



Ryszard Kapuściński in Azerbaijan, 1967. Courtesy the Estate of Ryszard Kapuściński.

The Hermeneutic Relation between Reporter and Ancient Historian in Ryszard Kapuściński's *Travels with Herodotus*

Magdalena Horodecka
University of Gdansk, Poland

Abstract: This article focuses on Ryszard Kapuściński's book *Travels with Herodotus*, published in Poland in 2004 and translated into English in 2008. The main thesis analyses the hermeneutic relation between two protagonists, Kapuściński the reporter and Herodotus the historian. The paper shows how Kapuściński used quotations from *The Histories* in his autobiographical narration to create a certain vision of the journalistic profession. It also shows a journalistic way of understanding sources and the role of reporters who describe events and then face the task of writing history. The article also shows why Kapuściński took Herodotus's *The Histories* with him during many of his journeys, how the book "witnesses" his own traveling experience, and how it becomes yet another interlocutor of the text—a mirror for the author and his reflections about the world. Kapuściński's reading technique can be compared with hermeneutic theory of interpretation, which presents reading of literary texts as a process of understanding ourselves.

In a lecture delivered at Collège de France on October 19, 1978, Roland Barthes claimed that any event in life could lead either to interpretative commentary or to purely narrative storytelling.¹ He connected two kinds of writing with two categories: metaphor, which answers questions typical for the essay, for example, What is it? and What does it mean?; and metonymy, which uses questions essential for plot constructions, for example, What is the background of the episode I recount? Barthes's remark is a good starting point to analyze the structure of *Travels with Herodotus*,² where elements of the essay are connected with elements of action and plot. Interspersed as they may seem, events presented by Herodotus's and Kapuściński's respective

adventures inspire one another. Interpretation of Herodotus's *The Histories*³ becomes for the reporter a primary tool to understand his own professional life. Kapuściński in *Travels*, one of his last books, published in Poland three years before his death in 2007, summarized his understanding of the reporter's mission and his philosophy of history with the help of Herodotus's text. Hidden in the book was one of his inspirations: hermeneutics.

I begin this discussion of hermeneutics in *Travels* by quoting poststructuralist Barthes because his remark shows the intertextual construction of the book. On the other hand, it should be emphasized that Barthes's concept of crisis of authorship—derived from the definition of literature as a game of languages where the “I” of the writer is absent⁴—is not adequate to Kapuściński's philosophy of reading and writing. It is particularly important to remember that Kapuściński in the 1980s and 1990s became much more interested in philosophy. He read Barthes and Richard Rorty, along with Wilhelm Dilthey and Paul Ricoeur. Many quotations of these authors can be found in his intellectual diary, the six volumes of *Lapidaria*,⁵ which, surprisingly, has still not been translated into English. *Lapidaria* demonstrated an important paradox in Kapuściński's philosophical views. He was inspired by the new poststructural and postmodern thought, especially by the idea of fragment (as epistemological and literary “form”), but never agreed with the idea of the “death of the author.” In his books one can find a permanent presence of a strong, self-aware Cartesian Self.⁶ That is why forms of his late work seem poststructural but the narrator who tells the story is not “written by the language.”⁷ The aim of this study is to show how in *Travels with Herodotus* he discovered that hermeneutics could provide an answer to the question: What does it mean to be a writer, a journalist, and a reader? For Kapuściński the process of reading was inseparable from writing and understanding.

Most of Kapuściński's work is, to a degree, autobiographical. *Travels with Herodotus* highlights the autobiographical through a curious juxtaposition of two narratives—by Kapuściński and by Herodotus. The link does not lead to a conflict of discourses, but to their interactive coexistence. The intertextual concept behind the book is unique to Kapuściński's writings, although it has been used by other journalists before and since. A similar idea of traveling with the companion from another time is present in the books of William Dalrymple,⁸ Tony Horwitz,⁹ and Geert Mak.¹⁰ For those writers and journalists the “ancestor” they chose—Marco Polo (Dalrymple), James Cook (Horwitz), and John Steinbeck (Mak)—is someone to be followed over the decades or centuries to gauge how the world has changed. In Kapuściński's book the time construction and narrative situation are different. He searches

his past life to find important episodes in his professional biography and then juxtaposes them with Herodotus's stories.

