

ani do zlekceważenia w interpretacji przedmiotowej samoistości obiektu badanego. Tak więc rumuńska „nowa krytyka” swoiście rozwiązuje antynomię: subiektywizm — obiektywizm w krytyce. W odniesieniu zaś do teoretyka krytyki literackiej szczególnie akcentuje jego prawa i obowiązki twórcze. Świat pojęć literackich to nie tylko sfera dziedzictwa przeszłości, to także teren twórczych zabiegów teoretyków krytyki w kreacji, w poprawie funkcjonujących pojęć literackich, a przede wszystkim w przebadaniu specyficznego ich świata.

Dodajmy, że końcowe w cennej książce A. Marino przypisy zawierają przebogatą bibliografię do rozlicznych problemów w zakresie wielu dyscyplin naukowych. To dla pracowników nauki istny skarb.

Stefania Skwarczyńska, Łódź

Stanisław Dąbrowski, *LITERATURA I LITERACKOŚĆ. Problemy, argumenty, wnioski* (LITERATURE AND LITERARINESS. Problems, arguments, conclusions). Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków 1977, pp. 320.

Stanisław Dąbrowski's study consists mainly of papers previously published in various collections of essays. *Literature and literariness* is not, however, a set of incoherent studies. Its main interest is focused on the problems connected with definitions and determinants of literariness, the range of a term 'literature,' the material of literature, literary aspect of a text as well as the subject matter of literary studies. The texts have been altered, completed by the author and arranged in a uniform way.

Dąbrowski looks for definitions and determinants of literariness in the layer of literary material. The subtitle: Problems, arguments, conclusions, characterizes very well the method chosen by the author in his research. Dąbrowski tries to define the area in which literature can be placed through confronting the-

oretical standpoints concerned with the problem of literariness and placing these theories beside present research practice of literary scholars. Discussing the research tradition the author emphasizes the theories which provide a factual determinant for defining literariness. He is less interested, however, in an attempt to find axiological criteria which make defining literature possible.

Since Dąbrowski has chosen theoretical conclusions concerned with what literature is in its material layer as the material for his analysis, it seems possible to include his book to monographies discussing certain aspects of methodology of literary research, and to treat it as an attempt to answer a question of the essence of material subject of literary studies.

A word is most frequently accepted by literary scholars to be a material determinant of literature. Dąbrowski discusses two basic groups of problems connected with treating language as literary material. The first part of the book is devoted to the extent verbal constructions can be treated as literary constructions and included to the theory of literature; in the second part, on the other hand, the author analyzes the problem of exclusiveness of language as literary material.

In Polish literary studies Stefania Skwarczyńska treated the problem of verbal character of literary material in a particularly detailed way. Dąbrowski, tracing main ideas of *An Introduction to Literary Studies* as well as of other Skwarczyńska's works, points to neutral and objective character of the conception of literature as all sensible verbal expressions. The attitude of a scholar approaching a text without an attempt to evaluate it makes it possible to take into account the whole of literary output (similarly to what bibliography does) while the objectivity of formulation is seen in the cohesion of theory and research practice.

Contemporary theory of literary research does not choose its research material according to an aesthetic model accepted

a priori. Evaluation has been separated from generic classifications of culture products. The range of interest of a literary scholar has expanded beyond traditional literary kinds and genres. Theoreticians are concerned with such forms of notation as a letter or diary, and such verbal expressions as a joke, facetiae, anecdote, parable, proverb, etc.¹

The changes in understanding literature are caused by the changes of literature itself, and also by the dialectic of aesthetic conceptions. Dąbrowski's conception, taking this changeability into account, aims at proving the justification of examining all kinds of utterances in order to extract and define its potential literary aspect. The author comes out with a method of research based on readiness to notice literariness in any linguistic utterance.²

Such a solution is close to Juliusz Kleiner's standpoint. In *Character and Subject Matter of Literary Research* he aimed at treating the subject matter of literary studies as an aspect of all texts.

Literariness as a certain aspect of a linguistic utterance is of another important practical consequence. According to Dąbrowski such literariness should constitute the subject matter of literary research not only with reference to exclusively verbal utterances, but also to the creations which use different kinds of materials. Real artistic culture in which a word fulfilling its literary function coexists with fine arts and music (e.g. songs) speaks for including all language usages into the field of literary research. On the other hand in such verbal situations as a conversation, monologue, improvisation or a speech a word coexists with mimicry, gestures without losing its literary aspect. Thus the author suggests treating li-

terature as a field of also-linguistic constructions, i.e. a system which is heterogeneous as far as its material is concerned.

The value of *Literature and literariness* relies on the fact that through polemics with various standpoints found in rich bibliography on the subject and generalizations of certain elements of practical artistic activity the reader is introduced to complicated problems in a many-sided way. Dąbrowski does not aim at building a maximum open concept of literature through a negation of theoretical output and presentation of an absolutely new proposal. He rather tries to generalize a certain theoretical trend in understanding of literature, considering his views to be a specific extension, reinterpretation and further conclusions particularly of Kleiner's and Skwarczyńska's conceptions.

