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ABSTRACT

In this thesis, I intend to show that it is possible to offer a partial explanation for the fact that pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction has been recognised only to a very limited extent in Britain. In doing this, I embrace the limitations and unaddressed areas of polysystem theory, an approach that leads to several contributions to this theory so that it is more suited to look at marginal translations. In this study, the source context and the largely hypothetical target context (given the predominant lack of English translations) of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction are conceptualised as systems informed by a variety of factors.

I begin by introducing polysystem theory in Chapter 1, where I also explain the rationale for its use in this study. I also briefly define pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction and elaborate on the nature of its visibility in Britain. I then go on to consider, in Chapter 2, the origins and the characteristics of the literature in question in search of factors that inform the current status of this literature in Britain. In Chapter 3, I focus on specific aspects of British culture and history to identify factors embedded in the target context that inform the current limited recognition of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain. In Chapters 4 and 5, I turn to the texts of the few English translations of Polish-Jewish works of fiction; and consider the dynamics of their publishing processes respectively. Finally, the conclusions I draw in final Chapter 6 are that polysystem theory can be applied to account for the limited attention paid to pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction as a whole in Britain; and, possibly, to account for other largely unacknowledged literary works in other contexts. Moreover, drawing on the results of this study, I suggest ways in which the current status of the literature I am concerned with can be changed in future.

My main contribution is that of the new concept of a systemic gap, which in this study represents largely untranslated writing in British literature, and which has enabled me to address the question of the limited reception of Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain. In the light of these findings, I argue that it is useful to look at untranslated texts and largely unrecognised translations because such research can offer new insights into the practice and the theory of translation.
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A note on terminology

Literary works by Polish Jews written specifically in the Polish language are referred to as “Polish-Jewish” while literature by Polish Jews more broadly, regardless of the language (which could include Polish, Hebrew or Yiddish), is termed “Polish Jewish” (without a hyphen).
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Why polysystem theory?

The famous statistic that only three percent of all the published works in the English language are translations originally gave an indication of the proportion of translations of both literary and non-literary texts on the US publishing market in 2007 (Three Percent Website 2016). And yet, it has often been quoted also in reference to the British literary market (Anderson 2014; Tate 2016), giving a bad name to English-language publishers beyond the USA, who have been generally seen as reluctant to introduce literature from other parts of the world to their readers. Although I have referred to this three percent ironically, there is, presumably, a reason why translations into English have not been particularly popular, also in Britain. The most recent available data suggest that the proportion of literary translations into English in Britain and in Ireland between 1990 and 2012 was slightly higher than three percent, and consistently remained above four percent (Büchler and Trentacosti 2015:5), a number that is now also quoted by English PEN on the official website (English PEN 2016).

However, attempts to explain the reluctance to publish literary translations in Britain and elsewhere have not been insightful. The blame is often attributed to publishers who tend to rely on the assumption that non-Anglophone literary works simply will not sell well in the UK. “Mainstream publishers are still very much about the bottom line,” says BJ Epstein, a translation scholar and practitioner, and adds that the reading public in Britain is often underestimated by British publishers (in Alberge 2014). Consequently, it is mainly profitable translations of bestsellers, most notably prose, that dominate the market of translated literature into English, as noticed by the translation theorist Lawrence Venuti, who has observed that British and American publishers tend to focus on acquiring bestsellers, and limit the financial risk of introducing “financially risky” books, which include the English translations of foreign works more broadly (2008:12).

Similarly, in her discussion specifically about the translation of fiction, Charlotte Barslund (2011: 151), a translator of Scandinavian literature into English, has observed that “[p]ublishers generally have no wish to publish
translations which will seem unintelligible to their readers”, and therefore it is only the works which “have the greatest appeal – based on a range of criteria – to potential readers” that are usually selected for translation into English. As a result, publishers are generally wary of going beyond the predictable preferences of readers. And yet, Barslund has added that she is unsure whether it is anyone’s responsibility at all to have a balanced representation of the literature of a particular country (2011: 151). Perhaps blaming publishers would be the easiest way to end the discussion, but it needs to be remembered that publishers do not operate in isolation. On the contrary, their decisions and successes, or publishing failures, are linked to the source literature and its context, not to mention their own social, cultural and economic settings. It is from this angle that I intend to look at the few English translations of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction: Loves and Ambitions, the translation of Herminia Naglerowa’s novel; Salt of the Earth, the translation of Józef Wittlin’s work; The Cinnamon Shops, a collection of short stories originally written by Bruno Schulz; and a short story from the Lucifer Unemployed collection, by Aleksander Wat (cf. Table 1 below). It is the question of the limited attention paid to these translations that informs my enquiry to explain the limited recognition of pre-war Polish-Jewish prose fiction more broadly among British publishers and readers. By following this literature from its source Polish context to its largely hypothetical British context, I wish to explain in more detail why most of this body of literature remains untranslated into English and why the translations that do exist have not been positively recognised.

I intend to address the lack of visibility (a term I define in detail in section 1.5 below) of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain from the point of view of polysystem theory. This theory is the best possible tool because it enables me to look at translations from an all-embracing systemic point of view, taking into account various factors from the areas of reality that are not directly connected with texts but which nevertheless contribute to determining the visibility or lack of visibility of the literature I am concerned with. Adopting such a broad perspective makes it possible to work with bodies of literary texts as a whole, rather than individual texts in isolation, because within this theoretical framework the former are conceived as systems that are interdependent with other systems, being informed and shaped by multiple factors. In the theory of polysystems, a system is
composed of “the network of associations that can be hypothesised for a certain set of assumed observables” (Even-Zohar 1990: 27).

The concept of a polysystem was created by the Israeli cultural theorist Itamar Even-Zohar in the early 1970s, but the notion of a literature as a system stems from the Russian Formalist thinkers working roughly between 1914 and the late 1920s (Hermans 1999: 102; 103; 104). Russian Formalists, such as Yuri Tynyanov and Roman Jakobson, looked at a literary work, and at literature more broadly, as self-renewing and hierarchically organised “structured wholes” (Hermans 1999: 104). The introduction of polysystem theory into translation studies by Even-Zohar led to a shift in the focus of the discipline from textual investigation, which revolved around linguistic aspects of translation, towards a more interdisciplinary approach that took into account various non-linguistic factors that affect translation. In other words, the systemic approach to translation provides theoretical tools for looking at the context of translation more broadly. In polysystem theory, systems comprising various kinds of literatures are in constant flux so that they constantly change their positions within their systems, which in turn relocate within a larger system over time. This movement in the systemic conceptualisation of literature is driven by literary factors, such as literary tendencies and publishing practices, as well as extra-literary factors, such as history, politics or economy. Thus, drawing on a systemic model of literature, I conceive British literature as a polysystem (although, it is important to note, a polysystem does not necessarily have to equate to a literature of a particular country). The model of systems does not exist in and is not isomorphic with the real world because it is just a model. In the diagram below, I offer a systematic representation of the particular areas of British literature I shall be examining. It should be understood as a small part of the overall polysystem of British literature.
Extra-textual factors:
society readers’ preferences politics
economy literary tendencies the identity of British Jews
readers’ expectations publishing practices translation practices

Figure 1 A systemic representation of the particular areas of British literature

The first system represented in the diagram (1) is British-Jewish literature. In my discussion, I am concerned with its historical and sociopolitical contexts and with literary themes and tendencies within that literature to offer possible explanations as to why pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction would not have lain within the interests of the vast majority of the target reading audience, including writers, readers and publishers. The period I am most interested in spans from the late 19th century, which coincides with the rise of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction, to the beginning of
the 21st century, a temporal span that reflects the evolution of the system and the changing nature of factors that determine it in the systemic model. However, when I address historical factors that inform this system I also look at the medieval history of British Jews. The second system (2) comprises the English translations of Polish literature. As far as this system is concerned, I shall determine the preferences of publishers and readers regarding the selection of Polish literature in order to explain why literary and publishing trends in this system have not led to any particular interest in most pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in the target context, in particular in most recent times. Finally, the third system (3) comprises Jewish writing in Britain, mainly literatures from Israel and from the USA. While the systems of Israeli Hebrew Jewish and Yiddish works comprise primarily English translations, the system of Holocaust writing also includes literature originally written in English. Rather than language, it is the origin and the theme of this writing that defines its place in this system. These three kinds of Jewish writing are part of the cultural legacy of European Jewry as a whole, of which Polish Jewry forms part. Thus, it makes sense to assume that the expectations of readers and the main publishing trends in each subsystem (i.e. system within a system) need to be considered to determine how the presence of these literary works in Britain have affected the status of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction there.

It is also worth noting that extra-textual factors listed above the systems in Figure 1 will vary, depending on the historical time and the literary system discussed. However, they should be considered as part of each system individually.

The black gap of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in the middle of the systemic model outlined above represents the largely unrecognised translations I have referred to earlier, and inevitably hints at the lack of English translations of most pre-war Polish-Jewish works. Given that polysystem theory has not been used to explain untranslated texts or largely unrecognised translations thus far, I have designed the concept of a systemic gap to accomplish it. The concept of a systemic gap is, then, a representation of a specific literary phenomenon modelled as a subsystem of a system because it is part of the larger system of British literature. It is important to note that this model does not exist in and is not isomorphic with the real world. The gap is defined by semi-visible translations that exist, and serves as a descriptive tool to explain the lack of visibility of a specific
literature more broadly, including the lack of translations altogether, in a particular foreign context. The concept of the systemic gap, then, resembles that of a literary system as defined by Even-Zohar, in particular with regard to its hypothetical and inferential nature.

The gap in the model is located between all the three systems within the larger system of British Jewish literature because, as I intend to show in my thesis, several factors related to each system can partly explain why only few works of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction have been translated and why these translations have not been widely recognised in the target polysystem. In other words, just as systems themselves are not self-contained and self-defined, neither is a gap which, standing for few unrecognised translated works of fiction, is informed by the history, dynamics and factors relating to other systems. In this respect, the gap also resembles a subsystem of a system. The gap’s relations with other systems is reflected in the structure of the thesis, which looks at literary, linguistic and cultural factors of the target system (I outline the structure of the thesis further below). The concept of the systemic gap, it is worth noting, has not been created in polysystem theory thus far, and it is one of my primary aims in this study to introduce it by looking at pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain.

The concept of a system is, thus, very broad and therefore is able to accommodate factors linked to translation in its broadest sense, such as the preferences of the reading public, politics, publishers’ strategies etc. These and other factors vary from system to system. For instance, literary trends, readers’ preferences and their underlying factors will presumably be different in the system of British-Jewish literature and in the system of translated Polish literature. Furthermore, such factors themselves, as pointed out earlier, change over time, reflecting evolving societies and literary trends, fashions and political contexts in the real world. Consequently, the following mapping of factors behind the lack of visibility of the literature I am concerned with is, to a large extent, chronological because some factors can only be inferred from the historical past. It is also worth noting that while the application of a systemic approach allows me to identify particular areas that need to be explored more closely in order to ultimately explain the lack of visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction, the areas themselves need to be explored differently.
Therefore, in order to explain why translated pre-war Polish-Jewish prose fiction has not been widely acclaimed in Britain, I will apply a particular analytical textual comparison in order to look at the translation shifts in the texts of the translations I am concerned with. I will then infer possible impacts of these shifts on the text’s interpretation and reception with the help of a cognitive-based theory. Finally, I will link the results of the text-based approach to the wider argument about the lack of visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish literature in Britain.

A process-based approach, on the other hand, will be a way to look at preceding processes of publishing of the translated texts to find out whether they predetermined the ensuing limited reception of published translations in any way. Here, I will have recourse to actor network theory, which will help me to look at the reasons for and consequences of the moves and strategies by people involved in the translation projects in question. I will then contextualise identified actions and strategies in their political and literary settings to see how the ventures in the translation projects I discuss were affected by their literary contexts. In doing so, I will look at people who were involved in these projects as individuals “guided by conventions and expectations from others within and outside the team” (Jones 2011: 4-5).

Similarly, the question of why most pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction has not been translated into English at all will require a specific approach. I will first focus on the source literature and its context to track down specific historical and socio-political aspects of the history of the development of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in its original context to identify factors that may have pre-determined the predominant lack of potential of this literature for translation. I will also consider literary and linguistic features of this fiction to see whether any of these aspects have impeded the translation into English.

I will adopt this approach when I look at the other end of the unrealised transfer, that is the British target context. I will narrow my focus down to three areas that include three literary systems, as I have pointed out earlier. I will also look at factors that may not be classified as strictly underlying one system only in the model of the British context I have devised. For instance, I will track down the historical process of the development of the community of British Jews in Britain, alongside their changing cultural identity to infer, for example, why some aspects
of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction would not have lain within the expectations of British-Jewish readers. Although in this discussion I will not analyse any literary texts in detail, I will occasionally bring in particular aspects of some examples of British-Jewish fiction to illustrate a wider argument concerning the target context.

It is also worth stressing again that the relatively invisible status of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain, whereby most translations are yet to happen and those that exist have not triggered much of a response, makes the explanation I offer in this thesis largely inferential. This means that I will rely neither on any real-time process research nor on any specific hard data (such as translation or publisher’s reports or statistics). Instead, I will look at particular aspects of reality, infer links between various factors across time and across different places, to form a coherent explanation of the phenomenon I am concerned with.

1.2 Reasons for testing polysystem theory

Even-Zohar was aware that theories arise from “a negotiation (…) between certain conceptions and concretely local situations” (1991: 3). Looking into a particular “set of problems”, as the translation theorist Gideon Toury has observed, is “the best means of testing, refuting and especially modifying and amending the very theory, in whose terms research is carried out” (Toury 1995:1). By looking at factors underlying the lack of visibility of a particular literature in Britain, I wish to take up questions that pertain to polysystem theory that have been left unanswered so far, in particular whether polysystem theory can be used to explain the lack of visibility of particular literatures in a particular context. Testing polysystem theory in this way opens up the possibility to redesign it, which, in translation research, has been historically applied to look both at existing translated literatures as a whole and at the position of literary works within systems. Such was the aim of Even-Zohar in his seminal conceptualisation of polysystem theory: one of his primary goals was to address and explain, among other things, the role of literary translation in the structure of the historical model of Hebrew literature in Israel (1978: 75-91).

Since then, most applications of polysystem theory in translation studies have tended to focus on visible translated works that have been recognised by the target audience and that had a particular impact on the target context (cf. 6.1.2).
The positive impact of the French translations of English novels on the French literary system was the focus of the study of the translation scholar Shelly Yahalom (1981; see also Hermans 1991: 112-114 for a detailed discussion of the research). A subsequent work by the translation theorist Lieven D’hulst looked at the role of translation in shaping French poetry at the turn of the 19th century (1987; see also Hermans 1991: 114-117). Polysystem theory was also used by another translation theorist, Chong Yau Yuk, to examine the reasons for the acclaim of certain Chinese versions of the Bible (Chong 2000). Finally, in a more recent study, Noriko Matsunaga-Watson looked at the translations into Japanese that were named bestsellers by Japan’s Publisher’s Yearbook between 1953 and 1998 in order to “examine the validity of polysystem theory’s views on text selection” (2005: 161).

Thus, while the aim of polysystem theorists has been primarily to look at how translations contribute to literary systems, I seek to explore why particular translations have failed to do so. Consequently, in order to test out what has not been, rather than is, translated I have created a concept of what I term “a systemic gap”, which I have explained earlier.

1.3 The meaning of “Polish-Jewish”

When I use the term “Polish-Jewish” I want to accentuate Polish-Jewish experience, rather than religion, ethnicity or national belonging. What I am particularly concerned with is the Jewish aspect of Polish-Jewish writing. In my understanding of it, I draw on the literary scholar Robert Alter’s primary criterion of Jewish experience for classifying a literary work as Jewish:

One cannot, however, simply discount the possibility that some essentially Jewish qualities may adhere to the writing of the most thoroughly acculturated Jews. Most readers have sensed in at least some of these “post-traditional” (...) Jewish writers certain modes of imagination or general orientations toward art and experience that seem characteristically Jewish, even where the writer (...) avoids all references to his ethnic origins. (Alter 1969: 18)

Thus, my main criterion is, too, a Jewish experience because the reliance on overt Jewish themes may be deceptive, as noted by Alter.

It is worth highlighting, however, that any literature whose label conveys religion, ethnicity or nationality runs a risk of obtaining a particular political and
ideological charge. One of the political slants implied by the label of the broader term of “Jewish literature” is addressed by Even-Zohar, for whom “only a nationalistic Jewish approach, or a racist antisemitic one (…) would adopt the term ‘Jewish literature’ on the basis of the origin of writers” (Even-Zohar 1978: 79). For writers to be classified as Jewish, Even-Zohar further argues, they need to have written in Hebrew at some point in their writing career (1978: 80).

For others, such as the scholar of literature Eugenia Prokop-Janiec, the term “Jewish literature” imposes a particular identity on writers. She argues that the cultural and national identity of anyone, including Polish Jewish writers, is an extremely complicated and delicate issue, and, thus, in the case of Polish-Jewish writing, “[t]he only approach that is intellectually and morally proper is one that respects the self-identification of the writers” (Shenitzer 2003: xvi-xvii). However, she also admits that the reliance on autobiographical records or literary works in their own right is equally problematic, and fails to offer any alternative definition.

I stand against such negative and exclusive definitions of Jewish writing. My intellectual position in this regard is akin to that of the French scholar of Yiddish studies Rachel Ertel, who says that the concept of Jewish literature written in a non-Jewish language tends to be “exploited to racist ends”, forcing critics to a kind of self-censorship (1994: 224). Ertel adds that the concept of such literature reflects well the two-fold nature of literary works which are born from the writer’s individual consciousness and, equally, from the experience of a collectivity (Ertel 1994: 224). Therefore, there is no reason why the criterion of belonging to a particular nation state should be the only acceptable one.

Indeed, “Jewish literature” does not necessarily have to imply racist or antisemitic undertones. Conversely, it may be indicative of the multifaceted nature of this writing, also in relation to majority literature, which Jewish writing tends to be part of. For example, Jewish American literature, in which “Jewish” qualifies “American”, may imply a hierarchy that gives American literature a more prominent position. Equally, though, the term can suggest a more stable and more inclusive position of Jewish writers within American literature as a whole (a position signified by the lack of a hyphen in “Jewish American”). The question of distinctiveness inherent in Jewish writing is brought up by the literary scholar Hana Wirth-Nesher, for whom Jewish American writing “need not be read as exclusively American
literature” (2016: 11), because Jewish writing brings into American literature distinct themes and style that are bound up with the experiences of Jewish writers in that country, and reflect what Wirth-Nesher terms “the modern valorization of multiple cultural origins” (Wirth-Nesher 2016: 11).

Similarly, Polish-Jewish writers who convey their concerns and worldviews in their writing which goes beyond overtly Jewish themes still remain Polish-Jewish to me, as with the case of any writer who does not cease to belong to a certain group of writers when writing about issues not directly related to their immediate cultural context. This varying presence of Jewishness (i.e. what constitutes being Jewish) within pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction is discussed further in Chapter 2. It is, however, worth pointing out briefly that the role of Jewishness in the lives of some of the writers whose fiction I discuss in this thesis shows that the Jewish aspect of their work is often intangible and yet present, as in their lives. The place of Jewish heritage in the lives of Bruno Schulz (1892-1942) and Aleksander Wat (1900-1967) was similar to some extent. Both writers were born into self-professed Jewish families. Schulz’s parents belonged to the Jewish community even though they were not exceedingly religious (Robertson 2003: 35). Similarly, Wat’s family was Jewish and proud of their Jewish traditions. Wat’s father, Mendel Michał Chwat, was a Hebrew school graduate who studied Jewish scriptures and Kabbalah throughout his life (Venclova 1996: 2). Moreover, Wat’s Jewish ancestors included once famous Jewish sages and wonder-workers (Venclova 1996: 3). However, neither writer, Schulz or Wat, outspokenly identified themselves with the community of practising Polish Jews. At the same time, though, they never officially severed their connection with Jewish traditions, nor did they deny their Polish-Jewish origin. Schulz “was not indifferent to [Jewish] myths or sacred rites,” which made him attend Jewish services occasionally (Robertson 2003: 35). Similarly, Wat, who spent his formative years in the company of assimilated Polish Jews and non-Jewish Poles, distanced himself from the community of practising Jews. Even then, however, his Jewish background left an imprint on his own creative work, which also contains tropes of his childhood fascination with Catholicism, leading to a “distinctive amalgam of Judaism and Christianity”, most notably in his later literary works, as noted by the American literary scholar Tomas Venclova (1996: 8). Wat openly admitted that
he “always felt [him]self a Jew-Jew and a Pole-Pole (...),” and was proud of having two backgrounds (Venclova 1996: 14-15). Correspondingly, Jewishness in the pre-war works of both Wat and Schulz is expressed in an indirect way, conveyed by literary themes and style. This vague presence of Jewishness enables multiple readings of their texts, a Jewish one being only a possibility.

Herminia Naglerowa (1890-1957) was also born into the family of Polish Jews (Terlecki 1967: 8). However, although it contains specific historical and cultural references, her pre-war novel would be challenging to read from the perspective of her Jewishness. And yet, it would be equally problematic to assume that the scant presence of references to Jewishness in her work came hand in hand with the rejection of her Jewish background. The fact that she decided to abandon the idea of writing a novel about Moses and to focus on her wartime experiences instead after the Second World War, as noted by the Polish émigré writer Tymon Terlecki (1967: 19-20), may reflect her priorities that were likely to overshadow her own Jewish identity in her creative work.

Józef Wittlin (1896-1976) never renounced his Jewish origins by conversion but remained for some Jewish only “by name”, to use the words of the Polish Jewish writer Isaac Bashevis Singer in his conversation with Philip Roth (2002: 81). In his writing, too, Wittlin’s Jewishness is less pronounced, overshadowed by his overall concerns with the condition of humanity and human dignity after the First World War. Humanist concerns have a central place also in his pre-war novel Sól ziemi [Salt of the Earth]1. This novel is bound to be read as a humanist protest against the war rather than a novel that would be specifically Jewish although it does contain minor Jewish characters and references to Jewish culture.

Whether or not Wittlin’s humanism, Naglerowa’s commitment to the situation of Poland during and after the Second World War, or the unique imagery in Schulz’s works are informed by their Jewish origins is, in any case, a secondary question that would have to be answered by the readers themselves because it is

---

1 Sól ziemi was intended as the first volume of a trilogy which was never completed by Wittlin (Wiega ndt 1991: xlvii)
the reception of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction, rather than its birth, that I address in this thesis. My focus, then, shifts from defining Polish-Jewish writing to how it is perceived in Britain (although I briefly address the dual nature of this writing again in Chapter 2). Therefore, although it is necessary to highlight ideological nuances that are inherent in this literature, its strict definition is not the major concern of this study.

1.4 Pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction

Pre-war fiction originally written in Polish by Polish Jewish writers is only a part of a larger picture of literary achievements by Polish Jews, termed together as Polish Jewish literature (without a hyphen), spanning across genres (poetry or feuilletons, for example) and languages (Yiddish and Hebrew). Seen as a system, Polish Jewish literature consists of a Hebrew-language literary system, a Yiddish-language literary system, and a Polish-language system (see, for instance, Shmeruk 1989 for an insightful discussion of the pre-war trilingual culture of Polish Jews). The focus of this thesis, however, is largely restricted to Polish-language Jewish fiction.

The lack of visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain becomes especially striking if compared with the availability of post-war Polish-Jewish writing in English, a body of literature that inevitably comprises wartime and Holocaust memoirs as well as historical fiction. British English translations include, among other titles, the translation of Natan Gross’s *Kim pan jest, Panie Grymek?*, translated as *Who Are You, Mr Grymek* (Brand 1969) and republished again in 2001; Władysław Szpilman’s *Pianista*, translated as *The Pianist: The Extraordinary Story of One Man’s Survival in Warsaw 1939-1945* (Bell 1999); Henryk Vogler’s *Wstęp do fizjologii strachu*, translated as *Lessons in Fear* (Laskowski 2002); Michał Grynberg’s edited book *Pamiętniki z getta warszawskiego: fragmenty i rejesty*, translated as *Words to Outlive Us: Eyewitness Accounts from the Warsaw Ghetto* (Boehm 2003); Stella Müller-Madej’s *Dziewczynka z listy Schindlera. Oczami dziecka*, translated as *A Girl from Schindler’s List* (Brand 1997); or, finally, Adolf Rudnicki’s *Wniebowstąpienie*, translated as *Ascent to Heaven* (Stevens 1951). Some of these titles have later been republished in the USA, others have not.
Conversely, there are post-war Polish-Jewish works of literature that have been published only in the USA, and not in Britain (as yet), such as Hanna Krall’s *Sublokatorka*, which has been translated as *The Subtenant* (Stasińska and Weschler 1986) or Bogdan Wojdowski’s *Chleb zrucony umarłym*, translated as *Bread for the Departed* (Levine 1997). Other works of fiction, such as A *Scrap of Time and Other Stories* (Levine 1987), the American English translation of Ida Fink’s *Skrawek czasu*, were re-published in Britain (1988, London: Owen). Although the interest in this literature would have been different in each country, it makes sense to assume that post-war Polish-Jewish fiction is a shared interest for both British and US publishers and readers, though to a varying extent. That interest has been, presumably, the primary drive behind re-editions of some of the above-listed translations, such as *The Subtenant*, which was re-published again in 1992 (Evanston), *Scrap of Time*, re-published in 1988 (London), in 1989 (New York and Harmondworth), in 1995 and in 1998 (Evanston). Moreover, Krall’s *Zdążyć przed Panem Bogiem* has been translated into English twice as *Shielding the flame: an intimate conversation* (Stasińska and Weschler 1986) and as *To steal a march on God* (Kosicka 1996). Two different translations into English suggest that there was a need for a revised new translation, with a likely view of presenting another reading of and facilitating a wider acclaim of the book in different English-language target contexts.

Thus, while the USA and Britain share – although to a varying degree – an interest in post-war Polish-Jewish fiction, it is not the case with pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction. Table 2 lists forty pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction writers as a sample for this thesis, though it is worth mentioning that the list is not complete and does not exhaust the entire legacy of pre-war Polish-Jewish prose writers, mainly because pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction is still difficult to identify and catalogue. As pointed out earlier, of all forty writers only four have been translated into English: Herminia Naglerowa, Bruno Schulz, Aleksander Wat and Józef Wittlin (see Table 1 below). In this thesis, I seek to explain why these particular works have been translated into English and why their reception in Britain has been relatively limited. The limited notice taken of these translations in Britain contributes to the lack of visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction more broadly, therefore the empirical examination of the publishing process and of the subsequent reception
of these four writers will help to shed more light on my overall argument about the limited recognition of this literature as a whole in Britain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>author</th>
<th>original title</th>
<th>translations into English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schulz², Bruno</td>
<td>• <em>Sklepy cynamonowe</em> (1933)</td>
<td>• <em>Cinnamon Shops and Other Stories</em> (Wieniwska 1963, London)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Sanatorium pod klepsydra</em> (1937)</td>
<td>• <em>Sanatorium under the Sign of the Hourglass</em> (Wieniwska 1978, New York)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wat, Aleksander</td>
<td><em>Bezrobotny Lucyfer</em> (1927)</td>
<td><em>Lucifer Unemployed</em> (Vallee 1990, Evanston)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittlin, Józef</td>
<td><em>Sól ziemi</em> (1936)</td>
<td><em>Salt of the Earth</em> (de Chary 1939, London)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Later re-editions of the same translation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 1940, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 1941, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 1970, Chicago</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction translated into English

Although the small number of English translations listed above brings together both American and British publishing ventures, this thesis focuses mainly on Britain rather than on both Britain and the USA together because the cultural and literary contexts of these countries are too different to include in one picture of literary reception that I seek to paint. However, I look into the much wider acclaim

---

² As discussed in Chapter 3, Schulz has been widely translated into English, and the number of re-editions exceed the limits of space here. Therefore, I include only the original dates of the first translations of Schulz’s short stories, retaining, however, the re-editions of the English translations of the remaining Polish-Jewish works of fiction.
of Schulz’s works in the USA (discussed in Chapter 5) in order to find out what has facilitated his acclaim there, and how its underlying causes may explain a different and less-engaging response to this fiction in Britain.

There is, then, something specific about Britain that is conducive to explaining, firstly, the limited engagement of the British reading public with the published translations and, secondly, why the remaining Polish-Jewish prose fiction have not been translated into English thus far. This thesis attempts to define what this specificity is informed by and how it links to the poor status of the literature in question in Britain. In search of an explanation, it is worth adding that I do not rely on any aesthetic judgements of the literature I discuss. Aesthetic values in literature, as in any other creative field, not only change over time but they are also bound to be subject to individual perception. Therefore, what I can take for good writing, others do not necessarily have to. Consequently, aesthetic judgement of literature would not be a viable explanation in the investigation of literary reception, especially from the perspective of polysystem theory, in which the aesthetic value of literary works is not seen as a factor that shapes literary systems. On the contrary, the rejection of value judgements, which makes it possible to look behind literary systems, has been a strong claim in polysystem theory since its inception, as noted by Even-Zohar (1990: 13):

[i]t may seem trivial, yet warrants special emphasis, that the polysystem hypothesis involves a rejection of value judgments as criteria (…) If one accepts the polysystem hypothesis, then one must also accept that the historical study of literary polysystems cannot confine itself to the so-called “masterpieces” (…) This kind of elitism cannot be compatible with literary historiography just as general history can no longer be the life stories of kings and generals.

1.5 The meaning of “visibility”

While I have just discussed the kind of reception of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain I focus on in this thesis, it is worth stressing again that I seek to explain why the existing translations have received, in fact, barely any attention in Britain and how such a poor response links with the absence of the English translations of the remaining works of Polish-Jewish fiction, leading to the overall lack of visibility of this literature in Britain.
Therefore, the small number of translations in its own right is not the main factor that underlies the lack of visibility of the literature in question in Britain. It is rather the vague borderline between unrecognised presence and the absence. I draw on the concept of the invisibility of the translator that has been created by Venuti in his discussion about the translator’s situation and the process of translating in Britain and in the USA (Venuti 2008). In it, “invisibility” refers both to the fluent and transparent nature of the translated text which obscures the translator’s interventions, leading to the increased invisibility of the translator; and to the practice of reading and assessing translations in which issues relating to the translation in its own right tend to be rare (Venuti 2008: 1-2). In other words, the term “invisibility” stands for the general lack of awareness of the role of the translator in fiction translation.

Similarly, the predominant lack of awareness of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain is what informs its lack of visibility. It encompasses both the presence of largely acknowledged existing translations and the lack of English translations altogether. The concept of the lack of visibility as I use it in this thesis, then, goes beyond the ontological status of texts, and considers instead broader literary, cultural and linguistic factors, as I have explained earlier.

The number of existing translations is not the main issue that defines that lack of visibility also because a large-scale translation of a writer does not secure a wider acclaim abroad. The history of translation has witnessed successful single translations into English, as with the case of the Danish writer Peter Høeg and the English translation of his novel, *Miss Smilla’s Feeling for Snow* (David 1993, London), which became “phenomenonally successful” (Scott 2000: 318), contributing to the wider international interest in Scandinavian detective fiction in the 1990s (Crace 2009). Similarly, the English translation of Jostein Gaardner’s *Sofies verden* as *Sophie’s World* (Møller 1995, London) became an immediate success, reviewed as “a wonderful book” which, as a book about philosophy for children, must have required a special talent to write, as praised by the Irish editor and author Peter Costello (1995: 228).

And because the lack of visibility that I am concerned with refers both to untranslated literature that remains in its original context, and to translated works in the target context, then in order to see what informs that lack of visibility, both contexts in Poland and in Britain need to be considered. The lack of visibility of pre-war Polish-
Jewish fiction in Britain could be explained by its relatively short literary tradition, which was moreover obscured by the Second World War. During the Second World War, almost three million Polish Jews perished during the Holocaust. Only three hundred survived, including those who had been exiled to the Far East in the Soviet Union and those who were either in hiding in the country or managed to survive in extermination camps (Żbikowski 2013:112). The horrific events of the Second World War caused a big cultural loss in the legacy of Polish Jewry. Therefore, the annihilation of Polish Jews and of the considerable part of their literary heritage may be contributing factors to the limited awareness of the existence of Polish-Jewish literature in Britain.

It can also be said that another obvious reason for the unrecognised status of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain is the fact that Polish remains a rather rare source language in literary translation, which means that Polish literature is still little known in the world. Suffice it to say that from 1999 to 2009, only 265 Polish titles of all genres (prose fiction, drama, poetry, reportage and memoirs) were translated into English (Rzepa 2011:256). By contrast, within an earlier yet similar time span of ten years from 1989 to 1999, the overall number of translations from English into Polish, reached 15 054 (over 6 000 of which comprised translations from British English; see Adamiec and Kołodziejczyk 2001).

However, none of these explanations can be directly linked to pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction or the British context in their own right. Instead, these broad explanations hint at general factors which are not enough to describe and explain the limited notice taken of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in a more insightful way. Therefore, I seek to offer an explanation that goes beyond the obvious given, and that looks instead at factors embedded in this literature’s original context and in the specific aspects of the British context. It is worth highlighting, though, that the reason for offering such an explanation is not just to account for a particular set of translation phenomena. I do so, firstly, to test polysystem theory and suggest ways in which it can be enhanced, and, secondly, to offer a theoretical framework to look at lesser-known areas of literary polysystems to see exactly why they are less visible.
1.6 Structure of the thesis

In Chapter 2, I focus on the source context of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction and discuss various factors relating to the source culture, literature and language, which shaped this literature as what I term “inherently unavailable” for translation (a term I define further in Chapter 2). This chapter focuses on the Polish factors underlying the lack of visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain. I discuss how the origin and the cultural identity of Polish Jewry as well as the characteristics of Polish-Jewish fiction may have determined its availability for translation into English. The brief outline of Polish-Jewish prose I offer here is necessarily concise and does not take into account all themes, titles and literary genres within the entire pre-war Polish-Jewish writing. The main focus of this thesis is placed on the status of this prose fiction in Britain so the idea behind the outline is to present the main literary tendencies and features that distinguished pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction from remaining literatures in the source context. Although I focus on prose fiction, several poets, such as Maurycy Szymel and Roman Brandstaetter, are also mentioned to place prose fiction in the wider context of pre-war Polish-Jewish literature.

Chapter 3 mirrors the former in that it looks at the corresponding cultural, linguistic and literary factors in the target British context (although other countries, such as Israel and the USA are also discussed when I look at the English translations of fiction from these countries). The main overall aim of this chapter is to pin down factors that underlie the lack of visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain, in particular the factors that have contributed to the limited interest in this writing among target readers.

Chapter 4 looks at the translation approaches in all four existing translations I have listed in Table 1 above, that is Loves and Ambitions, the translation of Naglerowa’s novel; Salt of the Earth, the translation of Wittlin’s novel; The Cinnamon Shops, a collection of short stories originally written by Schulz; and a short story from the Lucifer Unemployed collection, originally written by Wat. I discuss the translation of Wat’s short story despite it being published in the USA because, rather than its production, it is the translated text in its own right and its potential effects on the reader that are relevant. My contention in this chapter is
that the accumulation of particular translations shifts might have influenced the interpretation of these texts in a way that led to the diminished interest in them.

Chapter 5, on the other hand, goes behind these translation projects (except for *Lucifer Unemployed* because the publishing venture was carried out in the USA) in order to look at the motives behind incentives and strategies by authors, translators and publishers before the publication of the book. I also examine how they have contributed to the limited reception of the texts in Britain, and how they are linked with the lack of translations of the remaining Polish-Jewish prose fiction more broadly. Additionally, I also look at British-published anthologies that do include translations of excerpts of Polish Jewish literature in order to explain how they militate against the wider acclaim of the literature I am concerned with.

It is also worth noting that reception in this discussion means mainly critical reception, especially early reviews, although literary criticism that addresses particular works of Polish-Jewish fiction in English translation is also referred to. Critical reception, it should be noted, is not the same as the interest of the general public, which in any case would be problematic to measure given the largely invisible status of this literature. Moreover, critical reviews tend to highlight unique features of a particular literary work, and the question I am interested in is why readers have not, or have (as in the case of Schulz’s works in the USA) engaged with them. Additionally, differences between critical responses in the source context and in the target context of a particular work in translation may also hint at translation shifts and their role in the lack of visibility of the translations. Critical reception of some of the English translations of pre-war Polish-Jewish prose fiction is addressed in Chapter 5, in which, among other things, I draw a contrast between the rather long-standing popularity of Schulz’s short stories in the USA and the limited recognition of his *oeuvre* in Britain to determine what has caused that difference. Literary criticism is also mentioned in earlier chapters, mainly to support my line of argument, especially in relation to possible readings of works I discuss, as I do in Chapter 4, in which I include Venclova’s critical approach to Wat’s works, for example.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>the author’s name</th>
<th>title</th>
<th>year of publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bunt lawin [The Rebellion of Avalanches]</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tatry, narty, miłość [Tatra Mountains, Skis, Love]</td>
<td>1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Triumf bestji [The Triumph of the Beast]</td>
<td>1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mój film [My Film]</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Więczierz w głębinie [A Fish Pot in the Depth]</td>
<td>1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usta Italji [The Lips of Italy]</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Godzina kalinowa [Viburnum Hour]</td>
<td>1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pochwała życia i śmierci [The Praise of Life and Death]</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont, Leo</td>
<td>Diablica [A Female Devil]</td>
<td>1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sprawa pomiędzy dwoma trupami [An Issue Between Two Corpses]</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pomiędzy sądem a sumieniem. Rozwiązanie zagadki psychologicznej &quot;Sprawy przy drzwiach zamkniętych” [Between a Court and Conscience. A Solution of a Psychological Puzzle 'A Case Behind Closed Doors']</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the author’s name</td>
<td>title</td>
<td>year of publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berman, Izydor</td>
<td>Contributor of poetry and prose to non-Jewish and Polish-Jewish papers(^3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boruchowicz, Maksymilian</td>
<td>Miłość i rasa [Love and Race]</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandstaetter, Roman</td>
<td>Nad brzegiem polskiej rzeki (published in the Nowy Glos newspaper only) [On a Bank of a Polish River]</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czyński, Jan</td>
<td>Jakobini Polscy: powieść z czasów rewolucyi 1830 [Polish Jacobites: a Novel from the Time of a Revolution]</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endelman-Rosenblatt, Czesława</td>
<td>Ludzie którzy jeszcze żyją [People Who Are Still Alive]</td>
<td>1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feldman, Wihelm</td>
<td>Piękna żydówka [A Beautiful Jewess]</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Żydziak. Szkic psychologiczno-społeczny [A Yid. A Psychological and Social Sketch]</td>
<td>1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nowelle i obrazki [Novellas and Pictures]</td>
<td>1889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) For more Polish-Jewish writers who published in Polish-Jewish press see, for example, Kołodziejska 2014.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>the author’s name</th>
<th>title</th>
<th>year of publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W okowach [Chained]</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nowi ludzie [New People]</td>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cudotwórca [A Miracle Worker]</td>
<td>1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Feldszuh, Rubin</td>
<td>Noce palestyńskie [Palestinian Nights]</td>
<td>1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Reuwen)</td>
<td>Czerwone dusze. Opowiadania palestyńskie [Red Souls. Palestinian Novels]</td>
<td>1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Góriska, Halina</td>
<td>Ucieczki [Escapes]</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Druga brama [The Second Gate]</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nad czarną wodą [By Black Water]</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Hochberżanka, Maria</td>
<td>Mudantka [Mudantka]</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Ihr, Daniel</td>
<td>Sambation [Sambation]</td>
<td>1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Jarecka, Gustawa</td>
<td>Ludzie i sztandary [People and Banners]</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Kinderfreund, Aleksander</td>
<td>W pogoni za szczęściem. Powieść z czasów przedwojennych [In Pursuit of Happiness. A Pre-war Novel]</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Krzywicka, Irena</td>
<td>Pierwsza krew [First Blood]</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the author’s name</td>
<td>title</td>
<td>year of publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kobieta szuka siebie [A Woman Looks for Herself]</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ucieczka z ciemności [Escape from Darkness]</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lec, Stanisław</td>
<td>Zoo [A Zoo]</td>
<td>1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satyry Patetyczne [Exalted Satires]</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madler, Adam (Marek Bauman)</td>
<td>Falista Linia [A Wavy Line]</td>
<td>1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cienie zdarzeń [The Shadows of Events]</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melcer, Wanda</td>
<td>Czarny ląd [Black Land]</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyersowna, Malwina</td>
<td>Z ciasnej sfery. Podług podań i papierów familijnych [From a Narrow Sphere. Family Stories and Records]</td>
<td>1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naglerowa, Herminia</td>
<td>Krauzowie i inni (trylogy) [The Krauzes and Others]</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Czarny pies [A Black Dog]</td>
<td>1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motyw księżyca [A Motive of a Moon]</td>
<td>1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matowa kresa [A Mat Line]</td>
<td>1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zawalidroga [A Hurdle]</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ludzie prawdziwi [True People]</td>
<td>1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the author’s name</td>
<td>title</td>
<td>year of publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prędski, Artur</td>
<td>Serce bez ojczyzny [Heart without Homeland]</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rey, Sydor</td>
<td>Kropiwniki [Kropiwniki]</td>
<td>1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudnicki, Adolf</td>
<td>Lato [Summer]</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Żołnierze [Soldiers]</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doświadczenia [Experiences]</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Szczury [Rats]</td>
<td>1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Niekochana [Unloved]</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schulz, Bruno</td>
<td>Sklepy cynamonowe [Cinnamon Shops]</td>
<td>1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanatorium pod klepsydrą [The Sanatorium under the Sign of the Hourglass]</td>
<td>1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Słonimski, Antoni</td>
<td>Teatr w więzieniu [A Theatre in Prison]</td>
<td>1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Torpeda czasu [A Torpedo of Time]</td>
<td>1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dwa końce świata [Two Ends of the World]</td>
<td>1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W oparach absurdu [In the Fumes of Absurd] (co-written with Julian Tuwim)</td>
<td>1920-1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szymel, Maurycy</td>
<td>Krawiec z Białegokamienia [A Tailor from Biały Kamień]</td>
<td>1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gdzie jesteś Ewo? [Where Are You, Eve?]</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenenbaum, Emil</td>
<td>Na początku było kłamstwo. Komedia [At the Beginning There Was a Lie. A Comedy]</td>
<td>1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the author’s name</td>
<td>title</td>
<td>year of publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vogel, Debora</td>
<td>Akacje kwitną. Montaż [Acacia is Blossoming. A Montage]</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wat, Aleksander</td>
<td>Bezrobotny Lucyfer [Lucifer Unemployed]</td>
<td>1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ja z jednej i Ja z drugiej strony mojego mopsożelaznego piecyka [Me on the One and on the Other Side of My Pug-Iron Stove]</td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittlin, Józef</td>
<td>Sól Ziemi [The Salt of the Earth]</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zahorska, Stefania</td>
<td>Korzenie [Roots]</td>
<td>1937</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Examples of pre-war Polish-Jewish prose fiction

Since I am concerned primarily with prose fiction (excluding children’s literature), poetry, drama and non-fiction are not included here. See Shenitzer 2003 and Panas 1996 for more on different genres within Polish-Jewish literature.
2 SOURCE LANGUAGE POLYSYSTEM FACTORS

In polysystem theory, literature, as a particular body of texts, alongside a variety of broader cultural, political and historical factors that shape literary traditions, are conceptualised as systems. However, the idea of a system itself predates the beginnings of the theory of polysystems in the early 1970s. As noted in 1.1, the concept was borrowed by Even-Zohar from the late Russian Formalists, in particular from Tynyanov (Even-Zohar 1990: 29; Shuttleworth 2009: 197), who was the first to refer to literature as a system, drawing on the notion of the language as a relational “system of signs expressing ideas” originally devised by the linguist Ferdinand de Saussure ([1916] 1983: 15; 10). Although Tynyanov posited that “[t]he study of [literary] evolution must move from the literary system to the nearest correlated systems (…)” (1971: 77), the correlations between individual components of this system were left undiscussed by him, as noted by Hermans (1999: 105).

Even-Zohar took the concept of a system further to explain, rather than merely describe, the historical structure of Israeli Hebrew literature. By embarking on a project to look into the diachronic (historical) and synchronic (contemporary) aspects of the literary tradition of Hebrew literature in Israel, Even-Zohar addressed the unanswered question of the links between systems. In order to highlight the dynamics of systems, he introduced the concept of a polysystem, that is “a multiple system, a system of various systems which intersect with each other and partly overlap” (Even-Zohar 1990: 11). Systems within systems, by contrast, were initially referred to as “subsystems” (Even-Zohar 1978: 40).

The accommodating nature of interrelated polysystems is especially useful in the examination of links and interdependencies between various areas of reality that inform a particular translation phenomenon (such as politics, historical events, and the publishing industry, etc.). In other words, the systemic inclusive approach to literary phenomena entails discussing literary texts in conjunction with their wider contexts that encompass, for example, cultural, historical and political factors.

---

5 In the revised edition of his articles on polysystem theory, Even-Zohar (1990) replaced the concept of a subsystem with that of a system due to the inherently open nature which assumes that every system can be comprised of other systems.
Therefore, the system of pre-war Polish-Jewish prose with which I am concerned in this study comprises literary texts as well as specific aspects of their historical and cultural background that have shaped this body of works and conditioned their status in the source context. I also devise the models of systems in the polysystem of British literature (cf. Figure 1) and relate their factors and dynamics to the lack of visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish works of fiction in Britain. This chapter, however, seeks to pinpoint concrete aspects of the source system that predetermined the overall limited availability of pre-war Polish-Jewish writing for translation prior to the actual processes of translating. In other words, my focus on the source context will show that certain aspects of the historical development of the literature in question have contributed to its overall lack of visibility in Britain, where pre-war Polish-Jewish works of fiction have mostly remained untranslated.

Such a focus on the source context, however, has not been in the area of interest of polysystem theorists, perhaps partly because the issue of largely untranslated literature has not been addressed so far. The role of the source literary systems in translation is considered by polysystem theorists only to a limited extent and mainly in conjunction with the target text: Even-Zohar, for instance, focuses on the realisation of “the textual relationships of a source text” in the target text while discussing the idea of an “adequate translation”, defined as a translation that “realizes in the target language the textual relationships of a source text with no breach of its own linguistic system” (Even-Zohar 1975:43 in Toury 1995:56). In his discussion of the central position of translations in the literary polysystem, Even-Zohar (1990: 47) only implies the existence of the source text, saying that “principles of selecting the works to be translated are determined by the situation governing the [target](home) polysystem: the texts are chosen according to their compatibility with the new approaches (…) they may assume within the target literature.”

Selection here refers to the selection of a work for translation, a process which necessarily encompasses everything that precedes the act of translation itself. It appears then that the source context could theoretically play a significant role in determining the potential of literary works for translation. And yet, Even-Zohar tends to focus on the impact of translations on the target context, without mentioning the role of the source context in the process of selecting works for translation to the target system. I argue, however, that the process of selecting literary works for translation
can rely on their availability, or, alternatively, their lack of availability for translation in the source context. This availability for translation, in turn, can also depend on the visibility of the text in the source context, determined by the inherent cultural, linguistic and literary features of the source system that render a particular text likely, or unlikely, to be translated. It is these contextual inherent features that I am concerned with in this chapter, and I seek to explain how they have limited the chances for the majority of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction to be translated into English.

In other words, I attempt to show that it is possible to pin down specific features of the context of the source literature which affect its availability for translation. Correspondingly, the unavailability of a specific kind of writing for translation is likely to be informed by source contextual features. Such “inherent unavailability for translation” is an umbrella term that I have coined to stand for literary and non-literary attributes of original literature and its context that predetermine the unlikelihood of translation and successful recognition in a largely hypothetical target context. Some of these contextual factors can be considered as an obstacle to translation in general, while others can be seen as militating specifically against the translation into English and into the British context. In the case of the latter, such factors are analysed in conjunction with various aspects of the target context. Source-context factors that need to be considered in parallel with the target ones include, for instance, the differences between the cultural identities of Polish Jewry and British Jewry.

The consideration of the source context of a particular literature raises, in turn, the question of the ontological status of the source context in polysystem theory. According to Toury, the process of translating involves “being a text in a certain [target] language”, and representing “in that language/culture another pre-existing text in some other language, belonging to some other culture and occupying a definite position within it” (Toury 1995:56). In other words, the concept of translation involves the state of “being” a translated text, and representing a source text. Such an approach endows the source text with a somewhat passive role, that is the role of being represented by a target text. My approach, however, extends the role of the source context beyond its relationship with the target context, foregrounding the importance of the source context in its own right. Thus, the status of the source context in its own right becomes one of the three stages of the translating process:
1. The status of the source text in the source context, a position that determines the literature’s inherent unavailability, or availability, for translation;
2. The act of translation;
3. The status of the target text in the target context (both “being” a translated text and representing a source text).

I intend to use the more inclusive approach to the source literature and its broader setting in order to define the position of Polish-Jewish prose fiction in the source context so that I can explain how this position determines the literature’s unavailability for English translation. In the following discussion of the source system, I distinguish cultural (1.1), literary (1.2) and linguistic (1.3) contextual factors. It is important to note that for the sake of clarity I refer to historical facts in the past tense, and to the systemic model in the present tense.

2.1 Historical and socio-political factors in the source polysystem that militate against translation

2.1.1 Jewish autonomy as a historical factor

Poland was one of the few places in Europe where Jews historically enjoyed a considerable degree of political and cultural autonomy, creating favourable conditions for them to nurture their own traditions, language and religion (see, for example, Michalowska-Mycielska 2013 for more on the autonomy of Jews in Poland). In other words, historical conditions made it possible for the culture of Polish Jews to preserve its distinctiveness. This distinctiveness has also shaped Polish-Jewish literature in ways that may have rendered this literature a somewhat unlikely candidate for English translation. In this section, I aim to explain in particular the relationships between the history of Polish Jews and the rather limited potential of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction for English translation.

