TAMARA BRZOSTOWSKA-TERESZKIEWICZ

 https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5225-3307

Institute of Literary Research, Polish Academy of Sciences
tamara.brzostowska@ibl.waw.pl

ALL COLOURS OF TRANSLATION
Matthew Reynolds (ed.), 2019. *Prismatic Translation*, Cambridge: Legenda

Abstract

This article discusses the volume of essays *Prismatic Translation*, edited by Matthew Reynolds (Cambridge: Legenda, 2019) in light of the history of optical metaphors for translation and recent modernist studies. Tracing the conceptual genealogy of the term and the subtleties of its theoretical usage, the author argues that "prismatic translation" remains an impressive though still excessively ambiguous translation studies metaphor that has not yet solidified into a precise and operative theoretical tool. Notwithstanding these objections, *Prismatic Translation* can be considered an excellent reference volume for professionals and students engaged in literary and cultural translation studies, as well as comparative modernist studies.

Keywords: prismatic translation, Matthew Reynolds, translation studies, modernist studies, translation metaphors, experimental translation

The term "prismatic translation" has only recently been introduced in cultural translation studies discourse but, as confirmed in *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Activism* (2020), it has already entered the fundamental vocabulary of the discipline. It can even be said that it has joined the family of frequently repeated "terms-signposts, terms-slogans, terms-calls"[1]

---

[1] Janusz Sławiński's terms used in reference to the newly introduced term "intertextuality" in Polish literary studies (Sławiński 1999: 154).

which stimulate and instruct the latest historical and theoretical research into the nature of translation. The editors of the handbook, Kayvan Tahmasebian and Rebecca Ruth Gould, apply the term to "the multiplicity of renderings that inevitably arise in the process of adapting a [semantically dense] text [of the original] (…) for different audiences" (Tahmasebian, Gould 2020: 51). Moreover, "prismatic translation" is a definition commonly attributed to the volume's editor Matthew Reynolds, which he employs to cover "plural modes of translation that release the multiple possible meanings of the source text rather than offering just one equivalent" (Reynolds 2016: 87).

It is this new theorisation of "prismatic translation" that was declared among the most important goals of the collection of essays *Prismatic Translation* (2019), edited by Reynolds and intended to demonstrate "the recent growth of prismatic modes in anglophone literary translation and translational literature". It has been argued that the newly theorised phenomenon is to be understood predominantly in its "agonistic relation to the 'channel' view"[2] of translation. The almost four-hundred-page volume is the result of a conference organized by the Oxford Comparative Criticism and Translation Research Centre (2015), together with the collective project *Prismatic Jane Eyre: An Experiment in the Study of Translations*. This methodological experiment in translation studies by Reynolds and his research team aims to document the multilingual translational reception of Charlotte Brontë's famous gothic romance, starting with the novel's "prismatic title" in target literatures[3] and ending with the "diffraction spectrum" of key words and more extensive fragments of the novel, visualized with the use of various digital humanities tools.[4] The project *Prismatic Jane Eyre* is part of the *Creative Multilingualism* research program and is conceived as an important direction in cultural studies regarding the creative potential of multilingualism (see Reynolds, Park, Clanchy 2020: 131–149).

Tracing the expansive career of "prismatic translation" in recent Western translation studies, from Reynolds's *Translation: A Very Short Introduction* (2016) to *Hamlet Translations: Prisms of Cultural Encounters Across the Globe*, edited by Marta y Minier and Lily Kahn (2021), one might

---

[2] From the paratext on the back cover of *Prismatic Translation*.

[3] For example, the title of Teresa Świderska's Polish translation of the novel is *Dziwne losy Jane Eyre* [The Strange Fate of Jane Eyre] (1959).

[4] See "Prismatic Jane Eyre: An Experiment in the Study of Translations", *"Creative Multilingualism"/ Oxford Comparative Criticism and Translation*, https://prismaticjaneeyre. org [access: 13.11.2020] and Reynolds, Park, Clanchy 2020: 134–137.

suppose that, firstly, the term is relatively stable and that, secondly, the conceptualisation of translation as a prism is entirely new and historically unprecedented. But this is not necessarily the case for a historian of Central and Eastern European modernist translation studies and literary translation criticism.