To demonstrate the difference in perspectives, compare Kapuściński's book with Dalrymple's *In Xanadu: A Quest*. In 1986, Dalrymple decides to follow the footsteps of Marco Polo via Polo's book *The Travels*. He starts in Jerusalem and then goes through Syria, Turkey, the Soviet Union, and China. He perceives his journey through the eyes of Polo's text, not only searching the places he sees but also considering what Marco Polo thinks about these towns and cities. The main difference between the two narratives lies in the intertextual strategy of quoting the writer-ancestor: while nearly absent in Dalrymple's reportage, it plays a crucial role in Kapuściński's book. The other difference is hidden in the composition of the texts. While Dalrymple decides to describe his journey in linear structure, Kapuściński constantly uses retropection. Finally, the comparison shows the difference in the writer's motivation. Dalrymple, at the time a young student of Trinity College, Cambridge, seems to have fun during his travels, trying to add to his knowledge through direct observation. His studies of books—Polo is but one of many resources he uses—make *Xanadu* both adventurous and erudite. In Kapuściński's narrative we hear the voice of the "old reporter" recollecting his professional life and reading Herodotus to inspire himself in the search for understanding the Other—the role of travel and writing. For him it is enough to use only one resource, the Herodotus narrative, and go deep inside the text to create an intellectual and psychological portrait of his authority. The impression is that the reader is hearing one conversation between two masters.

That is why we can observe in *Travels* the influence of old genres, namely, the conversation with the dead, the personal document, the interview with an important figure, and bearing witness to the present.¹¹ Kapuściński plays a surprising game in this respect. His primary interlocutor, Herodotus—though never directly addressed in the dialogue—is a member of the ancient world, and *The Histories* simultaneously witnesses Kapuściński's own journeys and becomes yet another interlocutor of the text. Although there are two main narrators-protagonists (Herodotus and Kapuściński), the image of Kapuściński dominates the book. His autobiography appears directly (in memories and in all elements of reconstructed biography of the reporter), and indirectly (in reflections, analyses, and interpretations of Herodotus's work). In many respects, the historian seems to be Kapuściński's alter ego, a mirror in which the reporter not so much watches himself as is watched by the reader. That is why the role of the other text in understanding oneself—the crucial idea of hermeneutics—is deeply present in *Travels*.

Reconstructing Herodotus

Let us then have a look at Herodotus and the way he appears in *Travels*. It is surprising just how much of the book is given over to the historical accounts of Herodotus—not only the narrative sections quoted from *The Histories* but also fragments Kapuściński wrote in his attempt to concisely paraphrase the text. Thus, with almost half of the book being somehow related to Herodotus, it could be argued that *Travels* seems, in large degree, to have been coauthored by the Greek historian.

A comparison may prove useful here between the picture of Herodotus that is revealed in his own *The Histories* and the image offered by the Polish reporter. The Greek rarely writes about himself. His narrative mainly concentrates on recounting stories, as well as describing customs, religions, and peoples he meets. There is, of course, a lot of information on topography and the countries explored. Herodotus appears to be not only the father of history, as Cicero would have it, but also a sociologist, ethnographer, and geographer. On the interdisciplinary character of his interests, Seweryn Hammer writes, “[Herodotus] is interested in the lives of people, in climate, soil types and in natural produce. For ethnography he created a system, discussing nations, languages, religions, and cultures. In fact, the list of Persian peoples he offers in Book 7 became the basis for subsequent geographical and ethnographic explorations of the ancient East.”¹²

