

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TRANSLATIONS OF JANKO MUZYKANT

BY HENRYK SIENKIEWICZ

with special reference to
V. Korolenko's Russian translation,
J. Curtin's English translation,
and N. Tasín's Spanish translation.

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and
Research in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

by

Kevin M. Windle

Department of Russian and Slavic Studies

McGill University

1974

© Kevin M. Windle 1974

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TRANSLATIONS OF JANKO MUZYKANT

BY HENRYK SIENKIEWICZ

with special reference to V. Korolenko's Russian translation, J. Curtin's English translation, and N. Tasin's Spanish translation.

Kevin M. Widdle - Department of Russian and Slavic Studies

Doctor of Philosophy

Abstract

Henryk Sienkiewicz's brief period of popularity among foreign readers was followed by a swift loss of interest in the Polish novelist. The fact that Sienkiewicz is still admired by his own countrymen suggests that the author may have suffered at the hands of his translators. This dissertation examines one of Sienkiewicz's best-known stories in translations from three countries where Sienkiewicz was widely read, with the aim of determining their relative quality, and to what extent the translators are responsible for the writer's decline. After the establishment of criteria in Chapter I, the three translations are presented side by side with the original and studied in detail in Chapter II, with additional reference to other versions of the same story. The more significant facts which emerge from this chapter are classified and assessed in the succeeding chapters, and the relative closeness of the translations to the original is established.

ÉTUDE COMPARATIVE DE TRADUCTIONS DE JANKO MUZYKANT PAR
HENRYK SIENKIEWICZ

par rapport à la traduction en russe par V. Korolenko, la
traduction en anglais par J. Curtin, et la traduction en
espagnol par N. Tasín.

Kevin M. Windle - Département d'Études Russes et Slaves
Ph.D.

Résumé

Après avoir connu un grand succès auprès de ses
lecteurs étrangers, Henryk Sienkiewicz est très vite tombé dans
l'oubli. Le fait qu'il jouit toujours d'une grande popularité
chez ses compatriotes suggère que les traductions de ses oeuvres
en soient la cause. Dans cette thèse un des contes les plus
connus de Henryk Sienkiewicz est comparé avec des traductions
faites en trois pays où ses oeuvres se lisaient avec beaucoup
d'intérêt, dans le but d'établir la qualité de ces traductions.
Après l'établissement des critères au chapitre I, les traductions
espagnole, russe, et anglaise sont présentées avec l'original
au chapitre II. Les résultats de cette étude de textes sont
classifiés et évalués dans les chapitres suivants. D'après ces
résultats, la qualité des trois traductions est précisée, et
la précision relative des trois traductions est établie.

PREFACE

Russian names, quotations, and book titles are transliterated according to the Library of Congress system. Thus Henryk Sienkiewicz's name appears as "Genryk Senkevich" when it occurs in Russian material. Exception is made only when a published work bears the name of its author transliterated according to a different system. Thus "I. Galperin" and "L. N. Tolstoy" will be found in the bibliography.

Several articles have been written about Sienkiewicz and his translators, particularly about his American translator Jeremiah Curtin. Material about his Russian and Spanish translators is considerably rarer, and there appear to have been no detailed examinations of translations of any of the short stories, neither in English, nor in Spanish, nor Russian.

The present work is intended to go some way toward bridging the gap in the study of this important Polish writer. The tentative application of a quantified method of measuring the literal accuracy of the translations is new, and the results obtained are useful as a relative assessment of one aspect of the translations, though not as an absolute statement of the quality of any single translation. The stylistic analysis of Janko Muzykant in Chapter IV is believed to be the most detailed yet made, and the examination of the translations according to

its findings is also new.

In a dissertation of this nature one is faced with certain problems involving the disposition of the material. In the interests of efficiency it is essential to include the texts under discussion - the original and the translations - in full. If this is not done, it becomes necessary to introduce many long quotations from the texts. The presentation of the complete texts does not obviate the need for some quotations, but these can, at least, be kept to a manageable length. The reader can turn to the reproduced texts to study contexts, and for easy reference to other details.

After some consideration and experiment it was discovered that the reader would be inconvenienced less if the story and its translations were presented, not separately in an appendix, but incorporated in the chapter entitled "Examination of Texts." One page of the original is presented at a time, with the corresponding pages of the translations in close proximity. The separate numbering system used for these pages should make them easier to locate, and the different type of the different languages should serve as a visual aid. There are fifty-seven such pages in all, interspersed through Chapter II. The pages of translation correspond exactly to the segment of text being studied. They follow the segment, bearing the same page number, as well as an identifying letter for the language: P - Polish, R - Russian, S - Spanish, E - English. Thus a typical sequence is: P8, R8, S8, E8. The same order is followed throughout the

chapter.

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Professor J. G. Nicholson for his expert advice and guidance.

Thanks are due to the McLennan library, and particularly to the staff of the Inter-Library Loan Department for their indefatigable efforts to locate obscure material. The Polish Library has also been a source of much otherwise unobtainable material, and the friendly assistance given by the librarians, Mrs. Maria Nowosielska and Mrs. Jolanta Pomian, deserves special mention.

For providing Italian, Czech, and Portuguese translations of Janko Muzykant, I am most grateful to Miss Maria di Salvo, of Florence; Mr. Jan Vladislav, of Prague; and Miss Helena Stepanoff, of São Paulo, respectively.

A special note of appreciation is due to Mr. Gennady Adrianow, without whose initial instruction in the Polish language this work would not have been possible.

I would like to express my gratitude to Mr. Howard Hasell for his help with the proof-reading, and to Miss Ludmilla Shestoff for her encouragement throughout my work on this thesis, and for her invaluable and tireless work as a typist.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ENGLISH ABSTRACT..... 1
FRENCH ABSTRACT..... 11
PREFACE..... 111
TABLE OF CONTENTS..... vi

CHAPTER
I: THEORETICAL PREMISES, CRITERIA, AIMS..... 1
II: EXAMINATION OF TEXTS..... 31
III: CONTENT EQUIVALENCE..... 311
IV: STYLISTIC EQUIVALENCE..... 359
V: CONCLUSION..... 403

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 427

CHAPTER I
THEORETICAL PREMISES, CRITERIA, AIMS

Any comparison of an original text with its translation serves one of two main purposes.¹ Firstly, it can advance theoretical study of the translation process, and secondly, it can serve the more restricted end of providing a critical study of the work of a given translator. Ia. Retsker adds a third purpose, educational,² which need not concern us here.

A close comparison of any text with its translation will yield information of both a linguistic and an extra-linguistic nature. In the first place, discoveries may be made about the basic differences between two linguistic systems, and about the difficulties of rendering certain structures of the source language (henceforward abbreviated as SL) in the target language (henceforward abbreviated as TL). On the extra-linguistic side, it may be discovered that a given translator is incapable of rendering certain elements of the original in the TL, purely because of his own limitations, because of insufficient knowledge of the subject matter, or indeed of the SL. The extra-linguistic encompasses the literary, as well as the ability and tastes of the translator. The linguistic is that which is relevant to the comparative systems of two or more languages.

The linguistic information gleaned from such a study can

only be totally reliable if ideal translations are at hand. This is clearly an impossible pre-condition. At best the translator will commit isolated lapses, by failing to find the right TL expression, by overlooking words or phrases, or at worst by misunderstanding passages of the original and having imperfect command of the TL idiom. The translator himself, his strengths and weaknesses, are a factor of major importance. Jiří Levý affirms that linguistic studies of translation often leave aside the influence of the translator, who is not merely the "point of contact" between two languages.³ The translations studied below vary widely in accuracy and in style. None of them can be considered ideal.

In discussing methods of comparing translations, V. N. Komissarov concedes that the translator leaves his personal mark on the text, and the fact that mistakes are made, but he maintains that, since errors will usually be readily recognizable as such, they need prove no obstacle to purely linguistic investigation.⁴ Further, he says that the choices open to the translator are so limited by the meaning of the original on the one hand, and the norms of the TL on the other, that a scientific study of the available alternatives and the reasons for any given choice is fully possible.

However, an examination of sixteen translations of Janko Muzykant has not shown this to be the case.⁵ The translator who allows himself any degree of freedom immediately lays open a far wider range of choices than might be suspected, including minor,

unnecessary changes of meaning, and overall stylistic change. Hence the opportunities for an objective study of the translation process as a linguistic phenomenon are severely restricted. This does not in any sense invalidate Komissarov's statements: it simply indicates that in practice the translator often permits himself wider limits of choice than the theorist might consider possible or desirable.

At this point it is necessary to bear in mind the basic classification of texts put forward by Katharina Reiss, who divides texts broadly into inhaltsbetont, formbetont, effektbetont.⁶ The first of these designates factual, informational documents, such as news reports, scientific papers, and others in which the factual content is of prime importance. The second embraces literary works in prose and verse, in which the specific, factual detail is of lesser importance and subordinate to the literary form. The third indicates writings or utterances designed to produce a definite reaction in the readers or listeners, such as anniversary speeches or propaganda works, where effect is the most important consideration.

Komissarov's remarks might with justice be applied to the first of these three categories, where factual detail takes precedence, but it is more difficult to apply them in the other two areas of translation. The story by Henryk Sienkiewicz which forms the basis for this study belongs firmly in the second category, and most of the translators make choices which Komissarov might consider impermissible, as well as changes of detail

which would be unthinkable to the translator of inhaltsbetont material.

Nonetheless, an attempt will be made to evolve and apply a rudimentary arithmetical method of assessing the relative accuracy of the three translations under study. This can be achieved with a reasonable degree of objectivity by counting in-essential deviations from the original, i. e., errors, omissions, and additions, and assigning a numerical value to each deviation. This is necessary, as no two errors are likely to have the same effect on the translated work, and even the same error in two different contexts may give different results. Difficulties will be encountered in establishing the numerical value of each deviation, and here it may be necessary to accept some limited degree of subjectivity.

Since we are dealing with a literary work it must be emphasized that this kind of computation can give only a rule-of-thumb guide to the factual accuracy of the translation. This latter aspect must be kept separate from any assessment of the literary qualities of the translation. A translation may express everything contained in the original with an accuracy of one hundred per cent, yet be no stylistic match for the original. Conversely, the translation may match the style of the original very successfully, yet lose a large percentage of specific detail. The numerical assessment can reflect a judgement of only one aspect of the translator's work.

It might be argued that if arithmetic can be used to

express the inaccuracy of a translation caused by inessential deviations, then a similar system could be applied to provide an estimate of the inevitable deviations due solely to the differences between the SL and the TL, and thus achieve a mathematical statement of these differences. Given near-perfect translations in all TUs, such a method might be thought possible, were it not for the fact that in this area, despite appearances, objectivity is much harder to attain than in that of unnecessary deviations.

In a different context K. Reiss quotes Ortega y Gasset's comments on the German and Spanish words for "wood." "El bosque" does not mean the same thing to a Spaniard as "der Wald" does to a German. Furthermore, "der Wald" does not mean the same to a German from the Black Forest as to a German from Essen. "El bosque" may have different associations for a fifteen-year-old Spaniard from those it has for a sixty-year-old Spaniard. This is typical of the kind of problem which would be encountered in such a study. Differences exist between apparent synonyms between languages, both in their areas of meaning and in their connotations. To assign numerical values objectively to such deviations is a manifest impossibility.

This is the main reason why the bias of this study is not linguistic but extra-linguistic, with more emphasis on the literary aspects. Another reason is that set forth by P. Newmark.⁸ The scientific study of translation, which he says will always be the comparison of two texts, is not yet possible, and it is

hampered partly by the lack of an adequate, standardized terminology. The study of translation is still in its incipient stages, despite numerous admirable recent works, notably by Soviet scholars, and, as Komissarov confirms, a universally accepted system of terms has yet to be developed.⁹ This lack of an adequate terminology has been felt acutely by the present writer, who has had to resort to the familiar vocabulary of the grammarian and the student of literature, with the occasional use of apt terms created by experts in the field of translation such as J. P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet.¹⁰

This study, then, does not claim to be totally scientific, principally because, in the area of literary study, and this includes to a large extent the study of literary translation, one can rarely make the objective judgements which are the pre-requisites of any science. It is not necessary here to discuss the vexed question of whether translation is a craft or an art. In all the heated polemics which have arisen over this point, few, if any, of the most ardent advocates of linguistic theories of translation have denied that creative talent is necessary to the translator.¹¹ The question is not whether artistic gifts are a factor, but at what point they come into play.¹² In general, the greater the difference in structure and idiom between SL and TL, the more the translator must exercise his ingenuity and creative ability, and the more he impresses his own individuality upon the text. The fact that an artistic element is present, in whatever degree, renders a strictly

scientific analysis that much more difficult.

Conclusions reached regarding the relative value of the three translations under study will be supported by all available evidence, but in the final analysis the conclusions must rest solely on the answer to the question of what, in the writer's eyes, constitutes "a good translation." Critics will disagree on criteria, and criteria will change with time. Few contemporary students of translation would agree with Lord Woodhouselee, who in his treatise of 1790 holds that the translator has a duty to expunge "vulgarity" and "bad taste" from the original, as Pope did with Homer.¹³ In the case of less successful translators than Pope, many would regard this approach as bowdlerization. Yet even if the criteria are generally accepted, critics will disagree on what meets these criteria and what does not.

A. V. Fedorov gives a useful working definition of an adequate translation: "Polnotsennost' perevoda oznachaet ischerpyvalushchuiu peredachu smyslovogo soderzhaniiia podlinnika i polnotsennoe funktsional'no-stilisticheskoe sootvetstvie emu."¹⁴ The second part of this definition, however, requires further clarification, since the term which is being defined is used in the definition, and we are compelled to ask precisely what is meant by "polnotsennoe" in this context.

Here E. A. Nida's definition is valuable. Nida states that one definition of what he calls a dynamic-equivalence translation is "the closest natural equivalent to the source language message."¹⁵ (Dynamic equivalence is set against formal

equivalence, or word-for-word translation in which each SL part of speech is rendered by its TL counterpart. Hence dynamic-equivalence translation is the only kind possible for normal purposes). The essential term here is "natural," and Nida cites other authorities who use this word and consider naturalness vital to good translation.

O. Kade notes that it remains unclear how "the closest natural equivalent" is to be understood,¹⁶ though Nida is at pains to clarify this term, which he says applies in three areas: "A natural rendering must fit (1) the receptor language and culture as a whole, (2) the context of the particular message, (3) the receptor-language audience."¹⁷ The last of these three areas is crucial, and in it the term "natural" defies all objective definition. No two English speakers are likely to agree all the time on the comparative naturalness of two English texts. As will be shown, this writer considers the English of the translator Jeremiah Curtin to be less than natural, but his work has been highly praised by other critics. Presumably they either found Curtin's English natural, or their criteria for judging a translation did not include naturalness.

For all this, a definition sufficient for our purposes can be arrived at by combining Fedorov's definition with Nida's in the following way: a good translation is one which conveys as fully as possible the content of the original, and achieves the closest possible natural correspondence to its style. It must be accepted that the term "natural" and others like it

cannot be defined objectively. The critic must inevitably impose his own views, and, not infrequently, his own intuitive feelings about language. Words like "natural" and "faithful" will be used here according to this writer's judgement, in the knowledge that the reader's judgement may be at variance with his own. Fully objective statements will be possible only part of the time.

The primary purpose of this study is to examine how one of Sienkiewicz's best known short stories was first presented to readers in Spain, in Britain and America, and in Russia (i. e. in one language each from the Romance group, the Germanic group, and the Slavonic group), by a detailed analysis of one translation in each of the three languages. The aim is to discover to what extent each translator succeeded in reproducing the form and the content of Sienkiewicz's story in the TL, and how each fell short, and to determine which is the best of the three, applying objective criteria in so far as this is possible. The method used is a line-by-line comparison of the three translations and the original. Extensive reference is made to other translations in the respective languages, and to others in related languages, as these often show alternative choices to those made in the translations to be evaluated.

This study will attempt to correct the imbalance pointed out by J. Levy when he asserts that the subjective rôle of the translator has been largely overlooked in theoretical works on the subject. Widely differing attitudes to the process of

translation on the part of the three translators will be discovered; however, it is not possible to generalize on the basis of these discoveries and assert that, for instance, Jeremiah Curtin's approach is typical of a certain American school of thought at a given time. All three translators worked very much as individuals, and they must be judged as such.

The definition of a good translation adopted above imposes two distinct sets of criteria according to which a translation must be assessed. (1) How much of the content of the original is preserved, taking into consideration the limitations of the TL? How much is lost? What, if anything, is added? (2) To what extent is natural stylistic correspondence with the original achieved? If to a small extent, why is this so? If to a large extent, how is this achieved? Here again the limitations imposed by the TL must be borne in mind.

A third criterion now arises, which has less to do with translation skills than with the ability to write: (3) how successful is the translation as a piece of prose in its own right, independent of the original? It is not inconceivable that a talented writer may produce an excellent version of the story, though writing in a completely different style, and even with great changes in the material content of the original. These three criteria will be applied in turn in the concluding chapters of this work.

The above definition permits us to come to terms with the six pairs of conflicting views on translation set down by

Theodore Savory and often quoted in works on translation: ¹⁸

1. A translation must give the words of the original.
2. A translation must give the ideas of the original.
3. A translation should read like an original work.
4. A translation should read like a translation.
5. A translation should reflect the style of the original.
6. A translation should possess the style of the translator.
7. A translation should read as a contemporary of the original.
8. A translation should read as a contemporary of the translator.
9. A translation may add to or omit from the original.
10. A translation may never add to or omit from the original.
11. A translation of verse should be in prose.
12. A translation of verse should be in verse.

The last pair does not concern us here. The fourth pair is not relevant since the three translators whose work is under study were contemporaries of the author. In the remaining four pairs the choice is swiftly decided according to the terms of the definition. If the translation reads naturally, it should read like an original work (No. 3). If it is to achieve the closest possible natural correspondence to the original, it must reflect its style (No. 5). By the same token, the translator may not add to the original, nor omit any part of it (No. 10).

In the case of the first pair, however, a compromise solution is necessary, since each procedure, carried to its logical conclusion, gives unsatisfactory results, - the first leading to incomprehensibility, and the second to paraphrase.¹⁹

Although some scholars aver that paraphrase is to be avoided at all costs and that the translation of the words of the original is the surer method,²⁰ this writer considers that of the two evils the lesser is paraphrase. Clear, intelligible

circumlocutions are to be preferred to incomprehensible word-for-word translation. In practice, however, most translators strike a balance between the two extremes.

In the course of this study many observations will be made concerning specific details and differences between the languages involved. These are essential, as the difficulties facing the translator depend partly on the degree to which the structure and lexis of the SL differ from that of the TL. As a rule, it is to be expected that a Russian translator will have less difficulty with a Polish text than will a Spanish or English translator. The conclusions which emerge from these observations will be useful in comparative studies of the languages concerned, of the kind written by Vinay and Darbelnet and Alfred Malblanc.²¹ However, it is not within the scope of the present work to undertake a systematic study of this kind, involving four languages. Moreover, the textual basis, one short story, would be insufficient for such a study, although quite adequate for the different research aims of this project.

Henryk Sienkiewicz. His life and works.

Sienkiewicz (1846-1916) published his first novel Na marne in 1872. He rapidly achieved fame through this and the volumes of short stories which followed. In the seventies he travelled widely in Europe and the United States, and his journeys provided him with material for new works. During this early period his name is often linked with those of Alexander

Świętochowski, Eliza Orzeszkowa, and Bolesław Prus, all of whom were active in the Positivist movement in Poland. Like them, Sienkiewicz directed his literary efforts toward a condemnation of the feudal social order which existed in his country, endeavouring to expose it, and speaking out in favour of economic and social progress toward the scientific era which had long since overtaken western countries. Janko Muzykant, written in 1879, belongs in this period.

Later Sienkiewicz abandoned his Positivist standpoint and became more and more conservative. This earned him the contempt of his former associates, who regarded him as a renegade.²² By the time his historical trilogy was complete (1888) his Positivist days were well behind him. The trilogy, Ogniem i mieczem, Potop, Pan Wołodyjowski, was enthusiastically received and established him firmly as a major figure in Polish letters.

It was the trilogy, together with Quo Vadis?, his novel of ancient Rome, and Krzyżacy which won him fame abroad. These works, particularly Quo Vadis?, enjoyed popularity unprecedented for a Polish author, in Russia, in Western Europe, and in the United States. Sienkiewicz's exceptional gift for narrative and his feeling for language, together with a meticulous attention to detail, probably account in large measure for the success of the historical novels, which are imbued with strong patriotic feeling. His novels set in modern Poland, Bez dogmatu (1890) and Rodzina Połanieckich (1894), did not arouse the same interest abroad.

A measure of Sienkiewicz's success outside his native land is the zeal with which his works were translated. By the time he wrote Quo Vadis? foreign publishing houses were competing for the right to publish translations. A recent count shows that his works, or some of them, have been translated into no fewer than forty-eight languages.²³ Many have also been filmed and staged.

It is a curious fact that Sienkiewicz's immense popularity in many countries faded as suddenly as it had begun, and has never recovered since. A commentator in a highly-regarded English monthly recently wrote in an article on the Nobel Prize, "Insignificant figures like Sienkiewicz [sic], Heyse, Jensen, Quasimodo remained lost in their insignificance."²⁴ Such a disdainful dismissal of the man many regard as Poland's greatest novelist might well offend the sensibilities of those Polish scholars who have devoted decades to the study of his life and works. One of the purposes of this study is to examine to what extent Sienkiewicz's translators are to blame for this decline.

Janko Muzykant

This is perhaps the best known of the stories written in Sienkiewicz's Positivist period. Translations are numerous in Russian, English, French, and German. It has appeared in at least thirty languages.²⁵ A number of film, ballet, operatic and theatrical adaptations have been made from it. The story is particularly widely known in the Soviet Union, where it has

appeared in condensed form in readers for children, and in book form, in large editions, also for children.²⁶

The plot of the story is simple in the extreme. It is the tale of a boy, apparently born illegitimate, living with his mother in conditions of crushing poverty in a remote village. The boy is the only important character in the story. The others are sketched in with a minimum of deft strokes.

Janko is sickly from birth, solitary, and of less than average intelligence. His one passion in life is music, and it is this which brings about his premature death. One night he enters the country seat of the local gentry to inspect a violin which belongs to the servant. The servant catches him and the boy is handed over to the officers of the law to be tried and receive a fitting punishment. The punishment, a savage beating, leaves Janko unconscious and he dies shortly afterwards. The point of the story is made clear in no uncertain terms when the gentry return from their holiday in Italy, enthusing over the abundance of artistic talent they discovered there. They know nothing about Janko or his death, and do not suspect that they may have overlooked potential talent on their own doorstep.

A more detailed breakdown of the plot and the structure of the story will be provided at a later stage, but even the bare bones of the story, as outlined here, will indicate that the material lends itself easily to a highly emotional interpretation. However, Sienkiewicz keeps a tight rein on sentiment, and the story is characterized by a large measure of restraint. The

story is told in the third person, with only occasional asides from an otherwise objective narrator.²⁷ The language is simple, incorporating certain features of peasant speech in the narrative to match the subject matter. Lines of dialogue are few, and the success or failure of the story therefore hangs largely on the easy, sometimes almost off-hand narrative.

It is precisely through this restraint that Sienkiewicz achieves his effect. The readers' reaction to it is a clear measure of his success, and a common reaction, one of lacrimose sentimentality, can be seen in the work of some of his more important foreign readers, namely his translators. The illustrations accompanying one of the Russian translations typify this reaction.²⁸ One of the illustrations shows ethereal angelic figures hanging over a cherubic Janko, playing violins and lyres. In another, the same figures stand weeping over his grave. This tendency to sentimentality will become clear in the main part of this work. It constitutes one of the features which is ill suited to a purely scientific analysis.

It is interesting to note that Sienkiewicz himself soon came to view this story with something approaching disgust, as his Janko spawned a whole family of imitative creations by other would-be writers.²⁹ This unexpected turn of events, the proliferation of similar tales in the Polish literary journals of the early eighties, is put forward as one of Sienkiewicz's reasons for abandoning themes of this kind to turn to the genre of the historical novel.³⁰

The popularity of this story is one reason for its choice as the subject of this study. Another reason is that it presents neither more nor less of those features which perennially cause translators to despair. The rural Polish setting ensures some use of dialect and of realia unfamiliar to foreigners, but such features are not overworked. There is hardly any play on words in the text. In short, it is a text of only average difficulty, presenting only those problems which the experienced translator can expect to encounter, without those of highly individual language which he would expect to find in, for example, Gogol's Mertvye dushi or Joyce's Ulysses. Moreover, since it is a fraction of the length of these works, one may expect the translators to pay more attention to detail. This study will show to what extent this expectation is realized.

The Translations.

In general the principle has been to choose the first translation made in a given language, so as to preclude the possibility of one translator referring to previous translations in the same language. In the case of the English translation, this principle has not been observed, but even the most casual comparison of Jeremiah Curtin's version with the only previous one quickly reveals that no such influence or borrowing took place. It is, of course, still possible that some translators could have referred to previous translations in other languages, but this is extremely difficult to verify or confirm unless the entire

translation is made through an intermediate language.

The choice of languages is determined by the major linguistic groupings of Europe, the three main groups being represented by one language. Translations into languages other than Russian, English and Spanish are also used extensively for reference in the body of the text. Additional English and Russian translations are used for the same purpose. Conclusions, however, are confined to the following three texts:

- Sienkiewicz, Henryk. Yanko the Musician, in Sielanka; A Forest Picture, and other stories. Authorized, unabridged translation by Jeremiah Curtin. Boston: Little, Brown, 1898.
- Senkevich, Genryk. Ianko-muzykant, translated by V. G. Korolenko, in Povesti i rasskazy Senkevicha. Ed. by I. A. Satsa and V. S. Ratner. Moscow: 1957.
- Sienkiewicz, Enrique. Janco "el músico," in Narraciones. Translated by N. Tasin. Buenos Aires: Austral, 1947.³¹

The dates accompanying the above editions are not necessarily the dates of first publication of the translations. Curtin's translation of the story first appeared in 1893, and Tasin's in 1921.

Curtin's translation has been selected because he was the authorized English translator of all Sienkiewicz's works. Curtin, an American, was personally acquainted with the author, who overcame his initial misgivings about this "nieznośny człowiek," as he called him in private,³² and granted him the exclusive right to translate all his works.³³ It is largely thanks to Curtin's prodigious efforts that Sienkiewicz achieved the popularity he

enjoyed in North America and Britain. The American translator (1835-1906) was renowned as an anthropologist and a traveller, as well as a linguist, working tirelessly at his translations while busy at other tasks, often in remote places and in unfavourable conditions.³⁴ Before learning Polish and translating Sienkiewicz, he translated some works by Gogol', Dostoevskii, and Aleksei Tolstoi.³⁵

Curtin is generally given credit for introducing previously unknown Russian and Polish writers to the English-speaking public, and his translations of Sienkiewicz have remained the standard ones to this day. Opinion as to the value of his work is divided. This writer considers that Sienkiewicz might have enjoyed more lasting popularity among English readers, and a more favourable reception among the critics, if Curtin had worked in more favourable conditions and received a better literary grounding in his native tongue.

Curtin's translation is the second of seven known English translations of Janko Muzykant. The first, by Charlotte O'Connor Eccles, appeared in 1892, some months before Curtin's.³⁶ This translation will also be referred to in the text. The count of seven translations does not include a detailed summary of the story which appeared in an introductory article on Sienkiewicz in a Scottish journal, before any complete English translations were published.³⁷ The version of the story is much more than a summary, since a large part of the text is translated, and the intervening parts are given in précis form, but in great

detail.

It is not generally realized that the famous Russian writer Vladimir Korolenko (1853-1921) produced a small number of translations from Polish, including some of Mickiewicz's poetry.³⁸ His Russian version of Janko Muzykant was in all probability the first of about seven to be written, but the last to appear. It was made in 1880, within a year of the publication of the original. Korolenko was in prison at the time, and while there he read extensively and wrote the story Chudnaia, as well as translating Sienkiewicz's story.³⁹ His translation lay undiscovered and unknown for over seventy years. It was found by Aleksandr Khrabrifskii,⁴⁰ and published only in 1957, by which time several other Russian versions were available.

Sienkiewicz's major works were very widely disseminated in Spain. Mieczysław Giergielewicz lists a large number of Spanish translations.⁴¹ The list of translations of Quo Vadis? is particularly imposing, and bears witness to the popularity of this work among Spaniards. The work was favourably reviewed at an early date by leading Spanish critics, who noted that among the reading public at large it had outstripped all other foreign works in popularity.⁴²

The critics refrained from passing judgement on Sienkiewicz's use of language, since the only translations to which they had access were, in their words, scandalously bad.⁴³ The translators, who all worked from French, not from Polish, were described not simply as traitors, but as butchers.⁴⁴ However,

not all Spanish readers read the Spanish translations. The well known novelist Emilia Pardo Bazán, the author of Los pazos de Ulloa and other important works of this period, read the French translations of Sienkiewicz.⁴⁵ Pardo Bazán was something of an authority on Russian literature, as her studies of major Russian writers, and later of the revolutionary period show.⁴⁶ In an article on Sienkiewicz written in 1901, she opined that the Polish author's greatest achievements were not his long novels, but his short stories; specifically Janko Muzykant, Jamioł, and Latarnik.⁴⁷ These, she said, displayed a rare sensitivity and delicacy, as well as an ability to condense, which were as yet unsurpassed by any other short-story writer.

Most of Sienkiewicz's works were available in Spain in at least one translation by the time the author died, but it was only in the early twenties that translations directly from the Polish began to replace the early ones from French. These came from the pen of Nicolás Tasín (Nikolai Tasin), apparently a Russian emigrant,⁴⁸ who appears to have possessed a formidable literary and linguistic talent. He is the author of a small number of original works in Russian, and his list of translations from Russian into Spanish is impressive, containing the names of Kuprin, Chekhov, L. Tolstoi, A. Tolstoi, L. Andreev, Korolenko, Gor'kii, Sologub, Saltykov-Shchedrin, among others.⁴⁹

From Polish Tasín translated Sienkiewicz's Na marne, Na polu sławy, and several shorter works by the same author. For many years his translation of Janko Muzykant was the only

Spanish version made from the Polish; even today there appear to be only two, suggesting that Sienkiewicz's short stories have not become as widely known in Spain as his novels, despite Pardo Bazán's high opinion of them.

As can be seen, Curtin, Korolenko and Tasín had more in common than the Polish author they all translated. They shared a deep and abiding interest in Slavonic literature. Two of them wrote original works in Russian, Tasín translated works by Korolenko as well as by Sienkiewicz, and both Tasín and Curtin worked with great energy on the translation of numerous valuable works from Russian and Polish.

Bibliographical difficulties in the study of translated works,

The compiler of a bibliography of translated works encounters problems of a unique kind. Translations may appear in obscure publications, frequently without the translator's name, on occasion without the author's name, and often under unrecognizable titles. Julian Krzyżanowski's pioneering work on translations of Sienkiewicz is prefaced with several cautions to this effect.⁵⁰ He does his best to cover books, journals and newspapers, but omissions are still to be found. Jerzy Maciuszko, in his bibliography, lists books and a selection of journals.⁵¹ The compiler does not claim that his bibliography is complete, since he has not examined every newspaper or magazine which could conceivably contain a translation from the Polish. Index translationum lists only books, and even in this limited sphere

its omissions are numerous.⁵²

Acquiring translations in languages other than English and French is every bit as difficult as establishing their existence. The best North American libraries will contain most original works and most English translations of them, but there is no reason why they should hold Serbian or Portuguese translations of them. The possibility cannot therefore be ruled out that other translations of Janko Muzykant exist, possibly made earlier than O'Connor Eccles's and Tasin's, and that these have passed unnoticed by the bibliographers.

A further difficulty is that of establishing whether or not a translator had recourse to a previous translation in the same language. Plagiarism in translation is notoriously difficult to prove or disprove. The best qualified experts may arrive at opposite conclusions.⁵³ Although it can be said with certainty that no plagiarism took place in the case of Curtin, Korolenko, or Tasin, it appears that the second of three Russian translations used here drew heavily on an earlier one.⁵⁴ The later translation makes no reference to the earlier one, and nothing is said about its being a revised version, but the similarities are frequently striking. Whole sentences are identical in places where the original offers several possibilities, and where Korolenko's version is quite different. Nevertheless, in other places the divergences are greater than one would expect to find in a version which has simply been revised. There remains the possibility that the 1948 version is a composite translation,

put together by combining parts of several earlier translations.

There is little doubt that all the English, German, Russian, Czech, Spanish and French translations used here were made directly from the Polish original. However, in order to say for certain that this is so it would be necessary to study closely every previous translation in all languages. Janko Muzykant had appeared in many languages before Tasin's Spanish translation appeared, and this task is outside the present writer's purposes and abilities. It should be noted, however, that Tasin's version betrays no more evidence of indirect translation than do Korolenko's or Curtin's, and a brief glance at Tasin's list of publications reveals that he had no need to work through an intermediate language. It can be accepted that his translation is from the Polish, as stated in the published edition.

On the other hand, there seems to be much evidence to support the contention that Eduardo de Noronha's Portuguese translation of 1901 was made not from the original, but from O'Conor Eccles's English version.⁵⁵ The practice of indirect translation has long been current in certain parts of the world, although it is now said to be on the wane. The practice was especially prevalent in Portugal and Brazil.⁵⁶ O'Conor Eccles's translation is the freest of the four English versions examined here, and not a few of her changes, omissions, and even additions are repeated in the Portuguese version. To a lesser extent, the same applies to an Italian version by O. L. di Varsavia,⁵⁷ which

follows Tasín's Spanish text closely.

In the case of the Portuguese translation, the similarities with the English version at first appear to be incontrovertible evidence of indirect translation, but de Noronha's translation is so free that in places it corresponds neither to the original nor to the English, and there are occasional instances of an omission in the English where nothing is omitted in the Portuguese. These few instances would seem to refute the charge of indirect translation. Since O'Connor Eccles states that her translation is "from the Polish" one is obliged to discount the possibility that both she and de Noronha worked through an undiscovered intermediate translation. It seems more likely that de Noronha had some slight knowledge of Polish, enough to permit occasional reference to the original, but preferred to work basically from English, in the manner described by J. Levý.⁵⁸ The same may be true of the Italian translator mentioned above.

In cases such as this the difficulties facing the researcher are almost insurmountable. On balance, the evidence suggests that de Noronha's and O. L. di Varsavia's translations are indirect, and they will be treated as such here. Both would prove fertile ground for a separate study of the transformations which a literary work can undergo after two translations.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ Ia. Retsker, "Zadachi sopostavitel'nogo analiza perevoda," in Teoriia i kritika perevoda, ed. by B. A. Larin (Leningrad: 1962), p. 52.
- V. N. Komissarov, Slovo o perevode (Moscow: 1973), p. 26.
- ² Ia. Retsker, p. 52.
- ³ Jiří Levý, Die literarische Uebersetzung, trans. by Walter Schamschula (Frankfurt/M.: Athenaeum Verlag, 1969), p. 25. Since the original (Umění překlada [Prague: 1963]) was amplified and largely rewritten for the German translation, both the original and the translation are cited below.
- The term "point of contact" is a reference to Uriel Weinreich's study of bilingualism, Languages in Contact (The Hague: Mouton, 1967).
- ⁴ V. N. Komissarov, p. 26.
- ⁵ Henryk Sienkiewicz, Nowele wybrane (Warsaw: 1971).
- ⁶ Katharina Reiss, "Ueberlegungen zu einer Theorie der Uebersetzungskritik," Linguistica Antverpiensia, No.2 (1968), 371.
- ⁷ Ibid., 378.
- ⁸ Peter Newmark, "An Approach to Translation," Babel, XIX, No. 1 (1973), 17.
- ⁹ V. N. Komissarov, p. 26.
- ¹⁰ J. P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet, Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais (Paris: Didier, 1963).
- ¹¹ A. V. Fedorov, Vvedenie v teoriu perevoda (Moscow: 1953).
- I. Kashkin, "V bor'be za realisticheskii perevod," in Voprosy khudozhestvennogo perevoda (Moscow: 1955), 120-64.
- Edmond Cary, La traduction dans le monde moderne (Geneva: Georg, 1956).
- Eugene A. Nida, "Nauka perevoda," Voprosy iazykoznanii, No. 4, 1970, 3-14.
- E. G. Etkind, "Khudozhestvennyi perevod," Voprosy iazykoznanii, No. 4, 1970, 15-29.

- 12 J. P. Vinay, J. Darbelnet, p. 23.
- 13 Lord Woodhouselee (Alexander Fraser Tytler), Essay on the Principles of Translation (London: J. M. Dent, no date), p. 55.
- 14 A. V. Fedorov, p. 132.
- 15 Eugene A. Nida, Toward a Science of Translating (Leiden: Brill, 1964), p. 166.
- 16 O. Kade, Zufall und Gesetzmaessigkeit in der Uebersetzung (Leipzig: 1968), p. 25.
- 17 E. A. Nida, Toward a Science of Translating, p. 167.
- 18 Theodore Savory, The Art of Translation (Boston: The Writer, 1968), p. 50.
- 19 F. Ayala, Problemas de la traducción (Madrid: Taurus, 1965), p. 18.
- 20 Brenno Silveira, A arte de traduzir (São Paulo: Edições melhoramentos, 1955), p. 87.
- 21 Alfred Malblanc, Stylistique comparée du français et de l'allemand (Paris: Didier, 1966).
- 22 Czesław Miłosz, The History of Polish Literature (London: Macmillan, 1969), p. 308.
- 23 Życie Warszawy, No. 295/71, quoted in Mozaika polska, No. 4, 1972, p. 30.
- 24 Hans Habe, "Thoughts on the Nobel Peace Prize," Encounter, XLII, No. 2 (February, 1974), 96.
- 25 Julian Krzyżanowski, Dzieła Sienkiewicza w przekładach, Vol. LIX: Wydanie zbiorowe dzieł Sienkiewicza (Warsaw: 1953).
- 26 Rodnaja rech' III, ed. by E. E. Solov'eva, et al. (Moscow: 1963), pp. 49-52.
- Genryk Senkevich, Janko-muzykant, trans. by V. G. Korolenko (Moscow: 1964).
- 27 J. Krzyżanowski, Twórczość Sienkiewicza (Warsaw: 1973), p. 87. Statements in this important work about the effectiveness of Sienkiewicz's objectivity in Janko Muzykant appear to conflict with statements made in another volume, in which he says that

the story is marked by "tearful mawkishness" [łzawa opłostkowość]. J. Krzyżanowski, Pokłosie sienkiewiczowskie (Warsaw: 1973), p. 34.

28 Genryk Senkevich, Polnoe illiustrirovannoe sobranie sochinenii, Vol. 12 (St. Petersburg: 1902).

29 Baronowa X.Y.Z. [Antoni Zaleski], Towarzystwo warszawskie (Cracow: 1886), quoted by J. Krzyżanowski, Henryk Sienkiewicz, Żywot i sprawy (3rd ed., rev.; Warsaw: 1973), p. 116.

Jan Baculewski, "Życie i twórczość Henryka Sienkiewicza," in Henryk Sienkiewicz, materiały rocznicowe, ed. by Monika Michalska (Warsaw: 1966), p. 42.

J. Krzyżanowski, Twórczość Sienkiewicza, p. 87.

Jan Máchal, Slovanské literatury, Vol. III (Prague: 1929), p. 372.

30 A. Zaleski, in Żywot i sprawy, p. 116.

31 The name in the title is spelt "Yanco" in the text, but "Janco" in the table of contents.

The accent marking the stress on "Tasín," not shown in the Austral edition, is restored here in accordance with consistent usage in Antonio Palau y Dulcet, Manual del librero hispano-americano (Barcelona, Oxford: 1969), Vol. XXI.

32 J. Krzyżanowski, Żywot i sprawy, p. 216.

33 Mieczysław Giergielewicz, "Henryk Sienkiewicz's American Resonance," Antemurale, X (1966), 266.

34 H. B. Segel, "Sienkiewicz's First Translator, Jeremiah Curtin," Slavic Review, XXIV (1965), 193.

35 M. Giergielewicz, "Henryk Sienkiewicz's American Resonance," 262.

36 H. Sienkiewicz, "Little Janko," trans. by C. O'C. E. [Charlotte O'Connor Eccles], The Ave Maria, XXXIV (1892), 60-64.

37 Anon., "A Polish Novelist - Henryk Sienkiewicz," Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, CXLV (April, 1889), 498-513.

38 Aleksandr Khrabritskii, notes to V. G. Korolenko o literaturze (Moscow: 1957), p. 652.

39 notes to V. G. Korolenko, Istoria moego sovremennika (Moscow: 1965), p. 989.

40 Bazyli Białokozowicz, Z dziejów wzajemnych polsko-rosyjskich związków literackich w XIX wieku (Warsaw: 1971), p. 291.

41 M. Giergielewicz, "The Works of Sienkiewicz in Spain," Polish Review, Vol. XIII, No. 1 (Winter, 1968), 114-19; No. 3 (Summer, 1968), 89-91.

42 Eduardo Gómez de Baquero, cited by Gabriela Makowiecka, "Sienkiewicz i Hiszpania," Kwartalnik neofilologiczny, XV (1968), 132.

43 G. Makowiecka, 134.

44 Ibid.

45 Ibid., 145.

46 Emilia Pardo Bazán, La revolución y la novela en Rusia (Madrid: 1887).

47 quoted by G. Makowiecka, 145.

48 Ibid., 135.

49 Catálogo general de la librería española i hispanoamericana, años 1901-30, Vol. V (Madrid: Instituto Nacional del Libro Español, 1951), p. 545.

50 J. Krzyżanowski, foreword to Dzieła Sienkiewicza w przekładach.

51 Jerzy Maciuszko, The Polish Short Story in English, a critical bibliography (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1968).

52 Index translationum, Répertoire internationale des traductions (Paris: International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, 1932-41; UNESCO, 1947-).

53 Ia. Retsker, "Plagiat ili samostoiatel'nyi perevod," in Tetradi perevodchika, ed. by L. S. Barkhudarov (Moscow: 1963), p. 42.

54 G. Senkevich, Rassказы, ed. by E. M. Riftina, trans. anon. (Moscow: 1948).

G. Senkevich, Polnoe illiustrirovannoe sobranie sochinenii, Vol. XII (St. Petersburg: 1902).

55 H. Sienkiewicz, "Janko, o pequeno músico," trans. by Eduardo de Noronha, in O faroleiro e outros contos (Rio de Janeiro: Delta, 1962).

56 Paulo Rónai, Escola de tradutores (Rio de Janeiro: Edições de Ouro, 1967), p. 33.

57 Enrico Sienkiewicz, "Janco il musicante," trans. by O. L. di Varsavia, in Per il pane, ed altri racconti (Milan: Treves, 1926).

58 J. Levý, Umění překladu, p. 143.

CHAPTER II
EXAMINATION OF TEXTS

The following is a detailed comparison of the text of Janko Muzykant with the translations by Curtin, Korolenko and Tasin. Each page of the original is accompanied by one page from each translation. Commentary on the translations follows each group of four pages of text and translation, and each section of the commentary is followed by a brief summary of the corresponding portion of the text, and of the salient features noted in the translations.

For ease of reference the numbers in the left-hand margin refer to the line of the original. Hence, if a translator omits lines of the original, the fifth line on the page of his translation may correspond to the eighth line on the matching page of the original. On both pages the line will be marked "8." The numbers in the margin of the pages of analysis also refer to the lines of the original.

In addition to the page numbers, the pages of the text and the translations bear numbers for reference purposes: P1, E1, S2, R2, etc. The letters are the initials of the languages in question: Polish, English, Spanish, Russian.

The footnotes used in Korolenko's translation are the translator's, except in three places where it is indicated that

they are the editor's.

Frequent reference is made to other translations besides the three mentioned above. All translations are referred to by abbreviations, in most cases based on the name of the translator, as shown in the following list. In the case of a reprinted translation, the date in brackets is that of its first publication.

- C. Sienkiewicz, Henryk. Sielanka; A Forest Picture, and other stories. Tr. by Jeremiah Curtin. Boston: Little, Brown, 1898. (1893).
- OE Sienkiewicz, Henryk. "Little Janko," tr. by C. O'C.E. [Charlotte O'Connor Ecales]. Ave Maria, XXXIV (1892), 60-64.
- Anon. Anonymous. "A Polish Novelist - Henryk Sienkiewicz." Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, CXLV (April, 1889), 498-513.
- J. Sienkiewicz, Henryk. "Janko the Musician," tr. by N. B. Jopson. The Slavonic and East European Review, XV (July, 1936), 29-36.
- Z. Zebrowski, Rev. Walter. "Sienkiewicz's 'Janko Muzykant' - Criticism and translation." Polish American Studies, XXII, No. 1 (1965), 17-29.
- T. Sienkiewicz, Enrico. Narraciones. Tr. by N. Tasfa. Buenos Aires: Austral, 1947. (1921).
- K. Senkevich, Genryk. Povesti i rasskazy. Various translators. "Ianko-muzykant" tr. by V. G. Korolenko. Moscow: 1957.
- PSS Senkevich, Genryk. Polnoe illiustrirovannoe sobranie sochinenii. Vol. 12. St. Petersburg: 1902.
- R. Senkevich, Genryk. Rasskazy. Ed. E. M. Riftina. Moscow: 1948.
- B. Sienkiewicz, Henri. Contes. Tr. by V. Bugiel. Paris: La Renaissance du Livre, n. d. [c. 1928].

- OL Sienkiewicz, Enrico. Per il pane, ed altri racconti.
Various translators. "Janko il musicante" tr. by
O. L. di Varsavia. Milan: Treves, 1926.
- G. Sienkiewicz, Enrico. Il guardiano del faro, e altre
novelle. Tr. by Cristina Agosti Garosci. Milan:
Rizzoli, 1953.
- N. Sienkiewicz, Henryk. O faroleiro, e outros contos.
Various translators. "Janko, o pequeno músico" tr. by
Eduardo de Noronha. Rio de Janeiro: Delta, 1962.
(1901).
- P. Sienkiewicz, Henryk. "Janko, der Musikant," tr. by
Sonja Placzek. Ausgewählte Werke der Nobelpreisträger.
Vol. 4. Berlin: Paul Franke Verlag, 1930.
- Ž. Sienkiewicz, Henryk. Drobné spisy. Tr. by Jaro Žalov.
Prague: Beaufort, 1901.
- Rum. Sienkiewicz, Henryk. Črty uhlém. Tr. by Josef Rumler.
Prague: Svoboda, 1950.
- M. Sienkiewicz, Henryk. Strážce majáku, a jiné povídky.
Tr. by Karel Málek. Prague: Dětské knihy, 1956.

The original is copied from: Sienkiewicz, Henryk.

Nowele wybrane, Warsaw: 1971. This text in turn is reprinted
from: Sienkiewicz, Henryk. Dzieła, Vol. II. Warsaw: 1949.

All texts are reproduced exactly, with only the
following minor amendments. Three misprints are corrected in
the Spanish text, and "sic" is inserted at one point where a
capital letter appears to be used unnecessarily. Editorial
footnotes in Nowele wybrane are not reproduced.

JANKO MUZYKANT

(original)

Przyszło to na świat wątłe, słabe. Kумы, co się były zebrały przy tapczanie położnicy, kręciły głowami i nad matką i nad dzieckiem. Kowalka Szymonowa, która była najmądrzejsza, poczęła chorą pocieszać:

5. -- Dajta -- powiada -- to zapalę nad wami gromnicę, już z was nic nie będzie, moja kumo; już wam na tamten świat się wybierać i po dobrodzieja by posłać, żeby wam grzechy wasze odpuścił.

10. -- Ba! -- powiada druga -- a chłopaka to zara trzeba ochrzcić; on i dobrodzieja nie doczeka, a -- powiada -- błogo będzie, co choć i strzygą się nie ostanie.

Tak mówiąc zapaliła gromnicę, a potem wzięszy dziecko pokropiła je wodą, aż poczęło oczki mruzyc, i rzekła jeszcze:

15. Ja cię "krzce" w Imię Ojca i Syna, i Ducha Świętego i daję ci na przyzwisko Jan, a terazie, duszo "krześcijańska", idź, skądś przyszła. Amen!

ЯНКО-МУЗЫКАНТ

(В. Г. Короленко)

Родилось это на свет слабое такое да тцедушное. Кумушки, собравшиеся участливой кучкой у скамьи, на которой лежала родильница, покачивали головами над этой матерью и над этим ребенком. Шиманиха, жена кузнеца, самая разумная из них, обратилась к больной с словом утешения.

5. -- Давайте, -- говорит, -- я над вами громницу¹ зажгу. Вы уж, -- говорит, -- не жилица на свете, вам уж на тот свет собираться, да его врекодобие позвать, чтобы грехи вам разрешил.

-- Ба! -- другая говорит. -- А мальчишку-то сейчас крестить надо; он и ксендза не дождется, и то хорошо, коли "стригэй"² не останется.

10. Говоря таким образом, зажгла громницу, а затем, взяв на руки ребенка, прыснула на него водой, так что бедняга стал жмуриться, да и говорит при этом:

-- Крещу тебя во имя отца и сына и духа святого и даю тебе имя Ян³, а теперь душенька христианская, ступай, откуда пришла. Аминь!

1. Восковая свеча, получаемая накануне пасхи у всенощной; ее держат за образами в переднем углу и принимают (ей) силу талисмана во время грозы. Ее же зажигают у одра умирающего.
2. Стрига -- душа ребенка, умершего до крещения.
3. Ян -- Иван.

Sl

YANCO "EL MÚSICO"

(N. Tasín)

Nació enclenque, raquítico. Las vecinas, reunidas alrededor del lecho de la recién parida, sacudían la cabeza, observando ora a la madre, ora al hijo. La herradora, más entendida que las demás, púsose a consolar a la enferma.

5. -- Aguarda -- dijo --; voy a encenderte un cirio bendito. Estás apañada, comadre; lo que debes hacer es prepararte para el viaje al otro mundo y llamar a un cura para que te despache.

-- Y al crío -- dijo otra -- es menester bautizarlo inmediatamente, pues ni tiempo va a dar a que llegue el señor cura. Todavía gracias a que no se nos muera.

10. ~~more.~~

Y así diciendo encendió un cirio, tomó en brazos a la criatura, rocióla con agua y dijo:

-- Yo te bautizo en el nombre del Padre, del Hijo y del Espíritu Santo, y te impongo el nombre de Yanco.

15. Y ahora, alma cristiana, ya puedes volverte allá de donde viniste.

YANNO THE MUSICIAN

(J. Curtin)

It came into the world frail, weak. The gossips, who had gathered around the plank bed of the sick woman, shook their heads over mother and child. The wife of Simon the blacksmith, who was the wisest among them, began to console the sick woman.

5. "Let me," said she, "light a blessed candle above you. Nothing will come of you, my gossip; you must prepare for the other world now, and send for the priest to absolve you from your sins."

10. "Yes!" said another, "but the boy must be christened this minute: he cannot wait for the priest. It is well even to stop him from becoming a vampire."

So saying, she lighted the blessed candle, and taking the child sprinkled him with water till his eyes blinked; and then she said,—

15. "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. I give thee Yan as name; and now, Christian soul, go to the place whence thou comest. Amen!"

Commentary on page 1.

1. Sienkiewicz's use of neuter "to," referring to the child, is retained by K. as "eto." C., adhering as closely as possible to the original, uses "it" in English, despite the slightly strange effect which this occasions. The neuter is acceptable in Russian and Polish, since the word for "child" is neuter, but its use in English is questionable, the more so as the sex of the child is soon made clear. "He," used by OE and Anon., is more natural. The Spanish subjectless verb, showing no gender, avoids the problem. B.'s French translation departs further from the original: "ce petit être." Most translators keep the expression "came into the world." T. and N., however, reduce this to "was born."

The adjectives "wątły, słabe" are rendered accurately by C., K., and T. K. adds "takoe" and inserts "da" between the adjectives, thus already imparting a "folksy" tone to the narrative. C. separates the two adjectives by a comma, thus preserving the exact sentence structure of the original, although the addition of the conjunction "and" is expected in English. The addition is made by J., OE, and Z.

"Kuma," which recurs in 1. 6, is a particularly difficult word to render in other languages, especially

English, the relationship it describes apparently being peculiar to the Slavs. For the Russian translator this does not present any difficulty. K. prefers to use a diminutive of the same word, in which the secondary meaning "gossip" is stronger. He omits the word when it recurs in the dialogue. C. uses "gossip" appropriately the first time, but less so on its second occurrence, where one woman addresses the mother as "my gossip." T. uses "neighbours" in the first instance, but in the second "comadre," which is very close to the original, containing both the idea of a close, not blood relationship, and that of a "gossip." B. first uses the French cognate of this word "la commère," followed in the dialogue by "ma bonne." This seems to be among the best solutions to the problem in the non-Slavonic translations, although some specialists maintain that the translator should consistently use the same word to render one recurring word of the original, without resorting to synonyms.¹ G. uses Italian "comare" on both occasions.

Sienkiewicz's use of the somewhat archaic pluperfect form of the verb "były zebrali" cannot be rendered in translation without loss of the archaism. C. uses the pluperfect, copying the original construction, where T. and K. use participles in the subordinate clause.

2. K. makes the subordinate clause a little more vivid by the addition of two words of his own. There is no mention in the original of "uchastlivaia kuchka."

"Tapozan" usually has the meaning "couch," or sometimes simply "bed," as a near-synonym of "łóżko." However it is usually a truckle-bed, and C.'s "plank bed" is therefore accurate. In K.'s version it becomes a plain, wooden bench. T. uses the less common of two Spanish words for "bed." After changing "tapozan" to "skam'ia" K. then finds himself obliged to insert a subordinate clause, as the simple genitive which suffices if "bed" is used, is no longer adequate.

"Położnica" is not difficult to render exactly in Russian and Spanish, but C. has to change this to "sick woman" to avoid recourse to clumsy paraphrase, even though he has to translate "chora" in the same way. The main clause of this sentence presents no real difficulty. C.'s word-for-word translation is perfectly adequate. K. feels it necessary to insert "etoi" and "etim" before the nouns. T. inserts a gerund "observando" to reinforce the main verb. B. begins a new, inserted sentence after "hochsient la tête" in order to explain why heads were being shaken: "La mère et l'enfant semblaient en bien piètre état." Both the French and the Spanish translators apparently feel that a word-for-word translation will not make clear why the women were

shaking their heads... B.'s inserted sentence, however, is surely superfluous. The problem could have been solved, as in Spanish, by a gerund: "en regardant la mère et l'enfant."

3. "Kowalka" has to be expanded in English to "the smith's wife." In Russian "kuznechikha" is possible as a feminine form of "kuznets," but K. prefers "zhena kuznetsa," perhaps to avoid the comical effects of "Shimanikha kuznechikha." Spanish allows feminine forms of masculine words, giving the meaning "the wife of" and T. uses such a form. The name is omitted by T., changed to "Shimanikha" by K. to preserve the "folksy" tone, and changed to refer only to her husband in English. C. anglicizes the smith's name. This is somewhat inconsistent, since he does not anglicize the name "Janko" in the title, as some other translators do.

C., K., and T. all add either "among them" or "than the others" in the subordinate clause. K. and T. omit the verb "byla" to make an adjectival phrase of the original clause.

The terse main clause of the original is lengthened considerably by K., presumably to achieve what he feels to be a more elegant turn of phrase. The other Russian versions, which are word-for-word, are adequate: "nachala/prinialas' bol'nuiu uteshat'."

5. The suffix "-ta" in "dajta" is a regionalism

which can hardly be conveyed in translation.² C. has little choice but to use "let me," which necessitates a closer syntactic link with the rest of the sentence than in Polish or Russian. T. changes this, using the imperative of the verb "to wait." Interpretative translation is used by C. and T. to render "gromnica" as "blessed candle." All the other translators do the same, except the Czechs, who have a cognate word, and K., who retains the original Polish word and explains it in a footnote.

K.'s translation of "juże z was nic nie będzie" is more successful than C.'s and T.'s. C.'s literal version gives an expression which one does not normally associate with the dying, and which, removed from its context, would have no clear meaning: "Nothing will come of you." Anon.'s "You are near your end," is both clear and appropriate. Like C.'s, T.'s version is less clear than the original: "Estás apañada," (literally: You are caught/seized.)

6. The dative infinitive construction of the next clause is rendered word-for-word by K. Only a prefix needs to be changed. The Spanish translation, in which the modal verb "deber" must be introduced, gives the exact meaning and reads well, but it is much longer.

"Dobrodziej" (benefactor) is used as "priest" only in peasant speech, and in the mode of address

"księżę do przodu." Neither C. nor T. can find a suitable word in their respective TLa. K. comes by far the closest, the first time this word occurs, with "ego prepodobie." Thereafter he uses "ksendz," a russified form of the standard Polish word. J. achieves some semblance of the original popular parlance with "send for parson," without the article. This usage, however, and the word "parson" itself, lend the approximation something one can only associate with rural England. A minor problem for the non-Slavonic translators is the choice of the article. The majority use the definite article, which seems the more likely, since it is improbable that such a small, remote village would have more than one priest. T. and N. are the only ones to use the indefinite article.

The last clause of this sentence is easily rendered by all translators. K. adheres closely to the dative construction of the original. T. renders the verb neatly by Spanish "despachar."

In the original the second person plural "wy" is used by the speaker. This is a somewhat archaic or regional manner of addressing a single person, standing between the familiar "ty" and the formal third person "pani." No equivalent can be found in any of the TLa. T. uses the familiar second person singular, while K. chooses to retain the second person plural in Russian,

in which it is the standard, polite form. English cannot express any distinction here.

8. Exclamations and interjections can prove extremely difficult to translate satisfactorily. "Ba" is preserved unchanged in K.'s translation, although its Russian meaning does not fully coincide with its Polish meaning. "Ba" in Russian is an expression of astonishment and little else. In Polish it can be an emphatic word, and can often be translated as "Yes!" or "Of course!" In the context it seems that the second woman is forcefully expressing her agreement with the first, rather than scornful disagreement, as one might think on reading K.'s translation. C. uses "Yes!" T. avoids the difficulty by omitting the exclamation.

C. and T. use the past tense where Sienkiewicz has "powiada" and K. "govorit" in the present. The regional form "zara" of standard "zaraz" is untranslatable,³ as is the sub-standard shortening of "trzeba" to "trza." C. and T. render these words in standard, literary English and Spanish. K. manages to preserve something of the flavour of colloquial speech by using a similar word-order, and the diminutive "mal'chishka" with the emphatic particle "-to."

9. A slight, inessential change in C.'s translation is the introduction of the auxiliary verb "cannot" in rendering the verb "nie... dozeska." T. employs a long,

colloquial clause of twelve words to render five words of the original.

The second "powiada" in this paragraph is understandably omitted by C., K., and T.

C. and T. make a separate sentence of the last part of the original sentence. It is difficult to translate as it involves Eastern European folk beliefs which are not known to most foreign readers. Its meaning is, roughly, "It will be a good thing if he can be prevented, at least, from becoming a vampire." According to popular belief, children who die before they can be baptized live on as vampires.⁴ C.'s English sentence has a faintly curious ring: "It is well even to stop him from becoming a vampire." This could easily be improved without departing from the literal: "It will be as well, at least..." The preposition "from" is unnecessary with the verb "to stop," if not incorrect. However, it is doubtful whether the English reader can be expected to understand what the woman is saying from C.'s version, as he offers no explanation of the rôle of the vampire.

K.'s version is very close to the original. His "koli" is true to the peasant speech of the character. He russifies the Polish word "strzyga," but the explanation of its meaning in his footnote is inadequate, telling the reader only that the word means "the soul of a child who dies before being baptized," without mention of

the vampire. B. and G. provide more informative footnotes to explain this point.

T. suppresses the vampire, and with it the need for a footnote. In his translation the woman asserts simply that the child must not die before being christened. This solution is at the cost of some of the local colour provided by Sienkiewicz's use of folklore, and furthermore, the expression "que no se nos muera moro" introduces associations which are specifically Spanish. The first meaning of "moro" is "Moorish" (as opposed to Spanish, and Christian), and by extension "heathen" or "unbaptized," (cf. "hablar en cristiano" meaning "to speak Spanish").

11. This sentence is translated, for the most part, clearly and accurately. T., however, omits the clause "aż poczęło oczki mrużyć," perhaps through inattention. C., K., and T. begin the sentence with a gerundive subordinate clause, as in the original. The word "gromnica" is handled in the same way as in l. 5, with the difference that T. now drops the adjective "blessed," leaving simply "a candle." The definite article, as used by C. and B., might be more fitting here, as one assumes the candle in question is the one already referred to.

The past gerund "wziąwszy" is preserved as such by K. alone. "Having taken" would be awkward in English, and C. accordingly uses the present gerund. T. dispenses

with the gerund in favour of an indicative verb in the preterite.

12. Changes are minor in the remaining part of the sentence, with the exception of T.'s omission. "Aż" is changed to "so that" by K., while C., more literal, has "till." C. does not attempt to convey the diminutive ending of "oczki," and K. obviates the need for the word by using a reflexive verb which implies "eyes."

One notices K.'s slight tendency to embellish when he inserts the noun "bedniaga" before the verb "stal zhmurit'sia," although the unexpressed subject of the original verb is simply "dziecko."

The baptismal speech can be translated almost word-for-word into the three languages concerned. C., K., and T. all adhere to the sentence structure and word-order of the original. T. unaccountably omits "Amen!" thereby losing Sienkiewicz's touch of humour, in placing "Amen" after "idź, skądś przyszła." T. also breaks the sentence into two after "Jan."

None of the translators attempts to reproduce the woman's regional pronunciation of "ch" as "k" in "chrzce" and "chrześcijańska."⁵

14. Versions of the name "Jan" might give cause for dispute. Why does C. change it to "Yan"?⁶ Why does T. use the diminutive before Sienkiewicz himself does so? B., J., and G. translate the name into their own

languages: "Jean," "John," and "Giovanni."

All translators except T. render the imperative "idź" as an imperative in the TL. T. inserts the auxiliary "to be able," though with imperative meaning. K. uses the imperative of a rather more forceful verb, "stupaj," thus accentuating slightly Sienkiewicz's touch of humour.

Summary of page 1.

Even at this early stage it is apparent that the English version is the closest to the letter of the original. We note that K. and T. make minor additions where C. adds nothing. T. tends to omit more than the other translators. Most of his omissions are of single words, but on one occasion (l. 12) a whole line is left out.

Certain stylistic features of the original are lost in translation. Sub-standard features in the speech of the village women are converted into colloquial, but correct, Spanish. K. takes care to compensate for the loss of some sub-standard forms by the introduction of others, and by the more frequent use of diminutives.

Thus far there is nothing in the English translation to indicate that the women speak anything but the standard literary form of the SL. The style of prayer is, however, marked off from the rest of the dialogue by the use of the second person singular "thou" and the corresponding verb forms.

The local colour added by the use of the word "strzyga" and its powerful superstitious overtones is preserved with varying degrees of success, though none of the TL readers is likely to receive an impression comparable to that made on the SL reader in clarity and vividness.

original

5. Ale dusza chrześcijańska nie miała wcale ochoty iść, skąd przyszła, i opuszczać ohuderlawego ciała, owszem, poczęła wierząc nogami tego ciała, jako mogła, i płakać, chociaż tak słabo i załośnie, że, jak mówiły kumy: "Myślałby kto, kocię nie kocię, albo co!"

