



**Citation:**

Stelmach, W. (2023). Polish translations of “The life of Adam and Eve” as a research problem: An analysis of translation strategies. *Slavia Meridionalis*, 23, Article 2912. <https://doi.org/10.11649/sm.2912>

## **Wojciech Stelmach**

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4841-140X>

# **Polish Translations of “The Life of Adam and Eve” as a Research Problem: An Analysis of Translation Strategies**

## **1. Introduction**

In an article of 1996 titled “The difficult art of translation”, Aleksander Naumow draws attention to the problems faced by translators of literature. He writes, among other things, of the conflict arising from the clash of two language systems. Naumow believes that this conflict becomes deeper where the translation of ancient texts is concerned, because the translator then comes up against the problem of the work’s dual existence: in the old version and in the contemporary translation (Naumow, 1996). A way to overcome the barrier resulting from the collision of two planes of expression, according to Agata Kawecka, Ivan N. Petrov, and Małgorzata Skowronek, is “to apply an appro-

This work was supported by the Polish Ministry of Education and Science.

Competing interests: no competing interests have been declared.

Publisher: Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.en>), which permits redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, provided that the article is properly cited. © The Author(s) 2023.

appropriate convention or strategy of translation, preceded by thorough study of the history of the already-existing translations from (Old) Church Slavonic into modern languages” (Kawecka et al., 2009, p. 252). Those authors accurately note that “it appears [...] that in the case of this type of texts [translated from Old Church Slavonic into modern languages – W.S.] it is not possible to identify one single correct method of translation” (Kawecka et al., 2009, p. 252).<sup>1</sup>

This conclusion of the Łódź-based Paleo-Slavicists inspired research into the translation strategies adopted by two Polish translators of (among others) Old Bulgarian literature: Teresa Dąbek-Wirgowa and Agata Kawecka. The analysis is based on two independent translations of “The Life of Adam and Eve”, which appear in anthologies of Old Bulgarian texts – *Seven Heavens and Earth. An Anthology of Bulgarian Prose* (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983), and *Apocrypha and Old Testament Legends of the Southern Slavs* (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006).

The aim of this paper is to identify the most significant types of translation transformations which the translators used, and which are predominant in their works. An interpretation of these operations will then be made, taking account of the probable reasons for and purpose of such modifications. At the same time, the translation strategies and semantic dominants present in the translated texts will be identified by name.

It is not possible to compare the two authors’ translation strategies directly, because their works do not fit the definition of a translation series (a term used by Balcerzan, 1998), as they are based on different source versions. The source for the translation by Teresa Dąbek-Wirgowa, published in the anthology *Seven Heavens and Earth* was a modern Bulgarian translation by Kuyo Kuev, published in *Chrestomathy of Old Bulgarian Literature* edited by Kuev, Petar Dinekov and Donka Petkanova (Диников et al., 1978). In turn, Agata Kawecka worked with fragments of two manuscripts: a codex from the Library of the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church (in the collection Grujić 100), and the so-called Panagyurian Codex (from the collections of the National Library in Sofia, num-

---

<sup>1</sup> Because of space limitations, issues of methodology have merely been sketched in the main body of this paper. The cited article by the Paleo-Slavicists from Łódź is the first in a series of five published texts, the others being: Kawecka et al. (2010a, 2010b, 2011a, 2011b, 2012). Reference should also be made to other works by Aleksander Naumow (1984, 1985, 1996), a work by Izabela Lis-Wielgosz (2019) on the translation of Old Bulgarian and Old Serbian literature into Polish, and the subsequent *Annotated Bibliography of Polish Translations of Orthodox Slavic Literature* (Skowronek et al., 2021).

ber 433).<sup>2</sup> To describe the strategies used by the two translators, it is necessary to examine the way in which they worked with the source texts.

Edward Balcerzan, in his chapter “Poetics of artistic translation”, referring to the work of Viktor Koptilov, identifies and characterises the following types of translation transformations: reduction,<sup>3</sup> inversion,<sup>4</sup> substitution,<sup>5</sup> and amplification<sup>6</sup> (Balcerzan, 1998, p. 27). The Poznań-based researcher notes that these changes “concern both the text (more precisely: segments of the text) and the work (more precisely: the structural arrangements in the work)” (Balcerzan, 1998, p. 27). These transformations are characteristics of artistic translation, of which the two Polish authors’ translations of “The Life of Adam and Eve” can be considered examples.

## 2. “The Life of Adam and Eve” in Teresa Dąbek-Wirgowa’s translation

Notable in the work by Dąbek-Wirgowa is the effort made to preserve the stylistic features of the original text, while at the same time modernising its formal layer. This is a consequence of the choice of source text – a translation from Old Bulgarian into Modern Bulgarian.<sup>7</sup> Kuev’s translation preserves the “structural arrangement” present in the Old Bulgarian source, even though, in contrast to the transliteration by Yordan Ivanov (Иванов, 1970),<sup>8</sup> it uses modern rules of punctuation. The imitation of the style of the original

---

<sup>2</sup> For assistance in gaining access to photocopies of these manuscripts, I am grateful to employees of the Serbian National Library and the SS. Cyril and Methodius National Library in Sofia, and to Mr Krum Krumov.

<sup>3</sup> Shortening of a segment by omitting certain elements, or omission of certain features of a stylistic system (after: Balcerzan, 1998, p. 27).

<sup>4</sup> Change in the order of words, word groups, or higher-level components (after: Balcerzan, 1998, p. 27).

<sup>5</sup> Replacement of elements (after: Balcerzan, 1998, p. 27).

<sup>6</sup> Inclusion of new elements in the text, usually having been implicit or concealed by ellipsis in the original (after: Balcerzan, 1998, p. 27).

<sup>7</sup> Two observations should be made in this regard: 1) Kuev’s is an intralingual translation, and could serve as an independent object of research in translation studies; 2) Dąbek-Wirgowa’s is a mediated translation. For more on indirect (mediated) translations in the history of the relations of Polish culture with foreign cultures, see e.g. Kłos (2018). On mediated translations in general, see e.g. Lu (2021).

<sup>8</sup> This is a reprint of an edition from 1925.

in Dąbek-Wirgowa’s translation is clearly visible in the way in which she presents the chronology of the successive events described in the text, for example, in the first paragraph of “The Life of Adam and Eve”:

Киев: Преди да съгреси, Адам живееше в райа и имаше всичко, каквото поискаше, и всичко изпълняваше неговата воля – зверовете, животните и крилатите птици. По Адамово нареждане те ходеха, хранеха се и летяха. Без неговата заповед не смееха нито да ходят, нито да лежат, нито нещо да ядат; също така и Ева. (Динеков et al., 1978, p. 150)

Dąbek-Wirgowa: Zanim zgrzeszył, Adam przebywał w rajcu, mając wszystko, czego zapra-  
gnął, i wszelakie stworzenie wypełniało jego wolę – dzikie bestie, zwierzęta i skrzydlate  
ptactwo na rozkaz Adamowy chodziły, jadły i fruwały, a przeciw jego woli nie śmiały się  
ruszyć, położyć ani pożywić, podobnie jako i na rozkaz Ewy. (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 43)

Similarly, in later parts of the text (the bolded verbs here are respectively a past active participle and two past tense forms):

Киев: **И взе** Адам жена си Ева, **излезе и седна** пред райските врата. (Динеков et al., 1978, p. 150)

Dąbek-Wirgowa: **I wziąwszy** żonę swoją Ewę, **wyszedł i siadł** u rajskiej bramy. (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 43)

The structuring of the content in the Bulgarian text is undoubtedly preserved from the source which the first translator used. Ancient works are characterised by a linear expression of the temporal relations of the described events, with successive clauses added in series. This has been described with reference to Old Polish material by, among others, Zdzisława Krążyńska, Tomasz Mika and Agnieszka Słoboda (Krążyńska et al., 2015), and Aleksandra Deskur (2016). The latter author, summing up the characteristics of the phenomenon in the context of the Old Polish New Testament apocrypha, writes:

Preservation of the chronology of events can be observed on two levels:

- on the syntactic level: the order of clauses in a sentence or several separate sentences reflects the extralinguistic sequence of events; in sentences with preserved chronology, compound or complex sentences dominate;
- on the textual level: sentences with preserved chronology dominate in parts of the text devoted to narratives about events, but appear to a lesser degree in parts containing commentary and interpretation. (Deskur, 2016, p. 10)

In the Polish translation of “The Life of Adam and Eve”, it is seen that the chronology of the text is preserved with the use of different means than in the source. In place of compound sentences in which the order of the inde-

pendent clauses expresses the sequence of events, sentences with main and dependent clauses are used. The Polish translator *de facto* preserves the order of the events described in the source, but employs substitution, replacing one form of the predicate with another (a past tense verb is replaced with uninflected participles, such as the present participle *mając* “having”, or the past active participle *wziąwszy* “having taken”). By these means, the translator expresses temporal relations of events – respectively simultaneity or sequentiality.

