

## Sławomir Buryła\*

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9838-0467>

# Dziennik wojenny by Leopold Buczkowski. A challenge for a (young) editor

## Trauma and the texture of writing

The academic reception of Leopold Buczkowski's work, with minor exceptions, is dominated by the structuralist and the literary history approaches. Suffice to quote a few books: *Granice spójności narracji* by Maria Indyk, *Przemoc świata* by Tadeusz Błażejowski, *Poetyka powieści niefabularnej* by Bodgan Owczarek and his studies published in national journals, and *Prawda mitu i literatury* by Sławomir Buryła<sup>1</sup>. The structuralist method (mainly focusing on the issue of intertextuality) also offered much for Ryszard Nycz's studies in *Sylwa współczesne* and *Tekstowy świat*<sup>2</sup>. The structuralist method (mostly at least), constitutes the foundation for the articles gathered in a collection entitled *...zimą bywa się pisarzem*<sup>3</sup>.

However, the unique texture of *Dziennik wojenny*, as well as *Czarny potok*, *Dorycki krążanek* and *Pierwsza świetność*, is the reason why they constitute interesting objects for analysis by aficionados of post-structuralist theories. That was the foundation of the doctoral dissertation of Dawid Skrabek entitled *Traumatyczna*

---

\* Professor, University of Warsaw, Faculty of Polish Studies, Chair of Editing and Stylistics, ul. Krakowskie Przedmieście 26/28, 00-927 Warszawa, [slawomirburyla@wp.pl](mailto:slawomirburyla@wp.pl).

1 M. Indyk, *Granice spójności narracji. Proza Leopolda Buczkowskiego*, Ossolineum, Wrocław 1987; T. Błażejowski, *Przemoc świata. Pisarstwo Leopolda Buczkowskiego*, Wydawnictwo UŁ, Łódź 1991; B. Owczarek, *Poetyka powieści niefabularnej*, PWN, Warsaw 1999; S. Buryła, *Prawda mitu i literatury. O pisarstwie Tadeusza Borowskiego i Leopolda Buczkowskiego*, Universitas, Krakow 2003.

2 R. Nycz, *Sylwy współczesne. Problemy konstrukcji tekstu*, Ossolineum, Wrocław 1984; R. Nycz, *Tekstowy świat. Poststrukturalizm a wiedza o literaturze*, IBL, Warsaw 1993.

3 *...zimą bywa się pisarzem. O Leopoldzie Buczkowskim*, S. Buryła, A. Karpowicz, R. Sioma (eds.), Universitas, Krakow 2008.

*tkanka sztuki*<sup>4</sup>. In it, the author emphasised mainly the findings of Jacques Lacan, the French psychoanalyst, and Slavoj Žižek, his continuator. Skrabek consistently developed his interpretation of Buczkowski's works using a category which had been previously mentioned by the commentators of the writer, though usually they referenced it as just one of many, never placing it in centre focus. That category is the category of trauma.

Until then Buczkowski's journal had been omitted by researchers.<sup>5</sup> Skrabek was probably the first to extract its exceptional texture, quite justly emphasising the unique character of the text. The application of trauma realism in the case of Buczkowski's works proved innovative and accurate.<sup>6</sup> According to Skrabek, thus defined realism reveals trauma through traumatic form. To show the Real means to show "naked life", History not touched by any myths, and so had not yet managed to tame and galvanise it. Thus, Buczkowski in his journal – and later in *Czarny potok* – had to move to the side of ugliness, brutality, and cruelty; he had to – by using dissonance – shatter the readers' good mood<sup>7</sup>.

Skrabek's objective – in which he remained true to the spirit of the loner from Konstancin – was to reconstruct the notion of a total work. In it, literature coincides with the graphic message and musical compositions. The young researcher's perspective differed from the previous approaches. The initial assumptions of his dissertation read:

My intention [...] shall be not only to present the literary interpretation of the output of the author of *Wertepy*, but also its graphic and musical interpretations. I would prefer not to [...] discuss those works individually, separating that which is literary from that which is graphic and musical. [...] Such an interpretation, inter-semiotic all things considered, is not so much a presentation of the relationships between literary and other artistic domains, as an indication that there exist moments in those works when suddenly one discourse transitions into another, for a moment, a blink of an eye, it becomes its own contradiction which by introducing a division results

---

4 D. Skrabek, *Traumatyczna tkanka sztuki*, dissertation written under the supervision of Professor Anna Burzyńska in 2011. The typescript of the doctoral dissertation is available at the library of the Faculty of Philology of the Jagiellonian University.

5 I discussed him to some extent in my book *Prawda mitu i literatury*.

6 On traumatic realism vide, e.g. K. Bojarska, *Wydarzenia po Wydarzeniu. Białoszewski – Richter – Spiegelman*, IBL, Warsaw 2012.

7 A question arises whether – paradoxically – *Czarny potok* or *Dziennik wojenny* do not create some added layer, something which should be termed "the charm of terror." Suffice to reference the descriptions of destruction and ruin, extremely suggestive and terrifying, yet superb in literary terms. Quite similar to the depressing images of the nature of the Borderlands, drowned in blacks and greys. It seems apt that *Czarny potok* is sometimes considered to possess a strange hypnotising power.

in the shattering of all structures. [...] It is dialectics outside dialectics, dialectics of that which is literary and that which is graphic and musical, which leads not to a synthesis but to a loosening of meaning, structure, and substance. Therefore, the graphic and musical creations are somewhat the main building blocks for those works, not just mere ornaments.” (p. 20)<sup>8</sup>

According to Skrabek, the point was not to identify and name the relationships between various areas of art, but to achieve a type of unity where the type of creative activity is perceived through another; where, sometimes, the means of expression typical for one area of art are involuntarily cast onto another.

