

Fořt, Bohumil

Roman Jakobson's view of realism in the light of early discussions of realist literature

Brno studies in English. 2024, vol. 50, iss. 1, pp. 155-165

ISSN 0524-6881 (print); ISSN 1805-0867 (online)

Stable URL (DOI): <https://doi.org/10.5817/BSE2024-1-9>

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/digilib.81080>

License: [CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

Access Date: 18. 01. 2025

Version: 20250107

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

ROMAN JAKOBSON'S VIEW OF REALISM IN THE LIGHT OF EARLY DISCUSSIONS OF REALIST LITERATURE

Brno Studies in English
Volume 50, No. 1, 2024

ISSN 0524-6881 | e-ISSN 1805-0867
<https://doi.org/10.5817/BSE2024-1-9>

BOHUMIL FOŘT

Abstract

The phenomenon of realist literary fiction has been in the centre of attention of theoreticians and thinkers since onset. The study focuses on a critical comparison of various aspects of the realist novel in selected early discussions of realist literature, as delivered namely by Émile Zola, Hippolyte Taine, Gustav Flaubert, Guy de Maupassant, Henry James, and others, and of those delivered by Roman Jakobson in his influential study *On realism in Arts* (1921). This comparison is also enriched by the context of modern theoretical investigation in the field and shows the major similarities and dissimilarities between the early views of realism and its modern theoretical depiction.

Key words

Roman Jakobson; realism; truth; truthfulness; illusion

Roman Jakobson on Realism

Although in his extensive *oeuvre* Roman Jakobson only pays occasional attention to the phenomenon of realism, it is a matter of fact that his early study *On Realism in Arts* (first published in Czech in 1921) has received wide theoretical attention and has been repeatedly used in various analyses and comparisons regarding literary realism. (1) Today, the study is considered one of the most important early starting points to the systematic inquiry of the phenomenon.

Roman Jakobson starts his essay in a rather revolutionary tone when formulating his scholarly view of the investigation of literary realism in direct opposition to the contemporary approaches. The author accuses the existing views of lacking scholarliness and of utilising slipshod terminology. This, according to Jakobson, results in the fact that the contemporary discussions on realism do not differentiate between various meanings of the term: “Until recently, the history of art, particularly that of literature, has had more in common with causerie than with scholarship. It obeyed all the laws of causerie, skipping blithely from topic to topic, from lyrical effusions on the elegance of forms to anecdotes from the

artist's life, from psychological truisms to questions concerning philosophical significance and social environment" (Jakobson 1987: 19). In other words, these discussions, Jakobson argues, lack proper understanding of the topic and therefore cannot serve as a base for a meaningful and systemic taxonomy of the notion. In order to avoid the confusion, Roman Jakobson, in this early attempt of an analytical grasp of literary phenomena, offers three variants of the meaning of realism.

Roman Jakobson, in order to avoid any confusion that may stem from an undifferentiated use of the term, stipulates that realism can have three different meanings: "Realism may refer to the aspiration and intent of the author, i.e., a work is understood to be realistic if it is conceived by its author as a display of verisimilitude, as true to life (meaning A). A work may be called realistic if I, the person judging it, perceive it as true to life (meaning B). [...] Thus a new covert identification has occurred, a third meaning of the word "realism" has crept in (meaning C), one which comprehends the sum total of the features characteristic of one specific artistic current of the nineteenth century" (Jakobson 1987: 20).

Today, this general taxonomy of the meaning of the notion of realism (together with the principle of automatization vs. actualisation of realist artistic tool as mentioned later) are usually highlighted as the most important findings of Jakobson's early article. It should be initially emphasized that these three meanings have been an object of scholarly discussion since the very beginning onset. They not only find themselves as the object of frequent analysis, but they are very often used in critical comparisons of Jakobson's early view of realism with the following concepts offered by modern scholars in this area. These comparisons are valuable not only because they show the similarities and dissimilarities of different concepts of realism but they also document the development of theoretical thought about realism since Jakobson's early taxonomical attempt to the present day. And indeed, Jakobson's view has been compared to Roland Barthes' "effect of reality", as well as to the views of Roger Sukenick, Jean-François Lyotard and others. (2)

