

T.Ewertowski

*Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan, Poland***Images of Rome in Polish and Serbian literature of the Romantic Period**

The main aim of the paper is to analyze and interpret various images of Rome in Polish and Serbian literature of the Romantic period. The main concepts are based on imaginary geography. Michael Foucault's concept of heterotopia is also used. The primary focus of the paper is the literary works of the following Serbian and Polish authors: P. Njegoš, L. Nenadović, A. Mickiewicz, J. Słowacki, Z. Krasinski, C. Norwid. It corroborates how various philosophical ideas and ideological values are demonstrated in representations of the ruins of Rome.

Key words: Rome, Romantic period, Słowacki, Krasinski, Mickiewicz, Njegoš, Nenadović, imaginary geography.

Introduction

For writers of the 19th century, as was for Polish and Serbian romantic writers, travelling to Italy was not just an entertainment or tourist trip. Almost always, a journey to Italy created an opportunity for intellectual and spiritual development through contact with an enormously rich cultural heritage, let alone the beautiful Mediterranean landscape. Olga Stuparević even uses the formula, 'a pilgrimage to culture and art' (Stuparević, 1976, p. 103)*. Stanisław Burkot claims that Italy was the main destination for romantic artists, historians, poets and anyone who wanted to learn more about the classical heritage (Burkot, 1988, p. 309).

One of the significant points on the map of those cultural pilgrimages, if not the most important, was Rome. From the many comments about the greatness and stature of Rome, a remark by Adam Mickiewicz[†], from a letter to his daughter, may be considered fairly evocative[‡]. The Polish poet compared Rome to a gold mine:

Nabytki twoje w wiadomościach i uczuciach zostaną ci od teraz na zawsze. Słyszałaś, jak ludzie pracują w Kalifornii na kawałek złota: teraz dla ciebie Rzym jest tą **kopalnią** (Mickiewicz, 2005, p. 153, emphasis mine).

Your discoveries in knowledge and feelings will be kept by you forever. You've heard how people work in California for a piece of gold. Now Rome is such a **mine** for you[§].

In this paper, what Polish and Serbian romantic authors found in this 'spiritual mine' will be analysed. The topic is broad, so the purpose is to give a meaningful overview and to provide the reader with carefully selected examples which show the most important general traits of the receptions of Rome in Polish and Serbian literature of the Romantic period.

Textual Rome, imaginary Rome

In a monograph on textual approaches to the Eternal City, Catherine Edwards emphasizes that Rome has inspired many books over the centuries. It could even be said that every stone in Rome has an additional, symbolic meaning. Edwards claims that 'the notion of *Rome* has been detached from its material aspect to take on an endlessly mobile symbolic life' (Edwards, 1996, p. 135). Representations create additional ideological value and symbolic meaning to a place. This phenomenon is universal, but the Eternal City shows this aspect of a textual reality very pointedly due to its cultural significance of being the capital of an empire. This part of the paper will present how such an ancient place could be described in different ways and how it could gain diverse meanings and ideological values.

* See also Živančević-Sekeruš (2009, p. 17).

[†] Adam Mickiewicz [1798-1855] was a key poet of the Romantic period in the Polish literature; he is also considered the most important Polish writer in history and one of the most important European authors of the Romantic period. His most important works were *Dziady*, *Pan Tadeusz*, and *Konrad Wallenrod*. Mickiewicz was also a revolutionary politician and religious activist. He was educated as a classical philologist and lived in Rome from 1829 to 1831 – on this period, see Litwornia (2005) – and again in 1848.

[‡] An interesting interpretation of Mickiewicz's letter could be found in Ziemia (2003).

[§] All translations into English are my own, unless otherwise indicated. Translations were made to ensure the paper is coherent for non-Polish and non-Serbian speaking readers. I have sought to provide exact translations; however, they cannot be acknowledged as proper literary translations.

The Serbian traveller Ljubomir Nenadović* described the ruins of the Roman Forum, using the idea of **historical punishment**:

Rimski forum, gde su se tolika istorijska dela svršila, gde je ugovaran rat i mir; forum, gde se sudbina sveta rešavala, leži u razvalinama i sada se zove «kraljica pijaca» (...) Grabež i pljačka su i osnažili Rim, grabež i pljačka oborili su ga i pretvorili u ruine. Ko sabljom seče, od sablje pogine. Što su Goti, Vandali i Huni ostavili uspravo, došli su Normani i oborili. Opljačkani narodi po dalekim krajevima Azije, Afrike i Jevrope davno su osvećeni. Na ognjištu njihovih tirana, na forumu starih Rimljana, goveda planduju. (Nenadović, 1907, p. 97–98).

The Roman Forum, where so many historical deeds took place, where war and peace were negotiated, where the fate of the world were decided, now lays in ruins and is called 'cows' market' (...) A pillage and a plunder strengthened Rome, a pillage and a plunder overthrew and turned it into ruins. He who lives by the sword shall die by the sword. What the Goths, the Vandals and the Huns had left, was destroyed by the Normans. Robbed nations from far-away lands of Asia, Africa and Europe were avenged a long time ago. In the heart and home of their tyrants, at the old Roman Forum, cattle grazes.

Later, Nenadović compared the fate of ancient Rome and other ancient cities to the future of capitals of modern empires:

A o čemu bi drugom nego o prošlosti mogao čovek misliti na razvalinama Koloseuma, pored koga taj Rim, taj veliki balsamirani mrtvac, leži. I za varoši, i za države, priroda ima svoje zakone. I one imaju svoju mladost, svoju starost, svoju smrt. Niniva i Memfis, one velike varoši, oko kojih se jedva za dan i noć obići moglo, poznaju se danas po kamenim stubovima što vire iz zemlje; a London, sabor i magacin sveta, podigao se na onom mestu, gde su divlji zverovi svoje pećine imali. Rim pao i postao nejak; **Mars preselio svoje dvorov u Pariz.** — Pa koliko miliona godina treba, da tako jedna varoš, kao što je Niniva i Memfis, poraste do najvišeg stupnja, i da se svim svojim stanovništvom, sa svim svojim bogovima i oltarima, i sa svojom slavom, propadne? Ni pune sve hiljade godina! (...) **Doći će vreme, kada će putnici dolaziti na obale reke Sene i Temze, i kopati zatrpano kamenje, da pronađu gde je Pariz i London.** Uništenje ovako velike varoši, i rasturiti jedan mravinjak, za prirodu je sve jedno (Nenadović, 1907, p. 116, emphasis mine).