For Buczkowski, experiment was not a matter of artistic choice (as was the case during the period of European avant-garde). By joining the poetics of fragment (significant for the literature of the Holocaust), the experiment proves a necessity in the case of a world which cannot be made whole again. Approaching the same plot once again and returning to scenes and situations which had already been told constitutes the guiding principle of the story of *Czarny potok*. Yet the re-illumination of events (situations) does not lead to solving them; even worse – it does not always help settle which version is the most probable. *Czarny potok* (to some extent *Dziennik wojenny* as well) is the dialectics of approximating and relegating substance. Nothing is (nor can be) absolutely clear. That is the nature of trauma itself, not a result of how the author toys with the reader.

Trauma is doomed with the poetics of fragment, non-linear stories (or rather its opposite), and chaotic torn narration violating the rules of realistic reproduction. In fact, the artist has an opportunity to touch upon the major aspects of the Shoah. Skrabek thus put it:

The events of the Shoah belong to a different order of *reality*, which is why they must be discussed in a different in-credible manner. Therefore, historical or realistic narration cannot constitute the basis for any reflection or any attempt to present the Holocaust, but rather [...] an attempt to create something which will evade the established norms of expression. Only by subjecting the language and the literary matter to transformations which the latter has not yet experienced, can we attempt to say anything about an experience which – just like that literature – has never occurred before. (p. 312)

---

<sup>8</sup> D. Skrabek, *Traumatyczna tkanka sztuki*, p. 20. It would be easy to list the aficionados and commentators of the interdisciplinary output of the author of *Pierwsza świetność* who had pointed out his works as a painter, sculptor and musician – Adam Wiedemann and Agnieszka Karpowicz to name but a few – yet almost all of them did so while making the sacrifice (surely unintentional) of downgrading his prose whenever their reflections would enter the realm of art history. [Unless indicated otherwise, English versions translated from Polish]

No one has ever emphasised so strongly the coherence of Buczkowski's art, where the theme of war (the Shoah in particular) seeks its reflection not only in prose but also in other realms of artistic expression. It also forms and determines the artist's existence: his house in Konstancin and its surroundings become filled with paintings and sculptures. Thus understood, art assumes the form of an existential project.

Skrabek's meticulously driven argument defines a point of reference for the editor of *Dziennik wojenny* (as well as later texts) which cannot be omitted. First of all, the researcher indicated the notion of a total work, which was fundamental for Buczkowski. Digital releases and the internet environment seem the best medium for indicating the essence of this concept. Digital copies enable one not only to preserve the past qualities of traditional printing, but they also add new functionalities. Apart from a chance to expand the array of critical devices and to freely include facsimiles (almost unhindered by financial considerations), there are also the much more extensive options of graphic design, i.e. uploading files with images, photographs, and sound effects.<sup>9</sup> Secondly, by using the theory of trauma, Skrabek convincingly tracked the relationship between the book's unique punctuation – most visible in “Grząski sad” and “Powstanie na Żoliborzu” – and the moment when the text was written. Thus, a fringe experience leaves its trace in the texture of the work.

## Starting point

Buczkowski's journal is part of the collections of the Adam Mickiewicz Museum of Literature in Warsaw. The meanings of “live speech” (which resulted in books: *Proza żywa, Wszystko jest dialogiem, Żywe dialogi*) indicate that Buczkowski often referred to the journal. He sometimes even quoted its fragments, yet he did not agree to it being published. That poses a problem. Zygmunt Trziszka's account is not considered absolutely reliable, not only by Buczkowski's closest relatives. *Proza żywa, Wszystko jest dialogiem* and *Żywe dialogi*<sup>10</sup> have not been compared with the basis of the editing process, i.e. tape recordings gathered in the private collections of Anna Trziszkowa. My experiences with editing *Znakiem tego, udialogizujemy dalej* indicate, in fact, that the author of *Heppeniada* could have intervened considerably in the tape scripts<sup>11</sup>. More questions arise. It has never been verified which part of the material recorded on the tapes was used in the printed version.

9 J. Gruchała, “Wirtualny wydawca i użytkownik edycji elektronicznej”, in: *Europejski kanon literacki*, E. Wichrowska (ed.), Wydawnictwo UW, Warsaw 2012.

10 L. Buczkowski, *Wszystko jest dialogiem*, Warsaw 1984; L. Buczkowski, *Proza żywa*, Pomorze, Bydgoszcz 1986; L. Buczkowski, Z. Trziszka, *Żywe dialogi*, Pomorze, Bydgoszcz 1989.

11 “*Znakiem tego, dialogizujemy dalej*”, S. Buryła, Z. Trziszka (eds.), *Regiony* 1998, issue 1/3, pp. 89–102.

One thing is clear: book editions surely did not include the entirety of the taped discussions between Trziszka and Buczkowski. Of course, an editor has the right to select certain elements, but in the case of Trziszka and his attitude towards source material one can suspect the nature of his selections (and the extent of his editorial changes). Did he omit some fragments due to some inconveniences (not only his own)? As far as I know the author of *Wertepy* corrected only the first part, i.e. *Proza żywa*. He did not “correct” the remainder.

