

SUMMARY

Literariness. Models, gradations, experiments

Each new literary phenomenon threatens the identity of literature, at the same confirming it. Artistic novelty initiates change in the hierarchy of topics, causes deregulation of the norms of expression, contributes to the increase of disorder among the genres, enforces the revision of boundaries separating literature from non-literature or paraliterature, and verbal communication from non-verbal one. The greatest breakthroughs and the most rapid turns, however, do not destroy the universal model of literariness; it remains invariably attractive for writers, interpreters, readers, critics, historians and theoreticians of the written word. Various stimuli instigate reflection on literariness: formal-linguistic, 2. emotional, 3. ideological, 4. scientific. The formal-linguistic one stems from the mechanism of derivation: the existence of literature makes an a priori assumption of the existence of its essence, which is literariness itself. The emotional one creates the urge to reach the 'alchemic' mystery of the word art, which becomes the source of spontaneous literary science. The ideological one accompanies the institutionalisation of literary culture. The scientific one appears whenever the phenomena of literature/literariness become the subject of cognitive operations, which explain and organize its statics and dynamics, identity and diversity, systemness and eventualization, constancy and gradationality of communicative energy.

The basic instrument of literary academic knowledge is metalanguage. The metalanguage of each event in the universe of speech, which also includes an artistic event, may be (for a moment) another, properly directed verbal event; academic knowledge of literature appears to be a multilingual and multimetalingual discipline. When organizing high literature, it is essential to make a distinction between facts and communicative effects. Facts are subject to description and analysis within a speaker's elementary language competence, whereas effects, such as imagery, musicality, fictionality, singularity, cohesion, orienting a statement towards self-organization etc. are writers' goals (illusions?), the mottos of schools of writing and study. Neither a fact, nor an effect of a given poetics can serve as a universal discriminant of literariness. One needs to search for a qualificator of literariness in the relationships between a given work's internal orders.

This condition is met by the contrariety idea of literariness, recurring in artistic realizations of different periods, in conservative and novel poetics, both indigenous and based on others. Literariness means suspending the logical non-contrariety norm (*lex contradictionis*), according to which two contradictory opinions on the same matter, in the same continuance, cannot be both considered true. In practical communication, it is unacceptable for A and non-A to be true at the same time; in literary communication, it is essential. The contrariety essence of literariness may manifest itself in significant sequences of words and sentences of a literary work or be active on the structure's various levels. It is not just opinions, but also the tensions between the factors present in a given work: artificiality and naturalness of expression, order and chaos of the plot, experiment and returning to previously used techniques, impartial observation and biased opinion on the world, its visibility and invisibility, the ability or inability to express the author's intuitions, realistic and imaginative orientation etc. The contrariety model remains open for the changing artistic trends – due to the gradational nature of the energies created in literature.

The tensions between the expressible and non-expressible (expressed and unexpressed) and between the visible and the invisible, as well as the conceptualizations or visualizations of literary 'worlds' resulting from them, are possibilities, not orders, for a reader, yet without the realization of those possibilities the reception of some types of works becomes incomplete. The sources of those tensions should be sought in the psychology of personality, describing the writers' and recipients' life experiences. Other effects of the contrariety nature of a literary work, such as the directives of conflicting writing programmes, require crossing the border of life experience and the knowledge of the history of literature. Specifically literary collisions shape a work's internal dramaturgy when: 1. single works are treated as evidence of meeting or a failure to meet the conditions of literariness; 2. one guesses the tensions in the structure of a single work; 3. the author refers to antagonistic poetics. A special kind of collision, available to connoisseurs, may be a confrontation of a work's ontological concept with the poetics of a given work. Connoisseurs here become subjects, and at the same time observers of their own autocommunication, an important aspect of which is 'limitative imagination', set on the perception of various boundaries, separating literature from other forms of human beings' verbal activity. They are: 1. existential boundaries between the forms of existence and the 'non-existence' of sovereign high literature 2. linguistic existential boundaries between autocommunication, which is the internal speech of a writer and/or a recipient of a literary work, and the oral and written literature and

a literary text, which participates in multi-code transmissions; 3. symbolic boundaries between high literature and other forms of interpersonal, artistic, non-artistic and paraartistic communication; 4. internal linguistic boundaries between literary, non-literary and paraliterary states of speech; 5. internal literary boundaries between indigenous and foreign literature, between the modern works and the works from the past, between literary periods, kinds, genres, historical poetics.

A reading-active form of literariness is genealogical literariness, manifested by the signals of being embedded in the tradition of artistic literature. Genealogical diversity of the word art may be defined in five aspects: translatory, intertextual, literary studies, hybrid and workshop-related; in the last one, we are dealing with literature in *statu nascendi*, taking place between the changeability of the work being created, and the unchangeability of the work created. The common factor of those aspects is gradational activity of the signals coming from outside the literature, meaning the still present semantic dimension, from full vividness to the boundaries of disappearance, which is never ultimate in literary art. The form of analytical relations with genealogical literature, sharing its mechanisms and styles to the largest extent, is interpretation, which is a reversal of a metaphor. Interpretation is described by: 1. bivocality, which means the omnipresence of the voices of the interpreter and the author, 2. multitude of hypotheses concerning the work's internal hierarchy, 3. the chance of transferring the rules guiding the perception of one work to other text entities, 4. oratorical diversity of interpretative statements, stimulated by differing communication goals: educational, ideological, program-creative, author-related, analytical.

