

ARENT VAN NIEUKERKEN

## NORWID'S POEMS AND LETTERS ABOUT ROME AND THE PAPACY IN THE CONTEXT OF FRENCH POLEMICS

In a letter to his trusted correspondent Konstancja Górską, sent (probably) from Paris in February 1852, three years after the eventual suppression of the liberation movements that emerged as part of People's Spring, Norwid explicitly linked the fate of Poland – or rather the situation of the enslaved Poles – to the uprising in Italy and the figure of Giuseppe Garibaldi, one of the founding fathers of the united Italy:

Także bajką jest, ażeby dla braku wojska Polska nie istniała; musi-ć być sporo tego wojska, jeżeli w jednym roku było:

1. w Poznańskim pod Mierosławskim,
2. w Polsce pod Langiewiczem,
3. w Austrii pod Radeckim,
4. w Węgrzech pod Bemem,
5. w Piemoncie pod Chrzanowskim,
6. w Rzymie pod Garibaldiem. (DW X, 391)

[So it is a fib that Poland would not exist due to the absence of an army; there must be a lot of this army, if in one year it was:

1. in Poznań Region under Mierosławski,
2. in Poland under Langiewicz,
3. in Austria under Radetzky,
4. in Hungary under Bem,
5. in Piedmont under Chrzanowski,
6. in Rome under Garibaldi.]

The differences in terms of nationality and ideological options between the leaders mentioned here, whom Polish soldiers apparently served equally faithfully, is a proof of Norwid's well-known thesis that Poland does not [yet] exist as a full-fledged nation/society. He attributes this to the fact that Poles lack the

necessary quality to become a real nation (i.e. a collective person). In his opinion, “Tyle i takiej egzystencji naród ma, ile i jak jest w stanie człowieka uszanować” (DW X, 391) [A nation’s existence and its kind depends on how much it is able to respect a man], yet at that time, in Poland partitioned by neighbouring powers, especially in the Congress Kingdom, it was difficult for such “respect”. The very fact of juxtaposing Garibaldi with the Russian commander and governor of the Congress Kingdom – Paskiewicz, with the conqueror of the Italian national army Radetzky, with the commander of Vienna besieged by the army of Habsburg counter-revolution, and the hero of the Hungarian uprising – General Józef Bem, shows that there is no special or positive valuation here. It is only a small link in a complex chain of sometimes perverse arguments aimed at proving the thesis that Poles, through their own immaturity, do not measure up to the height of their destiny<sup>1</sup>. This lack of maturity is not a good signal for the future, as in the case of Mickiewicz and the first generation of Russian Slavophiles (Kireyevsky, Khomyakov), who treated the – as they believed – small role of Slavic peoples in the development of the general European culture as an argument for the fact that it is due to this indeterminacy that they soon would contribute to the revival and maybe even transformation of the sterile “Romano-Germanic” culture<sup>2</sup>. In

<sup>1</sup> Polish immaturity, both in terms of nationality and society, is a recurrent motif in the entire work of Norwid and it returns, for example, in the late poem *Epizod*, in which the Polish cavalry fight “under Sadowa” on both sides: “(Zacni rodacy – rzutcy do konia i broni). / Z tej strony żółci, biali, czerwoni, niebiescy, / Z tamtej – niebiescy, żółci, biali i czerwoni” [(Good countrymen – enthusiastic about the horse and weapons). / On this side yellow, white, red, blue, / On that side – blue, yellow, white and red.], whereby their “Polishness” boils down to the pure appearance of certain elements of their colourful uniforms. The most well-known context is, of course, another late poem by Norwid, *Słowianin*: “Jak Słowianin, gdy brak mu naśladować kogo, / Duma, w szerokim polu, czekając na s i e b i e –” (PWsz II, 254) [Just as a Slav, lacking anyone to imitate, / Poders, in vast pastures, waiting for h i m s e l f –].

<sup>2</sup> Mickiewicz associates this backward “civilisation” development, among others, with the fact that Slavs have been focused on home life, which was the natural space of the family system. The ideal image of “home and communal happiness thanks to the fertility of the land, the gentleness of the people’s customs, faithfulness with which people kept the ancient traditions defining the character and mode of ownership” interfered with the progress in other areas associated with “historical” development. Thus, Slavs were not the subject, but the object of history. Their strength was the resistance to development, persistence in the “primitive forms” (A. MICKIEWICZ, *Dziela*, vol. X, Warszawa 1998, pp. 303-304), but for this reason they did not have state-forming capabilities. Their state structures were created by other nations that conquered Slavs. It turns out, however, that this “persistence in primeval forms”, precisely because it results from the implementation of a certain, though unilateral ideal, does not exclude the equally positive role of Slavs in the later, perhaps even the final stage of history, in which the “material” factors (introduced to Slavic societies by foreign peoples) transform into the spiritual ones. A projection of such a utopian perspective

Norwid's works, this lack of a distinct civilizational mark among the Slavs, and especially Poles, is only a symptom of the simple fact of civilizational backwardness, a proof of the "inborn tendency to obedience", an expression of the "imitating spirit" (DW X, 392). It turns out that all the important reforms in Poland were carried out not by Poles themselves but by the rulers of the powers participating in the partitions:

Polska w Europie:

1. *Jako Kościół* – Aleksander, rosyj. Imperator, rozstrzyga kwestię rozwodów – na stronę Rzymu przeciw Sejmowi Polskiemu.
  2. *Jako wojsko* – Konstanty cesarzewicz zaszczerpia dyscyplinę militarną w Polsce.
  3. *Jako lud* – król pruski nadaje własność ludowi i oświeca go.
- [...]
- To to jest Polska w Europie. (DW X, 391, 392)

[Poland in Europe:

1. *As a Church* - Alexander, the Russian Emperor resolves the question of divorce – in favour of Rome, against the Polish Sejm.
  2. *As an army* – Konstantin, Tsar's son, instils military discipline in Poland.
  3. *As a people* – the Prussian king gives property to the people and enlightens them.
- [...]

This is Poland in Europe.]

In this letter to Konstancja Górską, however, something else is important: already in the early 1850s, the main criterion for assessing the maturity of a nation or society for Norwid is the category of the person-man, always linked to the God-man, i.e. Christ. The vicar of Christ in this earthly world is the pope, and it was to his defence that Norwid together with Krasiński came in 1848, when after the murder of the "reactionary" – or, from another point of view, moderately liberal – minister Rossi<sup>3</sup> (Norwid described this episode in *Białe kwiaty*)

---

was the political system of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, whose historical effectiveness assumed the existence of a community of liberated spirits. However, the history showed that the system demanded too much of its citizens, but – Mickiewicz does not draw this conclusion explicitly – the fact that Slavs did not work out imperfect – but effective – systems, suggests that they would be the ones to reconcile the "letter" with the "spirit". We will see that Norwid combines the destiny of Poles with the destiny of Rome, which in the form of the papacy gave an example of an effective – also from the point of view of the logic of history – spiritualisation of the "letter" of pagan Rome (the author of *Vade-mecum* thus narrows down the Slavophilic inclinations of the professor from *Collège de France*).

