



Mateusz M. Kłagisz  and Renata Rusek-Kowalska 

## The Dragoman and the Scholar: Two Polish Translations of Sa‘di’s *Golestān*

*This article discusses two Polish translations of Sa‘di’s Golestān, prepared by Samuel Otwinowski and Wojciech Biberstein-Kazimirski (alias Albert Kazimirski de Biberstein) and published in 1879 and 1876 respectively. Though edited at the end of the nineteenth century, Otwinowski’s translation had been originally completed in the first half of the seventeenth century and is assumed to be the first one or one of the very first renderings of Sa‘di’s work into a European language. The question that remains unresolved is whether or not Otwinowski’s translation, despite being unpublished, was known to seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Polish poets. One can find some stories and motifs “picked” from Sa‘di’s Golestān in their poetry, but they seem more likely to have been influenced by non-Polish renderings. This article describes the different translation strategies adopted by the two translators, the literarily gifted dragoman Otwinowski and the nineteenth-century philologist Biberstein Kazimirski.*

**Keywords:** Sa‘di; *Golestān*; Otwinowski; Kazimirski; Polish Translation; Cultural Mobility; Wisdom Literature

### Introduction

Our article discusses two Polish translations of Sa‘di’s *Golestān*, one by Samuel Otwinowski and the other by Wojciech Biberstein-Kazimirski (hereafter Kazimirski) published in 1879 and 1876 respectively. We are interested in the cultural mobility and oral transmission of wisdom literature between the Muslim and Christian worlds as well as the different *skopoi* (purposes of the translation) and the translation strategies adopted by both translators: the literarily gifted dragoman Otwinowski and the precise scholar Kazimirski.

Though published in 1879, Otwinowski’s translation was originally completed in the first half of the seventeenth century and is assumed to be the first or at least

---

Mateusz M. Kłagisz is an Assistant Professor at the Department of Iranian Studies at the Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland.

Renata Rusek-Kowalska is an Assistant Professor at the Department of Iranian Studies at the Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland.

one of the very first renderings of Sa'di's work into a European language.<sup>1</sup> It was made during a period of intense but turbulent political contacts between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (hereafter Poland) and the Ottoman Empire (hereafter Turkey), whereas Kazimirski rendered the *Golestān* in a completely different cultural and political atmosphere while making ends meet as an exile in Paris following the partition of Poland in 1795. The histories of their creations are micro-histories of a single displaced object and, as Stephen Greenblatt says, such peculiar, specific and local micro-histories constitute the overall cultural relationship between unexpected times and places.<sup>2</sup>

Otwinowski's translation should be the subject of our interest to the same extent as various material goods imported from the East, mainly men's clothing, carpets, weapons and other items for personal use,<sup>3</sup> especially as the transfer of cultural systems is more challenging than the mass transfer of wealth.<sup>4</sup> In seventeenth-century Poland the adaptation of the products of material culture from the East was not accompanied by an adaptation of the products of its intellectual culture, since literary inspiration was sought in the West.<sup>5</sup>

Kazimirski's rendering, on the other hand, was made by a nineteenth-century orientalist educated in the West, and may be conceived of as an outcome of the academic movement of the Oriental Renaissance.<sup>6</sup> Completed and published in Paris, it was accurate, well-researched and richly footnoted and was thus aimed at satisfying a Polish readership's epistemic thirst for knowledge of eastern culture.

### *Otwinowski and his Giulistan*

Otwinowski was born between 1575 and 1585 into a family that belonged to a community of the anti-trinitarian wing of the Polish Reformation (so-called Polish Brethren).<sup>7</sup> Around 1604 he found himself in Istanbul where for six years he studied oriental languages, mainly Turkish as well as the basics of Arabic and

<sup>1</sup>Among the first translations of Sa'di's *Golestān* into European languages one can enumerate: (1) the French rendering by André Du Ryer (1634); (2) the Latin version by Georgius Gentius (1651); as well as (3–4) the German editions by Friedrich Ochsenbach (1636) and Adam Olearius (1654) (*Brancaforte*, "Persian Words of Wisdom," 450–72).

<sup>2</sup>Greenblatt, "Cultural Mobility: An Introduction," 17.

<sup>3</sup>Czartoryski, *Mysli o pismach polskich z uwagami*, 185. Tazbir, *Kultura szlachecka w Polsce*.

<sup>4</sup>Greenblatt, "Cultural Mobility: An Introduction," 10.

<sup>5</sup>Tazbir, *Kultura szlachecka w Polsce*, 160. On the other hand, the *Bible* (1599) in its successful translation by the Jesuit, Jakub Wujek (1541–97), was a tame religious and cultural text from the Oriental culture circle. Since the Middle Ages, literary oriental traditions in a broader perspective, together with their themes, motifs and genres, have reached Poland mainly through translations from Latin and western European languages, e.g. a spiritual romance about Buddha-Josafat, known in the West since the twelfth century, which appeared for the first time in Polish in the sixteenth century in the *Żywoty świętych* [*The Lives of the Saints*] by Piotr Skarga (1536–1612).

<sup>6</sup>See Schwab, *La Renaissance Orientale*.

<sup>7</sup>Sa'di, *Perska księga na polski*, vi–ix (hereafter Otwinowski); Baranowski, *Znajomość Wschodu w dawnej Polsce do XVIII wieku*, 78–108.

Persian essential for translating Ottoman correspondence.<sup>8</sup> After returning to Poland, he began his state service, first as a translator on the Polish–Turkish border and then as a dragoman in the Crown Chancellery of Sigismund III Vasa (1587–1632) and, most likely, Władysław IV Vasa (1632–48). He probably died circa 1650.

His interests went beyond diplomatic issues and included historical,<sup>9</sup> folklore<sup>10</sup> and literary topics. The fruit of the latter is a translation of the *Golestān* entitled *Giulistan to jest Ogród różany* [*Giulistan That Is the Rose Garden*] completed between 1604 (first journey to Istanbul) and 1640 (end of work as a dragoman).<sup>11</sup> However, as mentioned above, it was only published in 1879 as *Perska księga na polski przełożona od Jmci Pana Samuela Otwinowskiego Sekretarza J. Kr. Mci, nazwana Giulistan to jest Ogród Różany* [*A Persian Book Translated into Polish by Dear Sir Samuel Otwinowski, Secretary to His Royal Highness, called Giulistan That Is the Rose Garden*] by Wincenty Korotyński and Ignacy Janicki. It is impossible to say what happened to this manuscript from the time of its creation until 1841, when it was donated to Józef I. Kraszewski.<sup>12</sup> Even then it was still largely unknown: Kazimirski did not provide any information about it in the comments to his translation published in Paris in 1876.<sup>13</sup> It was for this reason that the editors of the Otwinowski's translation wanted to "restore Otwinowski's place in history and literature,"<sup>14</sup> as they were convinced that it was the first rendition of the *Golestān* into a European language and of a higher literary quality than its nineteenth-century counterpart. Their edition was based on a manuscript comprised of eighty-three cards from a collection of *silva rerum*<sup>15</sup> destroyed during World War II. It is

<sup>8</sup>With regard to the training process for aspiring dragomans we only know that they were required to have good command of both written and spoken Turkish, Arabic and Persian. Since these languages were not taught in Poland at the time, any vocational training could only take place abroad, mostly in Turkey. See: Baranowski, "Znajomość języka tureckiego," 9–37; Kołodziejczyk, *The Crimean Khanate and Poland-Lithuania*, 252ff.

<sup>9</sup>Otwinowski translated Ain-ı Ali's work on the Ottoman state, completing it with his own comments (Nosowski, *Polska literatura polemiczno-antyislamiczna XVI, XVII i XVIII w.*, I, 142–3).

<sup>10</sup>Otwinowski wrote in Andrzej Lubieniecki's diary on 23 November 1618 a pseudo-Arabic invocation to the Holy Trinity *yā allāh yā 'isā yā rūb-al-'isā* that should mean "In the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit" (*rūb-al-'isā* is Jesus's title and "the Holy Spirit" is in fact *rūb-al-quds*), two Turkish poems (one of them erroneously identified as Persian) and a vigorous signature in the Ottoman style (Tr. *tuğra*) (Manuscript in the Biblioteka Książąt Czartoryskich, Kraków, sign. I 1403).

<sup>11</sup>Otwinowski, ix. Kieniewicz, *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, vol. XXVI(1), 649; Baraowski, "Najdawniejsze polskie przekłady," 33–48. As researchers do not agree on the precise time that Otwinowski prepared his translation, it is impossible to state firmly that his translation of Sa'di's *Golestān* was the first into a European language. Yet, judging by the content of his *Giulistan*, and the lack of both *explicit* and *implicit* references to Du Ryer's and Ochsenschlag's translations in his work, Otwinowski can be regarded as the pioneer in the field of European renditions of Sa'di.

<sup>12</sup>The manuscript was donated by an unidentified V. J. Warchocki, who brought it to the editorial office of the *Athenaeum* journal "among the interesting remnants from the times of Sigismund III's rulership" (Kraszewski, *Athenaeum*, V, 248; Kraszewski, *Athenaeum*, I, 238; Kraszewski, *Podróż*, 5).