About what else than the past could man think on the ruins of the Coliseum, around which Rome, that great embalmed corpse, lays. Nature has its laws for cities and states, too. They also have their youth, their old age, their death. Nineveh and Memphis, those great cities, which could be barely walked around in a day and night, are today recognized only by stone columns protruding from the ground; whereas London, the world's council and warehouse, grew on the place where wild beasts had had their caves. Rome fell and became weak; Mars moved his court into Paris. But how many millions of years are needed for such a city like Nineveh and Memphis to grow to the highest level and to vanish with all its population, with all its gods and altars, with all its glory? Even not a thousand years (...) The time will come, when travelers will approach the banks of the Thames and Seine, and dig stones to find where Paris and London are. Destroying such a big city and destroying an anthill, for nature it is the same.

It seems obvious that Nenadović looked at the ruins of Rome from the standpoint of the philosophy of history. The current state of Forum Romanum is a sign of punishment. Although he used a quote from the Bible, his concept of history was not religious. It was based on the idea of metamorphose as a basic law of nature.

The Polish poet Zygmunt Krasiński† also described the ruins of Rome, based on a similar philosophical idea of historical punishment. However, his general conclusion was different. Firstly, Nenadović referred to the laws of nature, whereas Krasiński wrote about God as a factor in history (about Krasiński's philosophy of history, see (Janion, 1962; Waško, 2001). In the poem dedicated to his wife Eliza, the Polish poet used a representation of the ruins of Rome to show his ideas on history:

* Ljubomir Nenadović [1826-1895] was a Serbian writer, diplomat and politician. He came from the famous Nenadović family, which played a key role in Serbian politics and culture of the 19th century. He published a lot of poems; however, in the history of Serbian literature he is important as the author of travel writings (*Pisma iz Italije*, *Pisma iz Nemačke*, *Pisma iz Švajcarske*, *Pisma o Crnogorcima*) (Popović, 1972, p. 233–272). He travelled to Italy in 1851 and 1852 and described his travels in the book *Pisma iz Italije* ('Letters from Italy').

† Zygmunt Krasiński [1812-1859] is one of the most important Polish poets of the Romantic period. He is called a prophet-poet (*wieszcz* in Polish, an equivalent of Latin *vates*), along with Mickiewicz and Juliusz Słowacki. He belonged to an aristocratic family and his outlook on the world was more conservative and catholic than those of other important Polish romantic poets. He lived for many years in Rome. He is best known for his works *Nie-Boska komedia*, *Irydion* (the drama is set in ancient Rome), *Przedświt*.

Biada im wszystkim, ludziom krwawej dłoni,/ **Bo Bóg piorunem z świata ich wygoni**/ I śladu po nich w świecie nie zostanie!/ Patrz! wokół ciebie na rzymskiej równinie / Co zostało z dumy!/ Pośród pustyni mętny Tyber płynie, / **Wkoło zwalisk rupy**./ I tu chadzali w purpurze i złocie / Niesprawiedliwości -/ **A dziś ich świątyn marmury śpią w błocie**/ Nad prochem ich kości. (Krasiński, 1973a, p. 116, emphasis mine).

Woe betide all the people of a bloody hand,/ **Because God will drive them out of the world** with lightning,/ And not a trace will be left./ Look! Allaround you on the Roman plain/ What's left of the pride!/ Through a desert the muddy Tiber flows/ **All around rubbles of ruins**/ Here they walked [dressed] in purple and gold/ Of injustice/ **And today marbles of their temples sleep in mud**/ Over the dust of their bones.

Krasiński, as with Nenadović, used the description of Roman ruins to formulate a general conclusion about principles of history, which he also applied to the political landscape of the 19th century. However, his political ideas were different. Nenadović used examples of France and Great Britain as contemporary world powers whose greatness would pass away just as the greatness of Rome had passed due to the natural law of temporality. Krasiński used the example of Rome as a harbinger of the fall of the Russian empire, which was perceived by him as an embodiment of evil in history (Fiećko, 2005). In Krasiński's autobiographical novel *Adam Szaleniec* ('Adam the Madman'), the main character compared Rome and Russia:

Marzyłem wśród ruin. Świat starożytny, u stóp mych powalony przed krzyżem drewnianym, milczenie grobów ponad nim, burze naszego stulecia, wspomnienie mojej ujarzmionej ojczyzny, wszystko mieszało się w moim mózgu. Pocieszałem się, patrząc na Rzym leżący wśród gliny i błota; gdyż w dzieciństwie poprzysiągłem zemstę innemu Rzymowi i depcąc pierwszy, sądziłem, że kiedyś deptać będę drugi. Nocą, idąc z Kolizeum do grobu Cecylii, brałem w ręce z uśmiechem ironii złomy porfiru, jaspisu: ciskając je o kamienie cieszyłem się, że pryskają w tysiąc okruchów. „Tak będzie kiedyś z dumą Północy». (Krasiński, 1973b, p. 190).

I dreamed among the ruins. The ancient world has fallen in front of a wooden cross, the silence of tombs above it, storms of our age, reminiscence of my subjugated homeland, everything was messed up inside my brain. I consoled myself, looking at Rome laying in clay and mud, because in my childhood I had sworn a revenge on the other Rome and while I was trampling the first, I thought that one day I would trample the other. At night, while walking from the Coliseum to the tomb of Cecilia, I took in my hands chunks of porphyry and jasper with an ironic smile. I was throwing them on the stones and was glad to see that they shattered into thousands of fragments. 'It will happen to the pride of the North someday'.