The translator preserves stylistic features of the source text (as was shown in the analysis of her work at the syntactic level), but, despite that, somehow makes it more modern, and adapts it to the needs and capabilities of a normal reader from her own times (one who does not have everyday contact with Old Bulgarian literature). The need for a different structuring of the narrative from that found in the source may be explained by the changes that have taken place in people’s way of conceptualising reality. This is described by Deskur thus:

The presence of the phenomenon under discussion [the reflection in text of extralinguistic reality – W.S] on both syntactic and textual levels reinforces the thesis of a particularly archaic origin – rooted in the oral tradition – of the preservation of the chronology of events from extralinguistic reality in the syntactic structure. By the same token, the process of dissociation of sentences from the extralinguistic chronology should be seen as one of the processes that were strongly stimulated by the literarisation of the Polish language. (Deskur, 2016, p. 11)

The target reader of Dąbek-Wirgowa’s translation thinks differently from the recipient of the Old Bulgarian text. This is because the process of perception is dependent on the organ of sight – the reader can return at virtually any moment to an earlier part of the text (even at sentence level) and perform a structuring of events in their mind. This is reflected, for example, in the translator’s use of amplification with content-introducing elements like *wtedy* (“then”), *a wtedy* (“and then”), *znowu* (“(then) again”), *a gdy* (“and when”), which serve to emphasise the sequence of events:

Киев: И взе Адам жена си Ева, излезе и седна пред райските врата. Адам видя как трябваше да роди Каин и брата му Авел, как Каин уби Авел и се наскърби много. (Динеков et al., 1978, p. 150)

Dąbek-Wirgowa: I wzięwszy żonę swoją Ewę, wyszedł i siadł u rajskiej bramy. **A wtedy** poznał, że zrodzi syna Kaina i jego brata Abla, którego Kain zabije, i wielce się zasmucił. (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 43)

Киев: Отидоха и намериха Авел, безмилостно убит от ръката на Каин. (Динеков et al., 1978, p. 150)

Dąbek-Wirgowa: **A gdy** poszli, znaleźli Abła, zgładzonego bezlitośnie ręką brata.  
(Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 43)

Кув: Адам живя 930 години и заболя. (Динеков et al., 1978, p. 150)

Dąbek-Wirgowa: **A kiedy** przeżył dziewięćset trzydzieści lat, legł złożony niemocą.<sup>9</sup>  
(Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 44)

The two last examples not only contain amplification introduced by Dąbek-Wirgowa, but also exemplify the syntactic changes occurring in the translation as a consequence of that type of modification. Where the source contains independent clauses linked by a conjunction, the translation – as a result of the use of conjunctions of the *when* type – contains sentences with dependent clauses.

Besides amplification, another means of modernisation used in translation is substitution, namely the replacement of one expression with another. This is

---

<sup>9</sup> With regard to the cited examples beginning *a gdy* or *a kiedy*, one might consider whether Dąbek-Wirgowa is attempting to lend the apocryphal text a biblical style. The answer to this question is not clear. Certainly, such a scheme of sentence construction is characteristic of the Polish biblical style (see e.g. Koziara, 2009, p. 26), and Dąbek-Wirgowa's use of amplification with conjunctions indicating the order of events makes the text more similar to old (and even ancient) prose works that reproduce the extralinguistic order of events, including the Bible. Scholars generally believe that the writers of the apocrypha imitated or attempted to reproduce a biblical style. Such an interpretation of the language of non-canonical texts is based on a treatment of the Bible as a textual indicator of certain stylistic features that were first (or exclusively) represented there, or as continuing to represent that style. It should be remembered that the history of the apocrypha is just as long as that of the Bible itself; that in the beginnings of Christianity many different works were written about Jesus Christ, the Virgin Mary and the Apostles, and the canon of biblical scriptures was first established in the fourth century. The definition of a list of holy books by the conciliar fathers was a necessary condition for the emergence of the notion of apocrypha in Christianity (for more on this see Starowiejski, 2015). It is significant that both before and after the establishment of the canon, all of these texts not only imitated (usually deliberately) the biblical style, but also developed it – in Greek and the Semitic languages, then in Latin, Georgian and Armenian, and finally in the Slavic languages, naturally including Old Church Slavonic (it is sufficient to trace the path taken by translations of the story of Adam and Eve; see e.g. Sokolski, 2014). Because in the early days of the Church and the process of recording holy books it was permissible to use various texts (for example, the now apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus and Protoevangelium of James), the biblical style was quite widespread – after all, one of the criteria was adherence to the principle of *decorum* in the linguistic layer of religious texts. The discretionary definition of the canon during the Councils, followed by schisms within the universal Church, led to different treatments of the apocrypha among medieval systems of literature. In the Church Slavonic culture, texts from outside the canon found a place in the liturgy, rites and worship, which in a way re-sanctioned their existence in the body of religious literature. In Polish scholarship, this process has been described by Aleksander Naumow (1976).

used mainly for stylistic reasons. An example is seen in a passage summarising the biblical scene of Abel's murder by Cain:

Dąbek-Wirgowa: A gdy poszli, znaleźli Abła, zgłodzonego bezlitośnie **ręką brata**. I rzekł Pan do Archanioła Michała: Powiedz Adamowi, żeby nie gromił syna swego Kaina **za zabójstwo** ani się nie trapił, lecz ukrył smutek w sercu swoim. (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 43)

Киев: Отидоха и намериха Авел, безмилостно убит от **ръката на Каин**. И рече господ на архангел Михаил: Кажи на Адам да не упреква своя син Каин **за това престъпление** и да не скърби, но да го скрие в сърцето си. (Динеков et al., 1978, p. 150)

In the above example, the translator twice replaces one sentence element with another. The first substitution occurs within the object of a sentence: the name of Cain is replaced with the word *brat* ("brother"), expressing the relationship between the two characters. In this way Dąbek-Wirgowa underlines the dramatic nature of the situation and the seriousness of the crime of fratricide. Further, the euphemistic though powerful expression *за това престъпление* ("for that crime") is translated as *za zabójstwo* ("for the murder"), whereby the translator explicitly names the act perpetrated by Cain.<sup>10</sup> She thus gives cohesion to the message of the whole text, which contains explicit reference to murder ("And then he learned that he would beget a son Cain and his brother Abel, whom Cain would kill, and he became greatly sad"; "Fourteen years passed, and then Cain killed his brother, as is said"; "And when they went, they found Abel, slain mercilessly by the hand of his brother" – Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 43).

Substitution also serves to avoid repetitions and preserve the stylistic uniformity of the Polish text. An example is the translation of the Bulgarian verb *пека* as either *rzec* ("say") or *spytać* ("ask"), or sometimes *odeprzeć* ("reply"). In the whole of the Polish text, one may observe the translator's consistency in selecting equivalents depending on the context. When matters relating to the characters are interrupted by lengthy narrative description, Dąbek-Wirgowa uses the verb *rzec*, for example: "I **rzekła** Ewa do Adama: [...]" (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, pp. 43–44), "A Set **rzekł**: [...]" (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 44), "**rzekł** Adam do synów: [...]" (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 44). In dialogues she varies the equivalents chosen, making the linguistic description of the situa-

---

<sup>10</sup> The author may have intended in this way to emphasise the emotional overtone of the passage – Cain had killed his own brother, and this was the first such breach of God's law (violence against another person).

tion more dynamic; for example: “I **rzekł**: [...] I zgromadzili się jego synowie i córki, zaś Adamowy syn Set **zapytał**: [...] Nic mnie nie uleczy – **odparł** Adam, na co jego dziatki **spytały**: [...] A Set **rzekł**: [...] Jakże to wniędziesz do rajcu, mój synu? – **spytał** go Adam. Na co Set **odparł**: [...] I **rzekł** Adam: [...] A syn **spytał**: [...]” (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 45).

The translator makes an exception at points where an act of speaking is expressed by two verbs in the same sentence, for example: “[...] **przywołał** ją do siebie, **mówiąc**: [...]” (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 43), “I **zwołała** Ewa swe dzieci i wnuki, **mówiąc**: [...]” (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 45), “I **przyzywała** swego syna Seta, **mówiąc**: [...]” (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 48). The second verb form used in all of these examples is the present participle *mówiąc* (“saying”), while the first is a verb meaning “call” or “summon” in the past tense. In the corresponding places in the source we find two verbs of speaking connected by a conjunction; respectively: “Адам повика жена си Ева и ѝ рече: [...]”, “Повика чедата и внуците си и Ева им рече: [...]”, “Тя повика своя син Сит и му рече: [...]” (Динеков et al., 1978, pp. 150, 151, 154).

Pleonastic syntactic structures built from a present participle and a speech verb are referred to in historical linguistic studies as *verba dicendi*. They are regarded as one of the types of traditional syntactic “biblisms” (Koziara, 2009). Such constructions are often found in Old Polish apocryphal texts, being syntactic borrowings of Semitic origin (the transmitter being first the Greek and later the Latin Bible), and their primary function is to introduce direct speech (see e.g. Kierkowicz, 2011; Kleszczowa, 1989; Ziółkowska, 2016).

Because the Old Bulgarian text is based on a Greek source (cf. Adamczyk, 2005; Miltenowa, 2012), the presence there of similar constructions should not come as a surprise. Dąbek-Wirgowa deals with the translation of these syntactic constructions with good effect. The fact that they are present both in the Old Bulgarian text (being preserved in the modern Bulgarian translation) and in the Old Polish translation is certainly a factor that works in the translator’s favour. The language, in spite of the changes taking place within it, accumulates older elements and mixes them with newer elements, and although the described method of introducing direct speech is not common in contemporary vernacular languages, its use by translators does not cause problems to readers of the text. It should be noted that both Kuev and Dąbek-Wirgowa use syntactic schemes in which the superordinate element (in a syntactic sense) is a verb denoting calling, summoning, or shouting, while the subordinate element is a present participle denoting an act of speaking.



This means that the pleonastic nature of the construction is masked somewhat, and the text does not feel strange to the reader.

Another type of translation transformation often used by Dąbek-Wirgowa is inversion. On one hand, its use may result from a difference in the word order used for attributive elements in Polish and Bulgarian; for example, *ciało Ewy* ("the body of Eve") for the Bulgarian *Евиното тяло*. On the other hand, the inversion applied by the Polish translator may introduce hierarchisation of the content. This is illustrated by the following passage:

Dąbek-Wirgowa: Nic mnie nie uleczy – odparł Adam, na co jego dziatki spytały: Czyż tak się smuczysz, ojcze, wspominając dobrodziejstwa raję? (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 44)

Киев: Адам отговори: „О, чедо мое, моята болест е неизлечима.“ И децата му рекоха: „Татко, да не би да си спомняш райските блага, та затова така скърбиш?“ (Динеков et al., 1978, p. 150)

In the translation we observe a change in the order of elements of the text: the metatext (quotation) appears first, followed by the words introducing the narrative (the reverse order is found in the source). Inversion is also used in the sentence spoken by the children of Adam. While in the Bulgarian text the source of the emotion (the recollection of paradise) is foregrounded, in the translation the emphasis is on the experience of sadness itself, rather than its source. This changes the emotional overtone of the passage, because Dąbek-Wirgowa appears to be underlining the children's empathy with their father, whereas the author of the Bulgarian apocrypha focuses on conveying the linearity of the events (first the experience of paradisaal comforts, and later the longing for them). Also noteworthy is the "literarisation" of the word order in the Polish translation of this sentence. Dąbek-Wirgowa inserts the vocative between the clauses, while in the Bulgarian it comes at the start – as it would in the spoken language, where it serves to gain the attention of the addressee of the utterance.

