

tributable to the researcher's little experience at that time. Of course, the author of the review knows the subsequent works of Anita Jarzyna, which, according to the reviewer, prove that we are dealing with a great commentator of Polish poetry.

Key words: Norwid; Norwid's reception; poetry of the 20th century; contemporary poetry; Mieczysław Jastrun; Rafał Wojaczek; Tadeusz Różewicz; Joanna Mueller; anthropology of literature.

Translated by Rafał Augustyn

PAWEŁ TAŃSKI (1974) – Ph.D., Institute of Polish Literature, Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń;
e-mail: ptanski@wp.pl

Izabela Piskorska-Dobrzyniecka NORWID READ AND TEACHING HOW TO READ

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18290/sn.2018.36-15en>

Idee i formy. Studia i szkice o Norwidzie [*Ideas and Forms. Studies and Sketches on Norwid*] is the third book by Marek Buś entirely devoted to Cyprian Norwid¹ It was preceded by dissertations on the editorial fate of Norwid's legacy (*Składanie pieśni. Z dziejów edytorstwa twórczości Cypriana Norwida* [*Putting the Song Together. History of the Editing of Cyprian Norwid's Works*], Kraków 1997) and on Norwid's most important researchers-discoverers in the first decades of the 20th century (*Norwidyści: Miriam – Cywiński – Borowy – Makowiecki – Wyka. Konteksty* [*Norwid's Researchers: Miriam – Cywiński – Borowy – Makowiecki – Wyka. Contexts*], Kraków 2008). Although the author did not plan these books to form a series or be subsequent volumes, the problems addressed in these studies complement and correspond to each other. The author's vast research experience and the already well-established image of Norwid's work are particularly evident in the latest publication, which, as it were, gathers and sums up the previously presented threads. Already a quick look at the table of contents makes it possible to put forward an obvious statement that the proposed dissertations are the result of the author's earlier research gathered during his work on the indicated

¹ M. BUŚ, *Idee i formy. Studia i szkice o Norwidzie*, Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL 2014, pp. 391.

publications as well as the preparation of a new edition of *Dziela Wszystkie* [*The Complete Works*] by Norwid.

The second factor integrating the texts in the volume is the author's personality, his unique style of formulating thoughts and delivering arguments, great freedom in exploring Norwid's extensive legacy, pertinent argumentation preceded by an in-depth analysis of selected source fragments. The studies included in the book can be read as stories about Norwid, told with expertise, as the result of relishing in personal reading and reflection on Norwid's literary and epistolary activity, as well as that related to discursive texts. However, the consequence of this great freedom is sometimes the lack of footnotes indicating the quotes, but also providing the texts with a critical apparatus documenting the authorship of particular research findings. Their absence in some articles can be explained by their purpose. Apart from scientific texts addressed to a narrower group of rather skilful readers of Norwid, well or at least cursorily oriented in the literature of the subject, in *Idee i formy* we will also find texts intended for the general public, students or other (less competent) readers.

In the latter case, the lack of a defined virtual recipient (about whom we know only that he is an untrained reader) loosens the style of expression (while maintaining the precision of thinking and formulating judgements) and aiming the message more at explaining the presented content than illustrating it. The heterogeneity of the scientific statement is directly proportional to the reader's reading skills. Young, inexperienced researchers will gain a lot of benefits and systematise their knowledge about the "phenomenon of Norwid" from these more textbook-typical syntheses. It must be emphasised that both the detailed and general studies are written in beautiful Polish, free not only of stylistic shortcomings or superfluous ornaments, but also free of obtrusive professional terms, which often disrupt the reception of scientific dissertations rather than support it.

The texts contained in *Idee i formy* have been written over many years and published in scientific monographs, journals, press, and even in a textbook – thus, they are genologically diverse. Apart from interpretative articles, the volume includes extensive reviews of a scientific monograph and editorial work, comparative texts (a comparative sketch: Miłosz – Norwid and juxtaposition of artist-researcher: Norwid – Pigoń), considerable synthetic studies, problem monographs with essayistic elements, and even an interview and a story based in literary history. With such a wide range of writing styles and different groups of recipients, the book breaks with the rigid adherence to the convention to which we are accustomed on the basis of our own scientific discourse. Combined with expressing the author's personal attitude towards Norwid and the undisguised

lack of objectivity in the presented interpretative choices, *Idee i formy* is almost a ground-breaking publication.

