

Ewa Kujawska-Lis
Instytut Neofilologii
UWM w Olsztynie

INTO THE HEART OF MATTERS – IN SEARCH OF THE FINALITY OF THE TRANSLATION PROCESS

Key words: translation, revision, translation series, *Heart of Darkness*, recodification

As theoreticians of translation emphasize, the research in the field in question can be either product-oriented or process-oriented, yet to a certain degree the two areas of interest overlap (Bassnett 1980/1985: 28). The following analysis is essentially process-oriented as it attempts to investigate the reasons for introducing changes into the revised version of a translation of a literary text. Yet in order to provide the possible explanation for the shifts the relation between the source language text and the target language text(s) must inevitably come to the surface. Thus a product-oriented analysis will lead to process-oriented conclusions.

Much research has been carried out concerning the process of translation. Depending on the theoretical approach, the process is divided into three or two phases. The two-step process is advocated by Coseriu. He differentiates the semasiologic phase, that is the stage of interpreting and the onomasiologic phase, that is the stage of reverbalsation (cf. Dąmbska-Prokop 2000: 76). The three-step model of the translation process which accommodates a "linking phase" seems more common. Thus the linguistic model by Nida and Taber is based on: analysis, transfer and restructuring, although, occasionally it is considered a two-step model of decoding (which consists of the first two mentioned stages) and re-encoding. Nida's three steps can be roughly compared to the cognitive phases of understanding, deverbalsation and re-expression proposed by Lederer (cf. Dąmbska-Prokop 2000: 76).

The initial stage of the translation process is further subdivided into certain cognitive acts, as well as linguistic activities. The analysis, apart from the linguistic evaluation of the text, comprises compiling information concerning the text, the communication situation, the addressee, discourse functions, discourse type, etc. Thus at this stage not only linguistic material is considered but also non-linguistic factors, such as context and co-text, norms governing particular discourse types or genres. This stage leads to the "understanding" of the text with all that the term implies. It should result

in comprehending the sense (or contextual meaning) of the text viewed as a cognitive operation of grasping all the linguistic and non-linguistic elements united in a text and then "remembering" them apart from their linguistic form. In other words, it culminates in transfer/deverbalisation. The synthesis, which succeeds the middle-stage, means the actual production of the target text. It does not involve merely linguistic shifts from one language to another followed by intralingual shifts within the target structures, but recodification or rather creating the third code, the code of translation which emerges from the matrix code (of the original) and the target code (Frawley 1984/2003: 257).

The three phases are also evident in the scholarship of Russian linguists who saw analysis and synthesis as the initial and final stages of the process, linked by the mediating phase which is understood differently by various scholars. Thus for Rewzin and Rozen-cwejg it is moving from the textual matrix of the original to the new linguistic shape in the translation with accordance to previously established equivalences (cf. Ojcewicz 1991: 26). Komissarow sees the second stage as interlingual transformation, which follows the analysis understood as intralingual transformation and precedes the synthesis: final transformation within the target language structures (cf. Ojcewicz 1991: 26-27).

No model is complete, however, unless the synthesis/recodification stage is meant to include the "after-stage" of self-criticism, revision and final re-shaping of the new text. It is Koptiłow's model which most strongly pronounces the notion that the stage of synthesis is by no means the final phase of the translation process. The scholar believes that it is not the end of the process but the beginning of the next stage, i.e., the analytical verification of the target text (cf. Ojcewicz 1991: 27). Also Lipiński emphasizes the role of self-correction in his model based on analysis, finding a hierarchy of translation priorities, the translation process per se and verification (2000: 26-27). This is when the translator's role shifts from that of the second writer in the stage of re-expression/restructuring/synthesis to that of a critic. From the theoretical point of view the self-criticism stage should lead to the final version of the translation. The question is when this particular stage is finished and it seems that no theory is to answer it as the decision concerning the finality of the process is based on a purely subjective judgment: "the translator can never be sure of himself, he must never be. He must always be dissatisfied with what he does because ideally, platonically, there is a perfect solution, but he will never find it. (...) So he must continue to approach, nearer and nearer, as near as he can, but like Tantalus, at some practical point he must say 'ne plus ultra' and sink back down as he considers his work done, if not finished (in all senses of the word)" (Rabassa quoted in Korzeniowska, Kuhiwczak 1994: 141). Thus the theory provides the translator with a finite model of the translation process, practice makes them finish the process at some arbitrarily chosen point, and the utopian vision of a perfect translation extends the process ad infinitum.

