

mych. badaczy. *The Sign of Three* nie może zatem funkcjonować nawet jako, poparty dość niezwykłymi przykładami, wykład filozofii Peirce'a.

Wydaje się, iż zarówno semiotyka Peirce'a jak i „metoda” Holmesa i Dupina stanowią jedynie pretekst do podjęcia prezentowanych w kolejnych artykułach rozważań. Podstawowym celem książki nie jest bowiem ani wykazanie pokrewieństwa w sposobie myślenia Peirce'a i detektywów, ani dowodzenie przydatności systemu Peirce'a do opisu powieści detektywistycznej (czy też na odwrót), ani też opis owej powieści. Celem jej jest tworzenie i rozwijanie teorii i ona też staje się podstawowym przedmiotem zainteresowania autorów. Świat zjawisk służy tu po prostu jako arbitralnie dobrany materiał przykładowy. Badacze uznają prymat teorii nad rzeczywistością — zafascynowani są oni metodą a nie przedmiotem. Stąd też brak koncentracji na zrozumieniu określonych zjawisk — wysiłek skierowany zostaje na model rozumowania. Teoria nie jest związana z żadnym wykraczającym poza nią przedmiotem badań, sama raczej taki przedmiot stanowi. Rozważania badaczy z *The Sign of Three* mają w większości charakter samozwrotny, nie służą niczemu oprócz służenia samym sobie.

Tendencję ową poświadcza jakby artykuł wstępny Thomasa Sebeoka [*One, Two, Three Spells UBERTY. (In Lieu of an Introduction)*] poświęcony wykazaniu szczególnej fascynacji takich badaczy jak Peirce, Freud czy Tesla oraz Conan Doyle'a i Poego (a także, jak można przypuszczać, samego Sebeoka) układami trójkowymi. Z fascynacji owej wszakże nic nie wynika — podobnie zresztą jak i z samego artykułu.

Owa samozwrotność wypowiedzi zbliża działania autorów do działania ludycznego, do swego rodzaju gry z językiem, z teorią nie mającą pokrycia w rzeczywistości. Wydaje się, iż dopiero taki odbiór *The Sign of Three*, włącznie się w zabawę i przyjęcie jej reguł

pozwoliłoby na oddanie książce pełnej sprawiedliwości.

Joanna Kokot, Gdańsk

Krzysztof Krasuski, Norma i forma. KONSTANTY TROCZYŃSKI — KRYTYK LITERACKI I TEORETYK LITERATURY (Norms and Forms. Konstanty Troczyński — literary critic and theorist). Ossolineum, Wrocław 1982, 216 p.

The book of Krzysztof Krasuski has been a successful reconstruction of a small fragment of Polish literary theory and literary criticism in the twenty-year period between World War I and World War II. The author of *Norms and Forms* has tried to describe the structure and the realization of some doctrine of theory of literature. This attempt has been the more interesting because Krasuski has presented views of a critic who has been underestimated and infrequently called on for weightiness of achievements, while at the same time some elements of his theoretical system have tacitly been adapted.

Konstanty Troczyński was born on 9 December 1906 in Częstochowa. In the 1920-ties he read Polish studies at Poznań University. He was a student of Prof. Tadeusz Grabowski, a historian and theorist of literature, the author of *Wstęp do nauki literatury... [An Introduction to the Teaching of Literature (1927)]*, and workes devoted to the history of literary criticism in Poland from pseudoclassicism to modernism. Czesław Łatawiec remembers Konstanty Troczyński from this period as a very clever and outstanding in academic maturity student, a member of the university monarchic and Christian Democratic Party organizations. But very soon Troczyński broke with politics devoting himself entirely to studies. Additionally he began sociological faculty where he was a student of Prof. Florian Znaniecki. Due to friendly patronage of professors: Znaniecki, Grabowski and So-

beski, the future scientist obtained his doctorate in 1928. The subject of his dissertation being *Teoria poetyki. Szkic z zakresu metodologii nauki o literaturze* (*Theory of Poetics. An Essay in Methodology of Study of Literature*). Next year he received a scholarship in order to continue his literary studies in France. After he had returned to Poland he worked as a grammar school teacher. In 1931 he went to France again, and to Germany.