10. Posłano po księdza; przyjechał, zrobił swoje, odjechał; chorej zrobiło się lepiej. W tydzień wyszła baba do roboty. Chłopak ledwo "zipał", ale zipał; aż w czwartym roku okukala kukulka na wiosnę chorobę; więc się poprawił i w jakim takim zdrowiu doszedł do dziesiątego roku życia.

15. Chudy był zawsze i opalony, z brzuchem wyдутym, a zapadłymi policzkami; czuprynę miał konopną, białą prawie i spadającą na jasne, wytrzeszczone oczy, patrzące na świat, jakby w jakąś niezmierną dalekość wpatrzone. W zimie siadywał za piecem i popłakiwał cicho z zimna, a czasem z głodu, gdy matula nie mieli co włożyć ani do pieca, ani do garnka; latem chodził w kossulinie przepasanej krajką i w słomianym "kapalucie", spod którego obdartej kani spoglądał zadzierając jak ptak głowę do góry.

Короленко

Но христианская душа, очевидно, не имела ни малейшего желания "идти, откуда пришла", и вообще не желала оставлять крохотного тела, а начала брыкаться худенькими ножками этого тела и плакать, да тихо таково да жалостно, что кумушки говорили промех себя: "Котенок не котенок -- кто его знает, что уж это такое!"

Послали за ксендзом. Приехал, сделал свое дело, уехал; больной стало лучше. Через неделю вышла баба на работу. Малый еле тянет, а все-таки тянет, да на четвертый год "укуковала" кукушка хворость, он и поправился, да кое-как через пень-колоду перевалил за десятый годок.

Худой был всегда да загорелый, щеки впалые, а брюхо раздутое. Волосенки белые-белые, точно вот лен, спадали все на лоб, закрывая большие глаза навывкате, всегда широко раскрытые, точно глядевшие в какую-то неведомую необъятную даль. Зимой сидел малый за печкой, тихо всхлипывая от холода, а порой так и с голодухи, когда матушке нечего было положить ни в горшок, ни в печку. Летом ходил в рубашонке, опоясанной кромкой, и в соломенном обдерганном "капльухе"¹, из-под которого поглядывал точно птица, задирая головенку кверху.

1. Шляпа с широкими полями.

Tasín .

Pero el alma cristiana no tenía grandes deseos de volver al lugar de donde había venido, dejando en la tierra su cuerpecito descarnado. Al contrario, comenzó a agitar cuanto pudo sus piernecitas y a llorar; pero de tan lastimero modo, que decían las comadres:

5. --¡Es cosa de reírse; maulla como un gatito!

Mandaron por un cura. Fué, hizo cuanto el caso requería, y luego se marchó.

La paciente fué mejorando, y al cabo de una semana ya pudo reanudar su trabajo. El chiquitín, maullaba todavía; pero, al fin y al cabo, maullaba..., y así, maullando, llegó a los cuatro años, en cuya edad, cual si se viera libre de embrujamiento, empezó a crecer, aunque miserablemente, muy poco a poco, hasta alcanzar el décimo año de su menguada y ruin existencia.

10. Era un chicuelo tostado por el sol, con la panza abultada y las mejillas enjutas. Los cabellos, de estopa, casi blancos, le caían por delante de los ojos; unos ojos claros y desencajados que parecían mirar en el vacío.

15. En invierno se escondía detrás de la estufa apagada, y allí se quedaba llorando de frío y de hambre cuando la madre no tenía qué echar en el puchero. En verano iba por esos mundos de Dios con una camisa ceñida con un cintajo y un desvencijado sombrero de paja, por debajo del cual miraba, levantando la cabeza como un pajarillo.

Curtin

But the Christian soul had no wish whatever to go to the place whence it came and leave its lean little body. It began to kick with the legs of that body as far as it was able, and to cry, though so weakly and pitifully that, as the gossips said, "One would think 't is a kitten; 't is not a kitten, — what is it?"

5. They sent for the priest; he came, he did his duty, he went his way, — the sick woman grew better. In a week she went out to her work. The little boy barely "paled," — still, he paled on till in the fourth year the cuckoo brought him sickness in spring; but, 10. he recovered, and with some kind of health reached the tenth year of his life.

He was always lean and sunburnt, with bloated stomach and sunken cheeks; he had a forelock of hamp color almost white and falling over clear, staring eyes, which looked at the world as if gazing into some immense distance. In winter he used to sit behind 15. the stove and cry silently from cold; and from hunger too, at times when his mother had nothing to put into the stove or the pot. During summer he went around in a shirt, with a strip of cloth for a belt, and a straw hat, from beneath the torn brim of which he looked with head peering upward like a bird.

Commentary on page 2.

1. Slight changes occur in the translation of this sentence. K.'s "ochevidno" is not in the original. T.'s "no tenía grandes deseos" (had no great desire) is slightly different from the original, but it reads well in the TL. Before "whence it came" C. and T. both insert "the place," thus lengthening the sentence.

2. Some translators bolster their rendering of the adjective "chuderlawy" by minor additions. The word means "lean" or "scraggy," and C.'s translation of it as "thin" therefore needs at least the reinforcement of the added adjective "little." T. finds a more appropriate adjective and uses a diminutive form of the noun: "cuerpecito." His "descarnado" is closer to the meaning of the original adjective than K.'s "krokhotny," just as J.'s "puny" is closer than C.'s "thin."

K. repeats the verb "to wish" in a different form before the second infinitive, and inserts "voobshche." After the gerund "leaving," T. adds "en la tierra." "Owszem," here in the meaning "on the contrary/far from it," is ignored by C., who breaks the sentence here, and rendered by K. as Russian "a," which lacks the contrastive force of the original word. T. conveys this accurately, beginning his new sentence with "al contrario." J., P., R., B., and two of the Czech translators are careful to express the exact meaning of this word.

3.

K. and T. use diminutives to render "nogami," though no diminutive is used in the original, and K. inserts an adjective, also in a diminutive form. K. omits "jako mogła." Sienkiewicz's two adverbs are combined in one adverbial phrase in T.'s version: "de tan lastimero modo." C.'s translation of this line is exact. K. uses "tikho" rather than "slabo," which is suggested by the original, and he carries the peasant colloquial tone of the narrative further by the double use of "da" (in the meaning "and"), and by "takovo" in preference to "tak."

4.

The last part of this sentence is simplified somewhat in K.'s and T.'s versions by the omission of "as" in, "so weakly and pitifully that, as the gossips said..." The change in meaning is minimal. K. adds to the original by inserting "promesh sebia."

The last sentence of this paragraph appears to pose problems for some translators. Beyond all doubt, K.'s version is the best, preserving the exact meaning and the style of speech of the original. The meaning, in standard English, is: "Anyone would think it was a kitten or something." It is rendered with this meaning by Z.

C., however, appears to have difficulty with the colloquial construction of the original. He can make sense of it only by rearranging the punctuation to make the sentence read, "Myślałby kto kocię. Nie kocię." His

translation clearly shows this: "One would think 't is a kitten; 't is not a kitten, - what is it?" Sienkiewicz's punctuation is correct and no such change is necessary. Having rendered "kocię nie kocię" in this way, C. is now obliged to change "albo co!" to the question "What is it?" as "or something" cannot sensibly be attached to the first part of his sentence.

Although C. appears to have not fully understood the original sentence, the meaning is not seriously distorted. The stylistic disparity between the original and the translation is, however, striking. "One" is rare in the colloquial speech of the English lower classes, where its place is taken by the indefinite "you." Its use is out of tune with the old-fashioned colloquial abbreviation "'t is."

More striking however is the glaring error in the English sequence of tenses, which makes the whole sentence sound extremely unnatural. After "one would think," either the subjunctive, or, in everyday speech, the simple past tense must be used: "one would think it were/was a kitten." This is not a common error among native speakers of English, though common enough among foreign students of the language.

T. and other translators resort to adaptation to render this line, rather than exact translation. T. attempts to understand the situation, rather than the

words spoken: "Es cosa de reírse; maúlla como un gatito!" Sienkiewicz's text says nothing about laughing, nor does it mention the noise made by the baby, but, given the situation, this inference may legitimately be drawn from the context. PSS, R., OL, Z., and Rum. do the same. In English, J. adopts a similar approach: "'tis more like a cat miaowing nor anything else," but the attempt at English dialect ("nor") is somewhat strained. K. is perhaps more fortunate than other translators, in that the closeness of the Russian and Polish idioms allows him to retain the original construction: "kotenok ne kotenok."

6. Sienkiewicz begins his next paragraph with a construction peculiar to Polish, - an impersonal past passive participle in the neuter. K., T., and C. use an active verb in the third person plural. In Russian and Spanish, though not in English, no subject need be expressed. A passive construction is possible in English: "The priest was sent for," (J.), but C. prefers the active verb. Unlike most of the other translators, T. uses the indefinite article: "un cura."

In the second part of this sentence Sienkiewicz achieves a terse, balanced rhythm by using three verbs separated by commas, without conjunctions. C. keeps to this as best he can, separating his verbal phrases by commas, without "and," and repeating the personal pronoun.

The English ear might expect the conjunction before the last verb, but C. does manage to preserve a certain rhythm, which the conjunction would break. English does not allow him to preserve the rhythm as efficiently as does Russian. K.'s line matches the original almost perfectly, since the two motion verbs used here are almost the same in Russian as in Polish. K. has only to change the Polish prefix "od-" to "u-" and add "delo." T.'s version gives no hint of the rhythm of the original. It is broken by the addition of "y luego," and by the expansion of "zrobił swoje" to "hizo quanto el caso requería." The change of meaning is insignificant.

7. All the translators have so far adhered to the paragraph division of the original. At this point, however, T. departs from it, by detaching the last element of Sienkiewicz's sentence and adding it to the next as the first sentence of a new paragraph.

A dative construction is used in the original, where only an active verb can be used in English. The Russian idiom used by K. is very close to that used in the original. Sienkiewicz uses a perfective verb, meaning that the recovery was swift and complete. K. reproduces this with a Russian perfective verb, but T.'s "fue mejorando" emphasizes the continuity of the process and makes its duration seem longer.

C. and K. translate the next sentence literally,

but C., like T., avoids the insoluble problem of finding a stylistic equivalent to Polish "baba" by using the pronoun, since it is clear who is the subject of the sentence. B. uses "pauvre femme" here, the adjective being an addition of his own and in no sense an equivalent to "baba." C.'s "her," qualifying "work," is superfluous. T.'s translation of this sentence is closer to paraphrase. If translated into English it gives: "she was able to take up her work again," a slight expansion of the original. The modal verb is as unnecessary in Spanish as it is in English.

8. Sienkiewicz's reasons for putting quotation marks round "zipał" are unclear, and this causes minor problems for his translators. It may be intended to indicate that this is what the village women said about the baby, rather than to mark the word off as belonging to popular speech. "Zipać" is perfectly acceptable in standard Polish, meaning "to breathe, draw breath, pant," and the expression "ledwo zipać" can mean "to be more dead than alive," though it is impractical to translate it this way here. C. faithfully reproduces the quotation marks and finds an English word from the same stylistic level, but "to pule" does not mean "to breathe."

K.'s "tlanut'," used in the present tense with the meaning "to survive," effectively conveys the meaning. T. resorts, for the second time, to "maullar,"

the onomatopoeic verb used of cats, which is further from the original than C.'s "to pule." Another English translator, J., uses the verb "to gasp," which is too strong, but his version is otherwise deficient in that he fails to render the contrast "ledwo..., ale..." His translation runs, "By then the babe was just about 'gaspings,' as they said, and gasp he did." T. catches the contrast and emphasizes it by inserting a long expression. The most accurate rendering from a non-Slavonic translator is B.'s, which conveys the meaning of "zipać" with perfect accuracy: "Le petit garçon, vivotait à peine, mais il vivotait."

The following clause in this sentence is totally misunderstood by C., who gives it a meaning opposite to its real meaning: "the cuckoo brought him sickness in spring," for "okukala kukułka chorobę." None of the other translators makes this mistake. K. conveys the correct meaning in Russian with ease by forming a prefixed, transitive verb "ukukovat'," analagous to the verb used by Sienkiewicz.

Having reversed the meaning of this clause, C. then has to turn "więc" into a contrastive conjunction "but," which it is not. "Więc" means "so, therefore, consequently."

T. suppresses the cuckoo and once again resorts to paraphrase, thereby losing another element of the

story's local colour. His paraphrase is a literary simile separated by commas from the rest of the sentence. The original metaphor, which is worked into the main clause, is one which might well have been used by the village women themselves. The simile used by T., while rendering the basic meaning, reads more like the product of the literary man's imagination than the speaking style of the characters.

K. uses the prostorechie word "khvorost" for "choroba," and the colloquial diminutive "godok." Both are in keeping with the tone of the narrative, although Sienkiewicz uses standard literary words on both occasions.

C.'s rendering of the expression "w jakim takim zdrowiu" expresses the meaning correctly, but sounds somewhat lame: "with some kind of health." The English preposition normally used with "health" is "in." T. departs so far from the original here that it is not easy to say which phrase of his translation corresponds to Sienkiewicz's "w jakim takim zdrowiu." It is necessary to consider the wider context of his sentence to see how he has coped with the problem: "empezó a crecer, aunque miseramente, muy poco a poco." The original says nothing about "beginning to grow," and the translator needs two adverbial phrases to render one concise expression. K. matches meaning and style exactly,

although his "koe-kak" could be omitted, as it is practically synonymous with the colloquial expression "cherez pen'-kolodu."

10. T. takes impermissible liberties with the last phrase of this paragraph. Where Sienkiewicz has simply "life," T. writes "menguada y ruin existencia." The translator wishes to touch the reader's emotions at a point where the author does not intend to do so.

This paragraph is considerably longer in T.'s translation than in the original, and the former seems almost unwieldy when compared to the concise simplicity of the original. It contains no fewer than five subordinate elements in commas, which break the flow. Sienkiewicz has only one, "w jakim takim zdrowiu," without commas. K. and C. adhere closely to the original sentence structure.

11. T. omits the adjective "thin" and the adverb "always." Strictly speaking, K.'s sentence is paratactic and grammatically incorrect. The two descriptive phrases are simply attached to the main clause, without any grammatical or syntactic connection. K. presumably does this to preserve the likeness to spoken narrative. Such loosely constructed sentences are indeed characteristic of the spoken language, and the connection provided by the sense is all that is needed. Sienkiewicz's sentence, however, is correct, since he uses "z" with the

instrumental case to link these phrases to the main clause. C. and T. translate the preposition.

12. "Czupryna," unlike Russian "chub," does not mean "forelock," as used by C. and J., but simply "hair" or "head of hair," as it is rendered by K. and T. K. sustains the colloquial tone of the narrative by using a diminutive form and a doubled adjective: "volosenki belye-belye." This is a slight deviation from the original "almost white," which the other translators preserve. K. expresses the adjective "konopna" in a simile: "just like flax." C. inserts the word "color," and T. uses the noun: "de estopa."

- In K.'s version, Janke's hair falls over his brow, before covering his eyes. This obvious truth is not stated in the original, nor in the other translations. K. renders "wytrzeszczone" accurately by "navykate." T.'s "desencajados" is equally apt, but C.'s "staring" is weak by comparison.

T., who breaks the sentence with a semi-colon before going on to describe Janke's eyes, also shortens the sentence, considering "looking at the world" to be unnecessary, and therefore omitting it, as K. does. By making the boy gaze into "el vacío" instead of "niezmierna dalekość," T. changes the effect produced by the description. "Staring into space" is liable to give the reader an impression of vacant foolishness,

rather than of romantic distraction as intended by the author.

K. applies two adjectives to "distance," instead of the original one, and he lengthens the description of the boy's eyes in the same way: "bol'shie... navykate, vseгда shiroko raskrytye." "Navykate" alone would have been ample.

14. T. breaks this long paragraph into three, making the first division here.

The frequentative imperfective verb "siadywał" cannot be conveniently rendered by a Russian frequentative. K. uses the past of "siet'", and C. uses the continuous past tense. The Spanish and French translators are hampered by the lack of verbs meaning "to be seated" in the Romance languages. T. writes "he used to hide." Sienkiewicz uses no noun or pronoun to refer to the boy at this point, but K. inserts a noun of his own choosing, the colloquial "malyi." He uses the diminutive "pechka" rather than the full form "pech'." T. inserts the adjective "apagada" (extinguished) to qualify "la estufa," feeling that the sense demands it.

C.'s "used to cry silently" is an unimaginative rendering of the original, giving no hint of the variant of the verb used by Sienkiewicz. The same must be said of T.'s "llorando," with the adjective omitted. Both "to cry" and "llorar" are equivalents not of "popłakiwał"

but of "plakać." K.'s "vskhlipyvat'," J.'s "to whimper," and B.'s "pleurnicher" are much more accurate choices. T. inserts a verb, "allí se quedaba llorando," feeling perhaps that this reads better than "y lloraba," which
 15. would be closer to the original. T. and C. remove "sometimes," as the following clause makes this apparent.

To render Polish "głód," K. uses not the standard Russian "golod" but the prostorechie form "golodukha." The English and Spanish translators use standard TL nouns, since no other possibilities would be open to them even if Sienkiewicz himself had used a sub-standard word. As usual, K.'s choice is in keeping with the style of his own translation, but he goes a little further than the author in his use of popular forms.

The endearing word "matula" is matched only by K.'s "matushka." C. and T. use the neutral words "mother" and "la madre."

Sienkiewicz's use of the verb in the masculine plural with a feminine singular noun is characteristic of peasant speech.⁷ It is one of the devices which the author uses as an aid in matching the style of the narrative to the speech of his chief protagonist. It is impossible to convey this in English, Spanish, or even Russian. The three translators are compelled to use standard verb forms.

Curiously, it is the Spanish idiom which most

16. closely matches the Polish in "nie mieli co włożyć," which might almost be a syntactic calque from "no tenía qué echar." K. uses the dative with "nechego." T., however, omits the stove for no apparent reason.

C., T., and K. begin a new sentence after "garnka."

The original "chodził w Roszulinie" becomes an expression of no less than six words in T.'s translation: "iba por esos mundos de Dios con una camisa...," although an equivalent to "he wore" would be adequate. T. does not employ a diminutive of "camisa" where Sienkiewicz and K. do so. Polish "krajka" can mean "a belt," but all three translators interpret it in context in its second meaning "a strip of cloth."

17. No equivalent can be found in any of the TIs for the dialect variant "kapalus" of standard "kapelus." K. russifies the Polish word and adds an explanatory footnote. The lack of an adjective from "straw" in Spanish obliges T. to render "słomiany" as "de paja." K. and T. simplify the sentence by omitting the word "brim" and transferring its adjective to qualify "hat." C.'s efforts to produce an absolutely literal version lead him to keep "brim," though in a somewhat clumsy fashion: "from beneath the torn brim of which..." instead of the neater "from beneath whose torn brim..." "Kania" with the meaning "brim" is purely dialect,⁹ and

since no TL dialect equivalent is likely to be available, no harm is done by omitting it altogether. This meaning bears no relation to the word's primary meaning in standard Polish, "a kite" (Milvus milvus), - the cause of a serious misunderstanding in Z.'s translation, which can only baffle the reader.

18.

T. and K. follow the original in using a gerundive construction ("zadzieraając..."). Curtin's construction, with the preposition "with," is slightly different.

Sienkiewicz has no diminutives in the last clause. In K.'s translation we find "golovenka" and in T.'s "pajarillo" for "głowa" and "ptak." B. goes further with "petit oisillon."

Summary of page 2.

With this page the introductory scene describing Janko's birth closes, and there follows a description of the growing boy and of his life with his mother.

T. and K. make several additions. For the most part these are minor, but one of T.'s additions involves two emotive adjectives. Omissions in T.'s translation also become more numerous.

T. again detracts from Sienkiewicz's local colour by paraphrasing the line about the cuckoo. C.'s only serious error on this page involves this same expression, which is given opposite meaning.

All the translators break down Sienkiewicz's sentences, T. more than K. and C. T. is the only one to break down and rearrange the original paragraphs at this stage.

Lapses in C.'s English continue to make themselves felt, most prominently in his incorrect sequence of tenses (1. 4). One may argue that since Sienkiewicz did not intend to make his village folk speak perfect Polish, the translator has the right to introduce errors in the TL. The point is valid, but those errors introduced must be those which are current among TL speakers. C.'s errors are not of this kind, and are, to all appearances, the result of the translator's imperfect command of the TL.

K. is more lavish than the author in his application of diminutives and secondary diminutives.

original

Matka, biedna komornica, żyjąca z dnia na dzień niby jaskółka pod cudzą strzechą, może go tam i kochała po swojemu, ale była dość często i zwykle nazywała "odmiercem". W ósmym roku chodził już jako potrzódka za bydłem lub, gdy w chałupie nie było co jeść, za bedłkami do boru. Że go tam kiedy wilk nie zjadł, zmiłowanie boże.

Był to chłopak nierozgarnięty bardzo i jak wiejskie dzieciaki przy rozmowie z ludźmi palec do gęby wkładający. Nie obiecywali sobie nawet ludzie, że się wychowa, a jeszcze mniej, żeby matka mogła doczekać się z niego pociechy, bo i do roboty był ladaco. Nie wiadomo skąd się takie uległo, ale na jedną rzecz był tylko łapczywy, to jest na granie. Wszędzie też je słyszał, a jak tylko trochę podrosł, tak już o niczym innym nie myślał. Pójdzie, bywało, do boru za bydłem albo z dwojakami na jagody, to się wróci bez jagód i mówi szeptaniem:

— Matulu! tak ci coś w boru "grzało", Oj! Oj!

A matka na to:

— Zagram ci ja, zagram! nie bój się!

Jakoż czasem sprawiała mu warszochwią muzykę.

Короленко

5. Мать, бедная "коморница"^{1.}, жившая изо дня в день точно ласточка под чужой крышей, мохнат, и любила там малыша как-нибудь по-своему, да и была же часто и звала обыкновенно "подмененышем". Восьми лет ходил малыш за стадом в качестве подпаска или порой, когда дома есть было нечего, в бору собирал грибы. Как уж его там волки не съели, -- божья милость, видно!

10. Очень уж был он нерасторопен и, как обыкновенно деревенские ребята при разговоре о чужими, он пихал в рот указательный палец. Не ожидали люди, чтобы малыш "дошел", и еще менее, чтобы мать дождалась от сынка поддержки, потому что и в работе он ничего не стоил. И в кого только он удался -- неизвестно, на одно лишь был очень падох, именно на игру. Повсюду ему слышались какие-то звуки, и как от земли немного поднялся, повырос, ни о чем более и не думал. Пойдет это в бор за коровой или с "двойками"^{2.} по ягоды соберется, ничего не наберет, 15. с пустыми руками вернется, да и говорит, шепелявя:

-- Матуля, так штой-то в бору "игрляет". Ой, ой!

А мать ему:

-- Сыграю я тебе, погоди!

Да и бывало: игрывала по нем большой кухонной ложкой.

1. Коморник -- имеет в польском языке несколько значений, между прочим -- меховщик, землемер. Здесь это слово значит: нанимательница квартиры в чужом доме.

2. Два горшка, соединенные ушком.

Tasin

5. La madre, pobre asistenta que vivía día por día, como una golondrina bajo tejado ajeno, le quería quizá... a su manera; pero con frecuencia le surraba. A los ocho años, Yanco ayudaba ya a los pastores, y cuando en casa no había ni un mendrugo, íbase al bosque a buscar setas. ¿Cómo fué que no lo devoraron los lobos? Sólo Dios lo sabe.

10. Era un muchacho pusilánime que, según costumbre de todos los rapazuelos campesinos, se chupaba el dedo cuando oía hablar a los demás. Nadie creía que llegase a grande, y aun menos que su madre pudiese hacer de él algo de provecho, porque, en realidad, no servía para nada.

Cómo fué no se sabe; pero por una cosa sentía una irresistible inclinación: por la música. Por todas partes oía música, y, ya mayorcito, sólo en la música pensaba, siempre en la música.

15. Si lo mandaban al bosque con las ovejas o con un cestito para recoger bellotas, volvía a casa con el cesto vacío y exclamaba:

--¡Madre mía, y cómo cantaba todo en el bosque!

¡Uy! ¡Uy!

Y la madre le interrumpía:

--¡Aguarda, aguarda; soy yo quien te va a cantar una cosa! --y le cantaba cierta canción sobre las costillas.

Curtin

His mother, a poor lodger, living from day to day, like a sparrow under a stranger's roof, loved him perhaps in her own way; but she flogged him often enough and called him "giddy-head" generally. In the eighth year of his life he went to herd cattle, or, when there was nothing to eat in the cottage, to the pine woods for mushrooms.

5. It was through the compassion of God that a wolf did not eat him:

He was a very dull little fellow, and, like village children, when spoken to put his finger in his mouth. People did not even promise that he would grow up, and still less that his mother could

10. expect any good from him, for he was a poor hand at work. It is unknown whence such a creature could have come; but he was eager for one thing, music. He listened to it everywhere, and when he had grown up a little he thought of nothing else. He would go to the woods for the cattle, or with a two-handled basket for berries, but

15. would come home without berries and say, stammering, —

"Mamma, something was playing in the woods. Oi! oi!"

And the mother would say, "I'll play for thee, never fear!"

And in fact she made music for him, sometimes with the poker.

Commentary on page 3.

1. If the full meaning of the word "komornica" were to be conveyed in translation, several words would have to be added in each TL. Of its several meanings, the one intended here is "landless peasant, living in rented accommodation." K. transliterates the Polish word and gives a full explanation in a long footnote. C.'s "poor lodger" provides the reader with the essential information. In T.'s version she becomes a cleaning-maid, rather than a tenant, and in three Czech translations the word used is "podruhyně" (farm worker). It is true, of course, that her precise calling is of no great importance, provided that it is suitably humble. So long as the adjective "poor" is not omitted, the reader is supplied with the basic facts.

J. and B. both feel that a single word, like "lodger," is insufficient, and they choose to amplify, in order to clarify the matter. J. has, "his mother, too poor to have a cottage of her own..." B. considers even this insufficient, and explains further: "sa mère, qui n'avait même pas une petite mesure à elle - signe d'une grande pauvreté chez le paysan polonais..." "La mesure" seems too strongly derogatory to be introduced here.

The original present active participle "zyjąca" is turned into a past active participle by K., and a

present gerund by C. T. favours a relative clause with an indicative verb in the imperfect.

The simile is rendered faultlessly by most of the translators, including T. and K. C., however, in the first of his ornithological errors, turns the original swallow into a sparrow. To C.'s urban American readers this may seem an inconsequential detail, as indeed it might be if it were not the key to the image which the author is introducing here. Sienkiewicz does not choose "swallow" at random, and the simile is weakened if another bird is chosen in its place. Polish country people know that swallows return year after year from long migratory flights, to nest on the same buildings. Sparrows, which are non-migratory, are not known to have this habit, being equally at home under any roof. The original image is vivid, but that in C.'s translation has little meaning for this reason.

J. gives a neater and more elegant rendering of this simile than C. J.: "like a swallow under strange eaves." C.: "like a sparrow under a stranger's roof."

2.

It should be noted that the word "strzecha" used here means "thatched roof," not simply "roof" (Polish "dach"). It is impractical, however to insert the adjective in English, although Z. does so, as it detracts emphasis from the key word "strange." None of the translators, except Z., considers the thatch important enough

to mention. In regional usage, Russian "strekha" has the same meaning as its Polish cognate, but K. prefers the standard "krysha." All the Czech translators use "stře-cha," but in Czech the word has lost the meaning "tatch" and is equivalent to Polish "dach."

The original "może," the colloquial contraction of "być może," can be matched by exactly the same contraction in Russian. Standard forms have to be used in English and Spanish.

In preference to the pronoun "him," as used by the author, K. avails himself of another of the numerous Russian words for "lad," this time "malysh." He is able to retain "tam," which has no real meaning here, but which serves as an indicator of the colloquial style. It cannot be expressed in English or Spanish.

Further features of the colloquial style in K.'s translation of this sentence are the insertion of "kak-nibud'" to reinforce "po-svoemu," and the use of "da i... zhe" to translate Polish "ale."

T. and K. omit "dość."

3.

The word "odmieniec" causes some difficulties, as can be seen from the variety of ways in which it is treated. T. does not seek to translate the clause in which it occurs. He omits it, thus losing another detail related to folklore and superstition.

G. evidently did not have good enough reference

works to establish all the meanings of "odmieniec." Its meanings are various, but by elimination and by consideration of the context it becomes clear that its meaning here is "changeling," not "giddy-head."

K. and B. express the meaning correctly by well chosen TL words. The Great Polish-Russian Dictionary gives "naidenysh" and "podkidysh" as archaic or regional equivalents to "odmieniec."¹⁰ It is clear, however, that the former means "foundling" and the latter "abandoned child," neither of which carries the connotations of "odmieniec," which are rooted in ancient superstitions. K.'s "podmehenysh" is superior to both.

C.'s word-order owes its awkwardness to the placing of the adverb "generally." Its natural position is before the verb "called."

The following sentence is rendered accurately by all translators. Janko's age is expressed concisely in Russian by the genitive case with no preposition. C. imitates the original construction, but adds "of his life."

The meaning of the dialect word "potrzódka" is not fully conveyed by C.'s verbal expression, "he went to herd cattle," since the word means not "herdsman," but "boy who helps herdsmen."¹¹ This is made clear by T.'s "ayudaba ya a los pastores." By using this expression T. makes the translation of "za bydlem" unnecessary. K.'s "podpasok" has the exact meaning of the original

word. He lengthens the clause by the addition of "v kachestve."

T. changes the original "or" to "and."

After "ili," K. inserts "poroi."

"W chałupie" is rendered in Russian and Spanish by "at home." C. rejects this method and tries instead to translate "chałupa" exactly, but he is not entirely successful. To the English ear, "cottage" denotes too cosy a dwelling to match the original word, which means "hut," though not necessarily in a pejorative sense.

T.'s translation of "nie było co jeść" lays greater stress on the poverty in which the boy and his mother live. Translated into English, T.'s rendering gives: "there was not even a crust of bread." A literal Spanish translation would have been sufficient.

5.

Several of the translators, T. among them, do not render "bór" exactly, preferring to leave it as "wood," rather than add adjectives to make it specific. C. makes "wood" plural, and adds the qualifier "pine." Since the Russian word is the same as the Polish, K. does not need to add an adjective.

K. makes a structural change here. Instead of the original "he went to the pine-wood for mushrooms," K. writes "he gathered mushrooms in the pine-wood."

The last sentence of this paragraph is idiomatic and it helps to sustain the colloquial tone of the

narrative. C.'s version is literally correct, but it cannot be called colloquial. This is clearly a line of oral narration, and the narrator's speaking tone ought to be conveyed if possible. T. comes closer by posing a direct question: "Como fué que no lo devoraron los lobos?" and supplying the answer: "Sólo Dios lo sabe." K. preserves both the meaning and the narrative tone. C. does not make the wolf of the original plural, as T. and K. do.

7. T.'s rendering of "nierozgarnięty" as "pusil-
ánime" (timorous, faint-hearted) is inaccurate, as the latter cannot refer to the boy's mental capacities, which are described by the original adjective. K.'s "nerastoropen," is very apt, as is B.'s "très peu débrouillard." C.'s "dull" and J.'s "backward" are adequate.

K. inserts the colloquial "uzh," and replaces the noun "chłopak" with a pronoun.

"Jak wiejskie dzieciaki" is rendered by a longer phrase in the Spanish translation: "according to the custom of all village boys." T. succeeds in finding a stylistic equivalent to "dzieciaki" in "rapazuelos." C. and K. render this phrase as exactly as possible. K. adds the adverb "usually." Sienkiewicz uses a present participle in the subordinate clause. All the translators use a verb in the indicative.

8.

Where the author has "in conversation with

people," K. writes "in conversation with strangers."

C.'s version suggests that the boy himself does not speak, but only listens. T.'s version gives the same meaning: "when he heard other talking."

"Gęba," a colloquial or even vulgar word, is not matched in any of the translations, although K. compensates with a colloquial verb "pikhat'." T. changes this to "he sucked his finger," as does J. K. adds an adjective to make clear that Janko put his index finger in his mouth. The original is less specific, and no other translator makes such an addition.

The main verb of the following sentence cannot be translated literally into English as "they promised themselves," although C. comes close to this, using "to promise" without the reflexive pronoun. This is a purely Polish turn of phrase which in English has little to do with promises. All the other translators realize this and avoid the verb "to promise." K. has "ozhidat'," and T. "creer." J. utilizes a passive construction: "it was not thought likely..." which reads better than C.'s "to promise."

9.

"Nawet" is omitted by T. and K.

"Ze się wychowa" is rendered in the obvious way by C., with the verb "to grow up." In Spanish the preceding negative expression requires the subjunctive mood. K. uses the motor verb "dolti" in a manner so idiomatic

that he himself feels the need for quotation marks. This is not justified by the original, in which a standard Polish verb is used.

K. again uses "malysh" in preference to the personal pronoun, although the subject is obvious and not stated in the original. J. makes a slight change here: "that his mother would rear him." B's method is similar. A slight change of emphasis is thus introduced. The question now seems to be not, "Would Janko grow up or not?" but rather, "Would he be brought up by his mother or by somebody else?"

10. "Pociecha," here used idiomatically, is translated accurately by all three translators.

K.'s dislike for the pronoun manifests itself again when he uses "synok" in place of the original pronoun. T.'s translation makes the mother a more active agent in the boy's development than she is in the original: "that his mother could make something worthwhile of him" (T.). In the original, the mother is totally passive at this point, taking no steps to advance her son's education or development.

C. gives a good rendering of "do roboty by ladao." K. employs a verbal expression: "on nichego ne stoil." T.'s version is very close to this, with the difference that he replaces "at work" with "in reality," giving a minor change of meaning.

The word "i," which has emphatic meaning in this phrase, ("he was no good at work either"), is rendered by its cognate in Russian, and omitted by T. and C.

11. C.'s translation of the next sentence is less than satisfactory for two main reasons. His "it is unknown" is an excessively literal rendering of "nie wiadomo," and C. does not appear to notice that his use of the present tense is out of place, as he uses the past tense in the rest of this sentence and in the preceding one. It is possible to use the present here, but only if "nie wiadomo" is translated in a more idiomatic manner, (cf. J.: "Heaven knows where it came from.") T. also uses the present successfully. K. uses the Russian equivalent of the Polish impersonal construction. C. does not fully understand the clause "skąd się takie ulęгло," or what it refers to. It appears that he seeks a subject for the neuter verb, decides that it must be "dziecko," and therefore translates the clause as "whence such a creature could have come." The result is misleading, since the Polish subjectless verb refers not to a person, but a situation. The sentence is not about Janko's origins, but those of his taste for music. K.'s "whom he took after," also used by Z., is correct. T.'s simplified version gives the general meaning clearly: "how it came about is not known." B.'s version is totally erroneous: "On se demandait

même comment un être pareil avait bien pu survivre."

"Tylko" is omitted by C. and T. The adjective "łapczywy" (greedy, avid) is rendered by C. as "eager." J.'s "yearned after" is perhaps better than the attempt to render the Polish adjective by an English adjective. T. departs further from the original structure: "he was irresistibly attracted by one thing." K. uses "padkii," reinforced by "ochen'." He then introduces "imenno" to match the original "to jest." "Granie" (playing) can be rendered as "music" in English and Spanish.

"Też," which has little meaning in this position, is omitted by K., T., and C. C. changes the original verb "słyszeć" to "słuchać," to give "he listened to it everywhere." This may possibly be the result of design rather than accident, but little purpose is served by the change. K. and T. use TL words meaning "to hear."

T. repeats the noun "música" rather than use the pronoun, as Sienkiewicz and C. do. K., who used "igra" in the previous sentence, now changes this to "kakie-to zvuki." The change from the original is justified by the context, since the author is saying that to Janko all sounds are music.

K. uses a reflexive verb with the dative case, "i smyshlits''," rather than follow the original construction.

by K. "Kak povyros" is sufficient by itself to render the meaning, but K. uses this in conjunction with a longer expression with exactly the same meaning: "kak ot zemli nemnogo podnialsia." T. renders the clause by a short phrase in apposition, the colloquial diminutive of the comparative adjective: "ya mayorcito." Many of the translators, including G., K., and T., reduce "jak tylko" to "when."

13. For the author's "o niczym innym nie myślał," T. writes "he thought only about music," and reinforces this by adding "always about music." K. adds an emphatic "i." All three translators omit the adverb "już."

Sienkiewicz uses the perfective future verb, with the impersonal "bywało" in apothesis, meaning "he used to go," or "when he went." This is an asyndetic construction more typical of the folk-tale than of literary prose, in which the subordinating conjunction "when" would normally be used. K. follows the original very closely, with the Russian cognate verb in the same form, but without Russian "bywało." No such colloquial effect can be produced in English or Spanish. T. translates this sentence by a conditional construction, restoring the subordinating conjunction, and G. simply links the two clauses with the conjunction "but." Instead of the verb "to go," T. uses the passive verb

"to be sent."

"Bór" occurs here for the second time, and the non-Slavonic translators do not apply qualifying adjectives to the TL words meaning "wood."

B. makes an interesting addition, showing that he has thought carefully about the context and the meaning of the words, but remains puzzled by certain aspects of the content. Thinking, presumably, that one does not send cattle to graze in woods, he makes it clear that Janko makes separate expeditions: into the fields with the cattle, and into the woods for berries: "Quelquefois il s'en allait dans les champs avec les bêtes ou dans les bois pour cueillir les baies..." Fields are not mentioned in the original, which gives us to understand that both berries and cattle were in the wood.

14.

"Bydlp" is a collective noun, and K.'s rendering of it as "korova" (one cow) is therefore incorrect, less incorrect however than T.'s "sheep." The word is occasionally applied to other ungulates, meaning, for example "cattle and sheep together," but it can never mean "sheep" alone. G. and N. make the same mistake as T. A source of real difficulty is the meaning of the preposition "za" with the instrumental case. K., who can use the same construction in Russian, is not forced to be more explicit than the original, as the other

translators are. C. has "for the cattle" (i. e. to fetch them), whereas T. has "with," and J. "behind." It is not possible to say whether the boy went with the cattle, or to fetch them, or to look for animals which had strayed into the wood from the meadows, since all three English versions are linguistically possible. However, only the third meaning is logically possible, since cattle do not graze in pine-woods. T.'s "with the sheep" makes it seem as if Janko took the animals there to graze, as a matter of course, which is improbable. This explains K.'s change of "bydio" to "korova" (one cow at a time). This is a simpler solution than B.'s attempt to rationalize by introducing "fields."

"Dwojaki" poses another minor problem. T., who considers perhaps that the kind of receptacle is of little importance, has "cestito" (small basket). C. attempts to render this exactly, but is wrong in making this "a two-handled basket." The word means "a basket," not "a pot," more precisely two pots, hung one above the other on the same handle. The pot is double, not the handle. K. retains the original word in quotation marks, and explains it, incorrectly, in a footnote: "dva gorska, soedinennye ushkom." Ž. and Rum. make the same mistake. This error is far less serious, however, than that made by several other translators.

J. blunders by choosing the wrong one of several equivalents offered by the dictionary: "he would go... with

the twins." The translator does not appear to be deterred by the fact that no twins have been mentioned in the story so far. This does disturb other translators, who nevertheless assume that the reference is to human beings. Even a translator of Polish extraction makes this mistake: "with the cattle or with people." P. has "mit Kameraden"; OE, "with a playfellow"; N., "with the other boys."

T. and K. add verbs before "berries." T. has "recooger" (to gather), and K. "soberetsia po." Strictly speaking, K.'s "nichego ne naberet" is superfluous, as he expresses exactly the same meaning in the following clause, "s pustymi rukami vernetsia."

C.'s literal rendering of "bez jagód" as "without berries" is of course perfectly correct, but the more natural English version is "without any berries" or "with no berries," or, as in J.'s translation, "empty-handed." K.'s version is also "empty-handed," although he could quite well have followed the original with "bez jagod."

15.

"Mówi szepłeniąc" becomes "exclamaba" in Spanish, with no adverb or gerund. The following exclamation justifies the change to some extent. The verb "szepłenić," or more commonly "szepłenić" means "to lisp." C.'s "stammering" and B.'s "an balbutiant" are therefore not quite correct. K.'s version is exact.

The use of tenses in this sentence is colloquial, and hence difficult to equal in a non-Slavonic translation. Though English has a historic present, it generally belongs to a lower colloquial level than its Polish counterpart. It would be incongruous for C. to adopt it here. The original has two verbs in the perfective future, and one in the present. K. preserves this tense usage in Russian, adding two more perfective future verbs. T.'s three verbs are all in the imperfect, as are C.'s.

16.

The affectionate diminutive "matula" is simply transliterated by K. The Russian reader may or may not recognize this as a polonism. T. uses standard Spanish "madre," but with the possessive pronoun to give it more exclamatory force. C. has "Mamma."

There is nothing in C.'s translation of this line to suggest either the boy's excitement, or his speech defect. The result is a bald statement in standard English. J. uses almost the same wording, but effectively transmits the lisp which has been mentioned in the narrative: "thomething wath playing." This is perhaps the only way to achieve a comparable effect in English to the original "grlalo." T. does not convey the speech defect, having omitted the reference to it in the previous line. He does, however, retain the exclamatory force by rendering "tak" as "y cómo." He uses

the verb "to sing," rather than "to play," followed by "everything," rather than "something." The latter change adds to the exclamatory force.

K. reproduces the word-order and almost the exact wording of the original. The distortion of "grało" is matched by the same distortion of Russian "igralo." However, K. finds this defect insufficient and adds another of his own: "shto!-to." All the translators are obliged to omit the dative pronoun "ci."

The difficulty of translating interjections here presents itself once more. C. can think of no better solution than to reproduce the sound exactly: "O! oi!" What the English reader will make of this is open to question, since the flat rendering of the previous sentence, without so much as an exclamation mark, provides no clue. C. gives no hint as to whether fear, pleasure, anxiety, or mere curiosity is expressed here. Indeed there is almost no emotion of any kind in the translated line. J. at least anglicizes the exclamation: "Oh, oh!" T.'s version, "Uy! Uy!", is perhaps as vague as C.'s, but as his preceding sentence is more forceful, this is less important. K. can freely use exactly the same exclamatory words as Sienkiewicz uses in the original. G. and N. take the exclamation to be Janko's attempt to imitate the music he has heard in the wood, and render it as "la-la-la."

17. K. renders this verbless phrase by a dative without a verb, rather than the original "na" with the accusative. In English and Spanish a verb is essential, though why T. chooses "interrumpía" is not clear.

18. C.'s rendering of the mother's reply is the most literal possible. The use of the English second person singular "thee" gives it a slightly archaic flavour, not suggested by the original. Such wit as there is in this reply depends partly on the mother's repetition of the dative pronoun "ci," which Janko uses in his statement: literally, "something was playing for you." The reply is, "Now I'll play something for you." As the "ci" of the first sentence cannot be preserved in translation, the point is partly lost, not only in C.'s version.

K.'s version of this line is very close to the original, but "¡ogodi" is preferred to "Never fear." T. does the same, using the imperative "Aguarda." His translation of this line is considerably longer than the original, but it reads very naturally, and the meaning is expressed more idiomatically than in C.'s version.

19. T. sustains the play on "cantar" in this line and the next. "Le cantaba cierta canción" is a neat rendering of the word play of the original. C.'s translation of this line is not inspired. "In fact" sounds out of place here, and in any case the original does not

9

require it. "Poker" is incorrect, since "warzach~~ew~~" means "ladle," as it is rendered by the other translators, except T. who omits it. This omission, and that of "czasem," in favour of "sobre las costillas" (on his back) seems to indicate that T. is less concerned with exact verbal correspondence to the original, than with producing a Spanish version which will read well.

The dative third person pronoun "mu," rendered by C. as "for him," is better translated "on him," as is done by J. and K. ("po" with the prepositional). K. renders "czasem" by "da i byvalo," followed by a frequentative verb uncommon in standard Russian.

Summary of page 3.

The description of Janko's boyhood continues. His developing passion for music is stressed, and the punishment he suffers for it is described. His mother's attitude to him and her contempt for his eccentric tastes are clearly shown in two short lines.

Minor errors in the translations are now more numerous. "Warzachew," "bydło," and "jaskółka," all simple nouns with one-word equivalents, are mistranslated. "Dwojaki" creates difficulties for all, as does "odmieniec," which is successfully translated only by K.

The tendencies noted already in the translations are becoming more pronounced: C. continues to be very literal, even to the point of leaving the decidedly Slavonic exclamation "oi! oi!" unchanged except for a spelling adjustment. K.'s additions are more numerous at this stage than those of T.

P4

original

Chłopak krzyczał, obiecywał, że już nie będzie, a taki myślał, że tam coś w boru grało... Co? Albo on wiedział?... Sosny, buki, brzezina, wilgi, wszystko grało: cały bór, i basta!

5. Echo też... W polu grała mu bylica, w sadku pod chałupą ćwierkotały wróble, aż się wiśnie trzęsły! Wieczorami słuchiwał wszystkich głosów, jakie są na wsi, i pewno myślał sobie, że cała wieś gra. Jak posłali go do roboty, żeby gnój rozrzucał, to mu nawet wiatr grał w widłach.

10. Zobaczył go tak raz karbowy stojącego z rozrzuconą czubryną i słuchającego wiatru w drewnianych widłach... zobaczył i odpasawszy rzemyka, dał mu dobrą pamiątkę. Ale na co się to zdało! Nazywali go ludzie "Janko Muzykant"!... Wiosną uciekał z domu kręcić fujarki wedle strugi. Nocami, gdy żaby zaczynały rzechotać, derkacze na łąkach derkotać, baki po rosie burczyć; gdy koguty piły po sa-
15. płociach, to on spać nie mógł, tylko słuchał i Bóg go jeden wie, jakie on i w tym nawet słyszał granie...

Короленко

5. Малыш визжал, обещал: "Не буду, не буду!", а сам все думал: "Играло штой-то в бору, играло!" Вечерами он жадно ловил разноголосицу неугомонившейся еще к ночи деревни, и уж, верно, ему чудилось, что вся деревня звучит каким-то концертом. Даже на работе, раскидывая в поле навоз, он слушал с интересом, как ветер играл между зубьями вил.

10. Увидел этак однажды "карбовый"¹, как он стоял недвижно, с вставшими по ветру волосами, жадно слушая музыку ветра и вил, -- увидел, снял это с себя крепкий ремень да и вывел мальчика из приятного ~~созерцания~~ знатной вострепки. Да куда уж тут! Так его люди и прозвали: "Музыкант Янко!"... Весной он бегал из дому к ручью делать свирели из ивовой коры, а по вечерам, когда лягушки в прудах затягивали свой тысячеголосый торжественный хор, когда в траве отзвывался дергач, большие жуки гудели, обивая блестящие росинки, и петухи, рассевшись на изгородях, выкрикивали в разных местах по деревне, --

15. "Музыкант Янко" не мог сомкнуть глаз, и уж бог один знает, какую только музыку мог он слышать и в этой нескладнице...

1. Надсмотрщик.

Tasín

Chillaba el infeliz; prometía no hablar más de música; pero ni por un momento dejaba de pensar en los sonidos y armonías que en el bosque oía.

Pero ¿qué es lo que oía?... ¿Lo sabía él acaso?... ¡Los pinos, los abetos, los brezos, las encinas, los pájaros; todo, todo cantaba en el bosque; el bosque entero cantaba!... ¡Hasta el eco!... En los prados cada hierba

5. cantaba también, y en el huerto los gorriones piaban tan recio, que al oírles temblaban las cerezas. Al anochecer poníase a escuchar las voces que llegaban del villorrio y le parecía como si todo el villorrio cantara... Cuando lo mandaban a extender estiércol, oía cantar el viento al pasar por entre los dientes del bieldo... Una vez que
10. estaba así, con el pelo revuelto, escuchando embelesado los mugidos del viento, quitóse el capataz el cinturón y le dió con él unos azotes, como recuerdo. Pero todo, todo fué en vano.

La gente le llamaba Yance el Músico.

En primavera se escapaba de casa para irse al borde del arroyo melódico, y de noche, cuando croaban las ranas en los charcos y cantaban los gallos, de pie sobre
15. los setos vivos, él no podía dormir, con el oído siempre en acecho. Dios sabe qué armonías descubría en todas aquellas voces.

E4

Curtin

The boy screamed and promised that he would not do it again, and still he was thinking, "Something is playing out there in the woods." What was it, — did he know? Pines, beeches, golden orioles, all were playing, — the whole forest was playing, and that was the end of it!

5. The echo, too! In the field the artemisia played for him; in the garden near, the sparrows twittered till the cherry-trees were trembling. In the evening he heard all the voices that were in the village, and thought to himself that surely the whole village was playing. When they sent him to work to spread manure, even then the wind played on the fork-tines.

10. The overseer caught him once standing with dishevelled forelock and listening to the wind on the wooden tips; he looked at the little fellow, unbuckled his own leather belt, and gave him a good keepsake. But what use in that? People called the boy "Yanko the musician." In the springtime he ran away from the house to make whistles near the river. In the night, when the frogs were croaking, the land-rail calling in the meadows, the bittern screaming in the dale, the cocks crowing behind the wicker fences, he could not sleep, — he did nothing but listen; and God alone knows what he heard in that playing.

15.

Commentary on page 4.

1. K. prefers "vizzhal" to the cognate "kriohal," and T. uses "chillaba" rather than "gritaba," since the sense is "screamed" rather than "shouted." C. also has "screamed."

The elliptical "ze już nie będzie" needs some expansion in translation. C. adds the necessary verb: "promised that he would not do it again." T. is more precise: "he promised not to talk about music any more." K. substitutes direct speech for indirect, and this allows him to follow the original very closely.

Polish "a" should be rendered not as "and" (C.), but as "but," since it is plainly a contrastive conjunction here. C.'s choice of tenses, "was thinking," is not the best. He would have done better to use either "he thought," or the tense he was using earlier in his narrative, "he would think." It is not possible to use the continuous past when the emphasis is clearly not on continuity but on repetition.

2. T. expands this sentence and adds emphasis by inserting "not for a moment [did he cease thinking about the sounds and harmonies he could hear in the wood]." This version says more about the nature of the sounds than the original does. A literal Spanish translation is possible, and it would be adequate: "pero todavía

pensaba que algo cantaba en el bosque."

C. and K. use direct speech instead of indirect in the last clause. Both adhere more closely to the original than T. Other translators, notably OE and N., give a freer interpretation of this line than T.'s. OE: "but he thought all the more of how beautiful the forest was, and how full of voices that sang and rang." Sienkiewicz says nothing about the beauty of the forest, and to speak of singing, ringing voices is to attribute to the author more lyrical feelings than he wishes to profess at this particular point.

K. now omits four lines, presumably unwittingly, and resumes his translation only on line 5 with "wie-
-czorami," linking two paragraphs of the original.

C. and T. render both of the original questions as questions. "Albo" has to be omitted in both versions. T. lengthens the questions, adding "but" before the first, and "perhaps" in the second. B.'s translation, in which the second question is turned into a statement, is closer to the original than T.'s, and reads better than the persistent use of the interrogative in C.'s: "Quoi? Il ne savait pas."

The short list of trees and one bird should not present any difficulties, since all these words can be found in any good dictionary, yet only R., P., J., and the Czech translators have them all right. K. is usually

- accurate in matters of this kind, but this is one of the lines he omits. The four words mean "the pines, the beeches, the birch-grove, the (golden) orioles." C. renders three of them correctly, but he overlooks "brzezina" and omits it. T. adds "encinas" (holm-oaks) to the list, renders "brzezina" incorrectly as "heather," and reduces "wilgi" to "birds" without indicating the species.

3. T. doubles "wszystko" and adds "in the wood." He still uses "to sing" instead of "to play." T. and C. repeat the verb after "cały bór," which has no verb in the original. T. omits "basta," although it is of Spanish or Italian origin. C. translates the expression accurately: "that was the end of it!"

4. "Echo też" is translated in the most obvious way by C. T. has "even the echo!" "Field" becomes plural in the Spanish translation, as in B.'s French version. The dative "mu" is given as "for him" by C. and omitted by T.

C. uses the Latin name "artemisia" for "bylica," instead of the English name "mugwort," used by J. T. reduces this to "every blade of grass," and in the same way OE has "blades of grass," preferring to use general words known to everybody, rather than precise botanical names known to relatively few.

T. inserts "also," with "and" after the comma, where C. uses a semi-colon to break the original sentence.

C. renders "sadek" as "garden," which is acceptable, though "sad" is usually limited in meaning to "orchard." Neither T. nor C. express the diminutive, as B. does by inserting "petit."

5. "Pod chalupą" is omitted by T., and translated by C. as simply "near," with no noun. The remaining part of this sentence is translated literally into English. The only slight difficulty is caused by the ambiguity of "wiśnia," which can mean either the tree or the fruit. In fact it matters little which is chosen. Most translators, except T., choose to make this the trees.

T.'s phrasing of this sentence increases the hyperbole of the original by making the cherries animate: literally, "on hearing them, the cherries trembled." Sienkiewicz himself makes inanimates come alive later in the story, but T.'s change is nevertheless an otsebiatina at this point, since a near-literal translation is possible. The adverb "recio," applied to the chirping of the sparrows, is also unnecessary.

In a curious error OE overlooks the link, "aż," between the two clauses, and simply places one clause after the other with no subordinating conjunction: "the sparrows twittered, the cherry-trees rustled and trilled." The final verb is totally inappropriate, since it can only be applied to bird-song, never to trees. Moreover the reader assumes that it is the wind which rustles the

trees, since the connection with the sparrows has now been lost.

B. also modifies this sentence considerably. Some translators appear to hold to the view that if any part of the original cannot be literally true it must be changed into something more credible. Such a policy, carried to its logical conclusion, would eliminate all hyperbole, as well as many metaphors. In B.'s translation the trees serve only as perches for the sparrows, and do not tremble: "pépaient pour lui à tue-tête les moineaux juchés dans les branches des cerisiers."

Once again, C.'s choice of English tense could be improved upon. The form required here is "trembled," not "were trembling."

K.'s translation now resumes after the omission of four lines. He translates "wieczorami" by its exact Russian equivalent, also in the instrumental case. After this he elaborates somewhat on the main clause. The original is very simply worded: "he used to listen to all the voices of the village." K.'s version is more verbose. The author has no adverb, where K. inserts "zhadno." "Lovit' raznogolositsu" is an apt choice of words, but the following participial phrase qualifying "village" is of K.'s own making: "neugomonivsheisia eshche k nochi." This apart, the genitive case gives a neater rendering of this phrase than the original.

subordinate clause.

The Polish frequentative verb "słuchiwał" cannot be conveniently rendered in translation. C. follows the original, using a subordinate clause: "that were in the village," instead of the genitive "of the village."

For the second time in the space of one page C. confuses the verbs "słuchać" and "słyszeć," confirming the suspicion that he is not sure which is which.

"Na wsi" more commonly has the meaning "in the country" than "in the village," and OE, N., and P. give it this meaning. The other translators take this to refer to Janko's village. This choice is perhaps motivated by "cała wieś" in the same line, which seems more likely to mean "the whole village" than "all the surrounding countryside."

T. inserts an auxiliary verb before "to listen," and omits the word "wszystkie." He uses the verb "to arrive" instead of "to be": "las voces que llegaban del villorrio."

The word "pewno" is the object of some misinterpretation. C. does not understand its meaning, but still contrives to fit the word in as best he can: "[he] thought to himself that surely the whole village was playing." The meaning is changed by placing it after "that," instead of before "thought," where it belongs. Had the author intended the meaning given it by C., he

would have written, "myślał sobie, że na pewno cała wieś gra." J. makes the same mistake: "he was sure in his heart that the whole village was playing." B. is also unfamiliar with this typical use of "pewno," thinking that the idea of certainty must apply to Janko's thoughts: "il fut persuadé que c'était pour lui seul que le village palpait et bruissait." "Pour lui seul" is an unjustifiable addition.

The actual meaning of "pewno" in this position is, "he very likely/no doubt thought that the whole village was playing." K.'s "verno" in apothesis is correct. The other two Russian translators use "veroiatno." All three Czech translations are correct, having two different words with the meaning of Russian "naverno" in the correct position. T. omits "pewno."

Instead of "pensaba," T. uses the dative construction "le parecia." K. does the same with "emu chudilos'." K. then amplifies Sienkiewicz's monosyllabic verb "gra" to eight syllables: "zvuchit kakim-to kontsertom."

7.

The last sentence of this paragraph undergoes only minor changes in T.'s, C.'s and K.'s translations. K. changes the first clause by omitting the verb "posłali" and moving to the beginning of the sentence. This is followed by a gerund, in place of the purpose clause of the original. T. omits "do roboty," since the context

makes it unnecessary. OE has a lexical error here which is repeated by N.: Janko is sent to "toss out hay," and not to spread manure, as in the original. In Z.'s version, Janko is sent out "to make the soil rich."

C. moves "even" to stress "then," whereas properly speaking it should emphasize "the wind." The original can have no other meaning than "even the wind played for him." The total effect of C.'s error on the English text is of very little importance, but it is curious that the translator should do this when the English would read better with "even" in its proper place, and better still without "then." Rigid adherence to the Polish "jak..., to..." construction is not necessary in such a short, simple sentence. T. omits "even."

In K.'s sentence there is no place for "even," since the construction is entirely different, with Janko as the subject of the main clause. K. adds "s interesom." K., T., and C. all omit "for him." Like K., T. makes Janko, not the wind, the subject of the sentence, with the verb "to hear." He lengthens the sentence by inserting a verb in the infinitive: "oía cantar el viento al pasar por entre los dientes." Most of the translators, including C., T., and K. mention the teeth or prongs of the fork, although the author does not do so. "Tines" is one of C.'s happier choices, a far more musical word than the more prosaic "prongs."

8.

OE inserts a gratuitous sentence before "Jak posłali..." The addition is faithfully repeated by N.: "His companions could only wonder at him; they heard none of these beautiful things."

9. All the translators except T. begin a new paragraph here. C. translates the first verb as "he caught" instead of "he saw." The choice is appropriate in this context. K. transcribes the Polish word "karbowy" and explains in a footnote that it means "nadsmotrshchik." Since this is an adequate translation of the word, the reader may wonder why he did not use it in the text and thus dispense with the footnote.

C. observes the structure of the original sentence as closely as possible, using two participles, "standing" and "listening," just as the author does. K. avoids the first participle by "uvidel... kak on stoial nedvizhno," and renders the second by the gerund "slushaia." The adverb "nedvizhno" is an addition.

The structure of T.'s sentence is quite different. Because of the paucity of verbs for "to stand" and "to sit" in the Romance languages, T. is forced to use the verb "to be." The second participle, however, is retained as such, "escuchando." C. omits "tak," which is well translated by J.: "the overseer caught him at it." C. repeats his earlier error in the translation of "czupryna": "with dishevelled forelock." J.'s "with his

hair all tousled" is better, if the spelling is unorthodox. K.'s and T.'s translations of this phrase are accurate, though "po vetru" is a minor addition in the Russian version.

10.

K. adds an adverb, "zhadno," accompanying the gerund "alushaia." T. also adds an adverb: "escuchando embelesado," (enchanted). Both these translators expand on the sound to which Janko listens. Sienkiewicz says simply "the wind," not "the music of the wind," as K. does, nor "los mugidos del viento," as in the Spanish translation.

K. now omits the adjective "wooden," qualifying "fork," and T. omits mention of the fork. T.'s version appears to be erroneous here, as Janko is not listening to the "roar" of the wind in general, but to the musical notes produced by the wind on the tines of his fork. The sound referred to by T. in this sentence has little in common with the singing of the wind in the fork, referred to in his previous sentence, although the original describes the same sound in both places.

Sienkiewicz's repetition of the first verb in the sentence is reproduced by K. T. omits it on its second occurrence, where C. renders it by a different verb: "he looked at." There seems to be no reason why C. should not repeat "he caught," which he used the first time.

"Zobaczyć" does not mean "to look at."

The past gerund "odpasawszy" is translated as an indicative by K., T., and C. Here OE makes two mistakes, one of meaning and one of aspect: "The overseer... would seize a strap and give the dreamer a few cuts..." The verb "odpasać" means "to take off" (a belt - "pas"), not "to seize." The three perfective verbs in this sentence, and the adverb "raz," leave no doubt that the beating occurred only once. This translation makes it appear a regular event.

The use of the verb "odpasać" makes it reasonably certain that "rzemyk" has the meaning "belt," although the dictionary may give the alternative "strap." C., T., and K. make clear that the former is meant here. K. adds the adjective "krepkii."

11. The addition of "own" in C.'s version, ("his own leather belt"), seems superfluous, since the reader is unlikely to think that this refers to anybody else's belt.

The last clause of the sentence undergoes a variety of transformations. C.'s translation of "dobra pamiątka" is the most literal, and one of the most accurate. T. preserves the idea of a "keepsake" by adding "como recuerdo." K. loses this by using the colloquial "znatnaia vstrepka." He does, however, preserve the original's mildly joocular tone with the expression he uses in its stead, even if the original says nothing

about "pleasant contemplation." J.'s "gave him what for as a reminder" has a loose, slangy ring, ill suited to the original.

The exclamation which follows, actually more of a question, is translated almost literally by C. His verbless question "But what use in that?" has a slightly curious effect and does not sound like colloquial English. Other translators, including T., use a statement, or an exclamation in the affirmative. T.'s "But all, all was in vain," is accurate. J.'s version is more colloquial than C.'s and sounds less like a translation: "But it did no good!" K.'s rendering is by far the most colloquial.

12. There are no difficulties for the translators in the short sentence where the boy's name is used in the diminutive for the first time. This is the line which gives the story its title. It is strange, however, that J. should call him "Johnnie the Musician," while using "Janko" in the title. T. and B. make a separate paragraph of this sentence, considering that its importance in the story merits this. K. uses the verb "to nickname" instead of "to name," and he changes the aspect to perfective. The aspect change is logical in the circumstances, with the use of the different verb. B. does not change the verb, but still prefers the preterite to the imperfective. T. uses the imperfect. K. reverses

the name and the sobriquet: "Muzykant Ianko." This appears to serve little purpose. K.'s word-order and the use of "tak... i..." do however make clearer the reason for the boy's being so named, as they strengthen the connection with the preceding account of his usual behaviour.

T. omits all reference to "fujarki." C. translates this as "whistles," which is adequate, since the usual dictionary equivalent is "reed pipes." K.'s "svireli" is exact, but he qualifies this further by saying that they were made from willow bark, not reeds. We must presume that K. had sources of information other than the dictionary when he made his translation. B. also mentions willow branches. P. Ostafin leaves "fujarki" unchanged in his English version.¹²

After omitting "fujarki," T. tries to compensate, mistakenly, by supplying a musical adjective to qualify "stream": "melodioso." He adds the word "bank," as does B.

13. C.'s use of "river" is not quite correct, since "struga" is of necessity a smaller water-course than "rzeka." Most translators use words meaning "stream." J.'s "brook" is preferable to C.'s "river."

K. and C. reduce "kręció" to "to make."

One may question C.'s use of the preposition "near" for the original "u niedle strugi." It seems clear

that the preposition required is "by" or "beside."

