

[講演]

**Transculturality and Its Discontents.  
Some Notes on Polish Literature “without a Fixed Abode”:  
With a Focus on Jewish-Polish Literature between the Two World Wars**

Magdalena Marszałek

**1. Introduction**

The return of an aggressive nationalism paired with authoritarian tendencies is currently terrifying the liberal world. The present-day success of right-wing populism in Poland is a symptom of both a regional identity crisis and a crisis of democracy that extends well beyond the region. However complex the political, social and cultural reasons for this success may be, it can also be understood as the rollback reaction of a “monoculture” that presents itself as threatened, a culture in which the dream of every radical modern nationalism became a reality through the catastrophes of the twentieth century (the Nazis’ extermination policy, the ethnic cleansing and revolutionary transformation of the immediate post-war period): an (almost) mono-ethnic, (almost) mono-lingual, (almost) mono-religious nation. Today the “monocultural” rollback in Poland is asserting itself, first, against the historical ethnic, linguistic and religious plurality of Polish cities and regions, which has been frequently reconstructed, remembered and imagined in recent decades, especially in literature. It is also asserting itself against knowledge of the past, which contradicts a one-dimensional history of heroic victimhood, for example by incorporating Polish complicity in the Holocaust into its view of history. Second, however, the “monoculture” is also turning itself against a contemporary world shaped by migration streams. At the same time, the experience of migration has been one of the most important themes of Polish literature from the nineteenth century to the present day: Polish literature is profoundly marked by the experience of exile, displacement, politically and economically motivated migration, and the freedom to travel that was regained after 1989. What conclusion can be drawn from this? That literature and social reality are two different worlds between which no literal translation is possible? Yes, certainly. What I am interested in, however, is a different question, which I would like to formulate in a somewhat pointed way: If in the last 30 years Polish literature, which has grown weary of the lived “monoculture”, has fervently revived past plural worlds and remapped the literary realm through a new wanderlust, does this mean that this literature has indeed left the “monoculture” behind? Can we speak of a transculturality in contemporary Polish literature? Or is transculturality something that is

primarily found in the history of Polish literature(s)? Before seeking to answer this question, I will first briefly address the concept of transculturality, which the contemporary field of literary studies eagerly deploys, in light of the growing abundance of literary texts that move among different languages and geographical and cultural spaces.

## **2. Transculturality and literary globalisation**

In German-speaking countries, the term *transculturality* was definitively shaped by the philosopher Wolfgang Welsch, who proclaimed the disappearance of national cultures into hybrid network cultures as early as the 1990s (Welsch 1997). According to Welsch, globalisation, migration and mobility, as well as mass media and digital communication are increasingly transforming all of us into transcultural subjects, who in turn live in increasingly culturally heterogeneous societies. For Welsch, transculturality is not merely an unavoidable and welcome future for a globalised humanity. Rather, he discovers in it a universal principle of cultural development, which also encompasses the past (cultural dynamics based on mobility, linguistic contact and exchange), in light of which the traditional “sphere model” of national cultures (Herder) appears historically inaccurate. The utopian factor in Welsch’s thinking about transculturality can certainly be criticised as culturalist in light of the question that is becoming increasingly relevant today in criticism of postmodernist thinking, which is directed at the blind spot of the postmodern apologia for cultural diversity and entanglement: in the affirmation of hybridity and diversity, conflicts and power structures are often masked and economic and social inequality are often ignored (cf. Eagleton 2016).

A look at the now-vast field of literary texts that are written, for example, in English or German by first-generation immigrants and other “travellers between the worlds” reveals a whole range of possible approaches, from affirmatively dissociating oneself from linguistic, spatial and identity affiliations to move towards a new cosmopolitanism to grappling dramatically with the challenges of a life “in between”. In German-language literatures, the number of authors whose native language is not German has grown dramatically in the last two to three decades.<sup>1</sup> It is revealing that German studies (as a national philology) found it difficult for a long time to grasp German-language migrant literature conceptually (cf. Chiellino 2007). Curiously, interesting literary theory proposals have come primarily from the German study of Romance languages; the field of Slavic studies now also contributes to the study of such literature, due not least to the growing visibility of German authors whose language of origin is Russian (cf. Hausbacher 2009). Ottmar Ette, a scholar of Romance literatures, has been developing a theory of literary globalisation beyond national philological or comparative categorisations for almost 20 years—in concepts such as “literature on the move” (Ette 2001

