How Can History Support Translation Studies?  
A Case of the Polish Translators of *Faust*  
Between 1826 and 1938

The American theorist and historian of literary translation, Laurence Venuti [1995] emphasised the importance of the translator in the translation process. This fact resulted in more profound research conducted by scholars and theorists such as Michaela Wolf [2006], Andrew Chesterman [2009], Anthony Pym [2006, 2009], Susan Bassnett, and Andre Lefevere [1998].

The translator has found themselves at the centre of research interests and has become a person embedded in a society that influences them and their translational activity, as well as the final product of the process: the target text. The study of such a translator required the implementation of new instruments, so sociological tools were used in this case. Over time, the sociology of translation emerged and researchers have begun to examine the socio-cultural context surrounding translators and to reconstruct translator biographies, which became a way of completing the history of translation. Renata Makarska [2014, 2016] developed four segments in her research: a linguistic biography combined with a topobiography, an analysis of the network of contacts with publishers, authors,
etc., the translator’s self-presentation, and an analysis of the relationship
between translation activity and other activities undertaken by the transla-
tor. According to Makarska, translator biographies should be compiled. By
systematising the guidelines, it has been possible to compare individual
biographies and draw deeper conclusions.

Four segments created by Makarska were used by Markus Eberharter
[2017, 2018], who compiled and collated biographies of literary translators.
Eberharter [2021] took a further step in his research on translator biogra-
phy and indicated that such a biography should not be a goal in itself and
consist only of the collection of encyclopaedic facts, but should serve to
reconstruct the translatorial identity (the term borrowed from Eberharter
[2021]) and include elements capturing its translational dimension. Re-
constructing microhistory can be a method of defining the translator as
a social individual entangled in sociocultural forces.

A translator biography, or even several biographies put together, is
still not enough to effectively complement the history of literary transla-
tion with information about the translator as a social individual. A tool
is needed to link biographies and reconstruct the histories of groups of
translators. The tool called microhistory, which is offered by history, may
be the answer to this methodological need.

Microhistory is a historiographical practice that emerged in Italy in
the late 1970s and early 1980s. Italian historians like Carlo Ginzburg and
Giovanni Levi noticed the need to pay attention to the individuals and the
role they play in history. Embedding an individual in a general historical
context can complement already known general historical themes with new
facts and conclusions [Gregorowicz 2014]. The application of microhis-
tory to reconstruct a larger historical picture and to reflect the historical
context more fully, eliminates the risk of overgeneralization, which leads to
the impoverishment of historical reality [Medick 1996: 59]. The question
arises whether it is possible to reconstruct the history of the translator using
microhistory, how this method could be used, and what it can contribute to
the history of literary translation. Can the history of the literary translator
and the history of literary translation be treated as general history and thus
be studied by its methods?
History is narratives. From chaos comes order. We seek to understand the past by determining and ordering ‘facts,’ and from these narratives, we hope to explain the decisions and processes which shape our existence.¹

The history of the literary translator and the history of literary translation is also concerned with cataloguing the facts and explaining the decisions and processes that have shaped literary translation. Matthew Reynolds wrote about the directions and goals of the history of literary translation. He wondered how to map the changing interrelationships of ‘literature’ and ‘translation’ and how to capture the important contexts of literary translation, which may differ from contexts that are important for other types of literary production. In addition, Reynolds considered how to handle and represent the extremely complex historicity of literary translation with its overlapping layers of time and looping [Reynolds 2018: 23]. Complementing the history of literary translation with the history of the translator seems tempting because of the new facts and conclusions that may emerge, so far undiscovered due to basing the history of literary translation solely on texts. Moreover, the translator-centred approach as a new research optic has already been proposed by literary translation scholars in 2021 as a manner of presenting translators as human beings [Pym 2009, Chesterman 2009].

