

**WERONIKA SZWEBS**

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9806-515X>

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

weronika.szwebs@amu.edu.pl

## TRANSLATOR AS POLEMICIST: THE CLASH OF PARADIGMS IN THE FIRST POLISH EDITION OF SAID'S *ORIENTALISM*<sup>1</sup>

---

### Abstract

The article analyzes the paratextual activity of Witold Kalinowski, the author of the first Polish translation of Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1991), paying special attention to his polemical remarks and their relation to the vision of scientific, theoretical discourse. The translator does not strive for invisibility. On the contrary, he uses footnotes and brackets inserted in the main text to comment on different aspects of Said's work. He signals problems ensuing from the differences between languages and cultures, explains the nature of linguistic difficulties and justifies his own solutions. He also takes on the role of editor and commentator, explaining Said's allusions, supplementing the discussion with additional information, anticipating readers' doubts about certain facts that might sound suspicious, and even inserting bracketed additions and clarifications which suggest that the original is unclear or imprecise. Finally, Kalinowski overtly expresses his polemical attitude: he provides certain parts of Said's discussion with *sic!* annotation (thus suggesting that the author is wrong) and adds footnotes where he argues with what he sees as the author's dubious and far-fetched interpretations. The *Translator's Note* gives certain insight into the nature of the disagreement between the author and the translator. Explaining why *Orientalism* is a difficult book to translate, Kalinowski enumerates its troubling features: the combination of different types of discourse and the large number of polemical accents, due to which the book is not fully scientific. The

---

<sup>1</sup> The article was written as part of the project “Translation of theoretical discourses in the Polish humanities at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries” (no. 2017/25/N/HS2/01585) financed by the National Science Centre, Poland. The author also obtained funding for a doctoral scholarship from the National Science Centre (no. 2018/28/T/HS2/00514).

moment of the book's publication might suggest that such a qualification could have been a result of the then scarce presence of poststructuralist thought and cultural studies in the Polish humanities. However, the analysis of Witold Kalinowski's articles as well as his doctoral thesis from the 1980s shows both his awareness of the theoretical currents that influenced *Orientalism* and his critical attitude towards Marxist thought. It is the aversion to the Marxist-inspired interpretations – both Kalinowski's personal methodological conviction and a widespread attitude in the early post-communist Poland – that seems to be the reason of the clash in the first Polish translation of Said's work.

**Keywords:** travelling theory, Edward Said, orientalism, postcolonialism, translation of theory, translator's visibility

## 1. Travelling *Orientalism*

*Orientalism* by Edward W. Said, published in 1978, is today regarded as one of the founding texts of postcolonial theory and a canonical work within contemporary humanities and social sciences. The book became not only an impetus for further exploration of ideological mechanisms governing representation, and for debunking the entanglements of scientific discourse with political expansion, but also an inspiration in the application of such critical methodology on other fields in the humanities and social sciences (Elmarsafy, Bernard 2013; Gran 2013; Harrison 2013). Critical reaction to Said's concept, however, was not always positive – numerous and often fierce polemics, formulated from various political, institutional and theoretical stands, concerned virtually every angle of his thesis: its general conclusions, ideological assumptions, methodological consistency, research knowledge, factual reliability and style (Huggan 2005; McCarthy 2010). It is worth looking at the elements of the enormous and complex network of factors which brought *Orientalism* to international fame, since it allows for interesting observations on the mechanisms of theory's reach and constitute an important element in the characterisation of local scientific fields.

Said is of course a protagonist in this article as the author of *Orientalism*, but it is worth mentioning that he also wrote an influential article on the migration of theories – *Travelling Theory* (1983), in which he postulates that both the ways in which ideas travel and spread, as well as the responsible mechanisms, should also be considered. According to Said, describing the movement of a theory must take into account and characterise certain recurrent, permanent stages: the starting point – the set of circumstances in which the idea first arose; distance travelled; a set of conditions of acceptability,

the fulfilment of which allows the idea to be adopted in a new context, as well as a set of conditions affecting its new, transformative uses and position in a target context. It must be emphasised that Said does not refer to the issue of interlingual translation and the role of translators neither in his enumeration of the research steps nor in the subsequent analysis. Such issues, however, have been discussed by other scholars focused on tracing theories travelling between languages, cultures and philosophical traditions (Gal 2003; Cassin 2004; Cassin et al. 2014; Susam-Sarajeva 2006). My analysis fits into this particular broad current, but, out of necessity, it will be limited to discussing selected aspects of the first Polish translation of *Orientalism*, and the contextual information concerning the origin and reception of both the original and the translation will be ancillary to the explanation of these aforementioned aspects. I shall discuss the translator's paratextual activity, paying particular attention to his polemical gestures and their relationship with specific assumptions concerning scientific discourse.

Before analysing the translator's paratexts, it is as well to collate the information on the various Polish editions of *Orientalism*. The first Polish translation by Witold Kalinowski, a doctor of philosophy employed at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences, was published by Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy in 1991, but work on it began much earlier. According to the imprint, the translation was "submitted for typesetting in August 1989"; the foreword by Zdzisław Żygulski Jr is dated 1987, and refers to the translator's work.<sup>2</sup> The second translation of *Orientalism* by Monika Wyrwas-Wiśniewska was published in 2005 by Zysk i S-ka publishing house and reissued in 2018.

If one wants to look at the paratextual actions of the first translator, it is also worth mentioning other elements of the paratextual structure of the text that contribute to this edition. The primary motive of such elements, enhanced by the publication of the book in the prestigious series "Biblioteka Myśli Współczesnej" (Library of Contemporary Thought), is to recognise the author and emphasise the prestige and importance of his concept. Said's status is conventionally highlighted by a brief informational note on the back cover. The status of *Orientalism* as an intellectual event – its innovation, success among readers and attractiveness for a wider, Polish, audience – is

---

<sup>2</sup> It is possible that the mention of the translation (quite general and courteous) at the end of the foreword was added later (similarly to the postscript added after 1990), but was included in the continuous text for compositional reasons.

highlighted by an excerpt from an editorial review by Jan Kieniewicz, a professor of history, found on the back cover.<sup>3</sup> A more ambiguous attitude toward Said emerges from the several-page “Introduction to the Polish edition” written by Prof. Zdzisław Żygulski Jr, an art historian specialising in Asian countries. In his summary, Żygulski does justice to the success of the book, and recognises its importance in Poland, but also mentions its controversy, including Said’s tendency to repeat a priori theses obsessively, and the arbitrariness of the image of orientalists he creates. Żygulski devotes much space to the Polish, pre-Saidian understanding of orientalism, inserting a sentence that interestingly deviates from Said’s theory and later applications of postcolonial theory in Poland: “In fact, our orientalism has always been homely, romantic, non-possessive; it has enriched our culture without harming nations that are the source of the artistic inspiration” (p. 9).<sup>4</sup>

## 2. Translator on display

The translator’s comments are undoubtedly the most interesting elements of the Polish edition of *Orientalism*’s paratextual structure. There are at

---

<sup>3</sup> In 2016, Jan Kieniewicz during a debate he initiated, “Perspektywy postkolonializmu w Polsce, Polska w perspektywie postkolonialnej,” (“Postcolonial perspective in Poland, Poland in postcolonial perspective”) mentioned that together with Zdzisław Najder, who lectured at Columbia University and knew Said, they had sought to publish *Orientalism* in Polish at the end of the 1970s/early 1980s (Kieniewicz 2016: 184–185, 270). It is worth emphasising that in 1980, at Najder’s request, Kieniewicz wrote the text “Orientalizm. Idea kształtująca rzeczywistość” (“Orientalism. The Idea that Shapes Reality”) which was supposed to be a review of Said’s book, but which grew to the size of a stand-alone article. It was first submitted to *Twórczość* but eventually was published in *Przegląd Orientalistyczny* in 1987 but with the date of 1985 (Kieniewicz 1985; Kieniewicz 1999: 13). Kieniewicz also referred to *Orientalism* in 1986 in his book *Od ekspansji do dominacji. Próba teorii kolonializmu (From Expansion to Domination. An Attempt at the Theory of Colonialism)* (Kieniewicz 1986: 13).

