



Foreigner in One's Own Language^{*}

Models of Translating Modern Croatian Dialect Literature into the Standard Croatian Language

Stranci u vlastitom jeziku
Modeli prevođenja moderne hrvatske dijalektalne
književnosti na hrvatski standardni jezik

Mario Kolar

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5258-7179>

UNIVERSITY OF RIJEKA
mario.kolar@uniri.hr

Date of submission: 25.05.2021 | Date of acceptance: 3.09.2021

ABSTRACT | Since there are many differences between the standard Croatian language and the Croatian dialects (Čakavian, Kajkavian and Štokavian), Croatian literary works written in dialects usually include a glossary or otherwise try to bring their language closer to inodialect readers. This paper first reconstructs the models of translating modern Croatian dialect literature into the standard Croatian language and then analyses the advantages and disadvantages of each model.

KEYWORDS | modern Croatian dialect literature, literary translation

^{*} This article has been funded by the University of Rijeka project *uniri-mladi-hu-man-20-7*.

Introduction

The fact that Croatian literature does not only include works written in Croatian testifies to its history, but also to its modernity. It is sufficient to mention the rich tradition of Croatian Latinism¹ or Croatian Glagolitic writers who wrote in the Old Slavonic language² and there are, of course, works in Hungarian, German and in the languages of other nations with which Croats have shared their historical fate. The recent history also includes the so-called emigrant literature written in various foreign languages, especially during the second half of the 20th century (the communist regime).³ However, even if these and similar examples are not taken into consideration, drawing a parallel between Croatian literature and Croatian language still requires a more detailed explanation. One of the questions that arises is the definition of the Croatian language. Namely, not only have Croats called their language differently throughout history, but today this term actually refers to at least four language entities: the standard Croatian language and the Čakavian, Kajkavian and Štokavian dialects.⁴ In this sense, Croatian literature equally comprises works written in all the four language entities.

Although this phenomenon may appear self-evident, it is, unfortunately, ignored by Croatian literary history. Indeed, the term Croatian literature often means only literature written in the standard language. This is a consequence of historical processes in which the standard language took precedence over dialects. A major breakthrough in this direction occurred in the first half of the 19th century, when the Croatian writer and politician Ljudevit Gaj together with his supporters decided to linguistically and politically homogenize the contemporary Croatian territory.⁵ Namely, until the beginning of the 19th century,

- 1 Veljko Gortan and Vladimir Vratović, “Temeljne značajke hrvatskog latinizma,” in: *Hrvatski latinisti I / Croatici auctores qui latine scripserunt I*, eds. Veljko Gortan and Vladimir Vratović (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, Zora, 1969), 5—41.
- 2 Stjepan Damjanović, *Slovo iskona. Staroslavenska / starohrvatska čitanka*, second, extended edition (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2004).
- 3 Vinko Brešić, “Hrvatska emigrantska književnost (1945—1990),” *Croatica*, no. 45—46 (1997—1998): 247—271.
- 4 “Croatian language, as a full expressive potential of the Croatian speech community, exists in multiple layers: from organic local speech, the way it is used in local communities ‘at home’, through interdialects, urban and regional colloquial languages, various jargon and slang to the standard language.” Radoslav Katičić, *Hrvatski jezik* (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2013), 243. Here and afterwards, unless otherwise indicated, the translation of quotes from Croatian is mine (MK).
- 5 On integration processes through which the modern Croatian nation was created see: Nikša Stančić, *Hrvatska nacija i nacionalizam u 19. i 20. stoljeću* (Zagreb: Brabat, 2002).

Croatian literature and literacy developed in three literary languages: Čakavian, Kajkavian and Štokavian, which were based on organic idioms spoken in certain Croatian regions: Čakavian was mostly used in the west, partly on the coast and on the islands, Kajkavian was mostly spoken in the northwest, and Štokavian in the northeast and the southernmost region. Ljudevit Gaj and his supporters, however, decided to abolish the aforementioned trilingualism and advocated the creation of a supra-regional common language for the entire Croatian territory.⁶ This step was indeed inevitable, that is, it was a prerequisite for the creation of a modern Croatian nation. However, the way of establishing the national language merits some discussion. Indeed, only one language tradition was chosen as its basis — Štokavian, and only in one of its varieties (Ijekavian). Thus, instead of creating a common language on the basis of (at least partially) all three language traditions, one of the three became superior to the other. In accordance with these intentions, all forms of Čakavian and Kajkavian, as well as those Štokavian dialects that did not become the basis of the new national language, were gradually excluded from any public use. Although there were other proposals,⁷ Gaj's conception of language became generally accepted over time, and today's standard Croatian language is decisively influenced by Štokavian. Of course, Čakavian and Kajkavian, participated in its creation, but their share was negligible.

During the above-mentioned processes, referred to as the Croatian national revival, a rigid linguistic hierarchy was created, with the dominant standard language and Čakavian, Kajkavian and non-standard Štokavian having the status of less important, but also less valuable languages.⁸ The exclusive prestige of the standard language was the basis of some later language policies that aggressively excluded Čakavian, Kajkavian and non-standard Štokavian from any public use and created a narrative about their inferiority to the standard language (or even

6 According to Škiljan, Gaj and his supporters start from “complete and a priori identification of linguistic and national community, from determining their homogeneity and [...] from axiom according to which the language has always been a sacrosanct national symbol which permanently and in an immutable way marks both the national collective and each individual in it.” Dubravko Škiljan, *Govor nacije. Jezik, nacija, Hrvati* (Zagreb: Golden Marketing, 2002), 235.

7 For different suggestions for the development of the Croatian language until the end of the 19th century see: Zlatko Vince, *Putovima hrvatskoga književnog jezika. Lingvističko-kulturnopovijesni prikaz filoloških škola i njihovih izvora*, third, extended edition (Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske, 2002).

8 Just as Mićanović explains, standard languages often become symbols of nations, which serves as a source of their prestige over non-standard languages. This is exactly what happened to the Croatian language. Krešimir Mićanović, *Hrvatski s naglaskom. Standard i jezični varijeteti* (Zagreb: Disput, 2008), 9–29.

their uselessness), while, at the same time, denying not only their centuries-old tradition and importance in the history of Croatian literacy and culture, but also the fact that Croats never stopped using them, at least in private communication. That kind of narrative was supported especially by the so-called *hrvatski vukovci*, Croatian followers of Serbian linguist Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, who postulated that the only basis, as well as the upgrade of the Croatian standard language should be the Štokavian dialect,⁹ in order for the Croatian standard language to be as close as possible to Serbian, a fact connected to the later political goals.

The creation of a rigid hierarchical relationship between the standard language and the Čakavian, Kajkavian and Štokavian idioms was also reflected in literary output. Thus, from the middle of the 19th century until its end, there are almost no literary works in the dialects. This, however, changed considerably at the beginning of the 20th century, when two very prominent and influential Croatian writers of the time, Vladimir Nazor and Antun Gustav Matoš, published their poems in dialects.¹⁰ Soon, a growing number of poets began to write in dialects, including some of the most important ones, such as Tin Ujević and Miroslav Krleža, and following them, many others until this day.

