Parentheses
in Krystyna Miłobędzka's poetry: Aspects of a linguistic analysis of the poet's late works

Agata Ostrówka-Dombkowska

ORCID: 0000-0002-7668-749X

Linguistic analyses of artistic texts often focus on a range of issues concerning specific works or specific writers, with particular attention being paid to idiolectal or idiostylistic features[1]. A significant number of analyses also considers questions of style or methodology. However, parentheses, which are the focus of this paper, are rarely a topic of scholarly considerations.

Obviously, one cannot limit the analysis of specific linguistic procedures in a literary text to the immediate textual context of linguistic expression because the layout of signifying elements in a work of art is much more complex than in a non-artistic text[2], as evidenced by the poetic function of texts. Such is the case with parentheses, which are primarily (but not exclusively) defined as bracketed interjections. Theoretical foundations for the analyses of parentheses in poetic texts were developed in Stanisław Bąba and Stanisław Mikołajczak's *Parenteza w polskiej liryce współczesnej*[3] [*Parenthesis in modern Polish lyrics*]. The two scholars

[1] See e.g. publications about the language of writers in the Bielańskie prace językoznawcze series.

[2] E.g. Maria Renata Mayenowa, Poetyka teoretyczna. Zagadnienia języka [Theoretical poetics. Language issues] (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 2000), 423–424.

[3] Stanisław Bąba, Stanisław Mikołajczak, „Parenteza w polskiej liryce współczesnej" [„Parenthesis in modern Polish lyrics"], in: O języku literatury [On literary language], ed. by Józef Bubak, Aleksander Wilkoń (Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 1981), 79–105.

listed formal exponents of parenthetic interjections in poems, related to their position within the verse structure. Even more importantly, they also established a classification based on semantics and meaning relations with the non-parenthetic text.

1. Accessory type
    a. Stage directions-type
    b. Contextual
    c. Motivating
    d. Seemingly motivating
2. Commenting and complementing
    a. Complementing
    b. Commenting
3. With reference (recalled)
4. With a chronological remark and digression
    a. With a chronological remark
    b. With digression
5. With modal and emotive-emphatic constructions
    a. With modal constructions
    b. With emotive-emphatic constructions
6. Defining words, translations
7. Specifying
    a. With precision
    b. With detailing
8. Varying
9. Referential[4].

I am interested in showcasing the semantic scope of parentheses, which I believe to be crucial for a philological analysis. I would also like to draw attention to the functional aspects of parenthetic interjections in lyrics. The linguistic perspective, adopted here, will allow me to shed light on some aspects of the phenomenon under consideration. Both the topic and scope of the analysis are Krystyna Miłobędzka's poems. Her works are likewise oriented linguistically, which may contribute to an interdisciplinary, multiaspectual reflection.

Much has been written about the language of Miłobędzka's works. Some of these analyses assign the author to the linguistic trend (e.g., Agnieszka Czyżak[5], Anna Legeżynska[6] or Marcin

---

[4] See Bąba, Mikołajczak, 82.

[5] Agnieszka Czyżak, „Po-zbierane niepokoje – przemiana i przemijanie" [„Collected worries – transformation and transcience"], in: Miłobędzka wielokrotnie [Miłobędzka on numerous occasions], ed.by Piotr Śliwiński (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Wojewódzkiej Biblioteki Publicznej i Centrum Animacji Kultury w Poznaniu, 2008), 154–162.

[6] Anna Legeżyńska, „Lingua contemplativa według Krystyny Miłobędzkiej" [Krystyna Miłobędzka's Lingua contemplativa"], in: Wielogłos. Krystyna Miłobędzka w recenzjach, szkicach, rozmowach [Polyphony. Krystyna Miłobędzka in reviews, essays, conversations], ed. by Jarosław Borowiec (Wrocław: Biuro Literackie, 2012), 425–449.

Malczewski and others[7]), although there are also publications which point to the distinctive nature of her poems[8]. Some scholars combine the two approaches[9]. Piotr Bogalecki believes that the relations of Miłobędzka with the activities of other poets are important, but he also recognizes her separateness and the "child-likeness" of her language as a more suitable interpretive context than the linguistic approach[10]. There are also publications on the relationship between language and the non-linguistic reality as well as on language and creation, often emphasising the primacy of experience over language in the poetry of the author of *Anaglify (Anaglyphs)*[11], writing "about not-growing-up, not-coming to terms with words" [12], writing in a way "that words want to chase some runaway thought" [13]. In her conversation with Jarosław Borowiec[14] Miłobędzka also talks about the creation of language, co-occurring with writing a poem, and about "writing herself and the world", as mentioned by Malczewski[15]. Other issues related to the language of her works have also been addressed in numerous texts[16].

Analysing parentheses in a poetic text is a complex issue. Apart from the requirements of a linear inscription of the text and semantics of typical language use, equally important is the very act of reading a poem. This reading is not limited to the writing surface and the plane of reception of the linguistic message. The graphic layer plays a particularly impor-

[7] See Marcin Malczewski, „Między językiem a światem. O poezji Krystyny Miłobędzkiej" [„Between language and the world. On Krystyna Miłobędzka's poetry"] (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertaion, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, 2015), accessed Feb. 25th, 2022, https://repozytorium.amu.edu.pl/bitstream/10593/14669/1/doktorat.pdf; Marcin Telicki, „Przyglądanie się sobie" ["Looking at oneself"], in: Wielogłos. Krystyna Miłobędzka w recenzjach, szkicach, rozmowach, 401–409; Elżbieta Winiecka, „Lingua defectiva, czyli język Innej w poezji Krystyny Miłobędzkiej" [„Lingua defectiva or, the language of the Other in Krystyna Miłobędzka's poetry]. W Wielogłos. Krystyna Miłobędzka w recenzjach, szkicach, rozmowach, 451–466.

