

Agnieszka Kałużna
Uniwersytet Zielonogórski
agarob11@o2.pl

**Interpretation of the source language text
as a means of adjusting translation
to the target language culture
on the example of selected
18th century translations**

Introduction

Among the many available definitions of translation, one which is often cited is that of translation as a process of “reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style” [Nida, Taber, 1969: 12]. This definition sees translation as a phenomenon which operates between two languages, but does not explicitly state that this also, in consequence, involves translation between two cultures. Another citation seems to confirm the above-mentioned statement in the following way:

Translating as an activity and translation as a result of this activity are inseparable from the concept of culture. The translational capacity of culture is an important criterion of its specificity. Culture operates largely through translational activity, since only by the inclusion of new texts can the culture undergo innovation as well as perceive its own specificity. Translation and translating are concepts that belong in an active culture [Chalvin, Lange, Monticelli, 2011: 25].

Just as there are various ways of defining the notion of translation, so too the term culture has been variously defined. According to one of the definitions included in the New Lexicon Webster's Encyclopedic Dictionary of the English language, culture refers to "the social and religious structures and intellectual and artistic manifestations etc. that characterize a society" [*The New Lexicon Webster's Encyclopedic Dictionary...*, 1988: 235]. Palumbo, on the other hand, provides a definition which is likely to be more relevant in the field of translation, namely that culture may be considered to be a "dimension which is linked to the knowledge, activities and artefacts associated with a given language community and which provides added meaning to the basic linguistic, referential meaning of words" [Palumbo, 2009: 31]. The earliest definition is the one by Edward Burnett Tylor [1871] who specified culture as: "that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society" [Tylor, on-line].

The significance of culture for the study of translation has been the subject of heated debate, and although, unquestionably, culture plays a significant role in the process of translation, the extent to which this is so varies depending on the language and the individual, as well as the cultural features of a given society. When rendering a given text which is abundant with cultural qualities, the translator, depending on his/her intention and deliberate effort, can either conceal elements of foreign culture and domesticate the source text to serve the target language readers as a second original or conversely, reveal and emphasise exotic traces of the source culture in translation.

As this article deals with examples of interpretation/manipulation in translation, perhaps one should define the term manipulation first. According to a dictionary definition *to manipulate* refers to: "to handle, esp. with skill, [...] to cause by clever manoeuvring to act as one wishes, to make dishonest changes in (e.g. election results) so as to suit one's purpose, to influence" [*The New Lexicon Webster's Encyclopedic Dictionary...*, 1988: 607]. Manipulation can be perceived as a negative phenomenon inclined towards abuse or as a neutral or positive trend emphasising someone's skill in achieving their goals. In the Enlightenment period, translators did not use the term *manipulation* in reference to translation but only such words as *paraphrase*, *interpretation*

or *adaptation*, thus perhaps emphasising the degree of freedom to interpret the original which was accepted by 18th century translators. Today, such *interpretations* would be considered to verge on the manipulative in the more negative sense of the term, but this article aims to show that directions in 18th century translation emphasised skill in achieving the goals of adjusting the source text to suit the target language cultural requirements.

Nowadays, translation studies offer a variety of approaches which help the translator deal with the challenge of culture in translation, including the Skopos Theory, Cultural Turn by Mary Snell-Hornby, Translator's Invisibility by Lawrence Venuti, Quality Assessment approach by Juliane House, and more. In the 18th century translation studies did not exist as an academic subject and although the notion of translation was extensively discussed by scholars and writers, who were prominent representatives of the period, it was not examined academically to the extent it is today. Having stated the above, it is perhaps worth presenting the opinions on translation and culture of selected intellectual figures of the Enlightenment Age in Poland.

Translation in 18th century Poland

In Europe the culture of the Enlightenment period developed particularly in France, England and Germany. The role of France was peculiar, for Paris was regarded as the centre of Enlightenment culture and French became the international language of the educated people, with some non-French writers adopting French as their second literary language. This trend facilitated the dissemination of ideas through the press and international publishing houses. The main ideas which were popular in the period related to the dominance of reason and practical thinking. It was believed that knowledge could be acquired by experience [Majda, 1985: 136-137].

