

MAGDALENA WOŹNIEWSKA-DZIAŁAK

‘RZECZ CZARNOLESKA’ AS PERCEIVED  
BY THE THIRD GENERATION OF ROMANTICS:  
CYPRIAN NORWID AND TEOFIL LENARTOWICZ

The history of the reception of the works of Jan of Czarnolas is an interesting case for many reasons, even from the perspective of researches on Classicism as a permanent phenomenon of Polish literature (‘nadprąd’ [over-trend] in Julian Krzyżanowski’s terminology). For instance, it is a part of an important nineteenth century narration on native tradition, community, language and Polishness. It helps to illustrate nineteenth-century nostalgia for the lost Arcadia and irrevocably bygone Golden Age. In addition, it indicates one of the most important trends in the then culture of the second half of the nineteenth century and poets whom I make the protagonists of my article: the tendency of creating and sustaining the discourse of identity, discourse of bonds and collective memory<sup>1</sup>, which was one of many goals that the people of the era designated for themselves. ‘W cieniu Cytadeli i w warunkach niekończącego się stanu wojennego’<sup>2</sup> (In the shadow of the Citadel and in the conditions of an endless state of war) the need for national myths and legends bringing back the spirit of the nation to life was as much significant as an ongoing debate of Polish historians about the questions on ‘the subject of our history’. The debate which, as Andrzej Nowak said, ‘was of paramount importance for rescuing and, at the same time, developing Polish identity’<sup>3</sup>. Jan of Czarnolas as ‘the archetypal model of the poet and citizen’<sup>4</sup> undoubtedly supported that spiritual formation of the third generation of literary-artistic Romanticism.

---

<sup>1</sup> B. DOPART, *Kultura polska lat 1796-1918*, [in:] *Historie Polski w XIX wieku*, ed. A. Nowak, Warszawa 2013, p. 323.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 327

<sup>3</sup> A. NOWAK, *Historia w wychowaniu współczesnych Polaków*, [in:] *Po co nam historia?*, ed. E. Kizik, Gdańsk 2013, pp. 76-77.

<sup>4</sup> W. WALECKI, *Jan Kochanowski w literaturze i kulturze polskiej doby oświecenia*, Wrocław 1979, p. 88.

When rediscovered he became an inherent part of Romantic reflection on sense of freedom and greatness of nation painfully experienced during 'Paskewich Night'.

Kochanowski began to enter the collective consciousness as a poet only of his kind<sup>5</sup> at the end of 18<sup>th</sup> century. It is largely due to Franciszek Bohomolec, the publisher of his works from 1767. Knowledge of artistic creation and recognition for the Czarnolas model of life in 19<sup>th</sup> century, we owe, to a large extent, to Kazimierz Brodzinski, who, during lectures at the Warsaw University from 1822 to 1839, enthusiastically spoke about the poetry of the author of *Pieśni* and *Fraszki*<sup>6</sup>. Bringing back the memory of Kazimierz Brodziński as a researcher of Czarnolas artistic creativity is not coincidental, though. I would like to devote my attention to the poets belonging to the third-generation Romantics. That is those who formed generational community, not from a sociological perspective, as Kazimierz Wyka wanted (then Norwid and Lenartowicz would have belonged to the second generation<sup>7</sup>, but from aesthetic perspective. This community was formed in 1840s in Poland, and Roman Zmorski, Seweryn Filleborn, Kornel Ujejski and Narcyza Żmichowska were also its co-originators. Brodzinski's works and those of exceptional strong impact, written later by Kraszewski in late 1840s, made that the 'confusion' about the works and Jan Kochanowski seemed completely understandable<sup>8</sup>. It was multidimensional and long-lasting.

As one can remember, there were attempts to question the originality of the poetry of Czarnolas with harsh words and comments at the beginning of Romanticism. Maurycy Mochnacki did it consistently, but ultimately no one succeeded, even Mickiewicz failed to 'assassinate' the author of *Pieśń świętojańska o Sobótce*<sup>9</sup>. Moreover, Mickiewicz, what I would stress most empathetically, as

<sup>5</sup> T. CHACHULSKI, *Opóźnione pokolenie. O recepcji „głębokiej” Jana Kochanowskiego w poezji polskiej XVIII wieku*, Warszawa 2006, p. 23.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Z.J. NOWAK, *Jan Kochanowski w sądach Kazimierza Brodzińskiego*, [in:] *Jan Kochanowski. Twórczość i recepcja*, v. II, ed. Z.J. Nowak, Katowice 1985, p. 40. It is worth recalling that in 1821, Brodzinski also emphasized the charm of Kochanowski's *Lamentations* in the treatise *O klasycyzmie i romantyzmie*, and he himself undertook the funeral cycle many times, for instance in the treatise *O elegii* (1821), in *Pisma rozmaite* (a thoroughly reworked treatise *O elegii*, 1830). Brodzinski also thought highly of *Pieśń świętojańska o sobótce* and *Psalterz Dawidów*. In 1827, in his treatise *O życiu i pismach Franciszka Karpińskiego*, he gave priority to Kochanowski from among other translators of that exceptional collection of prayers and poems.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. K. WYKA, *Pokolenia literackie*, Kraków 1977.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. S. PIGOŃ, *Studia literackie*, Kraków 1951, pp. 65-68.

<sup>9</sup> Marta Piwińska's expression, cf. IDEM, *Czy Mickiewicz zamordował Kochanowskiego? Interpretacja romantycznej interpretacji*, [in:] *Nasze pojedynki o romantyzm*, ed. D. Siwicka, M. Bieńczyk, Warszawa 1995.

a ‘Romantic scholar’ and a ‘historian of the culture of great calibre’<sup>10</sup> appreciated in his Parisian lectures the Classicism of Jan of Czarnolas, noting how well and how uniquely the poet developed Polish national culture<sup>11</sup>. Therefore, it should be no wonder that, in the second half of 19<sup>th</sup> century, there were many publications on Kochanowski, his travelling, Czarnolas, Czarnolas linden tree, the projects of a statue of the creator<sup>12</sup>, the poet’s skull (sic!) decomposing the historical, literary and national theme into prime factors<sup>13</sup>.

As it was already mentioned, Józef Ignacy Kraszewski<sup>14</sup> and Teofil Lenartowicz wrote about the author of *Odprawa posłów greckich*. The name of the author of *Psalterz Dawidowy* is also placed in the writings of Cyprian Norwid. In my opinion, all what was appreciated in the poetry and the personality of Jan Kochanowski in artistic work of the poets of the third generation of Romanticism is placed in Lenartowicz’s and Norwid’s works.

In the writings of Teofil Lenartowicz, there are many traces of Kochanowski’s works reception. Peregrinations of this lirnyk around the country undertaken together by Kolberg, Zmorski and Ujejski often led through Czarnolas as evidenced by the poetic entries in commemorative books<sup>15</sup>. Because of their deep themes, the

---

<sup>10</sup> Marta Piwińska used these terms, cf. IDEM, *Wolny myśliwy. Osiem prób czytania Mickiewicza*, Gdańsk 2003, p. 209.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Ibid, p. 222.

<sup>12</sup> A monument of Kochanowski was once Wincenty Pol’s unfulfilled idea.

