

MARKO MARULIĆ'S CROATIAN POETRY
IN ENGLISH IN THE LIGHT
OF UMBERTO ECO'S THEORY OF TRANSLATION

Vladimir Bubrin

UDK: 821.163.42-13=111Marulić, M.
81'25
Izvorni znanstveni rad

Vladimir Bubrin
Toronto
vbubrin@sympatico.ca

Although there is evidence that interest in Croatian literature in the English-speaking world is on the rise (primarily in newer Croatian literature), the fortune of Marko Marulić in English translation is modest. To date, only *Judita* has been translated fully into English, while the Split master's other worthy Croatian works remain only partially translated and mostly untranslated. This is both unfortunate and ironic: unfortunate because an important body of work of one of Europe's leading Humanist/Renaissance writers remains relatively unknown in the English-speaking world; ironic because Marulić was well-known in England, as well as in other parts of Europe through his Latin works during his own lifetime. Moreover, English boasts of a rich tradition of producing new translations of past literary masters practically with each successive generation (e.g. in the last 10 years two new translations of Homer's *The Odyssey* and one of *Iliad* appeared, one new translation of the Persian classic *Gilgamesh*, and a new translation of *Beowulf*). Nonetheless, the little of Marulić that we have in English provides, for the most part, a helpful basis for moving forward and correcting the gap with fuller and up-to-date translations.¹

¹ I am referring to the following existing translations, upon some of which I shall comment in my paper: Thomas Butler's translation of *Judita* (parts of Canto V) in his *Monumenta Serbo-Croatica* (Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 1980); Ante Kadić's translation of the same Canto from the same poem (verses 165-240) in the *Journal of Croatian Studies*, Vol. XVII (1986); Henry J. Cooper Jr.'s complete translation of *Judita* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991); Graham McMaster's translation of selected

I propose to present here an approach to translating Marulić into English which would make him both relevant and aesthetically appealing to the modern reader. In a sense, this is not unlike the goal of Marulić's Croatian translator Marko Grčić, who lamented about the fortune of Marul's masterpiece *Judita* as »...a work praised by many but read by very few«.² My approach will be based on Umberto Eco's theory of translation as set out in his recently published *Experiences in Translation*.³ Eco's method, perhaps more fresh than revolutionary, is attractive because it is practical and broader in scope than the traditional linguistic-based approach to the complex task of translating. The complexity is compounded when one adds to the differences of language the sensibilities of a different culture from a different time in history, as is the case with Marulić. We are working with the safe assumption that when writing also in Croatian, Marulić was relevant, interesting and appealing to his contemporaries, that he had something to say to them, that they recognized his artistry, and that his works contained a recognizable Marulić voice, by which I mean the author's particular wisdom, meaning, and experience, over and above the basic information contained in his works.

With its multi-laired preoccupation with linguistic norms, cultural and literary codes and structures, Eco's theory of translation is clearly an offshoot of the Formalist or Structuralist school of thought represented by the likes of Roman Jakobson, Charles Peirce and George Steiner whose lineage as a semiotician Eco represents in our days. However, what separates Eco from his predecessors is that as a translator himself with substantial practical experience in the trade, he offers a methodology backed up by persuasive examples and solutions to concrete problems, which go beyond bare theory.

In a nutshell, in Eco's theory, translation is a semiotic task, a species of the genus interpretation, governed by certain principles proper to translation (*Experiences in Translation*, p. 80). It is broader than a narrow linguistic exercise, it is not about comparing two languages, but about the interpretation of a text in two different languages, thus involving a shift between cultures. According to Eco »Any interpretation remains a bet, a shift not only between two languages, but two cultures« (17). Because it is an »interpretive act« which incorporates both linguistic and aesthetic values, a translation can express an evident »deep« sense of a text even when violating both lexical and referential faithfulness. Translation proper is defined by Eco as »...a strategy that aims to produce, in a different language, the same effect as the source discourse, and poetic discourse is said to aim at producing an aesthetic effect« (93).

parts of *Judita* in the journal *The Bridge/Most* (1-4, 1999); and »Divici Mariji« [»To the Virgin Mary«] translated by John Miletic in his *The Lute and Lattice*, 1981.

² Marko Marulić, *Judita*, translation and commentary by Marko Grčić (Zagreb: Mladost, 1983).

³ Umberto Eco, *Experiences in Translation* (Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 2001). In 1998 Eco delivered three specialized lectures, »Text and Translation«, at the University of Toronto, which provided the basis for his book.

