

Adam Karpiński
Institute of Literary Research,
Polish Academy of Sciences
Warsaw

Wiesław Pawlak
The John Paul II
Catholic University of Lublin

Humanism and Philology¹

Our research into the philological dimension of humanism, carried out within the framework of the project *Humanism in Polish Culture*, must begin, naturally, by establishing, or at least trying to establish, the meaning of the terms and ideas whose functioning we are to examine – meanings that derived from the Greek language, were consolidated and particularized by Latin and Latin culture, transformed during the Middle Ages and finally assimilated into European culture by the Renaissance.² Among these terms the keywords would seem to be *philology* and *philologist* (Polish: *filologia*, *filolog*) which came to mean approximately what they mean today only in late antiquity; and we may follow this process by tracing the relationships between these terms and other terms such as *criticism* (Polish: *krytyka*) and especially *grammar* (*gramatyka*), which was also treated as the study of literature (*inter alia* by the Stoics). *Philology* remained for a long time an ambiguous term that could include the whole field of study embraced by the system of seven liberal arts, as is clear from Martianus Capella's work *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*. Thus in the twilight years of antiquity the polysemy of the originally Greek word was heard again. It would continue to resonate following antiquity until the 12th century, after which Martianus Capella's work declined in popularity.

The crystallization of the term *philology* in the meaning close to the one it has today took place in relation to Renaissance humanism. It is enough to recall the works of Paul Oskar Kristeller, who removed much of the philosophical ballast from the notion of humanism and steered it

1 This chapter presents a summary of the research published in the collective volume *Humanism and Philology* (*Humanizm i filologia*), ed. A. Karpiński (Warsaw: Neriton, 2011).

2 J. Domański, *Filologia a humanizm. Starożytne precedensy humanistycznej koncepcji filologii*, in: *Humanizm i filologia*.

in the direction of philological interests and pursuits.³ In Kristeller's conception of humanism the status of the Renaissance humanists is defined quite precisely: they were first and foremost philologists, i.e. "scholars and users of classical languages and literatures." In a short chapter such as this where space is limited, it is not possible to even give a brief outline of the scope and outcomes of the humanists' philological or paraphilological activities, study of languages, recovery of the Greek heritage, and research into the accuracy of Latin texts. In the field of source criticism, a work that is especially important in demonstrating the working tools of a humanist-philologist is of course Lorenzo Valla's *De falso credita et ementita Constantini donatione*, from which modern textual criticism may be said to have begun. A figure of particular importance for many reasons is Erasmus of Rotterdam, the enormity of whose achievements as a humanist-philologist is hard to grasp: his editorial activities, work on sources, commentaries. The Renaissance period shows a humanist to have been someone who exploited the antique heritage, who treated philology as the acquisition, publication, study and commentary of the writings above all of antique classical and Christian authors, and who combined these activities with his own creative writing, which imitated and emulated those same antique authors. The fruit of the philological work of the humanists is not only a new style, i.e. in relation to the Middle Ages, in their own works and in the Greek texts they translated into Latin; philology, or *studia antiquitatis*, extended beyond the study of merely language and literature and tried to penetrate deep into the mentality of the past, thus helping to construct a modern approach above all to history, to the past.

The context of the European Renaissance and the reconstruction of the relationship between humanism and philology are essential background for understanding and describing Polish Renaissance humanist philology, which is clearly a crucial presence in Polish culture; though it is also important to maintain a balance between European Renaissance and specifically Polish features.

Here the ideas of Kristeller, who associates humanism closely with philology and the idea of *studia humanitatis*, again prove to be useful. Our object of investigation is thus the rather narrow "domain of issues that were nevertheless an important component of the activity of educated people in the 16th century: the philological preparation of texts by antique authors; interest in the textual problems that formed the basis of such editorial work; and finally the so-called *antiquitates*, which were

3 P.O. Kristeller, *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters*, vol. 1-4 (Roma, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1956-1996).

closely linked to the interpretation of texts but also demanded knowledge in the fields of history and archaeology.”⁴ Evidence of these philological interests is the activity of several professors at the Kraków Academy (Akademia Krakowska) in the first half of the 16th century. Jan Ursinus, Jan Sommerfeld the Elder (Aesticampianus) and Wawrzyniec Korwin (Laurentius Corvinus or Laurentius Rabe) were admirers of antique literature and of a refined Latin style. In their lectures they commented on the works of Roman authors and published compendia of practical stylistics: the first two produced textbooks on how to write letters (*Modus epistolandi*); the third published a collection of examples demonstrating how to write correctly, which was reissued in many subsequent editions and entitled *Hortulus elegantiarum* (1502). The interests of another professor in the Faculty of Arts John of Oświęcim (Sacranus) developed in a similar direction. A pupil of Francesco Filelfo and John Argyropoulos, Sacranus attracted listeners as a commentator on Cicero and compiled his own *Modus epistolandi* (1507). The activities of these scholars may be treated as imitations of the early stages of Italian humanism, whose typical example of a compendium on style and rhetoric was Lorenzo Valla’s work *Elegantiae linguae Latinae*. From the second decade of the 15th century the influence of Erasmus of Rotterdam became increasingly evident in the intellectual life of Kraków, including the Academy. Earlier exponents of Erasmus had been the itinerant scholars, such as the Englishman Leonard Cox or the Swiss Valentin Eck.⁵ Interest in the works of Erasmus of Rotterdam grew rapidly among educated people; some managed to gain lecturing posts at the Academy. Thanks to these propagators, a Latin style modelled on that of Erasmus began to be popularized already by the 1520s. The genres of expression used by Erasmus (the dialogue, the letter) likewise became popular; but what is most important is that the ideal adopted by Erasmus of *bonae litterae* – the humanist model of education based on the study of antique authors – became universally accepted. This model was realized by *inter alia* Wojciech Nowopolczyk (Albertus Novicampianus, c. 1504–1559) and Szymon Marycjusz of Pilzno (1516–1574).

The most interesting achievements in Polish philology took place in the third quarter of the 16th century and were associated with the studies undertaken by Polish scholars at Italian universities and their contacts with the scholarly communities there. The activities of several hu-

4 J.S. Gruchala, *Polska renesansowa filologia humanistyczna. Filologowie polscy czasów renesansu wobec problemu tekstu i języka*, in: *Humanizm i filologia*.