J. has "down by," which is more accurate.

C.'s choice of tense ("ran away") is by no means incorrect, but since his sentence contains no indicators to show that the action is habitual, the reader might take this to mean one single action. J.'s "would run away" eliminates this possibility. T. and K. can only use the imperfect tense and the imperfective aspect, respectively. Both T. and K. run this sentence into the next, whereas C. follows the sentence division of the original.

K. uses "evenings" rather than "nights."

C. and T. omit the auxiliary verb "zaczynać," which governs three infinitives in the original. Both use the imperfect tense of these verbs.

At this point K. starts to indulge his taste for lyrical description. The frogs do not simply croak, as they do in the original: instead they "raise their thousand-voiced triumphant chorus." He also adds that they are "in pools," which Sienkiewicz regarded as unnecessary. T. makes the same addition, but is otherwise more restrained, so restrained, in fact, that the author's next two references to natural history are omitted in toto. OL's omissions are identical.

"Derkacz" (Grex grex) is translated correctly by K. and C. PSS has the only serious mistranslation of

this phrase: "diatel [nachina] dolbit'." There is no similarity between cormorakes and woodpeckers, and the latter do not frequent meadows ("łaki").

14. K. changes "na łakach" to "in the grass," and has to repeat "kogda," after his long insertion concerning the frogs.

The verb "derkotać" loses its onomatopoeia in C.'s and K.'s versions.

"Baki" is mistranslated by a large number of translators. The difficulty lies in the fact that the word has some ten meanings,¹³ of which three might at first sight appear possible here: (1) gad-fly, (2) coll. bumble-bee, (3) bittern. B., Ž., M., P., and all the English translators except Z. choose the last meaning in this context (Botaurus stellaris). C.'s "the bittern screaming in the dew" rings false to anyone with a rudimentary knowledge of ornithology, whether or not he knows the Polish original. By no stretch of the imagination can the cry of the bittern be described as a scream. In fact, the only verb used to denote the call of this bird is "to boom," (cf. J. and OE). An Italian translator creates a positively surrealistic effect by using the wrong verb: "the bitterns whispered under the dew," (G.).

However it is not only the verb which is suspect in C.'s translation. The reader is bound to ask what

the writer means by placing the bittern "in the dew," thus suggesting the grass of a meadow, when the bittern's exclusive habitat is dense reed-beds where dew is scarcely a factor. C., ignorant of these matters, is not disturbed by such details. J. and OE evidently are. Both use the correct English verb, "to boom." J. omits "dew," and OE changes it to "marsh": "the bitterns boomed in the marsh." Having decided that the noun means "bittern," she then changes the rest of the clause in order to have the bird make its customary sound in its natural habitat. Her version does at least read well in English, although incorrect. It produces a certain aural effect and does not arouse the reader's suspicions as C.'s version does.

In fact, all these translators are wrong in assuming that "bak" is a bird. Only the context, particularly the verb, can tell us that it is not. Since the verb means "to hum/drone/rumble," it immediately excludes bitterns and points to the most common colloquial meaning of "bak" - "bumble-bee." The author is referring to the sluggish drone of large bees when moisture in the atmosphere and the grass slows their movements. "Horsefly," used by Z., is a possible meaning of the word, but again it is the verb which makes this less likely than "bee." All the Russian translators, including K., do at least have an insect here, but "beetle" does not figure

among the meanings of "bák." Only one translator, Rum., renders this line correctly, with Czech "žmelák."

K. continues with the gerundive phrase "obivaia blestiashchie rosinki," an expansion of "po rosie." K. adds his own adjective and changes "dew" to "dewdrops," showing a tendency to be more poetic than the original.

C., T., and K. do not repeat "when" before "cocks" as the author does. T.'s translation now resumes as the text returns to more familiar ground.

"Po zapłociach" appears with some variations, partly because the preposition "po" can have many meanings, but also because of the meaning of "zapłocie," which is not "a fence" but, as its composition implies, "the area behind, or enclosed by, a fence." The original does not say, as T. and K. do, that the cockerels were perched on the fences. C. and OE use the preposition "behind," and J. has "outside." Perhaps the best translation would be simply "in the farmyards," since this is all that is meant in the original. M. conveys this precisely.

T.'s "de pie sobre los setos vivos" departs from the original in three ways: "standing" is unnecessary; the birds are not on top of the hedges, and "setos vivos" is over-specific in relation to the original word. K.'s version is unnecessarily long, but he conveys the meaning of the Polish preposition "po" by adding "v rasnykh"

mestakh po derevne." The Russian clause has ten words for the original's four.

15. The main clause can be rendered literally. Only K. departs slightly from the literal with "close his eyes" instead of sleep.

K. does not feel it necessary to include "tylko słuchał," as it is clear from the last clause of the sentence that Janko is listening. T. translates this not as a verbal expression, but as an adverbial phrase: "con el oído siempre en acecho." C.'s translation of "tylko" as "nothing but" is apt.

The accusative personal pronoun "go" cannot be translated here.

K. inserts the colloquial "uzh": "Uzh bog odin znaet." T. omits "jeden."

16. Minor errors arise in the translation of the last phrase of this sentence, although the meaning is clear: "what playing he heard even in this [the crowing of the cocks]." C. does not quite catch the meaning of the original, rendering it as if it read "co on słyszał w tym granic." In C.'s version the narrator does not dispute that Janko heard music, but wonders what he heard in it. In the original the narrator wonders what music the boy could possibly hear in the sounds he has described.

"W tym" is best expanded to make clear that it refers back to the sounds previously listed. T. does

this: "in all these voices," K. does the same with "neskladitsa," which is perhaps a little too strongly pejorative. Since "nawet" is difficult to place in the translation, and adds little to the meaning, it can safely be omitted. All three translators leave it out, but K. retains the original "i," which also means "even" in this context.

K. inserts an auxiliary verb: "on mog slyshat'." "Granie" is translated by T. as "armonías," as it is by OE in English, and B. in French: "harmonies infinies."

Summary of page 4.

The description of Janko's boyhood and his pastimes continues, with the emphasis heavily on his love for music.

T.'s paragraph division now departs radically from the author's. C. and K. follow the original more closely.

K. makes one serious omission, of four lines.

At least an elementary knowledge of natural history is required if any of the detail on this page is to be rendered fully. The translator who lacks this knowledge is forced to circumvent the difficulties by omitting specific words, as T. does, or to risk making serious errors, as C. does.

The phonetic effects in lines 13 and 14 are weakened in all three translations. K. tends to expatiate and make up for Sienkiewicz's short phrases, containing rich assonances and alliteration, by sheer weight of words.

Elsewhere on this page K. displays his penchant for additional adverbs and adverbial phrases. T. also makes a number of additions.

original

Do kościoła matka nie mogła go brać, bo jak, bywało, zahuczą organy lub zaśpiewają słodkim głosem, to dziecku oczy tak mgłą zachodzą, jakby już nie z tego świata patrzyły...

- Stójka, co chodził nocą po wsi i aby nie zasnąć liczył
5. gwiazdy na niebie lub rozmawiał po cichu z psami, widział nieraz białą koszulę Janka, przemykającą się w ciemności ku karczmie. Ale przecież chłopak nie do karczmy, chodził, tylko pod karczmę. Tam, przycałwszy się pod murem, słuchał. Ludzie tańcowali obertasa, czasem jaki parobek pokrzykiwał: "U-ha!" Słychać było tupanie butów, to znów głosy dziewczyn: "Czegóż?" Skrzypki śpiewały cicho: "Będziem jedli, będziem pili, będziwa się weselili", a bassetla grubym głosem wtórowała z powagą: "Jak Bóg dał! jak Bóg dał!" Okna jarzyły się światłem, a każda bejka w karczmie zdawała się drgać, śpiewać i grać także, a Janko słuchał...
- 10.
15. Co by on za to dał, gdyby mógł mieć takie skrzypki grające cienko: "Będziem jedli, będziem pili, będziwa się weselili." Takie deszczuki śpiewające. Ra! ale skąd ich dostać? Gdzie takie robią?

R5

Короленко

В костел мать его и водить перестала, а то, бывало, как загудит орган или запоют на хорах сладким голосом божественную песню, у ребенка глаза застилает туманом, и глядит он кругом таково странно, точно вот с того света.

5. Сторож, ходивший по деревне ночным дозором и, чтобы отогнать сон, считавший на небе звезды или тихо беседовавший с собаками, много раз замечал белую рубашонку Музыканта, который тихо подкрадывался по направлению к корчме. Однако мальчик не входил, конечно, в корчму, -- он подползал только к стенке и там, прикорнув и затаив дыхание, слушал. Внутри гремел веселый "обертас"¹, порой парубок выкрикивал "У-га!", и раздавалось притопывание каблучков,
10. то опять звонкие девичьи голоски выносились: "Что же!" Скрипки напевали тихо и нежно: "Будем есть, будем пить, будем душу веселить", а контрабас грубым голосом вторил с надлежательной важностью: "Как бог даст! Как бог даст!" Сноп яркого света брызгали из окон в темноту летней ночи, и каждый брус в корчме, казалось, вздрагивал, колебался и пел... А музыкант Янко только слушал и слушал...
15. И чего только не отдал бы Янко за эти скрипки, выводившие тонкими нежными голосками: "Будем есть, будем пить, будем душу веселить", за эти звенящие певучие дощечки. Ба! да откуда возьмешь их и где только их делают?!

1. Тавец.

Tasín

La madre no lo llevaba nunca consigo a la iglesia, porque en cuanto el órgano rompía a tocar y empezaba a oírse el coro de suavísimas voces, se le cubrían de niebla los ojos al pequeño, cual si mirasen asomados al otro mundo.

5. El sereno del pueblo, que para ahuyentar el sueño contaba las estrellas o conversaba con los canes, veía con harta frecuencia la camisilla blanca de Yanco camino del mesón. Pero Yanco no entraba en el mesón; quedábase por allí muy cerquita, y, pegadito a una pared, poníase a escuchar. Dentro bailaba la gente, y un muchacho cantaba: ¡Ay, ay, ay! Oíanse las voces de los mosos y el restregar de los zapatos y el violín que cantaba muy meloso: Comamos, bebamos, cantemos..., mientras el contrabajo, con voz profunda, le respondía: Como Dios quiere, como Dios quiere... Las ventanas resplandecían de luz; las vigas del techo parecía que temblaban, que tocaban, que cantaban; y Yanco no se cansaba de escuchar.
- 10.

15. ¡Oh, qué no habría dado él por poder poseer un violín como aquél, que tocase tan meloso Comamos, bebamos, cantemos!... ¿Qué cosa más rara esos maderos cantores! ¿De dónde los sacarán?... ¿Quién los construirá?...

Curtin

His mother could not take him to church, for as soon as the organ began to roar or the choir sang in sweet voices, the child's eyes were covered with mist, and were as if not looking forth out of this world.

5. The village policeman who walked through the place at night and counted stars in the sky to keep from sleeping, or conversed in a low voice with the dogs, saw more than once the white shirt of Yanko stealing along in the dark toward the public house. But the boy was not going to the public house, only to a spot near it. There he would cower at the wall and listen. The people were dancing the obertas; at times some young fellow would cry, "U-ha!"
10. The stamping of boots was heard; then the quarying voices of girls, "What?" The fiddles sang in low tones, "We will eat, we will drink, we shall be marry;" and the bass viol accompanied in a deep voice, with importance, "As God gave! As God gave!" The windows were gleaming with life and every beam in the house seemed to tremble, singing and playing also; but Yanko was listening.
15. How much would he give to have such a fiddle playing thinly, "We will eat, we will drink and be marry"! Such singing bits of wood! But from what place could he get them, — where were they made?

Commentary on page 5.

1. T. begins a new paragraph here.
- K. changes the verb "to be unable" to "to cease," and adds the emphatic "1" (even). He uses the verb of motion "vodit'," instead of the Russian cognate of Polish "brać," as the former is more correct in literary Russian. T. uses "llevar" in the imperfect, omitting the modal. He adds the adverb "never," and "with her," neither of which is essential. C.'s literal translation of the first clause is adequate. C. and T. both use "as soon as," rather than the more literal "when," to good effect. K. retains the original "bywało," while changing "because" to "or else."

The two perfective verbs which follow are rendered by two Russian perfective verbs identical in meaning to those of the original. In Russian, as in Polish, the future can be used here, but English and Spanish translators have to use a past tense.

It would be difficult to find a less appropriate choice for "zahucza" than C.'s "to roar," above all in this context, describing the effect of the organ music upon Janko. J.'s "to roll" and OE's "to peal" are incomparably more fitting. The neutral "to play," used by T., is no more than adequate, as it is less precise and less evocative than the original verb.

The English and Spanish translators have to use

the auxiliary verb "to begin" to render the meaning concisely expressed in the prefix "za-."

✓ 2.

K., T., and G. all avoid the trap into which two of the English translators fall. J. and OE fail to realize that "organy" is not the subject of both verbs, but only of the first, "zahuożą." G. makes the same mistake, taking it to be the subject of "zaśpiewają" as well. Although this is grammatically possible, it is logically unlikely. These translators can be seen struggling to make sense of this clause: "as soon as he heard the organ roll or maybe its sweet, soft notes," (J.); "when the organ murmured or pealed," (OE); "l'organo rombava o cantava con dolci suoni," (G.).

..In fact, the subject of "zaśpiewają," the people in the church, either the choir or the congregation, or both, is left unexpressed in the original. The translator must insert a suitable subject. G. adds "the choir" and makes the collective "voice" of the original plural. T.'s solution is somewhat similar, with the subject "el coro de suavísimas voces." The adjective in the superlative is an unnecessary addition. K. makes two additions here, giving the verb an object, "bozhestvennuiu pesniu," and adding "na khorakh."

Where the author has the dative "dziecku," K. has "u" with the genitive. T. uses a dative construction not unlike that of the original. The noun "pequelluole"

is a colloquial diminutive form which does not correspond to the neutral "dziecko." Its use here may be an attempt to compensate for the conversational tone missed earlier.

The extended use of the verb of motion "zachodzić" with the instrumental cannot be matched by the same construction in Russian, and still less in non-Slavonic languages. K. effects a transformation, making "glaza" the object of the verb "zastilat'." T. uses a reflexive verb. Once again, C.'s choice of verbal tense is doubtful, since "were covered" denotes a state, not an action, and it does not convey the frequentative nature of the action. The simple past tense used by J. ("a haze spread over his eyes") is more satisfactory.

3.

The final image is not suited to literal translation into English. C.'s attempt to adhere closely to the original bears this out: "the child's eyes were covered with mist, and were as if not looking forth out of this world."

T. and K. are far less literal. T. makes Janko look into the other world, instead of out of it, and he adds the adjective "dazed." The result is a concise and vivid simile.

K. takes some of the emphasis away from the expression of the boy's eyes by making the pronoun "he," not "eyes," the subject of the sentence, and by the addition

of adverbs: "krugom takovo stranno." The impression made by this line is not quite that of the original, in that the boy now appears to be turning his head in a strange manner, whereas Sienkiewicz emphasizes the distant look in his eyes.

4. "Stójka" belongs on the fringe of the area of realia,¹⁴ as similar institutions can be found in some, but not all, of the TL cultures concerned. K.'s "storozh" is apt in Russian. C.'s "village policeman" is functionally adequate, but it implies an official post rather grander than Polish "stójka." "Watchman," used by J. and OE, is more appropriate. Spanish "sereno" is so much a part of Spanish tradition that it is commonly left untranslated in translations into other languages. On a visit to Spain, Sienkiewicz himself expressed his liking for this peculiarly Spanish institution,¹⁵ and it seems unlikely that he would have translated it into Polish as "stójka."

The long relative clause beginning "co chodził..." is retained as such by C. and T., but not by K., who uses past active participles.

C.'s rendering of the verb of motion and the preposition, "who walked through the place at night," is a good example of the dangers of literal translation.

"Chodzió" means "to walk," and "po" can mean "through," among other things. Yet if one were to re-translate C.'s

version into Polish, without foreknowledge of the original, one would think first of "przechodził przez wieś," not of "chodził po." J.'s version is exact: "went his rounds in the village."

T., who adds "del pueblo" to "el sereno," omits "chodził nocą po wsi." The logic of this is not easily refuted. The duties of the "sereno" are well known, therefore it is unnecessary to say that he patrolled the village. Since we are told that he counts the stars, there is no need to say "at night," or "in the sky," both of which T. omits. The author, however, is less logical, and T. is improving the original, however slightly, by removing the superfluous.

Russian translators can use the same verb and preposition as in the original, "khodit' po." K. uses "nochnym dozorom," rather than simply "noch'iu."

5. "Aby nie zasnąć" leaves little room for experiment and none for error. The various expressions used by the translators are all equally good. This clause is kept in its original position by T. and K., but in English it is better moved. However, if moved it should be placed after "rozmawiał po cichu z psami," rather than after "liczył gwiazdy," as both actions are intended to drive away sleep. In C.'s version, only the latter serves this purpose.

T. omits "po cichu."

K. prefers "noticed" to "saw," which is retained

by C. and T.

C. renders "nieraz" literally as "more than once," K. has "many times," and T. uses "very frequently." C.'s word-order, exactly that of the original, is not that of normal English: "saw more than once the white shirt of Janko." The English adverb is not usually situated between the verb and its object.

6. The author does not use a diminutive of "koszula," but T. uses a diminutive of "camisa," and K. employs the form "rubashonka," which is usually considered derogatory.

C.'s "of Janko" sounds less natural in context than "Janko's." K. refers to the boy not by name, but as "the Musician."

K. uses a relative clause with an indicative verb rather than the present participle used by the author. C. preserves the participial construction. T. does not use a verbal form, but rather "camino del mesón." The description of the nature of the action, contained in "przemykająca się," is lost by the omission of this verb.

No harm is done by the omission of "w ciemności" in T.'s translation, since his sentence already contains one indicator that it is dark. K. also omits "w ciemności," introducing the adverb "cicho" in its place. Where the original has only the preposition "k," K. adds "po napravleniiu."

For "karczma," C. has "public house," which, like OE's "alehouse," is strongly reminiscent of England or Ireland. K. uses the Russian cognate of the Polish word.

7. The crux of the next sentence is the contrasted prepositional usage: "nie do karczmy, tylko pod karczmę." The contrast is clearly expressed in the Russian and Spanish translations. Although C.'s version contains a contrast, his rendering of the prepositions appears acceptable only as long as one does not read the following sentence. With no context, his translation of the prepositions could not be faulted, but here, "to a spot near it [the public house]" cannot be equated with Janko's position as stated in the next sentence, "crouching against the wall."

T. and K. transfer the contrast from the prepositions to the verbs, using "did not enter" for the first verb. In K.'s version this is set against a second verb of motion "podpolzat'." T.'s second verb is "to remain." Proximity is expressed in T.'s translation by the colloquial diminutive of "cerca," - "cerquita."

8. C. changes the original past gerund to a past indicative ("przycozawszy się"). Both C. and J. use the verb "to cower." This English verb almost invariably implies fear, but the original makes no suggestion of fear at this stage. "To crouch," used by OE, does not have this implication. T. uses a past passive participle in

a diminutive form, "pegadito a una pared." K. deems one past gerund insufficient, and adds a second: "zataiv dykhanie." T. adds an auxiliary verb before the infinitive "to listen."

The noun "obertas" is unlikely to have any meaning for anyone but a Pole. It is a variant of "oberek," a kind of Polish or Lithuanian folk dance. C., who does not translate it, gives no footnote, but the context tells us that it is a dance of some kind. T. tells the reader only that "the people were dancing," taking the view that the kind of dance is of no importance. J. and OE avoid using the Polish word. OE has a vague paraphrase, and J. renders the word as "a barn dance."

K. and T. both add "inside." K.'s transformation does not involve the use of the verb "to dance." "Ober-tas" is transliterated and a footnote is supplied. The dance is qualified by the adjective "veselyi," and the verb "gremel" adds to the impression of merriment.

9. T. omits "ozasem."

"Jaki" is a colloquial form of "jakis." It is not translated by T. or K. C. retains it as "some."

K. renders Polish "parobek" by its Russian cognate, a dialect word in the TL. The original word, which means "farm hand" or "ploughboy," is rendered by less specific words in Spanish and English: "boy," and "young fellow." J. attempts to find a closer equivalent:

"yokel."

K. changes only the prefix of the Polish verb "pokrzykiwał." This is changed in the Spanish version from "he would cry out from time to time," to "he was singing."

The youth's exclamation is faithfully transcribed by C. and K. T. changes this to ";Ay, ay, ay!" thinking perhaps that this is more song-like than "U-ha!" after the change from shouting to singing.

K. joins the next sentence to the previous one with a conjunction. "Słychać było" is a typically Polish construction with no Russian equivalent.

K. uses the reflexive verb "razdavalos'." The most obvious English equivalent, the passive, is used by C. T. translates this by the reflexive verb "oíanse," and the second subject of it is a verb in the infinitive used as a noun, "el restregar," a characteristically Spanish construction. This verb, however, means "to rub, to scrub," and not to "stamp," which is the meaning of the original word.

K. has "heels" instead of "boots."

10.

"Znów" is omitted by C. and T.

C. applies a superfluous qualifier "querying" to "voices," unnecessary as the quoted word is a question. OE makes an inexplicable addition here, calling the girls' voices "affected." The adjective "zvonkie" is

added by K., who uses a diminutive of "golos" and inserts another verb.

It is presumably a moment's carelessness which causes T. to write "the voices of the boys," instead of "of the girls," ("los mozos," instead of "las mozas"). T. omits the direct question "czegóż?" as do B. and OE.

Since "skrzypki" is a plural noun, it is not possible to tell whether singular or plural meaning is intended here. Most of the translators have "violins" in the plural. T. and G., however, use the singular. K. adds a second adverb "nezhno," where Sienkiewicz has only "cicho." The fiddles "murmur" in OE's translation, although in K.'s, T.'s and C.'s versions they "sing," as in the original.

The song itself is in regular trochaic metre. K. succeeds in preserving the metre, the rhyme, the exact meaning, and a hint of the dialect forms used in the original.¹⁶ It is not possible in Russian to match the Polish continuous future formed from "być" and the past participle, but K. finds an alternative in the archaic infinitive forms "esti," "piti," "veseliti." By inserting "dushu," he arrives at the exact number of syllables of the original, and the trochaic metre is preserved. The rhyming vowel sounds are exactly those of the original.

By contrast, R.'s Russian version succeeds only

in transmitting the meaning: "Budem est', budem pit', budem veselit'sia." This has no rhyme, the metre is irregular because of the last verb, and it contains no features of anything resembling dialect.

It is, of course, more difficult to match K.'s achievement in a non-Slavonic language. T. creates a semblance of rhyme, by using three verbs in the first person plural of the subjunctive, producing a regular, amphibrachic, metre. The language is standard Spanish, and the last verb, "let us sing," has a different meaning from the original.

In English, C. produces a pedestrian, literal version, with no attempt to reproduce any of the characteristics of song. It is unclear why he changes the auxiliary verb from "will" to "shall" for the third verb alone. It is instructive to compare this version with J.'s. J. uses almost exactly the same words, yet with slight rearrangement; and judicious placing of "and," he creates a line which does sound like a line of song, even if the rhyme is missing: "We'll eat and we'll drink and merry we'll be." Another successful translation of this line is P.'s: "Wollen essen, wollen trinken, wollen mit den Glaesern klinken." These versions are much closer to the original than C.'s or T.'s.

12.

The last part of this sentence is rendered literally by C. T. omits "z powaga." K., on the other

hand, develops this by the addition of the adjective "nadlezashchei."

K. makes a slight adjustment in the wording of the double bass's "accompaniment." The perfective past of the original is changed to the perfective future "dast." C.'s word-for-word translation is unlikely to have any meaning for the English reader. J.'s version is more imaginative: "'Tis God's boon." T. has "As God wills."

A lapse of attention causes confusion of "light" and "life" in C.'s translation: "The windows were gleaming with life," for "Okna jarzyły się światłem." However this error is of little consequence. Apart from this, C. follows the original very closely.

K. effects a major transposition of categories, with additions of his own: literally, "shafts/sheaves of bright light splashed from the windows into the darkness of the summer night,..." (Underlined parts are K.'s additions). The author's four words are flamboyantly expanded into ten words in Russian. It is interesting to compare this with R.'s Russian version, in which the exact meaning is expressed concisely in three words: "Okna gereli ognem."

13.

A slight change is necessary in rendering the verb "zdawała się" into Russian. In Polish it is personal, governed by "bełka," but in Russian it must be

impersonal, separated from the rest of the sentence by commas. This change is not necessary in English, nor in Spanish, although T. uses an impersonal form.

T. does not translate "każda," and his version gives "the beams of the roof," instead of "every beam in the inn."

In the original, three infinitives follow the personal form of "zdawać się." C. uses one infinitive and two gerunds. In Russian and Spanish these verbs are in the indicative past. For the most part the verbs are rendered by their literal equivalents. K. and T. reverse the order of the last two. K.'s "kolebalsia" does not, however, correspond to Polish "grać."

14. C. alone translates "także," keeping it in the position as in the original. Such placing of "also" at the end of the sentence is acceptable in North America, but considered incorrect elsewhere in the English-speaking world. In this context it is better to omit it.

The last clause of the sentence appears deceptively easy to translate. A word-for-word translation of "a Janko słuchał," such as C.'s "but Yanko was listening," is hardly sufficient. In the first place, C.'s use of "but" can only puzzle the reader, who will ask where the contrast lies. Most of the non-Slavonic translations have "and," which is more logical. In the

second place, some addition is necessary if the meaning of the verb is to be clear. In Russian, one word suffices: "A Ianko yse slushal," (R.). K. inserts "tol'ko" and doubles the verb, as J. does in English: "and Johnnie listened and listened." T. writes, "and Janko did not tire of listening." All these alternatives read well because they add the slight emphasis which is needed. If this is not added, the paragraph ends weakly on an anti-climax, as C.'s version shows.

15.

The first sentence of the new paragraph requires either an exclamation mark or a question mark, although it has neither in the original. Most of the translators supply one or the other. K. and T. render the question in the negative, ("What would he not have given?"), although the original question is phrased affirmatively, and C. follows the original. The negative is perhaps more usual in questions of this kind even in English, cf. J.: "What wouldn't he give...?"

C. changes "what" to "how much," thus making the matter seem purely financial.

K. begins his sentence with "i" and inserts "tol'ko." He prefers the prefixed verb "otdal," to the unprefixd "dal" used by Sienkiewicz and by R. In the conditional clause, C. and K. dispense with the modal "mogli," accompanying "nieb." Indeed K. dispenses with the conditional clause altogether, using "za eti

skrypki" instead. T. has a purpose clause instead of the conditional, and he retains the modal in the infinitive: "pon poder poseer."

English translators differ about the tense of the main verb. As the narrative is mainly in the past tense, one expects the past conditional to be used here, as it is by B. and T.: "que no habría dado él..." OE also has, "What would he not have given..." C. and J., however, use the present conditional: "How much would he give..." This choice could only be justified if part of the accompanying narrative were in the historic present, but in C.'s version this is not the case.

"Skrypki" can safely be said to have singular meaning here, whatever doubts there may have been about its number earlier, and this time most translators use the singular, including C. and T. K. continues to use the plural. K. replaces "takie" with "eti." C. and T. are more literal.

The present participle active is rendered as such by C., and as the past active participle of a different, transitive verb by K. T. has a relative clause with a subjunctive verb here.

16. The single adverb "cienko" of the original is expanded by K. to an adverbial phrase in the instrumental. The fact that he uses the instrumental plural leaves little doubt that he understands "skrypki" as a plural.

He qualifies the noun with not one adjective but two. "Nezhnyi" is not in the original. T. inserts "so."

The line of "song," repeated in the original, is repeated by most translators without change. The slight change made by C. may indicate that he is dissatisfied with his original rendering of this line. This time he omits the auxiliary before the third verb, and replaces it by "and." K. and T. do not modify their translations of this line.

17. K. links the following short sentence, which is incomplete in the original, to the preceding one, by repeating the preposition "za." C. and T. make a separate exclamation of these three words. T.'s exclamation is somewhat longer than the original sentence, but it is made to sound suitably colloquial by the use of "Qué cosa más rara que...!" Sienkiewicz's participle "spiewające" is rendered by a noun used as an adjective, "cantores." This short sentence is not easy to render naturally in English. C. is not fully successful. J.'s attempt, which differs only in the attempt to render the diminutive, is better: "Such tiny, singing chips of wood!" K. adds an adjective which is not in the original, the present participle "zveniaschie."

The exclamation "Ei!" is omitted by most translators. K. transcribes it, and OE renders it as "Alas!" The latter is not inappropriate, but the exact meaning of

this cryptic ejaculation requires at least four words in English: "Easier said than done!" T. and C. omit the word.

The infinitive in the following question is best rendered by a personal verb in other languages. T. uses the indefinite third person plural in the future. K. also uses the future, in the indefinite second person singular. Only the English translators make the verb apply exclusively to Janko. C. adds the modal, which is needed in English, and uses the past tense. C.'s version would have been closer to the norms of spoken English if he had used "where" instead of "what place."

T. omits "but."

In the following question the indefinite third person plural is best replaced by an English passive construction, as in C.'s version. The tense must be past, as this is reported speech or thought. OE's "How could he make it?" is inaccurate. The question becomes "Who will make them?" in T.'s translation, and R. makes the same change. K.'s translation is exact, except that he inserts "tol'ko," and renders Polish "takie" by the accusative pronoun "ikh."

Summary of page 5.

Janko's musical tastes become more clearly defined. He visits the local inn, where he hears a violin, and begins to wonder how he can acquire one of his own.

Besides adding adjectives in his translation, K. inserts extravagant flourishes in places. Despite his additions, however, his sensitivity to language shows itself, in that he knows where it is possible to make additions, without transforming the text beyond recognition. His description of the singing and dancing at the inn is at least as vivid as in the original.

T. loses none of the vitality of the original in this passage, but one feature of Polish realia is allowed to fall out in the translation: "obertas." The word is retained in C.'s and K.'s versions, but with scant explanation.

C.'s translation is flawed less by the minor error in rendering "światło" than by his loose translation of Polish prepositions and his poor use of his English vocabulary, (the organ "roars"; Janko "cowers"). Certain foreign-sounding sentences also detract from his fluency.

original

Żeby mu przynajmniej pozwolili choć rękę w rękę wziąć coś takiego!...

Gdzie tam! Wolno mu tylko było słuchać, toteż i słuchał zwykle dopóty, dopóki głos stójki nie ozwał się za nim z ciemności:

— Nie pójdieszże ty do domu, utrapieńszo?

5. Więc wówczas zmykał na swoich bosych nogach do domu, a za nim biegł w ciemnościach głos skrzypiec: "Będziem jedli, będziemy pili, będziewa się weselili", i powaźny głos basetli: "Jak Bóg da! Jak Bóg da!"

Gdy tylko mógł słyszeć skrzypki, czy to na dożynkach, czy na
10. weselu jakim, to już dla niego było wielkie święto. Własił potem za piec i nic nie mówił po całych dniach, spoglądając jak kot błyszczącymi oczyma w ciemności. Potem zrobił sobie sam skrzypki s gonta i włosienia końskiego, ale nie chciały grać tak pięknie jak tante w karczmie: brzęczały cicho, bardzo cichutko, właśnie jak
15. muszki jakie albo komary. Grał jednak na nich od rana do wieczora, choć tyle za to odbierał szturchańców, że w końcu wyglądał jak obite jabłko niedojrzałe.

Короленко

Эх, дали бы ему раз, хоть один только разочек взять что-либо подобное в руки. Где уж!... Он мог только слушать, и он слушал, слушал до тех пор, пока из ночной темноты не раздавался голос ночного стражника:

-- А не пойдешь ты домой, полуночник!

5. Тогда уж он мелькая в темноте своими боевыми пятнами, а за ним вдогонку неслись голоса скрипок: "Будем есть, будем пить, будем душу веселить", и исполненный важности контрабас добавлял свое: "Как бог дал, как бог дал, как бог дал!"

10. Большой Праздник выпадал на долю Янка, когда ему удавалось послушать любимые скрипки -- на свадьбе или после жнива. После таких праздников он забивался за печку и целые дни просиживал молча, поглядывая из темноты сверкающими, как у котенка, глазами. Кой-как снарядил он и себе скрипочку из теса и конских волос, но она не умела играть так прекрасно, как те, что подвизались в корчме; она звенела тихо, таково тихо, точно вот монка мелкая или комары. Однако он играл на этой скрипке от утра и до ночи, хоть за это столько ему пинок доставалось, что наконец он стал похож на незрелое набитое яблоко.

15.

Tasfn

¡Oh, si una vez, siquiera una vez, pudiese él tener uno en la mano! Pero no; al pobrecillo sólo le era dado poder escuchar el del mesón... hasta que se oía la voz del sereno:

--¡Vete a casa, diablillo!

5. Entonces se alejaba a toda prisa, con los pies descalzos, y en la obscuridad y en el silencio de la noche distinguía ya lejanas la voz melosa del violín: Comamos, habamos, cantemos..., y la profunda y majestuosa del contrabajo: Como Dios quiera, como Dios quiera...

10. Era para él una gran fiesta el día que podía oír música, ya fuese en un casamiento o en la fiesta de las mieses. Terminadas las tocatas, subíase encima de la estufa y allí permanecía horas enteras pensativo, ensimismado, con los ojos relucientes como un gato.

15. Ingeniándose, llegó a fabricarse un violín con una crin y una corteza; pero aquel violín no quería tocar tan bien como el del mesón; tocaba, sí, pero con voz muy ronca y apagada, como un ratón o como un mosquito. Sin embargo, rascábalo todo el santo día, desde el amanecer hasta que se acostaba, a pesar de recibir por el dichoso violín tantos y tales mojicones, que ya tenía la cara hecha una alcachofa de puro magullada.

Curtin

If some one would just let him hold such a thing in his hand even once! How could that be? He was only free to listen, and then to listen only till the voice of the watchman was heard behind him in the darkness, —

"Wilt thou go home, little devil?"

5. Then he fled away home in his bare feet, but in the darkness behind him ran the voice of the fiddle, "We will eat, we will drink, we shall be merry," and the deep voice of the bass, "As God gave! As God gave! As God gave! As God gave!"

10. Whenever he could hear a fiddle at a harvest-home or some wedding, it was a great holiday for him. After that he went behind the stove and said nothing for whole days, looking like a cat in the dark with gleaming eyes. Then he made himself a fiddle out of a shingle and some horsehair, but it would not play beautifully like that one in the public house, — it sounded low, very low, 15. just like mice of some kind, or gnats. He played on it however, from morning till evening, though for doing that he got so many cuffs that at last he looked like a pinched, unripe apple.

Commentary on page 6.

1. The natural English translation of the first part of the new sentence is "If only...", as in J.'s version. C. does not add "only," although without it it is more difficult to make this sentence sound like idiomatic English. He does however compensate by using "just."

T. and K. begin the sentence with exclamatory words which are not in the original.

The subjectless third person plural used by the author, "pozwolili," is matched in K.'s Russian, though with a different verb. C. supplies the subject, "some one." T. uses a different construction, and does not mention permission, saying instead "if he could."

"Przynajmniej," having the same meaning as "choć," can be seen here as a reinforcing word. K. and T. supply the emphasis by repetition: "raz, khot' odin tol'ko razochek" (K.); "una vez, siquiera una vez" (T.). K. goes further than T. by inserting "tol'ko" and by using the diminutive.

"W rękę wziąć" is translated as literally "as possible" by K., the only change being the use of the plural, "ruki." C. and T. use "to hold" rather than "to take." "Coś takiego" is simplified by T. to "one [violin]."

2. It is not difficult to find Russian equivalents for the idiomatic Polish expression "Gdzie tam! Gde

uzh!" used by K., is exact. In other languages, the translator must decide exactly what this means in context. No such succinct expression is likely to be available. C. conveys the meaning accurately in a rhetorical question, while losing all trace of the colloquial. "But no," used by T., is similar in this respect. French "impossible," in B.'s translation, is more emphatic, and thus closer to the original.

C's literal translation of the phrase beginning "wolno..." is adequate, but perhaps lays excessive stress on the idea of freedom. OE's version is less literal and more natural: "All he could do was to listen." T.'s version is not far removed from the literal, but the modal "to be able" is added, in addition to the idea of permission, and the diminutive noun "pobrecillo" takes the place of the original pronoun. K. uses only the modal "mog."

T. apparently feels that the verb "to listen" needs an object, and duly supplies, "el del mesón," (that/the violin of the inn).

T. omits the conjunctions and the repetition of the verb "sluchał."

C. gives a stronger, limiting meaning to "totez i" than does K., who renders this simply by "and." In C.'s version this becomes "and then... only..." and in R.'s "da i to..." which is very close. K., T., and

C. all omit "zwykle."

3.

The remaining part of this sentence is translated accurately by all, except T., who omits "za nim z ciemności." K. and C. now use different words to render "stójka." K. has "nochnoi strazhnik," instead of "storozh," which he used in line 4, page 5, and C. has "watchman" instead of "village policeman."

Not content with "iz/temnoty," the exact equivalent of the Polish phrase, K. adds the adjective "nochnoi."

C. uses a passive to render the reflexive verb "ozwał się." K. and T. use reflexives in constructions very similar to that of the original.

4.

In the watchman's line addressed to Janko, C. again uses the English second person singular, producing the effect of a somewhat forced archaism. This line is phrased as a negated question in the original, but C. renders it by a question in the affirmative. T. uses a simple imperative, which gives a sharper tone of command than the original. The exclamatory form used by J. reads well in English: "Off home with you, you young imp." The repetition of the pronoun before the epithet is an obvious idea which C. might have done well to adopt. T. adheres closely to the original structure, but "polunochnik" (night-bird) is a somewhat free rendering of Polish "utrapieniec," (pest). T., like

C., uses the word "devil," but in a diminutive form.

5. "Więc," which has little meaning here, is omitted by all three translators. No two translators use the same expression for the colloquial verb "zmykać," (to scurry/scamper away). T. expresses this weakly in standard Spanish: literally, "he would go away with all speed." K.'s "mel'kal" is more descriptive, but less so than the more colloquial expression in R.'s version: "so vsekh nog udiral." C.'s "fled away" is better than J.'s "would sneak off," as the latter describes a quite different kind of action, but J.'s tense is the more appropriate. OE's choice of verb, "would patter away," is better than C.'s and J.'s.

T. and K. omit "do domu," which is of little importance, and may in any case be assumed.

K. transposes "w ciemnościach" from the second clause to the first, in order to make Janko's bare heels flash in the darkness, thus creating a more vivid visual effect than in the other translations.

6. T. has not only "in the darkness," but also "in the silence of the night," which is not in the original.

C. again uses "but" to translate Polish "a," where T. uses "and."

T. departs further from the original than C. and K. in his translation of the second clause. A transposition of categories makes Janko the subject of

the verb "to distinguish," and "voice" the object. The voice no longer pursues the boy through the night in so active a manner as it did in the original text. Furthermore, T. says that the voice is "already distant," which is a far cry from the original "za nim biegl glos skrzypiec."

K. has the verb "nestis'," instead of "bezhat'," while preserving the syntactic structure of the original, and adding the adverb "vdogonku" to stress the idea of pursuit. In English this can easily be conveyed by the preposition. It is better expressed by J.'s "ran after him," than by C.'s "ran behind him." C.'s sentence is a close copy of the original.

T. has the adjective "melosa" accompanying "voice," although Sienkiewicz uses no adjective on this occasion.

The minor problem of distinguishing singular from plural arises again, this time not with "skrzypki," but with the closely related noun "skrzypce." As before, all indications point to a singular meaning. Sienkiewicz has "glos" in the singular, but K. has both "voice" and "fiddle" in the plural. C., who used the plural before, now uses the singular. T. consistently uses the singular.

The "song" of the fiddle is repeated in the original and in all three translations. C. now reverts to his original version of this line.

7.

"Głos basetli" governs no verb in the original, since "biegł" is singular, governed only by "głos skrzypiec." In C.'s version, both nouns govern the verb "ran." In T.'s version, the voice of the double bass is the second direct object of the verb "distinguir," and the problem of a correct grammatical connection in the place of inappropriate parataxis is thus solved.

K. provides a second verb and omits "voice," making the bass itself the subject.

Where the author has a single adjective, "poważny," T. has two: "profunda y majestuosa." Neither of these corresponds closely to the original, but jointly they approximate to "solemnity." C.'s "deep" is less accurate as a translation of the original adjective than the expression employed by K., a past passive participle with an abstract noun: "ispolnennyi vazhnosti."

The "song" of the bass recurs in identical form, but K. makes a small change in his rendering of it. Instead of the future verb which he used the first time, he now uses the past tense, as in the original.

9. C.'s translation of the following sentence is literal and accurate. K. and T. place the last clause first. Rather than "moch'," the Polish cognate of which is used by the author, K. and R. use the reflexive "udavat'sia" with the dative. This is followed by the

infinitive "to listen to" in the perfective, where the original has "to hear" in the imperfective.

K. continues to use the plural "skripki." Most of the other translators, including C., R., and PSS, now use the singular. T. replaces "fiddle" with "music." K. inserts the adjective "liubimye" to qualify "skripki."

K. does not seek a noun equivalent to "dożynki," although the word has a Russian cognate,¹⁷ with exactly the same meaning, in regional use. He uses "zhnitva" instead. "Zhnitvo" is also limited to regional usage.¹⁸

10. It is hardly necessary to translate "jakim," accompanying "weselu." T. and K. omit it, but C. retains it.

The main clause can be rendered literally in all three TLs. K., however, replaces the verb "to be" with the Russian idiom "vypadat' na doliu."

The adverb "potem" is expanded by K. to "after such holidays," and by T. to an absolute, participial construction, "terminadas las tocatas." "Wlazil" is rendered by the most general verb of motion in C.'s version: "he went." J.'s "to crawl," and OE's "to creep" are more accurate. T. and OL have Janko climb on top of the stove, not behind it.

K. gives less emphasis to the nature of the motion with "zabivalsia."

11. "Nio nie mówil" is expressed by the adverb "moloha" in K.'s version, and by two adjectives in the

Spanish version: "pensativo, ensimismado." Neither adjective actually means "silent," but both imply it. C. renders the original expression literally.

K. and T. introduce new verbs in this sentence, both made necessary by the structural change in which Janko's silence is expressed adjectivally or adverbially. K. inserts "prosizhival," and T. "permanecia."

The change from "whole days" to "whole hours" in T.'s and OL's versions is presumably the result of carelessness. J. uses a more idiomatic English expression than C.'s literal "for whole days": "for days on end."

The gerund "spoglądajac" becomes the English gerund "looking" in C.'s translation. This may appear to be an accurate, literal rendering, but the English verb has more than one meaning, and in the context of C.'s translation it is the wrong meaning which emerges.

"Looking like a cat in the dark," will be understood as "appearing like," whereas the Polish verb means "to look/glance." Had C. inserted a preposition ("looking out"), this would have been avoided. K.'s gerund "posmatrywaia" contains no possible ambiguity. T. does not use a verb here.

T. omits "w ciemności."

"Jak kot" in the original qualifies the gerund "spoglądajac." K. changes the position of this phrase to make "kak u kotenka" refer to the noun "glaza."

K. has "kitten," rather than a full-grown cat.

12.

The last part of this simple sentence is changed in many ways by different translators. B. reads more into the original than the author states: "seulement ses yeux brillent dans l'ombre d'une fièvre intérieure." Prepositional usage varies. J. has "into the darkness," and K. "out of the darkness," for the original "in the darkness." OE makes this refer exclusively to the cat of the simile: "with great, glowing eyes, like those of a cat at night."

Some translators begin a new paragraph here, T., B., and OE among them. "Then" is omitted by T. and K. The adverb "koi-kak," with which K. begins the sentence, is not used in the original. The reflexive pronoun in the dative is preserved by C. and K., and T. also suffixes "se" to "fabricar." K. uses "i," perhaps to take the place of Polish "sam" in the original.

This time there can be no doubt that "skrzyпки" has singular meaning. All translators render it as a singular. K. uses a diminutive form.

T. begins his sentence with the gerund "ingenidn-dose," and follows this with the auxiliary "llegó a." Neither of these verbs is strictly necessary.

T. uses the preposition "with" where the author and the other translators have "out of."

13.

The materials from which Janko makes his violin

should present no difficulties for the translators. Sienkiewicz uses the collective noun "wiosienie," which K. renders by a plural. T. is wrong in translating "gont" as "bark," since the original word means "roofing shingle." OL makes the same mistake. C. and K. translate this correctly.

K. changes the Polish auxiliary "choć" to Russian "umet'." The auxiliary is rendered literally by T., and the English "would" used by C. can have this meaning.

T. replaces the pronoun with "this violin."

"Tak," preceding the adverb, is omitted by C., though retained by T. and K. The adverb itself, "pięknie," is variously translated, but English translators are unanimous in their choice of "beautifully." T. reduces this to "well," and B. and OL do the same. K.'s "prekrasno" is an obvious choice in Russian.

14. Once again the question of the number of violins in the inn is raised. "Tante" in the original is plural because it stands for "skrzypki." K. repeats the plural since his first reference was plural. C. now uses the singular, despite the fact that his first reference to the instruments at the inn included "fiddles" in the plural. The same inconsistency appears in J.'s version. Here as elsewhere, T. consistently uses the singular.

C. does not repeat the "as... as..." pattern of

the original, but follows the adverb by "like" instead.

In Russian, "kak te v korohme" is all that is needed to convey the original meaning, but K. turned this into a relative clause, adding the verb "podyzalis'."

C. and T. translate the verb "brzęczały" by the general words "to sound," and "to play," which give little indication of the nature of the sound produced. J. uses two verbs, both more precise, "to hum" and "to buzz," in the attempt to match the sound of this primitive instrument to that of the insects to which it is compared. K.'s single verb "zvenet'" can be applied to both insects and stringed instruments.

K. uses the cognate of Polish "cicho" and repeats it, though not in a diminutive form as in the original. He replaces the original "bardzo" with Russian "takovo." The diminutive cannot be rendered in English, since it is already accompanied by "very" in the original.

T. makes more changes in this line than K. and C.: literally, "it played, yes, but with a hoarse, hushed voice..." The first adjective is far removed from the original "cicho."

T. omits "właśnie."

15.

An elementary slip, apparently caused by misreading, is committed by no less than four translators, T. and C. among them. Where the original has "mushki," T., C., J. and P. read "myshki." This error is compounded,

in Spanish, with T.'s change from "mice" to "a rat," though this may explain his erroneous use of the adjective "ronca" in the preceding line. This word is omitted by a few translators, but the majority render it correctly.

K. inserts the adjective "melkaia."

Polish "komary" is rendered correctly by T., C., and K., although T. uses the singular.

"Jakie" is retained by C. alone.

This sentence contains none of the difficulties of the last, partly because the one simile in it is easier to translate. To render the first verb T. uses "rascar" (to scratch), rather than "tocar," which he perhaps feels he has overworked. K. and C. translate "grać" by its literal equivalent. K. repeats the noun ("on this violin"), although the author and the other translators use the pronoun.

The adverbial phrase "od rana do wieczora" is translated literally in most cases. K. prefers "night" to "evening." T. expresses the same meaning twice over in two consecutive phrases: "todo el santo día, desde el amanecer hasta que se acostaba."

16.

T. renders "choć" by "a pesar de" (despite). K. and C. translate this literally. C. adds a verb in his translation of "za to": "for doing that." T.'s version is incorrect since he equates Polish "to" with the

violin: "por el dichoso violin." The adjective is the translator's own addition. In fact the Polish pronoun refers not to the violin itself, but to Janko's habit of playing it from dawn till dusk.

Polish "tyle" becomes in Spanish not simply "tantos," which is all that is needed, but "tantos y tales" (so many and such).

An insignificant change occurs in K.'s translation of "szturchaniec" (a blow/cuff). Instead of this, K. has "pinok" (kick), although the word has an exact Russian equivalent, which is used by R.: "tumak." OE has both "kicks" and "cuffs." The verb in this clause is rendered somewhat lamely in C.'s translation as "got." The transformation of categories in J.'s version reads better than most of the other English versions: "even though it earned him so many cuffs that..." K. uses an impersonal reflexive verb with the dative, "emu dostavalos'." T.'s choice is the most obvious verb, "recibir."

In the context, the best translation of "w końcu" is not "at last," used by C., but "in the end." T. uses "ya," although "al fin" might be more appropriate. The literal Russian translation "nakonets" is accurate. The auxiliary "stat'" is added by K. in his translation of the last verb of the sentence.

The adjective "obito" which the author applies

to "jabiko" means "bruised," and it is translated as such by J. C's "pinched" is ~~adequate~~, but it is not a word commonly applied to apples.

In Spanish, the "bruised, unripe apple" becomes a "battered artichoke." The image is every bit as vivid as that of the original, but there is no apparent reason for this change. K. gives a literal translation of the original.

OE removes the simile, apparently for the sole purpose of indulging a taste for alliteration: "kicks and cuffs he got till he was black and blue."

Summary of page 6.

Janko's youthful adventures continue. It is now clear that his one joy in life is music. His longing to possess a musical instrument leads him to construct his own rather primitive fiddle. His elders are unimpressed with the results and beat him for playing it.

Sienkiewicz's long paragraphs are broken into shorter units by T., but preserved in their original form in the English and Russian versions.

Errors of slight importance occur in T.'s and C.'s translations: "mushki" (not "mice"), "gont" (not "bar"), "dni" (not "hours").

T. and K. continue to make minor additions, whereas C. makes none.

original

Ale taka to już była jego natura. Dzieciaczyna chudł coraz bardziej, brzuch tylko zawsze miał duży, czuprynę coraz gęstsza i oczy coraz szerzej otwarte, choć najczęściej łzami zalane, ale policzki i piersi wpadały mu coraz głębiej i głębiej...

5. Wcale nie był jak inne dzieci, był raczej jak jego skrzypki z gonta, które ledwie brzęczały. Na przednówku przy tym przymierał głodem, bo był najczęściej surową marchwią i także chęcią posiadania skrzypek.

Ale ta chęć nie wyszła mu na dobre.

10. we dwórze miał skrzypce lokaj i grywał czasem na nich szarą podziną, aby się podobać panie służącej. Janko czasem podczołgiwał się między łopuchami aż pod otwarte drzwi kredensu, żeby im się przypatrzeć. Wisiały właśnie na ścianie naprzeciw drzwi. Więc tam chłopak duszę swoją całą wysyłał ku nim przez oczy, bo mu się zdawało,
15. że to niedostępna jakaś dla niego świętość, której nie godzien tknąć, że to jakieś jego najdroższe ukochanie. A jednak pożądał ich. Chciałby przynajmniej raz mieć je w ręku, przynajmniej przypatrzeć się im bliżej... Biedne, małe chłopskie serce drżało na tę myśl ze szczęścia.

Короленко

да уж такая была натура: малыш худел все больше и больше, только живот все выпячивался, да белые волосы становились все гуще, да глазенки раскрывались все шире, да все чаще дрожали в них светлые детские слезки. А щеки и грудь западали все глубже и глубже...

Он несколько не походил на других детей, скорее напоминал он свою же скрипку из халкого теса, издававшую тихие, еле звенящие звуки. Притом каждый год к весне он начинал помаленьку обмирать от голода, так как в это время ему приходилось питаться сырой морковью да еще мечтами об обладании настоящею, всамделишною скрипкой.

Не к добру привели беднягу эти мечты!

10. На барском дворе у лакея была скрипка, и он пиликал на ней в час серых сумерек, желая этим прельстить горничную панны. Янко подползал временами промеж густого лодушника к рамным дверям лакейской, чтобы поближе присмотреться к инструменту. А скрипка висела на стене, прямо против дверей, и у бедняги вся душа сосредоточивалась в глазах, устремленных к этой недоступной святыне, к которой он недостойн яркоснуться: это был предмет его жгучей, страстной любви. И он пожелал ее. Раз, хоть раз один взять ее в руки или хоть взглянуть на нее прямо и вблизи... Бедное маленькое мужичье сердечко билось и трепетало от счастья при одной этой мысли.

Tasín

Pero... era así de natural.

Yanco enflaquecía visiblemente; el pelo se le enmarañaba cada día más; los ojos se le ponían grandes, y a menudo se le llenaban de lágrimas; el pecho se le hundía, y se le ahuecaban las mejillas... No se parecía en nada a los demás muchachos; a quien se parecía era a su violín de corteza, que apenas chistaba. Además, el hambre le iba extenuando, porque cuando no tenía pan -- y era con frecuencia -- sólo se alimentaba de zanahorias crudas y... de aquel inmoderado afán de poseer un violín de verdad.

Aquel afán no le llevó por buen camino.

10. El criado del palacio solariego sí que poseía un violín de verdad, y a veces, por la noche, lo tocaba un rato para recrear a la señorita camarera. Yanco iba de puntillas hasta la puerta de la despensa para contemplar el violín, que estaba colgado en la pared de enfrente.

15. Mirábalo embelesado, con arrobamiento, como si se tratara de un objeto sagrado...

¡Oh, si una sola vez siquiera pudiera él tenerlo entre las manos para examinarlo bien!... Y sólo de imaginarlo ya se le derretía de gusto el corazón.

Curtin

But such was his nature. The poor child became thinner and thinner, only he had always a big stomach; his forelock grew thicker and thicker, and his eyes opened more and more widely, though filled oftener with tears; but his cheeks and his breast fell in more and more.

5. He was not like other children at all; he was rather like that shingle fiddle of his, which hardly made a noise. Besides, he was suffering from hunger before harvest, for he lived mainly on raw carrots, and the wish to have a fiddle. But that wish did not turn out well for Yanko.
10. At the mansion the lackey had a fiddle and he played on it sometimes at twilight to please the waiting-maid. Yanko crept up at times among the burdocks as far as the open door of the pantry to gaze at the fiddle. It hung on the wall opposite the door; the boy would send his whole soul out through his eyes to it, for it seemed to him that that was some unattainable object, which he was unworthy to touch, that that was some kind of dearest love of his. Still he wanted it. He would like to have it in his hand at least one time, to look at it near by. The poor little fellow's heart quivered with happiness at the thought.
- 15.

Commentary on page 7.

1. The following short sentence can be translated fairly literally into all the TIs. K. introduces it by "da," rather than the literal "no" used by R. C. and T. omit "już." K. omits the possessive modifier "jego."

In T.'s version the verb "to be" has "he" (Janko) as its subject, instead of "his nature." The phrase "de natural" is adverbial.

"To" in the original is superfluous and can scarcely be retained in any of the translations.

Two translators, OE and B., feel that this sentence as it stands is inadequate and needs further explanation. The additions are similar in the two translations: "Il n'y avait rien à faire. / Sa nature le forçait à jouer," (B.); "He could not help himself: it was in his nature," (OE).

The variant of "dzieciak," "dzieciaczyna," is rendered in English with the help of the adjective "poor." K. uses "malysh," and T. refers to the boy by name.

The structure of the original comprises a four-fold repetition of "coraz" with the comparative. It is not easy to follow this structure in translation. In Spanish it is completely lost. T.'s first verb means "weakened" rather than "grew thinner," and the adverb used is "visibly" rather than "more and more." In most

of the English versions, "ohudzi coraz bardziej" is rendered by the repetition of the comparative adjective: "became thinner and thinner." K.'s translation, structurally the closest to the original, also involves repetition: "khudel vse bol'she i bol'she."

2. The following clause, beginning "brzuch" is omitted completely by T. Its structure is changed in Russian, since the verb "to have" is not used, and "zhivot" becomes the subject of the verb. C.'s translation is literal.

In the original, the verb "he had" governs two other objects besides "brzuch": "czupryna," and "oczy." Since the translators cannot easily follow this pattern, alternative verbs must be found for each individual clause. "To grow" (C.) and "to become" (K.) are the verbs most widely used by the translators for "czupryna." T. departs further from the original with "enmarafarse" (to become tangled). The adjective used by the author, and by T. and K. is "thicker." T. renders "coraz" by "cada día más" (more each day).

K. inserts the adjective "belye" to modify "volosy." This piece of information is supplied earlier in the story but Sienkiewicz does not repeat it here.

K. uses the affectionate secondary diminutive "glazenki" to translate the neutral Polish "oczy."

3. Another verb is needed here in the translations,

to be used of eyes. C. and K. use "to open," as this is suggested by Sienkiewicz's adjective "otwarté." As before, W. uses "vse" with the comparative.

In English the possessive modifier "his" has to be repeated before each noun. This is not necessary in the other TLs.

T. does not use "to open," but "to grow big." He does not convey the meaning of "coraz" and the comparative.

K. uses "da" as a connector to link all the clauses in this sentence, including the next one, where Sienkiewicz uses the contrastive conjunction "choť." T. also has "and" here. C. is one of a minority of translators who consider it important to translate "choť" literally.

In this phrase Sienkiewicz has a superlative adverb rather than a comparative. This passes unnoticed by several translators, including C., who uses the comparative "oftener," and T., who has "often" in the positive degree. K. translates this phrase as if it were another in the "coraz" series.

C. matches the participial construction "zami zalane" by its exact English equivalent, the past passive participle and the preposition "with." T. uses a reflexive verb meaning "to fill." K. has a totally different construction at this point, using the verb

"droshali" with "tears" as its subject. In his reference to these tears he departs from the original by using a diminutive form where the original has a full form, and by inserting two emotive adjectives "svetlye, detskie," where Sienkiewicz has no adjectives at all. The difference is all the more striking when one compares this version with R.'s sober translation: "glaza napolnialis' slezami."

4. K. begins a new sentence here. The conjunction "ale" is omitted by T. The author has one verb "wpadaly" for both "policzki i piersi," but T. uses separate verbs for each. K. and C. follow the original and use the same verb for both. K.'s "zapadali" differs from the original verb only in its prefix.

T. does not express the comparative, nor provide an equivalent to the "coraz" construction. The last of the "coraz" expressions is rendered exactly by K.: "vse glubzhe i glubzhe." C. also uses repetition to express "coraz." In T.'s translation the fourfold repetition of "coraz" is lost, but it is to some extent replaced by the repetition five times of the same verbal structure, a reflexive verb in the imperfect, with the indirect object pronoun: "se le enmarañaba"; "se le ponían"; "se le llepaban"; "se le hundía"; "se le ahucaban."

5. "Nie był jak" is translated word-for-word by C., while T. and K. use the verb "to resemble." T. has "lon

muchachos" (boys) instead of "niños" (children).

We may note here that Spanish is the only one of the TLa which tolerates the omission of the subject pronoun to the same degree as Polish. Neither of the main verbs in this sentence has a pronoun in the original, nor in Spanish, but it is necessary in English and desirable in Russian.

The pitfalls of word-for-word translation are illustrated once again by C.'s rendering of Polish "raczej." He translates the word correctly as "rather," but since he keeps it in the same position in the sentence the reader will understand "rather" in the sense of "somewhat": "He was rather like that shingle fiddle of his." In order to give "raczej" its true meaning, C. would have done better to use "more" (cf. OE), or place "rather" elsewhere, so that no such confusion could arise. The Russian equivalent "skoree" contains no possible ambiguity.

T. makes a syntactic change which renders the word "raczej" unnecessary: "whom/what he resembled was his bark violin." This is accurate except for the repetition of an earlier mistake in the meaning of Polish "gont."

K. uses a different verb "napominat'" in the second clause from that which he used in the first, although the author and the other translators repeat the

same verb.

6. C. uses "shingle" as an adjective modifying "fiddle." This construction is possible only in English. Other translators must use a preposition with a noun. K. inserts an adjective: "iz zhalkogo tesa." There is no adjective in the original, but K. is not alone in supplying one. OE has "poor little fiddle."

As on earlier occasions, K. begins the subordinate clause with a past active participle, rather than the relative adjective "kotoryi." Most other translators use the relative pronoun, including T. and G.

Numerous variations are possible for "brzęcoś." Two of the Russian translators, but not K., use the Russian cognate "bręchat'." C.'s "which hardly made a noise" is barely adequate since it evades any description of the sound. Spanish "chistar" is more descriptive.

K. describes the sound by means of adjectives whose meaning is contained in the verb of the original: "izdavavshuiu tikhie, ele zvenishchie zvuki." This version is somewhat longer than the original and those Russian versions which use the cognate. The structure of the Spanish subordinate clause is exactly that of the original.

Most of the translators begin the next sentence by moving "przy tym" into the first position in the

sentence. None of the TLs has a noun equivalent to Polish "przednówek," but simple circumlocutions are not hard to find. K.'s "k vesne" seems a little too early in the year to express the original meaning. "Pered novym khlebom" used by the other Russian translators is exact.

T.'s Spanish sentence explains the meaning in extremely general terms: "when he had no bread, and this was frequent,..." Up to a point this is a logical interpretation of the original, as the Polish name for this time of year implies that bread is scarce, but T. does not make clear that by "frequently" he means every year, for weeks on end. C.'s adverbial phrase "before harvest" expresses the time of year accurately.

C.'s translation of "przymierał głodem" as "he was suffering from hunger" is a little weak. The English tense is wrong, since the verb in the original has frequentative or repetitive meaning, whereas "was suffering" indicates a single process. This context demands "he suffered/used to suffer." Moreover, C.'s interpretation of the meaning of the verb is unsatisfactory, since the original means "to be starving," or "to be near death from hunger," which is considerably stronger than "to suffer." J.'s version is therefore more accurate: "he was not far from starving."

K. adds an auxiliary verb and the adverb

"pomalen'ku." PSS has "chut' ne umiral," which is stronger than K.'s "nachinal pomalen'ku obmirat'."

7. In a transformation of categories in the Spanish translation, "hunger" is the subject of the verb "extenuar" (to torment).

K. omits "najczęściej," which is rendered literally by C., and changed to "only" by T. The English idiom "to live on," used by C., is not far removed from the Polish "żyć" with the instrumental. The verbs used in Spanish and Russian mean "to nourish oneself."

K. inserts "v eto vremia," and the impersonal modal with the dative, "emu prikhodilos'."

Three translators P., OE, and N. render "marchew" (carrot) incorrectly as "turnip."

K. changes "cheć" to "mechty," followed by the preposition "o." Other translators use "zhazhda," followed by the genitive case. K. now adds two adjectives where none are used by the author: "nastoiashchei, vsamdelishnoi skripkoi." Both adjectives mean "real," and the second is merely a highly colloquial synonym of the first.

T. also adds adjectives here: "cheć" is rendered as "inmoderado afán"; just as K. adds "real," modifying "violin," T. writes "un violín de verdad." OE shows the same tendency: "his longing, his intense longing."

9. C. attaches this sentence to the previous paragraph. T. and K. omit "ale," with which the original sentence begins. Where the author has the verb of motion "wyjść" with the dative, all the Russian versions have the transitive verb of motion "privesti" with the accusative.

K. uses the noun "bedniaga," although only the pronoun is used in the original. K. places the subject at the end of the sentence, although it is first in the original and in the other translations.

T.'s translation of the verb is not unlike that in the Russian versions: "llevar" with the accusative. The last phrase, (literally) "along a good road," differs little from the original "na dobre."

C. follows the original as closely as possible. He uses the boy's name instead of the pronoun.

10. K. inserts the adjective "barskii" before the Russian cognate of Polish "dwór," since this is needed if the word is to be understood correctly in Russian. English translators render "dwór" in three different ways: "mansion" (C.), "manor house" (J. and Z.), "castle" (OE). Of these the last is perhaps less appropriate than the other two. T.'s "palacio solariego" is accurate."