Two parts of the journal were copied from the manuscript and prepared for printing by Bogusław Żurkowski. “Powstanie na Żoliborzu” was published first (*Regiony* 1992, issue 3/4). Yet in chronological terms, the events recorded in “Grząski sad” preceded it (*Ex Libris* 1994, issue 57)<sup>12</sup>. The third part of the journal applied to the fortunes of the author of *Dorycki krużganek* from the fall of the Warsaw Uprising to the autumn of 1945. It was first printed – edited by Sławomir Buryła and Radosław Sioma – in *Teksty Drugie* (2001, col. 2). “Koniec wojny” was printed on A5 sheets of a normal student notebook, as was “Grząski sad” and “Powstanie na Żoliborzu”. “Koniec wojny” occupies 31 of the 93 numbered pages. “Grząski sad” and “Powstanie na Żoliborzu” are of similar sizes.

In 2001, a book edition of Buczkowski’s journal was released, prepared by Buryła and Sioma.<sup>13</sup> The accompanying *Aneks* included a fragment entitled *Znakiem tego, dialogizujemy dalej*. It was originally intended to be included in the second volume of *Żywe dialogi*. *Znakiem tego, dialogizujemy dalej* presented the loner from Konstancin as an uncompromising person disillusioned about the intentions of the approaching Red Army, consciously assessing the political situation before and after the Warsaw Uprising. In order to draw the complete multifaceted creative image of Buczkowski and his mental state from when he was writing *Dziennik wojenny*, we supplemented our edition to include poems from the 1940s (though many were lost during World War II, the total number of which is hard to estimate). Together with the journal they form a coherent whole in terms of the mood and theme<sup>14</sup>.

According to the writer’s son, who in turn mentioned Marian Kratochwil, the author of *Czarny potok* had “a backpack full of poems” (Most of them were lost, though it is possible that some remain scattered in private collections.) We

<sup>12</sup> The same issue included a reprint of “Grząski sad”. Żurkowski’s edition included some inconsistencies which were partly the result of the haste with which the Krakow researcher worked trying to prepare for printing the previously unknown work by the author of *Dorycki krużganek*.

<sup>13</sup> L. Buczkowski, *Dziennik wojenny*, S. Buryła, R. Sioma (eds.), Wydawnictwo UWM, Olsztyn 2001.

<sup>14</sup> *Nieznane wiersze Leopolda Buczkowskiego* edited by Sławomir Buryła and Radosław Sioma were published in *Przegląd Artystyczno-Literacki* 1998, issue 10; *Twórczość* 1999, issue 2, *Regiony* 2000, issue 2/4. A considerable portion of these has probably been lost, though it is also possible that some of them are scattered in private collections.

made that decision remembering that those were works which must be interpreted in the context of the issues signaled in “Grząski sad” and “Powstanie na Żoliborzu”.

The case of the avant-texte of *Dziennik wojenny* remains a mystery. The final part of the journal in the third book is preceded by a page with an inscription: “III 87”, while the previous two: “I 87” and “II 87”. Sioma and I decided that those were the dates when Buczkowski was organising and rewriting his journal when we were preparing it for printing almost two decades ago.

The three volumes included approximately 20 sheets filled with “a child’s handwriting.” One of those included the following fragment covering half a page: “Tadeusz Buczkowski and daddy Leopold and mummy Marysia and uncle and auntie.”<sup>15</sup> Where did it come from? If it was written by a child, i.e. Tadeusz Buczkowski, it must have been written much earlier than in the 1980s (at that time Tadeusz Buczkowski was already a man of forty, and his sister Agnieszka, now Wood, was of a similar age). The following explanation cannot be excluded, though: Leopold Buczkowski, to save money, used notebooks which were used by a child in the first half of the 1950s and which were bought then or even a bit earlier. A definitive answer could entail a visit to the Museum of Literature and a verification of the three notebooks to establish when they were manufactured.

If, in the case of *Dziennik wojenny*, one applies the old maxim that “editing means editing out”, a question arises about omissions. Paweł Rodak thus discussed the relationship between the source of a fair copy and the fair copy itself:

It is something natural and [...] authentic when a diarist destroys his diary completely or partly, tears out pages and blurs original notes, thus proving the intimate nature of the diarist practice. It is just as authentic that by transforming the original diary into a literary diary text the author changes his notes. What is important, however, is to remember that the practice of recording everyday events and the practice of copying them result in the creation of not two identical texts, i.e. an original copy and a duplicate, but two different (both text and content-wise) versions of a diary, which only once compiled and viewed together create a new value in every aspect: material, textual, and fictional.<sup>16</sup>

What disappeared from the notes recorded regularly by Buczkowski? The question cannot be answered, due to a lack of the source for the 1987 fair copy. Thus, the path most vital for genetic researchers, i.e. from an avant-texte to the work, cannot be traced back.

---

<sup>15</sup> The Polish version retains the original punctuation.

<sup>16</sup> P. Rodak, *Między zapisem a literaturą. Dziennik polskiego pisarza w XX wieku*, Wydawnictwo UW, Warsaw 2011, pp. 365–367.

The process of copying results in one more area of doubt. It centres around the question about the division between a journal and a memoir, about the rules governing how those two autobiographical genres transcend one another. I wish to reiterate the question referring to Rodak's discussion of Maria Dąbrowska's technique. Allow me to quote a longer excerpt from the researcher's argument:

The first record in 1956 Dąbrowska began with a realisation: "The journal is turning into a diary." [...] In fact, the change, though not complete, occurred earlier, more or less during the war. That was when the journal began to resemble a constantly being moved in time (by a week, two weeks, a month) diary being created mainly with future readers in mind, which was visible, e.g. in the intentional structure, careful selection of the language, and the diversification of the stylistics of writing, but also in the use of various forms of presentation. It was then that Dąbrowska engaged in a systematic reading and re-writing her journal. It was then that she wrote "supplements" to it, starting with remarks on the differences between a journal and a diary [...] It was then that her personal everyday writing practice shifted towards literature yet never losing its everyday nature.<sup>17</sup>

Without the source for Buczkowski's fair copy, one cannot conclude anything about the situation. Yet it is indisputable that each copying (after a long time) of one's own notes carries the indicated *risks*. Deletions and super-script indicate that. Where (or when) did the remarks in the journal come from? Were they a sign of an unfaithful (careless) process of copying or rather a result of editing; of untraceable changes introduced as he was working on his final draft in January, February and March of 1987?

