

UDC 811.131.1'255.4

821.131.1.03=163.42

Original scientific paper

Received on 25 November 2010

Accepted for publication on 7 April 2011

A Chakavian Paraphrase of Marino's Epyllion *La Strage de gl'Innocenti*

Smiljka Malinar

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Zagreb

smalinar@ffzg.hr

In this paper we investigate in what way, how faithfully and with what departures from the source text the man of letters from Trogir, Dominig Laurić, translated the epyllion *La Strage degl'Innocenti* by Gian Battista Marino, not long after the author's death, addressing it to the nuns of St. Peter's convent in Trogir and "all the people of Trogir". We shall focus primarily on the lexis and rhetorical figures.

Explaining the adoption of the syntagm "sunken cultural treasure" - a syntagm coined in the sphere of anthropological scholarship - as a term used in literary criticism and discussing its application to the phenomena of 17th- and 18th-century utilitarian literature, characterized by the "ingenious 'figural' style" taken over from artistic literature, Z. Kravar, in his article *Baroque as a Sunken Cultural Treasure*¹ illustrates socio-literary "sinking" of forms originated and extended in the élite milieu by the case of the popular religious poem *La Strage de gl'Innocenti* by G. B. Marino. Published posthumously (in 1632), this is the only text by Marino which was spared the condemnation and almost total oblivion that - after his brilliant success in Europe² - excluded his other works from an active literary existence before the end of the same century.³ In contrast

¹ Published in Kravar 1993 : 161-191. For the previous citation cf. *ibid.*: 164. The Croatian version of the article was previously published in the book: S. Malinar, „Od Marulića do Marina“, Ex libris, Zagreb 2000. English translation: Sanja Matešić and Graham Mc Master (quotations from Laurić).

² For a concise overview of Marino's European fortunes cf. Zogović 1995: 35-41. The first contacts of Croatian poets with Marino occurred in the early seventeenth century.

³ Croce 1912. But the note by Zogović (1995: 40) on the editions of Marino's works from the 17th century which were read in Dubrovnik shows that his disappearance from literary life was not so sudden and so complete. Towards the end of the 18th century *Adone* was to be published again in Paris and London.



to this, by the end of the seicento *La Strage de gl'Innocenti* had been published in Italy many times – there are testimonies to show that even Italian peasants knew whole passages by heart⁴ – and it was published and translated into a number of European languages, including Latin, in the 18th and 19th centuries, all the way up to the beginning of the 20th century.⁵

Kravar notes that Marino's poem gained such extraordinary popularity, or, as it seems to us, such popularity and a corresponding socio-literary positioning, "perhaps in spite of its original intention", pointing out that it was envisaged as a modest-length epic poem, that is, as "an example of a literary form that belonged to artistic poetry",⁶ like other products by the same author. There is no doubt that the ambitious Marino, desirous of literary recognition and social success, addressed his work primarily to the political potentates and representatives of the literary élite in whose society, after all, he moved – to them he also addressed his reflections on the technical aspects of his work and announced his literary plans⁷ - and it was among them he expected this poem of his, like his other work, to be well received.

At the same time, with his choice of subject Marino made his text part of the literary corpus which, in post-Tridentine Europe, was deliberately and consciously used as a means of ideological discipline and control (by acting on the feelings of the recipients). In addition to this, he chose a subject that was sure to have a shocking effect, one of the most impressive emotional and imaginative constellations of the Biblical subject repertoire, an episode familiar to every believer, which had often been dealt with in religious literature intended for the common people.⁸ The use of the ingenious style – which sets Marino's poem apart from the previous popular versions of the *Massacre of the Innocents* – was no longer a novelty even in texts intended for primarily religious purposes, produced in ecclesiastical circles: in the second half of the 17th century prominent homilists such as F. Panigarola and C. G. Capaccio used conceits and other highly ornamental stylistic procedures.⁹ This meant there was a somewhat unstable boundary between high and low forms, which was, when it came to the homily genre, erased *ad hoc* before audiences comprising a mixture of social classes, and that stylistic clichés characteristic of artistic literature were consciously encouraged to sink. Therefore the collateral effect of the response to and popularity of *La Strage* beyond the author's primary circle of reception was

⁴ Cf. Menghini 1888: 279.

⁵ For more detailed information cf. Croce 1934: 106-107, 116-118.

⁶ 1993: 169 and 171.

⁷ Cf. Marino 1911-1912, *passim*. Pozzi 1960: 445-447, 460-461.

⁸ For works dealing with this topic written in Latin cf. Kravar 1993: 170, n.10, and Morović 1978: 72.

⁹ Cf. Pozzi 1960: 15-16, 54, 56-57.



not wholly unexpected. Even so, the presence of some undoubtedly “populist” characteristics in the stylistic structure of Marino’s poem does not necessarily mean that the most immediate advantages of participation in the “collective organism” of religious literature were at the top of his agenda. (For example, they certainly did not influence the inclusion of sonnets on religious subjects in the first and third parts of his *Lira*, nor did they prompt him to compose the pseudo-homilies, i.e., the homily-like “stylistic exercises” entitled *Dicerie sacre*).¹⁰ Marino primarily wished to prove himself in the prestigious literary form of the religious poem – which had been endowed with its status in the previous century by Sannazaro, Vida, Tansillo and Tasso¹¹– the ideological topicality and “suitability” of which could conveniently affirm him as an author with the correct world view before those ecclesiastical and worldly arbiters on whom his status as a social protagonist and writer depended, a status that might have been at risk due to the persistent suspicions and occasional outright accusations of lasciviousness and blasphemy made against him.¹² (The ultimate example of Marino’s ideological opportunism was the anti-Huguenot pamphlet *La sferza*, which he presented to Maria de’ Medici during his sojourn at the French court, albeit at a moment which was politically dangerous for him.) Marino mentioned *La Strage* for the first time in 1605, along with a number of other titles – among them the earliest version of *Adone* – which were to be illustrated by the painter Bernardo Castello.¹³ When he next mentioned it, in 1619 – after more than a decade – again mentioning *Adone* in the same breath, he announced that *La Strage* would be printed in Torino with a dedication “al serenissimo prencipe cardinale”.¹⁴ Not long afterwards (in 1620), he yoked *La Strage* and *Adone* together in a common publishing plan,¹⁵ which was realized only in the case of his profane poem. In letters written after this he again announced the publication of the poem, even declaring it to be “una delle migliori composizioni che mi sieno uscite dalla penna, e senza comparazione più perfetta dell’*Adone*” (in relation to which he suddenly

¹⁰ The work was conceived in a milieu of fashionable church dignitaries and the men of letters who gathered around them. For further detail cf. Pozzi 1960: 32-41. He dedicated his first book, *Lire*, or *Rima* (cf. Besomi 1969: 9) to his patron Melchiorre Crescenzi, Pope Clement VIII’s chamberlain. Two compositions were written for a nun from the Crescenzi family. Cf. *ibid.*: 37.

¹¹ With the epic poems *De partu Virginis*, *Christias*, *Le lagrime di S. Pietro* and *Gerusalemme liberata*.

¹² It was from the possibility of the latter accusation that he vigorously defended himself in his “Self-Defence” addressed to the Piedmontese ruler Carlo Emanuele: “Ho potuto io per aventura meritar titolo di reo poeta, ma non di poco religioso. Ho potuto errare nello scrivere, ma non già nello scrivere cose indegne di scrittore cattolico”. Marino, 1911: 78.

¹³ Cf. *ibid.*: 48-49. The division into two cantos which Marino set out on this occasion does not correspond to the final, printed form.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*: 220-221.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*: 265.

expressed great reservations)¹⁶ and considering dedicating it to the Pope.¹⁷ These were probably tactical manoeuvres with which he wished to “cover the back” of *Adone* by drawing attention to his literary-religious commitment.¹⁸ A year before his death came his last and, in view of his previous statements, perplexing reference to *La Strage*: “To sto dando l’ultima mano al poema degl’*Innocenti*.”¹⁹ It seems that it was only then, when he realized that not even the wealth and fame he had won in France or his triumphant return to Italy would save him from the threat of censorship, that he seriously decided to publish his religious poem, although his strength was ebbing. This did not happen in his lifetime, but *La Strage de gl’Innocenti*, borne along by the mainstream of the popular and permanently topical religious genre, “in the hands of the pious common people” if not in “the memory of an aesthetically demanding audience”,²⁰ was to outlive all the other works of its author by an almost full four centuries (while the *lasciviette* and the profane-religious syncretism with its ironic connotations, if not other, more subtly expressed subversive standpoints²¹ in *Adone* caused it to be included in the *Index librorum prohibitorum* six years after Marino’s death).

Judging by the octaves which Marino transferred to *La Strage* from the unfinished epic poem *Gerusalemme distrutta*, he initially intended to rewrite and brush up his religious poem, and therefore probably to publish it (he had abandoned the idea of a direct rivalry with Tasso). No interventions in the body of the text can be observed, however, after 1615, while at the same time certain octaves moved to later versions of *Adone*.²² Marino, it seems, gave up the idea of publishing *La Strage*, probably because he lost interest in the canonical literary form to which the text belongs; in the only epic poem he finished, he simultaneously did away with the characteristics, sanctified by tradition, of epic poetry. Referring to *La Strage*, Kravar observes “frequent departures from narration” in favour of “description, reflection, enumeration”, that is, interference of description and rhetorical ornamentation with narration.²³ Marino was to introduce this kind of relationship in an even more extreme form in *Adone*, “poème de la paix”, where digression and ornamentation overshadow the plot, devoid of the characteristics which constituted the mainstay of epic narration.

La Strage retained the traditional epic characteristics because the interest and significance of its subject-matter were based on a “true” event, which is, moreover,

¹⁶ “... il qual poema presso di me non è in tanta stima quanta ne fa il mondo.” *Ibid.*: 289.

¹⁷ Cf. *ibid.*, II: 42.

¹⁸ As he did in the above-mentioned letter to Carlo Emanuele: “E perché mentre delle poesie vane e giovanili si fa menzione, non se ne pongono a contro tante morali, spirituali e divote che sono uscite dalla mia penna?” *Ibid.*: 77.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*: 69.

²⁰ Kravar 1993: 170.

²¹ This is dealt with in greater detail in Malinar 2002: 320-321 and 353-354.

²² Cf. Pozzi 1960a: 449-452.

²³ Cf. Kravar 1993: 160.

protected by its sacred status. Descriptive digressions, therefore, could not be permitted to lead to a degradation of the text-making function of the plot, which the profane subject-matter of *Adone* allowed. Regardless of any later additions and modifications, the religious epyllion testifies to an earlier stage of the author's literary development which was later transcended (the abandoned epic poem *Gerusalemme distrutta* also belongs to this stage; its title suggests, inter alia, an intention to make abundant use of the descriptive verbal effects permitted by the approach to the subject-matter from the angle announced by the author): owing to its subject-matter it resisted adaptation and reshaping in line with the development of Marino's understanding of the epic poem, to which the reworking and final version of *Adone* bears witness.

Croce's list of translations of *La Strage* – which is repeated by most other, later sources – should be extended to include two Croatian paraphrases of this work.²⁴ The first, entitled *Ubijenje nemilo pravodne dičice* (*The cruel killing of the innocent little children*), written in prose, appeared only eight years after the first publication of the epyllion in Naples.²⁵ The text was signed by the “noblemen from Trogir” and erudite Dominig Laurić, whose identity has not yet been established, but who may have been a member of the renowned aristocratic family of Andreis.²⁶ The second, originating from the beginning of the 18th century, is a translation in verse of the first twenty-eight octaves of *La Strage* from the pen of Nikola Marija Antica, a man of letters from Dubrovnik.²⁷ In the dedication of the former translation, dedicated to his cousin, Sister Marcela Laurić, a nun in the convent of St. Peter,²⁸ the author refers to her wish to provide her sisters with access to instructive and interesting religious reading matter. Marino's text, above reproach from the standpoint of Christian orthodoxy, was an obvious choice due to its topicality and success with a broad audience, and the choice was also probably directed by the reputation and influence enjoyed by the author as a profane writer in the literary circles of Dalmatia and Dubrovnik.²⁹ The communication situation in which Laurić is the intermediary – the direct addressees are the nuns of St. Peter, who receive great joy and spiritual delight “from books on the life of Jesus Christ”, but “all the people of Trogir”, mentioned a little earlier, may be discerned in the background – implies that precedence will be given to reproducing those components of the text which the translator considers to be important from the

²⁴ *Ibid.*: 170, n. 11.

²⁵ Cf. Morović 1978: 69.

²⁶ Cf. *ibid.*: 70-72.

²⁷ A detailed analysis of this text is found in the chapter „Marinova *Strage de gli Innocenti* u prevodu Nikole Marije Antice“, in Zogović 1995 : 65-78.

²⁸ This is also shown by the “Ciceronian style” of his dedication and, if identical to Dominik Andreis, as suggested by Morović, he was undoubtedly “among the best-educated people of Trogir in his time”. 1978: 71.