[8] See Anna Kałuża, Wola odróżnienia. O modernistycznej poezji Jarosława Marka Rymkiewicza, Julii Hartwig, Witolda Wirpszy i Krystyny Miłobędzkiej [The will of differentiation. On modernist poetry of Jarosław Marek Rymkiewicz, Julia Hartwig, Witold Wirpsza and Krystyna Miłobędzka] (Kraków: Universitas 2008), 47; Krzysztof Kuczkowski, „Poezja «nocy, nijak, bezgłosu, zadławi»" [„The poetry of «night, no-way, voicelessness, chokings»], in: Wielogłos. Krystyna Miłobędzka w recenzjach, szkicach, rozmowach, 371–377; Aleksandra Zasępa, Czas (w) poezji Krystyny Miłobędzkiej [Krystyna Miłobędzka and time in/ of her poetry] (Wrocław: Warstwy, 2016), 199–201.

[9] See Karol Maliszewski, „«Przed mową jest mowa obszerniejsza». Poezja obok słów" [«Before speech there is a bigger speech». Poetry besides words"], in: Miłobędzka wielokrotnie, 8–13; „Krystyna Miłobędzka. 8.06.1932", Culture.pl, accessed February25th, 2022, https://culture.pl/pl/tworca/krystyna-milobedzka.

[10] Piotr Bogalecki, Niedorozmowy. Kategoria niezrozumiałości w poezji Krystyny Miłobędzkiej [Unconversations. The category of incomprehensibility in Krystyna Miłobędzka's poetry] (Warszawa: Narodowe Centrum Kultury, 2011), 30–31, 41–42.

[11] Maliszewski.

[12] Joanna Grądziel-Wójcik, „«Spróbuj zbudować dom ze słów». O wierszach «niezamieszkanych» Krystyny Miłobędzkiej"[„«Try to build a house of words». On «uninhabited» poems of Krystyna Miłobędzka"], in: Miłobędzka wielokrotnie, 34.

[13] Tadeusz Nyczek, „Miłobędzka: pokrewne, osobne" [„Miłobędzka: familiar, separate"], in: Wielogłos. Krystyna Miłobędzka w recenzjach, szkicach, rozmowach, 359.

[14] Jarosław Borowiec, „«Pisze się tak, jak toczy się życie». Z Krystyną Miłobędzką rozmawia Jarosław Borowiec", [„«One writes the way one's life goes». Jarosław Borowiec in conversation with Krystyna Miłobędzka"], in: Miłobędzka wielokrotnie, 178–189.

[15] Marcin Malczewski, „Między językiem a światem" [„Between language and the world"], in: Wielogłos. Krystyna Miłobędzka w recenzjach, szkicach, rozmowach, 393.

[16] E.g. Michał Larek, „Nie. O pewnym aspekcie poezji Krystyny Miłobędzkiej" [No. On a certain aspect of Krystyna Miłobędzka's poetry"], in: Miłobędzka wielokrotnie, 59–71; Anna Kałuża, „Prezentacje Ja. O Imiesłowach Krystyny Miłobędzkiej" [„Presentations of I. On Krystyna Miłobędzka's participles"], in: Miłobędzka wielokrotnie, 105–113; Marcin Malczewski, „Krystyna Miłobędzka: wychodzenie z cienia" [„Krystyna Miłobędzka: stepping out of the shadow], in: Wielogłos. Krystyna Miłobędzka w recenzjach, szkicach, rozmowach, 411–424, Malczewski, „Między językiem a światem"; Legeżyńska; Winiecka.

tant role, at the level of verse-line at that[17]. These reasons alone endow a parenthesis with an interesting stylistic potential – its punctuation makes it visible even before reading happens.

Other formal features of parenthesis are typically described with reference to its occurrence in prose and non-artistic texts[18]. It is said to be an element of an utterance (a sentence, a clause) and it may (but does not have to) enter into formal and semantic relations with elements of the main utterance. Removed from within the main sentence, it will maintain grammatical accuracy and semantic coherence[19]. These conditions may prove unsustainable in poetic texts, especially in poems deprived of formal sentence-creating elements, like verbs, capitalization or punctuation.

This article analyses poems from two books of poetry: *Po krzyku* [*After a shout*] (2004) and *gubione* [*one by one lost*] (2008)[20]. This choice was motivated by a discernible evolution of Miłobędzka's poetics. As noted by Bogalecki, in her earlier books of poetry one can discern an ever-increasing predilection for specificity[21]. Bogalecki interprets it as "[t]urning towards material aspects of the text's existence"[22]. In later books of poetry the orientation of specificity was combined with the "traditional" character of the poem [23]. Bogalecki associates other indications of the distinctiveness of *Po krzyku* and *gubione* with a different creation of the "I" speaking: arguably, in these collections Miłobędzka combines the types of the lyrical "I" from her previous books of poetry, e.g., woman-mother, collectiveness, hidden subject or poem as subject. Referring to *gubione*, Bogalecki states that "[o]ne of the recurring topics or techniques are also […] «disappearance», which becomes a «rule», not only of *Po krzyku* but also of the entire «silencing» phase in Miłobędzka's works"[24]. One may assume that *Po krzyku* and *gubione* differ from earlier books of Miłobędzka's poetry in terms of a gradual reduction of the word and means of expression. This is why analysing parentheses in such peculiar syntactic context opens up a number of investigative possibilities, an outline of which I would like to present in this essay.

---

[17] Artur Grabowski, Wiersz. Forma i sens [The poem. Form and meaning] (Kraków: Universitas, 1999); Witold Sadowski, Wiersz wolny jako tekst graficzny [Free verse as a graphic text] (Kraków: Universitas, 2004).

[18] See e.g. Andrzej Moroz, Parenteza ze składnikiem czasownikowym we współczesnym języku polskim [Parenthesis with a verbal element in modern Polish] (Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 2010); Gabriela Dziamska-Lenart, Innowacje frazeologiczne w powojennej felietonistyce polskiej [Phraseological innovations in post-war Polish essay-writing] (Poznań: Wydawnictwo „Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne", 2004).

