

Luigi Marinelli

"Swojskość i cudzoziemszczyzna w dziejach kultury polskiej", red. Zofia Stefanowska, Warszawa 1973 :
[recenzja]

Literary Studies in Poland 19, 144-160

1988

Artykuł został zdigitalizowany i opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

reason), and also as the motif of different times, in which Icarus (and also a Renaissance artist) could fulfil his purposes.

Pelc's book builds up a synthesis out of a great number of microanalyses. This makes his study very useful for historians of literature. The reader is offered the image of the epoch in motion and realized that the movement was a prolific dialogue of Poland with the rest of the West.

Sum. by *Antoni Czyż*
 Transl. by *Zofia Lesińska*

Swojskość i cudzoziemszczyzna w dziejach kultury polskiej (The Native and Foreign Trends in the History of Polish Culture), ed. by Zofia Stefanowska, PWN, Warszawa 1973, 411 pp.

In this review, the Polish words *swojskość* and *cudzoziemszczyzna* are generally translated as "native and foreign trends," a solution which can not render the various implications and connotations of the two concepts (in *cudzoziemszczyzna* the elements of fashion and approval for any kinds of import from abroad is very strong). These notions are deeply rooted in the linguistic and cultural consciousness of the Poles, which would be enough to give importance to the book under discussion. This can be considered a synthesis of Polish cultural history from the point of view of the attachment to local traditions and yet of the openness to foreign or, in any case, "alien" elements.

Foreign and *alien* do not pose the same terminological problems, since they render quite well the distinction between *obcy*, *cudzy* on the one hand, and *cudzoziemski* on the other, which is reaffirmed more than once in our book.

Historically, that which is not related to a certain native or local culture is by no means said to be *foreign* because of its nationality, but merely *outside* or *alien* (in Polish, precisely *obcy*, *cudzy*), outside the bounds of a certain social, political, economic, linguistic, ethnic or religious predominating group. This is even more obvious in those periods of history in which a regular consciousness of peoples' national membership was not yet shaped

(up to the 15th-16th century), or was just taking shape (up to the 19th century). In the multinational and polyethnic history of Polish culture, expressed in various socio-religious, politico-economic, regional-linguistic contexts, the distinction between *foreign* and *alien* appears to be fundamental to an understanding of the dialectics which are internal to that culture and its evolution. To cite just a few of the "issues": the Lithuanian and the Ruthenian, the Slesian, the Jewish, the culture of nobles and the intellectual proletariat, the medieval Latin literary tradition and the Slavonic vernacular, the "rurality" of the native tradition and the propulsive role of the cities, ect.

In spite of, but very much thanks to those, sometimes lacerating, divisions, thanks also to that dialectic—which in the gloomy periods transforms itself into the incontestable and dictatorial domination of one particular group (social, ethnic, religious, economic, political, linguistic, etc.) over the others—exactly thanks to its variety, Polish culture preserved itself in the greater moments of crisis and danger for its own survival, whether the causes were native or foreign.

The book we are introducing is composed of the materials, enlarged and partly modified, related to the scientific Conference *Walka z cudzoziemszczyzną w kulturze polskiej. Ksenofobia i postawa otwarta* (*The struggle with the foreign trend in Polish culture. Xenophobia and open attitude*), organized by the group of scholars dealing with psychosociology of literature in the Institute of Literary Studies (IBL) of the Polish Academy of Sciences (PAN), held in Warsaw, november 25–27, 1971.¹

¹ These are, in English translation, the titles of the papers included in the book—B. Zientara: Foreigners in Poland between the 10th and 15th cent.: their role in the mirror of Polish medieval opinion; J. Kłoczowski: The Poles and foreigners in the 15th cent.; A. Wyczański: Considerations about xenophobia in Poland during the 16th cent.; J. Tazbir: The relation with foreigners during the Baroque Age; J. Michalski: Sarmatian trend and europeanization of Poland in the 18th cent.; M. Klimowicz: Foreign and native trends. Elements of Polish culture during the Enlightenment; J. Jedlicki: Polish ideological currents in front of Western civilization between 1790 and 1863; T. Łepkowski: Remarks on mono- and polyethnicism of the Polish nation in the 1st half of the 19th cent.; Z. Stefanowska: Mickiewicz "amidst alien elements"; B. Skarga: Is Positivism an antinational trend?; J. J. Lipski: The myth of the nativeness of culture (on the example of the reception of Kasprowicz).

An issue immediately connected to our terminological and semantic preamble is the change of the title in its passing form the "oral form" of the scientific conference to the "written form" of the book. Undoubtedly, it is not only a matter of style. In fact, if it is true that the semantic space of the more neutral "native and foreign trends" implies also the sense of the *struggle*, it is not true at all—and this is the common corollary of all the papers of the conference—that the struggle with the foreign element has been the crucial condition in the creation of a national conscience of Polish culture.