<sup>4</sup> A crucial element in the assimilation of postcolonial theory in Polish humanities was an attempt to look at Polish culture as being entangled in quasi-colonial or colonial relations of dependence. Adopting such a view allowed Poland to be considered both as a colonised and colonising country. The nature of Polish discourse (political, literary and scientific), concerning the so-called Kresy (Eastern Borderline) was one of the overriding directions of reflection which, in the light of Said’s theory, revealed its ideological entanglement (Bakuła 2006; Bakuła 2015). Considerations on the possibilities of applying postcolonialism within a Polish context were conducted, among others, in the pages of *Teksty Drugie* 2003 no. 2/3, 2003 no. 6, 2006 no. 1/2, 2006 no. 6, 2007 no. 4, 2008 1/2, 2010 no. 5 and 2011 no. 6.

least three reasons for this. Firstly, their number and expressiveness make the translator much more visible than is normally the case, as outlined in translational theory and reading practice (Venuti 1995, 1998). Secondly, they go beyond the set of roles and attitudes traditionally associated with translation – either purely “task-oriented” or based on identification with the author. Thirdly, and most significantly, some of the comments testify to the translator’s polemical attitude toward Said’s reasoning, which may be explained by Kalinowski’s belonging to a different humanistic paradigm than the one represented by the author.

Witold Kalinowski’s paratextual activity manifests itself in several ways. From a formal point of view, his notes represent three categories: parentheses in the main text, footnotes at the bottom of the page, and a one-and-a-half-page note “From the translator” at the end of the book. All the interjections, except those limited to providing the original version of a term or excerpt, were captioned with the initials or the name of the translator. It is clear that Kalinowski does not limit his task to the interlinguistic transfer of content – he highlights specific translation problems, provides supplementary information on the described phenomena, occasionally makes a coherent text adjustments and argues with the author. To give an idea of the character of these paratextual interventions, I will discuss them below, beginning with the most conventional and those which fit into the mould of narrowly understood translator roles and ending with those that go beyond it.

## 2.1. Between languages

Many of Kalinowski’s paratexts are closely related to the translator’s primary task – namely the interlinguistic transfer of content – in that they signal and comment on doubts and problems stemming from the differences between languages or the uncertainty as to the meaning of the original. The least complicated examples include adding parentheses to the main text containing an original term or fragment. There are over twenty such examples in the book, and the problems identified in this way appear locally, which means they do not relate to the terms that appear throughout the book or constitute its theoretical foundation. Apart from adding parentheses in the main text, Kalinowski decides to make comments in the footnotes to signal and explain doubts about translating specific terms. Although there are only a few such situations, they provide insight both into the translator’s

motivations behind a particular choice and sometimes also into the dynamics of discursive changes:

[Original] Now at last we approach the long-developing core of essential knowledge, knowledge both academic and practical, which Cromer and Balfour inherited from a century of modern Western Orientalism: knowledge about and knowledge of Orientals, their race, character, culture, history, traditions, society, and possibilities (p. 38).

W ten sposób zbliżamy się wreszcie do tej wiedzy, wiedzy zarazem akademickiej, jak i praktycznej, którą Cromer i Balfour przejęli po stu latach rozwoju nowoczesnego zachodniego orientalizmu: wiedzy o orientalczykach\*, o ich rasie, charakterze, kulturze, historii, społeczeństwie, tradycjach i perspektywach.

\* Zdecydowałem się tu wprowadzić neologizm, wzorowany na angielskim rzeczowniku *Oriental* (l.mn. *Orientalists*). Czynię tak ze względu na niedogodność operowania terminami „człowiek Wschodu” czy „człowiek Orientu” w dłuższych i bardziej skomplikowanych okresach zdaniowych, usprawiedliwia mnie również szczególnie pejoratywny sens, jaki (zdaniem Saïda) rzeczownikowi *Orientalists* nadawali cytowani w tej książce przedstawiciele, wyznawcy i praktycy orientalizmu; sens, którego daremnie by szukać w polskim „człowieku Orientu”. „Orientalczyk” często nie ma kompletu cech ludzkich, jest intelektualnie, a może i biologicznie – niedorozwinięty. Przypadkowe skądinąd podobieństwo brzmieniowe do słowa „neandertalczyk” nie jest więc aż tak bardzo mylące (*W.K.*) (p. 70).

[I decided to introduce a neologism here (orientalczyk), following the English noun *Oriental* (pl. *Orientalists*). I do so because the use of the terms “człowiek Wschodu” or “człowiek Orientu” (“man of the East” or “man of the Orient”) is inconvenient in longer and more complicated sentences; a further justification arises from the pejorative meaning (in Saïd’s opinion) given to the noun *Orientalists* by the representatives, adherents and practitioners of Orientalism quoted in this book, a meaning that cannot be found in the Polish “człowiek Orientu.” “Orientalczyk” often lacks all human features, and is intellectually, or even biologically, retarded. The accidental sonic resemblance to the word “Neanderthal” is therefore not so misleading (*W.K.*)]

Kalinowski’s decision is plausible from the perspective of language economics, and the remaining arguments are at least understandable, although one may wonder about the results of introducing the neologism in place of a historically rooted and even biased term. It is no wonder that it is difficult to obtain a similar effect when considering not only systemic

but also historical differences between languages. As noted above, the neologism “orientalczyk” actually appears throughout the entire book, but the translator does not entirely abandon the terms “ludzie Wschodu” and “człowiek Wschodu.”<sup>5</sup>

Besides highlighting the motivations of the translator’s choices, footnotes sometimes make it possible to observe the evolution of the Polish language as related to socio-cultural changes:

[Original] Orientalism itself, furthermore, was an exclusively male province; like so many professional guilds during the modern period, it viewed itself and its subject matter with sexist blinders<sup>6</sup> (p. 207).

Nadto i sam orientalizm był domeną wyłącznie męską; jak wiele innych środowisk profesjonalnych okresu nowożytnego, patrzył on na siebie i na swój przedmiot przez końskie okulary ideologii seksu\*.

[Moreover, orientalism itself was an exclusively male province; like many other professional guilds of the modern period, it looked at itself and its subject through one-sided sex ideology\*.]

\*„...ideologii seksu” – w oryginale po prostu: *sexist blinders*. Pragnę jednak uniknąć przenoszenia na grunt polski terminu „seksizm”, który wprawdzie coraz bardziej przyjmuje się w zachodniej publicystyce, ale po polsku brzmi wyjątkowo niezręcznie (*W.K.*) (p. 303–304).

[“...sex ideology” – in the original: *sexist blinders*. However, I would like to avoid transferring into Polish the term “sexism,” which, although more and more established in Western journalism, sounds exceptionally awkward in Polish (*W.K.*).]

Stating that the term “sexism” sounds “exceptionally awkward” in Polish is, in fact, just one person’s opinion, yet it can – and even should be – commented on from a broader perspective and treated as a sign of the times<sup>7</sup>. Nowadays, it is hard to imagine that the unfamiliarity of the word “sexism” would be so marked as to be untranslatable. Interpretation of some phenomena in this key may be considered alien, but the word itself is familiar,

<sup>5</sup> Wyrwas-Wiśniewska uses terms “człowiek Wschodu” and “ludzie Wschodu”.

<sup>6</sup> All the phrases marked in bold are mine.

<sup>7</sup> Wyrwas-Wiśniewska here uses the term “sexist blinders” (p. 292).

even if identified as a political tool of the opposition. One can wonder how a domesticating paraphrase of the term influences the sense and overtone of the excerpt. How does “sexism” relate to “sex ideology”? “Sex ideology” brings to mind looking at all aspects of reality through sex rather than through the (discriminatory) lens of gender. The statement that orientalists look at their subject “through one-sided sex ideology” suggests Said’s interpretation developed elsewhere, according to which orientalists create a stereotypical vision of excessively excited and perpetually sexually unsatisfied Arabs. Due to these shifts, the terms “gender discrimination” or “gender bias” would be safer solutions. The choice of “sex ideology” does not invalidate Said’s interpretation but makes it more ambiguous.

Kalinowski uses footnotes also to comment on problems and doubts related to impossible-to-translate ambiguity or wordplay. Sometimes he reveals the background of the foreign language to draw attention to a semantic or stylistic nuance:

[Original] Between 1882, the year in which England occupied Egypt and put an end to the nationalist rebellion of Colonel Arabi, and 1907, England’s representative in Egypt, Egypt’s master, was Evelyn Baring (also known as “Over-baring”), Lord Cromer (p. 35).

