

POLISH STUDIES IN TRANSLATION: RE-MAPPING AN INTERDISCIPLINARY FIELD

PIOTR DE BOŃCZA BUKOWSKI, MAGDA HEYDEL

Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland

ABSTRACT

Developing dynamically since the 1950s, contemporary Polish studies in translation have their roots in earlier anthropological and philosophical writings of Bronisław Malinowski and Roman Ingarden. The impact of Structuralism, arguably the most influential paradigm for translation theory in Poland, was decisive in defining its goals, methods and tools as well as in opening new vistas. The interdisciplinary character of the field of Polish translation studies has been visible from very early on; we claim that this factor makes it such a rich and inspiring body of work in the 1960s and later.

Looking at the phases of its development and its relationships with what was going on in translation studies elsewhere, we seek to re-map the established points of view on the nature of translation theories and descriptions developed in Poland. We reassess the importance of the creative dialogues within the field against the background of theoretical discourses these studies both stemmed from and invoked. This lets us see how Polish writings on translation relate to the discourses of today's Translation Studies, especially that in many cases they seem to precede and herald them. We look at the ways in which Polish scholars have entered the area of Translation Studies, the positions they have been theorizing from and the contribution they have been making to the interdisciplinary area of international research in translation. Our paper is centred around a set of texts selected for a reader presenting the highlights of Polish studies in translation we worked on in 2013.

Keywords: translation studies; Polish translation studies; structuralism; interdisciplinary research; transdisciplinary research

The starting point

In the introduction to his study *Staff i Kochanowski: Próba zastosowania teorii informacji w badaniach nad przekładem* (Staff and Kochanowski: An Application of Information Theory in Translation Studies), Jerzy Ziomek (1965: 3) voiced the opinion that Polish studies in translation lack ties to the “general theory of translation” developing abroad.

He also pointed out that the body of work done in Poland is rather modest.¹ When compared with scholarship in Russia, France, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Germany, or the United States, Polish translation studies in the mid-1960s might not have seemed particularly impressive. Still, it appears that Ziomek did not discern the original input into theorizing translation in the writings of such scholars as the anthropologist Bronisław Malinowski, the philosopher Roman Ingarden, the linguist Zenon Klemensiewicz or the literary scholars Stefan Szuman and Seweryn Pollak.

Ziomek's 1965 book marks the beginning of the structuralist phase in Polish translation studies. Although the structuralist inspirations date back to the pre-war period when the works of the Russian Formalists and the Prague Circle were already influential in Poland (cf. Głowiński 2005: 90; Lewicki 2001: 640–648) it was the 1960s and 70s that witnessed the dynamic growth of interest in this paradigm. It was also then that Polish studies in translation gained momentum, which led to the creation of some of the most valuable and lasting contributions to the field. As a result of the re-organization of the area of translation studies which came together with the new paradigm, priority has been given to research conforming with the structural model of producing knowledge highly influenced by Saussure's linguistics, which brought about an unprecedented development in the field. Together with the new way of theorizing translation, a new research area came into being. This naturally meant that other methods and languages of research tended to be marginalized or overlooked. The interdisciplinary and multidimensional character of the field has been reduced or at least re-modelled under the formative influence of structuralism.

The objective of the present paper is to look at translation studies in Poland as an interdisciplinary field of research with a focus on the role structuralism played in its formation. It will help to better understand the process of the making of the discipline², discuss the main areas and directions of research and, ultimately, assess the consequences and perspectives for its development. The formation of the field involved some interesting processes which are not ideologically and politically neutral, while the legacy of structuralism in the shaping of Polish translation studies is far from unequivocal. Our research to date (de Bończa Bukowski, Heydel 2013) shows that there is a need to redefine

¹ Citing only Olgierd Wojtasiewicz's *Wstęp do teorii tłumaczenia* ("Introduction to Translation Theory", 1957), a volume *O sztuce przekładu* ("On the Art of Translation", 1955) edited by Michał Rusinek, and an essay by Waław Borowy on Tadeusz Boy-Żelenski, a translator of French literature into Polish (1952).

² The institutional status of TS in Poland is still uncertain. According to the regulations of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education translation studies is not a separate discipline; it belongs to the field of humanities as a sub-branch of linguistics, literary studies, cultural studies and theology. (On the other hand there is a separate discipline called family studies.) According to the criteria of the National Science Centre (NCN), a governmental agency for funding basic research, translation studies belongs to the domain of arts, humanities and social sciences where "linguistic translatology" is a subfield of diachronic and text linguistics, while "literary and cultural translation" belongs to literary studies. This situation of translation studies on the map of humanities on the one hand may be seen as a sign of its unclear character and possibly also weakness; on the other though TS is defined by many scholars as an interdisciplinary domain. Edward Balcerzan (1992: 877) places research on translation within the limits of literary studies but claims that "it has all the qualities of interdisciplinary knowledge and draws on the universal achievements of the humanities (philosophy, anthropology, psychology, semiotics, linguistics)", it is methodologically diverse and "allied" with hard sciences: cybernetics and mathematical logic.

the terms with which the field has been described as well as to look critically at Polish discourse on translation. This will allow us to bring to light the relationships between the different approaches and methods of work within the field and, consequently, to re-map this interdisciplinary area of research. A glance at the new work going on in Polish translation studies in the twenty-first century will make it possible to show the continuity of some research paths as well as opening up a new vistas in understanding the notion of interdisciplinarity.

