

POLISH TRANSLATION STUDIES:
TOWARD A TRANSDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH

Piotr de Bończa Bukowski, Magda Heydel

Translation Studies in Poland have been developing since the late 1940s. In the 1960s and '70s, the Structuralist thought gave a new momentum to the work on translation which resulted in the most dynamic phase in its history and settled a framework for further research.¹ Still, since the 1990s we have been witnessing a new wave of fascinating work being done in multiple areas of Translation Studies, both in the context of the new trends in world Translation Studies and the Polish tradition of research. The aim of our paper is to look at some promising new directions in Polish Translation Studies against the background of what has been done in this area for the last 60 years in order to propose a framework for studying the history of Translation Studies and, more importantly, to sketch a new perspective in the research in translation. Our general claim is that Polish research on translation has passed from the early period of multidisciplinary, through a strong and influential interdisciplinary phase to the stage where areas of transdisciplinary research emerge. This latter phase, still rather fluid, offers space for fascinating work whose effects and results are relevant not just for the relatively narrow field of translation defined as inter-textual practice, but gives insights into the construction of cultures, societies, histories, memories etc and thus shows its role as an interface for wider research in humanities.

Multidisciplinary beginnings

Poland has a long tradition of studies in translation. The pre-academic phase dates back to 15th century² but the first phase of academic Translation Stu-

¹ See E. Tabakowska, *Polish Tradition*, in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, ed. by M. Baker, London & New York, Routledge, 2001, pp. 523-531; L. Costantino, *Necessità e poetica. Profilo della traduttologia polacca contemporanea*, Roma, Lithos, 2012; *Polska myśl przekładoznawcza. Antologia*, ed. P. de Bończa Bukowski, M. Heydel, Kraków, WUJ, 2013.

² Cf. *Pisarze polscy o sztuce przekładu 1440-2005*, Wybór i opracowanie E. Balcerzan i E. Rajewska, Poznań, Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 2007; E. Tabakowska, *Polish Tradition*, cit.

dies dates back to the 1930s and the groundbreaking work of Bronisław Malinowski who discussed translation in the context of anthropology and culture studies.³ A new dynamic opening for the discipline of Translation Studies in Poland came after the World War II. In reference to this period it is more apt to speak about reflection on translation rather than Translation Studies in the present sense of the term. The reflection was pluralistic and multidisciplinary in character, it presented a variety of approaches, methodologies and critical languages. Read together, the works published in this period form an ‘anthology’ of ideas on translation – and indeed in 1955 such an anthology, entitled *Sztuka przekładu* (Art of translation) was published under the auspices of the Polish PEN.⁴ Divided into two parts: theoretical analyses and studies from translators, it contained papers by Roman Ingarden (a philosopher), Zenon Klemensiewicz (a linguist), Jan Parandowski (a writer), Zofia Szmydtowa, (a literary scholar), Kazimierz Kumaniecki (a classicist and translator) and Waław Borowy (a literary critic and comparative scholar).

Each of the contributors to the volume starts from their own disciplinary perspective. Their observations and findings are not coordinated by any central translational discourse or a dominating idea as to the name and nature of Translation Studies, only by the idea that translation is an ‘art’. In effect we get a multidisciplinary collection where the very notion of translation is not really problematized, but taken for granted in many different ways. The main fields of interest here are language and literature in the context of philosophy, literary history, tradition and creativity. The volume, as one of its authors puts it “is an open debate”⁵ and from today’s perspective can be seen as a document of an introductory phase of the discipline formation.

The idea of linguistics as a framework for Translation Studies introduced in the 1955 volume in Zenon Klemensiewicz’s essay⁶ was developed further, two years later, in 1957, by Olgierd Wojtasiewicz in his monograph *Wstęp do teorii tłumaczenia* (Introduction to translation theory). Wojtasiewicz’s work, the first academic book publication in Polish Translation Studies, is an ambitious early attempt at turning Translation Studies into a separate discipline based on formal linguistics. The author, who was a sinologist and a formal linguist set his aim at shifting Translation Studies from the area of

³ B. Malinowski, *Coral Gardens and Their Magic*, vol. 2: *The Language of Magic and Gardening*, London, Indiana Univ. Press, 1935.

⁴ *O sztuce tłumaczenia*, ed. M. Rusinek, Wrocław, Zakład im. Ossolińskich, 1955.

⁵ J. Parandowski, *Przedmowa*, in *O sztuce tłumaczenia*, cit., p. 9.

