

Eugeniusz Czaplejewicz

"Problemy poetyki pragmatycznej",
red. nauk. Eugeniusz Czaplejewicz,
Warszawa 1977 : [recenzja]

Literary Studies in Poland 2, 141-149

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.

idea of rivalry (*agon*), praise of the principles of self-dependence and pleasure are factors which are equally essential for tradition as they are for Gombrowicz's attitude and writing, being those factors which permitted him to formulate his peculiar utopia.

Sum. by *Ryszard Nycz*

Transl. by *A. Korzeniowska*

Problemy poetyki pragmatycznej (Problems of Pragmatic Poetics), ed. E. Czaplejewicz, Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 1977.

The book is a collection of materials from the session organized by Zakład Teorii Literatury i Poetyki (Department of Literary Theory and Poetics) of Warsaw University on 21st, 22nd March 1974. Formulating a draft of pragmatic poetics and discussing its various aspects, the materials renew also the most fundamental questions concerning literature and literary studies, their range, character, tasks and functions.

The concept of pragmatic poetics as presented by the papers in this volume, cannot be placed in one particular trend of contemporary literary studies but stems from several different tendencies. The study on pragmatic poetics is highly indebted first of all to inspirations of semiotics for its interest in the pragmatic sphere. In that sense it is concurrent with what is being done not only in logic, linguistics, sociology and philosophy (by Y. Bar-Hillel, W. Kummer, R. M. Martin, D. Sudnow, R. Thomason, D. Wunderlich, and others) but also in the field of literary studies, especially in the theory of literature (by D. Breuer, T. A. van Dijk, E. Nierlich, R. Ohmann, S. J. Schmidt, G. Wienold, and others). The suggestion for pragmatic poetics does not, however, identify itself with those trends of interests, but instead attempts to overcome them by referring to other traditions and ways of thinking.

Semiotic inspirations in pragmatic poetics are modified by problems of dialogue or, to be more precise, by a theoretical and methodological trend in the humanities, usually associated with Bakhtin, in which dialogue is the central cognitive and ontological cate-

gory. The thesis on the dialogical character of literary phenomena is assumed also by the authors of the conception of pragmatic poetics as one of the most fundamental premises from which they draw far-reaching conclusions as regards the nature and structure of the literary work, the ways it functions, the understanding of literature, as well as the character of literary studies and especially poetics. Thus, they oppose both the conceptions of pragmatic study which are of semiotic origin and theories of dialogue of the formalistic and structuralistic provenance, and reject the theory of literature formed on the grounds of those trends.

The role of the dialogical inspirations does not, however, end here, for through dialogue and studies of the Bakhtin school two main currents move, one of which tends towards dialectics and Plato (e.g. Czaplewicz's paper), and the other towards Marxism (Z. Mitosek's and B. Owczarek's papers). Pragmatic poetics seems to support those trends of contemporary scholarship which discover and aim at adopting a dialectical way of thinking. It assimilates also some of the categories worked out by dialectics, especially by Plato, whose name is used in the book as the catchword for one of the most important currents in European thought pertaining to literature, a current to which pragmatic poetics is considered to belong. In its interest in dialectics and those concepts of the pragmatic study which are based on it pragmatic poetics differs from such propositions as e.g. D. Breuer's which in solving pragmatic problems would resort to rhetoric.

While writing about dialectics, the authors refer also to its modern version, the one proposed by Marxism. It is not only dialectics, however, which appeals to them in Marxism, but other categories as well, such as the category of practice and the category of production, which help to mark out the sphere of pragmatic study of literature. As a matter of fact, Marxist inspirations are very conspicuous throughout the book. Marxism as a theory of social development and social phenomena and as a "methodology of interpreting meanings" (Lam, p. 6) constitutes the philosophical background of all the papers. It is also a subject of particular fascination: the authors enthusiastically cite both classic and modern students of Marxism, such as Althusser, Balibar, Macherey. This extremely intense attitude seems to prove a certain concurrence of pragmatic

poetics with a keen interest taken in Marxism throughout the world recently.