Because the original version of the journal is missing, the question about the material can also be posed only in reference to the 1987 manuscript. The selection of the material in an extreme situation and in the safe environment of one's home are two completely different matters. It is difficult to state today whether the first version of the journal had the form of a notebook or maybe loose sheets. Or maybe it was recorded, if not completely then maybe partly, on another type of material than notebook pages or typing paper. That obviously affects the process of how meaning developed:

The page format, the paper type and characteristics of a series of materials or one single material throughout play an important role in the process of writing. A writer works one way with a notebook, where the pages progress naturally and exist side

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibidem, pp. 392–393.

by side, and differently with loose independent sheets; a small scrap of paper offers a completely different space than a large-format page, etc.<sup>18</sup>

Did notes recorded *hic et nunc* include any traces of the war (e.g. stains, singeing)? What did Buczkowski use to record his thoughts? A fountain pen, a pencil, or a crayon? Or maybe he was forced to use other tools due to the conditions of existence during the occupation.<sup>19</sup>

The sentence written on 27 Dec 1944 results in yet another set of questions in genetic criticism. Buczkowski rebuked himself: “Reconstruct the material to ‘Grząski sad’”<sup>20</sup>. What material was he referring to? Did he mean to inscribe oral or written testimonies of the witnesses of the events? Or maybe he meant to write additional notes, remarks, observations himself, and possibly include drawings and photographs, which did not make the cut for the version of the journal as we know it now. In “Powstanie na Żoliborzu” Buczkowski did indicate photographs and drawings as alternative and enriching forms of commemorating the tragedy of the Uprising. The majority of the photographs from that time perished in the Warsaw Uprising. But some survived. They are part of the Tadeusz Buczkowski’s family archive. One cannot exclude the possibility that the author of *Wertepy* planned to include them in “Grząski sad” or “Powstanie na Żoliborzu”. That would prove the heteronomous nature of the journal. The 1987 fair copy includes traces of that. The texts of “Grząski sad” and “Powstanie na Żoliborzu” include passages in verse form. There are also a few drawings sketched by Buczkowski (there might had been more in the original version). One is an image of a draw well.

Buczkowski’s visual imagination was a distinctive quality of his prose. The author of *Pierwsza świetność* owed it to his inclination for painting. The visual dimension of the journal is visible not only in the host of images depicting the madness of destruction, but in actual references, e.g. to paintings by William Turner and James Ensor.

The heteronomous aspect of “Grząski sad” and “Powstanie na Żoliborzu” corresponds to the notion of a total work, mutual transcendence, and the coexistence of various art disciplines and their major forms of expression.

The issue of the origin of *Dziennik wojenny* refers to a broader issue: of “origins documents (*dossier* of origins).” Pierre-Marc de Biasi thus defined it:

<sup>18</sup> P-M de Biasi, *Genetyka tekstów*, trans. F. Kwiatek, M. Prussak, IBL, Warsaw 2015, p. 90.

<sup>19</sup> The notebooks kept at the Museum of Literature include text recorded predominantly in fountain pen. Only some fragments were recorded in pencil. At those instances, the pages are faded, and the text is hardly legible. A colour pencil was used to record the fragments by the child.

<sup>20</sup> L. Buczkowski, *Dziennik wojenny*, p. 85.



Origins documents consist “archives” usually maintained by national heritage institutions, either public or private. Their very nature is the reason why they include working manuscripts: designs, plans, notes, notebooks, sketches, drawings, notes from reading, marginalia, fragments of earlier versions, document excerpts, preliminary drafts, fair copies, author’s corrected copies, etc. They also include autographs enabling better understanding of the origins, such as correspondence, private diaries, calendar, youth writings, etc. [...] The origins documentation may be supplemented with other material [...] yet important for the analysis checked out books, letters received, personal library of the writer, publishing contracts, official files and documents, last wills, family archives, etc.<sup>21</sup>

Sadly, Buczkowski’s artistic legacy is still largely unstudied. It consists not only of written texts, but also paintings, photographs, drawings, sculptures<sup>22</sup>, and cassette tapes with musical recordings<sup>23</sup>. It would be necessary to study thoroughly the respective collections of the Museum of Literature in Warsaw, those in Nakvasha where he was born, Tadeusz Buczkowski’s archive in Split, and the private archive of Anna Trzyszkowa. That gives rise to many questions. The legacy of the author of *Wertepy* has not undergone a separate “investigation”. As Tadeusz Buczkowski indicated, the Museum of Literature has not catalogued the entire collection, which the institution received in the 1990s. Such a statement requires verification, of course.

Two years ago, Agnieszka Karpowicz and I were able to establish a team of specialists in Buczkowski’s works. One of its objectives is to create a virtual museum of Buczkowski. It would serve as the source of information on his output, but also as a source of knowledge on the writer himself, documenting the facts from his life, probable events and those completely improbable in his life.<sup>24</sup> Some biographical doubts resulted from Buczkowski’s fickle nature, as he was eager to provoke readers, toy with them, fabricate events in his biography or treat them rather freely. Our knowledge of what happened to the writer in 1943–1945 is scant. Yet it constitutes the key context for *Dziennik wojenny*. Individual short details about that period are contained in three volumes of the “live talks” prepared in cooperation

---

21 P-M de Biasi, *Genetyka tekstów*, p. 52.

22 Some sculptures have survived only in photographs, other are kept by the friends of Tadeusz Buczkowski, the writer’s son. Some were stolen from the garden surrounding the writer’s house in Konstancin in Piasta St.