²⁹ As is evident from the title, M. Zogović deals with the topic of Marino's fortunes in Dubrovnik in the above-mentioned book.



viewpoint of its didactic-utilitarian purpose. Ascribing the success of the epyllion primarily to its subject-matter "and some ... elements of content": the juxtaposition of cruelty and sentimentality, which "is always of interest to poorly educated audiences",³⁰ Kravar allows for the possibility that this "and other texts of a similar physiognomy and sharing a similar fate appealed to the public because of their stylistic virtues as well".³¹ Laurić also focused on the stylistic characteristics of the text when he explained why he had translated Marino's verses in prose: it was important to expound "the knowledge of the cause and of the manner of the massacre of the innocent Children and the end to which those blessed little souls came in detail and all clearly represented in the way that it happened to them".³² This explanation is more pertinent than the one he provides in the form of conventional modesty at the beginning of his address – "if my manner of composing in the Slavonic language is not as sweet-sounding and learned as others have composed and written pleasantly, blame my sluggish mind, which is not used to this kind of translation nor to such virtue"³³ (although most probably this statement should not be understood as a mere nod to convention). From his utilitarian standpoint, Laurić saw one important characteristic of Marino's stylistic manner as worthy of reproduction – minute description and an abundance of detail which provides the occasion for exuberant ornamentation and varied combinations of figures of speech – and the constraints of metre, the necessity of selection or addition according to the dictates of a given, fixed pattern, would doubtless prevent its reproduction.³⁴

Paraphrasing Croce, Morović concluded that in Laurić's prose translation "Marino's images, comparisons, antitheses and wordplay have lost their artificiality and rhetorical characteristics."³⁵ (In his view, this is a consequence of the adoption of the prose form, whereby Laurić made the "religious and exciting" topic of the work accessible to "the reading public for which the work was translated into Croatian").³⁶ Kravar, on the other hand, notes that Laurić translated

³⁰ Kravar 1993: 170.

³¹ *Ibid.*: 171.

³² Cf. Morović 1978: 72. He confirms again that this is the primary aspect when he goes on to say: "I composed and put into this language everything it was given to me to find out about these unfortunate deaths."

³³ *Ibid.*: 77.

³⁴ The second and most recent Croatian prose translation of Marino's verses is congruent, from the technical aspect, with Laurić's: selected compositions from *Lira* and *Galeria*, translated by M. Machiedo. Wishing to "respect to a maximum extent the syntax, sentence rhythm, poetic imagery and, especially, the rhetorical figures...", the translator abandoned (or, rather, had to abandon) the attempt to reproduce "verses, metre and rhyme". Machiedo 1997: 129-134. Machiedo's contribution was, of course, written from motives quite different from Laurić's, as is evident from the title.

³⁵ Morović 1978: 173.

³⁶ *Ibid.*: 171.



Marino "very faithfully, with much feeling for his abundant metaphorical-antithetical ornamentation"³⁷ adducing as an example the paraphrase of octave IV, 105. Still, for more exhaustive information about the translation one must again turn to Morović. Having established that Marino's text has been translated almost literally,³⁸ he goes on to list the translator's interventions and departures from the "letter" of the source text. Laurić left out 14 stanzas (out of a total of 419): the introductory invocation, the summaries preceding individual cantos, and a number of stanzas within the cantos; he abbreviated or omitted some places – "more difficult and complex ones" – and added "exhaustive explanations of certain names."³⁹ While most of the structural interventions may be considered to be linked to the change of genre, the transition from a narrative poem to a "little baroque novel",⁴⁰ that is, to an uninterrupted narrative, the explanations accompanying names such as „Tolomeo ... Medea ... Janus"⁴¹ testify to Laurić's attempt to avoid the problems of perception and understanding of the text which might have arisen due to the limited experience and insufficient education of his readers. A sample of only three instances is not representative in relation to the quantitative proportions of Laurić's interventions – of the glossatorial type – in the segment of so-called "cultural references": by this we mean terms whose referents do not belong to a cultural domain familiar to Laurić's audience and its everyday life experience. These are primarily characters and *loci* from antique classical culture (mythology), distant geographical points of reference, and certain exotic entities (which do not belong to Biblical geographic and other *realia*).⁴² Marino used them to implement the baroque postulate of astonishment in the most direct form, at the level of the primary motif and lexical components of the text. Laurić's interventions, which paint a picture of the (supposed) cultural lacunae of his audience, may be the most obvious symptoms of the "sinking" of Marino's text, brought about by its transferral to a closed convent milieu or, quite simply, to the milieu of a small, relatively isolated Dalmatian community.

Laurić most frequently explains non-transparent referents with an attributive syntagm or sentence or replaces them with a paraphrase: II 102: "Steso in un letto d'ebeno frondoso" (3) – „ležeci na jednoj postelji od carna stabla" ("lying on a bed made of black wood")⁴³; "...il ramo intinto di Lete" (6) – „jednu granu omočenu u Riku paklenu koja se zove Lethe" ("a branch dipped into the hellish

³⁷ *Ibid.*: 171, n.11.

³⁸ *Ibid.*: 73.

³⁹ *Ibid.*: 74-75.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*: 75, and for an explanation of this formulation: 73.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² The Christian religious entities are exempt from this procedure because for Laurić and his addressees they were familiar and real.

⁴³ The Croatian text is published according to the edition of H. Morović, 1978. The division into the first (: 79-84), second (: 84-98), third (: 98-107) and fourth (: 107-118) parts corresponds to Marino's cantos.



river called Lethe"); II 122: "Da l'alte cataratte il Nil cadente" (8) „Nilo, velika rika, iz visokih dubin pada i protiče" ("the Nile, a great river, falls and flows from lofty depths"); III, 32 "Somigliavano Amore e Citerea" (4) – „... ko Bogu od ljubavi, a ona kako Božici Majci njegovoj prikladaše"; ("...resembled the God of love, and she the Goddess his Mother"); „...Marte" (7) – „... Bog od boja" ("...the God of war"); III 87: "Quell'altra fa con dolorose note – Del petto un Mongibel, de gli occhi un Gange" (5-6) - „Nika rad bolesti vidi se u parsih goriti kakono Mongibel, velika gora od Sicilie; a nika Gan'je, tekuću riku, u svojih očiju satvorila jest" ("One seems to burn in her breast for pain like Mongibel, a great mountain in Sicily; and another has made in her eyes a Ganges, a flowing river"). The last example is interesting as an illustration of some of Laurić's typical translator's interventions beyond the domain of cultural references, prompted by a desire to be explicit and, in part, by didactic motives. Laurić "normalized" the metaphorical geographical term Mongibel by using a simile (having adapted the content of the previous line) which explicates the thematic basis of the analogy "breast" – "(the great mountain of) Mongibel"; however, he retained the metaphor in the second part in full (perhaps because of the more direct and obvious link between the two halves of the metaphor, i.e. "(a great) river" and "(abundant) tears" and the widespread use of the same kind of metaphorical pairs in spoken language).

The glossatorial additions are skilfully woven into a highly poetically coloured passage, which is interesting as an example of "indigenization", i.e., the selection made by Laurić; reformulating and adding to the text offered in the original, he retained those of its elements which could result in a reconstruction familiar and convincing to the readers for whom it was intended.

Uom te non già, né d'uman seme nato
 Creder vogl'io: te la crudele e sorda
 Sirte produsse, o l'Ellesponto irato,
 O la Sfinge, di sangue immonda e lorda,
 L'empia Chimera, o Cerbero spietato,
 O l'infame Cariddi, o Scilla ingorda;
 E ti nodo, là fra lo stuol vorace
 De' dragon di Cirene, Arpia rapace. (IV, 74)

Ja nikada ne virujen da si ti človik, ni od človičaskoga simena porojen. Tebe poda na svit Heliponte, ono more ko dili Asiu od Europe; ali Cerbar, duh pakleni brez niedne milošće; ali Scila, ali Karibdi, ne nasićeni školji od driva koji mimo njih brode se. Ali te zadoji ona tvarda i nemila Arpia meu množtvon od ljutih drakuni i Sirenah morskih. (I can never believe that you are a man nor born of the seed of man. The Hellespont, that sea that divides Asia and Europe, gave you upon the world, or Cerberus, spirit of hell without any mercy; or Scylla, or Charybdis, rocks not sated





of the ships that sail past them. Or you were suckled by that harsh and unkind Harpy among the multitude of fierce dragons and sea sirens.)

The omission of the word “*anfesibene*” – “fabled snake”, which was probably unknown to Laurić, does not affect the coherent functioning of the passage composed of the remaining parts, where „*Cerber*” – presumably for the sake of the uneducated audience and for obtaining the effect of the hyperbole) – is supplied with a gloss in the form of an apposition: I, 59: “*Così gli parla, e poi l’anfesibene, / de le schiume di Cerbero nodrita, / Ch’al manco braccio avvilupata tiene, / Venenosa e fischiante al cor gl’irrita*” (1-4) - „Tako mu govoraše, a paka zvizdajući rasardi srce njegovo pinom od Cerbera, Hudobe troglave, jidne i otrovne, ku pri sebi nosaše”. (Thus she spoke to him, and then, hissing, angered his heart with the foam of Cerberus, a three-headed monster, baleful and poisonous, which she carried with her”.

The gloss in II, 138, seems to be prompted by primarily ideological motives: “*le statue eccelse, i celebrati e chiari / Idoli suoi precipitò l’Egitto*” (3-4) – „One prilike kamene i uzvišeni njihovi Idoli ča su krivi Bozi profundaše se u Egiptu” (“Those figures of stone and their lofty idols which are false Gods tumbled down in Egypt”).

The Croatian periphrastic form – the only possible autochthonous replacement for “statue” – fills up the syntagmatic space of the noun and its attribute. “*Eccelso*”, on the other hand, as the only adjective with a concrete meaning, directly antithetical to the meaning of the predicate verb (the integrated diachronic Italian loan-word „*profundati se*” annuls the status of “actant”, i.e., the metonymic personification “*Egitto*” put in place by the source text), is the only one transferred to the Croatian text.

Laurić also replaced concrete names with general terms: II,32: “*il tentator d’Averno*” (5) – „*napasnik od Lokve*” (“The tempter from the Pond”) with an approximate generic equivalent, on the basis of the positive or negative meaning linked to them: I, 43: “*Medea*” (4) – „*vištica*” (“witch”); IV, 72 “*Tigri ircane*” (2) – „*zviri*” (“beasts”); “*Ria Megera*” (3) – „*Sila paklena*” (“hellish force”). He frequently omits the mythological designation : I, 38: “*tonar del gran Cocito i sassi e l’onde*” (5) – „*Čujaše se kako jedan trus od vode i kamen’ja*” (“It resounded like a quake of water and stones”); II, 64: “*Tartarea caligine*” (5); III, 57: “*Tauro d’Agrigento*” (5); III, 69: “*Nioba*” (5) (none of these has a substitute in the Croatian translation). He does the same with larger chunks of text – lines or couplets: II 64: “*Menade sembra, allor ch’oribilmente / Rota se stessa al suon del cavo bosso*” (thus at the same time removing a non-narrative segment and avoiding a synecdochal periphrasis, a figure towards which Laurić shows a marked aversion elsewhere in the text); also with stanzas or strings of stanzas, especially decorative and Baedeker-like catalogues of exotic *loci amoeni* or *mirabilia* of classical antiquity (the lighthouse of Pharos, the Sphinx, the labyrinth, the colossus of Rhodes, Egyptian cities ...). Catalogues of historical and mythological figures from classical antiquity are also subject to the general tendency to reduce and simplify: this is Laurić’s





predominant stance, one might almost say adopted *a priori*, towards the layer of cultural references and one of the active principles governing his attitude toward Marino's text in general, which he applies without exception when it comes to less well-known historical figures from classical antiquity.⁴⁴

When it comes to the best-known Greek mythological villains, however, a summary of the mythological episode to which they owe their notoriety is added to their names, which in the Italian text are accompanied by an allusive and summarizing adjective.

In mensa detestabile e funesta
L'ingorde Arpie con la vorace Fame,
E l'inumano Erisitton, di questa
Cibano ad or ad or l'avide brame;
E con Tantalo e Progne i cibi appresta
Atreo feroce e Licaone infame;
Medusa entro '1 suo teschio a la crudele
Porta, in sangue stemprato, a bere il fele. (I, 42)

⁴⁴ It is precisely for this reason that the historical protagonists who require a detailed familiarity with antique history, and who were probably unknown to Laurić himself, are completely omitted in the translation of octave II, 11. In this octave the translator gives an example of a skilfully formulated narrative sequence, achieved by stringing together sentences, in exchange for the polysyndeton in the source text. The text also provides several other examples of Laurić's translation procedures: the "interpretative" translation of the Italian prefixal derived word "disusato" – expressed periphrastically due to the lack of a corresponding Croatian form („načini s kojima ni dano svakomu" – "ways that are not given to everyone") – as well as the lexicalized metaphor "superar le frodi" which is translated literally („nadajti privare" – "overcome deceit"); and the approximate, not quite adequate translation of "rintuzzar l'arme" („odmaknuti oružje" – "put aside weapons", perhaps Laurić did not quite understand the Italian verb), which weakened the metonymic structure. The metonymic periphrasis "'1 mar ... di Rodi", however, which was probably just as incomprehensible, has been preserved in its original syntactic form („more od Rodi") with Laurić's independent addition "kill the little children" which brings the amplificatory digression back to the basic motif of the whole epyllion.

