

Dariusz Pachocki*

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1498-3648>

Textual meanders. *Diary 1954* by Leopold Tyrmand – a problem of not only a philological nature

The study of the creative process is an interesting yet somewhat problematic task. It is sometimes the case that the final text of a work does not necessarily correspond to the initial intention of its creator. One extremely interesting example is *Diary 1954* by Leopold Tyrmand. The work, which is considered one of the masterpieces of 20th century literature, premièred in *Tygodnik Powszechny* in 1957, and when Tyrmand emigrated to the US, it was printed in instalments by the London-based *Wiadomości*. It is worth remembering that initially it did not draw any particular interest among literary enthusiasts.

Sławomir Mrożek was among the first people to read the journal. In a letter to Tyrmand of 8 May 1974 he wrote:

I read your journal (its instalment in the latest *Wiadomości*). This genre is guaranteed to appear attractive mainly to people upwards from my generation (or maybe slightly downwards, too). What I found particularly interesting were the author's reflections about himself, his role in the contemporary world, in Warsaw. His doubts and dilemmas. His self-scepticism. Because a man is interested in man, as Gombrowicz wrote, so less in what one person says about himself to another person, and more what that person says about himself to himself. I know well that the world will not be interested in the fact that you survived Stalinist times retaining integrity. After some time, the world couldn't care less whether a person had been a jerk or whether he was just. That's the ugly truth, but the truth nonetheless. What

* Ph.D. hab., Catholic University in Lublin, Institute of Polish Studies, Department of Textology and Editorship, Al. Raławickie 14, 20-950 Lublin, dariuszp@kul.pl

remains is curiosity how it happened and why, regardless whether it was mean or just. How it happened inside a person. Then, there, whenever.¹

In the same letter, the author of *Tango* raised the issue which resulted in a lively debate a few years later:

I wonder to what extent the published text is the raw authentic journal, and how much of it is a contemporary present study. Personally, I would prefer it if it was just the former. Have you considered publishing actual notes as they were, or rather insert between them your commentary, the contemporary one, clearly marking the division? That would offer an extremely interesting illustration of the path of a person, what he thought then, and what he thinks now about his thinking then.²

Quite intuitively, Mrożek touched a very sensitive matter, as Tyrmand's *Diary 1954* – prior to the publication of consecutive instalments in *Wiadomości* – was subjected to extensive editorial interventions. It all began with an invitation to a special issue of *Wiadomości* in early 1974. It was sent by Stefania Kossowska. Tyrmand proposed, as he put it, “a few excerpts from the journal.” The fragment he sent suited Kossowska's taste. A collaboration ensued, as a result of which within four years twenty-seven installments of the work were published, constituting half of its total volume. Quite quickly, though, it became evident that not everything was going as the writer had wanted. Kossowska tried to convince Tyrmand to abandon some fragments of the journal. In a letter of 18 July 1974, she wrote:

I can see two reasons for those “evasions”: sometimes excessively drastic and lengthy “bedside” accounts, which draw more attention in the fragments of the weekly than in the entire book, which is outside the readers' selection. Second reason: no periodical can afford (or at least it shouldn't) to release personal, strong, hurtful, or even offensive opinions about real people identified per their names. It's not only a case of *libel*, but also of a human responsibility of the editor. Again, a book is something different, because its author is solely responsible for it³.

Tyrmand was willing to compromise, but only within certain limits. He responded to Kossowska's demands in a letter of 24 July 1974, in which he argued that “[...] a strict application of the rule that it is not acceptable to print ‘strong’

1 S. Mrożek, L. Tyrmand, *W emigracyjnym labiryncie. Listy 1965–1982*, introduction, editing, notes by D. Pachocki, afterword T. Nyczek, Krakow 2017, p. 222. [Unless indicated otherwise, English versions translated from Polish].

2 Ibidem, pp. 222–223.

3 Vide: L. Tyrmand, *Listy do redaktorów “Wiadomości”*, editing and notes by M.A. Supruniuk, editing consultation B. Dorosz, Wydawnictwo UMK, Toruń 2014, pp. 82–83.

opinions about people and that which is hurtful will lead us to pure inability. This journal is filled with personal spiteful remarks with an ideological tint, and that is the whole point of it.”⁴ Tyrmand tried to convince Juliusz Sakowski to agree with him. In a letter of 13 August 1974, he complained that he was less and less willing to abandon those plots which could hurt people and considered it impossible to delete them altogether. He argued that his journal “is probably the first and the only attempt at settling a personal score with the overt and covert communist world of Warsaw.”⁵ He wrote that everything that was unthinkable in communism was completely natural in Western memoirs. The pugnacity of opinions is considered there a “moral and documentary” advantage, while personal plots constitute an indispensable element of the whole in regards to its literary qualities. He concluded that if two ingredients were to be extracted, not much would survive, i.e. a set of “castrated general observations.” Tyrmand’s inquiries did not result in the outcome he wished for. The tension between the author and the editor continued to grow. Neither was completely satisfied with the final version of the text. Kossowska kept implying to Tyrmand that *Wiadomości* would not print the whole work. That was why, already in 1977, Tyrmand began an extensive search for a publisher. He did not want to publish with Giedroyc, as his relationship with *Kultura* had deteriorated for various reasons. He sought a publisher in London. The journal’s manuscript, which Kossowska had held, was given to Andrzej Stypułkowski, the founder of the Polonia Book Fund publishing house. A long period of silence ensued, which troubled Tyrmand considerably. He tried, to no avail, to contact Stypułkowski for an entire year. Finally, in mid-July 1979, Stefania Kossowska wrote: “I learnt by accident that your book is ‘in reading’ by a reader – so it will be probably printed?”⁶ That reader was Nina Karsov. The decision was in line with Tyrmand’s intentions. The book was recommended for printing.

