

## ***Rachunki* from Exile. Emigration Experiences in the First Józef Ignacy Kraszewski's Annual. Introductory Research**

**Urszula Kowalczyk**  
University of Warsaw, Poland  
ORCID: 0000-0002-0867-3184

**Abstract:** The article raises questions about the influence of Józef Ignacy Kraszewski's exile experiences on the ways of creating critical subjectivity in *Rachunki*, especially in the first annual published in Poznań in 1867 under the pseudonym Bolesławita. The analysis includes metatextual statements, metaphors which facilitate the naming of writing tasks and goals, as well as the functions of selected grammatical forms. This allowed me to highlight the importance of the writer's diagnoses of contemporary times from the perspective of an exile. The article demonstrates that this did not mean a clear self-identification established through the textual strategies applied, but rather influenced the identity instability of the creative subject disclosed in *Rachunki*.

**Key words:** Józef Ignacy Kraszewski, *Rachunki*, emigration, the 1860s, identity

### ***Rachunki* z wygnania. Doświadczenia wychodźcze w rocznikach Józefa Ignacego Kraszewskiego. Rekonesans**

**Abstrakt:** W artykule podjęte zostały pytania o wpływ wygnańczych doświadczeń Józefa Ignacego Kraszewskiego na sposoby kreowania podmiotowości krytycznej w *Rachunkach*, a zwłaszcza w ich pierwszym roczniku opublikowanym w Poznaniu w 1867 roku pod pseudonimem Bolesławita. Analizie poddano wypowiedzi metatekstowe, metaforękę wspierającą nazywanie podejmowanych zadań i celów pisarskich oraz funkcje wybieranych form gramatycznych. Pozwoliło to na wyeksponowanie znaczenia, jakie miało dokonywanie przez pisarza diagnoz współczesności z perspektywy przede wszystkim wygnańca. Pokazano, że nie oznaczało to jednoznacznej autoidentyfikacji ustalonej poprzez stosowane strategie tekstowe, lecz raczej wpływało na tożsamościowe rozchwywanie ujawniającego się w *Rachunkach* podmiotu twórczego.

**Słowa kluczowe:** Józef Ignacy Kraszewski, *Rachunki*, wychodźstwo, lata 60. XIX wieku, tożsamość

<sup>1</sup> The title *Rachunki* (literally: Accounts) can be treated as ambiguous. It indicates accounting (counting, summarizing, balancing) understood not in the economic sense, but as summing/balancing up social, cultural and political profits and losses. For Kraszewski, *Rachunki* is also a diagnosis, a settlement, and even a word having moral connotations related to the "examination of conscience".

1.

No other work would perhaps offer a more panoramic picture of Polish literature, culture and politics in the 1860s<sup>2</sup> than *Rachunki* written by Józef Ignacy Kraszewski, signed with the pseudonym B.[ogdan] Bolesławita. The annuals were published in Poznań between 1867 and 1870 and constituted a diagnosis of the Polish situation in all the partitions and emigration in the years 1866–1869.<sup>3</sup> The books were considered as one of the most important voices in the ongoing discussion about the validity and effects of the January Uprising, and, in a broader perspective – about the possible and most effective methods and attitudes that could guarantee the oppressed nation would preserve its identity and eventually regain freedom.<sup>4</sup> At the same time, however, their scope went far beyond this discussion because they provided a unique insight into the social, mental, political and cultural transformations in Poland and Europe in the seventh decade of the 19th century – a period exceptional for many reasons.

Concluding *Wstęp* (Introduction) to the first annual of *Rachunki*, Kraszewski clearly formulated its task: “The aim of the collection is a report, not entirely like a chronicle, of the past year and recent times; a confession of thoughts, issues, works, beliefs and more important facts that concerned our nation” („Celem zbiorku jest sprawozdanie niezupełnie kronikarskie z upłynionego roku i czasów niedawno ubiegłych; spowiedź z myśli, zaprzątnień, dzieł, przekonań i faktów ważniejszych, które narodowość naszą obchodziły”).<sup>5</sup> He was also held accountable for the accomplishment of this very aim. It was not easy to critically reflect and then study the multitude of issues and problems addressed by Bolesławita. At the same time, his contemporaries reacted to his work so strongly that one could speak of a “journalistic

---

<sup>2</sup> On the importance of this decade, which is still not fully appreciated in the history of literature, see: e.g. *Literatura południa wieku. Twórczość lat sześćdziesiątych XIX stulecia wobec romantyzmu i pozytywizmu*, ed. J. Maciejewski, Warszawa 1992; *Literatura i kultura lat 60. XIX wieku między polityką a prywatnością. Dyslokacje*, ed. U. Kowalczyk, D.W. Makuch, D.M. Osiński, Warszawa 2019.

<sup>3</sup> B. Bolesławita [J.I. Kraszewski], *Z roku 1866. Rachunki*, Poznań 1867; ibidem *Z roku 1867. Rachunki. Rok drugi*, parts one and two, Poznań 1868; ibidem, *Z roku 1868. Rachunki. Rok trzeci*, Poznań 1869; ibidem, *Z roku 1869. Rachunki, Rok czwarty*, Poznań 1870. Fragments of the last volume were reprinted and summarized in the magazine: “Kraj” 1870, no. 222–225, 227, 239, 241, 246, 248, 252.

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. W. Danek, *Publicystyka Józefa Ignacego Kraszewskiego w latach 1859–1872*, Wrocław 1957, pp. 31–133; J. Bachórz, *Kraszewski-Bolesławita a następcy, czyli o narodzinach legendy powstania styczniowego*, „Rocznik Towarzystwa Naukowego imienia Adama Mickiewicza” 1981, R. 16; B. Osmólska-Piskorska, *Powstanie styczniowe w twórczości Józefa Ignacego Kraszewskiego*, Toruń 1963; E. Czapiewski, *Między buntem a ugodą. Kształtowanie się poglądów politycznych Józefa Ignacego Kraszewskiego*, Wrocław 2000.

<sup>5</sup> B. Bolesławita [J.I. Kraszewski], *Wstęp*, to: ibidem, *Z roku 1866. Rachunki*, Poznań 1867, p. 5. I further mark it in the main text using the abbreviation R 1866 and adding the page number.

sensation.”<sup>6</sup> In other words, the basic set of crucial current problems discussed by the author in his works was identified relatively quickly. What could be read in almost all the reviews<sup>7</sup> was clearly confirmed years later by the researcher of Kraszewski’s writings, Wincenty Danek, stating that the most important intention of the author of *Rachunki* was “to handle the feudal-clerical camp”<sup>8</sup> dominant in Galicia, especially in Kraków. Already in the writer’s first monograph, published after his death, written by Piotr Chmielowski, both the various phases of his account settlement as well as its non-obviousness<sup>9</sup> were thoroughly described. Still important and clear, although not always sufficiently prominent in the discussions, was the issue of emigration. The belief in the opposition to emigration emerging in the country, especially in Galicia, or even aversion to it and its political goals defined as independence-related in the sense of insurrection, was the fundamental starting point for Kraszewski’s critical comments.<sup>10</sup> The need to defend the status of Polish emigrants scattered throughout Europe and the world was the consequence of the author distancing himself from the legalistic and organicist (sometimes also loyalist) proposals of Kraków’s cultural and political elites, as well as his opposition to the general demoralization and collapse of ideals in the homeland. There is no doubt that Bolesławita became the first such committed record keeper, analyst and judge of the transformations taking place in the 1860s that were closely related to the reconfiguration of the relationship between the homeland and the emigration.