A change of meaning caused by inversion may also be observed in the next sentence:

Киев: Стани с моя син Сит и иди срещу рая с плач, [...]. (Динеков et al., 1978, p. 151)

Dąbek-Wirgowa: Idź z moim synem Setem, stańcie naprzeciw bram raję i płaczcie, [...]. (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 44)

By changing the order of the verbs, the translator changes the meaning of the sentence. This is because the order of predicates reproduces the order of events in extralinguistic reality (the chronology of events). In the Polish

translation, Seth and Eve do not get up and go to paradise in tears, but go to the gates of paradise and stand weeping next to them. According to the Bulgarian text, Eve and Seth wept in repentance from the very start of their journey to the gates. From the Polish translation, in turn, one may understand that they did not start weeping until they reached the gates of paradise.

The next example differs from the others in that the translator was consistent in the use of equivalent elements. One may speak in this case of equivalence not so much at word level, but rather at the level of the syntax of a complex sentence. The statement below was made by Adam twice, and was twice translated in exactly the same way. Dąbek-Wirgowa foregrounds that fact that Adam and his children are given over to service (submitted to someone’s authority), with less emphasis on the question of whom they are to serve (the lord of heaven and earth). In this way, she emphasises something significant to the Polish reader: the overtone of the passage relating to the so-called chirograph of Adam, namely the dispute between God and Satan about power over man. In the Bulgarian text, by contrast, the emphasis is placed on the holder of power, because – as has been noted by Y. Ivanov, among others – “The Life of Adam and Eve” contains elements of the dualistic beliefs of the Bogomils (visible in this and other parts of the story).

Киев: Който е господар на земята, негов ще бъда аз и моята челяд. (Диников et al., 1978, p. 153)

Dąbek-Wirgowa: Temu będziemy służyć, ja i czeladź moja, kto jest panem i władcą ziemi. (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 47)

The last of our particularly interesting examples of inversion is contained in the sentence that concludes the entire work:

Киев: Свет, свет, свет, алилуя, свет е господ, изпълнил небето и земята със своята слава. (Диников et al., 1978, p. 154)

Dąbek-Wirgowa: Alleluja, święty, święty Pan nasz, pełne są Jego chwały niebios a i ziemia. (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 49)

Dąbek-Wirgowa applies inversion not only to the acclamation (placing *alleluia* in front of the repetitions of the word *święty*, “holy”) but also to the elements of the verbal group. In the first case, she combines inversion with reduction (shortening the acclamation to two repetitions of *święty*) and amplification (adding the expression *Pan nasz*, “our Lord”). It is interesting that she gives an independent translation of the Bulgarian *славословие*, subjecting it to numerous changes, instead of performing a substitution and quoting the Polish

version of the text of the hymn *Sanctus*, which in terms of content essentially corresponds to the hymn present in the source text.

The last type of transformation which the translator applies to the text is reduction. In most cases, she removes pronouns and particles, which are fairly numerous in the Bulgarian text, and no doubt originate from the Old Bulgarian source. For example, the sentences “Тогава Адам **ми** рече”, “Дай ми сега **своя** запис”, and “А когато Сит дойде, **майка му му** рече” (Диников et al., 1978, pp. 153–154) are translated into Polish as “I odparł Adam”, “Daj mi tedy cyrograf!”, and “A gdy przyszedł, rzekła” (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, pp. 47–48). This does not affect the meaning of these sentences; it only makes the translation less similar to the quasi-biblical texts that imitate the style of the holy scriptures. This may result from a desire to render the work in more modern language, which would be directly linked to its intended purpose: the translation of “The Life of Adam and Eve” is part of an anthology of texts aimed at making the most interesting examples of Old Bulgarian prose literature accessible to a contemporary Polish audience.

The translation is evaluated not only on the basis of the aforementioned transformations applied by the translator. There are also stylistic decisions, serving at least in a subtle way to make the translation more similar to the original. One such technique applied by Dąbek-Wirgowa is archaisation. This is manifested chiefly in the use of apt lexical equivalents that the reader may perceive as old and no longer in use. For example, she translates the Bulgarian много (“greatly”) with the literary word *wielce* (“wielce się zasmucił” – Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 43), and uses the archaic possessive adjective *Adamowy* (“na rozkaz Adamowy” – Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 43) on the pattern of the original “по Адамово нареждане” (Диников et al., 1978, p. 150). Moreover, the Bulgarian “Много ви съжалявам, понеже нищо не разбирате” (Диников et al., 1978, p. 151) becomes “Niezmiernie mi was żal, gdyż nic nie pojmujecie” (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 45). The use here of *pojmujecie* (rather than the now more usual *rozumiecie*, “you understand”) is an example of archaisation on the one hand, but on the other takes account of the extratextual, cultural context. In using words representing a high stylistic register, the translator highlights the devil’s eloquence, which made him able to tempt Eve.<sup>11</sup> Other archaisations include the translation of the imperative *вземи* (“take”) as *weźmij* rather than the now usual *weź* (“weźmij wielki kamień” – Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983,

---

<sup>11</sup> The Latin edition of the apocrypha concerning Adam and Eve contains a sentence stating that Eve was obedient to the serpent’s courteous suggestion (see Stelmach, 2020).

p. 47), and the use of substitution in the sentence “I ujrzawszy cudowne moce, które stały na niebiesiech przed obliczem Pana, zapłakała z wielkiego strachu” (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 48; Bulg.: “Ева видя големи чудеса, които стояха пред бога, и плака от голям страх” – (Диневков et al., 1978, p. 154), where пред бога (“before God”) becomes *na niebiesiech przed obliczem Pana* (“in the heavens [archaic form] before the Lord’s countenance”). A further use of this stylistic technique is the attachment of a flecational ending to a personal pronoun, as in the sentence “Tyś jest mądry [...]” (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 44; Bulg.: “ти си много мъдра” – Диневков et al., 1978, p. 151), where the second person singular ending -ś attaches to the pronoun *ty* (“you”) rather than to the copular verb as would be usual in the modern language.

The strategy adopted by Dąbek-Wirgowa to facilitate communication with the old text, namely a strategy of domestication, is mostly applied consistently, although some decisions concerning the choice of form diverge from the standard rules. This is visible in the graphical arrangement of the text, where the translator does not distinguish the characters’ utterances in any way other than by introducing them with a colon. Moreover, in some cases she does not end quotations with a full stop, but continues them with further clauses that form part of the narrative. The following is an example of this:

Киев: И рече: „Елате, мои чеда, при мене.“ Адам се изплаши много, защото не знаеше каква е болестта му. (Диневков et al., 1978, p. 150)

Dąbek-Wirgowa: I rzekł: Chodźcie do mnie, dziatki moje, gdyż wielce się uląkł, nie wiedząc, jaka zmogła go niemoc. (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983, p. 44)

The translator’s placement of an element of the main text after the quotation without any indication that this is what is being done (the use of a comma as a separator suggests a continuation of the quotation) introduces ambiguity. In the Bulgarian version, the translator (or editor) separated the quotation from the narrative layer by explicit graphical means (quotation marks). The decision not to separate the quotation from the narrative layer, together with the reduction of the speaker’s name in the translation, merely increases the impression that the sentence may be unintelligible. The translator’s efforts to make the text as accessible as possible to the modern reader are thwarted in this case by the form in which the content is presented.

However, such editorial defects are not the most serious oversight. A significant error in the translation is found at the very start – in the final part of the first paragraph.

Киев: Преди да съгреси, Адам живееше в рая и имаше всичко, каквото поискаше, и всичко изпълняваше неговата воля – зверовете, животните и крилатите птици. По Адамово нареждане те ходеха, хранеха се и летяха. Без неговата заповед не смееха нито да ходят, нито да лежат, нито нещо да ядат; също така и Ева. (Динеков et al., 1978, p. 150)

Dąbek-Wirgowa: Zanim zgrzeszył, Adam przebywał w raju, mając wszystko, czego zapragnął, i wszelakie stworzenie wypełniało jego wolę – dzikie bestie, zwierzęta i skrzydlate ptactwo na rozkaz Adamowy chodziły, jadły i fruwały, a przeciw jego woli nie śmiały się ruszyć, położyć ani pożywić, podobnie jako i na rozkaz Ewy. (Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1983b, p. 43)

The source text contains the nominal sentence *също така и Ева* (“and Eve likewise”), indicating that Eve, like the beasts, would do nothing against Adam’s will.<sup>12</sup> The Polish text also has a nominal sentence here (a form corresponding to that of the source), but it expresses an entirely different meaning: *podobnie jako i na rozkaz Ewy* (“and likewise at Eve’s command”). Dąbek-Wirgowa thus changes the sense of the text to imply that Eve and Adam hold equal positions with respect to the animals. The translator to some extent creates a new version of the apocryphal story, in which woman and man are equal to each other as creatures of God formed in an identical act of creation. This leads to inconsistency with further passages of the translation which unambiguously imply Eve’s subordination to Adam (for instance, in the words with which she addresses him: *panie mój*, “my lord”).

