

grandson” of Cyprian Norwid, also included in this book, turned out to be important from the perspective of Norwid Studies. The quiet hero of almost all the stories about the Young Poland included here is Baudelaire. The book is written in the spirit of correlation between the arts – reflection on literature is intertwined with thoughts on painting of the epoch. The author evokes the aura of Young Poland’s “here and now”, he recreates the atmosphere of that artistic everyday life.

Summary translated by Rafał Augustyn

Key words: Young Poland; Baudelaire; Cyprian Norwid; Aleksander Szczęsny; everyday life; Miriam; poet; poetry; painting; art.

KRZYSZTOF TRYBUŚ – professor ordinarius, DLitt, literary historian at the Institute of Polish Philology of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań; his research interests are focused on the literature of Polish Romanticism, in particular works by Norwid and Mickiewicz, and problems of literary tradition and cultural memory; author of three books; co-editor of many volumes of dissertations and sketches, member of the editorial board of “Pamiętnik Literacki”; e-mail: tryb@amu.edu.pl

Karol S a m s e l – POSSIBLE, IMPOSSIBLE.
DIFFICULT NORWID
IN DIFFICULT NORWID STUDIES

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18290/sn.2017.35-13en>

At the outset, one should probably recall the title of one of the studies by Grażyna Halkiewicz-Sojak, the author of the book *Nawiazane ogniwo. Studia o poezji Cypriana Norwida i jej kontekstach*. I am referring here to one of the researcher’s texts serving as an introduction to the monograph *Monografia Cypriana Norwida – książka postulowana, ale czy możliwa* [The Monograph on Cyprian Norwid – a book postulated, but questionably possible]. It seems that with this very title Halkiewicz-Sojak hit the very centre of what in Norwid Studies not only “is crystallising” as problematic, but also (at the same time) is characteristic of it and immutable¹. I should repeat once again, I am referring here not so much to the

¹ G. HALKIEWICZ-SOJAK, *Monografia Cypriana Norwida – książka postulowana, ale czy możliwa*, [in:] *Nawiazane ogniwo. Studia o poezji Cypriana Norwida i jej kontekstach*, Toruń 2010, pp. 15-24.

status of what is “postulated, but not entirely, not fully possible”, but to the attachment to start the so-called analysis and interpretation of Norwid’s literary works with this reservation. The reservation that I am referring to – significant, integral and innate as to the outcome of a given study, namely that it is “postulated” but uncertain “on the scale of real possibilities” – characterises most monographs published as part of the Library of John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin “Studia Norwidiana”, including the monograph with the meaningful title *Trudny Norwid* [Difficult Norwid]². Let us note right away: it has a significant, salutary effect on Norwid Studies, and often – as a preliminary assumption – it is sometimes also overruled by scholars within Norwid Studies, whereas the book, this anthology of research articles entitled *Trudny Norwid*, aptly turns out to be a kind of an “(at least partially) accomplished monograph on the topic”. Thus, the assumption of research aporia makes the results of the research impervious, reinforces them and makes them resistant to at least certain percentage of falsifying verification attempts³.

Let us, however, consider other consequences of adopting a methodological point of view, verified in Norwid Studies, “postulate, but do not create, do not allow for something against the given modalities”. This perspective rejects the possibility of using *ad hoc* hypotheses, and it is good it works this way. However, how can one investigate Norwid’s multi-faceted, equivocal difficulty if this hypothetical model is rejected? The difficulty – like no other concept in the study of the ontology of Norwid’s work – indicates the idiomatic nature of the author of *Vade-mecum*, and in order to study the idiomatic model of writing, one should probably search for the idiom of such specific language modelling. It must be admitted that the monograph edited by Piotr Chlebowski is still at least partially victorious in mastering the problem, which otherwise – quite abstractly, insufficiently precisely – was described as the “difficult Norwid” problem. After all, not so much the partiality, but rather the incompleteness of findings concerning the fundamental question raised by the researchers let us – to use Halkiewicz-Sojak’s terms – state that in the matter of the so-called Norwid’s difficulty the last word has not been said. To put it differently, this is not a monograph on “difficult Norwid”, but rather a half-monograph, to some extent still a “postulative, modal,

² *Trudny Norwid*, ed. P. Chlebowski, Lublin 2013.

³ In contemporary Norwid Studies there is probably a strong Popperian movement, and this would be Karl Popper and his project of falsificationism – not, for example, Thomas Kuhn and his project of scientific revolutions – that would serve as the scientific patron of the research on Norwid. The most prominent propagator of this research methodology in *Trudny Norwid* is Edward Kasperski.

not fully realised” book, anticipating the researcher who will only deal with the problem of Norwid’s difficulty⁴.

It does not change the fact that the volume edited by Piotr Chlebowski, 21st part of “Studies and Monographs” on Norwid published under the auspices of The Learned Society of John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin (TN KUL) and the Institute for the Study of Cyprian Norwid’s Literature is gripping and encourages discussion, often polemical. I would like to start it here and I consider it an honour and distinction. In my discussion, I will follow the way the theses were presented in the book, therefore, I will discuss the articles and studies according to their order of presentation in the book. And hence, it is better to come back to the first text, by Bernadetta Kuczera-Chachulska, on the historico-literary lesson of Norwid’s difficulty, from the perspective of knowing the content of the entire book, as here, in addition to the main theme, many micro-threads are intertwined, which testifies to the thematic consistency of the whole monograph. It is worth paying attention, for example, to Zofia Stefanowska’s research, which is widely presented by Kuczera-Chachulska. She does that in order to indicate that in her reading of the difficulty of Norwid, Stefanowska is an adherent of Józef Czapski, who is having a dispute over the poet with Wojciech Karpiński, a “Polish pseudo-classic” having no good word for Norwid – as Czapski likes to name the author of *Herb wygnania*⁵. However, in the context of Kuczera-Chachulska’s text, one should remember Anita Jarzyna’s text, in which Stefanowska appears as the opponent of the poetic readings of Norwid’s *Trzy strofki* performed by Julian Przyboś and Mieczysław Jastrun⁶. Her role in shaping opinions on Norwid’s difficulty is thus dynamic and not always conciliatory, similarly to her dynamic (and therefore fascinating) general stand on Norwid’s difficulty.

Already the very first text in the volume presents theses which are juxtaposed with counter-theses in further parts of the book. The issue of updating and optimising new research methodologies is considerably controversial. The most striking example of antagonism here is the problem of *colonial studies* and their applicability in the context of the previous achievements of Norwid Studies: Kuczera-Chachulska has a short answer to that – “a researcher of Norwid will rather

⁴ Or maybe the first step has already been taken? I am referring here to the “attempt to introduce” the problem, the attempt present in Norwid Studies: M. BUŚ, *Zagadnienie “trudności” Norwida (uwagi wstępne)*, [in:] *Zbliżenia historycznoliterackie. Prace ofiarowane Prof. Stanisławowi Burkotowi*, eds. T. Budrewicz, M. Buś, Kraków 2003.

⁵ B. KUCZERA-CHACHULSKA, *Trudny Norwid. Historycznoliteracka lekcja poety*, [in:] *Trudny Norwid*, p. 10.

⁶ A. JARZYNA, *Trzy strofki na dwa głosy*, *ibidem*, p. 375.

not come to think of considering Polish literature as colonial literature”⁷, however, a hundred pages later (in Sławomir Rzepczyński’s text) we can read that, after all, “one of the interesting proposals for research on Norwid is brought by post-colonial theory”⁸. Despite that, the extremity of both points of view seems to be understandable. Kuczera-Chachulska, as an advocate of studying the lyric, not only “following Zgorzelski”, but also “following Maciejewski and Stefanowska”, is a defender of the immanent reading of the text⁹, and it is this methodological model that is clearly resounding in her discussion of the dispute between Czapski and Karpiński. In turn, studying the reception strategies of Norwid’s text, and in a wider context – the ways of designing and directing creativity (especially with regard to prose¹⁰), Rzepczyński is engaged in transcendent reading, which more strongly than in the case of Kuczera-Chachulska stimulates the need for methodological innovation. The clash of immanent and transcendental Norwid Studies in the context of the integrity of the so-called colonial research on Norwid’s work in this case probably emphasises the need (if not the necessity) to re-think the subject.

Edward Kasperski’s excellent text entitled *Trudny Norwid. Trudna metodologia. Jak badać Norwida?* [Difficult Norwid. Difficult methodology. How to study Norwid?] could easily be used as an essential study of the whole problem. The “hermeneutic suspicion” of the author of the monograph *Kategorie komparatystyki* would correspond here with the suspicion of eminent researchers of other author’s literatures, among others, Henryk Markiewicz (who writes about Czesław Miłosz), whose text *Czego nie rozumiem w „Traktacie moralnym”?* was rightly evoked in the context of difficult Norwid by Joanna Zach¹¹. These two problems have much in common: the difficulty of Norwid is the reverse of Miłosz’s difficulty, whereas aporias in Norwid Studies are the reverse of the aporia in Miłosz Studies. Kasperski tries to illuminate the “collision of individual methodologies with

⁷ B. KUCZERA-CHACHULSKA, *Trudny Norwid. Historycznoliteracka lekcja*, p. 11.

⁸ S. RZEP CZYŃSKI, *W romantyzmie i poza romantyzmem. Jeszcze o problemie umiejscowienia twórczości Norwida*, [in:] *Trudny Norwid*, p. 113.

⁹ This does not mean, however, that her work was devoid of erudite contexts. It is worth mentioning here the question raised by Kuczera-Chachulska regarding the association and linking of “Norwid’s difficulty” with religious and philosophical “meditativeness”, “meditation on the symbol and symbols” à la Simone Weil. B. KUCZERA-CHACHULSKA, *Trudny Norwid. Historycznoliteracka lekcja*, p. 21.

¹⁰ It is worth recollecting here the title of S. Rzepczyński’s post-doc publication: *Wokół nowel „włoskich” Norwida. Z zagadnień komunikacji literackiej* (Słupsk 1996).

¹¹ J. ZACH, *Myśleć wierszem. Norwid i Miłosz*, [in:] *Trudny Norwid*, p. 353.

the historical matter embodied in Norwid¹². Moreover, he tries to convince that in such a case, even the notion of “anomalies of creativity is sometimes relative”¹³, and therefore – let us add – treacherous. Markiewicz asks straightforwardly “how is it possible that with such a profusion of studies on Miłosz, with the general conviction of the significance of *Traktat* in his artistic work – almost nobody hinted at the interpretational difficulties that this work presents”¹⁴. Markiewicz would later use particularly strong words, to some extent perhaps unfair. He would show harshly that this kind of ignorance is reminiscent of the way of behaving of “the augurs of postmodern critics, jumping silently over incomprehensible fragments of texts »like a frog that covers a muddy pond by jumping from leaf to leaf«¹⁵.

Markiewicz’s philippic stirred a justified storm among the researchers of Miłosz’s works – this was reminded by Joanna Zach in *Trudny Norwid*¹⁶. It is easy to imagine it in the area of Norwid Studies, especially considering how small the number of studies on the problem of “logical inconsistencies” or “anomalies” in *Promethidion* or *Vade-mecum* is. Perhaps there is a need for texts analogous to that by Michał Kuziak, published in the volume *Strona Norwida*. His contribution was eloquently titled: *Czarne kwiaty, których nie ma* [Black flowers that do not exist] (subtitle: *Jak dekonstruuje się tekst Norwida?* [How to deconstruct Norwid’s text?])¹⁷. The presence of such experimental studies in the field of Norwid Studies, as well as subsequent attempts at meta-methodological reflections by

¹² E. KASPERSKI, *Trudny Norwid, trudna metodologia. Jak badać Norwida?*, ibidem, p. 65.

