The Translation of the Petrarch's Sestina *A Qualunque animale alberga in terra* by Dinko Ranjina

Smiljka Malinar
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
University of Zagreb
smalinar@ffzg.hr

In this article we shall analyse the way in which the Dubrovnik poet Dinko Ranjina translated Petrarch's sestina *A qualunque animale alberga in terra* while adapting it to the possibilities of Croatian versification. The sestina, the highest formal achievement of Provencal poetry, is based on a multiple combination of the number 6 (six stanzas of six lines using six rhyme -words), with a strictly determined alternation of rhyme-words in each stanza (according to the *retrogradatio cruciata* scheme) and a predetermined manner of linking the stanzas (described by the term *coblas capfinidas*). Ranjina retained the six -line stanza, and the linking of the strophes according to the *coblas capfinidas* system. But the Croatian traditional line, the dodecasyllabic, which he uses instead of Petrarch's hendecasyllabic, is handled according to its own rules. Dodecasyllabics are regularly used in pairs, and both verses are linked by rhyme. This automatically cancels out the possibility of applying the scheme of the *retrogradiato cruciata*, which includes a reciprocal relation of the rhyme-words of two neighbouring stanzas and is based on the division of the sestina into two three-line sections. The dodecasyllabic verse scheme is the cause of other formal deviations from the original; Ranjina's composition is two stanzas shorter than Petrarch's and the final three-line stanza is replaced by a couplet. In addition, it also leads to a reduction of the range of the motifs of the original, simplifying and sometimes trivialising its lexical and semantic components.

Francesco Petrarca, XII:[1]

A qualunque animale alberga in terra,
Se non se alquanti c'hanno in odio il sole,
Tempo da travagliare è quanto è 'l giorno;
Ma, poi che 'l ciel accende le sue stelle,
Qual torna a casa e qual s'annida in selva,
Per aver posa al meno in fino a l'alba.

---

[1] Petrarch's sestina is cited according to *Le Rime*, 1984: 22-24. Ranjina's composition is published on the basis of the edition *Piesni razlike*, 1891, with minor corrections and some graphic adaptation to the Florence edition from the year 1563.

Et io, da che comincia la bella alba
A scuoter l'ombra intorno de la terra
Svegliando gli animali in ogni selva,
Non ho mai triegua di sospir col sole;
Poi, quand'io veggio fiammeggiar le stelle,
 Vo lagrimando e disïando il giorno.

Quando la sera scaccia il chiaro giorno
E le tenebre nostre altrui fanno alba,
Miro pensoso le crudeli stelle
Che m'hanno fatto di sensibil terra.
E maledico il dí ch'io vidi 'l sole:
 Che mi fa in vista un uom nudrito in selva.

Non credo che pascesse mai per selva
Sí aspra fera, o di notte o di giorno,
Come costei ch'i' piango a l'ombra o al sole,
E non mi stanca primo sonno od alba;
Ché, ben ch'i' sia mortal corpo di terra,
Lo mio fermo desir vien da le stelle.

Prima ch' i' torni a voi, lucenti stelle,
O tomi giú ne l'amorosa selva
Lassando il corpo che fia trita terra,
Vedess'io in lei pietà! Ch'in un sol giorno
Può ristorar molt'anni, e 'nnanzi l'alba
Puommi arricchir dal tramontar del sole.

Con lei foss'io da che si parte il sole,
E non ci vedess'altri che le stelle,
Sol una notte! E mai non fosse l'alba,
E non si transformasse in verde selva
Per uscirmi di braccia, come il giorno
Ch'Apollo la seguia qua giù per terra!

Ma io sarò sotterra in secca selva
E 'l giorno andrà pien di minute stelle
Prima ch'a sí dolce alba arrivi il sole.

Dinko Ranjina, 29:

Ka god zvir, vjeruj, jes pod nebom na sviti
    izvan tih, ke sunca ne mogu viditi,
    način je općeno svijema vazdje dan,
    da trude toliko, koliko vide dan;
    nu zvizde kad pridu, sve zađu u gore,
    za moći počinut daj mirno do ʒore.
A ja, vaj, netom zrak taj svietli od ʒore

> počne se kazati s neba zgar vrh gore,
> pokoja ne imam, dokli god trpi dan,
> pod toli nemilu sreću sam doli dan,
> pak kako mrak skrije zrak svijetli na sviti,
> nemilo plaču sve želeć dan viditi.
> I kad se ne bude veće zrak viditi,
> da s neba prosvitlja svaku stvar na sviti,
> sve moje počnu klet večere i ʒore,
> dokle god sunce zgar izide vrh gore,
> videći ja, u vlas jadovno da sam dan
> toj, ka mi vik ne će dopustit miran dan.
> Pri će se mrkla noć obrnut u biel dan,
> neg li će ijedan mir od nje bit vik mi dan,
> i zviri srdite utažit vrh gore,
> neg ću imat jednu noć mirnu ja do ʒore:
> toliko nemilos nje huda na sviti
> malo se jur boli moju zled viditi.
> Pokli od nje nije mi miran dan viditi,
> me zore vik će mrak smrtni imati na sviti.[2]

The issue of the filiation of motivic and formal characteristics of Croatian Petrarchism, which implies the attempt to state the share of direct Petrarch's influence in opposition to that of Petrarch's followers or particular petrarchist „schools", was thoroughly analyzed on the sample of Ranjina's poetic corpus by Mihovil Kombol in the article *Dinko Ranjina i talijanski petrarkisti* (Dinko

---

[2]   We shall cite the English version of Ranjina's translation:

> Whatever animal is 'neath the sky on earth.
> save only those who in the sun's sight have no mirth,
> universally to each one is given the way
> to labour while to some extent they see the day,
> but when the stars emerge, they all are homeward drawn
> to lay them down to rest in peace until the dawn.
>
> But I, oh woe, no sooner are those beams of dawn
> from o'er the mountains of the morning drawn
> no peace or calm have I, as long as lasts the day
> in such a great misfortune is arranged my way
> yet when the night does hide the light of day from earth
> I sorely weep and long for that poor daytime mirth.
>
> And when no more there is any beam for mirth,
> illuminating from the sky all things upon earth,
> I start to curse my every evening, every dawn
> until the sun from out behind the hill is drawn
> seeing that I am cast into misery's way
> that will never grant me calm and peaceful day.
>
> Sooner shall black night be turned into bright day,
> for no peace from her shall ever come my way;
>   Translated by Graham McMaster.