The idea of empirical thinking was derived from England, where the role of education and tolerance were emphasised; the human brain and behaviour came to be analysed from a more psychological point of view. It was believed that society could be shaped in compliance with these philosophical perspectives and thus a utopian, ideal community could emerge [Majda, 1985: 137].

In Poland the Enlightenment coincided with a period that witnessed the dramatic events which were finally to lead to the partitions of our country. Despite, or perhaps even because of this political chaos, culture flourished. This was the time of growth and development of the press and printing activities in Poland. As a result, as books became more readily available, there was a growing demand for literature among wider sectors of the population, and this, in turn, led to an increased demand for translation. As French was the main international language of the educated classes, translations from French dominated. It was in the 18th century, then, that secular translation came to gain prominence for the first time.

The trend of popularising literature went hand in hand with the growing demand for translations and translators. As the profession of the translator was just emerging, translating was most frequently performed by writers and poets, thus providing them with the opportunity to improve their writing skills [Kałużna, 2011: 11]. The phenomenon of translation was widely debated by 18th century writers and scholars, whose opinions concerning how to translate were divided. From the discussion on translation, two main approaches to the art of translation can be distinguished. One of them concentrated on translating literally, word-for-word, whereas the other emphasised the necessity of translating freely, allowing for creativity and individual interpretation of the source text on the translator's part.

Views on translation and culture in translation by Polish 18th-century writers

Polish writers of the Enlightenment Age who were in favour of free translation criticised word-for-word translation as it was believed to distort the original and blur the meaning of the source text [Ziętarska, 1969: 28]. One of the advocates of the less slavish approach to translation was Franciszek Bohomolec (1720-1784), who expressed his opinion as follows:

Nie na słowa, ale na rzecz w tłumaczeniu oglądać się należy. To sztuka, to chwalebne tłumaczenie, kiedy ja myśl autora gładko i żywo wyrażę, choć innymi daleko słowy. Gdzie mi trzeba, tam się rozszerzę, a gdzie widzę,

że się autor niepotrzebnie rozszerza, tam krócej też samą rzecz wyrażę, to zawsze mając na oku, żebyśmy nie tylko zrównał, ale i przesadził żywością mego wyrażenia wyrażenie tego autora, którego tłumaczę [Balcerzan, 1977: 71].

His idea of the translator was of a writer who made his own translation decisions as to how express the original author's intentions. It was the translator who added to and enriched the original with his version and interpretation of the source text and it was the translator's decision to abridge the source text if he believed this to be necessary. Thus, Bohomolec perceived the translator as someone who, as a writer himself, could make autonomous decisions on how the original should be tailored. Words were only guidelines for the infinite imagination of the translator's interpretation of the source text. He believed the translator was granted almost indefinite freedom to interpret the original, to the extent of a literary critic [Ziętarska, 1969: 71].

Challenges of translating culture were noticed by an anonymous writer, who included his opinion on how the translator should deal with the original in the popular 18th century magazine entitled *Monitor*. His view was that the translator should fulfil four conditions when rendering a foreign text:

[...] wszelkie bowiem, by też najdoskonalsze, tłumaczenia podobne są do ananasów lub innych indyjskich owoców, które po różnych cieplicach ogrodowych w Europie nader są delikatne i wyborne, ale nigdy nie dochodzą delikatności tych, które się w własnym kraju rodzą. Tłumacz czworaką ma pracę zamiast dwoistej pierwszego pisarza. Tłumacz powinien i przejąć autora myśl, i kształt pisania jego wyrozumieć, i w języku swoim wyrazi równające się wyrazom autora wynaleźć, i starać się o gładkość stylu językowi swemu właściwą [Balcerzan, 1977: 73].

This anonymous writer compared translation to exotic fruit, which could be well planted far away from the native country with more or less success, although the greatest flavour came from the fruit planted in the native environment, and no artificial planting house could ever equal the natural conditions. In his opinion, the translator was a writer who had more duties to fulfil than the original author, called by him the first writer. The first writer only had to think reasonably and be able to express his thoughts smoothly in writing. The translator, however, was required

to understand the first writer's intentions, to acquaint himself with the way of his writing, to find corresponding equivalents in the target language, and to transfer them into the target language in a natural way.