Potei già de l'Arabia e de l'Egitto / Fiaccar l'orgoglio, e 'n disusati modi / Del falso Atemion, d'Arbella invito / Rintuzzar l'armi e superar le frodi, / Antigono lasciar rotto e sconfitto, / Uccider Papo e '1 mar vincer di Rodi, / Schernir Pacoro, e vendicar potei / Contro il perfido Ircano i torti miei. (Mogao bih skaršiti oholast Arabie i Egipta, i s načini s kojima ni dano svakomu nadajti privare, odmaknuti oružje, pridobiti more od Rodi, pobiti Dicu i osvetiti protiva nevirniku krivine moje. (I could shatter the arrogance of Arabia and Egypt, in ways that are not given to everyone to overcome deceits, put aside and blunt weapons, conquer the sea of Rhodes, kill the Children and have revenge against infidels of my guilt.)





Na stolu prokletomu u toj kući side pohlepne Arpie, koje krv izpiju; Glad i Erisiton, koji prem za glad proda jednu hćer ipak izi svoje isto meso; Tantalo, ki budući zazva Bogove na jiden'je poda jin svojega sina za jisbinu; Likaone uboica od gosti, i ostali takovi nose jizbinu na stolu; Medusa, hći Blinina,⁴⁵ koja budući sagrišila s Neptunom bi od Bogov' obraćena u zmie. Ta ista nosi jid za pivo razvodnjen i izmišan s karvju. (On the damned table in that house sit voracious Harpies that drink blood; Famine and Erisichthon, who though for his famishment he sells a daughter yet will he eat his own flesh; Tantalus, who for he calls the Gods to a banquet and serves them his own son for meat; Lycaon, murderer of guests, and other such bore meat to the table; Medusa, daughter of Blina, who since she had lain with Neptune, was turned by the gods into a snake. She bears bile to drink allayed and mixed with blood.)

These glosses also contribute to the hyperbolization of the negative pole, in accordance with the utilitarian and moralistic aims of Laurić's translation.

By means of substitution of text, addition, summarizing, and syntactic reorganization, Laurić reduced Marino's descriptive abundance to a more balanced measure in relation to the narrative component, to which he subjugated both the syntagmatic and syntactic form. In this way he avoided the lexical pitfalls of the Italian text and adapted the distinctive characteristics of the translation to enhance the credibility of the events in the plot and to take on board the presumed experiential horizon of his readers.

Quasi del vero Sol verace araldo
Vide e senti la Paretonia piaggia.
Nacque zaffir, topazio, ostro e smeraldo
Per la contrada inospita e selvaggia;
L'Orso, il Tigre, il Leon conobber Dio
Ed a lambirlo il Cocodrillo uscio. (11,127)

Po komu godir putu hodjaše Osib svudi jih naslidovaše od Višnjega roda svitlost i toplina, po svih putih u pustinji meu sieni i meu dubljen rajahu se pridraga kamen'ja ka svitlost davahu. A medvidi, lavi i ostale zviru od gore poznavahu Boga i njemu se vele humljeno klanjahu. (Whatever road Joseph trod, there followed them everywhere light and warmth from the Most High, on all roads in the deserts among the shadows and among the trees precious stones were born that gave light. And the bears and lions and other beasts of prey knew God and bowed down to him most humbly.)

⁴⁵ Such an entity seems unknown to greek and roman mythology.





In both the places where Marino mentioned the mannerist painter Arpino, his contemporary, some of whose paintings he owned, devoting to them several madrigals in his collection *La Galeria*, Laurić transformed him into the Greek painter Apelles. Did he do so because the name of Apelles was known to at least some of the more high-class and cultured inhabitants of Trogir (the apposition “excellent painter”, however, is probably not just an ornamental periphrasis but also an explanation for the benefit of those to whom the name meant nothing), while Arpino was not known to Laurić himself? Or did he feel that mentioning a classical author, enveloped in an aura of indisputable authority, was more fitting in view of the elevated subject-matter? III, 1: “O perché la mia penna oscura e vile, / Ch’a ritrar tanti orror vien meno e cade, / Del gran martirio ebreo l’istoria amara, / Arpin, dal tuo pennello or non impara?” (5-8) – „Ali zašto moje pero nerazumno (koje za prikazati toliku strahotu i gorko zkazan’je od velike muke žudiske na manje dohodi) ne nauči se sada od tebe Apele, izuča Pitura, i od tvoga penela” (“But why does my witless pen (which faints to depict such horrors and the bitter tale of the great suffering of the Hebrews) not learn now from you, Apelles, excellent Painter, and from your brush”.)

Bypassing the inadequate summarizing of the adjectival binomium from the first stanza and the syntactic “normalization” of the third and fourth lines – since Laurić did not notice or did not wish to reproduce the hyperbaton – we note the calque of the phrasal verb in the second line and the technical term „penel” (“brush”), a replica of the Italian term with the same meaning. The term was probably not taken over by Laurić directly, but was part of the general lexical stock of the Chakavian dialect of his time. From the aspect of reproducing technical terms, it is interesting to note the continuation of the passage mentioning Arpino-Apelles,⁴⁶ which again contains a wide range of translation strategies:

⁴⁶ Quella tua nobil man, che senso e vita
Dar seppe a l’ombre ed animar le tele,
Onde la schiera lacera e ferita
Ancor sente dolor, sparge querele,
E, quasi a nuova strage, ancor irrita
L’empio tiranno e ’l feritor crudele,
Or ai miei ’nchiosi i suoi color comparta,
Si ch’emula al tuo lin fia la mia carta. (III, 2)

Ona tvoja ruka plemenita, ka umi dati očućen’je jednomu osinu i činiti jedna postava da kako govori, tako da ova množ razdarta i izranjena jošće ćuti bolest i šalje tužbe kako da bi na novu pogibl naticala nemila kralja i nemilostivoga Uboicu. Nu sada mojoj carnoj masti udili tvoje masti i tvoje tange ali kolure neka se moja karta utiče z tvojom postavom. (That noble hand of yours that can give feeling to a shadow and make a canvas as if it spoke, so that this multitude torn and wounded still feels pain and sends complaints so as to prompt the unkind king and merciless Murderer to new perils. But now bestow your greases (inks) and your tints or colours on my black grease (ink) and let my paper compete with your canvas.)

The second time Arpino is mentioned, he is transformed into Apelles in the translation of stanza III, 59.





literal translation, reduction or preservation of binary structures – this is the predominant type of syntagmatic disposition in Marino's text, prompted, inter alia, by the metrical pattern and octave structure – periphrastic substitution and explication of the Italian denominal verb (made semantically concrete in the Croatian translation). The case of „karta” (“paper”) is identical to that of “pennello” – „penela”; “inchiostro” is translated here with the periphrasis „crna mast” (“black grease”),⁴⁷ providing an occasion for lexical gradation and semantic variation, realized by the repetition, in the subsequent text, of the second part of the compound word (with a corresponding change of meaning). We can only speculate as to whether Laurić used the word „mast” as an echo of the previous syntagm and a way of highlighting its semantic and terminological specificity and then returned to the version that had already been used in a more neutral setting and which was lexemically independent of the previous term, in the form of contact synonyms,⁴⁸ equivalent diachronically, but differently marked synchronically: the word „koluri” (“colours” is in the same class as the terms „penel” and „karta”; „tange” (“tints”), a synchronically assimilated term, is, from the diachronic point of view, also an Italo-Romance loan word.⁴⁹ The synecdoche “lin” is translated by the literal expression „postava” (“canvas”), as is the lexicalized variant of the same figure “tele” in the second line.

The last group of examples can also be seen as an example of a specific, technical lexis which was, owing to its primary quality as something new and unusual in relation to the well-established literary domains, assuming specialized knowledge which was not available or transparent to everyone, considered to be especially suitable for the display of ingeniousness. Marino was very moderate in this respect and in his occasional use of technical terms – which often have ornamental referents – he did not overstep the boundaries of an aestheticizing lexical purism and objects and motifs traditionally considered fit for poetry. Thus in octave II, 133 he enumerates various precious objects, which Laurić reduces to a single specific token, retaining the term which was evidently the easiest to translate into Croatian. In his paraphrase Laurić follows the syntax of Marino's text skilfully and successfully as long as he can identify it with “undemanding”, routine forms common in prose of a religious derivation and intention, characterized by binary patterns, polysyndeton, parataxis, moderate hypotaxis and the occasional use of coordinated relative clauses. It seems, therefore, that he did not perceive the syntagmatic tour-de-force which separates the adverb

⁴⁷ In the translation of II, 106: “d'inchiostro di luce” (6) he avoided the unwanted lexical oxymoron by means of the morphonologically adapted Latinism „ingostun” (“ink”): „i s ingostun od svitlosti” (“and with ink made of light”). (In ERHSJ: 724-725 is recorded the form „ingvast”).

⁴⁸ „Tange i koluri” appears in II, 96, 4, as a summary of more precise colouristic designations: “D'azzurro e d'oro; e, fra purpureo e bianco” – „sa zlaton i s razlicimi koluri i tangami” (“with gold and with various colours and tints”).

⁴⁹ Cf. ARj, XVIII: 99.





from the verb in the second line with a long relative clause and places it at the end of the fourth line. Perhaps the result in Croatian of such an error „a lit (odie) s cafiren dragim kamen'jem” (“and /clothes/ flight with sapphire precious stone”) might be understood, by analogy, as a very bold metaphor.

Qual di se stesso e genitore e figlio,
 Move l'Angel, ch'al par del Sole è solo,
 Di foco il capo e di piropo il ciglio,
 Con ali d'ostro e di zaffiro, a volo.
 Ammirando il diadema aureo e vermiglio,
 Del pomposo suo re, l'alato stuolo
 Lieto il corteggia, e con canora laude
 Al miracol d'Arabia intorno applaude.

Oni koi je samoga sebe Otac i sin u jedno tisnu Angela da san i kakono sunce odie s ognjen glavu i ramena s krelami, a lit z cafiren dragin kamen'jem gledajući zlatu krunu velikoga kralja, vas radostan da ga združuje i zvonon od hvale izuće i na čudo od Arabie, ka razdiljuje Žudiju od Egipta, da okolo nje igra i veseli se. (He who is himself both Father and son in one moves the Angel that he himself and like the sun clothes with fire the head and shoulders with wings, and flight with sapphire precious stone, looking at the golden crown of the great king, all joyful to join with him and with bells of thanks excellent to play and rejoyce around him, to the astonishment of Araby that divides Judea from Egypt.)

The *bisticcio* “sole”/“solo” in the line, which is impossible to reproduce due to the structural non-correspondence of the two languages, and the theological implications⁵⁰ of which, it seems, Laurić did not understand, was put into context by Laurić by means of a simile (we might say relatively successfully). The geographical note added to “Arabia” might mean that Laurić did not recognize the periphrasis referring to the phoenix. (The translation of lines 6–8 may be seen as a form of anacoluthon, but only if one adopts the most benign interpretation, not wishing to declare it simply incoherent). Another possibility is that we are dealing with compensation for the absence of an explanation of the periphrasis in the Italian text which, translated directly, would remain unclear to his audience.

Likewise, in II, 79 Laurić “summarized” the precise individual tokens by a general term and then joined together both of the substituted terms by an independently added explanation of their effect: “Di piropi immortali e di rubini / Fascian l'eburnea fronte ampie ghirlande” (5-6) „Čelo njegovo vijaše se urešeno s

⁵⁰ Cf. Pozzi's comment on the line in which it is found on p. 530 of his edition of Marino's epyllion.





vencami od drgih kamenov', koji iz sebe svitlinom njihovom mećahu kako jedan oganj." (His brow was seen adorned with wreaths of precious stone, which from itself with its light as if it emitted flames.)

As part of the simile, a traditional epic digressive figure which builds up the whole of stanza IV, 93 – its presence and the way it is used in Marino's religious epyllion may be read as a mark⁵¹ of his adherence to the orthodox, Virgilian epic form – made up of recognizable, inherited material,⁵² Marino uses a scientific term new to poetry (in its literal meaning); "atoms".⁵³ Laurić passed over this term,⁵⁴ just as he passed over the newly discovered metaphorical adjective

⁵¹ For some of the functions of the simile in the epic poetry cf. Fališevac 1997: 64.

⁵² Similes in which the protagonist is an animal belong to the topical material of European epic poetry from its earliest examples. Marino's predecessor was Dante, *Inferno*, XXVI, 28-29: "come ... / vede lucciole giù per la valea" and the poet and his immediate predecessors and contemporaries competed in the metaphorical exploitation of this topos, the constellation of which frequently included the adjective "animato". Cf. Besomi 1969 :150-154.

⁵³ Tommaseo – Bellini, I: 715, cite only one literary example, a Petrarchan sonnet by Giacomo Colonna.