The text provides no clue as to whether the article accompanying "lackey" should be definite or

indefinite. T., C., N., OL, P., and the other English translators assume that there is only one lackey, and therefore use the definite article. B. and G. use the indefinite.

Before the verb "to possess" T. inserts the emphatic "sí qué," which stresses the contrast: Janko has no violin, but the lackey has one. This is further stressed by the repetition of "un violín de verdad," with which T. ended his last paragraph. The original does not have the word "real" in either sentence.

K. translates the verb "mieć" by the preposition "u" with the genitive, although PSS has Russian "imet'."

No equivalents can be found for the frequentative form "grywać" in any of the TLs. K. even omits "czasem," although it carries part of the function of the frequentative. T. includes this and adds another time phrase which is not present in the original: "un rato" (for a while).

"Szara godzina" (literally: in the grey hour) is correctly rendered by C. as "at twilight," and by K., although K.'s phrase is longer than necessary. R.'s "v sumerki" is all that is required. In Spanish the most accurate expression would be "al anochecer," but T. uses "por la noche" (at night), which is less exact.

11.

The purpose clause beginning "aby..." is

accurately translated by C., T., and K., but the valet's motives for playing are subject to inexplicable distortions in OE's English version and in N.'s Portuguese translation. The last part of the sentence should read "to win the maid's favour," (J.). "To please" is marginally less precise than "podoać się" (to win favour). OE has "to please his pretty sweetheart and his fellow-servants." "Sweetheart" tells us only her sex, saying nothing about her station, and the original does not say whether she is pretty or ugly. No fellow-servants appear in Sienkiewicz's original. N.'s version is very similar, except that he does not include the adjective "pretty."

K. uses the gerund "zelaia" rather than the conjunction "chtoby." He then commits one minor error which is attributable to misreading of the case endings. The original has "pannie słuźacej" (to the serving-maid), a noun and a present participle active modifying it, in the same case, the dative. K.'s translation shows that he has read this as "panny słuźacej" (to the servant of the young mistress), in which "słuźacej" is an adjective functioning as a noun, in the dative, and the noun "panna" is in the genitive. K. retains the Polish word "panna."

T.'s verb "recrear" (to entertain) is inexact, as is C.'s "to please."

T. omits "ozasem."

Various verbs are used to describe Janko's movements as he approaches the house. Only T.'s version, with the neutral verb "to go" and the adverbial phrase "on tiptoe," is slightly inaccurate, since the basic meaning of the original verb is "to crawl."

12. T. omits "między łopuchami." For the most part this element of natural history is rendered correctly by the other translators, including C. and K. "Łopuch" is a variant form of the standard word "łopian," but in Russian "lopukh" is itself the standard form. According to J.M. Milik, "łopuch" had not been recorded before in literary works.¹⁹

P. renders "łopuch" by the imprecise word "plants," and OE renders it incorrectly as "climbing plants." N., who makes the same mistake, proceeds to make a whole series of errors in this sentence. His sentence runs, "Janko climbed up the branches of the creepers to the servant's window, in order to hear the music." [Janko subiu pelas ramas da trepadeira até a janela do camareiro a fim de ouvir a música]. The sentence should read, "Janko sometimes crept through the burdocks up to the open door of the servants' quarters, in order to gaze at it." The mistranslation of "łopuch" and the purpose clause appears to have its origins in OE's version, and the additional errors flow from these.

K. inserts another adjective, modifying "bur-docks": "gustoi."

"Aż pod" is rendered in Russian by the use of "samyi" (up to the very door). C.'s "as far as" is adequate, as is T.'s "hasta."

T. and K. omit the adjective "otwarfe."

An editor's footnote in Nowele wybrane Sienkiewicza explains that "kredens" can mean either "pantry" or "servant's quarters."²⁰ In this context the latter meaning is apt, and this is the one preferred by K., who uses "kuchnia." The majority of translators, however, including T. and K., choose "pantry."

K. qualifies the verb in the purpose clause by inserting the adverb "poblizhe." The Russian construction used here is very like that of the original, with the difference that in Russian the preposition "k" is required after the reflexive verb. K., T., and C. all use the noun, rather than the pronoun which the author uses.

Janko's purpose in creeping up to the house is incorrectly rendered in J.'s version, just as it is in OE's and N.'s: "to listen to it (the violin)."

13:

T. links this sentence to the last by means of the relative pronoun. He and B. express the main verb by a passive construction, where an active verb can be used in the other TEs, including English and Russian.

"Właśnie" can be omitted with minimal loss, and this is done by T. and C. K. conveys it by "primo."

T. has "on the wall opposite," without mention of the door. Strictly speaking, it is not necessary to mention the door, since the word "opposite" is used, and we know that Janko is in the doorway.

K. joins these two sentences by a comma and a conjunction. C. also links them, by changing the original full stop to a semi-colon.

T. shortens this long sentence considerably, but still contrives to express the essence of the meaning: literally, "He looked at it enchanted, with rapture, as if it were a sacred object." C.'s version, on the other hand, is a very close literal translation.

"Wieżo" and "tam" are omitted by G., T., and K.

14. Only C. and B. attempt to render the first figure of speech exactly as it stands in the original: "the boy would send his whole soul out through his eyes to it," (C.). This cannot be said to be entirely successful, perhaps because of the strangeness, not to mention the rhyme, of "whole soul." B.'s version, which gives the same meaning, does not have this strangeness:
- "l'enfant lui envoyait-il toute son âme par ses yeux."

K. makes adjustments in his version of this sentence. He uses "bedriaga" in place of the original "okropak," and continues: "all his soul was concentrated

in his eyes, staring at..." The hyperbole of the original is thus softened. The same occurs in the other Russian translations. PSS has simply, "mal'chik zhadno smotrel na..." R. has the same expression, but endeavours to reinforce it by working in the clause "vsia dusha mal'chugana ustremialas' k nei." The result, however, is something of a literary cliché which does not have the metaphorical force of the original.

15. T. and K. omit "bo mu się zdawało," while C. retains it. T. and K. do not translate "jakaś" or "jakieś" in the two consecutive clauses which follow. In any case, K.'s modulations make it impossible to translate the first "jakaś."

"Dla niego" is omitted even by C., as it is obvious to whom it refers.

"Niedostępna świętość" is poorly rendered by T. and C. The basic idea of "świętość" is expressed in T.'s "objeto sagrado," but the idea of its inaccessibility is left unexpressed. On the other hand, C.'s "unattainable object" leaves the notion of "holiness" untranslated. Without fear of being pedantic, one may also question whether concrete objects like violins, as distinct from abstracts, can be "attained."

The relative clause, "stora, nie godzian things," is translated literally by C. and K. and omitted by T.

this sentence, dispensing with the superlative adjective and substituting two positive adjectives with superlative meaning: "eto byl predmet ego zhguchei, strastnoi liubvi." C.'s absolutely literal rendering of this clause can hardly be considered good writing in English. He clumsily repeats "that that" in both clauses, where he could have used "that it" or "that the fiddle." Polish "jakies" is translated where it would have been better left out: "that was some kind of dearest love of his." It is evident that C.'s overriding concern is for literalness, and that his concern for good English prose is slight.

T. omits the short sentence, "A jednak požadał ich." K. appears to make a mistake of aspect in rendering the verb by "pozhelal." The verb in his translation is perfective, meaning "to begin to desire." The original verb, despite appearances, is not the perfective of "żądać" (to demand), but an imperfective, meaning "to covet." PSS and R. correctly use the imperfective "zhelal." C.'s version might be improved by the use of a stronger verb than "to want." J.'s "to yearn for" is more fitting.

K. begins the sentence with "and," in place of the contrastive conjunctions used in the original, "a jednak."

The tense with which K. begins the next sentence

is clearly incorrect English. While Polish "chiałby" can mean either "he would like" or "he would have liked," owing to the restricted variety of Slavonic tenses in comparison with western languages, the translator must match the tense to that of the rest of his narrative. Since this entire paragraph is in the past, "he would like" cannot be correct. Only "he would have liked" can be used here, cf. B.'s "il aurait voulu," and G.'s "avrebbe voluto."

K. and T. do not use the verb "khotet'," and both give this sentence an exclamatory form and intonation. K. has both verbs in the infinitive. He stresses "przynajmniej raz" by repetition: "raz, khot' odin raz." All Russian translators use the verb "vziat'" to render Polish "mieć."

G., whose translation of this line is as literal as possible, uses "one time" instead of the more usual "once."

K. inserts "or" between the two clauses. T. inserts the conjunction of purpose "para."

"Przynajmniej" is repeated in the original before the second verb, and K. repeats "khot'." G. and T. do not repeat it.

Like K., T. rephrases this sentence as an exclamation. G. inserts "or" and continues with the verb "vziat'."

18. Where the original has the comparative adverb "bliżej," T. has "well," modifying the verb "to examine." K. adds a second adverb: "priamo i vblizi." He does not use the comparative degree.

In the original, the noun "serce" is accompanied by three adjectives, "biedne, małe chłopskie," the last of which presents some ambiguity. T. omits all three adjectives. The basic meaning of "chłopski" is "peasant," from the noun "chłop," but few of the translators give it this meaning in their versions. Among those who do are K. ("muzhich'e"), B. ("de paysan"), and the three Czech translators. The others, including C., if they do not omit the word, interpret it as a derivative of "chłopiec" (boy): "the poor little fellow's heart," (C.).

K. uses the diminutive "serdechko."

Several translators make minor additions to qualify "mysł." All the Russian translators have "pri odnoi mysli." T. makes a similar addition, while using a verb instead of a noun: "solo de imaginarlo."

K. employs two verbs to render the single verb of the original: "bilos' i trepetalo" for "drżało."

Summary of page 7.

J.'s precarious existence is described further. The main plot now begins to take shape with the information that the servant in the mansion has a fiddle, and that Janko is in the habit of creeping up to the servant's door to look at it.

K.'s propensity for adding adjectives shows itself again. No less than six are added on this page.

T. omits one short sentence: "A jednak pożądał ich"; and two clauses of about the same length.

As before, the Spanish and Russian versions read well, but C.'s is marred by ugly turns of phrase: "that that was some unattainable object... that that was some kind of dearest love of his." The frequent use of "some" or "some kind of" is the result of C.'s habit of translating Polish "jakiś" almost every time it occurs. His use of tenses is sometimes faulty.

original

Pewnej nocy nikogo nie było w kredensie. Państwo od dawna siedzieli za granicą, dom stał pustkami, więc lokaj przesiadywał na drugiej stronie u panny pokojowej. Janko, przyczajony w łopuchach, patrzył już od dawna przez otwarte szerokie drzwi na cel wszystkich

5. swych pożądań. Księżyc właśnie na niebie był pełny i wchodził ukośnie przez okno do kredensu, odbijając je w kształcie wielkiego jasnego kwadratu na przeciwległej ścianie. Ale ten kwadrat zbliżał się powoli do skrzypiec i w końcu oświetlił je zupełnie. Wówczas w ciemnej głębi wydawało się, jakby od nich biła światłość srebrna; szczególnie
10. wypukłe zgięcia oświetlone były tak mocno, że Janek ledwie mógł patrzeć na nie. W onym blasku widać było wszystko doskonale: wcięte boki, struny i zagiętą rączkę. Kołeczki przy niej świeciły jak robaczkowe świętojańskie, a wzdłuż wisiał się smyczek na kształt srebrnego pręta...
15. Ach! wszystko było śliczne i prawie czarodziejskie; Janek też patrzył coraz chętniej. Przykucnięty w łopuchach, z łokciami opartymi o chude kolana, z otwartymi ustami patrzył i patrzył. To strach zatrzymywał go na miejscu, to jakaś nieprzeswycięzona chęć pchała go naprzód. Czy czar jakie, czy co?...

Короленко

- Однажды ночью в лакейской не было ни души. Господа давно уже гуляли за границей, дом стоял пустырем, а лакей коротал вечера у горничной. Янко, притаившись в лопушнике, давно уже созерцал сквозь широко раскрытую
5. дверь предмет своих страстных желаний. На небе как раз стоял полный месяц, и свет его, падая косвенно в отверстие двери, рисовал на противоположной стене светлый, яркий, выделавшийся из темноты четырехугольник. Этот светлый четырехугольник, сползая вдоль стены, все приближался к месту, где висела скрипка, и, наконец, она, вся освещенная, вынырнула из мрака. Тогда она засияла из глубины темной
10. комнаты точно серебряным светом: все выпуклости и изгибы сверкали так сильно, что глаза Янка не выносили этого блеска. В этом волшебном освещении видны были совершенно ясно: изящный перехват, струны, перегиб ручки. Шпильки белели и покрывались подобно светящимся червячкам, и тут же серебряной нитью свесился тонкий смычок...
15. Ах, все было так прекрасно, так волшебно прекрасно! И взор Янка светился все разгоравшейся страстью. Сидя на корточках меж листьями лопуха, с локтями, упертыми в худые колени, с открытым ртом, он все смотрел и смотрел. Страх удерживал его на месте, непонятное непобедимое желание толкало вперед. Колдовство, что ли, какое?!

Tasin

Una noche la despensa estaba desierta y no se veía a alma viviente en toda la casa, pues los señores se hallaban en el extranjero y el criado debía de encontrarse en un sitio apartado del inmenso caserón -- quizá en las habitaciones de la señorita camarera --. Hacía ya rato que

5. Yanco estaba contemplando el objeto de sus ansias; la luna llena entraba a raudales por la ventana de la despensa, yendo a dibujar en la pared un gran cuadro luminoso. El cuadro aquel se corría poco a poco hacia el violín, hasta que, por último, le iluminó de lleno. Lo que más relucían
10. eran las partes salientes del instrumento, y tan resplandecientes resultaban, que Yanco no las podía mirar. Con la luz aquella todo se veía con la mayor nitidez; los costados ondulados, las cuerdas, el mástil, las clavijas relucían cual luciérnagas en la noche de San Juan, y a lo largo del violín colgaba, cual plateado galón..., el arco.
15. ¡Qué bello, qué fantástico era todo aquello! Yanco lo contemplaba con arrobos y avidez.

Acurrucado debajo de los arbustos, con los codos apoyados en las puntiagudas rodillas y abierta la boca, miraba, miraba sin pestañear, miraba siempre. En momentos se sentía sobrecogido de miedo; en otros, una fuerza irresistible lo empujaba hacia adelante. ¿Era acaso un hechizo?

Curtin

A certain night there was no one in the pantry. Their lordships had been in foreign countries for some time, the house was empty, the lackey was at the other side with the waiting-maid. Yanko, lurking in the burdocks, had been looking for a long time through the broad door at the object of all his desires. The moon in the sky was full, and shone in with sloping rays through the pantry window, which it reflected in the form of a great quadrangle on the opposite wall. The quadrangle approached the fiddle gradually and at last illuminated every bit of the instrument. At that time it seemed in the dark depth as if a silver light shone from the fiddle, -- especially the plump bands in it were lighted so strongly that Yanko could barely look at them. In that light everything was perfectly visible, -- the sides with incisions, the strings, and the bent handle. The pegs in it gleamed like fireflies, and at its side hung the bow which seemed a rod of silver.

Ah, all was beautiful and almost enchanted; and Yanko looked more and more greedily. He was crouched in the burdocks, with his elbows pressed on his lean knees; with open eyes he looked and looked. Now terror held him to the spot, now a certain unconquerable desire pushed him forward. Was that some enchantment, or what?

Commentary on page 8.

1. Word-for-word translation of "pewnej nocy" by C. gives an expression which is rarely heard in English, "a certain night," instead of the usual "one night,"

K. strengthens "nikogo" to "ni dushi." T. makes the pantry the subject of the sentence, and describes it as "deserted."

T. joins two sentences of the original and moves "dom stał pustkami" forward. This short phrase is given additional emphasis: literally, "there was not a living soul to be seen in the whole house." C. and K. do not go to such lengths.

"Państwo" is rendered in four different ways in the English translations: "their lordships" (C.), "the master's family" (J.), "the master and mistress" (Z.), "the family" (OE). The last is not sufficiently specific, and C.'s "their lordships" adds a faintly ironic or facetious touch which is not in the original. "Gospoda," used in all the Russian versions, and T.'s "los señores" are accurate.

2. The verb "siedzieli" is subject to different interpretations. It is unlikely, however, that it means the masters were in permanent residence in another country. In this case the most likely verb would be "mieszkałi." Hence "to live," used by PSS and OE is not fully appropriate. Spanish "hallaron" little more than

synonym for "to be," is apt. K.'s "galiat" fits well into the context, though somewhat more specific than the original word. C. uses the verb "to be."

"Od dawna" is omitted by T.

C. omits the conjunction "więc," but T. and K. translate it as "and."

K. interprets "przesiadywał" as a frequentative: "he whiled away the evenings." The Spanish and English renderings show that the English translators understand this to refer to a single action, not a repeated action. C. again uses the verb "to be," and T.'s "encontrarse," like "hallarse" in the preceding line, means little more than this. T. also adds the modal "deber de," in the sense of "must have been," or "very likely was." This introduces an element of uncertainty which is not to be found in the original.

3. K. omits "na drugiej stronie," which is rendered literally by C. This phrase is changed and developed by T.: "in a distant part of the immense house." While the first part of this phrase is acceptable, the second, "del inmensa caserón," comes from the translator alone. Although we know that the house belongs to the gentry, we have no reason to suppose that it qualifies for the augmentative "caserón," (from "casa"), or for the epithet "inmenso." Sienkiewicz has so far referred to it only by the neutral noun "dwór."

Before "u panny pokojowej" T. inserts "perhaps": "perhaps in the serving-maid's room." The narrator in the original does not leave this open to doubt. C. and K. do not make any additions here.

The original past passive participle "przyczajony" becomes a present gerund "lurking" in C.'s version. K. and the other Russian translators use the past gerund. The adjectival phrase "przyczajony w łopuchach" is not translated by T. He thus avoids the problem of discovering the Spanish name for "łopuch." What remains of this sentence is translated accurately.

4. T.'s second omission in this sentence is of four words: "przez otwarte szerokie drzwi." This is rendered in full by K., but C. omits "otwarte."

The object of the main verb can be translated literally into all TLs. T. omits "wszystkich," and K., who also leaves this out, replaces it with "strastnych."

5. T. and several other translators do not translate "in the sky," referring to the moon, as it is pleonastic. C. and K., however, retain it. "Właśnie" is omitted by T. and C., but K. renders it as "kak raz," although it adds little to the meaning.

T. shortens the first clause by omitting the verb "to be" and applies the adjective "full" directly to its noun. The elements of this sentence are rearranged by K., without change of meaning. The verb

"stoiat" is used of the moon, since the modulation K. has effected makes "byt" impossible. He prefers the noun "mesiats" to "luna."

The verb "wchodzil" is translated literally by T., and as "shone in" by G. The original adverb "ukośnie" is accidentally or deliberately changed to "a raudales" (in torrents) by T. There is no similarity between the two expressions beyond the fact that both can plausibly be applied to moonbeams.

6. K. does not speak of the moon "entering" the room, but adds "its light," and uses a gerund in a subordinate clause: "falling obliquely through the doorway." A minor error is the translation of "okno" as "door." PSS adds that the window was open. This is superfluous from all points of view.

"Do kredensu" may be omitted here, as we know which room the author is referring to. K. duly leaves this phrase out. C. uses "pantry" as an adjective qualifying "window," - a construction peculiar to the English language. T. has "the window of the pantry," rather than "into the pantry."

In the original a subordinate clause follows, introduced by the present gerund "odbijając." K. makes this his second main clause by using a verb in the indicative here. C. translates it as a relative clause referring to "window." T. uses the gerund of the auxiliary

verb "to go": "yendo a dibujar."

The verbs used by T. and K., meaning "to sketch/outline," give a somewhat more accurate description of the process in question than does "to reflect," used by C. and J. This is only one of several meanings of "od-bijać," and an outline marked by moonlight through a window cannot properly be described as a reflection.

C.'s translation of "w kształcie" is literal. In T.'s and K.'s versions the square of light is the object of the verb "to sketch."

K. omits "wielkiego," modifying "kwadratu," supplanting a participial phrase, "vydeliavshisya iz temnoty," and using two adjectives, "svetlyi, iarkii," in place of a single one in the original. T., like C., follows the original more closely, although T. omits "przeciwległej" and C. omits "jasnego."

OE's version of this sentence affords a good example of the strivings of a translator to make his version more "poetic" than the original. Those elements which are symptomatic of this tendency are underlined here: "The moon, at her full, swam high in the heavens; her beams threw a shaft of light across the room, and fell on the opposite wall." This is very different from C.'s bald, word-for-word translation, in which even the moon is neuter. We may note in passing that the moon cannot have been swimming very high, as its beams fell on

the opposite wall, not on the floor.

7. The conjunction "ale" is omitted by C., T., and K. K. repeats the adjective "svetlyi," although the original adjective is not repeated. He also inserts a gerundive subordinate clause which is not essential: "spolzaia vdol' steny." The idea of "powoli" is conveyed partly by the verb "spolzat'," and partly by the adverb "vse." In the original the patch of light approaches the violin, whereas in K.'s translation it approaches the place where the violin is hanging. R. gives a much more literal Russian version of this first clause. Literal translation is also possible into English and Spanish, as C.'s and T.'s versions prove.

8. T. links the clauses by the conjunction "until," instead of "and," which is used by the author, and by C. and K. For the rest, T.'s rendering of the second clause is more literal than C.'s or K.'s. To express the adverb "zupelnie" C. expands the object of the verb: "every bit of the instrument." The violin is the subject of K.'s second clause: "ona, vsia osveshchennaia, vynynula iz mraka." The active verb imparts a certain independent life to the violin. This seems fitting, but it is not suggested by the original.

T. omits the first part of the next sentence, no fewer than twelve words of the original.

C.'s "in the dark depth" is a literal translation

which does not read well in English. At the very least, C. could have used the plural "depths," or better, followed OE's example and omitted the word: "in the darkness." K. use the same words as in the original, but adds the genitive "komnaty" and changes the preposition to "iz" in place of the original "w."

9. K. does not translate "wydawało się," but since the function of the verb is duplicated by Polish "jakby," Russian "tochno" by itself is sufficient. The violin is the subject of K.'s sentence, and the light emanating from it is expressed in the instrumental case. C., closer to the original, has "light" as the subject of the second clause.

T.'s translation resumes at "szczególniej." C.'s translation reads awkwardly because of the position of "especially." J. has "above all," which can be left in the same position without giving rise to any awkwardness. K. omits "szczególniej," and T. resorts to paraphrase: "That which shone most was..."

10. No two translators render "wypukłe zgięcia" in the same way: "plump bends" (C.), "swelling curves" (J.), "the projecting parts of the instrument" (T.). K. uses two nouns with no adjective: "vse vypuklosti i izgiby." In T.'s and K.'s versions the curves are the subject of the active verb "to shine," whereas in the original and in C.'s translation they govern a passive

verb, "were lit up."

"Tak moono" is rendered literally by K. and C., although in English "brightly" seems more fitting than "strongly." T. begins a second main clause: "y tan resplandecientes resultaban..."

Only C. retains "ledwie" in the last clause. T. and K. change this to a simple negative. K. expresses the meaning in a quite different way: "Janko's eyes could not stand the glare."

11. In the phrase "w onym blasku" the noun receives the adjective "magic" in K.'s translation. Further intimations of supernatural powers in the next paragraph are thus anticipated.

The Polish infinitive construction is rendered by K. by means of the verb "to be" with the adjective "vidny" as its complement. The adjective is in the plural because K. omits "wszystko," and the adjective now agrees with the three items which follow. C.'s "everything was perfectly visible" is the obvious English rendering of the original phrase. T. has a reflexive verb: "todo se veía."

"Perfectly" or its equivalents are the natural choice for the adverb "doskonale." Variations occur in T.'s and K.'s translations. T. employs an adverbial phrase: "with the greatest clarity." K. has one adverb modifying another: "sovershenno iasno."

Sienkiewicz describes the object of Janko's desires by enumerating its salient features. The three parts of the fiddle are in the accusative as they are additional objects of the infinitive "widać." Under C.'s pen the instrument loses some of its beauty. "The sides with incisions" for "wcięte boki" suggests notches rather than the elegant waist of the violin. The adjective in T.'s translation is "curving." K. does not use the word "sides," but "perekhvat," the correct term for the waist of a violin, with the adjective "iziashchnyi," which is more qualitative than descriptive of shape.

12.

No variation is possible in translating "struny."

"Zagięta rączka" emerges in C.'s version as "the bent handle." While literally possible, this would seem to indicate that the violin has been violently misused. Sienkiewicz intends no such interpretation. In the context, the noun should be rendered not as "handle" but as "neck" (cf. OE). J.'s "fret-board" would be acceptable for a guitar, but all instruments related to the violin are characterized by the absence of frets. T.'s "mástil" is correct, but the adjective is omitted, perhaps because "curving" has already been used to describe the sides of the instrument. "Bent" is the least appropriate English adjective. "Curved," used by J., is apt. K. transposes grammatical categories to give "peregib ruchki."

T. runs this sentence into the next. The

diminutive "kołeczki" (from "kołek") is not rendered as a diminutive by T. or K. FSS uses a diminutive form, and B. inserts the adjective "little." "Przy niej" can be omitted, as it is by T. and K. Z.'s "near it" is totally incorrect, since the pegs are part of the violin.

K. has two verbs, "beleli i iskrilis'," for the original's one, "świeciły." T. and C. have accurate one-word equivalents.

Most translators select the obvious equivalent for "jak," except K., who uses "podobno" with the dative.

13.

An interesting error occurs in T.'s rendering of "robaczki świętojańskie." The translator does not realize that the noun and the adjective together mean "glow-worms," although a literal translation of the two words gives "Saint John's little worms." The diminutive and the image have lost their force. T. takes "robaczek" alone to mean "glow-worm," and the adjective to be the author's imaginative simile. The result in the Spanish translation is: "cual luciérnagas en la noche de San Juan," (like glow-worms on the night of San Juan, i. e. on midsummer's night). The transformation of the adjective, to give it a seasonal meaning, is presumably dictated by the absurdity of "Saint John's little worms."

Thus Sienkiewicz's straightforward simile, "like glow-worms," is made more elaborate in translation.

C.'s "fireflies" is an acceptable alternative

since the two terms are often interchangeable in common usage.

The preposition "wzdłuż," here used adverbially, is rendered by K. as "tut zhe." T. has a much longer expression: "a lo largo del violín." The Polish imperfective verb "zwieszał się" is translated by a perfective, "svesilsia," in K.'s version.

K. adds the adjective "tonkii," modifying "smychok." "Na kształt" becomes simply "like" in the Spanish version, and C. begins a relative clause here, using the verb "to seem" without "like." K. conveys the simile by using the instrumental case. "A silver thread," however, is not quite the meaning of "srebrny przęt." The noun may be translated as "rod" (C.), or "switch," but in context the best choice is surely "wand" (cf. J. and OE), in view of its magical effects. T. changes the simile: "like silver braid." The texture of the material is stressed, rather than its form.

Word-order varies in the last clause. K. moves the simile forward, as does T., placing "smychok" at the end of the sentence. T. also sets it off by a pause, and emphasizes it with an exclamation mark, for dramatic effect. This conflicts with the serene, undramatic tone of the original.

15.

T. adds this sentence and the next to the preceding paragraph.

The original exclamation is preserved with only spelling modifications by K. and C. T. omits it. The following sentence becomes an exclamation in several texts, including T.'s. This is done in Spanish by placing "que" before both adjectives. The second adjective, "fantástico," in its true sense, is not far removed from the original "czarodziejskie." Since "prawie" would weaken the exclamation, T. and K. omit it. The latter inserts "tak" in its place. K. repeats the same adjective "prekrasno." qualifying it the second time by the adverb "volshchno." C. adheres rigidly to the original wording and punctuation.

16.

An alternative to the verb "to look," or the insertion of an object, might have improved C.'s rendering of the second clause. J. rephrases this part of the sentence to good effect, but his version is marred by unfortunate alliteration: "Johnnie's greed grew as he gazed." OE's "Janko gazed with hungry eyes" is apt, but the meaning of "coraz" and the comparative is lost. This element falls out in T.'s translation as well. "Con arrobo y avides" does not convey the comparative. K.'s version is less literal than those of his two compatriots. Janko's gaze is the subject of the verb "to shine," which is followed by the instrumental case. The original "coraz" is matched by "vse" and the past active participle "razgoravshisja" modifying the noun

"strast'iu."

The author's change from the form "Janko" to "Janek" is not reflected in any of the translations.

The adjectival phrase of the original, "przykucnięty w łopuchach," becomes a full clause in C.'s translation, thanks to the addition of "he was." The past passive participle is rendered as a passive in English, although the active participle "crouching" conforms better to standard English usage. Why C. departs from his usual practice of following the grammatical structures of the original is not clear, since this is one point where there is no need to change the sentence structure. J.'s and OE's translations prove that this sentence is not of unmanageable length and that the subordinate clauses can easily be preserved as such.

K. and T. follow the original more closely, T. with a past passive participle, and K. with a gerund.

Having used "creepers" before, OE now renders "łopuchy" wrongly as "ivy." T. has so far avoided mentioning this plant, but here it becomes apparent, that he does not know the word and does not have access to an adequate dictionary. "W łopuchach" is rendered as "under the bushes." Burdock is a coarse weed which bears little resemblance to a bush, and it would be difficult to crouch "under" it.

K. inserts the word "leaves": "mezł list'iami

lopukha."

The next phrase is rendered as literally as possible by K., C., and T.

17. C. commits a minor error in translating "z otwartymi ustami" as "with open eyes." The reader of the translation might well suspect an error as the result is tautological: "with open eyes he looked and looked."

The doubled verb used by C. is literally correct, but "to look" is not the best possible word. The Slavonic languages are poor in equivalents for English "to stare/gaze," but in contexts such as this it is clear that Polish "patrzeć" should be translated in this way, (cf. J.). K. repeats "smotrel" and adds "vse."

T. gives undue emphasis to this by threefold repetition of the verb, with added adverbs: literally, "he looked, looked without blinking, looked all the time."

- The balance of the original sentence, in which two contrasting clauses are each introduced by Polish "to," is not retained by any of the Russian translators, although the contrast is clear without the use of "to." C.'s version with "now" is word-for-word. T.'s "en momentos..., en otros..." is a close and natural Spanish equivalent. Polish, Russian and English idioms conveniently coincide in the first clause. T.'s version is
- 18.

less literal: "he felt himself overcome by fear."

C., at pains to translate every word of the original, renders "jakaś" as "a certain." In fact the Polish word is used so much more frequently than its English equivalent that it may be best omitted.

T. and K. do not translate it, but K. inserts "neponiatnoe" in its place. T. and two of the Russian translators change desire to "force."

C.'s adjective "unconquerable" is the first that comes to mind for "nieprzewyciężona," but "irrepressible"(OE) and "irresistible" (T.) seem more fitting alternatives in conjunction with "desire."

19.

The colloquial question, which reads perfectly well in Polish is not easily turned into natural English. OE senses the danger and omits it. C. does nothing to avoid the awkwardness of a close literal translation: "Was that some enchantment, or what?" He might, at least, have thought of using "it" instead of "that." J.'s version, which is structurally the same, is less awkward, precisely because of the use of "it," and the omission of "jakie": "Was it witchcraft or what?"

T.'s translation of this line is adequate, but here the colloquial note provided by "czy co?" is lost.

K.'s version, which is at once a question and an exclamation, is suitably colloquial.

Summary of page 8.

The general background and the description of Janko's character ends here and the main action of the story, Janko's last sortie to the mansion to look at the fiddle, begins. The emphasis on this page is almost entirely on the visual, specifically, the beauty of the violin hanging in the moonlight, and the alluring, almost hypnotic effect which it has on the boy.

The violin is described in highly lyrical terms and this is important from a structural point of view; as the reader must be made to appreciate the powerful attraction the violin holds for Janko. T. and K. match the original in enthusiasm, and T.'s accidental embellishment of one of the author's similes is not out of place. On the other hand, C.'s ungainly sentences and weak vocabulary detract somewhat from the beauty of the instrument, which now has "a bent handle" and "incisions" in its sides.

K.'s only error, in rendering "okno" as "door," is of virtually no importance.

original

Ale te skrzypce w jasności czasem zdawały się przybliżać, jakoby płynęku dziecku... Chwilami przygasaly, aby znowu rozpromienić się jeszcze bardziej. Czary, wyraźne czary! Tymczasem wiatr powiał; zaszumiały cicho drzewa, załopotały łopuchy, a Janek jakoby wyraźnie usłyszał:

5.

-- Idź, Janku! w kredensie nie ma nikogo... idź, Janku!...

Noc była widna, jasna. W ogrodzie dworskim nad stawem słowik zaczął śpiewać i popwizdywać cicho, to głośniej: "Idź, pójdź! weź!" lelek półcziwym cichym lotem zakreślił się koło głowy dziecka i zawołał: "Janku, nie! nie!" Ale lelek odleciał, a słowik został i łopuchy coraz wyraźniej mruczały: "Tam nie ma nikogo!" Skrzypce rozpromieniły się znowu...

10.

15.

Biedny, mały, skulony kształt z wolna i ostrożnie posunął się naprzód, a tymczasem słowik cichuteńko popwizdywał: "Idź! pójdź! weź!"

20.

Biała koszula migotała coraz bliżej drzwi kredensowych. Już nie okrywają jej czarne łopuchy. Na progu kredensowym słychać szybki oddech chorych piersi dziecka. Chwila jeszcze, biała koszulka znikła, już tylko jedna bosa nóżka wystaje za progiem. Na próżno, lelku, przelatujesz jeszcze raz i wołasz: "Nie! nie!" Janek już w kredensie.

Короленко

Скрипка, вся сверкающая, ясная, казалось, выплывала из мрака вперед, приближалась к ребенку... то опять очертания темнели, она точно удалялась, чтобы приблизиться опять и опять. Чудеса, видимое колдовство! Между тем подул ветер, деревья тихо прошумели, залопотали широкие листья лопушника, и Янку послышалось так явственно:

5. -- Ступай, Янко! Там нет никого... Ступай же, Янко!...

Ночь была тихая, светлая. В барском саду над прудом соловей стал запевать да пощелкивать: "Поди возьми!"
Добрая птица лелек¹ закружилась бесшумно над его головой:
10. "Нет, нет! Янко!" Но лелек улетел, а соловей остался, и лопушник, качаясь, все бормотал про себя: "Нет никого, нет никого!" Скрипка опять выступила вперед, засияла...

Маленькая сгорбленная фигурка двинулась осторожно вперед, а между тем соловей тихо-тихо пощелкивал: "Поди,
15. — иди, возьми!"

Белая рубашонка, не закрытая темными листьями, мрет недалеко от растворенной двери; усиленное дыхание больной детской груди слышится уже на пороге. Еще мгновение, и за порогом виднеется одна только босая детская
20. ножка. Напрасно, ты, лелек, добрая птица, пролетаешь еще раз, крича: "Нет, Янко, нет!" Янко ступил уже в комнату.

1. Лелек -- козодой, (ред.)

Tasín

Parecía que el reluciente violín se fuese acercando...

¡Sí, debía de ser un hechizo!...

En aquel preciso instante sopló el viento, y en el susurro de las hojas oyó Yanco distintamente una voz que muy quedo le decía:

5.

--¡Ve, Yanco; no hay nadie en la despensa; ve, Yanco!...

La noche era clara y transparente... En los árboles del estanque comensó a cantar el ruiseñor en trinos, ora dulces, ora estridentes, que decían:

--¡Anda, Yanco, cógelo!...

10.

Un buho prudente y juicioso revoloteó en torno a la cabeza del pequeñuelo, chillando:

¡No, Yanco; no vayas, no lo toques!...

Pero el buho desapareció y las hojas de los arbustos volvieron a susurrar:

--¡No hay nadie en la despensa!...

Relució de nuevo el violín... El mísero cuerpecito empezó a moverse, y el ruiseñor silbó otra vez:

15.

--¡Anda, Yanco, cógelo!...

Ya la blanca camisilla avanza hacia la despensa; ya no se destaca en el fondo obscuro de los arbustos; ya está rozando el umbral..., y al cabo de un segundo se borra su silueta, quedando tan sólo un piececito fuera, que al fin también desaparece.

39 (continued)

20. **¡Yese ya dentro de la despensa la anhelosa res-
piración de aquellos pulmones... Es inútil que venga
el buho a gritar de nuevo:**

--¡No lo toques!...

Curtin

But the fiddle in the bright light seemed sometimes to approach, as it were to float toward the boy. At times it grew darker, to shine up again still more. Enchantment, clearly enchantment! Then the breeze blew; the trees rustled quietly, there was a noise in the burdocks, and Yanko heard, as it were, distinctly, —

5. "Go, Yanko, there is no one in the pantry; go, Yanko!"

The night was clear, bright. In the garden a nightingale began to sing and whistled with a low voice, then louder, "Go! go in! take it." An honest wood-owl turned in flight around the child's head, and cried, "Yanko, no! no!" The owl flew away, but the nightingale and the burdocks muttered more distinctly, "There is no one inside!" The fiddle shone again.

10. The poor little best figure pushed forward slowly and carefully; meanwhile the nightingale was whistling in a very low voice, "Go! go in! take it!"

The white shirt appeared nearer and nearer to the pantry. The dark burdocks covered it no longer. On the threshold of the pantry was to be heard quick breathing from the west breast of the child. A moment more the white shirt has vanished; there is only one naked foot outside the threshold. In vain, O wood-owl, dost thou fly once again and cry, "No! no!" Yanko is in the pantry.

20.

Commentary on page 9.

1. C. alone retains "but," and he, T., and K. all omit "te" or render it by the article. C.'s "in the bright light" is the closest and most accurate translation of "w jasności." T. and K. make the brightness emanate from the fiddle itself. K. translates this phrase by applying two adjectives to the noun: "vsia sverkaiushchaya, iasnaya." T. uses a single adjective: "reluciente."

K. renders the main verb by the impersonal "kazalos'." In English and Russian it remains the main verb.

"Czasem" is omitted by K. and T.

K. uses two active verbs, reversing the original order, in which the gerundive clause "jakoby płynąc..." follows the infinitive "się przybliżyć."

2. It seems probable that C. has misread the gerund "płynąc" as the infinitive "płynąć" and proceeded to render each grammatical form by its English equivalent. If he had noticed that this was a gerund the literal translation would in fact read more easily: "as if floating," instead of "as it were to float."

T. translates this sentence only as far as "przybliżyć," omitting "jakoby płynąc ku dziecku."

K. makes a minor addition, although he omits "jakoby"

The following sentence, eight words in the original, is omitted by T.

K. links this sentence to the last with "to opiat'." His "ochertania temneli" is an effective means of rendering the verb as it gives it a more definite subject than it has in the original. C.'s "grew darker" is accurate, if unimaginative.

English and Russian translators alike are able to observe the original structure, in which the purpose conjunction "aby" is used where no purpose is intended. C. renders the verb "rozpromieni6 się" as "to shine up," which expresses the meaning less elegantly than the original verb, with the loose prepositional usage characteristic of American English.

3. K. departs from the original by adding his own clause, "ona tochno udalialas'," as if to explain the visual effect of the "darkening outlines." Instead of "rozpromieni6 się," he has "priblizit'sia." Where Sienkiewicz calls attention to the light alternately fading and growing brighter, K. makes the violin approach and retreat. The adverbial phrase "still more" is inappropriate after K.'s change of verb, and he therefore changes the phrase to "opiat' i opiat'."

The short exclamation beginning "Ozary..." harks back to the question posed shortly before (p. 8, l. 19), and supplies the answer. C.'s elliptical rendering is

almost word-for-word, but the adjective "wyrznię" is translated as an adverb, "clearly." J.'s version reads rather better: "It was magic, clearly it was magic." K. uses two different words to translate "czary," which is repeated in the original: "chudesa," and "koldovstvo." T. underlines the fact that this is the answer to an earlier question by beginning the sentence with "yes." His exclamation, "It must have been a spell!" is a complete grammatical unit and a complete sentence, rather less exclamatory than the original.

T. begins a new paragraph with this sentence. "Tymczasem" (meanwhile) is interpreted by some translators as meaning little more than "then," and translated accordingly. C., J., and PSS do this. T. has "at this precise moment." With this exception, very little variation is possible in the translation of "wiatr powiał."

4.

To express the two perfective verbs with the prefix "za-" which follow it is necessary to use the auxiliary verb "to begin." Some translators, however, think it unnecessary to emphasize the beginning of the action, C. and T. among them. K. retains the prefix "za-" only with the second verb.

C. has difficulty in finding two nearly synonymous verbs for "zaszumiał" and "zaskopotał." For the former C. uses "to rustle," but is reduced to "there was

a noise" for the second. A precise, descriptive word is rendered by the most general, and least evocative "noise." Furthermore, this vague expression suggests something unknown, perhaps an animal, moving in the burdocks. Because of the syntactic structure adopted by the translator, the reader will not at once attribute this sound to the wind, in the same way as he will in the original, or even in the translation of the preceding clause: "the trees rustled quietly."

T. combines both sounds in one expression, using the noun "susurro" (whisper) to express both verbs: "in the whisper of the leaves Janko heard..."

In his second clause, K. also mentions the leaves of the burdocks, adding the adjective "shirokie."

T. and K. omit "jakoby," although C. renders it as "as it were." His "as it were, distinctly" seems contradictory, if not actually meaningless. C. would have been well advised to leave it out, as other English translators do.

5. T. supplies a direct object for the verb "uslyszal," rather than follow it with direct speech. The object provided is "a voice," in both T.'s and J.'s versions, and this of itself entails the insertion of another verb, indeed, of a whole relative clause in Spanish: "una voz que muy-quieto le decia." The adverbial phrase "muy quieto" (very softly) is not in the

original, and it is superfluous, as the reader already knows from "susurro" that the voice was soft.

K. uses a reflexive impersonal verb with the dative to render "uslyszai." He inserts "tak" before the adverb "iavstvenno."

6. The imperative "Idź!" is translated in a more varied manner than one might expect. T. and C. use literal equivalents in Spanish and English. K. uses "stupai," rather than the obvious "idi," used by PSS and R. J.'s "reach for it" seems misplaced, since the boy is still several paces away from the violin.

The remaining part of the sentence is rendered literally by all, except that K. uses "tam," instead of "v lakeiskoi." The command is repeated in identical form at the end of the line, the only change being the insertion of "zhe" by K.

7. The next short sentence poses no problems for the translators. In English, however, the reader expects to find the conjunction "and" between the adjectives. C. does not supply it. J. turns the sentence round to produce a natural English turn of phrase, in which the conjunction is not required: "It was a clear, bright night." T.'s version, which is otherwise literal, includes the conjunction.

In Russian a minor difficulty arises from the near-synonymous adjectives, "widna, jasna." The cognate

of the former is inapplicable here. Two of the Russian translators are reduced to the repetition of the same adjective: "svetlaia, svetlaia." K. changes the meaning of the first adjective: "tikhaia, svetlaia." It appears that all the Russian translators consider it important to preserve the pattern of the original sentence, ending in two adjectives, as the alternative, a single adjective without repetition, would be too terse. In Russian, as in the original, no conjunction is needed.

The adverbial phrase of place is shortened in various ways. The adjective "dworskim" in "w ogrodzie dworskim" is omitted by C., O., PSS and R., since it is obvious which garden the author is referring to. K. retains "barskii." T.'s version differs from the others in that the garden is not mentioned. T. has instead, "en los árboles del estanque" (literally: in the trees of the pond).

"Nad stawem" is omitted by C., presumably by accident. K. gives the most literal version of this line, adding nothing and omitting nothing.

and all the other English translators use the indefinite article with "słowik," but T. uses the definite article in Spanish.

8. The main verb complex, the auxiliary "to begin" with two infinitives, is changed by C. to two separate past tense verbs: "began to sing and whistled." His

sentence might have read more naturally if he had rendered both Polish infinitives as English infinitives.

K. follows the original construction, but changes the second verb to "poshohelkivat'," instead of "posvistyvati'." T. suppresses the second infinitive, saying "began to sing in trills," thinking perhaps that this is a more appropriate description of the nightingale's song than a literal translation of "to whistle." T. translates the adverbial phrase "cicho, to głośniej" by two adjectives qualifying "trinos": "ora dulces, ora estridentes." Nothing is lost by ignoring the comparative degree ("głośniej"), but "estridente" is not the happiest choice since it implies a negative, qualitative judgement of the sound, where the original word is a neutral adverb of degree.

C. renders both adverbs literally. His choice of preposition in the phrase "with a low voice" is doubtful, as the usual preposition is "in."

K. omits both adverbs.

T. makes use of a relative construction applied to "trinos," to connect the quotation to the preceding part of the sentence.

The three imperatives create some minor problems. Literal translation is completely ruled out here. The first two verbs differ only in aspect, therefore the difference between them cannot be expressed in non-

Slavonic languages. Nevertheless, C. makes a distinction of a different order: "Go! go in!" as if the second verb were not "pójdz" but "wejdz." The third imperative "weź!" is easily translated, but in non-Slavonic versions it requires an object. This is supplied by most translators except J.

J.'s "Reach, touch, fetch." sounds slightly strange because he supplies no object for the third verb. Neither of the verbs meaning "to go" can be found in this version, but the formal correspondence between the original and the translation is striking. The original line consists of three monosyllabic imperatives ending with very similar sounds: *dź, dź, ź*. This is closely matched in J.'s translation by three monosyllables with the same ending: *oh, oh, toh*. This translator reveals an awareness of an element which other translators have either not noticed or not considered important. The words "spoken" by the bird are important at once for their meaning and for at least a suggestion of an onomatopoeic transcription of the bird's song. J. alone tries to reproduce both. K.'s "podi voz'mi!" renders only the meaning. T.'s "Anda, Yanco, oógelo!" is too long and gives no hint of onomatopoeia.

9. Further ornithological confusion now ensues with "lelek" (nightjar, Caprimulgus europaeus), a bird less famed in world literature than the familiar nightingale.

Few of the translators render this correctly, but among those who do are the Czechs, who have the same word. K. simply transliterates the Polish word. Since "lelek" is not used in Russian, and since it is standard Polish, not dialect, there seems to be little reason for not using its standard Russian equivalent. K.'s editors provide a footnote, giving the Russian equivalent "kozodoi." The only non-Slavonic translators to use the correct TL words are B. and Z.

The most popular/incorrect choice is "owl" (C., T., PSS, R., OL): The nightjar is not related to any species of owl, and no English or American dialect is known to use "wood-owl" (C.) as an equivalent to "nightjar." Those translators who do not know what a nightjar is appear to seek a more familiar bird of the night to take its place. G. avoids naming the species, saying only, "il buon passero notturno" (the good bird of the night). Other translators name species still less like the nightjar: "raven" (OE and N.), "night heron" (P. and J.). This last species is unknown in north-eastern Europe.

T. and C. use the indefinite article with "owl." Other translators use the definite article.

In the original the adjective "poczciwy" (kindly) belongs with "lot," but since it is difficult to apply such an adjective to "flight," most translators

move it forward to accompany "lelek." Its meaning undergoes some changes in the process. K. renders it correctly as "dobryi," but "honest," found in three of the English versions, including C.'s, is not equivalent to "pocziwy" but to "uczciwy" or "rzetelny." Likewise "pochtennyi," used by R. and PSS, means "worthy of respect," not "kind-hearted." T. uses two adjectives, "prudent, and "wise," neither of which has the meaning of the original word. In all these versions the choice seems to be determined not by the adjective in the original, but by what the bird says.

T. and C. omit the second adjective "cichy." However, these two and K. translate the main verb and the preposition accurately, unlike OE ("flew over") and PSS ("proletela nad"). These two versions do not make clear that the bird flew round the boy's head.

T. uses the diminutive "pequeuelo" to translate "dziecko."

K. omits the verb "zawołał." T. expresses it by a gerund.

10. The bird's exclamation "Janku, nie! nie!" is free from the suggestion of onomatopoeia contained in "Idź! pójdź! weź!" and it offers even less scope for experiment. C. makes no changes. K. places the boy's name last, rather than first. T. expands the original command considerably: "No, Janko; don't go, don't touch

it!"

C. omits "ale" at the beginning of the next sentence. The incorrect translation of "lelek" is repeated consistently by C. and T.

"Odleciał" is rendered as "disappeared" by T., who retrenches the sentence by omitting the next clause, "a słowik został." C. includes the nightingale, but omits the verb "został," thus making "słowik," with "łopuchy," the subject of the verb "mruczały." This appears to be the result of inadequate checking of the translation against the original.

11. "Łopuchy" now become "the leaves of the bushes" in the Spanish version. The characteristically Spanish verbal structure "volvieron a susurrar" means only "whispered again." It does not convey the adverbial "coraz wyraźniej."

C.'s and J.'s "muttered" for "mruczały" is the first word the dictionary offers, but it is by no means suitable for plants rustling in the breeze, much less for nightingales, (C.). OE's "cried" is still less fitting. "Murmured" would be better. In the same way, K.'s "bor-motal pro sebia" is less apt than "sheptali," used by PSS and R.

K.'s version is fairly close to the original until the end of the sentence, where "coraz wyraźniej" is not translated. He also inserts the gerund

"kachala¹," to make plain the origin of the sound.

K. uses the collective noun "lopushnik" instead of the plural "lopukhi," used by the other Russian translators.

"Tam nie ma nikogo!" is almost a repetition of part of line 6, except that "tam" is used instead of "w kredensie." K. repeats "Net nikogo!" twice, without "tam." T. repeats his earlier version with no changes. C. has "inside" in place of "there."

12. T. renders the next short sentence literally, but changes the word-order, placing the subject in the final position. C.'s translation is equally literal. PSS is more literal than K., who renders one verb by two in an apparent attempt to describe the action more precisely: "vystupila vpered, zasiala."

OE's translation of this line is an undisguised exercise in embellishment of a simple original: "The fiddle still hung in the track of the moonbeams."

13. The three adjectives accompanying "ksztat" are reduced to one in T.'s version by the omission of "skulony" and the use of the diminutive "cuerpecito" to express the adjective "little." Some of the translators feel, perhaps, that three adjectives are too many. None of the Russian translators has more than two. K. and H. omit "biedny," and both use the adjective "malen'kaja" in conjunction with the diminutive "Figurka."

C. gives a literal rendering of the verb "posunął się": "pushed forward." In practice this verb means simply "to move," and it is translated as such by K., T., and PSS. T. translates the perfective verb with the prefix "po-" by means of an auxiliary meaning "to begin."

14. T. fails to translate the two adverbs "z wolna i ostrożnie." K. omits the first of these. T. also omits "naprzód," but this may be understood when left unsaid.

In the second clause, T. omits "tymczasem" and once again leaves out an adverb, the diminutive "cichuténko."

The original verb is in the imperfective aspect, but T. uses the preterite "silibó" with the adverb "again": "the nightingale whistled again." The author has, "Meanwhile the nightingale was/went on whistling softly." C. and K. give accurate renderings. The latter uses the doubled adverb "tikho-tikho" to translate the diminutive of the original. The diminutive is conveyed in English by the insertion of "very" (C.): "in a very low voice." This does not approximate to the colloquial tone of the original. J.'s "ever so softly" and B.'s "tout doucement" are better in this respect.

The three imperatives of line 8 are repeated, and most of the translators, including T. and C., repeat their previous versions with no changes. K., however, adds "idi," which did not appear in his version of line 8.

16. Tenses are mixed in this paragraph of the original, and this is reflected in the translations. The present tense is dominant in the original, and in the Spanish version the past tense is not used at all. K. and T. adopt the present for the first verb, "migotaba."

K. and T. use diminutives for the word for "shirt," where a standard form is used in the original. T. begins his sentence with "ya" (already). In his version the adverbial phrase "coraz bliżej" is expressed in the verb "to advance," and the exact meaning of the original verb, describing the light reflected from Janko's shirt, is not conveyed.

The door, which is mentioned in the original, is not mentioned by C. or T. C.'s verb "appeared" does not do justice to the author's "migotaba."

K. changes the adverb phrase from "ever closer" to "not far from," and adds the adjective "open," accompanying "door." The adjective "kredensowych" is left out since it is no longer necessary.

17. Some of the translators, including T. and C. link this sentence to the next. T. separates the clauses by a semi-colon, but K. incorporates the second sentence into the first as a participial phrase qualifying "poboszonka": "ne zakrytaia teonyui list'iami." The black burdocks of the original are rendered as "dark leaves." In English, C. also uses "dark," perhaps thinking the

alliteration of "black burdocks" excessive.

The verb "okrywał" is used in the present in the original, but C. continues to use the past.

T. makes this short sentence considerably longer and gives almost opposite meaning to the verb. Where the author writes, "The black burdocks no longer conceal it," T. has "It no longer stands out on the dark background of the bushes."

The clause with which T. continues the sentence is not present in the original: "ya está rozando el umbral," (it is already brushing against the doorway). The sentence which comes next in the original appears several lines further on in the translation. T.'s addition seems to be motivated purely by a desire to give an added "literariness" to the narrative, where the original, even at this dramatic moment in the story, is singularly devoid of any obvious literary devices. T.'s version has three clauses in succession introduced by "ya," where only one clause in the original begins with "już," giving a rhythmic repetition which is not in the original.

Sienkiewicz now uses an impersonal infinitive with a direct object. In K.'s version the object becomes the subject and the reflexive verb "slyshat'sia" is used. The Spanish construction is identical to K.'s.

C. continues in the past tense with the passive

verb "was to be heard." The awkwardness of his sentence is due partly to this verb form, partly to its position in the sentence, and partly to the absence of any article before "quick breathing." OE and J. use the definite article here. C.'s word-order is exactly that of the original, and markedly less natural for this reason.

K. omits "kredensowym," as it is clear which doorway the author has in mind. T. has "already in the pantry," instead of "on the threshold," the reason being that the sentence occurs later in his version, and circumstances have therefore changed.

18.

Not all the translators render "szybki oddech" by its literal equivalent, as C. does. PSS and R. have "prerystoe," which is less accurate than K.'s "usilennoe." Spanish "anhelosa" is apt. T. omits the adjective "chorych," and the noun "dziecka," saying instead, "the breath of these lungs." K. renders "child" by the adjective "detskii."

Literal translation now leads to a serious lapse in C.'s English: "A moment more the white shirt has vanished." Such a sentence could not normally be heard from any native speaker of English. Only the insertion of the conjunction "and" is necessary to make acceptable colloquial English of this: "A moment more and the little white blouse had disappeared." (OE).

S. adopts the historic present in this sentence.

He does not convey the diminutive suffix of "koszulka."

T. changes "his white shirt" to "his outline," and his translation of "chwila jeszcze" as "al cabo de un instante" is less colloquial than the original phrase.

19. K. omits "biała koszulka znikła," and proceeds directly to the next clause. This becomes a subordinate clause in the Spanish version, introduced by the gerund "quedando." T. has a Spanish diminutive for the original diminutive "nozka," and K. uses the Russian cognate. The adjective "bosa" is omitted by both T. and C.

K. inserts the adjective "detskaia," modifying "nozka."

The Polish verb "wystaje" is rendered by the Russian reflexive "vidneetsia" by K., as a gerund "remaining" by T., and simply as "there is" by C.

T. adds a relative clause qualifying "foot": "which at last disappears as well." This may be deduced from the context and it is not said in the original.

T. now begins a new paragraph with the sentence beginning "Na progu kredensowym..." which has been transposed from its position in the original.

C.'s version of the sentence beginning "Na progu" is literally correct, but hardly satisfactory: "In vain, O wood-owl, dost thou fly once again..." The use of the second person singular is a

20. and the same applies to the insertion of "O," to express the original vocative. The result is dangerously similar to parody, which, of course, is not the author's intention. The verb "to fly" requires a preposition, not only to express fully the meaning of the original prefixed verb of motion, but also to improve the English style. "By" and "past" serve this purpose in OE's and J.'s translations. T. uses the verb "to come," leaving the verbal prefix unexpressed. K. renders the original verb correctly by its cognate "proletat'." PSS and R use the same basic verb with the prefix "pri-," although this is equivalent to Polish "przy-," not to "prze-."

T. does not preserve the form of direct address to the bird in the second person singular. Instead, this sentence becomes part of the third person narrative. Its basic construction is, "It is useless..." with the subjunctive. The second verb of the original is expressed as an infinitive of purpose: "que venga a gritar."

K. conveys everything which is said in the original with only minor changes. The pronoun "ty" is inserted, and the epithet "dobraia ptitsa," which the translator applied to the nightjar in line 9, is repeated. The second verb is rendered as a gerund.

All previous errors in the translation of "lelek" are repeated here.

Apart from G., few translators are content with

a literal rendering of the nightjar's protesting call, although there is no reason why it should not be translated literally. T. has "Don't touch it!" instead of "No!", and K. inserts the boy's name, although it is not used in the original.

The last short sentence is not translated by T. C.'s version, in which "juž" is omitted, is correct. K. uses a verb, where "to be" is understood in the original:
"Ianko stupil uzhe v komnatu."

Summary of page 9.

Janko is lured into the servant's room by the enchanting beauty of the illuminated violin. The emphasis shifts for a while from the visual to the aural, as conflicting forces of nature struggle to control Janko's will. The nightjar tries to restrain him by flying round his head and calling, but the boy is urged on by other voices which prove stronger.

T.'s paragraphing and sentence division is very different from that of the original. His paragraphs tend to be much shorter.

All translators make brief omissions, including C., who appears to overlook a verb, "został" (l. 10), with detrimental effects on the meanings of his sentence. T. and K. make longer omissions.

Further traps await the translator in the names of birds and plants. These are important, since nature is not simply the background to Sienkiewicz's story; but an active force playing an important part, especially at this stage. Few translators know the meaning of Polish "lelek," and T. mistranslates "łopuchy."

original

Zarzechotały zaraz ogromnie żaby w stawie ogrodowym, jak gdyby przestraszone, ale potem ucichły. Słowik przestał pogwisdywać, łopuchy szemrać. Tymczasem Janek czołgał się cicho i ostrożnie, ale zaraz go strach ogarnął. W łopuchach czuł się jakby u siebie, jak dzikie zwierzątko w zaroślach, a teraz był jak dzikie zwierzątko w pułapce. Ruchy jego stały się nagłe, oddech krótki i świszczący, przy tym ogarnęła go ciemność. Cicha letnia błyskawica, przeleciawszy między wschodem i zachodem, oświeciła raz jeszcze wewnątrz kredensu i Janka na czworakach przed skrzypcami z głową zadartą do góry. Ale błyskawica zgasła, księżyc przesłoniła chmurka i nic już nie było widać ani słyszeć.

Po chwili dopiero z ciemności wyszedł dźwięk cichutki i płaczliwy, jakby ktoś nieostrożnie strun dotknął — i nagle...

Gruby jakiś, zaspány głos, wychodzący z kąta kredensu, spytał gniewliwie:

-- Kto tam?

Janek zataił dech w piersiach, ale gruby głos spytał powtórnie:

-- Kto tam?

Zapałka zaczęła migotać po ścianie, zrobiło się widno, a potem... Eh! Boże! Słychać klątwy, uderzenia, płacz dziecka, wołanie: "O! dla Boga!", szczekanie psów, bieganie świateł po szybach, hałas w całym dworze...

Короленко

Тут лягушки грянули разом в соседнем пруду из-под темных ветвей барского сада. Соловей замолк, лопух не шелухнет, стих ветер... Между тем Янко полз далее и далее, но вдруг его объял ужас. Среди лопухов он чувствовал себя дома, точно зверенок в родимых кустах, теперь он напоминал зверенка в ловушке. Его движения стали порывисты, дыхание короткое, со свистом, к тому же он очутился во тьме. Тихая летняя зарница, промчавшись по небу от востока и до заката, еще раз осветила комнату и в ней Янко на четвереньках перед скрипкой, с головой, приподнятой кверху. Но зарница потухла, туча закрыла луну, и уже ничего не было ни видно, ни слышно...

Только через минуту из темноты выволакался тихий и жалобный звук, точно кто неосторожно коснулся натянутой струны, и вдруг...

Грубый заспанный голос, по-видимому из темного угла комнаты, окликнул сердито:

-- Кто тут?

Янко притаил дыхание, но грубый голос окликнул вторично:

-- Кто тут?

Черкнули по отце спичкой, стало светло, а затем... Ах, боже! Послышались ругань, удары, детский плач, крики: "О! ради бога!", собачий лай. В окнах забегали огоньки, в усадьбе поднялся шум, суетня...

Tasín

Las ranas, como asustadas, rompen a croar allí en el estanque; pero cesan en seguida, y cesa el ruiseñor de trinar y las hojas de susurrar. La noche se oscurece.

Entretanto, Yanco se arrastra por el suelo de la despensa, poco a poco, despacito, con un miedo atroz, que le crispera las manos y los pies y le hace silbar el aliento en la garganta...

Mientras estaba fuera sentíase como en su propia casa, como un animalito silvestre metido en un matorral; pero ahora, en la lóbreguez de la despensa, le parece como si hubiera caído en una trampa. Un relámpago que cruza el horizonte ilumina de improviso la despensa y al chiquillo, que, caminando a gatas, avanza con la cabeza levantada. Más el relámpago se apaga, y la Luna [sic] se esconde tras una nube, y todo queda en las tinieblas.

De repente óyese un sonido lúgubre, triste, como si alguien tocara las cuerdas del violín, y... en seguida la voz recia de un hombre soñoliento que grita desde un rincón:

--¿Quién es?...

Yanco suspende el aliento; pero la recia voz repite:

--¿Quién es?...

Una cerilla se enciende, y..., ¡Santo Dios!, óyense golpes, gritos, sollozos; "¡Jesús, misericordia!" Y ladridos de perros, y voces, y ruidos por toda la casa, que se va alumbrando con las velas que acuden de todas partes, llevadas en alto por gente soñolienta.

Curtin

The great frogs began to croak in the garden pond, as if frightened, but afterward grew silent. The nightingale ceased to sing, the burdocks to rustle. Meanwhile Yanko crept along silently and carefully, but all at once fear seized him. In the burdocks he felt at home, like a wild beast in a thicket; but now he was like a wild beast in a trap. His movements became hurried, his breath short and whistling; at the same time, darkness seized hold of him. A quiet summer lightning flashed between east and west, and lighted up once more the interior of the pantry, and Yanko on all fours with his head turned upward. But the lightning was quenched, a small cloud hid the moon, and nothing was to be seen or heard.

After a while a sound came out from the darkness, very low and complaining, as if some one had touched strings unguardedly, and on a sudden some rough, drowsy voice, coming out of the corner of the pantry, asked angrily, —

"Who is there?"

Yanko held his breath in his breast, but the rude voice inquires again, —

"Who is there?"

A match became visible on the wall; there was a light, and then — Oh, my God! curses, blows, the wailing of a child, and crying "Oh, for God's sake!" — the barking of dogs, moving of lights behind the window, a noise through the whole building!

Commentary on page 10.

1. T. and C. use the auxiliary verb "to begin" to translate the prefix "za-" of the perfective verb "zarzechotać." K. has the perfective "grianut'," which denotes a single action.

T. and C. omit "zaraz," but its meaning is continued in Spanish auxiliary "romper a," which indicates a sudden burst of sound. K. uses the colloquial adverb "razom."

"Ogromnie" is omitted by several translators, including T. and K. Of those who retain it, some, C. among them, either misread it or misunderstand it. It is the adverb form, not the nominative plural of the adjective, which would be "ogromne." G.'s version, "the great frogs," shows that he has understood it wrongly as the adjective. Two of the Czech translators make the same mistake, using the adjectival forms "ohromné" and "veliké." M., however, renders it correctly as "hlasitě." PSS, R., B., and P. also translate the word correctly.

