

POZNAŃ TRANSLATOLOGY: SCHOOL OR TRADITION?*

Ewa Kraskowska

Poznań-based Polish philology studies prides itself on a long history of literary translation research.¹ This article has two objectives: first, it is my intention to present the most prominent scholars whose work has contributed to the overall achievement of the so-called Poznań school of translatology; second, I intend to offer some considerations as to whether it is at all justified to use the term ‘school’ with reference to their achievement. The Institute of Polish Philology is by no means the only department at Adam Mickiewicz University where translation research is practiced as a discipline. It is a very popular field of studies with English, German and French philologists representing the Faculty of Modern Languages and Literature (Neophilology),² which seems a naturally better environment for its development. Ultimately, knowing a foreign language is prerequisite to either practice translation as a craft, or study it as a subject of academic research. In this regard, Polish literary scholars can hardly compete with neophilologists in the field. However, pursuing a career in literary studies research requires a high level of expertise in understanding, analyzing and interpreting texts as well as recognizing their cultural contexts. These turn out to be invaluable skills in translation re-

* Translation by Marta Mazurek.

¹ See for example L. Costantino, *Introduzione*, in *Teorie della traduzione in Polonia*, a c. di L. Costantino, Viterbo, Sette città, 2009, p. VIII. Although the term ‘translatology’ used with reference to translation research is widespread primarily in Slavic languages and German, its popularity with Anglo-American scholars is limited, and some representatives of the discipline, such as James Holmes, rejected it altogether. The neologism ‘traductology’ derived from French seems to be more often encountered in English. For the discussion of the terms see M. Snell-Hornby, *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or shifting viewpoints?*, “Benjamins Translation Library”, vol. 66, Amsterdam, John Benjamins B.V., 2006, p. 41-42.

² In particular Maria Krysztofiak-Kaszyńska should be mentioned here, who is the author of numerous articles and books on literary translation (*Przekład literacki a translatoologia*, Poznań, Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 1999 and *Translatologiczna teoria i praktyka przekładu artystycznego*, Poznań, Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 2011 – to name just two of them).

search at the same time. Additionally, the overall prominence of the Poznań school of translatology has obviously been bolstered by the fact that the scholars who played the first fiddle and set the tone within it were themselves renowned poets and translators. The school's intergenerational character was another crucial asset. Consequently, the school's merit was recognized and confirmed by the editors of two anthologies of texts representing Polish translation scholarship, namely Piotr de Bończa Bukowski and Magdalena Heydel³ as well as Lorenzo Costantino. Heydel and de Bończa Bukowski's anthology contains fifteen essays by Polish translation researchers written in the years 1935-2002. Five essays, which make up one third of the total, were authored by academics representing Poznań's Institute of Polish Philology (Edward Balcerzan, Stanisław Barańczak, Anna Legeżyńska, Seweryna Wyślouch, Jerzy Ziomek). Only one of these authors (Wyślouch), who specialized in intersemiotic translation – or, transmutation in Jakobson's terminology – was not strictly a member of the translatology circle. Three out of the essays in question were also included in the Italian anthology edited by Costantino (Balcerzan, Barańczak, Ziomek). For the use of this article, the terms 'Poznań translation scholars', 'Poznań translation research', or 'Poznań translatology' will be used consistently with reference to literary translation research and to Polish literary studies scholars at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. At the end of my reflection, I will return to the question if it is justified to refer to them as 'school' in the academic sense.

Poznań Polish literary studies scholars took an interest in translation studies in the 1960s, when the humanities – especially literary studies – were invaded by structuralism, which soon found its allies in semiotics and literary communication theory. Structuralism was then perceived as an alternative to Marxism, which had dominated the academic world in the Soviet Block after World War II in its vulgarized and doctrinal version. The scientific discourse of structuralism allowed literary studies scholars to perceive their research as free from ideological taint, objective and – consequently – reliable. At the same time, associating oneself with structuralism implied the scholar's resistance to the dominant system; thus, adherence to the structuralist approach in Poland in the 1960s and 1970s was a political gesture to an extent. Structuralists were repeatedly criticized for allegedly hermetic jargon in which their works were published; nonetheless, their impact on the development of Polish literary theory was tremendous. It can be argued that before the 1980s there was no literary theory in our country other than structural semio-