It is not common that one may study the process of translation on the basis of several written versions of the same translation by the same translator. The psycholinguistic approach to translation does involve the analysis of the process through Think Aloud Protocols, yet TAPs focus rather on the cognitive processes during the act of translation per se and they involve mostly interpreting rather than written translation (cf. Dąbmska-Prokop 2000: 164). Moreover, they tend to center on the stage of

comprehending the sense and re-verbalizing it, rather than on the painstaking phase of criticism and revision. Also the finality of the process itself is not researched thoroughly. Thus it seems interesting to investigate the finality of the translation process on the basis of the translated text treated as a final version and its revised rendering. The finality is understood here provisionally as the decision to publish the translation, that is providing the reader with a completed translated text. Revision is treated widely as any changes introduced to the published text, whether by the translator himself/herself or the editors. The discussion will inevitably lead to the issue concerning the connection between the revision stage and other stages in the translation process, especially analysis. These are the points to be addressed in the present analysis of two published translations by Aniela Zagórska of Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*.

Heart of Darkness published originally in 1899 has enjoyed several translations into Polish so far. The first to appear was Zagórska's 1930 version, who seems to have established the title *Jądro ciemności* which none of the subsequent translators dared change. Much later, towards the end of the 20th century, her version was followed by newer ones of Jędrzej Polak (1994), Barbara Koc (2000) and Ireneusz Socha (2004). Of the four, Zagórska (1890–1943) may be considered an expert translator of Conrad's works as she provided the Polish readership with, inter alia, *Lord Jim*, *Szaleństwo Almayera* (*Almayer's Folly*), *Wykolejeniec* (*An Outcast of the Sea*), *Zwycięstwo* (*Victory*), *Między lądem a morzem* ('*Twix Land and Sea*), *Złota strzała* (*The Arrow of Gold*), *Zwierciadło morza* (*The Mirror of the Sea*)¹. Thus she may in no way be called a novice when it comes to Conrad, his works and their translation. She was actually the first winner of the Polish PEN Club Award in 1929 for outstanding literary achievement, which was initially conferred upon translators only (<http://www.culture.pl>). Yet when one gets an opportunity to read *Jądro ciemności* in her translation published in 1930 and at any later date, one can easily notice changes between the two works, in some cases quite substantial ones.

The following analysis chooses to focus on Zagórska's translations since she was the one who began the translation series of *Heart of Darkness* and to some extent all the following translations were influenced by her rendering, but also because it is the only case when one is able to study the process of translation not with the view of the series per se but from the perspective of revision/correction. Thus the discussion shall concern the 1930 version labeled Translation 1 (T1) and the 2004 version called Translation 2 (T2)². *Jądro ciemności* translated by Zagórska was reprinted several

¹ Interestingly, towards the end of the 20th century the publishing house "Zielona Sowa" published several books by Conrad, yet almost each was translated by a different person: *Tajfun* and *Lord Jim* by Michał Filipczuk, *Smuga cienia* by Ewa Chruściel, *Szaleństwo Almayera* by Tomasz Teszner. It seems that it is difficult to talk presently about a translator who specializes in Conrad's works, as was the case with Zagórska. Michał Filipczuk, for instance who translated two works by Conrad, is also the translator of such works published by "Zielona Sowa" as: *Opowieść wigilijna* by Charles Dickens, *Z wybranych problemów filozofii* and *Pragmatyzm* by William James, *Wyspa skarbów* by Robert Louis Stevenson, *Rozważna i romantyczna* by Jane Austen and *Natura* by Ralph Waldo Emerson. Thus he seems to be a full-time translator of literary/non-literary texts employed by the publishing house rather than one who specializes in translating Conrad.

² T2 is a reprint (though it is not stated explicitly in the book) of the 1972 version included in the first full edition of Conrad's works in Poland edited by Zdzisław Najder. Although still labeled as Zagórska's

times by various publishing houses, it is noticeable, however, that unless it is indicated that the work is a reprint of the 1930 translation published by Dom Książki Polskiej, it is inevitably T2 that the reader may get acquainted with. The most obvious difference between T1 and T2 is that of spelling and punctuation, which is rather obvious given the changes the Polish language has undergone over the years. Such changes will not be in the scope of the following discussion, as they are only interesting from the historical perspective and they were initiated by the editors who adapted the text to the modern orthography. The attention shall be focused on changes which are rooted in the interpretation stage rather than on technicalities. The differences between the two texts concern various issues, among others: terminology (especially nautical terminology) in a narrow sense, and lexicon in a wider sense (choice of particular lexical items), treatment of metaphors and structural repetitions, syntax influencing understanding the work, shifts of meaning and mistranslations. Because of the limited scope of this work, only selected issues will be discussed in detail.

