

IRENA SOCHA
Katowice

BOOK STUDIES IN POLAND BETWEEN 1945 AND 2015: THE SOURCES OF THEORETICAL INSPIRATION*

The book or the document (graphic representation)? ‘The life of the book.’ Karol Głombowski’s functional theory. Janusz Dunin as a researcher of editorial forms of the book. Radosław Cybulski’s take on book consumption. The book in the media space. The ‘book culture’ paradigm. The theory of book art.

KEYWORDS: bibliology, theory of bibliology, methodology of bibliology, disciplines related to bibliology, Polish bibliological school

In picturing a retrospective panorama of the theoretical legacy of post-war Polish book studies to mark the 60th anniversary of bibliological research and scholarship at the University of Wrocław, one must first of all decide on the order in which to compose it. The chronological sequence will not convey the complementarity and vivid kinship of intellectually related, yet temporally distant, works. The theme-based sequence will relegate distinguished personalities formative of the discipline’s conceptual and theoretical potential, not infrequently in many of its fields, to the background. Given this, my intention in this paper is to combine two orders (the problem-based one centred around paradigms determining major thought tendencies and the author-based one where a personal name is a ‘trademark’ of a given paradigm or a specific set of problems) as mutually complementary and, at the same time, inscribe them into a diachronic dynamic. However, to consider the evolution of bibliological thought, one must rely not only on its

* Editor’s note: This paper is a translation of a slightly modified and revised version of the article ‘Nauka o książce w Polsce w latach 1945–2015. Teoretyczne źródła inspiracji’ originally published in volume 60 of *Roczniki Biblioteczne*.

fundamental theoretical writings but also on research projects in which those have been implemented, creatively continued or methodologically verified, in this way making a relevant ‘theory-generating’ contribution. Therefore, I begin (section 1) by discussing the object of the discipline (the book, the document), deliberation on which has almost constantly been a part of theoretical thought, sometimes stirring up new arguments, and consequently determined the major elements of the research field and scope. Subsequently (sections 2–6), I present research trends in the study of the book and the bibliological process that added up to the mainstream tradition — the foundation of the theory of book studies. Finally, I consider those that have considerably expanded the research field in recent years (parts 7–9).¹

The overall work of post-war bibliology has been surveyed in collected volumes and monograph papers devoted to its leading scholars, particularly to Kazimierz Piekarski, Aleksander Birkenmajer, Jan Muszkowski, Stefan Vrtel-Wierczyński, Adam Łysakowski, Karol Głombiowski, Radosław Cybulski, Janusz Dunin and Krzysztof Migoń. Immense credit for developing the theoretical identity of the discipline *vis-à-vis* other human and social sciences and for chronicling its trajectory is certainly due to Migoń, a prolific author of studies on these issues. Since the 1970s, Migoń has co-founded, interpreted and systematised bibliological thought in Poland in a broad interdisciplinary context of writings, both Polish and international (Russian, German, French, American, British, Czech and Hungarian). His *Nauka o książce. Zarys problematyki* [*Science of the Book: A Thematic Outline*] (Wrocław 1984) was a foundational text showcasing a mature theory of the discipline in Poland, which was then honed in his following publications.² Migoń discussed the central theoretical trends and research models, systematised the methodological and terminological *apparatus* in relation to the communicational, ethnic, media-studies and anthropological aspects foregrounded at the time and, in doing so, identified new research needs. By producing studies dedicated to Głombiowski, Łysakowski, Muszkowski and other luminaries, he portrayed the history and theory of Polish bibliology. Other scholars, including Barbara Bieńkowska, Maria Juda and Paulina Buchwald-Pelcowa, who have depicted the development of bibliology in general studies, survey papers, articles on selected aspects and critical reviews of textbooks, have illumined the theory of the discipline from multiple angles.

With its roots as a self-standing discipline dating back to the 18th century (Żbikowska-Migoń, 1989; Koredczuk, 2005), bibliology crafted its basic theoretical

¹ I am aware that there are also other important issues related to the theory of bibliology and that any selection, particularly within such an extensive timeframe, inevitably omits or marginalises other viewpoints. Given this, my selectively cited examples do not represent the totality of the research. Multiple research trends and issues are listed and described by Migoń (2007, pp. 13–24).

² Some of them are cited further in this paper.

framework in the 19th century and took a fully recognisable shape in the inter-war period to prove a dynamically developing science that continued to redefine its research object and to redraw its boundaries over the following decades in response to the intellectual challenges posed by other human and social sciences, with which it shared akin problems and overlapped in vaguely demarcated border zones. What remained unchanged amid these new inspirations and multidirectional explorations was, equally importantly, that which Bieńkowska (1999, p. 45) considers the texture proper of bibliology as such: its discursive theory and its research toolkit comprising methods for identifying prints and manuscripts, for classifying documents, for studying book collections, and the like, which have been repeatedly tested in research tradition and precisely elucidated in the literature and methodology.³ At the same time, affinities of concepts and notions developed in bibliology and other human and social disciplines stand as testimony not only to their mutual intellectual and methodological influences, but also to the ongoing bolstering of multidisciplinary scrutiny as the norm of and the prerequisite for the scholarly truth (Migoń, 2007).

1. ‘The book or the document (graphic representation)?’ is a question concerning the main object of scrutiny and, thus, the object and scope of bibliology (Migoń, 1983; Potkowski, 2001). This question is embedded in an opulent tradition of historical and historic-cultural research of the theory of writing, which shows civilisation, technological and also mental developments involved in literacy processes and the transition from oral culture to written culture and, on, to media communication.⁴ The advent of digital text forms, users’ simultaneous reliance on multiple recording manners and communication ‘channels’⁵ and the development of information theories combined to give a new relevance to the question of whether this object is the (handwritten and printed) book in the multiple historic-cultural varieties of its editorial existence or rather the written document (graphic record) as an instance of socially embedded communication that registers all signs of culture, with

³ She relied on the theory of book studies proposed by Birkenmajer, who regarded bibliology as a specialised knowledge of the material form of the book studied in the dynamics of social — bookselling, library and reading — circuits, passing over the content of the book and its impact on readers; see also Bieńkowska (1978, 2011, p. 15).

⁴ A lot of the foreign literature that addresses these issues (e.g. Jack Goody, Elisabeth Eisenstein, Walter Ong, Eric Havelock, Robert Escarpit, Marshall McLuhan, Umberto Eco, Marc Lipovetsky and Jean Serroy) has been translated into Polish, for example as part of the *Communicare. Historia i kultura* [*Communicare: History and Culture*] series edited by Andrzej Mencwel. In Poland, this kind of research has been conducted by historians (Wacław Urban, Janusz Tazbir, Ewa Wipszycka and Andrzej Wyczański) and linguists (Aldona Skudrzyk).

⁵ The sociologists of culture refer to this phenomenon as *meta-reading*. See Chymkowski (2002, pp. 120–121).

the latter option primarily propounded by the Belgian-French school (Paul Otlet, Robert Estivals) in the early 20th century, though inspirations of documentological concepts can be traced further back to Gabriel Peignot (Migoń, 2004, 2007).⁶

In Polish bibliography, explorations inspired by the book and written communication have predominantly appeared in the study of reading practices (at the intersection with sociology and linguistics) (Hojka, 2010) and in specialist palaeographic research on the development of editorial lettering systems as carried out by, for example, Edward Potkowski, Jan Sławiński and Juda. In the interwar period, research on the script was combined with practical aspects of learning to read as conditioned, among other factors, by the graphic design of the book: its lettering and other features of its editorial outfitting (e.g. studies by Hanna Dobrowolska). Specific to book studies, the issues of document science as a subdiscipline that fashions typologies of and classifies documents (books, brochures, periodicals, documents of social life and e-books) and arranges their resources, with its utility aligning it with both librarianship and information science, were accommodated in Muszkowski's theory (Ladorucki, 2014). Dunin (1998), who highlighted the diversity of the cultural forms and functions of the book — its heterogeneous and amorphous nature that encompasses anything from cheap handbills to bibliophilic cimelia — challenged the definitions that bound the identity of the book to its structural features alone.⁷ Dariusz Grygowski (*Dokumenty nieksiążkowe w bibliotece [Non-Book Documents at the Library]*, Warszawa 2001) worked at the intersection of librarianship, informology and bibliography, scrutinising an extensive context of civilisation-cultural aspects of contemporary *net-culture* in order to analyse the classification, typology and preservation of non-book library documents. His work provided opulent material for discussions on the development prospects of contemporary information resources and systems, on the transformations of the book itself and, consequently, on reception practices.

In answering the pivotal question whether the object of bibliological research should be defined as a document of written communication (analogue or electronic) or as a book (that is, a document possessed of defined editorial properties making its social use possible), the latter option prevailed at a certain point, as the book, primarily conceived of in terms of its historically most abiding form of a codex, was put at the centre of research, along with its distinctive processes

⁶ Migoń (2011b) explains that despite different terms ('writing civilisation,' 'civilisation of the book') used in works by contemporary Francophone researchers (such as Estivals, Jean Meyriat and Brigitte Richter), they are conceptually identical with 'book culture.'

⁷ Dunin's position in this respect was opposite to Głombiowski's, which probably also resulted from the cultural difference in the forms of documents in the epochs that they researched.

of production, morphology, aesthetics, dissemination and consumption.⁸ Before that, however, there were attempts to assign this central place to script materialised in the form of a document as a tool of social communication, which opened the door to document science and, today, to efforts at pinpointing the sites that bibliology shares with informology (Migoń, 1983, 2009a; Góralaska 2011). Expanded definitions of the book, which make room for all its formal and material iterations, were promoted by librarian and bibliographer Vrtel-Wierczyński (1951; see also Migoń, 1984b), who identified three categories of ‘bibliological objects,’ with a successively decreasing proportion of written text in them; they were the book in the narrow sense, the book in the broad sense (music note sheets, graphics, printed ephemera, posters, programmes, etc.) and materials recording various aspects of life (certificates, post stamps, playing cards, films, photographs, music albums, etc.). Later, Cybulski drew on Vrtel-Wierczyński to locate the definition and the conceptual scope of ‘the book’ in three fields: the book in the narrow sense (in the codex form), the book in the broad sense (all documents that fulfilled the function of the book, whatever their form), and other documents in social communication, using a variety of media (e.g. iconography and films) (Cybulski, 1984). The broad concept of ‘the book’ was championed by Łysakowski (Migoń, 2003a). The semiotic standpoint underpinned an ‘expanded’ definition of the communication in an overview of bibliological and literary-studies research offered by Janusz Kostecki.⁹ Migoń (1993, pp. 111–112) argues that ‘[m]odern bibliology is a science of the structure and properties of communication mediated by graphic characters,’ regardless of the medium involved, both in the past and today. Such views on the object of research spotlight the process of written communication as such (its form, course, barriers, effectiveness and consequences), albeit in strict conjunction with the form of the document as a medium that affects the communicative potential of the message.