<sup>3</sup> Pellegrino Rossi (1787-1848) was a well-known Italian economist (he was giving lectures between 1833 and 1845 in Paris) and tried to reform the fiscal system in the years 1847-1848 in

the Papal States. He was generally considered a liberal and supporter of united Italy. During his administration, Pope Pius IX hesitated over two options: to lead the movement seeking to unify Italy, which would entail the transformation of the Papal States into a constitutional monarchy (the pope would be the head of the federation of constitutionally governed Italian states), or to maintain a passive attitude (for fear of Austrian intervention). Mickiewicz wrote about the (disappointed) hopes that Italian patriots (supporters of *Risorgimento*) associated with Pius IX in one of his articles in *La Tribune de Peuples* (A. MICKIEWICZ, “Pius IX”, [in:] *Dziela*, vol. XII, Warsaw 1997, pp. 256-262). Rossi fell victim to this manoeuvring and on 15 November 1848 he was stabbed with a dagger by a young radical. An evidence of the good reputation enjoyed by Pellegrino Rossi in France is the fact that his murder was mentioned in “Journal des Débats” of 25 November 1848 (at that time this newspaper represented the stand of moderate, somewhat “liberal” conservatism). Upon citing a short report from the newspaper “La Speranza” justifying the murder of the minister who allegedly provoked the Roman people, the French newspaper comments: Et est-ce donc ainsi que certains gens servent ou croient servir la cause du peuple et de la liberté?” (<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k448205g.item>). The very person of Pius IX and his policy is described by “Journal des Débats” on 27 November against the background of a more comprehensive account of the murder and attack on the Quirinal as follows: “L’illustre Pie IX, ce généreux promoteur de la liberté italienne, a été assiégé dans son palais, pendant la journée du 16 novembre, par une multitude en délire, et il a été contraint par la violence de céder aux exigences d’une démagogie effrénée qui achèvera peut-être, hélas! par ses excès de perdre la cause italienne” (<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k4482077/f3.item.zoom>). We thus see that Norwid’s positive assessment of both the minister’s policy and the Pope’s conduct was in line with the opinion of the so-called political centre. The reaction to Rossi’s assassination was different in Italy, which at that time was in a state of revolutionary enthusiasm. “Journal des Débats” cites the correspondence from Rome to the Florentine newspaper “L’Alba”: La soirée qui a suivi le meurtre de M. Rossi a été une véritable fête italienne. Des rassemblements nombreux se sont formés; ils parcouraient les divers quartiers de la ville en criant: *Vive la Constitution italienne ! vive le peuple ! vive le poignard de Brutus ! vive l’Union ! vive le ministère démocratique ! vive l’Italie républicaine !*” (<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k4482077/f3.item.zoom>). A similar description can be found in the newspaper “Le Constitutionnel” of 26 November (at that time it supported Louis Napoleon who was preparing to enter the race for the post of president of the Second Republic). Both French newspapers repeat the praise of the perpetrator of the crime sung by the crowd: “Béni soit la main qui a frappé du poignard le tyran” (<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k668402v/f1.item.zoom>). Norwid, who was an eyewitness to these events, describes this episode in *Zarysy z Rzymu*: „Zabicie człowieka, który idzie usprawiedliwić się przed sądem (a może nawet i sprostować wyobrażenia krzywe), niesłychaną jest zbrodnia; sztylet, który go przeszył, rozdarł zarazem i powagę narodowego zgromadzenia, a chorągiew w lichy zmienił łachman. Deputowani zaniemieli, to ich milczenie tak naganne rzesza haniebnie zrozumiała i o t r z e c i m Brutusie (?) pieśń śpiewano wieczorem pod oknami wdowy pana Rossi” [Killing a man who goes to justify himself in the court (and maybe even correct false imaginations) is an unprecedented crime; the dagger that pierced him, at the same time tore the gravity of the national congregation and turned the banner into a mean rag. Deputies were silent, their shameless silence was understood as disgrace by the crowd and the song about the third Brutus (?) was sung in the evening under the windows of the widow left by Mr. Rossi] (PWsz VII, 14) (see also: Z. TROJANOWICZOWA, Z. DAMBEK, J. CZARNOMORSKA, *Kalendarz życia*

the people of Rome imprisoned Pius IX in the Quirinal. Although Pius managed to quickly escape from the palace to the Gaeta fortress, where he created a new “counter-revolutionary” government, for over half a year Rome itself had been governed by the supporters of the republic. Garibaldi was appointed the commander of the army of the Roman Republic. Garibaldi had just arrived in Italy from South America, where he had participated in various civil or liberation wars. The pope returned to Rome only owing to the intervention of the French, who at the beginning of the presidency of Louis Napoleon (later Emperor Napoleon III) forced the Roman Republic to surrender (on 3 July 1849). Garibaldi and his supporters<sup>4</sup> fled to Genoa and emigrated. The intervention of the French army led by General Oudinot provoked great indignation among liberal parliamentarians<sup>5</sup> in Paris (it was before the coup of Louis Napoleon, his – as the left-wing journalist Karl Marx described – “18 Brumaire”), but the prevailing argument was that the intervening French army did not let the Austrians to secure their position on the Apennine peninsula<sup>6</sup>.

---

*i twórczości Cypriana Norwida*, vol. I: 1821-1860, Poznań 2007, p. 326). As for the defense of the Pope, “Journal des Débats” emphasises the role of the Swiss Guard and the ambassadors of France, Spain, Russia and Bavaria (and even – according to “Le Constitutionnel” of 27 November – the ambassador of Holland) who stayed with the pope during the attack at the Quirinal, while cardinals and other higher ranked clergymen scattered.

<sup>4</sup> Garibaldi left the city leading his corps of “5,000 to 6,000 soldiers” exactly on 3 July (see “Journal des Débats” of 9 July: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k4484307/f1.item.zoom>). In the accounts of the siege of Rome, French newspapers often mention the presence of foreign warriors of dubious conduct. There were certainly many Poles among them.

<sup>5</sup> The echoes of these debates can be found in “La Tribune des Peuples” edited by Mickiewicz. The poet emphasises there that Pius IX did not fulfill hopes placed in him, that he surrendered to the stagnation of the Church as institution and to the materialism of Roman priests and cardinals. Mickiewicz juxtaposes the institutional church with the church of the Spirit (see his article of September 1849 entitled “*Pius IX*”, [in:] *Dziela*, vol. XII, p. 260). By contrast, Norwid’s entire intellectual and poetic effort was directed to show that the letter and the spirit are inseparable from each other. It was from this specific perspective, dictated by mystical Mickiewicz, that he evaluated the so-called “Roman question” and its significance for Poles.