T. omits the adjective "ogrodowym." K. has "v sosednem prudu," and goes on to "iz pod temnykh vetvei barskogo sada." Of this, only the last word is taken from the original.

The remaining part of the original sentence, six words, beginning "jak gdyby (...)" is not translated by K.

T. continues to use the present tense in this sentence and the next two, although the author reverts to the past.

The phrase "jak gdyby przestraszone" is rendered literally by T. and C., but moved forward in the Spanish sentence to be placed next to "las ranas," with which it agrees.

C.'s version of the last clause of the sentence is accurate, but J.'s "then fell silent" is neater, terser English than C.'s "but afterward grew silent." In J.'s construction "but" can be dispensed with, and the verb "fell" conveys a suddenness which "grew" does not. T. uses the verb "to cease."

T. runs two sentences into one, using a comma and the conjunction "and." He repeats the verb "to cease" with the infinitive, in a literal rendering of the Polish "przestać" with the infinitive. He now renders "łopuchy" as "leaves." "And" is inserted to separate the two infinitives, as in J.'s English translation. C.'s version is word-for-word, without any conjunction.

Instead of the verb "to cease" with infinitives, K. uses three finite verbs, the third in an added clause: "stikh veter." The information in this third clause may be deduced from the second, but, as J. Levy points out, the translator, by the very nature of his profession, sometimes feels it necessary to add explanatory phrases.

where the original author does not consider it necessary to do so.²¹

T. also makes a short addition for which no obvious motive can be found in the original: "la noche se oscurece," (the night grows darker). The reason for the addition may be simply that it accords well with the mood of the original, with the growing sense of impending catastrophe and the sudden silence.

T. begins a new paragraph here. The first part of this sentence is rendered literally by most translators. Some diversity appears with the adverbs "cicho" and "ostrożnie." T.'s two adverbial expressions are not close in meaning to the original words: "poco a poco, despacito," (gradually, very slowly). "Quietly" becomes "quickly" in J.'s version. Neither of the adverbs are expressed by K. in "polz dalee i dalee." G.'s translation, however, is exact.

T. makes another addition in this sentence: "Yanco se arrastra por el suelo de la despensa," (across the pantry floor). The reason for this is that it is necessary to add an adverbial phrase indicating direction or location after the verb "arrastrarse." Adverbs are needed in other languages as well, hence C.'s "along," and K.'s "dalee."

4. The second clause is rendered literally by G. and K. T. effects a radical change here. The second clause

is transformed into an adverbial phrase: "son un miedo atroz." The idea of his being suddenly seized by fear is thus lost.

T. does not end the sentence here, but moves the sentence which begins on line 6 of the original forward ("Ruchy jego..."), joining it to this sentence as a relative clause modifying "fear," in a somewhat free translation. He then begins a new paragraph.

T. again avoids mention of "łopuchy" by saying "while he was outside." K. and C. are more literal. K. uses the preposition "sredi" with the genitive, rather than "v" with the locative, used by PSS and R.

5. Sienkiewicz's simile is carefully preserved by all three translators, although none of the English translators attempts to render the diminutive termination of "zwierzatko," no doubt because the adjective "little" would sound incongruous with the set expression "wild beast." Diminutives are used in Russian, Spanish, and Portuguese, and B. adds "petit."

K. inserts the adjective "rodimye," qualifying "kusty." T. inserts a past passive participle: "animal placed in a thicket."

K. omits "ale," linking the two contrasted clauses.

T. adds the clause "in the gloom of the pantry," which is unnecessary, as Janko's position is already

clear.

- C. follows the original construction with the verb "to be" and "like." K. and T. depart from this simple formula: "it seems as if he had fallen into a trap," (T.); "he reminded [one] of a little animal in a trap," (K.). Sienkiewicz's image relies on the contrast between the two clauses: a wild beast in its natural environment, and a wild beast in a trap. The contrast is partly lost in T.'s version as the animal is not mentioned in his second clause. The image is also weakened if a synonym for "animal" is used the second time, as in N.'s Portuguese version where "bichinho" is used in one clause, and "animal" in the other. N. and OE embellish the original slightly by replacing the verb "to be" with "to quiver": "now he quivered like a wild creature in a snare," (OE).
- 6.

The major part of the new sentence has been moved forward by T. to line 4, and translated as a relative clause attached to a previous sentence. The last five words of this sentence, however, are not translated: "przy tym ogarnęła go ciemność."

- The first part of the sentence can be rendered literally in English. This is one of the few places where C.'s and J.'s versions are identical. K. has "porzysty" for Polish "nagle." He renders the adverb "świeżo" by the preposition "s" with the noun "awist."
- 7.

C. has "at the same time" for "pry tys," slightly different from K.'s "k tomu zhe." C.'s version is as literal as possible, but K. does not say that darkness "seized" the boy, preferring the less dramatic "on ochutisla vo t'me." C.'s rendering is closer to the original.

C.'s use of the indefinite article with "lightning" does violence to accepted English usage: "A quiet summer lightning flashed..." This could never be said by a native speaker of English, since lightning, like electricity and water, is not something which can be counted. The only possible English expression here is "a flash of lightning." J. has, "A flash of summer lightning softly passing..." The change from the adjective "cicha" to the adverb "softly" is more successful than C.'s word-for-word "quiet... lightning." Lightning is noiseless by nature, and the adjective "quiet" in this position gives a curious, unnatural emphasis to this fact. This emphasis is not felt in the original, nor in K.'s version. T. omits not only "cicha," but also "letnia." OE changes "quiet" to "pulsing," which bears no relation to the original adjective, and by using the definite article suggests that this was not an isolated flash.

All the Russian translators render the subject of the sentence in full, omitting nothing, and

approaching tautology by using "zarnitsa" (summer lightning) in conjunction with the adjective "letniia." The adjective could be omitted.

The most serious mis-translation of this sentence occurs in Portuguese: "In the moonlight which swept the room from corner to corner." "Lightning" becomes "moonlight," and "from east to west" is changed to "from one corner to the other."

8. The gerundive phrase modifying "blyskawica" becomes the main clause of C.'s sentence, and a relative clause in the Spanish version: "que cruza el horizonte" (which crosses the horizon). The phrase "from east to west" is thus paraphrased. K. uses a past gerund, as in the original, though of a different verb; "promchavshis'." He also inserts "po nebu."

C. follows the prepositional usage of the original with "between east and west." Most other translators use "from" and "to," including J. and T.

T. changes "raz jeszcz" to "de improviso" (suddenly).

9. "The interior of the room" is shortened in T.'s translation by the omission of the obvious. K. also omits "vnutrze."

After "konnatu" K. inserts "i v nai," where the author and the other translators connect both objects of the verb by the conjunction alone.

The structure of the remainder of the sentence is the same in K.'s and C.'s versions as it is in the original. C., however, omits "przed skrzypcami," as does T.

T. uses the diminutive "chiquillo" instead of the boy's name. This is followed by a relative clause, with a gerundive phrase in apposition contained in it: "who, crawling on all fours, is advancing with his head raised."

OE makes emotional additions in this sentence. The lightning illumines "poor, trembling Janko," who is "cowering" before the violin.

10.

The English translators have some difficulty with the verb "zgasia," used of lightning. It is not easy to find a suitable English verb which can be applied to the sudden appearance and disappearance of a flash of lightning. C.'s "was quenched" implies external factors, and is therefore unsatisfactory. J.'s "died down" describes a gradual process, which this is not. OE's "ceased" is little better than "stopped," which is weak and insufficiently descriptive. Spanish "apagarse" is adequate, as is K.'s "potukhnut'."

K. and T. do not render the diminutive "chmurka." C. supplies the adjective "small." A transformation of categories occurs in Spanish, with "the moon" becoming the subject of its clause, governing a reflexive verb.

K. and C. preserve the original construction.

11. C.'s translation of the last clause of this paragraph could hardly be more literal. Only "już" is omitted. The Polish structure also passes easily into Russian, but the infinitives must be rendered as neuter short adjectives: "widno," "slyshno." T. departs further from the original, saying, "everything is left in darkness." This effectively conveys the visual element, but leaves the aural "or heard" untranslated.

T. is still using the present tense.

12. C. and T. omit "dopiero." T. inserts "suddenly" in its place. The word is not inappropriate, but it does not translate the adverb of the original. T. then omits "z ciemności."

The verb "wyszedi" is rendered literally by C. as "came out," and by K. as "vyrvalsia," which suggests a more violent movement, or, in this context, a louder sound. T.'s "is heard" is somewhat closer to the original.

The adjectives accompanying "dźwięk" are best translated by K. as "tikhii i zhalobnyi." The latter is better than C.'s "complaining," and the various equivalents of "sad" used by other translators. T.'s "légubre, triste" do not translate "cichutki."

13. Divergencies are minor in the subordinate clause beginning "jakby..." T. omits "nieostrożnie." There

Sienkiewicz has "strings," K. has "a taut string."

C. has "strings" with no article, although the violin is now at the centre of the reader's attention and one expects "the strings" (cf. J.).

K. uses the colloquial "kto" for "kto-to" or "kto-nibud'." The other Russian translators use these forms in full: "kto-to" (R.), "kto-nibud'" (PSS).

14. C. and T. run this paragraph into the next. K. observes the original division.

C. translates "jakis" as "some," although he could well have used the article. "Jakis" is not rendered by T. or K.

T. applies the second of the two adjectives not to "voice," but to "man," which he inserts: "the hoarse voice of a sleepy man."

C. uses the same participial construction as that of the original: "coming out of the corner."

K. omits the participle, using the preposition "from" by itself. He then makes two minor additions: "po-vidimomu," "temnogo ugla." In T.'s version the main verb and the original participle are expressed in a relative clause, referring to "voice." The main verb "asked" of the original and the adverb "gniewliwie" are condensed into the verb "shouts."

Twice in the course of one sentence of C.'s translation one wonders whether the translator is not

excessively fastidious in his rendering of Polish verbal prefixes. He has "come out" for "wyszedł" (1. 12), and "coming out" for "wychodzący" (1.14). In both cases "out" is redundant, and its repetition makes this all the more noticeable.

16. The brief question allows little variation in translation. K., however, changes "tam" of the original to "tut." The most natural question in Spanish is not "Who is there?" but "Who is it?" The latter, used by T., ("¿Quién es?"), is shorter by three syllables than "¿Quién está allí?" The same is true in Portuguese, but N. nonetheless uses the longer formulation.

In English, either "Who is it?" or "Who is there?" might be used in this situation. If the second is chosen, in view of the circumstances, it must be remembered that the rough, sleepy voice would almost certainly make the contraction of the interrogative pronoun and noun "who is," and not enunciate three clear syllables. C. and J. keep the two words separate. OE and Z. make the natural liaison.

17. C. is the only translator to render the superfluous "w piersiach": "Yanko held his breath in his breast." K. and T. realize that this is unnecessary and omit it. C. has his second verb in the present tense ("inquires"), despite the fact that his first verb is past, and that both verbs are past in the original.

T. continues to use the present consistently.

Although the author repeats the same verb here as in l. 14 ("spytaj"), T. and C. use a different verb on the second occasion. T. has "repeats" instead of "shouts," and C. has "inquires" instead of "asks."

19. The question is repeated in identical form in all three translations.

20. The first clause of the new paragraph describes the match being struck. It is translated in this way by K. and T., but C.'s version is extremely vague: "A match became visible on the wall." Such an imprecise translation of the verb "zaczęło migotać" leads to the loss of the vividness of the original.

T. omits "po ścianie."

The next clause "zrobiło się widno" is also omitted by T., perhaps because it is obvious that the match lights up the room. C. would have been well advised to omit his slack, extraneous "there was a light." OE's version shows more imagination, if more is said than in the original: "then there was a little spurt of flame."

21. T. omits "potem."

The exclamations are rendered faithfully by C., T., and K. C. omits "słychać" and presents the sounds which follow as a simple list with no verb. T. uses a reflexive verb in the present, "óyense." K. also uses a

reflexive, but in the perfective past: "poslyshalis'."

T. omits "klatwy," and changes "placz dziecka" to simply "sobs," omitting "dziecka." K. uses the adjective "depakli" rather than the genitive "rebenka."

22.

In C.'s list the last noun might be better rendered as "cries of" rather than "crying" (wołanie). The ambiguity of "crying" (shouting/weeping) is not immediately resolved by the elliptical context, and since the preceding noun is "wailing" one might expect the next to mean "weeping." The lack of a grammatical connector between the noun and the exclamation does nothing to clarify the matter.

The exclamation itself is translated literally by C. and K., and slightly less literally by T.: "¡Jesus, misericordia!" It is the force of the exclamation which matters, rather than its form.

T. now begins a new sentence. Of the last three items, the first is easily translated, but the others create some difficulties. After "the barking of dogs," K. begins a new sentence, expressing the action of the original nouns by Russian verbs. This transposition of categories gives better results than C.'s careful copy of the grammatical structure of the original, and a more accurate version than the flights of fancy into which the Spanish translator now launches. T. has much which is not in the original: "And the barking of dogs, and

voices, and noises all over the house, which is being lit up by candles which hurry in from all sides, carried aloft by sleepy people." Neither of the relative clauses, nor the last participial phrase are present in the original, and the fact that they include mention of candles (where the original has "light") can hardly justify such a long addition.


C.'s version of the last two phrases is less satisfactory still, as it has none of the vividness of the Spanish translation, nor the energy of the original. "Bieganie swiateł" is reduced to a sluggish "moving of lights." "Hałas," effectively rendered by J. and OE as "uproar," is reduced to "a noise." Of all the English words denoting fast movement and loud noise, C. can find nothing better than their lowest common denominators, which inevitably deprive the original of its colour and life.

In these four short lines C. offers one example of sloppy writing, in the loose, confused syntax of "and crying" (l. 22), and manifests a woeful lack of vocabulary and imagination in four places:

zapałka <u>zaczęła migotać:</u>	a match <u>became visible.</u>
zrobiło się widno:	there was a light.
<u>bieganie swiateł:</u>	<u>moving</u> of lights.
hałas:	a noise.

In fairness to C., T. also uses "ruidos"

(noises), but he more than compensates for this loss with his long addition. K. also uses "shum," for which most dictionaries would give "noise" though its meaning is narrower, but he reinforces it with "suetnia."



Summary of page 10.

The story moves towards its climax as Janko overcomes his terror with difficulty, and steals into the room to inspect the fiddle at close quarters. Tension mounts as the nightingale stops singing, the wind drops, and the croaking of the frogs ceases, giving way to an ominous silence. J. Krzyżanowski cites this passage as an example of Sienkiewicz's extraordinary ability to evoke a certain kind of atmosphere: "Sienkiewicz dawał wręcz popisowe obrazy nastrojowe, ukazując grozę, która czai się i narasta w mroku nocnym i zapowiada nieuchronne zbliżanie się zagłady."²²

Contrasting light and darkness play an important rôle. The brief flash of lightning is followed by total darkness as a cloud hides the moon, making the danger seem all the more imminent. The silence is finally broken when Janko touches the strings and wakes the servant. The narrator appears to observe the ensuing uproar from outside the house.

The translations of this page contain numerous departures from the original, in the form of addition, omissions, and rearrangements of the material in T.'s version, and to a lesser degree in K.'s. T. omits several adjectives and adverbial phrases, and makes his longest addition to date (l. 23).

C.'s English deteriorates further with the misuse of the indefinite article (l. 8). The central scene of the story loses some of its force because of his unimaginative choice of words.

Plł.

original

Na drugi dzień biedny Janek stał już przed sądem u wójta.

5. Mielisz go tam spędzić jako słodziejaka?... Pewno. Popatrzyli na niego wójt i ławnicy, jak stał przed nimi z palcem w gębie, z wytrzeszczonymi, zalęknionymi oczyma, mały, chudy, zamorusany, obity, nie wiedzący gdzie jest i czego od niego chcą? Jakże tu sądzić taką biedę, co ma lat dziesięć i ledwo na nogach stoi? Do więzienia ja posłać czy jak?... Trzebał przy tym mieć trochę miłosierdzia nad dziećmi. Niech go tam weźmie stójka, niech mu da różgę, żeby na drugi raz nie krał, i cała rzecz.

10. Bo pewno!

Zawołali Stacha, co był stójką:

— Weś go ta i daj mu na pamiętkę.

15. Stach kiwnął swoją głupowatą, swiergocą głową, wsiął Janka pod pachę, jakby jakiego kociaka, i wyniósł ku stodółce. Dziecko czy nie rozumiało, o co chodzi, czy się zalekło, choć, że nie oswało się ni słowem, patrzyło tylko, jakby przerażony ptak. Albo on wie, co z nim robią?

Короленко

На следующий день Янка стоял уже перед судом у вуйта¹.

5. Неужто хотят судить малого в качестве ворят.. Вероятно. Посмотрели на него вуйт и судьи, как он стоял перед ними с пальцем во рту, с широко раскрытыми некурганскими глазами, маленький, худой, запячканый, карбый, не знала даже, где он, что нужно от него этим людям. Как тут судить такое создание, которому всего десять лет, которое еле держится на своих слабых ножках. В тюрьму его, что ли?.. Где уж! Надо же притом иметь и немного жалости к детям. Пусть его попросу возьмет сторож, да пусть поостегаает маленько розгой, чтобы другой раз не повадно было, и все тут.

10. -- Ну, конечно!
Позвали Стаха, что был сторожем.
-- Возьми-ка его да поостегай для памяти.

15. Стах мотнул глумливой головой, головой зверя, захватил Янка под мышку, точно котенка, и конес его на гумно. Дитя будто не понимало, что с ним происходит, или уж очень было запугано, оно не издавало ни одного звука, лишь смотрело на рук, как смотрит бойманная птица. Потом ему знать, что это с ним хотят сделать.

1. Вуйт (или вуйт) -- начальник сельской администрации.

Yasía

Al día siguiente, Yanco fue conducido ante el juez. ¿Iban a juzgarlo como ladrón? Naturalmente. El alcalde y el juez lo miraron de arriba abajo, rígidos y severos, cuando compareció ante ellos, chupándose el dedo, desencajados los ojos por el terror, chiquitín, macilento, molido a golpes... Pero ¿qué castigo darle, si aun no había cumplido los diez años, si apenas se sostenía de pie?... ¿Meterlo en la cárcel?... ¡A pesar de todo, había que tenerle un poco de lástima! ¡Ea! ¡Que le ceja el sereno y que le dé unos azotes para que se le quiten las ganas de robar!

Y llamaron a Stach, el sereno.

--Tómalo por tu cuenta y procura que guarde memoria de su pecado.

Sacudió Stach la bestial cabezota, cogió al chiquillo como si fuera un gato y lo llevó debajo del brazo hasta el henil. Yanco no entendía ni una palabra de cuanto le sucedía; pero tenía un miedo cerval y no se atrevía a chistar; sólo miraba, miraba, cual pajarillo cogido en la red.

Continued

The next day Yanko stood before the tribunal of the village mayor.

5. Was he to be tried as a criminal? Of course! The mayor and councilmen looked at him as he stood before them with his finger in his mouth, with staring and terrified eyes, small, poor, starved, beaten, not knowing where he was or what they wanted of him. How judge such a poor little misery, who was ten years of age, and barely able to stand on his legs? Send him to prison, -- how help it? Still it was necessary to have some small mercy on children. Let the policeman take him and give him a flogging, so that he won't steal a second time, and that's the whole business.

10. It was indeed!

They called Stah, who was the village police.

"Take him and give him something for a keepsake."

15. Stah nodded his dull beetlelike head, thrust Yanko under his arm as he would a cat, and took him out to the barn. The child, whether he failed to understand what the question was, or whether he was frightened -- 't is enough that he uttered not a syllable; he merely stared like a bird. Did he know what they were doing with him?

Commentary on page 11.

1. A curious error occurs in OE's rendering of "na drugi dzień." OE has "two days later," and N. reproduces this mistake.

C., T., and K. all omit the adjective "biedny."

After using the historic present tense for the duration of the central scene, T. now reverts to the preterite. He changes the verb from the active "stood before" to the passive "was led before."

K.'s version of this line is word-for-word, with identical word-order. Even Polish "już" is preserved. This is omitted by T. and C.

The peculiarities of Polish village justice belong in the area of realia and can be rendered only approximately in most other languages. K. transliterates Polish "wójt," and relies on the context, particularly "przed sądem," to give his reader an understanding of the word. The editor of the translation adds a footnote: "nachal'nik sel'skoi administratsii." C.'s translation is close to this: "the tribunal of the village mayor. T.'s version is only approximate: "przed sądem u wójta" becomes simply "before the judge."

2. The verb "mieć" with an infinitive expresses obligation, though a less compelling obligation than "musieć" or "powinien." Some translators take care to

express the obligation: "devait-on" (B.), "dolzhny-li" (PSS), "nuzhno" (R.). However, the alternatives used by C., T., and K., with little or no idea of obligation, are fully acceptable. C. has a passive verb with no modal auxiliary: "was he to be tried." T. also avoids the modal: "were they going to judge him..." K. uses a different auxiliary, in the present tense: "Surely they do not want/intend to judge the boy..." The addition of the colloquial "neuzhto" is fully justified by the two particles which heighten the indignant tone of the original, and are not in themselves translatable: the suffix "-i" attached to the verb, and "tam." Some of the indignation is lost in T.'s and C.'s versions, in which no equivalents are found for these.

K. uses the noun "malyi" instead of the pronoun. C.'s and J.'s use of "criminal" for "złodziej" is inexact, since the word means "thief." K., T., OH, B., and P. render this by precise TL words.

K.'s reply to the question, "Veroiatno," appears weak even without reference to the original. In context it is barely correct. "Pewno" here can only mean "of course," as it is rendered by the other translators.

3.

T. adds an adverbial phrase to the first verb in the next sentence: "lo miraron de arriba abajo," (looked him up and down).

The noun "vojt" recurs with "lawniy," who became

"judges" in K.'s version. This is less accurate than "glasnye," used by PSS and R. T., who used "el juez" (judge) for "wójt," now has "el alcaide y el juez," both in the singular. His choice of dignities seems somewhat arbitrary, and the Spanish associations of "el alcaide" are almost as strong as those of "el sereno." In modern Spanish the word means "mayor," but in medieval Spanish it was used in its original Arabic meaning, "judge."²³

C.'s "councilmen" is adequate, as is "beadles" in J.'s translation, though this word may be too specifically English. OS's "the landlord" is clearly incorrect.

T. inserts two adjectives to qualify "lawiocy": "rígidos y severos." The verb "staz przed nimi" is changed to "appeared before them." K. and C. translate this literally, as they do most of the adjectival phrases which follow.

T. changes "z palcem w gąbie" to a gerundive phrase: "sucking his finger."

4. K. renders the adjective "wytrzeszczony" to "ras-krytyi," reinforced by the adverb "shiroko."

Of the four adjectives which follow, one is mis-translated by C. "Zamorunsky" means "soiled/grubby," but C. renders it as "starved." "Gudy" can sometimes mean "poor," as C. translates it, but here it is more

likely to have its basic meaning of "thin." T. omits "zamorusany." All four adjectives are rendered correctly by K.

5. T. omits the phrase beginning "nie wiedzący...", comprising nine words of the original. G. and K. give near-literal renderings of this line, introducing it with a gerund as in the original. K. inserts "dazhe": "ne znaia dazhe..."

The verbal construction "czego od niego chca" is translated by the Russian impersonal "nuzhno" with the dative. The indirect object is inserted in full ("etim liudiam"), in place of the pronoun.

The construction of the rhetorical question is taken directly from the original by G., at the cost of fluency in English. "Jak sądzić" is not in the least unusual or ungrammatical in Polish, but its literal translation "how judge" is both of these. J. and OE make the necessary correction: "How, thought the justice, could anyone try..." (OE). This version, however, is flawed by the addition "thought the justice." In the original, the thought appears as the narrator's and cannot be ascribed to any of the characters in the story, certainly not in such a way as to suggest that any of the representatives of justice have doubts about the morality of their duties. The addition is repeated in N.'s Portuguese translation.

J.'s version, with no additions, is better than

C.'s and OE's: "How were they to sentence..."

T.'s version is not unlike J.'s in that he translates "sądzić" as "to punish": "What punishment were they to give him?"

6.

T. avoids the difficulty of finding an equivalent to "bieda" by using the pronoun. Neither does K. do full justice to this word by rendering it as "etakoe sozdanie." C.'s "such a poor little misery" is adequate, if a little strange. Polish "tu" in this sentence is an enclitic filler-word which must be omitted in English and Spanish. K. retains it as "tut" in Russian.

The original relative clause becomes two separate conditional clauses in Spanish. Two relative clauses are used in Russian. The use of Polish "co" in place of "który" is primarily colloquial, and in Russian "kotoryi" is more usual in a context such as this.

The reversal of the numeral and the noun in the original gives the meaning "about ten," but none of the translators renders this meaning. K. adds "only," and T. makes Janko a little less than ten years old.

All elements of the second part of the relative clause are expressed by K., T., and C. In English the more common expression is "to stand on one's feet," rather than "legs," as used by C. K. uses the diminutive "nozki" where the original has the full form, and he inserts the adjective "slabyi." The insertion of "svoi"

has no effect on the meaning.

7. K. can omit the verb "posłać" in his translation of the next short sentence. It cannot be omitted in Spanish or English.

The interrogative "czy jak," with which this sentence ends, seems to puzzle C. A close translation would be "Send him to prison, or what?" C. has "Send him to prison, - how help it?" It is not possible to say whether the fault lies in a misunderstanding of the colloquial Polish expression, or in inability to express it in English. Be this as it may, the result is not colloquial English, but "translator's English," and the meaning is not that of the original. This is in sharp contrast to K.'s translation of this line, which is in natural, colloquial Russian: "V tiur'mu ego, chto li?" T.'s version is accurate, but does not convey the colloquial. "Czy jak" is omitted.

The next sentence is rendered accurately by C., T., and K., whose translations differ only in their tenses. The narrator, who is thinking aloud here, uses the present in the greater part of this paragraph, and it is difficult for the translator to avoid using the present. As this sentence can be read as a homily of general application, there is no reason for not preserving the present in the translations. C. and T., however, use the imperfect. T.'s reason for doing this

is that the generality "nad dziećmi" has been made specific by his use of the pronoun "him" (i.e. Janko). This is not so in C.'s version.

8. This sentence and the next are written in such a way that they could be direct speech by one of the magistrates. By using the past tense in the first of these sentences, T. and C. eliminate the possibility that this might be direct speech. Both translators rectify this in the sentence beginning "Niech go..." Here there is little alternative but to render direct speech as such.

For obscure reasons, T. inserts the exclamation "Ea!" between the two sentences.

This sentence is rendered accurately by C., T., and K. N. makes the mistake of identifying "stójka" with the servant whose violin is the cause of Janko's present predicament. Both are translated by the same word, so that the servant takes his own revenge upon the boy. The correct article here seems to be the definite article, as used by T. and C., although OE has "a watchman."

While following the structure of the original sentence, K. inserts two adverbs of his own. The first, "poprostu," does not change the meaning, but the second, "malen'ko" in "pust' postegaet malen'ko rozgoi," does modify the meaning somewhat. However, the form is

prostorechie, and its use does compensate for the colloquialism lost in the translation of "dać rozgą" as standard "postegaet rozgoi."

C. renders "dać rozgą" without mention of the instrument, as does T.: "que le dé unos azotes" (let him give him a few lashes).

The purpose clause is translated literally by C., but K. uses a colloquial expression which is peculiar to Russian, and necessarily less literal: "ohtoby... ne povadno bylo." T.'s subjunctive clause is also less literal than C.'s version: "in order that the desire to steal might leave him."

9. The final phrase "i cała rzecz" is omitted by T. C.'s literal translation results in an expression which no English speaker would be likely to utter in this situation: "and that's the whole business." The natural equivalent is "and that's the end of the matter." This may be varied slightly, as it is by J. and OE, but C.'s version, while conveying the meaning in a comprehensible fashion, sounds as if it were written by a foreign student of English. K.'s "i vse tut" is correct.

10. The exclamation "Bo pewno!" might appear to be direct speech, but since it is not marked as such in the original it is clear that it comes from the narrator, who is ironically adopting the point of view of the jurymen. However, several of the translators, K. among them, mark

this as direct speech, presumably by one of those present in the court-room.

C. does not do this, but his version fails because he misconstrues the meaning. His "It was indeed!" refers to the end of the last sentence ("That's the whole business"), and thus appears as a hint, anticipating the boy's tragic end. The correct translation, "Yes, of course," (J.), simply expresses the narrator's ironic agreement with the magistrate's wise decision to give Janko a flogging. The exclamation is omitted by T.

11. The subjectless third person plural "zawołali" is rendered literally by T. and K. C. has to insert the indefinite pronoun "they."

C.'s "transliteration" of "Stach" as "Stah" is of little assistance to his readers, since a final "h" is no easier for an English-speaker to pronounce than the original "ch." Nevertheless, this form is to be preferred to Z.'s "Stanley." T. dispenses with the relative clause by placing "el sereno" in apposition. C. and K. preserve the relative pronoun and the verb "to be."

Even in a simple sentence such as this the poverty of C.'s English manifests itself: "Stah, who was the village police." English demands that the noun be "policeman." The only conceivable situation in which C.'s version could be regarded as correct would be one

in which the author wished to make a jocular, derogatory remark about the village, by saying that it was so small that the sole representative of the law was Stach. This is not Sienkiewicz's intention, and there is nothing to indicate that C. deliberately intends to make such a remark.

12. The meaning of the court's instructions to Stach is conveyed accurately by C., T., and K., but only K. expresses their off-hand tone and the single colloquialism. The enclitic "ta" is rendered by suffixing "-ka" to the imperative. K. again uses "da" for "and."

T. expresses the sense of the original, but in a considerably longer sentence, containing twenty-two syllables for the original's ten. The use of the word "pecado" (sin) does not seem wholly appropriate.

13. The verb "kiwnął" is changed in several translations, including T.'s, since Spanish lacks a verb denoting a nod of assent. For this reason T. has "sacudió... la cabeza" (shook his head). Of the Russian translators only PSS uses "kivnul," the cognate of the Polish word. K. has "motnul."

In the original, two adjectives modify "glowa." T. translates only the second, omitting "glupowata." K. and C. express both, K. using a noun in the genitive to render the second, rather than an adjective, and

repeating the instrumental "galovol."

The following two clauses are translated in full by K., C., and T. with few changes. T. moves "pod pachę" from the second clause to the third. Again he uses the diminutive "chiquillo" where the original has the boy's name.

Russian translators differ as to the accusative case of "Janko." FSS and R. treat the proper noun in "-ko" as indeclinable, as is customary in modern Russian, but K. has the accusative "Ianka," as in the original Polish.

14. "Kociak" is translated by C. and T. as "cat," although its literal meaning is "kitten," as used by all the Russian translators.

"Jakiego," if translated into English, would only cause unnecessary clumsiness. It is duly omitted by most of the English translators, as well as by T. and K.

The diminutive termination of "stodółka" is not expressed by any of the translators. T.'s rendering of this word as "el henil" (hayloft) is inexact, though this is of very slight importance. C.'s and K.'s versions are more accurate.

The original verb of motion "wyniósł" has the prefix changed to "po-" in all the Russian translations. K. changes the original preposition "k" to "na" with the accusative.

15. The two "oxy" clauses are not translated completely correctly by T. The meaning can be expressed by "either...., or..." or by "whether...., or whether..." (C.), but in T.'s Spanish version the two clauses, parallel in the original, are contrasted: "Yanco no entendía ni una palabra...; pero tenía un miedo cerval" (Janko did not understand a word...; but he was mortally afraid.) A basic change has come about in the meaning of the sentence. The narrator now knows more about the boy's feelings than he did in the original, where he could only hypothesize about the reasons for Janko's silence.

C. renders the two clauses as literally as possible. K. conveys the sense correctly by separating the two clauses by "ili." C. succeeds in rendering the meaning in English which is comprehensible, but little more. His rigid adherence to the word-order and structure of the original leads to doubling of the subject. "The child" (l. 14) could well have been left out, since the pronoun "he" (l. 16) apparently governs the same verb ("to utter"). This would have produced a more elegant sentence, and removed the impression that the sentence only just hangs together grammatically.

The common expression "o co chodsi" is translated as "what the question was" by C. This is a possible translation, but by no means the natural one in the context, (of "what it was all about" or "what was

about J.). Reading C.'s translation, one might think that a question had been addressed to the boy by one of the officials, but this is not the case. "V ochem dele," used by P33 and R., is the exact Russian equivalent of the Polish expression. K. has "what was happening to him," as does T.

16. There appears to be no good reason for C.'s use of "it is" instead of "is," nor for his change of "ni szowem" to "not a syllable." K. has "ni odnogo zvuka," which reads more naturally than C.'s version. T. adds the auxiliary "to dare."

The last clause and the simile are rendered correctly by C. Almost all the other translators feel a need to add to the simple simile "jakby pabrzyk ptak." All the Russian translators add an adjective: "like a trapped bird." K. also inserts an adverbial expression: "smotrelo iz ruk." T. makes one addition similar to that made by the Russian translators, but more elaborate: "like a bird caught in the net." T. Bujnicki quotes this sentence and the preceding one, containing two comparisons with the natural world and the adjective "zwierzęca," as examples of the naturalistic strain in the story.²⁴ This is not the only instance of humans being compared to beasts.

The next sentence, seven words in the original, is omitted by T. C. renders the sentence literally.

omitting only the first word "albo." The main verb in the present tense "on wie" must be rendered as past. G.'s translation, like J.'s, is incorrect because the verb "zrobią," in the perfective, is translated as "what they were doing," as if the original had the imperfective "robią." The correct translation is "what they were going to do to him." K. renders this correctly as "khotiat delat'."

"Albo on wie" is translated by K. as an infinitive construction: "Pochem emu znat'."

Summary of page 11.

Janko's deed swiftly brings the inevitable consequences in its wake. He is brought before the village court, sentenced, and taken out to receive his punishment at the hands of the half-witted Staoh. The narrator now appears more directly involved in his story, frequently inserting his own asides. K. mistakes one of these for a line of dialogue.

On the whole the translations follow the patterns already established, of close adherence to the original by C., and of a much freer approach by T. K.'s method falls between the two.

The translators' varied handling of Polish realia can be seen in their treatment of Polish "wójt" (1. 1).

original

Dopiero jak go Stach w stodołę wziął garścią, rozsiągnął na ziemi i podgiwwszy kossuliny, machnął od ucha, dopieroś Janek krzyknął:

-- Matulu! -- i co go stójka różga, to on! -- Matulu!

matulu! -- ale coraz ciszej, słabiej, aż za którymś razem uoiło dziecko i nie wołało już matuli...

5.

Riedne, potrasakane skrzypki!...

Wj, głupi, sły Stachu! ktoś tak dzieci bije? Toż to małe i słabe i zawsze było ledwie żywe.

10.

Przyszła matka, sabrała chłopaka, ale musiała go zanieść do domu... Na drugi dzień nie wstał Janek, a trzeciego wieczorem konał już sobie spokojnie na tapczanie pod sgrzebnym kilimkiem.

15.

Jaskółki świągotwały w osierotni, co rosła pod przybłą, promień słońca wchodził przez szybę i oblewał jaśnością słońca, rozczochraną główkę dziecka i twarz, w której nie zostało kropli krwi. Ów promień był niby gościńcem, po którym mała duszyczka chłopczyka miała odejść. Dobrze, że choć w chwili śmierci odchodziła szeroka, słoneczną drogą, bo za życia szła po prawdziwie ciemistą.

Короленко

Только когда Стах на гумне стреб его своими лапами, растянул на земле, поднял рубанок и вытянул крутом со всего плеча, тогда только Янко воскликнул:

-- Матуля! -- И как его сторож розгой ударит он свое: "Матуля, матуля!", но все тише, слабее и, наконец, удары раздавались по-прежнему и уже не сопровождались детскими криками. Янко замолк.

Бедная, разбитая скрипка!...

-- И глух же ты, скверный Стах! Разве бьют так детей? Ведь это же было мало и бессильно, в чем и раньше душа-то держалась!

Пришла matka, взяла ребенка, но уж должна была до-
10. нести на руках до дому... На другой день Янко не поднялся, а на третьи сутки, вечером, он умирал спокойно под толстым рядом.

За стенкой, в листве черемны щебетали ласточки, солнечный луч прорывался в оконце, окружая сиянием спутанные светлые кудри и бледное личико ребенка, в котором не было
15. уже ни кровинки. Луч этот был точно открытой дорогой отходящей детской душе. Благо, что хоть теперь открылась ей широкая дорога ярких лучей, ее жизненный путь был поистине путь страшно тернистый.

Tasín

Pero cuando Stach, después de tenderlo sobre el heno, le hubo dado con su correa brutalmente el primer golpe sobre las carnes, no pudo aguantar y gritó:

--¡Madre!

Y a cada azote que le lastimaba el cuerpo gritaba el infeliz:

--¡Madre!... ¡Madre!...

5. Pero con voz más acabada cada vez, hasta que, por último, enmudeció. ¡Pobre mísero violín destrozado!

¡Estúpido, malvado Stach! ¿Quién les pega así a los niños? ¡Y era aquél tan pequeño, tan enclenque y enfermizo! ¡Si apenas se sostenía!...

10. Fué la madre por él y tuvo que llevarlo en brazos; al llegar a casa lo acostó. Ya no se levantó más el pobrecillo. Al tercer día ya casi no respiraba, agonizando quietamente debajo de su raído cubrecama.

15. Chillaban las golondrinas al revolotear por entre las cerezas del huerto contiguo a la casita; un rayo de sol entraba por la ventana, abierta de par en par, iluminando con áurea claridad aquella cabecita hecha una borra y aquel semblante exangüe... Era el rayo aquel como un camino por el que el alma del angelito subía al cielo. Y era un gran consuelo que, al menos en el momento de la muerte, se le abriese aquella senda ancha y luminosa a él, cuya vida había sido un senderito tan angosto y tan lleno de abrojos...

Curtin

Only when Stah took the handful to the stable, stretched it on the ground, and raising the shirt from it struck a full blow, only then did Yanko scream, "Mamma!" and as long as Stah flogged him he cried, "Mamma! mamma!" but always lower and weaker, until after a
5. certain blow the child called mamma no longer.

The poor broken fiddle!

Ai, stupid, angry Stah, who beats children that way? Besides, this one is small and weak, hardly living.

The mother came, took the little boy, but she had to carry
10. him home. The next day Yanko did not rise from the bed, and the third day, in the evening, he died quietly on the plank cot under hamp matting.

The swallows were twittering in the cherry-tree which grew at the cottage; the rays of the sun entered in through the window pane and colored with the brightness of gold the dishevelled hair of the little boy and his face in which not one drop of blood remained.
15. That ray was as it were a road upon which the soul of the boy was to go away. It was well that it went by a broad shining road in the moment of death, for during life it went on a thorny one, truly.

Commentary on page 12.

1. C.'s first clause contains two minor errors:

"Only when Stah took the handful to the stable."

"Stodoła" means "a barn," not "a stable." C.'s translation of its diminutive form (p. 11, l. 14) was correct. Secondly the translator misreads "wziął w stodole" as "wziął w stodołę," i.e. as a motor verb with the barn as the destination in the accusative, whereas it is actually in the locative.

"Handful," as the object of the verb, is C.'s attempt to translate the instrumental "garścią," which presents a minor problem for English translators. J., who does not make either of C.'s mistakes, does not express this fully: "Only when Stach grasped hold of him in the barn." K. comes closer by introducing the word "paws": "sgreb ego lapami." T. omits "wziął garścią."

T., who changes the opening phrase from "only when" to "but when," then makes a syntactic change by rendering the second main verb "rozciągnął" as part of a subordinate clause: "after stretching him out on the hay." Since T. used "hayloft" to translate "stodołka" when it first appeared, it seems logical to use "hay" for "ziemia" on this occasion, although both words are inexact.

2. The past gerund "podgiąwszy" is given as a

present gerund by C., and as a finite verb by K.

T. omits "podgiąwszy koszulę." C. does not convey the diminutive ending of the noun.

"Machnął od ucha" requires some slight expansion and clarification in other languages. A word-for-word translation is not possible. C.'s "struck a full blow" is correct. K.'s version is closer to the original construction, but the implement of chastisement is mentioned: "vytiaňul prutom so vsego plecha."

T.'s translation of these three words of the original adds up to thirteen TL words, partly thanks to some additions. Like K., T. mentions the instrument, incorrectly, as it is not a strap. Neither the adverb "brutally," nor any other is used in the original. T. stresses that it is after the first blow that Janko screams, and also mentions where the blow lands: "sobre las carnes." This is not in the original.

"Dopiero" is repeated in the original, and in English "only then" can also be repeated, as it is by C. K. does the same. Another verb is inserted by T.: "no pudo aguantar y gritó" (could not hold out, and shouted).

N.'s translation of "krzyknał" could hardly be further from the original: "he murmured in a low voice."

3. K. preserves the Polish affectionate form "matula," which is once more rendered in Spanish as

standard "madre." C. uses the affectionate form "Mamma."

Sienkiewicz follows this with a somewhat colloquial verbless construction. At least one verb must be supplied in translation. K. inserts "uderit" in the perfective future, which gives a suitably colloquial note in this context, as does the verbless "on svøe," by which he introduces Janko's next cry.

As well as the verb "gritaba" (shouted), which is necessary, T. inserts a relative clause of his own: "Y a cada azote que le lastimaba el cuerpo..." (with each lash which tormented his body). T. also uses the noun "el infeliz," instead of the pronoun, as the subject of the verb.

Here, as before, C. does not mention the birch ("rózga"), using the verb "to flog" without mention of the instrument. His version "as long as Stah flogged him" does not make it clear that the boy cried out after every blow. This is plain in the original, and in K.'s and T.'s translations.

4. "Cerez" with the comparative adverb is rendered by C. as "always lower," though J. uses the more normal English expression "ever lower," and OE has an equally natural turn of phrase: "lower... each time." K. and T. express this correctly, but T. has only one adjective with "voice" to express the two adverbs of the original.

C. does not produce a satisfactory version of

the remaining part of this sentence. His rendering is literally correct, except for the insignificant omission of "ucichło dziecko," but his awkward English, resulting from his literal translation of "którymś," ("after a certain blow"), outweighs whatever virtues this version may have. T. renders "za którymś razem" by simply "at last," but this does not make clear that Stach continues to beat the boy after he has fallen silent. K. stresses

5. this not only by using "nakonets," but by inserting "udary razdavalis' po-prezhnemu." He paraphrases the original "nie wołało już matuli" by saying "the blows were no longer accompanied by childish cries."

T. shortens the sentence by omitting the last clause, "nie wołało już matuli."

6. The exclamation is translated word-for-word by O. and K. T. adds the adjective "misero" to the original two, and attaches this sentence to the previous paragraph.

7. The exclamation which follows, addressed to Stach, is punctuated as direct speech in K.'s and B.'s versions. Who the speaker is the translators do not indicate. In the original, this is not said by any of the characters. The narrator is once again thinking aloud.

This is likely to puzzle the reader, since there is no such exclamation in current English usage. J.'s "fie on you!" is somewhat quaint, but the sense is clear.

The two adjectives applied to Stach are rendered with perfect accuracy by T. and K. C.'s "angry" for "zly" is inappropriate in this context. This is only one of the meanings of the word, and what is meant here is an inherent characteristic, not a mood. Moreover, it has nowhere been suggested that Stach is angry. He is portrayed as a witless creature, as unlikely to feel anger as any higher emotion. The correct translation is "wicked" (OE).

The rhetorical question is accurately translated by C., T., and K. K. uses "razve" with the subjectless third person plural, rather than the interrogative "kto." Once again, he uses a sub-standard variant of "tak." C. and T. are more liberal, both using "who."

The next sentence, in which the narrator continues to express his horror at Jenko's punishment, is given emphasis by the introductory "tol." C. renders this by "besides," T. simply by "and," and K. by "ved" followed later by "zhe." It is not easy to see how this sentence will in other languages without substantial changes, mainly because of "izvolite lyub." T. is very good. "this one is small and weak, hardly living, it says."

because of the awkwardness of the last two words. J. gives a more idiomatic rendering: "with never any hold on life."

T. breaks this sentence into two separate exclamations, which together express the meaning of the original in full: "And this one was so small, so weak and sickly! He could hardly stand up!" The imperfect tense is used in both exclamations, and the adjective "enfermizo" is the translator's addition.

Janko's frailty is effectively expressed in a colloquial turn of phrase in K.'s translation, which does not attempt to copy the original construction.

9. C. and K. translate the next sentence in a fairly literal manner. K. has only two minor insertions: "uzh," and "na rukakh."

Standard Polish "do domu" is rendered by K. not as standard Russian "domoi," but as "do domu," which may be regarded as a Ukrainism or a Polonism, but in either case it is sub-standard as Russian.

T., like K., inserts "in her arms," and after this he adds a separate clause of his own: "upon arriving home she put him to bed."

10. C. and K. give close literal equivalents for the first main clause. T., however, ends the sentence after "went" and attempts to highlight the point by changing the meaning: "the poor little thing never got up again!"

The diminutive noun "pobrecillo" is used where the author uses the boy's name. Although it turns out to be true that Janko never gets up again, Sienkiewicz says only that he did not get up the next day.

The second clause can easily be translated directly into all three TIs. Care must be taken, however, in rendering the imperfective verb "konal... sobie." G. is wrong in translating this as "died." All the Russian translators use the imperfective "umiral," and most of the others have the imperfect tense, stressing the gradual process. The Spanish imperfect gives suitable emphasis to the slowness of Janko's death: "casi no respiraba, agonizando quietamente..." Although this is paraphrase, it is closer to the original meaning than the use of the preterite "died" by G., OE, and N.

T. omits "wioszczył."

11.

The use of the redundant dative pronoun "sobie" is highly colloquial, lending an almost casual tone to the narrative. OE's "he breathed out his soul in peace" has nothing of the colloquial style of the original.

"Tapoxen" is not mentioned in K.'s or T.'s translations. It is not necessary as we already know that Janko is in bed, and this is confirmed by the words "złoty sypialnia" "golden bedroom." G. renders "tapoxen" as "bed," which is close to the term he used at the beginning of the story.

12.

T. inserts a second verb in the infinitive, so that the swallows in his version are in flight, whereas in the original they appear to be perched. C. does not repeat his earlier error of rendering "jaskółki" as "sparrows." Z. betrays his ignorance either of English usage or of the sound of swallows by making these birds "chirp." This verb is appropriate for sparrows, but not for swallows. The correct word is that used by C., "to twitter."

K. makes a minor addition: "y listve cherešni."

T. makes the cherry-tree plural.

The situation of this tree is less precise in the translations than in the original, owing to the impossibility of finding an equivalent to Polish "prawyta": "a shelf of earth running along the front of a peasant's cottage."²⁵ K.'s "za stenkoi" is vague, but, coming at the beginning of the sentence, it forms a natural link with the previous paragraph, in which we see Junko in bed inside the house.

"At the cottage," used by C., is also vague, since "at" is the least precise of all the possible English prepositions. Like C. and K., T. does not attempt to translate "prawyta": "among the cherry-trees of the garden adjoining the house."

The single instance of the original in this paragraph is C.'s translation.

13.

For no apparent reason, the window through which this sunbeam enters is open in T.'s version, thanks to the addition of five words.

The phrase "oblewał jasnością złotą, rozozochraną główkę" gives rise to disagreement among the translators as to the function and case of "złotą." It can be instrumental, agreeing with "jasnością," or accusative, agreeing with "główkę." The majority of translators choose the former interpretation, including C. and T. Some, however, including K. and two of the Czech translators, Ž. and Rum., render the word as an accusative modifying "główkę." It is impossible to say for certain which meaning Sienkiewicz intended, but it seems probable that K., Ž., and Rum. are right, as the comma between "złotą" and "rozozochraną" would not be needed if the two were not in the same case.

K.'s interpretation is easier to translate than C.'s and T.'s. A more elaborate phrase is needed in most languages if "złotą" goes with "jasnością": "coloured with the brightness of gold" (C.), "poured its golden brightness over..." (T.). This interpretation also leads to extremes such as O.'s "flooded with glory."

It is easier to apply a second adjective to "główkę" than to work the adjective "złotą" into an adverbial phrase as T. does. "Illuminated and golden" (O.) and "Illuminated, golden and..." (C.) are also possible.

(rozczochrana)." Here both adjectives are translated by longer phrases.

14. K. and G. both render "główkę" as "hair" rather than "head," as the adjectives indicate that this is what is meant. T. renders the original diminutive by its exact Spanish equivalent.

The second object "twarz" of the verb "oblewał" and the accompanying relative clause are rendered literally by G. and K., except that K. uses the diminutive "lichiko" and inserts the adjective "blednos" as well as the adverb "uzhe." T., on the other hand, reduces the relative clause to a single adjective, "bloodless."

The image in the next sentence suffers from certain banal additions made by some of the translators, T. among others. In the original, the ray is like a road for the boy's departing soul. T., G., OE, and N. feel that this can be improved by stating the direction his soul is to take. Thus OE has "a track for the little fellow's soul to ascend to heaven." The same addition is made by T., who goes further by saying "al alma del angelito" for "male duszyoska chlapeczyka." In N.'s version the road becomes a ladder leading to heaven. G. and K. do not take such liberties with the original.

K. avoids the relative clause by using a present active participle with the dative case. He adds the adjective "obscuro" qualifying "cruz" in the original.

diminutives, which might be considered excessive used with "mala," are not rendered in Russian, and the adjective "mala" is omitted.

C. translates this sentence correctly, but his English shows signs of carelessness. "That ray" is a perfectly correct rendering of "ów promień," but it is not obvious which ray C. is referring to, since in line 12 he translated the singular "promień" as plural "rays."

It is not necessary to translate "niby" as "as it were," when "like" would be just as suitable.

16:

It is not usual in English to use the prosaic verb "to go away" of the soul leaving the body.

The use of the verb "mieć" as a modal is retained by C.: "was to go away." K. and T. do not attempt to retain it.

C. omits "choć."

K. renders "w chwili śmierci" as simply "now." He then transposes categories to make "dorożka" the subject, instead of "dusza." T.'s version might almost be a translation of K.'s Russian. C. follows the original more closely, changing only the word-order.

K. renders the adjective "brzoźny" not by the Russian cognate, but by a noun with an adjective in the genitive: "dorożka brzoźna iuchał."

C. links the two clauses by the conjunction "and," which is left out by K. T. makes the two clauses

in the second clause as in the first, making "put" the subject of the verb. The structure of T.'s sentence is not dissimilar. Janko's life is equated directly with a narrow, thorny path. The first adjective "tan angosto" is added by the translator.

C. translates "po prawdzie" correctly as "truly," but appends it in a somewhat unnatural manner at the end of the sentence. The expression is omitted by T. K. keeps it and adds another qualifier: "strashno ternistyj."

Summary of page 12.

Stach administers the sentence of the court, leaving Janko unconscious, to be carried home by his mother and put to bed. The narrator expresses his own views to a greater extent than in preceding parts of the story, upbraiding Stach for his thoughtless action, which leads to the boy's death.

After the description of the trial and the punishment, the narrative style changes to describe a situation. The scene on the morrow of the beating is depicted in extremely lyrical prose, which some translators, notably T., tend to add to.

original

Tymczasem wychudłe piersi poruszały się jeszcze oddechem, a twarz dziecka była jakby zasluchana w te odgłosy wiejskie, które wchodziły przez otwarte okno. Był to wieczór, więc dziewczęta, wracające od siana, śpiewały: "Oj, na zielonej, na runi!", a od strugi dochodziło granie fujarek. Janek wsłuchiwał się ostatni raz, jak wieś gra... Na kilimku przy nim leżały jego skrzypki z gonta.

Nagle twarz umierającego dziecka rozjaśniła się, a z bielejących warg wyszedł szepc:

-- Matulu?...

10.

-- Co, synku? -- ozwała się matka, którą dusiły łzy...

-- Matulu, Pan Bóg mi da w niebie prawdziwe skrzypki?

-- Da ci, synku, da! -- odrzekła matka; ale nie mogła dłużej

mówić, bo nagle z jej twardej piersi buchnęła wzbierająca żalność, więc jęknął tylko: "O, Jezu! Jezu!", padła twarzą na skrzynię i zaczęła

15. ryczeć, jakby straciła rozum, albo jak człowiek, co widzi, że od śmierci nie wydrze swego kochania...

Jakoś nie wydarło go, bo gdy podniósł się, znowu spojrzała na dziecko, oczy małego grajka były otwarte wprawdzie, ale nieruchome, twarz zaś poważna bardzo, mroczna i stępała. Promień słoneczny od-

20.

szedł także.

Pokój ci, Janku!

Короленко

Между тем исхудалая грудь подымалась еще слабым дыханием, а по выражению детского личика было видно, что оно жадно ловит голоса деревни, врывающиеся в открытое окошко. Был вечер, и девки, возвращаясь с сенокоса, пели: "На зеленой, на травушке!", а со стороны ручья лились переливы свирелей. Последний раз слушал музыкант Янко, как пела деревня... На рядне с ним рядом лежала его тесовая скрипка...

Вдруг лицо умирающего ребенка прояснилось, и победившие уста пролепетали:

-- Матуля...

10.

-- Что, сыночек, -- спросила мать, подавляя подступившие к горлу рыдания...

-- Матуля! Будет ли у меня на том свете настоящая скрипка?

-- Будет, сыночек, будет! -- ответила мать, но уж не могла сказать ничего больше, потому что в груди ее поднялась горькая жгучая жалость: "О боже! боже!" -- и она повалилась грудью на сундук и заревела точно безумная или как человек, которому стало ясно, что уж не вырвать ему свою любовь из когтей смерти.

15.

Да и не вырвала, -- когда, поднявшись, она посмотрела на ребенка, глаза маленького музыканта были открыты, но неподвижны, а лицо носило печать какого-то напряженного и как будто мучительного величия. Луч солнца отблескивал также...

20.

Мир тебе, Янко!

Tasín

Aquel pecho extenuado todavía respiraba un poquitín, y aquel lívido semblante parecía absorber aún la música que por la ventana entraba. Anocheceía; las mozas del villorrio regresaban de los prados cantando alegremente: ¡Oh, sobre la pradera, sobre la verde pradera!... Y del arroyo llegaba como un gorjeo, y la campana de la iglesia dulcemente tañía. Y Yanco, moribundo, escuchaba aquella música por la postrimera vez... Junto a él; sobre la cama, yacía también su violín de corteza.

5.

De pronto la carita del niño agonizante se iluminó, y sus labios, en un temblor convulsivo, murmuraron:

--¡Madre!

10.

--¿Qué quieres, hijo mío?

--¡Madre! Dios Nuestro Señor, ¿va a darme en el cielo un violín de verdad?

--Sí, hijito; te lo dará, te lo dará --exclamó la madre.

Pero no pudo decir más, porque el corazón se le despedazaba dentro del pecho.

--¡Jesús, Dios mío! --gimió la infeliz.

15.

Y cayó desplomada sobre el baúl, estallando en desesperados sollozos, como una loca.

Quando alzó la cabeza miró a su niño; los ojos del musiquillo estaban abiertos e inmóviles, y tenía la cara seria, lívida, afilada.

20.

El rayo de sol también había desaparecido...

¡Descansa en paz, Yanco!

Curtin

Meanwhile the emaciated breast moved with another breath, and the face of the child was as if absorbed in listening to the sounds of the village which came in through the open window. It was evening, so the girls coming back from hay-making were singing, "Oi, on the green field!" and from the stream came the playing of pipes. 5. Yanko listened for the last time to the sounds of the village. On the matting lay the shingle fiddle at his side.

All at once the face of the dying boy lighted up, and from his whitening lips came out the whisper "Mamma!"

10. "What, my son?" answered the mother, whom tears were choking.

"Mamma, will the Lord God give me a real fiddle in heaven?"

"He will, my son, He will give thee one," answered the mother; but she could speak no longer, for suddenly in her hard breast burst the gathering sorrow, and groaning only, "O Jesus! O Jesus!" she fell 15. with her face on a box, and began to wail as if she had lost her reason, or as a man wails who sees that he cannot wrest the beloved one from death.

In fact, she did not wrest him; for when she raised herself again she looked at the child. The eyes of the little musician were open, it is true, but fixed; his face was very dignified, 20. gloomy, and rigid. The ray of the sun had gone also.

Peace to thee, Yanko.

.

Commentary on page 13.

1. T. begins a new sentence, omitting "tymczasem," with which the original sentence begins. C.'s literal rendering is slightly odd: "moved with another breath." This seems a somewhat unusual way of saying that Janko was still breathing, which is all that is meant by the original. J. manages to express this in a natural idiom which is close to the Polish: "heaved another breath." Many of the translators feel that another adverb or adjective needs to be supplied here. Accordingly, K. has "slabym dykhaniem." T. adds the colloquial diminutive "un poquitin," (a little).
2. The second clause of this sentence has to be re-phrased in most TLs. C.'s translation is accurate and comes as close as possible to a literal version. The verb "was absorbed" is an appropriate addition. T., like several other translators, J., OE, N., P., B., and R., renders "jakby" by the verb "to seem," instead of "as if." "Była jakby zasluchana" becomes "parecía absorber" in Spanish. "Absorbing," however, is a more passive action than the intent listening described in the original. The adjective "lívido" is an unwarranted addition on T.'s part. K.'s re-working of the main clause is the most radical, but no part of the original is omitted: "po

vyrazheniiu detskogo litsa bylo vidno, chto on zhadno lovit..." This version is somewhat longer than its original equivalent, but this rendering of "zasluchana" by the active verb "lovit'" with an adverb is more accurate than "to absorb," used by T.

Hereafter, the translation of this sentence becomes simpler, but even here some minor, and apparently arbitrary, distortions occur. The object of the verb, "odgłosy wiejskie," becomes "music" in T.'s version, without the adjective. C. and K. are more accurate: "sounds of the village" (C.), "golosa derevni" (K.). In both cases the adjective is rendered by a genitive.

The relative clause modifying these sounds is preserved as such by T. and C. K. and the other Russian translators avoid the relative by using the past active participle of an imperfective verb. By choosing the verb "vryvat'sia," K. makes the sounds louder and more insistent than in the original, which has the verb of motion "vchodzil."

3. T. loses little by omitting the adjective "open," modifying "window." He did, in fact, mention that the window was open at a point where Sienkiewicz did not (p. 12, l. 13).

K. uses the diminutive "okoshko" where a full form is used in the original.

A fairly literal translation of the next sentence,

such as C.'s, will suffice in most cases. There is no variation in the translation of the first clause, except the transformation of categories by T., who uses a verb: "anochećia." He replaces the conjunction "więc" with a semi-colon. He unnecessarily qualifies "girls" with the phrase "from the village," which is not in the original, but is nevertheless appropriate, unlike N.'s version, in which "dziewczęta" become male peasants.

C. and K. observe the original sentence structure, with a gerund in the subordinate clause, followed by the main verb "were singing." T. changes this by making the verb "to return" the main verb, followed by the gerund "singing."

4. In the original the girls are returning "from the hay." In many translations this is made more precise. Most of the English translators use "hay-making," including C., and similarly K. has "senokos." T. simply says "from the meadows," not mentioning the hay.

It may be noted here that some translators have a penchant for adjectives and adverbs, often the first which come to mind, which they deem fitting in descriptions of carefree bucolic life. Sienkiewicz's sentence contains not one adjective or adverb, and none need be supplied in the translation of any part of the sentence. T., however, has "singing merrily," and OE writes "light-hearted peasant girls."

C., T., and K. do not omit the line of song, as some other translators do. C. is concerned above all with its meaning, and on these grounds his "O! on the green field!" cannot be faulted, though, as before, the Slavonic exclamation sounds out of place in an English song. J. makes two minor improvements, changing "O!" to "Oh," and using "mead" instead of "field."

The double use of the preposition, before the adjective and before the noun, is characteristic of Polish and Russian folk poetry and song. Only a Russian translator can use the same structure, as K. does, with the diminutive of "trava" instead of a word meaning "meadow." T. approximates to this by repeating the whole phrase, with the adjective included only the second time.

K. omits the exclamatory "Oj."

5. T. makes a new sentence of the last clause of the original sentence. His description of the sound which comes from the stream is vaguer than the author's, and not entirely accurate: "como un gorjeo." This Spanish noun has a wide variety of applications and could, in different contexts, be translated as "warbling," "trilling," or even "gurgling." In this context it will be understood as the sound of the water itself. (OE and N. state unambiguously that it is the sound of the stream which is heard). OL's Italian version is a calque of T.'s Spanish. The original is clear and precise: "ed strugi dochodsilo"

granie fujarek." This cannot be inferred from T.'s misleading version.

The addition of "a sort of" in Spanish adds to the vagueness, since there is no "jakby" in the original to justify it.

C.'s literal translation of "granie fujarek" is all that is needed. K.'s syntactic change seems designed solely to add acoustic effects: "lilis' perelivy svi-relei."

T. does not end the sentence here as the author and the other translators do. Instead he adds a notable otsebiatina. Not content with having one kind of music reach Janko on his death-bed, he invents a second, suitably pious one: "and the church bell softly tolled." The church bell also tolls in OL's version.

In the next sentence, T. adds an adjective, describing Janko as "moribundo." The addition is unnecessary, if less obtrusive than the sound of the church bell. In other respects his translation of this sentence is accurate. The change from the verbal "jak wieś gra" to the noun "aquella música" is satisfactory, although "la música del villorrio" would be closer to the original.

C.'s rendering of this phrase, "the sounds of the village," is exactly the same as his translation of "odgłosy wiejskie." It does not suggest "playing."

K. prefers the verb "pet" to "igrat'." Unlike

PSS, he does not use the Russian cognate of the verb "wsłuchiwać się," but "slushat'."

The name "Janko" is accompanied by his nickname "muzykant" in K.'s translation.

6. The last sentence of this paragraph is rendered accurately by C., T., and K. For "na kilimku" T. has "on the bed." The change is of no consequence, since T. has rendered "kilimek" correctly before, and we know that the matting is itself on a bed of sorts. The addition of "tambien" (also) seems to serve little purpose here.

T.'s previous error in the translation of "gont" is repeated.

7. The whole of the following sentence is translated faithfully by C., T., and K. The structure of the first clause follows the original in all three translations. The only deviation, of a very minor order, is not one of structure: T. uses the diminutive "carita" where the author has the full form, "twarz."

In the second clause, K. and T. adopt the same syntactic change, making "lips" the subject of the verb "to murmur," whereas in the original, "szep" is the subject of the verb "wyjść." C. copies the original construction.

A change of tense in the participle (present "bielejących" to perfective past "pobelevshie") in K.'s version results in a slight change of meaning: "lips which

had [already] turned white."

8. Here T. departs further from the original, omitting this participle, and adding the phrase "in a convulsive tremor." This dramatic touch is not present in the original.

C. follows not only the grammatical structure, but also the exact word-order of the original.

K.'s verb "prolepetali" (babbled/stammered) is not quite the same as "prosheptali" (whispered), used by PSS and R., which is equivalent to and cognate with the verb used in the original.

K. prefers the slightly archaic "usta" to "guby," which is used by PSS and R.

9. Previous renderings of "matula" are repeated here.
10. The mother's question is slightly longer in Spanish: "What do you want, my son?" K. renders the diminutive "synek" by the Russian secondary diminutive "synochek."

