

RENATA GADAMSKA-SERAFIN

## NORWID'S *ROMA ANTIQUA* IN ITS FULL GLORY

Among the numerous works about Norwid, there appear, from time to time, such works which undoubtedly are milestones in the research on this prominent “poet of cultures” and which immediately take a permanent honourable place in Polish literary studies. One of them is indubitably Magdalena Karamucka's *Antyczny Rzym Norwida [Norwid's Ancient Rome]*,<sup>1</sup> a book published by Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza in Poznań in the series “Filologia polska” (Vol. 165) in 2016. The Author's PhD dissertation (of the same title), which was the basis of this monograph, received a prestigious President of the Council of Ministers' award – which serves as a good recommendation for the book.<sup>2</sup> Magdalena Karamucka is simultaneously a Polish, classical and German philologist, which without a doubt had an influence on the value and expertise of her dissertation, as she has a broad humanistic and cultural knowledge which enables her to competently discuss the issue from the title. It is worth mentioning that her research was based not only on materials collected in Poland but was also based – which, in this case, is desirable and even indispensable – on her extended visits to libraries in Rome and Berlin. Indeed, a modern approach to philological studies requires not only a good technique, proficiency and literary sensitivity, but also a broad research context and good comparative skills (as well as the possibility to travel freely!).

The reviewed book has filled a significant research gap of an almost generational span. The first substantial statement about Norwid's Rome was uttered by

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. M. KARAMUCKA, *Antyczny Rzym Norwida*, Poznań 2016.

<sup>2</sup> The book is not yet available in a digital version (online), which would make it more “sought-after” and accessible (the first paper edition has already sold out), and facilitate its scholarly and popular circulation.

a classical philologist Tadeusz Sinko<sup>3</sup> in the 1930s.<sup>4</sup> Obviously, this issue was not entirely abandoned; it was subsequently undertaken mainly by Marian Śliwiński<sup>5</sup> in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, also newer Norwid-related studies have followed the “Roman imagination” of the poet-magician (for instance Piotr Chlebowski’s<sup>6</sup> and Anna Borowiec’s<sup>7</sup> dissertations on Norwid’s “artistic portfolio,” or a great collected volume on *Quidam*<sup>8</sup>). It does not change the fact that since 2016 there has not been any monograph which encompasses the whole of this extremely important, maybe even fundamental question for Norwid’s work and thought.<sup>9</sup> Even the sole duration of the poet’s reflection on the Roman legacy (several decades) must have resulted in its depth, fluctuations and variability and, at the same time, its remarkable richness and multi-aspectual nature.

As we read in the introduction of the book, the aim of the analysis was “to interpret Cyprian Norwid’s complex, ambivalent relationship with the antique *Romanitas* as well as to reveal a rich gamut of his references to the reality of ancient Rome.”<sup>10</sup> Karamucka writes:

<sup>3</sup> Cf. T. SINKO, *Klasyczny laur Norwida*, [in:] *Hellada i Roma w Polsce*, Lwów 1933, pp. 40-115.

<sup>4</sup> Władysław Dobrowolski’s publication (*Norwida opowieść o wiecznym Rzymie i wiecznym człowieku Quidamie*. „Pamiętnik Literacki” 1927, Vol. 24, pp. 291-308) was chronologically prior to Sinka’s text, but its scope was much narrower. Important and valuable as these two works from the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century might be, from the perspective of the contemporary state of research it is hard to consider them as exhaustive.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. M. ŚLIWIŃSKI, *Norwid wobec antyczno-średniowiecznej tradycji uniwersalizmu europejskiego*, Słupsk 1992; *Rzym pogański w „Quidamie” Norwida*. „Słupskie Prace Humanistyczne” 1990, Issue 8a (1987), pp. 85-104; *Norwid o chrześcijanach z katakumb*, „W Drodze” 1992, Issue 3, pp. 70-76; *Norwid wobec tradycji antyku i chrześcijaństwa*, „Słupskie Prace Humanistyczne” 1992, Issue 11a, pp. 213-242; *Roma pogańska Norwida – retrospektywna utopia totalitaryzmu*, „Filomata” 1993, pp. 215-228.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. P. CHLEBOWSKI, *Romantyczna silva rerum. O Norwidowym „Albumie Orbis”*, Lublin 2009.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. A. BOROWIEC, „*Album Orbis*” Cypriana Norwida jako księga sztukmistrza, Gdańsk 2015.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. „*Quidam*”. *Studia o poemacie*, ed. P. Chlebowski, Lublin 2011.

Apart from the abovementioned publications, there are several less significant ones related to the subject, which Karamucka scrupulously lists in the bibliography.

<sup>9</sup> Although in 2003 Olga Płaszczewska’s book *Wizja Włoch w polskiej i francuskiej literaturze okresu romantyzmu (1800-1850)* (Kraków 2003) about the image of Italia in the Polish Romantic literature was published, the ancient Rome in Norwid’s *opere magno* is an exceptional case – so elaborate and complex that it unarguably requires a separate detailed analysis.

<sup>10</sup> M. KARAMUCKA, *Antyczny Rzym Norwida* (back cover).

Rome in Norwid's work is not only limited to literary references, commentaries, interpretations or translations. In the poet's writings we can find the Roman scenery, atmosphere, more or less loose references to texts and myths. *Roma antiqua* constitutes an extremely important element of Norwid's historiosophy and reveals itself in a great number of his works.

Ancient Rome is a "cultural space" which, as *Roma aeterna*, goes beyond the temporal and geographical borders [...].<sup>11</sup>

Norwid's ancient Rome is thus presented in this study in multiple forms: as a geographical, historical, and cultural reality as well as a literary topos.

Both aims of the work, i.e. finding numerous direct literal references that Norwid made to the Roman culture and showing its functioning in the sphere of the artist's reflection on his contemporary reality, were achieved in a more than satisfactory way.

Because of the aforementioned multifaceted nature of the theme, the publication was divided into four general parts: Part 1 - *Romantyczne i Norwidowe odkrywanie Rzymu* [*Romantic and Norwid's Exploration of Rome*] – devoted to the Roman part of Norwid's biography and his Roman readings; Part 2 - *Norwid wobec historii antycznej Romy* [*Norwid and the History of Roma Antiqua*] – focuses on the poet's political, religious, and historiosophic reflection revolving around Rome; Part 3 - *Starorzymska literatura i sztuka w refleksji Norwida* [*Old Roman Literature and Art in Norwid's Reflection*] – follows the paths of Norwid's reflections on literature, art and Roman theatre, and Part 4 – *Norwid – "poeta rzymski"* [*Norwid – a "Roman poet"*] – presents reminiscences, quotations (and paraphrases) taken from works of Roman authors (Catullus, Horace, Juvenal, Ovid, Virgil), titles and mottos from Roman literature, and finally Norwid's Roman translations and his Roman correspondence.