The metaphor of translation as a diffraction of a beam of light (the original) via the prism (language, target literature, translator's creative personality, worldview assumptions, contextual conditions), is undoubtedly an apparent symptom of the change that has been taking place in contemporary thinking concerning the role of translation in creating culture. The concept of translational diffraction allows us to define new research areas and perspectives, effectively displacing mimetic concepts of translation as a mere mirror image,[5] a transparent glass that freely transmits light rays,[6] or a clear window. The latter has been particularly popular in Bible translation studies[7] and translation studies on the Holocaust.[8] The sources of this decisive change, however, date much further back than is assumed by the editors of *Prismatic Translation* or *Creative Multilingualism. A Manifesto* (2020). Indeed, the metaphor of translation as a prism itself dates back much further than the famous concept of refraction introduced by André Lefevere, one of the founding fathers of Translation Studies, who studied the "refraction of light" (text) at the border of two different linguistic and cultural centers. It is worth recalling that the Belgian translation scholar understood refraction as "the adaptation of a work of literature to a different audience, with the intention of influencing the way in which that audience reads the work"

---

[5] See such contemporary uses of the metaphor of translation as a mirror (a set of mirrors) not only reflecting but also generating light, as Steiner [1973] 1998: 317, Brower 1974, and Legeżyńska 1999: 235. For a critique of the concept of translation as a mirror (a labyrinth of mirrors), see e.g. Hermans 2002: 4 and Tymoczko 1999: 19. The concept of translation as a broken mirror was formulated by Dorota Urbanek (2004: 10–11).

[6] One of the earliest formulations of this concept is that offered by Nikolai Gogol in reference to Vasily Zhukovsky's Russian translation of Homer's *Odyssey* (1842–1849) (Gogol [1880] 1952: 337). A recent revision of the concept of translation as a transparent medium can be found in Norman R. Shapiro's writings: "A translation is like a pane of glass. The better it is, the less it will be noticed. It's only the bubbles and flaws that make it visible, and that consequently attract the observer's attention" (1997: xiii). See also a critique of the illusion of the translation's transparency (Venuti [1995] 2002: 1).

[7] See e.g. Burke 2009 and Goodwin 2013: 195: "we must have clear windows, clean and polished, so that the reader of today can look through them, almost as if they weren't there, to see the λοΥος ('logos', or 'word'), the transcendent signified within".

[8] See e.g. Lourie 1999: 46.

(Lefevere 1982: 4), recognizing its mechanisms not only in translations, but also, inter alia, in literary criticism, historiography, teaching and composing anthologies (see also Lefevere 1984: 217).

As a matter of fact, the groundwork for this far-reaching notion of translation as a prism was instigated by early modernist translation criticism which emphasised the resemblance between a translator and a "crystal amphora" (Potocki 1912: 84), multiplying the diffraction of a beam of light (the original text) into countless colours of the spectrum.[9] In Russian translation criticism, the "elder" symbolist Konstantin Balmont traced the diffraction of Oscar Wilde's *Salome* "in the Polish prism" of Juliusz Słowacki's *Sen Srebrny Salomei* [The Silver Dream of Salomea] and Jan Kasprowicz's *Uczta Herodiady* [The Feast of Herodias] (Balmont 1908). Among the visual metaphors of translation within the modernist pre-theoretical translation studies discourse, one can also find other comparisons to optical instruments. Translation was conceived as "a reflector of light and distant poetic mirages", which "brightens up not only with reflecting light" (Potocki 1912: 84; emphasis T.B.-T.).[10] Literary translation was also compared to the optical performance of the human eye. To quote but one example, Zenon Przesmycki (Miriam) described translation in terms of a process of transformation of light energy into the energy of the nerve process and integration of visual information that takes place in the retina: "The glows and rays of science that come to us from foreign sources will be judged according to our atmosphere and used as long as they fit the retinas of our reading public. If they are too bright, they can spoil its eyesight. On the other hand, we do not need them if they are too weak" (Przesmycki [1901] 1967: 32).[11]

It might be said that the metaphor of a translator (translation) as a prism or even a cluster of prisms conveyed the crucial components of modernist translators' consciousness and cultural self-knowledge. It expressed the defining (and necessary) condition for the modernity of translation studies reflection. This modernity manifested itself in conceptualising translation as a mode of literary production, challenging the autonomy of the source text in the target culture, transgressing the model of the translator's invisibility,

---

[9] As Antoni Potocki wrote about Antoni Lange, a translator of ancient Indian, Babylonian and Assyrian literatures. Unless otherwise indicated, all translations from the Polish and Russian are by the author of the article.

