Univerza *v Ljubljani*
FILOZOFSKA
FAKULTETA

Martina Ožbot

TRANSLATION AND MULTILINGUALISM

A Dynamic Interaction

Ljubljana 2021

Translation and Multilingualism: A Dynamic Interaction

Contents

0   Introductory Remarks

The focus of the present volume is on questions relating to translation and multilingualism, the latter being understood to encompass situations of two or more languages coexisting and interacting in a given environment. The situations discussed concern primarily translational and linguistic contact between Slovene and Italian, but the studies in this book also take into account several other European cultures. The cases examined mainly relate to translation in the contemporary world, however, in order to understand the role and functioning of translated texts today, I consider knowledge of the past dynamics of linguistic, literary and cultural developments to be of particular relevance, and for this reason there is a strong historical component underlying the research presented in all the chapters. Apart from the historical approach, which is a general feature of this volume, the perspective adopted is of a descriptive and, to a lesser degree, of a theoretical nature.

A basic tenet of my research is that translation is endowed with a special significance in small and non-dominant cultures (with the adjective "small" being intended in an entirely neutral sense). Although it is certainly true that major, dominant cultures have also continually or (sometimes) sporadically drawn upon foreign material through translation, its influence on such cultures has been less pervasive, whereas in non-dominant cultures it has typically been of fundamental importance. Slovene translation history is a case in point: perhaps somewhat paradoxically, translation has been both a means through which foreign forms, models and ideas reached and often transformed the Slovene language as well as Slovene literature and culture, and at the same time an instrument for their consolidation.

On the other hand, the "export" of Slovene literature to other cultures through translated texts has often shown that the power of translation to reach the Other can be rather limited and that its transformative potential can rarely be taken for granted. Translation is undoubtedly a major and obvious channel for intercultural communication, but its success (or failure) is highly context-dependent and contingent upon a variety of elements present in a given translational situation.

Finally, it should be underscored that translational phenomena are inextricably linked to multilingualism. Translation always presupposes some form of multilingualism, through the figure of translator, who must by definition be at home in

more than one language. But then there are many other ways in which translation and multilingualism interact, both within an individual and within a society. The present volume seeks to shed some light on these issues.

Several people have helped me in the preparation of this volume. I shall limit myself to sincerely thank those who have made its publication possible in the most essential ways:

Tone Smolej and Tanja Žigon by kindly assuming the role of reviewers, Jure Preglau by ensuring a swift and thoroughly professional editorial process and Oliver Currie, my husband, for always being my first (and most critical) reader.

April 2021   M O

I   Translation as an Agent of Culture Planning in Low-Impact Cultures

1   Defining the terms

In this paper, I shall deal with the role of translation as a planning mechanism in low-impact cultures.* I use the term *low-impact cultures* in reference to cultures associated with peripheral literatures, i.e. those which tend to receive influences rather than exert them. Among such peripheral literatures one can find, for example, literatures in limited-diffusion languages, literatures written in minority languages, and postcolonial literatures. My observations refer principally to literatures in limited-diffusion languages and in part to literatures in minority languages, but they are not necessarily limited to them. As far as central or canonical literatures and peripheral or non-canonical literatures are concerned, a separate discussion would be necessary to determine exactly what constitutes a canonical and what constitutes a peripheral literature. For our purposes suffice it to say that among the determining factors are the strength of the literary tradition, the political status of the language in which a given literature is written, and the number of speakers of that language, including its bi- or multilingual speakers, who are a precondition for translation to take place.

The other term from the title, *culture planning,* is understood to cover a range of activities aimed at changing or directing the state of a given culture in terms of various linguistic, literary and artistic practices as well as those concerning the daily life of its members in the broadest sense. Cultures, like languages, being dynamic organisms, are subject to constant change, which occurs either by virtue of their autonomous developments or through their contact with other cultures, or through a combination of both. To some extent, culture change takes place in a planned way, in accordance with the preferences and ambitions of individuals or groups who possess the power (economic, political, ideological, etc.) to influence or guide the development of a given culture. As far as contact between cultures goes, translation is of central importance and can, in fact, be used as a powerful instrument in culture planning (cfr. Toury 2003), although its actual impact upon cultures is, of course, not always a consequence of planned activities. Moreover,

---

*   All the chapters are published as they originally appeared, with only a few minor bibliographical and spelling adjustments.

translation is by no means the only vehicle of contact-induced culture change: the latter can also take place through unmediated contact – when members of the source culture and of the receiving culture are able to communicate without the help of a translator or interpreter, or when the importation of elements from foreign cultures does not necessarily involve verbal communication (ample evidence is given by music, visual arts, fashion, etc.).