⁶ Z. Klemensiewicz, *Przekład jako zagadnienie językoznawstwa*, in *Polska myśl przekładowicza. Antologia*, cit., pp. 53-65.

general literary reflection seen by him as non-academic and impressionistic to a scientifically grounded, mathematicized area of formal “science of translating”.⁷ Wojtasiewicz ‘purifies’ the area of translation research by excluding the questions of literary art and aesthetics, he postulated the figure of the “idealised translator” and the idea of “general translatology”, free from grounding in any particular languages.⁸ Wojtasiewicz’s book, even if slightly dated from today’s point of view, marks the beginning of the disciplinary phase in Polish Translation Studies and the awareness of the specific nature of research in interlingual translation.

(Inter)disciplinarity within the structural framework

The disciplinarity of the research organization becomes an important issue in the next phase of Translation Studies development in Poland. In the 1960s, structural linguistics and its ambition to make the study of literature a ‘scientific’ discipline became the framework for the research in translation. Structural linguistics gave a very powerful impulse to Polish humanities, becoming an inspiration for a number of large scale interdisciplinary projects.⁹ Literary translation seemed to be an ideal object of study as it combined linguistic processes and mechanisms with questions of style and artistic quality. Thus, the study of stylistics as a problem of translation and the poetics of translation become the main topic of research.¹⁰

The focal points of translation research in this period were language as a structure, semiotics and information theory.¹¹ Strong inspiration came from Soviet structural and semiotic research in translation¹² where the opposition

⁷ O. Wojtasiewicz, *Wstęp do teorii tłumaczenia*, Wrocław-Warszawa, Zakład im. Ossolińskich, 1957, pp. 20-21.

⁸ Ibidem, p. 9.

⁹ Cf. P. de Bończa Bukowski, M. Heydel, *Polska myśl przekładowicza. Badacze, teorie, paradygmaty*, in *Polska myśl przekładowicza. Antologia*, cit., pp. 13-16.

¹⁰ Cf. J. Ziomek, *Staff i Kochanowski. Próba zastosowania teorii informacji w badaniach nad przekładem*, Poznań, UAM, 1965, E. Balcerzan, *Styl i poetyka twórczości dwujęzycznej Brunona Jasińskiego*, Wrocław, Zakład im. Ossolińskich, 1968.

¹¹ Cf. A. Drzewicka, *Przekład poetycki jako przedmiot badań historycznoliterackich w świetle współczesnych teorii tłumaczenia*, “Rocznik Komisji Historycznoliterackiej”, 7 (1969), pp. 95-147.

¹² Cf. E. Balcerzan, *Teoria i krytyka przekładu w Związku Radzieckim*, “Pamiętnik Literacki”, 57 (1966), pp. 223-243; St. Barańczak, *Radzieckie dyskusje nad teorią przekładu*, “Nurt”, 1968, no. 8, pp. 52, 62.

between literary and linguistic approaches was clearly marked. Also, the ambition to design machine translation models stemming from linguistic analysis left its trace on the work of Polish scholars in this period.¹³ In opposition to the previous phase of Translation Studies with its interest in artistic and philosophical grounding of translation, now the central issues were: translation process, translatability, equivalence and units of translation. Unarguably the most important achievement of this period in translation research in Poland was the stylistics of translation formulated by Balcerzan and others¹⁴ where the structural model of language and of literary text is implemented to the analysis of the process and product of artistic translation.¹⁵ This phase of research produced a set of convenient tools and efficient methodological procedures for students of translation and become the basis for mainstream work in Polish translation analysis.

At this stage Translation Studies in Poland enters its interdisciplinary phase. Structural Translation Studies are located at the meeting point of linguistics and literary studies. Literature provides material for analyses, while linguistics provides methods and tools, informs the metalanguage of the new discipline and becomes the basis for the coherence of the emerging field. In fact it offers the framework within which the study of translation – with a special emphasis on ‘artistic translation’ – is considered relevant and legitimate as academic work. Thanks to the transfer of methods and tools the new discipline gains a high level of coherence and unity characteristic to interdisciplines.¹⁶

Paradoxically though, the overflowing of disciplinary boundaries consists in organizing the new research field according to the rules set by the controlling discipline. As a result, in a later period the mainstream academic Translation Studies were positioned within the field of applied linguistics which had a negative impact on the emancipation of Translation Studies as a discipline as well as the interdisciplinary project. Somewhat surprisingly then, the interdisciplinary phase brings a further atomization rather than an integration

¹³ Cf. A. Wierzbicka, *O języku dla wszystkich*, Warszawa, Wiedza Powszechna, 1965.

¹⁴ Cf. A. Drzewicka, *Z zagadnień techniki tłumaczenia poezji. Studia nad polskimi przekładami liryki francuskiej w antologiach z lat 1899-1911*, Kraków, UJ, 1971.

¹⁵ Cf. St. Barańczak, *Poetycki model świata a problem przekładu artystycznego (1984)*, in *Polska myśl przekładoznawcza. Antologia*, cit., pp. 217-238.