¹³ Ibidem.

¹⁴ H. MARKIEWICZ, *Czego nie rozumiem w “Traktacie moralnym”?*, ”Teksty Drugie” 2006, vol. 5, p. 212. Two years later, the nestor of Polish literary studies received answers to his doubts and reacted to them himself: see A. FIUT, *Panu Profesorowi Henrykowi Markiewiczowi – w odpowiedzi*, ”Teksty Drugie” 2008, vol. 5; J. ZACH, “*Traktat moralny*”: *poezja jako “akt umysłu”*, ibidem; Ł. TISCHNER, *Glosa do artykułu prof. Henryka Markiewicza “Czego nie rozumiem w »Traktacie moralnym«?*”, ibidem; M. LUBELSKA, *Czcigodny Panie Profesorze!*, ibidem; also H. MARKIEWICZ, *Odpowiedź miłoszologom*, ibidem (pp. 175-205). In connection with the book *Trudny Norwid*, I think it is worth paying attention to the two-dimensionality, “Janus-like character” of Joanna Zach: on the one hand, in the well-known dispute about the meaning of *Traktat moralny* she represents Miłosz’s side, on the other – she creatively transfers the echoes of that dispute to Norwid Studies.

¹⁵ Markiewicz refers here to Kathe Polli’s statement from 1996 on postmodernists (*Pro-molotov cocktail*, “The Nation” 1996) (H. MARKIEWICZ, *Czego nie rozumiem...*, p. 212).

¹⁶ J. ZACH, *Mysleć wierszem*, p. 353.

¹⁷ M. KUZIAK, *Czarne kwiaty, których nie ma. Jak dekonstruuje się tekst Norwida?*, [in:] *Strona Norwida. Studia ofiarowane Profesorowi Stefanowi Sawickiemu*, eds. P. Chlebowski, W. Toruń, E. Żwirkowska, E. Chlebowska, Lublin 2008, pp. 271-282.

Kasperski (such as that in *Trudny Norwid*), make Norwid Studies only to some extent impervious to potential allegations of the so-called scanning reading of Norwid's work. It seems that something more is required, perhaps a reformation movement would be needed¹⁸.

The monograph on "difficult Norwid" published by Catholic University of Lublin lacks also something else, namely the contradictory reconnaissance, such as the problem of Norwid's "clarity" or "readability". Among all the texts published in the volume, I have encountered only one article constructed in opposition to the "starting topic" of the book – this is the text by Joanna Trzcionka "...owszem jasny jest bardzo". *Kłopoty badacza Norwidowskich dramatów* ["...yes, he is very clear". Problems of the researcher of Norwid's dramas]¹⁹. Also Edward Kasperski writes about Norwid's readability, but does not distinguish between the concepts of readability and accessibility of his work²⁰, unlike, for example, Elżbieta Dąbrowicz in her article entitled *Norwid czytelny* [Readable Norwid]. There, upon discussing the context of the origin of the poem *Do emira Abd el Kadera*, Dąbrowicz seems to suggest that the problem of recognising the "obscurity" of Norwid's work is largely due to the lack of distinction between the notions of "difficulty" and "inaccessibility" of his work. The latter results from the insufficiently developed context of the creation of the work, from basing solely on the condensed metrics to *Dziela zebrane* by Juliusz Wiktor Gomulicki. The poem *Do emira Abd el Kadera* gains its full picture only owing to Dąbrowicz's gathering of full press documentation on the religious massacre that took place in the 1860s in Damascus. We learn from her that in the era of attacks on European consulates, the emir gave shelter to foreign consuls, not to Christians, that in the light of the 19th-century press information he was considered a "defender of international law", not a "defender of Christians"²¹. Not recognizing the problems

¹⁸ In this way, we come back to the question about the superiority of the patrons of philosophers of science, those who would be able to equip Norwid Studies with a specific "research framework". Popper – or maybe Kuhn? From this study it is probably evident that at least I do not deny Kuhn's contribution to the methodology of research on the literature of a given author. However, the contribution does not mean the resignation from the reliable Popperian method of reading texts in Norwid Studies.

¹⁹ J. TRZCIONKA, "...owszem jasny jest bardzo". *Kłopoty badacza Norwidowskich dramatów*, [in:] *Trudny Norwid*, pp. 379-390.

²⁰ "Another obstacle are the mysterious, difficult to resolve problems of readability or – simply – accessibility of Norwid. They correspond to a certain hermeticism of his writing [...], the practice of »difficult form«, to »obscurity«, idiomatic language and style, the allusive and associative way of thinking". E. KASPERSKI, *Trudny Norwid*, p. 53.

²¹ E. DĄBROWICZ, *Norwid czytelny*, [in:] *Jak czytać Norwida? Postawy badawcze, metody, weryfikacje*, eds. B. Kuczera-Chachulska, J. Trzcionka, Warszawa 2008, p. 45.

of “difficulty” and “inaccessibility” of the content of Norwid’s works may lead to a “scandalous” division into “ordinary readers by themselves” (such as the reader of “Dziennik Poznański” in which Norwid published his poem about Abdel-Kader, the reader perfectly familiar with the circumstances of the slaughter of Christians in Damascus from the press) and “connoisseurs at their own request enclosed in Norwid’s ghetto”²². The text by Dąbrowicz was included in the 2008 volume *Jak czytać Norwida? Postawy badawcze, metody, weryfikacje*.

Another – extremely reliable and also convincing – attempt to bring Norwid’s “connoisseurs” out of their “Norwid Studies ghetto” is Michał Kuziak’s study on difficult Norwid²³. In order to understand the motivation of Kuziak-researcher’s study on Norwid, it is worth reading this text from the perspective of his other studies, especially those concerning Mickiewicz’s modernity²⁴. Of course, declaring Mickiewicz’s so-called modernising modernity must be done *ante rem*, and the researcher is always aware of this, even if he is talking about the pioneering nature of *Kursy literatury słowiańskiej*²⁵. According to Kuziak, the Paris lectures primarily testify to Mickiewicz’s staging of rhetorical strategies aimed at shaping his attitude towards modernity. In fact, Mickiewicz renounces participation in all founding acts of the new epoch, but in this slighting, there lies a deep intellectual act: the recognition of the full dimension of the approaching time and the declaration of the inability of the old man to participate in the march of new people. Here, however – at the same time! – the meta-founding aspect of the lectures on Slavic literature is revealed, i.e. Mickiewicz’s attempt to build at least a temporary “axiosphere”, the sphere of the plurality of languages and attitudes, the pluralism of literary poetics, taking into account the new, as if modernising element – over the yet embryonic, still not even pre-modernist modernity. In this sense, Mickiewicz in the 1840s, though in the eyes of the “archemoderna” probably anachronistic as

²² Ibidem, p. 39.

²³ M. KUZIĄK, *Poeta trudny. Tezy o idiomatyczności Norwida (na marginesie interpretacji)*, [in:] *Trudny Norwid*, pp. 67-96.

²⁴ See IDEM, *Mickiewicz wobec nowoczesności*, [in:] *Romantyzm i nowoczesność*, ed. M. Kuziak, Kraków 2009, pp. 81-108; also IDEM, *Wielka całość. Dyskursy kulturowe Mickiewicza*, Słupsk 2006; IDEM, *O prelekcjach paryskich Adama Mickiewicza*, Słupsk 2007; IDEM, *Inny Mickiewicz*, Gdańsk 2013.

²⁵ Kuziak does not link the concept of Mickiewicz’s modernity with modernism, he understands it rather similarly to Hugo Friedrich, following Weber, as “disenchanted”, “de-romanticised Romanticism”. Without introducing the category of Mickiewicz’s modernism, exposing the categories of modernity and enlightenment, he identifies, however, a certain dimension of the correspondence between Mickiewicz’s work and the new epoch. IDEM, *Mickiewicz wobec nowoczesności*, pp. 100-101.

a Romantic man, the author of a *quasi*-academic, professor-prophetic pan-Slavic utopia, becomes close to his “late grandchildren”, not to the argonauts of modernity, but to those who were disappointed with the first modern argonautism, who would seek the “solutions” appropriate to late, mature modernism²⁶.

On this Mickiewiczian background, the study of Norwid’s modernity, pursued by Kuziak, seems to me insufficient. In particular, I am worried about the category of idiomaticity in literature (Michał Kuziak ultimately aims at presenting the theses on Norwid’s idiomaticity). But what is actually idiomaticity, and why does Norwid Studies aim to spread the thesis about the idiomatic nature of its subject of research? Moreover, putting forward such theses is considered to be a response to the burning question for researchers of the 19th century concerning the poet’s historico-literary affiliation. Of course, Romanticism, neo-Romanticism, pre-Modernism and Modernism are approximate concepts, however, as approximations they are adequately specified and equipped with the potential for being further detailed – here we can distinguish subclasses, such as early-Romantic, but not pre-Romantic Norwid’s Classicism, or early-Modernist and pre-Modernist Norwid’s Parnassianism, early-Modernist, but not pre-Modernist Norwid’s academism, Norwid’s pre-Raphaelitism or Norwid’s early-Romantic and pre-Romantic sentimentalism. This context gives, in a comprehensive manner, the answer (though in the form of an alternative definition) to the question about the so-called literary affiliation of the author of *Promethidion*. But this answer is not given by the context of idiomaticity, which is a context from another categorial order!

We shall thus notice that in the case of Kuziak’s theses on “Norwid’s idiomaticity” we speak about a different kind of approximation: idiomaticity is here not only an approximate but also a simplifying notion: Norwid’s literary idiom against the background of a non-idiomatic, general context allows only for the basic exclusive division into idiomaticity and non-idiomaticity. In order to be able to precisely talk about “idiomatic Norwid”, one should first precisely define Norwid’s literary idiom. This is probably impossible without a linguistic study, but not in the Jakobsonian spirit, as it has been done so far, on a micro-language scale²⁷, but

²⁶ Therefore, Kuziak puts forward the thesis that “Mickiewicz-writer has followed a path characteristic of a modernist author – from the aforementioned admiration for a multitude of languages of literature to negative poetics, which testifies to his disappointment with the world of literature, noticeable in the lyric poetry of Lausanne, but also formulated in critical texts from the 1830s and in Parisian lectures”. Ibidem, p. 101.

²⁷ The research on the language of Cyprian Norwid was influenced by the Jakobsonian model, which strongly “orients” the interpreter at linguistic analysis. Jakobson established the model of this way of interpretation in two separate dissertations on two poems by Norwid: *Przeszłość* and *Czulość*. Jakobson published the study on *Przeszłość* for the first time in “Pamiętnik Literacki”

rather on a macro-language scale. The analysis of the connotations of Norwid's so-called literary idiom would be an arduous, but also an extremely valuable task, requiring a series of hybrid, analytico-synthetic approaches, while simultaneously preserving the care that the exclusive and separate idiom of Norwid's texts does not get contaminated or mixed with interpretative idioms used by researchers with regard to the texts they read. Idiomaticity, idiomatic research of Norwid's work should be preceded here by idiomology, the idiomatic study of this legacy. In the case of Mickiewicz, Michał Kuziak spoke about the 19th-century historico-literary affiliation of the writer. He did not use the hypostatic concept of idiomaticity. His approach was thus methodologically uncontroversial. However, against this background, Kuziak's reflection on Norwid – productive and interesting – must, as part of systematic study, take at least a few steps back (at least to the level of the definition of so-called Norwid's idiom).

