

the methodology used by Anna Roter-Bourkane, the contexts she describes and the ambition to define the concepts mentioned in the title of the book. At the same time, the authors raises questions about the aesthetics of the treatise-typical features, which in the examined book is not clearly distinguished from the genre of treaty.

**Key words:** treatise; features of treatise; 19<sup>th</sup> century; poetry; Cyprian Norwid; genology.

*Summary translated by Rafał Augustyn*

MAGDALENA WOŹNIEWSKA-DZIAŁAK – PhD, assistant professor in the Department of Theory of Culture and Interculturalism, Faculty of Humanities, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University (UKSW) in Warsaw. Author of the book *Poematy narracyjne Cypriana Norwida. Konteksty literacko-kulturalne, estetyka, myśl* (2014). UKSW, ul. Dewajtis 5, 01-815 Warszawa; e-mail: m.wozniewska@uksw.edu.pl

Grażyna H a l k i e w i c z - S o j a k – ON THE HIDDEN  
DIMENSION OF THE  
ROMANTIC HERITAGE

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18290/sn.2017.35-15en>

Ewa Szczeglacka-Pawłowska has been consistently developing her research methodology for over a dozen years, looking for a research perspective that would allow to read the poetry of Polish Romanticism in exile with respect for the achievements of several generations of editors and historians of literature, but also with emphasis on the researcher's own, if possible original, approach. This is best evidenced by her two books: *Romantyczny homo legens. Zygmunt Krasiński jako czytelnik polskich poetów* [Romantic homo legens. Zygmunt Krasiński as a reader of Polish poets] (Warsaw 2003, 367 pages) and *Romantyzm "brulionowy"* ["Draft paper" Romanticism] (Warsaw 2015, 580 pages). But not only; this direction of the author's search is also indicated in her articles published in journals, as well as scientific reviews<sup>1</sup>. The characteristic feature of these articles is the precise

<sup>1</sup> Among others, Ewa Szczeglacka reviewed the works by: Dariusz Seweryn, *O wyobraźni lirycznej Adama Mickiewicza* ("Pamiętnik Literacki" 1998, vol. 1), Anna Kubale, *Dramat bólu istnienia w listach Zygmunta Krasińskiego* ("Pamiętnik Literacki" 1999, vol. 2), Elżbieta Dąbrowicz, *Cyprian Norwid. Osoby i listy* ("Pamiętnik Literacki" 2000, vol. 2), Jarosław Ławski, *Marie romantyków. Metafizyczne wizje kobiecości* ("Przegląd Humanistyczny" 2004/2005).

and reliable reconstruction of the authors' argumentation and their methodological conceptions, as well as striving to show the place of each dissertation against the background of the previous research and only from this perspective potentially engaging in a discussion with the theses contained in it. In this context, the books written by the author should not be left unnoticed.

The reading of both monographs prompts us to ask about the perspective of scientific narrative, about the choice of the point of view from which the researcher looks at Polish Romantic literature and finds an uncharted area among the extensive tradition of philological readings. It is immediately prominent that she chooses problems that seemingly do not promise to look into the mainstream of the epoch, but, as it turns out, open a perspective leading to significant amendments in the image of Polish Romanticism. In the first book, the author inquires into how Zygmunt Krasiński read Adam Mickiewicz, Juliusz Słowacki and Cyprian Norwid. The answers she gives lead to the poetics of reception, they allow to extract critical and literary-theoretical threads from the writer's extensive correspondence, creating a portrait of Krasiński-reader. The author sets herself such tasks at the start, but as she gathers further insights and interpretations, she goes beyond them. Both the subject of research and the researcher herself are to be credited for it. In the poet's letters we may find not only an expression of the impressions and reflections noted on the margins of the books, but there we will also find the attempts to put the books he read in the broad contexts of the epoch: philosophical, religious, aesthetic and political. The reconstruction of these aspects leads to the central issues of post-January Uprising Romanticism, such as cognitive aspirations of poetry, literature vis-à-vis philosophy, Byronism and Shakespearism vs the crisis of Romantic individualism, prophetic poetry – its temptations and borders, messianism and its various variants. It turns out, as a result, that the answers to the questions about the style of Krasiński's reading enable us to outline a map of the main themes of Polish Romanticism in exile in its mature and final period. Therefore, even though the author refuses to define her work as a monograph, I use this term, noting that at least we are dealing here with a monographic outline.

