

Kocmanová, Jessie

[Fredeman, William E. Pre-Raphaelitism]

Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. D, Řada literárněvědná. 1969, vol. 18, iss. D16, pp. 232-234

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/108024>

Access Date: 27. 11. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

prostor atp., přece jen — právě pro povahu samotného předmětu — tu existuje určitá nejistota interpretace. Cestu k syntéze, k postžení typů, scén nesoucích vývoj, i celé divadelní oblasti vidí Jacquot v oblasti vyložené komparatistické s tím, že při nápadných analogiích mezi vzdálenými oblastmi nesmíme zapomínat na jejich odlišné kontexty.

Sborník obsahuje, jak jsme viděli, čtyřiatřicet studií badatelů skutečně známých jmen: z oblasti německé Theaterwissenschaft — Heinz Kindermann, Carl Niessen, mnichovský Günter Schöne, z francouzského divadelního výzkumu vedle zmíněného Jeana Jacquota, André Chastel ze Sorbonny aj., objevují se jména představitelů anglické i americké teatrologie i jejich kolegů z Itálie a severovýchodních zemí.

Snad je tato „západní“ orientace nevhodná v tom směru, že právě slavistická oblast mohla dokreslit tuto problematiku — především v kapitolách apercepce a vlastního přístupu k italským vlivům jak v oblasti dalmatské, tak v oblasti česko-polské.

Zdeněk Srna, Libor Štukavec

Tristan Rémy, **Klauniády**. (Z francouzského originálu Entrées clownesques přeložil a vysvětlivky napsal Jan Brabec. Praha, Orbis, 1968, 284 strany.)

Výstupy klaunů patří k významným produktům divadelního charakteru, žijícím mimo oblast divadel. Celým svým rázem blížily se vystoupením různých kočovnických a náměstických a tržišních.

Vznikající z nápadů svých interpretů, dostávaly výstupy klaunů definitivnější podobu v manéžích cirkusů. Jejich scénária se pak šířila, obrušovala a dotvářela ústním podáním, nikoli nepodobným tradování projevů folklorních (lidových písní, pohádek, pověstí atd.).

Zel, dlouho se nenašel nikdo, kdo by specifické umění klaunů, stojící jak na projevu mluvním, tak na projevu akrobatickém, písemně zachytil. Ač šlo leckdy o klauny těšící se plným právem ohromné slávy (bratři Fratellini, Enrico Sprocani — známý pod jménem Rhum, Dario a Manrico Menchi atd.). Teprve francouzský spisovatel Tristan Rémy, autor proslulé knihy o „posledním z pierotů“ Janu Kašparu Debureauovi, hrouževnatým úsilím shromáždil na 150 klaunovských výstupů. Z nich pak vybral 60 čísel, těch, která ke svému provedení potřebují co nejméně rekvizit, a shrnul je do samostatné knihy. A tak jsou podklady tohoto svérázného umění, které se víc nežli po sto let dědí od generace ke generaci klaunů a které přechází také od národa k národu, konečně zaznamenány.

Rémy přirozeně věnoval největší pozornost klaunským výstupům ze zemí západních. Svědčí o tom i předmluva „Klaunský výstup“, pokoušející se především zachytit historii klaunských scének, žel, jen ve Francii, kam klaunové přišli z Anglie (např. Andrew Ducrow) po návratu Bourbonů. Klasická doba klaunů nastává ve Francii rokem 1864, kdy byl vydán zákon o divadelní svobodě, otevírající cirkus mluvené komedii. Rémy sice připomíná různé druhy klaunů (humoristický, politický atd.), sepětí jejich umění s tradicí komedie dell' arte, s mimy, se španělskými šašky apod., i fakt, že s klaunerií souvisí filmová groteska, nicméně obsírněji a hlouběji tyto vztahy nerozebírá. K tomu, aby vznikla takováto syntetická práce, bylo by zapotřebí předchozích studií o klaunských výstupech jednotlivých národů. Rémymu náleží zásluha za to, že dal ke studiu této problematiky popud a že k němu svou „antologií“ poprvé sebral důležitý materiál.

Artur Závodský

William E. Fredeman, **Pre-Raphaelitism**. A Bibliocritical Study. (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1965, pp. 327.)

The Associate Professor of English at the University of British Columbia, William E. Fredeman, has presented us in this volume with a remarkable combination of expert bibliography and original critical assessment. This comprehensive work is the first bibliography of Pre-Raphaelitism on such a scale and with such a purpose, for as Professor Fredeman stresses in his Preface, it is not a mere formal descriptive bibliography, but is intended as a “critical reference guide to the whole subject of Pre-Raphaelitism”. The sub-title, “A Bibliocritical Study”, though employing an

unusual term, describes what Professor Fredeman calls his "tripartite approach". He is concerned, that is, with three purposes, to define Pre-Raphaelitism and its different phases so as to "reflect the complexities involved in dealing with the movement critically", to examine the shifting critical attitudes by means of a survey of selected scholarship, and finally to give an annotated check list of both primary and secondary sources, covering both literary and visual Pre-Raphaelitism.

