

Bernadetta K u c z e r a - C h a c h u l s k a – THE “VERTICAL”
 ORCID: 0000-0002-1817-9083
 DIMENSION
 OF NORWID STUDIES

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18290/sn2139.18-en>

In 2019, Lidia Banowska’s book with the strong and recommendable title: *Byt i światłocień. O antropologii poetyckiej Cypriana Norwida* [*Being and Chiaroscuro. On Cyprian Norwid’s Poetic Anthropology*] was published by the Adam Mickiewicz University Publishing House. The second part of the title suggests a broad thematic scope, hinting at a monographic study of the Romantic poet’s oeuvre. However, the explanation of this intriguing title, provided in the introduction, may not be entirely straightforward. While the title emphasises Norwid’s focus on the observation of humanity (anthropology), the introduction brings another issue to the forefront – irony, which appears to assume a somewhat equivalent importance. The author clarifies this interplay, stating: “I was interested in how the two spheres interfere with each other – they interpenetrate closely, intersect closely, meet to some extent or not at all”¹ (emphasis added – B.K. Ch.) Yet, Banowska’s point of departure subtly implies that Norwid’s anthropology is fundamentally shaped by irony, an idea contradicted by the quoted statement. Irony, as suggested, is merely one aspect of Norwid’s poetic approach, existing alongside several other expressive tendencies. This raises an additional question: Does Norwid’s two-layered language derive solely from irony?

The issue can also be approached from a slightly different perspective. It might appear that the poet’s irony is primarily tied to his language and mode of expression. However, this dimension also fundamentally shapes the identity of the speaker. Irony, in a sense, projects onto the subject or “emerges” from the subject as its “source” – much like in the case of Socrates, the archetypal ironist². Here,

¹ L. Banowska, *Byt i światłocień. O antropologii poetyckiej Cypriana Norwida*, Poznań 2019, p. 15.

² However, there seems to be some disorder or lack of precision in this area in the book. Consider, for instance, the sentences: “Norwid’s synthesis of the Socratic tradition and the ironic reading of Christ’s message, in the light of which the poetry of the author of *Vade-mecum* reveals itself as a continuation of the mission to proclaim the truth and to serve the word. In this perspective, irony as a lesson in humanity resembles not only the eclectic unmasking of illusion and the maieutic “birthing of truth” by Plato’s teacher, but turns out to be one of the varieties of imitation of Christ (*imitationem Christi*), all the more important because it is one of the knots connecting

the “how” dimension shifts into a “who” dimension. If one takes the second part of the book’s title seriously and consistently pursues this shift, the dissertation could have repositioned Norwid’s conception of irony into a somewhat newer, perhaps less explored, domain.

Therefore, the book addresses two issues – irony and Norwid’s anthropology, making them the scopes of a joint problem area that mutually condition each other. Judging from the author’s commentary and the overarching implications of the book’s title, the anthropological perspective on Norwid’s work emerges as the central focus. Irony, in turn, functions as a kind of meta-tool – essential for uncovering the image of humanity embedded in the writings of this 19th-century poet. It shapes Norwid both as a poet and as a thinker, serving as a critical lens through which his anthropology can be interpreted.

Such a problem statement proposed by Lidia Banowska seems justified. While the theme of irony in Norwid’s writings has been extensively explored (the literature on the subject is fairly cited), the explicit connection of irony to anthropology draws from the profound content of Norwid’s oeuvre. This approach promises an original interpretation and opens pathways to a comprehensive monographic study of his works – an endeavour that, paradoxically, seems increasingly challenging.

The dissertation is divided into two parts. The first, devoted to irony, spans about eighty pages, the second – 260 pages. These proportions alone naturally position the book as primarily a study of Norwid’s anthropology.