Writers of the Enlightenment period were willing to advise and instruct young scholars on how to translate. One of such authors who was eager to present his view in this regard was Ignacy Krasicki (1735-1801). In his notes on translating books he enumerated the stages the translator should complete before the actual act of translation in the following manner:

Nim więc dzieło zacznie, powinien się niejako przeistoczyć w tego, którego tłumaczyć zamyśla, powtórzonym czytaniem, uwagą pilną i pracowitą przyswajając sobie jego sposób myśli i wyrażenia. Z tych powodów łatwa konsekwencja, iż ta praca nie upodla, która kopiującego z oryginałem równa, jeżeli nie przenosi. Doskonałość nauk nie razem wzrasta, ale na wzór innych produkcji ludzkich krokiem niewspornym, po stopniach nieznacznych wierzchołku dochodzi. [...] Przeczyć temu nie można, iżby w kopijach nie traciły oryginały, ale jak wszystkie – ta reguła ma swoje ekscepcyje. Nie kopija, ale kopiującego ręka temu winna, iż oryginałowi nie zrówna. Doświadczenie nauczyło, jak autorowie zyskali na tłumaczeniu, a tłumaczący słusznie nabytą sławę dzielili z tymi, którym do wytworności dopomogli [Balcerzan, 1977: 75].

In this sample the author advised the translator to put himself in the shoes of the original writer and try to understand his way of thinking and writing by careful study and thorough reading of the original. On the one hand, Krasicki warned the reader that despite this advice and the translator's best intentions, the result of the translator's endeavours could be far from expected, if the translator was not skilled enough in the art of translation. On the other hand, according to Krasicki, there were authors who had gained their popularity thanks to translation and these translators could share their fame with the writers and masterpieces they had helped to make famous through their translation. Krasicki was of the opinion that translators, by way of skilful translation, should strive to become worthy of their renditions.

It was also Krasicki who emphasised the role of culture in translation. He was aware that to translate it was not enough to know the language of the original, its linguistic and grammatical rules but also idioms, history

and manners of behaviour operating in a given society. He expressed his view on culture in translation in the following way:

Nie dość jest rozumieć język cudzy, trzeba go umieć; a umieć dokładnie – bardzo rzecz trudna, w umiejętność albowiem nie tylko wchodzi gramatyczne prawidła, ale sposoby mówienia, do czasów przystosowane przysłowia, rzeczy co innego niekiedy znaczące, niż w brzmieniu znaczą [...]. Nie tylko dokładna wiadomość języka, ale historii, obyczajowości, praw ludu, którego się dzieła przekładają, użyteczną jest i potrzebną [Balcerzan, 1977: 76-77].

This quotation clearly illustrates that Krasicki realized that knowledge of culture of a given language was as significant as the knowledge of translation rules. Without respecting and including the cultural qualities of a given society in translation, the translator could easily go astray with his work. Although, according to Krasicki, knowledge of a foreign language and its cultural peculiarities was by no means easy.

This prominent Polish writer and translator paid attention to the differences between languages and the fact that they were difficult to translate as there were seldom direct equivalents. He expressed his view that it was perhaps the translator's role to try to search for similarities between languages if possible. He expressed his opinion as follows:

Każdy język ma swoje właściwe prawidła, ma swoje sposoby wyrażenia i wyluszczenia każdej rzeczy: te rzadko z innymi zgodne, chyba jeden z drugiego albo obadwa od jednego pochodziły. Łatwiej Hiszpanom, Włochom z łacińskiego przekładać, bo czerpają w powszechnym źródle. Polski z słowiańskiego wraz z ruskim i czeskim pochodzi, trzeba więc przywdziwać na inne języki słowiańszczyzną naszą. A ciężko takiemu to uczynić, który albo się do tego źródła nie udał, albo w księgach dawnych własnego narodu nie nauczył, jak prawdziwą polszczyzną mówić i pisać należy [Balcerzan, 1977: 79].

In this quotation Krasicki pointed out that it was probably easier to translate from or into languages of the same or similar origin. According to Krasicki it was easier for the Spanish and Italian people to translate from Latin, just as it was easier for the Polish to translate from Russian or Czech as the shared origin of languages could facilitate the process of translation.