<sup>13</sup> A group of those who wrote about Kochanowski or made him the subject of their artistic work was numerous up to the end of 19<sup>th</sup> century. I will mention some of them so as to illustrate the scale of the phenomenon: Stanisław Jachowicz (*Wieczór Kochanowskiego w Czarnolesie*, 1853), Seweryna Duchyńska (poemat *Wianek na cześć Jana z Czarnolasu*, 1884), Adam Belcikowski (*Wieczór w Czarnolesie*, 1882), Wincenty Pol (*Do Jana Kochanowskiego*, 1878), Maria Konopnicka (*Na cześć Jana Kochanowskiego*), Felicjan Faleński (*Jan Kochanowski jako poeta liryczny*, 1864; *Treny* ed. by Faleński were published in 1866, and *Pogadanka o fraszkach* in 1881. In 1899, Gabriela Zapolska changed a historical novel of Klementyna Hoffmanowa, née Tanski titled *Jan Kochanowski w Czarnolesie* into the stage play. Kazimierz Władysław Wójcicki (1869), Bronisław Chlebowski made the study of the poet’s works; (*Jan Kochanowski w swietle własnych utworow. Wizerunek własny*, 1884), Stanisław Tarnowski (the author of the book *Jan Kochanowski*, 1888), Kazimierz Morawski, Stanisław Windakiewicz, Józef Kallenbach and Stanisław Dobrzycki continued their works.

<sup>14</sup> Kraszewski’s treatise titled *Jan Kochanowski*, published in 1843, ‘ustaliła na długie lata kryteria odbioru poety czarnoleskiego’ (specified the criteria of the reception of Czarnolas poet for long years), cf. H. BURSZTYŃSKA, *Sądy Józefa Ignacego Kraszewskiego o Janie Kochanowskim*, [in:] *Jan Kochanowski. Twórczość i recepcja*, v. II, p. 73.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. J. NOWAKOWSKI, *Pod urokiem Czarnolasu. Jan Kochanowski Teofila Lenartowicza*, [in:] *Janowi Kochanowskiemu ziemia rodzinna. Księga referatów radomsko-kielecko-czarnoleskiej sesji naukowej 450-lecia urodzin poety (29<sup>th</sup>-31<sup>st</sup> May 1980 r.)*, ed. J. Paclawski, T. Ulewicz, Warszawa–Kraków 1981, pp. 241-257.

following texts draw especial attention: an early poem *Jan Kochanowski* (from 1844, first edition 1845, „Niezapominajki”), *Dzwon Zygmunt, Szopka*, later poem: *O Satyrze albo leśnym mężu* and also Bologna lectures of the author of *Lirenka*<sup>16</sup>, which fasten and crown Lenartowicz’s views on the two most important eras (according to the poet) in our history: the Renaissance and Romanticism<sup>17</sup>

The poem *Jan Kochanowski* is a clear paraphrase of the epigrams by the author of *Do gór i lasów*. It is also a reflection of yearning for safe world with clearly defined order of values and stoic philosophy of life. The protagonists of the poem are Jan of Czarnolas and his poetry, but the person who wants to speak with the lips of the poet is Lenartowicz himself - nostalgic, moved and as Jan Nowakowski formulates: longing for his dreamt *Tusculum*, quiet, picturesquely blending in Polish scenery. The poet-bard, who fights with lute in his hand for the truth, fights like a knight in armour in the name of a just cause. He convinces, in the poem, of the advantages of life patterned on the ‘customs of the fathers’. Czarnolas linden tree giving refuge is here, as usually, the source of hope for the reward for honesty and virtue. It is also the one whose shade and bliss favour ‘golden dreams’ of the poet and newcomers staying in the mansion of the host Jan. The end of the poem is significant:

Pójdź, gościu, w moje progi, otwarte ci wrota,  
Wita cię stara prawość i stara prostota,  
Zrzuć zbroje i rumaka pachołkowi oddaj,  
A zwyczajom się naszym staropolskim poddaj!<sup>18</sup>

Open door at home, hospitality and kindness of the host who personally invites to the table and joint party, as Jan Nowakowski noticed, provide specific *modus dicendi* of Lenartowicz’s poetry about Jan of Czarnolas<sup>19</sup>. Let us bear in mind that the poet took this topic from Jan Kochanowski’s *Satyra albo Dziki mąż*, and refers to grumbling about the collapse of knight crafts in favour of landowning model of life. The Satyr of Master Jan complains of departing from the chivalrous ideals, and thinks that it is the reason for withdrawal from laudable customs of our forefathers. In Lenartowicz’s poem, the poet encourages to devote oneself to the

<sup>16</sup> J. Nowakowski shows that numerous threads and themes, used by Lenartowicz in depicting and describing lost homeland, are taken from Kochanowski, who best and most fully portrayed Poland. (*Pod urokiem Czarnolasu*, pp. 243-244).

<sup>17</sup> D. DĄBROWSKA, *Wykłady bolońskie Teofila Lenartowicza*, „Ruch Literacki” 2000, No 3 (240), p. 280.

<sup>18</sup> T. LENARTOWICZ, *Jan Kochanowski*, [in:] ID., *Wybór poezji*, ed. J. Nowakowski, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1972, p. 21, v. 55-58.

<sup>19</sup> J. NOWAKOWSKI, *Pod urokiem Czarnolasu*, p. 243.

old Polish customs, feast and being together. Czarnolas and its host are invaluable standards of living in the community so important for Romantics<sup>20</sup>. They are a myth of old-Polish family nest. Does the poem unveil other not mentioned traits?

Polish Republic, long past and lost together with landowners' ideals, became an important reference for Lenartowicz on the verge of his literary career. It is significant that we discuss the poem published in 1845 in New-Year publication 'Niezapominajki' with famous *Kalina*. Kazimierz Wójcicki, Lenartowicz's cordial friend, who presented him Kochanowski's artworks, noted that 'after folk song, the poet of Czarnolas was the second teacher<sup>21</sup> of Teofil. In my opinion, the two published poems (by Lenartowicz and Kazimierz Wójcicki) initiate two important trends on which the poet focus in his poetry: sometimes linking them (like in *Mały świątek* with motto from *Pieśń świętojańska o Sobótce*) and sometimes separating them clearly. Those trends are Lenartowicz original folksiness and historicity<sup>22</sup>. Various features are combined in Lenartowicz's folksiness so that it escapes direct definitions. One cannot define it with a simple opposition: folk – aristocratic, Slavonic - Latin Christian. It also should not be reduced to idyll ('hurt idyll', 'orphan idyll'<sup>23</sup>) because it presents the world of the natural integrity of a person, where a sublime sacredness is intertwined with the story of human fate that is sometimes bitter, full of pain and fear<sup>24</sup>. But it is not all! Lenartowicz's folksiness reduces the opposition of Piast – Sarmatian and gets inside historical meanings in the sequence of narration on the history of nation where Piast, Jagiellonian and Sarmatian epochs form a sequence. This is not folksiness beyond history occurring in separated residuum of national life somewhere at the beginning or on the margins. It is a historical and nationwide phenomenon<sup>25</sup>.

---

<sup>20</sup> Cf. A. ZIOŁOWICZ, *Poszukiwanie wspólnoty. Estetyka dramatyczności a więź międzyludzka w literaturze polskiego romantyzmu (preliminaria)*, Kraków 2011, p. 6.