A mistake of this kind, although serious, does not change the fact that Dąbek-Wirgowa’s translating skills appear mature, and the translation strategies and transformations that she applies seem fully in accordance with the intended purpose of the translation. The anthology *Seven Heavens and Earth* was highly commended as a translated work by the ZAiKS Society of Authors, which in 1993 awarded Dąbek-Wirgowa a prize in the field of translation of foreign literature (Szwat-Gyłybowa, 1999). The Warsaw researcher’s translation work on this anthology was no doubt a particular challenge for her. As her scholarly output shows, her interests were connected with the literature of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, and of the period of socialist realism. Most prominent among her literary translations are texts originally written by authors contemporary to her. One of the main factors

---

<sup>12</sup> Like the beasts. The purpose was to underline the subjection of woman to man’s authority, in accordance with Genesis 2, this subjection supposedly being a result of the “supplementary” function of the act of creation of woman from man’s rib.

in the decision to prepare an anthology of ancient literature may have been the long-lasting collaboration between the Warsaw school of Slavicists and Dinekov, and in particular the author's own acquaintance with him. While working in Bulgaria as a Polish language teacher, Dąbek-Wirgowa worked at the same institute as Dinekov and Kuev. In 1978, the latter two researchers (together with Petkanova) edited the afore-mentioned collection *Chrestomathy of Old Bulgarian Literature* (Диников et al., 1978), which contained selected works of medieval literature written in Church Slavonic and Old Church Slavonic, arranged by genre and translated into modern Bulgarian. That work's publication may have had a major influence on the Polish translator's decision to undertake the preparation of an anthology under her own editorship. A particular factor may have been the inclusion in the chrestomathy of intralingual translations, serving to make the oldest Slavic works accessible to twentieth-century readers. Dąbek-Wirgowa was one such reader. However, she was distinguished by her high level of competence in literary translation, as well as her knowledge of ancient Bulgarian literature (she was the author of a book published in 1980 titled *The History of Bulgarian Literature. An Outline*; see Dąbek-Wirgowa, 1980). It also seems that the author found herself in a time that was favourable for the history of science and the history of translations, because the 1970s and 1980s were a period that saw the realisation of many projects aimed at familiarising Polish readers with Slavic literatures (including their oldest forms) (cf. Jakubowski, 1972; Jakubowski & Łuźny, 1971; Konstantinowa & Gałązka, 1987; Łuźny, 1988; Naumow, 1984, 1985).

The anthology *Seven Heavens and Earth* was thus part of a trend in Polish-Slavic and Polish-Bulgarian literary life. In turn, Dąbek-Wirgowa's work on the translation of "The Life of Adam and Eve" is characterised by an attention to detail (for example, uniformity in vocative forms) and by a stylistic faithfulness to the original text, despite the introduction of some linguistic modifications that result from differences between the two languages as well as differences in time.<sup>13</sup> It should also be noted that the translation is marked by features of the author's style, such as attempts at lexical archaisation. In this, she is clearly aware to whom the text is addressed – a modern reader might perceive a text with archaised inflection or syntax to be foreign, but would

---

<sup>13</sup> Kuev's translation is close to the Old Bulgarian source in terms of stylistic and grammatical language features.

be accustomed to archaic vocabulary (having read the works of Sienkiewicz, for example). All of the decisions taken by the author make it possible to speak of "Słowo o Adamie i Ewie" as a translation of high quality, at the same time having great scholarly value, since like the other texts, it comes with a critical apparatus in the form of notes explaining the issues that the author considers to be of greatest interest.

### **3. "The Life of Adam and Eve" in Agata Kawecka's translation**

The translation of "The Life of Adam and Eve" in the anthology *Apocrypha and Old Testament Legends of the Southern Slavs* (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006) is one of more than twenty produced by Agata Kawecka. Like all of the apocryphal texts included in that volume, it is a translation based on manuscript sources. Did this have an influence on the final form of the translation? Is there evidence that Kawecka was aware of Dąbek-Wirgowa's earlier Polish translation? These questions may be answered by means of analyses of the methods of translation, including the translation transformations applied and the dominant features present.

The attention of a researcher analysing Kawecka's translation is drawn first to the structuring of the content. The text is divided into paragraphs, and dialogue parts are clearly separated from the narrative layer: they begin on a new line, and the whole of a character's utterance is preceded by a dash. By adopting this formal arrangement, the translator or editor avoids a situation where the reader might misunderstand the text.

Like Dąbek-Wirgowa, Kawecka also modernises the text in her translation. This is necessary, since the source she uses is distant, not only culturally and linguistically, but also temporally. The cultural and temporal discrepancies overlap; the style of medieval literature deviates from the principles applied in modern writing. It is also significant that the old texts were themselves largely translations, adaptations, translated compilations, and their sources were both written and oral. There is also the influence of rhetoric, theology, and biblical style – visible even in texts not closely related to the liturgy and religious rites – as well as the way of thinking about the written word, which was considered sacred in its own right.

The desire to modernise the language of the apocrypha is manifested in the text most of all in examples of substitution. The very first sentence contains a change that presages the kind of choices that the translator will be making:

Слово за Адам и Ева: Běshe <sup>ʸ</sup>ada<sup>m</sup> vъ rai přzh<sup>d</sup>e sъgrěshenia [...]. (MS Grujić 100)<sup>14</sup>

Kawecka: **Zanim** Adam dopuścił się grzechu, przebywał w Raju [...]. (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, p. 31)

Kawecka transforms the first sentence in such a way that it begins like a story (“**Before** Adam sinned, he lived in Paradise...”) – it simultaneously establishes the time of the events and preserves their chronology. As further transformations (including substitutions) will show, the translator’s objective is to prepare a text that will be easy to understand, interesting, and, at the same time, adapted to a contemporary style. Few people read the apocrypha in the original (in manuscripts or in transliterations or transcriptions), and the purpose of the anthology edited by Minczew and Skowronek was to present to readers the wealth of literary motifs, multiplicity of forms, and thematic diversity of old South Slavic literature. The inclusion in one volume of apocrypha (no doubt partly of spoken origin, but written down early) and originally oral legends was not accidental; however, it required the translators and editors to establish some common principles. The genetic closeness – and similarity of content – of the texts that they selected may have contributed to the fact that the range of stylistic means applied in the translation of the apocrypha and legends was made uniform.

Further examples of substitution are found in the following paragraph:

Слово за Адам и Ева: роеть <sup>ʸ</sup>ada<sup>m</sup> zhenu svo<sup>ʸ</sup>cy Evvu izъshъdъ i sěde na městě přē<sup>d</sup>h drvēmi raiskymi . vidě <sup>ʸ</sup>ada<sup>m</sup> sъnъ kako choshte<sup>t</sup> roditi Kaina i Avela brata <sup>ʸ</sup>emu i vidě kako choshtet ubiti Kainъ Avela i vъskrъbě <sup>ʸ</sup>ada<sup>m</sup> vel’mi. (MS Grujić 100)

Kawecka: Zabrał więc swoją żonę Ewę, wyszedł i usiadł u bram Raju. Zobaczył wtedy we śnie, że spłodzi Kaina i jego brata Abla, którego Kain zabije, i bardzo się tym zasmucił. (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, p. 31)

---

<sup>14</sup> Transliterations of the manuscript from the Grujić 100 codex by me [W.S.] – based on the rules for transliteration of Old Cyrillic script used by the journal *Palaeobulgarica*. I develop the abbreviations present in the manuscript by writing in the upper fraction. I introduce capital letters in the transliteration of the names of the characters. I do not introduce punctuation in accordance with contemporary rules, instead I render the delimitation marks present in the manuscript. I cite the transliterations of the text from the Panagyurishte Codex (NBKM 433) in each case after the work of Y. Ivanov *Bogomilski knigi i legendi*, developing the abbreviations introduced by the publisher.



A substitution combined with amplification (the addition of an element) is found in the clause “Zobaczył **wtedy** we śnie” (“[He] saw **then** in [his] sleep”; in the original: “vidě <sup>Y</sup>ada<sup>m</sup>ь sъnъ”). The translator adds an adverb of time, positioning the events on the time axis, and also introduces a prepositional construction, since Polish does not have the construction “to see a dream”. Kawecka nevertheless preserves the meaning of the fragment recounting the vision that Adam had in his sleep. Further in the quotation another substitution is used, with one phrase being replaced by another. A sentence with a relative clause is used in place of a sequence of clauses linked with coordinating conjunctions. As has been shown with examples from Dąbek-Wirgowa’s translation, this latter type of structure is characteristic of the oldest forms of the language. Kawecka thus modernises the syntax so that the text does not seem foreign to the reader.

The translator does not do this consistently, however, and despite appearances, this is not a mistake. In many passages where the sequence of clauses reflects the order of events in extralinguistic reality, the author retains the parataxis, as in the following example:

Слово за Адам и Ева: i vъsa vъ volyu <sup>Y</sup>ego chozh<sup>d</sup>achu . zvěrie i skoty i ptice periaty . onizhe povelěnie<sup>m</sup> <sup>Y</sup>adamověm chozh<sup>d</sup>achu . i chranyachuse i lětachu . ne povelěvshu <sup>Y</sup>adamu kъ veshte<sup>m</sup> ne smě<sup>v</sup>achu ni choditi ni leshti ni sъněsti čto. (MS Grujić 100)

Kawecka: Wszelakie stworzenie wypełniało jego wolę – i dzikie zwierzęta, i bydło, i ptaki na jego rozkaz chodziły, jadły i latały. Bez jego zgody zaś nie śmiały ani chodzić, ani fruwać, ani nawet się pożywić. (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, p. 31)

Like Dąbek-Wirgowa, Kawecka also modifies the syntax by introducing hypotaxis in place of compound sentences with coordinating conjunctions. She does this by replacing past tense verbs with uninflected present participles, as in the following examples, which both contain the participle *mówiąc* “saying”: “I zapłakała wtedy głośno, mówiąc” (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, p. 34) – “i vъsplaка sъ Yevga veliko i r<sup>e</sup>e” (MS NBKM 433); “i nie pozwolił mu obrabiać ziemi, mówiąc” (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, p. 41) – “i ne da<sup>a</sup> Yadamu zemq̄ rabotati i r<sup>e</sup>e Yadamu” (MS NBKM 433).