The scope of this work is thus very broad. Regardless of its complexity, the author managed to keep an admirable intellectual discipline of the narration, which enabled her to formulate clear conclusions and to maintain a holistic view of the problem, which is the main asset of this substantive and interesting book.

A synthetic review of various aspects of the 19<sup>th</sup> century travels to and through Italy (cultural, as well as religious, diplomatic and political travels) was based on a substantial repertoire of Polish and foreign studies. The attention was rightly drawn to the specificity of the motivation of the Polish people visiting contemporary Rome and the domestic tradition of these journeys (the idea of Poland as *antemurale christianitatis*, devotion to the Catholic Church and papacy as well as the Sarmatic pilgrimage habits). Norwid's Italian optics, showing a clear relatedness to some of Krasieński's texts, were included in the late phase of the Romantic

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 12.

“Italomania” characterised by a tendency to provide critical and satirical perspectives. In Norwid’s case, an important factor which strengthened this ridiculing tone was, as it was aptly stressed, his criticism towards Sarmatic and feudal relicts of the Polish nobility’s mentality which influenced the nature of their travels as well as their reception of Italy.

The interest in Roman antiquity (Romantic “romanism”) was a specific variant of the fascination with Italy, modelled by competing neoclassical currents such as Hellenism and Philhellenism. They influenced the perception of “the Greek literature as original and spontaneous, whereas the Roman literature was seen as secondary and imitative.”<sup>12</sup> The Greece-Rome antinomy thus translated into other antinomies, such as: originality-imitation (in Norwid’s works also originality-“vulgarisation”), and also – which Karamucka fails to mention – into St Paul’s antithesis of “the spirit” and “the letter.” It is also worth mentioning that on the “Greek” side in Norwid’s works there is also “naturalness” and “theological transparency” (Homer) which, according to the poet, are lost or obscured in the pagan Roman culture (with some exceptions only).

Karamucka substantively discusses the context of the Romantic reinterpretation of the classical tradition which – as she stresses – the first-generation Romantics “raised in the spirit of classical education”<sup>13</sup> by veritable rationalists and antiquity admirers (such as Jan Śniadecki, Gotfryd Ernest Groddeck) knew very well. Unfortunately, she did not offer any reflection on the reality of Norwid’s middle-school education, which took place during the repressive years of the “Paskevich Night,” or its comparison with Mickiewicz’s (or Słowacki’s) educational experience – after all, this difference was quite fundamental. Norwid was raised on the texts of Romantic “giants” and it is from there that he took “Roman” inspirations, which were already transformed in the new spirit. However, he did not graduate from an equally great school of the classics, as the brilliant presenter of the *Lausanne Lectures* (A. Mickiewicz). He did not even finish philological (or any other) studies. Gomulicki wrote that “he could generally get by in Latin” (PWsz VII, 686), but he was far from Mickiewicz’s proficiency in this area. The speech made by the poet for the Polish emigrants gathered in the Brussels town hall on the anniversary of the November Night in 1846 is particularly significant here:

Naród jest to prosty człowiek. Czego się pługiem nie dogrzebie, nie domodli u krzyża i nie dopłcze w cichym łkaniu, to przetoczy się nad nim jak uczoność łacińska, jak protestantyzm lub doktryny encyklopedystów zeszlowiecznych (*Głos niedawno do wychodźstwa polskiego przybyłego artysty* [*The voice of an Artist that Recently Joined the Polish Emigration*], PWsz VII, 7).

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 36.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., p. 32.

The nation is a simple man. Whatever he will not dig out with a plough, whatever he will not pray for by the cross, whatever he will not cry for in his silent sobbing, it will pass him by like Latin wisdom, like Protestantism, like the doctrines of the encyclopaedists of the past century.

The image of the “Latin learnedness” rolling over the heads of listeners as fruitlessly and vainly as “the doctrines of the encyclopaedists” of the 18<sup>th</sup> century is, undoubtedly a *signum temporis*. This claim rather unequivocally classifies “Latinness” as a kind of anachronism (obviously not for the speaker, but for the contemporary “public”), an outmoded reality, uninteresting, unattractive, and above all – incomprehensible for modern people. Józef Tischner linked this “Latin learnedness” to the teaching of the Church (including the “omitted” truths of faith), whose liturgy was still conducted in Latin in the 19<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>14</sup> although this expression can be understood in a broader sense – as a metaphor for the contemporary erudition or education which created a system of dead signs out of the language of Horace and Cicero. In mid-19<sup>th</sup> century the world of classical wisdom did not appeal to the collective imagination, and schools (and universities) did not try to present it in an attractive and efficient manner. However, this is not an argument undermining Norwid’s classical competence which is highly admirable. It only signals a significant difference in the reception of and the knowledge about the ancient world, which appears between the times of Mickiewicz’s early life and Norwid’s youth. This observation also makes it possible to appreciate the greatness of the erudite effort of our post-Romantic who gained his knowledge about the ancient world mostly on his own, through his numerous readings and travels.

According to Magdalena Karamucka (as well as all senior scholars interested in this subject) it is fundamentally important to distinguish two categories in Norwid’s reception of Rome: *Roma pagana* and *Roma Christiana* which he perceived and evaluated completely differently. The Rome of emperors is a metaphor for paganism, possessiveness, tyranny, decadence, materialism, the “form” and the “letter.” The Christian Rome of catacombs, on the other hand, embodies new values approved by the poet, situated on the side of the “spirit,” therefore, close to the Romantics. This antithesis is fundamental for the author’s further considerations.

In accordance with the rules of logic and methodological correctness, the presentation of a rich repertoire of Norwid’s references to Roman antiquity starts with an overview of the “Roman” facts from Norwid’s biography. They are presented in great detail and shown in a broad context of historical events, i.e. his four stays in Rome in 1844, 1845 as well as 1847 and 1847/1848. Each of these visits was, as the author notes, of a slightly different character and took place under dif-

<sup>14</sup> Cf. *Skrzyżowanie dróg. Norwid księdza profesora Józefa Tischnera* (radio broadcast), ed. and dir. R. Bobrowska, Radio Kraków (broadcast: 11 November 1997, published in 2000).

ferent personal and historical circumstances, which affected the complexity and multi-aspectual nature of the poet's encounters with the Eternal City: "Art and philosophy was intertwined with politics."<sup>15</sup> Karamucka notices that the Rome of catacombs and the Colosseum, the Rome of intimate religious experience and intense romantic feelings caused by Maria Kalergis, the Rome of artistic bohème that gathered in Caffè Greco and the Rome of political manifestations would be reflected in Norwid's epistolography as well as his artistic and literary creations till the end of his life. Emphasising Norwid's "constant mental presence"<sup>16</sup> in Rome, the author notes the first lyrical manifestations of the creation of his personal myth of Italia (*Italiam! Italiam!; W albumie [In an Album]*), and also his Italian longings of "the penultimate days:" his failure to permanently move to Italy; a letter to Antoni Zaleski in which Italy was endearingly called "mamka" [wet nurse] (PWsz X, 87); a letter to Seweryna Duchńska from 1880 (PWsz X, 150) as well as the novelistic "Italian trilogy" bringing back, with remarkable sharpness, the Roman reality from the author's senile memory. In a word, the scholar finds undisputable evidence for the fact that the Polish poet – Cyprian Norwid – lived and died dreaming of Italy.