However, the compilation of a single translator biography is insufficient to reflect the full socio-cultural context, so it is crucial to conduct comparative studies of several biographies. By comparing several translator biographies described according to the same categories such as origin, education, professional path, hobbies, place and time of life, and achievements in translation, it is possible to reconstruct a microhistory of a group of translators living and working in a specific time and space. Analysing and reconstructing first the smaller histories based on a comparative study of several translator biographies should eliminate the risk of overgeneralising conclusions about the collective history of translation and the literary translator. Reconstructing the general history based on microhistories, i.e., going from the detail to the general, can also prevent us from overlooking important trends that have an impact on the general situation of translators. Furthermore, it can help to catch patterns that occur, for instance, only in a certain geographical area or only in a certain language pair.

This research concerns the translators of *Faust* by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, who translated the text in whole or in fragments into Polish.\(^2\) It should be mentioned that *Faust* consists of two parts written between 1773 and 1832, and was published in its entirety in 1833, after the author’s death. *Faust* is not a traditional drama, although it contains elements of tragedy, comedy, satirical drama, medieval mystery play, and opera. The second part of *Faust* is even less playable than the first one. It is a text with strongly exposed epic and lyrical themes, which allowed Goethe to express his understanding of life.

The translators who are the subject of this study were selected based on the time when they translated *Faust* in its entirely or fragments. The study’s time frame was set from the early 19\(^{th}\) century to the outbreak of the second world war. The specific narrower dates (1826–1938) stem from the fact that the first translation of a passage was made in 1826, and the last in 1938.\(^3\)

In microhistorical research, in addition to the time caesura, it is important to define the geographical area. In this case, I focus on translators originating from the Polish lands, even though Poland was politically divided by partitions until 1918.\(^4\)

45 translators were included in the study group: Julian Korsak, Adam Mickiewicz, Stefan Garczyński, August Bielowski, Aleksander Groza, Józef Paszkowski, Antoni Józef Szabrański, Wiktor Baworowski, Juliusz Gieczewicz, Aleksander Krajewski, Alfons Walicki, Feliks Jezierski, Ludwik Jenike, Józef Czermak, Kazimierz Strzyżewski, Waclaw Tyzenhaus, [2] The research group included persons who translated the text in whole or in fragments and their works were published or remained unpublished but there is evidence or indication that such translations existed. It should be remembered that the nineteenth-century literary translator was not a professional in the modern sense. Therefore, it is impossible at that moment to separate professional translators from amateur translators. Accordingly, the analysis includes all those who meet the above criteria and whose works were created between 1826 and 1938. This ensures that the research group is broad enough to present a wide picture of the sociocultural situation of people involved in literary translation.

[3] The first Polish translation was a fragment made by Julian Korsak and published in *Dziennik Warszawski* in 1826. The last translation in the period under study is a fragment by Stanisław Maykowski published in *Wypisy z literatury polskiej* in 1938.

[4] I deliberately write about the origins of the translators and not about the place where the translation was created, because for example some works were made by people being deported to Siberia due to their political involvement, which is the case of Alexander A. Krajewski.

It is noteworthy that there is only one woman, Barbara Beaupre, in the group. Patriarchy was strongly entrenched in the 19th century and as a consequence, women were subordinate to their fathers, brothers, or husbands. So much so that even finding information about them was not straightforward and generally happened through the prism of whose daughter, sister, or wife the female translator was. Beaupre’s case is to the point. It was only possible to identify her owing to the information about her father, Józef Antoni Beaupre, who was a famous Polish physician. When he was exiled to Siberia by the tsarist authorities, his daughter, Barbara, went with him. The father, who belonged to the intelligentsia, took care of her education and so she had access to language learning. Barbara spoke French, English, Russian, and German. The partial translation of Faust made by her was published in Głos Narodu and signed with her name [Obrączka 1999: 63]. The publication and signing of translations by female translators was not an obvious thing in the 19th century. In this case, Barbara’s brother, Antoni Beaupre, who was the editor of Głos Narodu, seems to have played an important role and ensured that his sister’s work was properly attributed.

