UNIVERSITY OF BELGRADE

FACULTY OF PHILOLOGY

Višnja I. Krstić

INTRA- AND INTERLINGUAL TRANSLATION THROUGH THE PRISM OF LINGUISTIC FLUIDITY AND LITERARY CIRCULATION

Doctoral Thesis

Belgrade, 2019

УНИВЕРЗИТЕТ У БЕОГРАДУ

ФИЛОЛОШКИ ФАКУЛТЕТ

Вишња И. Крстић

ИНТРА- И ИНТЕРЛИНГВАЛНО ПРЕВОЂЕЊЕ КРОЗ ПРИЗМУ ЛИНГВИСТИЧКЕ ФЛУИДНОСТИ И ЦИРКУЛИСАЊА КЊИЖЕВНОСТИ

докторска дисертација

Београд, 2019

INFORMATION ON THE SUPERVISOR AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Supervisor:

       Dr Mirjana Daničić, Associate Professor
       Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade

Members of the Committee:

       Dr Bojan Jović, Principal Research Fellow
       Institute for Literature and Art, Belgrade

       Dr Mina Đurić, Associate Professor
       Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade

       Dr Greta Goetz, Associate Professor
       Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade

Date of the defense: _____

PODACI O MENTORU I ČLANOVIMA KOMISIJE

Mentorka:

       dr Mirjana Daničić, docent
       Filološki fakultet, Univerzitet u Beogradu

Članovi Komisije:

       dr Bojan Jović, naučni savetnik
       Institut za književnost i umetnost, Beograd

       dr Mina Đurić, docent
       Filološki fakultet, Univerzitet u Beogradu

       dr Greta Goetz, docent
       Filološki fakultet, Univerzitet u Beogradu

Datum odbrane: _____

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

INTRA- AND INTERLINGUAL TRANSLATION THROUGH THE PRISM OF LINGUISTIC FLUIDITY AND LITERARY CIRCULATION

Extended Abstract: This dissertation concentrates on Roman Jakobson's widespread classification of translational relations, which distinguishes *intra-*, *interlingual*, and *intersemiotic translation*. Albeit part of a tripartition, it is the distinction between *intra-* and *interlingual translation* that is central to this investigation. Inspired by the case of Serbo-Croatian's administrative substitution with a greater number of individual languages – this dissertation argues that *intra-* and *interlingual translation* are not stable relations, further asserting that they are parasitic primarily on the definition and delimitation of language.

Jakobson's notions of *intra-* and *interlingual translation* are investigated through a twofold prism – of *linguistic fluidity* and *literary circulation*. On the one hand, *linguistic fluidity* serves as a basis for the exploration of the *causes* in the concepts' instability. The term collectively denotes a series of manifestations where linguistic borders are challenged – either on a macro level, when the whole language undergoes a change in its unity and identity, or a micro level, when the boundaries are shifted in a multilingual text. On the other hand, *literary circulation* is selected as a means of measuring the *effects* of these inconsistencies, particularly in cultural terms.

The fundamental aim of this thesis, therefore, is to diagnose the *causes* and *effects* of translational relations' instability. For the sake of supporting the argumentation, the dissertation has tested five hypotheses altogether – all of which have proven completely true. As many as three are considered in regard to the causes of linguistic borders' uncertainty:

- Determining what is translated *inside* and what *outside* the language is contingent on the way speech varieties or lects – such as standard languages, creole languages, pidgin languages, regional dialects, sociolects, and registers – are delimited.
- A lack of mutual intelligibility between separate lects is not the necessary condition for language separation.
- Social and political factors play a role in the delimitation of languages.

One hypothesis refers to the way in which translational relations are established:

- Translational relations are not pre-given but *contextually* determined in each individual case.

Finally, the last hypothesis concerns the effects of linguistic instability by focusing on the international circulation of literature:

- Linguistic discontinuity hinders literary circulation.

The five hypotheses are examined with the help of several methodologies: sociolinguistic approach, close reading in combination with comparative translation discourse analysis, and distant reading.

This thesis has been structured around four main parts: I Prelude (Chapter 1, 2, and 3); II Translational Relations' Instability: Causes (Chapter 4, 5, and 6); III Translational Relations' Instability: Effects (Chapter 7); IV Conclusions (Chapter 8). A short overview of each chapter will be provided below, with a special emphasis on Parts II and III, which constitute the body of this dissertation.

Chapter 1 *Introduction* acquaints the reader with the thesis' contextual background, puts forward its argumentation, formulates the main research question and hypotheses, and then proceeds to establish a theoretical framework, determine the research scope, and define key terminology.

Chapter 2 *Intra- and Interlingual Translation: Origin, Evolution, and Critique* poses a review of current scholarship on the topic, with a narrow focus on the theoretical revisions of Jakobson's notions of *intra-* and *interlingual translation.* Six main lines of critique emerge: the classification's relationship with interpretation; its scope; its negligence regarding the translation of polysemiotic mediums; its inattentiveness to the uncertain nature of linguistic

borders; its implication concerning the minimal unit of translation; its assumption of monolingualism. After diagnosing the underexplored areas of study, the chapter locates the thesis' principal points of departure.

Chapter 3 *Methodological Overview* explains the dissertation's rationale for methodological pluralism – citing the individual methodologies' limitations and the project's interdisciplinary nature. The chapter pays meticulous attention to each of the employed methodologies – sociolinguistic approach, close reading, comparative translation discourse analysis, and distant reading.

Chapter 4 *Translational Relations in a Temporal Context: The Folk Ballad Hasanaginica* delves into the temporal dimension of translational relations' instability by tracing the long history of the folk ballad *Hasanaginica*. As the language identification of this ballad has been the subject of heated debates, the chapter opens with a timeline of South Slavic lects under study and goes on to outline the ballad's origins and context. *Hasanaginica*, which precedes any linguistic codification, is understandable to speakers of multiple modern standards and contains a series of linguistic features mutual to all of them. Owing to its ambiguity, the ballad escapes a clear linguistic classification in modern terms, which exposes the tentative nature of linguistic boundaries. The chapter discusses the ways in which literature, languages and their borders change, thereby demonstrating that the passing of time does affect the ballad's translatability and the associating translational relations.

Chapter 5 *Translational Relations in a Spatial Context: Stevan Sremac's Novel and Zdravko Šotra's Film Zona Zamfirova* centres Zdravko Šotra's ecranisation (2002) of Stevan Sremac's novel *Zona Zamfirova* (1903), which features the Prizren-Timok dialect of the Serbian language. Departing from the Serbian speakers' claim that an interlingual translation into Croatian helped them understand *Zona Zamfirova*'s dialectally saturated dialogues better, the chapter aims to answer how it is possible that a speaker of one language can have difficulties understanding a dialect of their own language yet comprehend the translation into what is officially a foreign language. With a view to assessing the rate of destabilisation of *intra-* and *interlingual* relations in a spatial context, the chapter first measures the degrees of distance and closeness between standard Serbian, the Prizren-Timok dialect, and standard Croatian. A theoretical deliberation is supplemented with an empirical study in which intelligibility is reviewed both through the self-assessment and objective testing of Serbian speaker's understanding of the Prizren-Timok and Croatian lect. The final part of this chapter analyses the complex ways in which fragmentation and heterogeneity affect linguistic borders and, by extension, translational relations.

Chapter 6 *Translational Relations in a Textual Context: David Albahari's Multilingual Story 'Learning Cyrillic'* uses David Albahari's short story 'Learning Cyrillic' (2003) and its English translation by Ellen Elias-Bursać (2012) to examine the destabilisation patterns in the concepts of *intra-* and *interlingual translation* that occur in a multilingual environment of a text. The story's multicultural exchange is palpable in the intersection of three languages – Serbian, English, and the Blackfoot indigenous language of North America – and two scripts – Latin and Cyrillic. The predominantly Serbian text is interspersed with words in the Blackfoot language, whereas the story's English setting is represented through fictional multilingualism. These relations change in Elias-Bursać's translation: on the one hand, the English language no longer intertwines immaterially but physically dominates the text; on the other, few short sentences in the Serbian Cyrillic script, together with the authentic Blackfoot phrases, remain untranslated into English. This chapter reinforces the pertinence of a contextual framework for the study of multilingual literature's translational relations through the analysis of Elias-Bursać's multilingually and graphically aware translation, which disrupts the traditionally predictable behaviour of 'source' and 'target'. Lastly, the chapter proposes the adoption of a scalable minimal unit of translation – in the hope of facilitating the identification of translational relations.

Chapter 7 *Literary Circulation in the Context of Linguistic Discontinuity: Todd Hasak-Lowy's Short Story 'The Task of This Translator'* investigates how literature circulates in the aftermath of linguistic discontinuity. Analysed against Todd Hasak-Lowy's short story 'The Task of This Translator' (2005), the chapter surveys the presence of Serbian literature in Anglophone countries, concentrating on the roles that educational institutions, publishing industry, and the reading public play in the processes of cultural cross-contamination. The quantitative data is collected mainly from databases and statistical reports, whereas the qualitative data is extracted from interviews and texts by translators, scholars, and publishers. The chapter proves that the Serbian literature's hindered circulation in the transnational field of Anglophone countries partially stems from the Serbo-Croatian splintering and its successor's common misidentification in international circles.

Finally, Chapter 8 *Conclusions* restates the main findings of this project and summarises the arguments put forward in the previous chapters. The overall conclusions are supplemented with the discussion of the thesis' original scientific contribution. Lastly, identified are the areas that could be promising research avenues for future studies.

Key words: translational relations, intralingual translation, interlingual translation, literary translation, linguistic fluidity, multilingualism, literary circulation, Serbo-Croatian language, Serbian literature, Anglophone literary field.

Scientific discipline(s): Translation Studies, Linguistics, Literary Studies.

Scientific subdisciplines: Translation Theory, Sociolinguistics, Comparative Literature, Multilingualism Studies, Sociology of Translation, Historical Linguistics.

UDC:

INTRA- I INTERLINGVALNO PREVOĐENJE KROZ PRIZMU LINGVISTIČKE FLUIDNOSTI I CIRKULISANJA KNJIŽEVNOSTI

Rezime: Disertacija obrađuje naširoko prihvaćenu klasifikaciju prevodilačkih relacija, predloženu od strane lingviste Romana Jakobsona, koja razlikuje *intra-*, *interlingvalno* i *intersemiotičko prevođenje*. Mada deo tročlane podele, glavni predmet istraživanja predstavlja odnos između *intra-* i *interlingvalnog prevođenja*. Inspirisana slučajem administrativnog cepanja srpskohrvatskog jezika na veći broj nezavisnih jezika, glavni argument ove disertacije jeste da *intra-* i *interlingvalno prevođenje* nisu stabilne relacije, već da one pre svega zavise od načina na koji se definiše i ograničava jezik.

Jakobsonovi pojmovi *intra-* i *interlingvalnog prevođenja* istraživani su kroz dvostruku prizmu – *lingvističke fluidnosti* i *cirkulisanja književnosti*. S jedne strane, lingvistička fluidnost služi kao osnov za razmatranje *uzroka* nestabilnosti ovih koncepata. Termin se odnosi na niz manifestacija gde su jezičke granice dovedene u pitanje – bilo na makro nivou, kada se menja jedinstvo i identitet čitavog jezika, ili na mikro nivou, kada pisac namerno pomera granice unutar višejezičnog teksta. S druge strane, *cirkulisanje književnosti* trebalo bi da pomogne u procenjivanju *posledica* ovih pomeranja, posebno na polju kulture.

Glavni cilj ovog istraživanja jeste da ispita *uzroke* i *posledice* nestabilnosti prevodilačkih relacija. Kako bi se poduprela izneta argumentacija, postavljeno je ukupno pet hipoteza – i istraživanje je pokazalo da su sve u potpunosti tačne. Čak tri odnose se na uzroke promena jezičkih granica:

– Određivanje šta se prevodi *unutar*, a šta *izvan* jezika, zavisi od načina na koji su utvrđene granice jezičkih varijeteta ili „lektova" – poput standardnih jezika, kreola, pidžina, regionalnih dijalekata, sociolekata i registra.

– Nedostatak međusobnog razumevanja između različitih „lektova" nije nužan uslov za razdvajanje jezika.

– Društveni i politički faktori igraju ulogu u razgraničavanju jezika.

Jedna hipoteza odnosi se na način na koji se uspostavljaju prevodilačke relacije:

– Prevodilački odnosi nisu unapred dati, već se moraju *kontekstualno* određivati u svakom zasebnom slučaju.

Najzad, poslednja hipoteza tiče se posledica lingvističke nestabilnosti po međunarodno cirkulisanje književnosti:

– Jezički diskontinuitet otežava cirkulisanje književnosti.

Ovih pet hipoteza ispitivano je pomoću nekoliko metodologija: sociolingvističkog pristupa, bliskog čitanja, komparativne prevodilačke analize diskursa i udaljenim čitanjem.

Disertacija se sastoji od četiri dela: I Uvod (poglavlja 1, 2, 3); II Nestabilnost prevodilačkih relacija: uzroci (poglavlja 4, 5, 6); III Nestabilnost prevodilačkih relacija: posledice (poglavlje 7); IV Zaključci (poglavlje 8). Sledi kratak pregled pojedinačnih poglavlja, sa posebnim osvrtom na drugu i treću celinu, koje čine centralni delo rada.

Prvo poglavlje *Uvod* upoznaje čitaoca sa kontekstom rada, iznosi argumentaciju, formuliše glavno pitanje istraživanja, kao i hipoteze, a zatim definiše teorijski okvir, obim istraživanja i terminologiju.

Drugo poglavlje *Intra- i interlingvalno prevođenje: poreklo, evolucija i kritika* predstavlja pregled literature na datu temu, pri čemu je posebna pažnja usmerena na teorijska preispitivanja Jakobsonovih pojmova *intra-* i *interlingvalnog prevođenja*. Izdvaja se šest glavnih linija kritike: odnos Jakobsonove klasifikacije sa interpretacijom; obim; zanemarivanje kompleksnosti prevođenja polisemiotičkih medija; zanemarivanje nesigurnosti jezičkih granica; implikacije po pitanju minimalne jedinice prevođenja; pretpostavka monolingvizma. Nakon što su ustanovljeni slabo istraženi aspekti određeni su glavni pravci u kojima će se disertacija razvijati.

Treće poglavlje *Metodološki pregled* objašnjava zašto se ovo istraživanje opredelilo za metodološki pluralizam – navodeći ograničenja pojedinačnih metodologija, ali i interdisciplinarnu prirodu projekta. Posebna pažnja posvećena je svakoj od korišćenih metodologija – sociolingvističkom pristupu, bliskom čitanju, komparativnoj prevodilačkoj analizi diskursa i udaljenom čitanju.

Četvrto poglavlje *Prevodilačke relacije u vremenskom kontekstu: narodna balada Hasanaginica* bavi se vremenskom dimenzijom nestabilnosti prevodilačkih relacija kroz ispitivanje viševekovne tradicije balade *Hasanaginice*. Budući da je određivanje jezika ove narodne pesme već neko vreme predmet rasprava, poglavlje počinje istorijskim pregledom određenih južnoslovenskih „lektova", a zatim se u kratkim crtama objašnjava poreklo i kontekst *Hasanaginice*. Ova balada ispevana je pre bilo kakve kodifikacije jezika, a danas je razumljiva govornicima čak četiri moderna standarda. Sadrži niz lingvističkih odlika koje su zajedničke svim novonastalim standardima. Zbog ovih višesmislenosti, baladu je teško lingvistički klasifikovati, makar u savremenim jezičkim okvirima, što ukazuje na nestabilnost granica među jezicima. Poglavlje diskutuje načine na koje se književnost, jezik i njegove granice menjaju, time pokazujući da protok vremena i te kako utiče ne samo na prevodivost ove narodne pesme, već i na propratne prevodilačke relacije.

Peto poglavlje *Prevodilačke relacije u prostornom kontekstu: roman Stevana Sremca i film Zdravka Šotre Zona Zamfirova* prati ekranizaciju Zdravka Šotre (2002), rađenu po romanu Stevana Sremca *Zona Zamfirova* (1903), gde je većina dijaloga na prizrensko-timočkom dijalektu srpskog jezika. Polazeći od tvrdnji pojedinih govornika srpskog da im je interlingvalni prevod na hrvatski pomogao da bolje razumeju delove *Zone Zamfirove* koji su na prizrensko-timočkom, poglavlje nastoji da odgovori kako je moguće da govornik jednog jezika ima probleme u razumevanju dijalekta sopstvenog jezika, a da pri tome razume prevod na zvanično strani jezik. U želji da oceni u kojoj meri *intra-* i *interlingvalno prevođenje* mogu biti destabilizovani u prostornom kontekstu, poglavlje prvo ispituje udaljenost i bliskost između standardnog srpskog, prizrensko-timočkog dijalekta i standardnog hrvatskog. Teorijsko razmatranje upotpunjeno je empirijskom studijom gde je razumljivost prizrensko-timočkog i hrvatskog među govornicima standardnog srpskog merena samoocenjivanjem, ali i objektivnim testom. Poslednji deo poglavlja analizira kompleksne načine na koje fragmentacija i heterogenost utiču na jezičke granice i, analogijom, na prevodilačke relacije.

Šesto poglavlje *Prevodilačke relacije u tekstualnom kontekstu: multilingvalizam u „Učenju ćirilice" Davida Albaharija* obrađuje pripovetku Davida Albaharija „Učenje ćirilice" (2003) i njen prevod na engleski u izvedbi Elen Elijas-Bursać (2012) kako bi istražila obrasce destabilizacije koncepata *intra-* i *interlingvalnog prevođenja* u višejezičnom tekstu. Multikulturalnu dimenziju ove pripovetke pronalazimo u preseku tri jezika – srpskog, engleskog i severnoameričkog indijanskog jezika plemena Crna Noga – i dva pisma – latinice i ćirilice. Tekst prevashodno na srpskom prošaran je rečima na indijanskom jeziku, dok je anglofoni kontekst pripovetke predstavljen pomoću fiktivnog multilingvalizma. Odnosi među jezicima menjaju se u prevodu Elijas-Bursać: engleski više nije prisutan samo fiktivno, već fizički dominira tekstom, dok je nekoliko kratkih rečenica ispisanih srpskim ćiriličnim pismom, kao i nekoliko autentičnih fraza na jeziku plemena Crna Noga, ostalo neprevedeno na engleski. Ovo poglavlje potvrđuje značaj kontekstualnog okvira u izučavanju prevodilačkih relacija višejezične književnosti kroz analizu prevoda Elijas-Bursać, koji izrazito vodi računa o multilingvalnom i grafičkom aspektu, i remeti inače predvidivo ponašanje „izvornika" i „ciljanika". Najzad, poglavlje predlaže uvođenje prilagodljive minimalne jedinice prevođenja kako bi olakšala određivanje prevodilačkih relacija.

Sedmo poglavlje *Cirkulisanje književnosti u kontekstu jezičkog diskontinuiteta: pripovetka „Zadatak ovog prevodioca" Toda Hasaka-Luja* istražuje posledice jezičkog diskontinuiteta po cirkulisanje književnosti, koje su analizirane u svetlu pripovetke Toda Hasaka-Luja „Zadatak ovog prevodioca" (2005). Dat je pregled prisustva srpske književnosti u

anglofonim zemljama, pri čemu je akcenat na ulozi koju obrazovne institucije, izdavaštvo, ali i čitalaštvo igraju u procesu unakrsne kulturne kontaminacije. Kvantitativna građa prikupljena je mahom iz baza podataka i statističkih izveštaja, dok je kvalitativna sakupljena iz intervjua i tekstova čiji su autori prevashodno prevodioci, profesori i izdavači. Poglavlje dokazuje da delimičan uzrok smanjenog cirkulisanja srpske književnosti u transnacionalnom polju anglofonih zemalja leži u rascepu srpskohrvatskog jezika, ali i lošem prepoznavanju jezika-naslednika u međunarodnim krugovima.

Osmo poglavlje *Zaključci* ponavlja glavne rezultate ovog projekta i rezimira argumente iznete u prethodnim poglavljima. Ukupni zaključci upotpunjeni su diskusijom originalnog naučnog doprinosa ove teze, a na samom kraju date su i smernice koje bi mogle biti od koristi u budućim istraživanjima.

Ključne reči: prevodilačke relacije, intralingvalno prevođenje, interlingvalno prevođenje, književno prevođenje, lingvistička fluidnost, višejezičnost, cirkulisanje književnosti, srpskohrvatski jezik, srpska književnost, anglofono književno polje.

Naučne oblasti: studije prevođenja, lingvistika, studije književnosti.

Uže naučne oblasti: teorija prevođenja, sociolingvistika, komparativna književnost, studije multilingvalizma, sociologija prevođenja, istorijska lingvistika.

UDK:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AUTHOR'S NOTES ON TRANSLATIONS, SPELLING, AND REFERENCING

– Unless otherwise indicated, all translations are my own.
– Standard British spelling is followed throughout the manuscript. Nevertheless, other English standards are retained inside quotations and bibliographic entries.
– Titles and quotations originally written in the Serbian Cyrillic script are transliterated into the Serbian Latin script.
– The style of this manuscript is closely formatted in adherence to the guidelines issued by the Faculty of Philology of the University of Belgrade.
– The referencing and bibliography of this manuscript follow the Author–Date Chicago Manuel of Style (17th ed.).

I
Prelude

1   Introduction

Translation becomes law, duty and debt,
but the debt one can no longer discharge.

Jacques Derrida, 'Des Tours de Babel'

1.1 Balkan Babel

Babel and the Balkans share more than just the initial letter. In fact, allegorical parallels between the biblical city and the modern region pose no novelty: the sociolinguistic landscapes of these two structures – removed in time, space, and fictionality – bear a marked resemblance. The collocation 'Balkan Babel' appears, for instance, in Sabina P. Ramet's book *Balkan Babel: The Disintegration of Yugoslavia from the Death of Tito to the Fall of Milošević* ([2002] 2004). In reading the myth about the origins of linguistic diversity 'as a story of the failure of cooperative action' (Ramet [2002] 2004, 3), Ramet uses this biblical narrative to examine the ambitious project of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, arguing that the principal reason for the country's eventual disintegration during the early 1990s lies in its leaders' inability to formulate a common political language, which would provide the necessary legitimation (Ramet [2002] 2004, 3–4). The alliterative phrase is similarly foregrounded in the title of Emily Apter's chapter 'Balkan Babel: Translation Zones, Military Zones' from *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature* (2006). There the author delves into the Balkan peninsula's splendid – and often deeply troubled – history of multilingualism and -culturalism in the attempt to equate the translation borders with those defined by wars. Apter merges the Babelic myth with Maria Todorova's notion of 'Balkanism' to create a new metaphor, that of 'Balkan Babel', which is supposed to stand for 'the acute anxieties that surround possession of a discrete language in territories of intense linguistic variegation and border conflict' (Apter 2006, 133). In Ramet's comparison, Babel represents an inevitable collapse brought by the unsustainability of the old system. In Apter's vision, Babel also symbolises a collapse – but into the uncertainties of a new order.

My idea of exploiting the biblical myth for the study of former Yugoslav territories lies precisely in this tension between the old and the new, between the certain and the uncertain. This dissertation concentrates on the linguistic plane. Yugoslavia, literally 'Land of the South Slavs', existed in one form or another for most of the twentieth century, occupying a considerable portion of Southeastern Europe – stretching from the Julian Alps in the west to the Danube's Iron Gates in the east, from the Pannonian Basin in the north to the Great Prespa Lake in the south. The federation created in the aftermath of the Second World War consisted of six constituent republics: Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Slovenia, Macedonia, and Montenegro. While the majority in Slovenia and Macedonia spoke Slovenian and Macedonian respectively, the majority in other four constituent republics shared a common language: Serbo-Croatian (also called Serbo-Croat and Croato-Serbian). This polycentric South Slavic language had two standard varieties, Serbian and Croatian. When the Yugoslav federation collapsed in the early 1990s, inducing a series of independence wars and ethnic conflicts, not only the joint country split into multiple nation states but also the Serbo-Croatian language succumbed to severe erosion.

In both the Balkan and the Babel scenario, the unique language suffers a sudden erasure. Under changing circumstances, multiple tongues occur; their exact number remains unknown. The Adamic language vanishes, morphing into the thousands of world's languages; the Serbo-Croatian monolith cracks, diffusing into a debatable number of individual languages – two, three, four, or potentially even more. The actors in both stories strive to make a name for

themselves ('The Tower of Babel', *Genesis* 11:4): Babelians fail, Yugoslav nationalists – at least a portion – succeed. The feeling of omnipresent confusion prevails. In this turmoil, one crucial difference arises: mutual comprehension among Babelians becomes corrupt; that among former Yugoslavs survives intact.

Regardless of the divergence in understanding, the heirs of both structures face the challenge of *translation*. In writing about the Babelian episode, Jacques Derrida posits that '[t]ranslation becomes law, duty and debt, but the debt one can no longer discharge' (Derrida 1985, 174). In these novel circumstances, translation is both necessary and impossible (Derrida 1985, 174). But for George Steiner – who sees any communication as translation, resting on the belief that no two individuals speak exactly the same language – translation *predates* the fall of the structure: 'The affair at Babel confirmed and externalized the never-ending task of the translator – it did not initiate it' (Steiner 1975, 48). Just a quick glance at the analogy between the iconic story from the Book of Genesis and its modern Balkan counterpart opens a whole set of theoretical questions about language and translation that will be addressed throughout the dissertation. For now, the phrase 'Balkan Babel' should provide us with a starting point in interrogating what the dynamic sociolinguistic situation of the Balkans, particularly that of former Yugoslav countries where Serbo-Croatian was spoken, can tell us about translational phenomena.

1.2 Research Problem and Hypotheses

Translation, understood either as a process or a product,[1] can be systematised in a number of ways and against various sets of criteria. According to Gideon Toury, some of the frequently recurring typologies of translation are created on the following principles:

- 'the nature of the addressee who turns into an addresser' (e.g. human vs. machine);
- 'the medium, or the communication channel' (e.g. written vs. oral);
- 'the types of messages which serve as the initial and/or resultant texts' (e.g. literary vs. non-literary);
- 'the (prospective or actual) relationships between the target and source texts, or, rather, the rank, or level, where these relationships are (or are to be) established' (e.g. literal vs. free). (Toury 1986, 1118)

Any attempt to compare different typologies must prove futile by virtue of their mutual incommensurability. Envisaged against a qualitatively different set of criteria, their distribution and application differ greatly. Considering the variety of ways in which translation can be classified, it is interesting that one typology has gained much more currency than the rest, especially in general discussions of translation (Toury 1986, 1113).

Arguably, the most widespread classification of translation is that proposed by the linguist Roman Jakobson (1896–1982) in his seminal essay 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation' ([1959] 2012), which distinguishes three types:

a. *Intralingual translation* or rewording is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language;

---

[1] Eugene Nida's essay 'Principles of Correspondence' is one of the pioneer attempts to resolve this ambiguity by using the gerund-form *translating* to denote the process – as distinguished from *translation*, which is meant to refer to the product alone (Nida [1964] 2012). For a more detailed discussion on this terminological issue, see, for example, Gideon Toury's 'A Cultural-Semiotic Perspective' (Toury 1986, 1111–1113).

b. *Interlingual translation* or translation proper is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language;

c. *Intersemiotic translation* or transmutation is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign system. (Jakobson [1959] 2012, 127; my bullet points and emphasis)

Albeit part of a tripartition, it is the distinction between *intra-* and *interlingual translation* – featured in the very title of this dissertation – that will be central to our investigation. That is to say that the dissertation will remain primarily in the domain of *verbal* expression. Jakobson's 'three kinds of translation' are based on the 'ways of interpreting a verbal sign' (Jakobson [1959] 2012, 127). As these 'ha[ve] been worked out in terms of the *relations* (differences and similarities) between the basic types of the two codes, in which the respective entities are encoded' (Toury 1986, 1113; emphasis in the original), it is safe to refer to them as types of 'translational relations'.

What does Balkan Babel reveal about translational relations? The sudden ramification of the shared tongue implies that language is not as fixed an entity as we usually imagine. Namely, Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin once coexisted as different varieties of Serbo-Croatian. Today they tend to be regarded as separate languages – despite the high degree of mutual comprehensibility. The replacement of Serbo-Croatian with respective national languages draws attention to the phenomenon of *linguistic fluidity*. Applying the metaphor of a river to a language sparkles the idea of constant movement. This mode of flux brings into question whether the boundaries between languages can be permanently fixated.

The presupposition that languages are constantly in flux exposes the rigid nature of Jakobson's concept of *intra-* and *interlingual translation*. The main research question posing itself is:

Are the relations between *intra-* and *interlingual translation* stable?

A series of subquestions follows: What factors determine what is translated inside and what outside the language? If they are unstable relations, what are the key causes of relation changes between *intra-* and *interlingual translation*? If they are unstable relations, what are the effects of this instability?

I argue that *intra-* and *interlingual translation* are not stable relations. Furthermore, I propose that these instabilities can occur in at least three different contexts: temporal, spatial, textual. It should be noted that this division is quite tentative – the temporal and spatial dimension often function conjointly and cannot be strictly separated. This thesis also asserts that any alteration in the language's configuration is bound to directly reflect on translational relations. Additionally, I maintain that the relationship between *intra-* and *interlingual translation* can be destabilised not only on a macro level, as has been suggested so far when the unity and identity of the whole language is transitioning, but on a much smaller scale – that of a text. The alteration of borders, therefore, need not be merely linguistic or administrative but also artistic and experimental: a writer can remove the traditional barriers by mixing different languages in a single text, producing what scholars refer to as multilingual literature. This dissertation will address how different kinds of linguistic instability – taking place in any of the three mentioned contexts, that is temporal, spatial, and textual – affect translational relations *between* and *within* languages. In addition, it will attempt to evaluate the broader impact of these instabilities.

The fundamental aim of this thesis, therefore, is to diagnose the *causes* and *effects* of translational relations' instability. For the sake of supporting the argumentation, the dissertation plans to test five hypotheses altogether. As many as three will be considered in regard to the causes of linguistic borders' instability – these will be repeatedly discussed in

Chapter 4 and Chapter 5. The first one concerns the translational relations' presumed dependency on the definition and delimitation of language:

– Determining what is translated *inside* and what *outside* the language is contingent on the way speech varieties or lects – such as standard languages, creole languages, pidgin languages, regional dialects, sociolects, and registers – are delimited.

The terms 'speech variety' and 'lect' will be defined shortly (see 1.4.2). The next hypothesis departs from the common impression that the successors of the Serbo-Croatian language have retained mutual comprehensibility despite the official separation:

– A lack of mutual intelligibility between separate lects is not the necessary condition for language separation.

Positing that the linguistic criterion is not crucial in the definition of natural languages forefronts the possibility of a social interference. To this effect, the thesis will test the following claim:

– Social and political factors play a role in the delimitation of languages.

If the above statements prove true that linguistic borders are liable to change, then it becomes pertinent to test a kindred hypothesis with reference to the way in which translational relations are established:

– Translational relations are not pre-given but *contextually* determined in each individual case.

The thesis will test the above hypothesis across as many as three chapters – 4, 5, and 6. In pursuance of balanced and multifaceted results, each chapter will be reserved for a different context: the *temporal* will be discussed in Chapter 4, *spatial* in Chapter 5, and *textual* in Chapter 6.

Finally, the last hypothesis, examined in Chapter 7, will be the solitary one concerning the potential *effects* of linguistic instability. Building on the assumption that the shifts akin to that of Balkan Babel can have a profound impact on various spheres, this dissertation will restrict its analysis to those pertaining to culture. Hence, the principal focus will be on the international circulation of literature. Hypothesised is the following statement:

– Linguistic discontinuity hinders literary circulation.

The five hypotheses put forward in this section will be examined with the help of several different methodologies: *sociolinguistic approach* (Chapter 4 and 5), *close reading* in combination with *comparative translation discourse analysis* (Chapter 6), and *distant reading* (Chapter 7). All of these will be presented and elaborated on in a separate chapter (see 3.2–3.4). Properly explained will be, in addition, the rationale behind the adoption of methodological pluralism as well the underlying dangers that such mixing carries for the final results.

1.3 Justification for the Research

Why is any of this important? Why should one dedicate hundreds of pages to exploring translational relations? On the whole, the significance of this research could be sought in the intersection of several aspects. First and foremost, the notions of *intra-* and *interlingual translation*, essential for the discipline of translation studies, are in dire need of a reassessment, especially in light of linguistic fluidity. Secondly, linguistic fluidity is a phenomenon not limited to the Serbo-Croatian case – although this particular rupture masterfully demonstrates that languages are far from immobile. The dissertation hopes that the investigation of the linguistic situation of the Balkans can help us refine the scrutinised theoretical concepts, which, in return, could serve as the first step in understanding, accepting, and perhaps even improving the linguistically convoluted situation in the region. Thirdly, linguistic fluidity's micro manifestation, that appearing on a textual level, has become increasingly present in literary production across latitudes. It is worthy of examining, then, how multilingual experimentations, which challenge borders deliberately, affect translational relations. Ultimately, the effects of linguistic discontinuity and altered translational relations have been generally underexplored. This thesis' nexus on the cultural sphere could give us insight into one segment of the domino effect produced by the tectonic movements in the linguistic landscape of the Balkans. Each of these four streams will be presented in more detail below.

1.3.1 Intra- and Interlingual Translation as Key Terms of Translation Studies

Even before Jakobson's death in 1982, various honourable publications recognised the immense importance of this polymath's scholarship. There have been multiple attempts to systematise Jakobson's broad academic activities. One such endeavour is Daniel Armstrong and Cornelis Hendrik van Schooneveld's volume *Roman Jakobson: Echoes of his Scholarship*, envisaged as a collection of essays by scholars from 'each branch of science where the influence of Roman Jakobson's work and thinking has been felt' (Armstrong and Schooneveld 1977, v). The selected papers venture into a wide range of fields, such as phonetics, phonology, semiotics, phenomenology, generative grammar, poetics, folklore, child language, aphasia, history of linguistics, to name but a few. The field that we do not find in Armstrong and Schooneveld's book, not even peripherally, is that of translation studies.

To an extent, the exclusion of translation studies could be explained by the discipline's relatively late institutionalisation: in 1977, when *Roman Jakobson: Echoes of his Scholarship* was first published, translation studies were not considered a matured discipline but more of an interdisciplinary field. In the Preface to the fourth edition of her landmark book *Translation Studies*, Susan Bassnett explains that the rise of the eponymous field was hastened by 'the seismic changes of the late 1980s and early 1990s', mostly those of political nature, such as 'the collapse of communism and the break-up of the former Soviet Union, China opening its doors to the world, and the end of apartheid in South Africa' but also of economic kind, such as '[the] lower costs of international travel' (Bassnett 2014, 1). It was approximately around that revolutionary time that 'the subject began to be taken seriously, and was no longer seen as an unscientific field of inquiry of secondary importance' (Bassnett 2014, 1) and, moreover, that 'translation began to be seen as a fundamental act of human exchange' (Bassnett 2014, 2). Only with the disciplinary recognition of translation studies, the profound impact of Jakobson's conceptualisations[2] became fully visible.

---

[2] It is interesting that in the introductory chapter of *Roman Jakobson: Echoes of his Scholarship*, Schooneveld emphasises not the originality of Jakobson's ideas but 'the potency of [his] conceptualizations' built on the principles discerned by his predecessors (Schooneveld 1977, 1), thereby signalling a strong theoretical dimension of his complete oeuvre, drawn from the studies of phenomena approached both within a language and across languages.

One text in particular, focal to this dissertation, left an indelible trace in the discipline's advancement. Jakobson's article 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation', originally published by Harvard University Press in Reuben Brower's epochal volume *On Translation* (1959), has gained the status of a core text in translation studies. We find it reprinted in a number of collections of primary texts aiming to outline the key developments in translation theory and research. While a comprehensive list and a discussion of reprints falls outside the scope of this dissertation, a few do deserve a special mention. For instance, 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation' appears in Lawrence Venuti's classic anthology *The Translation Studies Reader* (2012, 126–131), which primarily focuses on the works that have shaped the twentieth and twenty-first century. Venuti states that '[t]he signal achievement of Roman Jakobson's widely cited 1959 essay [. . .] is to have introduced a semiotic reflection on translability' (Venuti 2012, 111). Likewise, Daniel Weissbort and Astradur Eysteinsson's exhaustive survey of fundamental texts on translation in English tradition, entitled *Translation: Theory and Practice: A Historical Reader*, also includes Jakobson's famous essay (Weissbort and Eysteinsson 2009, 330–336). The editors, in comparison to Venuti (2012), emphasise a different dimension, noting that Jakobson's essay 'extends the significance of translation to include *intralingual* and *intersemiotic* [in addition to *interlingual*] *translation*' (Weissbort and Eysteinsson 2009, 330; my square brackets and emphasis). It is this very division, central to the dissertation at hand, that is quoted across textbooks – inside and outside the Anglophone world where it originated.

Let us take a brief look at the contexts in which Jakobson's tripartite division is commonly featured. Composing an extensive list would be impractical – if not unattainable – given that the typology has been transplanted globally; for this reason, the discussion is restricted to the publications with a relatively wide distribution. One such sourcebook is Susan Bassnett's *Translation* Studies. In its first chapter, entitled 'Central Issues', under the subheading 'Types of Translation', Jakobson's categorisation is cited in full (Bassnett [1980] 2014, 25). In this section, Bassnett chooses to problematise the notion of equivalence, on which the division is based, in lieu of offering alternate typologies of translation. Seeing that translation can be (and, more importantly, has been) classified in a number of ways and against different sets of criteria, as it has been suggested earlier, the act of singling out Jakobson's model speaks in favour of its primacy in the field. More concerned with alternative options – and more critical of Jakobson – is Jeremy Munday in *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*, who provides the reader with several other systematisations of translation throughout his book. In the very beginning of Chapter 1 'Main Issues of Translation Studies', Jakobson's three types are neatly quoted and elaborated on separately (Munday 2012, 8), yet the challenges to this division are set out at a much later point (Munday 2012, 59–60; 256). Such early placing of Jakobson's classification – right after the introduction of 'source' and 'target language' – gives us the impression that, despite occasional criticism, the notions of *intra-*, *interlingual*, and *intersemiotic translation* are a prerequisite for further engagement with the theories and concepts of translation studies.

1.3.2 Linguistic Instability as a Recurring Phenomenon

To justify the study of the *intra-* and *interlingual translation*'s instability, we ought to estimate whether the cases that bring these notions into question are isolated or common. To what extent the linguistic situation of the spotlighted Balkan countries is unique can only be assessed by looking at other related instances. Of interest are the cases of linguistic instability triggered by sociopolitical factors, not the changes that occur spontaneously. In the section on the relationship between language and ideology, Munday lists some examples of asymmetry between languages:

> [L]anguage imbalance (and the economic and political power behind it) has been a constant backdrop to translation throughout the ages. This encompassed the hegemony

and prestige of Classical languages such as Greek, Latin and Sanskrit which constrained translation of sacred scriptures into vernacular languages. More recent political developments include the creation of Bahasa Malaysia as a language distinct from Bahasa Indonesia to promote national unity in Malaysia, the promotion of 'lesser-spoken' languages such as Irish and Basque in Europe, and the division of Serbo-Croat into distinct languages (Serbian and Croatian) for political and identitary reasons. (Munday 2012, 210; round brackets in the original)

The rift between Bahasa Malaysia and Bahasa Indonesia exposes that linguistic branching is not limited to the languages of the Balkan Slav. Excluded from Munday's list is probably the most famous modern instance of linguistic bifurcation for sociopolitical reasons, that involving Hindi and Urdu.[3] The quoted excerpt indicates that non-linguistic interfering into linguistic matters is more common than it appears, though the process and final results may not always be as dramatic as in Serbo-Croatian case. The indication that languages tend to frequently join and part as a result of non-linguistic forces highlights the pertinence of studying of the relationship between language and sociopolitical factors.

1.3.3 Multilingualism as a Shifting Paradigm

When linguistic borders are destabilised on the level of a literary text – through the artistic mixing of different languages – the result is multilingual literature. Multilingualism, as a phenomenon, has a much broader reach – in addition to art, it can manifest on the level of an individual, institution, state, to name but a few. While Liesbeth Minnaard and Till Dembeck, editors of *Challenging the Myth of Monolingualism*, put forward that multilingualism, rather than monolingualism, is 'the sign of our present time' (Minnaard and Dembeck 2015, 9), Yasemin Yildiz, author of *Beyond the Mother Tongue: The Postmonolingual Condition*, asserts that it is the *tension* between multilingual realities, on the one hand, and the endurance of a monolingual paradigm, on the other, that organises the social world of western societies (Yildiz 2012, 2). As of late, a growing number of scholars from different disciplines has directed their research towards multilingual realities. Similarly, this shifting paradigm has been an inspiration to writers and other artists that use language as a creative tool. In light of these recent tendencies, it would not be an overstatement to suggest that the study of multilingualism and its effects upon translatability bears a wider social relevance.

1.3.4 Cultural Effects of Linguistic Instability

As current scholarship has concentrated on the exploration of influences that *cause* the instability in linguistic and consequently translational structures, little has been researched into the potential *effects* of these convulsions. The outlined problem hides much broader – and more ominous – implications of linguistic, translational, cultural, and sociological kind. While this project cannot possibly venture into all of these realms, explored will be only the issues pertaining to literature. The pronounced vulnerability of literary structures creeps in to internal as well as to external layers. On a national level, canons gravitate towards revision with every new constellation of languages. On an international level, the traditional patterns of literary circulation are likely to remodel. The ways in which fiction circulates in the aftermath of linguistic discontinuity has not been studied adequately. With a view to decoding these newly formulated patterns but also with the hope of increasing the international visibility of

---

[3] For a publication that considers the division between Hindu and Urdu controversial, see, for example, Abdul Jamil Khan's monograph *The Politics of Language. Urdu/Hindi: An Artificial Divide* (2006). For a publication that justifies the divide, see, for example, Maria Isabel Maldonado Garcia's monograph *Urdu Evolution and Reforms* (2015).

literature(s) in the affected language(s), the mentioned aspects are well worthy of a more thorough academic inspection.

1.4 Definitions and Terminology

As terminology is far from uniform, this section aims to define the most important terminological positions that this thesis has adopted. Attention will be directed at the two key terms – *linguistic fluidity* (see 1.4.1) and *literary circulation* (see 1.4.5) – used to organise the whole research. Likewise, outlined will be the terms characterised by ambiguity: this includes the cluster of terms *language, speech variety*, *standard variety*, *literary standard*, *lect*, *languoid*, *idiom* (see 1.4.2), the scopes of which overlap to an extent; and *multilingualism* (see 1.4.4), which ought to be specified in relation to *bilingualism*. Explained too will be the implications contained in the term *Serbo-Croatian successor languages* (see 1.4.3). Other terms vital for the thesis, more controversial ones in particular, will be discussed as they are introduced.

1.4.1 Linguistic Fluidity

In his monograph *Language and Identity*, Michael Cronin is keen to fight the common treatment of translation as something fixed. To counterbalance such perception, he proposes the concept of 'translation as a *mutable mobile* which operates within a *topology of fluidity*' (Cronin 2006, 28; my emphasis). Such approach acknowledges the phenomenon's natural inclination towards movement and change. This research situates itself precisely in this 'topology of fluidity' and presupposes that translation is a 'mutual mobile'.

I use *linguistic fluidity* as an umbrella term, to collectively refer to a range of manifestations where linguistic borders are challenged. From a macro perspective, *linguistic fluidity* covers the instability of linguistic unity and linguistic identity. From a micro perspective, *linguistic fluidity* is used to describe multilingual texts that disrespect traditional integrity of languages and do not hesitate to fuse different linguistic entities to form a novel literary expression. In current literature, this term is usually employed to mark one of the above mentioned aspects.

1.4.2 Language, Speech Variety, Standard Variety, Literary Standard, Lect, Languoid, Idiom

Since *language* is too broad a term, it would be helpful to theoretically nuance its distribution by introducing a few related notions. In the sea of candidate terms, most germane to our discussion are the following: *speech variety*, *standard variety*, *literary standard*, *lect*, *languoid*, *idiom.*

In sociolinguistics the term *speech variety* has been subject to debate for its multiple meanings:

> The term *speech variety* is the label given to that language (or form of language) used by any group of speakers. It is an ambiguous term, which can refer to the basic lexicon, phonology, syntax, and morphology shared by members of the group or to speech used by members of the group in particular situations. Speech varieties are of four types: the *standard* language, social speech varieties (also called social dialects or *sociolects*), regional speech varieties (or *regional dialects*), and functional speech varieties (or *registers*). (Southerland and Katamba [1987] 1996, 541; emphasis in the original)

In this particular project, *speech variety* will be used to refer to the *standard variety*. This is probably the most widespread usage of this term. It should be noted that *standard variety* is often treated interchangeably with *literary standard*. The more general use of *speech variety*

has been ruled out because *speech variety* stays *within* a language and in this discussion it will often be undesirable to label some structures as language.

  Lect is the most suitable term when it is impossible, irrelevant, or touchy to determine the exact categorisation of a certain linguistic structure. *Lect* is especially adequate in contexts where discerning linguistic borders is a sensitive question and where the researcher strives to maintain neutrality. To this effect, it has often been used in the discussions on Arabic's mutually incomprehensible dialects,[4] which many regard as separate languages. Considering that the sociolinguistic landscape of the modern Balkans suffers from socio-political tensions, I firmly believe that the term *lect* would be the most appropriate for our analysis.

  Languoid overlaps with *lect* for the most part – the main difference lies in that it can be used to denote much larger structures, such as Sprachbunds. As the priority of this dissertation is to find a term that would eliminate the distinction between a language and a variety, and, occasionally, between a language and a dialect, *languoid* appears unnecessarily broad. For this reason, *lect* will be implemented consistently throughout the thesis.

  At last, *idiom* will be used to refer to lects of a specific historical period or a specific context, such as the language of a certain author.

1.4.3 Serbo-Croatian Successor Languages

Problematic too is the way of collectively referring to Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin in the post-disintegration context. This thesis, which borrows Ranko Bugarski's[5] now widely accepted[6] terminology, opts for the *Serbo-Croatian successor languages* phrasing. This is neither to imply that these individual lects have no history prior to the Serbo-Croatian phase nor that they have directly developed from Serbo-Croatian. Rather, the term denotes an *administrative* succession. In that sense, the thesis will often metaphorically refer to Serbo-Croatian as a 'monolith'.

1.4.4 Multilingualism

Let me add a short note regarding the scope of the term *multilingualism*. I agree with Larissa Aronin and Ulrike Jassner in considering *bilingualism* a case of *multilingualism* rather than the other way round (Aronin and Jessner 2014, 56). I deem the use of term *bilingualism* superfluous in that distinguishing the exact number of languages in operation is irrelevant for this study. Henceforth, the term *multilingualism* will be used to cover the use of two as well as of a greater number of languages.

1.4.5 Literary Circulation

The term *literary circulation* will be used in the sense defined by David Damrosch. *Literary circulation*, in a nutshell, refers to the phenomenon when a literary work travels 'into a broader world beyond its linguistic and cultural point of origin' (Damrosch 2003, 6). Oftentimes this 'point of origin' is defined in strictly national terms. As *literary circulation* is inextricably

---

[4] For more on Arabic lects, see, for example, Joseph Chetrit's paper 'Judeo-Arabic Dialects in North Africa as Communal Languages: Lects, Polylects, and Sociolects' (2014).

[5] See, for example, Ranko Bugarski's 'What's in a Name: The Case of Serbo-Croatian' (2004).

[6] For the publications that utilise this phrase, see, for example: Celia Hawkesworth's essay 'Serbo-Croatian and its Successors in British Universities' (2004); Sven Gustavsson's 'Serbo-Croatian and its Successors in the Nordic Countries' (2004); Srđan Mladenov Jovanović's 'Assertive Discourse and Folk Linguistics: Serbian Nationalist Discourse about the Cyrillic Script in the 21st Century' (2018).

intertwined with the concept of *world literature* in Damrosch's rendering, two lengthy excerpts are worth quoting to portray the nature of this relationship:

> My claim is that world literature is not an infinite, ungraspable canon of works but rather a mode of circulation and of reading, a mode that is as applicable to individual works as to bodies of material, available for reading established classics and new discoveries alike. (Damrosch 2003, 5)
> […]
> A work enters into world literature by a double process: first, by being read *as* literature; second, by circulating out into a broader world beyond its linguistic and cultural point of origin. A given work can enter into world literature and then fall out of it again if it shifts beyond a threshold point along either axis, the literary or the worldly. Over the centuries, an un- usually shifty work can come in and out of the sphere of world literature several different times; and at any given point, a work may function as world literature for some readers but not others, and for some kinds of reading but not others. The shifts a work may undergo, moreover, do not reflect the unfolding of some internal logic of the work in itself but come about through often complex dynamics of cultural change and contestation. (Damrosch 2003, 6; emphasis in the original)

The exploration of global phenomena is acutely sensitive. Damrosch, therefore, emphasises the impossibility of establishing an impartial view: 'For any given observer, even a genuinely global perspective remains a perspective *from somewhere*, and global patterns of the circulation of world literature take shape in their local manifestations' (Damrosch 2003, 27). The position from which this project speaks as well as the assumptions that it makes will be outlined in the following section.

1.5 Delimitations of Scope and Key Assumptions

Within the scope of this dissertation falls the linguistic landscape of the four Balkan countries: Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and, to a lesser degree, Montenegro; occasional intersections and relations with other South Slavic languages – Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Slovene – are addressed peripherally. As far as the timescale is concerned, the dissertation will focus not only on the post-Yugoslav production but also on the texts from earlier stages, including a folk ballad that predates any standardisation.

A crucial remark before proceeding any further. Whether Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin are one language or four separate languages in their own right is a highly sensitive question these days, bound to entangle any intellectual engagement in political discourse. Bugarski tries to explain this duality:

> If we discard various ideological extremes, is there a way of deciding whether Serbo-Croatian is still one language or is it now several languages? I believe that this dilemma can no longer be resolved in a straightforward and unqualified way. The question must rather be posed on two or three levels simultaneously. On the linguistic and communication level, Serbo-Croatian can still legitimately be regarded as a single entity. Its different national norms are extremely close to each other structurally, a fact reflected in the unimpeded communication among speakers of average education from, say, Belgrade, Podgorica, Zagreb and Sarajevo. In contrast, on the political and symbolic level there is clearly no more Serbo-Croatian, since – as already stated – this term does not occur in the legislation of the new states on formerly Yugoslav territory, where their separate standard languages serve as major symbols of national identity and statehood.
> […]

It is clear from these considerations that, when viewed in such a multi-layer perspective, the existence of Serbo-Croatian is not an either-or but a both-and matter. In its barest essentials it boils down to the statement that standard Serbo-Croatian today is simultaneously one language and several languages: one linguistic in the guise of three or four political languages.

[. . .]

Given this duality of perspective, most linguists will presumably grant priority to the first level mentioned, as confirmed by the continuing prevalent practice of international scholarship of treating Serbo-Croatian as essentially a single entity. I myself share this view, both as a linguist and as a native speaker of what I have always thought of as Serbo-Croatian. Conversely, those primarily concerned with safeguarding and promoting national interests as they see them, including some politically engaged linguists, are more likely to give pride of place to the second-mentioned level of observation. (Bugarski 2004, 18)

Pinpointing the exact number of Serbo-Croatian's successors has also been the subject of much debate: some are willing to grant only Serbian and Croatian the status of a language, whereas others acknowledge Bosnian and Montenegrin too. This thesis has no ambition to challenge the current position of these lects nor to further politicise the linguistic question by attempting to discern linguistic borders. When discussed from a contemporary perspective, the dissertation will refer to Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin as separate languages – respecting their official statuses, as recognised by the respective countries responsible for their standardisation.[7] Such position is by no means taken in the attempt to legitimise the new standards but rather as a way of exploring how the complex phenomenon of linguistic fluidity influences translational relations.

The subjective component problematises the matter at hand in a way that reinforces Donna Haraway's assertions that no research is neutral, that no perspective is all-encompassing, and that no knowledge can be objective in that it is impossible to simultaneously dwell inside and outside the frame (Haraway 1988). If we concede there is some truth in these ideas, perhaps then I should state that I speak from the Serbian side of the border and that my, to use Chomsky's term, linguistic competence is that of a 'native' speaker of Serbian, even though I belong to the last generation born in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the official language of which was Serbo-Croatian.

The parts of this dissertation that take a transnational perspective are limited to the ways in which the dynamic linguistic situation of the Balkans has been reflected on the educational systems and literary spheres of the Anglophone countries – the UK, the USA, Canada, and Ireland in particular – in the period following the disintegration of Yugoslavia. My decision to track circulation on a relatively wide sample is motivated by the assumption that a comparative analysis could show certain patterns and, thereby, lend greater validity to the results.

The overall scope of this dissertation has been dictated by my restricted linguistic and literary competences. My study of theoretical conceptualisations is limited to a specific cluster of languages. Further empirical research, venturing into cultural traditions and linguistic situations of other communities and regions, would be necessary in supplementing, reaffirming, or perhaps challenging, the theoretical findings of this as well as of previous studies.

---

[7] It should be noted that the Board for Standardisation of the Serbian Language challenges the position of the Bosnian language. The text of its decision on the Bosnian or Bosniak language is available at the following link: http://www.ossj.rs/odluke-i-saopstenja/o-statusu-bosanskog-ili-bosnjackog-jezika/.

1.6 Outline of the Thesis

This thesis has been structured around four main parts:

> I   Prelude (Chapter 1, 2, and 3);
> II Translational Relations' Instability: Causes (Chapter 4, 5, and 6);
> III Translational Relations' Instability: Effects (Chapter 7);
> IV Conclusions (Chapter 8).

A short overview of each chapter will be provided below, with a special emphasis on Parts II and III, which constitute the body of this dissertation.

Chapter 1 *Introduction* acquaints the reader with the thesis' contextual background, formulates the main research question and hypotheses, and then proceeds to establish a theoretical framework, determine the research scope, and define key terminology.

Chapter 2 *Intra- and Interlingual Translation: Origin, Evolution, and Critique* poses a review of current scholarship on the topic, with a narrow focus on the theoretical revisions of Jakobson's notions of *intra-* and *interlingual translation.* Six main lines of critique emerge: the classification's relationship with interpretation; its scope; its negligence regarding the translation of polysemiotic mediums; its inattentiveness to the uncertain nature of linguistic borders; its implication concerning the minimal unit of translation; its assumption of monolingualism. Having diagnosed the underexplored areas of study, the chapter locates the thesis' principal points of departure, which build on the four of the mentioned lines – all barring the scope of Jakobson's typology and its relationship with interpretation.

Chapter 3 *Methodological Overview* explains the dissertation's rationale for methodological pluralism – citing the individual methodologies' limitations and the project's interdisciplinary nature. The chapter pays meticulous attention to each of the employed methodologies – sociolinguistic approach, close reading, comparative translation discourse analysis, and distant reading. Not only their individual underpinnings are explained but also how they function collectively.

Chapter 4 *Translational Relations in a Temporal Context: The Folk Ballad Hasanaginica* delves into the temporal dimension of translational relations' instability by tracing the long history of the folk ballad *Hasanaginica*. As the language identification of this ballad has been the subject of heated debates, the chapter opens with a timeline of South Slavic lects that evolved into Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin and goes on to outline the ballad's origins and context. *Hasanaginica*, which precedes any linguistic codification, is understandable to speakers of four modern official languages and contains a series of linguistic features mutual to all successor languages. Owing to its ambiguity, the ballad escapes clear linguistic classification in modern terms, which brings to the fore the tentative nature of linguistic boundaries. The chapter discusses the ways in which literature, languages and their borders change – in the attempt to demonstrate how the passing of time affects the ballad's translatability and the associating translational relations.

Chapter 5 *Translational Relations in a Spatial Context: Stevan Sremac's Novel and Zdravko Šotra's Film Zona Zamfirova* centres Zdravko Šotra's ecranisation (2002) of Stevan Sremac's novel *Zona Zamfirova* (1903), which features the Prizren-Timok dialect of the Serbian language. Departing from the Serbian speakers' claim that an interlingual translation into Croatian helped them understand *Zona Zamfirova*'s dialectally saturated dialogues better, the chapter aims to answer how it is possible that a speaker of one language can have difficulties understanding a dialect of their own language yet comprehend the translation into what is officially a foreign language. With a view to assessing the rate of destabilisation of *intra-* and *interlingual* relations in a spatial context, the chapter first measures the degrees of distance and closeness between standard Serbian, the Prizren-Timok dialect, and standard Croatian. A theoretical deliberation

is supplemented with an empirical study in which intelligibility is reviewed both through the self-assessment and objective testing of Serbian speaker's understanding of the Prizren-Timok and Croatian lect. The final part of this chapter analyses the complex ways in which fragmentation and heterogeneity affect linguistic borders and, by extension, translational relations.

Chapter 6 *Translational Relations in a Textual Context: David Albahari's Multilingual Story 'Learning Cyrillic'* uses David Albahari's short story 'Learning Cyrillic' (2003) and its English translation by Ellen Elias-Bursać (2012) to examine the destabilisation patterns in the concepts of *intra-* and *interlingual translation* that occur in a multilingual environment of a text. The story's multicultural exchange is palpable in the intersection of three languages – Serbian, English, and the Blackfoot indigenous language of North America – and two scripts – Latin and Cyrillic. The predominantly Serbian text is interspersed with words in the Blackfoot language, whereas the story's English setting is represented through fictional multilingualism. These relations change in Elias-Bursać's translation: on the one hand, the English language no longer intertwines immaterially but physically dominates the text; on the other, few short sentences in the Serbian Cyrillic script, together with the authentic Blackfoot phrases, remain untranslated into English. In pursuance of reinforcing the pertinence of a contextual framework for the study of multilingual literature's translational relations, the chapter analyses how Elias-Bursać's multilingually and graphically aware translation disrupts the traditionally predictable behaviour of 'source' and 'target' and thereby proposes the adoption of a scalable minimal unit of translation.

Chapter 7 *Literary Circulation in the Context of Linguistic Discontinuity: Todd Hasak-Lowy's Short Story 'The Task of This Translator'* investigates how literature circulates in the aftermath of linguistic discontinuity. Analysed against Todd Hasak-Lowy's short story 'The Task of This Translator' (2005), which humorously portrays some of the key problems, the chapter surveys the presence of Serbian literature in Anglophone countries, concentrating on the roles that educational institutions, publishing industry, and the reading public play in the processes of cross-cultural contamination. The quantitative data is collected mainly from databases and statistical reports, whereas the qualitative data is extracted from interviews and texts by translators, scholars, and publishers. The chapter aims to show that the Serbian literature's hindered circulation in the transnational field of Anglophone countries partially stems from the Serbo-Croatian's splintering and its successor's common misidentification in international circles.

Finally, Chapter 8 *Conclusions* restates the main findings of this project and summarises the arguments put forward in the previous chapters. The overall conclusions are supplemented with the discussion of the thesis' scientific contribution. Lastly, identified are the areas that could be promising research avenues for future studies.

2 Intra- and Interlingual Translation

Origin, Evolution, and Critique

> *There is no such thing as a new idea. It is impossible.*
> *We simply take a lot of old ideas and put them into*
> *a sort of mental kaleidoscope.*
>
> Mark Twain, *Mark Twain's Own Autobiography*

2.1 Preliminaries

This chapter introduces the theoretical debate surrounding Roman Jakobson's classification of translation[8] – and particularly that pertaining to the notions of *intra-* and *interlingual translation*. The review aims to cover the debate's entire trajectory, starting from its inception in the 1980s all the way to the most recent articles, published just few months before the drafting of this piece. In part, Jakobson's model has been the subject of perpetual revisions as a consequence of the historical moment in which it originated. Namely, the year 1959, when 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation' saw the light of day, considerably precedes the foundation of translation studies as an independent discipline. In the decades when the study of translation theory and practice was still peripheral in the wider system of academia, there was no unified framework of research.

> Scholars interested in translation approached different, all of them partial, aspects of this phenomenon [. . .] and they did so within various disciplines, subdisciplines and interdisciplines, such as logic, theoretical and descriptive linguistics, contrastive and applied linguistics, *stylistique comparée*, comparative literature,[9] and comparative poetics. (Toury 1986, 1111)

While an early timing of these publications does not diminish the merit of their findings, it leaves research conducted during the pre-discipline era highly prone to additional scientific scrutiny.

In wake of translation studies' institutionalisation, which took place in the 1980s, Toury deems a reexamination of ideas conceived in another context absolutely necessary (Toury 1986, 1111). '[W]ith the widening of the perspective', he holds, 'additional "facts" inevitably present themselves, whereas the known ones have been reinterpreted, reformulated, and very often even modified according to the basic assumptions and initial hypotheses of the discipline and in connection to the newly discovered "facts"' (Toury 1986, 1112). It should come as no surprise, then, that the first articles revisiting Jakobson's seminal essay, published in the mid-1980s, coincide with the establishment of translation studies. After more than twenty-five years of silence, during which 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation' (1959) was not questioned,

---

[8] Reviews of scholarship on the fluidity of South Slavic languages, multilingual literature, canon creation, and literary circulation will be distributed across the dissertation as a whole, in chapters dealing with each of these topics respectively.

[9] André Lefevere and Susan Bassnett (1990) discuss the traditional position of translation studies within '[the] amorphous quasi-discipline known as Comparative Literature' (Lefevere and Bassnett 1990, 12), arguing that since 'no study of Comparative Literature can take place without regard to translation' (Lefevere and Bassnett 1990, 12), comparative literature should be considered a subdiscipline of translation studies rather than the other way round (Lefevere and Bassnett 1990, 12).

a series of reconsiderations has appeared – beginning with those by Jacques Derrida (1985) and Gideon Toury (1986) in the 1980s, across John Sturrock (1991), Anthony Pym ([1992] 2010), and Theo Hermans (1997) in the 1990s, to Omar Calabrese (2000), Umberto Eco (2003), Özlem Berk Albachten (2014), Kathleen Davis (2014), and Henrik Gottlieb (2018) in the new millennium – thereby continuing, with relative constancy, till the present day.

Other noteworthy studies – yet those addressing facets of Jakobson's typology auxiliary to this dissertation – will be pointed towards where adequate. The first section of this chapter will, however, be reserved for the aforementioned revisions of 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation' (1959), which offer a substantial portion of critique. One more remark: only Sturrock's (1991) article is fully dedicated to the review of Jakobson's stances on translation; in other publications, where Jakobson's tripartition is not the principal theme but serves merely as a starting point for further exploration or as a conceptual framework, the critique is either scattered across the piece or concentrated in one place, usually the introduction where the notion of *translation* is being defined. For the purposes of this literature review, I shall prioritise aspects important for this thesis rather than the overall argumentation of the given work.