Within a three-year period he wrote and published two important works: *Przedmiot i podział nauki o literaturze* [*The Subject and Classification of Study of Literature* (1929)] and *Rozprawa o krytyce literackiej* [*An Essay on Literary Criticism* (1931)].

In 1932 he received the post of a literary manager in Polish Radio in Poznań. He actively took part in literary and cultural life of the city. He was a theorist of a literary group "Prom" (*Ferry*) and a joint editor of a short-lived "Życie Literackie". After "Życie Literackie" had ceased to exist he associated with "Dziennik Poznański" and "Nowa Kultura" where he wrote literary and theatrical criticism. Although he was not closely tied with the Poznań university circle he continued his scientific research which resulted in further essays on theory of literature: *Zagadnienia dynamiki poezji* [*Problems of Dynamics of Poetry* (1934)] and *Elementy form literackich* [*Elements of Literary Forms* (1936)]. In 1935 his literary essays, under a significant title: *Od formizmu do moralizmu* (*From Formism to Moralism*), were published. The last work of Troczyński entitled *Artysta i dzieło* [*The Artist and the Work* (1938)] was a monographic study of Próchno by Wacław Berent.

The outbreak of World War II interrupted his scientific work. We have the knowledge of his last years from recollective accounts, Janina Popowska recorded the fact of his September travel when among a big group of volunteers he set out from Poznań in order to take part in the defence of War-

saw. Then he returned to Poznań only to be displaced to the Kielce region. Forced inactivity and departure from routine work became an adversity for that hard-working man therefore he moved to Cracow at the earliest convenience. First he worked as a fishmonger there and then he took part in underground teaching. In his spare time he visited the Artist's Cafe run by Anna Cybisowa. And there, in the cafe, he was suddenly arrested by the Nazis. He was deported to Oświęcim (Auschwitz) where he was executed by a firing squad on 27 May 1942.¹

It seemed necessary to remind of these few facts for documentary reasons; all the more so, as Krzysztof Krasuski has omitted biographic information in his work. He has been interested only in literary theory and literary criticism which were the fields of Troczyński's scientific work.

Structuralist methodology patronizes Krasuski's essay in a significant way. It is visible in the very composition of the book which in the greater part (7 chapters) has been devoted to the reconstruction of the system of theory of literature. In the last two chapters Krasuski has tried both to place Troczyński in the historical and literary context of the epoch and to show, as the author of the monography has put it, "the rootedness of his output in the intellectual and literary culture of the period". Such an organization of the text clearly shows Krasuski's intentions aiming at precise and factual description of the subject against a background of historical, scientific and literary phenomena which accompanied it. The author of *Norms and Forms* has un-

¹ Sources of biographic information: *Biographical Dictionary of Wielkopolska*. Warszawa 1981, p. 772. *Small Dictionary of Polish Writers*, Vol. 2, Warszawa 1981, p. 255. *Dictionary of Authors*, [in:] *Theory of Literary Study in Poland*, ed. H. Markiewicz, Vol. 2, Kraków 1980, p. 344. D. Ratajczak, *Critic's Armchair*, Poznań 1981. Cz. Latawiec, *Meetings with Konstanty Troczyński*, Nurt, no. 6, 1976. J. Popowska, *The Absent Are Right*, *ibid.*

doubtedly been acquainted with a contemporary norm of reading Troczyński, proposed by Anna Jelec-Legeżyńska; not directly though, but in philosophical, sociological and aesthetic contexts.² Yet, it has to be admitted that recognitions made by Krasuski in this respect have often had too selective and sketchy character.