and 2003), “writing-between-worlds” and “literatures-without-a-fixed-abode” (Ette 2005 and 2017). According to Ette, the new migrant literature holds tremendous knowledge of life, ranging from knowledge of survival to knowledge of coexistence (Ette 2010). Literature since its beginnings—that is, since it told the story of the expulsion from the Garden of Eden—can be understood as an “experimental testing ground for models of *Konvivenz* [‘living together’, from the Latin *convivere*]” (Ette 2012: 78). Particularly today, in the current phase of accelerated globalisation, literature’s multilingual and polylogical knowledge of coexistence is highly significant for peaceful *Konvivenz* on a global scale (Ette 2012: 81).

### 3. Transculturality *within* and *with* Polish literature

Against the backdrop of Ottmar Ette’s theoretical considerations, the question of the “knowledge of coexistence” of Polish literature(s) arises for me: a knowledge of cross-border commuters and language-switchers, pilgrims, exiles, colonisers and the colonised, social climbers (e.g. into the aristocracy that is equated with Polishness) and dropouts. Poland’s turbulent history offers a wealth of material for literary treatments of lives “in between” and the conflicts that go along with them, as well as the potential that also goes along with them—potential to mediate, translate and understand, that is, potential for the *Konvivenz* that indeed determined everyday life during the long periods between the catastrophes. From the eastward-expanding early modern empire (*Rzeczpospolita*) to the nation without a state under threefold imperial rule, from the multi-ethnic nation state between the world wars to the “monocultural” Communist nation state—in all of these periods, the (not always voluntary) “travellers between the worlds” include authors who switch their cultural, social or political affiliations far more frequently and easily than is tolerable to the national canon of Polish literature. A history of Polish travellers who switch into other languages and of travellers from other linguistic realms who arrive in Polish literature remains to be written: an entangled literary history in which Polish surfaces in writing as a language of origin or destination, as a literary episode or as one among multiple native languages, perhaps only to vanish again. Specific investigations of Polish-German, Polish-Russian and Polish-Ukrainian literary entanglements and especially of Jewish literatures in Poland make clear that this is a multifaceted phenomenon, which, however, is at best familiar to a small body of experts. But philological research too, which has since the nineteenth century been nationally bound (not only in Poland), remains far too rarely willing to set aside its national philological lens in order to focus on the multilingual, the hybrid and the non-canonical in the oeuvre—as well as in the intertwining of the life and work—of bilingual or multilingual authors, and to treat it on an equal footing. Research on Polish Romantic regionalism has devoted a great deal of attention to transcultural imaginations

of the self in the Polish-Ruthenian-Belarusian context,<sup>2</sup> and postcolonial studies have contributed significantly to the deconstruction of the Polish national myth of *Kresy* [eastern borderlands] and raised awareness of the hegemonic position of Polish (cf. Trybuś 2007). However, the lived multilingualism and multiple cultural affiliations of authors have rarely been the explicit focus of attention. Yes, flamboyant literary adventurers such as Michał Czajkowski, who moved between Poland, Ukraine and Russia, as well as between Catholicism, Islam and Orthodoxy, have once again become attractive to researchers (cf. Woldan 2017), but who is aware that Wincenty Dunin-Marcinkiewicz, a “second-tier” Polish Romantic regional author who lived in Minsk and whose writings included libretti for Stanisław Moniuszko, made his debut with a Polish-Belarusian drama that is today considered the first (and thus a classic) text in Belarusian literature? (cf. Ananka 2017) Who explores the significance, for example, of Russian as the debut language of Polish poet Bolesław Leśmian or of Polish for the Ukrainian poetry of Bohdan Ihor Antonyč? Imperial multilingualism shaped the image of central and eastern Europe for a long time; literary Galicia is considered the epitome of this multilingualism, which is reflected both in the individual linguistic decisions of authors and in the multilingualism of the literature of the region itself. In any event, literatures of the Jewish diaspora are considered a paradigm of literary multilingualism (from a Polish studies perspective, cf. Adamczyk-Garbowska 2004).

