

Jerzy Święch

"Model komunikacji przekładowej",
Jerzy Święch, "Teksty", nr 6 (1975) :
[recenzja]

Literary Studies in Poland 1, 180-181

1978

Artykuł został zdigitalizowany i opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

are found next to drawings, objects and actions. For the novel of those days (in comparison with the earlier and the contemporary one) the boundary of the natural language cannot be passed. The novel may reach it but it cannot go past it.

Sum. by the author

Transl. by *A. Korzeniowska*

Jerzy Świąch, Model komunikacji przekładowej (The Model of Translational Communication), "Teksty", 1975, No 6, pp. 13.

Every artistic translation, because of its message from the sender (translator) to the receiver (reader), requires investigation against the background of the whole situation of communication and also against the background of a certain "strategy" which has to ensure the desired efficacy and selectness for this message. This situation implies a certain *role* chosen by the translator from the repertoire which is historically changeable (for example, one can mention the roles of a translator as a popularizer of foreign literature, innovator, ideologist, etc.), as well as its correlation with the role of the reader. Every translator, more or less consciously, does his absolute best taking into account some imagined reader, who, as he presumes, either knows or does not know the language in which the original text was written (the translator's tactics are dependent on this to a great extent), and either has or has not at his disposal the knowledge which allows him to place the translated work in its indigenous context, etc. The translator's choice of strategical variants, because of the reader's expectations and his presumed reaction is practically unlimited. To help him he has (although not always) the criticism of the translation, which verifies to a certain extent the moves made by the translator and acts as a mediator in the contact between himself and the reader. Criticism, on the one hand, wishes to connect the reader's expectations with the ideal of the so-called masterly translation, suggesting to him the existence of such an ideal norm of which a translation may only be an imperfect representation and therefore disposes him sceptically every time to the translator. On the other

hand though, it verifies the final effect of the translator's work, employing the obligatory criteria of literary criticism. The efficacy of the understanding along the line of translator—reader sometimes depends also on the setting of a specific *code* into motion, and in the role of such a code (especially when it concerns the translations of classical works which have their own national, basically conservative, traditions in every literature) there often appears a series of translations, i.e. many translations, seemingly verifying each other, of one work or of a whole complex of works (e.g. ancient classical works, Shakespeare). The translator's strategy towards the reader is often to create a translation while having in mind certain stereotypes of perception which have developed as a result of the existence of a strong translational tradition. Canonical translations, usually being the reason of the forming of such stereotypes, play a singular role here.

The translator's strategies are, to a certain degree, always present in the actual text of translation and the role of analysis is to draw them out. They simultaneously distinguish, through the superiority of some "tactics" and the elimination of others, a freely chosen stage in the development of the art of translation. In each stage of the development of this art other restrictions and constraints act along the line of translator—reader and the efficacy of understanding is also dependent, in every historical case, on the configuration of phenomena forming a literary synchrony. A translation is the result of sensible compromises between the aims set by the translator and for whose realization he engages appropriate means, and the requirements which are set by the rules of literary communication: conventions, genres, metrical patterns, etc. It is also clear that the translator's strategies themselves become the aim of the author's endeavours. This happens when the role of the translator enjoys a high social prestige and when the translational attempts become the model for innovatory or avant-garde actions. The model of translating which is so strictly dependent on the rules of literary communication continuously finds itself in the centre of literary tendencies.