

Mladen Engelsfeld

Krleža Into English

The first English translation of Krleža's novel "Povratak Filipa Latinovicza" (The Return of Philip Latinovicz) and problems of rendering Krleža into English

In this paper on the translation of Krleža's novel *Povratak Filipa Latinovicza* into English I would like to discuss some of the problems of translating Krleža into English and to state the reasons why I find it difficult to agree with two American assessments of this translation.

The English translation of Krleža's novel *Povratak Filipa Latinovicza (The Return of Philip Latinovicz)* requires special and detailed consideration. First, the publication of a major Croatian writer in the most wide-spread foreign language nowadays is in the national interest; second, apart from selected passages and one or two short stories, this is the first English translation of one of Krleža's major works. In Central and Eastern Europe, and especially in Austria, France, Germany, Hungary, Czecho-Slovakia and Poland, the reputation of Krleža as a writer has already been well established, but in English speaking countries, and particularly in Great Britain, America and Canada, Krleža is practically an unknown writer. So far *The Return of Philip Latinovicz* has been translated into Albanian, Bulgarian, Czech, Danish, French, German, Magyar, Norwegian, Polish, Rumanian, Russian, Slovakian, Slovene, Swedish, and English.

Povratak Filipa Latinovicza, originally published in 1932, was first translated into English by Zora G. Depolo in 1959 (pub. by Lincolns-Prager, London) and the same translation has been simultaneously republished in 1969 both in the U. S. A. (Vanguard Press, New York) and in Canada (Copp Clerk Publishing Company, Toronto). On the occasion of its first

publication in America the translation was favourably received by two American reviewers, one of whom, Suhadolc, is probably a Slovene or of Slovene descent. In *The New York Times Book Review* of February 15, 1970, pp. 4, 26, Ernst Pawel calls it an "uncommonly sensitive traslation" (p. 26) and in *The Slavic and East European Journal* (Spring 1971, Vol. XV, No. 1, pp. 87—88) Joseph Suhadolc finds the translation "accurate and only occasionally not quite idiomatic" (p. 88). Pawel does not substantiate his assessment of the translation and what he has written is probably his impression of it; Suhadolc, however, documents his objections to the translation with a number of concrete examples.

Suhadolc's review of the novel

In the review of *Povratak* (SEEJ, XV/1, 1971, 87—88) by Joseph Suhadolc of Northern Illinois University among the listed errors one can note two kinds. The first kind of error is mistranslation which is common to any translation, and of which he finds quite a number: thus "kada je mati *prodala trafik*" (*Povratak Filipa Latinovicza*, Zora, Zagreb, 1962, p. 11, italics mine) is not "when she kept the tobacconist's shop" (*The Return of Philip Latinovicz*, Lincolns-Prager, London, 1959, p. 13, italics mine) but "when Mother sold the tobacconist's shop"; "spomenika" (p. 64) is not "movement" (p. 57) but "monument"; "ispod pupka" (p. 118) is not "below her breast" (p. 103) but "below the navel"; "u posljednjoj konzekvenciji i za njega" (p. 152) is not "and only in the last place for him" (p. 132) but "in the last consequence also for him". To this category of errors one should add omissions which do not essentially change the meaning of the original as in the example "donosi ljudima legendarnu sreću" (p. 114), rendered as "bring them happiness" (p. 100) instead of "bring them legendary happiness", where the word "legendarnu" (legendary), one might suppose, has been accidentally left out.