The concluding section of this chapter hopes to identify the areas underexplored by previous publications with a view to detecting research gaps in the existing literature. In addition to situating this project within the current debates of the field, it also provides a synthesis of the critiques outlined in earlier parts of this chapter. An assessment of the already pursued lines of argument should help point out the directions in which the dissertation will seek its scientific contribution. Once the boundaries of existing knowledge are set out, the section will proceed with refining the study's scope – especially in theoretical terms; at this point, its limits will also be carefully acknowledged. A concisely defined scope along with a clearly positioned research should serve as an onset for the analysis but, before that, for the selection of adequate methodologies.

2.2 *Intra-* and *Interlingual Translation*: Main Lines of Critique

Synthesised in this section are the most pertinent lines of critique directed at Jakobson's typology as well as at the notions of *intra-* and *interlingual translation* specifically. Over the years, theorists have approached 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation' (1959) from a vast range of perspectives, encompassing a great number of facets. Generally speaking, Sturrock (1991), Calabrese (2000), Gottlieb (2018), and to a large degree, Eco (2003) proceed in the semiotic tradition of the original text; Toury (1986) expands the semiotic perspective by combining it with a cultural one; Pym's ([1992] 2010) study is almost exclusively rooted in culture; Hermans's (1997) mainly sociological viewpoint is occasionally intertwined with a cultural one; Albachten's (2014) article is predominantly sociologically oriented; Davis (2014) looks at the issues through the lens of history; and, finally, Derrida (1985) positions his discussion within the philosophy of language. This variety of perspectives and their combinations has been used to highlight different issues emanating from Jakobson's framework. In rough terms, six dominant lines of critique can be singled out. The typology has been under scrutiny for: its assuming relationship with interpretation (see 2.2.1); its scope (see 2.2.2); not taking into consideration the complexity of translating polysemiotic mediums (see 2.2.3); disregarding the difficulty of determining linguistic borders (see 2.2.4); implying that *word* is the minimal unit of translation (see 2.2.5); presupposing the monolingual nature of content (see 2.2.6). These six lines of critique – around which the following subsections have been structured – often overlap and it is not always possible to fully segregate one from the other. To this effect, the provided subsectioning should be taken merely as indicative. Finally, as this section has been organised in accordance with the reviewed studies' argumentation – rather than chronologically or thematically, for example – the discussion on publications touching on more than one line of critique will inevitably be split between subsections.

2.2.1 Translation and Interpretation

While the relationship between *translation* and *interpretation* will not be analysed in this dissertation, I deem it important to present this line of critique as it has almost invariably been featured in semiotically-tinted deliberations of Jakobson's three-part division. Let me begin with Sturrock's (1991) tellingly entitled 'On Jakobson on Translation' contribution to *Recent Developments in Theory and History: The Semiotic Web,* 1990 – the only article-length revision devoted solely to Jakobson's standpoints on translation. The text's predominant position is, expectedly, a semiotic one, albeit accompanied with frequent excursions into the philosophy of language. Sturrock argues that Jakobson 'takes a broad view of what translation consists in, by identifying it with the primary linguistic act of "interpretation", or semiosis' (Sturrock 1991, 309). Why would Jakobson put an equals sign between the notions of *translation* and *interpretation*? By Sturrock's logic, these concepts are 'continuous' with one another, despite contemporary English's distinction between the two (Sturrock 1991, 309). '[I]t would be foolish to categorize them as distinct operations' (Sturrock 1991, 309), as the sole distinction, he maintains, lies in the amount of freedom interpreters and translators assume (Sturrock 1991, 309). According to Sturrock, translation is 'more rigorous' and this divergence is embodied in English grammar, which places a definite article in front of 'translation' and an indefinite one in front of 'interpretation' (cf. 'the translation' and 'an interpretation') (Sturrock 1991, 309; brackets in the original). But just like manifold interpretations can coexist, so too manifold (re)translations can occur, and with the establishment of retranslation studies in the 1990s,[10] more and more theorists tend to talk about 'a translation' rather than 'the translation'.

Jakobson's proclamation that his three kinds of 'translation' are distinguished on the basis of '*interpreting* a verbal sign' (Jakobson [1959] 2012, 127; my emphasis) troubled Eco as well. In his semiotically oriented book *Mouse or Rat: Translation as Negotiation* (2003), which is more popular in character than any other publication reviewed in this chapter,[11] Eco departs in the same direction as his fellow semiotician Sturrock. With a view to grasping the basic premise of Jakobson's typology, Eco thoroughly investigates the relationship between *translation* and *interpretation*.[12] As outlined, Sturrock suggests the two terms are synonymous, thereby proposing what appears to be a non-hierarchical understanding, devoid of any assessments whether one presupposes superiority over the other. Nevertheless, Eco believes the relationship in question must be a hierarchical one: either translation is a form of interpretation or it is the other way round (Eco 2003, 124). If Jakobson's classification relies on Pierce's broad notion of interpretation, then *intra-*, *interlingual*, and *intersemiotic translation* are, in fact, three types of *interpretation*. In this case, which Eco deems more probable, the

---

[10] The emergence of retranslation studies is usually traced back to the year 1990, when Paul Bensimon and Antoine Berman formulated the so-called 'retranslation hypothesis' in the special edition *Retraduire* (Retranslation) of the Paris-based journal *Palimpsestes*. See the two opening texts: Paul Bensimon's 'Présentation' (Introduction; 1990) and Antoine Berman's 'La retraduction comme espace de la traduction' (Retranslation as a Space of Translation; 1990). More recently, a small cohort of studies has tried to counter 'the discourse of lack' induced by the retranslation hypothesis; see, for example, Françoise Massardier-Kenney's article 'Toward a Rethinking of Retranslation' (2015).

[11] Primarily based on a series of lectures, the book's referencing is rather limited. It should be noted that Eco wrote on the topic in a couple of articles, e.g. in 'Traduzione e interpretazione' (Translation and Interpretation, 2000). The revisited versions of these papers have been incorporated into *Mouse or Rat: Translation as Negotiation* (2003). As the book is said to contain Eco's most mature thoughts on the matter, the earlier publications will not been taken into consideration.

[12] For the discussion on the relationship between *translation* and *interpretation*, see also Maurizio Gagliano's paper 'Traduzione e interpretazione. Proposta per una griglia teorica unitaria' (Translation and Interpretation. Proposal for a Unified Theoretical Grid; 2000).

unstated premise of the division is: 'translation is a species of the genus *interpretation*' (Eco 2003, 124; emphasis in the original). Eco even speculates that Jakobson used the term *translation* in lieu of *interpretation* not to break the spirit of the volume to which he was contributing (Eco 2003, 124). If, however, Jakobson was straightforward in distinguishing three kinds of *translation*, then the underlying premise is: 'every interpretation is a form of translation' (Eco 2003, 124). The recognition that '*rewording* covers an immense variety of types of interpretation' (Eco 2003, 124; emphasis in the original) could make it tempting to accept the latter option.

Eco, however, finds the latter line of reasoning – advocated, among others, by George Steiner in *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation* (Steiner 1975) – problematic. Departing from Pierce's inclusive notion of *interpretation* (which Eco believes was the starting point for Jakobson too), Eco objects Steiner's theory that all interpretation is a form of translation (Eco 2003, 125–126). In the section 'Rewording is not translation', Eco pushes Pierce's statement – that suggesting interpretation can be conducted by means of synonyms, definitions, paraphrases, deductions, or encyclopaedic entries – to its limits by applying it in practice to an excerpt from Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. From this humorous exercise of rewording first solely by means of definitions (Eco 2003, 127–128), then by means of synonyms (Eco 2003, 128–129), and finally by means of paraphrase (Eco 2003, 129–130), Eco deduces that a blind application of these strategies – while undoubtedly still a form of *rewording* – qualitatively differs from the customary process of translation and should not be considered one of its forms (Eco 2003, 130). This poses a serious challenge *to interlingual translation*'s alternative term of *rewording*, which – as we shall soon see – many authors are hesitant to embrace.

2.2.2 The Scope of Jakobson's Typology

In introducing the concepts of *intra-* and *interlingual translation*, the previous chapter (see 1.3.1) has attempted to illustrate Jakobson's enormous contribution to the field of translation studies. A quick survey of general contexts in which Jakobson's division has been commonly featured – ranging from introductory sourcebooks to anthologies of translation studies – has aimed to underline the status of Jakobson's essay 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation' (1959) as a *sine qua non* of the discipline in question. This subsection has no intentions of restating what has already been affirmed in this respect; rather, it wishes to advance the discussion by setting out the conceptual reasons that enabled the institutionalisation of Jakobson's text in the first place. To this effect, the discussion will centre the arguments suggesting the division's role in fostering the expansion of our understanding of translation, but also those running counter to this widespread belief.

Whether the scope of Jakobson's typology is (too) narrow or (too) broad has been a matter discord among translation theorists. On the whole, a slender majority agrees the value of Jakobson's triad lies in its broad understanding of translation that includes, *intralingual* and *intersemiotic* along with the traditional *interlingual* one (Albachten 2014, 574; Weissbort and Eysteinsson 2009, 394). Albachten, for example, writes that 'Jakobson's categorisation is an important attempt to position translation in a broad framework in which translation is not defined only as an interlingual process or the product of such process' (Albachten 2014, 574). By putting Jakobson's model in a historical perspective, Hermans reminds us how revolutionary and, in a sense, controversial it must have been in 1959 to propose that translation also encompasses *rewording* and *transmutation* (Hermans 1997, 17). Such open interpretation of translation, which goes beyond the realms of linguistic by including *intersemiotic*, is said to have played a valuable role even in contemporary definitions of translation (Weissbort and Eysteinsson 2009, 394).

Nonetheless, the inclusion of *intersemiotic translation*[13] remains somewhat controversial even in the 1990s and 2000s. Sturrock, for instance, finds the proposed typology too broad (Sturrock 1991, 310). In lieu of joining those endorsing Jakobson's extension of the concept of translation, Sturrock argues in favour of its restriction: he opposes the admission of *intersemiotic translation* on the grounds of its impossibility to undergo a backtranslation (Sturrock 1991, 310). For, he deems, *intersemiotic translation* is 'a one-way operation', whereas *intra-* and *interlingual translation* are '[] two-way or reversible operation[s]' (Sturrock 1991, 310). Despite his restriction of translation to the notions of *intra-* and *interlingual* ones, Sturrock does not circumscribe translation to verbal content (Sturrock 1991, 310). Citing the examples of pictorial and iconic signs, Sturrock states '[t]here is no need why that should not count as an act of translation, for it is certainly not "transmutation"'(Sturrock 1991, 310).

Sturrock is not alone in finding Jakobson's incorporation of *intersemiotic translation* theoretically unjustifiable. A conspicuous proponent of such belief is Eco, who, at the very first page of his book *Mouse or Rat: Translation as Negotiation*, openly declares his position 'against the exaggeratedly indulging idea of translation' (Eco 2003, 1). He proceeds to specify the word *translation* will be used in its 'proper sense', *id est* 'the version from a text A in a verbal language Alpha into a text B in a verbal language Beta' (Eco 2003, 1). In confining the notion of *translation* to *interlingual* kind and to verbal content alone, Eco's understanding of *translation* is the most restrained one of all hereby reviewed authors. He goes as far as to draw the distinction between translation (n.b. without inverted commas), which is supposed to denote *interlingual translation*, and the 'so-called "translation"' (n.b. with inverted commas), which marks *intersemiotic translation* (Eco 2003, 2).

Eco repeats Sturrock's argument that *intersemiotic translation* should not be included into the translation family on account of its inability to produce a satisfactory backtranslation. From the plethora of examples that Eco provides to support this statement, I will quote just one:

> If I read the French translation of an English poem I have many ways of figuring out what the original was or at least what it was about. If I listen to the musical composition without knowing the painting I have little chance of tracing the visual source. (Eco 2003, 159)

Interestingly, Eco's own exercise from the first chapter of his book could be used to challenge this assertion. Namely, Eco uses an automatic translation system to translate the phrase 'The works of Shakespeare' from English into Italian and back into English. The results are as follow:

> The works of Shakespeare → *Gli impianti di Shakespeare* →
> The plants of Shakespeare (Eco 2003, 10)

The comical result 'The plants of Shakespeare' demonstrates that reconstructing the original from a translation is tricky even when it comes to verbal content. One may argue the final result is unfortunate only because it is the product of a machine rather than a human translator. Given that we replace 'Shakespeare' with some non-famous name, there is no way a human translator can tell if the polysemous word *impianti* refers to 'works' or 'plants'. In Eco's example, of course,

---

[13] For more on various facets of *intersemiotic translation*, approached mainly from a semiotic perspective, see articles published in the special issue 'Sulla traduzione intersemiotica' (On intersemiotic translation) of the Italian journal *Versus: quaderni de studi semiotici* (2000), edited by Nicola Dusi and Siri Nergaard. See particularly Nicola Dusi's paper 'Introduzione. Per una ridefinizione della traduzione intersemiotica' (Introduction. For the Redefinition of Intersemiotic Translation; 2000) from the aforementioned volume. See also Nicola Dusi's recent article on the topic: 'Intersemiotic Translation: Theories, Problems, Analysis' (2015).

we can deduct by virtue of our extralinguistic knowledge that 'works' is a more probable solution than 'plants' but there is no obstacle preventing one to write about 'the plants of Shakespeare'. It is only because we are familiar with Shakespeare's occupation and with the original phrase that served as a starting point that we find the backtranslation so comical.

The exclusion of *intersemiotic translation* continues on other grounds too. Eco believes that both Jakobson's terms – *intersemiotic translation* and *transmutation* – are inadequate and should be replaced with *adaptation*[14] (Eco 2003, 158). To prove that *adaptation* is qualitatively different from *translation*, Eco groups supporting examples around two sections: 'Adaptations say too much' (Eco 2003, 160–163) and 'Adaptations say too little' (Eco 2003, 163–165). For the purpose of brevity, interrogated will be only the former claim. Determined to show that adaptations say *too much*, Eco comments on a book-to-film metamorphosis of Henry James's novel *Portrait of a Lady*:

> It happens that in the movie [directed by Jane Campion] Isabel is interpreted by Nicole Kidman. I personally like this actress, undoubtedly very beautiful, but I think that the movie would arouse different feelings if Isabel had the countenance of Greta Garbo or the Rubenesque features of Mae West. Thus the director has made the choice for me, and as a spectator I am *less* free than as a reader. (Eco 2003, 160; my emphasis)

In writing about literary translation of prose, Antoine Berman observes the same problem: 'Where the original has no problem moving in the *indefinite*, our literary language tends to impose the definite' (Berman [1985] 2012, 245; emphasis in the original). In lieu of quoting Berman's instances, let me return to Eco's own example from the beginning of his book: 'where English recognises three separate content entries [*nephew*, *niece*, and *grandchild*], Italian recognises only one: *nipote*' (Eco 2003, 23–25; emphasis in the original). Without going into further specificities of the problem Eco was trying to illustrate with this ambiguity, it is clear that when translating 'nipote' from Italian into English, one has to decide whether the relative in question is the son/daughter of the person's sibling or child. More often than not, there is no way to know; yet, to use Berman's phrase, the *indefinite* has to be rendered with the *definite* (Berman [1985] 2012, 245). Eco's 'nipote' example, then, demonstrates that saying 'too much' is a problem equally present in 'translation proper' as in *intersemiotic translation*.

Calabrese's paper 'Lo strano caso dell'equivalenza imperfetta (modeste osservazioni sulla traduzione intersemiotica)' (A peculiar case of imperfect equivalence [modest observations on intersemiotic translation]; 2000) contains further challenges to Jakobson's typology. Even though the nucleus of Calabrese's article is *intersemiotic translation*, he comments on *intralingual translation* as well, arguing there is no room for it under the *translation* umbrella. What Jakobson terms *intralingual translation* Calabrese does not consider a form of translation or transformation at all, but merely a different *use* of the same language – as dialects or idiolects, for example, do not constitute a distinct system (Calabrese 2000, 103). Interestingly, Eco borrows the idea of 'use' (albeit in a textual context) from Lucio Spaziante (2000)[15] – although for different purposes: to exclude *intersemiotic translation* (Eco 2003, 170) – arguing that many of what Jakobson calls *intersemiotic translation* is, in fact, a *use* of a text, where the original serves as a 'stimulus' (Eco 2003, 170).

---

[14] For the relationship between *translation* and *adaptation*, see, for example André Helbo's paper 'Adaptation et traduction. Une liaison dangereuse?' (Adaptation and Translation. A Dangerous Liaison?; 2000).

[15] For more details, see Lucio Spaziante's article 'L'ora della ricreazione' (Recreation Time; 2000) from which this idea is taken.

Calabrese's rationale for the expulsion of *intersemiotic translation* is quite different. His deliberation of the proliferating terminology surrounding the concept of *intersemiotic translation* and its variants arrives at the conclusion that when talking about, say, illustrations, descriptions, or, adaptations, we do not opt for the term 'translation', not even in a metaphoric sense (Calabrese 2000, 101). *Intersemiotic translation* would be possible to theorise only on the condition that *all* semiotic systems are more or less equivalent and, therefore, comparable (Calabrese 2000, 102). What prevents the formulation of a general theory (which could encompass *intersemiotic translation*) is the existence of processes that simultaneously function at two levels: within the pre-established system(s) but also as systems in their own rights. Some examples of 'systems in themselves' (*sistemi di se stessi*, as Calabrese terms them in Italian) are to be found in music, architecture, cinema, and so forth (Calabrese 2000, 103).

Some authors – those whose position is on the completely opposite side of the spectrum from Sturrock (1991), Eco (2003), and Calabrese (2000) – claim Jakobson's categorisation may not be as *inclusive* as it appears to the majority. Its initial openness, Albachten maintains in 'Intralingual Translation: Discussion within Translation Studies and the Case of Turkey', is somewhat undermined by the author's decision to 'ascribe[] the qualifier "proper" only to the second group', that of *interlingual translation* (Albachten 2014, 574). In doing so, 'Jakobson weakens his attempt to broaden the definition of translation by including intralingual and intersemiotic forms of translating' (Albachten 2014, 574). Similar concerns have been expressed by Toury (Toury 1986, 1113) and Gottlieb (Gottlieb 2018, 45) in particular. Albachten's paper, where this critique is put forward, belongs to Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter's *A Companion to Translation Studies*, which includes – though at the very end – a section on *interlingual translation*, the type traditionally kept in the shadow of its *interlingual* counterpart (Albachten 2014, 573). Other publications have also hoped to modernise the field by throwing light on underrepresented forms of translation: an outstanding example would be Edwin Gentzler's study of various 'tradaptations',[16] an increasingly popular form of rewriting (Gentzler 2017, 170–171). In addition to Albachten's paper, Bermann and Porter's collective volume features another pertinent article that directly engages with the inconsistencies of Jakobson's framework – Kathleen Davis's 'Intralingual Translation and the Making of a Language' (2014). While Albachten's study does it in relation to *intralingual translation*'s status within the division, Davis's inquiry – reviewed in one of the ensuing subsections – draws on the aggregate effects of time-induced changes upon the notions of *intra-* and *interlingual translation*.

Albachten, who situates her discussion in a wider debate on Jakobson's tripartition, traces various practices of *intralingual translation* in twentieth-century Turkey, particularly those concerned with 'updating' the language of classics in light of ideological and orthographic changes brought up by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's nation-building project. Her goal is to show that 'intralingual translation is not merely a linguistic activity where identical reproductions of the original are made by replacing words with their synonyms' (Albachten 2014, 583). Her argument, therefore, follows the line of critique signalling Jakobson's inclination towards *interlingual translation*. The monopoly of interlingual output has been flagged, among others, by Scott (Scott 2012, 1–2) and Pym (Pym [1992] 2010, 23). Albachten tries to fight *intralingual translation*'s all-too-often exclusion from the translation family, on the grounds of its complex character, which makes it no less intricate than some other forms of translation. In Turkish academic circles, she notes, intralingual production is peripheral to the extent that it is referred

---

[16] Gentzler insists that 'tradaptation', a cross between translation and adaptation, is much more than a witty coinage but, rather, a genre in itself (Gentzler 2017, 170), 'characterized by both a faithful translation, showing respect for the original, as well as adapting it ever so subtly, so that certain references can be understood from a minority culture within a majority culture, an almost underground or repressed culture that the mainstream ignores' (Gentzler 2017, 170).

to as 'transfer' in lieu of 'translation' (Albachten 2014, 575). As previously mentioned, Albachten believes *intralingual translation* occupies a subsidiary status within Jakobson's typology (Albachten 2014, 574). With a view to correcting what she perceives as a bias, Albachten brings forward a series of illuminating examples from the Turkish context in order to support her assertion that *intralingual translation* should be on par with *interlingual* (the only one which Jakobson qualifies as 'proper'), as it 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' (Albachten 2014, 583).

Unlike Albachten, who reads the assignment of the qualifier 'proper' to only one category as a way of imposing certain hierarchy onto the typology, which therefore undermines the broad character for which it is praised (Albachten 2014, 574), Hermans has more understanding for Jakobson. From the point of view of Hermans' essay 'Translation as Institution' (1997) – which sees translation as a socially regulated and culturally conditioned activity – the hierarchy implied by the insertion of the qualifier 'proper' next to *interlingual translation* is not the order Jakobson is trying to impose personally. Rather, such positioning, which appears to subordinate *intralingual* and *intersemiotic translation*, is a mere reflection of 'what the non-academic community is prepared to call translation' (Hermans 1997, 17), for, beyond academia and especially at the time when *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation* (1959) was published, 'translation *is* translation proper, and only that' (Hermans 1997, 17; emphasis in the original). The attachment of the qualifier 'proper' to *interlingual translation* alone is, then, a sign of Jakobson's self-reflexivity (Hermans 1997, 18), an evidence of his awareness that the inclusion of *intralingual* and *intersemiotic translation* exceeds the realms of what is conventionally known and accepted as translation (Hermans 1997, 17).

If Hermans is to be asked, responsible for what both he and Derrida see as a 'paradoxical' synonymy of *interlingual translation* and *translation proper* (Derrida 1985, 173; Hermans 1997, 18) is the tension between the two contexts in which any meta-language on translation dwells (Hermans 1997, 18). For, Jakobson's conceptualisations belong to the domains of 'scholarship, education, research, academia, etc.', while, at the same time, they constitute a part of 'translation as social institution' (Hermans 1997, 18). This duality of translation discourse poses a much wider issue, surpassing the example of Jakobson's triad. Hermans asserts that '[t]he recognition that the academic discourse about translation is itself rooted in the institution of translation renders the separation between object-level and meta-level profoundly problematical' (Hermans 1997, 18), adding that '[t]his is especially the case if we accept Jakobson's claim that rewording constitutes, however improperly, a form of translation' (Hermans 1997, 18). In other words, by discussing, one is constantly rewording – that is translating intralingually – which prevents a translation scholar from establishing a distance deemed necessary to describe the object of study. This impossibility of alienation points towards the conclusion that 'the discourse about translation is inherently and necessarily ambivalent' (Hermans 1997, 18), which gives Hermans the courage to suggest that '[t]ranslation studies is then a subsystem of the system of translation' (Hermans 1997, 19).

On the one hand, Hermans (1997), and Weissbort and Eysteinsson (2009), and, to a lesser degree, Albachten (2014) have credited Jakobson's categorisation of translation for its open character, while, on the other, Sturrock (1991), Eco (2003), and Calabrese (2000) have attacked it for the very same reason. Gideon Toury is, at best, sceptical about any such assessment that describes Jakobson's typology as broad. Having adopted a cultural-semiotic perspective in his entry for Thomas Sebeok's *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Semiotics*, Toury labels Jakobson's division 'crude', mainly on the basis of its 'afflict[ion] with the traditional bias for *linguistic* translating' (Toury 1986, 1113; emphasis in the original). The precedence of the linguistic, he observes, is prominent to the extent that 'the notion of language appear[s], at least as a possibility, in each one of its three categories' (Toury 1986, 1113). In accordance with Toury's earlier quoted belief that the basic assumptions of the field – and Jakobson's

conceptualisation could certainly be regarded as one – ought to be revisited constantly and, if need be, reformulated (Toury 1986, 1112), Toury (1986) proposes an alternative division, the goal of which is to remedy a seemingly unjust treatment of the non-linguistic.

A swift glance is enough to reveal the altered version's effort to shed the apparent structural asymmetry found at the base of the original form. First and foremost, Toury disagrees with Jakobson in the assessment that *intra-* and *interlingual translation* operate on the same level as *intersemiotic translation*. A logical step that Toury takes in correcting this misbalance is the creation of a supracategory to house the notions of *intra-* and *interlingual translation*. On that account, Toury introduces a completely new category – that of *intrasemiotic translating*[17] – envisaged to operate in opposition to *intersemiotic translating* (Toury 1986, 1114). It is within *intrasemiotic*, then, that Toury separates *intrasystemic* (the example of which would be *intralingual translating*) from *intersystemic translating* (the example of which would be *interlingual translating*) (Toury 1986, 1114). *Intra-* and *interlingual translation* – regarded as individual types of translation by Jakobson – cease to exist categories per se in Toury's schematisation and become mere examples of the relations between codes.

Apart from these specific concerns in regard to Jakobson's classification, Toury harbours doubts about the very need for any typology of translation. In spite of his attempt to hone Jakobson's classification by offering an alternative schematisation that does not privilege the linguistic, Toury holds that,

> any such typology, be it the most systematic and refined one, seems important and useful only to the extent that the relations between various semiotic systems really affect the mechanisms which are inherent in translating itself as a type of activity. (Toury 1986, 1114)

Rather than a direct critique of Jakobson's conceptualisation, this standpoint may be interpreted as a reassessment of the relationship between theory and practice, which brings into question the purpose of theory in general. Are theoretical models, which are – by rule – based on practice, only justified if they can affect practice in return? – Toury seems to wonder. Perhaps we could go as far as to suggest this is an unwitting subversion of translation studies, a theoretically oriented discipline at the time still in its infancy. Be that as it may, this whiff of scepticism is relevant for our discussion mainly as a clue signalling that Toury's reorganisation of Jakobson's concepts – or any other similar attempt, for that matter – should not be taken as an absolute paragon but as a subtle refinement of 'the only typology [that] has gained some currency' (Toury 1986, 1113). In the decades to come, Toury's critique would be quoted widely (Albachten 2014, 575–576; Hermans 1997, 17) and, moreover, endorsed for its impartial nature that 'does not privilege one type of translation over another' (Albachten 2014, 576). General discussions of translation, as it has been shown in the previous chapter (see 1.3.1), have kept favouring the tripartition put forward by Jakobson.

2.2.3 Polysemiotic Mediums

The inclination towards the linguistic criterion, however, is not the only objection that Toury raises against Jakobson's categorisation. He is reluctant to cast away one of his principal objections – that Jakobson's typology is 'readily applicable only to *texts*, that is, to semiotic entities which have surface, overt representations' (Toury 1986, 1113; emphasis in the original). This, indeed, may be a drawback – but one that can be alleviated, if not completely eliminated, by broadening our understanding of the term 'text'. In the article 'Semiotics and

---

[17] Please note that Toury, unlike Jakobson, distinguishes between *translation* as a product and *translating* as an act or process.

Translation' (2018) from Kirsten Malmkjær's volume *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies and Linguistics*, Henrik Gottlieb, whose stance is clearly a semiotic one, asserts that '[a]s semiotics is intertwined with semantics – signs, by definition, make sense – any channel of expression in any act of communication carries meaning. For this reason, even exclusively nonverbal communication deserves the label "text"' (Gottlieb 2018, 48). Gottlieb's inclusive proposal is a direct inheritance of the 'linguistic turn'[18] – the assumption that everything can be read as a text – which took off in the 1970s. Yet, an indiscriminate imposition of a textual framework runs certain risks and John Toews wonders, though in the context of intellectual history, whether 'the theory of the linguistic density and complexity of texts, contexts, and their apparently circular relationships outrun its possible utility' (Toews 1987, 886).

Gottlieb's (2018) study departs in the direction indicated by Toury (1986), further exploring the assertion that Jakobson's division fails to take into consideration the possibility of a text being embedded in more than one code (Toury 1986, 1113). Consequently, 'when undergoing an act of translating, [texts] may have *more* than one semiotic border to cross' (Toury 1986, 1113; emphasis in the original); examples include when oral becomes written, religious secular, and literary non-literary (Toury 1986, 1113). Gottlieb also acknowledges 'the complex (*polysemiotic*) textual nature of communication, in which several semiotic channels are used simultaneously' (Gottlieb 2018, 46; emphasis and brackets in the original) but goes a step further in presenting that 'not all translated texts use the same communicative channels as their originals' (Gottlieb 2018, 46). In the fashion of Jakobson (1959) and Toury (1986), Gottlieb takes 'relation[s] among signs' as a principle criterion (Gottlieb 2018, 45) in formulating a new 'semiotically based taxonomy of translation'. Although aware that some hybrid entities may resist classification (Gottlieb 2018, 60–61), Gottlieb's ambitious aim is 'to provide conceptual tools for dealing systematically with *any* type of translation encountered in today's communicative landscape' (Gottlieb 2018, 46; my emphasis).

Gottlieb's rather elaborate – and, at times, perhaps convoluted – classification is formulated against multiple criteria, encompassing the following four dimensions of translation:

I   The degree of overlapping between the semiotic channels of a source and target text poses the overall framework of Gottlieb's typology. The distinction between *intersemiotic* and *intrasemiotic translation* is borrowed from Toury (1986); yet, the two theorists depart in the assessment whether different natural languages belong to different semiotic systems: while Toury (1986) believes so, Gottlieb finds such view 'unfortunate' in the sense that 'all vocal languages use the same oral (and often written) semiotic channels', with the exception of 'communication between a (deaf) sign language user and a (hearing) user of a vocal language', which deserves the label of 'intersemiotic translation' (Gottlieb 2018, 46–47; brackets in the original).

II The second dimension concerns the potential changes in the translation's semiotic makeup. In contrasting the semiotics of a target text with that of the original, Gottlieb establishes four groups: a. *isosemiotic* (same number of channel[s] as in the original – as opposed to the remaining three categories where the relations change); b. *infrasemiotic* (fewer channels than in the original); c. *ultrasemiotic* (more channels than in the original); d. *diasemiotic* (different channel[s] than in the original) (Gottlieb 2018, 51).

III Judging by the degree of social regulation, Gottlieb is careful to separate *conventional translation* from *adaptational* one (Gottlieb 2018, 51–52). This is a middle ground solution in comparison to Eco's proposal to fully replace *intersemiotic translation* with the term *adaptation* (Eco 2003, 158).

---

[18] For a detailed periodisation of 'linguistic turn', see, for example, Judith Surkis's article 'When Was the Linguistic Turn? A Genealogy' (2012).

IV Finally, in accordance with 'the presence or absence of verbal material in source and/or target texts' (Gottlieb 2018, 50), Gottlieb distinguishes the following types: a. *verbal* (remains verbal); b. *nonverbal* (remains nonverbal); c. *verbalised* (becomes verbal/contains verbal elements); d. *deverbalised* (becomes nonverbal/contains nonverbal elements) (Gottlieb 2018, 52).

The novelty of this typology could be sought in its systematic approach to the relations between *source* and *target*, in regard to a potential polysemiotic nature of a text as well as in connection with the presence of verbal content. Ultimately, what sets it apart from earlier attempts of classifying translation on the basis of semiotic relations is Gottlieb's honouring of the social criterion – an aspect overlooked by both Jakobson (1959) and Toury (1986).

2.2.4 Linguistic Borders

Comparably early in the chronological trajectory, another eminent commentator joined in the conversation about Jakobson's 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation' (1959). Jacques Derrida's essay 'Des Tours de Babel' (1985), the hallmark of Joseph Graham's volume *Difference in Translation*, takes a radically different perspective from the previously reviewed ones by approaching the matter from the angle of philosophy of language. Derrida's paper uses the biblical myth about the origins of linguistic diversity as an onset for the exploration of translatability and its limits. An English translation by the editor (from which I quote here) is printed alongside the French original. Both texts, notwithstanding the difference in languages, bear the exact same title. Throughout the piece, Graham's English is interspersed with multilingual intrusions. At first, it seems the essay's carefully chosen title is left in French as a result of its multilayered and ambiguous nature that would resist any just rendering into English. For those not familiar with French, Christopher Norris's semantic guidelines, provided in his seven-page-long review of *Difference in Translation*, demystify Derrida's untranslated (or, as some would say, untranslatable) title. Namely, the French noun 'tours' can mean 'towers' but also 'twists', 'tricks', or 'tropes', whereas 'des tours' is homophonous to 'detours' (Norris 1988, 54), *id est* they share the same pronunciation in spite of disparate spelling. Norris goes on to suggest that Derrida's title does not merely sound 'witty or idiomatic' but supports the author's argument on the irreducibility of the original by illustrating it in practice (Norris 1988, 54). '[Derrida's] point', Norris summarises in simple(r) terms, 'is that every natural language will come up against limits of *internal* translatability as soon as it touches on the radical instability of sense that is figured in the biblical myth' (Norris 1988, 54; emphasis in the original). These limits, as we shall soon see, emanate from a myriad of sources.

As a prelude to his deliberation on Walter Benjamin's cornerstone essay 'Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers' ('The Task of the Translator'; [1923] 2012), which occupies most of the piece, Derrida's 'Des Tours de Babel' (1985)engages with Jakobson's tripartite division, finding it problematic on several grounds. In commenting on the synonyms that accompany each of the three translation categories, Derrida suggests that Jakobson provided a tautological definition in explaining *interlingual translation* as *translation proper*. These two phrases are synonymous in Derrida's opinion as they both denote 'translation in the ordinary sense, interlinguistic and post-Babelian' (Derrida 1985, 173). Most importantly for the purposes of this literature review, Derrida maintains that Jakobson's notions of *intra-* and *interlingual* translation are contingent on the presupposition 'that one can know in the final analysis how to determine rigorously the unity and identity of a language, the decidable form of its limits' (Derrida 1985, 173). Two important factors, to be taken up by a number of future researchers, are introduced here: 'the

unity of a language' and 'the identity of a language'.[19] Even though both of these terms strike us as utterly tentative structures in a linguistic context, Derrida proceeds without a detailed elaboration on the ways in which these may proliferate or alter.

Determining boundaries of a language was a source of unease for Toury (1986) and Albachten (2014) as well. Toury is particularly concerned about the position of *inter-dialectal translation* within Jakobson's division (Toury 1986, 1113). A comment placed in parenthesis, under the bullet point of *interlingual translating*, briefly voices Toury's critique that translation between dialects poses 'a borderline case', which is 'usually appended to the intralingual, but at times also to the interlingual type of translating' (Toury 1986, 1113). Along the same lines, Albachten poses the question of territorial distribution in asking how we can distinguish between languages and dialects and creoles (Albachten 2014, 574). This is, in fact, an extension of Toury's criticism (Toury 1986, 1113). While Toury chooses not to underpin his claim on the interdialectal translation's ambiguous status with any relevant illustration, Albachten does provide an example – that of Turkic languages, which are, from case to case, regarded as independent languages or as dialects of Turkish (Albachten 2014, 574–575). What is more, Albachten uses her relatively long section on literature review to acknowledge the pivotal role of a temporal determinant in asking '[h]ow [] the boundaries [can] be drawn between different historical stages of development of a language' (Albachten 2014, 574) as well as in wondering whether 'the borders of a language [should] be determined by lack of intelligibility' (Albachten 2014, 574). The extension of a 'temporal' line of this critique is to be found in Davis's article 'Intralingual Translation and the Making of a Language' (2014), while the elaboration of a 'spatial' one in Pym's book *Translation and Text Transfer* ([1992] 2010).

Having embraced a cultural approach, Pym's *Translation and Text Transfer* urges the materiality of texts' movement – across space and time – be taken into account in the study of translation. His section 'Translation can be intralingual or interlingual' expands in the direction of *interdialectal* translation, brought up by Toury (1986). Pym considers the notions of *intra-* and *interlingual translation* independently of the original context of Jakobson's tripartition; the fact that an explicit mention of Jakobson's systematisation is omitted may indicate a relatively high measure of autonomy that these notions enjoy across the field of translation studies. Pym opens the section by stressing the widely accepted primacy of the *interlingual* (Pym [1992] 2010, 23), an aspect discussed in the earlier subsection of this chapter. Pym is straightforward in questioning the very assumption of 'the field' (not of Jakobson!) that there is 'a radical division between interlingual and intralingual transfer' (Pym [1992] 2010, 24). Quick to dismiss such reasoning, Pym questions the separation on two grounds. First of all, he brands the distinction superfluous inasmuch as '[t]he kinds of translation that can take place between idiolects, sociolects and dialects are essentially no different from those between more radically distanced language systems' (Pym [1992] 2010, 24). As early as 1975, Steiner expresses that the problems occurring on intra- and interlingual level are the same – the difference being that translation between languages renders these problems more visible than it is the case with intralingual translation (Steiner 1975, 47). Steiner – unlike Pym ([1992] 2010) and Sturrock (1991) – does not use this argument to explicitly question Jakobson's distinction. Sturrock openly challenges the typology, stating that 'the problem of translation – that is, of synonymy – remains the same whether the translation be affected between two natural languages or within one language' and further noting that Jakobson's assignment of 'rewording' only to *intralingual* category is invalid as both *intra-* and *intralingual translation* are actually 'forms of "rewording"' (Sturrock 1991, 309). In addition to finding the two processes qualitatively identical, Pym goes

---

[19] Some hints about his interpretation of 'linguistic unity' and 'linguistic identity' can be found in his other publications, particularly in essays 'Signature Event Context' ([1972] 1988) and 'Freud and the Scene of Writing' (in co-authorship with Jeffrey Mehlman, 1972), as well as in his book *Speech and Phenomena* ([1967] 1973), which explores Edmund Husserl's twofold meaning of the notion of sign.

a step further than Sturrock in asserting that 'there are no natural frontiers between languages' (Pym [1992] 2010, 24). The problem of discerning linguistic borders – through space and across time – has been pointed out by Derrida (1985), Toury (1986), Pym ([1992] 2010), Albachten (2014), and Davis (2014).

In considering the relationship between translation and culture, Pym arrives at the idea to use translation (whether we label it *intra-* or *interlingual*) as a means of determining the level of cultural distance. In simple terms, the formula is as follows: if translation occurs, the two cultures are distant; if translation is unnecessary, this absence comes a sign of cultural continuity (Pym [1992] 2010, 25). Contrary to expectations yet in line with his statement that 'there are no natural frontiers between languages' (Pym [1992] 2010, 24), the level of transformations in a translation does not increase with cultural distance (Pym [1992] 2010, 24). An important remark: while Pym does acknowledge cases of 'bicultural communities' – 'where it is difficult to decide if translation crosses a cultural frontier or not' (Pym [1992] 2010, 26) – the cases which are not clear-cut, as those involving cultural hybridity, fall outside the proposed schematisation. Even though Pym declares '[c]ulture is not geo-politics' and '[t]ransfer and translation concern situations of contact and exchange, not linear separation' (Pym [1992] 2010, 26), he, paradoxically, seems to be in pursuit of determining cultural borders, reproducing a black and white map of what gets translated and what remains untranslated.

Davis (2014) revisits Jakobson's systematisation mainly through the interrogation of 'linguistic unity', departing in the direction pointed out by Derrida (1985). While concluding that Jakobson's division is rooted in synchrony, Davis urges that *linguistic identity*, one of the pillars of Jakobson's conceptualisation, cannot be claimed independently of the temporal dimension (Davis 2014, 588). Her paper, therefore, takes a historical perspective in the attempt to clarify the borders of English. Linguists agree in that the oldest texts in this language, dating from as early as seventh century CE, are inaccessible to the modern readership in its authentic form; yet, they diverge in the assessment whether this language of the past, commonly referred to as 'Old English' or 'Anglo-Saxon', is in fact English. A diachronic inquiry into linguistic boundaries inevitably spotlights the tension between *intra-* and *interlingual translation*. In Davis' opinion, our inability to draw any clear line between translation that takes place within a language and between languages stems from the incessant processes of translation (Davis 2014, 587), which have obscured this distinction. Davis argues that it is translation that has enabled English's continuity and managed to secure its unity till the present day (Davis 2014, 587). Moreover, she demonstrates that English, with all its historical variations that take radically different shapes, can be considered a single language only if we acknowledge its long and rich translation history – which has operated from Old English to its more modern counterparts and often through the mediation of other 'foreign' languages, most notably Latin. Translation, then, is to thank for an uninterrupted lineage that has bypassed understanding as the principal criterion in establishing internal linguistic boundaries.

2.2.5 Minimal Unit of Translation

The important question is not only between what entities the translation takes place, but also what segment the researcher treats as a unit of translation. While characterising Jakobson's typology as groundlessly broad, Sturrock (1991) criticises one of its basic premises – that concerning the minimal unit of translation – as overly narrow. The famous examples of 'сыр/cheese' and 'celibate/bachelor' (Jakobson [1959] 2012) are simply too 'word-oriented' (Sturrock 1991, 311). Despite the fact that Jakobson provides only word-based illustrations and fails to consider translational relations in a wider context, he remains fairly vague on the topic, making no explicit comments as to what should be taken as the unit of translation. 'The danger in any semiotically-oriented theorizing about translation', Sturrock observes, speaking from the semiotic position himself, 'is that we may come to see translation as an atomistic procedure,

which looks for equivalence between one verbal sign and another, instead of between whole sequences of signs'(Sturrock 1991, 318). Along the same lines, Albachten asserts that 'Jakobson's use of word-based synonymy is certainly something that does not bring us closer to solving translational problems' (Albachten 2014, 575) and praises Sturrock's criticism not only as legitimate but immensely valuable in highlighting the issue.

A number of theorists has suggested a solution for the minimal unit of translation. Sturrock himself opts for the *sentence* (Sturrock 1991, 318). Eco's (2003) and Calabrese's (2000) proposition of a textual framework sheds light on the significance of a contextual plane yet leaves unclear what they mean by 'text' in the first place. Finally, Pym's fairly liberal understanding of the primary unit – *culture* ([1992] 2010, 25) – seems to be in service of his formula for determining cultural distance rather than of refining the notions of *intra-* and *interlingual translation*. The issues surrounding the minimal unit of translation will be elaborated on most substantially in the chapter on multilingualism (see 6.4.2).

2.2.6 Multilingual Content

The final line of critique concerns a rather complex issue that current literature mentions only tangentially. In 'Des Tours de Babel', Derrida brings up the delicate question of approaching multilingual content – although not directly in relation to Jakobson's typology, as this dissertation intends to do – but in a much broader context, that of translation studies. '[A]ll too often', Derrida claims, '[theories of translation] treat the passing from one language to another and do not sufficiently consider the possibility for languages to be implicated *more than two* in a text' (Derrida 1985, 171; emphasis in the original). This observation is followed by a series of crucial questions: 'How is a text written in several languages at a time to be translated? How is the effect of plurality to be "rendered"? And what of translating with several languages at a time, will that be called translating?' (Derrida 1985, 171). Derrida, mindful of Walter Benjamin's multilingualism, tries to engage with some of these issues in the remainder of his own essay on the example of 'Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers' ('The Task of the Translator'; [1923] 2012). As much as the phenomenon of multilingualism may have been overlooked at the time when Derrida's comment was made, it has captured a great deal of academic attention in the following decades. In fact, a whole area of research has emerged under the umbrella of multilingualism studies, thanks to the scholarship of Reine Meylaerts, Rainier Grutman, Dirk Delabastita, and others. Similarly to the faith of translation studies, the once interdisciplinary field has started to gain prominence as a discipline in its own right.

2.3 Points of Departure

The studies covered in this literature review have been mainly theoretically oriented with little or no empirical backing. Apart from Albachten's (2014) and Davis's (2014) articles, which are structured around concrete cases, and Eco's (2003) book and Calabrese's (2000) paper, which rely on a number of vivid examples, the remaining ones are purely theoretical in nature. To this effect, the level of empirical knowledge concerning the relationship between *intra-* and *interlingual translation* is still rather low. 'If they [essays on the theory of translation] are not as rich in quotations as Steiner's *After Babel*', Eco cautions, 'they are as bad as a book on dinosaurs that lacks any attempt to reconstruct the image of a dinosaur' (Eco 2003, 1). While I do not deem purely theoretical research flawed, this thesis will respond to Eco's call in trying 'to reconstruct the image of a dinosaur'. The lively academic debate surrounding Jakobson's notions, which has been ongoing for more than three decades, could, therefore, benefit greatly from a large-scale project of this kind. A twofold contribution will be sought in providing substantial empirical evidence, on the one hand, and in offering a further theoretical refinement, on the other.

As far as particular lines of critique are concerned, the dissertation will – admittedly, to a varying degree – build up mainly on four of the six previously presented lines. Even though the first two, those pertaining to the scope of Jakobson's typology (see 2.2.2) and its relationship with interpretation (see 2.2.1), are almost entirely negligible for this thesis' general discussion, I decided to incorporate them into this chapter as they set a fruitful context for the notions of *intra-* and *interlingual translation*. Namely, the balance between linguistic and non-linguistic elements falls beyond the spotlight of this thesis, which centres linguistic elements. Similarly, the overall status of the linguistic within the reviewed classifications is largely irrelevant for the study at hand, as its main concern is contained in the relationships between different kinds of *linguistic* translation.

The probing question of what should be taken as a primary unit of translation, discussed by Sturrock (1991), Eco (2003), Calabrese (2000), and Pym ([1992] 2010), will be one of the major issues raised in Chapter 6. Although we should be indebted to Sturrock for pinpointing the problem, there is still a great void surrounding the unit of translation. Sturrock's (1991) relatively crude criticism, motivated solely by his search for equivalence, only attacks Jakobson's fixation on the word-level and suggests focusing on the sentence-level instead. The debate has been left almost fully open as neither of the theorists explores alternative minimal unites, nor the relationship between different levels, nor the possibility of destabilisation in hybrid contexts. Chapter 6 will, therefore, try to take these questions into consideration in its search for a solution that could reconcile different positions held by the theorists under study. Closely related to these are the issues exposed by the line of critique dealing with polysemiotic mediums. Chapter 6 will use the discussion on the unit of translation as an onset for the investigation of the notions of source and target, the tentative nature of which has been shown in Gottlieb's (2018) study. The Chapter on Multilingualism will try to analyse certain hybrid instances – the existence of which Gottlieb acknowledges but chooses not to systematise or deliberate in much detail.

My expansion of the forth line of critique – that on linguistic borders – will be conducted on the example of Serbo-Croatian and its successors. Split between two chapters, the discussion of boundaries between languages will be driven by Albachten's question: 'Should borders of a language be determined by lack of intelligibility?' (Albachten 2014, 574). Chapter 4 will primarily attend to the role of temporal factors in establishing these boundaries, whereas Chapter 5 will focus on translational issues that incur from regional stratification. The temporal and spatial dimension are often inseparable as both of them participate in the constitution of translational types (Gottlieb 2018, 45); for this reason, the division between temporal and spatial factors should be taken only as indicative. While Davis's (2014) study on English has focused on the instance where a language is referred to by the same name even when it is no longer understandable, the Chapter 4 will explore a somewhat unusual case, where the lack of continuity has obscured the name of the language but has not affected its comprehension. I believe the proliferation of languages in the Balkans would add another layer of complexity to the matter discussed not only by Davis (2014) but also Pym ([1992] 2010) and Derrida (1985), among others. What is more, Chapter 5 will engage with Albachten's (2014) and Toury's (1986) note on the dubious position of *interdialectal translation* within Jakobson's categorisation, which, albeit recognised as problematic, has yet to be backed with hard data. Lastly, chapters 4 and 5 will try to test the validity of approach proposed by Pym ([1992] 2010), which uses the presence or absence of translation as a way of determining the level of cultural distance.

The least travelled research avenue of all seems to be the one pertaining to multilingual content. Notwithstanding the plethora of studies dealing with multilingualism, to my knowledge, the notions of *intra-* and *interlingual translation* have not been explored through the prism of this phenomenon. The closest they have been brought together is to be found in Derrida's brief comment calling for a more considerate treatment of multilingual texts in a translational perspective (Derrida 1985, 171), placed in the same publication where he revisits

Jakobson's tripartition. Chapter 6 will try to connect translation studies and multilingualism studies, in the hope that the publications of the latter discipline – although written in slightly different contexts – could prove invaluable in casting a new light on Jakobson's typology.

Finally, an aspect that has been almost completely overlooked by previous researchers concerns the *effects* – not causes – of *intra-* and *interlingual translation*'s supposed instability. The exception is Davis's general comment that abandoning the distinction between *intra-* and *interlingual translation*, by virtue of the notions' instability, 'would ignore the history of the politics of language and the enormous social, cultural, and economic stakes of language identification' (Davis 2014, 588).This area appears underexplored to the extent that it could be the subject of multiple book-length projects delving into the possible consequences of the translational relations' instability for the social, cultural, and economic domain. I intend to seek my contribution in the exploration of the not too obvious cultural risks – particularly those relating to literary structures. The focus will be on the mechanisms of literary circulation outside the national borders.

As the reviewed literature demonstrates, the concepts of *intra-* and *interlingual translation* have been interrogated not only continuously but from multiple angles. The incessant presence of revisions, starting from Derrida's 1985 article, can be associated with the fact that Jakobson's text 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation' (1959) was published at the time when the field of translation studies had yet to be admitted to the academic circle. An exciting range of perspectives employed in these revisions stems, in all likelihood, from the field's expansion, which has enhanced interactions with many neighbouring disciplines. Given that we exclude hybrid approaches, the discussed theorists have placed the phenomenon in as many as five vantage points –semiotic, cultural, sociological, historical, and philosophical. With a view to obtaining a more comprehensive picture of the problem, this dissertation will combine several of the previously used perspectives. A more varied approach should allow for the examination not only of the concept's manifold facets but, moreover, a scrutiny of the same facet through different lenses. A detailed elaboration of the perspectives adopted by this thesis is reserved for the next chapter.

3   Methodological Overview

[The] view of infinite vision is an illusion, a god trick.

Donna Haraway, 'Situated Knowledges'

3.1 Methodological Pluralism

In the attempt to explain how individual experience can be systematised, sociologist Erving Goffman argues in favour of methodological pluralism. He proposes a rather broad methodological approach of 'frame analysis', stressing the inevitably partial and arbitrary nature of every research. In lieu of embracing a single methodology, Goffman opts for 'isolat[ing] some of the basic frameworks of understanding available [. . .] for making sense out of events' (Goffman 1986, 10). Goffman's once revolutionary publication set an important precedent for the now widespread practice of combining approaches. In the apparent absence of a totalising one-fits-all methodology (or, should I say Methodology?), which could account for all the complexities within a certain field, present-day researchers often seek to combine and complement different models. This, of course, does not exclude the possibility of creating new procedures alternative to mainstream ones – for those who feel more adventurous. The dissertation at hand, however, has no intentions of being methodologically innovative or consistent. Rather, in light of Goffman's advocacy for mixing research tools, it plans to incorporate several already established methodologies,[20] with a view to examining the studied phenomenon's diverse manifestations as well as the effects it produces.

My rationale for methodological diversity should be sought in the intersection of at least three aspects. The first one concerns the multidisciplinary character of this research: apart from translation studies, it ventures into the realms of sociology of language, comparative literature, and multilingualism studies. As this project makes translation studies overlap with more than one filed, it would be challenging to come up with an all-encompassing framework that could allow for a satisfactory interpretation of results extracted from heterogeneous sources. The second aspect responsible for this project's ranging methodologies lies in the multifaceted nature of the phenomenon under investigation. Namely, the dissertation intends to examine external as well as internal factors that destabilise the relations between *intra-* and *interlingual translation*. Casting a light on both externally and internally caused changes requires a separate palette of tools. On the one hand, a sociological approach, implemented in Chapters 4 and 5, will draw attention to the extralinguistic factors, while, on the other, Chapter 6's close reading in combination with comparative translation discourse analysis will expose those emanating from texts' immediate contexts. A thorough investigation of the studied object, therefore, calls for an employment of both top-down and down-top methods. Finally, the procedures used to explain what causes the phenomenon are not adequately suited to measure the phenomenon's impact. To this end, Franco Moretti's notion of distant reading will be applied in Chapter 7 in the attempt to signal the long-term effects that linguistic instability exerts on miscellaneous literary structures, most substantially on international circulation.

The switch to methodological liberalism comes with a set of dangers. As Larissa Aronin and Ulrike Jassner point out '[t]he decision-making process becomes less straightforward, and requires knowledge and scholarly maturity from a researcher to arrive at the appropriate decision, regarding the choice of methods and techniques' (Aronin and Jassner 2014, 71). To prevent the choices from seeming haphazard, the scope of each approach will be carefully

---

[20] Seeing that a glaring number of publications use the term 'method' interchangeably with 'methodology', I wish to underline that this dissertation uses 'method' to denote the very procedure of conducting research and 'methodology' to refer to the ways in which ideas are linked when interpreting results.

defined, its limitations as well as potentials earnestly acknowledged. The failure to clearly state the criteria against which the research is structured can easily jeopardise the validity of study's results. In addition to providing a one-by-one overview of individual methodologies, the following sections will strive to indicate how they relate to one another. The discussion will also reflect on their main advantages over some other frequently employed options. Another element of risk stems from the fact that translation studies has traditionally been somewhat of a methodological crossroads – likely as a consequence of its decade-long status as an interdisciplinary field rather than a discipline in its own right. The proliferation of methodologies, partially inflicted by the general trend of borrowing from other spheres, makes listing and evaluating all available methods a Sisyphean task. Moreover, their combinatory potential is limitless, which further complicates the matter. For the sake of efficiency, the discussion will be restricted to the approaches actually used in the course of research, interspersed, where appropriate, with brief reviews of those adopted in comparable projects. Lastly, a dire peril lies in situations where the varying methods are mutually incommensurable. Albeit quantitatively and qualitatively distinguished, the methodologies chosen in this dissertation operate on a single scale, thereby ensuring the study's results remain consistent.

3.2 Sociolinguistically Oriented Approaches

Scholarly work, especially that which delves into theoretical depths, frequently draws criticism for appearing too detached from reality. That his research might fall into this very trap was a concern of Clifford Geertz, cultural anthropologist credited for the development of 'thick description'. His methodology, which shifts attention from the subject to the material reality, has been transplanted to a number of fields beyond social sciences. Geertz writes:

> The danger that cultural analysis [. . .] will lose touch with the hard surfaces of life – with the political, economic, stratifactory realities within which men [sic] are everywhere contained – and with the biological and physical necessities on which those surfaces rest, is an ever-present one. (Geertz 1973, 30)

Further, he adds that '[t]he only defense against it, and against, thus, turning cultural analysis into a kind of sociological aestheticism, is to train such analysis on such realities and such necessities in the first place' (Geertz 1973, 30). Although my dissertation deviates from Geertz's thick description in that it moves in a linguistic rather than cultural direction, what it takes from this stance is the pertinence of accounting for extralinguistic layers in the study of what strikes us as an utterly linguistic phenomenon.

Geertz's standpoint, then, kindles the need for rethinking Jakobson's concepts of *intra*- and *interlingual translation* – the ones deeply rooted in a semiotic tradition – through 'the touch with hard surfaces'. To this effect, Chapters 4 and 5 of this research will seek to contextualise these somewhat elusive translational concepts and give them a more immediate focus through the employment of a sociolinguistically oriented approach. The former revisions of Jakobson's typology where the social dimension received due consideration – as those by Albachten (2014), Hermans (1997), and Davis (2014), for example – have proven this a promising research avenue. The proposed methodology will attempt to outline how the notions of *intra*- and *interlingual translation*, devised on purely semiotic principles, can become unstable under specific circumstances. The sociolinguistic approach will be instrumental in examining several hypotheses:

– Translational relations are not pre-given but contextually determined in each individual case.

- Determining what is translated *inside* and what *outside* the language is contingent on the way speech varieties or lects – such as standard languages, creole languages, pidgin languages, regional dialects, sociolects, and registers – are delimited.
- A lack of mutual intelligibility between separate lects is not the necessary condition for language separation.
- Social and political factors play a role in the delimitation of languages.

If we assume that some methodologies suit certain types of issues better than others, then the prominence of the sociolinguistic approach in the study of lects relating to the Serbo-Croatian monolith should come as no surprise. From the early 1970s, a number of Yugoslav projects have fruitfully adopted the frameworks borrowed from social sciences to examine the intriguing phenomena surrounding the country's linguistic scene. Milorad Radovanović and Randall Major pinpoint the Croatian author Dalibor Brozović and the Serbian author Pavle Ivić as forerunners of the sociolinguistic approach (Radovanović and Major 2001, 2). What is more, they argue that the swift rise of such models in former Yugoslavia resulted from the combination of two factors: 'the modern scientific paradigm' and 'optimally adequate tools for the exceptionally complex Yugoslav language, social, and cultural situation (national, ethnic, political, confessional, cultural, historical, etc.), closely connected with this paradigm by the nature of things'(Radovanović and Major 2001, 1; brackets in the original). Radovanović and Major imply that the linguistic landscape in question is almost inseparable from the accompanying socio-cultural factors; addressing it in isolation, therefore, becomes insufficient. Thematically, sociolinguistic orientation has become particularly widespread among researchers working in the following fields: language planning and language policy, language stratification, bilingualism/multilingualism/diglossia, languages in contact, and verbal interactions (Radovanović and Major 2001, 2). In statistical terms, 'among the *macrolinguistic* subjects, topics in the field of *language planning and language policy* outnumber all others in sociolinguist production' (Radovanović and Major 2001, 2; emphasis in the original). The dissertation at hand, similarly to the majority of these publications, tackles language planning and language policy but ventures into the areas of language stratification and multilingualism as well.

Even though a substantial number of projects embracing a sociolinguistic approach to the study of former Yugoslavia directly engages with translation practices, the contributions are primarily attributed to the domain of Slavic rather than translation studies. For example, if we take a closer look at the academic output of Pavle Ivić, Asim Peco, Ranko Bugarski, Milorad Radovanović, Celia Hawkesworth, to name but a few, we will notice the accent is not so much on expanding theoretical concepts but, rather, on interpreting current linguistic trends. To a degree, this pattern has started to shift over the course of last decade, owing to an increasing presence of translation studies across institutions of higher education. A good example of a scholar discussing translational phenomena on the case of some South Slavic's languages is Jim Hlavac, whose work on codification and multilingualism, among other topics, poses a valuable contribution to the field of translation studies. Similarly to Hlavac, I see an enormous potential in applying empirical data available on the fluidity of lects spoken in former Yugoslavia onto translational phenomena. By implementing the sociolinguistic approach, a methodology continually present in the debate surrounding these lects, the dissertation would take the ever-evolving linguistic matters as a starting point in refining the theoretical notions of translation studies.

Before proceeding, it is important to address another aspect in relation to the two sociolinguistically oriented chapters – their temporal dimension. Namely, areas of sociolinguistics concerned with linguistic variation traditionally bridge the gap between diachronic and synchronic analysis. Considering the stress this dissertation places on the variations stemming from temporal factors, chapters 4 and 5 try to merge the often-contrasted

approaches of diachrony and synchrony. The diachronic part of my research intends to combine the comparative method with the method of internal reconstruction. The key difference between these two fundamental tools of diachronic linguistics[21] is contained within their scopes: the comparative method is a 'treatment of comparable elements in [two or more] related languages' (Lehmann 1993, 27), whereas internal reconstruction 'relies on data in only one language' (Lehmann 1993, 31). The employment of both is necessary insofar as the dissertation hypothesises relations between as well as within languages. The synchronic part of my investigation will try to explain a geographic distribution of certain features across the given territory. The process of data collection will include a test assessing the comprehensibility of certain lects as well as a questionnaire sampling the speech community's attitude towards them – the results of which will be discussed in Chapter 5. Altogether, combining synchrony and diachrony would allow the dissertation to delve into the historically changing social realities and their impact on the structural development of a lect without neglecting its current state.

3.3 Close Reading and Comparative Translation Discourse Analysis

The main constraint of a sociolinguistic approach to the study of *intra-* and *interlingual translation* is that its strong focus on external factors fails to account for the relation changes that derive from text's own hybridity. Surveying transitions that occur as a result of internal forces requires a different type of tools from those used in the examination of external intrusions. In this thesis, the investigation of the phenomenon's micro-scale manifestation rests on the study of multilingual content found in literature. Considering multilingualism in a translational perspective calls for a two-phase procedure: it is only after a meticulous scrutiny of language relations in the original that the inspection of the translation process can commence. To test the principal hypothesis of this research – that translational relations are not pre-given but contextually determined in each individual case – on the example of multilingual content, I propose the employment of two methods: close reading and comparative translation discourse analysis respectively.

In current scholarship, multilingualism's diverse occurrences – be they in an individual, society, or in art – have been explored beyond the narrow confines of a single framework. Aronin and Jassner, whose paper systematises the broad spectrum of methodologies adopted in multilingual studies, note that such pronounced methodological openness proceeds from the multiplicity of employed perspectives – citing psychological, educational, social, cognitive, emotional, and political one in particular (Aronin and Jassner 2014, 57). The authors' discussion of future tendencies stresses the rising prominence of two streams: the approaches formulated on the basis of dynamics system theory and complexity theory (Aronin and Jassner 2014, 61); and those grounded in theoretical thinking, which Aronin and Jassner collectively refer to as 'conceptualisations' (Aronin and Jassner 2014, 62). Especially praiseworthy is the effort of these two branches to capture the phenomenon's many specificities and ever-changing nature. What makes these novel approaches inadequate for the study of literary multilingualism, however, is their preoccupation with the individual and its position within society. As neither of these streams elucidates multilingualism's artistic dimension, the research of literary multilingualism, then, may benefit more substantially from the application of traditional philological methods.

Chapter 6 illustrates a materialisation of intra- and interlingual instability by concentrating a multilingual text that combines several languages. When dealing with hybrid writing, the preliminary step involves identifying the delicate interrelations between the

---

[21] The term 'diachronic linguistics' is synonymous to that of 'historical linguistics'.

languages in the original. Prior to any considerations of the translation process, the researcher needs to understand the function that each individual language performs in the given piece. Further important elements to be taken into account include, *inter alia*, power relations within the text, their wider implications, and stylistic effects. If polyglossic insertions into the dominant lect occur in more than one language, their roles should be assessed separately rather than in conjunction, to prevent lapsing into generalisations. In pursuance of these steps, I suggest approaching the problem from a purely literary perspective through the widely established practice of close reading.

The phrase 'close reading' ought to be used with utmost care, as this – in Jonathan Culler's words – 'sine qua non of literary study' (Culler 2010, 20) comes with a set of issues attributable to the term's heterogeneous interpretations. The conspicuous lack of an overarching definition may stem from the practice's association with different schools of thought[22] but also from the fact it has been taken for granted (Culler 2010, 20). The problem persists, in part, as a result of scholars' inability to at least identify what close reading stands in opposition to (Culler 2010, 20). The first antonym that comes to mind – Franco Moretti's distant reading[23] – does not seem plausible enough to Culler: he dismisses this option as 'Moretti's fascinating analyses of large-scale trends [. . .] are too divergent from regular modes of literary analysis to serve in a defining contrast' (Culler 2010, 20). Culler tries to move away from the close/distant scale by asking if close reading should be contrasted with 'something like sloppy, or casual reading' (Culler 2010, 20). An articulation emphasising the practice's attentiveness to detail may be a good lead in determining, to use arithmetic terminology, the lowest common denominator. Nevertheless, the issue of scale should not be avoided altogether.