While not enclosed in any firmly established theoretical conception in Poland yet, research on the written document has encompassed an array of aspects, ranging from specialist palaeographic studies, to works on the typology and classification of written documents, examinations of the perception of typefaces in reading

⁸ This view was upheld by Muszkowski and Głombiowski. Muszkowski seems to have perceived documentological inspirations (see his *Dokumentacja i dokumentologia [Documentation and Document Science]*, 1947) and a possible book-vs.-written document opposition, which prompted him to define the book as open to other forms of text preservation and denoting ‘a self-contained product of the graphic materialisation of cultural content undertaken with a view to preserving, transmitting and disseminating this content among people’ (Muszkowski, 1948, p. 151) and ‘any form of noting down some content, regardless of what process of graphic materialisation has been applied’ (Muszkowski, 1951, p. 79).

⁹ ‘There is no doubt that in order to fully depict people’s cultural participation [...] one must treat all texts of culture on equal footing, whatever semiotic material they employ and whatever communication technique is used to transmit them’ (Kostecki, 1977, p. 5).

and explorations of literacy processes and language competence for the verbalisation of reading experience, to bibliological monograph publications analysing the script as an expression of the book's material form and aesthetics. This diversity has reaffirmed the 'openness' and 'capaciousness' of the discipline as its signature features. The fact that various social settings and cultural audiences simultaneously rely on varying forms of 'book'-based and 'para-book'-based communication (exemplified by occasional prints and practices of handwriting, rhetorical activity [e.g. so-called talking magazines], later periodical publishing and today Internet involvement) continues to inspire new theoretical and research questions. Both the cultural and 'documentological' approaches to written communication must handle the challenge of bringing together the theoretical toolkits of the book- and script-centric frameworks. This is relevant not only with respect to today's multimedia cultural communication but also regarding historical research. In the history of Polish culture, handwritten communication (correspondence, reading diaries, memoirs, etc.) and rhetorical communication (comments on reading, elaborating on its content, discussions, *tableaux vivants*) thrived as complementary to 'printed' communication for much longer than suggested by scrutiny from the angle of technology.¹⁰ The wealth and interdependence of these forms have been discerned by Małgorzata Komza, who studies developments at the borderline of book aesthetics (script) and image aesthetics through the lens of communication. The coexistence of various forms of book-based, handwritten, iconographic and rhetorical communication has been chronicled by Jolanta Gwioździk on the basis of rich resources of book culture in monastic communities.

2. 'The life of the book.' Bibliological theories revolving around the 'life of the book' paradigm, where the book is defined as a process comprising production, dissemination and consumption, have perhaps been most common and longest-abiding in Poland since the 1930s. The 'life of the book' concept was forged in Piekarski's theoretical thought. As sociology developed and made a career as an inspirational science for multiple disciplines of the humanities, sociologically-modulated ideas made their way into book studies in the 1930s (works by Stanisław Orsini-Rosenberg, Paweł Rybicki and Jan S. Bystron) and were used by Muszkowski to design a coherent bibliological theory, which served as the continually modified methodological foundation of book-studies research for longer than half a century. Scrutinised in retrospect, Muszkowski's theory (1951a, 1951b; Głombowski, 1972) — which was anchored in Spencerian positivist evolutionism and, accordingly, relied on the notion of the development of the constantly improving book 'species' (with the stages of study labelled as 'embryology,' 'physiology'

¹⁰ The importance of considering both the rhetorical and the written dimensions of cultural communication is borne out, for example, in Albert Gorzkowski's study (2003).

and ‘morphology’) and its users, foregrounded its social embedment and functions, applied a systems lens and sought to fuse axiological and pragmatic aspects — can easily be seen as rooted in the 19th century but also surprises by offering intuitions far ahead of later tendencies in the humanities, such as the ‘documentological’ and ‘anthropologically’ inflected approaches. Muszkowski, and then Głombowski, constructed a humanistic vision of bibliology, in which value was put on collectives arising in the book system and various kinds of relations established in them (the roles of the reader, the buyer, the bibliophile, the student engaged in self-education and looking for information, the critic offering assessment, the librarian influencing users’ attitudes and decisions, etc.).¹¹ His argument may have been phrased in popular language, but Muszkowski made sure that his *Życie książki* [*The Life of the Book*] represented scholarly consistency and clearly demarcated bibliology as a science.¹² In this model, the methods and tools of bibliology work until the book finds its way into the reader’s hands. Further processes are investigated by psychology (‘readers’ mental sphere’), history (‘their actions’) and the sociology of literature (the audience, types of readers) (Muszkowski, 1951b, pp. 398–399). In the second, post-war edition of *Życie książki*, Muszkowski followed ‘the spirit of the time’ and expanded the disciplinary field by including library pedagogy and the ways that reading impacted worldviews in it.

The paradigm of ‘the life-of-the-book’ as ‘an ensemble of social facts related to the creation, production and use of the book’ (Muszkowski, 1972, p. 93) promoted monograph research on institutions ‘servicing’ these life stages, which tended to be conducted even by scholars who did not refer directly to Muszkowski’s theory. Each of these research areas modified the basic method of historical criticism of sources and their sets to develop its own specialised methods for the study of printing, publishing, the publishing repertoire, book collections, etc. This specialisation resulted in a certain ‘fragmentation’ of the bibliological process.

In hindsight, researchers point out the durable values of Muszkowski’s popularly framed theory, including terminological definitions and specifications, which made the terms ‘bibliology’ and ‘book studies’ recognisable and commonly used; its essential contribution to the structural development of the discipline — bibliology — as a theory of book science and of book studies, bibliography and library science as its inner subdisciplines; the appreciation of practical and applied aspects; the development of a theory that laid the foundation for bibliological educa-

¹¹ ‘[P]rocesses of book creation, production, dissemination and use are sites of social phenomena and social facts, and [...] in the course of these developments, distinct social groups are formed which are bound by their members’ attitude to the book, whether they fully or only partly realise this’ (Muszkowski, 1972, p. 97).

¹² Muszkowski regarded the sociology of the book as ‘a division of sociology’ and considered it an auxiliary science of bibliology.

tion programmes; ideas of the ‘openness’ and interdisciplinarity of book science; and information-science inspirations.

The notion that ‘Muszkowski’s outstanding work helped bibliology obtain the status of an autonomous scholarly discipline and the rank of a university degree programme’ (Ladorucki, 2014, p. 43) is certainly right. Głombiowski’s later functional theory clearly built on Muszkowski as it offered a systems account of the book as a cultural and social phenomenon and, at the same time, as an artefact possessed of a generically predetermined written and editorial form, with a priori assigned and a posteriori performed functions, processually approached across its circuit and its institutional ‘encasing’ in the cultural and social context. Muszkowski’s framework to a degree supported the ‘morphological’ order. By making the notion of ‘function’ primary and unifying, Głombiowski proposed a reversed view and insisted that book research was integral with research on the reading public. Contemporary research paradigms have largely invalidated the ‘life-of-the-book’ concept, though its elements are permanently inscribed in the functional theory, which has proven ergonomic as a tool for systematising and depicting the research material. Consequently, monograph studies of selected stages and institutions of the book circuit are still numerous, even though they tend to be embedded in an ‘expanded’ semiotic-cultural or anthropological context.

3. Karol Głombiowski’s functional theory. Studies of the institutions and aspects of the bibliological process promoted the emergence of separate subdisciplines and, then, autonomous disciplines of library science and information science, which again required theoretical self-definition. Similarly, the notion of ‘the function of the book,’ a pivotal element of Muszkowski’s thought, needed to be defined. Initially, ‘the function of the book’ was associated with the content of the book and its ‘influence’ on readers. Researchers realised that bibliology did not have sufficient conceptual or methodological tools for this, but the practical needs of librarianship and library pedagogy encouraged expanding the discipline to cover these aspects. Liminal issues (sociological, psychological, literary) had already been incorporated into the scope and conceptual structure of bibliology in various ways by Piekarski and, later, Łysakowski and Vrtel-Wierczyński.¹³

Attempts to develop a theory enclosed in the uniform ‘conceptual model of book science’ and founded on the tripartite but integral bibliological process were undertaken by Głombiowski in the 1960s and later.¹⁴ He regarded the book, or ‘text materialised in the physical structure of the book’ (Głombiowski, 1981),

¹³ In his theory of bibliology, Vrtel-Wierczyński (1951, pp. 206–207, 210–211) located book consumption in three sectors: reading practices, book sociology and bibliological psychology.

¹⁴ His key studies were two books: *Teoria i metodologia nauki o książce* [Books Science: Theory and Methodology], Gdańsk 1985, and *Książka w procesie komunikacji społecznej* [The Book in the Social Communication Process], Wrocław 1980. See also Migoń (2001, 1988), Koredczuk (2015).

where the content and the editorial form made up a whole, as a species of cultural and social communication, which was not reducible to the function of a vehicle for content. Głombiowski's notion of the function was complex, encompassing the function of the book's editorial form *vis-à-vis* the text, the functions of the book system and its institutions in the communication process and the social functions of writing in ensuring 'the sustainment, integration and historical continuity of society' (Głombiowski, 1970, p. 24). The core of the book structure was (thematic and semiotic) communicativeness, that is, 'accessibility to the reader's perceptual capacities, achieved through the means of communication specific to book expression.'¹⁵ Głombiowski clearly set his functional theory apart from the concepts that defined the book as one of the texts of culture and, as such, stripped it of its bibliological *differentia specifica* and autonomous identity.¹⁶

Głombiowski's theory provided a methodological foundation for multiple studies in Poland and abroad:

[T]hey take old (and to a lesser degree contemporary) book culture as their object; the book is understood as a social communication tool, and bibliological facts are explained through the knowledge of the functional properties of the book in multiple contexts of its existence; the research perspective covers an extensive field of issues from the production of books to their reception (thus the entire 'bibliological process'). (Migoń, 2011a, p. 50)

This theory was also the point of departure for the Wrocław school of bibliological research, particularly in the field of book-studies theory, book historiography and the historical study of libraries and reading practices.