The second kind of error one can note among those mentioned in Suhadolc's review is of somewhat different nature. Suhadolc remarks that translating "sedmogimnazijalec" (p. 9, 19) with "a schoolboy in the seventh form" (p. 11) or "a seventh-form schoolboy" (p. 16), "U šestom razredu" (p. 55) with "In the sixth form" (p. 50), "u sedmom liceju" (p. 145) with "In the seventh form" (p. 126) and "u petoj gimnaziji" (p. 153) with "in the fifth form" (p. 133) is not adequate. Because of the emotional experiences of the young people involved, it is important to know at what age certain episodes took place: *gimnazija* for boys and *licej* for girls was an

eight-years course which in Croatian followed the completion of the fourth grade of an elementary school, and not the fifth grade, as Suhadolc mentions, which was true of Slovenia but not of Croatia. As *sedmogimnazijalec* (literally: a seventh-form schoolboy) Philip was most likely eighteen or seventeen years old. Footnotes, rather than the corresponding school-form of the corresponding school, might be one of the solutions to this problem in concrete cases like "sedmogimnazijalec". The classical educational system in Europe widely differs from that of America, so that even the corresponding form (grade) of a corresponding school, if there is one, might lead to unnecessary misunderstandings. I would suggest the use of footnotes even when one has to deal with abstract concepts: the cultural traditions and civilization of Europe are often different from those of America or, say, Japan or China.

These errors which I classed into two kinds are Suhadolc's only quarrel with Mrs. Depolo's translation. To his observations I would like to add some more.

Knowledge of Croatian and of Krleža's Croatian

Excellent knowledge of the language from which one translates is a necessary qualification for a successful translator provided, of course, that he has a full command of the language into which he translates: also, the translator should be familiar with the specific language of the author as, for example, the dialectal expressions the author uses. Unfortunately, Zora G. Depolo often fails in both cases.

1. The adjective "starinski" (antique, archaic, ancient). This adjective is used in the novel 16 times.¹ In all 16 occurrences it has a positive meaning, denoting something personally very intimate, warm and close. Mistaking "starinski" (antique, archaic, ancient) for "star" (old) or "zastario" (old-fashioned), Mrs. Depolo usually translates the adjective "starinski" with "old-fashioned" (zastario); only in 3 occurrences out of 16 the rendering may be said to be adequate — original: pp. 21 (the second occurrence of "starinski" on this page), 102, 245, translation: pp. 22, 90, 213. Now, to give an example of mistranslation of "starinski" in the context. Krleža's text: "i ono neobično drago, tajanstveno, starokalendarsko djelovanje mile, *starinske* i zaboravljene riječi 'ogenj'" (p. 82, italics mine) has

¹ The source of frequency data in this paper has been the unpublished computer-key-word-in-context concordance of the full text of *Povratak Filipa Latinovicza* (65, 159 words), prepared in 1968 by Prof. Željko Bujas (English Department, Zagreb University) at Linguistics Research Center, University of Texas.

been translated in the following way: "the strangely intimate mysterious effect, as of an ancient calendar, of that *old-fashioned* [should be: archaic], forgotten cry [should be: word] of 'fire'" (p. 74, italics mine). Here the word "old-fashioned" is out of place: an old-fashioned word cannot have an intimate and mysterious effect. Another example of mistranslation of "starinski" occurs in the translation of the following sentence: "Filip se pripio uz jedan ogroman pojastučen *starinski* naslonjač" (p. 22, italics mine), where Krleža's words have been rendered as follows: "Philip clung to a huge *old-fashioned* [should be: ancient or antique] upholstered armchair" (p. 23, italics mine); old furniture (antiques) is not always old-fashioned or out of fashion.

2. The word "foringa" (a means of transport). The word "foringa" (pp. 53, 282) in the Kajkavian dialect means "a means of transport" and not "cab" (pp. 48, 197), although a sort of a cab or buggy (in Croatian "fijaker") was once Philip's means of transport from Kaptol railway-station to Kostanjevec. "A carriage and a pair", "buggy" or "cab", or some similar corresponding expression, is the English or American equivalent of the Croatian word "fijaker", which word (fijaker) is used 8 times in the novel. To translate both "foringa" (a means of transport) and "fijaker" (a carriage and a pair, buggy, cab) by the same English equivalent (cab, buggy), is an unnecessary impoverishment of the text.

The knowledge of, and the feeling for, a work of art

Thorough knowledge of, or an instinctive feeling for, the writer and his work, and preferably both, is a *sine qua non* for every translator. I will therefore dwell on this point at great length, paying special attention to the key-words and the key-concepts of Krleža's novel.