The cultural dimension was also the subject of consideration for Onufry Kopczyński (1735-1817) who stressed the necessity of taking care of the purity of the native language in translation. He was one of those writers who advised translators to avoid the use of too many borrowings. His opinion in this regard was the following:

Co się trafia powracającym z cudzych krajów, że im tam dłużej bawili, im mniej z rodakami mieli obcowania, tym więcej tchną cudzoziemczyzną; toż się trafia obcującym z cudzoziemskimi książkami, że cudzoziemskie myślenia i mówienia sposoby przejmują, choćby nieradzi, dopieroż gdy umyślnie w osnowę mowy ojczystej wcześniej czy niewcześniej tkają pstrocinę cudzoziemskie. [...] żeby tłumaczenie było doskonałe względem toku polskiego – pomoże wielce po kilku poprawach, tyjących się osnowy i wierności myśli autorowych, odczytywać tłumaczenie bez zaglądnia do autora. W ten sposób dzieło cudzoziemskie tak się na nasz krój przerobi, że i znaku nie zostanie tłumaczenia [Balcerzan, 1977: 82].

Kopczyński's piece of advice addressed to translators was to proof-read and re-read one's translation without reference to the original author in order to retain the native character of translation and avoid borrowings and foreignness in one's work. If the translator treated his rendition as a separate piece of text rather than part of the original, then the native character of translation would be visible in translation according to Kopczyński.

A reoccurring tendency can be observed in the opinions of some 18th century Polish writers comparing the work of the translator to that of a painter. The emphasis was put on an attempt to express the images of the original in translation. As the translator's role aspired to that of a painter's, then the expectations towards the translator's work were of high standards [Ziętarska, 1969: 41]. One of such writers who shared these views on translation was Ignacy Włodek (1723-1780), who defined the process of translation in the following way:

Głupie mniemanie, że do tłumaczenia z jednego języka do drugiego nie potrzeba żadnej nauki, żadnego dowcipu, ale cała rzecz zawisała na pracy i wertowaniu słowników. Aby kto poznał, czy złe czyli dobre tłumaczenie, trzeba dobrze umieć i języki te, które się przekładają, i sztukę tłumaczenia; nie dosyć zaś jest, że komu się podoba i że się piękne zdaje: bo może się

podobać lub nieuczonemu dla niewiadomości, lub uczonemu dla jakiej innej przyczyny, nawet może być prawdziwie piękne pismo, mowa, etc., a złe tłumaczenie; jako w malowaniu może być piękne malowanie, ale nieszczerze i złe wyrażenie tego, co jest malowanego [Balcerzan, 1977: 84].

Włodek's words can be taken as a summary of Polish 18th-century opinions on translation, the common feature of which was that the art of translation could not be based merely on the reproduction of words. Translators should strive for perfection in translation just as painters doing their best to re-create foreign reality transformed by their own artistic talent.

***Robinson Crusoe* by Daniel Defoe translated by Jan Chrzyciel Albertrandi (1769)**

Although prominent Polish writers of the Enlightenment period were willing to express their views on how to translate and how not to translate in an excessive manner, they did not use the word *manipulation* in their work when describing the process of translation, as *manipulation* was not associated with translation in the 18th century. It is difficult for us to state today why this was the case. Perhaps the way they understood translation, their idea of translation, had little in common with contemporary ideas of translation and manipulation. However, this is only an assumption which, unfortunately, can never be confirmed. Nevertheless, for the purposes of this article and bearing in mind our analysis of the different connotations of the word *manipulation*, the translation analyses undertaken below will attempt to assess whether the *manipulations* of the source texts represent abuse of the original texts or whether they can be interpreted as the translators' skills in achieving their goals by adjusting their translations for the benefit of their target audiences.

The contemporary definition of manipulation states that to manipulate means: "to influence someone or control something in a clever or dishonest way; to skilfully handle, control, or use something; to change, correct, or move information" [*Macmillan English Dictionary...*, 2002: 68].

