

ANNA KOZŁOWSKA
ORCID: 0000-0001-7465-9316

“BEYOND-GRAMMATICALITY” OF NORWID’S SYNTAX

I

In one of his letters to Julian Fontana, Norwid wrote:

Jeszcze się nikomu nie śniło o gramatyce, kiedy już były arcydzieła – *Homer by!!!* Dlatego są prawa *starsze* i krzepkie więcej daleko od pisowni i gramatyki.

Owszem – powołaniem stanowczym arcydzieł jest być *nieustannie po-nad-gramatycznymi*, i takimi przeto *były, są i będą we wszystkich językach i we wszystkich całego świata literaturach*.

Gdyby nie takimi były?... zakrzepłoby wszelkie obcowanie żywiołów ducha i sił – I byłaby mowa arcykrystaliczną zamarzłą sadzawką, której szyby dawałyby się geometrycznie rąbać i układać (DW XII, 434).¹

No one was yet dreaming of grammar when there had already been masterpieces – *there was Homer!!!* That is why there are laws far *older* and more rigid than spelling and grammar.

Indeed, it is a definite vocation of masterpieces to be *constantly beyond-grammatical*, and this is what *they have been and will be in all languages and in all the world literatures*.

If they were not made this way?... all communion between the elements of spirit and forces would coagulate – And speech would be an arch-crystalline frozen pond, whose panes could be geometrically chopped and arranged.

The above passage has been used quite often in descriptions of various elements of Norwid’s language, but the category of “po-nad-gramatyczność” [beyond-grammati-

¹ In addition to the two editions of Norwid’s works (by Gomulicki and the Lublin edition), I have also included a critical edition of *Vade-mecum*: C. NORWID, *Vade-mecum*, ed. J. Fert, Lublin 2004 (henceforth VM). I corrected some of the analysed passages; these corrections were relevant to the analysis of language, restoring the texts to their original authorial spelling on the basis of the manuscripts available in the Polona digital library (www.polona.pl), see also C. NORWID, “*Vade-mecum*.” *Transliteracja autografu*, ed. and introduction by M. Grabowski, Łódź 2018) and the Digital Library of the National Museum in Kraków (<http://cyfrowe.mnk.pl>).

cality, lit. post-supra-grammaticality] proposed by him has not yet received a deeper interpretation, although it seems compelling for at least two reasons. Firstly, despite the fact that most contemporary readers are probably most likely to identify the term *po-nad-gramatyczny* [beyond-grammatical] used in the quoted passage with *niegramatyczny* [ungrammatical], this does not need to be the only way to interpret this adjective (more on this below). Secondly, although “beyond-grammaticality” mentioned in the letter to Fontana is a constitutive property of masterpieces, in my view, it also characterises well the linguistic practice of the author of the *Vade-mecum* cycle. In this article, it will be treated not as a prerequisite condition for a masterpiece, but precisely as a descriptive category, highlighting and ordering the main features of Norwid’s language and style, above all – his way of forming utterances.²

As I have already mentioned, the lexeme *po-nad-gramatyczny* [beyond-grammatical] can be assigned several different senses. Although it is not listed in lexical dictionaries from Norwid’s epoch, which allows it to be counted among the poet’s hypothetical neologisms,³ and the *Internet Dictionary of Cyprian Norwid’s Language* (ISJCN) still does not contain an explication of its meaning,⁴ a certain interpretative clue is provided by the semantics of the related lexemes, such as: *gramatyczny* [grammatical], *gramatycznie* [grammatically], *gramatyk* [grammarian], *gramatyka* [grammar] and *niegramatyczność* [ungrammaticality].⁵ According to the descriptions of meanings proposed in ISJCN, in Norwid’s idiolect “grammaticality” is associated with linguistic rules or their description, as well as with the construction of words, sentences and utterances.⁶ A review of their uses allows us to

² So far, only Jadwiga PUZYŃNINA has pointed to the presence of “beyond-grammaticality” in Norwid’s language, identifying it with various poetic licenses and syntactic deviations (see eadem, “O języku Cypriana Norwida,” in: eadem, *Słowo – wartość – kultura*, Lublin 1997, pp. 435-438).

³ For the authors of the *Internet Dictionary of Cyprian Norwid’s Language*, Norwid’s “hypothetical neologisms” include the lexemes he used but which “do not appear in any of the historical dictionaries of the Polish language” (*Zawartość i budowa “Internetowego słownika języka Cypriana Norwida,”* <https://sownikjezykanorwida.uw.edu.pl/budowa>).

⁴ See <https://www.sownikjezykanorwida.uw.edu.pl/index.php?podglad=&idh=126923> (accessed 28 December 2020).

⁵ The adjective *po-nad-gramatyczny* does not appear in Piotr Sobotka’s article, which discusses Norwid’s use of lexemes from the relevant lexical family, including: *gramatycznie*, *gramatyczny*, *gramatyk*, *gramatyka*, *gramatyzm* [grammatically, grammatical, grammarian, grammar, grammatism] (see P. SOBOTKA, “Fenomenologia, personalizm, frazeologia, gramatyka,” *Studia Norwidiana*, Vol. 22-23: 2004-2005, pp. 181-187).

⁶ The following definitions from the ISJCN provide the basis for this generalisation: *gramatyczny* [grammatical] ‘concerning the construction of words, sentences, utterances’; *gramatyk* [grammarian] ‘a scholar concerned with the structure of language’; *gramatyka*

see further that in his utterances, the poet sometimes links grammatical rules with correctness,⁷ although most contexts do not show this normative characterisation. As noted by Piotr Sobotka, *gramatyka* [grammar] and *gramatyk* [grammarian] also adopt rather negative connotations in Norwid’s language – the former “is often associated by the poet with formalism, with a set of rigid, ossified, ultra-conservative rules that impede a fresh look at the reality of rules,”⁸ whereas “the poet refers as grammarians to people who, instead of dealing with the concrete, with life, content themselves with abstractions.”⁹

Considering the meanings present in a group of derivationally related lexemes, the adjective *po-nad-gramatyczny* [beyond-grammatical] can be understood in at least three ways:

1. ‘not conforming to the rules of correctness, being outside the norm’;
2. ‘divergent from current or common linguistic customs; unconventional’;
3. originating in a level of language other than grammar; not merely derived from the structure of words, sentences, utterances (and thus – more unrestrained, less rigid and abstract, and more strongly related to life’).¹⁰

With regard to Norwid’s utterances, one can speak of “beyond-grammaticality” in all the meanings indicated above.

II

The incompatibility of a certain part of Norwid’s statements with the norms of correctness applicable in his lifetime is a problem well rooted in the study of the language of the author of *Promethidion*. Normative reflection was introduced into the linguistic explorations within Norwid Studies by Ignacy Fik, the author of the first monograph on Norwid’s idiolect. Although this study produced many accurate observations and insights, it is hard to resist the impression that the author was not

[grammar] 1. ‘description of linguistic rules’, 2. ‘language rules, also fig.’; *niegramatyczność* [ungrammaticality] ‘an expression constructed in violation of grammatical rules’. The keyword *gramatycznie* [grammatically], similarly to *ponadgramatyczny* [beyond-grammatical], does not yet have a semantic description in ISJCN (accessed 28 December 2020).

⁷ In addition, in the following passage of the already cited letter to Fontana, a reference is made to “poprawny Osiński” [correct Osiński] (DW XII, 434).

⁸ P. SOBOTKA, “Fenomenologia, personalizm, frazeologia, gramatyka,” p. 186.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Connotative elements, which are not included in the narrow definition, are provided in brackets.

so much interested in description, but rather evaluation. This is particularly evident in the chapter on syntax, where on almost every page Fik levelled serious accusations at Norwid, noticing in his utterances, *inter alia*, “a whole series of involuntary gaps in thought and sentence,”¹¹ inconsistencies in the construction of complex sentences, “carelessness in finishing his works”¹² and signs of “getting lost in syntax”¹³; finally, he concludes that “in many cases it is impossible to speak of any syntax at all,”¹⁴ because – he argues – for Norwid, the requirements of sentence formation, including its correctness, must always give way to semantic considerations:

While arranging complex sentences, instead of certain sentence elements having a specific syntax, Norwid inserts a notion equivalent in meaning [sic!], but requiring different formal correspondences. He forgets the form at the beginning of a sentence and ends it logically in terms of content, but inconsistently in terms of grammar.¹⁵

The exaggeratedly normative orientation of Fik’s dissertation, and especially its parts concerning syntax, was already pointed out by his first reviewer, Antonina Obrębska-Jabłońska, who aptly pointed out that the author “analyses the linguistic material of Norwid’s works from a predominantly aesthetic point of view,”¹⁶ and not from a linguistic one, which, combined with insufficient knowledge of the language system and methodological deficiencies, results in inconsistency, visible especially in the part on syntax – it sometimes leads to a complete disregard for the principle of sentence formation, at other times to an unjustified and surprising rigour in the evaluation of expressions. Interpreting several constructions criticised by Fik, Obrębska-Jabłońska showed that they may be the result of Norwid’s conscious and deliberate linguistic procedures and a manifestation of his “right to poetic licence,” and that their “apparent lack of logic involves an artistic effect of high measure.”¹⁷ In connection with the aesthetic character of the poet’s utterances, the linguist pointed out that it is not justified to juxtapose them with the norms of correctness and questioned Fik’s already quoted judgment:

¹¹ I. FIK, *Uwagi nad językiem Cyprjana Norwida*, Kraków 1930, p. 34.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 30.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 35-36.

¹⁶ A. OBRĘBSKA-JABŁOŃSKA, [review:] “Ignacy Fik. ‘Uwagi nad językiem Cyprjana Norwida’”. *Prace historyczno-literackie*, nr 34. Kraków 1930, str. 89, “Język Polski” 1931, XVI, Issue 1, p. 17.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

When Mr Fik says that in many cases “one cannot speak of any syntax at all” (p. 35) in Norwid’s works, he should add that he refers to conventional syntax, in line with school textbooks.¹⁸

Instead of looking through the lens of correctness, Obrębska-Jabłońska offered an extremely modern perspective on Norwid’s syntactic slip-ups, which she defined as follows upon discussing one of the examples:

It is in this arrangement of contradictions, in an inconsistent train of thought, captured almost with realistic truthfulness, that Norwid’s specific poetic conception is expressed.¹⁹

Some contemporary scholars have commented on this issue in a similar vein, convinced that Norwid’s “ungrammaticalities,” even those unconscious, resulting from carelessness or ignorance, i.e. constituting an offence against norms, serve his artistic aims well. For instance, Stefan Sawicki noticed that the poet’s difficult-to-read, “rough” syntax is in line with his conception of the reader’s activation and cooperation, or even meeting of the sender and receiver in the act of reading: “Norwid’s syntax is often something akin to a charade for the reader. Solving it becomes a prerequisite for its understanding.”²⁰ The complexity and non-obviousness of syntactic relations, and sometimes even the presence of anacolutha were also recognised as a value by Wojciech Kudyba, who interpreted them as an expression of the author’s meditative attitude:

It is precisely owing to sentence-forming operations that the poet achieves the valuable effect of a semantic flickering of an utterance, it “hinders” access to the uttered truth and precisely by this means it allows this truth to be grasped in a deeper, less superficial way.²¹

Whatever one’s opinion of the role of syntactic faults in Norwid’s idiolect and texts, it is hard to deny that the author of *Vade-mecum* did suffer from various kinds of lapses in the construction of his utterances. The types of anacolutha most frequently represented in the poet’s works, and thus somehow characteristic of his style, include: 1. deviant connections, i.e. incongruent with the linguistic norm,²²

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 22-23.

²⁰ S. SAWICKI, “Norwid: od strony prawnuków,” *Teksty Drugie* 2001, Issue 6, p. 24.

²¹ W. KUDYBA, “*Aby mowę chrześcijańską odtworzyć na nowo...*”. *Norwida mówienie o Bogu*, Lublin 2000, p. 87.

²² It should be borne in mind that the linguistic norm in Norwid’s time was much less established than today and was essentially based on the opinions of individual authors of works on linguistic correctness.

2. homonymous structures, 3. ambiguities concerning the function of anaphoric elements, and 4. disrupted coherence.

1. As for the connections which can be classified as the first type of the anacolutha concerned, researchers have been particularly interested in participle clauses,²³ which in Norwid's texts often appear in a version which does not conform to the 19th-century norm. Already in the 19th century there was a rule (still binding today) stipulating that the agent of the participle clause should be identical to that of the main clause. The relevant norm was formulated at the end of the 18th century.²⁴ Grammarians of Norwid's epoch were unanimous in judging participle clauses that were not subordinated or incorrectly linked to the main clause as "contrary to the spirit of the language" and "reprehensible"²⁵; moreover, in the linguistic practice of the epoch, as Irena Bajerowa showed, the number of deviations and mistakes concerning participles systematically decreased over time "almost to zero."²⁶ Meanwhile, in Norwid's works we can read:

Są ludzie, których lepiej znać z ich cienia:
Twarz w twarz spojrzawszy, osobistość znika
(DW III, 139)

There are people who are better known by their shadows:
Looking face to face, their personality disappears

Do pokoiku tego, który jak Juliusz mawiał: "Zupełnie byłby dla szczęścia człowieka wystarczającym, gdyby nie to, że w jednej stronie jego kąty nie są zupełnie proste, źle będąc skwadratowanym" – do tego, mówię, pokoiku innego dnia wieczorem wszedłem był (DW VII, 48).

Into this little room, which, as Juliusz used to say: "Would be quite sufficient for man's happiness, were it not for the fact that on one side its angles are not quite straight, being badly squared" – into this, I say, little room did I enter the other evening.

²³ In Polish – *oznajmienie imiesłowowe*. This term was introduced by Zenon Klemensiewicz and roughly corresponds to the most popular expression used by contemporary authors today – *imiesłowowy równoważnik zdania* [participle clause].

²⁴ See A. MAŁECKI, *Gramatyka historyczno-porównawcza języka polskiego*, Vol. 2, Lwów 1879, pp. 485-486.

²⁵ See I. BAJEROWA, *Polski język ogólny XIX wieku. Stan i ewolucja*, Vol. III: *Składnia. Synteza*, Katowice 2000, pp. 125-126.

²⁶ A. SŁOBODA, "Imiesłowy u Norwida," *Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne. Seria Językoznawcza* 2001, Issue 8 (28), p. 145.

Przy ulicy *Tour des Dames* na wzgórzu jest dom, do którego dopiero wszedłszy, rozkład schodów i fragmenta z gliny polewanej czternastowieczne, florenckie okazują, iż poważnego artysty to mieszkanie... (DW VII, 55)

At *Tour des Dames* street, on a hill, there is a house in which, only upon entering, the layout of the staircase and the fragments *coated with fourteenth-century clay* in Florentine style show that it is the dwelling of a serious artist...

Owszem – lecz śpiesz się, oto bowiem, kwiat
Nie będąc na czas zrobiony,
Odmieniać muszę włosów tok i szat,
Wieczór mój! – prawie stracony!
(PWsz I, 317)

Indeed – but hurry, for behold, a flower
Not being done in time,
I have to change my hair and robe,
My evening! – almost lost!

The number and role of such grammatical realisations in Norwid’s texts are sometimes evaluated differently. Agnieszka Słoboda, who examined the uninflected participles appearing in *Czarne kwiaty* [*Black Flowers*], which is a stylistically quite neutral text, expressed the opinion that “anacoluthic constructions, in which this identity [of the subjects of a clause transformed into a participle construction and of the superordinate clause] is absent, are frequent in Norwid’s works.”²⁷ For Norwid, the participle was primarily a means of condensing the content, allowing two different relations to be expressed at the same time, and a means of developing sentence structure, and sometimes – an exponent of the intentional archaization of the text.²⁸

A different conclusion was reached by Anna Ciołek, who undertook a description of participle clauses occurring in Norwid’s letters.²⁹ According to her: “the author of *Vade-mecum* used constructions with an uninflected participle intentionally, in accordance with the linguistic norm of the second half of the 19th century.”³⁰ The most controversial issue concerns linking the participle clause with the superordinate clause via identical subjects:

²⁷ See *ibid.*, pp. 149-150.

²⁸ A. CIOŁEK, “Imiesłowowe równoważniki zdań w listach C. K. Norwida,” *Poradnik Językowy* 2015, Issue 7, pp. 23-31.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

The participle clause in the language of C.K. Norwid's correspondence is fully subordinated. [...] However, the few examples appearing in the analysed material attest to the use of forms that deviate from the then prevailing norm, which presupposes the participle clause to be fully subordinated. Such peculiarities most often result from a failure to observe the principle of subject identity.³¹

Not only does this conclusion seem poorly justified, as the author does not cite the frequency of constructions that respect the principle of identity of subjects and those that violate it, but it is also contradictory: it is not possible to consider a participle clause as a "fully" subordinated structure if in the described corpus there are – even if only "few" – cases of non-subordination.

It seems that it is difficult to attribute a uniform interpretation to all of Norwid's participle constructions deviating from the 19th-century norm – in some situations the alleged contemporary participle undoubtedly constitutes a breach of the norm, in others – it can be interpreted as an adnominal expression present in old Polish, and in Norwid's texts – archaic, sometimes attributive, and sometimes close to the entire developing clause. It is also impossible to point to a single reason for Norwid's violation of the principle of subject identity. Jadwiga Puzynina explained this practice by the frequent introduction of colloquial speech into his poems, the possible influence of the North-Eastern variety of literary language (close to the poet both due to his origin as well as his readings and emigration contacts), or the French influence.³² By contrast, Agnieszka Słoboda justifies it by departing from the principles of rhetorical prose, characterised by a considerable predominance of hypotaxis over parataxis. The analysed constructions, on the one hand, break the monotony of coordinate clauses, which dominate the poet's texts, and on the other hand, mask the paratactic character of such linking.³³ It can also be assumed that the presence of unsubordinated participle constructions in Norwid's texts was supported by his knowledge of the Old and Middle Polish grammar, which allowed for such structures.³⁴

2. From the point of view of comprehensibility, syntactic homonymy, i.e. the possibility of ascribing at least two different interpretations to a given structure, resulting not from the polysemy of the constituent elements, but from the fact that

³¹ See A. SŁOBODA, p. 149.

³² J. PUZYKINA, "Z problemów składni w tekstach poetyckich Norwida (na materiale 'Va-de-mecum')", in: eadem, *Słowo Norwida*, Wrocław 1990, pp. 100-101.

³³ See A. SŁOBODA, p. 149.

³⁴ I analysed the status of participle clause in more detail in the article: A. KOZŁOWSKA, "Kilka uwag o archaicznym składniowych w tekstach Cypriana Norwida," *Studia Norwidiana*, Vol. 29: 2011, pp. 101-104.

two different syntactic units are represented by the same textual exponent, also appears to be a linguistic error. In linguistic studies, the prevailing view is that the homonymy of statements indicates a certain awkwardness of sentence formation, that – both in the plan of individual speech formation and in the perspective of the history of language – it is indicative of a lack of precision which should be abandoned in the course of further development and which is opposed by the tendency to make syntactic relations more precise.

Homonymy of utterances is a rather abundantly represented and manifold phenomenon in Norwid’s writing. As in general Polish, it is most often associated with: 1. grammatical homonymy (syncretism) of nominal groups that make up an utterance; 2. inter-phrase accommodations of pronouns; 3. the presence in the sentence of the so-called loose elements (and the resulting possibility of various segmentation of the elements); 4. syntactic properties of deverbal nouns derived from binary predicates (this is an intermediate type between sentential homonymy and lexical homonymy), 5. the construction of coordinate groups. I will try to illustrate each of these types with relevant examples.

In the second stanza of “Syberie” [Two Siberias], the syncretism of the two adjectival forms – the plural dative and the singular instrumental – contributed to the ambiguity of the construction:

– Wróćcież kiedy? i którzy? i jacy?
Z śmiertelnych prób:
W drugą Syberię – pieniędzy i pracy,
Gdzie wolnym-grób! (VM, 51)

– Will you ever come back? and as who? and what?
From fatal trials:
Into the second Siberia – of money and work,
Where the grave awaits the free/Where the grave is free!

The expression used here with a hyphen (or a dash in some editions) “wolnym-grób” can be read in two ways: 1. with the dative – as the equivalent of the expression ‘the grave for the free’; ‘the grave awaits the free’, 2. with the instrumental – as a nominal predicate without the linking *być* [be] – ‘[only] the grave is free’. Although the first of these interpretations probably is evoked by the readers more frequently, they both fit well into the context of the work as a whole.

Difficulties related to the ambiguity of inter-phrase pronoun accommodations arise, for example, in the following passage from “Vanitas”:

Żydzi, jako wśród sosen, cedry,
Celnymi są – ale, Niemcowi
Wykłada to doktor z katedry,
Co, zwietrzył i Moskal, nim się dowiē! (VM, 47)³⁵

Jews, as cedars among the pines,
Are accurate – but, to the *German*
The doctor lectures ex cathedra that
Which the *Muscovite* has noticed before he knows it!

The problem we are interested in concerns primarily the pronoun *co* [what/which]. The presence of the counterpart *to* [this/that] in the previous verse allows us to interpret this pronoun as an announcement of conjunction and thus to see the clause beginning with *co* as its complementation: *doctor wykłada Niemcowi to, co zwietrzył i Moskal* [the doctor lectures the German on what the Muscovite has noticed]. In this version, the content of the lecture, and at the same time the essence of the Muscovite's intuition, remains implicit, non-verbalised – unlike when we interpret the pronoun *co* as an indicator of a defining clause referring to the whole situation of high self-esteem of individual nations (the last line would then have to be read as follows: *to, o czym była mowa, zwietrzył i Moskal* [what has been discussed has also been noticed by the Muscovite]).

Norwid's works also abound in examples of homonymy resulting from the ambiguous assignment of so-called loose elements, i.e. those remaining outside the relations of connotation and accommodation, and thus sometimes capable of being associated with more than one component. Such instances of homonymy usually do not play a key role in the process of understanding the text, but only nuance its meaning. Since they are not a source of interpretative problems, they are characterised by a kind of transparency and are often overlooked in reading.

What is not obvious, for example, is the place occupied in the structure of the utterance by the phrase “znad planety” [from above the planet] in the poem “W Weronie” [In Verona]:

Cyprysy mówią, że to dla Julietty,
Że dla Romea, ta łza, znad planety
Spada, i groby przecieka (VM, 19)³⁶
Cypress trees say it's for Julietta,
That it's for Romeo, that tear, from above the planet
It falls and trickles through the graves

³⁵ In the cited passage I have restored the punctuation from the manuscript.

³⁶ I have restored the punctuation of the manuscript in the quoted passage.

The punctuation used in the autograph seems to support linking this expression with the verb “spadać” [to fall] (*spada znad planet* [it falls from above the planet]), and thus to consider it as an adverbial. It is possible, however, that Norwid did not intend such a strong enjambement, and that “from above the planet” was intended as an adnominal expression (*łza znad planety* [a tear from above the planet]). It is worth noting here that the comma, which ostensibly separates the noun and the prepositional phrase, does not necessarily have a delimiting function in Norwid’s texts, especially since in the analysed passage we deal not with one but two commas.

In Norwid’s autographs, double commas enclosing a selected element of the utterance sometimes play a different role – they emphasise the thematic expression or its main segment. This is the case, for instance, in the opening lines of the title work in the *Vade-mecum* cycle:

Klaskaniem mając obrzękłe prawice
Znudzony pieśnią, lud, wołał o czyny (VM, 12),

Their hands swollen from clapping
Bored with singing, the people, cried out for action,

in which, the commas and therefore the pauses and a forced change of intonation (anticadence) are used by the poet to distinguish the main segment of the thematic section, signalling an intention to speak about the people and not about something else. Perhaps the same intention – the highlighting of the main segment of the thematic phrase – should be attributed to the procedure of separating the phrase “ta łza” [this tear] in the poem “W Weronie” with commas.

A well-known passage from “Modlitwa” [Prayer] can be used as an example of homonymy resulting from the use of deverbal nouns:

Przez wszystko do mnie przemawiałeś – Panie!
[...]
I przez tę rozkosz, którą urąganie
Siódmego nieba tchnąć się zdaje – latem – (PWsz I, 135).

You have spoken to me through everything – Lord!
[...]
And by that delight which insulting
The seventh heaven seems to infuse – in the summer –

The phrase “urąganie siódmego nieba” can be understood here as both *genetivus subiecti* (‘that the heavens insult someone/something’) and *genetivus obiecti* (‘that

someone/something insults the heavens'), although the latter interpretation seems perhaps somewhat less justified.

In several passages, the non-obviousness of syntactic interpretation is related to the properties of coordinate groups, or more precisely to the possibility of seeing a coordinate relationship at different levels of the utterance. Perhaps the most complex example of this kind of homonymy can be identified at the beginning of the poem "Dziennik i epos" [Journal and Epic]:

Treści, cudne smakiem a ciemne czasy
I ciągle Postępu zdobycze
Uczyli – że są dziś *Mecenasy*...
Ależ są i *Mecenasowicze!*... (VM, 110)³⁷

Contents, marvellous taste and dark times
And constant achievements of Progress
Resulted in that – today there are *Patrons*...
But there are also *Would-be-patrons!*...

The construction of the first verse formally allows for as many as five possible (though, due to the word order employed, not exactly equivalent) interpretations: 1. 'contents that have marvellous taste, and dark times'; 2. 'contents that are marvellous through taste and dark through times/because of times'; 3. 'times that are marvellous in taste contents and dark'; 4. 'content and times that have marvellous taste and are dark'; 5. (probably the least likely) 'contents that have marvellous taste and are dark, and times'. The employed punctuation does not necessarily facilitate the interpretation; although the poet has separated the word "treści" [contents] from "cudne" [marvellous] in this poem with a comma ("Treści, cudne smakiem a ciemne czasy" [Contents, with marvellous taste and dark times]), which for the contemporary reader, accustomed to syntactic punctuation, may seem to be an argument in favour of interpretations 2 or 4, there is no certainty that Norwid's comma actually marks the boundary of a segment in the coordinate group.

3. In addition to constructions that violate the norms of collocability and homonymic structures, anacolutha in Norwid's texts also include such utterances in which the referentiality of anaphoric elements has been disrupted. The most famous example of this phenomenon comes from the first poem of the *Vade-mecum* cycle:

Nad czołem słońce i jaw, ufny w błędzie,
Tak, znów odczyta *on*, co ty dziś czytasz,

³⁷ I have restored the punctuation of the manuscript in the quoted passage.

Ale on, spomni mnie... bo mnie nie będzie! (VM, 14)

Overhead the sun, and daylight sanguine yet flawed,
So will *heread* again what you read today,
And will recall me.... when I’ll be no more!³⁸

The reference of the anaphoric pronoun *on*[he/it], which can refer either to “syn” [son] or “wnuk” [grandson] or to “jaw” [daylight], remains ambiguous.

4. The last type of anacoluthon characteristic of Norwid involves the breach of coherence – such as in the poem “Finis”:

Tak, *flory-badacz*, dopełniwszy *zielnik*,
Gdy z poziomego mchu najmniejszym liściem
Szeptał o śmierciach tworów; chce, nad wnijsciem
Księgi, podpisać się... pisze... *śmiertelnik!* (VM, 122)

Thus, *a researcher of flora*, completing the *herbarium*,
When from the level of moss with the smallest leaf
Whispered about the deaths of the creations; wants, on the front sheath
Of the book, to pen his name... he signs... *mortal!*

In this passage, the poet changes the subject of the sentence without signaling this at all. The initial reference is made to the researcher, but the constituent clause beginning with *gdy* [when] (“Gdy z poziomego mchu najmniejszym liściem / Szeptał o śmierciach tworów” [When from the level of moss with the smallest leaf / Whispered about the deaths of the creations]) refers, after all, not to him but to the herbarium, while the next two: “chce, nad wnijsciem / Księgi, podpisać się...” [wants, on the front sheath / Of the book, to pen his name...] and: “pisze...” [he signs...] – again to the researcher.

The purpose of employing anacolutha, and thus the status of this phenomenon as an artistic procedure, does not seem obvious. However, it is worth noting that Norwid by no means avoided anacolutha. He did not try to eliminate them even in the works contained in *Vade-mecum*, which he revised and improved on many times. On the contrary – in the already quoted letter to Fontana, he paraphrased Juliusz Słowacki, suggesting that he was aware of the presence of faults also in his own utterances:

Tutaj, przepraszam bardzo Jegomościów,
Że będzie wiele *niegramatycznościów!* (DW XII, 435)

³⁸ English translation by D. BORCHARDT, in collaboration with A. BRAJERSKA-MAZUR, *C. Norwid, Poems*, New York 2011, p. 19.

Here, I apologise your Lordships very much,
That there will be many *ungrammaticalities!*

This feature of Norwid's utterances corresponds perfectly with the idea of the text as a dynamic entity, undermining trust in fixed linguistic forms, non-obvious, holding the reader's attention and demanding reflection and interpretation. Whether or not the anacolutha were used consciously by Norwid, they can be regarded as one of the determinants of his poetics.

III

Beyond-grammaticality can also be understood as a tendency to use language in an unconventional way, to go beyond its pragmatic use. In Norwid's syntax, it is expressed primarily through: (i) authorial innovative collocations, (ii) intense complication of syntactic structure, (iii) multiple interjections, and (iv) archaicity.

1. One of the many instances of Norwid's syntactic innovations occurs in the poem "Stolica" [Capital]:

Idzie pogrzeb, w ulice spływa boczne
Nie-pogwałconym krokiem;
W ślad mu pójdę, *giestem* wypoczną,
Wypoczną, *okiem...*! (VM, 33-34)

A funeral is marching, flowing into the side streets
With a non-violent step;
I will follow it, I will rest with a *gesture*,
I will rest, with my *eye...*!

The verb *rest* neither today nor in the 19th century Polish language does/did collocate with the instrumental case (*giestem*, *okiem*). Through the use of such an unconventional combination, the poet has achieved an interesting effect, highlighting aspects or dimensions – or causes, since such an interpretation is also possible – of the projected "rest."

2. Norwid's texts usually give the readers the impression of being very long and syntactically complex. The research indicates this impression is not misplaced. Anna Wierzbicka showed that the development of the compound sentence in post-Renaissance Polish poetry consisted, *inter alia*, in a decrease in the number of constituent clauses and a reduction in the number of levels of subordination in

hypotactic sentences.³⁹ Also within the 19th century itself, there was a reduction in the number of clauses in a compound sentence (from 4 in 1801-1810 to 3 in 1891-1900)⁴⁰ and an almost complete disappearance of sentences consisting of more than 7 constituent clauses.⁴¹ The number of levels in subordinate clauses remained constant throughout the 19th century, averaging 2.⁴²

No similar calculation is available for Norwid’s writings as a whole, but the above data can be contrasted with observations about the narrative poem *Quidam*. Compound sentences predominate in the work, most of them quite long. The average number of constituent clauses of a compound sentence is even higher than in the first period distinguished by Bajerowa, and amounts to as many as 4.6⁴³. This results not only from the relatively high number of sentences encompassing 8-12 constituent clauses (altogether they constitute more than 1/8 of all the compound sentences in the poem), but also by the quite high frequency of record-long constructions, such as this one, containing 18 constituent parts:

Noc to,¹ w czas której ten i ów powstawa,²
 Nućąc ³ lub klątwy rzucając niewczesne;⁴
 A prawda ludziom zda się jak zabawa,⁵
 Zabawa – jako strapienie bolesne:⁶
 Słowo jest ogień⁷ | – milczenie jest lawa – ⁸
 Jakoż szczęśliwy,⁹ kto wstawszy,¹⁰ gdy ciemno,¹¹
 Nie dotknął liry swojej nadaremno;¹²

Przedświtu blasków doczekał,¹³ a potem
 Wytrwał¹⁴ | i,^{15a} dniowy jaw jakkolwiek szarpie,¹⁶
 Wytrzymał burzę,^{15b} co przemija z grzmotem,¹⁷
 I skubie tęczę – dla serca – na *szarpie*¹⁸

(DW III, 193-194)

This is night,¹ during which this and that arise,².
 Humming³ | or casting untimely curses;⁴
 And the truth will seem like fun to people,⁵

³⁹ See A. WIERZBICKA, *System składniowo-stylistyczny prozy polskiego renesansu*, W. GÓRNY, *Składnia przytoczenia w języku polskim*, Wrocław 1966, pp. 21-24.

⁴⁰ See I. BAJEROWA, p. 107.

⁴¹ See *ibid.*, pp. 17, 107.

⁴² See *ibid.*, p. 108.

⁴³ For a detailed discussion on the syntax of the poem, see A. KOZŁOWSKA, “Kilka uwag o składni “Quidama”,” in: *“Quidam”*. *Studia o poemacie*, ed. P. Chlebowski, Lublin 2011, pp. 507-529, esp. pp. 517-519.

Fun – as a sorrowful affliction:⁶
The word is fire⁷ | – silence is lava –⁸
How lucky,⁹ | who gets up,¹⁰ | when it's dark,¹¹
And did not touch his lyre in vain;¹²

He lived to see the dawn of luminance,¹³ | and then
He persevered¹⁴ | and,^{15a} | however daytime reality was yanking,¹⁶
He weathered the storm,^{15b} | which passes with a thunder,¹⁷
And plucks a rainbow – for the heart – for a bandage¹⁸ |

As can be seen, in Norwid's case, he did not delete excessively long sentences. Quite the contrary – the poet seemed to bind individual syntactic elements together very loosely, sometimes not even linking them, but only juxtaposing them with one another, in order to achieve a maximally developed structure, at least horizontally (the number of levels of constituent clauses in *Quidam* lies within the 19th-century norm).⁴⁴

3. One of the many factors complicating the syntax of Cyprian Norwid's works are also the expressions enclosed in parentheses. Ignacy Fik has already written about the poet's characteristic "additions and parentheses" which, combined with the "drawer-like syntax," makes a whole series of sentences extremely difficult to put in order and understand.⁴⁵ Norwid made abundant use of parenthetical statements in all types of his texts, but the most surprising is their frequency in lyrical works – in the *Vade-mecum* collection alone, the poet introduced them into poems as many as 51 times.⁴⁶

Contemporary researchers agree that parenthetical interjection is usually characteristic of spoken language. Consequently, written parentheses most often appear in texts that are close to speech, in particular colloquial speech, as well as in literary works stylised as this type of speech. In this context, the *Vade-mecum* cycle, saturated with parenthetical constructions, appears as a work that imitates a spoken text, creating the illusion of colloquial speech and "live" contact with the reader, suggesting that the author – as in the case of oral communication – clarifies his thoughts only while speaking, which entails frequent corrections and additions.

⁴⁴ See *ibid.*, pp. 110f.

⁴⁵ I. FIK, p. 30.

⁴⁶ For a more extensive discussion of this problem, see A. KOZŁOWSKA, "Nawiasem mówiąc. O wtrąceniach nawiasowych w wierszach z "Vade-mecum" Cypriana Norwida," in: *Norwid. Z warsztatów norwidologów bielańskich*, eds. T. Korpysz, B. Kuczera-Chachulska, Warszawa 2011, pp. 35-66.

The parenthesis used in poetic texts can be seen as one of the indicators of the prosaisation of the language of lyric poetry. Parentheses introduce a discursive⁴⁷ and intellectual element into Norwid’s poems. By using parenthetical interjections in his speech, the speaking subject, takes on the role of a commentator, reporter and narrator, who talks about something and at the same time supplements and corrects his story, and sometimes subjects his own text and the judgements expressed in it to critical reflection. Thus, parenthesis allows Norwid to highlight the unstable nature of phenomena, to bring out their non-obviousness, complexity and interconnectedness. It is worth noting here, by the way, that parenthetical interjections are most abundantly represented in those works in which the convention of free conversation or polemics prevails (“Do Walentego Pomiana Z.” [To Walenty Pomian Z.] – 9 uses, “Purytanizm” [Puritanism] – 5 uses, “Powieść” [Novel] – 3 uses).

The abundance of parenthetical interjections in *Vade-mecum* can also be linked to several other (sometimes contradictory) tendencies present in Norwid’s work – to his characteristic strive for a condensed content to be conveyed; to the dynamism of his language,⁴⁸ to his digressiveness. Above all, however, it perfectly aligns with Norwid’s practice of constructing a polyphonic text, one in which a multiplicity of possible points of view and perspectives of evaluating phenomena is expressed through syntactic complications. The “syntactic levelling of the utterance” that takes place through the use of parentheses⁴⁹ serves the internal dialogical character of the text, or, to recall Bakhtin’s term, its polyphonic nature.

Parenthetical interjections used as a means of signalling polyphony also disrupt (at least apparently) the coherence of the poetic text, which thus becomes an interpretative task for the reader who is invited to reconstruct the coherence of the work.

4. Norwid’s syntax appears unconventional to the readers of his texts also because many of the constructions he uses are archaic or at least outdated.

One of the archaic features of Norwid’s syntax is the use of non-agentive constructions featuring verbs with the reflexive pronoun *się* [reflexive verbs] in the function of predicate, linked with nouns in the nominative:

[...] jedyny punkt, którego napotyka się widoki cokolwiek zbliżone do tych, które w Rzymie napotykasz (DW VII, 46).

⁴⁷ Teresa SKUBALANKA drew attention to the strong discursiveness of Norwid’s *poems* in her work “Styl poetycki Norwida ze stanowiska historycznego” (in: eadem, *Mickiewicz, Słowacki, Norwid. Studia nad językiem i stylem*, Lublin 1997, p. 161).

⁴⁸ See J. PUZYŃNINA, “O języku Cypriana Norwida,” in: eadem, *Słowo – wartość – kultura*, Lublin 1997, pp. 425-426.

⁴⁹ This is the term that Anna KALKOWSKA proposed in her article “Poziomy tekstu, czyli polifonia druga,” in *Styl a tekst. Materiały międzynarodowej konferencji naukowej, Opole 26-28 IX 1995*, eds. S. Gajda, M. Balowski, Opole 1996, pp. 61-68.

Prawda się *razem dochodzi i czeka!* (VM, 57)

[...] the only point in which views somewhat approaching those one comes across in Rome encounter themselves.

The truth is *both reaching and waiting for itself!*

These structures are equivalent to passive expressions: ‘views are encountered’, ‘rays are withheld’, ‘truth is reached and waited for’. Passivity is associated with non-agentivity of the subject that here does not signify the performer of the action but its object. Such sentences in the 17th and 18th centuries gradually transitioned into the category of subjectless, the indicator of which became the impersonal form of the verb combined with the accusative, replacing the previously used personal reflexive form combined with the nominative (*ziemia się uprawia* > *ziemię się uprawia* [equivalent to: ‘the soil is cultivated’]).⁵⁰ The constructions encountered in Norwid’s works – with the subject and the nominative – are a relic of the Old and Middle Polish language.

The syntactic archaic elements present in Norwid’s texts also include the use of the plural verb forms with mass/collective subjects. Already at the beginning of the 19th century, there was formal accord in such relationships, which supplanted the earlier constructions based on the real-semantic relationships, i.e. with the plural verb form.⁵¹ Meanwhile, the old *ad sensum* constructions can still be found in Norwid’s works:

Powiem Ci tylko, ani ukryć się poważę,
Co? myślą, gdy wyrzeczę kto słowo: *Poeta!*
Im zdaje się, że dziewięć panien kałamarze
Noszą mu – (VM, 134)

Let me just tell you, I will not dare hide it,
What? they think when someone utters the word: *Poet!*
It seems to them that nine ladies carry him
The inkwells –

A remnant of the old Polish syntax is also the gender-based inconsistencies in the concord relations, which in the 19th century were already quite exceptional, and occurred rather in spoken language, especially in the Eastern Borderlands and Galicia. In Norwid’s work, on the other hand, one regularly encounters passages in which a non-masculine noun has been linked to a masculine-personal form of the verb:

⁵⁰ See K. PISARKOWA, *Historia składni języka polskiego*, Wrocław 1984, pp. 42-43.

⁵¹ See I. BAJEROWA, p. 44f.

Kapłańskie sługi, w podkasanych szatach,
Z stryczkami w ręku sunęli po kwiatach,
Po koszach, w błoto ległych z owocami.
Kapłańskie sługi biegli ze stryczkami [...]
(DW III, 262)

Priestly ministers, in pulled-up robes,
Were gliding over the flowers with halters in hand,
Over the baskets, laying into the mud with the fruit.
Priestly ministers were running with halters [...].

Another departure from the 19th century convention in favour of earlier practice concerns Norwid’s construction of the nominal predicate, or more precisely, the grammatical case of its main part, known as the predicative. Here, the nominative and the instrumental cases compete with each other. According to Zenon Klemensiewicz’s estimates, the predicative noun in the nominative, predominant in Old Polish until the 18th century, was virtually supplanted in the 19th century, and occurs in only 4% of the uses in the masculine gender and 3% in the feminine.⁵² In Norwid’s works, on the other hand, the predicative noun in the nominative is represented so often that one can probably consider this feature as one of the archaising features of his style:

Co może być ta postać z więdnących liści wychylona, której profil żółtawy na sklepienia
ciemność tak wybiega?... (DW VII, 35-36)
„Człowiek jest gaz, ferment, wapno...” (DW III, 352)
Świat jest gorzkość...
Bóg – miłość (PWsz I, 280)

What can that figure be, leaning out of the withering leaves, whose yellowish profile is outlined
against the darkness of the vault?....
“Man is gas, ferment, lime...”
The world is bitterness...
God – love

The 19th century was a time of the disappearance of the Polish version of the *accusativus cum infinitive* (ACI) construction. ACI in 19th century Polish was already a unique phenomenon, present in principle only in the first half of the century, and stigmatised by grammarians as Germanism or Gallicism. Meanwhile, Norwid used ACI relatively abundantly – though rarely in its full variant:

⁵² See Z. KLEMENSIEWICZ, “Orzecznik przy formach osobowych czasownika ‘być,’” *Prace Filologiczne* 1927, Vol. 11, pp. 123-181.

Temu gwoli *Chińczyk* się być mniema
Za utwierdzonego w środku globu (VM, 47)

This is why the *Chinese* think
To be fixed in the middle of the globe

Usually Norwid's realisations of ACI are devoid of the accusative:

Mniemałem słyszeć bzy rozkwitające (DW III, 337)⁵³

I thought I heard lilacs blooming

or – even more frequently – devoid of the infinitive:

A Romę marzył podobną do łuku
Tryumfalnego (DW III, 121)⁵⁴

And he dreamt of Roma similar to a
Triumphal arch

An extensive and highly varied class of archaic phenomena employed by Norwid are the specificity of case government and the related use of old case functions.

The main direction of the development of Polish case forms is marked by a gradual transition from the dominance of synthetic constructions to the predominance of analytical forms, i.e. realised through prepositional phrases. The increase in analyticity taking place in the 19th century concerns complements as well as attributes and adverbials, as documented in detail by Irena Bajerowa's research.⁵⁵ However, Norwid repeatedly introduced then departing prepositional forms into his texts. Consider, for instance:

Śmiesznie jest, a czasem przykro patrzeć na tych obłąkanych ludzi, co znacznymi pieniędzmi zakupują okrawki wstążek i papieru (DW VII, 23)

Tego więc plwając, pokoić się wracał
On mąż (DW III, 191)

⁵³ A full ACI construction would still require the accusative form *się*.

⁵⁴ In the example cited, the infinitive *być* [be]underwent elision.

⁵⁵ See I. BAJEROWA, pp. 68-87.

It is funny, and sometimes sad, to see these insane people who, [spending] considerable money, buy offcuts of ribbons and paper

Thus swearing, he returned to make peace
Him husband

Norwid also repeatedly used the obsolete synthetic case forms (in the genitive) with comparative complements following adjectives and adverbs in the comparative and superlative:

Bo dalszy schodów ciąg od furty pnie się
Nie już do domu, lecz znów na ulicę
Wyższą tarasu (DW III, 169)

Because the further staircase from the gate climbs
No longer to the house, but back to the street
higher than the terrace

In the writings of the author of *Promethidion* there are also numerous synthetic attributes that were falling out of use at that time⁵⁶:

Mająż one pozostać zamkniętymi osobistymi nabytkami przez obawę rubasznego krytyka, przywykłego do dwóch tylko formuł na wszelki płód wyciętych... (DW VII, 43)

They are to remain closed personal acquisitions due to the fear of the crude critic, accustomed to only two formulas of the natural goods...

As well as adverbials, as in the opening verse of the first poem in the *Vade-mecum* cycle:

Klaskaniem mając obrzękle prawice,
Znudzony pieśnią, lud wołał o czyny (VM, 12)

Their hands swollen from clapping
Bored with singing, the people, cried out for action,

The instrumental of cause employed here by Norwid was no longer in use in the 19th century.

Of course, not every instance of Norwid’s use of an old or departing form is associated with conscious archaization.⁵⁷ We can undoubtedly speak of such a proce-

⁵⁶ See *ibid.*, p. 68.

⁵⁷ I have discussed the issue of the archaicity of Norwid’s syntax in more detail in A. KOZŁOWSKA, *Kilka uwag o archaicznych elementach składniowych w tekstach Cypriana Norwida*.

ture in the case of works that have been particularly strongly saturated with archaic constructions – for example, the narrative poem *Quidam*, some novellas, such as “*Ad leones!*,” and some of his dramas, such as *Kleopatra i Cezar* [*Cleopatra and Caesar*], *Wanda* or *Zwolon*. Significantly, in the texts of the author of *Vade-mecum*, even the conscious and deliberate use of archaisms usually does not serve the characterisation of the language of the bygone era, but fulfils various secondary functions, related primarily to stylisation into a lofty utterance. Teresa Skubalanka appropriately wrote: “In general, it can be said that the vast majority of archaic forms, words and syntactic constructions do not serve the purpose of archaization proper, but to achieve a poetic hieratic style.”⁵⁸

IV

A completely different understanding of “beyond-grammaticality” (although not called as such) appears in those utterances by Norwid in which the conviction, characteristic of him, is revealed that every language – and language in general – is not “abstrakcyjna mowa” [abstract speech] (PWsz VI, 232), but a “żywotny” [lively] phenomenon, realised in concrete events, having its own internal dynamics and inherently escaping both normative regulation or any other laws formulated by grammarians. In an earlier work, I called this attitude – which in Norwid’s case concerns more than just language – anti-systemic or anti-abstract.⁵⁹ One of its foundations is a distrust of such accounts of language which, by focusing on the rules that supposedly govern it, reduce it to a set of such rules and thus completely ignore its essence. As Norwid wrote, “Panowie gramatycy zaprzętać się zwykli jakąś abstrakcyjną mową, której nie ma” [Gentlemen grammarians are usually preoccupied with some abstract speech that does not exist] (PWsz VI, 232). What does exist, what constitutes the foundation of our experience of language and the basic object of linguistic observation – in Norwid’s conception – is a communicative event, or using today’s nomenclature – a speech act, taking place at a given time and place, involving real participants and subject to specific conditions. It is precisely this concrete, usage-related or – as we would say today – pragmatic aspect of language that is highlighted by Norwid’s original linguistic ideas, largely precursory to the achievements of 20th and 21st century linguistics, that is: the postulate that silence should be counted as a part of speech, the intuition contained in *Milczenie*

⁵⁸ T. SKUBALANKA, *Styl poetycki Norwida ze stanowiska historycznego*, pp. 156-157.

⁵⁹ See A. KOZŁOWSKA, “Norwid a polscy badacze języka. Preliminaria,” in: *Kulturowy wymiar twórczości Norwida*, eds. J. C. Moryc OFM, R. Zajączkowski, Lublin 2016, pp. 177-191.

[*Silence*] regarding information communicated in a sentence indirectly, but implied by the sentence (today we refer to such information as *presupposition*),⁶⁰ the idea of the dialogical, “echoic” character of all speech, and the awareness that words in different contexts acquire various senses – “przemieniają[się]. Nie tylko jedne po drugich, ale i przy drugich – – inaczej jedne by się przez drugie nie oświecały!” [they transform themselves. Not only one after another, but also with one another – – otherwise one would not be elucidated by the other!] (PWsz VII, 392). Norwid’s recognition of the inadequacy of grammatical devices is also evidenced by some of his punctuation practice, such as his treatment of the exclamation mark:

Zaś wykrzyknika nie tylko policzyć trudno do zasadniczych gramatyki posiadłości, z przyczyny że on jest po-za-składniowym, bo cały się na wyrzutniach i niegramatycznościach buduje, ale i z tej, że właściwie mówiąc, tylko tam brzmi wykrzyknik, gdzie nie jest deklamacyjnie zastrzeżonym i nakreślonym, lecz gdzie się on sam z ustroju słów gwałtem wyrывa... (PWsz VI, 231)

As for the exclamation mark, it is not only difficult to count it among the essential grammatical possessions, as it is extra-syntactical, because it is based entirely on elision and ungrammaticality, but also because, as a matter of fact, the exclamation mark only reverberates, where it is not reserved or meant for declamation, but where it comes out violently from the system of words on its own...

Norwid’s views find expression in his practice of constructing utterances. Some of his characteristic “tricks” rely precisely on the use of mechanisms that are present only in the utterance. Two of the most important phenomena in this area for him include metatext and thematic-rhematic structure.

1. Some elements of a metatextual nature, i.e. authorial comments present in Norwid’s texts have already been discussed: Ewa Wiśniewska analysed titles and subtitles, epigraphs, dedications, footnotes, prefaces, dates and other annotations present in *Vade-mecum*,⁶¹ while in my article “Nawiasem mówiąc...” I provide a description of parenthetical interjections.⁶² Slightly different – and much more difficult, still not described – are those elements of the metatext that have not been separated from the main text in any conventional way. In the absence of the usual typographical signals of distinctness (graphic signs, blank spaces, font changes etc.),

⁶⁰ See S. SAWICKI, “Norwid o nieujawnianym wymiarze zdań,” in: idem, *Wartość – sacrum – Norwid 2. Studia i szkice aksjologiczno-literackie*, Lublin 2007, pp. 139-147; J. PUZYNIŃNA, “Milczenie w twórczości Norwida,” in: eadem, *Słowo poety*, Warszawa 2006, pp. 147-167.

⁶¹ See E. WIŚNIEWSKA, “Autorski metatekst w ‘Vade-mecum’,” in: *Studia nad językiem Cypriana Norwida*, pp. 153-170.

⁶² See A. KOZŁOWSKA, “Nawiasem mówiąc”.

one usually tries to interpret them as if they were regular components of syntactic relationships; meanwhile, they are elements from another level of utterance and the attempt to incorporate them into the network of formal syntactic relationships cannot succeed. The predilection for the use of such undistinguished – or non-obviously distinguished – metatextual components, which break down the structure of the utterance and at the same time introduce into it a different (superior, authorial) perspective on phenomena, seems to be one of the important features of Norwid's manner of speaking in general and his sentence-forming strategy in particular. Consider, for example, the ending of the poem "Zapał" [*Fervour*]:

Lecz, z świętym-ogniem stało się jak z Niebios darem –
Po Legendowych wiekach, przyszły historyczne,
Ogień-boski, za-przestał być Dziejów skazówką
(Natomiast, tanie mamy *Zapałki-chemiczne*
Które, gdy zręcznie ujmiesz – obrócisz w dół, główką
I o obuwie potrzasz?... płomyk, wraz wybucha;
A Turki, pałą fajkę z długiego cybucha...) (VM, 80)

But, the same happened to the holy-fire as with Heaven's gift –
After the ages of Legends, came the historical ones,
Divine-fire ceased to be the guide of History
(On the other hand, we have cheap *chemical Matches*
Which, when you grasp them aptly – turn their head downwards
And rub against your shoes?... A flame soon ignites;
And the Turks smoke a long blow-pipe...)

The work concludes with a parenthesis, which is itself already meta-linguistic in nature, but its special status has been signalled – in accordance with convention – by the two-sided parentheses. The interjected and parenthetical text is a compound utterance, whose last segment: "A Turki, pałą fajkę z długiego cybucha" [And the Turks smoke a long blow-pipe] connects rather weakly with the preceding ones. The author's punctuation (the use of a semicolon) does not determine the nature of the link (which, after all, is necessary within a single utterance) between this fragment and the rest of the compound utterance. How to interpret the ambiguous conjunction *a*[and/while] used by Norwid here? Is it a determinant of connectivity (which would be strange), or perhaps of contradiction? Or should the last line be regarded as a commentary on the remark about matches, devoid of any transition signals, a kind of "metatext in a metatext," which introduces information from the next level of transmission, complementing that given in the commented text? This last version is perhaps the most convincing – especially since the analysed verse

stands in the same relation to the three parenthetical verses preceding it as those three verses to the main text – a relation that can be explicated as follows: ‘I want to add something else.’

The metatext is also sometimes understood in another way – as a set of components of the text relating to the text itself, a kind of ‘seams’ of the utterance.⁶³ Such is the nature of, *inter alia*, the elements that bind the constituent sentences together and express modality. Norwid seems to have been aware of their special status. His punctuation habits, characteristic of him but unusual nowadays, include, for instance, separating through punctuation the main, objective part of a sentence from the metatextual elements introducing it – conjunctions, interrogative and relative pronouns and particles:

Lecz, szczęśny dwakroć, kto ma córki przytém (VM, 25)
[But, twice as fortunate, who has daughters by his side]

Ale, wydaża każdy, że aż parno (VM, 33)
[They shout, rush, crush, stifle each other]

Zawsze, u Ciebie *pora*
[...]
Zawsze, Ty, *u siebie*, jak umysł zdrów:
Czy, w oliwnym kraju posuchy (VM, 30)
[Always, you have *time*
[...]
Always, you, *at your place*, a mind of sanity:
Whether, in the olive country of drought]

Co, triumfem się raczą... (VM, 33)
[Who, with triumph they gorge themselves....]

[...] gdy, głowy
Wnijdą na swe tułowy (VM, 35)
[[...] when, heads
Will climb on to their trunks]

Gdyby!... dawano oba, w liczbie mnogiej (VM, 25)
[If!... both were given, in plural]

⁶³ This concept was proposed by Anna WIERZBICKA in her work “Metatekst w tekście” (in: *O spójności tekstu*, ed. M. R. Mayenowa, Wrocław 1971, pp. 105-121). Dorota PIEKARCZYK, among others, wrote about different concepts of metatext in her dissertation *Metafora metatekstowe*, Lublin 2013, pp. 13-29.

Lecz! – pod stopami drżą mi sarkofagi (VM, 50)
[But! – under my feet the sarcophagit remble]

2. In every empirical, realised and actualised sentence (i.e. in an utterance), apart from the syntactic structure there is the so-called thematic-rhematic structure (functional/actual segmentation of the sentence), which expresses the universal structure of knowledge: someone knows what is being talked about (indicated by the thematic expression) that *p* (referred to in the rhematic part) is *not-p*.⁶⁴ This type of segmentation is signalled in Polish primarily with sentence stress (contrastive), intonation and pauses (especially the so-called thematic caesura). Since for today's readers Norwid's text is primarily graphic in nature, and only secondarily, during recitation, can it acquire a phonemic form, we are indirectly informed about the presence and form of exponents of thematic-rhematic structure, which have a suprasegmental nature, by graphic elements, which in Norwid's case are signs of intonation, subordinated primarily to signalling what and how much is said in a sentence. Their interpretation, however, is not straightforward; the task is not made any easier by Norwid himself, who often uses the graphic signals of this structure inconsistently. It even seems that the blurring of the distinction between thematic and rhematic part, a kind of vagueness in their delineation, can be considered a characteristic feature of Norwid, who sometimes seems to strive to say all at once, suggesting to his readers that both the main theme and the rheme are equally important and distinguished. In the spoken text, of course, this has to be resolved, since one of the main exponents of the thematic-rhematic structure is the sentence stress. In view of this and remaining true to the poet's intentions –how should the following passage from "Harmonia" [Harmony] be read?

I nerwów gra, i współ-zachwycenie,
I tożsamość humoru;
Łączą ludzi bez sporu:
Lecz *bez walki*, nie łączy *sumienie!* (VM, 18)?

And a nerve-racking game, and mutual delight,
And the identity of humour;
Bring people together without dispute:
But *without struggle*, *conscience* does not unite them!

⁶⁴ See A. BOGUSŁAWSKI, *Problems of the Thematic-Rhematic Structure of Sentences*, Warszawa 1977, p. 229ff.; idem, *A Study in the Linguistics – Philosophy Interface*, Warszawa 2007.

Did the author mean that it is conscience – and not something else – that does not unite without a struggle, or that conscience does not unite without a struggle and not in some other way? Both elements are emphasised, which makes the graphic representation of this poem hardly trustworthy. A closer look at the semantics of the work does lead to the conclusion that the *p* mentioned in the definition is conscience in the quoted fragment, but the graphic signals, as is often the case in Norwid’s texts, are clearly intended to emphasise the thematic part as well.

Consideration of the thematic-rhematic structure would, however, unravel some of the problems of interpreting Norwid’s sentences. For instance, in the first stanza of the poem “Wielkie słowa” [Big Words], there is a surprising reproach:

Czy też o jedną rzecz zapytaliście
O jedną tylko, jakkolwiek nienowa!
To jest: *gdzie papier przepada jak liście*
Pozostawując same *wielkie słowa...* (VM, 99)

Did you ask one thing
Just one, however not new!
This is: *where the paper vanishes like leaves*
Leaving only *big words...*

The construction of the subordinate question combined with the comparison produce a somewhat bizarre effect. As the syntax of this utterance seems to suggest, should the recipients of the utterance really be interested in where the disappearing paper goes? In other words – are we really asking *where*, or is it precisely the locative information that constitutes the rhematic part of the utterance? Interpretative clues are provided by the manuscript’s graphic form, which betrays the structure of knowledge outlined here. The departure from the practice, typical of Norwid, of placing the question mark immediately after the pronoun beginning the subordinate clause result from the fact that the pronoun *gdzie* [*where*] does not seem to play the role of a complement to the verb *przepadać* [*vanish*]; by contrast, the extent of the emphasis suggests that the subject of the question is not where the paper goes, but the whole situation described in the third verse of the stanza. The emphasised phrase probably conceals an ellipsis, which could be completed as follows: *where* [it happens so / such a situation takes place that] *the paper vanishes like leaves*.

As I have already mentioned, the importance of the phenomena characteristic of enunciation is reflected in Norwid’s graphic layout, especially punctuation. The graphic layout of Cyprian Norwid’s manuscripts have repeatedly aroused the

However, by treating punctuation as part of the intonation-rhetorical model, its role is often reduced to that of an instrument for shaping the sound layer of a work, or possibly a means of expression. Nevertheless, intonation can – and should – be seen not only as a means of vocal interpretation of a text (necessarily individual, related to a specific speech act), but also as an exponent of meaning.

The question of the link between intonation – and, indirectly, the punctuation which signals it – and the thematic-rhematic structure seems particularly important.⁶⁶ This is because the graphic representation in Norwid’s texts can serve to topicalise, indicate or “order” rhemes, and signal the thematic caesura.

For example, the intra-sentence question mark used by Norwid does not introduce the usual interrogative intention into the utterance, but the intention of highlighting its subject. Rather, the operation accomplished by the use of the question mark consists in singling out the actual topic of the utterance and contrasting it with all other conceivable topics; it has a lexical counterpart – the sender’s intention here can be paraphrased as follows: “as for..., when it comes to...” Question marks appearing in a sequence of negated poetic definitions in the poem “Królestwo” [Kingdom]:

– Prawda? nie jest *przeciwieństw-miksturą*...
 [...]
 Orzeł? nie jest pół-żółwiem, pół-gromem,
 Słońce? nie jest pół-dniem a pół-nocą,
 Spokój? nie jest pół-trumną, pół-domem,
 Łzy? nie deszcz są, choć jak deszcz wilgocią (VM, 55)

– The truth? is not a *mixture of opposites*...
 [...]
 The eagle? is not half-turtle, half-thunder,
 The sun? is not half-day and half-night,
 Serenity? is not half-coffin, half-house
 Tears? are not rain, though like rain they dampen

should be thus interpreted as an exponent of meaning: ‘I am talking about the truth / eagle / sun / peace / tears’ or ‘as for the truth / eagle / sun / peace / tears.’

⁶⁶ Jolanta CHOJAK was the first to notice this problem (see eadem, “Echa nie zadanych pytań”); it was much less pronounced in Barbara SUBKO’s article (see eadem, “O Norwidowskiej sztuce stawiania kropki”). It was also the subject of my dissertation: “Grafia Cypriana Norwida jako sygnał struktury tematyczno-rematycznej wypowiedzenia”.

Graphic signs are also used by the poet to indicate rhemes or their main segment. In this role, underlining (rendered in print as italics or expanded spacing) is most common:

czytanie więc *sztuką* jest... (DW IV, 215)
[reading is thus *an art...*]

Ja? nazywam się *czynność* – prawda?... *marność!* (VM, 20)
[I? am called *activity* –truth?... *futility!*]

Orient wierzy – Europa rozumuje, Ameryka konfrontuje (PWsz VII, 378)
[The Orient believes – Europe reasons, America confronts]

Życie – jest to przytomność, a przytomność – obecność, a obecność jest jawność,
z której rośnie sumienie, więc moc, więc krzepkość wielo-woli... (PWsz VII, 39)
[Life – is consciousness, and consciousness – presence, and presence is
openness, from which conscience grows, thus power, thus the robustness of multi-
volition....]

In Norwid's texts, one can find many passages in which a comma separates the main rheme, thus "ordering" the rhematic part of the utterance:

piszę, pamiętnik artysty (VM, 13)
[I write, an artist's diary]

Patrzy, na gruzy nieprzyjaznych grodów (VM, 19)
[It looks, upon the ruins of hostile forts]

Ma, sobie właściwą republikę (VM, 32)
[It has, a republic *sui generis*]

Nie-prze-palony jeszcze glob, Sumieniem! (VM, 16)
[A not-yet-burned globe, with Conscience!]

The separation of the rhemes is also achieved by full stops, which can be very surprising to the modern reader:

... sny kochałem ciemne
Z tych jedne były mdłe i nic do rzeczy
Jak kwiaty drugie lekkie i nadziemne.
o trzon łodygi wyższe kału (PWsz 1, 69)⁶⁷

⁶⁷ I have restored the punctuation used in the autograph in this passage.

... I loved dark dreams
Of these some were bland and nonsensical
Others like flowers light and above ground.
a stem higher than mud

The full stop used in the penultimate verse in the above passage makes the segment specifying the noun *flowers* a separate, albeit dependent on the preceding sentence, single-part (devoid of subject exponents) statement that forms part of an extended characterisation of flowers and, indirectly, of dreams.

In many of the graphic signs present in Norwid’s manuscripts, one can also see a signal of thematic caesura. This is how one should interpret, for example, the poet’s habit of inserting a comma between the subject and the predicate groups:

czytanie więc, ma stronę monumentalną (DW IV, 215)
[reading therefore, has a monumental side]

„Ziemia, jest krągła – jest kółista!” (VM, 11)
[The Earth, is round – is spherical!]

Ateński szewc, mówił do Rzeźbiarza (VM, 17)
[The Athenian shoemaker, spoke to the Sculptor]

Myślenie, nic przez się nie utwarza (VM, 17)
[Thinking, creates nothing by itself]

Niebo, się zdaje przypominać Bogu (VM, 51)
[Heaven, seems to remind God]

The role of graphic signs as the signals of thematic-rhematic structure indicated here specifies the fundamental recognition that links the poet’s graphic layout with intonation; however, intonation is treated here not only as an expressive signal or declamatory cue, but also as an exponent of the organisation of an utterance.

In light of the considerations concerning the role of mechanisms governing utterances, it is worth pausing to consider Stefan Sawicki’s thesis: “Norwid’s poetry is a distinctly syntactic poetry.”⁶⁸ The scholar probably referred hereto the traditional meaning of the term syntax, i.e. links based on dependency relations, meeting the

⁶⁸ S. SAWICKI, “Co badacze literatury zawdzięczają językoznawcom i czego od nich oczekują,” in: idem, *Wartość – sacrum – Norwid 3. Studia i szkice aksjologiczno-literackie*, Lublin 2017, p. 84.

semantic and syntactic requirements of individual expressions. Since they play an important role in Norwid's writings, and their faults and complications indeed often "impede the understanding of the text,"⁶⁹ the emphasis on the syntactic character of the poet's work seems entirely justified. At the same time – as I have showed above – limiting the description of Norwid's utterances to strictly syntactic relations cannot yield satisfactory results, which is due to two reasons:

1. because, in practice, we always deal not so much with abstract patterns determined by the systemic properties of lexical units, but with utterances, i.e. sentences that are used, realised and actualised;

2. because their author eagerly uses the mechanisms governing utterances, which appear only in the speaking plan, above all the thematic-rhematic structure and metatext.

Of course, the sphere of the use of a sentence can also be conventionally referred to as "syntax," but if we would like to define this area precisely, Norwid's poetry is not so much syntactic, i.e. grammatical, but rather related to usage, linked to the so-called "current" organisation of the utterance in the sense of Jadwiga Wajszczuk, i.e. to the description of the "stratification and the manner of accumulation (hierarchisation) of the layers of the utterance."⁷⁰

V

As can be seen, each of the three ways of understanding "beyond-grammaticality" indicated in this article is reflected in Norwid's linguistic practice. Each of them also expresses an important and characteristic stylistic tendency of this author,⁷¹ namely: transgressing norms, unconventional language use, and using mechanisms associated with "living" speech. Although it is not always possible to unambiguously interpret a given phenomenon present in the poet's utterances and to link it to one of the above-mentioned tendencies,⁷² one cannot deny that they constitute the

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ J. WAJSZCZUK, *O metatekście*, Warszawa 2005, p. 30.

⁷¹ For a discussion of the notion of stylistic tendencies, see T. SKUBALANKA, "Jeszcze o stylu poetyckim, styl dzieła literackiego i stylu indywidualnym," in: eadem, *O stylu poetyckim i innych stylach języka. Studia i szkice teoretyczne*, Lublin 1995, pp. 203-205.

⁷² With regard to Norwid's syntax, Jadwiga Puzynina noted: "Reading the poems of the author of *Vade-mecum*, in many places we are not sure whether we deal with an archaic form, with some regionalism, a neologism, with poetic licence or with an ordinary syntactic derailment" (J. PUZYNIŃA, *Z problemów składni w tekstach poetyckich Norwida*, p. 95).

main core of Norwid’s stylistic idiolect and – along with the features not mentioned here – contribute to his project of artistic language.

Although in this article I have focused on the problems of the construction of utterances, I would like to conclude by noting that the above-mentioned tendencies can also be seen at other levels of Norwid’s idiolect and texts. After all, there are also plenty of inflectional or even orthographic mistakes in his utterances,⁷³ which contribute to his concept of “beyond-grammaticality” understood as non-compliance with the rules of correctness. In turn, many of Norwid’s graphic habits,⁷⁴ especially punctuation,⁷⁵ depart from the conventions used in his epoch. Evidence of “beyond-grammaticality” equated with originality, breach of conventions, are also the poet’s lexical neologisms⁷⁶ and neosemantisms. As far as the last of the meanings of “beyond-grammaticality” distinguished in this article is concerned, i.e. the tendency to look for means of expression other than grammatical, less rigid and better reflecting the peculiarities of “living” speech, one can indicate here, for instance, the manifestations of “Norwid’s struggle with form,”⁷⁷ already described many times, present at the level of lexis, etymology and pragmatics, which include, *inter alia*, etymologising and reaching for obliterated meanings of words,⁷⁸ the use of par-

⁷³ Some were highlighted by the already cited Ignacy Fik.

⁷⁴ Analysing the author’s corrections in the manuscript of *Rzecz o wolności słowa* [*On the Freedom of Speech*], Ewa Wiśniewska aptly pointed out that “Breaking linguistic conventions created [...] within Norwid’s idiolect a kind of new system, because it was in many cases consistent” (E. WIŚNIEWSKA, “Poprawki autorskie w rękopisie ‘Rzeczy o wolności słowa,’” in: *Język Cypriana Norwida. Materiały z konferencji zorganizowanej przez Pracownię Słownika Języka Norwida w dniach 4-6 listopada 1985*, eds. K. Kopczyński, J. Puzynina, Warszawa 1990, p. 63). See also, *inter alia*: E. ENGELKING-TELEŻYŃSKA, “Użycie wielkich liter w pismach Norwida – próba systematyzacji,” in: *Język Cypriana Norwida*, pp. 29-38; B. SUBKO, “O podkreśleniach Norwidowskich – czyli o podtekstach metatekstu”.

⁷⁵ See, *inter alia*: A. KOZŁOWSKA, “Jednostka wobec konwencji...,” M. ROGOWSKA, “Tekst Norwida jako problem edytorski i interpretacyjny”; B. SUBKO, “O funkcjach łącznika w poezji Norwida”, eadem, *O Norwidowskiej sztuce stawiania kropki*.

⁷⁶ See, *inter alia*: I. FIK, pp. 40-54; S. KANIA, “Uwagi o neologizmach w twórczości Norwida,” *Zeszyty Naukowe. Uniwersytet Szczeciński. Szczecińskie Prace Polonistyczne* 1989, Issue 2 (25), pp. 117-127; A. KOZŁOWSKA, “O możliwości wykorzystania ‘Narodowego Fotokorpusu Języka Polskiego’ w badaniach neologizmów pisarzy (na przykładzie języka Cypriana Norwida),” in: *Wokół pewnego cytatu*, ed. K. Wojan, Warszawa 2020, pp. 167-172; T. SKUBALANKA, “Neologizmy w polskiej poezji romantycznej,” Toruń 1962.

⁷⁷ This is now considered the classic formula by Stefan SAWICKI (see idem, “Norwida walka z formą,” in: idem, *Norwida walka z formą*, Warszawa 1986, pp. 9-23).

⁷⁸ See, *inter alia*, S. GAJDA, “Norwida myślenie o języku,” in: C. K. Norwid. *W setną rocznicę śmierci*, ed. J. Pośpiech, Opole 1984, pp. 125-126; T. LEWASZKIEWICZ, B. WALCZAK, H. ZGÓL-

onomasia, polysemy and homonymy,⁷⁹ the author's attempts to redefine concepts, e.g. by using the so-called poetic definitions,⁸⁰ and finally – employing the poetics of silence and the use of implicatures.⁸¹

Transl. Rafał Augustyn

REFERENCES

- BAJEROWA I., *Polski język ogólny XIX wieku. Stan i ewolucja*. Vol. III. *Składnia. Synteza*, Katowice 2000.
- Biblioteka Cyfrowa Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie: <http://cyfrowe.mnk.pl/dlibra/docmetadata?id=19716&from=pubindex&dirids=1&lp=179> [accessed 4 November 2020].
- BOGUSŁAWSKI A., *Problems of the Thematic-Rhematic Structure of Sentences*, Warszawa 1977.
- BOGUSŁAWSKI A., *A Study in the Linguistics – Philosophy Interface*, Warszawa 2007.
- CHOJAK J., “Echa nie zadanych pytań czy wyróżnione tematy (o pewnych użyciach Norwidowskiego pytańnika),” in: *Studia nad językiem Cypriana Norwida*, eds. J. Chojak, J. Puzynina, Warszawa 1990, pp. 13-36.
- CIOŁEK A., “Imiesłowowe równoważniki zdań w listach C.K. Norwida,” *Poradnik Językowy* 2015, Issue 7, pp. 23-31.
- ENGELKING-TELEŻYŃSKA E., “Użycie wielkich liter w pismach Norwida – próba systematyzacji,” in: *Język Cypriana Norwida. Materiały z konferencji zorganizowanej przez Pracownię Słownika Języka Norwida w dniach 4-6 listopada 1985*, eds. K. Kopczyński, J. Puzynina, Warszawa 1990, pp. 29-38.
- FIK I., *Uwagi nad językiem Cypriana Norwida*, Kraków 1930.
- GAJDA S., “Norwida myślenie o języku,” w: *C. K. Norwid. W setną rocznicę śmierci*, ed. J. Pośpiech, Opole 1984, pp. 119-129.
- KALKOWSKA A., “Poziomy tekstu, czyli polifonia druga,” in: *Styl a tekst. Materiały międzynarodowej konferencji naukowej, Opole 26-28 IX 1995*, eds. S. Gajda, M. Balowski, Opole 1996, pp. 61-68.
- KANIA S., “Uwagi o neologizmach w twórczości Norwida,” *Zeszyty Naukowe. Uniwersytet Szczeciński. Szczecińskie Prace Polonistyczne* 1989, Issue 2 (25), pp. 117-127.
- KLEMENSIEWICZ Z., “Orzecznik przy formach osobowych czasownika ‘być,’” *Prace Filologiczne* 1927, Vol. 11, pp. 123-181.
- KORPYSZT., *Definicje poetyckie Norwida*, Lublin 2009.
-
- KOWA, “Cyprian Kamil Norwid jako lingwista i filolog,” *Studia Polonistyczne* 1983-1984, Vols. XI-XII, pp. 165-204.
- ⁷⁹ See, *inter alia*: S. SAWICKI, “Z zagadnień semantyki poetyckiej Norwida,” in: idem, *Norwida walka z formą*, pp. 24-41.
- ⁸⁰ See, *inter alia*, T. KORPYSZ, *Definicje poetyckie Norwida*, Lublin 2009.
- ⁸¹ Jadwiga Puzynina wrote about Norwid's “poetics of silence” and sentences requiring various additions (eadem, *O języku Cypriana Norwida*, p. 444); cf. also: eadem, “Milczenie w twórczości Norwida,” eadem, *Z problemów składni w tekstach poetyckich Norwida*, pp. 105-109; S. SAWICKI, “Norwid o nie ujawnionym wymiarze zdań”.

- KOZŁOWSKA A., “Kilka uwag o archaicznych elementach składniowych w tekstach Cypriana Norwida,” *Studia Norwidiana*, Vol. 29, 2011, pp. 99-117.
- KOZŁOWSKA A., “Kilka uwag o składni ‘Quidama,’” in: “*Quidam*”. *Studia o poemacie*, ed. P. Chlebowski, Lublin 2011, pp. 507-529.
- KOZŁOWSKA A., “Nawiasem mówiąc. O wtrąceniach nawiasowych w wierszach z “Vade-mecum” Cypriana Norwida,” in: *Norwid. Z warsztatów norwidologów bielańskich*, eds. T. Korpysz, B. Kuczera-Chachulska, Warszawa 2011, pp. 35-66.
- KOZŁOWSKA A., “Jednostka wobec konwencji. Uwagi o interpunkcji w tekstach Cypriana Norwida,” in: *Tożsamość tekstu. Tożsamość literatury*, eds. P. Bem, Ł. Cybulski, M. Prussak, Warszawa 2016, pp. 115-130.
- KOZŁOWSKA A., “Norwid a polscy badacze języka. Preliminaria,” in: *Kulturowy wymiar twórczości Norwida*, eds. J. C. Moryc OFM, R. Zajączkowski, Lublin 2016, pp. 177-191.
- KOZŁOWSKA A., “Grafia Cypriana Norwida jako sygnał struktury tematyczno-rematycznej wypowiedzenia,” in: *Język pisarzy: środki artystycznego wyrazu*, eds. T. Korpysz, A. Kozłowska, Warszawa 2019, pp. 101-125.
- KOZŁOWSKA A., “O możliwościach wykorzystania “Narodowego Fotokorpusu Języka Polskiego” w badaniach neologizmów pisarzy (na przykładzie języka Cypriana Norwida),” in: *Wokół pewnego cytatu*, ed. K. Wojan, Warszawa 2020, pp. 167-172.
- KOZŁOWSKA A., “Homonimia składniowa w tekstach Cypriana Norwida (na przykładzie Vade-mecum),” in: *Język pisarzy – problemy gramatyki*, eds. T. Korpysz, A. Kozłowska, Warszawa 2021.
- KUDYBA W., “*Aby mowę chrześcijańską odtworzyć na nowo...*”. *Norwida mówienie o Bogu*, Lublin 2000.
- LEWASZKIEWICZ T., B. WALCZAK, H. ZGÓŁKOWA, “Cyprian Kamil Norwid jako lingwista i filolog,” *Studia Polonistyczne 1983-1984*, Vols. XI-XII, pp. 165-204.
- MAŁECKI A., *Gramatyka historyczno-porównawcza języka polskiego*, Vol. 2, Lwów 1879, pp. 485-486.
- OBREŃSKA-JABŁOŃSKA A., [review:] “Ignacy Fik. ‘Uwagi nad językiem Cypriana Norwida,’” *Prace historyczno-literackie*, Issue 34. Kraków 1930, 89 pp.”, *Język Polski* 1931, Vol. XVI, Issue 1, pp. 16-23.
- Polona: www.polona.pl
- PIEKARCZYK D., *Metafory metatekstowe*, Lublin 2013.
- PISARKOWA K., *Historia składni języka polskiego*, Wrocław 1984.
- PODRACKI J., “Imiesłowowy równoważnik zdania w perspektywie historycznej,” *Poradnik Językowy* 1982, Issue 7, pp. 456-470.
- PUZYNINA J., “Z problemów składni w tekstach poetyckich Norwida (na materiale „Vade-mecum”),” in: eadem, *Słowo Norwida*, Wrocław 1990, pp. 95-114.
- PUZYNINA J., “O języku Cypriana Norwida,” in: eadem, *Słowo – wartość – kultura*, Lublin 1997, pp. 419-447.
- PUZYNINA J., “Milczenie w twórczości Norwida”, in: eadem, *Słowo poety*, Warszawa 2006, pp. 147-167.
- PUZYNINA J., T. KORPYSZ, *Internetowy słownik języka Cypriana Norwida*, content-related collaboration: J. Chojak, technical assistance: J. Miernik, M. Żółtak, 2009, <https://sownikjezykanorwida.uw.edu.pl>.

- ROGOWSKA M., "Tekst Norwida jako problem edytorski i interpretacyjny. Zarys na przykładzie autografu Do M... – wtóry list," *Humanistyka XXI wieku. Badania doktorantów Wydziału Polonistyki UW* 2011, Issue1(2): http://hum21.vdl.pl/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/humanistyka_xxi_wieku_2011h1a.pdf.
- ROGOWSKA M., "O intonacyjno-retorycznej roli Norwidowskiej interpunkcji," *Studia Norwidiana*, Vol. 30, 2012, pp. 23-38.
- SAWICKI S., "Norwida walka z formą", in: idem, *Norwida walka z formą*, Warszawa 1986, pp. 9-23.
- SAWICKI S., "Z zagadnień semantyki poetyckiej Norwida," in: idem, *Norwida walka z formą*, Warszawa 1986, pp. 24-41.
- SAWICKI S., "Norwid: od strony prawnuków," *Teksty Drugie* 2001, Issue 6, pp. 24-32.
- SAWICKI S., "Norwid o nie ujawnionym wymiarze zdań," in: idem, *Wartość – sacrum – Norwid 2. Studia i szkice aksjologiczno-literackie*, Lublin 2007, pp. 139-147.
- SAWICKI S., "Co badacze literatury zawdzięczają językoznawcom i czego od nich oczekują," in: idem, *Wartość – sacrum – Norwid 3. Studia i szkice aksjologiczno-literackie*, Lublin 2017, pp. 79-89.
- SKUBALANKA T., *Neologizmy w polskiej poezji romantycznej*, Toruń 1962.
- SKUBALANKA T., "Jeszcze o stylu poetyckim, stylu dzieła literackiego i stylu indywidualnym," in: eadem, *O stylu poetyckim i innych stylach języka. Studia i szkice teoretyczne*, Lublin 1995, pp. 185-205.
- SKUBALANKA T., "Styl poetycki Norwida ze stanowiska historycznego," in: eadem, *Mickiewicz, Słowacki, Norwid. Studia nad językiem i stylem*, Lublin 1997, pp. 144-162.
- SŁOBODA A., "Imiesłowu u Norwida," *Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne. Seria Językoznawcza* 2001, Issue 8 (28), pp. 139-150.
- SOBOTKA P., "Fenomenologia, personalizm, frazeologia, gramatyka," *Studia Norwidiana*, Vol. 22-23, 2004-2005, pp. 181-187.
- SUBKO B., "O funkcjach łącznika w poezji Norwida," in: *Język Cypriana Norwida. Materiały z konferencji zorganizowanej przez Pracownię Słownika Języka Norwida w dniach 4-6 listopada 1985*, eds. K. Kopczyński, J. Puzynina, Warszawa 1990, pp. 39-53.
- SUBKO B., "O Norwidowskiej sztuce stawiania kropki," in: *Studia nad językiem Cypriana Norwida*, eds. J. Chojak, J. Puzynina, Warszawa 1990, pp. 103-122.
- SUBKO B., "O podkreśleniach Norwidowskich – czyli o podtekstach metatekstu," *Studia Norwidiana*, Vol. 9-10: 1991-1992, pp. 45-64.
- WAJSZCZUK J., *O metatekście*, Warszawa 2005.
- WIERZBICKA A., *System składniowo-stylistyczny prozy polskiego renesansu*, W. Górny, Składnia przytoczenia w języku polskim, Wrocław 1966.
- WIERZBICKA A., "Metatekst w tekście," in: *O spójności tekstu*, ed. M.R. Mayenowa, Wrocław 1971, pp. 105-121.
- WIŚNIEWSKA E., "Autorski metatekst w 'Vade-mecum,'" in: *Studia nad językiem Cypriana Norwida*, eds. J. Chojak, J. Puzynina, Warszawa 1990, pp. 153-170.
- WIŚNIEWSKA E., "Poprawki autorskie w rękopisie 'Rzeczy o wolności słowa,'" in: *Język Cypriana Norwida. Materiały z konferencji zorganizowanej przez Pracownię Słownika Języka Norwida w dniach 4-6 listopada 1985*, eds. K. Kopczyński, J. Puzynina, Warszawa 1990, pp. 55-67.

„PO-NAD-GRAMATYCZNOŚĆ” (NIE TYLKO)
SKŁADNI NORWIDA

Streszczenie

Artykuł omawia główne cechy języka i stylu Norwida, odwołując się do zaproponowanej przez samego poetę kategorii „po-nad-gramatyczności”. Została ona potraktowana jako kategoria opisowa, uwydatniająca i porządkująca przede wszystkim (choć nie tylko) właściwości Norwidowej składni.

Przymiotnik *po-nad-gramatyczny* może być rozumiany na trzy sposoby: 1. ‘niezgodny z regułami poprawnościowymi’; 2. ‘odbiegający od zwyczajów językowych; niekonwencjonalny’; 3. ‘pochodzący z innego poziomu języka niż poziom gramatyczny’.

W twórczości Norwida można odnaleźć przejawy ponad gramatyczności w każdym ze wskazanych wyżej sensów. Wśród konstrukcji naruszających normę językową omówione zostały anakoluty, struktury homonimiczne, niejasności dotyczące funkcji elementów anaforycznych oraz zakłócenia spójności. Do elementów niekonwencjonalnych, odbiegających od zwyczajów epoki, należą m.in.: innowacje w zakresie łączliwości, komplikacje struktury składniowej, wielość wtrąceń nawiasowych oraz stosowanie konstrukcji archaicznych. W tekstach Norwida szczególnie istotne są nie tylko mechanizmy właściwe składniowej, czyli gramatycznej płaszczyźnie wypowiedzenia, lecz także zjawiska obecne na innych jego poziomach, takie jak metatekst i struktura tematyczno-rematyczna.

Słowa kluczowe: składnia; idiolekt Cypriana Norwida; anakolut; innowacje składniowe; metatekst; struktura tematyczno-rematyczna.

“BEYOND-GRAMMATICALITY” OF NORWID’S SYNTAX
(AND BEYOND)

Summary

The article discusses major characteristics of Norwid’s language and style in light of the concept of “beyond-grammaticality” developed by the poet himself. Considered as a descriptive category, it organises and foregrounds certain properties of his syntax as well as other elements of his speech.

The adjective “beyond-grammatical” can be understood in three ways: 1. failing to comply with rules; 2. departing from linguistic convention; hence unconventional; 3. derived from a level of language different than grammar.

Norwid’s works can be shown to display beyond-grammaticality in all of the above senses. A discussion of constructions that violate linguistic norms accounts for the following: anacoluthon, homonymic structures, obscurities related to functions of anaphoric elements, and disruptions of coherence. Unconventional elements departing from the epoch’s standards include, *inter alia*, innovations in collocability, complications of syntax, numerous parenthetical remarks, and the usage of archaic constructions. In Norwid’s texts an important place is held not only by mechanisms proper to syntactical or grammatical level of enunciation, but also by phenomena present on other levels: metatextuality and thematic-rhematic structure.

Keywords: syntax; Norwid's idiolect; anacoluthon; syntactic innovation; metatext; thematic-rhematic structure.

ANNA KOZŁOWSKA, PhD, Professor at Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw. Director of the Institute of Linguistics, Head of the Department of Authorial Language Research. In the years 1996-2003, member of the team of the Dictionary of Cyprian Norwid's Language at the University of Warsaw. Her main research interests include the language of writers, especially Cyprian Norwid and Karol Wojtyła, linguistics methodology, stylistics and syntax. Author of many scientific works on linguistics and Norwid Studies, including monographs: *Chrześcijaństwo w pismach Cypriana Norwida* (2000; as Anna Kadyjewska; co-authors: Tomasz Korpysz, Jadwiga Puzynina) and *Od psalmów słowiańskich do rzymskich medytacji. O stylu artystycznym Karola Wojtyły* (2013), editor of numerous collective volumes, co-organiser of a series of conferences on the language of writers. Corresponding address: Institute of Linguistics WNH UKSW, ul. Dewajtis 5, 01-815 Warszawa; email: a.kozlowska@uksw.edu.pl