¹⁶ B. Nicolescu, *Transdisciplinarity – Past, Present and Future*, in *Moving Worldviews – Reshaping sciences, policies and practices for endogenous sustainable development*, ed. by B. Haverkort and C. Reijntjes, Holland, COMPAS Editions, 2006, pp. 142-166.

of the fields of knowledge.¹⁷ The work of the Warsaw school of Franciszek Gruzca may serve as an example here. The concept and framework of “translatorics”¹⁸ in fact brought a further division of the research area in translation and deepened the artificial divide created between the linguistic (proper, academic) and the literary (intuitive, impressionistic) approaches. Anna Legeżyńska, one of the heirs of the structural phase in translation stylistics and communication, who in her 2002 article attempted at summing up the development of Polish Translation Studies, mentions the interdisciplinary character and a strong connection with structural linguistics as central elements of the field. Legeżyńska claims that in its ambition to emancipate, the discipline has neglected other possible perspectives.¹⁹

Nevertheless, the work done in Polish Translation Studies within the structurally informed interdisciplinary framework brought some very interesting results, especially in the work of the Poznań School. Inaugurated in the late 1960s with the works of Jerzy Ziomek and Edward Balcerzan, it soon became the central point on the map of Translation Studies in Poland.²⁰ The main topics and research areas in translation included semiotics, information theory and (later) hermeneutics (Ziomek); stylistics, theory of semantic fields and the poetics of artistic translation (Balcerzan); the concept of semantic dominant in (Barańczak); literary communication (Legeżyńska), intersemiotic contexts (Wysłouch); and intertextuality (Kraskowska).²¹

Towards the turn

A further phase in Polish Translation Studies began in the 1980s, together with the overall change in humanities and the general crisis of the structural metalanguage. There was a shift from the research into the systematic nature

¹⁷ Cf. R. Nycz, *Kulturowa natura, słaby profesjonalizm. Kilka uwag o przedmiocie poznania literackiego i statusie dyskursu literaturoznawczego*, in *Kulturowa teoria literatury. Główne pojęcia i problemy*, ed. M.P. Markowski, R. Nycz, Kraków, Universitas, 2006, p. 30.

¹⁸ F. Gruzca, *Zadania translatoryki*, in *Glottodydaktyka a translatoryka*, Warszawa, Wydawnictwa UW, 1981, pp. 9-27.

¹⁹ A. Legeżyńska, *Przekład: pewniki, spory i pytania w translatologii*, in *Sporne i bezsporne problemy współczesnej wiedzy o literaturze*, ed. W. Bolecki, R. Nycz, Warszawa, IBL PAN, 2002, p. 286.

²⁰ See E. Kraskowska, *From Information Theory to Feminist Criticism. The Tradition of Translation Studies at the Institute of Polish Philology in Poznań*, in the present volume.

²¹ Cf. L. Costantino, *Necessità e poetica*, cit., pp. 49-84; P. de Bończa Bukowski, M. Heydel, *Polska myśl przekładowicza. Badacze, teorie, paradygmaty*, cit., pp. 23-28.

of language towards pragmatics, a turn towards the subjectivity of the human actor and the first harbingers of the cognitive turn.²² In this context, the general translatology with its ambition to eradicate the traces of contingency of human action and create idealized systematic models lost its grounding.

In spite of some new inspirations coming from the work of Anton Popovič and James Holmes and the work of such innovative scholars as Wojciech Soliński or Edward Balcerzan and his research group, the work done in Polish Translation Studies in this decade is to a large extent secondary in value.²³ At that time, this seemed to be a more general tendency in translation research at large. In 1985, Theo Hermans discussed the need for a renewed Translation Studies in his introduction to *Manipulation of Literature* claiming that the original, centred and linguistically informed methodology is not relevant to the really interesting questions emerging within the field of translation research. The turn in Translation Studies happened against the background of the Cultural Turn(s) in humanities, the emergence of culture and social studies.²⁴ It became gradually apparent that translation as a multidimensional form of intercultural communication needs some much more complex methodologies than the one developed within the linguistic paradigm.

At the same time, on the international scene the new Translation Studies were shifted from the auxiliary position within linguistics and literary (comparative) studies to the central place in humanities. The philosophical and anthropological context of translation research returned with a renewed force.²⁵ The radical opening of the field and a gradual liberation from the axioms of translation as construed by the structural approach, as well as the emergence of the postcolonial and gender paradigms, helped Translation Studies become an interface for the analysis of culture creation and intercultural contacts.²⁶

²² Cf. D. Bachmann-Medick, *Cultural Turns. Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften*, Reinbek bei Hamburg, Rowohlt, 2006; E. Tabakowska, *Językoznawstwo kognitywne a poetyka przekładu*, "Teksty Drugie" 3 (1990), pp. 97-113.