T. omits the narrative line of six words which accompanies the direct question. This is not an insignificant omission, since it contains one of the very few indications of the mother's attitude to the events.

K. changes "ozwała się" to "sposila."

The relative clause is rendered literally by C.: "whom tears were choking." This is correct, but J.'s version, in which the relative clause is changed to a

phrase in apposition, reads better: "[answered], her voice choked with sobs."

J. is not alone in suppressing the relative clause and in changing "tears" to "sobs." K. does the same, making the connection by means of a gerund: "podavliaia podstupivshie k gorlu rydania."

11. God is not mentioned in K.'s translation of Janko's question, but the reference to heaven is preserved. T. and C. stay closer to the original, rendering "Pan Bóg" literally, and retaining the verb "to give."

12. In the mother's reply, C. does not use the simple affirmative "Yes," but follows the Slavonic formula of repeating the key word of the question, exactly as in the original. Most of the other non-Slavonic translators use "yes," reinforcing it in most cases by repetition of part of the question. T. has "yes," followed by a twofold repetition of the verb and the accompanying pronouns. He uses the verb "to exclaim," rather than "to reply."

All the Russian translators render the comparative adverb "dłużej" by a direct object, "nichego bol'she." The concomitant change of aspect ("mówić" to "skazat'") is made by K., PSS, and R. C. uses the adverbial "no longer."

13. The subordinate clause which gives the reason why she could speak no more undergoes certain changes in the translations. In the Spanish version the loss might be

minimal if only the adverb "nagle" were omitted, (K. also omits "nagle"), but as well as this the tense of the verb is changed. Sienkiewicz uses the perfective past, denoting a sudden action. T. uses the imperfect, and his choice of words describes the mother's emotional state in somewhat trite terms: "porqué el corazón se le despedazaba dentro del pecho," (because her heart was breaking in her breast). C.'s translation is more accurate: "for suddenly in her hard breast burst the gathering sorrow." One might question the word-order, and note that the original has "from her breast," but in essence the translation is correct. K.'s version is also correct for the most part. He has grief "mounting," instead of "bursting forth," but he uses the perfective aspect.

More serious than the change of tense or aspect is the omission or distortion of the adjective "twardej" modifying "piersi." Many of the translators are obviously perplexed by the appearance of this epithet, applied to Janko's mother, at this tender moment in the narrative. They regard it as incongruous, and the mental convolutions which they follow in the attempt to fit the word into their conception of Janko's mother are all too apparent.

However, the expression "twarda piersi" means exactly what it says. If we remember the few lines early in the story about the mother and her somewhat grudging affection for her son, it comes as no surprise to find

her characterized in passing as "hard-hearted." The fact that even she breaks down in these circumstances is a measure of the tragedy of the situation.

The expression can be rendered literally as "from her hard breast." C., P., R., and the three Czech translators render this correctly. T., K., and several others omit the adjective. The omission of this single word cannot be dismissed as trivial, as it is one of the few sketchy strokes providing information about the mother's character.

J.'s "pent-up breast" is an attempt to make sense of "twarda" while disregarding its lexical meaning. B. does the same with "son coeur crevasse." K.'s use of two adjectives with "zhalost'," "gor'kaia" and "zhguchaiia," does not compensate for the loss of "twarda."

Most translators appreciate that this long sentence might become inordinately unwieldy if not broken at some point. T. begins a new sentence and a new paragraph here. K. uses a colon to create a pause. C., however, manages to follow the sentence structure of the original, omitting nothing, and his sentence is neither clumsier nor harder to follow than Sienkiewicz's. The subordinate clause beginning with the past gerund "jękawszy" is retained by C., who uses a present gerund. K. omits this. T. has the verb "gemir" in the indicative, and calls the woman "la infeliz."

14.

The mother's cry of despair is changed slightly by T. and K. The original "O, Jezu! Jezu!" becomes "¡Jesús, Dios mío!" in Spanish, and "O bozhe! bozhe!" in K.'s Russian version. C. uses the words of the original, but repeats "O."

T. omits "twarzą" and inserts the adjective "unconscious" in its place. K. translates "twarzą" not by "litsom" but by "grud'iu." "Skrzynia" is correctly rendered by C., T., and K., but it is a source of some puzzlement to OE and N., who think that "table" makes better sense.

15. The following verb "zaczęła ryczeć" is rendered by T. as a gerund: "bursting into despairing sobs." "Ryczeć," however, is not quite "to sob." "To howl" or C.'s "to wail" are more accurate. K. expresses the beginning of the action by the prefix "za-" instead of the auxiliary.

"Jakby straciła rozum" is translated word-for-word by C. T. and K. turn this into an ordinary simile with a noun: "like a madwoman." The second simile, twelve words in the original, is left untranslated by T.

C. and K. render the second simile accurately, with some syntactic changes in the Russian version. For the author's "who sees," K. has "to whom it has become clear," and he uses a dative construction with the infinitive, "uzh ne vyrvat' emu," where the author has a finite

verb. A minor addition in K.'s version is "iz kogtei smerti" for the original "od śmierci."

C.'s translation of "swego kochania" as "the beloved one" is, unlike normal English usage, in which the possessive adjective is normally used and the word "one" omitted. "His beloved" would read better. C. perhaps does not realize that "kochanie" can refer to both sexes.

17.

Having omitted the long simile at the end of the previous paragraph, T. now has to omit the four words at the beginning of the new paragraph, since they refer back to the simile. The reference is carefully preserved by C. and K., although C.'s English is imperfect. The verb "to wrest," like "to tear" or "to pull," requires a preposition after its object, to indicate "direction whence." If any of these verbs are used, "from death" should be repeated, or another preposition (e. g. "away") added in its place.

K. does not translate the object pronoun "go," nor the conjunction "bo."

C. and T. use finite verb forms to render the gerund "podniósłszy się," which K. translates by a Russian gerund. T. and K. both break the sentence after "dziecko": T. by a semi-colon, C. by a full stop.

18.

T. has the diminutive "musiquillo," instead of the adjective "little," used in the original. T. changes the conjunction "but" to "and": "open and fixed." In

the original the contrast is emphasized by the addition of "wprawdzie," which T. omits. C.'s "open, it is true, but fixed" is accurate. K. also omits "wprawdzie," but he renders the conjunction correctly.

19. The last clause of the sentence varies widely in the translations. A very slight problem is posed by "steżala," which might be an adjective or the feminine past of the verb "steżać." It seems more likely that it is an adjective, although R. uses the verb "zastyło." Since the words are related and their lexical meaning is the same, this should not cause any difficulties.

As often happens when more than two adjectives occur together, at least one is distorted in translation. Of T.'s "serious, livid, thin," only the first matches one of Sienkiewicz's adjectives, and "bardzo" is omitted. Of T., C., and K., only C. produces an accurate rendering of all three. K.'s sentence is barely recognizable as a translation of the Polish: "litso nosilo pechat' kakogo-to napriazhennogo i kak budto mrachnogo velichia."

The final sentence of this paragraph is not difficult to render in other languages. All versions can be ~~literal~~. The only structural difference is that K., T., and C. use the genitive construction "of the sun," instead of the original adjective.

20. As in the original, C. appends "also" at the end of the sentence, despite the intrinsic ugliness of this

usage in English.

Most of the non-Slavonic translators use the pluperfect tense, including T. and C.

21. A near-literal rendering of the next short phrase is possible in most TLs. C.'s expression is a calque of the original, although another English translator, OE, has "Rest in peace." This is the expression used by T. in Spanish. K.'s version, "Mir tebe, Ianko!" is as close to the original as C.'s.

Not all the translators pay due attention to the punctuation of the original. OE marks this line as direct speech, as if uttered by the mother or some other character in the story. N. does the same and makes further additions which leave no doubt that the mother is speaking: "Rest in peace, my son! Sleep, little Janko!" These additions are all the more striking in a translation which is generally to be noted for lengthy excisions.

Summary of page 13.

Janko dies in a scene of extreme pathos, after a poetic description of the sounds of evening in the village. Even on his death-bed, Janko does not lose his longing for music. For this reason the sounds described here are of the utmost importance. None can be allowed to fall out. T. renders one of the sounds in a very vague manner, but adds one of his own to compensate for the loss (1. 5).

T.'s translation strikes one by its unwarranted additions, sometimes of adjectives, and sometimes of whole phrases. T. and K. both omit one significant adjective referring to the boy's mother, about whose character we learn a little more at this point.

Pl4

original

Nasajutrz powrócili państwo do dworu z Włoch, wraz z panną i kawalerem, co się o nią starał. Kawaler mówił:

-- Quel beau pays que l'Italie.

-- I co to są lud artystów. On est heureux de chercher

5. là-bas des talents et de les protéger... -- dodała panna.

Nad Jankiem szumiały brzozy...

R14

Короленко

* * *

На следующий день господа вернулись из Италии в свою усадьбу. Вернулась молодая барышня с женихом. Жених говорил барышне:

— Quel beau pays que l'Italie!

-- И что за народ, -- настоящий народ художников.

5. On est heureux de chercher là-bas des talents et de les protéger...^{2!}

-- добавила барышня.

Над музыкантом Янко шумели березы...

1878

-
1. Что за прекрасная страна Италия! (Франц.)
 2. Какое счастье отыскать там таланты и помогать им. (Франц.)
(ред.)

Sl4

Tasin

Al cabo de unos días regresaron de Italia los señores del palacio solariego. Volvió la señorita y el caballero que le hacía la corte.

Dijo el caballero:

--Quel beau pays que l'Italie!

5. --¡Y qué artista es allí la gente! --añadió la señorita--. On est heureux de chercher là-bas des talents et de les protéger...

.....

Sobre la tumba de Yanco susurran los abetos.

Curtin

On the second day the master and mistress of the mansion returned to their residence from Italy, with their daughter and the cavalier who was paying court to her. The cavalier said, —

"*Quel beau pays que l'Italie!*"

5. "And what a people of artists! On est heureux de chercher
là-bas des talents et de les protéger," added the young lady.

The birches were murmuring above Yanko.

Commentary on page 14.

1. The adverb "nazajutrz" is changed by some translators. The majority, including K., translate it accurately, but T., B., and OL write "after a few days." C. renders the meaning correctly, but no speaker of English would be likely to say "on the second day" in this context, since the author is not talking about a series of days ("on the third day..., on the fourth day..., etc."). The English equivalent in this context is "next day," as used by J. and OE.

The subject of the sentence, "państwo," is less readily translatable into English than into Spanish and Russian. This problem has arisen before (p. 8, l. 1). In English "państwo" really necessitates more than one word. C.'s "the master and mistress of the mansion" is correct, but rather long. This is better, however, than the arbitrary conferment of grander titles, of OE: "the baron and his family." One suspects that N.'s "a familia do Barão" has its origins here. K. and T. use the same words for "państwo" as they did earlier.

"Do dworu" can easily be omitted, since it is clear what the family is returning to. C. does not omit it, although he already has "of the mansion" in his translation of "państwo." T., who has rendered "państwo" in a similar way, does omit the destination. At this point, K.'s version is the most literal.

K. and T. end the sentence after "Italy," and begin the next sentence by repeating the verb "returned."

The noun "panna" is translated more fully into Spanish than into other languages, as "señorita" contains every aspect of the meaning of "panna." Both mean "young lady," and both, as derivatives of "pani" and "señora," can mean "daughter" of the same, as here. English and Russian do not offer such convenient equivalents.

2. Polish "kawaler" has obvious etymological connections with Spanish "caballero," used by T. C. and T. translate the original relative clause by relative clauses in the TLs. K. combines the noun and the relative clause in a single noun, "zhenikh."

K. supplies the indirect object after "said." This is not expressed by the author, nor by T. and C. K. uses the verb in the imperfective, as Sienkiewicz does, although PSS and R. use "skazal."

3. All the French of the original is left in French by T., C., and K. Some of the translators translate the French into the TL, including OE and N., who do not indicate that French is spoken. Since the author uses French for a definite purpose, to underline class distinctions,²⁶ the translator should provide some indication that the young couple are speaking French here. In his French translation B. has to insert the words "en

français."

4. P. misreads the original punctuation and attaches the first sentence of the young lady's reply to her suitor's exclamation.

C.'s literal translation of this line, "And what a people of artists!" has an odd ring in English. Most translators effect some change here. T.'s version is successful: "And how artistic the people are there!" K. divides the sentence into two parts: "I chto za narod - nastoiashchii narod khudozhnikov." By rendering "artysta" as "khudozhnik" K. narrows the meaning to one specific aspect of the visual arts, whereas the original word denotes anyone who is occupied with any of the arts, visual or not. If it is necessary to define this word further than in the original, the point of the story is better served if the Italians are described as musicians. PSS and R. use "muzykal'nyi narod."

6. The last line of the story can easily be translated word-for-word, but few of the translators do this. K. inserts "muzykantom" before "Ianko," T., and several others, insert "the grave of."

T. has the main verb in the present tense.

As usual, botanical errors occur in the translation of "brzozy." T. and OL have "spruces," OE "larches," N. "pines," all evergreens, which do not resemble the deciduous birch.

The closing line of the story draws much of its effect from its terseness. Olga Scherer-Virski cites this closing line as an example of Sienkiewicz's technique at its best.²⁷ She notes that Sienkiewicz can provide a sharp closing note in four words, where others, like Orzeszkowa, use more words to prove a point and weaken the effect. Sienkiewicz, she says, loses much of this effective concentration in his "post-positivist" stories.

If a similar effect is to be produced in the TL, all redundant words must be cut out. C.'s version, which is accurate, could be improved by using "rustled" instead of "were rustling." All additions should be avoided here. In this respect OE's version of this line is the worst, with three separate additions, including two inexcusable adjectives: "The larches rustled over little Janko's lowly grave."

Summary of page 14.

The last section of the story makes its social comment in extremely dry, unadorned language. Since the sentences are clear and simple, with no possible ambiguities, all three translators can produce accurate renderings with no difficulty. All refrain from making additions, and the terseness of the original is fairly well reproduced by literal translation. Neither C., T., nor K., however, produce such a terse closing line as the original author, although brevity is vital at this point.

FOOTNOTES

¹ J. P. Postgate, Translation and Translations (London: G. Bell, 1922), p. 40.

M. Vaksmakher, "Na strazhe dvukh bogatstv," in Redaktor i perevod (Moscow: 1965), p. 29.

² J. T. Milik, "Gwara ludowa w nowelach Sienkiewicza," Język polski, XXVI, No. 5 (1946), 142.

³ Ibid., 141.

⁴ J. G. Frazer, The Golden Bough, Vol. X (New York: Macmillan, 1935), p. 284.

⁵ Milik, 141.

⁶ Several reviewers took exception to C.'s transcription of Polish names, and one went so far as to call it "an insult to common sense. Anon. review of The Deluge, in Athenaeum, Sept. 3, 1892, p. 318.

⁷ Olgierd Wojtasiewicz, Wstep do teorii tłumaczenia (Wrocław: 1957), p. 93.

⁸ Milik, 141.

⁹ Ibid., 144.

¹⁰ D. Hessen, R. Stypuła, Wielki słownik polsko-rosyjski (Warsaw, Moscow: 1967).

¹¹ Milik, 144. This word is noted as a dialect equivalent to "pomocnik pasterza."

¹² Janko the Musician, trans. by Peter A. Ostafin (Orchard Lake, Michigan: Sodalis Press, 1938), cited by Rev. W. Zebrowski, "Sienkiewicz's 'Janko Muzykant' - Criticism and Translation," Polish American Studies, XXII, No. 1 (1965), 22.

¹³ Witold Doroszewski, Słownik języka polskiego (11 vols.; Warsaw: 1958-69).

¹⁴ See p. 349 for a definition of the term "realia."

¹⁵ Gabriela Makowiecka, "Sienkiewicz i Hiszpania," Kwartalnik neofilologiczny, XV, No. 2 (1968), 137.

- 16 Millik, pp. 142, 145. The first person plural endings in "-m" and "-ewa" are listed as regional forms.
- 17 Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo iazyka, AN SSSR (17 vols.; Moscow, Leningrad: 1950-65).
- 18 Ibid.
- 19 Millik, 144.
- 20 Henryk Sienkiewicz, Nowele wybrane (Warsaw: 1971), p. 94.
- 21 Jiří Levý, Die literarische Uebersetzung, trans. by Walter Schamschula (Frankfurt/M.: Athenaeum, 1969), p. 118.
- 22 Julian Krzyżanowski, Twórczość Henryka Sienkiewicza (Warsaw: 1973), p. 100.
- 23 J. Corominas, Diccionario crítico etimológico de la lengua castellana (4 vols.; Berne: 1954).
- 24 Tadeusz Bujnicki, Pierwszy okres twórczości Henryka Sienkiewicza (Cracow: 1963), p. 341.
- 25 Jan Stanisławski, Wielki słownik polsko-angielski (Warsaw: 1970).
- 26 Mieczysława Romankówna, "Rola stylizacyjna obcojęzycznych składników w trzech nowelach Henryka Sienkiewicza," Rocznik komisji historyczno-literackiej, III (1965), 154.
- 27 Olga Scherer-Virski, The Modern Polish Short Story (The Hague: Mouton, 1955), p. 130.

CHAPTER III

CONTENT EQUIVALENCE

The translator is not customarily granted the same freedom in dealing with his original as is the writer in the handling of his raw material. The writer may take as his material any humdrum incident or situation, use his imagination to develop it, and produce a moving work of literature. Sienkiewicz's famous story Latarnik is a case in point. The story of an encounter with an expatriate Pole working as a lighthouse-keeper in Central America is based on fact, but the author embellished the bare facts considerably in order to create a somewhat sentimental literary effect - called "outright kitsch" by one uncompromising critic.¹

The writer cannot be denied the right to use his sources as he wishes. The translator, however, whose task it is to render content and style as exactly as possible, is not permitted this freedom. He must reproduce what the original author says, no more and no less.

The writer, particularly of historical novels, may be forgiven the occasional anachronism or error of historical detail. Sienkiewicz himself is said to have committed not a few errors of this kind.² Yet if a translator adds anachronisms of his own he is rarely allowed to forget it. Several pages have been

devoted to anachronisms in a Russian translation of Krzyżacy.³ In the interests of accurate translation, however, it is right that such errors be pointed out. Anything which threatens to vitiate the qualities of the original work, as well as attempts to enhance them, should be noted.

What follows is an attempt to assess the degree of similarity between Janko Muzykant and its translations by counting and evaluating deviations. A statistical evaluation of this kind is essential, in J. Levý's view, in the analysis of a translation.⁴ Errors will be examined first, followed in turn by changes, unnecessary omissions, and additions.

Here it should be noted that there appear to be some slight textual variations in different editions of the original. Sienkiewicz himself is not known to have re-worked the story, as he did Z pamiętnika poznańskiego nauczyciela for censorial reasons, but since the work appeared in several different publications, some editorial changes seem inevitable. In an article on children in Sienkiewicz's works a long passage is cited from an 1896 edition of Janko Muzykant.⁵ Assuming that it is quoted correctly, this text differs from that in Nowele wybrane in the following ways: the variants "przyźba" and "świergotały" replace "przyzba" and "świegotały"; "wschodził" replaces "wchodził"; there are two slight changes of word-order. None of these changes would show in translation. However, when two adverbs are omitted, this could have a slight effect on the statistics given below: "nie mogła [dłużej] mówić"; "[znowu] spojrzała na dziecko."

Textual discrepancies in editions of the original may be the cause of some of the other apparent omissions and additions. While these might lead to minor fluctuations in the figures arrived at, it does not seem likely that they would alter the overall picture of the relative accuracy of the three translations.

Errors (accidental changes), and deliberate, but linguistically unnecessary changes are sometimes indistinguishable, but since both are examined, albeit separately, it is hoped that none will escape notice. Numerical values will be assigned to each deviation, according to its effect on the text. The results will provide a useful assessment of the accuracy of the translators in reproducing the content of the original.

Since many lexical deviations will have purely stylistic effects (e. g. the replacing of one adjective by another), the figures arrived at will also provide information about stylistic change. Style is discussed in a separate chapter, partly by analysing the facts obtained in this chapter, but since form and content are inextricably bound up, as in any work of art, it is likely that there will be a large degree of overlap. As J. Moravec says, the critic's task is to see how accurately the translator reproduces unity of form and content.⁶ This being so, one may try to evaluate the reproduction of form and content separately, before proceeding to their unity, but it is difficult to divorce them entirely.

Errors.

The importance of lexical errors in translation, as has been frequently pointed out, should not be over-estimated.⁷ It is probable that few translations appear without at least one solecism which has escaped the notice of translator, editor, and proof-reader alike. Mistakes can be eliminated only through revision by other translators who are competent in both languages. A study of errors and their effects in a wide selection of literary texts might well show that many originals can tolerate a surprisingly large number of errors with little damage. Beyond a certain level, however, varying in different texts, the quality of the translation declines steeply with each new error.

Great care must be exercised in distinguishing errors from the modulations which the TL demands. Furthermore, it may prove extremely difficult to distinguish deliberate, but inessential changes from errors. When a translator writes that Janko resembles a bruised artichoke, instead of a bruised apple, it may be assumed that he has done this on purpose, perhaps thinking to produce a more colourful simile, as it is highly unlikely that he does not know the Polish word "jabłko." However, cases of this kind sometimes arise where one cannot say for certain whether a change is deliberate or accidental, since we cannot read the translator's mind. As a rule, the critic must deal mainly with results, as the processes which lead to them cannot always be divined.

Mistakes can occur at three separate stages of the

translation process. The first stage is the reading of the original: when a translator reads "myshki" instead of "mushki" and translates accordingly, the error is in the eye, not in the mind. The second stage is the comprehension of the original: Curtin's rendering of "okukała kukułka chorobę" (p. 2, l. 8) is a clear case of misunderstanding of the original at a point where the dictionary will be of little assistance. Mistakes at the comprehension stage constitute the bulk of the errors found in the translations of Janko Muzykant. In general these errors are the most serious.

At the third stage, the writing of the TL version, two types of elementary error may arise. Even with perfect understanding of the original the translator may choose a wrong word or expression in the TL. An accomplished translator may do this occasionally, but these errors are more common when a translator is working into a language other than his own. When a translator is a native TL speaker the proportion of such errors should be low. Several errors of this kind occur in Curtin's native English.

A fourth class of errors arises at the third stage of translation from simple word association in the TL. When Korolenko writes "door" instead of "window" there can be no question of his misunderstanding the original; misreading is most unlikely as the Polish words are dissimilar and each closely resembles its Russian cognate; there can obviously be no question of faulty command of the TL playing a role here. The error

stems from momentary inattention and a natural association of windows and doors. Likewise, when "light" becomes "life" in an English translation, the association is purely phonetic. The change of "whole days" to "whole hours" in the Spanish translation may result from an association of units of time.

The three stages are well defined and can only rarely overlap. Nevertheless the reader of a translation may not always be able to see as easily as shown above at which stage a given error arose. There are cases when the only person who could say without doubt how the error came about would be the translator himself, if the error were pointed out to him.

If a translator writes "to hear" for Polish, "słuchać" (not "słycać") on one occasion, the slight change of meaning could come from simple misreading. If this is done persistently, however, it may be that the translator has the two Polish words confused in his mind. If he also confuses "widzieć" and "patrzeć," which bear no orthographic or phonetic resemblance to each other, it is legitimate to suppose that the resultant change stems not from careless reading but from mental confusion, and hence imperfect understanding of the SL text. The translator, if asked about this, could give an unequivocal answer. The reader, however, cannot be sure.

Many of the errors pointed out here, like many of the omissions, may be regarded as matters of minute detail. It may be said that in a story like Janko Muzykant it is of no consequence if a beech-tree in the original becomes a spruce in

translation, or a bee a large beetle, and that this kind of change would matter only if the author were writing a botanical or an entomological work. Most students of translation, in the U. S. S. R. at least, would take exception to this attitude and argue that if the author considers a detail important enough to merit inclusion in his work, the translator has no right to omit it or change it, whether by accident or design, unless other overriding considerations force him to do so. In commenting on a Russian translation of Marcel Aymé's works and on errors of detail, L. Vindt asks, "Nuzhno li sporit' o znachenii 'chut'-chut' v iskusstve?"⁸ Bertolt Brecht's English translator also stresses that a work of art is an accumulation of detail, in his introduction to an edition of Brecht's plays.⁹

Mistakes in translation are gathered below under each translator's name. All errors are identified by letters in the right-hand column, indicating their cause:

R - reading/misreading,

U - understanding,

TL - incorrect use of the target language, giving different meaning,

TLA - word association in the target language.

Alternatives are given where the cause cannot be definitely established.

Each error is evaluated in terms of its effect on the text. It is necessary to assign to each error a value, which cannot correspond to the number of units of translation, or

semantic units, involved. Mistakes resulting from misinterpretation of the word "bąk," for example, affect only one semantic unit, but if this word becomes "a beetle" in one translation and "a bittern" in another, the latter is much further from the meaning intended by the author than the former, and must be assigned a higher value. Errors are therefore assessed by "units of divergence," the basic unit being 1, and the highest value 3 being given to mistakes which reverse the meaning of the original.

Curtin

Page,	line.		Value.	Cause.
2	4	Myślałby kto, kocię nie kocię, albo co!	1	U
2	8	Okukała kukulka chorobę. (opposite meaning)	3	U
2	12	czupryna (not "forelock")	1	U
3	1	jaskółka (not "sparrow." Simile spoiled)	2	U/TLA
3	3	odmieniec (not "giddy-head")	1	U
3	14	dwojaki (not "two-handled basket")	1	U
3	19	warząchiew (not "poker")	1	U
4	6	pewno myślał sobie, że cała wieś gra. ("pewno" misplaced in translation)	1	U
4	7	to mu nawet wiatr grał. (not "even then the wind played." "Nawet" misplaced)	1	U/TL
4	10	zobaczyć (not "to look at")	1	U

Page,	line.		Value.	Cause.
4	14	bąki (not "bitterns." Change of insect to bird)	2	U
5	12	okna jarzyły się światłem (not "life")	1	TLA
6	11	spoglądając ("looking like" is ambiguous, but wrong meaning will be read here)	1	TL
6	15	mushki (not "mice")	1	R
7	5	raczej ("rather" so placed as to give wrong meaning)	1	TL
8	17	z otwartymi ustami (not "eyes")	1	TLA
9	9	lelek (not "wood-owl")	1	U
10	1	zarzechotały ogromnie żaby (adverb rendered as adjective "ogromne")	1	R/U
11	4	zamorusany (not "starved")	1	U
11	10	Bo pewno! (made to refer to wrong part of preceding sentence)	1	U
11	17	zrobią (tense/aspect)	1	R/U
12	1	stodoła (not "stable")	1	U
12	1	wziął w stodołę (rendered as "w stodołę")	1	U
12	7	zły Staoh (in context, not "angry")	1	U
12	10	konał sobie (aspect)	1	R/U

<u>Tasín.</u>			Value.	Cause.
Page,	line.			
3	1	komornica (not "asistenta")	1	U
3	7	nierozgarnięty (not "pusilánime")	1	U
3	14	bydło (not "ovejas")	1	U
3	14	dwojaki (not "cestito")	1	U
4	2	buki (not "abetos")	1	U
4	3	brzezina (not "brezós")	1	U
4	14	po zapłociach (not "de pie sobre los setos vivos")	1	U
5	10	głosy dziewczyn (not "los mozos")	1	TLA
6	11	po całych dniach (not "horas")	1	TLA
6	13	gont (not "corteza")	1	U
6	15	mushki (not "un ratón")	1	U
8	12	robaczki świętojańskie (not "luciérnagas en la noche de San Juan")	1	U
8	16	łopuchy (not "arbustos")	1	U
9	9	lelek (not "el buho")	1	U
9	17	nie okrywają jej łopuchy (given opposite meaning)	3	U
13	19	mroczna (not "lívido")	1	U

Page, line.			Value.	Cause.
13	19	steżala (not "thin")	1	U
14	1	nazajutrz (not "al cabo de unos días")	1	U
<u>Korolenko</u>				
3	14	dwojaki (description in footnote incorrect)	1	U
4	14	baki (not "bol'shie zhuki")	1	U
4	14	po zapłociach (not "rassevshis' na izgorodiakh")	1	U
7	11	pannie służącej (both dative, not "panny" in genitive with "służącej" in dative)	1	R
8	6	przez okno (not "door")	1	TLA
11	2	pewno (in context not "veroiatno")	1	U

The totals in units of divergence are: Curtin - 29, Tasin - 20, Korolenko - 6. It can be seen from this that Korolenko's version, with an insignificant number of minor errors, is considerably more accurate than both Curtin's and Tasin's. It seems likely that Tasin's errors would have outnumbered Curtin's if Tasin had not omitted some of the difficulties which Curtin tackled.

It is worth noting that in all three translations a large proportion of errors concerns the lexical meaning of nouns. These account for five of Korolenko's six units of divergence, twelve of Curtin's twenty-nine, and thirteen of Tasin's twenty.

Lexical errors concerning verbs and adjectives are few in number: in the three translations together there are only three mistakes concerning the meaning of verbs, and four concerning the meaning of adjectives. The proportion of noun errors very roughly parallels the relative frequency of the noun in the languages concerned.

Not all errors, however, are lexical. There is a small number of grammatical errors involving verbs. Curtin in particular is not sufficiently attentive to aspect distinction. Of the three, Curtin is the only one who repeatedly misreads or misunderstands grammatical and syntactic points of the original. There are no mistakes of this kind in Tasin's translation, and only one, of very slight importance, in Korolenko's.

Changes

We now turn to those changes made by the translators in places where purely linguistic considerations do not make these necessary, and where the material content of the original is changed. Changes which have purely stylistic effects will be discussed in the following chapter, as will the stylistic effects of some of the changes in content listed below. The figures in the right-hand column represent units of divergence, as for errors.

Curtin

Page,	line.		Value.
3	2	strzecha ("roof" for "thatched roof")	1
3	5	bór ("woods" for "pine wood")	1
7	6	przymierał głodem ("was suffering from hunger" for "would almost starve")	1

With these exceptions, Curtin makes no changes in the meaning of the original other than those already listed as errors. This is a result of the care he takes to reproduce the exact meaning of the original at all times. This method gives rise to numerous changes in the area of style, to be examined later.

Tasin

Page,	line.		Value.
2	9	w jakim takim zdrowiu (becomes "empezó a crecer, aunque miserablemente, muy poco a poco")	1
3	2	strzecha ("roof" for "thatched roof")	1
3	5	bór ("wood" for "pine wood")	1
3	15	mówi szepleniąc (becomes "exclamaba")	1
4	3	wilgi ("birds" for "golden orioles")	1
4	4	bylica ("each blade of grass" for "artemisia")	1
5	3	jakby już nie z tego świata patrzyły ("into" for "out of." Opposite meaning, but not detrimental to simile)	1

Page, line.		Value.	
6	10	właził potem za piec ("onto" for "behind")	1
6	17	jak obite jabłko niedojrzałe ("artichoke" for "apple")	1
9	9	lelek poczciwym cichym lotem ("wise and sensible" for "kindly and quiet")	2
10	8	raz jeszcze ("suddenly" for "once more")	1
10	12	po chwili dopiero ("suddenly" for "only after a moment")	1
11	5	Jak tu sądzić taką biedę...? ("to punish" for "to try")	1
11	15	czy..., czy... (rendered as contrasted clauses, separated by "but")	1
13	5	granie fujarek (the sound becomes that of the stream)	2
13	14	padła twarzą na skrzynię ("fell unconscious" for "fell face down")	1

Korolenko

Page, line.		Value.	
3	2	strzecha ("roof" for "thatched roof")	1
6	16	tyle szturchańców ("kicks" for "cuffs")	1
8	13	na kształt srebrnego pręta ("thread" for "wand")	1
9	7	noc była widna ("quiet" for "clear")	1
11	10	Bo pewno! (marked as direct speech in translation)	2
12	17	Ej, głupi, zły Stachu! (marked as direct speech in translation)	2

Korolenko's last two changes, concerning matters of punctuation, might well be considered mistakes. The two exclamations are marked in the original as part of the narrative, not as the speech as one of the characters. The author is using a technique very like the skaz, and this is damaged if the punctuation is changed, turning these lines into direct speech.

It must be said that the majority of the above changes, in all three texts, do not have drastic effects upon the story. It matters little whether Janko is punished with slaps or kicks for playing his home-made fiddle. Whether Janko crawls behind the stove or climbs on top of it has no bearing upon the events in the story. "Strzecha" is a more specific word than "dach," but in the context in which it occurs the addition of adjectives to render its exact meaning would be more harmful than the less specific word without adjectives. Changes of this kind are here given the value 1.

Korolenko's changes of punctuation have a more serious effect, and are therefore given a higher value. Tasín's change involving the sound which Janko hears from his death-bed is also given a higher value, as sounds and music are important in the story, and the reference to the pipes playing harks back to a point earlier in the story (omitted by Tasín), where Janko himself makes reed-pipes by the stream. The total figures for translators' changes, in units of divergence, are: Curtin - 3, Tasín - 18, Korolenko - 8.

Omissions

Most critics are agreed that the translator has no right to omit any part of the original text. I. Kashkin deplors the fact that there are too many translators who allow themselves omissions and additions, and make unwarranted changes.¹⁰ He writes that omissions are particularly noticeable in short stories, where every word counts. S. Masliak echoes this view.¹¹ According to J. Levý, translators in Czechoslovakia consider that any contracting or omitting of difficult expressions is immoral.¹²

Only unnecessary omissions which give rise to changes of meaning, or to a weakening of the original meaning, are counted here. In many contexts, Polish particles like "już" and "tam," whether used adverbially or not, can be dropped with no noticeable change of meaning. In a noun and adjective combination the adjective may often be omitted the second time the combination occurs. If "gromnica" is translated as "blessed candle," the English adjective may be left out if "gromnica" reappears a few lines further on, so long as only one candle has been mentioned. The ubiquitous Polish "jakiś" can become wearing in some TLs if it is translated every time it occurs.

The value of each omission is established here according to the number of semantic units involved. An omission no longer than one word is one semantic unit. If a sentence is omitted, the sentence is broken down into units of meaning, often of more than one word. Prepositions are not separated from their accompanying nouns or pronouns. The reflexive particle "się" is

counted with its verb as one unit. Set expressions such as "o co chodzi" are counted as one unit. The conjunction "i" is not counted as a unit unless it has the meaning "even" or is used emphatically as "too." The relatives "który" and "co" are not counted. In common expressions in which a verb and a noun customarily go together, the two words are counted as one unit, as in "oczeki mrużyó."

The figures in the right-hand column indicate the number of semantic units in each omission.

Curtin

Page,	line.		Value.
2	2	owszem. (in meaning "on the contrary")	1
3	10	i (in meaning "too," "either")	1
4	3	brzezina	1
5	17	Ba!	1
6	13	tak	1
7	12	otwarte	1
8	6	jasnego	1
9	7	nad stawem	1
9	9	cichym	1
9	10	został	1
10	9	przed skrzypcami	1
11	1	biedny	1
12	4	ucichło/ dziecko	2
12	17	zawsze było	1

Tasín

Page, line.		Value.	
1	8	Ba!	1
1	12	aż poczęło/ oczki mrużyć	2
1	15	Amen!	1
2	11	chudy	1
2	13	patrzące/ na świat	2
2	15	ani do pieca	1
2	17	którego obdarłej/ kani	2
3	2	dość	1
3	3	zwykle/ nazywała/ odmieńcem	3
3	9	nawet	1
3	10	1 (in meaning "too," "either")	1
3	19	czasem	1
3	19	warząchwia	1
4	3	1 basta!	1
4	4	pod chałupą	1
4	6	wszystkich	1
4	6	pewno	1
4	7	nawet	1
4	9	zobaczył go	1
4	10	w drewnianych/ widłach	2
4	12	kręció/ fujarki	2
4	13	derkacze/ na łakach/ derkotać	3
4	14	baki/ po rosie/ burczyó	3
5	1	mogła	1

Page,	line.		Value.
5	4	co chodził/ nocą/ po wsi	3
5	5	na niebie	1
5	5	po cichu	1
5	9	czasem	1
5	10	"Czegóż?"	1
5	12	z powagą	1
5	17	Ba!	1
6	3	za nim/ z ciemności	2
6	12	w ciemności	1
7	2	brzuch/ tylko/ zawsze/ miał/ duży	5
7	11	czasem	1
7	12	między łopuchami	1
7	12	otwarte	1
7	15	której nie/ godzin/ tknąć	3
7	18	biedne,/ małe/ chłopskie	3
8	4	przez otwarte/ szerokie/ drzwi	3
8	4	wszystkich	1
8	5	na niebie	1
8	7	przeciwległej	1
8	8-9	Wówczas/ w ciemnej/ głębi/ wydawało się/ jakby/ od nich/ biła/ światłość/ srebrna.	9
8	10	ledwie	1
8	12	zagięta	1
8	15	Ach!	1
8	19	Czy co?	1
9	2	jakoby/ płynąc/ ku dziecku	3

Page,	line.		Value.
9	2	Chwilami/ przygasaly,/ aby znowu/ rozpromienic sie/ jeszcze bardziej	5
9	10	a slowik/ zostal	2
9	11	coraz/ wyraźniej	2
9	13	skulony	1
9	13	z wolna/ i ostroźnie	2
9	14	tymczasem	1
9	14	cichuteńko	1
9	18	chorych	1
9	19	bosa	1
10	1	ogromnie	1
10	6	przy tym/ ogarnęła go/ ciemność	3
10	7	cicha/ letnia	2
10	9	przed skrzypcami	1
10	11	ani słychać	1
10	12	z ciemności	1
10	13	nieostroźnie	1
10	20	po ścianie	1
10	21	a potem	1
10	21	słychać	1
10	21	klątwy	1
10	21	dziecka	1
11	1	biedny	1
11	4	zamorusany	1
11	7	czy jak?	1
11	9	i cała rzecz	1

Page, line.		Value.	
11	13	głupowatą	1
11	16	Albo on/ wie,/ co/ z nim/ zrobią?	5
12	1	Wziął/ garścią	2
12	5	i nie/ wołało/ już/ matuli	4
12	7	Ej	1
12	10	wieczorem	1
12	17	po prawdzie	1
13	2	wiejskie	1
13	3	otwarte	1
13	7	bielejących	1
13	10	ozwała się/ matka,/ którą dusiły/ łzy	4
13	13	nagle	1
13	13	twardej	1
13	15	albo jak/ człowiek, co/ widzi,/ że od śmierci/ nie/ wydrze/ swego kochania	7
13	17	Jakoż/ nie/ wydarła/ go	4
13	18	wprawdzie	1
13	19	bardzo	1

Korolenko

2	13	patrzące/ na świat	2
3	2	dość	1
3	9	nawet	1
4	2	Co?/ Albo on/ wiedział?.../ Sosny,/ buki,/ brzezina,/ wilgi,/ wszystko grało:/ cały bór,/ i basta! Echo też.../ W polu/ grała mu/ brylica,/ w sadku/ pod chałupą/ świerkotwały/ wróble,/ aż się/ wiśnie/ trzęsły!	20

Page, line.			Value.
4	10	drewnianych	1
7	10	czasem	1
8	2	na drugiej stronie	1
8	9	szczególniej	1
8	15	prawie	1
9	8	cicho,/ to głośniej	2
9	11	coraz/ wyraźniej	2
9	13	biedny	1
9	13	z wolna	1
9	18	biała/ koszula/ znikła	3
10	3	cicho/ i ostrożnie	2
11	1	biedny	1
12	7	Ej	1
13	4	Oj	1
13	13	nagle	1
13	13	twardej	1
13	14	jęknąwszy	1
13	18	wprawdzie	1

We see that Curtin is more conscientious than Tasin and Korolenko in his efforts to include in his translation everything which is contained in the original. No more than fifteen semantic units of the original are lost in his translation, as against one hundred and fifty-five in Tasin's, and forty-seven in Korolenko's. Curtin's omissions are all extremely short, involving at the most two semantic units. Korolenko's omissions are also

mostly short, with the notable exception of that on page 4, where four important descriptive lines are left out. Tasín appears to proceed in a more arbitrary fashion, avoiding potential difficulties (e. g. "derkacze," "baki"), and not infrequently omitting long clauses and even whole sentences.

No consistent pattern can be discerned in the omissions of any of the three translators. On the whole it appears that all grammatical categories suffer equally. It can, however, be said that in Korolenko's shorter omissions it is adjectives, adverbs, and adverbial phrases which occupy a prominent position. In an examination of an English novel in its Portuguese translation, B. Silveira notes the omission of one adverb in the sentence, "She was mulish, vacant, sullenly melancholy."¹³ This he regards as a serious mistake. One can only conclude that he would strongly disapprove of Tasín's and Korolenko's translations of Janko Muzykant. The overall effect of all the omissions is a loss of specific detail.

Additions

To facilitate the location of the added parts in the original text, the nearest associated word or phrase of the original is given in brackets.

All additions are assessed according to the number of semantic units contained in each, following the method used for omissions.

Curtin

Page,	line.		Value.
5	10	querying (głosy dziewczyn)	1

Tasín

1	2	observando (nad matką, i nad dzieckiem)	1
2	2	en la tierra (opuszczać)	1
2	10	menguada/ y ruin (życia)	2
2	14	apagada (za piecem)	1
4	3	las encinas (in list of trees)	1
4	3	Todo, todo/ cantaba/ en el bosque (wszystko grało)	3
4	5	tan recio (ówierkotały wróble)	1
4	5	al oírles (się wiśnie trzęsły)	1
4	10	embelesado (słuchającego)	1
4	10	los mugidos (wiatru)	1
4	13	melodioso (wedle strugi)	1
4	13	en los charcos (żaby zaczynały rzechotać)	1
5	1	nunca (nie mogła go brać)	1
5	15	Oh (Co by on za to dał...)	1
6	6	y en el silencio/ de la noche (w ciemnościach)	1

Page,	line.		Value.
6	6	melosa (głos)	1
6	12	ingeniándose (zrobił sobie sam skrzypki)	1
6	15	todo el santo día (grał jednak)	1
7	7	inmoderado (chęcią)	1
7	8	de verdad (skrzypek)	1
7	10	un rato (grywał)	1
8	2	debía de (przesiadywał)	1
8	2	en un sitio/ apartado/ del inmenso/ caserón/ ... quizá (na drugiej stronie u panny pokojowej)	5
9	4	una voz/ que muy/ quedo/ le decía (usłyszał)	4
9	17	Ya/ está rozando/ el umbral (łopuchy)	3
9	19	que al fin/ también/ desaparece (nożka za progiem)	3
10	3	La noche/ se obscurece (łopuchy szemrać)	2
10	3	por el suelo/ de la despensa (Janko czołgał się)	2
10	23	que se va alumbrando/ con las velas/ que acuden/ de todas partes,/ llevados/ en alto/ por gente/ soñolienta. (w całym dworze)	8
11	2	de arriba abajo (popatrzyli)	1
11	3	rígidos/ y severos (ławnicy)	2

Page, line.		Value.	
11	8	¡Ea! (miłosierdzia nad dziećmi)	1
11	12	de su pecado (na pamiątkę)	1
11	16	cogido/ en la red (ptak)	2
12	2	con su correa/ brutalmente/ ... sobre las carnes (machnął od ucha)	3
12	2	no pudo/ aguantar (krzyknął)	2
12	3	que le lastimaba/ el cuerpo (różgą)	2
12	6	miserio (biedne)	1
12	8	enfermizo (małe i słabe)	1
12	10	al llegar/ a casa/ lo acostó (do domu)	3
12	13	abierta/ de par en par (szybę)	2
12	16	al cielo (odejść)	1
12	17	tan angosto (ciernista)	1
13	1	lívido (twarz)	1
13	3	del villorrio (dziewczęta)	1
13	4	alegremente (śpiewały)	1
13	5	y la campana/ de la iglesia/ dulcemente/ taffia (fujarek)	4

Page, line.			Value.
13	5	moribundo (Janek)	1
13	6	también (leżały)	1
13	8	en un temblór/ convulsivo (szept)	2

Korolenko

1	1	takoe (słabe)	1
1	2	uchastlivo/ kuchkoi (kumy)	2
1	12	bedniaga (poczęło oczki mrużyć)	1
2	1	ochevidno (dusza chrześcijańska)	1
2	2	voobshche (opuszczać chuderlawego ciała)	1
2	2	promesh sebia (jak mówiły kumy)	1
2	9	koe-kak (doszedł)	1
2	12	na lob (spadające)	1
3	2	kak-nibud' (po swojemu)	1
3	6	uzh (był to chłopak)	1
3	8	obyknovenno (przy rozmowie)	1
3	8	ukazatel'nyi (palec)	1
3	13	ot zemli/ ... podnialsia (podrósł)	2

Page,	Line,		Value.
3	14	nichego ne/ naberet (się wróci)	2
4	5	zhadno (słuchiwał)	1
4	6	neugomonivsheisia/ eshche/ k nochi (wsi)	3
4	6	kakim-to/ kontsertom (cała wieś gra)	2
4	7	s interesom (wiatr grał)	1
4	9	nedvizhno (stojącego)	1
4	10	zhadno (słuchającego)	1
4	10	krepkii (rzemyk)	1
4	10	muzyku (wiatru)	1
4	11	iz priatnogo/ sozertsania (dobrą pamiątkę)	2
4	13	v prudakh/ zatiagivali/ svoi tysfache- golosyi/ torzhestvennyi/ khor (żaby)	5
4	14	obivaja/ blestiaschie/ rosinki (bąki)	3
5	1	di (do kościoła)	1
5	2	bozhestvennuu/ pesniu (słodkim głosem)	2
5	3	i gliadit/ on/ krugom/ takovo stranno (jakby już nie z tego świata)	4
5	6	tikho (przemykająca się)	1

Page,	line.		Value.
5	7	konechno (nie do karczmy)	1
5	8	zataiv/ dykhanie (przyozaiwszy się pod murem)	2
5	10	zvonkie (głosy)	1
5	10	i nezhno (cicho)	1
5	12	nadlezhashchei (powagą)	1
5	12	snopy/ ... v temnotu/ letnei/ nochi (okna jarzyły się światłem)	4
5	16	nezhnymi/ goloskami (cienko)	2
5	17	zveniashohie (śpiewające)	1
6	1	Ekh (żeby mu... pozwolili)	1
6	3	nochnoi (z ciemności)	1
6	9	liubimye (skrzypki)	1
6	12	koi-kak (zrobił sobie)	1
6	14	chto podvizalis' (w karczmie)	1
6	15	melkafa (mushki)	1
7	2	belye (ozuprynę)	1
7	3	svetlye/ detskie (łzami)	2
7	6	zhalkogo (gonta)	1

Page,	line.		Value.
7	8	nastoiashcheiu,/ vsamdelishnoiu (skrzypek)	2
7	12	gustogo (łopuchami)	1
7	13	poblizhe (się przypatrzeć)	1
7	18	priamo (przypatrzeć się)	1
8	8	k mestu,/ gde/ visela (zbliżał się)	3
8	11	volshenom (blasku)	1
8	12	• beledi (kołeczki)	1
8	13	tonkii (smyczek)	1
8	15	tak..., tak... (śliczne... czarodziejskie)	1
8	16	list'iami (łopuchach)	1
8	18	neponiatnoe (chęć)	1
9	2	iz mraka (płynąc)	1
9	2	ona/ tochno/ udaialas' (chwilami przygasały)	3
9	4	shirokie/ list'ia (łopuchy)	2
9	4	tak (wyraźnie)	1
9	19	detskaia (nożka)	1
10	1	sosednem (stawie)	1

Page, line.		Value.	
10	1	iz-pod temnykh/ vetvei- (w stawie)	2
10	3	Stikh/ veter (szemrać)	2
10	5	rodimyykh (zaroślach)	1
10	13	natianutoi (strun)	1
10	14	temnogo (kąta)	1
10	14	pe-vidimomu (wychodzący)	1
10	16	rastvorennoi (drzwi)	1
11	6	slabykh (nogach)	1
11	16	iz ruk (patrzyło tylko)	1
11	16	poimannaiia (ptak)	1
12	12	listye (czereśni)	1
12	14	blednoe (twarz)	1
12	17	strashno (ciernista)	1
13	13	gor'kaia/ zhguchaia (żalność)	2

As might be expected, we find that Korolenko and Tasin add most liberally to the original text, while Curtin makes no more than one barely significant addition. The total figures for translators' additions, in semantic units, are: Curtin - 1,

Tasín - 87, Korolenko - 109.

Whereas omissions, which can often be accidental, show no definite pattern, additions, which are unlikely to be accidental, reveal more about the translator's methods and his attitude to the original. Of Tasín's shorter additions, seventeen are of adjectives or adjectival phrases, and fifteen are adverbial. This is a high figure, when one bears in mind that the longer additions, of several semantic units, are not included here. In Korolenko's translation the number of adjectival and adverbial additions is higher still. Among his shorter additions, thirty-two are adjectival and twenty are adverbial. In three places Korolenko furnishes two adjectives to go with a noun which has no adjectives in the original.

Tasín and Korolenko both display a tendency to be repetitious where the original is not. When, for instance, Sienkiewicz tells us that "the whole forest was playing," Tasín adds to this by expressing it in two ways: "todo, todo cantaba en el bosque; el bosque entero cantaba!" When Sienkiewicz writes that Janko would return empty-handed from his search for berries, Korolenko in effect tells us this twice: "nichego ne naberet, s pustymi rukami vernetsia." There are four instances of this in the Russian version, and two in the Spanish version. Changes such as this, not to speak of the longer insertions, have an effect on the writer's style.

By adding together the figures obtained for translators' errors, changes, additions, and omissions, we can now arrive at

a good estimate of the relative closeness of the translations to the original.

	C.	T.	K.	
Errors	29	20	6	units of divergence
Changes	3	18	8	units of divergence
Omissions	15	155	47	semantic units
Additions	<u>1</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>109</u>	semantic units
Total	48	280	170	

It is possible to translate these figures into percentages, but the percentages must be used for comparative purposes only since we are combining figures of different kinds, units of divergence for errors and changes, and semantic units for additions and omissions. The only denominator which can conveniently be used is the number of words in the original: 2167. It is not practical to divide the whole of the original text into semantic units, nor is it realistic to evaluate errors by semantic units, for reasons explained earlier.

The following percentages do, however, accurately reflect the relative literal exactitude of the three translations: Curtin - 2.2%, Tasin - 13%, Korolenko - 7.9%. We may call these figures the deviation factor, expressing in relative terms the difference between the literal content of the original and that of the translations.

One aspect of the relation of the translations to the original which cannot be fitted into the above computation, but which nonetheless deserves mention, is the division of sentences

and paragraphs. As with the purely verbal elements of the translations, we find that Curtin follows the original most closely, and that Tasin departs from it the furthest. There are six places where Curtin breaks Sienkiewicz's sentences, three where he joins sentences which are separate in the original, and three minor changes of paragraphing. Tasin shows a marked tendency to shorten Sienkiewicz's paragraphs. There are twenty-five breaks of paragraph which are not in the original, and six places where Sienkiewicz's divisions are not observed. The sentences of the original are broken in eighteen places, and there are fourteen occasions where the original sentences are run together. Korolenko observes the original paragraph division scrupulously. The sole departure occurs where the translator omits whole sentences and runs two paragraphs into one as a result, apparently by accident. Korolenko breaks the original sentences in twelve places, and joins others in ten places.

One notices that omissions and deviations from the original abound most notably in the area of natural phenomena. Sienkiewicz had a considerable knowledge of natural history and he made use of this to good effect in his tales of rural Poland. Many of Sienkiewicz's translators do not have this knowledge, and their ignorance of wild life makes itself felt in omissions and errors. In technical translation it is generally held to be self-evident that no one should undertake to translate a text if he has no knowledge of the subject matter. The same principle might well be applied to belles lettres, but in practice it

rarely is. V. Rossel's mentions a Ukrainian novel which he himself translated into Russian and in which natural history is important.¹⁴ He could not have translated it, he says, if he had not been familiar with the rural Ukraine.

With the exception of Korolenko, most of the translators stumble when the author introduces specific birds, trees, and insects, although it is this kind of detail which plays an important part, not only in establishing and reinforcing the verisimilitude of the story, but in the action of the story itself. In the early scenes, the bees, cormorakes, beeches and pines are a vital part of the background, but in the central scene, the burdocks, the nightjar, and the nightingale are elevated to the status of active participants, as well as being important in the maintenance of tension.

J. Levý quotes I. Olbracht on one of the basic skills involved in the art of writing.¹⁵ The writer should never say, "A bird was sitting on the tree" [Na stromě seděl pták], but rather, "A yellow-hammer was sitting on the alder" [Na olši seděl strnad]. If the writer takes the trouble to do this, the translator clearly has no right to render the second sentence as the first, to turn the precise into the general. B. Silveira is intolerant of translators who practise this form of synecdoche. Examining a Brazilian translation of a novel by Sinclair Lewis, he discovers that "willow" is translated as "slender tree," and roundly condemns this method as "patent folly" [tolice das mais rotundas].¹⁶

Jan Parandowski contrasts the precise language of country-dwellers with the vagueness of that of modern city-dwellers.¹⁷ Only the latter, he says, are content to live among nameless objects and look at "trees," "bushes," and "corn." Country people live not among trees, but among oaks, birches and willows. "Corn" must be either "rye" or "wheat."

In some of the translations of Janko Muzykant we find unconscionable omissions and negligence in the rendering of references to natural history. Curtin, Tasín, and Korolenko cannot be counted among the unconscionable, but their versions nevertheless contain numerous deviations from the original. Some species are relegated vaguely to a genus: "artemisia" to "grass" (Tasín). Species are confused: "nightjar" to "owl" (Curtin and Tasín). Insects become birds, and grass becomes bushes: "bumble-bee" to "bittern" (Curtin), "burdocks" to "bushes" (Tasín).

The blame for all such distortions lies with the translators, since all the languages concerned have names for all the species mentioned, even in the one case where a species is little known in the TL country, (the golden oriole, Oriolus oriolus, is unknown in North America and rare in the British isles). Bearing in mind Olbracht's and Parandowski's remarks, the distortion is generally less egregious when a translator mistakenly confuses species ("spruce" for "beech"), than when the name of a species is replaced by a generic word like "tree" or "grass," although the former is an error, and the latter is, in a sense, correct. If one species is replaced by another the text may

still retain its local colour, which will be largely lost if the generic word is used.

As ever, the context decides the gravity of the distortion. A mistake of species in a list can be of little or no consequence. The same mistake has more serious effects when the species in question is the subject of one of the author's images, as when Curtin changes "swallow" to "sparrow." Confusion of genus, of insect for avian for example, is liable to result in nonsense.

In their approach to problems of this kind the translators reveal their attitudes to their readers. Different translators in different countries naturally do not expect identical general knowledge on the part of their readers. The writer of the original has a good idea of his audience, and of its general knowledge and level of education. His translator, if, as is most likely, he lives in a foreign country, may have comparable general knowledge, besides the benefits of his studies of the SL and the culture associated with it, but his "general" knowledge of life in the SL country is unlikely to be as complete as that of a native reader of the SL text. The reader of the translation is still less likely to have the background knowledge of the SL reader, and due allowance must be made for this when specific national realia arise.

Nonetheless, while allowing for the fact that the knowledge of the educated TL reader cannot fully coincide with that of the educated SL reader in certain areas (national history,

literature, folklore), the translator must not do the TL reader the injustice of underestimating his knowledge of those aspects of life which the TL and SL countries have in common. It must not be assumed that the reader is totally ignorant. Even if the translator of Janko Muzykant knows nothing about trees, birds, or insects, he must not take it for granted that the reader knows no more than he does, and omit or deal carelessly with details of natural history.

It is true that for many readers the change of one species of tree to another will have very little significance, especially in the light of what Vladimir Nabokov calls "the incredible ignorance of natural objects that characterizes young Americans of today."¹⁸ But since the author usually writes for those who do know the difference, the translator must translate for people with the same knowledge in the TL, even if he does not have this knowledge himself. There is no linguistic obstacle to the exact translation of the names of all the elements of flora and fauna mentioned in Janko Muzykant into all the TLs studied here.

We now turn to areas in which there is a linguistic or cultural obstacle to be overcome in conveying the exact meaning of the original. In a tale of peasant life such as Janko Muzykant, it would be difficult to avoid certain highly specific features of rural Polish life which are likely to be unknown in many or all of the TL countries. Indeed, such features are necessary in order to set the story firmly on a tangible background. The story could not make its point so forcefully, at least to the

reader of the original in 1879, if its setting were not well defined.

Several of the specific facets of Polish life which present themselves in Janko Muzykant defy simple translation into other languages, and it is instructive to study how these are handled by the English, Russian, and Spanish translators. Some translators tend to skate over difficulties, simplifying them in order to make them comprehensible to the TL reader, but vague and devoid of local colour. At the other extreme, some translators translate as literally as possible, with little or no attempt to explain the results.

The word "realia" is used here in the meaning given it by Soviet students of translation. The fullest definition of the term, taking into account previous works on the subject, is proposed by S. Vlahov and S. Florin:

Реалиями мы назовем слова (и словосочетания) народного языка, представляющие собой наименования предметов, понятий, явлений, характерных для географической среды, культуры, материального быта, или общественно-исторических особенностей народа, нации, страны, племени, и являющиеся, таким образом, носителями национального, местного или исторического колорита; точных соответствий на других языках такие слова не имеют. 19

This definition is perhaps the most ample possible, but it cannot be called definitive because of one major omission. It overlooks the fact that, while it is highly unlikely that any word will have exact equivalents in all the world's languages, it is not improbable that an equivalent will exist in one or two closely related languages, in countries whose cultural history

is closely tied to that of the SL country. A term which constitutes an element of realia in translation from Russian into English may not be realia in translation from Russian into Ukrainian. Russian "kolkhoz" is realia to the English translator, but not to the Ukrainian translator. Ukrainian has its own acronym, very similar to the Russian one, and the reality to which it applies is identical in Russian-speaking and Ukrainian-speaking territory, and equally familiar to both peoples.

There are no doubt words in all languages with no equivalent in any other, but there are many more which have equivalents in a few languages only. Hence it is important that in using the term "realia" we make clear to which two languages we are referring.

Vlakhov and Florin are aware of other shortcomings in their definition. As usage is constantly changing, can one say that a word ceases to be realia if it becomes established in a foreign tongue? The authors claim that the word "sputnik" has already become international.²⁰ Thus, in posing the question, "Realia li eto?" as the authors do,²¹ one cannot always find an unequivocal answer by applying the above definition, as borderline cases are numerous and the context plays a decisive rôle. Nevertheless this definition, though imperfect, is the best there is, as realia cannot be entirely set apart from other classes of word.

Vlakhov and Florin divide realia into four main groups, each with sub-divisions: (1) geographic and ethnographic,

(2) folklore and myth, (3) way of life [byt], (4) social and historical.²² Such elements of realia as there are in Janko Muzykant fall principally into the categories of folklore and myth, institutions (social-historical), and way of life.

At an early stage in the story the importance of christening the child before he dies may not be clear if the sentence is translated word-for-word. The beliefs associated with this are not, in fact, exclusively Polish. They have wider currency in Eastern Europe, particularly in Bulgaria,²³ though only in a limited milieu, among the peasantry. Since this way of life is now passing, beliefs of this sort may be considered historical-folkloric realia.

English and American readers are not likely to be aware of such beliefs, and Curtin's literal translation does little to elucidate the matter. Tasín modifies the sentence in order to avoid an enigmatic result such as Curtin's, but by modifying it he loses the essence of the meaning. The reader of the translation learns only that the boy must not die unbaptized, with no hint of the possible consequences if he does. Furthermore, the use of the word "moro" introduces purely Spanish associations. The dangers of introducing SL realia in a translation have been noted by several experts.²⁴

Korolenko's method, which consists of retaining the Polish word "strzyga," with a footnote, is hardly more informative, as the footnote says simply that the word means "the soul of a child who dies unbaptized." This much is clear from the context. The

translator does not make it clear that, according to superstition, the soul turns into a vampire which preys on livestock. If this information is not supplied, the footnote serves little purpose. None of the three translators does full justice to this piece of folkloric realia.

The colourful image of the cuckoo calling the boy back to health, drawn from the speech of the people about whom Sienkiewicz is writing, again stems from popular belief. The clause "okukała kukulka chorobe" does not constitute realia in the strictest sense of the word, since there is nothing exclusively Polish about any of the three words taken individually. However, the expression as a whole and the belief on which it is founded have not the same wide currency. The expression passes easily into Russian. Korolenko can render it word-for-word. Curtin misunderstands the expression and gives it opposite meaning in his translation, and Tasin's paraphrase avoids the cuckoo altogether. Of the three versions, Korolenko's is the only one which can be considered satisfactory.

In the field of social customs, the dance known in Polish as "obertas" will not be familiar to English, Spanish, or Russian readers. Curtin nevertheless uses the original word with no explanation, reasoning perhaps that the reader will deduce that it is a dance and require no further information. Korolenko also uses the original word, and his cryptic footnote, "a dance," tells us no more than might be guessed. Curtin and Korolenko, who preserve the Polish word, give the reader no more information.

than Tasin, who omits it and uses the verb "to dance" by itself. None of these versions is fully satisfactory. The French and German translators say more, in footnotes about this Polish or Lithuanian folk-dance.

None of the TLs dealt with here (except Czech) has a word for Polish "gromnica": This specimen of religious realia is, however, easily rendered by descriptive translation, ("blessed candle"), in most other languages. Curtin and Tasin both use this. Korolenko retains the Polish word and provides a lengthy footnote by way of explanation.

There are two cases of social, or institutional realia in Janko Muzykant: "karbowy," and "wójt." In both cases Korolenko uses the original words, with no footnotes. Tasin uses approximate translation, finding words which designate people who fulfil roughly the same functions, and Curtin's method is similar. A danger of intrusive SL realia presents itself once more, and the Spanish translator does not avoid the danger by using "el alcalde" for "wójt." It is difficult for the Spanish reader to associate a functionary who bears this title with any country but his own.

It is worth noting that some English translators working from Polish have seen fit to use "wójt" in their English versions without translating it. E. C. M. Benecke and M. Busch supply a footnote explaining the etymology of the word.²⁵

We see then that Korolenko is the only one of the three translators to be consistent in his method of rendering Polish realia. He relies heavily on footnotes, although some of these

are not as helpful as they might be. Opinions differ as to the rôle of the footnote in literary translation. There are those who hold that it is an obstacle to ease of reading, that it is a last resort, and even that it is an admission of failure on the part of the translator.²⁶ On the other hand there are those who maintain that the translator has an obligation to provide supplementary information, that this should be kept out of the text, and that the judicious use of footnotes is therefore essential.²⁷ On the whole, Korolenko's version, with footnotes, conveys the specific details of the original more completely than the Spanish and English versions. His footnotes are neither so numerous nor so long as to be a real obstacle to reading.

In rendering any specific piece of realia the advantages of each different method of translation must be weighed carefully against the disadvantages. The context must decide how much importance the exact translation of realia should have. In Janko Muzykant the institutional realia ("wójt," "karbowy"), may be allowed to lose their specific "Polishness" with little loss to the story, as long as these two minor personages and others are kept separate. On the other hand, there is no legitimate reason for diluting the folkloric realia ("strzyga," "okukała kukułka chorobę"), which carry much local colour, and can be explained without difficulty.