The corpus of literary works written in Croatian dialects from the Croatian national revival until today is traditionally referred to as modern Croatian dialect literature (hereinafter: dialect literature). It suggests that post-revival Croatian literature consists of four linguistically differentiated sub-corpora: the standard language and Čakavian, Kajkavian and Štokavian dialects. At the same time, many writers write in standard language and some in the dialects, usually in their local one. In this sense, one could say that they are bilingual writers, that is, that Croatian literature is multilingual. Of course, the works of Croatian writers in foreign languages also contribute to its multilingualism.¹¹

9 More on standardization of the Croatian language in the 20th century in: Lada Badurina, "Standardizacijski procesi u 20. stoljeću," *Anagram*, January 3, 2011, <http://www.hrvatskiplus.org/article.php?id=1781>.

10 Matoš published his first Kajkavian poem "Hrastovački nokturno" [Hrastovac's nocturne] within his novella *Nekad bilo — sad se spominjalo* [Once upon a time — now a tale, 1900], and Nazor published his first Čakavian poem "Galiotova pesan" [Galley-Slave's Song] in his novella *Veli Jože* [The Giant Jože, 1912]. Here and afterwards, unless otherwise indicated, the translation of titles of literary works is mine (MK).

11 One of the most famous contemporary Croatian writers writing in foreign languages is Josip Novaković, who lived in the United States of America from the mid-70s till 2009 and nowadays lives in Canada and writes exclusively in English. He has published short story collections *Apricots from Chernobyl* (1995), *Yolk* (1995), *Salvation and Other Disasters* (1998), *Infidelities* (2005) and *Three Deaths* (2010), novels *April Fool's Day* (2004), *Heritage of Smoke* (2017) and others, as well as several

However, this is a problem that extends beyond the topic of this paper, so we will only look in more detail at the internal Croatian literary multilingualism. It should be noted that the dialect literature itself consists of works written in Croatian dialects, spoken by Croats outside Croatia (e.g., Croatian minority communities in Serbia, Austria, Italy, and Hungary).¹²

In Croatia, not only the standard language is used for communication, but also Čakavian, Kajkavian and Štokavian dialects, as well as various interdialects, sociolects, idiolects and other language forms that are not covered by this paper. As mentioned above, Croatian dialects are spoken across a restricted area, which means that Croatian native speakers have knowledge of only one dialect, that is, they usually speak or understand other dialects less well. This aspect must be taken into account when talking about dialect literature. Namely, Čakavians will certainly have difficulties in understanding the Kajkavian literary works and vice versa. However, since Čakavian, Kajkavian and Štokavian dialects have several subdialects and those have even more varieties along with their sometimes significant differences, difficulties in understanding may arise even among speakers of the same dialect. In this sense, as rough as it may sound, Croats cannot understand all Croatian literature, especially that written in dialects. In order to overcome the afore-mentioned literary multilingualism, that is, to facilitate readers' comprehension, dialect literary works are often accompanied by glossaries or other appendices that attempt to translate or explain words which the readers cannot understand. Sometimes literary works in dialect are also published with a parallel standard language version. So far, various models have appeared in Croatia by means of which dialect literary texts try to be linguistically closer to inodialect speakers. In this article, I will attempt to reconstruct which models are most commonly used, what principles are followed and what are the advantages and disadvantages of each.

essay books, memoirs and handbooks on writing fiction. Some of his works have been translated into Croatian: short story collections *Grimizne usne*, translated by Jadranka Pintarić and Ljiljana Šćurić, 2000, *Tri smrti i devet života*, translated by Saša Drach, 2020, *Truplo puno meda*, translated by Saša Drach, 2021; novels *Prvi aprila*, translated by Dinko Telečan, 2009, *Dimna zavjesa*, translated by Saša Drach, 2016.

12 The most comprehensive overview yet of the Croatian speech communities outside of Croatia in: Sanja Vulić, *Blago rasutih. Jezik Hrvata u dijaspori. Dio 1* (Split: Književni krug, 2021).

Translation Practices in the First Croatian Collection of Dialect Poems

I will first demonstrate how the language of dialect literature is brought closer to the widest possible readership by analysing the translation model of the first Croatian collection of dialect poems, *Z mojih bregov* [From My Hills] by Fran Galović, and then numerous other editions of dialect literature.

Galović's collection of poems *Z mojih bregov* was written in Kajkavian, more precisely in the Kajkavian dialect of Galović's native village Peteranec¹³ in north-western Croatia. As can be seen from the date given for the poems, Galović wrote them in 1913 and 1914, but since he died on the frontline during World War I in October 1914, he did not manage to publish or finish the collection — of the 30 poems planned, he wrote 22. The collection was first published posthumously in 1925 in the journal *Književna republika* [Literary Republic].¹⁴ In the meantime, two other poets published their collections of Kajkavian poems: Dragutin Domjanić, *Kipci i popevke* [Images and Poems, 1917] and Nikola Pavić, *Pozableno cvetje* [Forgotten Flowers, 1924], so Galović's collection was not the first to be published, but it was the first collection of poems in Kajkavian — and in fact in the dialect — considering the time when it was written. The editor of the journal *Književna republika* was Miroslav Krleža, who himself published his collection of Kajkavian poems *Balade Petrice Kerempuha* [The Ballads of Petrica Kerempuh] in 1936. The journal was printed at Vinko Vošicki's printing house in Koprivnica, a small town near Galović's hometown of Peteranec. As indicated in the notes accompanying Fran Galović's verses, the poems from the author's manuscript were prepared for publication by the writer and linguist Julije Benešić.¹⁵

The mentioned Notes also provide Benešić's brief comment on the characteristics of Galović's Kajkavian language, as well as a list of 29 Kajkavian words for which translations into the standard language and explanations are provided. According to Benešić, the translations and explanations were done in collaboration with Ivan M. Stanković "who in 1914 was chaplain in Peteranec, the birthplace of the late F. G."¹⁶ However, as can be seen from the explanation of some words, Benešić did not rely in his work only on the local chaplain, but, as a linguist, he also added explanations from old Kajkavian and other diction-

13 Mijo Lončarić, "Galovičeva i današnja peteranska kajkavština," *Rasprave. Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje*, no. 1 (1991): 47–63.

14 Fran Galović, "Z mojih bregov," *Književna republika*, no. 11–12 (1925): 479–502.

15 Galović, "Z mojih bregov," 503.

16 Galović, "Z mojih bregov," 503.

aries (although the possibility that Stanković himself added the explanations cannot be excluded). As for the reasons why he decided to compile a glossary, Benešić only briefly states that he brings translations and explanations “of words unknown to the Štokavians.”¹⁷

The collection *Z mojih bregov* was first published in book form in the second volume of Galović's collected poems, also prepared by Benešić.¹⁸ The poems in this edition are accompanied by Benešić's Note on Galović's language and the translations and explanations of Kajkavian words, where in this edition there are ten more than in the Note published in the journal *Književna republika*. Along with the poems, Benešić includes the same Note with the same number of translated Kajkavian words in the tenth volume of Galović's collected works from 1943.¹⁹ The next edition of the poetry collection, at the same time the first book edition, was prepared in 1948 by Dragutin Tadijanović.²⁰ Together with the poems, a note about Galović and his poetry was published, in which Benešić's Note about the language of Galović's Kajkavian poems was adopted (quoted) in its entirety, as well as the list and explanations of Kajkavian words “unknown to Štokavians.”²¹ Benešić's list and translations/explanations of Kajkavian words were also added in the next two editions of Galović's selected works, that prepared by Nada Pavičić-Spalatin²² and that by Milivoj Solar,²³ as well as in some much later editions.²⁴

A selection from Galović's works, prepared for the edition *Pet stoljeća hrvatske književnosti* [Five Centuries of Croatian Literature] by Šime Vučetić,²⁵ was the first to exclude Benešić's glossary and to bring a significantly larger number of translated or explained Kajkavian words. In the glossary at the end of

17 Galović, “Z mojih bregov,” 503.

18 Fran Galović, *Pjesme*, 2, ed. Julije Benešić (Zagreb: Binoza, 1940).

19 Fran Galović, *Pjesme II*, ed. Julije Benešić (Zagreb: Hrvatski izdavački zavod, 1943), 290–292.

20 Fran Galović, *Z mojih bregov*, ed. Dragutin Tadijanović (Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Hrvatske, 1948).