Culler's paper, structured around the very notion of close reading, only peripherally touches upon its relations to the non-plausibly opposed distant reading. Engaged in rendering the method's essential features more explicit, Culler refrains from dissipating his attention by discussing the alternatives. Jay Jin's study, entitled 'Problems of Scale in "Close" and "Distant" Reading', brings notice to the quasi-division's middle ranges, *id est* to the simultaneous employment of close and distant reading – be it in a linear (that is subsequential) or a back-and-forth fashion. Jin's parallel tracing of these two terms and their interactions, throughout the previous decades, masterfully 'demonstrate[s] that much confusion stems from the mixing and matching of the three positions, sometimes by the same scholar in the same work' (Jin 2017, 115). With the hope of preventing further methodological and rhetorical inconsistencies, Jin tries to reconcile these binary understandings by offering a synecdochic and metonymic rendering of close and distant reading respectively. A reading 'structured by the logic of part-part relationships' (Jin 2017, 105) allows us to effortlessly adjust our scale in accordance with the object of research. By virtue of Jin's model, a unit – however partial in the wider network of things – can become the object of analysis in its own right. In comparison to similar theoretical models,

> [f]raming 'close' and 'distant' by way of synecdoche and metonymy does not lock either side behind a new set of bars, but considers how these interpretive practices rhetorically deform and reshape texts to be understood as pieces of evidence, parts in an argument. The synecdoche/metonymy distinction foregrounds relations between 'close' and

---

[22] Culler remarks various traditions from which the practices of close reading derive, such as 'Anglo-American New Criticism' and 'the French tradition of explication de texte' along with 'more recent versions of deconstructive, rhetorical, and psychoanalytic reading' (Culler 2010, 20).

[23] It should be mentioned that Franco Moretti is not the only scholar associated with distant reading. Besides Moretti, we find the term, most notably, in Peter Middleton's monograph *Distant Reading: Performance, Readership, and Consumption in Contemporary Poetry* (2005).

'distant' reading that distinctions of scale, of micro/macro and zoom/stasis, otherwise miss. (Jin 2017, 118)

By the same token, Jin's understanding of close reading allows us to shift freely between different units of analysis without committing to the daunting questions of scale (Jin 2017, 112–113). It is exactly the flexible nature of this methodology that permits studying multilingualism's disparate manifestations under a single umbrella.

The latter half of Chapter 6 seeks to embrace a comparative view in the attempt to sketch the ways in which the relations between languages change in the translation process. Even though close reading and translation can go hand in hand quite nicely (Culler 2010, 24), the monolingually oriented practice of close reading does not suffice in our case. More suitable, I deem, would be to build up on the practice of close reading by introducing what Alexander Burak formulates as 'comparative translation discourse analysis'. This extended application of discourse analysis is dedicated to conducting 'detailed comparative dissections – or "deconstructions" – of the text at different levels of analysis (semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic)' (Burak 2013, 2; brackets in the original). This comparison of individual parameters 'should form the foundation for an informed view of how a translated text works, with reference to its original, in its new sociocultural setting' (Burak 2013, 2). Although this approach was tailored to tackle 'different translations of the same material' (Burak 2013, 1), it could be fruitful even for those studies that do not involve retranslations. In the examination of multilingual content, my analysis will aim to cover multiple translations not by looking at published retranslations side-by-side but, rather, by proposing alternative options in addition to the existing solutions.

It should be noted that Burak's source-oriented comparative translation discourse analysis stands in stark contrast to the aesthetic-based approach, which Lawrence Venuti collectively labels as 'belletrism' (Venuti 2013, 235). The dominant trait of this target-based approach lies in that it nurtures the translation's independence in relation to the original, thereby blending the customary borders between a translation and an adaptation. Likewise, this autonomy of original texts' derivatives contributes to the abolishment of the distinction between a 'first-' and 'second-order creation' (Venuti 2013, 235). In outlining the canonisation of belletrism in Anglophone translation circles – both academic and professional – Venuti traces this trend back to the early twentieth century, claiming 'it originated in modernist literary practices, particularly in the insertion of translations or adaptations into original compositions, but also in the polyglossia that characterizes many modernist texts, the use and quotation of foreign languages, whereby the reader is turned into a translator' (Venuti 2013, 235). Albeit intimately tied to multilingual experimentation, such 'impressionistic' approach, which 'always carries a literary agenda' (Venuti 2013, 236), would be ineffective in our case, for this research has no interest in critically evaluating the readability of the final product. Most importantly, considering a translation autonomously from the original – be it fictional or material – would fail to account for the changes that take place in the translation process, which are at the core of this dissertation.

3.4 Sociology of Translation and Distant Reading

In the final chapter of the thesis' body, the discussion moves from the phenomenon's causes to its effects. The attention, therefore, splits between the contemporary literary scene of Serbia and the competitive translation market of the Anglophone countries. The dissertation hypothesises that linguistic discontinuity hinders the circulation of works in translation. This part of research ventures into a somewhat novel field – that of sociology of translation. Thanks to Pierre Bourdieu's formulation of field theory, many disciplines in the humanities have

undergone the so-called 'sociological turn'.[24] Over the course of 1990s, the sociology of translation has established itself within the realm of translation and interpreting studies (Angelelli 2014, 1; Sapiro 2014, 82). A sociological approach shifts the accent from the translation as a product to the intricate ways in which translations are created and circulated. Two research avenues emerge hereby: one centering 'the agency of translators and interpreters' and the other 'the social factors that permeate acts of translation and interpreting' (Angelelli 2014, 1). In lieu of interpersonal relations, the dissertation will inquire into the significance of the so-called 'large-scale' factors. In Gisèle Sapiro's opinion, these include – but are not limited to – translation schools, literary and academic journals, publishing houses, translation prizes, professional associations, and, finally, society as a whole (Sapiro 2014, 82). It is through the examination of educational and cultural institutions in the first place that this dissertation will attempt to track the circulation of Serbian literature in translation throughout the Anglophone world.

As Chapter 7 takes a macro perspective by concentrating on the roles that institutions and the general reading public play in the processes of cultural mediation, the notion of distant reading resurfaces accordingly. While its synecdochic rendering has been discussed in the previous section, what requires further elaboration at this point is the consideration of its modes, which markedly differ from those of close reading. Although Franco Moretti is not the sole proponent of distant reading, as previously noted, his theorisations are most germane to us, owing to their engagement with the concept of world literature. In order to methodologically grasp the massive literary conglomeration of world literature, which is filled with differences and asymmetries, Moretti claims that one may need to sacrifice the text, for 'the ambition is now directly proportional *to the distance from the text*: the more ambitious the project, the greater must the distance be' (Moretti 2013, 48). What the researcher gets in return is the opportunity to 'focus on units that are much smaller or much larger than the text: devices, themes, tropes – or genres and systems' (Moretti 2013, 48–49). Moretti, therefore, endorses the idea of scaling the approach so as to correspond to the object of study as neatly as possible. Such adaptable scalability is in line with Jin's synecdochic approach to distant reading. 'And if, between the very small and the very large', Moretti continues, 'the text itself disappears, well, it is one of those cases when one can justifiably say, Less is more' (Moretti 2013, 49). Culler points out that distant reading in Moretti's sense 'would turn any sort of attention to an individual text into close reading' (Culler 2010, 20). It is exactly the ease with which Moretti's model allows travelling along the close/distant axis that makes it complementary – rather than opposed – to the formally antonymous practice of close reading. Chapter 7, devoid of textual analysis in the classical sense, will look up to Moretti's model in measuring the impact that the fluidity of *intra-* and *interlingual translation* make upon literary structures.

---

[24] In some publications, it is also referred to as 'social turn'.

II
Translational Relations' Instability:
Causes

4   Translational Relations in a Temporal Context

The Folk Ballad *Hasanaginica*

> *The way we understand ourselves is inextricably and*
> *permanently entangled*
> *with the way we understand language.*
>
> Daniel Dor, *The Instruction of Imagination*

4.1 Introduction

Multidimensionality arises as the dominant trait of translational relations. As Gottlieb's typology has exemplified (see 2.2.3), of utmost importance is to take into consideration multiple dimensions in the formation of translational types. It is precisely the neglection of this feature that has weakened Jakobson's distinction between *intra-* and *interlingual translation* and made it subject to re-examinations. Fully isolating temporal from spatial factors is virtually impossible as both pose constituent parts in the formulation of translational types (Gottlieb 2018, 45). Yet, as part of the attempt to analyse the complex patterns in which translational relations change over time, the spotlight of this chapter will be on the temporal aspect. This is not to imply that the spatial component will be disregarded altogether, but, rather, that its exploration will be subsidiary for now; the phenomena surrounding the spatial facet will be central to the following chapter (see Chapter 5). In more specific terms, the chapter at hand will take a diachronic perspective and scrutinise the processes of vertical translation; whereas reserved for the next chapter are the processes of horizontal translation – through the prism of synchrony.

The ways in which translational relations evolve over time will be studied on the example of the folk ballad *Hasanaginica*. The poem had been passed down through generations for probably more than a century before it was finally printed in the travelogue *Viaggio in Dalmazia* (A Journey to Dalmatia; 1774) authored by the Italian abbot Alberto Fortis. Whether earlier written versions exist has been a topic of heated debates. What is certain, however, is that it was thanks to Fortis' publication that *Hasanaginica* captured an international attention. The ballad's discovery was sensational, particularly in light of the fact that the late eighteenth century was the era of sweeping interest in folklore across Europe. First translations ensued quickly: among the ballad's translators have been some of the world's finest poets, such as: Johann Wolfgang von Goethe[25] (approx. 1775) into German; Walter Scott[26] (1798) into English;[27] Alexander Sergeyevich Pushkin (1835) and Anna Akhmatova (1950) into Russian;

---

[25] See, for example, Miloš Trivunac's essay 'Geteov prepev Asanaginice' (Goethe's Translation of Asanaginica; 1932).

[26] See, for example, Milan Ćurčin's *Ser Valtera Skota Hasanaginica* (*Hasanaginica* of Sir Walter Scott; 1925).

[27] Over the course of last few years, Vukova zadužbina (Vuk's Foundation) published edited volumes in German, English, French and Russian, which contain a selection of texts from Stefanović Karadžić's oeuvre, including *Hasanaginica*, and an overview of their reception across Europe in the nineteenth and twentieth century. See Boško Suvajdžić's *Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, 1787–1864–2014: Mündliches Volksgut der Serben* (Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, 1787–1864–2014: Serbian Traditional Oral Heritage; 2015); *Vuk Stefanović Karadžić: Serbian Traditional Oral Heritage* (2016); *Vuk Stefanović Karadžić: Le patrimoine oral serbe* (Vuk Stefanović Karadžić: Serbian Traditional Oral Heritage; 2017); *Вук Стефанович Караджич: Сербское устное народное наследие* (Vuk Stefanović Karadžić: Serbian Traditional Oral Heritage; 2018).

Prosper Mérimée (1827) and Adam Bernard Mickiewicz (1841) into French.[28] To date, it is estimated that *Hasanaginica* has been translated into more than forty languages. In addition to translations, there have also been numerous retranslations: for example, more than fifty into German and more than twenty into English (Jones 2010, 279). But despite these impressive figures testifying to *Hasanaginica*'s acclamation in foreign languages,[29] we have yet to specify the name of its original language.

An implicit premise of Jakobson's concepts of *intra-* and *interlingual translation* is the ability to determine the language of the original and of the translation. Or to use the wide-spread terminology, the language of the 'source' as opposed to that of the 'target'. Easy as this may sound, with *Hasanaginica*, it is a somewhat complicated task. The ballad's language has been variously described as 'Morlacchian' (Goethe [1775] 1975, 75); 'Serbo-Croatian' (Butler 1980; Burkhart 2006, 26); 'Bosnian' (Bulić 2014, 12); 'Croatian' (Lukežić 2005); 'Serbian' (Stefanović Karadžić[30] [1846] 1975, 310); 'Bosnian–Croatian–Serbian' (Jones 2010); 'South Slavic' (Mecklenburg 2015, 80). As we shall see, some debate about *Hasanaginica*'s language deliberately, holding a certain position; others are drawn into the discussion reluctantly and try to give the most neutral answer; finally, a portion attaches linguistic labels without even realising that there has been any debate at all. From a modern perspective, *Hasanaginica* is understandable to speakers of as many as four modern standards – Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin.[31] But the ballad precedes any codification – both the early ones standardising these idioms jointly and the recent ones standardising them separately. A number of linguistic features present in *Hasanaginica* is mutual to all of these standards, which makes the ballad ambiguous and complicates its linguistic classification in modern terms. As a consequence, the poem seems to resist translation as well. For, if *Hasanaginica* is in, say, Croatian, how can we translate it into, say, Serbian, when the very original already reads as a Serbian text? By extension, one may ask: if Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin are separate languages, as their official statuses suggest, how come they resist being mutually translatable?

The ballad's trajectory through various linguistic and historical constituencies can serve as a useful starting point in investigating how translational relations shift on a time scale. The fluid identity of South Slavic lects, particularly those stemming from the Serbo-Croatian monolith, therefore, brings into question the rigidity of Jakobson's concepts of *intra-* and *interlingual translation*. To this effect, I argue that *Hasanaginica*'s vertical translation – that operating between different linguistic and historical constituencies – indicates that *intra-* and *interlingual translation* are not stable relations. To underpin this statement, I hypothesise the following:

– Translational relations are not pre-given but contextually determined in each individual case.

[28] For more on French translations, see, for example, Mihailo Pavlović's 'Slovenska antiteza u francuskim prevodima *Hasanaginice*' (The Slavic Antithesis in French Translations of *Hasanaginica*; 1974).

[29] Among others, the English poet Samuel Taylor Coleridge was fascinated with *Hasanaginica*. See, for example, Ranka Kuić's essay 'Kolridž i *Hasanaginica*' (Coleridge and *Hasanaginica*; 1970).

[30] Stefanović Karadžić's classification of *Hasanaginica* as Serbian is indirect: he states that Fortis published the ballad in 'our language' (Stefanović Karadžić [1846] 1975, 310), thereby avoiding a direct linguistic classification. The ballad was, however, included in *Srpske narodne pjesme* (Serbian Folk Poetry; 1846), the title of which openly stresses the Serbian component.

[31] A note on Montenegrin: today, it is one of the successors of the Serbo-Croatian language. However, the debate surrounding *Hasanaginica*'s lect, which will later be explained in more detail, involves the other three successors, that is Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian.

- Determining what is translated *inside* and what *outside* the language is contingent on the way speech varieties or lects – such as standard languages, creole languages, pidgin languages, regional dialects, sociolects, and registers – are delimited.
- A lack of mutual intelligibility between lects is not the necessary condition for language separation.
- Social and political factors play a role in delimitation of languages.

All of the above listed hypotheses will also be tested in the following chapter (see Chapter 5), whereas the hypothesis on contextual contingency of translational relations will be additionally tested in the chapter on multilingual content as well (see Chapter 6).

The body of this chapter is divided into three main parts. With a view to investigating the relationship between sociopolitical factors and linguistic codification, the first section is dedicated to reconstructing the timeline of South Slavic lects that are today recognised as Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin. As these have been a subject of various agreements – some formal, some informal – even a brief sketch requires quite some space. This overview, however, will serve as a point of reference in the following chapters as well, which is why I deem it important to outline all the key events in the development – even when they are not pertinent for the analysis of this chapter. From the historical background of South Slavic lects, the focus moves onto the inquiry of *Hasanaginica*'s origins and context. The final part discusses the ways in which literature, languages and their borders evolve – all with a view to demonstrating how the passing of time affects the ballad's translatability and the associating translational relations.

4.2 Chronology of South Slavic Lects

If we acknowledge that every text has a diachronic structure, as Steiner suggests in his groundbreaking book *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation* (Steiner 1975, 24), then it may be crucial to place the text against the trajectory of the language in which it was composed:

> An informed, avid awareness of the history of relevant language, of the transforming energies of feeling which make of syntax a record of social being, is indispensable. One must master the temporal and local setting of one's text, the moorings which attach even the most idiosyncratic of poetic expression to the surrounding idiom. (Steiner 1975, 25)

For this reason, the section at hand will attempt to reconstruct a timeline of the development of South Slavic lects – with the exception of Bulgarian. The aim is not to discuss various liturgical lects in use over the centuries, such as Old Church Slavonic, Serbian recension of Church Slavonic, Croatian recension of Church Slavonic, and Russian recension of Church Slavonic; likewise, Slavonic-Serbian (*slavenosrpski*), the literary language of Serbs in the Habsburg Empire – itself an artificial hybrid of vernacular Serbian, Russianised Church Slavonic, and Russian – also falls outside the scope. Rather, the idea of this chronological overview is to look at the key conditions and documents that allowed for the joint standardisation of Serbo-Croatian so as to gain a better understanding of the circumstances that led to the language's eventual decomposition. The accent, therefore, falls on the period from the nineteenth century onwards.

4.2.1 Pre-Standardisation (c. 1800–1850)

In rough terms, at least four conditions need to be met to ensure a successful standardisation. Traditionally, the first step is the unification of the writing system. Furthermore, this should be

accompanied with a set of prescriptions on grammar and vocabulary usage. Yet all these regulations can prove ultimately futile unless there is a body of literature that competently uses the new standard. To this effect, it is understandable why the term '(linguistic) standard' is often used interchangeably with 'literary language'. This section will take a cursory look at how the fulfilment of these four conditions in the Serbian and Croatian case led to a joint standardisation. Political and ideological backgrounds of the linguistic question will, as much as possible, be left unaddressed.

4.2.1.1 A Serbian Reform (c. 1800–1850)

At the turn of the nineteenth century, the Serbian orthography was in a transitionary phase. An important step towards the modernisation of the Serbian Cyrillic script was conducted by philologist Sava Mrkalj (1783–1833). His groundbreaking publication *Salo debeloga jera libo azbukoprotres* (Fat of the Thick Yer, i.e. Alphabet Reshuffling) proposed the number of letters to be reduced from the existing forty-two (Mrkalj 1810, 6) to twenty-six (Mrkalj 1810, 14). Mrkalj's simplified alphabet was further honed by the leading language reformer of the time, Vuk Stefanović Karadžić[32] (1787–1864), who gradually created the final version of the Serbian Cyrillic alphabet consisting of thirty letters – in use till the present day. The most important feature of Stefanović Karadžić's reformed alphabet lies in its strict adherence to the phonemic principle, in such a way that one grapheme corresponds to one phoneme (Piper and Klajn 2014, 17). As early as in his 1814 grammar *Pismenica serbskoga iezika po govoru prostoga naroda* (The Serbian Grammar According to the Speech of Common People), Stefanović Karadžić adopted the principle famously advocated by the German philologist Johann Christoph Adelung (1732–1806): 'Write as you speak and read as it is written' (Adelung 1782, 34; Stefanović Karadžić 1814, x).

The second important condition in standardising a language lies in the development of systematic grammar rules. In this respect, an important publication for the Serbian language was Vuk Stefanović Karadžić's *Pismenica serbskoga iezika po govoru prostoga naroda* (1814). Printed in Mrkalj's Cyrillic script, it is an early work where the author still heavily relies on the Slavonic-Serbian heritage, drawing particularly from the works of Avram Mrazović and Milentija Smotricki (Milanović 2010, 117–118). Notwithstanding its drawbacks, *Pismenica* could be considered a seminal publication inasmuch as it ensured that the vernacular is described, however tentatively, in grammatical terms. What is more, the book provided the necessary norms for the application of grammatical rules. A revisited grammar, known under the name of *Srpska gramatika* (Serbian Grammar), was printed as a part of the front matter in Stefanović Karadžić's 1818 dictionary. This grammar was both descriptive and prescriptive in nature and, for a while, it was considered referential (Milanović 2010, 124) until the publication of Đuro Daničić's *Mala srpska gramatika* (Little Serbian Grammar; 1850).

The third condition for a successful standardisation lies in the domain of lexicography. In this respect, Stefanović Karadžić's ambitious project of *Srpski rječnik* (The Serbian Dictionary; 1818) provided solid grounds for the systematisation of Serbian lexis. The dictionary's 26,270 entries were collected from the following regions: Serbia, Vojvodina, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Slavonia, and Croatia (Milanović 2010, 121). As Stefanović Karadžić's lexical material relied on popular speech and rural folklore, some intellectuals saw the absence of more specialised scientific terminology as the dictionary's major downside (Franolić 1980b, 33). The considerably expanded second edition of the dictionary, published in 1852, consisted

---

[32] To prevent any confusion, I record the name 'Vuk Stefanović Karadžić' always in full notwithstanding the way it appears in the cited publication. Different shortened variations occur, such as: only Stefanović, only Karadžić, St. Karadžić, Stef. Karadžić, etc.; in a number of Serbian publications, he is even referred to by his first name – contrary to modern academic conventions.

of approximately 47,000 entries. Albeit much larger in scope, it still predominantly focused on the vernacular lexis.

Finally, the forth condition refers to the literary application of the new codification. Of great magnitude for Stefanović Karadžić's reform is the year 1847, often quoted as the year when an informal victory was secured (Milanović 2010, 125–126); the official victory came only in 1868, when the Serbian government lifted the final ban on the use of Stefanović Karadžić's Cyrillic script (Milanović 2010, 132). Four major works written in the folk language were printed in 1847. First of all, Đuro Daničić's philological polemic *Rat za srpski jezik i pravopis* (The War for the Serbian Language and Orthography; 1847). Then, Branko Radičević's *Pesme* (Poems; 1847) and Petar II Petrović Njegoš's *Gorski vienac* (The Mountain Wreath; 1847). Lastly, Stefanović Karadžić's translation of the *New Testimony* into Serbian (1847). The diversity of genres to which these four works belong speaks in favour of the reform's wide applicability and stands as a testimony to its ultimate success.

4.2.1.2 A Croatian Reform (c. 1800–1850)

As the Serbian and Croatian reform in the first half of the nineteenth century are somewhat intertwined, this sub-section will summarise only the key developments in regard to orthography and grammar. As for lexicography, no projects comparable to Stefanović Karadžić's dictionary were conducted around this time. As already noted, *Srpski rječnik* – despite its name – was not restricted to the words used in the predominantly Serbian-speaking territories, which made the publication valuable for the study of Croatian lexis too.

Over the course of 1830s, Ljudevit Gaj (1809–1872), the leading figure of the Illyrian Movement, and other associates gathered around this pan-South-Slavist cultural campaign, conducted a reform of the Latin script. The feat is similar to Stefanović Karadžić's phonemic adjustment of the Cyrillic script. Gaj's short book *Kratka osnova horvatsko-slavenskoga pravopisanja* (Brief Basics of the Croatian-Slavonic Orthography; 1830) – published parallelly in the Kajkavian dialect of Croatian[33] and in German – looked up to the orthographies of Western Slavic languages, most notably Czech. *Kratka osnova* made a major breakthrough by proposing the introduction of diacritics as a means of marking palatal consonants (Gaj 1830). In subsequent years, after some additional corrections, Gaj's Latin scrip took its final shape. The alphabet is still in use in Croatia, Serbia,[34] Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Montenegro.

In the first half of the nineteenth century, Croatian grammars rested on two dialectal bases: Štokavian and Kajkavian; at the time, no grammars were written in Čakavian, the third Croatian dialectal basis. Some examples of Kajkavian grammars include: Josip Ernest Matijević's *Horvatzka Grammatika oder kroatische Sprachlehre* (Croatian Grammar; 1810), Josip Đurkovečki, *Jezichnica horvatzko-slavinzka za hasen Slavincev, i potrebochu oztaleh ztranzkoga jezika narodov* (Croatian-Slavic Grammar For the Slavonian Use and the Use of Other Foreign Nations; 1826), and Ignac Kristijanović's *Grammatik der kroatischen Mundart* (Grammar of the Croatian Idiom; 1837). Although Kajkavian grammars are not a rarity, Štokavian ones were more numerous. I will mention only two, written by prominent linguists of the Illyrian Movement: Vjekoslav Babukić's *Osnova slovnice slavjanske narěčja ilirskoga* (The Basics of the Slavic Grammar of the Illyrian Dialect; 1863), printed in instalments in the journal *Danica ilirska*, and Antun Mažuranić's *Temelji ilirskoga i latinskoga jezika za početnike* (The

---

[33] The Serbo-Croatian language has three dialectal groups: Štokavian (*štokavski*), Čakavian (*čakavski*), and Kajkavian (*kajkavski*). These have been named after the most common pronoun for *what*: (Štokavian: *šta, što*; Čakavian: *ča*; and Kajkavian: *kaj*). All modern standards use the Štokavian dialectal basis. Among the four successors of the Serbo-Croatian, Kajkavian and Čakavian dialects are spoken only in Croatia.

[34] For the historical overview of digraphia in the territories of the Serbs and Croats, see, for example, Thomas F. Magner's paper 'Digraphia among Croats and Serbs' (2001).

Basics of the Illyrian and Latin for Beginners; 1839). The presence of both Kajkavian and Štokavian grammars shows that the fight for the dominant dialect was ongoing and that the winner was far from decided. As we shall see below, this was about to change with the ratification of the Vienna Literary Agreement – which specifies the Croatian adoption of the Štokavian dialectal basis.

4.2.2 Birth of the Joint Standard: Vienna Literary Agreement (1850)

The unifying efforts culminated in March 1850, when prominent members of Serbian, Croatian, and Slovene intelligentsia gathered in Vienna to discuss the creation of a common literary language. The document signed during this convention later became known as the Vienna Literary Agreement. In addition to the two Serbian signatories, Vuk Stefanović Karadžić and Đuro Daničić, the document was ratified by five Croatian representatives – Ivan Mažuranić, Dimitrije Demeter, Ivan Kukuljević, Vinko Pacel, and Stjepan Pejaković – and one Slovenian delegate – Franz Miklošić.[35] It is safe to assume that '[t]he 63-year-old Vuk [Stefanović Karadžić] with his great renown must have been the dominating figure in this small group' (Magner 2001, 18). The overwhelming Croatian presence at the meeting, however, masks the absence of some of the leading Croatian linguists, such as Ljudevit Gaj, Vjekoslav Babukić, and Antun Mažuranić (Franolić 1980b, 31). Also, it should be mentioned that the signatory Ivan Mažuranić later withdrew his consent (Franolić 1980b, 31).

Let us take a closer look at the Agreement's main provisions. The document opens with a statement explaining what motivated the gathering in the first place:

> We, the undersigned, aware that *one* people needs to have *one* literature, and in that connection with dismay witnessing how our literature is splintered, not only by alphabets, but still by orthographic rules as well, convened these past days to discuss how we could agree and unify in our literature as much as is now possible. (*The 1850 Literary Agreement* [1850] 2004, 168; emphasis in the original)

This excerpt brings to the fore two important points. Firstly, the visibility of literature, the aspect that will be discussed more thoroughly in the chapter on literary circulation (see Chapter 7). Secondly, more pertinently for this chapter, it proposes the idea of one-to-one correspondence between people and literature. By extension, this could also be interpreted as a one-to-one correspondence between people, literature, and language.

The Agreement's first two points deal with the choice of the dialect that should become the standard. Having rejected the idea of mixing dialects and creating a new, artificial hybrid not used among the people, the eight intellectuals decided to 'designate the southern dialect as literary' (*The 1850 Literary Agreement* [1850] 2004, 168). This is followed by an interesting recommendation: those who do not want to write in the designated dialect are advised to use one of the other two popular dialects – but consistently (*The 1850 Literary Agreement* [1850] 2004, 168–169). Reasons for the southern dialect's triumph are manifold and I quote them unabridged:

a. because most of the people speak that way;
b. because it is the closest to the old Slavic language, and therefore to all other Slavic languages;
c. since nearly all the folk poems are created in this dialect;

---

[35] Please note the variations in the name of the Slovene philologist: his first name appears both as 'Franz' and 'Franc', while his last name appears as 'Miklosich', 'Miklošič', and 'Miklošić'. Throughout the dissertation, his name will be cited the way it appears on each publication.

d. since all the old Dubrovnik literature is written in this dialect;
e. since most of the literary figures of both the Eastern and Western faiths already write in this way (although not all mind all the rules). (*The 1850 Literary Agreement* [1850] 2004, 168)

The choice of this dialect, today recognisable under the term Eastern Herzegovinian dialect (*istočnohercegovački dijalekat*; Milanović 2010, 131), was a compromising solution. The long-term significance of the Vienna Literary Agreement could be sought in the Croatian adoption of the Štokavian dialectal basis. In this way, the selection of the Eastern Herzegovinian dialect, which is Štokavian, actually meant that the Croats had abandoned their Čakavian basis as well as the Kajkavian one that they shared with the Slovenian language. Instead, they adopted the new-Štokavian linguistic pattern, normatised by Stefanović Karadžić (Petrović and Gudurić 2010, 22). Even though Croatian speakers of Štokavian constituted a minority, this was the dialectal basis of the old Dubrovnik literature, which – many believe – proved the convincing argument for the acceptance of the Štokavian basis (Jonke 1971, 100; Herrity 1992, 162)

The Vienna Literary Agreement concerns only the adoption of the written standard. No name of this standard is mentioned anywhere in the text. It should be underlined that in 1850, it was by no means a national language. Those who spoke and wrote in this lect lived scattered across the region.

> [I]n the nineteenth century, the Serbs and the Croats were split among three, even four, States, some in the Principality (later the Kingdom) of Serbia, some in the Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary (Croatia – Slavonia – Dalmatia – Istra and Voivodina [*sic*]) and others in the Ottoman Empire (Bosnia and Herzegovina), while the Montenegrins had a principality of their own. (Franolić 1980b, 32; round brackets in the original; comment in square brackets my own)

The fragmentation was, therefore, of both administrative and cultural kind. Peter Herrity, a rare researcher who dedicated attention to the linguistic developments of the latter half of the nineteenth century, argues that the Vienna Literary Agreement and its legacy are responsible for the degree of closeness between what would subsequently become the two variants of standard Serbo-Croatian (Herrity 1992, 162). Despite the mixed reactions to the Agreement (Herrity 1992, 168), the effect of its guidelines eventually proved long-term.

4.2.3 Joint National Standardisation (1918–1990s)

The 1850 Vienna Literary Agreement set the grounds for the emergence of the common national language. This, however, would not happen until 1918, when the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes was formed in the aftermath of the First World War. For more than seven decades, the common language remained in official use – although variously defined and regulated throughout the succession of as many as four states: the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes (1918–1929); the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (1929–1941); the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia (1945–1963); and the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (1963–1992). The idea of a joint national standardisation would be finally deserted with the disintegration of SFR Yugoslavia in the early 1990s. Listed below are some of the key documents regulating the language question over the joint period.

4.2.3.1 Constitution of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes (1921)

The language question was clearly regulated with the adoption of the state's first constitution – the Vidovdan Constitution (Vidovdanski ustav) in 1921. Article 3 stipulates that the

Kingdom's official language is 'Serbo-Croatian-Slovene' (*srpsko-hrvatsko-slovenački*). This formulation will remain in use during the whole interwar period, notwithstanding the alteration in state's name to the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in 1929.

4.2.3.2 Constitution of the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia (1946)

Article 65 of the 1946 Constitution of the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia stipulates that the official languages are those of the people's republics. No specific language names are mentioned. Vladislav B. Sotirović claims that this Constitution, first after the Second World War, announced three languages official – Serbo-Croatian, Slovene, Macedonian (Sotirović 2007, 84) – yet no specific article in the text of the 1946 Constitution supports this claim. On the contrary, my findings suggest that the language question was not federally regulated in the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia. Indeed, Macedonian and Slovenian gained official weight in their respective republics; a detailed analysis of their individual regulation, however, falls outside the scope of our immediate interests. More pertinent is that the status of Serbo-Croatian, which was not clearly regulated until the Novi Sad Literary Agreement of 1954.

4.2.3.3 Novi Sad Literary Agreement (1954)

In comparison to the unofficial character of the Vienna Literary Agreement (1850), the Novi Sad Literary Agreement of 1954 was organised under the state's supervision. Twenty-five Serbian, Croatian, and Montenegrin linguistics and writers (Franolic 1980a, 57) gathered to discuss the burning language issue. The Agreement, which consists of ten points, is an attempt to come up with compromising solutions that would ensure the unity of the shared tongue. The document opens with an unambiguous statement: 'The popular language of Serbs, Croats, and Montenegrins is *one* language' (*The 1954 Novi Sad Literary Agreement* [1954] 2004, 172; my emphasis). Bosnians are not mentioned. As far as the name of the language is concerned, the second provision specifies that 'it is necessary in official use always to state *both* of its constituent parts' (*The 1954 Novi Sad Literary Agreement* [1954] 2004, 172; my emphasis), thereby allowing two variants: Serbo-Croatian and Croato-Serbian. Apart from declaring the equality between the Cyrillic and the Latin script (point 3; *The 1954 Novi Sad Literary Agreement* [1954] 2004, 172), as well as between the two pronunciations – *(i)jekavian* and *ekavian*[36] (point 4; *The 1954 Novi Sad Literary Agreement* [1954] 2004, 172) – the Agreement regulates the domains of orthography and lexicology, commissioning a common orthographic manual (point 7; *The 1954 Novi Sad Literary Agreement* [1954] 2004, 172) along with a reference dictionary of the Serbo-Croatian literary language (point 5; *The 1954 Novi Sad Literary Agreement* [1954] 2004, 172).

Particularly noteworthy for this project is the tenth point, which states the following:

> It is necessary to stand up decisively against the placing of artificial barriers to the natural and normal development of the Serbo-Croatian literary language. It is necessary to curb the harmful phenomenon of unruly 'translating' of texts, and to respect the original texts of the writers. (*The 1954 Novi Sad Literary Agreement* [1954] 2004, 173; inverted commas in the Serbian original)

Intralingual translation, for the authors of this resolution, is evidently neither a translation in the proper sense – as was (or still is?) a popular belief – nor a justified act. In fact, they go as far as to label the practice as 'harmful'. Harmful for what or for whom, one may wonder. In all

---

[36] Depending on the substitution of the common Slavic 'jat', Serbo-Croatian distinguishes three pronunications: (i)jekavian, ekavian, and ikavian. Ikavian has not entered any of the modern standards.

likelihood, for the unity of the shared tongue. Be that as it may, this stipulation poses a rare insight into the official attitude towards *intralingual translation*, as translation practices were not legally regulated in former Yugoslavia (at least not federally).

4.2.3.4 Constitutions of the Socialist Federal Republic Yugoslavia (1963, 1974)

The 1963 Constitution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is the first post-World War Two supreme legal act that regulates the language question with reference to particular languages (this statement does not refer to minority languages). Article 131 explicitly states that the official languages of the country are 'Serbo-Croatian, that is Croato-Serbian, Slovene, and Macedonian'. In a decentralising attempt, this Article reinforces the equality of these three languages. What is more, this ensured a uniform language policy across the territories where Serbo-Croatian, that is Croato-Serbian, was used. The dual naming was supposed to honour the language's polycentricity and such phrasing ('Serbo-Croatian, that is Croato-Serbian') was in line with the second provision of the Novi Sad Literary Agreement, which requires that '[i]n naming the language, it is necessary in official use always to state both of its constituent parts' (*The 1954 Novi Sad Agreement* [1954] 2004, 172).

The next federal constitution, passed more than a decade later, in 1974, eliminates altogether names of any official languages. The right to determine the language(s) is delegated to the socialist republics (Article 269). The same year, individual constitutions of the six republics (Serbia; Croatia; Bosnia and Herzegovina; Slovenia; Macedonia; Montenegro) and two autonomous provinces (Vojvodina; Kosovo and Metohija) were enacted. Sotirović notices that these nine constitutions from 1974 contain as many as fifty-one article dedicated to the questions of language (Sotirović 2007, 75). These documents have brought major changes insofar as the question of *lingua communis* and its naming was no longer supra-regulated. While Serbia (Articles 233 and 240), Bosnia and Herzegovina (Article 4), Montenegro (Article 172) as well as the autonomous provinces of Vojvodina (Articles 5, 233, 237, and 308) and of Kosovo and Metohija (Articles 5, 230, and 236) all kept in their respective constitutions the previously-established 'Serbo-Croatian' and/or 'Croato-Serbian' phrasing, Article 138 of the Croatian Constitution from 1974 introduced a completely new wording: Croatian literary language (*hrvatski književni jezik*). In abandoning the Serbian component from the language name, the 1974 Croatian constitution, therefore, violated the earlier mentioned second provision of the Novi Sad Literary Agreement, which – it is worth repeating – stipulates that '[i]n naming the language, it is necessary in official use always to state both of its constituent parts' (*The 1954 Novi Sad Agreement* [1954] 2004, 172). This article later became the subject of a legal action and in 1988 the Yugoslav Constitutional Court pronounced Article 138 of the 1974 Croatian Constitution to be in contradiction with the 1974 Yugoslav Constitution, particularly Article 378 (Sotirović 2007, 76). The constitutions of 1974, which will remain in effect till the final breakup of Yugoslavia in the early 1990s, point towards the conclusion that the language policies in the final stage of SFR Yugoslavia's existence were, to an extent, disparate inasmuch as the question of language and its name(s) was differently regulated from state to state. The lack of a single federation-wide language policy deepened the discrepancy in the legal treatment of the common language.

4.2.4 Ramification of the Shared Language (1990s and 2000s)

In part, a gradual dispersal of the Serbo-Croatian language was parallel to the omnipresent political turmoil and warfare induced by the disintegration of SFR Yugoslavia during the 1990s.

> In the years following Tito's death [1980] [SFR] Yugoslavia degenerated into a loose collection of six squabbling republics (Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Slovenia, Macedonia, and Montenegro) and two autonomous regions (Vojvodina and Kosovo). On

June 25, 1991, two western republics, Croatia and Slovenia, declared their independence, with Bosnia and Herzegovina and Macedonia later following suit. (Magner 2001, 21; round brackets in the original; my square brackets)

The immediate offsprings of the diffused Serbo-Croatian were Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian, as constitutionally and lawfully recognised by their respective nation-states between 1990 and 1993 (Bugarski 2004, 12). Establishing a precise timeline is somewhat problematic, though '[o]ne can date the birth of the modern Croatian language in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina as June 25, 1991, the day Croatia declared political independence' (Magner 2001, 21; brackets in the original). The former varieties of Serbo-Croatian have become officially separate languages and established one-to-one correspondence between the language and the nation. As this process was straightforward, I deem providing detailed legal evidence superfluous. Suffice it to say that in everyday life Serbian remained largely intact, 'as there have been no serious attempts to alter its linguistic profile' (Bugarski 2004, 13); Croatian became a target of 'a semi-official drive for purification and Croatization' aimed to be achieved 'by reviving Croatian archaisms, institutionalising regionalisms and creating neologisms' (Bugarski 2004 12); Bosnian was set to contradict its Serbian and Croatian counterparts through the emphasis of 'the Oriental features of the local linguistic and cultural tradition' (Bugarski 2004, 12). A belated successor, springing from the Serbo-Croatian compound, is Montenegrin, the marked prominence of which roughly corresponds to the period surrounding the 2006 referendum on leaving the union with Serbia. Following the comparably late onset of the language's standardisation (Bugarski 2004, 12), Montenegrin has been raised to a status of the official language in the eponymous country.

4.2.5 Recent Developments and Future Prospects

In 2017, a number of linguists from Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Montenegro, the four successor states where Serbo-Croatian was spoken, signed the so-called 'Declaration on the Common Language'. Initiated by two eminent linguists – Ranko Bugarski of Serbia and Snježana Kordić of Croatia – the Declaration was crafted with the idea of remedying the linguistic, translational, cultural, and other issues that emanate from the present state of affairs – that is from these languages' official separation in spite of their mutual understandability. In a nutshell, it is a petition calling for all lects stemming from the Serbo-Croatian monolith to be recognised as one. With a general note that 'every state, nation, ethno-nation, or a regional community is free to independently codify its variety of the shared language' ('Deklaracija o zajedničkom jeziku' 2017), the practical results of this petition have yet to be seen. By now (March 2019), the Declaration has attracted more than 9,000 signatories, including the world-renowned linguist Noam Chomsky. Despite the relative endorsement of general public on all sides of the borders, the institutional interest in the matter has been rather low. To this effect, a renewed linguistic union – perhaps under a completely new name – seems unrealistic at the moment.

In the meantime, Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian, and Montenegrin continue to lead their independent lives. Whilst writing on the topic of language death, linguist David Crystal briefly reflects on the possible destiny of the three Serbo-Croatian successors (three, since the book was published a few years before Montenegrin entered the Balkan language scene): 'The forces which are currently making Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian increasingly different from each other could one day – though it is a long way off – produce three mutually unintelligible languages' (Crystal 2002, 90). With the benefit of a time distance, it is easier to identify certain signs of the diverging trend. A significant indicator of distancing, for example, emerges from Croatia's accession to the European Union in July 2013, when the Croatian language automatically became the twenty-fourth official language of this prominent intergovernmental organisation. This legislative move may prove an important instrument in shifting power

relations between the successors of Serbo-Croatian. For, membership in the European Union and the accompanying linguistic recognition may help Croatian to generate substantial external funding and eventually even acquire greater international prestige.

Writer David Albahari goes a step further in his predictions. Having self-professedly shifted his position from 'defending' the Serbo-Croatian unity, which he firmly advocated during the 1980s and 1990s, towards a more moderate stance of accepting linguistic differences (Albahari 2019, 176), Albahari now holds that the diverging trend is unstoppable:

> The languages will undoubtedly continue to differ even more; sooner or later, all these languages – Serbian, Croatian, Montenegrin, and Bosnian – will fulfill the linguistic conditions, whatever they might be, and become recognised as independent languages (which is still not the case). For some time, the differences will be encouraged by political and nationalistic circles, but afterwards the language will start doing this by itself. Namely, new generations, all those born after the disintegration of Yugoslavia, will be brought up in different linguistic environments; to them, 'Serbo-Croatian' will mean nothing but that, there will be no nostalgy to motivate them to fight for the survival of some 'primeval language' spoken by their parents and grandparents. They will grow up surrounded only by one language, and for them other languages will be, no matter how strange it sounds now, foreign languages that are easy to learn, but still foreign. (Albahari 2019, 174–175)

Whether the uniting or the diverging stream will win remains to be seen. In the long run, both scenarios seem equally viable. Either way, one thing is certain: lects of the Balkan Slav are bound to remain in flux.

4.3 On Hasanaginica

The South Slavic folk ballad most widely recognised under the title *Hasanaginica* (sometimes also *Asanaginica*, *Hasan Aginica*, *Asan Aginica*, etc.) revolves around the tragic destiny of the eponymous protagonist – noble wife of the Ottoman military commander Hasan Aga. The poem's synopsis is fairly simple:

> Hasan Aga lies wounded, perhaps from a border skirmish with Christian troops, in his tent high on the mountain. Hasan Aginica, however, out of a sense of decorum or shame, dares not visit him. As a result, he divorces her, forcing her to return without her children to her mother's family; she is then married off by her brother to another man. All this she accepts, but one thing she cannot: the loss of her beloved children. (Jones 2010, 277)

Over the centuries, it was not only the poem's extraordinary beauty that has fascinated scholars far and wide. Namely, the numerous blanks that surround *Hasanaginica* have made the ballad even more captivating. These blanks range from thematic ones – such as why she was ashamed to visit her wounded husband – to those relating to the text's mysterious origins: where did it come from?; when was it created?; how did Fortis record it?; and so on and so forth. Where questions have been left unanswered, speculations abound. The following paragraphs will try to sketch some of the key theories relating to the ballad's background. This survey should help us to grasp why *Hasanaginica*'s position in the modern linguistic and social landscape of the Balkans is so incredibly ambiguous.

To the best of our knowledge, *Hasanaginica* was first printed in the abbot Alberto Fortis' 1774 book *Viaggio in Dalmazia* (A Journey to Dalmatia; 1774). Placing Fortis' travelogue in a wider intellectual context may be beneficial:

The late 18th century was the age of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, of the belief that societies less corrupted by civilization had a natural nobility and vigour which so-called advanced cultures had lost. It was also the age of Ossian's Celtic epics and of admiration for the uncorrupted, vigorous creativity output of the folk cultures that lay at Western Europe's fringes. (Jones 2010, 277)

In the spirit of Rousseau, one chapter of Fortis' travelogue describes the customs of Morlacchi (Fortis 1774, 43–105) – a population of the Dalmatian inland mountain people – whom their rulers Venetians saw as 'the exemplary model of primitive Slavdom' (Wolff 2002, 13). It is at the very end of this chapter that *Hasanaginca* appears as a prime example of the Morlacchian literature (Fortis 1774, 98–105). Thought to be Slavicised Vlachs, the Morlacchi spoke a Slavic dialect. Many publications, especially earlier ones, assert that *Hasanaginica* is composed in Morlacchian. For example, Goethe's translation includes a note right under the title on the ballad's language, which states: 'Morlakisch' (Morlacchian; Goethe [1775] 1975, 75). These people's exact origins are obscure; no less cryptic is their ultimate fate:

> Since the Morlacchi qua Morlacchi disappeared from the rank of nations, or even ethnographic groups, over the course of the nineteenth century, their descendants are presumably Serbs or Croats; yet the assignment of those modern national labels to the eighteenth-century age of Venetian rule would be historically anachronistic. (Wolff 2002, 12)

Viaggio in Dalmazia put *Hasanaginica* in the Morlacchi context but the story of the ballad's origins is fairly convoluted, especially in light of the fact that Fortis leaves no information on how he encountered the ballad.

Based primarily on the clues from the poem, most scholars claim, with a relative amount of certainty, that *Hasanaginica* originated in the region of Imotski, located in Dalmatian Hinterland of today's Croatia (Murko [1935]1975, 355; Mahmutćehajić 2010, 540). Over the course of the seventeenth century, this inland strip belonged to the Bosnia Eyalet of the Ottoman Empire. In the aftermath of the Great Turkish War (1683–1699), Ottomans lost most of Dalmatia and the control of this territory was split between two city-states: Venice and Dubrovnik. In 1717, Imotski passed to Venetian rule. The toponym Imotski is mentioned in the very ballad along with two historical figures – Hasan-Aga Arapović and Beg Pintorović – who are known to have lived nearby in the late seventeenth century (Jones 2010, 282). These historical ties have given scholars reasons to believe that the ballad dates from the period before 1717, the time when the Ottomans still ruled over this territory (Mahmutćehajić 2010, 540). Some leave space for the idea that the poem could have originated in Christian times, but while the memory of Ottoman times still persisted (Jones 2010, 280). Alternatively, it has been suggested that the ballad could have come to Dalmatia from Bosnia (Nakaš 2010).

Fortis is thought to have recorded the ballad in Dubrovnik (today's Croatia). The original text in a Slavic lect, entitled 'Žalostna pjesanca plemenite Asan-Aginice', was published alongside an Italian translation – 'Canzone dolente della nobile sposa d'Asan Aga' (Fortis 1774). More than a century after Fortis' seminal publication, Franz Miklosich (1813–1891) printed the so-called Split Manuscript, under the title 'Der Text der Spalatiner Handschrift' (Text of the Split Manuscript) in *Über Goethe's 'Klaggesang von der edlen Frauen des Asan Aga'* (On Goethe's 'The Mournful Song of the Noble Wife of Asan Aga'; 1883), for which he claimed was the text that Fortis consulted during his Dalmatian trip (Miklosich 1883, 11). The original Split Manuscript is missing, which further deepens the issue of authenticity. Today, Fortis' and Miklosich's texts

are considered two versions of the most famous variant (Nakaš 2010, 289).[37] There are more than dozen other variants – some relatively similar, some so remote they could be considered poems in their own right.[38]

Nonetheless, the most widespread version of the text is neither that of Fortis nor of Miklosich – but Stefanović Karadžić's reduction.[39] In his earliest collection of folk poetry under the title *Mala prostonarodna slaveno-serbska pjesnarica* (1814), Stefanović Karadžić included Fortis' *Hasanaginica* – though with a series of orthographic, lexical, and other interventions. The ballad was excluded from Stefanović Karadžić's subsequent collection *Srpske narodne pjesme* (Serbian Folk Poetry, 1823–1824), for he was hoping to find the ballad among folk singers and write it down first-hand (Murko [1935] 1975, 354). After these attempts proved futile (Murko [1935]1975, 354), Stefanović Karadžić returned to Fortis' text, but this time with more care. Compare the opening lines in Stefanović Karadžić's two versions:

> Шта се бели у гори зеленой?
> Ил' е сниег ил су лабудови?
> (Stefanović Karadžić [1814] 1975, 301)

> Шта се б'јели у гори зеленој?
> Ал' је снијег, ал' су лабудови?
> (Stefanović Karadžić [1846] 1975, 310)

It is the 1846 version, printed in Stefanović Karadžić's *Srpske narodne pjesme* (Serbian Folk Poetry, 1846), which utilises modern orthography, that is probably the best known reduction nowadays.

4.4 *Hasanaginica* over Time

Prior to discussing how relations between languages function in a translational perspective, one ought to pinpoint the language of what is traditionally referred to as the 'source' or the 'original'. We have already asserted that many ambiguities make this a delicate task in *Hasanaginica*'s case. In general, studying the literary language of the past is somewhat problematic. In his paper 'Literature of the Future: Language of the Past (and Present)', Crystal considers this issue from an intralingual perspective:

> The 'language of the age' is not to be identified with the 'language' or 'competence' of a person or community, or with some general notion of 'everyday conversation'. Competence includes everything in the language system, whereas 'language of the age' does not. To talk about the language of some age [. . .] is to characterise that period with

---

[37] For a contrastive analysis of Fortis's and Miklosich's versions, see Lejla Nakaš's paper 'The Ballad of Hasanaginica: Fortis' Redaction and the Split Manuscript' (2010).

[38] For other texts with motifs from *Hasanaginica*, see, for example Thomas Butler's collection *Monumenta Serbocroatica: A Bilingual Anthology of Serbian and Croatian Texts from the 12th to 19th Century* (1980).

[39] For more on different variants, see, for example: Radosav Medenica's 'Fortisova *Hasanaginica* i splitski rukopis' (Fortis' *Hasanaginica* and the Split Manuscript; 1979); Pavle Ivić and Aleksandar Mladenović's 'Filološke napomene o Hasanaginici' (Philological Notes on Hasanaginica; 1984); G. Gesemann's 'Die Asanaginica im Kreise ihrer Varianten' (Asanaginica in the Circle of its Variants; 1923); Paul-Louis Thomas's '*Asan-aginica* iz Vukove *Pjesnarice* u odnosu na Fortisovu i kasniju Vukovu *Hasanaginicu*: uticaj na francuske prevode balade' (*Asan-Aginica* from Vuk's *Pjesnarica* in Comparison to Fortis' and Vuk's later *Hasanaginica*: Influence upon French Translations of the Ballad; 2014).

reference to a small sub-set of the language of a whole at that time. Certain features stand out, we see in retrospect, which enable us to contrast that age with some other. [. .]

It is difficult to study the language of an age, because of the problem of obtaining a sufficiently clear bird's eye view of the period in question – something which becomes increasingly difficult, the further back in time we look. (Crystal 1987, 43; inverted commas in the original)

Examining the idiom of a certain historical period is, therefore, fairly problematic even when the matter is not further complicated by the subsequent splintering of the scrutinised language.

The merging of intra- and interlingual perspective has problematised the lect of *Hasanaginica*, which has been variously described by its translators, interpreters, researchers, and others. The recurring question posed – implicitly or explicitly – is: whose is *Hasanaginica*?[40] By extension, in what language was the ballad composed? To illustrate the diversity of classifications present in current literature, let us cite the most prominent ones. Goethe, the ballad's first translator into German, identifies its language as 'Morlakisch' (Morlacchian; Goethe [1775] 1975, 75); Stefanović Karadžić includes the ballad in his collection of Serbian folk poetry, thereby implicitly categorising it as 'Serbian' (Stefanović Karadžić [1846] 1975, 310; see 4.1); Lukežić argues that its language is actually 'Croatian' (Lukežić 2005); Bulić is eager to prove that the language in question is in fact 'Bosnian' (Bulić 2014, 12); Butler, who writes in the Serbo-Croatian era, opts for 'Serbo-Croatian' (Butler 1980) but so does Burkhart, who writes *after* the disintegration of SFR Yugoslavia (Burkhart 2006, 26); Jones, the ballad's most recent retranslator into English, tries to avoid any strict national labelling by consistently calling the language 'Bosnian–Croatian–Serbian' (Jones 2010). Norbert Mecklenburg, who has written about *Hasanaginica*'s various nationalisation and appropriation attempts,[41] acknowledges the multiplicity of involved communities:

> *Hasanaginica*, a South Slavic folk-ballad of the late 17th century, has been elevated to the level of world literature thanks to Goethe's German adaptation entitled *Klaggesang von der edlen Frauen des Asan Aga* (The Mournful Song of the Noble Wife of Asan Aga) as well as thanks to translations into other languages, and, for about two hundred years, it has been worshiped, received and mediated as Serbian, Croatian or Bosnian cultural heritage. (Mecklenburg 2015, 77)

Mecklenburg adds a paragraph-long 'terminological' digression explaining that even though Goethe asserts that the ballad is in 'Morlacchian', the language of *Hasanaginica* started even in Goethe's time to be regarded as 'Serbo-Croatian', which has become problematic following the disintegration of SFR Yugoslavia (Mecklenburg 2015, 79–80). Mecklenburg concludes that 'since all three nations rightly claim the tradition to which the work belongs, the fairest description, although not linguistically accurate, is certainly "South Slavic"' (Mecklenburg 2015, 80). While this analysis has no intentions of attaching national labels and recognises the futility of such attempts, the already existing diachronic research on the given topic can serve as a

---

[40] Inspired by this question, Mate Kuvačić–Ižepa published a book, popular in character, under the title *Čija je Asanaginica* (Whose is Hasanaginica; 2007). The debate on *Hasanaginica*'s language has been addressed directly in two nationally coloured essays: Iva Lukežić's 'Dijalektološko čitanje Fortisove "Asanaginice"' (Dialectologic Reading of Fortis' 'Asanaginica'; 2005), which advocates for Croatian, and Refik Bulić's 'Na kome je jeziku spjevana Hasanaginica' (What is the Language of Hasanaginica; 2014), which advocates for Bosnian.

[41] For a partial history of *Hasanaginica*'s various nationalisation and appropriation attempts, see Norbert Mecklenburg's essay 'Von den Sitten der Morlacken zur Weltliteratur' (From Customs and Traditions of Morlachs to World Literature; 2015).

useful point of departure in the explanation of translational relations' development. The following paragraphs will focus on the key aspects that have made the ballad ambiguous in such a way that it has strong ties with all three modern speech communities. The reasons for this are manifold and stem both from literary and linguistic sources. The spheres of language and literature cannot always be strictly separated; for the purposes of internal systematisation, however, we will try to keep them provisionally split.

4.4.1 Literature over Time

The first obstacle lies in the belief that the folk ballad in question originally belongs to an oral tradition. Its inscription is thought to have taken place approximately a century after the ballad's creation. In *How to Read World Literature*, David Damrosch tackles the issue of transitioning 'from orature to literature', noting that 'writing is a fairly recent invention' (Damrosch 2009, 25) and that we tend to forget that 'the earliest written works were usually versions of songs or stories that had been orally composed and transmitted' (Damrosch 2009, 26). A problem that arises thereby is the meddling nature of inscription – that is, of course, if we presume that *Hasanaginica* stems from orature. Postmodern theorist Raymond Federman draws attention to the collective effort of publishing a work of fiction by stressing that 'not only the writer [...] create[s] the fiction, but all those involved in the producing and ordering of that fiction; the typist, the editor, the typesetter, the printer, the proofreader, and of course the reader' (Federman 2001, 70). The list could be fruitfully expanded to include the collector of folk literature. The role of these literary mediators, as well as the amount of freedom they assume, has been largely neglected in modern scholarship.

Yet, the possible intrusions into the initially oral form of *Hasanaginica* have been well researched. While Stefanović Karadžić's reduction soothes Fortis' inconsistencies and follows the rules of modern orthography – which in part explains his version's considerable appeal – signs of intermediacy are plentiful in Fortis' version too. Listed below are some of them:

- dialectal basis: elements of Čakavian in the otherwise Štokavian text;
- substitution of the Common Slavic 'jat' (Ѣ): the predominantly (i)jekavian text is interspersed with instances of ikavian[42] (and even one ekavian) pronunciation;
- versification: four lines containing eleven syllables in the otherwise ten-syllabic verse structure.

These leave plenty of room for speculation. For instance, the remains of the ikavian pronunciation in Fortis' text have given scholars reasons to believe that the ballad was originally ikavian and only subsequently reworked into (i)jekavian to fit the conventions of the Dubrovik literary language (Nedić [1971] 1975, 459). By analogy, the same theory could be formulated around Čakavian insertions, no matter how scarce, in the otherwise Štokavian text.

In addition to the inconstancies within one manuscript, a facet worthy of discussion is the transformation of the presumably verbal content of *Hasanaginica* into more than one text. As previously outlined (see 4.3), the ballad was recorded with slight – and occasionally not-so-slight – variations. Can we consider all these texts mere variants of a single original, even if we know that certain versions vary to the extent that some scholars argue these are different works altogether? Or, should each inscription be treated as an entity in its own right? In other

---

[42] Looking at Fortis' text, Nakaš specifies the exact cases where ikavian insertions occur: 'The singer-narrator uses *ikavian* forms in three places: *starišini*, *dice*, *prid nju*; in all remaining places *ikavian* forms belong to Hasanaginica's direct speech: *ne želila*, *dizu*, *starišina*, *gdi*. The quotation from the letter Hasanaginica wants written is not direct speech, it is reported by the narrator, as is Hasanaginica's message. The children do not have words with *jat* in direct speech' (Nakaš 2010, 297; emphasis in the original).

words, should we talk about, say, Fortis' or Miklosich's *Hasanaginica* rather than *Hasanaginica* the folk ballad? Francis Jones' translation into English, for example, rests solely on Fortis' publication. Is not the 'authoritative' version – as that by Stefanović Karadžić, for instance – also a construct, a mere *attempt* at reconstructing the original rather than an insight into an actually authentic manuscript? Besides, we ought to acknowledge that improvisation is a general characteristic of the spoken folk tradition. Milman Parry, the classicist credited with establishing the scholarly discipline of oral tradition, uses the example of illiterate Serbian poets 'guslars' to argue that Homer's oeuvre could have been originally oral rather than written (as it was presupposed in the early twentieth century), despite the extraordinary length of Homer's works (Parry 1930). Parry seeks underpinnings for his theory in the analysis of Homer's style, hoping to expose the frequent employment of certain ready-made 'formulae', also found in Serbian orature, which allow poets to recite thousands of verses without deviating from the metric scheme (Parry 1930, 80–81). The complex storytelling techniques that enable variation in the spoken composition along with the consequential existence of several written versions challenge our perception of a work of art as a fixed structure. To this effect, utmost care is required when discussing *Hasanaginica*, a work of art that most likely has its roots in orature, as the modern rules of literature, firmly embedded in textuality, may not necessarily apply.

Finally, the shift from the spoken to the written medium brings an extra layer of complexity since the act of inscription transplants the work from its authentic context. Let us consider the points Derrida puts forward in his essay 'Signature Event Context', where he deliberates about the traditional difference between 'written' and 'oral' communication.

> A written sign, in the current meaning of this word, is a mark that subsists, one which does not exhaust itself in the moment of inscription and which can give rise to an iteration in the absence and beyond the presence of the empirically determined subject who, in a given context, has emitted or produced it. (Derrida [1972] 1988, 9)

That is to say, the oral exists in the moment and is tied to a particular speaking subject; what is written does not only transcend the specific timeframe but operates independently of any subject.

As a result of inscription, the written has the potential to dwell in different contexts, free of its original context. The act of turning the oral utterance into a text has enabled the ballad *Hasanaginica* to travel along the temporal axis. This, in turn, causes a rupture with the original context:

> At the same time, a written sign carries with it a force that breaks with its context, that is, with the collectivity of presences organizing the moment of its inscription. This breaking force [*force de rupture*] is not an accidental predicate but the very structure of the written text. (Derrida [1972] 1988, 9; brackets and emphasis in the original)

Rupture with the original context affects the language and, furthermore, the text's potential translational relations. This rupture with the original context and the ability to travel along the temporal axis prevent the text's translational relations from being pre-determined; instead, it marries them to a particular context. This, then, confirms the hypothesis on the contextually determined nature of *intra-* and *interlingual translation*.

4.4.2 Language over Time

Derrida's 'breaking force' is a precondition for, to channel Walter Benjamin's scholarship, the text's *afterlife* (*Überleben*) (Benjamin [1923] 2012). How does this contextual rupture affect specifying the text's language? What is the relationship between a text and its language? If an

oral utterance is a manifestation inevitably tied to a particular moment, does this mean the name of its language is fixed, *id est* unaffected by possible fluidity of a linguistic identity? Is, by extension, then, the language of a text susceptible to change – in accordance with the prospective alterations in language's unity, identity, or standardisation – despite the fixedness of the text itself?

From the above discussion, one may infer that an act of inscription allows for the fixation of the literary text's content. Clive Scott is determined at fighting this common preconception; a lengthy quote is worth citing:

> [W]e do not mean that that meaning *within* the ST [source text] has achieved stasis, since everyday polysemy, connotative range and interpretative variation, are part of the ST's literariness. No, we mean rather that the ST is deemed to have achieved *textual* stasis, has authority as a text, so that the TT [target text] can safely mount itself on that ST and aim at the same completeness, the same achieved condition. But the ST, as we have it before us, is in fact not in a suspended state, but at the intersection of three durations: the process of the work's composition and revision, a process which has within it the potentially infinite extension; the process of the ST's post-publication life, in the minds of countless readers, in different editions, imitations, adaptations, merchandising, and so on; the process of the ST's existing and becoming in the mind of any *individual* reader. (Scott 2012, 2–3; emphasis in the original; my square brackets)

The folk ballad *Hasanaginica*, with its multiple variants and variations, is a prime example refuting the idea of text's immobility.

Nevertheless, even if we disregard the inevitable fluctuations of a source text, its alleged fixedness alone is not the sufficient condition to understand the text's message. For, a successful transmission of a written message is contingent upon two major factors: first, the physical survival of the medium; and, secondly, the decipherability of the text's meaning. Take a tablet in Linear A, an example borrowed from Dennis Duncan's essay 'Languages Lost in Time'. The medium itself, which could date from as early as twenty-fifth century BCE, has survived the demise of its civilisation, reaching all the way to the modern era. We, the people of the twenty-first century CE, have the tablet, we have the text. Though, its meaning, at this point, seems irretrievably lost; or, as those more optimistic would have it, the tablet's meaning has yet to be retrieved. This ancient enigma brings into question the prospects of 'communication across deep time' (Duncan 2019, 158). Not across decades or centuries, but across distant millennia.