The most striking difference between T1 and T2 is the treatment of the key, eponymous *heart* and *darkness*. The two words which begin (if we treat the title as the beginning of a work of art) and end Conrad's work are ever present in the novella. The final words uttered by the narrator: "(...) seemed to lead into the *heart* of an immense *darkness*" (Conrad 1985: 121, emphasis mine)³ return to the beginning, to the title of the work and clasp it in particular frames of reference. *Heart* can be understood as *the inside* – the inside of a country, a continent, the earth or human soul – self. Similarly *darkness* can represent various phenomena – the tangible jungle, the intangible evil, the unknown, destruction, exploitation, the wild, the savages. The list could continue, as both words are used symbolically. *Darkness* may also envelop the dark side of humanity. Thus, similarly to the story itself which may have different levels of meaning, the title and its components may be comprehended in various ways. *Heart of Darkness* can be the middle of the black continent, where the narrative takes place. It can be treated as the centre of a hell-like earth, where human beings experience evil and destruction. It is also a place where civilised people are faced with a former stage of development – the wild and savage tribes who still live in ignorance. In their own hearts people discover their other selves, if *heart* is to be interpreted almost literally. *Heart of darkness* is then the heart permeated with evil or ignorance. The darkness of evil in which Kurtz exists also has its hearts – of people who love him: Russian harlequin, the African tribe and two women – the Intended left in Europe and the black lover. The jungle has its heart too – the deepest place unknown to the white man, which nevertheless vibrates with life.

The English text is "scattered" with *hearts* and *dark(ness)*. The words are used both literally and metaphorically and their presence is rather oppressive. Literal collo-

translation, the 1972 version underwent "the editorial scrutiny" which resulted in providing the readers with "the corrected version". Thus in the present analysis the T2 version is treated as revised rather than self-revised version. This, however, should not be treated as invalidating the argument about the translation process, as the stage of self-revision may include consultations with other experts.

³ For the sake of convenience any further longer quotation from *Heart of Darkness* shall be indicated as *HD* followed by the appropriate page number.

cations include expressions such as "pitch dark" (HD 58), "approach in daylight – not at dusk, or in the dark" (HD 72-3), "dark human shapes" (HD 100), "The darkness of an impenetrable night" (HD 103), "dark eyes" (HD 117), "the room was growing darker" (HD 118). In the majority of cases, though, the meaning of literal collocations with *heart* or *darkness* is extended to acquire the metaphorical one: "dark places of the earth" (HD 29), "darkness was here yesterday" (HD 30), "face the darkness" (HD 31), "tackle a darkness" (HD 31), "guarding the door to Darkness" (HD 37), "sent into the depths of darkness" (HD 46). It is noticeable that although the expressions with the *dark* element appear in the text from the first paragraph, their frequency, especially collocating with *heart*, increases as the story progresses and near the end there is hardly a page without one or the other. The question is whether it is difficult to render the expressions which contain the lexical items of *heart* and *darkness* consistently in order to achieve the same oppressive, brooding and beating effect as can be felt when reading the original, given their metaphorical dimension.

Darkness seems much less problematic than *heart*, as the latter refers both to the centre (of the land) and the literal organ sometimes treated metaphorically, so depending on the meaning of a particular metaphor the consistency of rendering may not be possible to achieve. The following table presents a selection of translations of collocations including the two key components:

Nr	Original	Translation 1	Translation 2
1.	one of the dark places of the earth (29)	było ongi jednym z mrocznych zakątków ziemi (68)	było jednym z ciemnych zakątków ziemi (6)
2.	It had become a place of darkness (33)	Przeobraziło się w miejsce, gdzie panuje mrok (73)	Przeobraziło się w miejsce, gdzie panuje ciemność (9)
3.	the silence of the land went home to one's very heart (56)	cisza kraju przenikała do dustry (107)	cisza kraju przenikała do dustry (26)
4.	profound darkness of its heart (65)	głęboki mrok z wnętrza ładu (121)	głęboką ciemność z wnętrza ładu (32)
5.	the heart of impenetrable darkness (83)	z głębi nieprzeniknionej ciemności (146)	z jądra nieprzeniknionej ciemności (44)
6.	powers of darkness (85)	mroczne potęgi (150)	ile ciemnych potęg (46)
7.	the heart of darkness (109)	z głębi ciemności (186)	z jądra ciemności (63)
8.	Barren darkness of his heart (110)	jałowy mrok jego serca (186)	jałową ciemność jego serca (64)
9.	I will wring your heart yet! (110)	Dobiorę ci się jeszcze do trzew! (187)	Dobiorę ci się jeszcze do bebechów! (64)
10.	His was impenetrable darkness (111)	Ten człowiek tkwił w nieprzeniknionym mroku (188)	Ten człowiek tkwił w nieprzeniknionej ciemności (64)
11.	like the beating of a heart – the heart of conquering darkness (116)	jak bicie serca – serca zwycięskiej ciemności (196)	jak bicie serca – serca zwycięskiej ciemności (68)
12.	An unearthly glow in the darkness (119)	nieziemską jasnością wśród mroku (200)	jasnością wśród ciemności (70)
13.	seemed to lead into the heart of an immense darkness (121)	zdając się prowadzić wgłąb niezmierzonej ciemności (203)	zdając się prowadzić do jądra niezmierzonej ciemności (72)

The first thing to notice is the inconsistency of treatment of *darkness* in T1. Depending on the collocation either *mrok* or *ciemność* are used. Both are obviously correct as the equivalents of *darkness*, yet it is difficult to establish any pattern of using one word or the other. It cannot be stated that when *dark(ness)* is used literally then it is translated as *mrok*, and when metaphorically then it becomes *ciemność*. It also cannot be suggested that when it collocates with *heart* then it is translated as *ciemność*. It seems that the decision which word to choose is purely arbitrary. T2, however, treats the key expression much more consistently and employs one expression throughout the course of the text, one which is present both in the title and in the final sentence of the story. With this unchanging attitude T2 achieves more easily the level of oppressiveness present in the original. The change between T1 and T2 seems to have resulted from a more profound focus on detail at the stage of analysis and noticing the pervasiveness of *darkness*.

Paradoxically, *mrok* seems in certain Polish collocations much more powerful than *ciemność* when it comes to creating oppressive atmosphere because of its indeterminacy. It does not only refer to the lack of light but evokes fear, like in *mroczny las*, whereas *ciemność* in its primary meaning refers to the first quality mentioned. Perhaps the decision to use this expression and its derivatives in T1 was governed by this additional interpretative possibility, as well as the tendency to avoid repetitions. Yet it is quite obvious that Conrad repeats *dark(ness)* consciously. A number of its synonymous expressions in English is vast indeed, and he occasionally employs *gloom*, especially at the beginning of the story when describing the Thames and its surroundings. Yet his persistency in choosing *darkness* becomes the semantic dominant creating a network of interrelated meanings. Describing the two women in the headquarters of the company in Brussels as "guarding the door of *Darkness*" (HD 37) suggests that once you walk inside you are inevitably to descend down to the very centre of darkness – its heart. As several critics already observed, the expression itself and the situation obviously provokes associations with the traditional descent into hell, such as in Virgil's *Aeneid* or Dante's *Inferno* (cf. Watt 1988: 324)⁴. It is at this point in the narrative when the lexical item becomes infused with all the additional, symbolic and intertextual meanings (which is even emphasized by its capitalization) pointing to Marlow's descend into his own/civilization's/Kurtz's, etc., *darkness*. Hence, the initial impulse to dispense with the repetitious use of one word in T1 and typical collocations is abandoned in T2, pointing out that in T2 interpretation takes precedence over *uzus*.

The situation with *heart* is even more complex. T1 employs various expressions so as to make them collocate naturally with surrounding lexical items. Thus at least six different possibilities are used: *wnętrze (łądu)*, *głębia (ciemności)*, *serce*, *trzewia*, *duża*, *wgłąb*. Interestingly in the provided examples *jądro* of the title does not even appear. With such a wide selection, the eponymous metaphor is not so evident within the textual material and consequently does not focus the reader's attention. T2 attempts a more consistent approach eliminating all synonyms but the two which refer to

⁴ Ian Watt in his influential essay discusses in more detail the symbolism of *Heart of Darkness* and provides many more different interpretations of the scene in the anteroom (see: 1988: 323–325).

the two meanings of the polysemous *heart*: *jądro* as *centre* and *serce*. It also does not resign from *dusza*. It is impossible to achieve in the Polish language the same polysemous effect with *heart* as in English when it is to be rendered as *jądro* (the primary meaning of which is ‘testicle’). If *jądro* were to be used consistently then absurd collocations might appear when the word *heart* clearly refers to its primary meaning, especially in example 8. Thus, with some exceptions, the extended meaning of *heart* as centre is consistently rendered as *jądro* providing the Polish version with the frame of the title-ending of the story. This allows for seeing in the revised version a careful patterning of wording and certain repetitions of images leading to a more in-depth interpretation of them.