As Janusz Maciejewski aptly demonstrated, since the 1950s, the Polish circles and institutions shaped by the Great Emigration had no longer had such a significant impact on Polish matters. Important events influencing this process of revaluation were related to the years 1864, 1866 and 1871. The defeat of the January Uprising brought “a short-term revival of Polish political life abroad as a result of [...] a wave of new emigrants” („krótkotrwałe ożywienie polskiego życia politycznego na obczyźnie w wyniku [...] fali nowych emigrantów”)<sup>11</sup> but also an awareness of the necessary modification of the rules of Polish community life. Gaining autonomy created the chance

<sup>6</sup> W. Danek, *Józef Ignacy Kraszewski*, Warszawa 1973, p. 401. At the same time, the author believed that although *Rachunki* caused lively discussions, the quality of comments in these disputes was too low and only Zygmunt Miłkowski (Teodor Tomasz Jeż) managed to enter into an actual ideological debate with Bolesławita. W. Danek, *Publicystyka...*, p. 117, 126.

<sup>7</sup> See *Bibliografia literatury polskiej Nowy Korbut*, vol. 12: *Józef Ignacy Kraszewski. Zarys bibliograficzny*, compiled by S. Stupkiewicz, I. Śliwińska, W. Roszkowska-Sykałowa, Kraków 1966, pp. 194–195.

<sup>8</sup> W. Danek, *Józef Ignacy Kraszewski*, Warszawa 1973, p. 395.

<sup>9</sup> P. Chmielowski, *Józef Ignacy Kraszewski. Zarys historyczno-literacki*, Kraków 1888, pp. 353–363.

<sup>10</sup> In this context, see J.W. Borejsza, *Emigracja polska po powstaniu styczniowym*, Warszawa 1966, pp. 257–271.

<sup>11</sup> J. Maciejewski, *Mala emigracja (1864–1914). Próba uporządkowania problematyki*, in: *ibidem*, *Obszary i konteksty literatury*, Warszawa 1998, p. 186.

for Galicia, and not for the emigration, to “begin to play the role of the centre of Polish free speech” („zaczęła odgrywać rolę centrum polskiego wolnego słowa”),<sup>12</sup> which also changed the expectations towards it.<sup>13</sup> The end of the Franco-Prussian War and the process of unification of the German Empire weakened hopes for insurrection activities in Poland, established new relations between the country and the emigration and changed the status of the Polish communities in German territories. In *Rachunki*, Kraszewski had the opportunity to be a commentator of processes related to the first two of the above-mentioned turning points.

One may say that although Bolesławita took into consideration all the geopolitical differences of the divided Polish lands and the dispersion of what in the 19th century used to be called “the Polish element” („żywiół polski”) beyond their administrative borders (the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth or the demarcation lines separating the occupying powers), the most important factual or imagined distinction was the one he made between Galicia of the autonomous era and Polish emigration, i.e. Poles in Western European countries and America. Regardless of which side of the division sketched by Bolesławita the critical or the research-related attention was directed towards, it usually confirmed the synthetic meaning of the “reporting, information and criticism annual” („rocznik sprawozdawczo-informacyjny i krytyczny”)<sup>14</sup> and it exposed the value of “critical *silva rerum* from year to year” („krytyczna *silva rerum* z roku na rok”).<sup>15</sup> It was the nature, the scope and the various structures of the writer’s identifications of the problems of the 19th century’s crisis that usually occupied the professional readers of his work. Equally interesting, however, are the textual strategies used in Bolesławita’s work, the changing perspectives, the narrator’s positions, and the roles of the subject. These are the issues that I intend to focus on.

## 2.

Despite the dominance of interest in what Bolesławita had to say, and not in how he articulated it, professional audiences of the writer’s contemporaries tried to define his authorial roles in *Rachunki*. This was done, for example, by the editorial staff of “Kraj”, making an effort to popularize

<sup>12</sup> J. Maciejewski, *Mala emigracja (1864–1914)*, p. 186.

<sup>13</sup> As Maciejewski remarked, some of the post-January Uprising emigrants also went to Galicia, and some emigration institutions started to be moved there, e.g. the Czartoryski Museum from the Lambert Hotel. See J. Maciejewski, *Mala emigracja (1864–1914)*, p. 186. See also: *ibidem*, p. 190.

<sup>14</sup> W. Danek, *Józef Ignacy Kraszewski. Zarys biograficzny*, Warszawa 1973, p. 404.

<sup>15</sup> *Z roku 1869. Rachunki, przez Bolesławitę*. (Year four. – Poznań in Żupański.), „Kraj” 1870, no. 222, p. [1].

the most important fragments of their latest annual and appreciating the achievements of “an *ad hoc* historian of the present” („doraźny historyk terażniejszości”).<sup>16</sup> Years later, Alina Witkowska drew attention to the fact that in Kraszewski’s reporting work, “[t]he conscious genre hybridity was fuelled by the contradictory energies of the author’s subjectivity („[u]świadomioną hybrydyczność gatunkową zasilają sprzeczne energie podmiotowości autorskiej”).<sup>17</sup> This apt and inspiring statement is no less important for my considerations than the observation (albeit also requiring developing and supplementing) that Bolesławita “incidentally became the first outstanding monographer of emigration, demonstrating extraordinary insight into understanding its historical and existential fate” („mimoходом stał się pierwszym wybitnym monografistą emigracji, wykazującym niezwykle przenikliwość w rozumieniu jej historycznego i egzystencjalnego losu”).<sup>18</sup> The “monographer of emigration” was certainly one of the textual incarnations of the “bookkeeper of his times”. However, one needs to remember that the subject of *Rachunki* is also – to use a paraphrase – a “bookkeeper of his experiences”. It seems, therefore, worth making yet another attempt at studying Bolesławita’s work, but this time by recognizing the ways in which these experiences entered his accounting reports, since the nature and the quality of his judgements cannot be independent of the author’s textual figures. Signing *Rachunki* with a pseudonym is already very significant. This seems to me particularly interesting and, moreover, still too rarely discussed. So far, it was appreciated most by Wiesław Ratajczak, who reconstructed “the author’s self-portrait from the time of keeping vigil over the dying nation” („autoportret autora z czasu czuwania przy konającym narodzie”)<sup>19</sup> and emphasized the aspect of loneliness in a situation of specific cultural and political transformation and the moral suffering related to the belief in the “tragic consequences of sins that were unconscious, unconfessed and unatoned for” („tragiczne następstwa win nieświadomych, niewyznanych i nieodpokutowanych”)<sup>20</sup>. The researcher concluded that “[t]he most important incarnation of the author remains the confessor” („[n]ajważniejszym wcieleniem autora pozostaje jednak spowiednik”).<sup>21</sup> This

<sup>16</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>17</sup> A. Witkowska, *Buchalter swoich czasów*, in: *Zdziwienia Kraszewskim*, ed. M. Zielińska, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1990, p. 90. On the various contemporary approaches to hybridization see e.g. D.M. Osiński, *Hybrydy gatunkowe – między niemożliwością, przejściowością a poszukiwaniem pełni*, „Tekstualia” 2021, no. 3 (*Gatunki hybrydyczne w literaturze i sztuce*), pp. 3–17.