When preparing the book for printing, Tyrmand faced a dilemma. He described it in the introduction for the edition, in which he declared firmly: “this book contains the entire journal not altered for any editorial reasons, moral dilemmas, political necessity, or social concessions.”⁷ Yet not everyone believed that. And quite aptly, as it turned out later.

4 Vide: L. Tyrmand, *Listy do redaktorów “Wiadomości”*, p. 84.

5 Ibidem, p. 87.

6 Ibidem, p. 191.

7 The journal was published in 1980 by the Polonia Book Fund publishing house.

Reception all over the place

The release of *Diary 1954* was welcomed with huge interest⁸, and almost immediately there appeared questions about its authenticity. The heated debate in which many people participated was caused by the decision to include a copy of the manuscript on the book's cover. The more intrepid readers noticed that the text on the cover did not correspond to the same printed fragment. That applied to the note of 9 March, which began as follows: "Today, I was at a hearing [at] Writers Union." Yet the final version was quite different: "Kisiel dragged me today to the Writers Union for a hearing of his song."⁹ In an extensive and kind-natured study, Roman Zimand arrived at the conclusion that Tyrmand changed the conclusion of the note of 8 March provided that the cover consisted a copy of a single manuscript sheet, not a compilation of two sheets:

That day in the morning, against his earlier fears, Tyrmand was approved by the acceptance board at ZLP, which he described on p. 262/264. In the evening, he engaged in a "fiery discussion on architecture with K.T. Toeplitz and Z. Kałużyński (265). The copy photocopy indicates that the discussion was not limited to architecture. One could assume that Tyrmand, making a joke, said something about the board. And considering the fact that neither Toeplitz nor Kałużyński were spotless to him, he regretted that he got carried away in his joking mood. That was removed from the printed version. Instead, we have in the book a four-paragraph-long discussion of Bauhaus, the Frascati street, the author's visit in Paris, his love, and his dream of returning to that street of Frascati.¹⁰

Regardless of his findings regarding the changes in the journal, Zimand argued that Tyrmand's book lacked any passages which could not have been recorded "in the first quarter of 1954."¹¹ Yet there were many readers who wondered whether the

⁸ In an extensive study of Tyrmand's journal, Henryk Dasko wrote: "People ripped *Diary* out of each other's hands: at the time when it was published, any description of the 1950s was rare. The book also fulfilled the role of a social catharsis: here, in the centre of Warsaw, at the peak of Stalinist terror, Leopold Tyrmand, a well-known oppositionist, openly and explicitly described the reality and his anti-communist attitude. In some way *Diary* offered an alibi for those creators who for years whispered among themselves about their works that ended up in the sock drawer; when their drawers were finally opened, it turned out they were empty." Vide: H. Dasko, "Tyrmand, Ameryka, 'Dziennik'", in: *Odłot malowanego ptaka*, Rosner i Wspólnicy, Warsaw 2009, p. 205.

⁹ L. Tyrmand, *Diary 1954*, Polonia Book Found, London 1980, p. 267.

¹⁰ Vide: R. Zimand, *Wojna i spokój*, Polonia Book Found, London 1984, p. 30.

¹¹ *Ibidem*, p. 31.

book might have been apocryphal.¹² Tyrmand had never responded to that issue publicly, yet there exists a document which might shed some light on the matter. Apparently, the author of *Zły* had a chance to read Roman Zimand's article discussed above. He indicated that in a letter of 13 October 1983 he sent to Zimand. There, he referred to three doubts expressed by the author of the article, one of which applied to the copy included on the cover:

The rough drafts included attachments, written on loose sheets one, two or a few days afterwards: they were tossed into a special folder included to the typescript in [19]73, in New Canaan, Connecticut. Soon after the edited, as you aptly pointed out, version, in which the mentioned quote was articulated somewhat differently yet identical in terms of meaning with the manuscript, was completed, our base-ment [word used in English in the Polish version] suffered a local flooring caused by a burst water main in our part of the town. Some rough drafts survived, including the March one with those pages, but many of my papers, documents, archives, including the discussed folder, perished.¹³