2   The culture-planning potential of translation

The importance of culture planning by means of translation is, of course, considerably higher in low-impact cultures than in high-impact cultures for the very reason that in low-impact cultures translation has a more prominent role than in high-impact cultures, which tend to be relatively self-sufficient and therefore rely, to a greater degree, on their own internal resources. So, as is well-known, in many low-impact cultures translated texts account for a very significant part of the total number of publications; for example, in Slovenia, about one third of the annual production of books will be translations (SI/RR 2009: 14), whereas in the United Kingdom the amount of translations into English published per year as compared to original works in that language is about ten times smaller, representing only 3% of the total book production, according to the data provided by the Book Trust (BT). As Itamar Even-Zohar (1990: 46–48) has suggested, translation occupies a central position in a literary polysystem in three situations: *a)* when a given literature is young, i.e. in the process of being established; *b)* when it is peripheral or weak; *c)* when it is undergoing a crisis. In principle, any literature can find itself in a situation when one or more of the three conditions apply and when translation is called for as a vehicle to reinvigorate it. To mention a well-known example, such was the case with Italian literature at the beginning of the 19th century when in her essay *De l'esprit des traductions* Mme de Staël suggested Italian literature regenerate itself through translations from European literatures. This is, obviously, an instance of a literature in crisis and once it is overcome the perceived need for translations may again diminish.

Peripheral literatures, however, are in a permanent state of being translation literatures. What is more, the cultures to which they belong are translation cultures with a double need for translation: on the one hand, they usually have to produce translations from other languages if their own languages and literatures are to maintain their vitality; on the other hand, peripheral literatures are often forced

to provide translations from their languages on their own, simply because very few members of high-impact cultures know the languages of peripheral literatures, so the number of potential translators is usually very limited. Typically, low-impact cultures rely, to a large degree, on their own resources in their contacts with high-impact cultures – thus giving way to "self-translation" or "autonomous translation" (in Michael Cronin's terms; see Cronin 2006: 40–41) – whereas high-impact cultures, due to their self-sufficiency, rather depend on external input when importing texts from low-impact cultures (thus making use of "heteronymous" or "dependent translation"; ibid.).

In addition to what has been observed so far, it is worth pointing out that there are yet other factors which may contribute to the prominent status translation often has in low-impact cultures. Let us only mention two of them: first, at various points in their history, low-impact cultures may not have enjoyed political independence (and for many of them this continues to be the case), and to somehow compensate for their being deprived of political autonomy they sought self-affirmation in cultural expression. In such a context, translation can be considered a means of becoming connected to and of communicating with the wider world and therefore of acquiring some of the missing legitimacy. Second, because of their lack of political autonomy low-impact cultures were usually forced to learn the language of the politically dominant group and thus become bilingual, sometimes at the expense of nearly losing their own language. This was also the case with Slovene from its earliest history until 1991 when Slovenia gained its independence (Prunč 1997a, 2009: 549; Stabej 1998: 22–23). In actual fact, rather than by bilingualism proper the situation was characterized by diglossia; the speakers' competence in two (or more) languages were hardly ever on an equal footing and were often also socially and functionally conditioned. For centuries, the high code was mainly German and – in western regions of the Slovene-speaking area – to an extent Italian. On the other hand, in the decades between the foundation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia after the end of World War I and the fall of socialist Yugoslavia in 1991 many Slovene speakers were bilingual with Serbo-Croat, although with Slovenia becoming part of Yugoslavia in 1918, and in particular after World War II, Slovene gained unprecedented ground and became the official language in all areas of public life apart from the army. Living with more than one language, Slovenes have often come to perceive translation – which is a special form of bilingualism – as natural and necessary. On the other hand, it may be worth pointing out that bilingualism (at least individual if not societal) is merely a necessary, not a

sufficient condition for translation to take place. In many bilingual, and especially diglossic settings, bilingualism may be an excuse for the absence of translation, often with detrimental effects for the language representing the low variety and for the community of its speakers (cfr. Meylaerts 2009a: 10–13).