5 J. Glomski, *Patronage and Humanist Literature in the Age of the Jagiellons: Court and Career in the Writings of Rudolf Agricola Junior, Valentin Eck and Leonard Cox* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007).

manist philologists deserve attention: Stanisław Iłowski, translator of the works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Demetrius of Phaleron; Franciszek Masłowski; Andrzej Petrycy Nidecki (editor of *Fragmentorum M. Tullii Ciceronis libri IV*, Venice 1561, 1565); Jan Zamoyski (*De senatu Romano libri duo*, Venice 1563); Jan Kochanowski as a scholar of Aratus (*M.T. Ciceronis Aratus ad Graecum exemplar expensus et locis mancis restitutus*, Kraków 1579); Jakub Górski, author of textbooks on rhetoric and commentator on Cicero; Benedykt Herbest, editor and biographer of Cicero (*M.T. Ciceronis epistolarum libri IV*, Kraków 1561; *M.T. Ciceronis vita e scriptis et verbis eiusdem descripta*, Kraków 1561); and also the distinguished Hellenist and Hebrew scholar Stanisław Grzepski (*De multiplici siclo et talento hebraico, item de mensuris hebraicis tam aridorum quam liquidorum*, Antwerp 1568). The discovery of St John Chrysostom's unknown homilies (*De divitiis et paupertate; De non contemnenda Ecclesia Dei et mysteriis; De Anima, De ignavia et ebrietate; De humilitate; De adversa valetudine et medicis* Kraków 1541; *Orationes duae: de humilitate animi et de uxore et pulchritudine*, Kraków 1545) and their translation into Latin brought Marcin Kromer international fame. Similarly, the Latin translations of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* made the Jesuit, Stanisław Warszewicki famous throughout Europe (*Aethiopicae historiae libri decem*, Basel 1552, Antwerp 1556). A separate area is biblical philology, the fruits of which included no less than five translations of the Bible into Polish from the original languages.⁶ The twilight of Renaissance humanism was marked by the activities of several professors at the Kraków and Zamość Academies. Stanislaus of Marzenin (Marenius, died 1580) was one of the last scholars to know all three ancient languages (Hebrew, Greek and Latin). Adam Burski (died 1611), a professor at the Zamość Academy achieved fame thanks to his work *Dialectica Ciceronis* (Zamość 1604), in which he gathered together and edited fragments relating to Stoic logic. Also in Zamość, Szymon Birkowski published in 1602 a Greek edition with his own translation into Latin of the work *De collocatione verborum* by Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Another philologist who drew on the best models was the poet Szymon Szymonowic (Simon Simonides), who published an edition of the commentary on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* by Pseudo-Herennius, again in the original Greek with Simonides' own Latin translation (*Enarratio in Metaphysica*, Zamość 1604). A continuation and at the same time crowning of Renaissance philological scholarship was the activity of Szymon Starowolski (Starovolscius, 1588–1656), collector

6 D.A. Frick, *Polish Sacred Philology in the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation: Chapters in the History of the Controversies (1551–1632)* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).

of tomb inscriptions and compiler of bio-bibliographical dictionaries (*inter alia: Scriptorum Polonicorum Hekatontas*, Frankfurt am Main, 1625).

A separate, perhaps even the most important element in the overall picture of Polish humanism and Polish Renaissance philology is the legacy of Jan Kochanowski. Kochanowski's output may be regarded both as the crowning and the consequence of philological thinking, and as an example of the approach of an exceptionally gifted writer who defined himself and his literary ambitions in relation to tradition. As Jerzy Mańkowski writes:

When we seek the most apt definition or term, with which we might describe this figure—conceived as someone distinct from the historically existing Jan Kochanowski the poet—i.e. the figure, to whom we have assigned the task of acquainting us with the heritage of antique literature and selecting from it items worthy of creative imitation, then the word that immediately springs to mind is “philologist.”⁷

This philological side to the great poet manifests itself in at least three ways, which are by no means exhaustive. The first manifestation of Kochanowski's philological sensibility is his search for themes “above and beyond the divisions separating times and cultures.” Kochanowski looks at traces of ancient cultures preserved in literature from the point of view of his own times. The result of this approach was his discovery in the literature of antiquity of records that were surprisingly relevant to his own times and to Polish culture; see for example his *Song of Saint John's Eve* (*Pieśń świętojańska o Sobótce*), the *frasca* or “trifle” entitled *The Priest* (*O kapłanie*), or *Threnody XII* of his *Threnodies* or *Laments* (*Treny*). The second feature of Kochanowski the philologist comes to light when we examine closely those works or fragments that could be recognized as translations, but translations which uncover in a quite specific way values conferred in the antique tradition and which render them relevant to the poet's own times, thereby discovering a sense beyond the literal. In other words, what may seem to be an end in itself, i.e. the straightforward translation of a literary work, turns out to be merely a point of departure, a *modus operandi* in relation to the translator's fundamental aim of enriching his own culture through the transferral and assimilation of an important work of the past; see for example Kochanowski's *Songs* (*Pieśni*), Psalm 42 of his *David's Psalter* (*Psalterz Dawidów*), the opening verses of *Fenomena*—his translation of Aratus' *Phenomena*, or Menelaus'

⁷ J. Mańkowski, *Jan Kochanowski – filolog (ustalenia, pytania, perspektywy)*, in: *Humanizm i filologia*.

prayer in *Monomachia: the Duel between Paris and Menelaus* (*Monomachija Parysowa z Menelausem*). We gain our third and perhaps most perfect image of Kochanowski the questing philologist in his tragedy *The Dismissal of the Grecian Envoys* (*Odprawa posłów greckich*). In every detail as well as in the design of the whole, the drama is an excellent example of how the poet constructs out of his assembled resources—taken from a variety of authors and texts—a work which possesses nothing of the randomness of a miscellany and does not make obvious to the reader its genetically diverse components; the latter always make up a coherent whole, an organic unity. Without appreciating the contribution made by Kochanowski the philologist, it is not possible to fully understand the poet: as a result of the philologist's intervention, the more than thousand-year achievement of ancient literature is able to infiltrate the new poetry. The participation of both philologist and poet in the creative process cannot be separated; their roles should nevertheless be differentiated. Without his superb knowledge of classical literature Kochanowski's own work would have been quite different—we would not have had the Kochanowski we have today.