In Krasiński's vision, in the history of Rome and ruins of the Eternal City, the contemporary political situation of Poland and Russia and a metaphysical concept of history were mixed. In comparison with Nenadović, some similarities in motives and ideas are clearly visible (ruins as the sign of historical punishment). However, differences in conclusions are striking. The Polish poet, while describing Roman ruins, introduced the Christian philosophy of history and heralded the fall of the Russian Empire. For the Serbian author, remains of Forum Romanum demonstrated the law of metamorphose in nature, and because of it all capitals of modern empires would turn into ruins some day.

Of course, the fact that the two aforementioned authors' descriptions of Roman ruins are different could be easily explained by a different outlook on the world. The main concept of this paper is based on the notion of imaginary geography. According to the theorist of this orientation, a description is always an expression of outlook on the world and cultural background of the author. Erazm Kuźma, in reference to Jurij Lotman and Roland Barthes, emphasizes that the language of space could also be a language of values and ideas. Even basic geographical notions, like the West and the East, very often carry ideological meaning (Kuźma, 1980). Edward Said introduces the concept of imaginative geography and history: 'So space acquires emotional and even rational sense by a kind of poetic process, whereby the vacant or anonymous reaches of distance are converted into meaning for us here (...) For there is no doubt that imaginative geography and history help the mind to intensify its own sense of itself by dramatizing the distance and difference between what is close to it and what is far away' (Said, 1977, p. 55). Maria Todorova demonstrates connections between 'Discovery', 'Invention' and 'Classification' on the example of the Balkans. In any description of a new place, discovery goes hand in hand with invention of the place, while the imagination of the subject plays a key role in the creation of an image of the place. Moreover, new information is 'classified' into patterns which do not exist in reality, but which are invented by the perceivers (Todorova, 2009, p. 116–117)*.

* Compare: Bassin, 1991; Jezernik, 2007; Wolff, 1994.

The aforesaid theoretical concept is applied in this paper to analyse different images of Rome in Polish and Serbian literature of the romantic period. As the cases of Nenadović and Krasinski show, Rome could be transformed into an object of ideological discourse. And concepts of imaginative geography help analyse such transformation.

Rome as a palimpsest, Rome as a heterotopia

Both Polish and Serbian authors quite often wrote about the feeling that Rome is an exceptional place. Adam Mickiewicz, in the letter to his daughter Maria quoted above, expressed admiration for the grandeur of Rome:

‘Rzym jest dotąd największą rzeczą na ziemi’ (Mickiewicz, 2005, p. 152).

Rome has so far been the greatest thing on Earth

Petar II Petrović Njegoš*, in a letter to his friend Dmitrije Vladislavljević, also emphasizes the greatness of Rome:

Ah, Rim, veličestveni Rim! Te razvaline velikoga Rima! (Njegoš, 1981, p. 203)

Ah, Rome, magnificent Rome! Those ruins of great Rome!

Why was Rome perceived as a special place? This is not merely a question of magnificent buildings. This part of the paper will analyse how cultural heritage and historical legacy influenced the perception of the Eternal City as a space of exceptional experience.

Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, the precursor of romanticism, introduced several Italian topics into the European literature of the 19th-century in his travel report *Italian Journey*. On pages of that book, huge admiration for Rome is clearly evident. One of the most important feelings is a feeling of visiting a place that is familiar even though it is only being visited for the first time:

‘All the dreams of my youth have come to life; the first engravings I remember — my father hung views of Rome in the hall — I now see in reality, and everything I have known through paintings, drawings, etchings, woodcuts, plaster casts and cork models is now assembled before me. Wherever I walk, I come upon familiar objects in an unfamiliar world; everything is just as I imagined it, yet everything is new’ (Goethe, 1970, p. 129).

This feeling is common among the 19th century Polish and Serbian writers. Nenadović, while describing his first visit to Rome, also made the claim that he had been visiting a place already well-known.

Kad stranac prvi put po ulicama Rima ide, čini mu se da ide kroz neku varoš, gde je proveo svoje detinjstvo. Pita za Panteon, za Koloseum, za Kapitol, za forum, kao za kakve stare svoje poznanike (Nenadović, 1907, p. 84).

When a foreigner walks for the very first time on the streets of Rome, it seems to him that he walks through a city where he spent his childhood. He asks about the Pantheon, the Coliseum, the Capitol, the Forum, as if he asks about his old friends.

Zygmunt Krasinski described his first visit using very pathetic words. The similar feeling of familiarity appears however:

Jest pewne uczucie, które dojeżdżając do Rzymu mimowolnie do duszy się wkrada. Coś jakby teńącego poszanowaniem przed tyłoma wiekami sławy, wielkości, zbrodni i nieładu (Krasinski, 1963, p. 214).

There is one feeling, which unwittingly creeps into soul while approaching Rome. Something redolent of respect for so many centuries of glory, greatness, crime and disarray.

In this context, Duncan Kennedy is to the point, that ‘Rome visited is always in some sense Rome revisited’ (Kennedy, 1991, p. 19). Kennedy shows how complicated are the relations between time, space and narration in writings about Rome. He does not write about Polish and Serbian romantic writers; nevertheless, his conclusions are also valid for the authors who are the focus of attention in this paper.

The experience of history in Rome is very different to that in other places. The subject feels that he is at the centre of events. Goethe claimed: ‘It is history, above all, that one reads quite differently here from anywhere else in the world. Everywhere else one starts from the outside and works inward; here it seems to be

* Petar II Petrović Njegoš [1813-1851] was the *vladika* (the political and religious leader) of Montenegro and one of the most important poets of South Slavic literature. He is considered a great Serbian poet and, nowadays, he is also a key figure of Montenegrin cultural canon (about this problem, see Zieliński, 2005). His most famous works are *Górski wieniec*, *Luča mikrokozma*, *Lažni car Šćepan mali*. He visited Rome in 1851 (Kilibarda, 1999, 2012; Pižurica, 1998), that year in Naples, Italy, he met Ljubomir Nenadović and then travelled for a few months together.

the other way around. All history is encamped about us and all history sets forth again from us. This does not apply only to Roman history, but to the history of the whole world' (Goethe, 1970, p. 148).