Począwszy od 1882 roku, kiedy to Anglicy zajęli cały Egipt i położyli kres patriotycznemu powstaniu pułkownika Arabiego, aż do roku 1907 głównym przedstawicielem Anglii w Egipcie, faktycznym panem Egiptu był Evelyn Baring (przezwanym też Over-baring\*) Lord Cromer.

\* *Over-baring* – słowo to (w nieco innej pisowni: *over-bearing*) znaczy: arogancki, apodyktyczny (*W.K.*) (p. 66).

[*Over-baring* – the word (with a slightly different spelling: *over-bearing*) means: arrogant, authoritarian (*W.K.*).]

[Original] However, when Curzon referred somewhat inelegantly to Oriental studies as “the necessary furniture of Empire,” he was putting into a static image the transactions by which Englishmen and natives conducted their business and kept their places (p. 215).

Kiedy Curzon niezbyt elegancko\* określał studia orientalne jako „niezbędne wyposażenie imperium”, zatrzymywał tym samym w statycznym obrazie transakcje, poprzez które Anglicy i krajowcy prowadzili i kontynuowali wspólne interesy.



\* „...niezbyt elegancko...” – ściślej mówiąc, Said użył słowa *furniture*, czyli „umeblowanie” lub nawet „mebel” (*W.K.*) (p. 313–314).

[“...somewhat inelegantly... – to be more precise, Said used the word *furniture* which means “umeblowanie” or even “mebel” (*W.K.*.)]

While in the first example, the footnote is necessary to preserve the element of the characteristics present in the original<sup>8</sup> in the second, it is a much less obligatory complement in discussing a linguistic nuance, despite finding quite a satisfying Polish equivalent. The examples mentioned above affirm that visibility is not a source of discomfort for Kalinowski. He provides footnotes not only where their absence could result in making the translator responsible for an unjustified decision, but also in cases where they constitute a useful, but not necessary supplement, and where their absence would not confuse readers. Despite the relationship footnotes have with the narrowly understood role of the translator (who is responsible for the transfer of the text from one language to another), they go beyond the norm – their non-occasional presence and character affirm the translator’s willingness to be noticed.

## 2.2. Erudition and editing

The first Polish edition of *Orientalism* contains numerous examples of aside interjections by the translator that indicate his departure from the narrowly understood role of the translator, moving more towards the role of an editor and commentator. At least one of the aspects of this role is relatively conventional. Although it is not closely related to the problems of interlinguistic transfer, in practice, it is even more common in translators’ paratextual activity than explaining the intricacies and translation issues arising from differences between languages.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, for the sake of order, it should be noted that in Kalinowski’s translation, there are over twenty footnotes mostly containing biographical information about the figure mentioned by

<sup>8</sup> Wyrwas-Wiśniewska omits the untranslatable wordplay and does not explain this decision in a footnote (p. 71).

<sup>9</sup> This is what happens in Wyrwas-Wiśniewska’s translation. There are more than thirty only encyclopaedic or dictionary footnotes (which are not related to problems generated by translation).

Said, and sometimes also explaining the concept, name of the institution or historical event. In footnotes, Kalinowski also translates all French quotations that appear in Said's text, which, both in the original and in the second Polish translation, were left untranslated.

In the first Polish translation of *Orientalism*, there are also much more interesting and less conventional editorial and commentary gestures, which are not limited to preventing the effects of deficiencies in encyclopaedic or polyglot erudition. In a few cases, Kalinowski introduces footnotes that are intended to explain Said's allusions or to supplement his argument with additional information:

[Original] For Renan was succeeding to the chair of Hebrew. And his lecture was on the contribution of the Semitic peoples to the history of civilization. What more subtle affront could there be to "sacred" history than the substitution of a philological laboratory for divine intervention in history (...) (p. 139).

Albowiem Renan obejmował wtedy katedrę hebrajskiego, a przedmiotem odczytu był wkład ludów semickich w historię cywilizacji. Czy można było zatem subtelniej zadrwić ze „świętej” historii, niż wstawiając do niej, na miejsce boskiej interwencji, laboratorium filologiczne?\*

\* Tydzień później, 27 lutego 1862, Renan całkiem już otwarcie dał wyraz swojemu sceptycyzmowi wobec przekazu biblijnego. Powiedział mianowicie, że Jezus nie był Bogiem, lecz tylko „wyjątkowym człowiekiem”. Wywołało to skandal; wykłady Renana w Collège de France zawieszono na wiele lat; wznowił je dopiero w 1871 roku (*W.K.*) (p. 209).

[A week later, on February 27, 1862, Renan openly gave voice to his skepticism about the biblical message. He said that Jesus was not God, but "a special man." It caused a scandal; Renan's lectures at the Collège de France were suspended for many years; he resumed them only in 1871 (*W.K.*).]

Sometimes the translator anticipates possible doubts of suspicious readers with his comments:<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> A similar example is the explanation of the usage of the feminine verb when referring to George Eliot: "George Eliot to pseudonim pisarki, której prawdziwe nazwisko brzmiało Mary Ann Evans (*W.K.*)" ("George Eliot was the pseudonym of a writer whose real name was Mary Ann Evans") (p. 253). For the sake of clarity, it should be mentioned that in the part of the book preceding this footnote, the translator uses masculine nouns several times to refer to Eliot.

[Original] In the Christian West, Orientalism is considered to have commenced its formal existence with the decision of the Church Council of Vienne in 1312 to establish a series of chairs in “Arabic, Greek, Hebrew, and Syriac at Paris, Oxford, Bologna, Avignon, and Salamanca” (p. 49–50).

Za formalny początek orientalizmu na chrześcijańskim Zachodzie uważa się na ogół decyzje Rady Ekumenicznej Kościoła w Vienne\* w 1312 roku ustanawiające katedry języków „arabskiego, greckiego, hebrajskiego i syryjskiego na uniwersytetach w Paryżu, Oksfordzie, Bolonii, Avignonie i Salamance”.

\* To nie jest pomyłka tłumacza. W oryginale wyraźnie Vienne, czyli miasto w pobliżu Lyonu, a nie Vienna, czyli Wiedeń. Rzecz zdarzyła się w okresie, kiedy siedzibą papieży był pobliski Avignon (*W.K.*) (p. 87).

[This is not a translator’s mistake. In the original, it is Vienne, so a city near Lyon, not Vienna. The event happened during the period of the Avignon Papacy (*W.K.*.)]

Taking into account only Kalinowski’s statement, the situation seems quite simple: the translator assumes that a reader who knows English might suspect that the name Vienne is a result of a spelling mistake and that it could place the burden of responsibility for the alleged mistake on the translator. Commenting on the decision allows him to deflect any such accusations and, what is more, to provide additional information. If we look more broadly at the problem, we can draw conclusions from this footnote about Kalinowski’s attitude to the issue of a translator’s visibility. Firstly, by anticipating unfair accusations of a mistake, he assumes – contrary to popular belief – that a reader will remember the translator’s mediation and, therefore, that the translator is visible. Secondly, by speaking up when the convention does not require it, and on a subject not exceptionally controversial or crucial to Said’s argument, Kalinowski proves that visibility does not worry him.

Kalinowski’s editorial and commentary activity often take even more unusual forms, which can be interpreted as a sign of his polemical attitude towards Said’s book. About 30 square brackets appear in the translation, indicating that the source text is considered unclear, imprecise and requires editing.<sup>11</sup> Such gestures perform several functions, although in some cases,

---

<sup>11</sup> Examples not mentioned in the article are on following pages: 68, 69, 143, 154, 222, 267, 307, 339, 350, 351, 352, 358, 359, 364, 385, 386, 387, 388, 390, 390-391, 395, 396, 398, 411, 452.

it is difficult to decide which one is dominant. Sometimes the annotations are intended to disambiguate Said's argument and to reorganise it; in others, the stake is not so much understanding as stylistic quality, and sometimes the content in parentheses is necessary to provide logical completeness, grammatical correctness and comprehensibility. Here are a few examples that represent those possibilities:

## 1.

[Original] Just as a land barrier could be transmuted into a liquid artery, so too the Orient was transubstantiated from resistant hostility into obliging, and submissive, partnership. After de Lesseps no one could speak of the Orient as belonging to another world, strictly speaking. There was only "our" world, "one" world bound together because the Suez Canal had frustrated those last provincials who still believed in the difference between worlds (p. 92).

