

DOROTA GOŁUCH 

Cardiff University
goluchd@cardiff.ac.uk

POLISH-POSTCOLONIAL SIMILARITIES. RECEPTION OF TRANSLATED POSTCOLONIAL LITERATURE IN POLAND (1970–2010)^{1*}

Abstract

Many studies of postcolonial translation feature analyses of translational and publishing decisions and their potential influences on the relationships between the colonizers and the colonized (e.g. Jacquemond 1992, Tymoczko 1999, Spivak 2004). This article proposes a different methodology, focusing instead on the presence of translated postcolonial literature in Poland through a systematic, discursive study of its reception. Based on the results of an unpublished doctoral study (Gołuch 2013) – which analysed nearly a thousand reviews of African, Indian, Caribbean and Middle Eastern writing, published in the Polish press between 1970 and 2010 – the article demonstrates that Polish reviewers increasingly often affirm Polish-postcolonial similarities, even if Orientalist, othering discourses remain present in the reviews.

This finding contributes to timely debates about Polish self-perceptions. Emphasising the otherness or exoticism of postcolonial texts and contexts, the reviewers tend to write from the position of Europeans and to identify with Orientalist biases. Yet, the emerging discourse comparing postcolonial experiences of migration, independence struggle, and post-independence complexes with Poland's own past and present offers an interesting counterbalance to a long-standing tradition of othering perceptions. Focusing on specific similarities, some reviewers seem to think of Poland and themselves in postcolonial terms.

* This article was originally published in Polish in *Przekładaniec* 2016, vol. 33, pp. 46–70. The English version was published with the financial support from the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education (DUN grant).

¹ The research has been supported by the Arts and Humanities Research Council.

Furthermore, the article contributes to scholarship on Polish postcolonialism. Numerous incisive studies have examined the Partitions of Poland (1795–1918), Nazi occupation (1939–1945) and Soviet domination (1945–1989) in terms of colonisation, at the same time employing postcolonial tools to revisit issues of Polish domination over Belarusians, Lithuanians and Ukrainians, as well as Polish attitudes to non-European colonised peoples (e.g. Thompson 2000, Kłobucka 2001, Cavanagh 2003, Fiut 2003, Bakula 2006, Janion 2006, Buchholtz 2009, Gosk 2010, Kołodziejczyk 2010, Skórczewski 2013, Wojda 2015). Notably, the themes of Poland's status as a colonised and colonising country within the immediate region, on the one hand, and Polish perceptions of non-European postcolonial peoples, on the other, tend to be explored separately (cf. Wojda 2015). This article, however, suggests that a Polish postcolonial self-image might be manifesting in response to an encounter with translated postcolonial writing, and generally argues for bringing the two thematic strands together to explore further the interdependencies between Poland's postcolonialism and Polish attitudes to non-European postcolonials.

Keywords: postcolonial translation, Polish postcolonialism, reception studies, discourse analysis, Orientalism, solidarity

The article contributes to debates about postcolonialism in Polish contexts and highlights the role of translation in this area of study. The debates tend to draw on either analyses of Polish representations of postcolonial countries *or* re-readings of Polish literature and history from a postcolonial perspective. This article, however, examines relationships between Polish attitudes to postcolonial “Others” and Polish self-perceptions (in particular the emerging and debated self-image of Poland as a postcolonial country). To this end, I employ tools from translation studies and reception research: the vantage point of translation studies is particularly useful because translation enables contact, shows how the Others represent and express themselves, and, finally, reflects but also affects attitudes to them. Therefore, choosing the Polish reception of *translated* postcolonial literature² as my object of study,

² Postcolonial literature is defined as writing that, firstly, systematically features postcolonial societies, which face the material and cultural consequences of colonialism. Secondly, the authors are in a position to describe and represent the societies due to their (broadly understood) belonging. This study focuses on the literatures of the postcolonial societies of Africa, the Indian subcontinent, the Caribbean and the Middle East. Polish reception of another important non-European literature, Latin American literature, has been analysed by Małgorzata Gaszyńska-Magiera (2011).

I am able to combine issues and areas of research that are less likely to be considered together otherwise.

Analysing the discourses present in Polish reviews of translations of postcolonial prose, from the years 1970–2010, I seek to address the following questions: how were the postcolonial Others perceived and what does it tell us about Polish self-perceptions? Does a strong sense of cultural difference – which has long informed European and Polish representations of the ex-colonised – correlate with specific views about Poland’s geopolitical and cultural position? And: to what extent, if at all, does the perception of difference co-exist with a vision of Polish-postcolonial similarities, which in turn may imply a sense of Poland’s own postcoloniality? With its focus on translation and reception, this investigation of Polish perceptions of postcolonial peoples and Polish self-perceptions promises to uncover potential interconnections and contradictions, while also combining a scholarly application of the term “postcolonialism” in Polish contexts with an inquiry into the geopolitical and cultural locales that constituted the original subject matter of postcolonial studies.

Postcolonial theory has been successfully applied to Polish and post-Communist studies research, even if scholars recognise that some differences, e.g. disparate evaluations of Marxism (Kołodziejczyk 2010; Sowa 2011), make intellectual exchanges between the main streams of these disciplines more difficult. Polish and post-Communist studies scholars also insist on a two-way, dialogical relationship with postcolonialism and on adapting, rather than merely adopting, its critical tools (Bolecki 2007; Kołodziejczyk 2010: 38). This approach is evident, for example, in the work of the Post-dependence Studies Centre (Gosk 2010).³

Postcolonial inspirations in the field of Polish studies have led to some important work on the Partitions (1795–1918) and Communism (1945–1989) as forms of colonialization, and on symptoms of the postcolonial condition in the aftermath of the Partitions and Communism (e.g. Domańska 2008; Gosk 2010; Sowa 2011; Skórczewski 2013; Gosk 2015). Other studies focused on Poles’ cultural and mental dependency on the West and the latter’s role as a “surrogate hegemon” (Thompson 2010). At the same time, analyses of relevant Russian, German and Anglo-Saxon materials demonstrated imperialist or Orientalising approaches to Poland (Thompson 2000;

³ For publications list, visit <http://www.cbdp.polon.uw.edu.pl/publikacje.html> [access: 28 June 2018].

Janion 2006; Neuger 2007; Surynt 2007; Gąsior 2010). Scholars also asked questions about Poland's imperial past (Fiut 2003): they demonstrated traces of Orientalism, mimicry and hybridity in Polish writing about the "Borderlands", or Eastern provinces of pre-war Poland (Bakuła 2006; Gosk 2010; Wojda 2015), and analysed certain colonising policies of the Communist authorities towards the so-called Regained Territories, i.e. Poland's Western provinces post-1945 (Wojda 2015). Furthermore, postcolonial categories have been mobilised to reflect on the positions of "internal Others", including Polish Jews (Prokop-Janiec 2010) and the Lemko people of the Carpathian region (Stańczyk 2012; Duć-Fajfer 2014).

Alongside the studies on Poland's position and identity, there is another strand of research indebted to postcolonial criticism: critical re-readings of Polish writing about non-European colonised peoples. Scholars have examined echoes of colonial discourses in Polish texts, including futurist poetry (Wojda 2015), youth novels such as Henryk Sienkiewicz's 1911 classic *In Desert and Wilderness* (Kłobucka 2001; Cichoń 2004) and Alfred Szklarski's post-war adventure stories (Buchholtz 2009; Żółkoś 2010; Rybicki 2012), as well as children's literature from the 1930s: comic-style books by Kornel Makuszyński and Marian Walentynowicz (Sosnowski 2005) and Julian Tuwim's nursery rhyme about *Murzynek Bambo*, or Black Boy Bambo (Moskalewicz 2005). Other studies have interrogated Polish aspirations to obtain overseas colonies during the Partitions (Białas 1997; Gołaszewski 2010) and in the interwar period (Borkowska-Arciuch 2007; Jarnecki 2010; Wojda 2015).

The two strands have developed in parallel. Symptomatically, in his article "From Black Boy Bambo to Hans Castorp, Or How Can Postcolonialism Help Polish Studies?", Dariusz Skórczewski (2006: 81) states that the title question requires a "twofold answer".⁴ He then separately discusses the two types of research: critical readings of texts with colonialist overtones such as "Black Boy Bambo", which "could just as well have been penned in another place on Earth" (2006: 81), and studies that uncover literary traces of Poland's own colonialism and postcolonialism, represented in the article's title by Paweł Huelle's 2004 novel *Castorp*. These two perspectives, I argue, could be helpfully combined.