In a relatively wide perspective has Krasuski discussed the importance of influence that the works of Florian Znaniecki, an outstanding sociologist and author of an original theory of culture, had upon him. Krasuski has claimed that, in the very beginning of his work, Troczyński adopted Znaniecki's theoretical language and the most general categories of description of humanist reality. Then he has pointed to the fact that many internal logical operations in the framework of the formed cognitive system of literature e.g. various generalizations, systematics and classifications came from that source (pp. 13—14). He has also stressed that Troczyński's dependance, though constant and characteristic of his scientific achievements as a whole, was not total. Very strong at the moment of his debut, it was undergoing constant transformations together with his original scientific development. It seems that Troczyński had a full consciousness of being dependent upon those influences. He subordinated applying general sociological theory of culture in the study of different cultural functions (and also artistic and literary function which was a central category in his system of knowledge) to the results obtained in particular branches of the humanities. He formulated that opinion in *Problems of Dynamics of Poetry* ascertaining at the same time an unsatisfactory level of their development. Similar reflections, numerous though scattered, can be found in almost all of Troczyński's publications. And although Troczyński did not believe in the possibility of transforming literature by literary criticism, he saw

² A. Jelec-Legeżyńska, *Between Formalism and Structuralism*, *ibid.*

such a possibility on the part of science.

Another observation, important from the point of view of a contemporary reader, should be added here; Troczyński's texts can be distinguished by a specific nature of inner polemic. This allows us to assume that he was unusually acquainted with the problems of contemporary humanities and shows his personal involvement in their solving.

It should also be stressed that in the twenty years between World War I and World War II the range of influence of Znaniecki's views on culture was very wide. Analyzing the influence of humanistic thought on the practice of literary criticism in the 1930-ties Krzysztof Dybciak states: "Personalism and culturalism are the main characteristics of critics belonging to the 1910 generation. The goal of their intellectual work is a search for values, that is forms, behaviour, cultural institutions which could be decisive for individual and group activities".³ It is possible to detect the presence of Znaniecki's ideas in the output of critics of the 1910 generation e.g. Ludwik Fryde, Kazimierz Wyka or Waclaw Kubacki. In comparison to them the range of Troczyński's "indebtedness" is particularly great. It includes not only individual categories but also explains the presence of such elements of his general methodological instruction as anitpsychologism, nomotetism and formalism. And also his stressing of logical dissimilarity of theoretical and historical issues shows a close connection with Znaniecki's views on the subjects of epistemological separateness of theoretical and practical branches in sociology.

The problem of Troczyński's formalism has been formulated by Krasuski in a very interesting way pointing to its comprehensive and documentarily evident sources. Formal method of literary study came into being under the influence of modern philosophical and

³ K. Dybciak, *Personalistic Literary Criticism. Theory and Description of Tendency of the 1930-ties*, Wrocław 1981, p. 63.

scientific tendencies occurring in the framework of the so called anitpositivistic change. Those tendencies based on Kant's aesthetics and Herbart's formalism, and also on the achievements of some branches of a traditional philology or new views originated in linguistics, together strongly influenced the aesthetic orientation in the field of which New Criticism, the formal school or language and literary structuralism came to existence, all of them related in the sense of primary inspirations.⁴

It is difficult to indicate a direct influence of any of the theories of study mentioned above on Troczyński's methodological attitude, however, one can undoubtedly speak of certain specific fields of his interest. He evinced it especially regarding Husserl's phenomenology and neoidealistic German study of literary forms. He must have also known at least some of works of the Russian school of stylistics. It is at Poznań University that for the first time Borys Tomaszewski's *Teoria literatury* (*Theory of Literature*) was translated. We should think that Troczyński was a careful observer of the development of Polish formal study concentrated in the scientifically active university centres of Vilnius and Warsaw.⁵ In the opinion of contemporaries the Poznań centre and Troczyński played an important role in the creation of formal, ergocentrically oriented methods of literary study and contributed to the creation of structuralism in Polish research work which has developed so strongly after World War II.⁶

Krzysztof Krasuski claims that the formalism characteristic of Troczyński's early research work (e.g. *An Essay on Literary Criticism* or *Problems of Dynamics of Poetry*) declined in the latter

part of the 1930-ties giving way to structural and phenomenological formulations. The paper *Elements of Literary Forms* (1936) seems to be a significant beacon of these transformations. It is also interesting because contains an ontological model of a literary work complementary to Roman Ingarden's proposition expounded in *Das literarische Kunstwerk* (1931).