In addition, the researcher is not ashamed of the pleasure of reading Norwid, he confesses (far too modestly) that while discussing the material he remains a reader, noting down the findings that have been written before him. However, his respect for the poet does not exempt him from taking the necessary distance, of which he reminds us many times in his texts, confronting his reading with the reception of other researchers and critics, always putting his reflections in the necessary context.

Although in the introduction to his book Buś admits that he does not trust any specific methodology that could bring homogeneous research tools, the reader can indicate the particular currents underlying the studies presented in the book – in addition to the already mentioned tendency to contextual interpretation, the reader will find references to intertextual research and philological hermeneutics, also to Roman Ingarden's phenomenology and the use of tools of cultural analysis.

The publication consists of two main parts. The first one contains scientific papers (interpretations, reviews, synthetic studies), the second one encompasses three essayistic articles for the general public. It is a pity the author did not divide and arrange in a hierarchy the texts from the first part – the most extensive studies “are lost” between the less important texts (such as reviews). In addition, the texts consciously arranged to follow one another, as subordinate to the central subject of the entire book, are in no way separated from comparative dissertations or texts related to history. However, I think it was a deliberate solution, leaving more freedom to the reader, who can choose the order of reading. The decision to read the texts in a non-linear manner is without prejudice to the reception of the book content.

The book begins with interpretative texts. The first – *Tęsknota Norwida* [*Norwid's longing*] presents a discussion of *Moja piosnka (II)* [*My song (II)*]. The author had made an attempt to interpret this work already in the 1970s². Buś ponders over the genre; his reflections are supported by a review of Norwid's early works, pointing to Norwid's situating of *Moja piosnka (II)* in opposition to the great and inspired Romantic song. The researcher analyses the structure of lyric poem, determines the contexts in which it was read (the problem with the “stigma” of Słowacki's *Hymn o zachodzie słońca na morzu* [*Hymn on the sunset at sea*]). He recalls the classical interpretation of Czesław Zgorzelski, Ireneusz Opacki, Alina Merdas, Juliusz Wiktor Gomulicki, Władysław Folkierski and Zdzisław Łapiński. For him they are a starting point for a detailed syntacti-

² Together with B. Gryszkiewicz, “Ruch Literacki” 1977, vol. 2.

cal and versification analysis. The intertextual hints lead the reader to penetrate deeper layers of senses. Buś presents the diverse problems of successive stanzas, which are reflected in the structure of the poem, considering their reading in both serious and ironic ways. He interprets the text through the inevitable human condition – longing. He points to the form that this feeling takes on in other works by Norwid. Buś emphasizes the difference between *Moja piosnka* and the often juxtaposed *Hymn....*, proving that longing can also be full of hope.