Attempts at combining these perspectives appear in a small number of articles which touch upon possible connections between Polish experiences

⁴ All translations from Polish are mine, unless otherwise stated – D.G.

of dependency or peripherality and Polish representations of non-Europeans. For instance, Anna Cichoń (2004) briefly ponders why the Polish protagonists of *In Desert and Wilderness*, who lived under the Russian yoke, tended to identify with the English colonisers and not the colonised Africans. Claire Cavanagh (2003) implied that, thanks to their Polish origin, Joseph Conrad and Czesław Miłosz could approach the dominant discourses on colonialism and imperialism from a critical distance and, possibly, better understand their mechanisms and their victims. The only book-length study that blurs the boundaries between studying, through a postcolonial lens, the representations of the Self and those of the Other in Polish contexts is *Polska Szeherazada* (Polish Scheherazade) by Dorota Wojda: a multifaceted collection looking at a variety of literary projects, including not only stories of Poland's own (post)colonial position and colonising past but also "texts that show Poles' attitudes towards the bondage and domination of others" (Wojda 2015: 36). This article argues for further, systematic study of the links between Polish experiences of colonialism and Poles' perceptions of the (ex-)colonised in other parts of the world. Moreover, I suggest that such research will greatly benefit from a focus on translation and reception as the zones that show us precisely the interlinking of the Self and the Other: their encounter, confrontation and mutual influence.

In this study, I analyse the discourses used in reviews of literary translations: this is a relatively original method in translation and postcolonial research, and I choose it for the following reasons. The work on translations of postcolonial literature often examines translatorial and publishing decisions, discussing their more or less hypothetical influence on the cultural relationships between the former colonisers and the ex-colonised. Some studies advocate or criticise a particular translation approach, associating it with certain political and cultural meanings. For instance, "anthropophagic" adaptations of European literatures are believed to facilitate the cultural decolonisation of Brazil (Vieira 1999). Or, mechanical translations of the so-called Third World literatures are critiqued (Spivak 2004). In Gayatri Spivak's view, such translations obscure the textuality of the originals, because translators favour a reductive transfer of "meaning", overuse calques and generally approach stylistic and rhetorical nuances with insufficient skill or care. Spivak does not offer a formula for a successful translation but stresses that the method for translating each text should emerge from a unique, intimate encounter with the author's artistic subjectivity, the rhetoricity of the text and the singularity of its contexts.

Other studies take a step back from individual texts to analyse entire corpora of existing translations instead; e.g., Richard Jacquemond (1992) surveys translation flows between Egypt and France, while Maria Tymoczko (1999) compares several English translations of an Irish epic. Jacquemond's study shows that, even if in some cases translational strategies correlate with cultural perceptions following the familiar patterns described by Itamar Even-Zohar or Lawrence Venuti (i.e. the colonised faithfully translate the classics of the metropole, which, in turn, selectively adapts their writing), the full analysis presents a more complex picture. This suggests that, in the grander scheme of things, one cannot learn about intercultural relations by analysing translations alone. Tymoczko's book demonstrates that both the Anglicised translations of the epic and the translations recreating the original poetic supported the Irish independence struggle: what counts is, therefore, not the strategy as such but the political context and significance of a translation.

Overall, it seems that examining specific translational choices remains a helpful method for studying cultural attitudes towards Others, but, also, that each text, paratext and context should be analysed in sufficient detail. I had indeed used that method (Gołuch 2011; Gołuch 2014) but when planning work with a larger corpus – an estimated 293 Polish translations of postcolonial literature appeared between 1970 and 2010 (Gołuch 2013) – I saw that a detailed qualitative analysis was not viable. Another option was to investigate selected aspects of translation and publication (e.g. translation of culturally-loaded words and hybrid language, use of footnotes, cover design) and to speculate if they are indicative of Polish attitudes to postcolonial Others. However, I rejected this method as potentially too arbitrary.

Exploring reception, and more specifically published reviews, seemed the right solution because comments by reviewers and critics – who, to some extent, represent as well as influence the views of larger social groups – can indicate more directly how postcolonial countries have been perceived in Poland. Therefore, my study includes book reviews and related articles that were originally written in Polish and discuss, with a few exceptions, postcolonial prose in Polish translation. The corpus comprises 902 texts: 140 texts from the 1970s, 243 from the 1980s, 113 from the 1990s and 406 from the 2000s. It was compiled based mostly on two bibliographies: *Polska Bibliografia Literacka* (years 1970–1998) and *Bibliografia Zawartości Czasopism* (years 1996–2010). A bibliography of Polish underground publishing (Kandziora et al. 1999) was also used, as were tables of contents and online archives of relevant press outlets.

The reviews and articles were analysed to establish which discourses mark Polish attitudes to postcolonial peoples. It showed, as one might expect, the presence of othering discourses. Another finding, however, emerges as novel and interesting: I identified numerous comparisons of Poland and postcolonial countries. The discourses of otherness and the comparisons implying similarity are presented below.⁵

Discourses of otherness and exoticism, 1970–1989

Orientalising discourses (Said 1978) present in the reviews include discourses of otherness, which stigmatise non-Europeans as irrational, barbaric and mysterious, and the discourse of exoticism, which presupposes an absolute boundary between the Self and the Other (in line with the meaning of the Greek root *ἔξω*: “outside”). Representative examples of othering discourses used in the years 1970–1989 include a statement that African short stories point towards “the spiritual realms of Africans that have not yet been reached by the white man” (Nowicki 1978) and a praise of the Guinean author Camara Laye for “bring[ing] the rational Western world closer to the mysteries of Africa” (Borowska 1973: 143). It is also worth mentioning an article about African literature which starts with the premise that “in Africa, in the beginning was not the word” (Krzemiński 1975). The negation of a Biblical verse (John 1:1) is intended to support the view that Africans rely on feeling, rather than reason, and gain self-knowledge through music and dance, as opposed to literature. Krzemiński (1975) reasserts the relationship between self-reflexivity and writing when he adds that “[Africans’] thought has not been tamed by an alphabet of their own”. The reviewer employs a colonial discourse of African otherness: an opposition of logocentric rationalism and emotional irrationality was supposed to prove African inferiority and lack of self-sufficiency, thus justifying colonial government.

The discriminatory character of this dichotomy is particularly evident in a review of Amos Tutuola. The reviewer treats the author’s non-standard language and unconventional narrative (recreated in Ernestyna Skurjat’s Polish translation) as an expression of African irrationality, which, in turn,

⁵ For an analysis of other discourses present in the reviews (discourses of universalism, progress and knowledge) and a discussion of reviewers’ comments about translation, see Gołuch 2013.

is an insult to widely-accepted standards: “*Our* concept of literature is governed – still – by rationalism” (Bojarska 1984: 73; emphasis added). There is no doubt how one should interpret the pronoun: “yes, I am dividing the world (...). ‘Them’ means Africa, ‘Us’ means Europe” (Bojarska 1984: 73). Another text which portrays Africa as an archetype of otherness, albeit in a less derogatory way, is an article on Wole Soyinka. Introducing Soyinka as the 1986 Nobel Prize winner, the reviewer reminisces that in the games of his childhood the rhyming phrase *Afryka dzika* (wild Africa) “was a sort of magical charm, a synonym of adventure and mystery” (Jodłowski 1987).

Discourses of otherness are also present in some responses to the fatwa on Salman Rushdie issued by Ayatollah Khomeini in 1989. For example, one commentator proclaims the West and Islam to be “two different planets” (Majewicz 1989); this rhetoric gains prominence in the following decades. Interestingly, Polish accounts of the fatwa were initially controlled by the crumbling regime and followed the official line of “solidarity” with the Third World. One article, citing the words of an Iranian Ayatollah, referred to Rushdie as “a mercenary of colonialism” (Bukowski 1989), while censors blocked a protest letter by the Polish PEN and had an article about importing Iranian oil printed in its stead (*Bez komentarza*, 1989). A commentary which activated discourses of otherness and was critical of Iran and the Third World did, however, appear outside of the censors’ reach, in the Polish émigré press. Wojciech Skalmowski, an émigré critic and Iranian studies scholar, published an essay about Rushdie in the influential Paris-based *Kultura*. Skalmowski, who used the penname M. Broński, discussed the fatwa as symptomatic of a conflict between Western civilisation and Asian “fanaticism” (Broński 1989: 184).