²³ Cf. W. Soliński, *Próba poetyki przekładu artystycznego*, "Litteraria", 7 (1974), pp. 55-79; *Wielojęzyczność literatury i problemy przekładu artystycznego*, red. E. Balcerzan, Wrocław, Ossolineum, 1984.

²⁴ See *Translation, History and Culture*, eds. S. Bassnett, A. Lefevere, London & New York, Pinter, 1990.

²⁵ G. Steiner, *After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation*, Oxford-New York, Oxford Univ. Press, 1975. J. Derrida, *Des tours de Babel*, in *Difference in Translation*, ed. J.F. Graham, Ithaca, Cornell Univ. Press, 1985, pp. 165-248.

²⁶ S. Bassnett, A. Lefevere, *Constructing Cultures. Essays on Literary Translation*, Cle-

In Polish Translation Studies, so strongly rooted in structural linguistics, the crumbling of the paradigm meant also the crumbling of the basis for the interdiscipline. In the late 1980s, and early 1990s the gap between linguists and literary scholars interested in translation became wider than ever before. Interdisciplinarity was declared but not practiced. Still, a lot was published in Translation Studies and a wide variety of approaches were present: from the 'purist' position of Grucza's school of translatorics through Barańczak's translation criticism anchored in the findings of the Poznań School and his vast experience in literary translation, Tabakowska's first presentations of cognitive linguistics as a framework for translation analysis to deconstructive concepts in the works of such scholars as Markowski and Sławek.²⁷ Much of what was written on translation in Poland opposed the tendency to limit the scope and nature of translation research. This is where a space opened for the introduction of a transdisciplinary approach to studying translation.

There are many theorizations of transdisciplinarity, none of them apparently final, as the idea itself is fairly recent and not fully formed. The main common features of transdisciplinarity concepts are: the co-ordination of disciplines functions on many levels without a central explanatory matrix or obligatory theoretical ground; disciplines are not construed as separate units but rather as nodes in the network of knowledge which is dynamic and undergoes a constant process of reconfiguration; the metaphor of power over territory loses its importance and is replaced by critical reflection on the lines of division, the basis for inclusions and exclusions within borderlines.²⁸

Looked at from the transdisciplinary perspective, translation seems to be a model subject of study. It is a highly universal phenomenon: it is ubiquitous, present in all spheres of life and all areas of knowledge production. Translation may be defined as a trans-phenomenon,²⁹ which has to be obser-

vedon, Cromwell Press, 1998; M. Tymoczko, *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*, London & New York, Routledge, 2006.

²⁷ E. Tabakowska, *Językoznawstwo kognitywne a poetyka przekładu*, cit.; M.P. Markowski, *Efekt inskrypcji. Jacques Derrida i literatura*, Bydgoszcz, Homini, 1997; T. Sławek, *Kalibanizm. Filozoficzne dylematy tłumacza* [1991], in *Polska myśl przekładoznawcza. Antologia*, cit., pp. 275-287.

²⁸ Cf. E. Jantsch, *Inter and Transdisciplinarity: A Systems Approach to Education and Innovation*, "Higher Education", 1 (1972) 1, pp. 7-37; B. Nicolescu, *Transdisciplinarity – Past, Present and Future*, cit., pp. 142-166; W. Welsch, *Vernunft. Die zeitgenössische Vernunftkritik und das Konzept der transversalen Vernunft*, Frankfurt a. M., Suhrkamp, 1996, pp. 946-947.

²⁹ Z. Wawrzyniak, *Textwissenschaft als Transdisziplin*, in *Perspektiven der polnischen*

ved and described from a number of various perspectives and is a locus of crossing approaches none of which would be able to give a satisfactorily and final answer to its questions. Polish translation scholars in recent years have contributed some very interesting discussions to the emerging transdisciplinary research paradigm. In the remaining part of the paper we present briefly three such transdisciplinary areas where the new idea of translation as a cultural phenomenon and of Translation Studies as an interface for research in humanities can be seen: translation and philosophy, translation and sociology, and translation and psychology. In each case we begin with the presentation of some cases of the traditional interdisciplinary approach to move on to the more innovatory research we venture to describe as transdisciplinary.

Translation and philosophy

Polish research in translation has been closely connected with philosophical reflection from the very beginning of its development. Roman Ingarden's dissertation *O tłumaczeniach* (On Translation, 1955) places translation within the frame of his phenomenological theory of literary aesthetics developed in the 1930s.³⁰ Combining his philosophical concepts with the practical experience of translating both literary and philosophical texts, Ingarden analyses the process of interlingual translation as a reconstruction and re-creation of the complex system of the multilayered original work of literary art. His claim about the polyphonic harmony of the layers within the literary work opens ground for discussion on the nature of meaning in literature and the role of the conceptualizing subject in creating senses in the process of interpretation. It was also an argument against the models of translation analysis that ignored the special features of literary translation.³¹

The problem of the untranslatability of languages and the conditions of interpretation of linguistic utterances can be traced also in the work of other philosophers and theorists. Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz wrote on the translatability of languages in the context of semantic definitions of utterances already in 1934.³² Later the question returned together with the renewed interest in

Germanistik in Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft, Hg. von A. Dębski und K. Lipiński, Kraków, WUJ, 2004, pp. 325-331.