Similar observations have been formulated by Polish and Serbian authors. Mickiewicz, in a letter to his friend Franciszek Malewski, stated that it is very interesting to familiarize himself with the past in Rome, where events took place.

Liwiusz tu na miejscu ma dziwny urok, bo w wieczór można iść oglądać scenę wypadków czytanych z rana (Mickiewicz, 1998, pp. 614–615).

Reading Livius here has a specific charm, because in the evening you may go to see a scene of events about which you read in the morning

Nenadović expressed similar feelings. Rome is so deeply connected with the history of the world that visiting it is like visiting the scene of historical events known from books:

Kada čovek prvi put ulazi u ovakvu jednu varoš, s kojom je svetska istorija tako tesno skopčana, obuzmu ga neka osećanja, o kojima ne može sam sebi računati: osvrće se svuda, gde će da vidi one ljude i događaje, o kojima je čitao i slušao. Kad smo se približili kapijama Rima, sve što sam iz istorije o Rimljanima znao, ponovilo mi se u mislima (Nenadović, 1907, p. 83).

When a man enters such a city, with which the world's history is so tightly linked, he is overwhelmed by some feelings, which are not easy to describe. He looks back everywhere to see those people and events about which he reads and hears. When we were approaching the gates of Rome, all that I knew about the history of the Romans were repeated in my thoughts.

The abundance of symbolical meaning makes *Urbs Aeterna* an exceptional space. The Polish poet Cyprian Norwid*, in his short prose *Zarys z Rzymu* ('A sketch from Rome'), made a paradoxical statement in trying to describe the place of action, negating a sensual attribute of the Eternal City:

Ten Rzym, miejsce tak mało, tak prawie wcale nie mające zmysłowego miejsca charakteru — Rzym to środek, punkt prawie w matematycznym rozumieniu — Rzym to owa kolumna na starożytnym forum, na której były zapisane odległości miast państwa, czyli świata... (Norwid, 1973, p. 11).

This Rome, the place which has few, hardly any traits of sensual qualities — Rome is the centre, almost a point in a mathematical sense — Rome is this column on the ancient forum, where distances between cities of the state, or the world, were written

Following Norwid's remark, the city Rome is the centre of the world, for it rules the state which controls the world. Therefore, the city loses its material character, because it is linked to such a waste of historical and cultural heritage, that symbolic meanings cover material substance (to be compared with Edwards' words about 'endlessly mobile symbolic life' in the notion of Rome). Krzysztof Trybuś claims that Rome is a model of the world for Norwid (Trybuś, 2000, pp. 68–69). In general, for Polish and Serbian writers from the Romantic period, Rome and its history represented a universal value. According to Radosław Piętka, deliberations over Roman history were one of the basic approaches to any reflexion on history. Piętka uses a very evocative expression: 'A primer of the philosophy of history' (Piętka, 2007, p. 15).

At the end of this part, three different terminological concepts will be introduced to describe specific qualities of the Eternal City in the literature. Firstly, to emphasize the special characteristics of Rome, it could be said that the Eternal City is a **heterotopia**. According to Michel Foucault, heterotopia juxtaposes several spaces and functions in relation to all the remaining spaces (Foucault, 2005). It describes romantic visions of Rome — the Eternal City is linked to various other places and events for the romantic writers. Secondly, Catherine Edwards uses the term '**palimpsest**' to describe the multi-layered cultural and historical heritage of Rome (Edwards, 1996, p. 28). Thirdly, Kwiryna Ziemia uses the term '**symbol**' in the sense of Paul Ricoeur, in writing about the abundance of Rome's symbolical meanings in Mickiewicz's works. The city is material for various symbolical senses. Those three terms, 'heterotopia', 'palimpsest', and 'symbol', create a perspective for understanding how and why Rome was so exceptional a place for Polish and Serbian romantic authors.

* Cyprian Norwid [1821-1883] was a very important poet of the Romantic period in Poland. He belonged to the second generation of Polish romantic poets and his works are specific. Because of that, he was not recognized during his life and his poetry is quite different from other great romantic poets, sometimes he is called a classicist (Fieguth, 2009; Stefanowska, 1993; Trybuś, 2009). Nevertheless, nowadays he is considered 'the fourth great poet' of the Romantic period, along with Mickiewicz, Słowacki and Krasiński. He spent a few years in Rome and a few of his works are set in the Eternal City (Biliński, 1973).

Ruins are the most important element in the image of Rome from the 19th-century, at least according to romantic writers. It should be emphasized that Rome was not a modern metropolis then. The capital of a weak and reactionary Papal State was a small city, and a lot of the ancient monuments (e.g. Coliseum) were outside the city borders and thus were left unattended. A popular motive in 18th and 19th century paintings was a shepherd on ruins and which evocatively shows the rural character of Roman Campagna (Mocarska-Tycowa, 2003). As Radosław Piętka insists, for the writers of the romantic period, Rome was 'the Rome of melancholic ruins' (Piętka, 2003, p. 120).

Romantic attitude towards the ruins of Rome was full of ambivalence. A very interesting example of this phenomenon is the words from Njegoš's letter, quoted above:

Te razvaline velikoga Rima. Kada čovjek u njemu dođe, ne zna da li ga udivljenje potpiri u više ushićenje, ali mu žalost vse dušu ugasi i opečali nad grobnicom veličija svijetskoga. Doista **su se kod mene obadva elementa borila** kao zla svekrva sa dobrom snahom (Njegoš, 1981, p. 203, emphasis mine).

Those ruins of great Rome. When man comes there, he does not know if he goes into raptures of admiration, or sorrow will dampen his soul and sadden him over the tomb of world greatness. Really, those **two elements fought inside me** like a bad mother-in-law and a good daughter-in-law.