Skalmowski’s publications, including the essay on Rushdie and two essays on V.S. Naipaul, constitute the most substantial commentary on post-colonial writing in the émigré press and an interesting example of othering. Skalmowski writes favourably about Naipaul, arguing that Naipaul defends the primary role of civilisation – which stands for order, respecting shared values and supporting the betterment of individuals – over barbarity (chaos, pointless violence, rewarding mediocrity). Naipaul is also said to prove that “the stagnation, inefficiency, stupidity and cruelty of under-civilised societies are to a large extent *their own fault*” (Broński 1982: 52; original emphasis). Skalmowski values Naipaul’s views for their “incorrectness”. His correspondence with the émigré playwright Sławomir Mrożek shows that both considered superficial political correctness, supposedly challenged

by Naipaul, as a defining characteristic of the Western left. They also believed that the Western left exposed European civilisation to the threat of being swept by a despotic Asian ideology: Soviet Communism (Mrożek, Skalmowski 2007: 445). Generally, the use of othering discourses by Skalmowski and Mrożek – political emigrants during the Cold War – should also be read as their objection to the (actual or imagined) ideological biases of the European left, which they associated with propaganda representations of the Third World by the Communist regime in Poland. Another relevant context is the Polish tradition of conceptualising Russian aggression as an attack of Asiatic barbarism.

I have discussed both representative and extreme instances of othering in the Polish reviews of translated postcolonial literature in the period 1970–1989. The discourses appeared with similar frequency in both decades, i.e. in about ten per cent of all the reviews (11 out of 140 reviews in 1970s and 24 out of 243 in 1980s). In the following section I examine the discourse of exoticism and its critiques.

In the texts from the 1970s and 1980s, exoticism is treated as an asset of the reviewed work; e.g. a reviewer of Ahmadou Kourouma's novel praises the translator for changing the original title *Les soleils des indépendances* (Suns of Independence) to *Fama Dumbuya najprawdziwszy. Dumbuya na białym koniu* (Fama Dumbuya the Truest. Dumbuya on a White Horse), calling the new title “great, exotic for us and intriguing” (Bugajski 1976). Literature is also treated as a substitute for travels from the proverbially grey Communist Poland to colourful lands far away, which in reality were impossible for financial and political reasons. A collection of Indian short stories is nicknamed “colourful elephants” as each story transports the reader into an exciting Indian landscape (Zieliński 1974), while a Nigerian novel is praised for taking the reader on an exotic journey (Tom 1987).

At the same time, the discourse of exoticism was criticised as a sign of yielding to neo-colonial pressures, which reduce Third World countries to the role of a commodity, curiosity and tourist attraction. For example, the title of Kourouma's book, mentioned above, strikes another reviewer as stereotypical and commercial: “[the publisher] did, after all, decide to scare us with black folks (...). The publisher simply thinks that the book will sell better if the title is exotic enough” (Czeszko 1976: 26). A review of the Indian writer R.K. Narayan, who was very popular in Poland and stayed with the Indian ambassador during his 1973 Warsaw visit, states approvingly that Narayan does not try to “attract readers with exoticism” (P.L. 1988).

Critique of exoticism tied in with the official policy of promoting socialism in the Third World. It is particularly evident in a text about Naipaul by Waław Sadkowski, who was editor-in-chief of *Literatura na Świecie*, an influential monthly specialising in literary translations. Sadkowski (1971) begins with an ideological critique of Naipaul's early work – *The House of Mr Biswas* is like 'a stall with exotic souvenirs' and legitimises Capitalist influences in the Caribbean – only to make favourable comments about his later writing, supposedly a testament to Naipaul's growing engagement and literary as well as political "maturity".⁶

Overall, exoticism was mentioned more often in the 1970s than in the 1980s: positive comments were noted in 21 out of 140 reviews (15%) in the 1970s and 24 out of 243 reviews (10%) in the 1980s, while criticisms appeared in 14 out of 140 texts (10%) in the 1970s to almost fade away in the 1980s (8 out of 243 reviews, or 3%). Importantly, praises of exoticism appeared with a frequency similar to that of the othering discourses discussed earlier, significantly increasing the total number of statements which stress a sense of difference.

Discourses of otherness and exoticism, 1990–2010

In the reviews from the 1990s and the 2000s, discourses of otherness occur less often than in the preceding decades (6 out of 113 texts, or 5%, in the 1990s and 13 out of 406 texts, or 3%, in the 2000s). However, ingrained stereotypes persist. The discourses continue to appear in discussions around the fatwa; e.g. one article contrasts Christian "objectivism" with Islamic "determinism" (Cackowski 1997), while another, published in the right-wing daily *Rzeczpospolita*, announces that a consensus between Islam and the liberal West is impossible (Marzec 2010). Similar views reappear in reviews of Naipaul. Skalmowski summarises his earlier essays in a regional monthly (1995), while the conservative weekly *Wprost* introduces Naipaul as a Nobel Prize laureate with the heading "Full understanding between people of different civilisations is not possible" (Kobus, Kukliński 2001). Importantly, the same issue of *Wprost* features articles supporting President

⁶ In reality, Naipaul's work shows no evidence of leftist sympathies. Thirty years later, Sadkowski claimed that he had intentionally misrepresented Naipaul's politics, so that censors would allow his Polish translations (2001).

George W. Bush's "war on terror". Overall, these uses of othering discourses in the context of tensions between "the West" and "Islam" (fuelled by Samuel Huntington's "clash of civilisations" thesis) are clearly linked to Poland's new geopolitical position in the post-1989 world.

It should be added that responses to the fatwa were rather varied. Some de facto rejected Orientalising attacks against the "irrational" East, accentuating various ideological positions. The pro-regime statements from 1989, mentioned earlier, can be compared with responses at the other extreme of the emerging political spectrum: the Christian National Union party (Zjednoczenie Chrześcijańsko-Narodowe) condemned Rushdie, and any plans to translate *The Satanic Verses* into Polish, in the name of respecting religious feelings (SAN 2008). The intellectuals associated with the Christian monthly *Więź* represented a yet different stance, suggesting that Khomeini used religion for political purposes (Kozak et al. 1990: 167).

The discourse of mystery was becoming less prominent in the 1990s and 2000s – possibly because the number of African translations declined after the end of the Cold War – but it did not disappear. It is worth mentioning a commentary on J.M. Coetzee by Helena Zaworska, which appeared in a few press outlets including the centre-left daily *Gazeta Wyborcza*. Zaworska (1997; 2004) introduces Coetzee as a source of knowledge about Africa. She believes that "the black psyche" appears unfathomable "even though whole hordes flash on our TV screens nearly every evening"; yet, Coetzee uncovers the "mysteries" of the continent for the reader through literary epiphanies, which prove as informative and enlightening as the writing of Conrad. Zaworska is particularly impressed by the strangely familiar character of Marta from *In the Heart of the Country*:

I have already encountered a similarly evocative image of a woman who offers *magical initiation into Africa*. Yes, she appears briefly at the end of *Heart of Darkness* (...). A black woman, treading with pride, decked with trinkets and amulets: "She was savage and superb, wild-eyed and magnificent" (Zaworska 1997: 63; emphasis added).

Although Coetzee does allude to *Heart of Darkness* (the title, *In the Heart of the Country*, being a prime example), the attitude of postcolonial writers to Conrad is a complex one. A univocally critical judgement was made by Chinua Achebe, who argued that Africa had been used by Conrad as an exaggerated symbol of otherness, while Africans – the portrait of the black woman is one of Achebe's examples (Achebe 1977: 785–786) – merely

complemented the “wild” setting. Although later re-readings partially rehabilitated Conrad by noting his critique of colonialism (Said 1993), hyperbolic admiration for “a proud black woman”, and for initiation into African darkness, seems anachronistic (cf. Jarniewicz 2001; Heydel 2011). *Heart of Darkness* also features in a review of Naipaul’s book. Tracing intertextual connections, the reviewer uncritically uses such phrases as “primordial African instincts” or “the voice of primordial consciousness” to describe contemporary Africa (Wróbel 2002).