The biographical and literary facts were supplemented in the book with a mini-catalogue of "Norwid's Italian footsteps" which includes three memorial plaques commemorating the poet's stay in different locations in Rome as well as the Roman Archive of the Congregation of the Resurrection at Via San Sebastianello, which keeps his original letters. Also, the reconstruction of the routes of Norwid's trips by the Tiber would be desirable (as far as possible) and placing the routes on a plan of the city, or at least including in the index – not only for scholars but also other travellers – a list of all the Roman locations (at least of the ancient Rome) that the author of *Quidam* mentions in his writings. English travellers use similar information about the works of Byron to travel in Venice,<sup>17</sup> it would be thus wonderful to make a similar journey in Rome with Cyprian Norwid. This should be considered when planning the second edition of the book.

Due to the fact that the poet's way of perceiving the ancient Rome and his knowledge about it were formed, to a considerable degree, through his readings, it was worthwhile to compile a reading list based on Norwid's letters and notes. Although Karamucka stated that her aim was not to "provide a complete list of

---

<sup>15</sup> M. KARAMUCKA, *Antyczny Rzym Norwida*, p. 52.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 59.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. G. DOWLING, *In Venice and in the Veneto with Lord Byron*, Venezia 2008; A. AMISON, *An English Milord in Europe and Italy*, Venezia 2016, ed. II.

texts read by Norwid,”<sup>18</sup> her reconstruction of Norwid’s “Roman library” is admirable. She divided it into three substantial groups of works: 19<sup>th</sup> century works and editions about Rome (inter alia, by Byron, Stendhal, Chateaubriand, Michelet, Sismondi, Krasieński, E.G. Bulwer-Lytton, Gibbon, Coulanges, Lelewel, and popularising publications in the French press); antique Latin texts (inter alia, by Tacitus, Cicero, Livy, Flavius, Paternulus, Suetonius, Pliny the Elder and Pliny the Younger, Cato the Elder, Ovid, Horace, Virgil, Juvenal, the Latin Fathers of the Church – St Augustin and Tertullian as well as Lactantius the apologist); and the books read by Norwid in Rome. It is commendable that Karamucka did not only enumerate the titles, but also drew attention to Norwid’s specific way of reading the Roman historians’ works – always through the lens of Christian historiography.

The fundamental work by Johann Joachim Winckelmann *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* [*The History of Ancient Art*]<sup>19</sup> as well as its Polish adaptation by Stanisław Kostka Potocki entitled *O sztuce u dawnych, czyli Winkelman polski*<sup>20</sup> should be included in the catalogue of works read by Norwid (Winckelmann’s work is mentioned in the dissertation, but in a different context), which undoubtedly influenced his opinions strongly about ancient Rome (and the ancient world in general). These readings are not typically “Roman” (both authors were admirers of Greek art), but they have undeniably, to a great extent, shaped young Norwid’s

<sup>18</sup> M. KARAMUCKA, *Antyczny Rzym Norwida*, p. 61.

<sup>19</sup> In his letter to Jan Koźmian from 1850, Norwid mentions J.J. Winckelmann with admiration: “w epoce zepsucia i zniepokojenia formy przyszedł w pomoc [sztuce – R.G.-S] Winckelmann i Canova, i ideał formy starożytnej” [in the epoch of corruption and degradation of the form, Winckelmann and Canova as well as and the ideal of the ancient form have come to rescue art] (PWsz VIII, 108). Winckelmann’s name was included by J. W. Gomulicki in *Indeks nazwisk* [index of names] to the poet’s letters (PWsz X, 452), it was, however, omitted in *Indeks osobowy* [index of persons] in the newer calendar of Norwid’s life (cf. Z. Trojanowiczowa, Z. Dambek, I. Grzeszczak, *Kalendarz życia i twórczości Cypriana Norwida*, Vol. III: *Aneks, bibliografia, indeksy*. Poznań 2007, p. 136).

D. Pniewski (*Między obrazem a słowem. Studia o poglądach estetycznych i twórczości literackiej Norwida*, Lublin 2005) wrote about the influence of the views of this German art historian and archaeologist on Norwid. Nota bene, Karamucka included this book in the bibliography.

<sup>20</sup> S.K. POTOCKI, *O sztuce u dawnych, czyli Winkelman polski*, Vols. I-III, Warszawa 1815, a significant part of Vol. III was devoted to Roman art.

Although S.K. Potocki’s name or the title of his work do not appear in the preserved Norwid’s writings, the years of Cyprian’s youth spent in a middle-school in Warsaw and in the “painting studio” of Aleksander Kokular (who was previously employed by Count Aleksander Potocki in Wilanów and did many commissions there) make it possible to state with certainty that Norwid must have visited Wilanów and knew the publicly available collection of the “Polish Winckelmann”. As an art student in the capital he probably also knew his *O sztuce u dawnych*. Perhaps, Norwid’s idea to write a synthesis of world history (commissioned by Adam Potocki) was even inspired by this.

perception of “the presumed Roman art,”<sup>21</sup> i.e. the conviction about the secondary character of Roman works:

Did Romans have their own art or was that art borrowed from other nations? This question leaves no doubt; everything in the Roman art proves that it was only imitative.<sup>22</sup>

The first point of Magdalena Karamucka’s analysis was Norwid’s perception of the relations between the Roman categories of “state” and “nation.” As it was emphasised in the dissertation, following Antoni Dunajski,<sup>23</sup> for a son of the nation who was brutally deprived of his state, it was an exceptionally relevant question and thus it was rightly prioritised in the hierarchy of issues discussed in the book.