<sup>6</sup> For the siege of Rome by the French Expeditionary Corps and the international context of this event, see “Journal des Débats” of 4 July 1849 (it reported on the state of affairs of 30 June when the Republican government of Rome began, against the will of Garibaldi, negotiations on the capitulation of the city). It was known that the pope (at that time he stayed in Gaeta fortress) was surrounded by many influential clerics who sought an alliance between the Papal States and Austria. Louis Napoleon could not let this happen; this would have been contrary to the “legitimate interests of France” on the Apennine Peninsula. In addition (but it was rather an ideological pretext) this would have meant the end of any “liberal idea” in the Papal States (<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k448425s/f1.item.zoom>; access date: 12 September 2017).

Norwid's attachment to the pope and the papacy, both to the person of Pius IX and to the institution, is well known. It is thus not surprising that Norwid did not change his critical attitude to the revolutionary Garibaldi even at the time when the whole of Europe admired the successes of the liberator of Sicily and Naples and the main – next to the minister of Piedmont, Cavour – originator of the unification of Italy. He did not like the fact that Poles themselves, in the hope that they would be able to repeat the Italian example, in a certain sense became “garibaldi-ists” during the January Uprising. From Norwid's point of view, this attitude was another evidence that Poles lacked their own and positive idea that would allow them to integrate into a real society. This is evident, inter alia, in their change of political preferences from day to day:

Czemu, jak się pokaże Garibaldi, zaraz Polacy garybaldziści – potem ciż sami cavourzyści – potem, jak Bij-smark, to bijźe-smarki!! – potem gorczakowowiści etc., etc. – a wszystko w żalobie i w konfederatkach!!! – „*that is the question*” (co to jest pieczęć-bestii?...) (PWsz IX, 141, list do Mariana Sokołowskiego, Paryż, lipca, 1864).

[Why, as Garibaldi shows up, soon there are Poles-garibaldiists - then the same become Cavour's followers – then Bismarck's followers, then Gorchakov's etc., etc. – and all that in mourning and in four-pointed Polish confederate caps!!! – “*that is the question*” (what is the seal-of-the-beast?...) (a letter to Marian Sokołowski, Paris, July, 1864).]

It is less about the humorous evocation of the apocalyptic context. What is more important is the diagnosis Norwid makes for Poles, both in the country and in exile. This diagnosis is again connected to Garibaldi's actions. It turns out that the leader of the Italian revolutionaries is positively perceived by a nation that lives in a state of dissipation of its social forces. It cannot focus these forces because the Polish “elites” – as we would say now – could not carry out the necessary social reforms. Or to put it differently, when these reforms, e.g. the abolition of serfdom, were carried out, it happened under foreign pressure and for the wrong reasons, and what should have been general was narrowed down to particular:

Przecież i kwestia krzyczącej do Boga sprawiedliwości, kwestia chłopów, o którą trzech Papieży po sobie idących dopominało się u narodu polskiego – dopiero jako-narodowa, a nie jako Chrystusowa podniesioną i rozstrzygniętą jest. (PWsz IX, 63)

[After all, the question of justice shouting to God, the question of peasants, demanded by three consecutive popes from the Polish nation – has been raised and resolved only as a national matter, and not as one relating to Christ.]

“Jesteśmy żadnym społeczeństwem. / Jesteśmy wielkim sztandarem narodowym.” [We are no society. / We are a big national banner.]

(PWsz IX, 63). This famous statement from a letter to Michalina Zaleska née Dziekońska [Paris, 14 November 1862], which Norwid wrote at the time when the tension around the so-called Roman question reached its zenith<sup>7</sup>, and only a few months before the outbreak of the January Uprising takes on a deeper meaning in the context in which the incarnate archetype of all personality, Christ and his vicar – the pope, support the ideal of a society based on “family” and supranational relations. The idea of justice and social equality constitutes here a synthesis of Roman pagan universalism and evangelical message which, through the sacrifice and martyrdom of many individuals-persons, transformed the order of conquest and oppression into “Osobę jakąś wielką” [a great Person] who “jest gdzieś w Społeczeństwie:/ Czoło ma w gwiazdach, stopę – czerwoną w męczeństwie” [is somewhere in the Society: / has their forehead in stars, foot – red in martyrdom] (DW IV, 242-243, *Rzecz o wolności słowa*). That is why Norwid believes that only the pope can be his rightful ruler. From the point of view of the author of the poem *Na smętne wieści z Watykanu*, Pius IX, who escaped from the Eternal City to Gaeta a few days after the attack on the Quirinal, did not disappoint the Romans’ hope of democratic reforms and joining the struggle for the unification of Italy, but shared the martyrdom of the oppressed nations, in particular the Polish nation. Thus, what most monarchs experience on their deathbed does not refer to the dying prisoner of the Vatican (the poem *Na smętne wieści z Watykanu* was written in December 1877):

Atoli ówdzie, w cichym Watykanie,  
 Żaden lud z piersią nie stanie rozdarta,  
 „Władałeś!... – grożąc – a wiesz co wygnanie?  
 Co praw-odjęcie!” [...]

(PWsz II, 231)

[Howbeit elsewhere, in the quiet Vatican,  
 No people will stand with a bare breast,  
 „You ruled!... – threatening – and you know what is exile?  
 What is depriving of rights!” ...]

---

<sup>7</sup> The day before, in another letter to the same addressee, he mentioned “Garibaldi’s wound”, informing that “siedemnastu doktorów otacza go, ale dotąd i kula nawet nie wyciągnięta” [seventeen doctors surrounds him, but so far the bullet has not even been extracted] (PWsz IX, 62). Garibaldi was wounded in the Battle of Aspromonte, in which his supporters were defeated by the army of the new Kingdom of Italy. This defeat thwarted the attempts of the leader of the Italian Republicans to take control of Rome.

During his stay in Gaeta Pius IX learned (at least this is how Norwid interprets the history of his pontificate) to look at the world from the perspective of an exile. He was deprived of his rights when in 1870 the army of the united Kingdom of Italy entered Rome. It was in this sense – in a letter from the beginning of December 1862 to Joanna Kuczyńska – that Norwid could write:

Jak wiadomo Pani, jestem obywatelem rzymskim – *civis romanus sum* – Władzca Rzymu jest moim monarchą – nie wiem przeto bynajmniej, jakie są urządzenia w Polsce, i nie wiem, jakie cenzury są prawa, ani wiedzieć tego nie mam obowiązku, będąc Rzymianinem, choć w Polsce urodzonym – tak jak niegdyś Paweł Apostoł Żydem z urodzenia był, a jednakże prawo obywatela rzymskiego obowiązywało go. (PWsz IX, 64)

[As you know, I am a Roman citizen – *civis romanus sum* – The Ruler of Rome is my monarch – hence, I do not know what provisions are in Poland, and I do not know what laws are censored, nor do I have an obligation to know them, being a Roman, though born in Poland – just as Paul the Apostle was a Jew by birth, and yet the law of a Roman citizen applied to him.]

The personal sufferings of the highest priest of Christianity authenticate his charisma as the ruler of Rome. The pope's authority, based on the sacred history and fate of the apostles, precedes the "modern" division of power into two spheres: "secular" and "spiritual". According to Norwid, all authentic authority is rooted in the sacred and constitutes a kind of priesthood; one should note, however, that for Norwid these concepts have a much wider scope than in common interpretations<sup>8</sup>.