Before structuralism – the opening of interdisciplinary research

In its early phase (1930s to 1950s) the work on translation by Polish scholars was not ascribed to a separate discipline. Researchers theorized translation as an interesting and relevant problem within the framework of anthropology, philosophy, general linguistics and other areas of humanities. While not granting translation and translation studies a special status, this model of research promoted a wide view on what translation is, what area of knowledge its study belongs to and what kind of methodological language to describe it with. In the works of Bronisław Malinowski, Zenon Klemensiewicz and Roman Ingarden there seems not to be any ready-made definition of what translation is, what it does and – most importantly perhaps – what it should or must do. Each of these scholars reflected on translation from the point of view of his own discipline in an attempt to answer questions they saw as important from a wider perspective. Their observations shed light on some less obvious aspects of what we define as translation today.

In the work of Bronisław Malinowski, the question of translation stems from reflections on the position of language in intercultural communication. Malinowski, famous for his method of “participant observation” in ethnology, postulated a deep immersion in the everyday life of the society being studied. The experience of language as the medium for rituals, magic, and daily life is central to his thinking. In his text “The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages” (1923), appended to the work *The Meaning of Meaning* by Ogden and Richards, Malinowski couples his own field research with the theory of linguistic meaning laid out by the Cambridge scholars. This allows him to formulate his pragmatic concept of the word as an action (cf. Rakoczy 2012), strongly linked to situational and cultural contexts of communication. He rejects the notion of linguistic meaning as a value contained in a grammatical construction, as if in a box, but sees the emergence of meaning as a result of a number of factors which are non-linguistic in nature. The problem of meaning is seen by Malinowski as a practical issue. In order to understand an utterance (translate it) one has to understand the order of the culture as a whole. The material gathered by an ethnologist is fundamentally untranslatable, and consequently the culture proves to be inaccessible. This difficulty may be overcome by elucidating the conditions of the translation process. For Malinowski, the process of translation does not have the character of an interlingual procedure that can be schematized by designating semantic/grammatical units and a set of rules of correspondence. It is rather a complex process of understanding the Other (cf. Malinowski 2013). The scholar did not create a formalized description of translation as a procedure – in light of

his assumptions, this is neither possible nor productive. Malinowski's translation philosophy is ahead of its time as a harbinger of later concepts of translation as a hermeneutical intercultural practice in which the operative unit is not the word, sentence or text, but culture. His theses anticipate approaches from the fields of anthropology and cultural studies arriving more than half a century later (cf. Brocki 2008).

Zenon Klemensiewicz's analysis, "Przekład jako zagadnienie językoznawstwa" ("Translation as a Linguistic Issue", 1954) although basically linguistic, also sees the problem of translation against a wider panorama of the exchange of products of the human mind in a multilingual and multicultural world. For Klemensiewicz, who had both linguistic and literary expertise, "translation action" is one of the most important factors informing the consciousness of readers. Klemensiewicz views translation as an interaction of two linguistic and stylistic systems, often distanced from each other. He postulates linguistic description of this complex phenomenon, but the main focus of his analysis in this context is on literary language. He claims that "artistic language" (his term) is the most demanding object of translation, a "test" for the translator and translation critic. Klemensiewicz postulates the concept of adequacy in place of an unsustainable faithfulness which had been based on the myth of literality. He underscores that translation is a creative act dependent on one's own original realization of another's thought, which demands a closeness and particular affinity between the author and translator (Klemensiewicz 2013: 65).

The third important early source domain for Polish translation studies was philosophy. Roman Ingarden's remarks on translation stem from his work in literary aesthetics: *Das literarische Kunstwerk* (*The Literary Work of Art*, 1931) and *O poznawaniu dzieła literackiego* (*Cognition of the Literary Work of Art*, 1937). Ingarden studied the problem of understanding in the process of reception of the work of literature and the transfer of its complex meanings into another language. His reflections were also based on his practice as a translator of philosophical texts. According to Ingarden, a work of literature is a multilayered structure, characterized by a formal unity resulting from an internal relationship between the layers of verbal sounds, units of meaning, schematized appearances, and represented objects. It is schematic (contains areas of imprecision) and intentional, demanding substantiation in the act of reception. Finally, it contains artistic qualities and aesthetic values alongside the plurality of aesthetic qualities which leads to their polyphony. Translation introduces change into all layers of the structure, not just the linguistic make-up of the text, so equivalence is not the core question of translation. The fundamental problem is whether the individual identity of the work of literary art is (or can be) retained in translation. This leads the philosopher to a further question: what are the qualities relevant to the individual identity of a given work of literary art? Depending on the type and scope of these changes, the translated work may retain or lose its unique identity. It is in this context that Ingarden defines the difference between a faithful translation of scientific and artistic works. Most important, the translator of scientific works concentrates on an intelligible and understandable way of conveying what the work "conceptually presents" – by way of new verbal sounds. The translator of literary works – on the other hand – tries to make sure that these new sounds do not impinge upon "the polyphonic harmony of [the work's] aesthetically valent qualities in all layers of the work" (Ingarden 2013: 83). Ingarden theorizes translation here as a philosophical

problem concerning the nature of the work of literary art and its understanding. This line of thinking was neglected in later research with a simplified model of the structure of literary work. In this way, Ingarden's analysis complicates the simplistic view of translation as a mechanical process of linguistic substitution.

This varied landscape of translation research, while lacking a solid centre or a unified metalanguage, nevertheless promised multidirectional development for future research. The methodological pluralism of the beginnings of Polish translation studies coupled with its variegated terminology opened up a possible ground for non-dogmatic interdisciplinary dialogue. It would be too much, though, to say that such a dialogue actually took place. In the decades to come, some of these early concepts would be neglected for a long time (Malinowski), some would be developed outside the main current (Ingarden), while some (Klemensiewicz) would be incorporated into what was to become the mainstream of translation studies, with Jerzy Ziomek as one of its main exponents.