In a literary work understood as an autonomous and purposeful structure, marked on the one hand by the inner form and on the other hand by an instruction of artistic balance, Troczyński distinguished 4 layers: graphic, symbolizing (i.e. linguistic), layer of social values and a sphere of the so called artistic reality. According to him, the three first do not have the nature of an aesthetic layer because they are conditioned by technical, symbolizing and social activity of the artist. The fourth layer is revealed to a reader of the work following the process of abstraction from the graphic form and after the linguistic desymbolisation of the work had taken place. Troczyński also explained: "The content of the artistic reality of a literary work is the content of visions subjected to the process of substantiation and development, that is to say, subjected to the influence of formal elements of art."⁷ It is interesting that looking for an ideal structure of a work Troczyński refers to „Gestalt psychology” and not to stylistic or linguistic studies. That feature in Krasuski's formulation is to testify that Troczyński belonged to "inventory-making and descriptive stage of structuralism". It seems however that it leads us to believe in other possibilities of interpretation. "Gestaltpsychologie" as a part of the so called holistic psychology could add to creation of a tone of secular personalism characteristic of Troczyński's later works. Krasuski has

⁴ S. Skwarczyńska, [an introductory essay], [in:] *Theory of Literary Study Abroad*, Vol. 2, pt. 1, Kraków 1974, p. 14.

⁵ Cf. A. Jelec-Legeżyńska, *op. cit.*, and S. Skwarczyńska, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, pt. 2, Kraków 1981, p. 73.

⁶ See: H. Mrkiewicz, *The Reception of Russian Formalism in Poland*, [in:] *The Consciousness of Literature*, Warszawa 1985.

⁷ K. Troczyński, *Elements of Literary Forms*, quoted after a part of the text, reprinted in: *Problems of Theory of Literature in Poland Between the World Wars*, selected by H. Markiewicz, Wrocław 1982, p. 40.

given his attention to those issues at the end of his book.

The essential part of it, as we have already mentioned, has been devoted to the description of a system of the theory of literature. Starting with the characteristics of Troczyński's unique terminology Krasuski tries to show how it works when put into practice. At the same time he stresses evolutionary traits of Troczyński's attitude; from fascination with "the idea of pure literary aesthetics" to the more and more safely marked "literary ethism" of the latter part of the 1930-ties. Krasuski has achieved the most interesting results investigating, in compliance with his, preferred methodology, Troczyński's specific terms and rules of their application. In the reconstruction of the system he has made use of, a proposed for study of literary criticism, method of Janusz Sławiński which consists of establishing characteristic lexis, grammar, semantics and syntax of discussed texts.⁸ The results obtained in this way confirm the change of Troczyński's methodological orientation manifesting itself in the verbal form. That change consisted of transformation from "formalism to moralism". This change also took place in case of majority of Polish critics in the 1930-ties.

The value of these measures has been stressed because even today the reading of Troczyński's books is not an easy task which is due to their highly abstract character and complexity of categories and classifications. Thus, it has been necessary to translate his terminology into the language of contemporary study.

Krasuski has comprehensively discussed those threads in Troczyński's ideas of the study of literature which so far have not lost their innovatory or precursory character. Let us mention some of them:

— formulating a literary work as

a text creating a unique fictional reality;

— discriminating between the real author of a work of art and an author (hero) belonging to the world created and its causative subject;

— ideas (shared with Ostap Ortwin) on the subject of construction and function of such categories of poetics as: lyrical ego, lyrical state, poetic language and its style; and also the notion of "the norm of intimacy";

— in theory of monography, stressing the opposition between scientific understanding of an artist's biography and accompanying it historical anecdotes; postulating an aesthetic model of literary study;

— unusually strong and constantly stressed belief in the necessity of separating theoretical disciplines from other forms of literary study;

— stressing the necessity of creating such a critical attitude towards literature which would fulfill the terms of an objective and cognitively educating specialist evaluation.

