

Wojciech Kruszeński – A HALF-WAY REVOLUTION.  
ON THE EDITION OF NORWID'S  
ARTISTIC PROSE  
BY ROŚCISŁAW SKRĘT

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18290/sn.2016.34-11en>

A critical edition gives the opportunity to have an exceptional read. Naturally, it mainly serves contact with the work. It is meant to make a text available to the reader in the best possible shape, closest to the author's creative vision, correct, a result of often many years of a researcher's consideration of literary documentation. A properly constructed critical edition also provides much additional information: about the work, its genesis and publication history, about the decisions of the author and the editors. One may thus read materials published in a critical edition in a somewhat round-about manner, in the sense of not taking interest only in its major value: the literary work, but at the same time following the art of editing. One may take a critical edition and read the work in the context of the author's biography, other important works, artistic and intellectual trends animating the given epoch. One may read it existentially, but also see it as an object of editorial activity. Due to the meticulousness given to the publication of the work, a critical edition is better for such purposes than any other. Also, since it often happens that a critically prepared text is different from what has so far been known to the general public, the use of such a publication may and often has led to revising judgements within literary history, as well as to a verification of the principles of editing work. Editions of that kind do not appear often enough in Poland. It is thus rare that a reader has the opportunity not only to learn what is new in the current state of knowledge on Norwid, but also what is new in philosophy, in the methodological tendencies which organise it, what has been discovered in the archival resources available to researchers since the last major (if not critical) edition.

Reaching for Norwid's prose as prepared by Rościsław Skręt, I tried mainly to answer the question about the editor's method. I was less interested in Norwid's work itself than I was in how it had been prepared for publication.

I read the seventh volume of Cyprian Norwid's *Dzieła wszystkie* with two assumptions. The first, negative one comes down to the conviction that editor's declarations should not be of interest to me. About a dozen years ago, when the Editing Committee of Norwid's *Dzieła wszystkie* first started work, an editing instruction was printed in "Roczniki Humanistyczne"<sup>1</sup>. There would have been nothing easier

---

<sup>1</sup> "Roczniki Humanistyczne" 51(2003), vol. 1.

than to compare the assumptions at the basis of the editors' work with what has actually been done. However, the method of deciphering decisions from a specific textual shape of the work and the accompanying apparatus seemed of more interest to me. Initial declarations, may they be the most justified ones, and thought-out in the best manner, must be modified when confronted with the pressure of particular publication problems. Hence attempts to evaluate editors by assessing the consistency of assumptions formulated years earlier are pointless. (Generally, the category of consistency – quite contrary to the common belief in the editing environment – is not really that useful in editing. This problem will be mentioned again further in this paper). Neither was I interested in rigorously assessing the editors' decisions against the decisions of the editors of the other volumes so far published within *Dziela wszystkie*. The only coherence and the only consistency I sought were confined to the bounds of the seventh volume. It was in Norwid's artistic prose that I attempted to find the reasons for specific solutions suggested by Rościsław Skreć.

The other, positive assumption consisted in choosing the category which directed my reflection concerning the volume. When reading Norwid's prose, I was looking for traces of the editor's dialogue with the great writer. That dialogue happens in the area of a tension between two poles: the tendency to impose the editor's own voice, own language on the poet (the editor inflicts a violation on the author and makes him/her say what and how the publisher wishes) versus the tendency of absolute passivity, when the publisher capitulates in the face of complex literary matter. I looked for traces of battling those temptations, which would indicate that true dialogue is occurring in the edition. When creating that space of dialogue in relation to works important for national culture, which have had numerous editions of various kinds, a scientific editor must be exceptionally careful. In such cases (one of them being Norwid's work) the editorial tradition has a strong impact on the editor. It is due to that tradition that *Pan Tadeusz* is still being published with the *Epilogue*; even in cases when the editor doubts *expressis verbis* that the poem belongs to the national epic. The impact of tradition is simply difficult to overcome in most cases. So far, no researcher has reflected on this important category. And yet editorial tradition exists, and is experienced by anyone who attempts to specify the text of a given work. The editor struggles not only with the author and the work, but frequently (and a truly painful struggle that is) also with the tradition of the work's presence in national literature. The choice alone of editing a work is caused by noting some gap in the very editorial tradition. Many decisions are made in its context, and not always against it. Sometimes, editors adopt some arrangement of their predecessors in a non-reflexive manner. It is the editorial tradition which sometimes drowns out the author's voice, and changes a dialogue into a *unisono* choir. While trying to find the space

of dialogue between the poet and the editor, I paid particular attention to the editorial tradition present in the relations, and mainly to traces of a conflict with it.