Today, after a hundred years of national statehood, however—along with catastrophic world wars and genocidal terror—, literary multilingualism in East Central Europe definitively belongs to the past. The coordinates of a postimperial transculturality shifted dramatically under the pressure of the national. It was a part of the imperial legacy that many authors in interwar Poland moved among multiple languages, such as German, Yiddish, Ukrainian, Russian and Polish; modern nationalism, however, proved to be a powerful dispositif that tied languages tightly to identities (and vice versa).

#### **4. Polish-Jewish literature between the world wars**

Under the pressure of modern nationalism and at the same time as a phenomenon of the diasporic multilingualism of Jewish literature, a new variety of Polish-language Jewish literature emerged in the interwar period, which displayed an ambivalent transculturality that reflects the unresolved problems of that period. Jewish-Polish literature experienced a heyday in the 1930s; just a few years later, the world that had generated it would be almost entirely annihilated. When we think of a potential (unwritten) entangled history of Polish literature(s), Jewish-Polish literature of the interwar era marks its high point: it is a high water mark not only because the Second World War ended the cultural plurality that was historically connected

to Polishness, but also because to this day Polish culture has not generated any comparably intense or relevant spaces for negotiating complex, hybrid identities, not even in its rich body of migrant literature.

The term “Polish-Jewish literature” denotes an explicitly transcultural field of literature that developed gradually in the nineteenth century—first in the integrationist circles of “Poles of Mosaic faith”—and became increasingly connected to cultural and political Zionism after the First World War. There is a radical generational and ideological split between the Jewish educated elite’s project of cultural integration into the Polish majority society in the nineteenth century and the later notion of a Jewish Polishness, which was inspired by Zionism (and was by no means homogenous), and in which both Polish acculturation and a Jewish cultural and national self-awareness were expressed. The younger generation’s turn to Zionism in the early twentieth century was ultimately (also) a reaction to the failure of integration in the face of a Polish nationalism that was increasingly radical in its anti-Semitism. Zionism as a national project responded not only to anti-Semitism and to the nationalisms of the non-Jewish surroundings, but also to the crisis of the traditional diaspora. In the trilingual system of Jewish culture in Poland between the two world wars—as Chone Shmeruk depicts it (Shmeruk 1989)—Polish increasingly competed with Yiddish, and then became the second-most-important language of Jewish literature in Poland, ranking below Yiddish but well above Hebrew. In this period, the concept of Polish-Jewish culture designated that transcultural portion of the public in cultural life in which Jewish national ideas coalesced with linguistic Polonisation and thus also with hybrid identities and relationships, which differed considerably from the older, integrationist identity politics of Poles of the Jewish faith.

The Jewish-Polish literature of the interwar period fell into utter oblivion after the Second World War. Even before the war, it was little known to the Polish cultural mainstream, as it operated in a specific cultural “circuit”—in the Polish-Jewish cultural scene, which was organised around its own press (a Polish-language Jewish press) and its own publishers. Even if individual Jewish authors were able to move between the Jewish-Polish and mainstream Polish cultural worlds, the Polish majority society in particular had little interest in the Jewish-Polish cultural world. After its participants were murdered in the Holocaust, its literary production vanished, insofar as it had even survived the devastation of the war, into library archives. Only decades later—beginning in the late 1980s—were the poetry and prose of Jewish-Polish authors gradually rediscovered and edited. In the 1980s, Władysław Panas became the first to devote powerful essays to Jewish-Polish authors such as Maurycy Szymel, Anda Eker, Roman Brandstaetter, Maurycy Szlanger, and Debora Vogel (Panas 1996). Eugenia Prokop-Janiec’s monographic work on Polish-Jewish literature of the interwar period, which

remains a definitive work to this day (Prokop-Janiec 1992 and 2003), was published in 1992. A few years later, Prokop-Janiec edited a 500-page anthology of Polish-Jewish poetry that presents a selection of the poetic output of more than 50 authors, thereby offering insight into the scale of a transcultural literary movement that ended definitively with the Shoah (Prokop-Janiec 1996). Annotated anthologies of the poems and prose of Maurycy Szymel (Antosik-Piela / Prokop-Janiec 2015) and the poetry of Anda Eker (Antosik-Piela / Prokop-Janiec 2017) have appeared recently.