---

<sup>8</sup> Quite an unexpected ally of Norwid in the defence of the papacy against both Republicans and the followers of the Piedmont dynasty was the French socialist and anarchist Pierre Joseph Proudhon. The authors of *Kalendarz Życia i Twórczości Cypriana Norwida* have already pointed out that Norwid knew his journalistic texts on the unification of Italy, in which Proudhon stressed the special importance of the Roman question for entire Europe (Z. TROJANOWICZOWA, Z. DAMBEK, J. CZARNOMORSKA, *Kalendarz...*, vol. I, pp. 97-98). A particularly important context (not mentioned in the *Kalendarz*) seems to be Proudhon's remarks on the papacy, published in the article *Mazzini et l'unité italienne*. The author declares himself there as an opponent of the papal power and Catholicism ("Je suis aussi peu gibelin que guelfe; je ne crois pas plus au renouvellement du pacte de Charlemagne qu'à la résurrection de la chevalerie" – P.-J. PROUDHON, *La Fédération et l'unité en Italie*, Paris 1862, p. 34), but he also notes that from the point of view of the stability of the Second Empire, which he – though – deems ultimately to be doomed to failure, he nevertheless treats as an attempt to resurrect the universal Christian empire of Charlemagne, because the alliance between the pope and the emperor is indispensable. According to Proudhon, Mazzini realises that the ultimate guarantee of the power of European monarchs is precisely the existence of the papacy in its capital – Rome. The abolition of the Papal States would not be a problem if the Universal Empire existed in its medieval form. However, this is not the case and Proudhon proves that the incorporation of the Papal States into one of the many national kingdoms would destroy the charisma of the alliance between the throne and the altar as the legitimate imperative of imperial power, which cannot be national but must be universal (in this sense, around 1860, two states were fighting for



The priesthood of Pius IX is, as it were, updated by his decisions and fate as the head of Christianity. The pope became a true priest (this is the main theme of *Zarysy z Rzymu*) during the period of anti-papal riots which immediately preceded the founding of the Roman Republic:

Nie Rzym przez Rzymian postawiony, ale Rzymianie przez Rzym z różnych zbudowani są plemion. I jak przed Zbawicielem przez ideę wszechmocny, tak po Zbawicielu przez Wszech-Miłość społeczeństwo się to utworzyło.

Na tej drodze jedynie postępować może z mocą wielką i nie zawodząc się na próżno, zwłaszcza iż Vice-Chrystus (o ile sądzić Go nam wolno) nie okazał się wcale oddalonym od sprawiedliwych wieku potrzeb<sup>9</sup>. (PWsz VII, 12-13)

dominance in Europe – according to Proudhon – legitimate heirs to the idea of Charlemagne, France and Austria). That is why Mazzini desperately wanted to destroy the pope's "secular power": "Mazzini [...] veut Rome, et de suite. Il traite d'hypocrites ceux qui, plus soumis à l'autorité du souverain Pontife à l'égard du spirituel. Il comprend, comme Napoléon I<sup>er</sup>, que si le Saint-Père est le roi du spirituel, il est le roi de l'univers" (P.-J. PROUDHON, *La Federation*, p. 22). The theocratic idea lost all its vitality and it had to be replaced by another idea, namely the sacralisation of the nation. However, Proudhon believed that Mazzini's slogan "Dio e popolo" is just another "metaphysical" illusion that would do even more damage than the previous alliance tout en insistant pour l'abolition du temporel, se montrent autant between the throne and the altar (in this context he also points out that in the past the "secular" monarchs, fighting against the papacy, had, in a sense, dug their own grave. In fact, Proudhon rejects Mazzini's (and Garibaldi's) republicanism because he thinks it is grounded in national egoism. Therefore, republicanism, similarly to the patriotism of Poles who slavishly imitate "Mazzinism" and Garibaldism, is above all a "great national banner" obscuring important European problems which are of social nature and concern mainly the material poverty of the proletariat. In this context Proudhon mentions Mazzini's rejection of the Poles' requests to combine the Italian and Polish questions. Justifying his refusal, the Italian conspirator referred to the class difference between the Polish aristocracy and Italian democracy. Proudhon continues: "Fort bien, s'il ne s'agit que de réformes économiques et l'émancipation du prolétariat. Mais nous venons de voir qu'en Italie la question était tout unitaire [subsequently, the French anarchist tries to prove that the federal system would suit better the Italian traditions and customs as well as the regional diversity of Italy] et nationaliste; pourquoi donc repousser les Polonais?" (PROUDHON, *La Federation...*, p. 44). Interestingly, in these reflections on Mazzini, Garibaldi, Rome, Venice, and also generally on the European political system, Proudhon – just like Norwid – completely disregards the meaning of Prussia and England. He is convinced that the future of Europe depends only on Napoleon III, whose decisions he personally – but unsuccessfully – tried to influence.

<sup>9</sup> From this sacral perspective, the fate of the papal minister Pellegrino Rossi is also transformed. Norwid realised that due to his stay in France, Rossi lost his roots in his native country ("Co do osoby pana Rossi, wedle otaczających go warunków, trzeba wyznać, iż ten obywatel długi przeciąg czasu pozostawał za obrębem narodu (na wygnaniu) – i że przy mnóstwie wiadomości, które tamże zaskarbił, i przy praktyce w rzeczach stanu, przy godnościach wreszcie, jakich doszedł, stracił zarazem ten zewnętrzny narodowości akcent, który – w sobie małą będąc rzeczą – w chwilach jednak drażliwych przybiera postać obowiązku i do obywatelskich cnót się liczy")

[Rome is not built by Romans, but Romans by Rome are built of different tribes. And as before the Saviour the society was created through the idea of omnipotence, so after the Saviour it was through Omni-Love.

This road may be taken only with great power and without disappointment in vain, especially since Vice-Christ (if we are allowed to judge Him) did not at all turn out to be distant from the just needs of the time.]