<sup>13</sup>Jeziński, "Giulistan, to jest Ogród różany S'adego," 464–74.

<sup>14</sup>Otwinowski, ii.

<sup>15</sup>*Silva rerum* (Polonized: *sylwa*) defines a collection of texts of a non-uniform character, created on the principle of free choice. It includes records from everyday observations and reflections, quotations of private and public documents as well as literary works in Polish and/or Latin. This type of literature was

therefore impossible to say whether this was the original manuscript or, as both suggested, a copy.<sup>16</sup>

Initially, it was believed that Otwinowski translated the *Golestān* directly from Persian but it has since been established that his command of the language was too poor and he must have used a Turkish translation.<sup>17</sup> There are some linguistic features indicating a translation by relay:

- (1) The Persian noun *golestān* was rendered in Polish as *giulistan*, i.e. its Turkish pronunciation *gülistān*.
- (2) The name Muhammad appears as Me[c]hmet[/d],<sup>18</sup> which is the Turkish rendition of the Arabic Muḥammad and which was borne by six Ottoman sultans. This version was never applied to the prophet, called Muhammet by the Turks,<sup>19</sup> but the graphical forms of Mehmed and Muhammet are identical. Otwinowski followed the local pronunciation, which may also suggest a rather poor command of Arabic. The usage of Me[c]hmet[/d] is somewhat surprising as the western European form Ma[c]homet was more common in Polish at that time.
- (3) The Polish orthography of (Arabic-)Persian names indicates a Turkish language filter, e.g. Kiey-Husrew ← Tr. Keyhüsrev instead of the expected Kej-Chosraw.<sup>20</sup>
- (4) A few Middle Eastern toponyms appear in their Turkified versions, e.g. Misyr ← Tr. Mısır instead of Mesr or Egipt.<sup>21</sup>
- (5) The usage of a few Turkish terms, not found in the Persian original, that had been previously adopted into Polish, e.g.: *bajram* “festival,”<sup>22</sup> in the sense of ‘*id al-’adhā*’ “the Festival of Sacrifice” ← Tr. *kurban bayramı* “t.s.”<sup>23</sup>

widespread between the sixteenth and eighteenth century (Zachara, “Sylwy—dokument szlacheckiej kultury,” 197–219; Gazda, *Słownik rodzajów*, 1019–21). *Silva rerum*, which included Otwinowski’s translation, also contained Latin and Polish texts on contemporary history, contacts with Turkey as well as travel to Istanbul, all dated 1557–1622 (Otwinowski, iii–v).

<sup>16</sup>Kraszewski, *Podróże*, 5. Otwinowski, ii. Comparing the manuscript of *silva rerum* and Otwinowski’s hand-written translations of the Ottoman documents, they came to the conclusion that the former had not been written by the same hand as the latter.

<sup>17</sup>Baranowski, “Najdawniejsze,” 42–3. In 1979 Baranowski returned to the problem of Otwinowski’s source text, explaining that he had encountered some traces that may indicate that Otwinowski received a translation of the *Golestān* from a Sunni emigrant from Azerbaijan to Istanbul at the beginning of the seventeenth century. He also added that he was going to deal with this issue in a separate work but such a text has never been published (Baranowski, *Polsko-azerbejdżańskie stosunki kulturalne*, 45 (footnote 2)). It could have been one of four different Turkish translations: (1) the Kipchak *Gülistān Terzūmesi* by Seyf-i Serāyī (fourteenth century); (2) the Chagatai *Gülistān Terzūmesi* by Sibiçâbâ (fourteenth century); (3–4) the Ottoman-Turkish *Gülistān* by Mahmud b. Kâdî-i Manyas (fifteenth century) or *Kitâb-ı Nigâri-stân ve Hadîka-i Sebzi-stân* by Za’îfi (sixteenth century). On Turkish translations of the *Golestān* see Büyükkaracı Yılmaz, “On Gulistan’s Turkish (Re)translations,” 11ff.

<sup>18</sup>Otwinowski, 126; Sa’di, *Golestān*, 352.

<sup>19</sup>Stachowski, *Słownik historyczno-etymologiczny turcyzmów w języku polskim*, 378.

<sup>20</sup>Otwinowski, 57; Sa’di, *Golestān*, 186.

<sup>21</sup>Otwinowski, 86; Sa’di, *Golestān*, 246.

<sup>22</sup>Otwinowski, 64; Sa’di, *Golestān*, 202.

<sup>23</sup>Stachowski, *Słownik historyczno-etymologiczny*, 49.

Along with these linguistic features, there are traces of cultural elements that point to translation by relay: “(1) ethnicities not mentioned in the Persian original, e.g. Bulgarzyn “Bulgar”;<sup>24</sup> (2) Istanbul (consistently called Konstantynopol “Constantinople”) is the background of some stories.”<sup>25</sup>

For these reasons in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries Polish researchers accused Otwinowski of inaccuracy, distortions resulting from misunderstanding, taking too many liberties in his interpretation, and omissions, especially in Chapter 5 and 8. Their reservations were based on Kazimirski’s and western European translations.<sup>26</sup> Although they noticed discrepancies between the two Polish renderings,<sup>27</sup> there was never a question as to whether both translators had the same Persian text at their disposal. Meanwhile, the inaccuracies in Otwinowski’s translation, which were perceived as the traces of the translator, indicate rather that the intermediate text, i.e. the Turkish translation, must have been far from the original. The fact that we do not have this intermediary text does not allow us to identify whether minor changes had already made their appearance in the Turkish translation or if these came later in the Polish one, or during its rewriting into the *silva rerum*. This is the case for example when we read: “Gdybym widział dobrego, że nad studnią chodzi, / Nie wytrwałbym, bo przestrzedz takiego się godzi [If I had seen a good man that was going around a well, / I would not proceed to warn him as it is right to do so],”<sup>28</sup> where “good” substitutes “blind,” since in the original we find: “But if I see a blind man near a well / It is a crime for me to remain silent.”<sup>29</sup>

For a long time, discrepancies between the original and the translation were considered to reduce the value of the latter.<sup>30</sup> However, the value of Otwinowski’s translation lies in its lively and vibrant language, as well as in its interesting translation strategy consisting of four elements: (1) archaization; (2) the use of genres developed in Polish literature; (3) domestication; and (4) foreignization. Due to these four elements Otwinowski was able to familiarize the Polish readership with the culturally alien and geographically distant work of Sa’di. The appropriateness of his translation in relation to the original is not just to be defined in terms of its faithfulness. It should be considered in terms of his recreation of the universal character of Sa’di’s *Golestān*. When looking for the paradigms that guided Otwinowski, we would do well to recall Horace’s maxim *nec verbum verbo curabis reddere fidus interpres*, because while working with the Turkish translation he skillfully rendered the style of the original. In his own version he implemented, somewhat unconsciously, the basic assumptions of the modern Nidaesque understanding of dynamic equivalence. Presumably, if his work had been published in print shortly after its creation, being close to the esthetic

---

<sup>24</sup>Otwinowski, 252.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., 178–9; Sa’di, *Golestān*, 500.

<sup>26</sup>Święcicki, “Najnowsze prace orientalistów polskich,” 107.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., 108.

<sup>28</sup>Otwinowski, 70.

<sup>29</sup>Sa’di, *Golestān*, 215.

<sup>30</sup>Machalski, “W 700-lecie ‘Gulistanu’ Sa’diego z Szyrazu,” 251.

expectations of the seventeenth-century Polish readership, it would have had a measurable impact on the work of later poets and writers.

It was Janicki who pointed out that Otwinowski's language was quite outdated for the times he lived and worked in. Janicki explained this by his long stay in Turkey and the lack of contact with living Polish language.<sup>31</sup> Such an assertion is difficult to accept since Otwinowski's translations of Ottoman correspondence do not differ from the language norm of that time. He must have been driven by something else when he decided to age the Polish. There are two issues at stake: (1) a willingness to highlight a certain stylistic tonality; and (2) the urge to refer to well-known literary patterns. Firstly, archaization allowed Otwinowski to emphasize the didactic and moralizing character of the *Golestān*. Secondly, it could enhance the translation to better incorporate it into the natural habitat of Polish culture, i.e. to create the sense of "at-homeness" which is, as Greenblatt writes, "often claimed to be the necessary condition for a robust cultural identity."<sup>32</sup>

Archaization is closely related to the use of genres developed by Polish literature during the height of its development in the sixteenth century. Otwinowski combined the rhymed epigram, known in Polish as *fraszka*, and a type of tale, the *powieść*, related to the oral genre of the *gawęda*.<sup>33</sup> This inventive and precise solution enabled the domestication of the translation, helping him to bring the text closer to its audience.<sup>34</sup> The *gawęda* is a specifically Polish epic genre written in prose and verse. It has the character of a free, unpretentious story of varying length and is connected to the transformation of folk oral tradition into a written form.<sup>35</sup> As a genre it was informed by the literary esthetics of Romanticism, but its beginnings should be sought in the Baroque and Enlightenment culture of family or communal feasts, when various stories similar to those that constitute the *Golestān* were told in public and in private. Viewed in this context, Otwinowski's priority is clearly the adaptation of the original text to its target culture. This can be compared to Du Ryer's strategy of domestication (as opposed to Gentius' academic approach). Otwinowski's translation, like Du Ryer's, Ochsenbach's and Olearius' renditions, is aimed at a wider audience, but though he partly domesticates the text, he does not eliminate the Muslim context of the original, as was the case of Du Ryer's and (based on Du Ryer's version) Ochsenbach's *Gulistan*.