21 Galović, *Z mojih bregov*, ed. Dragutin Tadijanović, 55–56.

22 Fran Galović, *Poezija i proza*, ed. Nada Pavičić-Spalatin (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1963), 41–42.

23 Fran Galović, *Lirika, pripovijetke, drame, kritika*, ed. Milivoj Solar (Zagreb: Znanje, 1966), 295.

24 Fran Galović, *Izabrane pjesme*, ed. Milivoj Solar (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1997), 111–112; Fran Galović, *Izbor iz djela*, ed. Mladen Kuzmanović (Vinkovci: Riječ, 1999), 55–56; Fran Galović, *Z mojih bregov*, ed. Milivoj Solar (Koprivnica: Matica hrvatska, 2002), 66–67.

25 Fran Galović, “Pjesme i poeme; proza,” in Julije Benešić, Fran Galović, Milan Vrbanić, *Izbor iz djela*, ed. Šime Vučetić (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, Zora, 1969), 111–376.

the book, its editor, Croatian linguist and translator Bratoljub Klaić, selected about two hundred Kajkavian words from Galović's collection of poems, for which he provides translations and explanations,²⁶ a significant increase over earlier glossaries, which included about forty words. A somewhat different Kajkavian-standard language glossary is presented in a new edition of Galović's selected works, prepared for the edition entitled *Stoljeća hrvatske književnosti* [Centuries of Croatian Literature] by Joža Skok,²⁷ who is also the author of the accompanying glossary. In the Note to the edition, Skok first states that the glossary has "removed many unreliable explanations so far" and is "supplemented by explanations of a number of previously unregistered Kajkavian words, upon consultation with previously published volumes of the Kajkavian dictionary and experts on the Kajkavian dialect, and also upon a personal verification of the language of Galović's locals."²⁸ Skok's glossary contains some words that Klaić's glossary does not, but also some that Klaić's does. Furthermore, Skok translates or explains certain words differently than Klaić. However, it contains almost the same number of words as Klaić's glossary. A larger number of Kajkavian words, and, at the same time, the largest number of translated and explained Kajkavian words from Galović's poetry collection can be found in the first volume of the new edition of Galović's collected works prepared by Milivoj Solar and Božidar Petrač.²⁹ The glossary of Kajkavian poems for this edition was compiled by linguist Mijo Lončarić, who provides translations and explanation for nearly 300 Kajkavian words.³⁰ As can be seen, the number of translated or explained Kajkavian words from Galović's poetry collection ranged from Benešić's 30 words to almost ten times more in Lončarić's glossary.

However, Galović's collection of Kajkavian poems was also published with other types of appendices that sought to bring his language closer to the readers. Thus, in the independent edition of the collection *Z mojih bregov*, prepared by Božica Jelušić,³¹ translations of single Kajkavian words are provided for the first time next to the poems themselves, rather than collectively in the glossary at the end of the book. At the same time, translations of about forty words are included, mainly those translated by Benešić, although some new ones have

26 Bogoljub K. [Klaić], "Rječnik," in Benešić, Galović, Vrbanić, *Izbor iz djela*, 493—515.

27 Fran Galović, *Izabrana djela*, ed. Joža Skok (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1997).

28 Joža S. [Skok], 1997: "Napomena," in Fran Galović, *Izabrana djela*, ed. Joža Skok (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1997), 403.

29 Fran Galović, *Pjesme*, eds. Milivoj Solar, Božidar Petrač (Koprivnica: Ogranak Matice hrvatske, 2005).

30 Mijo Lončarić, "Rječnik kajkavskih pjesama," in Galović, *Pjesme*, 402—411.

31 Fran Galović, "*Z mojih bregov...*," ed. Božica Jelušić (Bjelovar: Prosvjeta, 1990).

been added. This model of providing translations of single Kajkavian words right next to the poems is immediately followed by some of the later editions.³² Still, it should be mentioned that some editions of Galović's Kajkavian collection do not contain a glossary or other appendices where the Kajkavian words would be translated or explained.³³

Looking at the main editions of Galović's collection of Kajkavian poems *Z mojih bregov* so far, one can see that some editions contain a complete glossary at the end of the edition, whereas in other editions translations of single words are provided next to the poems, and in some there are no translations or explanations at all. The practice is, therefore, very different. Moreover, there are also significant differences within the same model. Thus, companion glossaries at the end of the book contain not only different numbers of words (from 30 to almost 300), but also different words and translate or explain the same words in different ways. The same is true for the model according to which presumably unknown Kajkavian words are listed next to the poems.

Translation Practices in Different Editions of Dialect Literature

The two mentioned models of translating dialect words dominate in other editions of dialect literature as well, not only in editions of a single author's works — the anthologies of Čakavian and Kajkavian literature have so far most frequently used these two models. Thus, the first two anthologies of Kajkavian poetry, those by Nikola N. Bačić³⁴ and Nikola Pavić,³⁵ contain a complete glossary at the end of the book, while the third, that by Mladen Kuzmanović,³⁶ provides the translations of some words right next to the poem. The most prolific Kajkavian anthologist, Joža Skok, opted for a companion glossary in both his anthologies

32 Fran Galović, "*Z mojih bregov...*" i druge pjesme, ed. Vjekoslav Prvčić (Koprivnica: Mali Princ, 2002); Fran Galović, *Zaboravljeni perivoj*, ed. Božica Jelušić (Vinkovci: Riječ, 2007).

33 Fran Galović, *Z mojih bregov. Izbor poezije i proze*, ed. Vjekoslav Prvčić (Koprivnica: Mali Princ, 1994); Fran Galović, *Zeleni oblak*, ed. Mladen Kuzmanović (Zagreb: Mozaik knjiga, 2000).

34 Nikola N. Bačić, *Antologija nove hrvatske kajkavske lirike* (Sisak, Naklada knjižare S. Jünker-a, 1937), 119–121.

35 Nikola Pavić, ed., *Antologija novije kajkavske lirike* (Zagreb: Lykos: 1958), 135–143.

36 Mladen Kuzmanović, ed., "Antologija novije kajkavske lirike," *Kaj*, no. 3–5 (1975).

of Kajkavian poetry,³⁷ and in his anthologies of Kajkavian drama³⁸ and prose.³⁹ The anthologies of Čakavian poetry, from the first ones prepared by Hijacint Petris and Ive Jelenović⁴⁰ to the more recent ones (Ivo Jelenović,⁴¹ Zvane Črnja and Ivo Mihovilović,⁴² Milorad Stojević,⁴³ Antun Milovan⁴⁴) translations of certain dialect words are listed next to the poems.