According to Norwid, it is for the defence of the “just needs of the time” that Pius IX was forced to flee from the Eternal City, becoming an exile for some time. From this perspective, the murder of Pellegrino Rossi proves the lack of understanding of these needs, or the regression in relation to the pre-Christian age. This was to be proved by the fact that people spontaneously compared this disgraceful act to the murder of Julius Caesar by Brutus. The people prove in this way that they just do not understand – or rather misunderstand the needs of the time. In the context of the sacred history “Nie ma nic smutniejszego, jak wywlekanie larw z przeszłości ku odwdzięczeniu rzeczy nędznych obecnego żywota – wywoływać cienie z miejsc milczenia, by uprzętały kał uliczny, jest szatańską robotą!” (PWsz VII, 14) [There is nothing sadder than dragging larvae from the past to repay the miserable things of the present life –summoning shadows from the places of silence to clean up the street excreta is Satan’s work!]. It happened because “Czasy, ponieważ są czasami, a nie pełną wiecznością, ile razy ideę swoją mają, i głupstwo swoje mają także [...]” (PWsz VII, 15) [Times, because they are times, and not the entire eternity, how many times they have their sense, and they also have their own nonsense...]. Norwid associated the solution to the Roman question proposed by garibaldists and Mazzini’s supporters (i.e. the separation of the state from the Church and the degradation of the pope to the rank of

---

(PWsz VII, 14-15) [As for the person of Mr. Rossi, according to the conditions surrounding him, it must be admitted that this citizen stayed outside of his nation (in exile) for a long period of time – and despite a multitude of messages which he had gained there, and his practice in the affairs of the state, and finally the honours he achieved, he also lost this external feature of his nationality, which – being small in itself – in sensitive moments takes the form of duty and counts among the civic virtues]. However, he expiated everything with his martyr’s death, while Pius IX met with ingratitude of the Roman people. According to his custom, Norwid associated these experiences, precisely because they were “personal”, with the sacred history and also with the fate of Socrates: “O niewdzięczności, jakiej doznał najświętobliwszy ludzi Ojciec, mówić tyle nie będę, ile o śmierci pana Rossi; przypisuję to bowiem, albo raczej policzam, do osobistych jego rzeczy. Człowiek serca wielkiego nie może minąć się z Kalwarią, ani usta stworzone do błogosławieństw Chrystusowych – z octową gąbką lub cykutą...” (PWsz VII, 15) [I will not say as much about the ingratitude experienced by the holiest people’s Father as I will about the death of Mr. Rossi; I attribute it, or rather, I count it to his personal things. The man of great heart cannot pass by Calvary, nor the mouths created for Christ’s blessings can miss the vinegar sponge or hemlock... ].

the Bishop of Rome) with the turbulent history of Rome in the years 1848-1849, to which he was – at least at the beginning – an eyewitness. Perhaps that is why his assessment of Garibaldi may sometimes be unfair.

Many of Norwid's friends did not understand his position in this matter, mistakenly treating his opposition to the Roman Republic in the years 1848-1849, and then his defence of the papacy against the idea of the united (and secular) Kingdom of Italy as evidence that the poet was a supporter of the pope's secular power. However, Norwid's attachment to the papacy as a principle linking the letter with the spirit (I ignore his personal worship of the person of Pius IX) resulted from the deep conviction that nations can be organisms in which all social groups cooperate with each other only with reference to the idea of apostolic succession. Only then would the social energy not be wasted in the narrowly understood "ethnic" conflicts – though, precisely in the case of Poland, which has been subjugated by its neighbours, such social solidarity did no longer exist.

According to Norwid, the problem of enslaved Poland consisted, first of all, in the fact that the idea of the nation and the postulate of freeing it from foreign force was not sufficiently connected with the ideal of Christian social solidarity deriving from the Middle Ages, but it was undoubtedly universal. No wonder that Poles, who – according to Norwid – are the last society on the globe, and the first nation on the planet (PWsz IX, 63), may have seen as attractive the attempt made by garibaldists to deprive the pope of monarchical, earthly power, and to establish Rome as the capital of a new, secular and national Italian kingdom under the rule of Victor Emmanuel (at the same time, the large differences between various regions of Italy, of which Norwid was perfectly aware, were largely neglected). Nations subjugated by foreign countries tend to fall into a state of social self-enslavement. An important reason for the inability to cope with this enslavement turns out to be the illusion that the question of nationality can be separated from the wider question of struggle for social solidarity, for overcoming the system in which one social group is legally subordinated to the other. "[P]atriotyzm-chrześcijański" [Christian patriotism] (see the poem *Do władcy Rzymu*, which Norwid wrote in the summer of 1862, i.e. in the period when the so-called "Roman question" threatened with the outbreak of a European war) is not about "nieuszanowanie osoby tej lub owej, ani władzy tej lub owej" [disregarding *this or that person, or this or that power*] but about the respect for "*osoba-człowiek*" [the *person-man*] (DW X, 390).

This one-sided Polish patriotism, which absolutizes the particularist category of the nation, can also be combined with another negative phenomenon in social development, related mainly to the so-called higher classes. European "community", i.e. the so-called upper classes, as well as the Polish aristocracy, loved

Garibaldi, but the reasons for this veneration was not a good prognostic for the future of the country. This is the topic of a part of the letter to Joanna Kuczyńska, written a little earlier, in August 1862:

A proszę mi powiedzieć, czyli wiele się znajdzie osób do tyła uosabiających całą społeczność? Tę społeczność piękną profilem swoim, silną biustem, tę społeczność rysującą się na pieniądzu jako Republika, Cesarstwo, Państwo, Anarchia; kochającą się w Stolicy Apostolskiej, w Proudhonie, w Mierosławskim, w Lamartine, w telegrafach, w kręceniu stołów, w rozsądku i ekonomii politycznej, w Świętym Ignacym, w krynolinach itp. Rano to, wieczorem owo; w Piątek tamto, w Niedzielę na kazaniu [...]. Dziwię się, że Garibaldi dotąd nie należał do onych wybranych – Garibaldi, który, zdaje się, że jest przeznaczonym, aby panował wiekowi temu i był *l’homme de la Providence du XIX siècle par une raison très simple, car il a été épicier et corsaire!* (PWsz IX, 49-50, Paryż, około sierpnia 1862).

[And please tell me, is there many people who would embody the entire community? This beautiful society with its own profile, strong breasts, this community that appears on money as the Republic, Empire, State, Anarchy; in love with the Holy See, Proudhon, Mieroslawski, Lamartine, telegraphs, turning the tables, common sense and political economy, Saint Ignatius, crinolines, etc. This in the morning, that in the evening; yet that on Friday, during the sermon on Sunday [...]. I am surprised that Garibaldi has not belonged to those chosen ones – Garibaldi, who seems to be destined to rule this age and to be *l’homme de la Providence du XIX siècle par une raison très simple, car il a été épicier et corsaire!* (Paris, around August 1862).]

Politics, religion, ideology, technical development, entertainment and even spiritism are combined here with no real (i.e. spiritual) integrating factor (unlike Pius IX and Pellegrino Rossi, Norwid does not see the possibility to find a place for Garibaldi in the sacred history<sup>10</sup>). This society (“community”) is not so much torn apart, but rather atomised, and its guiding principle is having fun. For Garibaldi, the most fanatical supporter of making Rome the capital of the national Kingdom of Italy and the potential (or indeed true) hero of such society, Norwid envisaged two anti-heroic roles *par excellence*: a shopkeeper and a pirate (the second role is certainly an allusion to his Sicilian expedition in 1859, which stirred enthusiasm in the major part of the public opinion in Western Europe). It seems to be a sign of the times (cf. “pieczęcią-bestii” [seal-of-the-beast] – a letter to Marian Sokołowski, PWsz IX, 141) that contemporaries noticed a “pirate” (judging him positively, “romantically”), but the other role (of a “shopkeeper”) was omitted in silence. Both of these roles, however, exclude heroism in the

---

<sup>10</sup> However, in the collective Italian imagination Garibaldi was often compared to Christ (see L. RIALI, *Garibaldi: invention of a hero*, New Haven 2007, pp. 149-150).