Also in some recent studies of the evolution of the Polish vernacular as a literary language—a field of study close and similar to ours²—there has occurred a corresponding passing from the "aggressive" tone of the term *walka o język* (*struggle for the language*), that was greatly in fashion in the 50s, to the more neutral, and much more historically grounded, "language question."³ It is to be pointed out, however, that many incitements for the correction of these terms came from foreign scholars as C. Backvis, R. Picchio, H. Goldblatt, and others.⁴

² A proof of this is, for example, the excellent essay of B. Otwinowska, „Problemy języka jako wyraz kształtowania się świadomości narodowej w literaturze renesansu” (Problems of the Language as an Expression of the Making of a National Conscience in Renaissance Literature), [in:] *Problemy literatury staropolskiej I*, ed. by J. Pelc, Wrocław 1972, and in general her book *Język – naród – kultura. Antecedencje i motywy renesansowej myśli o języku* (*Language – Nation – Culture. Antecedents and Motives of Renaissance Thought on Language*), Wrocław 1974.

³ M. R. Mayenowa's "uncertainty" is interesting. The title of her most recent essay on this topic is "Aspects of the Language Question in Poland from the Middle of the 15th Cent. to the Third Decade of the 19th Cent." ([in:] *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question*, ed. by R. Picchio and H. Goldblatt, vol. 1, New Haven 1984), but she opens it with these words: „It is generally accepted that the appearance of the first orthographic treatise for Polish [...] marks the beginning of the *struggle* for the *exclusive* use of the native language in the cultural life of the Polish lands” (my italics, *L. M.*).

⁴ Cf. C. Backvis, "Quelques remarques sur le bilinguisme latino-polonais dans la Pologne du XVI^e s." "Communications présentée au Congrès de Slavistique de Moscou, 1–10 IX 1958; R. Picchio: "Guidelines for a Comparative Study of the Language Question among the Slavs," [in:] *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question*, vol. 1; "Principles of Comparative Slavic-Romance Literary History," [in:] *American Contributions to the VIII International Congress of Slavists (Zagreb and Ljubljana, September 3–9, 1978)*, ed. by V. Terras, vol. 2, Columbus, Ohio,

The "non-aggressiveness" of the words reflects, in both cases, the non-dogmatism of the assumptions, and in this sense the contribution of the foreign element to the cultural (and literary-linguistic) choices of a nation can be now identified with the tradition of that nation itself. This is the thematic centre of the sober afterwords by S. Tregutt (here translated), where the words xenophobia and xenomania, inasmuch they are signs of passivity or mere aggressiveness, give their place in historical studies to the idea of national tradition, seen as *enérgeia*, as an active and unceasing creative process of the cultural identity of a people/nation.

The book we are dealing with, one of the most interesting products of the Polish cultural historiography in these last 20 years, clearly shows one fact: the periods when the extremes were inclined to predominate (the aggressive position of a total aversion towards the foreign influences or the passive unconditional acceptance of them), have corresponded with a cultural decline, which was also political and economic. Fortunately, it has often been a question of trends, which found opposition in the vital forces of the nation, maybe a minority, but always on the *qui vive* against the apathy, the cultural levelling, "premonitions of numbness and of historical death" (S. Tregutt). A 20th-century case of an intellectual, exemplary in his isolation, who was in the front line against the fictions and the commonplaces of history and culture, is Witold Gombrowicz, "Sarmatian" cosmopolitan, very inconsistently consistent in his unmasking of the "Polish complex," revealer of often displeasing truths about Poland and Polishness.

But our book ends with the Young Poland in Jan Józef Lipski's essay on the „National-Democratic" reception of Kasprówicz's poetry. We therefore abandon the problematic statement we have followed so far, and we shall continue by considering the reports in this book edited by Zofia Stefanowska in their chronological order.

* * *

Benedykt Zientara's paper presents a very complex, but lucid outline of the Polish attitude towards the foreign and alien elements

1978; H. Goldblatt, "The Language Question and the Emergence of Slavic National Languages," [n:] *The Emergence of National Languages*, ed. by A. Scaglione, Ravenna 1984.