A very interesting example of such ambivalent attitude to the Roman ruins is a fragment of Zygmunt Krasiński's letter to his father:

Ruiny, **ślady przemocy, potęgi i ucisku teraz leżą w błocie i glinie**. Kampania Rzymska jest szeroką mogiłą opasaną Apeninami, naga, bez krzewu, bez drzewa, zielona rzadką murawą, z niebem wiecznie błękitnym, z słońcem podobnym do słońca pustyni; tu i ówdzie pasą się trzody nad grobem wielkich mężów (Krasiński, 1963, p. 236).

Ruins, **traces of violence, power and oppression now lay in mud and clay**. Roman Campagna is a wide grave rounded by the Apennines, bare, without bushes, without trees, with thin layers of grass and eternally blue sky, with the Sun like the desert Sun. Here and there, flocks graze over a tomb of great people.

In Njegoš's letter, admiration for the magnificent heritage of Rome is mixed with sorrow over its departed greatness. In Krasiński's letter, ruins are simultaneously the sign of power and crime, of might and decay*.

A comparison of those two statements shows some valid points about the romantic attitude towards Roman ruins. To examine this problem thoroughly, various research concepts should be taken into account. Radosław Piętka emphasizes an interesting ambivalence towards the Roman ruins (Piętka, 2003). On the one hand, they are a symbol of human fragility and of the inevitable law of temporality. On the other hand, they demonstrate the might of ancient civilizations. However, in both cases, man is overwhelmed by the power of time and by the greatness of the ancient heritage.

Chloe Chard analyses 'ghosts and ruins as repositories of memory in travel writings' (Chard, 1999, p. 127). In late 18th century and 19th-century writings, ruins are often connected with nights and ghosts. There is the ghost of a lost mistress who might appear, supernatural beings manifest themselves, and suppressed memories return. Ruins are the space for the uncanny and alienated.

Duncan Kennedy pays attention to the temporal perspective of ruin writings (Kennedy, 1991). In his description of Roman ruins, reflexions on the past of Rome are juxtaposed with the narrator's present time and thoughts about the future (which was already demonstrated in Nenadović's and Krasiński's works).

Grażyna Królikiewicz gives a comprehensive analysis of the romantic image of ruins (Królikiewicz, 1993). The researcher points to the ambivalence and complexity of this topic in the literature and paintings of the Romantic period. Ruins have a dual nature because they are simultaneously a part of nature and culture. They are at the same time new entities and fragments of the past. What is more, ruins introduce some hermeneutical problems, because they are perceived as a semiotic object, as a sign of the past. Meditations on remains of ancient buildings also show the mechanism of memory and imagination. As traces of the past, ruins are used to introduce topics from the field of the philosophy of history, which was already demonstrated by examples taken from Nenadović and Krasiński. Ruins could also be perceived as an aesthetic object. For the anticlassicist movement, ruins were an example of the picturesque and sublime, because decayed buildings were more interesting than the classical beauty of perfection.

It should also be pointed out that ruins were an important element of Rome, also for the ancient writers. For example, Marcus Terentius Varro described the Saturnian remains, visible on the Palatine, and in *Eneida*

* In general, Krasiński's views on ancient Rome and Christianity were full of ambivalence, see Śliwiński (1986).

Aeneas observed on the same hill 'monuments of earlier man' (Edwards, 1996, p. 11). Consequently, looking at Rome through the prism of ruins had been done from the very beginning.

Among all the ruins of Rome, the Coliseum is the most famous. Njegoš named this building as the most interesting sight in Rome, along with Saint Peter's Basilica and Raphael's painting *Transfiguration* (Njegoš, 1981, p. 204). In the description of this place, some common, important motives appear which show how the ruins of Rome tend to acquire ideological value.

In writings about the remains of the Flavian Amphitheatre, the aforementioned complex of ideas, connected with ruins and the philosophy of history, is present. Ljubomir Nenadović compared the Coliseum to the corpse of a giant and with satisfaction emphasized that in the ancient times this building had been at the centre of Rome while in the 19th century it was outside the city.

The Flavian Amphitheatre was often used to introduce the topic of games in the arena and Christian martyrdom. Among the notes of Njegoš about Rome and ancient civilisation, remarks about games are very common (Njegoš, 1956)*. It is one of the most important topics in nineteenth century writings about ancient Roman culture. A description of bloody entertainment was often used to stereotype the Romans as a nation of primitive, brutal conquerors, with cruel soldiers in foreign countries and bloodthirsty spectators of gladiator games at home. This connection between Roman imperialism and arena games is underlined by the fact that wild beasts for games were brought from subdued lands[†], that amphitheatres were built by slaves, and that people killed during games were often slaves from conquered nations[‡].

Thirdly, the Coliseum was often presented as a symbol of the triumph of Christianity. The most important reason for this interpretation of the ruins of the Flavian Amphitheatre was the fact that in the centre of the circus, where Christians had been killed in the ancient times, a wooden cross stood tall. The Roman Empire fell and Rome became the Papal city. The cross in the Coliseum was very important especially for Krasinski. The Polish poet, at his first visit to Rome, was disappointed by Saint Peter's Basilica[§]. In the letter to his father, he claimed that at the basilica men thought too much about human art and there is no real Christian spirit in the church (Krasinski, 1963, p. 215). However, the cross in the Coliseum was the real centre of Christian faith for Krasinski**.

Ten krzyż wart wszystkich kościołów Mediolanu i Rzymu. Przezeń żywiej Bóg przemawia niż przez sklepienia złotem, srebrem, drogimi kamieniami zasute. Ten krzyż temu tysiąc lat, taki sam jak dzisiaj, deptany był w tych miejscach, za niego rzucono tygrysom i lwóm chrześcijańskie dziewice. Wtenczas Koliseum stało wielkie, pyszne (...); a teraz rozsypuje się on w gruzy i upada, a krzyż się nie odmienił, z drewna jak wtenczas, a jednak stoi pośród budowy, stoi nad ziemią, która go prześladowała, i panuje tam, gdzie nim pogardzano (Krasinski, 1963, p. 216).