The categories of interpretation can be used on both an exegesis of a fragment of a literary piece (like its title), and on interpreting the message of a group of works. In order to describe a random gathering of texts which were inspired by a known work or works of literature, as well as the authors' programs, scholars' concepts, events from the author's/authors' biographies or from the collective history of writing, I use the term 'the great silva'. The great silva ceases to be a chaotic stream of texts when subject to great interpretation, which shapes elements into a statement. Significant great silvas of the Polish literature are, among others, *mickiewicziana* and the texts generated the works, manifests and the legends of the *avant-garde*.

Literariness is an ever-lasting source of methodological controversies. It antagonizes the thoughts of structuralists and post-structuralists; imposing or removing the distance between attitudes is in this case gradational in its nature. However, significant differences concern the axiology of literary

science. Structuralism opts for grading separate pieces of literature and resigns from evaluating a convention, whereas post-structuralism refrains from evaluating separate texts, viewing it as a reprehensible lust for power, and ruthlessly evaluates a convention, worshipping all which is postmodern and degrading everything which can serve as a voice of modernity. Tensions emerge in relation to the basic categories of literary science, such as the author, work, poetics, history of literature, literariness. Extreme post-structural doctrines proclaim deconstruction, directed towards general terms of theoretical poetics, at the same time searching given texts for elements which are impossible to determine. From the point of view of the methodology of structural studies, deconstructive operations on given works – which have been long known to the critics, used in literary plays or parodies – may be useful within the boundaries of a scientific experiment, just like many other specialties, deliberately narrowing the focus of studies. Deconstructing the foundations of the knowledge of literature is unacceptable to the connoisseurs who treat the questions concerning literature/literariness as fundamental, although polemics with the deconstruction can facilitate the renewal of the ways of reasoning.

The highlights of structuralism, both external and internal, reveal the multitude of ramifications and variants, phases and transformations, visions and revisions, judgments which are difficult to compromise between, or even mutually exclusive; as a result, it appears impossible to globally negate or accept all that structuralism has created and is creating at present. In the texts formulated in the mainstream of contemporary structuralism (recurrent) we can distinguish three ways of manifesting one's own hierarchy of values: offensive, clearing and defensive. Analogical diversity can be observed in the case of someone else's reflections and evaluations of structuralism. They are empathic, neutral or aggressive in its nature. Contemporary literary science, observed in complex ramifications and diversities, is neither fully innovative, conservative, completely impossible to relate to other experiences of neighboring cultures, nor completely contaminated with the original sin of plagiarism; it is not in every inch modern or postmodern, neither continuously structuralist, nor totally post-structuralist. At the same time, it appears impossible to eliminate one common feature from this conglomerate: the stance towards the disputes concerning literature/literariness.

A way to move beyond the polemic scenarios, which begin to repeat themselves to a dangerous extent, may be replacing the dichotomy of 'literature – non-literature' with a trichotomy 'literature – non-literature – paraliterature'. Paraliterature not only serves as an intermediary between literature and non-literature, but is a source of original order for both of

them, being the most frequent form of human verbal communication. We all (the speaking and the thinking) speak and think in paraliterature (of natural science, law or technology), whereas only some have contact with literature. Both literary and non-literary systems manifest themselves as specialties of speech: they both stem from paraliterature and go beyond it.

Not only within the boundaries of the logosphere, but also in multi-code communication, which is semiotics' focus of interest, specific features of a literary statement appear. Semiotics is related to literary science by means of: 1. communicative vision of the world, 2. dialectic of the object and sign, viewed in terms of semiosis, 3. openness to various ideologies. Semiotic directing of literary studies opens numerous perspectives in the studies of the dimensions of a literary work – in the context of actual time-space experiences of a human being. The basic kinds of references appear to be helpful in ordering works according to genres when: 1. literature appeals to a uniform system of proxemic orientations, 2. it simultaneously activates two or more systems of spatial culture, 3. it uses the experiences of a human being's semiotic success or failures in dealing with real space.

Semiotics paves the way towards multimedia genealogy, tracking and ordering the coincidences between forms and genres of different communication systems (literature, painting, architecture, drama, films, music). Apart from constant determinants, such as the structure of a statement and the communicative situation related to it, an active genre-creating element is the type of transmitter, which generates the opposition between monomedia to multimedia. Both forms and genres originate from simpler forms. Genres emerge from repetition of text structures; theoretically any text can generate a genre of some sort (as it recently happened to *moskaliki*). Forms, on the other hand – in multimedia space – can be described either by means of adapting the traditional literary triad (lyric, epic and drama), or as a multiplication of selected forms. The latter possibility is given to us by selecting popular, paraliterary genres, present both in high and popular culture. From the intentions, formed in an essay, a report or a column – from the model attitudes of the transmitter towards the world, audience and the material of artistic statement – emerges a *quasi*-generic order, which provides instruments for analyzing the similarities and differences between the works of all arts. Their relations do not abolish the borders between communicative orders, on the contrary, they remain a vivid background for making the specific features (such as literariness, musicality, drama- or movie-like nature) more prominent.

Translated by Jacek Wełniak