Tyrmand tried persuading Zimand that the cover included a note recorded on a loose piece of paper, not in a notebook. The quoted passage might indicate that Tyrmand did not read the letter prior to sending it. Had he done so, he would have seen how doubtful his story seemed. It is also puzzling that Tyrmand was not particularly surprised by the inadequacy of the notes he mentioned. It would be quite difficult to decide whether the incoherence between the copy and the original was a lapse or an intentional act of Tyrmand, who thus intended to spur additional interest in the book. The position presented by Marcin Kowalczyk in *Tyrmand karnawałowy* seems convincing:

It seems quite naive to state that Tyrmand obliviously included the photocopy of the manuscript on the cover of the London edition of *Diary*. It differed from the corresponding fragment in the book. The act should rather be understood as a conscious act of the author indicating that what we are dealing with is a re-edited text. The thesis of Tyrmand's lapse is very unlikely.¹⁴

¹² Apart from textual inconsistencies, some indicated calques from English and general clumsiness of some passages. Vide: M. Piasecki, "Dwa oryginały. Spór o 'Dziennik 1954' Leopolda Tyrmanda", *Gazeta Wyborcza* 1995, issue 132; P. Bratkowski, "Dziennik 1954-1980-1995", *Gazeta Wyborcza* 1995, issue 137.

¹³ Every sheet of the copy of the letter held by the Hoover Institute has its left margin cut off, hence the proposed reconstructions of some letters were provided in brackets. Original spelling has been preserved in the Polish version.

¹⁴ Vide: M. Kowalczyk, *Tyrmand karnawałowy*, Universitas, Krakow 2009, p. 69.

Thanks to the documents preserved in the Hoover Institute we do not have to rely solely on speculation. It is true that Tyrmand recorded notes on loose sheets alongside taking notes in a notebook.¹⁵ However, everything seems to indicate that he did not want to or he could not report the actual chain of events to Zimand. Fortunately for us, the sheet that was selected for the cover copy is quite peculiar. It includes the end of a note of 8 March and the initial fragment from the following day. Tyrmand introduced two corrections there. He changed the sentence: “Basically, those men are narrow-minded, raised by communism, towards whom ironic relativism in assessing anything fails completely” to: “Basically, those men are narrow-minded, raised by communism, towards whom ironic relativism fails completely in assessing anything.” He encircled the phrase “fails completely” and drew an arrow indicating its new location. Two sentences further, there is a sentence which reads: “They have a huge gap to the class of the morning verification board.” In an earlier version, the board was supposed to be a “classification” board, but the writer abandoned the idea, which is visible in a blurred fragment of a word which reads: “classifica”. Undoubtedly, the copied sheet came from a notebook.¹⁶ A letter by Nina Karsov¹⁷ proves extremely valuable in the context of this discussion; the letter reads:

I would like to consult the cover with you (the book is going to be a 216 x 135 cm paperback).

These are the propositions:

Solid cover with the author’s name and title;

A photograph of the author (but then: contemporary or from 1954?;

A 1954 Warsaw cityscape which would wrap around the book (if so, which fragment would you suggest? Do you, by any chance, have an appropriate photograph?

I could send over a few albums for you to choose from);

Fragment of the manuscript of *Diary*, properly blown up and aligned with the title (if so, please select a fragment and send a very good “bromide”, original copy preferably, which I will, of course, return to you).

¹⁵ Two other notes from loose sheets survived; he included them in the main narrative when preparing the journal for printing in 1973 (e.g. the final note of 29 March). However, no notes (not even in various editions) that would appear both on sheets and in the notebook survived.

¹⁶ The discussed editorial changes are partly obscured by the copy of a photograph of the Castle Square included on the cover. Despite that, they are discernible.

¹⁷ Nina Karsov confirmed that the book was being prepared and published when she was managing “both publishing houses (Polonia Book Fund and Overseas Publications) during the absence of Andrzej Stypułkowski from England”, yet she could not recall the exact sequence of events. Details based on a letter by Nina Karsov of 22 July 2016.

We have not come up with anything better, and I would like *Diary* to stand out with its graphic design. Should you have an idea, please remember that we cannot use more than three colours.¹⁸

As it turns out, Tyrmand had the chance to select a manuscript which the publisher included on the cover. He accepted that proposition and he suggested a sheet from a notebook. It is difficult to state why he was so determined to construct a story which was not reflected in facts. It may be possible that he did not remember what he refused to admit before Zimand. Then again, that could have been one of the elements forming his legend, which does not seem so improbable.

A Polish original or an American fake?

The lead theme of the debate which grew in its scope was the question whether Tyrmand published his actual journal which he kept in the first months of 1954 or whether he created a fake after emigrating, styling it in terms of its narration and composition to match journalistic narration. In the introduction to the first edition, he stated:

The facts are as follows:

- I kept this journal for the first three months of 1954;
- for twelve years the rough drafts lied deep inside rarely opened drawers;
[...]
- in 1965, after years of futile efforts to receive a passport, I was finally driving West in an old Opel; I was convinced I would emigrate, but I took the rough drafts with me inserting them, with the help of a trusted mechanic, near the differential; excessive caution as it turned out, customs officers, as I was crossing the border, were more interested in whether there will be a new edition of *Zły*;
[...]
- in 1968, when freedom was chosen, the journal crossed the Atlantic and travelled with me from place to place for five years; having settled in New Canaan, Connecticut, I copied the journal using a typewriter and I prepared it for a future book edition.”