Before proceeding to investigate whether the translation which most nearly re-creates the content of the original is in fact the best translation, this chapter may be concluded by

re-stating the order of content equivalence to the original: (1) Curtin, (2) Korolenko, (3) Tasin. It should be borne in mind, however, that although the figures show Curtin closer to the original than Korolenko, the latter has far fewer errors, and his rendering of realia and natural phenomena, while imperfect, is more complete than Curtin's.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ Czesław Miłosz, History of Polish Literature (London: Macmillan, 1969), p. 310.
- ² Kazimiera Iłlakowiczówna, "Kilka słów o przypadkowych tłumaczeniach," in O sztuce tłumaczenia, ed. by Michał Rusinek (Wrocław: 1955), p. 241.
- ³ V. B. Obolevich, "Rol' nauchnykh znanii v tvorcheskoi praktike perevodchika," in Teoriia i kritika perevoda, ed. by B. A. Larin (Leningrad: 1962), p. 163 et seq.
- ⁴ Jiří Levý, Umění překladu (Prague: 1963), p. 147.
- ⁵ Henryk Sienkiewicz, Nowele (Warsaw: 1896), cited by Siostra Beatrycja C. R., "Dziecko w utworach Henryka Sienkiewicza," Sodalis, XXXVIII; No. 4 - 338 (April 1957), 93-4.
- ⁶ J. Moravec, "O významu překladu a překladatelském mistrovství," in Kniha o překládání (Prague: 1953), p. 49.
- ⁷ Fritz Guettinger, Zielsprache (Zurich: Manesse Verlag, 1963), p. 113.
Kornei Chukovskii, Vysokoe iskusstvo (Moscow: 1964), p. 26. The author stresses that mistakes of this kind are less harmful than a deliberate system of digressions, which distorts the image of the original author.
- ⁸ L. Vindt, "Marsel' Eme v rukakh perevodchikov," in Redaktor i perevod (Moscow: 1965), p. 113.
- ⁹ Eric Bentley, translator's introduction to Bertolt Brecht, Parables for the Theatre (London: Penguin, 1968), p. 17.
- ¹⁰ I. Kashkin, "V bor'be za realisticheskii perevod," in Voprosy khudozhestvennogo perevoda (Moscow: 1955), p. 120.
- ¹¹ S. Masliak, "Pereklady z slovians'kykh mov," in Pytannia perekladu (Kiev: 1957), p. 116.
- ¹² Jiří Levý, "Translation in Czechoslovakia," in Proceedings of the Fourth Congress of the International Federation of Translators (Oxford: Pergamon, 1967), p. 218.
- ¹³ B. Silveira, A arte de traduzir (São Paulo: Edições Melhoramentos, 1955), p. 121.

- 14 V. Rossel's, "Perevod i natsional'noe svoebrazie pod-
linnika," in Voprosy khudozhestvennogo perevoda (Moscow: 1955),
p. 13.
- 15 Umění překladu, p. 92.
- 16 B. Silveira, p. 67.
- 17 Jan Parandowski, Alchemia słowa (Warsaw: 1956), p. 156.
- 18 Vladimir Nabokov, "The Servile Path," in On Translation,
ed. by Reuben Brower (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966),
p. 103.
- 19 S. Vlakhov, S. Florin, "Neperevodimoe v perevode," in
Masterstvo perevoda, No. 6 (1969), p. 438.
- 20 Ibid., p. 439.
- 21 Ibid., p. 440.
- 22 Ibid., p. 434 et seq.
- 23 J. G. Frazer, The Golden Bough, Vol. X (New York:
Macmillan, 1935), p. 284.
- 24 Olaf Blixen, La traducción literaria y sus problemas
(Montevideo: Universidad de la República, 1954), p. 35.
- R. Rait-Kovaleva, "Nit' Ariadny," in Redaktor i perevod
(Moscow: 1965), p. 18.
- 25 Selected Polish Tales, tr. by E. C. M. Benecke and M. Busch
(London: Oxford University Press, 1921), p. 14.
- 26 Umění překladu, p. 83.
- Georges Mounin, Los problemas teóricos de la traducción,
tr. by Julio Lago Alonso (Madrid: Gredos, 1971), p. 11.
- J. P. Vinay, J. Darbelnet, Stylistique comparée du fran-
çais et de l'anglais (Paris: Didier, 1963), p. 264.
- A. Argo, "Fakty i vyvody," in Masterstvo perevoda, No. 2
(1959), p. 299.
- 27 J. P. Postgate, Translation and Translations (London:
G. Bell, 1922), p. 44.
- B. Silveira, p. 63.

Witold Jabłoński, "Zagadnienia przekładów z języków
orientalnych zilustrowane na materiale chińskim," in O sztuce
tłumaczenia (Wrocław: 1955), p. 62.

CHAPTER IV
STYLISTIC EQUIVALENCE

Before a stylistic study of the translations is begun a brief examination of the stylistic structure of the original is in order. The story falls naturally into seven sections and the author's use of language follows a regular pattern of development through these sections. A stylistic breakdown follows.

Section 1: p. 1, l. 1 - p. 2, l. 10 (Przyszło to... życia). Janko's birth and his unexpected survival are described. The language is laconic and simple with very short sentences. Where the sentences are longer, they are held together by simple conjunctions: "a..., aż..., i..."; "Ale..., owszem... chociaż..."

There are only two relative clauses in this section, both in the first paragraph, and both short. Only two gerunds occur: "mówiąc," and "wziąwszy." Adjectives are kept to a minimum.

This section sets the tone of the story by the barest of sentences, of terse, informational content: "Przyszło to na świat wątłe, słabe"; "Posłano po księdza; przyjechał, zrobił swoje, odjechał; chorej zrobiło się lepiej." The author cannot be accused of wasting words here.

The four lines of dialogue between the "kumy" are equally concise.

Section 2: p. 2, l. 11 - p. 7, l. 9 (Chudy był zawsze...

nie wyszła mu na dobre). This long section is mainly descriptive of Janko and his mother. The boy's appearance, his behaviour, and his character are presented in detail. We learn of his love for music, the lengths to which he would go in order to hear it, and the beatings it earned him.

This section may be sub-divided as follows: Janko's beating at the hands of the overseer, his expeditions to the inn, his home-made fiddle. In essence, however, these four pages go together to form the background and set the scene for the main action, stressing the musical theme by carefully selected details, and presaging misfortune in the line which concludes the general background: "Ale ta chęć nie wyszła mu na dobre."

On the whole the sentences in this section are longer. Their construction remains simple, but it is less terse than in the introductory section. Imagery plays a larger part, and subordinate clauses are more frequent. Musical effects are used in describing the sounds of the village, making Sienkiewicz's prose at times closer to poetry. The narrator's personal involvement in his story becomes apparent in rhetorical exclamations and questions: "Ale na co się to zdało?"; "Ba! ale skąd ich dostać?"

Section 3: p. 7, l. 10 - 19 (We dworze... ze szczęścia). Here the shift occurs from the general background to the immediate background, leading up to the main action. The servant's violin, the object of all Janko's desires, is now introduced for

the first time. We learn how Janko is in the habit of creeping up to the servant's door to admire it.

This section consists of one paragraph of pure narrative, but the curt, detached manner of the first section is now gone. The author is no longer so sparing in his use of adjectives. The emotional note is felt more strongly, in lines like the following: "chłopak duszę swoją całą wysyłał ku nim przez oczy"; "biedne, małe, chłopskie serce drżało."

Section 4: p. 8, l. 1 - p. 10, l. 23 (Pewnej nocy... hałas w całym dworze). Janko's last, fatal expedition to the manor constitutes the dramatic centre of the action of the tale. Tension mounts inexorably from the first two highly poetic paragraphs describing the violin hanging in the moonlight and its fatal, ~~magic attraction,~~ to Janko's capture.

Sienkiewicz relies heavily on sound and light effects here, and on the use of natural phenomena. The benevolent nightjar tries to dissuade Janko with its call, but the nightingale and the wind in the burdocks urge him on. The tension is heightened by the struggle between these two forces, but we know that the boy is not strong enough to resist the temptation and heed the nightjar. Contrasting light and darkness are exploited to the full: Janko's white shirt, the black burdocks, the silver light reflected from the fiddle, the flash of lightning and the ensuing darkness as the moon is hidden. Finally Janko betrays his presence by touching the strings, and the silence is shattered as the household suddenly awakes.

Section 5: p. 11, l. 1 - p. 12, l. 11 (Na drugi dzień... zgrzebnym kilimkiem). Janko's arrest, trial and sentence are related. The narrator's standpoint comes to the fore here, especially in ironic rhetorical questions, and equally ironic replies: "Mieliż go tam sądzić jako złodzieja?... Pewno." The narrator also addresses himself directly to Stach, the watchman, to express his sympathy for the hapless boy and give vent to his outrage at Stach's treatment of him.

The atmosphere of enchantment, so strongly felt in the previous section, gives way abruptly to a realistic account of the summary court proceedings and the speedy execution of the severe sentence. The tragedy of Janko's situation is heightened by the speed of events at this point, and the pace of the author's narrative.

Section 6: p. 12, l. 12 - p. 13, l. 21 (Jaskółki świątały... Pokój ci, Janku!) Janko's death is movingly described in lyrical prose very like that of the scene-setting paragraphs in the second section. Some imagery is used, the main image being that of the sunbeam serving as a path for Janko's departing soul. Light effects are again prominent: this same sunbeam lights up Janko's head, and disappears the moment he dies. As he lies dying he hears the familiar sounds of the village, to which Sienkiewicz gives special emphasis. Some of these sounds, the birds in the cherry-tree and the pipes, echo those mentioned in the background description of the second section.

The tone of the narrative is quiet and serene, even when

Janko's mother's despairing outburst is described, and the author's only direct comment is, "Pokój ci, Janku!"

Section 7: p. 14, l. 1 - 6 (Najajutrz... brzozy). This brief, ironic conclusion, about the gentry's homecoming, represents a return to the unadorned, simple sentences of the introductory section. The two sentences of narrative which introduce the brief exchange in French are extremely spare and laconic. Not one adjective is used. The very last sentence echoes the musical theme.

Mieczysława Romankówna makes an important point about the stylistic purpose of the use of French in the concluding lines. It is, she says, the central part of a system of contrasts, designed to bring out the story's social point.¹ This and other contrasts contained in the last few lines are listed as follows:

wieś - dwór; nędza - dobrobyt; język ludu - francuszczyzna;
talent rodzimy - pochwała obcych; cierpienie matki i śmierć
zameczonogo dziecka - salonowe zabiegi o rękę panny z
dworu; patos rozpacz - powierzchowna towarzyska paplanina;
prostota w objawianiu wewnętrznych uczuć - atmosfera savoir
vivre'u.

The three short sentences in French are therefore much richer in content than they appear at first sight.

In breaking the story down into these seven sections we find that a definite stylistic pattern emerges. The story unfolds gradually, from Janko's inauspicious birth, through his solitary childhood, to the central event of the story and his unnecessary death. The tension rises sharply at the beginning of the fourth section to its culminating point when Janko is caught; at the

end of this section. Subsequent events seem more or less inevitable, and tension falls away, giving way to pathos as Janko dies and the author makes the final cutting social comment.

In one respect the stylistic pattern is symmetrical, centring around the fourth section. The first section and the last are recounted in equally lapidary, emotionless language, which is concise and effortless. These sections provide the basic information in a bare minimum of words. The author does not make his presence felt in either section.

The second section matches the penultimate. The language is no longer so dry as in the first and last sections. Both contain calm, poetic descriptions of the countryside and its characteristic sounds, some of which are the same in both sections. The descriptive passages are fuller, with a strong lyrical tendency. Imagery, which is slight in the first section and wholly absent in the last, is now used more extensively. Sentences are longer, with more liberal use of adjectives and subordinate clauses. The author's presence is felt, to a limited extent, in rhetorical interpolations and in certain value judgements: "Dobrze, że... odchodziła szeroką, słoneczną drogą..." (p. 12, l. 16).

The emotional note is stronger in the third section, where Janko gazes at the fiddle, projecting his soul out towards it, and where his "poor little boyish heart" trembles at the thought of touching it. Emotion also runs high in the fifth section, in the description of Janko before the court and the

profusion of adjectives used here: "z wytrzeszczonymi, zalekłymi oczyma, mały, chudy, zamorusany, obity..." Emotion is heightened by the use of rhetorical questions. The presence of the narrator can be felt distinctly in the third and fifth sections, more clearly in the latter.

There is thus an even progression from a cool, detached presentation in the introductory scenes, to close emotional involvement in the climax of the story, back to a detached attitude in the closing section. The detachment in the final scene is of course partly illusory, as the spare narrative conceals the narrator's indignation somewhat thinly. Nonetheless a deliberate attempt is made to hold sentiment in check.

The translator of the story should preferably be aware of this pattern and follow it closely. It is not absolutely essential that he be aware of it, since a near-literal translation like Curtin's, with no additions or omissions, can reproduce the pattern without any conscious effort. However, a translator who, like O'Connor Eccles, inserts adjectives in the closing line ("the larches rustled over little Janko's lowly grave") is unwittingly doing violence to the stylistic structure of the original. In Tasin's version, the change of "życie" to "menguada y ruin existencia," in the first section, has a similar effect.

If a literal translation can reproduce the basic stylistic pattern, it cannot reproduce the finer points of Sienkiewicz's style. It has been remarked that in many places

Sienkiewicz gives excellent examples of the skaz.² When W. Lednicki pointed this out he was thinking primarily of the novels, especially Krzyżacy, but examples can also be found in the short stories, including Janko Muzykant.

In reading the story one has the distinct impression that the narrator is one of the villagers who has witnessed the events and is recounting them orally, a person with an exceptional narrative gift, but one who speaks the language of the village folk. It is not that the language is studded with dialect forms or words, (these are present, but not in inordinate numbers), but most of the narrative is in a simple, unaffected style, and the narrator breaks into his third person account with comments of his own.

Alina Nöfer observes that in Janko Muzykant the narrator sometimes speaks, "ni to w swoim, ni w jego [Janka] imieniu," and goes on to describe how Janko's longing for the violin is revealed through the boy's own thoughts and feelings.³ This is the very essence of the skaz: narrative in the third person, but with events seen through the eyes of the hero and related, at least in part, in the speaking style of the hero.

One of the difficulties in translating this story lies in reproducing the easy flow of the narrative and making it sound like natural speech. A translation which is stiff or difficult to read aloud cannot be counted a successful reproduction of the original. As we shall see, Kozłowski's and Tasin's versions read freely and naturally, while Curtin's is somewhat less

than natural.

Texts in which the skaz technique is used are notoriously difficult to render in other languages, partly because they usually involve sub-standard language and class and regional dialects. An original which incorporates these features is likely to lose many of them in translation, sometimes because no equivalents exist in the TL, and sometimes because of lack of imagination on the part of the translator. In general, sub-standard language in the original, class and regional accents and dialects become several steps closer to standard language in translation. The extremes of style, from the vulgar to the concinnous, tend to move closer together and blend in one amorphous neutral style.

More often than not this process arises out of necessity. Ralph Parker's translation of Solzhenitsyn's Odin den' Ivana Denisovicha is one of many examples, though K. Chukovskii does not absolve the translator from all of the blame in failing to render Solzhenitsyn's colourful use of prison-camp slang.⁴

Sub-standard forms and, to a certain extent, slang can sometimes be matched in the TL without undue difficulty. Regional dialects, however, present almost insoluble problems. Opinions differ as to the approach the translator should adopt in seeking to render dialect. S. Masljak, criticizing a translation by his colleague M. Fryhara of Maria Konopnicka's poetry, complains that Polish dialect is rendered by standard literary Ukrainian.⁵ M. Fryhara replies with the question, "Which

Ukrainian dialect should she have used?"⁶ K. Chukovskii states both points of view in a non-committal manner.⁷ K. Horálek maintains that the use of dialect in translation should be minimal, that the translator should not strive to equal the SL dialect in his TL version.⁸ Similarly, J. Levý considers that the most a translator can do is distinguish standard city speech from uneducated provincial speech, avoiding any specific regional dialect, as this entails too strong an association with one TL area.⁹

Happily for the translators of Janko Muzykant, the dialect forms used in this story and in some of Sienkiewicz's other short works, though drawn primarily from the Mazowsze area which the author knew well, are not intended to set the scene in any well defined area, but rather to serve as a class indicator, while making the tale seem applicable to any village anywhere in Poland.¹⁰ The distinction is less geographical than social.

In his penetrating article on the use of dialect in six of Sienkiewicz's short stories, J. Milik lists some of the dialect expressions and variants used in Janko Muzykant. A complete list follows, including some forms not mentioned by Milik:

"co się były zebrały" for "co się zebrały,"

"dajta" (the suffix "-ta" is dialect),

"juże,"

"dobrodziej" for "ksiądz,"

"zara" for "zarsz,"

"krzcę," "krześcijańska" ("k" for "ch"),
 "matula nie mieli" for "matula nie miała,"¹¹
 "kapalus" for "kapelusz,"
 "kania" for "rondo,"
 "potrzódka," meaning "pomocnik pasterza,"
 "ówierkotać" for "ówierkać,"
 "rzechotać," "zarzechotać" for "rechotać," "zarechotać,"
 "derkotać" (onomatopoeic formation based on "derkacz"),
 "bąk" for "trzmiel,"
 "będziem," "będziewa" for "będziemy,"
 "łopuch" for "łopian."

Some of these have since passed into the standard language, but it appears that Sienkiewicz was among the first to use certain of them (e. g. "łopuch") in a literary work.¹²

None of the translators seeks dialect forms or vocabulary to render any of the above. Karolenko, however, does retain the dialect word for hat in a similar, russified form ("kapyliukh"), with a footnote, and in the line of song in which "będziem" and "będziewa" appear he uses archaic infinitive endings ("piti," etc.). Not only do Tasin and Curtin find no dialect equivalents for the words listed above, they use very few expressions or variants elsewhere which can be considered dialect.

Karolenko, on the other hand, introduces several features of prostorechie, though few of dialect, in other places. "Koi," "baba," "khvorost'," "golodukha," "malen'ko," "pochem," are all prostorechie. "Zhnitvo" is restricted to regional use.

Prostorechie may be the ideal vehicle for the translation of SL dialect, since it conveys the desired rustic flavour without the close regional associations of TL dialect.

"Parubok" is generally regarded in Russia as a Ukrainian word, though it may be that Korolenko selected it because of its similarity to Polish "parobek," which is used in the original. The expression "do domu" (used in Russian) is also likely to be seen by Russian readers as a Ukrainianism. These two expressions, and "zhnitvo," represent the only places where anything resembling a local TL dialect is used by Korolenko. All the other translators use less dialect than this, with the sole exception of J. Rumler, who uses several regional expressions in Czech.

Dialect, however, is not the mainstay of the skaz technique in the story. More prominent is the use of highly colloquial words, forms, and turns of phrase which have no regional associations, and few of class:

"trza" for "trzeba,"

"jaki" for "jakiś,"

"kocię nie kocię, albo go!"

"baba,"

"zipać,"

"w jakim takim zdrowiu,"

"może go tam i kochała,"

"gęba,"

"ładaco,"

"albo on wiedział,"

"i basta,"

"ale na co się to zdało!"

"Gdzie tam!"

"cichutko,"

"cichuteńko,"

"dzieciaczyna,"

"Jakże tu sądzić...,"

"czy jak?"

"konał już sobie spokojnie," (colloquial use of dative reflexive/ pronoun).

All these make their contribution to the skaz technique, the longer expressions more than the single words. Besides the adverbial diminutives contained in the above list, fourteen noun diminutives are used, most of them characteristic of the spoken language rather than the literary language.

As if to compensate for what Korolenko may have felt to be inadequate rendering of the original dialect expressions, the Russian translation abounds in colloquialisms. Indeed the range of colloquialisms in Korolenko's version is wider than in the original. The extensive use of "da" for "and," the frequent insertion of "uzh" and the suffix "-to," the shortening of "mozhet byt'" to "mozhet," the insertion of "taki" and "takovo" where not strictly necessary, the use of "kto" for "kto-nibud'," the doubled adjectives ("belye-belye"), all mark the style as that of Russian as it is spoken rather than written.

Several colloquial locutions occur, such as "cherez

pen'-kolodu," "znatnaia vstrečka," "chtoby ne bylo povadno," "vsamdelishnyi." In his use of diminutives Korolenko outdoes Sienkiewicz. He uses no fewer than twenty diminutives, as against the author's sixteen, and many are used repeatedly. The secondary diminutives, "synóček," "golóvenka," "volosenki," "razochek," are highly colloquial.

By way of contrast, there is little in Curtin's version which can be said to be colloquial English, unless the somewhat outmoded "it is" and the use of "thou" be considered as such. The fact that English offers virtually no diminutive or augmentative forms is a major limitation which no English translator can surmount.

Tasín relies heavily on diminutives in his attempt to reproduce the original style in Spanish. In fact, with the exception of a number of exclamatory expressions, diminutives are almost the only feature of the colloquial to be found in his translation. As in Polish, Spanish diminutives formed from adverbs and adjectives tend to be more colloquial than noun diminutives. Tasín has four such forms, "mayorcito," "cerquita," "pegadito," "poquitín," among a total of twenty-one diminutives used.

It is interesting that of the noun diminutives five are words referring to Janko: "chiquitín," "chiquillo," "pequeñuelo," "angelito." These are some of the ten different words used by Tasín to refer to Janko. The other five are: "crio," "niño," "criatura," "muchacho," "el infeliz." This is a much greater variety than is found in the original, where only four nouns are

used. Korolenko, with six words, also outdoes the original. Curtin, on the other hand, uses only three different words, - one less than the original.

Dialect and colloquialisms cannot, however, create the skaz by themselves, since the skaz is more than the simple choice of words. The selection of vocabulary from the appropriate stylistic level is an instrument in the development of linguistic identification between narrator and hero. But more important than linguistic identification is identification of thought. The latter is, it is true, partly dependent upon the former.

In Janko Muzykant the narrator expresses the thoughts of the hero almost as if they were his (the narrator's) own, although the third person is retained most of the time:

Co by on za to dał, gdyby mógł mieć takie skrzypki grające cienko... Takie deszczuki śpiewające. Ba! ale skąd ich dostać? Gdzie takie robią? Żeby mu przynajmniej pozwolili choć raz w rękę wziąć coś takiego!... Gdzie tam! (p. 5, l. 15 et seq.)

These lines are very similar to some of those quoted from the major novels, in a valuable study of Sienkiewicz's narrative devices, as examples of mowa pozornie zależna, or represented discourse.¹³ It is characterized by the author's "representing" his protagonist's thoughts, not reporting them at second-hand. The term "represented discourse" is applied by D. Welsh where W. Lednicki uses "skaz." The device is signalled by vocabulary and style, and by the absence of "stage-directions" such as "he thought." While W. Lednicki and D. Welsh use these terms only in connection with Sienkiewicz's longer works, T. Bujnicki applies

the term "mowa pozornie zależna" to Janko Muzykant and says that it plays an important part in the story.¹⁴

Although the narrative in the lines quoted above is basically in the third person, there are times when the third person disappears, as in the incomplete sentence, "Takie deszczuki śpiewające," and in the impersonal question which follows it. These two phrases and the two exclamations could well come from Janko himself. The change to a present tense verb in the question, "Gdzie takie robią?" is highly significant, as it indicates that the author's train of thought has momentarily slipped into that of his hero. Korolenko manages to reproduce this merging of personalities very successfully, despite the syntactic changes which are necessary. The present tense is preserved ("delaiut"), and no person is specified in "Otkuda voz'mesh ikh?"

Tasín also achieves a notable stylistic success here. The colloquial turn of phrase in "¿Qué cosa más rara que esos maderos cantores!" expresses all the ardent enthusiasm of the original, in fact rather more. The two questions have future verbs and appear to come from Janko himself.

The skaz shown here does not fare so well in English. In the first place, "Such singing bits of wood!" is a singularly un-poetic rendering. Beyond this, however, the translator cannot be blamed for his lack of success with the phrases which follow. "Gdzie ich dostać?" can hardly remain impersonal in English, and the person supplied must be "he," since to use "I" would be an impermissible liberty even though the original might suggest it.

The verb, which is in the infinitive in the original, must now be given a tense, and since the present ("can") would sound out of place the translator is reduced to using the past ("could"). (Curtin's use of the present conditional for "Co by on za to dał?" appears to be the result of his imperfect command of English tenses, rather than a desire to render the skaz). The same applies to the next question, in which the English past tense must be used, "Where were they made?" Furthermore, Curtin renders "Gdzie tam!" by a past tense verb: "How could that be?"

Thus the identity of narrator and hero, so perfectly achieved in the original, comes near to being destroyed, less because of discrepancies in levels of language between the original and the translation, than because of inherent differences in the TL and SL modes of expression. Curtin's English might be improved, to read more colloquially and more naturally, but there is little he can do to avoid making the original impersonal constructions personal, and replacing the infinitives by past tense verbs. The other English translators do the same.

Although Korolenko's reproduction of the skaz is on the whole very faithful, minor lapses come about through misreading of the punctuation. Thoughts which appear as the narrator's or commentator's are marked by the translator as direct speech (p. 11, l. 10; p. 2, l. 7). Tasin also moves away from the skaz in his rendering of "Okukała kukułka chorobę" (p. 2, l. 8), which reads like an authorial simile, not like the speech of the protagonists.

The loss of dialect and colloquialisms and the dilution of the skaz in some of the translations is one aspect of a process known in Russian as sglazhivanie stilia. It has often been said that the cardinal sin of many translators is a levelling down of the language of the original.¹⁵ This process takes many forms. Dialect is an area in which the translator usually has little choice but to adopt standard TL forms. Realia too, by definition, are bound to lose their distinctive qualities in translation. In some translations the elements of natural history in Janko Muzykant fall victim to this process. Tasin omits some of those he does not know, and uses the words "grass" and "bush" where species are named in the original.

Inadequate rendering of flora and fauna usually occurs because the translator is less familiar with the subject matter than the author, and does not know the SL specific names, if he knows them in the TL. However, sglazhivanie stilia commonly occurs with everyday words which the translator can understand immediately, but for which he can neither find an equivalent, nor make a modulation as an alternative. In this area, as distinct from those of dialect or realia, the translator can often be held directly responsible.

The student of translation constantly observes that highly specific SL words and expressions are rendered by more general, imprecise TL words. The English translator who renders Russian "shum," "shorokh," "zyuk," and "shelest" all by "noise" is guilty, at best, of extreme mental laziness. Imprecision of

this kind can cause irreparable damage to any text. An original which is clear, precise and colourful becomes vague and colourless.

J. Levý, who illustrates this process very clearly, taking examples from translations of Karel Čapek's works, distinguishes three separate kinds of stylistic impoverishment: (1) the use of a general word to designate something specific, (2) the use of a stylistically neutral word in place of an emotionally tinged one, (3) little use of synonyms for variation.¹⁶ Most, though not all, of the examples found in the translations of Janko Muzykant belong to the first class.

Few examples of this process can be found in Korolenko's or Tasín's versions. Curtin's, however, offers a wealth of examples, whose cause lies primarily in the translator's insufficient TL vocabulary. The following examples, based on the verb "to bend," belong to J. Levý's third category, arising because of an inadequate stock of synonyms. Alternatives are suggested in brackets:

"the plump bends in it [the violin]" for "zagięcia" (curves),
 "the bent handle [of the violin]" for "zagięta rączka" (curving).
 "Bent" has very different connotations from "curving," which would be more appropriate here. Other examples are:
 "the poor little bent figure" for "skulony" (hunched, crouching),
 "used to ory silently" for "popłakiwał" (whimpered),
 "went behind the stove" for "właził" (crawled).

When light and sound effects are brought into play the

lapunae in the translator's vocabulary make themselves felt more than ever:

"a match became visible" for "zaczęła migotać,"

"moving of lights behind the window" for "bieganie świateł,"

"the white shirt appeared nearer and nearer" for "migotała,"

"there was a light" for "zrobiło się widno."

More than light effects, sound is of vital importance in Janko Muzykant and irreparable harm is done by replacing precise words with extremely imprecise ones, as in the following examples:

"the voice of the watchman was heard" for "ózwwał się,"

"the fiddle, which hardly made a noise" for "brzęczały,"

"the fiddle sounded low, very low" for "brzęczały,"

"there was a noise in the burdocks" for "załopotwały łopuchy,"

"a noise through the whole building" for "hałas,"

"the land-rail calling" for "derkotać."

Words like "to sound," "to appear," "to move," "to become visible," "noise" are the weakest and most general words possible in these contexts, making for pale, uninteresting prose. They are no more than indicators, whereas Sienkiewicz's vocabulary is vividly descriptive and precise.

At times, when Curtin does seek a precise word, he selects an inappropriate one. Organs do not usually "roar" (cf. O'Connor Eccles, "to peal"). Nor do burdocks or other tall grasses "mutter," ("to murmur" would be an acceptable alternative). This last example is particularly striking in its

context as Curtin omits one of the main verbs "został," governed by "słowik," with the result that both the burdocks and the nightingale are made to mutter. Bitteras do not scream, but in any case the translation of this phrase is completely incorrect, as pointed out in the examination of texts. It should read "bumble-bees were droning."

Most of the watering-down of specific vocabulary in Tasín's version is in the field of natural history. On more familiar ground Tasín successfully avoids sglaziwanie stilla most of the time. Apart from his translation of "brzęczeć" as "tocar," "popłakiwać" as "llorar," and of "szarą godziną" as the less precise "por la noche," there are virtually no instances of this, although it must be remembered that much has been omitted.

Unlike Curtin, Tasín has a tendency to reinforce the style by more emphatic expressions than those of the original. Where Sienkiewicz has simply "chodził w koszulinie," Tasín writes "iba por esos mundos de Dios con una camisa." Likewise, "nie było co jeść" becomes "no había ni un mendrugo." Other examples are: "no se veía a alma viviente en toda la casa" (dom stał pustkami),

"la luna entraba a raudales"
(księżyc wchodził ukośnie).

Here the added emphasis is accompanied by a change of meaning.

"miraba sin pestañear, miraba siempre"
(patrzył i patrzył),

"el corazón se le despedazaba dentro del pecho"
(buchnęła z jej twardej piersi wzbierająca żalosc).

It will be noted that these stylistic changes accord closely with the type of addition made by Tasín, as listed in the preceding chapter. As in Korolenko's version, a tendency to add adjectives and adverbs was observed, and to be repetitive on occasion. In other words, Tasín and Korolenko tend at times to be more specific and more emphatic than the author.

One presumes that these tendencies are the result of deliberate policy, since it is not easy to add words without thinking about them, but there are isolated cases where the original is embellished by accident, owing to misunderstanding of the original. Such is Tasín's rendering of "jak robaczki świętojańskie" as "cual luciérnagas en la noche de San Juan." The Polish expression for "glow-worm" apparently strikes the translator as a vivid image which must be carefully preserved. In fact the expression has long since lost its evocative power, and is to a Pole no more than the verbal symbol for the insect, just as French "la belette," Italian "la donnola," and German "das Schoentierlein" are no longer regarded by natives in their original, etymological light.¹⁷ To the foreigner, however, these words represent a fresh and colourful vision of familiar objects. Here Tasín translates not the symbol for the object, but the erroneous impression which the word makes on him. His extended simile fits well into the text, but it is nevertheless more than Sienkiewicz wanted to say.

One might expect more of the author's images to undergo drastic changes in the freer translations. In point of fact,

this is not the case in Janko Muzykant. Very little imagery is lost in any of the translations, except as part of longer omissions, and none is added except in the one case mentioned above. Similes beginning with "jak" are translated as such, and hyperbolic figures of speech ("ćwierkotały wróble, aż się wiśnie trzęsły") are rendered in the same form by all translators.

To some extent the stylistic reinforcement noted above may be necessary at times to compensate for inevitable watering down in other places, but if carried to extremes it is likely to heighten the sentiment in the story. Virtually nothing is watered down in Korolenko's version, yet it is he who adds most liberally to the original. Where adjectives are added their choice is dictated by the feelings the original inspires in the translator, and the emotional note is thus intensified. Where the author writes "grief," Korolenko has "bitter, burning grief." Where the author has "tears," Korolenko has "light, childish tears." "Voices" becomes "tender little voices." Tasfn's additions are of exactly the same kind, as a glance at the list in Chapter III will show. In this way Janko Muzykant, already considered by some to verge on the morbid, moves a step closer to the maudlin.¹⁸

An examination of the phonetic effects used in the story must now be undertaken. As has already been remarked, Janko Muzykant, as its title indicates, owes much of its success to Sienkiewicz's sensitive use of sound and musical effects. As

Janko hears music in the simplest, everyday sounds, Sienkiéwicz, throughout the tale, stresses the sounds of the village which Janko hears. Janko's life really begins only when the cuckoo's call brings him health at the age of four. (Curtin's error in making the cuckoo bring Janko disease is thus of more than slight significance). The story closes with the sound of the birches rustling over his grave.

All Janko's activities are accompanied by, if not centred around, musical sounds. Pipes, fiddles, and organs play, girls sing, frogs croak, trees and grass rustle, bees drone, and several species of bird give their distinctive songs and calls. Sound plays a crucial rôle in the central scene, when Janko steals into the servant's room to inspect the violin, the physical embodiment of all his aspirations. As A. Nofer says, the dramatic tension in this scene depends on the sound effects.¹⁹ She claims, furthermore, that in no other story did Sienkiéwicz achieve such ideal unity of content and means of artistic expression.

Hence it can be seen that the omission of sounds or their sources, or failure to render them adequately in translation, has dire effects. The weakening of descriptive sound words by Curtin is a serious flaw. Even his confusion, twice in the space of one page, of the basic verbs "to hear" and "to listen" cannot be dismissed as entirely inconsequential. Tasín's omission of some species of bird and insect with their sounds, and his imprecise rendering of others is also serious.

Korolenko's single long omission is extremely unfortunate since the lines left out contain no fewer than seven different sounds, which are all music to Janko's ears.

Musical and poetic effects in Sienkiewicz's prose itself appear to have escaped the notice of most critics of Janko Muzykant, yet the story is rich in such devices as alliteration, assonance, rhyme-like terminations, and even metric effects. In three phrases, beginning on p. 4, l. 13, a complex array of these devices can be found:

"żaby zaczynały rzechotać,
derkacze na łąkach derkotać,
bąki po rosie burczyć."

In the first phrase the near-alliteration is striking (ż, z, rz). The line would be less effective if the standard form "rechotać" were used and the alliteration were thus lost. In the second phrase alliteration is even stronger (d, k, k, d, k), and the verb in the infinitive rhymes with that in the first phrase. The third phrase displays some limited use of alliteration (b, b), but more of assonance (a, o, o). Further, these vowels have a dull, hollow ring in keeping with the sound they describe. All three phrases are strongly onomatopoeic. The three verbs are largely responsible for this effect, particularly "derkotać," which is almost as onomatopoeic as the English verb "to cuckoo."

The three phrases follow a very definite metric pattern:

˘ - - / - ˘ - / - ˘ -
 - ˘ - / - ˘ - / - ˘ -
 ˘ - / - ˘ - / ˘ -

Each phrase falls naturally into three feet in which the dominant metre is amphybrachic. The last line is shorter by two syllables and forms two trochees flanking an amphybrach.

A. Nofer quotes the sentence in which these lines occur, and comments that, although the author is speaking, the words form something like the lines of a song which Janko hears.²⁰

Surprisingly, something of this survives in the translations. Alliteration and assonance are indicated in brackets.

Curtin:

"when the frogs were croaking, (r, g, r, k)
 the land-rail calling in the meadows, (l, l, ll)
 the bittern screaming in the dew."

Here, however, the alliteration is more a matter of luck than of judgement, since the first line can hardly be translated any other way. The English verb is onomatopoeic, like its Polish equivalent. The alliteration in the second line is accidental and does not coincide with the sound it describes, which is far better conveyed by the rough "r"s and sharp "k"s of the original. There is no alliteration or onomatopoeia in the third line, which is, in any case, totally incorrect as a translation. The first five syllables of each line are metrically identical (˘ ˘ - ˘ -), and the present participle endings in "-ing" coincide.

Of these three phrases, only the first remains in Tasín's version, but this is not devoid of phonetic effects:

"cuando croaban las ranas en los charcos," (c, r, r, r, c),
(a, a, a, a, a; a, a).

Again it may be a matter of accident that the Spanish word for "to croak" is as onomatopoeic as it is in English and Polish, but the addition of "en los charcos" strengthens an already strong phonetic similarity.

Korolenko makes no attempt to reproduce any of the original sound effects here, relying instead on purely verbal descriptive power in two lengthy additions. The corresponding part of his sentence runs: "kogda liagushki v prudakh zatiagivali svoi tysiachegolosyi torzhestvennyi khor, kogda v trave otzyvalsia dergach, bol'shie zhuki gudeli, obivaia blestiaschie rosinki..." There is no significant onomatopoeia in this sentence beyond that which is inherent in the verb "gudet'."

In the original, some of the same devices reappear later in the story, though nowhere in such densely concentrated form as in the sentence examined above. In the scene in which Janko listens to the merrymaking at the inn, alliteration and assonance are strong in the description of the sound of the bass-viol:

"basetla grubym głosem wtórowała z powagą..." The dominant consonants (g, g, g) and the vowels (u, o, ó, o, o, a) impart a slow and weighty dignity, in contrast to the thinner, faster "song" of the violin.²¹ Nothing of this is left in Curtin's

"the bass-viol accompanied in a deep voice," but in Tasín's "con

voz profunda" some of the vocalic resemblance is preserved. Nor are these features entirely lost in Russian, thanks to Korolenko's use of cognates: "grubym golosom vtoril s nadležashchei vazhnost'iu," (g, g), (u, o, o).

The monosyllabic imperatives in the nightingale's song, "Idź! pójdź! weź!" all ending in the same consonant, are not matched by Curtin, Korolenko, or Tasin, who evidently consider the meaning more important than the sound. Jopson is the only translator to convey the phonetic effects here.

When the croaking of frogs is heard again and described in very similar words, the translators make little or no attempt to reproduce the sound effects: "zarzechotały zaraz ogromnie żaby," (z, rz, z, z, ż). Neither the consonantal sequence nor the dominant vowel "a" appear in the translations.

The sounds reach a sudden, cacophonous peak when the servant awakes and catches Janko red-handed: "Eh! Boże! Słychać klątwy, uderzenia, płacz dziecka, wołanie: 'O! dla Boga!', szczekanie psów, bieganie świateł po szybach, hałas w całym dworze..." Sienkiewicz gives a certain regularity to this otherwise confused uproar through the use of homeoteleusis, - the three endings in "-anie," evenly spaced, and the not dissimilar ending of "uderzenia," which, like the other three nouns, is trisyllabic and therefore stressed on the middle syllable. Nothing similar can be found in Korolenko's version, nor in Tasin's. In the latter, a long addition is made, apparently to add to the impression of panic. Curtin's version, which is weak at this

point because of a series of very general sound words for the original's exact words, reproduces the fourfold homeoteleusis only thanks to literal translation of the verbal nouns, resulting in four endings in "-ing."

Korolenko inserts one appropriate piece of alliteration at a point where the original has none, perhaps with the intention of compensating for some of the original alliteration which he did not convey. The playing of pipes in the distance, as Janko lies dying, is expressed in soft, liquid "l"s: "lilis' pelyv svirclei," (cf. the original "granie fujarek"). Tasin's way of compensating for the omission of this phrase is the introduction of a sound which is not in the original, and which has the effect of a somewhat tired cliché: the gentle tolling of church bells.

If we now forget the original for a moment and consider the three translations as independent creations describing the same events, we find that they vary widely in literary quality. Korolenko's version is written in rich, evocative language, with many expressions characteristic of the rural lower classes, used with perfect ease and impeccable taste. His text is written with great feeling and understanding of the subject matter, and he is able to express his feelings towards it with unerring accuracy, never failing to select le mot juste. This skill is extremely valuable, especially in the lyrical passages. It might well be said, however, that feelings are allowed to come through

a little too often, and with a certain lack of restraint, however great the verbal skill used in expressing them.

Tasín's version, written in a flowing, natural style, reads extremely easily, but in comparison with Korolenko's it appears less lexically rich, being presented in a fairly homogenous style of standard, though often colloquial, Spanish. The lyrical passages bear witness to great feeling, but sometimes lack the specific detail which Korolenko's version contains. There are fewer sources of sound, and some of the remaining ones appear in more generalized form. Like Korolenko, the writer lets his feelings towards the hero emerge clearly, and, some might say, to excess.

It is less easy to consider Curtin's text as an independent creation, since his use of English never lets the reader forget that he is reading a translation. One cannot tell whether he was not inspired, as Korolenko and Tasín obviously were, by the subject matter, or whether he was in fact caught up by it but unable to convey his impressions in writing. In either case he does not appear to have needed to exercise the restraint which is wanting in the Russian and Spanish versions.

Curtin's text is marked by a limited range of vocabulary and a flat, uniform style which is immediately recognizable as "translator's English," in which le mot juste is the exception rather than the rule. The content, for the most part, is there in all its detail, but the form is lacking, and hence there can be no talk of unity between the two.

A major obstacle to ease of reading in Curtin's translation is the translator's incorrect use of English. His meaning may or may not be obscured by this, but even where it is not the monolingual reader who is not familiar with either Sienkiewicz or Curtin is sometimes forced to pause and wonder whether the translator is striving to catch an oddity in the original Polish, or whether his knowledge of English is insufficient for his task. The reader is bound to halt in surprise when he comes upon "a quiet summer lightning," and ask how a native speaker of English could fail to use the indefinite article correctly.

Verb tenses are sometimes wrong in context, giving an odd effect, although it is not always possible to say that they are incorrect without reference to the original:

"he was suffering from hunger," (every year, therefore "suffered"),

"he would like to have it in his hand,"
(narrative in past, therefore "would have liked"),

"and still he was thinking,"
(repeatedly, therefore "would think/thought"),

"till the cherry-trees were trembling,"
("trembled"),

"as soon as the organ began to roar... the child's eyes were covered with mist,"
("became covered/would become covered/misted over/would mist over").

Curtin's word-order sometimes departs from that of normal English, particularly in the placing of adverbs, as noticed by one of Sienkiewicz's first American reviewers.²² According to the critic, it is one of the causes of the "odd, foreign tone" which strikes one in Curtin's prose:

"... it went on a thorny one, truly,"

"[she] called him 'giddy-head' generally,"

"he had always a big stomach,"
("always had")

"[he] saw more than once the white shirt of Janko,"
("more than once saw")

"the rays... colored with the brightness of gold the... hair,"
("colored the hair with the brightness of gold").

These examples show Curtin's misplacing of the English adverb and adverbial phrase, but other sentences sound strange because of rigid adherence to the Polish word-order, in which the subject often comes last:

"suddenly in her hard breast burst the gathering sorrow,"

"on the threshold of the pantry was to be heard quick breathing."

Word-for-word translation is the source of many of Curtin's infelicities. He persists in rendering almost all of Sienkiewicz's "pewien," "któryś," and "jakiś," apparently without realizing that the English equivalents of these very common Polish words are not normally used so frequently. The same applies to "jakby," "jakoby," and "niby," which often occur in the dialogue. This habit of Curtin's gives the following results: (the original word is given in brackets)

"gazing into some immense distance,"
(jakaś)

"at a harvest-home or some wedding,"
(jakim)

"just like mice of some kind,"
(jakie)

"that was some unattainable object,"
(jakaś)

"that was some kind of dearest love of his,"
(jakieś)

"was that some enchantment, or what?"
(jakie)

"some rough, drowsy voice,"
(jakiś)

"some young fellow,"

"a certain unconquerable desire,"
(jakaś)

"after a certain blow,"
(któryms)

"a certain night,"
(pewnej)

"the fiddle... seemed... to approach, as it were to float,"
(jakoby)

"Yanko heard, as it were, distinctly..."
(jakoby)

"That ray was as it were a road,"
(niby).

Worse damage is done in other translations (witness W. Zebrowski's "somekind of" [sic], repeated four times), but nonetheless the effect of all Curtin's "some," "some kind of," and "a certain" is wearing and irritating to the English reader. In almost every case "jakiś" could be replaced by the English indefinite article, and Curtin's prose would be the better for it. In fact, Curtin omits it only once, where it is almost impossible to translate it sensibly (though Zebrowski blithely repeats his "somekind of"): "Stach wziął go pod pachę, jakby jakiego kościaka."

"As it were" in apothesis for "jakoby" and "niby," if out of tune with the prevalent colloquial style of the original, need not appear clumsy if used once, but when used three times

the awkward pause created in the sentences is felt very strongly. The original expressions do not break into the sentence in this way.

It is a truism to say that what is the natural mode of expression in one language is, more often than not, unnatural in another. It is therefore imperative that any translator be able to recognize expressions which cannot pass naturally into the TL, and deal with them accordingly. In the words of S. Markish, it is necessary to be mindful at all times of the "correctional coefficient" [popravochnyi koeffitsient].²³ The fastidious transfer into English of every Polish "jakiś," "pewien," and "jakby," with little variation, serves only to encumber the English text with words which are at best unnecessary, and at worst meaningless ("heard, as it were, distinctly").

Tasín, by contrast, translates these words only where they are absolutely necessary. "Jakiś" is usually reduced to the indefinite article. "Jakoby" and "niby" are rendered effortlessly, and only where they are essential, by "como," "como si," "cual si," or by the verb "parecer." Tasín does not allow extraneous words to hamper his fluid style.

Korolenko, like Tasín, rarely translates "jakiś" by its equivalents "kakoi-to" and "kakoi-nibud'." Instead he omits it, and most often renders "jakby" and "niby" by "točno," which is in keeping with the stylistic level of the original and does not break the flow of the sentence in the same way as English "as it were."

In this connection M. Vaksmakher's comments on a Russian translation of Saint Exupéry's Pilote de guerre are strikingly applicable ^{to} Curtin's translation of Sienkiewicz's story:

"Dosadne shumy i shorokhi meshaiut uslyshat' chisty i surovyi goloś rasskazchika. . Melochi? Opiat' -taki melochi. No stil' iz-zà nikh - inoi."²⁴

The passive verb forms "was heard," "was to be heard" catch the reader's eye at several points in Curtin's version. Sometimes this is a consequence of an unimaginative reduction of a more specific word. At other times the cause is Curtin's painfully literal translation of Polish constructions:

"A cloud hid the moon, and nothing more was to be seen or heard,"
(nic już nic było widać ani słychać)

"On the threshold was to be heard quick breathing,"
(słychać)

"The stamping of boots was heard,"
(słychać było)

It is not impossible to reproduce the Polish subjectless infinitive construction, but if this is done often, or without due care, the translation will be immediately recognizable as such. One cannot, after all, translate the familiar greeting "Co słychać?" as "What is to be heard?"

When Sienkiewicz uses the verbs of motion "wyjść" and "wychodzić" in connection with sounds, twice in one sentence, Curtin renders both absolutely literally as "to come out." The meaning is, of course, perfectly clear, and no distortion of the original sense is occasioned, but the sentence becomes inordinately wordy since the preposition "out" is superfluous in both

places, and the second verb could be omitted altogether (p. 10, l. 14). This happens again in one of the closing scenes: "from his whitening lips came out the whisper..." (p. 13, l. 9). The removal of the preposition would improve the sentence and make the word-order sound like that of normal English.

Curtin's use of prepositions, though never totally incorrect as Żebrowski's sometimes is, occasionally leaves room for doubt: (alternatives are suggested in brackets)

"with some kind of health," (in)

"the cherry-tree which grew at the cottage," (by/beside)

"the lackey was at the other side," (on)

"who walked through the place at night" (cf. Jopson, "went his rounds")

"during summer," (in).

The last of these is changed in a recent re-print of Curtin's translation to conform to more common usage ("in the summer").²⁵

Curtin appears to be incapable of finding natural English expressions for some of the everyday Polish locutions used by the author:

"Let the policeman... give him a flogging,...and that's the whole business." (i cała rzecz).

This ungainly expression is not at all like the normal English mode of expression. A similar one follows:

"The child, whether he failed to understand what the question was," (o co chodzi).

It seems impossible that Curtin could have been unfamiliar with this very common expression, and difficult to divine why the

obvious equivalent (in this context) did not occur to him:
 "what was going on."

"Ale na co się to zdało!", which is one of several idiomatic questions and exclamations instrumental in sustaining the conversational tone of the original, is rendered in doubtful English as "But what use in that?", which is neither idiomatic nor colloquial. No translator should have to search far for the idiomatic equivalent: "What use was that?" or "What good could that do?"

At times an expression which sounds like good English is applied in a context where its use seems improbable:

"Nothing will come of you," (Juże z was nic nie będzie).

This English phrase might be used of a plan or an enterprise, meaning that it will not bring results. It could be applied to a person, with a similar meaning, that no brilliant future awaits him; but it is unlikely to be used, however euphemistically, to tell someone that he is dying.

Other failures of idiom can also be traced to word-for-word translation. Many sentences are translated directly into English with no thought for the norms of English expression. Thus we find: "How judge such a poor little misery?" (Jakże tu sądzić). Having decided that this curious infinitive construction is acceptable English, Curtin promptly repeats it two lines further on, where it is not suggested by the original: "Send him to prison, - how help it?" (czy jak?).

Still less likely to be heard from an English-speaker is

"A moment more the white shirt has vanished," (chwila jeszcze, biała koszula znikła). The insertion of "and" after "more" would have made passable colloquial English of this sentence, but Curtin does not seem to know where conjunctions need to be added. Generally speaking, in translation from Russian or Polish into English, it is often necessary to insert "and" where the original has only a comma. Some examples in Curtin's version are: "The night was clear, bright"; "It came into the world frail, weak."

While one cannot describe this syntax as incorrect, it could be improved by the conjunction in place of the comma. The offence against the accepted rules of English syntax can be felt more clearly in this sentence: "The mother came, took the little boy, but she had to carry him home." The first clause should be linked to the second by "and." Occasionally the wrong conjunction is chosen: "The boy screamed and promised that he would not do it again, and still he was thinking, 'Something is playing...'" The contrast demands that Polish "a" be rendered by "but." It is true that the Slavic conjunctions pose problems at times, even in translation between two Slavic languages, as noted by I. Camutaliova,²⁶ but the above examples are not from difficult contexts.

It is well known that in translation from most Eastern European languages into English it is often necessary to insert possessive pronouns where these are not used in the original. (The same is true of translation from Germanic and Romance

languages, where the definite article must be replaced by a possessive pronoun). Curtin does this correctly most of the time, but occasionally slips: "as a man wails who sees that he cannot wrest the beloved one from death," (his). In one place Curtin inserts a possessive where it is not required: "she went out to her work."

Curtin appears to see each word of the original as a functional unit complete in itself, with one immutable English meaning attached to it. His insistence upon rendering Polish "to" as "that," although alternatives readily suggest themselves, sometimes engenders odd effects: "Was that some enchantment, or what?" Since it is perfectly clear in the context what "that" stands for, the simple pronoun "it" should be used instead of the emphatic demonstrative pronoun. This is one of the minor errors commonly made by foreign students of English, including the French, who often use "that" for "cela" where the translation should be the unemphatic "it." In one sentence, already spoiled by Curtin's translation of "jakiś," a singularly ugly effect is produced by Polish "to" being twice rendered as "that" after Polish "że" (also "that"): "It seemed to him that that was some unattainable object, ... that that was some kind of dearest love of his." Polish "że" must of course be rendered as "that," but other words exist to render Polish "to." The doubled "that" cannot fail to grate on the reader's ear.

Curtin's graceless English thus acts as a constant reminder to the reader that the text was first written in another.

language. It is almost the only reminder, but its presence is felt throughout the story. In this regard the English translation contrasts sharply with Korolenko's Russian version. The fluent prose of the latter would scarcely betray any foreign origins if the translator had not used occasional Polonisms like "do domu" and other purely Polish words which need to be explained to the Russian reader. These words, used deliberately, serve to remind the reader of the geographical setting of the tale. Curtin, on the other hand, uses only one foreign word, "obertas," but it is his use of English which gives away the fact that his text is a translation.

Korolenko's use of Polish words with footnotes is a satisfactory means of dealing with Polish realia, but one may wonder why he leaves the word "lelek" in its original form, since this word is not an element of realia, it has a Russian equivalent ("kozodoi"), and the fact that the editors feel that a footnote is needed proves that the word will not be understood by Russian readers. Korolenko also leaves it to the editors to add a footnote for the word "wójt," which he leaves in Polish with no explanation. Korolenko has been praised for knowing exactly when to use SL words in a translation, and for using them only when absolutely necessary.²⁷ The same critic insists that the use of SL words is permissible only when Russian has no equivalent. This is certainly not the case with Polish "lelek."

Of the three translations, Tasin's gives the least sign of being a translation. The style does not give it away, and no

Polish words or footnotes are used. Only the Polish names provide a clue to the story's country of origin. One might justifiably complain that the story has become too Spanish through the elimination of Polish realia, and the use of words with exclusively Spanish associations, like "moro," "el sereno," and "el alcalde."

All things considered, it is clear that the order of stylistic equivalence to the original is as follows: (1) Korolenko, (2) Tasín, (3) Curtin. The Russian translator's reproduction of the easy, colloquial style is by far the closest. Tasín makes a creditable attempt, but Curtin's version is, in the main, not only not colloquial, but stiff, clumsy, and difficult to read. The accurate reproduction of the level of language is a factor in the reproduction of the skaz technique, and hence the skaz is best represented by Korolenko, worst by Curtin, and with some limited success by Tasín. The lexical poverty of Curtin's translation, in which much of the vividness of the original is lost, is in marked contrast to Korolenko's rich and colourful use of Russian. The Spanish version is suitably vivid only in places, and suffers at times from excessive generalization of the specific.

From the above it might be concluded that Korolenko is the only translator with sufficient literary skill in the TL to match Sienkiewicz's skill in the SL. It is indeed plain that Korolenko's skill with words far surpasses Curtin's, and is superior to Tasín's, yet his version is not ideal. The phonetic

effects, which are-so important in the original, are poorly conveyed in the TL, and when Korolenko attempts to compensate he frequently overdoes it. His additions, and Tasin's, go beyond the level of the permissible and exaggerate one aspect of the story, sentiment, more than the author of the original might have liked. Nevertheless, this fault is minor when compared with the large-scale stylistic impoverishment which occurs in the English translation.

Some minor improvements have been made in Curtin's English by the editors of a recent volume, but the revision does not go far enough.²⁸ Of some dozen changes, very few are at points where improvement is really needed: "Stah who was the village police" is changed to "Stah, who was the night watch"; "during summer" to "in summer." These changes are for the better, as are some of the corrections of word-order, but the bulk of the changes are not vital ("mamma" to "mother"), and Curtin's worst flaws, including his tenses and "a quiet lightning," are not extirpated. The revisor apparently worked without reference to the original, as all Curtin's errors of translation proper are left intact.

FOOTNOTES

- 1 Mieczysława Romankówna, "Rola stylizacyjna obcojęzycznych składników w trzech nowelach Henryka Sienkiewicza," Rocznik komisji historycznoliterackiej, III (1965), 153.
- 2 Wacław Lednicki, Henryk Sienkiewicz, a retrospective synthesis (The Hague: Mouton, 1960), p. 70.
- 3 Alina Nofer, Henryk Sienkiewicz (Warsaw: 1959), p. 115.
- 4 Kornei Chukovskii, Vysokoe iskusstvo (Moscow: 1964), p. 155.
- 5 S. Masliak, "Pereklady z slov'ians'kykh mov," in Pytannia perekladu (Kiev: 1957), p. 120.
- 6 Pytannia perekladu, p. 190.
- 7 K. Chukovskii, p. 139.
- 8 K. Morálek, Kapitoly z teorie překládání (Prague: 1957), p. 17.
- 9 Jiří Levý, Umění překladu (Prague: 1963), p. 84.
- 10 J. T. Milik, "Gwara ludowa w nowelach Sienkiewicza," Język polski, XXVI, No. 5 (1946), 147.
- 11 Olgierd Wojtasiewicz, Wstęp do teorii tłumaczenia (Wrocław: 1957), p. 93.
- 12 J. T. Milik, 144.
- 13 David J. Welsh, "Sienkiewicz as Narrator," Slavonic and East European Review, XLIII (1965), 373.
- 14 Tadeusz Bujnicki, Pierwszy okres twórczości Henryka Sienkiewicza (Cracow: 1968), p. 360.
- 15 V. Barnet, "K otázce výběru slova při překladu," in Kniha o překládání (Prague: 1953), p. 133.
- 16 J. Levý, p. 93.
- 17 Georges Mounin, Les belles infidèles (Paris: Cahiers du Sud, 1955), p. 35.
- 18 Monica Gardner, "Henryk Sienkiewicz," in Great Men and Women of Poland, ed. by Stephen Paul Mizwa (New York: Macmillan, 1941), p. 280.

- 19 A. Noffer, p. 115.
- 20 Ibid.
- 21 The associations of the vowels "u" and "o" are noted in the following:
Olaf Blixen, La traducción literaria y sus problemas. (Montevideo: Universidad de la República, 1954), p. 50.
- E. A. Nida, Towards a Science of Translating (Leiden: Brill, 1964), p. 31.
- 22 Nathan Haskell Dole, review of Children of the Soil, in The Bookman, I, No. 6 (July, 1895), p. 398.
- 23 S. Markish, "Voprosy i otvety," in Masterstvo perevoda, No. 6 (1969), p. 285.
- 24 M. Vaksmakher, "Na strazhe dvukh bogatstv," in Redaktor i perevod (Moscow: 1965), p. 28.
- 25 Janko Muzykant, in Nobel Prize Library: Seferis, Sholokhov, Sienkiewicz, Spitteler (New York: 1971), p. 251.
- 26 I. Camutaliová, "Některé zvláštnosti ruských spojek a jejich překlad do češtiny," in Kniha o překládání (Prague: 1953), p. 317.
- 27 N. Liubimov, "Perevod - iskusstvo," Novyi mir, No. 5 (1962), p. 242.
- 28 Nobel Prize Library.

CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

From the foregoing it emerges that the preference order in content equivalence to the original differs greatly from that in stylistic equivalence. The order of content equivalence is: (1) Curtin, (2) Korolenko, (3) Tasín, and the gap which separates Curtin and Korolenko is much wider than that between Korolenko and Tasín. Curtin strives to follow the letter of the original far more closely than the other translators. His text contains very few omissions, and fewer additions, whereas the Spanish and Russian translators provide numerous examples of both. Curtin's version is a painstaking attempt to reproduce the content of the original in its entirety, even to the point of following the sentence and paragraph division of the original. Notwithstanding his attempts to be literally faithful, his translation is not free from errors. His mistakes far outnumber Korolenko's, and exceed the number in the Spanish version.

In style, as in content, we are dealing with extremes, but here the order of equivalence is almost reversed: (1) Korolenko, (2) Tasín, (3) Curtin. Here the gap between Korolenko and Tasín is much narrower than that between Tasín and Curtin. Korolenko's elegant, simple Russian is a very good match for the original style. Rich in colloquial and prostorechie forms which

fit naturally into the text, his version could easily have been taken down from oral narrative, just as the original could.

Tasín also produces a reasonable likeness of the original, though without the stylistic variation of Korolenko's. The virtues of these two translators outweigh the failing they have in common, a weakness for extravagant otsebiatiny, and, especially in the case of Tasín, a desire to be more "literary" than the original author.

Curtin, on the other hand, whose version is ill suited to oral narrative or to reading aloud, cannot be accused of embellishing, or of intensifying the emotional tone. On the contrary, his translation suffers by being for the most part dry and uninspired. Its style, in which neither dialect, nor sub-standard Polish, nor colloquialisms are reproduced, is no match for that of the original, but still more striking is the fact that the translator's handling of his native language leaves much to be desired. The paucity of his vocabulary, his misuse of the English verb, the misplaced articles, the foreign word-order, all testify to the fact that Curtin not only lacked any real feeling for language, as stated by H. Segel,¹ but also that he had never mastered the basic principles of English grammar and syntax.

In view of the radical disparity observed between the orders of content equivalence and stylistic equivalence, it remains to be established which is the more important in the case in hand: the exact reproduction of the content of the original,

or close, stylistic equivalence. All translation is of necessity a system of compromises and sacrifices.² All elements of the original must be carefully weighed and their relative importance established, in order to decide which elements must be preserved at all costs, and which may be allowed to fall out. Where it is possible to preserve all elements, this must be done, but in the many cases where it is not possible to do this, only the elements of secondary importance must be sacrificed. As N. Zabolotskii affirms, the success of a translation depends on the translator's ability to combine a measure of accuracy with a measure of naturalness.³ The translator must have the insight and the sensitivity to perceive the author's priorities, and the ability to sacrifice only the lesser priorities to preserve the greater.

In prose translation it is generally important to preserve the details of the original as far as this is possible, but if the results are liable to prove severely detrimental to the original style, it may be advisable to let the details of the content suffer. This of course depends largely upon the nature of the text. In the case of Janko Muzykant, it is, in the final analysis, the total impression which counts, and the total impression unquestionably derives above all from Sienkiewicz's graceful Polish style and his finely-wrought sentences. Speaking generally about Sienkiewicz, Stefan Żeromski stressed that he was first and foremost a master of the Polish language:

I dziś jeszcze, mimo rozpowszechnienia form i rodzajów artystycznych, nikt go nie prześcignął w spokojnej, prostej a doskonale pięknej budowie zdania, w logicznym rozwoju okresów, uwydatniających obrazy i ukazujących myśli. Czytając utwór Sienkiewicza jakiegokolwiek natury nie doznajemy przykrości i nieznośnych zahaczeń o skazy, zadry i szczyrby - ani jednego tam fałszu dla oka, ani jednego dla ucha. Trzeba mu przyznać pierwszeństwo, jako mistrzowi sztuki pisania, samego kunsztu wypowiedzenia się po polsku na piśmie.⁴

T. Lehr-Splawiński emphatically supports this view.⁵

Sienkiewicza's beautifully constructed sentences stand at the very centre of his art. The consummate skill which Żeromski praises in Sienkiewicz's use of language is his strongest point, and it is vital to convey it in translation, if need be, at the cost of some of the material detail. Korolenko, and to a lesser extent Tasiń, often achieve some of the elegance of the original. Curtin's sentences, however, are all too often anything but beautiful, indeed, one critic has called Curtin's English "grotesquely inelegant" (in With Fire and Sword), and "dense and inelastic to a painful degree" (in general).⁶

A perceptive article by a monolingual American reader contains some germane comments on this topic:

An almost total absence of beauty of phrase or rhythmic sentence-cadence in the English translations lends color to the conception of him [Sienkiewicz] as a colossal rough-hewer. Yet between the pre-eminence that is indisputably his as a painter of magnificent word pictures and his apparent lack of stylistic grace there appeared to any thoughtful mind a curious inconsistency. I have been informed by two Polish acquaintances, whose knowledge of their own language and of ours was equally appreciative and discriminating, that the shortcoming is entirely in the versions we possess; that in the originals are to be found limpid harmony and sonorous majesty, together with a hundred other turns of expression, onomatopoeia, and other untranslatable devices which are the secret of verbal magic. Unfortunately the chief renderer of Sienkiewicz in English, Jeremiah

Curtin, almost entirely forgot the spirit of his model in striving after the letter, and his subsequent emulators sought to surpass him by an even more faithful and art-destroying literalness.⁷

If critics like Gosse, Lockert and Segel are severe in their criticisms of Curtin's English, the average English reader, some of whose comments are recorded by W. Śmigieliski, is even harsher.⁸ Śmigieliski tells how he warmly recommended The Deluge to his English friends, and how not one of them could read it to the end. To a man they condemned it as "naive and often just silly; a great part incomprehensible; horrible English; not readable." The blame for this lies not with the author but with Curtin, as Śmigieliski clearly illustrates by quoting three totally unintelligible sentences from the translation. He calls for the removal of all such ill-conceived "propaganda" for Polish literature from English public libraries. It is hoped that this study has revealed some of the specific reasons for such negative reactions to Sienkiewicz by English readers.