This cross is worth all the churches of Milan and Rome. Through it, God speaks more lively than through vaults full of gold, silver and precious stones. This cross, one thousand years ago, the same as today, was trampled at these places. For it, Christian virgins were thrown to the tigers and lions. That time, the Coliseum was great, haughty (...) and now it is crumbling and falling, while the cross has not changed, made of wood like that time, and stays in this building, over the country which was persecuting it.

As Krasinski's words show, for the image of Rome in romantic literature it is very important that Rome is not only the capital of an ancient empire, but is also the place of the Holy See. However, this topic is linked to a number of other questions related to the romantic attitude towards religion and Christianity as well as relations between Orthodox and Catholic churches, issues that are well beyond the scope of this paper.

To recapitulate the most important problems mentioned in this article, one poem, which evokes a great number of issues, will now be analysed. Juliusz Słowacki's^{††} *Rzym* ('Rome') described a vision of Rome as a decayed space of ruins and meadows, which was compared to a desert:

* On ancient topics in the notes of Njegoš, see Flašar (1997, p. 253–304).

† About animals in the context of Roman games, see Śliwiński (1992, p. 201–204).

‡ It is interesting to compare statements made about the Coliseum with similar remarks made by another Serbian traveller, Milan Jovanović Morski (1834–1896) about the ancient amphitheatre in Naples (Jovanović, 1898, p. 56). However, the question of whether Jovanović belongs to the Romantic period is a problematic issue (Tartalja, 1984).

§ He shared this feeling with Njegoš, who wrote a poem on the cupola of Saint Peter's Basilica *Radi čovjek sve što raditi može*. In the first part of the poem, the lyrical voice admires the magnificence of the church. However, in the second part, the Basilica is compared with dust, because it is only a creation of weak human beings. The real temple of God is the cosmos.

** About Krasinski's religious anxiety, see Przybylski (1999, p. 23–37).

†† Juliusz Słowacki [1809–1849] is considered one of the greatest poets of Polish literature. He wrote many interesting dramas and poems (*Kordian*, *Balladyna*, *Beniowski*, *Król-Duch*, etc). In his lifetime, he was overshadowed by Mickiewicz; however, he is now perceived as a great rival of the older poet. He visited Rome in 1836.

Nagle mię trącił płacz na pustym błonię:/ 'Rzymie! nie jesteś ty już dawnym Rzymem'./ Tak śpiewał pasterz trzód siedząc na koniu/ Przedemną mroczną błękitnym dymem/ Sznury pałaców pod Apeninami,/ Nad nimi kościół ten, co jest olbrzymem./ Za mną był morski brzeg i nad falami/ Okrętów tłum jako łabędzie stado,/ Które ogarnął sen pod ruinami./ I zdjął mię wielki płacz, gdy tą gromadą/ Poranny zachwiał wiatr i pędził dalej/ Jakby girlandę dusz w błękitność bladą./ I zdjął mię wielki strach, gdy poznikali/ Ci aniołowie fal — a ja zostałem/ W pustyni sam — z Rzymem, co już się wali./ I nigdy w życiu takich łez nie lałem./ Jak wtenczas — gdy mię spytało w pustyni/ Słońce, szydzący bóg — czy Rzym widziałem? (Słowacki, 2005, p. 113).

Suddenly, a cry of sorrow touched me on the empty meadow:/ 'Rome! You are not old Rome anymore',/ a shepherd on a horse was singing it./ In front of me, dim with blue smoke,/ a string of palaces [standing] on the foot of the Apennines/ above them [palaces] was the church... a giant./ The shore was behind me,/ and a fleet of ships in waves, like a flock of swans,/ were seized with sleep under the ruins./ And then tears overcame me, when this flock [of ships]/ were moved by a wind, and [a wind] drove them far away/ as a garland of souls into wan blueness./ And fear overcame me, when they [ships] disappeared./ those angels of the waves — And I was left alone/ in the desert — with Rome, which was collapsing./ And I have never in my life shed such tears/ as then, when in the desert/ the Sun, a deriding God, asked me, if I had seen Rome.

The poem is a variation on the theme of the famous elegy by the sixteenth-century Sicilian humanist Janus Vitalis, very popular in Polish and European literature (Graciotti, 1991; Zarucchi, 2013). The main topic of the poem is a feeling of alienation and fragility in being confronted with ruins (Inglot, 2002; Kuczera-Chachulska, 2002; Mikołajczak, 2002; Zgorzelski, 1980). The image of Rome in the poem is subjective, metaphorical and emotional. Three elements are contrasted: 1) contemporary Rome with palaces and Saint Peter's Basilica; 2) ancient ruins in decay; 3) ships on a shore. According to Czesław Zgorzelski, there is strong opposition in the poem: a static Rome and a dynamic movement of ships that make the lyrical voice cry (Zgorzelski, 1980, p. 28). Ships may be a symbol of 'reserves of imagination' (Foucault, 2005, p. 124). When they disappear, the lyrical voice is overcome with sadness, because Rome, in the past the greatest city on earth, is now in decay, is 'collapsing'. As demonstrated above, among the ruins of Rome poets felt overwhelmed by a feeling of inevitable fragility. In this context, it should be noted that the lyrical voice meets two 'characters'. The first is the shepherd. According to researchers, this person introduces a contrast between the old Rome, imperial city, now in ruins, and present-day Rome, which is inhabited by peasants and in decay. The second 'character' is a symbolic one — the Sun, 'a deriding god'. According to Chloe Chard, ruins are repositories of the unconscious and supernatural and such is the case with Słowacki's poem. It should also be pointed out that the Sun appears in a place described as 'the desert'. Rome, which used to be the capital of an empire, the city of the gods (Edwards, 1996, p. 44–68), the centre of Catholicism, is described in the poem as the desert where 'a deriding God' reveals itself. The final question ('Have I seen Rome?') and the lyrical voice's tears introduce a contrast between the overwhelming power of time and nature (symbolized by the deriding Sun) and the fragility of human deeds and achievements that are even as magnificent as Rome itself.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Centre of Science (Project 2011/03/N/HS2/01724, Decision Number DEC-2011/03/N/HS2/01724) and by a Scholarship of the Foundation of Adam Mickiewicz University.