In the continuation of the same essay, Duncan discusses an extreme case of how future generations can be warned about hazardous radiation at sites where nuclear waste has been disposed, maintaining that the mean lifetime of a radioactive particle before decay considerably exceeds the lifespan of any known language (Duncan 2019, 159; 165). This temporal juxtaposition makes the author wonder whether the fate of every language is to become lost one day (Duncan 2019, 159). Scientific evidence suggests that languages do expire (Crystal 2002). David Crystal states in his book-length study *Language Death* that there is nothing new about the phenomenon:

> Languages have always died. As cultures have risen and fallen, so their languages have emerged and disappeared. We can get some sense of it following the appearance of written language, for we now have records (in various forms – inscriptions, clay tablets, documents) of dozens of extinct languages from classical times [. . .]. (Crystal 2002, 68; brackets in the original)

We have already discussed the revolutionary role that the introduction of writing systems has played in accessing remote idioms. What is worthy of further consideration at this point is the

apparently finite nature of languages. Even though we tend to perceive languages as relatively fixed structures, their instability surfaces not only in the act of their death but in the way they evolve.

Having elaborated on a series of illuminating examples from various literary classics, Steiner declares: 'Language is in perpetual change' (Steiner 1975, 17). Research from different branches of linguistics confirms this claim, but this topic is too broad to fall within this study's scope. Steiner's rather general observation should suffice:

> [T]here are instances of arrested or sharply diminishing mobility: certain sacred and magical tongues can be preserved in a condition of artificial stasis. But ordinary language is, literally at every moment, subject to mutation. This takes many forms. New words enter as old words lapse. Grammatical conventions are changed under pressure of idiomatic use or by cultural ordinance. The spectrum of permissible expression as against that which is taboo shifts perpetually. (Steiner 1975, 18)

These changes stay largely covert when the succession of old and new elements is smooth and coherent; more dramatic events, such as the branching of Serbo-Croatian, bring these transformations to the fore. An important question arises hereby: provided that we acknowledge that living languages constantly evolve, how (if at all) can the meaning be preserved in this condition of perpetual change? One such attempt may lie in the notion of linguistic standardisation.

Can people control the language? Philosopher Martin Heidegger touches on the power relations between language and mankind in a chapter examining the complex interrelationship between the notions of 'dwelling' and 'building'. It is there that he expresses the seminal thought: 'Man acts as though *he* [*sic*] were the shaper and master of language, while in fact the *language* remains the master of man' (Heidegger [1971] 2001, 144; emphasis in the cited translation; comment in square brackets my own). The quote is famously featured as one of the epigraphs in Steiner's *After Babel*. Kindred ideas have been put forward by Stefanović Karadžić more than a century before Heidegger:

> Language does not tolerate tight moulds. It gravitates towards eternal movement. It is upon us to direct this flow. (Stefanović Karadžić cited in Peco 1990, 6)

Both Heidegger and Stefanović Karadžić honour the dominant position of language over its users. Nevertheless, Stefanović Karadžić, the leading figure in the nineteenth-century reform of the Serbian lect, is more inclined to believe that human action is not entirely futile in the matter.

As lects constantly evolve, it would be unrealistic to expect that their flow can ever be fully regulated. In spite of many obstacles, standardisations still exist. What is worthy of further scrutiny, then, is the effect that codification(s) can have upon the direction of lect's development. Let us try to illustrate this phenomenon on *Hasanaginica*. Jones, the ballad's most recent retranslator into English, shares in an afterword his impression of the language in Fortis' version:

> To modern Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian readers, the poem's language is markedly old-fashioned and regional. This is hardly surprising for a folk poem gathered almost a century before a standard language was established (though, interestingly, it was folk poetry from the regions where Croatian, Bosnian, and Serbian speech had most in common which gave the basis for this standard). (Jones 2010, 286–287; brackets in the original)

Jones' parenthetically inserted comment is crucial for our analysis: if we go back to the provisions of the Vienna Literary Agreement, we will remember that the 'southern dialect', that is the Eastern Herzegovinian dialect (*istočnohercegovački*), was selected, among other reasons, on the grounds that 'nearly all the folk poems are created in this dialect' (*The 1850 Literary Agreement* [1850] 2004, 168). *Hasanaginica* is no exception. This transitionary dialect was chosen since it shared a great number of similarities, but its codification, in return, brought the idioms even closer together. Upon the disintegration of SFR Yugoslavia, features of this 'southern dialect' have entered the modern standards of all four Serbo-Croatian successors: Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin. This act of standardisation, despite its unofficial character, fostered unification, which, in all likelihood, produced a greater number of similarities than it would have been the case had the idioms remained unregulated. This confirms the hypothesis that social and political factors play a role in the delimitation of languages.

A short digression: Benedict Anderson stresses that in history certain vernaculars did serve administrative purposes, citing, *inter alia*, the example of the English court prior to the Norman Conquest (Anderson [1983] 2006, 41). To find examples from the mediaeval Serbian Empire of the Nemanjić dynasty, one should look no further than the famous *Dušan's Code* (*Dušanov zakonik*; 1349).[43] Although this legal document was written in the vernacular, mixed with elements of Old Church Slavonic (Stanojčić and Popović [1989] 2014, 15) – the language of the Orthodox church at the time – we cannot speak of it as of a 'national' language in the modern sense, as its official use was sporadic and unregulated by any codification; it was merely an instrument of the state which allowed for a wider understanding.

The switch from vernaculars to standards and further to national languages requires an additional level of scrutiny. Tobias Harding, whose book investigates the doctrine of Swedish cultural policies, reminds us of the linguistic conditions prevailing in the pre-standardisation era: 'European vernaculars obviously existed before the nations. Many languages that are national today had, however, no distinct borders in those days; they were separated by continuums of slightly different dialects' (Harding 2007, 44). Depending on the grammarian, these dialectal continuums of Southern Slavs were classified under different headings,[44] which, regrettably, paved the way to future conflicts. Standardisation, in general, could be understood as '[the] process of unification and consolidation', the aim of which is to unite large territories through the adoption of a single written language (Febvre and Martin, [1958] 1976, 319). It should come as no surprise, then, that it was the widespread use (both literary and non-literary) of the 'southern dialect' that helped the creators of the Vienna Literary Agreement designate it as the standard (*The 1850 Literary Agreement* [1850] 2004, 168). As the document specifies, the adoption of this particular dialect was deemed simply '[the] most *practical* for the people and literary unity' (*The 1850 Literary Agreement* [1850] 2004, 168; my emphasis). No obstacles prevented other entities from assuming the role of the standard. One could suggest that the choice of lect(s) to standardise is always arbitrary in the sense that it is a decision of the few, in our case a decision reached between few eminent men of letter representing Serbian, Croatian, and Slovene interests. This additionally confirms the hypothesised role of social and political factors in the delimitation of languages.

A lack of genuine continuity between the pre-standardisation and standardisation era comes as a result of shifting political and statal paradigms in the nineteenth-century Europe,

---

[43] For other works written in the Serbian 'folk' idiom prior to the mid-eighteenth century, see Aleksandar Milanović's book *Kratka istorija srpskog knjizevnog jezika* (A Short History of the Serbian Literary Language; 2010), particularly pp. 57–63.

[44] For the classifications of dialectal continuums before Stefanović Karadžić's reform, see, for example, Asim Peco's monograph *Vukovim jezičkim stazama* (In Vuk's Linguistic Footsteps; 1990), particularly pp. 10–31.

brought by the rise of nationalism. The Romantic era, with its emphasis on individuality and glorification of the past, provided the intellectual framework for the constitution of nation-states. In his monograph *Nations and Nationalism*, Ernest Gellner argues that nation is a construct rather than a natural category (Gellner 1983, 49) and that, rather than nations, the basic units are actually cultures, 'often subtly grouped, shading into each other, overlapping, intertwined' (Gellner 1983, 49). According to Gellner, nationalism as a shaping force operates on three basic principles: 1. turning pre-existing cultures into nations; 2. inventing new nations; 3. obliterating pre-existing cultures (Gellner 1983). Gellner is careful to stress that nationalism does not strive towards imposing 'these mythical, supposedly natural and given units' but, quite the opposite, it provides 'the crystallization of *new* units, suitable for the conditions now prevailing, though admittedly using as their raw material the cultural, historical, and other inheritances from the pre-nationalist world' (Gellner 1983, 49; my emphasis).

In this creation of new units, language is often an instrument that gives the new structure legitimacy. One of the preconditions of modern nation states is the one-to-one correspondence between a nation and a language (see Chapter 7). When a language enters political streams, its face can become altered to suit certain agenda. For this reason, Robert M. W. Dixon proposes a distinction between 'linguistic languages' and 'political languages':

> The word 'language' is used in at least two rather different senses. There is the political sense where each nation or tribe likes to say that it speaks a different language from its neighbours. And there is the linguistic sense where two forms of speech which are mutually intelligible are regarded as dialects of a single language. Typically, several 'languages' in the political sense may each be a dialect of one language in the linguistic sense. (Dixon 1997, 7; inverted commas in the original)

In his book, Dixon embraces the 'linguistic sense' of language, adding that '[o]nce political considerations are firmly discarded, it is generally not a difficult matter to decide whether one is dealing with one language or with more than one in a given situation' (Dixon 1997, 7). But can political considerations – and social interventions more generally – be simply discarded? And what would be the consequences of taking a blind eye on socially-induced changes?

While Dixon's distinction may be helpful in certain contexts, I find its implications for translation studies quite dangerous. First of all, it ignores the social aspect of language, which, I argue, is an inseparable component in the constitution of linguistic identity and linguistic unity. Secondly, this dichotomy is rooted in synchrony, thereby neglecting the evolutionary processes in which one idiom may develop beyond comprehension over a certain amount of time, as it will later be discussed on the example Old English and modern English (see 4.4.3). Thirdly, such division is inattentive to the role of power relations in constituting a language. In other words, it overlooks the complexity of the notion of a language and of the influence that 'political language' can have upon 'linguistic language'. For translational relations, the introduction of 'linguistic languages' as opposed to 'political languages' would only create an utter confusion. In his paper 'What's in a Name: The Case of Serbo-Croatian', Bugarski also discusses the aforementioned distinction, which he tried to introduce independently of Dixon (Bugarski 2004, 18). Bugarski, unlike Dixon, is mindful of the potential consequences of embracing a dual perspective:

> [I]f it is possible for an entity to be at the same time one language and several languages, depending on the point of view, this kind of situation makes it even more difficult to distinguish between languages and varieties, or to count the world languages. (Bugarski 2004, 18)

The very fact that certain lects become the matter of political forces can in the long run alter their 'purely linguistic' profile. For the presented reasons, I deem it safer to avoid this distinction as its application would prove ultimately inconclusive when placed in a translational perspective. What ought to be analysed further is the element that Bugarski touches upon in the above quote: the problem of distinguishing borders of a language (or languages) that have been the subject of political or social alterations. The question of linguistic borders will be considered synchronically in the next chapter, whilst here, in the section to follow, it will be examined through the lenses of diachrony.

4.4.3 Linguistic Boundaries over Time

As pointed out in literature review, Jakobson's notions of *intra-* and *interlingual translation* have attracted criticism for the often-encountered difficulty of discerning linguistic boundaries, which is a prerequisite for specifying translational relations (see 2.2.4). Derrida (1985), Toury (1986), Pym ([1992] 2010), Albachten (2014), and Davis (2014) have all pointed out this important issue – both across space and through time; the spatial aspect of this problem will be addressed in the following chapter (see Chapter 5), whereas the temporal one will be discussed hereby. For instance, Derrida expresses his concern about the arbitrariness that lies at the core of Jakobson's notions, contained in the presupposition 'that one can know in the final analysis how to determine rigorously the unity and identity of a language, the decidable form of its limits' (Derrida 1985, 173). Along the same lines, Albachten asks '[h]ow [] the boundaries [can] be drawn between different historical stages of development of a language' (Albachten 2014, 574), posing one of the most crucial questions this chapter attempts to answer.

As though foreseeing the potential issue, Jakobson explicitly states in 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation' that 'differential bilingual grammars' are the instruments that 'should define what unifies and what differentiates the two languages in their selection and delimitation of grammatical concepts' (Jakobson [1959] 2012, 128). Jakobson clearly puts too much faith in linguistics in a narrow sense and the primacy of a purely grammatical criterion. Is it sheer naivety to believe that the judgement of contrastive analysis would be taken as axiomatic? Such strategy would probably be sustainable in vacuum but can grammar overpower external determinants, such as social or political factors? Linguistics in a broader sense, which encompasses all sciences that take language as an object of study, and sociolinguistics in particular, honour a wide range of non-grammatical components that partake in the making of a language. As previous parts of this chapter (see 4.2, especially 4.2.4 and 4.2.5) have shown that certain non-linguistic factors can be responsible for the changes in linguistic unity, any further dwelling on this issue would be superfluous.

More pertinent is the temporal dimension of linguistic forms, which Jakobson's purely synchronic point of view disregards altogether. So, what happens when we add the element of diachronicity to the equation? Those criticising Jakobson's formulation of the concepts of *intra-* and *interlingual translation* often resort, consciously or less so, to a text that considerably precedes 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation' – that is to Ferdinand de Saussure's posthumously published *Course in General Linguistics* (Saussure [1959] 2011), the work foundational not only to 'the era of the sign' but far beyond. Pym, for example, points out that '[t]hose who travel on foot or have read the diachronic part of Saussure know that there are no natural frontiers between languages' (Pym [1992] 2010, 24). Pym's subsequent elaboration refers mainly to the territorial distribution of lects, which will be examined more closely later on (see Chapter 5). But what can Saussure's chapter 'Diachronic Units, Identities and Realities' from the *Course* teach us about language's temporal boundaries? Saussure opens the chapter by asserting that '[s]tatic linguistics works with units that owe their existence to their synchronic arrangement' (Saussure [1959] 2011, 179) and proceeds to suggest that 'in a diachronic succession the elements are not delimited once and for all' (Saussure [1959] 2011, 179), accompanying these two claims with relevant schematisations. The provided drawings

seem to depict the temporary – if not illusory – fixedness of linguistic structures, which can only be stable in a given moment; a historical perspective reveals that units have the potential to evolve and acquire new distributions. In support, Saussure offers several instances from different branches of linguistics, indicating the conceptual issue of defining the scope of a 'unit' – be it synchronic or diachronic. The inability of moulding a *diachronic unit* further conditions our understanding of *diachronic identity*. 'To say that two words as different as [Latin] *calidum* and [French] *chaud* constitute a diachronic identity', Saussure explains, 'means simply that speakers passed from one form to the other through a series of synchronic identities in speaking without there being a break in their common bond despite successive phonetic changes'(Saussure [1959] 2011, 182). Although Saussure examines the concepts of diachronic and synchronic identity on a phonetic sample, nothing prevents us from applying the same reasoning to the language as a whole. This reaffirms Pym's comment on the blurredness of linguistic borders but, moreover, serves as the basis for Kathleen Davis's argumentation in 'Intralingual Translation and the Making of a Language' (2014).

Davis' essay could be interpreted as an expansion of Saussure's claim on the preservation of diachronic identity through a seamless succession of synchronic ones (Saussure [1959] 2011, 182). To avoid terminological confusion, it should be noted that Davis uses the term *linguistic identity* without distinguishing between synchronic and diachronic as does Saussure. Saussure's distinction is useful inasmuch as it helps us to closer examine the notion of *vertical translation* – that operating between different linguistic and historical constituencies. Nevertheless, Saussure's distinction leaves the problem of distinguishing between different units open. As presented in literature review, Davis argues that the processes of continuous (what would be termed *intralingual*) translation have allowed for the preservation of the English linguistic identity despite the loss of comprehension between its early and modern version (Davis 2014, 587; see 2.2.4). Contributing to the debate on the relationship between Old English and modern English, Davis reflects on the most widely recognised epic poem composed in Old English:

> The question of whether *Beowulf* is written in English thus misses the point, since it assumes that we can ascertain the identity and history of 'English' without taking into consideration the translation history that enabled the reading, editing, publication, and institutionalization of texts like *Beowulf*. (Davis 2014, 58; emphasis and inverted commas in the original)

Davis, therefore, stresses the importance of translatability and translation history in determining the temporal borders of a language.

Hasanaginica's case, however, is an inverted one: textual translation (*intralingual* one) has contributed little to its preservation and institutionalisation – and that is only if we count Stefanović Karadžić's reduction as an intralingual translation. Given that we restrict the discussion only to Fortis' *Hasanaginica*, then textual translation has played no role whatsoever. Notwithstanding the archaic and regional texture, the language of Fortis' variant, recorded in the eighteenth century, is still understandable today. If we extend Saussure's earlier mentioned observations to the identity of a language in general rather than to its individual elements, we soon realise that the question of whether *Hasanaginica* is in Serbian, Croatian, or Bosnian misses the point as it ignores the historicity of the idiom in which the ballad was written and its development – which has not been that of 'seamless succession' but that of rupture and ramification. The chronology testifying to the fluidity of this linguistic identity has been provided earlier in this chapter (see 4.2). Drawing from Saussure, we arrive at the conclusion that there are two possible scenarios: a series of synchronic identities can result either in continuity or in change. The English case is that of continuity, the Serbo-Croatian, its predecessors and successors', is that of change. The evolution of languages confirms the

hypothesis suggesting that what is translated inside and what outside the language is contingent on the way speech varieties or lects are delimited.

Let us further analyse possible translational relations among, say, modern Serbian and modern Croatian and its predecessors, although what will be said can be applied to any of the Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin language pair. From the moment Serbian and Croatian were standardised separately henceforth, we can translate between these two languages, and it is a clear example of *interlingual translation* by Jakobson's standards, as it operates between two distinct languages. During the time when codification prescribed the existence of Serbo-Croatian – one language with multiple varieties – the translation between Serbian and Croatian was between different standard varieties, which is a characteristic example of *intralingual translation*, as it takes place within one language. But what about the translation process that operates from an idiom that precedes any official standardisation (as is the case with that of *Hasanaginica*), on the one hand, and between a language standardised in modern times, which is actually one in the series of descendants of the unnamed pre-codification idiom? Would such vertical translation be classified as *intra-* or *interlingual*? Vertical translation between different historical constituencies, where multiple modern ones originated from a historical one, problematises Jakobson's distinction between *intra-* and *interlingual translation*. It does not seem fully *intralingual* by virtue of the shift in linguistic identity; it does not seem fully *interlingual* by virtue of retained comprehensibility.

Here we arrive at Albachten's question as to whether 'the borders of a language [should] be determined by lack of intelligibility' (Albachten 2014, 574). This is certainly the model that Dixon proposes when introducing the distinction between a language in the *linguistic* and in the *political* sense (Dixon 1997, 7; see 2.2.4). Is comprehension a criterion? In short, from a parallel analysis of *Beowulf* and *Hasanaginica*, the answer is: no. The English of *Beowulf* is not understandable to the modern English-speaking readership yet it is considered one language – albeit retroactively prequalified with the adjective 'old', added to make the diachronic idiom distinguishable; the lect of *Hasanaginica* is understandable to the modern Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian/Montenegrin-speaking audience but there is no continuity between the idiom of the ballad and the modern standards. It is not the lect that has been fluid but its linguistic identity. The lect *per se* has not changed beyond recognition but its integrity has not been preserved. *Hasanaginica*'s case, hence, confirms the tested hypothesis that a lack of mutual intelligibility between separate lects is not the necessary condition for language separation. This paradox runs counter to our instinct of how linguistic borders are established.

Pym's proposed model of using translation as a way of determining cultural proximity and distance (Pym [1992] 2010, 25; see 2.2.4) appears as a promising tool for crystallising boundaries without succumbing to political divisions:

> It is enough to define the limits of a culture as *the points where transferred texts have had to be (intralingually or interlingually) translated*. [. . .] In this way, translation studies avoids having to link up all the points of contiguity in the way that political frontiers do. (Pym [1992] 2010, 25–26; brackets and emphasis in the original)

The unsaid premise of this approach is that there has to be a one-to-one correspondence between a language and a culture, which leaves instances of linguistic and cultural hybridity outside the equation. To this end, the model could be said to have both linguistic and cultural implication. Real-life evidence, however, refutes the viability of Pym's approach for linguistic purposes, inasmuch as the formula presupposes that mutual intelligibility determines borders of a language – which has been proven false from a diachronic perspective by the cases of *Hasanaginica* and *Beowulf*. Nevertheless, Pym's model is beneficial in excavating underlying cultural paradigms, which has been identified as its primary goal. Since *Hasanaginica* does not need to undergo translation to be understood by those speaking Serbian, Bosnian, Croatian, and

Montenegrin, then, according to Pym, this is an indicator of cultural proximity. Conversely, *Beowulf*, which can only be understood by a speaker of modern English in translation, indicates cultural distance despite the English language's unbroken lineage. Pym's model is therefore applicable to diachronic idioms as well as to synchronic lects, which will be scrutinised in the next chapter (see Chapter 5).

Helpful might be to 'zoom out' and see how the issue of diachronicity is approached in case of literary heritage. In *How to Read World Literature*, Damrosch writes about striking the right balance when engaging with centuries old literature:

> In reading across time, we need to keep both aspects alive, neither submerging ourselves in antiquarian details nor absorbing the work so fully into our own world that we mistake *The Odyssey* for a modern novel or look to it for the same pleasures we expect from movies and television today. (Damrosch 2009, 25)

One may argue that the same should apply to a diachronic assessment of linguistic aspects. Despite some obsolete features, *Hasanaginica* is still largely understandable to the modern readership speaking Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and/or Montenegrin. The standardisation of Serbo-Croatian as well as its ramification came considerably after the composition (and transcription) of *Hasanaginica*. For this reason, it appears logical that we should not impose the modern linguistic debate surrounding the successors of Serbo-Croatian upon *Hasanaginica*; rather, we should acknowledge the ballad's historicity.

Hasanaginica teaches us that the tension between primordial and modern times is embodied in the inability to impose lect's contemporary parameters onto a work from the past. Inevitably, any answer favouring one language over the others would be an *appropriation* formulated in the wake of nationalisation of non-material cultural heritage that ensued after the breakup of SFR Yugoslavia. The modern standards in their current form and institutionalisation are a relatively recent invention on *Hasanaginica*'s centuries-long trajectory. For this reason, any answer that singles out one language would rest on a reconstruction, as there is no actual continuity in tradition – despite the preserved intelligibility. *Hasanaginica*, undoubtedly, belongs to the cultural heritage of all three previously mentioned linguistic communities – and to many more literary traditions to which it has been transplanted. Yet, the debate as to whether its language is Serbian, Croatian, or Bosnian is highly problematic insofar as the ballad precedes the division of these languages as we know them today. This reconciling solution, however, comes with a series of practical issues when put in a translational perspective.

4.4.4 Translatability over Time

So, how does the temporal uncertainty of linguistic borders affect *Hasanaginica*'s translatability? We can honour the ballad's historicity and avoid choosing the name of a language to attach to it but, in a translational perspective, the unspecificity of the language becomes highly problematic for discerning intra- and interlingual relations. Before discussing the effects of temporal discrepancy on Jakobson's notions, let us consider possible translation directions. After all, translation, as a practical act, needs workable solutions. Provided that we remove the ballad's long and saturated history and focus only on the text in one of its preserved forms – say Fortis' manuscript – we are left with a highly ambiguous entity, which incorporates many common grammatical features shared by Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian. The two most important common features are the Štokavian dialectal basis and the (i)jekavian pronunciation. No other dialectal basis than Štokavian has entered the three modern standards; for this reason, between whichever modern standards we decide to translate (Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian), the Štokavian dialectal basis remains intact. With pronunciation, the situation is slightly different, as Serbian also standardises the ekavian pronunciation in addition to the (i)jekavian; Bosnian

and Croatian, however, have codified only the (i)jekavian one. From the synchronic point of view, translating from the (i)jekavian to ekavian could be regarded both as *interlingual* (from Croatian/Bosnian into Serbian) and as *intralingual translation* (from Serbian into Serbian). On the lexical front, the situation is as convoluted, owing to the presence of obsolete vocabulary in Fortis' *Hasanaginica*. Eliminating obsolete vocabulary from the translation into any of the three contemporary standards would be more of a *modernisation* of the text, ergo *intralingal*.

This odd mixture of intra- and interlingual relations is a result of anachronism between the text of the original and the order of modern standards that have developed from a diachronic idiom. A vertical translation between a historical variety of a language that precedes codification, on the one hand, and modern standards that have developed from this particular historical variety, on the other, escapes the confines of Jakobson's dichotomy. For this reason, using 'pure' linguistics as a means of determining what is translated inside and what outside the language becomes insufficient. Jakobson's suggestion to turn to 'differential bilingual grammars' (Jakobson [1959] 2012, 128) is of little use. The grammatical criterion is simply overpowered in cases where one and the same translation has both intra- and interlingual properties. The studied example points towards the conclusion that a single text and a single translation in one direction can embody both intra- and interlingual relations. These hybrid examples will be discussed in more detail on the example of multilingual content (see Chapter 7). This proves the hypothesis stating that translational relations are not axiomatic but determined contextually – yet not only in the contextual framework of time and space but also that of a text.

Overall, the chapter's findings confirm all four tested hypotheses, thereby underpinning the main argument, that *intra-* and *interlingual translation* are not stable relations. This chapter's diachronic perspective demonstrates that lects constantly evolve and it is indispensable to take this aspect into consideration when disusing and constructing translational types. In the Babelic context, Derrida stresses precisely this incompleteness of the structure:

> The 'tower of Babel' does not merely figure the irreducible multiplicity of tongues; it exhibits an incompletion, the impossibility of finishing, of totalizing, of saturating, of completing something on the order of edification, architectural construction, system and architectonics. (Derrida 1985, 165; inverted commas in the original)
> [...]
> What the multiplicity of idioms actually limits is not only a 'true' translation, a transparent and adequate interexpression, it is also a structural order, a coherence of construct. (Derrida 1985, 165–166; inverted commas in the original)

The structure is incomplete as a language is inherently bound to evolve, eventually multiplying or reducing in number. It is exactly on the basis of this inability to define a language as a fixed and durable structure that Derrida brings into question Jakobson's widely accepted categorisation of translation. This perpetually changing linguistic landscape is certainly exemplified by the scrutinised languages of the Balkan Slav. Over time, languages either continue or cease to exist; in death, they multiply or they vanish. With these changes in linguistic landscape, translational relations are bound to shift. Any form of stability can only be illusory and temporary. As a result, translational relations can never be predetermined but, rather, they need be established in relation to a concrete context.

4.5 Chapter Conclusions

In sum, *Hasanaginica* embodies multiple ambiguities that make its status highly complicated. First of all, the ballad was composed in the Eastern Herzegovinian dialect. Selected as the

literary standard in the mid-nineteenth century, owing to its transitionary character, the Eastern Herzegovinian dialect later brought the Croatian, Bosnian, and Serbian idioms even closer together. Many of its features have entered all three modern standards. Furthermore, what adds another layer of ambiguity to the ballad is the existence of multiple variants and multiple reductions of a single variant. Along the same lines, the fact that the poem was transformed from the oral into the written medium with the help of an unknown number of intermediators leaves plenty of room for speculation about the possible original form. These factors have placed the ballad into the centre of vigorous heritage debates, especially after the SFR Yugoslavia's breakup. While this study avoids taking a political and nationalistic tint, the already prolific research surrounding the ballad's cultural and linguistic ambiguities – some of which is deeply ideological – has proven a fruitful starting point in the investigation of translational relations.

Departing from Jakobson's arguable neglection of translational relations' multidimensionality, this chapter has explored their temporal dimension on the example of South Slavic ballad *Hasanaginica*. The unstated premise of Jakobson's concepts is that in order to establish what is translated inside and what outside the language, one needs to be able to specify the so-called 'source' and the 'target' language. Through the prism of diachrony, the chapter has revealed this premise's problematic nature, hidden in the inability to always clearly determine what counts as a language, especially in the pre-standardisation era. Moreover, the language's evolutionary character tends to obscure its temporal borders. And, thanks to the invention of writing systems, literature is able to transcend its original context and travel through time. *Hasanaginica*'s rupture with the original context, accompanied with its language's subsequently fluid identity, has caused a disbalance between the past and the present in linguistic terms.

This chapter's sociologically oriented reassessment of Jakobson's notions of *intra-* and *interlingual translation* signals that these concepts were conceived on the premise of synchrony. In vertical translation, their validity is limited: namely, they can be applied to cases where linguistic unity has been preserved, but they fail to encompass the cases of linguistic discontinuity – as is the case with Serbo-Croatian, its predecessors, and successors. Namely, the lect of *Hasanaginica* has gone through multiple phases. In rough terms, these could be divided into four stages: the period that precedes any codification (when *Hasanaginica* was both created and first written); the period of a joint literary standard; the period when this literary standard was upgraded to a joint national language; and, finally, the period of ramification, which produced languages that correspond to the newly formed nation-states. During all these phases, understanding has remained almost intact – proving that mutual intelligibility does not affect linguistic borders. Translating from a diachronic idiom, which precedes any official codification, into synchronic languages that have developed from that diachronic variety is problematic as the translation product features both intra- and interlingual properties. This makes it impossible to label the translation as fully intralingual or fully interlingual, tying it to a textual context.

One of the key findings of this chapter lies in broadening our understanding of the social component. The chronological overview of South Slavic lects (with the exception of Bulgarian) has shown how the idioms were socially regulated – at times brought together, at times separated by official state means. As codification is a social act, the results indicate that the social factor does play a role in the delimitation of languages and, by extension, the constitution of translational relations. With translations that involve standards, hence, relations cannot be discerned based solely on the linguistic criterion, that is independently of their diachronic codification.

In conclusion, the sociolinguistic approach of this chapter has been helpful in demonstrating the ways in which translational relations shift on a temporal axis. A close link to lects' territorial distribution has been left only tangentially explored. To expand the discussion

on translational relations' multidimensionality, then, the next facet worthy of detailed examination is translational relations' behaviour in a spatial dimension. This will be the main subject of the following chapter, where a sociolinguistic approach will be employed in the attempt to grasp how translational relations between Serbo-Croatian successors function in a synchronic frame.

5 Translational Relations in a Spatial Context

Stevan Sremac's Novel and Zdravko Šotra's Film *Zona Zamfirova*

*At any one time
language is a kaleidoscope
of styles, genres and dialects.*

David Crystal, 'From Riddle to Twittersphere'

5.1 Introduction

Although the title identifies spatial factors as this chapter's focus, such emphasis – made in service of the dissertation as a whole – is somewhat undue. Considering translational types' multidimensionality, which makes the spatial components inseparable from temporal ones (Gottlieb 2018, 45), the above title should be taken with a pinch of salt. Since Jakobson's notions of *intra-* and *interlingual translation* are deemed to have been conceived in a synchronic perspective (Davis 2014, 588; see 2.2.4), this chapter aims to check whether horizontal translation actually brings them stability. While Chapter 4 explores the ways in which linguistic borders evolve from a diachronic angle, this chapter interrogates the ways in which linguistic borders have been established – mostly synchronically but also diachronically. In comparison to the previous chapter, another major difference lies in what is taken as the starting point in the formulation of translational relations: Chapter 4 has dealt with language and its multiplications, whereas this one brings to the fore its fragmentary nature through the investigation of sublinguistic structures, so as to assess the rate of destabilisation not only of *intralingual* but also of *interlingual* relations.

Particularly suitable for our debate is the literary body of Stevan Sremac (1855–1906), writer considered a forerunner of modern dialectologists (Peco 1995). A historian by training, active around a decade before Olaf Broch and Aleksandar Belić published first serious linguistic studies on Serbian dialects (Peco 1995, 154), Sremac meticulously collected dialectal material during his residences and trips across Serbia. Sremac's effort to record authentic lexis, grammatical features with all their morphological, syntactic and other specificities, and even mark some elements of prosody is particularly impressive. These notes on local linguistic features, along with anecdotes, tales, songs and other forms derived from folklore, helped him create convincing literary characters. As a proponent of realism,[45] Sremac left dialectally rich oeuvre that offers reliable insight into the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century speech of different regions of today's Serbia – ranging from the northern region of Vojvodina (*Pop Ćira i pop Spira* [Priests Ćira and Spira], 1894), to Western Serbia (*Vukadin*, 1903), and Southern Serbia (*Ivkova slava* [Ivko's Feast], 1895; *Zona Zamfirova* 1903).

Central to this chapter is Sremac's novel *Zona Zamfirova*[46] – the story of a turbulent love affair between the captivating Zona Zamfirova, youngest daughter of a respectable well-to-do man, and her beloved Mane, who is a mere craftsman. Only after a series of cacophonous events

---

[45] For more on Sremac in the context of Serbian literary realism as well as on other notable proponents of this movement, such as Laza Lazarević, Janko Veselinović, Radoje Domanović, Petar Kočić, Borisav Stanković, see, for example, Dimitrije Vučenov's monograph *O srpskim realistima i njihovim prethodnicima* (On Serbian Realists and their Predecessors; 1970).

[46] Printed in installments in the prestigious Belgrade-based literary journal *Srpski književni glasnik* (The Serbian Literary Herald) over the course of 1903, Stevan Sremac's *Zona Zamfirova* was published as a novel only in 1907, a year after the author's sudden death.

does their love result in marriage, effectively destabilising the barriers between an old elite and emerging working class. Set in the southern Serbian town of Niš, only recently liberated from the Ottomans, most characters speak the Prizren-Timok dialect,[47] with grammatical features quite removed from the Serbian standard. In addition, most dialogues are peppered with archaisms, historicisms, and borrowings, mainly of Turkish origin, making the novel hardly comprehendible to a modern audience.

The 2002 ecranisation of *Zona Zamfirova*, directed by Zdravko Šotra, aimed to preserve authentic utterances of the late-nineteenth-century Niš. The adaptation turned out a great success, with record-breaking statistics[48] that threw a public spotlight on the artistic potential of dialects.[49] Many of the film's humorous lines have been so widely quoted they have entered popular culture. In the years to come, the film was frequently screened on the Serbian National Television (RTS). The inspiration for this chapter comes from these television airings. Namely, in Serbia, over the years the film has been shown with no intralingual translation of the dialectally saturated parts, which constitute roughly eighty percent of the film. In Croatia, however, the national television (HRT) has subtitled the film in standard Croatian.[50] This fact alone would not pose a compelling matter had it not provoked an avalanche on social media:[51] a portion of Serbian speakers who had previously seen the film with no explanatory intervention whatsoever claimed that the interlingual translation into Croatian helped them finally understand *Zona Zamfirova*'s colourful dialogues.

Is it possible and, if yes, how come that a speaker of one language can have difficulties understanding a dialect of their own language yet comprehend the translation into what is officially a foreign language? The ability to determine clear boundaries between languages, as well as between a language and a dialect, is one of the premises on which Jakobson's notions of *intra-* and *interlingual translation* rest. Any destabilisation of linguistic borders has to reflect on translational relations. This chapter repeatedly tests the same four hypotheses as in the previous chapter (see Chapter 4):

---

[47] For more on the boundaries, characteristics, and sub-dialects of the Prizren-Timok dialectal zone, see, for example, Asim Peco's *Pregled srpskohrvatskih dijalekata* (A Survey of Serbo-Croatian Dialects; 1991), pp. 41–48; Pavle Ivić's *Dijalektologija srpskohrvatskog jezika: Uvod u štokavsko narečje (*Dialectology of Serbo-Croatian Dialects: An Introduction into the Štokavian Accentuation; 1985), pp. 110–131; then *Prizrensko-timočki govori; Dosadašnja proučavanja; Bibliografija* (The Prizren-Timok Dialect; Current Research; Bibliography; 1996) by Ivić et al.; also conference proceedings, edited by Ivić, *Govori prizrensko-timočke oblasti i susednih dijalekata, zbornik radova sa naučnog skupa* (Dialects of the Prizren-Timok Region and the Neighbouring Dialects, Conference Proceedings; 1994).

[48] According to Wikipedia, Šotra's *Zona Zamfirova* is 'the most watched Serbian movie ever, having been seen by a total of 1.2 million people in theater release in Serbia and 1.6 million when Montenegro and Republika Srpska in Bosnia and Herzegovina are counted' (Wikipedia, *Zona Zamfirova*, 2019).

[49] Soon after *Zona Zamfirova*, Šotra filmed another ecranisation of Sremac's work – *Ivkova slava* (Ivko's Feast; 2005) – also set in the nineteenth-century Niš.

[50] During the 1990s, the Croatian subtitling of Serbian films, especially of Srđan Dragojević's *Lepa sela lepo gore* (Pretty Village, Pretty Flame; 1996) and *Rane* (The Wounds; 1998), were not enthusiastically received in Serbia. See, for example, Teofil Pančić's newspaper article 'Titlovanje i tiltovanje' (Subtitling and Tilting; 1999), available at the following link: https://www.vreme.com/arhiva_html/vb1/4.html.

[51] For example, Serbian actor Branislav Trifunović tweeted on 4 May 2013: 'Sinoc je na Hrt-u bila "Zona Zamfirova" sa prevodom, tako da su je i mnogi nasi gradjani konacno razumeli.. [sic]' (Last night HRT was showing *Zona Zamfirova* with a translation, so a lot of our citizens have finally understood it too...). The tweet generated fifty seven likes and twelve retweets. The original tweet is available at: https://twitter.com/BrankoBranislav/status/330584994219163649.

- Translational relations are not pre-given but contextually determined in each individual case.
- Determining what is translated *inside* and what *outside* the language is contingent on the way speech varieties or lects – such as standard languages, creole languages, pidgin languages, regional dialects, sociolects, and registers – are delimited.
- A lack of mutual intelligibility between separate lects is not the necessary condition for language separation.
- Social and political factors play a role in the delimitation of languages.

The body of this chapter consists of three uneven parts. At the beginning, Sremac's text will serve as a basis for the description of the Prizren-Timok dialect's vocabulary and grammar. The second part addresses the interplay between standard Serbian, the Prizren-Timok dialect, and standard Croatian on the example of Šotra's film – with a view to identifying the points of distance and closeness between and within these lects. A theoretical deliberation is supplemented by an empirical study in which intelligibility is examined both through Serbian speaker's self-assessment and objective testing of understanding the Prizren-Timok and the Croatian lect. The final part of this chapter's body is predominantly concerned with the complex ways in which fragmentation and heterogeneity affect linguistic borders and, by extension, translational relations.

5.2 *Zona Zamfirova*: Obstacles to Comprehension

Many works from Sremac's diverse oeuvre contain lengthy dialectal intrusions, mostly in dialogues. In general, the use of the vernacular can have, as Luigi Bonaffini notes, 'far-reaching and deeply rooted implications' of 'literary, psychological, political, existential, anthropological' kind (Bonaffini 1997, 279). Although stimulating material for a literary study, the roles that dialects plays in *Zona Zamfirova* fall outside this chapter's scope. More pertinent is a linguistic analysis, with a particular stress on lexicological and morphophonological aspects. Marilyn Sternglass' assertion that 'the reader is not expected to have a sophisticated background in linguistics in order to read and profit from dialect literature' (Sternglass 1975, 202) may be true for the majority of the dialect literature corpora, yet Sremac's far from discriminate use of the regional language hinders the overall coherence of the novel. The goal of the following analysis will, therefore, be to outline why dialectally saturated parts are largely inaccessible to a modern audience.

An important note: the film script is not identical to the text of Sremac's novel. Notwithstanding the preserved authenticity of the idiom featured in the original, certain archaisms and regionalisms are replaced with words of higher frequency. The substitutes, however, were carefully selected to have been in use at the time when the novel's plot takes place. For instance, *teste* = ten, ten-piece (Sremac [1907] 2008, 95; Škaljić 1966, 614) is substituted with *tuce* = dozen (Šotra 2004, 00:52:30-00:52:34), which is used elsewhere in the novel (Sremac [1907] 2008, 15). In addition, *zambak* = lily (Sremac [1907] 2008, 32; Škaljić 1966, 646) is replaced with a more frequent name for this flower, *krin* = lily (Šotra 2004, 00:31:22-00:31:29). Despite these minor lexical adjustments intended to suit the modern audience, substitutions of this kind are the exception rather than the rule of the 2002 ecranisation. As such, the idiom of the novel is not radically different from that of Šotra's film; hence, Sremac's text can serve as a reliable source for the interrogation of the described phenomenon.

5.2.1 Vocabulary of the Prizren-Timok Dialect

Understanding the specificity of the Prizren-Timok dialect requires an investigation of the legacy bequeathed by the centuries-long Ottoman rule on the Balkans. Determining precisely the duration of the Ottomans' presence in the region under study is complex, insofar as the span is dependent upon an arbitrary selection of key events that establish a framework. Generally, it is safe to assert that the Ottoman Empire exercised powerful influence upon the territory in question from the late-fourteenth until the early-twentieth century. The residual effect of this prolonged political, cultural, religious, and, above all, linguistic contact between the Ottomans and the Slavs lies in a thick layer of Oriental lexis, added to the idiom of the conquered Slavs. The impressive number of 8,742 vocabulary items is listed in Abdulah Škaljić's comprehensive dictionary of the Turkish elements found in the Serbo-Croatian language (Škaljić 1966, 23). Škaljić believes that this figure is high since 'the attitude toward Turkisms has always been much more liberal than toward the words taken from other non-Slavic languages' (Škaljić 1966, 14). The Serbo-Croatian lects 'developed freely under the Turkish government, for the occupier was indifferent toward the customs of the Balkan Slavs as well as toward their language. Turkisms were neither imposed by force nor systematically implemented through policies' (Škaljić 1966, 14). Despite the palpable presence of Turkish words in the present-day Serbo-Croatian successors, their distribution across the region is uneven. Motoki Nomachi points out that the quantity of Turkisms is contingent on the dialect, adding that '[i]n general, their proportion is greater where there has been contact with Turkish on an everyday basis' (Nomachi 2015, 49).

The inadequacy of regarding the Serbo-Croatian linguistic region as a single unit in the given context is due to the frequent alteration of borders over the course of the turbulent Balkan history. The three crucial centres for this study – today's cities of Zagreb, Belgrade, and Niš – were finally freed from the Ottomans in 1718, 1806, and 1878 respectively. The approximate eighty-year interval between the liberation of each of these centres has led to a varying degree of the Turkish elements in their vernaculars. On the least Turkish side of the spectrum is 'the pure Croatian of Zagreb ([formerly] Agram)', which 'has largely thrown aside these alien elements and substituted many words of genuine Slavic composition and origin, chiefly for concrete objects, which are still expressed by the corresponding Turkish phrases in Bosnia-Herzegovina [and elsewhere]' (Prince 1931, 241; round brackets in the original; comments in square brackets my own). In the middle is 'the purely Serbian idiom', which 'has retained in the speech of daily life a large number of Turkish substantives' (Prince 1931, 241). Finally, the lect of Bosnia and Herzegovina is 'much more Turkified than the Serb proper and, in fact, may be spoken in such a way as to be quite unintelligible in Belgrade' (Prince 1931, 241). Although Prince focuses on Bosnia and Herzegovina rather than on the South of Serbia, both of these provinces were only liberated in 1878, hence, it is no surprise that their utterances are more 'Turkified' in comparison to those of Belgrade or Zagreb, the inhabitants of which had already distanced themselves from Turkish-language influence for quite some time.

Published just twenty-five years after the Ottomans left Niš, *Zona Zamfirova* attests that the Turkish vocabulary was still fresh in the everyday exchanges of the town. From a modern perspective, *Zona Zamfirova* abounds in archaisms, such as *pendžer* = window (Sremac [1907] 2008, 8; Vujaklija 1996, 666), and *jabandžija* = newcomer (Sremac [1907] 2008, 37; Vujaklija 1996, 361), which have an adequate substitute in modern Serbian. Historicisms such as *mangal* = brazier (Sremac [1907] 2008, 13, 119; Škaljić 1966, 445), and *šiše* = bottle, glass (Sremac [1907] 2008, 21, 31, 33, 81; Škaljić 1966, 1020), denoting everyday objects that are no longer contemporary, are much less prevalent in the novel. Turkisms that still enjoy a widespread currency in the Serbian language, as is the case with *đene-đene* = so-so (Sremac [1907] 2008, 127; Vujaklija 1996, 243), *nargila* = hookah (Sremac [1907] 2008, 8; Vujaklija 1996, 578), and

merak = desire, lust (Sremac [1907] 2008, 73, 80, 83, 91; Vujaklija 1996, 534), to name but a few, are vividly present in the text.

When examining the etymological composition of vocabulary found in both the novel and the film, it is important to clarify that the umbrella term 'Turkism', widely accepted by Serbian linguists, connotes a layer incorporating not just the lexis of Turkish origin but also the words that entered Serbian from other languages, most substantially Arabic and Persian, through the mediation of Turkish (Stanojčić and Popović 2014, 200). The examples provided below aim to illustrate this multilayeredness on the corpus from the novel. Indisputably from the Turkish language are *zevzek* = fool (Sremac [1907] 2008, 85, 104, 133; Vujaklija 1996, 305), *ćutek* = beating, slapping; stick (Sremac [1907] 2008, 70, 134; Vujaklija 1996, 915), *čekmedže* = drawer, cashbox (Sremac [1907] 2008, 40; Vujaklija 1996, 1010), and so forth. Following is the category of non-Turkish Oriental words that reached Serbian indirectly: from the Arabic language – *adžamija* = young, inexperienced (Sremac [1907] 2008, 42, 47, 48, 52, 53, 155; Vujaklija 1996, 95), *bulbul* = nightingale (Sremac [1907] 2008, 34, 158; Vujaklija 1996, 132), *zarf* = bundle (Sremac [1907] 2008, 17, 83; Vujaklija 1996, 305); from Persian – *dert* = sorrow, grief (Sremac [1907] 2008, 64, 66, 79, 166; Vujaklija 1996, 206), *ibrik* = carafe (Sremac [1907] 2008, 13; Vujaklija 311), *sejmen* = guard, watchman (Sremac [1907] 2008, 132; Vujaklija 1996, 803), *et cetera*. Finally, we should mention non-Oriental words that entered Serbian through Turkish, such as Greek *mastika* = a type of flavored liqueur (Sremac [1907] 2008, 8, 13, 21, 30, 32, 33, 112; Vujaklija 1996, 522), and *atlas* = silk (Sremac [1907] 2008, 94; Vujaklija 1996, 84); Romance *a-la-franga* = of Western style (Sremac [1907] 2008, 39; Škaljić 1966, 82; Vujaklija 1996, 29). Quite often, the incoherence of *Zona Zamfirova* emanates from hybrid forms that combine traits of the Prizren-Timok dialect with the borrowed vocabulary. As a result, certain double-tiered innovatory phrases are almost impossible for laymen to decipher, even with the help of dictionary.[52]

5.2.2 Grammatical Features of the Prizren-Timok Dialect

From the point of view of linguistic typology, the main point of divergence between the Prizren-Timok dialect and the Serbian standard lies within the morphophonological structure. First of all, 'the declension [of the Prizren-Timok dialect] is very simplified – usually, only two cases occur: nominative and accusative' (Stanojčić and Popović 2014, 12). Standard Serbian, however, distinguishes between as many as seven cases: nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, vocative, instrumental, and locative (Stanojčić and Popović 2014, 78-79; Piper and Klajn 2014, 323–386). By giving preference to prepositional phrases rather than to inflectional case endings, the Prizren-Timok dialect has a much lower morpheme-per-word ratio, in comparison to more synthetic standard Serbian. For instance, the dialectal phrase '*sas usta*' (with mouth; Sremac [1907] 2008, 32), consisting of a preposition and a noun in the nominative case, replaces the standard form 'ustima' (with mouth), using the inflectional ending '-ima' to derive the instrumental case of the noun. On the phonological front, the extent of deviations from the standard is as extreme. The standard Serbian prosodic system has four accentuated prosodemes, which are distinguished by length (long or short), tone (rising or falling), and stress placement (Petrović and Gudurić 2010, 115–116). In the Prizren-Timok dialect, 'only stress placement fulfills a distinctive function and neither quantity nor tonal oppositions are operative' (Alexander 1975, 1). As the list of grammatical dissimilarities is fairly extensive, I restrict this discussion only to the most conspicuous examples.

---

[52] Consult also *Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog i narodnog jezika* (Dictionary of the Serbo-Croatian Literary and Vernacular Language; 1959–), popularly known as 'Rečnik SANU' (Dictionary of the Serbian Academy of Science and Art [SASA]). For a dictionary of the dialect under study, see, for example, Jakša Dinić's *Timočki dijalekatski rečnik* (Timok Dialectal Dictionary; 2008).

5.3 Distance and Closeness: Standard Serbian, the Prizren-Timok Dialect, and Standard Croatian

The goal of this section is to estimate the levels of distance and closeness between the Serbian standard and the Serbian dialect of Prizren-Timok, and between standard Serbian and standard Croatian. Initially, the degrees of proximity between both pairs will be considered theoretically, combining diachronic and synchronic approaches. What will follow is an empirical part of research that hopes to confirm the theoretically developed sub-hypothesis positing that the level of proximity is greater between standard Serbian and standard Croatian than between the Prizren-Timok dialect and standard Serbian. The empirical research will be conducted on purely synchronic content.

5.3.1 Distance: Serbian Standard and the Prizren-Timok Dialect

The Prizren-Timok's disparity with the standard as well as with other Serbian dialects has encouraged some non-Serbian scholars to suggest that the Prizren-Timok dialect does not belong to the Štokavian but to the Torlak dialect group. The first researcher to propose the Torlak dialectal group as distinct in the system of Serbian (or Serbo-Croatian) dialects[53] – albeit under the term 'Svrljig' (German: *Svrljiger*-Dialekt; Serbian: *svrljiški govor*) – was the Croatian linguist Milan Rešetar (Rešetar 1889, 97). It was the Croatian linguist Tomislav Maretić, a decade later, who introduced the term 'Torlak' (Maretić 1899, 7). Over the course of the twentieth century, the transitionality of this lect sparkled a debate that included the most notable linguists of the time, such as Aleksandar Belić, Milan Rešetar, Pavle Ivić.[54]

More recently the conclusions of authoritative dialectologists Pavle Ivić and Asim Peco have brought some consensus among scholars – at least in Serbian academic circles.[55] Peco clearly emphasises the distinctive character of the Prizren-Timok dialect in opposition to other Štokavian dialects. Nevertheless, he insists on a classification rooted in diachrony by claiming that the Prizren-Timok dialect was a constituent part of the Štokavian dialectal group and shared its features until the thirteenth century (Peco 1991, 42). The crucial phase of divergence, according to Peco, took place between the thirteenth and sixteenth century, when the dialect under discussion evolved independently of other Štokavian dialects (Peco 1991, 42). Ivić's argumentation goes in the same direction yet he renders the diachronic aspect even more visible by dedicating a separate section to these speeches' development (Ivić 1985, 120–125) as well as to their relationship with similar Bulgarian and Macedonian dialects (Ivić 1985, 118–120).

The discussion on the position of the Prizren-Timok dialect has been rekindled when the *UNESCO Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*[56] classified Torlak as a separate language.

---

[53] Stefanović Karadžić's 1818 classification of Serbian accentuations, based mostly on the replacement of the Common Slavic 'jat' (ѣ) is tripartite: Herzegovian (Ercegovačko), Resava (Resavsko), and Srem (Sremačko) (Stefanović Karadžić 1818, XVI).

[54] For a more detailed history of the polarised linguistic dispute on the classification of the Prizren-Timok dialect during the first three quarters of the twentieth century, see Ronelle Alexander's monograph *Torlak Accentuation* (Alexander 1975), particularly pp. 7–10. In this publication, Alexander regards the Prizren-Timok dialect as Torlakian, which she claims was the prevalent view among on the matter at that time – influenced by Ivić (Alexander 1975, 10). Ivić, however, later changed his mind and classified it as Štokavian (Ivić 1985).

[55] The lect that Serbian dialectologists refer to as the Prizren-Timok dialect of the Serbian language is sometimes classified differently, especially by Bulgarian and Macedonian linguists.

[56] The *UNESCO Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger* is available at the following link: http://www.unesco.org/languages-atlas/index.php.

The Board for Standardisation of the Serbian Language reacted, issuing guidelines on the scientific treatment of the disputed lect:

> What was previously even in some linguistic publications termed the South-East or the Torlak dialect of the Serbian language is in modern Serbian and Slavic studies termed the Prizren-Timok dialectal region [. . .]. (Odbor za standardizaciju srpskog jezika 2019)[57]

Quoting Ivić in support, the Board concludes that scientific publications should consistently use the term 'the Prizren-Timok dialect of the Serbian language', as has been done in this thesis.

Terminology aside, let us briefly explain one of the most important diachronic events responsible for today's differences between the Prizren-Timok dialect and standard Serbian. Namely, the evolution of the Prizren-Timok dialect corresponds to that of the Balkan *Sprachbund* (Ivić 1985, 122–123). The term Sprachbund, or linguistic area, refers to a group of genealogically unrelated languages, which have developed an elaborate network of shared characteristics, as a result of geographical proximity and language contact (Thomason 2000, 311–316). The lects of the Balkan Sprachbund are 'Rumanian [*sic*] (a Romance language); Bulgarian, Macedonian and southeastern dialects of Serbian (all are Slavic languages); Albanian; Greek; perhaps Balkan dialects of Romani (an Indic language); and dialects of Turkish that are spoken in the Balkans' (Thomason 2000, 317; round brackets in the original; comment in square brackets my own). Theorists have attempted to pinpoint the elusive origins of the Balkan Sprachbund. Juoko Lindstedt's believes that 'the source language simply does not exist in the traditional sense: the sociolinguistic contact situation has caused changes that would not have occurred in any of the Balkan languages by internal drift' (Lindstedt 2000, 238). Of most interest for this study is the West–East divide within the Serbian language. Western Serbian dialects as well as the Standard, which is based on the dialects of Vojvodina and Herzegovina (see 4.2.2), are Balkanised only peripherally. The Prizren-Timok, spoken in the southeast, stands out in comparison, as the distribution of Balkanisms is much higher. Nomachi's research demonstrates that 'the Prizren-Timok dialect group possesses main features of the Balkan Sparachbund that are foreign to standard Serbian in many cases' (Nomachi 2015, 36). This is a clear indicator of the divergence between the Standard and the Prizren-Timok dialect. Nonetheless, reasons for the distancing between the two come from other sources not outlined hereby.

5.3.2 Closeness: Standard Serbian and Standard Croatian

While the story of the Prizren-Timok dialect and standard Serbian is that of divergence, the story of standard Serbian and standard Croatian is that convergence – at least until the early 1990s when Serbo-Croatian officially bifurcated. The more recent distancing tendencies between the two lects have already been discussed (see 4.2.5) as well as the circumstances under which the Serbo-Croatian union was conceived (see 4.2.2 and 4.2.3). In short, the Vienna Literary Agreement, concluded in 1850, solidified the Croatian adoption of the Štokavian basis, which, on the one hand, brought Croatian closer to Serbian but, on the other, distanced it from its Kajkavian and Čakavian dialects. Worthy of further consideration at this point is the previously unaddressed post-partition relationship between the standards and dialects of Serbian and Croatian.

---

[57] For the complete text of the above quoted statement, issued by the Board for Standardisation of the Serbian Language in April 2019, see the following link: http://www.ossj.rs/odluke-i-saopstenja/prizrensko-timocki-govori/.

In her groundbreaking book *Jezik i nacionalizam* (Language and Nationalism, 2010), the Croatian linguist Snježana Kordić, one of the initiators of the 'Declaration on the Common Language' (see 4.2.5), asserts that 'Croats, Serbs, Bosnians, and Montenegrins share the standard language (Štokavian) but not dialects, as neither Kajkavian nor Čakavian are dialects of the Serbs, Bosnians, and Montenegrins' (Kordić 2010, 76). In deliberating on the nature and purpose of a standard in comparison to a dialect, Kordić concludes that the main goal of linguistic standardisation is to ensure better prospects of communication across a wide region (Kordić 2010, 70). Of course, the adoption a supraregional standard serves a number of non-linguistic purposes, of economic, administrative, and other kinds (Kordić 2010, 71). On a communication plane, Kordić insists that 'the difference between the standard language in Croatia, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Montenegro is much smaller than that between the Croatian dialects themselves' (Kordić 2010, 76). Kordić explains that this phenomenon results from the supraregional nature of the standard, which gives it supraregional prospects of communication rather than regional ones, as is the case with a dialect (Kordić 2010, 76). As Serbian and Croatian shared a common standard for a prolonged period of time, it should come as no surprise that the communication prospects have remained relatively intact even upon separation. While Kordić's analysis focuses on Croatian dialects, I believe the situation is rather similar with the Prizren-Timok dialect: even though it is classified as Štokavian – unlike Kajkavian and Čakavian dialects which have separate dialectal bases – its position is transitionary towards the South East and, therefore, not shared with Croats, Bosnians, or Montenegrins. The juxtaposition of the Prizren-Timok dialect with the standards of Serbian and Croatian on the example of *Zona Zamfirova* will attempt to prove in practice what has already been asserted in theory: that the differences between standard Serbian and standard Croatian are much less severe than those between standard Serbian and the Prizren-Timok dialect.

5.3.3 Empirical Research

The following part of the chapter will be dedicated to a practical investigation of the understandability of standard Croatian, on the one hand, and the Prizren-Timok dialect, on the other, from the perspective of people who speak standard Serbian. The sub-hypothesis to be tested is as follows:

> An average speaker of standard Serbian educated after Serbian and Croatian became separate languages, has more difficulties understanding the Prizren-Timok dialect, which is a dialect of the Serbian language, than understanding standard Croatian, which is officially a foreign language.

While a number of parameters could be used to define 'an average speaker of standard Serbian', only three are pertinent in this case. First of all, let us dwell on the often encountered position that no person can be described as a speaker of the standard. In this respect, Kordić insists that without oral communication a standard language could not fulfil the purpose of everyday communication and, as such, would fail to meet the two necessary conditions to be called a standard: polyvalency (the property of serving all spheres of the social life) and polyfunctionality (the property of having multiple functional styles, one of which is oral) (Kordić 2010, 73–74). I also believe that, with the spread of education, it has become possible to have speakers of the standard, notwithstanding the speaker's background. The second vital point is that 'an average speaker of standard Serbian' is a person whose first language is Serbian, who speaks new-Štokavian, and who has not gotten much contact with the Prizren-Timok dialect, a dialect the distribution of which is generally confined to a small area away from the centre. Lastly, the sub-hypothesis was restricted to the persons educated after Serbian and Croatian became separate languages with a view to shifting focus to the post-partition era.

The two methods that have been selected as a means of conducting this research are questionnaire and test. Such intermethod mixing should produce complementary results: while the questionnaire is constructed to elicit the participant's attitudes towards the understandability of the discussed lects, the test is designed to measure the actual level of comprehension. These two methods have been combined strategically to give insight into the potential discrepancy between the person's perception of comprehension and actual comprehension.

5.3.3.2 Questionnaire and Test Formulation

The questionnaire and the test are integrated into a single form (see Appendix A). The total of twenty-four multiple-choice questions has been divided into five sections:

I   General questions;
II   The Prizren-Timok dialect;
III Listening comprehension of the Prizren-Timok dialect;
IV   The Croatian language;
V   Listening comprehension of the Croatian language.

Apart from the introductory part, the rest is evenly split between the Prizren-Timok dialect (II and III) and the Croatian language (III and IV).

The first section consists merely of two multiple-choice questions. The opening question inquires into the informant's age. Gathering this piece of information is crucial in that the study aims to sample adults born between 1984 and 2001. The year 1984 has been taken as the upper boundary under the assumption that those born in 1984 are the first generation who started formal education after Serbian and Croatian became separate languages. Although in Serbian schools the switch from Serbo-Croatian to Serbian was rather slow and poorly regulated, especially in the beginning, it is presumed that this generation did not formally engage with Croatian. The year 2001 has been taken as the lower boundary only in the interest of the research's legal side: the requirement is that informants must be of age, that is eighteen. The second question in the general part aims to ensure that Serbian is the participant's first language. The term 'mother tongue' is added as an alternative to the 'first language': albeit somewhat outdated, the formulation 'mother tongue' is more widely recognised among laymen.

The second part tries to assess the degree of informant's familiarity with the Prizren-Timok dialect by asking whether there has been any contact with the dialect under study and, if yes, then in what ways. The term Prizren-Timok dialect is used in the section heading but in questions it is referred to geographically, that is as the speech of south-eastern Serbia; to assist the informant, names of the major localities where the dialect is spoken are also provided in brackets. In this part, the film *Zona Zamfirova* is introduced with the goal of confirming two of this chapter's assumptions: that the film has been widely watched, even repeatedly so, and that the viewers had some difficulties in understanding the dialectally saturated dialogues.

The third part moves away from relying on the informant's self-assessment of understanding the dialect and practically tests the level of comprehension of the Prizren-Timok dialect. Contrary to expectations, the material used for this purpose is *not* the film *Zona Zamfirova*, which served only as an *inspiration* for the sub-hypothesis. The idea of evaluating the dialect comprehension on this film has been ruled out for several reasons.

First and foremost, one could argue, and quite rightly so, that translating the film's dialogues from the Prizren-Timok dialect into the contemporary Croatian standard is an act of diachronic or vertical translation. As the Croatian subtitle poses a retranslation and, moreover, an indirect translation of the historical idiom, this translation from Serbian into Croatian has

every right be viewed as vertical rather than horizontal. This matter is troubled yet not worthy of special attention. For, the empirically tested sub-hypothesis rests on genuinely synchronic material – content in both Croatian and Prizren-Timok lect originated in the second decade of the twenty-first century. By replacing the language of *Zona Zamfirova* with contemporary spoken material in the Prizren-Timok dialect, the potential questioning of synchronicity is eliminated.

Secondly, the film has been widely screened and many of the dialogues, which may not have been understandable at first, are now comprehended thanks to their frequent citing in popular culture. The popularity of the film is best summarised by the Serbian Institute for the Advancement of Education's decision to eliminate Sremac's *Zona Zamfirova* from the list of high school required readings, as – in the words of the Institute's vice president Dejana Milijić Subić – 'the film is so popular that students remain in the domain of film production, without actually reading the book' (Milijić Subić 2019).