In *Travels with Herodotus*, the Greek historian’s image is filtered through the personality and interests of the author. Kapuściński remains only partially faithful to the picture that is revealed in *The Histories*. Most of all, he leaves his own imprint on the figure of his master. The reporter paints a realistic portrait of the historian (paying attention to credibility), but adds a few authorial touches. This style of reading, according to the categorization proposed by Michał Głowiński, is *expressive* because its narration strongly aims at individual reconstruction of the identity of the author of the text.¹³ Still, we can also notice elements of *instrumental style*: it happens now and again that Kapuściński the reader quotes Herodotus to discuss his writing techniques as a paradigm he perceives as relevant for both historians and journalists.

When looking at these crucial aspects of the subjectively reconstructed Herodotus, it is worth noticing what information we receive about the Polish reporter who narrates the story. The writer’s personal interests extend to the selection of quotes from Herodotus. The use of quotes is motivated by a need to make the reader interested in what fascinated the author himself.

In certain places, another demand seems to be a key factor. Kapuściński frequently presents Herodotus’s text as if it were contemporary crime fiction, selecting shocking, dramatic moments and not avoiding scenes of blood

and gore. A person being impaled or the rotting body of the dying queen Feretime is shown with matter-of-fact precision. The brutality of the material may originate in the spirit of ancient times, but the fact that it is used so explicitly highlights its transgressive aspect. Thus, the violent character affects the reader of *Travels* much more than it could affect contemporary readers of *The Histories*, where its intensity wavers within the long, complicated narrative. Still, Kapuściński's motivation behind this strategy may be completely different. The brutality is not necessarily an advertising trick, drawing the reader's attention. It is, instead, an example of the author's genuine interest in the sufferings of ancient people. Herodotus, as Kapuściński remarks at some point, treats the material with the indifference of somebody who is well used to it. The reporter, in turn, reacts to the scenes, observing them with awe. The empathy of the observer, of the sympathetic listener, is at work again.

Another dimension of the subjectively constructed portrait of Herodotus is the use Kapuściński makes of his own imagination as an interpretative tool for the ancient book, its style, and for the historian's working methods of travel and observation. It is visible in the passage describing Babylon being besieged by Darius the Great. The reporter first offers a quote from the historian and then adds: "Let us imagine this scene."¹⁴ The fragment following such a statement is not always a pure product of imagination. Quite often, as in the case of this passage, such comment is only a symptom of change in the speaking voice. Authorial narration takes over to reconstruct the events in a condensed, shorter version. It is easy to notice how much Kapuściński's imagination relies on his own extensive knowledge. The symptomatic suggestion quoted above is followed by a detailed passage:

Let us imagine this scene. The world's largest army has arrived at the gates of Babylon. It has made camp around the city, which is encircled by massive walls of clay brick. The city wall is several meters high and so wide that a wagon drawn by four horses all in a row can be driven along its top. . . . It will be twelve hundred more years before gunpowder makes its appearance in this part of the world. Firearms won't be invented for another two thousand years. . . . So the Babylonians feel invincible, able to behave with impunity—nothing can happen to them.¹⁵

I will return to the motif of imagination as a narrative regulator, but here I would like to stress that an example of such authorial interpretation can be also found in numerous fragments that aim at reconstruction of Herodotus's journalistic talents and his methods of collecting information. The historian is precise and laconic, using fragments of the stories he has heard but rarely revealing much about the circumstances in which he did so. Let us then have a look at how Kapuściński discusses the historian's workshop:

For now, people gather in the evenings at the long, communal table, by the fire, beneath the old tree. Better if the sea is nearby. They eat, drink wine, talk. Tales are woven into those conversations, endlessly varied stories. If a visitor, a traveller, happens by, they will invite him to join them. He will sit and listen. In the morning, he will be on his way. In the next place he comes to, he will be similarly welcomed. The scenario of these ancient evenings repeats itself. If the traveller has a good memory—and Herodotus must have had a phenomenal one—he will over time amass a great many stories. That was one of the sources upon which our Greek drew.¹⁶

This representative passage shows how the reporter's imagination adds (on the basis of his knowledge) to the content of Herodotus's. The added material, otherwise absent, is thus more interesting, more actively arousing, as if presenting a detective's work. The writer is puzzled with the places of indeterminacy in the ancient text and consequently tries to solve mysteries through acts of imagination.