From the aforementioned, it can be assumed that the role and influence of Jakobson's early article about realism in art has been analysed and described thoroughly in the modern theoretical environment. Therefore in the current study I have decided to follow the time axis in reverse and compare Jakobson's view of realism with ideas that can be found in the works of early realist writers and thinkers. In this respect I am specifically going to work with the first two meanings (A+B) of realism suggested by Roman Jakobson. The reason for this being that although the third (C) meaning of the notion of realism can be (and has been) considered an important contribution to the literary historical view of realism, when dealing with the early discussions of realism we actually work with the views of realism that are in fact simultaneous to the realist literary production. Therefore they can barely be able to view literary realism as a literary historical phenomenon. The only exception is the realist's view of previous literary periods and trends that serve as a tool for the demarcation of realism. This attitude, together with their strife to find new and specifically realist poetic means, can be viewed in close connection with Jakobson's idea of the opposition between automatization and actualisation. This idea, firmly bound to the notion of deviation, in fact enables Jakobson to point out the dynamic essence of literary aesthetic communication of which a realist artwork is a means:

“Thus, in discussing meaning A of the term “realism” (the artistic intent to render life as it is), we see that the definition leaves room for ambiguity:

A₁. The tendency to deform given artistic norms conceived as an approximation of reality.

A₂. The conservative tendency to remain within the limits of a given artistic tradition) conceived as faithfulness to reality.

Meaning B presupposes that my subjective evaluation will pronounce a given artistic fact faithful to reality; thus, factoring in the results obtained, we find:

B₁. I rebel against a given artistic code and view its deformation as a more accurate rendition of reality.

B₂. I am conservative and view the deformation of the artistic code, to which I subscribe, as a distortion of reality” (Jakobson 1987: 22–23).

Discussions concerning realism in the arts are ancient and initially appeared simultaneously with the rise of realist art itself. In terms of literary realism, these discussions commonly take the form of specific paratexts and metatexts, such as reviews, essays, polemics, forewords and afterwords, or are directly implemented in realist artistic texts. Today, these early thoughts of realism, together with the later theoretical grasps of the phenomenon, represent a valuable source of ideas for anyone who wants to study literary realism systematically and in its historical and developmental contexts. Nevertheless, at the beginning of the investigation of literary realism and its contexts it has to be emphasized that right from the very start speaking about one realism is impossible historically as well as ideologically: realism, especially in literature, represents an extremely variable phenomenon which resists a simple grasp, description, and interpretation. In spite of this fact, I believe that it is possible to generalize some of the most common features of this particular kind of literary art – these features can be connected with concepts such as exactness and rigidity, probability, verisimilitude, truth and truthfulness, faithfulness, etc. And in addition, I believe that the discussions of realism, which are equally variable like realism itself, also share common ideas which can be put together, distributed to sets, analysed, and compared.

Nevertheless, in order to narrow down the scope of possible topics regarding the phenomenon of literary realism for the purpose of a critical comparison with Jakobson’s view, my reasoning will be centred around the crucial notion of the *purpose* of literary realist art: *semantics* and *pragmatics* represent, in my belief, one of the most important points of view which brings essential and fruitful information for our detailed comprehension of realist fictional literature. At these two levels a strong connection with the first two meanings of the notion of realism suggested by Jakobson can be detected: meanings A and B, when put together, I believe, directly refer to the communicative essence of realist literary artworks, considering the writer’s as well as the reader’s intentions and the literary artwork

as a specifically fabricated sign. In addition, this view also implements other notions, such as “verisimilitude” or “true to life”, which, as we will see soon, play a key role in the early discussions about realism.

Let us now pay our attention to some of the clusters that can be set as leitmotifs in the early discussions on realism and which represent essential features of these discussions. As we will see, a specific context of the clusters can be put into a direct relationship with the contexts suggested by Roman Jakobson.

