

Translated by Monika Szuba

On Debates in Literary Studies

1. The coal of our profession?

Kazimierz Wyka once called tradition “the coal” of his profession¹. When he wrote *O potrzebie historii literatury* (*About the Necessity of Literary History*) – in the mid-sixties – a similar metaphor expressed confidence in the secure status of this field, respect for its achievements, and belief in its future. “Black gold” in Poland was then still a synonym of a mineral without which one could not imagine dynamic economic development. It was the mineral “foundation” of industry favoured by communists.

Nowadays Wyka’s metaphor remains still up to date, but probably not how the author would have wished. Mines go bankrupt, coal has lost its value, and it is slowly being pushed out by more modern ways of obtaining energy. Such a devaluation may also be an offence against the status of literary history among humanist discourses. If in the sixties it enjoyed great success, and its position seemed stable, later there appeared many voices clamoring for a thorough revision of its research methods and object of study. Some announced its inevitable death².

That is why we should think about whether such forecasts are right and pose three questions: about the genesis of the debate over literary history, the reasons for the criticism aimed at it, and ways of overcoming the crisis (real or supposed). The following article will offer an overview of the main voices in the debate that has been under way for many years, in Poland as well as elsewhere.

2. Literary studies in the twentieth century

Debates over the methods and the subject of literary research are not a new thing. They were current a hundred years ago when Wilhelm Dilthey, rejecting positivist methodology, suggested his own understanding of the objectives and tasks of literature.

¹ “I am a literary historian. For someone following such a profession tradition is the same thing as coal for a miner...He changes or helps others change the coal stored on library shelves, made under pressure of the past, into the fuel of everyday” (Wyka 310).

² As Maria Janion wrote, “it is probably the most drastic question, as history has lost the unambiguous and obvious status that it enjoyed in the golden age of positivism. The destructive process has gone so far that today the question ‘How is literary history possible?’ is accompanied by another, more drastic question: ‘Is literary history possible at all?’” (Janion 192).

Similar discussions returned throughout the twentieth century because – as Teresa Walas has aptly noticed – structuralism and hermeneutics, the most influential trends in literary studies, had “an overt antihistorical thrust” (Walas 430). Starting with Ferdinand de Saussure, structuralists have been focusing rather on the internal organization of the text (language) than its evolution. They have been interested in general rules of the text construction and the making of meaning (culminating in work by Barthes, Greimas, Todorov, Genette, and others, considered to be the manifest of narratology, published in the eighth issue of *Communications* in 1966), and not its genesis or historical change. In brief – they tended to value a synchronic over a diachronic approach. They tried to aim interpretation at the text itself – understood as a closed structure – and clear it from psychological and sociological influences. They also devoted less attention to historical context. For instance, Gérard Genette suggests opposing to the “temporal determinism of genesis” “a somewhat spatial determinism of structure”, and understanding the text not in terms of “genesis”, but of “relationship” (Genette 283).

It was equally important that Claude Lévi-Strauss, the father of structuralism after Ferdinand de Saussure, based his theory on researching “savage” communities, functioning outside history, in an “eternal now”. It is obvious that such research worked better with synchronic than diachronic ideas.

In turn, hermeneutics, as Walas argues, did not focus on history (as “a type of objectifying cognition”), but on “historicism”, “positively describing the type of experience that is understanding” (Walas 430). Neither Dilthey’s category of “historicism”, used by Heidegger, nor Gadamer’s “fusion of horizons” refer to history understood as the subject of philological studies. “Historicism” describes our being in the world, and explains the necessity of referring to tradition, interpreting it in order to achieve self-knowledge. The “fusion of horizons” in turn describes a state in which time distance between the past and the present disappears. According to Gadamer, it is a necessary condition of understanding the past. Gadamer did not intend to build an objective systemic knowledge of the past. On the contrary, he described experiencing a literary text as “listening in” and as an intimate “conversation”. As a result of the “fusion of horizons”, it was possible to reach understanding, thanks to which a work of art “stands face to face before us” (Gadamer, *Estetyka* 125), and then “invites us to listen in and start a dialogue in which understanding is achieved” (Gadamer, *Wiersz i rozmowa* 135).