1. The word "neposredan" (genuine, immediate, direct, natural). Philip's words about his early separation from genuine life "Tu se je odbio od životne neposrednosti još davno" (p. 31, italics mine), are rendered as "It was there long ago, at the very beginning, that *he had rejected* the direct contact of life" (p. 30, italics mine). The word "rejected", though seemingly correct, is an unfortunate choice by the translator for it implies a conscious choice — rejection — for which choice Philip was far too young; moreover, the novel makes it clear that Philip's separation or divorcement from reality occurred as a result of the forces beyond and above him. I would therefore suggest a translation which appears to me to be

more appropriate: It was there long ago, at the very beginning, that *he had cut himself off* from the immediacy of life.

The failure of Balloczanzky's marriage is explained by his separateness from genuine life. The words of the narrator "sve su to bili elementi koji su ogradili Vladimira Ballocsanzkoga od *neposrednosti životne* čudnim i nevjerovatnim stijenama od kartona" (p. 148, italics mine) are rendered as follows: "were all elements which had fenced off Vladimir Ballocsanzky, as with strange and incredible cardboard walls, from *the realities of life*" (p. 129, italics mine). Now, the translation "the realities of life", though seemingly correct, is not happily chosen for it might imply meanings which the original phrase does not contain: the phrase "the realities of life" also suggests meanings which are usually contrasted with a romantic or an idealistic conception of life. A better rendering for "od neposrednosti životne" would be "from genuine life". Another reason for finding a better equivalent for the phrase "od neposrednosti životne" will be stated in the next paragraph.

The expression "najneposrednije u nama" (p. 213), which occurs in a very important context, is inadequately translated as "the most intimate within us" (p. 184); a more appropriate rendering would be "the most genuine (immediate) within us". The word "neposredan" and its derivatives (neposrednost, najneposredniji, etc.) expresses one of the key-ideas of the novel. In cases such as this one, where one word stands for a definite idea, the translator should stick to the principle, here violated, that the same word or expression should be translated with the same equivalent whenever possible. In *The Return* the word "neposredno" has been translated in a variety of ways (the direct contact of life, natural, straightforward, genuine, intimate, etc.), which could have been avoided if the translator had paid attention to its meaning and importance in the novel. Many of the mentioned equivalents are good, but only if taken in isolation from the rest of the novel.

2. The word "podloga" (foundations, origin). One of the key-ideas in the novel is expressed by the word "podloga" (foundations) although in the novel it is used only 12 times. There are other words expressing the same idea (the word "osnova" and partly its 14 derivatives, and the words "zemlja" and "tlo") but they, too, are not numerous. The word "podloga" is 9 times successfully rendered as "foundation", and in the three remaining cases it has been translated as "undertone" (or. p. 59, tr. p. 53), "background" (or. p. 81, tr. p. 73), and "region" (or. p. 81, tr. p. 73). Taken in isolation, each of these equivalents for "podloga" may pass. In two cases out of these three (or. pp. 81, tr. 73) the translator could easily have used the English word "foundations".

In the following example the word "podloga" successively appears in two sentences but is rendered by two different English equivalents. As it illustrates the usual practice of the translator, I quote in full.

Croatian: Ta stara zaboravljena riječ probudila je u Filipu jak osjećaj panonske *podloge*. On ni sam nije znao zašto, ali u taj tren osjetio je neobično jako neku subjektivnu elementarnu pripadnost toj podlozi: osjetio se doma.

(p. 81, italics mine)

English: The old forgotten cry [should be: word] awakened in Philip a vivid [should be: strong] feeling of his Pannonian *background*. He himself did not know why, but at that moment he felt most intensely a kind of basic connection with that *region* [should be: background, as in the previous sentence, though in both instances I would prefer the word "foundations"]: he felt at home.

(p. 73, italics mine)

There was no need here to translate the same word with two different equivalents (background, region). As already mentioned, the translator should make an effort to translate the same word or expression with the same equivalent, and if he believes in the work of art he translates, he should not try to improve upon it.