Sciences and humanities

From the very beginning, many of the realist authors and thinkers expressed their desire to develop realist art in firm connection with contemporary scientific and philosophical approaches and methodologies. The inspiration from the sciences and humanities and their methodological background was desired as a guarantee for the main purpose of realist art, which is to contribute to the human knowledge of humans and their world. Émile Zola in his study *Le Roman expérimental* (1880) admits that his inspiration for the grasp of the naturalistic novel comes from experimental medicine (3) and suggests that in his thoughts of literature “it will often be but necessary for me to replace the word “doctor” by the word “novelist”, to make my meaning clear and to give it the rigidity of a scientific truth” (Zola 1893: 1–2). He further explains that “when it has been proved that the body of man is a machine, whose machinery can be taken apart and put together again at the will of the experimenter, then we can pass to the passionate and intellectual acts of man. Then we shall enter into the domain which up to the present has belonged to physiology and literature; it will be the decisive conquest by science of the hypotheses of philosophers and writers” (17). It can be concluded that the analogy between a doctor and a writer represents a strong piece of evidence of the specific intentionality of realist art – a doctor not only explores the anatomy of a human but also uses his knowledge in order to describe them and interpret their contexts, as he is viewed by another prominent thinker of realism, Hippolyte Taine: “[the realist writer] lacks true nobility; delicate matters escape him; his anatomist’s hands soil chaste natures; he makes ugliness more ugly. – But he triumphs when it is a matter of depicting base existences; then he is immersed in the ignoble, where he dwells without repugnance; with inner satisfaction he follows household worries and financial manipulations. With equal contentment he follows the development of exploits of force. He is armed with brutality and calculation; reflection has provided him with knowing combinations; his roughness frees him from fear of shocking people” (Taine 1963: 107).

Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that although the inspiration from (experimental) medicine represents a significant source for the development of realist art, from a wider methodological perspective other inspirational sources for articulating the realist method and its purpose have also been mentioned: thus, the *scientific metaphor* of realism welcomes other sciences and their methodologies to the discussion. Among others, Gustav Flaubert calls for an archaeological approach in literature: “That’s what is so fine about natural sciences: they don’t wish to prove

anything. Therefore, what breadth of fact and what an immensity for thought! We must treat men like mastodons and crocodiles. Does anyone fly into a passion about the horns of the forms or the jaws of the latter? Show them, stuff them, put them in solution, that's enough, but appreciate them, no. And what are you yourselves, you little toads?" (Flaubert 1963: 92-93), and similarly, but with a different intention Edmond de Goncourt connect the purpose of the realist art with moral history, which is, not surprisingly, also based on a scientific base: "now that the novel has become, by analysis and by psychological study, contemporary moral history, now that the novel has taken upon itself the researches and the duties of science, it may lay claim to a similar freedom and immunity" (Goncourt 1970: 38).

As we have just witnessed, the realists' thrive for an art which is designed and developed in firm connection with the sciences and humanities and their methods represents one of the strongest arguments for the demarcation of realism.(4) Clearly, this proclaimed change not only legalizes the use of scientific language and methods, but it also renders true Jakobson's claim of deviation (= change) of poetic tools in order to achieve the reality effect. As we will see later, in terms of the realists' aim this change does not take place only at the level of language and method, but also at the level of particular topics being depicted by realist novels. In addition, it should also be emphasized that the *scientific metaphor* of realist art is firmly bound to its general teleology: in order to fulfil the proclaimed task of realist art, which can be paraphrased as a scientifically based contribution to the general knowledge about humans and their worlds, the realists often draw their attention to the object of their thoughts – reality as such. In order to achieve this task, the authors and thinkers of realism often put strong emphasis on their view of the connection between reality as such, its description, analysis and knowledge about it, and also on its representation.

As soon as the relationship between reality as such and the reality represented becomes an essential part of the early realists' discussions, inevitably, the crucial notion of *truth* (and related terms) comes into play: indeed, truth (and truthfulness) belongs among the most collocated notions in terms of the realist art; faithfulness, mimesis, verisimilitude, accuracy, certainty, and others keeping them company. Thus, expectedly, truth and verisimilitude play a crucial role in the attempts of defying, demarcating or describing essential qualities of realist art, which consequently also strongly influence the view on the teleological and pragmatic contexts of the art. In this respect, the early discussions of realism seem to accord with Jakobson's later systematic thoughts, which state directly: "What is realism as understood by the theoretician of art? It is an artistic trend which aims at conveying reality as closely as possible and strives for maximum verisimilitude. We call realistic those works which we feel accurately depict life by displaying verisimilitude" (Jakobson 1987: 20). And indeed, truth and verisimilitude have played crucial roles in the attempts of a demarcation of realist art across cultures and centuries – not only do they appear in the early discussions of realism and in the suggestions delivered by Jakobson (meaning A and B), but the actually function as leitmotifs co-defining realist art to the present day.