⁵⁴ Whereas he translated the primarily anatomical term "meati", II, 134: "De la vita i meati e dell'udito (7-8) with a non-specific, general term: „i zatvori ulazen'je od očiju i od ušiju" ("and closed the orifices of their eyes and ears"),

The following correspondences point to the lexical limitations of Croatian in the domain of architectural terminology or, perhaps, Laurić's incompetence in this field (or simply his neglect of descriptive precision): III, 5, 5: "sala ... loggia" - „pristrižak" ("porch"), III, 14, 5: "atrio" - „polača" ("palace").

Contrary to this is the example of lexical "ostentation", prompted in part by the source text, or rather made possible by the colonial status of Croatian, in stanza IV, 110, where one of the contact synonyms is Laurić's addition: "Quivi de l'innocenza e de la Morte / Spiegar la Bianca e la purpurea insegna / Vedrenvi, e, per trofeo, fra quelle schiere / Far de le rotte fascie alte bandiere" (5-8) - „Toti će vas viditi odvijati bile i carljene barjake i bandire od pravednosti i od smarti; i zadobit će meu onu množ gdi od odih razdaratih i karvavih vaših pašić' činite visoke i velike standarde." ("There they will see you unfurling the white and red banners and pennants of righteousness and of death; and they will triumph among that multitude seeing you making high and great standards out of your torn and bloody swaddling-bands"). Laurić's translation as a document of the lexical stock of his time and milieu is undoubtedly an interesting topic worthy of research in its own right. Morović, for example, drew attention to a number of words not recorded in ARj (1978: 75).

Laurić only seemingly resolves the issue of architectural terminology by a minimal semantic intervention in octave III, 18, which is otherwise lexically and syntactically faithfully translated (where all the bicolons of the source text have been reproduced and their syntagmatic structure and syntactic hierarchy preserved, including the calque of the syntagm "l'usata via" as "the path they use to take"). "Trema il gran tetto al suon di tante spade" - „Darhćaše velika palača na zvon od toliki mači" ("The great palace trembled with the sound of so many swords").

The substitution of lexemes causes the loss of the synecdoche (this expression is brought back to realistic probability, which does not exclude a component of hyperbole realized at the level of *res* rather than *verba*). Laurić returns to the correspondent term where





"animato".⁵⁵ Still, he achieved precision in nomenclature with the word "carvci" ("little worms") when replacing the synecdoche with a literal expression, and by making a constant effort to reproduce the Italian text in almost every detail he achieved a translation that is extremely, "didactically" explicit.

Si come là per entro i folti orrori
De' boschi ombrosi in su sereni estivi,
Vacillando con tremoli splendori
Volanti animaletti e fuggitivi
Sembrano, a' peregrini ed a' pastori,
Animate faville, atomi vivi,
Onde dal lume mobile e mentito
Il seguace fanciul spesso è schernito;

Kakono u gustinji strahovitoj od dublja zelenoga na litnjoj vedrini, oni leteći i bigučii carvci zahodeći s onom darhatom svitlošću kažu putnikon i pastiron one iskre njihove kako od ognja, tako od s(v)itlosti lažive ono ditešce koi ju nasliduje večekrat privaren i porugan ostone. (As in the terrible depth of green trees in the summer's serenity, those flying and creeping little worms coming out with that trembling light show travellers and shepherds those sparks of theirs like flame, so that the child who of false light follows several ways remains cheated and mocked.)

The basis of octave IV, 94 is one of the terms most exploited for similes in poetry. In the fifth line Laurić explicated the collective technical term "architetrici" by an analytical description: "(female) master builders of little houses". The entire stanza is interesting because it also contains other solutions for Marino's (semi) technical terms and as another example of Laurić's fascination with Marino's ornamented, precious and sentimentally idyllic descriptions:

O com'api sollecite ed industri
Per l'odorate d'Ibla aure novelle
Nel vago aprii, fra rose e fra ligustri,
Vanno a libar queste dolcezze e quelle,
Onde fan poscia, architetrici illustri,
Nobil lavor di ben composte celle,

other elements of the context (or rather the semanteme of the predicate) and the situational credibility of the episode demand it. By using it he again did away with the synecdoche ("mole") and reduced the whole expression to the level of literal utterance.

⁵⁵ Cf. Besomi 1969 : 143-150.





Moli ingegnose e fabbriche soavi
Di bianche cere e di odorati favi:

Ali kakono one pomnjive i obartne pčelice po vitracih od one mirisne gore Hyble, u vrime od lipoga Aprila meu rusulicama i meu rumenim cvičicen gredu opijajući slatkost od ovoga i od onoga cvitja. Poton toga učine se umiče Meštrovica plemenitoga grajen'ja kućic' njihovih od pribiloga voska i mirisnoga cvitja. (Or as those careful and virtuous bees on the breezes of the fragrant Mount Hybla, in the time of lovely April among the roses and among the blushing flowers go drinking in the sweetness of this and that flower. Then they became the skilful female masters of noble construction of their little houses made of the whitest wax and fragrant flowers.)

The hexameronic passage and the occasional cosmological-astronomical excursions contain the highest concentration of technical and scientific terms which confront the translator with a new domain, unfamiliar to Croatian literature, and with previously untried lexical strings. Marino might have emulated Guisone's translation (1592) of Du Bartas's *La divine sepmaine*, and the Italian language of his time had at its disposal a rich technical and scientific lexis. Laurić, on the other hand, apart from the description of the creation of the world in the Book of Genesis (which, of course, does not contain technical and scientific terms), could rely, to a very limited extent, only on the Italian source text. In this situation he was helped most by his translation technique – explanation, selection and substitution of the material offered. In this way he was able to avoid problematic places, “untranslatable” perhaps because of the insufficient lexical stock of the contemporary Chakavian dialect or because his readers were culturally unprepared for them due to their repugnance toward a conjunction of science and literature and the use of corresponding technical terminology (neither should the desire to speed up the rhythm of narration be overlooked). In III, 94, 5, for example, the word “sphere” is taken over from the Italian text, but in II, 24: “farsi colonne al ciel, basi alle sfere” (4) Laurić left out the second half-line, a more abstract and scientific replica of the first⁵⁶ (which completes the synecdoche after the hyperbolic metaphor in the first half-line).

Vede l'alte piramidi famose,
Quasi monti de l'Arte e quasi altere,
Per le stelle assalir, scale sassose,
Farsi colonne al ciel, basi a le sfere,

⁵⁶ He also omitted the adjective “sferico” in his translation of stanza III, 5: „Fatta di tempio sferico si vede” (4) – „sazidan kako jedan tempal” (“Built like a temple”). But “sfere” is also translated by an equivalent Croatian word. Cf. 1978: 15.





E ricoprir sotto le spalle ombrose
Le piagge tutte e le colline intere,
Vietando ognor, con la lor vasta mole,
A le selve la luce e '1 passo al Sole.

Vidi visoke Piramidi, glasovite kako gore i kako uznosite uzhodeći do zvizd'; skale kamene gdi se činjahu stupi do Neba i gdi pokrivahu njihovim osinon polja i varhe iste od gor', braneći svaki čas njihovon veličinom Dubravan svitlost, a suncu prohodišće. (See the high famed pyramids like hills and how they climb haughtily to the stars; stone steps that are like pillars to the Heavens and that cover with their shadows the fields and tips of hills, all the time blocking with their bulk the light to the groves and passage to the sun.)

In Laurić's translation of II, 78: "Girò le luci il gran motore in lei." (5), the theological-technical synecdoche "il gran Motore", which traditionally belongs to the literary lexis,⁵⁷ is also reduced to a literal expression: „I tako veliki stvorac nebeski upri oči svoje u Divicu" ("And so the great heavenly creator fixed his eyes upon the Virgin").

An example of uninterrupted reworking and adaptation of the source text (in which, applying his usual methods, Laurić trivializes a passage equipped with technical and scientific terms – literal and metaphorical – and reduces it to a traditional framework of scientifically unmarked discourse) is found in verses II, 83 and 86:

Tremaro i poli a la sua voce, e l'asse,
Che sostien la gran macchina, si torse.
De le sfere sovrane e de le basse
Tacque il vario concento e '1 ciel non corse.
Tigri con Gange indietro il pie ritrasse,
Curvossi Atlante e vacillaron l'Orse,
E da l'alta immortai bocca di Dio
Irrevocabilmente il fato uscio.
Per te figlia, dal nulla il tutto io tolsi,
L'aria distesi, il foco in alto affissi,
Nel gran vaso del mar l'acque raccolsi
Ed al suo corso il termine prescrissi;
i fonti e i laghi strinsi, i fiumi sciolsi,
L'ampia terra fondai sovra gli abissi,
E i fermissimi cardini del mondo
De la volta del ciel supposi al pondo.

⁵⁷ From Dante and Petrarch to Tasso.





Protrese se istok i zapad na glas njegov, i ztup jaki ki uzdarži vas ovi svit maknu se svojega mista. Razlike zkladan'je od Ajera zamuknu, Nebo ne micaše okoliše svoje, Tigri i Gan'je rike naj mogućije na sviti nazad se vratiše. Ukrivni se Atlante, velika gora, a iz visokih ust' Boga neumarloga izajde odluka ovako govoreći: - Radi tebe, hčerce moja, svaka od ničesar ja ztvorih. Učinih Ajer, a oganj na visoko postavih jin meaše. Stisnuh studence, a rike odpuštih. Utvardih prostranu zemlju i vas svit varhu jezera, a visoko Nebo na težinu od kolih njegovih. (The east and west shook at his voice, and the mighty pillar that sustains this whole world moved from its place. The various harmonies of the air fell quiet, the sky did not move its circles, the Tigris and the Ganges most powerful rivers in the world returned. Atlanta, great mountain, went awry, and from the high mouth of God undying came the decision speaking thus. For your sake, daughter of mine, I created all from nothing. I made the air, the fire, placed its boundaries high. I pressed the springs and released the rivers. I determined the spacious land and all the world above the lake, and the high sky on the weight of its pivots.)

In the first line the term "poli"⁵⁸ is "explained": „protrese se istok i zapad” (“trembled East and West”); in the second the periphrastic metaphor “gran macchina” („vas ovi svit”) is replaced by a literal expression; the third and fourth lines are partly remodulated, and the word “sfere” is translated by the closest equivalent „okoliš” (“surrounds”);⁵⁹ in the fifth line, geographic names which were probably unknown to Laurić’s audience are explained, with the exception of “Atlante”, which had been explained already. “Orse” (and the part of the line linked to it) are omitted altogether, presumably for reasons of narrative economy, or rather situational, rather than lexical, (lack of) understanding. There follows a word-for-word reproduction of the line referring to God, with the omission of logically redundant epithets. In the next octave Laurić replaced the term “abissi” (familiar, to be sure, from *Liber Genesis* 1, 2, translated as „dubine” - “depths” in the *Lekcionarij Bernardina Splićanina*)⁶⁰ with the more common and concrete noun „jezera” (“lakes”), and he avoided the syntagm “volta del ciel” by means of reformulation („visoko Nebo” - . The only term in this passage which is translated directly and precisely, “cardini” - „kolih” (“pivots”), belongs to the everyday technical lexis.

In stanza II, 94, Laurić omitted the last two lines in which heavenly bodies are described by a metaphorical periphrasis: “Indi de’ corpi lubrici e correnti / Gli oblique balli e i lievi giri e i lenti” (7-8), while in line five he dealt with the syntagm “sfera immobile” by a replica of the noun and a reshaping of the adjective

⁵⁸ The initial utterance is modelled on Virgil’s „Intonuere poli”, *Aen*, I, 90.

⁵⁹ For the meanings of this word and its use in other texts cf. ARj, VIII: 830-832.

⁶⁰ Cf. ARj, VIII: 832.



into a relative clause: „... i pria od sfere ka je stanovita” (“and before the sphere which is immobile”)

Evaluating the stylistic characteristics of Laurić's translation, Morović⁶¹ uses the syntagm “artificiality and bombast” when referring to Marino. The corresponding term in Croce's text, on which he relies, is “stile ingegnoso”.⁶² Apparently on that occasion, when setting out his evaluation of *La Strage*, Croce's understanding of *ingegno* and ingeniousness is closest to an identification of this term with the excessive use of ornament accompanied by a hypertrophy of figural speech⁶³. Croce goes on to list some of Marino's figures (we are partially familiar with them from Morović's paraphrase) “comparazioni, immagini e antitesi e bisticci” - and adds: “tutti facili a cogliersi”. This lapidary statement is close to an evaluation of Marino's lyrical poetry, chronologically parallel to the first and only reliably confirmed period of work on *La Strage* and uttered some thirty years later, which demystified Marino's pioneering role in relation to the other poets with whom he shared the literary arena,⁶⁴ such as Grillo, Casoni, Rinaldi, the members of the Accademia dei Gelati of Bologna, Stigliani, Imperiali.⁶⁵ It was they, rather than Marino, - as scholars such as O. Besomi and C. Colombo established by close comparative reading - who affirmed the new baroque aesthetics and practiced its tenets in a much bolder and more persistent form. “... la ricerca dell'immagine insolita o della figura audace”,⁶⁶ in other words, metaphors which have become independent of their subject-matter and thematic substratum, “strong” and so-called incongruent metaphors⁶⁷ are missing from Marino's first collections of poems (written up to 1614). (This does not mean they do not contain “modern” rhetorical figures, but only that Marino avoided disharmonious and overly complex combinations.)⁶⁸

Croce's next words indicate, however, that in the case of *La Strage de gl'Innocenti*, the transparent ingeniousness is made more complex by at least one

⁶¹ Cf. Morović 1978: 73.

