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This article engages with Marian Zdziechowski’s research on the writings of Zygmunt Krasiński. Zdziechowski’s work goes beyond reading Romantic-era poetical works to reconstruct a comprehensive view of the world as presented by Krasiński. Issues are also addressed of how philosophical treatises complicate reception history.
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Introduction

Marian Zdziechowski (1861–1938) is revered as an erudite scholar of many interests. He was a Polish literary historian, an expert in Slavic cultures, a religious philosopher and a political moralist. His intellectual profile is defined by his impressive scientific and publishing career, and in an ideological sense by his theories regarding intransigent catastrophic thought. For this reason Czesław Miłosz, a student of Zdziechowski in Vilnius, referred to him as the “philosopher of despair” and as the Cassandrian prophet.

1 Zdziechowski’s ethos, especially in his mature years, was rooted in his religious and philosophical attitudes and political views, which – as Konrad Górski rightly points out – became a central issue in Zdziechowski’s reflections after the turn of the century. This shift in emphasis brings to mind words in the introduction to Zygmunt Krasiński’s Przedświt (Predawn), according to which history will be fulfilled by transforming the political sphere into the religious one. Konrad Górski, “Ś. P. Marjan Zdziechowski”, Ateneum Wileńskie 2 (1938), i–xx; Zygmunt Krasiński, “Przedświt”, in Dzija literackie, vol. 1, ed. P. Hertz (Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1973), 151.

2 Zdziechowski was a professor at several universities: the Jagiellonian University in Kraków, the Stefan Batory University in Vilnius, as well as the University of London and the University of Warsaw (at the latter two he held this honor only nominally). He was author of the first Polish scholarly work on Slavic literatures, Mesjaniści i Słowianofil. Szkice z psychologii narodów słowiańskich (1888). He was a professor at the Academy of Learning in Budapest and a permanent speaker at the Cracow Literary Association. From 1933 he was president of the Society of Friends of Learning in Vilnius. He was active socially: in 1901 he founded the Slavic Club in Kraków, and of the magazine Świat Słowiański four years later. He published in the periodicals Biblioteka Warszawska, Bluszcz, Czasu, Niwa, Przegląd Literacki, Przegląd Polski, Przegląd Powszechny, Świat and Kraj – a list prepared on the basis of numerous studies by researchers. The following publications proved particularly useful: Marian Zaczyński, “Wstęp”, in: Marian Zdziechowski, Wybór pism (Kraków: Spółdzielczy Instytut Wydawniczy “Znak”, 1993); Irena Burzacka, Ideał a rzeczywistość. O krytyce moralistycznej Mariana Zdziechowskiego (Poznań: Osolineum, 1982); Jan Krasicki, Eschatologia i mesjanzm. Studium światopoglądu Mariana Zdziechowskiego (Wrocław: Wiedza o Kulturze, 1994).
“calling out into the wilderness”\textsuperscript{5}. Zdziechowski’s pessimism was an intellectual and spiritual expression of his concern for the civilizational identity of Europe\textsuperscript{4}. In the face of this crisis, made manifest in the increasing process of secularization, Zdziechowski referred to various philosophical and literary traditions in searching to reconcile the situation. For Zdziechowski, history and the evils associated with it remain fundamental problems. Such reflections lead to eschatological issues. Andrzej Walicki, in his classic work from 1983, appealed for Zdziechowski to be perceived as “an eschatological, catastrophic thinker, but not a millenarian, not a messianist”\textsuperscript{5}. Walicki stated that Zdziechowski rejected the idea of a “radical regeneration” of the earthly world as patronized by August Cieszkowski, another Polish Romantic thinker. On the other hand, Walicki believed, although it was irrational and “against hope”, that:

the inevitable end of the world, the definitive end of mankind’s earthly destinies, will be followed by something more than the thousand-year-old kingdom of justice and prosperity: that the apocalyptic vision of Saint John will then be realized, and therefore the victory over death, the reconciliation of God the Creator with the world created in the final act of divine self-revelation\textsuperscript{6}.

Radical eschatology that seeks to deny the “terrestrialization of the idea of salvation” is confirmed by Zdziechowski, who claimed that the Russian messianists, who are “less real and at the same time more logical”, understand “the impossibility of linking two such contrasting ideas as the evolution of today’s world and the transformation of the earth into the Heavenly Jerusalem”\textsuperscript{7}. The perspective of the apocalyptic transformation excludes the consideration of the phenomenon of salvation within the framework of earthly chronology. There is a need for the coming of Eschaton – a reality completely different from the temporal.