The Term »strategy« contained in the definition is comforting for translation practitioners because it emphasizes the practical bend of Eco's approach. What Eco's definition means is that translating encompasses not only interpreting the contents of the original text, but also interpreting the intention of the original text. For this reason as part of the strategy, »...a translator could permit himself a good deal of license in order to render the effect that the source text seems to wish to create« (94). Recognizing that every language has its distinctive character, Eco distinguishes between target-oriented and source-oriented translations. While there will be losses in the process of translation, there can also be gains as much as the genius of the target language permits. Notwithstanding the license allowed by Eco, a translation's faithfulness to the original, he maintains, can be achieved without being literal if it manages to preserve the sense of the original text though the sense does not have to depend on the lexical meaning of the word/sentence. Put in another way, a translation can be faithful (in the broader sense) even if it seems referentially false. What Eco, however, seems to insist upon is the preservation of the »deep« sense of the story, at the expense of which the translator is entitled to change the surface one. Parallel to the already mentioned source and target language differentiation, Eco maintains that a good translation is not concerned with denotation but with connotation of words and text, in which mere equivalence in meaning is not a satisfactory criterion for a correct translation. The »equivalence« to be sought is a functional one, one that works in the target language and generates in the process the same effect aimed by the original. Eco's advice to the translator is not to be disturbed that there is an original but, having figured out what the purpose of the text is, consider the translation as if it were the original. To put it plainly, the translation must stand alone as a work of poetic discourse.

The question then arises: what is the role of the original or the source text? Although Eco does not provide a direct answer, it can be surmised from the context of his target language oriented approach. Apart from a thorough knowledge of the original text, the translator must be sensitive to the inner rhythm of the original narrative or story, its connotative values, i.e. that which rests behind the outer form and style. The translator must recognize and respect the deeper sense of the story, the voice, the meaning and the wisdom of the original (e.g. the irony, the satire, the playfulness, what moves, what angers, what delights the author). In the goal of achieving the same effect, Eco requires the careful translator to follow the »stage directions« supplied by the original text. The result is in Eco's words »rewriting that stands at the limit of the original creation« (115). In the world of semiotics, he goes on to say, »rewriting is a case of interpretation, and is translation proper only in part, if not in the sense in which (on the basis of critical interpretation of the original text) it has pretensions to conveying, not the letter of the original, but its 'guiding spirit' (whatever that means)« (115).

Although Eco's wide-ranging approach is not applicable in its every detail to translating any one writer, including Marulić, it is flexible enough to be helpful in attaining the objective of rendering the translation of his works accessible and relevant to the modern reader. In illustrating this I will rely primarily on my

own translation of Marulić's *Susana*, according to some his most representative Renaissance work, and where appropriate and necessary, I will refer to some of the other existing translations of Marulić's works in English.

I will start with an obvious example of what one encounters in translating Marulić. Today Marulić in the original sounds and is archaic, not only to a reader from another language but to the Croatian reader as well. Therefore, the translator needs to decide how to deal with this obvious fact. In his translation of *Judita*, Henry R. Cooper Jr. made the choice of making his translation sound archaic. Even his publisher, Columbia University Press, uses this to advertise the translation by stating that in addition to the accompanying scholarly annotations, »he [Cooper] has preserved the archaic flavour of the story.«⁴ Cooper himself appears to reinforce this approach when he explains in the »Translator's Forward«: »I have attempted to imitate the language of the King James version of the Book of Judith: though archaic to the modern English ear, this idiolect is still understandable and conveys a flavour and dignity that are quite similar, in my opinion, to Marulić's own language vis-à-vis modern Serbo-Croatian« [sic].«⁵ While Cooper's translation is indeed an accomplished one, as a translation »strategy« it is debatable. In my opinion, there is no need to try to make Marulić sound archaic in a translation, unless one wants to convey or replicate how the 16th century writer might sound to his 21st century readers in Croatian. I think we can agree that when writing *Judita* Marulić did not intend to sound archaic to his readers. He was conveying a current and timely message in view of the historical circumstances of the times, in a language that was contemporary to his readers. In fact, it was written to be understood by those »not learned in the Italian and clerical [i. e. Latin] language«⁶. Insisting on making Marulić sound archaic essentially has the effect of pegging him to a fixed historical time, making him an historical curiosity rather than a writer worth reading today for the aesthetic appeal of his work. Without burdening the translation with an »archaic flavour«, the air of »dignity« which Cooper properly identifies in *Judita*, can be replicated through the formality of language to which English is amenable, particularly in the context of the biblical theme of Marulić's poem and its didactic tone, both in the main line of the story as well as in the digressions. In Eco's system of translation, this could be achieved through the use of »functional equivalents« in the target language, which are at the same time linguistic, literary and in the broader sense cultural, tied to the tradition of Christian lauds, devotion, and hymnody shared both by Croatian and contemporary English. Taking the cue from Eco, a more fitting approach would