What “knowledge of coexistence” is conveyed by this literature, which is only being noticed by Polish readers decades after its emergence? It is a bitter knowledge: the Jewish-Polish authors of the interwar period primarily thematise the contradictions of a “hyphenated identity” and of the discrepancies inscribed in it. Hyphenated labels such as “Polish-Jewish poetry” and “Polish-Jewish authors” are self-definitions, by the way. Following the failure of the integrationist project, these self-descriptions reflected a double cultural affiliation, which was not devoid of conflict: on the one hand, a connectedness with the Polish language and culture, including the Polish literary tradition, and on the other hand an identification with the Jewish national ideas that were expressed in cultural and political Zionism. By no means were the transcultural notions of identity of Polish-Jewish authors of the interwar period uniform or consistent; the spectrum of Zionist positions between avowals of cultural belonging and real political options for action was also broad. In the mid-1930s, the Polish-Jewish press fiercely debated the new Polish-language Jewish literature.<sup>3</sup> Roman Brandstaetter (1906–1987) and Maurycy Szymel (1903–1942) were two important figures in this debate; their positions show its dividing lines well.

In 1933, Roman Brandstaetter initiated the discussion with a series of articles on Polish-Jewish poetry, very much in the tone of a manifesto:

[...] w chwili gdy wartki pług chaluca przecina skibę palestyńskiej ziemi, a wiatr znowu szeleści wśród bujnych winnic – tutaj, wśród nas, sad falami srebrnej Wisły rodzi się powoli typ pisarza polsko-żydowskiego, narodowo i kulturalnie nie zasymilowanego, który w mowie polskiej śpiewa hebrajską tęsknotę za ziemią ojczystą i bez reszty wypowiada w swej twórczości [...] specyficzną duszę żydowską. [...] Pochyleni w kornym hołdzie przed wielkim dorobkiem poetyckim pisarzy poskich [...] – stanowimy jednak dzisiaj odrębną grupę poetycką, wychowaną w cieniu wysokiej kultury żydowskiej; zdajemy sobie jasno sprawę z faktu, że jesteśmy w pełnym słowa znaczeniu pierwszymi żydowskimi pisarzami narodowymi tworzącymi po polsku. (quoted from Prokop-Janiec 1992: 18)

[...] at this moment, when the fast plow of the *halutz*<sup>4</sup> cuts the ridge of Palestinian soil and the wind rustles in the lush vineyards, here, among us, on the silver Vistula, a kind of Polish-Jewish writer is slowly evolving who is unassimilated nationally and culturally, who sings in the Polish tongue his Hebrew yearning for the land of his fathers and completely expresses in his works [...] the specific Jewish soul. [...] We bow in humble homage before the great poetic achievements of the Polish writers [...] but today a distinct group of poets reared in the shadow of high Jewish culture; we are clearly aware that we are, in the full sense of the word, the first national Jewish writers who create in Polish. (quoted from Prokop-Janiec 2003: 4)

Brandstaetter, the grandson of a Haskalah scholar and Hebrew poet, studied Polish literature in Krakow and made his debut as a Polish poet, that is, in the non-Jewish press, before adopting Zionist positions in the early 1930s. In his articles, he emphatically underscored the national mission of Polish-language Jewish literature; the language itself appeared to him to be a sort of historical necessity (for authors who could not speak Hebrew) and at the same time an anomaly, as it put the Polish-Jewish poet in the paradoxical situation of a twofold lack of belonging. Brandstaetter sparred with Maurycy (Moshe) Szymel, son of a Yiddish-speaking working-class family, rooted in the shtetl culture, who wrote his poetry in both languages: Polish and Yiddish. Szymel criticised Brandstaetter's instrumentalization of Polish-Jewish poetry in the service of an aesthetic Zionist utopia that disregarded the real lives of the Jewish masses in the diaspora. Szymel also criticised a Zionism that was overly oriented to ethnic state nationalism, which did not do justice to the history and diasporic conditions of the Jewish people. He defended the languages of the diaspora, including Polish, as equal languages for the articulation of Jewishness (Szymel 1933).