The first practical analysis includes *Robinson Crusoe* by Daniel Defoe translated by Jan Chrzyciel Albertrandi in 1769 entitled *Przypadki*

Robinsona Kruzoa, which was issued in *Journal Polonais* [Sinko, 1968: 105]. The translation is interesting to examine as it provides numerous examples of the translator's diverse and creative work. The first impression one may have by studying both the original and the translation is that the translator approached the original in a liberal way. Albertrandi's interpretative skill dominates in the translation. The translation seems to constitute an embellished second original with only a few plots corresponding to the original. To illustrate Albertrandi's style of translating, the following fragment has been quoted below:

[...] Come, let us make a bowl of punch, and we'll forget all that [...] [Defoe, 1904: 5].

[...] Idź ze mną poydziem się ucieszyć, a Bachus wybije nam z pamięci gniewy Neptuna [Defoe, 1769: 8].

This example demonstrates Albertrandi's creativity and imagination deployed in his translation. It should be noticed that he avoided simple solutions and literal meaning in translation. His rendition shows the translator's individual character and original interpretative skill. Albertrandi translated the original as if he was the author of the book himself; like a spirited writer he followed the plots in his own way, sometimes even adding fragments which were absent in the original. The following fragment may serve as a confirmation of these words:

[...] I though the bitterness of death had been past, and that this would be nothing too, like the first. But when the master himself came by me, as I said just now, and said we should be all lost, I was dreadfully frightened; I got up out of my cabin, and looked out but such a dismal sight I never saw: the sea went mountains high [Defoe, 1904: 6].

[...] Spodziewać się zaiste nie mogłem, iż mię druga tak prętko po pierwszej, a oraz daleko za nią straszliwsza potka nawalność. Okropne śmierci zbliżający się wyobrażenie, znowu na strapionym umyśle moim stanęło. Przypomniałem sobie, a to z niezmiernym żalem, dawniejsze moje przedsięwzięcia wrócenie się do Oyca, rzucenia się do nóg jego, prośzenia o przywrócenie dawney łaski, y przebywania z krewnymi, którzy y kochali mię, y swoje na mnie nadzieie zasadzali, y sami mię uszczęśliwić mogli. Żaden nigdy widok straszliwszy w oczach moich nie stanął. Wały morskie na wzór

gó podnosiły się, a bez przerwania po sobie następując, na okręt nasz były, każdego momentu zatopieniem mu grożąc [Defoe, 1769: 11].

Indeed, it is difficult to find corresponding and convergent fragments when comparing the original and the translation. The part beginning with words: *Przypomniałem sobie...* used in the Polish version does not occur in the original at all. Perhaps, Albertrandi by imagining dreadful experiences of the poor sailor, Robinson, felt that in such a moment of distress the main character could turn to the memories of his father, and did not hesitate to include such an association in his translation. By adding plots which were considered relevant to him, Albertrandi tailored the original to his translator's needs enriching and giving individual flavour to his work.

On the one hand, Albertrandi eagerly improved the original by his own creative ideas as a writer, and on the other hand, he did not hesitate to omit plots he regarded as irrelevant in his translation. The following quotation illustrates the above-mentioned tendency in the translator's work:

[...] This was game indeed to us, but this was no food; and I was very sorry to lose three charges of powder and shot upon a creature that was good for nothing to us. However, Xury said he would have some of him; so he comes on board, and asked me to give him the hatchet. "For what, Xury?" said I. "Me cut off his head," said he. However, Xury could not cut off his head, but he cut off a foot, and brought it with him, and it was a monstrous great one. I bethought myself, however, that perhaps the skin of him might one way or other be of some value to us; and I resolved to take off his skin if I could [Defoe, 1904: 16].

[...] To dzieło uciechę nam wielka sprawiło, ale nie, coby do pokarmu służyć mogło, nie przyniosło. Żalowałem trzech naboików daremnie straconych. Ale Xury upewnił mię, iż niejaki z tąd pożytek odnieść mogliśmy, iakoż Lwa zabitego z skóry nader piękney odzierać począł. Pomagałem mu podług możności, a wyznać muszę, iżbym nigdy nie potrafił rzeczy tej wykonać [Defoe, 1769: 31].

This time Albertrandi decided not to include the plots referring to descriptions of cutting off the lion's head and foot. He simply ignored them and smoothly moved towards describing the taking off the skin of the mentioned animal. Apparently, he perceived his role as a translator

as the one who filters information of the original and shapes it in accordance with his own preference.

