

Krzysztof RUSNAK

COGNITIVE FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE UNDERSTANDING LITERATURE

This article has essayistic character, not that of a strict scientific dissertation but such was its intention – to give it a more creative character by presenting my own points of view which are based on my own experience and observation. It is hardly feasible to measure the influence of all cognitive factors upon our perception of reality in a scientific way. Of course, we can determine, by way of tests and statistics, the level of someone's intelligence, sensitiveness, education, etc., but we cannot predict or measure how, or to what degree one's sensitiveness or experience or intelligence is used while reading a literary work, or what part they play in the process of our cognition. If we took two persons with similar or the same test results on their sensitiveness, life experience, intelligence or personality, still each of them would manifest a different reception of the same book.

Our process of perception of reality depends on many factors, the simplest being our senses. People who do not have a full command of them have poorer perception. For example, if we take the blind, they can never appreciate and enjoy the physical, tangible beauty of the world, its colours, shades of green in spring, or the beauty of art. If we take the deaf, they cannot experience the beauty of music, murmur of the sea at dusk or twittering of birds. Sight and hearing are, perhaps, the two most important senses, less – are taste, touch and smell.

Apart from the senses, there is a number of other factors of a more complicated and abstract nature, such as features of our personality and character, of our intellect (the way we think, analyse, synthesise), or those that depend on our education, cultural circle, experience, religion, tradition, etc. They largely influence the process of our cognition, often without our being aware of it. In as much as in the case of the senses it is easy to notice their malfunctioning or lack of function, in the case of abstract factors it is not that simple, if possible at all. Even if we have a high degree of self-awareness and know that these

factors can influence our perception of reality, it is not possible to exactly determine the degree to which they shape it since there is no “neutral” cognition. We cannot strip man of his cognitive abilities, i.e., deprive him of his mind or personality or education or tradition and then test the “neutral mode of cognition” since, if we deprive him of his cognitive apparatus, no cognition will, obviously, take place. Therefore, we never know exactly to what extent our vision of reality is blurred by the way we get to know it. *Life is a dream*,¹ as P. Calderón de la Barca (2000) put it. We never truly know whether or how much our perception of reality, our judgements, opinions, interpretation of someone’s behaviour and evaluation of other people’s acts are proper, assuming that a “proper perception of reality” exists at all.

These, however, are the queries of epistemology, not literature, therefore I will concentrate here not on general issues concerning theory of cognition, but only on those cognitive factors that are closely connected with understanding literature. The very term “understanding” needs, however, a little clarification. It may refer only to purely mental cognition and operates, then, only on an *epistemological level*² (we are able to mentally grasp the meaning of a literary work, we are able to analyse its structure, development of the plot, protagonists’ problems, etc.). Understanding may also involve emotional or psychological cognition operating on an *axiological level* (we get emotionally involved, we react to the protagonists’ experiences, we sympathise with them or not, we feel certain tension building up, etc. Finally, the book leaves a certain impression upon us either in terms of various psychological experiences – one of them being, e.g. “catharsis” (Aristotle 1997), or impressing upon us various value systems). Thirdly, understanding also refers to *aesthetic level*, where the reader may enjoy the style of the book (e.g., various stylistic figures, precision of language used, richness of vocabulary or, in the case of poetry – verse and rhyme). Literature is different from science in that it is interested not only in the purely epistemological, mental aspect of cognition but, also, in axiological one – in introducing values into human life and shaping our axiological sensitiveness. Therefore, full understanding of literature takes place when both epistemological, axiological and aesthetic level are combined. This is not possible in sciences since it would be difficult to answer the question of how to introduce values into mathematics, chemistry or astronomy.

Let us now proceed to analyse factors that may have an impact on understanding literature. The list is as follows.

¹ The main protagonist in Calderón’s drama *Life Is a Dream* is imprisoned in a dungeon by his father, a king, who is afraid that, according to what the stars had told him, his son might deprive him of his throne. One night, while asleep, he is taken by his father to the palace and raised, for a try, to the throne. Then they take him back to the dungeon where, upon waking up, he loses the ability to distinguish between which part of his existence belongs to reality and which one is a dream.