⁴ Columbia University Press, February 1991. Retrieved 20 February 2006 from <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/cup/catalog/data/08803/0880331992.HTM>.

⁵ Marko Marulić, *Judith*, trans. by Henry R. Cooper, Jr. (New York: Columbia University Press, East European Monographs, No. CCCII, 1991), p. viii.

⁶ Marko Marulić, *Judita*, in *Duhom do zvijezda*, edited by Bratislav Lučin (Zagreb: Mozaik knjiga, 2001), p. 33. [»...neka ju budu razumiti i oni ki nisu naučni knjige latinske aliti djačke«.]

be to find linguistic equivalents from such a context, which would not be at odds with the voice and tone found in the original.

Marulić's brief poem »To the Virgin Mary« [*»Divici Mariji«*] can serve as a good case in point of how one can avoid archaisms proper while preserving the formality and piety of the original. Fashioning the translation after the English version of the Marian prayer »Hail, Holy Queen«, its turn of phrase, imagery, tone and even rhythm the translation can be made to sound familiar to the English reader:

Hail Mary, hail to you, lily most white,
Sheltered in the bosom of your beloved son;
Have mercy on us sinners, with grace you are filled,
My soul cries onto you, from distress do us protect.
For your Son's forgiveness we beg you, Queen, to pray,
Our Morning Star most bright, of the sun a brilliant light,
Betrothed of God in the Trinity Divine,
Our gracious advocate before your Son.
Bow your ear, hear my sigh,
In my sin where I lament, Our Lady dearest,
For thee let my heart always yearn
So that among the saints an abode I may earn.

[*Zdrava si, Marije, zdrav, žilju pribili,
Ki u parsi krije tvoj sinak premili;
Na grišne se smili, puna si milosti,
Duša k tebi cvili, čuvaj nas žalosti.
Da nam tvoj sin prosti, moli ga, kraljice,
Sunčene svitlosti prisvitla Danice,
Božja nevistice u Trojstvu Božjemu,
Dobra odvitnice pri sinku tvojemu.
Uzdahu mojemu priklon uši tvoje,
u grihu mojemu gdi cvilim, Gospoje;
Neka sarce moje vazda želi k tebi,
Gdino sveti stoje da najdem stan sebi.⁷]*

There is no danger that incorporating into the translation of this poem the formal, devotional terms or constructs found in the English Marian text, such as »Mother of mercy«, »to you do we cry«, »we send up our sighs« and »most gracious advocate« found in »Hail Holy Queen«, the translated text would sound foreign or be inadequately understood. In fact these constructs give the translated poem the expected air of formality and satisfy Cooper's call for dignity, remain-

⁷ All original citations from Marulić are based on the texts found in *Duhom do zvijezda*, op. cit.

ing at the same time referentially faithful to the original without falling into the elementary trap of a literal translation.

Turning to examples from *Susana*, this is how I would translate the opening and closing of the poem:

In Thee, who art the Creator of all, I place
The hope of these words, which I now prepare to sing;
I cease not, therefore, to entreat your mercy,
So that my word and my song may be guided by its light ... [1-4]

[*Stvoritelj ki si svih, u tebi postavljam
Ufan'je riči sih, ke peti pripravljam;
Zato se ne ustavljam proseć milost tvoju
Da po njoj upravljam riči i pisan moju...*]

Similarly, the last four verses:

O you song which I sang, rest your music
Upon the altars of God and do decree: Be deigned to receive O Lord
This song of your gifts, you who reigns
Over all creation, and to paradise do us bring. [778-780]

[*Pisan ma sih stvari kanat na stol pridaj
Od Božjih oltari i rec: o Bože, taj
Prijet tvojih dari pisma se dostojaj,
Ki vladaš sve stvari, privedi nas u raj.*]

The key in these particular examples is in finding equivalents in the translation in the language and culture of Christian piety, which resonate in the original. This, of course, is in addition to the correspondence of biblical language with several versions of the translation of the Bible available in contemporary English.