⁶² Croce 1932: 107-108.

⁶³ Cf. Kravar 1993: 163-164. For different definitions and contextualisations of this concept in seventeenth-century rhetorical discussions, regularly linked to two other axiomatic mainstays of baroque poetics, cf. Fališevac 1987: 173-184.

⁶⁴ It was established by Croce in the Anthology *Lirici marinisti*, published in 1919. For more details cf. Besomi 1969: 11-13.

⁶⁵ The works of O. Besomi collected in the previously cited book and the contributions of C. Colombo 1969 deal with this topic. This kind of research was encouraged, and a significant contribution to it was made, by today's greatest Marinologist, G. Pozzi.

⁶⁶ Besomi 1969: 54.

⁶⁷ Thus, for example, out of fifteen metaphors on the theme of “a wound” introduced by Grillo, Marino adopted only four, and these “le meno violente, le più comuni perché normalmente impiegate nella predicazione e nella lirica”. Besomi 1969: 54.

⁶⁸ These assessments, of course, imply the existence of a tacit general consensus (which does, indeed, exist) on the basic starting point from which the assessment is made.

element which is, "in the nature of things", missing from Marino's lyrical corpus: "Piacque ... col trattarla" (i.e. "la materia") "in una serie di quadri che arieggiano alle scene di un teatro di burattini, compiono sempre il più smisurato dei gesti ad esprimere il carattere ad essi attribuito". Croce goes on to vary and develop the same idea: "Ogni passo del racconto, ogni punto delle descrizioni, è reso enorme pel rilievo che ricevono tutti i particolari, tutti a lor volta iperbolizzati".⁶⁹ Regardless of possible later rewritings, *La Strage* is a document "del Marino giovanissimo o relativamente giovane"⁷⁰ to make use of Pozzi's category which is not founded exclusively on the chronological criterion), not only by the absence of a number of syntactic and lexical innovations which characterized his later work (to which Pozzi directed his attention)⁷¹ – and in this respect it corresponds to Marino's lyrical segment – but also because the formal structure of his composition crystallized in accordance with the rules of the traditional, classicistic, so-called Virgilian epic poem⁷² (which Pozzi failed to notice). Constrained by the obligatory list and sequence of motifs of the New Testament story – which also determined the structural characteristics of the epyllion – Marino did not miss the opportunities – as indicated by Croce's words – opened up by this same "determinism" in the direction of intensifying the verbal and stylistic effects in the poem.

The evangelical episode of the massacre of the innocents (prefiguring Christ's sacrifice) is one of the actualizations of the primary ontological opposition of good and evil, light and darkness, God's and Satan's kingdom, built into the foundations of the world view to which Marino belongs, as does, after all, the entire western European (literary) culture. Its linguistic sign and rhetorical counterpart is the antithesis which functions as the generative cornerstone and shaping principle at all levels of the structure of the text, and with its fundamental, abstract blueprint is projected as a binary form, the most frequent reflexive pattern of the organization of the text at all its levels.⁷³ The verse form of the octave, based on

⁶⁹ Croce 1932: 107 and 112.

⁷⁰ Pozzi 1960a: 460.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*: 459-460.

⁷² These have been illustrated by Pavličić 1979 with reference to the opposition between *Judita* and *Osman*, applying the conceptual categories expounded by H. Wölfflin in his work *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*. In the traditional epic poem, each canto is structured as an independent whole, events are linked by continuity in place and time, the parts of the epic are symmetrically arranged, and the preferred constructional figure is the simile; all these features are found in Marino's epyllion. Cf. Pavličić 1979: 203-236.

⁷³ In Marino's time the vitality of this traditional religious figure was supported by the basic ideological model of the culture of the Counter-Reformation.

In Italy the immediate predecessor of *La Strage* was the chapter of the same name in the prose work *I quattro libri della Humanità di Cristo* by Pietro Aretino. Aretino, it seems, had the same ambitions as Marino when he chose his subject (and resembled Marino, up to a point, in his temperament and eccentricity and in the combination of insolence and skilful hypocrisy). The sharp-sighted Marino was quick to see the possibilities offered



the even-number principle, was also conducive to the use of the binary structure (and the *endecasillabo* with its caesura after the fifth line provided sufficient room for a horizontal binary division).

The and cruel death of the most innocent and helpless victim, as the topic on which the epyllion was based, contained a hyperbolic and paroxystic component which made it possible to achieve both a "heightened tone" and the amplification and extremisation of the negative and, mirroring it, positive poles at the level of denotative directness: many of Marino's verses and octaves achieve hyperbole (and hyperbolic antithesis) by the accumulation of literal meanings – where the credit is due to the special, "amazing" properties of their referents,⁷⁴ with the field of vision frequently narrowed down and with minute analytical description, whether we are dealing with an insistence on horrifying and crude realistic detail in the scenes of the massacre of the infants of Bethlehem, with ornamental detail in the descriptions of the earthly *loci amoeni* through which the Holy Family moves, or with the heavenly spheres and their inhabitants. In the culminating episodes of the epyllion, the scene depicting the killings, Marino activated the most prestigious and extreme baroque figure – the conceit – with an intensity unparalleled in his literary corpus. The procedure of horizontal amplification, the only kind possible within the fixed coordinates provided by the events, meant filling in the space of the lapidary and generalized evangelical sketch which, all the same, provides the groundwork for a "multiple view"⁷⁵, the depiction of a large number of individual incidents, a series of micro-episodes "topographically" most often corresponding to the octave, each of which demonstrates one example, one aspect, one variant of wounding, mutilation and murder, one form of the executioner-victim relationship. Weaving the conceit into the descriptive and narrative progression (culminating in the "amazing" sting in the tail in the seventh and eighth lines) Marino added another dimension to the elementary hyperbolic character of his expression which is based on anatomically precise and crudely realistic description (and thus on a certain choice and "concentration" within the level of direct naming), and by doing so, intensified it. The conceit engages the

by the subject, and he was helped by the fact that Aretino's work – on which *La Strage* also relies when it comes to elements of language and style, especially in the murder scenes – sharing the general condemnation of its author, was hard to obtain and almost forgotten. Marino, who was accused of plagiarism by many of his contemporaries and later critics, liked to conceal his sources and was proud of the fact that they were not always easy to discover.

⁷⁴ They, too, were the objects of numerous instructions in baroque poetics on how to achieve the effect of *acutezza* and the display of *ingenium*. Cf. Fališevac 1987: 182-183.

⁷⁵ "Tunc Herodes ... iratus est valde, et mittens occidit omnes pueros, qui erant in Bethlehem, et in omnibus finibus eius ... " *Mt 2,16, Biblia Vulgata*, 1967: 964. The sentimental-hyperbolic way in which the topic is dealt with could also have been prompted by the passage from Jeremiah's prophecies reminded in the same place: „Vox in Rama audita est. / Ploratus, et ululatus multus: / Rachel plorans filios suos. / Et noluit consolari, quia non sunt“.





reader's special attention, forces him to become absorbed in it and dwell on every detail, and, in conjunction with detailed descriptions, really makes it possible for him to "learn... in what manner and how ... it happened."

Therefore the use of conceits coincides with Laurić's primary didactic interest, and on the basis of numerous examples one might conclude that the translator from Trogir had no other aspirations than to go with the flow of the Italian source text.

Trionfa il feritor sopra il ferito,
E poi che l'ha ferito anco il minaccia;
Geme e vagisce l'un, l'altro il vagito
Col ferro in bocca e 'l gemito gli caccia;
Quei, svelto a forza e con furor rapito
Da le braccia materne, apre le braccia,
E la semplice bocca a chi l'impiega
Sporge e rende al crudel bacio per piaga. (III, 22)

Raholi se Uboica svarhu ranjenoga i pokle ga je ranio jošće mu priti.
Jauče i uzdiše brišni Ditić, a Cocan oni jauk i oni uzdah s oštrin mačen
u garlo tiska i bode. Oni po gnivu i po sili ugrabljen od ruk' Majke svoje
otvara ustaca i prip(r)osta ustaca kaže i daje onomu ko ga rani, i vraća
nemilomu Uboici celov za ljutu ranu.

(The murderer triumphed over the wounded and after he had wounded him still threatened. The poor Child groaned and sighed, and the executioner with sharp sword pressed and stabbed that moan and that sigh into the throat. He rapt with anger and force from the hands of his mother opened his little mouth and the simple little mouth showed and gave to him who wounded him, and repaid the cruel killer with a kiss for the grievous wound.)

Pianse la sventurata, ei non udilla,
E di man le rapí l'amato amore
Orfanetto pupillo, anzi pupilla
De gli occhi, occhio de l'alma, alma del core.
Mentre con piè non fermo egli vacilla,
L'orme segnando con incerto errore,
E' reciso al meschino in un istante
Il camin de la vita e de le piante. (III, 34)





Plakaše nesrična, a on jo ne slišaše, i iz ruke ugrabi joj dragu ljubav, sirotu ali ženicu od očiju, ali isto tako od duše, ali istu dušu od sarca. I čim s nožicom nejakom on se povojaše, eto u jedan čas prikrati mu trišćenjak hod od nožić' i od života. (The unhappy one wept, but he did not listen to her, and from her hand seized her dear love, orphan or apple of the eye, or of the soul, the same soul of the heart. And so soon with little feeble legs he stumbled, there at once the villain deprived him of walk of legs and life.)

Iva il terzo trescando a salto a salto
Sovra un finto destrier di fragil canna.
Miser, né sa qual repentino assalto
A morte crudelissima il condanna.
Ecco quel cor d'adamantino smalto,
Pria con man lo schermisce, e poi lo scanna,
Ne lo spazio l'abbatte, e quivi il lassa
A giostrar con la Morte, e ride e passa. (III, 63)

Treti biše uzjaha na jednomu konjicu učinjenu od jedne male tarščice, i kakono Dičica igrajući se poskakovaše vele veselo, a ne znadiše brižan koje harlo nazkočen'je na nemilu smart njega su'jaše. Eto ono sarce studeno stvoreno od tvardoga Diamanta, naj pria se rukon branjaše ga, a paka ga prikla. Varže ga na zemlju i ondi ostavi ga da se igra i utiče s nemilon smatru. I nasmiavši se pojde naprida. (The third mounted a little horse made of a little rush, and like a child that plays jumping very merrily, and did not know the poor one what sudden attack had condemned him to a cruel death. who aimed with sudden attack at his unpleasant death. There that cold heart made of hard Adamant, first with his hand he held him back, and then slaughtered him. He cast him on the ground and there left him to play and compete with cruel death.) And, laughing, he went on.

The explanation of the circumstances and impulses that prompted his translation effort – the reasons for his choice of author and text – which Laurić addressed to Sister Marcela tacitly implied, as a starting point, a very close contact between the original and the translation, very careful and precise transmission of the constituent elements of the form moulding the content of the Italian text using the means of the Croatian language. The three examples given here are illustrative of the ultimate limits of the pliability of the Croatian replica, oriented towards reproduction of the phenomena evoked by the Italian text, the restoration, using the means of another linguistic system, of all the elements of the image and the lexically expressed sense provided by the source text. In the “preparatory parts”



Laurić would sometimes speed up the process, abbreviate and summarize the translation, so as to avoid too frequent narrative holdups. (He did not apply this criterion, or any other translation strategy, consistently so it is difficult to speak of a predominant principle governing the shaping of the Croatian translation. The statistically predominant method is certainly the application of the binary scheme – in a certain number of examples it is not prompted by the source text – the reduction of epithets – counterevidence for both of these claims could be adduced – and the annulment of synecdoche and periphrasis. In the description of the murders themselves, however, he does not omit a single semantic link.

The limits of translatability set by the linguistic automatism – specifically, the lack of lexemic correspondence between Italian and Croatian – prevented the transmission of the etymological figure or *paregmenon*⁷⁶ and *paronomasia* in III, 22 and 34.

Thus the conceit into which these figures are woven loses its pregnancy and communicative edge. The effect of the paradoxical combination is also weakened

⁷⁶ The etymological figure is mostly preserved where this is premitted by the lexemic system of the Croatian language (and where it did not interfere with the translator's intention to organize the text differently): II, 36: " ... a che l'afflitto popolo affliggi?" (3-4) - „Zašto tužnom puku tuge zadaješ?" ("Wherefore you cause sadness to the sad people"); III, 146: "Di fortuna a schernir gli scherni e l'onte" (5) – „i za porugati rугan'ju i brezakon'ju od sriće njegove" ("and to mock the mockery and lawlessness of their happiness"). Laurić, moreover, applies it himself as compensation for the loss of the bicolon: "Di quest'opre, talor famose e conte, / D'una in altra città vulgate e sparte" (1-2) – „Od ovoga dilovan'ja toliko glasovita, razglašena u mnoge Gradove" ("Of this action so famous, renowned in many Towns").

