

kowska and E. Chlebowska, Lublin 2008). The discussion of the contents of all 28 scientific articles published in the volume is the starting point for sketching a panorama of contemporary Norwid Studies and determining the contribution of Professor Stefan Sawicki to the development of this discipline.

**Key words:** Cyprian Norwid; Stefan Sawicki; Norwid Studies; jubilee.

*Translated by Rafał Augustyn*

MAREK STANISZ – PhD, Professor at the University of Rzeszów, Polish philologist, literary scholar; e-mail: marekstanisz@gmail.com

## Paweł Tańsk i – NORWID’S EXPANDING COSMOS

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18290/sn.2018.36-14en>

Anita Jarzyna wrote a book that was worth waiting for. “*Pójście za Norwidem*” (w polskiej poezji współczesnej)<sup>1</sup> [“*Following Norwid*” (in Polish contemporary poetry)] is a diligent work, showing the author’s fine philological skills and enriching our knowledge of poetry. The study – an MA thesis completed in 2008 – was developed under the supervision of the outstanding expert of Polish poem, Prof. Piotr Śliwiński. The book was published five years later, without unnecessary haste, in a good rhythm, in accordance with the spirit of the idea of the person whose work it describes. Being perverse as usual, I think it was a good thing that Norwid’s work was discovered long after his passing away; his contemporaries and subsequent generations of readers were not prepared to accept such an unprecedented artistic phenomenon as the writings of the author of *Moja piosnka* (I) [*My Song* (I)]. I have the impression that even we, the devourers of books from the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, are not yet fully prepared to read Norwid’s utterly original work. It is excellent that so many studies have been created on this work and new ones are constantly being developed in order to illuminate the art of the word of the author of *Vade-mecum*. Anita Jarzyna proved in her book that the poets discussed by her draw by the handful from Norwid’s poetic world, that

---

<sup>1</sup> Lublin 2013: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego Jana Pawła II, Ośrodek Badań nad Twórczością Cypriana Norwida KUL [The Learned Society of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Cyprian Norwid Literature Research Department KUL], pp. 254.

they read it and come into dialogue with this astonishing cosmos of his artistic visions, presentiments, intuitions, thoughts, ideas and aesthetics.

However, in the paragraph opening the book, the author writes: “One day there will surely appear a book (a tome?) which fully covers the reception of Cyprian Norwid in contemporary poetry. Perhaps it has not been written so far, because it is a phenomenon that is obvious (because no one determines the shape of contemporary poetry like Norwid – the most innovative, least 19<sup>th</sup>-century author of the 19<sup>th</sup> century) and simultaneously unprecedentedly extensive, because there is a bizarre obligation to refer to Norwid” (p. 7). I absolutely do not agree with these words, because I think that Jarzyna overestimates the influence of the otherwise brilliant artist on the shape of modern poetry. This is why we need a work that would take a closer look at the reception of Norwid’s poetry in contemporary Polish poetry, and perhaps it would show that Norwid is not responsible for the history of our poetry. Or maybe that is why such a study has not been created, because there would not be anything to write about. Norwid’s line was exhausted long time ago, the insightful articles by Stanisław Barańczak, mentioned by Anita Jarzyna – *Norwid: obecność nieobecnego* [*Norwid: The presence of the absent*] (1983) and *Using and Abusing Norwid: Modern Polish Poetry in Search of Tradition* (1983) (pp. 8-10), were enough. Well, perhaps Norwid’s tradition had an impact on the work of poets in the past, also in the epoch about which Barańczak writes, but it has passed nowadays. For this reason, the title of Anita Jarzyna’s book is very misleading – instead of the adjective “contemporary” [Polish poetry], some other attribute should have been used. Maybe she should have just mentioned the names of the authors discussed in the book? In *Conclusion* the book does mention Eugeniusz Tkaczyszyn-Dycki, but this does not suffice to claim the book discusses contemporary poetry. The heart of truly contemporary poetry beats elsewhere, for example in volumes published by Biuro Literackie in Wrocław, Wydawnictwo Wojewódzkiej Biblioteki Publicznej i Centrum Animacji Kultury in Poznań or in a few other publishing houses. I understand that the term “contemporary poetry” is a buzzword that allows many authors, including Anita Jarzyna, to freely use the names of poets of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and those after 2000, but I would demand that it be not as free and arbitrary, I would call for precision and common sense – after all, contemporary refers to nowadays, and not to something that was some time in the past or even ten years ago. True contemporaneity encompasses yesterday and today, it includes volumes of poetry and poems published now, this year, in the previous year, even two years ago, even five years ago, but not in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, from which we have been separated already by 18 years. Of course, there is an urgent need for a new division of the history of literature of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, but this is a subject for other considerations. If we would like to

write a work entitled “*Pójście za Norwidem*” (*w polskiej poezji współczesnej*), we would have to look at the poems from the recent time and then publish such a book quickly so that it would be consistent with the title and up to date, so that it would have the power to comment on what is really contemporary, and not on what has passed. If Anita Jarzyna had titled her study differently, it would be consistent with the subject of her work and would not be misleading or confusing.