Post-1989, the discourse of exoticism appears less often than before and with a similar frequency across the following two decades, the 1990s (6 out of 113 reviews, or 5%) and the 2000s (20 out of 406 texts, i.e. 5%). The interpretative key of exoticism is used to read stories from India, the Maghreb and East Africa, among others. Reviewers write that *The God of Small Things* is set in a place “as exotic as India” (Sobala 1998), Tahar Ben Jelloun’s stories “come from an exotic Moroccan world, the desert land of scorpions and Quranic surahs” (Wilk 2008), while the memoirs of Waris Dirie “are about a true experience and its exoticism attracts the reader much like *The Arabian Nights*” (Karpińska 2003). A reference to *The Arabian Nights* is particularly telling given that the collection is an archetypal exoticising representation of the “Orient” and its long-lasting popularity has resulted from translational politics (Jacquemond 1992; Mamet-Michalkiewicz 2011).

Objections to the discourse of exoticism hardly register in the “apolitical” literary criticism of 1990s Poland (1 out of 113 texts, or 1%), to return after the year 2000 (16 out of 406 texts, or 4%), when the role of politically engaged criticism increased (Czapliński 2009) and postcolonial theory became better known in Poland.⁷ For example, a reviewer of the Indian writer Aravind Adiga approvingly notes that Adiga does not depict “exotic landscapes, flavours and smells of the subcontinent to appeal to (...) Western tourists” (Adamowski 2008). Critique of exoticism is accompanied by a questioning of the discourses of otherness. Kinga Dunin comments on binary divisions in Naipaul’s prose:

On the one hand, there is the world of the West, rationality, linear history, civilizational inventions, objective language. On the other hand, history without dates, spirituality and the mysteries of other peoples, which evade our categories (Dunin 2002).

⁷ Polish translations of Edward Said, Gayatri Spivak, Homi Bhabha, Helen Tiffin, Chinua Achebe and Stuart Hall, among others, appeared in books, anthologies and magazines.

In his review of André Brink, Jerzy Jarniewicz (2010) remarks that postcolonial writers are sensitive to various forms of exclusion and gender-based exclusion is no exception; this is one of few references to gender in the whole corpus of reviews.

Next to the discourses of otherness and exoticism discussed above, the reviews contain comments on similarities between Polish and postcolonial historical experiences. It is to this finding that I now turn.

Polish-postcolonial similarities, 1970–1989

In the 1970s, the reviewers write about anti-colonial struggle using direct or indirect references to the Partitions and Nazi occupation. For instance, in an article on Syrian literature, Ma'ruf Arna'ut is said to write “to uplift the hearts”: the well-known quotation from Sienkiewicz clearly refers to the Polish independence struggle during the Partitions (Jachołkowska-Bator 1976). A reviewer of the Algerian writer Mohammed Dib comments that the topic of war, central to Dib's writing, is very familiar indeed to Polish readers (Stolarek 1977). Interestingly, similar comparisons were used by representatives of postcolonial countries whose links to Poland were forged due to policies of cooperation between the Eastern Bloc and the Third World. The Indian ambassador K. Natwar-Singh (1973) says in an interview that his generation remembers colonialism and can therefore fully understand the Polish tragedy of World War Two. Natwar-Singh also edited an Indian short story collection, which was translated into Polish during his term as ambassador. This example neatly illustrates an interplay of politics and culture, reminding us of the important role translation plays in both.

The most interesting comparison from the 1970s concerns Négritude and Messianism, i.e. the Romantic idea that Poland's doomed struggle against despotic monarchies in the nineteenth century was a sacrifice for the freedom of other countries. The comparison appears in the same article which denied that in Africa in the beginning was the Word. Its author introduces Négritude, a movement co-founded by Léopold Senghor, in a rather selective way: it is supposedly based on “spiritualism, the primary role of spiritual and metaphysical values of the black man, whose cognition is intuitive and not sensual and rational like the cognition of a European” (Krzemiński 1975; cf. Leopold 1973: 71). He then refers to a book by the African studies scholar Wanda Leopold, who suggests that an early form of one of the strands of

Négritude resembles Polish Messianism “with its mythical self-image and equally arbitrary ideas about Western European nations” (Leopold 1973: 72; quoted in Krzemiński 1975). This comparison clearly assumes commonality of historical experiences. According to Leopold, the attempts to give meaning to suffering and to claim a historical mission were, in both cases, made “under the condition of economic backwardness and long-term partitions” (Leopold 1973: 72). Moreover, the suggestion that Poles had links with movements that in some ways defied rationality complicates the stark contrast between Africa and Europe presented earlier in Krzemiński’s article.

In the 1980s, statements of similarity appear a little more often than in the 1970s (10 out of 140 reviews, or 7%, in the 1970s and 24 out of 243 reviews, or 10%, in the 1980s) and as frequently as the discourses of otherness or exoticism in the same decade. References to the Partitions and World War Two continue, but, at the end of the decade, allusions to Communism appear as well.

Interesting examples include a review by Maria Bojarska, who declared a division into “us” and “them” in her review of Tutuola. She compares the topics explored by Nadine Gordimer and the nineteenth century Polish writer Eliza Orzeszkowa, “[Orzeszkowa] also had to divide the world into two (Poland, Russia; gentlewomen, peasant women (...); a stupid parvenu, (...) a wounded freedom fighter, etc.)” (Bojarska 1985: 103). Although the national, social, ethnic and racial divisions do not have simple equivalents, this comment suggests similarities between the subjugation (as well as resistance) of people under colonialism, apartheid and the Partitions.

World War Two returns in a comparison of Wole Soyinka’s *The Man Died. Prison Notes* with a text by Julius Fučík, *Reportáž psaná na oprátce* (1945; *Report from the Gallows*, trans. Stephen Jolly, 1951), which appeared in an article on Soyinka by Sadkowski (1986; see also Piłaszewicz 1987). Fučík (1903–1943) belonged to the Czechoslovak Communist resistance and wrote his report in a Gestapo cell, while Soyinka smuggled his notes out of prison where he was held during the Nigerian civil war (1967–1970). Moreover, both texts address universal themes: human freedom, dignity and struggle. This comparison suggests that a conflict in Nigeria (in this case a postcolonial civil war) reminds the reviewers of the painful experiences of World War Two in Central and Eastern Europe. At the same time, one wonders if references to Fučík, who had been celebrated as a hero by Communist propaganda, may have resonated negatively with Polish readers in 1986, a few years after the imposition of Martial Law.

At the end of the 1980s, colonialism and postcolonial regimes were also compared to Poland's dependence on the USSR. An interesting example can be found in several reviews of Emil Habibi. Discussing a character from Habibi's novel, a Palestinian collaborating with the Israeli state, the reviews employ the term "ketman", which resonates with recent Polish history. It was used by Miłosz, in *The Captive Mind*, to refer to showing obedience towards oppressors without truly embracing the oppressive ideology and to explain Polish intellectuals' responses to Communism. This comparison appears for example in a pro-Party magazine, *Życie Literackie* (Bugajski 1988), which suggests that while *The Captive Mind* was officially banned,⁸ "ketman" was used in the press in the final days of censorship and on the eve of debates about settling accounts with Communism and its supporters. Overall, in the reviews of Habibi, important and controversial events of recent Polish history are interwoven with the history of a region affected by colonialism, while the dilemmas and choices of groups discriminated against in the Middle East are compared with the dilemmas of Eastern European societies during Stalinism.

Another reference to Communism appears in the context of the "Rushdie affair". In 1989, *Literatura na Świecie* reprinted, after the *The New York Times*, statements of solidarity with Rushdie by authors from around the world. This included statements by Miłosz and the dissident intellectual Adam Michnik (Vargas Llosa et al. 1989: 324, 326), who liken Iranian fundamentalism to Polish totalitarianism (e.g. Miłosz stresses that his books had been censored as well). *Literatura na Świecie* also published a piece by the writer Ryszard Kapuściński (1989), who analyses the fatwa as a sign of conflict between democracy and dictatorship and emphasises that Eastern European writers often side with democracy regardless of consequences. He suggests that the role of literature is understood similarly in Eastern Europe and postcolonial countries.

⁸ Over thirty editions were, however, published underground (Pawelec 2011). In 1988 three substantial analyses of *The Captive Mind* appeared in issues No 1 and 5 of the oppositional magazine *Res Publica*.