Substitution for stylistic reasons is also applied by Kawecka at the level of lexical equivalence. On the one hand it is used for archaisation, as in “zapowiedział” (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, p. 31) – “r<sup>e</sup>e” (MS Grujić 100); “złożył weń ciało Adama” (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, p. 44) – “i vъzložhi ego vъ grobъ i prěliya i re<sup>ce</sup>” (MS NBKM 433). On the other hand, it may serve to modernise

the text, as in the expression “w krainie Kir” (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, p. 31) – “вѣ kirno mĕsto” (MS Grujić 100); “jeśli chcesz być stworzeniem bożym” (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, p. 41) – “ashte li choshteshi b<sup>o</sup>zhi biti” (MS NBKM 433); and in the sentence “Powiedziałem ci, że z prochu powstałaś i w proch się obrócisz” (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, p. 44) – “tako rĕchъ tebĕ: zemĕ esi, вѣ tŏzh<sup>d</sup>e zemŏ paky poidesh” (MS NBKM 433). In the last example direct speech is changed to indirect, this being a result of the context: in the manuscript the quoted sentence is preceded by the clause “G<sup>ospod</sup>ъ re<sup>če</sup>”, translated as “And the Lord said”. To avoid the repetition of clauses introducing direct speech, the translator transforms the second of them such that it instead introduces indirect speech.

Of all parts of the text where substitution is used, the reader’s attention should be drawn to one in particular, coming at the very end of the work. The Polish translator uses this type of transformation in the acclamation that appears in the Old Bulgarian manuscript in the form: “s<sup>vŏt</sup>ъ, s<sup>vŏt</sup>ъ, s<sup>vŏt</sup>ъ, a<sup>ll</sup>i luya, s<sup>vŏt</sup>ъ свѣтъ G<sup>ospod</sup>ъ, isrlъ(нъ) n<sup>ę</sup>bo i zemlŏ slavy ego” (MS NBKM 433). Instead of making complicated changes as Dąbek-Wirgowa did, Kawecka uses words from the hymn *Sanctus*, still present in the liturgy and well known to Polish readers: “Święty, święty, święty Pan Bóg zastępów, pełne są niebiosa i ziemia chwały Jego, alleluja!” (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, p. 44). Such far-going domestication in the translation is justified by the intended purpose of the work and by the context (a larger collection intended for a general audience). Through this approach to the translation of a formula that is a particularly difficult element in view of its recurrence and rootedness in culture, and thus in the consciousness of the addressee of the text in the source language, the translator ensures that her target readers will feel closer to the text – that they will not feel uncomfortable dealing with the work in translation.

This decision of the translator has another important consequence: the reader has the opportunity to notice that the apocryphal work is a parabiblical text – it draws from the Bible and canonical sources in terms of the selection and realisation of the genre, the recontextualisation of motifs (a term used after: Izydorczyk, 2021), and above all the style, linguistic means, and content.

Apart from substitution, Kawecka also makes very frequent use of amplification and reduction. The first is used primarily for stylistic reasons. The translator adds such elements as particles (*otóż* “so”, *więc* “therefore”, *wtedy* “then”, *zaś* “whereas”, *też* “also”), pronouns (*ona* “she”, *im* “to them”, *sobie* “to [him]self”), and conjunctions (*dlatego* “therefore”, *potem* “next”, *i* “and”), thus modernis-

ing the text of the apocrypha. By adding particles that refer to the content of the previous clause or sentence, or by inserting conjunctions, she makes visible the connectedness of the narrative – the way the sentences form a larger whole. It is not that phrases are isolated from each other without these elements, but the logical connection between them would not then be so obvious to the reader as it is after the insertion of additional elements that lend structure to the content.

Amplification also serves to make the content coherent. Kawecka uses it in the final sentence of the first paragraph (where Dąbek-Wirgowa made an erroneous translation that changed the meaning of the passage). In translating the nominal sentence “takozh<sup>dezhe</sup> i <sup>Y</sup>evva” (MS Grujić 100), Kawecka avoids ambiguity by means of an amplification marked as such with the use of square brackets: “Podobnie [posłuszna była] Ewa” (“Eve [was obedient] likewise”) (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, p. 31). This leaves no doubt that Eve’s status was the same as that of the animals – she was subordinate to Adam. A similar addition is found later in the text, in the sentence: “Kiedy tamtego dnia nadeszła szósta godzina, Ewa pokłoniła się [Szatanowi] i ujrzała, jak wróg przybrał anielską postać”, which translates the Old Bulgarian “tog<sup>da</sup> priblizhi s<sup>o</sup> čas<sup>ě</sup> .s. pokloni s<sup>o</sup> Evga i vidě yako stvori s<sup>o</sup> vr<sup>a</sup>g<sup>ь</sup> a<sup>n</sup>g<sup>e</sup>l<sup>s</sup>kym<sup>ь</sup> obrazo<sup>m</sup>” (MS NBKM 433). The name of Satan (here in the dative, *Szatanowi*) is added partly because of the lack of an object in the clause (to whom did Eve bow?), but also in view of the importance of this piece of information.

There is one point in the text, however, where the technique of amplification marked by square brackets is used unnecessarily. In the sentence “[Bóg] zaś rzekł do Michała Archanioła” (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, p. 31), there is a subject added (*Bóg* “God”) where, we may assume, the translator did not notice the presence of a subject in the original text. The sentence in the manuscript is in fact complete (it contains all of the elements): “i r<sup>e</sup>č<sup>e</sup> G<sup>o</sup>s<sup>o</sup>p<sup>o</sup>d<sup>ь</sup> k<sup>ь</sup> y<sup>a</sup>rcha<sup>n</sup>gelu Michailu” (MS Grujić 100). It is true that the whole of the start of the sentence (“i r<sup>e</sup>č<sup>e</sup> G<sup>o</sup>s<sup>o</sup>p<sup>o</sup>d<sup>ь</sup>”) was written in abbreviated form. There are a number of abbreviations in this place in the text, which of course may have influenced its reading, but on the other hand, this abbreviation is well visible and is commonly used in manuscripts.

Another transformation that the translator frequently uses is reduction. This is done primarily for stylistic reasons, to produce a text with a modern syntactic structure. Kawecka removes from her translation superfluous elements such as pronouns, as in “Wtedy przyszedł do niego Michał Archanioł

i rzekł” (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, p. 31) – “togda pride <sup>ʎ</sup>archa<sup>n</sup>g<sup>l</sup>ь Michai<sup>l</sup> k<sup>t</sup> <sup>ʎ</sup>adamu i reče <sup>ʎ</sup>emu” (MS Grujić 100), “A cóż to za niemoc i skąd na ciebie przyszła?” (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, p. 32) – “kako ti bolest<sup>ʎ</sup> ye<sup>stb</sup>, kako ti priide?” (MS NBKM 433); nouns, as in “Powiedz Adamowi, żeby nie wypominał swojemu synowi tego, co tamten uczynił” (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, p. 31) – “r<sup>ʎ</sup>ci <sup>ʎ</sup>adamu da ničto<sup>zhe</sup> izr<sup>ec</sup>et<sup>ʎ</sup> s<sup>i</sup>nu svo<sup>ʎ</sup>emu **Kainu** odělē to<sup>mb</sup>” (MS Grujić 100), “I zapłakała wtedy głośno, mówiąc” (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, p. 34) – “i v<sup>ʎ</sup>splaka s<sup>ʎ</sup> **Yevga** veliko i r<sup>ec</sup>e” (MS NBKM 433); adjectives, as in “i dzikie zwierzęta, i bydło, i ptaki na jego rozkaz chodziły, jadły i latały” (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, p. 31) – “zv<sup>erie</sup> i skoty i ptice **periat**i . onizhe povel<sup>enie</sup><sup>m</sup> <sup>ʎ</sup>adamov<sup>em</sup> chozh<sup>d</sup>achu . i chranyachuse i l<sup>et</sup>achu” (MS Grujić 100), “jak to zostało zapisane” (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, p. 31) – “yako<sup>zhe</sup> ye<sup>stb</sup> ure<sup>ene</sup>no **nemil**ostivno” (MS Grujić 100); and even whole clauses: “Zawołał wtedy wielkim głosem” (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, p. 31) – “i v<sup>ʎ</sup>z<sup>ʎ</sup>ri Yadam g<sup>l</sup>aso<sup>m</sup> veliem<sup>ʎ</sup> i r<sup>ec</sup>e” (MS NBKM 433). All of these translation operations have an influence on the fluidity of the text, and often follow as a result of other decisions, such as the use of inversion or substitution.

Among all transformation types, Kawecka selects inversion quite frequently; however, its use is largely a result of differences between the languages in terms of word order (for example, in the order of an adjectival attribute with a pronoun in the function of attribute). The adjustment of the source text to conform to rules applicable in the target language causes it to “free itself” to some extent from the biblical style, of which one characteristic feature is the attribute in postposition.

As noted above, Kawecka’s translation – although correcting some errors of the earlier translator – is not perfect and flawless. Those faults that were identified and described above did not have a significant influence on the reception of the work. There is, however, a part of the text where the meaning deviates from what is written in the source. We read in one paragraph:

Слово за Адам и Ева: i o<sup>l</sup>q<sup>ci</sup> skoti vs<sup>ę</sup>ki<sup>ʎ</sup> **veshti** o<sup>l</sup>let<sup>q</sup>sht<sup>i</sup><sup>ch</sup> i chod<sup>q</sup>sht<sup>i</sup><sup>ch</sup> i stvori divie pitomo i nare<sup>ci</sup> v<sup>ʎ</sup>s<sup>ę</sup>koi veshti imena. (MS NBKM 433)

Kawecka: Oddzielisz zwierzęta domowe i wszystkie **rzeczy** od ptactwa i gadów, a dzikie bestie oswoisz i nadasz każdemu zwierzęciu imię. (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, pp. 36–41)

We observe here a mistake probably resulting from misunderstanding of the meaning of one of the words. The sentence “i o<sup>l</sup>q<sup>ci</sup> skoti vs<sup>ę</sup>ki<sup>ʎ</sup> **veshti**

o' letqshti<sup>ch</sup> i chodqshti<sup>ch</sup>” was translated as “Oddzielisz zwierzęta domowe **i wszystkie rzeczy** od ptactwa i gadów” (“You will separate household animals **and all things** from birds and reptiles”). The Łódź-based translator erroneously interpreted the noun вещи, which in the modern language indeed means “things” (see “Вещь”, n.d.-a). In the older Bulgarian language, however, it had a wider meaning, a fact recorded by the digital dictionary of Old Bulgarian compiled under the *Cyrrillomethodiana* project. One of the meanings given by that lexicon is “естество, същност, характер, природа” (“Вещь”, n.d.-b). The Polish translation of the sentence might therefore have been: “Oddzielisz bydło **wszelkiego rodzaju** od zwierząt latających i wolno chodzących” (“You will separate cattle **of all kinds** from flying and slow-moving animals”).