Norwidian sense. Hence, it is impossible to compare Garibaldi with Moses, who “wiek blisko przeżywszy, powstawa / Wyswobodzicielem ludu – / Heroizm czysty wcześniej nie dostawa, / I nie dostawa – bez c u d u!” (PWsz II, 106) [having lived for almost a century rises / As the Liberator of the people – / Pure heroism does not suffice early on, / And it does not suffice – without a miracle!].

Garibaldi, or rather the attitude to him of people from various environments, in particular those from the upper class, epitomises the process of alienation, typical of European societies of the “age of trade and industry”. Events in the field of politics, culture and everyday life are isolated (by the “press”) from the original context (which would allow to place them – as positive or negative – in the sacred history), are subject of “vulgarisation” and “flattening”. This causes self-enslavement of individuals and societies. Such “entertainment-oriented” – as we would say today – view allows us to combine everything with anything, because the hierarchy, in which these elements, representing various aspects of historical and social life, had their specific places, became vague. However, Norwid’s poetics of friction and fracture sets itself a goal – not only in artistic poetry and prose, but also in letters – to re-establish this hierarchy. This hierarchy is ultimately rooted in the sacred and that is why the so-called “Roman question” was so important to Norwid.

Garibaldi, the supporter of Rome as the capital of one “national” state, and the opponent of Rome as the spiritual capital of the Christian world, represents – from Norwid’s point of view – a stance that is very harmful to the future of Poland. That is also why the author of *Improwizacja na zapytanie o wieści z Warszawy* is deeply concerned about the popularity of the leader of the Italian Republicans on the eve of the outbreak of the January Uprising. Above all, he is afraid of associating the manifestations that took place in many cities of the newly unified Italy at the turn of January and February 1862 with peaceful manifestations in Warsaw at the beginning of 1861. An element connecting Warsaw demonstrations with the movement seeking to take Rome away from the pope might seem to be their spontaneity. During the Roman Carnival at the end of February 1862, manifestations against the secular power of the pope spread also to Rome. The order in the Eternal City was guarded not only by the papal police, but also the French gendarmerie (it should be remembered that in July 1849, the French banished from Rome the supporters of the republic commanded by Garibaldi and became the guarantors of the “earthly” papal power, although not in the interests of papal universalism – only the old anarchist Proudhon understood the importance of the papacy for the survival of the Second Empire – but above all for the balance between the European powers). In the newspaper “Le Temps” of 18 February 1862 we may find the full text of an appeal of the (underground) national committee of Rome addressed to the residents of the city (a summary of this manifesto was placed in “Journal des Débats”). It

can be assumed that many readers – especially Polish emigrants – associated this committee with similar organisations in Poland on the eve of the January Uprising. In this manifesto, the committee expresses their hope that at the moment, when the question of the secular power of the papacy is close to being resolved, during the manifestations, “which will certainly take place at the carnival”, the residents of Rome should abstain from all acts that would show disrespect to the pope and the Catholic faith:

Il est important, en un mot, que chacun de vos actes soit une preuve nouvelle de ce que vous restez catholiques sincères, en même temps que vous ne voulez pas qu’on entrave votre droit d’être Italiens.

(In a word, it is important that each of your actions be a new proof you will remain faithful Catholics, but at the same time, you do not want to have your right to be Italian restricted.)

The point is that in this “close” resolution of the Roman question, the state was to be separated from the Church, since in the secularised society the head of the Catholic Church cannot simultaneously be an earthly ruler. However, the Catholic faith itself was to retain its privileged position. By approving the new peaceful patriotic manifestations in the Eternal City and even calling for them, the committee thus appeals for an attitude that is “conciliatory and which unites in the heart [ideals] of the Church and the homeland, faith and freedom”. The manifesto ends with the following exclamation:

Vive le Pape non roi! Vive Victor Emmanuel II, roi d’Italie!

Rome, le 6 février 1862

« Le comité national romain. »

As matter of fact, a few weeks later, at the end of February, peaceful demonstrations took place in Rome, which supported the aspirations to deprive the pope of his earthly power and to incorporate the city to Italy as its capital. The echoes of these “anti-carnival” protests (concerning the manifestation that took place on 25 February, the accounts of it are rather scarce, which may be related to the censorship in France of Napoleon III) are found in the French press, for instance, in a short mention in the newspaper “Le Temps” (2 March 1862):

Le comité national a invité les Romains à quitter les réunions du carnaval pour se rendre au Forum, siège de la grandeur antique. De nombreux rassemblements ont obéi samedi à ce mot d’ordre sans pousser aucun cri.

La gendarmerie française et la gendarmerie pontificale ont fait évacuer le Forum. Aujourd’hui, les rassemblements ainsi que les précautions continuent. Des arrestations ont été opérées. [...]

(The national committee urged the Romans to leave the carnival and go to the Forum, the symbol of the ancient grandeur. On Saturday, many meetings adapted to this day's motto, while remaining silent. The French and pontifical gendarmerie evacuated the Forum. Yesterday these meetings were continued with precaution measures still in place. Arrests are in progress).

Interestingly, in another reference to the peaceful manifestation in Rome, the French newspaper mentions the attempts of Archbishop Feliński to obtain from the authorities of the Congress Kingdom the right to return for Polish clerics sent to Siberia. In the so-called "Bulletin du jour", which is a summary of the most important events of the day, "Le Temps" also mentions the consequences of depriving Ernest Renan of the chair of comparative linguistics for insulting religious feelings. The newspaper defends the author of *The Life of Jesus* (although the book was published only a year later), stressing that "the professor of Collège de France managed to talk about Jesus Christ in the same categories as about St Peter, without offending religious feelings". This wider context seems to be important to Norwid's comments on this "anti-carnival manifestation", which constitute the sole content of his letter to Aleksander Jełowicki, the head of the Congregation of the Resurrection.

In this letter, Norwid juxtaposes nations that were Christian from the very beginning (e.g. Poles; thus, from Norwid's point of view, the Polish nation was established only after the baptism) with the "older" nations, which initially, already having certain national identity, were pagan and only in the course of their history they converted to Christianity. The very manner in which Norwid presented this opposition is so significant that it is worth quoting it in its entirety:

[...] tylko u narodów, których istota tradycyjnego wątku, tak na polu cywilnym, jak i na polu religijnym jest jedną i tąż samą – tylko, mówię, u ludów, których byt równocześnie i bliźnięco z Chrześcijaństwem się rozpoczął; tylko, powtarzam, u tych ludów wierzę w możebność natchnień postępowo-tradycyjnych. I jakkolwiek z takowego niepokalanego trybu rzeczy nie wyłączam i ludów starszych (to jest ludów, które dwie cywilizacje: pogańską i chrześcijańską, przechodziły), nie przeto jednak każdy baczny umysł od razu pojmie, jak dalece słuszniej jest ufać onym raczej masom ludowym, których historyczność i chrześcijaństwo jedno-promiennie wzeszły i wzrosły.