It is therefore important to trace the history of Jewish communities across Europe first to understand why it was in Eastern Europe that Jews could choose to remain distinct from the rest of society. From the 13th to the 15th centuries, when Jewish expulsions were taking place in modern-day France, England and Holland, Polish Jews witnessed the first watershed in gaining autonomy in Poland. In the 13th
century, the Statute of Kalisz was issued by Bolesław Pobożny (Duke Boleslaw the Pious) to officially confirm the scope of freedom of Jews in north-eastern Poland (Zaremska 2011:9). Over the next three centuries, Polish Jews were governed by autonomous Jewish judicial and administrative bodies, making them increasingly self-sufficient. In Western Europe, by contrast, Jews fell victim to the waves of religious prejudice and expulsions, starting from the 1290 expulsion of Jews from England, to the 1392 expulsion in present-day Northern and Central France, the 1492 expulsion of Jews from Spain, the forced conversion of Portuguese Jews in 1497, the expulsion of Jews in Southern France around 1501, and several minor cases of the expulsion of Italian and German Jews in several areas in present-day Italy and Germany in the 15th and 16th centuries (Shear 2010: 141-142). Modern-day Poland, therefore, became “a welcoming destination,” in particular for Northern European Jews who originally fled from England, present-day Holland and Germany (Shear 2010: 142-143). In 1580, a nationwide body called the Council of Four Lands (Sejm Czterech Ziem in Polish) was set up in Poland to represent Polish Jews across the country – although never officially legalised, it helped retain their legal independence (Obirek 2011: 24). The autonomy of Polish Jews was not only limited to politics and law but it was also evident in the lives of the ordinary Jewish population. As opposed to city Jews, Jews in the shtetls, that is predominantly Jewish towns, formed close-knit communities around the synagogue, a rabbi and other religious institutions. Such a traditional way of life survived until the outbreak of the Second World War due to their cultural isolation from their non-Jewish neighbours (Michalowska-Mycielska 2013: 24). Thus, Yiddish, a Judeo-Germanic vernacular shared by Ashkenazi Jews (i.e. Central and Eastern European Jews; Shear 2010: 143), remained the vernacular and Judaism a widely practised religion in shtetls, preserving the unique character of a Jewish shtetl culture. The dynamics of the co-existence of Jewish and non-Jewish inhabitants on the one hand, and the insular character of closed traditional unassimilated Jewish communities, on the other, made shtetls different from other Polish towns (see, for instance, Hoffman 1997, who paints a picture of the pre-war shtetl Bransk, a town close to her parents’ hometown).

The few historical facts relating to the history of Polish-Jewish communities which I have just briefly outlined suggest that, although far from a safe haven, Poland offered consistent continuous conditions which allowed for a separate Polish Jewish
culture to thrive over a long period of time. This continuity was absent in Britain, and this historical difference partly explains why some features of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction would not have attracted much interest in Britain. A corresponding Jewish culture in Britain had historically a very different dynamics because there was no continuity that would allow a distinctive British-Jewish culture to thrive, a historical fact that I discuss in Chapter 3, in 3.1.1. In addition to the discontinuous history of British Jews, the potential to create a distinct British-Jewish culture was nipped in the bud by the tendency of British Jews to embrace non-Jewish society, in particular by the mid-1890s, when the establishment of British Jews “set about anglicising the immigrants and their children” (Feldman 1994: 329; see Feldman 1994: 329-352 for more on the politics of anglicisation). Although I discuss the history of British Jewry in greater detail in the next chapter, I refer to it only briefly here because this historical and social difference between British Jews and Polish Jews explains why literary trends and readers’ preferences would have been different in the two countries, especially with regard to the interest in the Jewish aspects of fiction.

For one thing, the concerns of Polish-Jewish literature that are rooted in the source-cultural context may not necessarily be what would have been widely appreciated by British readers, especially before the late 20th century, when the British-Jewish cultural identity was being increasingly recognised in contemporary fiction in Britain (an issue I discuss further in Chapter 3 in 3.2.1.6). Jewish pious behaviour, religious precepts, the backwaters of shtetls, and every-day life were the themes which inspired some of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction. Although some literary themes would have partly coincided with the concerns of British Jews (such as the issue of uncertainty in relations with fellow non-Jewish citizens), others would have been rather foreign to most Jewish and non-Jewish readers in Britain (such as poverty and poor education in shtetls, or other social problems typical of Polish Jewry before the Second World War).

However, whether or not literary themes in Poland and in Britain would have overlapped is not the central issue for the potential of Polish-Jewish fiction to be translated into English. What seems to be more significant here is the fact that Jewishness was historically dealt with differently in the two countries. Although it is discussed more fully in Chapter 3, it is worth mentioning here that in the target context, the culture of Jews from Central and Eastern Europe brought over to Britain
by immigrants in the early 20th century (discussed further in 3.1.2) was, as I have mentioned earlier, stifled and exposed to naturalisation, mostly by members of the British Jewish establishment who wanted to keep their Jewishness a private and inconspicuous issue. Thus, immigrant British-Jewish literature, dating back to the 1920s and 1930s, often showed Russian and Polish shtetls in a negative light and rarely dealt with the traditional Jewish culture of Ashkenazi Jews from Eastern Europe (cf. 3.2.1.2).

Therefore, shtetl-related literary themes in some works of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction, informed by Polish-Jewish cultural identity, may not have been received positively by British-Jewish readers for cultural reasons. The English translations of such works of Polish-Jewish fiction might possibly be seen as entailing “certain incompatibilities with target norms and practices, especially those lying beyond the mere linguistic ones” (Toury 1995: 56). As a result, these translations’ acceptability, that is subscription to target culture norms (Toury 1995: 57), would have been unlikely. Moreover, if norms operate at every stage of the process of translating, as noted by Toury (1995: 56), then not only reception but also selection of overtly Jewish prose fiction for English translation seemed to be unlikely. In other words, when linked to the question of the hypothetical recognition of the English translations of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain, their lower acceptability would have been caused by insufficient interest in some specifically themed works of fiction among target readers.

The second problematic issue for the translation of Polish-Jewish prose implicated by the distinctiveness of Polish-Jewish culture is the occasional use of Yiddish in some pre-war Polish-Jewish works of fiction. The Yiddish language was deeply ingrained in the culture of Polish Jews because it was continuously in use for centuries until the vibrant culture of Polish Jews perished during the Holocaust (although there were attempts by surviving Jews to revive Yiddish culture in post-war Poland; see Ruta 2008 for more about post-war Yiddish culture in Poland). It was only in the mid-19th century that Polish Jews, and Polish-Jewish writers, began to acculturate on a larger scale, abandoning Yiddish and Hebrew in favour of Polish (Adamczyk-Garbowska 2004: 122). Not surprisingly, then, Yiddish writing remained much more popular than Polish-language Jewish literature. This preference of Jewish readers was mirrored in the demand for Yiddish journalism, which doubled the
demand for Polish-language newspapers in the early 20th century (Wodziński 2013: 77). The deep-rooted Yiddish culture is also reflected in the tropes of Yiddish in some Polish-Jewish works of fiction, which I will look at more closely in 2.3.1, where I discuss Yiddish as a stylistic and linguistic hindrance to English translation. The presence of Yiddish tropes in Polish-Jewish fiction would have posed obstacles to a successful translation into English in the early 20th century as it would do now but, presumably, for different reasons.

In the 1920s and in the 1930s, there would certainly have been readers in Britain, in particular Jewish immigrants from Central and Eastern Europe and their descendants, who would have been able to interpret and translate Yiddish into English. And indeed, Yiddish traces can be found in some works of British-Jewish fiction.6 A problematic issue at that time would have been the chances of this fiction for successful reception in Britain, rather than the translation itself, because the backwaters of shtetls and social problems ingrained in Jewish shtetls were themes which were typical of the Polish-Jewish novels that deployed Yiddish. Such topics, embedded in the reality of Polish Jewry, would have been, as pointed out earlier, of little interest for the target reading public. In the present day, on the other hand, Yiddish tropes in Polish-Jewish fiction raise questions of how they can be translated into English in a way that target readers, most of whom would be no longer familiar with Yiddish, can notice and understand (in 2.3.1 I discuss specific examples of Yiddish from selected pre-war Polish-Jewish novels and their problematic translation).

Furthermore, the use of Yiddish and specific themes in Polish-Jewish fiction, shaped by the history of Polish Jewish communities, were likely to be contributing factors for the marginal status of some Polish-Jewish fiction within the source context. Polish-Jewish fiction which dealt with political and social issues from the perspective of the Polish Jew failed to become more widely known even though political novels and fictionalised documentary writing were popular in the Polish literary mainstream

6 Examples include Louis Golding’s Magnolia Street (London, 1932) and Simon Blumenfeld’s Jew Boy (1935, London). These writers were often born to immigrants themselves, and thus tended to be familiar with some Yiddish words and the problems of assimilation faced by newly-arrived Yiddish speaking Eastern European Jews in England. I discuss their literature in Chapter 3 in greater detail.
in the 1920s and 1930s (Miłosz 1969: 384; see also Polska. Literatura. Druga Rzeczpospolita 2015 for a more detailed account of Polish literature at the time). Such a place outside of the literary canon, from the perspective of polystystem theory, makes most of the literature in question unlikely to be translated into another language because, as argued by Even-Zohar (1978:48), a literature tends to have a greater potential to be translated the more centrally it is located in the source system. It is important to note that Polish-Jewish fiction especially, rather than poetry, remained peripheral\(^7\) in the Polish literary system. Polish-Jewish poetry was relatively acclaimed, in particular in the late 1920s and 1930s. Prior to 1928, only three collections of Polish-Jewish poetry were published: Jakub Appenszlak’s 1915 *Mowie polskiej* [To the Polish Language]; Karol Rosenfeld’s 1920 *W ciszy łez. Poezye golusu* [In the Silence of Tears. The Poetry of Galut]; Lucjan Krasucki’s 1923 *Wiersze wybrane* [Selected Poems]. Towards the late 1920s, the number of published Polish-Jewish poetry collections proliferated considerably, and included work by Karol Dresdner, Jakub Lewittes, Mauryce Szymel, Stefan Pomer, Roman Brandstaetter and others (Prokop-Janiec 1992: 27).

Furthermore, there were also Polish-Jewish poets who not only enjoyed better acclaim but who also gave momentum to the Polish mainstream poetic developments (see Opalski 2015). Tadeusz Peiper, for example, was a leading member of the Kraków avant-garde literary movement, while Julian Tuwim and Antoni Slonimski were two of the five founders of the prominent *Skamander* literary group (see Opalski 2015 or Zawada 2000 for more on widely recognised Polish-Jewish poets before the war). The wider recognition of Polish-Jewish poetry rather than of Polish-Jewish fiction confirms that there is something particular about pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction that has kept it away from the literary mainstream, and, thus, prevented it from being widely translated into English.

---

\(^7\) Peripheral literary systems comprise works that are outside of the literary canon and are less recognised, as opposed to the systems in the central position (Even-Zohar 1990: 14). I will henceforth use the term “marginal” to refer to the peripheral position of a system or literary works.
2.1.2 Emancipation and Haskalah as sociocultural factors

The historical beginnings of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction also predetermined its marginal status in the source context. Polish-language Jewish fiction emerged under the influence of the Jewish enlightenment and emancipation, which had made Jews throughout Europe, including Poland, more open to the non-Jewish language and culture in the countries they lived in. *Haskalah*, a Hebrew term for the intellectual movement of Jewish enlightenment, pursued by Moses Mendelssohn and others, originated in 18th-century Germany (Shear 2010: 162) and aimed to reconcile the challenges of modernisation with Jewish cultural identity and religion (Wodziński 2013: 63). Some of the proposed reforms included the liberalisation of religious observance and the introduction of secular subjects in school curricula, the abandonment of Yiddish and adoption of the language of society as the first language (Geipel 1982: 11). The overall goal of *Haskalah* intellectuals was to encourage Jews in Central and Eastern Europe to integrate with society and to pursue a more modernised way of life, preserving, however, the Jewish cultural identity and continuing to adhere to Judaism (see Shear 2010: 162-165 for more on *Haskalah* ideologies).

It took time for *Haskalah* ideas to catch on in Poland and to have a long-lasting impact on Polish Jews. Consequently, it was only in the mid-19th century that Polish Jews became open to and mastered the Polish language on a wider scale to the extent that they began to pursue literary careers in this language, a fact which was foreshadowed by the first recorded Polish-language texts by anonymous Jewish authors at the end of the 18th century, written to encourage Jews to acculturate and emancipate in Polish society (Opalski 2015). Polish-Jewish fiction was later printed predominantly in the press and was largely limited to newspaper articles, along with a few serialised novels (see also Prokop-Janiec 1992: 17; 23; 26). It was only in the late 1920s that Polish-Jewish prose fiction began to be increasingly published in a book form, independently of the press (Prokop-Janiec 1992: 26-27).

The serialised publication form in its own right made the availability of early Polish-Jewish fiction for translation almost non-existent for a long time from the moment when the first works of Polish-Jewish fiction were written. To determine what was printed where and to piece all series together would have required a knowledgeable source-culture actor, a term in actor network theory for both people...
and texts that are part of various networks (Jones 2011:13; 25; 26). The existence of such a source actor would have been unlikely: Polish-Jewish newspapers were read mainly by Jewish Poles despite the fact that winning the interest of non-Jewish audiences was one of the major intentions of the editors (Wasserstein 2012: 256; Adamczyk-Garbowska 2004:126). Therefore, the chances for a particular work of Polish-Jewish fiction to be noticed by an actor from a more central non-Jewish Polish literary mainstream were likely to be slim. That marginal position deprived emerging Polish-Jewish writing of the chance to obtain wider critical acclaim that could have made it less marginal and more visible in the source context.

_Haskalah_ not only led to the birth of Polish-Jewish literature but it also determined its content. Social reforms and ideas that were propagated by the intellectuals of the Jewish enlightenment perhaps inevitably influenced the topics that inspired Polish-Jewish fiction, which “bore a political character”, being “produced for specific occasions” and being “part of a lobbying effort promoting emancipation” (Opalski 2015). Thus, Polish-Jewish prose, practically from its very beginning, was socially engaged and dealt mainly with social and cultural issues of Polish Jews. Such a focus in Polish-Jewish fiction was initially a response to the _Haskalah_ concerns, but was later amplified by the social and political changes that happened in the Second Polish Republic in the early decades of the 20th century (which I discuss further in 2.1.3). The embedded social responsibility of Polish-Jewish fiction, therefore, was extended in time and was bound to maintain the marginal position of this literature until the early 20th century. It remained less acclaimed also because the world of Polish Jews was not usually of much interest to the general non-Jewish Polish reading public. As noted by the literary scholar Monika Adamczyk-Garbowska, non-Jewish Polish readers did not engage much with Polish-Jewish fiction, or with Yiddish and Hebrew literature (Adamczyk-Garbowska 2004: 125-126). Perhaps if Polish-Jewish fiction had addressed issues which non-Jewish readers could have identified with more, it would have been acclaimed by non-Jewish Polish readers. However, Polish-Jewish prose writers generally failed to feed Jewish features into the Polish literary mainstream due to the lack of interrelations between these two literary worlds, an observation also made by the Polish-Jewish sociologist and essayist Aleksander Hertz (1987: 270-273). From the systemic perspective, the limited literary exchange made the system of Polish-Jewish fiction relatively hermetic, making it difficult for it to
shift towards a more central place, and thereby to secure the chance for being translated.

2.1.3 Politics in the Second Polish Republic (1918-1939) as a political factor

The preoccupation of Polish Jews with their place in society and political rights in Poland, the issues that were addressed by the intellectuals of the Jewish enlightenment, continued throughout the 1920s and 1930s. The first three decades of the 20th century saw the rise of antisemitism in Poland, instigated especially by the campaigns of the national democratic right-wing party (Narodowa Demokracja). In Germany and in the rest of Europe, growing fascist and Nazi movements were increasingly drawing the attention of the general public to the question of Jewish identity. Although difficult to define, people’s identity is inevitably informed by appraisals of oneself made by oneself and by others (Strauss 1997: 11). Consequently, rising antisemitic tendencies inevitably affected the self-identification of Jews (I will also mention the case of the British-Jewish poet Michael Hamburger in 3.2.1.4). In Poland too, Polish Jewish writers began to be increasingly self-conscious and self-doubting. Julian Tuwim, one of the co-founders of the Skamander literary group, for example, was accused by a contributor to the “Prosto z mostu” [“Straightforward”] literary weekly magazine of not writing in proper Polish but only in the Polish language in the 1930s. For him, Tuwim’s soul jabbered, implying that the poet and his writing were unworthy of “true” Polish literature (Gliński 2013).

This “atmosphere of apologising”, a term later used by Isaac Bashevis Singer (Singer 1977:14), transformed Polish Jewish writers into unwelcome “intruders” in the eyes of Polish nationalists, and influenced both their self-identification and the literature they wrote, making it difficult for some writers to pursue their writing and choosing literary themes freely. At the same time, those Polish-Jewish writers who avoided overt Jewish themes in their writing were often accused by Jewish nationalists of betraying Jewish traditions and language (Adamczyk-Garbowska 2004: 123). In different political and social circumstances, Polish-Jewish fiction could perhaps have offered more self-conscious, self-confident and more imaginative works that would have gone beyond social and political issues which inspired, for example, Feldszuh Rubin’s Noce palestynskie [Palestinian Nights] or conversely, that would have contained more Jewish references in the imaginative and acclaimed fiction that did
exist, for example in Antoni Słonimski’s or Leo Belmont’s works. Furthermore, in a different political and social setting, the general reading public may possibly have been more ready to welcome literature by Polish Jews, leading to the literature’s better acclaim, which, in the end, could have enhanced its availability for translation.

In addition to the rise of antisemitism, the political scene in Poland in the early 20th century saw the increasing popularity of Zionism, the Jewish national movement (Żbikowski 1997: 202). The prospect of emigration to Palestine preoccupied especially those who were not entirely assimilated or anyone who felt marginalised by the surge in antisemitism in the late 1920s and in the early 1930s. Polish-Jewish writers, too, were influenced by Zionist ideas to the extent that a separate genre of persuasive Zionist fiction emerged, addressing the main ideas and goals of the Zionist movement. The blatant political slant of these texts has been one of the factors that have undermined the potential of this fiction for English translation. The content of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction, including Zionist writing, will be the focus of the following section, which addresses the literary aspects of the literature in question rather than its historical context, linking the former to their limited translation potential.

2.2 Literary factors in the source polysystem that militate against translation

Thus far, I have focused on the contextual historical and cultural factors that underlay the birth of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction, its main features and themes. In this section, by contrast, I intend to look at its literary features that also inform the literature’s inherent unavailability for translation. I have identified three literary factors that seem likely to have made the translation of this literature difficult: translation-unfriendly content (2.2.1), its translation-resistant nature (2.2.2) and, lastly, the lack of visibility of this fiction in contemporary Poland (2.2.3).

2.2.1 Translation-unfriendly content of pre-war Polish-Jewish prose fiction

This section seeks to look more closely at specific literary works in order to see what aspects of particular novels may have militated against English translation. I will begin with the discussion about Zionist fiction, followed by a brief examination of the
novel of manners, to talk about various kinds of Polish-Jewish fiction that were less involved in issues strictly relating to the Jewish reality in Poland.

As pointed out in the previous section, the question as to whether or not to emigrate to Palestine concerned many Polish Jews, as with the case of many Jews in the rest of Europe where the emergence of the international Zionist movement and the surge of antisemitism made them reflect upon their place in the countries they lived in. In Poland, too, the creation of a separate Jewish state was debated so widely that it inspired the rise of a persuasive Zionist novel, a kind of literary fiction which was propelled by the ideology of the Zionist movement. Polish-Jewish Zionist prose won the attention of many readers, especially among Polish Jews (Prokop-Janiec and Żurek 2011: 6). The circulation of Józef Hartblaj’s 1928 Zionist novel Jehoszua. Powieść osnuta na tle życia haluców [Jehoszua. A Novel Based on the Lives of Halutzim] was just over one thousand. Three years later, the circulation of Henryk Adler’s novel Ariela i Jakub: Palestyńskie opowieści romantyczne [Ariela and Jubal: Palestinian Romantic Stories] reached two thousand. Although these numbers are only inconclusive they do imply that Zionist writing was increasingly in demand at the end of the 1920s. The main feature of this kind of fiction that may be considered as contributing to this prose’s inherent unavailability for translation is its pronounced political slant and the way it is conveyed.

The simple plot and style typical of Polish-Jewish Zionist fiction were presumably designed to make persuasive points about emigration to Palestine. It is worth remembering that the persuasive aspect of literature was necessary because a considerable number of acculturated or assimilated Polish Jews, who were bound to read Polish-language rather than Yiddish or Hebrew literature, were not too involved in or familiar with Jewish politics in Poland. As the scholar of Jewish history Ezra Mendelsohn hypothesised, the process of acculturation also entailed an increasing detachment from Jewish politics among Polish Jews: “The ever-growing encroachment of Polish on Jewish life did not mean that the Jews were assimilating into Polish society. It did, however, indicate the severe obstacles confronted by the adherents to Jewish national cultural autonomy (…)” (Mendelsohn 1983:67). This detachment from Jewish politics of most acculturated Jews was presumably taken into account by some Polish-Jewish writers of Polish-language Zionist fiction with the pronounced and straightforward message about the gains of emigrating to Palestine to
build a Jewish state, conveyed by a simple plot and shallow, black-and-white characters.

The profile of literary characters tends to mirror the dilemmas of acculturated Polish Jewry, in particular self-reflection about their Jewish identity and their relation to Poland. The characters’ ideological transformation into a chalutz (a Hebrew term for a Jewish immigrant to modern-day Israel who helped to develop the land for the future Jewish state) from an ordinary Polish Jewish citizen is often the main drive of the narrative (see Prokop-Janiec 1992: 249-256 for more on the narrative features of Zionist fiction). Hartblaj’s Jehoszua..., for example, tells a story of Jehoszua, a Polish-born young Jewish man, who gradually realises that actively contributing to the creation of an independent Jewish state is a better option than staying in Poland. He and his friends decide to leave Poland. While crossing the pre-war Polish-Romanian border, his friend Izaak is shot by a border officer, an incident that foreshadows the commitment of future chalutzim to the Zionist cause. Having reached Palestine, Jehoszua and his surviving friend settle in the “Cofim” colony, where he transforms into a charismatic leader who works hard for the common cause of a future Jewish state, a transformation which is reminiscent of the main character’s’ development in a bildungsroman. Similar simple and one-dimensional plots are shared literary features with ideologically-slanted political propaganda literature, such as, for instance, socialist realist writing in Poland under the Communist regime, including Andrzej Braun’s Lewanty [Merchant Ships] (1952) or Jan Wilczek’s Nr 16 produkuje [Number 16 is Manufacturing] (1951).

This political charge may be one of the reasons why this kind of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction would not be a good candidate for translation. Political literature, in general, never translates well because it “seems to demand a lifeless, imitative style,” as noted by George Orwell (Orwell 2000: 355). Moreover, whether or not fictional, political texts tend to address a very specific audience and a particular problem, forming a culture- and history-specific setting that consequently may cause problems in translation and, even if translated, in the hypothetical successful reception in a different context. Its potential acclaim in Britain would also depend on the form and on the kind of appeal of the Zionist ideology in Britain. Although I discuss the case of Zionism in Britain further in Chapter 3, it is worth mentioning here that British Zionism was informed by different political and social ideas that went beyond the
interest of the creation of the Jewish state in Palestine. Consequently, the Zionist movement in Britain targeted audiences that were different from those in Poland. Given such historical differences between the Polish and the British forms of Zionism, pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction would not, in all probability, have fit in with the expectations of readers in the target context before the war. Similarly, after the war the ideological and political aims of the Zionist movement were to change upon the foundation of the State of Israel in 1948, creating different expectations from Zionist-themed literature, not only in Poland or Britain but worldwide. In this new political context, pre-war Polish-Jewish Zionist fiction would have stood small chances of winning the major interest of readers.

In addition to politics, Polish-Jewish writers were also concerned with the ordinary everyday life of Polish Jews. Devoid of the blatant political or ideological slant, this kind of literature revolved around problems rooted in the reality of Polish Jews. Stefania Zahorska’s 1937 novel Korzenie [Roots], for example, follows the parallel stories of characters from the Jewish middle class and those with no Jewish background (see Clarke 2000: 421-427 for a brief discussion of this book in English). Wanda Melcer’s Czarny ląd [Black Land, 1936] comprises a set of literary impressions, inflected with her own reflections about the lives of unassimilated Polish Jews in Warsaw. Kazimiera Alberti’s 1931 novel Ghetto potępione. Powieść o duszy żydowskiej [A Condemned Ghetto. A Story of a Jewish Soul] relates a story of a Jewish woman, Regina Grunszpan, a talented singer, who succeeds in breaking free from a backward and impoverished shtetl to start a career as an opera singer, and who later adopts a shtetl-born little girl Róża. And although pre-war literary portraits of Polish Jews could be potentially illuminating to a foreign reading public, such themes would not have been widely acclaimed in Britain in the early 20th century. Although I explain why in the next chapter, it is worth mentioning briefly that it would have been mainly an issue of the problematic recognition of the Jewish cultural identity and its impact on target-context literary trends and interests that were unlikely to make Jewish-themed literature popular. Even when Jewish themes were addressed by British-Jewish writers, their literary concerns tackled various problems relating to the lives of Jews in Britain rather than elsewhere. In the instances where Jewish life in continental Europe was referred to, European Jewishness tended to be associated with the painful past of persecution, as in Simon Blumenfeld’s 1937 Phineas Kahn.
Not all Polish-Jewish prose works, however, remained close to the political and social problems of Polish Jews. At the other end of the spectrum there were works that heavily drew on more acclaimed literature, both from Poland and abroad, a literary dependence that, as I will explain further, may have posed some obstacles for their translation. In polysystem theory, a tendency to borrow particular literary models suggests that the borrowing literary system is still in the process of developing and thus tends to import literary forms in order to develop further. According to Even-Zohar, such an inherent reliance on acknowledged literature occurs especially in a system of “tender age, or weakness, or specific cultural or political conditions,” and often concerns “the literature of a minority group within a majority group”(Even-Zohar 1978: 45), such as the literature by Polish-Jewish writers in the larger mainstream Polish-language literary system. The dependence on other literatures may involve texts from other systems within the same polysystem, which, in this case, would be the polysystem of Polish-language literature, or it may engage literary texts from another polysystem. In either case, literature that seeks to imitate more acknowledged works raises questions regarding its potential for translation, mostly due to its limited degree of originality.

An example of Polish-Jewish fiction that draws heavily on more mainstream Polish works is Herminia Naglerowa’s *Krauzowie i inni*. This novel, and its translation into English, will be my major concern in Chapters 4 and 5, but what needs to be highlighted here is that *Krauzowie i inni* is heavily inspired by the long tradition of historical-novel-writing which was highly recognised. The social and political aspects of this kind of literature played an important role in raising general awareness of Polish victorious history at the time when Poland was partitioned and incorporated into the neighbouring countries of Prussia, the Russian and the Prussian Empires between 1772 and 1918 (Sherwin 1997: 69). Therefore, historical fiction has had a relatively established position in the Polish literary canon, which made this writing more likely to be translated into English. And, indeed, the historical trilogy of novels by the acclaimed literary Nobel Prize winner Henryk Sienkiewicz (1846-1916) was not only translated into English (Curtin 1890, 1892, 1893), but the translations won a certain degree of acclaim to the extent that Sienkiewicz was familiar to some English mainstream writers of the early 20th century. H. G. Wells, for instance, referred to him as “the Polish patriot novelist” in his 1914 letter to the editor of *Labour Leader* (Smith
Therefore, the themes of Polish independence in historical fiction were already introduced to the British reading public in the translation of the iconic Polish novelist long before the 1954 English translation of *Krauzowie i inni* was published in Britain. And yet, Naglerowa’s novel was translated though with a limited success. Although I offer an explanation of this limited acclaim in Chapters 4 and 5, it is my contention that the lack of novelty conveyed in this particular translation was one of the factors that underlay the limited reception in Britain. The poor impact of Naglerowa’s novel in English translation confirms the claim about the dynamics of literary systems put forward by Even-Zohar, who argues that the import by a strong established literary system, like English literature, from a minor literary system, like the system of pre-war Polish-Jewish prose, is very unlikely unless it entails the transfer of any kind of novelty. Otherwise, such literary imports are bound to be rejected by the target system (see Even-Zohar 1978:49; 66 where he looks at a similar translation case in his study of the Israeli Hebrew literary system).

Similarly, the reliance of some of Polish-Jewish fiction writers on foreign, rather than Polish, classical works may be a contributing factor toward their inherent unavailability for translation. Pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction that emulated foreign classics includes, for example, Wilhelm Feldman’s early novel *Ananke. Kartki chorej miłości* [Ananke. Pages of Mad Love, 1898], heavily inspired by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s *Die Leiden des jungen Werther* [The Sorrows of Young Werther], in particular the theme of frantic unrequited love and the epistolary form. Therefore, the chances of *Ananke*...to be translated into English would be very thin because it would be unlikely for the English target system to need worldwide classics emulations from literature that is less-known. Similarly, Antoni Słonimski’s 1926 science-fiction short story *Torpeda czasu* [Time Torpedo], inspired by the literature of the English writer H.G. Wells, would be unlikely to receive a warm welcome in Britain, where the book, assuming it was translated, would hardly offer anything new to the British reading public, who would have been all too familiar with H.G. Well’s works. Although detective fiction by Polish-Jewish writer Leo Belmont gained wider acclaim in the source context, his works still remain untranslated into English, which may be partly explained by the fact that it was mainly writers in Britain, and in the USA, who prepared the ground for crime fiction, starting from world-famous Arthur Conan Doyle and Agatha Christie to perhaps slightly less celebrated names, such as Dorothy
Sayers or Anthony Berkeley (see Rzepka and Horsley 2010 for more on crime fiction in general). In the Britain of the 1920s and 1930s, when Belmont wrote most of his novels, the interest in any translated crime fiction was presumably small because it was the time when “Anglo-American crime fiction was translated into European languages and shaped the resident traditions to some extent” (Seago 2015), not the other way round. In other words, it was mainly translations of English-language detective fiction that enriched other literatures with novelty, forming a literary interdependence that left little space for translations of this fiction into English.

Among Polish-Jewish writers who wrote before the Second World War there were also those whose literary voice contributed to the literary mainstream in pre-war Poland. In line with modernist propensity to experiment with forms and styles, they developed their own unique literary voices, capturing the attention of mainstream publishers and readers. Aleksander Wat became a leading futurist writer whose early fiction of iconoclastic tales was an important contribution to the Polish mainstream literature in the 1920s and in the 1930s (Venclova 1996: 106), writing short stories that were “paradoxical parables (...) as an act of radical distrust and scorn of civilisation”, as the Polish writer Czeslaw Milosz referred to them (1990:ix). Bruno Schulz, whose prose “breaks with what is usually called a novel or a short story,” significantly enriched Polish literature, which won him a literary award from the Polish Academy of Literature (Milosz 1969: 429-430.) Józef Wittlin’s 1936 novel Sól ziemi enjoyed an instant success so much so it won the prize of the Wiadomości literackie literary magazine [Literary news], awarded by the magazine’s readers and editors, followed by novel’s nomination for a Nobel literary prize candidate (Kaliszewski 2003).

Their literature was rooted in the social and political reality of Polish Jews much less than the previously discussed works. It makes sense, therefore, to assume that more imaginative aspects of Polish-Jewish modernist prose, together with its novelty and wider acknowledgement in the source context, would have made it more available for English translation. And indeed, the writers Wat, Schulz and Wittlin have been translated into English. However, the reception of these translations in Britain has been relatively limited. Although the underlying reasons are mainly to be found in the target context, I argue that there is something inherently problematic in these texts that may be a contributing factor to their recognition: the dual Polish-Jewish
origin of this fiction and the ways it manifests itself (discussed further on in Chapters 4 and 5). Moreover, because this kind of Polish-Jewish fiction is only implicitly Jewish, the act of translation and subsequent reception of indirect cultural references are likely to require a greater effort in reading and in translating to find and convey them. In other words, more covert Jewishness in literature may be an issue for translating and, if transferred in translation, for reclaiming and acknowledging it by target readers. Rather than manifest itself by overt Jewish themes, the dual Polish-Jewish identity of these writers underlay writers’ imagination and sensitivity, forming part of the Polish-Jewish experience to which I have referred earlier in Chapter 1.

Although Polish-Jewish experience informs modernist Polish-Jewish fiction, it remains relatively elusive. On the level of literary themes it is perhaps easier to find links between a particular literary work and underlying Jewishness. For example, the themes of identity and motherland, which are present in Wittlin’s Sól ziemi..., or continuous references to the struggle between atheism, Christianity, agnosticism and Judaism in Wat’s “Żyd wieczny tulacz” may be read as references to the experience of being Jewish in Poland. However, on the textual level, reading individual references and their networks may be more difficult. Therefore, in order to convey such Jewishness in translation, these references and their networks (which I refer to as “signifying chains” and “chains of signification” in my discussion of the translations in Chapter 4) must be transferred in a translation.

Thus, pigeonholing Polish-Jewish writers associated with the Polish mainstream and the avant-garde as strictly Polish leaves out those aspects of their writing that may come from their Polish-Jewish background. Both the tendency to refer to them as Polish, rather than Polish-Jewish, especially after the Second World War and at the time of the Communist regime (an issue I discuss in 2.2.3), and the elusive presence of Jewish references, make it unlikely for Jewish aspects of their literature to be included in the general discourse. By the same token, they may be overlooked during the process of selecting for and publishing Polish-Jewish fiction in English translation. For this reason, organisations and institutions promoting Polish literature and art in Britain (which I will also discuss in Chapter 3), should promote Polish-Jewish literature in an inclusive way, highlighting all cultural aspects that this fiction can offer to the target reading public. Yet, Jewish background is not mentioned in the biographical notes of Wittlin, Wat or Schulz on the official website of the Polish
Book Institute, one of the leading cultural institutions responsible for the promotion of Polish literature abroad (Polski Instytut Książki 2016). Such institutional obliteration of the nuances that underlie Polish-Jewish literature only minimises the chances of Polish-Jewish fiction to be recognised as Polish-Jewish, rather than Polish, in the general awareness of readers.

The issue of acknowledging the Jewish aspects in Polish-Jewish fiction is not only a matter of doing justice to this writing and its writers. It may also be an important issue that determines the reception of literary works. As I will show in Chapter 5, the interest in Jewishness that underlies Schulz’s works, for example, has been part of the increasing engagement with his writing by US readers, whose enthusiastic response has contrasted with the limited acclaim of Schulz’s work by British readers.

2.2.2 Translation-resistant nature of pre-war Polish-Jewish prose fiction

The special place of literature for expressing the writer’s identity was once acknowledged by the Jewish-born Egyptian French poet Edmond Jabès, who said that “it was in declaring [him]self a writer that [he] first felt Jewish. In this sense that history of the writer and that of the Jew are both but the history of the book they lay claim to” (1985:27). As discussed, the identity of Polish-Jewish writers tends to be conveyed in their literature in multiple ways. While in the previous section I have sought to explain how its textual manifestations have contributed to the inherent unavailability of particular works for translation, in this section I intend to discuss the cultural identity of Polish Jews more broadly. If cultural identity is generally shaped by “certain group allegiances or characteristics such as religion, gender, class, ethnicity, sexuality and identity” (Larrain 1994: 154), then it makes sense to relate the cultural identity of Polish Jews to their shared allegiances, such as religion, ethnicity or their experiences.

The first reason why Polish-Jewish cultural identity would stand in the way of Polish-Jewish fiction to be translated into English is because it has historically been different from that of British Jews. Historical factors in Poland, it should be recalled, made it possible for a distinct and multifaceted culture of Polish Jews to emerge. Therefore, Jewish identity could be openly embraced by Polish Jews, especially by those Jews who refused to assimilate. In Britain, by contrast, the Jewish cultural
identity has been historically less visible, even though it has been revisited at various moments in history. As I shall explain in the next chapter, the general ambivalent attitude to overt manifestations of Jewishness has inevitably shaped British-Jewish literature, and with it the interests of the reading public in ways that have possibly rendered the dominant themes of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction unlikely to win much recognition, in particular before the 1960s (cf. 3.2.1).

It is also important to note that identity for every writer, as for all people individually, can mean something else and can, equally, change in response to historical events or personal life circumstances. Correspondingly, the nature of the particular kind of literature or its perception may change, too. In the case of Polish-Jewish literature as a whole, the Holocaust changed the priorities of Polish Jewish writers after the war, and this change was bound to have an impact on the general perception of Polish-Jewish literature in a way that may have worked against the visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction elsewhere, also in Britain.

Although the impact of the Holocaust on the consciousness and on the identity of surviving Polish Jews necessarily varied case by case, what is particularly relevant here is the appropriation of the pre-war reality and legacy of Polish Jews by the Holocaust. It also happened with writers’ consciousness and their post-war writing, marking a shift that has influenced the general awareness of the existence of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Poland and abroad. After the end of the Second World War, for example, Adolf Rudnicki (1912-1990) openly regretted not having addressed the reality of Polish Jews before the Holocaust, saying that only one of his pre-war novels, Lato [Summer], related scenes from the lives of Jewish artists in Poland. Rudnicki expressed his regret in his comment to the novel’s post-war edition, in which he expressed his feelings of regret and guilt. He also added that revisiting Lato was as comforting to him as a memorial candle light (Rudnicki 1984: 93-94). Such a preface, in which the writer himself moves the context of his pre-war novel to the Holocaust setting, is likely to overshadow his pre-war oeuvre, which had been well received by literary critics before the outbreak of the Second World War (Adamczyk-Garbowska 2003: 1058). His pre-war fiction has also been overshadowed by his later prolific writing which revolves around Jewish suffering and resistance during the Holocaust, most notably by the Epoka pieców series [The Epoch of Crematoria] (see also Adamczyk-Garbowska 2003 for a more detailed discussion of Rudnicki’s post-war
literature). And although there is a good reason for seeing Rudnicki as a Holocaust writer, this tendency makes it less likely for his pre-war fiction to become more known about, and, thus, potentially less available for translation.

The Holocaust has appropriated the pre-war Polish-Jewish world also in a different way. The Holocaust made some Polish Jews start writing after the end of the Second World War to pay a literary tribute to the pre-war reality of Polish Jews. Such decisions to engage with Jewishness reflected a shift in their dual Polish-Jewish identity closer to Jewish self-awareness. This was the case with Julian Stryjkowski (1905-1996), who, having spent the Second World War in Moscow (Garbowska 2004: 127-128), openly admitted that it was after the tragic annihilation of Polish Jewry that he felt compelled to identify himself as a Jew and to build a literary monument to the pre-war world of Polish Jewry (Stryjkowski 1986: 190; Garbowska 2004: 127-128). His tetralogy of novels, including Głosy w ciemności [Voices in the Darkness, 1956], Austeria [The Inn, 1966], Sen Azrila [Azril’s Dream, 1975] and Echo (1988), paint the picture of the world of Jewish communities before the First World War. Such post-war writing that evokes the pre-war world of Polish Jewry from the Holocaust perspective hijacks themes that were once the domain of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction. It is not surprising, therefore, that “[a]s portraits of Jewish life in Poland, Stryjkowski’s works stand comparison with those of both Bruno Schulz and of Isaac Bashevis Singer”, as noted by Ursula Phillips, a translator and literary scholar (Phillips 1996). Whether or not these literary portraits of Jewish life in Poland indeed stand comparison is a different matter. What is important here is that such thematic appropriation of the pre-war Polish-Jewish reality by Holocaust literature, which is already significantly more visible than pre-war Polish-Jewish literature has deprived pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction of its potential to offer new, though revived, literary themes in the source context of Polish literature as a whole, diminishing the chance of pre-war works for wider recognition and greater visibility. Furthermore, instances of the appropriation of the pre-war Polish-Jewish world by the Holocaust narrative also happen in the target context, in particular in the case of English-language anthologies of Polish fiction that include Polish Jewish literature (which I discuss more broadly in Chapter 5). Such a Holocaust-tinted image of Polish Jewish literature created by those anthologies, together with the shadow of the Holocaust on pre-war Polish-Jewish literature, which, as I have just explained, was inextricably linked to
the shifted self-identification of Polish Jews in the source context, are likely to contribute to the lack of potential of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction for English translation, giving priority to Holocaust literature.

From the perspective of a polysystem, identifying pre-war Polish-Jewish writing with Holocaust literature moves the former to another system in the target polysystem, that is the system of the English translations of Holocaust writing (cf. Figure 1). Such a different position in the target context makes it equally unlikely for the literature in question to gain more visibility. Even assuming that there was an interest in pre-war Polish-Jewish prose among readers and, to use the term from actor network theory (Jones 2011: 25), actors, such as publishers and literary agents who form a network leading to a potential translation project, their first point of reference would not, presumably, have been Holocaust writing. Moreover, Polish Holocaust literature in the target system occupies a relatively marginal position. Holocaust writing in Britain has been dominated by the US literature to the extent that this phenomenon is sometimes referred to as the “Americanisation of the Holocaust”, which leaves both the “rare examples of Anglo-Jewish treatment of the Holocaust” (Kremer 2002) and Polish Holocaust writing lesser-known. Thus, it makes sense to assume that Holocaust literature has been widely recognised in the USA in particular to the extent that a Holocaust label may even help some writers win wider acclaim in the USA, but not in Britain. This was the case with an emerging popularity of post-war Polish-Jewish writer Jerzy Kosiński (1933-1991). As noted by Thomas Gladsky, a scholar of American literature,

[a]part from the considerable merits of Kosinski’s first three novels, Kosinski’s reputation increased geometrically when he “emerged” as a Holocaust survivor (a Jewish one no less) (...) Elie Wiesel glorified Painted Bird in terms that praised Kosinski as a chronicler of the Holocaust. (2003: 138)

Similarly, the US recognition of the works by Bruno Schulz was partly driven by a particular focus on his tragic death during the Holocaust and his Jewish origin (the case of the American reception of Schulz’s works will be discussed more broadly in Chapter 5). In Britain, by contrast, the Holocaust label would not presumably have paved the way to his wider recognition. The question of the identity of writers and the nature of their literature, then, is a factor not only in the availability of a particular
literature for translation, but it also impacts the reception of literary works and reader’s interests (an issue I will also pick up on in Chapter 5).

2.2.3 The lack of visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in contemporary Poland

The current lack of visibility of this fiction is an additional factor which makes this literature an unlikely candidate for translation in the nearest future because, as we know from Even-Zohar (1978:48), a central position of literary works in a system tends to increase their chances of being translated into another language. Since a detailed analysis of the recognition of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Poland would require a separate study, my intention is only to hint at the marginal general awareness of this literature in the source Polish context.

One aspect of the limited recognition is a narrow range of individuals who share an interest in this literature. They include mostly academics rather than ordinary readers. Research on Polish-Jewish literature has in fact gained momentum over the past twenty-three years. It began with the seminal study of pre-war Polish-Jewish writers by Prokop-Janiec (1992), who unearthed the world of pre-war Polish-Jewish writing. Since then, pre-war Polish-Jewish literature has been explored from multiple angles, such as Polish-Jewish identity, literary themes and philosophy (cf. the Bibliography for specific titles). The most recent academic works on Polish-Jewish fiction include Polskie tematy i konteksty literatury żydowskiej [Polish Topics and Contexts of Jewish Literature, 2014] co-edited by Prokop-Janiec and Marek Tuszewicki; and Kulturowe i literackie kontakty polsko-żydowskie. Historia i współczesność [Cultural and Literary Polish-Jewish Contacts, 2014], also edited by Prokop-Janiec.

The diversity of academic inquiry into Polish-Jewish fiction, however, does not easily translate into its availability to the general public. Seen through the lens of actor network theory, despite their prestige, academic scholars are unlikely actors to disseminate and raise the general awareness of little-known literature. This task is rather the responsibility of publishers and literary agents. It is not surprising, then, that the availability of most pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction is limited to academic institutions, such as the Digital Repository of Scientific Institutes (RCIN), Digital
National Library (CBN) or the Institute of Literary Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences (PAN). Very often, digitalised books are copyrighted and inaccessible from non-academic locations. This, in turn, limits the group of potential readers to an exclusive hermetic academic circle. In nationwide public libraries and bookstores, by contrast, pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction is generally difficult to encounter. The following table gives an idea of the availability of some works of pre-war fiction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writer</th>
<th>Merlin.pl</th>
<th>Antykwariat.pl</th>
<th>National Library</th>
<th>Warsaw University Library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aleksander Wat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoni Słonimski</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazimiera Alberti</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Belmont</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>&gt;15</td>
<td>&gt;11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henryk Adler</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubin Feldszuh</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 The availability of pre-war Polish-Jewish prose fiction by selected writers

What stands out in the table is the contrast between the resources of academic libraries (National and Warsaw University Libraries) and the almost non-existent stock of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in ordinary online bookshops (Merlin.pl and Antykwariat.pl). And although the availability of literature in its own right does not
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secure wider recognition, it helps to raise the general awareness of its existence among the general reading public.

The current limited recognition of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction may be historically informed by post-war politics and censorship of the Communist regime that was in power until 1989, when the Communist regime collapsed. Although the question of Holocaust memory in Poland is a topic in and of itself (see Tych 2001), the Communist propaganda tended to erase the Jewish memory of war victimhood, branding “Jewish victims of the Holocaust exclusively as ‘Polish citizens’” (Tyszka 2010: 188). Inevitably then, the awareness of what really happened to Jews between 1939 and 1945 among the majority of Poles at the end of the 1990s was still very limited (Tych 2001: 315). State-instigated antisemitism was also used by the Communist apparatus to pacify social unrest in the 1960s. In the wake of anti-Jewish campaigns launched by the Communists, almost thirteen thousand Polish Jews left Poland between 1968 and 1971 (Stola 2000:9). Antisemitism, then, was part of the official line of internal politics, but was also linked to the Soviet anti-Israeli support for the Arab armies in the 1967 Arab-Israeli War (see Stola 2000 and Golan 2006 for more about the conflict). Given such a political atmosphere, the promotion of pre-war Polish-Jewish literature and culture by state-run cultural and academic institutions was highly unlikely, making pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction largely invisible at the time.

A more recent factor that underlies the poor visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction is linked to the low average reading rate and to mainstream reading preferences of the general public. Approximately sixty-three percent of the entire Polish population did not read any work of literary fiction at all in 2015 (Michalak et al. 2015:4). The most popular fiction among those who do read includes love stories, fantasy and sensation novels (Michalak at al. 2015: 4), in particular fiction written by well-known writers, such as Stephen King, Dan Brown or Agatha Christie, read in translation; and by domestic authors of bestsellers, including Andrzej Sapkowski, Katarzyna Grochola in addition to canonical authors Henryk Sienkiewicz and Adam Mickiewicz (Michalak et al. 2015: 70). Dominant reading preferences that revolve around bestsellers and classics make it unlikely for pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction to gain a better position in the general awareness of the Polish reading public.
And yet, there have recently been attempts to bring some works of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction to light. Wittlin’s Sól ziemi was the subject of a radio broadcast in the second programme of Polish Radio, which also broadcast the series of readings of his novel (Hagemajer-Kwiatek 2014; Damięcki 2014). The same radio channel has also recently launched the series of readings of fragments of several stories by Schulz (Lisiecka 2016). However, it is debatable whether the broadcasts have had any wider impact on the general reading preferences because Polish Radio Two, whose mission is to educate and promote high-brow literature and art, remains detached from the popular and mainstream tastes of the general public as a niche radio channel (KBR: 2015). Another attempt to unearth several works of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction has been made by Lissner Studio, which has released several audiobooks of Leo Belmont’s novels, including Pod gilotyną [Under the Gallows], Markiza de Pompadour [Marquise de Pompadour] and others. Finally, the launch of the Retropress.pl Internet portal, which publishes articles from pre-war Polish-language newspapers, also includes pre-war publications by Polish Jews (such as Melcer’s Czarny ląd series of literary reportages) together with newspaper articles that reflect the perception of Jews before the war, such as, for instance, Zbigniew Rakowski’s article “Zażydzona Temida w salach i na korytarzach sądów warszawskich” [“Themis full of Jews in the room and corridors of Warsaw courts] published in the Polonia newspaper in 1937.

However, in order to increase the visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Poland, individual portals and audiobooks may not be sufficient because they reach individuals rather than groups of people. For this reason, reading lists in schools would have to include some works of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction to make a significant change in the literary awareness and habits of younger generations. Yet only one pre-war Polish-Jewish prose fiction writer Bruno Schulz is on the senior high school compulsory reading list (Sawicki 2016). Unless more pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction writers are brought to light in the source context, the potential of this literature for translation is bound to remain small.
2.3 Linguistic factors in the source language polysystem that militate against translation

The potential of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction for translation is also influenced by the factors relating to the Polish language. For one thing, literature in the Polish language, unlike that in major modern languages such as Spanish or French, struggles to be translated into English, especially when we remember that literary translation in general is not particularly popular in Britain (cf. 1.1). For another thing, however, there are particular linguistic aspects that are inherent in some works of Polish-Jewish prose fiction that may have rendered their translations unlikely. In the following section, I intend to discuss ways in which the mechanics of the Polish language in selected literary works may be problematic during the process of translating.

2.3.1 Yiddish in pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction - a linguistic and stylistic hindrance to translation

As discussed earlier in 2.1.1, Yiddish, an aspect of the cultural distinctiveness that underlies Polish Jewish literature, remained a widely spoken vernacular among Polish Jews until the outbreak of the Second World War. Called affectionately mame loshn (the mother tongue), Yiddish was originally the vernacular of the unassimilated Ashkenazi Jews (Geipel 1982: 3; 5), but its continuous use was made possible by the “singular nature and circumstances of the Ashkenazi settlement in Eastern Europe” (Geipel 1982: 44). Although seen as a jargon inferior to Polish by some assimilated Polish Jews before the war (Adamczyk-Garbowska 2011: 128-129; Prokop-Janiec 2013: 77-95), Yiddish was inevitably conveyed in some works of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction. The translation of the traces of Yiddish into English in a way that potential target readers can engage with may be problematic.

The main two problematic issues for the English translation would be the identification of Yiddish tropes and the interpretation of their possible meanings in the text. Yiddish words and the Yiddish syntax, which tend to be overt manifestations of Yiddish in pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction (Adamczyk-Garbowska 2011: 128-139), require a certain command of Yiddish on the part of the reader and, thus, the translator. Once noticed, however, the main cognitive challenge to understanding Yiddish is posed by underlying cultural references. They rely on readers’ background knowledge.
of at least basic Yiddish phrases and related cultural references that are bound up with the traditional world of Polish Jews and Yiddish culture more broadly.