In seeking a source for such a philosophy, reference can be made to Artur Żywiołek, who notes that Zdziechowski’s “looking for the New Jerusalem” would be “a significant reversal in the attitude of pessimism”\textsuperscript{8}. A philosophy negating the pessimistic belief that “the world lies in evil” is eschatological in nature. This involves a belief in the coming of the Church of Saint John, that is, a future age in which the teachings contained within the biblical Book of Revelation will be realized. The Church of Saint John concept was formed, among others, in reaction against the crisis of religion during the Age of Enlightenment. Contemporary research also indicates that Romanticism was one source

\textsuperscript{4} Zdziechowski followed the existential attitude according to which “pessimism is a creative force”, because “from absolute pessimism, which recognizes that suffering and evil are the content of being, passive submission to it does not yet flow”. His position is a conscious act of heroism with an ethical motivation. M. Zdziechowski, “Pesymizm jako siła twórcza”, in Wybór pism, 466–479.
\textsuperscript{5} Andrzej Walicki, Między filozofią, religią i polityką. Studia o myśli polskiej epoki romantyzmu (Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1983), 40.
\textsuperscript{6} Walicki, Między filozofią, religią i polityką, 40.
\textsuperscript{7} Zdziechowski, “Antynomie duszy rosyjskiej (Mikołaj Bierdiajew)”, in Wybór pism, 275.
\textsuperscript{8} Artur Krasiński, Zdziechowskiego Żywiołek, “Wypatrywanie Miasta Bożego”, Słupskie Prace Filologiczne no. 8 (2010), 46.
of this apocalyptic attitude. It is Romanticism as “one of the first testimonies of the cultural solstice”\(^9\) points to the eschatological and messianic paths leading Zdziechowski to seek the City of God.

These two points of view indicate a certain sense of constancy in Zdziechowski’s worldview. Adopting the Romantic paradigm while reading Zdziechowski’s works lets us to understand his dialogue with various nineteenth-century traditions. Romantic philosophical thought, which for Zdziechowski mainly comprised German idealists and Polish and Russian religious thinkers, allowed him to take up a position against the approaching “specter of the future”, or at least to make a gesture of tragic heroism and point out an eschatological counterproposal.

Certain thinkers revived Zdziechowski in his work and stimulated further research. These include August Cieszkowski and Zygmunt Krasiński in Poland, Vladimir Solovyov and Nikolai Berdyaev in Russia, and Arthur Schopenhauer and Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling in Germany\(^10\).

Krasiński’s inclusion in the pantheon of Romantic philosophers is somewhat controversial and has been questioned\(^11\). In Zdziechowski’s reading, however, Krasiński is an artist but is perhaps primarily a thinker. For the former, the latter’s work, including Nie-Boska komedia (The Undivine Comedy, the drama written in 1833, published in 1835), provides a unique example of the Romanticist vision, differing from sentimentalism in Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s works and excessive emotion in early texts by Lord Byron, Adam Mickiewicz, and Juliusz Słowacki. A positive attitude to Krasiński is particularly worth emphasizing in this context. The influence of those poets on Zdziechowski’s understanding of the Romantic tradition demands a closer look. Knowledge of the bardic tradition’s “spiritual legacy”, as manifested in Zdziechowski’s work, emphasizes modernist thinkers’ positions on Romanticism. Such a study would also contribute to further discussions on the Romantic legacy’s significance for future generations of thinkers.

**How Zdziechowski reads Krasiński: reconnaissance**

As indicated above, Zygmunt Krasiński held a special place in Marian Zdziechowski’s reflections. Initially the latter’s acquaintance with the former took place alongside his reading of two other famous Polish Romantic writers, Adam Mickiewicz and Juliusz Słowacki. Zdziechowski’s later work, however, is a separate research subject as regards Krasiński’s oeuvre.

His article in Kraj magazine in 1882, “Ideały Mickiewicza i Krasińskiego a słowianofilstwo rosyjskie” (Mickiewicz’s and Krasiński’s ideals of Russian Slavophilia)\(^12\), explores

---

\(^9\) Krasiński Zdziechowskiego Żywiołek, “Wypatrywanie Miasta Bożego”.

\(^10\) Zdziechowski included the most extensive account of Russian and German philosophy in his largest philosophical work, the two volume Pesymizm, romantyzm a podstawy chrześcijaństwa. Cf. Marian Zdziechowski, Pesymizm, romantyzm a podstawy chrześcijaństwa, vols. 1—2 (Kraków: Drukarnia “Czasu”, 1915).

\(^11\) One of the last contributors this discussion was Arkadiusz Bagłajewski, who proposed determining Krasiński not as a philosopher, but placed among the era’s artists-thinkers. Cf. Arkadiusz Bagłajewski, Poezja “trzeciej epoki”. O twórczości Zygmunta Krasińskiego w latach 1836–1843 (Lublin: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UMCS, 2009).