<sup>21</sup> Quoted after: J. Nowakowski, *Komentarz do wiersza „Jan Kochanowski”*, [in:] T. LENARTOWICZ, *Poezje. Wybór*, selection & ed. J. Nowakowski, Warszawa 1968, p. 942. (Nowakowski refers to the text of Kazimierz Wójcicki *Teofil Lenartowicz*, „Kłosy” 1873, No 405).

<sup>22</sup> At late 1840s, Lenartowicz lectured on the history of Poland in a school for adult Jews in Kazimierz, and in university amphitheatre in Wesoła. Cf. J. NOWAKOWSKI, *Teofil Lenartowicz*, [in:] *Literatura krajowa w okresie romantyzmu 1831-1863*, v. II, ed. M. Janion, M. Dernałowicz, M. Maciejewski, Kraków 1988, p. 378.

<sup>23</sup> The interpretation of lyric made by Maria Janion for long has determined orphan idyll as a main feature of Lenartowicz poetry, cf. M. JANION, *Wiersze sieroce Lenartowicza*, [in:] id., *Gorączka romantyczna. Prace wybrane*, v. I, Kraków 2000, pp. 410-444.

<sup>24</sup> Folksiness is understood here as a domain of human fate

<sup>25</sup> In this sense Lenartowicz folksiness constitutes a very significant moment in the evolution of Romantic folksiness. Those oppositions played important role for most part of Romanticism.

The perspective, in the poem *Jan Kochanowski*, was slightly outlined, but it developed later and showed the author of *Lirenka* as a poet of historic culture, a poet rooted in tradition. Owing to it, he stops being a creator of the timeless world, an author closed within an intimate sphere of dreams and sorrows, exclusively, ‘singing for simple people’, a poor Masurian, Epigon of Romantics. He is the author of the following works: *Cztery obrazy* (from this cycle, especially, the poem *Wrogi*), *Szopka*, *Słówko o Piotrze Duńczyku*, *Bitwa raclawicka*, *Pamięci Ignacego Komorowskiego*, *Sowiński*, *Cienie syberyjskie*, *Sen Króla Jana*<sup>26</sup>. He is also the author of drawings, watercolours, sculptures and reliefs dominated by historical narratives: *Kazimierz Wielki*, *Jan III Sobieski*, *Szwedzi pod Jasną Górą*, *Śmierć Biskupa Stanisława*, *Kropielnica piastowska*, or (lost) relief *Zygmunt Stary*, *Zygmunt August*, *Kościuszko*<sup>27</sup>. Simplified folksiness is not an important part of his work. Its essence is not revealed by a diagnosis of ‘showing in the idyll petty existence against an idealized image of a traditional pre-freehold village’<sup>28</sup>.

Subtle but consequent and held in various ways dialogue with Renaissance personified in Kochanowski reveals in Lenartowicz’s artistic biography another dimension of this tradition. This is best proven by the above mentioned *Szopka*, published in Wrocław in 1849, where apart from traditional characters of Krakowska Szopka (The Kraków Nativity Scenes) appear Polish eminent writers and poets and heroes from history, among others, Mikołaj Rej, Jan Kochanowski, Piotr Skarga, Jan Chryzostom Pasek. One of the most significant themes of the work is national unity inheriting, beside achievement of gentry culture, tradition of folk culture<sup>29</sup>. They are not mutually exclusive. On the contrary, they constitute the greatness of the nation whose tradition they co-create. They defined the ideals and values to which Polish patriots wanted to stay faithful in 19<sup>th</sup> century and they illuminate the history of the state of which they are citizens<sup>30</sup>.

The poem *Dzwon Zygmunt* leads to the conclusion that the author of *Lirenka* had his own vision of 16<sup>th</sup> century, and that he was also an astute observer of the

---

<sup>26</sup> Jan Nowakowski mentions many of these poems as effects of innovative poetic actions of Lenartowicz indicating broad issues of his poetry. Cf. J. NOWAKOWSKI, *Teofil Lenartowicz*, [in:] *Literatura krajowa w okresie romantyzmu*, p. 390.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. *Teofil Lenartowicz – rzeźbiarz*, ed. A. Król, Kraków 1993.

<sup>28</sup> J. NOWAKOWSKI, *Wstęp*, [w:] T. LENARTOWICZ, *Wybór poezji*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1972, s. CI.

<sup>29</sup> J. NOWAKOWSKI, *Teofil Lenartowicz*, [in:] *Literatura krajowa w okresie romantyzmu 1831-1863*, v. I, p. 379.

<sup>30</sup> Franciszek Ziejka associates Lenartowicz’s *Szopka* with later *Bitwa raclawicka* by the poet, cf. F. ZIEJKA, *Złota legenda chłopów polskich*, Warszawa 1984, p. 161.

then history<sup>31</sup>. Lenartowicz knew Kraków very well. The poet used to go there, for instance in 1843, with Kolberg, as Stanisław Burkot wrote: ‘in order to increase the knowledge of the old capital, for specific repeat of the ‘missed lesson of history’ [...]’<sup>32</sup>, perhaps, for the underground activities too. The poet made Kraków the subject of his many poems; he made the city also the background of a poem about Marcin Borelowski-Lelewel. The story of Polish Golden Age together with the picture of Kraków are recalled in the poem *Dzwon Zygmunt*. Wawel Castle, Old Market Square and St Mary’s Cathedral create a symbolic and topographic map of the city. The *bell*, ‘which was named after the king’ becomes a clear emblem of the Golden Age’ in the history of the Republic. It is not only a material heritage, a valuable object, but also, and maybe above all, the witness of permanence and greatness of Polish nation:

A kto w tej dzwonu złotej dumie  
Zygmuntów wiek wysłuchać umie,  
A kto zrozumie, czym król stary  
Swe imię łał złotymi głoski,  
Czym nawołuje wciąż do wiary  
Od czterech wieków dzwon krakowski:  
Taki i pokój będzie chował,  
I ojcom hołd synowski złoży,  
I ziemię będzie swą miłował,  
I dom ojcowski, i dom boży.  
Ten ojców dróg się dowie z dzwonu,  
Tchnienie go boże przejdzie wskrośnie,  
Duch się w nim wzmoże i rozrośnie,  
I będzie wierny aż do zgonu,  
Żyw chodzić będzie po zakonie;  
Taka jest cnota w starym dzwonie.

The times of King Zygmunt Stary were special to Lenartowicz. They formed a symbolic epoch-making moment in the history to which the nineteenth century poet’s thoughts intuitively wanted to go. Developed with outstanding work of Jan of Czarnolas, it gains timeless dimension in the history because it represents a kind of synthesis of ethical and aesthetic ideals. Returning to those ideals perpetuates the belief in the uniqueness and strength of Zygmunt’s ethos and identical to Czarnolas one. The last strophe of *Dzwon Zygmunt* is following:

---

<sup>31</sup> No wonder that many of his poems have the character of patriotic agitation, confessions and declarations (*Chłopak*, *Dwa dęby*, *Wiersz do poezji*, *Wygnanie do narodu*, numerous upraising poems from 1860s).

<sup>32</sup> S. BURKOT, *Lenartowicz w Krakowie*, Kraków 1972, p. 5.