Sławomir Rzepczyński, the author of one of the last of the monographic studies on “difficult Norwid”, again unequivocally interpreting the multidirectional and homonymous “difficulty” as a specific “problem of situating the artistic work”, seems to remember about this need for regression that proves salutary for Norwid Studies. This is, after all, the “key” to reading the problem, a non-obvious, seemingly secondary, not immediately coming to one's mind, to some extent, arbitrary. Hence, why does Rzepczyński chose it again after Kuczera-Chachulska or Kuziak? There are two reasons for that. Firstly, the accumulation of “historico-literary” interpretations of so-called Norwid's difficulty. Secondly, their overwhelming frequency-based advantage over the research of the poet's “difficulties of style, language, imagination, and writing philosophy”. These two facts simultaneously (extremely symptomatic) not only re-orient – which is possibly less important – the starting topic of the volume *Trudny Norwid*, but also – which is perhaps far more important – they make us aware of the present, current needs of Norwid Studies. Today, it is this synthetic aspect of the study of Norwid's work, including, first of all, the problem of situating the author of *Promethidion* and *Assunta* that is subject to the greatest shifts, often manipulations. There is – as it seems – within Norwid Studies (and beyond it) a strong “revendicative front” for this legacy. It is felt by those of the authors of the collective volume *Trudny Norwid* who were put forward by the editors of the volume “on the frontage” of the whole; I think this was done quite on purpose. In this respect, Rzepczyński perfectly performs

(1963), while his work on *Czulość* was published in a collection of sketches dedicated to Wiktor Weintraub (1975). For more details, see: M. GŁOWIŃSKI, *Norwid i Jakobson (O granicach lingwistycznej analizy poezji)*, [in:] *Anabasis. Prace ofiarowane Profesor Krystynie Pisarkowej*, ed. I. Bobrowski, Kraków 2003, pp. 73-78.

the role of the one “closing the procession”. His study – unlike that of Michał Kuziak – cleverly bypasses the problem of idiomaticity, *de facto* only postulating the idiomatic attitude (but – crucially here – not the idiomatic model of research). Rzepczyński boldly points, while also wisely criticising Janusz Maciejewski’s “orientocentrism”, to the fact that making the researcher dependent on the issue of “situating” the subject of the study may lead to excessive, unnecessary intellectualisation, refining and obscuring, or even burying a significant problem through false historicism²⁸.

However – as Rzepczyński clearly expounds in his article – the “ahistorical study of Norwid” leads inevitably to the boundaries of “ideological recontextualisations”²⁹. From there comes, first of all, his idiomatic attitude, but without examining idiomaticity, without postulating idiomaticity – if I may say – as Kuziak does, secondly, specific “contextual looseness” without the need for recontextualisation; both trends are expressed in Sławomir Rzepczyński’s cautious proposal for “pragmatisation” of the research of Norwid: with the help of the so-called apparatus of new comparative studies, mentioned already in the context of Kuczera-Chachulska’s text on the post-colonial theory, gender studies and others. The pragmatic reading of Norwid could – in Rzepczyński’s opinion – maintain the marriage of “philology and history of literature with hermeneutics and comparative studies”³⁰ that is necessary for drawing complete research conclusions in the field of Norwid Studies. To make this possible, Rzepczyński constructs his study in a manner deceptively reminiscent of the perspective of the contemporary research on post-secularism. I want to stress that this is only my impression, resulting from certain philosophical readings. Nevertheless, according to Rzepczyński, the concepts of ontological security, epistemological security and post-certainty, relocate – as it seems – the position of the researcher in contemporary Norwid Studies quite well (*sic!*)³¹. The reinterpretation of Norwid’s legacy in the era of its

²⁸ About one of the symptomatic passages of Maciejewski’s book *Cyprian Norwid* (Warsaw 1992): “I do not want to diminish the curiosity of the author of these words or undermine his literary competence, but the above fragment can be an example of what mental voltes may be forced by the willingness to situate a poet in trends, currents and movements”. Rzepczyński further adds and simultaneously explains that “at the same time, in passing, Maciejewski sketches the figure of »difficult Norwid« who, if he is a representative of a movement, is a one-man movement, if he does the same as others, he does it otherwise, if he needs to be assigned somewhere, he must be put before, next to or in between”. S. RZEPczyński, *W romantyzmie*, pp. 103-104.

²⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 106.

³⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 105.

³¹ On this topic, see: A. MITEK-DZIEMBA, *Krytyczne otwarcie świeckości. Postsekularyzm jako formuła komparatystyczna*, [in:] *Drzewo Poznania. Postsekularyzm w przekładach*

revindication, in the era of general revendicationism of literature, should remind us of the state of the fundamental disruption of two feelings of security: ontological and epistemological. It is in the orbit of research on the so-called post-secular thought (to paraphrase Nietzsche) “the moment of the birth of the philosophy of post-certainty from the spirit of post-humanism”. The researcher of Norwid, diligently seeking methods, similarly to the man in the post-humanistic world of postmodernity, out of his own alienating feeling of post-certainty about the work, must himself draw conclusions indicating that he has developed a “self-assuring” method of reading. Therefore, it is this post-certainty that allows one not to favour an interpretation, it also allows not so much for non-preference as for widening of preference horizons and rejection of the “preferential reluctance”, for abandoning certain literary and linguistic preferences in reading, counteracting the formation of clichés in interpretation³². Introductory studies to the subject “Difficult Norwid” are just the first, over one-page part of the book. Further studies do not lose the strong, reinterpreting tone of the whole, although the so-called Norwid’s difficulties are often only implicit: Beata Wołoszyn continues her research line, drawing from a reconnaissance conducted by Rev. Antoni Dunajski, which reinforces the conviction that Norwid is defined by a theological rather than philosophical worldview³³. This time it is called incarnationalism. In this way, Wołoszyn distances this view from messianism and mysticism and, at the same time, ignores anthropological research on Norwid’s thought³⁴. Perhaps, in order to refresh the theological line of reading Norwid’s works, it would be worth focusing on the connection of Norwid’s thought to the philosophy of the Russian

i komentarzach, eds. P. Bogalecki, A. Mitek-Dziemba, Katowice 2012, pp. 266-280; also: J.-L. NANCY, *Na środku świata*, transl. by B. Mytych-Forajter, W. Forajter, ibidem.

³² I use here the concept of post-certainty following Anthony Giddens, who combines it with the concepts of the loss of ontological security and the security of “recovery/regaining by remodeling”. “In the post-modern world the relations of space and time will no longer be ordered on the grounds of historicity. It is difficult to say whether this will mean the revival of this or other form of religion; however, certain aspects of life will probably regain stability, similarly to certain features of tradition. This stability, in turn, will become an anchor for the feeling of ontological security, strengthened by the awareness of the social world subjected to human control”. In this situation, the experience of this stability will be the experience of the post-Certain. A. GIDDENS, *Konsekwencje nowoczesności*, transl. by E. Klekot, Kraków 2008, p. 126.

³³ Rev. A. DUNAJSKI, *Norwid – teolog?*, [in:] IDEM, *Teologiczne czytanie Norwida*, Pelplin 1996, pp. 13-52.

³⁴ “The conclusion can be drawn that Norwid’s worldview carries the hallmarks of incarnationalism and as such is part of the history of Catholic theology”. B. WOŁOSZYN, “Wcielenie” w trudnym świecie pojęć Norwida, [in:] *Trudny Norwid*, p. 131.

patristic Renaissance, represented e.g. by Father Georges Florovsky³⁵. The theme “Norwid and neo-patristics” could open this part of the research on the legacy of the author of *Assunta* which would reveal his modern pioneering work in relation to the Orthodox Church.

Lukasz Niewczas efficiently and, above all, in an extremely impressive subtlety of distinctions accounts for many interpretive stereotypes accumulated in the course of research on Norwid’s metaphor. First of all, he not only expands Stefan Sawicki’s scope of research on the polysemy of Norwid’s text³⁶, but also – pointing to the insufficiency of this research – he suggests a twofold interpretation of Norwid’s metaphor: associative-allusive and homonymic-polemical³⁷. At the same time, he convincingly polemicalizes with Michał Kuziak, indicating that what the latter originally considered to be Norwid’s comparison turns out to be *de facto*, in the light of his research, “a realised, extended metaphor”, a far-reaching result of “unsignalled transformations of comparison into metaphor”³⁸. It may be worth it in this context (as well as in the broader context of Norwid’s “non-bold” metaphors that are of particular interest for Niewczas) to refer to Mieczysław Porębski’s text, *Czy metaforę można zobaczyć?* [Can metaphor be seen?]. Porębski built it on the basis of the little-known example of Norwid’s poetic interpretation of Henryk Rodakowski’s painting *General Dembiński*³⁹.

The text by Dominika Wojtasińska – exhaustive in discussing the allegory of biblical figures of women named Maria – leaves certain dissatisfaction in the jux-

³⁵ Among the most recent works on this topic, see T. OBOLEVITCH, *Myśl o. Gieorgija Florowskiego*, [in:] EADEM, *Filozofia rosyjskiego renesansu patrystycznego. O. Gieorgij Florowski, Włodzimierz Łoski i inni*, Kraków 2014, pp. 63-170.

³⁶ S. SAWICKI, *Z zagadnień semantyki poetyckiej Norwida*, [in:] IDEM, *Norwida walka z formą*, Warszawa 1986, pp. 24-41.

³⁷ Ł. NIEWCZAS, *W koncercie form. Metafora wobec polisemii i porównania w poezji Norwida*, [in:] *Trudny Norwid*, pp. 148-149.

³⁸ Niewczas polemicalizes here with Kuziak’s text *O różnych “jak” in “Vade-mecum” Norwida* in a collective volume *Czytając Norwida 2* (Słupsk 2003) (ibidem, pp. 160-161).

³⁹ M. PORĘBSKI, *Czy metaforę można zobaczyć?*, “Teksty” 1980, vol. 6, pp. 69-70. In the article the author focuses on many examples, including the metaphor of the correspondence of arts as “active participation in a game” from Norwid’s poem [*Na portret generała Dembińskiego*]. This work is an attempt at the 19th-century ekphrasis of Rodakowski’s canvas. As we read in *Kalendarz życia i twórczości Cypriana Norwida*, simultaneously with the proclamation of Hungary’s “declaration of independence” in 1849 and the dethronement of the Habsburgs, “many Poles joined the Hungarian army and some of them served as commanders, including Józef Bem, whom Norwid dedicated the poem *Bema pamięci żałobny-rapsod* and Henryk Dembiński”. Z. TROJANOWICZOWA, Z. DAMBEK with participation of J. CZARNOMORSKA, *Kalendarz życia i twórczości Cypriana Norwida*, vol. I: 1821-1860, Poznań 2007, p. 349.

taposition of theological Mariology with secular and mythologico-cultural Mariology, or in fact – from the theological perspective – with pseudo-Mariology. The insufficiency is manifested here especially in the absence of references to Antoni Malczewski's *Maria* – particularly essential for Norwid as the author of *Assunta*, i.e. “better *Maria*”⁴⁰. Since Wojtasińska, speaking of the polysemy of the biblical names of Maria, uses the capacious, interthematic term introduced by Michał Głowiński – “dark allegory”⁴¹, she should probably also have included the symptomatic case of unbiblical (or implicitly biblical) case of Maria from Malczewski's poem. The name “Maria” understood as a “dark allegory”, as a way of “moving on the borderline of allegory and symbol”, implies a comprehensive, not a local interpretation. Therefore, in order to understand Norwid's “complete Maria”, I think it is necessary to take into consideration the research on Malczewski and Norwid, conducted as part of Norwid Studies by Sławomir Rzepczyński⁴². At the same time, it is worth getting familiar with Jarosław Ławski's articles on this topic (and also on the Romantic fascination with Mariology), including the one devoted to the symbolic function of the title of Malczewski's poem, as well as the whole dissertation of this researcher – *Marie romantyków. Metafizyczne wizje kobiecości. Mickiewicz – Malczewski – Krasiński*⁴³.