Making an allusion to the sworn testimony, Guy de Maupassant believes that truth is the leading criterion which demarcates realist art against other types of

artistic representation: “So, after the literary schools which wanted to give us a distorted, superhuman, poetic, touching, charming or proud vision of life, the realist or naturalist school came, which sought to show as the truth, nothing but the truth and the whole truth” (Maupassant 2014). Similarly, Émile Zola explicitly considers truth the essence of realist art: “The only great and moral works are those of truth” (Zola 1893: 37). Obviously, truth, as other notions of the early discussions of realism, is used in specific connections and constellations with many other concepts. Among other terms used in this context, I would like to draw our attention to the notion of *fact* which actually anchors fiction in reality – George Eliot, speaks about facts as the material of a truthful realist representation and emphasizes the role of the author in this process: “But with regard to that and to my whole book, my predominant feeling is, – not that I have achieved anything, but – that great, great facts have struggled to find a voice through me, and have only been able to speak brokenly. That consciousness makes me cherish the more any proof that my work has been seen to have some true significance by minds prepared not simply by instruction, but by that religious and moral sympathy with the historical life of man which is the larger half of culture” (Eliot 1971: 207). And for example Edmond Duranty further explains this need: “The ideal has disappeared; the lyrical spring has dried up. We have turned away from it. A severe and pitiless truthfulness has come even to art as the last word of experience” (Duranty 1963: 100).(5)

Poetics

Not surprisingly the discussions about truth and verisimilitude in connection with realist art are often accompanied by thoughts that go beyond methodological and philosophical argumentation and lead to the realm of the artistic form. The notion of creative artistic activity determining the realist *techné* is a frequent collocation in this respect. This creative activity underlying the artistic essence of realist art is also part and parcel of Roman Jakobson’s semiotic view of realist literary artworks – they are considered a means of specific aesthetic communication varying according to the communicators’ aims and needs. The same activity, according to George Henry Lewes, results from the fact that “our novels and plays, even when pretending to represent real life, represent it as no human being ever saw it” (Lewes 2009: 47). Guy de Maupassant goes in his thoughts even further, not only does he relativize our perception of reality, he also emphasizes the reality effect caused by a well developed illusion of reality: “How childish it is, indeed, to believe in this reality, since to each of us the truth is in his own mind, his own organs. Our own eyes and ears, taste and smell, create as many different truths as there are human beings on earth. And our brains, duly and differently informed by those organs, apprehend, analyze, and decide as differently as if each of us were a being of an alien race;” therefore, it is inevitable that each of us “has simply his own illusion of the world – poetical, sentimental, cheerful, melancholy, foul, or gloomy, according to his nature. And the writer has no other mission than faithfully to reproduce this illusion, with all the elaborations of art

which he may have learnt and have at his command.” As a consequence, thus, “the illusion of beauty – which is merely a conventional term invented by man! The illusion of ugliness – which is a matter of varying opinion! The illusion of truth – never immutable! The illusion of depravity – which fascinates so many minds! All the great artists are those who can make other men see their own particular illusion” (Maupassant 2014). As can be seen, the extreme subjectivity which Guy de Maupassant assigns to human reception essentially determines the aesthetic (artistic) mode of communication. In this view, realist poetics, thus, fully depends on the ways in which the conventional artistic means used by the author participate in the inter-subjective communication with the reader and with which effect. This view of the communicative essence of realist literary artworks is precisely what we can read for a couple of decades later when Roman Jakobson defines his meanings of realism and connects them with the idea of deviation: in his view, deviation explicitly presupposes a conventionally established set of poetic tools used and perceived with specific intentions and being subjected to the communicators’ needs.

This “air of reality” which is Henry James’ term for *realist illusion* seems connect the represented with specific procedures of representation and with the final effect of reality: “I may therefore venture to say that the air of reality (solidity of specification) seems to me to be the supreme virtue of a novel—the merit on which all its other merits [...] helplessly and submissively depend. If it be not there, they are all as nothing, and if these be there, they owe their effect to the success with which the author has produced the illusion of life.” If so, the cultivation of this success, “the study of this exquisite process, form, to my taste, the beginning and the end of the art of the novelist. They are his inspiration, his despair, his reward, his torment, his delight. It is here, in very truth, that he competes with life” (James 1884).