Ranjina and Italian Petrarchists), published in the year 1932.[3] By identifying Italian textual analoga of a series of Ranjina's passages and by describing them mostly as Petrarchist topoi (meaning that unambigous and direct Ranjina's model cannot be determined), Kombol concludes that Ranjina is firmly anchored within the value and formal horizon of the 'precious' *quattrocento* Petrarchism,[4] and he observes through the same glasses the poets later to come, followers of Bembo, aiming for refinement and measure of the original Petrarch. Due to the motivic and stylistic syncretism, which is the general characteristic of Petrarchist poetry, in Ranjina's case, also, Petrarch's influence is for the most part manifested as Petrarchist.[5] Direct dependence on Petrarch however is not questionable in the case of three Ranjina's poems, No. 8, No. 29 and No. 403. The first and the third are a translation of Petrarch's sonnets *Né per sereno ciel ir vaghe le stelle* and *Dolci ire, dolci sdegni e dolci paci*, respectively, the second (poem No. 29) is based on the sestina *A qualunque animale alberga in terra*.[6]

A possible neuralgic point of poetry translation – rendering of the meter of the original with the means of the target language – is overtly manifested in the encounter of the Croatian metrics with the sonnet form. As we already know, except for seven anonymous compositions in the so called *Ranjinin zbornik* (Ranjina's Anthology), the sonnet did not exist in the Dalmatian poetry of the 15th and 16th century, despite the fact that it was the dominant metrical form of Petrarch's and Petrarchist poetry, and the fact that Croatian Petrarchists often paraphrased and translated compositions written in that form. The sonnet was translated in the traditional Croatian metrical forms, double dodecasyllabic lines or octosyllabic four-verse stanzas. Occasional metrical experiments of a lesser number of authors, inspired by some particularly technicistic Italian texts, never result in the imitation of their basic metrical form. Our earlier poets are persistently ignoring the sonnet (except when writing in Italian), although from the technical aspect it was not impossible to reproduce it.[7] Regardless of the reason, be it the „metametric meaning" of the sonnet that relates this form exclusively to the Italian poetic tradition and the Italian language (which is suggested by S. Petrović),[8] or the structural inadequacy of the Croatian language,

---

[3]   Cf. Kombol 1932: 64-94.

[4]   Centres of this poetry were Italian courts, especially the Aragon court in Naples. Cf. Percopo, 1892: XI-VII. A list of more significant work dealing with court Petrarchism is presented by Bogdan, 2003: 175-185, *passim*.

[5]   Cf. Kombol 1932: 89-94. On pages 93 and 94, Kombol disputes the opinion of Torbarina 1931: 150-161, *passim*. about a second phase in Ranjina's work when the poet turns to Bembo and to the original Petrarch.

[6]   The poems are so marked in the only complete edition of Ranjina's poetry thus far. Kombol 1932: 92 also relates Ranjina's poem No. 293 to Petrarch's sonnet CII (*Cesare poi che 'l traditor d'Egitto*).

[7]   This is demonstrated by the sonnets in Ranjina's anthology and later on, by the example of Baraković. Cf. Petrović 1968: 34. On page 85, the author also briefly describes the Italian sonnets of Croatian poets.

[8]   Cf. *ibid*.: 97-99. Therefore, the sonnet is not accepted by Croatian versification, to which Italian poetry represents only an aesthetic model, while the realisation instruments are set by national circumstances and tradition.

due to which the sonnet form would hinder the possibility of the realisation of the Petrarchist ideal of *imitatio* (as stated by F. Čale),[9] Ranjina translates Petrarch's sonnets in double dodecasyllabic lines, just as was done by the majority of his predecessors and by his contemporaries. Accordingly, he has at his disposal a confirmed and conventional form, while there is no previous solution presented for the translation of the sestina. Ranjina is the first Croatian poet (and the only one in th long series of centuries, until the present days) who uses this metrical form, therefore he himself determining its Croatian characteristics.[10]

Sestina, the highest reach of the formalist aspirations of provencal poetry,[11] is based on the strict and complex combinations of verse endings. It is composed of six strophes, six verses each, and the three-verse supplement, called *tornada*. The closing words of the first six-verse strophe are repeated in all subsequent strophes, in a different order based on the *retrogradatio cruciata*[12] scheme: the closing words, that is, the rhyme-words of the three last verses (from the sixth towards the third) are alternating with the rhyme-words of the first three verses of the previous strophe (from the first towards the third). In the last, three-verse strophe, all six rhyme-words are repeated (only three of them as end-words). The sestina was invented by the Provencal poet Arnaut Daniel; Dante, introducing some minor changes of its metric structure and more significant lexical and stylistic interventions, establishes its canonic form, widespread throughout the entire Romance area in the 15th and 16th century, due to Petrarch's influence. Croatian literature before the 20th century came in touch with this form for the first and the only time through Ranjina's translation of the Petrarch's sestina. „Came in touch" is the only appropriate expression, because Ranjina did not translate the sestina into the form of the „true" sestina, he did not entirely reproduce its formal structure that determines it so characteristically. Still, he managed to create a metrically interesting and new form, thus once more being confirmed as a metrical experimentalist – which was unanimously assessed as a positive characteristic by the critique, otherwise regularly reproaching him for artistic incoherence or even for completely failed artistic results.[13] The fact that Petrarch wrote as much as nine sestinas (while the complete previous italian poetical corpus includes only four) and that sestina is thus a third metrical form in *Canzoniere*, is pointed out as significant by many authors, regardless of a

---

[9] Cf. 1984: 34-38.

[10] In the Florence edition, *Piesni raslike* (1563), a number of texts are written in the sonnet form. Valjavec did not present any of them in the original form, but broke them up in two-verse stanzas.

[11] For the presentation of the development of the sestina from the already existent Provencal poetic forms cf. Roncaglia 1981: 15-37. For a comprehensive literary-historical and comparatist presentation of the sestina cf. Riesz 1971. General information on the sestina in our text is based on Riesz's work.