³⁰ R. Ingarden, *Das literarische Kunstwerk*, Tübingen, Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1931; Id., *O poznawaniu dzieła literackiego*, Lwów, Ossolineum, 1937.

³¹ R. Ingarden, *O tłumaczeniach* [1955], in *Polska myśl przekładoznawcza. Antologia*, cit., pp. 79-102.

³² K. Ajdukiewicz, *Sprache und Sinn*, "Erkenntnis", 4 (1934), pp. 100-138.

Quine's theory of linguistic indeterminacy in the context of the discussion on the issues of relativism and interpretation theory.³³

The most fascinating field of research in the transdisciplinary area of philosophy and translation opens up in the 1990s together with a vivid interest of Polish literary and translation critics in deconstruction, a school of thought in itself deeply interested in translation as a process. It is worth stressing that in their work translation became not only an object of reflection but also an actual creative practice. Works of Derrida and other deconstructionists were translated by a number of Polish scholars which resulted in an inspiring debate both on the texts themselves and on the modes of transmission of complex ideas by means of language.³⁴ The criticism of translations became a starting point for deeper reflection.

Interestingly enough, one of the early papers inspired by Derrida and Nietzsche's thought, *Kalibanizm. Filozoficzne dylematy tłumaczenia* (Calibanism. Philosophical dilemmas of translation) by Tadeusz Sławek (1991) was devoted to translation as such. Sławek starts with Nietzsche's concept of translation and claims that the aim of neither reading nor translating is to stabilize the object of interpretation, but to undermine it in order to uncover the sphere of difference. This means that translation does not and cannot direct its efforts toward uncovering identity between original and translated text or producing it. Just the opposite: translation is an act of interpretation, an attempt at understanding the present, the time and space where and when the repetitive signs of language are bestowed with meaning and influence on the life of the subject. The Shakespearian figures of Prospero and Caliban invoked by Sławek in his study are interpreted as a figuration of the relation between the original language (Caliban's limited world enclosed in his limited language) and the open space of interpretation through translation (Prospero's books and language, and all the limitless possibilities they open up before Caliban). Translation here is conceptualized as a painful liberation from the limitations of the monolingual world but also of the struggle between the powerful author and rebellious translator.³⁵

³³ Cf. A. Chmielewski, *Niewspółmierność, nieprzekładalność, konflikt. Relatywizm we współczesnej filozofii analitycznej*, Wrocław, Wydawnictwo UW, 1997; B. Brożek, *Granice interpretacji*, Kraków, Copernicus Center, 2014.

³⁴ Cf. T. Rachwał, *Zakładanie przekładalności. Transfer, transfuzja, translacja*, in *Krytyka przekładu w systemie wiedzy o literaturze*, Katowice, Śląsk, 1999, pp. 123-131; M. P. Markowski, "Przy ryzyku, że będzie to zaskoczeniem". *Uwagi o tłumaczeniu Derridy*, "Literatura na Świecie", 11-12 (1998), pp. 248-261.

³⁵ T. Sławek, *Kalibanizm. Filozoficzne dylematy tłumacza*, cit.

Sławek's paper is an instructive example of transdisciplinary approach: the conclusions he reaches do not concern the further development of Translation Studies in the narrow sense of the discipline, although it introduces inspiring ideas as to the nature of translation. The more important conclusions concern interpretation of signs, especially the signs of language, by human subjects, the making of the interpreting self and the nature of meaning construction. Sławek shows how these philosophical questions are in fact centred on translation; what he discusses are not the philosophical aspect of translation but translatorial aspects of philosophy. These questions re-surface in further works by Sławek, and also in the work of Michał Paweł Markowski. In his 1997 book *Efekt inskrypcji, Jacques Derrida i literatura* (The effect of inscription. JD and literature) Markowski stresses Derrida's claim that "the question of deconstruction is at its core the question of translation"³⁶ and places the act of translating in the very centre of all interpretative and sense-creating activity. In his texts, Markowski returns to Derrida's idea of the monolinguality of the Other (stressed also by Sławek in his *Calibanism*) where translation is the impossible but necessary attempt at crossing the borderline of the self.

