattungen. Reflexionen über eine modifizierte Fundamentalpoetik*. Bern 1968.

who has found the roots of his conception in Staiger's *Grundbegriffe der Poetik*¹⁵, has also tried to "improve" genre systematics; besides the lyric, epic and dramatic elements he speaks of popular genres (*artistische oder publikum-bezogene Gattungen* — e.g. chansons, Brecht's song, etc.). But neither Pospelov's and Chernets' nor Rutkowski's proposals for new genre classification have been generally accepted.

In spite of the impact of all these conceptions and methodological trends, Czechoslovak genology has preserved its own individual structure and character. The evolution of Czech genology differs a great deal from that which can be observed in Poland, Germany and Hungary. It is primarily based on the conception of comparative studies, the beginning of which goes back to the period of positivism. Therefore the study of literary genres was not understood as a relatively independent field of literary scholarship but as an integral part of comparative literature. The inseparable unity of the two aspects is still alive in the most modern genological research¹⁶.

Let us have a look in greater detail at the present state of Czechoslovak genological conceptions. Our outline represents neither the development nor the present state of Czech genological thinking in its complexity; we have only tried to choose its most interesting and — in our view — most promising aspects. In the very beginning it is necessary to mention *Prague comparative genology*, which is represented by the works of Czech slavacists publishing their analyses in the journal "Slavia". The studies written by Slavomir Wollman, son of the world-famous Czech comparatist Frank Wollman, could serve as a model for further reflections. Wollman asserts that the subject of genology is not only the phenomenology of all the literary genres, but, more important, their mutual relations; each literary genre is "a system of systems". The comparative approach is therefore necessary to prevent genological research in general from being too independent of other parts of the complex literary analysis¹⁷. The theoretical aspects and the aspect of the author's poetics are expressed in the studies of V. Svatoň, who deals with the theory of the novel and with the novel's poetics in the manner recalling Bakhtin's understanding of the complexity of the aesthetic object¹⁸. The comparative typology of genres is also present in the collection of studies published by the Institute of Czech and World Literature in Prague entitled *The Relations and Aims of Socialist*

¹⁵ E. Staiger, *Grundbegriffe der Poetik*. Bern 1946.

¹⁶ See *Komparatistika a genologia* (red. P. Petrus). Acta facultatis philosophicae Universitatis Šafarikanae. Bratislava 1973.

¹⁷ See S. Wollman, *Sistema žanrov kak problema sravnitelno-istoričeskogo literaturovedenija*, in: *Problemy sovremennoj filologii. Sb. statej k 70-letiju V. V. Vinogradova*, Moskva 1965, pp. 341–349. S. Wollman, *Systém žánrů jako problém srovnávací literární vědy*, Slavia 1986, pp. 9–18.

¹⁸ V. Svatoň, *Dvě teoretické koncepce románu v sovětské porevoluční uměnovědě*. In: *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity*, D 27, 1980, pp. 95–104. V. Svatoň, *Svoboda a její kolize (K problematice děkabristické literatury)*. In: *Slovanské studie*, Brno 1979, pp. 103–116.

Literatures (1979) which includes two interesting studies, the first written in depicting the process of the building up of socialism¹⁹, the second by V. Macura, who deals with two Soviet mythological novels based on the same motif borrowed from ancient Greek mythology²⁰. D. Hodrová, the author of the first study, is one of the leading figures in the contemporary Czech theory of the novel²¹. From the general methodological point of view the studies and monographs of Z. Mathauser have to be taken into account as an important presupposition for any genological research²².

Much work — although more analytical than theoretical — has been done by a group of Prague literary scholars dealing with Russian literature. Their periodical "Bulletin ruského jazyka a literatury" (earlier: "Bulletin Ústavu ruského jazyka a literatury") contains analyses of the development of the Russian genre system. S. Wollman, V. Svatoň and D. Hodrová are more interested in the morphology of the literary object in its aesthetic meaning; the scholars publishing their works in the "Bulletin" stress concrete analyses of each particular genre or genre formation mainly from the thematic point of view. Jiří F. Franěk has dealt, for example, with the term "epopée"²³, B. Neumann specializes in the genres cultivated in the narodniks' prose²⁴, V. Doskočilová is interested in space-time relations in Soviet prose of the first two decades after the October Revolution²⁵, E. Fojtíková writes about the beginnings of the interest in the problems of literary genres in old Russian literature and about the old Russian short story²⁶, S. Mathauserová deals with the birth of the original Russian novel in the 18th century and the old Russian theories concerning the art of fiction²⁷, O. Uličná interprets the different

¹⁹ D. Hodrová, *Žánrový půdorys tzv. budovatelského románu*. In: *Vztahy a cíle socialistických literatur*, Praha 1979, pp. 121–141.