<sup>31</sup>Otwinowski, xii.

<sup>32</sup>Greenblatt, "Cultural Mobility: An Introduction," 3.

<sup>33</sup>Epigram (Pl. *fraszka*) is a short poetic work adapted to Polish literature from the western European tradition by two significant poets of the golden age—Mikołaj Rej (1505–69) and Jan Kochanowski (1530–84). They formulated its stylistic patterns, also defining its immanent ones, which caused today's researchers to distinguish a separate genre of "Polish epigram" (*fraszka polska*), different to the epigram from which it originates. To put it simply, we can say that an epigram consists of a generic scene, often humorous, sometimes also a play on words, and a punchline. Gazda, *Słownik rodzajów*, 345.

<sup>34</sup>The argument for this is also the fact that Book 8, which in original consists of maxims, in Otwinowski's translation was adapted, in terms of structure, to the remaining chapters and organized on the basis of stories.

<sup>35</sup>Gazda, *Słownik rodzajów*, 354–7.



With regard to the domestication of *Golestān*, three levels can be distinguished: (1) linguistic; (2) literary; and (3) cultural.

On the linguistic level, domestication involved using the lexical resources of the Polish language, without weighing the translation down with terms unknown to a wider audience. Therefore, although the ethnonyms “Arab(in)”<sup>36</sup> appear in Otwinowski’s work, it is Turczyn “Turk” that is considered to be a Muslim *par excellence*,<sup>37</sup> e.g. “Ja przez księgi Mojżeszowe przysięgam, / jeśli źle przysięgam, niech Turczynem zostawam [I swear by the book of Moses / if I swear badly, let me be a Turk],”<sup>38</sup> while in the original we read: “The Jew said: ‘I swear by the Pentateuch / That if my oath is false, I shall die a Moslem like thee.’”<sup>39</sup>

Accommodation to native lexical resources also caused the most common term for a Muslim ruler to be the noun *cesarz* “emperor,”<sup>40</sup> even if there appears the word *sultan* “sultan,”<sup>41</sup> or *padyszach* “padishah, king.”<sup>42</sup> The custom of addressing Turkish sultans as emperors was widespread before and during the time of Otwinowski, as evidenced by, inter alia, fragments of the *Pamiętnik Janczara* (*Janczar’s Memoirs*),<sup>43</sup> which he knew and developed.<sup>44</sup>

Domestication on a literary level was manifested by a bold procedure in the form of conscious disguised quotations of Kochanowski’s epigrams.<sup>45</sup> The fact that Otwinowski made use of them aroused the interest of the first researchers who were seeking an indirect influence of Sa’di’s work on Polish poets before they could even have gained the opportunity to get acquainted with it thanks to Otwinowski’s translation. Janicki was the first to write about this and the idea was developed by Marja Wrzeźniewska, who believed that Otwinowski translated the *Golestān* because fragments of it were supposed to be known to Poles traveling to Turkey and Persia.<sup>46</sup> They were thought to have brought home with them anecdotes from the *Golestān* and told them to their relatives or friends. As evidence she pointed out one of Kochanowski’s most popular epigrams *Na zdrowie* (*On Noble Health*): “Szlachetne zdrowie / Nikt się nie dowie / Jako smakujesz / Aż się zepsujesz [O, noble health / Thou – all our wealth! / None thy taste cost / Till thou art lost].”<sup>47</sup> Kochanowski supposedly became acquainted with Sa’di’s work thanks to his friend Andrzej Bzicki, who lived in Istanbul in the middle of the sixteenth century. However, he could have been likewise inspired by a paean in honor of Hygiea by

<sup>36</sup>Otwinowski, 71, 73.

<sup>37</sup>Stachowski, *Słownik historyczno-etymologiczny*, 599.

<sup>38</sup>Otwinowski, 239.

<sup>39</sup>Sa’di, *Golestān*, 644.

<sup>40</sup>Otwinowski, 15; Sa’di, *Golestān*, 96.

<sup>41</sup>Otwinowski, 16; Sa’di, *Golestān*, 100.

<sup>42</sup>Otwinowski, 100; Sa’di, *Golestān*, 239.

<sup>43</sup>Łoś, *Pamiętniki janczara*, 236.

<sup>44</sup>Prejs, *Egzotyzm w literaturze*, 54, 78.

<sup>45</sup>Jan Kochanowski (1530–84) was a Renaissance poet and creator of poetic patterns that would become integral to the Polish literary language.

<sup>46</sup>Wrzeźniewska, “Uwagi o Gulistanie i fraszce polskiej,” 5.

<sup>47</sup>Kochanowski, *Dziela polskie*, vol. I, 240–1. English translation by T. Bałuk-Ulewiczowa, *Kto mi dal skrzydła* [Who Hath Bewinged Me], 97.

Ariphron of Sikion (fifth/fourth century BC),<sup>48</sup> not Sa'di, who wrote: "thus also a man does not appreciate the value of immunity from a misfortune until it has befallen him."<sup>49</sup> The fact that Otwinowski rendered the quoted fragment changing its form but preserving the message: "nikomu zdrowie nie smakuje, aż jakiej choroby skosztuje [health does not taste good to anyone / until he tastes disease]" is proof of an in-depth knowledge of Polish literature as well as of a literary mind.<sup>50</sup>

Similar theses have been put forward concerning Story 10 from Chapter 4: "How knowest thou what is in the zenith of the sky / If thou art not aware who is in thy house?,"<sup>51</sup> which in Otwinowski's translation reads as follows: "Jako ty widzieć możesz co się dzieje w niebie, / Kiedy nie wiesz, że w domu masz [kurwę] u siebie [How can you see what is going on in the sky / When you do not know that you have a (whore) at home]"<sup>52</sup> and vividly resembles Kochanowski's epigram *Na matematyka* (*On a Mathematician*): "Ziemię pomierzył i głębokie morze, / Wie, jako wstają i zachodzą zorze; / Wiatrom rozumie, praktykuje komu, / A sam nie widzi, że ma kurwę w domu [H's measured ... the earth and fathomed the depths / He kens whence the sun rises and whither it sets / The wind's nature knows and futures foretells / He just can't see there's a whore in the house where he dwells]."<sup>53</sup> Can the coincidence between Kochanowski's epigram and the story in the *Golestān* serve as an argument in the discussion regarding Sa'di's influence on Polish artists? Not necessarily. We may be rather dealing here with a wandering motif which developed independently in two distant regions of the world.

Cultural accommodation involved the removal of some symbols of Islamic culture which could have been more difficult for the Polish audience to understand. Hence, there is in Otwinowski's translation no mention of the Kaaba: "O Arab of the desert, I fear thou wilt not reach the Ka'bah / Because the road on which thou travellest leads to Turkestan,"<sup>54</sup> as he proposed a different solution: "Boję się Arabinie, iżec zblądzić przyjdzie, / Bo droga, którą bieżysz, nie do Mechy idzie [I am afraid, oh Arab, that you will get lost / because the path you are going / does not lead to Mecca]"<sup>55</sup> replacing the Kaaba with Mecca. It is an example of dynamic equivalence when extra-textual factors force the translator to make changes in the text. The Kaaba of course is not Mecca but it is in Mecca, so the journey to Mecca also means the journey to the Kaaba. It is also an example of the preservation of the original religion but expressed in a way that is intelligible to the target audience.<sup>56</sup>

<sup>48</sup>LeVen, *The Many-Headed Muse*, 277–82. We would like to thank Tomasz Babnis for his help in finding the classical Greek reference.

<sup>49</sup>Sa'di, *Golestān*, 125.

<sup>50</sup>Otwinowski, 28.

<sup>51</sup>Sa'di, *Golestān*, 451.

<sup>52</sup>Otwinowski, 165–6.

<sup>53</sup>Kochanowski, *Dziela polskie*, 166. English translation by Bałuk-Ulewiczowa, 73.

<sup>54</sup>Otwinowski, 238.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid., 82.

<sup>56</sup>We can compare such a reductive process to Du Ryer's replacement of the mosque minarets with a church tower recorded by Brancaforte ("Persian Words of Wisdom," 457).



