

Ryszard Nycz

"Badania nad krytyką literacką", pod
red. Janusza Sławińskiego, Wrocław
1974 : [recenzja]

Literary Studies in Poland 1, 123-129

1978

Artykuł został zdigitalizowany i opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

beliefs which could be described after Znaniecki as a humanistic factor of a work of art, though after making in this notion some appropriate, sometimes quite radical, corrections from the methodological point of view and especially from the point of view of the Marxist conception of the connection of the consciousness of the creators and recipients of art with social practice.

Formation of a work of art within a definite context of artistic culture, deciding also about the way of its social functioning, is the subject of reflections included in the next three essays. And the problem to what degree the work, however formed, i.e. interpreted, can be the subject of intersubjective agreements and critical opinions is discussed in two more essays: *O interpretacji adaptacyjnej* (*On the Adapting Interpretation*) and *O obiektywności krytyki artystycznej* (*On the Objectivity of Artistic Criticism*).

The remaining items of our collection include interpretations of actual works of fine art or literary works, or they are devoted to the analysis of this type of interpretation. They are to show that our arrangement of the theoretical assumptions and problems they involve may not only play the role of a device which arranges, explains and improves the artistic criticism practice, but may even directly be used in practice of this kind.

Jerzy Kmita

Transl. by A. Korzeniowska

Badania nad krytyką literacką (Studies on Literary Criticism), ed. by J. Sławiński, Ossolineum, Wrocław 1974, pp. 219. The series: *Z Dziejów Form Artystycznych w Literaturze Polskiej* (*From the History of Artistic Forms in Polish Literature*), vol. XXXVII.

Among many of the problems undertaken by the authors of these studies there are undoubtedly two that are most important: the specific nature and non-autonomy of the subject. As far as the first is concerned, the question of assessment and the description of the structure of the critical statement are brought to the fore. The second problem, above all, required taking into consideration the relations into which criticism enters with other types of statements

and also the consequences which result from its mediumistic role, especially from "the natural" placing of criticism between science (discursive statements) and art ("creative" and literary statements).

Janusz Sławiński's article *Krytyka literacka jako źródło historyczne* (*Literary Criticism as a Historical Source*), opening the volume, deals with both of these aspects in the perspective shown by its title. It is only proper to stress that this is a further study of the subject by Janusz Sławiński who has been engaged in the problems of the theory of literary criticism for a long time. His conclusions, which were formed earlier, are the theoretical base for many, while the context has been the point of reference for the majority, whose work can be found in the collection. This observation applies especially to the sketch characterizing the following basic functions of criticism: operational, cognitive and estimating, postulating, and metacritical*—which, as he states in his last study, "may be treated as universal determinants of every literary critic's language" (p. 22).

In the discussed work, the author considers certain generalizations which make the practice of the history of criticism possible. He shows three parallel aspects of its subject: the critico-literary thought, criticism as a form of the appearance of literary consciousness which is complementary to literature, and criticism as an institution of literary life. He then discusses the researcher's basic problem in this line of studies. The first one concerns the type and the resources of the text. The criterion for isolating the subject is "the critical character" of the statement as a feature, which appears not only under the traditional forms which find themselves under the name of criticism (essays, treatises, reviews, causeries, etc.), but also in the critical manifestations which can be found within other fields of knowledge: literature, knowledge of literature, cultural policy, as well as their specific variants—censorship and internal publishing opinions.

The type and quality of information which is possible to use from such an isolated material at the same time forms the main perspectives for research, prepossessing the subject as evidence of:

* See J. Sławiński, *Funkcje krytyki literackiej* (*The Functions of Literary Criticism*), [in:] *Dzielo, język, tradycja* (*Writing, Language, Tradition*), Warszawa 1974.

reception, norms which determine the author's decisions and form the element of literary consciousness, ideals of desired literature, and the conditions of literary life. Besides, critical statements may be treated as units of the existing knowledge of literature. In this case, critical enunciations are parts of the historioliterary process and do not represent the autonomic subject. Its formation is dependent on the reconstruction of the language of literary criticism whose determinants are the above mentioned functions.

The mentioned perspectives for research, applied to the language of criticism, make it possible to formulate it respectively as: a code for understanding literary works, the formulated poetics of a certain field of creation, the utopia of writing, and the equivalent of programmes of institutions of literary life. According to Sławiński, dictionaries (whose collection create a notional system) and syntax, manifesting themselves in texts in the form of the rhetoric of literary criticism, decide about the specific nature of individual languages. From this point of view, criticism may be an independent subject for research, although the whole examination also requires taking into account the involvement in other systems as well as placing it in the integrative frame-work of historioliterary synthesis.