The problems of self returns, also, in works of Tadeusz Rachwał, whose earlier work (1998) was an attempt at formulating a deconstructive translation theory. Rachwał claims that theory of translation is in fact a theory of the original, as it tries to theorize the initial void, feigns to grasp the starting point or source of meanings, pretends that there is a defining norm of translation. Deconstructive theory of translation on the other hand helps to rescue the beginning by construing it as a difference. Every text is a translation, so comparative study is not about seeking differences between the original and translation but the difference and Otherness of what seems to be domestic and own. Rachwał undermines the notion of monolingualism: the multilingual character of any text is a trace of the Other within the self.³⁷

Translation and the social

Another transdisciplinary research space opens with sociological inspirations in Translation Studies. The question of the Other returns here in the context of the making of multicultural societies. As early as in 1987, Wojciech So-

³⁶ M. P. Markowski, *Efekt inskrypcji. Jacques Derrida i literatura*, Bydgoszcz, Homini, 1997, pp. 306-319.

³⁷ T. Rachwał, *Błaganie o początek, czyli teoria pewnej nicości translatologicznej*, in *Przekład artystyczny a współczesne teorie translatologiczne*, Katowice, Śląsk, 1998, pp. 7-22.

liński published a book *Przekład artystyczny a kultura literacka: komunikacja i metakomunikacja językowa* (Artistic translation and literary culture: linguistic communications and metacommunication) where he sketches non-literary and non-linguistic contexts for the discussion of translation. Although it is still placed within the frame of communication theory, Soliński's analysis touches also on the extra-textual aspects of translation, as he writes about institutions and social dimension of the translator's work. These topics find their continuation, already within the context of the new Translation Studies after the cultural turn, in the works of Marzena Chrobak and Małgorzata Gaszyńska-Magiera, who describe intercultural and international, relation through the prism of translation.³⁸

Sociology of translation which has been developing internationally since the 1990s³⁹ found a well prepared ground in Polish Translation Studies. Concepts and terms of Pierre Bourdieu such as field, capital, habitus or practice, proved to be helpful for scholars like Elżbieta Skibińska or Joanna Pach who use them more or less systematically as handy tools in their own work.⁴⁰ Wojciech Abriszewski, a translator and commentator of Bruno Latour's work, re-reads the actor-network theory through the prism of translation as a social practice. In Abriszewski's reading, sociology and translation meet in Latour's model of social links: there is no social reality except translations between mediators and they produce links.⁴¹

The reflection on the nature and role of translation within the sphere of the social, shifts the object of study from texts and languages to institutions and processes in local communities and the globalised world. Marian Golka observes cross-cultural communication as translation based on mutual borro-

³⁸ W. Soliński, *Przekład artystyczny a kultura literacka: komunikacja i metakomunikacja językowa*, Wrocław, Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis, 1987; M. Chrobak, *Między światami. Tłumacz ustny oraz komunikacja międzykulturowa w literaturze odkrycia i konkwisty Ameryki*, Kraków, WUJ, 2012; M. Gaszyńska-Magiera, *Przekład literacki jako spotkanie międzykulturowe*, in *Translatio i literatura*, ed. A. Kukułka-Wojtasik, Warszawa, Wydawnictwa UW, 2011, pp. 137-144.

³⁹ Cf. *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, red. M. Wolf, A. Fukari, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2007.

⁴⁰ E. Skibińska, *Kuchnia tłumacza. Studia o polsko-francuskich relacjach przekładowych*, Kraków, Universitas, 2008; J. Pach, *Dystynkcje kulturowe w przekładzie poezji z języka francuskiego na język polski na podstawie teorii Pierre'a Bourdieu*, in *Dystynkcje kulturowe w przekładzie z języka francuskiego na język polski*, ed. A. Ledwina, K. Modrzejewska, Opole, Uniwersytet Opolski, 2013, pp. 99-106.

⁴¹ K. Abriszewski, *Poznanie, zbiorowość, polityka. Analiza teorii aktora-sieci Bruno Latoura*, Kraków, Universitas, 2008.

wings and interference of cultures in multicultural societies; Paula Malinowski-Rubio studies translation as an element of public services in the context of migration and the making of the multicultural society.⁴² She puts a special stress on the communication of individual subjects. Hanna Schreiber writes on intercultural awareness in international military operations, where the problem of translation emerges and must be taken into consideration at the basic plane.⁴³

Some of the most interesting contributions come from a further opening of the research field, where the sociological perspective is coupled with historical and ideological ones. Such a combination yields interesting results in the research of Małgorzata Tryuk. In her recent works she looks at translation and translators in the context of Central Europe's complex history in the 20th century with a special emphasis on the World War II. In her study of interpreting, in the Nazi concentration camp in Auschwitz, Tryuk brings forth fascinating and shocking materials concerning the identity, position, work and fates of translators.⁴⁴ Her discussion stresses the connection between translation and the individual suffering, as well as the fact that it is the body of the translator that becomes the actual space in which the communication takes place together with its side-effects. The practice of translation brings suffering, death or (in much more rare cases) a chance to satisfy the basic needs of the body.