23 The cassette tapes are part of the private archive of Anna Trzyszka.

24 Another objective of our efforts is to develop a ten-volume edition of the writer’s prose works. That applies to texts from the first stage of the writer’s creative life: *Wertepy*, *Czarny potok*, *Dziennik wojenny*, *Dorycki kruźganek*, *Młody poeta w zamku*, *Pierwsza świetność*, personal correspondence, and *Kąpiele w Lucca*. The novel mentioned last would, according to the team, have a hypertextual form. That structure would reflect the hypertextual nature of *Kąpiele w Lucca* impossible to achieve in a traditional printed form.

with Trziszka. There are references to the deaths of Tadeusz and Zygmunt, his two brothers murdered by UPA units.

Modern technology, i.e. online publications and the available graphic design software, offers an opportunity to establish an attractive virtual museum. Its modern character would match well with the avant-garde spirit of Buczkowski's works. Just as with other such websites (the Virtual Museum of Konstancin is a good example), it would be possible to post links to other websites related to the author of *Czarny potok*.

Yet another objective of our efforts is to develop an interactive map where one could mark geographical/historical/biographical facts. Digitisation would enable wider access while preserving audio-visual material, graphic works, and photographs which are now available only to those personally interested in the output of the loner from Konstancin.

Due to the lack of irrefutable facts (maybe, one day, we will achieve certainty) we cannot unequivocally state whether the author of *Dorycki kruźganek* treated the 1987 version as the final one. Neither do we know whether he intended to publish his journal at all. It would be necessary to carefully study his personal correspondence and all the documents gathered in the collections of the Museum of Literature.<sup>25</sup> That could be a way to verify/expand our knowledge on the origins of *Dziennik wojenny*. When I visited Tadeusz Buczkowski in Split in 2015, I discovered the writer's long-forgotten notebook *Nota bene*. It would also require a careful study. It is a unique document, for until now no one knew anything about any rough notepad or notebook which belonged to the author of *Pierwsza świetność*. While, in fact, the nature of his prose – particularly in the later stage, based on excerpts, quotations and quasi-quotations, and allusions – somewhat enforces the existences of such avant-texte artefacts.

## Hasty decisions of (young) editors

Several years back, when Radosław Sioma and I were beginning to analyse the three school notebooks kept at the Museum of Literature, we were both young researchers starting our editing careers. That is an area, more so than many others, where one gains experience with time. Yet quite early on we understood that Buczkowski's journal should be amended in our edition.

What were the mistakes in *Dziennik wojenny*? Our intention to make the text more accessible should be considered as the source of the major mistakes. We were too eager to decide that the readers' comfort in reading was more important than

---

<sup>25</sup> Until now, the most extensive study of Buczkowski's private correspondence has been presented by Justyna Staroń in her master's thesis entitled *Listy Leopolda Buczkowskiego do żony Marii – próba edycji* (typescript of the master's thesis, KUL).

retaining the complex texture of the text. Therefore, we changed Buczkowski's trademark punctuation (it was retained by Żurkowski in "Grząski sad" and "Powstanie na Żoliborzu"), adjusting to the needs of the readers. We introduced *commas* and *periods* where they were necessary for logic and clarity. When working on the autograph, with the readers' benefit in mind, we unified the punctuation. Thus, we abandoned the varying *punctuation marks*: #, = #, =, -, specific for Buczkowski, while the journal of the author *Pierwsza świetność* stands out among other well-known works of the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> c. in that, e.g. its autobiographical and documentary message takes a unique linguistic form seldom found in the genre (stylistics, punctuation, and graphics).

As we were careful to retain the *emotional* nature of the journal, we retained in many instances the writer's peculiar *hyphenated writing* (it also appeared often in Buczkowski's personal correspondence). Yet the decision did not prove fortunate as within that same problem area two, opposite it must be added, editing principles are used.

Buczkowski did not add a title to the third part of the journal (unlike in the case of "Grząski sad" and "Powstanie na Żoliborzu"). It was introduced by the editors. We tried to find the most neutral descriptive form, if you will, for "end of war". The decision to add a title to the third part of the journal must be considered as an excessive intervention in the text and taking over the competences which belong to the author. The same applies to adding a title to the entire publication: "a war journal". Originally, neither of the three notebooks did include a title or a suggestion about the title of the whole.

Apart from the mistakes discussed above – which were caused by the methodological decisions made by the editors – *Dziennik wojenny* includes passages which we were unable to read. As per the rules of editing, such fragments were marked in square brackets. Those mostly applied to single words, not longer phrases. They included proper names and expressions (usually single words) specific for the linguistic code of a writer who was born and raised where several languages intersected.<sup>26</sup>

It is difficult to classify the edition of *Dziennik wojenny*. Instead of the type B edition we intended to achieve – which would feature the qualities of an academic edition, like the works published in the National Library series – we produced a type C edition (as per Konrad Górski's classification).<sup>27</sup> It is the latter that allows text interventions (mode of recording) to make it more accessible for the readers, without taking note of that which inspires genetic critics: the *history* of

26 The phenomenon is more emphatic on the pages of *Czarny potok*, which very often include words from Yiddish, Russian (Ruthenian), Ukrainian, and Polish. That is one of the reasons why Buczkowski's masterpiece is so hermetic.