[19] See Moroz; Zenon Klemensiewicz, Zarys składni polskiej [An outline of Polish syntax] (Warszawa: PWN, 1961); Agata Ostrówka, „Idiostylowy charakter parentez w tekstach Antoniego Libery" [„Idiostylistic nature of parentheses in Antoni Libera's texts"], Kwartalnik Językoznawczy 17, 1 (2014): 21–64; Marzena Stępień, Wyrażenia parentetyczne w strukturze wypowiedzi – właściwości semantyczne, składniowe, prozodyczne [Parenthetic expressions in the structure of utterance – semantic, syntactic and prosodic properties]. (Warszawa: BEL Studio, 2014).

[20] Both volumes are from Krystyna Miłobędzka's, zbierane, gubione [gathered, lost] 1960–2010. (Wrocław: Biuro Literackie, 2010). Quotations in this article will be indicated by the first letter of the volume title and page number in brackets.

[21] Bogalecki, 460–471.

[22] Bogalecki, 462.

[23] Bogalecki, 463.

[24] Bogalecki, 502.

Insertions in the texts under consideration vary in terms of their position relative to the verse(s), strophoid(s) or the entire poem. Specificity and reduction of linguistic richness, characteristic for the poet, whose writing relies on the very essence of language and words is reflected in the format of her poems, devoid of any formal sentence structure. Punctuation is functional: it features commas, question marks and exclamation points on line-ends, as well as dashes, hyphens, quotation marks, ellipses and, of course, brackets, extended over entire verses and individual elements of the text. Full stops in the closing function occur in only two poems from the *Po krzyku* and *gubione* books of poetry. Except for the single spelling of the first name ("Krystyna") and personal pronoun 'you' ("Ty") there is no capitalization. Signs used by the poet are suited to their 'transmitter' function. Of course, one does not mean here sentences in the formal sense; rather, a syntagmatic structure, compromised by an anti-syntactic poem. This makes the prerequisite for parenthesis as interjection into the main clause unsustainable[25]. Despite the required "obligatory co-occurrence[26] with the main structure"[27] there are in lyrics instances of bracketed material occurring in ambiguous, non-specific relations with the surrounding elements of the poem's structure. For the purposes of this article I take the parenthesis (interchangeably referred to as interjection or bracketed structure) to be an element of a poetic text underscored by means bracketing and characterized by semantic surplus. A close reading of the poem may well indicate the actual significance of the parenthetic fragment. In the following parts of this article I will present my thoughts on the issue.

One of the poems featuring an interesting use of the parenthetic structure is a text from *gubione28*:

> dróżki w ogrodzie
> (czarne wgłąb)
> (przeskoki, zgłębienia)
> dom przed zniknięciem w drzewach
> dom znikający w drzewach
>
>   (G 357)

It is worth noticing that the author placed two parentheses one after another without separating them by means of a main sentence fragment or a punctuation mark – a practice necessary in a non-poetic text. The "paths" (*dróżki*) opening the poem introduce the motif of movement, elaborated on in two final verses – even without any personal verb, nominal forms represent the gradation of visual impressions which may accompany move-

---

[25] Andrzej Moroz in his Parenteza ze składnikiem czasownikowym we współczesnym języku polskim quotes Maciej Grochowski's argument that „no isolated linguistic expression (even if it could operate without any context) can be a priori referred to as parenthesis") (Maciej Grochowski, „Metatekstowa interpretacja parentezy" [„Metatextual interpretation of parenthesis"], in: Tekst i zdanie [Text and sentence] [Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1983], 254, as quoted in Moroz, 52).

[26] This competition is understood as "co-occurrence with another syntactic sequence within the same unit" (Moroz, 52).

[27] Moroz.

[28] Translator's note: English versions of Miłobędzka's poems are available in Elżbieta Wójcik-Leese's critically acclaimed translations. In this article only those fragments of Miłobędzka's poems which are mentioned in the author's analysis have been translated (word-for-word) for the purposes of this paper.

ment. Interjections execute this motif in slightly different ways. Here the verb "inwards" (*wgłąb*) and nouns "leaps" (*przeskoki*) and "indentations" (*wgłębienia*) imply movement, while suggesting a different, more specific perspective. "Paths", visible "in the garden" (*w ogrodzie*) and "a house" (*dom*) which gradually "disappear[s] into the trees" (*znikający w drzewach*) recall a more general, synthetic view. A different analysis is offered by taking the perspective of horizontal-vertical relations. While the path, followed by the "I" speaking belongs with the horizontal plane, in the vertical space they notice (perhaps stopping for a while, deviating from the path) certain unevenness of that path. Also, the arrangement of parentheses betrays a gradation of sorts. From this perspective "leaps, explorations" would be modifiers of what earlier, at first sight, was only visible as "black" (*czarne*)[29]. Controversially, **wgłąb* ('inwards') can also be interpreted as a complex preposition[30]. Then the poem expresses the topic of movement through the paradox of expressing the motif of movement without using verbs, which is another proof of the author's skill. I interpret this possible ungrammatical usage, as intentional.[31] Summing up, each of the three above-proposed analyses demonstrates that that interjections introduce a different level of transmission, here – related to space (in the physical sense), which is invoked in the poem.

In a different poem Miłobędzka writes:

> mów
> nie zatrzymuj się
> (nie zatrzymuj siebie)
>
> (G 343)

The content of the parentheses seems to be a variant of the preceding utterance. The difference is the use of the reflexive "się", which modifies the meaning and highlights other

---

[29]The referentiality of the second interjection also opens up the possibility of analysing these elements in the context of verse parenthesis (Krzysztof Skibski, Poezja jako iteratura. Relacje między elementami języka poetyckiego w wierszu wolnym [Poetry as literature. Relations between elements of the poetic language in a free verse] [Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 2017], 260–266)