In the second interpretative article *Uwagi o “Próbach” Norwida* [Remarks on Norwid’s “Tests”] is dominated by a personal tone. At the beginning, with lightness that is specific to him, the researcher reports on the reason for the low popularity of the title text, related to editorial decisions of placing it in subsequent collective editions, in volumes other than poetry, and it being not a subject of school interest. The author reveals his fascination with the beauty of *Próby* – the poetic attitude and lyricism of the poem. Buś examines the work through the prism of Norwid’s programmatic texts – evoking structural and ideological references. As if to confirm his assessment, Buś follows the reception of the work, pointing to *Próby* as a work that might have attracted Przesmycki’s interest in Norwid and inspired other poets with its aesthetics (Bolesław Leśmian, Jerzy Liebert, Hanna Mortkowicz-Olczakowa, Stanisław Ryszard Dobrowolski). The researcher summarises the problems around which the previous interpretations of the text focused, distinguishing several issues: reading it as Norwid’s views on the tasks of poetry and poet; the entanglement of the poem in the context of a polemic with Lenartowicz, to whom Norwid explains his understanding of art. Buś reads *Próby* rather through Stefan Sawicki’s model, treating poetry as “the art of linguistic evocation”, testifying to the maturity and wisdom of the person writing it. Besides, Sawicki’s influence can be read between the lines also in other studies in this volume. Great respect for the word, both read and written, which manifests itself in the clarity of style, order of formulating thoughts and research diligence in the presentation of opinions, points not only to Stefan Sawicki’s school, but also to that of Zdzisław Łapiński – especially the predilection to contextual interpretation, even in relation to contemporary writers (*Miłosz and Norwid*). Buś focuses his interpretation of *Próby* around the problem of poetic style and Norwid’s attitude (similarly to the poem discussed earlier – interpreted by researchers both as a manifestation of irony and seriousness). Attention to the beauty of the lyric does not affect his research meticulousness in noticing the rhythmical and line harmony of the text. His clear, coherent argumentation easily guides the reader through the subsequent meanderings of Norwid’s syntax and semantics. Anyway, this is another study in the volume that can be treated as a textbook example of writing scientific texts. Nearly eleven

times the researcher asks a rhetorical question, encouraging the reader to seek answers together with him, instead of using the hermetic language of a philologist to lecture unverified theses. Buś conducts a “polyphonic dialogue” with the audience, he even invites Karol Antoniewicz and Jan Kochanowski to take part in this discussion.

Subsequently, Buś shares with readers his impressions from reading scientific texts. The collection of three reviews opens with the article *Czemu i Jak czytamy Norwida* [*Why and How do we read Norwid?*], which is a commentary on the book edited by Jolanta Chojak and Ewa Teleżyńska, published under the same title in Warsaw in 1991. Buś appreciates the contribution of linguistic research to Norwid Studies, careful reading of Norwid by the school of Warsaw linguists, who find pleasure in reading the author of *Vade-mecum*, proving that their solid methodological approach allows to identify in Norwid’s poetry language structures that have previously been disregarded or misunderstood. Such a careful study of his writing is not only attributable to the diligence of the authors of *Słownik języka Cypriana Norwida* [*Dictionary of Cyprian Norwid’s Language*], but, above all, – as Buś states – to the pleasure that this reading gives them. It is a motivation well understood by the reviewer himself, who perfectly combines research inquisitiveness with reader’s fascination. As it has already been mentioned, it does not exempt him from diligence and care for the logic of arguments, which unfortunately is not a standard in the practice of Norwid’s researchers, and which the discussed article documents.

The same applies to *Pożytki z czytania Norwida* [*Benefits from reading Norwid*], a review of Jacek Trznadel’s work *Czytanie Norwida. Próby* [*Reading Norwid. Attempts*] (Warszawa 1978). At the start, he points to the already existing analyses of this work. Instead of discussing the work, he indicates a few motifs that are most willingly discussed, and with which the reviewer himself undertakes polemics. Buś does not like the pretentious habit of putting oneself above scientific argument and disregarding the state of research in favour of the postulated fresh look, which brings only a seemingly faithful image of Norwid’s creative personality. The author appreciates the insightfulness of formulations, disciplined argumentation in discussing some interpretative threads. However, he also notices some disturbing signals that do not allow for applying the right critical apparatus to Norwid, as known by his readers, but only to the “idol”, the “puppet” as Trznadel perceives the poet. The polemical zeal, the constant concern not to be accused of admiration for Norwid, gives rise to distrust towards the object of research and towards his own attitude, which makes reasoning unconvincing and the very concept of Norwid artificial. It has had a distorting effect on the reading of some of his works, which is contrary to the reviewer’s practice, giving priority

to the text that should guide the researcher, and admitting quite light-heartedly to be applying his own “domestic” methodology (p. 8), which is determined by the object being examined and not pre-determined by the investigator.