Comparing Barbara Beaupre’s situation and the situation of the other translators in the study group, we see a lot of common ground. Some

---

5 Due to a lack of sufficient sources, the names of the three translators could not be identified.


of them come from intelligentsia or landed gentry. Among those who came from families owning or managing estates were Stefan Garczyński, Władzimierz Wolski, Władysław August Kościelski, Witold Hulewicz, A. Nowosielski, and Andrzej Niemojewski. Władysław August Kościelski cultivated landed traditions and remained a steward of landed estates. Even if the translator came from landed gentry, it does not follow that they remained landed gentry. Most of the translators were trying to become members of the intelligentsia. The same was true of translators belonging to nobility, such as Józef Paszkowski, Julian Korsak, Adam Mickiewicz, and August Bielowski. Social advancement was possible for them because family wealth and connections made it easier for them to occupy better social positions.

This intelligentsia has its origins in nineteenth-century society. In Polish sociology, the term denotes a heterogeneous stratum of different professional categories involved in cultural creativity in the broadest sense, organising work and social life, and dealing with issues that require specialist knowledge. The social stratum originated mainly from the landed gentry. It comprised descendants of the declassed gentry, or former landowners deprived of their property due to economic reasons or as a result of post-uprising repressions, who sought opportunities for themselves in the liberal professions and urban life. This kind of social shifting was possible for them thanks to their education, which, in turn, was associated with work in any of the intelligentsia professions. The clearest example of advancement to the intelligentsia is Jan Kasprowicz, who came from a peasant background but got an education and became a professor at the University of Lvov. Nevertheless, the situation of translators like Aleksander Groza, Józef Paszkowski, Aleksander Krajewski, Alfons Walicki, Feliks Jeziorski, Władysław August Kościelski, Witold Hulewicz, who came from the landed gentry and nobility, but later worked in intelligentsia professions, can also be considered in the category of social shift, while Ludwik Jenike, Kazimierz Strzyżewski, Karol Brzozowski, Leon Wachholz, Emil Zegadłowicz, Stanisław Estreicher, Stanisław Czaplicki, Józef Birkenmajer, Ludwik Szczepański, Jan Izydor Sztautynger, Stanisław

Maykowski, Barbara Beupre were born in intelligentsia families and simply remained in the stratum.

The Polish nineteenth-century family was the foundation and background for the individual: the wealthier it was, the greater support it provided, e.g., quality food, access to medical care and medicines [Żyromski 2000: 175-177], money to buy books and pay the fees for private education and university lectures [Sosnowski 2015: 241-242]. The better financial condition of the family finally led to social shift. Private home education also often provided opportunities to learn foreign languages such as English or French and to explore their literature [Cetera-Włodarczyk and Kosim 2019: 302]. The loss of independence\(^\text{10}\) was also connected with the restriction of access to the Polish language and culture and the denationalization of formal education. Therefore, the family home became responsible for passing on national values, traditions, and history [Maleczyńska 1987: 196].

The patriotic upbringing often resulted in the participation of translators in uprisings and taking action by them for Polish independence. Honoured for his participation in the November Uprising\(^\text{11}\) was Stefan Garczyński, who emigrated to Dresden after the fall of the uprising, and later to Switzerland, finally settling in France.\(^\text{12}\) Less fortunate after the November Uprising was August Bielowski, who moved to Galicia, where the Austrian authorities imprisoned him for two years for conspiring in

---

\(^{10}\) Poland lost its independence at the end of the 18\(^{\text{th}}\) century as a result of prolonged and adverse political and socio-economic changes, which left the country unable to transform and defend itself against hostile states. Poland was divided in the three partitions (1772, 1793, 1795) between three powers: Russia, Prussia, and Austria and disappeared from the map of Europe for 123 years.