Volumes of selected or collected poems in dialects by other authors also practise various ways of (not) translating. There is a glossary at the end of the book of selected Čakavian (and other) poems by Drago Štambuk *Kad su miši balali molfrinu* [When Mice Danced Molfrina, 2017] as well as in the collection of selected Kajkavian (and other) poems by Ivan Golub *Pohod milosti* [Visit by the Mercy, 2013], while the book of selected Kajkavian poems by Ernest Fišer, *Macbeth na fajruntu* [Macbeth at Closing Time, 2013], contains the translation of certain Kajkavian words underneath each poem. It should be noted that some editions of selected dialect poems do not contain added glossaries. For example, selected Čakavian poems by Milorad Stojević *Novelline o soldatu i sto ruž* [Novellas about a Soldier and a Hundred Roses, 2005]⁴⁵ and selected Kajkavian poems by Zvonko Kovač *Vrnul se buom* [I'll be Back, 2001].⁴⁶

- 37 Joža Skok, ed., "Ogenj reči. Antologija hrvatskoga kajkavskog pjesništva," *Kaj*, no. 4–6 (1986): 282–299; Joža Skok, ed., *Rieči sa zviranjka. Antologija moderne kajkavske lirike 20. stoljeća* (Zagreb: Tipex, 1999), 383–446.
- 38 Joža Skok, ed., "Ogerličići reči. Antologija hrvatske kajkavske drame," *Kaj*, no. 1–4 (1990): 315.
- 39 Joža Skok, ed., "Roužnik rieči. Antologija hrvatske kajkavske proze," *Kaj*, no. 1–3 (1999): 299–327.
- 40 Ive Jelenović and Hijacint Petris, eds., *Antologija nove čakavske lirike* (Zagreb: Zagrebačka Privredna štamparija, 1934); Ive Jelenović and Hijacint Petris, eds., *Antologija nove čakavske lirike*, second, extended edition (Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Hrvatske, 1947).
- 41 Ive Jelenović, ed., *Nova čakavska lirika* (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1961).
- 42 Zvane Črnja and Ive Mihovilović, ed., *Korablja začinjavaca u versih hrvatski složena mnogim cvitjem opkićena po zakonu dobrih poet* (Rijeka: Sabor čakavskog pjesništva, 1969).
- 43 Milorad Stojević, *Čakavsko pjesništvo XX. stoljeća. Antologija, studija* (Rijeka: Izdavački centar Rijeka, 1987); Milorad Stojević, ed., 2007: *Čakavsko pjesništvo XX. stoljeća. [Tusculum antologija]*, second, extended edition (Pula: Istarski ogranak Društva hrvatskih književnika, 2007).
- 44 Antun Milovan, ed., *Zlatna lira čakavska. Antologija čakavske umjetničke lirike od Marulića do Črnje* (Žminj: Čakavski sabor, 1998).
- 45 It is notable that some of Stojević's previous collections of Čakavian poetry did contain a glossary of Čakavian words (e.g., the collection *Rime amorose* [Love Poems, 1984]).
- 46 Some Kajkavian poems in that collection are actually translated into the standard language in full, and there are also different linguistic parallelisms present, which will be covered in more detail in later chapters.

As for the dialect prose, the companion dictionary at the end of the book is actually almost the only solution, since explaining words on the page where they occur would take up too much space. Such a dictionary at the end of the book is present in, for example, Kajkavian novels by Željko Funda *Ljudeki* [People, 2004], Denis Peričić *Netopir i Črni ljudi* [The Bat and the Black People, 2009] and Marko Gregur *Kak je zgorel presvetli Trombetassicz* [Bonfire of the Illustrious Trombetassicz, 2017], while some dialect novels do not contain any added dictionaries (e.g., the Kajkavian novel by Pero Budak *I norija je meštija* [Even Craziness is a Skill, 1994]. It is interesting that sometimes the same authors practise different methods in their works when it comes to translating dialect words. An example for that is currently the most popular Croatian novelist Kristian Novak, whose last two novels contain parts written in Kajkavian dialect. In the first one, *Črna mati zemla* (2013) [Dark Mother Earth, translated by Ellen Elias-Bursac, 2020], the author gives a collective glossary of Kajkavian words at the end of the book, while the second novel, *Ciganin, ali najljepši* [Gypsy, yet so Handsome, 2016], does not contain any added dictionaries. In books consisting of several shorter works of prose, instead of a companion glossary at the end of a book, a glossary appended to each text is also possible, as exemplified by the collection of Kajkavian short stories *Život večni* [Eternal Life, 2017] by Božica Brkan. Some books of short dialect prose do not contain any dictionary additions (e.g., the short story collection by Denis Peričić *Techno gost* [Techno Guest, 2016]).

The process of creating dictionaries and glossaries is also interesting. With regard to dialect anthologies, most anthologists have entrusted the work of translating dialect words to linguists. For example, linguist Stjepko Težak made the translations for the aforementioned Skok's anthologies of Kajkavian poetry and linguist Iva Lukežić for Stojević's anthology of Čakavian poetry. The situation is similar with the editions of a single author's works. As mentioned above, the glossary for the latest edition of Galović's collection of Kajkavian poetry *Z mojih bregov* was compiled by Lončarić⁴⁷ and the glossary of dialect words for *Izabrana djela* [Selected Works] of Nikola Pavić, Mate Balota, Pero Ljubić and Drago Gervais⁴⁸ was compiled by the Klaić. However, even editors or authors themselves made translations and explanations of dialect words for individual editions. The most famous example of the compilation of a glossary by an author himself is the aforementioned Krleža's Kajkavian poetry collection *Balade Petrice Kerempula* (1936). Krleža decided to compile a comprehensive

47 Lončarić, "Rječnik kajkavskih pjesama," 402–411.

48 Nikola Pavić and Mate Balota, Pere Ljubić, Drago Gervais, *Izabrana djela*, ed. Marin Franičević (Zagreb: Zora, Matica hrvatska, 1973).

glossary and interpretation of his collection because its language is very specific — in addition to numerous archaic words from the old Kajkavian literary tradition, it also contains many of Krleža's neologisms.⁴⁹ However, the fact that Mladen Kuzmanović later prepared an additional, even more extensive, glossary with explanations⁵⁰ shows how complex Krleža's language is.

In addition to the examples mentioned so far, there are other ways of bringing dialect literary works linguistically closer to readers who do not know the dialect in which the work was written. For example, next to some Kajkavian words in the poetry collection *Sijač radosti* [A Sower of Joy, 2012] by Ivan Golub, footnotes containing their translation and/or explanation into the standard language were added. Unlike the model according to which the assumed unknown dialect words are translated and explained upon their occurrence in the poem (usually below it), in this case the footnotes are used to give extra information on words in the poem itself.