3. The word "realizacija" (realization, achievement). Philip's sentence on painting "Slikati zvukove i mirise je nemoguće, a slike su nezamišljive u svojoj savršenoj *realizaciji* bez zvukova i bez mirisa" (p. 59, italics mine) has been rendered: "For it is impossible to paint sounds and scents, and the perfect *realism* of the picture is unthinkable without sounds and without scents" (p. 53, italics mine). The translator has here mistook the word "realizacija" (realization) for "realizam" (realism) which is a serious error: as a painter Latinovicz could not have belonged to the artistic movement of realism. The correct rendering would be: For it is impossible to paint sounds and scents, and the perfect realization of the picture is unthinkable without sounds and without scents.

4. The word "prirodan" (natural). Translating "I kao da je to sve prirodno" (p. 82, italics mine) with "And as if this were quite normal" (p. 73, italics mine) instead of "And as if this were quite *natural*" the translator makes an error. True, the words "natural" and "normal" are very often thought of as being synonymous, but they are not necessarily so. The novel opposes what is "natural" to what is "artificial", and the translation would be much better if the word "prirodno" (natural) was preserved in its basic meaning.

5. The word "tjelesan" (physical, of the body, bodily, of the flesh). *Bobočka II Episode* (16th) begins with Philip's exploration of his physical background. The word "tjelesan" (physical, of the body) is used twice in succession: "otkrio se Bobočki motiv *tjelesne* tajne. Ogroman, kao što su ogromne sve *tjelesne* tajne" (p. 144, italics mine). Not even once does the translator mention the word "tjelesan" but replaces it by an inadequate equivalent "sex": "the meaning of sex was revealed to Bobočka, a momentous revelation" (l. 125, italics mine). A possible better rendering would be: "the motif of the mystery of the body (flesh) was revealed to Bobočka. Huge, as all mysteries of the body (flesh) are (huge)". The word "tjelesan" is one of the key-words of the novel, and its form and meaning should be preserved in the translation whenever possible, and the more so because the problem of the body-mind dichotomy is one of the most crucial questions for Philip. Sex, however, is only one of the functions of the body.

6. Words "mutno" (dark, sinister, muddy) i "neshvatljivo" (incomprehensible). One of Krleža's characteristic expressions "i sve je to mutno i neshvatljivo" (p. 158) is erroneously rendered as "there was something very disturbing and mysterious about that" (p. 138) instead of the correct "and all this is dark and incomprehensible". Both words, "mutan" (dark, sinister, muddy) and "neshvatljiv" (incomprehensible) express definite meanings in Krleža's novel, and in his other works, and do not admit of incorrect interpretation.

7. The word "spoznaja" (cognition, cognizance, comprehension, understanding). Contemplating the portrait of his mother, Philip speaks of what he thought about her in his childhood: "ona njegova davna *spoznaja* da je njeno lice klaunsko, bijelo, kao brašnom namazano, sve je više dolazila do izražaja pod njegovim *kistom*" (p. 89, italics mine). This has been translated as follows: "that early *impression* [should be: cognition, realization] of his, that her face was like a clown's, white, as if covered with flour" (p. 79, italics mine). However, Philip does not speak about his *impression* of his mother, but about the *knowledge* he had of his mother while still a child. As evidenced by numerous examples in the novel, painting for Philip means a way of cognition and experience of the world. Philip's words in which he explicitly mentions the meaning his work has for him "da se pod *kistom* osjeti prvo *konkretno tlo spoznaje*" (p. 178, italics mine) are too freely and erroneously rendered as "so as to feel under the brush the first *basic outlines*" (p. 154, italics mine). A better rendering would be: so that one can feel under the brush the first *concrete ground (foundations) of understanding*. Philip's credo: "Ja vjerujem u čistoću umjetničke *spoznaje*" (p. 215, italics

mine) has been rendered thus: "I believe in the purity of artistic *intuition* [should be: cognition]" (p. 185, italics mine). The translation forgets that there is a great terminological difference between *intuition* and *cognition*.