Małgorzata Czermińska indicated that the debate over whether Tyrmand's work was written in 1954 or in the 1970s was not actually a purely philological dispute regarding the date when it was created. She raised a very important moral background for the debate:

¹⁸ Letter of 20 January 1980.

If the book is considered to be a journal, it is easier to draw more severe accusations towards people stained by any form of cooperation with the Stalinist regime. No explanation could help then, which otherwise could entail the concept of “Hegel’s bite”. If Tyrmand did write his journal in 1954 and already then posed his judgement (and was not afraid to express in his journal his opinions openly, which could have resulted in dire consequences for an “enemy of the people” should such a text end up in the wrong hands), it means that it was actually possible to avoid getting “bitten” and to avoid the “captivity of one’s mind.” And even without possessing any heroic traits. All that was necessary was a modicum of a sense of dignity, a bit of character, and some resistance to temptation. And maybe some defiance, too. Zbigniew Herbert would probably add that it was all about the power of taste¹⁹.

Regardless of what the truth was, the debate became polarised. Among those who objected to Tyrmand’s statements was his friend of many years: Tadeusz Konwicki.²⁰ He accused the author of forging *Diary 1954*. Konwicki’s book entitled *Zorze wieczorne* reads as follows:

Lolek calmed down a bit, shifted in his armchair, and said with a diabolic grin: “Well, I did not spare you in my *Diary*. I finally gave into my émigré editor and deleted many bitter, though true, words about you.” I shifted in my chair, too.
 “Lolo, my dear, but you wrote that journal in ‘76 or ‘77.”
 “No, untrue. I wrote it in ‘54.”
 “Lolo, so where did you get it from? How did you smuggle it?”
 “I hid it in the car’s exhaust system.”
 “Lolo, don’t you remember I participated in your departure. Both you and we, we knew that at the border the UB [Security Office] would take apart piece by piece not only your car but even your wristwatch.”
 “No, I stashed it away well.”
 Lolek defended himself while I kept attacking. He defended fearlessly though he could hardly hope I was going to believe him.²¹

Interestingly enough, in the same book Konwicki admitted with unbridled candour that he did not know the work against which he had so many reservations: “I haven’t read and I’m not sure if I’m ever going to read Tyrmand’s *Diary 1954*.”²²

¹⁹ M. Czerwińska, “Leopold Tyrmand – głos świadka”, *Rocznik Towarzystwa Literackiego im. A. Mickiewicza* 1993, p. 82.

²⁰ The authenticity of the journal was also questioned by Ryszard Maruszewski (*Literatura polska 1939–1991*, WSiP, Warsaw 1992, p. 79).

²¹ T. Konwicki, *Zorze wieczorne*, Alfa, Warsaw 1991, p. 55.

²² *Ibidem*.

The author of *Zorze wieczorne* most certainly took personally various rumours regarding passages in the journal which were supposed to reveal his engagement with the regime and the resulting gains. The fact that Konwicki's indignation had no factual basis was efficiently proven by Kazimierz Maciąg in an article entitled "Konwicki kontra Tyrmand czyli o autentyczności 'Dziennika 1954'". Moreover, Maciąg indicated that the persons who most often questioned the authenticity of the book were those whose "situation in 1954 was in strong contrast to Leopold Tyrmand's attitude and situation."²³

The deliberations and the resulting opinions of Roman Rimand were in complete opposition to Konwicki's opinion. In a summary of an extensive and virtually forensic study, Rimand wrote:

In defending *Diary 1954* against the accusation of forgery I stated that it would be very difficult if not impossible to falsify such a document. If I brought to the surface matters regarding which the writer tried to mislead readers and leave things out, that was also to help establish that a similar operation could not had been performed regarding any other plot of *Diary 1954*. The text offers no basis for that. That defends the authenticity of *Diary 1954*, an extremely interesting and unique account²⁴.

A decade later, in the introduction to an edition of the so-called original version of *Diary 1954*, Henryk Dasko, who had the opportunity to study the entire dossier of the work, confirmed Zimand's assumptions. For him, the manuscripts he viewed in the Hoover Institute in Palo Alto, California, completely settled the issue of the work's authenticity. In the introduction to the edition he prepared he did not conceal the fact that the manuscript differed significantly from the book version.²⁵ Today, thanks to the letters²⁶ exchanged between Tyrmand and Giedroyc and Zofia Hertz's²⁷ memoir, it is possible to say more about that controversial matter. Most of all, it must be stated that Tyrmand's journal, recorded in pencil throughout eight notebooks, was stored in Maisons-Laffitte after he had left Poland in 1965. He collected it a year later prior to travelling across the ocean. He presumably began editing his notes in 1973, and he published fragments in the London-based

²³ Vide: K. Maciąg, "Konwicki kontra Tyrmand czyli o autentyczności 'Dziennika 1954'", *Dekada Literacka* 1993, issue 9. Vide also: S. Nowicki, *Pół wieku czyścica. Rozmowy z T. Konwickim*, Warsaw 1990, p. 107.