Tak jak można było tamę naturalnego łądu przemienić w szlak wodny, tak też wschód został cudownie przemieniony ze stawiającego opór wroga w posłusznego i powolnego partnera. Po dokonaniach Lessepsa nikt już nie mógł poważnie mówić, że Orient to inny świat. Istniał już tylko jeden świat, „nasz świat”, świat zjednoczony; po otwarciu Kanału Sueskiego zniknęły gdzieś rzeczniczy zasadniczych różnic między światami [Wschodu i Zachodu – *W.K.*] (p. 145).

[Just as a dam of natural land could be turned into a waterway, so was the east miraculously transformed from a resisting enemy into an obedient and slow mate. After Lesseps' accomplishments, no one could seriously say that the Orient was a different world. There was only one world left, "our world", a united world; after the opening of the Suez Canal, the spokesmen of the fundamental differences between the worlds [of the East and the West – *W.K.*] have disappeared.]

## 2.

[Original] But how did and does Orientalism work? How can one describe it all together as a historical phenomenon, a way of thought, a contemporary problem, and a material reality? Consider Cromer again, an accomplished technician of empire but also a beneficiary of Orientalism. He can furnish us with a rudimentary answer (p. 44).

W jaki sposób jednak orientalizm działa? Jak można opisać go zarazem jako fenomen historyczny, jako sposób myślenia, jako problem do rozwiązania na dziś i jako materialną rzeczywistość? Powróćmy do Cromera, tego utalentowa-

nego technologa imperium, ale jednocześnie beneficjenta orientalizmu. Jego przykład daje nam jakąś elementarną odpowiedź [na pierwsze pytanie – *W.K.*] (p. 79).

[But how does orientalism work? How can it be described as a historical phenomenon, as a way of thinking, as a problem to be solved today and as a material reality at the same time? Let us return to Cromer, this gifted technologist of the empire, but at the same time a beneficiary of orientalism. His example gives us some elementary answer [to the first question – *W.K.*]

### 3.

[Original] Vatikiotis sets the tone of the collection with a quasi-medical definition of revolution, but since Arab revolution is in his mind and in his readers', the hostility of the definition seems acceptable (p. 312).

Vatikiotis określa w ten sposób tonację całego zbioru studiów: jest to quasi-medyczna definicja rewolucji; ponieważ jednak rewolucja arabska jest w przekonaniu Vatikiotisa i jego czytelników [czymś śmiertelnie groźnym – *W.K.*] więc i nieprzyjazny ton definicji wydaje im się do przyjęcia (p. 446).

[Vatikiotis thus defines the key of the entire body of studies: it is a quasi-medical definition of revolution; however, since the Arab revolution is in the opinion of Vatikiotis and his readers [something deadly – *W.K.*] so the unfriendly tone of the definition seems acceptable to them.]

In the first of the examples mentioned above, the annotation in parentheses gives an impression that it is supposed to make Said's text more organised and less ambiguous. In light of the argument presented in the paragraph, however, it is easy to conclude which worlds are being discussed. The second example presents a slightly different intention. It seems that Kalinowski is not leading the reader through a text that is, in his opinion, too complicated, but rather considers the author's style imprecise or unaesthetic, and therefore edits it. It is hard to imagine how the reader could believe it was possible that "Cromer's example" would provide an answer to the question concerning methodology, and not the question concerning the way orientalism works. The third example is the most explicit testimony in recognising Said's text as rough-edged and requiring editing. Although the original sentence is awkwardly constructed, it is correct and contains all the necessary information. The Polish version, however, is translated as if it is logically incomplete and incomprehensible without the note in parentheses.

Kalinowski's interventions encourage reflection on some of the features of Said's writing, but above all, they are a source of information about the way the translator sees and understands the text, the attitude he has towards the translated book, together with his personal views on the nature of his task. The cited notes above clarify problems that in fact do not seem particularly difficult to negotiate and which sometimes, as in the third example, suggest an incompleteness that does not exist in the original. Therefore, it can be concluded that Kalinowski perceives Said's text as poorly written, vague, and in need of editing. Having identified some elements as logical and stylistic "bungles" by the author, he decides neither to leave them without comment, nor to correct them in a way unnoticeable to the reader. In many cases, these so-called "mistakes" are so trivial that such actions would be perfectly within the bounds of the traditionally understood translator's privilege. Kalinowski translates Said by rendering in Polish those fragments which, in his judgement, are weaknesses by the author, and then subsequently adds his editorial adjustments. In this way, he expresses the desire to reliably convey the author's reasoning and style (even if he sometimes fails to understand either), yet at the same time, he gives an impression that Said's text is characterised by vague argumentation and stylistic awkwardness.

Kalinowski's need to complement, clarify and edit Said's text, visible in parentheses, and which occasionally verges on polemic, also seems to stem from some more elementary uncertainty about the nature of Said's discourse and doubts about the status of some of his statements:

Jak pisze Laroui, „przymiotniki, którymi von Grunebaum opatruje słowo 'islam' (średniowieczny, klasyczny, współczesny), są neutralne, a przy tym zbyteczne: nie ma [u niego – *W.K.*] różnicy między islamem klasycznym a islamem średniowiecznym (p. 424).

Mając do czynienia z oczywistą [dlań – *W.K.*] nieudolnością i niesprawnością polityczną współczesnych orientalczyków, europejski specjalista uznawał za swój obowiązek uratować jakąś część zapomnianej, antycznej wielkości Wschodu i wykorzystać ją jako „ułatwiający życie udoskonalenie” Orientu współczesnego (p. 127).

[As Laroui writes, “adjectives that von Grunebaum assigns to the word ‘Islam’ (medieval, classical, modern) are neutral and, at the same time, superfluous: there is no difference [in his text – *W.K.*] between classical Islam and medieval Islam”.

Dealing with the obvious [for him – *W.K.*] ineptitude and political inefficiency of contemporary Orientals, the European specialist considered it his duty to save some part of the forgotten, ancient greatness of the East and use it as a “life-facilitating improvement” of the modern Orient.]

In the above examples, Said uses free indirect speech, and in some passages, he writes from the point of view of the characters whose activities and opinions he wants to present. In such cases, Kalinowski often strives to disambiguate the fragment in order to make clear to whom a given statement should be attributed, and to emphasise the discrepancy between the orientalist’s point of view and Said’s own position.

### 2.3. Dissenting opinion

The translator’s polemical attitude is not only implicitly expressed, as in the above-mentioned examples. Some paratexts are the field of quite open polemics with Said, though developed to a different extent. Since differences of opinion between author and translator manifested in a given text is a relatively rare phenomenon, I will discuss all examples, trying to reflect on their essence and cause. Kalinowski openly argues with Said’s theses in two ways. Firstly he adds square brackets after a questionable statement with the note *sic!*, generally used to point out a mistake in the quoted text. In the translation of *Orientalism*, such a solution appears three times:

#### 1.

[Original] Sir Alfred Lyall once said to me: “Accuracy is abhorrent to the Oriental mind. Every Anglo-Indian should always remember that maxim” (p. 38).

Sir Alfred Lyall powiedział mi kiedyś: „umysł orientalczyka brzydzi się ścisłością. Każdy Anglo-Hindus [*sic!* – *W.K.*] winien zawsze o tym pamiętać” (p. 71).

[Sir Alfred Lyall once said to me: “the oriental mind abhors accuracy. Every Anglo-Indian [*sic!* – *W.K.*] should always remember about it”.]

## 2.

[Original] Between the silent appeal of Islam to a monolithic community of orthodox believers and a whole merely verbal articulation of Islam by misled corps of political activists, desperate clerks, and opportunistic reformers: there Gibb stood, wrote, reformulated (p. 282).

Ta platforma – w połowie drogi między milczącym oddziaływaniem islamu na jednolitą społeczność ortodoksyjnych wyznawców a werbalną jedynie artykulacją islamu uprawianego przez zbłąkane stadko działaczy politycznych, zdesperowanych intelektualistów i oportunistycznych reformatorów [*sic!* – *W.K.*] – to miejsce, gdzie staje Gibb: pisarz, który formułuje swój przedmiot na nowo (p. 404).

[This platform – halfway between the silent influence of Islam on the homogenous community of orthodox believers and the verbal articulation of Islam cultivated by a stray flock of political activists, desperate intellectuals and opportunistic reformers [*sic!* – *W.K.*] – this is where Gibb stands: the writer who formulates his subject anew.]

