

UDC 821.163.42-1GUN:821.131.1-133PRE
Original scientific paper
Received on 25 November 2005
Accepted for publication on 16 December 2005

Gundulić Translator of Girolamo Preti

Smiljka Malinar
Faculty of Philosophy, Zagreb

This paper, employing an analysis and comparison at the metrical, semantic, syntactic, rhetorical and narrative levels, investigates the relationship between Gundulić's text *Ljubovnik sramežljiv* (*The Bashful Lover*) and three compositions of which it is a partial paraphrase, *L'Amante timido*, *L'Amante occulto*, and *Amor segreto, costante e pudico* all by his contemporary Girolamo Preti. Gundulić's interventions and reworking resulted in a text with a much stricter and more compact structure, a more powerful conceptual and rhetorical charge and greater semantic intensity than any of the originals that he employed. Moreover, Gundulić, departed from the canon of narration characteristic of the genre of the idyll, constructing his text exclusively through the interplay of verbal elements. From the groundwork provided by Preti's texts, Gundulić derived a kind of static abstract, organised on the basis of relationships formed between the elements of its complex and multi-layered rhetorical structure.*

Ljubovnik sramežljiv (*The Bashful Lover*), written around 1620,¹ is the only extant lyrical composition of Gundulić devoted to the theme of love.²

* The text was previously published in Croatian in *Hrvatsko-talijanski književni odnosi*, III, Zagreb 1992: 17-48.

¹ So at least thinks Körbler, 1938: 21.

² For *Dijana* and *Armida*, which are closest in tone and content to *Ljubovnik sramežljiv*, are written in dialogue form, and hence could be fragments of the lost melodramas that Gundulić mentioned in the dedication to *Pjesni pokorne kralja Davida*. (cf. *ibid.* 331). Rešetar thinks that the said texts are independent dramatic units (1903: 283). He says of *Ljubovnik sramežljiv* that "probably it should be counted among the countless vain and empty poems" (1919: 142, 1923-24: 138-153), thinking of those works that Gundulić

It was first printed in 1829, and reprinted in 1838³. In the second part of the century, the Dubrovnik scholar Luko Zore was engaged with the text, and in 1881, in the 55th volume of *Rad JAZU*, he published “Gragja za književno-poviestnu ocjenu Gundulićeva *Ljubovnika sramežljiva*”.⁴ Zore asserted that *Ljubovnik sramežljivo* was not an original creation, rather a reworking of several fragments from three compositions by Gundulić’s contemporary, the Italian Baroque writer Girolamo Preti. These works were: *L’Amante timido*, *L’Amante occulto* and *Amor costante, segreto e pudico*. He printed in parallel a Croatian version and the corresponding sections from the Italian, gave a brief evaluation of the translation at the end, and handed down a judgement on the literary characteristics of the text with an extensive quotation from that “extremely valuable book” *Disegno storico della letteratura italiana* of Raffaele Fornaciari, in which Baroque writing is considered exclusively as an expression of a decadent taste in literature, and Preti is summarily presented as a “poeta pieno di stranezze e bizzarie”.⁵ A few years later, in *Rad* 127, Milivoj Šrepel printed in its entirety the idyll *L’Amante timido*, which was the basic model for Gundulić’s piece. Šrepel gave a laconic and very negative assessment of Marinismo, which was quite in line with the prevailing view of the time, and considered Preti’s text an extreme example of all the failings of this style of writing.⁶ A critical version of *Ljubovnik sramežljivo*, based on the versions of the texts printed to that time and on MS a) or M. 367⁷ was prepared by Đuro Körbler and Milan Rešetar for the edition of Gundulić’s collected works of 1938.⁸ The information about the Italian sources was based on the data set out by Zore (but with an erroneous citation of the composition *Amor costante, segreto e pudico* as *Amante costante*).⁹ In more

himself in the dedication to *Piesni pokorne kraglia Davida* calls “progeny of darkness”, one of which has the title *Posvetilište ljuveno* (cf. 1938: 330).

³ Cf. 1838: 97, 371.

⁴ “Material for a literary history evaluation of Gundulić’s *The Bashful Lover*” (1881 : 185-202). Starting from the original, Zore partially corrects the text of the edition of 1829.

⁵ 1881: 199.

⁶ Cf. 1896: 133-140

⁷ Cf. 1938, I : 97 and 131.

⁸ Cf. *ibid.* : 371-376 .

⁹ Cf. *ibid.* : 21-22.

recent times the *Ljubovnik sramežljiv* was briefly addressed by Dunja Fališevac in her monograph about Gundulić.¹⁰ In a subsequent work, this author went back to the same text and cited two sections as example of conceit constructions and stylistic procedures typical of literature of the Baroque period¹¹. In line with more modern publishing principles, *Ljubovnik sramežljiv* was printed in a new, "tiny" edition "to mark the 4th centenary of the birth of Ivan Gundulić".¹²

None of these authors – and they are the only ones to have dealt with *Ljubovnik sramežljiv*, directly or indirectly – was interested in the relationship between the piece and its Italian models, further than the mere observation of the fact. "How Gundulić made this mixture, I shall not hasten to judge, leaving it to mature years and greater sobriety of mind," stated Zore,¹³ implying of course a critical evaluation of the literary value of Gundulić's poem. Since he graphically reproduced the version and the corresponding original sections in a manner that enabled the reader to find his or her way readily and to make an *ad hoc* evaluation of the degree of dependence or disparateness – after each quatrain by Gundulić came a corresponding Italian fragment, with an indication of which text it was taken from – he probably considered it superfluous to embark himself on a precise analytical response, which alone will make it possible to move along from the initial phase. In this respect, *Ljubovnik sramežljiv* shares the fate of other smaller texts by Gundulić that criticism, totally absorbed in his major achievements, *Dubravka* and *Osman*,¹⁴ has until recent times dealt with very little.¹⁵

And then, the Gundulić text itself, at first glance, does not seem very encouraging. Thus the first 152 lines, of a total of 292, or the first 38

¹⁰ Cf. 1978: 267.

¹¹ Cf. 1989: 166-167.

¹² And "to mark the 40th anniversary of the founding and work of the Dubrovnik Summer Festival"(Gundulić 1989). The text on which our analysis is based is taken from this edition. The preface for the occasion was published by Paljetak (1999: 100-102).

¹³ 1881: 100-102.

¹⁴ For a Gundulić bibliography see Ravlić (1968 : 31-24), Fališevac (1978: 276-277); Nebesny (1991: 335-273).

¹⁵ Also to the early period of discovery belong, as well as the works of Zore and Šrepel already mentioned, another Zore article (1882:129-189) and the contribution of Talija (cf. Šrepel, 1898). Then came a long period of silence with but a single work, that by Haler (1938: 620-625), which lasted until the more recent articles by Fališevac (1989: 212-235 and 166-173) and the contribution by the same author (1990: 3-14) and Novak (1990: 19-24).

stanzas out of 73 all told – i. e. a little more than half of the composition – are faithful renditions of Preti's *L'Amante timido* from line 1 to line 98. (Or, more accurately, adding a stanza, and leaving out lines 84 and 85, which will be discussed below.) Zore thought that Gundulić "sometimes translated very copiously, and sometimes incompletely, as the reader will discover on reading the comparison". However, this assessment is not accurate, and is appropriate only to the superficial and accidental appearance of Gundulić's text. If we take into account some of the more essential constitutive layers, we shall discover without any difficulty that the course of the *fabula*, the semantic bases, the syntactic schemes and to a large extent the rhetorical figures of the Italian original are simply "impressed" in the other linguistic medium, of course, with appropriate adjustments and additions that were entailed by the metrical scheme of the translation – the octosyllabic quatrain rhyming *abab*. However, these interventions of Gundulić's too are mainly an expansion and development of the verbal texture of the original with respect to theme and motif, and hence, at least at first glance, are a new confirmation of faithfulness to the original, with the use of lexemes and expressions devoid of immediate correspondence in the model. In one case Gundulić independently writes in a whole quatrain:

Pođi, vjerni, pođi, mili,
pođ', mučecí moj glasniče,
prid oči one s kijeh dan bili
noći mojoj sam ističe (17-20).

But this is just a variation of lines 9-12:¹⁶

Pođi, vjerni, pođ' mučecí
navjesniče srca moga,
prid oči one ke je veći
pogled zraka sunčanoga;

which is authorised by the original version:

¹⁶ 1881: 186, n.1.

Vanne, Nunzia fedele, e taciturna
A que' begli occhi avante (6-7).¹⁷

On the whole the Italian original and the Croatian translation correspond in the manner illustrated by the preceding example: semantic, syntactic and metrical units of Preti's text are projected into the more extensive metrical space, and the translation is necessarily more detailed and explicit, and in places rhetorically more strongly toned than the original, but this does not change the basic character of their relationship.