The image of an important fragment of Polish Romanticism arose in the book, as it seems, without any preliminary synthetic assumptions. The author focused on those fragments of the writer's letters and discursive texts, which bear traces of his readings, but at the same time demand a commentary and introduction of interpretive contexts, which are often both thematically and programmatically extensive. This reveals a hermeneutic effort of understanding and the art of interpretation that the researcher mastered well. The choice of the topic favoured crossing the boundaries between different methodologies inclined to clearly iden-

tify certain problem areas. Krasiński – presented both as a reader and creator – allowed to combine history of literature told from the perspective of a recipient (as postulated by, for example, Hans R. Jauss) with the perspective of a historian investigating the history of authors and their works. The analysis of the ways of reading, revealed by the poet in his correspondence, revealed both the existential function of books (reading as a way of existence, reading as a source of self-creation) and the philosophical inspirations deriving from them, especially historiosophic inspirations. It allowed to unite the image of Krasiński as a poet of existence with the image of a thinker-historiographer. However, the presentation of the argument from the reflection on fragments to the ever wider problem areas, the resignation from – to some extent – organising ideas of the historians of ideas has also its price. Following Krasiński's thought and trying to unravel its meanders, the author sometimes does not notice (or does not emphasise it clearly) how the poet expands, modifies, sometimes blurs the meanings of certain concepts adopted in the philosophical language of the epoch (e.g. pantheism) or in historical-literary discourse (Towianism). The method adopted by the researcher allowed for a relatively free choice of problems, but it thus resulted in a disproportion in the degree of material detail in individual parts of the dissertation. The fullest and most insightful image of Krasiński's reading is contained in sections devoted to Mickiewicz and Słowacki. At this point, I would like to highlight a great chapter devoted to Krasiński's reader aporia while reading *Król-Duch*. The part devoted to Norwid is of a sketchy nature, although the very interesting interpretive approach in which the author reconstructs the dialogue of poets in poems about incipits – Norwid's *Od Anioła do Szatana...* and Krasiński's *Tyś nie śmierci łup!* – indicates that the other outlined threads could also have been developed.

In *Romantyzm "brulionowy"*, the author remained faithful to the heroes of her first book, but she looked at their biographies and works from a different perspective – a wider and also methodologically original one. She introduced the title category of "draft paper Romanticism" in opposition to "official Romanticism"; in the Introduction she wrote: "The book *Romantyzm "brulionowy"* is not a monograph on the epoch, but a project on reading its internal (unofficial) current, an attempt to highlight the "difference" that emerges from comparisons of two areas of creativity: the published and unpublished one; their mutual influence on each other"<sup>2</sup>.

In the centre of Ewa Szczeglacka-Pawłowska's interest are manuscripts (in particular, the manuscripts of works published after the authors' deaths), notebooks, notepads, diaries, albums of people close to Romantic artists, draft papers (the lat-

<sup>2</sup> E. SZCZEGŁACKA-PAWŁOWSKA, *Romantyzm "brulionowy"*, p. 39.

ter not only in the sense of drafts contrasted with fair copies, but also as sketches of unfinished works, left in the form of a fragment or concept outline). The book consists of *Introduction* and a short *Conclusion*, perhaps too laconic with regard to the content of the dissertation, and five parts divided into chapters. The first part, titled like the whole work, is an extension of the preliminary findings; it was devoted to the specification of the category of “draft paper Romanticism”. The second part (“*Liber manu scriptus*” of Adam Mickiewicz) concerns the analysis of the manuscripts of the author of *Sonety krymskie*, whereby Szczeglacka-Pawłowska focuses primarily on the autographs of poems. The most comprehensive, aiming at a monographic description of the subject, are the third (*Juliusz Słowacki’s notebooks*) and the fourth part (*Zygmunt Krasiński’s manuscripts*). The last, fifth part (*Towards Cyprian Norwid*) is written in the form of a sketch. The author deals there with two problems: in the chapter on *Czarne kwiaty* she demonstrates how the poet wanted to integrate a private, unofficial subject into the trend of official literature and how he searched for a formula to broaden the limits of literariness. By contrast, in the sketch dedicated to *Vade-mecum* she points to the draft paper character of this series of poems<sup>3</sup>.