Some of the issues which can be found in Sławiński's article have been elucidated in other works in a more detailed way. Stefan Sawicki undertook the problem of synthesis in his sketch *O syntetycznym ujmowaniu literatury* (*About the Synthetic Formulation of Literature*); Jerzy Kmita and the Slovakian scholar, František Miko, devoted their studies to the problem of assessment. Admittedly, they both consider the moment of assessment to be the essential determinant of a critical statement but they undertake the problem from different points of view and focus their attention on different aspects of the subject. For Kmita, in his work *Oceny krytycznoliterackie jako źródło historyczne* (*Critical Assessments as a Historical Source*), the opinions described as a symptom of appreciation of the given evaluating systems are the source for reconstructing the normative component of literary consciousness which constitutes the systems of beliefs marking the particular work. Critical assessment may fulfil this role in two aspects: as evidence—because of the contents and the definite quality of information—as well as the “remains” or the indication of certain beliefs and norms of the critic himself. Miko, on the

other hand, in his study *Wartościowanie i analiza dzieła literackiego* (*Assessment and Analysis of a Literary Work*), examines the value as the functional aspect of the work's style and considers the structure of the text, which marks the invariant of the contents, as its basic source. According to Miko, both a literary text and a critical statement, are built from this point of view in an analogical way. Criticism, viewed in this way, always reduces the whole to the value and is not interested in the structure of the text. It may either interpret, re-creating the process of generating value, or estimate as a whole. However, in both cases, it is a dependent and metatext phenomenon.

A few works are concerned with the structure of a critical text as a model or as a concrete statement. Marek Gumkowski and Janusz Pawłowski write *O wielogłosowości tekstu krytycznego* (*About the Polyphony of a Critical Text*), considering three aspects of its dialogistic structure: within the critic's output, in relation to the subject as well as in connection with the complementary and actualized context in the statement. On the other hand, Marian Płachecki and Krzysztof Zaleski are interested in *Metatekst w tekście krytycznym* (*The Metatext in a Critical Text*), differentiating between two of its basic variants: the delimiting metatext, describing a certain part of the text and not permitting itself to be moved into the linear order of the statement, and metacritical statements which speak for the whole text and can be moved within its boundaries. The authors reconstruct the deep structure of both types and connect them with the two aspects of time: the linear time of the statement and the duration of the structure, finally underlining the common element of both—pointing to the subject of the text. “Metatext—say the authors—is such a significative relation in which the authentic [...] presence of the author is most forcibly shown” (p. 93).

Henryk Markiewicz took an interest in a specific text in the work *Jak był zrobiony “Beniaminek” K. Irzykowskiego* (*How K. Irzykowski's “Beniaminek” Was Constructed*). The analysis of the rhetorical and ideological levels of this book makes it possible to observe in it the excellent realization of a pamphlet as a special variant of a critical statement. Definite material is also the basis for two historioliterary studies: *O zadaniach krytyki literackiej lat 1800–1820* (*About the Assignments of Literary Criticism between 1800–1820*) by Irena Kitowiczowa and Andrzej Biernacki's *Krytyka i historia litera-*

ture. Korbit — Kridl — Elzenberg: nieporozumienia powracające (*Criticism and the History of Literature. Korbit—Kridl—Elzenberg: Recurring Misunderstandings*). Two historical and critical statements: the prosecutor's speech during Flaubert's trial as well as Baudelaire's essay on *Madame Bovary*, were, for Ewa Szary-Matywiecka, the means for formulating two contrasting models, two ways of reading and two of the critic's types of roles (as a judge-censor and as an "ideal" reader). The title of the study: *Od krytyki ignorancji do krytyki kompetencji* (*From the Criticism of Ignorance to the Criticism of Competence*) summarizes their characterization.

Kazimierz Bartoszyński, in his article *Pogranicza krytyki literackiej* (*On the Border of Literary Criticism*), considered, in detail, the problem of the two-sided entanglement of the critical statement found among the "creative" statements characteristic of literature and the discursive statements which are characteristic of science, as well as the mutual heterogeneousness of these two types of statements where the "critical" element penetrates the literary and scientific texts while the "creative" and purely discursive elements penetrate criticism. The author first deals with the relation: "creative" statement—the literary critic's statement, considering those variants as integral wholes, while, according to him, the poetic quality of the literary text corresponds with the rhetoric quality (the specific "poetic quality" of the language) of the critical text.