[30] Classifying **wgłąb* 'inwards' as a preposition is supported by the consistency of grammatical forms and the commonality of usage. Also Paweł Próchniak in his review of gubione follows it: „[...] In that dust, in the sand, in darkness the «black inwards» opens up", as do «leaps, recesses», which engulf everything that is" (Paweł Próchniak, „Przeskoki, zgłębienia" ["Leaps, recesses"], in: Wielogłos. Krystyna Miłobędzka w recenzjach, szkicach, rozmowach, 270). An argument against this lexical choice is, of course, grammatical correctness. Dictionaries of Polish, both contemporary and earlier ones (e.g. Wielki słownik języka polskiego PAN [The comprehensive dictionary of Polish], ed. by Piotr Żmigrodzki, accessed March 10th, 2022, https://wsjp.pl/; Słownik języka polskiego PWN [Dictionary of Polish PWN], accessed March 10th,ca 2022, https://sjp.pwn.pl/; Słownik języka polskiego [Dictionary of Polish], ed. by Witold Doroszewski, vol. 9 [Warszawa: PWN, 1967]; Aleksander Zdanowicz et al., Słownik języka polskiego, vol. 2 [Wilno: Maurycy Orgelbrand, 1861]; Słownik języka polskiego, ed.by Jan Karłowicz, Adam Antoni Kryński, Władysław Niedźwiedzki, vol. 7 [Warszawa: K. Król and W. Niedźwiedzki, 1919]; Samuel Bogumił Linde, Słownik języka polskiego, vol. 6 [Warszawa: Drukarnia XX. Pijarów, 1814]), do not include the preposition **wgłąb*, but only the verb wgłębić 'to deepen'. Corpora of Polish (Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego [National Corpus of Polish], accessed March 10th, 2022, http://nkjp.pl/ and Korpus Języka Polskiego PWN [PWN Corpus of Polish], accessed March 10th, 2022, https://sjp.pwn.pl/korpus) define **wgłąb* as a complex preposition (28 hits for the PELCRA NKJP search engine, 30 hits for the Poliqarp NKJP search engine, 1 for Korpusu Języka Polskiego PWN); interestingly enough, none of them quotes examples of using wgłąb as an imperative.

[31]On the use grammatical error as a poetica means by Miłobędzka and other linguist-poets see, e.g. Zasępa, 208; Bogalecki, 47, 495.

connotations. "Don't' stop" (Pol. *nie zatrzymuj się*) could be understood – yet again – in the context of movement, but in combination with the initial "speak" (*mów*) it implies a communicative event, in which the subject is really saying "don't stop talking". The interjection is expounded as a request towards the interlocutor (or the subject in conversation with themselves?), not to stop "the entire" self, one's own (self-)expression or not to leave oneself only for oneself. Thus, the content of the parenthesis on one hand points to linguistic ambiguities and possibilities, on the other – to its limitations. Just changing the form of one grammatical word breaks the content of a fixed expression and opens up an entirely new semantic perspective, demonstrating the inadequacy of fixed phrases. The variability of the two expressions appears illusory – we are not dealing with two alternative options but with an expansion and a complementation of one of them by means of a parenthetic interjection.

The status of parenthesis as a secondary element (not in the meaning of hypotaxis but as a semantic and formal 'excess', unnecessary for the correctness of the utterance), and as a complementary form, indicates that the bracketed material is, metaphorically speaking, a record of the subject's whisper or thoughts. One of the functions of parenthesis in poetry would be then demonstrating the unsaid. A parenthetical interjection as a means of poetic expression acquires new properties.

Let the poet speak again:

>   być sobą tak, że już nie być
>   (obracaj to w kółko, w kółko
>   aż ci się zrobi pusto)
>   (G 367)

The poem might create the impression that it is a manual of how to separate being ("self-being") from non-being, language from the world and denotation – like a word which is spun around numerous times and finally loses any relation with what it refers to and thus becomes strange, semantically empty. We can also notice in the text a peculiar kind of syntactic parallelism, or syntactic-content parallelism between the non-interjected part and parenthesis. The first part of the opening verse is directly related to existence, which is antithetic to the second part. The interjecting strophoid initially refers to performing an activity, performed by the subject. The second part, through deconstructing the phrase *zrobić się komuś niedobrze* 'to be made to feel sick' assumes a passive adoption of the effect of that activity, i.e., the phenomenon of emptiness. The parallelism, present in the text is then a repetition of the juxtaposition "presence – lack"/ "to be – not to be" / "act-be – don't be". This procedure emphasizes the value of the parenthetic interjection. That interjection, on one hand appears to be an addition, excess, typical of non-artistic communication, on the other hand, "equal access" of parenthetic and non-parenthetic elements to means of poetic expression questions the redundancy of the former. Moreover, the inserted element introduces a different level of transmission – from the grammatical perspective the imperative mood is an adjustment to the recipient of this communication, an aspect missing from the preceding sentence fragment.

In some of Miłobędzka's poems bracketed interjections relate to the category of parallelism. In one of her works this is executed through symmetry, manifested in graphic structure:

powiedzieć Ty sobą	Twoim jest	Twoim mówię
w kółko dom	w kółko Ty	w kółko mówię
(mówię)	(mówię)	(mówię)
(nie chcę)	(nie jestem)	(nie czekam)

<div align="right">(G 363)</div>

The text can be "read graphically" in many ways. One of the possible interpretative keys are the vertical and horizontal axes of symmetry. In the former case the main axis is the middle column of the text, whose content – except the third verse – is oriented around the verb "to be" (*jest* 'is', *jestem* 'am'). A noticeable change of this orientation occurs in the interjected fragments – the already mentioned third verse with its *mówię* 'I am speaking' the negation of the verb "to be" in the fourth one (*nie jestem*). The presence of the horizontal axis enforces the parallelism of individual verses in the first two and second and third lines, creating the following juxtapositions: *powiedzieć Ty sobą – nie chcę* 'to say You yourself' – 'I don't want to'; *Twoim jest – nie jestem* 'is Yours' – 'I'm not'; *Twoim mówię – nie czekam* 'with Yours I speak' – 'I'm not waiting'; *w kółko dom – mówię* 'nothing but the house' – "I am speaking'; *w kółko jest – mówię* 'nothing but is' – 'I am speaking'; *w kółko mówię – mówię;* 'nothing but I am speaking' – 'I am speaking'. These open up interesting interpretive perspectives. In the above-quoted pairs one can discern an image of rebellion against the subject's "over-speaking" themselves and the addressee of the communication. They do not want to speak about the addressee or "to speak the addressee"[32], i.e. make them real, agree to their presence in language, and thus – in the world. The speaking "I" emphasizes their separateness from "you". The world of the subject is "over-spoken"; too many words lead to the loss of the "I" from sight (hearing?). Interjected texts become answers to the reality as it was.