It was not only studies of antique literature or the work of philologist-poets that contributed to the philological dimension of Renaissance culture in Poland, but also the developments in publishing and printing, which made possible and provided the impetus for the production of works on linguistics, translations and editorial undertakings, as well as the no less important education of subsequent generations of users of antique literature. Printing in the Renaissance period has often been the object of specialized studies; here we wish to indicate some of the issues demarcated by the relationship between humanism and philology, and above all the philological awareness that we have discerned among Polish typographers.⁸ Polish humanists educated at European universities began to practice the art and craft of printing, sometimes in cooperation with authors whose writings represented Renaissance ideas and modern approaches to writing. We know that the first typographer in Wrocław (Breslau), Kasper Elyan (1435–1486), studied from 1451, with various interruptions, in Leipzig, Kraków and Erfurt, and gained two bachelor's degrees. Hieronim Wietor, the most distinguished Polish typographer of the first half of the 16th century, gained a bachelor's degree in liberal arts from the Kraków Academy in 1499, but acquired his professional skills and experience in Vienna, an important centre of humanist culture. Wietor's workshop was to be the first typographic enterprise in the Polish

8 J. Krauze-Karpińska, *Polscy drukarze wieku XVI a filologia humanistyczna*, in: *Humanizm i filologia*.

lands dedicated to promoting humanist ideas and values. Polish humanists as well as foreign humanists active in Poland deposited their works first and foremost with Wietor, regarding him as an accomplished practitioner in the art of printing who guaranteed the high quality of the books he released onto the market. A good example on Polish soil of the humanist and publisher rolled into one was Jan Januszowski.

Proof of the humanist interests and profession competence of these printers is the scale of their publishing of classical works, both Latin and Greek, as well as Bibles. Brought to Kraków from Metz by Jan Haller, Kasper Hochfeder was responsible for the printing of Hesiod's *Georgicarum liber* in the Latin translation by Nicolaus de Valle (Kraków 1505). Florian Ungler released from his first printing house editions of Aristotle's *Oeconomicorum libri duo* in Leonardo Bruni's Latin translation and *De anima* (1512), Cicero's *Partitiones oratoriae* (1513) and Plutarch's *De libris educandis* (1514). Editions of classical authors increases in the following years, when a clear preponderance of Latin works becomes evident. The number of works published in Greek in the 16th and at the beginning of the 17th century does not exceed twenty, and these were relatively minor works in the main. Apart from the antique authors there was no shortage of works in the printers' lists representing contemporary humanist literature. Poggio Bracciolini's *Facetiae* were already published in Wrocław in the 15th century. Further publications of this kind appeared in the 16th century, including those by Franciscus Niger, Leonardo Bruni, Pomponius Laetus, Francesco Filelfo, Marcantonio Sabellico, Lazzaro Bonamico and the Viennese humanists Joachim Vadianus and Philipp Gundelius. Finally, Erasmus of Rotterdam was also published; his works were printed by Wietor, who until 1526 in fact possessed the exclusive right to publish his works (twenty-two editions in all); by Maciej Szarfenberg, the typographer of thirteen books by Erasmus, as well as by other printers.

Of particular interest in this context is the technical potential of the Polish presses which allowed this kind of editorial initiative to be realized, above all the supply of typographical materials: good typefaces and decorative or ornamental elements. The first to use an Italian-style typeface (modelled on Strasbourg prints) was Florian Ungler, who deliberately chose it to print modern humanist texts: treatises, poetical works, dedications and titles. From the beginning of 1515 Jan Haller was using the new Antiqua typeface (that year he used it to print Cicero's *Laelius sive de amicitia*). Antiqua type of the Venetian Renaissance kind was introduced to Kraków by Hieronim Wietor. He was also the first to use Aldus Manutius' italic font in the printing of a work by Erasmus of Rotterdam *Opus de conscribendi epistolis* (Kraków 1523), and was likewise

the first to supply his workshop (in 1522) with a Greek typeface. In addition, it is worth noting that the printing houses of Florian Ungler, Maciej Szarfenberg, Hieronim Wietor and Maciej Wirzbięta also had Hebrew type at their disposal.

From the point of view of the relationship between printing and philology, the philological effort made by 16th-century typographers is undoubtedly also connected with the publication of literature written in the Polish language, which was being supplied to the printers in ever greater quantities by Polish authors. This required dealing with the fact that the orthography of Polish had not yet been consolidated. How some sounds in spoken Polish should be written down was not yet fully established, which meant that the most suitable typefaces for Polish had also not been decided upon. These efforts, dictated by concern about linguistic accuracy, are visible in the initiatives taken to print compendia of the language: treatises on grammar and orthography; but they are also visible, and admittedly to varying degrees, in publishers' editorial practices which thus forced the standardization of the orthography and the correction of perceived errors. Examples of this philological concern about linguistic correctness in printed texts, as well as their elegance and fidelity to the author's intentions, are some of the books printed Florian Ungler, Maciej Szarfenberg and Maciej Wirzbięta, although many works published at the same time indicate a lack of such care in the behaviour of other printing houses. At lot depended in this respect on the status of the author of the text; proof of this are the editions of Jan Kochanowski's works, about which his publishers—Mateusz Siebeneicher, Łazarz Andrysowicz and above all Jan Januszowski—cared more than they did about the works of other authors.

In the light of phenomena we have analysed in our research, however, a general assessment of the philological initiatives and competence of Polish typographers appears ambiguous. A barrier to the development of Polish printing as an instrument of humanist philology was its low productivity. The size of the production of Polish printing houses was not impressive and cannot be compared with the leading printing centres of Europe. In the 16th century 3450 editions were published in Kraków, whereas only about 750 were issued by provincial centres, which together amount to a little over 4000 publications on not quite 60,000 printed sheets. All the domestic workshops put together produced a total of between 3.5 and 4 million copies of books during the course of the 16th century. The entire output of Europe during this time is estimated to have been between 150 and 200 thousand editions and between 150 and 200 million copies. The percentage produced by Polish printing houses is therefore not impressive. For this reason *inter alia*

many works by Polish authors never saw publication in domestic editions. Quality also appears to have been uneven; this could be for political reasons (insufficient interest on the part of successive rulers), social reasons (a limited demand for books in general), religious reasons (censorship) and – most importantly – economic reasons (lack of capital and an insufficiently developed system of patronage).