At the level of the *fabula*, this parallel course is interrupted in line 153 and line 99. The Italian original of the two quatrains that follow does not belong to the same composition but to another source, given by Zore, the idyll¹⁸ *L'Amante occulto*. In the next eight stanzas Gundulić returns to his first original (*L'Amante timido*), after which the subsequent verses are based once again on *L'Amante occulto*, then comes one taken from *L'Amante timido*, before a switch back to *L'Amante occulto*. In brief, then (with the exception of the fifth quatrain), the origin of Gundulić's verses is always to be found in one Preti composition or another; one other hand, in a somewhat changed form, verses 92-94 and the penultimate quatrain (lines 285-288) are taken from *Amor costante, segreto e pudico, Canzone I*, the degree of internal-segmental correspondence between translation and original being the same as in the first part. From line 153 the relation between the Italian original and the version in Croatian becomes a great deal more interesting. In order to define the corresponding parts of the

¹⁷ Preti's texts are cited according to the edition *Poesie di Girolamo Preti*, In Venetia et in Trevigi per G. Molino, with adaptation to more modern orthography and the more convincing textual solutions given by what is probably a somewhat later edition to be found in the NUL in Zagreb.

¹⁸ This term appears in the title of Preti's composition. The idyll became very popular in the 17th century. It is certainly one of the reasons why Marino in the foreword to his collection of idylls *La Sampogna* proclaimed himself "il ritovatore e l'introduttore di questa specie di componimenti nella nostra lingua" (Besomi 1975: 77). Somewhat questionable are the criteria according to which an idyll can be defined as a special verse form. From the metrical aspect we can consider it one of the variants of the canzone, which Stigliani too notices (Besomi 1975:79). Preti obtained European fame with the idyll *Salmace*, several times printed, and translated into French and Spanish (Fantuzzi 1789 :122-125). For Fornacari, in the section quoted by Zore, the idylls are "poemetti epico-lyrici in vario metro sopra oggetti pure mitologici" (1881: 201).

Italian and Croatian corpora, we are forced to apply a more active and flexible reading. In the second half of the text, Gundulić very liberally and at first glance unpredictably combines various parts of the original, making use of the flashback procedure. Thus in the 213-260 sequence, from lines 213 to 236, the reproduces the sequence of lines 133-153 of the idyll *L'Amante occulto*:

Indi l'incendio mio
Nodrito a poco a poco
Da l'esca del pensiero
Dal vento dei sospiri,
Tanto s'accese e crebbe,
E tanto ancor avanza
Che sta in forse il pensier qual sia maggiore
O la vostra Bellezza o 'l foco mio
E se non fosse il pianto
Che sfogando il mio duol temprà il mio foco
Poichè spegner no 'l posso, io sarei spento
Onde il tormento istesso
E più di voi pietoso.
Che ne lo stesso pianto io trovo aita
E bench'egli mi strugga, ei mi dà vita. (133-153)

Stoga užežen milim plamom
moj se ogan' gojit pazih
sladcijeh misli dragom mamom,
tihijem vjetrom uzdaħ plasih
Tim u meni svedġ goreći
taku plam je stekō krepos,
da ja ne znam ali veći
ogan' moj je al' tva ljepos;
jer, da grozних suza nije
kijema boles ka me mori
na čas vrući plam polije,
da me prešno ne izgori,
ja, ne moguć nijedan dio
ogn'a ugasiť razgorjena,

jaoh, život bi ugasio
ljepirica užežena.

Tako ista se muka meni
milosnija vele kaže
negli ures tvoj žudjeni
gdi je ufan' e me najdraže.

A to, er suze u plakan' u
pomagat me ne pristaju,
i ako uzrok mom skončan' u,
i život mi one daju. (213-236)

and after that, verses 1 to 18 of the same work:

Piansi lunga stagione, arsi, gelai,
ma taciturno amante
Le mie pene amorose
Nel centro del mio cor chiusi, e celai.
Arsi, ma fu il mio foco
Si profondo ed occulto
Che non fu noto a voi che l'accendeste
E fu de l'amor mio
Consapevole solo Amore, ed io
Soffersi ogni tormento,
ch'anima tormentata ha ne l'inferno
Ma fra i martir di Amore,

Non poter dir Oimè, parvi il più fiero
Anzi l'inferno ancora
E men crudo e penso
Che il silentio laggiù non ha ricetto
E fra l'alme dolenti
S'odono pur almen grida e lamenti.

Plačem tako sve me vrime
nu ljubovnik mučec viku
pod srdašcem ogn'enime
tajeć ljubav mŭ veliku.

Tako gorim vas u sebi,

nu moj ogan' skroven stoji;
nije objavljen još on tebi
ka ga užeže i razgoji.

Ja i ljubav, nitko veće
ni domisli, ni se stavi
od goruće, nu mućeće
i otajne me ljubavi.

Moja mlados trpi i kuša
muke one sve najgore
osuđena koje duša
posred pakla podnijet more.

Nu da je vrh svih muka huda
i najveće zlo ću riti
ne moć jedno „jaoh“ sred truda
prid vil dragom izustiti.

Nemilostan sasma pače
nije ni žestok pakô toli,
er se ciči, daj, i plače,
a ne múči u n'em doli. (237-260)

Stanza 277-280 is based on verses that in Preti's text (*L'Amante occulto* again) come after those on which the following couplet is based (281-282):¹⁹

Ma da una pietra alpestre
Trarrò forse ancora
Col focil de' lamenti
Faville di pietà, se non di Amore (72-75)
Tacqui ma nel mio volto
Un pallor si vedea (19-20)

ogn'ilo bi moje žalosne
tužbe izelo, jaoh, iz stijene

¹⁹ The next two verses "jaoh, da za stan srce moje / razgorjenu te ognju malo" (283-284) were taken, with a few variations, from the composition *L'Amante timido*: "Pensier, tema, silenzio, affanni, Amore, / Picciol vaso era un core" (227-228). This is one of the few examples where the translation is more concise than the original.

srca tvoga, jaoh, milosne
iskre, ako ne l'uvene. (277-280)
Mučim, ali bljedilo je
na mom licu upisalo. (281-282)

A re-reading of *Ljubovnik sramežljiv* along the lines of Zore's statement shows that the understanding we can gain from it is insufficient, that there is something more to be said about the text. This is not said so as to belittle the value of Zore's discovery. Nevertheless, however important the information that *Ljubovnik sramežljiv* is not an original work, and however interesting the precise and reliable identification of the original, the correspondence between the two texts should not be allowed to exhaust our interest, unless we wish to restrict ourselves to the mere juxtaposition of labels. Apart from that, after Zore, the issue was dealt with by Šrepel, who seemed not to have finished reading the article of his predecessor. According to him, that is, *Ljubovnik sramežljiv* is nothing but a translation of the poem *L'Amante timido* and "our poet, in spite of some liberties in the first 18 stanzas, follows Preti, then leaves the original, but still writes in the spirit of Preti. The ending is much milder than in the Italian poet".²⁰ Šrepel, that is, completely ignores the other two Preti texts that Gundulić wove into his composition. In addition, the assessment that Preti's "poem shows that Marinismo had gone over into total caricature" and that "Gundulić was unable to free himself of this taste when he went to translate it"²¹ might be interesting today only as a testimony of the times. The critical principles from which it starts are definitely outmoded, and it would be worthwhile attempting to apply to texts with a more contemporary and appropriate critical approach, purged of classicist prejudices. Even small works of great authors – and this is what Gundulić undoubtedly is in the context of Croatian Baroque writing – deserve being examined in greater detail even when they do not seem to promise any spectacular results. In this case, we are also enabled to learn something more about Girolamo Preti, another Baroque writer whose traditional image more up to date critical research has managed to a great extent to overturn.²² The manner

²⁰ 1896 : 73 and 133

²¹ 1896 : 73

²² Preti had the reputation of being one of Marino's most loyal followers. This reputation was enhanced by both poets with various promotional ploys. Thus Preti (with Achilini) publicly proclaimed Marino his teacher. Marino actually addressed to him and Antonio

in which a certain literary model is projected into another linguistic medium (and cultural context) always says something about the writer's intentions and capacities – with respect to the set of instruments he has at his disposal as a sharer of a certain literary tradition and the expectations of his immediate intellectual surrounds.²³ And as might have been concluded from the remarks above, in this respect Gundulić's adaptation of Preti's work opens up some not entirely uninteresting issues.