His sensitivity toward the combination of the semantic and formal aspects is illustrated by his translation of the highly stylised octave III, 24 where, with the exception of the first *paregmenon*, which is impossible to reproduce, syntagmatic, syntactic and semantic correspondence with the source text is achieved: "... così la punse / Punta d'acuto duolo" (1-2) – „ ... takovu, ubode mač od ljute bolesti" ("... like that, was pierced by a sword of grievous pain"). "Sul caduto figliuol cadde e congiunse / mano a man, volto a volto e seno a seno; / Stillò dal cor licor pietoso ed unse / Le piaghe acerbe, ond'era sparso e pieno; Sciolse ella gli occhi, egli le vene e quanto / Egli di sangue, ella versò di pianto". (3-8) – „Pade vrhu padenoga Ditića i sjedini ruku s rukon, obraz s obrazon, a parsi s parsimi. Izhojaše od sarca znoj milostiv, kojim pomaza rane njegove. Ona otvori oči, a on žile; i koliko on karvi toliko ona suz' prolivaše". ("She fell on top of the fallen Child and joined her hand to his hand, her cheek to his cheek, and her breast to his breast. From her heart there poured forth a balmy sweat, with which she dressed his wounds. The she opened her eyes, and he his veins, and she shed as many tears as he poured out blood").

By means of the etymological figure, a verbal combination is achieved which is mimetic in relation to the form of the content of the text. The synecdoche is again replaced with a direct expression. The sting in the tail of the conceit is achieved by means of positional and "grammatical" identification and a partial semantic equation of words not linked by the usual concepts.



because the economy of expression and rhythmic tension contingent on the verse form disappear and are replaced by the expansiveness and "reasonableness" of the prose form.

Laurić, however, managed to preserve the essential characteristics of the conceit by an appropriate "discipline" at a much more elementary level: by transmitting their conceptual outline and lexical "setup".

Most of the examples of this figure used by Marino in scenes of killing (such as the ones mentioned above) are intellectualizing conceits, based on the rational understanding and identification of the two poles of the antithesis⁷⁷ - between which there is a unidirectional proportional connection – and on an insight into the order of cause and effect and therefore a perception of the violation of that order. In this process Marino does not depart from the primary, literal meaning of words, making it easier for Laurić to reproduce in the Croatian language the lexical concretization of his conceits. Much rarer are conceits which involve a metaphor, arising from a merging of images, from a direct and momentary superposition, perhaps because insisting on the use of this figure as part of a conceit would be difficult to reconcile with the thread of moderate and balanced metaphor creation for which Marino had opted, somewhat at odds with the practice of his contemporaries.

Octave II, 14 :

Con silenzio però duro e mortale
tante voci ammutir faró ben io;
Voglio in un mar di sangue universale
L'ancora stabilir del regno mio (1-4)

⁷⁷ Several more conceits containing rational identifications and the corresponding translations are provided by the following lines:

IV,13: "Quei sputa il cibo, /e dentro il sangue e '1 latte / L'anima pargoletta ondeggia e nuota" (5-6) – „Oni brišni pljuje karv i mliko, /a duša u karv pliva i topi se“; IV, 25: "Questi, tra '1 latte e '1 pianto e '1 sangue e l'onda / Svenato cade e soffocato affonda" (7-8) – „Drugì meu mlikom, meu suze, / meu karv i meu vodu ranjen pade i zadušen utopi se “ (“This one, poor child, spewed out blood and milk, / and his soul swam and drowned in blood; another fell wounded among milk, among tears, among blood and among water and, suffocating, drowned”).

III, 89: "E mentre in acque il cor distilla tutto, / Mentre tutta in vapor l'anima scioglie, / Egli fa del petto suo, stringendol forte, / Già cuna in vita, or sepoltura in morte" (5-8) – „I čime sarce kopni u vodi, i čime sva duša u paru razčinja se, od svojih parsi ke bihu kolievčica u život učini greb u smarti“ (“and with his heart melting in water, and with all his soul dissolving into vapour, out of his breast, which was a cradle in life, he made a tomb in death”).

The source of the identification of "sangue"/"latte" is Aretino's text from which Marino also took the motifs of stanzas III, 18, 1; III, 22, 5-8; III, 63, 1-3 and IV, 4.





Nišće ne manje, s mučan'jem tvardim i umarlin hoću činiti da zamuknu tolici glasi, a sidro od moga kraljestva hoću ustanoviti u more od karvi. (Nothing less, with hard silence and dead I will make so many voices keep quiet and the anchor of my kingdom I will establish in a sea of blood.)

contains a realized metaphor, starting from an identification characteristic of non-poetic, everyday speech. Following from the identification thus set up, a combination removed from the predictable associations of the everyday expression is realized in line four as a conceit. (In the translation there is an inversion of metaphors in relation to the Italian text, because Laurić applied a progressive syntagmatic order in which the object precedes the adverbial.)

In stanza III, 73 the conceit is based on the identification of "animate"/"inanimate", "artificial"/"natural"; the domain of domestic everyday life, discovered by baroque poetry and familiar to the Trogir audience from their own life experience, is represented as the second pole of the antithesis:

Già solev'io, non è gran tempo avanti,
Trattando di mia man serici stami,
Nel lin, che vi copria, poveri infanti,
Con sottil ago ordir fregi e ricami;
Or da ferro crudel ne' vostri manti
Quali, ahi quali vegg'io lavori infami?
Fiera man vi trapunse, ed ecco in vui
Ricucir mi convien gli squarci altrui.

Ja bih naučna, ni vele vrimena, mojon rukon na lipu postavu koja vas pokrivaše, (nesrična Dičica!) s tankon jaglicon šiti lipe tege i rakame. A sada od nemiloga mača u vaše haljice koje tege i koje rakame gledan? Ah trišćenjaci! Ruka vas nemila izprobada, i eto od potrebe jest šiti i karpiti utline vaše. (I used, not so long ago, I would fain, not so long time past, with my hand upon the fine cloth that covers you, unhappy Boy, with thin needle sew nice embroideries. And now from the awful sword on your robe what embroideries do I see. Ah, the villains. Your hand is pierced, and now look it is necessary to sew and darn your wounds.)

The translation of octave III, 58, however, shows that Marino's rhetorical repertoire was not unquestionable when certain other, non-literary priorities of Laurić's undertaking came into play:





Quantunque invan: che 'n lui la punta orrenda
Drizza il fellon, ma falle il colpo ed erra;
Crudel l'error, ma più crudel l'emenda,
Che lui trafigge e lei trafitta atterra.
Egli le braccia aperte avien che stenda,
Ella in giù cade e nel cader l'afferra,
Onde, immobile tronco e senza voce,
Al figliuol crocifisso è fatta croce.

Da sve zaludu; zašto oni trišćenjak s raton od mača potegnu protiva njemu, ali ga ne porazi ni rani, i to neranjen'je vele veću nemilos satvori, zašto drugovja potegnu, i probi Ditića i Majku u jedno. Ditić prostri otvorene ručice, a Majka pade doli i potegnu ga za sobom; tako se satvori kako drivo brez glasa i propetomu sinku učini se križ. (All in vain; because that villain with the tip of his sword draws against him, but does not cut or wound him, and this not-wounding creates a much greater evil, for then he draws a second time and pierces both Boy and Mother at once. The boy spreads wide his hands, and his mother falls down and pulls him with her; so she creates a voiceless tree and makes a cross for her racked boy.)

The focus on the rhetorical aspects of the text was determined by the necessity of explicating the causal connections and the reconstruction of the sequence of events of the micro-episode being described. A secondary effect was the correspondence of the form with that of the source text ("but he neither defeated nor wounded him") and its annulment (the substitution of the binary structure in line three with a referential gloss and the loss of semantic and phonological figures). The orientation toward explication and the care taken to achieve referential credibility is also evident in the translation of the last two lines, where the conceit is located. Some of its elements are translated literally, and due to the lack of correspondence between the lexical structures of Italian and Croatian, the etymological figure is again lost. The image of the mother as the cross on which her son is crucified has been transferred to the Croatian text in its entirety and the point of the conceit has been translated literally and preserved. But while in Marino's text the juxtaposition amalgamates the literal and figural meaning, in the Croatian translation the image is explicated as a simile by the word „kako“ ("like").

The fact that Laurić "brought back" some of Marino's metaphors as similes, and preserved all the similes in the source text as such in the translation, reveals which type of ornamented discourse he was more at home with and points to a more traditional and conservative cultural experience than the one put before him by the Italian source text.





In stanza III, 69, to the learned simile given by the source text he himself added the same figure, making use of an experiential fact well known to his audience:

“Forato il ventre e l’una e l’altra coscia, / Sdrucito il picciol corpo a pie’ le giacque. / tempestato di piaghe, era a vedello / Con cent’occhi sanguigni Argo novello” (5-8) – „Vidi tarbušac i jedno i drugo stegno sve izbušano; razdart vas kip njegov jedva se u jedno daržaše. Ranami kakono gradon izbien i vijaše se kakono Argo koji sto očiju imaše” (“See the belly and one and the other thigh all pierced through. His body, all torn, barely held together. He was spattered with wounds like hail and seemed like Argus who had a hundred eyes”).

For that matter, Marino himself was not averse to the occasional “retreat” (because of the suggestion of the epic form of which the simile is an “emblematic figure”⁷⁸ or as a demonstration of a certain “caution” of expression). Thus he expressed the continuation of the metaphor in octave II, 14 with a simile in verse III, 82:

Parean gli sparsi corpi orridi avanzi
Di naufragio moral, legni sommersi,
Il sangue pueril flutto crudele,
E le membra e le fasce arbori e vele. (4-8)

Vijahu se raztarkana telesa, strašni ostanci kako od driv’ potopljenih.
Karv ditinjska carljene vali strahoviti, a telesa i povoji jarbori i jidra
(Scattered bodies could be seen, terrible remains as of sunken ships. The children’s blood terrible red waves, and their bodies and swaddling-bands masts and sails).

He clothed the analogy “petto”/“fornace”, an originally Biblical metaphor,⁷⁹ which was common in Marino’s time in both religious and profane poetry,⁸⁰ in the same figure: IV, 59: “Per farlo, o crudi, incenerire a pieno, / Vi bastava riporlo in questo seno” (7-8) – „O tvardi i nemili ljudi, ako hoćete da se u prah i u pepel obrati, dosti bi van i zadovoljno bilo postaviti ga u nidra moja”; IV, 60: “Là dove, quasi in immortai fornace, / Sue faville ognor vive Amor mantiene” (1-2) / „U ova nidra, u kojih Ljubav uzdarži žive svoje plamene kako u neumarlu peć” (“O hard-hearted and merciless men, if you wanted him to be turned into dust and ashes, it would have been sufficient and pleasing to you to place him in my bosom; In this bosom, in which Love keeps burning its living flames as in an eternal furnace”).

⁷⁸ Cf. n. 50.

⁷⁹ “Quoniam in aurum probatur aurum et argentum, Homines vero receptibiles in camino humiliationis”, *Eccli 2, 5-6. Biblia Vulgata*, 1967: 636.

⁸⁰ Christ’s breast is metaphorized as a furnace in the poem *S. Katarina od Sijene* by Junije Palmotić. A detailed description and interpretation of this passage is provided by Fa-liševac 1989: 175. An example of the same figure is provided by A. Grillo. Cf. Besomi: 233.





Laurić's attitude toward the three figures most frequently found in Marino's text – along with metaphor, these were synecdoche and periphrasis – is perhaps most directly revealing of his cultural attainment and the level of his literary and expressive literacy. Hence the forms and degree of sinking to which Marino's text was subjected in a milieu different from that of the original, addressed to a much more precisely defined and limited circle of readers.

A comparison of the examples where Laurić conveys the metaphors of Marino's epyllion and those where he omits or avoids them reveal his perception and reproductive interest, delimited by the horizon of the traditional metaphoric content of lyrical poetry of a Petrarchan derivation:⁸¹

O specchi del mio cor, volti amorosi,
Ov'io me stessa vagheggiar solea;
O soli di quest'occhi, occhi pietosi,
In ch'io mille dolcezze ognor avea;
O labra, onde pur or baci vezzosi,
Misti fra dolci risi, amor traea;
Ahi qual selvaggio, ahi qual tartareo mostro,
Ha sparso il sangue mio nel sangue vostro? (Ili, 75)

Zarcali sarca moga, ljubeznivi obrazi, u kojih sama sebi bih naučna gledati i raholiti se. O sunce od ovih očiju, oči milostivi od kojih ja tisuća slatkosti svaki čas primah. O uzta, iz kojih izhojahu slatki celovi, slatkimi smihon izmišani. Ah koji divji, koji tvardi i koji nemili proli karv moju u karv vašu?⁷⁸ (Mirrors of my heart, lovely dear cheeks, in which I would fain watch myself and be proud. O sun of these eyes, gracious eyes from which I took a thousand pleasures every moment. Oh mouth, from which sweet kisses come, with sweet smiles mingled. Oh what savage, what hard and what awful one spills my blood into your blood.)