Translation, apart from being a consequence of bi- (or multilingualism), can also mean acknowledgement of bilingualism and be a symbol of linguistic symmetry. A recent example is the European Union which ensures translation between all of its 23 official languages, proclaiming itself officially multilingual and conferring to these languages equality, at least on a declaratory level. On the contrary, absence of translation can signal refusal to acknowledge bilingualism. A case in point is reported by Cronin (2006: 86): from the middle of the 16th century Britain had an official post of the Irish language interpreter in Lord Deputy's office. However, a century and a half later, when Irish stopped being used in public situations, the interpreting service was also abolished (with the exception of the office of court interpreters who were indispensable for the functioning of the organs of justice). When the new regime became fully established, it did not want to consider important a language deemed inferior to English. Similar cases can still be found in many minority settings, sometimes even in those which are officially bilingual, but in which public authorities fail to provide translations into the minority language. Lack of translation often means self-centredness and disrespect for the other, whereas presence of translation implies acknowledgement of the other. Of course, besides being a sign of respect for the other, insistence on translation can also represent an act of defence of one's own language and culture as well as an attempt to strengthen and develop them. And this, again, explains why low-impact cultures practice translation more intensely than self-sufficient high-impact cultures tend to. However, irrespective of the nature of a given bilingual situation, bilingualism and translation remain inextricably linked. If in low-impact cultures more attention is given to translation than in high-impact cultures, this is often also because the former tend to be more bi- (or multilingual) than the latter.

2.1   The Slovene case

The histories of many European (as well as non-European) literatures testify to the importance translation has had in their development when it was used with obvious planning intentions concerning language, literature or culture at large. This is especially the case with peripheral literatures, like Slovene literature, which

throughout its documented history has been strongly dependent on translation. For example, *The Freising Monuments* (*Brižinski spomeniki*), the earliest Slovene texts (dating from the 10th to 11th century), contain translations from Latin and German (two confession formulas and a sermon on sin and repentance). In later periods too, translation continued to provide vital impetus for the development of the language and literature, especially in the Reformation period, with the first Slovene version of the Bible in 1584. Likewise, local poetry, prose and drama were boosted at different stages of their development by translations from various canonical literatures, mainly Greek and Latin, German, Italian, English and, especially from the end of the 19th century on, also French. Slovene literature belongs to a culture which is a typical instance of a low-impact culture – yet, the role of translation as a mechanism which shapes literary traditions is not limited to cultures which we now perceive as low-impact: let us remember the story of Latin literature which began with Livy Andronicus' *Odusia,* a translation of *Odyssey.*

Slovene cultural history shows that translation as a culture-planning instrument acquired a special significance with the growing importance of secular literature in Slovene from the end of the 18th century on. The literary renaissance happened in parallel to the growth of the awareness by Slovenes, a small ethnic group living at the edge of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, that they too should constitute an autonomous historical subject – a belief which was reflected in various national political programmes put forward in the first half of the 19th century. It was in actual fact the burgeoning of culture, especially around the middle of the century and in the following decades that made possible the recognition of the Slovenes as a nation despite their lack of political independence. At the time of the developing national sensibility, translation provided vital resources for the growth of literature especially in the fields of theatre and poetry.

Towards the end of the 18th century, the first Slovene plays, *Županova Micka* (1789) and *Ta veseli dan ali Matiček se ženi* (1790), were written by Anton Tomaž Linhart (1756–1795), an author who first tested his literary skills with a series of texts in German. Both of the two comedies were free translations (heavily adapted to the contemporary Slovene environment and displaying a nationalistic bias) from German and French, respectively: the former was based on *Die Feldmühle* by J. Richter and the latter on P.-A. de Beaumarchais' *Le mariage de Figaro.*

Poetry only started to flourish some decades later, when France Prešeren (1800–1849), now regarded as the national Slovene poet, revolutionized the Slovene

verse by introducing to it several poetic forms from different European and non-European literatures like the sonnet, the terza rima, the stanza, and the ghazal. Initially, Prešeren also wrote poems in German, but later embraced the challenge to turn the Slovene language into a vehicle capable of verbalizing complex thoughts and feelings on a par with European languages with more developed poetic traditions. This was an extremely daunting task given that at the time the Slovene poetic corpus was relatively limited. For Prešeren, translation was a means of polishing his own expression. So, when he was preparing himself to write an epic, he translated part of Byron's *Parisina,* and when he turned his hand to ballad writing, he sought practice by translating the pre-Romantic *Lenore* by G. A. Bürger, which had already gained wide popularity in the German-speaking world. By producing a Slovene version of *Lenore*, Prešeren was not only measuring himself up against the author of the German source text, but also against the earlier Slovene writer Žiga Zois, who had translated the poem at the end of the 18th century. (In fact, the ballad had already made its mark on Slovene literature, though not as a translation but as an original text as the poet Janez D. Dev composed a poem inspired by Bürger's ballad). There is, however, no comparison between the two translations; Prešeren's text displays an unprecedented language mastery, whereas in the earlier version the expression is far less sophisticated. The importance Prešeren himself attributed to his translation of *Lenore* is also evident from the fact that he included it in his 1846 collection of poems containing what he considered to be his most accomplished works.