## 3.

[Original] The contradiction in Gibb's work – for it is a contradiction to speak of "Islam" as neither what its clerical adherents in fact say it is nor what, if they could, its lay followers would say about it – is muted somewhat by the metaphysical attitude governing his work, and indeed governing the whole history of modern Orientalism which he inherited, through mentors like Macdonald (p. 283).

Sprzeczności rozważań Gibba – bo jest sprzecznością [*sic!* – *W.K.*] mówić o islamie, który nie jest ani tym, co o islamie mówią jego rzecznicy – duchowni, ani tym, co powiedzieliby o nim (gdyby mieli taką możliwość) jego świeccy wyznawcy – sprzeczności te zaciera w jakiejś mierze metafizyczna postawa dominująca w jego pracach, a w istocie dominująca także w całej historii nowoczesnego orientalizmu, której tradycje odziedziczył Gibb poprzez takich mistrzów jak Macdonald (p. 404).

[The contradictions in Gibb's considerations – because it is a contradiction [*sic!* – *W.K.*] to speak of Islam, which is neither what its spokesmen – clergymen say about Islam, nor what its lay followers would say about it (if they had the opportunity) – these contradictions are to some extent blurred by the metaphysical attitude dominating in his works, and in fact dominant throughout the



history of modern Orientalism, the traditions of which Gibb inherited through such masters as Macdonald.]

Any additional explanations in the footnotes do not accompany the notes in parentheses, and one might wonder what made the translator consider Said's arguments controversial. In the first fragment, the note *sic!* refers to the translation of an Anglo-Indian term, in this context meaning a person of English origin born or residing in India. Kalinowski chose a solution structurally corresponding to the original – "Anglo-Hindus." Despite this correspondence, its linguistic sense suggests an anglicised Hindu, and therefore may be misleading because of the absence of a disambiguating tradition and history of this term. *Sic!* could therefore be a way of expressing doubts as to whether Said uses an appropriate term, or uncertainty about what this term denotes and how to translate it. In the second example, Kalinowski probably considered the term "opportunistic reformers" to be an oxymoron – after all, one cannot pursue reform and accept the status quo at the same time. In the light of Said's reasoning, however, such a term is not incomprehensible because opportunism refers to the tardiness of the Muslim clergy who delay introducing reforms. In the third example, we can see the translator's objection to the legitimacy of Said's critical remark against one of the Orientalists. It is difficult to decide whether the objection is related to the repertoire of interpreting Islam allowed by Said or to the insufficiently precise (e.g. from the logical point of view) use of the word "contradiction". The common feature of all the above examples is that none of them used *sic!* to mark the author's simple and apparent factual error, and in the second and the third examples, it was used to indicate an objection to the interpretation suggested by Said.

The second means by which the translator openly argues with the author is to add a comment in a footnote. This type of intervention appears in Kalinowski's translation three times and helps him express his opposition to interpretations proposed by Said. Where does this objection come from? What does it reveal? Is it possible to assess its validity? Let us take a closer look at the examples:

[Original] In addition, this power would also enter a history whose common element was defined by figures no less great than Homer, Alexander, Caesar, Plato, Solon, and Pythagoras, who graced the Orient with their prior presence there (p. 85).

Nadto ta nowa potęga miała znaleźć się w szeregu historycznym, wyznaczonym przez postaci nie mniejszej miary niż Homer, Aleksander, Juliusz Cezar, Platon, Solon, Pitagoras – którzy zaszczytili Orient swoją tam obecnością\*.

\* Homer (...) Platon (...) Pitagoras – fragment ten stanowi dobitny przykład nadużyć interpretacyjnych, jakich niestety dopuszcza się Said w swojej krytyce orientalizmu. Komentowany tu tekst Fouriera stwierdza jedynie, że wielcy intelektualiści starożytności wędrowali do Egiptu, by się tam uczyć (w wersji angielskiej: „Homer, Lycurgus, Solon, Pythagoras and Plato all went to Egypt to study the sciences, religion and the laws”: według Saída – „who graced the Orient with their prior presence there”) – (*W.K.*) (p. 135).

[Homer (...) Platon (...) Pitagoras – this fragment is a striking example of Said’s misinterpretation in his critique of Orientalism. Fourier’s text commented on here only states that the great ancient intellectuals travelled to Egypt in order to learn (in English: “Homer, Lycurgus, Solon, Pythagoras and Plato all went to Egypt to study the sciences, religion and the laws”: according to Saída – “who graced the Orient with their prior presence there”) (*W.K.*.)]

Here, the disagreement stems not so much from the different opinions on the validity of a particular thesis but from the fact that Kalinowski does not recognise or accept Saída’s rhetorical and interpretative method. In a footnote, the translator cites a passage that appears in the text a few lines earlier, assuming that it is some explicit statement expressed in it that forms the basis for the author’s malicious remark. Proving that it is not so would be, therefore, tantamount to proving that Saída’s remark is unfounded. However, Saída does not seem to suggest that his irony directly comes from Fourier’s text – it is much broader and derives from the critical and personally engaged attitude which, in the book, is expressed both implicitly and explicitly – for instance, in the introduction. Although the footnote states otherwise, the essence of the disagreement between author and translator does not lie in a specific, detailed interpretation but in the approach to the acceptability of specific rhetorical procedures, as in the following example of polemic:

[Original] (another instructive change: the impression here is that many churches, of three kinds, were attacked; the earlier version is specific about three churches) (p. 317).

(następna znacząca zmiana: odnosimy wrażenie, że zaatakowano wiele kościołów tych trzech wyznań\* – podczas gdy we wcześniejszej wersji mowa jest o trzech konkretnych kościołach).

\* **Interpretacja cokolwiek naciągnięta.** Składnia, jaką posłużył się Lewis, nie sugeruje jednoznacznie, że napadniętych kościołów było więcej niż trzy: „several churches, Catholic, Armenian and Greek Orthodox, were attacked and damaged” (*W.K.*) (p. 453).

[**The interpretation is far-fetched.** The syntax used by Lewis does not directly suggest that there were more than three churches attacked: “several churches, Catholic, Armenian and Greek Orthodox, were attacked and damaged” (*W.K.*.)]

In this case, Kalinowski disputes the interpretation made by Said based on a specific text, or more precisely, two texts. The first is *The Revolt of Islam* by Bernard Lewis (1964), and the second is its slightly revised version, *The Return of Islam* (1976). Said believes that changes made in the second version of the text were not ideologically innocent and were intended to portray the Arabs as an aggressive crowd, prone to uncontrollable emotions. To prove this thesis, he analyses, among other things, the excerpt in which there is a change in methods of calculating the damage caused during the anti-imperialist riots in Egypt in 1945. In the first version, we find: “a Catholic, an Armenian, and a Greek Orthodox church were attacked and damaged” (pp. 316–317), and in the second: “several churches, Catholic, Armenian, and Greek Orthodox (...) were attacked and damaged” (p. 317). According to Said, the change in sentence structure made the degree of damage seem greater. In the first version, three churches of various denominations were mentioned, while the second one states that several churches were destroyed and belonged to three denominations, without specifying (for example, with articles) that it was one church of each denomination. Although Kalinowski is right in saying that “syntax used by Lewis does not directly suggest that there were more than three churches attacked,” it does not necessarily resolve the dispute in his favour. Said does not claim that the second version indicates greater damage but that the original version, unambiguously referring to three churches, was changed to one that allows readers to imagine more of them – and here he is right. In short, Said accuses Lewis of manipulation, if not a direct lie. It would be less risky to wonder if Lewis’s change significantly affects the meaning of the text or whether it is possible to be sure that it was introduced for ideological reasons and not for stylistic ones, for example. Kalinowski does not choose this direction of reasoning, and it is not easy to agree with his opinion. One further example requires analysis:

[Original] Under the auspices of the School of Oriental and African Studies there appeared in 1972 a volume entitled *Revolution in the Middle East and Other Case Studies*, edited by P. J. Vatikiotis. The title is overtly medical, for we are expected to think of Orientalists as finally being given the benefit of what “traditional” Orientalism usually avoided: psychoclinical attention (p. 312).