In Alberti’s novel *Ghetto potepione*, which revolves around the question of assimilating and abandoning the traditional world of Polish Jewry (cf. 2.2.1), most Yiddish words employed in this novel foreground the backward and underprivileged character of shtetls. “Gwir” (Alberti 1931: 15) means a “rich man” (Jacobs 2005: 90), a person which usually enjoyed recognition in small communities of mostly impoverished Jews. “Parnuse” (Alberti 1931: 16) stands for “livelihood” or “making a living” (Slobin 2002: 75), a concept inextricably related to the unique commercial atmosphere of a Jewish shtetl, where Jews had their own trade and workshops, the main economic drive in the shtetl community (Michałowska-Mycielska 2013: 24).

The role of Yiddish references in Wilhelm Feldman’s *Żydziak. Szkic psychologiczno-spółeczny* [A Yid. A Psychological and Social Sketch] by contrast, is slightly different. Some Yiddish phrases refer to the rich Yiddish oral tradition, such as “mines i klipes” (Feldman 1889: 6), which, according to the author’s explanation, stands for “female devils and evil ghosts”, abundant in Yiddish folk tales and legends. “Szmaryłnik” (1889: 115), on the other hand, is a noun that refers to those Jews who are bound to be baptised, a word that hints at the increasing importance of the question of baptism among Polish Jews, reflecting the question of assimilation. All these Yiddish phrases are only selected examples from the two novels but they show that their meaning in the context of the represented world may be challenging although they stand out and are relatively easy to identify for the reader. The creation of the textual world in the mind of the reader may be incomplete, affecting the readers’ cognitive engagement with the fictional world.

The syntactic imitation of the Yiddish language may be another hindrance to translation because it is less straightforward. For example, it would be difficult for the reader without any command of Yiddish to realise that the presence of many personal pronouns may suggest that the style of the text reflects Yiddish (as noted by Adamczyk-Garbowska 2011: 132) given that personal pronouns are not mandatory in the Polish language due to its inflection.

A case in point may be a short sentence from Feldman’s *Żydziak...*, in which one of the characters says (1889: 44), “My słuchamy, co napisano. Ty już chcesz ‘tłumaczyć’ zakon. I wy chłopcy uważajcie, co ten wygaduje” [“We are listening to
what has been written. You want to interpret the law already. And you, boys, be aware of what he is blabbering about”.] The presence of personal pronouns, such as “my”, “ty”, “wy” would not be necessary unless used for emphatic reasons. Equally, however, they may well represent the Yiddish language in the speech of the character. Such choices in the process of reading are part of cognitively creating and engaging with the represented world of Polish Jews in the novel. Without such a choice, the reader is left with a somewhat stylistically awkward piece of writing, unable to contextualise it in the novel’s setting. And because the translator is also a reader, it would take a knowledgeable translator to be able to convey nuances of this kind, including those relating to Yiddish and its meaning in a particular literary work. A question then arises whether such cultural and linguistic nuances can be transferred in the English translation in an engaging way for the target reading audience.

2.3.2 Polish in pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction - a linguistic and stylistic hindrance to translation

In addition to Polish reflecting Yiddish, the presence of Polish in some works of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction may be a problematic issue for translation even without conveying any tropes of Yiddish for two opposing reasons. In some literary works, such as Feldman’s Ananke... the Polish seems to be exceedingly ornate, in others, as with Hartblaj’s Jehoszua..., by contrast, its simplicity and repetitiveness may, too, work towards inherent unavailability for translation.

An exceedingly inflated and melodramatic style of literary fiction escapes a clear definition, however. In stylistics it is somewhat vaguely termed as “mannerism”, that is “the self-conscious cultivation of peculiarities of style – usually elaborate, ingenious, and ornate – in literary works of any period” (Baldick 2008c). A slightly more negative connotation is implied by the term “purple patch”, defined as “an over-written passage in which the writer has strained too hard to achieve an impressive effect” (see Baldick 2008a). Such writing then, especially when used in excess, may read as “undemocratic” and “insincere”, “at best artsy”, as noted by the American novelist Paul West (1985). As opposed to plain prose, such texts tend to draw attention to their own artificiality to the extent that they may obscure the meaning of the text. The hyperbolic undertone of such writing, together with its melodrama, may moreover
produce unintended comic effects. The overwrought nature of such style is then unlikely to be regraded positively by readers and critics.

Feldman’s novel abounds in flowery descriptions and melodramatic phrasing, such as “(...) jej dusza wiecznej dziewicy czuła, że ten taniec tej pary jest wprost aktem tajemniczym wielkiej zagadki natury (Feldman 1904: 89)” [“her soul of an eternal virgin felt that that dance of that couple was a mysterious act of a great puzzle of nature”]; or “[z]adrżała, każde włókienko w niej drgało, jak za dotknięciem drutu elektrycznego (Feldman 1904: 137) [“she trembled, every fibre was trembling inside her as if touched by an electric wire”]. In addition to fancy phrasing, Feldman frequently deploys old spelling, replacing the letter “j” with “y”, as in “poezya” (p. 3), “melodya” (p.2) or in “kolacya” (p. 82), which was not the spelling norm at the time (Karłowicz et al 1902: 394; 460; 920). And although literary language is bound to “create a complex verbal world that has as much presence, as much apparent physical bulk, as the world around it” (West 1985), in which the aesthetic aspect plays an important role, it should not distract the reader from that physical bulk of the real world embedded in a particular work of fiction. As West pointed out, “[a] writer who does purple all the time ought to have more tricks” (1985).

It is worth noting that Feldman’s Ananke…is not, presumably, an isolated case of purple prose in pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction. The desire to excel at the Polish literary language of some Polish Jews was part of their attempt to prove their place in the literary mainstream. This need to prove their literary merits was part of the emerging tendency of acculturating among Polish Jews in the late 19th century, in the lifetime of Feldman, who, incidentally, was a renowned keen assimilationist to the extent that he held Yiddish language in low regard (Shmeruk 1985: 93). The need to prove one’s place in Polish literature was to continue in the early 20th century under the pressure of unwelcome “atmosphere of apologising”, created by increasingly antisemitic tendencies in the Poland of the 1930s, as pointed out in 2.1.3. For Artur Sandauer, a Polish Jewish literary critic and essayist, his linguistic purism “ha[d] something of the convert in it” (Sandauer 2005: 97), whereby his linguistic and literary self-awareness were part of his overall feeling of not being entirely accepted in the wider literary community.

The other features that may have militated against English translation are the simplicity and the repetitiveness of some works of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction,
especially with reference to Zionist writing. As pointed out in 2.2.1, Zionist prose may pose specific hurdles for translation because of its persuasive mission and its content that addresses specific social and political issues that would be problematic to re-contextualise to another audience. But the style in its own right may also have been a hurdle to successful translation. The simplicity of the literary style and of the narrative were dictated by the political mission to the extent that the works by Zionist activists were frequently rejected by editors on the account of “substandard Polish” (Prokop-Janiec 2003: 35) despite their relative popularity in the 1930s. The text of Hartblaj’s *Jehousza*...includes several stylistic features of Zionist fiction. Frequent repetition of phrases may be found in the following excerpt, in which the theme of flowing tears is mentioned one after another: “Jehoszua słyszy, jak jeden z jego młodszych braciszków wymienia jego imię. Z oczu matki wytryska zdrój łez...” [“Jehoszua hears one of his younger brothers mention his name. A river of tears starts to flow from his mother’s eyes”], immediately followed by “Z pod powiek Jehoszuy wytrysły gorące łzy” [“Hot tears flowed from underneath Jehousza’s eyelids”] (Hartblaj 1928: 30). In addition to these repetitions, the accumulation of melodramatic moments may generate unintended comic effects, which may problematise the reading experience.

The following excerpt, on the other hand, illustrates the time-and place-specific setting of the novel, addressing specific issues that were relevant for Polish Zionists in the late 1920s, problems that would potentially be of little interest to the target reading public in Britain: “Mało im było rzezi płoskirowskiej...mało Petlury...Dość mam tego... na tydzień ruszam i basta” (Hartblaj 1928: 22) [“The Płoskirów slaughter wasn’t enough for them...neither was Petlyura...I am fed up with all that...I am leaving next week, period”]. The speaker refers to the recent history of Poland and tragic events that inform his decision to emigrate to Palestine and build a new home there. The pogrom that took place in Proskurov (Płoskirów) was one of many Jewish pogroms in present-day Ukraine in 1919 (see Heifetz 1921 for more on Jewish pogroms in 1919 Ukraine; see 202-227 for more on the Proskurov massacre). Symon Petlyura seized power over Ukraine following the withdrawal of the Germans, marking the rise of the Ukrainian independence movement. The role of Petlura in mass Jewish pogroms in Ukraine is still widely debated today but it is estimated that 100,000 Jews were slaughtered under his rule in Ukraine (Neapolitan 2015). Another specific cultural and political reference that may pose difficulties in the understanding...
of its significance in that novel is the fragment of the transliterated Polish version of
the *Techezakna* Zionist song, originally written in Hebrew (Zionist Songs. Techezakna 2016)

Though they break down the stylistic and narrative simplicity of the novel, such specific historical and cultural references may be difficult to understand for the audience in the country in which Zionism has been shaped by different values. Furthermore, culture-specific references may also be problematic for the process of translating, a point which I discuss in Chapter 4, in which I look at the texts and translation shifts of several English translations of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction.

In addition to literary and cultural factors, linguistic aspects of pre-war Polish-Jewish literary works, in particular the use of Polish in ways that challenge the conventions of the Polish literary language, can make Polish-Jewish fiction an unlikely candidate for well-received English translation. Such inherent unavailability, however, is only a partial explanation of the lack of visibility of this literature in Britain. The source factors that I have outlined in this chapter do not fully account for the limited interest in and recognition of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain. The remaining chapters, therefore, will seek to look at it from the perspective of the British target context.
3 TARGET LANGUAGE POLYSYSTEM FACTORS

After enquiring what informs the inherent unavailability of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction for translation, it is now necessary to look at target-context factors, that is factors that have contributed to the lack of visibility of the literature in question specifically in the British literary polysystem. This chapter mirrors the previous one in that it discusses the target system from a similar perspective to that adopted in my examination of the source one in the previous chapter, taking into account socio-political, literary and linguistic factors to determine their role in the overall lack of recognition of the pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain.

Prior to delving deeper in these issues, it is first important to note that the scope of target-system factors is broader than that of source ones, which are largely limited to Poland and to the period of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, when pre-war Polish-Jewish writing flourished, with occasional references to earlier moments in history (2.1.1) and to more recent times (2.2.3). The selection of relevant source factors that inform the inherent unavailability of the literature in question for translation is, then, driven largely by the origin, content and the status of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction. In other words, previously discussed source-context factors inform only one literary system, that of pre-war Polish-Jewish prose fiction in the larger polysystem of Polish literature.

By contrast, the examination of the target polysystem system in search of factors that inform the limited chances of the wider acknowledgement of literature I am concerned with takes into account factors that are part of more than only one literary system (cf. Figure 1). Only thus can it be hypothesised why pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction has not resonated with the expectations of target readers, publishers and target literary tendencies of various interests so far. The scope of literary genres and temporal span are broader in the following discussion. Rather than history and literary genres in their own right, it is the nature of their relations with the characteristics of the source system that is suggestive of possible reasons for the limited potential for the translation and wider recognition of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction.
3.1 Historical and socio-political factors in the target system that militate against translation

3.1.1 Discontinuous presence of Jews in England as a historical factor

In order to see why British-Jewish culture developed in a way that was bound to make the English translation of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction unlikely, it is necessary to trace the history of British Jews. Compared to the history of Polish Jews, the presence of Jews in Britain may seem to be relatively discontinuous. The premature end of Jewish communities in the Middle Ages and their late re-appearance in Britain in the late 17th century were bound to shape both the general perception of Jews and ways in which Jews tended to integrate into society from the late 17th century onwards. Having failed to form a distinct Jewish culture (as with the case of Polish Jews, for example), British Jews were later to be seen as no different from the rest of society, also by themselves. Such a different perception of Jewishness so different from that of Poland is a likely important factor that has contributed to the lack of acceptability and visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish prose fiction in the British target context.

As far as is known, the first recorded Jewish settlers arrived in England about 760 AD (Rosner 2014), but it was only after the conquest of William the Conqueror in 1066, who brought Ashkenazi Jews from Rouen over to London, that Jews began to form communities in Britain (Rubinstein 1996: 36; Roth 1949: 4; Hillaby 2013: 1). Under the reign of King Stephen (1135-1154), who advocated the decentralisation of royal power into local levels, Jews were able to settle beyond the borders of London (Hillaby 2013: 2). From then onwards, medieval Jewish communities grew slowly, never exceeding one percent of the population in total until the mid-13th century (Rubinstein 1996: 38). Although they existed in numerous towns across the country, such as York, Lincoln, Canterbury, Oxford, Norwich and others (Roth 1949: 11; 27), the Jewish community in London predominated over the others in terms of its size and significance (Roth 1949: 4; Rubinstein 1996: 38).

However, despite the relatively widespread Jewish presence in medieval England, its constant percentage in relation to the wider population suggests that although English medieval Ashkenazi Jews largely preserved the integrity of their communities, there were also cases of integrating and acculturating with the society at large by mixed marriages with gentiles, a practice that was not at all uncommon at
that time (Rosner 2014; Roth 1949: 119). Another reason for the unchanged proportion of Jews with regard to the wider population was conversion to Christianity, an act which Jews were forced to undertake to avoid heavy taxes levied on Jews, especially between 1244 and 1255 (Hillaby 2013: 118). In addition to economic reasons, the order to convert Jews into Christianity was issued by Pope Nicholas III, who in his 1278 Vineam sorec bull explicitly stated that the conversion rate among Jews had to increase for the sake of Christianity. Following the papal announcement, King Edward I ordered sheriffs, bailiffs and the Dominicans to crusade for conversion among Jews (Hillaby 2013: 119). Given the increased pressure to convert to Christianity, alongside the tendencies to blend with non-Jewish fellow citizens, the Jewish religion was bound to become a private issue for Jews living in Britain. On the surface, medieval Jews in Britain indeed “outwardly resembled their contemporaries” (Roth 1949: 95).

The relative lack of a long-standing distinct Jewish culture in England is mirrored in medieval Anglo-Jewish literature which, as far as my research has been able to establish, is predominantly religious-themed and written in Hebrew, the language of the Hebrew Bible and religious services. The Hebrew poetry of Meir ben Elijah of Norwich, one of the few currently known medieval British-Jewish poets in the late 13th century, is largely influenced by piyyutim (that is poems that are composed to embellish religious ceremony; Lieber 2015) and contains many quotations from the Hebrew Bible (Hillaby 2013: 289-290). Sepher Etz Hayyim by another British-Jewish poet Jacob ben Judah of London, on the other hand, is a codification of Jewish religious precepts in Hebrew and as such remains for some one of the most notable extant literary productions of medieval Anglo-Jewry (Hillaby 2013: 248). Medieval British-Jewish writing was, thus, largely hermetic and unintelligable to the wider non-Jewish audience at the time.

Moreover, the discussed “outward resemblance” of British Jews to their non-Jewish fellow citizens in the early medieval period was likely to further the tendency to blend with the rest of non-Jewish society among Jewish immigrants to Britain in later years given the lack of any other alternative. Additionally, the limited visibility of British-Jewish culture would have led to a different general understanding of being Jewish in England in comparison to Eastern Europe, where not only religion but also languages and a distinct way of life defined the cultural identity of Jewish
communities. These early cultural and historical differences were to underpin different literary tendencies in Jewish literature, alongside diverse expectations of readers more broadly much later in the late 19th century, not working in favour of Polish-Jewish pre-war fiction, as I shall explain in my discussion of British-Jewish literature in 3.2.1.

In 1269, the king of England Edward I issued the Edict of Expulsion (Roth 1949: 6; 68), expelling the majority of Jews from England over the next four hundred years, making it even more unlikely for British Jews to have a special place in the awareness of ordinary people at the time. The reasons behind the decision of Edward I are still being debated by historians, but it may have been dictated by the clergy, whose greater influence was supported by the world-wide policy by Pope Innocent III to empower the clergy and the church’s institutional structures across Europe (Rosner 2014; Sayers 1994: 135-136). Equally, the decision to expel Jews from England was likely to be driven mainly by financial and political issues rather than by antisemitic prejudice or religious animosity (see Hillaby 2013: 13-14). Although the latter were perhaps unavoidable, they were indeed marginal in England (see Rosner 2014; Rubinstein 1996: 11). Jews were the main source of financial loans among the upper and ruling classes who had difficulties paying the loans back given the financial crisis in England. Therefore, passing the law which made these loans null and void appeared a practical step. However, not all Jewish creditors agreed to abide by this law, which led to the more drastic step on the part of the ruling class. Jews who wanted or could afford to stay could do so if they converted to Christianity.

The mass expulsion and conversion under duress made Jews as cultural contributors even more invisible than before, and this situation lasted for almost four hundred years. It was only in 1655 that Lord Protector Oliver Cromwell admitted Jews from continental Europe (Katz 1994: 108-119). The growing community of British Jews included Sephardic and Ashkenazi Jews, who, historically, originated from Spain and from Germany respectively, although the latter were often poorer (Vaughan 1994: 12). Consequently, it was Sephardic Jews who came to dominate over Ashkenazi Jewry in the circles of the British-Jewish elite that was then concentrated in London. Wealthy Sephardic Jews were generally anxious that poorer Jews would spoil their image of “almost aristocratic English nonconformists” (Katz 1999: 202; 195-208). Thanks to the good position of British Jewry in the English elites in the 18th
century, British Jews were perceived as ordinary citizens. Perhaps not surprisingly, then, British Jews “were seldom, perhaps never, the central target of religious and racial hostility” (Rubinstein 1996: 59). Some of them continued to practise Judaism, others blended with the rest of society entirely. For historical reasons, therefore, a Jew was a Jew to English people only when he or she looked like a Jew (i.e. a Chasid in religious clothing; Rosner 2014). The largely inconspicuous presence of Jews in Britain stood in contrast with some parts of continental Europe, where Jewish communities who opted to live their traditional religious lives were seen as “anachronistic survivors in the Middles Ages” that needed to be emancipated to form part of society (i.e. granted equal rights with non-Jewish fellow citizens) (Rubinstein 2011: 248).

In the 19th century, the established British-Jewish elite sought to hold prominent positions in society and prove worthy citizens with equal rights to those of their non-Jewish countrymen. One of the British-Jewish reformers and intellectualists, Isaac d’Israeli (1776-1848), author of The Genius of Judaism (1833), advocated “[t]he civil and political fusion of the Jewish with their fellow-citizens”. According to him, the church and the synagogue, that is the Jewish religion, were to be the only spheres of life to separate Jewish from non-Jewish citizens (d’Israeli 1833 quoted in Katz 1999: 333). The only remaining inequality was the ban on Jews in Parliament, imposed by an outdated set of laws (see Rubinstein 2011: 248-250 for more on this). However, it was overcome in 1858, when Lionel Nathan de Rothschild became the first English practising Jew to sit in the House of Commons as an MP (Katz 1994: 323). The success of the Rothschilds crowned the efforts of British Jews to be on a par with the rest of society, Judaism remaining the only marker of their Jewish origin.

The complacency of British Jews in Britain informed their literature, in which overt manifestations were scarce, reflecting their attempt not to stand out as Jewish in wider society. This literary tendency, in turn, undermined the chances of overtly Jewish Polish-Jewish fiction for much recognition. Similarly, for the non-Jewish general reading public in Britain, not accustomed to overtly Jewish culture, Jewish-themed literature in general, whether native or in translation, was likely to be of little or no interest because of the fact that Jewishness in itself, historically, was not much of an issue they would engage with. Such reading preferences might be another reason
why pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction would stand little chance for wider recognition in Britain at the beginning of the 20th century.

The higher social and financial position of the British-Jewish establishment also meant that political and cultural power over British Jewry was mainly in their own hands. Jewish-related politics and culture were shaped mainly by institutions founded by the British-Jewish intelligentsia. In contrast to Central and Eastern Europe, grassroots popular movements were scarce, which may have been related to the general tendency of the established British Jewry to keep Jewishness inconspicuous. Therefore, it was the established British-Jewish elite who made all political decisions, especially prior to the arrival of Jewish refugees in 1881 (Bernstein 1996:95).

The political authority of the British-Jewish elites comes to the foreground in the question of Jewish political movements, for instance. The Eastern and Central European Bundist Jewish socialist movement did not take root in Britain despite the presence of Yiddish immigrants from Russia and despite the fact that socialism had a strong presence in early twentieth-century Britain, particularly during and after the First World War (Rubinstein 1996: 98; Rosner 2014). Similarly, Zionism, the Jewish national movement, had fewer supporters among British Jews than among non-Jewish English citizens, especially at the turn of the 20th century. In their attempts to obtain political equality in the Victorian era, established British Jews tended to identify themselves with the British Empire much more than with the Zionist cause because doing so would, in their mind, mean the betrayal of “the apparatus of patriotism and national loyalty [that] was owed (…) to Britain and to the British Empire rather than to any mooted Jewish State” (Rubinstein 1996: 170-171; Lipman 1986: xviii). Their ambivalent attitude to Zionism may almost certainly be linked also to the general tendency of the British-Jewish establishment to reject “any attempts to construct a separate Jewish national identity” (Rubinstein 1996: 99; 167). And precisely because the Balfour Declaration of 1917, which “favour[ed] the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people” (Mathew 2013: 231), foregrounded a distinct Jewish identity, it gathered more support among the non-Jewish British citizens than among British Jews (Bernstein 1996: 163; 172). The Zionist cause, then, became a case of nationwide policy (see Bernstein 1996: 163-165 for more on gentile British
During the brief period of his engagement with Zionism, the British-Jewish writer Israel Zangwill (1864-1926), the most famous spokesperson for British Jewry, failed to win more support for the Zionist cause among the British-Jewish elites, who were “entrenched in a secure existence and relative comfort” (Nahsohn 2006: 30).

The tendency to reject a separate Jewish identity, and a different affiliation of British Jews with the Zionist movement, were likely to work counter to the potential acceptability of persuasive Polish-Jewish Zionist fiction, which, it should be recalled, was so culture-specific that it was unlikely to fit with the political allegiances of British Jewry. In all probability, then, publishers associated with the established British-Jewish elite or writers, if at all interested in publishing Zionist literature, would prioritise other kinds of political writing.

However, the relatively comfortable position of British Jewry, which manifested itself so acutely in the political life, began to fracture with the first major immigration of Eastern European Jews, comprised of self-professed Jews from Eastern Europe who were later to be seen as the epitome of the Jew by the early 20th century (Rosner 2014). The new concept of Jewishness introduced by them had a profound impact on British Jewry and on the shape of British-Jewish literature as a whole, creating new obstacles for works of Polish-Jewish fiction to be welcomed in Britain in the early 20th century.

3.1.2 Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe as a socio-political factor

The large-scale immigration of up to 150 000 Jews from Russia and Eastern Europe to Britain which took place between 1881 and 1914 was triggered mainly by pogroms and draconian anti-Jewish laws introduced by Tsar Alexander II in Russia. Most refugees fled to the USA, but approximately 150 thousand settled in Britain (Rubinstein 1996: 94-95). Such a large influx of mostly Orthodox Jews, most of whom were impoverished Yiddish-speaking refugees and migrants who were looking for better employment opportunities created the critical mass which led to the formation

---

There is, however, much debate as to what extent the promotion of a separate Jewish state had an imperialist drive, rather than Zionist (see, for instance, Mathew 2013 for more).
of a separate Jewish world in Britain, in which Yiddish was a dominant language. They tended to settle in the East End of London, a traditionally migrant district, trying to pursue the trades and jobs they had had in their home countries (such as shoemaking, peddling, etc.). The thriving world of Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe laid bare foreign aspects of Jewishness, such as pious behaviour, the wearing of religious garments, unintelligible language and severe poverty, which had previously been largely unknown to British Jews. The Jewish population of England grew from 60 thousand in 1800 to approximately 200 thousand in 1905 (Roth 1949: 239; 265; 267).

This world, with its linguistic and cultural specificity, was something with which neither established British Jewry (mostly of Sephardic origin) nor non-Jewish English society were familiar. This is not to say, however, that the Jewish East End was an unknown place. On the contrary, this bustling Jewish area was talked about in newspapers and on the radio, creating, over time, an image of the typical Chasidic traditional Jew in the general awareness (see Brotz 1955:137-197 for more on the Jewish East End of London). The ongoing change in the understanding of Jewishness brought about by Jewish immigrants from Central and Eastern Europe in the early 20th century was reflected, for instance, in judicial discourse. Many judges, at that time, were “perturbed by the ‘eastern’ immigrants arriving in British shores,” which undermined the traditional association of Jewishness with the nation of ancient Israel (Herman 2006: 286-287).

The cultural and economic divide between the emancipated acculturated elites on the one hand and Jewish refugees at the turn of the 20th century on the other only furthered the tendency of established Jewry to repress any overt manifestation of Jewishness so that the image of British Jewry as “almost aristocratic English nonconformists” would not be spoilt by the new Eastern European idea of Jewishness. It should be recalled that the concept of British Jews as inconspicuous ordinary citizens was relatively rooted in the early 20th century, foreshadowed much earlier by the medieval history of British Jews, expulsion and their late re-admittance. What also made the established British Jewry keep their Jewishness a private issue was their increased fear of antisemitism, brought about by the refugees. Their escape from pogroms and state-instigated Jewish persecution gave a new perspective on Jewishness in Britain, that of a trigger for antisemitism. Consequently, the established
British-Jewish elite feared that any overt manifestation of Jewishness might provoke Jewish prejudice in society (especially in the late 1920s and early 1930s, when antisemitism was on the rise in continental Europe), which would ruin the financial and social position that members of the British-Jewish elite had achieved in Britain.

It is worth highlighting the important role of British-Jewish literature in the real-life dynamics of the life of British Jewry in the early 20th century. Indeed, the British-Jewish elite tended to be wary of literary works that dealt with the lives of immigrants for fear of prejudice against Jews at large, seeing them as potential triggers of anti-Jewish sentiments. In his preface to the Yiddish translation of his 1892 novel *Children of the Ghetto*, Zangwill mentions them openly:

> You [Yiddish readers] will not think that this book is an attack upon Jews, as some of the English-speaking Jews did who were frightened at the thought that the world would now discover that they were not exactly like English Christians (…) (English translation from Zangwill 1905: 229)

The tension between the overt Jewishness of new immigrants and the suppressed Jewish cultural identity of the more established British Jews was to continue until the outbreak of the Second World War. It is worth noting that this tension was not limited to Britain only. As argued by the English scholar Sarah Gordon, the immigration of foreign Jews, who usually had a distinctive look and tended to live in separate areas, only furthered antisemitic feelings in society in Germany. For fear of the rise of antisemitism, some German Jews even desired to stop the immigration of Eastern European Jews (Gordon 1984: 9-10).

Equally, the encounter with British culture also affected the cultural identity of the refugees, who tended to blend with British society at large and leave their traumatic past behind. Giles Fraser, a former canon chancellor of St Paul’s Cathedral and a regular contributor to the “Loose Canon” column in *The Guardian*, recalls:

> My ancestors came to these [British] shores escaping persecution. Many were central European refugees fleeing tsarist pogroms. And as Jews were being gassed in Nazi Germany, my family were desperately seeking to re-build their lives, searching for normality and acceptance. And for some, the best way to do this was to forget the past and to blend in. (Fraser 2015)

Inevitably, then, British-Jewish immigrant literature, which was informed by the real-life experiences of these immigrants to a certain degree, was to revolve around more
burning issues relating to the life of the immigrant in Britain. The Eastern-European cultural Jewish identity, on the other hand, tended to be linked to the traumatic past. Such negative literary representations of Eastern Europe, which were informed by authentic feelings of trauma, were bound to make pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction, especially socially and politically engaged writing, an unlikely candidate for English translation among readers and publishers associated with the circles of British-Jewish immigrants.

3.1.3 English reticence as a sociocultural factor

In addition to the historical reasons, another issue that was bound to contribute to the stifling of overt manifestations of Jewishness in the history of British Jewry is the general tendency in English society to be reticent about speaking openly about oneself and not to stand out as too different from the majority. The particular tendency not to speak openly specifically about religious beliefs tends to be linked to Protestantism. As opposed to Catholicism, the Church of England is not prescriptive in that there are no specific rules for adherents to follow. Instead, it offers space and freedom. As Paxman says,

This is the sort of woolliness that drives critics of the Church of England to distraction. If required by bureaucracy to declare their religious affiliation (…) millions will tick the box marked ‘C of E’. The rest is silence. (Paxman 2007: 95)

Perhaps owing to this particular aspect of the Church of England, there is, generally, no need in society to display religious beliefs or relics in churches. Religion has become, in a sense, part of the everyday, as “clothing and cars, understated and reasonably reliable, there when you need it” (Paxman 2007: 98).

Much later, in the mid-20th century, these features were to strike Anne Karpf (b. 1950), the daughter to Polish Jewish Holocaust survivors who came to Britain in 1947, who recalls in her memoir, “[t]he reticence of outsiders to speak about themselves was also led by the fear of not being a “proper person” (1996: 42), a tendency which made her view her own Jewishness as a completely private matter, and link Englishness with the outside world (1996: 49). Karpf openly admits that “little pellets of Englishness” prevented her from coming out as a Jew, giving rise to the feeling of “a sense of exclusion from the dominant culture” (Karpf 1996: 50). Her
experience dates back to the 1940s, and although these social norms still exist, they may now be changing with regard to Jewishness, an issue I discuss in section 3.2.1.6.

3.1.4 Other historical and social factors

The above outline of major issues relating to the history of British Jews may partly explain why Polish-Jewish prose fiction would potentially not be well received before the outbreak of the Second World War. The discussion has so far revolved mainly around the question of Jewishness and how it was experienced by different groups of Jews in Britain. In this section, I shall consider other historical factors that are not necessarily related to British Jewry but which, it can be argued, might have made Poland and, by extension, its literary legacy, somewhat obscure in the target context. Given that there is not the space to look into too much detail in this section I shall only suggest historical events that may have diverted the attention of the general public away from issues relating to the pre-war history of Polish Jews, most notably in the period following the Second World War.

The first major historical factor would have been the gradual collapse of the British Empire in the late 1960s, when the empire “was on the ropes”, having lost a significant number of colonies, such as Malaya, Ghana, Jamaica, Trinidad and others (Darwin 1991: xv-xvi; 3-4). Uprisings and wars, which marked the decolonising process and augured the end of the empire, were likely to direct the attention of the British general public away from Poland.

Secondly, the political and diplomatic links between Poland and Britain were relatively weak prior to the Second World War. The Polish Embassy, which was likely to be the main body promoting Polish art and literature (as is now the case with the Polish Cultural Institute, a diplomatic mission of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland; PCI 2016) opened only in 1929 (Pruszewicz 2014). The absence of a similar representative institution that could promote Polish arts and literature before 1929 is likely to be a contributing factor to the obscurity of Polish literature at the time. Indeed, it was only the end of the Second World War that saw the increasing visibility of Polish cultural presence in Britain, where Polish émigrés formed a significant community (Garliński 2001: 98).

Thirdly, the outbreak of the Second World War was likely to overshadow the pre-war legacy of Eastern European Jews. The events of the Second World War
propelled war-related literature, an assumption confirmed by the publication of the English translation of Wittlin’s war-themed novel *Sól ziemi* and its fleeting presence in British literature (discussed in 5.2.3 and in 5.5.3).

Finally, the Holocaust, as with the case of Polish-Jewish writers, also affected the cultural identity of British Jews in ways that is likely to have influenced the potential for pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction to be recognised positively in Britain. As briefly noted earlier, the feelings evoked by the Holocaust underlay the tendency to stifle Jewishness in the 1950s and 1960s. It was also the case with Kindertransport children, most of whom shed their Jewish identity. Jewishness was a painful topic, not only because it was related to the traumatising memory of the Holocaust. Most Kindertransport children yielded to the pressure of assimilation and were bound by the gratitude to the country that saved them from the Holocaust; consequently it was clear to them that it was best to “keep their heads down and not advertise their Jewishness” (Lassner 2010: 53).

This post-Holocaust stifling of Jewishness in Britain may be one of the reasons why British-Jewish literature was generally considered absent for two decades after the end of the Second World War, as I explain later in 3.2.1.4. Such a limited visibility of Jewishness in literary discourse may have directed the attention of the general reading public away from Jewish works of fiction, also from pre-war Poland.

### 3.2 Literary factors in the target polysystem that militate against translation

The previous section discussed how social and cultural changes have resonated with British-Jewish literature and, over time, changed its poetics, that is “a description of how texts (of any genre) are put together, how readers interpret them, and how such possible or likely interpretations result from the elements of the text itself” (Boase-Beier 2015: 14). It should be recalled, however, that in order to examine factors underlying the potential of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction for much recognition in Britain from the perspective of systems, in addition to the system of British-Jewish literature (3.2.1), the other two target literary systems need be considered: that of translated Polish literature (3.2.2) and the system of translated Jewish literature (3.2.3).

It is also worth considering the assumption that factors which condition literary reception are in a continuous flux, involving changing politics, economy, or literary
trends. Considering the changing nature of these factors from a systemic perspective, it is worth bearing in mind that a detailed analysis of factors in each literary systems I am concerned with would go beyond the limits of this thesis. Therefore, my focus in this discussion will consider the main factors in each system that are likely to have made pre-war Polish-Jewish prose fiction an unlikely candidate for English translation. The primary factors in the system of British-Jewish literature revolve around the question of the recognition of Jewish identity. In my discussion of the systems of translated Polish and Jewish literatures, by contrast, I shall examine the interests of the reading public and dominant themes in the literary mainstream as contributing factors to the overall lack of visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish prose in Britain.

The next section about the system of British-Jewish literature will begin with the examination of British-Jewish literature in the 1920s and 1930s, the heyday of Polish-Jewish prose fiction in the source system (i.e. the time when it stood the best chance of being translated into English); and continues through the period of the Holocaust to the early 21st century.

3.2.1 The system of British-Jewish literature
The most likely factor that is likely to have militated against the translation and the wide recognition of pre-war Polish-Jewish prose fiction in the system of British-Jewish literature in the 20th century is the changing nature of the perception of Jewish cultural identity and its reflection in British-Jewish literature over time.

Jewishness in Poland in the early 20th century, it should be recalled, was a topical issue, highlighted by the particular social and political circumstances (which, as noted earlier, Singer called “the atmosphere of apologising”; Singer 1977: 14). In other words, the Jewish origin of Polish-Jewish writers was in the limelight at the time, overtly manifesting itself in much Polish-Jewish fiction, especially Zionist prose and the novel of manners, which deal with a variety of problems faced by Polish Jews before the war.

In order to trace how the manifestations of Jewishness in British-Jewish literature have countered the visibility of Polish-Jewish fiction it is necessary to look at the changing nature of literary concerns regarding Jewish identity in British-Jewish literature over time. Therefore, I shall first discuss the 19th-century established British-
Jewish literature, that is literature written by established Jews (3.2.1.1); followed by the investigation of British-Jewish immigrant literature, that is literature written predominantly by Jewish immigrants and their second-generation descendants (3.2.1.2). The next section will look at the changes in established British-Jewish literature at the end of the 19th and in the early 20th centuries (3.2.1.3). I shall then examine British-Jewish literature in the post-war period (3.2.1.4 and 3.2.1.5). Finally, I shall address contemporary British-Jewish writing in the closing section (3.2.1.6).

3.2.1.1 The recognition of Jewish identity in established British-Jewish literature
As previously discussed, the place of Jews and Jewish identity in society in Britain was historically not as major a cultural or religious issue as it was in continental Europe. By the mid-19th century, British Jews were almost entirely emancipated, and their place in society was largely equal to others. There were still issues that had to be resolved, however, such as the interfaith relationship between Jews and Christians, one of the topics addressed by the British-Jewish writer Grace Aguilar (1816-1847) in *The Spirit of Judaism* (1842). She also discussed the history of British Jewry and the position of Jewish women in her nonfiction (Brown, Clements et al 2015).

Inevitably then, it was predominantly religion and politics that preoccupied British Jews and informed British-Jewish literature in the 19th century. The mid-19th century saw the publication of Benjamin Disraeli’s novels, such as *Vivian Grey* (1826), the “Young England Trilogy” (1844-1847) and *Endymion* (1850), which can clearly be seen as a pronouncement of his political ideas, in which government issues and social classes – related, in part, to British Jewry – hold a special place (see Flavin 2005 for a more detailed study of Disraeli’s novels). The political ends are particularly foregrounded in the trilogy, *Coningsby* (1844), *Sybil* (1845), *Tancred* (1847), which can be considered as “the first truly political novels in English” (Drabble 1998: 274).

As in politics of the time, in British-Jewish literature, too, Zionism was not overly popular. It tended to be the background rather than the main literary theme. Zangwill’s novel *The Children of the Ghetto* portrays the Jewish life in the East End of London and contrasts it with the different world of wealthy and acculturated Kensington Jews. Zionism is mentioned only occasionally in references to some characters. As Zionism finally became “not a powerful incentive” for Zangwill, the writer never addressed it in his later works of prose fiction (Rahib 1985: 102).
The presence of Zionist themes in the works of Isaac Rosenberg (1890-1918) is equally problematic. Although Moses (London, 1916), one of his dramatic plays, can be read as Zionist (see Lawson 2006: 25-26 for a Zionist reading of the play), it is devoid of the persuasive tone, typical of Polish-Jewish Zionist fiction. On the contrary, Rosenberg’s play can be equally interpreted from a socialist angle (Lawson 2006: 25) or through the lens of the Jewish religion (Poetry Foundation 2016).

Similarly, despite her involvement in the Zionist movement, the clear Zionist slant is missing in the novels of the Welsh Jewish novelist Lily Tobias (1887-1984), herself a daughter of Polish-Jewish immigrants. Instead, her novels draw on “her own unique mix of cultures, focusing on her compassionate pacifism and desire for equality for all” (Honno Welsh Women’s Press 2016). Her 1933 novel Eunice Fleet, for instance, revolves around the question of marginalisation of those who refused to fight in the First World War.

This is not to say that British-Jewish Zionist novels did not exist at all, but they tended to be rare. Thieves in the Night. Chronicle of an Experiment (1946) by Hungarian-born Arthur Koestler provides an example of a later post-war Zionist novel. It conveys Koestler’s own experiences as a Zionist pioneer at the time when the state of Israel was being built (1999:48-49). However, Koestler quickly renounced his Zionist leanings, voicing his disillusion with the Jewish state in Promise and Fulfilment (1949). Koestler came to England in 1940, and, one year later, adopted English as his literary language when he published his first book written in English Scum of the Earth (1941). And although his earlier novel Darkness at Noon (1940) was originally written in German, the book in English translation by Daphne Hardy was widely acclaimed, raising the awareness of the British reading public regarding Stalin’s regime (Birch 2009a; Birch 2009b). Koestler’s contribution to British literature was appreciated by George Orwell, who in 1944 (Orwell 2000: 268-278) makes it a reason to include Koestler in English letters. Orwell argues that England was at the time lacking a “special class of literature that [arose] out of the European political struggle since the rise of Fascism” (2000: 268), literature which could be written only by non-English writers who had seen totalitarian regimes “from inside” (Orwell 2000: 269). Others, like the English history scholar David Cesarani, claims that Koestler was “one of the greatest writers ever to adopt English as a second or third language” (Cesarani 1999: 557), adding that his strong connection with the
English literary world, such as his membership of the Royal Society of Literature in 1973, secure him a place in the history of the modern British novel, a position also acknowledged by the English writer and scholar Malcolm Bradbury (1993: 234-236).

Not only was Zionism removed from the main preoccupations of British-Jewish writers, but it also inspired a number of British non-Jewish writers. George Eliot addressed certain Zionist issues in her *Daniel Deronda* (1876) but it is rather “the mystical appeal of Zionism (...) that was rooted in the deep reverence for the Bible, whether as Holy Scripture, prophecy, [or] mythology” (Rubinstein 1996: 165) rather than its political aspect that transpires in the novel, as I shall discuss further on below.

British appropriations of Zionism, be it in the domain of religion, arts or politics, tended to be underpinned by Protestantism and by the support for the British colony in Palestine (Rubinstein 1996: 169). These ideological and literary appropriations of Zionism suggest that Zionist literature targeted a wider audience, and was not limited to British Jews. Given a different target audience and different ideological slants, Polish-Jewish Zionist fiction was unlikely to meet the expectations of the target reading public in Britain had it been translated into English at the time.

As far as religion is concerned, the second issue that informed British-Jewish literature in the 19th century, it was mainly present in the English translations of Hebrew religious writing, including works by Jacob Nikelsburger, Zailick Salomon or Isaac D’Israeli, for example (see Spector 2012: 27-33 for specific titles). As noted before, Aguilar was another British-Jewish writer who addressed religious themes in the works such as *Sabbath Thoughts and Sacred Communings* (1853) and *The Spirit of Judaism* (1864), among other works. However, rather than religion-themed writing, it was her novel *Home Influence* (1847) that made Aguilar “relative[ly] success[ful]” (Brown, Clements et al. 2015). As opposed to her other works, the novel is written in a “crypto-Jewish tradition which placed mothers at the centre of religious survival, shifting importance away from public (...) instruction towards domestic training (...)” (Brown, Clements et al.)

Given the problematic reception of overtly Jewish-themed fiction, alongside the literary appropriations of Jewish themes by non-Jewish British writers, it makes sense to assume that in order for British-Jewish literature to be positively recognised, the Jewish aspects had to be rather covert and implicit. Explicitly Jewish themes were
rather unlikely to be popular among the British non-Jewish reading public. It is worth recalling that their concept of Jewishness, shaped by historical factors, was bound to be limited to a rather insignificant question of different religion. The general attitude to issues which concerned strictly the community of British Jews was conveyed in an anonymous review of *Daniel Deronda* in *Saturday Review*, published in 1876 (Carroll 2000: 376):


> not only are these personages [British-Jewry as portrayed in *Daniel...*] outside our interests [but] the author seems to go out with them into a world completely foreign to us. What can be the design of this ostentatious separation from the universal instinct of Christendom, this subsidence into Jewish hopes and aims?

The readers’ response to the parts of the novel that faithfully represent the world of British Jews was then far from welcoming. Almost all English reviewers “followed suit, at best damning with faint praise the ‘Jewish part of the story’” (Cave 1995: xv). Although the novel was finally recognised by British-Jewish readers to a certain degree, it did not match the enthusiastic response from Central European Jews (Cave 1995: xvi-xviii), who did not find Eliot’s representation of the Jewish concerns “completely foreign.” These divergent attitudes to the literary representations of problems ingrained in the world of Jews were likely to be informed by the different perception of Jewish cultural identity by the general public.

There was, then, a tendency not to foreground Jewishness in British-Jewish literature at the time. Such an unwelcoming attitude to explicit Jewish themes suggests that it was rather unlikely for the system of established British-Jewish literature to accommodate the demand for Polish-Jewish prose fiction at the time. In other words, the rather improbable engagement with the implicit and explicit Jewish aspects of the literature in question among British readers would not have secured wider acclaim of works of Polish-Jewish prose.

From the perspective of polysystem theory, then, it makes sense to conceive established British-Jewish literature in the late 19th century and in the early 20th century as a relatively unstable system, with a culturally underpinned inherent tendency to suppress literary manifestations of the cultural identity of British Jews. In the terms of polysystem theory, such instability, informed by “specific cultural or political conditions” (Even-Zohar 1978: 45), fits in between the category of a “crisis”, defined as “historical moments where established models are no longer tenable for
younger generation” (Even-Zohar 1990: 48); and the category of “weakness”, which entails a certain notion of insufficiency of the range of literary works within a particular system (Even-Zohar 1990: 47-48). Indeed, in weak systems, a number of literary tendencies may be “blocked and made unusable” (Even-Zohar 1990: 81). In both cases, literary translations are more likely to happen in literary systems (Even-Zohar 1990: 47). However, the chances for such a relatively unstable system as that of British-Jewish writing to import works from the recent system of Polish-Jewish literature which tended to rely on more acknowledged literature itself (cf. 2.2) would have been small.

The limited potential for wide recognition of established British-Jewish literature raises a question, then, what exactly “the compatibility” of texts for translation means (Even-Zohar 1990: 47). The issue of the cultural differences that inform the divergent perceptions of Jewishness that seem likely to play a role in the acceptability of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in established British-Jewish literature suggests that the factor of “compatibility” should, perhaps, include factors other than “new approaches” or “innovative role,” as defined by Even-Zohar (1990: 47).

3.2.1.2 British-Jewish immigrant literature and Jewish identity

The arrival of Jewish immigrants from Russia and Eastern Europe gave birth to immigrant literature written predominantly by the second immigrant generation, bringing about changes to established British-Jewish literature. As I aim to show in the following discussion, both literary trends within British-Jewish immigrant literature in their own right and its influence on established British-Jewish literature (discussed in 3.2.1.3) seem likely to be contributory factors to the overall lack of visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction, though in a slightly different way.

Topical issues within British-Jewish immigrant literature revolved around the struggles to win acceptance in society and around other problems faced by Jewish immigrants in Britain. Such target-oriented themes tended to link Jewishness with the traumatic past in Eastern Europe, something that Jewish immigrants generally desired to forget. The dominant literary concerns were also informed by the tendency of immigrants to anglicise, which was likely to be also driven by the discussed attitude to Jewishness of British Jewry and the rest of society.
The issue of the relations between non-Jewish British people and Jewish immigrants was addressed in *Magnolia Street* (1932) by Louis Golding, himself the son of impoverished Jewish immigrants from Russia (Baker 2004). It relates a story set in the working-class district of Longton in Manchester between 1910 and 1930. The portrayed co-existence of non-Jewish British inhabitants side by side with Jewish immigrants foregrounds the differences between the first generation of Jewish immigrants and their non-Jewish neighbours. Yiddish newspapers, Jewish religious life embodied by the Lithuanian Brotherhood Synagogue, Rabbi Schulman and a religious school for boys are the core elements of the lives of Jewish immigrants in the novel. Moreover, the rather conservative perception of mixed marriages with non-Jewish people and the recurring presence of Yiddish words, such as “oi” (a Yiddish-sounding exclamation, p. 25), “chayder” (a Hebrew school, p. 11), “blintsies” (filled dumplings in traditional Jewish cuisine in Eastern Europe, p. 32) create the sense of alienation between the immigrants and their neighbours in the story world. The overt orthodox Eastern European cultural identity of the immigrant characters, moreover, is usually linked with their country of origin rather than with England: Reb Feivel is born in Kravno, the synagogue is named “Lithuanian Brotherhood”, Mrs Berman earns a living as a peddler, a job typical of poor Eastern European Jews, uncle Adolf escapes the poverty in Russia by setting up a real-estate business in New York, and Rabbi Schulman flees Russia to leave his miserable life in Russia behind.

The cultural tensions between Jews and their non-Jewish neighbours, as portrayed in the novel, are likely to reflect the struggles of Jewish Eastern European immigrants to feel at home in England, caught between the urge to shed the past to adapt to new life, and the prospect of leaving for the USA, having “no feelings” towards England, as with the case of one of the novel’s characters (Golding 1932: 368). Their self-identification was that of a “tribe of unconceivable people who lived in a slum street in a dark English town” (Golding 1932: 537). The younger generation, by contrast, is epitomised by the character Isaac Winberg, who calls himself Eric, and who severs his connections to his family orthodox background, with a view to moving on to become one of the “decent chaps” who conform to English traditions and culture (Golding 1932: 191).

A similar depiction of Jewish immigrants and their grim countries of origin are conveyed in *Phineas Kahn. Portrait of an Immigrant* by Simon Blumenfeld.
The story opens with an image of Tsarist Russia, where “Hebrews” are “beaten, squeezed and harassed from one end of the Pale of Settlement to the other” (1937: 26). Shtetl Jews suffer from destitution and anti-Jewish prejudice, and large Jewish families with many children struggle in “the dank fetid air of the Russia under Nicholas the Second” (Blumenfeld 1937: 64). Russian-born Phineas Kahn, a young Jewish man, arrives in England with the hope for a better life. The second part, ironically entitled “Golden Lands”, relates a series of events that show his misery as a shabby immigrant whose existence stands in stark contrast to “the more fortunate Jews who could parade with their wives up and down the broad pavement of Whitechapel, displaying their jewels and their smart clothes” (Blumenfeld 1937: 239). Phineas can never see England as his home and English as his own language, feeling culturally destitute of “the giants of Jewish literature (…) and the delightful drolleries of Sholem Aleichem” (Blumenfeld 1937: 298).

The loss and alienation of newly-arrived Jewish immigrants is one of the two dominating literary tendencies among second-generation Jewish immigrants to England. The other major literary topic revolves around the socialist and communist leanings of Jewish immigrants who, having embraced the culture of society at large, become part of the English working class and tend to have limited links with their parents’ memories of their country of origin. This kind of literature addressed the problems of Jewish working classes in Britain in the late 1880s, and continued to thrive in the early 20th century, fitting in with the increasing popularity of the socialist movement (Lawson 2006: 24).

Alec, the main protagonist of Blumenfeld’s Jew Boy (London, 1935), is a self-professed Communist and the son of immigrants, who are most likely of Jewish origin (Hepple 2005), although it is never explicitly stated. The revolutionary socialist agenda overshadows the question of Jewish identity in the novel, although the latter is still there, thematised by the portrayal of the lives of Jewish families in the East End of London and occasional references to Jewish culture and traditions. However, the main events in the novel revolve around the protagonist’s work in a factory in the wider socialist context of the East End of that time, with Alec being depicted as a member of the working class rather than a member of the community of Jewish immigrants.
The novel’s focus on the socialist agenda rather than the concerns of Jewish immigrants resonated with “the most recent trend in Ghetto literature (…) that attempt[ed] to take the Jew outside the confines of his own race boundaries, and to portray him in a class-relation to the Gentile proletariat,” as noted by the British-Jewish writer Willy Goldman, the son of Yiddish speaking Jewish immigrants from Russia and Romania himself (Goldman 1939: 83).

In a similar vein, Jewish-born Simon, the main protagonist of *My Mother’s House* by Tobias (London, 1931), prefers to shed his Jewish heritage entirely for the sake of his relationship with a non-Jewish English heiress and to advance in his civil service career.

Although the tradition of British-Jewish immigrant literature of the 1920s and 1930s was relatively short (Goldman 1939: 80), it can be safely stated that its themes usually tackled the reality of Jews in Britain. As far as my research has allowed me to establish, memoir literature with reflections about the past seems to be rare.