The above ideas presented by Troczyński in *An Essay on Criticism* originated from his observations of the state in which the then literary criticism had found itself. Troczyński accused it mainly aesthetic inexpertness and methodological chaos. He compared some of then contemporary conceptions discussing issues of mutual relation between criticism, learning and arts. He saw a lack of comprehension of both function and essence of criticism in Łempicki who sought for analogy between art and criticism on morphological and descriptive grounds, in Borowy indentifying criticism with creation or Adamczewski who found their bond in the use of certain constructions. As early as his scientific debut he ascertained that among all possible literary judgements only the one which understands literature as art and studies it in consideration of artistic values is the right one. Differences between criticism and art concern, in his opinion, two factors: the object which in art is formed and

⁸ See: *Criticism as a Subject of Study of History of Literature*, [in:] *Research in Literary Criticism*, Wrocław 1974.

in criticism is existing, and intention. The substance and material tools are common. Analogical to some extent for both fields compositional, technical and stylistic schemes are determined in criticism chiefly by cognitive methods. The proposed division of criticism seems to be controversial. But the attempt of defining literary criticism is very interesting: "Literary criticism is a practical cognitive activity, i.e. action of expressing evaluative opinions about literature. The objects of it is a literary work or a number of works and, if necessary, a literary personality. The intention is the evaluation. The tools are all methodological cognitive activities subordinated in their relationship to an axiological intention."⁹ A strong emphasis put on this property of judgements of literary criticism was common for Troczyński and Stanisław Brzozowski who, as K. Dybciak put it, expressed in the Polish tradition its evaluative nature in the clearest way.¹⁰

Chapters closing Krasuski's book are concerned with the problem of separateness and consonance of Troczyński's views in the framework of his generation and the period of the history of literature. It has been at the same time an attempt to look in a synthetic way at his output in literary criticism. Krasuski recognizes Troczyński's contribution to the change made by the 1910 generating, manifested in the departure from aesthetocentric Aristotelian poetics in favour of Platonic ethical understanding of art. However, the final recapitulation has come off unfavourably: "[...] although Troczyński's declarations on literary criticism attained great analytic and interpretative value, nevertheless the depth of their cultural expression did not have that sharpness. In that domain he remained visibly in Irzykowski's background. His texts do not have such 'high moral temperature' as the texts of Brzozowski. Because of that the contemporary evaluation of Troczyński's acti-

vity in literary criticism is ambivalent and nowadays he is valued higher as an interesting theorist of literature than as a critic" (p. 172). The author *Norms and Forms* has evidently underestimated the fact of proximity of views of literary criticism in the 1920-ties, developed within the limits of different systems of theory of literature. The names of Irzykowski and Brzozowski which have appeared in Krasuski's conclusion serve above all to demonstrate unauthenticity of Troczyński's ideas. All the same, the characteristic feature of that double spiritual patronage cannot be explained in the range of individual perception.¹¹

The book lacks a single reference to a great number of Troczyński's theatrical reviews, all the more so as they were an extension of his literary criticism but applied to stage play.¹² Excessive splitting of literary theory from literary criticism seems to account for the occurrence of evaluations contradictory to the quoted opinion; e.g. "as a theorist of literature (Troczyński) was becoming less and less consequent and precise", "whereas as a literary critic, more and more interesting" (p. 209). Unfortunately such statements do not make the orientation in the whole of Troczyński's ideas of theory of literature easier; they also cannot convince of changes taking place of them.

Thus, the scope of research outlined in Krzysztof Krasuski's book provokes supplementation of information however in a limited range, i.e. as a presentation of Konstanty Troczyński's system of theory of literature, it seems to be an interesting and necessary piece of work.

Jolanta Żadzikko-Sztachelska,

Białystok

Translated by Krzysztof Prymak

⁹ K. Troczyński, *An Essay on Literary Criticism*, Poznań 1931, p. 35.

¹⁰ K. Dybciak, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

¹¹ It has been indirectly proven by K. Dybciak, *op. cit.*; see also. M. Stępień, *Controversy over Stanisław Brzozowski's Works in the Years 1918 to 1939*, Cracow 1976 and W. Głowala, *Sentimentalism and Pedantry. Of the Aesthetic System of Karol Irzykowski*, Wrocław 1972.

¹² See: D. Ratajczak, *op. cit.*, a chapter devoted to Troczyński as a theatrical critic.