[12] The term is used in mediaeval rhetoric treatises. The schematic presentation of the strophe structure in the sestina is the following: ABCDEF, FAEBDC, CFDABE, ECBFAD, DEACFB, BDFECA, (B)E, (D)C, (F)A.

[13] Cf. Such as Kombol 1961: 182-183, Franičević 1974: 101-102, 110, Tomasović 1978:176-177.

large disproportion in the number of sonnets and canzonas and the number of sestinas.[14] Petrarch definitely demonstrates greater technicistic persistency than his predecessors (Arnaut and Dante, as well as Arnaut's imitators Bartolome Zorzi and Uc de Saint Circ). However, the larger number of included sestinas is also a consequence of the range of the *Canzoniere* and the conception of it as a poetic collection which should demonstrate the complete repertoire of possible lyric metrical forms (therefore along with sonnets, canzonas and sestinas, a certain number of ballads and madrigals is also included). Petrarch's sestinas, by their form directly connected to Dante's archetype, are not equally dependent on Dante when it comes to their motives and style. Yet, *A qualunque animale alberga in terra*, the first one in *Canzoniere*, along with *L'aere gravato e l'importuna nebbia* and *Giovene donna sotto un verde lauro*, belongs to a group that was most clearly influenced by Dante's *Rime petrose*, the micro-corpus of four compositions, including the sestina *Al poco giorno e al gran cerchio d'ombra*, and a double sestina *Amor tu vedi ben che questa donna*, besides the canzonas *Io son venuto al punto de la rota* and *Così nel mio parlar voglio esser aspro*. The sestina *A qualunque animale alberga in terra* relies on Dante not only in the formal sense,[15] and is at the same

---

[14] Cf. von Koppenfels 1967: 153. Riesz 1971: 355. Relevant explanation is offered by Vanossi 1980: 281: „Proprio l'uso intensivo della sestina appare anzi come l'innovazione più significativa del *Canzoniere* rispetto al sistema dei generi duecentesco, o più specifi-camente 'stilnovistico', di fronte alla quale passano in secondo piano altri fattori ... . Grazie al Petrarca, quello che era un isolato esercizio di bravura tecnica, ancora iscritto nell'ambito della canzone, acquista piena dignità di genere".

[15] Some of the most direct traces of Dante's *Rime petrose* are noted by Santagata 1990: 205, n. 95: the adversative pattern *Et io* ... in the second strophe and in every ten verses in the canzona *Io son venuto*, the 8th verse: „a scuoter l'ombra intorno de la terra" that reminds of the first verse of the sestina *Al poco giorno* ... „, the optative in the 28th verse „vedess'io in lei pietà ... " that reminds of the 53th verse in the canzona *Così nel mio parlar* ... : „Così vedess'io lui". We might also add that „Uom nudrito in selva" is by its situational substrate congener to the 21th verse.: „ch'io son fuggito per piani e per colli". In order to facilitate the understanding of the further text, we are also quoting Dante's sestina (1965: 158-159): „Al poco giorno e al gran cerchio d'ombra / son giunto, lasso, ed al bianchir de' colli, / quando si perde lo color ne l'erba: / e 'l mio disio però non cangia il verde, / sí è barbato ne la dura pietra / che parla e sente come fosse donna. /Similemente questa nova donna / si sta gelata come neve a l'ombra: / ché non la move, se non come petra, / il dolce tempo che riscalda i colli, / e che li fa tornar di bianco in verde / perché li copre di fioretti e d'erba. / Quand'ella ha in testa una ghirlanda d'erba, / trae de la mente nostra ogn'altra donna: / perché si mischia il crespo giallo e 'l verde / sí bel, ch'Amor lí viene a stare a l'ombra, / che m'ha serrato intra piccioli colli / piú forte assai che la calcina petra. / La sua bellezza ha piú vertú che petra, / e 'l colpo suo non può sanar per erba: / ch'io son fuggito per piani e per colli, / per potere scampar da cotal donna; / e dal suo lume non mi può far ombra / poggio né muro mai né fronda verde. / Io l'ho veduta già vestita a verde, / sì fatta ch'ella avrebbe messo in petra / l'amor ch'io porto pur a la sua ombra: / ond'io l'ho chesta in un bel prato d'erba, / innamorata com'anco fu donna, / e chiuso intorno d'altissimi colli. /Ma ben ritorneranno i fiumi a' colli / prima che questo legno molle e verde / s'infiammi, come suol far bella donna, / di me; che mi torrei dormire in petra / tutto il mio tempo e gir pascendo l'erba, / sol per veder do' suoi panni fanno ombra. / Quandunque i colli fanno piú nera ombra, / sotto un bel verde la giovane donna / la fa sparer, com'uom petra sott'erba."

time markedly "Petrarchist", clearly detached from its model by a series of motivic and lexical elements and by its degree of communicational and emotional explicitness. Both compositions have in common the same theme, which is almost self-understandable considering the dominant thematic line of medieval love poetry: the poet's unfortunate condition resulting from the unrequitted love for a beautiful and indifferent woman. In both sestinas to this theme form is given by landscape elements. This also represents one of the usual procedures of lyrical poetry at that time (while Arnaut creates his composition by juxtaposing a series of gnomic expressions which unite the most disparate elements of the empiric sphere). Both Dante's and Petrarch's sestinas are composed of a series of landscape images, playing the role of contextual-situational determiners and means of objectification of the poet's emotional state. Petrarch also follows Dante on the level of the conceptual and dynamic text organization, and its dynamic structuring. Thus, in both compositions the first two strophes represent the anthitesis domain, but the modalities of the presence of this figure are different in each of them. In Dante's text the anthitetis appears both in the first and in the second strophe, which are mutually connected by the *similitudo* figure. Petrarch uses the anthitesis at the connection point between two sestinas, while within the strophe he sets out a series of predicates, having the same basic meaning: therefore, in that segment of Petrarch's work the rhetorical layer is less complex.