Most experts are agreed that the first requirement of a good translator is a complete command of the TL, rather than a thorough knowledge of the SL.⁹ Neither Korolenko's command of Russian, nor Tasín's of Spanish can be called into question. Curtin, however, whatever his other talents, lacked the command of the TL necessary to write good English prose. Even if the original author had been a less accomplished stylist than Sienkiewicz, this alone would be enough, in the eyes of some specialists, to disqualify him from translation work. J. P. Postgate, among others, takes for granted that a translation must be

idiomatic.¹⁰ He quotes other sources, among them K. Schaefer: "Eine Uebersetzung muss vor Allem deutsch sein."

Since we have adopted as part of the definition of a good translation that it must achieve "the closest possible natural correspondence,"¹¹ Curtin's translation cannot be defended on the grounds that "a translation should read like a translation," (rather than as an original work).¹² His awkward literal version contains too many un-English turns of phrase and too many Slavonic exclamations ("O!", "A!"), which tend to make the translation sound less natural and more like a translation.

It is clear therefore that, in general, natural use of the TL is one of the most important criteria in judging a translation, unless the style of the original is deliberately unnatural. In particular, since masterly use of the Polish language is Sienkiewicz's greatest strength, the key to his uncommon narrative talent, the translator must strive to convey this ability above all. Equivalence in the level of language, in the stylistic progression noted in the original, and in the phonetic effects in short, in the "verbal magic" mentioned by L. Lockert, must take precedence over the reproduction of the material minutiae. Additional weight is lent to this view by the fact that the first critic to bring Janko Muzykant to the attention of the British public called it a "poem in prose."¹³ In poetic translation the form and the total effect are almost invariably more important than the material details of the content.

The order of total equivalence to the original is

therefore that of stylistic equivalence: (1) Korolenko, (2) Tasín, (3) Curtin. Even allowing for the fact that Tasín's imprecision concerning details of the content and his numerous omissions have a detrimental effect on the style, the overall effect created by his free and natural use of Spanish resembles that of the original more closely than that created by Curtin's use of English.

We see that the Russian translator has produced a better likeness of the original story than the Spanish translator, who has in turn produced a better likeness than the English translator. Had other translations in the same languages been selected, this order might be slightly different, but the Russian translations would remain the best. The Polnoe sobranie sochinenii version, and the Riftina version which resembles it closely are superior in every way to the Spanish and English versions. Since Spanish translations of Sienkiewicz's short stories are rarer, it would be vain to speculate as to the prospective quality of future versions. The English translations, however, are not of high quality.

Three factors play a part here, of which talent is one. Most of the English translations appear to have been undertaken in an amateurish fashion by people lacking the necessary ability. Curtin's work had been fully described in the foregoing text. O'Connor Eccles's version is written in correct and readable English, but with scant regard for the details of the original, and with a profusion of omissions and a plethora of otsebiatiny

far exceeding Tasin's or Korolenko's. The additions make it the most maudlin of all the translations considered here.

W. Zebrowski compares one paragraph of Curtin's translation with the same paragraph in a translation by P. Ostafin and asserts that "both are faithful and readable, though the latter does not have the overall ease of the former."¹⁴ Faithful, in a purely literal sense, Curtin certainly is, but it is difficult to maintain that his version is readable, or that it has ease.

Curtin's translation is, however, more readable than W. Zebrowski's own translation, which displays all the faults one expects to find when the translator is not a native speaker of the TL, faults which might have caused even Curtin's editors to think twice before printing the translation. Words are misused in a comical manner: "crony" (four times) for "crone," in any case far too disparaging a word to render Polish "kuma"; "the plugs near the violin" for "the pegs on the violin"; Janko "vegetated until he was four"; "his breahnting [sic] became short and wizened." As in Curtin's translation the sequence of tenses is often incorrect, and the article is misplaced: "a cuckoo came with a good news." Pronominal usage is wrong: "it" is used repeatedly for "Janko" and twice for "a person." Word-order suffers from SL interference: "It [Janko] only looked, as looks a bird." Prepositions are used incorrectly, again with SL interference: Janko "had been looking for a long time through the open wide kitchen door on the object of all his desires"; "the

desire of owning a fiddle." Glaring errors of English syntax occur, especially in the longer sentences: "It was only when Stanley [Stach]... came down with a blow did Johnny cry out"; "There the lad embraced with every fibre of his soul through his eyes the violin."

Curious stylistic discrepancies make themselves felt: Janko, who scarcely seems capable of speech, lisps "The woods resounded!", while the narrator finds it possible to say that the "overseed" [sic] who catches Janko took off his belt and "let him have it but good." The translator's understanding of the original is less complete than one might expect. The following is his translation of the line about Janko's hat, "spod którego obdartej kani spoglądał zadzierając jak ptak głowę do góry" (p. 2, l. 17): "from beneath which he would gaze at a tattered kite, holding his head high to the sky like a bird." The "tattered kite," whether child's toy or Milvus milvus, presumably has its origins in the dictionary definition of "kania," which has nothing in common with its dialect meaning. The translator is to be commended, however, for rendering most of the flora and fauna reasonably correctly.

Of the English versions of Janko Muzykant considered in this study, the best is undoubtedly the little-known text by N.B. Jopson. This translator achieves a fairly high degree of accuracy in the content, except for a few obvious errors, and his use of English is extremely competent. This last fact alone sets him apart from some of Sienkiewicz's other renderers. It

is perhaps a pity that the anonymous critic who first drew attention to Sienkiewicz in the English press did not undertake a complete translation of Janko Muzykant.¹⁵ His purpose was rather to acquaint the British public with the author's works by a survey article, including potted versions of some of the better known tales, but his translation of one third of the text, and the detailed summary of the remaining two thirds, bear witness to a literary skill equalled by few of those who later took up his call to translate Sienkiewicz's works.

For all their virtues, however, neither the anonymous version nor Jopson's rise to the level of the Russian translations. Here another factor comes into play: the difference between the SL and the TLs. As W. Winter says,

There is no completely exact translation. There are only approximations, and the degree of similarity possible between the original and the translation depends on the degree of similarity between the systems of form and meaning in the two languages involved. The more serious the deviations from one language to the other, the less of the original can be salvaged in the process of transfer.¹⁶

The Russian translator of Polish works therefore faces a considerably easier task than his English and Spanish colleagues.

Many lexical items in Russian and Polish are identical, and cognates are frequent. A Russian has no difficulty in rendering Polish "kuma," but the English translator is hard pressed to find a suitable equivalent, since the correspondence between the lexical inventories of Polish and English is less close than between those of Polish and Russian.

Russian and Polish grammatical structures, as well as syntactic structures, are often very similar, whereas the Spanish and English structures are less likely to coincide with the Polish. In Russian it is even possible to make discreet use of Polish expressions, like "do domu," where these are recognizably Polish, or where Polish usage coincides with regional Russian usage. Given the much greater differences between Polish on the one hand, and English and Spanish on the other, such opportunities very rarely present themselves to the English or Spanish translators of Polish works.

We have not yet considered the third factor, which is rather more difficult to define, but which may be designated broadly by the term "the TL literary tradition." Some students propose as a criterion the ability of the translation to take its place in the TL literature. The TL literary critic should be able to approach the text in the same way as he would if it had been first written in his language.¹⁷ This may have less to do with the translator's art, in disguising the fact that his work is a translation, than it has with the nature of the original.

By the time Korolenko translated Janko Muzykant, Russian literature already had a long tradition of socially concerned works, and Sienkiewicz's story fitted well into this tradition. This may be one of the reasons why Korolenko chose to translate it, and why other translations appeared very quickly and were so well received.

In England and the United States the picture is very different. By and large, stories on the theme of social injustice with children as its victim were not part of the tradition of English literature in the nineteenth century, and translated works of this kind, even from the pens of the most capable translators, were unlikely to meet with great success. Turgenev's Zapiski okhotnika, so widely admired in Russia, did not receive comparable acclaim in Britain or America. Works by Dostoevskii in a similar vein, Mal'chik u Khrista na elke and the much longer Bednye liudi, have never aroused the same interest among the English-speaking public as his more philosophical works.

Furthermore, the English reading public has long tended to regard even a slight display of sentiment with suspicion, and a literary work showing it as inferior. If a translation as moving as the original were produced, it would be likely to be dismissed as mere sentiment, and if, on the other hand, the story loses its power thanks to dull and insensitive translation, it is likely to pass unnoticed, as Curtin's did.

Spanish literature of the period, like English literature, provides few examples of stories on themes resembling that of Janko Muzykant. It is not the kind of work which could fall naturally into the national literature of the country. However, its style and tone may be more suited to Spanish tastes than to English tastes, indeed, in view of E. A. Nida's comments on this subject, the Spanish reader might well approve of Tasín's embellishments:

The standards of stylistic acceptability for various types of discourse differ radically from language to language. What is entirely appropriate in Spanish, for example, may turn out to be quite unacceptable "purple prose" in English, and the English prose we admire as dignified and effective often seems in Spanish to be colorless, insipid and flat. Many Spanish literary artists take delight in the flowery elegance of their language, while most English writers prefer bold realism, precision, and movement.¹⁸

Some of Tasín's more florid additions and changes may reflect a conscious desire to adapt the original to the tastes of the TL reader. The unnecessary lengthening of concise expressions from the original may be part of an overall pattern of adaptation designed to avoid the dry terseness of some parts of the original, which the Spanish reader might find uninteresting.

The attitude and feelings of the translator towards his original also play a significant part in determining the kind of translation he will produce. It is sometimes said that the translator should like the original work and be totally in sympathy with the author.¹⁹ Some, however, like J. P. Postgate, subscribe to a different view:

Many who use the word "sympathy" intend something emotional, such as admiration, love or esteem. Aversion, to be sure, is likely to mar a translator's work. But so, though more subtly, will partiality, as may be seen from a study of sympathetic translations. Translating, we must add, is an exercise of the intellect; and sentiment has no place in its performance.²⁰

Like Postgate, J. Levý underlines the need for objectivity and impartiality, since the results of the sympathetic translator's work have often exaggerated certain aspects of the original.²¹

Korolenko's and Tasín's versions of Janko Muzykant present two obvious examples of sympathetic translation and tend to

strengthen Postgate's case, since both translators show more emotional sympathy towards Janko than Sienkiewicz does. One can well imagine that if Korolenko's version were re-translated into Polish by a translator like Korolenko, then back into Russian by a like-minded translator, the text would be considerably longer, few nouns would be left without adjectives, and sympathy for the hero would be overbearing. Nevertheless it is beyond dispute that the sympathetic Russian and Spanish translations offer a closer likeness to the original than Curtin's impartial and unemotional one.

This leads us to consider the translators' motives for translating Janko Muzykant, since sympathy may often determine the selection of the text to be translated. In general, the critic ought, where possible, to take into account the translator's motives, even if, as here, one can do no more than speculate.

Korolenko is not known to have translated any other works by Sienkiewicz, and since he chose this story and no other, and translated it for no personal gain, much less fame, it seems probable that he was attracted to Janko Muzykant because it expressed ideas which coincided with his own, in a manner akin to his own style of writing. The story makes exactly the same kind of denunciation of social conditions as Korolenko himself sought to make in many of his own stories, and it is possible that Janko Muzykant made such a strong impression on him that he wrote his own Slepoi muzykant under its influence. One passage in his Istoriia moego sovremennika is strongly reminiscent of

Sienkiewicz's story.²²

One doubts whether Sienkiewicz's later, historical novels, of intensely patriotic content, would have had the same appeal for Korolenko, except as displays of stylistic and narrative skill. Korolenko may well have felt, however, that Janko Muzykant, on a theme dear to his own heart, could be a weapon in the political struggle to improve the quality of peasant life in the Russian empire.

Speculation about Curtin's and Tasin's motives must be more tentative, since both translators produced versions of numerous other works by Sienkiewicz, and selection therefore tells us little. Tasin's views on Sienkiewicz's works appear to have gone unrecorded. Curtin's views are but sparsely recorded, and those extant bear exclusively on the major novels, about which he was extremely enthusiastic.

It is unlikely that Curtin shared Korolenko's altruistic motives for translating Janko Muzykant. For one thing, he could not, as an American, be expected to feel himself involved, as Korolenko did, in social action on behalf of the peasantry of Eastern Europe. There is no reason to suppose that he admired Janko Muzykant more than Sienkiewicz's other writings. As he had set himself the task of translating all of Sienkiewicz's works, he may have seen it simply as one minor work in a series of others, which could conveniently be translated in between instalments of the next major novel.

Similarly, Tasin's translation is one of many he made of

Sienkiewicz's shorter works, probably on commission from a publishing house. Curtin's treatment of the text does not bespeak any special sympathy with the content. Tasín's, on the other hand, does, but this is in all probability the result of his being caught up by the emotional subject matter, rather than because of political sympathies.

The translator's likes and dislikes, his feelings towards the original, not to speak of his ability, all leave their mark on the text he translates. The translator can hardly help but impress some of his own individuality upon the original, and this is all the more apparent when the translator, like Korolenko, is a creative writer himself. Tasín and Curtin also produced original writings: Curtin wrote a number of anthropological studies, and his memoirs; Tasín is known to have tried his hand at belles lettres in the émigré Russian press,²³ but Korolenko is the only one of the three to achieve distinction in this field.

Writing at some length on the problem of individuality in translation, I. Kashkin says, "Bez individual'nosti net tvorchestva, a bez tvorcheskogo podkhoda net nastoiashchego khudozhestvennogo masterstva."²⁴ Individuality must, however, be held in check. Many experts agree that writers do not make the best translators as they tend to impose their own style on the original more than other translators do.²⁵ The translator who is also a writer is not always able to resist the temptation to make changes and "improvements" which the original author had not

contemplated, and might not have countenanced.

This weakness frequently gets the better of both Korolenko and Tasin. Paweł Hertz warns against the perils of "upiększanie języka i stylu" in translation.²⁶ Kornei Chukovskii holds that a translation should always be the author's self-portrait, not that of the translator, and he cites some changes and additions in Bal'mont's translations of Shelley in which the translator's self-portrait has displaced that of the original poet.²⁷ Some of Korolenko's additions to Janko Muzykant are remarkably similar to Bal'mont's additions to Shelley's poems.

Nonetheless it cannot be denied that the skilled writer enjoys a distinct advantage over the translator who is not a writer. Korolenko has immeasurably greater feeling for the niceties of language than Curtin, and he is invariably more precise than Tasin in his choice of words. In Janko Muzykant it is most important that precise, elegant prose in the SL be matched by precise, elegant prose in the TL, and only a talented writer can achieve this.

Korolenko's translation stands out among all others for another reason. Thanks to his personal experience of life in rural areas of Russia and the Ukraine he was better placed than the other translators to understand the realities of life as depicted in Janko Muzykant, in backward regions of Poland, much of which was under Russian domination. Being part Polish, part Russian, and part Ukrainian, and perfectly tri-lingual,²⁸ he had not only a better appreciation of the subject matter, but a more

intimate understanding of the subject matter than Curtin, and was better equipped to convey some of the story's finer points which eluded Curtin and Tasin. (It has unfortunately proved impossible to establish the extent of Tasin's personal experience of life in rural Russia and Poland, but on the basis of his translation one may surmise that it was no greater than Curtin's).

Finally, the durability of the translations must be considered. It may seem strange to talk of durability when the original itself is not yet a hundred years old, yet it remains an acknowledged fact that, for a variety of reasons, translations age much faster than original works.

Korolenko's Russian text remains as readable today as it was when he wrote it, one year after the publication of the original, as readable as Korolenko's own creations. Likewise, Tasin's translation cannot be said to have aged, but this version was written at a more recent date, some forty years after the original. If Curtin's translation has not improved with keeping, some publishers apparently do not consider that it is now outdated. The fact that his translation, always the most readily available, is the one chosen to be reprinted in 1971, with only minor revisions, is proof that Curtin's English style is not un-animously considered irredeemable.²⁹

Strange to say, another renowned American translator of Slavonic literature, Nathan Haskell Dole, whose comments on Curtin's Sienkiewicz translations were less than favourable, has suffered more with the passing of time than Curtin. Dole's

translation of Anna Karenina, which dates from the same period as Curtin's work, could not be reprinted today without extensive revisions, mainly because of the non-translation of many Russian words and expressions.³⁰ On every page the reader is confronted with words like "malchik," "prikashchik," "tulup," "kak-zhe," "babui," all in Dole's own unorthodox transliteration, and at a key point in the novel one finds "Ya beremenna." The monolingual reader is expected to refer to a long, but still incomplete, glossary at the back of the book and do his own translating. Whatever Curtin's faults, this is not one of them.

The fact remains, however, that Sienkiewicz's popularity in the English-speaking world has declined in a dramatic manner, indeed he has long since been all but forgotten. He was already sinking into oblivion a mere three years after his death, according to L. Lockert, who lays at least part of the blame at his main translator's door.³¹ Mieczysław Giergielewicz is of the same opinion: "The weakness of the translations could have been partly responsible for the novelist's accelerated eclipse."³² If, as W. Śmigielski tells us, the average English reader now finds Curtin's version of The Deluge utterly unreadable, this in itself should suggest that the time has come for new translations to be undertaken by a translator who knows the historical and geographical background thoroughly, and has a good literary command of English.

It would appear that Sienkiewicz's fortunes in the U. S. present a unique case of a highly gifted writer achieving

unprecedented fame abroad, through the efforts of a barely competent translator. This study of translations of one short story reveals the precise nature of Curtin's failings, and one of the main reasons for Sienkiewicz's fall from favour in the eyes of English readers and critics.

The same fate has not befallen Sienkiewicz in Russia nor in Spain. In the Soviet Union he is widely read even today, and greatly admired as a stylist and a story-teller. The fact that Janko Muzykant in Korolenko's translation could be printed in the sixties as a separate book is proof of the author's renown, and of the enduring popularity of his minor works.³³ In Spain too, according to M. Giergielewicz, Sienkiewicz's popularity continues to run high, and his major works are available everywhere in paperback editions.³⁴ It may be significant that in these countries no single translator enjoyed a monopoly over the author's works comparable to Curtin's.

In view of the shortcomings revealed in this study, it is to be hoped that future English translators of Polish literature will not be deterred by the profusion of existing versions of Sienkiewicz's works, nor by Curtin's monopoly in this field, from striving to emulate the Russian translators in producing faithful, readable versions which re-create the author's stylistic achievement. One may also hope that in Spain Sienkiewicz's short stories may receive the attention Emilia Pardo Bazán long ago claimed they deserve,³⁵ and which the major novels immediately received, and that future translators of Janko Muzykant will

control their sympathies and have more regard than Tasin for
the material content.

FOOTNOTES

¹ H. B. Segel, "Sienkiewicz's First Translator, Jeremiah Curtin," Slavic Review, XXIV (1965), 209.

² Artur Sandauer, "Troski tłumacza," in O sztuce tłumaczenia, ed. by Michał Rusinek (Wrocław: 1955), p. 345.

³ N. Zabolotskii, "Zametki perevodchika," in Masterstvo perevoda, No. 2 (1959), p. 251.

⁴ Stefan Żeromski, "Przemówienie o Henryku Sienkiewiczu," in Henryk Sienkiewicz, ed. by Janina Kulczycka-Saloni (Warsaw: 1960), p. 280.

⁵ T. Lehr-Splawiński, Język polski (Warsaw: 1947), p. 365.

⁶ Edmund Gosse, "Henryk Sienkiewicz," The Contemporary Review, LXXI (April, 1897), p. 524, p. 530.

⁷ Lacy Lockert, "Henryk Sienkiewicz," The Sewanee Review, XXVII, No. 3 (July, 1919), 277-78.

⁸ W. Śmigielski, "Sienkiewicz po angielsku," Wiadomości, XXIV, No. 48 (November 30, 1969), p. 4.

⁹ N. Zabolotskii, p. 252.

Dominique Arban, in Quality in Translation, ed. by E. Cary and R. W. Jumpelt (New York: Macmillan, 1963), p. 59.

Fritz Guettinger, Zielsprache (Zurich: Manisse, 1963), p. 218.

A. Kurella, "Teoria i praktyka perevoda," in Masterstvo perevoda, No. 2 (1959), p. 420.

A. Lefevere, "The Translation of Literature: an Approach," Babel, XIV, No. 2 (1970), 79.

R. Howard, "A Professional Translator's Trade Alphabet," in The Craft and Context of Translation, ed. by W. Arrowsmith and R. Shattuck (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1961), p. 168.

¹⁰ J. P. Postgate, Translation and Translations (London: Bell, 1922), p. 33.

¹¹ See page 8.

- 12 See page 11.
- 13 Anon., "A Polish Novelist - Henryk Sienkiewicz," Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, CXLV (April, 1889), 510.
- 14 W. Zebrowski, "Sienkiewicz's 'Janko Muzykant': Criticism and Translation," Polish American Studies, XXII, No. 1 (1965), 21.
- 15 Anon., 498-513.
- 16 Werner Winter, "Impossibilities of Translation," in The Craft and Context of Translation, p. 69.
- 17 S. Kovhaniuk, "Pereklad khudozh'noi rosiys'koi prozy na ukrains'ku movu," in Pytannia perekladu (Kiev: 1957), p. 74.
- 18 E. A. Nida, Toward a Science of Translating (Leiden: Brill, 1964), p. 169.
- 19 Iaan Kross, "Bez liubvi khoroshii perevod nemyslim," in Masterstvo perevoda, No. 6 (1969), p. 96.
- 20 J. P. Postgate, p. 102.
- 21 Jiří Levý, Umění překlada (Prague: 1963), p. 31.
- 22 V. G. Korolenko, Istoriia moego sovremennika, in Sobranie sochinenii, V (Moscow: 1954), p. 240.
The similarity is remarked upon and the relevant passage quoted in translation by Bazyl Białokozowicz, Z dziejów wzajemnych polsko-rosyjskich związków literackich w XIX wieku (Warsaw: 1971), p. 198.
- 23 Katastrofa (Berlin: Russkoe universal'noe izdatel'stvo, 1922) appears to be Tasín's only major work of fiction. This science fiction novel, set in 1987, has certain affinities with Karel Čapek's Válka s mloky (written later), and with H. G. Wells. The theme is an attack on this planet by creatures from Mars.
A short story by Tasín, Korol' detektivov, is listed by Ludmila Foster, Bibliography of Russian Emigré Literature, 1918-68, (Boston, Mass.: G. K. Hall, 1970), Vol. II, p. 1057.
- 24 I. Kashkin, "Tekuchie dela," in Masterstvo perevoda, No. 2 (1959), p. 119.
- 25 Maria Dąbrowska, "Parę myśli o pracy przekładowej," in O sztuce tłumaczenia, p. 199.
- 26 Paweł Hertz, "O tłumaczeniu ksiąg," in O sztuce tłumaczenia, p. 228.

27 Kornei Chukovskii, Vysokoe 'iskusstvo (Moscow: 1964), p. 21.

28 B. Slutskii, "Korolenko - perevodchik Senkevicha," Inostrannaia literatura, No. 11, 1965, 267.

29 Janko Muzykant, in Nobel Prize Library: Seferis, Sholokhov, Sienkiewicz, Spitteler (New York: 1971), p. 251-55.

30 Leo Tolstoy, Anna Kareńina, tr. by Nathan Haskell Dole (London: Walter Scott, c. 1895).

31 L. Lockert, 278.

32 Mieczysław Giergielewicz, "Henryk Sienkiewicz's American Resonance," Antemurale, X (1966), 332.

33 Henryk Senkevich, Janko-Muzykant, tr. by V. G. Korolenko (Moscow: 1964).

34 M. Giergielewicz, "The works of Sienkiewicz in Spain," Polish Review, XIII, No. I (Winter, 1968), 114.

M. Giergielewicz, "Hiszpania wobec Sienkiewicza," Wiadomości, XXIII, No. 9 (March 3, 1968), p. 2.

35 Quoted by Gabriela Makowiecka, "Sienkiewicz i Hiszpania," Kwartalnik neofilologiczny, XV, 2 (1963), 144.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- I. Primary sources. Texts and translations of Janko Muzykant.
- Sienkiewicz, Henryk. Dzieła. Wydanie zbiorowe. Ed. by Julian Krzyżanowski. Vol. II. Warsaw: 1949.
- Sienkiewicz, Henryk. Nowele wybrane. Warsaw: 1971.
- Sienkiewicz, Henryk. Sielanka; A Forest Picture, and other stories. Translated by Jeremiah Curtin. Boston: Little, Brown, 1898.
- Sienkiewicz, Henryk. "Janko the Musician." Translated by N. B. Jopson. The Slavonic and East European Review, XV (July, 1936), 29-36.
- Sienkiewicz, Henryk. "Little Janko." Translated by C. O'C. E. [Charlotte O'Connor Eccles]. Ave Maria, XXXIV (1892), 60-64.
- Anonymous. "A Polish Novelist - Henryk Sienkiewicz." Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, CXLV (April, 1889), 498-513.
- Zebrowski, Rev. Walter. "Sienkiewicz's 'Janko Muzykant' - Criticism and Translation." Polish American Studies, XXII, No. 1 (1965), 17-29.
- Sienkiewicz, Enrico. Narraciones. Translated by N. Tasín. Buenos Aires: Austral, 1947.
- Senkevich, Genryk. Polnoe illiustrirovannoe sobranie sochinenii. Vol. XII. St. Petersburg: 1902.
- Senkevich, Genryk. Povesti i rasskazy. Various translators. Janko-muzykant translated by V. G. Korolenko. Moscow: 1957.
- Senkevich, Genryk. Rasskazy. Ed. by E. M. Riftina. Moscow: 1948.
- Sienkiewicz, Henryk. Črty uhlem. Translated by Josef Rumler. Prague: Svoboda, 1950.
- Sienkiewicz, Henryk. Drobné spisy. Translated by Jaro Žalov. Prague: Beaufort, 1901.

- Sienkiewicz, Henryk. Strážce majáku, a jiné povídky. Translated by Karel Málek. Prague: Dětské knihy, 1956.
- Sienkiewicz, Enrico. Il guardiano del faro, e altre novelle. Translated by Cristina Agosti Garosci. Milan: Rizzoli, 1953.
- Sienkiewicz, Enrico. Per il pane, ed altri racconti. Various translators. Janco il musicante translated by O. L. di Varsavia. Milan: Treves, 1926.
- Sienkiewicz, Henryk. Janko, der Musikant. Translated by Sonja Placzek. In Ausgewählte Werke der Nobelpreisträger. Vol. IV. Berlin: Paul Franke Verlag, 1930.
- Sienkiewicz, Henri. Contes. Translated by V. Bugiel. Paris: La Renaissance du Livre, n. d. [c. 1928].
- Sienkiewicz, Henryk. O faroleiro, e outros contos. Various translators. Janko, o pequeno músico translated by Eduardo de Noronha. Rio de Janeiro: Delta, 1962.
- Senkevich, Genryk. Ianko Muzykant, in Rodnaia rech' III. Ed. by E. E. Solov'eva, et al. Moscow: 1964.

II. Secondary sources. Bibliographies and dictionaries.

Bibliographies.

Foster, Ludmila A. Bibliography of Russian Émigré Literature, 1918-68. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1970.

Giergielewicz, Mieczysław. "The Works of Sienkiewicz in Spain." Polish Review, XIII, No. 1 (Winter, 1968), 114-19; No. 3 (Summer, 1968), 89-91.

Catálogo General de la Librería Española e Hispanoamericana, Años 1901-30. 5 vols. Madrid: Instituto Nacional del Libro Español, 1932.

Index translationum, Répertoire international des traductions. Paris: International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, 1932-41; UNESCO, 1947-.

Krzyżanowski, Julian. Dzieła Sienkiewicza w przekładach. Vol. LXI: Dzieła Sienkiewicza. - Wydanie zbiorowe. Warsaw: 1953.

Krzyżanowski, Julian. Piśmiennictwo o Henryku Sienkiewiczu. Vol. IX. Dzieła Sienkiewicza. Wydanie zbiorowe. Warsaw: 1955.

Maciuszko, Jerzy. The Polish Short Story in English. A guide and critical bibliography. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1968.

Palau y Dulcet, Antonio. Manual del librero hispanoamericano. Bibliografía general española e hispanoamericana desde la invención de la imprenta hasta nuestros tiempos. 23 vols. Barcelona, Oxford: 1969.

Polska bibliografia literacka. Warsaw: Instytut badań literackich polskiej akademii nauk, 1954-72 (annual).

Dictionaries.

Coróminas, Juan. Diccionario crítico etimológico de la lengua castellana. 4 vols. Berne: 1954.

Diccionario enciclopédico de la lengua española. 4 vols. Barcelona: 1954.

Galperin, I. R. New English-Russian Dictionary. 2 vols. Moscow: 1972.

Garzanti Comprehensive Italian-English English-Italian Dictionary. Edited by Mario Mazon. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Grimm, Jacob and Wilhelm. Deutsches Woertebuch. 15 vols. Leipzig: 1854.

Hessen, D. and Stypuła R. Wielki słownik polsko-rosyjski. Warsaw, Moscow: 1967.

Horálek, K., Ilek, B., Kopecký, L. Česko-ruský slovník. Prague: 1968.

Il'in, V. S. Ukrains'ko-rosiys'kyy slovník. Kiev: 1971.

Linde, M. S. B. Słownik języka polskiego. 6 vols. Lwów: 1854-60.

Messinger, Heinz. Langenscheidts Handwoerterbuch Deutsch-Englisch. Berlin: 1959.

Oxford English Dictionary. 12 vols. Oxford: 1933.

Ozhegov, S. I. Slovar' russkogo iazyka. Moscow: 1960.

Příruční slovník jazyka českého. 9 vols. Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1935-57.

Robert, Paul. Le petit Robert. Dictionnaire alphabétique et analogique de la langue française. Paris: 1970.

Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo iazyka. 17 vols. Moscow, Leningrad: AN SSSR, 1950-65.

Slovník spisovného jazyka českého. 3 vols. Ed. by Bohuslav Havránek. Prague: Československá akademie věd, 1965.

Taylor, James Lumpkin. A Portuguese-English Dictionary. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press; 1970.

III. Other secondary sources.

Albert-Rouillac, Georges. "The Life and Works of Henryk Sienkiewicz." In Nobel Prize Library. Seferis, Sholokhov, Sienkiewicz, Spitteler. New York: 1971, pp. 257-61.

Antokol'skii, Pavel. "Chernyi khleb masterstva." Masterstvo perevoda, 1963. pp. 5-12.

Antokol'skii, P.; Auezov, M.; Ryl'skii, M. "Khudozhestvennye perevody literatur narodov SSSR." In Voprosy khudozhestvennogo perevoda. Moscow: 1955. pp. 5-44.

Arban, Dominique. [No title]. In Quality in Translation. Ed. by E. Cary and R. W. Jumpelt. New York: Pergamon, 1963. pp. 58-59.

Argo, A. "Fakty i vyvody." In Masterstvo perevoda 2 (1959). pp. 295-301.

Athenaeum. Review of Children of the Soil, by Henryk Sienkiewicz, trans. by Jeremiah Curtin. September 5, 1896, p. 320.

_____. Review of The Deluge, by H. Sienkiewicz, tr. by J. Curtin. September 3, 1892, p. 318.

_____. Review of The Deluge, (2nd edition). October 24, 1896, pp. 561-62.

_____. Review of Knights of the Cross, by H. Sienkiewicz, tr. by J. Curtin. May 10, 1902. p. 592.

_____. Review of On the Field of Glory, by H. Sienkiewicz, tr. by J. Curtin. August 11, 1906. p. 153.

- Athenaeum. Review of Sielanka; A Forest Picture, and other stories, by H. Sienkiewicz, tr. by J. Curtin. January 14, 1894, pp. 47-48.
- _____. Review of Yanko the Musician, and other stories, by H. Sienkiewicz, tr. by J. Curtin. March 24, 1894, p. 375.
- Ayala, F. Problemas de la traducción. Madrid: Taurus, 1965.
- Baculewski, Jan. "Życie i twórczość Henryka Sienkiewicza." In Henryk Sienkiewicz, materiały rocznicowe. Ed. by Monika Michalska. Warsaw: 1966.
- Balcerzan, E. "Teoria i krytyka przekładu w Związku radzieckim." Pamiętnik literacki, No. 2, 1966, 651-66.
- Barański, Zb. "Sienkiewicz w rosyjskiej literaturze radzieckiej." Pamiętnik literacki, No. 3, 1966, 310-21.
- Barkhudarov, L. S. (ed.) Tetradı perevodchika. Moscow: 1963.
- Barnet, V. "K otázce výběru slova při překlade." Kniha o překládání. Prague: 1953.
- Batiushkov, F. D.; Gumilev, N.; Chukovskii, K. Printsipy khudozhestvennogo perevoda. St. Petersburg: 1920.
- Beatrycja, Siostra C. R. "Dziecko w literaturze polskiej." Sodalıs, XXXVIII, No. 3 (March, 1957), 71-72.
- _____. "Dziecko w utworach Henryka Sienkiewicza." Sodalıs, XXXVIII, No. 4 (April, 1957), 93-98.
- Belloc, Hilaire. "On translation." The Bookman, LXXIV (September, 1931), 32-39.
- Białokozowicz, Bazyli. Z dziejów wzajemnych polsko-rosyjskich związków literackich w XIX wieku. Warsaw: 1971.
- Booth, A. D., et al. Aspects of Translation. London: Secker and Warburg, 1958.
- Borowy, Wacław. "Dawni teoretycy tłumaczeń." O sztuce tłumaczenia. Ed. by Michał Rusinek. Wrocław: 1955.
- Bosák, C. "Několik poznámek k syntaxi ruského a českého odborného stylu." Kniha o překládání. Prague: 1953.
- Brahmer, Mieczysław. "Z dziejów Sienkiewicza w krajach romańskich." Henryk Sienkiewicz, Twórczość i recepcja światowa. Ed. by Aniela Piorunowa and Kazimierz Wyka. Cracow: 1968.

- Brower, Reuben (ed.). On Translation. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- _____. "Seven Agamemnons." On Translation. Ed. by Reuben Brower. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Brueckner, Alexander. Literatura polska, od jej początków do chwili obecnej. Paris: Księgarnia polska, n. d.
- Bujnicki, Tadeusz. Pierwszy okres twórczości Henryka Sienkiewicza. Cracow: 1968.
- Camutaliová, I. "Některé zvláštnosti ruských spojek a jejich překlad do češtiny." Kniha o překládání. Prague: 1953.
- Canadian Magazine. Review of On the Field of Glory, by Henryk Sienkiewicz, trans. by Jeremiah Curtin. XXVI, No. 5 (March, 1906), p. 491.
- Cary, Edmond. "Prolegomena for the Establishment of a General Theory of Translation." Diogenes, XL (1962), 96-121.
- _____. La traduction dans le monde moderne. Geneva: Georg, 1956.
- Cary, E. and Jampelt, R. W. (Eds.). Quality in Translation, Proceedings of the IIIrd Congress of the International Federation of Translators. New York: Pergamon, 1963.
- Casagrande, J. B. "The Ends of Translation." International Journal of American Linguistics, XX, No. 4 (October 1954), 335-40.
- Catford, John C. A Linguistic Theory of Translation. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Chlebowski, Bronislas. La littérature polonaise au XIXe siècle. Ouvrage posthume publié et complété par Manfred Kridl. Paris: Institut d'études slaves de l'université, 1933.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. Vysokoe iskusstvo, o printsipakh khudozhestvennogo perevoda. Moscow: 1964.
- _____. Zhivoi kak zhizn', o russkom iazyke. Moscow: 1966.
- The Critic. Review of With Fire and Sword, by H. Sienkiewicz, tr. by J. Curtin. XVII (July 19, 1890), pp. 29-30.
- Csapláros, István. "Sienkiewicz na Węgrzech." Henryk Sienkiewicz, Twórczość i recepcja światowa. Ed. by A. Piorunowa and K. Wyka. Cracow: 1968.

- Culler, Jonathan. "Jakobson and the linguistic analysis of literary texts." Language and Style, V, No. 1 (Winter, 1971), 53-66.
- Cunningham, Dale S. "Translating and Editing." Meta, XVI, No. 3 (September, 1971), 135-52.
- Curtin, Jeremiah. "The Author of Quo Vadis?; my acquaintance with Henryk Sienkiewicz." The Century, LVI, No. 3 (July, 1898), 428-33.
- Cyblenko, H. "Sienkiewicz w Rosji." Henryk Sienkiewicz, Twórczość i recepcja światowa. Ed. by A. Piorunowa and K. Wyka. Cracow: 1968.
- Dąbrowska, Maria. "Parę myśli o pracy przekładowej." O sztuce tłumaczenia. Ed. by Michał Rusinek. Wrocław: 1955.
- Darbénet, Jean. "Traduction littérale ou traduction libre?" Meta, XV, No. 2 (June, 1970), 88-94.
- Demurova, M. "Golos i skripka." Masterstvo perevoda 7 (1970). pp. 150-85.
- Diagne, Momar Khary. "De l'équivalence à l'adaptation." Meta, XVI, No. 3 (September, 1971), 153-59.
- Dial. Review of Without Dogma, by H. Sienkiewicz, tr. by Iza Young. June 1, 1893, p. 341.
- Dokulil, Miloš. "K překládání slovesného vidu." Knihá o překládání. Prague: 1953.
- Dole, Nathan Haskell. Review of Children of the Soil, by H. Sienkiewicz, tr. by J. Curtin. The Bookman, I, No. 6 (July, 1895), 396-98.
- Etkind, Efim G. "Iz kakogo materiala delaiutsia knigi?" Tetradi perevodchika. Ed. by L. S. Barkhudarov. Moscow: 1963.
- _____. "Khudozhestvennyi perevod: iskusstvo i nauka." Voprosy jazykoznanija, No. 4, 1970, 15-29.
- _____. "Perevod i sopostavitel'naia stilistika." Masterstvo perevoda 2 (1959), pp. 71-86.
- _____. Poezija i perevod. Moscow: 1963.
- _____. "Teorija khudozhestvennogo perevoda i zadachi sopostavitel'noi stilistiki." Teorija i kritika perevoda. Ed. by B. A. Larin. Leningrad: 1962.

- Fedorov, A. V. "O smyslovoi mnogoplanovosti slova kak probleme khudozhestvennogo perevoda." Teoriia i kritika perevoda. Ed. by B. A. Larin. Leningrad: 1962.
- _____. "O sootnoshenii otdel'nogo i tselogo v protsesse perevoda kak tvorchestva." Voprosy iazykoznanii, No. 6, 1970, 27-35.
- _____. Vvedenie v teoriu perevoda. 2nd. ed., rev. Moscow: 1958.
- Finlay, Ian F. Translating. London: E. U. P., 1971.
- Firth, J. R. Selected Papers, 1952-59. Ed. by F. R. Palmer. London: Longmans, 1968.
- Fischbach-Pospelova, Maria. Polnische Literatur in Deutschland (Frankfurter Abhandlungen zur Slavistik, Bd. 2). Frankfurt: Anton Hain, 1960.
- Folejewski, Zbigniew. "Uwagi o roli dialektyzmów w literaturze pięknej, (na podstawie materiałów z literatury polskiej i rosyjskiej)." American Contributions to the Sixth International Congress of Slavists. Vol. II. Ed. by William E. Harkins. The Hague: Mouton, 1968.
- Forster, Leonard. "Translation: An Introduction." Aspects of Translation. London: Secker and Warburg, 1958.
- Frazer, James George. The Golden Bough. Vol. X. New York: Macmillan, 1935.
- Freudenthal, Hans W. L. "The Problem of Translating." Modern Language Journal, XXVI, No. 1 (1942), 62-65.
- Furmanik, Stanisław. "Paradoksy przekładu." O sztuce tłumaczenia. Ed. by Michał Rusinek. Wrocław: 1955.
- Gardner, Monica. "Henryk Sienkiewicz." Great Men and Women of Poland. Ed. by Stephen P. Mizwa. New York: Macmillan, 1941.
- _____. The Patriot Novelist of Poland, Henryk Sienkiewicz. London: J. M. Dent, 1926.
- Galtier, Lysandro Z. D. La traducción literaria, con una antología del poema traducido. 3 vols. Buenos Aires: Ediciones culturales argentinas, 1965.
- Giergielewicz, Mieczysław. Henryk Sienkiewicz. New York: Twayne, 1968.

- Giergielewicz, Mieczysław. "Henryk Sienkiewicz's American Resonance." Antemurale, X (1966), 257-354.
- _____. "Hiszpania wobec Sienkiewicza." Wiadomości, March 3, 1968, p. 2.
- _____. "Na marginesie pamiętników J. Curtina." Wiadomości, August 21, 1966, p. 1.
- Gladstone, William T. "Les dangers de la calcomanie." Babel, XVI, No. 3 (1970), 148-49.
- Gombrowicz, Witold. "Sienkiewicz." In Dziennik 1953-56. Vol. VI of Dzieła zebrane. Paris: Instytut literacki, 1971.
- Gorskii, I. G. "Genryk Senkevich." Istoria pol'skoi literatury. Vol. I. Ed. by V. V. Vitt, et al. Moscow: 1968.
- Górski, Konrad. "Sienkiewicz - klasyk języka polskiego." Henryk Sienkiewicz, Twórczość i recepcja światowa. Ed. by A. Piorunowa and K. Wyka. Cracow: 1968.
- Gosse, Edmund. "Henryk Sienkiewicz." The Contemporary Review, LXXI (April, 1897), 517-30.
- Govaert, M. "Paradoxes sur la traduction." Linguistica Antverpiensia, No. 5, 1971, 39-62.
- Guettinger, Fritz. Zielsprache, Theorie und Technik des Uebersetzens. Zurich: Manesse Verlag, 1963.
- Habe, Hans. "Thoughts on the Nobel Peace Prize." Encounter, XLII, No. 2 (February, 1974), 96-97.
- Hefzallah, Ibrahim M. "The Art of Translation." Babel, XVI, No. 3 (1970), 80-87.
- Hertz, Paweł. "O tłumaczeniu ksiąg." O sztuce tłumaczenia. Ed. by Michał Rusinek. Wrocław: 1955.
- Holmes, James S. (ed.). The Nature of Translation. Essays on the theory and practice of literary translation. The Hague: Mouton, 1970.
- Horálek, Karel. "K charakteristice ruštiny." Kniha o překládání. Prague: 1953.
- _____. Kapitoly z teorie překládání. Prague: 1957.
- _____. "O překládání infinitivních konstrukcí." Kniha o překládání. Prague: 1953.

- Horálek, Karel. "Za vyšší úroveň překladů z ruštiny." Kniha o překládání. Prague: 1953.
- Howard, Richard. "A Professional Translator's Trade Alphabet." The Craft and Context of Translation. A critical symposium. Ed. by W. Arrowsmith and R. Shattuck. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1961.
- Ilek, Bohuslav. "Metodika překládání." Kniha o překládání. Prague: 1953.
- Iłakowiczówna, Kazimiera. "Kilka słów o przypadkowych tłumaczeniach." O sztuce tłumaczenia. Ed. by Michał Rusinek. Wrocław: 1955.
- Ingarden, Roman (senior). "O tłumaczeniach." O sztuce tłumaczenia. Ed. by M. Rusinek. Wrocław: 1955.
- Iwazkiewicz, Jarosław. "Przekłady z Pabla Nerudy." O sztuce tłumaczenia. Ed. by M. Rusinek. Wrocław: 1955.
- Jabłoński, Witold. "Zagadnienia przekładów z języków orientalnych zilustrowane na materiale chińskim." O sztuce tłumaczenia. Wrocław: 1955.
- Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." On Translation. Ed. by Reuben Brower. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Kade, Otto. Zufall und Gesetzmässigkeit in der Uebersetzung. (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift Fremdsprachen). Leipzig: 1968.
- KarSKI, Gabriel. "Kłopoty tłumacza." O sztuce tłumaczenia. Ed. by M. Rusinek. Wrocław: 1955.
- Kashkin, Ivan. "Perevod i realizm." Masterstvo perevoda, 1963. pp. 451-65.
- _____. "Tekushchie dela." Masterstvo perevoda 2 (1959).
- _____. "V bor'be za realisticheskii perevod." Voprosy khudozhestvennogo perevoda. Moscow: 1955.
- Kattser, Ju. and Kunin, A. "Perevod prichastii s russkogo iazyka na angliiskii." Tetradi perevodchika. Ed. by L. S. Bar-khudarov. Moscow: 1963.
- Kijas, Julius. "Współzawodnictwo w teorii. Kaczkowski jako współzawodnik Sienkiewicza." Henryk Sienkiewicz. Ed. by Janina Kulczycka-Saloni. Warsaw: 1966.

- Klemensiewicz, Zenon. "Przekład jako zagadnienie językoznawstwa." O sztuce tłumaczenia. Ed. by M. Rusinek. Wrocław: 1955.
- Kloepfer, Rolf. Die Theorie der Literarischen Uebersetzung. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1967.
- Kniha o překládání. Prague: 1953.
- Komissarov, V. N. "K voprosu o sopostavitel'nom izuchenii perevodov." Tetradí perevodchika 7 (1970), pp. 46-50.
- Komissarov, V. N. Slovo o perevode. Moscow: 1973.
- Korolenko, Vladimir G. Istoria moego sovremennika. Moscow: 1965.
- V. G. Korolenko o literature. Ed. by Aleksandr Khrabritskii. Moscow: 1957.
- Kosko, Maria. Un "best-seller" 1900, "Quo Vadis?" Paris: Librairie José Corti, 1960.
- Kovhaniuk, S. "Perekład khudozhn'oi rosiys'koi prozy na ukrains'ku movu." Pytannia perekladu. Kiev: 1957.
- Krejčí, Karel. "Recepcja Sienkiewicza wśród Czechów i Słowaków." Henryk Sienkiewicz, Twórczość i recepcja światowa. Ed. by A. Piorunowa and K. Wyka. Cracow: 1968.
- Kridl, Manfred. Literatura polska, (na tle rozwoju kultury). New York: Roy publishers, 1945.
- Křížková, Helena. "Problemy českého a ruského slovosledu." Kniha o překládání. Prague: 1953.
- Krzyżanowski, Jerzy. "Henryk Sienkiewicz to Jeremiah Curtin: some unpublished letters." Polish Review, X, No. 3 (Summer, 1965), 3-21.
- Krzyżanowski, Julian. Henryk Sienkiewicz. Kalendarz życia i twórczości. Warsaw: 1956.
-
- ! Pokłosie sienkiewiczowskie, szkice literackie. Warsaw: 1973.
-
- . Twórczość Henryka Sienkiewicza. 2nd ed. Warsaw: 1973.
-
- . W kręgu wielkich realistów. Cracow: 1962.

- Krzyżanowski, Julian. Henryk Sienkiewicz. Żywot i sprawy.
3rd. ed. Warsaw: 1973.
- Kulczycka-Saloni, Janina (ed.). Henryk Sienkiewicz. Warsaw:
1966.
- Kumaniecki, Kazimierz. "Nad prozą antyczną." O sztuce tłumaczenia. Ed. by Michał Rusinek. Wrocław: 1955.
- Kundzich, Aleksei. "Perevodcheskaia mysl' i perevodcheskoe nedomyslie." Voprosy khudozhestvennogo perevoda. Moscow: 1955.
- Kurella, Al'fred. "Teoria i praktyka perevoda." Masterstvo perevoda 2 (1959), pp. 407-37.
- Larbaud, V. Sous l'invocation de Saint Jérôme. Paris: Gallimard, 1946.
- Lednicki, Wacław. Henryk Sienkiewicz. New York: Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America, 1948.
- _____. Henryk Sienkiewicz. A retrospective synthesis. The Hague: Mouton, 1960.
- Lefevre, André. "The Translation of Literature: an Approach." Babel, XVI, No. 2 (1970), 75-79.
- Lehr-Splawiński, Tadeusz. Jezyk polski, pochodzenie, powstanie, rozwój. Warsaw: 1947.
- Leites, A. "Khudozhestvennyi perevod kak iavlenie rodnoi literatury." Voprosy khudozhestvennogo perevoda. Moscow: 1955.
- Levik, V. "O tochnosti i vernosti." Masterstvo perevoda 2 (1959), pp. 254-75.
- Levý, Jiří. Die literarische Uebersetzung. Theorie einer Kunstgattung. Trans. by Walter Schamschula. Frankfurt: Athenaeum, 1969.
- _____. Umění překladu. Prague: 1963.
- _____. "Translation as a Decision Process." To honor Roman Jakobson, II. The Hague: Mouton, 1967.
- _____. "Translation in Czechoslovakia." Proceedings of the Fourth Congress of the International Federation of Translators. Ed. by I. J. Citroen. Oxford: Pergamon, 1967.

- Lipkin, S. "Perevod i sovremennost'." Masterstvo perevoda, 1963. pp. 13-52.
- Liubimov, N. "Perevod - iskusstvo." Novyi mir, No. 5, 1962, 233-56.
- Łobodowski, Józef. "Hiszpania wobec Sienkiewicza." Wiadomości, June 9, 1968, p. 6.
- Lockert, Lucy. "Henryk Sienkiewicz." The Sewanee Review, XXVII, No. 3 (July, 1919), 257-83.
- Lucas, F. L. Style. London: Cassell, 1955.
- Máchal, Jan. Slovanské literatury. 3 vols. Prague: 1922-29.
- Maciejewski, Jarosław. "Wielkopolskie" opowiadania Henryka Sienkiewicza. (Prace komisji filologicznej, XVII, No. 3). Poznań: 1957.
- Maeder, M. "Translation as a Literary Art." Canadian Modern Language Review, XXII, No. 3 (1966), 9-17.
- Maillot, Jean. "Toponymie et traduction." Babel, XIV, No. 1 (1968), 25-29; No. 2 (1968), 86-91.
- Makowiecka, Gabriela. "Sienkiewicz i Hiszpania." Kwartalnik neofilologiczny, XV (1968), 131-46.
- Malblanc, Alfred. Stylistique comparée du français et de l'allemand. Paris: Didier, 1959.
- Markiewicz, Henryk. Główne problemy wiedzy o literaturze. Cracow: 1965.
- _____. Tradycje i rewizje. Cracow: 1957.
- Markish, S. and Zond, M. "Voprosy i otvety." Masterstvo perevoda 6 (1969), pp. 284-93.
- Martino, Giovanni de. La traduzione attraverso le culture. Naples: n. d. [a. 1969].
- Masliak, S. "Pereklady z slovians'kykh mov." Pytannia perekladu. Kiev: 1957.
- Maymi, Protasio. "General Laws or Concepts in Translation." Modern Language Journal, XL (1956), 13-21.
- Mellor, Geoffrey. "Translation - The Problem of Form and Content." Linguistica Antverpiensia, No. 2 (1968), 309-18.

- Michalska, Monika (ed.). Henryk Sienkiewicz, materiały rocznicowe. Warsaw: 1966.
- Milik, J. T. "Gwara ludowa w nowelach Sienkiewicza." Jezyk polski, XXVI, No. 5 (1946), 139-148.
- Miłosz, Czesław. The History of Polish Literature. London: Macmillan, 1969.
- _____. "Jezyki, narody." Kultura (Paris), No. 9/312 (September, 1973), 3-18.
- Mitchel, Breon. "Balancing the Books: The Translator's Additional Problem." Babel, XVIII, No. 3 (1971), 9-12.
- Moravec, J. "O významu překladu a překladatelském mistrovství." Kniha o překládání. Prague: 1953.
- Mos'jakov, A. "K voprosu o sviazi stilisticheskikh funktsii frazeologizmov s perevodom." Tetradí perevodchika 7 (1970), pp. 89-97.
- Mounin, Georges. Les belles infidèles. Paris: Cahiers du Sud, 1955.
- _____. "La notion de qualité en matière de traduction littéraire." Quality in Translation. Ed. by E. Cary and R. W. Jumpelt. New York: Pergamon, 1963.
- _____. Los problemas teóricos de la traducción. Trans. by Julio Lago Alonso. Madrid: Gredos, 1971.
- Obolevich, Viacheslav B. Istoriia pol'skoi literatury. Leningrad: 1960.
- _____. "Rol' nauchnykh znanii v tvorcheskoi praktike perevodchika." Teoriia i kritika perevoda. Ed. by B. A. Larin. Leningrad: 1962.
- Oktábec, V. "O překládání ruských přechodníkových vazeb." Kniha o překládání. Prague: 1953.
- Ostudina, T. "'I' ili 'no'." Tetradí perevodchika 7 (1970), pp. 60-70.
- Nabokov, Vladimir. "The Art of Translation." New Republic, No. 105 (August 4, 1941), 160-62.
- _____. "The Servile Path." On Translation. Ed. by Reuben Brower. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

- Neveux, Jean B. "Sienkiewicz a Francja." Henryk Sienkiewicz, Twórczość i recepcja światowa. Ed. by A. Piorunowa and K. Wyka. Cracow: 1968.
- Newmark, Peter. "An Approach to Translation." Babel, XIX, No. 1, (1973), 3-18.
- Nida, Eugene A. "Linguistics and Ethnology in Translation Problems." Word, I, No. 2 (August, 1945), 194-208.
- _____. "Nauka perevoda." Voprosy iazykoznanija, No. 4, 1970, 3-14.
- _____. Toward a Science of Translating, with special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating. Leiden: Brill, 1964.
- Noel, Claude. "Onomatopées et traduction." Babel, XVI, No. 2 (1970), 67-73.
- Nofer, Alina. Henryk Sienkiewicz. Warsaw: 1959.
- Nofer-Ładyka, Alina. "Piśmiennictwo o Sienkiewiczu w latach 1945-65." Pamiętnik literacki, LVII, No. 3 (1966), 283-310.
- Paepcke, Fritz. "Verstehen und Uebersetzen." Linguistica Antverpiensia, No. 2, 1968, 329-52.
- Parandowski, Jan. Alchemia słowa. Warsaw: 1956.
- _____. "Homeryckie boje." O sztuce tłumaczenia. Ed. by M. Rusinek. Wrocław: 1955.
- _____. "O znaczeniu i godności tłumacza." O sztuce tłumaczenia. Ed. by M. Rusinek. Wrocław: 1955.
- Paris, Jean. "Translation and Creation." The Craft and Context of Translation. Ed. by W. Arrowsmith and R. Shattuck. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1961.
- Pasini, Gian Franco. "Lo studio delle metafore." Lingua e stile, III (1968), 71-89.
- Pervushin, Prof. Nikolai V. "K voprosu o teorii i praktike perevoda." Sbornik statei N. V. Pervushina. Vol. 1. San Francisco: 1970.
- _____. "Problems of English-Russian Translation." A Guide to Teachers of the Russian Language in America. XV, No. 57 (1961), 8-13.

- Piorunowa, Alina; Wyka, Kazimierz (eds.). Henryk Sienkiewicz, Twórczość i recepcja światowa. Materiały konferencji naukowej, listopad, 1966. Cracow: 1968.
- Postgate, J. P. Translation and Translations. Theory and Practice. London: G. Bell, 1922.
- Proetz, Victor. The Astonishment of Words, an experiment in the comparison of languages. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1971.
- Pryhara, M. [no title]. Pytannia perekladu. Kiev: 1957.
- Pytannia perekladu. Z materialiv respublikans'koi narady perekladachiv. Kiev: 1957.
- Radecki, Sigismund von. "Vom Uebersetzen." Die Kunst der Uebersetzung. Munich: 1963.
- Rait-Kovaleva, R. "Nit' Ariadny." Redaktor i perevod. Moscow: 1965.
- Redaktor i perevod. Moscow: 1965.
- Reiss, Katharina. "Ueberlegungen zu einer Theorie der Uebersetzungskritik." Linguistica Antverpiensia, No. 2, 1968, 369-84.
- Retsker, Ia. I. "Plagiat ili samostoiatel'nyi perevod?" Tetrad i perevodchika. Ed. by L. S. Barkhudarov. Moscow: 1963.
- _____. "Zadachi sopostavitel'nogo analiza perevoda." Teoriia i kritika perevoda. Ed. by B. A. Larin. Leningrad: 1962.
- Romankówna, Mieczysława. "Rola stylizacyjna obcojęzycznych składników w trzech nowelach Henryka Sienkiewicza." Rocznik komisji historycznoliterackiej, III (1965), 135-63.
- Rónai, Paulo. Escola de tradutores. Rio de Janeiro: Edições de Ouro, 1967.
- Rossel's, V. "Perevod i natsional'noe svoobrazie podlinnika." Voprosy khudozhestvennogo perevoda. Moscow: 1955.
- Rusinek, Michał (ed.). O sztuce tłumaczenia. Wrocław: 1955.
- Samoilov, David. "Sravnenie perevoda s originalom." Redaktor i perevod. Moscow: 1965.
- Sandauer, Artur. "Troski tłumacza." O sztuce tłumaczenia. Ed. by M. Rusinek. Wrocław: 1955.

- Savory, Theodore. The Art of Translation. Boston: The Writer, 1968.
- Scherer-Virski, Olga. The Modern Polish Short Story. The Hague: Mouton, 1955.
- Segel, Harold B. "Jak przyjmowano twórczość Sienkiewicza w Stanach Zjednoczonych." Henryk Sienkiewicz, Twórczość i recepcja światowa. Ed. by A. Piorunowa and K. Wyka. Cracow: 1968.
- _____. "Sienkiewicz's First Translator, Jeremiah Curtin." Slavic Review, XXIV (1965), 189-214.
- Selected Polish Tales. Trans. by Else C. M. Benecke and Marie Busch. London: Oxford University Press, 1921.
- Shakhrai, O. B. "'Lozhnye druž'ia' perevodchika." Voprosy iazykoznanija, No. 2, 1955, 107-11.
- Shor, V. "V ppiskakh utrachenogo smysla." Redaktor i perevod. Moscow: 1965.
- Shtaler, E. "O konwersnoi transformatsii, (na materiale frantsuzskogo iazyka)." Tetradzi perevodchika 7 (1970), pp. 84-89.
- Shveitser, A. "K voprosu ob analize grammaticheskikh iavlenii pri perevode." Tetradzi perevodchika 1 (1963), pp. 5-12.
- _____. "Vozmozhna li obshchaja teorija perevoda?" Tetradzi perevodchika 7 (1970), pp. 35-46.
- Silveira, Brenno. A arte de traduzir. São Paulo: Edições Melhoramentos, 1955.
- Slutskii, B. "Korolenko - perevodchik Senkevicha." Inostrannaia literatura, No. 11, 1965, 267-68.
- Śmigielski, W. K. "Sienkiewicz po angielsku." Wiadomości, November 30, 1969, p. 4.
- Sobolev, L. N. "O perevode obraza obrazom." Voprosy khudozhestvennogo perevoda. Moscow: 1955.
- Stawar, Andrzej. Pisarstwo Henryka Sienkiewicza. Warsaw: 1960.
- Swastek, Józef. "Pierwsi amerykańscy tłumacze Sienkiewicza." Sodalis, XXXVII, No. 3 (April-May, 1956), 100-01.
- Szmydtowa, Zofia. "Czynniki rodzime i obce w przekładzie literackim." O sztuce tłumaczenia. Ed. by M. Rusinek. Wrocław: 1955.

- Tancock, L. W. "Some Problems of Style in Translation from French." Aspects of Translation. London: Secker and Warburg, 1958.
- Tolstoy, L. N. Anna Karénina. Trans. by Nathan Haskell Dole. London: Walter Scott, n.d. [c. 1895].
- Trávníček, F. "O rytmu řeči." Kniha o překládání. Prague: 1953.
- Truchanowski, Kazimierz. "O tłumaczu i jego roli." O sztuce tłumaczenia. Ed. by M. Rusinek. Wrocław: 1955.
- Tuell, Annie Kimball. "Henryk Sienkiewicz." Catholic World, CVII (April, 1918), 17-31.
- Turover, G. "K probleme konvergentsii frazeologicheskikh paralelei, (na materiale ispanskogo i portugal'skogo iazykov)." Tetradi perevodchika 7 (1970), pp. 50-59.
- "Utwory Sienkiewicza na 48 językach." Mozaika polska, II, No. 4 (1972), p. 30.
- Vaksmakher, M. "Na strazhe dvukh bogatstv." Pedaktor i perevod. Moscow: 1965.
- Vinay, J. P.; Darbelnet, J. Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais. Paris: Didier, 1958.
- Vindt, L. "Marsel' Eme v rukakh perevodchikov." Redaktor i perevod. Moscow: 1965.
- Vlakhov, S.; Florin, S. "Neperevodimoe v perevode, - realii." Masterstvo perevoda 6 (1969), pp. 432-456.
- Volkov, Iu. "Sopostavlenie kak sposob analiza stilia khudozhestvennogo proizvedeniia." Tetradi perevodchika 7 (1970), pp. 71-77.
- Voprosy khudozhestvennogo perevoda. Moscow: 1955. •
- Wandruszka, Mario. "L'aspect verbal, problème de traduction." Linguistica Antverpiensia, No. 2 (1968), 459-76.
- Waterman, John T. Review of Toward a Science of Translating, by Eugene A. Nida. Language, XLII, No. 1 (1966), 93-105.
- Weinreich, Uriel. Languages in Contact. Findings and Problems. The Hague: Mouton, 1967.
- Welsh, David J. "Sienkiewicz and the Historical Novel; Evolution of a genre." Polish Review, XIII, No. 1 (1968), 39-57.

- Welsh, David J. "Sienkiewicz as Narrator." Slavonic and East European Review, XLIII (1965), 371-83.
- Westfal, Stanisław. "The Polish Language." Antemurale, X (1966), 3-108.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. "On the Semantics of Verbal Aspect in Polish." To honor Roman Jakobson, III. The Hague: Mouton, 1967.
- Winter, Werner. "Impossibilities of Translation." The Craft and Context of Translation. Ed. by W. Arrowsmith and R. Shattuck. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1961.
- Wojtasiewicz, Olgierd. Wstęp do teorii tłumaczenia. Wrocław: 1957.
- Wollman, Frank. Slovesnost slovanů. Prague: 1928.
- Lord Woodhouselee (Tytler, Alexander Fraser). Essay on the Principles of Translation. London: J. M. Dent, n. d. [c. 1907.]
- Wyka, Kazimierz. "O sztuce pisarskiej Sienkiewicza." Henryk Sienkiewicz, Twórczość i recepcja światowa. Ed. by A. Piorunowa and K. Wyka. Cracow: 1968.
- _____. "Sprawa Sienkiewiczã." Twórczość, No. 6, 1946. 84-106.
- Zabolotskii, N. "Zametki perevodchika." Masterstvo perevoda 2, (1959), pp. 251-53.
- Żeromski, Stefan. "Przemówienie o Henryku Sienkiewiczu." Henryk Sienkiewicz. Ed. by Janina Kulczycka-Saloni. Warsaw: 1966.

Addendum: The following item was received too late to be included alphabetically.

- Blixen, Olaf. La traducción literaria y sus problemas. Montevideo: Universidad de la República, 1954.