27 Vide K. Górski, *Tekstologia i edytorstwo dzieł literackich*, Wydawnictwo UMK, Toruń 2011.

a text's emergence, of its being born. When considered in terms of the array of the critical tools applied (extensive notes, Introduction and Afterword), *Dziennik wojenny* displays qualities characteristic of type B editions. Therefore, it would be most accurate to conclude that the version of Buczkowski's journal prepared by us is situated at the borderline between type B and C editions, having the qualities of both. Therefore, it cannot be considered as an entirely type B or type C publication, though it features more qualities specific for a type B edition.

## Endpoint

*Dziennik wojenny* cannot be read without any reference to *Wertepy* and *Czarny potok*<sup>28</sup>. It constitutes an intellectual and artistic bridge between them. Both the geography and the history of "Grząski sad" correspond to those of *Czarny potok*. They complement and shed additional light on each other.<sup>29</sup> In his dissertation, Skrabek discussed the relationship between *Dziennik wojenny* and *Czarny potok*, which consisted of not so much the evolution of formal devices marking the consecutive stages of the destruction of the novel texture in Buczkowski's works, but the emphatic introduction of trauma into the narration. *Czarny potok* seems in that sense a continuation and an eruption of imagination plagued by madness, the same which supported *Dziennik wojenny*.

The discussed reasons seem sufficient to argue in favour of an edition of *Dziennik wojenny* together with *Czarny potok*, while the desired edition would include *Wertepy*, *Dziennik wojenny* and *Czarny potok*. That could reveal various relationships which exist between the three texts, indicating, through its organisation, the evolution of Buczkowski's prose.

As I have already mentioned, our 2001 edition obscured the linguistic uniqueness of the journal for the benefit of accessibility. Today, with knowledge on the theory of trauma and traumatic realism, we would rather see in it a special form (and unique in Polish literature), trying to reproduce the exceptionality of the extreme experiences, not just another sign of Buczkowski's artistic extravagance. Facsimiles could save it to some extent. In the new edition facsimiles should constitute a visual supplement to the text of the journal which should help regain its dramatic nature – its inherent expressive potential and the dynamism of the struggles with the experiences of the Shoah. The point would be to return to the torn traumatic records of the three school notebooks.

<sup>28</sup> *Wertepy* must be first restored to the version prior to censorship interventions. Vide S. Buryła, "Edytorskie aspekty twórczości Leopolda Buczkowskiego. Rekonesans", *Pamiętnik Literacki* 2008, coll. 2, p. 167–189.

<sup>29</sup> The topic was raised by, e.g. S. Buryła, "Między 'Wertepami' a 'Czarnym potokiem'. Wybrane zagadnienia ewolucji prozy Leopolda Buczkowskiego", *Teksty Drugie* 2001, coll. 2, p. 265–273.

Just like in the case of several other works by the loner from Konstancin, the journal should be enriched with various types of iconographic material kept by the Museum of Literature in Warsaw, in the private collection in Split, and the collection of Tadeusz Buczkowski, the writer's son. Some can also be viewed on the website of the museum in Konstancin. Therefore, the new edition of Buczkowski's journal should include rich iconographic material. The first reason supporting such a decision is the heteronomous nature of *Dziennik wojenny*. Secondly, drawings, paintings, photographs, and maps enable one to fulfil the aesthetic concepts inscribed in the works and the statements by the "total artist." It would be difficult to ignore the role of photographs in the contexts for "Grząski sad" and "Powstanie na Żoliborzu". In "Powstanie na Żoliborzu" Buczkowski took photographs of human corpses and the frames of collapsing buildings. A similar function was fulfilled by his intended lithographic images of figures and events in the fights and the map of Warsaw. All that was intended to emphasise the historic truth, and to place the journal within the field of documentary relations remaining true to reality.

In *Dziennik wojenny* – as inspiring interpretational contexts reflecting Buczkowski's avant-garde, experimental, intertextual, and multi-media output – we included iconographic elements. The condition of the university's printing facilities was the reason why the included images lost much of their original clarity.<sup>30</sup>

The reading of "Grząski sad" largely depends on various historical and geographical references. The latter are often unclear today due to geopolitical changes that have occurred in Europe after 1945. The clarification of historical intricacies is one of the main challenges which an editor of *Dziennik wojenny* faces. A particular case applies to the first part entitled "Grząski sad". The events in Podolia it describes require historical commentary, more extensive and detailed than the one which we offered in the 2001 edition. Buczkowski, sometimes quite indirectly, spoke of specific facts. "Grząski sad", remaining a literary projection, is an account of the massacres of the Polish civilian population in Ukraine. It includes references to, e.g. the massacre in Huta Pieniacka.<sup>31</sup> The efforts which Polish researchers have made since 2000 to establish the reasons for and, most of all, the course of the conflict in Volhynia and Podolia enable better evaluation of Buczkowski's journal within the political and historical aspects.

Buczkowski's prose belongs to that vein which strictly demands commentary and notes. That is one of the conditions for clarifying its meaning and rendering the

---

<sup>30</sup> Currently, the most extensive collection of drawings, photographs and reproductions of paintings was included in an issue of *Konteksty* (2015, issue 3) devoted to the author of *Czarny potok*.

