

- ZALESKA Z., 1938, *Czasopisma kobiece w Polsce*, Warszawa.
- ZIELIŃSKI J., 1956, *Do dziejów prasy galicyjskiej: lwowskie „Słowo Polskie” z 1909 r. (W świetle memoriału Wojciecha Dąbrowskiego)*, „Prasa Współczesna i Dawna” nr. 1-2 (5-6).
- ZIELIŃSKI J., 1983, *Młodopolska recepcja Blake'a*, [w:] *Porównania. Studia o kulturze modernizmu*, pod red. R. Zimanda, Warszawa.
- ZIMAND R., 1964, *„Dekadentyzm” warszawski*, Warszawa.
- ZIMAND R. (red.), 1983, *Porównania. Studia o kulturze modernizmu*, Warszawa.
- ZIOMEK J., 1986, *Epoki i formacje w dziejach literatury polskiej*, „Pamiętnik Literacki”, z. 4.
- ŻÓLKIEWSKI S., 1979, *Modele polskiej literatury współczesnej we wczesnym okresie jej rozwoju*, [w:] *Kultura, socjologia, semiotyka literacka. Studia*, Warszawa.
- ŻURAWICKA J., 1962, *Zespół redakcji „Głosu” 1900-1905*, „Rocznik Historii Czasopiśmiennictwa Polskiego”, t. 1.
- ŻURKOWA R., 1971, *Znajomość dzieł Justusa Lipsiusa w Krakowie w XVII w.*, [w:] *Studia o książce*, t. 2, Wrocław.

Multatuli (1820-1887) in Poland A Historical-Literary Study of the Reception of Multatuli's Work in Poland in the Late 19th - Early 20th Century

Summary

Multatuli (pseudonym of Eduard Douwes Dekker, 1820-1887) was a high-ranking government official in the Dutch East Indies with the prospects for a brilliant political career when he made an attempt to protect the local people from exploitation in the province of Lebak, Java, where he was assistant commissioner. His efforts were perceived as insubordination as well as the negation of the so-called Cultivation System, an elaborate scheme of colonial exploitation which relied on Javanese chiefs (regents). Having fallen into disgrace with his superiors, Dekker resigned his post and returned to Europe where he found himself without a permanent job or steady income. As he had already considered writing before, in this situation Dekker decided to record his experience in Java and attack the principles of the Dutch colonial policy and existing political system. The novel *Max Havelaar* (1860; Polish editions in 1903 and 1994) became a political as well as society scandal and brought its author notoriety and international fame.

In the novel, the former official's meticulous record of facts is complemented by a fascinating creative act. Multatuli oscillates between realistic description and artistic fantasy, adding invention to the truth in order to make the latter easier to digest and even developing some aesthetic theory of the procedure. With its thoroughly modern unveiling of the consecutive layers of narration, the novel's innovative frame structure was far in advance of Multatuli's time and remains impressive today.

In time, when it became obvious that *Max Havelaar* would neither redeem the author in the eyes of his fellow citizens nor improve the lot of Javanese peasants, Multatuli began to attack all forms of injustice and criticize the follies of people, systems, and social conventions. In his later works, he satirized unsparingly middle-class morality, child-rearing practices, ossified religious tradition, mediocrity and narrow-mindedness. He also published a number of essays focused on social and moral issues which expressed his anachronistically radical views on the Dutch middle-class society and its institutions. He is one of few world-class authors successful at combining moral zeal with the mastery of structure.

The interest of the author of this study in the reception of Multatuli's work in Poland stems not only from his fascination with the Dutch writer's multi-dimensional writings. The exciting challenge, presented by the interdisciplinary study of the reception of any foreign literature, has been a factor as well, particularly that so far the reception of Dutch literature in Poland has not been studied in detail.

In the study, a theoretical background for the analysis of the reception phenomenon has been provided by adapting the categories developed on the grounds of linguistics, presented by Frans van Coetsem (*Loan Phonology and the Two Transfer Types in Language Contact*, 1988). Replacing the commonly used term *interference*, van Coetsem has introduced two distinct concepts. One is *imposition* (source language activity) or the influence of that language in which one is more fluent upon another language, mastered to a lesser degree. It affects primarily syntax and phonetic elements. Another term is *borrowing* (recipient language activity) or the influence of the language mastered to a lesser degree upon the language in which one is more fluent. This effect generally reveals itself through loan-words.

Transferring the linguistic typology proposed by van Coetsem onto the grounds of literary criticism, one may distinguish between two different approaches to the reception of foreign-language writers. Traditionally, the reception of foreign literature has been approached in the same manner as loan-words and interpreted as the permeation of a weaker culture by a stronger and dominant culture. However, the reception of literature may also be analyzed from a perspective different than the materialistic and mechanistic approach that views cultural phenomena as a system of connected vessels. The recipients' active role must be taken into consideration, not only in the context of their deliberate penetration into the realm of foreign literature but also from the perspective of them unconsciously imprinting the modes of their own culture onto the models of culture they encounter in the process. Consequently, the author of this article has proposed that in the studies of foreign literature reception, the emphasis should be placed on the analysis of the structures of *imposition* rather than those of *borrowing*. In other words, the research should focus not so much (and certainly not exclusively) on the translations of foreign literature and the recipients' perceptions of them but on the ways these phenomena reveal the literary and artistic consciousness of the discussed period.