The act of graphic reading also helps notice the functionality of parentheses within the text. The use of only parenthetic interjections in a significant portion of the text underscores the importance of their contents – a reading unlike the one typical of non-artistic communication. Parenthesis, which often conveys that which is 'extra', irrelevant, but important for presenting a possibly comprehensive picture of what one wants to convey, here also signals that which is left unsaid but is being thought – a truth which has not come to light. Thus understood the interjection realizes the scheme: "I say *a* (even though the truth is *b*)". The accumulation of bracketed (hidden) utterances "at the bottom" of the poem and the non-parenthetic ("revealed") "on top", brings to mind the structure of a plant, for example a tree, in which the roots balance with their size what is visible but they are also a condition of their existence. Similarly, it is only the second part of the poem which is added so as not to pay greater attention uncovers the conflict of the lyrical "I" with the world and the addressee of the text,

---

[32]See „»Mówienie o« w poezji jako fakcie egzystencjalnym przechodzi w »mówienie siebie« bądź też »mówienie sobą«"[„»Speaking about« in poetry as an existential fact becomes »speaking oneself« or »speaking by means of oneself«"] (Malczewski, „Między językiem a światem", 391), as well as: „Temporal distance between the plane of life and writing enables one to discern in the category of life-writing a call for a textualizing existence" (ibid.). Simultaneously, as already mentioned, scholars point to Miłobędzka's subject's detachment from creation in a text (e.g. Grądziel-Wójcik, 21–34; Nyczek, 345–370).

therefore it is a carrier of its semantic load. The structure of the work, to put it simply, can be divided into "the factual part" and "the truth part", thus reminiscent of the sonnet structure, whose opening stanzas are also "the factual part" and the final ones – "the part of pondering the world". Interpreting the final two lines of Miłobędzka's text as "the part of pondering the world" seems therefore justified.

A recurring feature of parentheses in Miłobędzka's works, as proven by some of the above-quoted poems, is their clause structure, which allows for the execution of two functions. The first is the different level of transmission (also visible in the above-analysed texts):

> mamy siebie krótko na wieczne zdziwienie
> patrz uważnie, przed tobą nie oddany uśmiech
> (ta twarz z bliska, szeroko rozstawione oczy)
>   (PK 296)

The first two verses are reflective in nature, while the interjections pertain to physical, tangible features (*ta twarz z bliska, szeroko rozstawione oczy* – 'that face up close, eyes wide-set'). This change of reference seems at odds with the rest of the poem, but it closes and complements its content, becoming the climax of the poem because it is within the parenthesis that the gradual specification of the lyrical context is finalised.

The opposite is visible in another text from the same book of poetry:

> dokładnie *czoło*, dokładnie usta, dokładnie dłonie
> z tą samą brudną plamką przy paznokciu
> z warkoczykami
> w żorżetowej sukience
> z dalią przy policzku, truskawką do buzi
> w tamtej błękitnoszarej przepasce na włosach
>
> (i: *czy popiół zakwita?*)
>   (PK 299)

In the poem above, yet again concluded by parenthesis, the interjection introduces an abstract layer. The rhetorical question (*i: czy popiół zakwita*?) – ('do the ashes bloom?') is a reference to something that contrasts with the tangible character of the preceding content, expressed through an accumulation of concrete nouns. It is an interpretative opening of sorts, introduced by the initial conjunction *i* 'and', used in the parenthesis.

Another interesting and recurring aspect of Miłobędzka's parentheses is their retarding function. A particular "holding one's breath" and delay can be listed as features of parenthesis. It can also be seen in the following texts:

> wyrwać z siebie ten lichy dzień ten niski las ten mokry cień,
> to zgniło-mokro

żeby biec żeby biegło żeby ci się to wszystko naraz zbiegło
(tu jeszcze coś, zapomniałam), chwilko chmurko
dziecino motylowa górko
                    (PK 314)

najprędzej gubię czasowniki, zostają rzeczowniki, rzeczy
już tylko zaimki osobowe (dużo ja, coraz więcej ja)
a imiona? giną, spójniki giną
trzy słowa, dwa słowa
wreszcie mój, mój we mnie
mój ze mną
świat
ja w pierwszej i ostatniej osobie
                    (PK 286)

Yet again parenthesis is used to introduce a distinct level of transmission in first of the two poems above, written in the style of everyday speech. This causes a stylistic break in the text – it seems that the aim of this procedure is to break the accumulation of metaphors and, at the same time, to distance oneself from the lyrical character of the poem through a self-critical act of questioning the absolutism of the act of creating the world in a poem, perhaps even an attempt to denounce the lyrical "I" which is too distant from a naively perceived reality...

Metalinguistic and metatextual, as well as metaidiostylistic reflection, which can be found in the second poem, is highlighted by means of a reductive layout, correlating with the content of the poem. This time the text of the parenthesis does not contrast with the remainder of the text. Following the formal expressions of bracketed interjections, it refers to the neighbouring text. Interestingly enough, its topic (the pronoun "I") recurs in the final verse, which is a change in the way of reading parenthesis and its "ennoblement", raising its status to that of a semantically and formally equivalent element. [33]

One might wonder if treating parenthesis in a "democratic" manner, equal to the rest of the text, as far as the use of anaphors is concerned, in the text below is proof of a similar "nobilitation" of the interjection to that which occurred in the above-discussed poem