8. Verbs of movement. The rhythm of the novel is very quick — everything is in incessant motion, agitation, movement. Most numerous are verbs expressing movement. Even the main theme of the novel, the query about the meaning and purpose of life, is often expressed in terms of movement. The important *Saint Roch's Church Feast Episode* (22nd) ends with Philip's question about the meaning of life expressed in terms of movement: "Kamo se sve to uopće giba" (p. 185). Mrs. Depolo's rendering "What was all this tending to" (p. 160) does not adequately render the verb "gibati" (to move); the translation "tending" does not do justice to the form of the original, so inseparable from the context. A possible better rendering could run as follows: Generally taken, where has all this been heading to?

9. Philosophical terms "oduhovljenje materije" (the spiritualization of matter) and "oduhovljeno stanje" (a high mental state, a spiritualized state). The Latinovicz-Kyriales controversy centres on the body-mind problem, i. e. on the question of the supremacy of either body or mind. The term "oduhovljenje materije" is used three times in succession (p. 201, and twice on p. 202), and in all of these three cases it has been translated with the term "the sublimation of matter" (pp. 174, 175). I would prefer the term "the spiritualization of matter" for it better expresses the notion, as it is used in the Latinovicz-Kyriales discussion, that high mental states are not the product of a separately created soul but rather of evolved and complexified matter.

Philip's words "postoji u stvaralačkom procesu jedno *oduhovljeno stanje*" (p. 203, italics mine) are translated: "there exists in the creative process *a sublimated state*" (p. 176, italics mine); instead, I would suggest this translation: there exists in the creative process *a high mental state or a spiritualized state*. The expression "a high mental state" strikes me as better than "a spiritualized state" since the latter implies *greater* permanence, which is not the right meaning of the text, and both these terms are superior to "a sublimated state".

Omissions and mistranslations

Under this heading I propose to discuss those omissions and mistranslations of particular words and phrases of the original which are not caused by the negligence of the trans-

lator (or printer), like the word "legendarnu" (legendary) already mentioned in the discussion of Suhadolc's review, but rather by the failure of the translator to attend to the essentials of the original.

1. The expression "viši razlog" (more profound reason). In the following example Philip's sense of meaninglessness and senselessness of life is registered in this way: "a sve je jalovo i nema nikakvog *višeg razloga* za opstanak" (p. 36, italics mine). This has been translated as follows: "but it was all futile and offered no *reason whatsoever* to justify one's existence" (p. 34, italics mine); the rendering shows that the translator has very likely understood the Croatian text in this way: a sve je jalovo i nema više nikakvog razloga za opstanak. Expressions like "višeg razloga" (more profound reason) frequently occur in the novel and express Philip's search for the meaning of life: life or one's existence, if it is meaningful and worth while, must be based on some profounder reasons. The more satisfying rendering would be: but it was all futile and offered no profounder reason for existence.

2. The word "tako" (so, thus, in this way). The word "tako" (so) is not an innocent word with Krleža; in his works it often symbolizes the powerful hidden forces which operate in man, society and history and are outside man's will and influence. In *The Return* the word "tako" (so) has been used 314 times, though it does not always express the mentioned meaning.

The fifth paragraph of the *Café II Episode* (5th) begins as follows:

Croatian: *Tako* se Filip dugo trzao u svom čađavom snatrenju [...].
Tako je krenuo i *tako* sada sjedi tu u kaptolskoj kavani [...].
(p. 46, italics mine)

English: Philip had tossed to and fro [should be: So Philip had tossed to and fro] for a long time in his gloomy day-dream [...].
So he had set out and now he was sitting [should be: so now he was sitting] in the Kaptol café [...].
(p. 42, italics mine)

In this paragraph Krleža uses the word "tako" (so) three times in succession; in an indirect way the repetitions of "tako" powerfully suggest meanings which are not explicitly stated in the text. The word "tako" has been left out twice because, one may conjecture, the translator considered it to be an unnecessary repetition. But omissions such as these, which are caused by the failure of the translator to respond to the writer's style, bereave Krleža's text of its essentials.