But while such formal parameters may be appropriate in translating specific parts of the *Susana*, particularly its didactic digressions, more flexibility is afforded the translator in those parts of the poem characterized by drama, humour, satire, and lyricism. To achieve in English what Marulić intended to achieve in his *čakavian* Croatian and to preserve characteristics of his Mediterranean temperament, one needs to resort to other tools, such as colloquialisms, satirical synonyms, and idioms of which English offers a great variety.

Let's take as an example the passage in which Marulić expresses moral indignation concerning what the two old men plot to do with Susana and at the same time, on a more subtle level, his use of suggestive images. Eco's advice to use the original as the »stage directions« for the translation works well here and helps the transition from the denotative to the connotative meaning of the text. This is how the two elders plot to trap Susana:

Upon finding Susana in the garden sitting
With cocked eyes, they kept lurking.
Gazing at her, they stopped in approbation
And with evil thoughts after her began to lust.
They stood there settled like a lion for a doe lying in wait
To trap her and press against her stretched out on the ground.
Or like the hound who does not growl but waits to sink his teeth
Holding back to rise when the time is right,
Shrivelling up, all shuddering, its jaws lifting
To gain for what he aims with a single leap. [182-192]

[*Ovi zamirihu Susanu mučevići
Kada ju vidihu u vartu sidećići.
Li u nju zarčevići, uzčudiše se; stav
Ter hudo mislećići, zajdoše u ljubav:
Stanu kakono lav košutu kad preži
Kako bi nju ustav pritiskal gdi leži;
Ali ki ne reži, ner čeka ujisti, pas
Ter o tom jur teži da poteče taj čas:
Stiska se, hlepi vas, gori glavu dvigne,
Ča želi jat danas da skočiv dostigne.*]

A more literal translation would deprive this passage of its drama and subtlety. The original intent is preserved through the uses of short phrases, alliteration, and syntactical inversion. Marulić's similes from the animal world and the world of hunting are enhanced through phrases such as »cocked eyes«, »[lion] lying in wait«, and the hound leaping to sink his teeth into the object of his attack. The replacement of the original's rather mild-sounding »*zajdoše u ljubav*« with the more explicit »began to lust after her« is balanced off in the equivalent of the lion pressing on the stretched out doe, and the hound (better than »dog«, because it conveys a fiercer image of the animal) gaining what he aims for with a single »leap« (or mount). The choice of the word for the victim animal is also important. While »roe« is a more precise translation of »*košuta*«, »doe« works much better, because it refers to the female species of deer.

The freedom allowed by Eco's method can be characterized as using approximate (i.e. functional) rather than exact equivalents consistent with the original's effect but which strays from a word-for-word translation. Here the translator can take advantage of the target language's rich diction associated with hunting, and enhancing the sensuality of the original through corresponding images. While the original passage contains only a hint of what ends up being said in translation, because the latter complies with the connotative meaning of the original it remains within the limits of the original's direction.

The passage containing the old men's proposal to Susana lends itself to a similar method of translation with the added characteristics of sleaziness, cowardice, and duplicity contained in the original text, which beg to be played with in translation.

Techniques of contraction, hyphenations, hurried syntax (i.e. short sentences, cascading phrases) capturing the characters' haste, and craftiness, are the translator's strategy of choice, which culminate in a depiction of Susana, terrified, helpless, but still gentle, beautiful and upstanding, contrasted by the preceding cowardly and duplicitous behaviour of the two old men.

Making haste, the old men set out towards her;
 To carry out what they intended, they said to her:
 »Look there's no one here,
 You're alone and we want to have you.
 Everyone's gone, no one can, no one'll
 Open the gate, who'll see us?
 So give in, don't deny us,
 For we're determined to love you.
 And if you refuse us, we'll swear by God that
 We caught a young man lying with you.
 Afraid that your servants 'll see, you dismissed them,
 Thinking that no one was here you made love with him.«
 Susana turned pale from fear
 Like a ripe apple covered in dust.
 Like reeds her limbs shook
 Quivering in the light breeze by the brook;... [231-246]