The third and the fourth strophe in both texts are for the most part explicative fragments which set out reasons for the situation described in the introductory strophes (with greater referential dynamics and emotional intensity in Dante's text). In the following two strophes occurs a change in the situation. However, while Dante is direct and synthetic, and first desires the lady „in lovely meadow grass" (in the 5th strophe) and then covers the hyperbolical announcement of the final defeat in the ultimate paradox form – the *adynaton* figure (the 6th strophe), Petrarch reflects upon his relation with the lady in both strophes, and explicates the non-apellant final result by the means of the *adynaton* figure in the final, three-verse strophe. In Petrarch's example there is no conflict between the two participants, because the lady is deprived of any subjective characteristic and is only a cause of the state towards which the poet directs his auto-analytical striving and introspective pedantry.

He never names the lady directly, he only briefly calls upon her not more than four times: twice using the personal pronoun *lei*, and twice recalling her metaphorical, that is, symbolic equivalents (*aspra fera*, *verde selva*). Within the universe of the text, the change of the situation does not surpass the fictional sphere, it is realized exclusively as the projection of the poet's desire, first by means of the generalised cliché description of the lady's benevolence, and then as an erotic fantasy, which, by absorbing and re-forming Dante's crypticality and alusiveness, returns to the Arnaut archetype, deprived of concrete, objective connotations.[16] The same as in Dante's example, the rhyme-words belong to

---

[16] Still, the direct quotation of Arnaut is the beginning of the 24th verse, imitating the first verse of the Arnaut's sestina „Lo ferm voler qu'el cor m'intra". The second half of the verse, according to Carducci's and Ferrari's comment (1984: 23, n.24), refers to *Paradiso*,

the semantic area of landscape and natural phenomena. Petrarch goes one step further: in his work, all rhyme-words, mutually connected on the basis of semantic affinity or contrariety, and partially on the basis of assonance (which also reminds of Arnaut and Dante) belong to the same semantic area. Petrarch's consistence, opposite to Dante's „ecclecticism" (in the sestina *Al poco giorno* the word *donna* does not belong to the natural sphere), surpasses the issue of the stylistic preferences and the outer form: it synthetizes and makes explicit the basic conceptual difference between the two compositions. Dante's sestina is created upon the syncretistic principle, upon the unification of the area of the alive and the unalive, that is, upon the anthropomorphisation of the nature and naturalisation of the human sphere. This characteristic – emblematically presented through the rhyme-words, among which, apart from the description of natural phenomena, the word *donna* is used, along with the word *petra* as a symbolic synonym of the previous term – is also displayed in the text in much more complex forms.[17] The entire composition is created upon the multiple semantic charge of particular lexemes, which produces the constant symbolic tension of the text, and also enables occasional conceit-style solutions.

This kind of symbolic layer is missing from Petrarch's text, the landscape is exclusively the objective correlative, that is, the describer and the measure of the poet's state, and by no means the projection of the tension between equality and dissimilarity. Instead of the permeation and the unification of different spheres, their separation and opposition occurs. Traces of the equation *donna* = *petra* are preserved in Petrarch's identification of *lei* (meaning *donna*, that is, *Laura*) with *aspra fera* and *verde selva*.[18] However, it is not the all-permeating principle of the text composition, but an isolated fragment with a strictly limited symbolic range. Petrarch's particularity, which however does not imperil the rationality and transparency of his expression, is the establishing of the symbolic correlation *Laura – lauro* by the metonymic synonyms of those terms. The primary connection may be reconstructed by correlating it with the entire context of *Canzoniere*.

Petrarch is literal in his description of the landscape. Instead of a superficially meager and vague set of lexemes, which however does reveal a complex semantic stratification, Petrarch is focused on a detailed analysis of the surface layer, on the creation of suggestive landscape images and precious descriptions, which in the text structure represent a value of their own and have not only a didascalic, but

---

IV, 52. Santagata (1990: 205, n. 983) also points to the similarity between the fragment 81-83 and the verses 66-71 of Dante's canzona „Così nel mio parlar … „. Carducci and Ferrari (1984: 23, n. 33) also recall two verses of Guiraut Borneilh.

[17] Precisely the word *petra* functions most clearly as the connection-word between both areas, as the description of the natural element, but also as the lexical substitute for the anthroponymic term (on the condition that the opposition [+abstract] [-abstract] is annuled).

[18] It is debatable whether *sole* in the 17th verse describes Laura „per la cui passione fosse diventato così squallido da apparirne quasi un uom selvatico." Carducci-Ferrari 1984: 23. The two authors prefer a negative answer: „Notisi che in tutta la sest. *sole* è usato sempre nel termine proprio". *Ibid*.

also a markedly decorative function. The only symbolic motif is also presented in the way that evokes its sculptural concretisation. It is based on the mythological story,[19] which annuls its referential polysemy and fluctuating semantic aura.

It is evident at the first glance that Ranjina's translation of Petrarch's sestina does not correspond to the description of that metrical form nor does it repeat the contents of the original in its entirety. What is more, printed as a continuous text in Valjavec's edition, it appears an agglomerate of double dodecasyllabic lines, and the only trace that remains of the sestina is a number of six rhyme-words and the closing part comparable to the *tornada*. The division into strophes, which Torbarina uses to „correct" Valjavec will however show that Ranjina's composition is a sestina of a kind, despite a smaller number of verses than is the case in the original – 26 against 39 – and the consequent impossibility of consistently using all the combinations of the number 6 which characterize the classical form of the sestina. Formally, Ranjina's „sestina" is two strophes shorter than the original text. The further it moves from the initial verses, the more different is its subject matter. According to Torbarina this is due to the the difficulty and the complexity of the metrical form: the author made the already complex rhyme form of the sestina „even more complicated", „because in his poem, from the total of six closing words in each strophe, two and two words are rhyming together"; therefore, „after the fourth strophe, he seems to lack breath" necessary for the finalisation of his ambitious design.[20]

Although noting a series of relevant characteristics of Ranjina's sestina, Torbarina did not describe its rhyme qualities precisely and reliably enough. Ranjina's strophe, consisting of three double dodecasyllabic lines is a synthesis,