Although this error does not have a great impact on the meaning of the work as a whole, it illustrates how many traps await the translator of old texts. Paying attention to the narrowing of the semantic fields of words that have come down to the modern language is one of the tasks that a translator of works from medieval times needs to undertake.

In spite of a small number of minor imperfections, the work completed by Kawecka deserves appreciation. It is not easy to make an intralingual translation of an ancient text, and it is even harder to translate such a work into a modern foreign language. This point was made by Dinekov, who noted that translation from Old Bulgarian requires a high level of specialised language competence, as well as excellent knowledge of the medieval culture and customs, and is therefore a task that presents many difficulties (Dinekov, 1977). It seems that Kawecka overcame those difficulties thanks to her good linguistic skills, and above all her experience in working with medieval manuscripts, which entailed knowledge of the culture of those times, including literary practices, which are preserved in her translation. The adopted translation strategy of retaining the character of the work while modernising its syntax is complemented by the introduction of archaisations on the lexical level. Another means of “ageing” the text is the addition of personal flectional endings to pronouns or conjunctions; for example, in *tyś* and *żeś* (Minczew & Skowronek, 2006, p. 32), where the second person singular ending *-ś* is joined to the words *ty* (“you”) and *że* (“that”). Readers are thus given the impression that they are reading an older work, which is in line with the strategy of preserving the style of the old text while modernising its syntactic layer, so as to make it more accessible to the reader.

## 4. Conclusions and future research

The present analyses and interpretations clearly show that both translators, independently of each other,<sup>15</sup> adopted an identical translation strategy. That is to say, they attempted to modernise the text in terms of its language, in such a way that features of the source were not lost in translation. This concerns changes made primarily at syntactic level, which ensure that the text does not feel strange to the reader.

The process of making the content accessible to the reader through modernisation of the syntactic layer is aided by amplification – the translators introduce elements that bring the text closer to the reader's own culture and receptive habits. This concerns such features of the biblical style as pleonastic constructions expressing speech acts, or specific linking elements known from the Bible that are used to produce defined syntactic relations in a sentence.

The translators also make frequent use of substitution, particularly at the lexical level. Word choice is determined by matters of style and genre – archaisation as a linguistic operation gives the reader the impression that the text is older than it is in reality,<sup>16</sup> and moreover makes it more similar to translations of the Bible, which also feature archaised vocabulary.

Both translators also attempted to represent the formulae contained in the source texts in the most appropriate way possible; however, they adopted different approaches: while Dąbek-Wirgowa undertook an independent attempt to translate the text of the hymn, Kawecka used an existing Polish equivalent of that work, providing further evidence of her adopted strategy of domestication.

Also visible is a certain continuity in the tradition of translations of "The Life of Adam and Eve". Although the translators were using different sources, as we have pointed out many times, Kawecka made herself familiar with Dąbek-Wirgowa's earlier translation, as reflected in her avoidance of an error made by the latter.<sup>17</sup>

Kawecka, Petrov, and Skowronek (Kawecka et al., 2009) draw attention to the didactic aspect of the creation of anthologies. Well translated<sup>18</sup> texts

---

<sup>15</sup> As evidenced, for example, by the fact that they used different sources.

<sup>16</sup> A desired effect, since the sources of the apocrypha date from antiquity.

<sup>17</sup> It should be noted that Kawecka effectively "improved" the source text by eliminating an ambiguity that was present in it.

<sup>18</sup> That is, translated in such a way as not to change the content, not to interfere with the narrative, and not to distort the message conveyed.

included in an anthology make it possible to carry out literary research, for example, into common threads. However, such collections serve not only as relays of content available to researchers, but also in a way as transmitters of culture, connecting the sender (who lived centuries ago and thousands of miles away) with the recipient (living here and now). By the translator's efforts, the temporal and spatial distances that divide those two participants in the act of communication can be overcome to such an extent that the reader does not feel the text to be foreign, and even acknowledges the text in such a form as functioning within the system of native literature.

Research carried out on a small sample produces results that can indicate potential directions of further work, of which two appear particularly promising.<sup>19</sup> The first concerns the study of anthologies of old texts as translations. It may appear that such collections are none too numerous, but it should be borne in mind that the available titles differ in terms of content, compositional principles, the competences of the authors and editors, and choice of sources. Another important factor is whether an anthology has a single or multiple authors. Examination of the consistency of composition, language and style, and also of adopted translation strategies (common to a collection as a whole or differing depending on the text) would appear to be an ambitious, though difficult research task.

Another of the options open to translation studies scholars is to undertake research encompassing multiple aspects. It is after all impossible to take any other approach to the question of the development of the skills of translators based on study of their entire body of work. Particularly if, firstly, they translate both old and contemporary texts, and secondly, if the translator's competences are augmented by the competences of a researcher. Tracking the changes (if any) that took place over the years in their style, observing and interpreting any influences from the environment in which they worked or work, identifying correlations between translations of old and contemporary texts – all of these tasks might be combined in a research project that may produce very interesting results, and at the same time fill a gap in Polish translation studies.

---

<sup>19</sup> This paper is based on one of the chapters of a BA thesis titled *How "The Life of Adam and Eve" Was Translated: Polish Translations in the Perspective of the History of Translation*. The remaining chapters were devoted to the role of anthologies in intercultural transmission and the influence of the academic environment on a translator's competences and working methods. The research perspectives relating to the analysis of anthologies are connected with those relating to the work of translators, and it was decided for that reason to include them here.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- MS NBKM 433** – *Слово за Адам и Ева*, National Library “St. St. Cyril and Methodius” (sygn. 433, so-called Panagyurian Codex), Sofia (*Слово за Адам и Ева*, n.d.-a).
- MS Grujić 100** – *Слово за Адам и Ева*, The Radoslav M. Grujić Collection in the Library of the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church, Belgrade (*Слово за Адам и Ева*, n.d.-b).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamczyk, M. (2005). Vita Adae et Evae (Apokalipsa Mojżesza?) w apokryficznych wersjach starobułgarskiej i staropolskiej. In M. Walczak-Mikołajczakowa & B. Zieliński (Eds.), *Z małą ojczyzną w sercu: Księga pamiątkowa dedykowana Profesorowi Tadeuszowi Zdaniewiczowi* (pp. 165–174). Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Balcerzan, E. (1998). *Literatura z literatury (strategie tłumaczy)*. Śląsk.
- Dąbek-Wirgowa, T. (1980). *Historia literatury bułgarskiej: Zarys*. Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Dąbek-Wirgowa, T. (Ed. & Trans.). (1983). *Siedem niebios i ziemia: Antologia dawnej prozy bułgarskiej*. Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Deskur, A. (2016). Zachowanie pozajęzykowej chronologii wydarzeń w strukturze składniowej (na podstawie staropolskich apokryfów). *Kwartalnik Językoznawczy*, 2016(3(27)), 1–13.
- Dinekow, P. (1977). *O bułgarskiej literaturze, folklorze i związkach z Polską* (J. Magnuszewski, Ed.; T. Dąbek-Wirgowa, Trans.). Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Izydorczyk, Z. (2021). The Gospel of Nicodemus in medieval European vernaculars: Textual sources and translatorial strategies. In A. Deskur, D. Rojszczak-Robińska, & W. Stelmach (Eds.), *Źródła staropolskich apokryfów: Pytania, problemy, perspektywy* (pp. 11–76). Wydawnictwo “Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne”.
- Jakubowski, W. (Ed. & Trans.). (1972). *Żywot protopopa Awwakuma przez niego samego nakreślony i wybór innych pism*. Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Jakubowski, W., & Łużny, R. (Eds.). (1971). *Literatura staroruska, wiek XI–XVII: Antologia: Teksty*. Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Kawecka, A., Petrov, I., & Skowronek, M. (2010a). Z problematyki przekładu starej literatury kręgu *Slavia Orthodoxa* na język polski (Cz. 2). *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis: Folia Litteraria Rossica*, 2010(3), 175–188. <https://doi.org/10.18778/1427-9681.03.15>
- Kawecka, A., Petrov, I., & Skowronek, M. (2010b). Aneks: Materiały do bibliografii przekładów starej literatury kręgu *Slavia Orthodoxa* na język polski. *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis: Folia Litteraria Rossica*, 2010(3), 189–193. <https://doi.org/10.18778/1427-9681.03.16>
- Kawecka, A., Petrov, I. N., & Skowronek, M. (2009). Z problematyki przekładu starej literatury kręgu *Slavia Orthodoxa* na język polski (Cz. 1) + Aneks – Materiały do bibliografii powojennych przekładów starej literatury kręgu *Slavia Orthodoxa* na język polski.