The rendering of "tako" does not challenge a translator to make special efforts. When Zora G. Depolo chooses to retain

it, she does so. An example: "Tako se našao pred maminim vratima" (p. 14) has been rendered: "So he had found himself in front of his mother's door" (p. 15).

3. The words "stremljenje" (aspiration) and "mravinjak" (anthill). Throughout the novel Philip has been asking himself the question about the sense and purpose of human efforts in life. This sense and purpose he finds in the perfect organization of an anthill, although he cannot comprehend it; an anthill is for him an anthropomorphic representation of human society in miniature. His words: "Postoji mravinjak sa svojim sivim snagama i micanjima, sa svojim višim redom i neshvatljivim *stremljenjem*" (p. 76, italics mine) have been rendered as follows: "There had stood an anthill with its grey, invisible forces and movements, with its superior order and incomprehensible *instincts* [should be: aspirations]" (p. 69, italics mine). Philip here specifically refers to incomprehensible aspirations (neshvatljivo stremljenje) in an anthill, which he would like to understand, and not to instincts, although instincts, too, play an important part in the life of any human or animal organization, as Krleža's novels very well show.

4. The word "kriminal" (crime). In the second sentence of the *Meditations Episode* (13th) Philip's meditations end with the conclusion that life, in fact, is a crime: "kako je život zapravo krvoločan i okrutan *kriminal*" (p. 114, italics mine). Mrs. Depolo's translation of this clause "how cruel and bloodthirsty life really was" (p. 100) omits the word "kriminal" (crime), so characteristic of Krleža, and in this way does not bring out the full meaning of the original: the conception of life as "a cruel and bloodthirsty crime" is one of Krleža's constant thematic preoccupations. A possible better rendering: what a cruel and bloodthirsty crime life really was.

5. The pronoun "naš" (our). The pronoun "naš" (our) in *The Return*, and in Krleža's other works, has a specific meaning: Croatian. It denotes something "ours", i. e. Croatian, applied to "our" circumstances and "our man", i. e. Croatian history and Croatian man. This is the reason why the word should be retained in the translation and its meaning explained to a foreign reader. The pronoun "naš" (our) has a special function in *The Return*.

In the *Saint Roch's Church Feast Episode* (22nd) the pronoun "naš" (our) has been used several times. Philip envisages a grand composition with "our man", i. e. Croatian man, as one of its central features: "a *naš* čovjek padavičav, krastav, gubav, pleše kosmat i pijan, i grgoče iz barila i tetura krvav, a nitko još nije mogao da ga naslika, i sve će to pojesti tmina, a nitko ne će znati da to naslika" (p. 183, italics mine). This

has been rendered as follows: "but man [should be: our man], epileptic, bescabbed, leprous, dances shaggy and drunken, and swills drink from barrels and staggers away bleeding, and no one has yet been able to paint his portrait, but all this will be engulfed in darkness, and no one will know how to paint it all" (p. 159). "Our man", i. e. Croatian man, is here an archetype: *homo primitivus* turned into *homo eroticus* and *homo animalis*, a symbol for a man who has remained uncivilized during the centuries of Western civilization. The omission of the word "naš" (our) makes the above translation senseless.

Somewhat earlier, in the same episode, Philip (Krleža) has again emphasized the pronoun "naš" (our): "Krist koji bi doista stupio u ovu našu panonsku graju, u ovaj smradljivi metež naših sajmova, taj treba da se osjeti nad stvarima kao metafizički sudar sa svim tjelesnim, pohotnim, mesnatim, poganskim u nama" (p. 179, italics mine). However, in the translation the pronoun "naš" (our) has been left out: "A Christ who would really step into Pannonian uproar [should be: *our* Pannonian uproar], that stinking turmoil of a country fair [should be: of *our* country fairs], should be felt above all things as a metaphysical shock to all that is physical, lascivious, carnal, pagan within us" (p. 155, italics mine).