[10] Again Antoni Potocki about Antoni Lange.

[11] For other sensual metaphors of translation, see Brzostowska-Tereszkiewicz 2013 and Kaźmierczak 2013.

and challenging "the dominance of transparent discourse" (see Yao 2002; Venuti [1995] 2002: 164–236). In a word, the metaphor of translation as a transformation, diffraction, or production instead of a simple reflection or free transmission of a beam of light (the original) was the clearest signal of the changes that Steven G. Yao called the "Modernist revolution in translation" (Yao 2002: 126), whilst tracking the translational component in James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* and Ezra Pound's poetic experiments. The metaphor of translation as a prism allowed the act of translation itself to be positioned at the centre of the modernist program of cultural renewal and artistic innovation, as a means of testing the aesthetic, semantic, stylistic and expressive possibilities of literary language and expanding its boundaries in national literatures. It is worth adding that the Western historiography of literary modernism brings yet another optical metaphor for translation "as a kind of dynamic procedural lens through which the Modernists could at once view both the past as well as other cultures and, perhaps even more importantly, focus their images of these traditions in their own times and in ways that could serve their individual ideological and aesthetic purposes" (Yao 2013: 216).

Early modernist conceptualizations of translation as a prism were significantly rekindled in the Structuralist translation studies discourse. As the Polish literary scholar Barbara Sienkiewicz noted, "a translator, with his personal inclinations, antipathies and entanglement in the complex conditions of her/his native literature takes on the role of a prism which refracts foreign tendencies and transforms them according to her/his own convictions about the requirements, constraints and permissible freedoms dictated by the prevailing rules of the process of literary communication" (Sienkiewicz 1982: 295). On the other hand, in his seminal essay on *The Poetics of Artistic Translation*, Edward Balcerzan assessed the scale of translational transformations: "If one title of a foreign-language work splits into so many translational variants, appeals to so many different semantic fields and to so many conventions, it is easy to imagine the transformations of the original's semantic whole in the act of translation" (Balcerzan [1969] 1998: 20). In recent Western European translation studies, the concept of "translation as a prism that broadens and transforms our understanding" (Weber 2008: 195) has been revised by Julie Tomberlin Weber:

> When we observe light passing through a prism, what we see and experience depends on whether we focus on the "pure" white light, the prism, or the walls on which a rainbow might become visible. Our experience also depends on

how willing we are to manipulate the relative positions of the light, the prism, and any surfaces to be illuminated. Translation involves similar transformation of a source text into a modern text that illuminates multiple discourses, both contemporary and historical (Weber 2008: 195).

The concept of "prismatic translation", viewed in the broader perspective of the history of modernist reflection on translation, is, in fact, as the Slovenian scholar Jernej Habjan notes, "a kind of return to literary translation that acknowledges the intervention of cultural translation" (Reynolds 2019: 189; emphasis T.B.-T.). In this context, it is even more astonishing that, despite its impressive conceptual and methodological impetus, *Prismatic Translation* lacks in-depth historical reflection concerning the notion of translational dispersion, not only within the context of modernist historiography, but also that of twentieth-century translation studies.

What draws the attention of the reader of *Prismatic Translation* is an extensive temporal, geographic-cultural and ethno-linguistic perspective – from ancient Egypt (Hany Rashwan's "'Annihilation is atop the lake': the Visual Untranslatability of an Ancient Egyptian Short Story"), through the period of early modernity in North India ("Poetic Traffic in a Multilingual Literary Culture: Equivalence, Parallel Aesthetics, and Language-Stretching in North India" by Francesca Orsini), the Russia of Peter the Great (Yvonne Howell's "Through a Prism, Translated: Culture and Change in Russia"), Thai contemporary poetry (Cosima Bruno's "Translation Poetry: the Poetics of Noise in Hsia Yü's *Pink Noise*"), the literary culture of contemporary Polynesia ("The Literary Translator as Dispersive Prism: Refracting and Recomposing Cultures" by Jeana Anderson), Iranian contemporary poetry ("In Words and Colours: Lingo-Visual Translations of the Poetry of Shafii Kadkani" by Pari Azarm Motamedi) to the latest challenges of digital media culture ("Algorithmic Translation: New Challenges for Translation in the Age of Algorithms"). The individual chapters of the book discuss such diverse media of expression as ancient Egyptian hieroglyphs, Victorian nonsense poetry (Audrey Coussy's "T Is For Translation (s): Translating Nonsense Alphabets Into French"), postmodernist translation experiments ("Literary Metatranslations: When Translation Multiples Tell Their Own Story" by Katarzyna Szymańska), and "algorithmic translation" created with the use of creative software ("Algorithmic Translation: The Challenges for Translation in the Age of Algorithms by Eran Hadas").