² Division mine.

General outlook upon life and reality

We can divide the outlook into two types: religious and non-religious. Those who represent a religious outlook (a variety of religions is a separate question here) may have a different interpretation of reality than non-believers. If, e.g., they believe in afterlife, certain problems concerning earthly existence discussed in a given literary work may seem peripheral to them. Thus, they may tend to diminish the book's value, saying that the problems presented are not that important since their religious doctrine has already given them answers to presented issues. It may, even, be sometimes difficult for them (if their minds are not flexible enough) to understand certain issues. Here we may have two groups of people: strict followers of the dogma who may tend to deprecate value systems and knowledge of reality outside their religious doctrine, and those conscious and open-minded people who are not restricted in their thinking in such a way. Since, however, religion is a means of cognition of reality, both physical (the world that surrounds us) and metaphysical, the conservative approach may lead to primitive interpretations of a literary work. E.g., for a Christian, a psychological novel analysing problems of earthly happiness or satisfaction of man's earthly life may seem unimportant since it is not earthly but eternal happiness that is most important to him and this will definitely somehow influence his understanding of the novel. A good example here may be mediaeval literature, where religious themes usually prevailed over secular ones, as problems of earthly existence were only in as much important as they could bear on the attainment of eternal happiness.

What also comes into play is a variety of religions. Each religion is a certain cognitive system. If we take, e.g., Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, or religions of Mesopotamia, ancient Egypt, Greece, etc., each of them presents a different concept of reality and a different value system. This, definitely, influences our cognition. Besides, with due respect to all of them, we must admit that there are those which are more flexible in their doctrine and value systems, or the way the doctrine is enforced, and those that are not, or making another division, those that permit a certain axiological or epistemological creativity and those that exclude it. For example, within Christianity, Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Church permit it but not Puritanism, with its doctrine of predestination. Neither does Islamic tradition where the principle of tribal or family revenge, without even considering its moral justification or necessity is an indisputable principle of conduct. Those who do not take revenge, violate the sacred law. For an average Muslim it might, therefore, be difficult to admire moral nobleness of someone who renounces the principle of "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth". To give the easiest example, it might be difficult for him to appreciate the ethical value of *Romeo and Juliet* since Romeo would be a fool who does not want to follow his family

predecessors and wage war with the Capulets. For a Christian or a non-believer with a deep sense of morality, it would, in turn, be difficult to understand the moral duty to take revenge upon the opponent (although there is a considerable difference here between the moral code of the Old Testament (more rigid) and the New Testament (more creative)).

The same might be referred to Puritanism, with its modified theory of predestination, according to which man's fate has already been decided by God and there is no possibility of changing it. Therefore, *The Scarlet Letter* by Hawthorne (1986) would be of no or little value to a dogmatic Puritan, since once doomed by God (it is Hester in this case), a human being cannot try to seek redemption and should be doomed for good by the community as well, which may lead to primitive, uncivilised cruelty (as it happens in Hawthorne's romance – Hester is terribly ostracised by the community she lives in).

Another example of how such a dogmatic approach may limit and reduce human epistemological development, is the well-known example of burning down the famous Library of Alexandria founded by Ptolemy I Soter, king of Egypt, which housed all writings of ancient Greece (about 700,000 scrolls). Reportedly, it was done on the order of caliph Umar I, who conquered Alexandria, and who said that if the scrolls contained the same as in the Koran, they were superfluous, and if they did not, they were detrimental (*Encarta*® 98), (Islam is here taken only as an example to illustrate the problem, not just to criticise it as a religious system).

For a non-believer, in turn, literary works with a strong didactic orientation (like much of medieval literature) may have little value since they reduce the complexity of human life down to a few simple principles that should indisputably be followed. Therefore, Chaucer's *The Canterbury Tales* (1986) will always be more interesting since they present a more realistic picture of human conduct, free from doctrinal predilections.