Polish-postcolonial similarities, 1990–2010

In the transformational decade of the 1990s, comments on Polish-postcolonial similarities appear in about ten per cent of the reviews (10 out of 113 texts), which is similar to the previous decade and, interestingly, twice as often as the discourses of otherness or exoticism in the 1990s. A text from 1995 features one of the most telling comments:

Let us honestly admit that our cultural status also had something to do with the Partitions, i.e. a sort of partial and temporary colonization. For some time you had to go to a colonial metropolis to make a name for yourself: to Petersburg, Vienna, Berlin (...) Maria Skłodowska married a Frenchman to leisurely do her radiation research, Przybyszewski bet on Berlin and Scandinavia, while Conrad worked for British ship owners. Besides, Germany tried to conquer Eastern Europe twice and Russia once (in the twentieth century) to gain a foothold in the game of world domination. And even now, when we are no longer a country of the East but have instead become a country of the South, we must court the former colonizers to get some capital. So we can understand the wretched of the earth as homeless people. We can understand the multiple entanglements and subtle tentacles of the colonial past (Magala 1995: 74).

Through his slightly humorous depiction of gifted individuals who lacked prospects in the peripheries, Magala raises the poignant question of migration, which is present in other reviews from the decade. Besides, he mentions the oft-repeated question of political subjugation by the neighbouring powers but makes an additional point about neo-colonial economic dependence. Finally, his statement is an attempt at self-definition after the fall of the Iron Curtain: the status of “a country of the South” implies a commonality of experience with postcolonial societies, named, after Frantz Fanon, “the wretched of the earth”.

Migration also takes centre stage in an article about Rushdie by the Iranian studies scholar Anna Krasnowolska. Krasnowolska believes that by focusing on the fatwa, debates around *The Satanic Verses* miss the main theme of the novel – the condition of immigrants in Europe – even though this issue should be of great interest to Polish readers. She adds, “for generations, the emigrant complex has been relevant to Poles too” (Krasnowolska 1994), thus drawing attention to similarities between the political, economic and cultural conditions, prevalent in Poland and in post-colonial countries, which cause emigration. She also notes that xenophobic

attitudes to migrants arriving in Europe exist in Poland as well and may get stronger. In hindsight both statements appear very apt and it is hard not to see a contradiction between a strong emigration tradition and a dislike for immigrants.

An important comment regarding Communist oppression appears in a text on André Brink by Michnik. He draws a strong line between the realities of South Africa and Poland, referring to Brink's books as "an encounter with a different world. (...) Without Auschwitz and the Gulag, without Hitler and Stalin (...), without Wojtyła and Solzhenitsyn" (Michnik 1993). At the same time, he says that the worlds are brought closer by similar experiences: "And yet a Polish reader easily recognises the feeling (...) of living under a dictatorship of contempt and helplessness, in a world where a human being becomes an object, a world where the police are omnipotent" (Michnik 1993). What this review illustrates is an interesting oscillation between, on the one hand, a sense of difference conjured by the references to Eastern European history, and, on the other hand, a sense of familiarity anchored in Polish-postcolonial similarities.

In the first decade of the twenty-first century, migration remains an important *tertium comparationis* and is discussed in relation to the timely topics of Polish emigration to Great Britain and multiculturalism. Comparisons between Poland and postcolonial countries and cultures – featuring in 32 out of 243 reviews (13%) – are slightly more common than in the 1990s and, importantly, outnumber instances of othering and exoticism. It is worth noting a piece on Kiran Desai's *The Inheritance of Loss* by Justyna Sobolewska. Sobolewska announces that "the exotic novel about India tells our story too" and then evocatively summarises the commonalities. She writes that "reading the scenes where people queue for an American visa, one might think they're set in 1980s Warsaw", as well as stating: "Fluid borders, resettlements, getting thrown out of your country – it's in our blood" (Sobolewska 2007: 65). According to Sobolewska, the appeal of the "American dream", strong both in Poland and in Desai's India, points not only to material longings but also an inferiority complex, which may result in a mixture of admiration and hatred for the former colonisers, and feelings of superiority and contempt towards those of an equal or lower status. Interestingly, the reviewer adds, "in Poland, we have had similar feelings towards our neighbours: our former colonisers and those colonised by us" (Sobolewska 2007: 65). It is a rare example of referring to Poland's domination over its Eastern neighbours as colonisation. A review of another Indian novel also compares the mentality

of Poles and Indians, saying, in no uncertain terms, that they share “provincialism, anachronism, a sense of mission and resentment against the whole world” (Budrecki 2007: 150).

The topic of Polish emigration, and particularly emigration to the UK in the 2000s, features strongly in Polish journalists’ interviews with British authors of postcolonial descent, who write about second-generation immigrants in a multicultural society. Poles have become a sizable group of immigrants in that society, which creates a link between Polish and postcolonial experiences. Mohsin Hamid (2008) notes that thanks to Eastern Europeans, the immigrant population in Great Britain has become predominantly white. He actually uses the phrase “we, immigrants”, while also implying that race or ethnicity remains an important category in thinking about migration. Nikita Lalwani (2008), in turn, talks about an adaptation phase after which new immigrants stop dividing people into “us” and “them”. After that phase is over, Lalwani adds, Poles in the UK may begin to identify with other immigrant groups. This is a reminder that a similar position does not guarantee identification, solidarity or even cooperation between immigrants, at least in the initial period.

It is worth stressing that these comments come from interviews with postcolonial authors conducted by Polish journalists; such interviews were more common in the 2000s, marking Poland’s participation in the globalising book market. It may be added that the poignant remarks by Sobolewska, mentioned above, were actually published alongside an interview with Desai, who in fact welcomed the idea of Polish-postcolonial similarities. Although the earlier decades saw cases of cultural diplomacy, international delegations and correspondence, it is only at the beginning of the twenty-first century that the Polish reception of postcolonial literature becomes less one-sided and more dialogical.

Last but not least, reading translations of novels set in Western European cities, the reviewers not only think about Polish immigrants in the West but also imagine multiculturalism à la polonaise. Zadie Smith’s *White Teeth* is, according to Adam Szostkiewicz, a book “about the Poland we will live in when, in some five or fifteen years, we will become part of the multi-ethnic and multicultural Europe and world”. However, he adds that this will not happen “if we see a victory of those who pose as the guardians of tradition (...) and do not want any ‘medley of colours’ here” (Szostkiewicz et al. 2002). Smith’s polyphonic novel, translated by Zbigniew Batko, is thus read as the voice of the multicultural West, which Poland – a country of the East

or the South – aspires to join. The review appeared a year before the Polish European Union membership referendum, so the question of “becoming part of Europe” translated into very real political choices.

Conclusion

Translation, editing, publishing and reception help to shape one’s perceptions of Others as well as one’s self-image. The study of reception has shown that readings of translated postcolonial narratives activate Orientalising discourses of otherness, which represent non-Europeans as mysterious savages, fanatical barbarians, unreal figures from exotic lands etc. Discourses of both otherness and exoticism together appeared in twenty-five per cent of reviews in the 1970s, i.e. in every fourth text, and in twenty per cent of the 1980s reviews. They met with criticism, especially in the 1970s and post-2000, and their use decreased to about ten per cent in the 1990s and eight per cent in the 2000s. Assuming that exoticism oscillates between the familiar and the unknown (Huggan 2001: 13), and divisions into “us” and “them” often come from ignorance, it is possible that the growing knowledge about postcolonial countries meant they no longer appeared as exotic and strange. Moreover, the opening of borders after 1989 led to more travel opportunities and with the sudden arrival of colourful products and advertisements on the once-grey streets and television screens, the demand for escapist exoticism decreased.

At the same time, the fact that textbook examples of Orientalism appear in influential press outlets suggests that thinking in terms of “us and “them” has not disappeared (other sources such as news reports from the 1990s, 2000s, and beyond, would probably confirm it). The reasons why othering and exoticising discourses fade out in the postcolonial reviews may include: the specificity of the reviewed literature (insightful prose of postcolonial authors, as opposed to e.g. popular adventure novels with an African backdrop⁹), unwritten rules of public discourse or the reviewers’ own standards and sensitivity.¹⁰

⁹ For example, novels by Wilbur Smith, born in a British family in Northern Rhodesia (today Zambia): in the 1990s twenty-seven books by Smith were published in Polish and the majority had on average three editions (Krajewska, Konieczniak 2009).