<sup>18</sup> A. Witkowska, *Buchalter swoich czasów*, p. 96.

<sup>19</sup> W. Ratajczak, „Papier – poczyty to przyjaciel, z którym pogawędzić miło”. *Osobiste tony w „Rachunkach” Kraszewskiego*, in: *Krasiński i Kraszewski wobec europejskiego romantyzmu i dylematów XIX wieku (w dwustulecie urodzin pisarzy)*, ed. M. Junkiert, W. Ratajczak, T. Sobieraj, Poznań 2016, p. 256.

<sup>20</sup> W. Ratajczak, op. cit., p. 252.

<sup>21</sup> Ibidem, p. 251.

role was also one that was most easily noticed and condemned by reviewers, especially the most critical of them, Stanisław Tarnowski.<sup>22</sup>

Meanwhile, it must be admitted that Bolesławita, throughout the years of publishing his annuals, made a lot of effort to name not only his various tasks, but also his writing roles and, above all, the individual experiences that defined them. This is particularly confirmed by the introductions to individual volumes, which allow the reader to follow his train of thought.<sup>23</sup> The writer defined his authorial position particularly clearly in *Wstęp* (Introduction) to the first volume of *Rachunki*, mentioned at the beginning of this article, ending with a clearly formulated conclusion, which has already been quoted. This initial volume shall constitute the primary focus of my attention in this paper.

In the introduction, the confessional formula (referring to both the confessor and the penitent) was accompanied by other significant declarations and self-definitions. The comparison with a life outcast, putting on monastic robes, led to the following reflection:

[...] whoever came down from the line of fighters, tired or wounded, and sat on a hill watching the swordsmen, should take a piece of paper and write down their history. [...] Why remind us here how one moved from the ranks of soldiers to the ranks of spectators, the disabled and the infirm ones who, though no longer able to fight, still want to look at the fighters. We know that even this curiosity is held against us by the young generation... (R 1866, 2).

[...] kto zszedł z szeregu walczących znużony czy ranny i siadł na pagórkę przypatrując się szermierzom, – powinien wziąć kartę do ręki i zapisywać ich dzieje. [...] Po cóż tu przypominać, jak się to z szeregu żołnierzy przeszło do widzów, do inwalidów i niedołęgów, którzy już bić się nie mogą, jeszcze na walczących patrzeć pragną. Wiemy, że nawet tę ciekawość ma nam za złe pokolenie młode... (R 1866, 2).

This “old monastic writer of annuals” („stary rocznikarz klasztorny”) (R 1866, 3) did not want to take on the role of a “cold annual writer” („chłodny annalista”) (1866, 2), but had the courage to undertake the difficult “mission of pointing out” („misja smagania”) (R 1866, 4) the faults, negligence and dishonesty of his compatriots. These suggestive forms contain a heterogeneous code of self-presentation, but one that evokes clear associations. Or rather, the first of the codes. For there was also the second one, since, just like in the first volume, there was the second introductory fragment, entitled *Rzeczy ogólne* (General Matters). Its importance is hard to miss since the author himself referred to it, by no means routinely or coldly: “Please read the next chapter, written at another moment, which we

<sup>22</sup> See S. Tarnowski, „Rachunki z roku 1867 przez B. Bolesławitę”. *Poznań nakładem Żupańskiego 1868. II tomy*, „Przegląd Polski” 1868/1869, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 157–158.

<sup>23</sup> Moreover, they also seem very interesting for other reasons in the context of the 19th-century practice of writing forewords. See M. Stanisław, *Przedmowa*, in: *Słownik polskiej krytyki literackiej 1764–1918. Pojęcia – terminy – zjawiska – przekroje*, vol. 2: *N–Z*, ed. J. Bachórz et al., Toruń–Warszawa 2016, pp. 406–411; E. Malinowska, *O przedmowach do „Rachunków” Józefa Ignacego Kraszewskiego*, in: *Romantyczne przemowy i przedmowy* ed. J. Lyszczyzna, M. Bąk, Katowice 2010, pp. 248–256.

did not have the courage to reject nor devote time to” („Proszę czytać rozdział następny napisany w innej chwili, któregośmy nie mieli odwagi odrzucić, ani mu tego poświęcić”) (R 1866, 4). One would like to immediately ask what could have intimidated the chronicler, who, with courageous determination, despite the feeling of marginalization in life, accepted the responsibility of a critic and assessor of his times. The reading allows us to state that the fear (albeit rather rhetorical) pushed into the background is what could be called the founding experience of the annuals – the memorable conversation that prompted the author to make a writing commitment. Therefore, the later elements in the composition of the text and the order of reading were in fact prior to them in the author’s biography, although the autobiographical code was secondary. In this way, primary issues that were too personal were made subordinate in *Rachunki*.<sup>24</sup> While in *Wstęp* (Introduction) Bolesławita was, as it were, “trying on” and selecting ready-made writing costumes – of a monastic scribe, an annual writer, a confessor – in *Rzeczy ogólne* (General Matters) he talked about the current determinants of the writing decision. These included not only the specification of time, but also – what is of particular importance – the location. For instance, under *Rzeczy ogólne* (General Matters) there was an annotation: “Lucerne, November.”

### 3.

In this case, the name of the Swiss city is not just a toponym confirming the place where the text originated. This signal pointing to a specific place on the map of Europe becomes significant because it closes an interesting description of the exile experience. Therefore, it becomes a sign of foreignness,<sup>25</sup> and, moreover, it is a special sign if we look at it from the perspective of what Kraszewski wrote about it in the same volume of *Rachunki*. His observations regarding the European reaction to the Polish post-January Uprising emigration were extremely bitter. According to the author, in Western Europe “the march into exile was probably equal to the one in Siberia or not much different from it... at the destination it was in fact often much worse than in Siberia” („pochód na wygnanie równał się pewnie sybirskiemu lub niewiele różnił się od niego...na miejscu przeznaczenia często było wiele gorzej niż na Sybirze”) (R 1866, 117), where the exiles experienced the mercy of the people wronged by the Moscow authorities:<sup>26</sup>

<sup>24</sup> See W. Ratajczak, op. cit., p. 251.

<sup>25</sup> As a side note, it is worth noting that on the new map of the post-January Uprising Polish emigration, the importance of Switzerland has increased significantly, becoming the second most important centre, after Paris, of Polish emigration. See J. Maciejewski, *Mała emigracja (1864–1914)*, p. 188, 192.