Social status

Social status may also be one of the factors that influence cognition and understanding literature. Far from simplifying, we must admit that an upper class reader will have expectations different from those of a lower class reader. This is connected both with education, material status and creature comforts. Due to these differences, an upper class reader will live in a different world of problems. For him, life reduced just to struggling for survival may somehow seem inconceivable or hard to comprehend. If, in turn, we take a lower class representative, those problems that might interest an upper class reader may seem mere trifles, not worth paying attention to. Thus, for example, *realism* or *naturalism*, which usually dealt with depicting the life of lower classes, might,

after some time, seem uninteresting to an upper class reader, not much intellectually challenging, too distant from his world, and too down-to-earth. For a lower class reader, *The Portrait of a Lady* by H. James (1986) might, in turn, seem out of touch with reality, since the problems that Isabel faces might seem pseudo-problems to him, not worth much attention. It does not, obviously, mean that it must always be so, and that people who do not experience hardships will not be able to understand the problems of those who do, but such understanding is usually attainable for those with over and above average power of perception and sensitivity.

Cultural differences

Here differences stemming from different cultural backgrounds come into play. It may be differences between world cultures, e.g. European, African, Asian, etc., as well as those between nations and even ethnic groups within the same nation. All of them may, to a certain extent, influence understanding a literary work. Tradition, upbringing, value systems of a given culture or a nation shape our perception of reality and we may find certain ideas strange or difficult to understand. We can quote here, as an example, American fascination with witchcraft, vampires, black magic and devil forces present not so much in literature, perhaps, but in present-day American cinema. This vogue may seem strange to Europeans, where cultures are more stabilised, not like those of the melting pot.

Education

Education is understood here in two ways: it refers to our general education (general knowledge), as well as to specific education (knowledge of literature, its history and theory). The more educated we are, the easier it becomes to understand a literary work on all levels of its organisation, i.e., its structure, its contents, language, style, etc. Also, we can more fully evaluate its significance based on the evolution of a given theme along literary history, etc. The better educated we are, the greater intellectual pleasure we can derive from reading a book. For example, for a reader with average education as well as aesthetic and cognitive sensitiveness, Shakespeare's *Macbeth* (1991) or Dostoyevsky's *Crime and Punishment* (1997) may be just detective stories. For a more educated one, they may be philosophical or theological works, touching upon metaphysical questions of human existence and, a still better-educated reader may enjoy the construction of the plot or language used, etc. Not to mention the fact that 20th c. literature (*modernism* and *post-modernism*)

requires quite a good deal of specific knowledge if we want to have a fuller, more coherent understanding of it, due to the variety and hermetism of artistic tendencies and trends.³

Personal sensitivity

Personal sensitivity may be the result of two factors: inborn sensitivity and sensitivity developed through education. Generally, we can talk about *axiological sensitivity*⁴ (emotional, aesthetic and ethical) and *epistemological sensitivity* (general interest in the world, in human life and in the development of civilisation) and *aesthetic sensitivity*. This sensitivity may operate in several ways. Firstly, there are people whose epistemological sensitivity may prevail over axiological one (they are able to mentally comprehend problems presented but are not axiologically influenced by the contents of the book). Secondly, there are people whose axiological sensitivity prevails over epistemological one and they get easily influenced emotionally or ethically before mental cognition follows. There are also readers with a balanced sensitivity and they probably have the best reception of a book as it is not dominated by any of the aspects and, thus, distorted.

There are also people who are not particularly sensitive to problems described if they do not concern them directly, therefore they will tend to disregard or deprecate the value of such works. This creates a kind of cognitive hermetism that limits their knowledge of reality. There are, lastly, people who, being even well-educated, suffer from cognitive deprivation and are not particularly sensitive to anything in the surrounding reality apart from daily chores and no literary works of a more metaphysical nature will appeal to them.

General life experience

The amount of general life experience may greatly pertain to the understanding and reception of a literary work. The more experienced we are, the better we can understand it. It may often happen that a young person, a smart university student, can produce a very sophisticated and interesting appraisal of a given literary work, based on a number of critical analyses, but this is only his external, theoretical knowledge, vicarious experience, not internalised by his mind and personality. Without critical analyses he would be

³ The same applies to 20th c. art, which has become extremely hermetic through its individualism. That may be qualified as good and bad point at the same time.