[*Starci se spraviše i potekoše k njoj;*
Ča htihu, praviše tere rekoše njoj:
 »*Eto na misto toj nitkore ini ni,*
Nere ti sama koj ljubav nosimo mi.
Vanka su ini svi , vrata otvoriti
Ni može tko, ni smi. Tko nas će viditi?
Zato ugodi nam ne krati sobom,
Jer se poljubiti odlučili smo s tobom.
Ako li neć, Bogom priseći ćemo steć
Mladića da s tobom zatekosmo ležeć.
Da toj ne vide hteć, rabe s' odpustila,
Nitkor da je tuj mneć, s njim si se ljubila.«
Staše ublidila Susana u strahu
Kakono prizrila jabuka u prahu;
Uda joj drhtahu kakono taršćice
Kimi tuj gibahu vitri kon vodice;]

Marulić's lively, comical, and satirical passage that follows is a delight. Susana starts to scream. Not to be outdone, the two old men belt out as well. She like a child in desperation, and they like revolting animals.

Then like a child she began to cry,
Fearing that they would do more than threaten.
Hearing the cry, the old men bellowed too;
Heeding the same, a shepherd nearby thought jackasses he heard,
Or, had he seen their beards, billy goats he would have thought,
And their noses had he seen, pecking cocks were they, he would conclude;
But had he seen them whole, I think
He would say: »Oxen you resemble to a tee.« [263-270]

*[Zatim kako dite suzeći vikat ja,
Boječ se da prite ino ne učine ča.
Vapaj videći ta, viknuše i starci;
Ču pastir niki i sta mneć da su to tovarci.
Mnil bi da su jarci, brade da jim zgleđa,
Petesi kljuvavci, k nosom da prigleđa;
A da svih razgleđa, tako se meni mni,
Rekal bi: »Goveda tako su kako vi.«]*

The choice of animals is crucial in order to convey the ridiculousness and repulsiveness of the two old men. In this case the same impressions are invoked with the described animals in the original as in the translation, though the translation offers choices, which become determinative of the effect of the passage. Thus »jack-ass« is better than »donkey« as it conveys the idea of a male and a fool. »Billy-goat« is better than »goat« as it is also synonymous with a stupid person; and »pecking cock« is better than »rooster« given the phrase's added sexual association. And finally, »oxen« is better than »bulls« or »bovines«, with its of clumsiness and foolishness. Care has to be taken to ensure that there is familiarity with the animal, which evokes the right kind of allusion connotation but at the same time remains relevant in the context of the milieu which the passage describes.

I am reminded in this connection of a problematic passage in *Judita* in which Marulić's translators appear to have struggled with the term »*morski medvid*« with uneven, and for the most part less than satisfactory results. The passage is from Canto 5, lines 197-198 in which the drunken Holofernes plops on his bed, becoming an easy victim of Judith's plot:

*Na njoj se obori Oloferne unid,
Zaspa većma gori nego morski medvid.*

Kadić translates this passage thus:

Having entered Holofernes plunged into it [i.e. the bed]
His sleep deeper than that of a polar bear.

Cooper translates »*morski medvid*« as »sea lion« (as does Charles Béné – »lion de mer« in French⁸), Butler as »some whale«, and Graham McMaster as a »monkish

⁸ *La Judith* de Marko Marulić, traduction Charles Béné (Zagreb: Most, 2002), p. 85.

seal«. In my opinion, »polar bear« is contextually inapt both for Marulić and for the poem's biblical source; »sea lion« and »monkish seal« are to my ear too mild; »whale« works to a degree, but it lacks the nuance of disgust that the original contains. In this particular instance it might have been prudent to abandon the actual world of sea animals and tap into the world of myth or legend translating »*morski medvid*« as »a sea monster«, a connotative choice which would have preserved the original's intent without being at odds with the poem's context.