<sup>26</sup> Here, it is worth noting contextually that the relationships between emigration and exile will become more and more diversified and complex as the number of records about

One poor, the poorest, humble Swiss country did not refuse to offer shelter to the unfortunate ones... so it was natural that all those who did not have their own country crowded there in search for refuge... maybe they failed to pay for the hospitality as they should have – but let the honour, fame and eternal memory be all the greater for the Swiss... They were the only ones who turned out to be humans... and Christians, but ones following the teachings of Christ and not the codes (1866, 115–116).

Jeden biedny, najuboższy, poczciwy kraik szwajcarski nie odmówił nieszczęśliwym przytuliska... ścisnęli się tam naturalnie wszyscy ci, którzy żadnego nie mieli... może nie tak jakby należało opłacili gościnność – ale też tym większa niech będzie cześć i sława i pamięć wiekiasta Szwajcarom... Oni jedni byli ludźmi... chrześcijanami wedle Chrystusa, nie wedle kodeksów (1866, 115–116).

Lucerne therefore “represents” Switzerland here. This means that it is not only a topographic sign of hospitality, but also a special stage of the exile route, symbolizing a place of salvation for those who had to leave their homeland and (often) were not accepted elsewhere, or chased away from wherever they were fleeing. The author might have wished to signal these connotations, even if he himself was able to travel between Dresden and Lucerne without such negative experiences. In *Wieczory drezdeńskie* (Dresden Evenings)<sup>27</sup> he already pointed out the special role of Switzerland on the map of Polish exiles.

The main part of *Rzeczy ogólne* (General Matters) offers a preliminary diagnosis of the relationship between the homeland and emigration. However, it is also significant that it is being revealed to the reader in a friendly conversation in which the author participated. We discover not only its content, but also the scenery, mood and effect. The account of a leisurely hike “on the shores of the wonderful Lake Lucerne” („brzegiem cudownym Jeziora Czterech Kantonów”) (R 1866, [6]) is by no means focused on the beauty of nature, but on the longings of the participants in a “sad” and “painful” conversation (R 1866, [6]), and, above all, on realizing and naming the life circumstances of an exile:

And we remembered that we, exiles, were wandering on the hospitable shores of the Swiss land and not on our Masovian plains on the sad banks of the fawn-coloured Vistula.

And there was a moment when even the colossal Righi disappeared from our sight, and we could only see our rustling pine forest in a sandy valley...

Invictis pax!

Yes! Yes! peace to the unconquered though defeated. This inscription does not strike us in vain... it promises us... relief in the future – but today?? today! (R 1866, [6]–7).

---

them increases. See e.g. D.M. Osiński, *W stronę diaspory syberyjskiej, czyli „sceny z życia koczującego” w latach 60. XIX wieku*, in: *Literatura i kultura lat 60. XIX wieku...*, pp. 104–122; idem, *Turystyka i martyrologia. Topografie syberyjskie, czyli o codzienności „na etapie” w refleksji autobiograficznej Rufina Piotrowskiego oraz wybranych wątkach intymistyki i reportażowości XIX wieku*, in: *Wędrówki po dziejach. Księga jubileuszowa Profesora Tadeusza Stegnera*, ed. I. Janicka, A. Janicki, Gdańsk 2022, pp. 501–523.

<sup>27</sup> J. I. Kraszewski, *Wieczory drezdeńskie*, in: idem, *Wieczory drezdeńskie. Listy drezdeńskie*, Lwów 1866, p. 10.



I przypomniał sobie, żeśmy wygnańcy błędzili po wybrzeżach gościnnych swobodnej szwajcarskiej ziemi, a nie na naszych równinach mazowieckich u brzegów smętnych płowej Wisły.

A była chwila, że nawet kolosalna Righi znikła nam była z oczów, przed którymi stał szumiący nasz laszek sosnowy na piaszczystej dolinie...

Invictis pax!

Tak! Tak! pokój niezwyczęzonym choć upadłym. Napis ten nie daremnie uderza oczy nasze... przyrzeka on w przyszłości i nam... uspokojenie – ale dziś?? dziś! (R 1866, [6]–7).

It is perhaps no coincidence that although in *Rachunki* Bolesławita writes more frequently about emigrants than about exiles, the latter and the more negatively connoted term appears here. Moreover, its pejorative character is reinforced by the situation of wandering, which implies not only having no roots in a foreign place, but also the feeling of being lost. It would seem that this instability may increase uncertainty regarding further actions. In Kraszewski's work, however, it results in an important decision: "In this decisive conversation on the shores of the lake... I finally relented and was persuaded by my friend to write accounts from the past year" („Tak w tej stanowczej rozmowie u brzegów jeziora... dałem się zwyciężyć przyjacielowi i skłonić do pisania rachunków z przeszłego roku”) (R 1866, 14).<sup>28</sup> The content of the conversation becomes the justification for making a writing commitment, or maybe also a motivation to choose creative activity as a confirmation of one's presence in a situation of exclusion, an affirmation of one's own identity through the continuity of writing practice.

Bolesławita shares with his friend the belief in the unjust accusations made towards emigration, which is blamed for stimulating insurgent moods, and he sharply criticizes the moral condition and behaviour that were clearly observable among his compatriots in the three partitions. Hence the conclusion:

Despite the curse that today weighs on the entire emigration, despite the country's revulsion towards it, the country which has broken even the most sacred bonds with it – it is still, due to its position, when pain does not blind it, when it knows how to suffer in silence, it is still the fairest since the most impartial judge in national matters. At least in matters that do not concern emigration itself.

We shall not grant emigration the right to interfere in the activities of the country, nor to make any strange claims to direct them – but why should those standing on the side... not see clearer and further than those whose eyes are somewhat covered with dust from the fight? (R 1866, 15).

---

<sup>28</sup> It is worth comparing this author's account with the opinion of Wincenty Danek: "It seems that it was his stay in Galicia in 1866, which showed Kraszewski all the misery and danger of this Polish district, and made him realize the need to direct the development of the lands under Austrian rule to a different path. Undoubtedly, here, among others, one should look for the origins of the idea behind *Rachunki* [...]". („Wydaje się, że właśnie pobyt w Galicji w r. 1866, ukazując Kraszewskiemu całą nędzę i niebezpieczne perspektywy tej dzielnicy polskiej, uzmysłowił mu w rezultacie konieczność skierowania na inne tory rozwoju ziem zaboru austriackiego. Niewątpliwie tutaj m.in. należy szukać zarodki pomysłu *Rachunków* [...]". W. Danek, *Publicystyka...*, p. 65.

Mimo przekleństwa, jakie dziś ciąży na całej emigracji, pomimo wstępu do niej kraju, który wszelkie z nią najświętsze nawet węzły potargał – jest ona jeszcze ze swego położenia, gdy ją boleść nie oślepia, gdy cierpieć umie nie szalejąc, najsprawiedliwszym sędzią, bo najbezbzstronniejszym spraw krajowych. W tym, co jej nie tyczy przynajmniej.