²⁰ V. Macura, *Dva sovětské mytologické romány*. In: *Vztahy a cíle socialistických literatur*, Praha 1979, pp. 143–168.

²¹ See her articles published in *Slavia*, e.g. *Komenského "Labyrint světa" a ráj srdce v tradici alegorického putování*, *Slavia* 1980, pp. 218–226.

²² See Z. Mathauser, *Čtverec umělecké specifičnosti*. *Estetika* 1980, 3. Z. Mathauser, *Literatúra a anticipácia*. Bratislava 1982. Z. Mathauser, *Švejkova interpretační analýza*. In: *Film a literatura*, Praha 1988, pp. 173–194. Z. Mathauser, *Metodologické meditace*. Brno, in print.

²³ J. F. Franěk, *Uvodní poznámka k problematice románové epopeje*. *Bulletin Ústavu ruského jazyka a literatury UK*, Praha 1965, pp. 91–101 (further: BRJL).

²⁴ B. Neumann, *O narodnické agitační proze*. BRJL, Praha 1977, pp. 91–108. B. Neumann, *K problematice pohádku v narodnické literatuře*, BRJL, Praha 1983, pp. 81–88. B. Neumann, *K problematice narodnického románu*, BRJL, Praha 1979, pp. 87–96.

²⁵ V. Doskočilová, *Metoda „román o románu“ v sovětské próze*. BRJL, Praha 1969, Bpp. 89–104. V. Doskočilová, *Čas v románech Leonida Leonova*. BRJL, Praha 1973, pp. 51–61. V. Doskočilová, *Člověk a čas v románech Konstantina Fedina*. *Čs. rusistika* 1978, pp. 110–114. V. Doskočilová, *Koncepce „času“ a proměny sovětského románu 20.–30. let*. BRJL, Praha 1976, pp. 27–32.

²⁶ E. Fojtíková, *Ke vzniku teoretického zájmu o otázky literárních druhů staré ruské literatury*. BRJL, Praha 1969, pp. 7–15. E. Fojtíková, *Russkaja bytovaja povest' nanakune Novogo vremeni*. Praha 1975.

²⁷ S. Mathauserová, *Ruský zdroj monologické románové formy* (M. D. Čul'kov). Praha 1961. S. Mathauserová, *Drevnerusskije teorii iskusstva slova*. Praha 1976.

evolutionary phases of the Russian longer lyric narrative poem ("poema")²⁸, J. Vávra speaks of the genre development of Soviet Russian lyric poetry²⁹, M. Genčiová has written many articles and two monographs on children's literature and science fiction³⁰. The genre aspect of literature in its complexity is explored in a collective textbook for students of Russian published by the group of Prague specialists in 1981³¹. The importance of the above-mentioned articles and studies lies in their historical and thematological interpretation; they are unfortunately less valuable from the theoretical and conceptual standpoints.

The Slovak genological school is based on the whole complex of receptional aesthetics explored by F. Miko, his colleagues and successors³². Their conceptions are very close to the receptional views typical of hermeneutics and deconstructivism and the Soviet "functional historical approach"³⁴; the common denominator is their accentuation of the factors of reception in the process of literary communication; they, of course, differ, methodologically and ideologically. The literary genre is understood neither as a normative set of rules, nor as an abstract "skeleton", but as a real "articulation" which cannot be realised outside the sphere of literary style. From a similar standpoint the problems of the relation between comparative and genological methods are explained and interpreted in a study by D. Ďurišin, the creator of the new comparative literary wholes³⁵. The outstanding Slovak theorist of literary genres J. Hvišč even speaks about the developmental stages of comparative genology and differentiates the genres as morphological principles on the one hand and concrete literary realisation on the other (polygeneric phenomena, genre syncretism, "nets" and "chains" of literary genres)³⁶. The same author in

²⁸ O. Uličná, *K problematice žánrových typů současné poémy*. BRJL, Praha 1979, pp. 115–127. O. Uličná, *Ruská sovětské poéma a česká lyrickoepická poezie XX. století*. BRJL, Praha 1981, pp. 77–90. O. Uličná, *Ruská sovětská dramatická poéma*. BRJL, Praha 1983, pp. 47–56.

²⁹ J. Vávra, *O vývoji ruské ódy*, BRJL, Praha 1972. J. Vávra, *Elegický žánr v současné sovětské poezii*. BRJL, Praha 1981, pp. 91–102.