Another example of cultural domestication is the consistent use of the term *Bóg* “God” instead of Allah (Pl. Alla[c]h), e.g. “Więc góra Tur między górami najmniejsza, ale przed oblicznością Bożą największa i najwdzięczniejsza [So the Tur (*sic*) mountain between the mountains is the smallest, but before God’s face it is the largest and the most grateful]”<sup>57</sup> which in the original is: “The smallest mountain on earth is Jur [*sic!*]; nevertheless / It is great with Allah in dignity and station.”<sup>58</sup> The fact that Otwinowski did not use the adapted term Alla[c]h (← Tr. Allah ← Ar. Allāh) at all may be proof of a deliberate act and willingness to emphasize the universal character of the *Golestān*—the noun Alla[c]h appears in the Polish literature at least from the sixteenth century and could easily have been used by Otwinowski.<sup>59</sup>

Accommodation on a cultural level also involved what Świącicki criticized as a temptation to smooth out the translation.<sup>60</sup> Otwinowski was tempted by Polish esthetics and morality, especially in a considerably shortened Chapter 5 in which he replaced homoerotic threads with heteronormative ones, e.g. “W mieście Hemedan nazwaném, był kady (wójt) uczony, ale młody. Ten rozmiłował się jednego kowala w onémże mieście mieszkającego córki [In the city named Hemedan there was a qadi (vogt) learned but young. He was in love with the daughter of a blacksmith of that city],”<sup>61</sup> while the original refers explicitly to a boy: “It is related that the qazi of Hamadan, having conceived an affection towards a farrier-boy.”<sup>62</sup> What guided Otwinowski in selecting stories to translate from Chapter 5 (only eleven of an original twenty-three) was a different view of morality: some topics may have seemed distasteful to most of his audience, and so were altered or completely removed. If we consider the main goal of the *Golestān* to be moral education, then it would have made sense for the translation to adapt the text to the target culture’s moral codes.<sup>63</sup>

The opposite of domestication is foreignization, i.e. externalization of the interest in elements of social and cultural life of different communities that are unusual from the European point of view. Otwinowski’s foreignization involved primarily the preservation of local color. The protagonists were not transferred to life in Poland, they remained in Damascus, Istanbul, “Indian Khorasan,” Syria or Iran. Foreignization concerned also Islamic terminology, but this is well balanced in terms of amount—an example of this balance is his choice to maintain Islam in the text, but also adapt the reference to the Kaaba and translate Allah. Nevertheless, researchers accused Otwinowski of not adding a glossary of oriental terminology. One question

<sup>57</sup>Otwinowski, 17.

<sup>58</sup>Sa’di, *Golestān*, 102.

<sup>59</sup>Stachowski, *Słownik historyczno-etymologiczny*, 19. If we knew which Turkish translation was used by Otwinowski, we would be able to analyze the frequency of the use of the nouns *Allāh* and *xodā* in the intermediate Turkish text and answer the question whether Otwinowski imitated it or independently decided in favor of such a solution.

<sup>60</sup>Świącicki, “Najnowsze,” 107.

<sup>61</sup>Otwinowski, 181.

<sup>62</sup>Sa’di, *Golestān*, 515.

<sup>63</sup>The problem of education, edification and morals in the *Golestān* is undertaken, e.g. by Katouzian, *Sa’di*.

arises here: was *mufty* “mufti,” the term that Janicki put in his glossary attached to the edition of Otwinowski’s translation, really completely unknown to potential seventeenth-century readers? In the *silva rerum* it was underlined and in print it is in italics, but we do not know whether it was Otwinowski who wanted to replace it with another word or whether an anonymous copyist considered it problematic.<sup>64</sup> The first evidence of this lexeme in Polish dates back to the sixteenth century and it must be remembered that the perspective of nineteenth-century researchers differed from the knowledge of the seventeenth-century intended readers.<sup>65</sup> The long-lasting border with Turkey as well as regular diplomatic contacts with Persia left their traces in Polish in the form of borrowings from Asian languages. It is also difficult to presume that Otwinowski made his translation with a view to educating his audience about the Islamic cultures, since he did not treat the *Golestān* as a source of knowledge about the Orient, but rather as a timeless and universal work.

Otwinowski’s translation stands to a certain extent in contrast to the widely maintained assumption that cultural exchanges between Poland and the Middle East lacked a literary dimension.<sup>66</sup> Rather than practical obstacles, it was the perception of religious differences that limited intellectual exchange, since Poles looked at Muslims with great aloofness and often reluctance. In sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Poland, frequently called the *antemurale christianitatis*, native and translated texts of a clearly anti-Islamic character were circulating and the growing conflict with Turkey only fueled an anti-Muslim spirit.<sup>67</sup>

Where did Otwinowski’s translation come from? There is no agreement on this. Some researchers believe that the affiliation to the Polish Brethren, which shaped the worldview of the entire Otwinowski family, was not without significance.<sup>68</sup> It is a fact that members of the Reformed churches were much more active in their contacts with the Muslim East. Hence, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in times of counter-reformation propaganda, the Polish Brethren especially were accused of favoring the enemies of Christianity.<sup>69</sup> The fact that his translation was largely devoid of elements directly referring to Islam, apart from the most basic ones such as e.g. *Alkoran* (Tr. *Alkoran* ← Ar. *al-Qur’ān*) “Quran,” indicates that the universal character of Sa’di’s work was more important to him.

Otwinowski probably did not make his translation only for his fellow worshippers, assuming that he remained an Arian until the end of his life is not so certain, as he served the pro-Catholic Sigismund III (and perhaps also Władysław

<sup>64</sup>Otwinowski, 51.

<sup>65</sup>Stachowski, *Słownik historyczno-etymologiczny*, 414.

<sup>66</sup>Turowska-Barowa, “Powieści Wschodnie Ignacego Krasickiego”; Tazbir, *Kultura szlachecka*, 160.

<sup>67</sup>Baranowski, “Najdawniejsze,” 33; Nosowski, *Polska literatura polemiczno-antyislamiczna*.

<sup>68</sup>Grabowski, *Literatura aryańska w Polsce*.

<sup>69</sup>Polish Protestants’ attitude towards Islam is an interesting but still unexplored issue. They did not perceive Islam as disgusting, like Catholics, but tried to become acquainted with the secrets of the Islamic faith as far as possible, and even to find a bridge between these different religions. See Tazbir, *Arianie i katolicy*.

IV) and most likely converted to Catholicism. The *Golestān* as a universalist text had to be for Otwinowski a work that both entertained and taught everyone at the same time. That is why the *Giulistan* is more than just a collection of rudimentary factual pieces of information about the Orient. It is a collection of timeless, supra-local and supra-cultural practical advice on how to act morally and ethically, how to live in a manner that does not harm others and how not to become too proud of oneself. Since the whole is interwoven with humorous anecdotes and concluded with humorous epigrams, the form and nature of which were known to the audience at that time thanks to Rej or Kochanowski's work, the final outcome is very suitable for any seventeenth-century Polish nobleman who liked to discuss varying topics during family and neighborly meetings.

Otwinowski's translation was in manuscript form, but we do not know what became of it. It is also impossible to say today how, when and by whom it found its way into the *silva rerum*. However, it is puzzling that somebody decided to rewrite it for their own needs—the tradition of creating a *silva rerum* was a response to the decline of printing culture in the seventeenth century. Various texts were (re)written and exchanged with family and friends. Hence the question of how far Otwinowski's translation could have traveled, even though it did not appear in print.<sup>70</sup> However, the fact that it lay forgotten for 200 years contradicts the thesis regarding its mobility. Unlike *Persianischer Rosenthal* or *Rosarium Politicum*, which inspired western European artists, Otwinowski's translation did not affect Polish Baroque or Enlightenment ones. It did not find a place for itself in the Polish literary tradition, and its artistic potential was not used in any way by subsequent generations of artists. Thus, Otwinowski's translation was not as mobile as some researchers imagined it to be. Did it appear too early for Polish culture, which was not ready to assimilate a landmark of eastern literature? Not necessarily. The fact that the translation remained unanswered by Polish culture was primarily influenced by various factors; inter alia, in 1647 the Sejm closed the printing houses belonging to the Polish Brethren, deepening the decline of printing culture in Poland, and between 1650 and 1655 Swedish troops ravaged the country, exacerbating a growing internal crisis. We can postulate that it was the victim of unfortunate circumstances rather than an isolated example of the adaptation of a product of a foreign intellectual culture that was ahead of its time, as Irena Turowska-Barowa claimed.<sup>71</sup> After all, at roughly the same time, Piotr Starkowski and Kazimierz Zajerski published their translations of the *Quran*, both unfortunately missing today.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup>Franciszek Machalski believed that it was well known to contemporaries from copies or oral accounts, although he does not provide any evidence of this. His conclusion: "Mais il semble qu'il ait été accessible au moins à certains représentants de la noblesse polonaise, puisqu'on en trouve des traces dans les oeuvres poétiques de Waclaw Potocki, poète du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle" (Machalski, "La littérature de l'Iran," 398) is incorrect. There are no traces of Sa'di's *Golestān* in Potocki's *Ogród frazsek*.

<sup>71</sup>Turowska-Barowa, "Echa orjentalne w literaturze stanisławowskiej," 205.

<sup>72</sup>Nosowski, *Polska literatura polemiczno-antyislamiczna*, vol. II, 311–12.

*Kazimirski and his Gulistan*

The second translation of Sa‘di’s *Golestān* into Polish was by Kazimirski. His rendering was published in Paris in 1876, three years before the one by Otwinowski. The plight of Kazimirski’s efforts resembles to a certain extent that of Robert Falcon Scott’s Antarctic expedition: having published his allegedly unprecedented translation into Polish, he discovered, with some disappointment, that he had been anticipated in his endeavor by no less than two and a half centuries. Moreover, it turned out that the Baroque translation, though incomplete and inaccurate, was esthetically superior to Kazimirski’s.