Pod auspicjami The School of Oriental and African Studies ukazał się w 1972 roku tom zatytułowany *Revolution in the Middle East and Other Case Studies* pod redakcją P.J. Vatikiotisa. Tytuł jest ostentacyjnie medyczny\*, oczekuje się bowiem uznania szczególnej zdolności współczesnych orientalistów (...) do psychoklinicznej opieki nad przedmiotem ich badań.

\* Nadużycie interpretacyjne Saïda. Termin *case study* (badanie konkretnego przypadku), choć pochodzące zapewne z medycyny, jest powszechnie przyjętym określeniem pewnej metody badawczej w socjologii – tak powszechnie, że na przykład w polskiej literaturze socjologicznej na ogół się go nie tłumaczy, pozostawiając angielską nazwę. **Napisałem: nadużycie, a nie: błąd czy lapsus, bo Saïd zbyt dobrze zna współczesną socjologię, by mógł o tym wszystkim po prostu nie wiedzieć (W.K.)** (p. 446).

[Saïd’s misinterpretation. The term *case study* (study of a specific case), although probably derived from medicine, is a commonly accepted term for a particular research method in sociology – so commonly used that, for example, it is usually not translated in Polish sociological literature as the English name is used. **I wrote: misinterpretation, not: a mistake or a lapsus because Saïd knows contemporary sociology too well not to be aware of all this (W.K.).**]

In this case, Kalinowski argues with Saïd’s statement that the title with the phrase *case study* has pointedly medical connotations and rightly notes that this term is also ubiquitous in sociology. For the record, it should be noted that Saïd’s remark may have resulted from the transfer and extension of the medical connotation to the title, which he found in Vatikiotis’s preface; nevertheless, Kalinowski’s doubts seems justified here.

Regardless of the degree of validity of Kalinowski’s remarks, two things should be noted. Firstly, the very existence of such annotations proves the translator’s unusual approach to his task. It seems that Kalinowski openly assumes that his role is not limited to making an interlinguistic transfer, nor even to explaining wordplay and ambiguities or providing encyclopaedic footnotes. His role and perhaps his obligation is to comment on the text from the position of a discussant interested in taking part in an intellectual debate.

The attitude of an intellectual commitment to socially essential matters, the desire for intellectual honesty, and the need for accuracy and reliability can be seen here. Besides, Kalinowski's attitude is rare even among translators who make a conscious choice to be visible. It is manifested in his polemical footnotes, not only by the lack of conviction as to the validity of some arguments, but also by a polemical, sceptical, distrustful attitude towards the concept – and perhaps more towards Said's method – in general. Kalinowski openly credits Said not so much with inattention resulting in a mistake or lack of accuracy, but rather with conscious malpractices. The statement claiming "striking example of Said's misinterpretation" gives the impression that they are numerous and significant and suggests an ambivalent attitude towards the whole book. It is worth discussing possible reasons for this state of affairs, referring to the comments from the translator's afterword.

### 3. Causes of the clash

A deeper insight into the reason for the differences of opinion presented above is offered in the translator's afterword. Kalinowski describes the main features of *Orientalism* which result in difficulties in translation:

Przekład książki Saida jest **kłopotliwy** (jak sądzę: dla każdego tłumacza i na każdy język), dlatego że nastąpiło w niej  **pomieszanie różnych rodzajów dyskursu**. Jest to w zasadzie **praca naukowa albo przynajmniej popularnonaukowa**, ale **pelno w niej akcentów polemicznych**. (...) Przedmiotem jego [Saida – W.Sz.] **namiętnych polemik** stają się nie tylko uczeni, lecz także publicyści i pisarze, malarze i poeci. Jednakże ten, **kto naukowo polemizuje z poezją, przestaje mówić językiem nauki i sam przekształca się w poetę**. **Jego wypowiedzi stają się nieuchronnie wieloznaczne** i poddają się różnorodnym – równoprawnym – interpretacjom czytelniczym (p. 469–470).

[The translation of Said's book is **troublesome** (for every translator in every language, I suppose) because it **confuses different types of discourse**. It is basically **a scientific work, or at least popular science**, but **it is full of polemical accents**. (...) The subject of Said's **passionate polemics** are not only scholars but also journalists and writers, painters and poets. However, **those who scientifically argue with poetry stop using the language of science and transform themselves into poets**. **Their arguments inevitably become ambiguous** and succumb to various – yet equal – interpretations by their readers.]

Although the starting point for such statements is an attempt to shed light on the translator's struggle, Kalinowski's statements regarding Said's book confirm and complement the conclusions that could have been drawn from previously discussed paratexts. The translator has doubts not only about the validity of the author's statements (which we know from his polemical interjections and footnotes), but also concerning the very foundations of the discourse the author offers. The essence of those doubts can be interpreted by the way in which he uses the concept of science. Kalinowski mentions it in order to demonstrate that Said's book does not entirely fit into the concept. Elements which, according to him, do not correspond with the scientific character are discourse inhomogeneity, marked with personal involvement, excessive ambiguity, and a proclivity for polemics,<sup>12</sup> especially aimed at artistic works. Therefore, according to Kalinowski, science *sensu stricto* is characterised by rhetorical and methodological homogeneity, objectivity and limitation to the subjects specific to its field. The evocation of the category of science, understood in such a way as to show the quirkiness of Said's argument, seems to be an acknowledgement of it as binding and an assumption that it constitutes an appropriate framework in this situation. Such an assumption, however, contradicts not only the methodological starting point of *Orientalism* but also the principles underlying several trends that have influenced it and re-evaluated contemporary humanities.

<sup>12</sup> Although this is material for further discussion, it is worth mentioning that Kalinowski, with the use of terminology, often emphasises and intensifies Said's negative attitude towards orientalism. I offer a few examples of such an action, citing also Wyrwas-Wiśniewska's solutions: 1. Said: "simple reflection of racial superiority" (p. 15), Kalinowski: „prymitywnym rozważaniem o wyższości rasowej” [primitive reflection of racial superiority] (p. 41), Wyrwas-Wiśniewska: „prostym odbiciem wyższości rasowej” [simple reflection of racial superiority] (p. 47). 2. Said: "cultural and racial essences" (p. 36), Kalinowski: „rasistowskich formuł” [racist formula] (p. 68), Wyrwas-Wiśniewska: „zasad kulturowych i rasowych” [cultural and racial rules] (p. 73). 3. Said: „musty «truths»” (p. 52), Kalinowski: spleśniałych «prawd» [mouldy «truths»] (p. 91), Wyrwas-Wiśniewska: „przestarzałych «prawd»” [musty «truths»] (p. 94). 4. Said: "second-order knowledge" (p. 52), Kalinowski: „pseudowiedzy” [pseudoknowledge] (p. 92), Wyrwas-Wiśniewska: „wiedzy drugorzędnej” [second-order knowledge] (p. 94). 5. Said: "Orientalist confidence" (p. 49), Kalinowski: „orientalistycznego zadufania” [Orientalist presumptuousness] (p. 85), Wyrwas-Wiśniewska: „orientalistycznej pewności siebie” [Orientalist confidence] (p. 89). 6. Said: "Parliament's doubts at home" (p. 34), Kalinowski: „głupie wątpliwości w londyńskim parlamencie” [stupid doubts in the London Parliament] (p. 65), Wyrwas-Wiśniewska: „wątpliwości ze strony Parlamentu” [doubts on the part of Parliament] (p. 70). 7. Said: "a celebrated instance" (p. 107), Kalinowski: „Jaskrawym i groźnym przypadkiem” [A bright and dangerous instance] (p. 106), Wyrwas-Wiśniewska: „Słynnym przykładem” [A famous instance] (p. 108).

Despite the polemical attitude towards some theses, and particularly practices, resulting from the fear that an excessive focus on textual mechanisms will remove the possibility to speak on politically important issues, Said was a theorist who drew conclusions from the poststructuralism paradigm. Both the awareness resulting from this lesson and the use of the concepts of discourse and power-knowledge taken from Michel Foucault, made it impossible for Said to believe in the existence of a scientific discourse that is pure, objective and separate from the researcher's position. Identification with the critical current of the humanities, which aimed at revealing the ideological entanglements and social determinants of science and art, was tantamount to the personal political commitment of the critic (Ashcroft, Ahluwalia 2001: 13–83; Racevskis 2005; Rooney 2009; Stafford 2009; McCarthy 2010: 13–55; Emig 2012; Zabus 2012). Although in numerous polemics concerning *Orientalism*, the lack of acceptance for the above-mentioned re-evaluations and assumptions is a common thread, there is no doubt that in academic circles, they were already recognised at the time of publication of the book, and in subsequent years only strengthened their status within mainstream humanities.