This manipulative tendency is noticeable in numerous aspects of his translation. By analysing the original and the translation, one may easily observe that the original is divided into twenty seven chapters, whereas the translation is described in two volumes (without the division into chapters). Originally, Daniel Defoe included many dialogues in his book. In the translation dialogues are replaced by narration. Originally, the main character, Robinson Crusoe keeps a regular journal. The main character in the translation does not keep any journal. There are more discrepancies between the original and the translation, one of which is the fact that in the original, individual plots are introduced in an organized, chronological order and follow a logical sequence, whereas the plots introduced in the translation are random and do not follow any specific sequence. But the most substantial difference occurs in the translation, in volume two from page 28 onwards, in which the translator unleashed his writer's originality, abandoning his translator's limitations for the sake of manifesting the writer's artistic talent. This is when Albertrandi created his own story line which is totally absent from the original. The translator's creativity is truly impressive. The plots which are non-existent in the original include, among other adventures, the settlement of tribes on the desert island and the introduction of Christianity there, Crusoe's trip to China and criticism of the Great Wall of China, Crusoe's journey to Russia and a visit in Moscow, spending winter in Siberia, trading camel fur in Russia, and many more.

The analysis of the above-mentioned plots imposes a question whether the translator's creativity goes beyond the boundaries of the original or not. Is it a manipulation of the translator's part or just adjustment of the source text to the requirements of the target language culture? Or perhaps both?

***The Merry Wives of Windsor* by William Shakespeare translated by Franciszek Zablocki (1782)**

An examination of this translation of Shakespeare's work is perhaps of particular interest because Zablocki's style of translating is far from boring and often amazes the reader. The rendition of the title itself is peculiar as Zablocki translated it into *Samochwał albo Amant Wilkołak*, which

demonstrates how liberal his approach to translation was. It is unlikely that this creative title was chosen without reason. Presumably, Zabłocki's intention was to replace a culturally alien proper name *Windsor* with more familiar and culture-friendly phrase *samochnwał*. Zabłocki's translation retained only few elements and plots of the original and developed his own story based on some similarities to the source text. Sometimes by analysing the original and translation one gets the impression that the translation constitutes a separate story with no resemblance to the original. The following fragment could serve as an example of this kind:

Have I liv'd to be carried in a basket, like a barrow of butcher's offal, and to be thrown in the Thames? Well, if I be serv'd such another trick, I'll have my brains ta'en out and butter'd, and give them to a dog for a new-year's gift. The rogues slighted me into the river with as little remorse as they would have drown'd a blind bitch's puppies, fifteen I' th' litter; and you may know by my size that I have a kind of alacrity in sinking; if the bottom were as deep as hell I should down. I had been drown'd but that the shore was shelvy and shallow – a death that I abhor; for the water swells a man; and what a thing should I have been when had been swell'd! I should have been a mountain of mummy [Shakespeare, 1999: 19].

Osobliwsza awantura! Trzeba być żelaznym, żeby to wszystko wytrzymać. Otóż to męstwo i przytomność ze wszystkich szczęśliwie dźwigają mnie razów. Zawierucho! Musiało być wody na kilka sążni. [...] Wszystkie moje przypadki, wypadają na przypadki znakomych ludzi. Przypominam sobie, że i Alexander wielki, chcąc zmierzyć głębokość morza, kazał się na łańcuchu żelaznym spuścić z szklanej bani ... Słyszałem, słyszałem ... Co to rak morski przeciął łańcuch ... A delfin go wyniósł. Jednak utrzymamy to w sekrecie. Lud prosty nie umie cenić rzeczy i sądzić o nich przyzwyczajenie. Jemu zda się to być rzecz śmiechu godna, co w rzeczy samej nie jest ... Ale ale. Uczyniłem obserwacją zgoła przeciwną powszechnemu zdaniu. Wszak to ja nic nie widziałem w wodzie. [...] Bo nagle WPana wrzucono. Pomąciłeś ją. [...] Ale też te bydlęta ... wrzucić mnie w wodę, gdyby jaką pakę [Shakespeare, 1782: 63-64].