\(^{11}\) The November Uprising called also the Polish-Russian War of 1830-1831 was a Polish national uprising against the Russian Empire, which broke out on the night of 29-30 November 1830 and ended on 21 October 1831. It covered the Kingdom of Poland and part of the territories incorporated to Russia (Lithuania, Samogitia and Volhynia). The main reason for the outbreak of the November Uprising was the fact that the Russian Empire did not respect the provisions of the Constitution of the Kingdom of Poland of 1815. Besides, the persecution of Polish independence organisations was intensified.

favour of Poland. Gustaw Zieliński was also a November insurgent. He was sent into exile in Siberia, however not for taking part in the uprising, but for helping fugitive emissaries. Karol Brzozowski took part in the January Uprising and was taken prisoner by Prussia. Brzozowski was also an independence activist and fought in the Greater Poland Uprising (1848). Włodzimierz Wolski did not fight in the January Uprising, but was involved in patriotic demonstrations and wrote texts in support of it. After the fall of the uprising, he emigrated to Paris, then to Brussels. Those who did not fight themselves had relatives who were insurgents, e.g., Kazimierz Strzyżewski did not fight in the January Uprising, but lost a relative in it, Wincenty Strzyżewski. Alfons Walicki’s son, Józef, took part in the January Uprising and was subsequently exiled to Siberia.

The turbulent political situation involved not only fighting in uprisings but also enduring repressions from the occupiers. Józef Paszkowski was unable to continue his education at university because of repressions in the Kingdom of Poland [Cetera-Włodarczyk and Kosim 2019: 301]. Adam Mickiewicz was not allowed to publish his texts in Russian-occupied territory [Kopczyński 1992: 153-170]. Jan Kasprowicz, like many other high school students at the time, had to face the efforts of Germanisation and

---


15 The January Uprising was a Polish national uprising against the Russian Empire. It broke out on January 22, 1863 in the Kingdom of Poland and on February 1, 1863 in Lithuania. It continued until autumn 1864, and covered the lands of the Russian-occupied territory, i.e., the Kingdom of Poland and the incorporated territories. It was the largest and longest-lasting of the Polish national uprisings. The direct cause of the revolution was the setting up of a brigade the Russians on 25 January. Poles refused to join the Russian army because 88 per cent of its soldiers never returned alive.

16 Elżbieta Orman, Kazimierz Strzyżewski (1862-1915), https://www.muzeum gostyn.pl/Gosty%C5%84ski%20S%C5%82ownik%20Biograficzny?idAkt=1420, visited 30 November 2022.


the expulsion of the Polish language from formal schools [Sosnowski 2015: 74-81]. Aleksander Albert Krajewski was arrested for his activity in a patriotic organisation, imprisoned, and finally deported deep into Russia, where he worked in a mine and steelworks. He spent there twenty years of his life [Szenic 1983]. Antoni Józef Szabrański was a member of an academic patriotic society. Fearing arrest, he had to flee to Wrocław.\footnote{Antoni Józef Szabrański, https://www.ipsb.nina.gov.pl/a/biografia/antoni-jozef-szabranski, visited 30 November 2022.}

The beginning of the twentieth century was not more peaceful in terms of political and historical changes and unrest. During the first world war, Zygmunt Reis served in the 1st Brigade of the Legions. He was wounded in the Battle of Krzywopłoty. He reportedly died during the second world war.\footnote{Emanuel Rostworowski [1988], “Reis Zygmunt”, [in:] idem, ed. Polski Słownik Biograficzny, vol. 31, Zakład Narodowy Imienia Ossolińskich Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź.}

Witold Hulewicz was conscripted into the German army during the first world war and fought on the French front. When he returned to Poznań, he took part in the Greater Poland Uprising (1918/1919)\footnote{The Greater Poland Uprising of 1918–1919 called also Wielkopolska Uprising of 1918–1919 or Posnanian War was a military insurrection of Poles in the Greater Poland against German rule.} on the side of the insurgents. During the second world war, he was arrested and executed after repeated brutal interrogations,\footnote{Mirosława Kozłowska, Witold Hulewicz, https://encyklopediateatru.pl/osoby/40840/witold-hulewicz, visited 30 November 2022.}