One must notice, however, that both the critical layer and the concept of literature as a literary aspect of all also-linguistic utterances presented in the work need further specification and explanation.

The author fully defines literariness on the material level of literature although this category becomes meaningful only, it seems, in the layer in which the processes of ideological and artistic realization of literature take place.

The analysis of the mode in which language exists in literature should also, it seems, be included into the research concerning the basis of the existence of literature. Dąbrowski only slightly touches the problem while it seems that here an important argument can be found in favour of treating literature as a heterogeneous formation, even when its functions are exclusively linguistic form. The interpretation of representative and communicative language functions in relation to the problem of literary material may mean that every utterance, after it is written down, loses its exclusively linguistic character and becomes a graphic utterance as well — while, on the other hand, an utterance which is pronounced has a sound character. What is more, material carriers of language which

¹ Cf. J. Trzynadlowski, *Małe formy literackie (Small Literary Forms)*, Wrocław 1977.

² L. Zawadowski, *Lingwistyczna teoria języka (Linguistic Theory of Language)*, Warszawa 1966, p. 120 — 130.

would seem of secondary value in relation to the utterance, begin to represent it.

A graphic and sound shape of a literary utterance originally subordinated to its communicative function, begins to represent the utterance secondarily as precisely a literary one. Even graphic and sound signs separated from communicative function do not stop to represent in their own way the utterance in which they were used.

From a methodological point of view Dąbrowski's conception can be treated as an attempt to grasp the essence of the development of literary studies. That is why, even when in the course of further research and specifications some of the conclusions in this work become modified, it will not destroy intellectually stimulating concepts underlining both the factors imparting energy into theoretical reflection and changeability of the subject of literary studies.

Artur Jeziorowski, Wrocław
Translated by Ewa Stachniak

[Maria del] Carmen Bobes [Naves], GRAMATICA DE «CANTICO» (ANÁLISIS SEMIOLOGICO). Ed. Planeta, Barcelona 1975.

Carmen Bobes essaie, dans sa *Grammaire de «Cántico»* (*Analyse sémiologique*), de s'engager dans la deuxième des deux directions qui, d'après elle-même, constituent la fonction de la critique: «a) celle de constater les changements de signification et en expliquer les causes, et b) celle de découvrir le système — sémiotique ou grammaire de chaque oeuvre» (p. 42). Le mot 'grammaire' est identifié, donc, avec celui de 'système sémiotique sous-jacent' dans l'oeuvre qu'on analyse, et cela suppose, par conséquent, l'existence de régularités, de constructions propres de l'auteur et de l'oeuvre choisie. La recherche de ces régularités sera une des principales tâches auxquelles C. Bobes s'applique.

Cependant, quand elle fixe les directions de la critique, C. Bobes nous montre implicitement un autre présupposé fon-

damental de sa méthode, qu'on peut relever partout et qui est formulé de façon explicite quelques pages après: «en tout cas, il y a deux faits clairs: 1) le langage poétique diffère du langage fonctionnel, et 2) les signes employés gardent la même apparence et le même signifié, ou tout au moins un signifié qui ne contredit pas celui qu'ils ont dans le langage fonctionnel». Or, le travail de C. Bobes s'oriente en même temps vers l'étude des écarts de la langue de *Cántico* à l'égard du langage fonctionnel.

Un troisième *a priori* peut se dégager de cette conception théorique: la différenciation du langage de la littérature cherche des effets artistiques — poétiques — spécifiques qui seront étudiés dans chaque construction particulière et par rapport à la règle ou le trait correspondant de la grammaire.

La *Grammaire de «Cántico»* est composée de quatre parties que l'on examinera ensuite.

Dans l'Introduction, elle pose des problèmes généraux à propos de l'oeuvre et de la critique littéraire. En ce qui concerne celle-ci, la recherche de C. Bobes se situe dans le courant sémiologique tel que, d'ailleurs, le titre l'avait déjà annoncé. Un chapitre de cette Introduction étudie les liens historiques de ce qu'on appelle critique sémiologique: le formalisme russe, qui s'occupe de l'oeuvre littéraire en elle-même, le structuralisme linguistique, et la sémiotique philosophique, le néopositivisme des cercles de Vienne, Berlin et Varsovie. Ce qu'il y a de plus remarquable dans la conception de C. Bobes c'est justement l'importance qu'elle accorde à l'influence de ces courants philosophiques à l'occasion de la naissance de la critique sémiologique; une telle importance apparaît non seulement quand l'auteur fait l'histoire de la critique sémiologique, mais aussi dans ses propres analyses.

Les trois autres parties s'identifient avec les trois branches de la sémiotique selon Morris: syntaxique, sémantique et pragmatique. Le plan du livre est clair: «il cherche l'objectivité (et la formalisation, autant que possible) de *Cántico*,