The new paradigm: structuralism in Polish language and literary studies

The introduction of structuralism was unarguably the strongest impulse for the development of language and literary research in Poland in the second half of the twentieth century and the one most fraught with consequences for the model of academic discourse in contemporary humanities. In 1958 – a year that marked a turning point – Roman Jakobson visited Poland to give a series of seminars, while Maria Renata Mayenowa also set up an open interdisciplinary seminar on structural linguistics and poetics in Warsaw (Głowiński 2005: 89; Lewicki 2001: 641). The interest in the new paradigm was very lively and many collaborative initiatives were undertaken by linguists and literary scholars (Głowiński 2005: 90). The mainstream of the work done within the new highly influential paradigm were projects in structural semantics and stylistics, as well as in descriptive and historical poetics.

One of the salient features of the new paradigm is the metalanguage which organizes and to a certain extent unifies the field of research. Structuralism created a framework of disciplines for the vast area of literary studies it gradually came to dominate (Sławiński 2002: 10). Going beyond the borders of linguistics, it had a tendency to subordinate a succession of disciplines in the humanities (Głowiński 1988: 211) by introducing its universalized discourse. The analysis of various cultural phenomena was also unified across disciplines on the plane of categories used in different research areas. Semiotics may serve as an example of such a super-discipline. It was supposed to define all human phenomena in terms of signs, thus providing a universal discursive matrix (Piaget 1977: 142–146).

Additionally, communication became a key notion in analysis, and the structural study of language became a model for any analytical procedure in humanities. The broadening of the field of academic exploration was linked to an imposition of a specific academic discourse. It was characterized by the attempt to reach scientific objectivity, precision of terminology, mathematization in some cases, use of formulae and graphs, and the avoidance of any traces of the subjective position. The use of statistics and numerical methods

was to ensure that domains criticized for their intuitive and impressionistic character might achieve a higher level of objectivity.

The structural framework for translation studies

It was in the 1960s that “scientifically” oriented research in translation started in Poland. Its emergence and the early stages of its development were conditioned by a number of factors. Beside the influence of structuralism, which was the main driving force, there was also a political element at work. From the late 1950s into the 1960s, Soviet research in translation played a central inspirational role in the general turn towards “objectivization” and “scientification” of work done in Poland (Balcerzan 1966). The turn towards linguistically centred works was also partly a reaction to the “pre-scientific”/“pre-academic” phase in reflection on translation referred to as “essayistic” or “intuitive”, “impressionistic” and “subjective” (e.g. Wojtasiewicz 1957). These qualifications were imposed on literary criticism of translation (the philological tradition), while linguistically oriented studies were dubbed “scientific”, “objective”, and “modern”. The powerful new paradigm started taking over the field by introducing an opposition which – with its ideological bias – rendered the entire previous phase of research less valuable or even devoid of value.

In his article on Soviet translation studies (1966), Edward Balcerzan emphasized the tension between literary and linguistic research by opposing the work of Korniej Czukowski and Efim Etkind. Balcerzan claimed that a reconciliation between the two lines in translation studies seemed impossible (Balcerzan 1966: 652). He also claimed that the ambition of the new, linguistically informed research was to “mathematize” the description of translation phenomena. The central position was given to the concepts of interlingual translatability and producing equivalence on the level of units of language. Research areas included issues of confrontation between languages, language universals, units of meaning, comparative grammars and comparative stylistics. They all were seen as contributing to the aim of designing translating machines – the great dream of this epoch in Soviet research in translation.

Similar concepts informed the abovementioned book on Staff and Kochanowski by Jerzy Ziomek (1965), who was one of the champions of interdisciplinary research in translation. The idea for this book came into being in 1961 under the direct influence of Soviet research in information theory as well as Pierre Guiraud’s semiotics and linguistic statistics (Wysłouch 2012: 272). The author saw statistical methods as a chance for achieving a level of precision that would help stylistics rise to a position equal to “scientific” disciplines such as linguistics or semiotics. This tendency shows in the work of scholars whose overall interest was rather in literature than linguistics.

Edward Balcerzan, himself a poet and translator, designed his poetics of translation (1968) on the basis of terms from structuralist poetics (cf. Balcerzan 2013: 103–118). In the early 1970s, Stanisław Barańczak – who in the decades to come was to become one of the most important translators of English language poetry and Shakespeare’s plays into Polish – used categories from structural linguistics to discuss poetry translation and the reception of translated verse (Barańczak 1974: 47–74). Many years later, Ziomek would look back at this period in translation research as a phase defined by “the complexes of

humanities scholars, who were overwhelmed by the complication of computers” (Ziomek 2013: 165–166).

Nevertheless, this kind of research in the 1960s and 70s cohered with the structuralist drive towards scientific precision in terminology, objectivity of description and the ambition to create a metalanguage for a “scientific” humanities supplemented with mathematized formulations and diagrams. Research in translation gradually became “a science of translating” whose aim was to produce hard knowledge on the process of translation and its conditions, objective definitions of equivalence, adequacy, invariance, shift, unit of translation, and to formulate a poetics and stylistics of translation. Within the opposition between language and parole, the former was given priority. Language was construed as a system of elements distributed according to a set of rules which controlled their hierarchy. The relations within the system were more important than the actual elements and the structural network of relations did not involve historical or positional dimensions. In their search for objectivity, the theoretical claims tended to be normative rather than descriptive.

The interdisciplinary character of translation studies in Poland: achievements and challenges

The structural and semiotic theory of language has been perceived as a basis for any theorizing of translation and a source of translation theory: without theory of language, theory of translation is impossible – a claim that critics also voice today (cf. Tabakowska 2012: 15–17). In this way, interdisciplinary research in translation has been situated between linguistics and literary studies, and it is these two disciplines that have determined the directions and models of the work done. The new paradigm in linguistics set up a framework for studies in translation. It designed its metalanguage and controlled the coherence of the field. “I believe in the mutual salutary influence of linguistics and philology,” wrote Roman Jakobson (1990: 65), but the direction of influence was clear here: linguistic descriptive categories were imposed on poetics. Translation – which had previously been understood as a genre of literature or a variety of literary practice – underwent a process of re-definition to become a product of interlingual re-coding. Theorizing translation became virtually impossible outside the paradigm of structural linguistics and its related fields (communication and information theory, sign theory) lest it should be considered old-fashioned, pre-scientific, non-objective or intuitive. The language of structural linguistics has become a controlling mechanism for the inner cohesion of the field and the integration of work situated in the area between linguistics and literary studies.