After the outbreak of the first world war, Józef Birkenmajer was called up to the Austrian officers’ school and later sent to the Eastern front, where he was taken captive. He escaped and fought on the Ural front. After the surrender of the 5th Siberian Division on 10 January 1920, he was interned by the Bolsheviks in a prisoner-of-war camp in Krasnoyarsk. Sentenced to labour in Tule, he escaped again and joined the Polish Army stationed in Lithuania. He went into reserve as an officer in the 5th Podhale Rifle Regiment. During the second world war, he volunteered for the army and died in the defence of Warsaw on 26 September 1939 [Grzegorczyk 1949: 7-8].

The first world war interrupted the promising career of a young scientist Edward Kołodziejczyk. On 5 May 1915, he was called up. He was killed in the battle of Surochov on the San River on 24 May 1915 at the age of only 27 [Elżbieciak 2006: 124]. During the second world war, Leon Wachholz,
being an academician, was sent to the Sachsenhausen concentration camp. He was released from it, but his health suffered so much that he never recovered. At this time, he took up professional translation and forensic publishing. At the same time, Stanisław Estreicher was also arrested in the Sonderaktion Krakau. Unfortunately, he did not survive his imprisonment in the Sachsenhausen camp.

After the outbreak of the second world war, Jan Izydor Sztaudynger was arrested by the Germans together with his family, imprisoned in the transit camp, and finally resettled to Malice in the Sandomierz district. In his own words, he evaded being shot by the Germans thanks to the fact that six months earlier he had ceased to be Secretary of the Trade Union of Polish Writers (Związek Zawodowy Literatów Polskich) and so he had not been included in the Germans’ prescription list. Henryk Balk, of Jewish descent, committed suicide in 1941 in fear of being shut in the ghetto.

The turmoil of history severely affected the translators. The translators who were working on Faust were skilled in literature and language. They were well-read, with experience in their own work or even in translation, with enough knowledge of the German language to appreciate the artistry of Goethe’s masterpiece and were able to tackle it. Adam Mickiewicz began to learn German in the autumn of 1818. At first, he studied works by Schiller, and only when he felt confident enough, he reached for Faust [Szmydtowa 1950: 49-53]. The first translator, who prepared the translation of both Faust’s parts, Feliks Jezierski, also seemed to have been maturing into this decision. Initially, he was involved in teaching, literary, and scientific activities. He spent two years in Germany, where he obtained his Ph.D., which also indicates his linguistic competence. He published

---

extensively in *Biblioteka Warszawska*. He wrote linguistic dissertations and translated English poets, but started to work on *Faust* only in 1880.\(^{28}\)

The same was true about Andrzej Niemojewski, who published fragments of *Faust* in 1907 in *Myśli Niepodległa* [Obrączka 1999: 62]. Niemojewski became fluent in German at Brodnica Gymnasium. He studied law in Tartu (today’s Estonia, then Jurjew in the Russian Empire), wrote for *Przegląd Literacki*, published two original volumes of poetry, debuted as a playwright, and was politically active and interested in religion. After gaining experience, he translated fragments of *Faust*, which thematically seemed to fit perfectly with his interests at the time.\(^{29}\)

With literary and linguistic competence in translation work, Zygmunt Reis approached *Faust* as a German teacher. Reis studied German and classical philology at the Lvov University. Later, he worked as a teacher but was active in journalism and literature as well. He also wrote poetry. Reis decided to translate *Faust* in 1932.\(^{30}\)