Placing pragmatic poetics at the junction of various tendencies in contemporary humanities, we should not overlook the fact that the conception of this poetics is a typically Polish product: it stems from Polish philosophical thought and is deeply rooted in Polish aesthetics, methodology and theory of literature. The pragmatic study as understood by the authors can be traced back to specifically Polish sources, to "Polish philosophy of action" formulated by the romantics, which after all its windings resulted in e.g. T. Kotarbiński's praxiology. The authors often use the conceptions of C. K. Norwid, J. Słowacki or J. Grotowski as a constructive element in creating their own concepts. A great importance is also ascribed to the works of S. Skwarczyńska in the field of theory of literature.

Obviously, the papers differ in their degree of concreteness, in the approach to the subject and in historioliterary materials which serve as the point of departure for theoretical reflections; they also reveal different aspects of pragmatic poetics and its inspirations, open various perspectives. Sometimes the differences concern even more fundamental issues.

E. Czaplewicz differentiates two trends in the study of literature: Aristotelian and Platonic. The Aristotelian trend is criticized for the autonomization of literature, aesthetization, immanentism, for isolating the literary work from its consituations, etc. The Platonic trend, on the other hand, is based, according to the author, on three main premises: 1) literature is an influence, 2) literature is dialogue, 3) literature is ideology. These premises constitute also the foundation of pragmatic poetics. From the first premise the author draws the following conclusions: 1) a literary work cannot be autotelic, it must be heterotelic, 2) the process of influencing is a complex dialectics of intention and effect, both of them being of a heterotelic character. 3) the study of literature should include also "non-literary" factors, 4) the literary work is a form of contact which goes beyond the models of the theory of communication, 5) and should be treated instrumentally, 6) literature is not restricted to fiction, but is an art of influencing by means of words. The second premise, that literature is dialogue, means

that: 1) literature takes part in the social process in a dialogical manner, 2) it builds up a context in the form of the dialogical process in which every literary work takes part as a rejoinder, 3) a literary work is a rejoinder, i.e. it does not constitute a whole but a part, it is not a structure but a process, it is created between individualities, it is multisubjective, it has an addressing quality ("it demands an answer"). The assumption that literature is ideology is to be understood in the sense that ideology pervades the dialogical process of influencing by literature with meaning and value, and it acquires dialogical features itself. Literature is ideology for: 1) it makes use of signs and its character is that of signs, 2) a literary work is a "living" utterance, having an individual meaning, 3) ideology appears in dialogue mainly in the process of understanding.

E. Kasperski discusses pragmatic poetics in opposition to structural and phenomenological poetics. His conception of pragmatic poetics is based on the reconstruction of Norwid's views realized also by the poet in his works. According to Kasperski, pragmatic poetics deals with both "fiction" and "applied" literature, but it aims at blurring this opposition by studying aesthetic functions as well as instrumental-utilizable ones of every literary work—both those expressed in the work by the author and those taken on by the work through its later "applications." The literary work is seen by Kasperski as a product of a writer's practice, as a bearer and medium of influence and as the effect of particular "applications." He defines the work as a system controlling the reader, the determinants of this system being: 1) partners, 2) their attitudes, 3) immediate and perspective interests, 4) situation, 5) the plane of interaction, 6) occasion which gives the utterance its topicality, 7) rules of "controlling" and "being controlled," 8) rules of composing a literary work and of its influence upon the readers. The controlling of the reader consists in organizing his personality, his knowledge, field of values, system of aims and his readiness to act. The most important questions of pragmatic poetics are those about the features of the text which guarantee the efficiency of influence in particular circumstances. The greater part of the article, however, is devoted to the analysis of subject as a category of poetics. The author distinguishes between a) the linguistic (and/or semiotic) subject of the text which realizes acts of speech, and b) the textual subject

which is the author's objectified personality, oriented towards achieving a definite purpose. Kasperski asks questions not only about how the author produces the literary work, but also about how the text produces the author and the reader produces the meaning of the text. This helps him to arrive at a different view on the phenomena of expression, on the construction of the lyrical subject and at the reinterpretation of the whole theory of the subject elaborated by past poetics.

W. Grajewski explored problems of the pragmatic study of story-telling understood not as a product of activity but as an activity in itself. He compared the pragmatic study to scenography which has to be reconstructed for "the semiotic drama" that story-telling is to be played. In order to reconstruct the "scenography," a set of questions, according to the author, should be asked, concerning both the teller (writer) and the listener (reader), their mutual relationships and their relations to what they tell or listen to (read), as well as the effects of modification of one element upon the others. These questions determine the scope and content of problems generally labelled as the pragmatic study of story-telling. The detailed analysis of the usefulness of each question leads to the conclusion that

the practice of story-telling a) identifies, selects and transforms the producer (teller-writer) of stories, b) identifies, selects and transforms the consumer (listener-reader) of stories, c) evaluation and classification of products of the narrative practice depend upon the tellers' and the listeners' qualities (p. 91).