## 1. CORPUS OF WORKS

Editing problems appear already at the stage of establishing which of Norwid's works should be included in the volume. Quite aptly, the editor tried to avoid a situation where you would have a discursive treatise on silence right next to a richly illustrated anecdote on a would-be suicide of a spinster, both works of a prose nature, as it were. The main challenge to a scientific editor is to order the author's legacy – a challenge that is the greater, the higher the rank of the writer in culture. The right composition of literary matter allows to notice essential dimensions of the works, its range, multi-current nature, or its exceptional condensation. The issue, however, lies in the fact that as the aforementioned rank rises (depending amongst others on the writer's proficiency and artistic inventiveness), the inter-genre divisions become less clear, starting from the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

So far, Norwid's publishers had trouble with his prose, resulting from the need to properly classify the works. For people with little orientation within the work of the author of *Vade-mecum* these may be surprising questions, as the dilemmas seem to concern basic issues. Thus: what is Norwid's prose, really? Gomulicki published *Garstka piasku* as a poem in prose (together with other poems in a collective edition). Przesmycki printed [*Archeologia I*] in the volume with Norwid's correspondence. A similar issue appeared with [*Dwie powieści*]. The basis for the first three editions of the work (from the interwar period) was Norwid's letter to Teofil Lenartowicz. Yet already in the first printing (1935) Gomulicki published it as prose. Two successive editors (Pigoń and Przesmycki) saw the work as just a letter. Including [*Archeologia*], *Garstka piasku* and [*Dwie powieści*] in the volume he prepared, Rościśław Skręt gave a practical answer to the question of the identity of the works: they are artistic prose. The decisions of a non-epistolary character of [*Archeologia*] and [*Dwie powieści*] (even though the works originate from letters) and non-poetic provenance of *Garstka piasku* (although the work does have a distinct lyrical hallmark) are important, as they categorically order Norwid's legacy.

Even more important and fundamental are problems resulting from the need to recognise the artistic character of those works. In this case, I understand boundaries of an artwork as a group of features which are difficult to define but which allow the editor to recognise some element of the writer's legacy as an artwork. It is not easy to put that process in a set of defining norms, as the author's wish in

that scope is difficult to grasp, fickle, and also dependent on a number of external factors. What is easy, however, is noticing the consequences of the research process aimed at differentiating an artwork from what is not one. In the seventh volume of Norwid's *Dzieła wszystkie* it is clearly seen on the example of *Archeologia*. Norwid attached the prose which today bears this title (as it was titled [*Archeologia I*] by editors) to letters addressed to two different women: Konstancja Górńska and Joanna Kuczyńska. Aside of the issue of whether it is artistic prose or a letter (which was solved by the editor as discussed above), what is this work? Is there one work in two versions, or are the discrepancies between the versions so strong that one may speak of two works, two *Archeologias* by Norwid? Rościśław Skręt chose the latter option. Indeed, on reading both *Archeologias* one may find arguments to support the thesis that these are two different works – differences so significant that they would disallow a classical variant register. However, I do have strong doubts as to such a solution. In my view, there is no basis allowing to adopt the version of two separate works. Norwid placed *Archeologia* in his correspondence. Had he been thinking of printing it, however – knowing his publishing habits and his writing aesthetics (in short, Norwid was not a multi-variant writer, much less one who would write subsequent variations on a given topic) – would he have published twice in a short period of time two different works on the very same topic and deludingly similar in many aspects? Naturally, the answer is no. The decision of double publication of *Archeologia* shows the limitations of the editor's method. To make it clear, I do not see that as a proof of the editor's helplessness or ignorance. I believe that this conscious decision shows the first important element which uncovers the presence of editorial tradition in the discussed volume. In this case, it turns out to be more important than the artistic tensions organising Norwid's writings. The editor's decision fits the dynamics of writing, but not the logic of the work.