Bartoszyński builds models of both types of statements and afterwards shows the main phases of the disturbance in balance of these patterns. Within one perspective, the penetration of "creative" elements to criticism leads from the attitude of research through the conflicting situation and the conscious putting of works of others into the critic's own contexts to postulating criticism as well as pseudo-critical writing which is now only "an imitation of criticism." From the opposite point of view, the infusion of critical elements into literature takes place in a triple way: by actualizing the "critical" element within the poetic function (pointing to the rules of construction); as an aspect of the autothematic statement, being carried into effect within the metapoetic function marked by stages leading from zero through a quotation or the quotation of structure, stylization, to the pastiche which appears as "an imitation of creative writing."

The author considers the next relation, connecting criticism with

discursive (scientific) statements, in a similar way. He constructs two models: the criticism of a discursive statement and literary criticism, confronting them because of the distance or lack of distance to the subject and the possibility of the existence of a common universum, of the uniformity of the critical and discursive sentences, and the critical and "creative" ones. The last issue firmly joins both relations connecting criticism.

The special aspect of the general problem of the "inter-genre" and heterogeneity of statements was undertaken by Krzysztof Dybiak and Tadeusz Witkowski in their study *Wypowiedź poetycka jako akt krytyczny (Poetic Statement as a Critical Act)*. According to the authors, each poetic statement is a critical act, although not every one is a critical statement the critical quality of which is made into a critical theme. Here too, the starting of the dialogue becomes a sign, a manifestation of critical information coming into being. The authors see the specific nature of this sort of information in the different status of this information and in a different role performed by the functions which are typical for criticism. They also see the greater marking of poetic statements with the "critical" element than it takes place in literary criticism.

Finally, it would be worth while mentioning yet one more proposition having its own place on the map of different research strategies of approaching the criticism phenomenon represented by the articles of the collection. Jan Prokop, in his interesting essay *Krytyka jako nierozumienie dzieła (Criticism as Misunderstanding of a Literary Work)*, starting from the existentialist thesis (put forward particularly by Sartre), of the reifying strength of somebody else's point of view, constructs the conception of criticism as of a special mediator, not so much between the work and the public but mainly between the author and his own work. From this point of view, misunderstanding as false (from the writer's aspect) perception of the work, as a schematized image of the author, is, as Prokop emphasizes, an extremely important factor of literary dynamics: "Criticism makes his work repugnant to the author, forcing him to search for new solutions" (p. 29). Thus, one may describe criticism as a parody of creative writing. The critic, naming and showing the rules and the model of the work, laughing at mannerism and conventionalization, becomes as much a "fool of literature" as its co-author—he forces

the authors towards reaction, "rectification," and to "self-commentaries." On the other hand, though, criticism understood in this way, is also an indispensable component of creative writing, not only in its apparent, written form, but also in the unofficial reactions to the text or finally, in the author's reflections on his own work.

Badania nad krytyką literacką is the prolegomena to the future history and theory of criticism. The volume, taken as a whole, does not offer any final conclusions but it enables forming them: it proposes certain tools; demonstrates, by way of example, the method of description; and informs, in a complicated way, the complex structure of the subject; articulates the specific status of criticism resulting from its role as a mediator; shows the characteristic ambivalence of its specific nature and notorious non-independence. The concentration of research interests on the neuralgic aspects of the subject brought about a comparative domination of considerations collected around the problems of assessment—diverse manifestations of cognitive and estimating functions as well as the issues connected with the outer and inner "metatextualism" of critical statements—therefore, with the aspects of the actualization of the dialogic and metacritical function. The efforts, undertaken by the authors, to introduce some order did not lead to reductive effects. On the contrary: the precision of description, as happens very often, exposes a new, probably truer, although not simple, physiognomy of criticism—its Janus-faced countenance.

Sum. by *Ryszard Nycz*
Transl. by *A. Korzeniowska*

Stefania Skwarczyńska, **Pomiędzy historią a teorią literatury (Between History and Theory of Literature)**, Instytut Wydawniczy PAX, Warszawa 1975, pp. 328.

The collection of articles under the title *Pomiędzy historią o teorią literatury* is a new book by Stefania Skwarczyńska, the outstanding theoretician and historian of literature. The author has been dealing for many years with the problems of methodology of literary research, general problems of study of literature, problems of genology and comparative literature, theory of translation and of drama. Among