Głombiowski's work was replete with inspirations that slightly later surfaced in literary studies and became widespread in bibliography; for example, his belief in the relevance of editorial paratextual elements to the cultural reception of texts fuelled the development of studies of front and back matter, and his insistence that '[e]very morphological component of the book is basically loaded with meaning' (Głombiowski, 1983b, p. 8) sparked reflection on the semiotics and functionality of the book, later carried on by Cybulski and Teodor Zbierski. Another crucial contribution was the notion of the (library, institutional, group and individual) repertoire, one of the basic epistemic concepts in bibliography, as a resource of data that document the functioning of the book, help make sense of reading decisions, reveal patterns of reading norms and practices and help establish 'in what measure the publishing production of a given historical period/group uses its repertoire to affect readers' consciousness formation in its fundamental elements' (Głombiowski, 1966, p. 8).

¹⁵ In this way, he 'closed' the disciplinary borders to 'non-book' written transmissions, such as microfilms (Głombiowski, 1981, p. 9).

¹⁶ Głombiowski deliberately avoided the term 'text of culture,' which was at the time winning a recognised place for itself in the humanities. His attitude is implied by his polemics with the opponents, in which he expressed his concerns and explained reasons behind his different standpoint. See Głombiowski (1983a) and Kostecki (1981).

Głombiowski paved the way for explorations of the subjective actions of readers themselves as makers, transformers and recipients of the world of the book, in this way channelling the broadly understood anthropological perspective: ‘he wanted to grasp the human being, his/her actions and his/her inner life, which is expressed in the production, collection, depiction and reading of books’ (Migoń, 1988, p. 11; see also Głombiowski, 1973).¹⁷ Calling for ‘expanding the sociological aspect empirically and theoretically,’ for defining the functional standpoint as ‘relating the role of the book to social life as a whole’ and for inquiring ‘in what social collectives the book operates and to what cultural needs of these collectives it responds’ (Głombiowski, 1970, pp. 8–9), Głombiowski opposed the reduction of bibliological research to the issues of reception and reading. He was aware that he was constructing a discursive model whose ‘ideally’ framed assumptions would be verified in empirical study.¹⁸ Głombiowski’s theory undoubtedly contributed to ‘bibliology’s attainment of independence’ and to the recognition of its distinctiveness from (though not unrelatedness to) other disciplines, in particular literary studies: ‘bibliologists’ view is broader: what matters to them is not the content of the work, but the content of the book, meaning the text proper in connection with all the elements of its materialisation in the book’ (cf. Borysowska, 2007).

The ‘systems’ and ‘functional’ frameworks became commonly adopted methodological tenets in bibliology and were given a comprehensive theoretical interpretation and international contexts in the works of Migoń: ‘Book studies takes as its object the book and bibliological processes: the production, circulation and reception of the book, as well as the consequences of these processes and the people and institutions involved in them. The object defined in this way can be succinctly captured as the book-reader entity’ (Migoń, 1984a, pp. 108–109).¹⁹ While the role of the reader as a subject was recognised, the principal research object was still embodied in the book with ‘the wealth and interconnections of form, content and function,’²⁰ the book conceived dynamically, though not infrequently in a somewhat ‘anthropomorphising’ manner. It took multiple monograph studies fathoming selected phenomena and ‘subsystems’ of the life of the book (e.g. bookselling, the repertoire and reception of the Oriental book or 18th-century novel, the editorial history of alphabet books and textbooks, etc.), interpreted processually or

¹⁷ Later, cultural participation was similarly defined as commenting, transforming and creating by Andrzej Tyszka (1971).

¹⁸ Rooted in the Greek ideal of *kalokaghatos*, the moral and aesthetic aspects of Głombiowski’s vision, though essential, have not always been highlighted. In relation to the function of the book, this has been spotted by Stanisław Antoni Kondek (2007, p. 325).

¹⁹ At the time, Migoń considered the book as a specific cultural phenomenon, rather than a written document, to be the main object of research. He endorsed the latter option later.

²⁰ This was how the object of research was depicted by Bednarska-Ruszajowa in her review of the second edition of Migoń’s book (*Studia o Książce* [17] 1988, p. 388).

functionally, for the compass of bibliology as a humanities and social-scientific discipline to be significantly expanded, which necessitated overviews covering the entire bibliological process within certain historical or territorial boundaries.²¹

‘The durability of fundamental beliefs and research methods shared by the community’ (qtd. in Migoń, 2011, p. 55), which Głombiowski considered the necessary condition of a research school, has been there for sixty years now with regard to the basic tenets of the functional theory, testifying to the longevity of this theory as fundamental to Polish (not only historical) book studies, though still undergoing development.²²

4. Janusz Dunin as a researcher of editorial forms of the book (*Rozwój cech wydawniczych polskiej książki literackiej XIX-XX wieku* [*The Development of Editorial Features of the Polish Literary Book in the 19th and 20th Centuries*] Łódź 1982). Dunin combined the bibliological tradition of historical source research on the book with the functional theory and the ‘communication’ perspective (for more details, see Ladorucki & Rządowska, 2009). The book is dialogic not only because it transmits content and as such is instrumental in social communication, but first and foremost because it is a ‘record’ of a certain cultural and social (also market) conjuncture and, at the same time, a medium of the potential for social dialogue, economic consumption and objective and intellectual utility. Communication occurs through a defined writing-and-editorial form — its specific structural features and functions, which are modified by the reader in particular situations.²³ Dunin pursued the vision of bibliology as a science boasting its specialised toolkit and clearly defined object, yet also receptive to and inspired by theories of cultural and literary studies and by humanistically inclined sociology. He knew that the more aware of its tradition, distinctive research field, and specific toolkit bibliology was, the more ‘open’ and interdisciplinary (while not eclectic) it could be. Dunin was one of the first researchers to study the book as a text in con-

²¹ The functional approach was embraced in literary studies at the time as well. For example, “‘Literary life’ should thus denote an ensemble of the functions of literature, along with the institutions that operate these functions. Research should cover the basic repertoire of the functions of literature and attend to the institutional fulfilment of these functions. [...] The study of the mechanisms of operating particular functions would thus be a basic task of a researcher of literary life’ (Dmitruk, 1980, pp. 15–16).

²² Though central to bibliology, the notion of the function has been very scantily addressed in theoretical studies. The few works that have dealt with this issue importantly include: Kostecki (1979), Włodarczyk (1992), and Socha (2012).

²³ Dunin appreciated the substantive aspects of the ergonomics and functionality of the editorial form of the book. This was expressed in ideas such as ‘WC Book. Książka klozetowa dla rozweselenia i refleksji’ [‘A WC Book: The Lavvy Book For Amusement and Reflection’], an editorial joke that also had a more ‘serious’ role of highlighting the function of the book as the unity of its text, editorial design and ‘use’ in a particular situation.

junction with editorial and communicative paratexts.²⁴ In the 1980s and especially the 1990s, the study of front and back matter and peritextual elements (dedications, poems to the reader, text in illustrations and on the cover, etc.), which were acknowledged as constitutive and essential for the reception and social functions of the text, was robustly developing in literary research. Dunin subscribed to Głombiowski's view that the (particularly historical) science of the book is a science of the human being. As a researcher of the history of reading, Dunin primarily looked for the 'anthropological' aspects of communications that differentiated cultural communities. This may have been the reason why he was keen to study peculiar developments (e.g. broadsides, street literature and children's literature) and the specific behaviour of their public.

5. Radosław Cybulski's take on book consumption. Initially, the theory of the book evolved first and foremost in historical research. It was developed in relation to the contemporary body of printed matter by Cybulski in his studies 'Struktura i właściwości książki' ['The Structure and Properties of the Book'] (*Studia o Książce*, vol. 14, 1984) and *Książka współczesna. Wydawcy — Rynek — Odbiorcy* [*The Contemporary Book: Publishers, the Market, Readers*] (Warszawa 1986), where the already entrenched notions of book morphology were combined with the semiotic perspective. He revisited the concept of 'book consumption,' which had been adopted by Muszkowski, but rarely used later, and found it functional in the examination of the (reading, bookselling, club, etc.) behaviour of book market participants. Drawing on inspirations from Jan Szczepański's sociological thought, Cybulski modified this framework by replacing the consumer behaviour of individuals and groups as the object of research with 'an integrated system of meeting the needs of book users' (Cybulski, 1983, p. 457). The organisation and operations of this system were an important research focus, with attention also devoted to the bonds arising within it and the barriers causing its dysfunctions. In this way, he overcame the susceptibility to 'fragmentation' observable in research on the bibliological process and to an extent fuelled by the concept of 'the life of the book.' One novelty proposed by Cybulski as a theorist was the redefinition of the book as a polysemiotic and communicative structure premised on the performance of the entire book system. His assumption was that encoded in the multi-layered morphological and functional structure of the book, in its inner 'orders' (editorial component parts), is a potential for programming the processes of its social circulation and reception. This represented an integrated view of the communication system of the book — informational and also social, economic, technological

²⁴ Migoń (2009b, p. 18) cites 1979 as the year of the completion of *Rozwój cech wydawniczych polskiej książki literackiej XIX–XX wieku* [*The Development of Editorial Features of the Polish Literary Book in the 19th and 20th Centuries*].

and aesthetic. Like his predecessors, Cybulski espoused the humanistic perspective: the book system as an economic and organisational reality, with consumer behaviour and choices within it, was closely linked to the quality of social ties, users' lifestyles and their axiological foundation, meaning the way of appraising cultural goods (the network of values, motivation theory, theory of cognitive structures). Cybulski did not transpose the theories or conceptual categories of the social and economic sciences or psychology onto book science, but integrated these accounts with bibliology to develop a conceptually coherent bibliological theory of book consumption and, at the same time, a research procedure applicable in practice. In this way, he provided a functional tool for researchers of editorial, library, bookselling and reading developments, both historical and contemporary.