The lively debate of the 1930s revealed certain contradictions in the conception of a new Polish-Jewish literature; nevertheless, this literature could be understood particularly as a site of creative examination by a generation seeking to self-assuredly determine its own complex cultural affiliations under increasingly threatening political circumstances and amidst a daily life marked by anti-Semitic hatred. This generation's literary texts—especially its poetry—permanently repeat images expressing dramatic aporia of “hyphenated identities”. Here the native/foreign language and the native/foreign homeland become their topoi. The figure of the chiasmus organises the relationships between both languages and spaces, as the chiasmus thus generally becomes the central figure of an identity that positions itself between languages and spaces as a paradox. (Panas already referred to the central figure of chiasmus in Polish-Jewish poetry in 1992.) A few examples to illustrate this:

Maurycy Szymel: *Elegia do ziemi polskiej*

Dałaś mi chleb Twój i spokój, dałaś mi niebo nad głową—  
Z jodeł Twoich miałem kołyskę, z lip Twoich mieć będę trumnę—  
A przecież nie Ciebie śpiewam Twoim urodnym słowem  
Ojczyzno nie moja, a droga—ziemio, na której umrę.  
(quoted from Prokop-Janiec 1992: 198)

*An elegy for the Polish land*

You gave me Your bread and peace, You gave me the sky over my head—  
My cradle was of Your firs, my coffin will be of Your lindens—  
But not of You do I sing with Your beautiful word  
Fatherland not mine yet dear—earth I'll die on.  
(quoted from Prokop-Janiec 2003: 148)

Maurycy Szymel: *Woń miodu i mleka*

Błogosławię was o łąki moje nieznane,  
Rozrzucone w ojczyźnie, która jest daleko,  
Błogosławię was, chodząc płowym, polskim łanem,  
Który pachnie jak miód i mleko.  
(quoted from Prokop-Janiec 1992: 196)

*The fragrance of mild and honey*

I bless you my unknown meadows,  
Strewn across my distant fatherland,  
I bless you, walking in a buff-colored Polish cornfield  
That smells of milk and honey.  
(quoted from Prokop-Janiec 2003: 145)

Maurycy Szlanger: *Wyznanie moje*

Lecz dopóki palmy nie rzuca cienia menory  
na moją—radosnym znojem przepelnioną—głowę,  
smutny będę i chory  
ja—polski poeta, hebrajski niemowa  
(quoted from Prokop-Janiec 1992: 208)



*My confession*

Until palms throw the shade of a menorah  
On my head—full of happy toil—  
I—a Polish poet, a Hebrew mute  
Will be sad and sick  
(quoted from Prokop-Janiec 2003: 159)

Daniel Ihr: *List*

A ja—piszę wiersz ten w obcej mowie,  
w mowie, co syczy na mnie jak wąż Żyd! Żyd! Żyd!  
(quoted from Prokop-Janiec 1992: 207)

*A letter*

And I—write this poem in a foreign tongue,  
in a tongue that hisses at me like a snake: Jew! Jew! Jew!  
(quoted from Prokop-Janiec 2003: 157)

The familiar language—Polish—is not one’s own, but one’s own language is a distant one that one does not (usually) master: Hebrew. The familiar, private diasporic homeland seems increasingly foreign, and in the distance of the foreign one glimpses that which is one’s own. Closely linked with the spatial chiasmus is the topos of return—as a return to language and as a return to the homeland. In both cases, these are exercises of the (poetic) imagination, for both the language and the land (Eretz Israel) are only potentialities at first. The linguistic and geographical concreteness of the diaspora stands in opposition to the dream images of the language of the ideal homeland. Polish-Jewish poetry developed a specific geopoetics in its juxtaposition of the familiar topographies of Polish landscapes with dream images of an ideal and distant, albeit geographically very concrete, homeland. The imagination is oriented to Eretz Israel as an ideal homeland; on the one hand, it invokes the cultural memory of Judaism, and on the other hand it looks forward, devising a (better) future. Despite their clear vectors, the images of that which is one’s own and that which is foreign have multiple motivations and are entangled in a paradoxical loop: the diasporic country has after all been one’s own home for generations. The longed-for return to the ideal homeland thus also has a painful downside, which many poems refer to: the return promises happiness, an idyll and redemption, but it also means parting and loss. It signifies an estrangement that is compelled by the outside world or even a new expulsion (expulsion from the landscape and the language). That is why the