The third reason that discouraged me from testing the comprehension on Šotra's *Zona Zamfirova* is the variable quality of actors' pronunciation of the Prizren-Timok dialect: while some excel at retaining even the finest phonological features, other actors' performances sound less convincing. For these reasons, I believe that investigating the dialect's comprehensibility based solely on the film *Zona Zamfirova* may produce misleading results. More suitable, hence, are the audio recordings of authentic dialectal content. Luckily enough, these are easily accessible online – thanks to the project *Contemporary field research of Zaplanje's oral tradition*,[58] based at the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Niš. The project's webpage[59] contains an invaluable database of digitalised open interviews with the residents of twenty-two villages (in the municipalities of Gadžin Han, Vlasotince, and Babušnica) in Zaplanje, a mountain area in south-eastern Serbia where the Prizren-Timok dialect is spoken. As the field interviews were conducted by professionals, the content is of outstanding quality for linguistic research. Our test combines several recordings of ninety-year-old Jelena from the village Donji Prisjan (municipality Vlasotince), who discusses with her interlocutor a series of topics concerning the countryside life and old traditions. From the longer videos, five short audio excerpts have been selected for the five listening comprehension questions. Each recording corresponds to one question. During the testing, participants were instructed to listen to each excerpt only once prior to answering the matching question.

The forth part, in form of a questionnaire, replicates the second part – but in lieu of the Prizren-Timok dialect, it investigates the comprehension of the Croatian lect. The same questions are repeated so as to assess the level of informant's familiarity with Croatian. Instead of the film *Zona Zamfirova*, the questionnaire poses general questions about films and TV programme in Croatian – whether they are watched and whether they are understood.

The fifth mirrors the form of the third part – but, expectedly, on the example of the Croatian lect. The listening comprehension test again consists of five questions, which are accompanied by corresponding audio recordings. The short excerpts are taken from the channel N1's regularly scheduled *Dnevik u 18* (News at 18 o'clock) in the Croatian language. The presenter, Ilija Jandrić, reads local and international news in standard Croatian. Prior to answering the listening comprehension questions, each excerpt is played only once. Finally, the ultimate question asks the informant who was easier to understand – Jelena, speaking the Prizren-Timok dialect, or Ilija Jandrić, speaking standard Croatian.

---

[58] More information about the project *Savremena terenska istraživanja usmene tradicije Zaplanja* (Contemporary field research of Zaplanje's oral tradition) is available at the project's web page: https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/projekat.

[59] The project's database, searchable by place, genre, and title, is available at the following link: https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/.

This study's primary data has been collected in person. Although this is a fairly slow method in comparison to more popular, electronic ones, it offers certain advantages. Principally, it ensures that listening comprehension test is conducted properly – that the recordings are played in a silent environment as well as that they are heard only once and by no means repeatedly. Furthermore, it eliminates the potential threat of consulting the dictionary or electronic sources to artificially inflate the score.

Out of thirty-five initially contacted participants, twenty-one agreed to participate in the study. The contribution of one respondent, however, had to be dismissed, for the condition of the first language being Serbian was not satisfied, leading to the dross rate of 4.7%. The analysed data, therefore, is based on the responses of twenty informants.

Following a short explanation, the form was distributed in person. Participants were instructed to read the questions carefully and to answer them in the given order. Audio recordings (five for the Prizren-Timok and five for the Croatian lect) were played before the corresponding questions. Participants were allowed to read the questions prior to hearing the recordings, but the accompanying audio material was played only once.

5.3.4 Data Interpretation: Self-Assessment vs. Test Results

Overall, the collected data unequivocally confirms the proposed sub-hypothesis, that an average speaker of standard Serbian educated after Serbian and Croatian became separate languages has more difficulties understanding the Prizren-Timok dialect, which is a dialect of the Serbian language, than understanding standard Croatian, which is officially a foreign language. This is attested by both the questionnaire and test results, the breakdown of which is provided in the paragraphs below.

When self-assessed, informants claimed to have been more exposed to the Croatian than to the Prizren-Timok lect; the same results are indicated by questions of both explicit and implicit kind. Exposure to either of the examined lects does not have geographical origins, as none of the respondents lived at the territories where these are spoken. When asked straight-forward, all participants stated that they have had contact with Croatian, whereas only three-fourths declared to have had contact with the Prizren-Timok dialect. Interestingly, as much as 95% saw the film *Zona Zamfirova*, the majority of whom repeatedly, but this experience was not initially recalled. In light of this information, then, the informants' exposure could be considered minimal rather than nonexistent. Contact with friends proved a valuable source of exposure, identified by 60% of participants in both cases. For the Prizren-Timok dialect, this is the most frequent form of exposure. Contact through relatives was also noted, albeit to a much lesser extent for both lects. While the two share almost the same figures for contact through friends and relatives, the main difference lies in the exposure through TV: only 30% claimed to have encountered the Prizren-Timok dialect this way, contrasted to 80% in Croatian's case. This disparity should come as no surprise, considering that the presence of a standard is by default much higher than that of a dialect: just compare, for example, the number of films available in Croatian and the number of films available in the Prizren-Timok dialect. Albeit a foreign language, as many as 90% of respondents do watch TV programme or films in the Croatian lect – however, most of them rarely. On the whole, we can conclude that participants, according to their own recollection, had more opportunities to hear Croatian than the Prizren-Timok dialect.

The majority of respondents, particularly 84% of those who watched Šotra's *Zona Zamfirova*, expressed they had difficulties understanding the film at first. From those who had difficulties, nearly 70% had a lot, whereas just over 30% had little. Upon the completion of the listening-comprehension test, all participants maintained that they had difficulties understanding the audio material in the Prizren-Timok dialect. Some had more difficulties

(60%), some less (40%), but none of the informants felt they did not struggle understanding Jelena from Donji Prisjan – not even those few who previously declared not having struggled linguistically while watching Šotra's *Zona Zamfirova*.

As for Croatian, none of the respondents indicated that they had a lot of troubles understanding the lect. Instead, the answers alternated between 'no difficulties at all' (65% before and 70% after the listening comprehension test) and 'yes, a little difficulty' (35% before and 30% after the listening comprehension test) – both before and after the respective listening comprehension test.

If we take the listening comprehension test as an objective measure of understanding the two studied lects, then Croatian is not just subjectively but also objectively easier to understand than the Prizren-Timok dialect. Namely, the ultimate question reveals that, subjectively, 95% of the respondents understood the content in the Croatian standard better than that in the Prizren-Timok dialect, whereas 5% understood the recordings in both lects roughly the same. This is objectively confirmed by the test results: all of the 95% who felt they understood Croatian better scored more points in the Croatian than in the Prizren-Timok test, whereas the 5% who expressed they understood material in both lects roughly the same achieved identical scores in both tests. In this case, there is a harmony between the results obtained through self-assessment, on the one hand, and through test-evaluation, on the other.

On the collective plane, the performance in the Croatian test was much better: the average number of points gained in the Croatian test was 3.8/5 in comparison to merely 2.2/5 in the Prizren-Timok test. What is more, one fifth achieved the maximum number of points in the Croatian test (5/5); in the Prizren-Timok test, not only did no one get 5/5 but not even 4/5. The outcome of the Prizren-Timok test is as follows: 30% with 3/5, 60% with 2/5, 10% with 1/5, and 0% with 0/5. The outcome of the Croatian test is as follows: 20% with 5/5, 50% with 4/5, 20% with 3/5, 10% with 2/5, and 0% with 1/5 and 0/5. In both tests, all participants answered at least one question correctly.

In case of the Prizren-Timok dialect, nearly one half those who watched the film *Zona Zamfirova* and did the listening comprehension test considered the two of unequal difficulty. Of those who regarded the materials in the Prizren-Timok differently, approximately one half found the film more difficult, while the other half found the test more difficult. On the one hand, the film *Zona Zamfirova* may appear easier to comprehend insofar as the memory of the very first viewing has become somewhat blurry as a consequence of the repeated exposure to the film and its dialogues. Furthermore, non-verbal clues, present in a film yet absent in an audio recording, can offer tremendous help. Likewise, the film is interspersed with narration that is not in the Prizren-Timok dialect, which further facilitates the understanding. On the other hand, some people may have evoked vivid memories of struggling with the film, the impression that has not vanished notwithstanding the passing of time or subsequent viewings.

As for Croatian, 70% did not alter their opinion on the difficulty of the Croatian language after taking the listening comprehension test. From those who did, one third found the listening comprehension more difficult than the general TV content in Croatian, while two thirds answered the opposite.

Another aspect worthy of notice is the participant's sense of self-confidence and self-criticism. When asked whether they had problems understanding the listening comprehension content, this, in part, ceases to be the assessment of the lect's difficulty but becomes a direct assessment of their own performance. The results show that the self-assessed degree of difficulty is often divorced from the actual test achievements. If we take that 'no difficulty' means gaining 5/5, 'a little difficulty' 4/5, and 'a lot of difficulties' 3/5, 2/5, 1/5, 0/5, then the self-assessment part does not correlate to the concrete test results in as many as 45% of cases for the Prizren-Timok and even 75% of cases for the Croatian lect. Such results indicate that the speakers of the Serbian standard have a particularly inflated opinion of their own competence in the Croatian standard.

Notwithstanding the discrepancy in the perception of competence and actual performance, the processed data signifies that the speakers of the Serbian standard do understand the Croatian standard better than the Prizren-Timok dialect. Such conclusion has been drawn from several sources:

1. The participants' own assessment of the lects' difficulty, as elicited from multiple questions, reveals that the Croatian standard is easier to comprehend than the Prizren-Timok dialect;
2. On the collective level, the average test score is significantly higher for the Croatian (3.8/5) than for the Prizren-Timok test (2.2/5);
3. On the individual level, both the self-assessment questions and the test results demonstrate that 95% of the respondents understood the content in the Croatian standard better than that in the Prizren-Timok dialect, whereas only 5% understood the recordings in both lects approximately the same.

Despite the plausible results of this empirical study, it is necessary to expose its limitations. For example, to ensure a higher respond rate, the study was deliberately kept short, particularly the listening comprehension test, which was reduced to an absolute minimum of five questions per set. In addition, the number of informants is only twenty. To eliminate these shortcomings, further empirical backing, conducted on a larger sample, would be beneficial. Lastly, the study could be replicated on other similar cases: for instance, the same kind of research could be carried out on the example of Croatian dialects of Kajkavian and Čakavian dialectal basis – to test whether the speaker of the Croatian standard has more problems comprehending the Kajkavian/Čakavian dialect of Croatian or the standard Serbian.

5.4 Translational Relations across Regions

What does this fascinating interplay between the Prizren-Timok dialect, standard Serbian, and standard Croatian reveal about translational relations? By introducing the term 'dialect' to the discussion of translational relations, we add a relatively neglected component to the equation. The basic unit – *language* – becomes fragmented. The existing classifications of translational relations (see 2.2), those proposed by Jakobson (1959), Toury (1986), and Gottlieb (2018), fail to straightforwardly deal with dialects or, for that matter, any sublinguistic structure. In fairness, Jakobson and his successors do consider the language's complexity indirectly, for the concept of *intralingual translation* operates within a language – which presupposes the existence of sublinguistic structures. The studied case of *Zona Zamfirova* brings to the fore the fragmentary character of a language, reminding us that we should regard language as a heterogenous form, not as a homogenous entity. A classification of translational types that would do justice to the language's heterogenous and, moreover, fragmentary makeup, ought to take into consideration sublinguistic levels as well. The issue of linguistic delimitation resurfaces thereby.

Admittedly, Toury does mention the liminal position of *interdialectal translating*, variously regarded as both *intra-* and *interlingual* (Toury 1986, 1113). This issue, raised in the critique of Jakobson's division, stays overlooked in Toury's own categorisation. Even if it is certain what constitutes a language and what a dialect, the position of *interdialectal translation* is ambiguous, as it can function both as *intra-* and as *interlingual*. When the translation process operates between different dialects of a single language, then such relation is considered *intralingual*. This is, indeed, the most common case in theory as well as in practice. Given that we regard *interdialectal translation* as any that operates between dialects, then much rarer, yet not impossible, situation is that in which two dialects belong to two different languages. In such case, the translation relation is characterised as *interlingual*. Even when frontiers between

languages and within a language are undisputed, translational relations can be inexplicit. From a wider perspective, the ambiguous position of interdialectal translation proves the hypothesis that translational relations between dialects are never predetermined but, rather, contextually established.

If dialects are to be systematically included in the formation of translational relation types, then a clear relationship between a *language* and a *dialect* need be established. And this, for several reasons, appears to be an impossible task:

> Laymen naturally assume that these terms, which are both popular and scientific in their use, refer to actual entities that are clearly distinguishable and therefore enumerable. [. . .]
> They represent a simple dichotomy in a situation that is almost infinitely complex. Hence they have come to be used to distinguish phenomena in several different dimensions, with resultant confusion and overlapping. The use of these terms has imposed a division in what is often a continuum, giving what appears to be a neat opposition when in fact the edges are extremely ragged and uncertain. (Haugen 1966, 922)

Haugen brings up an important polysemy – between 'language' as a scientific term and language as a natural phenomenon. Although 'language' as a term has been formulated with the hopes of describing the corresponding phenomenon, the two are bound to diverge. The fact that the former is socially constructed allows it to be accurately defined, while language as a phenomenon is an occurrence that need not have clear lines. When translating the natural world into science, the term – just as it often happens in literary translation – moves from the indefinite to the definite (Berman [1985] 2012, 245).

Certain examples of less imposing, 'indefinite' terminology do exist: neutral terms 'lect' and 'languoid' have been presented as early as in the dissertation's introduction (see 1.4.2). 'Lect' has been selected as this thesis' preferred impartial term and used consistently throughout the chapters to refer to cases where the exact distinction is either irrelevant or has been obscured, be it temporally or spatially. In the context of translational relations, the problem with 'lect' (or any neutral term for that matter) is that, by obscuring the difference between languages and sublinguistic structures, the difference between *intra-* and *interlingual translation* too becomes automatically obscured. 'Lect' recognises the existence of a linguistic form but does not specify on what level it functions in the wider linguistic organisation. This means that distinguishing the levels of linguistic organisation is the necessary precondition for the establishment of intra- and interlingual relations.

How does this discrepancy between the terminology and the phenomenon affect translational relations? As indicated in literature review, Derrida has touched upon this issue. Namely, he maintains that Jakobson's clarification of the term *interlingual translation* with the phrase *translation proper* is a superfluous repetition, inasmuch as both stand for 'translation in the ordinary sense, interlinguistic and post-Babelian' (Derrida 1985, 173). Derrida seeks the origins of this statement's apparent illogicity in the widespread use of *translation* in this sense:

> [Jakobson] supposes that it is not necessary to translate; everyone understands what that means because everyone has experienced it, everyone is expected to know what is a language, the relation of one language to another and especially identity or difference in fact of language' (Derrida 1985, 174)

Saturated with gentle irony, this quote contains much more than a mere terminological concern; alternately, it could be read as an extended criticism of Jakobson's tripartition. For, not only the scholars conducting research but also the people with no training in linguistics are expected to have a firm grasp of linguistic reality when engaging with Jakobson's concepts.

Derrida's principal objection to Jakobson's notions of *intra-* and *interlingual translation* is their dependency on the assumption 'that one can know in the final analysis how to determine rigorously the unity and identity of a language, the decidable form of its limits' (Derrida 1985, 173). By revisiting the premises on which Jakobson's concepts of *intra-* and *interlingual translation* rest, Derrida exhibits an important aspect: what constitutes a language and where its borders lie is neither axiomatic nor God-given; rather it is an arbitrary decision made by no one else but the one who carries out the analysis. If what is translated inside and what outside the language is, in Derrida's phrase, something 'decidable' (Derrida 1985, 173), then the conclusion can easily vary from analysis to analysis, whereby the dependence of Jakobson's notions becomes exposed.

The discrepancy between the Serbian standard and the Prizren-Timok dialect is a good example of language's heterogeneity and complexity. Language as a whole encompasses all the sublinguistic structures – notwithstanding the level on which they function. The standard variety, therefore, poses only one manifestation of a language, despite its presupposed superior position. A diachronic standardisation, where it exists, is valuable in giving translational relations contextual parameters. For, what is translated inside and what outside the language is contingent on the way speech varieties or lects are delimitated – as stated by the hereby confirmed hypothesis. By extension, translational relations become contingent on the establishment of a contextual framework. Setting this framework is, to a great extent, arbitrary as 'language', the term that we use to denote the totality of linguistic manifestations, diverges from the phenomenon it is trying to describe. 'Language' as a unit in the formation of translational relations has clear borders, whereas languages in real world are not necessarily specified with the utmost precision.

If the borders of a language are decided by an individual, then this concept is socially constructed. Some believe that language as a phenomenon too is a social construct. In response to Chomsky's influential cognitive theory, Daniel Dor revives the ideas of the pre-cognitive era, which are 'now being locally re-considered in certain quarters of the field' (Dor 2015, 1), arguing that 'the human condition is deeply social, and language is a social entity' (Dor 2015, 1). To this effect, Dor holds that '[t]he place to look at for the essence of language is not the mind-brain. It is social life' (Dor 2015, 1), further arguing that language is a socially-constructed 'communication technology', much like a book or telephone, rather than a social institution or cognitive capacity (Dor 2015, 1). Whether language as a phenomenon is socially constructed in entirety is a question that cannot be expected to get a definite answer and much less so from me. Whatever the case, 'language' that we use as the starting point in the analysis of translational relations is, I argue, situational and its borders are determined in a specific context. As a consequence, translational relations too, are bound to be defined only in relation to the given space and given time, where certain social conditions are in effect. This supports the main line of this dissertation's argument that *intra-* and *interlingual translation* are not stable relations, and again proves true the hypothesis on the contextual dependence of translational relations.

As we deepen the discussion about linguistic frontiers, the time may be right to revisit Albachten's pertinent question: 'Should borders of a language be determined by lack of intelligibility?' (Albachten 2014, 574), already brought up on multiple occasions (see 2.2.4 and 4.4.3). Along the same lines, we should ask ourselves: what role does intelligibility play in the delimitation of languages? Davis' extensively quoted study 'Intralingual Translation and the Making of a Language' (2014), which tracks the evolution of the English lect from Anglo-Saxon to modern times, indicates that the role of internal intelligibility is a negligible factor in the preservation of linguistic unity and identity. The same is implied by the analysis conducted on the lect of folk ballad *Hasanaginica* (see 4.4.3). As for this chapter, the empirical part has demonstrated that the degrees of intelligibility vary not only between languages but within a language to the extent that it is possible to have a situation in which an independent language

is more comprehensible than a language's dialect. In light of such results, it is indispensable to acknowledge that the borders of natural languages are not always determined by the principles of grammar. That is to say, languages need not be separated by the means of contrastive analysis, as Jakobson hoped would be the case when he wrote that 'differential bilingual grammars should define what unifies and what differentiates the two languages in their selection and delimitation of grammatical concepts' (Jakobson [1959] 2012, 128). The chapter's empirical engagement, therefore, confirms the hypothesis that a lack of mutual intelligibility between separate lects is not the necessary condition for language separation.

Social and political factors play a role in the delimitation of languages – posits the tested hypothesis that this chapter has proven true. As hypothesised, the empirical part of the study has shown that the lack of intelligibility is not a necessary condition for the separation of languages. The example of the Serbian and Croatian language is a case where the social criterion is stronger than the linguistic, which renders the usually dim social groundedness of the 'language' that we use as a unit of analysis more visible. When the linguistic criterion becomes less germane, social and political factors take over and start playing a crucial role in the identification of languages. Finally, the selection of a dialect to be taken as the standard is invariably a social act. The consensual codification of the Eastern Herzegovinian dialect brought Serbian and Croatian standards closer together (see 4.2.2) but left the non-standardised dialects on the margin, allowing them to develop in the direction away from the centre, as exemplified by the Prizren-Timok dialect. Likewise, the cracking of the Serbo-Croatian monolith was induced by socio-political changes, that is the disappearance of the common, which was replaced by the newly established nation-states.

As languages do not function in a sociocultural vacuum, cultural parameters too ought to be considered. Kenyan writer and academic Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o reminds his readers of an important aspect in positing that '[l]anguage, any language, has a dual character: it is both a means of communication and a carrier of culture' (Thiong'o 1986, 13). The latter component is overlooked by Dor (2015). Albeit Thiong'o's scholarship rises from the study of colonialism, it foregrounds the inextricable relationship between language and culture. Pym's model of determining cultural proximity (Pym [1992] 2010) by the means of translation – created with the hope of bypassing geopolitically derived linguistic borders (see 2.2.4) – is premised exactly on this interconnection between language and culture. The literature review has theoretically covered the model's main assets and weaknesses (see 2.2.4), and the model has been applied to the example of *Hasanaginica*'s lect (see 4.4.3). But what can Pym's formula reveal about *Zona Zamfirova*'s case?

On the one hand, the film *Zona Zamfirova* has been broadcasted *without* a subtitle in the Serbian TV. Indeed, 'intralingual subtitling has now become almost synonymous with subtitling for the deaf and hard of hearing' (González 2009, 15), yet one of its less frequent purposes is to accommodate 'viewers requiring written support to fully understand texts shot in nonstandard dialects of their native language' (González 2009, 15).[60] On the other hand, the film *Zona Zamfirova* has been shown *with* a subtitle in the Croatian TV, which is not surprising considering that Croatian and Serbian are now separate languages. What makes the case of Šotra's *Zona Zamfirova* compelling is that an *interlingual translation*, directed at the viewers of the target language (Croatian), has bypassed the border and found its audience among those in the giving culture who speak the source language (Serbian). According to Clive Scott, we should acknowledge the possibility of a translation's dual audience:

---

[60] Outside the region under study, the examples of intralingual audiovisual translation are plentiful. For instance, Greek television channels promote the practice of subtitling advertisements in standard Greek from 'the regional accent of Epirus' as well as from 'the Pontic dialect' (Kourdis 2015, 279). Similarly, the German broadcasters are said to almost invariably dub or subtitle Swiss German speakers (Weinreich 2011, 81–105).

> We need [. . .] to distinguish between a TT [target text] which generates an audience for itself by virtue of its connection with an otherwise unreadable ST [source text], and the TT which is part of the audience of the ST. (Scott 2012, 3)

This primarily refers to the *intra-/interlingual* rift: the former case concerns the traditional *interlingual translation* where the receiving monolingual audience has no access to the original, whereas the latter case applies to *intralingual translation* where the polyglot audience utilises the target text simultaneously with the source text. The distribution of the Croatian subtitle in *Zona Zamfirova*, which has reached Serbian as well as Croatian viewers, exhibits that the target text's two functions mentioned by Scott need not be divorced or polarised: one translation can happily serve both groups. What is more, we should allow for the existence of middle grounds: a portion of the polyglot group need not be fully proficient in both tongues but can consume the target text in behalf of supplementing their understanding of the source.

Can the described case of *Zona Zamfirova*'s translation be an indicator of cultural distance within a single cultural entity? I believe that, to an extent, such route does signal a rupture between the centre and periphery. Nevertheless, it could be that the distance is temporal as well as spatial. First, the film – devoid of any subtitle – is a form of modernisation in comparison to the book written almost a century before. Not only has the medium been updated but also the vocabulary, as noted earlier (see 5.2). On top of that, the Croatian subtitle too could be interpreted as an act of modernisation. Steiner claims that modernisations through translation are vital for the survival of written forms of art:

> Literature [. . .] has no chance of life outside constant translation within its own language. Art dies when we lose or ignore conventions by which it can be read, by which its semantic statement can be carried over into our own idiom [. . .]. (Steiner 1975, 30)

Šotra's ecranisation, if understood as a translation (as a form of *adaptation* or, in Jakobson's terms, *intersemiotic translation*), is certainly a modernisation of a kind. Croatian translation, then, further facilitates the meaning for the Serbian speakers who struggle with the old-sounding Prizren-Timok dialect. In light of *Zona Zamfirova*'s case, we could conclude that, despite the outlined disadvantages (see 2.2.4 and 4.4.3), Pym's approach, conceived to 'use facts about translation in order to locate contacts and differences *between* cultures' (Pym [1992] 2010, 26; my emphasis), is also helpful in locating the points of convergence and divergence *within* a culture.

5.5 Chapter Conclusions

The *afterlife* of Sremac's dialectally saturated novel *Zona Zamfirova* has served as an inspiration for the analysis of the regional stratification's impact upon translational relations. Of primary concern has been Šotra's linguistically vivid ecranisation of *Zona Zamfirova*, which seeks to preserve the phonetic and lexical authenticities of the Prizren-Timok dialect of the Serbian language. Released right before the famous book's centenary, the film broke all national records to become the most watched Serbian film. Today, some seventeen years after the initial airing, its enormous commercial success has yet to be surpassed. The distribution of Šotra's artistic achievement has not been confined to the national space: rather, it became a regional hit, with screenings in many former Yugoslav countries. It is the film's transnational circulation that has brought to the fore a curious case of Serbian speaker's impaired intelligibility of their language's Prizren-Timok dialect, contrasted to a much better comprehensibility of the subtitle in Croatian, officially a separate language. The Croatian subtitle, Serbian speakers claimed on social media, finally clarified the film, the film most of them had seen many times before – yet *without* explanatory interventions.

Stimulated by *Zona Zamfirova*'s case, the chapter has analysed the presumed distance between the Serbian standard variety and the Prizren-Timok dialect, on the one hand, and the presumed closeness between the Serbian and Croatian modern-day standards, on the other. From a theoretical point of view, this apparently paradoxical situation should come as no surprise. For, the evolution of the Prizren-Timok lect historically diverges from those of other Serbian – and likewise Croatian – lects of the Štokavian basis and corresponds to the development of the Balkan Sprachbund. Spoken in southeastern parts of Serbia, the Prizren-Timok dialect is transitionary towards the Bulgarian and Macedonian lects, a feature that has put it right in the centre of a decades-long debate as to whether it belongs to the Štokavian or Torlakian accentuation. Widely accepted in the Serbian academic circles of today is the Štokavian classification, under the influence of authoritative dialectologists Asim Peco and Pavle Ivić. While the Prizren-Timok was distancing, Croatian and Serbian were coming closer together by virtue of codification – first unofficial, later official – culminating in the Serbo-Croatian phase. From a more general perspective, the task of linguistic standardisation is to ensure better prospects of communication across a wide region (Kordić 2010, 70). Building on *Zona Zamfirova*'s case and Kordić's ideas, this chapter's empirical research – conducted on average speakers of standard Serbian, educated after the fragmentation of the Serbo-Croatian lect – has proven on a synchronic sample that standard Croatian is considerably easier to understand than the Prizren-Timok dialect. This is unequivocally confirmed both by the self-assessment and test results.

The introduction of dialects to the debate at hand has illuminated the effects of linguistic stratification on translational relations. Jakobson did have the fragmentary makeup of a language in mind when he formulated the concepts of *intra-* and *intralingual translation*, for *intralingual translation* presupposes the existence of multiple lects within one linguistic structure. What he neglected, however, is the identical uncertainty encountered in interlingual language pairs – the problem of determining clear borders between lects. Resultantly, we arrive at the conclusion that a sharp distinction between different levels of linguistic organisation is the necessary precondition for the establishment of intra- and interlingual relations.

Even though translational relations depend on the internal and external delimitation of languages, this poses a delicate task owing to the blurred boundaries between natural languages. 'Language' that we use as a unit of analysis does not perfectly mirror the language as a phenomenon and is, therefore, arbitrary to an extent. The indefinite is juxtaposed with the define. The linguistic borders' provisional nature exposes the instability of Jakobson's notions on the synchronic as much as on the diachronic front. It has been thought that Jakobson's translational relations were conceived on the premise of synchrony (Davis 2014, 588; see 4.5) and that problems occur only in the diachronic perspective.

In the attempt to pinpoint the decisive criterion in the delimitation of languages, this and the previous chapter have investigated two factors: the linguistic criterion (measured by intelligibility) and the social criterion. The previous chapter has signalled that the mutual intelligibility, or lack thereof, is not the necessary criterion in the partition of languages (see 4.2). This chapter's findings are in harmony. The instance of a speaker of one language having difficulties understanding a dialect of their own language yet comprehending the translation into what officially counts as a distinct language is a proof that intelligibility is not the crucial criterion in the erection of linguistic borders. More germane are sociopolitical factors, which have proven to play a vital role in merging and separating Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin lects. Namely, the process of unification of Serbo-Croatian was socio-politically induced – first through the stipulations of the Vienna Literary Agreement (see 4.2.2) and later through the constitutional regulations of the respective joint countries (see 4.2.3 and 4.2.4) – to the same extend as in the case of the shared tongue's ultimate ramification, when newly formed nation-states used language as a means of legitimation.

All things considered, we arrive at the conclusion that translational relations are not pre-given but contextually determined. This contextual framework, crucial in postulating linguistic borders and instituting translational relations, has at least two dimensions: temporal and spatial. The earlier chapter on *Hasanaginica* has concentrated on the former, whereas this one on the latter. Linguistic borders, however, be they internal or external, need not be destabilised on a wide scale, as the previously analysed instances have suggested. Sometimes, boundaries between and within languages are obscured deliberately and on a much smaller scale – that of a text. The following chapter intends to tackle literary works that amalgamate lects to convey a strong artistic impression – with the hope of unveiling the significance of the textual context in a multilingual environment.

6   Translational Relations in a Textual Context

David Albahari's Multilingual Story 'Learning Cyrillic'

At the heart of multilingualism, we find translation.

Reine Meylaerts, 'Multilingualism as a Challenge for Translation Studies'

6.1 Introduction

Up until this point, the sociolinguistically oriented chapters have oscillated back and forth between the temporal and spatial dimension of translational relations. As some of the previously tested hypotheses have demonstrated, translational relations are contingent on the fixation of lects' borders. To delimitate a lect as a unit of analysis, researchers need establish a contextual framework that is based both on temporal and spatial parameters. The usurpation of linguistic boundaries, however, can happen on a much smaller scale – that of a text. What I have in mind is the – sometimes conscious, sometimes subconscious – blurring of linguistic boundaries for artistic purposes. The pertinence of a textual context will, therefore, be interrogated on the example of literary multilingualism.

    '[A]ll too often', Derrida maintains, '[theories of translation] treat the passing from one language to another and do not sufficiently consider the possibility for languages to be implicated *more than two* in a text' (Derrida 1985, 171; emphasis in the original). The so-called myth of monolingualism – the idea that restricts expression to a single language – is stubbornly enduring, despite the plethora of studies debunking it conclusively. The origins of this modern myth can be traced in the ideology of nineteenth-century Romanticism, which adopts 'nation' as the principal criterion in the processes of language standardisation and consequent formation of literary canons. Regardless of the fact that literary multilingualism is an emerging site of critical attention within the fields of both comparative and world literature, research into the phenomenon's artistic manifestations is still marginal in comparison to that directed towards the cognitive or institutional grasp of the topic. To that end, Liesbeth Minnaard and Till Dembeck's edited volume *Challenging the Myth of Monolingualism* (2015)[61] poses a welcome addition to the field. The book aims to refute the powerful myth of presumed equivalency between a nation and its national language, the implications of which exceed the immediate scope of literature. On the whole, the editors approach the subject from a modern perspective, reinforcing it with sidelong glances to earlier practices, with a view to demonstrating that multilingualism – rather than monolingualism – is 'the sign of our present time' (Minnaard and Dembeck 2015, 9). The value of this publication for our discussion lies, foremost, in that it spontaneously builds up on Derrida's earlier quoted call to consider the specificities of multilingual texts when adopting a translational perspective (Derrida 1985, 171; see 2.2.6). For, multilingualism and translation go hand in hand, or, as Reine Meylaerts idiomatically puts it: 'At the heart of multilingualism, we find translation' (Meylaerts 2013, 519).

    In the interest of tackling the key theoretical questions raised by Derrida – 'How is a text written in several languages at a time to be translated? How is the effect of plurality to be

---

[61] For a longer review of Liesbeth Minnaard and Till Dembeck's volume *Challenging the Myth of Monolingualism* (Krstić 2017b), an abbreviated and slightly altered version of which is included here, see: *Oxford Comparative Criticism and Translation (OCCT) Review* (eds. Eleni Philippou and Dennis Duncan), available at: http://www.occt.ox.ac.uk/cct-review/challenging-myth-monolingualism-edited-liesbeth-minnaard-and-till-dembeck.

"rendered"? And what of translating with several languages at a time, will that be called translating?' (Derrida 1985, 171) – this chapter will analyse David Albahari's short story, originally entitled 'Učenje ćirilice' ('Learning Cyrillic'), from the collection *Drugi jezik* (Second Language, 2003). 'Learning Cyrillic', translated from Serbian into English by the critically acclaimed American scholar and literary translator Ellen Elias-Bursać,[62] has been included in the eponymous English edition of Albahari's selected stories. *Learning Cyrillic* (2012), comprising of twenty-seven stories, was published by the renowned Belgrade-based publishing house Geopoetika, as part of their *Serbian Prose in Translation* series,[63] successfully launched in 2008 and still ongoing. Provisionally, the original text is the point of intersection between three languages – Serbian, English, and the Blackfoot[64] indigenous language of North America – as well as between two scripts – Latin and Cyrillic. I say *provisionally* because English is represented with the help of fictional multilingualism. In Elias-Bursać's translation, all three languages physically dwell in the text; the two scripts are retained too. The goal of this chapter is to use Albahari's linguistically heterogeneous work to study the destabilisation of the supposedly fixed interlingual relations on the level of a text so as to test the hypothesis that translational relations are not pre-given but contextually specified in each individual case. The two previous chapters (see 4.5 and 5.5) have confirmed that this hypothesis is true with regard to the temporal and spatial context. What remains, then, is to test it on multilingual material to determine the importance of a textual context. The sociolinguistic approach, employed in the previous two chapters, has been deserted in favour of the two methodologies, which, in combination, account for the translational relation's changes that derive from the text's own hybridity – close reading and comparative translation discourse analysis (see 3.3).

The body of this chapter consists of three parts. The first part gives the story's general background, placing it in the context of post-Yugoslav migrant writing, as a prelude for the examination of the languages coexisting within 'Learning Cyrillic'. Split between the first and second part, the study of the story's linguistic relations is attentive to the matrix of Albahari's original as well as of Elias-Bursać's translation. The third part enters the theoretical waters in contemplation of how multilingual experimentations function in a translational perspective and how the literary interplay of heterogeneous languages affects the establishment of translational relations.

6.2 Multilingualism of Albahari's 'Learning Cyrillic'

Hybridity can be identified as a watermark of postmodern writing:

> For many writers, critics, and philosophers, postmodernity was seen as a function of the massive dislocations and technical advances that accompanied late capitalism, post-colonialism, and globalization, producing a profound sense of ontological uncertainty

---

[62] Ellen Elias-Bursać is a prolific translator from Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian, who has rendered into English not only a number of works by David Albahari but fiction by Dubravka Ugrešić, Daša Drndić, Slobodan Selenić, to name but a few. What is more, she co-authored with Ronelle Alexander a textbook used at universities across the US, entitled *Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian: A Textbook* (2010).

[63] For the complete list of titles published in Geopoetika's series *Serbian Prose in Translation*, see the publisher's official website, available at: http://www.geopoetika.com/edition.php?id=884.

[64] The Blackfoot language is also known as the Siksiká language. To avoid confusion, I will refer to it as Blackfoot consistently throughout the text. For more information on the geographic distribution and history of the Blackfoot language, see, for example, 'Native Languages of the Americas: Blackfoot (Siksika, Peigan, Piegan, Kainai, Blackfeet)': http://www.native-languages.org/blackfoot.htm. This website is a good starting point as it contains links to a considerable number of other Blackfoot language resources.

and fluidity that were reflected both in hybrid literary and artistic forms and in new 'cosmopolitan' identities. (Baer 2014, 158)

The acceleration of movement, affecting both people and ideas, has certainly fostered cross-cultural germination and encouraged the traversal of traditional linguistic and literary borders. Notwithstanding the correlation between hybridity and postmodernism, hybrid literary expression boasts a long history. In the English-language tradition, modernists have been celebrated for their extensive mixing of miscellaneous forms.[65] Much before them, experimentations of the kind are to be found in the legacy of English's early modern period – most splendidly, perhaps, in William Shakespeare's (1564–1616) oeuvre.[66]

Multilingualism is no stranger to Serbian writers either. By 'Serbian', I mean those composing principally in the Serbian language. Early in the twentieth century, we find, for example, an impressive palette of international and local languages in Jelena Dimitrijević's (1862–1945) travelogues.[67] A substantial body of Serbian multilingual literature, however, revolves around more permanent kinds of relocation.[68] Writer Borislav Pekić (1930–1992), himself a 'victim' of relocation, expresses the following idea:

> Ever since antiquity, people of letters, for a longer or shorter period of time, usually coercively, less commonly voluntarily, sometimes in an unclear mixture of reasons, spend their lives in what we call a foreign land, which is nothing but our world seen from some other side. Dante, Rousseau, Hugo, Zola, Byron, Rimbaud, Wilde, brothers Mann, Hemingway, Joyce, Pound, Beckett, Vuk Karadžić, Matoš, Crnjanski, Dučić, R. Petrović spent their lives rambling between the purgatory of Foreign land and the purgatory of Homeland, thinking and writing in the language of the country that had rejected them, or which they had rejected. This rejection, however, has never been, nor it can be, permanent. In whatever place or circumstances, a genuine writer will always belong to the history and destiny of their nation. (Pekić [2004] 2015, 24)

Interestingly, Pekić's binary view of literary expression – the mandatory choice between the 'native' and the host language – is challenged by his own writerly output that readily combines lects. Essential for our discussion, however, is Pekić's acknowledgement of a liminal space, which he refers to metaphorically as 'the purgatory of Foreign land and the purgatory of Homeland' (Pekić [2004] 2015, 24).

---

[65] For more on multilingual experimentations in modernist literature of Anglophone authors, see, for example, Juliette Taylor-Batty's monograph *Multilingualism in Modernist Fiction* (2013).

[66] See, for example, essays in the volume *Multilingualism in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (2015), edited by Dirk Delabastita and Ton Hoenselaars.

[67] Particularly compelling in this is respect is her travelogue *Sedam mora i tri okeana* (Seven Seas and Three Oceans: Travelling around the Globe; 2016). For a review of this book, see Višnja Krstić's 'Following the Traces of Eastern Civilizations' (2017a), available at the following link: http://www.knjizenstvo.rs/en/journals/2017/reviews/following-the-traces-of-eastern-civilizations.

[68] For more on exilic writing in Serbian literary tradition and beyond, see, for example, proceedings of the international round table 'Egzil(anti): književnost, kultura, društvo' (Exile[d]: Literature, Culture, Society), held in Vrnjačka Banja in October 2012. The eponymous proceedings *Egzil(anti): književnost, kultura, društvo* (Exile[d]: Literature, Culture, Society; 2012), edited by Dragan Bošković, include the total of nineteen papers that take the idea of exile quite liberally.

David Albahari (b. 1948) epitomises a contemporary post-Yugoslav writer caught in the liminality of diaspora and his forsaken homeland.[69] Confirming Pekić's hypothesis, he continued to write in the Serbian language upon the 1994 relocation to Calgary in the Canadian province of Alberta. Like Pekić, Albahari too contemplates his linguistic choices in a wider framework:

> In Josip Novaković's case, as in the case of the Bosnian author Aleksandar Hemon, who lives in Chicago, accepting the English language was a natural choice, for it was only after the relocation to America that they started writing more seriously. In other words, they did not have a fully formed style that would prevent them, as in my case, from immersing more deeply in the language of the new land. Writing is a search for style, and the moment the writer finds their style, the linguistic change becomes irrelevant or impossible. This is confirmed by numerous writers who lived surrounded by a second language: Isaac Bashevis Singer, Czesław Miłosz, Iosif Brodsky, Sławomir Mrożek, Josef Škvorecký, as well as many authors of old and new Serbian literary diaspora. They are, in fact, the proof that a real-life dislocation need not necessarily lead to a linguistic dislocation. (Albahari 2019, 166)

Even though Serbian has remained the language of Albahari's fiction, would it be fair to say that the relocation has left no trace whatsoever on his literary production? Is Albahari's 'literature of purgatory' the same as his 'literature of homeland'? I would argue that these two chapters are fundamentally different – not in terms of aesthetic achievement – but it terms of multidimensionality. That is to say, the Canadian phase displays qualities unknown to the domestic period: most notably, multiculturalism and -lingualism.

The evidence of exchange is palpable in 'Learning Cyrillic', the short story composed of two parallel lines of narration, which intermittently converge to create a vivid dynamics. What unites the two lines is the main protagonist, an unnamed teacher of the Serbian language, working in a church-based language school somewhere in North America, most likely in Canada, given the snowbound surroundings and the presence of a Blackfoot character. The first line follows the evening classes with the second generation of Serbian migrants, held in the complex of an Orthodox church:

> Fridays I go to church. I do not go to pray; I hold classes in the Serbian language for the children of emigrants. The class starts at 7:00 p.m. for the little ones aged six to nine. It ends at quarter to eight, and the class for children between nine and sixteen begins at eight. There are no sixteen-year-olds among these kids; the oldest is a thirteen-year-old boy. There are twenty boys and girls in the first group; in the second the most I ever get are seven or eight students, but only three come regularly. One six-year-old boy stays on for the older class because his sister is in it. She, however, never comes to the class for the little ones, though their parents probably drop them off together at 7 p.m. The children in the first group like singing, while the children in the second group don't like anything. I think they hate me; I do my best to avoid looking at them. (Albahari 2012, 75–76)

In this emigrant/immigrant (depending on the perspective) setting, the children's 'mother tongue' – Serbian – diminishes to a second language, extinguished by the host language of

---

[69] For a literary analysis of various aspects present in Albahari's work, see, for example, Mihajlo Pantić's edited volume *Slike (iz) porodičnog vremena: o književnom delu Davida Albaharija* (Images [from/of] a Family Time: On David Albahari's Literary Oeuvre; 2013)

English, which the young second generation speaks as their first. Children's lack of enthusiasm for learning on Friday evenings is juxtaposed to the elation of their parents:

> There are only four children this evening in the second group, counting the six-year-old boy who is here with his older sister. None of them says anything, and since I'm not asking, we sit there, silent; various sounds reach us. The thumping from the floor below is from members of the folklore group practicing the steps of circle dances. A restrained murmur, somewhere from beneath our feet, comes from the banter of the parents who wait in the room by the bar for the kids working on their Serbian language and folkdances. [...] There are times when the parents regret that the lessons finish so soon, and that they can't stay longer, to have at least one more beer. (Albahari 2012, 84)

The sources of teacher's anxiety hide not only in his pupil's poor motivation but also in their linguistic preferences. Judging by the teacher's words, the overall situation seems quite discouraging:

> The kids who come to the church, regardless of age, speak only Serbian with me. The minute they stop talking to me and turn to talk to each other they switch to English. It is enough for me to turn my back for a moment to start writing something on the board or to look for something among the books and papers, and the room where we work is filled with English words. (Albahari 2012, 91)

When the teacher tries to encourage them to speak Serbian among themselves (Albahari 2012, 91–92), the children's narrow active vocabulary and basic grammar errors become painfully salient.

The second line of narration follows a series of initially awkward encounters with a Native American man, called Thunder Cloud, whom the protagonist eventually befriends, right before the mysterious friend disappears as mysteriously as he appeared. This unusual friendship with the member of the Blackfoot tribe opens a whole new window into a culture completely unknown to the Serbian teacher. It is through the conversations with the Native American that the cultural dimension externalises, accentuating the pertinence of translation. This cultural collision turns the protagonist teacher of Serbian into a part-time interpreter (Albahari 2012, 87; 88–89; 98–99), a situation far from uncommon in postmodern literature:

> Because of the vagueness and instability of his [sic] location between poles that are no longer stable in themselves the translator has become an icon of the fluidity and multiplicity of modern culture. And with that, the translator has become an ever more prominent figure in fiction. (Strümper-Krobb 2011, 25)

A direct confirmation of Strümper-Krobb's assertion is to be found in the selection of this dissertation's primary texts: not only this chapter but also the following features a postmodern story where the protagonist is a translator, more precisely an interpreter (see Chapter 7).

6.2.1 English in the Source Text

Albahari's protagonist patiently mediates between the English-speaking Native American friend, on the one hand, and either the Serbian-speaking Orthodox priest or the Serbian-learning children, on the other. It is precisely through the protagonist's interpretations that the English of his Native American friend and, more broadly, of his host country resides in the text. This English is immaterial yet clearly present. Not a single word appears in English – despite the frequent interruptions of the Serbian narrative, aimed to suggest that a certain portion is originally in English or a translation from English. Albahari's story, hence, exemplifies what is

commonly termed 'fictional multilingualism' and 'fictional translation'.[70] Klaus Kaindl uses the term 'transfiction' to denote 'the introduction and (increased) use of translation-related phenomena in fiction' (Kaindl 2014, 4; brackets in the original).[71] While fictional multilingualism can perform a number of functions, in Albahari's 'Learning Cyrillic' fictional intrusions in English primarily serve to establish the story's Anglophone ambience. From a wider perspective, the fictional conversations in English connote the collective destiny of languages tangibly present in the text, which the global *lingua franca* of today gradually eradicates. The precarious position of the Serbian language is illustrated by the evening classes; that of the shrinking Blackfoot language by a museum exhibition that the Serbian teacher and his Native American friend visit. Neither the Serbian nor the Native American character is a 'native' speaker of English yet it is precisely English that allows them unrestrained communication. For one, it is the language of the coloniser; for the other, it is the language of the host. Rising above the story without ever being physically in attendance, English seems to have an overtone of imposition. Its fictionality, then, can be read as an act of resistance rather than denial – same as Albahari's deliberate choice to remain faithful to the Serbian language upon the relocation to Canada. In face of contiguity, I argue, the insistence on Serbian in the English-dominated environment poses a marked choice. When two or more languages occupy the same locale, then even the retention of the commonly unmarked monolingual paradigm ceases to be a neutral act and turns into a powerful literary device.[72]

6.2.2 Serbian in the Source Text

Albahari's short story 'Learning Cyrillic' concretely features both Serbian and Blackfoot language – albeit in different ratio. The situation with the most substantially present language of the story – Serbian – is somewhat complicated owing to the phenomenon called 'synchronic' or 'active digraphia'. Namely, Serbian is said to be a unique example of 'active digraphia' – that is 'the use of two different scripts for the same language' (Ivković 2013, 337). The Cyrillic and Latin alphabet are in use simultaneously:

> While in Russian and Greek the use of the Latin alphabet is an instance of latinization, the use of the Latin alphabet in Serbian may rather be considered an alternative orthographic practice, since in this language the Latin alphabet is already one of two officially recognized scripts. In this regard, Serbian is comparable to Latin-alphabeted languages, for example, French, Portuguese, Spanish or Czech, which use diacritical markings, such as accents, tilde or haček. (Ivković 2013, 337)

In Serbian, the choice of the alphabet to write in is entirely optional; in a non-literary context, the only condition is that the selected alphabet has to be used consistently throughout the text.
  As books can be published in both scripts in equal rights, a crucial question arises: who is the custodian of script? In many – perhaps most – cases, the author does not have specific

---

[70] Todd Hasak-Lowy's short story 'The Task of This Translator', analysed in the following chapter (see Chapter 7), also contains lengthy segments of fictional multilingualism and translation.

[71] For a historical overview of transfiction in literature, see Klaus Kaindl's chapter 'Going Fictional! Translators and Interpreters in Literature and Film: An Introduction' from the volume *Transfiction: Research into the realities of translation fiction* (2014), particularly pp. 5–8.

[72] For the discussion of literary monolingualism and its implications, see David Gramling's paper 'Getting up onto Monolingualism: Barthes, Kafka, Myth' from Liesbeth Minnaard and Till Dembeck's volume *Challenging the Myth of Monolingualism* (2015). Of particular interest is the examination of Franz Kafka's choice of German as his literary language in the so-called 'double monolingual' setting of modernist Prague.

requirements in regard to the choice of an alphabet and would happily agree to any preferable to the given editor, book series, and so forth. Sometimes, however, the author may have died long ago, so the choice of an appropriate script automatically becomes the publisher's responsibility. In some cases, of course, the preferences of a late author are well known and more-or-less respected – Miloš Crnjanski's (1893–1977) legacy is the case in point.[73] Nonetheless, explicit preferences are more of an exception than the rule. Whether the author is alive or not, a work of art results from a collective effort. Worth repeating, then, is Federman's earlier quoted observation:

> [N]ot only the writer [. . .] create[s] the fiction, but all those involved in the producing and ordering of that fiction; the typist, the editor, the typesetter, the printer, the proofreader, and of course the reader. (Federman 2001, 70).

As I have brought to the reader's attention before (see 4.4.1), the artistic freedom of these mediators is somewhat of a grey area. Ideally, it would be the editor's task to recognise the works where the choice of a script is a tool in the writer's arsenal. Where positively so, the choice of a script should be free to depart from the publishers' guidelines.

Whether Stubovi kulture, the first publisher of Albahari's short story 'Learning Cyrillic', was sensitive to these orthographic matters is unknown to me. Whether Albahari himself gave some explicit instructions with regard to the choice of a script is also unknown to me. In the two editions I consulted – Stubovi kulture's *Drugi jezik* (*Second language* [2003] 2005), which is a reprint of the first edition published in 2003; and Čarobna knjiga's *Izabrane priče* (*Selected Stories* 2015) – the text is entirely in the Latin script, with no artistic mixing of the two. Neither of the publications comments on the choice of script. *Drugi jezik* (*Second language* [2003] 2005) by Stubovi kulture goes *in medias res*, containing no preface, introduction, or note that could resolve the dilemma. Stripped of extralinguistic assistance, we have little choice but to resort to the text itself. Was Albahari aware of the script's importance for the story's interpretation? I believe the answer is yes. For, the story's very title, together with its delicate multilingual interplays, indicate that the eventual choice of the Latin script for the Serbian text was more probably deliberate than haphazard.

6.2.3 Blackfoot in the Source Text

Finally, the otherwise Serbian text contains occasional traces of the Blackfoot language. Chances are that an average Serbian reader is not even vaguely familiar with the specificities – neither linguistic nor cultural – of this Native American language that belongs to the Algonquian language family (Frantz and Russel (1989) 2017, xiii). In modern geopolitical atlas, its distribution is split between Canada and the US:

> The language here referred to as 'Blackfoot' is that spoken on three Southern Alberta reserves: Blackfoot [Siksika] Reserve, centered about one hundred kilometers east-southeast of Calgary; Blood [Kainaa] Reserve, covering a large area between Cardston and Lethbridge; and Piikani (AKA Peigan) [Apatohsipikani] Reserve, west of Fort MacLeod; as well as on the Blackfeet [Amskaapipikani] Reservation in Northwestern Montana. (Frantz and Russel [1989] 2017, xiii; round and square brackets in the original)

---

[73] For a comprehensive analysis of multilingualism in Crnjanski's classic *Roman o Londonu* (A Novel about Novel), see, for example, Biljana Djorić Francuski's paper 'Multilingual Literature, Translation, and Crnjanski's *Roman o Londonu* (A Novel about London)' (2013).

Many Native American tongues classify as vulnerable or endangered. The position of the Blackfoot language is also precarious, considering the constant decline in the number of fluent speakers. Nevertheless, it is estimated that several thousand people still speak the language (Frantz and Russel [1989] 2017, xiii).

Fairly important for our understanding of Albahari's multilingualism in 'Learning Cyrillic' is the Blackfoot's orthography. The systematisation of writing comes quite late on the trajectory of this Native American language: it was only in 1975 that the Roman-based orthography was officially approved (Frantz and Russel [1989] 2017, xix). The Blackfoot Latin alphabet, comprising only twelve letters, seems much simpler in comparison to those of English (twenty-six letters) or Serbian (thirty letters):

> Though it makes use of twelve letters which are also in the English alphabet, plus an apostrophe, it must be emphasized that these letters represent distinctive sounds of Blackfoot and not English sounds (though many Blackfoot sounds have close approximations in English). (Frantz and Russel [1989] 2017, xix)

In Albahari's short story, the Blackfoot vocabulary items appear in the Serbian Latin transliteration, without accents or double letters. Devoid of italicisation or any other form of graphical emphasis, they harmoniously blend in the surrounding Roman alphabet of the Serbian text.

The primary purpose of the Blackfoot words in Albahari's short story, I hold, is *not* to 'exoticise' the text. Rather, the idea is to use the foreign vocabulary to complement the portrayal of the unfamiliar culture-specific concepts. For instance, the conversation about *tipi*, between a Serbian-learning pupil and Thunder Cloud, illustrates this point:

> The girl gets up, coughs, and asks, 'Why do Indians [sic] live in those round, tall tents, and not in a house?' 'Because,' answers Thunder Cloud, 'the devil can chase you into the corner of a house, but in our tent, that we call a tipi, there are no corners, so the devil stays away'. (Albahari 2012, 89)

6.3 Multilingualism of Albahari's 'Learning Cyrillic' in Elias-Bursać's Translation into English

As I have argued on the example of Crnjanski's book *Roman o Londonu* (A Novel about London), when tackling multilingual content, a literary examination of the original need precede any discussion of its translation:

> It must be underscored that each language performs a different function within the text and should be approached separately. Bringing the multilingual occurrences under a single umbrella would produce only a crude generalisation. Hence, the first step prior to formulating translation strategies for each language embedded in the Serbian text is to reassess the relations among them in the original from a purely literary perspective, mindful of changes that will take place in the translation process. (Krstić 2018, 191)

Elias-Bursać certainly did not skip this step while preparing her translation of Albahari's 'Learning Cyrillic'. The section at hand will try to demonstrate why her decisions concerning multilingualism are not only well informed but belong to a grander strategy that renders the story's multilingualism more visible.

6.3.1 English in the Target Text

In Elias-Bursać's translation, the English language no longer intertwines immaterially but physically dominates the text. The substitution of English *in absentia* with English *in propria persona* is of little surprise considering the English's status as the designated target language of the translation. Rare cases where the target language is physically incorporated into the source text, as is the case in Crnjanski's *Roman o Londonu* (A Novel about London), are problematic on account of the originally multilingual intrusions' blending into the target text, which produces a homogenous translation (Krstić 2018, 191). In 'Learning Cyrillic', the target language is fictional, which makes the translator's job somewhat easier.

Fictional in place of actual multilingualism is usually employed to help the author incorporate a longer portion of text allegedly in a certain language. What prevents the author from utilising genuine multilingualism is the prospective hindered comprehension of the whole work. Nevertheless, some writers, such as Yoko Tawada,[74] boldly leave longer chunks untranslated – yet in behalf of a different effect, the discussion of which lies outside our focus. Albahari's ultimate goal is to portray English as the language of communication between the Serbian and Blackfoot communities, so when, in Elias-Bursać's translation, English becomes the target language, the story's need for its fictional representation terminates abruptly.

6.3.2 Serbian in the Target Text

Elias-Bursać leaves intact Albahari's indicators signalling the language currently in use. By virtue of the story's frequent linguistic alterations, such indicators are hardly avoidable. In spite of the fact that the formerly fictional English becomes real in the English translation, it is the Serbian language that suddenly becomes fictional – with the notable exception of few simple sentences retained in the Cyrillic script, which will be discussed shortly. In respect to the fictional representation of Serbian, I wish to draw attention to a single trace of English syntax hidden in the originally Serbian text that seems to have slipped Elias-Bursać's eyes. In the episode where the teacher forces his students to speak Serbian among themselves, Albahari offers a unique insight into the level of students' proficiency in Serbian:

> 'But why' I ask them, 'How can it be that you are unable to speak with your friends in your native language?' They look at me, say nothing, blink. 'Come on', I say to the boy with the curly hair, 'ask your friend something, but in Serbian!' 'He is not my friend', says the boy with the curly hair. 'Ask him something anyway', I say. The boy with the curly hair stares at the boy next to him. 'How are you', he finally says, in Serbian. 'I am fine', says the other boy, also in Serbian. Both of them look up at me, as proud as if they had been reciting *Hamlet*. (Albahari 2012, 91; italics in the original)

The boy's response in the Serbian original is: 'Ja sam dobar' (I am good; Albahari [2003] 2005, 189). As it is, it means more 'I am a good boy' than 'I am feeling good'. If one wants to refer to well-being rather than to ethical conduct, the adverb 'dobro' (good) is used in lieu of the adjective 'dobar' (good). What is more, Serbian is a pro-drop language – meaning that it has the ability to leave out pronouns where their meaning can be inferred either grammatically or pragmatically. This is a marked difference in comparison to English, which is not distinguished

---

[74] For more on translating Yoko Tawada's multilingual and -graphic experimentations, see, for example, the article 'The Bones of Translation: Yoko Tawada's Translational Poetics' (2015), written by her translator Bettina Brandt, from Liesbeth Minnaard and Till Dembeck's volume *Challenging the Myth of Monolingualism*. For Yoko Tawada's own intimate account, see, for example, her piece 'The Script of a Turtle or the Problem of Translation' (entitled 'Die zweite Vorlesung: Schrift einer Schildkröte oder das Problem der Übersetzung' in the German original; 2015) in Bettina Brandt's English translation from the abovementioned volume.

by the pro-drop phenomenon. The personal pronoun 'I', mandatory in English, becomes redundant in Serbian. An idiomatic response would, therefore, be: 'Dobro sam' (*Good am). The boy's answer 'Ja sam dobar' (I am good; Albahari [2003] 2005, 189) exposes that his English interferes with his Serbian even on the most basic level of communication. Elias-Bursać's translation 'I am fine' eliminates the awkwardness of the originally used expression that replicates English syntax. The non-idiomatic becomes idiomatic. Resultantly, the story's clue as to the students' fluency in spoken Serbian is annihilated.

Even though the Serbian edition does not combine the Cyrillic and Latin script, the translator has recognised the artistic potential of Serbian orthography's dual nature. In Elias-Bursać's translation, few short sentences in the Serbian Cyrillic script defy anglicisation:

> The little ones are working on their Cyrillic. I print the letters out on a smooth whiteboard with a wide, blue, felt-tip pen. Then I dictate short sentences for the practice of Cyrilli: 'Лела љуља Љиљану: Lela rocks Ljiljana. Ђак носи џак: The pupil carries a sack. And Ћира има чир: Ćira has an ulcer.' The children lick their lips while. (Albahari 2012, 76)

In the quoted Elias-Bursać's translation – unlike in the Serbian original – the promise of Albahari's suggestive title is fulfilled: not only the fictional migrant children learn the Cyrillic letters but also the reader gets the glimpse of a Cyrillic font. Acquainting the Serbian audience with the Cyrillic script is highly superfluous, which unravels why Albahari refrained from any graphical interferences of the kind. Transliterating the sentences practiced in a Serbian-language class, however, amuses the English readership as the curious shapes of the Cyrillic script materialise before their very eyes. Much to my regret, Elias-Bursać chose to supplement the dictated sentences with an English translation. In playing safe – that is in her reluctance to give up on the semantic for the sake of graphic – she missed the opportunity to diversity the uses of heterolingualism. For, as Esther Kilchmann argues on the example of Herta Müller's writing, 'heterolingualism is more than a stylistic device, it is a method to generate alienation and de-automatization, and thus to prevent an all-too easy understanding of the text' (Kilchmann 2015, 78). With a ready translation provided in immediate proximity, this function is irretrievably lost.

6.3.3 Blackfoot in the Target Text

Transliterated too – or, more precisely, back-transliterated – are the Blackfoot phrases. The shift, however, does not operate between different scripts but between two alphabets of the same script: the Serbian Latin and the Blackfoot Latin alphabet. For example, the lexemes for 'wolf', 'summer', and 'moon' are reversed to match the spelling of Blackfoot standardised Roman-based orthography:

- 'makoiji' (Albahari [2003] 2005, 186) → 'makoiyi' (Albahari 2012, 89)
- 'nipo' (Albahari [2003] 2005, 186) → 'niipo' (Albahari 2012, 89)
- 'kokomikisom' (Albahari [2003] 2005, 186) → 'kokomikisomm' (Albahari 2012, 89)

While, in all likelihood, Elias-Bursać is not fluent in the Blackfoot language, she conducted enough research to spot Albahari's Serbian transliteration, intended to accommodate the Serbian reader. Her systematic back-transliteration once again reinforces the idea that her whole translation of Albahari's 'Learning Cyrillic' is theoretically sound – pertaining to the treatment of multilingual amalgamations. How such handling of different languages affects translational relations will be discussed in the following section.

6.4 Translational Relations of Multilingual Content

Multilingualism and translation are inextricably intertwined. The bond that links the two phenomena – as well as the respective disciplines that study them – feels naturally strong. Yet, in disciplinary terms, it is translation studies, the older sibling, that plucked multilingualism studies from obscurity:

> In today's world, talk of multilingualism no longer raises eyebrows but is seen, quite matter-of-factly, as a sign of the times. Whether this is due to Deleuze's and Guattari's work on the 'deterritorializing' powers of language, or Bakhtin's forceful critique of 'monologic' and 'monoglossic' tendencies in Western thought, or the 'hybrid' character of postcolonial texts and cultures, or all of the above, the times they are indeed a-changin'. *Translation studies* can justifiably be said to have been in the forefront of this paradigm shift. (Delabastita and Grutman 2005, 11; my emphasis)

A range of many-sided issues emanating from the so-called 'post-monolingual condition', which tellingly marks our era, has been tackled head-on in Till Dembeck and Georg Mein's article 'Philology's Jargon: How Can We Write Post-Monolingually?' (2015). The study's theoretically informed assessment of the alternatives available to the monolingual paradigm suggests the impossibility of reversing the current trend is due to the complexities of the newly formulated hybrid forms that escape the existing categorisations of languages (Dembeck and Mein 2015).

6.4.1 Source and Target Language(s)

Albahari's shorty story 'Learning Cyrillic' defies the habitual labelling of languages in multiple ways; consequently, translational relations too become susceptible to interrogation. Employing the traditional terminology of 'source' and 'target' might prove helpful in approaching this issue. These two widely-accepted yet somewhat controversial terms can be used in collocation with 'language', 'text', 'discourse', 'culture', and so forth. To lift the terminological burden associated with the notion of 'source', some theoreticians opt for the less laden alternative of 'original', while others, as is the case with this dissertation, tend to treat 'source' and 'original' as synonyms.

As presented in literature review, Gottlieb[75] proposes a new typology of translational relations, based on several parameters, in the attempt 'to provide conceptual tools for dealing systematically with any type of translation encountered in today's communicative landscape' (Gottlieb 2018, 46; see 2.2.3). Despite this taxonomy's advertised sensitivity to the complexities of a modern-day expression and particularly to 'the possible differences in semiotic composition between source and target texts' (Gottlieb 2018, 47), Gottlieb's taxonomy is of little use for linguistically heterogeneous texts. That is *not* to say that Gottlieb's taxonomy cannot be applied to multilingual texts, inasmuch as nothing prevents us from classifying Elias-Bursać's translation by Gottlieb's standards – that is as *intrasemiotic*, *isosemiotic*, *verbal*, and *conventional translation*. But when it comes to the relationship between the 'source' and the 'target', Gottlieb's semiotically oriented taxonomy concentrates solely on the changes in the number of semiotic channels, which is less relevant for our understanding of how linguistically heterogeneous literary texts upset translational relations. To this effect, the core problems radiating from multilingual experimentations remain unaddressed.

---

[75] Terminology-wise, Gottlieb (2018) does not question the notions of 'source' and 'target'; he uses 'original' interchangeably with 'source'.