Both structuralism and hermeneutics treated literary history with reservations. Structuralists were more interested in general rules of literariness. That is why they preferred the synchronic approach. The representatives of hermeneutics were not interested in history (in a historical process), but historicity (humanity’s existential “tools”).

As a result, reading was for them an individual (intimate) experience and not an element of research methods.

3. Literary studies close up

Despite the distance or even aversion demonstrated by the representatives of the above-mentioned theories to literary history, until the 1960s none of them talked about a crisis or “death”. The first voices of this kind could not be heard until the end of the 1960s. That was when René Wellek delivered a lecture entitled “The Fall of Literary History” (1979), Max Wehrli asked a question whether literary history exists at all, and Ralph Cohen, the editor of *New Literary History*, advanced the thesis in the title of one issue that it (literary history) had become outdated.

As may be easily guessed, Wellek’s, Wehrli’s, and Cohen’s words appeared in the context of the poststructuralism emerging at that time. The connection between the poststructuralist turn and a crisis of literary history is highlighted by all the scholars interested in this problem. Henryk Markiewicz pointed out the key role that the emergence of “ahistorical trends” (such as New Criticism, archetypal literary criticism, Lacan’s psychoanalysis and interpretation) played (Markiewicz 5). Maria Janion quoted Roland Barthes, who in 1960 (in an article “History or Literature”) pointed at the contradiction between an academic and a critical attitude to literature, favoring the latter. He claimed that literary history is possible only as a version of sociology, i.e. as long as it focuses on literature and not on particular works, as they should be the objects of interest for critics alone. Barthes’s opinions were radicalised by the New Critics, who stated that either you study history or you read literature (Janion 192).

Finally, Edward Balcerzan summed postmodern approaches towards literature, reducing them to four radical principles:

“The conglomerate of various postmodern rhetorics, scientific approaches and anti-scientific ones (preferring carefree entertainment to the painstaking labor of academic research), can be reduced to four short slogans:

- a. There is no literature or history – there is only reading and writing texts.
- b. There is no literature – there is only history.
- c. There is no history – there is only literature.
- d. Literature and history are things of the past” (Balcerzan 317).

Thus, the current fears and doubts concerning the status of literary history originate from the birth of deconstruction and poststructuralism. It is worth mentioning that they were also influenced by more fundamental cultural changes that began in the second half of the 1960s and still continue today. Scholars point to the appearance

of the new electronic media, which not only change traditional philological methods, but also “modify the items of verbal, iconic, and literary systems: multimedia, new processes of communication, and reception change the notion of genre, discourse, aesthetic norm, original, copy, time, space. They break the previous concepts of style ... They also break typical spatiotemporal links in cultural or literary geography, eliminating any idea of a organic, linear, and unifocal conception of development” (Bolecki 57).

The rapid development of the new media could not remain without influence, not only on the work of philologists (painstaking library research yields to fast access to electronic sources), but also on the way of thinking about literature. We cannot forget that a literary historian also participates in history – he is a “child of his/her times”. And the times in which we live and work are characterised by pragmatism – in the social, political, philosophical, and cultural dimension. One of the consequences of the dominance of pragmatism, as Teresa Walas has noticed, is the aspiration to “free oneself from the weight of history”, which is not considered to be a teacher of life, but a kind of burden “The general pragmatism typical of postmodernity, focusing on today, diminishes the interest in things past, it reduces the perceptive perspective of tradition, it undermines thinking in terms of continuity” (Walas 432).

Walas notices that the historical approach has yielded to the problematic one also in education. It would be instructive to browse through high-school textbooks. In most of them the division according to historical periods has given way to a thematic arrangement. It is no longer a matter of acquainting students with history, but making the account fit the needs and expectations of contemporary teenagers.