- In M. Kuczyńska, W. Stępnia-Minczewska, & J. Stradomski (Eds.), *Krakowsko-Wileńskie Studia Slawistyczne* (Vol. 4, pp. 247–273). Wydawnictwo "Scriptum" Tomasz Sekunda.
- Kawecka, A., Petrov, I. N., & Skowronek, M. (2011a). Z problematyki przekładu starej literatury kręgu Slavia Orthodoxa na język polski (Cz. 3) + Aneks – Materiały do bibliografii przekładów starej literatury kręgu Slavia Orthodoxa na język polski (ks. protoijerzej Stanisław Strach, przekłady w rubryce *Język naszej liturgii*, "Przegląd Prawosławny", 1996–2010). *Rozprawy Komisji Językowej Łódzkiego Towarzystwa Naukowego*, 46, 73–90.
- Kawecka, A., Petrov, I. N., & Skowronek, M. (2011b). Z problematyki przekładu starej literatury kręgu Slavia Orthodoxa na język polski (Cz. 4) + Aneks – Materiały do bibliografii powojennych przekładów starej literatury kręgu Slavia Orthodoxa na język polski. In M. Kuczyńska, W. Stępnia-Minczewska, & J. Stradomski (Eds.), *Krakowsko-Wileńskie Studia Slawistyczne* (Vol. 6, pp. 309–325). Wydawnictwo "Scriptum" Tomasz Sekunda.
- Kawecka, A., Petrov, I. N., & Skowronek, M. (2012). Z problematyki przekładu starej literatury kręgu *Slavia Orthodoxa* na język polski (Cz. 5) + Aneks – Materiały do bibliografii powojennych przekładów starej literatury kręgu Slavia Orthodoxa na język polski. *Roczniki Humanistyczne Towarzystwa Naukowego KUL: Seria Słowianoznawstwo*, 40(7), 193–218.
- Kierkowicz, M. (2011). *Verba dicendi w sprawie chędogiej i Rozmyślaniu przemyskim*. *Kwartalnik Językoznawczy*, 2011(1(5)), 13–22. [http://pmichal-kwartjcz.home.amu.edu.pl/teksty/teksty2011\\_1\\_5/Kierkowicz.pdf](http://pmichal-kwartjcz.home.amu.edu.pl/teksty/teksty2011_1_5/Kierkowicz.pdf)
- Kleszczowa, K. (1989). *Verba dicendi w historii języka polskiego: Zmiany znaczeń*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Kłós, A. (2018). Przekłady niebezpośrednie w polsko-włoskich relacjach literackich w XX wieku: Rekonesans. *Przekładaniec*, 2018(37), 64–86. <https://doi.org/10.4467/16891864PC.18.013.9555>
- Konstantinowa, E., & Gałązka, W. (Eds.). (1987). *Niewidzialne skrzydła: Antologia poezji bułgarskiej (od IX wieku do 1944)*. Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Koziara, S. (2009). *Tradycyjne biblizmy a nowe polskie przekłady Pisma Świętego: Ujęcie filologiczno-normatywne*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Pedagogicznego.
- Krażyńska, Z., Mika, T., & Słoboda, A. (2015). *Składnia średniowiecznej polszczyzny: Pt. 1. Konteksty – metody – tendencje*. Wydawnictwo Rys.
- Lis-Wielgosz, I. (2019). Проблемът за преводите на старобългарски и старосръбски текстове на полски език. *Palaeobulgarica/Старобългаристика*, 43(1), 62–80.
- Lu, X. (2021). O przekładach z drugiej ręki (T. Starky, Trans.). *Tekstualia*, 2021(2(65)), 161–162. [https://tekstualia.pl/files/496d85da/lu\\_xun\\_-\\_o\\_przekladach\\_z\\_drugiej\\_reki\\_tlum.\\_starky\\_t.\\_pdf](https://tekstualia.pl/files/496d85da/lu_xun_-_o_przekladach_z_drugiej_reki_tlum._starky_t._pdf)
- Łużny, R. (Ed. & Trans.). (1988). *Opowieść o niewidzialnym grodzie Kitejezu: Z legend i podań dawnej Rusi*. Instytut Wydawniczy Pax.
- Miltenowa, A. (2012). Adamic tradition in Slavonic manuscripts (Vita Adae et Evae and Apocryphal Cycle about the Holy Tree). In A. A. Orlov, G. Boccaccini, & J. Zurawski (Eds.), *Studia Judeoslavica: Vol. 4. New perspectives on 2 Enoch: No longer slavonic only* (pp. 325–340). Brill. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004230149\\_019](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004230149_019)
- Minczew, G., & Skowronek, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Apokryfy i legendy starotestamentowe Słowian Południowych*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

- Naumow, A. (1976). *Apokryfy w systemie literatury cerkiewnosłowiańskiej*. Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Naumow, A. (Ed.). (1984). *Dar słowa: Ze starej literatury serbskiej*. Wydawnictwo Łódzkie.
- Naumow, A. (Ed.). (1985). *Pasterze wiernych Słowian: Święci Cyryl i Metody*. Wydawnictwo Znak.
- Naumow, A. (1996). Trudna sztuka przekładania. *Orthodoxia – Przegląd Prawosławny*, 1996(3(129)), 15–17.
- Skowronek, M., Lis-Wielgosz, I., Petrov, I. N., Stradomski, J., & Kawecka, A. (2021). *Komentowana bibliografia polskich przekładów piśmiennictwa kręgu Slavica Orthodoxa*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Sokolski, J. (2014). *Historia Adama i Ewy*. Oficyna Wydawnicza Atut.
- Starowieyski, M. (2015). *Barwny świat apokryfów*. Wydawnictwo Święty Wojciech.
- Stelmach, W. (2020). *Historyja barzo cudna wobec źródeł*. Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Szwat-Gyłybowa, G. (1999). Teresa Dąbek-Wirgowa. *Pamiętnik Słowiański*, 49, 70–72.
- Ziółkowska, O. (2016). *Specyfika języka “Rozmyślań dominikańskich” w świetle składni i leksyki*. Wydawnictwo Rys.
- Вещ. (n.d.-a). In *Речник на българския език*. Институт за български език. Retrieved November 20, 2023, from <https://ibl.bas.bg/rbe/lang/bg/%D0%B2%D0%B5%D1%89/>
- Вещ. (n.d.-b). In *Старобългарски речник*. Софийски Университет “Св. Климент Охридски”. Retrieved November 20, 2023, from [https://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/oldbgdict/oldbg\\_show/d\\_00929/](https://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/oldbgdict/oldbg_show/d_00929/)
- Динеков, П., Куев, К., & Петканова, Д. (Eds.). (1978). *Христоматия по старобългарска литература*. Наука и изкуство.
- Иванов, Й. (1970). *Богомилски книги и легенди*. Наука и изкуство.
- Слово за Адам и Ева* [MS NBKM 433] [Manuscript]. (n.d.-a). National Library “St. St. Cyril and Methodius” (NBKM 433), Sofia.
- Слово за Адам и Ева* [MS Grujić 100] [Manuscript]. (n.d.-b). The Radoslav M. Grujić Collection in the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church, Belgrade.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### (TRANSLITERATION)

- Adamczyk, M. (2005). Vita Adae et Evae (Apokalipsa Mojżesza?) w apokryficznych wersjach starobułgarskiej i staropolskiej. In M. Walczak-Mikołajczakowa & B. Zieliński (Eds.), *Z małą ojczyzną w sercu: Księga pamiątkowa dedykowana Profesorowi Tadeuszowi Zdaniewiczowi* (pp. 165–174). Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Balcerzan, E. (1998). *Literatura z literatury (strategie tłumaczy)*. Śląsk.
- Dąbek-Wirgowa, T. (1980). *Historia literatury bułgarskiej: Zarys*. Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

- Dąbek-Wirgowa, T. (Ed. & Trans.). (1983). *Siedem niebios i ziemia: Antologia dawnej prozy bułgarskiej*. Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Deskur, A. (2016). Zachowanie pozajęzykowej chronologii wydarzeń w strukturze składniowej (na podstawie staropolskich apokryfów). *Kwartalnik Językoznawczy*, 2016(3(27)), 1–13.
- Dinekov, P., Kuev, K., & Petkanova, D. (Eds.). (1978). *Khristomatiia po starobułgarska literatura*. Nauka i izkustvo.
- Dinekow, P. (1977). *O bułgarskiej literaturze, folklorze i związkach z Polską* (J. Magnuszewski, Ed.; T. Dąbek-Wirgowa, Trans.). Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Ivanov, Ī. (1970). *Bogomilski knigi i legendy*. Nauka i izkustvo.
- Izydorczyk, Z. (2021). The Gospel of Nicodemus in medieval European vernaculars: Textual sources and translatorial strategies. In A. Deskur, D. Rojszczak-Robińska, & W. Stelmach (Eds.), *Źródła staropolskich apokryfów: Pytania, problemy, perspektywy* (pp. 11–76). Wydawnictwo “Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne”.
- Jakubowski, W. (Ed. & Trans.). (1972). *Żywoť protopopa Awwakuma przez niego samego nakreślony i wybór innych pism*. Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Jakubowski, W., & Łuźny, R. (Eds.). (1971). *Literatura staroruska, wiek XI–XVII: Antologia: Teksty*. Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Kawecka, A., Petrov, I., & Skowronek, M. (2010a). Z problematyki przekładu starej literatury kręgu *Slavia Orthodoxa* na język polski (Cz. 2). *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis: Folia Litteraria Rossica*, 2010(3), 175–188. <https://doi.org/10.18778/1427-9681.03.15>
- Kawecka, A., Petrov, I., & Skowronek, M. (2010b). Aneks: Materiały do bibliografii przekładów starej literatury kręgu *Slavia Orthodoxa* na język polski. *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis: Folia Litteraria Rossica*, 2010(3), 189–193. <https://doi.org/10.18778/1427-9681.03.16>
- Kawecka, A., Petrov, I. N., & Skowronek, M. (2009). Z problematyki przekładu starej literatury kręgu *Slavia Orthodoxa* na język polski (Cz. 1) + Aneks – Materiały do bibliografii powojennych przekładów starej literatury kręgu *Slavia Orthodoxa* na język polski. In M. Kuczyńska, W. Stępniać-Minczewska, & J. Stradomski (Eds.), *Krakowsko-Wileńskie Studia Slawistyczne* (Vol. 4, pp. 247–273). Wydawnictwo “Scriptum” Tomasz Sekunda.
- Kawecka, A., Petrov, I. N., & Skowronek, M. (2011a). Z problematyki przekładu starej literatury kręgu *Slavia Orthodoxa* na język polski (Cz. 3) + Aneks – Materiały do bibliografii przekładów starej literatury kręgu *Slavia Orthodoxa* na język polski (ks. protoijerzej Stanisław Strach, przekłady w rubryce *Język naszej liturgii*, “Przegląd Prawosławny”, 1996–2010). *Rozprawy Komisji Językowej Łódzkiego Towarzystwa Naukowego*, 46, 73–90.
- Kawecka, A., Petrov, I. N., & Skowronek, M. (2011b). Z problematyki przekładu starej literatury kręgu *Slavia Orthodoxa* na język polski (Cz. 4) + Aneks – Materiały do bibliografii powojennych przekładów starej literatury kręgu *Slavia Orthodoxa* na język polski. In M. Kuczyńska, W. Stępniać-Minczewska, & J. Stradomski (Eds.), *Krakowsko-Wileńskie Studia Slawistyczne* (Vol. 6, pp. 309–325). Wydawnictwo “Scriptum” Tomasz Sekunda.
- Kawecka, A., Petrov, I. N., & Skowronek, M. (2012). Z problematyki przekładu starej literatury kręgu *Slavia Orthodoxa* na język polski (Cz. 5) + Aneks – Materiały do bibliografii powojennych przekładów starej literatury kręgu *Slavia Orthodoxa* na język polski. *Roczniki Humanistyczne Towarzystwa Naukowego KUL: Seria Słowianoznawstwo*, 40(7), 193–218.