An attempt to define Norwid’s Rome, to extract relevant categories belonging to this vision, made Karamucka conclude that Norwid’s perception of the pagan Rome is marked by a strong ambivalence. An elaborate exemplification convinces the reader of the fact that at first Rome appeared to the poet as the “letter” and the “form;” it was a structure initially devoid of natural, national (or even familial) community, dominated by statehood as well as the imposed “external” laws, as opposed to Greece which originated from “słowo-naród” [the letter-nation], “z Epopei” [from the Epic]. The formal process of shaping the Roman nation resulted in the creation of Roman expansionism and the concept of imperialism. For this reason, Norwid repeatedly made the Rome of emperors a prefiguration of modern empires,<sup>24</sup> equally characterised by the predominance of the category “state” over “nation” as well as the lack of respect for the notions of “homeland” and “nation” (*Słowo i litera* [The Word and the Letter]). The book indicates various consequences of the Romans’ neglect of the “native” concepts, which were insightfully noticed by the Polish poet – the lack of originality, imitation, assimilation of contents from different cultures and religions, construing itself based on “foreign models.” Karamucka writes that Rome thus perceived in Norwid’s views was becoming an “anti-utopia,” an antithesis of Christian and European culture.

Crucially, Karamucka not only reconstructs Norwid’s constataions, but finds full confirmation of their validity in Roman historians’ observations (Livy’s *His-*

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., Vol. II, p. 433.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. A. DUNAJSKI, *Naród i państwo w chrześcijańskiej refleksji Norwida*, [in:] *Norwid bezdomny. W 180. rocznicę urodzin poety*, ed. J. Kopciński, Warszawa 2002, pp. 105-115.

<sup>24</sup> The *empire* style from the Napoleonic times, which deliberately referred to the symbols of the imperial ancient Rome, confirms this statement by Norwid.



*tory of Rome*) as well as in the newest historical studies.<sup>25</sup> In this way, she reveals Norwid's remarkable historiosophical sense as well as his profound, perfect understanding of the workings of history.

Another view on the *Romae paganae* present in Norwid's perception and reconstructed in the work (in its further part) is much more positive. It consists of Roman republican ideas and the universalism of the Roman world, which predestined Rome to become a model of a great European cultural synthesis. The poet was convinced that "if there was anything noble in the politics of Rome, it was during the time of the Republic"<sup>26</sup> (this time was, as it is emphasised by the scholar, the time of the greatest respect for the idea of the nation in Roman history). This conviction was illustrated with a selection of interesting quotations from his works, rarely mentioned by researchers of Norwid and Polish literature. The admiration of the author of *Vade-mecum* for the mechanisms and institutions of the Roman Republic as well as for its most noble representatives (Cato the Elder and Cato the Younger, Brutus, Mark Antony) is clearly visible in these quotations. The Roman Republic is, in Norwid's view, a sign of ethos, a source of soldierly, liberal and patriotic inspirations, and finally also a proto-model of the European republicanism (although brought to the Romans by the Greeks). Karamucka's observation that an important reason for Norwid's focus on the questions of Roman "citizenship" and "republicanism" was his conviction about the grave dysfunction of these spheres in Polish reality, is remarkably accurate.<sup>27</sup> This observation reveals the poet's propensity to constantly actualise the Roman past and juxtapose it with the contemporary reality.

Karamucka also skilfully shows how the reflection on the possessive, imperialistic Rome and the demonisation of "statehood" led Norwid to reflect on the 19<sup>th</sup>-century empires, their political and cultural character as well as the links to the Polish cause (this can be seen already in the poem *Niewola* [*Enslavement*]). With great assiduousness and reliability she extracts from Norwid's works all traces of thinking in terms of analogies Rome-Russia, Greece-Poland, Poles-first Christians, often reaching fragments which have rarely been quoted, or even previously never discussed in the context of this topic.

The next parallel created by Norwid: Rome-France is not based – as it was rightly emphasised – on the categories of "state" and "nation," but on the correspondences in culture, morality, the similar cosmopolitan atmosphere of Paris

<sup>25</sup> Cf. S. ŁOŚ, *Rzym na rozdrożu. Studium monograficzne o Katonie Starszym*, Lublin 2009.

<sup>26</sup> M. KARAMUCKA, *Antyczny Rzym Norwida*, p. 132.

<sup>27</sup> Norwid juxtaposed the Roman republican ideal with his compatriots' faulty and often emotional understanding of patriotism as well as their inability to build a civil society and their leaning towards anarchy.

and Rome as well as embedding both civilisations in reason and materiality, with their simultaneous lack of spiritual and moral foundations.

Another perspective from which Norwid's vision of Rome is presented in the book is based on the dichotomy *Roma pagana-Roma Christiana*, which was exceptionally important for the 19<sup>th</sup>-century European and Polish thought (and probably most frequently commented on by Norwid scholars). This time again Karamucka focuses on two aspects (or, as she initially proposes after Marian Śliwiński, two paradigms<sup>28</sup>) of this juxtaposition which was so important for Norwid.

Karamucka indicates, first and foremost, the reasons for Norwid's fascination with the beginnings of Christianity – his reading of the works by Chateaubriand (as well as, we should add, Krasieński), St Augustin and St Tertullian, the letters of Saint Paul, or his visits to the Roman catacombs and the Colosseum. Surprisingly, there is no mention of Norwid's deep faith as well as his propensity to search for the truth “at the source” which was probably taken for granted. By contrast, Karamucka emphasises the poet's inclination to stress the parallels between the fate of 19<sup>th</sup>-century Poles and Christians from the Roman catacombs, as well as Norwid's predilection for perceiving the persecution from the times of emperors as a universal model for the situation of Christians worldwide, also contemporarily.

Karamucka follows the development of this reflection on the clash of Christianity with the pagan Roman world in lyrics and poems without neglecting – which is exceptionally important when striving to reveal the entire picture – Norwid's lost works, which were probably related to this theme (*Hippolitos*). She manages to retrieve a sizeable group of texts devoted to this important historical breakthrough. Their pages reveal the pagan Rome incapable of accepting the new truth and going beyond the corporeal, the material, the measurable; the Rome impervious to the transcendence, too immature for the ideal, desacralised and obviously hostile towards spiritual Christianity. The other part of the juxtaposition was also reflected upon – the Christian world, whose distinguishing features were: invincibility, focus on the transcendence and strength originating from faith. In the first perspective *Roma pagana* thus becomes a stark antithesis of Christian Rome, a European “antitradition” sui generis.

The second thread discussed in the dissertation is related to the anticipation of Christianity in the ancient Roman world, as observed in the poet's works. From this second perspective, *Roma pagana* appears as “a vestibule for the *Roma Christiana* category.”<sup>29</sup> Emphasising this, characteristic for Norwid's thought, tendency to seek cultural continuity and kinship, gravitating towards the idea of cumulation

---

<sup>28</sup> Cf. M. ŚLIWIŃSKI, *Roma pogana Norwida – retrospektywna utopia totalitaryzmu*, „Filomata” 1993, p. 216.