The dizzying diversity of analytical data, languages and contexts corresponds to a great wealth of research problems: from the visual alphabet and noise as artistic means of investigating the relationship between oral language and writing systems, from the issues of translational self-reflection and self-referentiality to the algorithmic re-translation of the Hebrew Torah into Japanese haiku. The diffusion of research issues is accompanied by a significant diversification of the theoretical languages of translation studies: from Freudian psychoanalysis and deconstruction to digital humanities. The co-authors of the volume explore the various fields of literary studies (theoretical and historical poetics, history of literature, sociology of literature), history of art, cultural anthropology, psychology of creativity and media studies. The book combines various types and genres of writing: from the theoretical translation studies manifesto ("Prismatic Agon, Prismatic Harmony: Translation, Literature, Language" by Matthew Reynolds) and "translation autobiography" (Philip Terry's rewriting of Du Bellay's *Les Regrets* and the translational self-reflection of the Iranian artist Pari Azarm Motamedi enriched with reproductions of her watercolors), through translation studies essays to historical and analytical-interpretative studies. The internal differentiation (not to say polarisation) of the volume proves that the metaphor of prismatic translation can provide an effective stimulus for the research imagination.

The broad, multi-context, transdisciplinary profiling of research creativity is undoubtedly the source of the stimulating power of Matthew Reynolds's project. However, it inevitably entails the risk of blurring the key concept of the volume aimed at theorising "prismatic translation" (see Reynolds 2019: 189). It would be difficult to affirm that the arresting and suggestive metaphor of "prismatic translation" has obtained the status of an effective theoretical tool. The central metaphor remains, in fact, a "bag" concept, encompassing a whole gamut of issues that theoreticians, historians and critics of translation (as well as practicing translators) typically associate with difference, multiplication (multilingualism, ambiguity, multiculturalism, multiple styles, multiple varieties), interference, creativity, novelty, experiment, metamorphicity and dispersiveness: from linguistic questions (e.g. morphological differences between languages) through the psychology of subjectivity (the evolution of creative self-awareness), cultural policy, metaphysical, epistemological and ethical issues, to the aesthetics of (linguistic and visual) speech. Extensive historical and artistic, theoretical and methodological topics have been organised into four main sections: "Frames", "Cultures", "Practices" and

"Readings". However, such an arrangement does not help to disentangle the dynamic interweaving of concepts, arguments, topics, and methods.

In terms of optical imagery, it can be said that the very concept of "prismatic translation" splits into countless spectral colours in the book itself. It embraces both monolingual and multilingual, single-author and multi-author translation series, experimental (homophonic and conceptual) translations, meta-translations, as well as "original" multilingual textual hybrids, logo-visual poetic translations, pseudo-translations functioning as the originals (original-esques). The individual studies included in the volume make a solid case for "prismaticity" as both a fundamental ontological property of each translation (a natural tendency towards inter- and intra-linguistic, inter- and intra-cultural proliferation, seriality and multivariantism as immanent properties and the way of existence of a translation),[12] and a specific property of target texts of a special type, e.g. conceptual translations created by combining ready-made elements (fragments of previous translations), such as Caroline Bergvall's *Via: 48 Dante Variations* (2005). "Prismaticity" appears both as a property of a translation series (the series "form[s] a complex, multifaceted prism" [Reynolds 2019: 326]) as well as a mode of practicing [original] artistic activity. Sometimes "prismaticity" necessitates plural modes of translation. It might be a feature of a particular receptive attitude towards the source or target artistic text ("prismatic understanding"), a specific mode of reading the original (or translation) ("prismatic reading", "prismatic experience for the readers", "prismatic angles of critique", "prismatic criticism"), or a characteristic of methodological principles ("prismatic approach", "prismatic point of view"). Prismaticity is both an indispensable feature of the prismatic process as well as the principle of the functioning of a multilingual society and polyphonic literary culture, as shown, for example, by the "prismatic everyday" of the early culture of Southeast Asia.[13] Prismaticity is a crucial property, both of the target language ("prism of linguistic difference") and the receptive culture. As Péter Hajdu explains: "Different political and cultural conditions create different

---

[12] The editor's introduction to the volume contains the following phrases: "translation is inherently prismatic", "translation's prismatic nature", "prismatic potential of translation", "translation is fundamentally multiplicatory – (…) its essence is not reproduction but proliferation", "the potential for multiplication is latent in any act of translation in the moment of its happening", "translation's pluralising force", "prismatic text".