The inclination of novelists to embrace British culture in their writing can be seen as a literary reflection of the real-life tendency to acculturate, marking the decline of the Eastern European Jewish culture in London. The growing assimilation of Jewish immigrants, which distanced them from the Yiddish culture of their ancestors, for example, was one of the reasons why Yiddish theatre was in decline in the East End of London by the mid-1930s (Rubinstein 1996: 99).

Therefore, explicitly Jewish Polish-Jewish fiction was unlikely to meet the interests of readers and writers of British-Jewish immigrant literature not only because it would not have fit with dominant literary tendencies. It is important to note that literature generally reflects real-life preoccupations, including changes in the cultural identity of a particular community, as with the case of British-Jewish immigrants. Therefore, the cultural identity manifested by the dual Polish-Jewish nature of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction was likely to undermine the desire of the immigrants in Britain to develop a different cultural identity, separate from that of Eastern European Jews.
3.2.1.3 Disruption in established British-Jewish literature

A different of concept of Jewish cultural identity brought by Jewish immigrants to Britain was bound to have an impact on acculturated British Jews who began to revisit their Jewish heritage, a phenomenon which may be referred to as a minor awakening of Jewishness among the established British-Jewish elite.

Some British-Jewish writers even began to “resent this forced and false relationship with people that cannot offer that which [one] needs” (Goldman 1939: 81). On the other hand, however, as noted earlier, the arrival of Jewish immigrants gave rise to the fears of antisemitism, the concern of established Jews and more acculturated descendants of earlier Jewish immigrants, triggered by the rise of National Socialism in Germany in the 1920s and early 1930s. The fear was also entwined with the concerns of losing secure and comfortable positions in society. Such tensions between the conservative and liberal approaches to Jewishness began to emerge as early as 1881, the year that saw the first wave of Jewish immigrants arriving in Britain.

Zangwill was one of the first British-Jewish writers who began to reflect on the cultural identity of British Jews, calling himself a “cockney Jew” to indicate his hybrid identity composed of native English values and of the values by his parents (Nahsohn 2006: 5). As in his life, in his literature, too, Zangwill dealt with issues relevant to Jewish communities in Britain. His debut short story *Motso Kleis* [Matza Balls, 1881], co-written at the age of seventeen to portray a shopping craze in the East End before Passover, met with strong opposition from his schoolmasters, who feared that such a realistic portrayal of the Jewish district would “turn Jews into an object of Gentile ridicule”, an issue which always remained sensitive to Jews (Nahsonhn 2006: 10). Such a reaction was perhaps not surprising given the fears of British Jews of exposing their Jewishness to the wider public.

Eleven years later, Zangwill wrote his most celebrated novel *Children of the Ghetto* (1892). The novel portrays the East End of London, inhabited by Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe and their families, contrasted with the established British-Jewish middle-class with their ambiguous relationship with Jewish immigrants at the time. As opposed to the reception of Eliot’s *Daniel Deronda*, *Children of the Ghetto* won major critical acclaim, both among British-Jewish and non-Jewish readers. The novel was deemed as a “conscious act of self-disclosure” in “the long history of Jewish self-effacement”, as noted retrospectively by Rabbi
Stephen Wise (quoted in Nahsohn 2006: 22). The reading public appreciated its realistic portrayal of a little-known immigrant world (see Rochelson 1998:11-12 for more on reviews), a somewhat unexpected response from the readers which encouraged Zangwill to write more about British Jews. As a result, the following parts of the series were published: *Ghetto Tragedies* (1894), and *Dreamers of the Ghetto* (1898).

Despite the acclaim of Zangwill’s explicitly Jewish novel, the general pressure not to expose one’s own Jewish identity never ceased to preoccupy the writer. Zangwill feared that limiting his writing to Jewish-themed literature would make him a “parochial writer” (Nahsohn 2006: 19) and, thus, wrote prolifically on non-Jewish themes as well. His fear of “being shut in the ghetto” (Zangwill 1983), informed by his desire for wider recognition as a non-Jewish writer, seemed likely to be the reflection of the tensions regarding Jewish cultural identity. Zangwill was also probably aware that the general reading public had little interest in Jewish themes and that the relative success of his novel was an exception. And, indeed, seven years later, in 1899, the staging of *Children of the Ghetto* in London turned out to be a failure, as noted by contemporary reviewers (Nahsohn 2006: 102-104). The concerns of the British-Jewish middle class about the play spoiling the good image of established Jews were important factors that informed the play’s limited success (Nahsohn 2006: 104).

It was precisely the concern about the image of the British-Jewish elite that made the novel *Reuben Sachs* (1888) by another established British-Jewish writer, Amy Levy, fairly controversial. The novel paints a picture of the descendants of Jewish immigrants in the East End who become members of the established British-Jewish London elite in wealthy Kensington and Bayswater in the 1880s. Although warmly received by a number of non-Jewish readers, including Oscar Wilde himself, who praised Levy’s novel for its “directness, its uncompromising truth, its depth of feeling” (Wilde 1890: 52), Jewish readers, by contrast, could not accept the malicious image of corrupted wealthy British Jews conveyed in the novel. The novel was referred to as “a work of self-hating antisemitism” in several British Jewish newspapers (Thomas 2015).

Even decades later, the tension over exposing Jewishness in literature within the community of British Jews remained. The lasting disillusionment with society was
expressed again by Zangwill in his poem “The Goyim” (Zangwill 1921: 324-326). It is about a little British-Jewish boy, Jacob, who calls on his fellow English Jews thus:

Back, back, he cries, brethren,
Back to the Ghetto,
To our God of Compassion (…)
And our old Sabbath candles!
For the others are Goyim,
Who despite all their Platos,
Their Shakespeares and Shellesys, (…)
Drink human blood.
Not only ours but their kinsmen’s.

The topic of the acceptance of Jews in society was also addressed by Naomi Jacob (1884 -1964) in her 1930 novel The Founder of the House.

However, the tendency to reflect on Jewish identity began to fade in the late 1920s and early 1930s. After its revival in 1921, when it was translated into eight languages (Rochelson 1998: 12), the recognition of Zangwill’s Children of the Ghetto diminished. Similarly, Levy’s works became less visible in the 1920s by way of “the wilful neglect on the part of her co-religionists” (Lask 1928: 168). Having written his debut novel Jews Without Jehovah (1934), Gerald Kersh (1911-1968) faced a libel case brought against him by his family and his publisher for writing about his own upbringing (Stevens 2007), which was against the widely accepted tendency of acculturated British Jews to keep their religion a private matter. Consequently, the novel was withdrawn the same day (Collard 2016), which resulted in very few copies of the novel surviving to this date (Duffy 2016). The growing concern about exposing Jewish identity in literature was also likely to be motivated by the rise of antisemitism in continental Europe. Another contributing factor might have been the increased sensitivity towards manifesting Jewish identity on the part of the second-generation Jewish immigrants who, as noted earlier, tended to blend in society and distance themselves from their Eastern European origins.

10 A writer born to Jewish parents in Teddington (Collard 2016).
In addition to the fleeting nature of the awakening of established British-Jewish writers regarding the question of their Jewish background, British-Jewish writers who were concerned with exploring their Jewishness tended to do so with a strong focus on the specific aspects of society in Britain, touching on the relations between Jewish and non-Jewish fellow citizens. Given the two characteristics of the disruption in established British-Jewish literature, Polish-Jewish fiction was probably unlikely to contribute to contemporary concerns of British-Jewish writers and their readers.

The uncomfortable feeling over exposing Jewishness may also explain the marginal position of British-Jewish literature in the literature of modernism, which, understood as a literary movement which, although rooted in tradition and classicism, “[was] fascinated by the impulse towards the ‘new,’” driven by a wider commitment to revisit and transform traditional forms of expression (Shiach 2010: 17-18). British Jews were unlikely to play “the role of progenitors of the culturally modern which they did throughout Europe before 1939 and in North America from the 1920s onward” (Rubinstein 1996: 179), remaining rather outside of “the cutting-edge of cultural innovation” (Rubinstein 1996: 178). Contrary to this common belief, there were, indeed, a number of British-Jewish modernist artists, but, as with the case of their non-modernist fellow writers, they were bound to struggle with their Jewishness. Their limited acclaim was inevitably linked with the problematic question of Jewish cultural identity.

The London-born painter and poet Mina Loy, for example, born as Mina Gertrude Löw in 1882, gained recognition only when she moved to the USA, becoming “American by adoption” (Radford 2010: 120). Perhaps the multicultural aspect of the New York Greenwich Village community of avant-garde writers of which she was part allowed her to express her reflections on identity more freely than in Britain. In her poem “Anglo-Mongrels and the Rose” (1923-1925), Loy draws on her mixed Hungarian-Jewish and British background, expressing the feeling of homelessness and alienation through Exodus, the Jewish wanderer, who

paces
the cancelled desert of the metropolis
with the instinctive urge of loneliness
to get to the ‘heart of something’

The heart of England

(Loy 1986: 116)

The British-Jewish painter William Rothenstein (1872-1945) erased his links with German-Jewish Bradford to be baptised (Rubinstein 1996: 178), while the US-born modernist sculptor Jacob Epstein (1860-1959), who lived in London from 1905 onwards (Rubinstein 1996: 178), clearly refused to be ever seen as a Jewish artist:

(…) I have never joined in all-Jewish exhibitions of art. (…) I am most often annoyed rather than flattered to be told that I am the best or foremost Jewish artist. (…) This pernicious racialism in art should be forever banished. (Epstein 1963: 198).

It makes sense to assume that the question of Jewish identity might possibly be even more problematic with the case of modernism, and its underlying opposition to traditional values in society in search of new forms of artistic expression. Such revaluation would have entailed revisiting cultural identity and the sense of community, as noted by the culture theorist Noah Isenberg (1999: 1; see Isenberg 1999 for more on Jewish culture in modernism in the German context). Thus, challenging the widely accepted concept of Jewish cultural identity in Britain was an issue that some British-Jewish writers addressed, though frequently undermining their chances for wider acclaim.

Consequently, rather than forging new ideas for Jewish modernist literature, the potentially accommodating concept of British-Jewish cultural identity was used by non-Jewish British writers in their writing. For the literary scholar Bryan Cheyette, the figure of the Jew “lies at the heart of modern English literature: not as a fixed myth or stereotype but as the embodiment of confusion and indeterminacy” (Cheyette 1993: i). The figure of the Jew, then, can be found in the works by Anthony Trollope, John Buchan, George Bernard Shaw or James Joyce.

Seen from the perspective of a literary system, the appropriation of the figure of the Jew may be seen as redressing a certain “vacuum” in the system of British-Jewish literature by the British literary mainstream within the polysystem of British literature more broadly. Defined by Even-Zohar as a situation in which “no item in
the indigenous stock is taken to be acceptable\textsuperscript{11} (Even-Zohar 1990: 48), the vacuum in the case I am concerned with refers to the limited potential for modernist writing to flourish within the system of British-Jewish literature. If the vacuum in the system makes it “easy for foreign models to infiltrate” (Even-Zohar 1990: 48), then it makes sense to assume such infiltration of “foreign models” can take place between two systems within one polysystem.

Thus, it makes sense to hypothesise that the system which is part of literature that is more established is bound to have recourse to other systems within the same polysystem if a vacuum occurs, as opposed to the system which is part literature that is less established, a claim also put forward by Even-Zohar, who says that “whereas richer or stronger literatures may have the option to adopt novelties (...) from within their indigenous borders, “weak”\textsuperscript{12} literatures (...) depend on import alone” (Even-Zohar 1990: 48). The inherent reliance of two systems, that of British-Jewish and that of British mainstream literature, then, is different from the system of Polish-Jewish fiction and its relation with the Polish mainstream literature. As discussed in 2.2.1, the system of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction tended to rely also on foreign works in addition to taking inspiration from Polish literary classics.

By the same token, the likelihood of translation of modernist pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction from the system perspective is rather small. The hypothesis is reflected in the reality: the stories by the modernist Polish-Jewish writer Bruno Schulz were translated only in 1963; while Wittlin’s novel Sól ziemi, though translated in 1939, was seen as meeting the needs of the readers who were concerned primarily with war themes, as I shall explain further on in Chapter 5.

If mapped onto the system of British-Jewish literature as a whole, it makes sense to assume that the social and cultural tensions between the established acculturated British-Jewry and Jewish immigrants led to two emerging sub-systems

\textsuperscript{11} Note that acceptability for the system does not presuppose a relationship between the source and the target texts (as meant by Toury, cf. 2.1.1). It is rather used to denote being legitimate or in accordance with established rules and standards in a particular system (see Even-Zohar 1990: 35 for example).

\textsuperscript{12} Weak literatures are contrasted by Even-Zohar to “larger and central” literature (1990: 47-48), that is more established literatures whose literary history tends to be longer and more acclaimed internationally.
within British-Jewish literature: the system of literature written by established British Jews, and the system of literature written predominantly by Jewish immigrants and their descendants. The intrasystemic dynamics of the British-Jewish literary system indicates a relatively unstable system, going through “turning points” (Even-Zohar 1990: 47), a systemic situation which is bound to encourage translations (Even-Zohar 1990: 47-50).

And yet, pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction was not likely to win much recognition in Britain. In the earlier discussion of established British-Jewish literature I have already mentioned that in order to explain the unlikelihood of translation from the perspective of polysystem theory, other factors than “new approaches” or “innovative” role of potential translations should be considered (cf. 3.2.1.1). Equally, the changing intrasystemic reliance between systems within a larger polysystem of established literature should also be considered to explain why pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction was not translated into English at the time from the systemic perspective (as pointed out above).

The above assumptions resonate with the thematic scope of the translations that did exist in the system of British-Jewish literature of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, comprising mostly the English translations of Hebrew religious literature. Since non-Jewish British literature was an unlikely source for such writing, translation was bound to be the means to meet the expectations of the general British-Jewish reading public. As a prolific translator of Hebrew religious writing, Alice Julia Lucas was the author of a number of the English translations of Hebrew literary works, including *The Children’s Pentateuch* (1878), *Songs of Zion by Hebrew Singers of Medieval Times* (1894), *The Jewish Year: A Collection of Devotional Poems* (1908) or *Talmudic Legends, Hymns and Paraphrases* (1908). Her translations were used mainly in religious services (Rubinstein 2011: 622). Similarly, Anna Maria Goldsmid’s translations were predominantly religious-themed and included, for instance, *The Development of the Religious Idea in Judaism, Christianity and Mahomedanism*, the 1855 English translation of Ludwig Philippsohn’s work, and *Deicides* (1872), the translation of the work of Joseph Cohen of France (Rubinstein 2011: 340). Hyman Klein (1908-1958) translated almost exclusively tractates of the Mishnah, which gives the background for the Jewish Law contained in the Torah (Rubinstein 2011: 523). It is safe to assume, then, that translations were prevalent in
religious writing in the target context. This makes sense given the discussed general tendency among British Jews to anglicise and embrace the target culture as a result of which the number of Hebrew-speaking Jews in Britain was bound to decrease, creating the demand for English translations of religious writing.

The limited dynamics in literary translation within the system of British-Jewish literature makes it possible to assume that literature that evolves within a literary system that has longer tradition (as with the case case of British-Jewish writing in Britain) may tend to work out their own way of development without any need for translated works that would play an “innovative role” (Even-Zohar 1978:23), a tentative assumption which would need further research.

This assumption, in turn, can lead to another hypothesis regarding the relation between the original research object which was the basis for conceiving polysystem theory and the theory itself. The seminal research that was to lead to the conceptualisation of polysystem theory in translation, it should be recalled, was carried out with the aim to devise the historical model of Israeli Hebrew literature, and to explain the role of Hebrew translations in it (see Even-Zohar 1978: 76-96; Even-Zohar 1990: 1). Similarly, Toury in his study of norms in the process of translating worked on study cases relating to “Hebrew literature in its evolution during the last 200 years so as to “achieve some unity and continuity” (Toury 1995: 113). The history of Israeli literature, however, is different from the development of more established literatures. Hebrew Israeli literature was shaped hand in hand with the statehood of Israel, which was home to multilingual population of many European backgrounds. This diversity was reflected in the Hebrew Israeli literary polysystem, informed by Polish, Russian and Yiddish literature (hence case studies of the status of Yiddish and Russian literature in the Israeli polysystem; see Even-Zohar 1990). In his discussion of the polysystemic approach to translation, designed in Israel and in the Low Countries, the translation scholar Edwin Gentzler remarks that “(…) the situation in Israel was more extreme than in the Low Countries because the latter had its own literary traditions and Hebrew lacked a canon of literary works and was totally dependent upon foreign language texts (…)” (Gentzler 2001: 107).

It makes sense to assume, therefore, that the unique situation of Hebrew literature in Israel, different from established literatures, was likely to shape polysystem theory in a way that would overlook tendencies that may be typical of
home-grown literatures with longer tradition. In other words, a relatively short literary tradition of the State of Israel at the time when the theory was being conceptualised was likely to influence some of the theory’s assumptions. Thus, it is likely that the attempt to explain the translation-resistant nature of British-Jewish literature within the polysystem of established British literature in the late 19\textsuperscript{th} and in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries can lead to new assumption in the theory of polysystems.

3.2.1.4 Non-Holocaust British-Jewish literature and Jewish identity

In her memoir Anne Karpf, recollects another moment when, as a young teenager, she became convinced that “there was no significant British-Jewish literature” (Karpf 1996: 50), an impression that might reflect the lack of visibility of British-Jewish fiction immediately after the end of the Second World War.

The relative invisibility of Jewishness in early post-war British-Jewish fiction seems to contrast with the more pronounced Jewish identity of British-Jewish poetry, however. Here, more visible manifestations of Jewish identity date back to pre-war times. The Jewishness in the poetry of the British-Jewish poet Isaac Rosenberg, who was “the first Jewish poet of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century to reach a wide English readership” (Lawson 2006: 2), is fairly pronounced. According to Lawson, “[r]oots, and their relationship to Jewishness, feature repeatedly in Rosenberg’s oeuvre” (2006: 20). Similarly, the poetry of another British-Jewish poet Siegfried Sassoon (1886-1967) can be read “in a hybrid British-Jewish context” (Lawson 2006: 47). After the Second World War, the Jewish aspect of British-Jewish poetry remained visible thanks to British-Jewish poets who fought for the presence of their poetry in British-Jewish literature, which, generally, was seen as non-existent or, at best, absorbed into British literature. In the interview with Lawson, Jon Silkin (1930-1997) explicitly argued for a Jewish reading of his debut collection of poems *The Peaceable Kingdom* (1954), wondering “why could not one have Isaiah as a recognition mark of the Jews?”(Lawson 1982). The Jewish-Welsh poet Dannie Abse (1923- 2014), on the other hand, openly and continually addressed his mixed identity in his poetry, as in *Poems: Golders Green* (1962), bringing “a Jewish twist to Wales” (Ivry 2012).

Furthermore, any references to the Holocaust and war-time Europe in the poems by British-Jewish poets may have exposed the Jewish identity of the poets,
even of those who officially dissociated themselves from their Jewish background, such as Michael Hamburger (1924-2007). In his memoir (1973: 20-21; see also Dale 1998: 18-19), Hamburger recollects his non-Jewish upbringing in Germany and contrasts it with the “sudden” moment when he was made to feel a Jew by his secondary school teacher in Berlin who had all Jewish boys lined up (1973: 20). The impact of the Nazi politics on his perception of his own identity reflects, to some extent, the way his name became associated by some with Jewishness in British-Jewish poetry. These of Hamburger’s poems which address the social and historical European context during the war, such as “From the Notebook of a European Tramp” (1945-1948), “Grodek: in Memoriam Georg Trakl” (1946) and, for instance, “Survivor’s Song” (1956), are bound to highlight his Jewish experience. This connection, and the fact that Hamburger is an acclaimed translator of Paul Celan’s poetry (e.g. Poems of Paul Celan; London, 1995) might have contributed to the tendency of critics, such as Axel Stahler (2007) or Efraim Sicher (2012), to see Michael Hamburger as a British-Jewish poet.

Dannie Abse did not shy away from Holocaust themes in his poetry either. On the contrary, in one of his poems written between 1986 and 1989 entitled ‘White Balloon’, Abse admits through the speaker of the poem that “Auschwitz made [him] more of a Jew than Moses did” (Abse 1990: 34). The statement resonates also with the poetry by Karen Gershon and Elaine Feinstein, whose awareness of the Holocaust and of Jewishness is fairly pronounced in their poetry (Lawson 2006: 165).

By contrast, the question of collective Jewish identity in British-Jewish fiction in the first decades after the Second World War seems more nuanced. In his overview of British-Jewish literature, Bryan Cheyette (2003: 7) observes that British-Jewish writers “have engaged in a good deal of self-inflicted mutilation”. This mutilation, by which Cheyette refers to the conscious avoidance of overt Jewish themes in works of fiction, is a tendency which, as I further argue, was prevalent mostly in the first two decades after the Second World War. It is outside of the confines of this thesis to include all British-Jewish works that kept Jewishness away from public notice so I shall limit my discussion to a few examples.

From the moment when his attempt to address his Jewish background was nipped in the bud in 1934, Kersh wrote stories that would largely avoid the question of Jewishness. As a result, “Kersh ended up as yet another genre writer, churning out
horror, mystery and sci-fi hack efforts, and largely forgotten by the time of his death in 1968” (Stevens 2007). In a similar vein to Gerald Kersh, Gerda Charles (1914-1996) began her literary career by portraying her Jewish Orthodox background but, fearing limited reception, focused on more general themes (Kerbel 2016). With her last novel The Destiny Waltz (1971), which “is more consistent with her earlier work which offered a substantial sociology of British-Jewry” (Kirkus Review 1972), Charles struggled to find a publisher (Kerbel 2016), a difficulty which may reflect the lack of interest of the general public in this kind of fiction.

In 1958, Brian Glanville (b. 1931) wrote his only Jewish novel The Bankrupts, which relates the story of Rosemary Frieman, a young daughter of wealthy Jewish parents, who “discovers the true values for which the Jewish race and faith should stand” and who, finally, breaks away “from the hollow bankruptcy of her parents’ lives” (Glanville 1958: 3). The novel is set in the Jewish part of London and its Jewish context is very clear to the extent that the novel opens with a glossary of Yiddish Words. Such an explicitly Jewish novel was the first and the last one in the oeuvre of Glanville, who began to write novels and short stories about Italy and football. Diamond (London, 1962) was his only other work of fiction that vaguely touches on the question of the Jewish identity. Middle-class Jewish provinciality serves there, however, only as a background for “the real action of Diamond – the sporting life” (Sloan 1962). Similarly, another British-Jewish writer, Eva Figes (1932-2012), wrote mainly non-Jewish fiction, and was to go down in the history of English literature as a feminist writer and the author of Patriarchal Attitudes (1970).

Harold Pinter’s early novel The Dwarfs (1990), originally written between 1952 and 1956, and which “indicates something of the flavour of Pinter’s [Jewish] background” (Cheyette 2003: 8; Cheyette 2007: 93), was not published until much later. The delay may have been partly caused by explicit references to Pinter’s social and cultural background. As Cheyette argues, “in order to succeed in the wider culture authors as diverse as Harold Pinter and Anita Brookner (…) had to write out or write implicitly about their sense of Jewishness” (2003: 8).

The above overview of examples of British-Jewish prose writers, however, indicates only a literary tendency. There were indeed a few writers who explored their Jewish identity more overtly. These include, for instance, Elaine Feinstein (see Lassner 200 for more on Feinstein’s fiction and Jewishness), although it was “the
deceptive looseness of her poetry” that gave her “a good deal more space to examine the particularities of her British-Jewish background” (Cheyette 2003: 8).

The British-Jewish writer Noami Jacob addressed the question of Britishness and Jewishness in her multi-volume saga about the emancipation Jewish Gollantz family, which she began with *The Founder of the House* (1930), and continued writing until the 1950s. Jacob became more popular in the 1950s, but not for Jewish themes – she regularly appeared on various BBC programmes in the 1950s, most notably in the *Woman’s Hour* series, for which she wrote and read her work *No Easy Way*, among other things. Jacob openly addressed the questions relating to women’s rights and equality. Her 1951 novel *A Late Lark Singing*, for instance, relates a story about an English weaver Ann Lockly who, beaten and denigrated by her husband Silas, revolts against his violent dominance, and tries, against the odds, to fulfil her “longing for education and enlightenment” (Jacob 1969: 173). The novel conveys a rather optimistic message that the position of women can improve by education and raising awareness of social problems, both among women and men.

These examples suggest that there was a certain kind of awkwardness about Jewishness in British-Jewish fiction over the course of the twenty years or so after the end of the Second World War. This uncomfortable feeling could be a continuation of the pre-war uneasiness about overt Jewishness, a feeling that could translate into the fears of some British-Jewish writers about failing to catch the readers’ attention.

However, the Holocaust was likely to be another important contributing factor in creating such thorny feelings about Jewish themes in British-Jewish fiction in the immediate post-Holocaust context. It could be argued that British Jews, who did not have first-hand experience of the Holocaust (it was the literature by war-time immigrants and Kindertransport children that was to mark the beginning of British-Jewish Holocaust literature) felt, perhaps, that addressing Jewishness in any other context than the Holocaust was inappropriate at a time when millions of European Jews had perished because they had Jewish origins. As with the case of most Jewish communities beyond Nazi-occupied Europe, in the USA or in Palestine for example, the sense of helplessness was forbidding (Rubinstein 1996: 350-352). With the case of British Jews, the uncomfortable feeling may have also been strengthened by their complacent position towards society, so different from the situation of European Jews in the wake of the Second World War.
Explicit Jewishness in the world of British-Jewish fiction in the first two decades after the Holocaust was not likely to be common. Equally, this literary tendency may partly explain the predominant lack of translations of pre-war Polish-Jewish prose fiction into English at that time. Although there were indeed two attempts to introduce Polish-Jewish writers after the war (that is Herminia Naglerowa in the 1950s and Bruno Schulz in the 1960s), neither of these works contains explicit references to cultural Jewish identity, and neither has managed to win much recognition in Britain. Although both cases will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5, it is worth noting briefly that the limited engagement with the Jewish aspects of Schulz’s works may be indicative of the ambivalent attitude to Jewishness in Britain after the Second World War.

Finally, it is worth noting that Auschwitz became the metonym of the Holocaust although, in fact, it should be linked with a much wider range of locations beyond the concentration camps, which in general awareness became “the ultimate symbol of the industrialised killing machine created by the Nazis” (Winstone 2010:2). Given such associations with Polish-Jewish history on the one hand, and the feeling of discomfort of British Jews on the other, the demand for pre-war fiction by Polish Jews in Britain was likely to be minor in the 1950s and 1960s.

3.2.1.5 British-Jewish Holocaust literature and Jewish identity
The Holocaust, by far the most atrocious tragedy in European history, has provoked literary responses worldwide, influencing literary tendencies in many countries. As noted by the literary scholar Sorrel Kerbel, “the change in British-Jewish writing occurred in the wake of both the Holocaust and its aftermath and the birth and consolidation of the State of Israel” (Kerbel 2016). However, the change did not happen before the 1960s, when British-Jewish literature remained rather silent about the Holocaust, as discussed earlier. The long silence specifically in British-Jewish literature may have been caused by the general tendency of Holocaust survivors to be reticent about their war-time experience. It usually took a long time for British-Jewish Kindertransport children to be ready to face and write down their memories. As Kerbel observes (2016),

> It took some years before the survivors were able to write of their trauma. In Britain, their readership appeared hostile; the emphasis was on forgetting and moving on,
not re-examining the past. Memoirs emerged, though writers of them wrote only a single work.

Indeed, it was the emerging British-Jewish Holocaust writers in the late 1960s and early 1970s who recovered Jewishness in British-Jewish literature, a literary phenomenon which can be called “a product of nostalgia and of post-Holocaust, post-multicultural hindsight” (Rubinstein 1996: 104). The emerging visibility of Jewish cultural identity tended to have more to do with the Central and Eastern European context of the Holocaust because most Holocaust survivors and war refugees who came to England during and after the war came from Central Europe (see Rubinstein 1996: 332-343 for more on British refugee politics at the time).

One of the first British-Jewish Holocaust writers to speak out about her Holocaust experience was Karen Gershon (1923-1993), a Kindertransport child, who edited We Came as Children (1966), the seminal collection of the autobiographies of two hundred and thirty-four German and Austrian Jews who fled Nazi terror and arrived in England in 1939. Another example of the early Holocaust writing includes Janina David’s account of her own experience in Nazi-occupied Warsaw A Square of Sky (1964). The next volume of her autobiography A Touch of Earth: A Wartime Childhood (1966), which relates her flight from Nazi Europe to England became very popular, “pav[ing] the way for many Holocaust memoir writers in the UK”, who “constitute a great contribution to British-Jewish literature” (Kerbel 2015). The relative popularity of Holocaust memoirs increased in the early 2000s, which saw the publications of Gwen Edelman’s War Story (2001), Reibstein’s Staying Alive: A Family Memoir (2002), Bluglass’s Hidden from the Holocaust: Stories of Resilient Children Who Survived and Thrived (2003) and many others.

The emergence of and the lasting presence of the Holocaust memoir literature from the late 1960s to the early 2000s suggests that there was a demand for Holocaust-themed literature at the time. Such preferences of readers and publishers were bound to make post-war rather than pre-war fiction by Polish Jews a more likely candidate for translation into English – a hypothesis reflected by the significant number of the English translations of Holocaust-themed post-war Polish-Jewish fiction (cf. 1.4).
3.2.1.6 Contemporary fiction and Jewish identity

The emergence of Holocaust memoirs, which explicitly foreground the Jewish identity of writers, was likely to encourage writers to explore cultural Jewish identity beyond the Holocaust context. However, the first literary themes that addressed it echoed the limited cultural visibility of British Jews in the past. The literary concerns of British-Jewish writers in the 1970s suggest that they tended not to have “an established sense of the past to rewrite nor a stable sense of place to locate a novel-sequence” (Cheyette 2004: 708). Muriel Spark’s novel *Mandelbaum Gate* (1965), for instance, is set in Jerusalem rather than in the British context, while *The Elected Member* (1969), the novel of Welsh-Jewish writer Bernie Ruben, relates the story of “a partial existence” of the son of a rabbi (Cheyette 2004: 708; see also Head 2002: 158-159), in which the real world is not too pronounced. The setting of Emanuel Litvinoff’s *Faces of Terror* (1973-1978), on the other hand, shifts from the East of London to Russia during the revolution.

The dominant themes in British-Jewish literature seem likely to have shifted towards the British context at the beginning of the 1980s. Ruben began to explore her Jewish origins in her family saga *Brothers* (1983), while Howard Jacobson “decided to face head on the thorny questions of Britishness” (Cheyette 2003: 10) in his early novels *Coming from Behind* (1983) and *Peeping Tom* (1984). As Cheyette notes, addressing the issue of Jewishness in the British context can also be explained by the fact that “several ethnic minorities became increasingly outspoken and accepted in Britain”, making it easier for British-Jewish writers to be more open about their identity too (Cheyette 2003: 10). Jewish legacy continued to preoccupy writers later on. In her 1997 literary account of her visit to Bransk, *Shtetl*, Eva Hoffman paints a portrait of the history of Bransk, a town in the vicinity of her parents’ hometown. In their co-written non-fiction book *Rodinsky’s Room* (1999), Rachel Lichtenstein and Iain Sinclair revisit their Jewish heritage (Gilbert 2006), and so does Linda Grant in her non-fiction work *When I Lived in Modern Times* (2000).

It is worth noting that the effect of the Holocaust on the perception of Jewish cultural identity, then, was similar to that on the self-identification as Jewish among Polish-Jewish writers. However, while the shadow of the Holocaust is likely to overshadow the pre-war literary legacy of Polish Jews (cf. 2.2.2), it might possibly contribute to the re-discovery of pre-war British-Jewish literature, as I shall argue...
further. Such a contradictory impact of the Holocaust on the two pre-war literary legacies suggests that extra-textual factors should be considered in polysystem theory in close connection with the research object rather than serve as universal factors that affect literary dynamics equally.

The tendency to revisit Jewishness in British-Jewish literature has coincided with the rise of academic interest in the history of British Jewry that began in the mid-1950s with Vivian Lipman’s (1921-1990) seminal study *Social History of the Jews in England* (1954). Limpan continued to contribute to the research of British-Jewry until 1990, when she published one of her last works *A History of the Jews in Britain since 1858* (see Massil 1990-1992). The literary legacy of British Jews drew the attention of Cheyette, the author of one of the first studies specifically on British-Jewish literature *Contemporary Jewish Writing in Britain and Ireland* (1988). In 2001, the literary scholar David Brauner published a study about post-war Jewish fiction (Brauner 2001), followed by Peter Lawson’s 2006 insightful work on British-Jewish poetry which marked “the first detailed investigation of the phenomenon of British-Jewish poetry” (Lawson 2006: i). Since then, the interest of literary critics in this literature has not faded. In her relatively recent work, the literary scholar Ruth Gilbert (2013) goes to the heart of the question of British-Jewish cultural identity in contemporary British-Jewish literature, providing “a lively and accessible introduction to the key issues in contemporary British-Jewish fiction, memoirs and journalism”, and exploring “how Jewishness exists alongside a range of other different identities in Britain today” (Gilbert 2013: blurb).

In addition to academic research, the question of British-Jewish literature has been gradually more prominent in the media. *The Guardian* has published a short article by Andrew Stevens, deputy editor of the 3 AM Magazine, about the possible return of the East End novel (Stevens 2007). The *JBooks.com* web magazine has reflected on the rise of British-Jewish literature (Weber 2009). In 2012, *New Statesman* has published an article by Linda Grant about the question of Jewish identity in the British-Jewish novel (Grant 2012). These publications are only a few examples but they do indicate a specific change in the British-Jewish literary discourse. Indeed, the change in the discourse about British-Jewish literature has questioned the previous general belief that British-Jewish literature did not exist, commonly held prior to the 1990s (Cheyette 2003: 7).
The mapping of the current changes in literary discourse is important because it makes it possible to estimate the chances of pre-war British-Jewish literature for revival, which, in turn, may potential direct the interest of readers and critics to equivalent literary works, such as pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction.

The changes in the literary discourse are likely to have informed the recent publications of pre-war British-Jewish works: Zangwill’s *Children of the Ghetto* (2004), Blumenfeld’s *Jew Boy* (2011), Tobia’s *My Mother’s House* (2015) or Jacob’s *The Gollantz Saga* series (2015 and 2016). The life of Lily Tobias is the focus of the book by the Welsh writer Jasmine Donahaye in *The Greatest Need: the Creative Life and Troubled Times of Lily Tobias, a Welsh Jew in Palestine* (2015). To what extent the publications are bound to engage the general reading public and trigger the wider long-standing interest in British-Jewish literature remains, however, an open question.

It makes sense to claim that this issue may be worth considering regarding the chances of pre-war Polish-Jewish prose fiction to be translated into English. If there is general awareness of the pre-war history of British Jews and, more importantly, of their literary output then British publishers and the reading public might possibly learn more about other Jewish communities in other parts of Europe before the war. Though a topic in its own right, the relation between clichés and general perceptions of a particular country on the one hand, and the intrinsic features of their writing on the other, is important to highlight. Clichés which “tend to hold a firm grip over the individual consciousness” inform our understanding and interpretation of various areas of reality, from ordinary conversations to art and literature (Zijderveld 1979: 5).

### 3.2.2 The system of translated Polish literature

The exploration of literary tendencies and the preferences of readers in the British-Jewish literary system is probably not sufficient to explain why pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction is relatively invisible in Britain. Equivalent tendencies from other systems within the polysystem of British-Jewish literature (cf. Figure 1) also need to be examined to determine why other kinds of readership and publishers have not been interested in the literature I am concerned with. As noted earlier, the scope of the research of literary reception in the target context is necessarily larger than that of factors that lie in the source context. As observed by Toury, the investigation of the potential for the translations’ acceptability (i.e. the subscription to target culture
norms; Toury 1995: 57) “tends to involve intrasystemic relations between translations and other members of the system” (Toury 2012: 99), even if the target system remains largely hypothetical, as with the case of this study.

It makes sense to consider the other literary systems in this study (that is the systems of Jewish writing and the system of Polish literature, cf. Figure 1) also because factors that inform each system reflect and contribute to the general understanding of what constitutes Polish and Jewish literature and culture more broadly. Indeed, as observed by Hermans (1999: 128), literature shapes “an image which readers across the world take metonymically to stand for that culture” (where metonymy means a replacement of a word or a phrase by a broader one associated with it; Baldick 2008d). Only then can it be inferred what underlies the lack of visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in each system.

The following discussion aims to give a short overview of the translation tendencies from the 1950s to see why the main interests of publishers and readers of Polish fiction in translation tended to steer clear of pre-war Polish-Jewish literature.\textsuperscript{13} It is worth noting that the process of publishing translations of a particular literature and its visibility are also informed both by the choices and interests of involved translators, and by the practices of cultural institutions, which will also be discussed.

The group of Polish works that have been translated since the 1950s includes a variety of literary works from the Renaissance and the Romantic periods as well as literature from the 19th-century (Philips 2000:1095). Some of them won some recognition of the target readers. The epic poem Pan Tadeusz by Adam Mickiewicz (1834), for instance, had drawn the attention of the acclaimed British poet and critic Donald Davie, who translated it as The Forests of Lithuania (1959). Additionally, contemporary poetry, especially poems by Tadeusz Różewicz and Wisława Szymborska, have also been translated by Adam Czerniawski. Among works written in the interwar period, which, it should be recalled, was the heyday of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction, the translations of literature by Stanisław Witkacy Witkiewicz and Leopold Staff in particular were relatively popular among Polish translators.

\textsuperscript{13} A detailed historical approach would go beyond the confines of this thesis (see Phillips 2000 for a more detailed overview of the English translation of Polish literature).
However, the majority of the English translations of Polish literature in the second half of the 20th century comprised Polish émigré and war-related literature, which reflected the isolated political situation of Poland under the Communists at the time of the Cold War, an issue I shall return to in Chapter 5, in which I will discuss the context for the translation of Naglerowa’s novel (see also Filip 1944, Coleman 1963 or Coulter 1977 for the specific titles of the English translations of Polish literature at the time).

The themes of wartime and post-war history of Poland continued to be popular until the late 2000s (Rzepa 2011: 263). For example, in his selection of ten top Polish books, the British writer James Hopkin (2008) recommends the poetry by Zbigniew Herbert, “who gave his voice (…) to the Solidarity movement”, a movement against the Communists founded in 1980 (Donovan 2005). Hopkin also mentions a novel by Taduesz Konwicki, referring to it as “a satire of communist times”, and a literary work by Andrzej Szczypiorski, read by him as “a story that follows (…) one of the last surviving Jewish women in Nazi-occupied Poland” (Hopkin 2008). He also refers to the poetry by Zbigniew Herbert, who, he argues, managed to create poetry after Auschwitz “with unflinching wit, poignancy and elan” (2008). Hopkin also lists the stories by Bruno Schulz, although without referring to his pre-war Polish-Jewish background, a detail which should be acknowledged to increase the general awareness of readers of pre-war Polish-Jewish literature more broadly.

In the present day, it is mostly contemporary Polish literature which enjoys relative recognition among British readers and publishers. In 2013, Litro Magazine, a British short story and creative arts magazine, published a special issue about Polish literature, guest-edited by the Polish novelist Anna Bakalar, who shares her own list of the top 10 Polish books for English readers (Bakalar 2013). Her list differs from that of Hopkin in that is composed of contemporary works of Polish works, such as these by Dorota Masłowska, Michal Witkowski, Olga Tokarczuk, Jacek Hugo-Bader and others (see Rzepa 2011: 276-289 for a detailed list of translations of Polish literature). Although necessarily informed by history, the concerns of these writers tend to shift further away from the war-related issues. In her debut novel originally written in English, Madame Mephisto (London, 2012), Bakalar reflects on the experience of contemporary Polish immigrants in London, an issue that is fairly topical today.
The growing interest in contemporary Polish fiction is also reflected in the choices of the translators of Polish literature. Danuta Stok’s recent translations, for instance, include *Illegal Liaisons* by Grażyna Plebanek (London, 2013), which revolves around the problems of the first generation of Poles who were born in democratic Poland. Stok has later translated the fantasy novel by Andrzej Sapkowski as *The Last Wish* (London, 2015). The award-winning translator Antonia Lloyd-Jones, on the other hand, has published her translations of Polish travel writing, including *The Other* by Zdzisław Kapuściński, *The Night Wanderers: Uganda's Children and the Lord's Resistance Army* (2012) by Wojciech Jagielski and *Kolyma Diaries* (2014) by Wojciech Jagielski. Her most recent translation includes a crime novel *Rage* by Zygmunt Białozienski (2016).

Although the relatively visible presence of Polish contemporary literature in English translation in Britain is likely to counter the previous image of Polish literature infused with politics and war, it may shift the attention of the general reading public away from pre-war Polish literature more broadly, including pre-war works by Polish Jews. Indeed, not a single work of fiction by Polish-Jewish prose writers was translated into English between 1999 and 2009 in Britain (see Rzepa 2010: 276-289).

The visibility of Polish literature in Britain also depends on the lines of policies run by Polish political and cultural institutions that promote Polish culture in Britain. The potential of individuals and institutions to influence the reading and writing of literature is referred to by the translation scholar André Lefevere as “patronage”, whereby the ideology of literature tends to be more important than its poetics (Lefevere 1992:15).

The issue as to how and what Polish literature has been promoted in Britain is a topic in itself, therefore I shall refer only to some aspects of the current strategies by the leading cultural institutions. Their interest revolve primarily around Polish contemporary literature, as with the case of the translators. The London-based Polish Cultural Institute, whose diplomatic mission is to promote Polish culture specifically in Britain, tends to popularise contemporary fiction above all, alongside literary classics. The two kinds of Polish literary writing tend to dominate in series of literary and cultural events staged by the Polish Culture Institute in Britain (PCI 2016).

The strategies of literary promotion are also conceived by institutions based in Poland. The Polish Book Institute (PIK), appointed by the Polish Ministry of Culture,
popularises Polish literature worldwide by means of funded translation programmes, such as the ©POLAND Translation Program. As a result, over one thousand and eight hundred Polish literary works have been translated into other languages (PIK 2016). However, pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction has been largely overlooked. The only writer who is promoted on their official website is Bruno Schulz (www.brunoschulz.eu). However, the list of events about Schulz’s works is obsolete, dating back to 2014\textsuperscript{14}, the neglect which seems likely to reflect the major focus on advertising current tendencies in Polish literature. The promotion of Polish contemporary literature is likely to form part of the future policies run by these institutions: contemporary Polish literature rather than older fiction is to be featured in the London Book Fair Market Focus in 2017. The featured presence of Poland at the London Book Fair, according to Grzegorz Gauden, Director of the Polish Book Institute, is bound to create the opportunity to promote especially contemporary travel writing, crime fiction and children’s books (LBF Market Focus: Poland 2016). It seems likely that the current objectives of the main institutions that promote Polish literature abroad and fund its translation are bound to make it unlikely for pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction to be translated into English any time soon.

3.2.3 The system of Jewish literature

It is now necessary to examine how the tendencies in the English translations of Jewish literature, to which pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction belongs, have contributed to the general perception of the target readership of what, and what does not, constitute Jewish writing.

It is first important to note, however, that Jewish literature more broadly eludes a specific definition because it encompasses literary works by Jewish writers in any language, not only in the languages historically used by Jewish communities worldwide (including Hebrew, Yiddish, Ladino, Judeo-Italian and Judeo-Persian and many others; see Benor 2016). Jewish literature, therefore, is inevitably bound to be considered a transnational kind of writing, crossing countries and languages.

\textsuperscript{14} As of 20\textsuperscript{th} September 2016.
Due to the wide variety of Jewish writing, I shall focus only on the literatures which form an important part of contemporary world Jewish literature: Yiddish, Israeli Hebrew and Holocaust literature (cf. Figure 1). When looked at from the perspective of the theory of the systems, the recognition of these literatures in Britain, and elsewhere, also depends on dominant literary trends and their inherent availability for translation in the source systems of these works which are primarily the USA and Israel.

Although the history of Jewish immigration to the USA is a topic in itself (see Szucs and Luebking 2006 for more on the origins of American Jewish communities), the USA boasts one of the largest Jewish communities worldwide (see Dashevsky and Sheskin 2014) and with it a considerable body of American Jewish literature. By self-translations and translations into English, the thriving Yiddish culture between the late 19th century and the mid-20th century, initially brought over by Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe, gave way to the English-language American Jewish literature (Yudkin 1982: 27-44; 112-128). It is also worth noting that Holocaust literature forms an important part of contemporary American Jewish fiction, as noted briefly in 2.2.2 and further below.

Contemporary Israeli literature, on the other hand, is written predominantly in Hebrew and as such is bound to inform the majority of Hebrew-language works within Jewish writing. Although the beginnings of Hebrew literature date back to the 1920s, the time of Mandatory Palestine (that is Palestine under British administration; Yudkin 1982: 84), Israeli Hebrew literature began to flourish after the foundation of Israel in 1948 (Toury 2002: xxviii-xxiv).

3.2.3.1 The system of Israeli Hebrew literature
Following the foundation of the State of Israel, Israeli Hebrew literature began to thrive. Its potential for English translation has been informed by the growing numbers of Jewish communities in the English-speaking parts of the world (Spicehandler 2000: 628), as discussed below.

In Britain, Hebrew literature, especially poetry, became more visible thanks to the involvement of prominent poets, such as Jon Silkin and Ted Hughes. Hughes became interested in the poetry of the Israeli poet Yehuda Amichai having co-founded the poetry magazine *Modern Poetry in Translation* with the poet and translator Daniel
Weissbort in 1964. What caught Hughes’s attention to Amichai’s poetry was that behind his poetry was “the internal and external history of the Jews of modern Israel”, and that “speaking for his generation of Israelis (...) has given him [Amichai] responsibilities that are even bigger and certainly unique” (Hughes 2000: xii-xiii). Amichai’s poems in English translation were included in the 1964 debut issue of Modern Poetry in Translation. As Amichai himself admits, it was “Ted Hughes who put [him] in the orbit” (Joseph 1992), despite the fact that the American English translations of some of his poems had been already published before.

Although the English translations of Amichai’s poems were not originally seen as only Jewish (in fact, he is often labelled simply “a love poet”; Joseph 1992), their increasing popularity, manifested by the retraductions and new editions of his poetry collections since their English debut (Weissbort 2000:126; 131), was bound to contribute to the growing interest in Israeli literature more broadly. The publication of Amichai’s poetry in English translation coincided with the translations of other works in Hebrew in the 1950s (Donahaye 2011: 6-7).

In the 1980s, the dynamics in the English translations of Hebrew literature began to be shaped mostly by large publishing houses rather than independent publishers. The change resulted in the English translations of mainstream and recognised Israeli Jewish authors. Between 2000 and 2010, Hebrew fiction began to outnumber the English translations of Hebrew poetry (Donahaye 2011: 12). Moreover, the largely commercially-driven aims of corporate publishing houses tended to inform their selection of literature for English translation. Consequently, it was predominantly “celebrity status” Israeli novelists, such as Amos Oz, David Grossman, Etgar Keret and Abraham Yehoshua who were as positively recognised among the British reading public (Donahaye 2011: 7; 18). The vast majority of Israeli fiction that has been recently published in Britain, however, revolves around the theme of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict (Donahaye 2011: 7). The dominance of this topic is likely to shape and meet the expectations of the general reading public, partly informed by the historic connection of Britain and Palestine (Donahaye 2011: 17-18).

The two tendencies in Hebrew literary translation in Britain indicate, then, that a significant number of the English translations of Hebrew literary works that are available to the British reading public revolve around the current concerns of the
Israelis and the political frictions in their country. As noted by the translators and scholars of Hebrew literature,

Given a presumed readership that comprises mainly diaspora Jews and those passionate about the Middle East, Hebrew literature that does not represent a recognizable Israeli sociopolitical reality, and that does not even obliquely treat the Arab-Israeli conflict, rarely finds its way into translation (Cohen et al., 2015). Given the topical themes in the English translations of Hebrew literature, is seems unlikely that pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction will find its way into English translation among the readers and publishers interested in Israeli Jewish fiction.

3.2.3.2 The systems of Yiddish and Holocaust writing
Rather than address contemporary times, Yiddish works and the literature of the Holocaust tend to revolve around the pre-war and post-war history of Jews.

Following the foundation of the State of Israel, Yiddish literature flourished mainly in the USA rather than in Israel due to “a war between Hebrew and Yiddish” in Israel until the late 1950s (Cohen 1964: 175). The politicisation of the language goes back to Palestine of the 1920s, before the 1948 proclamation of the State of Israel. It was propelled by the major aim of the Zionist movement to “create a new Jew who would resemble the ancient Israelites far more than modern European Jews”. Diasporic Jews from Europe were generally seen by hard-line Zionists as “weak, physically unfit, effeminate, unwilling to fight, useless with serious agriculture, and speaking that dreadful Zhargón [Yiddish]” (Katz 2004: 310). The aversion to Yiddish turned into violence to the extent that gangs, such as Gedúd meginéi ha-safá [Battalion of the Defenders of the Language], were set up in Palestine to beat up Yiddish media and writers in the 1920s (Katz 2004: 312-318). Consequently, Yiddish began to be officially associated with the Diaspora and anti-Zionism while Hebrew was increasingly linked with Israel and Zionism.

Such a division was artificial because it was contrary to the originally more nuanced cultural and political contexts in which the two languages were used in Europe prior to the outbreak of the Second World War. Vienna-born Nathan Birnbaum, a cofounder of Zionism, for example, strongly advocated the right of the Jewish population to list Yiddish in the Austro-Hungarian census in 1910 (Katz 2004: 269-270). It was only by the end of the 19th century, when Zionist and Jewish socialist
movements were institutionalised by schools and other educational centres, that Hebrew and Yiddish became associated with Zionism and Jewish socialism respectively (Katz 2004: 257).

However, it was easier to politicise both languages in Israel due to the “absence of a natural linguistic habitat [which] can prove to be a mortal blow for the living language (…)” (Katz 2004: 293). This divide between the two languages was politicised to the extent that campaigns against Yiddish were launched on the official governmental level (Katz 2004: 319-323). The tendency to stigmatise Yiddish was by no means an internal affair of Israel, and was also addressed outside of that country. It inspired, for example, the Welsh-Jewish poet Dannie Abse to write the poem “Of Two Languages”:

(…)

Now in Hebrew, bellicose, you say, ‘Go away.’
Once, softly in Yiddish, you begged, ‘Leave me alone.’
Tell me, what’s the word for ‘mercy’ in Hebrew?
In Yiddish, ‘mercy’ must have many synonyms.
Say now in Yiddish:
Say now in Hebrew:
‘Blessed Art Thou O Lord.’