⁴ Division mine.

unable to comprehend and evaluate it to such an extent. Therefore, his reception of a given literary work will somehow be superficial in the sense that it will be purely mental, not resulting from his own knowledge of reality or experience. Real reception in the sense that we can try to filter it through our life experience and then evaluate it, may take place much later, in subsequent stages of life, when our experience has grown, usually due to our personal experiences. There appears also another important point to make: if some people never experience certain situations or hardships in their life that might contribute to widening their experience, they may never be able to understand the meaning and value of a given literary work. They will, of course, be able to do it mentally, but never imbibe it psychologically or axiologically.⁵ Their understanding will, in this respect, remain more or less superficial, vicarious since it is probably not possible to fully transfer human experiences and human feelings. To give the simplest example, a normal person will never be able to comprehend the panic fear of a person suffering from claustrophobia who got trapped in a lift, or wild fear of someone, who, suffering from the fear of heights, is descending a ladder. A collection of stories analysing such claustrophobic fears might as well seem not much arresting for a reader who never suffered from this.

Historical factors

Our cognition largely depends also on a particular historical situation we are in. Historical events, e.g., genocide, wars, ethnic conflicts, etc., cause that the experiences of a given nation or generation that went through them may not be quite transferable to other nations or generations that did not experience them, even if they try hard to understand them. For example, during the partitions, Polish literature was dominated by patriotism, which was even considered its drawback, especially when it took on the form of naive or oversimplified ideas. J. Conrad who then emigrated to Britain and produced books about more universal issues of human life was not considered a patriot in certain literary circles in Poland and even called a traitor by E. Orzeszkowa who claimed that it was a patriotic duty for a Polish writer to write only about Polish, national issues and not about anything else (Najder 1974:257–70). His literary output, despite its being valuable, must have been strange to Orzeszkowa being not in line with existing needs. This shows how historical situation can flaw one's understanding of reality; namely, it may limit the cognitive range of a writer or a reader, narrowing the list of possible themes. Secondly, the experience of a historical situation does not seem much transferable, then, to the minds of outside readers

⁵ The same refers to our general perception of reality, not only to understanding fiction.

if it does not contain a decent amount of universal themes that might arrest their attention and be cognitively challenging.

Differences in civilisational development

Due to various levels of civilisational development (various world regions develop at different pace), certain problems described by authors of less developed countries that are now going through the phase that others had already left far behind, may seem obvious to the readers of more developed countries and thus not much interesting. This is a kind of epistemological *déjà vu* state that hinders our efforts to try to analyse the same or similar information, despite the fact that it may be in a slightly new context, or just to arrive at the conclusion that it is in the same context.

Expectation to find univocal answers to problems – the “guru” approach

This approach is characteristic particularly of young people who tend to expect from an author univocal answers to existential questions. They tend to try to find, so to speak, Archimedean principles for the existence of reality, for the sense of human life, to find absolute truths. They may hope, especially if a given author is considered a “great” one, that he is a wise man, a “guru” who has better understanding of existential issues and who will give them ready and definite answers to vexing questions and if it does not happen, they may feel disappointed.

Literature has educational character but cannot give such truths if they do not exist, otherwise it would fall into cheap didacticism (if it concerned ethics or morality), or ideological indoctrination or propaganda, thus losing its epistemological value and depth of insight – its educational function would then largely prevail over aesthetic and cognitive one. Without the awareness that it is not always possible to find a univocal solution, to present unquestionable, indubitable truth, certain works may seem unclear, misleading or of little value to such readers. If we take, e.g., Conrad’s (1993) *Lord Jim* with its *point of view* technique of narration, or Dostoyevsky’s novels with their *polyphonic novel* (Bakhtin 1985) form of narration, they end with no clear, univocal judgements passed or truths given, and someone may feel lost as to their final message, the final message being that there is no final univocal truth. This may be particularly problematic if the book deals with ethical issues, not so much aesthetic or epistemological ones, and requires a great deal of intellectual maturity on the part of the reader not to get lost or confused, or not to misinterpret it (It would be

a misinterpretation to accuse Conrad or Dostoyevsky of moral relativism due to their techniques of narration. They rather show complexities of arriving at some univocal solutions or truths.).