<sup>29</sup> M. KARAMUCKA, *Antyczny Rzym Norwida*, p. 170.

and synthesis of spiritual values, Karamucka uncovers a very probable affiliation between these conceptions and the views of August Cieszkowski. According to her, the idea of Roman cultural continuity is best exemplified in Norwid's works by St Paul who is both a "sign" of confrontation between *Roma pagana* and *Roma Christina* as well as a "place" where "romanitas" and Judaism – and later also Christianity – meet. The question of "hints" and "intuitions" of Christianity in the Roman world at the end of the pagan era (noted by the poet) is also presented in an exhaustive and factual way. The dissertation juxtaposes Norwid's mentions and notes about this theme with fragments of the writings by Cicero (*De natura deorum*), Virgil, (the famous Eclogue IV from *Bucolica*), Seneca (*Epistulae morales*) as well as the writings of the Fathers of the Latin Church. However, the author had a considerable problem with deciphering the fragment, in her opinion not very clear, of Norwid's dialogue *O historii* [*On History*], which mentions Tacitus:

Nam, jako Grekom, zda się, że pod koniec  
 Dopiero zstąpi historyk – jak goniec  
 Nieupragnionej jakiej wielkiej zmiany...  
 Choć zresztą – nie wiem, czy jesteśmy niżej  
 Od innych – Tacyt byłże już zrównany  
 Przez chrześcijańskie pióro?... z naszych krzyży  
 Zda się układać historia odmienna,  
 Mniej literacka może, lecz promienna!...

(PWsz I, 164)

We, as Greeks did, think that only at the end  
 A historian will appear – like a messenger  
 Of some undesired, great change...  
 Although – I do not know if we are lower  
 From the others – Tacitus has been equalled by  
 A Christian pen?... form our crosses  
 A different history seems to emerge,  
 Less literary maybe, but radiant!...

Karamucka writes about this fragment as follows:

How can we thus understand the statement that "Tacitus has been equalled by a Christian pen?" The interrogative mood is also quite puzzling. It seems that Norwid meant here that Christian writers read Tacitus and used his writings, but most probably with some reinterpretation.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., p. 182.

An attempt to interpret this quote in separation from the rest of the text was most probably the reason of the problem. The first part of the dialogue, preceding the quoted passage, is about the lack of national contemporary historiography and about unfamiliarity with one's own history, which negatively differentiates Poles from people of other European nations ("zupełnie historii nie mamy / Prócz kilku kronik" [we do not have history at all / Apart from a few chronicles]; "Historia nawet jako się podziela / Nie wiemy" [How history is divided / We do not even know]). The statement above clearly rejects such critical opinions which doubt the "historical" enlightenment of the nation announced by some ("nie wiem, czy jesteśmy niżej / Od innych" [I do not know if we are lower / From the others]). The anonymous adversary suggests that the historiography of other nations represents a similar level (to the Polish historiography). The question in which Tacitus is mentioned is a rhetorical question (presupposing a negative answer) about the existence of Christian historiographers equally good as the author of Roman *Histories* and *Annals* (i.e. "equalling" his pen). Possibly, the speaker is expecting to receive information about some genius Christian historiographer, whom he overlooked. At the same time, the debater claims that Polish history is radically different from the history of other nations (including the history of Rome). In the following part this martyrological "otherness" is juxtaposed with the persecution of the first Christians. Without going into a detailed analysis of various ambiguities and ironic tones,<sup>31</sup> found in this work by Norwid, it can be claimed that the interpretation of the fragment of *O historii* found in Karamucka's book is rather superficial and inaccurate. At the same time, it should be added that it is perhaps a sole interpretational flaw found in this interesting and valuable study.

The reader's attention is also drawn to an in-depth historiosophic analysis of *Quidam*, which is the most suggestive and the most artistically perfect fruit of Norwid's reflection on the pagan decadence of the Roman civilisation and the pagan-Christian antagonism. This part of the dissertation is summarised with the claim that the paradigmatic dichotomy in Norwid's perception of the ancient Rome does not actually exist, but is rather a matter of multifaceted perspective, as the Roman civilisation was finally incorporated by the "poet of cultures" into his grand, synthetic vision of European and global history. Karamucka explains that this reconciliation of contradictions was possible in Norwid's theory owing to his belief that Christianity did not negate, but actually "u-wydatniło" and "dopełniło" [enhanced and completed] the Roman legacy. The converted Rome became for

---

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Ł. NIEWCZAS, *Naród-analfabeta czyta księgę dziejów. Hermeneutyka przeszłości w wierszu „O historii” Norwida* [in:] *Norwid wobec historii*, eds. E. Chlebowska, Ł. Niewczas, Lublin 2014, pp. 351-368.

Norwid “świecznik” [the candelabrum] of nations, the historical capital of the European and Christian civilisation.

The third part of the dissertation analysed Norwid's views on the genesis and character of Roman literature. These are often scattered across the poet's writings as digressions and comments, hence finding them required a lot of work and perceptiveness. The aim was to collect and analyse these views and to attempt to evaluate “the extent to which they form a cohesive and consistent vision of the literature of ancient Rome.”<sup>32</sup> It is worth mentioning that Karamucka managed not only to recreate, but also attractively and meticulously present this vision.

The observation that “perceiving literature as a history of the universal word”<sup>33</sup> dominates in Norwid's work is an axiom on which the author bases her further considerations. Philosophical reflection on language, problems of the word and the relation between “the word” and “the letter” as well as the poet's historiosophy are key to Norwid's vision of Roman literature.

The first conclusions were based on the previously mentioned antithesis “Greek word-Roman letter;” according to Norwid, the Greeks expressed “treść swojej duszy” [the content of their soul] (“wewnętrzna Epopeja grecka” [the internal Greek Epic]) in song, whereas “litera miała być” [the letter was to be] (PWsz VI, 320) the calling of Rome. In other words, the pioneering role of Rome was to codify and normalise literature (Horace's *Ars Poetica*), to give “shape” to what in the Greek literature remained in the sphere of improvisation, inspiration, and what was devoid of self-awareness.<sup>34</sup> This “law” filled the gap “resulting from the deficit of the word.”<sup>35</sup> The transition from the spiritual, prophetic, and “intuitive” poetry to the literature based on formal rules was accompanied by the degradation of the poet's social status; in the light of the Christian Epiphany which took place on the territory of the Roman empire, the need to “prophesy” disappeared. The poet-prophet became a mere “literary man”. In addition, Karamucka attempted to incorporate Rome into Norwid's vision of the history of the word, expressed through genealogical metaphors. As the poet explicitly equated Greece with the “Epic,” Karamucka rightly suggested linking Rome and its “mundanity, practicality and historicism”<sup>36</sup> to Norwid's phase of “History.”