J. Gondowicz assumes that the literary work is not what is "given" but what is "given to be done," since it is not constant and unchangeable but "is formed" in the course of perception. Pragmatic poetics should be based on this assumption, and then it is the process of perception rather than the literary work in itself that will become the central problem of poetics. It is best to treat this process of perception in the way phenomenology (R. Ingarden) did, and in its phenomenological version pragmatic poetics would be concerned not with "the artistic object" but with "the aesthetic object," dealing with the latter's morphology, as it were, as well as studying and verbalizing the strategy of concretization, i.e. the ways in which the places of indeterminacy are realized in the process of concretization, the line of this realization, the choice of it and

the elimination of other possibilities. In this version, according to the author, pragmatic poetics could avail itself, beside the achievements of phenomenology, also of the theory of knowledge built by the philosophical current of pragmatism.

The next two papers present a conception of the pragmatic study of literature rather than of pragmatic poetics. This differentiation is especially important for Z. Mitosek's article. In her opinion poetics by its very nature is immanent: it is limited to penetration of the inside of the literary work (of literature), and thus it cannot reveal the whole meaning of the literary work treated as a *signe global*. This can be overcome when both the author and the reader are taken into consideration in their full historical and sociological concreteness, which is for the pragmatic study of literature and not for poetics to deal with. According to Mitosek, the pragmatic study of literature is interested mainly in the reader's activity towards the text. On this approach, the meaning of the text appears not as the effect of the author's activity but as an instrument of social practices or, to be more precise, as the effect of the readers' activity realized in the course of collective, not individual, reading. Reading is at the same time an operation of giving meanings to the text; the meaning of a literary work depends on its functions, on the way it is understood by particular, sociologically distinguished groups of readers. The stress laid on the attitude of the reader towards the text and on reading allows one to introduce a large sociological and historical context.

B. Owczarek also postulates a certain theory of the pragmatic study of literature, though he does not put it in such a strong opposition to poetics. He begins his considerations with criticizing the ways of understanding of the literary communication which have appeared in the Polish study of literature, accusing them of reductionism and of ascribing too much importance to some aspects. He arrives at the conclusion that Marxist theoretical problems have not been taken up by Polish scholars in a satisfactory way. This gap should be filled by the pragmatic study of literature, the subject of which would not be the literary work or literature in their exclusively communicational aspect, but the literary production, within which both the literary communication and the pragmatic mechanism (i.e. the influence of the text on the reader) fall. The

notion of the literary production covers the specific structure of the literary production within the global structure of economic and social production. In Owczarek's opinion,

what decides about the specific character of the literary production [...] is the discrepancy between ideological aspects of the conditions of production (the class situation of the writer, his environment) and the means of production of texts which are used (the method of realism) (p. 122).

Owczarek analyzes this discrepancy on the example of Polish soc-realistic novel, which enables him to define the subject of the Marxist pragmatic study of literature as a reproductive quality of texts or, in other words, their social productiveness.

R. Sulima showed what images of "another" man are formed in the family and neighbourly group and how they are communicated by members of the group, assuming at the same time that each type of contact has its corresponding type of image. In contacts taking place within the group we have to do with momentary images (eg. "marriageable girl," "the only daughter") or with images having the time dimension (e.g. spoken biographies, genealogies). Images are connected here with the establishing of the position in the group and it is to this purpose that the calling forth of patterns and models of the family life serve. On the other hand, in contacts taking place between analogous groups there emerge and circulate images formed on the common and naïve personology (e.g. stereotypes). Finally, in contacts with the social macrostructure there appear parascientific and paraliterary types of images, such as spoken or written biographies of local heroes, autobiographies and memoirs of peasants, etc. The above typology determines the typology of the listener/reader of images. These general theses were analyzed on the example of the actual memoirs of a Polish peasant (T. Skorupka from Kosowo). The analyzed text, reckoned as memoirs and thus as aiming at macrostructural contacts, not addressed to the family-neighbourly group, in fact does not go beyond the contacts within that group. Sulima traces how the position of the pre-supposed listener/reader affects and transforms the structural plan of images.