(Abse 1990: 32-33)

Due to the tendency to marginalise Yiddish in the State of Israel, Yiddish writing began to thrive in the USA, triggering the wave of English translations of Yiddish works (Schwarz 2000: 402-404). A significant number of Yiddish works of fiction paints a picture of the traditional world of Jewish towns before the outbreak of the Second World War, serving as “a mirror of a lost world by attempting to represent the most Jewish aspects” (Schwarz 2000: 402). Isaac Bashevis Singer, Sholem Aleichem and Mendele Sforim are the most celebrated Yiddish writers who epitomise this kind of literary fiction (see Schwarz 2000 for more on Yiddish literature).

The pre-war setting of Eastern European shtetls in their novels in English translation could potentially stimulate some target readers to learn more about the multicultural reality of Eastern European Jews, including their literary achievement in the Polish language. However, the ongoing limited recognition for this literature in Britain suggests the literary portraits of the pre-war traditional world of European
Jews in Yiddish fiction might have been possibly seen as an all-round representation of the pre-war Jewish world, with little potential to incite wider interest in other cultural areas of Polish Jewry.

The wartime history of European Jews is largely conveyed by Holocaust literature. As with the case of Yiddish literature, it has been mainly American writers who have become “the cultural leaders who have grappled with Holocaust inclusion and representation,” the phenomenon which partly informs the wider debate about the Americanisation of the Holocaust (Kremer 2002; see also Flanzbaum 1999: 8). Indeed, Holocaust literature in the USA is seen as one of the factors that curbed the development of American Yiddish literature (Rozett and Spector 2013: 301). The dominance of American fiction in the worldwide Holocaust writing may be, likewise, informed by the politicisation of the Holocaust in Israel. As observed by S. Lillian Kremer (2002), a scholar of Holocaust literature, this tendency fits with the debate about the Americanisation of the Holocaust:

There are many explanations for the limited early Israeli literary response to the demise of European Jewry. Self- and externally imposed silence affected many survivors, as did shame especially among young sabras (native-born Israelis) who were dismayed by what they perceived as the passivity of diaspora Jews. During the early period of the state, many survivors maintained a protective code of silence born of survivor guilt, conviction that the ghettos and camps were incomprehensible. The marginalisation of the Holocaust from the post-war public discourse is also linked by the Israeli critic Gilead Morahg to Zionist ideology which, together with the ambivalent attitude to the Holocaust, imposed “a dominant national metanarrative that precluded the possibility of an imaginative engagement with the experience of the Holocaust and was a major cause of the long literary silence on the subject” (Morahg 1997: 151).

The dominance of American English-language Holocaust writing, shaped by the international distribution and the corporate character of big publishing houses (a point raised also by Donahaye 2011: 13), is bound to meet the demands of British target readers and publishers interested in this kind of writing. The hegemony of US Holocaust writing might possibly make it more difficult for Polish Holocaust literature to spark the interest of readers in the pre-war history of Polish Jews, including their literary endeavours.
Although a considerable number of Polish-Jewish Holocaust works have indeed been translated into English for American publishers (see Adamczyk-Garbowska 2011: 232-243; Adamczyk-Garbowska 2004: 149-151), Polish Holocaust literature has not been widely recognised by the American reading public. As noted by Adamczyk-Garbowska in her discussion of the American reception of the Holocaust literature by Hanna Krall, Bogdan Wojdowski and others, the responses of American readers has been fairly limited, sometimes even negative (Adamczyk-Garbowska 2004: 149). It can be assumed, Adamczyk-Garbowska further argues, that the little notice taken of Polish-Jewish Holocaust literature can by informed by the relatively limited interest in Polish literature as a whole, or by another perception of the Holocaust (Adamczyk-Garbowska 2004: 151-151). Consequently, the potential for the US translations of Polish Holocaust literature to find their way to the wider recognition in Britain is probably small despite the prominent position of American Holocaust literature in world Holocaust writing.

Additionally, any immigrant literature, including that of the descendants of Polish Jewish Holocaust survivors, is bound to no longer form part of the Polish literary polysystem, as with the case of British-Jewish immigrant literary system within the larger polysystem of British literature, for example. When seen from the perspective of the literary systems, the relative invisibility of Polish Holocaust writing can then be related to its incorporation in another system. The vast majority of Holocaust survivors emigrated from Europe mostly to Israel or the USA (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum 2016), and with them Polish Jews too. Consequently, a number of Polish-Jewish writers began to write openly about their Holocaust experience in the language of their new home countries, such as widely-recognised Polish-born writer Eva Hoffman, Suzanna Eibuszyc, the author of a biographical memoir about her wartime family story Memory is our Home (2015). In Israel, Holocaust writers of Polish origin include, among others, David Grossman born to Polish parents (Adamczyk-Garbowska 2004: 162) and Uri Zvi Greenberg, whose literature became celebrated after twenty years from his debut, partly due to the discussed imposed silence on Holocaust survivors in Israel (Roskies and Diamant 2012 : 117-119).

Another factor that is likely to limit the potential of Holocaust literature to prompt wider interest in pre-war Polish-Jewish history is related to the common
perception of Holocaust writing. There exists an inherent assumption that the setting of Holocaust works, especially prose, is ghettos, concentration and labour camps somewhere in Central and Eastern Europe. This false assumption is informed by a somewhat distorted picture of the Holocaust caused by dominating English translations of camp and ghetto literatures by German and Polish authors (Boase-Beier 2015: 8-14). Such a distorted picture is bound to limit the history of Polish Jews with their entire pre-war cultural and literary legacy to the massive burial ground in the general awareness of target readers, an important factor that underlies the lack of visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction as a whole in Britain.

Another aspect of Holocaust writing that may possibly be an obstacle to the wider recognition of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction is that the setting in some of the Holocaust works may be unclear or not straightforward, being “the literature of the moment, seeking vainly to unite with the stream of time” (Lange 1995: 4). It is especially the case with poetry, which, in general, tends to “[c]onvey attitudes, feelings and experiences”, evoking an emotional reaction from the reader (Boase-Beier 2011: 165; see Boase-Beier 2015 and Rowland 2005 for more on Holocaust and post-Holocaust poetics). Such texts, then, are likely to draw the attention of the reader to the more emotional aspect of this literature, whereby the Polish-Jewish nature of such literature may be played down, and so may the likelihood of the text leading to wider interest in specifically Polish-Jewish literature.

However, given the diversity of Holocaust writing, it would be unfair to claim that every work of Holocaust literature in English translation is bound to militate against the translation of pre-war Polish-Jewish prose fiction. There are Holocaust writers who evoke the pre-war world of Jews rather than foreground first-hand Holocaust experience, which might possibly incite interest of the reader in the pre-war reality of Polish Jews. As discussed in 2.2.2, such post-war literary portraits of the pre-war world of Jews can be seen as a way for the Holocaust to appropriate the pre-war world of Polish Jews, as with the case of Stryjkowski’s works. However, of his entire “Galician tetralogy”, only the second one Austeria (1966) was translated by Wieniewska into English as The Inn (1971) originally published in New York and republished in London a year later (London: Barrie and Jenkins). And yet, the translation has not been widely recognised by the reading public. The remaining volumes of the tetralogy have not been translated into English altogether, while The
"Inn" has not been republished since 1972. The reception of Stryjkowski’s work may indicate that the depiction of the pre-war world of Polish Jews in Galicia has not captured the interest of the reading public enough to complete the translation of that tetralogy. Such a limited engagement of the readers with the text may be informed by many factors (which would require further research), but it might also reflect the overall lack of interest of the general reading public in pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction, an important factor that plays a role in the literature’s lack of visibility in Britain.

The variety of literary themes in the two systems of Yiddish and Holocaust literature, then, suggests that existing literature in each of them can meet the expectations of the readers regarding the history and the current situation of the collective experience of European Jews. Therefore, British publishers are unlikely to look for pre-war Jewish literature from the country whose literature in general is not as recognised as that of the USA and Israel. Such an assumption reflects one of the claims of polysystem theory, according to which translations are unlikely to happen unless the texts for translation convey “new approaches and the supposedly innovatory role they may assume within the target culture” (Even-Zohar 1990: 47).

3.3 Linguistic factors in the target language system

The major factor related to the English language in the lack of English translations of the majority of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction is the hegemonic status of the English language in the global translation market (cf. 1.1). The dominance of English as a source language in literary translation is conveyed in up to seventy percent of all translations (Heilbron 2010: 309). The deep-rooted, almost clichéd, image of the British publishing market as translation-resistant is informed and shaped by literary tendencies and the interests of the British general reading public. As such, it tends to be mentioned in the discussion about the reception of world literature in Britain (see Pym and Chrupala: 2005). By contrast, the Polish language is a rare source language for English translation, French and German being translated into English most often (UNESCO 2016).

Apart from the somewhat translation-resistant nature of the British publishing market, the increasing role of international publishing giants poses a threat to independent publishing houses, such as Granta or Stork Press, which significantly contribute to the publication of the English translations of world-wide and less-known
prose fiction, including Polish literature. By contrast, the aim of the AmazonCrossing, which is bound to dominate fiction in English translation, is largely to select books that the common reader is likely to read (Flood 2015). Given that publishers tend both to create the context of literary translation and, equally, to respond to the expectations of readers, they play an important role in introducing and marketing new literary works. However, commercially driven interests of the influential publishers are unlikely to change the “parochial” reading habits of the British reading public, to use the term of Nick Barney, the Director of the Edinburgh International Book Festival (in Flood 2015). Such an approach of big publishing houses suggests that as long as pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction remains less known and outside of the interest of the British “common reader”, then the likelihood for its publication by a major British publishing house, which would potentially help unearth this literature in the target context, remains small.

As this Chapter has sought to show, probing into various areas of the target context has made it possible to determine a number of factors that can partly explain why Britain remains a largely hypothetical context for the English translations of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction.

These areas are not confined to the specific one genre or one moment in history. On the contrary, in order to explain what historically informs the resistance to the literature I am concerned with I have examined non-fiction religious literature, poetry, over various moments in history. In this all-encompassing picture of literary reception the question of the characteristics of individual literary texts become less significant. As noted by Hermans, “[a] target oriented approach is a way of asking questions about translations without reducing them to purely vicarious objects explicable entirely in terms of their derivation” (1999: 39). This observation, in turn, implies that the intention behind a particular translation and a way by which a translated text aligns with target expectations and tendencies goes beyond one-to-one genre correspondence.

Such an all-inclusive approach to translation resonates with one of Toury’s claims, which implies that the study of the acclaim of literary translations entails linking the translated texts with “other members of their hosting systems, as well as these systems as organised wholes” (Toury 1995: 74). However, what is meant by such terms as “members” or “organised wholes” remains unclear.
The discussion will maintain its focus on the characteristics of the texts of the English translations of pre-war Polish-Jewish works that do exist (cf. Table 1). My aim is to show that specific translation shifts can influence the reading in a way that may contribute to the readers’ limited engagement with the translations, an important factor that underlies the lack of visibility of the literature I am concerned with in Britain.
4 PRE-WAR POLISH-JEWISH FICTION IN ENGLISH TRANSLATION

4.1 Rationale for a textual analysis

As discussed in Chapter 2, specific characteristics of the style of works of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction are likely to contribute to its overall inherent unavailability for translation (cf. 2.2.1). Correspondingly, the following discussion of the textual features of the English translations of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction that exist seeks to explain how they may contribute to the limited engagement of target readers with the texts. Rather than offering a critical analysis, the aim of the following comparison of the style of the original text with that of the translation is to look at the effects of the translation shifts that may affect the interpretation of the text. In other words, I aim to show that the style of the translated text can also play an important role in the reception of the translation, and in some cases influence the target reader’s perception of the remaining untranslated works of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction that the translated text stands for (cf. Table 2).

The texts I shall be concerned with in this chapter include mostly British English translations and include Loves and Ambitions (1954), Joseph Marek’s and Henry Charles Stevens’s translation of Naglerowa’s novel; Cinnamon Shops (1963, 1980), Celina Wieniewska’s translation of Schulz’s collection of short stories; and, finally, Salt of the Earth (1939, 1970)15, Paulinde de Chary’s translation of Wittlin’s novel. I shall also examine the American English translation of one story (“The Eternally Wandering Jew”) from the collection of Wat’s short stories, Lucifer Unemployed (1990) by Lilian Valle16. This story is included in my analysis because what is important here is the text’s hypothetical impact on the English-speaking public in Britain rather than the context of and the actual reception of the translation in the USA, which would need to consider the cultural, social and political differences between the USA and Britain. They will come to the foreground in the next chapter where I look at the long-standing recognition of Schulz’s works to determine what

15 The second date provided in the brackets is the date of the editions of the translations I am using in this study.
16 The Polish editions I shall use in this study are not the original editions of the works this study is concerned with, and include Naglerowa’s Krauzowie i inni (1946), Schulz’s Sklepy cynamonowe (1994), Wittlin’s Sól ziemi (edited by Wiegandt, 1991) and Wat’s Bezrobotny lucyfer (2009).
cultural aspects typical of the American culture has most likely informed more
evergetic reception that stands in contrast to the limited reception of the same
translation in Britain.

Texts in polysystem theory are “the most conspicuously visible products of
the literary system” (Even-Zohar 1990: 18), seen as the outcome of various processes
at work within a particular literary system (Even-Zohar 1990: 19). In other words,
rather than factors in their own right, they are perceived as a result of systemic
relations. My position in this discussion is, however, contrary to that of Even-Zohar
because the particular aspects of translated texts themselves, in my opinion, contribute
to their relative lack of recognition, in addition to being “a visible product” of the
overall lack of visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction as a whole in Britain. The
dual role of the translated texts in this study echoes the concept of the systemic gap,
which stands both for the largely unacknowledged translations this study is concerned
with, and the lack of English translations of the majority of pre-war Polish-Jewish
fiction as a whole. Consequently, it makes sense to argue that a specific translation
approach to the text may also lead to the creation of a gap in the target literary system.

4.2 Textual shifts in Loves and Ambitions and Salt of the Earth

Although the translation strategies for each text were presumably different, the style
of both texts tends to be rather diluted. In order to determine the translation shifts that
may inform this diffused style I have recourse to the comparative model originally
devised by the Dutch translation scholar Kitty van Leuven-Zwart. Her method to
identify shifts in the translations is informed by two objectives. The first one compares
the source text with the target text to identify “microstructural” shifts that is any
semantic or stylistic changes within clauses and sentences. The second one seeks to
examine the effects of these microstructural changes “on the macrostructural level”,
that is any changes in the setting, characters or temporal references (Leuven-Zwart
1989: 151). Having identified the translation shifts, I then explain how they may affect
the reading of the texts in question. Thus, I have distinguished five categories of
translation shifts. While shifts 1, 2 and 5 are borrowed from the French translation
scholar Antoine Berman (2012), shifts number 3 and 4 are mine:
1. Quantitative impoverishment of T T (4.2.1)
2. Destruction of the original vernacular plurality in T T (4.2.2)
3. Contradictory shifts in paratexts in T T (4.2.3)
4. Omission of localising names in T T (4.2.4)
5. Clarification (4.2.5)

It is worth noting that the identification of shifts in the target text does not imply, however, any consistent translation strategy in the process of translating, an approach to translation which plays an important role in the reading of the text and, thus, in the potential recognition of the translation. Given the more pronounced presence of a certain degree of inconsistency in the translators’ approach to Naglerowa’s novel, the examples of translation shifts in its English translation are discussed in conjunction with counter-examples from the same text, conveying possible indications of the lack of any particular strategy to the process of translating. Such counter-examples are given in the case of every translation shift except for category number three which points to contradictions in paratexts, showing inconsistencies in its own right; and except for category number five (clarification), to which counter-examples are provided by all the instances of erasures from the target text discussed in this section.

The descriptive part of the model includes clarifying descriptions of the observed shifts, possible reasons behind the shifts and their potential effects on the reading experience. In order to infer how the changes in the translated texts may affect their interpretations by the reader I shall utilise text world theory. This theory seems to be the most suitable tool to address the question of the cognitive engagement of the reader with the text, linking the characteristics of the text and the reader’s background knowledge with the textual world a reader creates in her or his mind while reading (see Semino 1997; Gavins 2007; and Stockwell 2002 for more on text world theory).

The concepts that I have borrowed from text world theory to address the translations shifts of the texts this study is concerned with include the “text world” (the reader’s mental representation of a textual discourse world; Gavins 2007:10), the “extrafictional voice” (an image of an author that a reader creates in her or his mind while reading a text; Stockwell 2002:42); a “deictic shift” (a shift in the reader’s cognitive perspective within the story world; Gavins 2007:36); “sub-worlds” (flashbacks, beliefs and views of characters in the text world; Stockwell 2002:140);
“world-builders” and “function-advancers”, the components of a text world. World-builders set a background for story events (such as time, place and characters), while function-advancers move the narrative forwards (such as states, actions; Stockwell 2002:137-138). Further concepts include the “attitudinal sub-world” (a type of a sub-world that is strictly related to characters’ desires, beliefs, purposes, and not necessarily to time or location (Stockwell 2002:140), “participant-accessible sub-world” and “character-accessible sub-world”, the first of which can be imagined both by the reader and the author while the sub-world is accessible only by characters in the story world (Stockwell 2002:142). The final concepts are “pop”, a deictic shift that takes the reader away from the story world to the level of the narrator or, further back to the real world; and “push”, which has the opposite effect of redirecting the reader’s attention towards characters and their thoughts (Stockwell 2002:46-47).

Furthermore, I argue that, in the case of the texts in question, translation shifts may contribute to breaking the source-text chains of signification (that is a signified-signifier relation of a linguistic sign as I shall explain below) and signifying chains (a meaningful strand of related signs throughout the text) that can be identified in the original texts.

In the context of translation, the concept of a “signifying chain” is mentioned by the translator Antoine Berman in his discussion about deforming tendencies in novel translation (Berman 2012: 247), which include quantitative impoverishment caused by lexical loss in the translated text. In addition to fewer words, quantitative impoverishment also erases networks, or chains, formed by particular words in the novel (Berman 2012: 248). Their preservation is important because, as Berman argues, a particular concept in the novel may be conveyed by more than one signifier, an assumption that suggests that the choice of words in the original text is far from random.

It is worth noting that the idea of a chain with reference to signifiers goes back to structuralist writers such as Ferdinand de Saussure, according to whom “in a linguistic structure everything depends on relations where words […] strung together one after another, enter into relations based on the linear character of languages” (Saussure [1916] 1983:121). The linearity may be associated with a “chain”, which Saussure uses to refer to auditory signals (sound patterns), and their representations in writing. With the case of auditory signals, a chain is a line of uttered sounds one
after another; it becomes “spatial line of graphic signs” with the case of the written representation of these signals (Saussure [1916] 1983:70). In my discussion, however, the concept of the chain in relation to linguistic signs is more relevant. A linguistic sign, for Saussure, consists of the signified (a concept in our brain) and the signifier (the speech form of the signified). It could be said that the signifier and the signified (for Saussure sound pattern or signal, and the concept or signification respectively) are chained to each other in the sense that neither has a meaning on their own (Saussure [1916] 1983:112-113). Such a relation is called a “chain of signification” in this thesis. In other words, a “chain of signification” refers to a signified-signifier relation.

However, there is another dependency with reference to linguistic signs in Saussure’s work which is also relevant here. This relation is not concerned with these two components of a sign but with linguistic signs as interdependent units. According to Saussure, linguistic signs must simultaneously coexist in order to be comprehensible. Saussure presents these differentiating dependencies of signs in the form of a chain (Saussure [1916] 1983:113):

Thus, the chain’s binary nature, as with the case of a single linguistic sign, becomes replaced with more complex relations among individual signifiers.

Such relations between signs forming a meaningful strand throughout the text (which I call “a signifying chain”) have been studied by a number of scholars. In his essay about the poetic function of language, the linguist Roman Jakobson talks about the phonological and grammatical “sound texture” and “undercurrent of meaning” in poetry (Jakobson 1960:373-375). It is Saussure and Jakobson’s concepts, on which the psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan draws his psychoanalytical and literary analyses

---

17 For the sake of clear terminology, it is worth noting that Saussure himself does not refer to this linear dependencies of linguistic signs as a “chain of signs”. It might be sometimes referred to as “Saussurean chain” (as in, for example, Ragland-Sullivan 1986: 127; 213; 234).
The term “signifying chain” appears in his reading of Edgar Allan Poe’s short story “The Purloined Letter”. Lacan links certain signifiers in the story, unearthing a meaningful network of the signifieds underlying the text:

Our inquiry has led us to the point of recognising that the repetition (…) finds its basis in what we have called the insistence of the signifying chain. (…) Imaginary incidences (…) reveal only what in it remains inconsistent unless they are related to the symbolic chain which binds and orients them. (Lacan 1972:38)

The concept of chains, then, conveys the idea that a network of signifiers in a novel can build a lexical texture which in itself is meaningful, both for the narrative and its reading. If that network in a novel is not recreated in the translation, then its reading is bound to be different.

My point is that the incompleteness of such chains in the translated texts may play a significant role in the limited engagement of the readers with the translations. Such chains may be disrupted very easily, regardless of the elements lost, because it is the linkage of signifiers that matters rather than individual signifiers which are unlikely to have a particular value or function when disconnected (Berman 2012: 248).

### 4.2.1 Quantitative impoverishment of the target text

Both novels, *Loves and Ambitions* and *Salt of the Earth*, are set in Galicia, part of southern Poland that became the official Austrian province of Galicia within Austria-Hungary in the late 18th century (Rozenblitt 2010: 180). *Loves and Ambitions* is set in the late 19th century, a crucial time when the question of independence was being revisited following the two failed Polish uprisings against Russia in 1830 and in 1863 (Osmanczyk and Mango 2003: 1818). Wittlin’s novel, set in a rural village in Galicia, opens with the day of the outbreak of the First World War. However, the political subtext to the Polish history is more pronounced in Naglerowa’s novel, where the question of Polish independence is a recurring theme, conveying many references to the Polish history. Cultural and historical tradition, as a setting and a major theme in the novel, forms a signifying chain throughout the text. Wittlin’s novel, by contrast, is less concerned with Polish history in its own right, addressing a more universal question of the mechanics of war. The story revolves around a member of the
particular ethnic minority of the Hutsuls which then lived in the borderland of the Austro-Hungarian empire. Peter Niewiadomski, the protagonist, is of mixed Hutsul-Polish origin. His rural and ethnic background, characterised by the chain of signifiers of references to ethnographic details of his culture, plays an important role in conveying Peter’s candid and somewhat naïve perspective on the war that is due to unfold. If the chain is not reproduced in the translation, this pristine perspective is backgrounded, significantly influencing the interpretation of the translated text. The following analysis begins with the discussion of translation shifts in Loves and Ambitions which lead to the quantitative impoverishment of the text, most notably with regard to the historical background. The table below shows three examples of quantitative impoverishment translation shifts in Loves and Ambitions and corresponding passages from the source text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>target text</th>
<th>source text</th>
<th>literal translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>... a deep shadow obscured the face of the Madonna... p. 1</td>
<td>...twarz Częstochowskiej pokryła się matowym cieniem... p. 1</td>
<td>.. the face of Częstochowa (fem. adj.) covered itself with a dull shadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It’s all wasted! Everything’s kaput! Hang the commanders from trees! p.43</td>
<td>Zmarnowali! Wszystko kaput! Powiesić dowódców p.53</td>
<td>They wasted! Everything caput! Wysocki, Hang the leaders!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>with a picture of the Polish Madonna (…) or a handful of Polish earth p.74</td>
<td>Z Królowa Korony Polskiej (…) z garstką ziemi racławickiej p. 90</td>
<td>With the Queen of the Polish Crown (…) with a handful of Raclawice soil.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Quantitative impoverishment translation shifts in Loves and Ambitions

In the first example, “Madonna from Częstochowa”, which is removed from the target text, conveys a deep-rooted and widely-recognised symbol of the divine protector and the queen of Poland. The legend has it that the icon of the Black Madonna saved a
Catholic monastery during the war with Sweden in the mid-17th century (sometimes referred to as the Swedish Deluge; Zabecki 2016). Thus, the source-text reader is bound to refer to the historic victory of the Polish troops and the role of the Catholic Church in the battle. The target text, by contrast, in which only “Madonna” is left, is deprived of the specific cultural reference, leaving the idea of Madonna open to any interpretation in the context of Christian religion. However, the reference to the widely known battle in the history of Polish independence is likely to be lost.

In the second example, the name “Wysocki”, which is missing in the translation, may refer to Piotr Wysocki, one of the central leaders in the failed 1830 November Uprising against the Russian occupiers (Majchrowski 1984: 13). It may, equally, refer to Józef Wysocki, who also took part in the revolt against Russians in Hungary in 1830 (Roberts 1991: 89). Although it is not certain as to which Wysocki the speaker refers to, it is clear that this name adds a deeper meaning to the sentence and informs the attitudinal sub-world of the speaker, who seems to be critical of the efforts of Polish insurgents in their relentless losing battle for freedom, also highlighted by the words “wasted” and “kaput”. The target reader, by contrast, is unlikely to associate the speech with the lost uprisings for independence because the name of the important historical figures, which contextualise the speaker’s speech in Polish history, is missing in the translated text. Consequently, the speaker is depicted as having no political outlook at all – the target reader is left somewhat clueless as to which commander is referred to, why the speaker wants them to be punished and what the comment relates to. This knowledge is also necessary to understand the developments in the narrative as relations among individual characters in the novel are driven also by their attitudes towards the question of independence.

In the third example, the shift relating to “Polish Madonna” may be explained in a similar way to the first example. Similarly, the target text lacks the information that Mother Mary is historically considered to be the Queen of Poland (“Królowa Korony Polskiej”, “the Queen of the Polish Crown”). This example conveys another reference to the Polish history, which is likewise removed from the translation, that of “ziemia racławicka” (soil from Racławice). Racławice is the historic site of an important battle against Russians during the Kosciuszko Uprising, a nationwide revolt against Russians and Prussians in 1794 (Szyndler 2009: 5). The battle of Racławice went down in history as a victory over Russians and continues to be ingrained in
Polish historical memory. The missing qualifier of the soil, then, leaves the target reader unable to associate a handful of soil with the important historic event, which, again, informs the character’s attitudinal sub-world and sets their speech in a particular cultural context.

The translation shifts in the discussed examples deprive the target text of signifiers that are chained to the broader concepts relating to the cultural and historical aspects of Poland. Scattered throughout the narrative, they form a specific signifying chain on a macro-textual level which, when lost, render the translated text flat, stylistically and thematically (with regard to the stylistic diversity of the original text). The way that the target text speaks to the reader is thus not close to that of the source text.

The effacement of these chains in the translation makes it unlikely for the target reader to experience a push towards the past and the historical background of the novel. “Push”, it should be recalled, is a term used in cognitive poetics, and particularly in text world theory, to refer to a shift of deictic centre, such as “I”, “here” and “now”, in the text world created in readers’ mind. The push moves the reader’s cognitive engagement with the story world further “inside” a novel and into the minds of literary characters (Stockwell 2002:46-47). In the English translation of Krauzowie i inni, the target-text reader’s perception of the text world and characters is less directed towards Poland’s historical past, changing the cognitive and intellectual engagement of the reader with the text.

Furthermore, while the question of the author’s intention is clearly fraught with difficulty (see Ryan 2011:30 for more on the intentional fallacy), it is nevertheless something both translators and critics, as well as many general readers, are bound to want to reconstruct. Naglerowa originally saw the novel as a farewell to her childhood hometown and to her own past (Terlecki 1967: 16). The accurate rendering of the historical time and the question of Polish independence was, thus, one of the writer’s intentions, an issue which I shall return to in my reconstruction of the process of the novel’s publishing in Chapter 5.

The reasons for the translation shifts can be only hypothesised. However, it makes sense to assume that the translators may have presupposed that the target reading public might be unfamiliar with the pre-war Polish history. Given the specific meanings tied closely to the Polish history and culture, their abandonment in the
translated text could be a way of enabling the novel to gain wider recognition among the target reading public, which might otherwise have found the text too alien.

Another possible explanation is that the removal of culture-specific references may have resulted from the limited translation skills of the translator involved in translating Krauzowie i inni into English, a question I shall look at further in Chapter 5. For now, it is worth noting that the cultural embedding and related references in particular are the places in the text which make the translator’s voice especially pronounced (Hermans 1996: 225), that is places which require major reconceptualising of the source culture-specific references on the part of the translator. Another indicator of the limited experience in translation would presumably be the low level of consistency in the translation approach, exemplified by the following counter-examples of the discussed shifts. I therefore bring in a couple of counter-examples that suggest a reverse pattern to erasing cultural and historical references in the target text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>target text</th>
<th>source text</th>
<th>literal translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Over Prince Joseph Poniatowski p. 123</td>
<td>Po księciu Józefie p. 150</td>
<td>after prince Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, p.4</td>
<td>..Stowarzyszenia Świętego Wincentego p. 6</td>
<td>the Association of Saint Vincent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4a Counter-examples to the quantitative impoverishment translation shifts in Loves and Ambitions

Rather than reducing the original text, the two shifts expand the meaning of the original text. In the first example, the source-text word “prince Joseph” is qualified with the surname of Poniatowski in the text of the translation. Józef Poniatowski was a significant military figure in the Polish uprisings against occupying countries in the 18th century (Askenazy 1974:86-96). The presence of the full name of the military leader is bound to help the reader refer to Polish history and politics of a certain time.
The addition in the second example in the target text is likely to mislead the reader. Qualifying the Society of Saint Vincent with “de Paul” makes a link to Saint Vincent de Paul, a French Catholic priest who helped the needy at the turn of the 17th century (Tyler 2014). His presence in the novel set in 19th century Poland becomes somewhat confusing. It is more likely that the name Saint Vincent in the original relates to Wincenty Kadicbek, who was a Kraków canonised bishop and a learned historiographer in the late 12th and in the early 13th century (Schlauch 1969: 258). Such a reference is a more probable link to history given that, traditionally, the clergy from the church named after this bishop were often engaged in the fight for independence (Pawłowski 2014). The common ground for the name and the context of the novel, then, is politics, the reference to which is not reproduced in the translation despite the intended explanatory addition on the part of the translator.

The accumulation of translation shifts in *Loves and Ambitions* is inevitably bound to lead to the quantitative impoverishment of the historical and political subtext of the novel, which has an impact on the interpretation of the novel, which becomes less rooted in the political history of Poland. Similarly, quantitative impoverishment can be also observed in the English translation of Wittlin’s novel *Sól ziemi*, in which the lost chains of signification refer largely to the ethnographic details of the Hutsuls, one of the East Slav peoples (jointly referred to as Ruthenians)18 living in the Zakarpattya province of present-day southwest Ukraine (Mackenzie 2005a). The examples of reductive shifts in *Salt of the Earth* are listed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>target text</th>
<th>source text</th>
<th>literal translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Then she took off her shawl and apron, slipped out of the dress (…) p. 142</td>
<td>Potem odwinęła krajkę, zrzuciła zapaskę, zdjęła spódnicę (…) p.118</td>
<td>Later she undid a krayjka, took off the apron and the skirt (…)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

18 Ruthenians are the East Slav peoples living in the Carpathian Mountains in present-day Poland, Ukraine, Slovakia and Romania. Most Ruthenians speak the language of the country they live in or a Ruthenian dialect (Mackenzie 2005b).
The sentence in example 1 contains a reference to a garment typical of a Hutsul village woman. “Krajka” stands for a colourful woollen band, which holds an apron that replaces a skirt in the traditional Hutsul attire (Wiegandt 1991:118 fn.). Translating it as an apron waters down the ethnographic specificity and may dilute the sense of the character’s belonging to the Hutsul community.

Similarly, “trombita”, the typically Hutsul instrumental wooden pipe that may be up to three metres long (Wiegandt 1991:29 fn.) is lost in the translated text. Furthermore, the translation replaces the original word with “long reed pipes”, an equivalent which does not reflect the cultural specificity of the instrument in the source text. The same word, however, is footnoted by the translator as “wind instrument used by Huzul shepherds, about two yards long” later in the novel (de Chary 1970: 194). Whether or not a delayed explanation from the translator was intentional remains debatable, yet, as a world-builder, this ethnographic detail is bound to inform the text world constructed in the reader’s mind while reading.

The third translation shift capitalises “kolomyjka”, one of Hutsul folk dances (Wiegandt 1991: 51), highlighting the uniqueness of the dance. However, such a sense of foreignness contradicts the narrative point of view which, through free indirect discourse, renders the inner thoughts of Peter Newiadomski, whose sub-world is embedded in the Hutsul culture, in which he grew up. The capitalisation of the dance, then, may change the protagonist’s attitudinal sub-world, that is his own mind-set and perception of the world. Additionally, the dance is footnoted by the translator as a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>(...) where shepherds blow their long reed pipes p. 33</th>
<th>(...) gdzie pasterze grają na długich trombitach p. 29</th>
<th>where shepherds play long trembitas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>For a moment, fragments of dance music lilted in his head, a Kolomyika (…) p. 59</td>
<td>Po głowie Piotra przewijały przez moment ułomki jakiejś melodii tanecznej, jakieś kolomyjki (…) p. 51</td>
<td>In the head of Piotr crossed for a moment fragments of a dance melody, some kolomyjkas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Quantitative impoverishment translation shifts in Salt of the Earth
Ukrainian folk dance (de Chary 1970: 59), an explanation which is likely to result in the deictic shift, whereby the reader’s attention is moved further away from the cultural milieu of the Hutsul protagonist.

And although the intricate picture of the Hutsul folklore is not the aim of the novel in its own right, it plays an important role in the narrative. Hutsul ethnographic references form a signifying chain of a primaeval way of life which clashes with civilisation, symbolised by rail and trains in the novel (Wiegandt 1991: lv). Such a clash, in turn, mirrors the dialectic process of two phenomena, alienation of people and sacralisation of military institutions (Wiegandt 1991: lxv), which are destructive to individuals and humanity as a whole. The picture of war mechanics conveyed through the eyes of the vulnerable protagonist from an ethnic minority magnifies the alien and incomprehensible aspects of civilisation crisis. Such an uncanny perspective on war informs Wittlin’s humanist outlook, the expression of which in his writing was widely acclaimed in Poland before the Second World War (Wiegand 1991: lxxviii – lxxix). If the style of literary work is considered as a constant decision-making process of which words to choose to convey something particular in the text (Boase-Beier 2006: 50-58), then it is almost certain that the erasure of particular stylistic features in translation destroys the original associations and implied background information, inevitably limiting the potential of the translated text to engage the reader as much as the source text does.

4.2.2 Destruction of the original vernacular plurality in the target text

As the Russian critic Mikhail Bakhtin famously said, the novel can be seen as a multiplicity of individual voices, including social dialects, languages of the authorities, professional jargons and many others (Bakhtin 1981: 262-263). Such a multilingual aspect of novel writing comes to the fore in Krauzowie i inni and in Sól ziemi, partly because of their setting in Galicia, which used to be a cradle of the diversity of ethnic minorities, religions and languages among predominantly Roman Catholic Polish speakers, Greek Catholic Ruthenians, and Jewish Yiddish speakers (Rozenblit 2010: 180).

Thus, linguistic differences manifest the cultural embedding of the narrative, and as such may be particularly problematic in the process of translating (Hermans
1996: 225; Berman 2012: 243). This diversity of languages is present in the original text of Naglerowa’s novel, convincingly rendering its historical background with archaic language and vernaculars. However, there are instances of their erasure in the translation. The following three examples show the extent of flattening in the target text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>target text</th>
<th>source text¹⁹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oh chopped beetroot and buckwheat groats! Don’t believe the gossip, I shall never be yours p. 30</td>
<td>Oj siczenyj buraczki, hreczenaja kasza – Ne zurit sia worozenki, ja ne budu wasza p.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>…his old maxims and sayings (...) “The Austrians will be selling soon their lousy coats to any loon” or “The Austrian rifle I admire; A very fine show, but it won’t fire” p.18</td>
<td>..przepowienie i aksjomaty (...) “Die Austrijaken warden bald verkaufen ihre lausigen Jacken” albo “Dem osterreichischen Gewehr geht’s immer quer” p.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>“My father was not concerned with honours, and he held his sons back so that they shouldn’t push themselves to the forefront,” Stanislaw said. p.54</td>
<td>“Mój ojciec nie ‘stojał’ o honory – a spostrzeglszy się, że powiedział „nie stojal”, jak zwykle był mawiać ojciec, poprawił: -- Nie stal o honory i (...)” p.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Translation shifts of the destruction of the original vernacular plurality in Loves and Ambitions

In the first example, the suffixes ”yj” in “siczenyj” and “enki” in “worozenki” suggest that the language in this excerpt is a Ukrainian dialect what was common in Red Ruthenia, which is the borderland between present-day south-eastern Poland and

¹⁹ See Appendix 1 for the glosses in English for the three discussed examples.
western Ukraine (Kuraszkiewicz 1976: lxv; lxxv). In the source text, Ukrainian is superimposed on the Polish language, and reveals the multicultural aspect of 19th-century Galicia. However, the use of the dialect also defines the social status of the speaker. The importance of the vernaculars in the novel’s fictional world is mentioned by Naglerowa in the introduction to the English edition of the book:

The Ruthenians spoke a slightly different language from Polish (…) In Eastern Galicia there was continual social and economic conflict between the Polish landlords and the Ruthenian villagers (…)” (Naglerowa 1954: xi)

The speech of the character, however, is rendered in standard English, which strips the character’s words of its contextualising meaning and, therefore, renders their sub-world accessible only to the characters rather than to the participants (i.e. the reader and the author).

In the second example, the speaker appears to speak in Yiddish because the word order in this sentence partly complies with Yiddish grammar in that the infinitive (“verkaufen”) is in the middle of the clause rather than at the end, as it is in standard German. However, the auxiliary verb in that clause (“warden”) is not Yiddish (which would be “veln”) and resembles German (“warden”). The character’s speech, then, may be a blend of both languages, foregrounding the linguistic and ethnic diversity of Galicia at the time, being perhaps a Galician dialect of the German language in the novel’s fictional world. With a rhyming saying, the speaker wishes bad luck on Austro-Hungary. Such “old maxims and sayings”, as the narrator calls them, were presumably passed down from generation to generation in the local community. The ironic tinge of the German may convey the speaker’s subversive political stance to the occupying authorities and as such defines their place in the political dynamics of the fictional world. That element, however, is removed from the translated text, in which this fragment is rendered entirely in English.

In the third example, the problematic word is the word “stojal”, which may be either Ukrainian or a word from the vernacular of Polish-language inhabitants of a lower social standing. In either case, however, it makes sense to assume that it is likely to reveal the background of the speaker given the intervention of the narrator. The omniscient narrator intervenes in the character’s speech mid-sentence thus: “(…) having realised that he said “nie stojal”, as his father used to say, he corrected himself (…)” (Naglerowa 1964: 66, my translation), bringing the attention of the reader to the
social and cultural significance of the words used. The narrator’s comment can also indicate the speaker’s linguistic self-consciousness, which, in turn, may indicate their social and professional advancement. This brings a certain degree of lifelikeness in the fictional world, and contributes to the overall picture of a dynamic community in an increasingly modern world, in which traditionally low and underprivileged social classes are beginning to break the rigid divide between the rich and the poor, and enter higher ranks of society. Such an inference is drawn from a single fragment in the text in the source language, but in the text of the translation, in contrast, similar interpretation of the character’s background is unlikely given the erasure of the vernacular and of the interventionist comment of the narrator.

The depiction of the changing social dynamics of pre-war Poland in Naglerowa’s novel, conveyed also by various vernaculars of the characters, is one of the novel’s features that was valued by the writer herself and the critics at the time when the novel was published (Terlecki 1967: 14-15). However, the flattening translation shifts in the translation are likely to deprive the translated text of these enriching characteristics, potentially hindering wider acknowledgement of the novel in Britain. Similarly, the characters in the translated text may be seen by the reader as unconvincing and wooden, devoid of reflections of the world that surrounds them. By contrast, the novel’s characters were seen by Naglerowa herself as “largely determined by the customs and the political, social and economic conditions of the land they inhabited and the regime which governed them” (Naglerowa 1954: vii).

The extent to which the translators and copy editors contributed to removing certain fragments conveying different vernaculars and languages, however, is open to further enquiry. It is unclear why the uses of different vernacular were not reproduced in the translation, and whether their removal was part of the translators’ consistent strategy of making the translation less foreign to the target reader. There are, however, contradictory shifts which retain the vernacular and, furthermore, supplement it with an English translation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>target text</th>
<th>source text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Das ist nich zum Lachen. That’s not a laughing matter. p. 147</td>
<td>Das ist nich zum Lachen! p. 178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The translators’ approach of supplying an English translation in these three examples stands in contrast with the discussed tendency to erase the presence of other vernaculars in the English translation of Naglerowa’s novel. In the source text, neither the German (1, 3), nor the Yiddish phrase (2) are explained, a fact which is likely to make the intervention of the translators more pronounced. Such a discrepant approach may be another sign of the lack of any clear strategy by the translators. Assuming that the absence of any particular translation approach can suggest the translators’ limited consideration of potential target readers and their main interests, then it makes sense to say that the translation was probably unlikely to win wider acclaim of the majority of target readers.

The reduction of vernacular plurality can also be found in the English translation of Wittlin’s Sól ziemi. The plurality of voices I am concerned with in the case of this translation informs both the multiethnic setting of the novel, and changes in the narrative points of view. The differences between the source and the target texts are exemplified in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>target text</th>
<th>source text</th>
<th>literal translation (and comment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(...) and God the Eternal (...) p. 231</td>
<td>(...) Boh Peredwicznyj (...) p.193</td>
<td>God of all ages (appears in Ukrainian carols)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The raucous blare of gramophone in the Officers’ Mess alone broke the silence p. 214</td>
<td>(...) darł się ochrypły śpiew płyty gramofonowej: <em>Puppchen, du bist mein Augenstern</em> <em>Puppchen, hab dich zum Fressen gern!</em> p.179</td>
<td>German lyrics of the song omitted in the target text <em>Little doll, you are my favourite Little doll, I love you enough to eat you!</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>For the first time in many years a judgment was passed on men, a judgement that took no account of their clothes. (…) pp. 71-72 (see Appendix 2 for the complete passage).</td>
<td>Pierwszy raz od wielu lat nie sadzono nas po ubraniu. p. 60 (see Appendix 2 to read the full passage)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Destruction of the original vernacular plurality in *Salt of the Earth*

In the first example, the Ukrainian language in the source text is not reproduced in the translated text despite the important role of the language in portraying the fictional world of the Hutsuls, as with the case of specific ethnographic details of Hutsul folk culture discussed earlier. The Hutsul vernacular, one of many Ukrainian dialects (Wiegandt 1991: 43), not only informs the cultural identity of the entire community, but it also conveys a sense of isolation of the Hutsuls from the wider world and from the incomprehensible mechanics of the war. In this particular example, the Ukrainian language is a vehicle to represent the protagonist’s innermost reflections about religion and death. The use of Ukrainian alongside the Hutsul origin of the protagonist
allows the reader to infer that “boh Peredwicznyj” [eternal God] embeds almost metaphysical thoughts of the character in the tradition of the Greek Catholic Church, the religion, it should be recalled, of the majority of the Hutsul ethnic minority (Wiegandt 1991: lvii). In the case I am concerned with, the linguistic and religious aspects of the character’s speech distinguish him and the rest of the Hutsul community from the Polish-speaking Roman Catholics. While such inferences can be made by the source-text reader, the target-reader is unlikely to conceive these ideas from the text from which the Ukrainian is removed.

In the second example, the excerpt in German conveys the lyrics of a song that, as far as the context of the quoted passage allows me to establish, is played by the officers in the Austro-Hungarian army. The text of the relatively primitive song, tinged with vulgarity, can be seen to reflect the image of the army, especially the high-ranking officers whose ironic image intertwines the entire original text. Such recurring depictions of the army and other institutions are part of the wider picture of war that informs the novel, composed of chain of signifiers which, if flattened and erased from the text of the translation, may speak to the reader very differently from that in the original text. Indeed, the number of instances when German is replaced with plain English or removed altogether are not limited to the discussed example. The German phrase “Achtung auf den Zug” [Attention. Trains] (p.52) is erased from or obscured in the target text (p.60); “Bajonett auf!” (p.55) is translated as “fix bayonets!” (p.63), and “recht” (p.56) is translated as “quite right” (p.65).

The third example differs from the other two in that it concerns the narrative perspective. The passage in question is originally narrated by the first-person plural narrator, and marks a clear line from the omniscient narrator, which dominates the entire novel (cf. Appendix 2 for the complete passage). The change in the narrative perspective, however, is not conveyed in the translation, with the omniscient narrator remaining the only perspective for the reader. And yet, it plays an important part in the interpretation of the text. It gives the reader another angle from which to look at the fictional world, providing a multidimensional view of the narrated events. Such a universal and all-embracing perspective is reinforced by the words used in this passage (cf. Appendix 2), which bring about associations with the biblical judgement day. In his description of the conscription, the narrator refers to conscripts as masses of naked bodies, objectified and used by the army for whom living people become
names in dusty records. Such an image conveys protest against the injustice as to who and why decides about the lives and freedom of others. The use of the plural form in this first-person narration highlights the unity of common people against the war, inviting the reader to become involved.

Rather than compare the original with the translated text, it is worth bringing in another excerpt (cf. Appendix 3) to show the importance of the narrator. Although marked with irony, the opening paragraph about the Hutsuls’ familiarity with irony is narrated by a detached, almost scientific narrator. The voice changes and becomes increasingly ironic to describe the reluctance of the Hutsuls to read. The mocking tone is bound to distance the narrator, and presumably the reader, from the Hutsul-born protagonist. Such a change can inevitably influence the reader’s attitude who is likely to read and interpret the ironic tone of the narrator, moving the reader further from the fictional world. The changed narrative perspective affects the participant-accessible sub-world, a world that can be constructed by the reader and the author but not by the characters.

The plurality of voices and perspectives which blend together throughout the entire text is noted by the Polish literary scholar Stanisław Gawliński (2014: 84-85, my translation), who says that

[a] kind of polyphony of Wittlin’s masterpiece [Sól ziemi], its stylistic diversity, ranging from lyricism, epic realism to ironic grotesque, has already inspired many scholarly interpretations. Intertextual features of Sól ziemi (…) are embedded in anthropological and cultural references.

If the translation of such a stylistically complex novel is flattened, leaving out the aspects that informs the novel’s a multi-layered structure, then the translated text is presumably unlikely to win wider acclaim in the target context. And, indeed, the main difference between the readers’ responses to Wittlin’s novel in Poland and in Britain concerns the novel’s style and form. While the two elements of the novel generally appreciated by Polish critics, the few British literary critics who noticed the publication of Salt of the Earth praised, most notably, the novel’s war-themed plot, characters and, occasionally, its comic aspects (Rzepa 2013: 188-189). The particular attention to the theme of war in the first reviews in Britain will be discussed further in Chapter 5 (5.5.3).
4.2.3 Contradictory shifts in the paratexts of the target text

The importance of paratexts has been widely addressed in translation and literary studies since the seminal publication of *Seuils* (1897), a study by the French literary theorist Gérard Genette translated into English in 1997 (Genette 1997).

Probing into the area of literary reception requires looking at paratexts, which show how the book is presented to the public and how it may be suggestive of the reasons behind its publication. Paratexts are defined by Genette as a threshold which “offers the world at large the possibility of either stepping inside or turning back” (1997:2). In other words, paratextual features tend to influence the reader’s engagement with the text.

It is in this vein that the following discussion will address the question of the paratextual features in *Loves and Ambitions* and *Salt of the Earth*, to see, ultimately, whether they also contribute to the limited recognition of the two translations in Britain. While the discussion of *Loves and Ambitions* focuses largely on the title, the question of paratexts in *Salt of the Earth* is related mostly to in-text footnotes. The examples listed in the table below present three kinds of paratexts, the title page, the preface and a footnote in the English translation of *Krauzowie i inni*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>target text</th>
<th>source text</th>
<th>literal translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Loves and Ambitions</em></td>
<td><em>Krauzowie i inni.</em> Powieść. Tom I</td>
<td>The Krazues and Others. A novel. Vol.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>preface: 8-page preface by the author</td>
<td>preface: two sentences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>footnote: The Schwarzgelbern, p. 60</td>
<td>footnote absent in this passage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Paratexts in *Loves and Ambitions*

The first example shows that the title page of the target text is more concise that that of the original one, which includes the title of the novel, the genre, and the volume number, an indicator that the volume is part of the trilogy, originally published
between 1936 and 1937 (Naglerowa 1946: 6). In the English translation, by contrast, the title of Loves and Ambitions is not accompanied by any volume number, an omission which may suggest that the plans of the publishers regarding the novel were not aiming at introducing the entire trilogy to the British reading public.

Owing to the title’s link to the content of a literary work, the title can be seen as a mediator between the author and the potential reader. As such, it can either invite them to step inside or turn back from the novel. The original title and the title of the translation of Naglerowa’s novel, however, suggest different narratives. While the original one conveys the idea of a family saga, the title of the translation is bound to bring associations with a love story. Given the mediating role of literary titles then, the English translation of the novel was likely to draw the attention of the readers whose interests do not entirely match the content of the book. The change of the title, however, is likely to be the publisher’s strategic move to facilitate the reception of the novel, a supposition discussed further in the next Chapter, where I discuss the process of publishing of the English translation.

As if to redress the disparities of the titles, Naglerowa contributed with an introduction, explaining the novel’s historical and social contexts, which are essential components of her novel. By acknowledging that the novel’s “setting is in a country almost unknown to English readers” (Naglerowa 1954: vii), Naglerowa was likely to be aware that the political context in 19th-century may have limited the translation’s potential for wider acknowledgements. Naglerowa writes thus,

(... and my characters (...) were largely determined by the customs and the political, social and economic conditions of the land they inhabited and the regime which governed them (...) I think a few lines of explanation will enable the reader to follow their stories more easily, and add to their interest. (Naglerowa 1954:i)

The explanatory nature of the preface may also manifest an attempt of the writer to redress the loss of historical references in the translation, and help the reader understand the setting of the novel. It makes sense to look at Naglerowa’s effort to make up for the partial erasure of the political and historical aspects of the novel’s setting as a protest against the approach of the translators, and possibly editors, to the text. The two discordant stances as to how introduce the book to the English-speaking audience, as manifested by the nature of the paratexts, can also suggest that Naglerowa might possibly have intended to target the novel to a different readership than the
translators or the editors. I shall discuss the possible conflict of gains between Naglerowa and others involved in the publication project further in Chapter 5.