<sup>31</sup> Vide W. Szwiec, "Informacja o śledztwie w sprawie ludobójstwa dokonanego przez nacjonalistów ukraińskich w latach 1939–1945 na terenie Huty Pieniackiej", in: *Prawda historyczna a prawda polityczna w badaniach naukowych. Ludobójstwo na Kresach południowo-wschodniej Polski w latach 1939–1946*, B. Paż (ed.), Wydawnictwo UW, Wrocław 2011, p. 117–125.

complex texture of the texts by the loner from Konstancin more accessible as their comprehension is extremely difficult. Though the content of *Dziennik wojenny* is not as complex as that of other works by the author of *Kamień w pielnuszkach*, it does include a series of words created at the intersection of different linguistic codes. Apart from linguistic elements which must be clarified, there are also literary allusions. We were not able to decipher all of them for the currently available edition. Clearly, it would also be necessary to offer a different, i.e. deeper and more detailed, analysis of the intertextual references to *Czarny potok*. Their nature requires a separate study, since Buczkowski often “copied” from the journal at the level of individual sentences or even longer dialogue-based passages. At other instances, he transferred single images from his masterpiece.

In *Dziennik wojenny* one constantly remains within the area of actual places. However, it would be necessary to conduct a careful survey of the area of Nakvasha and Brody to establish whether the place names included in “Grząski sad” were free of errors. To offer the readers with better understanding of the area described in the first part of Buczkowski’s journal, it would be necessary to include its detailed map. Such a decision is justified not only by one’s care for the readers and their sense of direction within the area described by the writer, but also by the dual nature of the journal. Both “Grząski sad” and “Powstanie na Żoliborzu” are held together by two tendencies: the autonomous unique literary narration is constantly being supplemented by an emphasised need to experience and record. In the introduction to his landmark monograph, which remained close in terms of its spirit to genetic criticism, Rodak posited:

The process of the literalisation of the journal described in the book does not mainly consist of its progressing fictionalisation (though that phenomenon could be observed here as well) or strengthening of the phenomena of self-creation and the intensification of the game with the readers (those exist there, too), but of using increasingly variable matter of life and experience of the writer as the proper matter of the work of literature, where the journal becomes its most perfect example.<sup>32</sup>

While remaining true to the autobiographical formula, Buczkowski’s journal introduces the natural force of imagination, and it literalises the message. That is to offer the truth about the world of the ongoing apocalypse – both of that in the Borderlands, and that among the rubble and corpses of Warsaw being slaughtered. That transcendence of the natural forces of literature and history, of aesthetics and autobiography makes “Grząski sad”, “Powstanie na Żoliborzu” and “Koniec wojny” a unique message when compared to other journals of Polish writers.

Buczkowski’s text is clearly exocentric. The author focused on the tragedy of the surrounding reality, the misery of nature and man, the literal extermination

---

<sup>32</sup> P. Rodak, *Między zapisem a literaturą...*, p. 12.

of animals, people, plants, and things. Buczkowski's journal inclined towards literature through its division into three parts. Additionally, the title of one of those has a clearly poetic origin: *Grząski sad* [Miry Orchard]. At this point it seems interesting that Buczkowski did not provide a title to the entire book. There is not even a brief indication of its genre affinity, i.e. *journal*.

The peculiar writing in "Grząski sad" and "Powstanie na Żoliborzu" should be classified somewhere between documentary and testimony. That is the speech of trauma. Yet even in it one could find an aesthetic dimension, not just the documentary. That special writing with its peculiar punctuation offered a form for the imagination, which in turn constituted a response to the madness of that reality.

In terms of particular issues – which deserve noting and a separate consideration – one should indicate the numerous instances of underlining, mainly in "Grząski sad" and "Powstanie na Żoliborzu". Buczkowski was not consistent in using that form of marking: sometimes he used it for titles of the works he was referring to, while in other instances, he used it to accentuate phrases or single words. The latter was more common. In *Dziennik wojenny* we ignored the underlining, viewing it as insignificant for the overall message, which could be indicated by the lack of consistency in its usage. Most probably, they were an expression of the writer's emotions, which he expressed in the act of copying. Sometimes, when they conclude a sentence, they also seem to serve as a coda, also related to the act of copying. The issue seems worth revisiting.

To conclude, a new edition of *Dziennik wojenny* is necessary. It is not only a matter of restoring the editors' good frame of mind. It would also benefit the readers for whom the editors had mostly in mind when developing the previous edition. Correcting mistakes (not only of editing) is something which is desirable, but what is even more important is to always consider the readers and their reading comfort. And then, there is the author, undisputed and unique, who proved too challenging for a young editor.

---

## Bibliography

- Biasi de Pierre-Marc, *Genetyka tekstów*, trans. Filip Kwiatek, Maria Prussak, IBL, Warsaw 2015.
- Błażejowski Tadeusz, *Przemoc świata. Pisarstwo Leopolda Buczkowskiego*, Wydawnictwo UŁ, Łódź 1991.
- Bojarska Katarzyna, *Wydarzenia po Wydarzeniu. Białoszewski – Richter – Spiegelman*, IBL, Warsaw 2012.
- Buczkowski Leopold, *Dziennik wojenny*, Sławomir Buryła, Radosław Sioma (eds.), Wydawnictwo UWM, Olsztyn 2001.