³⁰ M. Genčiová, *Literatura pro děti a mládež*. Praha 1984. M. Genčiová, *Vědeckofantastická literatura*. Praha 1980.

³¹ *Literární druhy a žánry pro posluchače rusistiky* (B. Neumann, V. Doskočilová, M. Genčiová, M. Hrala, J. Vávra, A. Picková, O. Uličná, S. Tvríková). Praha 1981.

³² See F. Miko, *Estetika výrazu*. Bratislava 1969. F. Miko, *Od epiky k lyrike*. Bratislava 1973. F. Miko – A. Popovič, *Tvorba a recepcia*. Bratislava 1978.

³³ H. R. Jauss, *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation der Literaturwissenschaft*. Konstanz 1967. H. R. Jauss, *Towards and Aesthetics of Reception*. University of Minnesota 1982. J. Derrida, *La dissémination*. Paris 1972. J. Derrida, *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore 1977. J. Derrida, *Positions*, London 1981.

³⁴ See *Ruskaja literatura v istoriko-funkcionalnom osveščeni*. Moskva 1979. *Literaturnyje proizvedenija v dviženii epoch*. Moskva 1979. N. V. Osmakov, *Istoriko-funkcionalnoje issledovanie proizvedenij chudozestvennoj literatury*. In: *Russkaja literatura v istorikofunkcionalnom osveščeni*. Moskva 1979, pp. 5–40.

³⁵ D. Ďurišin, *Svazj medzi komparativistikoj i genologijej*. Neohelicon IV, 3–4, Budapest 1976, pp. 93–110.

³⁶ J. Hvišč, *Problémy literárnej genológie*. Bratislava 1979.

his book *Poetics of Literary Genres* mentions the following aspects of modern genre theory: the aspect of the subject, the aspect of the object, the aspect of the expression, the aspect of the idea and the theme, the aspect of the form and the composition, the aspect of literary streams and schools. He also stresses the importance of the cooperation of comparative and genre studies: "The present boom in genological research into literature is closely connected with the expansion of comparative typology. The objects of the analysis (literary genres and genre forms) provide relatively constant types of literary evolution which are genetically structuralized and contain the essence of literary relations and contexts — e.g. the essence of comparative literary research"³⁷. J. Hvišč uses this conception of the development of literary genres when analysing the works in Slovak and Polish literatures.

A little apart from the methodology of the "Nitra circle" there is the extensive activity of Nora Krausová, the author of several monographs concerning genological problems. As early as 1964 she dealt with the theory of literary kinds in her book on the epic and the novel³⁸. Her point of view is based upon the dominant principle of the narration, which is also demonstrated in her book *The Narrator and the Categories of the Novel*³⁹. N. Krausová makes use of her brilliant knowledge of Thomas Mann's work (*Buddenbrooks*, *Der Tod in Wenedig*, *Der Zauberberg*, *Doktor Faustus*). Her book on the poetics of the novel contains a relatively wide range of different conceptions which she comments on and interprets (S. Skwarczyńska, *The Chicago Circle*)⁴⁰. An attempt at synthesis can be found in her monograph *The Meaning of the Form, the Form of the Meaning* (1984), in which she goes back to the theory of plot, to the segments of epic narration and to the systematics of the epic narrator and comments at the same time on Soviet and Western semiotics, French structuralism and the new poetic qualities in literature and film⁴¹. N. Krausová is fond not only of theoretical constructions but also of the genesis and history of particular genre formations; this is evident in her book on the Slovak sonnet⁴².

Slovak genological theory is also characterized by its collective spirit, by the effort to confront different conceptions and standpoints and to synthesize them. In the collection of essays *The Coordinates of the Literary Work*, a group of seven Slovak theorists made an attempt to apply the methodology of receptional aesthetics in an analysis of the literary process in general and in genre evolution in particular. F. Miko, Z. Rampák, N. Krausová, J. Škamla, P. Zajac, M. Šútovec and D. Slobodník set out to reveal new aspects of the

³⁷ J. Hvišč, *Poetika literárnych žánrov*. Bratislava 1985, p. 9.

³⁸ N. Krausová, *Epika a román*. Bratislava 1964, pp. 5–76.

³⁹ N. Krausová, *Rozprávač a románové kategórie*. Bratislava 1972.

⁴⁰ N. Krausová, *Prispevky k literárnej teórii*. Poetika románu. Bratislava 1967; for our purposes the most important is the chapter *K súčasnému stavu v genológii*.

⁴¹ N. Krausová, *Význam tvaru, tvar významu*, Bratislava 1984.