Pelagia Bojko situates her research reflection “in Norwid's circle of concepts of people and folklore”. Trying to talk about Norwid as a “poet of people and countryside”, using the expression taken from *Białe kwiaty* – the poet as a “folk element

⁴⁰ “But Norwid is probably concerned about something else, about the pessimistic overtone of Malczewski's poem, shattering the chance for true love. About Waclaw, whose »Bayronic« love for Maria leads to rebellion and crime, and to reject the senseless world, this, as he quotes in *Aktor*, »głuchego ludzkich uczuć i posępnego lasu« [deaf for human feelings and a gloomy forest]. Norwid had to oppose this. This is the direction to which his critical thought about *Maria* was maturing. Thus, he had to write his *Maria*, that is *Assunta*, in which – let us follow Maciejewski once again – he juxtaposed the look »around« with the »look up«”. S. RZEP CZYŃSKI, *Za co Norwid cenil “Marię”?*, [in:] *Antoniemu Malczewskiego w 170. rocznicę pierwszej edycji “Marii”. Materiały sesji naukowej, Białystok 5-7 V 1995*, ed. H. Krukowska, Białystok 1997, p. 445; see also: J. MACIEJEWSKI, *Spojrzenie “w górę” i “wokóło”*, “Roczniki Humanistyczne” 24(1976), vol. 1, pp. 233-247.

⁴¹ M. GŁOWIŃSKI, *Ciemne alegorie Norwida*, “Pamiętnik Literacki” 1984, vol. 3, pp. 103-114.

⁴² S. RZEP CZYŃSKI, *Za co Norwid*, pp. 441-452.

⁴³ On pages 186-187, Wojtasińska refers to the mentioned dissertation, but she is skeptical about the possible influence of Romantic Mariology – whether secular or religious – on Norwid, and hence she only perfunctorily refers to and recapitulates Ławski. Is this, however, not a prematurely drawn conclusion? J. ŁAWSKI, *Dlaczego “Maria”?* *Symboliczne funkcje tytułu w poemacie Antoniego Malczewskiego*, [in:] *Antoniemu Malczewskiemu*, pp. 137-180; also: IDEM, *Marie romantyków. Metafizyczne wizje kobiecości. Mickiewicz – Malczewski – Krasiński*, Białystok 2003.

of the worshiper⁴⁴, she *de facto* reduces three independent concepts into one: Norwid's simple man, people and nation. Other interpretive moves by Bojko are also risky, including the juxtaposition of the goose girl from *Stygmata* with the girl heroine of Słowacki's poem of genesis *Do pastereczki siedzącej na druidów kamieniach w Pornic nad oceanem*, about whom the voice in the lyric says directly: "i byłaś mi zarazem / Chłopieczką i Dyjanną"⁴⁵ [and you were to me at the same time / a Peasant Woman and Diana]. If we were to talk about the genesis inspirations in *Stygmata* (despite 40 years separating these two artistic works), we would probably start with an attempt to determine the relation of Norwid to Słowacki's genesis system, recall his reading of *Król-Duch*, then verbalize whether it would be possible to determine (in general) Norwid's fascination with the genesis folklore, or the conviction of the "peasant's spirit"⁴⁶ transplanted onto the philosophy of genesis from Andrzej Towiański. As for the "folk element of the worshiper" – in *Białe kwiaty* Norwid-narrator uses this phrase in specific circumstances, which should not be ignored and, it seems, he means "worshiping" the poor of London ("mieszkałem tam w najuboższym prawie domku najuboższej prawie części" [I lived there in the almost poorest house of the almost poorest district]; DW VII, 69). Thus, in this passage, he is much closer to Dickens than to Lenartowicz.

For a moment, once again in *Trudny Norwid* returns the issue of the interpretation of link LXXX of *Vade-mecum* – the lyric poem *Wielkie słowa* – this is due to the article by Grażyna Halkiewicz-Sojak, which is also a kind of postlude to the 2012 book edited by Dariusz Pniewski *Jedno dzieło – wiele interpretacji. Rozważania nad „Wielkimi słowami” Cypriana Norwida*⁴⁷. The case of the "monograph of one poem" is an isolated but fascinating case in Norwid Studies, since it stands on the peripheries of traditional studies on the author's lyric poetry, e.g.

⁴⁴ P. BOJKO, *W kręgu Norwidowskich pojęć ludu i ludowości – szkic*, [in:] *Trudny Norwid*, p. 211.

⁴⁵ Ibidem, p. 209. I cite Słowacki's lyrical poem from the edition: J. SŁOWACKI, *Do pastereczki siedzącej na druidów kamieniach w Pornic nad oceanem*, [in:] IDEM, *Dzieła*, vol. I, ed. J. Krzyżanowski, Wrocław 1959, p. 135.

⁴⁶ *Biesiada*: "So what kind of weapon is purity, humility, repentance, when one pure sigh of the Shepherd brings Him the light Column"; *Wielki Period*: "Today, repentance and hora for bumpkins of the Lord only, stupid for Christ, Slavic slaves. As much the spirit rises in a sigh, so much in the flesh and deed it appears; but those are rejected by the spirit of the earth". A. TOWIAŃSKI, *Biesiada. Wielki Period*, Kraków 2002, pp. 10-11, 46; further on this topic, see J. FERT, *Norwid wobec towianizmu*, [in:] *Norwid a chrześcijaństwo*, ed. P. Chlebowski, Lublin 2002, pp. 267-293.

⁴⁷ Compare: *Jedno dzieło – wiele interpretacji. Rozważania nad „Wielkimi słowami” Cypriana Norwida*, ed. D. Pniewski, Toruń 2012 and G. HALKIEWICZ-SOJAK, *Czy „Wielkie słowa” są trudną lekturą?*, [in:] *Trudny Norwid*, pp. 223-235.

as in Stanisław Makowski's anthology of interpretation *Cypriana Norwida kształt prawdy i miłości* or anthology edited by Jolanta Chojak and Ewa Teleżyńska *Czemu i jak czytamy Norwida?*⁴⁸. Halkiewicz-Sojak, in turn, emphasises the insufficiency of the monograph prepared by Pniewski, its natural incompleteness, she also shows that reading *Wielkie słowa* after the publication of this book still retains the character of residual "reporting from the beleaguered city of interpretation". Let me remind you the context of the polemics between Henryk Markiewicz and researchers of Miłosz's literature that I evoked a few pages ago. I wrote then that Miłosz's difficulty is in many respects a reverse of Norwid's difficulty. In the area of Norwid Studies, Halkiewicz-Sojak clearly shows that it is impossible to follow Markiewicz's path in order to fully "literalise" the literary text due to dynamic reasons. Logical incoherence is an inherent part of the work (even if only through the use of irony, which undermines the immanent logic of a literary work), and this incoherence leaves an interpretation gap – an area that cannot be filled with any substitute. In a sense, literature is the love for this emptiness in the work (*amor vacui*, not *horror vacui*) and as such it defends its integrity by means of autonomising the anti-logical spaces in the work⁴⁹. According to Grażyna Halkiewicz-Sojak, the closest to grasping Norwid's "suggestion of the sacred" in *Wielkie słowa* was Beata Romanowska. She approached the meaning of the poem owing to the "application" of Ingarden's concept of layers of a literary work. However, as the researcher recapitulates, even she was unable to single out or distinguish from themselves all Ingarden's "layers" in *Wielkie słowa*. At the same time, she was unable to fully distinguish Norwid's *quasi*-judgements from assertive sentences. It is probably hard to find a more convincing argument in favour of (moderately) anti-interpretational, anti-analytic and anti-literal reading of Norwid's texts⁵⁰.

⁴⁸ *Cypriana Norwida kształt prawdy i miłości. Analizy i interpretacje*, ed. S. Makowski, Warszawa 1986; *Czemu i jak czytamy Norwida?*, eds. J. Chojak, E. Teleżyńska, Warszawa 1991.

⁴⁹ It was exactly in this tone that Joanna Zach (moderately) and Magdalena Lubelska (extremely) answered Markiewicz's doubts: "At least in some cases the intention of the interlocutor does not coincide with something that I feel is the principle and framework of the poem" (Zach); "Definitely the most interesting field of meaning confrontation are the »places of misunderstandings«, the simplicity or linguistic uniqueness of which is deceptive" (Lubelska). In relation to *Traktat moralny*, they both talked about the failure in a "test for logical coherence" and about the "coincidence of opposition, ambiguity, generality". J. ZACH, "Traktat moralny", pp. 181-182; M. LUBELSKA, *Czcigodny*, pp. 194-195.

⁵⁰ Upon distinguishing Romanowska's interpretation here, Halkiewicz-Sojak unintentionally betrays her expectations concerning the layered, Ingardenian interpretation of Norwid's lyrical poetry. It is very telling if we could see this gesture in the light of the previous, linguistic, i.e. post-Jakobsonian interpretations of Norwid's lyrical poetry, it would mark the transition in Norwid Studies, in the interpretation of Norwid's lyric – "from Jakobson to Ingarden". It should be noted,

Anyway, the great advantage of the volume *Trudny Norwid* lies in that next to Halkiewicz-Sojak's text, which ends with anti-interpretational (as I stated above) *punctum*, we find a contrastive text showing the possibility of "fulfilled, finite interpretationism" – this refers to Marek Buś's study of *Stefan Sawicki's "Promethidion"*. Both Halkiewicz-Sojak (implicitly) and Buś (explicitly) refer to Sawicki's methods of reading texts: the first of these contributors recalls the classic method of evoking the meanings of a poem⁵¹, the other contributor – upon discussing Sawicki's monograph in a completely fascinating, but also "revolutionary", highly metaphorical way – testifies to the possibility of "epiphany of senses in science", pointing, for example, to Sawicki's example, who in the monograph on Norwid's most popular work achieves "illuminating understanding of the most important structural, thematic and moral qualities"⁵². And we can just observe how the use of two methodological metaphors – evoking and illuminating – referring to the research contribution of Stefan Sawicki, the author of the study *O świadomą ocenę w badaniach literackich*, can lead to different, but on both sides convincing conclusions.

Dorota Plucińska – upon analysing the lyrical poem *Zagadka*, link LIII of the "necessary twist in Polish poetry", *Vade-mecum* – rightly captures the literally fixed orality of Norwid's detail. On the one hand, it is a classical, semi-Socratic, semi-didactic *hapax legomenon*, on the other, a specific representation of elusive speech, liberated from the tyranny of "Pantheism-print". In order to talk about *Zagadka*, Plucińska uses a hermeneutic dictionary, she cites, *inter alia*, Paul Ricoeur, thus making a distinction between what is hermeneutic – in accordance with the meaning of Norwid's poem *Liryka i druk* – is "on the side of Lyric", and what is non-hermeneutic – will remain here "on the side of the Print". Perhaps, however, in the case of a lyrical poem such as *Zagadka* (concise, condensed, gnomic), it would be worth refraining from the hermeneutic interpretation of the "detail". In my opinion, it is much more appropriate to say that – after all, in the central series of lyrics in *Vade-mecum* – Norwid cultivates a kind of poetic heuristic, not hermeneutics; that *Zagadka* is perhaps not "as much as" a hermeneutic mystery, but it certainly – although "only" – would be a kind of sophisticated heuristic fic-

however, that in the context of the application of Ingarden's methodological apparatus to Norwid's artistic work, Kasperski would remain skeptical. "How was Ingarden's once relevant theory of the literary work relevant to Norwid's works? Did Ingarden's claims on the construction of the literary work really explain anything in the works of the author of *Quidam*?" E. KASPERSKI, *Trudny Norwid*, p. 65; see also Halkiewicz-Sojak's commentary on Romanowska's text, *Czy "Wielkie słowa"* (pp. 234-235).