from the 10th to the 15th century. In this phase—when the contacts with the most developed states and countries of Western Europe were not so intense—the relations with the neighbouring countries, such as Bohemia, Hungary, Lithuania, are very important. These relations—particularly with Bohemia—worsen in the periods of economic crisis (13th century): while in a period of growth, the 15th century, and in spite of the Hussitic heresy, the two cultures are as their closest.⁵ From the beginning of the 14th century, however, the problem of the foreigners in Poland can be identified, in one way, with the great German immigration. Two different modes of behaviour can be noted towards German colonists. Zientara considers them exemplary for the whole period, also towards the other nationalities: 1) on the one hand, the utilitarian attention (with attitudes which range from the selective exploitation of the individual skills of foreign “technicians” to xenomania *tout court*); 2) on the other hand, chiefly the ruling classes’ suspicion that the increased technical competence and the infiltration of foreigners in some spheres of power (clergy, law, courts) could damage the ethnic compactness of the nation. These tendencies, more or less opposite, can be found in two enunciations which date back to about the same period: the *Chronica Poloniae Maioris* “moves away, surprisingly, from the atavic stereotype of the Polish-German relations” (p. 19), asserting that “there are no two countries in the world kindly amicable to each other as the Slavs and the Germans” (l.c.). But an apparently unprejudiced observer, such as the French author of the *Descriptio Europae Orientalis* (of the beginning of the 14th century), speaks about a *naturale odium* between the Poles and the Germans, and it is in that time that the successful proverb “Jak świat światem, nie będzie Niemiec Polakowi bratem” (“Since the world began, a German will never be brother of a Pole”) has its origin. But

⁵ We must mention on this subject A. Brückner’s famous words: “As Casimir the Great viewed Charles, thus did Cracow viewed Prague, and one country the other; from there everything was taken, from money to spelling” (*Cywilizacja i język — Civilization nad Language*, Warszawa 1901, p. 52), often quoted by R. Jakobson in his studies of Czech-Polish cultural relations in the Middle Ages—cf. “Polska literatura średniowieczna a Cześć” (Polish Medieval Literature and the Czechs), *Kultura*, 1953, no 6, and „Szczupak po polsku” (Pike in the Polish Fashion), *Prace Polonistyczne* XX, 1965.

this "anti-German obsession" that "includes large sections of the clergy and of the gentry" (p. 29) comes from a real danger: in a period of political weakness, the idea of the ethnical and linguistic unity of the nation strengthens. In fact a linguistic criterion of national belonging takes shape—*język* and *naród* (*language* and *nation*) become almost synonymous, and this criterion is abandoned for the discerning of the general belonging to a higher state entity only after the second half of the 14th and in the 15th century. "with the stabilization of the political relations and the reinforcement of the Polish *szlachta*" (p. 37). In this period, Poland deserves also the epithet of "paradisus Judaeorum" (moreover, in medieval Poland, Jews were considered "German speaking," therefore a religious variation of that nationality). This title, in spite of the intentions of its creators, the West-European Catholic publicists who coined it as a pejorative term, remains as evidence that in the "golden autumn" of the Polish Middle Ages, "an open attitude towards the outside world dominates, and this was probably one of the reasons for the rapid economic and cultural development of Poland in this period" (p. 37).

Jerzy Kłoczowski's contribution is devoted to the 15th century, mostly through the filter of Jan Długosz's historic works and partly through those of Jan Ostroróg. This essay first of all refers to the problem of sources, of their accessibility, of their actual lack of a good edition and of "an appropriate understanding of their rhetorical and literary side, which is very important for all the texts of this period" (p. 41). Both the 15th-century synonymia of *natio* and *generatio* (derivation of the ethno-national group from one ancestor) and the recurrent identification of *natio* and *partia* are significant. So, too, is the search for justifications, both religious (the local patron saints⁶) and antiquarian (Długosz's development of the Lechitic legend), for the unity of culture and nation, which had already found expression in the revived and strengthened

⁶ G. Labuda, duly quoted by Kłoczowski, wrote about Wincenty from Kielce's work on St. Stanislas, of a "sacralization of Polish historical process." Cf. "Twórczość hagiograficzna i historiograficzna Wincentego z Kielc" (W. from Kielce's Hagiographical and Historiographical Works), *Studia Źródłoznawcze*, 1971, 16.

Regnum Poloniae. In this context, the opposition between *naturalis* and *extraneus* seems to be very important. For Długosz, Poland's "natural" boundaries are those of Boleslas the Brave; while both the extinction of the "natural" dynasty and the coming to the throne of "extraneous" kings have been a misfortune. But Długosz's patriotism and anti-Lithuanian attitude never become xenophobia; we find, indeed, not a few elements of an open attitude (particularly towards foreigners who were Catholic) which goes along with an inclination to moral judgement on men. Kłoczowski's thesis is that Długosz's ideas are fairly representative of Cracow's intellectual sphere, where bishop Oleśnicki was in the forefront, of the local University, of the court and royal chancellery, and of the greater part of that internationally very active city. On the contrary, Jan Ostroróg's xenophobic attitude, violently anti-German and adverse to the cosmopolitanism of the intellectual sets, could largely represent the *szlachta* positions and maybe the late 15th-century crisis of the ideas of a greater openness upheld by Cracow University. Kłoczowski's hypothesis, in its schematicity, must be highly appreciated, because it raises matters not yet thoroughly explained and which are also very important for an understanding of the following period of the historico-politic thought, and of all Polish culture between the 16th and the 17th centuries.