\(^12\) Marian Zdziechowski, “Ideały Mickiewicza i Krasińskiego a słowianofilstwo rosyjskie”, Kraj 5–7, (1882).
the Romantic tradition. It contains an interesting juxtaposition of the two writers’ views alongside a reflection on Russian Romantic literature. Zdziechowski also outlined the differences between their understandings of social issues, including their nation’s destiny and its duties. His thoughts as a twenty-one-year-old contrast significantly with his later findings. This is particularly evident in his reading of Krasiński’s most ambiguous works, such as Trzy myśli po ś. p. Henryku Ligenzie zmarłym w Morreale 12 kwietnia 1840 roku (Three thoughts left after Henryk Ligenza, deceased at Morreale on April 12, 1840). Zdziechowski’s evolving position regarding certain philosophical issues was also influenced by relations with his longtime mentor, Stanisław Tarnowski. His reading of “Trzy myśli” in his later years will be discussed below.

The first segment of his more serious work on Krasiński was in his doctoral dissertation, published in 1888: Mesjaniści i sławianofile. Szkice z psychologii narodów słowiańskich (Messianists and Slavophiles: sketches on the psychology of the Slavic peoples). In Zdziechowski’s attempt to penetrate Krasiński’s thoughts and understand his attitude towards life, he made recourse to the writer’s correspondence with Adam Sołtan and with Konstanty Gaszyński. Reaching back to both Krasinski’s literary works and letters made it possible to trace the Romantic poet’s thought in motion.

Thirty-eight pages of the dissertation are devoted to Krasiński; its chapter on Mickiewicz contains forty-eight pages and the one on Słowacki extends to fifty-eight pages, indicating a greater interest during this period in Słowacki’s work. While a comparable amount of attention was provided to the three writers, judgments on Krasiński reveal a certain apologetic tone:

The complete unity of views is an outstanding feature of Krasiński’s life, as well as his poetry; if the work of Mickiewicz and of Słowacki can be divided into two or more epochs differing in the perspectives of those poets’ views, with even the most careful reading of Krasiński’s letters, we notice no evidence of changes or spiritual experiences allowing the poet a different course of thought or action from the previous ones. The essence of things is always the same: the same complaints about physical suffering, the same exploitation of the fall of a nation, sometimes pushed to the extreme of despair, and finally the same solemnity of spirit, seeking solace in consolations of religion and in faith in the world’s purposefulness based on it, and in the victory of truth.\textsuperscript{13}

It is impossible to agree entirely with Zdziechowski in light of contemporary findings on Krasiński’s creative evolution. It must be also remembered that the opinion above was written in 1888, when Zdziechowski was twenty-seven. However, it is important to emphasize the high regard in which he held Krasiński, manifested both in his early texts and in those from his late period\textsuperscript{14}.

\textsuperscript{13} Zdziechowski, Mesjaniści i słowianofile, 257.

\textsuperscript{14} At the beginning of the Krasiński chapter in Mesjaniści i słowianofile, Zdziechowski wrote: “In his reasoning as well as in his inspirations, one can feel the element of sober criticism that protected him after the wilderness of unbridled emotionality or imagination”. In Wizja Krasińskiego, he described the poet as “the deepest of philosophical minds that Poland has ever produced”. Zdziechowski, Wizja Krasińskiego, 241; Zdziechowski, Wizja Krasińskiego, op. cit., 35.
Zdziechowski subsequently published *Filozofia Krasińskiego* (1907, Krasiński’s philosophy), which then formed the basis for his more extensive work on the Romantic poets. The intersection of his interests, between literature and philosophy, should come as no surprise. This period follows *Szkice literackie* (1900, Literary sketches), *Religia i sztuka* (1902, Religion and art), and *Pestis perniciosissima* (1905), which clearly indicate Zdziechowski’s interest in the fields of philosophy and religion.

Nevertheless, in *Filozofia Krasińskiego*, he incorporates the poet’s work into the broader circle of philosophy, pointing to relations between Hegel, Schelling, August Cieszkowski, and Krasiński. Zdziechowski entered a dialogue with positions other researchers, such as Stanisław Tarnowski, Edward Porębowicz and Jan Bołoz Antoniewicz, expressed. In doing so, Zdziechowski outlined his own interpretative vision of Krasiński’s works. This text also allows us to trace his “kinship of thought” with Cardinal John Henry Newman, and to recognize successive movements in Catholicism’s progression.

The year of 1912 should be considered separately. It coincided with the centenary of Krasiński’s birth and also with publication of several monographs on Krasiński and of the poet’s collected works. Zdziechowski published *Wizja Krasińskiego. Ze studiów nad literaturą i filozofią polską* (Krasiński’s vision: from studies of Polish literature and philosophy), in which he emphasized the importance of eschatology in the work, reinforcing Krasiński’s position as a philosopher. He also gave consideration to Cieszkowski’s passus Ojce nasz (Our father). There are also the chapters “Mickiewicz i Towiański” (Mickiewicz and [Andrzej] Towiański) and “Mistyka Słowackiego” (Słowacki’s mystique). The full study comprises Zdziechowski’s summa of Polish Romanticism. Artur Żywiołek explained its title convincingly:

Kraśński’s vision, in Zdziechowski’s view, becomes a kind of reenvisioning, repetition, reinterpretation of the *Undivine Comedy* author’s worldview. The title of Zdziechowski’s volume also points to this aspect of artistic imagination, with its roots in the experience of Romantic epiphany. Apart from the conventional semantics of “vision” as a creative image of reality, one can indicate a sensational and prophetic aspect. “Vision” is a close synonym for “seeing”, mystical delight, “feeling and faith”. Thus when Zdziechowski placed “vision” in the title of the volume in question, the main methodological profile of this study of Romantic literature was determined.\(^{15}\)

Żywiołek unequivocally exalts Zdziechowski’s work, for better or for worse. The analysis of the title reveals its author’s views on both Romantic literature and on philosophy. Taking up multidisciplinary topics in the context of history leaves the impression of Zdziechowski’s extensive reflections on the subject.

*Wizja Kraśńskiego* was followed by a prolonged uncreative period. This episode was only interrupted by a lecture in Berlin on 11 December 1935, repeated in Vilnius at the request of the Piotr Skarga Society in Warsaw. Zdziechowski admitted to not giving

any thought to Krasiński’s work during this time: “I have not carried out any research in this direction, I do not follow the fashion, I do not feel any desire to turn great people into small and poor figures, or, as they say today, to debunk them.”

The lecture was Zdziechowski’s return to his previous research. The emphasis on the “power of Leviathan”, which he spoke of in reference to a previously unanalyzed work, Niedokończony poemat (Unfinished poem) and which was the only example of new material. Zdziechowski referred to Wojciech Dzieduszycki’s work and to the looming specter of Communist revolution from the USSR. He would not witness events he foresaw. Catastrophic philosophy’s advocate died in Vilnius on 5 October 1938, less than a year before the outbreak of the Second World War.

Circumstances under which Zdziechowski gave his lecture deserve further consideration. His sudden return in it to the work of Krasiński must be placed in contexts of time and place, with the rise of Nazism. But these are subjects for a separate study.

***

From Zdziechowski’s works outlined above, we clearly see his regular recourse to Zygmunt Krasiński’s work. Connections between the two writers are so prevalent that they, too, would prove a fruitful avenue for further study. However, to undertake such an exercise it is necessary to clarify the context within which the later thinker was working, and his attitude to Polish Romantic works. Therefore the period from 1882 to 1912 is of particular interest, as during it Zdziechowski undertook his reading project. What follows is an outline of the “perimonographical” circle of reception. Zdziechowski’s previous interactions with researchers of Krasiński’s work may shed light on his worldview, in particular his model for reading Romantic texts.

The monograph circle: Tarnowski and Kleiner to Kallenbach

Following Henryk Gradkowski, who has collated a list of early researchers of Krasiński’s work, this essay will focus upon three particular writers: Stanisław Tarnowski,

---

16 Marian Zdziechowski, Zygmunt Krasiński (Odczyt wygłoszony w Berlinie 11 grudnia 1935 r., powtórzony w Wilnie w przekładzie polskim) (Wilno [Vilnius]: Drukarnia Archidiecezjalna, 1936), 3.
17 Zdziechowski refers to this particular work: Wojciech Dzieduszycki, Mesjanizm polski a prawda polska (Kraków, 1902).
18 It is noteworthy that Zdziechowski’s lecture was given at the center of the Third Reich, two years after Adolf Hitler had come to power. The Nazi Party’s ideology had already been fully demonstrated. His lecture’s concluding words were characterized by a tone of profound disaster. He would then turn his attention to the Communist Soviet Union.
19 The context of the period suggests viewing its philosophy from the perspective of the “asymmetrical reception” Anna Janicka has written about. The “cracked structure” of the positivist-modern Polish reading was determined by the political map of the day. Poles’ cultural awareness and their worldview were both shaped in accordance with the local internal logic of their country’s partitions. Therefore, the reception of Krasiński’s work could be considered from the perspectives of the three centers representing each partition: Warsaw, Poznań, and Kraków. Anna Janicka, “Krasiński postyczniowy. Przypadek młodych pozytywistów”, in Romantyczne repetycje i powroty, ed. Agnieszka Czajkowska, Artur Żywiołek (Częstochowa: Wydawnictwo im. Stanisława Podobińskiego Akademii im. Jana Długosza, 2011).
Józef Kallenbach, and Juliusz Kleiner. These scholars’ studies of Krasiński’s oeuvre are the most comprehensive, thus will be compared with Zdziechowski’s work.