Such a need for certain clear solutions is, in fact, a propensity of human mind, irrelevant of age that seeks clarity and order, therefore, it is a kind of a natural reaction. What satisfaction can a doctor have of the fact that he has a number of various or contrary diagnoses and none of them can be effectively used to cure a patient who dies in the meantime?

However, even if literature does not present univocal solutions in the cognitive or axiological sphere, still it plays a greatly positive role by turning people's attention to the depth and complexity of certain phenomena, and thus makes them more sensitive, tolerant and understanding. Literature, even if it does not give straight and coherent answers, has never deprecated values, or advocated their relativism or evil, save, perhaps, for the French symbolists, e.g., Baudelaire's (1989) *Flowers of Evil* or Huysmans's (1998) *Against the Grain* that are very controversial in this respect.

Inability to differentiate between epistemological, ethical and aesthetic values and cognitive, educational and aesthetic function of literature

The inability to do it may lead to certain distortions and oversimplifications, or primitive interpretations of certain literary works. In the *l'art pour l'art* period in French literature, or English *aesthetic movement* period, aesthetic function of literature and art much prevailed over educational and cognitive one. However, we cannot accuse literature of that period of amorality because of this prevalence (apart from a few controversial cases, the two of which are mentioned above). Likewise, going even more back in time, we cannot accuse Blake of immorality for his poem 'The Tyger' (Blake 1986) in which we have aesthetic fascination with evil (its beauty, power, fear that it raises, etc., the tiger being here its symbol). Sometimes, this ability to distinguish between these values is not only a question of a mere mental attitude, but requires quite extensive background knowledge about the history of ideas and historical development of literary currents.

General life situation of the reader

Our life situation may have a marked influence, negative or positive on the process of cognition. A reader who, at the moment, is experiencing severe hardships or life disasters, or his life may just be a string of misfortunes may, psychologically or mentally, not be prone to enjoy books that deal with certain

issues too distant from his experiences at that moment, therefore too abstract for him. E.g., people suffering from the Black Death in the 14th c. or Jews in a Nazi ghetto would not probably have enjoyed reading comedies, even if they were literary masterpieces. Neither would writers have probably produced them at that time.

Hermetism of literature

This particularly refers to modern literature (as well as art) which has become much hermetic in several ways:

– *through a range and number of references* made by the author to personal experiences or knowledge. E.g., if we take ‘Sailing to Byzantium’ by Yeats (1986), it may be difficult for readers to fully appreciate the aesthetic and cognitive value of the poem without their having been to Byzantium and having seen its splendour. Or, if we take *The Waste Land* by Eliot (1986), there are a lot biblical or mythological references that make it less comprehensible without detailed and frequent footnotes. Despite simple contents and imaging, the number of references makes it highly intellectual and more difficult to understand by the reader.

– *hermetic in its subject matter*. If we take Joyce’s *Finnegan’s Wake* (1989) or *Ulysses* (1990), they deal with very narrow, personal subjects that may, to some people, seem strange or peripheral. This may be opposed to, e.g., Shakespeare’s works that are more universal, i.e.; they concentrate upon more general issues of human existence. Also, if we take metaliterature (e.g. autotelic novel), its subject matter may make it too hermetic to understand without detailed professional knowledge of literary history and theory.

– *hermetic in its formal aspect*. If we take late 19th c. and, especially, 20th c. literature, the number of literary currents and doctrines (e.g. those of *modernism* and *post-modernism*) is so high that it makes it accessible only for a small circle of connoisseurs, with good background knowledge, but usually not for an average reader.

Excessive symbolism

We can distinguish three kinds of symbolism:

– *formal symbolism*: e.g., in English metaphysical poetry where authors used, according to the convention of *ars poetica* of that time, sophisticated literary devices for proper rhetoric. Without knowing the symbols, it is difficult to trace the contents of a poem.