²⁴ R. Zimand, *Wojna i spokój*, p. 49.

²⁵ Vide: H. Dasko, "Wstęp", in: L. Tyrmand, *Diary 1954*, introduction and editing H. Dasko, Tenten, Warsaw 1995, p. 29.

²⁶ I would kindly like to thank the management of the Literary Institute in Maisons-Laffitte for releasing the manuscripts of letters, and their help in my survey.

²⁷ Vide: <http://kulturaparyska.com/pl/find/item/Audio/73532?q=tyrmand>

Wiadomości in 1974–1978. The first book edition was published in London in 1980 by the Polonia Book Fund publishing house. In the foreword, Tyrmand wrote:

While working on the journal in Connecticut, Tyrmand's central dilemma was: what to do with opinions about people? Such opinions become aged and outdated, which does not mean that they become invalid or untrue [...] Obviously, in recording everyday news, moods, rumours, information caught in passing, a journal is susceptible to distortions, factual errors, sometimes major ones, deforming the truth even. In trying to tackle that problem I decided not to change anything in the texts – may it set in history together with my oversights, ignorance, carelessness, and mistakes²⁸.

Let us then consider the differences between the printed version and the initial form of the journal. Those mainly applied to the writer's political views. The manuscript of *Diary 1954* reads: "I have always had a liking for the figure of Lenin, unlike for Stalin. The former always had a revolutionary/underground Romantic air to him, so close to our fine literature." In the book version, Lenin was unequivocally referred to as the "master of crime and deceit." When comparing the London edition of the journal with Dasko's edition, one could also find differences which prove a shift in the author's temporal distance towards some matters. That applied, for example, to Zbigniew Herbert. In 1957, he was merely: "[...] one of the greatest poets of the young generation," while in the book edition, Herbert was emphatically named: "[...] the number one poet of his generation, or maybe even of the entire spread of Poland's post-WWII history."

The changes applied not only the content, but also to the composition. The end is particularly interesting. The final paragraph mysteriously is interrupted mid-sentence leaving the work without a clear conclusion. Years later, Tyrmand explained:

On the final night, tired of writing as it often happened, I interrupted the sentence midway with the intention to pick it up the following day. But I never came back to it. The following day Czytelnik offered me a contract to write *Zły*. Initially, I intended to continue writing my journal, but days passed suddenly filled by a different situation and obligations.

The comparison of the published version of the notebooks prove that the fragment also became an element of the creative efforts. Tyrmand achieved the effect of an unfinished journal by removing an extensive fragment of the text which concluded the records of a day. The first edition of the journal included many more such interventions. The differences between its first edition and the so-called origi-

²⁸ L. Tyrmand, "Przedmowa", in: idem, *Dziennik 1954*, ResPublica, Warsaw 1989, pp. 11–12.

nal version was studied in detail by Konrad Niciński, who noticed that Tyrmand's style had changed over twenty years. The new edition featured a much more extensive stylisation to resemble spoken language, drifting towards colloquial speech.²⁹ He also found that Tyrmand added around fifty new fragments, and reorganised many of the existing ones.³⁰

How many journals?

Leaving behind all of the questions on the originality of the work which are no longer valid, one should rather consider whether *Diary 1954* was one work or maybe two different works. I do not mean the difference between the manuscripts and the first book edition, but rather about works which function among readers on equal rights. I am referring to the first book edition of 1980 and Henryk Dasko's edition prepared based on manuscripts. The quoted article by Niciński includes the following fragment:

Therefore, all the characteristics are the reason why one should be discussing two separate works, which seems particularly significant as the difference has until now been widely ignored, e.g. most academic articles regarding Tyrmand's work lack any information on the version to which they refer. I hope that my discussion clearly indicated that the fact of treating both versions as one work (usually due to their authors' unfamiliarity with the original version) may introduce unnecessary chaos and severe interferences in the clarity of argumentation, especially if a reader knows both versions.³¹

The author of the text, trusting the editor of the "original version", did not analyse any archived documents. Yet, as it proved later, he did so too eagerly. The comparison of the edition prepared by Henryk Dasko and Tyrmand's notebooks proves that

²⁹ Vide: K. Niciński, "Dwie wersje 'Dziennika 1954' Leopolda Tyrmanda: wokół problemu tożsamości tekstu", *Pamiętnik Literacki* 2006, issue 4, p. 77.

³⁰ "In the London version, when that author was certain his book would reach readers who did not know from experience life in a totalitarian regime, that role of the text became emphasised even more, e.g. the descriptions of the activities of the repression machine were extended. Apart from retouching it for the emigration audience, there were added extensive passages which were previously only in an embryonic form. That mainly applies to 6 fragments, 4 of a educational nature, if you will, explaining in every basic detail how the system worked: on grass speech [empty promises] (9 Feb), on the mechanism of operation of the security office (10 Feb), on deceit as the core of the system (28 Feb), and on the institution of 'kick upwards' (25 Mar). They were included to increase the communication value of the text." Vide: K. Niciński, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

³¹ K. Niciński, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

access to the original copies was not enough to prepare a dependable edition. That mainly meant that when studying the journal Dasko made some controversial decisions, including some of Tyrmand's corrections while rejecting others.