What is the polemical activity of Witold Kalinowski against this background? It might be assumed that both the translator's detailed comments and his scepticism concerning the principles of Said's discourse resemble comments made in the original context by critical commentators who held methodological and political positions different to the author's. Kalinowski's arguments, taken from some footnotes and the afterword, might, however, suggest that he does not argue with the recognised critical method he does not agree with, but rather he takes a stand on what is, in his opinion, an unconvincing, hard to classify novelty. He does not so much recognise a methodological opponent in Said and dispute his interpretations, as to notice deviations from the common – in his opinion – binding scientific, objectivist paradigm and comments on some of them. One could hypothesise that the difficulty with grasping and accepting the principles of Said's method was strongly linked to the state of Polish humanistic discourse at the time. Although over a decade had passed since the publication of the original, as a result of the cultural and publishing policy during the period of the Polish People's Republic, post-structuralism and cultural research that had radically changed the landscape of Western humanities were still poorly known in Poland at the time of preparing the translation, and the emerging fashion for Western theories did not have opportunities to spread so quickly

(Domańska, Loba 2010). This was not significantly altered by the presence of Foucault's translations (1977, 1987), although a more robust internalisation of his theories would have favoured the acceptance of Said's method. Suppose those factors were to be considered decisive. In that case, the first Polish translation of *Orientalism* could be seen as a collision of different paradigms – a collision resulting not only from the author's and translator's different theoretical affiliations, but also from of the differences between the dynamics of the development of Western and Polish humanities.

However, the problem seems to be more complicated, as reading Kalinowski's scientific texts from the 1980s proves that his polemical attitude towards Said's arguments may have resulted not so much from the ignorance of their methodological foundation, but rather from the translator's disagreement with the assumptions of theoretical trends, which to some extent were close to the author of *Orientalism*. Kalinowski in various ways rejects the legitimacy or fruitfulness of analysing works of art as products of ideology, both in the article "Ideologiczne aspekty przekazów artystycznych i rozrywkowych" ["Ideological aspects of artistic and entertainment messages"] from 1982, and in the doctoral dissertation "Wątki socjologiczne w polskiej estetyce międzywojennej" ["Sociological themes in Polish interwar aesthetics"] defended in 1985. In the article, he states that "in art, there is less (...) danger of the formation of «newspeak» (...). The history of socialist realism proves that the language of art criticism or art theory can transform into newspeak; however, it is difficult even to imagine that art itself – its forms of expression, its language – can become newspeak" (Kalinowski 1982: 263–264). In his doctoral thesis, he criticises the genetic approach and "vulgar sociology," admitting that art can be an ideological tool, but at the same time acknowledging that focusing on this aspect makes it difficult to grasp its specificity (Kalinowski 1982: 26). Kalinowski considers such an approach to be reductionistic and argues against the approach of theorists with Marxist origins, such as György Lukács and Lucien Goldman.<sup>13</sup> In the article from 1986, "Walter Benjamin, czyli fałszywa świadomość krytyka" ["Walter Benjamin, or the critic's false consciousness"], Kalinowski pays even more attention to Marxist-oriented polemics; he diagnoses a specific distinction between philosophising as a cognitive activity and as an element

---

<sup>13</sup> Kalinowski acknowledges himself as a functionalist. With regard to aesthetics, he excludes the usefulness not only of genetics but also of structuralism. Those considerations are the subject of the second chapter of his doctorate, entitled "Funkcjonalizm versus genetyzm."



of class conflict, in which, in his opinion, devoted theorists are involved.<sup>14</sup> Kalinowski presents some studies by Fredric Jameson and Terry Eagleton, claiming that such a methodological approach does not have to bear the hallmarks of opportunism, since it also occurs among Western scholars. He even mentions Said when he describes the influence of Walter Benjamin on Western humanities:

Na jego koncepcje powołuje się też na przykład Edward W. Said, autor głośnej ostatnio rewizji dorobku orientalistyki. Said przedstawia całą wiedzę orientalistyczną Zachodu – zarówno w odmianie naukowej, jak artystycznej, a także we wszelkiego typu popularyzacjach – jako wytwór fałszywej świadomości, a zarazem narzędzie imperialistycznej ekspansji: politycznej, handlowej, technologicznej, kulturalnej, religijnej. W demaskowaniu tych ideologicznych funkcji – twierdzi Said – metody analiz kulturalnych zaproponowane w swoim czasie przez Benjaminą okazują się szczególnie przydatne (Kalinowski 1986: 184).

[His concepts are referred to by, for example, Edward W. Said, the author of the recently famous revision of the achievements of Oriental studies. Said presents all the oriental knowledge of the West – both in its scientific and artistic form, as well as in all types of popularisation – as a product of false consciousness and, at the same time, a tool of imperial expansion: political, mercantile, technological, cultural and religious. According to Said, the methods of cultural analysis proposed by Benjamin in his time proved particularly useful in exposing those ideological functions.]

Kalinowski's arguments found in his articles preceding the publication of the Polish version of *Orientalism* prove that the translator was well aware of the works of Western theorists which created the intellectual background

---

<sup>14</sup> The way in which Kalinowski characterises the distinction clearly shows his negative attitude towards this approach: “[Marxist] theorists – especially those, who discuss the phenomena of social consciousness – have never accepted that their claims are only strategic and do not describe or interpret reality. They are convinced that their works bear witness to the truth (and they still prove it and try to protect it in various ways). The interpretation of all intellectual and artistic works as a manifestation of social relations, and in «the final instance» as relations of material production, is one of those methodological directives regarded as scientific by Marxist theorists (in the extreme version: only scientific), which means they allow us to accurately and fully describe the essence of the studied phenomenon, the studied fragment of reality. A philosopher caught in this illusion, however, experiences moments of doubt. The first such critical moment occurs when facts that cannot be interpreted in the vein of historical materialism appear in the researcher's field of observation. Such a crisis can be overcome by rejecting uncomfortable facts” (Kalinowski 1986: 181).

for Said's book. The translator's polemical comments were not the result of ignorance concerning the intellectual roots of the method adopted by the author of the original, but rather the result of disagreement with the assumptions and interpretations inspired by such roots. Such disagreement was a part of a broad current of aversion towards Marxist positions in Poland resulting from the long-term domination of Marxism as an official political, cultural and scientific doctrine. And how do these expressive gestures of the translator, which are as much an expression of individual methodological views as a sign of place and time, appear in the context of the later reception of postcolonial theory in Poland?

The publication of *Orientalism* in 1991 did not trigger an intense response and did not become a direct inspiration for the use of postcolonial lenses in Kalinowski's homeland. Obviously, his translation was later noted in many texts that were part of the debate on the possible use of postcolonialism, which took place in Polish humanities in the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, but the translator's commentator-polemical activity was not commented on. Rather, the much-debated and recurring theme was the entanglement of postcolonial theory with Marxism. It was seen as one of the basic factors causing the distrust of those Polish researchers who were not convinced of the legitimacy of applying postcolonial theory, and an element overlooked or even "exorcised" by many Polish authors who undertook postcolonial research (Zajas 2008: 58–59; Sowa 2011: 444–448; Pieniądź 2016: 108–109). Marxist entanglement of postcolonial studies was seen as one of the reasons for excluding post-communist countries of Central and Eastern Europe from the interest of Western critics (Cavanagh 2003; Fiut 2003; Skórczewski 2006; Kołodziejczyk 2010; Skórczewski 2016). The attitude to the leftist categories underlying Western postcolonial theories has even become the basis for the division between "conservative" and "progressive" researchers (Bill 2014; Skórczewski 2016). Belonging to the "conservative" section was not, however, tantamount to a reluctance to consider power relations originating from intercultural contact nor a distrust of Said's concept. For example, Ewa Thompson referred to the categories he had developed not only in her pioneering book *Imperial Knowledge: Russian Literature and Colonialism* (Thompson 2000), where she used postcolonial theories to study Russian literature, but also in the article "Said a sprawa polska" ["Said and the Polish case"] (Thompson 2005), addressed to a broad audience, where she suggested that rethinking the historical situation of Poland through the prism of colonial dependence on Russia and the West could help it regain its

own identity and subjectivity. Dariusz Skórczewski also frequently referred to Said, arguing against the opinion that using the author's point of view must be tantamount to a reductionist attitude towards the aesthetic layer of a literary work (Skórczewski 2007). This necessarily concise review of attitudes shows that the causes of the paradigm clash, the effects of which can be observed in the first Polish translation of *Orientalism*, also influenced later commentators and users of Said's concept in Poland in various ways and to varying degrees. The specific position of Witold Kalinowski as a translator, the early moment of his comments in comparison with subsequent intense reception of postcolonialism, as well as the fact that the commentary and polemical dimension of his work was not referred to, encourage us to keep this particular case in mind.