– *symbolism of individual reference*: excessive use of symbolism may also be found in single books, not representing or belonging to any trend or literary

school or group. In *The Scarlet Letter* (1986) Hawthorne frequently uses Puritan symbols of good and evil (e.g., forest symbolises evil forces, a stream of sunshine – God’s grace, etc.), without the knowledge of which the reader misses the meaning of whole fragments. Many symbols differ across cultures, traditions and religions; therefore some may be misinterpreted. Also, if a book is overloaded with symbols, it may be tiring to read (it becomes then a sort of crossword puzzle) and difficult to understand.

– 19th c. *symbolism as a cultural trend*: in literature and art it appealed in most cases only to a certain group of people – those with particular sensitiveness to the supernatural, to the mysterious, to fantasy, free play of imagination, neurotism, etc. The above elements constituted its epistemology, its cognitive aspect. Such a kind of sensitiveness was not required to read Sophocles, Shakespeare or Gogol, therefore the range of readers who enjoyed it was not wide. For people devoid of such a neurotic personality, such literature is, to a great extent, strange and incomprehensible, even if it offers an interesting introspection into our self.

Psychological barrier caused by distance and time

If we read *Antigone* by Sophocles (1998), her moral dilemmas may not seem so appealing to us as the plot is set in bygone times and this may create a certain psychological and cognitive distance, despite the fact that many observations and truths are still valid. How many people would now care for the nobleness of her ethical attitude? Human suffering or human tragedies appeal more if they take place here and now. They become less appealing and less important if they belong to the past. This cognitive indifference to the events of the past would not affect all readers, but those with little epistemological or axiological sensitiveness, or those who are, first and foremost, interested in the times they live in.

Expectation of “great truths” vs. “mediocrity of life” themes

Triviality of the subject matter in, e.g., Faulkner’s *Light in August* (1999) or *The Brothers Karamazov* by Dostoyevsky (1997) may confuse the reader since they present truths about trivial fortuitousness of human existence, not lofty truths like those of Shakespeare. Still, they are great books for their depth of analysis of human natures and personalities. For those who expect of literature to discover great metaphysical truths rather than describe mediocre, commonplace reality with its truths may seem a bit misleading or disappointing because they

assumed a different cognitive attitude to it. The need for loftiness may blur cognition even to such an extent that they will deprecate the value of such books.

What is even more interesting, if we take *realism* or *naturalism* in literature, the works of Dickens, Thackeray, Balzac, Flaubert, Tolstoy, Sienkiewicz or Zola, depicting human life whose complexities are usually caused by external factors such as economic or social changes, not psychological ones, will be more popular and easier to read. If we take Dostoyevsky or even Stendhal, we have psychological realism depicted, i.e. not description of how much external factors shape it but how it is shaped due to psychological ones (protagonist's personality, character, way of thinking, etc.). This seems to cause a great difference to the reader, as *The Brothers Karamazov* would be more difficult to read than Dickens's *Great Expectations* (1994) or Zola's *Germinal* (1954).

Besides, it is quite difficult to make a fixed, general list of important and mediocre or trivial themes as far as our reality is concerned. It very often depends on circumstances. E.g., when we are in a hurry for an important meeting, the sight of a beggar in the street, whom we quickly pass in our car may be a trivial occurrence. On the other hand, the same beggar may make a great impression upon us and we may feel great compassion for his misery when we stroll along the street on a Sunday afternoon and have time for a metaphysical or psychological reflection.

Cognitive relativism

People living in the same village and leading the same life as old Santiago from Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea* (1999), or peasants from *The Peasants* by Reymont (1999) would probably find nothing great or extraordinary in these two literary works (disregarding, of course, their intellectual potential) since all of them personally experienced life presented there, so the reality presented in the novel would be nothing new to them. Similarly, prisoners of the Nazi concentration camps might find it difficult to appraise the value of post-war literature that described life in those camps, since most experiences described would be too familiar to them or too traumatic. If a writer was awarded Nobel Prize for describing their suffering, they might ask a question: 'Why? We have all also suffered and nobody gave us prizes for that and here a guy gets a prize for depicting our horror?' Fictional reality (the world presented) would merge with actual reality and there would probably be no possibility of separating them. We need a certain cognitive distance to be able to formulate certain balanced opinions, otherwise we may either underrate or overrate something, or not be able to rate it at all.