Let us try to establish the facts. Let me begin with the drafts. The manuscript of *Diary 1954* consists of 8 notebooks. It underwent two editions. There are also three different typescripts edited by Tyrmand himself. Furthermore, there survived sample copies of the 1980 edition. Academics rarely have the opportunity to approach such extensive and interesting material. When comparing the available archive material with the printed editions of the journal, one should conclude there are two versions which exist today. First, the so-called original version of 1995, which, in theory, was supposed to include the initial version of the manuscript. In fact, that is not the case. Henryk Dasko created something of a hybrid, using Tyrmand's editions as he pleased. Moreover, it lacks the complete names of many persons, which were replaced with initials. The other most popular edition was prepared by the Polonia Book Fund publishing house in collaboration with Tyrmand. Since he oversaw the preparations of the volume, one might assume then that it is completely in line with what the author intended. However, the publishing house applied many forms of pressure on the writer. The resulting publication differed from that what Tyrmand intended to offer his readers.

Edited or censored?

Two people were responsible for editing the journal: Zbigniew Stypułkowski and Nina Karsov. The latter, having read the typescript of *Diary 1954*, wrote to Tyrmand:

If it was up to me, I would publish it as it is, without any changes, unfortunately though, and that's what bothers me, it includes certain fragments which could mean for us all (the author, the publisher and the printers) certain trouble ("libel"). I'm not absolutely certain whether life corrects its old mistakes even if it wants to, but what I do know is that if someone decides to "correct" our "mistakes" and sues us, they will take us to the cleaners. That is why I would find it best if we could establish how to go about particularly risky passages.³²

Nina Karsov prepared for Tyrmand the names of people who, according to her, could feel offended by the contents of the journal and seek justice in court:

1. p. 72: Dora Gomb. Is she alive? If not, let's leave as it is.
2. p. 72: Aleksander Ford. He's emigrated west and he'll probably attack.

³² Letter of 03 July 1979. Nina Karsov's letters to Leopold Tyrmand are kept at the Hoover Institute in Palo Alto.

3. p. 140: Konwicki, Kierczyńska, and Ważyk. Kierczyńska is dead, so that's OK. Konwicki may be offended, I suppose he doesn't take pride in his book "Władza" and the "past period" in general. (Surely the dissidents will be offended on his behalf because he's their idol, but I suppose we don't need to care much for that. Dissidents will be also offended by the remarks on Słonimski on pp. 77–78).

4. p. 168: Podkowiński

5. p. 196: Staszewski. (I vaguely recall he has died recently. Am I right? Dissidents as above).

6. p. 199 Danka De Rosis.

Volume II

1. p. 9: Leon Przemski. Is he alive?

2. p. 12 & the following: Iwazkiewicz. Any touching up will only make it prettier, that is the meaning will not change, quite the opposite. What should we do? (That remark applies to almost everything.)

Further, there appear some other names, e.g.: Strykowski, Tarn, Sokorski, Ochab, Berman, Budrewicz, and Broniarek. In response to the suggestions, Tyrmand proposed to somehow mark the sensitive fragments, to which Nina Karsov replied:

Everything got delayed because I had to discuss your proposal with Mr. Stypułkowski. I finally managed to get hold of him. He did not agree to dotting: he believes the readers would consider it as censorship by the publisher. We agreed that I myself will introduce slight changes. In November, you will start receiving rough copies: I will mark all the proposed changes on the margin, and you will make the final decision.

Tyrmand tried to have an influence on the printing process until the very end. His intention was to preserve as much as possible. Eventually, though, he surrendered. In response to a letter from Karsov he wrote:

Your censorship is, this time, completely accepted. I can survive without a couple of insults against Ford and Strykowski (I even somewhat like the latter). Broniarek is a masochist and as well as I know him I gave some unique pleasure spitting at him, because it's in print, just like with Konwicki. But I won't argue with you.³³

Two weeks later, Karsov wrote that she had nothing against Konwicki experiencing some "perverse pleasure." Nonetheless the fragment which featured his name was censored "not due to a possible 'libel' suit, but at an explicit request by Mr. Stypułkowski." Furthermore, she stressed that "all other 'risky' fragments

³³ Letter of 05 January 1980.

(except for the description of Ford,” which she herself would choose to retain, remained unchanged. She argued that she defended them being convinced that the value of the journal consisted of, in part, glimpses of that which Tyrmand defined as “truths of the moment.” Consider the two people whose cases raised concerns and check how the “truth of the moment” they entailed was touched up.

The page indicated by Karsov included two fragments on Konwicki which were edited. From the course of the narration the following fragment was removed: “Konwicki, who seemed slow-witted resembling some beast swerving to avoid being kicked from the side, clad in some shapeless rags eliminating any assumptions of eroticism, looked as if someone smacked him on the head with a bat.” The phrase: “that poor moron has what he wanted” was changed to: “he finally has what he wanted.”³⁴ In the case of Aleksander Ford, the fragment in question was:

I remember when Aleksander Ford, the master of ideological slybootery, the virtuoso of securing for himself cars, large flats and gold dollars for a rainy day using Chopin quoting Lenin, destroyed that script during a public conference while praising it to the skies when discussing it unofficially, adding every now and again: “You must understand it yourself, don’t you...”