Fundamental to Professor Fredeman's purpose is his definition of the three stages of Pre-Raphaelitism, which as he says has been subject to a critical confusion beginning, at the very outset, with the critics of the 1850s, who failed to make the necessary distinction between "Ruskinism" and Pre-Raphaelitism.

In the Introduction to the Survey of Pre-Raphaelite Scholarship (pp. 1-38), Professor Fredeman stresses the three successive phases which the term Pre-Raphaelite is generally used to cover: the original Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, the pleiad of 1848; the Pre-Raphaelite Movement, including, as well as the Brotherhood, "all later aesthetic influences emanating from the Brotherhood and culminating in what may be called, historically and critically, a school". The third aspect, Pre-Raphaelitism, is the broadest in application, "essentially a generic usage, including the more common characteristics of the art and literature of ... the whole panoply of artists and writers for whom, roughly between 1848 and 1882, Pre-Raphaelitism was the special kind of romantic common denominator." Partly because of the "critical reticence" of the original Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, and the fact that much that we know of their ideas we know by hindsight through the mass of memoirs and autobiographies written half a century later, partly because of "the failure of critics to examine and explain the basic complexity of a movement which, beginning as a reform in painting, had its greatest influence in the field of English letters." (p. 2)

Much of the later critical confusion which surrounded and surrounds the concept of Pre-Raphaelitism sprang from the association of John Ruskin with the movement. Ruskin, seeing in the ideas and practice of the original Brotherhood artists much with which he could sympathize, was the first well-known critic to defend their work and standpoint. While his intervention in 1851 perhaps saved Pre-Raphaelitism from ending in obscurity through public neglect and the inarticulateness of the Brotherhood as to their actual principles, yet "as its formal apologist (he) played a role which was ultimately ambiguous" (p. 13). For in the public mind, Pre-Raphaelitism, essentially a doctrine of aesthetics, became associated with a moral, didactic and social purpose which in the minds of its founders it did not have. Only Ruskin and William Morris, of those directly connected with Pre-Raphaelitism, were primarily concerned with social conditions and social theory. On the other hand, while Pre-Raphaelitism helped to form the English Aesthetic Movement of the end of the century, it was by no means identical, in fact in some ways the very opposite of Aestheticism. Professor Fredeman's summing-up of the main characteristics of Pre-Raphaelitism in the year 1857 - the year of the Pre-Raphaelite Exhibitions in London and New York, when the Movement emerged as a recognized artistic school - shows the difference between Pre-Raphaelitism and the Aesthetic Movement: Pre-Raphaelitism was "characterized first, in subject matter, by the interests of the Romantic Movement; second, in treatment, by its emphasis on the literary content of pictures and by its own literary side; and, third, in technique, by a concern with visual accuracy and an emphasis on the fidelity of the artist in depicting natural scenes" (p. 16).

The Survey of Scholarship is followed by a very exhaustive commented bibliography divided into 100 sections in all and including bibliographies of source material, of individual members and associates, of historical and critical studies and other related works, of exhibitions, of collections and of Pre-Raphaelite book illustrations. The notes preceding the sections on individual figures sum up the salient points. Perhaps inevitably, in seeking to survey such an unruly and heterogeneous mass of material, some of the comments appear as snap judgments which could be debated. For instance, to call Ford Madox Brown a "plodding competent painter" scarcely does justice to the creator of *The Last of England* and *Work* (p. 151). The comment on Burne-Jones as a painter echoes the general opinion of his work as vague and nebulous without in any way accounting for the hold it had on the

very concrete imagination of William Morris. In general, however, the critical comments are objective and serve their purpose of orientation excellently.

With many figures, such as William Morris, whose interests and influence go far beyond the horizons of Pre-Raphaelitism, it must have been a real problem to know what to include and what to reject as irrelevant. One noteworthy item which seems to have escaped Professor Fredeman's net is the study of Morris's "Guenevere" volume by Dixon Scott, "The First Morris" (in a Liverpool University publication of 1912) which gives strong support to Professor Fredeman's conclusion — even although this conclusion is debatable — that "*The Defence of Guenevere* was a crystallization of all that was best in the energies generated by the first wave of Pre-Raphaelitism" and an accomplishment which "Morris never quite equaled" (p. 162).

Naturally the treatment of figures such as Ruskin and Morris, whose central importance for the history and theory of art and society is in the final analysis much greater than that of Pre-Raphaelitism, does not stress these wider aspects of their life and work. Professor Fredeman's book, however, does give a considered basis, hitherto lacking on such a scale, for the assessment on the one hand of the part played by these two great 19th-century figures in the Pre-Raphaelite Movement, and on the other hand of the considerable influence Pre-Raphaelitism and its tenets exercised on them.

The illustrations and the whole lay-out of the book make it delightful and simple to handle and there can be no doubt that its appearance is a landmark in Pre-Raphaelite studies.

Jessie Kocmanová