One of the ways to linguistically introduce dialectal works to inodialectal readers is to translate the entire dialect work (usually single poems) into the standard language. One of the first such examples was Ujević's poem "Oproštaj" [Farewell] from the anthology *Hrvatska mlada lirika* [Croatian Young Poets, 1914], which, due to the archaic Čakavian language in which it was originally written, is often published together with its translation into the modern standard language.⁵¹ Recently, a translation of the entire collection of Kajkavian poems *Balade Petrice Kerempuha* by Miroslav Krleža into the standard language was published, the work of Milovan Antun Tomić.⁵² As an example of a complete translation of contemporary dialect poetry, we can cite single books from the series *Biblioteka Kaj & ča: susreti* [Publication series Kaj & Ča: Encounters] by the publisher Kajkavsko Spravišće (Kajkavian Assembly) from Zagreb. This series brings in the same book the poems of one Kajkavian and one Čakavian poet, whereas in some editions the dialect poems are completely translated into the standard language. An example of such an edition is the poetry collection *Manutekstura* [Manual Texturing, 2006], where the Kajkavian poetry cycle by Božica Pažur and the Čakavian by Daniel Načinović are printed in parallel-text format with their translations into the standard language. The same applies to the Kajkavian cycle of prose poems by Ivo Kalinski and the Čakavian poem

49 Josip Vončina, *Korijeni Krležina Kerempuha* (Zagreb: Naprijed, 1991).

50 Mladen Kuzmanović, *Rječnik i komentar Balada Petrice Kerempuha Miroslava Krleže* (Zagreb: Liber, 1972).

51 Tin Ujević, *Pjesme i pjesničke proze*, ed. Šime Vučetić (Zagreb: Zora, Matica hrvatska, 1970), 83.

52 Miroslav Krleža, *Balade Petrice Kerempuha*, trans. [from Štokavian] Milovan Antun Tomić (Split: HKD Napredak, 2006).

cycle by Vladimir Pernić in the joint book called *Cicirici & senjali* [Chanticleer & Signs, 2007]. Standard language translations are given in a smaller font size and without line breaks splitting the verses into a new line below the original dialect text of the poem, indicating their subordination to dialect originals.

In Zvonko Kovač's aforementioned collection of poems *Vrnul se buom* [I'll be Back, 2001] we find a somewhat different parallelism established between a dialect and the standard language. Namely, in the last cycle of this collection, which has the significant double title *Vrnul se buom / Vratit ću se*, all poems marked with numbers from one to eight are listed in parallel dialect and standard language versions, having the same graphic layout. Therefore, none of the versions is subordinated by graphic design to the other, that is, both versions are treated equally. This makes it difficult to determine which is the original and which is the translation. It may be assumed that the author intentionally creates a dialect-standard linguistic parallelism, so that both versions indeed may be considered original. Such a conclusion is also suggested by the fact that throughout the cycle, the first and the second versions of the poem are alternated — the first poem in the cycle is first given in the standard language and then in the Kajkavian version, the second is given first in the Kajkavian and then in the standard language version, and so on. Through such an approach, Kovač probably wants to point out that both languages are the same, that is, equally his own. In this sense, it is not a matter of translating from one variety to another, but of writing in both varieties, dialect and standard, thus we cannot consider it as one of the models for translating dialectal poetry.

Finally, also worth mentioning is an authentic way of bringing dialectal poetry linguistically closer to inodialectal readers, which can be found in the award-winning Čakavian poetry collection *Smiljko i ja si mahnemo* [Smiljko and I, Waving to Each Other, 2020] by Evelina Rudan. In this collection, a list of Čakavian words is given below each poem. The words are not, in most cases, translated literally that is, word-for-word, (e.g., *karijola* (Čakavian) — *tačke* (standard Croatian word for a wheel-barrow)), but instead descriptive, subjective and creative translations are given, which become an indispensable part of the poem. Here is an example of how the author translates the Čakavian verb *zapasan*: "I walk past someone or something until I disappear from the other person's view (a nice verb, it has already appeared, it includes both the perspective of the passerby and the observer, as well as the passerby's feelings about the observer's perspective, the observer can also be a tree, so personifications are also included)."⁵³ In the glossaries provided below the poems, there are often

53 Evelina Rudan, *Smiljko i ja si mahnemo. Balada na mahove* (Zaprešić: Fraktura, 2020), 101.

explanations of certain toponyms and even of the subjects that appear in the poems. For example, expressions: “*na stancijah, na picelovemu, na boškici, na haluzovih parti*” — “all microtoponyms, the first is the best place to sleep, in the second hay smells the best, the third provides deep shade, in the fourth strawberries taste the best”). Or for example the word “*galjarda* — Galjarda, the name of a beautiful, patient and clever cow, white milk cow.”⁵⁴ Such explanations go beyond the usual function of dialect-standard translation manuals and actually become an integral part of poems. This is an innovative process that this book introduces not only to models of translating dialectal literature into the standard language, but also into dialectal literature in general.

Summary: Basic Models for Translating Dialect Literature into the Standard Language.

Two basic approaches of bringing dialect closer to inodialect readers can be discerned in the current practice of publishing Croatian dialect literature: (1) translating an entire dialect literary work into the standard language or (2) translating only individual dialect words.

Complete translations of dialect literary works

The advantage of translating a complete dialect literary work into the standard language is that it thus becomes fully linguistically comprehensible to all Croatian speakers. However, such an approach also has some disadvantages. First, editions that would contain a full translation of a literary work in dialect would have twice the length of the original publication. This is not so pronounced in the case of poetry publishing, especially when the number of poems is small and their length short. In plays and novels, however, the question of length is crucial. The second problem is even more significant and concerns the fact that a full translation is usually not needed. Namely, the standard language and dialects are not completely different languages, that is, there are not so many differences between them as between Croatian and a foreign language (except for closely related languages such as Serbian, Bosnian and Montenegrin). In other words, there are many similarities between the standard Croatian lan-

⁵⁴ Rudan, *Smiljko i ja si mahnemo*, 22.

guage and Croatian dialects. Moreover, both the standard language and dialects share a portion of the vocabularies, so it is not necessary to translate all the words from a literary work in dialect, but only those which differ between the two given language systems.

Additionally, a third aspect should be taken into account. By translating literary works from one language to another (and thus from a dialect to a standard language), the original may lose many characteristics. This is especially evident in poetry, where in the translated version it is often impossible to achieve the same transfer of meaning, as well as rhythmic, melodic, or similar effects that the original may possess.⁵⁵ Milivoj Solar has clearly shown this to be the case in Galović's Kajkavian poems⁵⁶ and Joško Božanić on the example of his Čakavian poems. He demonstrated that certain Čakavian words, such as those associated with the ancient Mediterranean maritime culture, cannot be translated into the standard language, as they have no synonyms in this system.⁵⁷

In view of all this, we can agree with Jože Skok's opinion that much more is lost than gained when translating complete works from a dialect into the standard language, and that it is therefore better to translate only those words that differ significantly in these two language systems.⁵⁸ This leads neither to the loss of semantic nuances, nor, in the case of poetry, to the loss of rhythmic-melodic effects (in those poems where they are present, of course). However, this does not imply that dialectal works cannot or must not be translated into foreign languages (and vice versa). Admittedly, this will cause various losses, but they are simply unavoidable, that is, they will be neither bigger nor smaller than those that occur in any other translation. So, if we are ready for such a compromise when translating from the standard Croatian language into a foreign language, we must be ready for it when translating from Croatian dialects into a foreign language.

