

Aleksander Bereza, *PROBLEMY TEORII STYLIZACJI W SATYRZE* (NOTES ON THE THEORY OF STYLIZATION IN THE SATIRE), Wrocław—Warszawa—Kraków 1966, pp. 126. Ossolineum.

The book is an interesting attempt at performing a contamination of what the author calls "two models of reference": the theory of satire and the theory of stylization. The domain of literary research, which results from the overlapping of these two models, determines to a large extent the approach of the author and the selection of literary samples and other material referred to, or quoted, in the present book. The "biradial" nature of the problem under investigation entails certain limitations, which the author discloses with commendable honesty, explaining them on the one hand by the innate properties of the sample material and, on the other, by the method which he has adopted throughout his work (pp. 122—123). Writes the author (p. 123): "A fundamental objective of the present work, and the sole reason for my digressions in the theory of satire, has been to explain the conception of stylization and appraise its function in a work of satire". Any inadequacies in the treatment of the theory of satire, inadequacies which were unavoidable in view of the aforesaid limitations, can be remedied at least partially by referring the reader to earlier essays of the same author<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. Bereza, *W kręgu „walki”. O problemach stylizacji* (More on "the Conflict". Notes on Stylization). Printed in the volume: *Z teorii i historii literatury* (Notes on the Theory and History of Literature), Wrocław—Warszawa 1963, pp. 201—226. Also by the same author: *Próba analizy parodii* (An Attempt at Analyzing Parody). Printed in: *Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis*, No. 13, Prace Literackie V (Literary

The book starts (pp. 5—14) with a review of works devoted to stylization in the theory of satire. The list of literature cited is not only proof of the scholarly conscientiousness of the author but also an illustration of the difficulties which he must have encountered from the very outset. Most theorists of the satire omit problems of stylization from their deliberations, and some see stylization as a disadvantage to a work of satire in that it tends to spoil the ideological merit of the work in question (cf. the views of the Soviet theorists Galavin and Elsberg, recounted on pp. 7—8). This fact limits considerably the scope of reference material which otherwise might be useful in the subsequent study.

The selection of the ancillary material, which thus had to be performed in an almost perfunctory manner, in the study of stylization problems shows in the approach of the author a distinct preference for a definite scholarly attitude (Chapter II). Bereza takes the side of authors adopting a functional approach to stylization problems (p. 15). S. Skwarczyńska, K. Budzyk, C. Rowiński, and the authors of *Zarys teorii literatury* (*Outline Theory of Literature*) are all scholars who investigate the functional aspect of these problems in the categories of literary research, whereas Z. Klemensiewicz, M. R. Mayenowa and T. Skubalanka represent the linguistic point of view in this matter. Bereza sees a possibility of reconciling the one standpoint with the other in the suggestions put forward by Bakhtin, to whom he devotes considerable space in the book. From the linguistic terminology, the author adopts the notion of opposition. Such oppositions as

Papers V), 1963, pp. 128—147. Also by the same author: *Parodia wobec struktury groteski* (Parody and the Structure of Grotesque). Printed in the volume: *Styl i kompozycja* (Style and Composition), Wrocław 1965.



occur in literary work, subjected to stylistic blending of the standard language with its dialectic or functional varieties, appear to the author as useful in examining the idea of stylization, if only in a limited degree.

Were the oppositions to be used on an exclusive basis, such an analysis would tend to atomize the linguistic structure of the work under investigation (p. 18). Therefore Bereza suggests a study of the oppositions: a) between stylistically neutral and stylistically conspicuous elements, and b) between elements exhibiting different grades of stylistic conspicuity (in the relation: stylization vs. the work subjected to it, cf. p. 28). The latter group of oppositions is enclosed in the relations "model vs. stylization", and is composed of various manifestations of the phenomena of identification and negation (both of which will be discussed further below). The notion of the model is examined by the author on pp. 31–37. Bereza objects to those scholars who look upon the model as a passive component of the opposition, failing to see that in cases of identification the model indeed influences the outlook of the work subjected to stylization (p. 32).

As the author sees it, the model is a province of understanding and agreement between the reader and the author who performs the stylizing operation (this being guaranteed by the social character of the model), while it also submits to a process of subjective structuralization, performed by the same author. Writes A. Bereza: "By subjective structuralization we understand the selection of a definite model together with its objective properties, as also such a manner of selection and such an arrangement of the objective properties as are imposed by the act of stylization and the aim (ideological, artistical, etc.) which this stylization is supposed to serve" (p. 33).