It is important to stress that research conducted within this methodological context has yielded some very interesting results. The most valuable and best unified body of work emerged from the Poznań School of translation studies initiated by Jerzy Ziomek with Edward Balcerzan, Stanisław Barańczak, Anna Legeżyńska and others. Their work in comparative poetics and stylistics constitutes one of the central achievements of Polish translation studies. The problem of style together with related questions of translatability and style-induced untranslatability, especially in “artistic translation”, provided a common ground for linguistic and literary translation research. Another new topic was

intersemiotic translation, which emerged in the context of semiotics (sign as a universal phenomenon) and the structural classification of various kinds of arts.

At the same time, the domination of one powerful paradigm imposed certain limitations on the kind of work conducted, as well as on the idea of what the actual subject of translation studies is. Rather than being a realization of the idea of an interdisciplinary field, translation studies has in fact become another area subordinated by the structuralist paradigm. Moreover, while many scholars have appreciated the interdisciplinary character of translation studies as an opportunity to cross borders towards a wider understanding of various problems, it has also been perceived as a danger to the inner cohesion and identity of the field. In the context of these fears, the domination of the linguistic framework was postulated as a possible integrating factor (Łazarczyk 1978: 70). Linguistically oriented interdisciplinary studies in translation were dubbed “*translatorics*”, and situated at the crossroads of “*linguistics, text studies, psychology and physiology*” (Grucza 1981: 13), with linguistics as the integrating element.

This line of research put the main stress on the relations between linguistic systems. This resulted in a limited understanding of translation and translating. Most scholars working within *translatorics* have been linguists. The main centre for this research has been the Institute for Applied Linguistics in Warsaw. It concentrated its research processes of translation on the level of lexems or grammatical structures, often without any relation to higher structures of textual construction or to extratextual contexts such as cultural and literary traditions, the individual poetics of the author and translator, or historical and social perspectives. This model of research reduced aesthetic categories and defined them according to interlingual rather than intercultural relations (Drzewicka 1967: 177). Consequently, it introduced a very restrictive definition of translation stressing the equivalence of the linguistic message. This led to the situation when certain more problematic forms – including adaptations, re-writings, imitations or intersemiotic translations – were excluded from the field of translation studies. Such an exclusive policy strengthened the division between linguistic (“*scientific*”) translation research and literary or – later – cultural (“*non-scientific*”) research.

In this way, the paradigm which was to provide common ground for integrated interdisciplinary research became a criterion of exclusion and restriction. The division into linguistic and literary areas in Polish translation studies is still rather strong (Fast 2012: 213–222). Most scholars ascribe their work to either linguistic or literary perspectives, presenting a linguistic or literary attitude to their subject. The division is also clearly visible in the topics and characters of translation journals and other publications, the conferences organized and university programmes opened. In this landscape there is also a conciliatory line stressing the need to bridge the gap or fill the chasm between the two areas of research (Tabakowska 2012). It seems, though, that it actually has had the opposite effect of stressing the existence of the division and the lack of any true common ground.

In effect, what might seem to be an interdisciplinary field of cooperation becomes a battlefield in a struggle for discursive power between the two disciplines (with some attempts at mediation going on). If interdisciplinarity means establishing common ground, the question arises: who is in charge of it? The main points of disagreement are the following questions:

- Who controls the field of translation studies?
- How is the power distributed, also in the institutional sense?
- Whose competences are crucial for its cultivation and broadening?
- Who organizes the field? Who defines categories and imposes terminology?
- Where is the borderline between the two paradigms? Is there a middle ground?

This situation has been stifling for the development of translation studies in Poland. Its outcome has not only been counterproductive, but also incongruent with the current state of art in translation studies at large, where the centre of attention has moved away from the literary/linguistic area to intercultural communication and media, on the one hand, and to sociology, cultural studies and anthropology, on the other. Hardly any attention has been paid to wider uses of semiotics in the humanities. While the field of translation studies is gradually becoming better defined, as well as more and more open to phenomena and contexts often very far removed from language and literature, thus promising a perspective of transdisciplinary research, the struggle for power continues to close up the space.

Towards a change

The changes in the scope and nature of translation studies came about together with changes in the field of literary studies, where the linguistically inspired structural methods of analysis also experienced a crisis. The definition of the object of literary study, and of the discipline's delimitation, became uncertain, as there were no common method, critical language or research models in operation. The discipline has experienced uncertainty as to its very existence. What has emerged from this unclear landscape is the (largely undefined) field of cultural studies. The "cultural turns" (cf. Bachman-Medick 2012) changed the location of research in literature. The boundaries between disciplines and zones of influence have become blurred, and – even more importantly – they seem not to be of such central significance any more.

In last four decades the domain of translation studies at large has also undergone a gradual shift from the research domain of language and literature (or linguistics and philology) towards the much wider space of (inter)cultural studies. This is clearly visible in the way the concept of translation has been defined in different periods over the development of translation studies. The definitions dating back to the early stage of the discipline's formation are strongly philologically oriented and normative in character (cf. Catford 1965). Later definitions, formulated already within the context of the cultural turn in translation studies, open up the field to encompass a much wider set of phenomena and to adopt a descriptive rather than normative position (cf. Toury 1995: 61). André Lefevere's understanding of translation as a form of refraction or re-writing opens the field of translation research even further to include objects and processes that the language oriented and linguistically controlled methodologies would reject as not belonging to the scope of translation studies at all (Lefevere 2012: 204n).