Prešeren's work radically changed the fortunes of the Slovene language and literature. Many Slovene writers, especially poets, of subsequent generations continued his tradition (and still do so) by translating literary works from a variety of languages and provided a vital impetus for the growth of their native language and literature.

3   Absence of translation and its consequences

If translation plays a significant role in the formation and development of languages, literatures and cultures, its absence can also have important consequences and influence the course of history of a given cultural community. As is well known, in many cultures (both, low-impact and high-impact), a decisive turn in their literary and translation histories came with the translation of the Bible, which enabled an unprecedented development of the languages and an

expansion of the range of their use. The case of the Bible also allows us to observe the role of translation in the development of national literatures *per negationem:* languages into which canonical texts such as the Bible were not translated at a crucial moment in history may have become deprived of the chance to develop into fully-fledged national languages. Such is, for instance, the case with Friulian, a Romance variety spoken in North-Eastern Italy. And such is also the case with Scots. At the time of the Reformation in Scotland, no complete version of the Bible was produced in Scots and the Scottish Calvinist Church as well as the Scottish parliament adopted the English Bible (though the Bible was to be translated into Scottish Gaelic). In this way, English acquired spiritual prestige and, consequently, social prestige as well, particularly after the Union of the Crowns in 1603. Interestingly, a long time later, in the period of the Scottish Renaissance in the first decades of the 20th century, Hugh MacDiarmid's attempt to make Scots a functionally rich language, again, involved a proposal to build a corpus of translations from various European literatures, which would enable Scots to expand its range of use and finally overcome its perceived subaltern relationship to English. On the other hand, translation is not an all-powerful means of preserving languages, literatures and cultures: Welsh, for example, is among the languages into which the Bible was translated relatively early (1588), with a very significant impact upon the development of language and literature, but this, of course, could not, as a result of political and other factors, prevent the language from losing ground to English in later centuries. Nonetheless, the question now is, would Welsh be alive and flourishing to the extent it is today, had it not become the main language of worship in Wales after the Reformation, in large part as a result of translation – above all of the Scriptures but also of numerous popular and learned religious works, which in turn helped foster the development of a native tradition of religious prose?

To sum up, translation is an exceptionally powerful means which makes possible speedy advancement of languages, literatures and cultures through the importation and appropriation of foreign models, i.e. through the accumulation of the capital already available in the source culture(s). It is a means of accelerated cultural development – i.e. of "temporal acceleration", to use a term proposed by Pascale Casanova (2002: 12) – or, in other words, a gap-filling instrument with which it is possible to make up for literary, linguistic and cultural delays. Whether in the process of the foundation of a culture or its renewal, translation opens up paths to other cultures and enables the consolidation of the receiving culture. However, the

expansion of a text corpus in a given language achieved through translation does not by itself guarantee either language survival or growth of a solid literary tradition, as I have just tried to show with the example of Welsh, where the problem was mainly of a political and economic nature.

4   Resistance to translation

Nevertheless, in order for translation to help the advancement of cultures, favourable political and social circumstances are not a sufficient condition; what is equally necessary is the speakers' willingness to use their language in a variety of domains; otherwise, translation remains a largely symbolic act. This has happened, for example, with Corsican, in which there have been, over the past decades, attempts to extend its uses, partly also by means of translation, as reported by Alexandra Jaffe (1999). However, the translational enterprise has not received unanimous support: opposing voices continue to be heard from those who consider translation an instrument by which French rule is perpetuated, since it is through translation that the oppressor's linguistic, literary and cultural patterns are absorbed. For some, translation from languages other than French appears more acceptable, though it is not necessarily considered an equally valid means of language advancement as original writing. The Corsican situation is a case of *political* resistance to translation – to use again a term proposed by Cronin – and similar stories have been reported for various periods in the histories of many other low-impact cultures including, for example, Flemish and Slovene, although they represent isolated examples rather than the norm.