In conclusion, several important remarks need to be made. Firstly, the above list of factors is not a complete one. I have presented only the most

important ones such that may exert great influence upon the process of cognition. Less important ones can be ignored, as they will not distort it so much. Secondly, we cannot presuppose that all above limitations simultaneously come into play. It depends on the type of a reader, of course. We can talk about several groups of readers. The least affected will be professionals whose job is connected with literature (university lecturers, literary critics, etc.). Their knowledge is so high that they are aware of most of them. Less aware will be university students doing a course in literature, therefore this article is directed mainly at them. As far as an average reader is concerned, the more educated, self-conscious, sensitive and experienced he is, the better understanding he will have. But the percentage of such readers is probably not very high – these usually are connoisseurs, or educated, sensitive people who, for their own cognitive need, have great interest in literature. The remainder will be more limited by the above factors, however, an average reader is usually interested in certain genres only, usually those easier to read like detective stories or novels of manners, etc., therefore, the above limitations may, in this case, be not so important.

References

- Aristotle.** [ab.330 BC] 1997. *Poetics*. Penguin USA.
- Bakhtin, M.** 1985. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Baudelaire, Ch.** [1857] 1989. *Flowers of Evil*. New Directions.
- Blake, W.** [1794] 1986. 'The Tyger' [in:] *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. M.H. Abrams (Gen. Ed.). Fifth Ed. Vol. 2. London: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Calderón de la Barca, P.** [1635] 2000. *Life Is a Dream*. University of Illinois Press.
- Chaucer, G.** [1387] 1986. *The Canterbury Tales* [in:] *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. M.H. Abrams (Gen. Ed.). Fifth Ed. Vol. 1. London. W.W. Norton & Co.
- Conrad, J.** [1900] 1993. *Lord Jim*. Denmark: Wordsworth Editions Limited.
- Dickens, Ch.** [1861] 1994. *Great Expectations*. Penguin Books.
- Dostoyevsky, F.** [1880] 1997. *The Brothers Karamazov*. Berkshire: Penguin Books.
- Dostoyevsky, F.** [1886] 1997. *Crime and Punishment*. Berkshire: Penguin Books.
- Eliot, T.S.** [1922] 1986. *The Waste Land* [in:] *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. M.H. Abrams (Gen. Ed.). Fifth Ed. Vol.2. London: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Encarta® 98 Encyclopaedia*. CD ROM edition.
- Faulkner, W.** [1932] 1999. *Light in August*. Vintage Books.
- Hawthorne, N.** [1850] 1983. *The Scarlet Letter*. Ohio: Penguin Books.
- Hemingway, E.** [1952] 1999. *The Old Man and the Sea*. Scribner Paperback Fiction.
- Huysmans, J.K.** [1884] 1998. *Against Nature*. Oxford University Press.
- James, H.** [1881] 1986. *Portrait of a Lady*. Penguin Books.
- Joyce, J.** [1922] 1990. *Ulysses*. Vintage Books.
- Joyce, J.** [1939] 1989. *Finnegan's Wake*. Penguin USA.
- Najder, Z.** (ed.). 1974. *Conrad w oczach krytyki światowej*. PIW.
- Reymont, W.** [1925] 1999. *The Peasants*. Shanghai Translation Publishing House.

- Shakespeare, W.** [1595?] 1991. *Romeo and Juliet* [in:] *Shakespeare Complete Works*. W.J. Craig (ed). Oxford University Press.
- Shakespeare, W.** [1606] 1991. *Macbeth* [in:] *Shakespeare Complete Works*. W.J. Craig (ed). Oxford University Press.
- Sophocles** [after 441 BC] 1998. *Antigone*. Oxford University Press.
- Yeats, W.B.** [1927] 1986. 'Sailing to Byzantium' [in:] *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. M.H. Abrams (Gen. Ed.). Fifth Ed. Vol. 2. London: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Zola, E.** [1885] 1954. *Germinal*. Viking Press.