Throughout the dissertation, Szczeglacka-Pawłowska examines the hypothesis that can be reduced to the question: does the inclusion of an unofficial current that reveals the process of creation, hesitation and dissonance in writers’ thinking and certain “stitches” of artistic compositions change the image of Romanticism established in the history of literature? Two more specific questions are subsumed under this fundamental question. The first concerns the relationship between the official, monumental current, referring to the set of ideas taken up by the successors, and the “draft paper” current. The second question focuses on Romantic lyricism and its variants.

Such study design required the selection and application of various methods from the broadly understood field of philology. First of all, it required editorial and textological skills necessary to work with manuscripts. In her analyses of manuscripts, Szczeglacka-Pawłowska compares the shape recorded in editions of Romantic works with earlier editions (if they exist) and goes back to the source retained in the autograph to restore its original context and reconstruct the circumstances of the creation of the work. This approach brings her closer to the methods proposed by the French genetic criticism, although the author of the dissertation does not point directly to this methodological inspiration. The thinking about manuscripts analogous to this philological school can be seen particularly in the

---

<sup>3</sup> It is worth noticing here, maybe as a side note, that J.F. Fert, the editor of *Vade-mecum* came to a similar conclusion as a result of his detailed textological research.

part of the dissertation devoted to Mickiewicz. Tracking the fate of manuscript traces sometimes resemble detective work, as in the case of Mickiewicz's sonnet *Czołobitność*, from which only two lines survived in the autograph. The author tries to determine what happened to the rest of the text and whether the rest existed at all. An example of such editorial investigation is also the search for the second, longer, first edition of Słowacki's poem [*Anioł ognisty – mój anioł lewy*], leading to the verification of the false information provided in "Nowy Korbut".

Secondly, next to textological and editorial methods, it is biographical studies that determines the research perspective here. The author of the dissertation is interested in the context of events and experiences accompanying literary creativity. Many years of studies of Krasiński and, in particular, of his lyric poetry, made Ewa Szczeglacka sensitive to this aspect in a special way. Krasiński's poems were most often created as works meant for private circulation; they were included in letters, they often played the role of a commentary on gifts, intimate and social situations, they preserved unofficial and completely individual places of memory. Incorporated in collective editions and devoid of primary contexts, they have different meanings than originally intended<sup>4</sup>. Sometimes their semantics becomes universal, but sometimes it is impoverished. Upon analysing the circumstances of the creation of manuscripts, the author of the dissertation restores those lost meanings. They refer not only, or maybe – not so much to the chronical biographical facts as to the existential moments. That is why the analysis of Krasiński's "draft paper" Romanticism required the introduction of a psychobiographic perspective.

The third methodological aspect in Szczeglacka's work is the art of interpretation, which involves the selection of works and specific issues that are the subject of subsequent chapters. The author is interested in the varieties of romantic lyricism. This is probably why in the case of Mickiewicz's works she chooses those from the Russian period, associated with a series of sonnets, and from the poet's later output she selects the lyric poetry from his Lausanne period and only few post-Lausanne poems (*Drzewo*, [*Wysłuchać się w szum wód głuchy*]). She confronts the poetic practice of Mickiewicz-lyricist with the remarks of the poet-lecturer, excerpted from the Paris lectures. Słowacki-lyricist exists in the dissertation as the author of sonnets written in his juvenile years (the analysis of *Album Salomei z Januszewskich...*), then – poems and fragments recorded in [*Raptularz wschodni*] and finally those from [*Raptularz 1843-1849*]. Szczeglacka tries to interpret the poems from the last period of Słowacki's artistic work differently than it was preserved in the historico-literary tradition. She does not look for traces of the philosophy of genesis, but above all for the poetic testimony of spiritual and existential

---

<sup>4</sup> Among Krasiński's researchers this problem is emphasised strongest by Maciej Szargot.

struggles with himself. The section devoted to Krasiński opens with a chapter on the relationship between the poems and the epistolary context in which the lyric poems originally arose. The starting point is the interpretation of the incipit poem *Bóg mi odmówił tej anielskiej miary...*, which the researcher reads, contrary to the previous interpretative tradition, as a “perverse manifesto” of the author’s creative autonomy, and not as a confession of poetic block. The following chapters of this part of the dissertation are devoted to: Swiss *Fragmenty*, albums prepared for Delfina Potocka, Stammbuch poems from Amelia Załuska’s album. They are full of very interesting editorial information and insights.