Reflection on the semiotics of the book was continued by Zbierski, for example in his *Semiotyka książki* [*The Semiotics of the Book*] (Wrocław 1978). Related ideas also surfaced in the work of Głombiowski, who regarded the book as a semiotic object, where meanings of the text, script and 'material' expression interacted in the service of the communicability of the message. However, 'semiotic thought' did not trigger a radical 'turn' for bibliologists, while this was the case for literary studies and culture sciences, where entirely new theories, research trends and conceptual apparatuses were spawned. Rather, aware of the stability and functionality of the methodological base and the conceptual toolkit in place, bibliologists used semiotic concepts to consolidate the methodological status quo. For Zbierski, these inspirations informed his definition of the book as a communicative structure appraised by criteria of functionality and ergonomics, however with the definition itself founded on the previously recognised morphological determinants; and for Głombiowski, semiotic thought was an argument reasserting the functional conception.

Proposals that fundamentally altered the theoretical vision of book studies more often than not came from outside the bibliological community. Jan Pomorski suggested locating bibliology within the sciences of social communication, which entailed remodelling its disciplinary structure (Pomorski, 1985, 1988). This redrawing proved inspirational and expanded the research field, but did not transform the previously established identity of the discipline. What discussions around the object of book studies accomplished was furthering the separation of informology as a distinct discipline. The semiotic perspective was also important to the study of electronic forms of the book. Małgorzata Górska draws on Cybulski's insights, the notion of the functional book and above all Umberto Eco's semiotic apparatus (semantic codes) to observe that 'the abandonment of written communication codes for computer technologies' also causes changes in the function (Górska, 2007).

6. The career of the **social communication situation** as a research concept and perspective resulted from the sociological and semiotic reorientation of humanistic thought and, with time, provided a thrust to the development of ‘anthropologising’ frameworks. In bibliology, the notion stemmed from and was anchored in the communication- and sociologically inflected functional theory as part of the triadic bibliological process (Zawisza, 1980), but its popularisation and a degree of autonomy were channelled by the studies of sociologists of literature, such as essayistic texts by Robert Escarpit, which enjoyed popularity in Poland from the mid-1960s on (cf. Ankudowicz, 1972), and by Stefan Żółkiewski’s research school in the Polish humanities. Like in literary studies, where the concept of ‘literary life’ (situated in the structure of the historical-literary process) was supplanted with the concept of ‘communication situation’ by researchers practising the sociology of literature (e.g. Żółkiewski, Krzysztof Dmitruk and Janusz Lalewicz) in the 1970s and 80s, the ‘communication situation’ came to replace the traditional idea of ‘the life of the book’ in bibliology as well. However, Głombiowski, the founder of the functional theory, opposed making the reader, rather than the book, a central research object (Głombiowski, 1981, p. 13).

Theoretical foundations and at the same time a new concept of empirical research on the reading social communication situation as captured on the basis of memoir testimonies in the second half of the 19th century were put forward by Kostecki, who integrated literary-theoretical concepts with the bibliological apparatus. Following Żółkiewski, Kostecki believed that ‘social institutions play a unique steering role in the shaping of reader behaviour’ (Kostecki, 1977). His inquiry thus focused on ‘various cultural compulsions’ involved in the institutional influence, access possibilities to text it produced and the interpretations it inspired. Kostecki regarded the reading communication process as a three-dimensional relationship between ‘the ensemble of institutions implicated in the production, dissemination of and access to texts,’ ‘the objectively available set of texts’ and ‘the reading public.’ He provided the most comprehensive portrayal of these relationships when, relying on an opulent and varied source material, he studied censorship in the second half of the 19th century not only in terms of its organisation and operations as a control institution but also as a *sui generis* communication system affecting the entire book circuit, for example, the availability and reception of repertoires and criteria for the evaluation of texts (*Trudny proces przenikania. Carska cenzura zagraniczna wobec importu publikacji w języku polskim w latach 1865–1904* [A Difficult Process of Infiltration: The Tsarist Foreign Censorship of Imported Publications in Polish between 1865 and 1904], Warszawa 2011). Kostecki gave a new prominence to ‘personality’ factors, axiological aspects and thus the readership’s active role, which was made possible, among others, by reliance on biographical documents (Kostecki, 2008).

A similar theoretical approach and set of sources (memoirs) informed Stanisław Siekierski's overview in *Czytania Polaków w XX wieku [Poles' Readings in the 20th Century]* (Warszawa 2000), which identified major reading communication situations at the end of the 19th and in the first half of the 20th century, complete with their specific ways of reading, the social and cultural status of the book and formal and informal organisation. In Siekierski's view, the communication situation was first and foremost distinctively marked by 'a way of reading,' that is, the reading decisions and behaviour of respective communities pursuing their cultural goals, with the organisation of this situation being a secondary factor.

The broadly conceived 'communication situation' took into account axiological aspects related to the participants' value judgments to a greater degree than 'the life of the book' did, with its focus on the depiction of the formal, organisational and institutional aspects. Consequently, the former invited interest from the younger generations of bibliologists and encouraged a surprising abundance of varied treatments. 'Political bibliography'²⁵ arose as an interesting trend that invigorated the study of the ideological contexts in which the book and reading system operated. Books by Stanisław Adam Kondek (*Władza i wydawcy. Polityczne uwarunkowania produkcji książek w Polsce w latach 1944–1949 [Government and Publishers: Political Factors in Book Production in Poland, 1944–1949]*, Warszawa 1993; *Papierowa rewolucja. Oficjalny obieg książek w Polsce w latach 1948–1955 [The Paper Revolution: The Official Book Circuit in Poland, 1948–1955]*, Warszawa 1999) carefully chronicled the organisational and legal, as well as institutional, meanders in which the book was enmeshed between 1945 and 1956, when social and cultural life was forcefully ideologised. Studies by Andrzej Drózdź (*Książki i rewolucja: ks. Antonio Marini — neapolitański jakobin i jego biblioteka [Books and the Revolution: Rev. Antonio Marini, a Naples Jacobin and His Library]*, Kraków 2004; *Od liber mundi do hipertekstu: książka w świecie utopii [From Liber Mundi to Hypertext: The Book in the World of Utopia]* 2nd ed., Warszawa 2009) showed the ideological entanglements and roles of the book in the history of culture. Multiple papers and books sought to capture cultural communication situations through its links to opinion bodies, such as the Church (works by Małgorzata Rządowolska, Jerzy Plis and Bogumiła Warząchowska), the press (works by Jerzy Franke, Agnieszka Paja and Anna Zdanowicz) and the political party and ideology (works by Danuta Adamczyk and Oskar Czarnik), to the social situation (works by Maria Krisań) or to the schooling and education system (works by Zdanowicz and Anna Nosek). In trying to grasp the characteristics of the communication situation and the institution associated with it, these studies arrived at its specific axiological quality,

²⁵ Migoń regards Estivals as the precursor of this theoretical approach and Henri-Jean Martin, the author of *Livre, pouvoirs et société à Paris au XVIIe siècle (1598–1701)* (vols. 1–2, Genève 1969), as the first researcher to embrace it. See Kuźmina (2011).

that is, the modes of appraising books, establishing reading repertoires and norms, and forming opinions. The merit of bibliological approaches lay in documenting how the book and press system, with the different institutions and settings that made up its organisational and material basis, furthered the purposes of politics and ideology.

7. The book in the media space. The importance of the media context of mass culture as relevant to the reception of publications was highlighted by sociologists of culture, such as Marcin Czerwiński, Antonina Kłoskowska, Alicja Rokuszewska-Pawełek and Katarzyna Citko (who built on the famed books published by McLuhan, Escarpit, Edgar Morin, Gillo Dorfles and Eco in the 1970s), and by researchers of reading practices Roman Chymkowski and Katarzyna Wolff. New attempts were launched to inscribe bibliology as a subdiscipline, side by side with press studies, into the meta-science of mass communication.²⁶ In bibliology, the notion of the book as an intrinsically ‘communicational’ phenomenon had developed since the 1930s, with Głombiowski and particularly Dunin (2008) later contributing to the popularisation and evolution of this concept. Challenges that bibliology faced as a result of the dynamic rise of media studies, the theory of which was not yet fully cemented, were aptly surveyed by Migoń (2002) in his search for perspectives of co-existence. While acknowledging the enrichment of bibliological research through the inspirational media-studies approach, Migoń insisted that the two disciplines had different research objects: the book, or more broadly the written document, in bibliology, and the media, with a focus on those involved in mass communication, in media studies.

In recent years, a research perspective triggered by the recognition of the intermedial quality of contemporary culture and thus combining the two — book- and media-studies — problem fields has been propounded by the young generation of bibliologists: Górska, Anita Has-Tokarz and Michał Rogoź. Polymorphous species of contemporary messages that operate as pop-cultural total products transfigure the structure and functions of the traditional book, its generic features and its links to particular reception situation. This propels researchers to expand their exploration field to include other communications that co-exist with the book in culture (including film, audio, web-based [Internet], computer, comic and press messages) and, though conveying similar content, tend to be preferred by the public because of their ergonomics, emotional potential, speed of transmission and easy perception. This is particularly relevant to children’s book, which are commonly subjected to ‘totalisation’ and have the originals replaced with adaptations and reworkings.

²⁶ Krystyna Bednarska-Ruszajowa argued against this standpoint (1993, p. 190).