Nie przyznajemy emigracji prawa mieszania się do robót i prac kraju, ani dziwaczych pretensji kierowania nimi – ale dlaczegoż by stojący na stronie... czyściej i dalej widzieć nie mieli od tych, co w kurzawie walki nieco pyłem zasypane mają oczy? (R 1866, 15).

However, the structure of the conversation and its meaning make us realize that it is not (only) a defence of the emigrants’ right to express opinions on common matters, but (also) the granting of the privilege of judging oneself as an exile. These words allow the reader to ascertain that the point of view adopted in *Rachunki* was located abroad, and to expect the declared objectivity of the report to be filtered through the emigration experience. In Kraszewski’s case this means confirmation of social importance (after all, not everyone was expelled from Warsaw as a potential threat, even before the uprising), the act of being marked with an exile stigma of redundancy, loss, humiliation, the obligation to represent and serve compatriots abroad, as well as the need to redefine one’s own relationship with the homeland. All this is, of course, not particularly difficult to conclude if one is familiar with Kraszewski’s biography.

#### 4.

Let us recall briefly that Kraszewski was writing *Rachunki* abroad when he was forced to leave his homeland in late January and early February 1863, but he published it in the Prussian partition, i.e. in his homeland. At that time he visited various places in Europe but his main place of stay was Dresden.<sup>29</sup> Initially, he obtained French citizenship there, in 1866 – Austrian citizenship, and in 1868 – Saxon citizenship. He was constantly involved in Polish affairs – for instance, he was writing texts to Western magazines explaining the issues related to the uprising, he became the treasurer of the local Polish philanthropic organization “Dobroczynność”, and he acted as an intermediary in the transport of weapons. When his colleague and friend, Leopold Kronenberg, was encouraging him to return to Warsaw and apply for the position of the head of the Department of Polish Literature at Szkoła Główna, the writer initially refused, arguing that he could serve his

---

<sup>29</sup> See W. Danek, *Józef Ignacy Kraszewski*, pp. 209–476. One needs to remember that this was Dresden before the important changes that took place after 1871, when, as a result of the unification of Germany under the leadership of Prussia, “both Saxony and Bavaria found themselves within the boundaries of the partitioning states. [...] emigrants in Dresden or Munich after 1871 can be treated at best as »semi-emigrants«. And that is how they saw themselves.” („tak Saksonia, jak i Bawaria znalazły się w obrębie jednego z państw zaborczych. [...] wychodźców w Dreźnie czy Monachium można po 1871 r. traktować co najwyżej jako swoistych »półemigrantów«. Tak zresztą i oni sami się widzieli”). J. Maciejewski, *Mała emigracja (1864–1914)*, p. 188, 192.

country better while in exile. Ultimately, however, he considered taking up the position, which, nevertheless, he failed to obtain due to the opposition of the tsarist authorities. Unable and unwilling to return to the Kingdom of Poland, Kraszewski tried to settle in Galicia as early as 1865 (at first he considered moving to Lviv, where he supported the creation of the local magazine "Hasło"). In 1866, he received the citizenship of Kraków, and in response to the invitation of Towarzystwo Wzajemnej Pomocy Studentów Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego (The Mutual Aid Society of the Jagiellonian University Students), Kraszewski stayed in this city from April 27 to May 7, 1867 and gave four lectures on Dante and the *Divine Comedy*. From there he went to Lviv where he repeated those lectures and also received honorary citizenship. Then he headed to Poznań but was forced to leave the city by the Prussian police and so he returned to Dresden via Berlin. Until 1869, he was trying to apply for the post of the head of the Department of the History of Polish Literature at Jagiellonian University, but without success due to, among other things, his conflicts with Kraków conservatives.<sup>30</sup>

At this point, however, I would like to focus on textual strategies and self-characterizations,<sup>31</sup> as these seem very interesting (and their connection with the above presented facts varies). Contrary to appearances, revealing the exile's experiences does not clarify the attitude of *Rachunki's* subject. He becomes a party to the "dispute" between the country and emigration. Furthermore, his attitude towards the land he was forced to leave may seem ambivalent. Nostalgia coupled with a harsh judgment of the growing practicalism in the homeland, which indicates consent to materialism and misguided adaptation to socio-economic and political circumstances, forces us to ask what its object is in this situation (something that used to be? something that is? something that could be?). The lack (or at least a radical weakening) of identification with the place from which one was expelled may also cause an excessive tendency to identify with the place where one has arrived. Emphasizing the situation of speaking from the position of an exile was a potentially risky move. After all, Kraszewski enjoyed considerable literary and social authority as a non-emigrant writer, and, to a large extent, this gave him the special right to judge his contemporaries. Even his opponents did grant him

<sup>30</sup> See W. Danek, *Józef Ignacy Kraszewski*, s. 409–279; idem, *Publicystyka...*, p. 49–65.

<sup>31</sup> This shift of interest from biographical information to the text is, in fact, a purely technical move, because the most important thing here is to point out the complex process of constant negotiation of meanings between the facts of the writer's biography as elements of the actual course of life, and the textual strategies aimed at talking about oneself, but not autobiographical ones in the simplest sense. In this context, see S. Rzepczyński, *Projekt „innego biografizmu”*, „Słupskie Prace Filologiczne. Seria Filologia Polska” 2007, no. 5, pp. 171–176; A. Ciałek, *Biografia jako reprezentacja*, „Annales Universitatis Paedagogicae Cracoviensis. Studia Poetica” 2016, R. IV, pp. 25–40. It would also be worth trying to juxtapose the issues discussed in this article with the interesting stance of Elżbieta Dąbrowicz. Eadem, *Biografia transgraniczna. Migracje jako problem tożsamości w polskim wieku XIX*, „Białostockie Studia Literaturoznawcze” 2010, no. 1, pp. 61–75.

this right.<sup>32</sup> If he presented the exile aspect as significant, it was something that, in a sense, both strengthened his reputation and stood in opposition to it, because its rationale was completely different (not as strong and not supported by such a long period of activity). It is hard to resist mentioning one context here. When, in the early 1860s, Kraszewski decided to support Polish affairs in the international arena, he went to France, where he found himself in the circle of people close to Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski<sup>33</sup> and there he published the famous pamphlet entitled *Sprawa polska w roku 1861* (The Polish Question in 1861).<sup>34</sup> Already then the text-related signals indicated that the conditions for the famous writer’s public speaking were becoming more complicated. The pamphlet was published anonymously in Paris, and its subtitle was *List z kraju* (A Letter from the Country). The reference to the situation of a person speaking abroad and from the emigrant’s position allows one, I think, to realize how other circumstances modulated Bolesławita’s voice in *Rachunki*.

Perhaps this should be seen as an example of the blurring of the seemingly clear division between domestic and emigration artists,<sup>35</sup> especially since the latter group was all too often associated in the general public consciousness with romantic bards. Bolesławita did not try to aspire to their prestige abroad. The already discussed self-identification techniques and the image of a wandering exile favoured identification with the excluded and also with one of his literary colleagues, i.e. Teofil Lenartowicz, to whom he wrote the following words immediately after leaving the country:

A sort of exile happened to me as well, such a strong *consilium abeundi* that I barely had time to pack my things and flee to Dresden. I left my family and wife in Warsaw. You understand my concern bearing in mind today’s Tatar rapes. [...] This is literally a *holocaust* for sins, sacrificed by heroes without any hope of success, which could only end in death or exile and disability (February 18, 1863).