The last review article is devoted to “*Promethidion*” Stefana Sawickiego [Stefan Sawicki’s “*Promethidion*”]. The author appreciates the diligence of the editorial preparation of the work, the value of *Editorial notes*, documenting the most important text variants. He compares the text proposed in the volume with earlier editions, which allows him to recognise this edition as critical and the best of all the previous ones. This is due to both a thorough interpretation of the poem and the excellent knowledge of *Promethidion*’s reception, combined with the experience of a textologist and the competence of an expert literary historian, which, according to Buś, gave the best possible result. Standing in opposition to the not very accurate interpretive ideas put forward by Trznadel (p. 101), resulting from the drama of “intentional «amateurism» contrasted with professional meticulousness” (p. 90) of Stefan Sawicki’s approach, characterized by “«positive conscientiousness towards the sources»”, digestion and refining of the research tradition (p. 111), in relation to which he can be polemical (instead of – systematically – reject it). The quoted fragment reveals a peculiar style of Buś’s texts – on the one hand, he is very careful about precision and linguistic correctness, on the other hand, he admits linguistic expressions from other sciences (e.g. biological) or even from colloquial language (“keeping an eye on Norwid’s interests”, p. 257). However, they do not bother the reader, but rather enrich the reading itself with the element of naturalness and the lack of scientific pomp, which often distance the readers not only from the researchers themselves, but also from the subject of their research. It is not only the style of expression that influences the pleasure of reading *Idee i formy*. Buś recognizes Sawicki as one of the masters of critical quotation, which “being an example, becomes an argument, if necessary – enlightened by an analytical commentary” (p. 115). By appreciating the role of his predecessors – Miriam and Borowy, as literary historians and critics combining “meticulousness with sensitivity, objectivising distance with commitment and not disguising one’s own fascinations” (p. 115) – through the way of formulating thoughts in the studies in *Idee i formy*, he himself unknowingly (or maybe even consciously?) joins the circle of masters.

The part oscillating around the problem of reading closes with a text concerning the understanding of this concept by the poet himself: *Cypriana Norwida „O czytania-sztuce pojęcie...”* [“*The concept of reading art...*” by Cyprian Norwid]. Buś starts the discussion by asking what reading was and was not for Norwid. Buś points to the recurring motif of reading, which used in various contexts – both in Norwid’s works and in his personal confessions – is a record of

his beliefs that the bond with society and tradition can only be maintained by consciously shaping the way the art is received.

Buś follows the reception of the dissertation on *Juliusz Słowacki* – both critics' opinions and contemporary analyses, partially reporting on the "incomprehensibility" of the text, which was designed by Norwid himself as an example of the art of reading, at the same time formulating its essence. Following Jan Błoński, the researcher defines Norwid's reading as a form of reaching critical truth, revealing in reality the divine plan. The author sketches a model of different ways of cognising, characteristic of Norwid at various stages of his creative path. Seeing the influence of Romantic beliefs in youthful creativity (the idealisation of folk understanding by feeling and intuition), he also points to significant differences in Norwid's perception of it (poetic understanding is perceived also as a skill). In *Epimenides*, Buś sees the traces of reading comprehensively understood as an activity that maintains the bond with the past of a given nation or individual. He notices that also in other works Norwid raised the role of reading – both loud and personal – to the status of art. Buś points out the tasks of the reader, to whom Norwid attributes the role of a co-creator, who should put effort into the reading activity. He then goes on to list the conditions that must be met in order for the reading to be exemplary. It is a pity that at this point the researcher does not indicate the sources of the cited phrases. Many of those do not belong to the most frequently cited repertoire, so it would certainly be easier for the reader to access them if bibliographic details had been provided.

Then Buś lists the next stages of Norwid's struggle for true reading: a protest against criticism that falsifies the creator-receiver relationship, against reducing reading to entertainment. Norwid did it mainly in practice – presenting a positive attitude, striving – according to the author – to objectivise the image of literature. The researcher writes down very important elements that accompany Norwid's reflections on reading, often marginalised: the right reading background, related to the restoration of the context of the work, opening the reader for multiple perspectives, facilitating the fulfilment of the primary goal of reading art, which is to reach the core, the "source", i.e. the civilizational forms that have emerged in the past, but influence the laws of the present, which contain "the meaning and the absolute of generations" (p. 138). The literary scholar devotes himself with reverence to the issue of conscientiousness, accurately discussing the multidimensionality of the tasks associated with it.