Paradoxically, the Polish word *serce* is as polysemous as the English one, among many of its meanings is also *centre*, *inside*, with such common collocations as *serce kraju/puszczy* (Słownik PWN 1989: 200). Thus the employment of this word in the translation might solve all potential problems with different layers of meaning of expressions in which the word *heart* appears. If one looks at the provided table in almost all examples *serce* might be used with a good result. The only problematic instance, and of course the most important one, would be *heart of darkness* in its nominative case in Polish: *serce ciemności*. It seems that although *serce* means the centre of something, it generally points to the nucleus of something concrete, something tangible, as in the provided collocations. When it refers to the centre, it requires collocation with some physical object (either human or non-human, but still a physical phenomenon), whereas *darkness* implies shapelessness. Obviously the original expression is an oxymoron, and so the translated version should share this quality, yet the oxymoron *serce ciemności* does not work (as a layman might say). The decision to use *jądro* involved providing different equivalents for the key *heart* depending on the collocation. However, as can be easily noticed in T1 she exercised more freedom in the selection of synonyms, whereas T2 is more controlled as if the translator worked to a greater extent under the constraint of the original text rather than the target language norms of naturalness.

It also is inevitable to ponder on example 9. One keeps wondering why T2 in which whenever possible *heart* is rendered as *jądro* or *serce* does not persist in this case, although it does change the original rendering of T1. The first option is obviously out of the question, yet potentially it seems possible to translate this exclamation by employing the word *serce*. Claiming that the editors overlooked this particular case is not justifiable, given the scope of corrections. Perhaps it is a matter of interpretation where "Wyrwę ci jeszcze *serce*!" is felt to mean *kill*, whereas "Wyrwę ci jeszcze *bebechy*!" or the T2 version refers to *plunder*. Kurtz when rendering the words clearly refers to what can be obtained from the wilderness, thus implicitly invoking the idea of raiding the jungle in search of ivory. Yet, if *heart* of the wilderness may be symbolically treated not only as its centre but also as its most valuable part – it may also refer to ivory. Consequently, "Wyrwę ci jeszcze *serce*!" might provide for the interpretation of the exclamation as referring to getting as much ivory as possible out of the dark land. It is interesting that the idiomatic expression (*to wring one's heart*) meaning "to make you feel sad or very sorry for them" (Cobuild Dictionary 1990: 1693) is treated by

Conrad on the one hand literally as extracting something from somewhere, and on the other hand metaphorically as referring to extracting from the jungle something most valuable. But he dismisses the idiom as such, whereas in the translation the Polish equivalent of this idiom might be actually used: "Chwycić za serce" (Słownik PWN Oxford 2004: 1374), again in its literal rather than idiomatic meaning.

The next change to be noticed between T1 and T2 is the rendering of the words which provide the clue to understanding the impact of Kurtz's insight before his death. These are the most powerful words in the entire work, whispered initially by Kurtz and then echoing in Marlow's mind: "The horror! The horror!" (HD 111, 117, 121). They are ambiguous and may be variously interpreted. Marlow comments: "I understand better the meaning of his stare, that could not see the flame of the candle but was wide enough to embrace the whole universe, piercing enough to penetrate all the hearts that beat in the darkness. He had summed up – he had judged. "The horror!" (HD 112-3). This commentary seems to have governed the choice of the lexical item to render the original *Horror!* in T1: "Ohyda! Ohyda!" (189). This indicates disgust at what Kurtz has seen, revulsion of the dark side. Even Marlow admits: "it [expression] had a vibrating note of revolt in its whisper" (HD 113). This might justify the T1 version. Yet T2 provides the reader with a completely different utterance provoking a new interpretation: "Zgroza! Zgroza!" (65). This indicates fear, dread as the outcome of the comprehension. Such an interpretation is justified on the basis of Marlow's further words: "It [the cry] was an affirmation, a moral victory, paid for by innumerable defeats, by abominable terrors, by abominable satisfaction. But it was a victory!" (HD 113). *Zgroza* reflects much more powerfully the feelings of somebody who had a glimpse of his entire life shortly before his death and understood the meaning of this insight. *Zgroza* may sound victorious as implying the dying person's admittance of his "devilishness" and fear of its outcome. *Ohyda* does not provoke such associations. It suggests disgust with oneself, one's life, life in general, but lacks the fear factor so strongly pronounced in the original.