Now, another misunderstanding of the pronoun "naš" (our). Krleža's words "kao jedinom rijetkošću za naše prilike" (p. 105, italics mine) are mistranslated in this way: "as the only rarity today" (p. 92, italics mine). The meaning of the original is this: as the only rarity in our conditions (circumstances). Krleža has here, once again, emphasized "our", i. e. Croatian and backward conditions, the provincial state of cultural affairs in Croatia as opposed to conditions in countries of Western civilization.

Other important omissions of the pronoun "naš" (our) can be also found elsewhere: twice on p. 134 (translation: 117), and on p. 180 (tr. 156). And needless to say, the pronoun "naš" (our) does not cause difficulties to the translator; there are many instances of satisfactory renderings of this word.

6. The misunderstanding of the pronoun "on". This example of mistranslation is mentioned because of the great importance of the sentence in which it occurs. The mistranslation seems to have been caused by the misunderstanding of the original. In the *Bobočka IV Episode* (27th) Philip is likened to a buried miner who tries to find his way out: "kao rudar zakopan pod debelim naslagama zatrpanog ugljenika, kad na sve strane bjesomučno ruje za izlazom" (p. 228). Krleža's text in Mrs. Depolo's translation does not make sense: "like a miner buried under the thick layers of a collapsed mine, when on all sides everybody is feverishly tunnelling to get out" (p. 197,

italics mine). A minor correction can easily put the things right: like a miner buried under the thick layers of a collapsed mine, when on all sides he (i. e. miner) is feverishly trying to get out.

Free rendering

Free rendering, of which there are several kinds, can be justified only if there is a special reason for it. Rather than speak in general terms, I propose to deal with particular cases.

1. Pannonian mire and (the coming) civilization. My first example concerns the antithetical contrast between civilization (big cities) and nature (villages), one of the major themes of the novel, and one of Philip's great dilemmas. Watching the airplane from the Pannonian mud, Philip makes the following comment: "Panonsko blato i civilizacija koja dolazi" (p. 71). This is translated as follows: "The Pannonian mine and civilization" (p. 64), but a more correct rendering would be: The Pannonian mire and the coming civilization. Probably in the desire to make the point sharper, the translator has missed an important implication. Philip's comment implies that the civilization from which he has escaped will finally reach the Pannonian plain — it is coming. This intuitive feeling of Philip's is expressed by the words "koja dolazi" (coming) which the translation omits.

2. Philip and sex. Philip's sexual desire towards Bobočka has been registered in the original in the following way: "Bila je tiha zelena mjesečina, kad je prvi put osjetio potrebu da zaboravi svoje vlastite nerazmjere i razdrtosti u krilu te žene" (p. 174, italics mine). In the translation this sentence runs as follows: "It was in the silent green moonlight that for the first time he felt the need to forget his own sense of disharmony in that woman's arms" (p. 150, italics mine). Instead of the expression "in that woman's arms", I would suggest the paraphrase "in making love to that woman". What the narrator had in mind when using the expression "u krilu te žene" was nothing less than sexual intercourse; the translation "in that woman's arms" is too euphemistic to suggest this meaning with the indirect explicitness of the original phrase. Not finding a satisfactory English equivalent, I have decided on a paraphrase.

3. Two inadequate equivalents. In the *Bobočka IV Episode* (27th) Krleža analyses the reasons for Philip's prolonged stay at Kostanjevec: "On je znao i osjećao jasno, da je zapeo na Kostanjevcu, i da bi dobro bilo, da se što prije makne" (p. 228, italics mine), and this is rendered as follows: "He knew perfectly well that Kostanjevec was a backwater for him and