In her 2006 book Maria Tymoczko took another step and put forth the idea of "enlarging translation" and radically opened up the definition of the concept. Tymoczko

claims that translation is a cross-cultural cluster concept of open and permeable borders, grouped together on the family resemblance principle (Tymoczko 2006: 83–90). According to her, there are three broad “cultural interfaces” or modes within which translation operates: representation, transmission and transculturation (Tymoczko 2006: 107n). This takes us very far from the narrow understanding of translation as a specific and normatively defined type of inter-textual relation. The broad definition of translation reorganizes the scope of translation research, while also changing the types of problems solved. Translation studies as a discipline is no longer limited to local issues of interlingual text transfer, but contributes to wide debates on problems of the humanities and society.

Re-mapping

In order to introduce Polish translation research into the context of the broadened vision of translation studies, it seems indispensable to view it outside the methodological framework created for it by structural linguistics. The idea is to give visibility to those lines of development which have been neglected or overshadowed by research oriented towards stylistics/equivalence and shaped by structuralism. The propositions discussed at the beginning of this paper – Malinowski’s ethnographic perspective, Ingarden’s philosophical reflections, and Klemensiewicz’s linguistics with a literary emphasis – have laid the foundations for a possible alternative course of the discipline’s development. Today, rediscovered, they can become an inspiring starting point for new research. The last two decades have seen dynamic growth in translation research in Poland, some of which seems related to these earlier propositions, even if there is no proof of a direct relation. In what follows, we provide a tentative list of some of the most interesting tendencies crystallizing in the new Polish translation studies. They are diverse and promise potential lines of development leading in different directions and redefining the scope and nature of translation studies.

The very notion of translation has been broadened – for instance, in descriptive and analytical work by Jadwiga Konieczna-Twardzikowa (2002), Piotr de Bończa Bukowski (2011) and Krystyna Pisarkowa (2012). In a study on *Don Quixote*, Konieczna-Twardzikowa asks about the role of the reader as a subject in the process of translation. Bukowski describes the process of translation of eschatological ideas into the language of special imagery in Miłosz’s poetry. Pisarkowa analyzes religious language (the examination of conscience) in terms of translation. None of these works construes translation as a process limited to what Jakobson saw as translation proper or what structural linguistics turned into the study of equivalence. They all go beyond these limitations to look for new areas that can be interestingly described as translations.

A group of works devoted to the study of creative translation and the interface between original creation and translation in individual oeuvres has also ventured into new territory. One of the interesting works here is Marek Pacukiewicz’s book on analogies between writing and translation in the work of Joseph Conrad (2002). Ewa Rajewska (2007) and Monika Kaczorowska (2011) also look from different perspectives at Stanisław Barańczak’s work as a poet and translator, viewing it as a creative continuum. Similarly,

Arkadiusz Luboń (2013) analyzes the place the idea of translation occupies in the artistic programmes of the 1968 generation of Polish poets. Magda Heydel (2013) studies the role of poetic translation in Czesław Miłosz's oeuvre, taking into consideration the context of his complex multicultural biography. A related field of research has been inspired by the new comparative literature. Books by Tomasz Bilczewski (2010) and Marta Skwara (2011) situate translation at the very centre of the interliterary dialogue, while Andrzej Hejmej (2012) opens the field even further by including an intersemiotic plane in his discussion of literature and music.

Research into intersemiotic translation has been present for at least four decades in Polish translation studies. The Jakobsonian category of transmutation (Jakobson 2012: 127), somewhat neglected in the light of the domination of linguistically oriented equivalence studies, was evident in the work of Maryla Hopfinger (1970: 159–188), who was one of the first to look at the technical conditions of intersemiotic translation in film. She underlines the interpretative work of adaptation and points to the level of cultural meaning as central to intersemiotic transfer. Later this line of research was continued in the 1990s, most notably by Seweryna Wysłouch, who wrote on correspondences between arts and alternative equivalent sense construction in different sign systems (Wysłouch 2013: 189–312). Elżbieta Tabakowska (2009: 37–48), recognized mainly for her work in cognitive linguistics, proposes a method of analysis for translations of visual into verbal signs, based on the claim that translation is an interpretation/reconstruction of image schemas. Other topics in this area include audio-description as translation (Chmiel, Mazur 2011; Jankowska, Szarkowska 2014), translation of pictograms and icons (Tomaszkiewicz 2009), and translation for digital media (Pisarski 2011). The studies mentioned above broaden the field of translation research by either adapting the terms of translation studies to analyze phenomena from beyond the traditionally limited area of translation studies or working out new concepts for the study of translation by incorporating the metalanguages of other disciplines. This is also true of works that examine translation as a social practice. The first Polish contribution to this field – Wojciech Soliński's *Przekład artystyczny a kultura literacka: komunikacja i metakomunikacja* (Artistic Translation and Literary Culture: Communication and Metacommunication) – was published as early as 1987. Soliński attempted to describe the position of translator and translation practice in its social dimension, beyond the limits of literature. More valuable analyses of sociological nature came from Elżbieta Skibińska (1999; 2008; 2009), who looks at translation through the prism of intercultural exchange and its agents: publishing strategies, sociological aspects, book history, paratexts.