[13] See Francesca Orsini's article "Poetic Traffic in a Multilingual Literary Culture: Equivalence, Parallel Aesthetics, and Language-Stretching in North-India".

prisms (with different distortions and interferences)" (Reynolds 2019: 326). Prismaticity belongs both to the characteristics of "prismatic translation culture" and to the inherent qualities of the translator's creative personality (Jeana Anderson's "The Literary Translator as Dispersive Prism: Refracting and Recomposing Cultures"). The spectrum of "prismatic translation" even includes the meanings of translation as a therapeutic tool for a schizophrenic personality ("The Schizophrenic Prism: Louis Wolfson's Translation Practice" by Alexandra Lukes).

To sum up, the rich semantic range of the title concept remains a "landscape of prismatic diversity" (Reynolds, Park, Clanchy 2020: 147) rather than a clearly defined notion. The variety and semantic flexibility of "prismatic translation" proves to be an inexhaustible source of terminological invention. For the contributors of the volume, "prismatic translation" is synonymous with such terms as "experimental and metamorphic translation" (Philip Terry), "extreme translation" (Adriana X. Jacobs), "algorithmic translation" (Eran Hadas) "lingo-visual translation" (Pari Azarm Motamedi), "multilingual imagining" (Reynolds, Park, Clanchy 2020: 132), and "translation multiples" (Kasia Szymanska). The index of "refractive" terms can be further increased to include "prismatically deviated texts" (Audrey Coussy), i.e. texts which are semantically divergent while maintaining formal similarities. Moreover, "prismatic translation" appears to have relatively high semantic overlaps with "post-translation" (Edwin Gentzler's terminological innovation, 2017) and Lefeverian rewriting as understood, for example, by Eugenia Loffredo and Manuela Perteghella, editors of *One Poem in Search of a Translator: Re-writing "Les Fenêtres" by Apollinaire* (2009).

The expanded, and hence considerably blurred, semantic scope of the term "prismatic translation" encourages endless metaphorical extensions, synonimisations and periphrastic descriptions which combine to form a distinctive translation studies "thesaurus of photosensitive words".[14] We read that a prismatic translation reveals "a rainbow of new meanings" (Yvonne Howell), one that is "dispersed in a halo of alternative 'equivalences'" (Kasia Szymanska). The translator "acts like a prism in breaking text down into its constituent, separable colours" (Jeana Anderson). Patrick Hersant notes that the opening lines of Coleridge's *Kubla Khan* "crystallize" and ultimately "diffract" as "various prismatic shades" of their numerous interpretations "blend into another one to provide a diachronic and polyphonic

---

[14] To recall the title of Tadeusz Śliwiak's collection of verses (Warsaw, 1988).

commentary as richly varied as the poem itself" (Reynolds 2019: 307). Peter Hajdu discusses the "spectrum" of the Hungarian translations of Petronius's *Satiricon*: "As a dispersive prism breaks up the white light into the spectral colours, (…) the translations show various colours of the ancient text as if separately" (Reynolds 2019: 312). Reynolds writes that "the source text reveals new colours of meaning when seen through the creative prism of translation" (Reynolds, Park, Clanchy 2020: 137). All this makes the concept of "prismatic translation" as intriguing as it is indistinct and ambiguous. Phraseologisms ("to look through the prism of something") intermingle with specialized descriptions of optical phenomena. Although the broad scope of the term "prismatic translation" increases the visibility of various forms, means, goals, conditions and dynamics of translation activity, identifying and characterizing the extremes of translation work, whilst revealing the diversity of possible research perspectives and contact zones between various fields of knowledge, it nevertheless significantly reduces the instrumentality and communicativeness of the term, calling into question the actual analytical usefulness of the concept. "Prismatic translation" remains as much a suggestive and excessively ambiguous metaphor that has not yet solidified into a stable and precise theoretical tool. It might be said that it is indeed "a jumping glass grasshopper / in a periscope tube" (Śliwiak 1981: 48), to recall the words of the Polish modernist poet-translator.