Tryuk's moving and inspiring discussion sheds new light on the way we think about translation as interlinguistic and intercultural communication as well as the position of individual translator vis à vis political and historical tensions. It also invites us to revise the common metaphors of translation as bridge building or loving relationships. We are confronted with images of violence, struggle and manipulation; translation clearly serves as an element of the totalitarian machine, still the translators, even in such extreme situations and threatened with various kinds of danger, have some power to oppose the power system by introducing some subversive practices. Far removed

⁴² M. Golka, *Imiona wielokulturowości*, Warszawa, Muza, 2010; M. P. Malinowski-Rubio, *Imigranci a komunikacja międzykulturowa w sferze usług publicznych w Polsce*, Kraków, Nomos, 2013.

⁴³ H. Schreiber, *Świadomość międzykulturowa. Od militaryzacji antropologii do antropologizacji wojska*, Warszawa, Wydawnictwa UW, 2013.

⁴⁴ M. Tryuk, *Interpreting in Nazi concentration camps during World War II*, "Interpreting", 12 (2010) 2, pp. 125-145; Ead., "You say nothing; I will Interpret". *Interpreting in the Auschwitz-Birkenau Concentration Camp*, in *Translation and Opposition*, ed. D. Asimakoulas and M. Rogers, Bristol, Multilingual Matters, 2011, pp. 223-243.

from any connection with the elegant textual procedure, translation here is construed as an act which can decide on a person's life or death.

In the contexts presented by the scholar the transparency of the act of translating or the translator's invisibility is denied. It is necessary to change the understanding of the interpreter's role and practice. Tryuk's analysis also proves that there is no neutrality in translation, especially in the context of conflicts.⁴⁵ Translation here is analysed in a close relationship with a real life frame, not cut off from the extra-textual contexts as it so often happens in the sterilised linguistic research. The transdisciplinary value of this work lies in the fact that it places translation as a social and historical practice against the background of wider social and historical processes. Not being a historian herself, Tryuk contributes to the field of mutual interest a new perspective and a powerful explanatory tool. Thus, by looking at translation, scholars draw conclusions relevant to broadly defined cultural studies and anthropology of culture. Taken another step further, this kind of study could also include questions concerning existential and psychological questions. On the other hand, translation itself may become an object of mutual transdisciplinary research of historians and philologists who may share their methodologies and materials.

Translation and psychoanalysis

The contexts of psychology and existence are activated in the third transdisciplinary field to be mentioned where translation meets psychoanalysis, especially in the context of memory studies. The concept of translation has played an important role in psychoanalysis and psychology. Jean Starobinski, a student of Freud's, claimed that psychoanalysis equals translation as its aim is to move from one language to another.⁴⁶ He also writes that symbol and symptom may be seen as translations of desire. Paul Ricoeur discussed Freud's concept of interpretation of dreams in terms of interlingual translation.⁴⁷ More recent examples of this line of thinking are shown in the work of Patrick Mahoney and Adam Phillips.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ M. Tryuk, *Thumacz ustny w sytuacjach konfliktowych i kryzysowych. Ujęcie socjologiczne*, in *Przekład jako produkt i kontekst jego odbioru*, ed. I. Kasperska i A. Żuchelkowska, Poznań, Wydawnictwo Rys, 2011, p. 385.

⁴⁶ J. Starobiński, *Psychoanalyse und Literatur*, Übers. E. Rohloff, Frankfurt a. M., Suhrkamp, 1990, p. 94.

⁴⁷ P. Ricoeur, *O interpretacji. Esej o Freudzie*, Przeł. M. Falski, Warszawa, KR, 2008, p. 88.

⁴⁸ P. Mahoney, *Towards the Understanding of Translation in Psychoanalysis*, "Meta: journal des traducteurs / Meta: Translators' Journal", Vol. 27, mars 1982, no. 1, p. 63-71;

The history of the 20th century in our part of the world brings exceptionally rich material to study, both in social (national) and individual dimensions. It is worth remembering that *Lost in Translation* by Eva Hoffman, one of the most striking accounts of translating one's own self into another language and the experience of trauma which accompanies this process is a story of the life of a Polish Jewish girl in the aftermath of the World War II and the anti-Jewish attitude of the communist authorities in Poland in 1960. Her memoir, composed many years after the actual events and after the author was able to cope with the psychological burden they put on her, has been read not just as a moving autobiography but as a psycholinguistic and psychoanalytical study.⁴⁹