**Krasiński – Zdziechowski – Tarnowski**

The first monographs on Krasiński’s work, which certainly influenced their reception by Marian Zdziechowski, were published after he had already published his first works. However, Zdziechowski almost from the beginning referred to the authority of Stanisław Tarnowski, whom he called “the deepest of critics” of the Romantic bard and of whom he was a pupil. In 1937, he expressed his gratitude to his former professor in a reading, “Stanisław hr. Tarnowski. W stulecie urodzin” (Count Stanisław Tarnowski: on his birthday centenary). Theirs can be viewed as a mentor-student relationship. Tarnowski, as the author of the foreword to *Irydion*, accompanied Zdziechowski in his first reading of the Romantic poet’s text:

I could not put it down. I was very impressed and touched by the majesty of his [Krasiński’s] thoughts and words, but I did not understand everything; I felt that it was something great, capturing my imagination on heights never before reached […]. After a year, my grandmother from Lviv brought me, of course secretly, two Krasiński volumes smuggled in her travel dress, which contained a foreword by Tarnowski. I rushed greedily to this foreword, and there I found the desired key to the sanctuary before which I had stood in silent adoration. Without exaggeration I can say that this day remains written in my memory as one of the happiest days of my life. Tarnowski introduced me to Krasiński’s world of thoughts and this became the guide in life and my motivation to work.

By calling Tarnowski the depositor of the “key to the sanctuary”, Zdziechowski pointed to his enormous influence over his own academic life. This “world of Krasiński’s thoughts” accompanied him in his reading of Krasiński at almost every stage.

We also see Krasiński’s trace in Zdziechowski’s intellectual, specifically his academic path:

I won his [Tarnowski’s] heart with a chapter on Krasiński. How was he supposed to express his appreciation for the book and its author? There was, in his opinion, no greater honor for the young writer to have been introduced to Julian Klaczko and that is why he invited me to dinner with family.

The exaltation that Zdziechowski experienced is a clear sign of Tarnowski’s influence. Relations between professor and student were close from the beginning. Zdziechowski

---


21 Zdziechowski, Mesjaniści i słowianofilowie, 274.


shows his deep respect for Tarnowski when he mentions the scholar as a member of his
doctoral-exam committee:

[…]

Tarnowski was convinced that I would amaze the committee with my thorough knowledge
and mastery. “Please cross out – question one – the history of Krasiński’s thought”. I started trying
to remember what I had written in my book; my nerves were shattered, I couldn’t remember²⁴.

It is debatable whether Tarnowski could have been the direct cause of his incapacity
during the exam, but repeatedly in his recollections he drew attention to in-
stances when he felt he was failing his master. The text presented for the birthday cen-
tenary has become an invaluable source of knowledge about Tarnowski’s great impact
on Zdziechowski’s life, whose presence provided direction for Zdziechowski’s intellectual
and spiritual growth.

As Henryk Gradkowski notes, Tarnowski was a renowned researcher of Krasiński’s work
for nineteenth-century thinkers and remains so today²⁵. In the early 1960s, Jerzy Starnawski
wrote about the professor’s monograph: “Even today, Tarnowski’s book should be treat-
ed as most beautiful, although real only in parts and lacking comprehensive information
about Krasiński”²⁶. Starnawski, while indicating that his findings have become obsolete,
pays homage to the scholar’s teachings. The inevitable aging of Tarnowski’s works has also
encouraged the birth of the myth of “beautiful” writing about Krasiński.

Count Tarnowski’s name appears in Zdziechowski’s texts mainly when Przedświt
(Predawn) is under deliberation. A chapter in Wizja Krasińskiego, “Eschatologia
w Przedświcie” (Eschatology in Predawn) opens with a Tarnowski quotation. For Zdziechow-
ski the poem appears as “the crown and type of this prophetic poetry, the peak from which
the poetry will begin to come down, the flower in full bloom, after which the poetry will
begin to wither and fall; the poetry is the highest turning point”²⁷.

While reading Przedświt, Zdziechowski doesn’t misappropriate Tarnowski’s words
or depart much from them. He also saw Krasiński’s work as a blossoming of the phi-
losophy in “Syn cieniów” (Son of shadows), and in the treatise O Trójcy w Bogu i Trójcy
w człowieku (On the trinity in God and on the trinity in man). The different distribu-
tion of accents occurs only in the matter of a work’s assumed didacticism. According
to Gradkowski: “In the analysis [Tarnowski] highlighted the historiosophical signifi-
cance of the work. He stressed that from Przedświt this work, once philosophical, begins
to adopt the features of didacticism strongly supported by poetic inspiration”²⁸.

Zdziechowski, however, objected to calling this work a didactic-philosophical poem.
He suggested that it should be seen as a “vision of the poet and thinker at the same
time”, in which “patriotic and religious feelings, bathed, animated and strengthened

²⁵ Gradkowski, “Pierwsi monografie Zygmunta Krasińskiego”, 299.
²⁷ Zdziechowski, Wizja Krasińskiego, 78.
²⁸ Gradkowski, Pierwsi monografie Zygmunta Krasińskiego, 299.
in the depths of philosophy transforming the universe into a heroic epoch of the spirit, merged into a wonderful whole, in which love is the beginning and the end [...]”29. According to him, didacticism is a false trail that should give way to an analysis of the omnipresent feeling – a cosmic force that can move history forward towards the epoch of the spirit. However, both researchers noted the shift in Krasiński’s philosophy and politics.