Ot i mnie coś spotkało na kształt wygnania, tak silne *consilium abeundi*, że mi ledwie się dano czas upakować, aby się schronić do Dreżna. Rodzinę, żonę, zostawiłem w Warszawie. Pojmujesz mój niepokój przy dzisiejszych tatarskich gwałtach. [...] Rzeczy tak stoją, że to jest wprost *holocaust* za grzechy, przez bohaterów bez nadziei powodzenia złożony, heroiczny poryw, któremu śmierć lub wygnanie i kalectwo końcem (18 II 1863 r.)<sup>36</sup>.

<sup>32</sup> See e.g. J. Szujski, *Kronika literacko-artystyczna* [review of „Rachunki z 1866 roku przez Bolesławitę”], „Przegląd Polski” 1866/1867, vol. 4, no. 12, p. 495.

<sup>33</sup> See W. Danek, *Publicystyka...*, p. 41.

<sup>34</sup> [J. I. Kraszewski], *Sprawa polska w roku 1861. List z kraju. (Listopad 1861)*, second edition, Paris 1862.

<sup>35</sup> Many of the issues I discuss below correspond to the issues discussed in a very interesting article by Anna Marta Dworak. See eadem, *O niezasadności pojęcia „polski romantyzm krajowy”*, in: *Georomantyzm. Literatura, miejsce, środowisko*, ed. E. Dąbrowicz, M. Lul, K. Sawicka-Mierzyńska, D. Zawadzka, Białystok 2015, especially pp. 595–597, 604–607. Hereby I would like to thank Professor Marek Stanisław for drawing my attention to this text.

<sup>36</sup> J. I. Kraszewski, T. Lenartowicz, *Korespondencja*, prepared for print and commented by W. Danek, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1963, p. 79.

These words clearly demonstrate the inseparability of the need to share personal experience and the obligation to comment on the tragic events of the uprising. In public statements, this inseparability resulted not only in the placing of primary focus on general matters rather than on oneself but also offered interesting grammatical and rhetorical solutions.

## 5.

As rightly noticed by Iwona Węgrzyn and Wiesław Ratajczak, Kraszewski demonstrated a clear reluctance to reveal his own subjectivity.<sup>37</sup> This was also clearly expressed in *Wstęp* (Introduction) to *Rachunki z roku 1866*:

This *I*, which is uncomfortable to evoke, sounds unpleasant to the ear, but what can replace it? *We* would sound too royal for these republican times, and only V. Hugo is allowed to speak in the third person... In fact, I would like to mention myself as little as possible – but sometimes it is impossible to avoid this intrusion... Why remind us here how one moved from the ranks of soldiers to the ranks of spectators, the disabled and the infirm ones who, though no longer able to fight, still want to look at the fighters (R 1866, 2).

To *Ja*, które z przykrością wywołać przychodzi, niemiło brzmi w uchu, ale czymże je zastąpić? *My*, byłoby już nadto po królewsku na te republikańskie czasy, a w trzeciej osobie wolno tylko mówić V. Hugo... W istocie, chciałbym o sobie wspominać jak najmniej, – ale wyminąć się z tym natrętem niepodobna... Po cóż tu przypominać, jak się to z szeregu żołnierzy przeszło do widzów, do inwalidów i niedołęgów, którzy już bić się nie mogą, jeszcze na walczących patrzeć pragną (R 1866, 2).

Despite the apparent clarity of this declaration, the reading of Bolesławita's work, especially the fragments concerning emigration, confirms that the choice of grammatical forms may not have been easy, or at least it might have brought effects of which the author may not have been aware. It also implies that it was not fidelity to the author's own writerly beliefs that determined this, but revealing the nature of an exile's situation in *Rzeczy ogólne* (General Matters) and recognizing it as the foundation of *Rachunki*. This, I think, means that in the narrative about emigration (but, of course, also in its other themes), the use of the forms "I", "we", "he" ("they") will not, paradoxically, clearly indicate the status of the text's subject, and distinctions consistent with linguistic norms do not always serve to demarcate meanings in a clear-cut manner. From a broader perspective, this is one of the possible reasons for the inconsistencies, contradictions and complexities present in *Rachunki*, which all too often have been pointed out to the author. These may have stemmed not only

---

<sup>37</sup> See I. Węgrzyn, *Wartość pamięci. „Noce bezsenne” w kręgu pamiętnikarskich form twórczości Józefa Ignacego Kraszewskiego*, in: *Europejskość i rodzimość. Horyzonty twórczości Józefa Ignacego Kraszewskiego*, Poznań 2006, pp. 298–299; W. Ratajczak, op. cit., p. 251. See also: T. Budrewicz, *Biografie Kraszewskiego i ich potencjał legendotwórczy*, in: *Między biografią, literaturą i legendą*, ed. M. Stanisławski, K. Maciąg, Rzeszów 2010, pp. 64–92.

from haste or the specific nature of the author’s style, but also from the ambiguity of his role as a writer.<sup>38</sup>

Here are some examples. The first sentences of the chapter entitled *Wychodztwo* read:

The pain of exile...is there a pen that could possibly describe it in writing?...broken connections with all that constituted life; from old graves to infant cradles, around there is only silence, longing, foreignness, faces of strange, alien people, the language of an alien land, different air, different soil under our feet and the bread that is not our dear black bread that we used to eat... (1866, [ 112]).

Boleści wygnania...jestże pióro, co by je odmalowało?... zerwane związki z tym wszystkim, co stanowiło życie; od starych grobów do niemowlęcych kolebek, w koło cisza, tęsknota, obczyzna, twarze dziwnych, nieswoich ludzi, język nieswojej ziemi, inne powietrze, inne prochy pod nogami i nie ten już nasz drogi chleb czarny, cośmy się nim żywili... (1866, [112]).

In the further course of the argument, we encounter the following comments:

The relationship between the land that these poor exiles left and them themselves cannot be broken without fault of one party, or a sin of the other (R 1866, 138);

Pomiędzy ziemią, co biednych tych wygnańców wydała a nimi związek zerwanym być nie może bez winy z jednej strony, bez grzechu z drugiej (R 1866, 138);

After the recent misfortunes brought to the country by this heroic but desperate act (January Uprising – U.K.), who would dare to contribute to some new mad schemes? – The present state of Europe, the public opinion and the very situation of emigration should completely reassure the country in this respect (R 1866, 138–139).

Któż po ostatnich kraju nieszczęściach, jakie sprowadził ten wybuch heroiczny, ale rozpaczliwy (powstanie styczniowe – U.K.), śmiałyby przyłożyć rękę do nowych jakich knozań szalonych? – Dzisiejszy stan Europy, poziom opinii publicznej i samo położenie emigracji, winny całkowicie kraj uspokoić w tej mierze (R 1866, 138–139).