55 "That has inspired a popular discourse of poetry translation as loss. Some lament the loss of source-text reproduction, as in Lefevere's view that most poetry translations 'are unsatisfactory renderings of the source text' because they fail to capture its totality [...] Others lament the loss of target-text quality, as in Robert Frost's reputed saying that 'poetry is what is lost in translation.'" Francis R. Jones, "The Translation of Poetry," in *The Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies*, ed. Kirsten Malmkjær and Kevin Windle (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), <https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199239306.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199239306-e-013>.

56 Milivoj Solar, 2010: "Galovićevo književno djelo," in Fran Galović, *Prilozi*, eds. Milivoj Solar, Božidar Petrač (Koprivnica: Ogranak Matice hrvatske, 2010), 51.

57 Joško Božanić, *Vernakularna stilistika* (Split: Književni krug, Filozofski fakultet, Katedra Čakavskog sabora, 2019), 232.

58 Joža Skok, *Kajkavski kontekst hrvatske književnosti* (Čakovec, Zagreb: "Zrinski," Zavod za znanost o književnosti Filozofskog fakulteta, 1985).

Translating single dialect words only

Two models are possible when translating single words from dialect into the standard language. The first, the oldest, and, the most widely used model is to organise selected dialect words into a companion glossary at the end of the edition. The second model consists of listing translations of single dialect words on the page where they appear. In the case of poetry, these translations are usually given directly below the poem and there are examples of single dialect words marked with a footnote in the poem itself. The main advantage of such an approach is that readers do not have to turn pages to find a glossary at the end of the book, and they do not have to search for the word in question in the glossary. However, the disadvantage of such a model is not only that those who know all the words in the poem may be bothered by these translations, especially when footnotes are used, but also that the same words may be repeated several times throughout the book, and consequently must be translated every time they occur. This is avoided when compiling a companion glossary, since the words are listed only once.

In addition to the advantages and disadvantages listed, both models raise some other points which require consideration. As for the companion glossary at the end of the book, the question arises whether the words should be listed in the order of their occurrence in the book or alphabetically. There might also be the question of how the words should be cited — in the grammatical form in which they appear in the work itself, or in their basic grammatical form? Perhaps both forms should be given — for example, first the word in the form in which it is found in the work, and then its basic form. If dialect words are cited in a companion glossary in the form in which they occur in the work itself, we may also ask whether they should be translated together with the context in which they occur (if they are part of a syntagm or other multi-word expression). Such a practice would be unusual for glossaries, but then again quite natural when citing the words upon their occurrence in the work itself. If we, however, list the words in a companion glossary in their basic form, we might ask whether they should be listed according to a dictionary standard, or is it sufficient to give only a dialect word and its translation without the usual information given in a dictionary. As for the translation itself, the question can be raised whether only a simple, short translation should be given or a broader explanation — this also raises the question whether the task of compilation of glossaries should be entrusted to specialists — linguists, or at least linguistically trained editors.

However, the most important issue related to both models of the second approach to translating dialect literature into a standard language, that is, one of translating only single dialect words, concerns the selection of the words to

be translated. Namely, how an author, editor, publisher or any other person responsible for translation can know which dialect words need to be translated and which do not? What criterion is used to determine this? Mindful of the speaker of the same dialect in which the work was written, one would probably translate smaller number of words: archaic, those limited only to a particular locality, and neologisms created by the author. If, on the other hand, one has an inodialect reader in mind, one should obviously translate more words. But here, too, the question arises as to how many and which words should be taken into account. We can also rephrase the question: which dialect words (that are not identical to those in the standard language) can with certainty be assumed to be known by all Croatian speakers? The dramatic nature of this question is evident from the examples of the aforementioned dialect-standard glossaries in Galović's Kajkavian poetry collection *Z mojih bregov*, where the number of translated words varies from thirty to almost ten times as many.

An even better example are the two editions of the anthology of Čakavian poetry, prepared by Milorad Stojević. It is understandable that the number of translated words varies in the editions of Galović's collection, since these editions were prepared by different editors, and the time span between the first (1925) and the latest edition (2005) is quite long. In contrast, the time span between both editions of Stojević's anthology is not that long (1987—2007), and for both editions the glossary was prepared by the same person, Iva Lukežić. How Lukežić changed her translation approach can be illustrated by one of the first modern Čakavian poems, *Galiotova pesan* [Galley-Slave's Song] by Vladimir Nazor. In the first edition of Stojević's anthology, Lukežić chose nine Čakavian words from the poem for translation, in the second three times more. The same applies for most of the poems repeated in both anthologies. In the note on accentuation and interpretation of texts at the end of the anthology, Lukežić herself admits that she translated too few dialect words in the first edition and later considered this a "weak point" of the anthology.⁵⁹ Therefore, Lukežić offers "as a new quality" of the second edition "Croatian-Croatian translations [...] of each word in the text that differs from the standard Croatian in phonological elements (at least in one) and/or morphologically (even minimally) and/or semantically. Apart from that, explanations are given for words in contexts (including syntagmatic combinations, sentences, and phrases) in addition to explanations of single words. I do all this in the hope that, with this kind of professional help, the reader will be able [...] to better navigate the poetic waters and deal with

59 Iva Lukežić, "Napomene o akcentuiranju i tumačenju tekstova," in *Čakavsko pjesništvo XX. stoljeća*, 389.

poetic adventures.”⁶⁰ This approach was chosen by Mladen Kuzmanović in the translation of Krleža’s Kajkavian *Ballads* — “to explain everything, or almost everything that deviates from the norm of standard literary language.”⁶¹ The approach proposed by Lukežić and Kuzmanović seems to be the most appropriate answer to the questions posed so far.

Conclusion

As can be seen from the discussion above, some dialectal works are fully translated into the standard language, some are only partially translated (only certain words and expressions), and some are not translated at all.

Authors, editors, or publishers of the dialectal works which do not include translation appendices obviously believe that everyone can understand the language of their works, or assume that readers will consult some of the dialect-standard dictionaries available in order to translate the unknown words. However, both assumptions appear to rest on shaky grounds — most Croatian speakers have full knowledge of only one (mother tongue) dialect, and it is not realistic to expect inodialect readers to fully understand a literary work written in dialect. Therefore, we can say that dialect editions that do not contain glossaries tacitly agree to the limited reception only among speakers of the dialect in which the work was written. The second assumption also has no realistic basis. Firstly, it is possible that there is no dictionary at all for the dialect in which the work is written, and secondly, even if it exists, most readers usually do not use dictionaries while reading, so they may discard the work. The result, therefore, will again be a very limited reception among the readership.

In the case of dialect editions that try to bring their language closer to inodialect readers, each of the possible models also has advantages and disadvantages. Thus, on the one hand, the translation of a dialectal work in its entirety contributes to its absolute comprehensibility; on the other hand, the original may unnecessarily lose many important features (semantic nuances, rhythmic-melodic features, etc.). The disadvantage of such an approach is that certain dialect words and expressions cannot even be adequately translated into a standard language. Therefore, translation of only certain dialect words and expressions is a more appropriate model. It turns out to be a better solution to give translations of single words and expressions on the same page where

60 Lukežić, “Napomene o akcentuiranju i tumačenju tekstova,” 389—390.

61 Kuzmanović, *Rječnik i komentar Balada Petrice Kerempuha*, 14.

the words occur, rather than to create a companion glossary at the end of the volume. In addition, words may be cited in the form in which they appear in the text itself, including a narrower or broader context, which is not convenient in a companion glossary. However, this is possible only in poems, shorter prose, and dramatic works, whereas longer literary works are condemned to a companion glossary at the end of the issue.