⁴² N. Krausová, *Vývin slovenského sonetu*. Bratislava 1976.

material analysed, e.g. the contrast of the ideal and the real in literature, the neglected or deformed term of the literary character, the importance of the ode in modern literature, new models of literary creation (science fiction), the complicated valences between literature and sociological and economic factors, the musical character of verse. The Slovak theorists have re-integrated the methods of philosophy, sociology and psychology to show that they can really function in practical life⁴³. The activities of Slovak genology are also reflected in the attention paid to genology in Slovak literary periodicals. As an attempt of such complementary discussion we could choose the studies published in 1988 in *Slovenská literatúra*⁴⁴.

The comparative conception of literary genology expressed in the works of S. Wollman and D. Ďurišín and the concrete thematological analyses made by the scholars concentrated round the "Bulletin of the Russian Language and Literature" is therefore complemented by the more philosophical aspects expressed by Z. Mathauser, S. Mathauserová, V. Svatoň, D. Hodrová and the whole Slovak group inspired by Miko's receptional aesthetics and closely connected with similar approaches cultivated in Western Europe, the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union. *The genological research in Brno*, which is concentrated in the Department of Russian and the Soviet literatures and Slavonic Literatures of the Faculty of Arts of Brno University could be characterized as a creative synthesis of history, theory and the comparative approach. The team headed by M. Mikulášek consists not only of Slavacists but also of specialists in Germanic, Romance and ancient literatures. This wide concept offers better opportunities for conclusive theoretical generalizations. The department has organized several conferences, the most recent in 1985 and 1988, in which a number of scholars from abroad participated. The 1988 conference, called "Literaria humanitas" was devoted to the centenary of the birth of the founder of Brno Slavonic and Russian studies, F. Wollman.

In his first monograph M. Mikulášek analysed the evolution of Soviet Russian comedy between 1925–1934, with the aim of emphasizing the importance of satire in the literature of socialist realism; his work was based on a comparative analysis of the genre⁴⁵. His second monograph, on Mayakovsky, is a profound interpretation of Mayakovsky's satirical comedies in the context of a wide comparative background (modern French literature, German expressionism)⁴⁶. All Mikulášek's monographs and sorter studies combine

⁴³ *Súradnice literárneho diela*. Bratislava 1986; see our longer review *Slovenské prínosy k metodológii literárí teórie*, in: *Česká literatura* 1988, 3, pp. 270–276.

⁴⁴ See N. Krausová, *Bachtin, teória intertextu a vývin žánru*. I. Pospíšil, *Problém genologických koncepcí*. J. Hvišč, *Systematika literárnych druhov*. P. Zajáč, *Poznámky na okraj žánrovej diskusie*. J. Noge, *Poviedky a nepoviedky*. J. G. Tajovského. J. Števček, *Fikcia a pravda Bajzovho románu*. In: *Slovenská literatúra* 1988, 4, pp. 289–358.

⁴⁵ M. Mikulášek, *Puti razvitiia sovetskoi komedii 1925–1934 godov*. Opera Universitatis Purkynianae brunensis, facultas philosophica, Praha 1962.

⁴⁶ M. Mikulášek, *Pobednyj smech (Opyt žanrovo-sravnitel'nogo analiza dramaturgii V. V. Majakovskogo)*. Brno 1974.

the genological aspect with comparative literary morphology⁴⁷. The two specialists in Polish literature, J. Pelikán and his wife K. Kardyni-Pelikánová, also deal with literature from the genological point of view. J. Pelikán deals with genological categories in his studies concerning Polish drama and the Polish and Russian novels⁴⁸, while K. Kardyni-Pelikánová has written several brilliant comparisons of the particular genres in Polish and Czech literature⁴⁸. D. Kšicová is known as a specialist in the Russian poetry of the 19th century; she analysed the longer lyric narrative poem ("poema") in a wide literary context in her second monograph and in a series of articles⁵⁰. J. Mandát (who died in 1986) write about folklore genres in modern literature, and later about the typology of the Russian sentimentalism of the 18th century and of the poetics of the Russian novel of the 19th century⁵¹. I. Pospíšil analysed the genre of the chronicle in Russian and World literatures in two monographs and generalized his conception in theoretical studies⁵². J. Jelínková has dealt with old Russian literature, especially with the short story of the Renaissance type⁵³. The problems of literary genres are also the main interest of other members of the department — J. Hrabětová, J. Dohnal and G. Bínová⁵⁴. Very close to this synthetic conception of literary genres are the studies written by M. Zahrádka⁵⁵ and V. Kostřica⁵⁶ from Olomouc University.