Wojciech (Adalbert) Feliks Ignacy de Biberstein Kazimirski (1808–87) was a Polish orientalist, translator and lexicographer born in Korchów near Lublin during the period of Polish partition between Prussia, Russia and Austria. He began his studies of oriental languages in Warsaw in 1828. His first teacher was Luigi Chiarini, a professor in the theological faculty at the University of Warsaw, an Italian priest and linguist, and an outstanding specialist in Hebrew. Then, supported by the Polish nobleman, Tytus Działyński, he pursued his studies in Berlin, focusing mainly on Sanskrit, taught by Friedrich Wilken. In the meantime he dreamt of studying Arabic and Persian with Antoine-Isaac Silvestre de Sacy in Paris. Yet, at the outbreak of the November Uprising of Poles against the czar of Russia in 1830, Kazimirski returned to Warsaw and became involved in the Polish struggle for independence. After the defeat of the Polish army in 1831, he emigrated to France and settled in Paris. In 1839–40 he went to Iran and Turkey and served as a translator for the French diplomatic mission in Iran. During that time, he started using his cognomen (geonomen) de Biberstein. After his return to Paris, he was employed in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He died in Paris in 1887.<sup>73</sup>

Among Kazimirski’s works, one should make special mention of the two-volume *Dictionnaire arabe-français* (1846–47, 1860, 1875), *Dialogues français-persans* (1833), and *Początki języka perskiego: Rozprawa [The Beginnings of the Persian Language: A Dissertation]*.<sup>74</sup> Kazimirski was the first European to discover the poetry of the Medieval Persian poet Manuchehri-ye Dāmḡāni (tenth/eleventh century). He published in 1876 a French translation of his poems entitled *Divan-e Manuchehri*. He is also the author of the earliest critical edition of Manuchehri-ye Dāmḡāni’s divan entitled *Menoutchehri: Poète persan du 11<sup>ème</sup> siècle de notre ère (du 5<sup>ème</sup> de l’hégire)* (1886). Kazimirski’s other renditions include a translation of the *Quran* into French entitled, *Le Koran: Traduction nouvelle faite sur le texte arabe* (1840, 1841, 1844, 1848, 1850, 1852, 1855, 1865, 1869, 1876, 1880), translations from *The Thousand and One Nights* as *Enis el-Djelis ou l’histoire de la belle Persane: Conte des mille et une nuits* (1846), and, last but not least, his rendition of Sa‘di’s *Golestān* into Polish: *Saadi: Gulistan, to jest ogród różany Sa’dego z Szyrazu [Gulistan, which is a Rose-garden by Sa’adi from Shiraz]* (1876), dedicated to Tytus Działyński.

<sup>73</sup>Reychman, “Kazimirski (Kazimierski),” 295–7.

<sup>74</sup>MS 1676 in the Biblioteka Kórnicka PAN.

Kazimirski's love of Sa'adi's writings began when he was in Berlin. However, his project to translate the *Golestān* was put on hold until he received a grant from the Polish count Jan Działyński (the son of Tytus). The publication itself was supposed to improve the financial conditions of the Polish exile. In a letter to his friend he confessed: "Apart from the aesthetic pleasure derived from undertaking this work, I had in mind the idea of scraping together some pennies (if it sold out) in order to print a little work on the East written in French."<sup>75</sup>

Kazimirski meticulously studied the Persian text and spent three years on its rendition. He compared the available translations, as his ambition was to surpass all of them in terms of accuracy of translation and the academic quality of the commentaries concerning eastern customs and concepts.<sup>76</sup> The translator hoped that the Polish reader "could measure and estimate the differences in worldview between the East and West and their ways of expressing them."<sup>77</sup> As an orientalist, he hoped that his painstaking endeavor would be appreciated, particularly in the academic milieu: "Should in the future any other work from the Muslim East become the subject of academic study or translation, I would have the right to be proud that the present translation of the *Golestān*, which gently familiarises the reader with the East and its outlook, thus far alien to him, has allowed him to appreciate more easily the beauties which he will encounter [in this book]."<sup>78</sup>

Thus, Kazimirski conceived translation as the creation of a bridge between cultures which were ostensibly different but ultimately shared some ethical concepts. He felt especially qualified for such a mission as one of the few well-educated nineteenth-century Polish orientalist endowed with both a good command of Persian and an extensive knowledge of Muslim culture.<sup>79</sup>

In the introduction to his translation, Kazimirski shared some of his concerns with the reader, expressed mostly in rhetorical questions:

Before publication [...] once again I posed myself the following questions: "Does this literary piece of the East deserve translation?" "Will it provide an intellectual benefit for Polish readers?" and "Bearing in mind such a great difference of imagery and style between West and East, is a rendition of this small Persian work feasible?" and last but not least, "Will it be received well by its readers?" I am able to answer all the questions but the last, and I do not dare to elicit the answer.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup>Janowski, *Correspondence*. All translations in the part concerning Kazimirski by Renata Rusek-Kowalska, unless otherwise specified.

<sup>76</sup>Turska-Barowa, "Zapomniani orientalista polski," 118.

<sup>77</sup>Sa'di, *Gulistan, to jest ogród różany Sa'dego z Szyrazu*, xviii (hereafter Kazimirski).

<sup>78</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>79</sup>Among a few other nineteenth-century Polish orientalists with a good command of Persian, one should mention Aleksander Borejko Chodźko (1804–91), the first European scholar to work on Persian folklore. Similar to Kazimirski, he was also active in French academic circles, but his main literary preoccupation was oral literature: popular poetry, folk tales and Persian theatre.

<sup>80</sup>Kazimirski, viii.

The translator then advertised the *Golestān* as a literary work of endless relevance and beauty:

It is rare that in the history of literature a purely literary piece retains all of its elementary value and freshness for the nation it was conceived in. Changes in social life, gradual evolution, the instability of imagery, and inconstancy of language in search of its ultimate form often condemn to obsolescence works of the intellect once popular and admired by their contemporaries.<sup>81</sup>

Praising the vivacity of Sa'di's work, Kazimirski compared the *Golestān* to Dante's *Divine Comedy*, a medieval work exceptional in the history of European literature which, then as now, still maintained its popularity and comprehensibility among all European nations and which also stimulated competitive translations.<sup>82</sup> The translator invoked the words of Sa'di, aware of the ageless nature of his writings: "Uszczknij listek z mego rózanego ogródka, bo ten zawsze będzie świeży" [Take a leaf from my rose-garden, as it always remains fresh].<sup>83</sup>

به چه کار آیدت ز گل طبقی  
از گلستان من ببر ورقی  
گل همین پنج روز و شش باشد  
وین گلستان همیشه خوش باشد<sup>84</sup>

Another feature which makes the *Golestān* parallel with the *Divine Comedy* is the richness of content. Dante's masterpiece, alternating between the sublime and the earthly, the horrific and the comical, the scientific and the personal, resembles to a certain extent Sa'di's work as it is also full of variety and humanistic in its message. Kazimirski's translation, meant to introduce the Eastern perspective to Polish readers, emphasized, at the same time, the universality of the *Golestān* and despite "the difference of imagery and style between West and East," the spiritual and intellectual vicinity of the work conceived in the Muslim world, foreign in appearance, but familiar in substance:

A God-fearing, pious, saintly man will encounter in this work by a Muslim writer, thoughts, expressions and ideas which correspond to his way of thinking, will notice that in the East people were apt to tear off the mask of hypocrisy, a man of worldly wisdom and common sense will find there an echo of his own observations; a skeptical ambiguity and paradoxes formulated as proverbs, which we call the people's

<sup>81</sup>Ibid.

<sup>82</sup>Ibid.

<sup>83</sup>Ibid., x, 11. A verbatim translation from Polish by Renata Rusek-Kowalska.

<sup>84</sup>Sa'di, *Golestān*, 84, 85.



book of wisdom; a lover of jokes and farces will laugh at the anecdotes, whereas a deeply virtuous man will discover numerous expressions of empathy and higher aspirations. A few pages of this alluring work should probably be omitted, but then who would not wish to delete many pages from [the works of] classical writers: the divine Plato, the sweet Anacreont, the good Xenophon or even the pure Vergil?<sup>85</sup>

Although the nineteenth-century orientalist declared his disapproval of the sexual content of a few pages in the *Golestān*, he did not censor the problematic Book 5 on love and youth, and rendered it *in extenso*.