Another aspect of the subjective input of the portrait of Herodotus is the independence with which the reporter manifests his understanding of the historian's work and identity. This seems a surprising element in the face of Kapuściński's earlier works, in which intertextuality was dominant (for example, in *Imperium*, where he shares with readers his knowledge about a given issue he acquired from his reading of numerous materials). In *Travels*, he is very much antibibliographic. Still, it is worth stressing that it is only an apparent independence. In fact, Kapuściński is well prepared to write about Herodotus. In an interview he mentions thorough research:

Before I settled down to work, I had accumulated a serious research basis of 140 books. A dozen or so were about Herodotus himself (although little information about him exists). They were more hypothetical than factual. I did not want to write another book about the same thing. I felt no need for that. So I thought, let's go another way, let's go back to my reporter's work. This was something I had never talked about before in a book.¹⁷

Thus, the intertextual aspect of *Travels* is limited to *The Histories*—the ancient work is the only source used. All comment comes from the author, who uses knowledge and empathy as primary reference points. He offers an *ad fontes* reading (though he does not read Herodotus in the original), tries to go as directly as possible to the ancient historian. He is clearly aware that a figure from more than 2,000 years ago is impossible to be seen in any objective way. Instead of looking for professional tools, he follows intuitively his own assumptions, hypotheses, and imagination. The effect makes specific impressions. On the one hand, we are surprised at the certainty with which Kapuściński talks about his intuitive observations on Herodotus. On the

other, the authorial tone of certainty is subdued by interrogative structures that dominate on a syntactic level. An example of the first technique—which represents a kind of reconstructed narration—can be found in the passage quoted above, in which Herodotus moves from table to table and listens to stories of the locals. The poetics of interrogation—inquisitive narration of questions—is also a common strategy in the book, for instance, in this comment Kapuściński offers after the concise quote from *The Histories* that mentions women strangled by besieged Babylonians in need of food:

Our Greek says nothing more about this mass execution. Whose decision was it? That of the Popular Assembly? Of the Municipal Government? Of the Committee for the Defence of Babylon? Was there some discussion of the matter? Did anyone protest? Who decided on the method of execution—that these women would be strangled? Were there other suggestions? That they be pierced by spears, for example? Or cut down with swords? Or burned on pyres? Or thrown into the Euphrates, which coursed through the city?

There are more questions still. Could the women, who had been waiting in their homes for the men to return from the meeting during which sentence was pronounced upon them, discern something in their men's faces? Indecision? Shame? Pain? Madness? The little girls of course suspected nothing. But the older ones? Wouldn't instinct tell them something? Did all the men observe the agreed silence? Didn't conscience strike any of them? Did none of them experience an attack of hysteria? Run screaming through the streets?¹⁸

We may also notice that these interrogative passages strongly dramatize the material presented by Herodotus. Facts offered by the historian are reworked in a way that adds new tragedy, escalates fears that must have overwhelmed the people in such terrifying circumstances. Thus, Kapuściński completes the gaps left by historical account, which typically concentrates on major conflicts, royal affairs, and large-scale processes. In other words, the reporter presents the experience of the individual common man—unimportant to Herodotus but of immense interest to modern historians.