³ P. de Bończa Bukowski, M. Heydel, *Polska myśl przekładowa*, Kraków, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2013; L. Costantino, *Teorie della traduzione in Polonia*, cit.

tics. With the Warsaw-based Institute of Literary Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences leading the way, Poznań's Polish literary studies was the only other centre in Poland where this methodology gained special importance, which was reflected in the academic teaching of theory and methodology of humanistic research. Such classic notions, terms and concepts as *signifiant*, *signifié*, *langue*, *parole*, diachrony and synchrony, secondary modelling system and projection of the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection to the axis of combination were all the students' staple diet (I, too, was a student at the time). Special emphasis was placed on the skill of literary text analysis, on the ability to grasp formal nuances, parallelisms and other artistic devices, to compare those with the range of devices available in the whole literary system, and the ability to decode semantic signals that emerged as a result. It is therefore not surprising that the phenomenon of translation could not remain under the radar of structuralism for long. As such, translation is a text "bound"⁴ with other texts: with the source text, with other translations of the same source text, and with other texts of target literature. Comparative textual microanalysis, at which structuralists became experts, has thus been a basic method of translation studies and research, whereas thinking in terms of systems allowed the results of microanalysis to extrapolate to broader theoretical frameworks, that is to construct translation theory and equip it with specific terminology and research issues.

Among the initiators of translation research within Poznań's Polish literary studies were Jerzy Ziomek (1924-1990) and Edward Balcerzan (b. 1937). An outstanding Polish literary historian (specialized in the Renaissance) and expert in classical rhetoric, Ziomek combined his competence of an erudite philologist-polyhistor with skills of modern scholar-theoretician in his inquiry. In the 1960s, he saw an opportunity to modernize the traditional discourse of the humanities so it would resemble 'hard' fields of science, hence his fascination with tools offered by the then novel disciplines such as information theory, game theory, or communication theory. Ziomek saw their potential for literary translation research and proposed a provocative experimental study in his 1965 publication titled *Staff i Kochanowski. Próba zastosowania teorii informacji w badaniach nad przekładem* (Staff and Kochanowski. An Application of Information Theory to Translation Studies).⁵ In the study, he

⁴ S. Barańczak, *Przekład artystyczny jako 'samoistny' i 'związany' obiekt interpretacji*, in *Z historii i teorii przekładu artystycznego*, red. J. Baluch, Kraków, 1974, pp. 47-74; Id., *La traduzione artistica come oggetto di interpretazione 'indipendente' e 'correlato'*, in *Teorie della traduzione i Polonia*, cit., pp. 69-80.

⁵ J. Ziomek, *Staff i Kochanowski. Próba zastosowania teorii informacji w badaniach nad przekładem*, Seria filologia polska nr 7, Poznań, Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza, 1965.

dexterously combined different areas of his interest: studies of the Polish Renaissance (Jan Kochanowski's Latin poetry), contemporary literature (works by Leopold Staff, whose creative activity spanned three literary epochs, that is modernism, the interwar and post-WWII periods), poetics and rhetoric as well as literary translation studies. Ziomek's experiment resulted in a highly original proposition of examining the relation between a source text and its translation with the application of mathematical tools. Below is a sample of an algorithm which Ziomek created for calculating the level of entropy and redundancy in the Polish translation of Kochanowski's Latin poems:

$$R = 1 - \frac{18\,071}{19\,750} = 4,45\%$$

Powtórzmy te same obliczenia dla przekładu:

$$H_1 = -2298 \sum_1^{1190} p_i \log_2 p_i = -2298 (-9,3557) = 21\,499 \text{ bitów}$$

$$H_m = -2298 \log_2 \frac{1}{1190} = 23\,462 \text{ bity}$$

$$R = 1 - \frac{21\,499}{23\,462} = 8,37\%$$

Ziomek's proposal failed to gain followers despite the fact that it was a pioneering attempt at introducing elements of stylometric analysis to Polish translation research. Neither did Ziomek himself continue developing his idea although he never lost interest in translation research. Ziomek entered the Polish canon of translation scholarship with a different study, titled *Przekład – rozumienie – interpretacja* (Translation – Understanding – Interpretation, 1978), which he wrote much later using a less hermetic language.⁶ Though the study contains traces of the author's earlier scientific fascinations (with cybernetics, game theory, and logic), they play an ancillary role to the linguistic semantic analyses which culminate with his thesis of the hermeneutic nature of translation. Ziomek's hermeneutics, however, was firmly grounded