Whose experiences does Bolesławita record? His own or the community’s? Is the plural form applied as a signal of identification or does it only serve rhetorical purposes? As regards his own experiences, are they presented from a standpoint of a Pole or rather a Pole-exile? And is this distinction even possible? Does it even make sense? And if the experiences are the community’s, then of which community exactly? Of all compatriots who mentally share the same historical experiences? Or maybe only of exiles? What about the third-person grammatical form? Does it signify distance, invalidating the potentially identifying form “we”, or is it introduced just for the sake of stylistic variety? How can we understand the last of the quoted fragments? Is this a diagnosis or rather a declaration? If it is a diagnosis, can it refer only to emigration or to everyone affected by the uprising, i.e. to the entire Polish society? And if it is a declaration, then whose declaration exactly is it? Can it be considered consistent with the author’s opinion on

---

<sup>38</sup> Among the reviewers of *Rachunki*, Zygmunt Miłkowski was the one who most accurately captured this non-obviousness of Bolesławita’s writing position. Idem, [Z. Miłkowski], „Z roku 1867. Rachunki”, przez B. Bolesławitę, „Niepodległość” 1868, no. 87, p. [1].

insurrections? Furthermore, one more difficult issue remains. How can you ask about the community or speak on its behalf if almost every page of your work affirms the drama of national fragmentation, misunderstanding, dispersion and discord? I pose these (sample) questions not to argue that clear answers are possible, but rather to demonstrate their multitude, as well as to show how varied they can be.

Let us also look at these two quotes:

The latest uprising may have this one real benefit – unfortunately! paid for with excessively bloody sacrifices, that it resulted in liberating us from the rule of people such as the late general Ludwik (Mierosławski – U.K.) and *consortes*. [...] The hero of Września, invisible on the battlefield, but conspiring and denouncing, soliciting money and respecting his precious health – is today a corpse buried under the grave of his own writings and printed tissue paper... (R 1866, 135).

Ostatnie powstanie może tę jedną korzyść rzeczywistą – niestety! okupioną zbyt krwawymi ofiarami, przyniosło, że wyzwoliło nas spod panowania takich ludzi, jak śp. generał Ludwik (Mierosławski – U. K.) i *consortes*. [...] Bohater spod Wrześni, niewidzialny na placu boju, a konspiracyjny i denuncjujący, dopominający się troskliwie o kasę, a szanujący swe najdroższe zdrowieczko – jest dziś trupem pogrzebionym pod mogiłą własnych broszur i zadrukowanej bibuły... (R 1866, 135).

This opinion is written by an exile from Lucerne and Dresden, and at the same time it is a continuation of the critical judgments about Mierosławski, already expressed in the pamphlet *Sprawa polska w roku 1861*.<sup>39</sup> It also included the following sentences:

The one who will lead us must be among us, suffer with us and break the enemy's defence line [...] Emigration has its own task, different goals, it is an emissary of the country, but not its government. With the greatest love for it, a bard cannot guess what is necessary and what is harmful to him at a given moment.<sup>40</sup>

Ten, który przewodzić ma sprawie, winien być wśród nas, cierpieć z nami i stać na wyłomie. [...] Emigracja ma swoje zadanie, cele różne, jest kraju wysłanką, ale nie rządem jego. Przy największej miłości dlań, nie może odgadnąć wieszczco, co w danej chwili, potrzebnym mu jest, a co szkodliwym.

What is the difference between the pronoun “us” in the first and the second statement? Who does it refer to in the respective statements? Does it help determine the self-identification of the writing subject? In 1862 the author of these words was anonymous, and in 1867 it was Bolesławita.

And finally, one more (but not the last possible) issue. In *Rachunki z roku 1866* the reader could find the following:

We have already mentioned how different the character, the mission of the first emigration was, the emigration which Europe accepted as the legal representation of the oppressed country. The emigration of that time was made up of completely different elements, because others were actively involved in the revolution of 1831. The military, most of them of higher

---

<sup>39</sup> [J. I. Kraszewski], *Sprawa polska w roku 1861. List z kraju. (Listopad 1861)*, second edition, Paris 1862, pp. 20–27.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 60.

ranks, the members of the Sejm, the officials, the intelligentsia, the nation’s representatives, poured out, expecting at that time that the emigration would only be temporary and that Europe would recognize itself wronged in our case, as justice and law were.

The desperate uprising of 1863 revolved around the youth, the middle class and the poor; everyone that emigrated escaped almost without a shirt, most often without knowledge of any language, without higher education... In the traveling bags of these paupers there was a handful of soil stained with blood and great love for the homeland (R 1866, 116–117).

Napomknęliśmy już, jak całę różny był charakter, posłannictwo emigracji pierwszej, którą Europa przyjęła za reprezentacją legalną uciśnionego kraju. Z całkiem też innych żywiołów składało się wychodźstwo ówczesne, bo inne wchodziły czynnie do rewolucji 1831 r. Wojskowi po większej części wyższych stopni, członkowie sejmu, urzędnicy, inteligencja, czoło narodu oficjalne wylało się, spodziewając naówczas, że emigracja będzie chwilową i że Europa uzna się w naszej sprawie skrzywdzoną, jak była sprawiedliwość i prawo.

Powstanie rozpaczliwe 1863 roku obracało się w kole młodzieży, klasy średniej i ludzi uboższych; wszystko, co wyszło, uciekło prawie bez koszuli, najczęściej bez znajomości jakiegokolwiek języka, bez wyższego wykształcenia... W sakwach podróżnych tych nędzarzy była garść ziemi krwią zbroczona i wielka miłość ojczyzny (R 1866, 116–117).

In this context, who was Bolesławita as an exile due to the uprising, but not as its participant? Who was he in real situations and as the author and co-protagonist of the reporting narrative? This question is even more intriguing because the image of the post-January Uprising emigration was carefully modelled by him and significantly contrasted with the situation of the Great Emigration. This is well illustrated by a suggestive change of judgments about the latter, particularly noticeable when comparing the above-mentioned opinion with those included in *Sprawa polska w roku 1861*. The author of the pamphlet wrote about Polish emigration in the following way: “Powerful and happy countries are sending their representatives surrounded by splendour and representing their strength and happiness; we sent poor exiles, broken old people, poets and soldiers to serve as a reminder that we were not allowed to express pain in our own land or die for our homeland.”<sup>41</sup> However, in view of the recent experience, this assessment has undergone significant corrections.

The writer knew both the post-November and post-January Uprising emigration, and even better he knew “the country”<sup>42</sup> in its various regional and partition variants. The lost exile from Lake Lucerne had to self-identify in the face of all Polish “communities” at the same time. In this situation, it was anything but easy to create a writer’s “balance sheet”. And subsequent volumes of *Rachunki* did not facilitate it at all.<sup>43</sup>

Translated by Karolina Puchała-Ladzińska

<sup>41</sup> [J. I. Kraszewski], *Sprawa polska w roku 1861. List z kraju. (Listopad 1861)*, second edition, Paris 1862, p. 15.

<sup>42</sup> On the concept of “country” as one indicating an imaginary space see A.M. Dworak, *op. cit.*, pp. 595, 602.