Hermeneutic Relation

The undermining of Kapuściński's authorial tone of certainty is a characteristic feature of the text. The cascades of questions are a symptom of a visibly hermeneutic attitude, which is essentially based on the desire to understand and on the close interpretation of the text. Kapuściński's writing and reading techniques thus reveal some influence of Ricoeur. Kapuściński follows the thinker by making a deliberate effort to interpret not only Herodotus's work but also himself. "Reflection is not so much a justification of science and duty

as a reappropriation of our effort to exist; epistemology is only a part of this broader task: we have to recover the act of existing, the positing of the self, in all the density of its works,"¹⁹ Ricoeur comments on the issue. In this way, the interpretation of *The Histories* has a clearly autobiographical character. It reveals the identity of the reporter-reader; and it leads to self-understanding through the interpretative effort and regular accumulation of knowledge about other works and writers.

Kapuściński's contact with Ricoeur's work is confirmed in *Lapidaria*. In volume six, we find a direct quote on multiple interpretative levels present in the text.²⁰ Elsewhere in the same volume, two somehow encyclopedic paragraphs are devoted to hermeneutics:

Hermeneutics—a method of interpreting texts and the world; discussed by Vico, Schleiermacher, Weber, Dilthey, and others. Both Weber and Dilthey talk about understanding as *verstehen*, putting yourself in the shoes of others. Recently the same problem has been addressed by, e.g. Gadamer and Ricoeur.

Hermeneutics originates in Protestantism, which pays great attention to appropriate reading of the Bible. Schleiermacher suggests multiple consecutive readings, while Dilthey extends hermeneutic procedures onto the interpretation of all human behaviours and creations.²¹

I do not want to dwell too much on such comments on hermeneutics (though this passage shows, for instance, the reporter's strong tendency toward concise and risky generalization), but I believe we may also easily assume that *Travels with Herodotus* does offer a deliberate reference to the hermeneutic approach. The technique seems more convincing if we realize that the writing of *Travels* is mentioned in *Lapidarium VI*. Moreover, a few pages later there's an excerpt from the interview Edwin Benedyk conducted with the author himself. It could be also true that Kapuściński started to become interested in hermeneutics while working on *Travels with Herodotus*. Thus, the approach could perhaps have some affinities with its content.

Hermeneutics is contextually relevant to *Travels* as it also touches upon a problem Kapuściński repeatedly deals with in most of his work. Historical distance between us and most creations of culture is—in hermeneutic approach and in much of the reporter's writing—neutralized neither by biographic recreation of authorial intention (biographism) nor the structure of the work (structuralism), but by the interpretation aimed at internalizing the text, breaking down the foreignness that is inherent in the temporal distance. Any other method would involve, as Katarzyna Rosner claims, an assumption that "all creations of antiquity bear witness to the fact that it does not have

anything to tell us.”²² Hermeneutics, in turn, makes us believe that every text is alive and will speak to us and play its primary cultural role by becoming a tool for the understanding of ourselves. Kapuściński seems to follow a similar interpretative approach. The autobiographical effects of such affinities follow suit.

In his specific *interview* with the historian, the reporter does not aim at fake Objectivity; he is clearly subjective when he openly and insistently communicates his admiration of both the work and life of the Greek. This could perhaps be seen as a flaw, an emotional disadvantage. Constant praise that fills the book in order to create a similar admiration in the readers may rather appear to increase their skepticism and distance. While the uncritical worship of Herodotus is indeed quite surprising in Kapuściński’s work, the origin of such an attitude lies in the tools he chooses for interpretation of *The Histories*—in the bracketing of bibliography. And we should bear in mind that other commentators see Herodotus in a dramatically different way. Polish historian Zygmunt Kubiak doubts his reliability, and in places clearly rejects Herodotus’s relation as untrue: “If we are to trust Herodotus, money was invented by the Lydians,” he writes. Elsewhere in the same text he openly disproves the statistics about the battle of Marathon: “When Herodotus claims there were sixty four hundred killed among the invaders and a hundred and ninety-two Athenians, I definitely do not believe him.”²³ Kapuściński is of a different mind—he seems to believe Herodotus, for the most part. Seweryn Hammer, another contemporary historian, comments that Herodotus was more of a writer than a historian because, simply, there was at the time no genuine historiographical tradition available to him to which he could refer. He remained, Hammer continues, under the influence of the Ionic novella with its dominant elements of folktale, fable, epigram, and puzzle. Herodotus followed the example of a logograph, Hectaeus of Miletus, the author of *Περιοδος γης* (World Survey), widely recognized as a piece of pseudo-historical writing. And although we know Herodotus went much further than his master, we have to remember that he based his work on Hectaeus’s data and followed his style. And that style, as Hammer proves, was itself close to the style of folktale or Homer’s *Odyssey*,²⁴ where entertainment was as important as knowledge. Even in antiquity this mode of writing generated a great deal of heated debate. Aristotle called Herodotus an uncritical storyteller, and similar, though less objective, pleas were offered by Plutarch and Aristophanes.