Humanist education occupies an important place in reflection on the interrelationship between humanism and philology – a theme which is significant if only because the reform of schooling was one of the most important postulates of Renaissance humanism.⁹ In accordance with the main direction taken by the intellectual interests of the age, pedagogy, as the next area to be addressed by scholars of philology, demanded a new educational model based on thorough knowledge of the three ancient languages (Hebrew, Greek and Latin) and the in-depth reading and interpretation of classical authors, to which the study of grammar was to lead along with a basic grounding in poetics and rhetoric. The proposed model was to concentrate above all on secondary-school education, which was responsible for the teaching of Latin, the basics of Greek and less often of Hebrew. In order to be able to meet their aims defined in this way, schools not only made use of already existing materials but created the need for new ones: phrase-books, textbooks for learning grammar, poetics and rhetoric, dictionaries, collections of proverbs and sayings, and other linguistic compendia; also compendia of knowledge relating to the culture of antiquity, as well as corrected editions and constant new analyses of the works of the classical authors included in the canon of recommended reading.

This ambitious educational programme was put into practice in the new type of humanist school in various countries in Europe, one of its main legislators being the Protestant educational reformer Johannes Sturm (Ioannes Sturmius). In Poland, among the schools of the new type, the college founded in Poznań (1519) by Jan Lubrański is especially worthy of note; it experienced its main flourishing after 1529 thanks to the arrival of Krzysztof Hegendorfer (Christoph Hegendorf) from Leipzig. Important centres of philological education were also the gymnasia in Elbląg, Gdańsk, Toruń and Chełmno in Pomerania, which promptly came under the influence of the Reformation. The new educational currents also reached the provinces. The fully humanist programme of instruction elaborated by Sturm was obligatory, for example, in the school founded by Mikołaj Firlej in today's Lubartów in the Lublin voivodeship. An im-

9 M. Piskała, *Filologiczna edukacja i humanistyczne szkolnictwo w XVI i XVII wieku w Polsce*, in: *Humanizm i filologia*.

portant centre from the point of view of humanist education was also the Academy in Zamość, officially opened in 1595.

The crowning of the philological model of schooling was the system offered by the Society of Jesus, whereby the collegium became the model for other schools responsible for the teaching of languages and literature. The first collegia in the Polish lands were opened in 1565 (Braniewo, Pułtusk); more came into being in the following years, including the one in Vilnius (Wilno) which was raised to the status of an academy (i.e. university) in 1579. In the mid-17th century there were already approximately 40,000 such schools, widely disseminating and popularizing elements of humanist literary culture. The initial stage of the order's educational activity manifested itself not only in the expansion in the number of collegia, but also in the Jesuits' compilation of their own modern—because they made use of the achievements of Renaissance philologists—textbooks, such as *Grammaticarum institutionum libri III* (Lisbon 1572) by the Portuguese Jesuit Emmanuel Alvarez; or *Poeticarum institutionum libri tres* by the specialist in poetics Jacob Pontanus (Ingolstadt 1594); or *De arte rhetorica libri II* by the rhetorician Cyprian Soarez (Coimbra 1560). An important role was also played by new critical analyses of antique authors adapted for the needs of schools in line with the Counter-Reformation ideology promulgated by the order (for example, M. Valerius Martialis, *Selecta epigrammata, in usum studiosorum Societatis Iesu*, Antwerp 1595). Also important was the uniform system that defined the principles of study and the organization of school life. The school programme compiled by the Jesuits (*Ratio studiorum*) and finally accepted in 1599 fulfilled, on the one hand, the hopes invested in it for regulating already existing schools; on the other, however, it led to the ossification of the curriculum, textbooks and lists of recommended reading that had been adopted as though forever. Further development was also not helped by the fact that all the teaching staff had been educated according to this same model. Eventually this led to a deep crisis in these schools, which the order tried to rectify only in the 18th century. The stagnation in humanist education based on philological studies did not affect exclusively Jesuit schools. Jan Amos Komenský (Comenius) also responded to the strong need felt in the mid-17th century for educational reform, by proposing a new method for learning languages based on visualization. But Comenius was already a representative of a new epoch that attached greater importance to the real world than it did to the world concealed within the complexities of style of the ancient authors.

From the philological perspective, Old Polish literary culture reaches the high point of its development during the Renaissance, i.e. at

the beginning of the early modern period, and when seen from this point of view, the 17th century could be treated as a time of stagnation and even regression. It is worth paying attention, however, to certain 17th-century developments, including the literary translations made at that time of antique writers.¹⁰ Most interesting are those translations in which glossaries and notes on the text – which themselves exploit the extensive commentaries of earlier Renaissance editions – provide evidence of the philological tools of the translators. Examples of such translations accompanied by extensive glossaries are two works published at the beginning of the 17th century: the translation of the odes and epodes of Horace by Sebastian Petrycy entitled *Horatius Flaccus in the Hardships of a Moscow Prison* (*Horatius Flaccus w trudach więzienia moskiewskiego*) published in 1609; and a Polish version of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* by Walerian Otwinowski published in 1638. The basic source for Petrycy's notes was the commentary by Dionysius Lambinus (Denis Lambin, 1520–1572) to an edition of Horace published in 1561, while Otwinowski used the commentaries of Raphael Regius (or Raffaele Regio, c. 1440–1520) entitled *In Ovidii Metamorphosin enarrationes*, which were published for the first time in 1493. Both Polish authors mostly make use of abbreviated versions of the notes provided by these scholars, incorporating them into their own explanatory notes, but in radically different ways. Petrycy does not confine himself to explaining the historical realia evident in Horace's lyrics. His notes on his own polonizations and updatings display an equal passion for glossology. A commentary constructed in this way, however, places an undue emphasis on the translated text itself, affording it a similar value to the Latin original. The direct opposite of a commentary conceived in this way are the more disciplined explanations provided by Otwinowski. In editing the notes of the earlier humanist scholars, the translator constantly remembers that his translation is directed at pupils whose Latin is too weak to read the texts in the original. In his commentary he therefore becomes an ambassador for antique culture, which he not only reveals in all its richness, but to which he also tries to give a new sense by grafting the pagan mythology onto contemporary Christian realia, thus allowing the *Metamorphoses* to exist in the ideological context of the Counter-Reformation. Despite their significant differences, the glossarial and translating ambitions of Otwinowski and Petrycy have features in common which clearly distinguish their commentaries from the earlier ones on which they are based. The authors of scholia on works of antique authors tried to explain the foreign text, passed down to them

10 R. Grzeškowiak, *Humanitas w translacji. Komentarze staropolskich przekładów pisarzy antycznych na przełomie XVI i XVII wieku i ich humanistyczne źródła*, in: *Humanizm i filologia*.

by the literary tradition. The two Baroque translators represent opposing positions yet both feel bound to explain their own translations, including their deficiencies. Often the translation of the lyric verse loses its coherence, and so the commentary enables lack of faithfulness to the original text or even lack of clarity in the translation to be explained away. It would also seem that the translation work and the philological tools engaged to support it are subordinated to the overriding principle of accessibility, suitability and usefulness for purely didactic purposes.