The printed version retained the following:

I remember when Aleksander Ford destroyed that script during a public conference while praising it to the skies when discussing it unofficially, adding every now and again: “You must understand it yourself, don’t you...”

At another location the text reads:

Ford knows how to make films, he’s a professional, he proved he can afford his own seal; but Ford also follows the ordered course or stage, while his only objective are awards, a trip to Cannes, material interests, his rule in Łódź, the Polish-communist Hollywood befitting him.

Originally, the fragment read:

Ford knows how to make films, he’s a professional, he proved he can afford his own seal; but Ford is also scum, a political scoundrel, smarmily following any ordered of the course or stage, whose only objective are awards, a trip to Cannes, material interests, his rule in Łódź, the Polish-communist Hollywood befitting him.

³⁴ Vide: L. Tyrmand, *Dziennik 1954*, Polonia Book Found, London 1985, p. 108.

It is worth mentioning that it would be pointless to look for the most controversial passages in the first notebook version of the journal. Tyrmand only added those in 1973 while preparing the first typescript version. It is possible that he treated the publication of his notes as an opportunity to settle some matters which he abandoned a few years prior in *Porachunki osobiste*³⁵.

Conclusions

The letters sent by Nina Karsov to Tyrmand prove that the publishers induced the writer to introduce extensive modifications, which were contrary to what he might have intended, though he did eventually agree to them. The letters included a recurring theme of possible law suits the publishing house might have faced. To avoid these the editors suggested and sometimes even demanded Tyrmand re-phrase specific fragments of the text. As a result of these extensive negotiations, Tyrmand reduced many names to initials only, in other cases he toned down the initially acute remarks about his colleagues. The modifications related to the publisher's intervention were part of a bigger whole of the writer's re-editing activities. The first printed version of *Diary 1954* includes several dozen new extensive fragments. The more significant changes applied not only to the length but also the quality. That version of the book was prepared by a writer 20 years older, who lived in a completely different cultural setting and in a different political and personal circumstances. His intended reader was also different. Based on all that I am inclined to conclude that the two version of the 1954 journal existing in circulation constitute two different works. One should, however, inquire about their forms. The so-called original edition does not meet the requirements of its own name as it is a hybrid, while copies of the first printed version duplicate the form of the work, to which Tyrmand agreed having been threatened with possible lawsuits. Therefore, it would be worth considering for new editions of the journal to restore both works to their true original forms.

Bibliography

Sources

Tyrmand Leopold, *Dziennik 1954*, manuscript (in the Hoover Institute collections).
 Tyrmand Leopold, *Dziennik 1954*, typescript (in the Hoover Institute collections).
 Manuscripts of the letters from Nina Karsov to Leopold Tyrmand (in the Hoover Institute collections).

³⁵ Vide: L. Tyrmand, "Porachunki osobiste", *Kultura* 1967, issue 3, pp. 3–39.

Subject bibliography

- Mrozek Sławomir, Tyrmand Leopold, *W emigracyjnym labiryncie. Listy 1965–1982*, introduction, editing, notes by D. Pachocki, afterword by Tadeusz Nyczek, Krakow 2017.
- Tyrmand Leopold, *Dziennik 1954*, London 1980.
- Tyrmand Leopold, *Dziennik 1954*, London 1985.
- Tyrmand Leopold, *Dziennik 1954*, Warsaw 1989.
- Tyrmand Leopold, *Dziennik 1954*, introduction and editing H. Dasko, Warsaw 1995.
- Tyrmand Leopold, “Porachunki osobiste”, *Kultura* 1967, issue 3, pp. 3–39.
- Tyrmand Leopold, “Przedmowa”, in: Tyrmand Leopold, *Dziennik 1954*, Warsaw 1989, pp. 11–12.