Equally convincing and with the same philological proficiency, Karamucka presents different variants of the antitheses “Greek literature-Roman literature,”

<sup>32</sup> M. KARAMUCKA, *Antyczny Rzym Norwida*, p. 201.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 211.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 209.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 219.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 217.

that is the dichotomies “inspiration”-“work” (artistic craftsmanship) as well as “Author”-“Vulgariser”, each time aptly exemplifying them with selected fragments of Horace’s works. According to the author, Norwid shared with Horace, above all, the conviction of the necessity to link *ingenium* with *ars* in the process of literary production. Another of Norwid’s “Roman” hypotheses – the claim about the lack of native Roman poets, the statement that Rome is “the homeland of prose” as well as the conviction of the “imitative” nature of Roman literature – were also analysed meticulously and in multiple contexts. The dissertation does not fail to mention the inclusion of ancient Christian writers (St Augustine, Tertulian) in the works of *Quidam*’s author.

The chapter on Roman literature was also enriched with a very interesting sketch representing the functioning of the Roman literary reality in Norwid’s critical reflection on the place of the writer in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Karamucka showed that Norwid, who constantly struggled with the economic aspects of the creative process in a “mercantile and industrial” reality, as well as with critics, publishers, and booksellers, would comment on his experiences using metaphorical language “derived from ancient Rome.”<sup>37</sup> The Roman reality of the times of St Augustine was for him an essential point of reference, which allowed him to understand the universal mechanisms of the literary word. He referred to it each time he dwelled upon issues such as the situation of the artist, need for patronage, freedom of speech, significance of coterie, functioning of the publishing and bookselling market, financing writers, etc.

Considerations about Norwid’s vision of Roman literature are concluded with an overview of the poet’s opinions about the most prominent authors of ancient Rome (Horace, Virgil, Tibullus, Propertius, and Catullus). Karamucka managed to interpret these judgements in a flawless, exhaustive, and comprehensive way – Norwid’s judgements which are not always coherent and consistent, often entangled with his multidimensional, autobiographical, and autothematic allusions. As elsewhere, she did not limit her analysis to quoting the Polish poet’s statements (often short, exceptionally concise notes – ambiguous and difficult to interpret), but she also indicated their Roman sources and finally confronted Norwid’s words with the works of Roman authors, generally finding confirmation of his insightful observations.

Norwid’s attitude towards the Roman “niepisanego słowa historycznego” [unwritten historical word] (PWsz VIII, 332), i.e. the nonverbal Roman material art, in particular architecture and sculpture, was another subject of research. Importantly, Norwid’s (unfortunately) lost *Przewodnik po zabytkach starożytnego*

---

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., p. 252.

*Rzymu ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem zabytków pierwochrześcijańskich* [*Guide to the Monuments of Ancient Rome with Particular Emphasis on Original Christian Monuments*] was mentioned here. Skilful explanations of Norwid's poetic and extra-poetic statements show how this subject was linked with his historiosophic ideas as well as his fascination with archaeology, which he treated as a means of more profound discovery of not only antiquity, but also modernity and – in a universal sense – the truth about humans in general. Karamucka analyses Norwid's intersemiotic idea of "reading" Roman sculpture and architecture (probably inspired, as she showed in her dissertation, by Lelewel's works), treating these examples of ancient origin – in line with Norwid's methodology – as reflections of the spirit of the nation, the source of knowledge about the past, and the basis of wisdom of the entire humanity.

Norwid's understanding of the originality of Roman art is yet another issue brought to the reader's attention. This area was perceived by the poet-magician as secondary (similarly to Roman literature), borrowed from the conquered nations (Norwid perceived only the Roman "wojskową-inżynierię" [military engineering] as original, PWSz VI, 348). Winckelmann's name should undoubtedly be mentioned here again, as his work became the main source of this judgement prevalent in Europe (as it was mentioned above) – unfortunately, Karamucka does not follow up on this issue.

In the overview of the subjects related to Norwid's reception of the Roman art Karamucka addressed, among others, the following issues: Roman liberal attitude towards the value of the original, imitation, eclecticism, the stigma of "PRZEMYSŁ-SZTUKA" [ART-INDUSTRY] (PWSz VI, 126) etc., analysed mainly in reference to the Greek art – "original, deriving from the infinite, inexhaustible springs of inspiration"<sup>38</sup> (the opposition Greece-Rome corresponds to, inter alia, the antimony "Author"- "Vulgariser"). Karamucka, the inquisitive Norwid scholar unwilling to settle for one-sidedness, also found other statements by Norwid, which prove that the poet also saw the Romans' contribution to the history of world art. These original Roman qualities are, above all, "pojęcie ogromu i ogarnięcie (koloseum)" [the concept of magnitude and managing (the Colosseum)] (PWSz III, 463), or, put differently, "potrzeba wielkości" [the need for greatness] (PWSz XI, 422), which was the expression of the imperial strive for might and monumentalism (the Colosseum, the Pantheon), as well as formalism, geometrical simplicity, and laconism. The fragments of Vitruvius' *De architectura libri X* gave an interesting context for Norwid's constations discussed in the dissertation.

---

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., p. 302.

Here returns the problem of cultural continuity between the art of pagan and Christian Rome, archetypal architectural forms (e.g. the circle), as well as the process of the natural assimilation of elements of the pagan art into the “proto-Christian,” especially catacomb art (and Norwid considered – as Karamucka mentions – a gesture of “looking up into the sky”, unknown to the pagan culture and reflecting the Christian truth of the Ascension, to be a significant *novum* in this art).

This part of the dissertation also mentions the Roman artwork of the “poet of ruins,” as well as his symbolic explanation (both positive and negative) of the Roman ruin-landscape referring to religious, social, philosophical, and existential issues. Among the many threads addressed here, what comes to the forefront is the *vanitas* theme (Pompeii), the relation between *Roma pagana* and *Roma Christiana* once more, the concept of “the whole” as well as the question of the picturesque nature of the Roman ruin-landscape. As Karamucka mentions, the majority of these views would function just as well in Romantic culture, but Norwid also added there his original observation, i.e. the anagram *Roma-Amor (Promethidion)*, which in his opinion most tellingly explains the reasons of Roman art’s immortality (as nothing “poczęte w miłości (...) nie ginie” [conceived out of love (...) ever dies], PWSz VI, 168). Especially this last non-trivial and revealing constata-tion Karamucka deemed as a special proof of the fact that Norwid saw “not only Rome’s imitation, modelling itself on the cultural legacy of Greeks and Etruscans, but also the Romans’ own contribution into what they were creating”<sup>39</sup>.

Finally, the dissertation addresses Norwid’s reception of the games and Roman theatre (based on his so far mostly overlooked draft *Widowiska w ogóle uważane [Spectacles largely attended]*). The scholar traces the origins of these interests in Tertullian’s *De spectaculis*, but interesting clues lead also to Varro’s and Ovid’s works. The conclusion which summarises a detailed analyses is the following: Norwid juxtaposed the Roman predilection for bloody spectacles (gladiatorial games), entertainment (wrestling, circus), and pantomime with Greek perfection in tragedy and classical comedy which were always standing “w obronie łagodności obyczajów” [in the defence of gentle manners] (PWSz VI, 389).