O! Janie, ojczyźnie polskiej pieśni,  
Jakież to czasy dusza nie śni!  
To gdy się serce k' nim dostroi  
W tej czarnoleskiej lip ustroni,  
Może cień ujrzę skroni twojej,  
Jak tam opiera się na dłoni.  
I może uśmiech twój dopatrzę,  
Że wiek Zygmunta, wiek bogaty,  
W takie oblekam proste szaty...  
Cóż, kiedy nie stać na bogatsze.  
I ja z mą pieśnią idę w lasy,  
A serce bije jak we młoty,  
Lecz takie pieśni, jakie czasy:  
Tyś widział wiek Zygmunatów złoty!

‘Wiek Zygmunta, wiek bogaty’ (king Zygmunt’s Era, rich era) is the essence of skilful state policy. It was the era of moral order and social harmony, the perfect economic situation was a real reference point in the history of Poland. The Romantic poet evoked this particular epoch in the history of Polish nation because, from the perspective of 19<sup>th</sup> century national bondage, it appears as a model of strong and lasting community ties just such as the nation deprived of sovereign needs<sup>33</sup>.

In the late poem *O Satyrze albo leśnym mężu, Jana Kochanowskiego powiernik* (to which corresponds the above mentioned poem *Jan Kochanowski*), Lenartowicz continues his historical reflections. Satyr, an acute observer of reality evaluates with fear, any changes and deviations of old Polish customs. He deplores the loss of his homeland, collapse of authorities and moral misery. The sixteenth century Republic with Czarnolas, the centre of Polishness, is gone forever.

Ojcowizna twoja, panie, przeszła w cudze ręce  
[...]  
Ale wieszczą w Polsce nie ma ni tych czasów słowa.  
Odmieniły się zwyczaje i postać, i mowa.  
[...]  
A tu wszystko wytoczone, wystrojone cudnie,  
Ucho to i chwali sobie, ale dusza chudnie.

Everything happens as in the original poem by Kochanowski. Satyr complains on strange and unfriendly contemporaneity. However, there is something that rescues the ideals of Czarnolas hamlet from oblivion, something that makes him

---

<sup>33</sup> Cf. A. ZIOŁOWICZ, *Poszukiwanie wspólnoty*, p. 8.



remain in human memory, in Polish national tradition: it is the work of the Czarnolas host, which is the heritage of tradition.

Wszystko poszło, panie Janie, nic czas nie ocalił,  
Pieśni jedne pozostały, twej bogactwo duszy,  
To dziedzictwo całe twoje, nikt go nie naruszy...

The poem *O Satyrze* makes a portrayal of Kochanowski as the first national poet, ideal host, landlord and Christian. One can find such a portrait of the author of *Pieśń świętojańska o Sobótce* in Bolonese lectures of Teofil Lenartowicz. Kochanowski and his epoch are their omnipresent theme<sup>34</sup>. Former splendour of the Republic and the splendour of poetry of the author of *Odprawa posłów greckich* situate higher than a sentimental, intimate retrospective. Return to the civic poetry of Kochanowski, to historical dilemmas and issues of the First Republic (for instance, through the analysis of *Odprawa posłów greckich*) makes Lenartowicz an art historian and history critic. He was ready to attribute a role of prophet, seer of Renaissance to Master of Czarnolas if only people would understand that:

‘democratic Poland would drive back the enemy and triumph over Asian barbarity. Its crown would not be found among the archaeological memorabilia in the Tsar’s museum in the Kremlin, and her sons would not have been imprisoned and tortured by the Russians and Prussians for the crime of singing the Polish national anthem, a simple song: ‘Jeszcze Polska nie zginęła’<sup>35</sup>.

Kochanowski’s artistic work is discussed, at length, from various perspectives and is placed in a particular historical context in the collection of Bologna lectures; and the poet is called ‘the father of well-developed Polish language and an inspired bard’<sup>36</sup>. Lenartowicz, however, emphasizes that he is interested in Kochanowski from different point of view: he presents him, mainly, because of his ideals<sup>37</sup>. He stresses the poet’s religiousness, his disposition exactly like the character of our nation; he can see in him a ‘true Slavic type’ and places him between other prominent people of 16<sup>th</sup> century: Jan Długosz, Marcin Kromer, Łukasz Górnicki<sup>38</sup>. He claims with conviction that ‘Poland, compared to other

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid, p. 252.

<sup>35</sup> T. LENARTOWICZ, *O charakterze poezji polsko-słowiańskiej*, introduction & crit J. Nowakowski, Warszawa 1978, p. 115.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid, p. 68.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid, p. 74.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid, p. 80

European nations in that epoch, enjoyed true happiness, peace and concord that had never been seen before<sup>39</sup>. Analysing historical context in details, he indicates a threat from Russia, a terrible monster who drowned freedom of Slavs<sup>40</sup>, which was called by Lenartowicz a page of infernal epic beginning in the times of the Jagiellonians and Stefan Batory. Lenartowicz, in one of his lectures, highlights the consideration over the artistic work of the Czarnolas poet in the following way:

Jan Kochanowski called himself the first from among the Polish who trod the Calliope Mountain. Adam Mickiewicz, Zygmunt Krasiński and others soared higher (than the Calliope rock) to the Mount of Olives of murdered nation, and from there they saw in vision the future Promised Land. Were those visions prophetic? Only time would give the answer<sup>41</sup>.

Norwid's interest in Kochanowski's poetry is slightly different. It is no coincidence that the mottoes of many Norwid's poems from the early period are the quotes from the works by Jan of Czarnolas. He was the patron of Norwid's youthful poetry, a kind of a wise man and a teacher of life<sup>42</sup>. Kochanowski was a personification of poetic genius to both young Teofil Lenartowicz and Norwid. 'Czaroleska rzecz' is an ideal of poetical speech; that is why, though it sometimes soothes pain and despair (of for example: emigrants and exiles), it is, first of all, a symbol of poetic truth. 'Czaroleska rzecz' is not the substitute of happiness but its 'difficult' variant. It does not absorb sadness. On the contrary, it deepens it and it makes readers aware of how severe might longing and separation be, like in *Moja piosnka* together with the loneliness of the artist who wants to gain his own poetical identity in accordance with Czarnolas pattern. The especial bond of poets conscious of the 'mission of the word' connects early Norwid with Kochanowski. Zofia Szmydtowa says it straight: 'As a lyricist, (Norwid) was a natural follower of Kochanowski, prone, from the beginning of his artistic work, to reflections, potential ally and lover of Horace, a would-be creator of a *Vade-mecum* series<sup>43</sup> – the heights of poetry'.

Norwid draws from the poetry of Jan Kochanowski in many ways, gradually, over the years exposing various Czarnolas threads<sup>44</sup>. Much proves that he thought

<sup>39</sup> Ibid, p. 81.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid, p. 114.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Z. TROJANOWICZOWA, „*Moje piosnki*”. *Próba nowej lektury*, [in:] *Romantyzm. Od polemiki do polityki. Interpretacje i materiały*, selection & ed. A. Artwińska, J. Borowczyk, P. Śniedziewski, Kraków 2010, pp. 79-80.