Six studies, not separated in any way in the layout of the book, following the part devoted to interpretations and reviews, have strictly monographic character. The first one *Zagadnienie trudności Norwida (uwagi wstępne)* [*The issue of Norwid's difficulty (preliminary remarks)*] is another extensive dissertation on the

phenomenon of difficulty – the phenomenon that has been studied but remains still unrecognised, and yet is extremely important for the understanding of Norwid’s work. The literary historian reconstructs the stigma of “incomprehensibility” attached to the author of *Promethidion* and avant-garde artists from the 1920s. However, his interests focus on selected evidence of reception of Norwid’s works, according to the typology proposed by Stefan Morawski in *Sztuka łatwa i sztuka trudna*³ [*Easy Art and Difficult Art*]. Buś discusses the successive subsystems of conditions, which are divided into: psychological, anthropological, ontological, pedagogical and sociological, which leads to the conclusion (also following Morawski) that the first step towards making difficult art easier is to consider it particularly valuable. This process is illustrated by the creation of “fashion for Norwid” (following Przesmycki’s editorial achievements, the accompanying disputes, polemics, which in the Stalinist era were replaced by the bad reputation of a clericalist and a reactionary).

Two shorter texts on historical issues have also a synthesising character: *Norwida spór z powstaniem* [*Norwid’s argument with the uprising*] and *Historia i historyk w pismach Norwida* [*History and historian in Norwid’s writings*]. The first one discusses the poet’s attitude to the November Uprising, understood as an armed uprising that strongly influenced Norwid’s generation through the ideology of revenge, which had a destructive impact on the consciousness of young people. According to the researcher, Norwid’s critical attitude towards the uprising influenced the formation of Norwid’s viewpoint on political phenomena and the assessment of the attitude of Poles towards their own destiny. In the second article, Buś examines how historical phenomena in their both subjective and objective aspects are evoked in the mind of the author of *Czasy* [*The Times*]. He presents Norwid’s multifaceted understanding of the role of history and the tasks of historians (archaeologists) in the lives of individuals and societies, or civilisations. The text features many quotations, remarks from Norwid’s works – unfortunately, the author does not always provide the title of the cited text or the bibliographic details.

In the text *Miłosz i Norwid* [*Miłosz and Norwid*], the researcher focuses on explaining the attitude of the contemporary poet (Miłosz) to his great predecessor (Norwid), the most noticeable philosophical similarities and affinity of both artists. The literary historian notices that despite Miłosz’s distance from Norwid, declared in Miłosz’s essayistic statements (*Ogród nauk* [*The Garden of Science*], *Ziemia Ulro* [*The Land of Ulro*]) and in a conversation with Aleksander Fiut

³ S. MORAWSKI, *Sztuka łatwa i sztuka trudna* [in:] IDEM, *Na zakręcie: od sztuki do posztuki*, Kraków 1985, pp. 38-72.

(*Rozmowy z Czesławem Miłoszem* [*Conversations with Czesław Miłosz*]), they have a lot in common. The author believes that the reason for Miłosz's reluctance towards the author of *Fortepian Chopina* [*Chopin's Grand Piano*] lies, on the one hand, in a kind of fear of falling under Norwid's influence: "he does not want to be similar to him [...], he defends his own autonomy" (p. 200), and on the other hand, in a reluctance to a popular, biased understanding of his legacy, absolutising the ideology of the nation (with Cywiński's role as Miłosz's teacher). Buś realises that Miłosz's characterisation of Norwid is falsified and misleading. He notes the presence of the latter in the works of the former without deciding to what extent it is hidden. He sees in Norwid a spiritual guide of the poet's growth, Miłosz quoted Norwid especially in his wartime texts. He notices that the two artists share the way of thinking about the role of poetry and its tasks – poetry as a way of life, "thinking with poetry" (p. 218), treating poetry as an art of reaching the truth.