Thus the revised translation introduces changes at the lexical level, but as in any literary work, the lexical level is nothing apart from the semantic one, and so even seemingly insignificant changes in the choice of vocabulary may influence the interpretation of the work.

The criticism/revision stage with respect to the treatment of key words clearly indicates the need for hermeneutic interpretation of the text and returns the translator to the initial phase of analysis focusing not on the linguistic material but on the meanings of particular lexical items with regard to the entire work, their interrelationships and patterns which they create.

Similarly, structural repetitions used by Conrad, that is repetitions of syntactical structures and vocabulary items, or, in a wider contexts, scenes or characters, are an extremely important feature of the discussed work. They point to different phenomena⁵.

⁵ A more detailed discussion of this characteristic feature of the novella with respect to the syntactical and lexical repetitions may be found in *Rhythmical Structure of Narration of "Heart of Darkness" and "Apocalypse Now"* (Kujawska 2002).

Generally this feature of the text is treated consistently in both T1 and T2. However, in cases when a particular word is repeated over the course of one paragraph several times and, in addition, it is polysemous, T1 tends not to overuse one word and instead takes advantage of both meanings of the original expression, whereas T2, although also trying not to overburden the text with one lexical item, persists in referring to one meaning. The following table illustrates the case in question. It represents fragments of two paragraphs which follow one another, but are divided into three sections so as to allow a detailed analysis:

Nr	Original	Translation 1	Translation 2
1.	I did not see – you understand...I did not see the man in the name...Do you see him? Do you see the story? Do you see anything? (57)	Nie umiałem sobie wystawić człowieka noszącego to nazwisko, tak jak i wy go sobie wystawić nie możecie. Czy widzicie go? Czy rozumiecie tę całą historię? Czy rozumiecie z tego cokolwiek? (109)	Nie umiałem sobie wystawić człowieka noszącego to nazwisko, tak jak i wy go sobie wystawić nie możecie. Czy widzicie go? Czy widzicie tę całą historię? Czy widzicie cośkolwiek? (109)
2.	Of course in this you fellows see more than I could then, you see me, whom you know...(58)	Wy, koledzy, możecie oczywiście z tego więcej rozumieć , niż ja podówczas. Wy rozumiecie mnie, którego znacie (110)	Wy, koledzy, możecie oczywiście z tego zobaczyć więcej niż ja wtedy. Wy widzicie mnie, którego znacie (27)
3.	It had become so pitch dark that we listeners could hardly see one another. (58)	Nastąpiła ciemność tak gęsta, że my, słuchacze, z trudem mogliśmy się widzieć . (110)	Nastąpiła ciemność tak gęsta, że my, słuchacze, z trudem mogliśmy się widzieć . (27)

Marlow who narrates the story at this point uses the polysemous *see* which refers to the actual physical act of recognizing something with one's eyes, to imagining some phenomenon, or to understanding it. The repetition in the original is so oppressive that it immediately catches the reader's attention, especially because not only the word itself is repeated but also syntactical structures in which it is used. Conrad skillfully operates on the different levels of meaning of *see*. In example 1 Marlow clearly implies that he could not *imagine* Kurtz as a man and asks his companions upon the *Nellie's* deck whether they can *imagine* Kurtz, *understand* Marlow's story or *understand* Kurtz's story. In extract 2 the meaning of *see* is still closer to *understand* rather than to the actual physical process of seeing. Yet what follows immediately in example 3 refers explicitly to the physical surroundings and the activity of seeing with one's eyes. Because it was so dark, on the boat's deck nothing could be seen and Marlow changes into a voice for his listeners just like Kurtz was for him. Hence not only lexical, syntactic but also semantic repetition is established.

One might argue that Conrad plays with words, and to a certain extent it is true, yet his reasons for the "game" is not to make the reader laugh (which is the typical function of word games) but to introduce a sharp contrast between Marlow's expectations and the reality. The agitated Marlow, involved deeply in his story (which is indicated by his direct and repeated questions) is not only unnoticeable by his audi-

ence because it is dark but also, and more importantly, not understood (as only the main narrator is listening to him, the others most probably being asleep: "There was not a word from anybody. The others might have been asleep, but I was awake" *HD* 58). This is a very powerful excerpt in the novella indicating lack of interest in Marlow's story. Its power is achieved at the graphical level by the oppressiveness of the word *see* which catches the reader's attention and focuses it on the overlapping of its meanings.