There is a much more important discrepancy in their readings of Krasiński. Master and pupil each accorded a different place to “Syn cieniów” in the philosophical tradition. Tarnowski, as Zdziechowski wrote, wrongly denied this work any poetic value, stating that “the first chapter of Hegel would be equally good”30. According to Zdziechowski, Krasiński’s work should be linked to another German philosopher: Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling. His objection to Tarnowski’s position is extremely important, especially for the student, because it reveals the way in which he perceived both Krasiński and the entire tradition of German Romanticism.

The antinomy between Hegel and Schelling becomes a source of philosophical dispute while providing unexpected observations. In the context of Zdziechowski’s reading, this subject merits a separate discussion; here, it suffices to quote Wizja Krasińskiego:

In “Syn cieniów”, Krasiński has included the history of the human spirit coming out of nature and the unity with the Absolute occurring through greater transformations. But the longing for God is the strength that leads him and raises him. On the other hand, Hegel robbed God of all life by making Him an absolute idea, while in his system there was not and could not be any place for longing which begins with looking into the gap between creation and the Creator, the sense of separateness of man and God, and with drowning in the universe and man. This feeling only awoke in Schelling, and it absorbed Krasiński31.

Thus, while Zdziechowski did not refer directly to Tarnowski’s monograph, he was still influenced by Tarnowski’s thinking and did not remain indifferent to his worldview. This is of importance when considering two further monographs: those by Józef Kallenbach and Juliusz Kleiner.

**Krasiński – Zdziechowski – Kallenbach**

Reference to Józef Kallenbach can only be found in Zdziechowski’s footnote to Wizja Krasińskiego. Zdziechowski recalled Kallenbach’s findings concerning the year that Modlitewnik dla pani Joanny Bobrowej (Prayer Book for Mrs. Joanna Bobrowa) was published, describing Krasiński’s period in Rome. It is impossible to compare the presences of Kallenbach and Tarnowski in Zdziechowski’s texts. The impact of Tarnowski’s influence on Kallenbach is demonstrated through his apologetic attitude to Krasiński’s person and work. In his monograph’s introduction, Kallenbach wrote:

29 Zdziechowski, Wizja Krasińskiego, 77.  
30 Zdziechowski, Wizja Krasińskiego, 62.  
31 Zdziechowski, Wizja Krasińskiego, 63.
Whoever knows Krasiński’s poetry can only see one side of the temple of his spirit and is not able to guess the wonderful variety and size of the whole edifice.\(^{32}\)

As Kallenbach and Zdziechowski consider Krasiński’s utilization of the sublime, metaphorical figures become a common feature for both. Zdziechowski consistently referred to Krasiński’s works via the image of a sacred building. In *Mesjaniści i słowianofilowie*, he interpreted the bard’s poetry as “a single building, a Gothic temple sounding and crying with melodies shooting into the sky of arcades.”\(^{33}\) This view is repeated in a reading of he presented when he was seventy-four. He again referred to the “the sanctuary that he needed the key to.”\(^{34}\) The commonality of Zdziechowski’s and Kallenbach’s imagery characterizes their work, but also instigate further thought regarding the unity of the Romantic reading experience. In *Wizja Krasińskiego*, Zdziechowski allowed for this kind of unconscious, symmetrical movement of thoughts by considering the similarity between Schelling’s and Krasiński’s thought processes. He called it “an idea that comes from ‘the air,’” a “natural symptom of the spirit.”\(^{35}\)

The other side of this “Krasiński temple” about which Kallenbach wrote is the rich content of Krasiński’s correspondence. In this case, the scholar prepared his work based on valuable studies published at the initiative of the poet’s grandson, Count Adam Krasiński. Kallenbach referred to the publication of two volumes of the letters to Henry Reeve and Adam Sołtan, and the publication of French works from the poet’s Geneva period, excerpts from *Wanda*, *O Trójcy w Bogu i Trójcy w człowieku*, and a new critical edition of Krasiński’s writings edited by Tadeusz Pini.\(^{36}\) He had recourse to a much broader collection of source materials and studies than Tarnowski had. His archival work should therefore attract attention. Nevertheless, Kallenbach’s study highlights the objective nature of his research, as is noted by Gradkowski, who recalled that “at the end of his activity [Kallenbach] even attempted to restore [the poet’s father] Wincenty Krasiński’s honor, whose historical role in the Kingdom of Poland was perceived negatively by the general public.”\(^{37}\)

**Kraśiński – Zdziechowski – Kleiner**

The monograph by Juliusz Kleiner, *Zygmunt Krasiński. Dzieje myśli* (Zygmunt Krasiński: the history of thought) is far superior to Kallenbach’s work and in relation to Tarnowski’s findings appears to be unique.\(^{38}\) Kleiner was primarily interested in “the history of problems emerging from national, social, and personal life, or from the general

---

\(^{32}\) Józef Kallenbach, *Zygmunt Krasiński. Życie i twórczość lat młodych* (1812–1838), vol. 1 (Lwów [Lviv]: Księgarnia Polska Bernarda Połonieckiego, 1904), XIII.