In noting both the extremely polarized meanings of "prismatic translation" and the authors' tendency to multiply translation studies poetisms, two points need to be emphasized. Firstly, neither the volume's considerable size, nor the broad research profiles of the contributors, have affected the editor's ability to contain the prism metaphor. Indeed, the wide variety of research topics constitutes an integral and indispensable part of Reynolds's methodology to include a "rich spectrum of chapters" (Reynolds 2019: 13). As he notes, "each chapter is (…) its own refraction of the [prism] metaphor, re-routing and reconfigurating it, and opening it to debate" (Reynolds 2019: 13). Nevertheless, this deliberately directional nature of the volume somewhat weakens the notion that its contents are all-inclusive. Secondly, despite the wide diversity of discourses, methods, contexts and analytical data, it is the "translation proper" which remains the main point of reference in each case. Focusing research attention on interlingual literary translation helps avoid the methodological reefs encountered by the advocates of the (excessively) broad concept of translation endorsed and promoted by the "translational turn" in

cultural studies.[15] The highlighted position of literary translation results in the inclusion of translation studies within a central, and not – as has been the case up until now – a peripheral trend of historical and theoretical literary studies reflection. It also allows us to bring to light the (in many important respects limiting[16]) assumptions of monolingualism in literary studies.

An important integrating feature of the volume is the identification of a number of general methodological assumptions. Firstly, the contributors to *Prismatic Translation* share the belief in the inalienable creative nature of translation, and thus value difference and modification at the expense of equivalence. They distinguish between different kinds of translation depending on the properties of the languages and poetics involved in the translation process (with particular emphasis on the specific relationship between speech and its visual representation), and they also emphasize translation's similarity to other modes of writing and rewriting (see Reynolds, Park, Clanchy 2020: 131).

Secondly, the articles in *Prismatic Translation* emphasize the inevitably multiplicative nature of translation, which "can be seen as a release of multiple signifying possibilities, an opening of the source text to Language in all its plurality".[17] As Reynolds clarifies, translation should be seen as "opening up the plural signifying potential of the source text and spreading it into multiple versions, each continuous with the source though different from it, and related to the other versions though different from all of them too" (Reynolds 2019: 3). The assumption of the continuity of the multi-coloured spectrum of translation, the source text and competing translations is accompanied by an understanding of language "more as a continuum of variation than as a collection of bounded entities" (Reynolds 2019: 3). Exposing the multifaceted interpretations (translations) of the original helps emphasize the materiality of the poetic language. As the Slovenian translation theorist Jernej Habjan notes: "Before modernity, it seems, translations were valued despite their style, original music, and syntax. After modernity, they will hopefully be valued precisely for these qualities" (Reynolds 2019: 200). In addition, the essays collected in the volume treat translations as "indexes of cultural diversity and historical development" (Reynolds (ed.) 2019: 1),

---

[15] Dilek Dizdar warned against it (2009: 90).

[16] The reverse of the coin is shown in David Gramling's brilliant monograph *The Invention of Monolingualism* (2016).

[17] Paratext on the back cover of *Prismatic Translaton*.

thus affirming that "tracing variants in translation can be a precise mode of cultural studies" (Reynolds, Park, Clanchy 2020: 136).

Regardless of the excessive flickering and elusiveness of the title concept, prismatic translation can indeed be grouped among terms that "open up an infinite number of paths to creativity" (Kohl, Bolognesi, Werkmann Horvat 2020: 25), as an "initial creative impulse" (Brown 2003: x) for translators of various specializations. For theoreticians, historians, critics and practitioners of translation, it requires constant analysis of more established concepts and categorizations, liberating well-known concepts and problems (language, meaning, equivalence), from previously entrenched positions, revealing unforeseen dependencies and hidden dimensions of translation and translation studies discourse.

In conclusion, I would like to recall the words of Janusz Sławiński, who once referred to an excessively – in his opinion – expandable and undefined category of intertextuality, which entered the field of literary studies in the 1980s with a certain momentum, foreshadowing significant reevaluations and methodological reorientations. Sławiński's arguments relating to the early origins of "intertextuality" in literary studies can be replicated using the concept of "prismatic translation", now being introduced into translation studies:

> all this disorder that it introduces: the mixing of phenomena that, in the light of the previous experience, should be carefully distinguished, combining truisms with paradoxes, detailed and quite naive analytical observations with lofty theoretical declarations – is a genuine testimony to an important shift of interest that has taken place in the domain of poetics [in the case of "prismatic translation – translation studies], allowing us to look at its main subject differently than before (Sławiński 1999: 155).