At the same time, there remains a crucial question we have to answer adequately — how to determine which words should be translated? Since it is almost impossible to predict which words and expressions an individual reader will not understand, as each reader has a different level of knowledge of different dialects, the best solution seems to be to translate all those words that differ by any, even the smallest phonological, morphological or lexical element from their counterpart in the standard language.

Bibliography

Literary works

- Brkan, Božica. *Život večni. Knjiga kajkavskih priča*. Zagreb: Acumen, 2017.
- Budak, Pero. *I norija je meštija. Humoristički roman*. Zagreb: Bil commerce, 1994.
- Domjanić, Dragutin. *Kipci i popevke*. Zagreb: Društvo hrvatskih književnika, 1917.
- Fišer, Ernest. *Machbeth na fajruntu. Sabrane i nove kajkavske pjesme 1978.—2013*, edited by Joža Skok. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2013.
- Funda, Željko. *Ljudeki. Kajkavski roman*. Varaždin: self-published, 2004.
- Galović, Fran. “Z mojih bregov.” *Književna republika*, no. 11—12 (1925): 479—502.
- Galović, Fran. *Pjesme. 2*. [edited by Julije Benešić]. Zagreb: Binoza, 1940.
- Galović, Fran. *Pjesme II*, edited by Julije Benešić. Zagreb: Hrvatski izdavački zavod, 1943.
- Galović, Fran. *Z mojih bregov*, edited by Dragutin Tadijanović. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Hrvatske, 1948.
- Galović, Fran. *Poezija i proza*, edited by Nada Pavičić-Spalatin. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1963.
- Galović, Fran. *Lirika, pripovijetke, drame, kritika*, edited by Milivoj Solar. Zagreb: Znanje, 1966.

- Galović, Fran. "Pjesme i poeme; proza." In Julije Benešić, Fran Galović, Milan Vrbanić. *Izbor iz djela*, edited by Šime Vučetić, 111—376. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, Zora, 1969.
- Galović, Fran. "Z *mojih bregov...*," edited by Božica Jelušić. Bjelovar: Prosvjeta, 1990.
- Galović, Fran. *Z *mojih bregov. Izbor poezije i proze**, edited by Vjekoslav Prvčić. Koprivnica, Mali Princ, 1994.
- Galović, Fran. *Izabrana djela*, edited by Joža Skok. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1997.
- Galović, Fran. *Izabrane pjesme*, edited by Milivoj Solar. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1997.
- Galović, Fran. *Izbor iz djela*, edited by Mladen Kuzmanović. Vinkovci: Riječ, 1999.
- Galović, Fran. *Zeleni oblak*, edited by Mladen Kuzmanović. Zagreb: Mozaik knjiga, 2000.
- Galović, Fran. *Z *mojih bregov**, edited by Milivoj Solar. Koprivnica, Matica hrvatska, 2002.
- Galović, Fran. "Z *mojih bregov...*" i *druge pjesme*, edited by Vjekoslav Prvčić. Koprivnica: Mali Princ, 2002.
- Galović, Fran. *Pjesme*, edited by Milivoj Solar, Božidar Petrač. Koprivnica: Ogranak Matice hrvatske, 2005.
- Galović, Fran. *Zaboravljeni perivoj*, edited by Božica Jelušić. Vinkovci: Riječ, 2007.
- Golub, Ivan. *Sijač radosti*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2012.
- Golub, Ivan. *Pohod milosti. Izabrane pjesme*, edited by Tonko Maroević. Zagreb, Školska knjiga, 2013.
- Gregur, Marko. *Kak je zgorel presvetli Trombetassicz*. Zagreb: Hena com, 2017.
- Kalinski, Ivo and Vladimir Pernić. *Cicirici & senjali*. Zagreb: Kajkavsko spravišće, 2007.
- Kovač, Zvonko. *Vrnul se boum. Popievke kajkavske, i najljepše*. Čakovec: Zrinski, 2001.
- Krleža, Miroslav. *Balade Petrice Kerempuha*. Ljubljana: Akademsko založba, 1936.
- Krleža, Miroslav. *Balade Petrice Kerempuha*. Translated from Štokavian by Milovan Antun Tomić. Split: HKD Napredak, 2006.
- Novak, Kristian. *Črna mati zemla*. Zagreb: Algoritam, 2013.
- Novak, Kristian. *Ciganin, ali najljepši*. Zagreb: Oceanmore, 2016.
- Novak, Kristian. *Dark Mother Earth*. Translated by Ellen Elias-Bursac. Seattle: Amazon Crossing, 2020.
- Pavić, Nikola, Mate Balota, Pere Ljubić, and Drago Gervais. *Izabrana djela*, edited by Marin Franičević. Zagreb: Zora, Matica hrvatska, 1973.
- Pažur, Božica and Daniel Načinović. *Manutekstura*. Zagreb: Kajkavsko spravišće, 2006.

- Peričić, Denis. *Netopir i črni ljudi. Pervi roman o zamaskjeranom revanžeru*. Zagreb: V.B.Z., 2009.
- Peričić, Denis. *Techno gost. Karnevalije i fantazije. Sabrane kajkavske priče i druge kratke proze (1995.—2016.)*. Zagreb: Kajkavsko spravišće, 2016.
- Rudan, Evelina. *Smiljko i ja si mahnemo. Balada na mahove*. Zaprešić: Fraktura, 2020.
- Stojić, Milorad. *Rime amorose*. Rijeka: Izdavački centar Rijeka, 1984.
- Stojić, Milorad. *Novelline o soldatu i sto ruž (zibrane & nove pismi)*. Rijeka: Riječki nakladni zavod, 2005.
- Štambuk, Drago. *Kad su miši balali molfrinu. Pjesme kroz prizmu ča-kaj-što*. Zagreb: Naklada Đuretić, Studio moderna, 2017.
- Ujević, Tin. *Pjesme i pjesničke proze*, edited by Šime Vučetić. Zagreb: Zora, Matica hrvatska, 1970.

Anthologies

- Bačić, Nikola N., ed. *Antologija nove hrvatske kajkavske lirike*. Sisak: Naklada knjižare S. Jünker-a, 1937.
- Črnja, Zvane and Ive Mihovilović, eds. *Korablja začinjavaca u versih hrvatski složena mnogim cvitjem opkićena po zakonu dobrih poet*. Rijeka: Sabor čakavskog pjesništva, 1969.
- Jelenović, Ive and Hijacint Petris, eds. *Antologija nove čakavske lirike*. Zagreb: Zagrebačka Privredna štamparija, 1934.
- Jelenović, Ive and Hijacint Petris, eds. *Antologija nove čakavske lirike*. Second, extended edition. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Hrvatske, 1947.
- Jelenović, Ive, ed. *Nova čakavska lirika*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1961.
- Kuzmanović, Mladen, ed. "Antologija novije kajkavske lirike." *Kaj*, no. 3—5 (1975).
- Milovan, Antun, ed. *Zlatna lira čakavska. Antologija čakavske umjetničke lirike od Marulića do Črnje*. Žminj: Čakavski sabor, 1998.
- Pavić, Nikola, ed. *Antologija novije kajkavske lirike*. Zagreb: Lykos, 1958.
- Skok, Joža, ed. "Ogenj reči. Antologija hrvatskoga kajkavskog pjesništva." *Kaj*, no. 4—6 (1986).
- Skok, Joža, ed. "Ogerličić reči. Antologija hrvatske kajkavske drame." *Kaj*, no. 1—4 (1990).
- Skok, Joža, ed. *Rieči sa vziranjka. Antologija moderne kajkavske lirike 20. stoljeća*. Zagreb: Tipex, 1999.
- Skok, Joža, ed., "Roužnik rieči. Antologija hrvatske kajkavske proze." *Kaj*, no. 1—3 (1999).