juxtaposition of the familiar and the dreamed-of is by no means simple. Contrasting depictions of the ‘Slavic’ landscapes of the North and the biblical or exotic Oriental topographies of the South do predominate in Polish-Jewish poetry. However, the familiar landscapes offer a template for the imagined: in many poems, the Polish landscape evokes the Palestinian by providing material for poetic images, comparisons and metaphors. It gives rise to an imaginative neighbourhood of the dissimilar in which the foreignness that is one’s own and the ownness that is foreign are recursively reflected. In these poetic dream images of Eretz Israel, that which is dreamed interferes with the familiar in a topographical chiasmus of a homeland that has become foreign and a foreignness that has been domesticated through utopia. Not infrequently, the familiar and imagined topographies interfere with one another—as in Szymel’s work—to form hybrid landscapes that appear as a topographical visualization of an identity that has been conceived as inherently contradictory.

On the one hand, the chiasmus structure of poetic images points to a deep, “organic” entanglement, but on the other hand it incessantly addresses a painful discrepancy. The new Jewish-Polish poetry of the interwar period describes Jewishness as the (inextricable) Other of Polish culture, which has become a source of suffering. The transculturality of Polish-Jewish literature of this era has absolutely nothing in common with the lightness of certain affirmative postmodern literary and theoretical schemes of a life “in between”: the necessity of an (impossible) either-or hangs above the richness of their images like a sword of Damocles. Transcultural identities are always determined by the political, social and discursive frameworks of their time.

## **5. Conclusion**

The migrations of accelerated globalisation are noticeably altering literary production. The concept of a new “global literature” or “world literature” (cf. also Sturm-Trigonakis 2007) designates contemporary literature that can no longer be clearly categorised into systems of literature that are arranged according to nations and single languages. It may well have some things in common with the early literatures of the Jewish diaspora or with the literature of twentieth-century emigrants and exiles, yet it is clearly different, as it tells different stories, which are marked by contemporary itineraries, motivations, and speeds and modes of switching location and language. In it, we can catch sight of a new cosmopolitanism or a laborious struggle with migration as the collateral damage of globalisation—depending on who is writing and who is reading.

How do authors who come from Poland contribute to this global literature? In Germany, these authors are—as measured against the scale of Polish migration in recent

decades—not particularly visible,<sup>5</sup> especially in comparison with the authors from the post-Soviet region who write in German.<sup>6</sup> The analyses of literature by Polish migrants in Germany who write in Polish<sup>7</sup> primarily repeat a single diagnosis: it is a literature that demonstrates its captivity to the cultural stereotypes and resentments of the “subalterns”, the discontents who nurse their own foreignness or who seek to cope with their migrant situation through self-exoticisation that ranges from the ironic to the grotesque (cf. Czapliński 2013, Dąbrowski 2016). One should not, however, be too quick to draw conclusions from this striking characteristic style concerning cultural difference, for this migrant literature too has its historical, social and economic context, which is ultimately crucial to migrants’ self-perception. If one comparatively examines Polish and German contemporary literature, however, there is an obvious difference: in recent decades, transcultural literature has become ever more visible in the German language, such that it is now necessitating a reconsideration of the notion of a national literature. This phenomenon is essentially unknown in present-day Polish literature. I can only think of one non-native-speaker author who is writing in Polish: Żanna Słoniowska from Lviv, who now lives in Krakow. In a conversation with the author about her book *Dom z witrażem* (2014, Engl. *The House with the Stained-Glass Window*, 2017) at the German-Polish bookstore *Buchbund* in Berlin in autumn 2016, Słoniowska said at the end that this was the first talk at which she had not been asked whether she was Polish or Ukrainian—a question that she always had to expect at readings in Poland. This anecdote is perhaps the best illustration of the challenge of a migrant transculturality for a “monoculture”.