The conclusions that emerge from our analyses of the translations by Petrycy and Otwinowski take on their proper significance when seen in the wider perspective, which demonstrates how the tasks of philology changed in the 17th century, when precisely usefulness became the most desirable value; when philological-literary studies disappeared and practical dictionaries and compendia enjoyed relative popularity; when the Renaissance model of humanist education *homo trium linguarum* was transformed into that of the Latinist-practitioner.¹¹ This model was popularized by the unusually rich supply of compendia typical of the age. These were collections of various types of extract from classical texts, which had a very long and rich tradition and consisted of maxims and dictums, anecdotes, exempla or moralizing stories, for which the models were the anthologies of Valerius Maximus, Aulus Gellius and Joannes Stobaeus as well as the Renaissance florilegia and *loci communes*.¹² Examples of such publications were *Apophtegmata* compiled by Bieniasz Budny (1599) and *Narrationes, sententiae, similia. Ex libris M. Tullii Ciceronis* compiled by Szymon Piechowicz (1611). Manifestations of philological interests were also the collections of proverbs, aphorisms and moral advice, such as *Proverbiorum Polonicorum collectorum centuriae decem et octo* compiled by Salomon Rysiński (1618). We may also place in this category the biographical dictionaries of Szymon Starowolski as well as his impressive collection of tomb inscriptions entitled *Monumenta Sarmatarum* (1655). Encyclopaedias of symbols were particularly popular as were, linked to these, collections of emblems. Dictionaries deserve special attention because of their practical applications, one of the most important being Grzegorz Knapski's (Gregorius Cnapius) *Thesaurus Polonolatinograecus seu Promptuarium linguae Latinae et Graecae* (1621). The encyclopaedism characteristic of the 17th century found its fullest expression only in the 18th century with Benedykt Chmielowski's *New Athens* (*Nowe Ateny*, 1st edn 1745–1746, 2nd edn 1754–1764). All these and similar

11 B. Milewska-Ważbińska, *Filologia praktyczna i kultura łacińska XVII wieku*, in: *Humanizm i filologia*.

12 A. Moss, *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).

works found their application within the ubiquitous cult of Latin treated, again in practical terms, as the second language of the Sarmatian *szlachta*. The Renaissance *humanitas* was gradually transformed into the 17th-century Latin culture of *latinitas*, which cultivated the connection with antiquity on quite a different basis from before.¹³

The next and extremely important chapter in the history of the relationship between humanism and philology is the age of Enlightenment.¹⁴ The manifestations in this period of humanist philological awareness were: on the one hand, the general characteristics of the age, including above all the new Enlightened editorial approaches, the movement to expand publishing and libraries, initiatives in the compilation of new dictionaries, the attitude to books generally, attempts to codify the language; and on the other, the transformations in the way authors thought about themselves as authors and about their own literary work in all its aspects, and hence about those areas where the close connection between the elements of the triad: author – work – text, becomes apparent. These two separate roads intersect at a certain moment in history; and this is the precisely the place where the new philological consciousness of the epoch finds its fullest expression.

In the first area, which could be described as something of a return to the philological perspectives of the Renaissance, the activities of the intellectual circles associated with the Załuski brothers – Andrzej Stanisław Załuski and Józef Andrzej Załuski – are particularly deserving of attention: editions of historical sources and of literary classics, publication of primary sources, interest in all aspects of the book and book collecting. The culmination of these activities was the opening in 1747 in Warsaw of the Załuski Library (Biblioteka Załuskich), a library open to the public, one of the largest public libraries in Europe, which fulfilled at one and the same time the functions of a national library and a working tool for scholarly research. The large number of studies on classical Latin literature and the widely conceived translation work of the period should be seen as phenomena similar to those familiar from Renaissance times. Among the group of distinguished translators were the poet Franciszek Dionizy Kniaźnin and other ex-Jesuits: Józef Epifani Minasowicz, Ignacy Nagurczewski, Nikodem Muśnicki. And among the most important translations we should mention the *Complete Works (Dzieła wszystkie)* of Tacitus (by Adam Stanisław Naruszewicz) and of Homer's *Iliad* (by

13 Cf. J. Axer, *Latin as the Second Language of the Polish Republic's Noblemen's Nation*, in: *Terra Marique. The Cultural Intercourse between the European Center and Periphery in Modern Time*, ed. J. Kieniewicz (Warsaw: OBTA UW, 2001).

14 T. Chachulski, *O humanistycznej świadomości filologicznej w dobie Oświecenia*, in: *Humanizm i filologia*.

Franciszek Ksawery Dmochowski). A new aspect of publishing was the appearance of critical editions of Polish writers of the late Jagiellonian period (to 1572) and even of more recent writers. Hence Adam Stanisław Naruszewicz and Franciszek Bohomolec published the Latin writings of Maciej Kazimierz Sarbiewski including *inedita*; and new editions appeared of works by Jan Dantyszek (Joannes Dantiscus), Klemens Janicki (Clemens Ianicius) and Szymon Szymonowic (Simon Simonides). Meanwhile Franciszek Dionizy Kniaźnin translated into Latin the most important (in his opinion) works of Jan Kochanowski – the poem *Muse* (*Muza*) and his *Threnodies* or *Laments* (*Treny*). Of special importance were the continuing developments in printing, and in the book trade and book distribution; and also the new high standards in critical editing, of which the most obvious manifestation was the conscientious, detailed attention paid to the standard of language in the published texts. Evidence of these tendencies are the collected and critical editions made by Michał Gröll and later by Franciszek Ksawery Dmochowski and Tadeusz Mostowski; editions of antique classics or Polish-language classics led by the works of Kochanowski; anthologies, lexicons and monographs. We should also note the crucial process of passing from poetics via bibliography to the textbook of literary history – to the type of work compiled by Józef Andrzej Załuski and Jan Daniel Janocki, and towards the end of the period by Michał Hieronim Juszyński and Feliks Bentkowski. Another important expression of philological awareness was the lively debate surrounding the national language and its relation to Latin or French. Connected with this debate was the publication of various lexicographical works of which the crowning was Samuel Bogumił Linde's (1807–1815) *Dictionary of the Polish Language* (*Słownik języka polskiego*), and also of textbooks of grammar, of which the most important was Onufry Kopczyński's *Grammar for National Schools* (*Gramatyka dla szkół narodowych*, 1778–1781).