Object bibliography

- Bratkowski Piotr, “Dziennik 1954–1980–1995”, *Gazeta Wyborcza* 1995, issue 137, p. 7.
- Budrowska Kamila, *Zatrzymane przez cenzurę. Inedita z połowy wieku XX*, IBL PAN, Warsaw 2013.
- Czerwińska Małgorzata, “Leopold Tyrmand – głos świadka”, *Rocznik Towarzystwa Literackiego im. A. Mickiewicza* 1993, pp. 77–83.
- Dasko Henryk, “Tyrmand, Ameryka, ‘Dziennik’”, in: *Odlot malowanego ptaka*, Warsaw 2009.
- Dasko Henryk, “Wstęp”, in: L. Tyrmand, *Dziennik 1954*, introduction and editing H. Dasko, Warsaw 1995.
- Konwicki Tadeusz, *Zorze wieczorne*, Alfa, Warsaw 1991.
- Kowalczyk Marcin, *Tyrmand karnawałowy*, Universitas, Krakow 2009.
- Kwiatkowska Katarzyna, Gawęcki Maciej, *Tyrmand i Ameryka*, słowo/obraz terytoria, Gdańsk 2011.
- Loth Roman, *Podstawowo pojęcia i problemy tekstologii i edytorstwa naukowego*, IBL PAN, Warsaw 2006.
- Maciąg Krzysztof, “Konwicki kontra Tyrmand czyli o autentyczności ‘Dziennika 1954’”, *Dekada Literacka* 1993, issue 9, s. 5.
- Maruszewski Ryszard, *Literatura polska 1939–1991*, WSiP, Warsaw 1992.
- Niciński Konrad, “Dwie wersje ‘Dziennika 1954’ Leopolda Tyrmanda: wokół problemu tożsamości tekstu”, *Pamiętnik Literacki* 2006, issue 4, pp. 71–94.
- Nowicki Stanisław, *Pół wieku czyścica. Rozmowy z T. Konwickim*, Oficyna Wydawnicza, Warsaw 1990.
- Piasecki Marcin, “Dwa oryginały. Spór o ‘Dziennik 1954’ Leopolda Tyrmanda”, *Gazeta Wyborcza* 1995, issue 132, s. 12.
- Szejnert Danuta, *Intencja autora i interpretacja – między intencją a atencją. Teksty i parateksty*, Wydawnictwo UŁ, Łódź 2011.

Sztuka czytania między wierszami. Cenzura w komunikacji literackiej w Polsce w latach 1965–1989, Kamila Budrowska and Maria Kotowska-Kachel (eds.), IBL PAN, Warsaw 2016.

Woźniak Marcel, *Biografia Leopolda Tyrmanda. Moja śmierć będzie taka, jak moje życie*, Wydawnictwo MG, Warsaw 2016.

Zimand Roman, *Wojna i spokój*, Polonia Book Found, London 1984.

Dariusz Pachocki

Tekstowe meandry. *Dziennik 1954* Leopolda Tyrmanda – problem nie tylko filologiczny

Streszczenie

W Instytucie Hoovera w Palo Alto przechowywana jest największa na świecie kolekcja rękopisów Leopolda Tyrmanda. Analiza tych materiałów daje podstawy do rozwiania pewnych wątpliwości dotyczących autentyczności jego *Dziennika 1954*. Panuje powszechne przekonanie, iż utwór ten jest oryginalnym dziennikiem, który został napisany w Polsce, co jest zgodne z prawdą. Jednak zanim został opublikowany, przeszedł różnego rodzaju modyfikacje (m.in. stylistyczne i kompozycyjne). Niezwykle ważką kwestią jest charakter zmian, na których zależało przyszłemu wydawcy. Lektura listów Tyrmanda dowodzi, że nie wszystkie modyfikacje były zgodne z jego wolą i że nie wszystkie zostały przez niego zainicjowane.

Słowa kluczowe: Leopold Tyrmand, rękopisy, Hoover Institution, *Dziennik 1954*, diarystyka, filologia, cenzura, krytyka tekstu

Textual meanders. *Diary 1954* of Leopold Tyrmand – a problem of not only a philological nature

Summary

The Hoover Institution at Stanford University holds the largest collection of manuscripts by Leopold Tyrmand in the world. An analysis of the materials stored at the Hoover Institution provides grounds for dissipating some doubts about the authenticity

of his *Diary 1954*. Today, we are certain that Tyrmand's work is an original diary that had been written in Poland. However, before it was published, it underwent various modifications (in terms of style, composition, and material). A very important issue is the kind of censorship made by the publishing house. The reading of Tyrmand's letters proves that not all of the modifications were in accordance with his will, and that not all of them were initiated by him. Moreover, readers of the article will learn some facts about Tyrmand's creative process and different variants of his works.

Keywords: Leopold Tyrmand, textual criticism, Hoover Institution, manuscripts

Dariusz Pachocki, dr hab., prof. KUL, autor prac naukowych oraz artykułów z zakresu krytyki tekstu, krytyki literackiej i literaturoznawstwa. Edytor dzieł Edwarda Stachury, Józefa Czechowicza, Bolesława Leśmiana, Stanisława Czycza, Władysława Broniewskiego, Leopolda Tyrmanda. Za działalność edytorską dwukrotnie uhonorowany „Feniksem” przez Stowarzyszenie Wydawców Katolickich oraz Medalem Prezydenta Miasta Lublin. Stypendysta: Fundacji na rzecz Nauki Polskiej, Ministra Kultury i Dziedzictwa Narodowego, Fundacji Kościuszkowskiej.

Dariusz Pachocki, Ph.D. hab., professor of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, author of academic works and articles in text criticism, literary criticism, and literary science. He edited the works by Edward Stachura, Józef Czechowicz, Bolesław Leśmian, Stanisław Czycz, Władysław Broniewski, and Leopold Tyrmand. He received the Feniks award from the Association of Catholic Publishers twice for his editing work, and a medal of President of the City of Lublin. He received scholarships from: Foundation for Polish Science, the Minister of Culture and National Heritage, and the Kosciuszko Foundation.