The diagnoses of Markiewicz, Janion, Balcerzan, and Walas were also repeated by Teresa Kostkiewiczowa in “Literary History under Reconstruction” (*Teksty Drugie* 2005, no. 1–2). She links the question about the validity of historico-literary studies with “the signs of crisis in the modern paradigm in the humanities, the crisis of history, cognition, subject” (Kostkiewiczowa 23). In her opinion, this crisis is a result of the expansion of the concepts of “trendy thinkers” (undoubtedly she means here deconstructionists and poststructuralists). The author suggests revising and reconstructing literary history and “paying close attention to everything that has undermined its foundation and undermined its stability”. According to Kostkiewiczowa poststructuralism hit at the foundations of literary history, calling into question the categories of continuity and subjectivity, and rejecting the thesis of the identity of literature. Thus it undermined the validity of historical research, as practicing literary history is possible only after accepting concrete ontological and cognitive assumptions.

First, it is necessary to “believe” in the existence of a subject understood as a specific set of beliefs about what it means to be human (Charles Taylor), or as specific strategy of being in culture (Harold Bloom). Only after accepting the existence of independent subjectivity, is literary history, “as a record of understanding and experiencing human existence in time”, possible (Kostkiewiczowa 25). Kostkiewiczowa mentions Taylor and Bloom, but it seems that any assumption stating that humanity is the subject of history, and not discourse or text, could be mentioned here. Second, it is necessary to assume the continuity of culture in order to make literary history possible. Each historical description must assume a sequence of events, their purpose, processuality, following in succession not only in temporal order, but also according to cause and effect. Finally, as Kostkiewiczowa writes, an assumption concerning literary identity is also necessary: “Practicing literary studies is only possible in the situation of such a ‘hard’ presentation of the subject, situated in the context of other discourses, but distinctly different from them” (Kostkiewiczowa 26).

These are three pillars of traditional literary history. The first two guarantee the possibility of practicing history and justify its purpose. The third one demonstrates that it is a separate discipline, one having a clearly defined object of study.

In the 1960s, Wyka considered that the above-mentioned assumptions constituted indisputable axioms. He wrote: “It seems that no one questions the exclusivity of the object [of research – TM], i.e. literature” (Wyka 340). He used an unusual metaphor, calling literature “a multifaceted crystal”, which touches other fields (history, philosophy, cultural anthropology, linguistics, psychology), but always retains its structure, thus remaining an object with perfectly smoothed edges (defined boundaries). From today’s perspective, such a strong belief in the “crystal” character of literature is no longer possible, as it is now compared to less noble objects: bulbs and rhizomes. The theses about the continuity of history and the existence of a “strong” subject in culture are not obvious either.

Postmodernists announced literature’s “death” a long time ago: Barthes wrote “The Death of the Author”, Jacques Derrida “The Ends of Man”, and Michel Foucault was interested in the crisis of the subject in *The Archeology of Knowledge*. Even if the concept of the “death of the human” in its most radical form has never become axiomatic in the humanities, it sparked a long discussion. The above-mentioned scholars challenged the opinion of the identity of literature, treating it as part of a general category of *écriture* and not as a separate discourse. They removed the boundaries between literature, philosophy, and science. As a result, the concept of literature became blurred. According to Derrida, it did not have any stable, unchanging form, and a text (literary,

philosophical, scientific) is not a realization of a ready-made model, but an “idiom” or an “event”.

Consequently, the history of such “blurred literature” became problematic. Questions concerning its boundaries and understanding multiplied. For instance, whether to include philosophical texts containing literary qualities or forms such as essay, biography, or diary? The question of the historical character of literature also mattered, as what we now consider literature had a different status in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. When there was no clear object of research, scholarship researching the object had to suffer.