We have already mentioned that in lines 1-157 Gundulić reproduces the first 98 verses of Preti's idyll *L'Amante timido*, and that in the following verses he freely combines some parts of this text and the idyll *L'Amante occulto*, also interpolating three verses from the composition *Amor costante, segreto e pudico*. All the quatrains of the Croatian text reflect the basic semantic, syntactic and rhetorical properties of the corresponding segments of the original. Wherever longer sections, more complete in their content, are taken over, the course of the *fabula* is also preserved. Gundulić's translation, although without doubt very close to the original, is far from "word by word" literal reproduction²⁴. Fragments in which the translation absorbs component parts of the prototype, only minimally

Bruni the *Lettera apologetica* in the foreword to *Sampogna*, admitting them as the best of his followers. However in expression and cast of mind Preti was much more connected to the pre-seicento tradition. Thus for example he opposed to the Marino sensuality the Platonic concept of love, and irritated his mentor with his conservative stance in the polemics about the *Adone*. Thus in the next century a careful reader like Pier Jacopo Martello was to pick out Preti and Bruni and Giovan Leone Sempronio and place them in a special group of moderate seicento writers (cf. Croce: 12-20). For the relationship between Marino and the Bologna Accademia dei Gelati (Academy of the Frozen) of which Preti too was a member (cf. Colombo 1967: 54-60).

²³ Gundulić does not always proceed the same way in his translations. While in *Ljubovnik sramežljivo* and *Piesni pokorne kraglia Davida* he expands the text only when the Croatian metre so requires, in the *Arijadna* translational license is not only motivated by formal and traditional requirements. In the article already mentioned about this text Zore distinguishes five forms of adaptation of the original (cf. 1882: 186).

²⁴ Examples such as: "Ne l'amoroso tuo dolce viaggio / A te sarà il mio core, / E scorta e precursore" (17-19) - "U ljuvenu tako u sebi / Putu i u slatku nada svima / Moje srce vodac tebi / I pritečnik biti ima". (28-32); "Ne' vuol' udir sol' un sospir d' amore / Necessario è un sospir a chi si muore" (88-89); "Zareče se pače u sebi / Ne čut uzdahe od ljubavi; / Ko mre, uzdah jest mu tr'jebi, / Da š njim život svoj ostavi" (141-144) show that Gundulić accepted the translation of Preti's text with precisely this intention, and achieved it as much as it was possible.

adding to them or being only very slightly more extensive²⁵, do not exceed one sixth of the total text. Much more often, Gundulić's quatrains are a result of an expansion of the Italian original with the use of strings of lexemic and phrasal additions, semantically identical to the groundwork of the text that they complement. The expansions are necessary not only because of the formal disproportion produced by the structural differences between Italian, as a mainly analytical, and Croatian, as a primarily synthetic, language, but also because of the lack of correspondence between the metre of the original and the metrical form of the translation. The verse form of Preti's texts consists of stanzas of unequal length that are built by sequencing heptasyllabics, or alternating heptasyllabics and hendecasyllabics, with an extremely free handling of rhyme. Irrespective, however, of the structural characteristics and length of the verse, the basic unit from which Gundulić starts is the foot, the textual segment that at the syntactical level is on the whole correspondent to the sentence, simple or complex. (It is characteristic that in the melodrama the extent of the retort is often determined by the foot). The translation corresponds to each such foot with the octosyllabic four line stanza rhyming *abab*. This is a traditional metre in Croatian poetry, to which Baroque authors, including Gundulić, were particularly inclined.²⁶ The Croatian quatrain most often reproduces the Italian couplet or tercet, and sometimes even just a single line.²⁷ This means that the semantic, syntactic and metrical units of the Italian text have to be adapted to the much more extensive metrical scheme of the translation, which is possible only by subsequent enlargement of the verbal mass. (The hendecasyllabics in Preti are not frequent enough to compensate for this disproportion.) In such examples, the translation

²⁵ We shall illustrate all three cases with the following examples: "Da indi in qua bramai / Che chiudesse questi occhi amore o morte, / Per non veder più mai cosa men bella" (123-125) - "Od tada sam sveg želio, Da zatvori oči moje / Ljubav, smrt li, da vidio / L'jepost ne bih manju od tvoje!" (192-196) - "Da indi in qua non vidi / Quaggiù beltà mortale, / Che di vostre bellezze avesse un raggio" (126-128); "Ja od tada ne opazih / Doli umrlu sv'jetlost n'jednu / Kâ od ljeposti tvojih dražih / Ima u sebi zraku jednu" (197-200) - "Dissi pien di spavento: / Sciolgasi il nodo, che quaggiù mi strigne / Perch' io possa colà sovra le stelle / Paragonar queste belezze a quelle" (138-140); "Tjem veće krat stah vapiti: / Već se biće mę rastvori, / Da m' je u raju istaknuti / Ljeposti ove s on'jem gori" (208-211).

²⁶ For a brief account of the metrics of Gundulić's texts cf. 1971: 9.

²⁷ "Tosto a mirar da l'un l'altro il rapia" (116) - "Stat zapanjen put jednoga / Vele mogô nigda ne bi, / Taj čas bi ga od drugoga / Pritegnula želja k sebi" (177-180).

is more capacious, more explicit, more redundant and sometimes more strongly marked rhetorically than the prototype. Clearly, Gundulić intervened into the Italian text because he was forced so to proceed: the confirmation of this is the inverse disproportion between original and translation where there is correspondence in the number of lines (4:4) or even a certain advantage favouring the original (5:4). Gundulić then condenses the Croatian text, although these interventions are inconsiderable as compared cases in which the Italian prototype is expanded.

Some examples of lack of correspondence between the original and the translation are provided below. While the first and second line of Gundulić's text: "Podji, liste moj ljuveni, / podji k onoj cjeća koje" literally translate the first and the beginning of the second line of the Italian: "Vanne, o carta amorosa / Vanne a colei per cui", the next two verses are a result of the expansion of the basic text, with a syntagmatic and modal reformulation of the whole section. The predicate, which is neutral in the Italian text in respect to the way in which the actions or events are actualised, that is, expresses the degree zero of mode – "moro" being a mere declarative expression – gains in the Croatian translation, with the periphrasis "je sila meni", the modal content of necessity. In addition, the synthetic form "moro", a metaphorical hyperbole at the level of *sententiae*, or the substance of the content, as well as a literal and neutral form of the naming of the action at the level of the form of the content of the text (which means in the framework of the mental conventions of the universe of love poetry) is rhetorically reinforced by the periphrastic form "dni svršit moje" (although it is a partially lexicalised metaphor). The translation is also expanded by one adverbial addition "u željah", the sememe of which also expresses modality, and takes on a pronounced connotation of hyperbole in this context, that is, achieves a combinatory seme [+ intensively]. In addition, the lexical expansions and the constructional coerciveness of the Croatian verse lead to intensification and doubling of the figure *per ordinem* contained in the original: the deviation from the usual word order – according to which the determiner always goes alongside the element to which it refers – in "per cui tacendo io moro" (2) is repeated in the Croatian in both corresponding verses, with the proclitic use of the auxiliary verb: "mučeci je sila meni / dni u željah svršit moje" (44).²⁸

²⁸ The figures in the Croatian text are close to examples which in rhetorical and stylistic primers illustrate the hyperbaton, although neither at the level of definition or at the

A more direct example of intensification can be found in the third quatrain, where in response to the more general and neutral (and lexically simpler) "A que' begli occhi avante" (6) (this is a Petrarchan *styleme*, deriving from troubadour poetry, and widespread among Baroque poets)²⁹ comes the periphrastic hyperbole expressed in the form of a comparative construction "prid oči one ke je veći / pogled zraka sunčanoga" (11-12) (which also derives from the Petrarchan inventory). Along with variation of lexemic components, the same figure is repeated in quatrain 5, the only verse unit without a match in the original:³⁰ "prid oči one s kojih dan bili / noći mojoj sam ističe" (19-20). In the Gundulić paraphrase we meet with a number of further examples of hyperbolic amplification as compared with the original: "Ne l'amoroso tuo dolce viaggio" (16) - "U ljuvenu tako u sebi / putu i u skladu nada svima" (29-30); "egli è mio destino" (23) - "u udesu mom je hudem / ter inako nije moći;" (37-38) - "Se [...] udir non vuole" (31) "vjeku [...] ne htje čuti" (51-52); "pianto" (36) - "grozno i tužno me cviljenje" (60); "vaj u kome vas vik tužim" (106) without any immediate occasion in the Italian text; "Deh [...] / A lei [...]" (70-71) - "ah jao, Bože / u prelijepu me gospoju" (109-110); "i miei sospir" (83) - "uzdahe moje ognjene" (132); "Alhor mesta e piangente" (96) - "tad s uzdasim daždec' grozno / suza rijeke, pismo tvoje / tužno skazanje i žalosno" (149-152); "E se non fosse il pianto / Che sfogando il mio duol temprà il mio foco" (141-142) - "Jer da groznijeh suza nije kojema bolest ka me mori / na čas vrući plam polije / da me prešno ne izgori" (221-224); "Poiché spegner no 'l posso, io sarei spento" (143) - "ja, ne moguć nijedan dio / ognja ugasit razgorjena,

level of the citation of examples is there a clear demarcation with inversion. As example of very free "word order" we might cite the following verses: "La traccia seguirai / De' miei lunghi sospiri, / Che per secreta via / A le bellezze amate / Manda e rimanda ogn'hor l'anima mia" (8-12) - "Trag od uzdah kojih slidi, / Ko'e upravljam sveg' bez broja, / Gdje se draga l'jepost vidi / Drum' otajni duša moja" (25-28).

²⁹ For example, in Antonio Bruni, Giuseppe Artale, Lorenzo Casaburi, Claudio Trivulzi, Baldassarre Pisani, Giuseppe Battista, *Ciro di Pers* (cf. Ferrero 1954, *passim.*, Getto 1962, *passim.*).

³⁰ In connection with this passage Zore says: "The poet either here repeated the idea in stanza three, or this is simply a variant and need not be printed in the text. In the Italian poem there is nothing of the kind" (1881: 187). The addition of this quatrain might be interpreted as an attempt for the unit that in the context of the whole composition functions as a prologue to be formally framed and separated from the rest of the work.

/ jaoh, život bi ugasio leptirica užežena" (225-228) in conjunction with the addition of one more Petrarchan topos;³¹ "più di voi" (145) - "negli ures tvoj žudjeni / gdi je ufanje me najdraže" (231-232); "Tacqui, misero, tacqui / però ch'ogni mia voce / Era pria che distinta / Troncata dal timor, dal duolo estinta" (204-207) - "Mučim, i ako glas i kada / stan žestocijeh muka uteče / od bojazni i od jada / dostigne se i prisječe" (269-272).

Also in the text are hyperboles with an explicitly stated term of comparison – the so-called superlative hyperbole – examples 29-30, 37-38 and 51-52 (here the term of comparison belongs to the temporal dimension, where the two preceding are qualitative hyperboles), and the elative or morphological adjectival hyperbole (examples 60, 106, 110, 132, 149, 221-222, 225, 228, 231-232), where the term of comparison is not expressed by any special morpheme, rather is implicit in the semantic content of the adjective. Amplification with the assistance of adjective and functionally equivalent additions, or nominal and verbal determiners, is a very common way of increasing the volume of verbal material, even when it leads to rhetorically less effective results. Determiners added on later regularly have the role of closer determination of the characteristics of the object, the supplementation or expansion of its semantic aura. This is mainly to do with standard and conventional epithets, part of the noun itself even when it is devoid of lexical expansions. Hence the translation is richer and more explicit primarily at the connotative level. Although in such examples it is not possible to speak of any hyperbolic effect, the translation is without doubt semantically more intensive than the original, and considering the affective marking of several basic and mutually cognate archisemes towards which the nascent lexical combinations tend to gravitate we can speak of the marked pathetic-sentimental colouring of several of the expressions, which was missing in the original or was indicated much more tentatively. The effect of expansion of the text with the use of verbs is quite similar; this is usually done with the introduction of a new verb lexeme into an already existing verb context – in combination with the effect of the figure of gradation and further intensification of meaning.

³¹ The vitality of which in the Baroque period is indicated by a Bunić composition (*Čim ljepir doleti na plamen od svijeeće*; cf. Ratković 1971: 86). Gundulić's intervention might have been spurred by a similar part in the fragment of Preti's text that he had not included in his initial choice of material from the original: "Qual incauto Augeletto / Che vola al cibo, e non iscorge il laccio" (*L'Amante timido*, 110-111).

We shall cite several examples of expansion with the use of nominal and verbal determiners: “Nunzia” (5) - “Navjesniče srca moga” (10); “Ne begli occhi di lei sdegno, o rigore” (26) - “i ako od oči nje svjetlosti / gnjevno, srčno, nesmiljeno / vidiš gorit nemilosti” (42-44) (a rhetorically neutral phrase in the original, “begli occhi” is replaced in the translation with a metonymic construction); “Che s’amore ha dolor non vuo’ che m’ami” (65) - “er ako moja lijepa vila / žalost stječe rados gubi, / ter joj ljubav nije mila, / ja vijek neću da me ljubi” (97-100); (expansion of the original heightens the antithesis); “ami, adori” (69) - “ljubim, častim, služim” (108); “taci” (80) - “zamukni mramorkome” (125); “offende” (86) “vrijedja i zledi” (133); “Forse avverrà ch’ascolte / L’annunzio de la Morte” (29-30) - “Nu ako moga cječ poraza glas od smrti čuje ljuti” (50-51); “quanto è più cruda” (73) - “koli vesma hoće biti / nemilosna, nepriklona” (115-116); “potessi” (82) - “da uzmožeš, ko po sreći / još pun želje te ljuvene” (129-130); “O la bocca, o i begli occhi, o ‘l crine, o ‘l seno” (147) - “L’jepe oči, drage usti / Rajsko lice pram tvoj zlati (175) (does Gundulić really remove the Croatian equivalent of the Italian “seno” for moralistic reasons, as Zore suggests?);³² “Che di vostre bellezze” (117) - “ka od ljeposti tvojih dražih” (199); “Io vagheggiavi talhora / Il cielo, il Sol, le Stelle / e tanto pareano belle / Sol quando hauean di voi qualche sembianza” (121-124) - “lijepa žudjah rajске dike, / zvijezde, sunce i nebesa, ukoliko bjehu slike / njih svjetlosti tvog ureda” (205-208) (in the translation the content of the generic concept “sembianza” is made precise);³³ “Indi l’incendio mio / Nodrito a poco a poco / Da l’esca del pensiero / dal vento dei sospiri” (133-136) - “Stoga užežen milim plamom / moj se oganj gojit pazih / sladcijeh misli dragom mamom, / tihijem vjetrom uzdah plasih,” (213-216); “E fu de ‘l Amor mio / Consapevole solo Amore ed io” (8-9) - “ja i ljubav, nitko veće / ni domisli, ni se stavi / od goreće, nu mućeće / i otajne me ljubavi” (245-248). (Here, as in the examples of 42-44 and 125, we can note a phonological repetition, which is independent of the original.)

The role of the closer determination of the “narrative” circumstances and the more explicit, analytical and affective exposition can be ascribed to the phrasal additions that are not immediately generated by a single element of the context: “Humilmente dirai” (27) - “smjernijem glasom tad

³² For he comments as follows: “It can be seen that Gundulić was pious because he did not want to translate *il seno*” (1881: 194).

³³ For similar examples, see the last paragraph of the commentary.

objavi / u zlu momu djelo tvoje" (45-46); "Ella dirà fors'anco" (40) - "Tijeme brže još će riti: / Pravo žalit nije ovoga" (65-66); "Deh mia timida carta" (47) - "A moj liste iščeznuti / gdi je proljetje mojih lita" (73-74); "Quante volte diss'io / Deh perché non potrebbe / Per vagheggiar costei tutta d'un punto / Diviso esser talhor lo sguardo mio" (149-152) - "Ah kolikrat čut se riti / ja uzdišuć: "Višnji Bože, / da se kako razlučiti / svud moj pogled ovi može / da bih tako odasvudi / gledajući u pokoju / mogao uživati u razbludi / sve ujedno lijepu moju!" (181-188). Sometimes such additions are just a variation of the text that is determined by the model: "Però che ben conviensi" (7) - "zašto slika i prilika / i stvar u svemu podobna je" (13-14); "E se vuol pur, ch'io muoia" (89) - "Nu ako je namijenila / veće života moga osudu / ter ushoće moja vila / da svakako umrijet budu" (37-140); "a chi si muore" (91) - "tko mre [...] / da s njim život svoj ostavi" (143-144); "E pur non mio oda il vento, / ch'io temo, che spirando / egli ancor non ridica i miei sospiri" (89-91) - "Ali život i čezne i vene / da su mučeci i uzdasi, / vjetrić pršeć oko mene / da ih ne čuje i ne izglasi" (265-268).

Moreover in the much more infrequent examples of the condensation of the Croatian text as against the Italian, Gundulić operates with the same type of language material. Thus in stanza 41 he misses out a whole sentence: "Dunque col piè tremante / Giunsi a l'Idolo mio (135-136),³⁴ which leads to the loss of a fabular and expressive topos in the text.³⁵

The interpolated sentence in stanza 37 "ah non lo spero" (92) is condensed in the exclamation "ah jaoh" (147) while a whole sentence is dropped in stanza 37 "A legger le tue note" (93).

Reduction of the text is also achieved through the unification of iterative figures: "Manda e rimanda ogn'hor l'anima mia (16) - "Koje upravljam sveđ / [...] duša moja" (26-28).

³⁴ The rest of the Croatian text is faithful to the Italian: "Dunque col piè tremante / Giunsi a l'idolo mio, quando repente / Tutta negli occhi miei l'anima corse / Ed ogni suo vigor chiuse in un guardo". (102-106) - "Tjem mâ duša naglo stupi, / I u oči dogje moje, / Te u jedan pogled skupi / Svekolike sile svoje" (161-164).

³⁵ A similar example is found in stanza 69: "Ah, da glase sve mučće, / ke vik jezic ne otvori, / zatravljena srca veće / čuješ nijemo kô govori" (273-276), which literally translates the fragment of 27-31 from *L'Amante occulto* with the omission of the allocutive periphrasis of line 37: *bella cagion de' miei tormenti*" and the next half line: "Come fredda in amor", which among other things does not relate immediately to the basic topic of the section.

Another characteristic Gundulićan procedure that helps the translation to become concrete and semantically specific is the replacement or supplementation of a pronoun with references of a semantically fuller meaning: “colà dove t’invio” (10) - “gdi ma mlados / puna želje stoji samo” (23-24); “egli” (20) - “Srce moje strjelovito” (33); “Chiedi, chiedi a colei” (49) - “Pita’ u one ka obstire / čelu od prama krunu zlatu” (77-78); “entro” (75) - “jadno srce” (119); “Ei muore” (81) - “Mre tvoj sluga! (128); or the replacement of general, hierarchically superior terms by concrete and conceptually subordinate versions: “ver l’amato oggetto” (21) - “put ljeposti gre ljubljene” (36); “A quell’alta incredibile bellezza” (99) - “vedra lica raj veseli, / svjetlo sunce oči drazih / sladki pogled, moj dan bijeli” (154-156).³⁶ The opposition illustrated by the last group of examples might, with a certain degree of generalisation, well be considered as emblematic of the corpus considered as a whole. Preti’s text might be defined as on the whole conceptual, and abstract, and Gundulić’s as mainly concrete and pictorial. On the basis of the preceding three groups of examples, with more discussion and more details, we could well speak of the essentiality and economy of Preti’s expression – the prevailing ratio of signifier and signified is 1:1, the most frequent parts of speech are verbs and nouns as headwords of the verb and noun phrases; most of the determiners – the most common of which are adjectives – are used for a more detailed characterisation of the elements to which they relate and are not predictable from the basis of the semic composition of the noun: this means that the adjectives are functional vis-à-vis the form of the content of the text and work as dynamic components of the course of the *fabula*.³⁷ Adjectives working as epithets, the semantic content of which is predictable from the sememe of the superior element (and the convention of the general poetic language to which they belong) are relatively few in number, semantically bland and affectively neutral.³⁸ By contrast, in Gundulić’s text there is a much greater proportion of pleonasms, while

³⁶ But we can also find an example of the opposite procedure: “A capir tutti insieme / Pensier, tema, silenzio, affanni, Amore. / Picciol vaso era un core” (226-228) (*Amante timido*) - “Jao da zaman srce moje / Razgorjenu ‘e ognju malo” (283).

³⁷ Particularly the following: “Dirai tacitamente” (4); “Tacita messagera a muto amante” (9); “luci d’amor [...] pietose / isdegnose” (92-93); “L’istoria miserabile e dolente” (96); tacite querele” (188).

³⁸ For example: “begli occhi” (7); “bel volto” (79); “alta, incredibile bellezza” (98).

the density of epithets and traditional metaphors is greater as well. Hence the text is marked by a certain precious and ornamental component that is missing in the original, oriented as it is primarily towards narration. In the Italian corpus the figures that are based on the syntagmatic order of the verbal components or, most commonly, on a binary structure of repetition of certain phonological, lexical and semantic elements, with an accompanying syntactic and syntagmatic parallelism – are the most common type of *ornatus*, particularly in the sequences taken over from *L'Amante timido* (in the type of discourse they are different from those that come from *L'Amante occulto*).³⁹ At that level too, Gundulić imitates the Italian text.⁴⁰ However, even if there is an overall formal correlation, the function of these figures in the appertaining contexts is somewhat different. In the case of Gundulić – where the stanzas are built on isosyllabic principles, the lines inside the quatrain always being rhyme-linked, they have the role of secondary and sporadic element for the recursive organisation of the text. Hence the use of them is less systematic and common than in the case of Preti, where even the longer sequences are organised on the principle of the reflection of the binary syntagmatic, semantic or even phonological scheme:

Poich'egli ad'hor da me s'invola
E ver l'amato oggetto
Com' a suo proprio entra, aspira e vola.
Che pria che tu la giunga io giunga a morire
Riverente t'inchina e se vedrai

³⁹ We might indicate the differences with the terms “lyrical and meditative” (*L'Amante timido*) and “narrative and expository” (*L'Amante occulto*).

⁴⁰ “Vanne, o carta amorosa, / Vanne a colei, per cui tacendo io moro” (1-2) - “Pogji liste moj ljuveni / Pogji k onoj, c'jeća koje / Mučeci je sila meni / Dni u željah svršit moje” (1-4); “Non chaggio no, non chaggio / Ch'a' miei sospir sospiri, / Ch'al mio languir languisca” (52-54) - “Ja ne pitam to saviše / Mojoj sreći, mojoj česti, / Da na uzdahe moje uzdiše / Da se boli môm bolesti” (81-84) - “Quinci la meraviglia e quindi amore, / Foco negli occhi havea, ghiaccio nel core” (111-112) - “Sjedne strane čuda mila / Razgledajuć slatko tima, / S druge ljubav i nje dila, / Bjeh led srcem, plam očima” - “Ond' io mentre sorgea (169-173) or even surpasses the the Italian text: “Vanne nunzia fedele e taciturna / A que' begli occhi avante” (6-7) - “Pogji v'jerni, pogj' mučeci / Navjesniče srca moga / Pred oči one, ke je veći / Pogled zraka sunčanoga” (9-12) - “Io bramo, io chaggio solo / Che 'l mio amor non isdegni” (66-67) - “Samo žudim, samo prosim, / U života moga svrsi, / Da na ljubav, kú joj nosim / Ne gnjevi se, jao, ni mrzi” (101-104).

Ne begli occhi di lei sdegno o rigore
Humilmente dirai
Che sei Nunzia di Morte e non d' Amore.
Forse avverrà ch'ascolti
l'annunzio de la Morte
Se l'annunzio d' Amore udir non vuole.
Forse ancor la pietate
La vedrai del bel volto
Cangiar le rose in pallide viole
Chi a che non impetri il muto inchiostro
Quella pietà che non impetra il pianto.
Mai poich'io sarò morto

Tarda sia la pietate a chi tacendo
Senza chieder pietà visse e morìo .
Ella dirà fors' anco
Degno fu de la morte
Chi nel morir non iscoprì sua sorte.
Sì, sì dunque, fia meglio
ch'ella al fin di mia vita almeno intenda
Prima un sospir di Amore
Che il sospir de la Morte.
Deh mia timida Carta
Ardisci e spera e prega
Chiedi, chiedi a colei
Di mio amor, di mia fede
Pietà ma non mercede.
Non cheggio, no, non cheggio
Ch'a' miei sospir sospiri
Ch'al mio languor languisca (20-54)

srce moje strjelovito
koje svakčas bježi od mene,
ter kô u mjesto svę vlastito
put ljeposti gre ljubljene.

Nu ako u udesu mom je hudem
ter inako nije moći,
da ja prije na smrt budem

negli tamo ti, jaoh, doći,
pokloni se umiļeno,
i ako od oči n'e svjetlosti
gn'evno, srčno, nesmiļeno
vidiš gorjet nemilosti,
smjernijem glasom tad objavi
u zlu momu djelo tvoje,
da ti nijesi od ļubavi
negli od smrti glasnik moje.

Nu ako moga cječ poraza
glas od smrti čuje ļuti
ona koja vijeku glasa
od ļubavi ne htje čuti;

nu zamalo od ružica
ako vidiš rujnos milu
promijenut ju usred lica
bijelijeh lijera na bljedilu,
tko zna da ju ne primože
nijemo pismo na smiļen'e,
što učinit vijek ne može
grozno i tužno me cviļen'e.

Ali po môj smrti veće
taj na vrijeme milost nije,
jaoh, jednomu ki mučeće
bez n'e živje i umrije!

Tijeme brže još će riti:
"Pravo žalit nije ovoga;
mre dostojno tko odkriti
ne htje mreći srca svoga."

Daj, daj boļe da, čim duša
na ishodu svom se vrti,
da prî jedan uzdah sluša
od ļubavi negli od smrti.

Ah, moj liste iščeznuti,
gdi je proljetje mojijeh lita
uputi se, veće uputi;
hod', smjej, moli, ufa', pita'!



Pita' u one ka obstire
čelu od pramâ krunu zlatu
od ljubavi, od me vire
milos samo, jaoh, ne platu!
Ja ne pitam toj saviše
mojoj sreći, mojoj česti
da na uzdahe moje uzdiše,
da se boli môm bolesti. (33-84)

In this fragment the principle of recursiveness is achieved concretely in very diverse forms: as synonymic iteration, as paronomasia, paregmenon, polyptoton, antithesis, *gradatio*, syntactical and lexical parallelisms, *bicolon*, *tricolon*, assonance and rhyme. Some of these figures are directly carried into the Croatian translation, or compensated for by some other iterative forms. At the same time certain other figures appear in Gundulić's text, which reflect no element of the model, although they are identical in terms of construction and (the immediate contextual) function. Still, among them, there is none of the uninterrupted sequencing that we can see in the Italian text. This does mean that Gundulić's figures of this kind have no organisation and structuring role. However, since the verbal cohesion of the composition is founded above all on the application of isosyllabics and rhymes, it is their rhythmical, ornamental, pathetic and affective functions that come to the fore, although this is also present in the original. What is more, we can state that in the original the rhythmical, musical and ornamental component is the primary element of the formal structuring of the discourse even at the level of form of expression, while in the translation the same component has a subordinate role. Preti's text is written in mainly free hendecasyllbics and heptasyllabics, and the succession of identical line endings is non-obligatory and unpredictable. So all other forms of repetition – most often founded in the binary principle – have an undoubtedly cohesive role, irrespective of in what position in the line they appear. This does not do away with their musical or indirectly affective function. The greatest concentration of such forms accompanies the lyrical passages, where the thematic word "sospiri" is present in the context or is at any rate implicit as sign of the manner in which the passage is to be pronounced within the fictional universe of the text. Hence in the case of Preti the recursiveness of the binary scheme can be understood as a transcoded mimesis of the sigh, expressed in resources inherent to



the selected code, as metaphor of sigh achieved by the activation of the formal and abstract capacities of the language. In Gundulić too a number of cognately structured fragments (stanzas 1, 3 and 5) can be interpreted in a similar way. Yet their continuity, their compactness, as we might almost call it, is distorted by the interference of the obligatory octosyllabic *abab* scheme. In addition, Gundulić, with the use of verbal *translata* to a somewhat greater extent than Preti makes use of direct mimesis, in line with the customs of the Croatian poetry of his or earlier times.

We have twice said that Gundulić, among other things, reproduces the rhetorical organisation of Preti's text. Yet this was not accompanied by the supply of any details about which type or level of ornamentation was used. In the previously quoted examples we dealt with tropes and *figurae electionis* and to a lesser extent *figurae sententiae*. But precisely in connection with this last kind of figure, our remark can be accepted without any kind of later corrections. They were built into the very foundation of the Preti corpus, in line with the general Baroque tendency to raise the figure "to the level of principle of composition".⁴¹ The theme of Preti's composition is made concrete as an elaboration and variation of the paradoxical topos of *mute speaking*⁴² which in the text is achieved with a string of other conceptual focuses based on the figures of antithesis and oxymoron or on paradoxical judgements. In this, Gundulić follows Preti completely.⁴³ (Hence the examples of the concettist stanzas noted by Dunja Fališevac are just a reflection of the Preti text). Gundulić does not intervene at this level, the area of his work is the surface and accidental layer. One might say that it is this level alone that has been spotted by critics who on the basis of a certain verbal restraint and moderation have linked Preti's name with that of Petrarch, without noticing how far Preti's *arguzie* are distant from the Petrarchan or stilnovistic schemes.⁴⁴

This level, with its aseptic nature and expressive essentialism was clearly unacceptable for Gundulić, in the sense that in the course of

⁴¹ Kravar 1971 :230

⁴² The origin is Ovidian, and the popularity of it is shown equally by the canzone of Stefano Protonotaro *Pir meu cor aligrari* and Marino's madrigals *Silenzio che parla*, *Amor secreto*, *Lettera amorosa* in the *Lira* collection.

⁴³ Apart from leaving out verses 84-85 of *L'Amante timido*: "Deh scriver potess'io / Sì come le parole, anco i sospiri", thinking them perhaps a too extreme example of stylisation by *concetto*. (This is the only case of semantic anomaly in the whole corpus.)

⁴⁴ Croce 1971: 12-20.

the process of translation it was necessary to reshape it so that the final result, i.e., the Croatian version, should acquire those features that in the given literary context would be acknowledged as literary. This above all else means the intensification of the rhetorical tones of the surface layer. We might on this occasion repeat what we have said about the metrical disproportion between the units of the Italian text and the Croatian quatrains.

We assume that the disproportion did not arise because, at least theoretically, Gundulić could not have settled the ratio differently, but because he had a certain pattern to hand, not only precisely metrically defined but also fairly well defined in suprasegmental forms such as syntagmatic units and *ornatus*. Every verse form suggested a certain lexical superstructure and a certain semantic aura. In the case of Gundulić this suprasegmental aspect was determined by poetry before and contemporary to him. Precisely for this reason *The Ljubovnik sramežljiv* has many more similarities with, for example, the poetry of Bunić than with the poetry of the original on which it was based.

In the corpus from which Gundulić's poetry was derived, the three texts on which it is based are not represented to equal extents. Most of the verses are taken from the idyll *L'Amante timido*, somewhat fewer from *L'Amante occulto*, while from the *Amor segreto, costante e pudico, Canzone 1*, only the *congedo* was taken, and then adapted to the Croatian context.⁴⁵

Quoting them side by side we can illustrate the relationship between the corresponding Croatian and Italian verses. The criterion for the division of the Croatian text is the segmentation of the Italian corpus, depending on the text to which a given part belongs. The numbers in the right hand column indicate the place of a given section in the context of the Italian composition:

Ljubovnik sramežljiv
1-152

L'Amante timido
1-98

153-160

L'Amante occulto
98-103

⁴⁵ "Canzon, vanne là dove / In compagnia de' miei pensier ne viene / Si sovente il mio cor, sì rado il piede" (92-95).

161-192	<i>L'Amante timido</i> 137-154
193-204	<i>L'Amante occulto</i> 112-120
208-211	<i>L'Amante timido</i> 157-162
212-235 236-260	<i>L'Amante occulto</i> 133-153 1-18
261-264 265 269-272	<i>L'Amante timido</i> 200-203 126 204-207
273-276 277-279 281-284	<i>L'Amante occulto</i> 27-31 72-75 19-20
285-288	<i>L'Amor costante, secreto e pudico</i> 92-94
289-292	<i>L'Amante timido</i> 214-216

Ljubovnik sramežljiv comprises 292 lines, *L'Amante timido* 308 and *L'Amante occulto* 345. From *L'Amante timido* Gundulić used about 100 lines, from *L'Amante occulto* 78, that is, about one third of each text. From the table above it is clear that Gundulić, shaping larger textual units, liberated himself from the immediate impact of Preti's composition. The correlation between the original and the translation within given sections is not transferred to the level of the overall text. From line 153 Gundulić's translation no longer communicates anything that was written in an uninterrupted sequence in Preti as well, diverges from each model with its dynamics and course of development, although in theme and motifs

and in given elements of the *fabula* it remains, of course, very closely connected to the Italian groundwork. By combining textual units taken from both or all three models, Gundulić created a new text that followed its own fabular master plan, tells a story that no longer depends on the development of events in a single one of the texts from the fragments of which it is composed. It is in this that Gundulić's translatorly originality can be seen: in his choice of material and the way it is joined, including the necessary omission and silencing of other material, to compose a text that as a whole is not like a single earlier work. Gundulić, dependent as he was on the model at the level of the sentence, nevertheless shows a considerable self-confidence at the level of the organisation of transphrastic units.

The criterion according to which Gundulić created his text, starting off from the Italian models, will be clearer if we compare *Ljubovnik sramežljiv*, *L'Amante timido* and *L'Amante occulto* from the point of view of formal contents, taking into consideration their theme and motives, and the dynamics of the course of the *fabula*. Both *L'Amante timido* and *L'Amante occulto* can be divided into a number of units – thematic, motivic, and narrative. The first division, which holds for both texts, starts from the number of participants in the events. First of all (or more precisely in more than a half of each work) there are just the lover (identified with the poet) and the lady that are the participants of the desired but never completely achieved dialogue. After that, a third and somewhat peripheral actant comes onto the scene. In *L'Amante timido* this is the gentle and confidential lady friend, who listens to the woes of the protagonist and tells him what his distant loved one is doing, while in *L'Amante occulto* it is a rival in love, to whom the lady imparts her favour at one time, after which the protagonist sends him packing showing the falsity of the rumours that the rival had spread. In *L'Amante occulto* presence / non-presence of the third actant is a fundamental discriminatory criterion, accepted by Gundulić: not a single verse in which the third sharer of the action appears is adopted. When we are dealing with *L'Amante timido*, Gundulić is a little less consistent, because in the second part of the text (from line 217) he does take on one short section (in considerably reduced form). This section it is true lies at the beginning of the second part (226-228), while the rest of the text is completely ignored by Gundulić, although given thematic elements in this text and in the rejected segment of *L'Amante occulto* are the same as in the part that he does take into consideration. There is a clear wish to restrict the text to the segment in which the events are shared only

by the poet and the unwilling lady. The text of *L'Amante timido* up to the verse to which it was followed by Gundulić (98) poses and explains the paradoxical topos of mute speaking or eloquent silence, more accurately, the silent communication of amorous pains, to which the protagonist is consigned because of the lady's unkindness. The basic motif develops with a sequence of minor scenes in which individual possibilities of *captatio benevolentiae* by the method of silent communication are considered, vis-à-vis the possible more or less favourable results. The protagonist the while quite often makes use of the strategy of paradoxical argumentation.⁴⁶

The first fragment (lines 1-98), which Gundulić conveys whole, can be summarised thus: the poet, forced to silence because of the lady's unkindness, confides his woes to a letter that, though mute, will eloquently reveal the poet's feelings, the amorous suffering that drives him to his death. The letter will find its way to the lady following the lover's heart, which resides at the lady's, and the trace of the lover's sighs. The lover has to communicate to the lady his feelings so that she should not accuse him of deserving death by his silence. The poet does not expect mutuality in feelings; he does not want the lady to suffer because of his woes. If he dies before the letter should reach the lady, it will become the harbinger of his death. But the lady will perhaps accept the poet's words benevolently. The last two lines in this segment indicate a change in the temporal perspective, and a reference to the prehistory of the state concerning which the poet is speaking.⁴⁷ This prehistory is the theme of the further text in both of the Preti compositions. However, Gundulić does not follow the version that lies in this text, i.e., in *L'Amante timido*, but builds a different variant with material taken over from *L'Amante occulto*, which he tacks on to the previous verses. *L'Amante occulto*, that is, goes on with the theme of involuntary love, love as the consequence of spiritual exaltation that is awoken by the lady's elevated moral characteristics, which are manifested and made concrete in her speech.⁴⁸ This is, then,

⁴⁶ For example: "Cheggio quel, che colei / Tanto meno può negar, quanto è più cruda, / Però che bramo solo / Le sia caro il dolor, ch'entro m'accora, / E voglio almen che con sua pace io mora" (72-76) - "Pitam ono što braniti / toli mane ima ona, / koli većma hoće biti / nemilostna, nepriklona" (113-116).

⁴⁷ "Alhor mesta e piangente, / dirai de l'amor mio, / L'istoria miserabile e dolente" (96-98) - "tad s uzdasima daždeć grozno / suza rijeke, pismo, tvoje / tužno skazanje i žalosno / od ljubavi rijet ćeš moje" (149-157).

⁴⁸ "Dirai, come sovente, / Lo Ciel mi diede in sorte, / Udir da la sua bocca, / Quel dolce suon di angeliche parole, / a cui primieri accenti, / Non si destò nel cuor fiamma amorosa, / Ma

a somewhat extreme variant of the stilinovistic and Petrarchan topos of the relation between love and virtue. This somewhat discriminating, long drawn out and stylistically and narratively speaking limp section did not interest Gundulić. He clearly, as is shown by the verses to come, did not mean to palliate the almost ritual narrative tension that during the whole of his composition is defined by the poles of attraction and repulsion. In an omitted section, a new situation is adumbrated, somewhat at odds with the previously indicated relationship of lover and lady (although belonging to the same inventory of topos). Thus Gundulić rejects the whole of this Petrarchan-Platonist throwback,⁴⁹ because the field of tension of his composition is not achieved in the area of the idea but of the *ingenium*. He is also singing of falling in love and adoration of the lady, but the relationship between earthly and divine love is differently posed: the lady is the one who contains in herself "skupnu ljepos" (159).⁵⁰ This concerns, of course, a topos of the same origin as the one that Gundulić rejected. Thus if there is an ideological gap between the Preti and the Gundulić text, it is not embodied as an opposition of ideas, but as inclusion, participation and distance. Preti still represents and explains a certain attitude (although his verses too show the impossibility of really reviving the Platonist strain of the previous centuries). This is shown by his polemical opposition to Marino's exclusively sensual concept of love. At least in this composition, Gundulić moved beyond this problem, for him the ideology was a fact that had been taken for granted and factored in, and was thus cancelled out as a component of the content, became nourishment of language and form, spur for prodigality of wit and fancy. Hence to the explanation *a minori ad maiore* Gundulić privileged a determined and compact hyperbolic stroke. For this reason, he made use of the verses from *L'Amante occulto*, which he extrapolated from the context that in his further development followed a very similar course as the omitted passages in *L'Amante timido*.

stupor riverenza, / Ond'in prima lei tacito ammirai, / E qual cosa celeste io l'inchinai
" (99-107).

⁴⁹ "Dissi pien di spavento / Deh se lassù nel Cielo / Fece il sommo Fattor cose sì belle / Sciolgasi il nodo che quaggiù mi strigne / Perch'io possa colà sovra le Stelle / Paragognar queste Bellezze a quelle" (157-162) – "T'jem veće krat stah vapiti: / Već se biće me rastvori, / Da m' je u raju istaknuti / Ljeposti ove s on'jem gori" (208-211).

⁵⁰ "Che nel vostro sembante / Il Fattor di Natura / Quasi in compendio di beltà rinchiuso / Per far del suo poter mirabil prova" (99-102) - "Tada poznah, višnja krepost / Da svu objavi vlast veliku / Sv ujedno skupnu l'jepost / Stavi u samu tvu priliku".

But Gundulić quickly returned to this text as soon as it had passed to the hyperbolic-metaphorical-ingenious exposition, once again deserting it just before the last stanza that belonged to the same type of discourse. He still developed the hyperbole started with the text from *L'Amante timido* – all the way to the paroxysm of the love-death – and varied the Platonic motif created as reflection of the lady, after which he used the retarded stanza as a motivational link that connected the previous topics and the text that followed. *L'Amante timido* went on with its Platonist-stilnovistic fragment, with the description of the process of falling in love, where once again words and situations occur that Gundulić had not allowed for in his version. Hence he completely skips this passage, finding useful semantic and rhetorical combinations again in *L'Amante occulto*, putting them from there into a much more suitable context. Then he used two more stanzas from *L'Amante timido*, after which, with the addition of thematically cognate stanzas from the second model *L'Amante occulto*, he concretely formed the topos of the amorous silence with which he circularly closed the course of the *fabula* of the composition before the final hyperbole.

The other Preti idyll, *L'Amante occulto*, in the section that Gundulić considered for his composition, is also characterised by a three-part organisation. Gundulić took over in its entirety the initial segment, ll. 1-22, but divided it into individual motif and figurative sets – the mute suffering of the unhappy lover (1-9), the hyperbolic comparison with hellish tortures and a witty point (11-18), the motif of deathly pallor (18-22) – which he freely linked with and interpolated into the other textual material. This concettist comparison with tortures of hell is the climax of a longer thematic section with motifs of amorous silence and tears as the only consolation and relief, which contains one conceptual piece of wit. The expository and reflective part, from l. 3 to l. 97, marked by a great density of causal sentences, does not interest Gundulić, who wants to communicate through paradoxical revelations, and not through the explication of a cause and effect sequence and the application of common sense logic. Hence he took only one, rhetorically pregnant and thematically emblematic, passage from the whole of this quite long segment:

Forse mai non udiste
Le tacite querele
D'innamorato cor che muto parla (29-31)

Ah da glase svę mučęće,
Kę v'jek jezik ne otvori,
Zatravljena srca veće
Čuješ n'jemo kô govori, (273-276)

Similarly from the next long passage, 53-97, thematically very close to the overture of *L'Amante timido*, Gundulić picked up only two metaphors and used them to intensify the context with added pathos, and not with the logical reinforcement of the argument:

Ma da una pietra alpestre
io trarrò forse ancora
Col focil de' lamenti
Faville di pietà se non di Amore (72-75)

E pur non m'oda il vento
Ch' io temo, che spirando
Egli ancora non ridica i miei sospiri (89-91)

Ognjilo bi mo'e žalosne
Tužbe izelo, jaoh iz st'jene
Srca tvoga, jaoh milosne
Iskre, ako ne ljuvene (277-280)

Ali život čezne i vene;
Da su mučęći i uzdasi,
V'jetric pršeć oko mene
Da ih ne čuje i ne izglasi (265-268)

In stanza 39, or line 153, Gundulić abandoned the composition *L'Amante timido* as his exclusive model and moved over to *L'Amante occulto*. This happened at the moment when it was necessary to define clearly which conceptual horizon Gundulić's discussion of love belonged. The main theme of the long segment of his text that starts with line 154 and finishes with stanza 54, or verse 140, is a description and analysis of the lover's condition. Gundulić clearly felt that the phenomenology of love should be precisely conceptually labelled – and for this purpose the verses from lines 98 to 102 of *L'Amante occulto* seemed particularly appropriate, allowing as they did for a rhetorically more telling expression. During the

whole of this segment quotations from *L'Amante occulto* were to function as declarative and ideological reference points, places for explication of the Platonist conception, while the lyrical and emotional intermezzos were consigned to the excerpts from *L'Amante timido*. If we look at what criterion Gundulić used to pick certain passages out of the general context of *L'Amante occulto*, we shall see that they were ideologically always very clear and practically exemplary didactic fragments which at the same time were characterised by a hyperbolic content. Hyperbolic motivation, again with the help of verses taken from *L'Amante occulto*, is the link with the next thematic segment, where motifs of amorous fires and tears are worked out, from which, according to the principle of the analogy *per oppositione* the motif of lovelorn aphasia continues, by mirroring the initial segment of the composition the motif of the unkind lady as well, in conjunction with an address to the letter and a new call to go in the trail of the lover's sighs.

In this part, Gundulić takes the greatest number of quotations from *L'Amante occulto*, apportioning them and linking them in a manner that often does not correspond to the way they relate to each other in the original. In this respect, Gundulić does not take into account either temporal or cause-and-effect succession of the prototype, subordinating it, rather, to the demands of the absurdity of the argument and the hyperbole of the paroxysm.

Gundulić's stance to the Italian original, which provides a text of a much more austere and compact structure, with a more powerful conceptual and rhetorical charge and greater semantic intensity than there is on the whole in either of the prototypes that he made use of, can be explained by the Croatian text's having belonged to a different literary setting than that to which the Preti composition belonged. For irrespective of all the quandaries and unclarity about the definition of the idyll, the form that made a name for itself in the 17th century was always based on the "story", on the dynamic development of the poetic situation, on the vectorial orientation of events, the failure of the initial and final narrative sequences to coincide. For this reason the dynamic structure and mimesis of the temporal progression and the cause and effect sequence are the basic constitutive features of the genre. However much it was permeated and burdened with ornamentation, the idyll was never mainly constructed by the application of procedures of verbal self-motivation, as is the case with the Gundulić translation. From the basis provided in Preti's texts, Gundulić

extracted a kind of static summary, structured by the relations established between the elements of his complex and multifaceted ornamentation. To be able to answer why Gundulić's composition differs precisely in this from Preti's, it is not even necessary to determine to which genre it belongs. It is enough to say that it is not the idyll, that it does not apply the canons of narration. There is no "story" in the Gundulić text (nor does the use of the terms *fabula* and *fabular* change anything here), and, what is more, there is almost nothing going on. The potential dynamics of given situations is cancelled out by their topic character and their projection into the temporal dimension of the past. For this reason the *fabula* goes round in a circle, and the metadiegetic aspect prevails over diegesis. It might be said that Gundulić, fascinated by the ingenious elaboration of certain topoi in the Preti text, understood that the organisation of discourses that annuls the "story" and develops into tautology creates a suitable ground for the establishment of a new order of things that evades the rules of the mimesis of referential relationships and draws its own conviction from the creative freedom of the *ingenium*.

Translated by Graham McMaster

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Besomi, Ottavio, Tommaso Stigliani: tra parodia e critica, *Esplorazioni secentesche*, Padova 1975, pp. 53-205.
- Colombo, Carmela, Il Marino e i suoi contemporanei, *Cultura e tradizione nell'Adone di G. B. Marino*, Padova 1967, pp. 42-84.
- Croce, Franco, Il marinismo conservatore del Pretie del Bruni, *Tre momenti del barocco letterario italiano*, Milano-Napoli 1971, pp. 102-124.
- Fališevac, Dunja, Ivan Gundulić, *Hrvatska književnost u evropskom kontekstu*, ed. A. Flaker and K. Pranjić, Zagreb 1978, pp. 259-277.
- Fališevac, Dunja, Concetto kao pojam barokne poetike i pjesnički postupak u hrvatskoj književnosti 17. stoljeća, *Stari pisci hrvatski i njihove poetike*, Zagreb 1989, pp. 166-173.
- Fališevac, Dunja, Duhovna lirika Ivana Gundulića i Djiva Bunića, *Stari pisci hrvatski i njihove poetike*, Zagreb 1989, pp. 212-235.
- Fališevac, Dunja, ed., I. Gundulić, Od veličanstva Božjijeh, *Piacularium Psalmorum Gundulae*, Zagreb 1990, pp. 19-24.

- Fantuzzi, Giovanni, *Notizie di scrittori Bolognesi raccolte da Giovanni Fantuzzi*, Bologna 1789.
- Ferrero, Giuseppe Guido, ed., *Marino e i Marinisti*, Milano-Napoli 1954.
- Getto, Giovanni, *Opere scelte di Giovan Battista Marino e dei Marinisti*, II, I Marinisti, Torino 1962
- Gundulić, Ivan., *Ljubovnik sramežljiv*, Biblioteka Malahna, I, ed. L. Paljetak, Dubrovnik 1989.
- Haler, Albert, *O Gundulićevim "Suzama sina razmetnoga"*, *Hrvatska revija*, 11, Zagreb 1938, pp., 620-625.
- Körbler, Đuro; Rešetar, Milan, ed., *Djela Ćiva Frana Gundulića*, SPH IX, Zagreb 1938.
- Kravar, Zoran, *Stil hrvatskog književnog baroka*, *Hrvatska književnost u evropskom kontekstu*, ed. A. Flaker and K. Pranjić, Zagreb 1978, pp. 223-242.
- Nebesny, Tatjana, *Prilozi za bibliografiju radova o hrvatskom književnom baroku*, *Hrvatski književni barok*, ed. D. Fališevac, Zagreb 1991, pp. 335-276.
- Novak, Slobodan Prosperov, ed., *Piesni pokorne kraglia Davida gospodina Giva Frana Gundulichia*, *Piacularium Psalmorum Gundulae*, Zagreb 1990, pp. 19-24.
- Paljetak, Luko, *Gundulićev "Ljubovnik sramežljiv"*, *Hrvatske teme*, Dubrovnik 1999, pp. 100-102.
- Preti, Girolamo, *Poesie di Girolamo Preti*, In *Venetia et in Trevigi per G. Molino*. Ratković, Milan. ed., *Djela Dživa Bunića Vučića*, PSHK XXXV, Zagreb 1971.
- Ravlić, Jakša, ed., *Ivan Gundulić*, PSHK, XII, Zagreb 1968.
- Rešetar, Milan, *Die Metrik Gundulić's*, *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, XXV, Berlin, 1903, pp 250-289.
- Rešetar, Milan, *Djela Ćiva Frana Gundulića*. Drugo izdanje. Priredio Đuro Körbler, U Zagrebu 1919, *Slavia*, II, 1923-24, pp. 138-153.
- Šrepel, Milivoj, *O Gundulićevim "Suzama sina razmetnog"*, *Rad JAZU*, 127, 1896, pp. 102-140.
- Šrepel, Milivoj, *O Gundulićevoj "Proserpini ugrabljenoj"*, *Napiao o. U. Talija*, U Dubrovniku 1898. 18. str. *Nastavni vjesnik*, VII, 1899, pp. 295-296.
- Zore, Luko, *O pjesniku Gunduliću*, *Rad JAZU*, 55, Zagreb, 1881, pp. 185-202.

Zore, Luko, Gragja za književno-poviestnu ocjenu Gundulićeve "Arijadne", *Rad JAZU*, 63, Zagreb, 1882, pp. 129-189.

GUNDULIĆ PREVODITELJ GIROLAMA PRETIJA

U članku se, analizom i usporedbom na metričkoj, semantičkoj, sinaktičkoj, retoričkoj i narativnoj razini, ispituje odnos Gundulićeva teksta *Ljubovnik sramežljivo*, prema trima sastavcima koje je djelomično parafrazirao, idilama *L'amante timido*, *L'amante occulto* i *Amor segreto, costante e pudico* njegova suvremenika Girolama Pretija. Gundulićeve intervencije i preoblike dale su tekst znatno strože i kompaktnije strukture, snažnijeg konceptualno-retoričkog naboja i većeg semantičkog intenziteta nego što je u cjelini ijedan od predložaka kojima se poslužio. Pritom je odstupio od kanona naracije, svojstvenoga žanru idile, gradeći tekst isključivo primjenom postupaka verbalne samopokretljivosti. Iz podloge koju mu pružaju Pretijevi tekstovi Gundulić izlučuje neku vrstu statičkoga sažetka, strukturiranog odnosom što ga uspostavljaju elementi njegove složene i slojevite retoričke strukture.

Ključne riječi: Gundulić, Preti, končetistički, idila, parafraza, metrički, semantički.

Key words: Gundulić, Preti, idyll, concetist, paraphrasis, metric, semantic.

Smiljka Malinar
Department of Italian Studies
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Zagreb
Ivana Lučića 3
10000 Zagreb, CROATIA
smalinar@ffzg.hr