History has also proved to be a fertile field of research for translation scholars. Apart from fascinating studies in the history of translation and translation doctrines (Gaszyńska-Magiera 2012; Chrobak 2012; Brzostowska-Tereszkiewicz 2012) – a field not yet quite developed in Poland – we also find works looking at translation in the context of the troubled history of Central Europe (Holocaust studies; migration as translation, Jewishness in translation, representation of violence, post-colonial and post-dependence studies; representations of the multicultural past, memory studies). Eugenia Prokop-Janiec (2013), Hanna Gosk (2008), Małgorzata Tryuk (2011), Tomasz Bilczewski (2010), Magdalena Waligórska (2013) and others have contributed to developing research in this area, which is particularly pertinent to the history of Central European nations, languages and cul-

tures. This seems to be one of the most important directions of interdisciplinary research, where translation studies plays an important role in dialogue, while also learning a lot through the confrontation of its own terms and methods with those from different disciplines.

Another space where translation studies has both contributed and learnt a lot is contemporary critical theory, especially deconstruction. Here translation is theorized outside the context of particular texts or intercultural communication, and is basically seen as a practice of meaning creation and critical interpretation. Much of the research here springs from philosophical inspirations. As early as 1991, Tadeusz Sławek, looked at translation through the prism of Nietzsche's and Derrida's thought, playing interpretatively with Shakespeare's drama and introducing the idea of Calibanism: the situation of the translator being overwhelmed by the richness of the translated literature and his relation with the figure of the author. The instability of the original meanings and the always already different position of the original is one of the main questions for Michał Paweł Markowski in his interpretation of Jacques Derrida's philosophy as translation (1998), as well as in his other works. Adam Lipszyc (2013) makes translation one of the main focuses of his interpretation of Walter Benjamin's oeuvre. These studies, although they seem not to belong in the immediate scope of translation studies, are invaluable in the way they open up the space for research in translation, while simultaneously underscoring the role understanding translation plays in the interdisciplinary space of discourse in the contemporary humanities.

Final remarks

The present paper is a result of research we undertook when working on an anthology of Polish translation studies, which was published in 2013 (de Bońca Bukowski, Heydel 2013). We had embarked on the project of anthologizing the most important ideas in the field with a feeling of uncertainty as to the possible outcome. There was a strong impression that many of the achievements in the field of translation research or translation theory (as it is often referred to in Polish) are of historical interest rather than being inspiring starting points for further research. It turned out that these assumptions were wrong – hence the idea of re-mapping the field. Our conclusions are pretty optimistic and can be summed up in a few points and one postulate.

The first of our conclusions is that translation studies in Poland has a rich and multi-dimensional tradition, and today it is alive and kicking. There is new research going on that is opening up many new areas. It is essential thought though to leave the limited area traditionally associated with research on translation to find the really fascinating studies. The history of Polish research in translation can be construed in more than one way, and it has the potential to open up more than one direction of future development.

Secondly, in retrospect, it is indisputable that the impact of structural thought on the shaping of translation studies has been decisive and that some of the most valuable work has been done within this sphere of influence. Nevertheless, this framework has also imposed certain limitations on the future development of translation studies. The analysis of various linguistic aspects of the process and product of interlingual translation has

become, so to speak, arid and self-centered. The findings of translation scholars have had little relevance for work in the humanities at large. It has become increasingly difficult to create links between research in translation and more general reflections on contemporary culture. This seems not only to be paradoxical but also to go against the very idea of translation as a sphere of (at least attempted) mutual communication between differing realms, especially in the era of globalization.

Thirdly, in spite of the domination of the linguistic paradigm and the discursive struggle for power, the sense of translation research as an interdisciplinary and multidimensional area has been retained. Structuralism – for all the limitations it seems to have imposed on Polish translation studies – can also be seen as an inspiration for interdisciplinary research, and indeed it has clearly opened up possibilities here.

Nevertheless, our fourth conclusion is that the form of interdisciplinarity typical of translation research as modeled in the context of the discursive struggle between linguistics and literary studies is not pertinent to the research being done in translation today. The interdisciplinary nature of translation studies goes far beyond the postulate to create and use common methodological tools in order to study a single object from different perspectives (Pelc 1995: 55–56). According to this conception, an interdiscipline emerges when there is a high level of integration between the participating disciplines. This is not a stable condition. Such a conception of interdisciplinarity, based on an implicit ideal of stability whose basis is a well defined metalanguage, inevitably leads to “territorial” conflicts and power struggles. It is not this kind of “inter” or in-between space that seems to be needed in contemporary translation research.

Finally, our postulate, which is rooted in analysis of selected areas in the discourse of translation studies in Poland, as well as in the discourse of the contemporary humanities, where the notion of translation crops up very often in various contexts. We claim that it is not interdisciplinarity, but transdisciplinarity that would make a suitably large and flexible framework for an enlarged translation studies. It would also be in accordance with the new “network” models of knowledge production and organization (cf. Welsch 1996: 946–947). Interdisciplinary projects where the space for translation research is carved from already limited disciplinary fields seem to be at odds with the nature of the phenomenon analyzed and described by translation studies – with its ubiquity and relevance to so many areas of culture in the context of a globalized world. Transdisciplinary projects, on the other hand, offer wide research areas, not limited by disciplinary borderlines, where many different languages and methods can co-exist in order to look for answers to questions relevant to all. This vision (admittedly, rather vaguely formulated here) makes space for translation studies as an important participant in the dialogue of the contemporary humanities.

REFERENCES

- Balcerzan, Edward (1966) ‘Teoria i krytyka przekładu w Związku Radzieckim’, *Pamiętnik Literacki* 57(2): 651–666.
- Balcerzan, Edward (1968) *Styl i poetyka twórczości dwujęzycznej Brunona Jasińskiego: z zagadnień teorii przekładu*, Wrocław: Ossolineum.