Another issue is related to ordering the prose works. In the volume reviewed here, a chronological order was adopted. The genological key, proposed by Gomułicki, was abandoned here due to the arbitrariness and vagueness of the adopted criteria. It was the right kind of decision. Naturally, a different division might have allowed to avoid certain ambiguities. Including [*Wymiana listów*] in the collection of prose translations (even if it were to contain just one element) could have given better insight into that part of Norwid's writing. Yet a chronological order has the additional value of allowing to notice the dynamics of a given writing trend, its intensification and weakening. It is difficult to doubtlessly settle which structure would have been better. It can definitely be stated that the presented composition is simple and clear and thus helps the reading, by not entangling it in unnecessary interpretational assumptions from the very beginning. The only thing which may

be doubtful is placing [*Wymiana listów*] in the volume, as mentioned above. It is not Norwid's original prose (as might be suggested by the book's composition and lack of inner divisions). It is a translation, and one whose basis is very well known, without the need to guess anything.

As to the choice of Norwid's prose works, I must declare one more thing. Along with the editor, I regret that the journal born of Norwid's journey to America has not been found. As a result, the reviewed book holds no works of Norwid which would have previously been unknown. However, the volume does have a new proposal for the prose canon, a new order, which is not a minor issue. That novelty is perhaps not a revolution, but rather a correction (like the decision with *Garstka piasku*), and an apt correction at that. The doubts as to the "double" *Archeologia* cannot change the final assessment of that aspect of the editor's work.

## 2. BASIS FOR PRINT

Text colophons often contain statements like "AMs has not survived" (*Łaskawy opiekun*, sp. 259), "AMs was lost" (*Menego*, p. 263). Why didn't they survive? Some such information should be compulsory reading for students of Polish philology, who more and more frequently do not see the connection between history and literature. A fragment of the editorial note to [*Wymiana listów*] (p. 288): "AMs, which was among the papers left by Zaleska, was lost in 1920 in Grodno". Fragment from a colophon of [*Dwie powieści*] (p. 289): "AMs, which was in the Krasieński Library in Warsaw with Lenartowicz's correspondence [...], burned in 1944". I quote the above because it may be that some Polish teacher (to-be?) reads this review – a person interested in the work itself, but not necessarily in the apparatus accompanying it. If the colophons are prepared thoroughly (like in the case of those done by Rościsław Skreń), they can also provide some solid nourishment to the reader.

Such a situation with archives further piles trouble for the editor. Twenty works have been published in the volume, and the autograph manuscripts of only eight of them exist. What is more, only seven of the works were published during Norwid's life. After 1862 (after the Leipzig edition of *Poezje*) no more prose of Norwid's was published by the author. The unpublished works include important ones, e.g. the whole prose tetralogy from the last years of his life (*Stygmat*, "Ad leones!", *Tajemnica Lorda Singelworth*, *Ostatnia z bajek*). Thus the situation is complicated and requires avoiding mechanical solutions as concerns the choice of the edition's basis. Below I present two examples, two different problems, which required different proceedings.

Completely exceptional (due to the “wealth” of documentation) is the situation with *Garstka piasku*. Two prints survive which have been prepared during Norwid’s life and under his supervision: the Paris (first) edition of 1862, and the above mentioned Leipzig edition. This editor followed the currently dominant editorial school and based his publication on the Leipzig edition. *Poezje* of 1862 were to be an important, groundbreaking book for Norwid. The right preparation for that publication was vital to the author. But the editor did monitor the text from the Brockhaus edition, however, and compared it to the first edition, which allowed him e.g. to acknowledge Gomulicki’s correction in verse 35 of the second part: “A ten cierpiał wiele lat za ojczyzną” (not “za ojczyznę” as given in the Leipzig edition). One can thus see that such proceedings are not in the least automatic, and the choice for the edition’s basis is understood correctly as a stage of work which is not equivalent to indicating the correct text. I would like to stress that, as it may not be obvious to everyone.