Bibliography

- 1 Bassin, M. *Inventing Siberia: Visions of the Russian East in the early nineteenth century*. *American Historical Review* (1991), 96(3), 763–794.
- 2 Biliński, B. Norwid w Rzymie. In M. Żmigrodzka (Ed.), *Cyprian Norwid w 150-lecie urodzin. Materiały konferencji naukowej 23–25 września 1871*, 1973, p. 151–195, Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- 3 Burkot, S. *Polskie podróżopisarstwo romantyczne*. Warszawa: PWN, 1988.
- 4 Chard, C. The road to ruin: memory, ghosts, moonlight and weeds. In C. Edwards (Ed.), *Roman presences. Receptions Rome in European Culture, 1789–1945*, 1999, p. 125–139. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 5 Edwards, C. *Writing Rome: Textual Approaches to the City*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- 6 Fiećko, J. *Rosja Krasiniego. Rzecz o nieprzejednaniu*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 2005.

- 7 Fieguth, R. Od „Pompei» do „Quidama». Z problemów klasycyzmu norwidowskiego. In K.Meller (Ed.), *Klasycyzm. Estetyka — doktryna literacka — antropologia*, 2009, p. 345–374. Warszawa: NERITON.
- 8 Flašar, M. *Njegoš i antika*. (M.Babović, Ed.). Podgorica: Institut imeni Njegoša, 1997.
- 9 Foucault, M. Inne przestrzenie. *Teksty Drugie*, (6), 2005, p. 117–125.
- 10 Goethe, J. W. *Italian Journey*. (W.H.Auden & E.Mayer, Trans.). Harmondsworth: Penguin books, 1970.
- 11 Graciotti, S. Losy jednej z elegii Giana Vitaliego, czyli ruiny Rzymu w polskiej poezji. In W.Jekiel, J.Rogoziński, & G.Błachowicz (Trans.), *Od Renesansu do Oświecenia*, Warszawa: PIW, 1991, p. 139–158.
- 12 Ingot, M. „Rzym» — elegia dramatyczna Juliusza Słowackiego. *Nie tylko o „Kordianie»*. *Studia nad twórczością Juliusza Słowackiego*, Wrocław: Dolnośląskie Wydawnictwo Edukacyjne, 2002, p. 180–189.
- 13 Janion, M. *Zygmunt Krasiński. Debiut i dojrzałość*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna, 1962.
- 14 Jezernik, B. *Dzika Europa. Balkany w oczach zachodnich podróżników*. (P.Oczko, Trans.). Kraków: Universitas, 2007.
- 15 Jovanović, M. *Gore dole po Napulju. Putničke crte*. Beograd, Zagreb: Srpska književna zadruga, 1898.
- 16 Kennedy, D. F. A sense of place: Rome, history and empire revisited. In C.Edwards (Ed.), *Roman presences. Receptions of Rome in European Culture, 1789–1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, p. 19–34.
- 17 Kilibarda, V. Njegoš i Italija. In S.Tomović (Ed.), *Enciklopedija Njegoš 1*. Podgorica: Fondacija Njegoš, CID, 1999, p. 161–169.
- 18 Kilibarda, V. Njegoševo poslednje putovanje: kroz Italiju 1850–1851. *Lingua Montenegrina*, (9), 2012, p. 151–172.
- 19 Krasiński, Z. *Listy do ojca*. (S.Pigoń, Ed.). Warszawa: PIW, 1963.
- 20 Krasiński, Z. (a). *Dzieła literackie. T. 1*. (P.Hertz, Ed.). Warszawa: PIW, 1973.
- 21 Krasiński, Z. (b). *Dzieła literackie. T. 3*. (P.Hertz, Ed.). Warszawa: PIW, 1973.
- 22 Królikiewicz, G. *Terytorium ruin. Ruina jako obraz i temat romantyczny*. Kraków: Universitas, 1993.
- 23 Kuczera-Chachulska, B. „Płacz» Słowackiego. Liryczna wartość motywu. *Przemiany form i postaw elegijnych w liryce polskiej XIX wieku. Mickiewicz, Słowacki, Norwid, Faleński, Asnyk, Konopnicka* (pp. 159–174). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu im. Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego, 2002.
- 24 Kuźma, E. *Mit Orientu i kultury Zachodu w literaturze XIX i XX wieku*. Szczecin: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej w Szczecinie, 1980.
- 25 Litwornia, A. *Rzym Mickiewicza: poeta nad Tybrem 1829–1831*. Warszawa: Prószyński — S-ka, 2005.
- 26 Mickiewicz, A. *Dzieła. T. 14. Listy, część pierwsza 1815–1829*. (M.Dernałowicz, E.Jaworska, & M.Zielińska, Eds.). Warszawa: Czytelnik, 1998.
- 27 Mickiewicz, A. *Dzieła. T. 17. Listy, część czwarta 1849–1855*. (M.Dernałowicz, E.Jaworska, & M.Zielińska, Eds.). Warszawa: Czytelnik, 2005.
- 28 Mikołajczak, M. Rzym neoklasycystyczny Jarosława Marka Rymkiewicza w kontekście wiersza „Rzym» Juliusza Słowackiego. In M.Kuziak (Ed.), *Juliusz Słowacki. Wyobrażenia i egzystencja* (p. 315–326). Słupsk: Pomorska Akademia Pedagogiczna w Słupsku, 2002.
- 29 Mocarska-Tycowa, Z. Rzym antyczny i Kampania Rzymska w malarstwie romantycznym. In M.Kalinowska & B.Paprocka-Podlasiak (Eds.), *Antyk romantyków — model europejski i wariant polski: rekonesans*, Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Grado, 2003, p. 593–603.
- 30 Nenadović, L. *Pisma iz Italije*. Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga, 1907.
- 31 Njegoš, P. *Njegoševa bilježnica*. (J.Jovanović, Ed.). Cetinje: Istoriski institut, 1956.
- 32 Njegoš, P. *Celokupna dela VI. Izabrana pisma*. (N.Banašević, V.Latković, & J.Milović, Eds.) (9th ed.). Beograd: Prosveta, Obod, 1981.
- 33 Norwid, C. *Pisma wszystkie. T. 7. Proza, część wtorek*. (J.W.Gomulicki, Ed.). Warszawa: PIW, 1973.
- 34 Piętka, R. „Terminus». Rzym jako symbol trwałości i przemijania, 2003. *Symbolae Philologorum Posnaniensium Graecae et Latinae*2, 15.
- 35 Piętka, R. Hellenizacja i deromanizacja. Dylematy dziewiętnastowiecznej refleksji o antyku. In E.Wesołowska (Ed.), *Romantyczna „antiquitas». Rzymskie inspiracje w teatrze i dramacie XIX wieku z uwzględnieniem mediacji calderonowskiej i szekspirowskiej* Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 2007, p. 9–18.
- 36 Pižurica, K. Mediteranski motivi u Njegoševom djelu. *Letopis Matice srpske*, 461(3), 1998, p. 582–605.
- 37 Popović, M. *Istorija srpske književnosti. Romantizam 2*. Beograd: Nolit, 1972.
- 38 Przybylski, R. *Rozhukany koń: esej o myśleniu Juliusza Słowackiego*. Warszawa: Sic!, 1999.
- 39 Said, E. W. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin, 1977.
- 40 Słowacki, J. *Wiersze. Nowe wydanie krytyczne*. (J.Brzozowski & Z.Przychodniak, Eds.). Poznań: UAM, 2005.
- 41 Stefanowska, Z. Norwidowski romantyzm. *Strona romantyków. Studia o Norwidzie*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1993.
- 42 Stuparević, O. Srpski putopis o Italiji. In N.Stipčević (Ed.), *Uporedna israživanja 1* (p. 103–181). Beograd: Institut za književnost i umetnost, 1976.
- 43 Śliwiński, M. *Antyk i chrześcijaństwo w twórczości Zygmunta Krasińskiego*. Słupsk: Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna w Słupsku, 1986.
- 44 Śliwiński, M. *Norwid wobec antyczno-średniowiecznej tradycji uniwersalizmu europejskiego*. Słupsk: Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna w Słupsku, 1992.
- 45 Tartalja, I. Jedan zaboravljen majstor srpske proze iz perioda ranog realizma. *Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane, Zbornik radova*, 13/2, 1984, p. 129–136.