⁵¹ Ibidem, p. 228 (in particular, footnote 10).

⁵² M. BUŚ, "Promethidion" *Stefana Sawickiego*, p. 250.

tion, as a matter of fact, in accordance with the “paideicity” of Norwid’s poetic attitude, pointed out many times by Pniewski⁵³.

The volume *Trudny Norwid* contains also a group of texts that testify to the need for “transcending” of researchers (not only young) beyond the current *status quo* of Norwid Studies. From this perspective one should speak not so much about “difficult Norwid” as about “difficult Norwid Studies”, the cumbersome discipline, i.e. problematic, inductivised, simplifying the subject of research or replacing it with a homonymous substitute, transposition. It seems that it would be the way in which Anna Borowiec, the author of the recent monograph on Norwid *Album Orbis*⁵⁴, would look at the problem of Norwid’s artistry. Borowiec’s work indicates relatively clearly that while examining the “difficult all-roundedness of the master artist” the author will seek to invalidate the post-Wykowski paradigm of Norwid’s artistic creation as a “poet and master-artist”; for it is a one-sided paradigm that assumes the illustrative character, not correspondence of Norwid’s “image in a work”⁵⁵. In turn, from the perspective of the latest research on the problem, Borowiec will polemicise with Aleksandra Melbechowska-Luty, the author of the monograph *Sztukmistrz. Twórczość artystyczna i myśli o sztuce Cypriana Norwida*⁵⁶. It is Melbechowska-Luty that will become here an embodiment of “difficult Norwid Studies”, suffering – as Borowiec puts it – from “the lack of distinction between the theory and a concrete artistic realisation”⁵⁷.

Against this – otherwise revisionist – background an interesting proposal is Edyta Chlebowska’s study of Norwid’s watercolour as (let us use one more time the study preceding Chlebowska’s text) a “concrete artistic realisation”⁵⁸. The

⁵³ D. PNIEWSKI, *Narzędzia Norwidowskiej moralistyki. Wzniosłość, pàthos, èthos i paideia w “Wielkich słowach” i w “Modlitwie”*, “Studia Norwidiana” 29(2011), pp. 119-134.

⁵⁴ A. BOROWIEC, *“Album Orbis” Cypriana Norwida jako księga sztukmistrza*, Gdańsk 2015.

⁵⁵ A. MELBECHOWSKA-LUTY, *Sztukmistrz. Twórczość artystyczna i myśli o sztuce Cypriana Norwida*, Warszawa 2001.

⁵⁶ K. WYKA, *Cyprian Norwid. Poeta i sztukmistrz*, Kraków 1948.

⁵⁷ A. BOROWIEC, *Trudna wielostronność sztukmistrza*, [in:] *Trudny Norwid*, p. 310. And just like Grażyna Halkiewicz-Sojak in relation to Beata Romanowska, Anna Borowiec suggests reading a monograph situated outside of strict Norwid Studies – it is supposed to be a model of problem analysis: I. WORONOW, *Romantyczna idea korespondencji sztuk. Stendhal, Hoffmann, Baudelaire, Norwid*, Kraków 2008. We should admit that this “exocentric” search for the possibility of resolving old disputes within Norwid Studies and along with that abandoning the “endocentric model of research” (I think this should be emphasised independently from our assessment of the quality and the way of creating and modeling of the polemical attitude of Borowiec) is symptomatic. This is also, to some extent, characteristic of this monograph – *Trudny Norwid*.

⁵⁸ See the previous footnote.

excellent specialisation of the subject is impressive here, and of course – with this degree of approximation – there are no symptoms of a “disease” consuming – according to Borowiec – “difficult Norwid Studies”. It’s a good thing that Edyta Chlebowska’s article itself is adjacent in the volume to the great study by Joanna Zach, entitled *Myśleć wierszem. Norwid i Miłosz*⁵⁹. Zach writes about Miłosz and Norwid’s “thinking with a poem”, while Chlebowska quotes the eloquent words of Norwid from one of his last letters to Franciszek Duchiniński (from 1883): “chcę tam doprowadzić akwarelę, gdzie jeszcze nie była, [...] żeby nią swobodnie myśleć można było” [I want to bring watercolour where it has not been yet, [...] to be able to freely think with it] (PWsz X, 197)⁶⁰. Thus, it is the equivalent of Norwid’s famous “maxim of adequacy”, and to be more precise – its elaboration: “one must give the thing (watercolour) – an appropriate word”, or (assuming that the watercolour is a “word”), one must “give the thing – an appropriate word (watercolour) to be able “to freely think with it”, in order – quoting *Czarne kwiaty* – not to violate faithfulness.” “Thinking with a poem” and “thinking with watercolour” are here two completely equal ways of practicing art in the intellectual sense, understood as an act of the mind (Joanna Zach’s term). Let us add that the words about “free thinking with watercolour / in watercolour” coincide with the period in which Norwid most likely finished writing *Tajemnica Lorda Singelwortha*. It is fascinating that along with the process of writing prose, the poet, and in 1883 an active prose writer, Norwid is accompanied by a desire to make an almost overt “necessary turn in Polish watercolour”⁶¹. Chlebowska’s recapitulations will surely prove the key reference material for a researcher will-

⁵⁹ J. ZACH, *Myśleć wierszem*, pp. 345-358. In her research on this parallel, Zach completely fantastically exceeds the boundary set previously by Marek Buś in his exhaustive texts about Norwid and Miłosz; moreover, unexpectedly, this boundary in Zach’s work turns out to be a Rubicon (!), beyond which there “unfolds” a new, innovative way of thinking about the relationship that can link both poets. See, among others, M. BUŚ, *Miłosz i Norwid*, [in:] *Czesław Miłosz*, ed. W.P. Szymański, Warszawa–Kraków 1987, pp. 119-138.

⁶⁰ E. CHLEBOWSKA, *Akwarelowe kontrasty Norwida*, [in:] *Trudny Norwid*, p. 342.

⁶¹ In the quoted letter to Duchiniński, Norwid mentions the very purpose of this new “thinking with watercolours” that he designed: “aby po równi i więcej niż olejne wyrażać mogła wszystko” [so that it can express everything equally and more than using oil] (PWsz X, 197, emphasis mine, K.S.). I decided to use here a strong notion, one that is meaningful within Norwid Studies, perhaps exaggerated, simultaneously a term and metaphor of “necessary-turn”, but I rely on the meaning of this excerpt of correspondence, which indicates that for Norwid – about whose growing, progressive “expansion of watercolour technique” writes Chlebowska, as early as in the 1850s – maybe it really became important to make a revolution *in partibus*, a “watercolour revolution” in the comfort of St. Casimir House. Hence, in a similar way, the creation of so-called Italian novellas should be seen as a “silent necessary-turn”? Ibidem, p. 329.

ing to at least provisionally and hypothetically determine the obscured dynamics of the genesis of so-called “Italian” novellas.

Let us turn now to the text written by Zach – the novelty of this study is worth a special presentation. Firstly, Norwid Studies has been waiting for a long time for such strong ennoblement of *Rzecz o wolności słowa* and under no circumstances could we expect that this poem, and not any other, could strengthen the parallel between Norwid and Miłosz. In Zach’s text, meanwhile, Norwid’s *Rzecz...* was mentioned on par with the so-called American “poetry of intellect”, along with Wystan Hugh Auden and Karl Shapiro who inspired the author of *Traktat moralny*⁶². In the fact that Miłosz’s treatise poetics can have its origin in Norwid, that both poets engage in “the poetry of intellect”, “adapting the forms of discourse to 18th-century practices”⁶³, and finally, that Auden, and equally with him Norwid can be considered patrons of Miłosz’s formal style⁶⁴, one can see the confirmation of an unconvinced style of thinking about Norwid, which, after all, is present in Norwid Studies owing to Arent van Nieuwerkerken, but even beyond Norwid Studies itself. According to this way of approaching the artistic work of the author of *Assunta*, Norwid would be “the Polish Eliot” or – better, more subtly – “the Polish announcement of Eliot”⁶⁵. This somewhat explains the intriguing suggestion made by Zach that “the artistic production of Miłosz and Norwid falls into two different phases of the same process that Miłosz called the erosion of religious imagination”⁶⁶. Let us only note how provocative this opinion must be for those of us who study Christianity in Norwid’s poetry – the example of “the Polish Eliot” makes us realise that religiosity is mentioned here *mutatis mutandis*, from the perspective of late modernism, looking for its anticipation in the so-called 19th-century “inter-period”, in “early modernism” or “late Romanticism” of Nor-

⁶² “Miłosz’s treatise poetry, referring directly to the American discursive poetry (W.H. Auden and K. Shapiro) emerged at the crossroads of at least several traditions, and one of them is *Rzecz o wolności słowa*”. J. ZACH, *Mysleć wierszem*, p. 353.

⁶³ *Ibidem*, s. 355.

⁶⁴ The patronage suggested here (Auden-Norwid) would take place regardless of the critical attitude of Miłosz to Norwid, or – which is equally likely – parallel to this attitude, which was evolving over the course of life of the author of *Zniewolony umysł*. Besides, Buś describes Miłosz’s attitude towards Norwid as “some kind of pretextual, sometimes chimerical”. M. BUŚ, *Miłosz i Norwid*, p. 123.

⁶⁵ This term is used by many researchers outside of the the field of Norwid Studies, e.g. Jolanta Dudek. See J. DUDEK, *Miłosz wobec Conrada 1948-1959*, Kraków 2014, p. 87; also: A. VAN NIEUKERKEN, *O “niewczesności” Norwida, dwóch modernizmach i Miłoszu*, “Teksty Drugie” 1995, vol. 6, pp. 53-68.

⁶⁶ J. ZACH, *Mysleć wierszem*, p. 357.

wid, who from the perspective of Zach, in this juxtaposition, would not be anyone but a prophet of religious erosion, the last prophet in a religious sense⁶⁷.

Anita Jarzyna's text – directly following Zach's study – turns out to be just as exciting as the previous one. Similarly to the Halkiewicz-Sojak's sketch from the volume *Trudny Norwid*, which should be read right after getting familiar with the volume *Jedno dzieło – wiele interpretacji. Rozważania nad "Wielkimi słowami" Norwida*, the study by Jarzyna should be approached as a commentary on her author's book *Pójście za Norwidem (w polskiej poezji współczesnej)*⁶⁸. What the researcher sensationally accomplishes in the study of the divergent analyses of *Trzy strofki* conducted by Jastrun, Przyboś and Bieńkowski, is the broad reception antagonism, the complicated reception deadlock in which Norwid's poetry and its interpretations was in the 1960s. The researcher skilfully makes it tense, and furthermore, puts the opposing schools of reading the poet into conflict, above all pointing to the fact that the years she discusses are *de facto* the real apogee of the "reception antagonism": the former post-Miriam and post-Wacław Borowy schools of reading Norwid, the symbolist and the constructivist reading, the innovative readings such as today's well-known "reading Norwid through Baudelaire" or "reading Norwid through Rilke" are confronted with one another⁶⁹. This has its

⁶⁷ Zach also notices (following Błoński) that "»Norwid's great poetry began at the time when it became darker and less ordinary«, i.e. "when its tissue thickened, and the spelling became more diverse and complex". "This breakthrough – as he claims – corresponds to the turn in Miłosz's artistic work that took place during the occupation, around 1943". It would be worth considering the importance of the dispute between Miłosz and Andrzej Trzebiński on Miłosz's turn towards the poetry of intellect and whether it could lead to "Norwid's response". Cf. the publication by A. Kopiński *Ludzie z charakterami. O okupacyjnym sporze Czesława Miłosza i Andrzeja Trzebińskiego* (Warszawa 2004) with texts written by A. Franaszek, *Głosy biednych ludzi. 1939-1945* ([in:] IDEM, *Miłosz. Biografia*, Kraków 2012, pp. 285-368, specially the subchapter *Gniewosz*) and Cz. Miłosz's – *Wojna 1940-1945* ([in:] IDEM, *Poszukiwania. Wybór publicystyki rozproszonej 1931-1983*, compiled by K. Piwnicki, Warszawa 1985, pp. 23-36).

⁶⁸ A commentary to, above all, the first chapter of the book. A. JARZYNA, *Norwid Jastruna: odmiany recepcji*, [in:] EADEM, *Pójście za Norwidem (w polskiej poezji współczesnej)*, Lublin 2013.

⁶⁹ This simultaneously agonistic, antagonistic and dialectical dichotomisation of Norwid, the reflection on this very "cratic" (the term introduced by Władysław Witwicki) way of thinking by the readers and researchers of the author of *Assunta*, leads Jarzyna to interesting statements. Here, for example, one could find – as can be deduced from her study – the origins of the perceived Norwid's anachronism and Norwid's modernity as equally controversial generalisations. The criticism of these concepts is, therefore, or rather may be not so much an objective, but historically conditioned criticism, based on reception, a criticism growing out of a dynamic opinion-making process with reference to the work. A. JARZYNA, *Trzy strofki*, pp. 365-366 (Norwid – Baudelaire: the parallel is proposed by Bieńkowski), pp. 375-376 (Norwid – Rilke: none of the analysts sees the parallel, it is proposed by Jarzyna), p. 369 (Miriam's Norwid, Borowy's Norwid; Jastrun emphasises the dif-

visible effects in the reception. Among other things, this leads to the collapse of interpretative negotiation techniques in Norwid's works, to the collision of reading strategies. As Jarzyna would interestingly suggest here: "maybe that is why Norwid did not become the patron of avant-garde, linguistic poetry, which was what Tymoteusz Karpowicz and the poets of the generation 68 demanded"⁷⁰. The cost of the deadlock could be thus quite significant, and *de facto* it could determine the shape and size of Norwid's reception after 1970, including the scale of the "manifestation" of Norwid's tropes in new wave poetics⁷¹.

To Joanna Trzcionka, we owe the only text in the volume devoted to the internal complexity of the dramatic element in Norwid's works. First, however, let us put the dominants of this study in order. Reading Norwid's drama is something quite opposite to reading lyrics. In both drama and poetry, there is the so-called "dramatic" or "dramatising" subject – who, for example, dramatizes themselves, their views (I will add that the same applies to prose, which Trzcionka does not mention⁷²). Dramatic instances in drama, in the case of Cyprian Norwid – such as the superior personality or the lyrical persona of a work, seek to merge the reference fields. In turn, dramatic instances in poetry, dramatic lyrical subjects dramatising the space of a poem, aim at further scattering, defragmenting these fields. There lies the diametric difference of perspectives, which determine the fact that Trzcionka abandons, in the study of drama, the "poetic" reading of Norwid in accordance with the canonical patterns of Czesław Zgorzelski, but it takes the path of reading "dramatic" Norwid, taken, among others, by Joanna Zach, who was previously mentioned in the context of Norwid and Miłosz, here the author of the work *Monolog różnogłosy. O dramatach współczesnych Cypriana Norwida*⁷³. The researcher took a wise, thoughtful step, as it exposes the autonomy of Norwid-playwright against the background of the more prevalent image of Norwid-poet

ferences between the two models). In connection with the parallel Norwid – Rilke, see its Polish origin (which Jarzyna does not expose): J. ZIĘBA, *Klerk zaangażowany. Stefana Napierskiego nowoczesna krytyka literacka wobec dyskursów krytycznych w Dwudziestolecu międzywojennym*, Kraków 2006, pp. 99-103.

⁷⁰ A. JARZYNA, *Trzy strofki*, p. 377.

⁷¹ It is worth looking from this very perspective at the motivation of Stanisław Barańczak's well-known study *Obecność nieobecnego*. That is why I use here the term "manifestation". S. BARAŃCZAK, *Norwid: obecność nieobecnego*, [in:] IDEM, *Tablica z Macondo. Osiemnaście prób wytłumaczenia, po co i dlaczego się pisze*, Londyn 1990, pp. 89-105.

⁷² See E. PACZOSKA, *Tajemnice konstrukcji. Dramatyzacja w powieści realistycznej (Bolesław Prus – Henry James)*, [in:] *Realizm, realiści, realność. W stulecie śmierci Bolesława Prusa*, eds. E. Paczoska, B. Szleszyński, D.M. Osiński, Warszawa 2013, pp. 249-258.

⁷³ J. TRZCIONKA, "...owszem jasny jest bardzo"..., pp. 381-382.

(the poet of conscience, dialogue, letters, etc.). I also dare say that we will not fully understand the independence of Norwid-playwright until we create a monograph of Norwid's Shakespearism or Cyprian Norwid's Shakespeare (*Białe kwiaty* convince of the legitimacy of searching for the extent of relations linking the dramatic ideas of both writers). However, Trzcionka knows about it very well – the quote from the title of her study: “...owszem jasny jest bardzo”. *Kłopoty badacza Norwidowskich dramatów* [...yes, he is very clear”. Problems of the researcher of Norwid's dramas] is a fragment of Norwid's statement about Shakespeare, in which the author of *Miłość czysta u kąpielni morskich* tries to express the conviction that the “external »fuzziness« [of Shakespeare's text – K.S.] often leads to clear conclusions”⁷⁴. It is worth recalling the accusations against Shakespeare (following Samuel Johnson) formulated half a century earlier by Jan Śniadecki; to use Trzcionka's terms – “clear conclusions” strolled along his tragedies and comedies, which as soon as they opened their mouths, expressed unbridled “external fuzziness”. Hamlet, Richard III, Othello – royal heroes “by descent” spoke in clear, crude language of peasants, and by their inclination to monologous vivisections they turned out to be the “traitors” of hermetic high literature, if I am allowed to say, they became folk heroes⁷⁵. This was also something that Norwid could mean when writing about the author of *Titus Andronicus* – “... yes, he is very clear”.

The clarity of Norwid's dramas is met by obscurity, perhaps the impossibility of a “psychobiographic” reading of his correspondence. Rev. Antoni Dunajski dedicates his reflection in *Trudny Norwid* to the “reconstruction of the epistolary portrait of young Norwid”⁷⁶. I would like to reformulate this question, as in my understanding, one would (also) be asking here about the possibility of creating a psychobiography of young Norwid – I would intentionally ask this question in the context of Anita Całek's book, already present in the area of research into Romanticism, *Adam Mickiewicz – Juliusz Słowacki. Psychobiografia naukowa*⁷⁷.

⁷⁴ Ibidem, p. 379.

⁷⁵ “As the famous critic and publisher of Shakespeare's works, Samuel Johnson admits there is no real tragedy in his works, because in almost all of them there is cheerfulness, and often crude and inappropriate joke is mixed up with affectionate and terrible things”; “The English like them [Shakespeare's plays – K.S.] and they attend them in swarms, because Shakespeare is the father of their drama, because in them the common folk see the customs of their ancestors and themselves”. J. ŚNIADECKI, [Sąd o Szekspirze], [in:] *Walka romantyków z klasykami*, introduction, extracts and compilation by S. Kawyn, Wrocław 1960, pp. 52-53.

⁷⁶ Rev. A. DUNAJSKI, *Trudności z rekonstrukcją epistolarnego autoportretu młodego Norwida*, [in:] *Trudny Norwid*, pp. 163-184.

⁷⁷ A. CAŁEK, *Adam Mickiewicz – Juliusz Słowacki. Psychobiografia naukowa*, Kraków 2012. In literature, it is not only possible to conduct in this way a psychobiographic study of the author,

The question whether Norwid's psychobiography is possible should perhaps be answered by a whole group of experts, and here, I would particularly listen to the voice of Elżbieta Dąbrowicz, the author of the formula for Norwid's "unstable model" in correspondence⁷⁸. However, Rev. Dunajski himself answers it also interestingly, providing in his own study a whole review of ambivalent attitudes that would torment a researcher in the projected situation of having to make an epistolary synthesis of young Norwid⁷⁹. Besides, there are many other advantages of the good text by Rev. Dunajski: he shows Norwid's drama as *homo duplex* (!), a young writer torn between Poland and France, trying to give his literary service to both homelands of Mickiewicz and Hugo at the same time (like Joseph Conrad?), reflecting even, in the light of the letter to Józef Bohdan Zaleski of 1852, on the possibility of his own "bilingualism"⁸⁰. The text by Rev. Dunajski incidentally makes us realise one more thing: unlike the epistolography of many 19th- century emigration correspondents, Norwid's epistolography is deprived of the post-traumatic element (how symptomatic is the fact that in Norwid's correspondence, due to biographical reasons and his personal choices, there are no letters to his mother, father or there are few complete examples or none of correspondence to his more or less close relatives, or finally, letters to many school friends from Leszno who might have reminded Norwid of the "Paskevich Night" - such as Felicjan Faleński⁸¹).

Against the background of other studies in *Trudny Norwid*, I would like to distinguish Wiktor Mikucki's sketch, which, according to me, is a special attempt

but also – which is much less frequently mentioned – a psychohistorical study of the period. The former was established in European research owing to the work by William McKinley Runyan, *Life Histories and Psychobiography: Explorations in Theory and Method* (1985), the latter is implemented in Polish context through the studies of Tomasz Pawelec, among others, in *Psyche i Klio. Historia w oczach psychohistoryków*, Lublin 2002.

⁷⁸ E. DĄBROWICZ, *Model niestateczny* [review of the book by P. Bojko *Oblicze człowieka. Rysy autoportretu w listach Norwida*], "Studia Norwidiana" 26(2008), pp. 231-236.

⁷⁹ "It is true that »unexamined« texts may be uncertain, erroneous, inaccurate, and their content not fully accepted by their author. On the other hand, this situation provokes us to recognise these texts as the best, most authentic material for reconstructing Norwid's epistolary portrait". Rev. A. DUNAJSKI, *Trudności z rekonstrukcją*, s. 164.

⁸⁰ Ibidem, p. 177.

⁸¹ Despite this, according to Zofia Trojanowiczowa, it should be reserved (just in case) that in the years 1840-1842 "the periodic connections of Norwid to the underground movement are very likely, while close contacts with the coryphaei of this movement are even certain". Z. TROJANOWICZOWA, *W kręgu "młodej piśmienności warszawskiej"*, [in:] EADEM, *Rzecz o młodości Norwida*, Poznań 1968, p. 72.

to search for the basis of Norwid's literary commentary discourse, the living tendency of the author of the poem *Do emira Abd el Kadera w Damaszku* to comment on historical events from the perspective of literary narrative, here: poetic and dramatic. Mikucki tries to prove that the result of Norwid's literary-historical-commentary passion in the years 1853-1856 would be the drama *Teatr bez teatru* and the poem *Pokój*.⁸² This is an important commentary on today's tendencies of speaking about Norwid in Norwid Studies, a historiosopher rather than historiographer, a possessor of historical generalising strategies rather than a revisioner of figures of historical thinking, a supporter of "retrospective utopia" rather than a dynamic archeologist of history.⁸³ In some way, we return in Norwid Studies to Hegel – even despite the conclusions drawn long ago from the book by Alicja Lisiecka *Norwid. Poeta historii*.⁸⁴ Universalism as a figure of Norwid's historical thinking, appropriating the fields of other figures of Norwid's historical thinking, especially the field of the figure of revision (to use the terminology proposed by Sławomir Rzepczyński⁸⁵), is an evidently post-Hegelian movement, even if carried out from a Christian point of view. I am afraid that we can be guided in this direction that in Norwid Studies there is indeed a temptation to overdo with universalisation of literary and philosophical content in Norwid's works for the sake of underestimating the revision of these. Meanwhile, the "revising Norwid" does not seem to be a "universalising Norwid", of course – similarly – the "universalising Norwid" will not be a "revising Norwid", thus no reverse appropriations should be made – of what is universal in favour of the present. I am referring here to the discussion of Wiktor Mikucki and Edward Kasperski, which the former reports in footnote 43 of his sketch⁸⁶. A cheerful and, at the same time, friendly conversation between the two "enthusiasts of Norwid's artistic work", addresses here *de facto*

⁸² W. MIKUCKI, *Komentarz polityczny Norwida do wydarzeń z wojny krymskiej w miniaturze dramatycznej "Teatr bez teatru" i wierszu "Pokój"*, [in:] *Trudny Norwid*, pp. 283-303.