Finally, postmodernists replaced the categories of permanence and continuity with the concept of discontinuity and contingency. Since the nineteenth century the development of literary history has been based on certain philosophical ideas: Leibniz’s science, eighteenth-century organic theories, Hegelianism, positivist evolutionism, and Marxism (Walas 429). These ideas were the ground where historical sciences could develop together with literary history. In Poland this development was further reinforced by the political situation, and because of that, “the attitude towards the past gained a special value in the national strategy of resistance and permanence. The link with tradition replaced the continuity of a national entity, and memory of such a link later became part of tradition” (Walas 429). Consequently, literary history was thought to operate on facts, leading to their reconstruction. However, numerous thinkers in the second half of the twentieth century looked carefully at this ideology, questioning the sense of the continuity of history. Thomas Kuhn showed that the history of science is not based on cumulation, but on violent revolutions, the result of which is not only an increase in knowledge, but a change in the cognitive paradigm and language that we use to describe reality (*The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*). In turn, Jean François Lyotard announced “the end of grand narratives”, and Hayden White stated that each historical narration is a construction of a story, and not faithful relating (*Metahistory* 1973).

4. Questioning the canon

Criticism of literary history practised by poststructuralists was accompanied by attacks on the literary canon, attempts at the revision of the recognized hierarchy of works, and, above all, a rejection of the idea that literature is “a set of the best products of the human spirit, the treasury of the highest values, celebrated by priests of hermeneutics”. This tradition initiated in German idealism and continued by philology, understood as *Geisteswissenschaften*, human sciences, was seriously damaged by increasing democratization, the development of popular culture, and a blurring of the division between high and low culture (Kostkiewiczowa 193).

These phenomena provoked suggestions that literary history should be written anew, as it resembled “an antique shop” (as the editors of *Tel Quel* put it). Radical critics posited its complete abandonment, arguing that it is a form of a repressive domination on the part of an ideology based on violence. The events that took place in 1989 at Stanford University in California were typical of this way of thinking. Students asked the university authorities to replace the mandatory course “Western Culture” with the course “Culture, Ideas, and Values”. Behind the innocent change of name, there was a real educational revolution.

“Extracts from Virgil, Cicero, Tacitus, Dante, Martin Luther, Thomas Aquinas, Tomas More, Gallileo, Locke, and Mill have been replaced with extracts from Rigoberta Manchu, Franz Fanon, Juan Rulfo, Sandra Cisneros, and Zora Neale Hurston (none of whom were dead white Christian males). The incident became an object of satirical attacks. Stanford University can be proud because it noticed the problem and tried to face it. But the problem is that the medicine may become worse than the illness itself. In theory there are many arguments for introducing “multiculturalism” and “ethnicity” in the syllabi of American universities. Unfortunately there is no Tibetan Tacitus, African Tomas Aquinas, or Mexican Stuart Mill, whose works could be placed on the reading list. In the records of none of the non-European cultures is anything that could serve as evidence of the allegedly liberal sources in America” (Davies)

Leaving such radical decisions apart, undoubtedly the choice of the canon is not only an aesthetic problem, but an ideological and political one. “The mechanism of assessment, selection and choice is ‘forever’ embedded in this discourse [literary history (TM)], hence it subordinates and excludes (...)”. “It is said that this hierarchization and choice are not made freely but from the perspective and in the interest of everyone who wields power in the discourse and culture. This way every grand historico-literary narrative at least potentially bears the weight of violence” (Walas 436).

Recently there has occurred a similar situation in Poland, when the Minister of Education, Roman Giertych, proposed to include Jan Dobraczyński’s texts on school reading lists and to remove works by Witold Gombrowicz.

We can expect similar discussions to come back with redoubled strength. Even the most open defenders of the canon cannot treat it as something given once and for all. They cannot avoid discussions about the basis and ideology behind the choices, and the social, cultural, and political factors which influence its development. Thus the canon is a fluid concept, losing its stability. On the one hand, such a situation revives literary research, as it provokes revisions and redefinitions (including more intensive research). On the other, it undermines the basis of this type of literary history (call it traditional), which claims the right to be called pure scholarship, free from ideology. Literary history turns out to be part of rhetoric.