The existence of the model is connected with the problematics of evocation, broached by the author who also uses that opportunity to launch an interesting attempt at a precise definition of the allusion. The notion of allusion can be examined against the background of stylization. Employed in stylization most frequently with a view to contrasting the features given the literary hero by the author against those with which the hero identifies himself, the allusion differs from stylization in that the model (Bereza suggests the term "source" in this place) evoked by it is exempt from the process of subjective structuralization — it is defined and determined socially (p. 38).

The former deliberations, together with an attempt at delineating the limits of stylization phenomena in a work of literature (pp. 41–60), define the first portion of the problematics (a theory of stylization) and are an interesting proposition in the aspect of research methodology. The application of this scholarly apparatus in examining the various functions of stylization in the satire is found in Chapters IV and V of the present work. The remainder of this review will be devoted to that problem.

In comparing the stylized work of literature with the model after which such stylization has been performed, the reader finds elements in which these two differ side by side with others which are common to both. This is called identification. Its function is to recall the model and, by means of an opposition to the remaining elements of the work, to direct the reader's attention to perceiving the negation of the model. Among the various manifestations of identification can be: the title, transposed with only insignificant alterations from the model to the stylized work; one or another quotation; imitation of the most repe-



titive lexical, versification, or other features, etc. Negation is defined by Bereza as "the disparagement of the model and preference for those models as represented by identification" (p. 79).

Negation is achieved by: a) multiplication of elements subjected to disparagement (e.g. archaisms in the parody of the historical novel, as done by Swinarski, p. 81); b) intensification or hyperbolization; c) inaccurate linguistic connotation, consisting in the clash of two linguistic conventions, given an equal footing (an example from *Postępowiec* (*Progressive Fellow*) by Sławomir Mrożek: "Responding to an appeal of the municipal authorities for a prompt garbage disposal, one P., a housekeeper, disposed of two tenants [...]", p. 86); d) realization of a metaphor (e.g. "tear apart the bottle necks of production").

The last-named two manners of negation have been employed frequently in the post-war satire with a view to ridiculing (disparaging) the artificial nature of the publicist language; both reveal its unintended grotesque.

The notions of identification and negation become particularly useful in examining the relationships between stylization and the literary subject person (here understood as the author, the satire's "I", the narrator) of a work of satire. Identification of the linguistic peculiarities of the heroes with the socially or functionally defined linguistic variety comprising the model is employed in satire most frequently with a view to disparaging the same heroes (e.g. the use of cant or other hoodlum phrases, etc.). The close bond between the satirical subject person and stylization is a determinant of the "skaz", with the role of which in the Polish post-war satire the author deals at length on pp. 111—119.

Chapter V of the work is concluded with remarks on the various manifestations of the category of the author in

a work of satire, and on the influence of such manifestations on stylization attempts (pp. 119—122).

The present review of necessity gives an inadequate treatment to the wealth of problems dealt with by A. Bereza. The reviewer has tried solely to present what seems to him the most interesting aspect of these problematics: the various sets of oppositions, occurring either between different elements of a work of satire or between that work and the stylization model. In the present situation when students of the theory of literature and literary critique make renewed attempts to subordinate their analyses to notions of opposition, the book of Bereza offers interesting suggestions in methodology of research and valuable precision of terminology (e.g. of the notions of travesty and allusion). Nor will it disappoint those of the readers who will seek a full inventory list of problems in the theory of stylization. While scrutinizing the various manifestations of stylization only in the linguistic aspect of the satire, and thereby omitting many other problems within the area of satire, the author nonetheless manages to outline a broader picture of those problems. He thus offers hope that a fuller treatment of the subject is still feasible.

Henryk Pustkowski, Łódź

Юрий М а н н, О ГРОТЕСКЕ В ЛИТЕРАТУРЕ, Москва 1966, с. 184. Советский Писатель.

Praca J. Manna jest jedną z kilku radzieckich publikacji poświęconych grotesce w ciągu paru ostatnich lat. Sąsiaduje ona z wnikliwym studium N. Bachtina (*Tworczestwo François Rabelais i narodnaja kultura sriedniewiekowja i rieniesansa*, Moskwa 1965) oraz popularnym szkicem A. Wulisa (*W laboratorii smiecha*, Moskwa 1966), stanowiąc potwierdzenie narastającego od