Why then does Kapuściński put so much confidence in Herodotus and find in him what others seem to miss? As the reporter himself puts it in the closing part of *Travels*, in our meeting with history we stand in darkness, surrounded by light. The light does not disperse darkness, but surrounds it—it

is external to the lack of knowledge. The writer casts light into darkness, which nevertheless remains impenetrable. The distant past cannot be uncovered—only a passing glimpse at it can be achieved through the workings of our imagination, through hypotheses, studying the remains of the past, and talking or writing about it. This seems to be the dominant historiosophical aspect of *Travels with Herodotus*. The choice of a particular rhetoric mode—suggesting certainty or doubt—is less relevant. Be it one or the other, the choice seems to be that of the narrative strategy. The past is inaccessible, unknown; only fragments are to be seen and described.

Kapuściński reacts to this perceptive predicament with a surprising degree of optimism. He seems to believe that if darkness cannot be dispersed, we shall concentrate our attention on the light itself—on our imaginative powers, which dictate to us how the traces could lead to a full picture of a person, to a complete presentation of events. Through such an attitude, history becomes a material of creation. It resembles art, not science. There is more in it of a hunter's expedition and a poet's creative fantasy than of a concrete account offered by a diligent archivist.

Kapuściński's historiosophical point of view seems to be similar to concepts of Hayden White, who stresses the role of interpretation and storytelling in historiography:

I realize that in characterizing historical discourse as interpretation and historical interpretation as narrativization, I am taking a position in a debate over the nature of historical knowledge that sets narrative in opposition to theory in the manner of an opposition between a thought that remains for the most part literary and even mythical and one that is or aspires to be scientific. . . . And narrative has always been and continues to be the predominant mode of historical writing. . . . The theory of historical discourse must address the question of the function of narrativity in the production of the historical text.²⁵

Affinities between the picture of Herodotus we receive and the author's working methods seem equally clear, especially to an avid reader. It is not only because Kapuściński projects onto Herodotus his own assumptions about the reporter's work or the actual sense of traveling. Similar values—such as possessing an antitotalitarian, democratic attitude—also link the two figures. Writing about oneself when writing about somebody else is even more visible if we juxtapose passages from *Autoportret reportera* (A Reporter's Self-portrait), a collection of interviews with the author, not translated into English) and *Travels with Herodotus*. In one interview, Kapuściński comments on his experiences: "When traveling, Odysseus is always welcome in any place in the world. The reason is that in those times—and in many communities of the

Third World until now—people did not distinguish those who came from the outside from those who were possible gods or their emissaries.”²⁶ We can find a similar example in *Travels with Herodotus*: “Herodotus’s travels would not have been possible without the institution of the proxenos, . . . a type of a consul. One had to demonstrate genuine hospitality to a new arrival, because one could never be certain whether this wanderer asking for food and a roof over his head was merely a man, or in fact a god who had assumed human form.”²⁷