It could be claimed that the idea of “competition with life” articulated above by Henry James is, in the context of the early discussions of realism, of special importance. According to some thinkers this specific competition can be achieved only thanks to truth that makes the realist work of art so powerful. Guy de Maupassant claims that for the artist “to achieve the effects he aims at – that is to say, the sense of simple reality, and to point the artistic lesson he endeavors to draw from it – that is to say, a revelation of what his contemporary man is before his very eyes, he must bring forward no facts that are not irrefragible and invariable. [...] “Truth” in such work consists in producing a complete illusion by following the common logic of facts and not by transcribing them pell-mell, as they succeed each other. Whence I conclude that the higher order of Realists should rather call themselves Illusionists” (Maupassant 2014).

As we have witnessed, the relationship between reality as such and reality presented by realist novels has been approached from several points of view, by various means and with various intentions. Nevertheless, the relationship between both realities is also crucially bound to the question of the purpose of realist art. Among others, Henry James realizes the importance of the realistically represented reality for our lives: “It is still expected, though perhaps people are ashamed to say it, that a production which is after all only a “make believe” (for what else

is a “story”?) shall be in some degree apologetic – shall renounce the pretension of attempting really to compete with life. This, of course, any sensible wide-awake story declines to do, for it quickly perceives that the tolerance granted to it on such a condition is only an attempt to stifle it, disguised in the form of generosity [...]. The only reason for the existence of a novel is that it does compete with life “ (James 1884). In order to conclude James’ thoughts, let us claim that realist literature plays an essential role for the noetic dimension of human existence: using specific means and strategies, realist literature constructs an illusion of reality, an illusion truthful to the extent that it actually competes with the reality as such. This crucial competition represents the final purpose of realist art: the clash between the represented reality and reality as such enables the recipients to learn from the truth about reality delivered through the channel of realist illusion.

Literary history and demarcation of realism

As previously mentioned, the third (C) meaning of realism offered by Roman Jakobson, that of a literary historical dimension of the notion, does not provide us with much space for comparison of Jakobson’s view and the early discussions of realism – simply because these discussions are simultaneous to and present in the very practice of realism and therefore cannot be viewed from a satisfactory historical distance. However, what can be found in the early discussions of realism in terms of a literary historical awareness is their tireless effort to demarcate realism against its predecessor, romanticism. And it should be stipulated, that in this point a large gap between the views of Roman Jakobson and the early realist thinkers can be found. Roman Jakobson when referring to periods and trends present in the history of the development of literature explicitly says: “Classicists, sentimentalists, the romanticists to a certain extent, even the “realists” of the nineteenth century, the modernists to a large degree, and finally the futurists, expressionists, and their like, have more than once steadfastly proclaimed faithfulness to reality, maximum verisimilitude—in other words, realism—as the guiding motto of their artistic program” (Jakobson 1987: 20). This statement obviously grows from a functional view of literature and in other words emphasizes the role in literature (and art) in human society and existence.

Nevertheless, not having a general literary historical view in their minds and also following their own agenda, i.e. to differentiate realism from any of the previous artistic stages, the early realist writers and thinkers commonly viewed realism in a strong division with the Romanticist art. For the realists, the stipulated strong opposition to Romanticism often served as a starting point for their own demarcation of their, realist area. In the realists’ view, Romanticism represents a kind of art, which is not capable of following the needs of modern man and their situation in the world. Émile Zola in his famous study *Le Roman Experimental* (1880) describes romanticism as “purely an uprising of rhetoricians” (Zola 1893: 65) and continues with a strong rejection of ideological literature whose mayor problem lies in its lyricism which blurs the truth: “I think that the form of expression depends upon the method; that language is only one kind of logic, and its con-

struction natural and scientific. He who writes the best will not be the one who gallops madly among hypotheses, but the one who walks straight ahead in the midst of truths. We are actually rotten with lyricism; we are very much mistaken when we think that the characteristic of a good style is a sublime confusion with just a dash of madness added; in reality, the excellence of a style depends upon its logic and clearness.” (48). In a more militant way, Fernand Desnoyers even calls for boycotting the traditional view of art as a tradition and emphasizes the role of the new, realist observer: “Let us write and paint only what is, or at least what we see, what we know, what we have experienced. Let us have no master or disciples! A strange school, isn’t it, in which there are no masters or disciples and the only principles are independence, sincerity, and individuality!” (Desnoyers 1963: 87).