Stojević, Miloard, ed. *Čakavsko pjesništvo XX. stoljeća. [Tusculum antologija]*. Second, extended edition. Pula: Istarski ogranak Društva hrvatskih književnika, 2007.

Scholarly sources

- Badurina, Lada. "Standardizacijski procesi u 20. Stoljeću." *Anagram*, January 3, 2011. <http://www.hrvatskiplus.org/article.php?id=1781>.
- Božanić, Joško. *Vernakularna stilistika*. Split: Književni krug, Filozofski fakultet, Katedra Čakavskog sabora, 2019.
- Brešić, Vinko, 1997 [1998]. "Hrvatska emigrantska književnost (1945.—1990.)." *Croatica*, no. 45—46 (1997—1998): 247—271.
- Damjanović, Stjepan. *Slovo iskona. Staroslavenska / starohrvatska čitanka*. Second, extended edition. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2004.
- Gortan, Veljko and Vladimir Vratović. "Temeljne značajke hrvatskog latinizma." In *Hrvatski latinisti I / Croatici auctores qui latine scripserunt I*, edited by Veljko Gortan, Vladimir Vratović, 5—41. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, Zora, 1969.
- Jones, Francis R. "The Translation of Poetry." In *The Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies*, edited by Kirsten Malmkjær, Kevin Windle. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. <https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199239306.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199239306-e-013>.
- Katičić, Radoslav. *Hrvatski jezik*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2013.
- K. [Klaić], Bogoljub. "Rječnik." In Julije Benešić, Fran Galović, Milan Vrbanić, *Izbor iz djela*, edited by Šime Vučetić, 493—515. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, Zora, 1969.
- Kuzmanović, Mladen. *Rječnik i komentar Balada Petrice Kerempuha Miroslava Krleže*. Zagreb: Liber, 1972.
- Lončarić, Mijo. "Galovićeva i današnja peteranska kajkavština." *Rasprave. Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje*, no. 1 (1991): 47—63.
- Lončarić, Mijo. "Rječnik kajkavskih pjesama." In Fran Galović, *Pjesme*, edited by Milivoj Solar, Božidar Petrač, 402—411. Koprivnica: Ogranak Matice hrvatske, 2005.
- Lukežić, Iva. "Napomene o akcentuiranju i tumačenju tekstova." In *Čakavsko pjesništvo XX. stoljeća. [Tusculum antologija]*, edited by Miloard Stojević, 389—390. Pula: Istarski ogranak Društva hrvatskih književnika, 2007.
- Mičanović, Krešimir. *Hrvatski s naglaskom. Standard i jezični varijeteti*. Zagreb: Disput, 2008.
- Skok, Joža. *Kajkavski kontekst hrvatske književnosti*. Čakovec, Zagreb: "Zrinski," Zavod za znanost o književnosti Filozofskog fakulteta, 1985.

- S. [Skok], Joža. "Napomena." In Fran Galović. *Izabrana djela*, edited by Joža Skok, 403. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1997.
- Solar, Milivoj. "Galovićevo književno djelo." In Fran Galović. *Prilozi*, edited by Milivoj Solar, Božidar Petrač, 5—158. Koprivnica: Ogranak Matice hrvatske, 2010.
- Stančić, Nikša. *Hrvatska nacija i nacionalizam u 19. i 20. stoljeću*. Zagreb: Brabat, 2002.
- Stojević, Miloard. *Čakavsko pjesništvo XX. stoljeća. Antologija, studija*. Rijeka: Izdavački centar Rijeka, 1987.
- Škiljan, Dubravko. *Govor nacije. Jezik, nacija, Hrvati*. Zagreb: Golden marketing, 2002.
- Vince, Zlatko. *Putovima hrvatskoga književnog jezika. Lingvističko-kulturnopovijesni prikaz filoloških škola i njihovih izvora*. Third, extended edition. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske, 2002.
- Vončina, Josip. *Korijeni Krležina Kerempuha*. Zagreb: Naprijed, 1991.
- Vulić, Sanja. *Blago rasutih. Jezik Hrvata u dijaspori*. Dio 1. Split: Književni krug, 2021.

Mario Kolar

Stranci u vlastitom jeziku

Modeli prevođenja moderne hrvatske dijalektalne književnosti na hrvatski standardni jezik

SAŽETAK | Rad se bavi pitanjem treba li modernu hrvatsku dijalektalnu književnost prevoditi na hrvatski standardni jezik, i ako treba, koji je najbolji model za to. Što se tiče dosadašnje prevoditeljske prakse, uočena su dva najčešća modela: (1) prevođenje cjelovitih djela s dijalekata na standardni jezik te (2) prevođenje samo pojedinih dijalektalnih riječi. Analizirajući nedostatke i prednosti svakog od njih, dolazi se do zaključka da je primjereniji drugi model zato što ipak postoji određen broj riječi koje su identične u standardnom jeziku i dijalektima. Pritom se sugerira i da bi bilo potrebno prevoditi sve one dijalektalne riječi koje se po bilo kojem svojem obilježju razlikuju od svoje standardnojezične istoiznačnice.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI | moderna hrvatska dijalektalna književnost, književno prevođenje

Mario Kolar

Foreigner in One's Own Language
Models of Translating Modern Croatian Dialect Literature
into the Standard Croatian Language

SUMMARY | The paper addresses the question of whether modern Croatian dialect literature should be translated into the standard Croatian language and, if so, what is the best model for doing so. Regarding the translation practice, the two most common models were observed: (1) the translation of complete works from dialects into the standard language and (2) the translation of only single dialect words. Analysing the disadvantages and advantages of each model, it is concluded that a more appropriate model is the translation of single words only, because a certain number of words in the standard language and in the dialects remain identical. It is also suggested to translate all dialect words that differ in their features from their counterpart in the standard language.

KEYWORDS | modern Croatian dialect literature, literary translation

MARIO KOLAR | PhD., literary historian and critic, is an assistant professor at the Department of Croatian Language and Literature, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Rijeka (Croatia). He teaches courses in modern and contemporary Croatian literature. To date, he has published three books: *Nuspojave čitanja* [Side Effects of Reading, 2014], *Između tradicije i subverzije. Časopis Kaj i kajkavska postmoderna* [Between Tradition and Subversion. Journal Kaj and Kajkavian Postmodernism, 2015], and *Izazovi čitanja* [Challenges of Reading, 2018]. He has prepared selected works by Fran Galović (*Dok večer se zmračí* [When darkness falls, 2020]) and by Dubravko Ivančana (*Izabrana djela* [Selected Works, 2017]) and is (co-)editor of several literary and academic books. Together with Julijana Matanović, he is the editor of the literary journal *Republika* [Republic] of the Croatian Writers' Association. He is the winner of the *Julije Benešić Award* (2014) for literary criticism.