In the Flemish situation in the 1920s and 1930s, which has been studied by Reine Meylaerts (2006b), the resistance was directed against translations into French as the socially dominant language in Belgium. Since those translations perpetuated the image of the simplicity and ingenuousness of the Flemish, thus strengthening the dominant position of the Francophone culture, some Flemish circles considered translation into French a betrayal, potentially leading to cultural assimilation and therefore believed non-translation to be a fairer choice. In the Slovene case, it was German that was considered a threat to the growth of Slovene literature, language and culture, in particular from the last decades of the 19th century to the end of the First World War and the fall of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, when Slovenia became part of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. The influence of German culture spanned over several centuries and was pervasive, affecting language,

literature and culture at large (Hladnik 1992: 110 ff.). Therefore it is not surprising that those involved in culture planning considered it important that for the language, literature and culture to fully develop, it was necessary to free itself of its historical German shackles and concentrate primarily on original writing rather than on translations and, as far as translation was necessary, to prioritize literatures written in languages other than German.

However, in spite of being stigmatized, German kept shaping the Slovene translation repertoire in at least two ways: first, works of popular literature and non-literary texts (like manuals or textbooks) intended for large audiences, part of which could not read German, were mainly translations from that language, although they were sometimes heavily adapted to the target setting, also with an aim of serving the political agenda of a nation struggling for autonomy (Prunč 2007: 60–63). Second, works of high literature continued to be translated, for it was through translations that German literature was emulated in a very direct manner so as to prove that the Slovene language too had its own creative potential. The reason for translating high literature, then, was not to enable monolingual Slovene readers to have access to it, since the circles who were most likely to be interested in it were bilingual in any case, but rather to enhance the development of the Slovene language and literature. Interestingly, some genres like the historical novel were excluded from translation, for it was considered urgent to encourage the writing of historic novels based on events from a genuinely Slovene past. As Miran Hladnik (1992: 107), who has critically studied German-Slovene literary relations from a translational perspective, has pointed out, the reasons not to promote translations from German were varied, being, for instance, political, moral and linguistic at the same time. They were political because of the endeavours to liberate the nation from Austro-Hungarian rule, moral because some critics deemed Russian literature "healthier" than German or French literature and linguistic because of the century-long heavy influence of German upon Slovene, which – it was believed – should be resisted and ultimately stopped.

Among the literatures which were considered particularly worthy of being translated into Slovene, were Slavic literatures, not least on ideological grounds. At a time when political programmes envisaged the nation's autonomy, either within the Austro-Hungarian Empire or outside it, the idea of a cultural and/or political bond with other Slavic peoples was certainly attractive. Therefore translation from Slavic literatures was encouraged, although not from all of them: texts in

Serbo-Croat were usually read in the original. As for literatures written in other languages, it was considered sensible to translate both canonical (French, English, American and in part Italian literatures) and non canonical literatures (for example, Scandinavian and Baltic literatures).

In an attempt to limit the overwhelming influence of foreign cultures, especially Austrian and German ones, Josip Stritar, the editor of *Zvon,* an important Slovene literary magazine published in the 1870s in Vienna, decided categorically to accept exclusively texts originally written in Slovene, the only exception being translations of Slovene literature into other languages (Stanovnik 2005: 53–57). The magazine was a relatively shortlived publication, but the fear of a suffocating German presence continued to be perceived well into the 1930s, when for the majority of Slovenes German finally became a foreign rather than a second language. Only then did translations from German begin to be considered as less problematic.

However, resistance to translation has not been limited to low-impact cultures; it is also frequent in high-impact cultures, although in them it may have *aesthetic* rather than political motivations. A classical example is Du Bellay's position expressed in his *Défense et illustration de la langue française* (1549) according to which imitation of classical Greek and Latin authors is to be preferred to translation.