⁸³ The predilection for this kind of determining Norwid's attitude towards history can be encountered in another, besides *Trudny Norwid*, collection of texts published by KUL, entitled *Norwid wobec historii*. The above-mentioned terms are derived from the following texts: S. RZEP CZYŃSKI, *Aktualizacja i uniwersalizacja jako figury myślenia historycznego Norwida* (term: "revisioner [of figures of historical thinking]"), G. HALKIEWICZ-SOJAK, *Historiozof, historiograf czy miłośnik archeologii – Norwidowski podmiot wobec tajemnicy dziejów* (terms: "historiosopher", "historiographer", "[possessor of historical] generalising strategies", "archeologist of history"), M. INGLÓT, *Koncepcja procesu historycznego w listach Norwida* („[supporter] of retrospective utopia”), [in:] *Norwid wobec historii*, eds. E. Chlebowska, Ł. Niewczas, Lublin 2014, pp. 11-66.

⁸⁴ A. LISIECKA, *Norwid. Poeta historii*, Londyn 1973.

⁸⁵ S. RZEP CZYŃSKI, *Aktualizacja i uniwersalizacja*, pp. 11-28.

⁸⁶ W. MIKUCKI, *Komentarz polityczny...*, p. 294.

an issue that is fundamental for Norwid Studies: reasons for the “universalising” and “revising” reading of the poem *Pokój*, and within it – the method of decoding the metaphor of the fall of Granada⁸⁷.

The contribution by Agata Brajerska-Mazur must pass for an extremely erudite text, which at the same time gives a cross-sectional picture of translational problems within Norwid Studies, and more precisely – the English translation of Norwid. Her study is also an excellent presentation and, simultaneously, recommendation of the anthology *Cyprian Norwid. Selected Poems* translated by Danuta Borchardt (Brajerska-Mazur collaborated with Borchardt while working on the volume, in the text we also find information that she suggested the translator, among others, to base her translation on the katena method)⁸⁸. I believe it is worth reflecting once again on the synthetic approach to English translations of Norwid’s works (Brajerska-Mazur authored the monograph *O angielskich tłumaczeniach utworów Norwida*⁸⁹), for example, from the perspective of the recently popular methodology of analysing translation series – examples of this kind of research in Poland are presented, among others, in the book by Agnieszka Adamowicz-Pośpiech *Seria w przekładzie. Polskie warianty prozy Josepha Conrada*⁹⁰. First of all, we should ask about the so-called series hypothesis⁹¹ in the area of research into the translation of Norwid’s works into English. If there have been as many as 15 English translations of *Bema pamięci żałobny-rapsod* and 7 English translations of *Do obywatela Johna Brown*, could it not be said that there is at least a seed, a foretaste of Norwid’s “translation series” in English literature (or Norwid’s “series in translation”)?

The book *Trudny Norwid* closes with the texts by Marek Bodusz and Piotr Chlebowski on rock as an aural or audiovisual translation of Norwid’s poetic semantics. Bodusz, referring *inter alia* to the study of Maryla Hopfinger on the

⁸⁷ Ibidem. The “revising” study – regardless of the quality and value of the final “revised” text – is always valuable in the area of study on the author. I will quote here an example of a text by Jerzy Zdrada about Apollon Nałęcz-Korzeniowski’s diary *Polska i Moskwa* and its importance in the research on the Polish base of Joseph Conrad-Korzeniowski. J. ZDRADA, *Apollo Korzeniowski’s “Poland and Muscovy”*, “Yearbook of Conrad Studies (Poland)”, 2008-2009, vol. IV, pp. 21-96.

⁸⁸ A. BRAJERSKA-MAZUR, *Dziesięć trudności – dziesięć przykazań w tłumaczeniu Norwida (i co z nich wynikło, czyli o przekładach Danuty Borchardt)*, [in:] *Trudny Norwid*, p. 392 (including the footnote explaining how to use the katena method).

⁸⁹ EADEM, *O angielskich tłumaczeniach utworów Norwida*, Lublin 2002.

⁹⁰ A. ADAMOWICZ-POŚPIECH, *Seria w przekładzie. Polskie warianty prozy Josepha Conrada*, Katowice 2013.

⁹¹ IDEM, *Seria przekładowa w ujęciu “Translation Studies”*. “Hipoteza serii”, ibidem, p. 39-41.

audiovisual context of contemporary culture, differentiates with one another the consecutive rock interpretations of Norwid's poems: *Moja Piosnka II* by Czesław Niemen and Stan Borys, *Bema pamięci żałobny-rapsod* from the album *Niemen Enigmatic* and from the album *Moniti Revan* (Maciej Maleńczuk, *Homo Twist* rock band). He also invokes paraphrases and pastiches of Norwid's text from *Closterkeller's* albums, and also from later records by *Homo Twist* (including the track *Lema pamięci kosmiczny pogrzeb*). The most recent recordings released after 2010, especially the album *Absurdustra – próba Norwida* by *Sikora Proniuk Duo*, may still be missing here. The example of *Absurdustra ...* suggests that the movement that Bodusz proposes, "the rebirth of high culture through low culture", bringing Norwid to the "market of contemporary culture", descent "from ultivated to vernacular"⁹², has perhaps already undergone sublimation, perhaps – I want to emphasize – the album by *Sikora Proniuk Duo* proves that there is a gradual return or reappraisal of Norwid's text – "from vernacular to ultivated."

The last text in the volume, written by Piotr Chlebowski, appears to be a perfectly complete analysis of "Niemen's rock suite to Norwid's poem". The author of the sketch remembers about everything, points to the context of the birth of progressive rock and psychedelic music, relevant for Niemen, describes the European career of the rock formula of "concept album" that inspired Niemen, and finally conducts a detailed analysis of the sixteen-minute work by Norwid – and though, not only on the basis of the most important interpretations of *Bema pamięci żałobny-rapsod* within *Norwid Studies* (here he especially distinguishes the work of Ireneusz Opacki⁹³), but he also holistically considers the musical methods of evoking the potential of Norwid's poem. On the one hand, he points to the significance of the rondo placed by Niemen in the first part, on the other, he praises Niemen's unity of the three cadences-anticadences and the role of the bolero in the third part. He reports on the cold reception of the "rock suite" by Anna Kamińska⁹⁴, who is inspired by Norwid, and, at the same time, he shows Niemen's rejection of the musical tradition of funeralism (Beethoven, Mahler, Chopin)⁹⁵. The volume *Trudny Norwid* is thus crowned with an in every respect fascinating text, which, however, at the same time, makes us realise how far we have departed at this point from the monographic reflection on Norwid's difficulty

⁹² M. BODUSZ, *Cyprian Norwid w rytmach rockowych*, [in:] *Trudny Norwid*, pp. 436-437.

⁹³ I. OPACKI, *Rapsod ostatni, rapsod pierwszy*, [in:] *Prace ofiarowane Henrykowi Markiewiczowi*, ed. T. Weiss, Kraków-Wrocław 1984, pp. 150-167.

⁹⁴ P. CHLEBOWSKI, "Bema pamięci żałobny-rapsod". *Rockowa suita Niemena do wiersza Norwida*, [in:] *Trudny Norwid*, p. 456.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 454.

(the main subject of the first hundred pages of the book). It is a pity, however, is it not something that the imperative of interpretive openness inscribed in the formula of *Colloquium Norwidianum* calls for?

Translated by Rafał Augustyn

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADAMOWICZ-POŚPIECH A., *Seria w przekładzie. Polskie warianty prozy Josepha Conrada*, Katowice 2013.
- BARAŃCZAK S., *Norwid: obecność nieobecnego*, [in:] IDEM, *Tablica z Macondo. Osiemnaście prób wytłumaczenia, po co i dla czego się pisze*, Londyn 1990, pp. 89-105.
- BOROWIEC A., *“Album Orbis” Cypriana Norwida jako księga sztukmistrza*, Gdańsk 2015.
- BRAJERSKA-MAZUR A., *O angielskich tłumaczeniach utworów Norwida*, Lublin 2002.
- BUŚ M., *Milosz and Norwid*, [in:] *Czesław Miłosz*, ed. W.P. Szymański, Warszawa–Kraków 1987, pp.119-138.
- BUŚ M., *Zagadnienie “trudności” Norwida (uwagi wstępne)*, [in:] *Zbliżenia historycznoliterackie. Prace ofiarowane Prof. Stanisławowi Burkotowi*, eds. T. Budrewicz, M. Buś, Kraków 2003.
- CALEK A., *Adam Mickiewicz – Juliusz Słowacki. Psychobiografia naukowa*, Kraków 2012.
- Cypriana Norwida kształt prawdy i miłości. Analizy i interpretacje*, ed. S. Makowski, Warszawa 1986, pp. 132-140.
- Czemu i jak czytamy Norwida?*, eds. J. Chojak, E. Teleżyńska, Warszawa 1991.
- DĄBROWICZ E., *Model niestateczny* [review of the book by P. Bojko, *Oblicze człowieka. Rysy autoportretu w listach Norwida*], “*Studia Norwidiana*” 26(2008), pp. 231-236.
- DĄBROWICZ E., *Norwid czytelny*, [in:] *Jak czytać Norwida? Postawy badawcze, metody, weryfikacje*, eds. B. Kuczera-Chachulska, J. Trzcionka, Warszawa 2008.
- DUDEK J., *Milosz wobec Conrada 1948-1959*, Kraków 2014.
- DUNAJSKI A., Rev., *Norwid – teolog?*, [in:] IDEM, *Teologiczne czytanie Norwida*, Pelplin 1996.
- FERT J., *Norwid wobec towianizmu*, [in:] *Norwid a chrześcijaństwo*, ed. P. Chlebowski, Lublin 2002, pp. 161-209.
- FIUT A., *Panu Profesorowi Henrykowi Markiewiczowi – w odpowiedzi*, “*Teksty Drugie*” 2008, vol. 5.
- FRANASZEK A., *Głosy biednych ludzi. 1939-1945*, [in:] IDEM, *Milosz. Biografia*, Kraków 2012.
- GIDDENS A., *Konsekwencje nowoczesności*, transl. by E. Klekot, Kraków 2008.
- GŁOWIŃSKI M., *Ciemne alegorie Norwida*, “*Pamiętnik Literacki*” 1984, vol. 3, pp. 103-114.
- GŁOWIŃSKI M., *Norwid i Jakobson (O granicach lingwistycznej analizy poezji)*, [in:] *Anabasis. Prace ofiarowane Profesor Krystynie Pisarkowej*, ed. I. Bobrowski, Kraków 2003, pp. 147-156.
- HALKIEWICZ-SOJAK G., *Historiozof, historiograf czy miłośnik archeologii – Norwidowski podmiot wobec tajemnicy dziejów*, [in:] *Norwid wobec historii*, eds. E. Chlebowska,