---

[19] The mythological *exemplum* in the verses 34-36 in the most direct example of Petrarch's classicism, confirmation of which, in the sense of derivation of segments of the „signified" and the affiliated verbal signifiers, may be found in numerous other passages. That is, the models of his landscape images belong to the classical cultural and literary tradition. Petrarch owes his illustrating metoculousness and preciseness to the classical authors, thus differing his landscape from Dante's concise lines and juxtaposed segments. His classical models are listed in detail by Carducci and Ferrari in the comment to their edition of the *Canzoniere*: he turns to classical authors primarily in order to realize the cosmic, unearthly anthitesis pole. Even one of the rhyme-words – *stelle* – appears several times in the Latin models of his images. However, the classical influence he receives is inseparable from Dante's influence (him being the first author to spread classical influence in Italian literature). Carducci and Ferrari overlooked that fact, partly because the correspondence on the level of the signified is less direct and clearly determinable. It concerns more conceptual and poetic orientation than textual concordance. Nevertheless, the unavoidable and almost automatic mediation link are not the *Rime petrose*, that is, the canzona *Io son venuto* .., where space phenomena and celestial bodies are observed from the scientific, astronomic point of view, but the *Divine Comedy*, where landscape, celestial and earthly phenomena are also functioning as a correlative of the poet's state on another, ontologically superior level, and are characterised by an analogous pictorial and expressional quality.

[20] Torbarina 1978: 10. This exact symmetry makes the poem an extraordinary feat of prosody and a metrical *tour de force*. 1931: 158.

or a compromise, between the ideal of the sestina and the limitations imposed by the chosen meter. The scheme of the double dodecasyllabic line, as the only Croatian verse form valid in the given circumstances (and as the predominant verse of Croatian Petrarchist poetry, and the only one that offers enough „metrical space") , contains the same rhyme in two vertically associated words, that is, three pairs of rhymes in each of the six-verse strophes. Accordingly, the strophe consists of three compact segments, therefore excluding the possibility of the use of the complex *retrogradatio cruciata* scheme, which is based on the combination of six word-endings differing from strophe to strophe. This can be noted if we compare the rhymes of Ranjina's sestina, as presented by Torbarina – *aa bb cc / cc bb aa // aa cc bb / bb cc aa // aa* – with the *retrogradatio cruciata* pattern: ABCDEF, FAEBDC, CFDABE, ECBFAD, DEACFB, BDFECA, (B)E, (D)C, (F)A. The only characteristic of the sestina consistently preserved by Ranjina is the *coblas capfinidas* system: the rhyme-word that closes the final verse in the strophe is at the same time the first rhyme-word in the following strophe. It could be concluded from Torbarina's scheme that this practice is at the same time the only binding principle of Ranjina's arrangement, and that the alternation of verses in position 2: *bb* and *cc*, is submitted to it. A combination of these two constructive moves makes the composition of Ranjina's sestina even more complex. That is, within each segment of two strophes, the two-verse stanzas are mutually corresponding according to the chiasmus outline. If we observe the arrangement of rhyme-words considering their lexeme characteristics, we may note that in most segments they are creating the same figure. The chiasmus created by couples with the same rhyme appears to be further enriching the basic chiastic structure, at the same time representing its counterpoint in the central verse segment 11-14, where it introduces irregularity into the variation of the homonyms *dan* (day) and *dan* (given). We might say that Ranjina compensates the unrealisable *retrogradatio cruciata* scheme, employing different, more available means of formal text composing. The conception of Ranjina's sestina is contrary to the assumption that the poet finished his composition after the fourth strophe, because he was unable to preserve the level of intellectual control demanded by this extremely calculated construction of the text, as Torbarina seems to suggest, attributing also the subject matter discrepancy between the original and the translation to formal-technical reasons: „Ranjina perfectly keeps step with Petrarch's sestina in the beginning, but the further it goes, the more liberated his following becomes".[21] As accurate as it may be, this laconic statement does not reveal any significant fact about the correlation between the two texts. Therefore, although in the first strophe Ranjina evidently puts in a lot of effort in order to translate the Italian original as acurately as possible, already in the third verse, faced with the demands imposed by the metrical form he uses, he is compelled to resign from the consistent execution of this intent, proven by the first, the second and the sixth verse. It seems that in the first strophe the only reason for resigning from the original is a different meter. That is, in the sestina the verse is the basic metrical unit, therefore also a syntactic

---

[21]   1978:10.

and motivic whole, and the contextual verse connection starts from that fact. In Ranjina's text, as in all texts written in double dodecasyllabic lines, the basic unit is the two-verse stanza, that is the verse couple. Therefore, in Petrarch's sestina, the pause is possible after the third verse, and in Ranjina's translation the third verse functions in symbiosis with its pair, so the motivic and the sentencial unit may end only after the fourth verse. Ranjina was forced to expand the contents of Petrarch's verse into two verse fragments, and then to contract the fourth and fifth verse of the original into only one verse. The second strophe – in which the pause appears after the fourth verse – seems to be the ideal model from the point of view of metrical-syntactic structure.[22] Nevertheless, Ranjina intervenes here again, evidently starting from criteria which are not dictated by the formal arrangement of the text. That is, he leaves out the ninth verse (where the word *animale* is repeated, the bisemanticness of which he has annulled already in the first verse, thus impoverishing the first strophe in terms of both rhetoric and content). He substitutes the ninth verse with an explicative supplement, which, although it seems most directly motivated by the necessity of using the rhyme-word corresponding to the previous one, up to a certain extent contracts the contents of the sestina, thus anticipating the theme of the strophes to follow.

It seems that Ranjina started shortening the measure of his text already from this verse on, creating it independently of the original, according to a consistent and well conceived blueprint. This blueprint excludes the sixth strophe, where the motif of sensual love and Daphne's mythological metamorphosis appears. And here we are not dealing with a reservation of a culturological or ideological nature. Erotic situations in some of Ranjina's poems are much more explicit than Petrarca's fantasies, and a series of paraphrases of ancient authors and occasional classical reminiscences have contributed to the false belief that Ranjina moved away from Petrarchism and turned to ancient authors.[23] Ranjina simply narrows the motivic spectre of his composition – it is the only certain conclusion to be made – and from the second part of Petrarcha's sestina he conveys only one motif, yet a basic one – the lady's cruelty. Announcing it in the second strophe, Ranjina works it out, bringing it to the climax and the hyperbolic solution in the next two strophes and in the closing two-verse stanza, rejecting any motivic „digression" offered by the model: mostly Petrarch's conceptually and expressionaly „intriguing" verses, which do not fit into the repetitive scheme of Ranjina's text. From the third strophe he conveys only two verses (the 13th and the 17th), which are repeating some of the previous textual fragments. (In the Croatian version, this auto-proliferation relation is brought to the extreme in the closing

---

[22] Exemptions are the verses 1-2 of the first strophe. The dominant chiastic arrangement within the two strophes is evident from the schematic presentation of Ranjina's rhyme-words: ABCDEF FEDCAB ABFECD DCEFAB BA.