This book, which makes full use of the poet’s formal “self-definition” by highlighting the place of irony in his behaviour – as can be tentatively assumed – stems from the deep structural formation of the entire output. It would only be a matter of extracting and describing these places, paying particular attention to the somehow functional presence of irony, which determines its overarching role in the shaping of Norwid’s anthropology. Suffice it to recall that Zdzisław Łapiński’s book *Norwid*, which has until now been treated as a monographic account of Norwid’s oeuvre, devotes its most extensive section precisely to man present in that oeuvre (“*Cóż jest człowiek?*” [*What is Man?*])³. Interestingly, the selection of sources in the chapter of Zdzisław Łapiński’s book only slightly overlaps with the body of texts discussed by Lidia Banowska in the second, anthropological chapter of her work. This observation is not intended as a criticism – after all, how many of Norwid’s poems touch on the theme of humanity? The answer is self-evident, perhaps even redundant. Is this a shortcoming on Banowska’s part? Almost certainly not. On Łapiński’s part? Again, not entirely. Or is it instead a reflection of

Norwid’s irony and anthropology”.

³ Z. Łapiński, *Norwid*, Kraków 1971.

the nature of Norwid's poetic craft itself? Does nearly every one of his poems engage with this issue? To a significant degree, yes. It appears that Banowska's dissertation does not fully address this complexity. The book does not sufficiently explore how this thematic abundance might be addressed from a research perspective. Nor does it critically examine why different scholars perceive Norwid's anthropology through such divergent prisms of source material. This omission represents a missed opportunity to delve into the unique characteristics of the 19th-century poet's work and the interpretive challenges it presents.

*

For the purpose of exemplifying the chosen theme, Lidia Banowska selects a handful of Norwid's poems. The first part is centred on *Ironia* [*Irony*] (the "definitional" chapter), the second part on *Królestwo* [*Kingdom*] (but also fragmentarily *Quidam* and the poems *Do Zeszłej* [*To the Deceased*], *Pielgrzym* [*Pilgrim*] and several others) – the first chapter; the second chapter of this part (and the main part of the book) cites fragments of *Fatum* [*Fate*], *Śmierć* [*Death*] and *Do Zeszłej*. The author expects, therefore, that as close an examination as possible of Norwid's individual poems will be the primary method of addressing the question posed in the introduction of the book.

Was the choice of poems in the context of reflections on both irony and anthropology appropriate? How did it contribute to solving the problems posed in the introduction? The first part of the book can (in the meantime) be left without comment (*Ironia* is, after all, a "definitional" poem in an almost literal sense). However, as a supplement to the issues explored in this section, the author might have also considered including *Ciemność* [*Darkness*] (this would be hermeneutically extremely constructive). Such a choice could have been hermeneutically illuminating, as this poem functions almost as a semantic counterpart to *Ironia*. It activates the "mechanism of chiaroscuro" by underscoring the negative dimension of darkness while also affirming its necessity in the process of uncovering truth.

However, the situation is slightly different in the second part of the book. The composition of the chapter – the essential chapter on Norwid's man – is determined by the hermeneutic description of *Fatum*, *Śmierć* and *Do Zeszłej*..., as the author writes, "selected according to the key of border situations: either literally – suffering and death, or figuratively – crossing the border between life and death, as well as further borders, already in another dimension of the world" (p. 15). Incidentally, these poems belong to a number of Norwid's masterpieces, and when we see them together, interpreted through the prism of "border situations," suffering and death, crossing the border, firstly – the question arises whether the

ranking of these poems is not largely due to formal considerations (Norwid's masterpieces), and secondly – do they exhaust the pool of Norwid's works fulfilling the conditions defined by the author as "border situations"? Especially if we take into account the poet's already well-recognised tendency to expose tragic situations that appear in the "micro-space" of human experience (as, for example, in *Pierścień Wielkiej-Damy* [*The Noble Lady's Ring*]). Thus, it is no longer the murder, the spectacular destruction depicted on stage, but the almost invisible, debased dignity of man in the space of salon interpersonal relations. In this situation, would it not be necessary to invoke, for instance, *Pielgrzym* (the poems admitted by Lidia Banowska have also been heavily explored in the literature on the subject), an almost programmatic interpretation of Norwid's anthropology? Especially since we observe in it both an irony subordinated to the main theme, and a subtle signal of suffering ("you think..."), and a process of "transformation" of burdens, of severity, into the possibility of reaching "heaven," although the "limits" are not explicitly mentioned. This poem is occasionally mentioned on p.121f., without taking into account the integral potential of meaning that is crucial for this dissertation. Many more similar poems, which are part of the central theme of this book and are also larger in volume, could be cited (e.g. *Wielkość* [*Greatness*], *Litość* [*Pity*], *Larwa* [*Larva*], *Czemu* [*Why*]). Why are certain key works missing here (the larger form of the poet's statement), such as *Stygmat* [*Stigma*], which also resonates within the space of life and death, the realm of the supernatural, albeit closely tied- as it is more common in Norwid's work – to the themes of temporality? And what of *Człowiek* [*A Human*]? Or "*Adorio ad Phrygium*"? These are mentioned by the author, but only "occasionally," in passing... Setting aside the artistic dimension of these works, let us turn to the conclusion of *Człowiek*. Below, I cite a rather arbitrary passage:

I to ja Ciebie, zrodzonego k'temu,
 Mamże zawodną ludzić pomyślnością?
 Byś nieświadomość swą zwał cudzą złością,
 Targał się ówdzie, gdzie klaskać masz w dłonie,
 A gdzie masz piorun cisnąć, skłaniał skronie? –

 Nie! – ty bądź raczej nie bardzo szczęśliwy –
 Pierwszym nie będziesz, ni ostatnim, przeto
 Bądź niezwodzonym! – umarły czy żywy? –
 Cykutą karmion czy miodem i mlekiem? –
 Bądź: niemowlęciem, mężczyzną, kobietą –
 Ale przed wszystkim bądź: Bożym Człowiekiem.

(PWsz II, 274)

And it is I vis-à-vis you, born for that,
 To delude you with unreliable good fortune?
 So that you could call your ignorance another man's anger,
 Struggle yourself as to where to clap your hands,
 And where to strike a thunder, bow your temples? –

 No! – you should rather be not very happy –
 You shall not be the first, nor the last, therefore
 Be unbeguiled! – Dead or alive? –
 Fed with hemlock or with honey and milk? –
 Be: a baby, a man, a woman –
 But before anything else, be: a Man of God.

How many elaborations and complements of *Fatum*, of *Śmierć* do we perceive in this passage. Even the “borderline” situation, so characteristic of Norwid, evoked by the figure of Socrates is present here (“Cykutą karmion” [fed with hemlock]).

From among the narrative poems, *Quidam* and a bit of *Assunta* are recalled. With a theme thus formulated, is it not too little? And yet we can find exquisite “anthropological” fragments in, for instance, *Pierścień Wielkiej-Damy*, *Kleopatra i Cezar* [*Cleopatra and Caesar*], which seem to invite contextual and complementary reflections. Attempting to reconstruct Norwid’s vision of humanity – one imbued with irony – based on a small selection of poems, even when supplemented sporadically with other texts by the poet, appears highly challenging. While definitional insights can sometimes be drawn from individual works, a comprehensive reconstruction of his “poetic anthropology” seems unlikely to be fully realized through such a limited scope. However, it is possible to defend Lidia Banowska’s choices. I assume that, respecting the adjective “poetic,” the author wanted to select lyrical texts with a certain density of content and expressive structural realisation. The miniature form makes it possible to augment the view of the problem, facilitating the radicalisation and expository isolation of meanings. The innovative, artful form encourages the expression of specific content, but also tempts the interpreter. One may suspect that the latter factor weighed on the author’s final decisions regarding the choice and focus of the field of exegesis. In such a case, it might be necessary to take into account (understand) the non-discursive, artistic side of the work. I will thus try to take a look at some of the fragments of the analyses and their conclusions.

Before that, however, I want to draw attention to important methodological declarations appearing in the introduction to the book (*Ironia i antropologia* [*Irony and Anthropology*]).

[...] the book's interpretative outline reveals reading as the primary perspective for the reception of Norwid's work, as well as its guiding purpose: to show the properties of Norwid's lyricism on the example of its central issues or "knots" (i.e. irony and anthropology) on the one hand, and on the example of its significant, masterful, yet under-read poetic realisations on the other. This is thus Norwid "told" by attentive, deep and close reading, in which text is embedded in contexts [...].

Here, the project of attentive, deep and close reading seems an edifying promise, after so many failures of attempts at "top-down" synthesis in the field of literary studies. Towards the end of the introduction, two hermeneuts are mentioned – as one might guess, patrons of Lidia Banowska's work: Paul Ricoeur – a distant, rather theoretical perspective, and a closer one – Ryszard Przybylski, author of works concerning not only Romanticism. As Lidia Banowska writes: "Przybylski openly points to Christian anthropology as the tradition underpinning his reasoning, treating it as a challenge not only to neo-formalism, but to all forms of dehumanised rationalism". And yet another important methodological gesture deserves to be noted: "The starting point of my thinking [...] is the primacy of the work over the method [...] it is the method that is subordinated to the work and not the other way round" (p. 18). As the footnote indicates, the author supports her views on Przybylski, who indeed refreshed and revitalised many strands of literary studies, but also made some mistakes by burdening hermeneutics with authoritative arbitrariness.

However, let us move on to interpretative practice and here we need to evoke yet another hermeneut of Polish Romanticism, who I have an impression was somewhat disregarded by Lidia Banowska. A hermeneut who is perhaps less recognisable, but with a responsible research discipline and the highest historico-literary competence regarding the artistic complication of the work – which, after all, as Lidia Banowska assures us, interests her the most. Finding ourselves on p. 157, the author, around the middle of the second chapter (Chapter 2, Part Two: *Norwid o kondycji człowieka* [*Norwid on the human condition*]) introduces a key shift in interpretation, based on an analysis of the masterpieces appearing here in the form of miniatures. Meticulously recalling the literature on the poem *Fatum*, she obviously attaches the greatest importance to comprehensive interpretations – the temporally more distant one by Stefan Szuman, who emphasises precisely the poem's masterful character, and by Marian Maciejewski (the hermeneut I mentioned earlier), a scholar who might be controversial in the circle of literary

scholars (for ideological and methodological reasons), but at the same time is one of the most eminent representatives of the art of interpretation. Stefan Szuman's interpretation of *Fatum* definitely precedes (time-wise) Maciejewski's exegesis. The two approaches are decidedly different. Szuman writes about the poem from an aesthetic position, he is not interested in, or lacks the tools to enter the dimension of hermeneutic exploration of meanings, which Maciejewski did later. I also think that Szuman's vision of Norwid's poem has its own imperishable value, and to an even greater extent I attribute such a rank to Marian Maciejewski's interpretation. Lidia Banowska writes: "Both interpretations seem insufficient today, although it is difficult to overestimate their valuable contribution to illuminating the meanders of Norwid's miniature" (p. 160, emphasis – B. K. Ch.).

I must admit that I do not understand this assumption of overestimation for several reasons. The most important of these is the cognitive result of the exegesis made by Banowska and the attempt to relate Norwid's fate to Sophocles' fate. I see no basis in the poem for such an interpretative move. The two works belong to completely disconnected mental, cultural and historical spheres. Today, but also in the 19th century, the word "fatum" [fate] has been treated as one not necessarily related to the setting of the events in Sophocles' drama.

Fate did not "come" to Oedipus, he discovered it when it was already there, "lingering" over him. The misfortune – literally – was caused by knowledge – "behold, he who has penetrated the content of the riddle", says the chorus. Awareness reveals fate, knowledge is the gateway to misfortune. In Norwid's poem, this knowledge, however we might understand it (the process of "odejście" [look back]), results in liberation from fate, overcoming it. This is quite the opposite situation. And a fundamental point, but one that relates to the earlier remark – Norwid was indeed fascinated by ancient Greek culture, but when it came to the "ontological" imagination, to understanding and reading the principle of the world, he was a man of "post-Christian" civilisation. The aforementioned Łapiński, in the chapter "Cóż jest człowiek?" [What is man?], writes that at the top of the poet's hierarchy of values lies the supernatural reality⁴. One can go further and say that the fact of the Incarnation is the culmination and ultimate "guideline" of the poet's thought. Sophocles' and Norwid's situations belong to completely different worlds; one can compare them, but what results can be expected? One can compare realities that have some significant common ground. It is probably impossible to attribute to such a biblically and theologically conscious writer as Norwid that within the realm of understanding

⁴ Z. Łapiński, *Norwid*, p. 55.

existence he remained at the level of ancient Greek consciousness, notwithstanding the immense cultural respect the poet had for that culture. Besides, the author of the dissertation herself writes:

It seems that by giving Poem XXX in the *Vade-mecum* cycle the title *Fatum*, Norwid evoked the figure of the ancient hero together with the notion of Destiny [...]. It is a hypothetical presence, that is, not confirmed by a direct textual reference, but only established indirectly – by the context of the ancient tradition evoked by the title and the image of the world evoked by it. (p. 166/167)

And she argues further:

However, the inclusion of Destiny along with a central figure symbolising submission to its inevitability is also supported by the aforementioned parallel with the poem *Sfinks* [*Sphinx*], at the centre of which is Oedipus. (p. 167)

The hypothesis motivated almost exclusively by the title formula (and one only needs to consult Polish dictionaries of the 18th and 19th centuries to realise that the word “*fatum*” functioned in Polish without “heavy” cultural connotations) cannot be used as the basis for the important interpretative suggestion proposed by the book’s author. Nor is it possible to impute to Norwid such an understanding of Destiny, which Lidia Banowska attempts to do. Nor does *Sfinks* evoke Oedipus; it is a pictorial structure, a functionalised figure, through which the most profound truth about man of our era is unequivocally told. There are some interesting partial insights on p. 173f., but the end of the subsection (p. 174) seems to again impose risky opinions.

And now one could pose the question about the logic and justification of the interpretative contexts chosen by Lidia Banowska, returning to Maciejewski’s *Fatum*. This scholar does not reach for such (contexts), which we need to justify in particular, he draws on the deeply explored awareness of existence and Christian attitude characteristic of Norwid, who in one of his letters to a friend (Mieczysław Pawlikowski, Paris, 12 March 1859) said that “proboszcz Twej parafii więcej od Sokratesa wie o rzeczach nieśmiertelności” [your parish priest knows more than Socrates about the immortal things]. And in his extremely precise argument, the researcher from Lublin updates the subjective source of the poem’s solutions. It is probably a difficult work of interpretation (Maciejewski’s work) to surpass, but one that can be complemented, continued, as Banowska does in the following passages.

What is unacceptable, however, is the closing of the commentary on *Fatum*, which describes the last phrase of the poem as ironic. No irony can be discerned there by any means, and I do not understand the last sentences of the subsection on p. 202.

When reading the other two interpretations, in which Lidia Banowska carefully extends the mostly justified contexts, one has the impression that the shape of the poem – somewhat contrary to the declarations from the introduction – is sometimes left at a distance by these contexts. However, I attribute this to the thematic insight of Lidia Banowska, who would like to refresh the meanings of the somewhat “worn out” language within Norwid Studies.

A certain lack of satisfaction connected with the interpretative dimension of this book would require addressing the issue of the poems from scratch, but the review rather lacks the space for this, thus I will highlight, without the order dictated by the layout of the dissertation, selected issues. On p. 138 the author writes about the poem *Do Zeszłej*:

The poem speaks precisely of Christ as a Person:

[...] wzlećmy już dalej!...
Tam gdzie jest N i k t i jest O s o b ą [...]

[...] – let’s fly up higher!...
There, where *No-body* is, lingers a *Person*:⁵

This interpretation, which is seriously misguided (see, for example, Stefan Sawicki’s interpretation), starts a thread (next page) that is unacceptable. *No-body* and *Person* refer to the one who by Norwid is often called the Eternal (of course, we remember about the Unity of Persons in the Trinity). No theologian would dare refer to Christ using the word *No-body*, while the poem’s paradox is precisely Norwid’s profound intuition of the incomprehensibility of the Eternal One – God the Father. The author repeats this mistake on p. 259 and again builds on that a specific argument. The book carefully presents an abundant collection of works from the field of Norwid Studies, while the reader has the impression that the use of the literature on the subject is somewhat unintegrated, disproportionate to the weight of the earlier findings from the literary tradition (lack of genuine consideration and cohesive continuation of the predecessors’ reflection).

⁵ English translation by D. BORCHARDT, in collaboration with A. BRAJERSKA-MAZUR, *C. Norwid, Poems*, New York 2011, p.59.

The personalist theme (a step towards the 20th century) is very important, repeatedly mentioned and discussed by other researchers, but here one could expect a stronger emphasis of Norwid as a determinant of Karol Wojtyła / John Paul II's thought. On the other hand, I am not convinced that Maritain in particular is so much "congruent" with Norwid; to a greater extent perhaps Mounier, but that is also an open question. I understand, however, that the idea was to outline some circles of possible affinities, dictated by the author's attitude towards the 19th-century poet.

*

As previously noted, the author's reflections on Norwid's concepts of "being" and "chiaroscuro" were ultimately constructed around a select number of particularly emblematic works from the poet's lyrical oeuvre – poems that have long attracted the attention and detailed analysis of the most distinguished Norwid scholars. One might provocatively argue that Lidia Banowska's fascination with these specific poems served as a pretext for her selection, driving her focus on these works as the basis for her study. This statement, of course, is an intentional overstatement, offered as a means to explore – on the margins of the themes and issues touched upon (sometimes only in passing) in her dissertation – a broader question that holds significance for the study of Norwid. At this juncture, my interest shifts to a wider perspective, one more aligned with research on the poet as a whole rather than the book from which these reflections originated.

In reflections on Norwid's work, a thematic approach tends to dominate. As a result, the poem becomes a space for extracting ideas, as if Norwid's remarkably important discursive order (present in all his works) has also influenced how we think about lyrical poetry, which emerges from a distinct creative framework, different from other literary forms and genres. In contemporary Norwid Studies, work on his poetry often supports broader ideas, thoughts, and theories, or – when read in isolation – clearly tends in that direction. Such an approach is unsurprising, for instance, in the case of a philosopher (cf. e.g. *Fortepian Szopena* [*Chopin's Grand Piano*] interpreted by Władysław Stróżewski), but it raises concerns in many other cases. This is not to say that ideas are unimportant, but rather that they are so deeply and subtly intertwined with the structure of the poem that uncovering them often becomes a very challenging task. In many cases, this process spans decades, requiring continual revisits of the same work. The smaller the poem, the more complex this challenge tends to be. This represents a distinct and particularly difficult reality in poetry research – one that we perhaps do not always fully acknowledge. It is a separate realm, and the most demanding one.

The basic, first task of the interpreter is to solve the aesthetic problem of the poem, i.e. to read it as a work of art, integrally. Activities such as counting nouns etc. will not help much here; on the contrary, they will disintegrate the work. Such activities may come later, if it turns out that the “number of nouns” does indeed co-create what I have called the aesthetic problem of the work, if it performs certain functions, because the aesthetic problem transcends the linguistic dimension, although it grows out of it. It is present at the intersection of the structure of the lyric and its “message,” which is difficult to concretise; it encompasses the totality, the integrity of the work, in order to constitute itself on all of this. In the area of lyrical interpretation, there is absolute strictness, non-randomness, non-arbitrariness. Of course, this is known to some, but perhaps on a more *apriori* basis. And it is a bit of a pity for Norwid’s excellent lyric to turn it into a realm of mere thought, even a very elevated one. Thought and idea resound incomparably more strongly in the lyric, and what is not discursive in it demands a special, elaborated and honest consideration. After all, if this idea arises during the actual, aesthetic “solving” of the poem, we will only fully understand its greater impact – greater than in a discursive framework – by focusing on what in the poetry transcends thought itself, while simultaneously being unique to that specific poem. This approach to lyrical poetry requires time, which translates into the possibility or impossibility of producing extensive volumes; it often crystallises over generations. The issue of the contexts used for interpretation is also complex and requires precision. The context (philosophical, cultural, the context of other arts, etc.) should be dictated by the poem itself, and perhaps to a greater extent than, for instance, the realities of the era or the poet’s biography. These are detailed issues to be resolved (functionally) in relation to specific cases. Interpretative experience teaches us to distinguish between these situations. The existing descriptions of Norwid’s poems are based on various assumptions based on different methods, needs, academic personalities, etc. Therefore, familiarity with and reading of existing works should not be “linear,” as this could mislead the interpreter. The art of interpretation, and perhaps especially the interpretation of Norwid’s poetry, is probably the most difficult task for Norwid scholars (or poetry expert). In addition to natural predispositions (literary sensibility), it requires the integration of editorial skills (if we do not have a well-established foundation for interpretative work), theoretical awareness, historical-biographical awareness, and others; also, importantly, mature scientific independence. The creative decisions of an accomplished artistic poet are not accidental; they leave a trace in the deep structure of the poem, and there is no real possibility of fully understanding the poem without the effort put into reconstructing these “traces”. The “vertical” dimension of Norwid Studies seems somewhat neglected. I point this out,

not to diminish the importance of research on the poet's language, contexts, etc., but rather to advocate for a "symmetric," "proportional" development of Norwid Studies as a whole.

Lidia Banowska's book indirectly brings together all the issues discussed and subtly raises questions about the nature of the individuality and distinctiveness of Norwid's poetic legacy. For this reason, its publication is a welcome contribution.

"PIONOWY" WYMIAR NORWIDOLOGII

Streszczenie

W szkicu podjęty zostaje problem ironii Norwida, powiązanej z jego antropologią. Kwestia ta pojawia się w ramach dyskusji z książką Lidii Banowskiej (*Byt i światłocień. O antropologii poetyckiej Norwida*). Rozważania prowadzą do konkluzji, że zadaniem interpretatora jest rozwiązanie problemu estetycznego wiersza.

Słowa kluczowe: Lidia Banowska; Norwid; liryka; wiersz; problem estetyczny.

THE "VERTICAL" DIMENSION OF NORWID STUDIES

Summary

The article deals with the problem of Norwid's irony in relation to his anthropology. This issue emerges in the discussion with the book by Lidia Banowska (*Byt i światłocień. O antropologii poetyckiej Norwida* [*Being and Chiaroscuro. On Norwid's Poetic Anthropology*]). The reflections presented by the author lead to the conclusion that solving the aesthetic problem of the poem is the interpreter's task.

Keywords: Lidia Banowska; Norwid; poetry; poem; aesthetic problem.

BERNADETTA KUCZERA-CHACHULSKA – professor of Humanities, employed at the Institute of Literary research of the Polish Academy of Sciences. Author of three books on Norwid, as well as others on Romantic and 20th-century literature and literary aesthetics. Until 2020, she worked at the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, where she was head of the Department of Research on Romanticism and the Works by Cyprian Norwid. There she also established the Department of Axiology and Literary Aesthetics, the journal "Colloquia Litteraria" dedicated to literary studies, and the publishing series "Problemy romantyzmu," in which 14 volumes were published, including several devoted entirely to Norwid. For three years until 2019 she served as director of the Institute of Polish Philology at the Faculty of Humanities.