The second area where the philological awareness of the Enlightenment manifests itself is connected with the birth of a new type of literary self-consciousness, with a new conception of oneself as an author and a new way of treating a work as one's own work. The writers of this period, and especially in this respect Franciszek Dionizy Kniaźnin, seek new rules for editing the language of their own works, conscious that the printer – unlike in the past – is no longer the one responsible for the orthographical correctness of their texts, but they themselves. Hence their concern about the shape of a verse or line, their sense of a special kind of exceptionality, which does not break with tradition yet tentatively heralds a new type of creative freedom for the author. The changes that we mention here become much more visible when juxtaposed with

the editorial practices that were widespread at the time. The editorial activities of Franciszek Bohomolec with regard to the literature of the Renaissance and the norms established by the critical editions published in the 1760s and 1770s become the point of departure for further, new transformations in the philological consciousness of writers such as Kniaźnin, Franciszek Karpiński and others.

The political catastrophe that struck Poland at the end of the 18th century left its mark on culture, including on humanist and philological culture, understood in the wide sense. In the 19th century a re-evaluation of the long established humanist *universum* deriving from Renaissance tradition, occurred finally and irreversibly. In accordance with the spirit of the European Enlightenment, the time when science became dominant, a clear disintegration of that *universum* took place, as a result of which there emerged a new conception of philology, while the idea of humanism began to acquire other contents. On the other hand, an exclusively Polish debate was now underway – because of the political situation that had condemned Poland to non-existence on the map of Europe – about national identity, and this also embraced the traditional domain of philology, i.e. of language and literature. A fragment of this debate was the so-called dispute between the classicists and Romantics provoked by the early poetry of Adam Mickiewicz.¹⁵ This was a dispute about language, about the language of poetry, assembling on one side of the debate the advocates of classicism who declared that the language should not be changed, and on the other poets who argued on the contrary for its dynamism. The most interesting thing about this dispute is the fact that the horror articulated by the “classicists” (Franciszek Ksawery Dmochowski, Franciszek Morawski, Kajetan Koźmian) at the deformation of the language was dictated by fears about the loss of national identity. However, the traditional style of poetic creativity, based on classical models and traditional philology, had to give way to the new. Mickiewicz, questioning whether the language was capable of expressing the historical experience that shaped national identity, responds that there is more than one language. With this he opens up a new way forward, demonstrating the possibilities of language that had remained until now outside the experience of classicism.

The disintegration of the Renaissance humanist *universum*, which finally came about in the second half of the 19th century, is obvious from the perspective of the history of philology.¹⁶ The encyclopaedic compilations published at the end of the 19th century are proof both of the confu-

15 M. Prussak, *Norma i tożsamość. Starcie romantyków z klasykami – nowe myślenie o filologii*, in: *Humanizm i filologia*.

16 G. Borkowska, *Humanizm pozytywistów. Duch i litera*, in: *Humanizm i filologia*.

sion in the use of concepts and terminology relating to philology (as in Orgelbrand's *Encyclopaedia*) and of attempts to bring order to this situation, for example according to the paradigm suggested by Friedrich August Wolf (as in the *Great Illustrated Universal Encyclopedia; Wielka Encyklopedia Powszechna Ilustrowana*). The parallel processes taking place in the Polish and European humanities provoked a division in philology into two philological disciplines, which from then on became more and more separate. On the one hand, national philologies, including Polish philology, became increasingly more distinct from one another; on the other, the field we will now call classical philology became a separate discipline. The plan to systematize scientific and academic disciplines, which emerged from the spirit of Positivism, led to the separation from philology of the study of language, or linguistics, which was now perceived – for example, by Jan Baudouin de Courtenay – as a genuine science in its own right distinct from philology; philology meanwhile became regarded as a field of erudite, encyclopaedic knowledge with no precise paradigm for pursuing research.

Philology in the second half of the 19th century was therefore a discipline at the cross-roads, which temporarily functioned in several incarnations at the same time. The first of these was the encyclopaedic approach, which was perhaps the closest to the synthesizing paradigm of 19th-century science. This encyclopaedic philology was cultivated by people who had a very broad knowledge of many different subjects and disciplines. One of these was Jan Karłowicz, a distinguished linguist and lexicographer, author of a dictionary of the Polish language (compiled jointly with Adam Kryński and Władysław Niedźwiedzki) and a dictionary of regional dialects, author of many ethnographic works, a connoisseur of fine art and a musicologist, who had received a versatile education at universities in Russia, France and Germany. Aleksander Brückner and the almost forgotten Ignacy Radliński also belonged to this select group of polyhistorians. Another incarnation of philology at the end of the 19th century was the philological work undertaken by writers themselves. The most outstanding representative of this kind of creative activity was the novelist Eliza Orzeszkowa, who collaborated with Jan Karłowicz and the journal *Vistula (Wisła)* edited by him. In addition to these two ways of practicing philology in the second half of the 19th century – encyclopaedism and “literariness” – a third tendency was also tentatively taking shape though not entirely consistently, orientated towards analysing and interpreting a text, where the text was treated as an autonomous object of study, detached from the biography of the writer and the history of the nation. The metaphor of a ripe fruit that falls from the tree and then pursues a life of its own conveys the substance of this

transformation. Further developments in this direction, however, were to occur within the framework of another paradigm: the literary historical. The attempts to define that paradigm, which are still going on today, could be expressed as the tension between the “spirit and the letter,” between the study of history and the study of the literary work in isolation from its historical roots. These are ultimately attempts to construct a new, modern humanities derived from philological fidelity to the letter.