Another difficult situation is related to [*Dwie powieści*]. No authentic version survived, and the first two editions (Gomulicki’s and Pigoń’s, both of 1935) have significant differences<sup>2</sup>. Rościśław Skręt compared both versions with the third edition, prepared by Przesmycki in 1939. All three editions were published at a time when the manuscript was still available. Conclusions from that comparison made the editor decide to choose as the basic text for further editing purposes the first (i.e. Gomulicki’s) edition. The study of this particular case proves that the editor treated tradition as a source which needed to be approached with critical consideration and not absolute obedience. It shows that he had the tools which allowed him to verify that tradition and use it for his own, original arrangements.

### 3. DETERMINING THE TEXT

The editor’s relation to the editorial tradition is best visible when viewed from the perspective of determining the texts of the works. Undoubtedly, Juliusz Wiktor Gomulicki and Zenon Przesmycki are fundamental names in that tradition. Their interference in the texts of the works were, however, verified by Rościśław Skręt, and not simply accepted. He accepted some of Gomulicki’s and Przesmycki’s improvements and included them in the texts in the newest edition of collected Norwid’s prose (e.g. correcting *kalendarza* to *kalendarze*, *nie zważali* to

---

<sup>2</sup> Incidentally, a study of the variants of the work allows to note one thing which may come as a surprise to modern editors, convinced of Stanisław Pigoń’s absolute mastery within editing. It turns out that he prepared [*Dwie powieści*] for print either carelessly, or with quite some freedom.

*nie zważały* – both examples from *Łaskawy opiekun*, p. 260). Yet noteworthy are the changes which he rejected, as they show an interesting feature of the method of both Skręt himself and his predecessors.

The notes which accompany the text show that Gomulicki changed forms from *mostu* to *mostku*, from *najprzód* to *naprzód* (the other case along with Przesmycki, both examples from *Menego*, p. 263), from *podarek* to *podarunek* (*Bransoletka*, p. 279), from *posądzany* to *posądzony* (*Cywilizacja*, p. 285). In many other places, Gomulicki also changed the text quite arbitrarily. The fact gives the impression as if he changed from a scientific editor into a publishing one at times. Let us consider what a review of Gomulicki's and Przesmycki's text arrangements shows. To take an example concerning *Bransoletka*, p. 279: "[...] Gomulicki's corrections, changing the 1E [Leipzig edition – W. K.] form of »pędzla« (I 6) and »pendzel« (I 73) to »pężla« and »pężel«, were considered unjustified". The Polish language of Norwid's times allowed two forms: *pężel* and *pędzel*. Thus Skręt rightly decided not to standardise the forms which were correct. Further in the same sentence, the editor noted that he also decided not to change *podarek* to *podarunek*, "although the form »podarunki« appeared earlier in 1E". That is an even more important place for me. The editor clearly states that he does not follow linguistic rules consistently, that he allows Norwid's language to be like it was in the basic text, as long as that language is correct. It is of lesser importance that it appears wobbly, inconsistent. I consider that choice of Rościsław Skręt to be the correct one. More than that: considering what happens in modern editing, which is gaining the nature of adaptation more and more, I believe that such a choice is worth separate consideration. I regret, however, that this principle was not applied at all stages of work on the volume, the best example being instances of modernised spelling, as discussed below.

As concerns determination of the texts, beside verifying editorial tradition in that area, Rościsław Skręt introduced many changes in relation to the previous shape of texts. All those changes are justified and serve the text well. The new delimitation of *Estetyczne poglądy*, where numbers were introduced in order to protect the work against mistaken reading (see p. 307), is the best example of that.

I find it difficult, however, to understand all the operations on titles. Norwid's translation from French was titled [*Wymiana listów między królem Abagarem i Jezusem Chrystusem*] by the editor of the seventh volume of *Dzieła wszystkie*. In *Pisma wszystkie*, Gomulicki published the text as [*Korespondencja między królem Abagarem i Jezusem Chrystusem*]. The editor explains (p. 288): "It seems that the »Wymiana listów« adopted in the title in this edition better corresponds to the content of the text". In my view, neither title is better or worse, the change is of no significance. In [*Dwie powieści*] the situation is quite different. The edi-

tor gives the text as found in the first edition (of 1935), but the title follows Gomułicki's *Pisma wszystkie*. It seems that this particular operation is justified, as it continues a certain tradition of the work's presence in Polish culture – a very influential culture – and at the same time following the first edition (as *Powieści dwie*) would change little.