This effect is achieved fully neither in T1 nor in T2, but the latter attempts a more consistent treatment of the key word, limiting the number of its synonyms, which nevertheless does not restrict the interpretative scope, as in example 2 the reader obviously notices that the meaning of the verb *widzieć* is extended to *wyobrazić sobie*. Yet it does not fully accommodate *comprehension* so crucial for Marlow. Still T2 version is less explicit and invites the reader to the intellectual game of interpreting the meaning of the passage, whereas T1 by introducing the verb *rozumieć* checks the reader's involvement in the process of decoding the fragment. It also destroys the link between paragraphs 2 and 3, thus ruling out the meticulous patterning of the original. Consequently, the changes introduced in T2 in comparison with T1 are again subordinated to the stage of analysis rather than post-synthesis with the view of deleting source language interferences or introducing intralingual syntactic shifts to make the text more natural. The reduction of the number of synonyms leading to creating a link between passage 2 and 3 points to the fact that the revision stage is closely related with noticing the careful patterning of lexical items in a literary work, which gains semantic significance and trying to create a text which would, at least to a certain extent, provide the reader with a similar patterning in order to achieve the same meaning.

Obviously the revision stage involves also introducing syntactical changes where necessary as for instance in the following example, which is just one of many:

1.	He carried his fat paunch with ostentation on his short legs (HD 62)	Obnosił ostentacyjnie swój tłusty brzuch na krótkich nogach (T1 111)	Obnosił ostentacyjnie na krótkich nogach swój tłusty brzuch (T2 30)
----	---	---	---

In T1 it is the belly which "possesses" short legs, so the shift in the word order was necessary in order to avoid the humorous effect which was not intended in the original.

Interestingly with respect to changes of vocabulary between T1 and T2, the choice of a lexical item may influence the way the character is "created" through words, for instance:

No	Original	Translation 1	Translation 2
1.	With gleams of varnished sprits (27)	blyskając pokostowanemi rejkami (65)	blyskając pokostowanymi rozprzami (5)
2.	Stood in the bows (27)	stał na baku (65)	stał na dziobie (5)
3.	the forepart of the steamboat (63)	obok przodu statku (117)	u dziobu statku (31)
4.	the water-gauge (70)	szkło wodowskazowe (127)	wodowskaz (35)
5.	a decked scow (79)	wielkiej łodzi z pokładem (140)	krypy z pokładem (42)

In T2 the narrators ("main" narrator in 1 and 2 and Marlow in 3, 4, 5) are much more knowledgeable of nautical profession due to specific nautical terminology used by them, than in T1 where more layman vocabulary is introduced. Thus they seem more credible, especially Marlow who "was the only man of us who still 'followed the sea'" (*HD* 29) and who consequently should be familiar with most technical terms as he indeed is in the original.

The scope of this analysis does not allow for the discussion of more examples thus the main emphasis has been put on the treatment of key words with the idea to highlight the link between the stage of revision and analysis (in this case hermeneutical analysis). The connection between the stage of revision and synthesis is rather obvious as revision is performed in order to make the final product comply with target language norms. Yet the modifications introduced at the revision stage resulting from a more detailed analysis of the original textual material, which lead to semantic changes, are more interesting as they immediately rise the question concerning the status of the revised text. Is the revised text still the same translation or should it be treated as a new translation in the translation series of a particular work?⁶ As Balcerzan emphasizes, potentially there exists an indefinite number of translations of a given literary work, with the first translation being the beginning of the series (whether realized or only potential) (1998: 18). Yet it is generally accepted that a series develops in time, which implies that a new translation in a series is the one which follows the previous one and there is a time distance between them. What to do, then, with a revised version of a published translation? If we treat the publication as the end of the translation process, which in Frawley's terminology would equal creating the code of translation, then it seems that a revised version, which follows in time the first version, may be treated as a new translation since it modifies the "original" code of translation.

It seems, however, that in determining the status of the revised version the key point is the degree to which the code of translation is modified as a result of introduced changes. If the changes involve "technicalities", such as punctuation, spelling or syntax then treating the text as a new realization of the series does not seem justified. Yet if the changes open the text into new interpretations then it may be granted a status

⁶ On the issue of the translation series see: Edward Balcerzan *Poetyka przekładu artystycznego* and *Jeszcze w sprawie serii translatorskiej* (1998).

of a new translation. In the first case, the translation process seems indeed to extend ad infinitum as the text may be constantly corrected. In the second case, the translation process finishes with the emergence of the text understood as the creation of the new code, whereas the revised version which radically changes this new code should be rather seen as a new translation.