- Buczkowski Leopold, *Proza żywa*, Pomorze, Bydgoszcz 1986.
- Buczkowski Leopold, "Wiersze", Sławomir Buryła, Radosław Sioma (eds.), *Przegląd Artystyczno-Literacki* 1998, issue 10, p. 69–73.
- Buczkowski Leopold, "Wiersze", Sławomir Buryła, Radosław Sioma (eds.), *Regiony* 2000, issue 2/4, p. 29–34.
- Buczkowski Leopold, "Wiersze", Sławomir Buryła, Radosław Sioma (eds.), *Twórczość* 1999, issue 2, p. 3–4.
- Buczkowski Leopold, *Wszystko jest dialogiem*, Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza, Warsaw 1984.
- Buczkowski Leopold, Trziszka Zygmunt, *Żywe dialogi*, Pomorze, Bydgoszcz 1989.
- Buryła Sławomir, "Edytorskie aspekty twórczości Leopolda Buczkowskiego. Rekoncesans", *Pamiętnik Literacki* 2008, col. 2, p. 167–189.
- Buryła Sławomir, "Między 'Wertepami' a 'Czarnym potokiem'. Wybrane zagadnienia ewolucji prozy Leopolda Buczkowskiego", *Teksty Drugie* 2001, col. 2, pp. 265–273.
- Buryła Sławomir, *Prawda mitu i literatury. O pisarstwie Tadeusza Borowskiego i Leopolda Buczkowskiego*, Universitas, Krakow 2003.
- Górski Konrad, *Tekstologia i edytorstwo dzieł literackich*, Wydawnictwo UMK, Toruń 2011.
- Gruchała Janusz, "Wirtualny wydawca i użytkownik edycji elektronicznej", in: *Europejski kanon literacki*, Elżbieta Wichrowska (ed.), Wydawnictwo UW, Warsaw 2012.
- Indyk Maria, *Granice spójności narracji. Proza Leopolda Buczkowskiego*, Ossolineum, Wrocław 1987.
- Konteksty* 2015, issue 3 [themed issue devoted to the works of Leopold Buczkowski].
- Nycz Ryszard, *Sylwy współczesne. Problemy konstrukcji tekstu*, Ossolineum, Wrocław 1984.
- Nycz Ryszard, *Tekstowy świat. Poststrukturalizm a wiedza o literaturze*, IBL, Warsaw 1993.
- Owczarek Bogdan, *Poetyka powieści niefabularnej*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warsaw 1999.
- Prawda historyczna a prawda polityczna w badaniach naukowych. Ludobójstwo na Kresach południowo-wschodniej Polski w latach 1939–1946*, Bogusław Paź (ed.), Wydawnictwo UW, Wrocław 2011.
- Rodak Paweł, *Między zapisem a literaturą. Dziennik polskiego pisarza w XX wieku*, Wydawnictwo UW, Warsaw 2011.
- Skrabek Dawid, *Traumatyczna tkanka sztuki* (typescript of doctoral dissertation, UJ).
- Staroń Justyna, *Listy Leopolda Buczkowskiego do żony Marii – próba edycji* (typescript of master's thesis, KUL).
- "Znakiem tego, dialogizujemy dalej", Sławomir Buryła, Zygmunt Trziszka (eds.), *Regiony* 1998, issue 1/3, pp. 89–102.
- ...zimą bywa się pisarzem. O Leopoldzie Buczkowskim*, Sławomir Buryła, Agnieszka Karpowicz, Radosław Sioma (eds.), Universitas, Krakow 2008.



---

Sławomir Buryła

## **Dziennik wojenny Leopolda Buczkowskiego – wyzwanie dla (młodego) edytora**

### *Streszczenie*

Artykuł traktuje o *Dzienniku wojennym* Leopolda Buczkowskiego. Chodzi o odpowiedź na pytanie dotyczące genezy tego tekstu, kolejnych faz jego powstawania. Jest to trudne zadanie, gdyż nie dysponujemy pierwotną wersją dzieła. Brak pierwotnej wersji utrudnia też badanie tzw. sfery materialnej dziennika. Możemy ją zrekonstruować tylko na podstawie zachowanej wersji rękopiśmienniczej.

Autor artykułu (z pozycji problemów edytorskich i filologicznych) omawia też *Dziennik wojenny* na tle innych wczesnych utworów Buczkowskiego (*Wertepy*, *Czarny potok*, zbiór kilkudziesięciu wierszy). Wskazuje na potrzebę nowego wydania *Dziennika wojennego* oraz na błędy popełnione w istniejącym wydaniu.

**Słowa kluczowe:** Leopold Buczkowski, dziennik, nowe wydanie, II wojna światowa

## **Dziennik wojenny by Leopold Buczkowski A challenge for a (young) editor**

### *Summary*

The paper discussed *Dziennik wojenny* [War Journal] by Leopold Buczkowski. It posed a question concerning the origins of the text and the subsequent stages of its development. That is a challenging task since the original version of the work is not available. Additionally, the lack of the first version makes it difficult to examine the so-called material sphere of the journal. It can be reconstructed only based on the surviving manuscript version.

The author of the paper also discussed *Dziennik wojenny* against the background of other early works by Buczkowski (*Wertepy* and *Czarny potok*, a collection of a few dozen poems), from the perspective of editorial and philological problems. He also demonstrated the need for a new edition of *Dziennik wojenny*, and indicated the errors committed in the existing edition.

**Keywords:** Leopold Buczkowski, journal, new edition, Second World War

**Sławomir Buryła**, profesor na Wydziale Polonistyki UW, w Zakładzie Edytorstwa i Stylistyki. Zajmuje się współczesną literaturą polską, a zwłaszcza prozą wojny i okupacji, Holocaustu oraz edytorstwem i kulturą popularną. Ostatnio wydał: *Rozrachunki z wojną* (IBL PAN, Warszawa 2017) oraz *Wojna i okolice* (IBL PAN, Warszawa 2018).

**Sławomir Buryła**, professor at the Faculty of Polish Studies, University of Warsaw, works at the Department of Editing and Stylistics. He focussed on contemporary Polish literature, in particular: prose writings from the Second World War and the occupation period, the Holocaust, and editing and popular culture. He recently published: *Rozrachunki z wojną* (IBL PAN, Warsaw 2017) and *Wojna i okolice* (IBL PAN, Warsaw 2018).