Andrzej Lam

"Dialogowość poezji Herberta", Andrzej Lam, "Teksty", nr 1 (1976) : [recenzja]

par C. Bremond s'oriente dans ce sens, bien qu'en tant qu'inventaire des rôles il soit un système trop dépendant de prémisses purement sociologiques;

d) entreprendre des études liées à la conception des matrices d'affabulation, sur la communicativité de la fable ou «communication de l'affabulation», et des tentatives (impliquées par le concept de matrices) de traiter la situation de la communication de la fable comme un modèle de jeu;

e) faire rapporter la typologie des fonctions de la fable ainsi que des schémas et figures d'affabulation à un éventail aussi large que possible de genres littéraires. Ce postulat concerne surtout les genres et variantes génotiques plus complexes ainsi que les plus modernes, étant donné que l'étude des fables a tout d'abord porté sur les genres traditionnels et «plus simples»: contes, romans policiers et d'aventure − et c'est surtout à partir de ce matériau que s'est dégagée la forme actuelle des recherches. Leur primitivisme relatif résulte surtout de ce que ces recherches ne sont qu'une phase préliminaire d'un certain type de réalisations scientifiques. Celui-ci cependant dépend aussi du genre de matériau littéraire soumis à l'analyse.

<div style="text-align:right">

Res. par l'auteur
Trad. par *L. Grobelak*
</div>

A n d r z e j L a m, **Dialogowość poezji Herberta (The Dialogue Character of the Poetry of Herbert),** "Teksty", 1976, No 1, pp. 18.

The increased interest of students of literature in the concept of dialogue is connected with the fact that focus of attention has shifted from the subject present in a literary work to its reader. The speaker and those to whom he speaks complement each other to the extent to which the reactions expected by the speaker can be traced down in the utterance. In a communicational contact of the two parties four roles can be discerned, since both the sender and receiver can be considered in relation to himself and to the other. A dialogue by its nature involves conflict, not only because it releases different opinions, but also because the transmission of one's position to the partner is hindered.

The author of the article presents various possibilities of realizing the structure of dialogue in poetry on the example of Zbigniew Herbert's poetry. More complex structures are superimposed in it on the simple structure of dialogue: as when the same phrase means something different in the speaker's position than in the position of the listener; when the same, but imagined, partner is addressed, when, finally, the speaker is aware of the misunderstanding and analyzes his own dialogue behaviour to himself, as if continuing the dialogue between the roles born out of himself.

Since literature represents not only statements and thoughts, but also behaviours of the communicating parties, it is necessary to extend the concept of dialogue on behavioural reactions, including gestures and facial expressions. Such a dialogue can be compared to a game between the partners. But the rules and aims of a game are more strictly defined than those of a dialogue. In literature, because of its linguistic medium, the dialogue character is directly and most clearly disclosed in a verbal exchange, but it is present in a deliverance and monologue as well, since they assume certain reactions of the alleged listener; it can also be manifest in narration, namely when its statements are questioned within the text itself. In the type of lyrical poetry represented by Herbert's poems those phenomena are especially conspicuous, since it permits for instantaneous change of roles and is not bound by any concrete objective situation, and thus viewpoints can be changed quickly and multiple aspects of the issues can be brought to light. This remark suggests an amendment to the thesis of M. Bakhtin that the study of what is said with regard to its relation to what another has said may be applied mainly to artistic prose. Lyrical poetry provides ample material for investigations of this kind, even when the statements of a lyrical subject fail to be explicitly presented in the dialogue form; it is sufficient that they are projections of a definite role to interpret them as invitations to dialogical reading. This pattern of inner and outher dialogical relations is reconstructed from the poem in which a wolf descended from Aesop's tales consciously plays the role assigned to him by the conventions of the fable, though he has an inner distance towards it. This device allows the poet to develop a whole system

of complex dialogical relationships with both the "addressee" of his poetry and its real reader; these relationships are established by the play with literary conventions. A different situation arises when one of the partners is the "inner voice" endowed with relative autonomy: the conscious element in the subject asks him questions and enters into tactical games with him. Essentially the same subject, conceived as a unified personality, is split here into three roles: the part which is conscious by itself, the part which is conscious by and through relations with the "inner voice," and the "inner voice" itself, inarticulate in its pronouncements; in addition there is also a comment addressed to an outside observer.

In another poem the author tries various conventions in which he might write a piece of poetry on a definite subject, and he considers the imagined reactions of readers to each of the unrealized variants; the attempt ends up in finding out that it is impossible to write the poem at all. In effect we have a poem on the impossibility of writing this poem and it is this piece of writing that is addressed to a real reader, who is thus initiated into the dialogical adventures of the author with himself. We have also pieces in which the lyrical subject has mute objects as his partners; their potential behaviour towards man is interpreted, and this behaviour sometimes turns into the imagined "speech" of the objects. The immobility of objects is often "anti-motion" rather than the state of rest: objects seem to stay immobile of their own will, as if to blame man for his constant instability.

The conclusion is that the dialogue in its classical shape has the character of interaction, both when its phases are successive and when they are intermittent (as in an exchange of letters). When reciprocal reaction is impossible, as when we disagree with a text by a dead author, the dialogue character consists in the strategy of decoding of the message and it is expressed in an interpretation allowing for variant hypotheses. This is an evoked dialogue: the speaker establishes the dialogue relation himself, but for this purpose he uses a text produced by someone else. The dialogue is then petrified by a static position, but it can be set in motion again at any moment.