The three methodological orientations indicated above are intertwined in individual parts of the dissertation in different proportions. This is attributable to the inhomogeneity of the analysed material. And thus, for example, in parts devoted to Mickiewicz and Słowacki, the author can fully show her mastery of textological research, since she examines the autographs; in the chapters on Krasiński’s works, in the absence of most manuscripts, dominates the art of interpretation and the use of biographical methodology (indispensable here due to the epistolary context that is widely referred to). The researcher uses with great freedom philological instruments, adequately selecting the methods she needs. She focuses her attention on lyrical poetry. In conclusion, she states that in the era of poetry, which was Romanticism, this literary genre was – paradoxically – ignored by the public, and sometimes also by poets. In such situation it found asylum in the space of privacy documented in albums, Stammbuchs, notebooks and draft papers.

Ewa Szczeglacka-Pawłowska’s work extracts the current of this inner literariness onto the historico-literary surface. Interesting, although requiring additional research, is also the hypothesis concerning Norwid’s reception. According to the author, one of the reasons for the rejection of the writer’s works by the 19<sup>th</sup>-century readers might be the fact that he was referring to this “draft paper” Romantic trend and wanted to introduce it to the official canon. It should be added here that in the 20<sup>th</sup>-century Polish lyrical poetry, this trend has not only entered the language of poetry, but even dominated this language.

It is worth adding that the book is an attractive reading, not only because of its scientific merits; some fragments about the fate of manuscripts of poems can be read as detective stories. The author perfectly mastered the art of interpretation and can use it, proposing interesting and well-motivated readings, sometimes going against the prevalent current of reading books. Owing to her ability to choose the original viewpoints from which she looks at the history of literature, she pointed out certain aspects in the image of Polish Romanticism that are overlooked or marginalised by researchers. The work also reveals the author’s excellent textological and editing skills.

Despite the unquestionably high evaluation of the work, I would like to share two critical remarks. The first concerns the composition of the vast material. The fragments on *Juliusz Słowacki's notebooks* and *Zygmunt Krasiński's manuscripts* are examples of monographic studies of the subject, and the content layout respecting the chronology of poets' works allows the reader to trace how in the "draft paper" trend of the artistic work of each of them their reflections were evolving and becoming deeper, how their poetic language was improving. The parts devoted to Mickiewicz and Norwid have a different, sketch-like character, and, additionally, in the part devoted to Mickiewicz – the order of chapters reverses the natural chronology without any explicit justification – Lausanne lyric poetry is the subject of the first chapter, whereas the sonnets from the Russian period are discussed in the last chapter. Therefore, we deal here with certain compositional incoherence, which probably, in part, results from the fact that the volume includes the author's studies published earlier in journals or collective volumes, which in their first prints constitute closed and coherent wholes<sup>5</sup>. This does not diminish the scientific significance of the volume, but indicates the method of work, characterised by returning to the previous topics, their verification and deepening.

The second critical remark concerns the fact that the author overestimates the hidden character of unofficial Romanticism, as arguments can be found pointing to the fact that "draft paper" literature was not at all such a hidden trend limited to the private sphere as the author suggests in several places. The great Romanticism in exile evolved in a relatively narrow circle of more or less close friends, and the opinions expressed in private letters quite quickly reached the wider public. Actually, the book features many examples of this process, and in Krasiński's letters or in Norwid's sketches one can find a critique of blurring the boundaries between the private and the public word, which testifies to the existence of this phenomenon. However, my opinion here should not be treated as an indication of a flaw but rather as an indication of a topic for discussion.

The book *Romantyzm "brulionowy"* proves that the author has found her own voice in the dialogue on the fundamental problems of Polish Romanticism, and that she listens to the voices of her predecessors. Ewa Szczeglacka-Pawłowska does not present the attitude of an explorer disregarding the tradition of Polish Studies. On the contrary, in her scientific writing one can find the inspirations of Waław Borowy, Stanisław Makowski and, perhaps above all, the continuation of the school of editing and interpretation initiated by Zofia Stefanowska.