In her scrutiny of the co-existence of the book ‘in contemporary communication realities made up of varied media systems,’ Góralaska takes the concepts of time and space as her starting point. In this framework, she perceives new functions of the book as ‘a specific antidote to the staggering dynamism of new media, an opportunity for slowing communication down and a guarantee of retaining “timeless values”’ (Góralaska 2009, pp. 144; 2011). Has-Tokarz (2010) and Rogoż (2015) have investigated different sets of resources each — specifically, horror stories and fantasy as book, publishing and polymedia genres — to demonstrate that the book, in particular the popular book, is a ‘parallel’ message in today’s convergence culture as it co-exists in the transmission of similar content and emotions with other communications, ones recorded in the ‘languages’ of the media. This ‘multi-adaptive co-existence’ is not indifferent either to the potential redefinition of the book as such or the way its system works. While the concept of the written document proves more open and functional for this purpose as well, it is not obvious whether it is sufficient. As shown by researchers, media convergence leads not only to the convergence of recording formats but also to the convergence of reception modes (Has-Tokarz, 2014). Undoubtedly, contemporary culture calls for ways of depicting the co-existence of heterogeneous forms of book and media communication. This bears important consequences for bibliological theory and begs the question whether, given the complementarity of bibliology and media studies (Migoń 2002), the profound cultural changes will permit this theory to continue in its current form without essential future theoretical and terminological revisions. This is a salient question, especially if bibliology does not want to remain a predominantly historical science. Answers to this and related question are sought, and in innovative ways too, by Jadwiga Woźniak-Kasperek, Sebastian D. Kotuła, Małgorzata Kisilowska, Góralaska and other scholars (Cisło & Łuszczyk, 2014).

8. The ‘book culture’ paradigm, though adopted as a novelty (Žibritová, 1975; Migoń, 2003b, 2007), looked back to Florian Znaniecki’s sociology of culture, and the texts of Bystroń and, then, of Józef Chałasiński, Szczepański, Kłoskowska, Anna Pawełczyńska and Andrzej Tyszka. The call for bibliology to encompass ‘the totality of book culture in the past and the present’ was articulated by Vrtel-Wierczyński, and, likewise, the integration of the book ‘with the entirety of material and spiritual culture’ was urged by Głombowski and ambitiously implemented by older and more recent historical works of the ‘Polish school of bibliology,’ which not infrequently preceded foreign theoretical projects that garnered fame later. In ascribing an extensive scope to bibliology as a science ‘of the world of books, of the book universe, of book civilisation,’ Migoń (2011b, p. 47) engaged in multifaceted analyses of this paradigm, in which it was possi-

ble to account for mental, communication and technological aspects as mutually complementary.²⁷ Migoń defined ‘book culture’ in reference to Paul Raabe’s view that it was ‘a historically formed and actively operating total presence of the book world stretching over a huge part of cultural life’ (Migoń, 2003b, p. 16).

Although this approach did not undermine either the classic triadic vision of the bibliological process (inscription, circulation and consumption) or the functional framework, it incisively redirected thinking in terms of ‘the anthropological order’ by insisting that it was not the book that ‘lived,’ but that it was people that, by living in culture, produced, exchanged and read books, in this way fostering ‘book worlds’ — repertoires, libraries, reading fads — and creating book culture in its spiritual-intellectual, civilisation-material and technological dimensions. An ‘anthropologisation’ of the bibliological process, previously perceived chiefly in institutional terms, was progressing. Not an artefact, but its cultural uses, and not so much the tool of social communication and communication process, as rather relations, interactions and the foregrounding of its human participants mediated their way into the spotlight. This promoted shifting the focus toward reading practices, in parallel to literary studies, where a cultural history of literature was being constructed.²⁸ The cultural theory of the book elaborated on the previous — functional and ‘communication’ — approaches.²⁹ Value added resided in the axiological dimension, with the book as a fundamental site of establishing, petrifying and changing cultural and social values by circles and communities rooted in them (Kostecki, 2008). As early as at the beginning of the 1980s, Migoń (1984a, p. 144) noted: ‘At the core of bibliological concerns are [...] the mutual, abundant and multidirectional relations of the book and the human being (social groups as such).’ Later, he defined bibliology as a science ‘of social book culture,’ which encompassed ‘the totality of book-related phenomena, processes and material and spiritual resources. Books in motion, in action (...) and their authors, owners and readers together make up a specific book culture’ (Migoń, 2007, p. 48). The cultural movement in bibliology neither reduced the traditional concepts or methodologies of book-studies research nor laid down new disciplinary structures.

²⁷ As he argued, ‘it can hold and bring together all the material and spiritual aspects of the book and the world of the book [...] as products of spiritual, material and technical culture’ (Migoń, 2007, pp. 13, 15).

²⁸ See collected volumes edited by Markowski and Nycz (2010), in particular Anna Burzyńska’s paper, ‘Kulturowy zwrot teorii’ [‘A Cultural Turn in Theory’], and by Walas and Nycz (2012).

²⁹ In their different ways, Muszkowski and Głombiowski emphasised ‘anthropological’ aspects (though ‘humanistic’ or ‘personalist’ would be a more accurate term). The former highlighted the group-fostering role of the book and the rise of occupational groups, such as printers, booksellers, critics and readers. The latter linked the humanistic aspect to the moral and aesthetic influence of the content and to changes in readers’ mentalities.

On the contrary, it combined this perspective on the 'internal' level with issues of document science, bibliography, classification and library science.

The model of empirical research underpinned by the 'book culture' paradigm was developed by the Wrocław-based historical bibliological community in the 1970s (Migoń, 2003c, 2011a; Herden & Koredczuk, 2008). It was used, for example, by Anna Żbikowska-Migoń in her *Książka naukowa w kulturze polskiego Oświecenia* [*The Science Book in Polish Enlightenment Culture*] (Warszawa-Wrocław 1977), where the processes of production, communication and dissemination of scientific writings in Poland in the Enlightenment were viewed as closely intertwined with intellectual and social life in the community of authors and, at the same time, readers of such publications associated with the University of Vilnius and embedded in the network of institutional and informal relations. This concept was picked up by the following generations of bibliologists. In her *Udział inteligencji prawniczej Królestwa Polskiego w kształtowaniu kultury książki (1815–1915)* [*The Contribution of the Juristic Intelligentsia to the Development of Book Culture in the Kingdom of Poland, 1815–1915*] (Wrocław 2011), Bożena Koredczuk extensively portrayed living with the book as practised by three generations of the juristic intelligentsia, a community unified by its system of (cultural, intellectual and professional) values that acted as publishers, booksellers, bibliophiles and editors to establish its communal book culture: reading repertoires, evaluative criteria for the world of the book and its uses. Janusz S. Gruchała (*Iucunda familia librorum. Humanisci renesansowi w świecie książki* [*Iucunda familia librorum: Renaissance Humanists in the World of the Book*], Kraków 2002) pictured the book world of Renaissance humanists by first outlining the axiological foundations of beliefs, motivations and relationships as underpinning the entire organisation of this community's 'world of the book,' including its material aspects.

'Anthropologically'-inflected approaches in the humanities sprang from various philosophical and scholarly ideas (Pomieciński & Sikora, 2009; Maryl, 2009; Mamzer, 2006). Those indebted to ethnology and evolutionary theory inquired, in broad lines, into the 'biological substrate of the social sciences' and, regarding reading, underscored its material and somatic conditions and aspects. Those informed by personalism and hermeneutics took a different direction, with the '*Geistiger Inhalte*' (as evoked by Raabe as well) deemed to affect the content-related, formal, generic and organisational features of the cultural communication process as a whole. In recent years, various facets of anthropologically- and culturally-inclined thought, on the whole gravitating to personalism, have been championed in bibliography by Drózdź (2007, 2011), Kostecki (2008) and Chymkowski (2011). Yet other aspects have been tackled in studies on book symbolism for example by Juliusz Domański (2002) and Alina Dziecioł (1997).

As a research perspective, ‘book culture’ has also been conducive to broadly conceived ‘regional’ approaches (Bieńkowska, 1988). In this respect, a remarkable theoretical and methodological contribution was made by Maria Kocójowa (e.g. *Krakowski świat książki doby autonomii galicyjskiej. Kształtowanie się nowego modelu w latach 1867–1882* [*The Cracow World of the Book in the Age of Galician Autonomy: The Development of a New Model between 1867 and 1882*], Kraków 1990), who critically applied the topographic method to explore the spatial situatedness of the institution of the book in Cracow in relation to other research and culture hubs. Kocójowa’s studies not only formed the cornerstone of the historical geography of the book but also opened the door to cultural approaches by shifting the focus from ‘the life of the book’ onto the relations, bonds and actions of the ‘people of the book’ as a real factor in bibliological processes.

9. The theory of book art and research on book aesthetics headed by Komza in the Wrocław-based bibliological community also derive from the cultural paradigm. Ideas of the book that fulfilled social functions as an integral aesthetic whole were part of Muszkowski’s and Głombiowski’s thought (Komza, 2014). Recently, the study of book art has tended to use the lens of ‘the poetics of reception’ in search of semiotic elements of the aesthetic-typographic structure that are paramount to dialogue with the readers and to social circulation (Komza, 2003a). Unlike other researchers, who predominantly analyse the structural components of book aesthetics and the contribution of illustrators and typographers, Komza has built on the functional theory to develop an original framework of research on book aesthetics with affinity to international, mainly French, thought. She has opened new interpretive fields at the intersection of typographic art, fine arts and visual arts in the context of image-mediated cultural communication. She explores the visual space of the book — ‘illustration-text relations,’ ‘relationships between respective elements of the book and its influence on the reader,’ the changing canons of ‘the graphic and typographic design of selected types of editions,’ ‘the reception of illustrations [...] and responses to the work as a whole’ (Komza, 2015, pp. 37, 39) — in a broad context of phenomena that express a society’s ‘aesthetic imagination,’ involving practices of *tableaux vivants*, theatrical performances, shows, exhibitions, social customs (the book as a gift, the book as paper theatre, the album) and technology (photography, murals). Grounded on plentiful sources, Komza’s work has brought together two mutually complementary research perspectives in exploring how editorially and functionally varied forms of documents (books) took shape in the historical development of aesthetic culture forms and how book art contributed to the establishment of the aesthetic canons, lifestyles, mental concepts and aesthetic standards of the age (Komza, 2001, 2003b). With a commitment to thorough research studies and an awareness of the complexity of

these issues and the definitional indeterminacy of several concepts, Komza (2008, 2015) has recently attempted to offer theoretical generalisations that determine the place of these thematic concerns in bibliology and to capture interdisciplinary interplays. While this proposal is tentatively formulated within the functional theory, Komza's wide-ranging empirical research clearly exceeds its boundaries, seeking to connect the history of the book closely to mental life and customs and to the entire culture of the image in its semiotic and substantive aspects. An important theoretical and methodological study of these issues has also been offered by Migoń (1984a, pp. 121–123).

Before concluding this outline, let me briefly discuss the contribution made to these theoretical discussions by bibliological journals and collected volumes of papers on the theory of the discipline, especially those published in the last fifteen years. Such publications have developed the disciplinary theory by addressing salient detailed issues, such as, besides the already listed ones, research on the popularity of works and authors (Żbikowska-Migoń), methodological and source-critical issues in bibliology (e.g. Migoń, Żbikowska-Migoń and Piotr Dymmel), philosophical sources of book-studies theory (Andrzej Nowicki, Agnieszka Łuszpak and Górska), methodologies of historical and contemporary research on reading practices (Teresa Radwan-Wińska and Kostecki) and the use of literary and biographical sources in bibliology (Małgorzata Stolzman, Wiesław Bieńkowski, Krystyna Bednarska-Ruszajowa, Siekierski, Anna Gruca, Koredczuk and Chymkowski).

Studia o Książce [*Book Studies*] (vols. 1–19, 1970–1993) deserves the name of a theoretical laboratory of the discipline (Derkacz & Łuszpak, 2016). The journal published texts that defined the object and scope of research and heralded important books (by Głombowski, Migoń, Żbikowska-Migoń, Nowicki, Cybulski, Siekierski, Zofia Gaca-Dąbrowska, Bieńkowska and many other authors) and the development of methodological trends (e.g. the notion of 'book culture' appeared in an article by Gabriela Žibritova as early as in the 1970s [vol. 5], Nowicki introduced the topic of iconology [vol. 5], and Franke offered a critique of the ways in which the concept of social environment was used in research on reading practices [vol. 8]). Somewhat less numerous scholarly debates revolved around methodological principles, as exemplified by Głombowski's contribution to vol. 11. Important volumes were devoted to overviews of the state of research and the needs of respective bibliological disciplines (book art, publishing patronage, editorship, the history of bibliophilism and reading practices), such as volume 12 (1982), which

opened with Migoń's extensive article 'Główne kierunki i perspektywy teorii księgoznawstwa' ['Major Trends in and Perspectives of Book-Studies Theory'] and closed with Głombiowski's polemic against some views advanced by Escarpit and Żółkiewski; volume 15 (1985), which was dedicated to source analysis and criticism in bibliography; and the volume of 1988, which announced its central theme in Migoń's opening paper 'Badania regionalne w historiografii książki' ['Regional Research in the Historiography of the Book'].

Theoretical articles also systematically appeared in *Roczniki Biblioteczne* [*Library Annals*], which published extensive source studies. They tended to delve into methodological aspects of subdisciplines of bibliography, as epitomised by the texts of Migoń ('Pismo jako przedmiot badań humanistycznych' ['Script as an Object of Humanistic Research']), Kocójowa ('W poszukiwaniu modelu badań dziejów ośrodków książki polskiej' ['In Search of a Research Model for the Study of Polish Book Centres']), Elżbieta Zawisza ('O przydatności nauki o książce w badaniach literackich...' ['On the Utility of Book Science to Literary Studies']), Jacek Wojciechowski ('Biblioteka jako wielosemiotyczne medium komunikacji społecznej' ['The Library as a Mutlisemiotic Medium of Social Communication']), Jerzy Ratajewski ('Czwarty raz o bibliotekoznawstwie. Rozważania metodologiczne' ['On Library Studies Yet Again: Methodological Considerations']), Marta Skalska-Zlat ('Bibliometria — pojęcia metody kierunki badań' ['Bibliometrics: Concepts, Methods and Research Trends']), Kazimiera Maleczyńska ('Założenia metodologiczne przyszłej historii książki, bibliotek i czytelnictwa na Śląsku' ['Methodological Tenets of a Future History of the Book, Library and Reading in Silesia']), Jadwiga Andrzejewska ('Pojęcie kultury czytelniczej...' ['The Concept of Reading Culture...']), Bednarska-Ruszajowa ('Z metodologicznych problemów badań nad czytelnictwem okresu Oświecenia' ['On the Methodological Issues in Research on Reading Practices in the Enlightenment']) and Stanisław Grzeszczuk ('Świadectwa odbioru jako źródła bibliograficzne' ['Confirmations of Receipt as Bibliographic Sources']).³⁰ After 2000, a range of new thematic concerns emerged, including bibliotherapy (Małgorzata Czerwińska and Tomasz Kruszewski), audio-visual contexts of the book (Górska and Aleksander Radwański) and the history of reading practices (e.g. Zdanowicz's comprehensive surveys of the foreign literature). Like in *Studies*, a review section for Polish and international publications in *Annals* furthered the evolution of the disciplinary identity in a wide-ranging European context.³¹

³⁰ Selected examples of the volumes: 27 (1983), 32 (1988) and 35 (1991).

³¹ The contribution of other journals, which proliferated along with the development of regional academic centres, falls outside the scope of this paper as an examination of journals and periodical publications from the science-studies and press-studies perspective, showcasing the development of book-studies research, deserves a separate study of its own.

As a response to Bieńkowska's (1999) call for new theoretical studies at the threshold of the new century, quite numerous conferences devoted to theory were held in the following years³² and likewise themed collected volumes, mostly conference proceedings, were published (e.g. Kisilowska, Puchalski & Kuźmina, 2000; Banacka, 2003; Migoń & Skalska-Zlat, 2008; Kuźmina, 2011a; Gondek, 2015). The theoretical maturity of the discipline is evidenced by monograph studies that explore a selected issue or concept (e.g. political bibliology, the cultural identity of the book, etc.) across bibliological subdisciplines and in relation to interdisciplinary contexts. The robust publishing dynamic of studies largely devoted to theoretical and methodological issues in bibliology certainly attests to the vitality and advancement of the discipline, which creatively spawns new and redefines old research fields.

This outline of the most frequently embraced research trends and the concepts correlated with them does not offer a complete picture of the diversity of book-studies explorations. Nonetheless, it captures an overall expansion of the discipline, with its scope demarcated first by the book as a writing-publishing (editorial) phenomenon, then by the book as the bibliological process and its social function, subsequently by the book in the contexts of polymedia communication and finally by book culture produced in and through social relations, actions and value-judgments. The 'usage' of concepts organising the research process kept changing; for example, the communication situation was first understood 'behaviourally' as premised on socio-civilisational factors, the social structure and institutional arrangements only to come to be determined by 'reading experience' in the mental ('concept mapping,' habituses), moral and even somatic dimension as bound up with values and motivations, which resulted, for example, in acknowledging the role of common readers (reception) (Franaszek, 1997). The functions of the book were also conceived of in increasingly profound terms: initially as the transmission and influence of content (and form) on readers, later as linked to institutions of the book system and finally as subjectively assigned and verified by the reading public. Similarly, the communicative approach, professed in almost all theoretical positions, was understood as: communicating the content of the book through its editorial outfitting; ways of organising the social process of written communication; the communicational role of selected book institutions;

³² For example, 'Od książki dawnej do biblioteki wirtualnej — przeobrażenia bibliologii polskiej. Na marginesie trzydziestolecia Instytutu Informacji Naukowej i Bibliologii Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika w Toruniu. Ogólnopolska konferencja naukowa. Toruń 23–24 październik 2007' ['From the Old Book to the Virtual Library: Transformations in Polish Bibliology. On the Occasion of the Thirtieth Anniversary of the Institute of Information Science and Bibliology, Nicolaus Copernicus University in Torun. Nationwide Conference, Torun, 23–24 October 2007'] (report in *Roczniki Biblioteczne* (52) 2008).

and interactions of the people of the book in the symbolic dimension and in the institutional context. Efforts were also dedicated to identifying overlaps of literary communication and informational communication as two different systems of social communication (Korycińska-Huras, 2006). Consequently, the focus of bibliological thought shifted from the book itself as a cultural artefact and its 'life,' that is, the bibliological process with its institutions, onto the functions of the book for the reading public in the process of social and cultural transmission and, finally, onto the reading public as a producer and user of book culture, whose operations are recorded — 'inscribed' — in bibliological documentation. Initially treated as separate, if not opposed, the bibliological and socio-cultural conceptions came to be viewed as complementary (Głombiowski, 1981; Radwan-Wińska, 1983).

The development of a science that constructs its own theory is borne out by its 'adaptive vitality' where, besides the traditional concepts lying at the foundation of the discipline, new ones are constantly 'tried out' and adapted to its toolkit. It is further borne out by the sustained balance between the firm theoretical crux, which forms the conceptual and methodological cornerstone of the discipline, and explorations and inspirations that illumine it in new ways: 'The multiplicity of so different viewpoints in book studies is beneficial in that it helps accumulate an ever more complete knowledge of this phenomenon of human civilisation' (Migoń, 2007).³³ Receptive to and also critical of inspirations coming from related sciences, Polish bibliography has managed to avoid both the pitfalls of eclecticism and the perils of isolation. It has developed an identity of an open discipline that is requisite for other humanities research (Bieńkowska, 1989) and at the same time must itself draw on such inquiries to fathom its own extensive research field.

Furthermore, the development of a discipline is borne out by its resonance with the discussions unfolding in related sciences at a given moment. The entire field of the humanities has seen theoretical explorations similar to those undertaken in book science, whereby not only akin research fields were scrutinised, borrowing concepts and methods, but above all the like theoretical tenets were endorsed.³⁴ Interdisciplinary humanistic research may be heading toward a meta-discipline studying how the human being (a community) operates in the culture of script and image, a meta-discipline that weaves together efforts of several sciences with their distinctive methodological and conceptual potentials. If this were the case, a central place would have to be allotted to the book (written

³³ Bieńkowska's view (2011, p. 15) is similar: 'In the light [of other sciences], bibliography appears not only as a full-fledged autonomous scholarly discipline but also as one that constantly expands the scope of its competence.'

³⁴ For example in literary studies: from the history of texts and biographies of authors, to the history of literary life and poetics of reception, to the cultural theory of literature that musters the issues of production, circulation and reception in an anthropological framework.

document), as a major form of the materialisation of symbolic culture and an axiologically marked system of cultural and social communication, and to bibliology with its specialised *apparatus* of book-studies and document-science research as ‘a full-fledged partner in inter- and multidisciplinary humanistic research (with necessary “forays” beyond the humanities)’ (Migoń, 2007, p. 24).

Finally, the development of a science is borne out by its capacity to ‘bring forth’ new research trends and disciplines. Autonomous disciplines today, library studies and informology have substantially relied on the theoretical experiences of bibliology. The ‘Polish school of bibliology,’ which as early as at the threshold of the 20th century combined, particularly in its historical research, an analysis of social developments with a cultural perspective and appreciated ‘anthropological’ and axiological aspects, not infrequently was ahead of or at least went hand in hand with theoretical discussions and research work abroad. Thereby, a paramount contribution to the initiation of new paths, concepts and aspects of book-studies research and to the production of books that embodied their model implementations has been made by Wrocław-based bibliologists.

Translated by Patrycja Poniatowska

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ankudowicz, J. (1972). Roberta Escarpita koncepcja socjologii książki. *Studia o Książce*, 3, 267–277.
- Banacka, M. (Ed.). (2003). *Nauka o książce, bibliotece i informacji we współczesnym świecie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo SBP.
- Bednarska-Ruszejowa, K. (1993). Z teorii i metodologii księgoznawstwa oraz dyscyplin pokrewnych 1987–1990. *Studia o Książce*, 19, 189–197.
- Bieńkowska, B. (1978). Aleksandra Birkenmajera koncepcja historii książki. *Przegląd Biblioteczny*, 46(2), 155–162.
- Bieńkowska, B. (1988). Badania regionalne w historiografii książki. *Studia o Książce*, 17, 17–33.
- Bieńkowska, B. (1989). Metody bibliologiczne w badaniach dziejów nauki. *Kwartalnik Historii Nauki i Techniki*, 29(2), 331–342.
- Bieńkowska, B. (1999). Bibliologia i okolice. In: *E scientia et amicitia. Studia poświęcone profesorowi Edwardowi Potkowskiemu. W sześćdziesięciopięciolate urodzin i czterdziestolecie pracy naukowej* (pp. 41–47). Warszawa — Pułtusk: Wyższa Szkoła Humanistyczna.
- Bieńkowska, B. (2011). Bibliologia dyscypliną rozwojową. In: D. Kuźmina (Ed.). *Bibliologia i informatologia* (pp. 13–22). Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Bibliologiczne. Oddział Warszawski.
- Borysowska, A. (2007). Bibliologia a literaturoznawstwo — pokrewieństwo warsztatów historyka książki i historyka literatury. In: D. Kuźmina (Ed.). *Bibliologia. Problemy badawcze nauk humanistycznych* (pp. 13–24). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo SBP.
- Chymkowski, R. (2002). Czytanie z ekranu — wstępny zarys problematyki. *Przegląd Humanistyczny*, 46(1), 120–121.

- Cisło, A., Łuszek, A. (eds). (2014). *Kulturowa tożsamość książki*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Cybulski, R. (1983). Konsumpcja książki. Zarys problematyki. *Roczniki Biblioteczne*, 17(1/2), 457.
- Cybulski, R. (1984). Struktura i właściwości książki. *Studia o Książce*, 14, 34–35.
- Derkacz, M., Łuszek, A. (2016). „Studia o Książce” (1970–1993) — koncepcje programowe i ich realizacja. *Roczniki Biblioteczne*, 60, 223–246.
- Dmitruk, K. (1980). *Literatura, społeczeństwo, przestrzeń. Przemiany układu kultury literackiej*. Wrocław [et al.]: Ossolineum.
- Dunin, J. (1998). *Pismo zmienia świat. Czytanie, lektura, czytelnictwo*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Dunin, J. (2008). Czasopisma i książki w świecie mediów XXI wieku. In: M. Rajewski, K. Stępnik (eds). *Media studies. Refleksja nad stanem obecnym* (pp. 227–234). Lublin: UMCS.
- Franaszek, A. (1997). O sposobach pojmowania literatury przez czytelnika. *Rocznik Biblioteki Narodowej*, 19, 153–163.
- Głombiowski, K. (1966). *Problemy historii czytelnictwa*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Głombiowski, K. (1970). O funkcjonalną teorię nauki o książce. *Studia o Książce*, 1, 24–26.
- Głombiowski, K. (1972). Nauka o książce w ujęciu Jana Muszkowskiego. *Studia o Książce*, 3, 153–169.
- Głombiowski, K. (1973). Nauka o książce nauką o człowieku. *Studia o Książce*, 4, 26–40.
- Głombiowski, K. (1980). *Książka w procesie komunikacji społecznej*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- Głombiowski, K. (1981). O dwóch tendencjach badań bibliologicznych. *Studia o Książce*, 11, 12–18.
- Głombiowski, K. (1983a). Czy bibliologia może się wybić na samodzielność? (W odpowiedzi moim czytelnikom – rzeczywistym i urojonym). *Roczniki Biblioteczne*, 27(1–2), 559–605.
- Głombiowski, K. (1983b). Książka a inne sposoby zapisu dzieła piśmienniczego, czyli o semiotyce książki. *Studia o Książce*, 13, 8–15.
- Głombiowski, K. (1985). *Teoria i metodologia nauki o książce*. Gdańsk: Uniwersytet Gdański.
- Gondek, E. (Ed.). (2015). *Teoretyczne zagadnienia bibliologii*. *Studia i szkice*. Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski.
- Gorzowski, A. (2003). Qui legit, intelligat. Refleksje o retorycznych modelach lektury w kulturze i literaturze dawnej. *Pamiętnik Literacki* (94) 2003, z. 1, 5–25.
- Górska, M. (2007). Funkcjonalność oraz komunikatywność książki tradycyjnej i elektronicznej w perspektywie semiotycznej. In: D. Kuźmina (Ed.). *Bibliologia. Problemy badawcze nauk humanistycznych* (pp. 360–370). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo SBP.
- Górska, M. (2009). *Książki, nowe media i ich czasoprzestrzenie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo SBP.
- Górska, M. (2011). Kryzysy informacyjne, rewolucje medialne i ich wpływ na rozwój piśmienności. In: D. Kuźmina (Ed.). *Bibliologia i informatologia* (pp. 239–250). Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Bibliologiczne. Oddział Warszawski.
- Has-Tokarz, A. (2010). *Horror w literaturze współczesnej i filmie*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Has-Tokarz, A., Malesa, R. (eds). (2014). *Homo legens czy homo consumens? Czytelnik i książka w XXI wieku*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Herden, E., Koredczuk, B. (2008). Badania naukowe w Instytucie Informacji Naukowej i Bibliotekoznawstwa Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego w latach 1956–2006. Próba syntezy i oceny. In: A. Żbikowska-Migóń, M. Skalska-Zlat (eds). *Dokument, książka i biblioteka w badaniach naukowych i nauczaniu uniwersyteckim* (pp. 181–200). Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Hojka, B. (2010). Język i pismo w kontekście powiązań interdyscyplinarnych nauki o książce. In: M. Kocójowa (Ed.). *Biblioteki, informacja, książka: interdyscyplinarne badania i praktyka*

- XXI wieku* (pp. 166–172). ePublikacje Instytutu Informacji Naukowej i Bibliotekoznawstwa Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Kisilowska, M., Puchalski, J., Kuźmina, D. (eds). (2000). *Wiedza o książce w nauce i dydaktyce*. Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski.
- Komza, M. (2001). Książka ilustrowana w oczach XIX-wiecznych odbiorców. *Rocznik Gdański*, 61(2), 219–227.
- Komza, M. (Ed.) (2003a). *Sztuka książki. Historia — teoria — praktyka*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Komza, M. (2003b). Żywe obrazy...; Książka z teatrem związana. *Roczniki Biblioteczne*, 47, 89–120.
- Komza, M. (2008). Bibliolog wobec nowych zjawisk w sztuce książki. In: E. Gondek, I. Socha (eds). *Centrum i pogranicze w polskiej kulturze wydawniczej i czytelniczej. Wybrane aspekty badań bibliologicznych i szkice historyczne* (pp. 29–41). Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski.
- Komza, M. (2011). Estetyka książki w badaniach bibliologicznych. In: D. Kuźmina (Ed.). *Bibliologia i informatologia* (pp. 57–64). Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Bibliologiczne. Oddział Warszawski.
- Komza, M. (2014). Jan Muszkowski o sztuce książki. In: G. Czapnik, Z. Gruszka, J. Ladorucki (eds). *Jan Muszkowski. Ludzie, epoka, książki. Tradycje i kontynuacje* (pp. 57–71). Łódź-Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego i SBP.
- Komza, M. (2015). Estetyka i sztuka książki w badaniach bibliologicznych. In: E. Gondek (Ed.). *Teoretyczne zagadnienia bibliologii i informatologii. Studia i szkice* (pp. 37–39). Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski.
- Kondek, S.A. (2007). Organizacja obiegu książek w PRL jako eksperyment bibliologiczny. In: D. Kuźmina (Ed.). *Bibliologia. Problemy badawcze nauk humanistycznych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Stowarzyszenia Bibliotekarzy Polskich.
- Koredczuk, B. (2005). *Początki teorii bibliologii. Dictionnaire raisonné de bibliologie (1802–1804) Gabriela Etienne'a Peignota. Analiza i recepcja*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Koredczuk, B. (2015). Karol Głombiowski — twórca wrocławskiej szkoły bibliologicznej. In: R. Aleksandrowicz, H. Rusińska-Giertych (eds). *Książka i biblioteka w procesie komunikacji społecznej* (pp. 19–38). Wrocław: Oficyna Wydawnicza ATUT.
- Korycińska-Huras, A. (2006). *Informacyjny kontekst komunikacji literackiej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Kostecki, J. (1977). *Charakterystyka wybranych społecznych sytuacji komunikacji czytelniczej w polskiej kulturze czytelniczej II połowy XIX wieku. Sesja naukowa nt. Społeczne uwarunkowania instytucjonalne życia literackiego*. Warszawa — Olsztyn: IBL PAN Warszawa, WSP Olsztyn.
- Kostecki, J. (1979). Pojęcie funkcji w bibliotekoznawstwie. *Bibliotekarz*, 45(5–6), 121–124, 148–151.
- Kostecki, J. (1981). W okopach bibliologii, w okowach bibliofilstwa. *Bibliotekarz*, 2–3, 44–47, 70–74.
- Kostecki, J. (2008). Czytelnik w świecie wartości. In: M. Skalska-Zlat, A. Żbikowska-Migoń (eds). *Dokument, książka i biblioteka w badaniach naukowych i nauczaniu uniwersyteckim* (pp. 85–113). Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Kuźmina, D. (Ed.). (2011a). *Bibliologia i informatologia*. Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Bibliologiczne. Oddział Warszawski.
- Kuźmina, D. (Ed.). (2011b). *Bibliologia polityczna*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo SBP.
- Ladorucki J., Rządowska, M. (eds). (2009). *Pasja książki. Studia poświęcone pamięci profesora Janusza Dunina*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Literatura.

- Ladorucki, J. (2014). System książki Jana Muszkowskiego. In: G. Czapnik, Z. Gruszka, J. Ladorucki (eds). *Jan Muszkowski. Ludzie, epoka, książki. Tradycje i kontynuacje*. Łódź – Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego i SBP.
- Mamzer, H. (2006). Przemoc i tekst. In: H. Mamzer (Ed.). *Formy przemocy w kulturze współczesnej* (pp. 27–43). Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza.
- Markowski, M.P., Nycz, R. (eds). (2010). *Kulturowa teoria literatury. Główne pojęcia i problemy*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Martin, H.-J. (1969). *Livre, pouvoirs et société a Paris au XVIIe siècle (1598–1701)*. Genève.
- Maryl, M. (2009). Antropologia odbioru literatury — zagadnienia metodologiczne. *Teksty Drugie. Teoria literatury, krytyka, interpretacja*, 1/2, 228–251.
- Migoń, K. (1983). Pismo jako przedmiot badań humanistycznych. *Roczniki Biblioteczne*, 27(1/2), 409–433.
- Migoń, K. (1984a). *Nauka o książce. Zarys problematyki*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Migoń, K. (1984b). Stefana Vrtela-Wierczyńskiego koncepcja bibliologii. *Roczniki Biblioteczne*, 28, 3–13.
- Migoń, K. (1988). Karol Głombiowski (1913–1986). *Studia o Książce*, 17, 3–14.
- Migoń, K. (1993). O nazwie dyscypliny, którą uprawiamy. *Przegląd Biblioteczny*, 61(1/2), 109–113.
- Migoń, K. (2001). Historia czytelnictwa według Karola Głombiowskiego. *Rocznik Gdański*, 61(2), 9–18.
- Migoń, K. (2002). Bibliologia wobec medioznawstwa: izolacja, komplementarność czy integracja. In: M. Juda (Ed.). *Książka i prasa w systemie komunikacji społecznej, przeszłość dzień dzisiejszy, perspektywy* (pp. 13–18). Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Migoń, K. (2003a). Centralne kategorie bibliologii Adama Łysakowskiego. In: *Adam Łysakowski, bibliotekarz, bibliograf, bibliolog. Materiały z sesji jubileuszowej. Warszawa, 10 września 2002* (pp. 43–52). Warszawa: Biblioteka Narodowa.
- Migoń, K. (2003b). Kultura książki. Program dla bibliologii i potrzeba dla studiów bibliotekoznawczych. In: M. Banacka (Ed.). *Nauka o książce, bibliotece i informacji we współczesnym świecie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo SBP.
- Migoń, K. (2003c). Pół wieku Instytutu Informacji Naukowej i Bibliotekoznawstwa Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego (1956–2006). In: M. Banacka (Ed.). *Nauka o książce, bibliotece i informacji we współczesnym świecie* (pp. 169–179). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo SBP.
- Migoń, K. (2004). Paul Otlet o bibliologii, książce i dokumencie. In: M. Kocójowa (Ed.). *Przestrzenie informacji i komunikacji społecznej* (pp. 370–376). Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Migoń, K. (2005). Bibliologia — nauka o kulturze książki. *Nauka*, 2, 49–57.
- Migoń, K. (2007). Bibliologia wśród innych nauk. Koncepcje, realizacje, perspektywy. In: D. Kuźmina (Ed.). *Bibliologia. Problemy badawcze nauk humanistycznych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo SBP.
- Migoń, K. (2009a). Uniwersum piśmiennictwa, jego właściwości, granice i sposoby istnienia. In: K. Migoń, M. Skalska-Zlat (eds). *Uniwersum piśmiennictwa wobec komunikacji elektronicznej* (pp. 11–20). Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Migoń, K. (2009b). Teoria książki w ujęciu Janusza Dunina. In: J. Ladorucki, M. Rządowska (eds). *Pasja książki. Studia poświęcone pamięci profesora Janusza Dunina*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Literatura.
- Migoń, K. (2011a). Bibliologia historyczna w kręgu wrocławskiego bibliotekoznawstwa uniwersyteckiego. In: D. Kuźmina (Ed.). *Bibliologia i informatologia*. Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Bibliologiczne. Oddział Warszawski.

- Migoń, K. (2011b). „Kultura książki” — wyrażenie potoczne, kategoria badawcza, czy specjalność naukowa?. In: E. Andrysiak (Ed.). *Ludzie i książki. Studia i szkice bibliologiczno-biograficzne. Księga pamiątkowa dedykowana Profesor Hannie Tadeusiewicz* (pp. 47–57). Łódź: Wydawnictwo Ibidem.
- Muszkowski, J. (1948). Książka jako przedmiot nauki. *Bibliotekarz*, 10/11, 151.
- Muszkowski, J. (1951a). Książka jako zjawisko społeczne. In: A. Gryczowa, K. Budzyk (eds). *Studia nad książką poświęcone pamięci Kazimierza Piekarskiego*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich.
- Muszkowski, J. (1951b). *Życie książki*. Kraków: Wiedza — Zawód — Kultura.
- Muszkowski, J. (1972). Wstęp do socjologii książki. *Studia o Książce*, 3, 97.
- Pitak, E. (1978). Klasyfikacja piśmiennictwa w nauce o książce. *Studia o Książce*, 8, 27–41.
- Pomiciński, A., Sikora, S. (eds). (2009). *Zanikające granice. Antropologizacja nauki i jej dyskursów*. Poznań: Biblioteka Telgte Wydawnictwo.
- Pomorski, J. (1985). W kierunku teoretycznej integracji badań bibliologicznych. *Studia o Książce*, 15, 157–189.
- Pomorski, J. (1988). Teoria i bibliologia. W kierunku teoretycznej integracji badań bibliologicznych. In: J. Pomorski (Ed.). *Profile nauki o książce* (pp. 7–42). Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Potkowski, E. (2001). Rękopis a druk. Przełom w dziejach techniki czy dziejach cywilizacji?. *Przeгляд Biblioteczny*, 69(3), 185–198.
- Radwan-Wińska, T. (1983). Z problemów współczesnej refleksji naukowej wobec badań nad czytelnictwem. *Roczniki Biblioteczne*, 27(1–2), 435–452.
- Rogoż, M. (2015). *Fantastycznie obecne. Anglojęzyczne bestsellerowe cykle powieściowe dla dzieci i młodzieży we współczesnej polskiej przestrzeni medialnej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Pedagogicznego.
- Skalska-Zlat, M., Żbikowska-Migoń, A. (eds) (2008). *Dokument, książka i biblioteka w badaniach naukowych i nauczaniu uniwersyteckim*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Socha, I. (2012). O pojęciu funkcji w bibliologii. In: K. Heska-Kwaśniewicz, K. Tałuc (eds). *Studia i rozprawy bibliologiczne* (pp. 101–110). Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski.
- Tyszka, A. (1971). *Uczestnictwo w kulturze. O różnorodności stylów życia*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Vrtel-Wierczyński, S. (1951). *Teoria bibliografii w zarysie*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich.
- Walas, T., Nycz, R., (eds). (2012). *Kulturowa teoria literatury 2. Poetyki, problematyki, interpretacje*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Włodarczyk, J. (1992). Funkcja społeczna książki. Z problematyki metod badawczych. *Acta Universitatis Lodzensis. Folia Librorum*, 3, 29–49.
- Zawisza, J.W. (1980). Propozycja schematu komunikacji bibliologicznej. *Studia o Książce*, 10, 39–57.
- Žibritová, G. (1975). Metodologiczne problemy badań nad historią kultury książki. *Studia o Książce*, 5, 3–14.
- Żbikowska-Migoń, A. (1989). *Historia książki w XVIII wieku. Początki bibliologii*. Warszawa: PWN.

**BOOK STUDIES IN POLAND BETWEEN 1945 AND 2015:
THE SOURCES OF THEORETICAL INSPIRATION**

Summary

The aim of the paper is to picture a retrospective panorama of the theoretical legacy of post-war Polish book studies. Of key importance to the author is the question of the object of the discipline and, consequently, its scope. The author discusses directions in book studies and the bibliological process making up — starting in the 1930s and with Jan Muszkowski's concept — the core tradition and foundation of book-studies theories: the theories built around the paradigm of 'life of the book,' looking at it as an integrally defined process of production, dissemination and consumption; Karol Glombiowski's functional theory, thanks to which 'systemic' and 'functional' approaches became a commonly accepted methodological premise in book studies; the concepts formulated by Janusz Dunin, who linked the bibliological tradition of historical source studies of editorial forms of books to the functional theory and to 'communication' perspective; the theory formulated by Radosław Cybulski, who, in combining the established morphology of the book with a semiotic and communication perspective, adopted 'book consumption,' that is, an 'integrated system of satisfying the needs of book users,' as a functional category to describe the behaviour of participants in the book market; the concepts focused on the 'social communication situation' as a research concept and perspective stemming from the sociological and semiotic reorientation of humanistic thinking. At the end, the author discusses the trends which have considerably expanded research perspectives in recent years: books in the media space; the 'culture of the book' paradigm, which is conducive to an 'anthropologisation' of the bibliological process, perceived no longer only institutionally, from the perspective of social communication, but also through relations, interactions and value judgements of people participating in it, which shifts research priorities towards the questions of reading and often also towards 'regional' approaches; and the theory of book art and research into book aesthetics. At the various stages of the development of bibliology and in relation to respective research approaches, the focus shifted from the book as a cultural artefact and its 'life,' that is, the bibliological process with its institutions, to the functions of the book with regard to the public in the process of social and cultural transmission, and, finally, to the public as the creator and user of the culture of the book, whose actions are 'recorded' in bibliological documentation.