The different approach to the text’s historical aspect can also be inferred from the little number of explanatory footnotes in the translation (example 3 in Table 8). The footnote I am concerned with is only one of two clarifying comments in the English text (Marek and Stephens 1954: 46; 60), a number which does not reflect the density of historical and political references in the source text. The footnote in question explains the meaning of the German word “Schwarzgelbern”, which was to be used by Poles to refer to individuals who collaborated with the Austrian authorities. The explanation in the footnote, then, conveys crucial information for the reader to understand the context of the quoted passage. Such footnotes could redress inevitable losses in translation but in order for them to aid the reader there would have to be more than two explanations.

Given the limited consistency in paratexts, the novel in the English translation, as a finished product, seemed to target different interests of readers. The title of the translation, *Loves and Ambitions*, conveys the themes of the everyday and romantic story; the preface, by contrast, foregrounds the political and historical aspects of the Polish reality in the 19th century. Such a diluted vision of the targeted readership, which I shall address further in my discussion of the dynamics of the process of publishing, may have been a contributing factor to the limited response to the novel, engaging neither the attention of readers interested in historical writing, nor readers whose fascinations lay in family romance sagas.

The nature of paratextual shifts in the English translation of Wittlin’s *Sól ziemi* largely concerns the imbalanced presence of footnotes. The 1991 Polish edition of the novel contains many explanations of Biblical, mythological, linguistic and ethnographic imagery in the text. The multiplicity of the footnotes, mostly introduced by the editor and literary scholar Ewa Wiegandt, may also reflect the network of signifying chains that inform the novel. For example, while chapter ten in the English translation includes only two footnotes, the source-text contains forty-two footnotes to expound the particularities of the cultural and linguistic aspects of various ethnic minorities, references to the Bible and Greek mythology, of which only two were originally added by Wittlin. The writer provides the Polish translation for the German phrases “Lemberg noch in unseren Händen” (p.255) and “Machen’s schneller”
(p.256), which are erased from the English translation. The omission of the original authorial footnotes in the target text suggests that the translator probably did not acknowledge the importance attached by the writer to the German phrases in the narrative, and, by doing so, removed their significance in the text, as noted earlier. Such imbalance in paratextual clarification continues throughout the entire text, most likely caused by the erasure in the translation of historical and cultural references that would potentially need referencing.

The Polish critical edition, containing an insightful introduction and footnote explanations by Wiegandt, is likely to help the reader appreciate the meticulous structure of Wittlin’s work, as opposed to the English translation. Critical material included in the text of the translation could be a way to make up for inevitable losses in the process of translating. Another means to compensate for the translation shifts would be the publication of a separate critical work on literary aspects of Wittlin’s novel. Indeed, in her American study of the writer’s works, the literary scholar Zoya Yurieff admits that one of her aims is to expose the non-Polish reader “to the author’s vision” of his work and shed light on formal and stylistic features of the novel (Yurieff 1973: 97). Such critical contribution could potentially help Salt of the Earth win more acclaim of critics and readers in the target context, increasing the novel’s chances for further retranslations.

4.2.4 Omission of names in the target text

The tendency to erase names can be noted in both Naglerowa’s and Wittlin’s works in English translation. In Loves and Ambitions, the omission seems to affect mostly the names of places; while in The Salt of the Earth it erases other kinds of proper names. While considering possible effects of such translation shifts, it is worth remembering that street names and other proper names create a network of specific places in the cognitive map of the text world in the reader’s mind, a model of the fictional space that readers create in their minds while reading (Ryan 2003:214-240). Such a map is bound to help them engage with the narrative and anchor it in a specific context. The table below lists three examples of the erasures of proper names from Loves and Ambitions.
The way to it ran through a small village, then by cart-ferry across the river Styr, and through more villages. Then you turned off the road and took the track straight to the wood. p. 199

It drove through Leszniów, and then by ferry on Styr to the town of Żurowice, after only through villages towards Mikołajów. After detouring slightly to Karolówka, you would take a shortcut through Damianówka to the oak wood.

Either Ladnowski sells the brickworks, or we will build our own (…) p. 191

Either Ladnowski sells the brickworks or we will build our own on Wólecka street

(...) the political prison at Lwow (…) p. 23

The Carmelite political prison in Lwow

Table 9 Omission of names in *Loves and Ambitions*

The first example shows the erasure of the names of villages, while the second exemplifies the omission of the name of the street (Wólecka). None of the names is presumably crucial for the unfolding of developments within the novel, but they are essential for the reader to create a cognitive topographic map of the text world. The reader’s mind is otherwise bound to create a nameless place, whereby the original realistic depiction of concrete places in the original is replaced by an almost mythical
anonymous village. Consequently, the reader may tend to mythologise other participants and events in the novel, including its political and historical references. Such reading not only does not align with the reading of any historical writing but it also makes it unlikely for target readers to appreciate the novel’s historical accuracy, which has, indeed, been critically acclaimed in Poland. For the literary and drama critic Tymon Terlecki, for instance, the novel can be seen as “a vast fresco”, which, dotted with realistic details, recalls a past forsaken world with a particular attention to historical detail (Terlecki 1967: 15; 8; 14).

Gaining knowledge about history is a possible way for the reader to engage with historical novel writing, which potentially may lead to its wider recognition. Thus, the loss of detail in the translation, which ultimately leads to the fictionalisation of the novel’s space, is likely to reduce the chances of the translation to win acclaim as a historical novel, as was the case in Poland.

From the perspective of narratology, defined here as a study of the narrative, forms of narration and the narrator (Baldick 2008), the use of proper names in the text is likely to bring the narrator’s voice closer to the world represented, whether as a member of the community or as a reliable omniscient narrator. The represented world, mediated to the reader by the narrator, can appear more authentic. With the effacement of proper names, the narrator grows more distant from the narrated world and less convincing. Such a changed narrative point of view can influence the reading process, taking the reader out rather than inside the text’s world. The reader, then, is bound to experience a pop deictic shift, which takes cognitive attention away from the story world to the level of the narrator in the process of reading.

The third example is different from the other two because the qualifying name does not relate to the location but to the name of a religious order, the Carmelites (“Karmelici”). As with the case of discussed historical references, the name of the order conveys a link to Polish history when the Lvov Carmelite monastery was turned by the Austro-Hungarian authorities into a political prison where Polish rebels were confined in the 19th century (Włodek and Kulewski 2006: 134). The erased name, then, provides crucial information for the reader regarding the political background.

As with the case of other translation shifts in Loves and Ambitions, the tendency to erase names is absent in the following two cases:
In the first example, the original name of the street is retained in the translation. Although the name of a character is preserved in the second case, the Jewish connotation it conveys, however, is lost. “Duwydl” is a Yiddish equivalent of David, appearing as Dovidl in the English translation of, for example, short stories by Isaac Bashevis Singer (Leviant 2000: 178). Translating the name as David is likely to affect the way the character is seen by the reader, who is unlikely to infer the Jewish aspect from the name of David.

The question of proper names in the source and in the target texts with the case of Wittlin’s novel is slightly different. While most of them are preserved in the target text, it is the ways they have been translated that is problematic for reading the translation. While the names of the places in Loves and Ambitions are especially significant both for the historical value of the text, some of the fictional names in Sól ziemi are important in that they form part of the imagery of the novel, contributing to the overall interpretation of the novel. The name of a police officer Durek (de Chary 1970: 63), for instance, qualifies him as a character because “durny” means “stupid” in Polish. The ambiguity of the name may contribute to the overall, frequently ridiculed, picture the novel gives of the Austro-Hungarian army as a collection of largely incompetent people with many faults and flaws. It is, therefore, one of many elements that inform the novel’s, and the writer’s, stance to the widely accepted authority of military officials.

Similarly, the name of the protagonist, Piotr Niewiadomski can be read as an epitome of a larger group. “Niewiadomy”, the stem of the surname, means “unknown” in Polish, which allows the reader to infer that the name can relate to what is known as Everyman in British literary tradition (Trussler 1996). Considering Peter’s Hutsul background, it makes sense to argue that Niewiadomski stands for a culture untouched
by civilisation, informed by naivety and innocence (Wiegandt 1991: lvi). If Peter stands for vulnerable individuals as a whole who credulously tend to respect the army embodied by vulgar Dureks then the novel can be read as a protest against war feeding on the susceptibility of humanity. Such insights are unlikely for the target reader to feed into the reading process from the names in the English translation. The protagonist’s name is translated into English as Peter Neviadomski, and footnoted with a brief explanation that reads “of unknown origin” (de Chary 1970: 36). Neither the English translation nor the clarifying footnote, however, are likely to foreground the epitomising bearing of the name. Rather than reflecting the origin of the character, which the reader is expected to know, the name conveys its universal meaning.

Given that cognitive and stylistic aspects of literature are interdependent in different ways and play a fundamental role in the reading experience (Boase-Beier 2003: 255), then it makes sense to assume that the interpretation of the text which is largely erased from significant figures of speech is bound to be more literal, and thus, less stimulating for the reader.

4.2.5 Clarification

This section aims to look at clarification, one of Berman’s categories of translation tendencies, which “aims to render ‘clear’ what does not wish to be clear in the original” (Berman 2012: 245). The recourse to clarification on the part of the translators of Naglerowa’s novel may be somewhat baffling given the observed tendency to erase names and references from the source text. And yet, the table below lists instances of in-text explications of source-text phrases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>target text</th>
<th>source text</th>
<th>literal translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>sticky Christmas sweetmeat p. 113</td>
<td>kutia, p. 138</td>
<td>kutia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>..our great country had been reduced</td>
<td>Wielka ojczyzna (...) skurczyła się dla nas</td>
<td>...the great homeland (...) shrank for us to the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 Clarification shifts in *Loves and Ambitions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To Galicia, to a town, to… p.128</th>
<th>do kraju koronnego, do miasta…p. 156</th>
<th>Crown land, to a city…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(...) looks like the devil in that traditional Polish coat, p.135</td>
<td>(...) wygląda w kontuszu jak Boruta, p.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(...) looks in kontusz as Boruta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first example, “kutia” refers to a traditional holiday dish common in Ruthenia and, historically, in the eastern borderland of the Polish Kingdom. Although now associated with Christmas, kutia used to be a special dish during holidays (PWN 2016). Containing candied fruits, grains, poppy seed and honey, it is different from traditional Christmas sweetmeat, both with regard to cultural origin and its ingredients. The domesticating equivalent in the translated text, which also attempts to explicate the source term, is bound to flatten the original cultural connotations with Slavic culinary tradition.

The attempt to clarify “kraj koronny” as Galicia only partly reflects the original meaning of the phrase. Galicia was historically only one of fourteen crown lands in the northern western part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, collectively called Cisleithania (Heilprin 1990: 137). “Galicia” then contains implicit information that rather than being an independent region, Galicia was part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The political status of Galicia as subject to the empire is not likely to be inferred from the text of the translation (“crown land”), which indeed may bring about opposite associations with an independent kingdom.

In the third example, the translation changes the meaning of two words. The clarification shift, however, affects only the translation of “kontusz”, a kind of a frock coat worn by Polish noblemen, especially in the 16th century, when Polish nobility were most influential in ruling the country, which was still independent at that time (Buszewicz 2015). The term, then, conveys a reference not only to the traditional noble garment but also to the specific political situation in Poland. Despite the translators’ attempt to expound the term (“traditional Polish coat”) the political and historical references are not reproduced in the translation.
“Boruta” is another word whose meaning is affected by the translation. According to Polish oral tradition, “Boruta” is a proper name of a particular devil which has its origin in Slavic pagan forest demons and which, as legend has it, is associated with the castle in Łęczyca (Dłużew ska – Sobczak 2016). Reducing Boruta to the generic name of a devil in the English translation deprives the figure of the devil of its ethnographic reference, which inform the novel’s setting, as with the case of other cultural and historical references.

In the English translation of Wittlin’s *Sól ziemi*, the observed clarification shifts, by contrast, are not so much related to historical accuracy but rather tend to affect the representation of the fictional world. Let us look at the following three examples from *Salt of the Earth*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>target text</th>
<th>source text</th>
<th>literal translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>All my brothers see the eagle as he circles in the air, holding in his talons the threatening symbol of his power. p. 8</td>
<td>Mój brat, moi bracia, widzą orła, jak w powietrzu szybuje i kurzą łapę z heraldycznym mieczem groźnie wyciąga. p 4</td>
<td>My brothers, my brothers, see the eagle gliding in the air and stretching the heraldic sword in hen’s claws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Suppakken. The term applied to soldiers who remained in the service after their term had expired, in return for their keep (the soup), p. 55</td>
<td>Zupak (pogardliwie) – podoficer zawodowy, ponieważ służył „za zupę”, tzn. po 12 latach służby miał prawo do rządowej posady p. 48</td>
<td>Zupak/souper (derogatory) – professional non-commissioned officer who served “for a soup”, that is he was entitled to a government position after 12 years of service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 Clarification shifts in *Salt of the Earth*

In the first example, “heraldic sword” (“heraldyczny miecz” in Polish) was replaced by “symbol of his power” in the translated text. Although the target-text equivalent seems less concrete than its source-text original, it also explicates the function of the image of the sword, imposing a specific reading of the weapon with regard to power relations. Such reading, however, subverts the narrative composition of the “Prologue”, which opens the novel.

The first section of “Prologue” focuses on the figure of a black eagle. It is only thanks to its attributes, that is two heads, a triple crown, a golden apple, and a naked sword (hence “heraldic sword”), that the reader knows that the bird is the animated eagle from the coat of arms of the Habsburg Austro-Hungarian monarchy (Wiegandt 1991: 3, fn.). The lack of direct historical references is an intricate feature of the prologue’s narration that allows for a more universal reading of the outbreak of the First World War, and as such can be read as a mythical genesis (Wiegandt 1991: lii). And although “symbol of power” in the English translation does not undermine the universal aspect of the text, it deprives it of its implicit link to the Habsburg monarchy.

The eagle is just not there. It disappears from royal seals, shop signs, metaphorically foreshadowing the defeat of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Therefore, although the image of the big gliding black eagle evokes danger and threat, it also embodies the future demise of the monarchy’s supremacy. This ambiguous and disproportionate representation of the eagle is part of the grotesque, that is bizarre and often disproportionate literary depiction of fictional characters (Baldwick 2008b). The grotesque, prominent in the “Prologue”, is also conveyed by the simultaneous presence of somber and comic elements (Wiegandt 1991: lii), such as the heraldic sword and the hen’s claws in the representation of the eagle, a clash which can be read
as undermining the authority of the Habsburgs from the outset of the novel. The grotesque undertone in the representation of the eagle in the English translation, however, is lost with the erased juxtaposition.

The second instance shows the translator’s attempt to clarify the meaning of the source-text “zupacy” with an explanation in the footnote. Although the term indeed calls for an explanation (Wiegandt also footnotes it in the Polish edition), not only does the translator’s definition not do justice to the function of the term in the passage, but the translation of the word itself is arguable. The word “zupak” (“zupacy” in plural) is a Polish word and is a derivative noun from “zupa” (soup). It is, therefore, unclear, why the translator employed the German-sounding equivalent “Suppaken”, a word that does not exist in German (as opposed to “Suppe” which means a soup) but which has its grammatical features, which are the capitalization of nouns and the suffix “en”.

What is more important in this instance, however, is how the word is defined in the translation. In her footnote, de Chary fails to mention that “zupak” is a derogatory name for non-commissioned officers. That implied disparagement of Austro-Hungarian army people corresponds with the discussed narrator’s perspective on the process of summoning ordinary men to military service, a link that the reader of the target text is unlikely to construe.

In the third example, the Polish source-word “pan” (which means “mister”, “gentleman” in English) is translated as the German “Herr” (“Sir”). In order to explain the effects of that shift it is necessary to contextualise the passage in question first. It is quoted from the final part of the novel’s second chapter which delves into the mind of the protagonist Piotr Niewiadomski after he receives the enlistment notice from the Habsburg emperor (de Chary 1970: 66-69; Wittlin 1991: 57-59). The exploration of the character’s thoughts through free indirect discourse brings the reader closer to his way of perceiving the war. For Piotr, a simple and illiterate man of Hutsul origin, the war turns the world as he knew it upside down (Wiegandt 1991: lix). In the translated text, his perspective is undermined by the presence of the German word “Herren”. The German word “Herren”, which presumably evokes the heading of the enlistment notice in German Peter has received, is a foreign word to him given his illiteracy and his distance from the world of war and German-speaking officers.
4.3 Textual shifts in “The Eternally Wandering Jew”

While the previous sections discussed the English translation of two novels and translation shifts that they had in common, this section aims to look at the translation of the short story “Żyd wieczny tułacz”, which forms part of *Bezrobotny Lucyfer*, a larger collection of short stories by Aleksander Wat, originally published in 1927. The entire collection was translated as *Lucifer Unemployed* by the American translator Lilianne Vallee.

Similarly to the English translations of Wittlin’s and Naglerowa’s novels, this short story can be seen as deprived of a certain chain of signifiers (that is a chain of related signs in the text), although such omissions are likely to be rare. While with the case of both novels, source-text signifying chains and chains of signification form recurring links to Polish history, politics and ethnography, lost references to Judaism in “The Eternally Wondering Jew” are bound to make the Jewish aspect of Wat’s writing less visible. This change, I argue, is likely to influence the reading of the text, moving it further away from its partly Jewish origin.

As with the discussed signifying chains, such chains in Wat’s short story that contain Jewish references may be indicative of the writer’s reality. The leap of thought to connect them to the writer’s background may be problematic and, as such, may require other texts than “The Eternally Wandering Jew”. Not only may it be difficult to connect the signifying chain to the writer’s life but it may also be problematic to find such chains in the source text of the short story.

As with the case of the remaining stories in the *Bezrobotny Lucyfer* collection, “Żyd wieczny tułacz” nihilistically undermines fundamental values of humanity, such as morality, religion and love. The subversive approach was Wat’s literary response to the destruction of the foundations of European civilisation during the First World War (Wat 2011, vol.1:29). In the story saturated with irony, mockery and science fiction, references to Jews and Judaism are part of the ironic and ridiculing undertone, such as the stereotypical images of Jews as the richest people (epitomised by the character Baron Gould) or poor underprivileged Eastern European Jews (epitomised by Nathan). Most references to Jews and Jewish tradition are retained in the target text although there are three cases that suggest otherwise.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>target text</th>
<th>source text</th>
<th>literal translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(...) as if the robe, skullcap, and sidelocks were not the adornments of a Jew. p.4</td>
<td>(...) jak gdyby kapota, krymka i pejsy nie były ozdoba Żyda. p. 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>In former days, he wouldn’t have had to worry. Nathan would have grown in his wisdom (...). p. 4</td>
<td>Dawniej nie miałby kłopotu. Natan obrastałby mądrością Talmudu (...) p.58</td>
<td>In the past, he would not have had any problem. Nathan would have grown in the wisdom of Talmud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Anti-Semite old believers (...). p.15</td>
<td>Antysemici Starozakonni (…) p.75</td>
<td>Antiemite adherents of Judaism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 Translation shifts in “The Eternally Wandering Jew”

In the first example, the source-text “kapota” can colloquially refer to a dark-coloured long men’s jacket, and mean a long black overcoat worn by ultra-Orthodox (Chasidic) Jews (Drezner and Wołosz 2002: 673). The context of the word suggests that it is in the second meaning that the word is used in the text. However, the reference to the Jewish garment is lost in the English translation, whereby “robe” is unlikely to connote Jewish tradition.

Similarly, the difference between the source and the target texts in the second example suggests that another reference to Jewish tradition is lost in the translation. In the Polish version, qualifying wisdom with the Talmud, that is Jewish ceremonial and civil law (OED 2016), foregrounds character’s immersion in the traditional Jewish practice of studying religious scriptures and commentaries. This connotation is removed from the target text in which the word “Talmud” is absent.

In the third example, “old believers”, the English translation of “starozakonni”, which is one way of referring to the adherents of Judaism in Polish, may be problematic. On the contrary, the phrase in English has little in common with
the Jewish religion: in reality Old Believers formed a religious group which separated from the Russian Orthodox Church in the 17th century (Laiz 2016: 50).

The source-text word stems from “stary” (which means “old”) and “zakon”, which in contemporary Polish means “convent”, but used to signify “law”, especially in the old translations of the Bible to refer to biblical law or to the Old Testament, present in the 16th-century Polish translation of the Bible by Jakób Wujek (Wujek 1884: 287). Therefore, the phrase “starozakonni” conveys the idea of the Old Testament, which draws primarily on the Hebrew Bible, also referred to as the Law (Zgółkowa 2004:148; Brückner 1989:633). Translating the source-text phrase largely on the basis of its morphological meaning (“stary” meaning “old” and “zakon” meaning “a convent”) not only deprives the target text of the reference to Judaism, which is present in the source text, but it also fails to convey the oxymoronic figure formed by the antithesis of “antysemici” (“antisemites” in English) and “Starozakonni” (“Jews”).

The three examples seem likely to be isolated cases of such omissions as the English translation of Wat’s short story probably preserves the source-text chain of Jewish signifiers. The tendency to preserve references to Judaism and to the Old Testament seems to be maintained in the English translations of the remaining short stories in the collection, which retain such words as “Jehovah” (Vallee 1990: 95), “Hewilath” (1990: 98) or “schlemiel” (1990:78). Indeed, the biblical imagery is important in the stories, embodying the writer’s nihilistic and iconoclastic stance to established beliefs and stereotypes. Equally, however, they may also be read as an indicator of Wat’s Jewish background, and thus, as the Jewish aspect of his work.

Therefore, although the preservation of the source-text chain of Jewish signifiers is important for the reading of the stories, I shall connect them to the role of the reader in reconstructing an implied author from the text, known as the extrafictional voice in text world theory (Stockwell 2012: 42). Such a chain, in other words, can provide textual clues for the reader to reconstruct the author and their intentions, that is the implied author and assumed intentions respectively. As noted by the translation scholar Jean Boase-Beier, the reconstructed, and therefore assumed intention need not be the actual one because it should be “as text-immanent as possible” (2003: 256). The reader’s attempt to reconstruct the author’s intentions “is what the reader uses to produce a reading of a text in which all elements can be
explained consistently” (Boase-Beier 2003: 256). Thus, with the case of Wat’s story, the chain of signifiers relating to Jewish tradition may, alongside other textual tropes, contribute to the way the reader reconstructs the assumed author and their intentions behind the text.

Although the reader does not have to be familiar with the life and the background of the actual author, I argue that perhaps especially in the case of Polish-Jewish fiction, the writer’s Polish-Jewish background should be communicated to the reading public. In other words, the reader should have an opportunity to relate the chain of Jewish references also to the writer. It makes sense because being able to find Jewish traces in Polish fiction by the target reading public is conducive to the visibility of Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain more broadly.

It also makes sense especially with the case of the British reading public for whom historically Jewishness has never been an issue that needed highlighting, as discussed in Chapter 3. Therefore, the British reader is not bound to pay particular attention to the textual references to Jewishness, in contrast to the US reading public who are more likely to be interested in the Jewish aspects of the texts and their authors. This major social and cultural difference has informed fairly divergent responses to Schulz’s works in both countries, as I shall discuss further on in Chapter 5.

The different cultural identity of the US reading public may explain why the study of Wat’s life and work by the literary scholar Tomas Venclova (1996), who also discusses Wat’s relation to his Jewish origin, has been published in the USA rather than in Britain. In his critical introduction, Venclova links Wat’s early fiction with his Jewish background, while mentioning Wat’s early short stories “Sprzedawca snów” [“Seller of Dreams”; Venclova 1996: 87] and “The Eternally Wandering Jew”:

(...) The Eternally Wandering Jew’ does not lack a personal element. It is not hard to recognize the young Wat in Nathan, the self-oblivious reader who goes through contrary stages in his quest for all-embracing Weltanschaung. The story is Wat’s first, if less than serious, attempt to come to grips with his Jewishness (and Polishness). We also find here the core of Wat’s personal religious experience. (Venclova 1996:97)

Venclova’s reading of Wat’s short story resonates with the author’s own attitude to religion and his Jewish background, which Wat summarises thus,
And back then I was against religion, an attitude so typical of assimilated Jews. (…) I didn’t write yet then [in 1929] but, perhaps, I mentioned to him [Stanisław Iwaszkiewicz, a Polish writer] the ideas that led to ‘Żyd wieczny tułacz’ (Wat 2011:229, my translation)

The author implied by Venclova in his critical study and the actual worldview held by the writer himself coincide, which indicates that it is possible to approach Wat’s fiction from the perspective of his Jewishness. The discussed example of Wat’s fiction raises a broader question regarding the role of paratexts and their potential to change the largely invisible status of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain. Critical introductions that could accompany the English editions of works of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction may help the target reader to reconstruct the implied author and see the Jewish aspects of their work.

Such an introduction is missing, for example, in the English edition of Naglerowa’s novel. It is, however, mentioned by Terlecki (1967) in his introduction to another novel by her. Being born into an assimilated Jewish family, the writer never shed her Jewish origins, but she never felt them more acutely during antisemitic slurs in the 1920s and 1930s (Terlecki 1967:16-17). It makes sense to assume, then, that her Jewish identity informs her writing to a certain degree. Indeed, Naglerowa was intending to write a novel about Biblical Moses after the Second World War (Terlecki 1967: 19), the historical tragedy that may have redefined her sense of belonging to the community of Polish Jews.

The Jewish aspects of Polish-Jewish fiction need not be always overt and may inform it in more nuanced and covert ways. However, in order for pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction to become more visible, they need to be highlighted and preserved in translation. An interesting parallel could entail the development and visibility of Jewish American literature, which has never lost its Jewish nature, preventing it from being homogenised with non-Jewish American fiction.

There was, though, a time when Jewish American fiction was considered by some American literary writers and critics, such as Ruth Wisse and Irving Howe for example, as being in decline and absorbed by the mainstream of American literature in the 1970s and in the early 1980s (Royal 2004: 1-2). However, as noted by the literary scholar Abraham Chapman, Jewish-American writers even at that time “[did not] disguise their Jewishness, [did not] turn away from Jewish characters and
depictions of Jewish life, even though they [did not] write exclusively about Jews”, contributing “something distinctive and distinguishable to American literature and have helped to enlarge and enrich the concept of ‘mainstream’ of American literature (…) (Chapman 1974: xxxi). Today, contemporary Jewish American literature still thrives and continues to receive critical attention (see Furman 2000 or Wirth-Nesher 2016).

The presence of paratexts in the English translation of Polish-Jewish fiction could potentially increase the visibility of that literature, at least in the awareness of the reading public. Given that the translator is also a reader, a need arises for separate relevant critical studies, that is epitexts to use Genette’s term (1977: 344), which could shed light on authors’ lives and background that would be available for the translators during the process of translating. The knowledge of the background of the writers may change the translator's, as any reader’s, approach to the themes and symbols in the text for translation. It could potentially enable them to identify source-text signifying chains, or chains of signification, which not only influence the reader’s cognitive engagement with the text but may also reveal the Jewish aspects of the writer’s fiction.

Thus, the inclusion of critical and explanatory paratexts can give the English reading public more contextual information about the texts. Such is a guiding principle of the editors of the Oxford World Classic’s Series, for example, who by providing “the broadest spectrum of literature from around the globe” are committed to scholarship and supply the texts with comprehensive paratexts so that the readers can “delve deeper with the help of the editors.” (Oxford World’s Classics 2016).

4.4 Textual shifts in The Street of Crocodiles
The case of the English translation of Sklepy cynamonowe, Bruno Schulz’s 1934 collection of short stories, shares certain similarities with the textual shifts in the English translations of Naglerowa’s and Wittlin’s novels. The first kind of shift that can be noted in the translation of his short stories can be termed as quantitative impoverishment of the target text (i.e. the loss of signifiers in translation; Berman 2012: 247). The table below lists three examples of such changes, followed by a brief discussion of each shift.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no</th>
<th>target text</th>
<th>source text</th>
<th>literal translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Visitation</td>
<td>Nawiedzenie</td>
<td>Visit/visitation/revelation/inspiration/appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The gale blew cold and dead colours on to the sky – streaks of green, yellow, and violet (…)</td>
<td>(…) na niebie wydmuchał wiatr zimne i martwe kolory, grynszpanowe, żółte i liliowe smugi (…), p. 90</td>
<td>in the sky, the wind blew out cold and dead colours, boxwood colour, yellow and lily-coloured streaks (…)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(…) as they stirred slightly in their daydreams p.12</td>
<td>(…) lekko falujących od marzeń południowej godziny, p. 20</td>
<td>slightly pulsating with dreams of the noon hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 Quantitative impoverishment in *Cinnamon Shops*

The first example is the title of a short story included in the collection. This title, as the other short stories “Nimrod” and “Treatise on Tailors’ Dummies, or the Second Book of Genesis”, indicate the somewhat supernatural, metaphysical aspect of the story. That hint, however, is present only in the source text and is lost in the translation. “Nawiedzić”, which is a derivative verb form of the noun “nawiedzenie”, can mean “affect” (especially with reference to calamities and catastrophes), “appear”, “visit somebody” or “inspire someone” (in the metaphysical sense of the word) (SJP 2016). The ambiguity of the word echoes the ambiguity of the entire story, in which it is not straightforward whether the protagonist’s father Jacob embodies
Biblical Jacob while wrestling with the godly angel. The word is only one of several indirect references to what could be interpreted as Jewish mysticism\textsuperscript{20}, or its specific Kabbalistic form, whereby Kabbalah can be broadly defined as “the aspects of Judaism that lie beneath present reality and cannot be proven by logic or the evidence of human senses” (Giller 2011: 2). A Kabbalah-driven biblical reading of Schulz’s work is offered, for example, by the Polish literary critic Władysław Panas (see Panas 1997). Although retained, the ambiguity of the title in the English translation may become less pronounced for the reader if other signifiers that refer to the mystical aspect of Schulz’s works are erased from the target text.

Although it concerns the translation of colours, the shift in the second example (2) can also be related to the mystical elements that can be found, interwoven, in Schulz’s work. As noted by the Polish critic Jerzy Ficowski, “[l]anguage is Schulz’s magic wand (...) indissolubly and organically connected to his vision, which cannot be translated into the medium of any other art” (Robertson 2003: 122). Indeed, Schulz himself writes that “[t]o name something means to join in to some universal sense”, to create” (in Robertson 2003: 122). It makes sense to assume, then, that the precision in reading the meanings of words in Schulz’s work is likely to be particularly important in the text’s interpretation. In the case I am concerned with, source-text “grynszpanowy” and “liliowy” are colour names that derive from plants (“grynszpan” means “boxwood”, and “lilia” is “lily” in English), bringing about associations with nature and flowers, which resonate with the evocative landscape in the quoted passage. By contrast, in addition to changing the source-text shades, the target-text equivalents of “green” and “violet” are likely to lose the poetic quality, which is ingrained in the dreamlike and oneiric aspect of Schulz’s text.

The third translation shift relates to the word “falujący” (pulsating) and its translation as “stirring” into English. The equivalent in the translation seems likely to break down a chain of the recurring word “falować” (to pulsate) throughout the narrative. The preservation of the word “pulsate” (or its other verb forms, such as “pulsating”) is essential to retain in the target text because it foreshadows the mystical

\textsuperscript{20} Defined here broadly as the preparation for or the suprasensual consciousness of the immediate or direct presence of God (Harpur 2005: 3)
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vision of reality, the nature of which is spelled out by the protagonist’s father in three stories collectively entitled “Treatise on Tailors’ Dummies”:

(…) for creation is the privilege of all spirits. Matter has been given infinite fertility, inexhaustible vitality, and, at the same time, a seductive power of temptation which invites us to create as well. In the depth of matter, indistinct smiles are shaped, tensions build up, attempts at form appear. The whole of matter pulsates with infinite possibilities that send dull shivers through it. (Wieniewska 1980: 56-37)

Specific words, such as “pulsate” for example, form a chain of signifiers that helps the reader understand the mystical unreal aspect of the narrative referred to by the narrator in “The Street of Crocodiles”, who says:

[s]everal times during our account we have given warning signals, we have intimated delicately our reservations. An attentive reader will therefore not be unprepared for what is to follow.” (Wieniewska 1980: 73)

If these signs are erased in the translation, even an attentive reading is unlikely to give much insight into the narrative, making it more difficult for the target reader to have a deeper, mystical reading of Schulz’s short stories.

The second kind of shift leads to the reduction of foreign words in the translated text. As in the other translations discussed earlier, vernacular plurality is also reduced in *The Street of Crocodiles*. However, while in *Loves and Ambitions* and *Salt of the Earth* vernacular plurality manifests itself as the presence of languages other than Polish (such as German or Yiddish), in Schulz’s works its predominantly borrowings from Latin or Greek and old-fashioned vocabulary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>target text</th>
<th>source text</th>
<th>literal translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Here, for reasons of accuracy, we must describe an insignificant small incident which occurred at the point of the lecture and to which we do not attach much</td>
<td>Tu musimy dla wierności sprawozdawczej opisać pewien drobny i błahy incydent, który zaszedł w tym punkcie prelekcji i do którego nie</td>
<td>Here for reasons of accuracy we must describe a certain small and insignificant incident that occurred during the lecture and which we do not attach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
importance. The incident, completely nonsensical and incomprehensible in the sequence of events, could probably be explained as vestigial automatism, without cause and effect p. 39

| 2 | A black market in railway tickets and bribery in general are the special plagues of our city. p. 72 | Plaga naszego miasta jest azjotaż biletów kolejowych i przekupstwo. p. 82 | The plagues of our city are the agiotage of rail tickets and bribery. |

| 3 | The Demiurge, p. 36 | Demiurgos, p. 45 | Demiurgus |

In the first example, the source-text word “antecedens” is equivalent to an antecedent, which means in English either a premise in an argument (as used in logic), or, more generally, a thing which precedes another (OED). The reference to logical argument is important here because the narrated events are in this passage narrated as “a sequence of events” which are suddenly disrupted by “an insignificant small incident (…) to which we do not attach much importance” (Wieniewska 1980: 39).

It is worth noting that the quoted passage is part of the story “Treatise on Tailor’s Dummies, or The Second Book of Genesis”, which, as noted earlier, is the
story in which Jacob explains “the dark and complex subject” (Wieniewska 1980: 40), an almost Kabbalistic perception of matter and reality in which, as noted earlier, logic tends to be disrupted. By contrast, the scientific style of the narrator can be seen as validating the metaphysical and illogical aspects of Schulz’s bizarre world. Equally, such style can also give greater weight to the events which would normally be seen as unimportant. Therefore, the target-text words “antecedents” and “cause and effect” may sound too casual to reveal the scientific undertone of the source text.

The word in the second example, “aziotaż” is a rare and little-known word in Polish, borrowed from French *agiotage* to refer to stock market speculation (OED). The question as to why Schulz used that particular term here remains open to debate. It is worth noting, however, that the sentence (2) is a standalone paragraph in the middle of the description of the train station on the Street of Crocodiles (ulica Krokodyli). That street is situated in the town’s industrial and commercial part of an “equivocal and doubtful character” (Wieniewska 1980: 67), rife with “sober forms of commercial endeavour”, “pseudo-Americanism” with its “rich but empty and colourless vegetation of pretentious vulgarity” (Wieniewska 1980: 67). Therefore, the term “aziotaż”, as the name of the street itself, could underline the cold-blooded and indifferent nature of rampant capitalism in that district. In the target text, however, that implied meaning is lost because “a black market” not only misinterprets the original term, but it also fails to convey any connotations that would foreground the evil image of the place.

The third example shows a nuanced yet, in my opinion, important difference between the meanings of “demiurge” and “demiurgos” in Polish, both of which translate into English as a “demiurge” and a “demiurgus” respectively. While both terms mean the same, their connotations may be different. “Demiurge”, a Latinised form of the Greek word δημιουργός (dēmiourgos), can refer both to the name of the creator of the world, and to the title of a high civil servant in some states in ancient Greece (OED). As opposed to the first meaning, the second one is only used of Greece. Thus, *demiurgus*, the less Latinised form of the word, is likely to foreground its Greek origin and its secular connotation. This ambiguous chain of signification, that is the link between the word and its referent, allows room for multiple readings of the passage. Given that the word opens the story which relates the mystical vision of reality (“Treatise on Tailor’s Dummies, or the Second Book of Genesis”), in particular
the creation of the world and humankind, the less Latinised form *demiurgus* can convey a secular element, highlighting the tension between ordinary reality and metaphysics.

As with the case of the English translations of the two Polish-Jewish novels, paratexts in *The Street of Crocodiles* also pose a number of baffling questions. The first one concerns the title. While the very first English translation was translated as *Cinnamon Shops and Other Stories* by Wieniewska (London, 1963), the stories were reprinted as *The Street of Crocodiles* in the USA in the same year (New York, 1963) and have been reprinted under that title since then21. Both titles are also the titles of short stories included in the collection, but they portray two distinct fictional worlds. While “Cinnamon Shops” depicts almost unreal, mysterious cinnamon shops (discussed further on), “The Street of Crocodiles”, by contrast, foregrounds the grittiness of a district consumed by capitalism. That difference is likely to matter, however, during rather than before the reading process.

As a threshold of interpretation, to use Genette’s term (1997), the title may predetermine the interpretation of the text. The two different titles of the English translations of Schulz’s works bring about fairly distinct associations. Cinnamon shops convey a warm image of an old-fashioned, warm and exotic shop, while the reptile predators in the second title connote something dark and dangerous. The second title, then, might have sounded more intriguing, bleak perhaps, particularly in the context in which Bruno Schulz has been associated with the Holocaust – as it happened in the USA, an issue I discuss further on in the next chapter. The question as to what extent the different title of the first British English edition of Schulz’s stories played a role in their limited reception in Britain remains debatable, but it makes sense to assume that it might have influenced the readers’ decision to “step inside” or “turn back” from the fictional world the title conveyed (Genette 1997:2).

While I touch on the translator’s preface in the next chapter, it is worth mentioning here that its content reflects, to some extent, the flattening approach of the translator. Despite the stylistic complexity of Schulz’s poetic prose, Wieniewska does not discuss the style of the source text or any challenges she may have encountered.

21 For the complete list of the re-editions of Wieniewska’s translations visit the website http://www.brunoschulz.org/przeklady-uk.html (accessed on 16 June 2014).
while translating. The question of style is mentioned only once, referred to as “a touch of [his] poetic genius”, which makes his prose “memorable, powerful and unique as are the brushes of Marc Chagall” (1980: 9)\(^\text{22}\). Such cliché and vague phrasing is unlikely to incite the target reader’s interest in Schulz’s original writing.

As in Loves and Ambitions, the names of locations in The Street of Crocodiles are tackled by the translator with a certain degree of inconsistency. The inconsistency, which is likely to affect mainly street names, concerns the disparity between their literal translation (as in the first and the third examples) and leaving them untranslated (as in example two), as shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>target text</th>
<th>source text</th>
<th>literal translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(...) Rampart Street, p.58</td>
<td>Podwale, p. 68</td>
<td>Podwale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lesznianska Street, 60</td>
<td>ulica Lesznińska, 70</td>
<td>Lesznińska Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Saltworks Street, 59</td>
<td>Żupy Solne, 69</td>
<td>Żupy Solne Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 Shifts in the translation of names in Cinnamon Shops

In example one, the source-text word “podwale” (1) literally means a space near embankment fortifications, a rampart. Likewise, the source-text “żupy solne” (3) can refer to salt works, or, alternatively, to a salt mine. In both cases, the translation approach was that of literal translation of both names. The second example (2) would be presumably more problematic to translate literally because, as opposed to the previous example, the name of the street (Lesznińska) is not directly derived from any common noun. It does, however, have certain reference to a hazel tree (“leszczyna” in Polish) because Leszno (from which the adjective “lesznińska” stems) is the name of a town that etymologically has its origin in leszczyna (Jurek 1996).

\(^\text{22}\)

That translator’s preface opened the first publication of Cinnamon Shops in 1963, and is included in the edition I am using in this study.
The contradictory approach to the names by the translator raises a question about the importance of location names in the topography of the cognitive map in the text world, and whether the map of the fictional world overlaps with the reality of Drohobycz, Schulz’s hometown (Ficowski 2002: 17). And although both maps do overlap, it is different from their correspondence to reality discussed in Naglerowa’s *Krauzowie i inni*. It should be recalled that the fictional world in this novel is a realistic depiction of the world at large, embedded in historical and political references. By contrast, the world in Schulz’s short stories is set in an unnamed mystical setting, which occasionally hints at Drohobycz, as noted by Ficowski:

Schulz scrupulously preserved the rudimentary details that endowed his own artistic creation with a kind of verisimilitude. Their traces scattered throughout his works were significant for his creative process: they were the guarantee of authenticity for his imagined world. (Robertson 2002: 92)

Thus, the names of the streets which occasionally appear in Schulz’s prose are not only historical records of pre-war Drohobycz, but their network also gives a certain degree of gravity to the dreamlike fictional world. The literal translation of some of these names can subvert “the guarantee of authenticity.”

The final translation shift that can be observed in the English translation of *Sklepy cynamonowe* is clarification, which, it should be recalled, “aims to render ‘clear’ what does not wish to be clear in the original” (Berman 2012: 245).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>target text</th>
<th>source text</th>
<th>literal translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>hypertrophy, p.13</td>
<td>elephantiasis, p.21</td>
<td>elephantiasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>mechanical toys from Nuremberg, p.59</td>
<td>norymberskie mechanizmy, p.69</td>
<td>Nuremberg mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>a Pan without a flute, p. 52</td>
<td>Pan bez fletu (…), p. 62</td>
<td>A Pan/Man without a flute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 Clarification shifts in *Cinnamon Shops*

The first example indicates the translator’s attempt to clarify the meaning of the source-text term “elephantiasis”. Elephantiasis is a disease that affects and deforms skin in a way that it begins to resemble an elephant’s hide (OED). Hypertrophy, on the other hand, is a pathological enlargement of a part or organ of animals or plants,
produced by excessive nutrition, but is also used as a more generic term - as an antonym to atrophy (OED). Although scientific details are not relevant here, what is important is that elephantiasis manifests itself in visible disproportions. Therefore, a sunflower suffering from elephantiasis, an image which appears in the opening story in the collection (Schulz 1994: 21), foreshadows the flexibility of matter that “has been given infinite fertility, inexhaustible vitality”, and that “[a]nyone can mould and shape” (Wieniewska 1980: 37-37), as with the verb “pulsate” discussed earlier. Thus, the referent of elephantiasis, the deformation of skin, evokes a powerful hyperbolic image, even for those who are not familiar with the word because the connection between elephantiasis and the hugeness of elephants is fairly straightforward.

“Hypertrophy”, by contrast, remains an obscure term which, moreover, does not create such poetic effects, ultimately influencing the reading of the target text, because is likely to erase the foreshadowing indicators of changing matter. This example, as the translation of source-text “demiurgos”, points to the importance of the chains of signifiers and of signification in the narrative and their role in the interpretation of the text.

The second example of clarification refers to the interior of cinnamon shops which for Joseph, the protagonist and the narrator, are the objects of his dreams (Schulz 1994: 69). Joseph sees the shops as a secret, “strange and most attractive”, almost unreal and mystical place which inspires apprehensive reverence in the boy (Wieniewska 1980: 59). The goods, sold by “old dignified merchants who served their customers with downcast eyes, in discreet silence, and who were full of wisdom”, are, too, so exotic that they are on the borderline of reality: Bengal lights, magic boxes, stamps of long-forgotten countries, and many others (Wieniewska 1980: 59). “Norymberskie mechanizmy”, translated as “Nuremberg mechanisms”, sounds equally mysterious and unfathomable. That air of mystery is lost in the target-text equivalent of “mechanical toys from Nuremberg”, which, moreover, defines Nuremberg mechanisms as toys. And although Nuremberg has indeed been famous for its production of toys since the Middle Ages (Hillier 1968: 37), it is not how the protagonist perceives the Nuremberg mechanisms. His is a world which resists clear-cut definitions and logic, and that essence of Schulz’s writing is lost by such shifts in the translation.
The next translation shift (3) also affects the way that the narrator sees the world. The quoted passages in this example are from the short story “Pan”, which relates an encounter of the narrator with a tramp. However, as cinnamon shops are not ordinary for Joseph, here, too, the encounter transforms into a magical and unreal experience. It does not just happen “between the back of sheds and outbuildings”, but rather in “the land’s end, the Gibraltar of the courtyard”, “enclosing that little world with finality” (Wieniewska 1980: 50). The orchard turns into “a paroxysm of madness”, in which overgrown cabbage heads become “enormous witches” (1980: 51). Similarly, the metamorphosis of the tramp into a “crouching” creature, with tufts of filthy hair, and eyes bursting shells (1980: 50) is Joseph’s perception of reality, as is the source-text figure of half tramp and half pan, the Greek god of woods and fields.

The ambiguous figure of a half tramp and half pan is also conveyed by the word “Pan”, which, in Polish, can refer either to the Greek god or to any man (as in “Mister” or “Sir” in English). Therefore, the source word Pan upholds the indefiniteness of the fictional world, as opposed to the translation, in which that ambiguity is lost, with Pan having only one meaning of the Greek god.

The discussed shifts in the English translation of Sklepy cynamonowe are likely to flatten the source text in a number of ways. And although Wieniewska’s English translation of Schulz’s work has won him international acclaim, it has been raising questions (discussed further on in 4.5.2). Indeed, the recent years have seen a growing demand for new readings and translations of Schulz’s works in English. These issues, however, concern the question of reception in its own right, which is addressed in the next chapter.

4.5. Translation approach as a factor in polysystem theory

The textual analyses of the English translations of selected works of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction suggest that certain losses are inevitable in the process of translating. However, it is their cumulative flattening effect that may be a contributing factor in the relative lack of visibility of the texts in question. As a result of the erasures of multiple references the translations may be deprived of their original features that could be appreciated by the target readers, ultimately leading to their relative lack of visibility.
The question of translation shifts is addressed by Toury, who argues that the target text’s “subjugation to target literary models and norms” may not only involve removing some features of the source text, but it may also entail additions to the target text (Toury 1995: 171). Such changes, Toury suggests, may help the target text to fit with the expectations of the target reader. Whether or not the discussed shifts are part of such a strategy, however, is debatable and would require further comparison with particular translation approaches practised by translators of Polish literature at the time when these translations were published. However, the fact that they have not won much recognition among target readers makes it likely that the recreated style in the translations may have been a contributing factor.

Furthermore, it is worth noting that all the discussed texts were literary debuts in Britain, a fact which raises a question specifically about the debut translations of relatively unknown writers. Assuming that literary translation is a means to introduce “new models or reality”, alongside new poetic language and literary techniques conveyed by “foreign works” (Even-Zohar 1990: 47), the balance between unfamiliar and familiar elements should be considered by publishers and translators, in particular with the case of literary debuts.

The initial interest of target readers tends to focus on those aspects of the text which enthuse readers, that is something that is new to them. For instance, Joseph Roth’s *The Wandering Jews* boasts a very realistic and journalistic portrait of German Jews before the outbreak of the Second World War, a quality which is appraised by critics abroad. In his review for *The Guardian*, for example, the British novelist and literary critic Adam Mars-Jones, remarks that “[Roth’s] journalism is usually impressionistic, though it breaks down occasionally (…) into ‘anxiety and statistics’” (Mars-Jones 2000). While Mars-Jones discusses Roth’s style (presumably in translation), the interest of the readers can be metatextual, focusing on general themes dominant in particular literature – as with the case of the current perception of African writing, which is seen in Britain as “invisible except when it is reflected on a mirror of social ills, cultural themes and political concerns” (Edoro 2016), issues which most British readers would be unfamiliar with, and thus, are likely to engage with.

In order to increase the chances for better acclaim of the discussed translations, the texts may have to be retranslated in order to compensate for the accumulation of erasures discussed in this chapter. Furthermore, given that the Jewish aspects of the
works are rather implicit, their re-translations will have to be equipped with introductions which would help the target reader associate the particular literary work with the entire pre-war literary legacy of Polish Jews.

It is worth noting, however, that the perceived balance between foreign and familiar aspects in any literary work varies from one text to another, depending also on the cultural identity of target readers. Indeed, the cultural background of target readers is likely to play an important role in the acclaim of literary debuts when it makes it easier for the reader to relate to a particular aspect of a literary debut or its author – which seems likely to have informed the long-standing acclaim of Schulz’s stories in the USA.

If we look at the relation between the reader and the text from the perspective of text world theory, it is the style of the text that selects the reader’s background knowledge during the reading process (Stockwell 2002: 135). It does so by limiting the reader’s worldview with a necessarily confined context during the reading process, involving the creation of a text world in their mind on the basis of in-text literal and inferential information. Consequently, if the text of the translation is deprived of historical and political references, as with the case of Loves and Ambitions, for example, then it has little potential to incite the reader’s background knowledge about Polish or Jewish characteristics of the books in question. The limited engagement of the reader with such elements of the discussed translations is likely to be conducive to the relative overall lack of awareness of the existence of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction as a whole in the target context.

4.6 Textual features of the target text in the concept of a systemic gap
Given the possible relationship between the style of the translations and their recognition as well as the recognition of literature the translated texts represent, it makes sense to argue that a cognitive approach to the translated texts, such as that of text world theory, may be incorporated in the polysystem theory, including the new concept of a systemic gap this thesis introduces.

The concept of a systemic gap, which stands for unrecognised translations as well as untranslated texts altogether, needs to be included because it may help explain why target readers do not engage with a particular literature. Neither the concept of a marginal literature (or peripheral, to use Even-Zohar’s terms) nor that of a vacuum,
which may be closest to that of the systemic gap, address the question of underlying reasons for the limited recognition of works in and for translation. Peripheral literature, as argued by Even-Zohar, tends to have “limited resources”, and thus often their “literary activities” can be incomplete (1990: 47). This lack, in turn, “may then be filled, wholly or partly, by translated literature” (Even-Zohar 1990: 47).

In other instances when Even-Zohar addresses the marginal position of translated literature within a larger system, as with the case of some translations into Hebrew, the marginal position of translations stands for vast bodies of works, such as “works translated from English, German, Polish” (Even-Zohar 1990: 49). However, the vastness and vagueness of such bodies make it too difficult to pinpoint specific factors that may underlie the marginal position. Similarly, the concept of “a periphery” itself relates to general phenomena in the dynamics of literary systems more broadly. The concept of a systemic gap, by contrast, is defined by the relative lack of dynamic engagement with specific texts in translation.