However, the most competent people to undertake the *Faust* translation seem to be Edmund Kołodziejczyk and Witold Hulewicz. They spoke German fluently and were interested in literature. Both had publications devoted to Goethe: *Goethe w Polsce* (Kołodziejczyk) and connected with the drama: *Polski Faust, rzecz o nowych polskich przekładach, o sposobach tłumaczenia i o polemice dookolnej* (Hulewicz).\(^{31}\) Additionally, Witold Hulewicz was a recognized translator and promoter of German literature in Poland.\(^{32}\) Nevertheless, Kołodziejczyk and Hulewicz limited themselves to translating only modest fragments. These fragments were probably produced while Kołodziejczyk and Hulewicz were working on the mentioned publications. Jan Izydor Sztaudynger also approached the translation of his *Faust* fragment as a specialist: he studied German philology.\(^{33}\)

---


30 Emanuel Rostworowski [1988], op. cit.


32 Mirosława Kozłowska, op. cit.

33 Grzegorz Kopeć, op. cit.
Many of the translators prepared only fragments of *Faust*. Even Hulewicz, Kołodzieczyk, and Reis, who graduated in German studies and were experts in German language and literature, did not take up the challenge. As Zofia Ciechanowska [1949: 89-91] wrote, the translations of *Faust* were created independently of each other. Part I was more popular among translators, but there are lots of shorter fragments, such as translations of only the Prologue (Adam Mickiewicz\(^{34}\)), fragments of the scene between Faust and Wagner (Alexander Groza), Margaret’s prayer (Włodzimierz Wolski), Margaret’s grievances (Wiktor Baworowski) or the song at the reel (Franciszek Żygliński, Karol Brzozowski). Many of the translated parts are extracts from various scenes (Julian Korsak, Stefan Garczyński, Włodzimierz Wolski, Henryk Balk), as well as those remaining only in manuscripts (Kwiryn Meleniewski, Edmund Kołodzieczyk, Andrzej Niemojewski). Excerpts were published in magazines or read at social gatherings in private salons. The translators made their choice of fragments mostly guided by their tastes and fascination. They seemed to enter into a personal relationship with the text and translated the scenes and dialogues which were of particular interest to themselves. This truly personal and intimate relationship is evidenced by translations that remained in manuscripts (e.g., the works of Gustaw Zieliński, Edmund Kołodzieczyk, Kazimierz Strzyżewski, Waclaw Tyzenhauz), were kept in desk drawers and never made public (e.g., the translations of Krywin Meleniewski or Witold Hulewicz, which are actually not confirmed unequivocally by researchers).

*Faust*’s translators were very often writers, poets, or publicists: Julian Korsak, Adam Mickiewicz, August Bielowski, Aleksander Groza, Józef Paszkowski, Stefan Garczyński, Aleksander Krajewski, Włodzimierz Wolski, Karol Brzozowski, Emil Zegadłowicz, Jan Kasprowicz, Witold Hulewicz, Józef Birkenmajer, Ludwik Szczepański, Jan Izydor Sztauynger. The interest in *Faust* among those concerned with the written word in the broadest sense is not surprising. A penman had to be familiar with literary classics, and Goethe’s work, which played an important role in the shaping of Polish Romanticism, was regarded as such.\(^{35}\) In the case of *Faust*, it is

\(^{34}\) The fragment of this translation has not been found. Knowledge of the fact that the Prologue from *Faust* was awaited was provided by Eustachy Januszkiewicz [Kurska 2017: 87].

\(^{35}\) It should be noted, however, that the opinion of the literary world about Goethe was not as positive as about Schiller [Rduch 2019].
more interesting that it was translated by people who pursued completely
different professions in their daily lives.