I have already expressed my conviction that editorial tradition should not be a burden, but solely a point of reference. Yet the criterion of relating to it should exclusively be correctness, understood according to the generally accepted meaning of the word and to editorial principles. If the title is correct, why change it? There already exists some tradition of the text's functioning. If it does not cause misunderstandings or misconceptions with the readers, why interfere? The above quoted example of [*Dwie powieści*] shows that Rościsław Skręt understands that, although he was not always able to avoid the temptation of superfluous originality.

#### 4. MODERNISATION

Modernising the language, quite contrary to common belief, is one of the most difficult operations on a text. What may seem a merely mechanical practice consisting in changing former spelling to contemporary one (according to a certain modernisation instruction) always founders, in fact, for detailed yet fundamental editing issues – details which so often make the editor helpless and doomed to making arbitrary decisions. The need to recognise the function of a given linguistic element and allocate it to the correct decision-making instance (the author, the typesetter, etc.), the need to see it in the right context, against a broad comparison material – all that commonly makes modernisation to a test of the scientific editor's work quality. At the same time, that area gives most opportunities for polemics. It is where editors differ most often, and most beautifully. Like I am different from the editors of Norwid's *Dziela wszystkie*.

In that newest edition of Norwid, there is one class of operations on the text which does not gain my acceptance. An editor's note (p. 257) says: "The care to maintain correctness of Norwid's texts does not exclude modernising some forms of his language, in particular phonetics and spelling. While modernising them, knowledge of the Polish language of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and of Norwid, as well as later changes concerning their stylistic marking were considered". I find it difficult to agree with two convictions included here. First of all, I believe that modernisations within spelling and punctuation are only acceptable if those features are not functional in the work, if they do not "match" artistically. I am deeply convinced that the sound layer of a literary work (phonetics, of which Skręt wrote) is an in-



tegral part of the work, regardless of whether those sound combinations are functionalised by the author or not. That is why I believe that interference in phonetics is unacceptable (at least in a critical edition). What is more, I find the criterion of changeable stylistic marking wrong. It is not only spelling and phonetics which change their stylistic marking. The word *kobieta* (woman) used to be stylistically marked in a completely different manner than today. And yet no one is looking for a replacement for the word in the newest editions of old literature due to that stylistic difference. I think phonetics should be treated in exactly the same manner.

For the same reason, I was upset over the decision to change *nareście* to *nareszcie*, *źwierzęcego* to *zwierzęcego*, *wreście* to *wreszcie*, *trwożliwie* to *trwoźliwie*, *ślachetny* to *szlachetny*, *śrebrna* to *srebrna*. Those modernisation show best what was lost and why. I have the inner conviction that Norwid was not allowed to “speak Norwid”, to speak the Polish of his own, the one he learnt in his homeland, according to the treasure of a local Polish accent, which he took abroad with him. Norwid was thus forbidden to return to his flat, boring, but *his own* Masovia. Why do today’s editors forbid him to speak his “Masovian”? Why is the Masovian hard *koketeria* (verse 26 in part III of *Bransoletka*) changed to the softened *kokieteria*, and *mystyka* (the form given in the first edition by Gomulicki) changed into *mistyka* ([*Dwie powieści*] v. 88)?

Reasons for such editorial decisions reach further than discussions in the Editorial Committee of *Dziela wszystkie*, and characterise the deepest habits of contemporary Poles: trained since school in linguistic standardisation, unwilling to speak publicly in the language of their home village, their region, actually on guard not to let anything slip. But I do like to taste those peculiarities. Thanks to a good construction of *Dziela wszystkie*, thanks to an extended collection of varieties I can commune with Norwid’s Polish (agreed: with what I believe to be Norwid’s Polish). Yet I believe shifting those phonetic forms to a non-textual position (to the rank of a variety) to be a wrong decision. (The fact that not all such interventions are exclusively phonetic in nature is a different matter. Changing *domówiał* to *domawiał* is of a different character).