As can be seen, these and similar demarcations grow mainly from the commonly shared assumption that realism lacks the quality of being artistic and that it is much closer to the sciences and humanities than to the art as such. However, it is obvious that these strict demarcations are more of a rhetorical than practical nature – from the very beginning realism displays artistic features and strategies and these features and strategies are, at the same time, considered in various proclamations and discussions. At the end of this part, let me quote an slightly extensive citation from one of the thoughts by William Sharp, who actually calls for an art which reunites features of both approaches in the realm of the arts: “Perhaps realism in literary art may be approximately defined as the science of exact presentment of many complexities, abstract and concrete, in one truthful, because absolutely reasonable and apparently inevitable, synthesis; this, *plus* the creative energy which in high development involves what is misleadingly called the romantic spirit, and minus that weakness of the selective faculty which is the dominant factor in the work of the so-called realists of Zolaesque school.” And the author continues with an essentialist claim that “realism and romance are found to be as indissoluble as soul and body in a living human being,” and therefore “true artist, no doubt, is he who is neither a realist nor a romanticist, but in whose work is observable the shaping power of the higher qualities of the methods of genuine realism and the higher qualities of the methods of genuine realism and the higher qualities of the methods of genuine romance” (Sharp 1965: 56).

Nevertheless, if we return to Roman Jakobson’s preliminary presumption that artistic periods and trends (named above), similarly to realism, have “steadfastly proclaimed faithfulness to reality, maximum verisimilitude—in other words, realism—as the guiding motto of their artistic program”, an essential difference between his and the early realists’ view points and intentions can be detected. Whereas early realist thinkers tried to demarcate a tool, which according to their teleology is able to describe the world truthfully and therefore can help to change the world for the better, Roman Jakobson’s intention is purely scholarly, and non-ideological – demarcating the area of an empirically based, analytically and comparatively conducted scholarship of literature. And unsurprisingly, this early suggestion of Jakobson is firmly connected to his semiotic project. Considering a language unit as a specific sign which is purely arbitrary to reality (and also to represented reality), Jakobson firstly states that “verisimilitude in a verbal

expression or in a literary description obviously makes no sense whatsoever”, in order to enter the area of convention and as the major process of establishing not only the relationship between a language sign and reality, but also the relationship between realism and reality. As soon as the relationship between realism and reality is proclaimed purely conventional, our attention can be drawn to the language means of realism as such. And this view, together with the meaning (C) of literary realism (the “*one which comprehends the sum total of the features characteristic of one specific artistic current of the nineteenth century*”) brings Jakobson to a solution that realist devices “are in fact also found outside the realist school” (Jakobson 1987: 25). This statement clearly opens the theoretical study of realism to diachronic and comparative contexts based on the analysis of discourse qualities. Undoubtedly, this is the moment when “literary science” about realism was born.

Notes

- ¹ For further reference see for example Herman 1996.
- ² In this respect see especially Brian McHales’s study “Revisiting Realisms; or, WWJD (What Would Jakobson Do?)”.
- ³ Zola actually views experimental medicine as a discipline which should be followed by naturalistic fiction: “Experimental medicine, which but lisps as yet, can alone give us an exact idea of experimental literature, which, being still unhatched, is not even lisping” (Zola 1893: 5).
- ⁴ The inspiration of the realist writers and thinkers from the sciences and humanities represents one of the strongest claims which seems to be shared by many of the participants. However, at the same time it is fair to admit that there are also voices which to confirm the uniqueness of literature, separate it from both, sciences as well as humanities: “Literature must be separated from philosophy and science; at least for our present purpose. Science is the expression of the forms and order of Nature; literature is the expression of the form and order of human life” (Lewes 2009: 46).
- ⁵ Obviously, the “ideal” present in the quotation refers to Romanticism, against which realism and its poetic license are commonly demarcated. Similarly, Edmund Duranty in his *Réalisme* places both styles in strong opposition: “upheld sincerity, modernity, and prose, along with truthfulness, as the distinguishing features of realism, in contrast to the idealisation, historical remoteness and verse typical for Romanticism” (Duranty 1970: 3). Nevertheless, the vast number of realist voices which demarcate realism against Romanticism can be, to an extent, balanced by a quite extensive citation from one of the thoughts by William Sharp, who actually calls for an art which reunites features of both approaches in the realm of the arts: “Perhaps realism in literary art may be approximately defined as the science of exact presentation of many complexities, abstract and concrete, in one truthful, because absolutely reasonable and apparently inevitable, synthesis; this, *plus* the creative energy which in high development involves what is misleadingly called the romantic spirit, and minus that weakness of the selective faculty which is the dominant factor in the work of the so-called realists of Zolaesque school. Thus regarded, realism and romance are found to be as indissoluble as soul and body in a living human being. The true artist, no doubt, is he who is neither a realist nor a romanticist, but in whose work is observable the shaping power of the higher qualities of the methods of genuine realism and the higher qualities of the methods of genuine romance and the higher qualities of the methods of genuine romance” (Sharp 1965: 56).