5   Tolerance of the foreign in low- and in high-impact cultures

Irrespective of the reasons for the opposition to translation in specific cases – in low- as well as in high-impact cultures – it is usually the potential absorption of linguistic, literary and cultural patterns that is considered problematic. This brings us to the question of the tolerance of the foreign, which may vary from culture to culture. Since low-impact cultures have a natural need for translation and are therefore used to continually appropriating foreign models, they may in principle be more open to adopt a variety of translation strategies, foreignizing and domesticating ones. With some simplification it can be suggested that in central literatures domesticating or target-oriented translation is the typical choice, whereas in peripheral literatures foreignization (source orientation) has a more important role. The idea can be seen as a reformulation of Even-Zohar's observation that in central literatures, in which translations occupy a peripheral position, "acceptability" tends to be the norm, whereas in peripheral literatures, where translations

are of greater significance, "adequacy" may be a frequent choice too. Or, in Toury's words "the more peripheral this status [of translation in a target culture], the more translation will accommodate itself to established models and repertoires" (1995: 271). Although any generalization is hard to sustain – for these are no more than tendencies – Slovene literature seems paradigmatic in this regard: Slovene target texts easily tolerate foreignization, at least in lexical and rhetorical terms, and appropriation of foreign patterns is a constant feature of translations into Slovene. On the other hand, a study of translations of Slovene literature into some high-impact languages, especially into Italian, has shown that domestication is the prevailing strategy and that the texts which have been received well in the target culture show a consistent target orientation (Ožbot 2011a). This is, of course, merely a preliminary observation and a large-scale empirical research would be necessary before we can draw any reliable conclusions.

It is worth emphasizing that the appropriation of foreign elements may be viewed negatively also in peripheral literatures, when these literatures come to perceive the source culture as potentially threatening. As we have seen, for Slovene agents of culture planning the threat came from German, so translations from languages other than German as well as original compositions were encouraged. A somewhat similar attitude has been reported, for instance in the case of Irish, where there has been a tendency to eliminate possible traces of the source language in translations from English, which was perceived as the language of the colonizer. Many more comparable examples could be given from different periods and different literatures.

By way of conclusion, I would like to highlight the fact that low-impact cultures and their literatures constitute a particularly fertile ground for research on translation history, certainly in a European context. A feature that the majority of them have in common is the prominent role translation has played in their development. On the other hand, the histories of low-impact cultures may also present considerable translation-related differences in terms of the length of their written traditions, the strength of foreign influences, the political context and relative size of their populations. Translation histories should, ideally, take into account all these as well as many other factors.

II   Dwarfs in Giants' Lands: Some Observations on Translating Minor Literatures into High-Impact Cultures – The Case of Slovene Literature in Italy

1   Preliminary remarks: researching the margins

As is well known, over the past decades literary, linguistic and cultural studies have been developing an increasing interest in topics which were traditionally considered peripheral. Examples of such formerly peripheral areas of research which have become more mainstream are, for example, post-colonial literatures, texts written in dialects and those written in other non-standard language varieties. Probably translation, whether literary or non-literary, as a derived and therefore typically perceived as a less important and less prestigious activity than original writing is another case in point. This paper will address yet another *peripheral* issue, i.e., the problem of exportation, by means of translation, of literatures written in limited-diffusion languages and belonging to low-impact cultures into major languages and into high-impact cultures.

It is likely that literatures written in lesser-used European languages are now being translated into other languages with greater intensity than ever before. This can to an extent be accounted for by the new political situation in Europe, which, at least in certain respects, is becoming a process of integration, where more and more often voices from the periphery can be heard as well. In spite of this, various kinds of imbalances and asymmetries unavoidably persist – in terms of the *self-sufficiency* of cultures, of their interest in one another and in terms of the exchange between them. Relations of power do matter and keep on shaping literary and cultural maps. In this contribution I will attempt to shed light on problems related to situations when literatures from the margins are introduced into high-impact cultures and enter into interaction with canonical literatures. The analysis will be centred on the introduction and presence of Slovene literature in contemporary Italy (2008), although the Italian situation shares a great deal of similarity with other situations in which Slovene literature is exported, via translation, into other high-impact cultures. Also, by analyzing the characteristics of this particular case of translational exchange, general features will be pointed out which are applicable to other instances of asymmetrical cultural and translational transfer. Before examining the case in question, it needs to be emphasized that the translation of

literary texts from minor literatures to high-impact cultures follows its own paths and differs in important ways both from the translational exchange between two high-impact cultures (for example, English and French) as well as from the translational exchange between two low-impact cultures (for example, Slovene and Norwegian or Czech and Finnish), for in either situation the interest between the cultures involved is reciprocal.[1]