Another study, titled *Stanisław Pigoń i Norwid* [*Stanisław Pigoń and Norwid*] also discusses similarities and differences between the title characters. The text complements the characterisation of the Norwid Studies expert, presented in *Składanie pieśni...* [*Putting the Song Together...*] and in *Norwidyści* [*Norwid's researchers*], enriched with previously unknown materials. Above all, Buś presents Pigoń's editorial achievements and his contribution to the promotion of research on Norwid at the academic level. The author quotes and provides an extensive commentary on Pigoń's statements referring to the existing (at that time) editions of Norwid's writings – works by Cywiński and Miriam. Buś then juxtaposes them with the reviewer's practice in order to objectively assess Pigoń's achievements in this field on the example of a few texts – not mentioned earlier in *Składanie pieśni*. Buś compares Pigoń's editions with those of Przesmycki and Gomulicki, owing to which the reader can see how much editorial interference affects the texts. The article also documents the post-war activity of the publisher. On the basis of the file preserved in Pigoń's archive – *Sprawa "Dzieł" Norwida* [*The Case of "Works" by Norwid*], Buś presents materials accompanying the initiative of publishing of *Dzieła wszystkie* [*The Complete Works*], which Pigoń supervised. Summarising his considerations, Buś revises his judgment on Pigoń's distrust towards Norwid – rightly noting that all the achievements of the professor discussed in the study are a clear testimony of his respect for the author of *Zwolon*.

This part of the volume closes with *Cyprian Norwid (próba syntezy podręcznikowej)* [*Cyprian Norwid (an attempt at textbook synthesis)*]. In subchapters entitled: *Norwid-poet, Playwright, Prose writer, Art master, Norwid's world of thoughts – the world of values, Romantic or Positivist*, ending with an asterisk separating a bio-bibliographic note, Buś in an accessible way discusses the most important issues related to Norwid's phenomenon. Looking at this work from

many perspectives, Buś discusses selected works. The literary scholar showed a great skill in condensing the most important information about the writer himself, his works, as well as the state of research. Without going into unnecessary details, he was able to recapitulate the most important judgments about the poet, mention the adaptations of his texts, show his thoughts in the Polish and European context.

The essayistic part of the book opens with a question: *Czy Norwid jest potrzebny Kościołowi?* [*Does the Church need Norwid?*]. The inspiration for writing the article was the *Letter to artists* by St. John Paul II, in which the pope quoted the author of *Promethidon*. Buś follows which ideas were particularly valued by the Holy Father – and the presence of which in his teachings was significant for the Church. He also answers, at least in part, the question as to what the Church can still learn from Norwid this day. First of all – appreciating the ethical and artistic maturity of the artist – Buś persuades the reader of the writer's influence on the shape of Polish poetry, starting from the 1930s and on the thought of Cardinal Wyszyński or Fr. Tischner.

The reception of Norwid's works is also addressed in the text *Kultura jako prawo narodu do istnienia* [*Culture as a nation's right to exist*]. In the interview with Marta Kwaśnicka, Buś is asked about the changing reception of the work of the author of *Ipse-ipsium*, both today and in his lifetime. The researcher makes us aware of how culture was controlled in the era of socialist realism, which had a negative impact on the perception of Norwid's writing and the role of critics in the formation of stereotypes about him. He discusses Norwid's views on the Polish and European identity.