After praising the virtues of the *Golestān*, Kazimirski goes on to mention previous translations of the work, starting with those in Latin by Gentius and Olearius and also refers to the one prior to theirs, an inadequate rendition by Du Ryer. Finally, the Polish translator concludes:

From Gentius' translation, many anecdotes, stories, parables and sayings were transmitted to European writings without knowledge of their origin, and then were put into circulation under the names of others. In the preceding and present century the translations have multiplied. There are three in French and four in English, there are German and Russian renditions and there are certainly more in other languages. However, so far there has been no Polish translation, which, given the vicinity of Poland to parts of the East, and the existence of centuries-old diplomatic and trade relations, it is surprising that nobody was inspired to become more closely acquainted with Eastern languages and literatures and why knowledge of the East should have always been mediated by the West. Especially when this work deserved translation for so many reasons. I must confess that I felt flattered by the thought of being the first to render it directly from Persian to Polish.<sup>86</sup>

Ironically, what the Polish exile failed to study carefully were the magazines issued in the partitioned Poland, which mentioned the existence of Otwinowski's manuscript.<sup>87</sup> There are several reasons which justify his ignorance. Primarily, he had limited access to Polish publications and two brief remarks made by Kraszewski in his magazine, *Athenaeum*, in 1841 and 1842, were not widely known. Secondly, facing the cultural hegemony of nineteenth-century western Europe, he must have suffered from a sort of eastern European inferiority complex, which made him assume a priori the non-existence of a Polish counterpart of western translation efforts and ignore the intellectual activity of the former generations of Polish dragomans and missionaries, whose written accounts served as valuable reference material

---

<sup>85</sup>Kazimirski, xiv–xv.

<sup>86</sup>Ibid., xv–xvi.

<sup>87</sup>Święcicki, "Najnowsze," 95.

on eastern culture in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.<sup>88</sup> Last but not least, his acquaintance with Asian languages and literatures was mainly mediated by western sources and western academic centers, the forerunners of modern philological studies.<sup>89</sup> Absolutely confident (or convinced a priori) of the huge gap between knowledge of eastern literature in Poland and western Europe, he felt eager to overcompensate for it and, thus, to deliver the best philological translation of an oriental masterpiece (and bestseller) to a Polish audience, a work that would surpass the relatively accurate and complete nineteenth-century European renderings of Sa'di's work, such as Karl Heinrich Graf's *Rosengarten* (1846) or the extensively commented French translations of Nicolas Sémélet (1834) and Charles-François Defrémery (1858).<sup>90</sup>

Kazimirski's translation of the *Golestān* remains a product of the demand for universal humanism aimed at getting acquainted with the "foreign" and "different" which, at least in the case of the Orient, was perceived and presented not as contradictory but rather as complementary to the Occident.<sup>91</sup> He addressed his rendition to an "enlightened but non-academic" readership with a classical educational background.<sup>92</sup> His philological translation may serve as a Polish paragon of the Oriental Renaissance, based on the study of eastern languages and integration of oriental literature which was, as Raymond Schwab argues, an organic continuation of the first Renaissance, which had allowed European intellectuals to rediscover Greek and Latin sources.

A considerable part of Kazimirski's edition is of an informative character. The translation itself is 220 pages, slightly more than half of his edition of *Golestān* (382 pages). The remaining parts comprise: an introduction (15 pages), a comprehensive biography of Sa'di (24 pages),<sup>93</sup> which is anticipated by a short lecture on the history of Persian literature and language; commentaries to 622 footnotes (113 pages), a short polemic on etymological issues with a Polish orientalist in Russia, Antoni Muchliński and his book *Źródłostownik wyrazów* [*Etymological*

---

<sup>88</sup>One can mention here the activity of the Dzierżek and the Otwinowski families; the accounts of Polish missions to Osman Turkey led by Jędrzej Taranowski (1574), Krzysztof Zbaraski (1622), Szymon Starowski's description of the Turkish court (1646), or Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł's account of his peregrination to the Holy Land and Egypt (1611). The competence of Polish dragomans fell into decline in the second part of the seventeenth century, whereas the Catholic missions supported by Polish kings continued to develop. Among the accounts left by Polish Catholic missionaries one should mention Tadeusz Krusiński's *Relatio de mutationibus Regni Persorum* (1727) (Reychman, *Znajomość i nauczanie języków orientalnych*).

<sup>89</sup>Though he was also acquainted with the works of Polish orientalists in Russia, such as Antoni Muchliński (1808–77), professor at the Petersburg University, with whom he argued on etymological issues (Kazimirski, 333–6).

<sup>90</sup>Defrémery, *Gulistan ou parterre des roses*; Graf, *Rosengarten*; Sémélet, *Gulistan ou Le parterre-de-fleurs*.

<sup>91</sup>Schwab, *La Renaissance Orientale*.

<sup>92</sup>Olkusz, "Zapomniana dyskusja wokół polskich," 183–96.

<sup>93</sup>As Kazimirski points out, his main reference on Sa'di's life was Charles-François Defrémery's introduction to his translation of *Golestān*, i.e. *Gulistan ou parterre des roses*.

Dictionary] (3 pages),<sup>94</sup> and last but not least, an index of “important things” (personal names, toponyms, important topics and concepts; 7 pages). Judging by the extent of the introductory and explanatory parts of Kazimirski’s *Golestān*, they constitute the organic component of his work. It shows that apart from disseminating eastern moral teachings and providing amusement, the translator’s goal was to familiarize the reader with oriental culture and to satisfy the epistemic needs of a nineteenth-century readership, well-educated in western and Classical literature and eager to complete their education with a basic knowledge of the East. Kazimirski’s attitude to the *Golestān* shows a shift in the treatment of eastern literature during the Oriental Renaissance: it is not fully assimilated, but fulfills the esthetic and epistemic pleasures of an intellectually sophisticated audience and its thirst for knowledge of an exotic, but at the same time familiar, Other. This Other is not only geographically closer to central and eastern Europeans than western Europeans, but it is also closer to them in its religious life. This can be witnessed, for instance, in the attitude towards sacrum (religiosity, either Muslim or Catholic), the affirmation of a “noble” poverty (Pers. *darvishi* cf. Pl. *cnota ubóstwa*), or the ability to do without (Pers. *qenā’at* cf. Pl. *skromność, poprzestawanie na małym*).

Still, though his rendition received positive reviews as a philological endeavor, it failed to gain wider popularity. Just after its publication in 1876, it was praised for its completeness and faithfulness. The indisputable strength of Kazimirski’s rendition was the addition of the informative introduction and commentaries.

One of the translation’s first reviewers, Lucjan Siemieński, praised the general educational value of Kazimirski’s rendering but, for the same reason, he also questioned the validity of translating the whole content of Chapter 5 “which is not among the most beautiful passages of the book.”<sup>95</sup> He also disapproved of the “unnecessary promotion” of the practice of dissimulation (*taqiyyeh*) among Polish readers. Siemieński, himself an outstanding translator of literary masterpieces (including the Greek *Odyssey* or the Persian story of Bizhan and Manizheh from the *Shahnāme*),<sup>96</sup> appreciated the esthetic values of the translation:

In praise of the translator we should add, ... that the rendition, though highly faithful, has lost neither its natural rhythm, nor the clarity intrinsic to our language. ... Mr. Kazimirski’s verses are far from ‘wooden;’ they sound like poetry and possess poetic harmony [*sic*]. ... Therefore this translation differs from many other translations into so called “blank verse,” which are deprived of metre and melody, have no poetic flair and resemble an assemblage of words which produce a cacophony, and often convey the meaning so awkwardly, that a reader must struggle to grasp it.<sup>97</sup>

<sup>94</sup>Antoni Muchliński (1808–77) was a professor and dean of the University of Petersburg. Muchliński, *Źródłostownik wyrazów*.

<sup>95</sup>Siemieński, “Sa’dy,” 230.

<sup>96</sup>Siemieński, *Biszen i Menisze*; Krasnowolska and Rusek-Kowalska, *Lucjan Siemieński i Karol Zaluski*.

<sup>97</sup>Siemieński, “Sa’dy,” 209–10.

Nevertheless, though Kazimirski's translations of Sa'di's versified punchlines "sounded like poetry," they were, in point of fact, unrhymed.<sup>98</sup> He considered himself a scholar and not a poet and was not ready to risk his academic authority by composing what may well have turned out to be bad poetry. Therefore, he remained faithful to his goal of rendering the precise meaning of the verses, leaving aside the potential esthetic value of rhymed translation. His accuracy is also witnessed in the distinction he made between Persian and Arabic verses by adding the abbreviations *w.p.* (Persian verse) and *w.a.* (Arabic verse), which preceded his blank-verse renderings.

After the publication of Otwinowski's translation, some critics compared both works and re-evaluated the esthetic values of Kazimirski's rendition. According to an extremely severe review by Świącicki, Kazimirski's *Golestān*, albeit assiduous and faithful to the original, is devoid of artistic merit. The majority of his blank verse is stiff and lacks poetic features.<sup>99</sup> Świącicki's remark is only partly justified, as the main shortcoming of Kazimirski's versed translations is the lack of rhyme. This disadvantage becomes the translator's cardinal sin only when contrasted with Otwinowski's smooth, rhymed verses. In conclusion to his assessment of the philological translation, Świącicki does justice to Kazimirski's efforts by claiming that though his rendition fulfills epistemic functions and may serve as a reference for Poles studying Persian, it would hardly win widespread popularity. On the other hand, the language of the Baroque version of the *Golestān* is so smooth that it barely sounds like a translation. Therefore, Otwinowski's rendition compensates for its shortcomings by being of greater artistic merit.