The book consists of four chapters preceded by *Introduction* and followed by *Conclusion*. The book is complemented by *Annexes*, containing “Norwid’s portraits in the late works by Hartwig, Herbert and Karasek”. In each part of the study, the author consecutively examines the presence of Norwid’s work in the oeuvre of one poet: Mieczysław Jastrun, Rafał Wojaczek, Tadeusz Różewicz and Joanna Mueller. And I must admit at once that while the lyricism of Wojaczek or Różewicz only benefits from a creative “conversation” with Master Norwid, the poetry of Jastrun inspired by the work of the Parisian emigrant appears today as little original, uninspiring and unworthy of considering, while the verbal experiments of Mueller – as Anita Jarzyna phrase it – his “linguistic games for the word” are, in my opinion, blown-up texts in which nothing interesting happens, and under the guise of being inspired by the work of the author of *Fortepian Chopina* [*Chopin’s Grand Piano*], the poet tries to hide his artistic and aesthetic shortcomings, his pseudo-innovative linguistic solutions. Jarzyna also describes a volume of Jastrun’s essays on Norwid, the volume that today, in all honesty, appears rather weak, and even damaging for the reception of Norwid’s masterpieces.

I agree that the chapters devoted to Wojaczek and Różewicz are needed, however, I would omit those on Jastrun and Mueller – not the same calibre, not the same quality of style, not the same poetic personalities. I would look elsewhere. It does not bring much that Anita Jarzyna writes: “Tymoteusz Karpowicz is, next to Norwid, the most important poet for Joanna Mueller” (p. 176, footnote 219) and that “Mueller shows how the two most important poets for her find «the revelation of the ancient Logos in the temporary staffage»“ (p. 176, footnote 219). Karpowicz was an outstanding poet, but the fact that an artist admits that the author of *Odwrócone światło* [*Reverse light*] is important to him does not contribute to the knowledge about the creative use of his writing strategies in his own activity as a poet. It goes without saying that the same is true of Norwid. On the other hand, the phrase about the “revelation of the ancient Logos in the temporary staffage” perfectly characterises also Mueller’s poetry – it is full of empty slogans which achieve nothing but some fashionable complexity of simple thoughts, not to mention the fact that “temporary staffage” is a linguistic nightmare that sounds displeasingly and pretentiously. For me, Mueller’s work is “a very distant relative” to Białoszewski and Karpowicz. At some point, Anita Jarzyna writes about the “risk

of the linguistic poem” in Mueller’s work; indeed, it is not a risk anymore but recklessness, in my opinion, it is a mockery of the readers, an impudent attempt at fooling them, as if they did not read, did not know the works by Białoszewski and Karpowicz. All the more as the Wrocław-based Biuro Literackie constantly reminds us of the extraordinary writings of Tymoteusz Karpowicz. I will repeat this once again – the author should have prepared herself more conscientiously for a book about Norwid’s work in contemporary Polish poetry, she should have searched for better poets than Jastrun and Mueller. I understand that these chapters had to be included in her MA thesis, but it was possible to omit these parts and draft new ones when preparing the dissertation for printing. It was also possible to skip the *Annexes*, i.e. the one 19-page sketch on “the portraits of Norwid in the late works of Hartwig, Herbert and Karasek”. Maybe I am a supporter of the old school, but for me philological research is a constant axiological construction, thus I would expect from the work of the type represented in this study, that it would show me the original areas of lyric poetry unknown to me, interesting approaches, but instead I was reminded of the boring, colourless poems by Hartwig (it does not matter they were about Norwid), unbearably pathetic and artificially erudite works by Herbert and the overly impertinent, superficial text by Karasek. It would have sufficed to just mention these texts or to reinterpret them, and not just “politely”, “schoolishly” present them in a way that is in line with the expectations of the elderly high school teachers.