As already mentioned, the translators in the study group belonged or
aspired to belong to the intelligentsia. In the studies by sociologists, such
as Lesław Sadowski [1988] or Janusz Żarnowski [1964], there is no infor-
mation about translators as a professional group. When characterising the
occupational groups comprising the intelligentsia, Żarnowski mentions:

in the ‘non-productive services’ section, I distinguish the following groups
. . . : 1) Administrative officials. 2) Lawyers and support staff. 3) Teachers.
4) Teaching staff. 5) Artists. 6) Physicians, pharmacists, and related profes-
sions. 7) Officers and 8) Clergy [Żarnowski 1964: 206].
[Translated by the author]

As can be seen, there are no translators. One can conclude that the pro-
fession of translator did not function in the public consciousness between
1826 and 1938, at least not to the same extent as a teacher, clerk, physi-
cian, or engineer. This type of work was seen as a hobby or as an activity
carried out concurrently with one’s profession as a teacher, clerk, etc. Ac-
cordingly, Faust’s translators included lawyers (Antoni Józef Szabrański,
Józef Czermak), a chemist (Kazimierz Strzyżewski), a painter (Franciszek
Żygliński), engineers (Karol Brzozowski, Ferdynand Gerżabka), physi-
cians (Rudolf Roźniatowski, Leon Wachholz), and an architect (Stanisław
Czaplicki). These professions were also their main source of livelihood.
Consequently, they did not need to make a living from translation and
undertook it mainly for reasons of personal fascination. What attracted
them to Faust was probably its metaphysical dimension. The Faust chosen
for translation may not have influenced these translators as much as it
influenced literary men who later used Faustian themes in their own
texts, but it nevertheless referred to their interests and perhaps their doubts
about faith, earthly existence, metaphysics, and the laws of nature. Hence
the translation of Karol Brzozowski (engineer, geologist, geographer),
Rudolf Roźniatowski (physician), Leon Wachholz (professor of foren-
sic medicine), Ludwik Szczepański (mountaineer in his youth), Andrzej
Niemojewski (astrologer with anticlerical views). It can also be assumed
that these translators’ interest in Faust stemmed from their identification
with the protagonist [Culler 1998: 132] or a crisis of their own worldview
as a result of their professional work. This may explain why only fragments
appeared and why many of these works remain unpublished or are actually not certain to have existed in the first place.

**Conclusion**

To sum up, using two kinds of tools: microhistory and translator’s biography based on Makarska’s segments, allowed to draw several conclusions concerning the social-cultural situation of *Faust*’s translators active between 1826 and 1938.

It was found that *Faust*’s translators were generally men with roots in landed gentry who aspired to the intelligentsia or already were its members. Their family provided them with educational capital, financial capital, and the capital of patriotic values. Each translator in the study group had experienced in their lives the hardships of the troubled political situation between 1826 and 1938, which may have triggered in them an interest in the metaphysics offered by *Faust*. Many translators in the study group are people who worked in non-literary professions. However, a potential crisis of worldview, probably an aftermath of the political situation and perhaps a doubt in the science they practiced, made them translate selected passages that appealed to them most. Therefore, Polish translations of *Faust* were born mostly out of personal motives and fascination rather than commissions from publishers or theatres. As a result, Polish versions of *Faust* are comprised of numerous fragments, often unpublished.

The above conclusions can contribute to complementing the history of literary translation with new ideas that go beyond the study of the reception of translated literature. In addition, they may shed new light on questions of the translatorial identity and translators’ position in the network of socio-cultural ties. Furthermore, they can contribute to an attempt to reconstruct the general history of literary translators. Translators’ biographies provide facts, but microhistory enables the researcher to combine them to illustrate the situation not only for a single translator but for a whole group working in the same period and a common geographical space.
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**Abstract**

This paper aims to answer the question of who the translators of *Faust* into Polish between 1826 and 1938 were. The problem is analysed thanks to the application of two research methods. In addition to the translator biography taken from the sociology of translation, a method taken from history, called microhistory, can be used. The use of microhistory in the translator study is useful to identify general trends prevailing in the field of translation and situations common to translators working in the same time frame and geographical-historical space. In this way, it has been possible to establish
that the *Faust* translators working between 1826 and 1938 were predominantly males, well educated, affected by the political events of the time, and chose to translate *Faust* as a result of personal literary fascinations.
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