(Translated from German by Jane Yager)

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> One of the most successful “transcultural” authors in Germany is Yoko Tawada, who lives in Berlin and writes in both Japanese and German. Her German writing is in many ways paradigmatic of contemporary transcultural and translingual literature, for her prose and poetry explicitly address—through inventive linguistic experiments—the particular linguistic and cultural sensibility that goes along with an existence “in between”.
- <sup>2</sup> The work of Maria Janion, a scholar of Romanticism, plays an especially important role in this area.
- <sup>3</sup> This discussion took place primarily in the Warsaw weekly newspaper *Opinia*; the Polish-Jewish authors otherwise largely grouped around the Lviv newspaper *Chwila* and the Krakow newspaper *Nowy Dziennik*.
- <sup>4</sup> *Halutz* means pioneer. *HeHalutz* was a Zionist youth organization in Europe and America that trained young Jewish people for agricultural settlement in Palestine.

- <sup>5</sup> Noteworthy here are the poet Iwona Mickiewicz, the prose authors Radek Knapp, Artur Becker, and Dariusz Muszer, as well as Matthias Nawrat and Emilia Smechowski from the younger generation, among others.
- <sup>6</sup> The most successful among them include Vladimir Vertlib, Wladimir Kaminer, Katja Petrowskaja, Olga Martynova, Olga Grjasnova, Lena Gorelik, Yulia Rabinowich, Eleonora Hummel and Waldemar Weber. Most of them came to Germany as Jewish refugees from the former Soviet Union (except Hummel and Weber).
- <sup>7</sup> They include Janusz Rudnicki, Krzysztof Maria Załuski, Brygida Helbig, Krzysztof Niewrzęda and Leszek Oświęcimski, among others.

### **Bibliography**

- Adamczyk-Garbowska, Monika. 2004. *Odcienie tożsamości. Literatura żydowska jako zjawisko wielojęzyczne*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Ananka, Yaraslava. 2017. Die Geburt von Belarus aus dem Geist der polnischen ruralen Operette. In: Kirschbaum 2017, 257–278.
- Antosik-Piela, Maria and Eugenia Prokop-Janiec (eds.) 2015. *Twarzą ku nocy. Twórczość literacka Maurycyego Szymła*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Antosik-Piela, Maria and Eugenia Prokop-Janiec (eds.) 2017. *Anda Eker. Miłość stracona*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Chiellino, Carmine. 2007. Interkulturalität und Literaturwissenschaft. In: Carmine Chiellino (ed.) *Interkulturelle Literatur in Deutschland. Ein Handbuch*, 387–399. Stuttgart, Weimar: Verlag J.B. Metzler.
- Czapliński, Przemysław. 2013. Kanony mobilności. In: Przemysław Czapliński a.o. (eds.) *Poetyka migracji. Doświadczenie granic w literaturze polskiej przełomu XIX i XX wieku*, 9–42. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Dąbrowski, Mieczysław. 2016. *Tekst kulturowy. O przemianach literatury emigracyjnej*. Warszawa: Elipsa.
- Eagleton, Terry. 2016. Postmodern Prejudices. In: Terry Eagleton, *Culture*, 30–48. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Ette, Ottmar. 2001. *Literatur in Bewegung. Raum und Dynamik grenzüberschreitenden Schreibens in Europa und Amerika*. Weilerswist-Metternich: Velbrück Wissenschaft.
- Ette, Ottmar. 2003. *Literature on the Move*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Ette, Ottmar. 2005. *ZwischenWeltenSchreiben. Literaturen ohne festen Wohnsitz*. Berlin: Kadmos.
- Ette, Ottmar. 2012. *Konvivenz. Literatur und Leben nach dem Paradies*. Berlin: Kadmos.