Translated by Gabriela Dudek

## References

- Ashcroft B., Ahluwalia P. 2001. *Edward Said*, London–New York: Routledge.
- Bakuła B. 2006. “Kolonialne i postkolonialne aspekty polskiego dyskursu kresoznawczego (zarys problematyki)”, *Teksty Drugie* 6, pp. 11–33.
- 2015. “Studia postkolonialne w Europie Środkowej oraz Wschodniej. Kwerenda wybranych problemów (1991–2014)”, in: B. Bakuła, D. Dabert, E. Kledzik, R. Kupidura, K. Piotrowiak-Junkiert, *Dyskurs postkolonialny we współczesnej literaturze i kulturze Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej*, Poznań: Biblioteka Porównań, pp. 101–181.
- Bill S. 2014. “W poszukiwaniu autentyczności: kultura polska i natura teorii postkolonialnej”, *Praktyka Teoretyczna* 11.
- Bolecki W. 2007. “Myśli różne o postkolonializmie. Wstęp do tekstów nienapisanych”, *Teksty Drugie* 4, pp. 6–14.
- Cassin B. 2004. *Vocabulaire européen des philosophies: Dictionnaire des intraduisibles*, Paris: Seuil.
- Cassin B., Apter E., Lezra J., Wood M. (ed.). 2014. *Dictionary of Untranslatables: A Philosophical Lexicon*, Princeton–Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Cavanagh C. 2003. “Postkolonialna Polska. Biała plama na mapie współczesnej teorii”, T. Kunz (trans.), *Teksty Drugie* 2–3, pp. 60–71.
- Domańska E., Loba M. (ed.). 2010. *French Theory w Polsce*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.
- Elmarsafy Z., Bernard A. 2013. “Orientalism: Legacies of a Performance”, in: Z. Elmarsafy, A. Bernard, D. Attwell (ed.), *Debating Orientalism*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1–17.

- Emig R. 2012. "Out of Place or Caught in the Middle: Edward Said's Thinking between Humanism and Poststructuralism", in: T. Döring, M. Stein (ed.), *Edward Said's Translocations. Essays in Secular Criticism*, New York–London: Routledge, pp. 130–143.
- Fiut A. 2003. "Polonizacja? Kolonizacja?", *Teksty Drugie* 6, pp. 150–156.
- Foucault M. 1977. *Archeologia wiedzy*, A. Siemek (trans.), J. Topolski (preface), Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- 1987. *Historia szaleństwa w dobie klasycyzmu*, przeł. H. Kęszycka (trans.), M. Czerwiński (introduction), Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Gal S. 2003. "Movements of Feminism: the Circulation of Discourses about Women", in: B. Hobson (ed.), *Recognition Struggles and Social Movements. Contested Identities. Agency and Power*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gran P. 2013. "Orientalism's Contribution to World History and Middle Eastern History 35 Years After", in: Z. Elmarsafy, A. Bernard, D. Attwell (red.), *Debating Orientalism*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 18–37.
- Harrison N. 2013. "Said's Impact: Lessons for Literary Critics", in: Z. Elmarsafy, A. Bernard, D. Attwell (ed.), *Debating Orientalism*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 216–241.
- Huggan G. 2005. "(Not) Reading „Orientalism”, *Research in African Literatures* 36(3), "Edward Said, Africa, and Cultural Criticism", pp. 124–136.
- Kalinowski W. 1982. "Ideologiczne aspekty przekazów artystycznych i rozrywkowych", *Studia Socjologiczne* 3–4, pp. 263–275.
- 1985. "Wątki socjologiczne w polskiej estetyce międzywojennej", nieopublikowana praca doktorska, Warszawa: IFiS PAN.
- 1986. "Walter Benjamin, czyli fałszywa świadomość krytyka", *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* 4, pp. 181–196.
- Kieniewicz J. 1985. "Orientalizm. Idea kształtująca rzeczywistość", *Przegląd Orientalistyczny* 1–4, pp. 9–29.
- 1986. *Od ekspansji do dominacji. Próba teorii kolonializmu*, Warszawa: Czytelnik.
- 1999. *Spotkania Wschodu*, Warszawa: Novus Orbis.
- (ed.) 2016. *Perspektywy postkolonializmu w Polsce, Polska w perspektywie postkolonialnej*, Warszawa: Wydział Artes Liberales.
- Kołodziejczyk D. 2010. "Postkolonialny transfer na Europę Środkowo-Wschodnią", *Teksty Drugie* 5, pp. 22–39.
- McCarthy C. 2010. *The Cambridge Introduction to Edward Said*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 4–55.
- Pieniądz A. 2016. "Historycy a teoria postkolonialna – między niewiedzą, odrzuceniem i krytyką", in: J. Kieniewicz (ed.), *Perspektywy postkolonializmu w Polsce, Polska w perspektywie postkolonialnej*, Warszawa: Wydział Artes Liberales, pp. 105–117.
- Racevskis K. 2005. "Edward Said and Michel Foucault: Affinities and Dissonances", *Research in African Literatures* 36(3), "Edward Said, Africa, and Cultural Criticism", pp. 83–97.
- Rooney C. 2009. "Derrida and Said: Ships that Pass in the Night", in: R. Ghosh (ed.), *Edward Said and the Literary, Social, and Political World*, New York–London: Routledge, pp. 36–52.

- Said E.W. 1979. *Orientalism*, New York: Vintage Books.
- 1991. *Orientalism*, W. Kalinowski (trans.), Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- 2005. *Orientalism*, M. Wyrwas-Wisniewska (trans.), Poznań: Zysk i S-ka.
- 1983. *Travelling Theory*, in: E.W. Said, *The World, The Text and The Critic*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Skórczewski D. 2006. “Postkolonialna Polska – projekt (nie)możliwy”, *Teksty Drugie* 1–2, pp. 100–112.
- 2007. *Interpretacja postkolonialna: etyka nauki, nauka etyki*, in: A.F. Kola, A. Szahaj (eds), *Filozofia i etyka interpretacji*, Kraków: Universitas.
- 2016. “Postkolonializm jako metoda: konserwatywna czy ‘postępowa’? Wstępne oczyszczenie przedpola”, in: J. Kieniewicz (ed.), *Perspektywy postkolonializmu w Polsce. Polska w perspektywie postkolonialnej*, Warszawa: Wydział Artes Liberales, pp. 119–145.
- Sowa J. 2011. *Fantomowe ciało króla. Peryferyjne zmagania z nowoczesną formą*, Kraków: Universitas.
- Stafford A. 2009. “Edward Said and Roland Barthes: Criticism versus Essayism. Or, Roads and Meetings Missed”, in: R. Ghosh (ed.), *Edward Said and the Literary, Social, and Political World*, New York–London: Routledge, pp. 19–35.
- Susam-Sarajeva Ş. 2006. *Theories on the Move: Translation’s Role in the Travels of Literary Theories*, Amsterdam–New York: Rodopi.
- Thompson E.M. 2000. *Trubadurzy imperium. Literatura rosyjska i kolonializm*, A. Sierszulska (trans.), Kraków: Universitas.
- 2005. “Said a sprawa polska. Przeciwno kulturowej bezsilności peryferii”, *Europa. Tygodnik Idei* 26, p. 11.
- Venuti L. 1998. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*, London–New York: Routledge.
- 1995. *Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation*, London–New York: Routledge.
- Zabus C. 2012. “The Archeology of Said: Father Foucault, Dieu Derrida, and Other (Af) Filiations”, in: T. Döring, M. Stein (ed.), *Edward Said’s Translocations. Essays in Secular Criticism*, New York–London: Routledge, pp. 56–73.
- Zajas P. 2008. *Postkolonialne imaginarium południowoafrykańskie literatury polskiej i niderlandzkiej*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.