⁴⁷ M. Mikulášek, *Idejnaja koncepcija i žanrovyye tradicii epoei M. Šolochova „Tichij don“ i sovremennyj literaturnyj process*. Slavia 1980, 3, pp. 227–238. M. Mikulášek, *Literatura mravní odpovědnosti a sebeobnovy. Ideověstetické koncepce, principy, metodologické rysy a žánrově tvaroslovná stratifikace literatury socialistického realismu*. Praha 1987.

⁴⁸ J. Pelikán, *Poválečné polské drama*. Brno 1976. J. Pelikán, *Napoleonské epopeje L. N. Tolstého a S. Žeromského*. In: Slovánské studie, Brno 1979, pp. 89–101.

⁴⁹ K. Kardyni-Pelikánová, *Panoramické powieści chłopskie w Czechach i Polsce w XIX i XX wieku* (Slavia 1975); *Máchův Máj a polská básnická povídka* (Česká literatura 1986).

⁵⁰ E.g. D. Kšicová, *Poéma za romantismu a novoromantismu. Rusko-české paralely*. Brno 1983. D. Kšicová, *K typologickému srovnání české a ruské poémy (Lermontov, Mácha, a Zeyer)*. In: Slovánské studie, Brno 1979, pp. 75–88.

⁵¹ J. Mandát, *Lidová pohádka v ruském vývoji literárním*. Opera Universitatis brunensis, facultas philosophica, Praha 1960. J. Mandát, *Ruská sentimentální povídka*. Úvodní stať. Texty. Komentáře. Sv. 1–2. Praha 1982, 1983. J. Mandát, *Počátky ruského epistolárního románu*. Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity, D 29, 1982, pp. 41–47.

⁵² E.g. I. Pospíšil, *Ruská románová kronika*. Brno 1983. I. Pospíšil, *Labyrint kroniky*. Brno 1986. I. Pospíšil, *Genologické pojmy a žánrové hranice*. Slavia 1981, 3–4, pp. 381–389.

⁵³ J. Jelínková, *Povídka renesančního typu ve starší ruské literatuře a ústní slovesnosti*. Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity, D 25–26, 1978–79, pp. 79–90.

⁵⁴ J. Hrabětová, *Staročeská báseň o Vilémovi z Kounic*. Cas. Matice moravské 103, 1984, pp. 84–100. I. Hrabětová, *České erbovní pověsti u polského kronikáře Jana Długosze*. Sb. referátů z 3. konference čs. polonistů, Ostrava 1986, pp. 196–201. J. Dohnal, *Žanrovyye osobennosti prozy L. Andrejeva*. Brno, in print. J. Dohnal, *Kompoziční postup časového předpětí v povídce L. Andrejeva „Predstojala kraža“*. Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity, D 35, Brno 1988. G. Bínová, *Tvorčeskaja evolucija V. Šukšina*. Brno 1988.

⁵⁵ M. Zahrádka, *Typologie ruských válečných memoárů třicátých let 19. století*. Bulletin, Praha 1969, pp. 77–88. M. Zahrádka, *O vývoji ruské válečné prózy*. Olomouc 1969. M. Zahrádka, *Paralely a vztahy (Česká a sovětská válečná próza)*. Praha 1986.

⁵⁶ V. Kostřica, *Studie z ruské klasické literatury*. Olomouc 1986. V. Kostřica, *O žanrovom svojeobrazii prozy N. S. Leskova*. Filologičeskije nauki 1974, 2, pp. 70–75.

All the genological streams and schools whose features can be found in contemporary Czechoslovakia are interested in new angles of research; the genological conferences held in Brno in 1985 and 1988 reflected a general tendency towards an analysis of the boundaries of genres⁵⁷, e.g. intergeneric, polygeneric and polysemantic phenomena (detective stories, science fiction, mass literature, documentary literature). We began by speaking about generic range: the literary genre is thus regarded as an aesthetic object which can be found at the focus of various "partial ranges" of the author, the reader, the society, social psychology, etc. The terms "range" (causality – anticipation mechanism), "stability", "lability", "accommodation", represent the most important aspects of genre transformations as a result of social, cultural, psychological and interpersonal factors⁵⁸. The development of contemporary Czechoslovak genology, and the different approaches which can be found within it show that genre optics has gradually become the most penetrating method of analysing the work of literature.

⁵⁷ See G. S. Morson, *The Boundaries of Genre. Dostojevsky's "Diary of a Writer" and the Traditions of Literary Utopia*. University of Texas, Austin 1981.

⁵⁸ See I. Pospíšil, *Problém genologických koncepcí*. Slovenská literatúra 1988, 4, pp. 298–313. I. Pospíšil, *Rozpětí žánrů*. Brno, in print.