<sup>43</sup> Justifying this statement requires, of course, a separate article.



## Bibliography

- Bolesławita B. [J.I.Kraszewski], *Z roku 1866. Rachunki*, Poznań 1867.
- Bolesławita B. [J.I.Kraszewski], *Z roku 1867. Rachunki. Rok drugi*, parts one and two, Poznań 1868.
- Bolesławita B. [J.I.Kraszewski], *Z roku 1868. Rachunki. Rok trzeci*, Poznań 1869.
- Bolesławita B. [J.I.Kraszewski], *Z roku 1869. Rachunki, Rok czwarty*, Poznań 1870.
- Bolesławita B. [J.I.Kraszewski], *Z roku 1869. Rachunki, przez Bolesławitę*. (Year four. – Poznań in Żupański.), „Kraj” 1870, no. 222.
- Bachórz J., *Kraszewski-Bolesławita a następcy, czyli o narodzinach legendy powstania styczniowego*, „Rocznik Towarzystwa Naukowego imienia Adama Mickiewicza” 1981, R. 16.
- Bibliografia literatury polskiej Nowy Korbut*, vol. 12: *Józef Ignacy Kraszewski. Zarys bibliograficzny*, compiled by S. Stupkiewicz, I. Śliwińska, W. Roszkowska-Sykałowa, Kraków 1966.
- Borejsza J.W., *Emigracja polska po powstaniu styczniowym*, Warszawa 1966.
- Budrewicz T., *Biografie Kraszewskiego i ich potencjał legendotwórczy*, in: *Między biografią, literaturą i legendą*, ed. M. Stanisław, K. Maciąg, Rzeszów 2010.
- Calek A., *Biografia jako reprezentacja*, „Annales Universitatis Paedagogicae Cracoviensis. Studia Poetica” 2016, R. IV.
- Chmielowski P., *Józef Ignacy Kraszewski. Zarys historyczno-literacki*, Kraków 1888.
- Czapiewski E., *Między buntem a ugodą. Kształtowanie się poglądów politycznych Józefa Ignacego Kraszewskiego*, Wrocław 2000.
- Danek W., *Józef Ignacy Kraszewski*, Warszawa 1973.
- Danek W., *Józef Ignacy Kraszewski. Zarys biograficzny*, Warszawa 1973.
- Danek W., *Publicystyka Józefa Ignacego Kraszewskiego w latach 1859–1872*, Wrocław 1957.
- Dąbrowicz E., *Biografia transgraniczna. Migracje jako problem tożsamości w polskim wieku XIX*, „Białostockie Studia Literaturoznawcze” 2010, no. 1.
- Dworak A.M., *O niezasadności pojęcia „polski romantyzm krajowy”*, in: *Georomantyzm. Literatura, miejsce, środowisko*, ed. E. Dąbrowicz, M. Lul, K. Sawicka-Mierzyńska, D. Zawadzka, Białystok 2015.
- [Kraszewski J. I.], *Sprawa polska w roku 1861. List z kraju. (Listopad 1861)*, second edition, Paris 1862.
- Kraszewski J. I., *Wieczory drezdeńskie*, in: idem, *Wieczory drezdeńskie. Listy drezdeńskie*, Lwów 1866.
- Kraszewski J. I., T. Lenartowicz, *Korespondencja*, prepared for print and commented by W. Danek, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1963
- Literatura i kultura lat 60. XIX wieku między polityką a prywatnością. Dyslokacje*, ed. U. Kowalczuk, D.W. Makuch, D.M. Osiński, Warszawa 2019.
- Literatura południa wieku. Twórczość lat sześćdziesiątych XIX stulecia wobec romantyzmu i pozytywizmu*, ed. J. Maciejewski, Warszawa 1992.
- Maciejewski J., *Mała emigracja (1864–1914). Próba uporządkowania problematyki*, in: ibidem, *Obszary i konteksty literatury*, Warszawa 1998.
- Malinowska E., *O przedmowach do „Rachunków” Józefa Ignacego Kraszewskiego*, in: *Romantyczne przemowy i przedmowy* ed. J. Lyszczyna, M. Bąk, Katowice 2010.
- [Miłkowski Z.], „Z roku 1867. Rachunki”, przez B. Bolesławitę, „Niepodległość” 1868, no. 87.
- Osiński D.M., *Hybrydy gatunkowe – między niemożliwością, przejściowością a poszukiwaniem pełni*, „Tekstualia” 2021, no. 3.
- Osiński D.M., *Turystyka i martyrologia. Topografie syberyjskie, czyli o codzienności „na etapie” w refleksji autobiograficznej Rufina Piotrowskiego oraz wybranych wątkach intymistyki i reportażowości XIX wieku*, in: *Wędrowki po dziejach. Księga jubileuszowa Profesora Tadeusza Stegnera*, ed. I. Janicka, A. Janicki, Gdańsk 2022.

- Osiński D.M., *W stronę diaspory syberyjskiej, czyli „sceny z życia koczującego” w latach 60. XIX wieku*, in: *Literatura i kultura lat 60. XIX wieku między polityką a prywatnością. Dyslokacje*, ed. U. Kowalczyk, D.W. Makuch, D.M. Osiński, Warszawa 2019,
- Osmólska-Piskorska B., *Powstanie styczniowe w twórczości Józefa Ignacego Kraszewskiego*, Toruń 1963.
- Ratajczak W., „*Papier – pocziwy to przyjaciel, z którym pogawędzić miło*”. *Osobiste tony w „Rachunkach” Kraszewskiego*, in: *Kraśniński i Kraszewski wobec europejskiego romantyzmu i dylematów XIX wieku (w dwustulecie urodzin pisarzy)*, ed. M. Junkiert, W. Ratajczak, T. Sobieraj, Poznań 2016.
- Rzepczyński S., *Projekt „innego biografizmu”*, „*Słupskie Prace Filologiczne. Seria Filologia Polska*” 2007, no. 5.
- Stanisz M., *Przedmowa*, in: *Słownik polskiej krytyki literackiej 1764–1918. Pojęcia – terminy – zjawiska – przekroje*, vol. 2: *N–Z*, ed. J. Bachórz et al., Toruń–Warszawa 2016.
- Szujski J., *Kronika literacko-artystyczna* [review of „*Rachunki z 1866 roku przez Bolesławitę*”], „*Przegląd Polski*” 1866/1867, vol. 4, no. 12.
- Tarnowski S., „*Rachunki z roku 1867 przez B. Bolesławitę*”. *Poznań nakładem Żupańskiego 1868. II tomy*, „*Przegląd Polski*” 1868/1869, vol. 2, no. 4.
- Węgrzyn I., *Wartość pamięci. „Noce bezsenne” w kręgu pamiętnikarskich form twórczości Józefa Ignacego Kraszewskiego*, in: *Europejskość i rodzimość. Horyzonty twórczości Józefa Ignacego Kraszewskiego*, Poznań 2006.
- Witkowska A., *Buchalter swoich czasów*, in: *Zdziwienia Kraszewskim*, ed. M. Zielińska, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1990.