[23] This opinion – as reported by Kombol trying to refute it – is represented by a series of older critics from Jagić and Maixner to Vodnik, Prohaska and Kasumović. It was being concluded that „Ranjina, by refining his taste through the lecture of Greek and Latin poets was the first in Croatia to understand the complete unnaturalness of our oldest love poetry". 1938: 34.

segment of the first and the second verse in the third strophe, which are repeating, specularly, the structure of the closing two-verse stanza of the previous strophe. It is this double chiasmus which marks the breaking point of the composition, the point where the two parts of the composition meet. An adapted segment of the fourth strophe is also added to it, explicitly presenting the stereotype of the cruel lady lover who makes the poet suffer. The fourth strophe and the two-verse conclusion are almost entirely independent from the original. True, both Petrarch and Ranjina are focusing on the motif of the cruel lady and the poet's suffering, and the *adynaton* in Petrarch's *tornada* is evidently generating Ranjina's double *adynaton*. But in all other elements, Ranjina is either completely independent from the original or connected to it by a very fine, almost invisible thread (this thread possibly connects the closing strophe of the paraphrase with the verses 21 and 22 of Petrarch's sestina). Ranjina moves away from the original because its poetic time is almost terminated. And, while Petrarch still has an opportunity to experiment with diverse expressive material, the Croatian author needs to bring the given theme to an end in a fitting manner. Therefore, in the last six-verse strophe and the three-verse conclusion he intensifies the rethotic tension of the text. Specularly in relation to the initial verses of the sestina, in a contracted form, the motives *zvir* (animal) and the alternation of day and night are repeated. Each of them forms the skeleton of the *adynaton.* The first *adynaton* thematically is the copy of the Petrarch's one (but its position in the text, it reminds of Dante), the second one has no correspondent in Petrarch's sestina. From Petrarch's text, Ranjina conveys only the closing element, a conceptually complex figure, contextualizing it entirely independently from the original, in accordance with the previous blueprint of the structure of his own text. Hyperbolisation based on an intellectual paradox is also realized in the final strophe (in that sense, his text moves parallely with Petrarch's). However, Ranjina did not use the *adynaton*, but the oxymoron, which is the abstract and the synthetic variant of the previous figure.[24]

Ranjina's composition is evidently a thought-out and consistently formed whole. In quantitative terms, it is shorter than the original by two sestinas and one verse of the *tornada* (i. e., two is one half of four, as in Petrarch three is one half of six), but it evidently does not mean that the Croatian author mechanically rejects a certain number of strophes and verses, although he seemingly applies that procedure also. That is, he leaves out the sixt strophe the only thing for which Torbarina – who presents it as „the only sincere passage in the whole *sestina* and one of the most passionate in the *Canzoniere*" [25] – reproaches him. However, considering the bookish origin of the motif Torbarina alludes to, this comment is not pertinent. What is more, that passage is genre-wise most conditioned. The motif of sensual love is the supporting element present in both archetypal sestinas, Arnaut's and Dante's, and is also characteristic of another genre in the Provencal

---

[24] Still, *adynaton* is not necessarily based on direct opposition, like the anthitesis or the oxymoron. Cf. Lausberg 1969: 110 for the adynaton as a form of paraphrase.

[25] 1931: 158.

poetry: *alba*, which the mentioned passage also recalls by the use the same-sounding word in the function of rhyme-word and by the situation it evokes. The supression of the mythological motif from the second part of the strophe („E non si transformasse in verde selva / per uscirmi di braccia, come il giorno / Ch'Apollo la seguia per la terra!", 84-86) and the absence of any mythological reference seems much more significant to us. The inclusion of the story about Daphne and Apollo is only one of the forms, probably the most stylized one, of the mythical, universalistic projection which Petrarch used to elevate his own, personal, „private" story to the level of a universal and exemplary situation, in order to turn the restricted, individual, case into the metaphor of human existential lack of unity and condemnation to the non-fulfilment. Passages 15-16 („Miro pensoso le crudeli stelle / Che m'hanno fatto di sensibili terra") and 23-27 („Ché, ben ch' i' sia mortal corpo di terra / Lo mio fermo desir vien da le stelle. / Prima ch' i' torni a voi lucenti stelle, O tomi giù ne l'amorosa selva / Lassando il corpo che fia trita terra") express the same concept, but there is no evidence of them in Ranjina's text. The Croatian paraphrase does not surpass the level of realisation of certain formal principles and elaboration of a literary topos: it is a very skilfully written and convincingly substantiated composition on the theme of the cruel lady and the poet's hopeless suffering, deprived of the metaphysical and symbolic dimension, which is the significant characteristic of the entire cycle of Petrarch's sestinas,[26] and is immanent to the genesis of the very form. In that sense, Ranjina is the prisoner of the tradition he originated from and the spiritual apprentice of the strambottists, regardless of the similarities or differences on the formal plan. From the third strophe on, that is, after the first half of his text, Ranjina breaks free from the direct dependency of the model and uses as much of its elements and in such the measure as it is necessary in order to further work out and complete the composition accordingly to the motivic and expressional setting of the first two strophes. In comparison with the original, motif-wise, they are already narrower and rougher in segments constituting the level of the ambiental situation and the context of events. Precious landscape images of classical origin are reduced to a more rational and more economic variant, appropriate for the nature and purpose of Ranjina's text, which is of a much more restricted reach than Petrarch's: as we have already mentioned, what Ranjina wants is to write no more than a formally interesting composition on the subject of the lady with a heart of stone. By that, the richness and the aesthetic potentialities of the model – owing to which the landscape, as functional as it may be in relation to the „message" and the conceptual scheme of the sestina, creates a level of the text endowed with its own significance and value – are reduced to the minimal obligatory and conventional part. This is clearly illustrated by the contrast between the harmony and pregnancy of the qualitative adjectives in Petrarch's text and the poverty and stereotypical manner of the paraphrase in that segment. For a thoroughly evident and understandable reason, this

---

[26] That is, as Vanossi 1980: 282 says: „ ... con Petrarca la circolarità della forma tende a farsi cifra dell'intera esistenza".

reductive tendency is even more apparent in the second part, where the share of didascalic-explanatory phrases is intensified. (This type of discourse is completely absent from the original.) Resenting „un certo mancamento ... di dolcezza" in the sestina, Tommaseo exempts Petrarch's sestina XXII, admitting it to be „vaga e leggiadramente tessuta". It is clear, even without a special analytical insight that the same could not be said about Ranjina's translation.