Andrzej Wyczański's paper, which was not delivered at the conference in 1971, sets out a very simple idea: the effective opening of Polish society in the 16th century and also the absence of a hidden inferiority complex (that often expresses itself through national megalomania) thanks to the economic vigour and to the full participation of Poland in the paneuropean cultural community of humanism, Renaissance and Reformation. All this caused "the 16th-century Polish society not to be cut across by xenophobia towards foreigners, or towards ideas, customs and products coming from abroad" (p. 70). Naturally, Wyczański's description is rather superficial. But sociologically speaking, that is to say in broad terms, he can not be considered incorrect. Yet he forgets some phenomena which were rather important for cultural life in the 16th century, for example the "italophobia" mentioned by Henryk Barycz.⁷ It is

⁷ Cf. H. Barycz, "Italofile i italofofi." [in:] *Spojrzenia w przeszłość polskoo-
-włoską*, Wrocław 1965.

in this period that the "black legends" of Callimach and Bona take shape. It was thought that the latter's ascent to the Polish throne would have meant the introduction of the *insidiae italicae* into the political and governmental systems. Not to speak of the religious context, where—around the mid-century—the opposition to *devotio italica* united Catholic and Protestant writers, even if from different points of view.⁸ Nor should one underestimate Marcin Bielski's anti-Italian attitude, which was not free from generic elements of xenophobia. After the Council of Trent and the polarization of the religious field, the situation becomes very much tense. Wyczański's essay lacks a diachronic view which allows one to understand better the change from the prevailing openness in the 16th century to the suspiciousness and xenophobia right at the beginning of the 17th century.⁹

A diachronic and typological approach do not exclude each other in the excellent essay by Janusz Tazbir, who in several of his scientific and popular writings has discussed the same issues.¹⁰

⁸ Barycz, *op. cit.*, mentions the controversy over the custom of Italian priests to sport beard and moustache, and two Krzycki's epigrams *De barbibus sacerdotum a Paulum III* and *In Paulum, pontificem barbaturum*. Beard, moustache, hair, clothing, fashion, generally all that today is called "look," are important elements for the understanding of the dialectics between foreign and native trend in the making of a national culture. In our book also, they have not been much considered, maybe because of the usual misunderstood sense of their minor scientific "seriousness." In fact we find allusions to them only in Tazbir's paper (fashion and "look" are constitutive elements of the Sarmatian theatricality), where he, opportunely, refers also to an amusing article by J. Jedlicki ("Golono, strzyżono, czyli historia kształci"—They Shaved, Cut off, or History Teaches, *Tygodnik Powszechny*, 1971, no 46), and in B. Geremek's intervention in the discussion (he is always very attentive to the "minor" or more often undervalued aspects of history), when he mentions that "beside the language, other distinguishing elements of 'nativeness' appear, and they can be traced in clothing, in the external appearances and even in personal acquaintances" (p. 327).

⁹ Cf. J. Tazbir: "Ze studiów nad ksenofobią w Polsce w dobie późnego renesansu" (Studies on Xenophobia in Late Renaissance Poland), *Przegląd Historyczny*, 1957; "Ksenofobia w Polsce w XVI i XVII w." (Xenophobia in Poland in the 16th and 17th Cent.), [in:] *Arianie i katolicy*, Warszawa 1971.

¹⁰ Among Tazbir's various studies on this subject, after the fundamental *Rzeczpospolita i świat. Studia z dziejów kultury XVII w.* (*The Rz. and the World. Studies on Cultural History of the 17th Cent.*), Wrocław 1971, of which see the French translation (Wrocław 1986)—the most recent are: "Polska w kulturze

The reciprocal charges of extraneousness to Polish culture of the reformed and Catholic post-tridentine area are the background on which different epilogues emerge: the tragic banishment of the Polish Brethren and comic linguistic megalomania (both for the franciscan Dembołęcki and for the arian exile Naronowicz-Naroński, Adam and Eve spoke Polish). Sarmatian and baroque rhetoric support each other in the hyperbole and in the grotesque (oranges, imported from the countries of the Jesuits, are considered a very harmful import for national customs). The baroque-sarmatian hyperbole, the xenophobic megalomania of the 17th-century Poland, according to Tazbir, stands up, fundamentally, thanks to three dogmas: 1) the „barn of Europe” dogma; 2) the *antemurale christianitatis*; 3) the superiority of the “gentry democracy” régime above others. The fact that, as time passed, these three dogmas more and more revealed themselves to be myths in the face of the economic, politico-military and institutional reality of the *Rzeczpospolita*, particularly after the “flood,” does not reduce, but increases the haughty judgement about foreigners, who in their turn consider Poland as “an exotic country, at least, if not a barbarous one” (p. 97). The exaggerated sense of superiority with which foreign countries were regarded above all in the second half of the century, raises the problem of its own sincerity. For Tazbir it is a question of an “opium” (p. 109), a mixture of megalomania and xenophobia administered in increasing quantities in order to reduce the anxiety caused by the increasing inferiority complex and by the criticism – multiplied after the “flood” – of the “anarchic” régime of *Rzeczpospolita szlachecka*. On the other hand, Sarmation cultural syncretism, its openness to the East (and the consequently very strong influence of Polish culture from and in that direction), can be explained by a perception, on the part of Polish *szlachta*, of the politico-ideological and cultural systems of Moscovia and the Near East as non-threatening. For them, the real danger was in the West. At the same time, they trusted in the West, and thought that, because

europiejskiej” (Poland in European Culture), [in:] *Spotkania z historią*, Warszawa 1986; “Pomiędzy Europą a Wschodem” (Between Europe and East) and “W roli pośredników” (Acting as Go-between), [in:] *Myśl polska w nowożytnej kulturze europejskiej*, Warszawa 1986; *Kultura polskiego baroku (The Culture of Polish Baroque)*, Warszawa 1986.

of those three "dogmas," and therefore for its own sake, Europe would do everything in its power to avoid the fall of the Polish state.

The history of the fall of these myths and of the final consciousness of the cultural, institutional, economic backwardness of the nation on the part of the Polish intellectuals, is told in the two reports that follow, dedicated to the ideological dialectics of Enlightenment, with particular consideration given to the problem of foreign patterns in the process of re-Europeanization of Poland during the 18th century. In both cases, one is very favourably struck by the adherence to texts: pamphleteering and political treatises for J. Michalski; literary pamphleteering and drama for M. Klimowicz.

Through S. Garczyński's, S. Poniatowski's, S. Konarski's and Stanislas Augustus's writings, through *Głos wolny*, the *Monitor* and *Zabawy Przyjemne i Pożyteczne*, etc., Michalski reconstructs the history of "desarmatianisation" of Polish culture by means of the various degrees of the reception and the receptivity of the European novelties. Consequently the outline is very complex and therefore difficult to summarize in a few lines. Under no circumstances can it be reduced to the superficial and stereotyped binary scheme *frac vs kontusz*, seen as progress vs conservatism, often proposed formerly by Polish historiography. As Claude Backvis explained,¹¹ the criticism of absolutism of the late Enlightenment finds very fertile ground in the *Rzeczpospolita* of *aurea libertas*: the Sarmatian return, after the first partition, thrives under the banner of progressivism, not only of patriotism, even if, as Michalski properly remarks, "Rousseau's ideas [*Considérations sur le gouvernement de Pologne et sa réforme projetée*], literally and superficially taken, were grist to the mill of traditionalism" (p. 156). And so for Staszic, who was a very fierce enemy of despotism, Poland had to pass through the stage of absolute monarchy. At the same time he opposes the acritical idealization of the foreign patterns and violently attacks Czartoryski's antisarmatian and reforming ideas of the beginning of Stanislas Augustus' reign. In these antinomies, in the (often apparent) contradictions of the writers of the "enlightened" and of the traditionalist field quoted by Michalski, one can see a faithful reflection

¹¹ Cf. C. Backvis, "Les Contradictions de l'âge stanislavien," [in:] *Utopie et institutions au XVIII^e s.*, Paris 1963.

of the tragedy of a nation that by all means tries to stop the rush towards its own destruction, and yet is conscious of being unable so to do.

In the first part of his paper, Mieczysław Klimowicz is interested in the two main institutions (the *Monitor* pamphleteering and the national theatre), which from 1765 to the Confederation of Bar, took upon themselves the task of "adapting" (almost in the sense of the classicist theory of *translation*) the ideas of the Enlightenment to Polish reality, which was anomalous for the lack, particularly as far as culture is concerned, of a *bourgeoisie* and also for its backwardness in all fields. This period of stanislavian literature (optimistic, anti-sarmatian, xenophilic) was followed by the first changes of mind; and, after *Małżeństwo z kalendarza*, Bohomolec wrote *Staruszkiewicz*. Krasicki, by then out of the political fight, tried, successfully, to create a new hero: *Pan Podstoli* is the result of an enlightened synthesis of tradition and innovation.¹² The youngest generation trained at the school of Enlightenment (Staszic, Kołłątaj, Jezierski, Zabłocki, Niemcewicz and the Jacobins Mejer and Pawlikowski) went even further, with the proposal of a new model of a nation-people, thanks to the demolition of the feudal privileges of the aristocracy. The new heroes, "enlightened Sarmats," of Niemcewicz's and Bogusławski's plays—with a 180 degrees overturning of the positions compared to the old oppositions of *sarmacki* and *szarmancki* (from *charmant*)—are literary expressions of the renaissance of the Bar tradition, of the synthesis between the struggle for independence and progressivism, traditionalism and Enlightenment, that became stronger during Kościuszko's insurrection. The Jacobin priests Mejer, Jelski, Karpowicz were also part of this new trend: how far from the satirical representation of the monk in the first period of stanislavian literature! For Klimowicz, therefore,

in the culminating moment of the making of the Polish nation, the balance between the foreign and native trends expressed itself on the one hand in drawing inspiration from European progressive thought without fears or complexes, on the other hand in the necessary appreciation of national values, acknowledging them as the main factor in the making of culture (p. 185).

¹² Cf. S. Graciotti, "Il vecchio e il nuovo nel *Pan Podstoli* di Krasicki," *Ricerche Slavistiche*, 1959, VII.

Jerzy Jedlicki turns our attention to the problem of Polish occidentalism from 1790 to 1863, and tries to conciliate economic history and the history of ideas, regarding some events external to the Polish historical and political process (most of all the Industrial Revolution) as very important for the prosecution of the ideal debate on the relations with the West and on the role of foreigners in Poland, at least as facts of obvious domestic significance such as the loss of independence. This gives rise to a view that is, in part, provocative (for this reason the discussion on this paper was very animated, both during and after the conference¹³). If this view can recall the contemporary debate between occidentalists and slavophiles in Russia on the one hand, on the other it is of great value for it does not restrict the investigation, reducing some different positions into only two factions, because "the relation with the West seen as model of industrial and cosmopolitan civilization did not determine in Poland the main lines of the ideological divisions (whereas this happened in Russia), however it became one of the centres of crystallization of the views of the world" (p. 190). For Jedlicki the fact is that

in the ideal struggle and in working for a national education, the doctrines seldom acted as comprehensive and organized structures. The normal course of things causes their individual members, theories and slogans to part from their body and to start an independent new life of ideological molecules, ready to join again in new combinations, often completely different from the original (pp. 218–219).

Thus certain antiurbanistic and anticapitalistic positions of Polish revolutionary emigration coincide paradoxically with those of the traditionalist sectors of Polish agrarianism, that is, of those who—in the middle of the 19th century—remained devoted to the Sarmatian dogma of the barn. Both the occidentalist and the ethnocentric factions included a range of political and ideological positions going from the extreme "right" to the extreme "left." There was a certain stabilization only around the 1850s, with the reinforcement of the pre-positivistic ideas, chiefly represented by *Biblioteka Warszawska*.

¹³ In the book the contributions concerning Jedlicki's paper (mostly critical and from several points of view) are by: S. Kieniewicz, B. Skarga, M. Kurzyna, R. Czepulis-Rastenis, A. Witkowska, M. Janion, T. Łepkowski, W. Petsch, with an extensive and articulate reply by Jedlicki himself.

This review which held a liberal, tolerant and open stance towards the intellectual and technological novelties coming from the West – is opposed by Jedlicki to the maximalism of the fighting democracy (but see also Dembowski's position) that "slave to only one progress (the one obtained through dialectics) ignored the other, obtained through accumulation" (p. 228).

Zofia Stefanowska's paper on Mickiewicz's "ambiguity" is unintentionally and implicitly in conflict with Jedlicki's theory. She defines the poet as the "foremost codifier of the Polish national megalomania, herald of the struggle against the foreign cultural element" (p. 225), and, at the same time, provincial lover of his own Lithuanianness, enemy of the "paving-over" of all the capitals' streets (Warsaw's and Paris' as well), but also "Polish, inhabitant of Europe" for whom "the sun of Truth does not know both Orient and Occident" (*To Joachim Lelewel*, here cit. p. 257). For Stefanowska the critical moment for Mickiewicz's and his generation's spiritual evolution is the 1831 insurrection. The subsequent disappearance of every pretence of institutional guarantee meant that "from now onwards Mickiewicz will think of his own nation's interests according to categories of European policy" (pp. 261–262). No longer will they be seen in the sense of the universalistic ideals of the Enlightenment, but in the sense of the need to reinforce the boundaries between Europe and Asia, between civilization and barbarity. For Mickiewicz this boundary passes through Russia itself: between the tsarist régime and the Russian people, whose great vocation for the redemption of the nations is the same as that of Poland. Mickiewicz's remarks are therefore devoted more to the future than to the past. The people/nation for Mickiewicz, the author of *Pan Tadeusz* and especially of *Slavonic Literature*, is not "a community based on an ethnic exclusiveness, but on a power of attraction which could synthesize different elements" (p. 274). His marked broad-mindedness towards the "Polish Israelites" is of a great significance in this respect. For Stefanowska, Mickiewicz's "ambiguous" attitude to parochialism and Europeanism at the same time depends on the fact that he is at once heir to the aristocratic old-Polish tradition and yet beyond it: in the *Polish Pilgrim*, which can be considered one of Mickiewicz's most xenophobic writings, the firm belief (certainly utopian) that the

problem of freedom is a problem concerning all the peoples, without boundaries or barriers whatsoever, is heavily underlined.