Toury,[76] another scholar interested in translational relations whose positions have been outlined in literature review (see 2.2), maintains that 'linguistic translating does *not* require the existence of any defined relationships between the respective languages and/or textual traditions' (Toury 1986, 1117; my emphasis). By contrast, Toury explains, a fixed relationship becomes unavoidable where a 'secondary' code derives from a 'primary' with mediation of certain previously established rules; the provided example is that of writing down oral material (Toury 1986, 1117). This 'primary–secondary' relationship does not occur in linguistic translating for the following reasons:

> [T]he [unidirectional] relationships established between the target and source texts are not a function of any other set of relationships that has logical priority over them, but a result of the interplay of *all* the cultural, textual and linguistic factors involved in every single act of performance, hence not necessarily the same in all cases. (Toury 1986, 1117; square brackets and emphasis in the original)

Departing from the premise that a translation is not a secondary derivative of the primary text, Toury further infers that,

> innumerable different acts of translating may be performed on one and the same source text, each one yielding a different product, in (target) linguistic substance and textual identity (function) as well as in terms of its relationships to the common source text. (Toury 1986, 1119; brackets in the original)

Insofar as the qualifiers 'source' and 'target' do not condition or regulate the translation process itself, the relationship between them emerges as arbitrary (Toury 1986, 1117); thereupon, the two terms – stresses the pioneer of descriptive translation studies – ought to be used descriptively rather than prescriptively (Toury 1986, 1117). Ultimately, this signifies that 'source' and 'target' should by no means be established beforehand but only *after* the translation process is completely finished.

In 'source' terms, Toury's suggestion that 'innumerable different acts of translating may be performed on one and the same source text' (Toury 1986, 1119) implies that the source text is a fixed and durable structure. An earlier section of this chapter dealing with the main features of Albahari's multilingual experimentations in 'Learning Cyrillic' (see 6.2) has underscored a series of uncertainties surrounding the authoritative version of the source text. Two graphical specificities of the source text have been identified as particularly vulnerable: the choice of the Latin script for the Serbian text in face of active digraphia; and the Serbian Latin transliteration of the Blackfoot intrusions. The thought that – in the biscriptural environment of Serbia – a different edition could cyrillicise the story without blinking an eye, brings into question our perception of the source text as utterly immobile. In deliberating about what he terms *autobiographical input* – that is a mode of reading which acknowledges and values personal interference – Scott tries to counter the widespread apprehension of the source text as an ultimately rigid and unchangeable structure:

> [T]he ST [source text], as we have it before us, is in fact not in a suspended state, but at the intersection of three durations: the process of the work's composition and revision, a process which has within it the potentially infinite extension; the process of the ST's post-publication life, in the minds of countless readers, in different editions, imitations, adaptations, merchandising, and so on; the process of the ST's existing and becoming in

---

[76] Toury (1986) does not question the very terminology of 'source' and 'target'. It should be added that he uses 'source' consistently.

the mind of any *individual* reader. (Scott 2012, 2–3; emphasis in the original; my square brackets)

The impossibility of pinning down the source text in its permanent form surfaced more vividly in the discussion of folk ballad *Hasanaginica* (see Chapter 4), which counts several variants of what is supposedly the recorded oral utterance as well as several revisions of these 'authentic' variants. In modern literature, where the notion of authorship figures strongly, it is not at all too obvious that a source text is in fact a consensus – prone to variation and transformation.

In 'target' terms, Toury's suggestion that 'innumerable different acts of translating may be performed on one and the same source text' (Toury 1986, 1119) allows for multiplicity through retranslation. In spite of the fact that no other translation of Albahari's 'Learning Cyrillic' has been published (which, of course, does not imply that no other translation exists), in the discussion of translational relations Elias-Bursać's rendering should be treated only as one manifestation, one performance. In future translations of Albahari's multilingual story, the relations between languages could easily change for a number of reasons – ranging from those creative, intimate decisions of a translator to more external forces, such as fluctuating power relations between languages. Just consider: would the multilingualism of Albahari's 'Learning Cyrillic' be interpreted in the same manner if the English language ceased to be a *lingua franca*? Albeit compelling material for analysis, indulging in speculations as to the prospective management of multilingual experimentations in future (re)translations has to be substituted by the investigation of actual strategies found in Elias-Bursać's translation.

Elias-Bursać's multilingually and graphically aware translation disrupts the traditionally predictable behaviour of 'source' and 'target' by obscuring the presumed one-to-one correspondence between the two. A call for a more flexible definition of 'source' and 'target' comes from Reine Meylaerts, who uses the multilingual setting of interwar Belgium as a framework for the investigation of translator's agency in relation to structure – particularly within 'habitus', one of the key concepts underlying Bourdieu's theory of social fields. Albeit through a sociological perspective, Meylaerts's analysis points in the direction similar to that indicated by Toury (1986) and Gottlieb (2018) – that '[t]exts and discourses can cross so-called linguistic and cultural boundaries, shaking up the analytical pertinence of a clear-cut distinction between "sources" and "targets"' insofar as there are 'numerous past and present contexts in which the ideal Western nation-state's one-to-one relationship among territory, language, literature and people has been blurred' (Meylaerts 2006, 75).

The body of literature on and by the post-Yugoslav émigré community in North America certainly shuffles these nation-based categories. The one-to-one correspondence between the source language of Albahari's 'Learning Cyrillic' and the target language of Elias-Bursać's translation has been distorted. As a result, the dynamic relationship between the source and target conditions the identification of translational relations. So, is Elias-Bursać's translation of Albahari's 'Learning Cyrillic' *interlingual* or *intralingual*? Tempting as it may be to define it as an *interlingual translation* from Serbian into English – such qualification would be only partially true. Albeit predominantly an *interlingual translation*, it is highly significant to acknowledge that both *inter-* and *intralingual* processes are in operation.

Let us tabularly break down the relations between the story's multifarious languages – be they fictional or concrete. Table 1 represents the languages in the source and target text, specifying whether the relation between them is *inter-* or *intralingual*.

Table 1. Translational relations of Albahari's 'Learning Cyrillic' in Elias-Bursać's translation.

Source text		Target text	Translational relations
Fictional English (expressed by **concrete Serbian** in the Serbian Latin alphabet)	→	**Concrete English** (English Latin alphabet)	*Interlingual translation*
Concrete Serbian (Serbian Latin alphabet)	→	**Concrete English** (English Latin alphabet)	*Interlingual translation*
		Fictional Serbian (expressed by **concrete English** in English Latin alphabet);	*Interlingual translation*
		Concrete Serbian (Serbian Cyrillic alphabet)	*Intralingual translation*
Concrete Blackfoot (Serbian Latin alphabet)	→	**Concrete Blackfoot** (Blackfoot Latin alphabet)	*Intralingual translation*

The examples of *interlingual translation* presented in Table 1 require little explanation. Well worthy of additional commentary are the instances of *intralingual* relations in the otherwise *interlingual* surroundings. To clarify their appearance and behaviour, the analysis ought to be turned towards the graphical facet.

Despite the increasing attention that multilingualism as a phenomenon has started to receive in theoretical circles, the study of alphabetical alternations has remained quite peripheral. When addressed, the graphical aspect is usually examined in the contexts of logographic writing systems, such as Chinese or Japanese. Perhaps on the grounds of the Roman alphabets' global dominance, the Cyrillic script – used in Eastern Europe and Asia – passes unnoticed in Western academia. Even though Albahari's 'Learning Cyrillic' is monographic in that it utilises only the Serbian Latin alphabet, the story's very title hints at the text's inner tension between the language's two parallelly used scripts. By infusing an all-Roman matrix with several sentences in non-Roman symbols, Elias-Bursać unlocks the creative potential of intermixing different scripts. The translator of Albahari's short story decided to keep certain

sentences in the Serbian language but opted to transcribe their originally Latin-spelled words into the Cyrillic script. Having placed these Serbian words in the midst of an English text, Elias-Bursać effectively embedded *intralingual* relations into what is contrary an *interlingual translation*.

The second example of *intralingual* interruption lies in a sporadic retention of the Blackfoot phrases. As the Blackfoot words stand out in Albahari's chiefly Serbian text as well as in Elias-Bursać's generally English translation, their transfer could be characterised as *intralingual*, inasmuch as it remains in the domain of the Blackfoot language. In saying so, we should not disregard the fact that slightly complicates the situation with the renderings in the Blackfoot language – that the Blackfoot lexical items were originally written in accordance with the Serbian Latin orthography rather than the standard Blackfoot writing system, which was amended in Elias-Bursać's translation.

6.4.2 Minimal Unit of Translation

As *intralingual* relations are scattered across a predominantly *interlingual* setting, it emerges that we can no longer label a *whole* translation of a multilingual text as solely *intra-* or *interlingual*. If both *intra-* and *interlingual* relations are in effect, how are we to impose one over the other or to calculate the ratio between the two? The intermingling of *intra-* and *interlingual* relations foregrounds the issue of the minimal unit of translation. If we go back to Jakobson's seminal essay 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation' (1959), which introduces the concepts of *intra-* and *interlingual translation*, we notice that Jakobson cites only word-based examples. As noted earlier (see 2.2.5), such narrow approach has been heavily criticised by Sturrock (Sturrock 1991, 311) and more recently Albachten (Albachten 2014, 575).

Interestingly, Sturrock's own analysis – preoccupied with the matters of synonymy between a rather limited elements – falls into the same trap. Sturrock firmly maintains that 'the smallest unit of equivalence in any translation *must* be the sentence' (Sturrock 1991, 318; my emphasis), thereby dismissing his colleagues' advocacy for much larger units that go 'beyond even whole texts to the cultures those texts are part of' (Sturrock 1991, 318); we shall encounter some of these examples soon. Nevertheless, I concur with Albachten's assessment that, while effectively challenging Jakobson's narrow approach, 'Sturrock also fails to see that the problem of translating is more than one of "determining synonymy", and the question of equivalence (and synonymy) in current translation theories is a controversial one' (Albachten 2014, 575; quotes and round brackets in the original).

Eco (2003) and Calabrese (2000) also embark on a search for the minimal unit of translation. As already noted, Calabrese negates the possibility of an all-encompassing theory of translation; his claim rests on the assumption that translation is an 'individual' and 'textual' phenomenon, which ought to be conceptualised 'locally' in lieu of globally (Calabrese 2000, 102). Owing to systems' mutual incommensurability, a translation theory based on the system as a whole is bound to fail (Calabrese 2000, 102); the minimal unit imposing itself is a *text*. Yet, Calabrese clearly states that *texts* too can, under certain conditions, simultaneously operate as individual systems (Calabrese 2000, 103), which somewhat weakens his argumentation. Of a similar attitude is his colleague Eco. An excerpt from *Mouse or Rat? Translation as Negotiation* is worth quoting:

> Translation is a phenomenon which does not concern the relationships between two languages or two linguistic systems – except in the rare cases in which one asks native speakers or interpreters how they would translate a given term in their own language [. . .]. Rather, translation is a process that takes place between two *texts* produced at a given historical moment in a given cultural milieu. (Eco 2003, 25–26; my emphasis)

As neither Calabrese nor Eco define what they mean by 'text', I am inclined to think their understanding of a textual framework is probably closer to a traditional one than to that asserted by Gottlieb (see 2.2.3).

The aforementioned ideas of a minimal unit are much more restricted than that of Pym. He dismisses both 'language' and 'community' as insufficient criteria (Pym [1992] 2010, 25): namely, these two terms do not necessarily correspond to each other, insofar as 'there are many more languages in the world than countries to house them' and 'numerous languages are spoken in more than one community' (Pym [1992] 2010, 24). As a substitute, he proposes 'the suitably vague term' – 'culture' (Pym [1992] 2010, 25). Since Pym's model of using translation to determine the level of cultural distance has been discussed before (see 2.2.4, 4.4.3, and 5.4), no further recapitulation will be provided at this point.

In a nutshell, no consensus has been reached pertaining to the minimal unit of translation. Seeing that all of the previously outlined positions have their strengths, this chapter suggests a reconciling tactic by arguing in favour of a *scalable* basic unit of translation. Namely, Jay Jin's (2017) idea of synecdochic and metonymic approach to 'close' and 'distant reading' (see 3.3) could be adapted to fit translational agenda. In this way, the imperative to predetermine what should operate as a unit of translation ceases to exist. With a scalable unit of translation, the researcher would no longer be forced to commit to a single unit; what is more, the analysis could freely travel between the very small and the very large without producing incommensurable results. The greatest benefit of a scalable approach, I believe, lies in stressing the importance of contextual and extralinguistic factors, which need be taken into consideration when attempting to theorise translational relations.

6.4.3 Contextual Framework

From a wider perspective, the asymmetry between the 'source' and 'target' language along with the problematic minimal unit of translation reinforces the pertinence of a contextual framework in the study of multilingual literature's translational relations. As previously mentioned, Toury asserts that the relationship between a source and target text results from 'the interplay of *all* the cultural, textual and linguistic factors involved in every single act of performance, hence not necessarily the same in all cases' (Toury 1986, 1117; square brackets and emphasis in the original). Hence, the specific way in which Elias-Bursać rendered Albahari's multilingualism, keeping the Serbian and Blackfoot elements in the otherwise English text, should be understood in terms of uniqueness rather than universality. This chapter's study of translational relations on the example of 'Learning Cyrillic' has demonstrated that the scrutinised act of translation is only one possible manifestation and that nothing prevents translational relations from shifting in any of the prospective (re)translations. While the previous two chapters have confirmed the tested hypothesis apropos to temporal (see 4.5) and spatial factors (see 5.5), this chapter adds the final piece to the puzzle – by proving true that translational relations are not pre-given but contextually determined in each individual case that involves multilingual content.

6.5 Chapter Conclusions

This chapter has drawn attention to the specificities of multilingual literature in the attempt to oppose the prevalence of a monolingual paradigm across literary studies. Although multilingual experimentations boast a long and rich history, it is the modern era that has galvanised people into a new mode of multicultural contact and active exchange. Albahari's short story 'Learning Cyrillic' spotlights the Serbian community in Canada: the protagonist is a Serbian-language teacher who works with the emigrant children on Friday evenings and whose humdrum routine is interrupted by a series of unexpected encounters with the Native American named

Thunder Cloud. Having maximised the potential of a multicultural setting, 'Learning Cyrillic' could be said to typify a linguistically hybrid text. Additionally, it is a transfictional piece – in that it creatively engages with translation matters – and it is precisely thanks to the protagonist's fictional interpreting that a greater number of languages figures in the text – not all of which are materially present. In the source text, the generally Serbian writing is interspersed with concrete traces of the Native American Blackfoot language, whereas English, albeit physically absent, dwells in the story with the help of fictional multilingualism.

Having combed the relations between the three languages in Albahari's original from a purely literary perspective, the chapter has proceeded to invigorate the discussion on multilingual fiction's translatability by immersing into the graphically and linguistically diverse world of Elias-Bursać's translation. Her translation of 'Learning Cyrillic' into English not only preserves the Blackfoot phrases found in the original, but leaves a couple of short sentences in the source language of Serbian, as an illustration of the Cyrillic content that pupils study at the evening classes. To that end, Elias-Bursać's translation is attentive not only to the role of multilingual insertions but to the aesthetic capacity of the Serbian dual orthography – which simultaneously utilises both the Cyrillic and Latin alphabet. Overall, Elias-Bursać should be commended for successfully navigating the Scylla and Charybdis of rendering multilingual literature.

'Learning Cyrillic' – seen through the prism of Albahari's and Elias-Bursać's version – manifests the complex relationship between multilingualism and translation. In order to detect translational relations, it is necessary to first pinpoint the so-called 'source' and 'target' language(s) involved in the process. As multilingual writing resists the customary identification of languages, in that one language is insufficient to cover the whole text, the text needs to be carefully dissected with a view to identifying 'source' and 'target' language(s). As the degree of multilingual elements varies greatly – ranging from a single word to much more substantial portions of a text – this chapter advocates the introduction of a scalable minimal unit of translation. The proposition, which looks up to Jay Jin's (2017) idea of scaling the research tools so as to bypass the unnecessarily prescriptive nature of one-fits-all models, could alleviate the problems of multilingual literature's shuffled translational relations. A scalable unit of translation could be tailored in accordance with the project's specific needs.

All things considered, we arrive at the conclusion that in a multilingual environment, the 'source' and 'target' language(s) can only be identified locally. As a result, the translational relations need to be defined anew again and again. This brings to light the importance of establishing a contextual framework. As the two previous chapter have confirmed on the example of temporal (see 4.5) and spatial aspects (see 5.5) – translational relations are not pre-given but, rather, contextually determined in the analysis of each individual case. Finally, it is here that the three-chapter-long discussion on the causes of the translational relations' fluctuations closes, leaving room for the analysis of the instability's far-reaching consequences.

III
Translational Relations' Instability:
Effects

7 Literary Circulation in the Context of Linguistic Discontinuity

Todd Hasak-Lowy's Short Story 'The Task of This Translator'

> *Bad news from Yugoslavia again. The situation is unclear.*
> *It used to bother me that it was too clear. Now that it is unclear.*
> *The advantage is, however, in clear situations. They decide for me.*
> *Now I have to manage on my own.*
>
> Borislav Pekić, *Život na ledu*

7.1 Introduction

While the previous chapters have been dedicated to the factors that *cause* the instability of *intra-* and *interlingual translation*, this chapter takes an opposite approach in investigating the *effects* produced by this instability. As the chapter reviewing current literature has shown (see 2.3), this facet has been almost completely overlooked by researchers writing on the topic. A brief mention of a possible impact of translational relations' fluctuation can be found in Kathleen Davis' article 'Intralingual Translation and the Making of a Language', where she raises the issue but chooses not to elaborate on it in much detail. If 'the boundaries between languages [. . .] cannot be secured' (Davis 2014, 588) – as exemplified by Derrida's discussion on the dual nature a proper name that simultaneously operates inside as well as outside the language, which Davis quotes – she wonders how we should tackle the issue of *intra-* and *interlingual translation* (Davis 2014, 588). Dismissing the distinction between the two types of translation is not an option, she claims, as 'it would ignore the history of the politics of language and the enormous social, cultural, and economic stakes of language identification' (Davis 2014, 588). So what is at stake when we cannot determine where one language begins and the other one ends?

On the example of SFR Yugoslavia's disintegration, many of those consequences have been discussed in current literature, albeit not necessarily in the context of translation theory. This chapter intends to delve into 'cultural stakes' with a view to exposing the effects exerted upon literary structures. The central focus will be on literary circulation – as defined by David Damrosch (Damrosch 2003) – of Serbian literature in the so-called 'core Anglosphere', which traditionally encompasses a set of five dominant English-speaking countries: the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and Ireland.[77] Seeing that circulation is a large-scale phenomenon, its manifestations are normally difficult to follow, which disguises the issues stemming from translational relations' instability. The low visibility of literary routes may be one of the reasons why this cultural aspect has been largely neglected in recent discussions of post-disintegration. The principal aim of this chapter will be to test the hypothesis put forward in the introductory chapter, that linguistic discontinuity additionally hinders the flow of literary circulation in an international framework.

---

[77] Definitions of the 'core Anglosphere' vary in that they may or may not include the Republic of Ireland and the English-speaking countries of the Caribbean Islands – the Bahamas, Barbados, and Jamaica. As stated, this thesis will use the term 'core Anglosphere' to refer to the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and Ireland. Accordingly, the qualifier 'Anglophone' will be used to refer to these particular states collectively rather than the whole English-speaking world.

To test this hypothesis, the chapter will take as a starting point a short story by the American author Todd Hasak-Lowy, entitled 'The Task of This Translator' (2005) and published in the eponymous collection. Its plot, set in a fictional college town in the USA, revolves around a curious 'translation institute', where Ted, a student-entrepreneur, struggles to find those working in lesser-known languages for his recently established translation agency (Hasak-Lowy 2005, 151). For lack of better alternatives, Ted convinces his friend Ben to take on a job of an interpreter. Despite the title's emphasis on translation, the story is actually about interpretation:

> The focus on interpreting rather than written translation in Lowy's story further questions the idea of borders. [. . .] [T]he process of interpreting collapses any clear identifications and delimitations; it highlights the fluidity of identities, like the fluidity of languages, which merge one with the other in the simultaneity of the process. (Apostolou 2014, 75)

Ben is hired to interpret from and to the unspecified Balto-Slavic language that he had studied as an undergraduate but barely understands. Even though the 'obscure' language, as the narrator puts it, remains unrevealed, its vivid description points towards the Serbo-Croatian and its successors. Despite the struggle to identify the story's 'obscure' language, the reader soon realises that pinpointing the exact language is irrelevant as it is a mere representative of hundreds of cultures, labelled as 'minor', which dwell on the verge of American attention.

'The Task of This Translator' can serve as an excellent basis for this analysis inasmuch as it illustrates the complexity of factors responsible for a rather inferior status of certain national literatures in a wider cultural framework, particularly that of Anglophone countries. The overall factors responsible for international circulation are much more numerous than those encompassed by this chapter; Gisèle Sapiro classifies them, for the purposes of her paper, into four broad categories: political, economic, cultural, and social factors (Sapiro 2016, 82). These, however, often intertwine to the extent that they cannot be clearly separated (Sapiro 2016, 82). For this reason, the principal hypothesis will not be tested in isolation but in combination with a set of related hypotheses concerning other important factors – be they of general nature or specific to the Serbian case. To this effect, the chapter aims to test the following sub-hypotheses in addition to the principal one:

1. the availability of Serbian-language courses at Anglophone universities is limited;
2. in Anglophone contexts, the Serbian language is often taught in combination with the Croatian and Bosnian variety;
3. teaching Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian collectively lowers the visibility of all three standards;
4. literary markets are largely governed by commercial interests;
5. the general interest in translated literature is rather low in the Anglosphere.

In investigating the causal relationship between the formulated sub-hypotheses, the chapter argues that it is the combination of these factors that forms a vicious circle preventing Serbian literature from penetrating the canonical barriers of world literature to a greater extent. In this constellation, I argue, linguistic discontinuity is an extra layer that prevents the circulation, which already happens at a slow rate for literatures written in less-known languages.

Overall, the chapter takes a sociological approach by concentrating on the roles that certain agents – educational institutions, publishing industry, and the general reading public in particular – play in the processes of cultural cross-contamination. The quantitative data will be collected from various databases, statistical reports, and online sources, whereas the qualitative data will be extracted from interviews and texts by translators, scholars, and

publishers actively involved in mediation. The body of this chapter is divided into five main sections. The first section contains a review of current literature on the topic and a definition of the study's theoretical framework. The second section discusses the possible identity of the 'obscure' language of Hasak-Lowy's story as well as the potential reasons for which it remains hidden. The third section focuses on the treatment of Serbian in educational institutions of three Anglophone countries; the forth one on the publishing industry, both of Serbia and the Anglosphere; the last one on a general underrepresentation of literature in translation across the dominant English-speaking countries. Finally, Chapter Conclusions brings the findings together and gives suggestions for further research.

7.2 Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

The circulation of Serbian literature in the Anglosphere has been generally understudied. An important publication is Snezana Zabic and Paula Kamenish's essay 'A Survey of Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian Poetry in English Translation in the U.S. and Canada', the scope of which is genre-specific[78] and limited to the period between 1970 and 2004. Zabic and Kamenish attempt to grasp what *enables* the circulation of Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian poetries on the North American continent, the presence of which has been continuous, albeit largely peripheral compared to literatures translated from other non-dominant languages (Zabic and Kamenish 2006, 3). The authors argue that the main determinants contributing to the processes of cultural exchange are, in fact, literary mediators – including émigré writers, who are often translators themselves, and scholars of world literature – and a few publishers committed to publishing poetry in translation. In comparison to Zabic and Kamenish's article, this chapter employs an inverted approach insofar as it tries to answer what *hinders* the circulation of Serbian literature in the Anglophone transnational field with a view to measuring the impact of linguistic instability.

Before proceeding any further, it ought to be emphasised that this chapter adopts the theoretical framework of field theory, developed by French social scientist Pierre Bourdieu. Owing to its wide applicability across disciplines, this theory needs little introduction; yet let us briefly summarise its main points in regard to literary production. In a nutshell, Bourdieu advocates the contextalisation of art works by considering them in *relational* terms:

> Constructing an object such as the literary field requires and enables us to make a radical break with the substantialist mode of thought (as Ernst Cassirer calls it) which tends to foreground the individual, or the visible interactions between individuals, as the expense of the structural relations – invisible, or visible only through their effects – between social positions that are both occupied and manipulated by social agents which may be isolated individuals, groups or institutions. (Bourdieu [1983] 1993, 29)

By putting a work in a social perspective – acknowledging its historical as well as spatial distribution – Bourdieu moves away from all forms of 'internal analysis', which he criticises for their isolationist approach that ignores the complex network of social relations that allow the very existence of a text in the first place (Johnson 1993, 10).

With a shift away from nation as the principal unit, Bourdieu's theory has come under close scrutiny for its alleged 'methodological nationalism'. Although the framework of field theory has been commonly adopted in a national context, those more familiar with Bourdieu's

---

[78] For English-language collections of Serbian poetry, see, for example, *Anthology of Serbian Poetry: The Golden Age* (1984), compiled by Mihailo Dordević; also *Cat Painters: An Anthology of Contemporary Serbian Poetry* (2016), edited by Biljana D. Obradović and Dubravka Djurić; also *Nine Serbian Poets: Anthology of Contemporary Serbian Poetry* (2012), anthologised by Vladimir Gvozden.

oeuvre claim he never explicitly limited it to the space of a nation-state (Sapiro 2018, 2). Indeed, many researchers have fruitfully embraced Bourdieu's field theory in examining phenomena across national borders, focusing on transnational and global fields. Larissa Buchholz, who has written on the theoretical challenges of extending the model beyond the confines of nation-state, stresses that, when doing so, researchers should be careful to take into consideration the specificities characteristic of higher levels, especially their 'multi-scalar architecture' that receives no mention in Bourdieu's original formulation (Buchholz 2016: 32–33).

How are the boundaries of a field – be it national or not – determined in the first place? Sapiro maintains that this is entirely the responsibility of a scholar, for '[t]he field is an abstract concept that allows for the methodological autonomization of an area of activity defined in a relational [. . .] and dynamic way [. . .], provided that this autonomization is justified on socio-historical grounds' (Sapiro 2018, 2). It should also be stressed that the field itself is not a fixed structure, insofar as '[t]he boundaries of fields are related to the processes of differentiation and specialization of activities, as well as to geographic borders, but these boundaries are not given, they evolve over time and are constantly reconsidered and challenged' (Sapiro 2018, 2). Knowing the conceptual perimeters of a field, let us try to circumscribe the fields discussed hereby. This chapter looks at the interaction of two literary fields, more specifically at the influence, however marginal it may be, of the Serbian field over that of 'core' Anglosphere. By default, the direction of symbolic goods' circulation within a field is from the centre towards the periphery (Sapiro 2018, 15). Between fields, power relations are as important. To alleviate the all-too-present asymmetries and imbalances, it may be vital to examine in more detail the flow that runs counter to what power relations dictate and the conditions that allow for such reverse distribution.

On the one hand, the Serbian field is a national one and corresponds to the country's borders. While the borders of a national field require little additional explanation, noteworthy is the connection of the Serbian field to the Yugoslav one. Ongoing is an academic discussion as to whether there ever was a genuinely Yugoslav literature or it was merely a conglomeration of individual national literatures.[79] For instance, in May 2018 the Faculty of Philology of the University of Belgrade and the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Novi Sad jointly organised a two-day international workshop, entitled 'Was There Ever a Yugoslav Literature? Debating the Histories of Yugoslav Literatures'. This is by no means a new question – in fact, it was repeatedly posed during the Yugoslav era. For instance, Svetozar Petrović's monograph *Priroda kritika* (The Nature of Critique; 1972), which discusses this issue systematically, reaches a dualistic conclusion:

> [. . .] we should talk about Yugoslav literatures as a collection of kindred national literatures, with spaces of interference and, at points, of multiple intertwinement, separate, therefore, but in such a way that we can talk about them also as components of a higher whole, so that we can correctly talk about Yugoslav literatures and about Yugoslav literature. (Petrović 1972, 247)

While this is a complex question, the consideration of which exceeds the ambitions of this chapter and dissertation in general, some factors affecting the emergence of the Serbian national field and its relationship with other historically connected structures will be addressed where appropriate. Broadly, the timespan studied is after the disintegration of SFR Yugoslavia and, more precisely, after Serbia's independence in 2006.

---

[79] A recent publication that systematically addresses this question is Adrijana Marčetić's edited volume *Jugoslovenska književnost: prošlost, sadašnjost i budućnost jednog spornog pojma/Yugoslav Literature: the Past, Present and Future of a Contested Notion* (2019).

On the other hand, the field of the 'core' Anglosphere, as I propose here, is a transnational one, unified by the English language. By translating a work of Serbian literature into English, it has the potential of becoming a part of this field. The attention of this chapter is predominantly split between the contemporary literary scene and the translation market of the USA and the UK, occasionally underpinned with relevant examples from Canada, Ireland, Australia, and New Zealand. What gives us the right to consider the USA and the UK the essential components of the proposed field is their traditional dominance in the formation of the English-language book market. Namely, the majority of publishing companies is based in these two countries – with centres in London and New York (Holifield 2014). Even though the former Commonwealth countries are working towards establishing their own publishers rather than just distributing what is produced in the USA or the UK, the dominance of these two industries is still overwhelming on the international market (Holifield 2014).

Thanks to the global prominence of the English language, the presence of minorised national literatures at any of the individual Anglophone markets may prove pivotal for their further circulation. Owing to an increasing number of non-native English speakers from across the globe, translation into English has become a mediator catalysing literary exchange between little related cultures. What is more, an English translation can also act as a mediator in a quite literal sense: Maureen Freely, who translates from Turkish into English, asserts in the article 'How I got lost in translation and found my true calling' for the *Observer* that '[those] who translate from non-western languages will often discover, if a book becomes a world phenomenon, that most other translations will be from [their] translation and not the original' (Freely 2010). In this way, an English translation becomes referential for further renderings. While the Anglophone market does not equal the canon of world literature, it certainly is an effective springboard for further circulation and, for this reason, its importance should not be undermined.

7.3 Unveiling the 'Obscure'

The first obstacle that prevents us from determining the exact language that the protagonist Ben is trying to master is the fictional multilingualism of 'The Task of This Translator'. Albeit entirely in English, the story conveys the impression of being partially written in an unspecified language. As Fotini Apostolou points out,

> this language [. . .] is vaguely present but mostly absent throughout the text, not only because of the absence of a name, but also because of its complete physical absence; not a single word of the language is given, apart from the client's name' (Apostolou 2014, 76).

From the narrator, we learn the following:

> This language is a European language, but seriously Eastern European, entirely marginal in pretty much anyone's genealogy of languages, just barely getting invited to the Indo-European family table. Just barely. Balto maybe, Slavic probably. (Hasak-Lowy 2005, 152)

What strikes the reader as foreign-language passages are in fact Ben's not-so-reliable translations from the language in question, initially filled with numerous 'blahs', which later evolve into more intelligible yet never fully coherent entities.

The isolated linguistic signifier that Apostolou mentions (Apostolou 2014, 76) is the male name Goran Vansalivich, with which the mysterious client signs off the letter, composed in clumsy English, where he requests the Institute's services (Hasak-Lowy 2005, 154). Drawing

from Derrida's suggestion that 'a proper name, in the proper sense, does not properly belong to the language'(Derrida 1985, 172), in that it resists *intralingual translation*, we should be careful not to jump to conclusions based merely on this signifier. If we do decide to follow this clue in search for the 'obscure' language, then a few elements should be taken into account. First of all, 'Vansalivich' is probably misspelt to signal the estrangement from ancestral land, as no such surname comes up in Google search.[80] The provided alternatives – 'Vasilevich', 'Vasilovich', 'Vasilyevich' – seem to be transliterated to match the norms of English orthography. It should be noted that the transliteration of proper names is often haphazard insofar as it is a matter of personal preferences in which the linguistic criterion does not necessarily play the decisive role. The most important clue found in the signed surname, then, would be the suffix '–ivich', which is characteristic of a wider Slavic region (Apostolou 2014, 76). The regional distribution of the name Goran is more narrow: according to Mike Campbell, it appears in four South Slavic languages – Serbian, Croatian, Slovene, and Macedonian – thereby pointing towards the Balkans, or, more specifically, former Yugoslavia (Campbell 2019).

Furthermore, one cannot ignore the parallels between the turbulent history of the Balkans – particularly the conflict that ensued from the disintegration of SFR Yugoslavia in the 1990s – and the narrator's lurid description of the story's mysterious language.

> This language hardly gets much mention outside of its local habitat, though it is the language spoken by those unfortunates that every fifteen years or so, whether under the auspices of fascist, Communist, or unspecified geopolitical misguidance, rise to international attention as they and their linguistic neighbors do horrible things to each other in the name of nation, religion, ethnicity, etc. (Hasak-Lowy 2005, 152)

The specific mention of 'linguistic neighbours' in lieu of simply 'neighbours' might be there to remind us of the fluid identity of certain South Slavic languages. In the aftermath of Yugoslav wars, once different varieties of Serbo-Croatian have been standardised as Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin. The mocking tone of the story seems to be mostly directed at an average American, who does not care to understand the circumstances surrounding the odd mixture of socio-political reasons causing the mutually understandable languages to become officially separate.

Yet, it may also be that the 'obscure' language remains deliberately vague because its blurry boundaries are somewhat unclear even to its own speakers. A curious example can be found in an article by the Serbian-based daily tabloid *Kurir*. In writing about the linguistic preferences of the Swedish footballer of Bosnian descent Zlatan Ibrahimović, the author came up with an interesting structure to refer to the language in question. Because of the structure's peculiarity, I quote it in the Serbian origianal first and then in an English translation.

> Legendarni fudbaler [Zlatan Ibrahimović] često voli i da priča na *ovom jeziku na kojima govore* [sic] *narodi na prostoru bivše Jugoslavije*, ali uživa i u muzici koja dolazi od tamo odakle su mu roditelji. ('Zlatan izazvao zemljotres na Balkanu' [Zlatan Triggered an Earthquake at the Balkans] 2019; my emphasis)

> The legendary footballer [Zlatan Ibrahimović] frequently likes to speak in *this language which are* [sic] *spoken by the peoples on the territory of the former Yugoslavia*, but he also likes the music that comes from where his parents are from. ('Zlatan izazvao zemljotres na Balkanu' [Zlatan Triggered an Earthquake at the Balkans] 2019; my emphasis)

---

[80] The only results that do come up are quotes from Hasak-Lowy's story.

The ungrammatical structure 'ovom jeziku na kojima govore' [this language which are spoken] ('Zlatan izazvao zemljotres na Balkanu' 2019) could be interpreted as a mere error in congruency; tabloids in general are more concerned with images than with words. But it is too tempting to interpret the disagreement between the singular noun and the plural verb as a Freudian slip pointing towards the inherent struggle between singularity and multiplicity of Serbo-Croatian and its successors. This parapraxis aside, the author's painfully cautious wording, devoid of any proper names to denote the language, implies that this is still a highly sensitive topic in the Balkans. The language of Zlatan Ibrahimović, therefore, remains unnamed – the language is clearly indicated yet its name is deliberately obscured, just like the language of the mysterious client Goran Vansalivich in Hasak-Lowy's story.

While the public seems slightly bewildered, a considerable number of sociolinguistic debates on the Balkans is directed exactly at the names of the new standards and their mutual interrelationship. Croatian professor Ivo Žanić believes that this struggle between languages from the territory of former Yugoslavia 'brings nothing good to the language that is fighting for prestige and public visibility', adding that 'small languages need good publicity: they need to maintain positive public presence, they need prestige, and prestige is closely related to media backing' (Žanić 2007: 353–354).[81] Although the idea of linguistic prestige is a controversial one, the harmful effects produced by poor reputation are, in my opinion, undeniable. Žanić's standpoint is in line with Hasak-Lowy's fictional assertion that the story's 'obscure' language is internationally inconspicuous unless it comes under spotlight for some atrocities committed at its territory (Hasak-Lowy 2005, 152). While Žanić's call for turning towards more pertinent issues than contrasting languages formerly standardised as one poses an important step forward, there is still a number of fields where the relationship between the new standards need be better regulated before any satisfactory progress can be achieved. One such field is the educational system of foreign countries, the problems of which will be presented in the following section.

7.4 Serbian Language at Anglophone Institutions of Higher Education

'The Task of This Translator' openly criticises the system of higher education in the USA, which has not gone through any kind of fundamental reform since the story's publication in 2005. In what Hasak-Lowy humorously terms 'a ferociously overpriced, nearly prestigious private college' (Hasak-Lowy 2005, 150), where Ben first had the opportunity to study the Balto-Slavic language, students appear to be neither enthusiastic nor diligent. With no deeper interest in the humanities, their selection of classes to attend seems random. For instance, we learn that Ted, the founder of the so-called Translation Institute, took a class named Transnationalism and Borders 'by mistake'. (Hasak-Lowy 2005, 150) Similarly, Ben, who had 'to fulfil the foreign language requirement' (Hasak-Lowy 2005, 151–52), was stirred into learning the 'obscure' language by 'helplessly following a striking romantic interest' (Hasak-Lowy 2005, 152). In contrast, Ben's 'starry-eyed' professor (Hasak-Lowy 2005, 152) of the Balto-Slavic language approaches the class with much more enthusiasm, naïve enough to believe that 'once this language program got off the ground [. . .] the students would sign up regularly, appreciating the sheer beauty of the language' (Hasak-Lowy 2005, 152). The fact that the class's survival depends on a series of external factors, such as secured external funding or the number of signed-up participants, reflects the underlying power relations that chase a small language out of the big picture.

---

[81] The problems that literature in a relatively small language faces was analysed on the example of Serbo-Croatian much before the disintegration of Yugoslavia; see, for example, Svetozar Petrović's essay 'Književnost malog naroda i strani utjecaj' (Literature of a Small Nation and Foreign Influences; 1971).

This section will examine some aspects of these power relations as well as some of the funding models for foreign-language teaching. In writing about the absence of the Serbian language at important Slavic departments across the world, journalist Marina Vulićević stresses that the presence of a language, especially a small one, at a foreign institution of higher education is the best way to promote not only the language but also the culture, for, in this way, writers are being translated and artists are invited to visit, all of which strengthens the cultural collaboration and makes way for new economic partnerships (Vulićević 2017). As the presence of Serbian at Anglophone universities is a prerequisite for further cultural exchange, this section will be somewhat longer than the other ones in its attempt to sketch the complexity of the investigated phenomenon.

7.4.1 The Availability of Slavic- and Serbian-Language Courses at Anglophone Universities

Hasak-Lowy notes that this language 'hardly gets much mention outside of its local habitat' (Hasak-Lowy 2005, 152). In the American context, the narrator describes it as thoroughly 'underappreciated':

> [I]t rarely surfaces even at gigantic state universities, places where enough people learn and teach, say, Flemish to push a few tables together at some popular bistro right off campus at the end of the semester in order to celebrate this Flemish thing they've built. (Hasak-Lowy 2005, 152)

To assess the validity of this statement, I will try to briefly outline the availability of Slavic- and, more specifically, Serbian-language degrees and courses at the institutions of higher education in three English-speaking countries, focusing first on the USA, where the story takes place, and, then, on Canada and the UK.

7.4.1.1 USA

The statistics reveals that, in the USA the total of thirty-nine universities offer a degree, or at least a course, in Slavic studies (University of Arizona Library 2017; American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages 2017; see Appendix B: Table 1). This constitutes less than 1% of all accredited tertiary institutions[82] in the USA. Content-wise, on offer are either language, literature, culture, or some combination of the three. Russian, the largest native language in Europe, can be studied separately at twenty-one university, while Slavic languages collectively with a concentration on a particular one are to be found at thirty-one institution (University of Arizona Library 2017). A degree in an individual Slavic literature other than Russian can only be found at Columbia, which regularly offers separate degrees in Polish, Ukranian, and Czech literature, and Yale, where Polish literature can be studied 'by special arrangement' (University of Arizona Library 2017). Finally, Russian domination is confirmed by the fact that six institutions offer degrees or courses only in Russian, without the possibility of choosing another Slavic language (University of Arizona Library 2017).

As for Bosnian, Serbian, and/or Croatian, commonly abbreviated as 'BSC' in the North American context, these are found – either as a major or minor – at the total of fifteen USA universities (see Appendix B: Table 1), which is less than half of all institutions where Slavic languages are taught. The following institutions offer a program or course in the Bosnian,

---

[82] According to National Center for Education Statistics's 'Digest of Education Statistics, 2015', in the academic year 2014/15, there were 4,627 accredited degree-granting postsecondary institutions in the U.S (National Center for Education Statistics 2015).

Serbian, and/or Croatian: Arizona State University, the University of California (Berkeley),[83] the University of Chicago, Harvard University, the University of Illinois (Chicago and Urbana-Champaign), Indiana University, the University of Kansas, the University of Michigan, the University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill), the Ohio State University, the University of Pittsburgh, Princeton University, the University of Texas (Austin), the University of Washington, the University of Wisconsin (Madison).

The size of the university is directly proportionate to the possibility of pursuing a degree in Slavic languages in the USA: the bigger the institution, the better the chances (see Appendix B: Table 1). Russian or Slavic departments are to be found at as many as twenty one 'extra large' USA universities that have more than 30,000 students enrolled. However, the mere fact that a Slavic department exists within a university does not guarantee the availability of courses or degrees in all Slavic languages. For example, Bosnian, Serbian, and/or Croatian appear only at half of those 'extra large' institutions that do teach Slavic languages. This figure somewhat confirms Hasak-Lowy assertion that the 'obscure' language central to his story is underrepresented even at 'gigantic state universities' (Hasak-Lowy 2005: 152). Outside these 'extra large' universities, Slavic languages collectively made it to a negligible number of ten 'large' (between 15,000 and 30,000 students), six 'medium' (between 5,000 and 15,000 students), and only two 'small' institutions (fewer than 5,000 students) in the USA. In addition to the aforementioned ten 'extra large' institutions, Bosnian, Serbian, and/or Croatian are on offer only at three 'large'- and two 'medium'-sized universities.

7.4.1.2 Canada

Across the northern border, in Canada,[84] the situation is as grim: Slavic studies are to be found only at three institutions (American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages 2017; see Appendix B: Table 2), which makes up only 1% of all universities and colleges.[85] Serbian, Croatian, and/or Bosnian are taught only at the University of Toronto, where these three are offered as separate languages. It might be important to mention the demographic aspect, insofar as the City of Toronto is the largest Serbian settlement in Canada, with almost twenty thousand citizens constituting the Serbian ethnic minority (Government of Canada/Gouvernement du Canada 2019). Nevertheless, the University of Toronto falls into the category of 'extra large' institutions, which means that the local demographic landscape is not necessarily the crucial component in the choice of foreign languages on offer.

7.4.1.3 UK

Across the ocean, the situation is somewhat better: in the UK, Russian and East European Languages are taught at as many as seventeen universities (Complete University Guide 2017; see Appendix B: Table 3), approximately 10% of all tertiary institutions in this country.[86] If we were to exclude Russian, however, the percentage would drop sharply. A full time degree in

---

[83] University systems, which constitute of multiple affiliated institutions, are counted as a single institution. In this way, the University of Illinois at Chicago and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, for example, are considered one rather than two institution. The particular institution of the system is indicated parenthetically.

[84] Note that Canada does not have an accreditation system. Instead, membership in the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) is considered to be a substitute.

[85] According to 'Canadian Universities', in Canada there are 223 universities and colleges that are members of the AUCC (University Study 2017).

[86] According to 'Check if a University or College is Officially Recognised', there are 169 officially recognised universities and colleges in the UK (UK Government 2019).

Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and/or Montenegrin – our presumed 'obscure' language(s) – can only be pursued at two institutions in the UK: University College London and the University of Nottingham.

7.4.2 Names of Serbo-Croatian's Successors at Anglophone Universities

How do all these universities deal with the problem of languages' names? Are the successors of Serbo-Croatian taught separately or under the same umbrella? Owing to a lack of continuity, these questions ought to be examined on a temporal axis. A tentative timeframe will be taken from the Croatian linguist Marko Samardžija, who, in writing about the Croatian language at foreign universities, distinguishes three periods, that is three 'Slavic paradigms':

I   The 'first Slavic paradigm', which lasted from the discipline's inception till the Second World War, was characterised by a strong interest in Paleoslavistics rather than in individual living Slavic languages (Samardžija 2008, 133);

II   The 'second' or the 'new Slavic paradigm', lasting from the end of the Second World War till the 1990s, was deeply rooted in Russistics, while the study of other Slavic languages was largely subsidiary (Samardžija 20008, 135). The residual effects of this paradigm are still visible at a large number of Anglophone institutions of higher education that favour Russian over other Slavic languages;

III   The 'third Slavic paradigm', which took over in the 1990s, has yet to be properly articulated; as a result of its poor definition, smaller Slavic languages get increasingly excluded from universities, even in countries with a well-established tradition of teaching Slavic languages (Samardžija 2008, 138).

This section will concentrate on the final phase, the beginning of which – in addition to the fall of the Iron Curtain – roughly coincides with the collapse of SFR Yugoslavia. Many foreign institutions where Serbo-Croatian was studied before the 1990s attempted a not-so-systematic reorganisation, undertaken with the aim of reflecting the emergence of new states and languages on the international scene. An overview of these regroupings, with the accent on current state of affairs, will be provided below. It should be mentioned, however, that certain factors other than political and linguistic fragmentation have made an impact upon these reconstructing efforts. The identification and discussion of these fall outside the scope of this chapter. Worthy of mentioning, however, is a diminishing interest in traditional philological studies, which are being replaced by cultural studies (Hawkesworth 2004, 280; Pasini 2008, 145).

7.4.2.1 USA

To investigate this issue on the territory of the USA, I have used the Modern Language Association's (MLA) *Language Enrollment Database, 1958–2016*, which provides comprehensive enrollment data for foreign languages taught in institutions of higher education in the entire USA from 1956 to 2016. The MLA stresses that names of languages are entered as delivered by institutions in each census (Modern Language Association 2019) and notes that 'language variants or different course names may produce enrollment listings that must be searched separately but might usefully be considered together' (Modern Language Association 2019). In case of Serbo-Croatian and its successors, we encounter as many as six different listings: Serbo-Croatian, Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian, Serbian/Croatian, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (see Appendix C, Table 1). Montenegrin does not come up in search results, neither individually nor in any language group.

Let us try to reconstruct a chronological overview. Expectedly, Serbo-Croatian is listed as the only language from 1974 (when first data for Serbo-Croatian is available) to 1990. In

1995, the first MLA census after the disintegration of SFR Yugoslavia, Croatian and Serbian appear individually for the first time in addition to the Serbo-Croatian, while Bosnian does not appear individually till 2006. Combinations encompassing more than one language, such as Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian and Serbian/Croatia appear in 2006 and 2009 respectively. Those combinations show a steady rising trend, while there is a precipitate decline in individual languages. In 2016, the last year for which the provided data is available at this point (January 2019), Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian separately have zero enrollments. On the other hand, the phrasings Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian and Serbian/Croatian both display rising trends from their first appearance. Interestingly, the glottonym Serbo-Croatian still exists, although it records a substantial fall from 2006 – when the first group name was introduced – henceforth. In 2016, the Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian wording achieved the greatest number of enrollments, the total of 159; the Serbian/Croatian came second with thirty-seven enrollments; and the Serbo-Croatian occupied the last place with just eighteen enrollments.

7.4.2.2 Canada

In Canada, the University of Toronto offers four separate undergraduate courses grouped under the heading of 'South Slavic' – Bosnian, Croatian, Macedonian, and Serbian.

7.4.2.3 UK

In the UK, however, both University College London and the University of Nottingham opt for the Serbian/Croatian phrasing.[87] Does the names' compatibility emerge as a result of a systematic grasp of the issue or it is sheer coincidence? According to Celia Hawkesworth, who spent most of her career as a lecturer in Serbo-Croatian, and subsequently Serbian and Croatian, at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies (SSEES) at University College London,[88] universities are given no legal guidance on the matter.[89]

> Government bodies, such as the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and the British Council, or government-funded institutions, such as BBC World Service, make decisions based on the political facts [. . .] But the universities are left to respond as they see fit. (Hawkesworth 2004, 273).

Is this freedom of choice more of a blessing or a curse? Writer Borislav Pekić, a Serbian émigré in London, found himself in a similar position in the 1980s. His synthesis of the issue, albeit formulated in the context of political turmoil rather than linguistic matters, is worth quoting here:

---

[87] For a detailed history of teaching Serbo-Croatian and its successors in the UK, see Celia Hawkesworth's article 'Serbo-Croatian and its successors in British Universities' in Ranko Bugarski and Celia Hawkesworth's edited volume *Language in the Former Yugoslav Lands* (Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 2004), especially pp. 273–277.

[88] More recently, Jelena Čalić, teaching fellow at the same institution, converted her teaching experience into a doctoral thesis entitled *The Politics of Teaching a Language Which is 'Simultaneously One and More than One': The Case of Serbo-Croatian* (2018). Her research into different institutionalisations of Serbo-Croatian successor languages in former Yugoslav countries and abroad suggests that – notwithstanding the overt changes in the curricula as well as in course and module naming – the Serbo-Croatian successor languages are still taught collectively (Čalić 2018).

[89] For the regulations of this issue in some non-Anglophone contexts – particularly those of France, Austria, and Scandinavia – see contributions in part V, entitled 'Serbo-Croatian (Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian) Abroad', of Ranko Bugarski and Celia Hawkesworth's volume *Language in the Former Yugoslav Lands* (2004).

Bad news from Yugoslavia again. The situation is unclear. It used to bother me that it was too clear. Now that it is unclear. The advantage is, however, in clear situations. They decide for me. Now I have to manage on my own. (Pekić [1983] 2009, 227)

The unclear situation in regard to the languages' new names forces lecturers to 'manage on their own'. This often means making decisions that are 'inevitably ideological', despite the efforts 'to adopt a neutral and scholarly course of action' (Hawkesworth 2004, 273).

7.4.3 Teaching Serbo-Croatian and Its Successors in Practice

Lecturers are clearly put in an unenviable position and staying neutral seems like an impossible task. So, official regulations (or lack thereof) aside, how do those teaching manage in practice? What does instructing Serbian/Croatian(/Bosnian) in one classroom actually look like?[90] A personal insight can be found in Celia Hawkesworth's article; hereby I quote a short excerpt:

> In our teaching practice, it is quite clear that we view the language, whatever its name, as one linguistic entity. Texts in all regional variants of the language are studied by all students. On the other hand, our practice has always been that individual students should select a particular version of the language and stick to that choice consistently in their own speech and writing. (Hawkesworth 2004, 277)

This kind of compromising solution is also adopted by the American professor of linguistics Wayles Browne, who teaches Slavic languages at Cornell University in the USA, an Ivy League institution where Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian is offered from time to time.

> [S]tudents should work on one standard – depending on the preferences of their teacher, or their textbook, or their friends, or their expected places of work – but they should also gain some experience in reading and understanding the other standards. (Browne 2004, 269).

Browne underlines a series of factors other than personal ones that play a decisive role in student's choice of a particular standard.

Although it may be hard, if not impossible, to generalise the competences and preferences of teaching staff, let us take a look at several possible scenarios. University College London, for example, has two lecturers – one for Croatian, funded by the Croatian government, and one for Serbian, employed by the College (Požgaj Hadži 2018, 477). Despite the presence of separate lecturers, the languages are taught together with a view to attracting a greater number of students (Požgaj Hadži 2018, 477). Yet not all institutions have optimum financial conditions to keep separate lecturers, so one person often has to cover all standards. Even though the official name of the course is, say, Serbian, in practice it does not necessarily mean that the study of Serbian will be guaranteed (Brborić 2015).[91] In the experience of Wayles Browne, who comes from the American context, '[t]eachers willing and able to teach a standard

---

[90] For a multifaceted theoretical analysis and practical overview of teaching Serbian as a foreign language, see, for example, Vesna Krajišnik's two edited volumes *Srpski kao strani jezik u teoriji i praksi: tematski zbornik radova* (Serbian as a Foreign Language in Theory and Practice: A Thematic Volume) 2 (2011) and 3 (2016); see also Vesna Krajišnik's paper 'Lektorati srpskog jezika' (Lectorates of the Serbian Language; 2014).

[91] For a more thorough analysis of the discussed issue by Veljko Ž. Brborić, see his essay 'Budućnost lektorata srpskog jezika sa osvrtom na prošlost i sadašnjost' (Future of the Serbian Language Lectorates with a Look at Past and Present; 2018).

other than their own were a rarity' (Browne 2004, 265). In this way, one standard can easily become more prominent than the others.

The main reason behind this asymmetry is, expectedly, of financial nature. In short, the funding of foreign-language lecturers is not always the responsibility of the institution where they teach, as there is also a portion of those whose funding is split between the foreign institution and their home country. Part of the problem lies in that the model of study sections, employed both by Serbia and by Croatia, is such that the study sections are currently under the jurisdiction of a relevant Ministry (Vulićević 2017; Požgaj Hadži 2018, 482).[92] As ministries are only administrative bodies (Požgaj Hadži 2018, 482), the status of study sections is underregulated. For this reason, both Serbian and Croatian philologists strongly advocate a systematic reorganisation, which would involve the establishment of a separate body, an umbrella organisation, in their respective countries, which would promote their languages abroad and oversee the related activities (Dragićević 2017; Požgaj Hadži 2018, 482). Interestingly, both Serbian and Croatian experts claim that their countries should look up to the Slovenian[93] model of study sections (Dragićević 2017; Požgaj Hadži 2018, 482), which has been successfully developed and implemented worldwide.

7.4.4 Outcomes of Linguistic Training

Hasak-Lowy exposes the fact that studying a new language at a USA institution is no guarantee that one would actually master it: when hired for a job, Ben opts for alternative methods of, as the author puts it, '(re-?)learning' the language (Hasak-Lowy 2005, 155). The story documents the protagonist's various attempts to improve his linguistic skills, which include memorising words from the dictionary and rehearsing conversations from a film with an English subtitle (Hasak-Lowy 2005, 155–56). Real-life underpinnings for Hasak-Lowy's fictional assertion can be found in Eric Dickens' essay 'Literary Translation in Britain and Selective Xenophobia' (2002). Although based on the example of the UK, Dickens also expresses his concerns in regard to the actual competence of those who study foreign languages at British institutions of higher education.

> It is quite true that languages tend to be taught rather half-heartedly in many British schools [. . .]. Not until university can young people encounter smaller, rarer, languages and only the tiniest of fraction of young people in Great Britain learn these to any degree of competence. (Dickens 2002, 4)

While this too is an important aspect contributing to the total number of lecturers and translators from non-dominant languages, its investigation certainly requires a whole separate study.

---

[92] In Croatia, the Ministry of science and education (Ministarstvo znanosti i obrazovanja) is in charge for study sections (Požgaj Hadži 2018, 473). In Serbia, the responsibility in previous years has been somewhat split between the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technological Development (Ministarstvo prosvete, nauke i tehnološkog razvoja), on the one hand, and the Ministry of Culture and Information (Ministarstvo kulture i informisanja), on the other (Vulićević 2017); it has been announced that the forthcoming reform of the Law on Higher Education will allow for a better regulation of the status of Serbian lectors abroad (for the text of the bill, see *Predlog zakona o izmenama i dopunama zakona o visokom obrazovanju* [Draft on the Higher Education Amendment Bill], available for download at: www.parlament.gov.rs/upload/archive/files/lat/doc/.../2889-18%20-%20Lat..doc).

[93] For more on the Slovenian model of study sections, see the Centre for Slovene as a Second and Foreign Language's webpage, available at: https://centerslo.si/en.

7.4.5 Serbian Language at Anglophone Institutions of Higher Education – Summary

The evidence presented in this section confirms the three sub-hypotheses formulated in regard to the status of the Serbian language at Anglophone institutions of higher education. First of all, the statistics on the availability of Serbian-language courses at universities of three Anglophone countries confirms the pertinence of Hasak-Lowy's multifaceted criticism of academia as well as the sub-hypothesis that the availability of Serbian-language courses at Anglophone universities is limited. Secondly, the investigation of the institutional reorganisations of South Slavic programs and courses during the 'third Slavic paradigm' confirms that in Anglophone contexts, Serbian is often taught in combination with Croatian and Bosnian. Thirdly, the accounts of teaching Serbian, Croatian, and/or Bosnian in practice point towards the conclusion that teaching the three standards cannot be evenly distributed when they are taught under a single heading, even when there is willingness for such feat. This confirms the part of the sub-hypothesis that teaching Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian collectively lowers the visibility of all three standards. Overall, the analysis presented in this section gives us reasons to believe that limited accessibility of formal training and its uncertain outcome in terms of linguistic proficiency are some of the key reasons for the shortage of Slavic-language teachers and translators in the Anglophone countries under study. In case of the Serbian language, its often unclear status in relation to other Serbo-Croatian successors further complicates the matter, making it even less visible in an already marginalised setting occupied by relatively small languages.

7.5 The Commercial Component of Literary Markets

Even the most conflicting articulations of world literature, as are those formulated by David Damrosch and Emily Apter, agree that translation lies at the heart of this much-disputed concept. On the one hand, Damrosch, a keen advocate of the idea, maintains that world literature 'encompass[es] all literary works that circulate beyond their culture of origin, either in translation or in their original language' (Damrosch 2003, 4). This understanding puts a translated text on par with one in the original language. The presumed equivalence between the two indicates that translation is indispensable in mediating texts through different cultures. On the other hand, Apter, as of late a bold opponent of World Literature, seeks to refute the concept on the grounds of untranslability, the phenomenon that is, along with incommensurability, crucial to her argumentation 'against world literature' (Apter 2013, 3). Regardless whether one believes in the long-term viability of world literature, it appears that the very concept is largely contingent upon translation. The availability and accessibility of translation becomes particularly vital when it comes to the transmission of literatures written in languages that are globally lesser known outside their native communities (Zabic and Kamenish 2006, 2).

Most theoretical discussions of translation, however, take a blind eye on the prevalence of dubious practices, low quality of produced translations, and the overall worrying state of the profession. 'The Task of This Translator', and especially its contextualised depiction of an interpreter at work, powerfully captures the grim reality of today's translation and interpreting practices. Hasak-Lowy moves away from Walter Benjamin's idealised notion of the translator

as formulated in the landmark essay 'Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers'[94] ('The Translator's Task', also translated into English as 'The Task of the Translator'), underlining an aspect that Benjamin dismisses altogether in his seminal essay – the commercial side of the profession. For Benjamin, translation belongs to the domain of art, and '[w]hen seeking insight into a work of art or an art form, it never proves useful to take audience into account' (Benjamin [1923] 2012, 75). These days, unfortunately, more often than not, translations are not only done for a particular audience, but for a specific client. This client, as we can see from Hasak-Lowy's story, is not necessarily someone competent to make relevant linguistic, aesthetic, or other judgements in regard to the quality of translation. But Ben's interpreting, even though it does not live up to the standards prescribed by the academic or professional community, satisfies the client, who declares in the end:

– When I return in five years, I want you to be my blah again.
– Your what?
– My translator.
– Oh. Of course. (Hasak-Lowy 2005, 177)

This points towards the conclusion that no translation is 'good' or 'bad' *per se*; the provisional success of a translation is a matter of expectations. In assessing a translation as 'bad', as we are all-too-often tempted to do, we are in fact aligning with a certain set of conventions.

> In doing so we are emphatically upholding and reaffirming our idea of 'translation', what it is and what it evidently is not, *and* at the same time we are appealing to a publicly recognized and acknowledged category, both a concept and practice, to which *this* translation should be made to correspond if it is to be accepted as a valid translation. (Hermans 1997, 5; emphasis in the original)

It is exactly this 'institution' of translation, as Theo Hermans terms it (Hermans 1997, 5), that Hasak-Lowy ridicules in his story by portraying a series of non-conventional practices, which depart from the idea of translation encountered in scholarly circles – the idea built on the premises of Benjamin, one of the founding fathers of 'the institution of translation'.

How does this rise of commercialism reflect on literary markets? Let us take a closer look at the commercial side of publishing and translational practices in Serbia, the country where, in all likelihood, an – if not *the* – 'obscure' language is spoken. Naturally, translators working from Serbian into English and vice versa are much easier to find in Serbia than it is the case in the fictional America of Hasak-Lowy. A concern of the literary translator Zoran Paunović, however, is that translations produced in Serbia are of variable quality – presumably by academic and professional standards. In an interview with Marina Vulićević for the *Politika*, he expresses the following view:

> A large number of publishers sees translation merely as a routine step in a series of steps necessary for the production of a book. Therefore, publishers prefer to hire translators

---

[94] Numerous hints, including the story's title ('The Task of This Translator' vs. 'The Task of the Translator') and the protagonist's name (Ben, which is short for Benjamin), indicate that Hasak-Lowy fictional piece is a creative response to Walter Benjamin's cornerstone text – the one foundational to the discipline of translation studies. For more on the relationship between Hasak-Lowy's short story and Walter Benjamin's essay, see Fotini Apostolou's chapter 'Walter Benjamin revisited: A literary reading in Todd Hasak-Lowy's short story "The Task of This Translator"' in *Transfiction: Research into the realities of translation fiction* (2014), edited by Klaus Kaindl and Karlheinz Spitzl.

who work quickly and for a minimum wage rather than those who care about the quality of translation. (Paunović 2009)

In the same text, Paunović adds that it is the Association of Literary Translators of Serbia (Udruženje književnih prevodilaca Srbije) that should lead the way in establishing the system of quality checks (Paunović 2009). According to Dickens, the situation is not much better in the UK either: he asserts that literary translation in the UK has become 'a marginalised field where dilettantes hold sway' (Dickens 2002, 8) and calls for literary translators to 'be treated as professionals and paid at a decent rate' (Dickens 2002, 8). Based on Paunović's and Dickens' statements, we may arrive at the conclusion that the disinterest in a standardised level of quality and the overall devaluation of expertise is more of a global trend than a country-specific occurrence.

Another important aspect to be taken into consideration when discussing the commercial component is the dynamicity of respective national markets. In rough terms, the production of literary translations from Serbian into English is split between the Anglophone countries and Serbia. Data available on the Index Translationum, UNESCO's database dedicated to books in translation, shows that, in case of Serbian literature in English translation, the publishing output is not evenly divided between the 'source' and 'target' cultures. To avoid inconsistencies that may arise as a result of changes in the state's and language's name, I have decided to delimit my search to the period between 2006 and 2018, which was characterised by stability – both in terms of state and language names. During this twelve-year period, the total of eleven book-length literary translations from Serbian into English came out in the 'core' Anglosphere: four in the USA, four in Canada, three in the UK, and none in Ireland, Australia, and New Zealand. Over the same time span, the number of those published by Serbian presses is 115, which is approximately ten times more in comparison to their Anglophone counterparts (see Appendix D, Table 1). Considering the modest size of the Serbian book market, this asymmetry speaks in favour of the Anglophone market's highly competitive nature.