---

[33] Scholars analysing parenthesis and its defining features also Focus on the issue of syntactic relations between the interjection and the main clause. Zenon Klemensiewicz points out that the inserted element is neither hypo- nor parataxically related to the main clause (Zenon Klemensiewicz, Zarys składni polskiej [Warszawa: PWN, 1961], 104). Similarly, e.g. Stanisław Karolak (Encyklopedia Językoznawstwa Ogólnego [Encyclopedia of general linguistics], ed. by Kazimierz Polański (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1999), entry „parenthesis"). Also Marzena Stępień in Wyrażenia parentetyczne w strukturze wypowiedzi [Parenthetic expressions in the structure of an utterance] claims that „the basic utterance does not connote syntactically a parenthetic expression; parenthesis is not accommodated by it [...]; if a parenthetic expression takes the form of a clause, then the utterance it co-creates does not belong with traditional division into main and subordinate clauses (Marzena Stępień, Wyrażenia parentetyczne w strukturze wypowiedzi – właściwości semantyczne, składniowe, prozodyczne [Warszawa: BEL Studio, 2014], 12 Andrzej Moroz distinguishes between interjection and parenthesis, taking the former to be a more general phenomenon, whereas parenthesis is characterized by "formal independence from the elements of the basic structure" (Moroz, 84).

jej moje biegnące
bez stąd
bez dotąd
bez jest
(bez tej która usiłuje być mną)
                    (G 337)

It is hard to come to a definitive answer. On one hand the final verse is a continuation of the anaphorical pairing, on the other – its content is formally distinct because its pronoun is made specific by a grammatically correct relative clause. Moreover, this sentence might well appear in a prose text, or even in a non-artistic one. Therefore, the hypothesis concerning the "ennobling" of parenthesis cannot be verified.

Another important technique, relevant for the present analysis, concerns the relationship between parenthesis and the main text:

ciągle ta sama nieopowiadalność!
(świecenie świata, szarość papieru)
światło papieru, kolor tej szarości
labirynt – w którym tylko każdy z osobna szczegół może być
nazwany
            (PK 290)

Following the definition of interjection, *świecenie świata, szarość papieru* 'the shining of light, the grayness of paper' refers to "undescribability". Here, the introduction of brackets may influence the interpretation of the work, reinforcing the relationship between the first two verses. Paradoxically, this fragment is not the most important one for our reflections upon interjections. The middle verse, which is also a strophoid, refers directly to the preceding line, which is the bracketed fragment. This dependence suggests that the words *światło papieru, kolor tej szarości* 'the light of paper, the colour of that greyness' are parenthetical with respect to the words they refer to. This is a second degree parenthesis, introduced without appropriate punctuation. Such 'unmarked' interjection in a poetic text is termed verse parenthesis[34].

The poem below presents a case in which interjections are one of many indications of correspondences between the verses:

że jesteś w rozłożystym powietrzu
otulona w chmury
(otulające cię chmury)
(chmury)
            (G 350)

---

[34]Skibski, 260–266.

drzewo tak drzewo
że drzewa już nie ma
chmury (chmury)
            (G 351)

In *gubione* the two poems are printed on facing pages, which provides an additional clue of their relationship. Both follow the same pattern, using the word *chmury* 'clouds', which is then repeated inside the brackets, with additional variant in the first poem. In the latter case the structure is also reductive. In both texts parentheses are an expression of metatextual, metalinguistic and ontic-referential reflections[35]. Seemingly, in the first example the interjections mirror deeper thoughts on the expression *otulona w chmury* 'wrapped in clouds', or on the 'clouds' themselves – if the addressee 'is […] / wrapped in clouds', then the inherent feature of those clouds is that they get 'wrapped' around that person. However, the search for the essence of things, for the best description possible, reduces that description to the name itself, because that name comprises all possible features of the designate. In the second text the "transitional parenthesis" was left out – the word 'clouds' is repeated, as if echoed in the interjection. This seems to support the conclusions from the previously considered text. The opening strophoid recalls yet another previously considered fragment: *obracaj to w kółko, w kółko / aż ci się zrobi pusto* 'spin it round and round / until it makes you empty'. Maybe the 'tree' is 'spun round and round/ until it [was made] empty', which is why 'the tree is no more'. Rescue may be found in the clouds which disappear before the word 'cloud' loses its meaning. Let us again recall the definition of a bracketed interjection: it is a procedure of excess, one which is weak as its form is equivalent to that of the cloud's ephemeral nature. The graphic dimension of the parenthesis is not meaningless either: the rounded brackets correspond to the oval shape of that atmospheric phenomenon. Similarly, the reductive layout of the parentheses in the first verse may symbolize clouds dispersed by the wind. As it turns out, the "weakness" of a parenthetical interjection may be evidence of its meaning-making properties.

Let us consider one more text with a closing parenthesis:

jedno za drugim, jedno na drugie
jedno w drugie
(jedno w jedno)
            (G 338)

Yet again, this is a metalinguistic reflection delivered through a bracketed interjection. The objects of that reflection are colloquial expressions, juxtaposed in an almost mathematical arrangement. A string of alternative expressions is interrupted by parenthesis, which questions the meaning of introducing order and value to things. Prepositions like *za, na, w* 'behind', 'on', 'in', point to objects but also – in a different perspective – they can relate to phenomena or people. Coincidence or circumstances are the cause, most often – external – for the subject of

---

[35] I am referring here to the reflection on the issue of „clouds" revealed in the poem, both in the sense of an actual object and the lexeme along with its reference to that object. In other words, this is reference in the basic meaning of the term. Detailed considerations on this topic can be found in Ewa Bińczyk's now classical Obraz który nas zniewala [The image that enslaves us] [Kraków: Universitas, 2007]).

action, choice of what will be first, more important and what will come after. Meanwhile, the human being is not capable of deciding objectively which of the elements should come first, especially that – as the text suggests – they are coeval.

The following poem illustrates the importance of parenthesis:

> (podziwiaj sztukę bycia cicho
> uderzysz w stół, odezwie się długopis)
>   (PK 317)

This application of brackets puts into question the traditional definition of interjection because there is no main clause to which the bracketed material would refer and be separated from. The text, as if uttered in passing, is the only element of the poem. The use of punctuation is likewise meaningful – it correlates with the motif of silence present in the poem. Moreover, it impacts the tension between verse boundaries because the coherence of the entire text is emphasized, despite versification.