¹⁰ It would be interesting to analyse online reviews or comments by non-professional and often anonymous readers and compare the findings.

Perhaps the main finding of my analysis is the sustained use of comparisons between postcolonial and Polish experiences: colonialism and the Partitions, struggle against the coloniser and the German occupant, subjugation by a (post)colonial regime and by the Communist party, emigration to global metropolises from former colonies and from Eastern Europe. Reading postcolonial prose in Polish translation, the reviewers are reminded of their own past and present, which prompts reflections such as “the exotic novel about India tells our story too” (Sobolewska 2007), quoted above. This trend appears on average in about ten per cent of all reviews in a given decade and rises slightly over the four decades (from 7% to 13%). Importantly, in recent decades similarities are noticed more often than differences and the terms “colonies” or “colonialism” are used with reference to Poland.

The analysis of reviews from four decades reveals a rather complex picture of Polish attitudes to postcolonial cultures and an equally complex self-image. During Communism, state-controlled media promoted cooperation with postcolonial countries and some reviewers followed the official geopolitical line, vilifying capitalist metropolises and judging the political stance of Third World writers. On the one hand, attempts, by the official discourse, to appropriate postcolonial literature were likely to put some readers off; this might explain the lack of discussions about postcolonial texts in underground publications (Kandziora et al. 1999). On the other hand, it seems that despite the propagandistic and objectifying treatment of the Third World by the regime, many years of literary exchanges and other contacts with postcolonial countries must have allowed some space for more authentic (for lack of a better word) encounters and for rethinking the boundaries between “us” and “them”. At least some of the comparisons with Polish and postcolonial experiences, signalled earlier, may exemplify or pave a way for such attempts. During Communism, Poland was also identified with Europe and its values or, in uncensored materials, with the West, seen by conservative émigré critics as the antithesis of Russia. After 1989, Poland’s belonging to the West was systematically emphasised, while the accession to NATO and the EU makes Poland, to use a more recent term, part of the global “North”. Yet, a sense of marginality is evident, for example, in the label “a country of the South” from the 1990s. Reflection on Polish identity and on the contemporary meanings of such concepts as “Europe” is also present in evocative and critical comments after the year 2000. In the reviews from the two decades, 1990–2000, reviewers discuss Poland using terms that connote the postcolonial condition (e.g. provincialism or

the emigrant complex) and directly refer to Poland as a colony or, occasionally, a coloniser.

Overall, how do Polish self-perceptions relate to Polish attitudes to post-colonial Others? On the one hand, reviews which stigmatise cultural differences often identify Poland with the West or Europe, imagined in opposition to “irrational”, “fanatical” or “savage” Others. On the other hand, in the years 1990–2010, discussing Polish-postcolonial similarities is accompanied by talking about Poland in postcolonial terms and, perhaps, by a postcolonial self-image. The platform of shared experiences enables Poles to look at non-Europeans from the same level and in the long run may lead to understanding, cooperation and even solidarity. Poland as a stronghold of the West and a country of the South: these motifs co-exist within the corpus of reviews and sometimes even in texts by the same person (e.g. Maria Bojarska) or in the same review (Krzemiński 1975). Commenting on a similar contradiction, in the context of Polish rule in the Borderlands, Bogusław Bakula (2006: 17) writes, “Nowhere (...) is it said that a colonised community cannot display colonising qualities. That is why Poles know perfectly well the world of both the colonised and the colonisers”. This remark also applies to the complexity of Polish attitudes to postcolonial Others.

I have stressed that Polish postcolonial studies tend to treat Polish and non-European topics separately. My analysis shows that the perspectives are interrelated and attitudes to oneself and Others develop dynamically; I argue that including the problematic of non-European postcolonialism in the research materials or meta-critical analyses on postcolonial Poland will help us achieve “a fuller and multifaceted insight into the relations between the Self and the Other” (Wojda 2015: 36). A few research questions may be briefly signalled at this point. Firstly, to what extent does an awareness of similarities between the historical experiences of Poland and former European colonies, facilitated through contact with translated postcolonial literature, allow Poles to re-work their prejudices? Future research might investigate whether and how comparatist impulses manifest in different areas of the public sphere, e.g. in Polish texts about postcolonial countries and their reception, in debates around aiding refugees, in various social campaigns or, last but not least, in history and literature classrooms (e.g. asking how educators approach *In Desert and Wilderness*, which commonly appears on school reading lists). Another issue, raised by my work, which would benefit from further inquiry is: to what extent did the propagandist support of the Eastern Bloc for decolonisation, a smokescreen for the USSR’s own

colonising practices, solidify negative attitudes to postcolonial countries among Poles? Did the official policy of comradely solidarity leave space for revising stereotypes and forging actual solidarity? Finally, new questions may emerge from existing scholarship. A sample question – which is not related to my study but to inquiries into German perceptions of Poles – might ask how German comparisons of Poles to primitive non-European peoples, used to legitimise German politics of Eastern expansion and colonisation (Janion 2006; Surynt 2007), impacted on Polish attitudes to postcolonial peoples. For example, could they have strengthened Poles' resolve to distance themselves from non-Europeans, in a sort of discursive self-defence?

Combining a regional Eastern European perspective with a global one should facilitate attempts to pose and answer such questions. This, in turn, will give us a better understanding of the relations between Polish attitudes to postcolonial Others and Polish self-perceptions and, as a result, a fuller picture of postcolonial Poland's place "on the map of contemporary theory" (Cavanagh 2003: 60). In the future, it is also worth remembering that translation is a crucial space of contact and confrontation, and the discipline of translation studies offers a range of useful research methods, from comparative analyses of translations and originals, to studies of extensive corpora of book reviews.

Bibliography

- Achebe C. 1977. "An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*", *Massachusetts Review* 18(4), pp. 782–794.
- Adamowski J. 2008. "Epoka po Gandhim, czyli Feudalizm nad Gangesem" [Review of A. Adiga, *Biały tygrys*, trans. by L. Stawowy], *Le Monde Diplomatique* 12, pp. 22–23.
- Bakuła B. 2006. "Kolonialne i postkolonialne aspekty polskiego dyskursu kresoznawczego (zarys problematyki)", *Teksty Drugie* 6, pp. 11–33.
- "Bez komentarza". 1989. *Przegląd Wiadomości Agencyjnych* 11, p. 5.
- Białas Z. 1997. "Whose Madagascar? The Case of the Colonised Colon", *English in Africa* 24(2), pp. 15–25.
- Bojarska M. 1984. "Wszelkie pojęcie idzie stępa" [Review of A. Tutuola, *Smakosz wina palmowego. Moje życie w puszczy upiorów*, trans. by E. Skurjat], *Nowe Książki* 9, p. 72–74.
- 1985. "Pani Nadine" [Review of N. Gordimer, *Zapach kwiatów i śmierci*, trans. by A. Glinczanka et al.], *Nowe Książki* 6, pp. 102–104.
- Bolecki W. 2007. "Myśli różne o postkolonializmie. Wstęp do tekstów nie napisanych", *Teksty Drugie* 4, pp. 6–14.