The ultimate dilemma for the translator of Marulić is how to handle the metric and rhyming features of his poems. Because Marulić's rhymes are mostly grammatical, they are straightforward and natural in the original. English obviously works differently and replicating the rhyming scheme would be difficult to sustain without losing the translation's spontaneity and rendering strained its effect. Some success has been achieved in replicating the metric balance of the verses and rhyme in the partial translation of *Judita* by Graham McMaster. It is an admirable feat, though the question arises, does it make Marulić more readable? Using Eco's model, it may be argued that the formal rhythmic structure and rhyming scheme may be sacrificed, without risking any major loss. That, however, does not mean that one should sacrifice the work's rhythm (less so rhyme) altogether for along with their formal metric/rhyming schemes, Marulić's Croatian poems also have their inner rhythm. In the case of *Susana*, the changing moods of its passages, its dramatic scenes (we have seen already the formal, the delicate, the dramatic, and the satirical) constitute the rhythm of the poem. The story as a whole has its own pace or tempo. *Susana* can perhaps be characterized as a »rhapsodic« literary composition in the sense of its virtuosity, intensity, and irregularity. While on surface the poem's changing moods can sometimes appear suppressed by its (more or less) regular cadence and rhyming couplets with a caesura in the middle, this need not be an obstacle for the translation's possibility of a rhythmic structure of its own based on lexical and syntactic choices, alliteration, contraction, enumeration, to name just a few available techniques. While a »free« translation is generally a reliable norm, a well-placed occasional rhyme can be useful as a climactic ending to a passage, playing the role of an exclamation mark, particularly when reading out loud. These points can be illustrated by the following sample translation of the most often cited passage from *Susana*, the description of Joachim's garden:

He had a large house built of marble,
Adorned with colours within and from without,
While the lower level was lined with arched columns at the base,
Which shone burnished like honey glaze;
Next to it a green meadow fragrant with grass spread,
And in the middle a well with water cool and crystalline.
Strewn around were benches of stone,
With vines veiling them in shade from above;
Lined beside them garden trees swayed,
Countless in number, resplendent in green.

And their every branch was laden with fruit,
Their foliage rustled when the breeze blew.
Now, every kind of tree grew here
Lending shade below, oaks, beeches and firs;
Cypresses and pines and green willows,
Green maples and trained vines on the top,
Red apples and golden quinces,
And planted beside them the sweetest almonds;
And native figs and the hinterland kind,
Readily pecked by birds when they see them ripened.
Then there were walnuts, hazelnuts, and chestnuts,
And sweetest pears imaginable and pomegranates sweeter no less,
And there were oranges, which we strain for baking,
Or cut in smaller peaces just for the taking.
Wild cherries, which yield a tart and sweet juice,
And sweet cherries, which are a treat to eat after a meal;
And peaches, which do not keep long after they've been picked,
Because their sides rot when they stay even a day;
But that's not the case with the fruit placed on the table over-ripe,
Plucked from the branch earlier, sorb-apples these would be.
Of these trees there was a hundred, whose crop when dried,
Would fill seven barrels and a half.
And gallnuts were plucked here from up high,
As were carobs, which had already turned black.
And further below in the field a smell hovered,
Sweeter than words can describe:
Basil sprouted in stalks with green myrtle,
Wormwood diffused and sweet marjoram with it.
Along one side rosemary grew all over,
And a bit below a row of roses bloomed;
And lilacs grew in another row next,
Whiter than the first fallen snow;
Tansies with immortelle, carnations and violets,
Looked like jewels embroidered on a garment.
A painter there never was, let anyone say what they will,
Schooled to paint all this with such great skills. [78-123]

*[Imiše širok stan mramorjem sazidan,
Iznutra ter izvan kolurju napisan,
Doli pak nanizan klondami i sveden,
Po klondah ulizan, lašćec kako meden;
Uza nj tarzan zelen mirisne travice,
Srid nje zdenac studen prebistre vodice.
Okolo stolice kamene stojahu,
Nad njimi lozice sincu im činjahu;*

*Kon njih se vijahu stabla perivoja
 Ka se zelenjahu, ne biše jim broja.
 A svaka njih hvoja voća puna biše,
 Šušnjaše jim foja kad vitar hlopiše;
 Totu bo rastiše varsti svake drevje,
 Pod kimi sin biše, dubi, hrasti, jel' je;
 Čepriši ter borje, ter varbe zelene,
 Zeleno i javorje, zgor loze vedene,
 Jabuke rumene i tkunje žutice,
 A kon njih sajene mendule slatčice;
 Pak smokve krivice i zamorščice, kih
 Rado kljuju ptice kad zrilih vide njih.
 Orasi nakon tih, lišnjaci, kostanje,
 I kruške slaje svih i šipci ne manje,
 I ke na pečanje naranče nažimat,
 Al, rižuć na manje, općeno vazimat.
 Višnje ke budu imat žerak i sladak sok,
 Črišnje ke pojimat dobro je izid smok;
 I praskve kim ni rok targane da stoje,
 Jere jim sagnje bok kada dan pristoje;
 Da ne tako koje kladu gnjile na sto,
 Davno snete s hvoje, oskorušve su to.
 Biše jih stabal sto, ke kad isušahu,
 Sedam badanj i po punih namirahu.
 Tuj se još targahu šešarci visoko
 I ki jur čarnjahu rogači nikoko.
 Zdol poljem nizoko miris slaji staše
 Ner besidom koko izreć se mogaše:
 Bašelak se bušaše s murtilom zelenom,
 Ruta uzhojaše i mažurana s njom.
 Jošće stranom jednom sve rusmarin biše,
 Malo niže pod kom red rusul restiše;
 Uz taj red grediše još jedan red žilji,
 Od kih snig ne biše, kad prem pade, bilji;
 Kaloper sa smilji, s garufli viole,
 Lica od berilji našvenih po stole.
 Lasa dir ki vole, ni pentur na svit bil
 Toli hitre škole sve sprengat ki bi umil.]*