Ranjina's paraphrase does not represent a mere shortening of the original, but a remodulation, an adaptation of the complete text to a different measure and different inner relations. Only one characteristic of the original is exempted from that: the number of six verses in the strophe. But the norm of the Croatian metre interferes with that rule, reducing the lexical range of the closing words. In Ranjina's text, the equivalents of *sole* and *stelle* are disappearing from the rhyme-word position – *sunce* (sun) is used twice, *zvizde* (stars) once, always in the centre of the verse – and they are substituted with by verbal forms. The result is the erosion of an entire layer of the text contents form – that is, the one that creates the outer base of the poet's emotional state – and the impossibility of maintaining the counterpointing between the objective and the subjective division of the time *continuum*. The word *stelle*, originating from the classic authors, in Petrarch's sestina represents the frame of some pictorially most suggestive and semantically most complex syntagms. In the translation, it is reduced to a mere chronometeorological information. (However, there is still a sufficient number of key words left, allowing to preserve a part of the hyperbolic charge of the original, and also some more impressive landscape entry.)

Riesz notices that three of the six rhyme-words in Petrarch's text – *terra*, *sole*, *stelle* – are denoting cosmic entities, two – *giorno*, *alba* – are chronological terms of reference, and *selva* illustrates an element of the earthly landscape. Therefore, he points out: „Dabei greifen komische und zeitliche Begriffe ineinander über, sind teilweise vertauschbar". [27] Similarly *selva* in verses 26 34 and 37, owing to the rhetorical „treatment" and to its diachronic origin, represents a referent that projects the events evoked in the text onto the background of eternal duration.[28] This circular movement is not repeated in Ranjina's paraphrase, where only two rhyme words – *dan* (day), *ʒora* (dawn) – are the exact translation of Petrarch's, two – *svit* (world), *gora* (mountain) – are near equivalents, used always with the same meaning, and two – *viditi* (to see), *dati* (to give) – belong to a different morphological category. Nevertheless, on the basis of four nominal rhyme-words, semantically the same or similar, we may conclude that Ranjina intends to follow the original as much as possible. However, this intention failes already in the second verse, once more due to the coercion of the dodecasyllabic line form. Using

---

[27] 1971: 70.

[28] The subtext of the verse No. 26: „O tomi giù nell'amorosa selva" is the following verse in the *Aeneid*: „Hic quos durus amor crudeli tabe peredit / secreti celant et myrtea circum / Sylva teget" (VI, 442). Cf. Carducci-Ferrari 1984: 23. Verse No. 37 is commented by the mentioned authors: „in s. selva. Chiuso in legno secco, cioè in una cassa da morto. Dice selva per legno come dicono i francesi (bois) e dissero anche i latini". *Ibid*.: 23-24.

the word *sviti* (world) in the first verse as a near synonym for *terra*, Ranjina, if he wishes to stay within the rules of the chosen meter, must vertically join it to a word with the same ending. As a supplementary integrating element, the word *viditi* (to see) offers itself to him. Associated to *sviti* it functions as a fixed pair and appears as a verse-creating cliché in other Ranjina's compositions[29] (and the theme of the Italian text is in no contrast with this choice).

The association of the noun *dan* (day) with a homophonous verbal form also follows the tradition: that is, *equivocum* is a figure close to the paretymological association, which appears to be one of the most common procedures of verse endings creation in previous Croatian poetry: in church mysteries, in Marulić's work, and less often in N. Ranjina's anthology.[30] However, in the aforementioned collection, in Šiško Menčetić's poem *Nika vil cvit vidi u mene žuto*, an *equivocum* of the same type as Ranjina's occurs.: „Nu ona još s kojom živiti rad uzdah / i da će pokojom namirit moj uzdah"[31] (*uzdah*1 – hoped, *uzdah* 2 – sigh)**.** We might ask ourselves if Ranjina would succeed in telling the episode of Daphne's metamorphosis and in translating all the complex and heterogeneous components of Petrarch's text on the basis of this rhyming vocabulary, determined by two thematically homogenous sestinas and the rules of the dodecasyllabic meter.

The first three strophes are varying the same motif– a comparison between the situation in nature and the poet's condition – in three formally similar versions. Therefore, the rhyming dictionary based on those versions could not be adapted to the representation of the second part, motivically and conceptually more complex and diverse. The space of six verses and six closing words enables a larger range of action and a mediation of a greater universe segment than the cataloguing of two-verse units and two-by-two formally identical rhyme-words. Owing to that fact, despite the strict principles of the *retrogradatio cruciata*, a sestina strophe is formally less restricting than the combination of three rhymes organized into two-verse stanzas.

Ranjina did not „lack breath", but – aware that the chosen metrical form and the restrictions it imposes, faced with the complexity of the original, might lead him into a situation with no way out – found a solution that complies with the traditional form and the demand for formal consistency and quality, carrying at the same time a visible mark of its Italian model.

---

[29] For example, in poems No. 50 and No. 52. In Ranjina's poetry, vertical association between *sviti* and the infinitive, regardless of its lexical contents, is rather often.

[30] We are citing some examples from all three texts: *budi/udi*, *stavi/ostavi*, *uzgor/na vrh gor*, *roka/priroka*. Marulić and church mysteries (*Crkvena prikazanja*) are quoted according to the editions of 1993 and 1893, respectively.

[31] Menčetić 1937: 214.