Another concept close to that of a gap is that of a vacuum. A vacuum in a literary system, as claimed by Even-Zohar (1990: 48), occurs when “no item in the indigenous stock is taken to be acceptable” and, once formed, “it is easy for foreign models to infiltrate, and translated literature may consequently assume a central position”. Although Even-Zohar does not explain what acceptable items in the indigenous stock exactly stand for, it makes sense to infer that a vacuum refers to an inert moment in the history of a particular literature, which is an essential condition for new translations to enrich it with new literary themes, forms and genres (Gentzler 2001: 118; 122). A vacuum, then, is a natural stage for the system to expand and “avoid stagnation” because it is filled with translations that contribute to the particular literary system. As noted by the translation theorist Nam Fung Chang, “whenever a new repertoire is accepted into a culture, one may assume that there must have been a vacuum to accommodate it” (2011: 314). A systemic gap, as I devise it, remains largely unfilled and the translations that define it are unlikely to become widely acclaimed. In other words, a systemic gap is not strictly a vacuum, as the lack of visibility does not equal absence.

The two concepts of “periphery” and a “vacuum” help explain specific “laws” or “universals” (1990: 53; 58), that is tendencies that condition the need for translations seen as a whole. The concept of a gap, by contrast, creates room for
tentative explanations of specific instances in which translations are unlikely to win much recognition. If a gap is within a particular system, defined as “the network of relations that is hypothesised to obtain between a number of activities called ‘literary’, and (…) these activities themselves (…)” (Even-Zohar 1990: 28), then the concept of a gap is informed by the relative lack of the texts’ engagement with the target-context network of literary relations and activities.

The next chapter will focus on extra-textual factors that have led to the limited reception of the existing translations of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction.
5 RECEPTION OF THE ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF PRE-WAR POLISH-JEWISH FICTION

5.1 Methodological approach and rationale

The conclusions I have drawn from the textual analyses of the translations discussed in the previous chapter only partly explain why the texts have failed to attract the attention of the general reading public in Britain. Although helpful in accounting for the lack of visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction, the investigation of textual features of translations may not be sufficient because they are only tangible results of initiatives and strategies that had begun prior to submitting a text for print, as noted by Jones (2011:192). Therefore, in order to offer a more thorough explanation of the relative lack of acknowledgement of the English translations of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain, I will adopt a process-based approach to the translation projects which have led to the publication of the texts I am concerned with, in addition to the text-based approach which I have adopted in the previous chapter. Both approaches, then, complement my systemic approach to the examination of the overall limited recognition of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain in that they help to explain the gap defined by the largely unacknowledged translations. Thus, it is necessary that both the processes of publishing and their final products, that is the texts of the translations, be examined in detail.

As pointed out in 1.1, in my process-based approach to looking at translation projects and their limited recognition, I intend to utilise actor network theory, which was originally devised by the French philosopher and sociologist of science Bruno Latour in *Science in Action* (1987) to look at the workings of science and technology and how they were practised by people involved. This theoretical approach has also been applied by the translation theorist Frances Jones in his study of the processes of translating selected Bosnian poems into English and of their communication to the wider target audience (Jones 2011). Drawing on Latour’s framework, Jones models human ventures as interdependent networks between human actors (such as translators, writers and people working for publishing houses) and non-human actors, that is artefacts created by people (such as texts), tracing their interactions and results of these contacts (Jones 2011: 25-26). These actors, in turn, hold certain powers that
help them negotiate relations within a network. The powers may be economic, symbolic (measured by prestige or status), social (measure by connections in society) or cultural (measured by cultural influence) (Jones 2011: 41). Such conceptualisation of human ventures explains well what underlies goals and motives for certain actions and strategies within a network, and how these may affect the success, or failure, of a network that informed a particular project. When applied to this research, the explanation of what informed decisions of people and institutions involved in particular projects to translate pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction may be helpful in determining why they were contributing factors that had pre-determined a limited acclaim of the texts in the target context.

Decisions and strategies of publishers and translators, however, cannot be examined in isolation, independently of the temporal, literary and political contexts of translation projects, referred to collectively as “a situational context”, which is also an important factor in a human venture in actor network theory (Jones 2011:41). A situational context accommodates political and economic issues, translation and literary trends and readers’ expectations, all of which, as I will seek to explain in the following sections, affect individual actors and their decisions within a particular network.

It is also worth noting that, given the publication dates of the debut translations I am concerned with, which are 1939 for Wittlin’s novel, 1963 for Schulz’s works and 1954 for the English translation of Naglerowa’s novel, the best way to arrive at the aims and relations between individual actors in the networks is by inference from factual evidence rather than by first-hand data.

The application of actor network theory not only makes it possible to examine production factors but it also provides a tool to look at reception. Target readers, in actor network theory as used by Jones, are linked to first-order network actors (people at the core of the project) by interest networks. Interest networks comprise real groups of people who read the translated text, mostly reviewers, who introduce the translated text to target readers in the real world (Jones 2011: 67). By looking at the initial instances of limited critical attention that the English translations have received I will be able to see what was, or was not, appreciated by the target audience and whether their response aligned with assumptions made by involved actors before the texts were published.
The boundary between production and reception factors, however, is not always clear because production usually takes reception into account, and interrelations and mutual influence between literary production and reception make it problematic to discuss each in isolation. Some factors, moreover, might have furthered a particular translation project and impeded its reception at the same time. Nevertheless, such distinction between production and reception factors is necessary for the sake of the clarity of my line of argumentation.

Thus, production factors, which include the situational context (5.2), publishers in the network (5.3), involved translators (5.4) are discussed separately from reception (5.5) in this chapter. Because my thesis focuses on pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain, my discussion of production factors will revolve around British rather than US translation projects (with one exception which I will briefly discuss below). Therefore, I intend to look primarily at the processes of publishing of the debut English translations of works by Naglerowa, Schulz and Wittlin and their reception in Britain, leaving aside the research of production and reception of US-published *Lucifer Unemployed*, a collection of stories by Wat, for further enquiry. My approach to the British publication of *Cinnamon Shops*, however, will be driven by contrasting responses to Schulz’s fiction in Britain and in the USA. Therefore, instead of focusing entirely on British reception, I will look at a relatively enthusiastic response to Schulz’s short stories in the USA to draw a contrast with a rather limited acclaim of the same text in Britain. Such a comparison will be illuminating in determining why the British reading public failed to engage with the book as much as readers did in the USA.
5.2 Situational context

5.2.1 Naglerowa’s Loves and Ambitions (London, 1954)

The situational context of the network that was to lead to the publication of Loves and Ambitions was largely informed by the current political climate, which influenced the goals and decisions some actors, especially those of Naglerowa, the author of the original novel, which was to be translated into English in London in 1954.

That year of 1954 marked ten years of an imposed Communist rule in Poland that began with the arrival of the Red Army in 1944 (Kemp-Welch 1999: 3) and ended with the first democratic elections in 1989 (Cottee 1995: 27). During this time, censorship in Communist Poland (called Polish People’s Republic; Yurieff 1973: 13) banned any subjective vision of reality, including literature that was against the doctrine of socialist realism, understood here as a set of government-imposed and controlled principles of art to portray Polish reality under the Communists in an optimistic and dynamic way (Folejewski 1961: 74; see Folejewski 1961 for more on socialist realism in Polish literature).

The period between 1945 and 1991 also marked the global conflict of the Cold War between the West, led by the United States, and the Soviet Union together with its Eastern-European satellite countries (Bahmueller 2016). For Poland, one of the satellites, the Cold War meant a political and cultural isolation from the rest of Europe. Dissident writers resorted to illegal printing or did not publish at all. In that formidable political and cultural situation in Poland, especially in the Stalinist period in the early 1950s (Czerminka 1999: 179), the writers who managed to escape Poland settled mainly in the USA and Western Europe, mostly in Britain and France (Miłosz 1983: 522), where they enjoyed freedom of literary expression which allowed them to give an alternative view of reality to that imposed by the censorship in Poland at the time thanks to such institutions as the London-based International P.E.N Committee for Writers in Exile (Jameson et al.1950). Émigré literature remained banned in Poland until 1978, when underground presses began operating in Poland (Filipowicz 1989: 158; 161). As with the case of émigré writing in general, Polish émigré literature and the experiences of Polish writers abroad resist a clear-cut definition and categorisation (see Miłosz 1983: 521-532 for an overview). They can be seen as “hermetic”,
“conservative”, and “relegated to the periphery of a host culture” by the literature’s strong links with the home cultural and historical values and ideology, as noted by the literary scholar Halina Filipowicz (1989: 157). On the other hand, however, that distance from home could give some writers “license to discard artistic taboos and explore untested grounds” (Filipowicz 1989: 157). A question, then, arises whether émigré literature can be understood without considering the political and cultural contexts of the home country, especially with the case of writers whose allegiances lay with the Polish political and cultural context at the time, as Naglerowa’s presumably did.

What distinguished post-war Polish émigré literature in particular was “its far reaching import and abiding presence in the national culture”, providing “Poland’s culture with much of its alphabet of referential immediacy, not only in the life of the literary imagination” (…) but in the spheres of political thought and social institutions as well” (Filipowicz 1989: 158-159). Consequently, a number of war-time and post-war Polish émigré writers were concerned mainly with Polish historical and literary tradition and with critical reflections of the current condition of Poland (Miłosz 2001: 15). Other émigré writers addressed Soviet labour camps, the oppressive Communist regime, literary recollections of the two decades of independence between the two World Wars (1918-1939) and the Jewish suffering during the war (PWN 2015)23. Such literature conveyed moral and political messages that questioned the official doctrine of the Communist authorities, undermining the “distorted” and “incomplete” vision of Polish life painted by the literature that was allowed in Communist Poland (Czerminska 1999: 185). It was only in the 1980s that émigré literary works, especially literary testimonies of Soviet occupation, such as Stanislaw Vincenz’s 1966 Dialogi z Sovietami [Dialogues with the Soviets] and Aleksander Wat’s 1977 Mój wiek [My Century], published abroad, could be illegally obtained by people in Poland (Czerminska 1999: 185). As Yurieff noted, “it [was] (…) not only desirable but even imperative, that many more books (…) on Polish writers living and writing abroad should appear outside Poland, beyond the bounds of Party controls” (1973: 15)

23 Post-war Polish émigré writers who left Poland in the 1950s and in the 1960s included Marek Hłasko, Czeslaw Milosz, Aleksander Wat, Sławomir Mrożek and many others (see Filipowicz 1989 and PWN 2015 for more names)
And because uncensored dialogues about Polish political and cultural issues were possible only abroad until the end of the 1970s (Adamczyk 2006: 240-241), Polish exile and émigré writing and their institutions abroad also played an important role in raising political awareness in the West with regard to the current situation of Poland and its place in Western Europe (PWN 2015), and to the questions of totalitarianism more broadly, addressed by, for example, Czesław Miłosz in his novel *Zniewolony umysł* [*The Captive Mind*, 1953]. Thus, a number of Polish émigré works were translated into English partly on political grounds (Phillips 2000:1094), including *A Minor Apocalypse*, Richard Lourie’s translation of Tadeusz Konwicki’s novel *Mała apokalipsa* (1983).

The politically infused literary environment was part of Naglerowa’s life right from the moment when she arrived in England in 1946 and stayed there for the rest of her life until her death in 1957. While in London, she was appointed vice-President of the London-based Association of Polish Writers Abroad (Czachowska 1978: 11), founded in 1946 to support values favouring human rights and the right of nations to freedom and to promote Polish literature abroad (ZPPO 2015). At this time, she also co-founded Dom Pisarza (The Writer’s House), the hub of the Polish elites and writers in London (Czachowska 1978: 11); in 1950 she was awarded for her outstanding merits in helping Polish refugees and immigrants in London (Czachowska 1978: 11).

Naglerowa’s early political engagement in London-based Polish émigré literary circles was, then, an important aspect of the situational context of the ensuing project of the translation of her novel into English. It also foreshadowed potential gains from this translation that Naglerowa was likely to have in mind. The translation, which was to mark her debut in Britain, seemed likely to be seen by her only as an attempt to co-align with the political Poland-orientated objectives of émigré writing I have mentioned earlier, rather than with literary trends and preferences of the target reading public in Britain.

In the introduction to the English edition of *Krauzowie i inni*, she conveyed her political stance, linking her pre-war novel with her post-war confinement in Soviet prisons during the Second World War:

> But the people of those later novels are dead. They perished in the dossiers of the Narkomvundel, in the Soviet prison at Lwow, in which I spent some time before being sent to a concentration camp [...] (1954: xiv-xv)
Additionally, her introduction provides the discussed extensive explanation of the historical and political background of the novel and its characters, such as Joseph Krauze:

As early as the second generation the foreign officials (...) began to regard themselves as Polish. They took their place among the ardent Polish patriots, revolutionaries (...) and voluntarily became part of the Polish community (...). One of my principal characters, Joseph Krauze, was the son of a German colonist, Theobald Krauze; but in 1848 Joseph became a revolutionary organiser (Naglerowa 1954: viii).

In addition to redressing the elements erased from the text of translation, the need to foreground the engagement of her characters in the fight for Polish independence could be seen as an attempt to fit the novel with the political and literary goals of Polish émigré writers. It should be recalled, however, that Polish émigré literature, especially works that were concerned with the political situation in Poland, were bound to attract limited attention of target readers, given the differences in the understanding of issues closely related to the history and politics of Poland. The general lack of attention of readers in host countries to émigré writers was an issue that preoccupied Miłosz, who reflects about the writer in exile thus,

[h]e was aware of his task and people were waiting for his words, but he was forbidden to speak. Now where he lives, he is free to speak but nobody listens and, moreover, he forgot what he had to say. (Miłosz 2001: 13)

Therefore, Naglerowa’s allegiance with the goals of Polish émigré writing might possibly have been a factor that contributed to limited acclaim of the English translation of her novel in Britain.

5.2.2 Bruno Schulz’s Cinnamon Shops (1963, London)

This 1963 translation of Schulz’s work marked the debut of his fiction in the English-speaking world. In this section section I shall look at the original context of this translation project in order to see what made it possible for a network of people and institutions to co-operate with a view to publishing the text. As opposed to the politically-charged situational context of the translation of Naglerowa’s novel, the publication of Schulz’s stories in English can be seen as a response to the literary and reading tendencies in the British literature of the early 1960s.
The condition of British literature in the late 1950s and early 1960s was seen as problematic and unstable by a number of literary theorists. In 1952, the British writer and critic Thomas C. Worsley wrote about the “inhibited state” of British literature in his article for the *Times Literary Supplement* (in Hargreaves and Ferrebee 2012: 1-2). The mid-century was also declared by the English poet John Lehmann as “an age without giants” (Lehmann 1956: 2). As the literary scholar Andrzej Gąsiorek (1995: 1) observes, the novel as a form of literary representation was exhausted as a result of the Second World War, the increasing popularity of radio, cinema and television, and the dominance of subjectivism in modernist literature, which was “left with few resources for dealing with social issues”. Thus, new literary forms were devised in Britain to address the reality in the post-war era. For example, Anthony Burgess’s *A Clockwork Orange* (1962) employs Nadsat, an invented slang of mixed words from Slavic languages and Cockney words, which can be read as reference to the dystopian vision of a state in connection with a real threat from the Soviets (a reading offered by Talbot 1963; Krämer 2011: 60-61; or Myers 2012). The themes of Arthur Clarke’s science fiction novels, likewise, echo nuclear and space races between West Europe and Soviet Russia (Feenberg 1995: 51-52), to which I have referred earlier.

From the perspective of polysystem theory, then, as other literatures in Europe, the system of British literature was also undergoing a crisis, creating what polysystem theorists refer to as “a vacuum”. In such a vacuum, as Even-Zohar argues, “no item in the indigenous stock is taken to be acceptable” (1990: 48). Vacuums tend to result from turning points in a system, that is “historical moments where established models are no longer tenable for a younger generation” (Even-Zohar 1990: 48). Consequently, Even-Zohar argues further, “[a]t such moments, even in central literatures, translated literature may assume a central position” (1990: 48). In other words, then, the import of literary forms that can contribute with new literary forms and themes are especially welcome by publishers and readers alike.

Thus, Schulz’s work had the potential to enrich British literature with its individualism and, to use Ficowski’s words, “personality [that was] of the kind of genius who sometimes creates great religious systems, or a magician or master of black arts, whose predecessors were burned at medieval stakes” (Robertson 2003: 26).
5.2.3 Wittlin’s *Salt of the Earth* (London, 1939)

Before looking at the situational context of the publication of the English translation of his novel in the target context, it is worth mentioning that Józef Wittlin was already a widely acclaimed writer in pre-war Poland. In 1936, the novel won a double prize of the *Wiadomości literackie* literary magazine, whose readers, moreover, named *Sól ziemi* the best book of 1935, the year of its publication (Yurieff 1973: 11). In 1939, the novel was awarded the Golden Laurel literary prize by the Polish Academy of Literature (Yurieff 1973: 11). Finally, *Salt of the Earth* was a Polish candidate for the Nobel Prize in 1939 (Wiegandt 1991: lxxx). The immediate success of the novel in Poland, furthered by its acclaim by influential and high-profile actors, increased the chance of the novel to be translated into other languages.24

In addition to the popularity of the novel in the source context, the political and historical circumstances in 1939 and their alignment with one of the main themes of Wittlin’s novel may have been a contributing factor to initiating the process of publishing the book in English translation. As pointed out in 4.2, the main theme of the novel is how war mechanics denigrates individuals, undermining fundamental values of freedom and human dignity (see, for example, Yurieff 1973: 70-98 and Wiegandt 1991: xlvi – lxxi for insightful studies of the novel). And although the novel revolves around the First World War, it exposes the “war myth” in a broader sense (Yurieff 1973: 70; see also Wiegandt 1991: lxxiii), stripped of Polish national or patriotic ideologies. The topics of war, catastrophic visions and human degradation were relatively popular in Polish literature in the interwar period (see Fiecko et al. 2014 for more about Polish catastrophic literature), but they were also likely to resonate with readers across Europe given both the rise of totalitarian regimes of Mussolini, Stalin and Hitler at that time (Roberts 2006: 2), and the imminent threat of the outbreak of the Second World War. The universal representation of war that was less rooted in the Polish historical and political reality than Naglerowa’s work, for example, might possibly have helped readers to identify with the novel’s concerns.

---

24 The novel was first translated into Czech, Dutch, German and Russian in 1937, followed by the translations into Italian, Hungarian, Swedish, French and English in 1939 (see Yurieff 1973: 166 for the dates of the translations into other languages and the translators’ names).
Wittlin himself admitted retrospectively that the experience of the Second World War helped the novel’s international success (Wiegandt 1991: lxxxiii).

A more universal anti-war message of Wittlin’s novel, then, may have fitted well with readers’ interests in Britain in the late 1930s, a period when “the demand for books rose to an unprecedented level” (Feather 2006: 194), making it easier for new and lesser-known fiction to be considered by publishers. And indeed, the time of the Second World War was generally prosperous for British publishers (Unwin 1960:260-261), with the increasing number of published books dealing with issues that reflected the “exigencies of war” (Feather 2006: 194). The 1939 British declaration of war on Germany in mid-September (Hodges 1978: 142) was bound to influence the choices of other British publishers. Indeed, 1939 saw the growing interest in the origins of war and in other crises of civilisation. That year, the Oxford University Press published the second volume of Arnold Toynbee’s *A Study of History*, which focuses on the breakdown of civilisations, alongside the publication of Robin Collingwood’s *An Autobiography*, “in which the crisis through which European civilisation was passing appears first in the shape of an intellectual disease” (Sutcliffe 1978: 247). Both publications coincided with the launch of Oxford Pamphlets on World Affairs (Sutcliffe 1978: 247). Gollancz publishing house, on the other hand, decided to publish Leonard Woolf’s *Barbarians at the Gate*, “which attacked totalitarianism whether of the Fascist or of the Nazi variety” (Sutcliffe 1978: 247). Methuen, which published *Salt of the Earth*, was equally keen to address the burning concerns of the time, an approach that may have helped in their choice of *Salt of the Earth*, an issue I shall discuss in 5.3.3

5.3 Publishers in the network

Drawing on Jones’s analyses of poetry translation projects (2011), I will refer to the process of publishing translations as first-order networks. These first-order networks are formed by specific people (actors) who co-operate together in order to achieve a certain goal (Jones 2011: 25-26; 28; 192). In translation projects, then, first-order

---

25 Detective fiction and left-wing works were also popular (Feather 2006: 170; see also Croft 1990 for more on British left-wing literature in the 1930s), the latter of which, too, mirrored the anti-Nazi and anti-Fascist atmosphere of the time.
networks involve individual people and companies or institutions that can be pinpointed by name, including such actors as the source author, the source text, translators, the text of the translation, and, finally, the publisher, that is the main ‘text transmitters’ who give a translation a physical book form and bring it to the target readers (Jones 2011: 28).

5.3.1 Naglerowa’s Loves and Ambitions

As discussed earlier, the main interest for Naglerowa behind the publication of her novel in English was presumably informed by her ideological affiliation with the current situation in Poland, a priority that distanced her from the interests of the general reading public in Britain. The publisher’s intention, by contrast, was likely to be driven by the reading interests of the British public with a view to marketing the novel. Such a conflict of aims most likely predetermined to some extent the future limited reception of the translation before it was to be submitted for print.

Naglerowa’s novel was published by Heinemann, a London-based well-established publishing house founded in 1890 (McAleer 2016: 25). Heinemann’s aim to target the publication to the widest possible reading audience might have also been driven by the current challenging economic situation, as was the case with the British publishing industry in the 1950s more broadly. It was the time when the texts’ monopoly in the leisure market gave way to a new form of entertainment, television. Publishers had to scrutinise the market more closely despite the fact that the two post-war decades of the economic downturn were over (Bloom 2008: 96). And although the year 1950 saw the largest number of newly published books since the end of the war in 1945 (Feather 2006: 198), the recovery of the British publishing market was hindered by growing competition from the USA and India. The increasing prominence of US publishing houses in Britain also affected Heinemann, which already operated as a subsidiary of the US-based Doubleday Page and Company of New York in 1954 (Feather 2006: 169).

Although a risky venture for Heinemann, the project of translating Krauzowie i inni into English would have aligned with the publisher’s 1951 publication of The World Apart, the English translation of Inny świat by the renowned émigré Polish writer Gustaw Herling-Grudziński. Translated by Marek Ciolkosz (penname Joseph Marek), the book gave an account of the writer’s imprisonment in a Soviet labour
camp, a theme which, as I have pointed out earlier, was common within Polish émigré writing. Heinemann also boasted a tradition of introducing new writers and literary experiences to British literature. Heinemann’s International Library series of translations, edited by the English writer and critic Edmund Gosse (1849-1928), aimed at popularising literature from other countries (Warner 2008: 6566). Similarly, Heinemann’s support granted to James Loeb contributed to the foundation of the New York Loeb Classical Library, which specialised in publishing bilingual English - Latin and Greek texts (see Horsley 2011 for a brief historical outline of the Library). The tradition of exploring new areas in literature remained in Heinemann’s business in the 1950s as well, when the publisher embarked on new educational publishing schemes in such countries as Ghana and Nigeria (Beale 1993). And yet, given the economic situation on the British publishing market, it made sense for Heinemann to proceed with a certain degree of caution during the process of publishing Loves and Ambitions, especially given the fact that the novel was an English literary debut of a Polish writer with whom the British reading public would have been largely unfamiliar.

In order to secure success, then, Heinemann was likely to fit the novel with as many interests of the reading public as possible. And these are also shaped by politics.

The worldwide Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962, a six-day public contest between the USA and the Soviet Union over the presence of Soviet nuclear missiles in Cuba, was the peak of the Cold War conflict, making it a very real threat across Europe and in the rest of the world (Colman 2016: 1). In addition to inspiring some British writers, the Cold War also steered readers’ curiosity towards the countries behind the iron curtain, a tendency which was mirrored in the increased popularity of Russian literature in Britain in the 1950s and 1960s (Falchikov 2000: 607), and which aligned with the overall increased number of literary translations I have discussed earlier. The other end of the spectrum of reading interests in the 1950s included family sagas as well as historical and costume romances (Bloom 2008: 35), such as Daphne du Maurier’s mystery-romance My Cousin Rachel (1951), Norah Loft’s Jassy (1945) and her later historical romance novels; or many romance and mystery novels by Georgette Heyer (Bloom 2008: 218).

The publication of Naglerowa’s novel seems likely to be the publisher’s attempt to address as wide a reading audience as possible in the 1950s. A change in the original title, as discussed in the previous chapter, could be seen as a strategic
move to attract readers of light literature. On the other hand, Naglerowa’s novel was introduced as offering a picture of Poland different from dominant war- and Communist-themed works. In her preface written for the English edition, Naglerowa herself pointed out that Poland was “a country almost unknown to English readers” (1954: vi), an assumption that might have possibly encouraged the publisher to contribute with Naglerowa’s novel to the British literature which, it should be recalled, was relatively unstable and in need for new themes at the time, to embark on the project. However, the dominant lack of knowledge about Polish history among the general reading public in Britain seems likely to partly explain the change of the title in translation and why specific historical and political references were obscured during the process of translation, as previously discussed.

Thus, the conflicting aims of the publisher and the writer were likely to limit the potential of the book to align well with the interests of readers. The translated text in its final form, including the style of translation and its paratextual presentation, seemed unlikely to make an important contribution either to war-themed writing or to lighter literature: the title of the translated text contradicts the main theme of this historical novel, as does the translation approach which deprives the text of a number of significant references to Polish culture and history.

5.3.2 Schulz’s Cinnamon Shops
As I have already pointed out in the discussion of the situational context of the publication of Schulz’s works in English (5.2.2), British literature in the 1960s, was generally perceived as in need of new literary forms, as claimed by literary critics. As noted earlier, in the theory of polysystems, a recently emerged literary system (such as Polish-Jewish fiction in pre-war Poland, discussed in 2.2.1), or a system that experiences some instability (such as post-war British literature) is bound to borrow new literary forms from other systems, be it from a system within the same polysystem, or from a different one.

The publication of Schulz’s short stories by the British publishing house MacGibbon and Kee resonated with the discussed conditions of British literature of that time. The publisher probed into different areas in search of new literature. In 1963, it published a variety of non-fiction works about science, society and politics, such as Fernando Henriques’s Prostitution and Society: A Survey, Willi Guttsman’s
They also included translations, such as Michael Heron’s translation of *Papua: Beasts and Men* by André Dupeyrat. It also published a number of English translations of literary fiction, including Robert MacDonald’s translation of *War and Peace* by Leo Tolstoy, Tatiana Shebunina’s translation of *Eve of War 1933-1941* by Ilya Ehrenburg, novels which reflected the general interest in war-themed fiction, influenced, it should be recalled, by the Cold War atmosphere of the 1960s.

Such search of new literature for English translation must have entailed looking at literary developments in other countries. And that dependency could have brought Schulz to the attention of the publisher MacGibbon and Kee. From the perspective of polysystem theory, the system of British literature imported a new literary work of fiction by Schulz from another literary system, that of France. However, in order to explain how this import happened, I need to utilise the concept of actors and networks: MacGibbon and Kee had, most likely, links with specific actors from the French literary system, in which Georges Sidre was a co-translator (next to Suzanne Arlet, Allan Kosko and Georges Lisowski) of Schulz’s collection of stories translated as *Traité des mannequins* [*Treatise of the mannequins*], published in Paris by Julliard in 1961, three years before the English translation of Schulz’s works.

The person (or actor to use the term from actor network theory) who linked the two systems (from the systemic perspective) was Eric Mosbacher, who relay-translated, i.e. translated from another translation, Polish fiction from French, such as Witold Gombrowicz’s *Ferdydurke* (1961), drawing on the French translation by Martin (Kapolka 2002: 353), and Gombrowicz’s *Cosmos* (1967), drawing on the French translation by Sidre. Although the last translation, which involved Sidre, took place four years after the 1963 English translation of Schulz in question, Sidre had known Schulz’s short stories from his earlier co-translations (*Traité des Mannequins*).

Aiming to attract the attention of readers to the English debut of Schulz’s works, MacGibbon and Kee ensured to present the book in a way that would be potentially appealing to British readers. Paratexts that accompanied the first edition of *Cinnamon Shops* suggest that the publishers desired to facilitate its reception in Britain. The front blurb said, “A piece like *The Birds* may put the English reader in
mind of a haunted Edward Lear while in *The Comet* the author seems to envision the world's end - a prophecy perhaps of life on the day of nuclear disaster.” The reference to the English artist and poet Edward Lear in the blurb might possibly have helped the English reader locate Schulz’s stories in a familiar literary ground, which, perhaps, made the book slightly less obscure to the general reading public. ‘Nuclear war’, on the other hand, related the book to the Missile Scare, with which most British readers were bound to identify. Similarly, the back cover blurb contained a reference to the widely known Czech writer Franz Kafka, a reference which was likely to have a similar effect on potential readers as the previously mentioned paratexts. The cover blurb introduced Schulz as a talented individual, a statement that could be inviting for those readers who were seeking new literary voices, much needed in the 1960s.

5.3.3 Wittlin’s *Salt of the Earth*

The Methuen publishing house was founded in 1889, and the publication of Rudyard Kipling’s *Barrack-Room Ballads* in 1892 was the first major success by the publisher (Duffy 1989: 5), which then led to its more established position in England in the following years. The diverse list of Methuen’s publications prior to the publication of the English translation of Wittlin’s novel in 1939 included works by Henrik Ibsen, Jack London, Alan Milne and many others (see Duffy 1989: 1-104 for more). In 1933, when Adolf Hitler rose to power in Germany (Roberts 2006: 2), Methuen published *A History of the Nazi Movement*, the English translation from the German of Konrad Heiden’s work about the history of Nazism (Duffy 1989: 98-99). It was only one of the many series of publications by Methuen that indicated the publisher’s involvement in raising political awareness of the general reading public. In her monograph about the Methuen’s list, the writer Maureen Duffy (1989: 99) notes thus:

> It can’t be alleged that Methuen as a company shirked its political duty in bringing the rise of fascism and dictatorship to the attention of the British public. The relevant titles run like a dark thread through the annual lists, beginning with the translation of Guiseppe Prezzolini’s account of Italian fascism and Mussolini in 1926.

That “dark thread” addressed issues that lay at the core of dictatorial power and totalitarianism (Duffy 1989: 99), and illuminated the understanding of the mechanics of dictatorship. It is worth noting that Methuen also published a variety of books that revolved around comedy, religion and nostalgia, “manifestations of the search for
explanation and security” (Duffy 1989: 103). It was in such context that the English translation of Sól ziemí was published in 1939. The universality of the novel, which asks questions about the nature of war, was likely to align with the attempts of the readers to understand what underpinned totalitarian ideologies that were on the rise in continental Europe. What was also likely to draw the attention of Methuen to Wittlin’s work was the novel’s translations into other languages in the rest of Europe, especially when the strategy to following up other literary markets was presumably common given that the demand for new literature in Britain was relatively high in the late 1930s. Such a dependency could have required direct contact between actors involved in the processes of translating work by the same author into different languages, as with the case of the English translation of Schulz’s stories, although the connections between actors involved in the translations of Wittlin’s novel would require further research.

Thus, it is likely that the political events were important factors that contributed to the publication of Sól ziemí in English. Moreover, the shared interest in anti-war ideology of the writer, publisher and the readers were bound to secure the novel relative popularity at the time (which I shall discuss further in 5.5.3).

5.4 Translators in the network

The role of translators in the networks of translation projects may vary, but according to Jones, it is rather rare for them to be the leading decision-makers (Jones 2011:189). In the process of publishing Loves and Ambitions, it should be recalled, the writer’s aims behind the publication of the translation were linked to literary and political gains that had to do with the current political situation of Poland. The publisher Heinemann, by contrast, was likely to relate the project with the interests of the target reading audience. In such conflicting political affiliations, it was the co-translators involved in translating Naglerowa’s novel, Marek Ciolkosz (penname Joseph Marek) and Stephen Garry (penname Henry Charles Stevens), who were likely to negotiate their positions in that network.
5.4.1 Naglerowa’s Loves and Ambitions

However, a limited decision-making power does not imply that translators were bound to have a neutral position in a particular network. On the contrary, Ciółkosz’s political allegiance aligned with Naglerowa’s in that he was born to London-based Polish émigrés who were committed to the democratic cause of Poland (Kowalski 2002 for more about it). Ciółkosz’s identification with such goals was likely to be one of the reasons behind his commitment to translate Herling-Grudziński’s memoir, an important testimony of the mechanics of the Soviet labour camps. The other co-translator Garry, as far as my research has been able to establish, was unlikely to be affiliated with the ideologies of the Polish émigré writers. Therefore, the presence of two actors with the shared agenda in this network could have shifted the entire project towards their aim of greater visibility among the émigré community, an objective that was to transpire in the reception of the translation, which I will address in section 5.5.1.

Equally important in translation projects is the translation competence of the translators involved, which encompasses their innate and acquired skills, knowledge and experience. Although the translation competence and the career path of every translator will vary, an early career professional in the field of literary translation “needs further training and education, normally interwoven with the experience she or he is gaining in the professional field”, as pointed out in the PETRA-E framework of reference for the training of literary translators, based on the enquiry by the Dutch-Flemish Centre of Expertise in Literary Translation (PETRA-E 2016). In actor network theory terms, the interpersonal, intertextual and social aspects of the translator’s experience are collectively referred to as “a career web” (Jones 2011: 51), which entails cognitive skills and benefits from co-operating with fellow professionals in the field.

Ciółkosz’s career web in the field of Polish English translations is fairly limited. By 1954, he had translated only one book into English (cf. Appendix 5 for the detailed list of his translations), a fact which may call the choice of Ciółkosz as the first translator into question and which may suggest political reasons behind that choice. Garry, by contrast, was a more experienced translator although his translations before 1954 included primarily English translations of Russian rather than Polish
literature (cf. Appendix 5 for titles). And yet, despite his significant experience in translating Russian literature, some aspects of these translations raised a certain degree of criticism. Brian Baer, a translation scholar (2000: 1276), drew the attention to Garry’s failure to portray regional dialects and colloquial expressions in Sholokhov’s fiction (see Appendix 5 for his 1934 and 1940 translations). This criticism echoes instances of the erasure of local dialects in the English translation of *Krauzowie i inni* (see 3.2). Moreover, Garry’s translations of Russian literature, alongside translations by other translators, were referred to as “pretty unsatisfactory” by publishers of the *New Writing* literary series to which Garry and other translators contributed their works between 1936 and 1939 (Patterson 2013: 200; Whitehead 1990: ix-x; 93). The limited scope of their career webs in the field of Polish to English translations may explain why the English translation of *Krauzowie i inni* is deprived of various source-text elements. A flattening translation approach may have contributed to the limited engagement with Naglerowa’s novel in English translation among target readers.

### 5.4.2 Schulz’s *Cinnamon Shops*

Although Schulz’s works most likely won the attention of the British publisher due to its connections with the French literary developments by the mediating role of the translator Mosbacher, it was Wieniewska who was involved in the process of translating *Sklepy cynamonowe* into English. Her plans regarding the text, as I seek to show in this section, co-aligned with those of the publisher, increasing the chances of wider reception of Schulz’s short stories.

The chances for better acclaim were also furthered by Wieniewska’s experience in translating Polish fiction into English. The career web of Wieniewska by 1963, when her translation of Schulz’s work was published in Britain, was more extensive than that of Ciolkosz and Garry (cf. Appendix 5 for the complete list of her translations). This experience brought her recognition as a literary translator (Czaykowski 1967). In 1955, for example, Wieniewska was commissioned to produce a translation of the works by the Polish writer Czesław Miłosz, the future Nobel Literary Prize winner. As a result, she translated his novel *Zdobycie władzy* (1955) as *The Usurpers* that year. This translation was later published in the USA as *The Seizure of Power* (1982).
Therefore, it makes sense to assume that discussed instances of omission in her translation of Schulz’s stories could be seen as her own way to facilitate the reception of his fiction rather than instances of negligence, an observation also made by the American translator Madeline Levine (Jankowicz 2012). Although, as far as is known, Wieniewska never disclosed her translation strategy, as suggested by Levine (Jankowicz 2012), Wieniewska’s aim behind translating Schulz’s works was, presumably, to translate Schulz’s stories “satisfactorily” (to use her own word quoted below), that is presumably in a way that would not be too challenging for target readers. This assumption was the main drive behind her translation project four years later, when Wieniewska excluded a particular poem by the Polish poet and critic Artur Międzyrzeczki from her anthology of Polish literature in English translation on the account that he “proved not to translate into English satisfactorily [...]” (Wieniewska 1967: 13). The reception of Schulz’s stories (5.5.2) will show that despite certain omissions, Wieniewska’s translation was readable enough to attract the attention of English-speaking readers, most notably in the USA. And although there were attempts to re-translate single stories into English by other translators26, Wieniewska’s translations have until recently continued to be the English voice of Bruno Schulz since her debut, as her wide acclaim suggests. Perhaps not surprisingly then, Wieniewska also translated the second volume of Schulz’s short stories which were comprised in Sanatorium under the Sign of the Hourglass (1977, New York).

5.4.3 Wittlin’s Salt of the Earth

Very little is known about Pauline de Chary’s life and career27. However, the history of de Chary’s translations prior to the 1939 publication of her English translation of Wittlin’s novel (see Appendix 5 for titles) indicates that not only was Salt of the Earth her debut translation from Polish but that it also topped a long list of languages de Chary had translated from during her career (i.e. French, German, Russian, Swedish and Italian). Although the available bibliographic data of her earlier translations name

26 These include the English translation of “Mój ojciec wstępuje do strażaków” by W. Stanley Moss and Zofia Tarnowska (Moss and Tarnowska 1958) and Louis Iribarne’s translation of two stories “Jesięń” and “Republika marzen” (Iribarne 1987)
27 Classe’s Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English, for example, does not include her name or any of the writers she had translated before 1939 (Classe 2000).
her as the translator of all the works, it also makes sense to assume that de Chary’s translation relied on earlier translations of Wittlin’s work.

The paratextual note to the 1939 edition of this translation names only de Chary as the translator (de Chary 1939: title page). However, it seems that informing the reader whether a particular translation was from the original language was a policy that was pursued by Methuen at the time. The title page of The Death Box, the 1936 English translation of Alexei Tolstoi’s novel published by Methuen, contains a note that the work was translated from the original Russian by Bernard Guilbert Guerney. Similarly, The Soul of the White Ant, Methuen’s 1937 edition of the English translation of Eugène N. Marais’s book, acknowledges that the translation was done by Winifred de Kok from Afrikaans. Such care taken to inform the reader about the translation is missing in the case of Salt of the Earth. Another paratextual fact that allows me to assume that de Chary relied on another translation while working on Wittlin’s novel is another note that says the novel was first published as Sól ziemi Chistranslatia (de Chary 1939: v), a title which not only does not correspond with the original Sól ziemi but the meaning of which is unclear - it is not certain what “chistranslatia” might mean in Polish and whether such a word exists at all. The only actor, in the network of the project of publishing Salt of the Earth, who would have been versed in Polish would have been de Chary – and yet, the misinformation was not rectified. There are indicators, then, that de Chary utilised one of the novel’s earlier translations to translate Sól ziemi in English.

Assuming that de Chary’s was a relay translation, which tends to be seen by translation practitioners as “a necessary evil” that is likely to convey any mistakes or shifts from the original translation in addition to shifts in the final translation (Baker and Saldahna 2009: 230), then de Chary’s translation may include a significant number of omissions and flattening changes, shifts which might have hindered a wider and long-standing acclaim of the novel in Britain. And, indeed, a fleeting interest in Salt of the Earth expressed in initial reviews (discussed further on in the next section) has not encouraged any further re-readings and re-translations of the book. De Chary’s remains the only English translation of Wittlin’s novel thus far. Such a short-lived career of Wittlin shortly before and during the Second World War in Britain may indicate that the main idea behind its original translation into English may have
possibly been to meet the concerns of the general reading public at the time when the outbreak of the Second World War was certain.

5.5 Reception

In actor network theory, readers are linked to first-order network actors by interest networks. Interest networks comprise real groups of people who read the translation, mostly reviewers, who then introduce the translated text to the target reading public in the real world (Jones 2011: 67). Because the translations I am concerned with have not boasted a wider acclaim, critical reviews will be the main sources from which I will infer further conclusions regarding the reception of the translations in question.

5.5.1 Naglerowa’s Loves and Ambitions

As far as my research has allowed me to establish, only two reviews of Loves and Ambitions have survived: one appeared in Polish in Britain, and the other in English in the present-day Kirkus Reviews US literary magazine, the discussion of which lies outside of the focus of this thesis (although its full text is attached as Appendix 4). In Britain, the only extant review was published in the 1954 issue of the Polish-language Orzel bialy journal (White Eagle), which was aimed at Polish-speaking readers in Britain. The magazine was the literary organ of Polish émigrés in Britain and, therefore, displayed a political slant, indicated by the headline ‘Polska walcząca o wolność’ (Poland fighting for freedom) on the title page. Although the review of the English translation of Naglerowa’s novel was fairly short, its second part conveyed significant information regarding the perception of Naglerowa’s debut in English:

This book should pave the way to translating another, perhaps more up-to-date book which is likely to draw more interest from citizens of the West, namely Sprawa Józefa Mosta (The Case of Jozef Most). (I.C. 1954, my translation)

The reviewer went on to explain that Sprawa Józefa Mosta, a realistic literary testimony of the mechanics of the Soviet prison system, drew extensively on Naglerowa’s own imprisonment in Soviet-occupied Lvov shortly after the outbreak of the Second World War. After harrowing interrogation, Naglerowa was sentenced to eight years of forced labour in Kazakhstan (Terlecki 1967: 17).

It makes sense to assume, then, that the theme of Sprawa...would, perhaps, help Naglerowa gain wider acclaim as a Polish émigré writer once she made a debut
with *Loves and Ambition* in Britain. However, the limited response to Naglerowa’s novel in Britain, which was largely confined to that single review, thwarted the initial plans behind the translation. Even that single review had a very limited impact on the target reading public because it was published in the Polish-language journal. The lack of acclaim of the reading public can be seen as “the safest mode of attack when one’s author has no expectant public,” as noted by the English writer George Gissing in *New Grub Street* in 1891 (Gissing 2016: 148). Similarly, the limited reception of Naglerowa’s novel by the British audience may well have been related to her political and literary identification with Polish émigré literature from the very beginning of the process of publishing the novel, a position which, as I have pointed out earlier in 4.2.1, took into account the expectations of the British reading public only partly given the hermetic nature of and specific literary themes pursued in post-war Polish émigré literature. Not surprisingly, therefore, since the 1954 publication of *Loves and Ambitions*, not only have the two remaining volumes of the *Krauzowie i inni* trilogy never been translated but neither has *Sprawa Józefa Mosta*.

### 5.5.2 Schulz’s Cinnamon Shops

In this section I intend to focus on the reception of Schulz’s short stories in the USA, where his work has been recognised more widely than in the UK, to establish what contributed to his acclaim there and draw conclusions about what was different in Britain. It is worth recalling that the pre-war collection of Schulz’s short stories I am concerned with was originally entitled *Sklepy cynamonowe*, which was translated into English by Wieniewska for the first time in 1963. The same translation, as I have pointed out in the previous chapter, was published under the title of *The Street of Crocodiles* in the USA in the same year. The initial response to his debut in the USA was promising but not sufficient to secure popularity. Isaac Bashevis Singer wrote a review, in Yiddish, of Schulz’s short stories in the *Forverts* [*Forward*] Yiddish daily (Shmeruk 1991: 161), but its influence on the general American reading public was necessarily limited. Robert Stilwell, a scholar of comparative literature, reviewed Schulz’s works in *The Saturday Review*, concluding with caution that they “merit much wider audience that [they are] probably going to find” (Stilwell 1963: 45). One year later Wieniewska’s translation was awarded the first Roy Translation Literary Prize (Wieniewska 1967:201), whose current prestige is rather difficult to establish.
It is sometimes considered that Schulz became more widely known after the American novelist Philip Roth decided to include the short story “The Street of Crocodiles” in the 1977 *Writers from the Other Europe* Penguin Series he edited (I shall return to Roth and Schulz below). This publication drew the attention of the American writer Cynthia Ozick, who was keen to discover more about Schulz from the copies of his letters that Roth made accessible to her (Kauvar 1993:203). The increased popularity of Schulz since then, if looked at from the perspective of the theory of actor networks, confirms an assumption that interest networks that form around a published work need to involve an actor with considerable symbolic and cultural power, as noted earlier.

However, the focus of the increasing attention to Schulz’s works changed over time. Between Schulz’s debut in 1963 to the late 1970s, it was mainly Schulz’s life that tended to be in the centre of attention of the audience. In other words, the style of his writing, and thus also of the translation, initially mattered less for the target audience. Singer’s Yiddish review, which I have mentioned above, discussed mainly the cultural differences in the backgrounds of Schulz as a Polish-Jewish writer, and that of Singer, a Polish Jewish writer who wrote in Yiddish (Shmeruk 1991: 161). The preface and the introduction written by Wieniewska and Ficowski respectively for Roth’s 1977 Penguin edition also revolved around Schulz’s life. In the second part of his introduction, Ficowski reflected about the nature of Schulz’s writing thus: “To what genre does *The Street of Crocodiles* belong? (…) I consider it an autobiographical novel (…) It is an autobiography – or rather, a genealogy – of the spirit…” (Kandel 1977: 20). Schulz’s works was described as an autobiographical novel also by Roth, who interviewed Singer to “talk about Schulz and about what life had been like for a Jewish writer in Poland” (Roth 1977: 50).

That dominant focus on Schulz’s life on the part of the audience in the USA was largely driven by a particular attention to Schulz’s tragic death. He was shot by the local Gestapo in the Drohobycz ghetto on the 19th of November in 1943 (Robertson 2002: 226). This tragic incident that ended Schulz’s life was bound to draw interest in the USA given that Holocaust literature has been particularly popular in the USA (cf. 3.2.3). In his review, Stilwell wrote that “*The Street of Crocodiles* […] introduces a unique voice from Nazi-occupied Poland” (Stilwell 1963: 40), a statement which contradicts the facts because Schulz wrote his two works of fiction,
as I have listed in the Introduction (cf. Table 1), before the Second World War broke out. Another review written for *The New York Times* in 1964 opened with the reference to Schulz’s death, bound to influence the readers’ interpretation of his stories before reading:

BRUNO SCHULZ, the author of this remarkable collection of stories, lived a solitary life in the provincial Polish town of Drohobycz, where he sustained himself outwardly by teaching art in a boys’ school, and inwardly by consecrating endless hours to writing—until, in 1942, he was shot dead by a Gestapo agent for venturing outside the ghetto to which he and the rest of the town’s Jews had been confined (Hamel 1964) Such a label does not only contradict the facts but it also obliterates the main drive of Schulz behind writing, which for him was underpinned with life rather than death. In his letter to the Polish literary critic Andrzej Pleśniewicz he wrote thus:

Were it possible to turn back development, achieve a second childhood (…) achieve its fullness and immensity – that would be the incarnation of an “age of genius”, “messianic times” which are promised and pledged to us by all mythologies. My ideal goal is to “mature” into childhood. (Roberston 2003: 72)

This unjust association of his fiction with the horrors of the Second World War is part of the shadow of the Holocaust and its discussed influence on pre-war literary achievements of Polish Jews. And yet, the Holocaust label that was pinned to Schulz’s works back then has taken root and still holds today. In her discussion of Holocaust literature, the Holocaust scholar Gillian Banner says that she chose to include Schulz’s stories “because of his relationship with memory and because his works illustrate a problematic aspect of the Holocaust” to the extent that, she further argues, they “reveal a world of loss” and “introduce the Holocaust into European literature” (Banner 2000:3). Moreover, a significant number of articles about Schulz’s works that were published in *New York Times* in the early 2000s linked his writing with the Holocaust, with such titles as ‘Debating Who Controls Holocaust Artifacts’ (Smith, 2001); ‘In Search of a Creative Light that Nazis Tried to Blot Out’ (Bohlen, 2002); or ‘His Art Couldn’t Save Him From an Era’s Evil’ (Bernstein, 2002).

Owing to the Holocaust label, Schulz’s life and death also inspired other US writers in their creative writing. Schulz’s murder was the main drive for Philip Roth to write *The Prague Orgy* (1985). Similarly, Ozick’s 1987 novel *The Messiah of Stockholm* was inspired by the allegedly lost manuscript of Schulz’s masterpiece
*Messiah* and Schulz’s life more generally (see Sokoloff 1988 for more on reinventing Schulz by Ozick). More recently, twenty years after the publication of Roth and Ozick’s novels, *The Street of Crocodiles*, a favourite of the American writer Jonathan Safran Foer, inspired him to create *Tree of Codes*, a work of art in a book form, which is made of fragments of short stories from *The Street of Crocodiles* (see Wagner 2010 for his interview with Foer about *Tree of Codes*).

Although the story of Schulz’s life has always been picked up by US writers, the interest in Schulz’s life receded in importance for the audience when the English translation (also by Wieniewska) of his other work *Sanatorium pod klepsydrą* was published in the USA in 1979, in the same series edited by Roth, one year after its first edition was published by the New York-based publisher Walker. The front blurb no longer presented Schulz as an unknown writer, as in the case of the 1977 edition of *The Street…*, but called him a versatile artist instead, indicating a certain degree of acclaim Schulz had won since his debut in the USA. The prefatorial presentation changed its focus from the writer’s life towards Schulz’s literary style (or rather that of the translation). This volume was prefaced by Wieniewska, and introduced by the American writer John Updike. The engagement of the prominent US literary figure rather than a Polish critic, as was the case of the 1977 edition of *The Street…*, was also indicative of Schulz’s relatively wide recognition and, presumably, contributed to his success. Updike shares his insights into Schulz’s style (1979: xiii-xix), comparing it to writers such as Franz Kafka, Marcel Proust and Joseph Conrad.

In his essay about Bruno Schulz, originally written in 2003, the South African John Maxwell Coetzee also comments on the style of Wieniewska’s translation of Schulz’s *Sklepy cynamonowe*, saying that ‘her translations read very well. Her prose has a rare richness, grace and unity of style’ (2007: 70). The 2008 US Penguin Classics edition of *The Street of Crocodiles and Other Stories* was prefaced by Foer, who focused more on Schulz’s unique artistic style more broadly, rather than his life. It also contains a rather extensive introduction by the Polish literary scholar David Goldfarb, who shares his insights about the cultural and literary background of Schulz’s stories. But he also points out specific omissions in Wieniewska’s translations, one of them being referred to thus:

A particularly poignant symbol of the mythic potential of all matter in Schulz is the figure of the *paluba*. *Paluba* is a word so untranslatable that Celina Wieniewska
cannot settle on a single English word for it, and sometimes simply passes it over (Goldfarb 2008: xvi).