\(^{33}\) Zdziechowski, *Mesjaniści i słowianofilowie*, 257.

\(^{34}\) Idem, *Zygmunt Krasiński*, op. cit., 5.

\(^{35}\) Zdziechowski, *Wizja Krasińskiego*, s. 43.

\(^{36}\) Kallenbach, *Zygmunt Krasiński*, ix–xvi.


mental atmosphere of the era\textsuperscript{39}. His is the first such extensive work devoted to Krasiński’s philosophical themes. Its framework is that of a dialogue Kleiner proposes, which Krasiński was to conduct with various European philosophers. Kleiner incorporated the poet’s works into a wide range of texts and ideas – from French materialism through German idealism to the circle of Polish messianism. Links between Krasiński’s thoughts and positions expressed by those philosophers greatly expand upon earlier studies. The extent of Kleiner’s research is illustrated by a passage describing relations between positions held by Krasiński and by two Polish Romantic philosophers, August Cieszkowski and Bronisław Trentowski:

In the cases of Krasiński and Cieszkowski, the trinity in man presents the same scheme – yet the replacement of the trinity “body, soul, self” with the trinity “body, soul, spirit” is not only a verbal difference. The concept of the spirit is higher and richer than Trentowski’s “self” and it draws its content from other sources\textsuperscript{40}.

However, Arkadiusz Bagłajewski accuses Kleiner of “the mechanics of the encyclopedic textualization of poetic and philosophical meanings of the work”, and points to a real possibility of interpretative abuse by the scholar\textsuperscript{41}. It is important to remember that almost a century separates the two researchers. From this perspective, Kleiner’s work on Krasiński’s oeuvre significantly contributes to the range of research into the poet’s philosophical worldview.

The reception of Kleiner’s study, published in 1912, is symptomatic of the time, being a thesis on the “history of the poet’s thought”. Zdziechowski’s Wizja Krasińskiego was announced at the same time, and both works emphasize the importance of studies inhabiting boundaries between poetry and philosophy – Trzy myśli Ligenzy (especially the poem “Syn cieniów”) and the treatise O stanowisku Polski z Bożych i ludzkich względów (On Poland’s Position of from godly and human reasons). Gradkowski also stressed that Kleiner saw these works as two elements of a triad, in which they were complemented by Przedświt. In his opinion, the works are united by the theme of the will’s apotheosis. A century after publication, the reception of Krasiński’s work appears to be moving towards a philological-philosophical synthesis.

While both Kleiner and Zdziechowski the philosophical aspects of Krasiński’s work, they take differing approaches to it. As with the opposition between Tarnowski and Zdziechowski, Kleiner interpreted “Syn cieniów” differently from the latter. For Kleiner, the poem was:

the full expression of a system, built on Hegelian foundations. Not of the Hegel system, because Krasiński was not a poetic translator of foreign thoughts; he felt the need to express them creatively only when he was convinced of attaining an independent position. He wrote “Syn cieniów”

\textsuperscript{39} Kleiner, Zygmunt Krasiński, vii.
\textsuperscript{40} Zdziechowski, Wizja Krasińskiego, 54.
\textsuperscript{41} Bagłajewski, Poezja „trzeciej epoki”, 256.
as a formulation of a worldview that he considered an improvement on and supplement to Hegel’s philosophy.\footnote{Kleiner, Zygmunt Krasiński, 333.}

In Kleiner’s words, the Hegelian, capacious vision of “Syn cieniów” finds its real basis in Cieszkowski’s philosophy. Thus Kleiner distanced himself from the position expressed by Tarnowski and by Zdziechowski, who, in contrast to both of them, emphasized Krasiński’s engagement with Schelling. While in the passage above Kleiner does not present Krasiński as enslaved by Hegel’s vision, Arkadiusz Bagłajewski reminds the reader that Krasiński-Hegel relationship was “as if it was the only one, proper for defining the specificity of the Polish philosopher’s thought”\footnote{Kleiner, Zygmunt Krasiński, 39.}. Maria Janion, studying Trzy myśli Ligenzy from a twentieth-century position, wrote that “the overwhelming need to rise above the randomness and passionate chaos of existence came from Krasiński’s inspiration from Hegel”\footnote{Maria Janion, “Krasiński – Mielikowski – Ligenza”, Pamiętnik Literacki 3 (1980), 124.}. The presence of the Hegelian system, which is in opposition to those of Giambattista Vico and of Schelling, seems problematic from a methodological point of view. However, Krasiński denied the validity of Hegelian thought in an 1839 letter to Edward Jaroszyński:

The old poet speaks to me: I want to wrap you and Hegel in a chain of devils, tie angels with wreaths; I want to bring all the fairy tales of the human kind to the position of truth... \footnote{Zygmunt Krasiński, Listy do Cieszkowskiego, Jaroszyńskiego, Trentowskiego, vol. 2, ed. Zbigniew Sudolski (Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1988), 29.}

Here Kleiner emphasizes the specific “inadequacy” of the Hegelian system. The hermetic philosophical deduction is contrasted with “fairy tales of the human kind”. Krasiński’s desire to present Hegel’s thought as moralistic is obvious in his letter to Jaroszyński. In Wizja Krasińskiego, Zdziechowski is concerned with the possibility of improving on those concepts. The perspective of “translation” or rather “transfiguration” allowed him to interpret “Syn cieniów” as a work that wasn’t even Hegelian. He did not perceive the protagonist’s evolution, his path to divine light, according to Hegel’s dialectics, but considered it instead in accordance with Schelling’s vision. Finding an affinity between Krasiński’s thought and that of Schelling, he stated that “Son of shadow is the man who is the triumph of Logos’s light in the struggle against resistant darkness”\footnote{Zdziechowski, Wizja Krasińskiego, 64.}.

**Conclusions**

The dialogue between Marian Zdziechowski and the work of Zygmunt Krasiński, along with further studies discussed above, leads to a fundamental revision of the Polish Romantic model. Thanks to Krasiński, Zdziechowski adopted a specific paradigm: ethical, historiosophical, eschatological. In Krasiński’s writings, Zdziechowski, according to Artur Żywołek, followed a “polyphonic arrangement of motifs of disintegration,
annihilation, night (darkness), pain, suffering and evil”\textsuperscript{47}. However, this pessimistic worldview finds its antithesis in the “eschatological vigil”, a patient attitude in the search for the New Jerusalem. Krasiński’s thought resonates clearly with his times’ philosophical traditions. Thus Zdziechowski, in his analyses, built parallels with Polish and German philosophical systems of the period. A major exponent of Krasiński’s oeuvre, the philosopher of catastrophe studied the Romantic poet’s work as a subject for research while also seeing Krasiński as an ideological guide whose philosophical attitude, sociopolitical thought, and religious sensitivity enabled him to construct his own worldview. Krasinski’s works can seem a spiritual basis for fighting Bolshevism, as indicated by the title of one Zdziechowski article. When the philosopher gave his last reading about Krasiński in 1936, he warned against “a stor

For Zdziechowski, the Bolshevik Revolution meant the historical intervention of negative forces, whose task was to “completely uproot from the human soul all thought of God and thus kill the longing for a greater life, and to destroy everything in the world that is the visible expression of this longing, starting with the temple of God”\textsuperscript{49}.

This essay has traced the history of Zdziechowski’s engagement with the work of Krasiński. The path of initiation was marked on one hand by subsequent works of his own, and on the other by positions taken by Krasiński scholars, a constant point of reference for Zdziechowski. Through his readings, he did not simply attempt to outline the poet-philosopher’s worldview. The analysis and interpretation of his works served Zdziechowski in recontextualizing them (a kind of reenvisioning, reconstruction, and perhaps even revitalization). Marking out Krasiński’s “perimonographical” circle of reception served to highlight the methodological order and multifaceted recognition. The reason for introducing various contexts, sometimes quite distant from reception history in the strictest sense, was to achieve a reading of the poet’s works in the context of Polish Romanticism’s characteristic philosophical and literary dualism.

Reflections from between 1882 and 1912 are evidence of Zdziechowski’s evolution as a researcher of Krasiński and as a thinker. This summary of thirty years of Zdziechowski’s engagement with Krasiński’s texts demonstrates that it was an exceptional time for both thinkers. For Zdziechowski, it was a period of development into the role of Cassandra-like prophet and political moralist. For Krasiński’s reception, it was a difficult period associated with unjustified silence and inappropriate ideologization. Zdziechowski thus remains one of the earliest scholars of Krasiński and the one who brought his work and thought into the twentieth century.

\textbf{This article in Polish version was published in \textit{Tekstualia} 3 (50), 2017, 85–100.}

\textsuperscript{47} Żywiołek, “Wypatrywanie Miasta Bożego”. 517.
\textsuperscript{48} Zdziechowski, \textit{Zygmunt Krasiński}, 17.
**Bibliography**


Zdziechowski, Marian. “Idealy Mickiewicza i Krasińskiego a słowianofilstwo rosyjskie”. Kraj, nos. 5–7 (1882).


Zdziechowski, Marian. Żygmunt Krasiński (Odczyt wygłoszony w Berlinie 11 grudnia 1935 r., powtórzony w Wilnie w przekładzie polskim). Wilno [Vilnus]: Drukarnia Archidiecezjalna, 1936.


Roussanka Alexandrova-Nowakowska, Work from the *Pegasus* cycle