In this fragment Zabłocki avoided using the original proper name *the Thames* as it would probably be too distant in terms of culture for his readers. Instead, he just placed the whole plot in a familiar-sounding setting,

as if in the neighbourhood, without actually specifying where exactly the scene took place. The main character was pushed into the river, which coincided with the event presented in the original, but this was the only similarity of the source text the translator used. Analysing both quotations, one may observe that the translation seems lighter and more humorous compared with more serious and pompous original. Perhaps Zabłocki, realising that Shakespeare's way of writing could be difficult to follow by target text readers decided to make it lighter in his translation.

It seems that the whole play is adapted to the Polish culture and all traces of foreignness are carefully concealed. The following fragment may serve as an example of the above-mentioned statement:

The Windsor bell hath struck twelve; the minute draws on. Now the hot-blooded gods assist me! Remember, Jove, thou wast a bull for thy Europa; love set on thy horns. O powerful love! That in some respects makes a beast a man; in some other a man a beast. You were also, Jupiter, a swan, for the love of Leda. O omnipotent love! How near the god drew to the complexion of a goose! A fault done first in the form of a beast-O Jove, a beastly fault! When gods have hot backs what shall poor men do? For me, I am here a Windsor stag; and the fattest, I think, I' th' forest. Send me a cool rut-time, Jove, or who can blame me to piss my tallow? Who comes here? My doe? [Shakespeare, 1999: 26].

Już tu musi bydź nasz Niemiec. Zawierucho! Day baczność na okolice. Ubiór iego kozuch włosem wywrócony do góry, czapka takóž kosmata z rogam ieleniami, maska w ręku brzydka, ale nie nadto straszna [...]. Najlepszy i najpewniejszy sposób nie obawiania się nikogo, zacząć od tego, aby dla drugich stać się straszny. [...] Jak teraz ubrany iestem, mógłbym straszyc samych diabłów – Mojego Niemca coś nie slychać [...]. Ktoś idzie? [Shakespeare, 1782: 101].

The word *the Windsor bell* does not occur in the translation; instead, this culturally-bound phrase was replaced by a character closer to the domestic reality, namely by the word *Niemiec*. The content of the whole plot has changed although there remained minor reference to the beast mentioned in the original. By way of comparing both the translation and original, one may notice that Zabłocki's rendition is an adaptation as it seems so distant from the original that it could well serve as a second

original, indeed. Analogous to Albertrandi, Zabłocki freed his creative translator's skill in a manipulative way. Most of Zabłocki's plots were not the ones created by Shakespeare, for example the main character of the play *Chwaliburca* (originally *Falstaff*) boasted that he killed a werewolf and his own page did not believe that and regarded his lord as a coward. Zabłocki was consistent with the idea of the werewolf in the translation, by way of example, in the original Shakespeare introduced fairies (local children dressed as fairies). Perhaps as a contrast to the original Zabłocki was more attracted to the idea of the werewolf and devils than fairies. The only factor both the source text and the target text have in common is a love affair but the manner in which it is presented in translation bears no resemblance to the original. Shakespeare wrote about two identical love letters which mistakenly reached the wrong addressee, Zabłocki involved Chwaliburca's page in making love advances towards a lady whose husband was very jealous of her (the aggressive German captain).

Conclusions

As has been presented above, both Albertrandi and Zabłocki used their translator's skills to tailor the translation to their own and readers' needs. Those manipulative translation manoeuvres could be justified culturally as both *Robinson Crusoe* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor* were rooted in a foreign culture. Perhaps the urge to make the foreign elements familiar culturally made them decide to adjust the original plots in a way to avoid exotic and alien proper names, characters, customs and traditions. One may say that they deliberately manipulated the original to meet the expectations of the Polish reader.

In conclusion, it can be stated that both translators provided indeed adaptations of the originals verging on the manipulative grounds. From the 18th century perspective, they acted in line with the contemporary theory of translation and, by way of creation, aimed at enriching the originals and contributing to the fame of the masterpieces they translated. From the 21st century perspective, their adaptations and interpretations serve as separate pieces of writing rather than translations as they have little in common with their originals.