- Balcerzan, Edward (1992) 'Przekład w badaniach literackich', in Alina Brodzka et al. (eds.) *Słownik literatury polskiej XX wieku*, Wrocław: Ossolineum, 876–882.
- Balcerzan, Edward (2013) 'Poetyka przekładu artystycznego', in Piotr de Bończa Bukowski, Magda Heydel (eds.) *Polska myśl przekładoznawcza. Antologia*, Kraków: WUJ, 103–118.
- Barańczak, Stanisław (1974) 'Przekład jako "samoistny" i "związany" obiekt interpretacji', in Jacek Baluch (ed.) *Z historii i teorii przekładu artystycznego*, Kraków: UJ, 47–74.
- Bilczewski, Tomasz (2010) *Komparatystyka i interpretacja, Nowoczesne badania komparatystyczne wobec translatoologii*, Kraków: Universitas.
- [Bończa] Bukowski [de], Piotr (2011) 'W przestrzeni przekładu. Czesława Miłosza i Emanuela Swedenborga tłumaczenie rzeczy ostatecznych', *Teksty Drugie* 131(5): 122–136.
- Bończa Bukowski de, Piotr, Heydel, Magda (eds.) (2013) *Polska myśl przekładoznawcza. Antologia*, Kraków: WUJ.
- Brocki, Marcin (2008) *Antropologia. Literatura – Dialog – Przekład*, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Katedry Etnologii i Antropologii Kulturowej UW.
- Brzostowska-Tereszkiewicz, Tamara (2012) 'Modernist Models of Literary Translation. At the Intersection of Translation Studies and New Modernist Studies', in Katarzyna Lukas, Izabela Olszewska, Marta Turska (eds.), *Translation im Spannungsfeld der Cultural Turns / Translation Among Cultural Turns*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Catford, John C. (1965) *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Chmiel, Agnieszka, Mazur, Iwona (2011) 'Audiodeskrypcja jako intersemiotyczny przekaz audiowizualny – percepcja i ocena jakości', in Iwona Kasperska, Alicja Zuchelkowska (eds.) *Przekład jako produkt i kontekst jego odbioru*, Poznań: Rys, 13–30.
- Chrobak, Marzena (2012) *Między światami. Tłumacz ustny oraz komunikacja międzykulturowa w literaturze odkrycia i konkwisty Ameryki*, Kraków: WUJ.
- Drzewicka, Anna (1967) 'Pole znaczeniowe a przekład poetycki (na marginesie propozycji metodologicznych Edwarda Balcerzana)', *Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny* XIV(2): 161–178.
- Fast, Piotr (2012) 'Zwątpienie w teorię (przekładu)', *Teksty Drugie* 135(2): 213–222.
- Gaszyńska-Magiera, Małgorzata (2012) *Recepcja przekładów literatury ibero-amerykańskiej w Polsce w latach 1945–2005 z perspektywy komunikacji międzykulturowej*, Kraków: WUJ.
- Głowiński, Michał (1988) 'Posłowie', in Terence Hawkes, *Strukturalizm i semiotyka*, trans. I. Sieradzki, Warsaw: PWN, 209–222.
- Głowiński, Michał (2005) 'Gang Strukturalistów', *Teksty Drugie* 91/92(1–2): 83–93.
- Gosk, Hanna, Karwowska, Bożena (eds.) (2008) *(Nie)obecność. Pominięcia i przemilczenia w narracjach XX wieku*, Warsaw: Elipsa.
- Grucza, Franciszek (1981) 'Zagadnienia translatoryki', in Franciszek Grucza (ed.) *Glottodydaktyka a translatoryka*, Warsaw: Wydawnictwa UW, 9–27.
- Hejmej, Andrzej (2012) *Muzyczność dzieła literackiego*, Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UMK.
- Heydel, Magda (2013) *Gożliwość tłumacza. Przekład poetycka dzieła Czesława Miłosza*, Kraków: WUJ.
- Hopfinger, Maryla (1970) 'Film i literatura: uwarunkowania techniczne przekładu intersemiotycznego', in Aleksander Kumor, Danuta Parczewska (eds.) *Sztuka – technika – film*, Warsaw: WAF, 159–188.
- Ingarden, Roman (2013) 'O tłumaczeniach', in Piotr de Bończa Bukowski, Magda Heydel (eds.) *Polska myśl przekładoznawcza. Antologia*, Kraków: WUJ, 79–102.
- Jakobson, Roman, (1990) 'My favorite topics' in his *On Language*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 61–66.
- Kaczorowska, Monika (2011) *Przekład jako kontynuacja twórczości własnej. Na przykładzie wybranych translacji Stanisława Barańczaka*, Kraków: Universitas.
- Klemensiewicz, Zenon (2013) 'Przekład jako zagadnienie językoznawstwa', in Piotr de Bończa Bukowski, Magda Heydel (eds.) *Polska myśl przekładoznawcza. Antologia*, Kraków: WUJ, 53–66.
- Konieczna-Twardzikowa, Jadwiga (2002) *Oryginał wzbogacony o przekład*, Katowice: Śląsk.
- Lefevere, André (2012) 'Mother Courage's Cucumbers: Text, System and Refraction in a Theory of Literature', in Lawrence Venuti (ed.) *Translation Studies Reader* (3rd ed.), London: Routledge, 203–219.
- Leżeżyńska, Anna (1999) *Tłumacz i jego kompetencje autorskie. Na materiale powojennych tłumaczeń z A. Puszkina, W. Majakowskiego, I. Kryłowa, A. Błoka*, Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