that it would be a good thing to move on as soon as possible" (p. 197, italics mine). The more faithful rendering of this text would be: He knew perfectly well and felt very clearly *that he had got stuck at Kostanjevec* and that it would be a good thing to move on as soon as possible. Now, the word "backwater", Mrs. Depolo's equivalent for "zapeti" (da je zapeo na Kostanjevcu), is an embellishment of Krleža's text, but unnecessary and out of place. She has already used the word "backwater", and very successfully, as an equivalent for Krleža's phrase "svračji zakutak": the first occurrence of "svračji zakutak" (orig. p. 53) she has translated as "magpie's nest" (p. 48), and the second (orig. p. 262) as "magpie-like backwater" (p. 224). In the original "svračji zakutak" is a reference to Philip's provincial birthplace (Kaptol), and not to Kostanjevec; what "svračji zakutak" (backwater) signifies is a small, provincial and Philistine town. Kostanjevec, however, is for Philip both a small backward village and a spot as yet not touched by the evils of civilization, a place where people still live natural, immediate and genuine lives. There is no need to call Kostanjevec a backwater when Krleža does not do so; what Krleža says is "da je [Filip] zapeo na Kostanjevcu", which means *that Philip had got stuck at Kostanjevec*. Mrs. Depolo's free rendering "backwater" is unjustified in the context where it appears because it gives different meanings and implications to Krleža's words.

Now, another example of inadequate rendering. Krleža's (Philip's) words "prisutnost tog tajanstvenog Grka, koji je uznemirivao i pojačavao *njegove gnjile sumnje*" (p. 228, italics mine) have been freely rendered as "the presence of the mysterious Greek, who had further aroused and intensified *his vague fears*" (p. 197, italics mine). Well, the presence of Dr. Kyriales has aroused Philip's doubts about many of his life's problems, and not his *fears*; further, the words "gnjili" (putrid, rotten), "gnjiloća" (putrescence, rottenness) and similar derivatives count as Krleža's characteristic expressions, and in this novel they are often used in descriptions of Philip's frame of mind. A more literal translation would be more faithful here: the presence of this mysterious Greek who had further aroused and intensified *his rotten (putrid) doubts*.

General remarks on the translation of "Povratak"
(The Return)

In assessing the value of a translation, one can hardly avoid recording one's general impression of it because this impression, too, is an unavoidable part of any criticism. My

impression of Mrs. Depolo's translation of *The Return* differs from that of J. Suhadolc and E. Pawel. The translation has not recorded the melody, flow, rhythmical movements and poetical force of Krleža's text; the language of the translation is stiff, flat and halting. Only occasionally one has the feeling that the translator has been able to register the riches of Krleža's language. Krleža writes with an unprecedented force and vigour of language which, one can rightly claim, cannot be adequately rendered into English, a language whose linguistic structure is so different from that of Croatian, or of other Slavic languages though this, of course, is true of any translation of an exquisite work of art. But were it not for the marvellous translation of Proust into English by C. K. Scott Moncrieff, I would have looked at Mrs. Depolo's translation of *The Return* differently. Proust uses long sentences like Krleža, and the style of both writers has other resemblances too. Although Proust thinks and expresses himself in a manner both different from, and even alien to, that of an Anglo-Saxon writer, Scott Moncrieff has been able to transplant the specific quality of Proust's style into English, so that when one reads Proust in the English of Scott Moncrieff, one has the feeling of reading Proust in French. Scott Moncrieff had an intimate knowledge of Proust and was deeply immersed in his subject. Of Zora G. Depolo's translation of *The Return* one cannot say the same.

Rather than assessing the value of the translation in general terms, I have concentrated on some particular examples of mistranslation. For every example of what I think is an avoidable mistranslation I have offered my own translation which, I think, might lead to a better solution to the problem in question. Moreover, I have tried to discover reasons which made the translator react the way she did and, as the analysis has shown, they mainly lie in her unfamiliarity with, and insensibility towards, Krleža's thought and language.

This paper does not cover all the problems posed by rendering Krleža into English; I have not, for example, discussed the problem of translating Krleža's characteristic use of irony or, to mention another example, how to make it explicit to an English or American reader that the accumulation of titles in front of someone's name is intended to produce an ironic or derogatory effect. I have refrained from quoting translated passages which seem to me to be without the intensity and poetical force of the original, partly because the translation has not reached that degree of excellence to offer enough grounds for such a discussion. I leave these problems for future consideration and, of course, to other students of Krleža.