As the first step in the analysis of the reception of Multatuli's work over the years, the list of existing Polish translations of his oeuvre is reviewed and the reception approaches typified in order to establish which elements in the reception of Multatuli's work were unusual and which followed a pattern typical of the reception of other Dutch authors in Poland. The reception of Multatuli's writings outside The Netherlands is discussed to provide a comparative background, with particular emphasis on Germany as the country from which his fame reached Poland. Then, relevant entries ('Dekker' or 'Multatuli') in encyclopaedias and remarks on his oeuvre in reference books on world literature published in Poland are analyzed, providing insights into the views and concepts related to his work on the one hand and the character of the discussed period on the other. The reactions of Polish critics to Multatuli's work are discussed in detail and the analysis of Polish translations (published as books or in journals) generally includes such constant elements as the presentation of the publisher or journal's profile, information on the translator and the description of each translation. The reception of Multatuli's oeuvre after 1945 is outlined.

While the general studies in the history of specific foreign literatures are important for the history of Polish literature, any attempt to provide a perspective on literary phenomena must take into consideration translations of foreign literature presented during the discussed period. The role played by the reception of foreign literature in the shaping of Polish cultural life in the late 19th-early 20th century is a related and important issue.

The last part of the study presents the factors which affected Multatuli's reception in Poland and focuses on an attempt to classify his oeuvre in terms of a specific model of literature. On the basis of analogies with the reception of other foreign literatures and authors and the analysis of the intellectual climate of the discussed period, a number of hypotheses are presented with respect to periodization and terminology concerning the culture and literature of the late 19th-early 20th century. These generalizations address the fundamental questions of Multatuli's reception in Poland, the 'whys' of reception.

The analysis of Multatuli's reception in Poland leads to a more general conclusion that foreign literature was a much more important and influential factor in Polish cultural life during the discussed period than it was generally assumed in reference publications although they usually openly acknowledged the effect of foreign impulses upon Polish literature. Consequently, any description and evaluation of Polish literature requires a comparative background provided by the study of foreign literature reception. Not only should the translations of foreign authors receive more attention in the literary-historical studies but they also should be considered in periodization and terminology defining the tendencies in Polish literary culture.

This approach to the issues of reception has led to the problem of the socially relevant models of literature in the late 19th-early 20th century and their place in the structure of Polish culture during this period. In the proposed model describing the relations between the reception phenomenon on the one hand and the period's literary consciousness on the other, the history of Polish literature from the early 19th century to the Second World War is described by the following formula: $a + ab + abc + (abc)d + e$, where a stands for Romanticism, b – for Positivism, c for Young Poland, d for Modernism, and e for the interwar period (1918-1939). From this perspective, a (Romanticism) dominates the entire 19th century and determines, so to speak, the spiritual space of the century. The 20th century opens with d (Modernism) whose distinctive feature was a desire to re-evaluate the existing cultural tradition and dispose of its significant part. In other words, the 19th-century *cumulation*, expressed as $a + ab + abc$ was being replaced by *renovation*, in our formula denoted as $(abc)d$.

Expressed by Young Poland, the desire to make Polish literature more 'European' was not unusual at the time as similar sentiments resurfaced in other countries as well. It meant the distancing of Polish literary culture from the solidly entrenched romantic mode (whose provenience was German) and bringing it closer, in more or less deliberate fashion, to the rationalistic tradition usually associated with Classical (and later Mediterranean) culture. In a sense, this shift of emphasis was an attempt (not entirely successful) to reach back to those phases of Polish literary and cultural tradition which had predated the partitions of Poland in the late 18th century.

Although more general interpretations based on the study of the reception of a single foreign writer present an easy target of critique as the scope is somewhat limited, it seems that the proposed terminology and typology may be applied to other art-related phenomena in the discussed period and help discover new perspectives. Although the pre-determined quality and scope of the reception material analyzed in the study define the assumptions and departure points, this is not necessarily a limitation. On the contrary, such specific perspective may shed a new light on the structure of the period, its turning points and various aspects as well as the relations between them. As Jerzy Ziomek put it (1986: 23): 'Periodization is a certain way of interpreting the history of literature because each attempt at dividing and connecting in order to create new configurations is a statement on the values and driving forces of the historical process (...). There is no single "correct" periodization because periodization is a way of understanding. An argument about the dividing and connecting of the historical evidence is always an argument about values, understood in a double sense: as developmental values and realized values'.

Translated by Małgorzata Możdżyńska-Nawotka