References

- Becker, George Joseph (ed.) (1963) *Documents of Modern Literary Realism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Desnoyers, Fernand (1963) On realism. *L'Artiste*, 9. December 1855. In Becker, G. J. (ed.) *Documents of Modern Literary Realism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 80–88.
- Duranty, Edmond (1963) On Madame Bovary. *Réalisme*, 5. March 15, 1857. In Becker, G. J. (ed.) *Documents of modern literary realism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 98-104.
- Duranty, Edmond (1970) [1856-1857] *Réalisme*, Paris, July 1856 – May 1857. Quoted in Grant, D. *Realism*. Methuen & Co Ltd.
- Eliot, George (1971) George Eliot to R. H. Hutton, 8 August 1863. In CAROLL, D. (ed.): George Eliot: *The Critical Heritage*. Ed. By David Carroll. Barnes and Noble, 206-207.
- Flaubert, Gustav (1963) To Louise Colet, March 31, 1853. In Becker, G. J. (ed.) *Documents of Modern Literary Realism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 92-93.
- Goncourt, Edmond de (1970) Foreword to Germinie Lacerteux. Translated in Grant, D. *Realism*. Methuen & Co Ltd., 38.
- Herman, Luc (1996) *Concepts of Realism*. Columbia: Camden House.
- Jakobson, Roman (1987) On Realism in Art. In Jakobson, R. *Language in Literature*. Harvard University Press, 19–27.
- James, Henry (1884) *The Art of Fiction* (<https://public.wsu.edu/~campbelld/amlit/artfiction.html>)
- Lewes, George Henry (2009) The lady novelists. In: Maitzen, R. (ed.) *The Victorian Art of Fiction, Nineteenth-century Essays in the Novel*. Broadview Press, 45–58.
- Maupassant, Guy de (2014) The novel. Preface to *Pierre and Jean*. <https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/m/maupassant/guy/m45pa/preface.html>
- McHale, Brian (2008) Revisiting realisms; or, WWJD (What would Jakobson do?). *The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 41 (2), 6–17.
- Sharp, William (1965) Review of a Howells novel *The Academy*. Quoted in Graham, K. *English Criticism of the Novel 1865-1900*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Taine, Hippolyte (1963) Balzac. In: Becker, G. J. (ed.) *Documents of Modern Literary Realism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 105–111.
- Zola, Émile (1893) *The Experimental Novel and Other Essays*. New York: The Cassell Publishing Co.

Bohumil Fořt (1973) obtained his PhD in literary theory (Charles University, Prague) in 2004. He taught at the University of Toronto and the University of London, currently he acts as a professor at Masaryk University (Brno) and as a senior researcher at the Czech Academy of Sciences (Prague). He is the author of five monographs (including *An Introduction to Fictional Worlds Theory*, 2016) and some sixty scholarly studies. His fields of interest are literary theory, narrative theory, literary realism, structuralism and fictional worlds theory.

Address: prof. PhDr. Bohumil Fořt, Ph.D., Department of Linguistics and Baltic Studies, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University, Jáselská 201/18, 602 00 Brno, Czech Republic. [email: amadeus@mail.muni.cz]



This work can be used in accordance with the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license terms and conditions (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode>). This does not apply to works or elements (such as image or photographs) that are used in the work under a contractual license or exception or limitation to relevant rights.