Kapuściński hides his face behind Herodotus, or perhaps he uses the ancient figure as a medium. Thus, Herodotus becomes Kapuściński’s double, a shade and mirror that had been accompanying him in his farthest travels. In some sense, he cannot dispose of him, but the ghost brings him genuine pleasure. Herodotus is not a romantic double—a phantasm indicating a neurotic chasm, or fears, or emotions of its original ‘I.’ He is kind to and friendly with his twin brother. Kapuściński says, “We wandered together for years. And although one travels best alone, I do not think we disturbed each other.”²⁸

Magdalena Horodecka is an Assistant Professor of Polish Literature and Theory of Literature at University of Gdańsk, Poland. Her most recent book is Narrative Strategies in Ryszard Kapuściński’s Reportages (Gdańsk, 2010). She is currently completing a book-length study on anthropological aspects of contemporary Polish literary journalism. horodecka@ug.edu.pl.



Notes

1. Roland Barthes, "Longtemps je me suis couché de bonne heure," in *Les inédits du Collège de France* 3, 1982.
2. Kapuściński, *Travels with Herodotus*, trans. Klara Głowczewska (London: Penguin, 2008).
3. Herodotus, *The History of Herodotus*, trans. George Rawlinson (London: Dent, 1964).
4. Roland Barthes, *S/Z*, trans. Richard Miller (London: Cape, 1974), 11.
5. Ryszard Kapuściński, *Lapidaria I–III* and *Lapidaria IV–VI* (Warszawa, Biblioteka Gazety Wyborczej, 2008).
6. Magdalena Horodecka, *Zbieranie głosów: Sztuka opowiadania Ryszarda Kapuścińskiego* (Gdańsk: słowo/obraz terytoria, 2010).
7. Barthes, *S/Z*, 204.
8. William Dalrymple, *In Xanadu: A Quest* (London: Flamingo, 1990).
9. Tony Horowitz, *The Untamed Word: Searching for Captain Cook* (London: Bloomsbury, 2002).
10. Geert Mak, *In America: Travels with John Steinbeck*, trans. Liz Waters (Sydney: Random House, 2014).
11. Roman Zimand, *Czas normalizacji: szkice czwarte* [Time of Normalization] (London: Aneks, 1989).
12. Seweryn Hammer, *Wstęp*, in *Herodot: Dzieje* ["Introduction," *The History of Herodotus*], trans. Seweryn Hammer (Warszawa: Czytelnik, 1959), 12.
13. Michał Głowiński, "Świadczenia i style odbioru," in *Style odbioru: Szkice o komunikacji literackiej* [Styles of Reading Literature], ed. Michał Głowiński (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1977).
14. Kapuściński, *Travels*, 129.
15. *Ibid.*, 129–30.
16. *Ibid.*, 270.
17. Ryszard Kapuściński, "Na własne oczy" [See for Yourself], interview by Krzysztof Masłoń, *Rzeczpospolita* (October 2004), 2–3.
18. Kapuściński, *Travels*, 128.
19. Paul Ricoeur, *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale University Press), 45.
20. Ryszard Kapuściński, *Lapidarium VI* (Warszawa: Czytelnik, 2007), 119.
21. *Ibid.*, 84–5.
22. Katarzyna Rosner, *Hermeneutyka jako krytyka kultury: Heidegger, Gadamer, Ricoeur* [Hermeneutics as a Critical Attitude to Culture: Heidegger, Gadamer, Ricoeur], (Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1991), 265.
23. Zygmunt Kubiak, *Dzieje Greków i Rzymian: piękno i gorycz Europy* [History of Greeks and Romans] (Warszawa: Świat Książki, 2003), 53.
24. Hammer, 13.
25. Hayden White, *Figural Realism: Studies in Mimesis Effect* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press), 3.

26. Ryszard Kapuściński, *Autoportret reportera* [Reporter's Self-portrait], (Kraków, Znak 2003), 57.
27. Kapuściński, *Travels*, 263.
28. *Ibid.*, 271.