<sup>43</sup> Z. SZMYDTOWA, *Program i dyskusja literacka we wczesnych utworach Norwida*, [in:] id., *Studia i portrety*, Warszawa 1869, p. 218.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Z. TROJANOWICZOWA, *Rzecz o młodości Norwida*, Poznań 1968, p. 100.

deeply over the works of the author or the *Lamentations*. Motivic and topica of the Czarnolas poet are worked out in Norwid's poetry not so much anew, as differently. They are shown in the nineteenth century light of Norwidian concepts of happiness, poetry (art), word, community, tradition, culture and history<sup>45</sup>. Hence the theme of Czarnolas linden as a symbol of Polishness and excellence in the art is not absent in Norwid's work. It can be seen in: 'lipy cieniste (shady linden)' from *Wspomnienia wioski*, 'lipy wzdychające (sighing linden)' from the poem *Do L. K.*, 'lipowy kwiat (linden flower)' from the poem *Powieść*, or even *skrzypki z „lipy czarnoleskiej (fiddles of Czarnolas linden)'* from the poem *Do Nikodema Biernackiego*<sup>46</sup>. The topos of Czarnolas lute and songs is not strange to Norwid either, which whenever he referred to it, was to identify the sources of true poetic inspiration and immortalizing forces dormant in it (*Do Józefa Bohdana Zaleskiego*, 1847; [*Czemż bo pieśni ma być tak niepewna*]). The author of *Zwolon* is also familiar with the model of poetic critique of social issues expressed in epigrams. Norwid was a follower of Kochanowski, an epigram-writer, though he defined quite different works with this term<sup>47</sup>. *Posiedzenie*, *Sila ich*, *Pewność*, *Dobra-wola*, *Miłość*, *Pascha*, *Przeszłość i przyszłość*, constitute a considerable collection of such unusual poetic phenomena<sup>48</sup>. Norwid drew many stoic ideological threads and many literary motifs 'from artistic work of Kochanowski', as Zofia Trojanowiczowa<sup>49</sup> noticed in her classical *Rzecz o młodości Norwida*. He adored him as he adored many other people of the Renaissance, and due to them also Socrates, Cicero and Horace<sup>50</sup>. He was interested in Kochanowski as an in-

---

<sup>45</sup> For example, for the purposes of discussion about 'historical normality and abnormality', Norwid paraphrases Kochanowski in *Zwolon*. Zofia Trojanowiczowa mentions about it, cf. Id., *Rzecz o młodości Norwida*, Poznań 1968, pp. 142-143.

<sup>46</sup> Zofia Trojanowiczowa analysed the poem, cf. id., *O wierszu Do Nikodema Biernackiego*, [in:] *Rozjaśnianie ciemności. Studia i szkice o Norwidzie*, ed. B. Stelmaszczyk, J. Brzozowski, Kraków 2002, p. 81.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Z. DOKURNO, *Kompozycje utworów lirycznych C. K. Norwida (up to 1852)*, Toruń 1965, pp. 142-143.

<sup>48</sup> Some of them can be directly collated with the poems of Kochanowski, for instance Norwid's *Dewocja* with the epigram of Jan of Czarnolas *Na nabożną*. Norwid continues the genre and theme, but he is much more a radical, harsh and uncompromising Christian. He does not paraphrase as often as, for example, Lenartowicz, but he forms continuation, sets a new perspective and moralizes. He critically evaluates those who paraded with their false piety, but also those who did not do the deeds of mercy according to Christian duty. Cf. Z. DOKURNO, *Kompozycje utworów*.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Z. TROJANOWICZOWA, *Rzecz o młodości Norwida*, p. 100.

<sup>50</sup> Zofia Szmydtowa wrote: 'Suggestive, pulsing with emotions Norwid's expressions about Socrates bring to my mind the words of his Renaissance admirers. [...] Kochanowski, in his Latin elegy (I, 12), paid tribute to Socrates because his being righteous cost him his life,

tellectual, philosopher and classic. Let us look at Norwid's poem *Człowiek* from 1857, offered to his sister Paulina Suska. In my opinion, the poem in a perfect way shows Norvidian model of reception of Kochanowski. The theme of a little child was not routinely used in 19<sup>th</sup> century; thus we intuitively turn to the cycle of Jan of Czarnolas. (The poem *Ojcowski psalm* by Kornel Ujejski is also an interesting context, but this work is also stylized on Old Polish modelled on Kochanowski<sup>51</sup>.) The subtle description of delicacy of a child presented in the poem *Człowiek* has no equal among the other works of the poet. It is surprising because the lyrical sensibility of Norwid was not, as it is known, immersed in an authentic experience of the poet's fatherhood. (Differently than in the case of Ujejski, the father of Kordian, or Lenartowicz, whose son died at young age). A splendid paradox dwells in here. Norwid encounters the author of *Treny* by writing a poem not related to mourning a lost child but with a birth of a child; thus he did not write a lamentation but genethliacon, in which admiration for a gift of life 'incarnated' in a little human being is one of the most important motifs.

Znać, że i K a p ł a n, bo ileż to razy  
 Domowe swary godzi bez obraży! –  
 Znać, że i W ł a d c a, bo zwierz mu domowy  
 Pod ciosy piąstki nachyla rad głowy;  
 Pies, straszny innym, kły podawa białe  
 Jako zabawkę paluszkom różowym,  
 Ruszenia kłamię senne i niedbałe,  
 W powinnym hołdzie prawom nad-zmysłowym.  
 A d z i e c i ę - c z ł o w i e k najmniej się nie dziwi,  
 Jakby do domu Pan wrócił z podróży;  
 Uśmiechem samym darzy i szczęśliwi,  
 samym rumieńca pobladnięciem trwoży<sup>52</sup>.

---

and whenever he mentioned about philosophy or philosophizing, he always used the term *Socratic*. Socrates was, for Old Polish poet, a wise and noble man, model for others, guardian of sciences, like muses were caretakers of art. The life and thought of Socrates was admired by Castiglione and Górnicki. Norwid also shared admiration for Cicero with people of Renaissance', Cf. Z SZMYD-TOWA, *Norwid wobec włoskiego Odrodzenia*, [in:] *Nowe studia o Norwidzie*, ed. J.W. Gomulicki, J.J. Jakubowski, Warszawa 1961, p. 147.

<sup>51</sup> K. UJEJSKI, *Ojcowski psalm (After birth of Kordian)*, [in:] ID., *Wybór poezji i prozy*, ed. K. Poklewska, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1992, p. 113.

<sup>52</sup> C. NORWID, *Pisma wszystkie*, ed. J.W. Gomulicki, v. I: *Wiersze I*, Warszawa 1971, p. 271. (If it is not marked differently, further cited as *PWsz* a Roman numeral means volume, whereas Arabic numeral is a page number).

Norwid refers to the Genesis, the sacred grounds of anthropology, and he decodes three dimensions of human dignity in the newborn (King, Priest, Prophet). We cannot find it in *Lamentations* by Kochanowski, but putting aside the differences, we can see that the poet refers to similar anthropological motifs built on old traditions. Norwid's poem develops into long poetic reflections about men in general, about their growing up, choices, maturing to humanity<sup>53</sup>. From the whole perspective, the poem appears just as the interpretation of Christian anthropology. It is associated with *Lamentations* not only by the motif of parental love, reflections on the fate and misery of life, reflections on changing fortunes and false glory which is not worth seeking, but also by a stoic and Christian wisdom. In Kochanowski's cycle, wisdom resounds in *Tren XIX* and it is uttered by the poet's mother. In the work of Norwid, it is stressed especially in the message about God's childhood as the greatest vocation of human being. The golden rule of being true to oneself and to God, reconciling oneself to one's fate, but at the same time, being invincible, trying to be moderate is a common 'denominator' of the compared poetry, which is, in my opinion, strengthened by assimilated and quoted wisdom of the Psalter.

It is significant that Norwid's *Człowiek* is a poem from the same period as the poem *Do Nikodema Biernackiego*. The thematic proximity of those poems can be seen in many undertaken threads: fame, popularity and the price one has to pay for them, also in the thread of life dedicated to art, which allows the poet to expand the theme of truth: truth of art and truth in general. Czarnolas linden, of which the musician Biernacki's violin is made, obligates to a particular conduct, as Zofia Trojanowiczowa said, to 'uninhibited telling the truth about the world'<sup>54</sup>. This transparency Norwid must have found in the poetry of the Czarnolas Master.

Differently Norwid used the theme from *Treny* in the poem '*Olówkiem*'. *Na książeczce o Tunce*, in which the author 'pobrzmiwając Kochanowskich lutnię (playing the Kochanowski's lute)', surprisingly undertook the motif of death of 'sierotka męża wielkiego (an orphan of a great man)'. Norwid, in this not very long poem, showed the Martyrdom and sacrifice of Polish clergy exiled to the Lake Baikal for the participation in the January Uprising. The poet's direct inspiration to write the poem was reading a book of Fr Waclaw Nowakowski<sup>55</sup>.

---

<sup>53</sup> The poem, in the guesswork, gives answers for many questions asked by Kochanowski in *Treny*, about who Urszulka could have been, what the way of life she would have chosen, and so on.

<sup>54</sup> Z. TROJANOWICZOWA, *O wierszu Do Nikodema Biernackiego*, p. 81.

<sup>55</sup> Jan Zieliński writes engagingly about Tunka, Father Wiesław Nowakowski, and also about Norwid's poem, indicating a plurality of contexts of the poem in the text of *Tunka*, submitted for publication in *Atlas romantyzmu polskiego*. Thanks to the author's favour, I could know the text of the article earlier.

Jako gdy trąba porwie warstwę lata  
 I rzuci w północ gestem osobliwym,  
 I jakby nie był tylko sprawiedliwym  
 Twórcą-przyrody, lecz i Ojcem świata,  
 I sprawy czynił wyjątkowej treści,  
 A meteory grały Mu choralnie,  
 Śnieg rozplakiwał się i czuł boleści  
 Ludzi okutych, co w nim brodzą walnie – –

\*

Jako – (pobrzmiwam Kochanowskich lutnią) –  
 Sierotka męża wielkiego, lubo ją  
 U-pogardliwią, lubo u-wierutnią,  
 Skazuje w przyszłość drobną rączką swoją  
 I własnej zda się rokować piastunce –  
 A ludzie, czując, co jest nad-człowiecze,  
 Szeptają, iż Anioł przez niemowlę rzecze –  
 – Tak... w owej „Tunc e”!...  
 (PWsz I, 218, w. 1-16)

Orszulka's death, from the perspective of *Tren XIX*, outlines a new perspective of life, hence the exiles wading in 'rozplakującym się śniegu' (snow bursting into tears), do not fall victim namelessly and futilely. Their exile, unjust punishment for uncommitted sins reminds undeserved death of a little child initially causing objection and despair of the father, becomes a source of consolation and 'transcendent' knowledge of the sense of human existence and divine judgement.

Kochanowski, according to Norwid, was a sage and a versatile man of Renaissance (*Uwagi o „Pamiętniku pieśniarza”*), the first author who 'ludu poezje uczoneму światu uwidomił' (showed folk poetry to the educated world) (*Nekrolog Fryderyka Szopena*). He was a creator of Polish poetic language, nonpareil example, combining 'peasant' and 'royal' dimension; the double dimension that makes the native language have the power to bond community, strengthen ties, establish lasting of the nation, to set its boundary or cancel it. After all, language is a culture-making phenomenon, a binding element with the spirit of the nation. Teofil Lenartowicz also wrote about it, but Norwid wrote much more of the Czarnolas phenomenon. In *Rzecz o wolności słowa*, he wrote:

Trzeba było być duchem, pokorą i pracą,  
 I siłą, i nicością – trudem nie lada co –  
 Żeby ów polski język nie opłonał naraz,  
 Lecz jak twierdza zupełna, jak obronny taras,  
 Ruś – Litwę – Prusy objął. Zarówno w Siewierzu,  
 Jak w Królewcu wybrzmiewał albo w Sandomierzu,

Gminny, sielski, uczony – kmiecy i krolewski –  
Ten kasztelański Jana język Czarnoleski.  
Język, który na Sądzie popiołów zawoła:  
„Uwity jestem z nerwów skrwawionych Anioła  
I sądzę was od stopy do włosa, bo jestem  
Wszystkich was – razem dechem i moralnym chrzestem!”  
(song XIII, v. 23-34.)<sup>56</sup>

It is difficult to imagine a greater praise than that exposed in the cited passage of the ‘Czarnolas word’. The poet personifying it, attributes to it eschatological dimension, makes it the language of the final judgement. Maybe, he turns this language into a task out of which we will be judged because it is the language of truth.

Norwid, in this context, also writes about language in his lectures *O Juliuszu Słowackim*, slightly resembling Lenartowicz’s considerations of Mickiewicz in Bologna lectures *O charakterze poezji polsko-słowiańskiej*. Here, by comparing the works of dramatic poets, Norwid gives priority to Słowacki. He says: ‘Gdyby dramata, czyli tragedie Juliusza Słowackiego były pisane przed Kochanowskim, postawiłyby nas na równi z literaturą hiszpańską lub angielską’ (If dramas or tragedies by Juliusz Słowacki had been written before Kochanowski, they would have put us on a par with Spanish or English literature). Elsewhere, he points: ‘Kochanowski bowiem miał tylko jeden język, Mickiewicz jeden, Zygmunt, Bohdan, Malczewski i każdy z tych filarów słowa narodowego jeden – ale Słowacki Juliusz wszystkie wieków, czasów, społeczeństw, typów i płci języki miał’ (Kochanowski knew only one language, Mickiewicz one, Zygmunt, Bohdan, Malczewski, and each of the pillars of national word one, but Słowacki all languages of centuries, times, societies, types and sexes). (PWsz, VI, 459). But how significant it is that Norwid, in the cited lectures, undertaking an analysis of the poem *Beniowski*, refers to the fragment about the Czarnolas Master, and where Słowacki plays a role of a continuator, who ‘mistrz z mistrzem rozprawia’ (speaks like master with master).

Chodzi mi o to, aby język giętki  
Powiedział wszystko, co pomyśli głowa;  
A czasem był jak piorun jasny prędko,  
A czasem smutny jako pieśń stepowa,  
A czasem jako skarga Nimfy miętki,

<sup>56</sup> C. NORWID, *Dzieła wszystkie IV: Poematy 2*, ed. S. Sawicki, P. Chlebowski, Lublin 2011, pp. 264-265.

A czasem piękny jak Aniołów mowa...  
Aby przeleciał wszystko ducha skrzydłem.  
Strofa być winna taktem, nie wędzidłem.

Z niej wszystko dobyć – zamglić ją tęsknotą;  
Potem z niej łyskać błyskawicą cichą,  
Potem w promieniach ją pokazać złotą,  
Potem nadętą dawnych przodków pychą,  
Potem ją utkać Arachny robotą,  
Potem ulepić z błota, jak pod strychą  
Gniazdo jaskółcze, przybite do drzewa,  
Co w sobie słońcu wschodzącemu śpiewa...

I gdyby stary ów Jan Czarnoleski  
Z mogiły powstał: to by ją zrozumiał,  
Myśląc, że jakiś poemat niebieski,  
Który mu w grobie nad lipami szumiał,  
Słyszcy, ubrany w dawny rym królewski,  
Mową, którą sam przed wiekami umiał.  
Potem by, cicho mżąc, rozważał w sobie,  
Że nie zapomniał mowy polskiej – w grobie<sup>57</sup>.

According to Norwid, the Providence appointed Słowacki to the mission of ‘preserving language’ – the ‘all-national language’, whose model was set by the language of the Renaissance poet. Indeed, the language was a material, acoustic equivalent of truth, and not only of poetry. It was the essence of defining, always adequately to the situation, always fully reflecting the sense of reality. Norwid’s motto ‘odpowiednie dać rzeczy słowo’ is close to the significance of ‘czarnoleska rzecz’, which is also an evidence of the ‘fight’ for evangelical purity of language.

Norwid wanted to return to the situation that could be called a ‘primal’ situation of naming, determining things anew, in a sense, to return to the situation of Kochanowski, the first Polish bard. The community of these poets’ thoughts creates the bonds of times and bonds of generations, making deep ethic issue from aesthetic theme (because it concerns the language of poetry). This community also proves that Norwid entered into the cultural dialogue with the Master of Czarnolas being impressed by his work and looking for the support of universal order which

---

<sup>57</sup> J. SŁOWACKI, *Beniowski. Poema*, ed. A. Kowalczykova, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1996, p. 135, ver. 133-156.



was expressed in Kochanowski's language, poetic form, accurate diagnosis or a piece of art that he created.

Both for Lenartowicz, who stayed in a romantic world of thoughts for the rest of his life, and for Norwid - the poet going far with the flow of the post-romantic changes of the image of the world, the tradition of *Rzecz Czarnoleska* was very significant<sup>58</sup>. The myth of Kochanowski filled the need for the tradition rooted in the ideals. That is why Lenartowicz appreciated him, above all, as a national poet who 'uczuć i troski nie skąpił (didn't stint on feelings or care)' for his country, and who remained a unique poet not cutting himself from 'the sources of the folk imagination'. The author of *Lirenka* adopted the opinion of Ignacy Józef Kraszewski about Kochanowski as a 'poet of great simplicity, purity, nobility and dignity'<sup>59</sup>. Czarnolas with its great host remained a synonym of motherland for Lenartowicz, an emigrant and vagabond.

According to Lenartowicz, the continuation of Polish culture was possible due to myths and symbols. That is why the reception of Kochanowski's works and legend about him ensuring peculiar continuum of the culture sprang from the necessity of updating the sources of existence of the nation. Hence the old Polish ethos, old Polish customs as the quintessence of Polishness create one of the variants of existence for the people growing up during Paskevich Night and fulfilling their poetical aspirations when the great Romantics had already spoken their last word. Lenartowicz, after all, belongs to a generation of people who have a deep awareness of the fact that the nation would face a radical and existential bet, it would face its 'to be, or not to be'<sup>60</sup>, a dilemma that was to be quickly resolved, so that an 'imagined Polish *politeia*'<sup>61</sup> would not become a pipe dream of a handful of madmen. This Lenartowicz spirit accompanying the reading of the writings of Master Jan and the model of their reception appeared to be very fruitful, and found many continuations, like writings of Felicjan Faleński, one of the most astute interpreters of Kochanowski (especially *Treny*) in the second half of 19<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> Cf. A. BUJNOWSKA, *Życie codzienne pogrobowców romantyzmu (Teofil Lenartowicz i jego korespondenci)*, Pułtusk 2006. The author, by the example of Lenartowicz, presents what the end of the Romantic era was in the consciousness of the generation of people like the author of *Kalina*.

<sup>59</sup> S. PIGOŃ, *Jan Kochanowski w sądach romantyków*, [in:] id., *Studia literackie*, Kraków 1951, p. 68.

<sup>60</sup> B. DOPART, *Kultura polska*, p. 322.

<sup>61</sup> A. NOWAK, *Historia w wychowaniu współczesnych Polaków*.

<sup>62</sup> Felicjan Faleński writes: 'Kochanowski created Polish native poetry. He also left behind the song ultimately hackneyed. And why does he suit to our heart so much? Behold, because he

The Czarnolas phenomenon, in Norwid's post-romantic adaptation, found its power, above all, in universal philosophy of life, but also in inspired by it search for the essence of language, order and harmony. It combines Norwid's post-romantic restitution of the poetics under the reign of two kings: Stanisław August Poniatowski and Zygmunt I Stary (known to some point to Lenartowicz)<sup>63</sup> with the search for new forms of 19<sup>th</sup> century epic and 19<sup>th</sup> century form of drama<sup>64</sup>. Kochanowski, in a special sense ensured this 'long lasting' of the classical trend, which - with its meandering, changing and enriching itself<sup>65</sup> - again and again forms the dynamics of literary process and never disappears from sight of a literary historian. No wonder that while searching sources of true national poetry poets such as Lenartowicz referred to the Renaissance or like Wincenty Pol<sup>66</sup> even to the Enlightenment (the works of Naruszewicz, Niemcewicz, Woronicz).

Translated by Bogdan Malec

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

BURKOT S., *Lenartowicz w Krakowie*, Kraków 1972.

BUJNOWSKA A., *Życie codzienne pogrobowców romantyzmu (Teofil Lenartowicz i jego korespondenci)*, Pułtusk 2006.

---

extraordinarily expresses the national spirit in its numerous manifestations.. He prays like no one before him and no one after him, the fiery wings of his inspiration give an impression of great deeds; He worships with dignity, admonishes like a prophet, flogs having torn heart, Though he had seen much the world, still he loves only his thatch and field [...]", cf. F. FALEŃSKI, *Przez Felicyana „Treny” Jana Kochanowskiego studiami i przypisami objaśnione*, Warszawa 1867, p. 2.

<sup>63</sup> Jan Nowakowski noted that the novelty of Lenartowicz's collection titled *Album włoskie*, involves, among other things, the richness of forms of poetic expression and the references to the Polish tradition of the Renaissance - the tradition of Jan and Piotr Kochanowski, Cf. J. NOWAKOWSKI, *Teofil Lenartowicz*, [in:] *Literatura krajowa*, p. 389; cf. Lenartowicz's *Wiersz do poezji*. It is also an example of reaching for classical tradition.

<sup>66</sup> Agnieszka Ziółowicz writes about *Pamiętnik do literatury polskiej XIX wieku* of Wincent Pol, cf. *Historia literatury, czyli depozyt życia. O Wincentego Pola budowaniu samowiedzy narodowej*, [in:] A. ZIOŁOWICZ, *Poszukiwanie wspólnoty*, pp. 247-260.

<sup>64</sup> E. NOWICKA, *Dramat staropolski w krytyce międzypowstaniowej. Kartka z dziejów zapomnianej dyskusji*, [in:] ID., *Omamienie – cudowność – afekt. Dramat w kręgu dziewiętnastowiecznych wyobrażeń i pojęć*, Poznań 2003, p. 256.

<sup>65</sup> See. B. DOPART, *Kultura polska*, s. 324.

<sup>66</sup> Agnieszka Ziółowicz writes about *Pamiętnik do literatury polskiej XIX wieku* of Wincent Pol, cf. *Historia literatury, czyli depozyt życia. O Wincentego Pola budowaniu samowiedzy narodowej*, [in:] A. ZIOŁOWICZ, *Poszukiwanie wspólnoty*, pp. 247-260.

- BURSZTYŃSKA H., *Sądy Józefa Ignacego Kraszewskiego o Janie Kochanowskim*, [in:] *Jan Kochanowski. Twórczość i recepcja*, v. II, ed. Z.J. Nowak, Katowice 1985.
- CHACHULSKI T., *Opóźnione pokolenie. O recepcji „głębokiej” Jana Kochanowskiego w poezji polskiej XVIII wieku*, Warszawa 2006.
- DĄBROWSKA D., *Wykłady bolońskie Teofila Lenartowicza*, „Ruch Literacki” 2000, No 3(240).
- DOKURNO Z., *Kompozycje utworów lirycznych C.K. Norwida (do 1852 roku)*, Toruń 1965.
- DOPART B., *Kultura polska lat 1796-1918*, [in:] *Historie Polski w XIX wieku*, ed. A. Nowak, Warszawa 2013.
- FALEŃSKI F., *Przez Felicyana „Treny” Jana Kochanowskiego studiami i przypisami objaśnione*, Warszawa 1867.
- JANION M., *Gorączka romantyczna. Prace wybrane*, v. I, Kraków 2000.
- LENARTOWICZ T., *O charakterze poezji polsko-słowiańskiej*, introduction & critic J. Nowakowski, Warszawa 1978.
- LENARTOWICZ T., *Poezje. Wybór*, selection & critic J. Nowakowski, Warszawa 1968.
- LENARTOWICZ T., *Wybór poezji*, critic J. Nowakowski, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1972.
- NORWID C., *Dziela wszystkie, IV: Poematy 2*, selection & critic S. Sawicki, P. Chlebowski, Lublin 2011.
- NORWID C., *Pisma wszystkie*, v. I-XI, collection, text selection, introduction and critical remarks: J.W. Gomulicki, Warszawa 1971-1976.
- NOWAK A., *Historia w wychowaniu współczesnych Polaków*, [in:] *Po co nam historia?*, ed. E. Kizik, Gdańsk 2013.
- NOWAK Z.J., *Jan Kochanowski w sądach Kazimierza Brodzińskiego*, [in:] *Jan Kochanowski. Twórczość i recepcja*, v. II, ed. Z.J. Nowak, Katowice 1985.
- NOWAKOWSKI J., *Pod urokiem Czarnolasu. Jan Kochanowski Teofila Lenartowicza*, [in:] *Janowi Kochanowskiemu ziemia rodzinna. Księga referatów radomsko-kielecko-czarnoleskiej sesji naukowej 450-lecia urodzin poety (w dniach 29-31 maja 1980 r.)*, ed. J. Paławski, T. Uliewicz, Warszawa–Kraków 1981.
- NOWAKOWSKI J., *Teofil Lenartowicz*, [in:] *Literatura krajowa w okresie romantyzmu 1831-1863*, v. II, ed. M. Janion, M. Dernałowicz, M. Maciejewski, Kraków 1988.
- Nowe studia o Norwidzie*, ed. J.W. Gomulicki, J.Z. Jakubowski, Warszawa 1961.
- NOWICKA E., *Dramat staropolski w krytyce międzypowstaniowej. Kartka z dziejów zapomnianej dyskusji*, [in:] *Idem Omamienie – cudowność – afekt. Dramat w kręgu dziewiętnastowiecznych wyobrażeń i pojęć*, Poznań 2003.
- PIGOŃ S., *Jan Kochanowski w sądach romantyków*, [in:] *Idem, Studia literackie*, Kraków 1951.
- PIWIŃSKA M., *Czy Mickiewicz zamordował Kochanowskiego? Interpretacja romantycznej interpretacji*, [in:] *Nasze pojedynki o romantyzm*, ed. D. Siwicka, M. Bieńczyk, Warszawa 1995.
- PIWIŃSKA M., *Wolny myśliwy. Osiem prób czytania Mickiewicza*, Gdańsk 2003.
- Rozjaśnianie ciemności. Studia i szkice o Norwidzie*, ed. B. Stelmaszczyk, J. Brzozowski, Kraków 2002.
- SZMYDTOWA Z., *Program i dyskusja literacka we wczesnych utworach Norwida*, [in:] *Idem, Studia i portrety*, Warszawa 1869.
- Teofil Lenartowicz – rzeźbiarz*, critic A. Król, Kraków 1993.
- TROJANOWICZOWA Z., *„Moje piosnki”. Próba nowej lektury*, [in:] *Romantyzm. Od polemiki do polityki. Interpretacje i materiały*, selection & critic A. Artwińska, J. Borowczyk, P. Śniedziewski, Kraków 2010.

- TROJANOWICZOWA Z., *Rzecz o młodości Norwida*, Poznań 1968.  
UJEJSKI K., *Wybór poezji i prozy*, critic K. Poklewska, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1992.  
WALECKI W., *Jan Kochanowski w literaturze i kulturze polskiej doby oświecenia*, Wrocław 1979.  
WYKA K., *Pokolenia literackie*, Kraków 1977.  
ZIEJKA F., *Złota legenda chłopów polskich*, Warszawa 1984.  
ZIOŁOWICZ A., *Poszukiwanie wspólnoty. Estetyka dramatyczności a więź międzyludzka w literaturze polskiego romantyzmu (preliminaria)*, Kraków 2011.

‘RZECZ CZARNOLESKA’ AS PERCEIVED  
BY THE THIRD GENERATION OF ROMANTICS:  
CYPRIAN NORWID AND TEOFIL LENARTOWICZ

S u m m a r y

This article offers a synthetic overview of how Jan Kochanowski’s artistic legacy manifested itself in the poetry of the third-generation Romantics – Cyprian Norwid and Teofil Lenartowicz. This overview of the work of the two latter poets proves that Czarnolas was perceived by them as an invaluable model of community life in the 19th-century context. The Czarnolas community ideally matched the Romantic reflection on the sense of freedom and the grandeur of the Polish nation – living in the political subjection to the partitioners. Jan Kochanowski and his oeuvre was a vital rediscovery, which allowed the 19th-century restitution of the myth of the Old Polish epoch, with its turning back to the roots of the Polish language and its debate on the fundamental problems of the time. All these motifs feature in the poetry by Norwid and Lenartowicz, who repeatedly made reference to the topos of the Czarnolas lute to show that they credit Kochanowski with being a poet of the nation.

**Key words:** poetry; 19<sup>th</sup> century; Cyprian Norwid; Teofil Lenartowicz; Jan Kochanowski; literary reception.

**Słowa kluczowe:** poezja; wiek XIX; Cyprian Norwid; Teofil Lenartowicz; Jan Kochanowski; recepcja.

MAGDALENA WOŹNIEWSKA-DZIAŁAK – PhD in humanities, adjunct in the Department of Theory of Culture and Interculturalism Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw; e-mail: m.wozniewska@uksw.edu.

Publication financed within the programme of Minister of Science and Higher Education under the name of ‘National Programme for the Development of Humanities’ in the years 2016-2021.