An exceptional use of the brackets can also be noticed in the text:

> w jakim ty świecie żyjesz?
> w pędzącym
> prędzej widzę, niż powiem
> (prędzej powiem, niż widzę)
> (*****)
> (***)
> (*)
>   (G 339)

This text also relies on parenthetic repetitions. Yet again, it is possible to discern the "plant" pattern here, i.e., a two-partite structure in which the interjections comprise the "roots" part of the poem. The reductive pattern also features – parentheses concern minimal content. That minimalism is evident in a gradual reduction of signs: first an expression, then a string of signs, finally – just a single sign. The use of asterisks instead of words also highlights divergence from the accepted definition of parenthesis. In the brackets-fragment interjection becomes a "smuggler of truth": "I say *a* (even though *b* is the truth)". Thus understood, the second part of the text is an answer to the first one. The first parenthesis, which is the culminating point of the poem's semantic tension, introduces an antithetical chiasm. The juxtaposition of graphic signs is a response to this arrangement: *prędzej powiem niż widzę* 'I say before I see', changes the expression "to speak faster than to think" and suggests talking about the world without having experienced it first. The asterisks might express "hollow talk", lacking any referentiality, and one which reduces itself, as it only carries little. [36]

---

[36]It could also be a trace of self-criticism – a serious one at that, because it refers to the manner of experiencing the world and writing about it by the subject. After all, one of the key properties of Miłobędzka's poetry is the simultaneity of creating and experiencing; a two-track creation – concerning the world and text. A possible support for this thesis might be found in the author's own words, who thus answered Borowiec's question „What kind of poet is Krystyna Miłobędzka?" "Lacking self-confidence [...]" (Borowiec, 178).

The above-analysed examples show a range of applications for bracket interjections in Miłobędzka's works. They demonstrate a particular semantic potential of parentheses used in a poetic text, even if its formal features are often not present. Parentheses in Miłobędzka's poems carry more 'functional load' than their non-artistic equivalents. This unique usage of parentheses is an inspiration for considering their functions in other books of Miłobędzka's poetry, as well as in the poetry of other authors. This issue definitely requires further study.

translated by Justyna Rogos-Hebda

References

Miłobędzka, Krystyna. *zbierane, gubione. 1960–2010*. Wrocław: Biuro Literackie, 2010.

Bąba, Stanisław, Stanisław Mikołajczak. „Parenteza w polskiej liryce współczesnej". In: *O języku literatury*, ed. Józef Bubak, Aleksander Wilkoń, 79–105. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 1981.

Bińczyk, Ewa. *Obraz który nas zniewala*. Kraków: Universitas, 2007.

Bogalecki, Piotr. Niedorozmowy. *Kategoria niezrozumiałości w poezji Krystyny Miłobędzkiej*. Warszawa: Narodowe Centrum Kultury, 2011.

Borowiec, Jarosław. „«Pisze się tak, jak toczy się życie». Z Krystyną Miłobędzką rozmawia Jarosław Borowiec". In: *Miłobędzka wielokrotnie*, ed. Piotr Śliwiński, 178–189. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Wojewódzkiej Biblioteki Publicznej i Centrum Animacji Kultury w Poznaniu, 2008.

Culture.pl. „Krystyna Miłobędzka. 8.06.1932". Date of access 25 February 2022. https://culture.pl/pl/tworca/krystyna-milobedzka.

Czyżak, Agnieszka. „Po-zbierane niepokoje – przemiana i przemijanie". In: *Miłobędzka wielokrotnie*, ed. Piotr Śliwiński, 154–162.

Poznań: Wydawnictwo Wojewódzkiej Biblioteki Publicznej i Centrum Animacji Kultury w Poznaniu, 2008.

Dziamska-Lenart, Gabriela. *Innowacje frazeologiczne w powojennej felietonistyce polskiej*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo „Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne", 2004.

Grabowski, Artur. *Wiersz. Forma i sens*. Kraków: Universitas, 1999.

Grądziel-Wójcik, Joanna. „«Spróbuj zbudować dom ze słów». O wierszach «niezamieszkanych» Krystyny Miłobędzkiej". In: *Miłobędzka wielokrotnie*, ed. Piotr Śliwiński, 21–34. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Wojewódzkiej Biblioteki Publicznej i Centrum Animacji Kultury w Poznaniu, 2008.

Grochowski, Maciej. „Metatekstowa interpretacja parentezy". In: *Tekst i zdanie*, ed. Teresa Dobrzyńska, Elżbieta Janus, 247–258. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1983.

Kałuża, Anna. „Prezentacje Ja. O *Imiesłowach* Krystyny Miłobędzkiej". In: *Miłobędzka wielokrotnie*, ed. Piotr Śliwiński, 105–113. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Wojewódzkiej Biblioteki Publicznej i Centrum Animacji Kultury w Poznaniu, 2008.

– – –. *Wola odróżnienia. O modernistycznej poezji Jarosława Marka Rymkiewicza, Julii Hartwig, Witolda Wirpszy i Krystyny Miłobędzkiej*. Kraków: Universitas 2008.

Klemensiewicz, Zenon. *Zarys składni polskiej*. Warszawa: PWN, 1961.

Kuczkowski, Krzysztof. „Poezja «nocy, nijak, bezgłosu, zadławi»". In: *Wielogłos. Krystyna Miłobędzka w recenzjach, szkicach, rozmowach*, ed. Borowiec, 371–377. Wrocław: Biuro Literackie, 2012.

Larek, Michał. „Nie. O pewnym aspekcie poezji Krystyny Miłobędzkiej". In: *Miłobędzka wielokrotnie*, ed. Piotr Śliwiński, 59–71. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Wojewódzkiej Biblioteki Publicznej i Centrum Animacji Kultury w Poznaniu, 2008.

Legeżyńska, Anna. „*Lingua contemplativa* według Krystyny Miłobędzkiej". In: *Wielogłos. Krystyna Miłobędzka w recenzjach, szkicach, rozmowach*, ed. Jarosław Borowiec, 425–449. Wrocław: Biuro Literackie, 2012.