5. What history of literature?

Criticism aimed at literary history by poststructuralists concerned equally the methods used in literary theory, the ideologies behind it, and the object of historical study itself. Janion pointed to the last, claiming that there are at least several ways of practicing literary history. What has been commonly called literary history constitutes a large number of academic approaches. Thus we can talk about the so-called “author’s” history of literature which focuses on monographs on individual writers, monographs interested mainly in their achievements (Janion 198). Hans Robert Jauss once suggested that literary history should be the history of reception, focusing mainly on the reception of literary texts and their influence on readers. Third, “the history of masterpieces”, although it is still unpopular, is also possible (Janion proposed such a project in an article published in *Problemy metodologiczne współczesnego literaturoznawstwa* (*Methodological Problems in Contemporary Literary Theories*), Kraków 1976). Fourth, studying literary life is an interesting perspective. Janina Straszakowa’s classic book *Życie literackie w Polsce w pierwszej połowie XIX wieku* (*Literary Life in Poland in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century*) (Warsaw 1970) is a good example. Literary history can also focus on studying general ideas, genres, and kinds, as well as problems in the work of authors, and not on studying their particular texts. Finally, there is also the history of subjects (Ernst Robert Curtius) and poetic imagination (Gaston Bachelard and George Poulet).

We can criticize all the above-mentioned kinds of literary history. Literary history which focuses on individual authors often relies too heavily on psychologism i biographism (see monographs written according to the “life and work” model). Literary history from the reader’s perspective, as proposed by Jauss, can be easily accused of moving away from studying literature itself to practicing the sociology of literary life. The history of masterpieces ignores a number of less outstanding works, at the same time depriving the narrative of an important context (masterpieces come to life among, or thanks to a reaction to, less outstanding texts). It prompts debates on the existence or non-existence of the canon. The history of literary life does the opposite thing: it pays less attention to the most important works, and too often moves into sociology, like Jauss’s history. Finally, literary history as history “tends to be questioned for treating literature as philosophy and for turning it into an attachment to the ‘history of spirit’, that it does not relate what makes it literature” (Janion 202).

In Poland, the most popular kind of practicing literary studies was “the methodology of writing the synthesis of literary history”, which “froze the reflection on what literary history might be in the second half of the twentieth century, stopped it in the past”

(Bolecki 47, 50). Włodzimierz Bolecki mentions the downside of such literary studies. He states that it has not worked out any historico-literary theory of literary text, and it has not formed its own ways of connecting texts with contexts, finally, it lacks its “own language which would enable linking statistical data, historical, political, biographical, and bibliographical information with philosophic contexts, text morphology, its reception, etc”. (Bolecki 51–2). Above all, as the maximalist ambitions of its representatives show, the assumption (an assumption that was accepted in silence at their foundation) that studying and describing history resembles copying the past, a historian has direct access which seem naïve from the today’s perspective.

6. Herstory and other stories

Nowadays – thanks to Hayden White and constructivists – such as “essentialist” approach can no longer be defended, and literary history, understood as an art of writing long syntheses, yields to new, more critical kinds of approach³. Bolecki pointed out that evolution proceeds firstly in the direction of smaller forms (a historian “nowadays sees literary history not through a system, a process, a synthesis (...) but through margins, small monographs, supplements, voices”); secondly towards fragmentariness coming from the maxim that “there does not exist one understanding of historicity or one truth about literary history” (Wyka 55–6).

Similarly, Walas states that poststructuralism brought a rejection of the illusion of objectivity, i.e. a conviction that one can see and describe things the way they really are (in practice this opinion was expressed in impersonal objectified utterance, assuming a point of view external in relation to the object). However, as Walas notices, every cognition is a matter of perspective and every point of view is arbitrary (Walas 436). This opinion has already become inextricable from the literary historian’s method – few question it, and few would be willing to agree with Wyka, who said that literary history is a field specialising in “reconstructing” the past, and its ambition should be to create an image of a period or a trend⁴. And although practice does not always follow theory, “the global history of literature is replaced with plural histories, offering narrow perspectives, individual aspects and subjective versions” (Walas 437). Some call these changes

³ “The historic-literary synthesis appears to be a faulty construction, impossible to realize because of gaps, unsure of its objectivity in the selection and interpretation of accessible material, deformed, if not as a result of subjectivism, then as a result of presentism, only hypothetical in explaining, struggling with resistant language matter, inevitably doomed to heterogeneity and inconsistency, to compromise and evasions. The awareness of all that should not cause an inferiority complex in the literary historian, as this imperfection is the consequence of the exceptional difficulty of the tasks that he needs to face” (Markiewicz 21).