Bibliography

- Balcerzan E., *Literatura z literatury (strategie tłumaczy)*, Katowice 1998, Śląsk.
- Bassnett-McGuire S., *Translation Studies*, London 1980, Methuen in: Pisarska, A. (ed.) *Readings in Translation Studies*, Poznań 1985, UAM, pp. 24–31.
- Conrad J., *Młodość. Jądro ciemności*, transl. by Aniela Zagórska in: *Pisma zbiorowe Josepha Conrada*, Vol. VI, Warszawa 1930, Dom Książki Polskiej.
- Conrad J., *Heart of Darkness*, Harmondsworth 1985, Penguin Books.
- Conrad J., *Heart of Darkness*, ed. by Robert Kimbrough, New York London 1963/1988, W W Norton & Company.
- Conrad J., *Jądro ciemności*, transl. by Barbara Koc, Warszawa 2000, Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza.
- Conrad J., *Jądro ciemności*, transl. by Aniela Zagórska, ed. by Anna Popławska, Kraków 2004, Wydawnictwo GREG.
- Conrad J., *Jądro ciemności*, transl. by Jędrzej Polak, Poznań 1994, SAWW.
- Conrad J., *Jądro ciemności*, transl. by Ireneusz Socha, Kraków 2004, Zielona Sowa.
- Dąbska-Prokop U., (ed.) *Mała encyklopedia przekładoznawstwa*, Częstochowa 2000, Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Języków Obcych i Ekonomii EDUCATOR.
- Frawley W., *Prolegomenon to a Theory of Translation*, (1984) in: Venuti, L. (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London and New York 2000/2003, Routledge, pp. 250–263.
- Korzeniowska A., Kuhiwczak P., *Successful Polish-English Translation. Tricks of the Trade*, Warszawa 1994, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Kujawska E., *The Rhythmical Structure of Narration of "Heart of Darkness" and "Apocalypse Now"* in: Wicher, A. (ed.) *English Philology* Nr 4, Łódź 2002, Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Humanistyczno-Ekonomicznej w Łodzi, pp. 87–98.
- Linde-Usiekniewicz J., (ed.), *Wielki słownik angielsko-polski, English-Polish Dictionary*, Warszawa 2004, PWN.
- Lipiński K., *Vademecum tłumacza*, Kraków 2000, Wydawnictwo Idea.
- Ojcewicz G., *Podstawy translatoryki*, Gdańsk 1991, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.
- Sinclair J., (ed.) *Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary*, London and Glasgow 1990, Collins.
- Szymczak M., (ed.) *Słownik języka polskiego*, vol. III, Warszawa 1989, PWN.
- Watt I., *Impressionism and Symbolism in "Heart of Darkness"* in: Conrad, J. *Heart of Darkness*, ed. by Robert Kimbrough, New York London 1963/1988, W W Norton & Company, pp. 311–335.
- <http://www.culture.pl/en/culture/artykuly/wy_in_nagrody_pen_clubu_2002>, on May 14, 2006.

Summary

The article aims at providing a provisional answer to the question concerning the finality of the translation process. The main point of interest is the status of the revised version of a published translation, that is whether the revision is to be treated as a new realization of a particular literary work (and consequently enriching the translation series of this particular work) or not. In the introductory part, the article examines shortly the models of the process of translation focusing on including the stage of revision into it. The analytical part discusses examples of changes introduced in the revised version of Aniela Zagórska's translation of Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* in comparison with the first published version. The analysis refrains from pointing out corrected mistakes or updating lexical items, syntax and spelling. It focuses on the changes in the treatment of key expressions (*heart* and *darkness, the horror*) as well as some examples of structural repetitions and changes of lexical items connected with nautical terminology. On the basis of the investigation one may conclude that the introduced changes do not involve merely intralingual shifts in order to make the revised target version more natural. Rather they involve alterations which stem from a meticulous hermeneutic analysis of the original work and noticing a careful patterning of the lexical items and structures so that this patterning may be reflected in the translation and provide for new interpretative possibilities. Consequently, in William Frawley's terminology, the translation code in the revised version is modified to such an extent in comparison with the code of the first translation that one may venture the hypothesis that the result is a new realization of this particular literary work.