If we disregard the possible oscillations in quality that Paunović mentions (Paunović 2009), a major problem with translations produced in Serbia is that they are predominantly aimed at the domestic market, as publishers generate more profit by distributing translations from English into Serbian than the other way round. For instance, the Index Translationum's statistics reveals that the number of literary translations from English into Serbian from 2006 to 2018 is 2945 (UNESCO 2019, see Appendix D, Table 2), which is as many as twenty-five times the number of translations in the opposite direction. Even when a publishing house does take the financial risk of translating Serbian literature into English, the work rarely travels outside the Serbian market, thereby failing, in Damrosch's phrase, to 'circulate beyond its culture of origin' (Damrosch 2003, 4).

To sum up, Paunović's and Dicken's impressions of how literary translations are commissioned in their countries indicate that economic interests subordinate other factors. In addition, the competitive nature of the Anglophone book markets further contributes to the low circulation of Serbian literature in translation. For, even when an English translation of Serbian work does exist and has been printed in Serbia, Anglophone publishing houses are not interested in distributing it in their territory. These two aspects, discussed in this section, largely confirm the sub-hypothesis put forward in this chapter's introduction, that literary markets are largely governed by commercial interests. The inability of translations produced in Serbia to be distributed in the Anglosphere brings us to a much broader issue – that of a generally dwindling popularity of translated literature in Anglophone countries, both among readers and among publishers.

7.6 Insufficient Anglophone Interest in Translated Literature

Before accepting the job of an interpreter, Ben's engagement with other cultures was limited to International Sushi Night, 'which falls on any and all odd-dated Tuesdays' (Hasak-Lowy 2005, 155). It is through the interaction with – and in – the 'obscure' language that the protagonist discovers a whole new world existing outside his immediate sphere of interest. The satiric tone of the story, which stresses Ben's initial ignorance about cultures other than his own, is directed at an average representative of the American culture (Apostolou 2014, 76). In addition, Hasak-Lowy plays with power relations in that his purposeful role reversal privileges the 'obscure', as we find traditionally advantaged native speakers of English struggling not only linguistically but also culturally.

Given that the awareness of other cultures can be raised through reading foreign literature, to blame for Ben's ignorance would be the low translation rates in English-speaking countries. According to Margo Fitzpatrick, '[i]n America and the United Kingdom, translations only constitute 3 percent of publications, with fiction accounting for less than 1 percent of that figure' (Fitzpatrick 2016). The Three Percent translation database, created by Chad W. Post at the University of Rochester, was launched with a view to reassessing the accuracy of this often quoted figure that lacks sufficient empirical backing (Post 2019). Post's database collects information on translated literature published in the USA from 2008 onwards. While the Three Percent translation database is invaluable material for research, it is restricted to works previously unpublished in English, thereby excluding retranslations of the classics and reprints of old editions. In spite of having information on translated works, we are still in the dark in terms of the total number of books published on the USA market, which disables us from calculating the exact percentage that translated literature constitutes in the USA.

A more detailed account of circulation is given in Alexandra Büchler and Giulia Trentacosti's statistical report that concentrates on the UK and Ireland. The report's findings suggest that 'the percentage of literature-related translations [. . .] over the twelve-year period [2000 – 2012] is [. . .] consistently above 4%, peaking at 5.23% in 2011' (Büchler and Trentacosti [2013] 2015, 5), which is significantly lower in comparison to other European markets of a similar size. For instance, in 2011 Germany's total yearly output of translations, both literary and non-literary, was approximately 12%; France's 16%; Italy's 20%; and Poland's 33% (Büchler and Trentacosti [2013] 2015, 5). Furthermore, the report, which emphasises that Eastern European languages are notably underrepresented (Büchler and Trentacosti [2013] 2015, 5), dedicates a whole chapter to a case study of translations from the 'Balkan languages',[95] a collective name here used for Serbo-Croatian, Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin (Büchler and Trentacosti [2013] 2015, 20). Although national literatures written in the Balkan languages are in a particularly precarious position, the figures reveal that the overall situation is as daunting.

Despite the discrepancies in the statistics presented in this section, the percentage of translated literature is exceptionally low in comparison to other markets, which confirms the sub-hypothesis formulated in this chapter's introduction that the general interest in translated literature is rather low in the Anglosphere. Before proceeding with conclusions, let us briefly consider some actors that have undertaken the quixotic task of promoting literature in translation, undiscouraged by its grim prospects. In the opinion of the literary translator Maureen Freely, for the presence of translated literature in the UK, however marginal it may be, we ought to thank 'the dozen or so publishers which remain committed to fiction in translation even as the walls of fortress English grow and grow' (Freely 2010). In case of literature coming from the Balkans, Büchler and Trentacosti's report commends efforts of

---

[95] It should be noted that Balkan languages are not limited to Serbo-Croatian and its successors. Traditionally they encompass Albanian, Modern Greek, Balkan Romance, and Balkan Slavic.

Istros Books in particular, an independent UK-based press which 'has brought a change to the publishing scene by highlighting a region that had until recently been *terra incognita*' (Büchler and Trentacosti [2013] 2015, 24). Hopes remain that more publishing houses would dare to follow in Istros Books footsteps, as the task of acquainting a worldwide readership with Serbian literature has yet to be fulfilled.

In addition to these adventurous publishers, Freely singles out three UK institutions dedicated to preserving 'the art of literary translation': the British Centre for Literary Translation at the University of East Anglia, the Translators Association, and the *Independent* Foreign Fiction Prize (Freely 2010). Hugely important too has been the Oxford-Weidenfeld Prize,[96] set up in 1999 to honour the best book-length literary translation from any modern European language into English. Since the publication of Freely's text in 2010, more prizes similar to *Independent*'s one have emerged, such as the Warwick's Prize for Women in Translation,[97] set up by Freely and her colleagues at the University of Warwick, and the TA First Translation Prize, set up by the literary translator Daniel Hahn, who generously 'donat[ed] half his winnings from the International Dublin Literary Award to help establish a new prize for debut literary translation' (Cowdrey 2017). Similarly to Freely, Dickens lists possible solutions that could remedy the current situation, despite his pessimistic view of the current state of the UK publishing industry put forward in the opening paragraphs. Namely, he claims that this tendency of monolingualism can carry on unchanged as 'Britain does not appear to need things that happen in foreign languages, politically, economically, or culturally' (Dickens 2002, 2). Nevertheless, towards the end of the article he places emphasis on the importance of more frequent publication of literary translations in periodicals, the need for more reviews of foreign literature in weeklies, and a better informed selection of works to translate (Dickens 2002, 9). It remains to be seen how (if at all) those in charge will respond to any of these calls.

7.7 Chapter Conclusions

'The Task of This Translator', the short story against which the status of Serbian literature has been analysed in this chapter, comes across as an ominous image of a future society, too self-obsessed to take notice of other cultures and blind to realise that maintaining transnational cultural ties is to their own benefit. The Anglosphere's higher education displays a systematic exclusion of less popular languages, the obstacle stemming from the fact that the choice of available languages is contingent on the demand, which is why only large universities can afford to continuously offer less sought-after languages. A lack of interest, then, causes a shortage of language teachers and professional translators. In addition, the literary markets of the USA and the UK are highly competitive and publishing works of Serbian literature in an English translation is exceedingly difficult in these countries, especially in light of their dwindling public interest for literature in translation.

Yet this chapter's findings signal that the blame should be on both sides. Nations where smaller languages are spoken need to approach the problem more seriously and formulate viable long-term strategies for the promotion of their languages and cultures abroad. This is

---

[96] Interestingly, the 2019 winner of the Oxford-Weidenfeld Prize is Celia Hawkesworth, commended for her translation of Ivo Andrić's *Omer Pasha Latas*, published by New York Review Books. For more on the Oxford-Weidenfeld Prize and its previous winners, see the following link: https://www.queens.ox.ac.uk/oxford-weidenfeld-prize.

[97] For more on the University of Warwick's Prize for Women in Translation, see, for example, Višnja Krstić's interview with the Prize's coordinator Chantal Wright, available in English at: http://www.knjizenstvo.rs/en/journals/2018/interview/women-in-translation-prize. For the Serbian version, see: http://www.knjizenstvo.rs/sr/casopisi/2018/intervju/nagrada-za-zene-u-prevodu-univerziteta-vorik.

especially true for languages the status of which has become internationally ill-defined as a consequence of linguistic fragmentation. Serbian authorities, then, should ensure their dominant language is studied properly in departments where it is offered in combination with other South Slavic standards. From the publishing angle, more should be done on increasing the visibility of Serbian literature abroad. Translations produced in Serbia, although much greater in number than those in the Anglosphere, are rarely distributed outside the domestic confines.

The combination of these elements thereby constitutes a vicious circle that hinders the circulation of Serbian literature in the Anglophone transnational field. Although linguistic discontinuity is not the sole factor that affects the circulation of literature, we could say that this chapter confirms the hypothesis that linguistic discontinuity *does* hinder the flow of literary circulation in an international framework. Rather than shifting the blame onto each other, we should jointly work towards understanding what enables and disables the processes of cultural and literary mediation. The obstacles outlined in this paper, which only one part of a complex network, stem from a number of different sources: multifaceted institutional constraints, commercial character of the publishing industry, and general public disinterest. All of these appear to be promising research avenues and more studies, venturing deeper into each of the three spheres, are necessary to confirm and solidify the findings presented in this chapter. Hopes remain that institutions on both sides will work towards protecting the processes of transnational cultural cross-contamination, for, if the discouraging trend persists, the already slow rate of circulation could be further impeded and the existing connections even permanently severed.

IV
Conclusions

8   Thesis Conclusions

Summary, Findings, Contribution; Future Directions

The affair at Babel confirmed and externalized
the never-ending task of the translator –
it did not initiate it.

George Steiner, *After Babel*

8.1 Intra- and Interlingual Translation: A Summary

Proposed in 1959, Jakobson's classification of translational relations – which distinguishes *intra-*, *interlingual*, and *intersemiotic translation* – considerably precedes the institutionalisation of translation studies as a discipline. At the time, translational phenomena were studied under the protectorate of different related fields, such as linguistics or comparative literature. With the eventual establishment of translation studies in academic circles, Jakobson's essay 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation', where the typology was originally put forward, emerged as one of the newly founded discipline's core texts. Such overt recognition put the categorisation under rigorous scrutiny. Over the decades, a number of scholars have revised *intra-* and *interlingual translation*'s basic premises: Jacques Derrida (1985) and Gideon Toury (1986) in the 1980s; John Sturrock (1991), Anthony Pym ([1992] 2010) and Theo Hermans (1997) in the 1990s; Omar Calabrese (2000) and Umberto Eco (2003) in the 2000s; Özlem Berk Albachten (2014), Kathleen Davis (2014), and Henrik Gottlieb (2018) in the 2010s. Jakobson's division has been examined from multiple perspectives – semiotic, cultural, sociological, historical, philosophical. On the whole, the criticism has been directed at the following aspects: the typology's relationship with interpretation; its scope; its treatment of polysemiotic mediums; its neglect of linguistic borders' tentativeness; its assuming minimal unit of translation; its embeddedness in the monolingual paradigm. Whatever the theorists' concerns, Jakobson's classification has not only proven to have an enduring impact but represents a historic breakthrough in expanding the concept of translation.

As outlined in the background chapters, two alternative classifications have derived from Jakobson's tripartition – by Toury (1986) and by Gottlieb (2018). Toury's refined categorisation poses an important departure in providing a balance: it is concise and less biased towards the linguistic. Jakobson's notions of *intra-* and *interlingual translation*, which cease to operate as categories in Toury's systematisation, remain highly relevant, insofar as the majority of discussions on translation still largely focuses on the verbal content. It is a pity that Toury's refinement attempt has not been embraced to a greater extent. As for Gottlieb's typology, it is too early to assess its prospective currency. On a speculative note, chances are that Gottlieb's classification could hardly rival the ubiquity of Jakobson's in general discussions precisely by virtue of multidimensionality, which – although its greatest strength – makes the systematisation all too elaborate for general purposes; nevertheless, it could be suitable for more specialised discussions.

8.2 Research Findings

Inspired by the so-called Balkan Babel, that is the case of Serbo-Croatian's administrative substitution with a greater number of individual languages, this dissertation has argued that

intra- and *interlingual translation* are not stable relations, further asserting that they are parasitic primarily on the definition of language. Jakobson's notions of *intra-* and *interlingual translation* have been investigated through a twofold prism – of *linguistic fluidity* and *literary circulation*. On the one hand, *linguistic fluidity* has served as a basis for the exploration of the *causes* in the concepts' instability. The term has been used to collectively denote a series of manifestations where linguistic borders are challenged – be it on a macro level, when the whole language undergoes a change, or a micro level, when the boundaries are shifted in a multilingual text. On the other hand, *literary circulation* has been chosen as a means of measuring the *effects* of these inconsistencies, particularly in cultural terms. The body of this dissertation has embraced an asymmetrical format. Structured around the proposal that the translational relations' instability can be found in at least three different contexts – temporal, spatial, textual – each chapter studying the instability's causes, that is three of them altogether, has focused on one of these dimensions. The effects of linguistic fluidity upon literary structures have been studied in a single chapter.

All five hypotheses that the dissertation has tested have proven completely true, thereby underpinning the thesis' main argument – that *intra-* and *interlingual translation* are not stable relations. Four hypotheses have been considered with respect to the causes of translational relations' instability; as many as three of those, discussed in chapters 4 and 5, have delved into the causes of linguistic fluidity:

– Determining what is translated *inside* and what *outside* the language is contingent on the way speech varieties or lects – such as standard languages, creole languages, pidgin languages, regional dialects, sociolects, and registers – are delimited.
– A lack of mutual intelligibility between separate lects is not the necessary condition for language separation.
– Social and political factors play a role in the delimitation of languages.

In addition, one hypothesis, tested across three chapters – 4, 5, and 6 – was formulated apropos of the translational relations' establishment:

– Translational relations are not pre-given but *contextually* determined in each individual case.

In that, Chapter 4 has examined the *temporal*, Chapter 5 the *spatial*, and Chapter 6 the *textual* context. Lastly, only one hypothesis, tested in Chapter 7, has focused on the instability's effects:

– Linguistic discontinuity hinders literary circulation.

The paragraphs below will explain what proves the aforementioned hypotheses true and present the overall conclusions of this project.

Deriving from Jakobson's disregard for translational relations' multidimensionality, Chapter 4 has used the South Slavic folk ballad *Hasanaginica* to interrogate the temporal dimension of *intra-* and *interlingual translation*. The ballad belongs to the Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian cultural heritage and, in the aftermath of Serbo-Croatian ramification, it has become a source of various ambiguities that impede the identification of its language. Having been transformed from orature to literature, *Hasanaginica* is characterised not only by the existence of multiple variants, such as Fortis' text and the Split Manuscript, but also by multiple reductions of these variants, such as Stefanović Karadžić's two reductions of Fortis' text. The authoritative variant is in the Eastern Herzegovinian dialect, transitionary between the western and eastern Serbo-Croatian lects, the features of which have been incorporated into all three modern standards – Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian.

The unstated premise of Jakobson's concepts is that in order to establish what is translated inside and what outside the language, one needs to be able to specify the so-called 'source' and the 'target' language. The chapter's diachronic perspective has revealed that the problem of this premise lies in one's inability to always clearly determine what counts as a language, especially in the pre-standardisation era. What is more, the chapter has shown that the language's evolutionary tendencies often blur its temporal borders. The invention of writing systems, however, has allowed literature to transcend its original historical context and travel through time. *Hasanaginica*'s departure from the original context, along with its language's historical changes in unity and identity, has created an acute asymmetry that prevents us from naming the language of the ballad and, consequently, determining its translational relations. All of these things confirm the hypothesis that *intra-* and *interlingual translation* depend on the way speech varieties or lects are delimited.

Chapter 4's analysis gives legitimacy to the previous assumptions that *intra-* and *interlingual translation* were conceived on the premise of synchrony. In a diachronic perspective, they are suitable for those cases where linguistic unity has remained unchanged, yet their usefulness becomes limited in cases of linguistic discontinuity – as exemplified by Serbo-Croatian lects. During the various phases of the Serbo-Croatian lects' standardisation, the mutual intelligibility between their different varieties has remained almost entirely unaffected – proving the hypothesis that mutual intelligibility does not affect linguistic borders.

The chronological overview of Serbo-Croatian lects, provided in Chapter 4, has catalogued their dynamic social regulation from the earliest codification attempts. Over the decades, they have been brought together and separated as a result of social actions. This confirms the hypothesis that the social criterion does play a role in the delimitation of languages and, by extension, the constitution of translational relations. This further implies that, where standard varieties are involved, translational relations cannot be identified merely on the grounds of the linguistic criterion; rather, translational relations become contingent upon social and political factors too, more specifically on the lects' diachronic codification.

While Chapter 4 has demonstrated the ways in which translational relations behave on the temporal axis, Chapter 5 has explored translational relations' conduct in the spatial dimension. The inspiration for this chapter stems from the *afterlife* of Sremac's novel *Zona Zamfirova*, composed primarily in the Prizren-Timok dialect of the Serbian language. Šotra's ecranisation of *Zona Zamfirova* from 2002 was sensitive to the dialect's authenticities. In its distribution across former Yugoslav countries, the film was subtitled into some of the Serbo-Croatian successor languages. Exposed thereby was the Serbian speakers' impaired intelligibility of their language's Prizren-Timok dialect, which stood in stark contrast to the decent comprehension of the subtitle in the officially separate language of Croatia. Across social media, Serbian speakers insisted the Croatian subtitle had facilitated their understanding of the film.

Stimulated by *Zona Zamfirova*'s case, Chapter 5 has delved into the presumed distance between the Serbian standard variety and the Prizren-Timok dialect, on the one hand, and the presumed proximity between Serbian and Croatian modern standards, on the other. The diachronic research suggests that the development of the Prizren-Timok historically diverges from those of other Serbian – and likewise Croatian – lects of the Štokavian basis and corresponds to the progression of the Balkan Sprachbund. In the meantime, while the Prizren-Timok was distancing, Croatian and Serbian were getting closer together through a series of joint codifications, which culminated in the Serbo-Croatian phase. Chapter 5's empirical research – carried out on the sample of average speakers of standard Serbian, educated in the aftermath of the Serbo-Croatian ramification – has proven on a synchronic sample that standard Croatian is much easier to understand than the Prizren-Timok dialect. The confirmation comes from a double source: from the self-assessment and test results. Consequently, the empirical part of research confirms the hypothesised statement – that a lack

of mutual intelligibility between separate lects is not the necessary condition for language separation.

Although Jakobson did take the fragmentary nature of language into consideration when conceiving the notions of *intra-* and *interlingual translation* – for *intralingual translation* posits the existence of multiple lects within a single linguistic structure – he underestimated the issue of determining borders between lects. To this effect, Chapter 5 concludes that a clear distinction between different levels of linguistic organisation is the prerequisite in establishing intra- and interlingual relations. Chapter 5's synchronic orientation has demonstrated that translational relations suffer from instability on the synchronic as much as on the diachronic front, the problems of which were diagnosed in Chapter 4. The synchronic issues stem from the blurred boundaries between and within natural languages, which confirms the hypothesis that translational relations depend on the internal and external delimitation of languages.

The results of Chapter 5 are in alignment with those of Chapter 4, as both indicate that mutual intelligibility, or lack thereof, is not the necessary criterion for the separation of languages. The case where a speaker of one language has troubles comprehending a dialect of their own language, on the one hand, but understands an interlingual translation into an officially distinct language, on the other, proves that the linguistic criterion, measured by intelligibility, is not the decisive factor in the establishment of linguistic borders. As hypothesised, superior is the social component, which has traditionally played an essential role in codifying Serbo-Croatian lects – be it jointly or separately.

Chapters 4 and 5 confirm the hypothesis that translational relations are not pre-given but contextually determined. The contextual framework, attentive to the temporal and spatial dimension, becomes vital in postulating linguistic borders and, by extension, translational relations. Linguistic borders, however, can be upset on a much smaller scale – that of a text. The dissertation has concentrated on the pertinence of a textual context through Chapter 6's examination of translational relations' behaviour in a multilingual environment.

With a view to opposing the dominance of a monolingual paradigm across literary studies, Chapter 6 has focused on Albahari's short story 'Learning Cyrillic', which spotlights the Serbian community in Canada. 'Learning Cyrillic' exemplifies a linguistically hybrid text, in that the generally Serbian writing is interspersed with concrete traces of the Native American Blackfoot language, whereas the English, although physically absent, dwells in the story with the help of fictional multilingualism. Elias-Bursać's graphically and linguistically aware translation of 'Learning Cyrillic' into English not only preserves the Blackfoot phrases found in the original, but leaves a couple of short sentences in the source language of Serbian, as an illustration of the Cyrillic content. Her translation is attentive not only to the function of multilingual insertions but to the aesthetic capacity of Serbian dual orthography that simultaneously utilises both the Cyrillic and Latin script.

The discussion of Albahari's 'Learning Cyrillic' and Elias-Bursać's translation points towards the complex relationship between multilingualism and translation. The identification of translational relations depends on the ability to determine the so-called 'source' and 'target' language(s), which becomes a challenging task in a multilingual text. Since the language ratio can vary greatly from text to text, Chapter 6 proposes the introduction of a scalable minimal unit of translation when dealing with multilingual content. In this way, the unit could be tailored to fit each project's specific needs, which would mitigate the problems of multilingual literature's destabilised translational relations to an extent. Finally, as the 'source' and 'target' language(s) have to be pinpointed locally in a multilingual environment, translational relations depend on the establishment of a contextual framework. Chapters 4 and 5 have upheld the pertinence of a contextual framework with reference to temporal and spatial dimensions; Chapter 6's analysis of the textual context has added the last piece to the puzzle by reconfirming the already double tested hypothesis that translational relations are not pre-given but contextually determined in each individual case.

From the three-chapter-long discussion of the *causes* concerning translational relations' instability, the thesis has moved onto the analysis of its *effects*. To demonstrate the ways in which the Balkan Babel scenario can impact the cultural sphere, Chapter 7 has concentrated on the international circulation of literature. Hasak-Lowy's short story 'The Task of This Translator' has served as a starting point in the investigation of the Serbian literature's status in the Anglosphere. Even though linguistic discontinuity is not the sole factor that affects the circulation of Serbian literature in the transnational field of Anglophone countries, Chapter 7 confirms the hypothesis that linguistic discontinuity *does* hinder the flow of literary circulation in an international framework. Chapter 7 outlines only a tiny portion of the overall problem but, in general terms, the issues emanate primarily from the following sources – multifaceted institutional constraints, commercial character of the publishing industry, and wider public disinterest. After identifying the consequences that linguistic discontinuity has upon literary circulation of Serbian literature in the Anglosphere, the thesis has attempted to propose systematic measures that could remove the existing impediments. The guardians of marginalised languages ought to formulate viable long-term strategies for the promotion of their languages and cultures abroad. This is particularly true for the languages the status of which has become ill-defined in international circles as a consequence of linguistic fragmentation. To avoid confusion, it should be ensured that Serbo-Croatian successors are studied properly in departments where all standards are grouped together. From the publishing angle, more should be done on enhancing the visibility of Serbian literature, for the translations produced in Serbia – albeit more numerous than those in the Anglosphere – rarely circulate outside the domestic confines.

8.3 Scientific Contribution

In strict terms, the value of this dissertation lies in a thorough and systematic reassessment of the notions of *intra-* and *interlingual translation*. The main goal – that is the detection of causes and effects of translational relations' instability – has been fulfilled adequately. Unlike previous scholarship on the topic, which has been almost exclusively theoretical, this project has supplemented the theoretical refinement with ample empirical evidence. Furthermore, this research's methodological pluralism has produced balanced results that are free of methodological bias. The employment of multiple methodologies has enabled the investigation not only of *intra-* and *interlingual translation*'s diverse aspects but an exploration of the same aspect through different lenses.

In conceptual terms, this dissertation has also been valuable in pointing towards the tentative nature of the term 'language'. While keen to stress the importance of delimiting language as a whole and related linguistic structures for scientific purposes, the project acknowledged the impossibility of clearly distinguishing real-world boundaries between and within natural languages. The durability and firmness of linguistic borders was examined both in the temporal and spatial dimension, which has proven their evolutionary rather than stationary tendencies. Linguistic borders' exploration in a textual context has revealed the aesthetic potential of their creative alterations.

The role of the social component in the making of a language has been another area to which this project has been eager to contribute. A careful overview of the ways in which Serbo-Croatian lects have been regulated by the respective state bodies has exposed the social background of changes altering linguistic unity and identity. In this context, the utility and practicality of separating 'natural' and 'political' languages has been questioned, concluding that – in a translational perspective – such duality only deepens the confusion and produces further ambiguities rather than eliminating them.

Previously, the effects of linguistic and translational instabilities have only been hinted at and speculated about. For, the academics working on the topic have been primarily

concerned with the causes. This dissertation, however, has cast a light onto the changes' effects. Seeing that the outlined problem carries a series of implications – of linguistic, translational, cultural, and sociological kind – this project has limited its scope to the cultural stakes, revealing the extreme vulnerability of literary structures in the aftermath of linguistic branching.

In broader terms, this thesis has been committed to counterbalancing the prevalence of the interlingual in translation-related discussions. On the one hand, the disproportion between *intra-* and *interlingual translation* has been signalled throughout the study of their troublesome relationship; on the other, the individual pertinence of *intralingual translation*, especially that involving dialects and standards, has been highlighted consistently for the sake of disputing the position that seeks to exclude intralingual relations from the translation family.

The consideration of multilingual literature has aimed to contribute to debunking the so-called myth of monolingualism. Perhaps more importantly, it has pointed towards the importance of *not* presupposing the monolingual nature of the content in a translational perspective. Hybrid experimentations have served as another channel for the analysis of linguistic borders' vulnerability. A notable achievement of this project, then, lies in demonstrating that the lines between languages are not only unclear in a macro but also in a micro perspective, where their blurring is a result of artistic amalgamations.

This thesis has hopefully made an impact not only in the purely theoretical realm but also in the domain of the linguistic and literary tradition that have been spotlighted for the purposes of a conceptual reassessment. This research has offered a quite exclusive insight into translational relations among Serbo-Croatian lects, and particularly among the newly formed successor languages. As the dissertation has originated in a potentially interesting historical moment, around the time when the 'Declaration on the Common Language' has been initiated, its findings could deepen the general understanding about linguistic fluidity's causes and effects.

Ultimately, this study has hoped to fill in the gap with regard to the circulation of Serbian literature in the transnational field of Anglophone countries. This particular route of circulation has received minimal scholarly attention and any advancement in this direction should be deemed valuable. In comparison to most literary traditions, the corpus of Serbian literature has been affected by linguistic discontinuity. Difficult as it is to track large-scale phenomena, a portion of this thesis has been devoted to sketching the post-ramification trends, thereby revealing that linguistic discontinuity has hindered the Serbian literature's circulation rate and reduced its visibility in international circles. If diagnosing the problem is the first step towards its solution, then this dissertation's significance could be sought in fostering public and institutional awareness about the international status of Serbian literature.

8.4 Promising Research Avenues

Over the course of this research, a number of promising directions for future studies have been identified. For those interested in conceptual nuancing, of special interest could be several terminological pairs. First of all, *intra-* and *interlingual translation*, focal to this dissertation, could be further fortified through the exploration of different contexts and cases where they undergo a change. Secondly, the third component of Jakobson's original tripartition – that is *intersemiotic translation* – could be revisited against the somewhat overlapping concept of *adaptation*. Thirdly, the notions of *source* and *target* – be it *language*, *text*, *culture*, or something else – have proven to be in dire need of a reassessment. Fourthly, *source text* and *original text*, sometimes used interchangeably, have also been somewhat problematic and a detailed investigation of their relationship would be beneficial for translation studies. Lastly, the authority of the *source text* could be deliberated in relation to *intralingual translation* – with a view to answering when the alterations made to a source text are considered merely different editions of the original source text and when they move to the realm of *intralingual translation*.

As linguistic fluidity is a recurring phenomenon, which consequently shifts translational relations, it is of the utmost importance to inspect it on traditions other than Serbo-Croatian. Especially suitable for this study's reaffirmation and expansion would be an analysis of the presently acute rift between Hindi and Urdu or between Bahasa Malaysia and Bahasa Indonesia. Of course, more adequate cases could as well be extracted from history.

As for Serbo-Croatian lects, translational relations and, more generally, translation practices among separate standards remain a highly underexplored area. To that end, it becomes highly germane to examine the complex ways in which translation is treated in the post-disintegration era. Worthy of inquiry are the lasting effects that the newly formulated translation policies have upon cultural, legal, social, and many other spheres.

Multilingualism, which has started to emerge as a sight of growing scholarly attention, poses another direction in which the findings of this thesis could be expanded. A corpus of literary texts that combine Serbian and English deserve to be scrutinised with more care; so far, the rare considerations of the kind have been conducted only in isolation. A large-scale project that systematically covers Serbian texts with English insertions and vice versa is required not only for the purposes of inspecting linguistic choices in a literary environment but as a way of unearthing deeper cultural ties and identifying the points of cross-contamination that the hybrid expression embodies.

Finally, this dissertation could provide a fruitful point of departure for future projects that wish to trace literary circulation. A more sophisticated account of the ways in which Serbian fiction travels outside its national confines is absolutely necessary, if we want to alleviate the severe consequences ensuing from linguistic discontinuity. Likewise, the intricate patterns of circulation should be investigated on the example of transnational spaces other than the Anglosphere – all with the fervent hope of increasing the visibility of literatures written in the languages affected by linguistic fluidity.

Bibliography

Works Cited

'The 1850 Literary Agreement'. (1850) 2004. Translated by Robert D. Greenberg. Reprinted in *Language and Identity in the Balkans: Serbo-Croatian and its Disintegration*, edited by Robert Greenberg, D., 168–171. New York: Oxford University Press.

'The 1954 Novi Sad Agreement'. (1954) 2004. Translated by Robert D. Greenberg. Reprinted in *Language and Identity in the Balkans: Serbo-Croatian and Its Disintegration*, edited by Robert D Greenberg, 172–174. New York: Oxford University Press.

Adelung, Johann Christoph. 1782. *Grundsätze der deutschen Orthographie* (Principles of the German Orthography). Leipzig: Breitkopf.

Albachten, Özlem Berk. 2014. 'Intralingual Translation: Discussions within Translation Studies and the Case of Turkey'. In *A Companion to Translation Studies*, edited by Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter, 573–585. Chichester: Willey Blackwell.

Albahari, David. (2003) 2005. 'Učenje ćirilice'. Reprinted in *Drugi jezik*, 171–203. Belgrade: Stubovi kulture.

Albahari, David. 2012. 'Learning Cyrillic'. Translated by Ellen Elias-Bursać. In *Learning Cyrillic*, 75–104. Belgrade: Geopoetika.

Albahari, David. 2019. *Dijaspora i druge stvari*. Novi Sad: Akademska knjiga.

Alexander, Ronelle. 1975. *Torlak Accentuation*. Munich: Otto Sagner.

American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages (AATSEEL). 2017. 'Departments and Programs'. *AATSEEL: American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages*, accessed 28 Sept. 2017. http://www.aatseel.org/graduate_programs.

Anderson, Benedict. (1983) 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London and New York: Verso.

Angelelli, Claudia V. 2014. 'Introduction: The Sociological Turn in Translation and Interpreting Studies'. In *The Sociological Turn in Translation and Interpreting Studies*, edited by Claudia V. Angelelli, 1–5. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Apostolou, Fotini. 2014. 'Walter Benjamin Revisited: A Literary Reading in Todd Hasak-Lowy's Short Story "The Task of This Translator"'. In *Transfiction: Research into the Realities of Translation Fiction*, edited by Klaus Kaindl and Karlheinz Spitzl, 69–86. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: J. Benjamins.

Apter, Emily. 2006. 'Balkan Babel: Translation Zones, Military Zones'. In *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Apter, Emily. 2013. *Against World Literature: On the Politics of Untranslatability*. London and New York: Verso.

Armstrong, Daniel, and C. H. van Schooneveled. 1977. 'Foreword'. In *Roman Jakobson: Echoes of His Scholarship*, edited by Daniel Armstrong and C. H. van Schooneveled, v-vi. Lisse: Peter de Ridder Press.

Aronin, Larissa, and Ulrike Jessner. 2014. 'Methodology in Bi- and Multilingual Studies: From Simplification to Complexity'. *AILA Review* 27 (1): 56–79. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.27.03aro.

Baer, Brian James. 2014. 'Interpreting Daniel Stein: Or What Happens When Fictional Translators Get Translated'. In *Transfiction: Research into the Realities of Translation Fiction*, edited by Klaus Kaindl and Karlheinz Spitzl, 157–175. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: J. Benjamins.

Bassnett, Susan. (1980) 2014. *Translation Studies*. 4th ed. London and New York: Routledge.

Benjamin, Walter. (1923) 2012. 'The Translator's Task' (Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers). Translated by Lawrence Venuti. In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 75–83. London and New York: Routledge.

Berman, Antoine. (1985) 2012. 'Translation and the Trials of the Foreign'. Translated by Lawrence Venuti. In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 240–253. London and New York: Routledge.

Bonaffini, Luigi. 1997. 'Translating Dialect Literature'. *World Literature Today* 71(2): 279–288.

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1983) 1993. 'The Field of Cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed'. In *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, edited by Randal Johnson, 29–73. New York: Columbia University Press.

Brborić, Veljko. 2015. 'Srpski jezik predaje hrvatski lektor' (The Serbian Language Taught by a Croatian Teacher). Interview by Marina Vulićević. *Politika*, 2 Feb. 2019. http://www.politika.rs/sr/clanak/337504/Drustvo/Srpski-jezik-predaje-hrvatski-lektor.

Browne, Wayles. 2004. 'Serbo-Croatian and its Successors in the United States of America'. In *Language in the Former Yugoslav Lands*, edited by Ranko Bugarski and Celia Hawkesworth, 259–271. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.

Buchholz, Larissa. 2016. 'What is a Global Field? Theorizing Fields beyond the Nation-State'. *The Sociological Review Monographs* 64 (2): 31–60. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/2059-7932.12001.

Büchler, Alexandra, and Giulia Trentacosti. (2013) 2015. 'Publishing Translated Literature in the United Kingdom and Ireland 1990–2012 Statistical Report'. *Literature Across Frontiers*, 11 Oct. 2017.

Bugarski, Ranko. 2004. 'What's in a Name: The Case of Serbo-Croatian'. *Revue des études slaves* 75 (1): 11–20.

Bulić, Refik. 2014. 'Na kome je jeziku spjevana *Hasanaginica*' (What is the Language of *Hasanaginica*). *Lingvazin* II (2–3): 10–13.

Burak, Alexander. 2013. 'Introduction'. In *The "Other" in Translation: A Case for Comparative Translation Studies*, 1–8. Bloomington, Indiana: Slavica.

Burkhart, Dagmar. 2006. 'Paradoxical Communication: The Bosnian Oral Ballad "Hasanaginica" as a Pretext for Literary Texts'. *Russian Literature* LIX (I): 25–39. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ruslit.2006.01.002.

Butler, Thomas. 1980. *Monumenta Serbocroatica: A Bilingual Anthology of Serbian and Croatian Texts from the 12th to 19th Century*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Calabrese, Omar. 2000. 'Lo strano caso dell'equivalenza imperfetta (modeste osservazioni sulla traduzione intersemiotica)' (A Peculiar Case of Imperfect Equivalence [Modest Observations on Intersemiotic Translation]). *Versus: quaderni de studi semiotici* 85–87:101–120.

Campbell, Mike. 2019. 'Meaning, Origin and History of the Name Goran'. Accessed 5 Nov. 2019. http://www.behindthename.com/name/goran.

Complete University Guide. 2017. 'University Subject Tables 2018: Russian and East European Languages'. *Independent*, accessed 20 Sept. 2017. https://www.thecompleteuniversityguide.co.uk/league-tables/rankings.

Cowdrey, Katherine. 2017. 'Hahn Donates Award Winnings to Found a First Translation Prize'. *The Bookseller*, accessed 12 Oct. 2017. http://www.thebookseller.com/news/hahn-donates-idla-prize-pot-fund-ta-first-translation-prize-573991.

Cronin, Michael. 2006. *Translation and Identity*. London and New York: Routledge.

Crystal, David. 1987. 'Literature of the Future: Language of the Past (and Present)'. In *Proceedings from the 3rd Nordic Conference for English Studies*, edited by I. Ljung Lindblad, 41–52. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.

Crystal, David. 2002. *Language Death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Culler, Jonathan. 2010. 'The Closeness of Close Reading'. *ADE Bulletin* 149:20–25. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1632/ade.149.20.

Čalić, Jelena. 2018. *The Politics of Teaching a Language Which is 'Simultaneously One and More than One': The Case of Serbo-Croatian*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University College London (University of London).

Damrosch, David. 2003. 'Goethe Coins a Phrase'. In *What is World Literature?*, 1–36. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Damrosch, David. 2009. *How to Read World Literature*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Davis, Kathleen. 2014. 'Intralingual Translation and the Making of a Language'. In *A Companion to Translation Studies*, edited by Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter, 586–598. Chichester: Willey Blackwell.

'Deklaracija o zajedničkom jeziku' (Declaration on the Common Language). 2017. *Jezici i nacionalizmi*, accessed 15 Mar. 2019. http://jezicinacionalizmi.com/deklaracija/.

Delabastita, Dirk and Rainier Grutman. 2005. 'Fictional Representations of Multilingualism and Translation'. *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series – Themes in Translation Studies* 4:11–34.

Dembeck, Till, and Georg Mein. 2015. 'Philology's Jargon: How Can We Write Post-Monolingually?' In *Challenging the Myth of Monolingualism*, edited by Liesbeth Minnaard and Till Dembeck, 53–70. Amsterdam and New York: Brill/Rodopi.

Derrida, Jacques. (1972) 1988. 'Signature Event Context'. Translated by Samuel Weber and Jeffrey Mehlman. In *Limited Inc*, 1–23. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Derrida, Jacques. 1985. 'Des Tours de Babel'. Translated by Joseph F. Graham. In *Difference in Translation*, edited by Joseph F. Graham, 165–207. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Dickens, Eric. 2002. 'Literary Translation in Britain and Selective Xenophobia'. *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 4 (1): 2–10.

Dixon, Robert M.W. 1997. *The Rise and Fall of Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dor, Daniel. 2015. *The Instruction of Imagination: Language as a Social Communication Technology.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Dragićević, Rajna. 2017. 'Na značajnim slavističkim katedrama bez srpskog jezika' (Important Slavic Departments Devoid of the Serbian Language). Interview by Marina Vulićević. *Politika*, accessed 2 Feb. 2019. http://www.politika.rs/sr/clanak/380513/Kultura/Na-znacajnim-slavistickim-katedrama-bez-srpskog-jezika.

Duncan, Dennis. 2019. 'Languages Lost in Time'. In *Babel: Adventures in Translation*, edited by Dennis Duncan, Stephan Harrison, Katrin Kohl and Matthew Reynolds, 154–165. Oxford: Bodleian Library.

Eco, Umberto. 2003. *Mouse or Rat: Translation as Negotiation*. London: Phoenix.

Febvre, Lucien, and Henri-Jean Martin. (1958) 1976. *The Coming of the Book: The Impact of Printing 1450–1800*. Translated by David Gerard. London: NLB.

Federativna Narodna Republika Jugoslavija. 1946. *Ustav Federativne Narodne Republike Jugoslavije* (Constitution of the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia).

Federman, Raymond. 2001. 'Surfiction: Writing with No Restraints'. In *Postmodernism*, edited by Derek C. Maus, 66–74. San Diego: Greenhaven Press.

Fitzpatrick, Margo. 2016. 'Translation in the English-Speaking World'. *Publishing Trendsetter*, accessed 11 Oct. 2017. http://publishingtrendsetter.com/industryinsight/translation-englishspeaking-world/.

Fortis, Alberto. 1974 (1774). *Viaggio in Dalmazia* (A Journey to Dalmatia). München: Verlag Otto Sagner.

Franolic, Branko. 1980a. 'Language Policy and Language Planning in Yugoslavia With Special Reference to Croatian and Macedonlan'. *Lingua* 51:55–72.

Franolic, Branko. 1980b. *A Short History of Literary Croatian*. Paris: Nouvelles Éditions Latines.

Frantz, Donald G. and Norma Jean Russel. (1989) 2017. Preface to the First Edition. In *Blackfoot Dictionary of Stems, Roots, and Affixes*, xiii–xiv. 3rd ed. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press.

Freely, Maureen. 2010. 'How I Got Lost in Translation and Found My True Calling'. *The Observer*, accessed 30 Sept. 2017. http://www.theguardian.com/books/2010/nov/28/maureen-freely-translation-orhan-pamuk.

Gaj, Ljudevit. 1830. *Kratka osnova horvatsko-slavenskoga pravopisanja* (Brief Basics of the Croatian-Slavonic Orthography). Budim: Tiskarnica Kralevskoga Sveučilišča.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. 'Thick Description: Toward an Interpretative Theory of Culture'. In *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*, 3–30. New York: Basic Books.

Gellner, Ernest. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Gentzler, Edwin. 2017. *Translation and Rewriting in the Age of Post-Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.

Goethe, J.W. (1775) 1975. 'Klaggesang vom der edlen Frauen des Asan-Aga' (The Mournful Song of the Noble Wife of Asan Aga). Reprinted in *Hasanaginica 1774 – 1974*, edited by Alija Isaković, 75–86. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.

Goffman, Erving. 1986 (1974). 'Introduction'. In *Frame Analysis: an Essay on the Organization of Experience*, 1–20. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

González, Luis Pérez. 2009. 'Audiovisual Translation'. In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, edited by Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha, 13–20. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Google Search. 2017. 'Vansalivich'. Accessed 17 Sept. 2017. http://www.google.rs/search?client=safari&rls=en&dcr=0&q=Vansalivich&oq=Vansalivich&gs_l=psy-ab.3...0.0.0.232925.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0..0.0....0...1..64.psy-ab..0.0.0....0.wWRT9u41LA0.

Gottlieb, Henrik. 2018. 'Semiotics and Translation'. In *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies and Linguistics*, edited by Kirsten Malmkjær, 45–61. London and New York: Routledge.

Government of Canada/Gouvernement du Canada. 2019. 'Census Profile, 2016 Census: Toronto, City'. Statistics Canada/Statistique Canada, accessed 27 Jan. 2019. https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=CSD&Code1=3520005&Geo2=CMACA&Code2=535&Data=Count&SearchText=toronto&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&B1=Ethnic%20origin&TABID=1.

Haraway, Donna. 1988. 'Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective'. *Feminist Studies* 14 (3): 575–599.

Harding, Tobias. 2007. 'Nationalising Culture: The Reorganisation of National Culture in Swedish Cultural Policy 1970–2002'. Department for Studies of Social Change and Culture, Linköping University.

Hasak-Lowy, Todd. 2005. 'The Task of This Translator'. In *The Task of This Translator: Stories*, 149–177. Orlando: Harcourt.

Haugen, Einar. 1966. 'Dialect, Language, Nation'. *American Anthropologist* 68 (4): 922–935.

Hawkesworth, Celia. 2004. 'Serbo-Croatian and its Successors in British Universities'. In *Language in the Former Yugoslav Lands*, edited by Ranko Bugarski and Celia Hawkesworth, 273–282. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.

Heidegger, Martin. (1971) 2001. 'Building Dwelling Thinking'. Translated by Albert Hofstadter. In *Poetry, Language, Thought*, 141–159. New York: Harper and Row.

Hermans, Theo. 1997. 'Translation as Institution'. In *Translation as Intercultural Communication: Selected Papers from the EST Congress*, edited by Mary Snell-Hornby, Zuzana Jettmarova, and Klaus Kaindl, 3–20. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Herrity, Peter. 1992. 'The Problematic Nature of the Standardisation of the Serbo-Croatian Literary Language in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century'. In *Language Planning in Yugoslavia*, edited by Ranko Bugarski and Celia Hawkesworth, 162–175. Columbus, OH: Slavica.

Holifield, Chris. 2014. 'The English Language Publishing World'. W*riters Services*, accessed 22 Jan. 2019. https://www.writersservices.com/resources/english-language-publishing-world-inside-publishing>.

Ivić, Pavle. 1985. *Dijalektologija srpskohrvatskog jezika: Uvod u štokavsko narečje* (Dialectology of Serbo-Croatian Dialects: An Introduction into the Štokavian Accentuation). 2nd ed. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.

Ivković, Dejan. 2013. 'Pragmatics Meets Ideology: Digraphia and Non-Standard Orthographic Practices in Serbian Online News Forums'. *Journal of Language and Politics* 12 (3): 335–356. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.12.3.02ivk.

Jakobson, Roman. (1959) 2012. 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation'. In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 126–131. London and New York: Routledge.

Jin, Jay. 2017. 'Problems of Scale in "Close" and "Distant" Reading'. *Philological Quarterly* 96 (1): 105–129.

Johnson, Randal. 1993. 'Editor's Introduction'. In *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, edited by Randal Johnson, 1–25. New York: Columbia University Press.

Jones, Francis R. 2010. 'Passing on the Hasanaginica: Translator's Afterword'. *Forum Bosnae* 51:278–288.

Jonke, Ljudevit. 1971. *Hrvatski književni jezik 19. i 20. stoljeća* (Croatian Literary Language of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Century). Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska.

Kaindl, Klaus. 2014. 'Going Fictional! Translators and Interpreters in Literature and Film: An Introduction'. In *Transfiction: Research into the realities of translation fiction*. Edited by Klaus Kaindl and Karlheinz Spitz, 1–26. Amsterdam andPhiladelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Kilchmann, Esther. 2015. 'Monolingualism, Heterolingualism, and Poetic Innovation: On Contemporary German Literature, with a Side Glance to the Seventeenth Century'. In *Challenging the Myth of Monolingualism*, edited by Liesbeth Minnaard and Till Dembeck, 71–86. Amsterdam and New York: Brill/Rodopi.

Kordić, Snježana. 2010. *Jezik i nacionalizam* (Language and Nationalism). Zagreb: Durieux.

Kourdis, Evangelos. 2015. 'The Semiotics of Subtitling of Language Variations in Television Advertisements in Greece'. In *Semiotics and Hermeneutics of the Everyday*, edited by Lia Yoka and Gregory Paschalidis, 279–289. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

Kraljevina Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca. 1921. *Ustav Kraljevine Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca* (Constitution of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes).

Krstić, Višnja. 2018. 'The Cultural Polylogue of Miloš Crnjanski's *Roman o Londonu* (A Novel about London)'. In *Comparative Literature as a Transcultural Discipline*, edited by Eduardo F. Coutinho, 187–196. São Paulo: Annablume Editoria.

Lefevere, André, and Susan Bassnet,. 1990. 'Introduction: Proust's Grandmother and the Thousand and One Nights: The 'Cultural' Turn in Translation Studies'. In *Translation, History and Culture*, edited by Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, 1–13. London and New York: Pinter.

Lehmann, Winfred P. 1993. "Methods." In *Theoretical Bases of Indo-European Linguistics*, 24–47. London and New York: Routledge.

Lindstedt, Jouko. 2000. 'Linguistic Balkanization: Contact-Induced Change by Mutual Reinforcement'. *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 28:231–246.

Lukežić, Iva. 2005. 'Dijalektološko čitanje Fortisove "Asanaginice"' (Dialectologic Reading of Fortis' 'Asanaginica'). *Čakavska rič: Polugodišnjak za proučavanje čakavske riječi* XXXIII (1–2): 101–129.

Magner, Thomas F. 2001. 'Digraphia in the Territories of the Croats and Serbs'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 150:11–26. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2001.028.

Mahmutćehajić, Rusmir. 2010. 'Tajna Hasanaginice'. *Sarajevske sveske* 27–28:537–559.

Maretić, Tomislav. 1899. *Gramatika i stilistika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga književnog jezika*. Zagreb: Hartman.

Mecklenburg, Norbert. 2015. 'Von den Sitten der Morlacken zur Weltliteratur' (From Customs and Traditions of Morlachs to World Literature). *Zagreber Germanistische Beiträge* 24:77–105.

Meylaerts, Reine. 2006. 'Conceptualizing the Translator as a Historical Subject in Multilingual Environments: A Challenge for Descriptive Translation Studies?'. In *Charting the Future of Translation History*, edited by Georges L. Bastin and Paul Bandia, 59–79. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Meylaerts, Reine. 2013. 'Multilingualism as a Challenge for Translation Studies'. In *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies*, edited by Carmen Millán and Francesca Bartrina, 519–533. London and New York: Routledge.

Miklosich, Franz. 1883. 'Der Text der Spalatiner Handschrift' (Text of the Split Manuscript). In *Über Goethe's 'Klaggesang von der edlen Frauen des Asan Aga'* (On Goethe's 'The Mournful Song of the Noble Wife of Asan Aga). Vienna: Akademie der Wissenschaften. 11–13. https://archive.org/details/bergoethesklagg00miklgoog/page/n8.

Milanović, Aleksandar. 2010. *Kratka istorija srpskog književnog jezika* (A Short History of the Serbian Literary Language). Belgrade: Zavod za udžbenike.

Milijić Subić, Dejana. 2019. In '*Zonu Zamfirovu* izbacuju iz lektire zbog filma' (*Zona Zamfirova* Getting Removed from School Reading Lists Because of the Film). *Politika Online*, accessed 3 July 2019. http://www.politika.rs/sr/clanak/430758/Zonu-Zamfirovu-izbacuju-iz-lektire-zbog-filma.

Minnaard, Liesbeth, and Till Dembeck. 2015. 'Introduction: How to Challenge the Myth of Monolingualism?' In *Challenging the Myth of Monolingualism*, edited by Liesbeth Minnaard and Till Dembeck, 9–14. Amsterdam and New York: Brill/Rodopi.

Modern Language Association (MLA). 2019. Language Enrollment Database, 1958–2016. *MLA: Modern Language Association*. https://apps.mla.org/flsurvey_search.

Moretti, Franco. 2013. *Distant Reading*. London and New York: Verso.

Mrkalj, Sava. 1810. *Salo debeloga jera libo azbukoprotres* (Fat of the Thick Yer, i.e. Alphabet Reshuffling). Budim: Slaveno-srbska pečatnja Kraljevskago vseučilišta vengerskago.

Munday, Jeremy. 2012. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. 3rd ed. London and New York: Routledge.

Murko, Matija. (1935) 1975. 'Asanaginica sa Šipana'. In *Hasanaginica 1774 – 1974*, edited by Alija Isaković, 354–362. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.

Nakaš, Lejla. 2010. 'The Ballad of Hasanaginica: Fortis' Redaction and the Split Manuscript'. *Forum Bosnae* 51:289–312.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). 2015. 'Digest of Education Statistics 2015', accessed 27 Sept. 2017. nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15_317.10.asp.

Nedić, Vladan. (1971) 1975. 'O nekim pitanjima "Hasanaginice"' (About Some Questions on 'Hasanaginica'). In *Hasanaginica 1774 – 1974*, edited by Alija Isaković, 459–466. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.

Nida, Eugene. (1964) 2012. 'Principles of Correspondence'. In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 141–155. London and New York: Routledge.

Nomachi, Motoki. 2015. '"East" and "West" as Seen in the Structure of Serbian: Language Contact and Its Consequences'. *Slavic Eurasian Studies* 28:29–63.

Norris, Christopher. 1988. 'Review of D*ifference in Translation,* edited by Joseph F. Graham'. *Comparative Literature* 1:52–58. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/1770642.

Odbor za standardizaciju srpskog jezika (Board for Standardisation of the Serbian Language). 2018. 'O statusu bosanskog ili bošnjačkog jezik' (On the Status of the Bosnian or Bosniak Language). Accessed 20 Nov. 2019. http://www.ossj.rs/odluke-i-saopstenja/o-statusu-bosanskog-ili-bosnjackog-jezika/.

Odbor za standardizaciju srpskog jezika (Board for Standardisation of the Serbian Language). 2019. 'Prizrensko-timočki govori' (The Prizren-Timok Speeches). Accessed 5 Nov. 2019. http://www.ossj.rs/odluke-i-saopstenja/prizrensko-timocki-govori/.

Parry, Milman. 1930. 'Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making'. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 41:73–148.

Pasini, Dinka. 2008. 'Lektorati hrvatskoga jezika na visokoškolskim ustanovama u inozemstvu' (Study Sections of the Croatian Language at Foreign Institutions of Higher Education). *Croatian Studies Review* 5 (1): 140–147.

Paunović, Zoran. 2009. 'Mnogo prevoda, malo pravih dela' (Many Translations, Little True Literature). Interview by Marina Vulićević: *Politika*, accessed 20 Sept. 2017. http://www.politika.rs/sr/clanak/100077/Mnogo-prevoda-malo-pravih-dela.%20Accessed%2030%20Sept.%202017.

Peco, Asim. 1991. *Pregled srpskohrvatskih dijalekata* (A Survey of Serbo-Croatian Dialects). 5th ed. Belgrade: Naučna knjiga.

Peco, Asim. 1995. 'Stevan Sremac preteča dijalektologa' (Stevan Sremac: A Forerunner of Dialectologists). In *Pisci i njihov jezik* (Writers and their Language), 130–159. Belgrade: Prosveta.

Pekić, Borislav. (1983) 2009. 'U materici slučaja' (In the Case's Womb). In *Život na ledu: Dnevnici*, edited by Petar Pijanović and Dragan Hamović, 227. Belgrade: Zavod za udžbenike.

Pekić, Borislav. (2004) 2015. *Pisma iz tuđine* (Letters from Abroad). Belgrade: Laguna.

Petrović, Dragoljub, and Snežana Gudurić. 2010. *Fonologija srpskoga jezika* (Phonology of the Serbian Language). Belgrade: Institut za srpski jezik SANU.

Petrović, Svetozar. 1972. *Priroda kritika* (The Nature of Critique). Zagreb: Liber.

Piper, Predrag, and Ivan Klajn. 2014. *Normativna gramatika srpskog jezika* (Normative Grammar of the Serbian Language). 2nd ed. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.

Post, Chad W. 2019. *Three Percent: Translation Database*. University of Rochester, accessed 1 Feb 2019. http://www.rochester.edu/College/translation/threepercent/translation-database/.

Požgaj Hadži, Vesna. 2018. 'Hrvatski jezik kao strani unutar slavističkoga, evropskog i svjetskog konteksta' (Croatian as a Foreign Language in the Slavic, European, and Global Context). *Tabula* 15:466–484. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32728/tab.15.2018.28.

Prince, John Dyneley. 1931. 'Surviving Turkish Elements in Serbo-Croatian'. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 51 (3): 241–261.

Pym, Anthony. (1992) 2010. *Translation and Text Transfer: An Essay on the Principles of Intercultural Communication*. 2nd ed. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group.

Radovanović, Milorad, and Randall A. Major. 2001. 'Introduction: On Serbian (Socio)Linguistics'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 151:1–6. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2001.045.

Ramet, Sabina P. (2002) 2004. *Balkan Babel: The Disintegration of Yugoslavia from the Death of Tito to the Fall of Milošević*. 4th ed. Boulder, CO and Oxford: Westview Press.

Rešetar, Milan. 1889. 'Die čakavština und deren einstige und jetzige Grenzen' (The Čakavian and its Former and Current Borders). *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 13: 93–109, 161–199, 361–388.

Samardžija, Marko. 2008. 'Poučavanje hrvatskoga na inozemnim sveučilištima i visokim učilištima u prošlosti i danas' (Teaching Croatian at Foreign Universities and Institutions of Higher Education Then and Now). *Croatian Studies Review* 5 (1): 133–139.

Sapiro, Gisèle. 2014. 'The Sociology of Translation: A New Research Domain'. In *A Companion to Translation Studies*, edited by Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter, 82–94. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Sapiro, Gisèle. 2016. 'How Do Literary Works Cross Borders (or Not)? A Sociological Approach to World Literature'. *Journal of World Literature* 1:81–96.

Sapiro, Gisèle. 2018. 'Field Theory from a Transnational Perspective.' In *The Oxford Handbook of Pierre Bourdieu*, edited by Thomas Medvetz and Jeffrey J. Sallaz, 1–25. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. (1959) 2011. *Course in General Linguistics*. Translated by Wade Baskin. New York: Columbia University Press.

Schooneveld, C. H. van. 1977. 'By Way of Introduction: Roman Jakobson's Tenets and Their Potential'. In *Roman Jakobson: Echoes of His Scholarship*, edited by Daniel Armstrong and C. H. van Schooneveld, 1–11. Lisse: Peter de Ridder Press.

Scott, Clive. 2012. 'Introduction'. In *Literary Translation and the Rediscovery of Reading*, 1–10. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Socijalistička Federativna Republika Jugoslavija. 1963. *Ustav Socijalističke Federativne Republike Jugoslavije* (Constitution of the Socialist Federal Republic Yugoslavia).

Socijalistička Federativna Republika Jugoslavija. 1974. *Ustav Socijalističke Federativne Republike Jugoslavije* (Constitution of the Socialist Federal Republic Yugoslavia).

Sotirović, Vladislav B. 2007. 'Ustavna i zakonska regulativa srpskohrvatskog jezika u SFRJ – 1974–1991' (Constitutional and Legislative Regulations upon the Serbo-Croat Language in SFR Yugoslavia – 1974–1991). *Nasleđe* 4 (6): 75–87.

Southerland, Ronald H. and Francis Katamba. (1987) 1996. 'Language in Social Contexts'. In *Contemporary Linguistics: An Introduction*, edited by William O'Grady, Michael Dobrovolsky and Francis Katamba, 540–590. 3rd ed. Harlow: Longman Pearson.

Sremac, Stevan. (1907) 2008. *Zona Zamfirova*. 2nd ed. Belgrade: Evro Giunti.

Stanojčić, Živojin, and Ljubomir Popović. (1989) 2014. *Gramatika srpskoga jezika: za gimnazije i srednje škole* (Grammar of the Serbian Language: for Gymnasiums and High Schools). 15th ed. Belgrade: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.

Stefanović Karadžić, Vuk, quoted in Asim Peco. 1990. 'Riječ unaprijed' (Foreword). In *Vukovim jezičkim stazama* (In Vuk's Linguistic Footsteps), 5–6. Valjevo: Biblioteka Milan Rakić.

Stefanović Karadžić, Vuk. 1814. *Pismenica serbskoga iezika po govoru prostoga naroda* (The Serbian Grammar According to the Speech of Common People). Vienna: u pečatnьi G. Ioanna Šnirera.

Stefanović Karadžić, Vuk, ed. [1814] 1975. 'Žalostna pesna plemenite Asan-Aginice'. Reprinted in *Hasanaginica 1774 – 1974*, edited by Alija Isaković, 301–302. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.

Stefanović Karadžić, Vuk. 1818. 'Predgovor'. In *Srpski rječnik: isšolkovan njemačkim i latinskim riječma* (The Serbian Dictionary: Paralleled by German and Latin Words), [III]–XX. Vienna: Gedruckt bei den P.P. Armeniern.

Stefanović Karadžić, Vuk, ed. [1846] 1975. 'Hasanaginica'. Reprinted in *Hasanaginica 1774 – 1974*, edited by Alija Isaković, 310–313. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.

Stefanović Karadžić, Vuk. 1852. *Srpski rječnik: isšolkovan njemačkim i latinskim riječma* (The Serbian Dictionary: Paralleled by German and Latin Words). 2nd ed. Vienna: u štampariji Jermenskoga manastira.

Steiner, George. 1975. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. New York and London: Oxford University Press.

Sternglass, Marilyn. 1975. 'Dialect Literature: Positive Reinforcer for Writing "In" and "Out" of Dialect'. *College Composition and Communication* 26 (2): 201–204.

Strümper-Krobb, Sabine. 2011. 'Spaces of Translation'. In *Crossing Borders. Space Beyond Disciplines*, edited by Kathleen James-Chakraborty and Sabine Strümper-Krobb, 17–31. Bern: Peter Lang.

Sturrock, John. 1991. 'On Jakobson on Translation'. In *Recent Developments in Theory and History: The Semiotic Web, 1990*, edited by Thomas A. Sebeok and Jean Umiker-Sebeok, 307–321. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Škaljić, Abdulah. 1966. *Turcizmi u srpskohrvatskom jeziku* (Turkisms in the Serbo-Croatian Language). Sarajevo: Svjetlost.

Šotra, Zdravko, director. 2004. *Zona Zamfirova*. DVD. Belgrade: Cobra Film.

Šotra, Zdravko, director. 2013. *Zona Zamfirova*. Zagreb: HRT.

Šotra, Zdravko, director. 2016. *Zona Zamfirova*. Belgrade: RTS.

Thiong'o, Ngũgĩ wa. 1986. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. London: James Currey.

Thomason, Sarah G. 2000. 'Linguistic Areas and Language History'. *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 28:311–327.

Toews, John. 1987. 'Intellectual History after the Linguistic Turn: The Autonomy of Meaning and the Irreducibility of Experience'. *The American Historical Review* 92 (4): 879–907.

Toury, Gideon. 1986. 'A Cultural-Semiotic Perspective'. In *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Semiotics*, edited by Thomas A Sebeok, 1111–1124. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

'The Tower of Babel'. N.d. *Genesis* 11:1–9. New Revised Standard Version Bible. Available at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Genesis+11%3A1-9&version=NRSV.

Trifunović, Branislav. 2013. *Twitter*, accessed 16 May 2019. https://twitter.com/BrankoBranislav/status/330584994219163649.

UK Government. 2019. 'Check if a University or College is Officially Recognised'. Accessed 21 Jan. 2019. www.gov.uk/check-a-university-is-officially-recognised/recognised-bodies.

UNESCO. 2019. *Index Translationum*, accessed 21 Jan. 2019. http://www.unesco.org/xtrans/bsform.aspx.

University of Arizona Library. 2017. 'Slavic Departments and Related Programs'. University of Arizona, accessed 27 Sept. 2017. http://intranet.library.arizona.edu/users/brewerm/sil/prof/slavdepts.html.

University Study. 2017. 'Canadian Universities'. Accessed 28 Sept. 2017. http://www.universitystudy.ca/canadian-universities/.

Venuti, Lawrence, ed. 2012. *The Translation Studies Reader*. 3rd ed. London and New York: Routledge.

Venuti, Lawrence. 2013. 'Towards a Translation Culture'. In *Translation Changes Everything: Theory and Practice*, 231–248. London and New York: Routledge.

Vujaklija, Milan. 1996. *Leksikon stranih reči i izraza* (Lexicon of Foreign Words and Phrases). 5th ed. Belgrade: Prosveta.

Vulićević, Marina. 2017. 'Na značajnim slavističkim katedrama bez srpskog jezika' (Important Slavic Departments Devoid of the Serbian Language). *Politika*, accessed 2 Feb. 2019. http://www.politika.rs/sr/clanak/380513/Kultura/Na-znacajnim-slavistickim-katedrama-bez-srpskog-jezika.