- Borkowska-Arciuch G. 2007. "Polskie doświadczenie kolonialne", *Teksty Drugie* 4, pp. 15–24.
- Borowska H. 1973. "C. Laye – powieściopisarz gwinejski", *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* 17(2), pp. 139–149.
- Broński M. [W. Skalmowski]. 1982. "Obszary mroku", *Kultura* 9, pp. 51–65.
- 1989. "'Szatańska' powieść Rushdiego", *Kultura* 5, pp. 175–185.
- Buchholtz M. 2009. "Poetyka (post)kolonialnej przygody podróżniczej. Przypadki Kornela Makuszyńskiego, Mariana Walentynowicza, Alfreda Szklarskiego i Tomasza Różyckiego", in: M. Buchholtz (ed.), *Studia postkolonialne w literaturoznawstwie i kulturoznawstwie anglojęzycznym*, Toruń: Adam Marszałek, pp. 105–143.
- Budrecki W. 2007. "Review of T.J. Tejpal, *Alchemia pożądania*, trans. by K. Oblucki", *Odra* 7–8, pp. 149–150.
- Bugajski L. 1976. "Review of A. Kourouma, *Fama Dumbuya najprawdziwszy. Dumbuya na białym koniu*, trans. by Z. Stolarek", *Radar* 1, p. 27.
- 1988. "Review of E. Habibi, *Niezwykłe okoliczności zniknięcia niejakiego Saida Abu an-Nahsa z rodu Optysymistów*, trans. by H. Jankowska", *Życie Literackie* 26, p. 15.
- Bukowski W. 1989. "Szatańskie wersety", *Dziennik Ludowy* 53, p. 3.
- Cackowski Z. 1997. "Ostateczne oparcie", *Wiadomości Kulturalne* 40, p. 7.
- Cavanagh C. 2003. "Postkolonialna Polska. Biała plama na mapie współczesnej teorii", trans. by Tomasz Kunz, *Teksty Drugie* 2–3, pp. 60–71.
- Cichoń A. 2004. "W kręgu zagadnień literatury kolonialnej – *W pustyni i w puszczy* Henryka Sienkiewicza", *Er(r)go* 8, pp. 91–108.
- Czapliński P. 2009. "Polityka literatury, czyli pokazywanie języka", in: K. Dunin (red.) *Polityka literatury*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Krytyki Politycznej, pp. 6–39.
- Czeszko B. 1976. "Mozolne odkrywanie Afryki" [Review of A. Kourouma, *Fama Dumbuya najprawdziwszy. Dumbuya na białym koniu*, trans. by Z. Stolarek], *Nowe Książki* 4, pp. 26–27.
- Domańska E. 2008. "Obrazy PRL w perspektywie postkolonialnej. Studium przypadku", in: K. Brzechczyn (red.), *Obrazy PRL. Konceptualizacja realnego socjalizmu w Polsce*, Poznań: Instytut Pamięci Narodowej, pp. 167–186.
- Duć-Fajfer H. 2014. "'Jestem u siebie' – tekstualna opozycja przeciw symbolicznemu wykorzenianiu w literaturach mniejszościowych w Polsce", in: H. Gosk, D. Kołodziejczyk (ed.), *Historie, społeczeństwa, przestrzenie dialogu. Studia postzależnościowe w perspektywie porównawczej*, Kraków: Universitas, p. 449–476.
- Dunin K. 2002. "Kelner i szaman", *Res Publica Nowa* 11, p. 100.
- Fiut A. 2003. "Polonizacja? Kolonizacja?", *Teksty Drugie* 6, pp. 150–156.
- Gaszyńska-Magiera M. 2011. *Recepcja przekładów literatury iberoamerykańskiej w Polsce w latach 1945–2005*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Gąsior P. 2010. "The Taming of the Eastern European Beast? A Case Study of the Translation of a Polish Novel into English", in: A. Fawcett, K.L. Guadarrama Garcia, R. Hyde Parker, (ed.), *Translation: Theory and Practice in Dialogue*, London: Continuum, pp. 147–163.

- Gólaszewski M. 2010. "Afryka i Afrykanie w XIX wieku na łamach *Tygodnika Ilustrowanego*", in: P. Średziński, M. Diouf (ed.), *Afryka w Warszawie: dzieje afrykańskiej diaspory nad Wisłą*, Warszawa: Afryka Inaczej, pp. 35–46.
- Gołuch D. 2011. "Chinua Achebe Translating, Translating Chinua Achebe: On the Polish Translation of *Things Fall Apart*", in: D. Whittaker (ed.), *Chinua Achebe's Things Fall Apart 1958 – 2008*, Amsterdam–New York, NY: Rodopi, pp. 197–218.
- 2013. *Postcolonial Literature in Polish Translation (1970–2010): Difference, Similarity and Solidarity*, PhD thesis, University College London.
- 2014. "What Does Literary Translation Bring to an Understanding of Postcolonial Cultural Perceptions? On the Polish Translation of Amos Tutuola's *The Palm-Wine Drinkard*", in: J. Boase-Beier et al. (eds.), *Literary Translation: Re-Drawing the Boundaries*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 149–167.
- Gosk H. 2010. *Opowieści „skolonizowanego/kolonizatora”. W kręgu studiów postzależnościowych nad literaturą polską XX i XXI wieku*, Kraków: Universitas.
- 2015. *Wychodzenie z „cienia imperium”. Wątki postzależnościowe w literaturze polskiej XX i XXI wieku*, Kraków: Universitas.
- Hamid M. 2008. "Diabelski uśmiech z 11 września" [M. Hamid in conversation with M. Strzelecka], *Gazeta Wyborcza* 146, p. 16.
- Heydel M. 2011. "Do kresu doświadczenia. O czytaniu *Jądra ciemności*", in: J. Conrad, *Jądro ciemności*, trans. by M. Heydel, Kraków: Znak, pp. 101–127.
- Huggan G. 2001. *The Postcolonial Exotic: Marketing the Margins*, Londyn: Routledge.
- Jachołkowska-Bator E. 1976. "Współczesna literatura Syrii", *Życie Literackie* 24, p. 9.
- Jacquemond R. 1992. "Translation and Cultural Hegemony: The Case of French-Arabic Translation", in: L. Venuti (ed.), *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*, London: Routledge, pp. 139–158.
- Janion M. 2006. *Niesamowita Słowiańszczyzna: fantazmaty literatury*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Jarnecki M. 2010. "Fantastyka polityczna czy konieczność. Portugalska Afryka, Nikaragua, Boliwia i Ekwador w polskich planach kolonialnych", *Sprawy Narodowościowe* 36, pp. 93–105.
- Jarniewicz J. 2001. "Pokolonialne kłopoty. Nobel dla Vidiahiara Surajprasada Naipaula", *Tygodnik Powszechny* 42, p. 12.
- 2010. "Afrykaner po apartheidzie" [Review of A. Brink, *Zanim zapomnę*, trans. by H. Falińska], *Gazeta Wyborcza [Kultura supplement]* 126, p. 14.
- Jodłowski M. 1987. "Tygrys nie trudzący się swoją tygrysowością", *Trybuna Opolska* 2, p. 4.
- Kandziora J. et al. (ed.) 1999. *Bez cenzury 1976–1989: literatura, ruch wydawniczy, teatr: bibliografia*, Warszawa: IBL.
- Kapuściński R. 1989. "Chomeini i Rushdie", *Literatura na Świecie* 10, pp. 320–322.
- Karpińska H. 2003. "Gazele wokół domu" [Review of W. Dirie, J. D'Haem, *Córka nomadów*, trans. by K. Chmiel], *Nowe Książki* 2, p. 33.
- Kłobucka A. 2001. "Desert and Wilderness Revisited: Sienkiewicz's Africa in the Polish National Imagination", *The Slavic and East European Journal* 2, pp. 243–259.

- Kobus J., Kukliński M. 2001. "Pełne porozumienie ludzi różnych cywilizacji nie jest możliwe – twierdzi noblista V.S. Naipaul", *Wprost* 42, pp. 126–127.
- Kołodziejczyk D. 2010. "Postkolonialny transfer na Europę Środkowo-Wschodnią", *Teksty Drugie* 5, pp. 22–39.
- Kozak T. et al. 1990. "O Szatańskich wersetach", *Więź* 5/6, pp. 166–167.
- Krajewska E., Konieczniak G. 2009. "Bibliografie literatury dostępnej w przekładach", in: M. Buchholtz (red.), *Studia postkolonialne w literaturoznawstwie i kulturoznawstwie anglojęzycznym*, Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, pp. 312–401.
- Krasnowolska A. 1994. "Dziura po książce", *Tygodnik Powszechny* 2, p. 9.
- Krzemiński A. 1975. "Krucze miseczki niepodległości" [Review of A. Kourouma, *Fama Dumbuya najprawdziwszy. Dumbuya na białym koniu*, trans. by Z. Stolarek; W. Leopold, *Literatura Czarnej Afryki*; W. Leopold, Z. Stolarek (ed.), *Antologia poezji afrykańskiej*, *Polityka* 33, p. 10.
- Lalwani N. 2008. "Samotność w obcym świecie" [N. Lalwani in conversation with P. Wilk], *Rzeczpospolita*, 18 March.
- Leopold W. 1973. *O literaturze czarnej Afryki*, Warszawa: PIW.
- Magala S. 1995. "Pod słońcem, na ziemi, na szerokim świecie" [Review of V.S. Naipaul, *A Way in the World*], *Czas Kultury* 3, pp. 72–74.
- Majewicz A.F. 1989. "Triumf szatana?" *Trybuna Robotnicza* 59, p. 6.
- Mamet-Michalkiewicz M. 2011. *Between the Orient and the Occident: Transformations of The Thousand and One Nights*, Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Marzec B. 2010. "Fatwa ciąży na Rushdiem", *Rzeczpospolita*, 26 Feb, <http://www.rp.pl/artukul/439550.html> [access: 18 April 2016].
- Michnik A. 1993. "André Brink – inne piekło" [Review of A. Brink, *Sucha biała pora*, trans. by T. Wyżyński, *Chwila na wietrze*, trans. by M. Konikowska], *Gazeta Wyborcza* [Książki supplement] 292(11), p. 1.
- Miłosz Cz. 1953. *The Captive Mind*, trans. by J. Zielonko, London: Secker & Warburg.
- Moskalewicz M. 2005. "'Murzynek Bambo czarny, wesoły...' Próba postkolonialnej interpretacji tekstu", *Teksty Drugie* 12, pp. 259–270.
- Mrozek S., Skalmowski W. 2007. *Mrozek, Skalmowski: listy, 1970–2003*, ed. A. Borowski, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Natwar-Singh K. 1973. "Sympatia, przyjaźń, współpraca" [K. Natwar-Singh in conversation with Z. Tyszcza], *WTK. Tygodnik Katolików* 9(1), p. 4.
- Neuger L. 2007. "Central Europe as a Problem", trans. by U. Phillips, in: J. Korek (ed.), *From Sovietology to Postcoloniality. Poland and Ukraine in the Postcolonial Perspective*, Huddinge: Södertörns högskola, pp. 23–31.
- Nowicki K. 1978. "Tajemnice kontynentu" [Review of M. Metelska (ed.), *16 opowiadań afrykańskich*, trans. by M. Metelska et al.], *Fakty* 26, p. 7.
- Pawelec D. 2011. "Zniewolony umysł – zmiana biegunów recepcji", *Postscriptum Polonistyczne* 1, pp. 183–190.
- Piłaszewicz S. 1987. "Wole Soyinka. Laureat Nagrody Nobla", *Przegląd Orientalistyczny* 1, pp. 13–25.
- P.L. 1988. "Z życzliwym uśmiechem" [Review of R.K. Narayan, *Moje dni*, trans. by Z. Reszelewski], *Kontynenty* 6, p. 23.

- Prokop-Janiec E. 2010. "Paradygmat postkolonialny w badaniach kulturowych relacji polsko-żydowskich", in: K. Stępnik, D. Tześniowski (red.), *Studia postkolonialne nad kulturą i cywilizacją polską*, Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, pp. 135–145.
- Rybicki J. 2012. "Sienkiewicz i Szklarski. Staś Tarkowski i Tomek Wilmowski. Rozpoznanie", in: T. Bujnicki, J. Axer (eds.), *Wokół W pustyni i w puszczy. W stulecie pierwodruku powieści*, Kraków: Universitas, pp. 363–376.
- Sadkowski W. 1971. "Przeciw tyranii egzotyki", *Współczesność* 3, p. 11.
- 1986. "W mroku ludzkich serc", *Polityka* 45, p. 10.
- 2001. "Wokół V.S. Naipaula", *Literatura na Świecie* 10–11, pp. 366–368.
- Said E. 1978. *Orientalism*, New York: Pantheon Books.
- 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*, New York: Knopf.
- SAN, 2008. "Super-Booker dla Rushdiego za *Dzieci północy*", *Gazeta Wyborcza* 162, p. 12.
- Skalmowski W. 1995. "Smutek Trynidadu i innych miejsc", *Arkusz* 10, p. 12.
- Skórczewski D. 2006. "Od Murzynka Bambo do Hansa Castorpa, czyli co postkolonializm może zaoferować poloniście", *Postscriptum Polonistyczne* 2, pp. 81–92.
- 2013. *Teoria – literatura – dyskurs. Pejzaż postkolonialny*, Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Sobala A. 1998. "Pakt między światem i snem" [Review of A Roy, *Bóg rzeczy małych*, trans. by T. Bieroń], *Gazeta Wyborcza* [Książki supplement] 163(7), p. 4.
- Sobolewska J. 2007. "Doskonałość utraty. Wywiad z K. Desai", *Przekrój* 42, pp. 64–65.
- Sosnowski M. 2005. "Uczłowieczanie-tego-co-nieludzkie w książeczkach o małpce Fiki-Miki i Murzynku Goga-Goga", *Teksty Drugie* 12, pp. 246–258.
- Sowa J. 2011. *Fantomowe ciało króla. Peryferyjne zmagania z nowoczesną formą*, Kraków: Universitas.
- Spivak, G.C. 2004. "The Politics of Translation", in: L. Venuti (ed.), 2nd edition, *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, pp. 369–88.
- Stańczyk E. 2012. *Contact Zone Identities in the Poetry of Jerzy Harasymowicz: A Postcolonial Analysis*, Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Stolarek Z. 1977. "Drażnienie nocy" ([Review of M. Dib, *Królewski taniec*, trans. B. Durbańo], *Nowe Książki* 16, pp. 19–21.
- Surynt I. 2007. "Badania postkolonialne a 'Drugi Świat'. Niemieckie konstrukcje narodowokolonialne w XIX wieku", *Teksty Drugie* 4, pp. 25–46.
- Szostkiewicz A. et al. 2002. "Korzenie czy nogi" [Review of Z. Smith, *Białe zęby*, trans. by Z. Batko], *Gazeta Wyborcza* [Książki w Dużym Formacie] 265(22), p. 36.
- Thompson E.M. 2000. *Trubadurzy imperium. Literatura rosyjska i kolonializm*, trans. by A. Sierszulska, Kraków: Universitas.
- 2010. "Whose Discourse? Telling the Story in Post-Communist Poland", *The Other Shore, Slavic and East European Culture Abroad, Past and Present* 1, pp. 1–15.
- Tom. 1987. "Cztery łyki egzotyki" [Review of T. Aluko, *Sądny dzień w Ibali*, trans. by E. Skurjat], *Kultura* 13, p. 10.
- Tymoczko M. 1999. *Translation in a Postcolonial Context*, Manchester: St. Jerome.

- Vargas Llosa M. et al. 1989. "Słowa za Salmanem Rushdie", trans. by A. Kołyszko, *Literatura na Świecie* 10, pp. 323–337.
- Vieira E. 1999. "Liberating Calibans: Readings of Antropofagia and Haroldo de Campos' Poetics of Transcreation", in: S. Bassnett, H. Trivedi (ed.), *Post-Colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*, London: Routledge, pp. 95–113.
- Walicki A. 2006. *Mesjanizm Adama Mickiewicza w perspektywie porównawczej*, Warszawa: IFiS.
- Wilk P. 2008. "Śmiertelnie niebezpieczna nadzieja" [Review of T.B. Jelloun, *To oślepiające nieobecne światło*, trans. by M. Szczurek], *Rzeczpospolita*, 24 November, <http://www.rp.pl/arttykul/223817.html> [access: 18 February 2016].
- Wojda D. 2015. *Polska Szeherazada. Swoje i obce z perspektywy postkolonialnej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Wróbel Ł. 2002. "Dusza nomady", *Nowe Książki* 12, pp. 47–49.
- Zaworska H. 1997. "Niesamowita Afryka" [Review of J.M. Coetzee, *W sercu kraju; Życie i czasy Michaela K.*; *Foe*, trans. by M. Konikowska], *Gazeta Wyborcza* [Książki supplement] 18(1), p. 5.
- 2004. "Gniewna stara panna w sercu pustki" [Review of J.M. Coetzee, *W sercu kraju*, trans. by M. Konikowska], *Nowe Książki* 7, pp. 62–63.
- Zieliński S. 1974. "Dwadzieścia jeden kolorowych słoń" [Review of K. Natwar-Singh (ed.), *Opowiadania indyjskie*, trans. by K. Szerer], *Nowe Książki* 3, pp. 13–14.
- Żółkoś M. 2010. "Łowcy kultur. Cykl powieści o Tomku Wilmowskim w świetle myśli postkolonialnej", in: K. Stępnik, D. Trzeźniowski (ed.), *Studia postkolonialne nad kulturą i cywilizacją polską*, Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, pp. 347–358.