This theme returns partially in *Poeta i sztukmistrz (gawęda historycznoliteracka)* [*The poet and art master (a literary-historical story)*], a lecture delivered for the winners of art competitions from the countries of the former communist bloc. The recipient is not easy, because it is difficult to determine the level of knowledge and acquaintance with Norwid, but the speaker is dealing well with it. There appear necessary bio-bibliographical details. Norwid is presented not only against the background of historical events, but also in the context of the rapid social changes that had an impact on the entire Polish emigration. The author quotes fragments of works, explaining Norwid's understanding of the role of art – both for the society and the individual. Buś presents the contents of the first edition of Norwid's *Poezja* [*Poetry*] (1862), the only one published during his lifetime. Discussing the volume published in Leipzig, he explains the selection of texts and the meaning of the title of the collection. He also presents the photographs of the autograph of *Vade-mecum*, Volume VIII of "Chimera" from 1904 and a volume of *Pisma zebrane* [*The Collected Works*] from 1911. He discusses Norwid's presence

in school and in culture (including mass culture). The reader gets an impression that the text of the lecture was reprinted without corrections adapting it to the reader's reception, making it an interesting read.

Idee i formy is a book that collects detailed studies and synthesising articles, which inevitably leads to certain threads recurring in various places. For example, the explanation of how to understand the term "poet-art master" appears in *Poeta i sztukmistrz (gawęda historycznoliteracka)* (p. 350) and in *Cyprian Norwid. Próba syntezy podręcznikowej* (p. 299). In several texts the reader will find remarks about Norwid's influence on John Paul II or reflections related to Norwid's understanding of the nation and history. Taking into account the size of the volume (the main text comprises 370 pages), these repetitions are virtually unnoticeable. The whole book was neatly published, prepared in an exemplary way in terms of editing and typography. Its another great advantage is its openness to readers of all ages – even those who take their first steps in a fascinating journey into the world of Norwid's works, motifs, thoughts and values.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BUŚ M., *Składanie pieśni. Z dziejów edytorstwa twórczości Cypriana Norwida*, Kraków 1997.
 BUŚ M., *Norwidycyści: Miriam – Cywiński – Borowy – Makowiecki – Wyka. Konteksty*, Kraków 2008.
 BUŚ M., *Idee i formy. Studia i szkice o Norwidzie*, Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL 2014.
 BUŚ M., "Promethidion" Stefana Sawickiego, [in:] *Trudny Norwid*, ed. P. Chlebowski, Lublin 2013, pp. 237-251.
 BUŚ M., *Krytyczne wydanie "Promethidiona"*, "Studia Norwidiana" 29: 2011, pp. 219-228.

NORWID CZYTANY I CZYTANIA UCZĄCY

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

Recenzja skupia się na przybliżeniu czytelnikowi treści najnowszej książki Marka Busia *Idee i formy. Studia i szkice o Norwidzie*. Ze względu na charakter omawianej publikacji, która w znacznej części jest zbiorem wcześniej wydanych artykułów, opisuje ich charakter i przeznaczenie. Odpowiada na pytanie, w jaki sposób Autor poradził sobie z uporządkowaniem studiów różniących się pod względem gatunkowym i kierowanych do rozmaitych odbiorców, o odmiennych kompetencjach czytelnicznych. Wskazuje na rolę książki Busia względem wcześniejszych jego prac, oraz jej wyjątkową wartość, także związaną z wkładem w znoszenie bariery dzielącej książki na te, przeznaczone dla wąskiego grona specjalistów, i na popularnonaukowe.

Słowa kluczowe: Marek Buś; Cyprian Norwid; czytanie; historia recepcji; interpretacja; edytorstwo.

NORWID READ AND TEACHING HOW TO READ

S u m m a r y

The review focuses on presenting to the reader the latest book by Marek Buś, titled *Idee i formy. Studia i szkice o Norwidzie*, Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, Lublin 2014. Due to the nature of the publication, which is largely a collection of previously published articles – it describes their character and purpose. It answers the question of how the author managed to organise studies that differ in terms of genre and that are addressed to various recipients with different reading competences. It discusses the role of the publication in relation to the previous researcher's works, and its unique value, also related to its contribution to the abolition of the barrier dividing books into those intended for a small group of specialists and those for the general public.

Key words: Marek Buś; Cyprian Norwid; reading; history of reception; interpretation; editing.

Translated by Rafał Augustyn

IZABELA PISKORSKA-DOBRZENIECKA - PhD student at the Department of Polish Romantic and Positivist Literature, Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń; e-mail: izabelapiskorska@gmail.com