- 46 Todorova, M. *Imagining the Balkans*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- 47 Trybuś, K. *Stary poeta. Studia o Norwidzie*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 2000.
- 48 Trybuś, K. Norwidowski klasycyzm — zarys problemu. In K.Meller (Ed.), *Klasycyzm. Estetyka — doktryna literacka — antropologia*, Warszawa: NERITON, 2009, p. 375–390.
- 49 Waśko, A. *Zygmunt Krasiński. Oblicza poety*. Kraków: Arcana, 2001.
- 50 Wolff, L. *Inventing Eastern Europe. The map of civilization on the mind of the Enlightenment*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.
- 51 Zarucchi, J. M. Du Bellay, Spenser, and Quevedo Search for Rome: A Teacher 's Peregrination. *The French Review*, 71(2), 2013, p. 192–203.
- 52 Zgorzelski, C.Rzym. In S.Makowski (Ed.), *Juliusza Słowackiego rym błyskawicowy. Analizy i interpretacje* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Szkolne i Pedagogiczne, 1980, p. 26–30.
- 53 Zieliński, B. Njegoš u srpskom i crnogorskom književnom i kulturnom kanonu. In T.Bečanović, R.Glušica, & M.Ivanović (Eds.), *Njegoševi dani 1. Zbornik radova sa međunarodnog slavističkog naučnog skupa*, 2005, pp. 9–25. Nikšić: Univerzitet Crne Gore, Filozofski fakultet.
- 54 Ziemba, K. Rzym Mickiewicza (wokół listu Adama Mickiewicza do Marii Mickiewiczówny z 19 grudnia 1851 roku). In M.Kalinowska & B.Paprocka-Podlasiak (Eds.), *Antyk romantyków — model europejski i wariant polski: rekonesans*, 2003, pp. 172–194. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Grado.
- 55 Živančević-Sekeruš, I. *Kako (o) pisati različitost*. Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, 2009.

T.Эвертовски

Поляк және серб әдебиетінің романтикалық кезеңіндегі Рим бейнесі

Мақалада поляк және серб әдебиетінің романтикалық кезеңіндегі Рим бейнесі қарастырылды. Мақала авторы P.Njegoš, L.Nenadović, A.Mickiewicz, J.Słowacki, Z.Krasinski, C.Norwid сияқты поляк және серб жазушыларының туындылары негізінде Рим бейнесіне салыстырмалы талдау жасады. Ол Рим бейнесін үш тұрғыдан қарады: «Рим утопия ретінде», «Рим дүниежүзілік өркениеттің өшу символы» және «Рим сияқты еуроөркениеттің мультимәдени факторы». Аталған концептілер мәтін үзінділерімен, сондай-ақ поляк және серб мәдениетінің, XIX ғасыр саяси және әлеуметтік өмірінің философиялық және идеологиялық аспектілерінің терең талдауымен нақтыланды.

T.Эвертовски

Образ Рима в польской и сербской литературе романтического периода

Автором статьи представлен сравнительный анализ образа Рима в произведениях польских и сербских писателей P.Njegoš, L.Nenadović, A.Mickiewicz, J.Słowacki, Z.Krasinski, C.Norwid. Выявлено три концепта, лежащих в основе интерпретации этого образа в польской и сербской литературах: «Рим как утопия», «Рим как символ увядающей мировой цивилизации», «Рим как фактор мультикультурной составляющей европейской цивилизации». Каждое из положений подтверждается не только текстовыми фрагментами, но и глубоким анализом философских и идеологических аспектов польской и сербской культуры, политической и социальной жизни XIX века.