Of course, absolute preservation of phonetic features of Norwid’s first editions and manuscripts may lead to some readers giving those forms a stylistic value at variance with the actual state of affairs. It cannot be ruled out that someone sees a stylistic value where there is no trace of one, where simply the language of the epoch, region, or community left its trace. Yet this is the role of other parts of a scientific edition, this is what notes, commentaries and editor’s additions serve – to ensure that the reader understands the work correctly. The text with its distinctive features (and I believe phonetics to be such) cannot be amended.

Rościśław Skręt was aware of the value of the linguistic layer. That was why he left the form *niedoperz* (p. 65), without changing it to the contemporary *ni-etoperz*. But I cannot see why he did not treat the words I quoted above with the same consistency.

Another issue are punctuation problems. Various editors had trouble with Norwid's punctuation. I see the editor's decisions within that scope as reasonable, although in a few single cases I would have decided on different solutions. I was mainly gratified to find retained many punctuation peculiarities, combinations of signs not commonly used today, e.g. ?? (p. 136), ??!!... (p. 152), or exceptional situations, like the one at p. 105: "one są sprzędami! – – Wszakże". As I know nineteenth-century literature (e.g. the writings of Fr. Stanisław Chołoniewski, older than Norwid, or of Józef Kraszewski, nearly of the same time as the author of *Assunta*), what one considers a punctuation peculiarity today, was a common occurrence in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. I have no doubt that the then punctuation was of a rhetorical nature. It had little in common with today's punctuation principles, based on recognition of the syntactic structure of an utterance.

Those punctuation peculiarities were significant enough for the editor to keep signals which in my view could have been omitted without any loss to the work, like the dashes ending some entities of *Garstka piasku*.

## 5. TEXT AND IMAGE

The absolute *novum* in this edition is the form of publication of *Klary Nagioszewskiej samobójstwo*. The anecdotal story was enriched by the poet with illustrations corresponding to the text. As a result, an exceptional textual-graphic hybrid was created, and along with it, an editing problem: how to publish that? Previously, the text was printed separately, and information about the images separately (Gomulicki's *Pisma wszystkie*), although a likeness of the manuscript did appear in the history of the various editions. The publication prepared by Rościśław Skręt treated the work for the first time in such a manner as leaves no doubts that this very hybrid nature is the integral work, that the graphic layer is not an addition to the text, but there are two strictly correlated layers.

The meticulousness of the editorial team (not just the editor) – worthy of the highest compliments – went so far as to substitute the initial *N* in the word *Niek-tórzy* at p. 158 with a copy of the initial from the manuscript. Not only the images, but even the page topography, the interrelations of particular elements were copied in print with all the care and attention due to the rarity.

It is, however, unavoidable to note that such a solution also constitutes a problem. The volume holds extensive iconographic material. One of the images is a plate showing the manuscript of *Pamiętnik podróżnego*. It looks very similar to *Samobójstwo*. In my view, it is also a text and graphics hybrid. Why then was this piece of work not treated identically as the other? Why with the *Pamiętnik* did the editor separate one document and made a specific editorial decision to raise only the textual layer to the rank of a work? The edition does not offer an answer to that question.

\*

In 2004, the Silesian Library in Katowice published a volume of Józef Czechowicz's poems edited by Prof. Tadeusz Kłak. The publication was titled: *Wiersze liryczne w układzie własnym poety*. Czechowicz never published such a volume. One of his notebooks does have a plan of such a publication: a project designed by the author of *nuta człowiecza* himself. The publication plan survived, but nothing more. The book proposed by Prof. Kłak is thus an editorial vision of the canon of the Lublin poet's texts. (Even if it is known what poems Czechowicz wanted to put in it, no one knew in what version. It is a crucially important issue if you remember Czechowicz's inclination to continuously revise his works).

I am recalling that publication here to emphasise how different the way chosen by Rościsław Skręt was. The last four prose works published in the volume survived until today as one archival set, called the epic tetralogy. It is known from Norwid's letters that the poet was planning to print those works; they were supposed to provide him with the necessary income. There is thus the temptation to act like Tadeusz Kłak, to differentiate that collection from the whole - somehow to try and stress the author's intention (visible even in the care given to the manuscript pages). Fortunately, the editor understood his calling not as substituting the author, but as keeping faithful to documentation.