⁴ “What can a Polish literary historian promise? Only that he will prepare comprehensive relationships concerning all literary periods and their complete evolution. Comprehensive relationships which include typical and prevailing literary processes, the place of these processes and the role of writers in the culture and ideology of future periods” (Wyka 340).

a crisis, as Walas concludes. Perhaps if we take Bolecki's and Walas's arguments into account we should say that it is not literary history that is in crisis, but its historical kind – a great synthesis written in the third-person singular?

We may wonder whether postmodernism really put literary history into mothballs, so that it is practiced only by entrenched traditionalists. It is quite the opposite⁵ – the supporters of the latest theoretical trends, seemingly critical of historical inquiries, pay a lot attention to them. The prefix post- in the term postmodernism, as Walas has noticed, brings historical thinking up to date and makes us revise the term modernism and its boundaries. Ryszard Nycz's book *Język modernizmu* (*The Language of Modernism*), is an example of a polemic with Wyka's now classic views. Similarly, *Romantyzm i nowoczesność* (*Romanticism and Modernity*), edited by Michał Kuziak, revises previous views concerning Romanticism from the point of view of postmodern literary studies.

There are many more examples that prove that we cannot escape from history, because every attempt at revision or criticism of the state of research inevitably becomes part of historico-literary research. Paradoxically: "We can say that thinking in terms of linearity and processuality had never fared better than at the moment of the declared death of history and the enthronement of the paradigm of writing which evoked the dispersion in space" (Walas 438).

We can illustrate that thought with feminist criticism. Since the end of the 1960s, the representatives of women's movements have focused their efforts mainly on current social and political problems – gender stereotypes, the place of women in the public sphere, sexism, etc. They have not only been limited to current affairs. Feminist scholars set as an aim the reinterpreting of history written from the prevalent male point of view. Mainly feminism is about remembering and discovering women's achievements, women who have been marginalized or passed over in silence. Literary history has become an instrument in the struggle for equality and one of the most dynamic fields in feminist studies. Her-story, a neologism used for the first time by Deborah Ohn (*Herstory: Women Who Changed the World*), employed to describe the writing of a "female" version of history (juxtaposing it with (his)story), has entered literary dictionaries and appears in an increasing number of publications (e.g. *Daughters of Eve: a Herstory Book* by Jean C. Kelchner or *Herstory* by Ingrid Campbell).

The situation concerning the proponents of other postmodern methodologies – intertextualism, psychoanalysis, New Historicism, cultural materialism – is similar. Thus,

⁵ Henryk Markiewicz notices that the crisis of literature and death have been announced for scores of years but it still exists and is doing well (Markiewicz 5).

we cannot talk about the crisis of literary history, but on the contrary, its flourishing thanks to those who loudly proclaim its “death”.

We should assess the changes that have taken place in literary studies in the last decades. Bolecki points out that a side-effect of the intellectual trend toward deconstruction is a worse kind of scholarship. Thus the thesis concerning the arbitrariness of methodological concepts is in danger of “rejecting research rules”; the thesis about the lack of any differences between literature and literary discourse “removes questions about the possibility of verifying interpretative theses and the validity of the research process”. Further, “The style of an essay is confused with the arguments of a dissertation... Overt subjectivism is considered to offer a refreshing rejection of fossilized academic traditions” (Bolecki 59).