Weinreich, Uriel. 2011. *Languages in Contact: French, German and Romansch in Twentieth-Century Switzerland*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Weissbort, Daniel, and Astradur Eysteinsson, eds. 2009. *Translation – Theory and Practice: A Historical Reader*. Reprint ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wolff, Larry. 2002. *Venice and the Slavs: The Discovery of Dalmatia in the Age of Enlightenment*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Yildiz, Yasemin. 2012. *Beyond the Mother Tongue: The Postmonolingual Condition*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Zabic, Snezana, and Paula Kamenish. 2006. 'A Survey of Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian Poetry in English Translation in the U.S. and Canada'. *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 8 (3): 2–9.

'Zlatan izazvao zemljotres na Balkanu' (Zlatan Triggered an Earthquake at the Balkans). 2019. *Kurir*, accessed 2 Feb. 2019. https://www.kurir.rs/sport/fudbal/3187615/zlatan-izazvao-zemljotres-na-balkanu-video-u-kome-ibrahimovic-pada-u-sevdah-uz-beogradjanku-halida-beslica-prokometarisao-i-nemanja-matic-evo-sta-mu-je-porucio-foto.

Zona Zamfirova. 2019. *Wikipedia*, accessed 3 July 2019. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zona_Zamfirova.

Žanić, Ivo. 2007. *Hrvatski na uvjetnoj slobodi*. Zagreb: Fakultet političkih znanosti.

Works Consulted

Albahari, David. (2003) 2005. *Drugi jezik* (Second Language). Belgrade: Stubovi kulture.

Albahari, David. 2015. 'Učenje ćirilice' (Learning Cyrillic). *Izabrane priče* (Selected Stories), 227–248. Belgrade: Čarobna knjiga.

Alexander, Ronelle, and Ellen Elias-Bursać. 2010. *Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian: A Textbook*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Babukić, Vjekoslav. 1836. *Osnova slovnice slavjanske narěčja ilirskoga* (The Basics of the Slavic Grammar of the Illyrian Dialect). *Danica ilirska* 2, no. 10: 37–40; no. 11: 41–44; no. 12: 45–48; no. 13: 49-52; no. 14: 53–56; no. 15: 57–60.

Bensimon, Paul. 1990. 'Présentation' (Introduction). *Palimpsestes* 4:ix–xiii.

Berman, Antoine. 1990. 'La retraduction comme espace de la traduction' (Retranslation as a Space of Translation). *Palimpsestes* 4:1–7.

Bermann, Sandra and Catherine Porter. 2014. *A Companion to Translation Studies*. Chichester: Willey Blackwell.

Bošković, Dragan, ed. 2012. *Egzil(anti): književnost, kultura, društvo* (Exile[d]: Literature, Culture, Society). Kragujevac: FILUM.

Brandt, Bettina. 2015. 'The Bones of Translation: Yoko Tawada's Translational Poetics'. In *Challenging the Myth of Monolingualism*, edited by Liesbeth Minnaard and Till Dembeck, 181–194. Amsterdam and New York: Brill/Rodopi.

Brborić, Veljko Ž. 2018. 'Budućnost lektorata srpskog jezika sa osvrtom na prošlost i sadašnjost' (Future of the Serbian Language Lectorates with a Look at Past and Present). In *Referati i saopštenja, 48. međunarodni naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane, Andrićgrad*, edited by Dragana Mršević-Radović and Boško Suvajdžić, 21–30. Belgade: Filološki fakultet, Međunarodni slavistički centar.

Ranko Bugarski and Celia Hawkesworth, eds. 2004. *Language in the Former Yugoslav Lands*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.

Centre for Slovene as a Second and Foreign Language. 2019. 'Centre for Slovene as a Second and Foreign Language'. Accessed 1 Feb. 2019. https://centerslo.si/en.

Chetrit, Joseph. 2014. 'Judeo-Arabic Dialects in North Africa as Communal Languages: Lects, Polylects, and Sociolects'. *Journal of Jewish Languages* 2 (2): 202–232. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1163/22134638-12340029.

Ćurčin, Milan. 1925. *Ser Valtera Skota Hasanaginica* (*Hasanaginica* of Sir Walter Scott). Zagreb: Nova Evropa.

Daničić, Đura. 1847. *Rat za srpski jezik i pravopis* (The War for the Serbian Language and Orthography). Budim: Univ. Schrift.

Daničić, Đuro. 1850. *Mala srpska gramatika* (Little Serbian Grammar). Vienna: Štamparija Jermenskog manastira. http://digital.bms.rs/ebiblioteka/pageFlip/reader/index.php?type=publications&id=2500&m=2#page/1/mode/2up.

Delabastita, Dirk and Ton Hoenselaars, eds. 2015. *Multilingualism in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Derrida, Jacques and Jeffrey Mehlman. 1972. 'Freud and the Scene of Writing'. *Yale French Studies* 48:74–117.

Derrida, Jacques. (1967) 1973. *Speech and Phenomena*. Translated by David B. Allison. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Dimitrijević, Jelena J. 2016. *Sedam mora i tri okeana: putem oko sveta* (Seven Seas and Three Oceans: Travelling around the Globe), edited by Biljana Dojčinović. Belgrade: Laguna.

Dinić, Jakša. 2008. *Timočki dijalekatski rečnik* (Timok Dialectal Dictionary). Belgrade: Institut za srpski jezik SANU.

Dordević, Mihailo, compiler. 1984. *Anthology of Serbian Poetry: The Golden Age*. New York: Philosophical Library.

Dusi, Nicola and Siri Nergaard, eds. 2000. *Versus: quaderni de studi semiotici*, Sulla traduzione intersemiotica' (On Intersemiotic Translation) 85–87.

Dusi, Nicola. 2000. 'Introduzione. Per una ridefinizione della traduzione intersemiotica' (Introduction. For the Redefinition of Intersemiotic Translation). *Versus: quaderni de studi semiotici* 85–87:3–54.

Dusi, Nicola. 2015. 'Intersemiotic translation: Theories, problems, analysis'. *Semiotica* 206:181– 205. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2015-0018.

Đurkovečki, Josip. 1826. *Jezichnica horvatzko-slavinzka za hasen Slavincev, i potrebochu oztaleh ztranzkoga jezika narodov* (Croatian-Slavic Grammar For the Slavonian Use and the Use of Other Foreign Nations). Pestha: M. Trattner.

Eco, Umberto. 2000. 'Traduzione e interpretazione' (Translation and Interpretation). *Versus: quaderni de studi semiotici* 85–87:55–100.

Francuski, Biljana Djorić. 2013. 'Multilingual Literature, Translation, and Crnjanski's *Roman o Londonu* (A Novel about London)'. *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 15 (7). DOI: https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.2383.

Gagliano, Maurizio. 2000. 'Traduzione e interpretazione. Proposta per una griglia teorica unitaria (Translation and Interpretation. Proposal for a Unified Theoretical Grid)'. *Versus: quaderni de studi semiotici* 85–87:189–198.

Gesemann, G. 1923. 'Die Asanaginica im Kreise ihrer Varianten' (Asanaginica in the Circle of its Variants). Munich: n.d.

Gramling, David. 2015. 'Getting up onto Monolingualism: Barthes, Kafka, Myth'. *Challenging the Myth of Monolingualism*, edited by Liesbeth Minnaard and Till Dembeck, 15–38. Amsterdam and New York: Brill/Rodopi.

Gustavsson, Sven. 2004. 'Serbo-Croatian and its Successors in the Nordic Countries'. In *Language in the Former Yugoslav Lands*, edited by Ranko Bugarski and Celia Hawkesworth, 251–258. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.

Gvozden, Vladimir. 2012. *Nine Serbian Poets: Anthology of Contemporary Serbian Poetry*. Novi Sad: Adresa.

Helbo, André. 2000. 'Adaptation et traduction. Une liaison dangereuse?' (Adaptation and Translation. A Dangerous Liaison?). *Versus: quaderni de studi semiotici* 85–87:121–132.

Ivić, Pavle, and Aleksandar Mladenović. 1984. 'Filološke napomene o Hasanaginici' (Philological Notes on Hasanaginica). *Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane* 4 (1): 361–380.

Ivić, Pavle, ed. 1994. *Govori prizrensko-timočke oblasti i susednih dijalekata, zbornik radova sa naučnog skupa* (Dialects of the Prizren-Timok Region and the Neighbouring Dialects, Conference Proceedings). Niš: Filozofski fakultet.

Ivić, Pavle, Nedeljko Bogdanović, Vilotije Vukadinović, and Jordana Marković. 1996. *Prizrensko-timočki govori; Dosadašnja proučavanja*; *Bibliografija* (The Prizren-Timok Dialect; Current Research; Bibliography). Niš: Filozofski fakultet.

Jakobson, Roman. 1959. 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation'. In *On Translation*, edited by Reuben Brower. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Khan, Abdul Jamil. 2006. *The Politics of Language. Urdu/Hindi: An Artificial Divide*. N.p.: Algora.

Krajišnik, Vesna, ed. 2011. *Srpski kao strani jezik u teoriji i praksi: tematski zbornik radova. 2* (Serbian as a Foreign Language in Theory and Practice: A Thematic Volume. 2). Belgrade: Filološki fakultet, Centar za srpski kao strani jezik.

Krajišnik, Vesna, ed. 2016. *Srpski kao strani jezik u teoriji i praksi: tematski zbornik radova. 3* (Serbian as a Foreign Language in Theory and Practice: A Thematic Volume. 3). Belgrade: Filološki fakultet, Centar za srpski kao strani jezik.

Krajišnik, Vesna. 2014. 'Lektorati srpskog jezika' (Lectorates of the Serbian Language). In *Zbornik Instituta za srpski jezik SANU. 2, Srpski jezik i aktuelna pitanja jezičke politike*, edited by Ivan Klajn, Predrag Piper, Sreto Tanasić, general ed. Sreto Tanasić, 217–226. Belgrade: Institut za srpski jezik SANU.

Kristijanović, Ignac. 1837. *Grammatik der kroatischen Mundart* (Grammar of the Croatian Idiom). Zagreb: Agram.

Krstić, Višnja. 2017a. 'Following the Traces of Eastern Civilizations'. *Književstvo: journal for studies in literature, gender and culture,* 7, accessed 20 Sept. 2019. http://www.knjizenstvo.rs/magazine.php?text=224.

Krstić, Višnja. 2017b. Review of Liesbeth Minnaard and Till Dembeck's *Challenging the Myth of Monolingualism*. *Oxford Comparative Criticism and Translation Review*, edited by Eleni Philippou and Dennis Duncan, accessed 1 July 2018. http://www.occt.ox.ac.uk/cct-review/challenging-myth-monolingualism-edited-liesbeth-minnaard-and-till-dembeck.

Kuić, Ranka. 1970. 'Kolridž i *Hasanaginica*' (Coleridge and *Hasanaginica*). *Prilozi za književnost, jezik, istoriju i folklor* 26 (1–2): 79–96.

Kuvačić–Ižepa, Mate. 2007. *Čija je Asanaginica* (Whose is Hasanaginica). Split: Naklada Bošković.

Maldonado Garcia, Maria Isabel. 2015. *Urdu Evolution and Reforms*. Lahore: Punjab University.

Marčetić, Adrijana, ed. 2019. *Jugoslovenska književnost: prošlost, sadašnjost i budućnost jednog spornog pojma/Yugoslav Literature: the Past, Present and Future of a Contested Notion*. Belgrade: Čigoja štampa.

Massardier-Kenney, Françoise. 2015. 'Toward a Rethinking of Retranslation'. *Translation Review* 92 (1): 73–85. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/07374836.2015.1086289.

Matijević, Josip Ernest. 1810. *Horvatzka Grammatika oder kroatische Sprachlehre* (Croatian Grammar). Zagreb: n.d.

Mažuranić, Antun. 1839. *Temelji ilirskoga i latinskoga jezika za početnike* (The Basics of the Illyrian and Latin for Beginners). Zagreb: Tiskom k. pr. mar. ilir. tiskarne Dra. Ljudevita Gaja.

Medenica, Radosav. 1979. 'Fortisova *Hasanaginica* i splitski rukopis' (Fortis' *Hasanaginica* and the Split Manuscript). *Zbornik Matice srpske za književnost i jezik* 27 (3): 398–431.

Middleton, Peter. 2005. *Distant Reading: Performance, Readership, and Consumption in Contemporary Poetry*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Mladenov Jovanović, Srđan. 2018. 'Assertive Discourse and Folk Linguistics: Serbian Nationalist Discourse about the Cyrillic Script in the 21st Century'. *Language Policy* 17:611–631. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-018-9478-2.

'Native Languages of the Americas: Blackfoot (Siksika, Peigan, Piegan, Kainai, Blackfeet)'. 2019. *Native Languages*, accessed 1 Aug. 2019. http://www.native-languages.org/blackfoot.htm.

Obradović, Biljana D. and Dubravka Djurić, eds. 2016. *Cat Painters: An Anthology of Contemporary Serbian Poetry*. New Orleans: Dialogos.

'Oxford-Weidenfeld Prize'. 2019. *The Queen's College, University of Oxford*, accessed 7 Nov. 2019. https://www.queens.ox.ac.uk/oxford-weidenfeld-prize.

Pančić, Teofil. 1999. 'Titlovanje i tiltovanje' (Subtitling and Tilting). *Vreme*, accessed 15 Nov. 2019. https://www.vreme.com/arhiva_html/vb1/4.html.

Pantić, Mihajlo, ed. 2013. *Slike (iz) porodičnog vremena: o književnom delu Davida Albaharija* (Images [from/of] a Family Time: On David Albahari's Literary Oeuvre). Belgrade: Biblioteka grada Beograda.Albahari, David. (2003) 2015. 'Učenje ćirilice' (Learning Cyrillic). *Izabrane priče* (Selected Stories), 227–248. Belgrade: Čarobna knjiga.

Parlament. 2018. 'Predlog zakona o izmenama i dopunama zakona o visokom obrazovanju' (Draft on the Higher Education Amendment Bill). Accessed 31 Jan. 2019. http://www.parlament.gov.rs/upload/archive/files/lat/doc/.../2889-18%20-%20Lat..doc.

Pavlović, Mihailo. 1974. 'Slovenska antiteza u francuskim prevodima Hasanaginice' *Hasanaginice*' (The Slavic Antithesis in French Translations of *Hasanaginica*). Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane 4 (I): 473–484.

Peco, Asim. 1990. *Vukovim jezičkim stazama* (In Vuk's Linguistic Footsteps). Valjevo: Biblioteka Milan Rakić.

Petrović Njegoš, Petar II. 1847. *Gorski vienac* (The Mountain Wreath). Vienna: u Jermenskome namastiru.

Petrović, Svetozar. 1971. 'Književnost malog naroda i strani utjecaj' (Literature of a Small Nation and Foreign Influences). *Letopis Matice srpske*, 147 (407), no. 1: 14–21.

Radičević, Branko. 1847. *Pesme* (Poems). Vienna: u Jermenskome namastiru.

Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog i narodnog jezika (Dictionary of the Serbo-Croatian Literary and Vernacular Language). 1959–. Belgrade: SANU.

Savremena terenska istraživanja usmene tradicije Zaplanja (Contemporary Field Research of Zaplanje's Oral Tradition). 2019. https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/.

Serbian Prose in Translation. 2019. *Geopoetika*, accessed 17 May 2019. http://www.geopoetika.com/edition.php?id=884.

Spaziante, Lucio. 2000. 'L'ora della ricreazione' (Recreation Time). *Versus: quaderni de studi semiotici* 85–87:235–249.

Sremac, Stevan. (1894) 2005. *Pop Ćira i pop Spira* (Priests Ćira and Spira). Belgrade: Politika.

Sremac, Stevan. (1895) 2006. *Ivkova slava* (Ivko's Feast). Belgrade: Nolit.

Sremac, Stevan. (1903) 1981. *Vukadin*. Belgrade: Nolit.

Stefanović Karadžić, Vuk, trans. 1847. *Novi zavjet Gospoda našega Isusa Hrista* (New Testimony of Our Jesus Christ). Vienna: u štampariji Jermenskoga manastira.

Stefanović Karadžić, Vuk. 1818. *Srpski rječnik: isšolkovan njemačkim i latinskim riječma* (The Serbian Dictionary: Paralleled by German and Latin Words). Vienna: Gedruckt bei den

P.P. Armeniern.

Stefanović Karadžić, Vuk. 1823–1824. *Srpske narodne pjesme* (Serbian Folk Poetry). Leipzig: Breitkopf und Ertl.

Stefanović Karadžić, Vuk. 1846 *Srpske narodne pjesme* (Serbian Folk Poetry). Vienna: u štampariji Jermenskoga manastira.

Surkis, Judith. 2012. 'When Was the Linguistic Turn? A Genealogy'. *The American Historical Review* 117 (3): 700–722. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1086/ahr.117.3.700.

Suvajdžić, Boško, compiler. 2015. *Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, 1787–1864–2014: Mündliches Volksgut der Serben* (Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, 1787–1864–2014: Serbian Traditional Oral Heritage). Translated by Anete Đurović. Belgrade: Vukova zadužbina, Čigoja štampa.

Suvajdžić, Boško, compiler. 2016. *Vuk Stefanović Karadžić: Serbian Traditional Oral Heritage*. Translated by Sandra Josipović. Belgrade: Vukova zadužbina, Čigoja štampa.

Suvajdžić, Boško, compiler. 2017. *Vuk Stefanović Karadžić: Le patrimoine oral serbe* (Vuk Stefanović Karadžić: Serbian Traditional Oral Heritage). Translated by Brigitte Mladenovic. Belgrade: Vukova zadužbina, Editions Čigoja štampa.

Suvajdžić, Boško, compiler. 2018. *Вук Стефанович Караджич: Сербское устное народное наследие* (Vuk Stefanović Karadžić: Serbian Traditional Oral Heritage). Translated by Ekaterina Yakushkina. Belgrade: Vukova zadužbina, Čigoja štampa.

Šotra, Zdravko. 2005. *Ivkova slava* (Ivko's Feast). Belgrade: Cobra Film.

Tawada, Yoko. 2015. 'The Script of a Turtle or the Problem of Translation'. Translated by Bettina Brandt. In *Challenging the Myth of Monolingualism*, edited by Liesbeth Minnaard and Till Dembeck, 171–180. Amsterdam and New York: Brill/Rodopi.

Taylor-Batty, Juliette. 2013. *Multilingualism in Modernist Fiction*. London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Thomas, Paul-Louis. 2014. '*Asan-aginica* iz Vukove *Pjesnarice* u odnosu na Fortisovu i kasniju Vukovu *Hasanaginicu*: uticaj na francuske prevode balade' (*Asan-Aginica* from Vuk's *Pjesnarica* in Comparison to Fortis' and Vuk's later *Hasanaginica*: Influence upon French Translations of the Ballad). *Prvi svetski rat i srpska književnost; Dva veka od Vukove Male prostonarodne slavenosrpske pjesnarice. Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane* 44 (2): 31–46.

Todorova, Maria. 2009. *Imagining the Balkans*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Trivunac, Miloš. 1932. 'Geteov prepev Asanaginice' (Goethe's Translation of Asanaginica). *Letopis Matice srpske* 106 (332), no. 1–3: 16–20.

UNESCO Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger. 2019. Accessed 5. Nov. 2019, http://www.unesco.org/languages-atlas/index.php.

Vučenov, Dimitrije. 1970. *O srpskim realistima i njihovim prethodnicima* (On Serbian Realists and their Predecessors). Belgrade: Društvo za srpskohrvatski jezik i književnost SR Srbije.

Wright, Chantal. 2018. 'Women in Translation Prize'. Interview by Višnja Krstić. *Knjiženstvo* 8. DOI: https://doi.org/10.18485/knjiz.2018.8.8.12. http://www.knjizenstvo.rs/en/journals/2018/interview/women-in-translation-prize.

Appendix A

Saglasnost

Višnja Krstić (u nastavku istraživač), student doktorskih studija na Filološkom fakultetu Univerziteta u Beogradu, traži Vašu saglasnost za učestvovanje u studiji koja čini deo njenog doktorskog istraživanja o prevodilačkim odnosima. Ovaj formular traži Vašu dozvolu da dati odgovori budu upotrebljeni u naučne svrhe.

Učestvovanje u studiji je u potpunosti dobrovoljno i moguće je odustati u bilo kom trenutku.

Upitnik se može popuniti za otprilike petnaest minuta.

Studija nije anonimna, budući da je istraživač upoznat sa identitetom učesnika.

Međutim, zagarantovana je privatnost sakupljenih podataka, koji će biti analizirani grupno, odnosno u kombinaciji sa odgovorima drugih učesnika, i na takav način da se iz odgovora ne može zaključiti identitet pojedinca.

Sakupljene podatke čuvaće istraživač neodređeni vremenski period.

Podnošenjem ovog formulara, potvrđujete da imate više od osamnaest godina, da ste upoznati sa odredbama formulara, kao i da ste saglasni sa navedenim uslovima.

Consent Form

Višnja Krstić (hereinafter researcher), PhD candidate at the Faculty of Philology of the University of Belgrade, requests your consent for participation in a study that constitutes a part of her doctoral research about translational relations. This form asks for your permission to use the provided answers for scientific purpose.

Participation in the study is completely voluntary and one is free to withdraw at any point.

The questionnaire can be completed in approximately fifteen minutes.

The study is not anonymous as the researcher is familiar with the participants' identity.

However, the researcher guarantees the confidentiality of the obtained data, which will be analysed collectively, that is in combination with other participants' responses, and in such a way that the answers cannot be traced back to an individual.

The collected data will be stored by the researcher for an indefinite amount of time.

By submitting this form, you confirm that you are at least eighteen-years old, that you have familiarised yourself with the form's provisions and that you agree with the above-stated terms.

Upitnik

Prvi deo: Opšta pitanja

1. Koliko imate godina?
   a. Manje od 18
   b. 18-35
   c. Više od 35

2. Da li Vam je srpski prvi, odnosno maternji, jezik?
   a. Da
   b. Ne

Drugi deo: Prizrensko-timočki dijalekat

3. Da li ste imali kontakta sa govorima jugoistočne Srbije (okolina Niša, Leskovca, Pirota)?
   a. Da
   b. Ne

4. Ukoliko ste imali kontakta sa govorima jugoistočne Srbije, na koji način? (Moguće je obeležiti više odgovora)
   a. Živeo/la sam u tom kraju
   b. Kroz kontakt sa prijateljima
   c. Kroz kontakt sa rođacima
   d. Putem TV programa
   e. Drugo
   f. Nisam imao/la kontakta

5. Da li ste gledali film *Zona Zamfirova* Zdravka Šotre iz 2002. godine?
   a. Da
   b. Ne

6. Ukoliko ste gledali film *Zona Zamfirova*, koliko puta?
   a. 1
   b. 2-3
   c. 4-5
   d. Više od 5
   e. Nisam gledao/la film

7. Da li ste imali poteškoća u razumevanju dijaloga kada ste prvi put gledali film?
   a. Da, mnogo
   b. Da, malo
   c. Ne, nimalo
   d. Nisam gledao/la film

Treći deo: Razumevanje prizrensko-timočkog dijalekta

Pažljivo saslušajte zvučne zapise devedesetogodišnje Jelene iz sela Donji Prisjan (opština Vlasotince) i odgovorite na pitanja na osnovu odlomaka koje ste čuli.

Odlomak iz video zapisa *Narodni život: ishrana, biljke*, dostupnog u celosti na sledećem linku:

https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/zanr/pripovetke/price-o-zivotinjama/item/142-narodni-zivot-ishrana-biljke

8. O čemu govori Jelena?
   a. Šumskim bobicama
   b. Lekovitim travama
   c. Jestivim pečurkama
   d. Alkoholnom piću

Odlomak iz video zapisa *Narodni život: ishrana, biljke*, dostupnog u celosti na sledećem linku: https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/zanr/pripovetke/price-o-zivotinjama/item/142-narodni-zivot-ishrana-biljke

9. Pune **kanate** paprika su u stvari:
   a. Pune kante
   b. Pune korpe
   c. Pune kese
   d. Puna kola

Odlomak iz video zapisa *Narodni život nekad*, dostupnog u celosti na sledećem linku: https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/zanr/pripovetke/price-o-zivotinjama/item/141-narodni-zivot-nekada

10. Šta seju seljaci?
    a. Kukuruz
    b. Pšenicu
    c. Ječam
    d. Raž

Odlomak iz video zapisa *Koleda*, dostupnog u celosti na sledećem linku: https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/zanr/pripovetke/price-o-zivotinjama/item/135-koleda

11. Koji od navedenih predmeta nose koledari?
    a. Masku
    b. Štap
    c. Kaiš
    d. Stolicu

Odlomak iz video zapisa *Koleda*, dostupnog u celosti na sledećem linku: https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/zanr/pripovetke/price-o-zivotinjama/item/135-koleda

12. Gde se suši meso?
    a. U sušnici
    b. U pušnici
    c. U vešeljki
    d. U sušenici

13. Da li ste imali poteškoća u razumevanju Jelene?
    a. Da, mnogo
    b. Da, malo
    c. Ne, nimalo

Četvrti deo: Hrvatski jezik

14. Da li ste imali kontakta sa hrvatskim jezikom?
    a. Da
    b. Ne

15. Ukoliko ste imali kontakta sa hrvatskim, na koji način? (Moguće je obeležiti više odgovora)
    a. Živeo/la sam u Hrvatskoj
    b. Kroz kontakt sa prijateljima
    c. Kroz kontakt sa rođacima
    d. Putem TV programa
    e. Drugo
    f. Nisam imao/la kontakta

16. Da li gledate filmove ili TV program na hrvatskom jeziku?
    a. Da, često
    b. Da, ponekad
    c. Da, retko
    d. Ne, nikad

17. Ako da, da li imate poteškoća u razumevanju sadržaja na hrvatskom?
    a. Da, mnogo
    b. Da, malo
    c. Ne, nimalo

Peti deo: Razumevanje hrvatskog jezika

Pažljivo saslušajte zvučne zapise Ilije Jandrića, voditelja Dnevnika N1 na hrvatskom jeziku, i odgovorite na pitanja na osnovu odlomaka koje ste čuli.

Odlomak iz emisije *Dnevnik u 18*, u celosti dostupne na sledećem linku:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKEIBL1K3Ts&list=PLtkTKfgc4b4Xe4f3ss1YxIMgSc6TG3Xp8&index=9

18. Za kada su najavljene konkretne mere u pokušaju da se spasi brodogradilište?
    a. Do kraja juna
    b. Do kraja jula
    c. Do kraja avgusta
    d. Do kraja septembra

Odlomak iz emisije *Dnevnik u 18*, u celosti dostupne na sledećem linku:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKEIBL1K3Ts&list=PLtkTKfgc4b4Xe4f3ss1YxIMgSc6TG3Xp8&index=9

19. Ko je najavio štrajk za jesen?
    a. Prosvetari
    b. Lekari
    c. Advokati
    d. Bankari

Odlomak iz emisije *Dnevnik u 18*, u celosti dostupne na sledećem linku: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKEIBL1K3Ts&list=PLtkTKfgc4b4Xe4f3ss1YxIMgSc6TG3Xp8&index=9

20. Nepoznati muškarac koji je turistkinju **ozlijedio**, zapravo ju je:
    a. Prepao
    b. Povredio
    c. Pretukao
    d. Presreo

Odlomak iz emisije *Dnevnik u 18*, u celosti dostupne na sledećem linku: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKEIBL1K3Ts&list=PLtkTKfgc4b4Xe4f3ss1YxIMgSc6TG3Xp8&index=9

21. Zbog čega konkretno su neke oblasti u Sibiru proglasile vanredno stanje?
    a. Zbog zagađenja vazduha
    b. Zbog zagađenja vode
    c. Zbog zagađenja zemljišta
    d. Zbog zagađenja životne sredine

Odlomak iz emisije *Dnevnik u 18*, u celosti dostupne na sledećem linku: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKEIBL1K3Ts&list=PLtkTKfgc4b4Xe4f3ss1YxIMgSc6TG3Xp8&index=9

22. Kojoj oblasti pripada zakon koji je upravo stupio na snagu?
    a. Zdravstvu
    b. Sudstvu
    c. Prosveti
    d. Saobraćaju

23. Da li ste imali poteškoća u razumevanju Ilije Jandrića, voditelja Dnevnika N1 na hrvatskom jeziku?
    a. Da, mnogo
    b. Da, malo
    c. Ne, nimalo

24. Da li ste bolje razumeli Iliju Jandrića ili Jelenu?
    a. Razumeo/la sam Iliju Jandrića bolje
    b. Razumeo/la sam Jelenu bolje
    c. Razumeo/la sam oba govornika približno isto

Hvala na saradnji i odvojenom vremenu!

Questionnaire

First part: General questions

1. How old are you?
   a. Younger than 18
   b. 18-25
   c. 30-35
   d. Older than 35

2. Is Serbian your first language/mother tongue?
   a. Yes
   b. No

Second part: The Prizren-Timok dialect

3. Have you had any contact with the local language spoken in south-eastern Serbia (Niš, Leskovac, Pirot, and the surroundings)?
   a. Yes
   b. No

4. If you have had some contact with the local language spoken in south-eastern Serbia, in what way? (It is possible to choose more than one answer)
   a. I have lived in this region
   b. Thorough the contact with friends
   c. Through the contact with relatives
   d. Through TV
   e. Other
   f. I have not had any contact

5. Have you watched the film *Zona Zamfirova*, directed by Zdravko Šotra in 2002?
   a. Yes
   b. No

6. If you have watched the film *Zona Zamfirova*, how many times?
   a. 1
   b. 2-3
   c. 4-5
   d. More than 5
   e. I have not watched this film

7. Did you have any difficulties understanding the dialogues when you first watched the film?
   a. Yes, a lot
   b. Yes, a little
   c. No, none at all
   d. I have not watched this film

Third part: Listening comprehension of the Prizren-Timok dialect

Listen carefully to the audio recordings of ninety-year-old Jelena from the village Donji Prisjan (Vlasotince municipality) and answer the questions based on what you have heard.

Excerpt from *Narodni život: ishrana, biljke* (Folk life: food, plants), available in full at: https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/zanr/pripovetke/price-o-zivotinjama/item/142-narodni-zivot-ishrana-biljke

8. What is Jelena talking about?
   a. Forest berries
   b. Medicinal herbs
   c. Edible mushrooms
   d. Alcoholic beverage

Excerpt from *Narodni život: ishrana, biljke* (Folk life: food, plants), available in full at: https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/zanr/pripovetke/price-o-zivotinjama/item/142-narodni-zivot-ishrana-biljke

9. Full **kanate** of peppers, in fact, mean:
   a. Full buckets
   b. Full baskets
   c. Full bags
   d. Full wagons

Excerpt from *Narodni život nekad* (Folk life in the past), available in full at: https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/zanr/pripovetke/price-o-zivotinjama/item/141-narodni-zivot-nekada

10. What do the farmers sow?
   a. Maize
   b. Wheat
   c. Barley
   d. Rye

Excerpt from *Koleda* (Koliada), available in full at: https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/zanr/pripovetke/price-o-zivotinjama/item/135-koleda

11. Which of the following objects do Koliada-goers carry?
   a. Mask
   b. Stick
   c. Belt
   d. Chair

Excerpt from *Koleda* (Koliada), available in full at: https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/zanr/pripovetke/price-o-zivotinjama/item/135-koleda

12. Where do the villagers smoke meat?
   a. In *sušnica*
   b. In *pušnica*
   c. In *vešeljka*
   d. In *sušenica*

13. Have you had any difficulties in understanding Jelena?
   a. Yes, a lot

b. Yes, a little
c. No, none at all

Forth part: The Croatian language

14. Have you had any contact with the Croatian language?
    a. Da
    b. Ne

15. If you have had some contact with the Croatian language, in what way? (It is possible to choose more than one answer)
    a. I have lived in Croatia
    b. Through the contact with friends
    c. Through the contact with relatives
    d. Through TV
    e. Other
    f. I have not had any contact with the Croatian language

16. Do you watch films or TV programme in the Croatian language?
    a. Yes, often
    b. Yes, sometimes
    c. Yes, rarely
    d. No, never

17. If yes, do you have difficulties in understanding content in the Croatian language?
    a. Yes, a lot
    b. Yes, a little
    c. No, none at all

Fifth part: Listening comprehension of the Croatian language

Listen carefully to the audio recordings of Ilija Jandrić, news presenter of the *Dnevnik u 18* (News at 18 o'clock) in the Croatian language, and answer the questions based on what you have heard.

Excerpt from *Dnevnik u 18* (News at 18 o'clock), available in full at:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKEIBL1K3Ts&list=PLtkTKfgc4b4Xe4f3ss1YxIMgSc6TG3Xp8&index=9

18. For when have the concrete measures in saving the shipyard been announced?
    a. By the end of June
    b. By the end of July
    c. By the end of August
    d. By the end of September

Excerpt from *Dnevnik u 18* (News at 18 o'clock), available in full at:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKEIBL1K3Ts&list=PLtkTKfgc4b4Xe4f3ss1YxIMgSc6TG3Xp8&index=9

19. Members of what profession announced they will go on strike in autumn?
    a. Teachers

b. Doctors
c. Lawyers
d. Bankers

Excerpt from *Dnevnik u 18* (News at 18 o'clock), available in full at:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKEIBL1K3Ts&list=PLtkTKfgc4b4Xe4f3ss1YxIMgSc6TG
3Xp8&index=9

20. The unindentified man who **ozlijedio** the tourist, in fact, did what?
    a. Scared her
    b. Hurt her
    c. Beat her
    d. Intercept her

Excerpt from *Dnevnik u 18*, (News at 18 o'clock), available in full at:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKEIBL1K3Ts&list=PLtkTKfgc4b4Xe4f3ss1YxIMgSc6TG
3Xp8&index=9

21. Why in particular have some regions in Siberia declared the state of emergency?
    a. Because of air pollution
    b. Because of water pollution
    c. Because of soil pollution
    d. Because of environmental pollution

Excerpt from *Dnevnik u 18*, (News at 18 o'clock), available in full at:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKEIBL1K3Ts&list=PLtkTKfgc4b4Xe4f3ss1YxIMgSc6TG
3Xp8&index=9

22. To what domain does the new law belong?
    a. Health care
    b. Law
    c. Education
    d. Transport

23. Have you had any difficulties in understanding Ilija Jandrić, moderator of Dnevnik N1 in
    the Croatian language?
    a. Yes, a lot
    b. Yes, a little
    c. No, none at all

24. Was it more difficult to understand Ilija Jandrić or Jelena?
    a. I understood Ilija Jandrić better
    b. I understood Jelena better
    c. I understood both speakers approximately the same

Thank you for your cooperation and time!

Test: Tačni odgovori i transkripti

Treći deo: Razumevanje prizrensko-timočkog dijalekta

Pažljivo saslušajte zvučne zapise devedesetogodišnje Jelene iz sela Donji Prisjan (opština Vlasotince) i odgovorite na pitanja na osnovu odlomaka koje ste čuli.

Odlomak iz video zapisa *Narodni život: ishrana, biljke*, dostupnog u celosti na sledećem linku: https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/zanr/pripovetke/price-o-zivotinjama/item/142-narodni-zivot-ishrana-biljke

Transkript
Jelena: ***Pa ima i tija šamijonci, i ovi šampanjci, i oni, i oni izlaze isto. E, one se dojdu ozolje im crveno, a odzgor su bele, bele, i one su slatke.***

8. O čemu govori Jelena?
    e. Šumskim bobicama
    f. Lekovitim travama
    g. Jestivim pečurkama
    h. Alkoholnom piću

Odlomak iz video zapisa *Narodni život: ishrana, biljke*, dostupnog u celosti na sledećem linku: https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/zanr/pripovetke/price-o-zivotinjama/item/142-narodni-zivot-ishrana-biljke

Transkript
Jelena: ***Nema ništa, paradajz je šta je bilo, eve sve ga iskida, pobaca, ovaj mana, pa ga sve pečat udari i od toj nema ništa. Ali tam ne mogu da idem, baštu smo imali. Tuj naberemo papriku, kad sadim papriku, po pune kanate.***

9. Pune **kanate** paprika su u stvari:
    e. Pune kante
    f. Pune korpe
    g. Pune kese
    h. Puna kola

Odlomak iz video zapisa *Narodni život nekad*, dostupnog u celosti na sledećem linku: https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/zanr/pripovetke/price-o-zivotinjama/item/141-narodni-zivot-nekada

Transkript
Jelena: ***Sadimo pasulj, pa toj oranje napravimo, pa sadimo pasulj, pa sejemo carevicu. Prvo posejemo carevicu, pa ona počne da klija, da nica. Mi tag sadimo pasulj, pa sadimo krompir, dok ne stigne do kopanje tamo.***

10. Šta seju seljaci?
    e. Kukuruz
    f. Pšenicu
    g. Ječam
    h. Raž

Odlomak iz video zapisa *Koleda*, dostupnog u celosti na sledećem linku:
https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/zanr/pripovetke/price-o-zivotinjama/item/135-koleda

Transkript
[Ispitivačica]: *Ovde kod Vas u Prisjan na Božić išli koledari?*
Jelena: *Išli. Koleda ide, to je išla koleda, tojašku, torbičku, i idu u koledu. I turimo pšenicu iza vrata i ono sas onu tojašku, cupa, cupa, koleda, diž se, babo, od stolicu, pa dokači kobasicu, pa mi turi u torbicu [smeh].*

11. Koji od navedenih predmeta nose koledari?
    e. Masku
    f. Štap
    g. Kaiš
    h. Stolicu

Odlomak iz video zapisa *Koleda*, dostupnog u celosti na sledećem linku:
https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/zanr/pripovetke/price-o-zivotinjama/item/135-koleda

Transkript
Jelena: *I takoj baba ustane, i ono tag im, sad nema svinje, tag je svaka kuća klala svinju, pa se meso sušilo, i ene kude smo imali ovde ka jedno, pušnica. Pušnicu i sušimo meso na drva. Tuj se i suši. I one vešeljke, tolke, pa previre. Sve toj što je toj ukusno i lepo, toj se u pušnicu suši. Toj je mlogo lepo.*
[Ispitivačica]: *I ona mu dade to?*
Jelena: *Toj mu dade, kobasicu mu turi u torbicu, pa ide, pa na drugo mesto, pa mu pa druga kuća dade, pa treća i takoj. Napuni torbičku sa sušenice, meso.*

12. Gde se suši meso?
    e. U sušnici
    f. U pušnici
    g. U vešeljki
    h. U sušenici

Peti deo: Razumevanje hrvatskog jezika

Pažljivo saslušajte zvučne zapise Ilije Jandrića, voditelja Dnevnika N1 na hrvatskom jeziku, i odgovorite na pitanja na osnovu odlomaka koje ste čuli.

Odlomak iz emisije *Dnevnik u 18*, u celosti dostupne na sledećem linku:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKEIBL1K3Ts&list=PLtkTKfgc4b4Xe4f3ss1YxIMgSc6TG3Xp8&index=9

Transkript
Vlada je čini se odlučila pokušati spasiti brodogradilište Treći maj. Zaključeno je da će se uključiti u deblokadu računa i pokretanje proizvodnje. Konkretne mjere najavljene su do kraja kolovoza. Nakon takve odluke Trgovački sud u Rijeci još jednom je odgodio odluku o stečaju brodogradilišta.

18. Za kada su najavljene konkretne mere u pokušaju da se spasi brodogradilište?
    e. Do kraja juna
    f. Do kraja jula

168

g. Do kraja avgusta
h. Do kraja septembra

Odlomak iz emisije *Dnevnik u 18*, u celosti dostupne na sledećem linku: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKEIBL1K3Ts&list=PLtkTKfgc4b4Xe4f3ss1YxIMgSc6TG 3Xp8&index=9

Transkript
Bolničkim hodnicima na jesen možda neće hodati nitko od lječnika i medicinskog osoblja jer su najavili da bi mogli krenuti u štrajk. Vlada je, naime, odbila povećanje plaće od četiri posto.

19. Ko je najavio štrajk za jesen?
 e. Prosvetari
 f. Lekari
 g. Advokati
 h. Bankari

Odlomak iz emisije *Dnevnik u 18*, u celosti dostupne na sledećem linku: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKEIBL1K3Ts&list=PLtkTKfgc4b4Xe4f3ss1YxIMgSc6TG 3Xp8&index=9

Transkript
Bizaran slučaj nasilništva dogodio se juče rano ujutru u Splitu. Za sad nepoznati muškarac slomio je nos dvadesetogodišnjoj turistkinji iz Norveške. Prema informacijama kojima raspolaže policija, djevojka se pokušala ukrcati u taksi vozilo kada joj je prišao muškarac, snažno je odgurnuo kako bi on ušao u taksi prije nje. Pritom ju je teže ozlijedio, te se udaljio s mesta incidenta. Policija za njim i dalje intenzivno traga.

20. Nepoznati muškarac koji je turistkinju **ozlijedio**, zapravo ju je:
 e. Prepao
 f. Povredio
 g. Pretukao
 h. Presreo

Odlomak iz emisije *Dnevnik u 18*, u celosti dostupne na sledećem linku: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKEIBL1K3Ts&list=PLtkTKfgc4b4Xe4f3ss1YxIMgSc6TG 3Xp8&index=9

Transkript
Veliki šumski požari i dalje bjesne u Sibiru. [prošli su] Proširili su se na oko tri milijuna hektara, što je gotovo površina cijele Belgije. Gusti dim širi se čitavim područjem, a zbog opasnosti, te slabe vidljivosti i zagađenog zraka, nekoliko je regija proglasilo izvanredno stanje. Na terenu je velik broj vatrogasaca, a predsednik Putin zapovjedio je i vojsci da pomogne u gašenju.

21. Zbog čega konkretno su neke oblasti u Sibiru proglasile vanredno stanje?
 e. Zbog zagađenja vazduha
 f. Zbog zagađenja vode
 g. Zbog zagađenja zemljišta
 h. Zbog zagađenja životne sredine

Odlomak iz emisije *Dnevnik u 18*, u celosti dostupne na sledećem linku: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKEIBL1K3Ts&list=PLtkTKfgc4b4Xe4f3ss1YxIMgSc6TG 3Xp8&index=9

Transkript
Od danas je na snazi novi zakon o sigurnosti prometa na cestama, što znači i veće kazne, čak do dvadeset tisuća kuna za počinitelje osam prekršaja koji su prepoznati kao uzročnici najtežih stradavanja u prometu.

22. Kojoj oblasti pripada zakon koji je upravo stupio na snagu?
    e. Zdravstvu
    f. Sudstvu
    g. Prosveti
    h. Saobraćaju

Third part: Listening comprehension of the Prizren-Timok dialect

Listen carefully to the audio recordings of ninety-year-old Jelena from the village Donji Prisjan (Vlasotince municipality) and answer the questions based on what you have heard.

Excerpt from *Narodni život: ishrana, biljke* (Folk life: food, plants), available in full at: https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/zanr/pripovetke/price-o-zivotinjama/item/142-narodni-zivot-ishrana-biljke

8. What is Jelena talking about?
   e. Forest berries
   f. Medicinal herbs
   g. Edible mushrooms
   h. Alcoholic beverage

Excerpt from *Narodni život: ishrana, biljke* (Folk life: food, plants), available in full at: https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/zanr/pripovetke/price-o-zivotinjama/item/142-narodni-zivot-ishrana-biljke

9. Full **kanate** of peppers, in fact, mean:
   e. Full buckets
   f. Full baskets
   g. Full bags
   h. Full wagons

Excerpt from *Narodni život nekad* (Folk life in the past), available in full at: https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/zanr/pripovetke/price-o-zivotinjama/item/141-narodni-zivot-nekada

10. What do the farmers sow?
    e. Maize
    f. Wheat
    g. Barley
    h. Rye

Excerpt from *Koleda* (Koliada), available in full at: https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/zanr/pripovetke/price-o-zivotinjama/item/135-koleda

11. Which of the following objects do Koliada-goers carry?
    e. Mask
    f. Stick
    g. Belt
    h. Chair

Excerpt from *Koleda* (Koliada), available in full at: https://projekti.filfak.ni.ac.rs/stiutz/zanr/pripovetke/price-o-zivotinjama/item/135-koleda

12. Where do the villagers smoke meat?
    e. In *sušnica*

f. In *pušnica*

g. In *vešeljka*

h. In *sušenica*

Fifth part: Listening comprehension of the Croatian language

Listen carefully to the audio recordings of Ilija Jandrić, news presenter of the *Dnevnik u 18* (News at 18 o'clock) in the Croatian language, and answer the questions based on what you have heard.

Excerpt from *Dnevnik u 18* (News at 18 o'clock), available in full at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKEIBL1K3Ts&list=PLtkTKfgc4b4Xe4f3ss1YxIMgSc6TG 3Xp8&index=9

18. For when have the concrete measures in saving the shipyard been announced?
    e. By the end of June
    f. By the end of July
    g. By the end of August
    h. By the end of September

Excerpt from *Dnevnik u 18* (News at 18 o'clock), available in full at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKEIBL1K3Ts&list=PLtkTKfgc4b4Xe4f3ss1YxIMgSc6TG 3Xp8&index=9

19. Members of what profession announced they will go on strike in autumn?
    e. Teachers
    f. Doctors
    g. Lawyers
    h. Bankers

Excerpt from *Dnevnik u 18* (News at 18 o'clock), available in full at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKEIBL1K3Ts&list=PLtkTKfgc4b4Xe4f3ss1YxIMgSc6TG 3Xp8&index=9

20. The unindentified man who **ozlijedio** the tourist, in fact, did what?
    e. Scared her
    f. Hurt her
    g. Beat her
    h. Intercept her

Excerpt from *Dnevnik u 18*, (News at 18 o'clock), available in full at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKEIBL1K3Ts&list=PLtkTKfgc4b4Xe4f3ss1YxIMgSc6TG 3Xp8&index=9

21. Why in particular have some regions in Siberia declared the state of emergency?
    e. Because of air pollution
    f. Because of water pollution
    g. Because of soil pollution
    h. Because of environmental pollution

Excerpt from *Dnevnik u 18*, (News at 18 o'clock), available in full at:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKEIBL1K3Ts&list=PLtkTKfgc4b4Xe4f3ss1YxIMgSc6TG3Xp8&index=9

22. To what domain does the new law belong?
    e.   Health care
    f.   Law
    g.   Education
    h. Transport

Appendix B

The list of institutions of higher education offering courses in Slavic studies in the USA, Canada, and the UK

Table 1. Courses in Slavic studies: the United States of America.

#	INSTITUTION and DEPARTMENT'S WEBSITE	AREA OF STUDIES	Bosnian, Croatian, and/or Serbian	SIZE
1.	Arizona State University https://silc.asu.edu/content/bosnian-croatian-serbian	Polish (minor)	YES	XL
		Russian		
		Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (minor)		
2.	Boston College http://fmwww.bc.edu/SL/	Russian Language and Literature	/	M
		Slavic Studies		
		General Linguistics		
3.	Brown University http://www.brown.edu/Departments/Slavic_Languages/	Russian Language and Literature	/	M
		Slavic Linguistics		
4.	Bryn Mawr College https://www.brynmawr.edu/russian/	Russian Language	/	S
5.	Columbia University http://www.columbia.edu/cu/slavic/	Russian Literature	/	XL
		Polish Literature		
		Ukrainian Literature		
		Czech Literature		
		Russian Translation		
		Slavic Cultures		
6.	Cornell University http://russian.cornell.edu	Russian Language	/	M
7.	Duke University http://www.duke.edu/web/slavic/	Russian Literature	/	M
		Slavic Linguistics		
8.	Florida State University http://www.fsu.edu/~modlang/divisions/russian/	Slavic Languages and Literatures	YES	XL
9.	Harvard University http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~slavic/index.html	Slavic languages and literatures with concentration on the study of literature	YES	L
		Slavic languages and literatures with concentration on the study of Slavic linguistics		
10.	Indiana University	Russian Literature	YES	XL

#	INSTITUTION and DEPARTMENT'S WEBSITE	AREA OF STUDIES	Bosnian, Croatian, and/or Serbian	SIZE
	http://www.indiana.edu/~iuslavic/	Slavic Linguistics		
		Slavic Literature and Culture		
11.	Michigan State University http://linglang.msu.edu/degree-programs/russian/	Russian Language	/	XL
12.	Middlebury College http://www.middlebury.edu/academics/ls/russian/	Russian Language	/	S
13.	New York University http://www.nyu.edu/gsas/dept/russian/	Russian and Slavic Studies	/	XL
14.	Northwestern University http://www.slavic.northwestern.edu/	Slavic Languages and Literatures	/	L
15.	Ohio State University http://slavic.osu.edu/	Specialization in Linguistics	YES	XL
		Specialization in Literature		
		Russian Literature		
		Slavic Linguistics		
16.	Pennsylvania State University http://german.la.psu.edu/slavic	Slavic and East European Languages and Literatures	/	XL
17.	Princeton University http://www.princeton.edu/~slavic/	Russian Literature	YES	M
		Slavic Linguistics		
18.	San Francisco State University http://www.sfsu.edu/~russian/	Russian	/	XL
19.	Stanford University http://www.stanford.edu/dept/slavic/	Slavic Language and Literature	/	L
20.	State University of New York, Albany http://www.albany.edu/llc/	Russian Studies	/	L
21.	State University of New York, Stonybrook http://www.sunysb.edu/eurolangs/	Slavic Languages and Literatures	/	L
22.	University of Arizona http://russian.arizona.edu	Russian and Slavic Languages	/	XL
23.	University of California,	Slavic literature and Culture	YES	XL

#	INSTITUTION and DEPARTMENT'S WEBSITE	AREA OF STUDIES	Bosnian, Croatian, and/or Serbian	SIZE
	Berkeley http://ls.berkeley.edu/dept /slavic/	Slavic Linguistics		
24.	University of California, Los Angeles http://www.humnet.ucla.e du/humnet/slavic/index.ht ml	Slavic Languages and Literatures	/	XL
25.	The University of Chicago http://humanities.uchicago .edu/depts/slavic/	Slavic Languages and Literatures	YES	M
26.	The University of Illinois http://www.library.uiuc.ed u/spx/	Slavic Linguistics and Literature	YES (the University of Illinois at Chicago and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)	XL
27.	University of Kansas http://www.ku.edu/~slavi c/	Slavic Languages and Literatures	YES	L
		Russian Language and Literature		
		Russian Culture		
28.	University of Maryland https://sllc.umd.edu/russi an/undergraduate/major	Russian Language	/	XL
29.	University of Michigan http://www.lsa.umich.edu /slavic/	Russian Literature	YES	XL
		Slavic Languages and Literatures		
		Slavic Linguistics		
30.	University of Missouri https://grs.missouri.edu	Russian Studies	/	XL
31.	University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill http://www.unc.edu/depts /slavdept/	Russian Literature and Culture	YES	L
		Comparative Slavic and East European Literatures and Cultures		
		Slavic Linguistics		
32.	University of Oregon http://reees.uoregon.edu	Russian Studies	/	L
		East European Studies		
		Eurasian Studies		

#	INSTITUTION and DEPARTMENT'S WEBSITE	AREA OF STUDIES	Bosnian, Croatian, and/or Serbian	SIZE
33.	University of Pittsburgh http://www.pitt.edu/~slavic/	Slavic Literature	/	XL
34.	University of Southern California http://www.usc.edu/dept/las/sll/	Slavic Languages and Literatures	/	XL
35.	University of Texas, Austin http://www.utexas.edu/cola/depts/slavic/	Slavic Languages and Literatures	YES	XL
36.	University of Virginia http://www.virginia.edu/~slavic/	Slavic Linguistics Slavic Literatures Contemporary Russian Studies Russian Literature Slavic Linguistics Slavic Folklore	/	L
37.	University of Washington http://depts.washington.edu/slavweb/	Russian Studies Slavic Studies Slavic Languages and Literatures	YES	XL
38.	University of Wisconsin http://slavic.lss.wisc.edu/	Slavic Languages and Literatures	YES (University of Wisconsin, Madison)	XL
39.	Yale University http://www.yale.edu/slavic/	Russian Literature Medieval Slavic Literature and Philology (by special arrangement) Polish Literature (by special arrangement)	/	L

Sources:

University of Arizona Library. 2017. 'Slavic Departments and Related Programs'. University of Arizona, accessed 27 Sept. 2017. http://intranet.library.arizona.edu/users/brewerm/sil/prof/slavdepts.html.

American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages (AATSEEL). 2017. 'Departments and Programs'. *AATSEEL: American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages*, accessed 28 Sept. 2017. http://www.aatseel.org/graduate_programs.

Table 2. Courses in Slavic studies: Canada.

#	INSTITUTION and DEPARTMENT'S WEBSITE	AREA OF STUDIES	Bosnian, Croatian, and/or Serbian
1.	University of Alberta http://www.mlcs.ualberta.ca/	Russian Studies	/
2.	McGill University https://www.mcgill.ca/langlitcultures/about-us/russian-studies	Russian and Slavic Studies	/
3.	University of Toronto http://sites.utoronto.ca/slavic/	Slavic Languages and Literatures	YES (Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian)

Sources:

University of Arizona Library. 2017. 'Slavic Departments and Related Programs'. *University of Arizona*, accessed 27 Sept. 2017.
        http://intranet.library.arizona.edu/users/brewerm/sil/prof/slavdepts.html.

American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages (AATSEEL). 2017. 'Departments and Programs'. *AATSEEL: American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages*, accessed 28 Sept. 2017.
        http://www.aatseel.org/graduate_programs.

University Study. 2017. 'Canadian Universities'. Accessed 28 Sept. 2017.
        http://www.universitystudy.ca/canadian-universities/.

Table 3. Courses in Slavic studies: the United Kingdom.

#	INSTITUTION and DEPARTMENT'S WEBSITE	AREA OF STUDIES	Bosnian, Croatian, and/or Serbian
1.	University of Bath http://www.bath.ac.uk/polis/study/	Interpreting and Translating (Russian)	/
		Translation and Professional Language Skills (Russian)	
2.	University of Birmingham http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/schools/lcahm/departments/languages/index.aspx	Russian and East European Studies Translation Studies (Russian)	/
3.	University of Bristol http://www.bristol.ac.uk/russian/	Russian Studies	/
		Modern Languages (Czech)	
		Comparative Literature and Culture	
		Translation Studies	

#	INSTITUTION and DEPARTMENT'S WEBSITE	AREA OF STUDIES	Bosnian, Croatian, and/or Serbian
4.	University of Cambridge http://www.mml.cam.ac.uk/slavonic	Polish Studies Russian Studies Ukrainian Studies	/
5.	University of Central Lancashire https://www.uclan.ac.uk/courses/ba_hons_modern_languages.php	Modern Languages (Russian)	/
6.	University of Durham https://www.dur.ac.uk/mlac/russian/	Russian Studies	/
7.	University of Edinburgh http://www.ed.ac.uk/literatures-languages-cultures/delc/russian	European Languages and Cultures (Russian)	/
8.	University of Exeter http://humanities.exeter.ac.uk/modernlanguages/russian/	Modern Languages (Russian)	/
9.	University of Glasgow https://www.gla.ac.uk/subjects/cees/	Central and East European Studies Russian Language	/
10.	University of Leeds https://www.leeds.ac.uk/arts/info/20058/russian_and_slavonic_studies	Russian and Slavonic Languages and Cultures	/
11.	University of Manchester http://www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/modern-languages/study/languages/russian-studies/	Russian and East European Studies	/
12.	University of Nottingham https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/clas/departments/modern-languages/modern-languages-cultures.aspx	Russian and Slavonic Studies	YES (Serbian/Croatian)
13.	University of Oxford http://www.mod-langs.ox.ac.uk/russian	Russian Studies Czech (with Slovak) Studies Polish (as subsidiary)	/
14.	Queen Mary, University of London http://russian.sllf.qmul.ac.uk/russian/	Russian Studies	/
15.	University of Sheffield https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/russian	Russian and Slavonic Studies	/
16.	University of St Andrews https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/modlangs/russian/	Russian Studies	/

#	INSTITUTION and DEPARTMENT'S WEBSITE	AREA OF STUDIES	Bosnian, Croatian, and/or Serbian
17.	University College London https://www.ucl.ac.uk/ssees/	Slavonic and East European Studies	YES (Serbian/Croatian)

Sources:

Complete University Guide. 2017. 'University Subject Tables 2018: Russian and East European Languages'. *Independent*, accessed 20 Sept. 2017. https://www.thecompleteuniversityguide.co.uk/league-tables/rankings.

UK Government. 2019. 'Check if a University or College is Officially Recognised'. Accessed 21 Jan. 2019. www.gov.uk/check-a-university-is-officially-recognised/recognised-bodies.

Appendix C

Language enrollment figures. All figures shown are for autumn semester.

Table 1. Language enrollment figures in the USA institutions of higher education, 1986–2016.

	2016	*2013*	*2009*	*2006*	*2002*	*1998*	*1995*	*1990*	*1986*
Bosnian	0	0	55	8	0	0	0	0	0
Croatian	0	1	44	24	3	1	11	0	0
Serbian	0	0	90	16	36	37	97	0	0
Serbo-Croatian	18	61	155	247	209	78	130	220	243
Serbian/ Croatian	37	33	12	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bosnian/ Croatian/ Serbian	159	154	24	26	0	0	0	0	0
Total under all names	214	249	380	321	248	116	238	220	243

Source:

Modern Language Association (MLA). 2019. Language Enrollment Database, 1958–2016. MLA: Modern Language Association. https://apps.mla.org/flsurvey_search.

181

Appendix D

Translations of literature from Serbian into English and vice versa, 2006–2018.

Table 1. The number of published book-length translations of literature from Serbian into English per country, 2006–2018.

Country	Number of published literary translations from Serbian into English
Australia	0
Canada	4
Ireland	0
New Zealand	0
UK	3
USA	4
Serbia	115
Total in 'core' Anglosphere	**11**
Total in 'core' Anglosphere and Serbia	**126**

Source:

UNESCO. 2019. *Index Translationum*. Accessed 21 Jan. 2019. http://www.unesco.org/xtrans/bsform.aspx.

Table 2. The number of published book-length translations of literature from English into Serbian per country, 2006–2018.

Country	Number of published literary translations from English into Serbian
Australia	0
Canada	0
Ireland	0
New Zealand	0
UK	0
USA	0
Serbia	2945
Total in 'core' Anglosphere	**0**
Total in Anglosphere and Serbia	**2945**

Source:

UNESCO. 2019. *Index Translationum*. Accessed 21 Jan. 2019. http://www.unesco.org/xtrans/bsform.aspx.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE ON THE AUTHOR

Višnja Krstić (1991) is a PhD Candidate at the Faculty of Philology of the University of Belgrade. She holds a BA and MA in English Language, Literature, and Culture from the University of Belgrade and an MA in English Literature from the University of Warwick, UK.

At the Institute for Literature and Art in Belgrade, she is involved in the project *Serbian Literature in the European Cultural Space*. Previously, she was involved in the project *Književstvo* at the Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade.

She authored a chapter in *Comparative Literature as a Transcultural Discipline*; articles in *Književna istorija* and *Književstvo*; reviews in *Cultural Sociology*, *Oxford CCT Review*, *Aspasia*, and *Irish Studies Review*.

She presented at conferences held in the USA (Harvard, UCLA, UMASS Amherst, New York), UK (Cambridge), Finland (Helsinki), the Netherlands (Utrecht), Austria (Vienna), and Serbia (Belgrade).

She attended Cornell University's School of Critical Theory, the University of East Anglia's Translation Summer School, and Harvard University's Institute for World Literature.

She was awarded multiple grants and scholarships, including postgraduate scholarships from the Serbian Ministry of Education, Science, and Technological Development and the British Comparative Literature Association; conference travel grants from the American Modern Language Association, the Austrian Academy of Sciences, the British Association for Slavonic and East European Studies; summer programme tuition scholarships from Harvard's Institute for World Literature and Cornell's School of Criticism and Theory.

She is a member of the International Comparative Literature Associations' Committee on Translation Studies.

Research interests: literary translation, multilingualism, and sociology of translation.

Изјава о ауторству

Име и презиме аутора ___ *Вишња Крстић* ___

Број индекса ___ *16063/Д* ___

Изјављујем

да је докторска дисертација под насловом

___ *Intra- and Interlingual Translation through the Prism of Linguistic Fluidity and Literary Circulation* ___

- резултат сопственог истраживачког рада;
- да дисертација у целини ни у деловима није била предложена за стицање друге дипломе према студијским програмима других високошколских установа;
- да су резултати коректно наведени и
- да нисам кршио/ла ауторска права и користио/ла интелектуалну својину других лица.

Потпис аутора

У Београду, *25. 11. 2019.*

Крстић Вишња

Изјава о истоветности штампане и електронске верзије докторског рада

Име и презиме аутора ___Вишња Крстић___

Број индекса ___16063/Д___

Студијски програм ___Језик, књижевност, култура___

Наслов рада ___Intra- and Interlingual Translation through the Prism of Linguistic Fluidity and Literary Circulation___

Ментор ___Др Мирјана Даничић___

Изјављујем да је штампана верзија мог докторског рада истоветна електронској верзији коју сам предао/ла ради похрањивања у **Дигиталном репозиторијуму Универзитета у Београду.**

Дозвољавам да се објаве моји лични подаци везани за добијање академског назива доктора наука, као што су име и презиме, година и место рођења и датум одбране рада.

Ови лични подаци могу се објавити на мрежним страницама дигиталне библиотеке, у електронском каталогу и у публикацијама Универзитета у Београду.

Потпис аутора

У Београду, ___25. 11. 2019.___

___Крстић Вишња___

Изјава о коришћењу

Овлашћујем Универзитетску библиотеку „Светозар Марковић" да у Дигитални репозиторијум Универзитета у Београду унесе моју докторску дисертацију под насловом:

Intra- and Interlingual Translation through the Prism of Linguistic Fluidity and Literary Circulation

која је моје ауторско дело.

Дисертацију са свим прилозима предао/ла сам у електронском формату погодном за трајно архивирање.

Моју докторску дисертацију похрањену у Дигиталном репозиторијуму Универзитета у Београду и доступну у отвореном приступу могу да користе сви који поштују одредбе садржане у одабраном типу лиценце Креативне заједнице (Creative Commons) за коју сам се одлучио/ла.

1. Ауторство (CC BY)

2. Ауторство – некомерцијално (CC BY-NC)

③ Ауторство – некомерцијално – без прерада (CC BY-NC-ND)

4. Ауторство – некомерцијално – делити под истим условима (CC BY-NC-SA)

5. Ауторство – без прерада (CC BY-ND)

6. Ауторство – делити под истим условима (CC BY-SA)

(Молимо да заокружите само једну од шест понуђених лиценци.
Кратак опис лиценци је саставни део ове изјаве).

Потпис аутора

У Београду, _25. 11. 2019._

Крстић Вишња