Another way of looking at philology at the end of the 19th century is offered by a perspective that treats it according to a much narrower definition and embraces textual criticism and critical editing, leaving aside as far as possible questions of national philology, which had become more or less identified with the tools of literary historical criticism. The process emerging in Poland philology understood in this way may be traced back to the editorial initiatives of the 1880s.¹⁷ A turning point on the road to modern philology thus conceived was the academic congress (named after Jan Kochanowski) that took place in 1884, where theoretical principles for the editing and publishing of literary works were discussed. This discussion, initiated by Roman Pilat’s pioneering paper entitled *How We Should Publish the Works of Polish Writers of the 16th and 17th Centuries* (*Jak należy wydawać dzieła polskich pisarzy XVI i XVII wieku*), was to lead in the course of the following decades to a break with philology defined in the spirit of Friedrich August Wolf as a meta-science that embraces the entirety of knowledge about the ancient world (*Altertumswissenschaft*), and to the reduction of philology to the tasks of academic editing. These theoretical reflections were accompanied by an intensive publishing programme. Work was begun already in 1884 on an edition of the complete works of Kochanowski, the so-called “Monumental Edition” (*Wydanie Pomnikowe*). In the following years, the bibliography of editorial work undertaken increases significantly; the number of series initiated by publishers likewise expands, series such as the *Library of Greek and Latin Classics* (*Biblioteka Klasyków Greckich i Łacińskich*), *Library of Forgotten Poets and Prose Writers of the 16th-18th Centuries* (*Biblioteka Zapomnianych Poetów i Prozaików Polskich w. XVI-XVIII*) and the most deserving of praise *Library of Polish Writers* (*Biblioteka Pisarzy Polskich*, 1887-1947, consisting of 87 volumes). Publishers’ initiatives were supported by a consolidated approach on the part of the academic community: in 1886 the Adam Mickiewicz Literary Society (*Towarzystwo Literackie im. Adama Mickiewicza*) was founded in L’viv (Lwów) and still functions today (its main division now being in Warsaw), which brought

17 M. Mejor, *Początki nowoczesnej filologii w Polsce (1884-1918) i wielkie edycje w okresie międzywojennym do roku 1939*, in: *Humanizm i filologia*.

together scholars (literary historians), publishers and graduates of the University of Lwów. The publishing organ of the Mickiewicz Society was its journal *Pamiętnik Towarzystwa*, which changed its name in 1902 to the *Literary Journal (Pamiętnik Literacki)*, and it too still functions as such today. In turn scholars of classical philology founded their own society, The Philological Society (Towarzystwo Filologiczne) in 1892. The organization was transformed in 1918 into the Polish Philological Society, and likewise still exists today along with its scholarly publishing organ *Eos*. The societies mentioned above (and ones not mentioned) as well as academic institutions, above all the Academy of Arts and Sciences (Akademia Umiejętności) in Kraków, carried on lively publishing activities. Various new series were founded; many shorter texts were published in the journals. The publication of “monuments” – as they were called – of the language, literature and history of Poland under the political conditions that existed at that time, thus acquired the status of a national undertaking.

The greatest effort was invested in rescuing works of Old Polish literature (i.e. of the mediaeval, Renaissance and Baroque periods) from oblivion, which was treated not only as a strictly academic task, but also a patriotic one. In the process of this work two separate sets of guiding principles emerged for the editing of older texts: one for texts in Latin, the other for texts in Polish. The most significant and productive aspect of this process would seem to be the fact that theoretical reflection, which was evolving parallel to the gradual emancipation of Polish philology, freed itself from the editorial methodologies elaborated by classical philology and ceased to make use of them in principle. At the same time the permanent rift between philology and the editing of historical sources was also becoming evident. Both spheres concentrated on elaborating their separate methodologies for editors based on their distinct goals: the documentation of the written source, on the one hand; and the making accessible to readers of an accurate and illegible text, on the other. A division also took place within classical philology itself due to the erosion of the principles governing the publication of classical texts: editors of mediaeval and Neo-Latin texts tried to elaborate their own methods. By the end of the 19th century critical editors of Neo-Latin texts in Poland had a real chance of introducing their own, truly innovative methods, but the strength of tradition, i.e. of models derived from classical philology, eventually prevailed. For many years the methods borrowed from classical philology dominated in the editing of Neo-Latin texts by Polish scholars. Only editions of mediaeval texts managed to break away from the rules and habits obligatory in the editing of classical texts. But this took place only in the 1920s in the work of Ryszard

Ganszyniec. Different strategies and different detailed solutions functioned in editorial practice. The experiences and proposals accumulated over decades of editorial work were put to good use only years later, in independent Poland (1919–1939), in the resolutions adopted by the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences (Polska Akademia Umiejętność) as it tried to consolidate the orthography and punctuation of the Polish language, and the principles for transcribing Old Polish texts into modern Polish.

In the mid-20th century the development of philology in Poland came to a standstill, resembling a fossilized relic that could not be resuscitated by the spirit of modernity. The experiences of 19th- and 20th-century European philology, and above all the establishment of norms and procedures—following the works of Paul Lehmann and Paul Maas—for reconstructing national philologies in Europe, closely tied to the achievements of classical philology, were greeted in Poland with resistance. Because of this the current state of textual criticism in Poland is such that it now has—at one and the same time—to make up for the arrears, so to speak, and deal with the problems confronting European philology in general as a result of the most recent cultural developments.

One area of confrontation is hermeneutics, which has always been linked to philology in accordance with the assumption that interpretation and textual criticism are philology's two basic spheres of activity.¹⁸ Hermeneutics, in the way that it has taken shape in modern times, was initially an auxiliary discipline to philology and theology and had the status of a *Kunstlehre*; it was therefore the technical art of understanding and explicating texts, and above all of explaining those places that were obscure and ambiguous. It has evolved over time and its successive metamorphoses in the 20th century indicate that it has become an increasingly crucial field of reflection for the humanities. Hans-Georg Gadamer, for example, undertook to transform the classic philological approach to a text into an approach that was *sensu stricto* philosophical. Interpretation ceased to be treated by Gadamer as an exclusively philological procedure or even as a universal method of approach in the humanities.