Laurić translated the idyllic image in stanza IV, 96 with great care so as not to miss a single element of Marino's text, and, moreover, he extended the lexical boundaries of the source text by occasional additions. Within the realized metaphor of the traditional type (7 – 8) there is room for the combination introduced by Grillo, "sanguigne brine" – „karvave rose" ("bloody dew"), of a Petrarchan design. The anemographic terms, however, are summarized by a collective term.⁸²

⁸¹ In another faithfully translated passage, the "untranslatable" cultural reference "tartareo" is compensated for by the multiplication of attributives.

⁸² Cf. Besomi 1969: 169.





Sparver turbini e nubi e il ciel sereno
Con chiare stelle a i lor trionfi arrise;
Austro e seco Aquilon, con l'ali a freno,
Si vaghe danze a vagheggiar s'assise;
Con festevoli plausi, a l'aria in seno,
Scherzar l'aure e gli augelli in mille guise;
Colse l'Aurora le sanguigne brine
E ne fe' gemme al seno e rose al crine. (IV, 96)

Razajdoše se markli oblaci, a Nebo svoj on vedrinom i svitlimi
zvizdami dobitću njihovu veselo se smijaše. Vitraci uzdaržeći krela
raholahu se u njihovo tancan'je. Ajer na tisuća načini igraše se s vitraci i
s ptičicami s velikim vesel'jen, a Zora skupivši karvave rose, pritvori u
drago kamen'je na parsi i rožice na kose. (The dark clouds parted, and
the Sky with its brightness and light skies smiled merrily on their victory.
The breezes, withholding, their wings celebrated their dancing. The air
in a thousand ways played with the winds and with the birds with great
joy and Dawn collecting the bloody dew turned it into precious stones
upon the breast and roses in the hair.)

Laurić is less inclined to accept the more modern metaphors of the *Seicento*,
which abandon the harmony of subject-matter and lexis that is characteristic of
Petrarchan poetry.

In stanza II, 20 the traditional designations for eloquence are used, originating
from classical authors and the Bible and revived by Grillo shortly before they
were used by Marino. Laurić, however, seems to have considered the metaphor
in the second line too bizarre or too "material", out of harmony with the idyllic
colouring of the other figures in the text.

II, 20: "Porta egli il mei ne la favella ed have / in bocca gli ami e ne la lingua i
dardi" (1-2) – „Od njegova govorenje izhojahu riči kako med prislatki“ ("Of his
speech there flowed forth words like sweetest honey").

"Fuor de le labra in bel sermon sonoro / Versò fiume di latte e vena d'oro"
(7-8) – „izpusti glas iz ust' njegovih prem kako rika od mlika u zlatnomu načinu,
i ovako poče govoriti“ ("He let his voice flow from his mouth like a river of milk
in a golden frame, and started speaking thus").

"Cultural sinking" is also manifested in the omission of the metaphor "teatro",
which is also traditional and confirmed by classical authors (e.g., Virgil). In II,
88 it was at odds with the subtext of the Book of Genesis which Laurić wished
to invoke in his translation.





“... e si fu l'uomo espresso, / Del teatro del mondo illustre imago; Anzi del mondo è mio teatro ei stesso” (2-4) – „I ztvorih človika priliku prisvitlu od svita, ali za bolje od mene istoga” (“And I created man in an illustrious image of the world, but better to say, of myself”). In II, 6, where the gap between the literal and analogical meaning is very small, he also considered it inappropriate to the context (and one might say that in both examples he understood it completely literally). “Non volse il fier tiranno a cielo aperto / La tragedia mirar crudele e mesta, / Ma quel portico scelse, al Sol coverto, Opportuno teatro a l'empia festa” (1-4) – „Ne hti kralj Irud na otvoreno nebo gledati toliko nemilo ubojstvo, da oni pristrižak pokriveni od rečene polače obra i odluči za to nemilo dilo, u komu sunce zrake svoje nikada prostriti ne mogaše.” (“King Herod did not want to see so wicked a murder under the open sky, but chose and designated that porch of the said palace for the wicked deed, in which the sun could never spread out its rays”).

Complex metaphors, which are based on “the exposure and substitution of one metaphorical correlate with another”⁸³ also remain beyond the translator's reproductive interest. He could have resolved the metaphor in line seven with the simile „krelami kakono veslami” (“with wings like oars”), but, perhaps, in view of the status of the referent, he thought the image too “realistic”.⁸⁴ II, 93: „Disse e fu fatto. Una pennuta luce / De la beata angelica famiglia” (1-2) – „Jedan Angel od blaženih na Nebi...”. (“An Angel of the blessed in Heaven...”), “E co' remi de l'ali in un momento / Naviga l'aria e va solcando il vento” (7-8) – „uputi se s krilima njegovim u jedan čas po Ajeru i po vitru” (“set out with his wings in an instant on Air and wind”).

Faced with a similar situation in II, 136, he uses the same type of solution: “Gli occhi leva pian piano, indi gli affisa / Verso il balcon de la stellata loggia” (3-4) – „otvarajući oči malo po malo, poče gledati u nebo zvizdami urešeno”. (Opening his eyes little by little, started looking upon the sky adorned with stars.)

Porta gli omeri ignudi, abile vesta
Gli scende in giù, sotto il sinistro fianco,
D'un velo sottilissimo contesta
D'azzurro e d'oro; e, fra purpureo e bianco,
Fendesì in due la lieve falda; e questa,
Succinta e breve in su 'l ginocchio manco,
Mentre vola ondeggiando e si dilata,
Morde con dente d'or fibbia gemmata. (II, 96)

Nosi ramena gola; svitla svita visi pod livon rukon odkana od pritanke
svionice sa zlaton i s razlicimi koluri i tangami, razdiljena na dvoje nad
livin kolinon; i čim lećaše razligaše se razpahujući, kako da ujidaše zubon

⁸³ Fališevac 1989: 175.

⁸⁴ This is also supported by the “deconcretisation” in the translation of II, 136.





od zlatne oprave lipoga bisera. (Bears bare shoulders; the bright dress hangs below the left arm woven of most fine silk with gold and various hues, divided into two over the left knee; and as soon as he flew it spread and floated, as if it bit with tooth of gold raiment with lovely pearl.)

In the translation, which begins with a calque from the Italian text, synonymic iteration is introduced as a rhetorical equivalent and simultaneously as a summary of the colouristic enumeration, while the synecdoche formed by the binomium "purpureo e bianco" with the following verse (5) and the synecdoche "falda" in the same line are omitted. The metaphor, "Morde con dente d'or" and the accompanying context are inadequately translated; the understanding of this metaphor might have been prevented by the hyperbaton, although even the translation as it stands manages to reconstruct the meaning of the imagery (expressed by a simile).

The synecdoches (and the occasional metonymy) and periphrases in Marino's text have been almost banished from Laurić's translation. (The passages cited so far provide numerous examples to support this.) The synecdoche is a conceptual figure which deprives the text of its expressive immediacy without the compensation of evoking a visual image. For Laurić it represented an unnecessary intellectual burden reducing direct communicative impact. This was even more the case with periphrasis, "roundabout speech", and Laurić wished to show and teach by direct naming or by acting on the imagination and feelings. In the Italian source text the frequency of these figures is a reflection of the derived, allusive character of the language at Marino's disposal, an artificial product consisting entirely of material of a literary origin. Laurić took the immediate, living speech of his milieu (demonstrating it to be suitable for literary use), and the prose tradition he originally belonged to offered him model after model oriented toward direct *captatio*. Clarity of utterance and clear division (which is why disharmonious metaphors were removed from the positive field of meaning, and, for example, grotesque descriptions were intensified by Laurić's independent additions)⁸⁵ were characteristic of the propaedeutic string preceding Marino's epyllion in the cultural memory of Laurić's audience. We are referring to ecclesiastical prose,

⁸⁵ As in the descriptions of the external appearance of the executioners which Marino places between the massacre scenes with a ritual regularity:

Oltre il mento pelato e 'l capo raso,
Oltre le tempie anguste e 'l ciglio irsuto,
Tre denti ha meno ed ha schiacciato il naso
E ne gli occhi ineguali il guardo acuto;
Benché 'l miglior de' duo, rigato a caso
D'un gran fregio a traverso, abbia perduto.
Ne la fronte e nel volto ha per trofeo
Ill carattere greco e 'l conio ebreo. (IV, 4)





whether with a prevailing didactic or narrative component, and the popular genre of mystery plays. Their formal and syntactic features prepared the form of Laurić's prose which, according to Morović, evinces a "talent for stylistic shaping",⁸⁶ and its ability to adopt the constructive patterns of the Italian source text and occasionally rewrite them in the same direction (for example by substituting a polysyndeton for juxtaposition).

In his dedication Laurić represents himself as totally identified with the pious inhabitants of the convent of St. Peter and the common people of Trogir. He is, however, superior to them because he directs the process of their cognition and chooses the most appropriate means to this end. Only his cousin Marcela is his equal, and he would allow her to introduce stylistic interventions into his translation.⁸⁷ His remarks also depict him as being convinced that "after turning over many books and valuable teachers"⁸⁸ he has chosen the best possible text. Finally, his manner of translation, which we may term very faithful – and therefore it preserves numerous stylistic features of Marino's text in the rhetorical segment (regardless of whether this is the result of a conscious intention, a special sensitivity to form on the part of Laurić as a man of letters, or the welcome consequence of his primary wish to provide as exact a translation as possible)⁸⁹ – confirms this attitude. (We saw in previous examples why Marino's ornaments were not transmitted entirely).

Laurić's translation confronts us with two other features – one independent of the Italian text, and the other prompted by it, but only to a lesser extent –

Osvin da imaše oguljenu bradu i glavu obrivenu, osvin temple od glave uzke i strahovite, osvin obarv' duzih i tvarda vlasa, bihu mu pomanjkali tri pridnju zuba; zavarnuta staše mu uzgor usnica i vas kraj od nosa. Imaše pogled strašan izhodeći iz krivih i razdartih očiju, pren da jedno oko koje zdravije biše vijaše se slipo i izranjeno. Obraz, ali čunka njegova biše sva izprikrižana starimi braskotinami i ranami; a čelo bulano žudiskon muniton. (Apart from having a bare chin and shaven head, apart from the temple of the head narrow and fearful, apart from the length of brows and hard hair, he was missing the three front teeth; his lips and the whole end of his nose were turned upwards. He had a look terrible that came out of eyes awry and torn, although one eye that was the healthier seemed blind and wounded. His face or snout was all criss-crossed with old cicatrices and wounds; and the brow was stamped with the Jewish seal.)

⁸⁶ Morović 1978: 71.

⁸⁷ Cf. *ibid.*: 77.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

⁸⁹ This intention sometimes runs up against Laurić's misunderstanding of the text, perhaps even his inadequate Italian. There are some rather interesting examples of this.

It seems that in stanza II, 53 the exotic origin of the three kings led Laurić to understand the perfect participle of "chinare" as a toponym: "... ma che sagace e maga / Gente e gente real dietro si tiri, / Si ch'ella qual fatidica e presaga, / China l'adori e stupida l'ammiri" (3-6) – „i da množtvo od kraljestva za sobon vode i da jin se Kina klanja i čudnovatim načinom gleda jih ...“ ("and that they lead after them a multitude of kingdoms and that China bows to them and gazes upon them in wonder").





which show that he wanted his work to contain yet another “hook” to ensure its acceptance by his fellow citizens: the adding of elements of “indigenization” which placed the text into predictable streams of communication and oriented it in a recognizable way toward the domestic Croatian audience (which had a simple imagination and unrefined taste, but a tendency to experience reality emotionally). The first sign of this are formulaic similes and colloquial additions, close to the style of folklore; I, 19: “sciolse / Ruggito” (5-6) – „poče lajati kako jedan pas”; III, 25: “Quei rugge e latra, e questa langue e geme” - „on reži i laje kako Lav, a ona tuži i uzdiše kako golubica”; III, 87: “Ulula, non sospira, urla, non piange” (4) - „viče a ne uzdiše; vije kako Vuk, a ne plače”; (“started barking like a dog; he growled and barked like a Lion, and she keened and sighed like a dove; shouted rather than sighed; howled like a wolf rather than cried”) the other is the frequent use of diminutives referring to the protagonists of the epyllion and the accompanying context: the use of diminutives follows

The surprising nature of the referent made possible the credibility of the interpretation offered by the Croatian text. In II, 125 Laurić transformed his evident misunderstanding of the phraseme “farsi solecchio” into a hyperbolic element of the description of Joseph. “... e ‘ncontro al balen ch’arde e sfavilla / Con la tremula man si fa solecchio” (3) – 2 „... i protiv svitlostju ka puštaše gorući plamen darhćući rukami svojimi pritvori se kako u malo sunce” (“and against the light that let out a burning flame trembling with his hands he was transformed as if into a little sun”). In II, 136, he again “improved” the Italian text: „Poiché ‘l vigore ha racquistato, in guisa / Che ‘n su le piante i gravi membri appoggia” (1-2) – „I pokle steče snagu kakono oni ki trudna uda na stablo nasloni” (“and since he gained strength like one who leans his weary limbs against a tree”).