⁶ See J. Ziomek, *Przekład – rozumienie – interpretacja*, in *Polska myśl przekładoznawcza*, cit., pp. 163-192; Id., *Traduzione – comprensione – interpretazione*, in *Teorie della traduzione in Polonia*, cit., pp. 81-112.

in rigorously analyzed textual matter. In the study, he also focused on equivalence relationship between source and target texts, which he divided into four distinct types: transliteration, transcription, description and borrowing.

Jerzy Ziomek found a common language with his younger colleague Edward Balcerzan, who was to become the leading researcher among Poznań's translation scholars. It was Balcerzan who eventually moved Poznań literary theory studies onto the ground of structural semiotics. Having spent his childhood in the Ukraine, Balcerzan mastered Russian, thanks to which he was instrumental in the Polish reception of Russian achievements in the field of theory and methodology of cultural literary studies (including quickly advancing Russian translation research). Balcerzan was also a translator of Russian poetry and soon revealed himself to be an original poet and fiction writer. As for methodology, Balcerzan has always affiliated himself with the theoretical thought of Eastern and Central Europe: from the Russian formalists, through the Prague Linguistic Circle and its post-war continuators, to the Tartu School of Semiotics with Jurij Lotman as its leader. Balcerzan has remained faithful to his choices to this day, thus testifying to the viability and universal character of the conceptions formed in those circles as well as demonstrating their superiority to poststructuralist, especially deconstructionist, theories. What is more, it should be emphasized that the whole Polish structural semiotic formation of the 1960s and 1970s was inspired by Russian and Czechoslovak theoretical thought. Although Western structuralism (especially French – Lévi-Strauss, Greimas, Genette, Barthes) played a certain role in our discourse then, it was still only marginal.

While translatology remains a major field of his academic interest, Balcerzan is also a distinguished literary historian, specializing in twentieth-century Polish literature (primarily poetry). Among his early studies representing the field of translation research are two: his canonical essay, frequently cited by both Polish and foreign academics, titled *Poetyka przekładu artystycznego* (The Poetics of Artistic Translation),⁷ which was included in both previously mentioned anthologies, and his book titled *Styl i poetyka twórczości dwujęzycznej Brunona Jasińskiego. Z zagadnień teorii przekładu* (The Style and Poetics of Bruno Jasiński's Bilingual Works. A Study in Translation Theory).⁸ Both publications date back to 1968, and the latter was recognized as a pioneering study of literary bilingualism in Poland. The study presented both

⁷ E. Balcerzan, *Poetyka przekładu artystycznego*, in *Polska myśl przekładowa*, cit., pp. 103-118; Id., *La poetica della traduzione artistica*, in *Teorie della traduzione i Polonia*, cit., pp. 17-38.

⁸ E. Balcerzan, *Styl i poetyka twórczości dwujęzycznej Brunona Jasińskiego. Z zagadnień teorii przekładu*, Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1968.

a general typology of the rare phenomenon of bilingualism in Polish literature and a detailed case study of Polish and Russian versions of works authored by the most prominent representative of Polish futurism, interwar communist and tragic victim of Stalinism. In his research on Jasiński's literary bilingualism, Balcerzan also applied some elements of the cultural approach in his study of ideological contexts of the works. Balcerzan's recent monograph on translation studies titled *Thumaczenie jako 'wojna światów'. W kręgu translatologii i komparatystyki* (Translation as 'the War of the Worlds': On Translatology and Comparative Studies),⁹ which was published in 2010, has already had three editions. Thanks to combining perspectives of a theoretician, literary historian, translation critic, comparative linguist and translator of Russian poetry in the monograph, the scholar demonstrates the whole arsenal of his academic skills and creative capacities. Typical of Balcerzan's academic discourse is perceiving both literature and literary studies as system, that is a set of elements and rules of their combinations. In the above-mentioned early article on the poetics of artistic translation, Balcerzan stated:

In my opinion the artistic translation, apart from being subject to universal laws of literature, is also subject to laws which are specific to it alone. [...] Only after having discovered this specificity, after having proved this otherness, the poetics of translation can start to work out its own research instruments. Its own system of notions and terms.¹⁰

Whereas his latest book, published in 2013 and titled simply *Literackość* (Literariness), contains the following firm statement by Balcerzan: "Without a system there is no subject of studies".¹¹ Balcerzan's merit and significance for translation research and literary studies hinge primarily on the codifying nature of his academic work: ordering, conceptualizing and labeling the field of studies and its various elements. In the 1970s, Balcerzan commenced an important project on the history of Polish translation studies by publishing the volume titled *Polscy pisarze o sztuce przekładu 1440-1974. Antologia* (Polish Writers on the Art of Translation 1440-1974. An Anthology), which he completed together with his then Ph.D students. A quarter of a century later, another edition of the book appeared, which he edited and expanded (1440-2005) in cooperation with Ewa Rajewska.¹²

⁹ Id., *Thumaczenie jako 'wojna światów'. W kręgu translatologii i komparatystyki*, Poznań, Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 2010.

¹⁰ Id., *Poetyka przekładu artystycznego*, cit., p. 101.

¹¹ Id., *Literackość. Modele, gradacje, eksperymenty*, Toruń, Fundacja na rzecz Nauki Polskiej, 2013, p. 149.

¹² *Pisarze polscy o sztuce przekładu 1440-1974. Antologia*, wybór, wstęp i komentarze E.

If Edward Balcerzan remains the most distinguished and recognizable academic representative of Poznań's translology circle, its most celebrated literary one is undoubtedly Stanisław Barańczak (1946-2014), whose poetry and art of translation have earned him an international reputation. In the latter half of the 1960s, when Ziomek's and Balcerzan's works had already paved the way for translation research within the field of literary studies in Poznań, Barańczak was studying Polish under the guidance of the two scholars, making his debut as a poet and member of the group which the history of Polish post-war literature labeled as *Nowa Fala* (the New Wave). New Wave poetry was characterized by distrustful and critical attitude to what was happening with language in the public sphere in Poland at the time, particularly to the language of political propaganda, or newspeak (*nowomowa*). In their works, the young members of this formation deconstructed this language by means of poetic word play (paronomasia, parody). As a result, the group was classified as Linguist Poets. Barańczak's sensitivity to language was more than his immediate reaction to the absurdity, hypocrisy and social deterioration of the political system. With time, his creativity developed to reach the highest level of poetic form, with regular and complex rhythm and rhyme as well as rich phonic structure. Simultaneously, Barańczak evolved as a translator, and the trajectory of his progress in this field was similar, since he started translating poetry as a labour of love in his early years at university. He commenced with lyrics of songs by the Beatles and soon moved to translating English Metaphysical poetry. After some time, he proceeded to Shakespeare and the whole English poetry canon (he also occasionally translated from Russian and German). The political turmoil of the 1970s and 1980s in Poland had a considerable impact on Barańczak's career as a poet, translator and academic. Engaged in the political opposition, Barańczak became one of the most prominent Polish dissenters in the latter half of the 1970s, which resulted in his expulsion from the university. He was reinstated to his academic position in 1980, when the mass upsurge of Poles led by Solidarity gained its momentum and gave the public freedom of speech, undermining the communist government for one and a half years. In 1981, Barańczak was offered the position of the Chair of Polish language and Literature in the Slavic Department at Harvard University. When martial law was introduced in Poland in December, 1981, his temporary emigration became permanent. Although this transfer left us with the feeling of regret over the loss of opportunity to meet our outstanding colleague on a daily basis, it ultimately meant a considerable

Balcerzan, Poznań, Wydawnictwo Poznańskie 1977; *Pisarze polscy o sztuce przekładu 1440-2005*, wybór i oprac. E. Balcerzan, E. Rajewska, Poznań, Wydawnictwo Poznańskie 2007.

gain to literature and culture, both at home and abroad. Harvard turned out to be a perfect environment for Barańczak's extraordinary talents and a springboard for his international career as a translator. Over the following decades, he both continued supplementing the canon of Polish translations of English poetry representing different epochs and – together with Clare Cavanagh – started translating Polish poetry into English. Whereas Barańczak's cooperation with Seamus Heaney culminated in an achievement of particular artistic excellence and cultural significance – the English translation of Polish literary masterpiece *Laments (Treny)* by Jan Kochanowski, which is a series of nineteen poems of the Renaissance poet grieving the death of his three-year-old daughter Ursula.

As a scholar preoccupied with translation research, Barańczak published only a few academic texts in the 1970s; nevertheless, his seminal article on the subject titled *Poetycki model świata a problemy przekładu artystycznego* (The Poetic Model of the World and Artistic Translation) was appreciated and reprinted by the editors of the Polish anthology – Bukowski and Heydel.¹³ Since Barańczak's strategies as a translator have always raised controversies, and the reactions to his achievements in this field ranged from absolute delight to severe criticism, he frequently expressed his opinions on translating poetry in essays, paratexts (forewords and afterwords), as well as polemics with the reviewers of his translations. The key concepts in Barańczak's theory of translation are "the model of the world" and the "semantic dominant". The former derives from Jurij Lotman's structural-semiotic discourse, the latter was favored by the Slovak translation scientist Anton Popovič. Concentrating on the model and the dominant, which are a work's core and its frame, Barańczak could justify deviations and lack of detailed precision in his poetic translations. He opined that the most important senses of the poem were often coded in its poetic form, and the complex network of rhymes, rhythms and alliterations carried more significance than the actual words used in it. As a consequence, substitution was according to him the principal method in translation. Barańczak's theory was normative as it transpired in his 1992 book on translation titled *Ocalone w tłumaczeniu* (*Saved in Translation*). The book contained "A Small Yet Maximalist Translatological Manifesto"¹⁴ and an anthology of poems in different languages accompanied with Barańczak's translations and commentaries in which he explicated the translator's

¹³ S. Barańczak, *Poetycki model świata a problemy przekładu artystycznego*, in *Polska myśl przekładowa*, cit., pp. 217-238.

¹⁴ Id., *Ocalone w tłumaczeniu. Szkice o warsztacie tłumacza poezji z dołączeniem małej antologii przekładu*, Poznań, Wydawnictwo a5, 1992.

main task and the manner of its completion in each case. With this revelation of the secrets of his translator's craft, Barańczak affiliated himself with what Translation Studies had recently proclaimed as the Translator's Turn,¹⁵ renouncing the notion of translator's invisibility. As a poet and translator, Barańczak falls into the category of Harold Bloom's "strong poet",¹⁶ and his translation activity is often perceived as continuation of his poetic creativity.¹⁷

The influential personalities and notable academic achievements of Jerzy Ziomek, Edward Balcerzan and Stanisław Barańczak were instrumental in the expansion of Poznań's translatology in the 1980s, which saw the completion of two doctoral dissertations; they became part of the lasting legacy in this field of research.¹⁸ Analyzing the post-war Polish translations of Russian poetry (Puškin, Majakovskij, Krylov, Blok), Anna Legeżyńska demonstrated how the translators' creative competences may vary in their ranges and how translations are embedded in specific communication situations (including "polemic translation").¹⁹ Legeżyńska developed her ideas independently of the western Translation Studies, and remained as if half way between the semiotic paradigm of communication and the cultural one. She was still very interested in the relation between an original text and its translation(s), as well as between the source and the target cultures; however, the study was also an early indication of a new approach in the discourse on translation, which focuses on the way a translation is situated specifically within the source culture.

The other dissertation, supervised by Jerzy Ziomek, was written by the author of this essay. It was a continuation of Edward Balcerzan's research on literary bilingualism and self-translation. My study focused on works by Stefan Themerson (1911-1988), who was a Polish avant-garde writer, filmmaker

¹⁵ D. Robinson, *The Translator's Turn*, Baltimore & London, The John Hopkins Univ. Press, 1991.

¹⁶ See H. Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence. A Theory of Poetry*, New York, Oxford Univ. Press, 1973.

¹⁷ M. Kaczorowska, *Przekład jako kontynuacja twórczości własnej. Na przykładzie wybranych translacji Stanisława Barańczaka z języka angielskiego*, Kraków, Universitas, 2011; E. Rajewska, *Stanisław Barańczak – poeta i tłumacz*, Poznań, Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 2007.

¹⁸ Nb. gender relations in the Poznań translatology circle reproduce the traditional division of gender roles, with men as masters and mentors and women as students and apprentices. I simply state this fact, with no remorse whatsoever...

¹⁹ A. Legeżyńska, *Tłumacz i jego kompetencje autorskie. Na materiale powojennych tłumaczeń poezji A. Puszkina, W. Majakowskiego, I. Kryłowa i A. Błoka*, Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1986.

and editor. After World War II the artist moved to London, where he lived with his wife Franciszka, the phenomenal painter, illustrator and stage designer. Mine was a pioneering monograph devoted to the, then, unfamiliar artist, whose work and personality have since become subjects of numerous studies and academic books, as Themerson's art is still – a quarter of a century after his death – highly original and timeless. The most innovative in the study was my treatment of multilingualism as key to Themerson's aesthetics, which was based on multiple perspective, multiple coding and multimedia, as well as on collage combination of poetics and styles to create new hybrid genres of artistic expression. These aesthetics was in turn a vehicle for expressing an ethical program built on acceptance of variety, otherness and a moral imperative grounded in the conviction that means which are used to achieve aims are more important than the aims themselves: "Decency of means is the aim of aims".²⁰ Thus, my study anticipated – *toutes proportions gardeés* – the 'ethical turn' in Translation Studies.

However, in the 1990s my interest in translation research began to wane. When Anna Legeżyńska withdrew from the field and Stanisław Barańczak stayed in the US, successfully publishing new volumes of brilliant translations of English poetry as well as his own poems, indeed, the only translologist left to continue research in Poznań was Edward Balcerzan. The reasons for my parting with translology were twofold: external and internal. First, I discovered a new fascinating field of interest, both academic and personal, that is feminism. Second, I was exhausted and bored with the incessant repetition of translation research procedures of meticulous textual analysis and interpreting differences which I had by that time, found uninspiring. Besides, I was quite busy working as a translator at the time. It started with a posthumously published Themerson's novel *Hobson's Island*, which I translated from English into Polish. I found the courage to undertake this task believing I could render the novel in Polish in the way the author himself would have done. Subsequently, I also translated novels by Malcolm Bradbury and Peter Ackroyd as well as some other quite random books, since 1989 marked the beginning of huge demand for literary translations, and publishers looked for efficient translators, particularly from English. However, I gave up this activity after some time as well.

Meanwhile, three events happened: Western Translation Studies announced the 'cultural turn'; supervised and mentored by Edward Balcerzan, a new

²⁰ E. Kraskowska, *Twórczość Stefana Themersona – dwujęzyczność i literatura*, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków, Ossolineum, 1989.

²¹ S. Themerson, *The Aim of Aims*, "Dialectics and Humanism" 4 (1980), pp. 37-39.

independent scholar matured – Ewa Rajewska, who was another academic fascinated with secrets of the art of translation and successful translator. Finally, the obstinate Balcerzan (now professor emeritus) and the hard-working and talented organizer Rajewska managed to convince me to join their efforts to supplement the graduate program in our Institute with a specialty in translation, which was opened three years ago. Each year a dozen or so students apply for the specialty, where they study history, poetics, theory of translation and translation criticism, as well as, learning different writing techniques which are necessary for a translator's work. They also completed a major team project, which was translating a long literary or academic text from English into Polish and preparing it for publication. So far the results of two projects have been published: *Mityngi myśli* (Meetings of the Mind) by David Damrosch and *Narratologia* (Narratology) by Mieke Bal, and a third book, *Wydziałowe Wieże* (Faculty Towers) by Elaine Showalter, is in print. The students of the translation specialty represent such a high academic level that five of them have already started post-graduate Ph.D. programs and are currently working on their dissertations; therefore, Poznań's translatology will continue developing in all likelihood. Let us return, however, to the initial question of whether or not it is a school.

It all depends, of course, on how we will define 'school' in its academic sense. As examples, such names come to mind as the Lviv-Cracov School of Philosophy and Logic, the Prague Structuralist School, the Tartu School of Semiotics, the Constance School of Reception Aesthetics, or the Yale School of Deconstruction. Within the field of translation research there are also the Leipzig school and the Zurich school. Therefore, it can be concluded that, first and foremost, the label 'school' is attached to a group of scholars on the basis of their connection with one specific academic centre, and Poznań's translatology meets this condition perfectly. Moreover, a 'school' has to have a leader, or leaders, and a group of students educated by them (as well as students of those students). In the Lviv-Cracov school the leader was Kazimierz Twardowski, in the Prague school – Roman Jakobson and Jan Mukařovský, and after the War – Jiří Levý, in the Tartu school – Jurij Lotman, in the Constance school – Hans Robert Jauss, and in the Yale school – Paul de Man, Harold Bloom and J. Hillis Miller. The Leipzig school was led by Otto Kade, Gert Jäger and Albrecht Neubert, whereas the Zurich school is associated with Ernst Leisi. What integrates a school, and thus becomes its binding material of sorts, is its methodology – constructed within the school, systematically developed during lectures, seminars and other forms of exchange of research results. Manufactured in this way, the 'product' and the discourse developed around it enter the academic world at large and influence scholars from outside the 'school'.

Poznań's translato­logists did not create a 'school' in this sense, despite the fact that we do have an unquestionable leader who is Edward Balcerzan. Although translation research constitutes a considerable part of Balcerzan's academic activity, it is neither the only nor the most important field of his interest and achievement. He is predominantly a literary theorist and historian of twentieth-century Polish literature. Balcerzan shared his fascination with translation studies with individual students (Anna Legeżyńska, Barbara Sienkiewicz, Ewa Rajewska, Adriana Kovačeva) and did not create any translatology seminar group for exchanging research experience or carrying out collective projects, except for the collective edition of the anthology titled *Pisarze polscy o sztuce przekładu* (Polish Writers on the Art of Translation). Whereas translation research was only a small part of Jerzy Ziomek's monumental academic achievement. Although Stanisław Barańczak wrote on translation research and constructed his own "translatological manifesto", his academic career was based on works on a different subject – his doctoral dissertation was devoted to Miron Białoszewski's poetic language. Balcerzan's only student who has continued translation research today is Ewa Rajewska.

As for methodology, it is hardly possible to claim that Poznań's scholars have constructed any innovative approach to translation research – they focused on developing and improving methods which already existed. Our research studies were clearly structural-semiotic in character and they contributed to the development of Polish translato­logical discourse and to the expansion of its field. It seems, however, that because of the rigorous methodological orientation, interest in translation research ebbed in Poznań Polish philology at the end of the twentieth century. Lack of contact with international translation research scholars and limited knowledge concerning the recent developments in the field outside Eastern and Central Europe brought Poznań's translatology to a deadlock. The impasse was overcome after 1989, when possibilities of academic research exchange opened and new poststructuralist and cultural perspectives entered the stage. The cultural approach has obviously always been present in translation research to an extent; for example, it is difficult to imagine translation research without considering issues of cultural interference, as multilingualism always evokes multiculturalism, analyzing exotization and familiarization as translation strategies requires a broad knowledge of cultural contexts, etc. Poznań translation research today comprises a wide range of issues, which is particularly reflected in topics selected by our Ph.D. students. They focus on issues such as problems with translation of theoretical texts and distribution of knowledge via translation, feminism in translation and translation in feminism, discourse on translation in the light of psychoanalytic theory, (homo)sexuality and translation, social

and political conditioning of translation art in Poland, translator as a theoretical issue, women's translation art in the twentieth century. They also continue studies on the legacy of our most eminent translators as well as on translations of Polish literary masterpieces (for example, works by Bruno Schulz and Witold Gombrowicz).

Taking everything into account, it should be concluded that Poznań's translatology can not be referred to as a 'school'. However, we can definitely talk about a long and fruitful tradition of literary translation research carried out by Poznań's Polish literary scholars, starting with scholars representing the structural-semiotic approach. I firmly believe that, today, this tradition is starting a new chapter and getting its second wind. I also firmly believe that the names of our outstanding scholars and luminaries should be found in reference books on translation research studies worldwide.