Another tendency characteristic of the 20th-century hermeneutic tradition aims in exactly the opposite direction. Instead of striving to elaborate a general theory of understanding or underline the philosophical dimension to an interpretational problem, its representatives stress the necessity of formulating a series of concrete rules for interpreting texts, which would take into consideration differences in the shaping of

18 P. Dybel, *Tradycja filologiczna a ewolucja pojęcia interpretacji w hermeneutyce XX wieku*, in: *Humanizm i filologia*.

their stylistic and formal aspects. Hermeneutics in the conception of authors such as Hans Robert Jauss has to return to being a part of philology and as the key discipline within philology's compass, without which any kind of work on a text is unthinkable. Also worthy of note are the attempts made by Peter Szondi to combine the traditions of philological and philosophical hermeneutics and endow them with historical awareness. The prelude to this way of conceiving hermeneutics is a new reading of the hermeneutic tradition to date, in which Szondi tries to show how far the two contradictory models of interpretation that define it—the first, grammatical model which depends on the *sensus litteralis* of the text; and the second which is allegorical and depends on its *sensus spiritualis*—are closely linked to the problem of historicity.

The hermeneutics of Paul Ricoeur is characterized by yet another approach, and appears as a specialized philological discipline, which has at its disposal its own methodology and conceptual apparatus, except that it requires a radical transformation in the light of contemporary developments. A completely different kind of attitude to the contemporary hermeneutic tradition is represented by several leading exponents of postmodernism: Richard Rorty, Zygmunt Bauman and—above all—Gianni Vattimo. In their approach to problems of understanding and interpretation shaped within this tradition, where they draw mainly on ideas of Heidegger and Gadamer, these authors anticipate the end of modernity. According to them, they have exposed the illusory nature of various metaphysical assumptions relating to the course taken by the historical process, and of traditional expressions of the subject's relation to tradition and attitude to other cultures.

The conceptions of the representatives mentioned (or not mentioned) here of various trends in contemporary hermeneutics have of course been assimilated to a degree by the Polish humanities, proof of which are the numerous translations as well original works by Polish authors inspired by the thought of Gadamer, Jauss, Ricoeur and others.¹⁹

19 H.-G. Gadamer, *Prawda i metoda. Zarys hermeneutyki filozoficznej*, trans. B. Baran (Kraków: Inter Esse, 1993) H. R. Jauss, *Historia literatury jako prowokacja*, trans. M. Łukasiewicz (Warsaw: IBL, 1999); P. Szondi, *Wprowadzenie do hermeneutyki literackiej*, in: *Współczesna myśl literaturoznawcza w Republice Federalnej Niemiec. Antologia*, ed. H. Orłowski, trans. M. Łukasiewicz [et al.] (Warsaw: Czytelnik, 1986); P. Ricoeur, *Egzystencja i hermeneutyka. Rozprawy o metodzie*, trans. E. Bieńkowska, H. Bortnowska, St. Cichowicz (Warsaw: Pax, 1985); idem, *Język, tekst, interpretacja. Wybór pism*, trans. P. Graff, K. Rosner (Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1989); R. Rorty, *Filozofia a zwierciadło natury*, trans. M. Szczubińska (Warsaw: Spacja, Fundacja Aletheia, 1994). For a general survey of the contemporary Polish humanities that also takes into consideration hermeneutics, see A. Nowicka-Jeżowa, *Nurty humanistyczne w kulturze polskiej. Perspektywy historii*

The extent and diversity of the hermeneutic schools requires however, or so it would seem, further multidisciplinary reflection on the tasks of philology as the art of communing with the multifarious texts of the literary tradition.

The final issue, to which we would like to draw attention, relates to how textual criticism and the critical editing of literary texts are practiced currently in Poland, and what challenges are presented to them by the development of the electronic media.²⁰ The point of departure for reflections on the theme of the role of editing and textual criticism in the contemporary Polish humanities should be an evaluation of the quality of the cultivation of both these branches of philology in relation to the traditional—understood in the best sense of this word—models developed in 20th-century European scholarship, and then following on from this, the definition of areas to be developed further both with reference to theoretical issues (for example, models for critical editions) and to publishing needs. The second group of problems is associated with the practical relationship, which realizes itself in the editorial process, between the two fundamental components of philology in the strict sense of this word, i.e. between textual criticism and the interpretation of the work. Faced by the clear and deeply motivated turn taken by philology towards hermeneutics and intertextuality, it would seem essential for an editorial model as well as models for critical editions to be elaborated which would take into consideration these tendencies. The third and most burning issue is “philology on the net” —a new quality in the humanities, which creates both threats and challenges, and changes fundamentally the way we think about texts and about our philological tools. An example of the changes is the new idea of a “library”, which ceases to be a place and becomes a multimedia screen. So-called “philological erudition” also takes on new connotations and requires a fresh definition in a situation of greater accessibility and informational proliferation, as does the extent of the competence of the philologist-editor who makes use of the new media. The greatest transformations, however, occur, or so it would seem, in the very understanding of what a text is. And we are not referring here to new types of text, which have existed only on the internet since their very inception. What will change will be the text of a work that is deeply rooted in tradition, published until now in linear, book form. The new media enable it to be shown in several dimensions at once, allowing various available editions to be taken into ac-

idei, in: *Humanitas. Projekty antropologii humanistycznej*, vol. 1: *Paradygmaty – tradycje – profile historyczne*, ed. A. Nowicka-Jeżowa (Warsaw: Neriton, 2009–2010).

20 A. Karpiński, *Edytorstwo i krytyka tekstu u progu XXI wieku. Kontynuacje i wyzwania. Dzieło jako przedmiot filologiczny*, in: *Humanizm i filologia*.

count at the same time, which until now could only be noted in the critical apparatus. The potential for “opening up” the text, which in traditional philology was closed and fixed, creates extraordinary perspectives for the development of genetic criticism, still sporadically present in philology today. The critical edition itself will also be subject to opening up – an edition which can, on the one hand, be presented on the internet as hypertext offering the possibility for multiple and multidimensional commentaries, and which can also, on the other, be constantly supplemented and corrected. The situation in which philology finds itself, or will find itself shortly, would seem to be analogous to the situation in the mid-15th century when it was confronted by the invention of print. And it will no doubt be able to cope again with the challenges.