- Lewicki, Andrzej Maria (2001) 'Językoznawstwo polskie w XX wieku', in Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Współczesny język polski*, Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS, 619–656.
- Lipszyc, Adam (2013) *Sprawiedliwość na końcu języka. Czytanie Waltera Benjamina*, Kraków: Universitas.
- Luboń, Arkadiusz (2013) *Przekraczanie obcości. Problemy przekłady w programach i twórczości poetów Nowej Fali*, Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego.
- Łazarczyk, Bohdan (1978) 'Wybrane problemy metodologiczne i teoretyczne współczesnej nauki o przekładzie', *Przegląd Humanistyczny* 149(2): 69–80.
- Malinowski, Bronisław (2013) 'Tłumaczenie słów nieprzetłumaczalnych', translated by B. Strassberg, in Piotr de Bończa Bukowski, Magda Heydel (eds.) *Polska myśl przekładoznawcza. Antologia*, Kraków: WUJ, 39–52.
- Markowski, Michał Paweł (1998) *Efekt inskrypcji. Jacques Derrida i literatura*, Bydgoszcz: Homini.
- Pacukiewicz, Marek (2002) *Dyskurs antropologiczny w pisarstwie Josepha Conrada*, Kraków: Universitas.
- Pelc, Jerzy (1995), 'Dyscyplina naukowa a badania i nauczanie interdyscyplinarne', in Wiesław Godzic, Tadeusz Lubelski (eds.), *Kino według Alicji*, Kraków: Universitas, 53–58.
- Piaget, Jean (1977) *Psychologia i epistemologia [Psychologie et épistémologie]*, translated by Z. Zakrzewska, Warsaw: PWN.
- Pisarkowa, Krystyna (2012) *Rachunek sumienia jako zadanie tłumacza*, Kraków: Petrus.
- Pisarski, Mariusz (2011) 'Nowe oblicza adaptacji tekstu w mediach cyfrowych. O powieści hipertekstowej *Popołudnie, pewna historia Michaela Joyce'a*', *Slavia Occidentalis* (68), 219–225.
- Prokop-Janiec, Eugenia (2013) *Pogranicze polsko-żydowskie. Topografie i teksty*, Kraków: WUJ.
- Rajewska, Ewa (2007) *Stanisław Barańczak – poeta i tłumacz*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.
- Rakoczy, Marta (2012) *Słowo – działanie – kontekst. O etnograficznej koncepcji języka Bronisława Malinowskiego*, Warsaw: WUW.
- Skibińska, Elżbieta (1999) *Przekład a kultura. Elementy kulturowe we francuskich przekładach "Pana Tadeusza"*, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo UWr.
- Skibińska, Elżbieta (2008) *Kuchnia tłumacza. Studia o polsko-francuskich relacjach przekładowych*, Kraków: Universitas.
- Skibińska, Elżbieta (ed.) (2009) *Przypisy tłumacza*, Wrocław, Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- Skwara, Marta (2011) *"Polski Whitman". O funkcjonowaniu poety obcego w kulturze narodowej*, Kraków: Universitas.
- Sławek, Tadeusz (2013) 'Kalibanizm. Filozoficzne dylematy tłumacza', in Piotr de Bończa Bukowski, Magda Heydel (eds.) *Polska myśl przekładoznawcza. Antologia*, Kraków: WUJ, 275–288.
- Sławiński, Janusz (2002), 'Co nam zostało ze strukturalizmu?', in Włodzimierz Bolecki, Ryszard Nycz (eds.) *Sporne i bezsporne problemy współczesnej wiedzy o literaturze*, Warsaw: Wydawnictwo IBL, 9–13.
- Soliński, Wojciech (1987) *Przekład artystyczny a kultura literacka: komunikacja i meta komunikacja*, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UWr.
- Tabakowska, Elżbieta (2009) 'Między obrazem a tekstem, czyli o przekładzie intersemiotycznym', in Alina Kwiatkowska, Jerzy Jarniewicz (eds.) *Między obrazem a tekstem*, Łódź: Wydawnictwo UŁ, 37–48.
- Tabakowska, Elżbieta (2012) 'Między komparatystyką i translatoologią: zwrot kulturowy we współczesnym językoznawstwie', in Włodzimierz Bolecki, Ewa Kraskowska (eds.) *Kultura w stanie przekładu: translatoologia – komparatystyka – transkulturowość*, Warsaw: IBL, 15–25.
- Toury, Gideon (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Tryk, Małgorzata (2011) "'You say nothing, I will interpret." Interpreting in the Auschwitz-Birkenau Concentration Camp', in Dimitris Asimakoulas, Margaret Rogers (eds.) *Translation and Opposition*, Clarendon: Multilingual Matters, 223–245.
- Tymoczko, Maria (2006) *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*, Manchester, Kinderhook: St. Jerome.
- Waligórska, Magdalena (2013) *Klezmer's Afterlife. An Ethnography of the Jewish Music*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Welsch, Wolfgang (1996) *Vernunft. Die zeitgenössische Vernunftskritik und das Konzept der transversalen Vernunft*, Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

- Wysłouch, Seweryna (2012) 'Strukturalizm i semiotyka w pracach Jerzego Ziomka', in Danuta Ulicka, Włodzimierz Bolecki, *Strukturalizm w Europie środkowej i wschodniej. Wizje i rewizje*, Warsaw: Wydawnictwo IBL, 267–279.
- Wysłouch, Seweryna (2013) 'Adaptacja filmowa jako przekład intersemiotyczny', in Piotr de Bończa Bukowski, Magda Heydel (eds.) *Polska myśl przekładoznawcza. Antologia*, Kraków: WUJ, 289–312.
- Ziomek, Jerzy (1965) *Staff i Kochanowski. Próba zastosowania teorii informacji w badaniach nad przekładem*, Poznań: Uniwersytet Adama Mickiewicza.
- Ziomek, Jerzy (2013) 'Przekład – rozumienie – interpretacja', in Piotr de Bończa Bukowski, Magda Heydel (eds.) *Polska myśl przekładoznawcza. Antologia*, Kraków: WUJ, 163–192.

Piotr de Bończa Bukowski
piotr.bukowski@uj.edu.pl

Magda Heydel
magdalena.heydel@tww.pl