#### *Otwinowski vs. Kazimirski*

For the purposes of comparing the two translation strategies we have chosen a short story from Book 2 *Dar axlāq-e darvišān* (*The Morals of Dervishes*).<sup>100</sup>

#### حکایت

مردی گفت پیر را چه کنم کز خلاق برنج اندرم از بس که به زیارت من همی آیند و اوقات مرا از تردّد ایشان تشویش میباشد گفت هر چه درویشانند مر ایشان را وامی بده و آنچه توانگرانند از ایشان چیزی بخواه که دیگر یکی گردد تو نگردند

کافر از بیم توقع برود تا در چین      گر گدا پیشرو لشکر اسلام بود

<sup>98</sup>With some exceptions, e.g. Kazimirski, 28.

<sup>99</sup>Świącicki, "Najnowsze," 107.

<sup>100</sup>Sa'di, *Golestān*, 49.

Otwinowski's *Giulistan*  
Powieść XXXIII

Młodzieniec jeden miał barzo uczonego i żywota dobrego a starego ojca. Przyszędłszy przedeń, uskarżać się poczał, mówiąc: "Ojczy mój, nie wiem co mam czynić? Od ludzi pokoju mieć nie mogę, i choćbym Bogu czasem chciał się modlić, przed nimi trudno, bo nigdy gość z domu mego nie wynidzie." Rzekł mu ojciec:

"Miły synu, tako czyn: Kiedy ubogi do ciebie przyjdzie, daj mu co możesz, i pożycz jeśliby czego potrzebował; kiedy bogaty, chciejże czegokolwiek od niego, nie przyjdzie-c drugi raz."

*Kiedy by się trafiło, żeby przed jakimś  
Ubogim żebrak bieżał wojski tureckimi  
Uciekliby z tamtego chrześcijanie kraju  
Bo w Imię Boże dawać nie mają zwyczaj.*

Translation to English

A young boy had a very learned and an old father who lived a good-life (lit. of a good life). Having approached him, he started complaining, saying:

"Oh my father, I do not know what to do? I cannot find peace from people, as if I even sometimes wanted to pray to God, it is difficult in their presence, because a guest never leaves my house."

His father told him:

"Dear son, do like this: When a pauper visits you, give him what you can, and lend him if he needed anything; when a rich man [visits you], ask him for anything, [and] he will not visit you again."

*If it happened that a pauper  
Ran and begged in front of Turkish soldiers,  
Christians from that country would escape  
Because they do not have in their habit  
To give [alms] in the name of God. [versed]*

Kazimirski's *Gulistan*  
Powieść

Uczeń jeden starcowi mistrzowi swemu raz mówił (249): "Ach, cóż ja pocznę? Znękany jestem tymi ludźmi, że tak tłumem przychodzą mnie odwiedza; tem nieustannem ich to wchodzeniem, to wychodzeniem, wszystkie godziny moje zatrute". A mistrz mu na to: "Ubogim pożycz pieniędzy, a u bogatych pożyczki zażądaj; już potem drugi raz koło ciebie kręcić się nie będą".

*w.p. Niech na czele wojsk islamu  
postawią żebraka  
Aż do Chin od niego niewierny  
drapnie natręctwa.*

Translation to English

A pupil was once telling to his old master (249): [249: here it refers to pupils and masters of sufism, a life devoted to contemplating God, 283]: "Alas! What shall I do? I'm haunted/harried with those people who visit me in crowds, with their constant entering and going out all my hours are poisoned." The master replied: "Lend money to the poor, and demand a loan from the rich; they will not surround you after that."

P.v. [Persian verse]

*Let's put a beggar at the front of the  
Muslim army,  
An infidel will whisk off from his  
obtrusiveness to China*

As we can see on the basis of this example, both translations of Sa‘di’s *hekāyat* (rendered in Polish as *powieść*, a term which today refers to the genre of the novel) are more extensive than the original highly concise story.<sup>101</sup> Otwinowski’s translation is far more elaborate and inaccurate, but at the same time it renders the meaning of the original story. By using the strategy of cultural domestication, he rendered the Muslim/Sufi terms of *morid* and *pir* as a “young boy” and a “a very learned and an old father who lived a good-life.” In this dynamic equation, the spiritual relationship between a pupil and his sufi master is replaced by a kinship, and the three adjectives describing the physical, spiritual and moral qualities of the father (old, very learned and who lived a good life), inserted in the text, spared him the necessity of referring to the religious context of the term *pir*. This omission of the religious context of the story is compensated later in the words of a boy who would sometimes pray to God, but is disturbed by others. Kazimirski, on the other hand, translates *morid* to “pupil” (Pl. *uczeń*) and *pir* to “his old master” (Pl. *starcowi mistrzowi swemu*) and adds a footnote explaining the Sufi context of the relationship of two protagonists of the story.<sup>102</sup> He also slightly archaizes the sentence by using an old-fashioned, inverted syntax (a pronoun *swemu* after a noun *mistrzowi*, similar to Persian order). What is peculiar to Otwinowski’s version is a translation of a distich which he conveys by a quatrain (with rhyme scheme aabb) corresponding to one of the variants of the Polish poetic genre of the *fraszka*. In his version of the poem, originally a “Muslim army” (*lashkar-e eslām*) is rendered as “Turkish soldiers,” whereas an infidel (*kāfer*) is translated to “Christians” (plural), and escaping to China (*chin*), the extremes of the Persian perception of the East, is replaced by escaping from one’s country in the West (i.e. a Christian one). The genuine eastern context of the verse is visibly westernized (“Turkified”) and the mischievous allusion to the avarice of infidels (who do not give alms) is aimed directly at Christians. This fragment underpins the assumption of the originally Turkish basis of Otwinowski’s translation. Quite astonishingly he maintains its message, which in the Christian context becomes self-deprecating.

Though his narrative is more elaborate than the original, Otwinowski also uses verbal ellipses which approximate his mode of writing to an oral style of storytelling and, at the same time, the conciseness (*ijāz/ekhtesār*) of Sa‘di’s own diction. Also Kazimirski, though by and large faithful to the genuine Persian text, introduces some devices, such as the exclamation *Ach!* (*Alas!*), to make the narrative sound more dramatic. Quite surprisingly, given his *modus operandi*, he does not comment here on

<sup>101</sup>The solution of rendering a short narrative prosaic form of *hekāyat* as *powieść* in both translations is of particular interest and testifies to the existence of alternative terms or genres to *gawęda* as (genuinely oral) “story” in the pre-modern Polish literature. Both terms, *powieść* and *gawęda*, derive from Polish verbs *powiadać* and *gadać* (to tell), which indicates oral origins of later literary (written) forms of “novel” (today: *powieść*) and “drawn-out story” (today: *gawęda*). Otwinowski’s and Kazimirski’s translations may imply that in pre-modern times *gawęda* could have been longer and more amorphous than *powieść* which then denoted “story” or “anecdote” (today: *opowiadka, historyjka, anegdota*).

<sup>102</sup>Kazimirski, 283. In a separate footnote 20, he gives a comprehensive lecture on Muslim mysticism, see: *ibid.*, 231–7, 281–2.



the Muslim obligation of almsgiving (*zakāt*) which can be inferred by a competent reader from the original and is mentioned by Otwinowski in his poem (*Because they do not have in their habit / To give [alms] in the name of God*).

### Conclusions

In conclusion, these two Polish renderings of Saʿdī's *Golestān*, Otwinowski's seventeenth-century translation by relay and Kazimirski's nineteenth-century scholarly translation, exemplify different types of cultural transfer between East and West. The former as a dragoman lived in a Muslim country and was able to engage with Asian languages through oral as well as written culture. He sought dynamic equivalence, presenting what he saw as the universal message of the *Golestān* in a domesticated version which would appeal to the Polish nobility familiar with Kochanowski's verses. The diction of his rendering is close to oral story-telling and the versified translations of even singular *beyts* are transformed into the Polish epigrammatic rhymed genre of the *fraszka*. This intensifies the didactic message and the amusing effect of Saʿdī's punchlines and makes the stories, at least potentially, integrate well into the Polish broad genre of *gawęda* or *powieść*, suitable to be read for amusement and retold for enjoyment in the social gatherings of the Polish gentry. Unfortunately, due to unfavorable historical circumstances, it remained largely unknown until its rediscovery in the nineteenth century. While Otwinowski's rendering is steeped in the Polish-Turkish context, Kazimirski's translation seems more involved with a western European background. As a Polish exile, educated in Warsaw, Berlin and Paris, Kazimirski views his endeavor within the context of the German and French faculties of oriental studies, which were steeped in a philological approach. His aim is to deliver the most comprehensively glossed rendition of Saʿdī's work in western scholarship showing that he could, as a Polish scholar, equal the western European authorities of the day.<sup>103</sup> Thus, he focuses mainly on familiarizing a Polish readership with Muslim and Persian culture, extending the Oriental Renaissance from France to Poland. Though it is not completely deprived of literary merits, it satisfied the epistemic demands of a well-educated Polish readership and may still serve as a reference for Polish students of Persian today.

### ORCID

Mateusz M. Kłagisz  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0807-3290>

Renata Rusek-Kowalska  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6513-9236>

---

<sup>103</sup>Still, one should remember that Kazimirski had no illusions that his translation of *Golestān* into Polish will be appreciated among French authorities and would influence directly his academic career. He hoped, nevertheless, to profit from selling it, in order to publish his strictly academic work on the East, written in French. See fn. 89.