- Ette Ottmar. 2016. *ZusammenLebensWissen. List, Last und Lust literarischer Konvivenz im globalen Maßstab*. Berlin: Kadmos.
- Ette, Ottmar. 2017. *Writing-between-Worlds: TransArea Studies and the Literatures-without-a-fixed-Abode*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyeter.
- Hausbacher, Eva. 2009. *Poetik der Migration. Transnationale Schreibweisen in der zeitgenössischen russischen Literatur*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Kirschbaum, Heinrich (ed.) 2017. *Wiedergänger, Pilger, Indianer. Polen-Metonymien im langen 19. Jahrhundert*. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang.
- Panas, Władysław. 1996. *Pismo i rana. Szkice o problematyce żydowskiej*. Lublin: Dabar.
- Prokop-Janiec, Eugenia. 1992. *Międzywojenna literatura polsko-żydowska jako zjawisko kulturowe i artystyczne*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Prokop-Janiec, Eugenia (ed.) 2003. *Międzywojenna poezja polsko-żydowska. Antologia*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Prokop-Janiec, Eugenia. 2003. *Polish-Jewish Literature in the Interwar Years*. Translated by Abe Shenitzer. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Shmeruk, Chone. 1989. Hebrew—Yiddish—Polish: A Trilingual Jewish Culture. In: Ysrael Gutman a.o. (eds.) *The Jews in Poland Between Two World Wars*, 285–311. Hanover, London: University Press of New England.
- Sturm-Trigonakis, Elke. 2007. *Global playing in der Literatur. Ein Versuch über die Neue Weltliteratur*. Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann.
- Szymel, Maurycy. 1933. Kij w mrowisku. W sprawie artykułów Romana Brandstaettera o poezji polsko-żydowskiej. In: Antosik-Piela, Prokop-Janiec 2015, 271–286.
- Trybuś, Krzysztof a.o. (eds.). 2007. *Kresy—dekonstrukcja*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo PTPN.
- Welsch, Wolfgang. 1997. Transkulturalität. Zur veränderten Verfassung heutiger Kulturen. In: Irmela Schneider and Christian W. Thomsen (eds.) *Hybridkultur. Medien, Netze, Künste*, 67–90. Köln: Wienand.
- Woldan, Alois. 2017. Kosakentum als Kulturtrope. Michał Czajkowski und polnisch-ukrainische Identitätsverhandlungen. In: Kirschbaum 2017, 235–256.

**Transkulturalität als Herausforderung.  
Einige Anmerkungen zur polnischen Literatur „ohne festen Wohnsitz“:  
mit Fokus auf die polnisch-jüdische Literatur in der Zwischenkriegszeit**

**Magdalena Marszałek**

Der Artikel fragt nach einem möglichen Geltungsbereich heutiger Konzeptualisierungen der literarischen Transkulturalität für die polnische(n) Literatur(en). Der Hintergrund der Überlegungen ist die ‚monokulturelle‘ Kondition der polnischen Gesellschaft nach den Katastrophen des 20. Jahrhunderts, die u.a. in den literarischen Rückgriffen auf die vergangene kulturelle Pluralität in den letzten drei Dekaden kritisch reflektiert wurde, heute aber wieder—in der populistisch-nationalistischen Politik—affirmiert wird. Dabei ermöglicht eine historische Perspektive auf die kulturellen Verflechtungen des literarischen Schreibens in der polnischen Sprache einen Einblick in die historisch heterogenen Formen literarischer Transkulturalität, die von den jeweiligen politischen und sozialen Kontexten abhängen. Eine umfassende Behandlung des Schreibens in der polnischen Sprache unter Bedingungen des Sprachwechsels bzw. der Mehrsprachigkeit seit der frühen Neuzeit bis zum 20. Jh. bleibt ein Desiderat. Den Höhepunkt einer auf diese Art gedachten Literaturgeschichte bildet—so die These des Artikels—die spezifische Ausprägung der polnisch-jüdischen Literatur in der Zwischenkriegszeit, in welcher Konzepte einer hybriden Doppelzugehörigkeit in linguistischen und topographischen Chiasmen dramatisch auf die Spitze getrieben werden und somit die ungelösten Probleme der Zeit spiegeln.