Pierwsi dziadowie nasi od Ś-o Wojciecha tak samo zaczęli boje od pieśni-nabożnej, jak i my dziś, w Warszawie, od pieśni i o pieśni poczynałiśmy – to jest proste i nieledwie pewne, jak wszelaki *monolit*!

Ale, jakkolwiek Rzym od parabolicznie porwanego w niebo Romulusa i od kapłana Numy-Pompiliusa, który sybilijskich słuchał natchnień – słowem: od początku swego i przez cały ciąg pontyfikalnego-senatu i patrycjatu ZAWSZE BYŁ KAPŁAŃSKI!... – z jednej strony wszelako dzisiejsi historycy nigdy nie uprzytomniali

publiczności tej strony dziejów rzymskich, bo historia zaczęła być nauką w czasach rewolucyjnych i jest jeszcze pamfletem; z drugiej strony podmuchy namiętne, które dziś nie pozwalają dojrzeć żadnym pierwocinom wszczynającego się na świecie patriotyzmu-chrześcijańskiego, powodem są, iż mniemam, że obowiązani jesteśmy nie tylko już sercem i duchem przy osobie Ojca Ś[wię]tego obstawać, ale nawet publicznie zbiorową naszą w tej mierze modlitwę uwydatnić. (PWsz IX, 14)

[... only for nations, whose essence in the area of tradition, both civil and religious, is one and the same – only, I say, for peoples whose history started simultaneously and close to Christianity; only, I repeat, for these peoples I believe in the possibility of progressive and traditional inspirations. And although from this immaculate mode of things I do not exclude the older peoples (that is peoples who have experienced two civilisations: pagan and Christian), not every watchful mind will immediately understand how much better it is to trust the masses of people whose historicity and Christianity in one way have risen and developed.

Our first grandfathers of St Adalbert were starting the battles with a religious song, just like we today in Warsaw, with song we started – it is simple and almost as sure as any *monolith*!

But, starting from Romulus parabolically taken to the heaven, the priest Numa Pompilius who listened to the Sybilian inspirations – in other words: from the very beginning and throughout the series of pontifical-senate and patriciate, Rome WAS ALWAYS PRIESTLY!! ... – on the one hand, today’s historians have never brought this side of the Roman history to the attention of the audience, because history began to be a scientific discipline in revolutionary times and it is still a pamphlet; on the other hand, passionate gusts of breeze, which today do not allow any to mature all those germs to Christian patriotism emerging in the world, are the reason for me to believe that we are obliged to stand by the Holy Father not only with our heart and soul, but also to publicly express our prayer in this regard.]

The superiority of spontaneous manifestations of the people in Warsaw in 1861, numerous holy Masses for the homeland, singing pious songs, etc., over the protest of the Roman people who on 25 February 25 went in a peaceful manifestation to the ruins of its ancient, pagan, pre-Christian grandeur<sup>11</sup>, is based on the fact that the people of Warsaw did not allow a schism in the Christian foundations of the Polish national identity. The residents of Warsaw did not see any contradiction between the aspirations of independence and the universal message of the Catholic faith, personified by the Catholic clergy. The Roman people are different, but it must be admitted (Norwid does not emphasise this problem here) that modern Romans found it harder to read the signs of the time than the people of

---

<sup>11</sup> This refers to a silent procession to the Roman Forum which is mentioned in “Le Temps”; hence we deal here with a similar – but peaceful – way of “reverse” thinking as in the case of the murder of the papal minister Rossi, the act compared to the heroic act of Brutus).



Warsaw, because the history of their nation was not a “monolith”, but consisted of two civilisations: “pagan” / (and) “Christian”. Unlike Norwid, the Roman “protestants” treated the opposition between ancient Rome with its imperial grandeur and present Rome as absolute. In their opinion, the latter was merely the capital of the once universal, but in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century weakening faith in the God-man (Christ, who through scientific research in critical theology, with Renan as its articulate spokesperson at the head, deprived of his divinity). The past of Italy and, above all, of Rome was great. The state was pagan at the time, and the present day seems miserable by comparison. In 1862, the state is ruled not by an emperor but by a priest<sup>12</sup>. After accepting such premises, one must reject not so much Christianity (this would be undesirable, even if only for tactical reasons, because the main ally of the Kingdom of Italy – France of Napoleon III, this “conservative-liberal” empire – “*L’empire conservateur et libéral*”<sup>13</sup>, chose cooperation with the Church), but the secular – from the point of the worldview accepting duality as an unavoidable social fact – claims of the papacy. That is the real meaning of the mentioned appeal of the national committee to the Romans. Secularism would allow for giving the emperor (king of Italy) what belongs to him and to the church (papacy) what is papal.

However, such a compromise solution would strengthen the disastrous – according to Norwid – consequences of this split, which his opponents treated as a historical necessity (perhaps even as a turning point in history; the Second Empire of Napoleon III was supposed to be a system that would reconcile all oppositions), but in reality only typical of a certain developmental stage of a society (as we would say now – for the “liberal-capitalist” modernity). At this stage of historical development, the sacred becomes invisible, or faith goes down to the “catacombs”. One can wonder, though, whether in the case of the Roman national

---

<sup>12</sup> Proudhon’s intuition that the sacerdotal and imperial power condition each other and that the only alternative for them is a social revolution and a federal self-government system was incomprehensible to them; the polarisation of power characteristic of the 19<sup>th</sup>-century society and the state seemed to them a “real” fact of life.

<sup>13</sup> Alfred de la Guéronnière, the French liberal conservative journalist, viscount and by the grace of the emperor member of the senate, defines this concept in the following way: “Le doctrine de l’Empire est, au contraire [i.e. the Second Empire of Napoleon III as opposed to the “revolutionary empire”]; the latter concept was, in a sense, propagated by Proudhon and earlier by Adam Mickiewicz], la liberté civile et politique, l’avènement régulier de la nation à la vie publique par le suffrage universel, l’indépendance de l’Église se combinant avec les droits de l’État, la pacification de l’Europe par la réconciliation des peuples et des rois. C’est ce que nous appelons *l’Empire conservateur et libéral*. (A. DE LA GUERONNIÈRE, *De la politique intérieure et extérieure de la France*, Paris 1862, p. 10)