The motif of the gladiator, which was in Norwid’s writings sometimes a symbol of ancient Rome and sometimes its antithesis – a figure of the fate of Christian struggling with evil in the circus ring of life, was analysed separately. Karamucka noticed different variants of this motif, such as “gladiator-Slav” (a Slav also meaning: a Pole-slave of tsardom) or “artist-gladiator” pitted against critics and false friends. Employing this single, typical Roman image, the author once

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., p. 322.



again showed that Roman culture became for Norwid a “repository of symbols”<sup>40</sup> in his reflection on later times. It is worth mentioning – and it was not mentioned in the book – that Norwid’s “gladiator” is a specific prefiguration (analogue) of another subsequent symbol born in the Middle Ages in the context of the crusades, the symbol of the “Christian knight” (Tasso), similarly embodying in *Pisma wszystkie* [*Complete Writings*] the idea of the uncompromising fight for the truth and expressing the universal situation of Christians in the world.<sup>41</sup>

The final, fourth part of the book about Norwid’s *Romanitas* has a strictly literary character. It deals with various forms of embedding the poet’s work in Roman literary texts – from reminiscences, paraphrases, quotes, which became the fibre of his writings, to titles, mottos, and translations. The multiplicity of references allows Karamucka to call Norwid “the Roman poet.” Another exceptionally important subject – although undertaken multiple times, but only outlined in general terms<sup>42</sup> and never properly researched – is Norwid’s relation to antiquity and broadly understood classical tradition in literature as well as the presence of evident classicising tendencies in his works. This subject forms the backdrop for further considerations. The dissertation *Antyczny Rzym Norwida* fills the gaps in the overall understanding of these issues to a considerable extent.

Karamucka, with expert proficiency, extracts real and hypothetical, multi-aspectual relations between Norwid’s works and the works of various Roman authors. It should be emphasised that intertextual analyses conducted in this part of the dissertation provide completely new contexts for interpreting Norwid’s lyrics and often lead to still unexploited interpretive paths. All this reveals to the reader the unknown, but at the same time convincingly presented side of Norwid’s poetry. The multitude and variety of antiquity-imitating motives found by the scholar in *Pisma wszystkie* is striking. She points to Norwid’s possible inspirations in Catullus’ texts (the poems *Skowronek* [*Skylark*] and *Do księgarza* [*To the Bookseller*]); motifs, allusions and hidden references to Horace, both these previously indicated by scholars and these noted here for the first time (*Bezimienni* [*The Nameless*], [*Do mego brata Ludwika*] [*To My Brother Ludwik*], *Polka* [*The Polish Woman*], *Psalmów-psalm* [*The Psalm of Psalms*], *Do Walentego Pomiana Z.* [*To Walenty Pomian Z.*], *Rzecz o wolności słowa* [*On the Freedom of Speech*],

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., p. 343.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. R. GADAMSKA-SERAFIN, *Człowiek-rycerz chrześcijański*, [in:] EADEM, *Imago Dei. Człowiek w myśli i twórczości Cypriana Norwida*, Sanok 2011.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. R. FIEGUTH, *Od „Pompei” do „Quidama”. Z problemów klasycyzmu norwidowskiego*, [in:] *Klasycyzm. Estetyka – doktryna literacka – antropologia*, ed. K. Meller, Warszawa 2009; K. TRYBUŚ, *Norwidowski klasycyzm – zarys problemu*, [in:] *Klasycyzm. Estetyka – doktryna literacka – antropologia*.

*Memento*, *Dwa guziki* [Two Buttons] and others); references to Ovid's elegies (*Tristia*), traces of Juvenal's stylistics and also "Virgil's stigmas"<sup>43</sup> in his works. A clear and telling sign of the intellectual belonging of some of Norwid's seminal works to the realm of *Romanitas* and *Latinitas* are – as it was rightly noted – their Latin titles (*Promethidion*, *Quidam*, *Vade-mecum*, the drawing *Christiani ad leones*, *Fulminant*, *A Dorio ad Phrygium*, *Ad leones!*, *Italiam! Italiam!*; *Aerumnarum plenus*, *Post scriptum*, *Vanitas vanitatis*, *Lapidaria* and others) and mottos (Tacitus, Cicero, Ovid, Horace, Pliny the Elder, St Augustin, Tertullian), as well as various Latin comments in these texts. Karamucka notices that the latter prove the poet's deep embeddedness in the Latin tradition as well as in the traditions of the old Polish nobility (an inclination to use macaronic language).

The in-depth analyses of Norwid's translations of Latin classical poetry (Horace, Ovid) reveal the creative (and not only descriptive) and pioneering (anticipating contemporary translational tendencies) character of these translations, which consisted in deepening current interpretations, extracting undertones, as well as deep, hidden, covert, and ironic contents. Karamucka fully agrees with Gomulicki in that Norwid translated these works of the Roman poets with which he identified himself to some extent, "through which he spoke as if himself,"<sup>44</sup> in which he found "threads and emotions valuable and close to himself."<sup>45</sup> The author follows the signs of this intellectual and emotional "appropriation"<sup>46</sup> of ancient texts, making them the key to understanding the poet's personal experience and life events. In light of these considerations, the author of *Quidam* seems not only to be a master of translation from Latin, but also an expert in making ancient texts universal.

An overview of Norwid's Roman correspondence and his epistolary stylisations as an ancient Roman summarises the considerations of the poet's spiritual nationality in the Roman cultural space; the nationality proudly confirmed in a letter to Joanna Kuczyńska: "*civis romanus sum*" (PWsz IX, 64).

Magdalena Karamucka's book, which is the fruit of a truly meticulous scholarly work, is undoubtedly one of the best syntheses on Norwid in the recent years. The holistic understanding of the poet's entire work (including his small notes and planned or lost titles) as well as the insightful, comprehensive analysis of texts, attention to source texts and facts, and very good knowledge of the current state of scholarly research, is especially admirable. Polemicising with the opinions

---

<sup>43</sup> M. KARAMUCKA, *Antyczny Rzym Norwida*, p. 417.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 440.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 441.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 472.

of older generations of Norwid-scholars, the author often rectifies, deepens, and completes their interpretations or reconciles the differences emerging between them. She aptly extracts fluctuations, evolutions, ambivalences (bipolarity), or even some inconsistencies in Norwid's thought, many times confronting its lack of clarity. The artist's reflection is not devoid of context, but rather embedded in the 19<sup>th</sup>-century texts (by Byron, Mickiewicz, Cieszkowski, Krasiński, Słowacki, Lelewel, Lenartowicz), confronted with works of prominent contemporary historians and philosophers, with works of writers and poets of the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries, which makes it possible to see it in an exceptionally broad cultural context and fully appreciate its stunning insightfulness and validity.