The experience of historical trauma, memory, transmission of traumatic past and their literary representations are among the topics studied by Tomasz Bilczewski. In his *Trauma, translation, transmission in the perspective of post-memory. From literature to epigenetics* he looks at the experience of emigration and the intergenerational transmission of trauma. His research verges on comparative literature, physiology of trauma and psychoanalysis. Translation becomes a functional context in all of these domains. In his study of Eva Hoffman's work and the process of self-translation into another language, Bilczewski looks at the ways in which translation functions as therapy, the work of grief undertaken in order to cope with history induced trauma and its intergenerational transmission.⁵⁰

Bilczewski, who came to the study of memory and epigenetics from comparative literature,⁵¹ not only describes literary manifestations of psychological processes but also attempts redefining the concept of translation by uncovering its function in individual identity creation. His findings, approached from the perspective of a literary and culture scholar, meet with the findings of Mahoney and Phillips. In his essay *On Translating a Person* Phillips claims, that the aim of psychoanalysis is to "to free people to translate and

A. Phillips, *On Translating a Person. Essays on Psychoanalysis and Literature*, in Id., *Promises, Promises*, London, Faber, 2002, pp.125-147.

⁴⁹ E. Hoffman, *Lost in Translation. Life in a New Language*, New York-London, Penguin, 1990.

⁵⁰ T. Bilczewski, *Trauma, translacja, transmisja w perspektywie postpamięci. Od literatury do epigenetyki*, in *Od pamięci biodziedzicznej do postpamięci*, ed. T. Szostek, R. Sendyka, R. Nycz, Warszawa, IBL PAN, 2013, pp. 40-62.

⁵¹ Cf. T. Bilczewski, *Komparatystyka i interpretacja. Nowoczesne badania porównawcze wobec translatologii*, Kraków, Universitas, 2010.

be translated” rather than force them to accept a definite form of the self.⁵² It is interesting to note the two faces of translation: trauma-inducing when an individual is forced to translate themselves and liberating when one is able to choose freely from among possible versions of the self-translation.

Translation Studies provides a key perspective in the transdisciplinary area concentrated on the identity narrations. Translation makes a meeting place for Freudian and neo-Freudian discourses, trauma and Holocaust studies as well as various literary and historical documents of processes of identity translation.⁵³

The rationale

From the perspective of the traditional 20th century Translation Studies and the linguistically oriented structural Eastern European translatology in particular the three domains of transdisciplinary research sketched above may seem vague and imprecise. The model proposed in our paper on the example of chosen domains of reflection may raise objections from those who value the clarity and precision of disciplinary divisions and construe the fields of research in terms of territories and borderlines. Indeed, the charge of advancing ‘pan-translatology’ has been voiced more than once against the kind of work that uses the term ‘translation’ outside its narrow philological scope.⁵⁴ These critics see the non-canonical use of translation in terms of a universal metaphor migrating freely between domain and thus contaminating them.

The transadisciplinary perspective proposes a different approach here, and particularly so in the context of translation. Translation is about crossing borders, it is about differences and changes, a certain impurity is at the very core of translation and its ubiquity testifies to the role it plays in all fields of the broadly defined humanities. Instead of closing the horizon down to turn to itself and probe into its own conditions, transdisciplinary Translation Studies ask questions about the human being in the multilingual and multicultural world where translation – in many senses of the term – has become the basic mode of operation. Translation may be seen here as a methodology for the study of culture understood not as a set of ready made stable artefacts, finite and clearly delimited texts, but as a human practice, a sphere of

⁵² A. Phillips, *On Translating a Person*, cit., p. 147.

⁵³ Cf. W. Gombrowicz, *Dziennik 1953-1956*, Kraków, WL, 1989, pp. 56-57.

⁵⁴ Cf. M. Pawica, *Przeciw pantranslatologii albo o tłumaczeniu synowi matematyki i przekładaniu tortu masą*, in *Między oryginałem a przekładem*, II, ed. M. Filipowicz-Rudek, J. Konieczna-Twardzikowa, Kraków, Universitas, 1996, pp. 397-409.

subjective activity. Texts of culture are not just structures of sign systems but of live experience. Transdisciplinary approach opens research to the new challenges of the changing model of global culture. Translation, even if we still hesitate to call it the episteme of the contemporary, has certainly become the key concept of the globalized world. It can describe its conflicts and sometimes also indicate the way to solve them. What is more, translation is the mode of cognition: on the one hand the need to translate it is an obstacle, but on the other it is an opportunity. All the same, at its core, translation returns to its basic sense, present in the development of the discipline from the very beginning: the hermeneutic interpretation of signs of the human world.

In this context we can also venture to answer questions concerning the value of Translation Studies for the contemporary world. Can it introduce change and make the world a better place? Is it a sustainable practice? Does it meet the principle of eco-logical research? What is the rationale for the research, programmes and all the energy spent on doing Translation Studies? As long as we look at Translation Studies as a methodology of understanding the intricate web of relationships between cultures and individuals living in languages and in history, answering these question should not be too problematic.