committee under the influence of agnostics such as Mazzini and Garibaldi, that compromise between the state and the Catholic faith was sincere. It has already been shown that Proudhon believed it to be a form of marginalisation of the role of the Church through the degradation of his supreme priest to the rank of an ordinary bishop of Rome, while the “secular” power in the form of a “unitary” Italian national idea – in no way compatible with the geographical, linguistic and social reality on the Apennine Peninsula – would undergo a specific but false sacralisation (because the society would still be torn apart, class differences would not be eliminated). In addition, as we have already seen, Norwid was very afraid that this way of thinking, treating the incommensurability of the sacred and the profane as something obvious, could spread to Poland, especially in this very critical moment of its history. In accordance with his general method of archaeology of the “Spirit”, he thus decided to show that the sacred – though not in the Christian form – contributed significantly to the formation of the Roman identity, also at the stage of pagan Rome. The factor enabling the linking of the history of ancient Rome with papal Rome that was contemporary with Norwid determined the previously mentioned category of “priesthood”, which constituted the basic category for the poet. Therefore, the initial, already priestly – though not yet “mature” – form of Rome could be treated as the prefiguration of Rome – the capital of Christian Europe. Such a “Christian patriotism” would be a more authentic expression of “progressive-traditional inspirations” than Napoleon III’s superpower politics (in February 1862 Norwid was very afraid that the French would sacrifice the pope in favour of an alliance with secular Italy; however, ultimately the view of Senator Alfred de la Gueronnière prevailed – according to him, the existence of a unified Italy with the capital in Rome could not be reconciled with the idea of Catholic unity needed by Napoleon III and his “conservative-liberal” empire to keep Republicans under control [see the pamphlet *L’abandon de Rome*, p. 13]<sup>14</sup>). It is therefore necessary for the contemporary Romans to open their eyes to this continuity between pagan and papal Rome. Norwid was deeply convinced that such a venture could have succeeded. He believed in the power of prayer which performed miracles in peaceful manifestations in Warsaw. Hence his request to Rev. Jełowicki to raise “publiczne modły na rzecz siedzącego na Stolicy Apostolskiej Piusa IX-o, Władcy Rzymu” [public prayers for Pius IX, the Ruler of Rome, seated on the Holy See] (PWsz IX, 14). The poem *Do Władcy Rzymu* is an artistic testimony to these dilemmas and hopes. Rome “Na fundamentach wryte miał: Wiara – / Pierw, nim był Rzymem – Rzym!” [On its foundations had: Faith – / First, before Rome – was Rome!] (PWsz I, 342). And that is why:

---

<sup>14</sup> *L’Abandon de Rome par M. le V<sup>e</sup> de la Gueronnière Sénateur*, Paris 1862.

[...] burze te marne przewieją  
I same tchnieniem zniesą się powtórnem,  
A lampy gorzeć będą, jak gorzeją,  
U grobu, który światłość daje im;  
Bo cóż Chrystusa byłoby Koturnem  
Ziemijskim? – jeśli nie – Rzym!  
(PWsz I, 343)

[... these futile storms will blow away  
And with a repeated breath cancel themselves,  
And the lamps will burn as they burn,  
At the grave which gives them light;  
For what would be Christ's Earthly  
Pedestal – if not – Rome!]

*Translated by Rafał Augustyn*

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- DE LA GUERONNIÈRE A., *De la politique intérieure et extérieure de la France*, Paris 1862.  
*L'Abandon de Rome par M. le Vte de la Gueronnière Sénateur*, Paris 1862.  
PROUDHON P.-J., *La Fédération et l'unité en Italie*, Paris 1862.  
RIALL L., *Garibaldi: invention of a hero*, New Haven 2007.  
TROJANOWICZOWA Z., DAMBEK Z., CZARNOMORSKA J., *Kalendarz życia i twórczości  
Cypriana Norwida*, vol. I: 1821-1860, Poznań 2007.

#### WIERSZE I WYPOWIEDZI EPISTOLARNE NORWIDA O RZYMIE I PAPIESTWIE W KONTEKŚCIE POLEMIK FRANCUSKICH

#### S t r e s z c z e n i e

Norwid interesował się żywo losami Państwa Kościelnego w drugiej połowie XIX wieku. Świadczą o tym zarówno niektóre jego listy, jak i wiersze. Znajdujemy w nich wiele śladów lektury (zwłaszcza francuskich) gazet i innych tekstów publicystycznych. Z punktu widzenia poety osoba papieża odgrywała ważną rolę dziejową. Właśnie Pius IX miał stanąć na czele federatywnie zorganizowanego państwa włoskiego. Głównym przeciwnikiem władcy Watykanu był Giuseppe Garibaldi, który w latach sześćdziesiątych XIX wieku przyczynił się w decydujący sposób do zjednoczenia Włoch, choć Francja Napoleona III nie dopuściła do zajęcia samego Rzymu. W odróżnieniu od dużej części polskiej emigracji, Norwid miał negatywny stosunek do

włoskiego republikanina. Nie uważał go (w czasie poprzedzającym powstanie styczniowe) za wzór do naśladowania. Przyczyną tej negatywnej oceny była Norwidowska koncepcja historii świętej zakładającej konieczną relację między dziejami a *sacrum*. Prowadzonej przez Garibaldi zbrojnej walki o założenie nowoczesnego państwa narodowego nie można było – zdaniem Norwida – umieścić w kontekście historii świętej (zupełnie inaczej miała się zaś sprawa z pokojowymi manifestacjami na ulicach Warszawy w 1861-1862). Włoski patriota zlekceważył przede wszystkim kapłańską charyzmę władcy Rzymu. Właśnie na niej, czyli na „patriotyzmie-chrześcijańskim”, polega[ło] uniwersalistyczne posłannictwo stolicy świata (pogański Rzym był jej prefiguracją). Autor wiersza *Do władcy Rzymu* był przekonany, że owa zakorzeniona w historii świętej wizja Rzymu, mimo chwilowych niepowodzeń, miała w końcu zwyciężyć.

**Słowa kluczowe:** Kwestia Rzymska; historia święta; Pius XIX; Garibaldi.

### NORWID'S POEMS AND LETTERS ABOUT ROME AND THE PAPACY IN THE CONTEXT OF FRENCH POLEMICS

#### S u m m a r y

Norwid was very much interested in the fate of the Papal State in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, which is testified in some of his letters and poems. Many traces of his reading newspapers and essayistic texts (particularly in French) can be found in these texts. From Norwid's point of view the Pope played an important, historical role. He believed that Pius IX should head a federation-based Italian state. The Pope's main opponent was Giuseppe Garibaldi who in the 1860s decisively contributed to the Italian unity, although Napoleon III's France did not allow him to capture Rome itself. Norwid – unlike the largest part of the Polish emigration – had a negative attitude towards the Italian republican leader. He did not consider him (in the period immediately preceding the January Uprising) a model to follow. The main reason of this negative assessment was Norwid's concept of sacred history that presumes there must exist a relation between the history and *sacrum*. According to Norwid, Garibaldi's armed struggle for the establishment of a modern nation state did not fit in the context of sacred history (by contrast, the peaceful manifestations on the streets of Warsaw in the years 1861-62 took an entirely different course). In particular, Garibaldi failed to appreciate the sacerdotal charisma of the Rome's ruler. But it was precisely this “Christian-Patriotism” on which the universal mission of the world capital (prefigured by pagan Rome) was based. Norwid, the author of the poem *Do władcy Rzymu* [To Rome's ruler], was convinced that this vision of Rome rooted in sacred history would – in spite of temporary setbacks – ultimately triumph.

*Summary translated by Rafał Augustyn*

**Key words:** the Roman Question; sacred history; Pius XIX; Garibaldi.