As the term manipulation can be also associated negatively, the question remains whether they had not gone too far in the attempt to adjust

the original to the Polish reality. Where is the limit and safe threshold between tolerable adaptation and manipulation which betrays the original? Is there any barrier in this regard?

REFERENCES:

- Balcerzan, E. (1977), *Pisarze polscy o sztuce przekładu 1440-1974. Antologia*, Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, Poznań.
- Chalvin, A., Lange, A., Monticelli, D. (2011), *Between Cultures and Texts*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main.
- Defoe, D. (1769), *Przypadki Robinsona Kruzoa*, przeł. J.Ch. Albertrandi, nakładem Michała Greła, Warszawa.
- Defoe, D. (1904), *Robinson Crusoe*, Hodder and Stoughton, London, [on-line] <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/defoe/crusoe.html> – 20.08.2013.
- Kałużna, A. (2011), *English Literary Translations into Polish until 1800*, Oficyna Wydawnicza Uniwersytetu Zielonogórskiego, Zielona Góra.
- Macmillan English Dictionary for advanced learners* (2002), Bloomsbury Publishing, London.
- Majda, J. (red.) (1985), *Okresy literackie*, Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne, Warszawa.
- Nida, E., Taber, R. (1969), *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, United Bible Societies, Leiden.
- Palumbo, G. (2009), *Key Terms in Translation Studies*, Continuum, London.
- Shakespeare, W. (1782), *Samochwał albo Amant Wilkołak*, przeł. F. Zabłocki, Drukarnia DUFOUR Drukarza J. K. MCI y Rzepltey, Warszawa.
- Shakespeare, W. (1999), [Etext#1781], *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, Project Gutenberg.
- Sinko, Z. (1968), *Powieść zachodnioeuropejska w kulturze literackiej polskiego Oświecenia*, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo PAN, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków.
- The New Lexicon Webster's Encyclopedic Dictionary of the English Language* (1988), Lexicon Publications, Inc., New York.
- Tylor, E.B., "Culture", [on-line] www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/146289/culture – 20.08.2014.
- Ziętarska, J. (1969), *Sztuka przekładu w poglądach literackich polskiego oświecenia*, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo PAN, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków.

STRESZCZENIE

Interpretacja języka źródłowego jako dostosowanie przekładu do wymogów kultury języka docelowego w oparciu o przykłady wybranych osiemnastowiecznych tłumaczeń

Celem artykułu jest przedstawienie przykładów interpretacji języka źródłowego jako dostosowanie przekładu do wymogów kultury języka docelowego w oparciu o dwa osiemnastowieczne tłumaczenia. Wspomniane tłumaczenia obejmują: *Robinsona Crusoe* Daniela Defoe/*Przypadki Robinsona Kruzoe* – tłum. Jan Chrzciciel Albertrandi (1769) oraz *The Merry Wives of Windsor* Williama Szekspira/*Samochwał albo Amant Wilkołak* – tłum. Franciszek Zabłocki (1782). W części teoretycznej omówione są poglądy na przekład i kulturę pisarzy polskiego oświecenia. W części praktycznej z kolei analizowane są wybrane przykłady interpretacji/manipulacji języka źródłowego jako dostosowanie przekładu do wymogów kultury języka docelowego. Artykuł kończą stosowne wnioski.

Słowa kluczowe: interpretacja/manipulacja, dostosowanie przekładu języka źródłowego, kultura języka docelowego, przekłady epoki oświecenia

SUMMARY

Based on an analysis of two 18th-century Polish translations, the article aims to consider the adaptation of the source language text as a means of adjusting a translation to the target language culture. The renditions in question are: *Robinson Crusoe* by Daniel Defoe translated by Jan Chrzciciel Albertrandi – *Przypadki Robinsona Kruzoe* 1769 and *The Merry Wives of Windsor* by William Shakespeare translated by Franciszek Zabłocki – *Samochwał albo Amant Wilkołak* 1782. After an outline of the views expressed by 18th-century Polish writers on translation and culture, selected examples of adaptation/interpretation of the source language texts are examined with a view to assessing the extent to which they may be considered to be translation adjustments to the target language culture. Finally, conclusions are drawn.

Key words: interpretation/manipulation, translation adjustment of the source language, the target language culture, 18th century translations