A more insightful interest in literary style rather than the writer’s life, however, inevitably raised questions about Wieniewska’s translation of Schulz’s stories. In his essay, Coetzee, for example, also points out that “there are occasions when Wieniewska silently amends Schulz […], makes it less florid, or universalises specifically Jewish allusions” (2007: 69-70). Similarly, the translator John C. Davis (2012) highlighted omitted passages, too much explanation and paraphrases, accusing the translator of shying away from the challenge to convey Schulz’s original style, adding that her translation conveyed Schulz’s original style “in a muffled way”. Theodosia Robertson, who translated and edited Jerzy Ficowski’s Regiony wielkiej herezji, an insightful study of Schulz’s literature and life (Robertson 2003), noticed that in 1963, in the year of the English debut of Schulz’s short stories, “the translator’s mission was to bring [them] to the English-speaking audience and that (…) Wieniewska’s readable translations succeeded admirably in their task” (Robertson 2003:18). She also added that it “[was] time for a more precise translation, one that does not simplify Schulz’s imagery or universalize his references” (2003: 18). Such instances of criticism of Wieniewska’s translation foreshadowed an emerging need for new readings of Schulz’s works in English. As a result, a new English translation of Sklepy cynamonowe by Davis was published in 2016 (Davis 2016), and his translations of other stories by Schulz are available online (Davis 2016a). Madeline Levine, a literary scholar and translator, has been working on a new English translation of the collected stories by Schulz (NYRB 2012; Jankowicz 2012). In an interview with the Tygodnik powszechny weekly, Levine argues that “the fiction of Bruno Schulz lies within the upper limits of translation impossibilities” and therefore it needed to be re-translated (Jankowicz 2012, my translation).

The gradual need for new translations of Schulz’s stories resonates with an observation of the American poet and translator Willis Barnstone, who observed that “[t]ranslation can never be definitive” in that “it survives and must be constantly refashioned and reborn” (1993: 231). Perhaps a translation of a little known writer from a remote country should be fairly plain and easy to read to win the interest of the target audience in the first place, and subsequently provoke questions and demands about deeper readings in the translation. However, given different responses to the
same translation in the USA and in Britain, it makes sense to assume that a plain translation may be one of the requirements for the readers’ lasting interest at the initial stage, which may then lead to re-translations. That interest, however, may also depend on the target reading public since it was thanks to some cultural characteristics of the US culture more broadly that Schulz’s work was recognised there better than in Britain. And because the initial response was related to Schulz’s life, it is likely that that characteristic has been related to a different attitude to Jewishness (and to the Holocaust) the recognition of which, as I have explained in Chapter 3, has long been problematic in Britain. It is worth recalling that in the Britain of the 1950s and the 1960s, the recognition of Jewishness in the literary world, especially in British-Jewish prose fiction rather than poetry, was only about to emerge (cf. 3.2.1.4). In the USA, in contrast, the place of American Judaism, although raising its own questions (see Sarna 2004), has historically been much more visible than in Britain. Indeed, “for the major part of American history it has been the nation’s largest and most visible non-Christian faith”, whereby active Jewish religious and secular institutions have extended the concept of American pluralism (Sarna 2004: xv). Similarly, on the literary plane, it is “the effort to revitalize Jewish life that lies at the origins of American Jewish life,” as noted by the scholar of Jewish studies Julian Levinson in his discussion of the image of America in selected works of Jewish American literature of the 19th century (Levinson 2016: 31).

The interest in Schulz’s works in the USA suggests that a writer can become acclaimed in a way that means that the style, also in translation, recedes in importance. The issue of the shifting importance of factors can be considered as a future development of actor network theory.

5.5.3 Wittlin’s Salt of the Earth
The 1939 English translation of Wittlin’s novel enjoyed a certain degree of popularity to the extent that Methuen published the second edition in 1940 after the debut. The first positive reviews printed in the popular newspapers in 1939 praised the novel, in particular the new perspectives on the nature of war offered by Salt of the Earth, the response that might have possibly been expected by the publishers. Selected fragments of 1939 reviews were published in Polish in the Polish literary magazine Wiadomości literackie (“O ‘Soli ziemi’ w Anglii” 1939: 7). The Observer (28th May)
published a review by the leading English novelist and critic Frank Swinnerton, who noted that the novel questioned the widely accepted Carlyle doctrine according to which history was made by great and brave people. Instead, he went on to argue, historians should look at ordinary anonymous people who not only make history but often are also its victims. Swinnerton’s reading of the novel resonated with that of the poet and critic Richard Church, shared in the review “Joseph Wittlin Shows Us War as It Attends the Peasants” in *John O’London’s Weekly* (19th August 1939). Drawing on his reflections about the novel, Church observed that the contemporary concept of war was different than twenty years before, whereby “a peasant was more important than an emperor”.

Although the link to the war was a major issue that was foregrounded in the reviews, what also transpires from the surviving analyses of Wittlin’s novel is the critical acclaim of de Chary’s translation, also praised in the texts by Swinnerton and Church. In another review published in *The Manchester Guardian* (27th August 1939), the critic Wilfrid Gibson appreciated the translation, especially its conveyance of the Hutsul culture that envelops the main protagonist and the preservation of the variety of languages in the former Austro-Hungarian empire as represented in the novel. Another reviewer in *Times* (26th August 1939) pointed to the style of the translation which can make minor events become serious in the eyes of the protagonist, “the intensity of poetic perception”. This aspect of the narrative could have been unnoticed by target readers considering the translation shifts that change the narrative point of view (cf. 4.2.2).

And yet, despite the initial enthusiastic responses to its English debut, the novel has not stood the test of time. Since the publication of the second edition of *Salt*..., no further editions or re-translations have been published in Britain. Such a fleeting acclaim, informed by the political context which was especially highlighted by the critics, may suggest that in order for a translation to maintain a certain degree of continuous interest in the target context, it needs to invite different readings regardless of the initial context in which it was published for the first time. A change of interest from the life of the writers to their fiction, for example, could be noticed in the American reception of Schulz’s works.

Similarly, although Wieniewska’s translation of Schulz’s stories was initially successful enough to win the attention of the reading public, it has recently begun to
be criticised, inviting further re-translations, as pointed out in the previous chapter. And although the reception of the individual translated text may differ in each case, it makes sense to assume that the anchor points which help target readers engage with a translated text should be linked to a theme that the target reading public could relate to beyond the initial context of the publication, as with the case of Schulz’s life and Jewishness in the USA.

5.6 Polish-Jewish literature in British-published anthologies

The preceding discussion of the acclaim of Schulz’s short stories in the USA has accentuated the importance of cultural characteristics of the target context for literary reception. However, as pointed out at the beginning of this chapter, a particular literary context for reception can also be shaped by factors relating to literary production. In other words, publishers and their publications also contribute to creating contexts for future publications. Anthologies, in particular collections of literary works published with a view to portraying a literature from a particular country in a condensed form, are perhaps especially important in shaping the general awareness about foreign literature in the minds of the general reading public. Translation anthologies, as noted by the literary scholar Paul Barnaby, tend to “offer a potted social history of the source culture” and, thus, have “a potential for both challenging and reinforcing prejudices or stereotypes” (Barnaby 2002: 86; after Kaszyński). In other words, such collections of texts which, it should be recalled, are also seen as actors in actor network theory, by shaping the awareness and expectations of the general reading public, not only inform the context of a particular network of a translation project, but they also determine a potential reception of a literary work. In this section, therefore, I intend to look at two British-published anthologies that include Polish Jewish literature. The first one, The Modern Polish Mind. An Anthology (1962), was edited by Maria Kuncewicz, a recognised Polish novelist and essayist in 1962. The second one, Portraits in Literature: The Jews of Poland, was published in 2011 and edited by Hava Bromberg Ben-Zvi, a writer and a Polish-born Holocaust survivor.

Kuncewicz’s overall aim behind the anthology was to present “a panorama of life rather than a show of literary excellence’ (Kuncewicz 1962: 3). In her introduction, she was clear about the aims behind editing the collection, which were largely politically motivated. She said, “West-oriented, Catholic Poland, a Slavic
country [...] serves as meeting ground for the two great forces of our time, Western democracy and Eastern Communism”, adding that literary representations of the minds of Poles would enrich ‘universal human experience’ with reflections of Polish literary minds ‘torn between German nationalist vindications on one side and the Soviet might on the other’ (Kuncewicz 1962: 3). The way she referred to Poland, however, foreshadowed an excluding nature of the entire collection: ‘Catholic Poland’ excludes other religions, while ‘Slavic’ leaves out other ethnic minorities. Additionally, the political allegiances of the Poles of the 1960s were not only oriented to the West, as suggested by her phrase “West-oriented Poland”. The political affiliations of Poles after the end of the Second World War were more nuanced. Indeed, there were Poles, including Polish writers and members of the elite, such as the prose writer Jerzy Andrzejewski or the poet Konstant Ildefons Galczynski, who were lured by the ideology of the Communist doctrine, a process explained by Miłosz’s Zniewolony umysł [Captive Mind, 1953].

I shall discuss Kuncewicz’s choice of texts only as far as her selection of Polish-Jewish writing is concerned to see whether her panoramic view of post-war Polish life includes any references to pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction. Although Kuncewicz included two Polish-Jewish authors who also had written before the Second World War, their pre-war oeuvre was either omitted entirely or its Jewish elements erased. The first piece of Polish-Jewish writing included in the collection was Antoni Słonimski’s essay Memories of Warsaw (Wojewoda 1962), a recollection of the writer’s pre-war childhood and his emigration to Paris and to London during the Second World War. Although a short biographical note (1962: 13) mentions Słonimski’s Jewish origin, it fails to inform the reader about his pre-war science fiction short stories “Torpeda czasu” (1924), and “Dwa końce świata” (1937) (cf. Table 2).

The second piece of Polish-Jewish writing included in Kuncewicz’s anthology was entitled “The Crystal Stream”, which was a chapter from Adolf Rudnicki’s Ascent to Heaven, translated into English by Harry Stevens, whom I mentioned earlier in my discussion about the English translation of Naglerowa’s novel. The novel Ascent to Heaven conveyed, above all, the experience of Polish Jews under Nazi occupation. And although the accompanying biographical note mentioned Rudnicki’s novel Lato (1938), it erased its Jewish themes, describing the novel as ‘impressions and
observations of life in an artists’ colony in the country […] (Kunciewicz 1962: 123). Yet, this novel dealt with very specific observations of a very specific life. It gives an account of the life of a community of Jewish artists in Kazimierz Dolny, a popular place among Polish and Polish Jewish artists before the war. The story was narrated from the point of view of an assimilated Polish Jew, which foregrounded differences between Polish orthodox Jews and those who were more acculturated. The novel, then, contained cultural nuances between the two pre-war worlds of Polish Jews, with occasional explanations of Jewish holidays and traditions.

Inevitably perhaps, Kunciewicz’s anthology could be seen as an overview of Polish literature by target readers. Burns Singer, for example, opened his review of the anthology for *The Listener* (Singer 1963) thus:

Beggars can’t be choosers; and, as far as Polish literature is concerned, most of us are pretty impoverished. (…) [Maria Kunciewicz] has, that is, the advantage of being able to introduce us to one of the richest of current literatures. Perhaps the role of literary anthologies in shaping the general awareness of readers is especially important when the literature in question is relatively little-known in another country, as Singer implies. Correspondingly, then, any exclusions, as the ones of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction from Kunciewicz’s anthology, are likely to limit the general concept of what Polish literature encompasses of the general reading public.

Similarly, the structure of the second anthology by Bromberg Ben-Zvi indicates that the editor sought to give a panoramic portrait of Polish Jews. The first part entitled “Our World of Yesterday” was to comprise pre-war literature by Polish Jews while the second (“Years of Flame and Fury”) and the third (“To Live Again”) encompassed literature that addressed war-time and post-war realities of Polish Jews. The first part, however, includes mainly the English translations of Yiddish writers, such as Scholem Asch (*The Rebel*), Israel Joshua Singer (*The Wedding Night*) and Isaac Leob Peretz (*The Lamed Vovnik*). Pre-war literature written by Polish Jews in the Polish language was left out altogether, a somewhat curious omission given that the anthology contains fragments of Jewish-themed works by non-Jewish Polish writers in English translation, such as *Mendel Gdański* by Maria Konopnicka and *Links in a Chain* by Eliza Orzeszkowa. The same part of the anthology also contains memoirs about pre-war times originally written after the Second World War, including *Time of Peace*, a memoir by Leon Weliczker Wells, and *A Jew in the Polish*
Army by Siegfried Helbreich. Such an appropriation of pre-war Polish Jewish reality by Holocaust literature, to which I have referred in Chapter 2 as “shadow of the Holocaust”, is bound to be a contributing factor in the overall lack of visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction more broadly.

That Holocaust shadow extends onto the other two parts in the anthology, dominated by war-time and post-war literary reflections. The Holocaust-orientated slant of the book calls into question one of the initial aims behind this anthology, which was, indeed, as the title suggests, to give a panoramic literary portrait of Polish Jews to “help to recapture and preserve, through its selection of poetry and prose, the memory of a rich life that is no more”, as Ben-Zvin herself said (2011: xxxv).

The discussion of various translation projects, then, suggests that pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction can be obscured before the processes of publishing and translating begin, as shown by the two cases of British-published anthologies in particular. The reconstruction of the remaining project networks indicates that the translation is bound to fail when the expectations and needs of readers are not taken into consideration. People engaged in the processes of publishing and translating would need to take into account the needs of the target reading public and push the limits of these expectations by offering something that the target audience is capable of recognising and taking their interpretations of further in their own ways. I have used actor network theory to describe what I have found about the influence of individual actors on the question of visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain. The concluding chapter will discuss, among other things, what changes to polysystem theory these findings entail.
6 CONCLUSION

6.1 Why polysystem theory?
Looking at the relatively underrepresented pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain from the perspective of polysystem theory allows me to suggest that “a balanced representation of the literature of a particular country” does not only depend on the publishers and their ability to judge the preferences of readers, as claimed by Barslund (2011: 151), to whom I have referred in the Introduction. In addition to the fact that publishers do not operate in isolation, that is independently of their cultural contexts, such a claim closes off the debate about balanced cultural representation in translation studies, limiting the debate to works that have been actually translated and acclaimed. In my discussion, by contrast, the lack of knowledge of the existence of the few English translations of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction writers is only a starting point to explore and explain the lack of visibility of this literature in both source and target contexts. The process of delving deeper into concerns relating to the relative lack of engagement of the British audience with pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction is, in my research, driven by two fundamental questions:

(i) Why have the few English translations that exist attracted only limited attention (although to a varying degree) and why have they not been retranslated in Britain thus far?
(ii) Why has the majority of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction never been translated into English at all?

In order to address these questions I frame my enquiry in polysystem theory, which enables me to consider various areas of reality, in the past and more recently. The discovery of what lies behind the lack of visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction entails a continuous process of questioning the titular research object (i.e. pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction) by the theory tested (polysystem theory), whereby the exploration of the largely unacknowledged literature brings more questions about literary reception. In other instances, however, the exploration of the overall lack of
visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain is a testing ground for polysystem theory, suggesting ideas as to how the theory may be expanded and utilised to explain other translation phenomena.

Thus, determining the reasons for this status of literature in Britain for its own sake is not the only objective of my thesis. Not only does the attempt to explain the gap pose further questions about polysystem theory and pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction, but it also brings about broader reflections about the reasons for looking at marginal and less visible literatures, even the untranslated, in translation studies. By the same token, the framework of my enquiry is informed by the following three points:

- designing and explaining the systemic gap (6.1.1),
- suggesting changes to polysystem theory (6.1.2),
- and practical benefits of this enquiry (6.2),

It is hoped that all the above points can illuminate our understanding of the workings of translation (6.3).

### 6.1.1 Explanation of the systemic gap

The following overview of possible reasons for the systemic gap, a concept which, it should be recalled, refers to untranslated texts and translations which up to now have been largely unrecognised, may indicate that the new model of a gap in the systems may be useful for other research projects in the future. Although reasons for the gap, which in this study represents the lack of visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain, are largely related to the target context, there are also several source-context factors that were to lead to the “inherent unavailability for translation” of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction as a whole, and that should be considered while discussing the reasons for the systemic gap. The overview of all the factors is presented in Table 17 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reasons for the gap</th>
<th>contributory factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lack of potential of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction to attract much interest specifically in Britain</td>
<td>culture-specific and overtly Jewish themes relating to the everyday life of Polish Jews in pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implicit Jewishness that may be difficult to identify, in particular in more imaginative modernist Polish-Jewish fiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discontinuous presence of Jews in Britain and its impact on a different perception of Jewish culture and Jewish identity in Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>arrival of Eastern European Jews in Britain and its relation to the tendency to keep Jewishness subdued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the impact of the Holocaust on British-Jewish writers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inherent unavailability for translation more broadly</td>
<td>time-and culture-specific aspects of socially and politically involved works in particular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>limited novelty of some works of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction and their emulation of acknowledged literary works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>limited development of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction, partly caused by the rise of antisemitism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literary tendencies in the target context</td>
<td>generally negative literary representation of the world of Eastern European Jews in British-Jewish immigrant literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>target-oriented concerns of British-Jewish immigrant literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a wide-ranging thematic scope of the English translations of Israeli Hebrew and Yiddish writing and of Holocaust literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dominance of Polish war-related historical and political fiction and the current promotion of Polish contemporary fiction in the English translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>style</td>
<td>persuasive character and the simple plot of pre-war Polish-Jewish Zionist fiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tropes of Yiddish and Polish culture in pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction that may be problematic for translators and readers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accumulation of flattening shifts in translated texts that may render the reading experience problematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publishing practices</td>
<td>limited accessibility of early Polish-Jewish fiction originally published in newspapers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the representation of Polish Jewish literature in British-published anthologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>general low rate of literary translations in Britain that can make the translation of little-known writers unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conflict of interests and of goals in the process of publishing, which can affect the style, the form and the promotion of the translated text in a way that can limit its potential for much recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attempt to fit a book in one specific area of the current preferences of readers, leading to short-lived popularity of the published text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limited awareness of the existence of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction of the general reading public</td>
<td>Holocaust appropriation of pre-war Polish-Jewish culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>marginal place of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in the source context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic recognition of a distinct Jewish cultural identity in Britain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major political events in the target context that were likely to direct the attention of target readers away from pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendency to repress overt manifestations of the writers’ Jewish identity in British-Jewish literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 The overview of factors that explain the gap
As this thesis shows, some of the factors played a role at a specific time in history, others, however, continue to contribute to the lack of visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain. Therefore, it makes sense to claim that it is the cumulative effects of the factors that provide a partial explanation for the gap in the polysystem of British literature. It is worth noting, however, that determining reasons for the gap is only a partial answer to the main question of the lack of visibility of the literature I am concerned with. Due to the all-embracing systemic perspective of this study, each factor I have identified in this study could be left aside for further in-depth enquiry.

6.1.2 Further changes to polysystem theory
The partial explanation of the status of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain entails revisiting polysystem theory, leading to new ideas as to how this theory can be expanded. If translation theories are understood as “concepts designed to illuminate and to improve the practice of translation” (Venuti 2012: 13) then it is vital that they be continuously revised in their own right to illuminate changing practices of translating and to explain what underlies such processes.

As pointed out in 1.2, polysystem theory has been used for other translation phenomena since its establishment. However, rather than expand the theory in its own right, most research projects tend to draw on it only as a point of departure to look at issues relating to literary reception. Mino Saito, for example, sees the theory as a tool that is “effective in analyzing the power that the translated literature of the Meiji era had in relation to its social context”, adopting the polysystemic focus on the target texts and on “societies that receive them” (Saito 2016: 420). Similarly, Peter Fawcett offers a case study of the translation techniques in the English translation of André Malraux’s La Voie royale by Stuart Gilbert to show that his translation approach relocated “the work in a sub-system of English literature different from the location it occupied in the French literary system” (Fawcett 2001: 103). In another study, Sirkku Aaltonen (1996) uses the concept of a “theatrical polysystem to talk about the system of theatre translation” to then look at how “conventions determine how texts come to be written and translated” and received (Aaltonen 1996: 105). Finally, in his study of French existentialism in the Jewish American novel after the Second World War, Phillippe Codde illustrates “an important role” of polysystem theory in his own research rather than offer changes to it (Codde 2003: 117). Although he reflects on the possibility to incorporate some ideas of the sociologist Pierre
Bourdieu into polysystem theory, polysystemic claims are not questioned (Codde 2003: 106-112). Thus, rather than challenge, these studies apply polysystem theory and its general concepts as developed so far to tackle specific translation issues.

By contrast, my critical approach to polysystem theory in this study coincides with that of Els Andringa (2006), who offers “a methodology derived from or applicable to the theory” (2006: 523). In her case study of the reception of Virginia Woolf’s works in the Dutch polysystem, Andringa not only describes the changing dynamics of Woolf’s acclaim in the Netherlands, but she also uses her findings to revisit polysystem theory. Thus, for example, she distinguishes between mentions of specific writers and their work by critics and reviewers, which precede the actual translations of these writers (Andringa 2006: 557-558) to look, subsequently, at the increasing visibility of the writers she is concerned with. Having broken down the process of gaining recognition, Andringa (2006: 557) then revisits Even-Zohar’s assumption about literary vacuum and its impact on the target literary system. She also attempts “to break up the concept of repertoire into components” (Andringa 2006: 560-561), redefining it as a mental equipment (2006: 501).

However, instead of explaining literary recognition, I focus on its relative lack in my study. Such a different focus to the majority of studies that employ polysystem theory necessarily involves questioning some of its assumptions and introducing new ones.

By using polysystem theory to research another translation phenomenon, that of relatively limited attention paid to pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain, I test a number of theoretical claims to identify the limitations of the theory and offer several changes. In other words, this study attempts to bridge a gap between theory and practice by “taking heed of (...) real-life behaviour (...) along with the factors underlying and conditioning them (theory),” an approach suggested by Toury (1995: 2).

The new concept of a systemic gap is the first contribution this thesis makes to polysystem theory. Its introduction will make it possible to look at less visible translations in literary systems (the importance of which I will explain in 5.3.2 below). For the sake of clarity, however, it is worth pointing out that the term “gap” is, somewhat misleadingly, sometimes used by polysystem theorists interchangeably with “vacuum”. For example, Toury’s claim (1995: 27) about “cultures resort[ing] to translating precisely as a major way of filling in gaps, whenever and wherever such gaps manifest themselves” overlaps with that of Even-Zohar who says that a literary vacuum refers to a situation when “no item in the indigenous stock is taken to be acceptable” (Even-Zohar 1990: 48). It is, then, clear that
both Toury and Even-Zohar refer to the same situation in the systems, that is the situation in which elements that are missing in one system are transferred from another system by translation.

Yet, the theory of polysystems has not thoroughly addressed the cases in literary history when translated texts failed to meet the expectations of target readers and publishers, remaining largely invisible. The instances in which largely unacknowledged translation is mentioned tend not to be supported by any examples. In his 1997 essay about the sociocultural dynamics of the cultural exchange of cultural and artistic goods, including translations, for example, Even-Zohar (1997: 358-359) assumes that “[n]aturally” not all imported goods result in (...) transfers”, i.e. they do not always integrate in the target system. However, Even-Zohar fails to explain what informs the “natural” instances of the little notice taken of some cultural products, such as translated texts. Another example of the lack of explanation of little acknowledgement of a particular literature can be borrowed from Even-Zohar’s discussion of intrasystemic relations in the model of the Hebrew polysystem. Not only does he not explain why exactly Yiddish literature was not widely acclaimed at the early stage of the formation of the Hebrew polysystem (1978b: 78-79), but he also mentions only recognised Yiddish writers, such as Sholem Aleichem and Isaac Leib Peretz. Lesser-known and less visible Yiddish works, which would possibly be more relevant to Even-Zohar’s point, are left out altogether. Their inclusion, however, may have resulted in a more insightful explanation of this translation phenomenon. It is my contention that there is much more at stake than a “natural” course of events that contribute to the relative lack of acknowledgement of literary works (cf. Table 3 below which offers an overview of factors identified in this study).

The modelling of a systemic gap in this study has also shown that the source context of literatures should be taken into account by polysystem theorists more than has been done thus far. Some factors in the source context, as this study seeks to show, are also bound to predetermine the reception of a particular collection of works in a target system. Such a slightly different ontological status of the source context should be in my opinion considered in the research on literary reception, embracing a more inclusive approach with regard to the source context.

Similarly, in order to explain the systemic position of a particular literature in another system, other theoretical tools must be used. Because the polysystemic approach seeks to give an all-embracing view of translation, it is bound to prioritise function-based
methods, that is approaches that look at the influence of translated texts on its target context. Toury’s examination of translational norms, that is socio-cultural constraints in translation, ranging from generally accepted rules to idiosyncrasies of translators (Toury 1995: 54-55), offers a more text-based approach. My contribution, on the other hand, would be to suggest that a process-based approach needs to be incorporated, provided by the tools of the actor network theory, which makes it possible to look into processes of individual translation projects and pinpoint, sometimes by inference, the affiliations and strategies of people and institutions involved. Such an approach would also make the theory less depersonalised, which is a point of criticism of this theory by Hermans, who observes that polysystemic claims about the conflicts between literature and culture are “waged by competing norms and models rather than by individuals or collectives” (Hermans 1999: 118). Without specific analyses of connections between people, texts and institutions and a wider world exceedingly general and unsupported statements about the role of the context of translated texts in translation are unlikely to be viable in the research of translation.

Additionally, it is necessary to determine translation shifts that can make the translated text difficult to engage with by target readers. In order to establish these shifts a comparative model needs to be utilised to identify them. Only then can possible effects on reading be inferred by means of a cognitive theory, such as text world theory, which I use in this study.

Furthermore, the issue of precision in determining factors that underlie the production and reception of translated texts raises a question about “laws”, also referred to as “universals” (Even-Zohar 1990: 53; 58), endorsed by polysystem theory. This thesis has shown that they should not be regarded as given but rather, as Even-Zohar himself suggests, “force (...) methodological speculations” (1991: 54) about a specific area of reality and its link to the translation phenomenon in question. I have used a number of polysystemic tendencies as a point of departure for a more detailed enquiry the result of which has not always confirmed the original law devised by Even-Zohar. For example, while looking at early-twentieth century British-Jewish literature and the impact of the arrival of Eastern European Jews on it (see 3.2.1.3), I have utilised the concept of a system “at a turning point” (Even-Zohar 1990: 47), a situation which, according to Even-Zohar, should increase the chances for translations in that particular system. However, given the fact that no works from pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction were translated at the time, I looked into specific social and cultural factors to infer why pre-war Polish-Jewish literature in particular was unlikely
to be well received. My approach coincides with that of Hermans, who observes that “[p]olysystem theory invests heavily in classifications and correlations but shies away from speculating about the underlying causes” (1999: 118).

Additionally, limited precision in explaining particular phenomena in polysystem theory makes the phrasing used by polysystem theorists confusing. In his discussion of the dynamics of a literary system Even-Zohar says that the first signs of the stagnation of some aspects of the “canonised culture” “manifest themselves in a high degree of boundness and growing stereotypisation of the various repertoires” (1990: 17). It is not certain, however, what is meant exactly by “boundness” or “stereotypisation”. The lack of clarity can also be found elsewhere, for example in Even-Zohar’s essay about the Hebrew-Yiddish polysystem, in which he states that “[i]t makes no difference, from the point of view of functional analysis, whether transfers from these systems have occurred deliberately or through unavoidable infiltration” (Even-Zohar 1990: 125). Such technical and impersonal phrasing, rather than giving answers, asks further questions. What and who makes specific texts transfer to another system? What is the difference between deliberate and unavoidable infiltration? And, finally, what is meant by infiltration in this example? Similarly, when discussing the conditions for literary interference, such as translation, to happen, Even-Zohar’s first claim is that “[c]ontacts will sooner or later generate interference if no resisting conditions arise” (1990: 59). However, his elaboration of this point (1990: 63-66) does not make it clear how contacts between communities influence the reception of literary works, for example. This study, by contrast, suggests that the relations between some cultural aspects of a particular community and literary reception can indeed be multiple.

6.2 Practical benefits of this study
The identified factors that inform the systemic gap (cf. Table 3), then, can be utilised to change the status quo. The point of interpreting the world, as Karl Marx famously stated, is to change it rather than theorise in isolation (Thesis eleven 2011). In other words, the understanding of multiple causes for a particular phenomenon can equip us with necessary knowledge to change the current situation. Correspondingly, as this thesis shows, the reasons for changing the visibility of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction are related both to the source and the target contexts of this literature.

Arguably, the value of literary texts goes beyond their stylistic qualities given that, as any other work of art, they are also vehicles for cultural legacy, even the neglected ones,
such as the Polish-language pre-war cultural legacy of Polish Jews. It can become more visible by “consecration”, that is by way of translating into a major language whose prestige and literary history are widely recognised in world literature (Casanova 2010: 289; 294-299). The translation into a major language may, likewise, bring little-known works more recognition in their original context, a supposition also offered by Jones in his discussion of the English translations of Bosnian poetry (Jones 2009: 306).

By the same token, the translation of neglected writing whose place in the world of literature is less prominent compared to that of British or French literary works, for instance, can also be seen as a political act. Translating literature that lies outside of the general interest of readers can potentially subvert dominant tendencies both in the practices of publishers and, more widely, in literary discourse which necessarily privileges some literatures at the cost of others.

Drawing on this study, I shall offer a variety of suggestions that can help make pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction more visible in Britain. The majority of recommended strategies concern people and institutions involved in translating, promoting and publishing because they are actors that mediate a selected text to their own context. However, because source-context factors also play a role in the visibility of translations abroad, several recommendations pertaining to the source context are also considered.

Firstly, in order for pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction to be more visible in the source context, a change that would improve the chance of this fiction for translation, Polish publishing houses would need to re-publish pre-war Polish-Jewish prose works and promote them among the general reading public, especially in schools given the current low reading rate of the general public: approximately sixty-three percent of the entire Polish population did not read any work of literary fiction at all in 2015 (Michalak et al. 2015:4). The selection of works for publishing and their subsequent introduction to schools, and to the general awareness of readers, would involve a number of important and high-profile actors. In order to select literary works that have a potential to attract the attention of readers would require co-operating with academic scholars of Jewish studies who have already been involved in unearthing this part of pre-war literary legacy of Polish Jews. The decision to include them in school reading lists would need to be approved by the Polish Ministry of Education. Finally, in order for the selected works to win as much acclaim as possible of ordinary readers, the promotion of literary works would need to engage widely-recognised
literary critics and writers whose prestige and authority could catch the attention of as many readers as possible.

The publishing strategies regarding the pre-war Polish-Jewish writers who enjoy a more established position in Poland would need to be changed. It is vital that the editions of their works include paratextual information regarding their Jewish background and its possible influence on their literary creativity, a change that would increase the general awareness of the existence of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction among Polish readers. Such a publishing strategy would have to go against the general tendency to avoid highlighting the Jewish origin of individuals, promoted also by some academics. Similarly, such a change in presenting Polish-Jewish writers would have to be implemented by British-based Polish institutions responsible for promoting Polish literature, such as the Polish Book Institute.

Finally, both Polish and British publishers who publish Polish Jewish Holocaust literature should make a distinction between works written before the outbreak of the Second World War and post-Holocaust literature. Such a distinction is especially important in the discussed case of post-Holocaust Polish-Jewish writers who also wrote before the Second World War, such as Adolf Rudnicki (see 1.2.2). By the same token, the publication of any post-war Holocaust literature that evokes the pre-war world of Polish Jews should contain a relevant introduction about the authentic pre-war literary achievements of Polish Jews. Otherwise, the general awareness of the literary legacy of Polish Jews would most likely be limited to Holocaust works.

The increased visibility of the literature in question in its source context would enhance the potential of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction to be translated into English. However, its recognition also depends to a certain extent on the strategies undertaken by target-context actors involved in the process of translating, publishing and promoting a selected literary work.

The translation of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction requires a translator who would have the background knowledge about various aspects of the pre-war world of Polish Jews which would help him identify its tropes, such as the imitation of Yiddish or references to Jewish culture, and convey them in the translated text. Knowledge about the Polish and Jewish origins of this fiction will presumably limit the number of flattening shifts so that the target reader could recognise Polish and Jewish aspects of a literary work. The aim to translate the text in a way that would not be exceedingly foreign or unduly familiar would additionally require from the translator a certain degree of awareness regarding the interests
and the general level of knowledge of the target readers regarding the theme of the work for translation. In order for a translator to acquire such skills they would presumably have to expand their career web, which would also increase their knowledge about current translation approaches and literary tendencies in the target context, information that would increase the chances of the translated text to be acclaimed by the target reading public.

Given the historically problematic recognition of Jewish identity in Britain (see 3.2.1), it would have to be the responsibility of the publisher to promote pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction that would present its Jewish aspect in relation to Jewish-themed fiction that enjoys relative popularity among the target reading public. One way of doing it is, for instance, linking the pre-war literary production of Polish Jews to a more acclaimed Israeli literature in a preface to the English translation of a pre-war literary work of fiction. Or conversely, the English translations of Israeli Hebrew, Yiddish and Holocaust literature, which revolve around the present and the past of the collective experience of European Jewry, should include critical introductions which would make the reader aware that the pre-war world of Polish Jews is also reflected in literary works written by Polish Jews in Polish before the war.

Furthermore, the current awakening of British-Jewish literature and the instances of new editions of pre-war works by British Jews may be potentially utilised by British publishers in their promoting strategies of pre-war Polish-Jewish literature, whether in critical introductions or promoting materials. A brief comparison of the two Polish-Jewish and British-Jewish literatures including more recognised names of British-Jewish writers, such as Israel Zangwill or Dannie Abse, would most likely attract greater attention of the target general reading public to the lesser-known works.

While introducing a work of pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction in Britain for the first time, British publishers need to be aware that its acclaim may be gradual and not always related to the style or content of the book (as with the case of the US acclaim of Schulz’s work). Consequently, in order to boost the interest of the reading public, a particular literary work would probably have to be re-edited and re-published, possibly leading to different readings and translations that would correspond with the changing interests of the target readers regarding a particular work of fiction. That recommendation is also valid for those pre-war works of Polish-Jewish fiction that have already been published in Britain. The original title of the English translation of Naglerowa’s Krauzowie i inni, which was presumably intended to fit the novel with the reading preferences of the readers in the
1950s, would have to be changed, let alone the translation approach used. Similarly, the English translation of Wittlin’s novel *Sól ziemi* would have to be revisited and the book re-edited so as to meet the current expectations of the reading public.

Furthermore, British-published anthologies of Polish or Jewish literatures should not obscure the existence of the pre-war literary legacy of Polish Jews. Otherwise, the awareness of this writing by the target reading public is likely to remain relatively insignificant, leading to a limited interest in this kind of literature.

The list of suggestions to improve the chances for pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction to be better recognised in Britain raises a question as to whether or not such recommendations could also be made regarding the rest of the overall pre-war literary achievements of Polish Jews and their potential for translation and acclaim abroad. Feuilletons, such as Roman Brandstaetter’s *Zmowa eunuchów* [1936, *The Conspiracy of Eunuchs*], can provide an interesting insight into the dynamics of the cultural world of Polish Jews, in particular their relations with the wider Polish audience. Similarly, the issue of the availability for translation of pre-war Polish-Jewish poetry may well be informed by different factors due to the different poetics, themes and institutions which publish and promote poetry among readers. Both areas of pre-war Polish-Jewish literature and their chances for translation require further research, which, if carried out, may offer suggestions to secure wider recognition of pre-war Polish-Jewish literary achievements more broadly, both in the source and in other contexts.

Finally, it is hoped that the proposed suggestions can be taken into account by cultural institutions in the initiatives aiming to bring a particular literary legacy to light.

**6.3. Reasons for researching less visible literatures**

In addition to benefitting the theory and the practice of translation, this study also invites a broader reflection about looking at less visible literatures in translation studies. Looking at marginal phenomena in translation studies “may be very illustrative, very telling with respect to things that are more central and more general,” as noted by Toury (in Simeoni 2008: 405). It is my contention that the exploration of cultural representation in literature, or in any other area, should ask questions about the underrepresented and less visible. Only then can more be known about what exclusions a particular selection involves. When applied to the area of literary translation, the study of such exclusions can shed light on the cultural, literary and linguistic aspects of the source and, above all, the target contexts that
inform these exclusions. If translation can be indicative of a cognitive image of a particular culture in a foreign context, it makes sense to argue that the way particular texts are, or fail to be, chosen for translation can be conducive to determining specific aspects ingrained in the target context, as this thesis suggests.

To facilitate research on less visible literature, I offer a theoretical research framework that can serve as a tool to identify factors that inform the limited recognition of less visible translations and of wider bodies of text that the translations stand for. This framework could potentially be used to partly explain the lack of visibility abroad of the literatures of the Sahel (see Wise 2001) and of the Tuaregs (see Falola et al. 2012: 51), or of the works of Kaifeng Jews in China (see Xin 2003). Serbian literary legacy before the Balkan Wars between 1912 and 1913 (see Klănčar 1939/1940) may also be considered. Some of these literatures share with pre-war Polish-Jewish fiction the minority status in their own countries of origin and the overall lack of visibility in Britain, the similarities that might make it easier to use the refined framework I am proposing here to address different issues. It draws on polysystem theory to pinpoint areas for further research, the examination of which would in turn require other methodological tools from other theoretical approaches.

Thus, if less visible literatures were researched within the framework of polysystem theory, the focus on the source context may lie on its cultural, literary and linguistic characteristics. Cultural factors can be related to specific moments of the history of the literature in question, alongside its cultural, social and political settings. Literary factors can be informed both by the content of the discussed literature and by the current recognition of the investigated literature. Finally, linguistic factors may be linked to linguistic and stylistic issues that may be problematic for translation, or to the popularity of the source language in literary translation.

The researched factors in the target polysystem may reflect those that inform the source system. Consequently, target cultural factors may lie in the history of a minority group there (including its cultural, social and political milieus); literary factors may address several characteristics of a particular minority literature in the target context and their relations both to mainstream literature and prevalent social conventions; and to the literature in question. Furthermore, literary tendencies in other target systems that share certain characteristics with the source literary system need to be addressed. It is worth highlighting, therefore, that the scope of literary genres to be researched in the target polysystem may be
larger than that of the source context. Linguistic factors might revolve, for example, around the popularity of the target language in world literature.

The proposed theoretical framework may also require looking at the processes of selecting, translating and publishing the texts that have been translated. Surviving reviews may be examined to establish whether and, if so, how the translations met or failed to meet the expectations of target readers. Similarly, anthologies of source literature published in translation may need to be considered to determine the choices of target publishers and the image of the literature in question as presented in the anthologies.

Additionally, the research framework should entail an overview of the reception of one of the translated texts in question in the second, different, target context. This way, any cultural differences between the general reading publics and their preferences may be determined.
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Appendix 1 Glosses in English for the three discussed examples of vernacular plurality in *Krauzowie i inni* [*Loves and Ambitions*]

| 1) UKRAINIAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Oj siczenyj | buraczki, hreczenaja kasza – | Ne | zurit . |
| Oh chopped | beetroots buckwheat porridge | not | feel disgust |
| sia worozenki, ja ne budu wasz-a |

**REFL.PRN**

enemies/fortune-tellers I not will be yours (feminine, plural)
2) GALICIAN GERMAN OR YIDDISH

...przepowienie i aksjomaty (...) “Die Austrjak-en warden bald

POL. GERMAN (Polish with a German suffix) GERMAN

predictions and axioms the Austrians will soon

verkaufen ihre lausig-en Jacke-n” albo “Dem osterreichisch-en

sell their lousy/poor/filthy jackets or the Austrian

Gewehr geht’s immer quer”

GERMAN GERMAN GERMAN GERMAN

gun goes+it always aslant/wrong
3) POLISH and UKRAINIAN

(...) mój ojciec nie ‘stojał’ o
UKRAINIAN

my father not was concerned with/to

honyry – a spostrzegłszy się, że powiedział
honours and having noticed/realised ø that said

‘nie stojał’, jak zwykle był mawiać ojciec, popraw-ił: -- Nie stał o honory (...) not as usually say father not stood for honours

was concerned was corrected
Appendix 2 The complete passage from *Sól ziemi* quoted in Table 7, together with its English literal translation (mine), and the English translation by Pauline de Chary

**Polish original, p. 60**

Pierwszy to raz od wielu lat nie sądzono nas po ubraniu. Przeciwnie: dziś tylko rozebrani byliśmy jeszcze coś warcii, tylko nago mogliśmy okazać najwyższe nasze zalety. Nic już o nas nie chciano wiedzieć ponad to, czyśmy zdrowi. Zaglądano nam w zęby, jak koniom na targu, oglądano z przodu, oglądano z tyłu, pukano do naszych wnętrz, by się przekonać, czyśmy nie robaczywi.

Do tej pory byliśmy tylko nazwiskami. Wszystkie kalkulacje Ministerstwa Wojny i Sztabu Generalnego opierały się na ilości nazwisk. Chodziły po świecie nazwiska, tuczyły się, rozmnażały, aby w dzień mobilizacji przemienić się w ciała.

**English literal translation:**

For the first time in many years we were not judged by the clothes. On the contrary, today we had a value only when we put off our clothes, only naked we could show our greatest assets. What mattered was only whether we were healthy. They were checking our teeth, like they did to horses during a horse fair; they were examining us from the front, from behind; and tapping our intestines to see whether we were not worm-eaten.

**English translation, pp. 71-72**

For the first time in many years a judgment was passed on men, a judgment that took no account of their clothes. To-day value could be assessed only when clothes had been discarded; it was only when naked that merit could display itself. For nothing was of interest but good health. Men’s teeth were examined like the teeth of horses at a horse sale; their bodies were inspected from in front, and inspected from hind; they were tapped and probed, lest haply the should be worm-ridden.

Till that moment men had been but names. The Ministry for War and the General Staff had been preoccupied solely and greedily with names. Names went to and fro on the face of the earth. Names waxed fat and multiplied – names that, on the day of mobilization, were to take unto themselves the forms of men.
Appendix 3
An excerpt from *Sól ziemi* and its equivalent in its English translation *Salt of the Earth*

**Polish original, pp. 51-52**

Ironia była obca w tych stronach. Toteż Piotr w pierwszej chwili nie wyczuł jej ostrza w słowach żandarma. Po głowie Piotra przewiały przez moment ułomki jakiejś melodii tanecznej, jakiegoś kolomyjki, granej na harmonii i na skrzypcach, a w oczach zafurkotały grube kolorowe spódnice. Prawie w twarz uderzyło go lube ciepło tych spódnic. Żandarm rychło oddał go jawie. Wyciągnął z torby, w której leżały kajdanki, nieduży, orłem zapieczętowany papier.

Gutenberg, Johann Gutenberg, nazywał się ów człowiek, którego diabeł spił w Moguncji reńskim winem i kazał mu w roku 1450 wynaleźć nową torturę ludzi niepiśmiennych i ubogich duchem. Opętany przez diabła, założył Gutenberg wspólnie z niejakim Fustem pierwszą drukarnię. Od tego czasu diabelskie ziarno, jak zarazki cholery, rozmnożyło się po całej kuli ziemskiej, aby dniem i nocą niepokoić, czarować, zatruwać lakome dusze, owładnięte pychą umienia. A chociaż tyle niewinnych płacht białego papieru zapaskudzono czarnymi znakami diabła, iż całą kulę ziemska można by w ten papier owinąć, mimo to jeszcze w roku 1914 wielu było ludzi sprawiedliwych na tej kuli, osobiście w śniatyńskim powiecie, którzy nie ulegli pokusie.

**English translation, pp. 59-60**

The habit of irony was so uncommon in these parts that, just at first, Peter did not catch the point of the gendarme’s words. For a moment, fragments of dance music lilted in his head, a *Kolomyjka* played by a concertina and a fiddle, and heavy, brightly colored skirts swayed before his eyes. Their lovely warmth beat against his face. But the gendarme soon called him back to earth. From the leather bag (the one where he kept the handcuffs) he extracted a paper, folded and sealed.

Gutenberg, Johann Gutenberg, was the name of that man who m the devil made drunk with Rhine wine in Mainz, and who, in the year 1450, invented a new torture for those who knew nothing of letters, for the meek in spirit. Possessed by the devil, Gutenberg, in league with a certain Faust, founded the first printing works. From that time on the devilish business spread like a cholera plague, to bewilder, bewitch, and poison, day and
night, grasping souls imprisoned by the pride of knowledge. But although since then so much harmless paper has been blackened by the devil’s marks that the whole globe might be wrapped in it, yet, in the year 1914, there were still many righteous souls, especially in the district of Snyatin, who had not yielded to temptation.
Appendix 4 The review of Loves and Ambitions in the Kirkus Reviews

The events of this well written novel take places in the years 1865 to 1867 in the small town of Bory, in Galicia, and its leisurely, fully rounded style is deepened by its kind view of humanity, which sees greatness in simple people and heroism in their lives. Such a one is Stanislaw Krauze, descendant of an emigre German, whose family has espoused the cause of Polish independence with a fervor that equals any Polish patriot's. His father had sold their prosperous brewery for the "Cause" and left his two sons to earn their way by selling agricultural machinery. With impoverished peasantry and absentee landlords indifferent to tiny Bory, crowded by the border on one side and cut off without a railroad to link it to the world outside, their sales are not many. It is Emilia, Krauze's favorite young daughter, and her suitors who center the story for in each young man Krauze recognizes some facet of his own frustration and despair. And it is a bitter pill for the old rebel to swallow when she ultimately chooses Luzinski, the nephew of the absentee landlord, once a revolutionary but now sold out to the forces that advocate the Germanization of Poland. Warm and mature, this is a sympathetic book about a little known country and its history.

Publication date: Aug. 23rd, 1954

Appendix 5 Career webs of the translators discussed in Chapter 5
Note that all listed titles are the titles of the translations. Only first editions of the publications are included.

Career web of Stephen Garry (Henry Charles Stephens) prior to 1954:

- 1934 - Sholokhov’s *And Quiet Flows the Don* (London: Putnam) RU>ENG
- 1935 - Sholokhov’s *Seeds of Tomorrow* (London: Putnam) RU>ENG
- 1936 - Makarenko’s *The Road to Life* (London: Stanley Nott) RU>ENG
- 1937 - Nilsen’s *The Cinema as a Graphic Art. On a Theory of Representation in the Cinema* (London: George Newnes) RU>ENG
- 1937 – Tchikvadze’s ‘The Road to Affluence’ in J. Lehmann (ed) *New Writing* no. 3, Spring, London: Lawrence and Wishart, p. 248 RU>ENG
- 1937 – Kldiashvili’s ‘The Lord of Lashketi’ in J. Lehmann (ed) *New Writing* no. 3, Spring, London: Lawrence and Wishart, p. 63 RU>ENG
- 1938 – Zoschenko’s ‘The Housing Crisis’ in J. Lehmann (ed) *New Writing* no. 5, Spring, London: Lawrence and Wishart, p. 163 RU>ENG
- 1938 - Pavlenko’s *On the East* and Mogilevskaya’s *A Camp on the Ice* (London: George Routledge) RU>ENG
- 1938 - Pavlenko’s *Red Planes Fly East* (London: George Routledge and Sons) RU>ENG
- 1939 - Panferov’s *And Then the Harvest* (London: Putnam) RU>ENG
- 1939 - Perventsev’s *Kochubei* (London: Routledge) RU>ENG
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• 1940 - Sholokhov’s *The Don Flows Home to the Sea* (London: Putnam) RU>ENG
• 1942 - Kuncewiczowa’s *Polish Milestones* (London: P.S. King and Staples) PL>ENG
• 1943 - four short stories for *Soviet Anthology* (ed. Rodker) (London: Cape) RU>ENG
• 1946 - Vinogradov’s *The Condemnation of Paganini* (London: Hutchinson and Co) RU>ENG
• 1949 - Grabowski’s *Folk Sculpture in Poland* (London: Polish Cultural Institute) PL>ENG
• 1951 - Botvinnik’s *One Hundred Selected Games* (London: Macgibbon and Kee) RU>ENG
• 1951 – Rudnicki’s *Ascent to Heaven Rudnicki* (NY: Roy Publishers) ENG>PL

**Career web of Andrzej Ciolkosz (Joseph Marek) prior to 1954:**

• 1951 - Grudziński’s *World Apart* (London: W. Heinemann) PL>ENG

**Career web of Celina Wieniewska prior to 1963:**

• 1936 - Hurst’s *Imitacja życia* (Warszawa: J. Przeworski) ENG>PL
• 1936 - Sutherland’s *Ogniwa lat* (Warszawa: J. Przeworski) ENG>PL
• 1937 - Hurst’s *Pięć i dziesięć. Powieść* (Warszawa: J. Przeworski) ENG>PL
• 1939 - Mitchell’s *Przeminęło z wiatrem,* (Warszawa: J. Przeworski) ENG>PL
• 1942 - Iwaszkiewicz’s *Summer at Nohant* (London: Minerva Pub.) PL>ENG
• 1945 - Fiedler’s *Thank You Captain, Thank You!* (London: MaxLove Pub) PL>ENG
• 1955 - Milosz’s *The Usurpers* (London: Faber and Faber) PL>ENG
• 1958 - Bakker’s *Ciske the Rat* co-translated with Peter Janson-Smith (London: Michael Joseph) NE>ENG
Career web of Pauline de Chary prior to 1939:

- 1922 – Gunther Plueschow My Escape from Donington Hall (London: Lane) DE>ENG
- 1922 - Roland Dorgelès Saint Magloire (New York: Doran) FR>ENG
- 1923 – Nelly Ptashkina’s Diary (London: Jonathan Cape) RU>ENG
- 1924 – Victor von Klarwill The Fugger news-letters (London: Lane) DE>ENG
- 1924 – Frank Heller’s The Perilous Transactions of Mr. Collin (London: Lane) SE>ENG
- 1925 – Frank Heller’s Mr. Collin is Ruined (New York: Thomas Crowell) SE>ENG
- 1933 - A. T'Serstevens’s The Enemy at the Gate (London: Barker) FR>ENG
- 1939 – Laura Orvieto’s The Immortal Babes (London: Andrew Bakers) IT>ENG