Z. Osiński examines the theatre of Jerzy Grotowski, especially the role of the spectator in the performances of the Laboratorium Theatre—both in the light of Grotowski's theory and in the 15 years' stage practice. Osiński argues that

the principle of directing simultaneously two groups of people (the actors and the audience) and treating them as one corporate body cooperating in the spectacle is one of the primary principles (p. 139).

and shows theoretical and practical consequences deduced from it in the Laboratorium Theatre. In the course of the development of this theatre the spectator went a long way from the conventional observer in *Orpheus*, through the outer participation in *Kain*, *Misterium Buffo*, *Siakuntala*, *Dziady (The Forefathers' Eve)* and *Kordian*, up to the extremely intense and full inner participation of the observer or witness in *Studium o Hamlecie (The Study on Hamlet)*, *Książę Niezłomny (The Firm Prince)* and especially in the various versions of *Apocalypsis cum figuris*. The author presents the evolution of both "the ideal spectator" and "the actual spectator," studying their changing functions against the background of Grotowski's specific view on the function of the theatre in culture, or rather in the contemporary world (the diagnostic-therapeutic function).

Osiński formulates conditions and objectives of influencing "the spectator—the man" (and the actor, to a certain extent) during a performance which, in Grotowski's case, goes beyond the sphere of the theatre as art and belongs rather to the art of living, since it aims at changing the world, man, and mutual relationships between people. The author's conclusions are not confined to the Laboratorium Theatre itself, they concern the role of the critic of this theatre as well, or even the methodology of study of the theatre in general. When dealing with the latter sphere of interest, Osiński makes use of the language worked out in the literary study and semiotics, but he refers also to the works of R. Bastide, A. Kępiński, K. Pollak.

As a whole, the discussed volume presents a certain stage of work upon pragmatic poetics. The Department of Literary Theory and Poetics of Warsaw University continues this work in books by individual authors, in collections of papers, in anthologies and in a large number of articles in such periodicals as "Miesięcznik Literacki" (Literary Monthly), "Przegląd Humanistyczny" (Humanistic Revue), "Regiony" (Regions), "Zagadnienia Rodzajów Literackich" (Problems of Literary Genres). At present the research is concentrated on: 1) methodological research in the sphere of Marxism, 2) study of dialogue, 3) attempts at building up and developing

something which can conventionally be called the pragmatic theory of literary work. In the nearest future some books covering this field are to be published.

The book contains the following articles:

Andrzej Lam, Preface.

Eugeniusz Czaplewicz, *Tradycje i założenia poetyki pragmatycznej (Traditions and Premises of Pragmatic Poetics)*.

Edward Kasperski, *Poetyka pragmatyczna — uwagi o jej przedmiocie i zadaniach badawczych (Pragmatic Poetics—Some Remarks on Its Subject and Tasks)*.

Wincenty Grajewski, *Uwagi o pragmatyce opowiadania (Remarks on the Pragmatic Study of Story-telling)*.

Jan Gondowicz, *Opis estetycznej konkretyzacji dzieła literackiego jako metoda poetyki pragmatycznej (The Description of the Aesthetic Concretization of the Literary Work as a Method of Pragmatic Poetics)*.

Zofia Mitosek, *W sprawie uzasadnienia pragmatyki literatury (On the Justification of the Pragmatic Study of Literature)*.

Bogdan Owczarek, *Pragmatyka literatury a marksizm (Marxism and the Pragmatic Study of Literature)*.

Roch Sulima, *Adresat relacji pamiętnikarskiej a potoczne wyobrażenie o "drugim" człowieku (The Addressee of Memoirs and the Common Image of "Another" Man)*.

Zbigniew Osiński, *Widz w Teatrze Laboratorium (The Spectator in the Laboratorium Theatre)*.

Sum. by Eugeniusz Czaplewicz

Transl. by M.-B. Fedewicz

Michał Głowiński, **Style odbioru (Styles de réception)**, Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków 1978.

Style odbioru, un nouveau livre de Michał Głowiński, se compose, comme le dit l'auteur, d'«esquisses sur la communication littéraire». En plus de nombreux articles, Głowiński a publié jusque-là les livres suivants: *Poetyka Tuwima a polska tradycja literacka*