The divisions, in fact, are not always identified with the geopolitical boundaries of a nation. It has already been affirmed here, and Tadeusz Łepkowski demonstrates it, listing four models of heterogeneity of the Polish population in the mid-19th century: its ethnic variety, social factors, the Lithuanian and the Slesian question and increasing regionalization, religious problems (particularly Jewish). Łepkowski deals with the positions taken up by the genuinely Polish ethnic and cultural element vis-à-vis the Byelorussian problem, the Ruthenian question (soon after called Ukrainian), the problems of the Polish-Czech borderland and the German ethnic problem (particularly on the western and northern borders) and the more complicated Jewish question. He comes to this conclusion: in the mid-19th century, theoretical position of openness prevailed, but this approval of polyethnism was more frequent in politically left-wing circles and, geographically, was referred more to the eastern than to the western borders of Poland. Even less did it concern the centre, because of the strong presence of the Jews, who were, at best, required to assimilate to Polish culture. Great damage was caused to the "pluralistic" theories in the second half of the century by the strengthening of the stereotyped representation of the Polish-Catholic and by the change of the left towards federalistic concepts (which are always dangerous for less protected minorities), and of the right to more and more exclusively monoethnic or exterministically ethnocentric theories.

This is a matter which relates to Barbara Skarga's question "whether actually Positivism has been an antinational trend or [...] contained in itself tendencies leading straight to nationalism" (p. 278). Both the accusations, in fact, were addressed to it by contemporaries, as well as in our century. The "dialectic of Polish Positivism"¹⁴ is examined by Skarga on the grounds of pamphlets (1860–1890)

¹⁴ The reference is to an important essay by H. Markiewicz "Dialektyka pozytywizmu polskiego" (1966), of which an English translation appeared in *Literary Studies in Poland* VI, 1980. B. Skarga's essay can be considered as a partial and implicit confirmation of the main point of Markiewicz's study.

and of the famous diatribe between the "old" and "young" press up to the entering onto the politico-ideological stage of two new protagonists: the socialists and the nationalists, with their mutual accusations of parochialism and xenomania, of cosmopolitanism and local patriotism. For Skarga:

What strikes one in these arguments is their form of mutual invective. In them there is more demagoguery than truth. Here, it was not a question of cosmopolitanism or particularism, but of the mutual attempt by two positions, two different views of society and the laws of its development to compromise one another (p. 291).

Then, when the parties went to war, a similar language and similar mutual accusations were used both for and against them. For example, the accusation "antinational" was used, now, by the positivists (or expositivists) both towards the loyalists (like Spasowicz) and the socialists. They both, in their turn, accused Świętochowski of nationalism. "The question whether positivism is an antinational tendency—Skarga concludes—is therefore useless. It depended on the situation, on the political ends of those who followed its theories" (p. 302). In fact both the extremists of nationalism, like Zygmunt Balicki, and the socialists later referred to certain theories of Positivism, not before they had conveniently modified them to their advantage (as Skarga well demonstrates for Balicki).

A manner in which extremism and strategies of the politico-ideological struggle can modify and misinterpret statements that have nothing to do with the purposes for which they are used, is well illustrated in Jan Józef Lipski's paper on the ruralistic, racist, "antiquarian" reception of Jan Kasprowicz's poetry. This kind of interpretation was started by the National-Democracy (ND) theoreticians (Popławski in *Głos*, then Z. Wasilewski and W. Kozicki), and met outstanding success up to the 1930s, that is until the moment of its definite dissolution with the end of the idea of a possible peasant hegemony in the integration process of the modern Polish nation. Lipski points out how that interpretation was not justified in Kasprowicz's texts (though the poet was personally bound to nationalists), and he particularly refers to the total absence of antisemitic tones, and emphasizes Kasprowicz's open attitude in this sense. The "myth of the nativeness of culture" is very uncertain ground when the writer hoisted as a standard as a result

of his “racial purity, unaltered by alien and heterogeneous dross, totally Polish, pre-Slavic, pre-Arian, because he is genuinely peasant” (Kozicki, p. 312), holds such open views. This myth is a very shaky concern, even in its “independentistic” side connected with Kasprowicz’s supposed anti-Germanism. In a previous book on the author of *Hymny*, Lipski had clearly proved the tight links with and Kasprowicz’s fruitful dependance on late 19th-century German culture and literature. Of the various components of the myth of the nativeness of culture based on that reading of Kasprowicz’s poems, only the rurality (not fortuitously often stressed also by non-National-Democratic critics) remains, seen as poetical expression of a cultural model opposed to the urban and technological model of the universalistic syncretism of modernity, which gains a footing in the 20th century. With this—Lipski informs us—“the traditional opposition of nature and culture moves inside culture itself” (p. 320).