*Translated by Rafał Augustyn*

---

<sup>5</sup> 14 studies or its fragments have already been published earlier (cf. bibliographical note, [in:] *Romantyzm "brulionowy"*, pp. 564-565).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- SZCZĘGLACKA-PAWŁOWSKA E., *Romantyczny 'homo legens'. Zygmunt Krasiński jako czytelnik polskich poetów*, Warszawa 2003.
- SZCZĘGLACKA-PAWŁOWSKA E., *Romantyzm "brulionowy"*, Warszawa 2015.
- KRASIŃSKI Z., *Dziela literackie*, vols. I-III, compiled by P. Hertz, Warszawa 1971.
- KRASIŃSKI Z., *Listy do Konstantego Gaszyńskiego*, compiled by Z. Sudolski, Warszawa 1971.
- KRASIŃSKI Z., *Listy do Henryka Reeve'a*, vols. I-II, transl. by A. Olędzka-Frybesowa, compiled by P. Hertz, Warszawa 1980.
- NORWID C., *Pisma wszystkie*, vols. I, II, VI, XI, compiled by J.W. Gomulicki, Warszawa 1971-1976.
- NORWID C., *Vade-mecum*, compiled by J.F. Fert, Wrocław 1999.

RZECZ O UKRYTM WYMIARZE  
ROMANTYCZNEGO DZIEDZICTWA

## Streszczenie

Tematem artykułu są interpretacje i tezy zawarte w dwóch książkach Ewy Szczęglackiej-Pawłowskiej. Pierwsza z rozpraw, zatytułowana *'Homo legens' Zygmunt Krasiński jako czytelnik polskich poetów*, została poświęcona romantycznej sztuce czytania pokazanej na przykładzie Zygmunta Krasińskiego i jego lektur udokumentowanych w korespondencji. Druga – *Romantyzm „brulionowy”* – nurtowi poezji romantycznej ukrytemu w rozproszonych rękopisach, brulionach, sztambuchach. W obu książkach Norwid jest tylko jednym z bohaterów: w pierwszej pracy został pokazany jako jeden z poetów czytanych przez Krasińskiego, w drugiej – jako autor, który chciał tytułowy „brulionowy” wymiar poezji wprowadzić do oficjalnego kanonu literackiego. Autorka dowodzi tej ostatniej hipotezy, odwołując się do interpretacji *Czarnych kwiatów* i *Vade-mecum*. Wyciąga też wniosek, że była to jedna z przyczyn odrzucenia twórczości poety przez współczesnych czytelników. Jakkolwiek tezy autorki obydwu rozpraw są poparte źródłowymi badaniami, to w przypadku wątku norwidowskiego wymagałyby szerszej egzemplifikacji.

**Słowa kluczowe:** Poezja romantyczna – rękopisy – bruliony – Krasiński – Mickiewicz – Słowacki – koncepcja romantyzmu „brulionowego” Ewy Szczęglackiej-Pawłowskiej.

ON THE HIDDEN DIMENSION  
OF THE ROMANTIC HERITAGE

## Summary

This article examines interpretations and theses contained in two books by Ewa Szczęglacka-Pawłowska. The first of the books entitled *'Homo legens' Zygmunt Krasiński jako czytelnik*

*polskich poetów* [‘Homo legens’ Zygmunt Krasiński as a reader of Polish poets] was devoted to the art of Romantic reading demonstrated on the example of Zygmunt Krasiński and his readings documented in his correspondence. The second book – *Romantyzm “brulionowy”* [“Draft paper” Romanticism] is dedicated to the stream of Romantic poetry hidden in scattered manuscripts, draft papers, albums. In both books Norwid is just one of the heroes: in the first work, he was portrayed as one of the poets read by Krasiński, and in the second – as an author who wanted to introduce the title “draft paper” dimension of poetry to the official literary canon. The authors prove the latter hypothesis, referring to the interpretation of *Czarne kwiaty* [Black flowers] and *Vade-mecum*. She also concludes that this was one of the reasons for rejecting the poet’s work by contemporary readers, Norwid’s thread would require broader exemplification.

Key words: Romantic poetry; manuscripts; draft paper; Krasiński; Mickiewicz; Słowacki; Ewa Szczeglacka-Pawłowska’s conception of “draft paper” Romanticism.

*Summary translated by Rafał Augustyn*

GRAŻYNA HALKIEWICZ-SOJAK – professor, DLitt., literary historian at Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń. Author of almost 90 academic publications and texts for the general public, including four monographs. Co-founder and Board member of Artur Hutnikiewicz Foundation as well as member of Programme Board of ‘Museion Norwid’ Foundation, since 2015 – Board member of Toruń Society of Arts and Sciences; e-mail: [grahas@uni.torun.pl](mailto:grahas@uni.torun.pl)