- Kierkowicz, M. (2011). *Verba dicendi w Sprawie chędogiej i Rozmyślaniu przemyskim*. *Kwartalnik Językoznawczy*, 2011(1(5)), 13–22. [http://pmichal-kwartjcz.home.amu.edu.pl/teksty/teksty2011\\_1\\_5/Kierkowicz.pdf](http://pmichal-kwartjcz.home.amu.edu.pl/teksty/teksty2011_1_5/Kierkowicz.pdf)
- Kleszczowa, K. (1989). *Verba dicendi w historii języka polskiego: Zmiany znaczeń*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Kłós, A. (2018). Przekłady niebezpośrednie w polsko-włoskich relacjach literackich w XX wieku: Rekonesans. *Przekładaniec*, 2018(37), 64–86. <https://doi.org/10.4467/16891864PC.18.013.9555>
- Konstantinowa, E., & Gałązka, W. (Eds.). (1987). *Niewidzialne skrzydła: Antologia poezji bułgarskiej (od IX wieku do 1944)*. Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Koziara, S. (2009). *Tradycyjne biblizmy a nowe polskie przekłady Pisma Świętego: Ujęcie filologiczno-normatywne*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Pedagogicznego.
- Krążyńska, Z., Mika, T., & Słoboda, A. (2015). *Składnia średniowiecznej polszczyzny: Pt. 1. Konteksty – metody – tendencje*. Wydawnictwo Rys.
- Lis-Wielgosz, I. (2019). Problemüt za prevodite na starobŭlgarski i starosrŭbski tekstove na polski ezik. *Palaeobulgarica/Starobŭlgaristika*, 43(1), 62–80.
- Lu, X. (2021). O przekładach z drugiej ręki (T. Starky, Trans.). *Tekstualia*, 2021(2(65)), 161–162. [https://tekstualia.pl/files/496d85da/lu\\_xun\\_-\\_o\\_przekladach\\_z\\_drugiej\\_reki\\_tlum.\\_starky\\_t..pdf](https://tekstualia.pl/files/496d85da/lu_xun_-_o_przekladach_z_drugiej_reki_tlum._starky_t..pdf)
- Łużny, R. (Ed. & Trans.). (1988). *Opowieść o niewidzialnym grodzie Kiteju: Z legend i podań dawnej Rusi*. Instytut Wydawniczy Pax.
- Miltenowa, A. (2012). Adamic tradition in Slavonic manuscripts (Vita Adae et Evae and Apocryphal Cycle about the Holy Tree). In A. A. Orlov, G. Boccaccini, & J. Zurawski (Eds.), *Studia Judeoslavica: Vol. 4. New perspectives on 2 Enoch: No longer Slavonic only* (pp. 325–340). Brill. [https://doi.org/10.1163/97890042230149\\_019](https://doi.org/10.1163/97890042230149_019)
- Minczew, G., & Skowronek, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Apokryfy i legendy starotestamentowe Słowian Południowych*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Naumow, A. (1976). *Apokryfy w systemie literatury cerkiewnosłowiańskiej*. Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Naumow, A. (Ed.). (1984). *Dar słowa: Ze starej literatury serbskiej*. Wydawnictwo Łódzkie.
- Naumow, A. (Ed.). (1985). *Pasterze wiernych Słowian: Święci Cyryl i Metody*. Wydawnictwo Znak.
- Naumow, A. (1996). Trudna sztuka przekładania. *Orthodoxia – Przegląd Prawosławny*, 1996(3(129)), 15–17.
- Skowronek, M., Lis-Wielgosz, I., Petrov, I. N., Stradomski, J., & Kawecka, A. (2021). *Komentowana bibliografia polskich przekładów piśmiennictwa kręgu Slavia Orthodoxa*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Slovo za Adam i Eva* [MS NBKM 433] [Manuscript]. (n.d.-a). National Library "St. St. Cyril and Methodius" (NBKM 433), Sofia.
- Slovo za Adam i Eva* [MS Grujić 100] [Manuscript]. (n.d.-b). The Radoslav M. Grujić Collection in the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church, Belgrade.
- Sokolski, J. (2014). *Historia Adama i Ewy*. Oficyna Wydawnicza Atut.

- Starowieyski, M. (2015). *Barwny świat apokryfów*. Wydawnictwo Święty Wojciech.
- Stelmach, W. (2020). *Historyja barzo cudna wobec źródeł*. Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Szwat-Gyłybowa, G. (1999). Teresa Dąbek-Wirgowa. *Pamiętnik Słowiański*, 49, 70–72.
- Vesht. (n.d.-a). In *Rechnik na bŭlgarskii ezik*. Institut za bŭlgarski ezik. Retrieved November 20, 2023, from <https://ibl.bas.bg/rbe/lang/bg/%D0%B2%D0%B5%D1%89/>
- Vesht. (n.d.-b). In *Starobŭlgarski rechnik*. Sofiiski Universitet "Sv. Kliment Okhridski". Retrieved November 20, 2023, from [https://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/oldbgdict/oldbg\\_show/d\\_00929/](https://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/oldbgdict/oldbg_show/d_00929/)
- Ziółkowska, O. (2016). *Specyfika języka "Rozmyślań dominikańskich" w świetle składni i leksyki*. Wydawnictwo Rys.

## Przekłady Słowa o Adamie i Ewie na język polski jako problem badawczy. Analiza strategii tłumaczenia

Artykuł prezentuje wyniki badań translologicznych nad przekładami staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego apokryfu *Słowo o Adamie i Ewie* na współczesny język polski, których autorkami są Teresa Dąbek-Wirgowa i Agata Kawecka. Oba teksty zostały zbadane niezależnie od siebie, ponieważ nie tworzą serii przekładowej. Przekłady zestawiono ze źródłami (bułgarskim oraz staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskim), co umożliwiło dokładne prześledzenie sposobu pracy tłumaczek z podstawami tłumaczenia. W artykule na wybranych przykładach zostały omówione typy transformacji przekładowych wykorzystane przez tłumaczki, a ponadto przedstawiono charakterystykę dominant obecnych w przekładach. Wskazano także nieliczne błędy, w tym przede wszystkim te, które zmieniają sens tłumaczonego tekstu. W podsumowaniu przedstawiono ogólne wnioski dotyczące pracy tłumaczek oraz perspektywy badawcze obejmujące dalsze badania nad antologiami literatury dawnej jako przekładami oraz nad warsztatem tłumaczy tej literatury.

**Słowa kluczowe:** przekład; język starobułgarski; język nowobułgarski; język polski; Agata Kawecka; Teresa Dąbek-Wirgowa; *Słowo o Adamie i Ewie*

## **Polish translations of “The life of Adam and Eve” as a research problem: An analysis of translation strategies**

This paper presents the results of translational research into Teresa Dąbek-Wirgowa and Agata Kawecka’s translations of the Old Church Slavonic apocrypha “The Life of Adam and Eve” into modern Polish. The two texts were examined independently of each other, since they do not form a translation series. The translations were compared with the Bulgarian and Old Church Slavonic sources, which made it possible to follow closely how the translators applied the fundamental techniques of translation. Using selected examples, the article discusses the types of translation transformations used, and characterises the dominant elements presented in the translations. Some errors are also pointed out, especially those that change the meaning of the translated text. The final part of the paper contains general conclusions about the translators’ work and indicates possible directions of future research, including further research into anthologies of ancient literature as translations and into the skills exhibited by translators of such literature.

**Keywords:** translation; Old Bulgarian language; Modern Bulgarian language; Polish language; Agata Kawecka; Teresa Dąbek-Wirgowa; “The Life of Adam and Eve”

**Wojciech Stelmach** (ws45802@amu.edu.pl) – doktorant w Zakładzie Historii Języka Polskiego Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu; absolwent bułgarystyki w Instytucie Filologii Słowiańskiej tej samej uczelni. Zainteresowania badawcze: apokryficzna literatura słowiańska w różnych jej kontekstach: językowym, literackim i przekładowym.

**Wojciech Stelmach** (ws45802@amu.edu.pl) – PhD candidate in the Department of History of the Polish Language at Adam Mickiewicz University, and a graduate in Bulgarian Studies at the same university’s Institute of Slavic Philology. Research interests: apocryphal Slavic literature in its various contexts: linguistic, literary, and translation.