- Ł. Niewczas, Lublin 2014, pp. 29-45.
- HALKIEWICZ-SOJAK G., *Monografia Cypriana Norwida – książka postulowana, ale czy możliwa*, [in:] *Nawiązane ogniwo. Studia o poezji Cypriana Norwida i jej kontekstach*, Toruń 2010.
- INGLOT M., *Koncepcja procesu historycznego w listach Norwida*, [in:] *Norwid wobec historii*, eds. E. Chlebowska, Ł. Niewczas, Lublin 2014, pp. 47-66.
- JARZYNA A., *Norwid Jastruna: odmiany recepcji*, [in:] *EADEM, Pójście za Norwidem (w polskiej poezji współczesnej)*, Lublin 2013, pp. 17-68.
- Jedno dzieło – wiele interpretacji. Rozważania nad "Wielkimi słowami" Cypriana Norwida*, ed. D. Pniewski, Toruń 2012.
- KOPIŃSKI A., *Ludzie z charakterami. O okupacyjnym sporze Czesława Miłosza i Andrzeja Trzebińskiego*, Warszawa 2004.
- KUZIĄK M., *Czarne kwiaty, których nie ma. Jak dekonstruuje się tekst Norwida?*, [in:] *Strona Norwida. Studia ofiarowane Profesorowi Stefanowi Sawickiemu*, eds. P. Chlebowski, W. Toruń, E. Żwirkowska, E. Chlebowska, Lublin 2008, pp. 271-281.
- KUZIĄK M., *Inny Mickiewicz*, Gdańsk 2013.
- KUZIĄK M., *Mickiewicz wobec nowoczesności*, [in:] *Romantyzm i nowoczesność*, ed. M. Kuziak, Kraków 2009, pp. 81-108.
- KUZIĄK M., *O prelekcjach paryskich Adama Mickiewicza*, Słupsk 2007.
- KUZIĄK M., *O różnych "jak" w "Vade-mecum" Norwida*, [in:] *Czytając Norwida 2*, ed. S. Rzepczyński, Słupsk 2003, pp. 133-147.
- KUZIĄK M., *Wielka całość. Dyskursy kulturowe Mickiewicza*, Słupsk 2006.
- LISIECKA A., *Norwid. Poeta historii*, Londyn 1973.
- LUBELSKA M., *Czcigodny Panie Profesorze!*, "Teksty Drugie" 2008, vol. 5, pp. 194-198.
- ŁAWSKI J., *Dlaczego "Maria"? Symboliczne funkcje tytułu w poemacie Antoniego Malczewskiego*, [in:] *Antoniemu Malczewskiemu w 170. rocznicę pierwszej edycji "Marii". Materiały sesji naukowej, Białystok 5-7 V 1995*, ed. H. Krukowska, Białystok 1997, pp. 137-180.
- ŁAWSKI J., *Marie romantyków. Metafizyczne wizje kobiecości. Mickiewicz – Malczewski – Krasieński*, Białystok 2003.
- MACIEJEWSKI J., *Spojrzenie "w górę" i "wokół"*, "Roczniki Humanistyczne" 1976, vol. 1, pp. 133-247.
- MARKIEWICZ H., *Czego nie rozumiem w "Traktacie moralnym"?*, "Teksty Drugie" 2006, vol. 5, pp. 205-212.
- MARKIEWICZ H., *Odpowiedź miłoszologom*, "Teksty Drugie" 2006, vol. 5, pp. 199-205.
- MCKINLEY RUNYAN W., *Historie życia a psychobiografia: badanie teorii i metody*, transl. by J. Kasprzewski, Warszawa 1992.
- MELBECHOWSKA-LUTY A., *Sztukmistrz. Twórczość artystyczna i myśli o sztuce Cypriana Norwida*, Warszawa 2001.
- MIŁOŚ CZ., *Wojna 1940-1945*, [in:] *IDEM, Poszukiwania. Wybór publicystyki rozproszonej 1931-1983*, compiled by K. Piwnicki, Warszawa 1985.
- MITEK-DZIEMBA A., *Krytyczne otwarcie świeckości. Postsekularyzm jako formuła komparatystyczna*, [in:] *Drzewo Poznania. Postsekularyzm w przekładach i komentarzach*, eds. P. Bogalecki i A. Mitek-Dziemba, Katowice 2012.

- NIEUKERKEN VAN A., *O "niewczesności" Norwida, dwóch modernizmach i Miłoszu*, "Teksty Drugie" 1995, vol. 6, pp. 53-68.
- OBOLEVITCH T., *Myśl o. Gieorgija Florowskiego*, [in:] EADEM, *Filozofia rosyjskiego renesansu patrystycznego. O. Gieorgij Florowski, Włodzimierz Łoski i inni*, Kraków 2014.
- OPACKI I., *Rapsod ostatni, rapsod pierwszy*, [in:] *Prace ofiarowane Henrykowi Markiewiczowi*, ed. T. Weiss, Kraków–Wrocław 1984, pp. 149-168.
- PACZOSKA E., *Tajemnice konstrukcji. Dramatyzacja w powieści realistycznej (Bolesław Prus – Henry James)*, [in:] *Realizm, realności, realność. W stulecie śmierci Bolesława Prusa*, eds. E. Paczoska, B. Szleszyński, D.M. Osiński, Warszawa 2013, pp. 249-258.
- PAWELEC T., *Psyche i Klio. Historia w oczach psychohistoryków*, Lublin 2002.
- PNIEWSKI D., *Narzędzia Norwidowskiej moralistyki. Wzniosłość, pàthos, èthos i paideia w "Wielkich słowach" i w "Modlitwie"*, "Studia Norwidiana" 29(2011), pp. 119-133.
- PORĘBSKI M., *Czy metaforę można zobaczyć?*, "Teksty" 1980 vol. 6.
- RZEPczyński S., *Aktualizacja i uniwersalizacja jako figury myślenia historycznego Norwida*, [in:] *Norwid wobec historii*, eds. E. Chlebowska, Ł. Niewczas, Lublin 2014, pp. 11-28.
- RZEPczyński S., *Wokół nowel "włoskich" Norwida. Z zagadnień komunikacji literackiej*, Słupsk 1996.
- RZEPczyński S., *Za co Norwid cenił "Marię"?*, [in:] *Antoniemu Malczewskiego w 170. rocznicę pierwszej edycji "Marii". Materiały sesji naukowej, Białystok 5-7 V 1995*, ed. H. Krukowska, Białystok 1997, pp. 441-452.
- SAWICKI S., *Z zagadnień semantyki poetyckiej Norwida*, [in:] IDEM, *Norwida walka z formą*, Warszawa 1986, pp. 24-41.
- SŁOWACKI J., *Do pastereczki siedzącej na druidów kamieniach w Pornic nad oceanem*, [in:] IDEM, *Dzieła*, ed. J. Krzyżanowski, vol. I, Wrocław 1959.
- ŚNIADECKI J., *[Sąd o Szekspirze]*, [in:] *Walka romantyków z klasykami*, introduction, excerpts and compiled by S. Kawyn, Wrocław 1960.
- TISCHNER Ł., *Glosa do artykułu prof. Henryka Markiewicza „Czego nie rozumiem w »Traktacie moralnym«?”*, "Teksty Drugie" 2008 vol. 5, pp. 188-193.
- TOWIAŃSKI A., *Biesiada. Wielki Period*, Kraków 2002.
- TROJANOWICZOWA Z., DAMBEK Z. with participation of J. CZARNOMORSKA, *Kalendarz życia i twórczości Cypriana Norwida*, vol. I: 1821-1860, Poznań 2007.
- TROJANOWICZOWA Z., *W kręgu "młodej piśmienności warszawskiej"*, [in:] EADEM, *Rzecz o młodości Norwida*, Poznań 1968.
- Trudny Norwid*, ed. P. Chlebowski, Lublin 2013.
- WORONOW I., *Romantyczna idea korespondencji sztuk. Stendhal, Hoffmann, Baudelaire, Norwid*, Kraków 2008.
- WYKA K., *Cyprian Norwid. Poeta i sztukmistrz*, Kraków 1948.
- ZACH J., *"Traktat moralny": poezja jako "akt umysłu"*, "Teksty Drugie" 2008, vol. 5, pp. 180-187.
- ZDRADA J., *Apollo Korzeniowski's "Poland and Muscovy"*, "Yearbook of Conrad Studies (Poland)", 2008-2009, vol. IV, pp. 21-96.
- ZIĘBA J., *Klerk zaangażowany. Stefana Napierskiego nowoczesna krytyka literacka wobec dyskursów krytycznych w Dwudziestoleciu międzywojennym*, Kraków 2006.

MOŻLIWE, NIEMOŻLIWE.
TRUDNY NORWID TRUDNEJ NORWIDOLOGII
S t r e s z c z e n i e

Tom *Trudny Norwid* jest nie tylko próbą stworzenia „monografii niemożliwej”, lecz także ważnym, bo przekrojowym dokumentem ewolucji polskiej norwidologii (być może właśnie ta, a nie inna problematyka książki ów interesujący horyzont szczególnie uprzyściplniała). Skutkiem tego – analizowany tu zbiór tekstów domaga się niejako dwóch dróg odczytywania i podlega tak samo dwóm równoległym ścieżkom interpretacyjnym. Jedna została wyznaczona przez temat całości tomu, druga realizowana jest mimowolnie, zwłaszcza w toku omawiania dyskusyjnych kwestii w obrębie dyscypliny. Ta druga wydała się autorowi niniejszego omówienia równie pasjonująca, co pierwsza. Stąd też jego próba syntetycznego połączenia obu interesów tej książki, choćby w ramach podtytułu niniejszego studium – hasła „trudnego Norwida trudnej norwidologii”.

Słowa kluczowe: Cyprian Norwid; norwidologia; Czesław Miłosz; metodologia badań nad autorem; idiom; Roman Ingarden; postsekularyzm; neopatrystyka; antagonizm recepcji; William Szekspir; hipoteza serii; metoda kateny; psychobiografia.

POSSIBLE, IMPOSSIBLE.
DIFFICULT NORWID IN DIFFICULT NORWID STUDIES
S u m m a r y

The volume *Trudny Norwid* [Difficult Norwid] marks not only an attempt to create an “impossible monograph” but also an important, large-scale record of the evolution of Norwid Studies in Poland (perhaps it is exactly this and not the other issues addressed in the book that made this interesting perspective particularly accessible). As a result, the collection of Texas examined here requires at least two ways of reading and is subject to the same two parallel interpretive paths. One of these was defined by the subject of the entire volume, while the other one is performed involuntarily, in particular in the course of discussing issues that are disputable in the discipline. The author of this review found the second interpretive path as exciting as the first, hence this attempt to synthesise the two interests of the book, if only under the heading of this study – the headword “difficult Norwid in difficult Norwid Studies”.

Key words: Cyprian Norwid; Norwid Studies; Czesław Miłosz; author research methodology; idiom; Roman Ingarden; postsecularism; neo-patristics; reception antagonism; William Shakespeare; series hypothesis; katena method; psychobiography.

Summary translated by Rafał Augustyn

KAROL SAMSEL – PhD, assistant professor in the Institute of Polish Literature, Faculty of Polish Studies, University of Warsaw; PhD candidate in the Department of Polish Philosophy, Institute of Philosophy, University of Warsaw. Address: ul. Łęczysk 23, 07-410 Ostrołęka; e-mail: lewks@wp.pl.