It is rather unusual that when translating IV, 68 Laurić mistook Ceres for her daughter Proserpina. Perhaps this was due to his unsuccessful attempt to decipher the periphrasis (although we assumed him to have an education which could have assisted him in such cases). The periphrasis, regardless of the reason for its preservation, does not run counter to the narrative dynamics. The hyperbaton is lost because of the sentence order in the translation, and the choice of epithet is made subject to the informativeness of the text.

Qual, da poiché perduta aver s'accorse
La bella figlia in su la spiaggia Etna,
Accese i pini infuriata e corse
Già de le spiche l'inventrice Dea,
E co' rapidi draghi il ciel trascorse
Stimolata dal duol che la traea,
Cercando pur la vergine smarrita,
Che fu in un punto sol vista e rapita

Kakono ona Božica ka iznajde glasje pokle u kraj mora Etne, gore privisoke, izgubi svoju Divojčicu, užga jele i dube zelene, i eto hitri Drakuni litajući ugrabiše ju, a ona izćući lipu mladicu u hip jedan bi i vijena i ugrabljena. (Like that Goddess who found the ears of wheat after by the sea of Aetna, most high mountain, lost her Little Girl, set light to firs and green trees, and there the swift Dragons flying seized her and she looking for her pretty little child was in a moment seen and seized.)





naturally from their referential features. But while Marino is very moderate in his use of diminutives and terms of endearment, Laurić multiplies them: he evidently reacts by a conditioned reflex,⁹⁰ counting on the identical response from his audience: in the massacre scenes the use of these linguistic forms and the pathos and sentimentality they evoke pushes the position of the victim to an extreme, while in the episodes depicted in the ascent of the “little children” to heaven the idyll of eternal bliss after a victory over evil is materialized. If not all of Laurić’s readers and listeners were able to fully follow the meanderings of Marino’s conceits, “little roses”, “little legs”, “little gowns”, “small breeze”, “little birds”, “little mouths”, “little children”, “little body”, “little faces”, “little souls”, “little heads of hair”, “little hands”, “little apple”, “little reed”, “little head”, “little cradle”, “little bride”, “little wires”, “young limbs”, “little roses”, “little bees”, “little stones”, “little lamb”, “little crowns”, “little brook”, “little swaddling-bands”, “little tears”, “nappies”,⁹¹ by arousing their compassion, ensured the success of his work.

⁹⁰ The same means, when dealing with the same theme, were to be used a century later by the homilist Fortunat Švagelj, who came from northern Croatia. Cf. Bratulić 1991: 286.

⁹¹ In Croatian: „rozice“, „nožice“, „haljice“, „vitrac“, „ptičice“, „ustatca“, „ditići“, „trup“, „malahan“, „lišca“, „dušice“, „kosice“, „ručice“, „jabučica“, „tarščica“, „glavica“, „kolevčica“, „nevistica“, „žicice“, „uda mlajahna“, „rusulice“, „pčelice“, „kamičci“, „jančić“, „krunice“, „potočac“, „pašice“, „suzice“, „pelenice“. Cf. Morović 1978, *passim*.



Bibliography:

- Besomi, Ottavio, 1969, *Ricerche intorno alla "Lira" di G. B. Marino*, Liviana, Padova.
- Biblia Vulgata*, 1965, *Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam Clementinam*, ed. A. Colunga and L. Turado, La Editorial Catolica S. A., Matriti.
- Bratulić, Josip, 1991, "Hrvatska barokna propovijed", *Hrvatski književni barok*, ed. D. Fališevac, Zavod za znanost o književnosti, Zagreb, pp. 279-296.
- Colombo, Carmela, 1969, *Cultura e tradizione nell' "Adone" di G. B. Marino*, Liviana, Padova.
- Croce, Benedetto, 1912, "Nota" (in G. B. Marino, *Poesie varie*, ed. B. Croce, Laterza, Bari, pp. 401-413).
- Croce, Benedetto, 1935, "La Strage degli Innocenti", *Varietà di storia letteraria e civile*, Laterza, Bari, pp. 106-118.
- Lirici marinisti*, 1969, ed. B. Croce, UTET, Torino.
- Fališevac, Dunja, 1987, "Concetto kao pojam barokne poetike i pjesnički postupak", *Ivan Bunić Vučić*, Zavod za znanost o književnosti, Liber, Zagreb, pp. 173-184.
- Fališevac, Dunja, 1989, "Concetto kao pojam barokne poetike i pjesnički postupak u hrvatskoj književnosti 17. stoljeća", *Stari pisci hrvatski i njihove poetike*, Liber, Zagreb, pp. 155-187.
- Fališevac, Dunja, 1993, "Figura u epu (na primjeru Marulićeve *Judite*)", *Kaliopin vrt, studije o hrvatskoj epici*; Književni krug Split, Split, pp. 53-76.
- Kravar, Zoran, 1993, *Nakon godine MDC*, Matica hrvatska, Dubrovnik.
- Machiedo, Mladen, 1997, "Mallarméovski Marino", *Rival*, 1-2, str. 129-134.
- Malinar, Smiljka, 2002, "Opis osjetila u *Adoneu*", *Od Marulića do Marina*, Ex libris, Zagreb, pp. 301-354.
- Marino, Giovan Battista, 1911-1912, *Epistolario*, I, II, ed. A. Borzelli and F. Nicolini, Laterza, Bari.
- Marino, Giovan Battista, 1960, "La Strage degl'Innocenti", *Dicerie sacre e la Strage degl'Innocenti*, ed. G. Pozzi, Einaudi, Torino, pp. 465-600.
- Menghini, Mario, 1888, *La vita e le opera di G. B. Marino*, Libreria A. Manzoni.
- Morović, Hrvoje, 1978, "Marinova *Strage degli innocenti* u prijevodu Trogirana Dominiga Laurića", *Čakavska rič*, 1, pp. 69-118.
- Pavličić Pavao, 1979, "*Judita i Osman* kao tipovi epa", *Rasprave o hrvatskoj baroknoj književnosti*, Čakavski sabor, Split, pp. 203-236.
- Pozzi, Giovanni, 1960, "Introduzione alle *Dicerie sacre*", in Marino, Giovan Battista, *Dicerie sacre e la Strage degl'Innocenti*, ed. G. Pozzi, Torino, pp. 13-65.
- Pozzi, Giovanni, 1960a, "Introduzione alla *Strage degl'Innocenti*", in Marino, Giovan Battista, *Dicerie sacre e la Strage degl'Innocenti*, ed. G. Pozzi, Torino, pp. 443-463.
- Tommaseo, Niccolò - Bellini, Bernardo, 1924, *Dizionario della lingua italiana*, UTET, Torino.
- Zogović, Mirka, 1995, *Marino i dubrovačka književnost*, Srpska književna zadruga, Novi Sad.

ARj= *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, 1880-1976, Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Zagreb.

ERHSJ = Skok, Petar, 1971, *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Zagreb.

ČAKAVSKA PARAFRAZA MARINOVA SPJEVA *LA STRAGE* *DE GL'INNOCENTI*

U ovom radu uspoređujemo Marinov epilij *La Strage degl'Innocenti* i prijevod što ga je osam godina nakon prvoga izdanja *Strage* (1632.) na hrvatskome sastavio trogirski literat Dominig Laurić, naslovivši ga *Ubijen'je nemilo pravedne dičice*. Prijevod je nastao na poticaj njegove rodice Ser Marcele Laurić, redovnice samostana sv. Petra u Trogiru, u potrazi za tekstem koji će njezinim suredovnicama izložiti "poznanje od uzroka i od načina ubojstva Dičice pravedne ... sve potanko ... kako jim se je dogodilo" te im pružiti „duhovno naslajenje“. Marinov epilij, neupitan sa stajališta kršćanske ortodoksije, name-tao se svojom aktualnošću i uspjehom kod (široke) publike, a na izbor je mogao utjecati i ugled što ga je Marino kao svjetovni pisac uživao u dalmatinsko-dubrovačkoj sredini. Vjersko-utilitarne pobude Laurićeva prevoditeljskog pothvata implicirale su vrlo pomno i precizno prenošenje konstitutivnih elemenata forme sadržaja talijanskoga teksta sredstvima hrvatskog jezika. Stoga je Laurić Marinov tekst preveo prozom (apostrofirajući kao mogućeg destinataru i „vas puk trogirski“). Laurić je, kako zapaža njegov izdavač Morović, Marinov tekst preveo „skoro doslovno“, odnosno - kako je vidljivo iz naše analize – na mnogo mjesta izravnom preslikom konstrukcija i riječi talijanskoga teksta, uz minimalnu, nužnu morfonološku prilagodbu. Ipak, doslovan prijevod a ni vjeran (koji nije nužno doslovan i „parazitski“) nije u cijelosti ostvaren. Tome su stajali putu i izričajna neopremljenost hrvatskog jezika (jezično parazitiranje često je pokušaj prevladavanja njegovih lakuna) i ograničeno kulturno iskustvo Laurićeve publike, i autorov djelomični stilski konzervativizam. Laurić je ispustio stanoviti broj mitoloških i kulturnih referenci, zemljopisnih naziva i „egzotičnih“ apelativa, vjerojatno pretpostavljajući da bi njegovoj publici bili nerazumljivi, a dio njih opremio je glosatorskim dodatkom ili zamijenio iskustveno bližim referentom. Selekciju, tumačenje, prilagodbu i zamjenu predloškom ponuđenog materijala isto je tako primijenio kako bi riješio problem prevođenja tehničkih i znanstvenih termina što ih Marino rabi u kozmogonijskim i zvjezdoznanstveničkim ulomcima *Strage*. Talijanski jezik Marinova vremena raspolagao je bogatim stručno-znanstvenim leksikom, dočim se Laurić našao suočen s novim područjem, nepoznatim hrvatskoj književnosti, i s dotad neiskušanom leksičkim nizovima. Svodeći ulomke opremljene tehničkim i znanstvenim nazivljem u tradicionalne okvire znanstveno neobilježene diskursa, bio je ujedno bliži očekivanjima i ukusu svoje publike, nesvikle na spoj znanosti i literature. Laurić uključuje svoj prijevod u predvidljive komunikacijske tokove i prepoznatljivo ga usmjerava prema domaćoj, hrvatskoj publici (jednostavne mašte i nerafinirana ukusa, ali sklonoj emotivnom doživljavanju realnosti) samostalnim zahvatima u odnosu na izvorni tekst: dodavanjem formulaičnih poredbi i kolokvijalnih izraza, bliskih folklornoj stilizaciji, ili pak umnožavanjem umanjenica i „riči od dragosti“ kad govori o protagonistima epilija.

Laurić prenosi i velik broj retoričkih figura Marinova teksta – automatizmom koji proizlazi iz težnje da se reproduciraju gotovo svi elementi slike i leksički izraženog smisla što ga pruža izvornik, ali i svjesnim odabirom i pristajanjem. Posljednju činjenicu potvrđuju primjeri gdje je ponuđenom uzorku pretpostavio drugačije rješenje. Kada je



riječ o metafori, nesklon je prihvaćanju modernijih, seičentističkih varijanti te figure koje napuštaju predmetnotematski i leksički sklad svojstven lirskomu pjesništvu petrarkističke derivacije.

Sinegdoh (uz poneku metonimiju) i perifrize Marina teksta gotovo su izopćene iz Laurićeva prijevoda. Sinegdoha je pojmovna figura te izričaju oduzima izražajnu neposrednost, a ne kompenzira je slikovitošću. Za Laurića je značila nepotrebno intelektualno opterećenje i smanjenu izravnu komunikacijsku dojmljivost. To još više vrijedi za perifrazu, »obilazno govorenje«, a Laurić je želio pokazati i poučiti izravnim imenovanjem i djelovanjem na maštu i osjećaje. U talijanskom izvorniku učestalost tih figura odraz je deriviranog, aluzivnoga karaktera jezika koji se nudi Marinu, umjetnog proizvoda sastavljenog od gradiva literarnoga podrijetla. Laurić uzima neposredni, živi govor svoje sredine (pokazujući da je prikladan za literarnu primjenu) a prozna tradicija kojoj je izvorno pripadao pružala mu je odreda uzore usmjerene na izravnu *captatio*: jasan izričaj i jasnu podjelu (zbog toga su, primjerice, disharmonične metafore uklonjene iz značenjski pozitivnog polja), kakvi su svojstveni eklezijastičkoj prozi i popularnom žanru crkvenih prikazanja, koji u kulturnom pamćenju Laurićeve publike prethode Marinovu epiliju.

Laurićev odnos prema spomenute tri figure možda najizravnije otkriva njegove kulturne dosege i razinu njegove literarne i izražajne spremne. Stoga i oblike i stupanj potonuća kojemu je u sredini drugačijoj od izvorne bio podvrgnut Marinov tekst.

Key words: sunken cultural good, G. B. Marino, Dominig Laurić, baroque poetry, translation, rhetorical figures, *conchetto*.

Ključne riječi: potonulo kulturno dobro, G. B. Marino, Dominig Laurić, barokna poezija, prijevod, retoričke figure, *cončeto*.

:

