

The Remake of *Judita*: A Modern Translation of the First Croatian Literary and Artistic Work

Vuk-Tadija Barbarić, Marijana Horvat

Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics, Zagreb, Croatia

ABSTRACT

To mark the five hundredth anniversary of the first edition of Marko Marulić's *Judita* in 2021 the Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics issued a prose adaptation of this famous epic in modern Croatian. Drawing on straightforward examples, this paper aims to illustrate and describe the adaptation techniques that were essential to bring this early sixteenth century work closer to a wider readership and to prompt readers from different walks of life and educational background to read Marulić's original. The paper is divided into three main sections. The first section outlines basic facts about Marulić's life and work. The second section analyses the historical, linguistic and cultural background of Marulić's *Judita* and considers its role in a contemporary society. The third section addresses specific aspects of its prose adaptation and the expected reception among twenty-first century readers, but also explores the concepts of intralingual translation and adaptation. The conclusion posits that this particular translation exemplifies that albeit intralingual translation is still an important theoretical construct, its practical purposefulness continues to be ambiguous.

Key words: *Judita*, Marko Marulić, translation, intralingual translation, adaptation

Introduction

The paper reflects on the new translation or adaptation of the fundamental Croatian literary and artistic work called *Judita*, by Marko Marulić, into modern Croatian. The translation came out to mark the five hundredth anniversary of the first edition of *Judita* (1521) and to expand its reception. The text of *Judita* is fairly incomprehensible to many present-day readers, which is why the original text was converted into prose and adapted to appeal to an average reader. The first two sections of this paper offer a more general context – essential details about Marulić and historical, linguistic and cultural facts relevant to understand the genesis of this epic, the underlying reasons for its translation as well as the actual need to sustain its pertinence and relevance in Croatian culture at all. They lay the groundwork for the third section, which considers intralingual translation and adaptation in the context of translation studies and scrutinizes specific adaptation strategies applied in this translation, explaining the reasoning behind them. The conclusion suggests that this particular example of intralingual translation and its adaptation strategies cannot be easily distinguished from interlingual translation. In this very case intralingual translation only remains a theoretical

construct of translation with evasive practical purposefulness.

About the life and work of Marko Marulić

It can be asserted with confidence that numerous scholars of history of the Croatian language and literature, and many others, have made reference to Marko Marulić at least once in their work. Nonetheless, the life of this great figure of Croatian literature is still relegated to the realm of solely partial disclosure. His works continue to inspire and to provide an inexhaustible source of new experiences and incentives for both readers and scholars alike.

Marko Marulić was born on 18 August 1450 in Split into a family of aristocrats and court justices. His father Nikola Pečenić de Marulis was a city court judge who served for nine tenures, and so was his grandfather Marko Petrov, whose name this author carries. His mother Dobrica Alberti (Obirtić) was also the scion of a noble family of court magistrates. Marko was the firstborn in the household of eight children. The roots of Marulić's family stretch far back to medieval times. His family members bore the surname Gavosolić and Pečenić until the fifteenth century. Apart from those surnames, family names Gavosulić, Pecanić, Pecenić, Pecinić, Balci are commonly

found in references as well¹. According to Cvito Fisković², in the fifteenth century the poet and his brothers took the Croatian surname Pečenić, which is how they were addressed by their fellow citizens and representatives of the Venetian Republic too. Fisković² contends that the aforementioned form (Pečenić) was preferred to other forms (Picinić, Pecinić, Pecenić). The surname de Marulis is mentioned for the first time in 1462³. Presumably, Marulić's upbringing was comparable to that of other patrician children. He attended the Humanistic School of Split under the tutelage of the esteemed Italian humanist Tideo Acciarini⁴ and continued his proverbial legal studies in Padua, but little is known about his stay there. In that period, he is mostly renowned for his eulogy delivered on Dodge Nikola Marcello, as cited by Marulić's friend, biographer and distinguished member of the Split Humanistic Circle Frano Božićević Natalis⁵, alluding to Marulić's sojourn in Padua. Dodge Nikola Marcello was in power from 13 August 1473 to 1 December 1474¹.

Marulić lived in the historic core of the City of Split, and was a prominent citizen. Similarly to his noble peers, aside from writing and family affairs he was equally preoccupied with public and judicial matters, and engaged on resolving local concerns. Marulić was an intellectual in his own right on a European scale and the most venerable member of the Split Humanistic Circle. He was erudite, a bibliophile who developed interests far more than in literature only. Marulić was a scholar, publicist and civil servant, very keen on music, painting and sculpture as well¹. Even during his lifetime Marulić's literary work and versatile humanistic background earned him great reputation in his home city, homeland and far beyond.

The period in which Marulić lived and worked was pivotal for both general history and regional history of this poet. In 1420 Split came under the rule of the Republic of Venice, with a population of 6000 to 8000, ascending economically, demographically, and culturally. By contrast, social differences and struggles between commoners and patricians were becoming more noticeable, Venice was striving to undermine the city self-government, and the Ottomans were lurking behind the city walls. During the Ottoman conquest of Bosnia (1463) and Herzegovina (1482) Marulić was worryingly attuned to the looming threat to Dalmatia and other Croatian regions, especially in the aftermath of the terrible tragedy suffered by the Croatian army in the Battle of the Krbava Field (1493). The invasion of Italy (1494) by King Charles VIII of France brought an abrupt end to peacetime that had sustained the growth of the Renaissance putting Italy at the heart of extremely intricate conflicts⁶. Those events must have affected Marulić's literary development and coloured his work. The history of Croatian literature remembers Marulić as an author of poems in Croatian and Latin, prose works and translations. His literary oeuvre is predominantly written in Latin. Marulić's book *De institutione bene vivendi per exempla sanctorum* [Instruction of How to Lead a Virtuous Life Based on the Examples of Saints] (Venice 1506) was particularly held in high re-

gard. His *Evangelistarium* [Evangelistary] (Venice, 1516 – the first edition reliably attributed to Marulić, but supposedly issued even earlier) was immensely popular too. His *Davidias* [The Davidiad] is a Latin epic written in hexameter recounting the biblical myth of David and Goliath. It was prepared for printing during the poet's life, but left unpublished until 1954. Aside from the abovementioned works Marulić wrote voluminous works in Croatian, but only few Italian texts were credibly ascribed to him.

Marko Marulić owes his epithet of the father of Croatian literature primarily to *Judita*, the first epic poem written in Croatian language, completed on 22 April 1501, and published twenty years later, i.e. on 13 August 1521. *Judita* is a biblical-Virgilian epic in six cantos (books) and 2126 double-rhymed dodecasyllabic verses. *Historija od Suzane* [Suzanna] is the next important work by Marulić in Croatian, a poem closely comparable to *Judita*, but much shorter (780 verses), succeeded by his anthological poem *Molitva suprotiva Turkom* [A Prayer Against the Turks]. Marulić's Croatian oeuvre features *inter alia* religious poems and epistles to the Benedictine nun Katarina Obirtić.

Marulić's translations reveal his remarkable linguistic gifts: he translated Petrarch and Dante from Italian to Latin, as well as the former from Italian to Croatian. On 20 June 1500 Marulić completed *Od naslidovan'ja Isukarstova i od pogarjen'ja tašćin segasvitnjih* [The Imitation of Christ], Croatian translation of the Latin book *De imitatione Christi*, nowadays most often attributed to Thomas Hemerken à Kempis. What is more, at the same time Marulić's piece is the oldest known Croatian translation of this popular medieval work, the most translated book in the world after the Bible.

Marulić's works synthesize classical achievements, the Bible and Christian teachings as well as the fruits of his home country's literary and linguistic tradition, suggesting how great a poet he was, departing from the Middle Ages to embrace the newly arisen humanistic thought and Western culture. Marulić was an advocate of Christian morality, who eagerly castigated church dignitaries whenever his admonishments were duly justified. Whilst absorbing knowledge from ancient sources and creating extraordinary works in Latin, he revered his mother tongue without fail. Quite like Dante, whom Marulić greatly admired and rightfully bears comparison with³.

Linguistic, Historical and Cultural Background of Marulić's *Judita* and *Judita* in the 21st Century

Marko Marulić is first and foremost an acknowledged Latin writer who rose to European prominence. The quite extensive Latin oeuvre earned him a reputation during his lifetime, making him a celebrated and respected author. When medieval spiritual values were in decline, in his Latin works Marulić propagated austere Christian

morality as the sole principle of human life, commonly espoused by similar Latin works in the Late Middle Ages. Owing to their clarity and persuasive reasoning his works were read widely across Europe, translated into many vernaculars and commended as a valuable read to Catholic worshippers. They were scholarly associated with the spiritual movement *Devotio Moderna* (Latin for “new piety”, lit. Modern Devotion), which emerged in the late fourteenth century in the Netherlands, spread to Germany and France shortly afterwards and finally reached Croatia from Italy.

The key religious features of the movement were spiritual simplicity and directness, practice of piety, examination of conscience, separation of piety and speculative theology, dogmatic sensitivity, mystical experience¹. No other book but *De imitatione Christi* [The Imitation of Christ] by Thomas Hemerken à Kempis was considered the classic work of the movement. Even though Pier Paolo Vergerio the Elder from Istria (1370-1444) was the first representative of the *Devotio Moderna* movement on Croatian soil, the fundamental traits of the movement were most lucidly postulated in the works by Marko Marulić⁷. Not only in his translation of Hemerken’s work but “also in his other works, both Latin and Croatian, Marulić promoted the ideas of the movement and became one of the exponents of the European lay spirituality programme in the period of humanism and a luminary of the Western spiritual renewal during the Catholic Restoration (the sixteenth/the seventeenth century)”⁷. Marulić practiced *Devotio Moderna* spiritual disciplines in his everyday personal life as well and was famous for his devotion and piety. The stories about his reckless youth, conversion and reclusive life at an older age are today largely unfounded⁸. He lived in very hard and uncertain times kindled by the enclosing conquests of the Ottoman Turks and the fear of their impending attack on his home city. *Judita* should be properly contextualized, i.e. scrutinized against such backdrop promoting Christian values and virtuous life in times filled with fear of destruction and uncertainty. According to its foreword, Marulić evokes a biblical story from the Old Testament, the story of Judith, a widow from Bethulia, who slew Holofernes to set the land of Israel free from peril, as a pretext for his original, untranslated literary work in Croatian “that those who knew no Italian or Latin books might understand it” (cf. English translation of *Judita* by Graham McMaster⁶). Prompted by the dire repercussions of the Ottoman onslaughts on Christian countries, Marulić ventured to spread the word that the conquerors could be defeated by displaying personal valour and resorting to divine intervention.

Judita is the cornerstone of Croatian artistic and literary authorship. It paints Marulić’s portrayal of completeness of the Croatian language and its preparedness to embrace the challenges and norms of the elevated humanistic style. *Judita* is very picturesque and provides realistic descriptions and scenes from life. It is recounted in double-rhymed dodecasyllabic verses that emulate an exceptional melodiousness. This epic poem impacted on

the later development of Croatian artistic poetry, both directly and indirectly. Marulić’s contemporaries evidently had great regard for this work as *Judita* was issued three times in his lifetime: the first edition (Venice, 1521) prepared for Split, the second (1522) for Dubrovnik, and the third (1523) for Zadar. All the three editions are remarkable and truly representative of the uniformity of older Croatian literature and the unity of language such literature was written in³.

The final verses of the epic herald the ground breaking significance *Judita* was to assume:

*Trudna toga plova ovdj jidra kala
plavca moja nova. Bogu budi hvala,
ki nebesa skova i svaka ostala.
(Umorna od te plovidbe moja nova lađa
ovdje spušta jedra. Neka bude hvala Bogu,
koji je stvorio nebesa i sve ostalo.)*

[Exhausted from its journey, this new boat of mine
Lowereth {lowers}^a now its sails: Praise be to God
Who crafted {created} the heavens and everything
else.]^b

Metaphorically, *Judita* is a boat, and the attribute ‘new’ suggests a departure from the Croatian poetic tradition of the time¹.

The language of Marulić’s Croatian works, including *Judita*, derives from the Chakavian vernacular of Split in the fifteenth and the sixteenth century. The Chakavian basis was reinforced with words from Church Slavonic, Dubrovnik vernacular and some general Shtokavian elements. More specifically, *Judita* is a Chakavian stylization of the early sixteenth literary language. Quite a lot of distinctive features of this language indicate linguistic responsiveness to the developments at the time, whereas some linguistic facts display literary qualities of older Croatian literature. Be that as it may but the language of *Judita* was an apple-of-discord in the light of the most recent amendments to the Croatian language curriculum for primary and secondary schools leaving *Judita* dismissed from the compulsory and complete reading list for secondary school with an argument that its language and style are extremely difficult, impenetrable, incomprehensible and very detached from contemporary young readers¹⁰. There are many reasons why this work should be on the list. *Judita* is the first epic written in Croatian and hence an important part of Croatian history, culture and identity, which earned its author the title of the father of Croatian literature. Besides, the personality of this biblical heroine could be extremely encouraging and invaluable for contemporary readers to look to. Judith is resolute, venturesome, emphatic, self-sacrificing, honest, brave, willing to face danger for community wellbeing, whilst simultaneously being simple and humble. She is the epitome of

^a This paper’s translator’s note and elsewhere below whenever denoted in curly brackets {}.

^b Cf. English translation of *Judita* edited by Henry R. Cooper Jr.⁹ and elsewhere below whenever denoted in square brackets [].

imperishable and desirable values, suggesting all the more reasons for which *Judita* could appeal to twenty-first century readers. To mark the five hundredth anniversary of its publication the Croatian Parliament declared 2021 the Year of Marko Marulić. For the occasion and to bring Marulić's masterpiece closer to current generations of readers, i.e. average Croatian language speakers, the Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics issued a modern Croatian adaptation of Marulić's *Judita*. This rendition was prepared to respond to the complaints "that *Judita* is unintelligible, barely penetrable without the help of a dictionary/glossary and a reader, and hence uninteresting and remote in the twenty-first century" and "to bring {*Judita*} back, metaphorically and literally, to a wider readership it was initially dedicated to 500 years ago" but also to foster better responsiveness of contemporary society to this work¹¹.

The Source Text vs. Modern Prose Adaptation/Translation

A group of researchers tasked with adapting Marulić's *Judita* to modern Croatian resolved to convert this epic poem to prose. Their main underpinning argument for preferring prose to recasting was the idea that this prose adaptation was not an alternative to Marulić's original, but should encourage reading and better understanding of his work, as vividly illustrated by citing Marulić's verses in the foreword to the modern version: ... *al kami, ki steći u zlato, zlatu da, // izvarsno svitleći, da zlato većma sja = ili drago kamenje koje svojim sjajem uz zlato pojačava i sjaj samoga zlata* [... or a precious stone, set in gold, which alloweth {allows} in the brilliance of its light, the gold to shine the more].

The term adaptation is not as marked as the term translation. Consequently, it is more appropriate in this particular case and precludes non-linguistically minded audiences from identifying this version with the prototypical or ubiquitous concept of translation. Such concept implies "replacing words of one language with words of another language while preserving the meaning intact"¹². However, in academia this kind of translation is known as intralingual translation, representing one of the three kinds of translation suggested by Roman Jakobson¹³ next to interlingual translation and intersemiotic translation. For obvious reasons, interlingual translation receives undivided scholarly attention, whereas the other two kinds of translation remain on the margins¹⁴. It is not surprising given that translation on the whole "has existed as a practice without theory"¹⁵. For Albachten, intralingual translation is "a cultural, historical, and political endeavor, going beyond the attempt to find equivalents for words, and thus needs to be analyzed with translational concepts"¹⁶. However, at the theoretical level, the position of the overall concept of intralingual translation within translation studies is sometimes called into question¹⁷.

According to Delabastita¹⁸, modern English versions of Shakespeare classics such as "Shakespeare Made Easy" may be regarded as a sort of intralingual translation, which is equally applicable to this rendition of Marulić's *Judita* as well. As a rule, the emergence of intralingual translations of important national literary works has historically sparked strong reactions. For instance, the Greek translation of the Gospels and the tragedy of Aeschylus performed in modern Greek precipitated riots in 1901 and 1903. Intralingual translation is particularly pertinent to Greece and available since 1526, when the first paraphrase of Homer's *Iliad* came out¹⁹. It is noteworthy to mention that the term adaptation is popular in translation studies too and commonly contrasted with translation: "Adaptation may be understood as a set of translative interventions which result in a text that is not generally accepted as a translation but is nevertheless recognized as representing a source text... Strictly speaking, the concept of adaptation requires recognition of translation as non-adaptation"²⁰. The exact meaning of the term adaptation is still vague, but nevertheless continues to be fairly widespread. On the one hand, in this particular case the term adaptation is arguably used on purpose as a euphemism for the term translation (i.e. intralingual translation) to avert the reader's aversion to the idea of a text translated from one language into the very same language, even more exacerbated by the fact that *Judita* was not only written in an old vernacular but also in a dialect strange to the basis of today's standard language. On the other hand, this modern prose version of *Judita* is obviously a result of applying different adaptation techniques. In that respect, this *Judita* truly is an adaptation in its own right as justly designated in the subtitle. In *Judita*'s case, adaptation techniques signify alterations of the source text to foster better communication between the old text and its contemporary readership. Admittedly, when defined so broadly, the modern *Judita* cannot be easily distinguished from the realm of translation. The controversy about adaptation and translation harks back to ancient times. Scholars cannot agree about the dividing line between translation and adaptation, and most commonly disagree about the extent to which the two remain faithful to the source text. Furthermore, some researchers believe that the concept of translation is general enough to embrace everything else otherwise subsumed under adaptation²⁰.

Intralingual translation emerges in response to a practical demand¹¹. Such, albeit extreme, example is intralingual subtitling provided for deaf and hard-of-hearing audiences on a regular basis²¹, in which case, normally, no question is asked about its legitimacy. It is usually taken for granted.

This prose adaptation is published side-by-side with the transcription of Marulić's original on the left, laid out in quatrains. The structure of the prose text replicates the quatrains, but not necessarily the order of lines in a quatrain, although the meaning of every line is conveyed entirely. To improve comprehension and to appeal to versatile reading audiences, the vocabulary contained within

this prose adaptation is unmarked. In other words, more neutral verb forms were preferred or, to be more specific, the aorist and the imperfect tense, and fairly often the gnomic (timeless) present, were largely replaced with the past tense. The participles were commonly paraphrased as subordinate or independent clauses. The adaptation of metaphors, idioms and collocations was especially demanding. Where such linguistic units were assumedly understandable to modern readers, they were substituted with their adequate modern counterparts. For instance, *postav rič u ustih mojih, // u sartcu razum prav, moć u rukah ovih* was adapted in the following way: *stavi riječi u moja usta, zdrav razum u srce i moć u ove ruke* [put thy {your} word on her lips, a right mind in her heart, strength in these hands]. The idiom *pod nogu postaviti* [put beneath] (in Latin *sub pede ponere* meaning ‘to be thought little of’) was conveyed with the Croatian idiom *baciti pod noge* (*da razlog pod nogu postavi nerazbor = ali nerazboritost baci razum pod noge* [so that sense might put senselessness {silliness} beneath it]). Sometimes it was necessary to provide a paraphrase or an explanation.

Marulić accounted for the struggles the reader might have with the meaning of some parts and for the very same reason incorporated his own explanations and comments in the text or on the margins (the so-called marginalia) to help the reader with some Latin words or names. In this rendition such parts were written in smaller italic typeface in relevant sections of the text. Occasionally, Marulić’s original comment needed to be paraphrased or additionally explained more concretely, e.g. the pronouns *ova, ovom* {she, her} in reference to Judith. In such cases, they were replaced with the name Judith to improve the reader’s understanding: *Da bi, di, ovu vidil, ali se ne bi boril, ali bi se vargal da ostavi nju, a pojde za ovom. (ovu, ovom = *Judita*; *Govori se da se Herkul ili ne bi bio borio ili da bi se bio odlučio ostaviti Dejaniru i poći za Juditom da ju je vidio*) {she, her = Judith} [This meanth {means}: had he seen Judith, either he would not have fought, or he would have resolved to leave Deanira and follow Judith].*

The example: *Toj rekši, izvi se iz vriće i vodom // po puti umi se i namaza vonjom* [That said, she undid the sackcloth and washed // her body all over with water, and anointed herself with oil] suggests that to grasp the meaning of Marulić’s verses, and older texts in general, the reader should know much more than merely seemingly familiar and everyday words that may actually allude to something else. More concretely, in the aforementioned context the words *vrića, put* and *umiti se* refer to *kostrijet, tijelo i oprati se / okupati se* [sackcloth, body and to wash, respectively], and *namazati vonjom* means ‘namirisati se, namazati se mirisnim mastima’ [to anoint {rub} oneself with oil]. As a result, the adapted verses were composed as follows: *Nakon što je to izrekla, svukla je sa sebe kostrijet, oprala tijelo vodom i namazala se mirisavom mašću* [That said, she undid the sackcloth and washed // her body all over with water, and anointed {rubbed} herself with oil].

The adaptation had no room for scholarly annotations and, consequently, the footnotes had to be eschewed. Nonetheless, from time to time some additions were inserted in the text regardless of the original to make its reading easier, as illustrated by the following example: *bludeći ozoja z družbom starih poet, // boge čtova koja = previše lutajući s družbom starih pjesnika, što je štovala poganske bogove* [in the misguided company of the poets of yore {of long ago}, who honoured {pagan} gods]. The adjective *poganske* {pagan} as a modifier renders the meaning more explicit, better elucidating the contrast between Christianity and ancient mythology emphasized in the invocation at the beginning of the epic.

Only now and then some explanations were provided within brackets to compensate for the lack of footnotes otherwise serving such purpose: *Devet biše božic i meju njimi Apolo s kitarom = Bilo je devet božica (muza), među kojima je bio Apolon s kitarom* [Nine in number were the gods {goddesses (Muses)} and among them Apollo with his lute]. Conjunctions were repeatedly inserted to neutralize and convert verses into prose: *tuj voli kasahu, tuj bravi potiču, // pastiri zvizdahu za njimi i viču. = volovi su kasali, ovnovi trčali, a pastiri za njima zviždali i vikali* [oxen went at a trot, rams scurried, the shepherds whistled and shouted at them].

Whenever possible, the adapters purposefully deployed a neutral word order (subject – predicate – object) to convey the meaning more adequately: *Grad veli Egbatan* (object) *sazida i sredi* (predicate) *kralj hvale pohvatan Arfažat* (subject) *od Medi = Slavohlepni Arfaksad* [Glory-seeking Arphaxad] {subject}, *kralj Medije, sazidao je i uredio* [who did reign o’er {over} the Medes, built round] {predicate} *velegrad Ekbatanu* [Ecbatane great walls of hewn stone] {object}].

Parts of speech were regularly interchanged: *a ne skup trikrat troj divička okola = a ne skup od triput po tri djevice u kolu* [not the thrice-three {three by three} choirs of maids] (*verbatim*: *a ne skup triput tri djevičanskoga kola* [and not the thrice-three {maiden} choirs]). In this particular case, literal translation would cloud the fact that the adjective *djevičanski* {maiden} signifies the composition of the choir. The meaning of the mathematical expression *skup triput tri* [thrice-three] and the genitive-structured *djevičanskoga kola* {maiden choir} is not clear, which is why the subjects and the number of subjects were expressed more explicitly.

The next example illustrates why a modification was inserted to explain that cedar was a type of tree used as a metonymy for Lebanon in the source text. The connection between Lebanon and the cedar tree cannot easily be discerned without a good command of specialized knowledge and needs to be made more explicit in the translation: *toj će harlo biti, Karmele i Libam, cedar = to će se uskoro dogoditi, Karmele i Libanone, koji si bogat stablima cedra* [and that quite soon, O Carmel and Lebanon, {dotted with} Cedar {trees}]. The abovementioned explication is also important because in this context Cedar used to be interpreted as a Syrian province²², which is completely inaccurate as many older texts frequently suggest that Lebanon should be collocated with cedar²³.

Some words were often omitted for conversion purposes, i.e. to transform the original epic into prose: *Svega naparčena tuj kola škripahu, // tuj noseć brimena kamil'je stupahu, // tuj voli kasahu, tuj bravi potiču* = *Kola napunjena svime tu su škripala, deve su stupale noseći teret, volovi su kasali, ovnovi trčali* [Loaded with all manner {kinds} of things, their carts creaked {here, hither}, their camels, bearing their burdens, moved on; oxen went at a trot, rams scurried, the shepherds whistled and shouted at them]. There was no need to repeat the original adverb in the translation.

The imperfect tense was avoided in this translation, which made the following example more demanding. Somehow the translation had to preserve the imperfective (continuous) aspect of an event in the past, which could not be expressed by the past simple tense. The meaning needed to be conveyed differently and compensated by laying a greater emphasis on the repetitive nature of the action: *Na zemlji padaše ptica sa visine // kad zavapijaše vojska iz dubine. = Ptice su padale na zemlju s visine kad god bi vojska zavikala iz dubine* [Birds fall {fell} to the ground from on high {the heights} when e'er {ever} the army letteth {let} loose with a shout]. The very same example is also a good illustration of a justifiable singular/plural replacement (*ptica* > *ptice*) [bird > birds] as the original singular evidently signified a synecdoche for rhyming purposes: *padaše* (third person singular) – *zavapijaše* (third person singular). The poetic style of the original text was once again rendered more neutrally.

Some words expectedly lacked adequate modern equivalents, and regularly had to be made less specific: *Suknje bihu svargli, župe pripasali* = *Sukli su halje, a gornji dio odjeće pripasali* [They had stripped off their garments {clothing}, girded {girdled} their shirts {upper clothes}]; *od zlata staoća sa strimi zlaćeni = pozlaćeni stremeni s donjim dijelom od zlata* [straps of gold with gilded stirrups {bottom part}]. In the former example *župa* is a special kind of long shirt or tunic, but the word *košulja* (“shirt” in English) would be too distinctive and inadequately transparent to denote the equivalent sixteenth century garment, which is why it was translated with a more abstract phrase *gornji dio odjeće* {upper clothes}. The latter example includes a very specific cavalry term *staoće*, i.e. a loop with a flat base to support the rider foot (translated in Croatian as *donji dio stremena* {bottom part of stirrups}). Even if it had a modern equivalent, it could not have been deployed in translation as only few readers would recognize it as such. The opposite examples, i.e. more specific translations of words, are rare. The translation of the noun *brav* as *ovan* [ram] is a good example. It is synonymous with a male livestock animal that can be found as a word nowadays, but perhaps too vague for younger urban generations. *Dika* {pride} is a very important word in *Ju-*

dita without an adequate modern equivalent. Today the meaning of the noun *dika* {pride} deviates considerably but not entirely from the meaning it was assigned by Marulić in his epic. He frequently employed the word *dika* in reference to great recognition and well-earned reputation, the meaning of which lies in the spectrum between, and coincides with, the nouns *čast* [honour] and *slava* [glory]. For lack of a better modern equivalent, the following strategy was adopted: *dika* was translated as a synonym of *slava* [glory] whenever deployed without *slava* [glory] in the same context, and of *čast* [honour] whenever denoted apart from the noun *čast* [honour].

Conclusion

To emphasize the significance of Marulić's *Judita* once more in this conclusion or to explain a clearly strong need for its modern translation, (from the point of view of this paper's authors) believed to have been shown in this paper, would be redundant. The conclusion will only dwell on the issue of a practically justified distinction between intralingual translation and interlingual translation as their theoretical justification should not and cannot be disputed. The third section outlines and describes a repertoire of translation/adaptation techniques by no means different from the conventional repertoire of similar techniques applied in interlingual translation, regardless of the fact that such techniques may be partially associated with the need to convert the original into prose. It conforms to the aforementioned position according to which as a rule intralingual translation and intersemiotic translation remain on the margins, which may well be one of the reasons why it is so. In this particular case the term intralingual translation only proved to be a neat theoretical construct that brings some clarity to the main characteristics and the relationship between the source and the target text, but not much more. Future research may attempt to provide more straightforward examples to determine whether some translation techniques would be more inherent in intralingual translation than in interlingual translation and vice versa.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to express their gratitude to Vanja Kulaš, Ph.D. and Željana Vučina Peh, M.A. from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, and Vladimir Bubrin, Ph.D., Toronto, whose kindness and responsive support were instrumental in detecting the whereabouts and consulting the English translations of *Judita* edited by Henry R. Cooper, Jr. and Graham McMaster.

REFERENCES

1. TOMASOVIĆ M, Marko Marulić Marul (Erasmus – Književni krug – Zavod za znanost o književnosti, Zagreb – Split, 1999). — 2. FISKOVIĆ C, Prilog životopisu Marka Marulića Pečenića. In: BABIĆ LJ, FISKOVIĆ C: Izabrana djela. Pet stoljeća hrvatske književnosti 124 (Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske, Zagreb, 1985). — 3. HORVAT M, Jezik Marulićeva djela Od naslidovan'ja Isukarstova i od pogarjen'ja taščin segasvitnjih. Doctoral thesis (Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb, 2005). — 4. MALINAR S, *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabensia*, 58 (2013) 63. — 5. MOROVIĆ H, Božičević Frano. In: Hrvatski biografski leksikon (Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, Zagreb, 2009 - 2020). — 6. FRANGEŠ I, Dike ter hvaljen'ja Marka Marulića. In: MARULIĆ, M: *Judita* (Književni krug, Split, 1989). — 7. ŠANJEK F, Dani Hvarškoga kazališta: Građa i rasprave o hrvatskoj književnosti i kazalištu 15/1 (1989) 63. — 8. McMASTER G, Most / The Bridge: A Journal of Croatian Literature The Journal of the Association of Croatian Writers, 1–4 (1999) 16. — 9. COOPER HR Jr. (Ed): *Judith* (East European Monographs – Columbia University Press, Boulder – New York, 1991). — 10. ANNEX TO THE CURRICULUM, List of suggested literary works for complete reading. In *Croat*. (Nacionalni kurikulum nastavnoga predmeta Hrvatski jezik, Prijedlog, Zagreb, 2016). — 11. BARBARIĆ VT, HORVAT M, JOZIĆ Ž, LEWIS K, PERIĆ GAVRANČIĆ S, ŠTRKALJ DESPOT K, *Judita* Marka Marulića: transkripcija i prilagodba na suvremeni hrvatski jezik (Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, Zagreb, 2021). — 12. BIRTIĆ M, BLAGUS BARTOLEC G, HUDEČEK L, JOJIĆ LJ, KOVAČEVIĆ B, LEWIS K, MATAS IVANKOVIĆ I, MIHALJEVIĆ M, MILOŠ I, RAMADANOVIĆ E, VIDOVIĆ D, *Školski rječnik hrvatskoga jezika* (Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje & Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 2012). — 13. JAKOBSON R, On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. In: BROWER RA (Ed): *On Translation* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1959). — 14. BAKER M, Introduction to the first edition. In: BAKER M, SALDANHA G (Eds): *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Second edition (Routledge, London – New York, 2009). — 15. WINDLE K, PYM A, European Thinking on Secular Translation. In: MALMKJÆR K, WINDLE K (Eds): *The Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2011). doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199239306.013.0002. — 16. ALBACHTEN ÖB, Intralingual Translation: Discussions within Translation Studies and the Case of Turkey. In: BERMAN S, PORTER C (Eds): *A Companion to Translation Studies* (Wiley Blackwell, Chichester, West Sussex, 2014). doi: 10.1002/9781118613504.ch43. — 17. KORNING ZETHSEN K, HILLMADSEN A, *Meta* 61/3 (2016) 692. doi: 10.7202/1039225ar. — 18. DELABASTITA D, Shakespeare. In: BAKER M, SALDANHA G (Eds): *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Second edition (Routledge, London – New York, 2009). — 19. CONNOLLY D, BACOPOULOU-HALLS A, Greek tradition. In: BAKER M, SALDANHA G (Eds): *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Second edition (Routledge, London – New York, 2009). — 20. BASTIN GL, Adaptation. In: BAKER M, SALDANHA G (Eds): *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Second edition (Routledge, London – New York, 2009). — 21. HILLMAN R, Spoken Word to Written Text: Subtitling. In: MALMKJÆR K, WINDLE K (Eds): *The Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2011). doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199239306.013.0026. — 22. MOGUŠ M, *Rječnik Marulićeve Judite* (Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, Zagreb, 2001). — 23. AKADEMIJIN RJEČNIK, *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika I–XXIII* (JAZU, Zagreb, 1880–1976).

V. T. Barbarić

Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics, Ulica Republike Austrije 16, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia
e-mail: vtbarbar@ihjj.hr

JUDITA U NOVOME RUHU: SUVREMENI PRIJEVOD PRVOGA HRVATSKOG KNJIŽEVNOUMJETNIČKOG DJELA

SAŽETAK

Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje 2021. godine, u povodu 500. obljetnice prvotiska *Judite* Marka Marulića, objavio je proznu prilagodbu toga znamenitog epa na suvremeni hrvatski jezik. Glavni je cilj ovoga članka na odabranim primjerima prikazati i objasniti postupke prilagodbe koji su bili nužni da bi se djelo s početka 16. stoljeća približilo što širem čitateljskom krugu te tako čitatelje različitih profila i obrazovanja potaknulo na čitanje Marulićeva izvornika. Članak se sastoji od triju temeljnih dijelova. U prvome se donose osnovne informacije o Marulićevu životu i djelu. U drugome se s povijesnojezičnoga i kulturološkoga motrišta analizira Marulićeva *Judita* te raspravlja o njezinoj ulozi u suvremenom društvu. U trećem poglavlju naglasak je na osobitostima njezine prozne prilagodbe i pretpostavljene recepcije čitatelja 21. stoljeća, a raspravlja se i o terminima unutarjezični prijevod i prilagodba. Zaključuje se da je na ovom konkretnom primjeru prevođenja pokazano da je unutarjezični prijevod i dalje važan teorijski konstrukt, ali da nije jasna njegova praktična korist.