Translated by the Author

References

Balcerzan, Edward. [1969] 1998. "Poetyka przekładu literackiego" [Poetics of Artistic Translation], in: Edward Balcerzan, *Literatura z literatury (strategie tłumaczy)* [Literature Out of Literature [Translators' Strategies], Katowice: „Śląsk", pp. 17–31.

Balmont, Konstantin. 1908. "Salomeia w polskoi pryzmie" [Salomea in the Polish Prism], in: Oscar Wilde, *Salomeia*, trans. Konstantin Balmont, Ekaterina Andreeva, Sankt Peterburg: Panteon, pp. 105–114.

Brower, Reuben Arthur. 1974. *Mirror on Mirror: Translation, Imitation, Parody*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Brown, Theodore L. 2003. *Making Truth. Metaphor in Science*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Brzostowska-Tereszkiewicz, Tamara. 2013. "Zmysły w modernistycznej krytyce i teorii przekładu" [Senses in the Modernist Translation Theory and Criticism], in: Włodzimierz Bolecki (ed.), *Sensualność w kulturze polskiej. Reprezentacje zmysłów w języku, literaturze i sztuce od średniowiecza do współczesności* [Sensuality in Polish Culture. Representations of the Senses in Language, Literature and Art from the Middle Ages to the Present Day]. The online thematic encyclopaedia is being transferred to the digital platform of the Polish National Library.

Burke, David G. (ed.). 2009. *Translation that Openeth the Window: Reflections on the History and Legacy of the King James Bible*, Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.

Dizdar, Dilek. 2009. "Translational Transitions: 'Translation Proper' and Translation Studies in the Humanities", *Translation Studies* 2 (1), pp. 89–102.

Gentzler, Edwin. 2017. *Translation and Rewriting in the Age of Post-Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge.

Gogol, Nikolai. 1952. "Pis'mo V. A. Zhukovskomu ot 28 fevralia 1850" [A Letter to V. A. Zhukovsky, 28th February 1850], in: Nikolai Gogol, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* [The Complete Collection of Works], Vol. XIV, Moskva: Izdatelstvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, p. 111.

Goodwin, Philip. 2013. *Translating the English Bible: From Relevance to Deconstruction*, Cambridge, UK: James Clarke & Co.

Gramling, David. 2016. *The Invention of Monolingualism*, New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Hermans, Theo. 2002. "Translation's Representations", in: Eva Hung (ed.), *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 4. Building Bridges*, Amsterdam–Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 3–18.

Kaźmierczak, Marta. 2013. "Sztuki wizualne jako metafory przekładu" [Visual Arts as Translation Metaphors], in: Włodzimierz Bolecki (ed.), *Sensualność w kulturze polskiej. Reprezentacje zmysłów w języku, literaturze i sztuce od średniowiecza do współczesności* [Sensuality in Polish Culture. Representations of the Senses in Language, Literature and Art from the Middle Ages to the Present Day]. The online thematic encyclopaedia is being transferred to the digital platform of the Polish National Library.

Kohl, Katrin, Bolognesi, Marianna, Werkmann Horvat, Ana. 2020. "The Creative Power of Metaphor", in: Katrin Kohl, Rajinder Dudrah, Andrew Gosler *et al.* (eds.), *Creative Multilingualism: A Manifesto, Cambridge*, UK: Open Book Publishers, 25–46, https://www.openbookpublishers.com/10.11647/OBP.0206.pdf [access: 03.11.2020].

Lefevere, André. 1982. "Mother Courage's Cucumbers: Text, System and Refraction in a Theory of Literature", *Modern Language Studies* 12 (4), pp. 4–7.

—— 1984. "On the Refraction of Texts", in: Mihai Spariosu (ed.), *Mimesis in Contemporary Theory: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 217–237.

Legeżyńska, Anna. 1999. *Tłumacz i jego kompetencje autorskie: na materiale powojennych tłumaczeń poezji A. Puszkina, W. Majakowskiego, I. Kryłowa i A. Błoka* [The Translator and His Author's Competences: on the Examples of the *Post-War Translations* of the Poetry of A. Pushkin, V. Mayakovsky, I. Krylov, and A. Blok], Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 2nd ed.

Loffredo, Eugenia, Perteghella, Manuela (eds). 2009. *One Poem in Search of a Translator: Re-writing "Les Fenêtres" by Apollinaire*, Oxford: Peter Lang.