Nevertheless, I must praise two chapters of Anita Jarzyna’s book – *Rafał Wojaczek: “to Norwid się kłania, widać dobrze przeczytałem jaki jego wiersz”* [*Rafał Wojaczek: “it is Norwid who bows, apparently I read his poem correctly”*] (pp. 69-104) and *Różewicz czyta Norwida „od prawie 60 lat”* [*Różewicz has been reading Norwid “for almost 60 years”*] (pp. 105-147). These are good sketches, insightfully showing the influence of the work by the author of *Czarne kwiaty* [*Black Flowers*] on the poetry of these two very different artists. The reader will find there convincing interpretations of texts, independent and deep reading of poems, the author’s reflections refer to the findings of her predecessors (for Wojaczek’s work – Cudak, Niewiadomski, Pióro; for Różewicz’s poetry – Wyka, Szargot, Żukowski). These fragments of the study show Anita Jarzyna’s skilful writing, her good philological skills and perceptiveness. The reader wants to return to these parts of the book, it is worth recalling them.

To sum up, *“Pójście za Norwidem” (w polskiej poezji współczesnej)* is an important book, although uneven, but this is caused by the researcher’s little experience at that time. However, I am convinced that her next works will prove that we are dealing with a promising commentator of Polish poetry.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABRISZEWSKA P., *Literacka hermeneutyka Cypriana Norwida*, Lublin 2011.  
 BUŚ M., *Idee i formy. Studia i szkice o Norwidzie*, Lublin 2014.  
 CHLEBOWSKA E., *Norwid sztukmistrz nieznany*, Lublin 2013.  
 JARZYNA A., *„Pójście za Norwidem” (w polskiej poezji współczesnej)*, Lublin 2013.  
 KORPYSZ T., *Definicje poetyckie Norwida*, Lublin 2009.  
 ŁAPIŃSKI Z., *O Norwidzie. Rzeczy dawne i najdawniejsze*, Lublin 2014.  
 MAKOWIECKI T., *Poeta i myśliciel. Rozprawy i szkice o Norwidzie*, compiled and edited by E. Chlebowska, W. Toruń, Lublin 2012.  
 NIEWCZAS Ł., *Niewidoczna metafora. Strategie mówienia przenośnego w poezji Norwida*, Lublin 2013.  
*Norwid – spotkania kultur*, ed. E. Chlebowska, Lublin 2015.  
*Norwid wobec historii*, eds. E. Chlebowska, Ł. Niewczas, Lublin 2014.  
 „*Quidam*”. *Studia o poemacie*, ed. P. Chlebowski, Lublin 2011.  
*Trudny Norwid*, ed. P. Chlebowski, Lublin 2013.

## ROZSZERZAJĄCY SIĘ KOSMOS NORWIDA

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

Omówienie dotyczy książki Anity Jarzyny „*Pójście za Norwidem*” (*w polskiej poezji współczesnej*), opublikowanej w Lublinie, w 2013 r. Jest to praca sumienna, ukazująca dobry warsztat filologiczny jej Autorki, wzbogacająca naszą wiedzę o liryce. Studium powstało pod kierunkiem wybitnego znawcy polskiej sztuki wiersza, prof. Piotra Śliwińskiego, jako praca magisterska, obroniona w 2008 r. Publikacja jest bardzo ważna, chociaż nierówna, ale spowodowane jest to ówczesnym małym doświadczeniem Badaczki. Autor omówienia zna, oczywiście, kolejne prace Anity Jarzyny, udowadniają one, zdaniem recenzenta tomu o Norwidzie, że mamy do czynienia ze świetną komentatorką polskiej poezji.

**Słowa kluczowe:** Norwid; recepcja Norwida; poezja XX w.; poezja współczesna; Mieczysław Jastrun; Rafał Wojaczek; Tadeusz Różewicz; Joanna Mueller; antropologia literatury.

## NORWID'S EXPANDING COSMOS

## S u m m a r y

The article discusses Anita Jarzyna's book "*Pójście za Norwidem*" (*w polskiej poezji współczesnej*), published in Lublin in 2013. It is a diligent work, showing good philological skills of its author and expanding our knowledge about lyric poetry. The study was created under the supervision of an outstanding expert in Polish poetry, Prof. Piotr Śliwiński, as an MA thesis, defended in 2008. The publication is very important, although erratic, but it is at-

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 20<sup>th</sup> 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 Norwid<sup>1</sup> 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 20<sup>th</sup> 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

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