The problem is difficult, but it also encourages discussion. If scientific editing is supposed to stay scientific, it has to have space for hypothesis. What is the nature of a hypothesis posed by the editor? It is clothed in the shape of a work's text. One could formulate it even stronger: the text of a work is a scientific hypothesis in editing. The collection of Norwid's artistic prose works published in Lublin seven years ago is such a research proposal within the texts' canon and shape. The problem of the supposed prose tetralogy (factual only in the archives) is the boundary which Rościsław Skręt does not cross in his hypothesis, signalling it only in the apparatus.

What can thus be learned about the dialogue with Norwid traditions as conducted by the researcher? I skip the obvious matters such as revising the decisions of his predecessors and eliminating their mistakes.

First of all, some decisions, like the one concerning *Samobójstwo Klary Nagnioszewskiej*, are groundbreaking in nature. The new manner of editing that work was possible likely due to e.g. the fact that we know more and more about Norwid's writings, more than in the years of Przesmycki's and Gomulicki's work. I believe that the decision to treat this document in such a manner would not have been made if not for the works by (for instance) Piotr Chlebowski on the album *Orbis* or Edyta Chlebowska's studies on Norwid's graphic art. It would likely not have occurred, either, if not for the reflection – present in modern Polish humanities – on the text-image relation, the bibliological code, the text as a graphic layout, or liberariness. Regardless of whether Rościśław Skręt reached for such works, the ideas were present in the humanities, creating a specific space also for editorial work. Yet the main reason why such an edition was possible is the development of printing technologies and new information technologies. Editors can now accomplish even the boldest research ideas, if not in paper form, then electronically.

At the same time, conclusions from such decisions have not been fully drawn (as evidenced by *Pamiętnik podróżny*). There was no obstacle (none that I know of) to treat the document just like *Samobójstwo*. What is more, since it was not published in a similar manner, that is a clear indication from the editors to the reader that those two works, despite their striking similarity, are actually totally different. What does that difference consist in, however? The manner of publishing those works seems to indicate that *Samobójstwo* is a textual-graphic hybrid, while *Pamiętnik* is an illustrated text.

If I were to risk a (perhaps incorrect) guess as to the reasons for such a decision, I would have been inclined to believe that the decision-making took into account editorial hesitation, the essence of which likely comes down to apprehension of excessive novelty. It was not supposed to be a revolution in Norwid's presence in Polish literature. There is a change, and a considerable one. There is, however, no revolution. Another proof of that is the modernisation issue I discuss above. Could Norwid have spoken in this edition so as to let the reader hear his Masovian heritage? He could have, but he does not. It was probably considered that readers were not ready, that Norwid could be harmed with that.

Thus I discover two features in the reviewed volume: an awareness of Norwid's peculiarities (with an accompanying readiness to present them) and a fear of revolution. Hence I see this book as a half-way revolution.

Translated by Agnieszka Gernand

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

NORWID C., *Dziela wszystkie*, vol. VII: *Proza*, part 1, prepared by R. Skręt, Lublin 2007.

A HALF-WAY REVOLUTION.  
ON THE EDITION OF NORWID'S ARTISTIC PROSE  
BY ROŚCISŁAW SKRĘT

S u m m a r y

The article is a review of the first volume of the critical edition of Norwid's prose developed by Rościsław Skręt. The review focuses on the choice of works for editing and print, on establishing the status of source texts, determining the form of the texts for print, performing language modernization and associating the textual material with iconography. Examining the actions undertaken by the editor in all these dimensions, one can put forward a claim that his work tries to follow two contradictory editorial directions. The editor developed an innovative canon of Norwid's prose and managed to avoid mistakes made by his predecessors. At the same time, one can observe that the editor restrained himself from departing too far from the solutions adopted by the previous editors. This latter tendency is particularly evident on the linguistic plane. Hence, one can describe the reviewed edition of the text as a half-way revolution..

**Słowa kluczowe:** edycja krytyczna; modernizacje językowe; Norwid; proza.

**Key words:** critical edition; language modernization; Norwid; prose.

WOJCIECH KRUSZEWSKI – Ph.D. with post-doctoral degree (habilitation), The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Institute of Polish Studies, Wojciech.kruszewski@kul.pl

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.