*Bibliography*

- Baranowski, Bohdan. "Znajomość języka tureckiego w dawnej Polsce (do połowy XVII wieku)." *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 14 (1938): 9–37.
- Baranowski, Bohdan. "Najdawniejsze polskie przekłady z literatury orientalnej." *Prace polonistyczne* 5 (1947): 33–48.
- Baranowski, Bohdan. *Znajomość Wschodu w dawnej Polsce do XVIII wieku*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Łódzkiego Towarzystwa Naukowego, 1950.
- Baranowski, Bohdan. *Polsko-azerbejdżańskie stosunki kulturalne w pierwszej połowie XIX wieku*. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1979.
- Brancaforte, Elio. "Persian Words of Wisdom Travel to the West. Seventeenth-Century European Translations of Sa'di's Gulistan." *Daphnis* 45 (2017): 450–72.
- Büyükkaracı Yılmaz, Fatma. "On Gulistan's Turkish (Re)translations: A Chronological Survey Through Paratextual Data." In *Studies from a Retranslation Culture. The Turkish Context*, ed. Özlem Berk Albachten and Şehnaz Tahir Gürçaglar, 11–27. Berlin: Springer, 2019.
- Czartoryski, Adam K. *Mysli o pismach polskich z uwagami, nad sposobem pisania w rozmaitych materyach*. Wilno: J. Zawadzki, 1810.
- Gazda, Grzegorz ed. *Słownik rodzajów i gatunków literackich*. Warszawa: PWN, 2012.
- Grabowski, Tadeusz, *Literatura aryańska w Polsce 1560–1660*. Kraków: Spółka Wydawnicza Polska, 1908.
- Graf, Karl Heinrich. *Moslichbeddin Sadi's Rosengarten*. Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1846.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. "Cultural mobility: an introduction." In *Cultural Mobility: A Manifesto*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt, 1–23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Janowski, Jan N. *Correspondence*. Vol. IV. MS 3685. Biblioteka Jagiellońska, Kraków.
- Jezierski, Feliks. "Gulistan, to jest Ogród różany S'adego z Szyrazu, z oryginału perskiego przełożył W. z Bibersteinu Kazimirski. Paryż, nakładem Biblioteki Kórnickiej. 1876." *Biblioteka Warszawska* 1 (1877): 464–74.
- Katouzian, Homa. *Sa'di. The Poet of Life, Love and Compassion*. Oxford: Oneworld, 2006.
- Kieniewicz, Stefan, ed. *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*. Vol. XXVI(1). Wrocław: PWN, 1979.
- Kochanowski, Jan. *Dzieła polskie*. Vols. I–III. Warszawa: PIW, 1953.
- Kochanowski, Jan. *Kto mi dał skrzydła [Who Hath Bewinged Me]*. Trans. Teresa Bałuk-Ulewiczowa. Kraków: Jagiellonian University, 2012.
- Kołodziejczyk, Dariusz. *The Crimean Khanate and Poland-Lithuania. International Diplomacy on the European Periphery (15th–18th Century): A Study of Peace Treaties Followed by Annotated Documents*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Krasnowolska, Anna, and Renata Rusek-Kowalska, eds. *Lucjan Siemiński i Karol Zaluski o literaturze perskiej*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2018.
- Kraszewski, Józef I. *Athenaeum*. Vol. V. Wilno: Teofil Glücksberg, 1841.
- Kraszewski, Józef I. *Athenaeum*. Vol. I. Wilno: Teofil Glücksberg, 1842.
- Kraszewski, Józef I. *Podróże i poselstwa polskie do Turcyi*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Biblioteki Polskiej, 1860.
- LeVen, Pauline A. *The Many-Headed Muse: Tradition and Innovation in Late Classical Greek Lyric Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Łoś, Jan. *Pamiętniki janczara czyli kronika turecka Konstantego z Ostrowicy napisana między r. 1496 a 1501*. Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności, 1912.
- Machalski, Franciszek. "W 700-lecie „Gulistanu” Sa'diego z Szyrazu." *Przegląd Orientalistyczny* 3(27) (1958): 243–53.
- Machalski, Franciszek. "La littérature de l'Iran en Pologne (après bio-bibliographique)." In *Hommage universel : actes du Congrès de Shiraz 1971 et autres études rédigées à l'occasion du 2500<sup>e</sup> anniversaire de la fondation de l'Empire Perse*, vol. 3, ed. Jacques Duchesne-Guillemin, Pierre Lecoq, and Jean Kellens, 397–410. Téhéran: Bibliothèque Pahlavi, 1974.

- Muchliński, Antoni. *Źródłostownik wyrazów, które przeszły, wprost czy pośrednio, do naszej mowy z języków wschodnich, tudzież mających obopólną analogję co do brzmienia lub znaczenia, z dołączeniem zbioru wyrazów, przeniesionych z Polski do języka tureckiego*. Petersburg: Cesarska Akademia Nauk, 1858.
- Nosowski, Jerzy. *Polska literatura polemiczno-antyislamiczna XVI, XVII i XVIII w.* Vol. I–II. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1974.
- Olkusz, Wiesław. “Zapomniana dyskusja wokół polskich przekładów ‘Gulistanu’ Sa’diego: z dziejów recepcji literatury Wschodu w dobie pozytywizmu.” *Pamiętnik Literacki* 81, no. 3 (1990): 183–96.
- Potocki, Wacław. *Ogród fraszek*. Vol. I–II. Lwów: Towarzystwo dla Popierania Nauki Polskiej, 1907.
- Prejs, Marek. *Egzotyzm w literaturze staropolskiej Wybrane problemy*. Warszawa: WPUW ILP, 1999.
- Reychman, Jan. *Znajomość i nauczanie języków orientalnych w Polsce XVIII w.* Wrocław: Wrocławskie Towarzystwo Naukowe, 1950.
- Reychman, Jan. “Kazimirski (Kazimierski) Bibersztejn Wojciech (Adalbert, (Albert).” In *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*. Vol. XII, ed. Emanuel Rostworowski, 295–7. Wrocław: PWN, 1966–67.
- Sa’di. “*Golestān*.” In *Kolliyāt-e Sa’di*, ed. Mohammad Ali Foruqi. Tehrān: Hermes, 1386 (2007–8).
- Sa’di. *Gulistan ou Le parterre-de-fleurs du Cheikh Moslib-Eddin Sadi de Chiraz*. Trans. Nicolas Sémélet. Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1834.
- Sa’di. *Gulistan ou parterre des roses*. Trans. Charles-François Defrémery. Paris: Librairie de Firmin Didot Frères, Fils et C<sup>ie</sup>, 1858.
- Sa’di. *Gulistan, to jest ogród różany Saadego z Szyrazu*. Trans. Wojciech z Bibersteina Kazimirski. Paris: Biblioteka Kórnicka, 1876.
- Sa’di. *Perska księga na polski język przełożona od Jmci Pana Samuela Otwinowskiego, Sekretarza J. Kr. Mci, nazwana Giulistan to jest Ogród Różany*. Trans. Samuel Otwinowski, ed. Ignacy Janicki. Warszawa: Biblioteka Ordynacji Krasieńskich, 1879.
- Schwab, Raymond. *La Renaissance Orientale*. Paris: Payot, 1950.
- Siemieński, Lucjan. *Biszen i Menisze. Ustęp z Firdusiego poematu Szach-namech*. Warszawa: Biblioteka Warszawska, 1855.
- Siemieński, Lucjan. “Sa’dy z Szyrazu i jego Gulistan.” *Kronika Rodzinna* 14–15 (1876) 209–11, 229–30.
- Stachowski, Stanisław. *Słownik historyczno-etymologiczny turcyzmów w języku polskim*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2013.
- Święcicki, Julian A. “Najnowsze prace orientalistów polskich za granicą.” *Ateneum: Pismo naukowe i literackie* 4, no. 1 (1879): 90–121.
- Tazbir, Janusz. *Arianie i katolicy*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1971.
- Tazbir, Janusz. *Kultura szlachecka w Polsce*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna, 1978.
- Turowska-Barowa, Irena. “Powieści Wschodnie Ignacego Krasickiego.” *Pamiętnik Literacki* 30 (1933): 249–61.
- Turowska-Barowa, Irena. “Echa orientalne w literaturze stanisławowskiej.” In *Prace historyczno-literackie: księga zbiorowa ku czci Ignacego Chrzczanowskiego*, 205–15. Kraków: W.L. Anczyc i S-ka, 1936.
- Turska-Barowa, Irena. “Zapomniany orientalista polski. W pięćdziesiątą rocznicę zgonu Wojciecha Kazimirskiego,” *Przegląd Współczesny* 65, no. 192 (1938): 109–22.
- Wrześniewska, Marja. “Uwagi o Gulistanie i fraszce polskiej.” *Lwów Literacki* 1, no. 3 (1937): 5.
- Zachara, Maria. “Sylwy—dokument szlacheckiej kultury umysłowej w XVII wieku.” In *Z dziejów życia literackiego w Polsce XVI i XVII wieku*, ed. Hanna Dziechcicieńska, 197–219. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1980.