In spite of the accusations against contemporary literary studies among the scholars who have participated in the debate over its current condition, there is a conviction that it is no longer possible to return to traditional historical narration, understood as an attempt to create a synthetic description of a literary and historical process. Consequently, some of the demands made by narratologists and constructivists should be accepted together with the less radical theses of poststructuralists. Balcerzan proposes a revision:

“The first call of postmodernity, ‘There is no literature or history, there is only reading and writing texts’ could be written as ‘reading and writing texts can be observed in some fields outside history and analyzed after excluding their literariness’ The second motto, ‘There is no literature – there is only history’ would be reduced to the assumption that history as a mechanism generating literature could be recognized if we assume a working hypothesis that concerns excluding this mechanism – not in order to prove its indisputable authenticity but to find in literature the energies which resist history... . The opinion that ‘there is no history, there is only literature’ should turn into a cautious question about the limits of the influence of literature on history, i.e. on actual national history and how it is perceived” (Balcerzan 318).

Kostkiewiczowa proposes revising the possibilities of the existence of literary studies after deconstruction, referring to the hermeneutic tradition, especially to the work of Paul Ricoeur:

“Referring to Ricoeur’s concept of discourse, we can say that a literary text as an event is historical and it is capable of transgressing its own historical time and becoming an equal link in a sequence of similar events. A literary text is an object that evokes tension between temporality (historicity) and timelessness (universality), and signs of this tension and its consequences constitute the area of observation for a literary historian” (Kostkiewiczowa 35).

Kostkiewiczowa, who has never been a poststructuralist, treats deconstruction like a refreshing shock in the humanities, stresses its constructive aspect, appreciates its critical

potential, which does not overthrow and destroy previous literary studies, but provokes the reader to a more critical revision of the attitude (she tends to think of deconstruction as radical hermeneutics). Thus she believes that hermeneutics (literary history) is possible after deconstruction, if it is a more critical hermeneutics, aware of the accusations of Derrida, Foucault, and other representatives of this trend.

Works Cited

- Balcerzan, Edward. "Granice literatury, granice historii, granice granic" *Polonistyka w przebudowie: literaturoznawstwo – wiedza o języku – wiedza o kulturze – edukacja*. Ed. Małgorzata Czermińska. Kraków: Universitas, 2005. Print.
- Bolecki, Włodzimierz. "Czym stała się dziś historia literatury". *Wiedza o literaturze i edukacja*. Warszawa: Instytut Badań Literackich, 1995. Print.
- Davies, Norman. *Europa: rozprawa historyka z historią*. Kraków: Znak, 2006.
- Gadamer, Hans Georg. "Estetyka i hermeneutyka". *Rozum, słowo, dzieje*. Trans. Małgorzata Łukasiewicz, Krzysztof Michalski. Warszawa: PIW, 1979. Print.
- Gadamer, Hans Georg. "Wiersz i rozmowa". *Poetica, Wybrane eseje*. Trans. Małgorzata Łukasiewicz. Warszawa: Instytut Badań Literackich, 2002. Print.
- Genette, Gerard. "Strukturalizm a krytyka literacka". Trans. W. Błońska. *Pamiętnik Literacki* 3 (1974). Print.
- Janion, Maria. "Jak możliwa jest historia literatury". *Humanistyka: poznanie i terapia*. Warszawa: PIW, 1974. Print.
- Kostkiewiczowa, Teresa. "Historia literatury w przebudowie". *Teksty Drugie* 1–2 (2005). Print.
- Markiewicz, Henryk. "Dylematy historyka literatury". *Pamiętnik Literacki* 4 (1986). Print.
- Walas, Teresa. "Historia literatury w przebudowie". *Polonistyka w przebudowie: literaturoznawstwo – wiedza o języku – wiedza o kulturze – edukacja*. Ed. Małgorzata Czermińska. Kraków: Universitas, 2005. Print.
- Wellek, Rene. "Upadek historii literatury". Trans. G. Cendrowska. *Pamiętnik Literacki* 3 (1988). Print.
- Wyka, Kazimierz. "Węgiel mojego zawodu". *O potrzebie historii literatury*. Warszawa: PIW, 1969. Print.