Malczewski, Marcin. „Krystyna Miłobędzka: wychodzenie z cienia". In: *Wielogłos. Krystyna Miłobędzka w recenzjach, szkicach, rozmowach*, ed. Jarosław Borowiec, 411–424. Wrocław: Biuro Literackie, 2012.

– – –. „Między językiem a światem". In: *Wielogłos. Krystyna Miłobędzka w recenzjach, szkicach, rozmowach*, ed. Jarosław Borowiec, 389–400. Wrocław: Biuro Literackie, 2012.

– – –. „Między językiem a światem. O poezji Krystyny Miłobędzkiej", Ph.D. Thesis, UAM, 2015, Date of access 25 February 2022. https://repozytorium.amu.edu.pl/ bitstream/10593/14669/1/doktorat.pdf.

Maliszewski, Karol. „«Przed mową jest mowa obszerniejsza». Poezja obok słów". In: *Miłobędzka wielokrotnie*, ed. Piotr Śliwiński, 8–13. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Wojewódzkiej Biblioteki Publicznej i Centrum Animacji Kultury w Poznaniu, 2008.

Mayenowa, Maria Renata. *Poetyka teoretyczna. Zagadnienia języka*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 2000.

Moroz, Andrzej. *Parenteza ze składnikiem czasownikowym we współczesnym języku polskim*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 2010.

Nyczek, Tadeusz. „Miłobędzka: pokrewne, osobne". In: *Wielogłos. Krystyna Miłobędzka w recenzjach, szkicach, rozmowach*, ed. Jarosław Borowiec, 345–370. Wrocław: Biuro Literackie, 2012.

Ostrówka, Agata. „Idiostylowy charakter parentez w tekstach Antoniego Libery". *Kwartalnik Językoznawczy* 17, 1 (2014): 21–64.

Próchniak, Paweł. „Przeskoki, zgłębienia". In: *Wielogłos. Krystyna Miłobędzka w recenzjach, szkicach, rozmowach*, ed. Jarosław Borowiec, 270–275. Wrocław: Biuro Literackie, 2012.

Sadowski, Witold. *Wiersz wolny jako tekst graficzny*. Kraków: Universitas 2004.

Skibski, Krzysztof. *Poezja jako iteratura. Relacje między elementami języka poetyckiego w wierszu wolnym*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 2017.

Stępień, Marzena. *Wyrażenia parentetyczne w strukturze wypowiedzi – właściwości semantyczne, składniowe, prozodyczne*. Warszawa: BEL Studio, 2014.

Telicki, Marcin. „Przyglądanie się sobie". In: *Wielogłos. Krystyna Miłobędzka w recenzjach, szkicach, rozmowach*, ed. Jarosław Borowiec, 401–409. Wrocław: Biuro Literackie, 2012.

Winiecka, Elżbieta. „*Lingua defectiva*, czyli język Innej w poezji Krystyny Miłobędzkiej". In: *Wielogłos. Krystyna Miłobędzka w recenzjach, szkicach, rozmowach*, ed. Jarosław Borowiec, 451–466. Wrocław: Biuro Literackie, 2012.

Zasępa, Aleksandra. *Czas (w) poezji Krystyny Miłobędzkiej*. Wrocław: Warstwy, 2016.

Dictionaries, language corpora and encyclopedias

Encyklopedia Językoznawstwa Ogólnego. Ed. Kazimierz Polański. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1999.

Korpus Języka Polskiego PWN. Date of access 10 March 2022. https://sjp.pwn.pl/korpus.

Linde, Samuel Bogumił. *Słownik języka polskiego*, t. 6. Warszawa: Drukarnia XX. Pijarów, 1814.

Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego. Date of access 10.03.2022. http://nkjp.pl/.

Słownik języka polskiego PWN. Date of access 10 March 2022. https://sjp.pwn.pl/.

Słownik języka polskiego. Ed. Jan Karłowicz, Adam Antoni Kryński, Władysław Niedźwiedzki, t. 7. Warszawa: K. Król i W. Niedźwiedzki, 1919.

Słownik języka polskiego. Ed. Witold Doroszewski, t. 9. Warszawa: PWN, 1967.

Wielki słownik języka polskiego PAN. Ed. Piotr Żmigrodzki. Date of access 10 March 2022. https://wsjp.pl/.

Zdanowicz, Aleksander et al. *Słownik języka polskiego*, t. 2. Wilno: Maurycy Orgelbrand, 1861.

KEYWORDS

parenthesis

verse parenthesis

Krystyna Miłobędzka

Abstract:

The article focuses on the issue of parenthesis in poetic texts, with focus on selected poems by Krystyna Miłobędzka. The analysis leads to the conclusion that interjection, particularly in its parenthetical form, has a different – broader – function in a poem than in other types of texts and is a significant interpretive signal. These reflections also demonstrate how the potential of parenthesis was exploited by the poet to create multiaspectual meanings.

artistic language

p a r a r e l l e l i s m

LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS
OF POETIC TEXT

NOTE ON THE AUTHOR:

Agata Ostrówka-Dombkowska – born in 1991 r., doctoral candidate at the Faculty of Polish and Classical Philology at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. Her interests revolve around artistic language, especially parentheses in different text types and authors' idiostyles. Her publications include *Idiostylowy charakter parentez w tekstach Antoniego Libery* [*The idiostylistic nature of parentheses in Antoni Libera's texts*] („Kwartalnik Językoznawczy" 17, 1/2014, pp. 21–64) and *Rozważania nad idiostylem Antoniego Libery na podstawie analizy antroponimów w powieści „Madame"* [„*Reflections on Antoni Libera's idiostyle on the basis of the analysis of anthroponyms in the novel "Madame"*], in: *Nasz język ojczysty – różne oblicza tożsamości* [*Our mother tongue – different faces of identity*], ed. by Rafał Mazur and Barbara Żebrowska-Mazur, pp. 135–150, Wydawnictwo Libron, Kraków 2019).