A great value of this publication lies in the fact that it does not represent Norwid's *Roma antiqua* in a fossilised form, but as a point of departure (or point of reference) in Norwid's considerations about almost all aspects of contemporaneity. The claim that the Polish poet "valued studying the antiquity in all its deep aspects, in monuments, in people, in emotions, and valued an active, as if actualising, approach to it"<sup>47</sup> is borne out in multiple examples. Another asset of this work are Karamucka's clearly formulated conclusions and research hypotheses, without which there would be no logic and transparency in scholarly argumentation.

There is no doubt that Karamucka managed to show Norwid as one of the greatest European (post-)Romantic experts in and enthusiasts of the phenomenon which we used to call *Romanitas* (*Latinitas*). In her book, Norwid's *opus magnum* (re)gained the context which – I dare say – was almost inexistent in the Norwid-related studies published so far.

Obviously, there are some areas of "incompleteness" or clumsiness in the dissertation, but – as Norwid emphasised himself – no human work is free of those. For instance, Norwid's "Roman" art works have not been discussed exhaustively (only some of them are mentioned), but maybe they were deliberately excluded from the scope of detailed research and left for art historians to study. It is also surprising that even though the motif of the gladiator was discussed in a separate subchapter, no attention was given to the (very important!) motif of Roman catacombs and Norwid's observations about catacomb art (obviously apart from the gesture of looking up to the sky), scattered across the poet's notes. This subject thus requires more research and a separate publication.

Regardless of the above, Magdalena Karamucka's book represents Norwid's Roman fascination in its captivating depth and fullness. We would almost like to say: "*nec plus ultra*" and finish with the conclusion that the subject has been exhausted, but Norwid says that "czytanie każdego arcydzieła jest nieskończone"

---

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., p. 442.

[reading each masterpiece is infinite] and takes place “w coraz głębszych głębiach” [at ever deeper depths] (PWsz VI, 444). Thus, it can be expected that new facts and new observations will be revealed in further scholarly research, casting new light on the issues seemingly already examined. *Antyczny Rzym Norwida* will remain a basic reference in this field for many years to come, and its interdisciplinary character will intrigue not only Norwid Studies experts or classical philologists, but also culture researchers, historians, art historians, archaeologists, philosophers, and representatives of other fields of humanities.

## REFERENCES

- AMISON A., *An English Milord in Europe and Italy*, Venezia 2016, Ed. II.
- BOROWIEC A., „*Album Orbis*” Cypriana Norwida jako księga sztukmistrza, Gdańsk 2015.
- CHLEBOWSKI P., *Romantyczna silva rerum. O Norwidowym „Albumie Orbis”*, Lublin 2009.
- DOBROWOLSKI W., *Norwida opowieść o wiecznym Rzymie i wiecznym człowieku Quidamie*, „Pamiętnik Literacki” 1927, Vol. 24, pp. 291-308.
- DOWLING G., *In Venice and in the Veneto with Lord Byron*, Venezia 2008.
- DUNAJSKI A., *Naród i państwo w chrześcijańskiej refleksji Norwida*, [in:] *Norwid bezdomny. W 180. rocznicę urodzin poety*, ed. J. Kopciński, Warszawa 2002, pp. 105-115.
- KARAMUCKA M., *Antyczny Rzym Norwida*, Poznań 2016.
- Klasycyzm. Estetyka – doktryna literacka – antropologia*, ed. K. Meller, Warszawa 2009.
- NIEWCZAS Ł., *Naród-analfabeta czyta księgę dziejów. Hermeneutyka przeszłości w wierszu „O historii” Norwida*, [in:] *Norwid wobec historii*, eds. E. Chlebowska, Ł. Niewczas, Lublin 2014, pp. 351-368.
- PŁASZCZEWSKA O., *Wizja Włoch w polskiej i francuskiej literaturze okresu romantyzmu (1800-1850)*, Kraków 2003.
- PNIEWSKI D., *Między obrazem a słowem. Studia o poglądach estetycznych i twórczości literackiej Norwida*, Lublin 2005.
- POTOCKI S.K., *O sztuce u dawnych, czyli Winkelman polski*, Warszawa 1815.
- „*Quidam*”. *Studia o poemacie*, ed. P. Chlebowski, Lublin 2011.
- SINKO T., *Klasyczny laur Norwida*, [in:] *Hellada i Roma w Polsce*, Lwów 1933, pp. 40-115.
- ŚLIWIŃSKI M., *Norwid o chrześcijanach z katakumb*, „W Drodze” 1992, Issue 3, pp. 70-76.
- ŚLIWIŃSKI M., *Norwid wobec antyczno-średniowiecznej tradycji uniwersalizmu europejskiego*, Słupsk 1992.
- ŚLIWIŃSKI M., *Norwid wobec tradycji antyku i chrześcijaństwa*, „Słupskie Prace Humanistyczne” 1992, Issue 11a, pp. 213-242.
- ŚLIWIŃSKI M., *Roma pogańska Norwida – retrospektywna utopia totalitaryzmu*, „Filomata” 1993, pp. 215-228.
- ŚLIWIŃSKI M., *Rzym pogański w „Quidamie” Norwida*, „Słupskie Prace Humanistyczne” 1990, Issue 8a (1987), pp. 85-104.

NORWID'S *ROMA ANTIQUA* IN ITS FULL GLORY

S u m m a r y

Magdalena Karamucka's book *Antyczny Rzym Norwida* [*Norwid's Ancient Rome*] is the first monographic study of the problem addressed in the title. Ancient Rome is presented in this valuable study from different perspectives: as a geographical, historical and cultural reality and as a literary topos. The starting point for the discussion is a chapter devoted to a Roman episode of Norwid's biography and his Roman readings. Another subject of analysis are the poet's political, religious and historiosophical reflections about Rome and his remarks on literature, art and Roman theatre. The main, comparative part is devoted to a meticulous analysis of reminiscences, quotations (paraphrases), titles etc. taken from works of Roman authors (including Catullus, Horace, Juvenal, Ovid, Virgil), Norwid's translational work and his Roman correspondence. However, Norwid's *Roma antiqua* presented in the monograph is not frozen in a dead form. The author shows in an interesting and convincing way how this *romanitas* becomes a starting (or reference) point for the author of *Quidam* in his reflections on almost all aspects of his contemporary times.

**Key words:** Norwid; Italy; Norwid's ancient Rome; *Roma antiqua*; Romantic antiquity; *romanitas*.

*Translated by Rafał Augustyn*

RENATA GADAMSKA-SERAFIN – PhD, lecturer at the Faculty of Polish Studies of Jagiellonian University (Department of History of Romantic and Enlightenment Literature); e-mail: renata.gadamska@gmail.com; renia5555@wp.pl