Lourie, Richard. 1999. "Who Korczak Was and Why We Cannot Know Him", in: Robert Moses Shapiro (ed.), *Holocaust Chronicles. Individualizing the Holocaust Through Diaries and Other Contemporaneous Personal Accounts*, introduction Ruth R. Wisse, Hoboken, NJ: KTAV Publishing House, Inc.

Potocki, Antoni. 1912. *Polska literatura współczesna*. Cz. II: *Kult jednostki 1890*–1910 [Polish Contemporary Literature. Vol. II: Cult of the Individual 1890–1910]. Warszawa: Gebethner i Wolff.

Przesmycki, Zenon (Miriam). [1901] 1967. "Nowości poetyckie I" [Poetic Novelties I], in: Zenon Przesmycki, *Wybór pism krytycznych* [A Selection of Critical Works], Vol. I–II, Ewa Korzeniewska (ed.), Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, pp. 31–32.

"Prismatic Jane Eyre: An Experiment in the Study of Translations", "Creative Multilingualism"/ Oxford Comparative Criticism and Translation, https://prismaticjaneeyre. org [access: 13.11.2020].

Reynolds, Matthew. 2016. *Translation: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

—— (ed.) 2019. *Prismatic Translation*, Cambridge: Legenda.

Reynolds, Matthew, Park, Sowon S., Clanchy, Kate. 2020. "Prismatic Translation", in: Katrin Kohl, Rajinder, Dudrah, Andrew, Gosler *et al.* (eds). 2020. Creative Multilingualism: A Manifesto, Cambridge, UK: Open Book Publishers, pp. 131–149; https://www.openbookpublishers.com/10.11647/OBP.0206.pdf [access: 03.11.2020].

Shapiro, Norman R. 1997. "Introduction", in: Jean de La Fontaine, *Fifty Fables of La Fontaine*, trans. Norman R. Shapiro, Urbana–Chicago: University of Illinois Press, pp. xiii–xviii.

Sienkiewicz, Barbara. 1982. "Dezautomatyzacyjna funkcja przekładu w przemianach prozy narracyjnej" [The Deautomatising Function of Translation in the Evolution of Prose], in: Jan Błoński, Stanisław Jaworski, Janusz Sławiński (eds.), *Studia o narracji* [Studies on Narration], Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź: Wydawnictwo PAN, pp. 291–304.

Sławiński, Janusz. 1999. "Bez przydziału (VII)" [Without Assignment (VII)], *Teksty Drugie* 1/2, pp. 151–163.

Steiner, George. [1973] 1998. *After Babel*: *Aspects of Language and Translation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3rd ed.

Śliwiak, Tadeusz. 1981. *Solizman*, Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.

—— 1988. *Słownik wyrazów światłoczułych* [Thesaurus of Photosensitive Words], War-
szawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.

Tahmasebian, Kayvan, Gould, Rebecca, Ruth. 2020. "Farhadpour, Prismatically Trans-
lated: Philosophical Prose and the Activist Agenda", in: Kayvan Tahmasebian, Re-
becca Ruth Gould (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Activism*,
Abingdon–New York: Routledge, pp. 49–69.

Tymoczko, Maria. 1999. "Post-colonial Writing and Literary Translation", in: Susan
Bassnett, Harish Trivedi (eds.), *Post-Colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*,
London–New York: Routledge, pp. 19–40.

Urbanek, Dorota. 2004. *Pęknięte lustro. Tendencje w teorii i praktyce przekładu na
tle myśli humanistycznej* [The Broken Mirror: Trends in the Theory and Practice
of Translation in the Context of Humanistic Thought], Warszawa: Wydawnictwo
Trio – Instytut Rusycystyki UW.

Venuti, Lawrence. [1995] 2002. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*,
London: Routledge.

Weber, Julie Tomberlin. 2008. "Translation as a Prism: Broadening the Spectrum of
Eighteenth-Century Identity", in: Anthony Gregg Roeber (ed.), *Ethnographies and
Exchanges*: *Native Americans*, *Moravians, and Catholics in Early North America*,
University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 195–207.

Yao, Steven G. 2002. *Translation and the Languages of Modernism. Gender, Politics,
Language*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

—— 2013. "Translation Studies and Modernism", in: J.-M. Rabaté (ed.), *A Handbook of
Modernism Studies*, Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, pp. 209–224.