Looking to Eco's theory of translation for an answer to an effective strategy for translating Marulić into English, I conclude as follows. A target language oriented translation is appropriate and can yield rewarding results. The key is not be tied strictly to the precision of meaning and wording of the original text. Instead, the translator should look for the original's voice, effect, and wisdom. He needs

to choose functional solutions easily recognized by the reader of the translation. As Eco said, a footnote in a translation is a sign of a weak, ineffective translation. A translator should also look beyond linguistic solutions. If one translates the language alone, one will be left with language. The poem's formal structure need not be replicated to achieve the intended effect of the original. While things may be lost in the process, other things can be gained, as I have tried to illustrate in some my examples.

Because, according to Eco's theory, translation is an act of interpretation the translator cannot avoid imposing his own interpretation on the original text. Provided the translator lays primary stress on emulation at the expense of literal faithfulness, the »*intentio operis*« can be preserved. Through a poetic discourse immersed in the genius and nuances of the target language, a translation following this approach stands to achieve a higher aesthetic effect.

Vladimir Bubrin

HRVATSKA POEZIJA MARKA MARULIĆA NA ENGLLESKOM
U SVJETLU TEORIJE PREVOĐENJA UMBERTA ECA

Marko Marulić nije bio baš najbolje sreće kad je riječ o prijevodima njegove hrvatske poezije na engleski. Od njegovih poema do danas je u potpunosti prevedena samo *Judita*, dok druga vrijedna pjesnička djela ostaju neprevedena. To je dosta paradoksalno kad se zna da su za Marulićeva života, pa i kasnije, njegova djela bila poznata u Engleskoj i u drugim europskim zemljama. Valja napomenuti i to da se u svojoj bogatoj tradiciji engleski ponosi time što na njemu svaka generacija priređuje nove prijevode klasičnih i starih književnih djela.

Iako se općenito može reći da je ono malo Marulićevih djela dobro prevedeno, valja pomišljati na nove pothvate, kako bi se Marulić učinio privlačnim i zanimljivim za modernog čitatelja. Teorija prevođenja Umberta Eca, kako ju je razradio u svojoj nedavno objavljenoj knjizi *Experiences in Translation* (Toronto, 2001), pruža prevoditeljima – a tu se svakako misli i na moguće prevoditelje Marulićevih djela – metodološke temelje i praktičan vodič u sučeljavanju s izazovima toga složenog zadatka. Prema Ecu, prevođenje je vrsta roda (*genus*) interpretacije, kojim upravljaju načela svojstvena prevođenju. Taj se »semiotički zadatak« ne odnosi na usporedbu dvaju jezika, nego na interpretiranje teksta u dvama jezicima, uvodeći tako zamjenu među kulturama. Eco povlači razliku između prijevoda usmjerena na jezik *s kojega* se prevodi i na jezik *na koji* se prevodi (takvi se prijevodi također imenuju kao »denotativni« i »konotativni« prijevodi), dajući prednost drugomu, a u isto vrijeme tražeći od prevoditelja da se povodi za

»smislom« originalnog teksta. Kako bi u tomu procesu sačuvao »duboki smisao« originalnog teksta ili priče, prevoditelju je dopušteno mijenjati površinski tekst. Iako je usredotočen na raščlambu odabranih dijelova iz Marulićeva opusa na engleskom u svjetlu Ecove metodologije i uputā, ovaj rad nastoji k tomu pokazati kako pozornošću i senzibilitetom prema geniju jezika na koji se prevodi čitanje Marulićeve poezije iz 16. stoljeća može nadići granice povijesne znatiželje te pokazati profinjenost složena pjesničkog diskursa i estetskog uspona.