With Lipski’s appropriate remark we come to the heart of our century in its torn selfconsciousness¹⁵. But the 20th century is excluded from our book¹⁶, with all the tragedies (the Jewish question¹⁷, the problem of the eastern and western borders, pre- and post-war emigration, Stalinism as a “native product” or rather violent “import”¹⁸) and contradictions (the Gierek period and its “occidentalistic”

¹⁵ Lipski himself mentions, as an example, the „modernolaty” and the ruralism (but in certain ways we can speak even of “technophobia”) of the Polish avant-garde, as well as of all avant-gardes. Concerning literary criticism, we only mention here two famous contributions of the period before the Second World War: K. Irzykowski. *Plagiatowy charakter przełomów literackich w Polsce* (*The Plagiarist Character of the Periods of Literary Transitions in Poland*), 1922, and J. S. Bystron. *Megalomania narodowa* (*The National Megalomania*), 1935.

¹⁶ Also A. Wierzbicki’s recent book, *Wschód – Zachód w koncepcjach dziejów Polski* (*East and West in Polish History Conceptions*), Warszawa 1984, does not deal with our century, and ends with the “occidental apologetics of the First World War period.” It represents, however, new evidence of the vitality, among Polish historians, of the subjects that are similar to those discussed in our book.

¹⁷ Among the most important and audacious contributions on the Polish-Jewish relations in pur century, we must mention J. Błoński’s “Biedni Polacy patrzą na getto” (*The Poor Poles Look at the Ghetto*), *Tygodnik Powszechny*, 1987, no 1959.

¹⁸ On this subject cf. J. Trznadel’s *Hańba domowa. Rozmowy z pisarzami* (*Domestic Shame. Conversations with Writers*), Paris 1986.

openness; „Sarmatian” return, with an inclination for a certain national megalomania in the early 80s).

Our wish is that this gap be soon filled, if only in an IBL PAN conference to come, and that we could maybe begin to clear the 20th-century field of stereotypes, ingenuousnesses or wrong convictions that still lie heavy on cultural historiography, literary criticism and pamphleteering as well as on Polish mentality of these recent years and on contemporary representation of Poland abroad.

Luigi Marinelli

Transl. by *Fiorenzo Fantaccini*

Cultura e nazione in Italia e Polonia dal Rinascimento all' illuminismo (Culture et Nation en Italie et en Pologne de la Renaissance aux Lumières), ss la dir. de V. Branca et S. Graciotti, Leo S. Olschki Editore, Firenze 1986, 414 pp.+41 ill.

Considérons un quadrilatère dont les quatre côtés représentent quatre concepts abstraits ainsi que des phénomènes historiquement concrets (de la Renaissance aux Lumières) figurés par ceux-ci: Culture, Nation, Italie, Pologne. Les diagonales, les triangles inscrits, les côtés eux-mêmes, les différents segments inscrits dans la superficie, «définissent» les thèmes des communications présentées au VII^e séminaire d'études italo-polonaises promu et organisé par la Fondation Giorgio Cini et par l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences (Venise, 15–17 novembre 1983)*.

* Les auteurs et les titres (en traduction française) des essais figurants dans le livre sont les suivants – B. Biliński: Autour de la genèse de la *Mazurek de Dąbrowski*, hymne national polonais, né à Reggio Emilia en 1797; G. Pizzamiglio, M. G. Pensa: L'Idée de nation dans l'historiographie littéraire italienne du XVII^e s.; T. Jaroszewski: Le Prince Stanislas Poniatowski et sa demure appelée «Ustronie» à Varsovie; P. Preto: Venise et les partages de la Pologne; M. Karpowicz: Le «Portrait mortuaire» et les «scapulaires» des tableaux religieux: deux exemples originaux de l'art polonais; S. Graciotti: L'Idée de peuple et de nation dans le XVII^e s. polonais entre le mythe nobiliaire et l'utopie démocratique; D. Caccamo: La «République nobiliaire» dans la perspective de Venise. Intérêts politiques et confrontation culturelle; J. Kowalczyk: Internationalisme artistique et société polonaise entre le XVI^e et XVII^e s.; C. Vasoli: Sperone Speroni et la naissance