Bibliography

Bogdan, Tomislav, 2003, *Lica ljubavi, Status lirskog subjekta u kanconijeru Džore Držića*, Zagreb, Zavod za znanost o književnosti Filozofskoga fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.

Carducci, Giosuè-Ferrari, Severino, 1984, edition and comment to Petrarca Francesco, *Le Rime*, Firenze, Sansoni.

Crkvena prikazanja starohrvatska XVI i XVII vijeka, 1893, ed. Milan Valjavec, SPH XX, Zagreb, JAZU.

Čale, Frano, 1984, Sonet i neki formalni aspekti hrvatskog petrarkizma, in *Izvor i izvornos*t: *poredbene studije*, Zagreb, Liber, pp. 29-52.

Dante, 1965 = Dante Alighieri, 1965, *Rime*, ed. Gianfranco Contini, Torino, Einaudi.

Franičević, Marin, 1974, Razlikosti Dinka Ranjine, in *Pjesnici i stoljeća*, Zagreb, Mladost, pp. 98-110.

Kombol Milan, 1932, Dinko Ranjina i talijanski petrarkisti, *Građa*, XI, pp. 64-94.

Kombol, Milan, 1961, Povijest hrvatske književnosti do narodnog preporoda, II ed., Zagreb, Matica hrvatska.

Koppenfels, Werner von, 1967, Dantes 'Al poco giorno' und Petrarcas 'Giovene donna', ein Interpretationsvergleich zweier Sestinen, *Deutsches Dante-Jahrbuch*, 44/45, pp. 150-189.

Lausberg, Heinrich, 1969, *Elementi di retorica*, Bologna, Il Mulino.

Marulić Marko, *Pisni razlike*, 1993, ed. Josip Vončina, Split, Književni krug.

Menčetić, 1937 = *Pjesme Šiška Menčetića i Gjore Držića i ostale pjesme Ranjinina zbornika*, 1937, ed. M. Rešetar, SPH II, Zagreb, JAZU.

Percopo, Erasmo 1892, ed., *Le rime di Benedetto Gareth detto il Chariteo*, a cura di E. Pèrcopo, vol. I, Tipografia dell'Accademia delle Scienze.

Petrarca, Francesco, 1984, *Le Rime*, ed. by Giosuè Carducci and Severino Ferrari, Firenze, Sansoni.

Petrović, Svetozar, Problem soneta u starijoj hrvatskoj književnosti, *Rad JAZU*, 350, Zagreb, 1968, pp. 5-303.

Piesni raslike Dinka Ragnine vlastelina dubrovackoga, 1563, In Fiorenza: appresso i figl. di Lorenzo Torrentino.

Ranjina, Dinko, 1891, *Pjesni razlike*, ed. Milan Valjavec, SPH XVIII, Zagreb, JAZU.

Riesz, Janos, 1971, *Die Sestine: Ihre Stellung in der literarischen Kritik und ihre Geschichte als Literarischen Genus*, Muenchen, Fink.

Roncaglia, Arturo, 1981, L'invenzione della sestina, *Metrica*, 2, pp. 15-37.

Santagata, Marco, 1990, *Per moderne carte: la biblioteca volgare di Petrarca*, Bologna, Il Mulino.

Tomasović, Mirko, 1978, Hrvatska renesansna književnost u evropskom kontekstu, in A. Flaker – K. Pranjić ed., *Hrvatska književnost u evropskom kontekstu*, Zagreb, Zavod za znanost o književnosti, Sveučilišna naklada Liber, pp. 167-192.

Torbarina, Josip, 1931, *Italian Influence on the Poets of the Ragusan Republic*, London, Williams & Norgate Ltd.

Torbarina, Josip, 1978, Petrarca u renesansnom Dubrovniku, in *Petrarca i*

petrarkizam u slavenskim zemljama, radovi Međunarodnog simpozija – Petrarca e il petrarchismo nei paesi slavi, Atti del convegno internazionale), Dubrovnik, 6-9. XI. 1974, ed. F. Čale, Zagreb-Dubrovnik, JAZU, pp. 3-14.

Vanossi, Luigi, 19890, Identità e mutazione nella sestina petrarchesca, in AA.VV., *Studi di filologia romanza e italiana offerti a Gianfranco Folena dagli allievi padovani*, Modena, Mucchi, pp. 281-99.

RANJININ PRIJEVOD PETRARKINE SESTINE
A QUALUNQUE ANIMALE ALBERGA IN TERRA

U članku analiziramo na koji je način dubrovački pjesnik Dinko Ranjina preveo Petrarkinu sestinu *A qualunque animale alberga in terra*, prilagodivši je mogućnostima hrvatske versifikacije. Sestina, najviši formalistički domet provansalske poezije, temelji se na višestrukoj kombinatorici broja 6 (6 strofa od 6 stihova i 6 riječi-rima), uz strogo određeni raspored izmjenjivanja riječi-rima u svakoj strofi (prema shemi *retrogradatio cruciata*) i isto tako obvezan način povezivanja strofa (*coblas capfinidas*) .

Ranjina je zadržao šestostihovnu strofu, pa i povezivanje kitica sistemom *coblas capfinidas*. Ali hrvatski tradicionalni stih kojim korespondira Petrakinom *endecasillabu*, dvanaesterac, ravna se prema sebi svojstvenim pravilima. Dvanaesterci se redovito rabe u paru a oba stiha povezana su rimom. To poništava mogućnost primjene sheme *retrogradatio cruciata*, koja uključuje uzajamni odnos riječi-rima dviju susjednih strofa i temelji se na podjeli sestine na dvije trostihovne cjeline. Dvanaesteračka stihovna shema uzrok je i drugih formalnih odstupanja od predloška – Ranjinin sastavak za dvije je strofe kraći od Petrarkina, trostihovni završetak zamijenjen je dvostihom – a dovodi i do redukcije motivskog raspona izvornika i pojednostavnjenja i mjestimično i banalizacije njegovih leksičko-semantičhih komponenti.

Key words: Dinko Ranjina, Petrarca, sestina, dodecasyllabic line, chiasmus, remodulation.

Ključne riječi: Dinko Ranjina, Petrarca, sestina, dvanaesterac, hijazam, premodulacija.