2   (Un)interested neighbours: Italian and Slovene literatures

Italian and Slovene cultures are neighbours and as such they have been in very close contact for centuries, in economic, political and cultural terms. However, in the area of culture, and of literature in particular, the exchange has mainly been unidirectional: Italian texts have been translated into Slovene since as early as the 16th century (Brecelj 2000), many of them, like Dante's *Divina Commedia,* several times (Brecelj 1965; Škerlj and Rakar 1965) – which is not insignificant, given that there are at present only about 2.3 million Slovene speakers in the world; on the other hand, relatively few works of Slovene literature have found their way into Italian culture and only a couple of them have elicited considerable response in it. This is not surprising considering the status of Italian literature as a canon-forming literature with respect to which Slovene literature is peripheral. Such unequal relationships are a fact of life for all peripheral literatures – for example, literatures in limited-diffusion languages, literatures written in minority languages, postcolonial literatures. Of course, a separate discussion would be necessary to determine exactly what constitutes a canonical and what a peripheral literature. For our purposes, suffice to say that among the determining factors are the strength of the literary tradition, the political status of the language in which a given literature is written, and the number of speakers of that language, including its bi- or multilingual speakers, who are a precondition for translation to take place.

A look at some quantitative data reveals the following: in the period after World War II about 230 books and many more texts in various anthologies (around 50, comprising either exclusively texts by Slovene authors or texts by authors of other

---

1   See also the following statement by Pascale Casanova (2004: 250): "The mutual interest of writers from small countries in each other is as much literary as it is directly political; or rather, their readings of one another are so many implicit affirmations of a structural similarity between the literature and politics of small countries."

literatures as well, as is often the case with thematic anthologies), periodicals and other publications have been translated from Slovene into Italian (Jan 2001b). In these translations, one finds, apart from poetry as the most frequently translated genre (about 100 books, i.e., 43.5% of all the translations), also prose texts (about 55 books, i.e., 24%), plays (about 15 books, i.e., 6,5%), folk tales and texts for children (about 60 books, i.e., 26%). Poetry represents an especially high proportion of the total amount of translation, in particular if one takes into account that besides single-author books of poetry, to which the 100 units refer, there are also multi-authored anthologies. The translated poets include classics, traditional and modern – some having been translated more than once – and apart from classics, there are numerous other authors, some of whom are mainly of local interest by virtue of being members of the Slovene minority in Italy[2] and at the same time of a mixed Italian-Slovene ethnicity.[3] Although the figures are rather modest – especially since nowadays over 30.000 book titles are published in Italy per year – and although many of the translated writers did not receive a great deal of attention from Italian critics and / or readers, it remains true that Slovene literature is one of the Slavic literatures most frequently translated into Italian, second only to Russian literature. This is a notable achievement for one of Europe's smallest nations.

By way of comparison, let me add that in the same period about 800 books comprising Italian literary texts were translated into Slovene, most of which have attracted considerable attention from critics and / or readers.[4] The disproportion in the amount of translation between the two literatures is understandable, as is the very small portion occupied by the Italian translations of Slovene literary texts in the total amount of literary translations into Italian (less than 0.5%). Evidently, on a purely quantitative level, the total number of Slovene literary texts at any time is small compared to the total volume of texts from world literature which could potentially be translated into Italian. In addition, translation from other languages has historically played a much more important role in the development of Slovene

---

2   In the Italian provinces of Trieste (**Trst**), Gorizia (**Gorica**) and Udine (**Viden**), there is a Slovene minority of about 70,000–80,000 people, who are bilingual speakers of Slovene and Italian. Some important Slovene writers are also members of this community.

3   Among the classics which have been translated several times there are also the Romantic France Prešeren and the Modernist Srečko Kosovel. Among the poets of local significance, the most successful has perhaps been Ljubka Šorli (1910–1993), a woman poet from Gorizia, whose work is familiar to both Slovene and Italian readers from the region (see Jan 2001a: 89–97).

4   Given the proximity of the two countries, one might expect greater interest from both directions. A similar case is reported by Wehle (1996: 162–164), who analyzes the presence of French literary texts on the German market and considers the prevalence of the American culture to play an important role in shaping the situation.

literature, as a peripheral literature, than in the case of a *canonical literature* such as Italian, and, moreover, the demand for translations from peripheral literatures has on the whole been particularly low in Italy. What does seem to call for analysis and explanation is that in spite of considerable efforts made by individuals and by institutions to make Slovene writers known to Italian audiences, the results achieved have in many cases been rather modest, as is clear if the reception of Slovene literature in Italy is examined in terms of its geographical extension (local / regional / national), in terms of its presence in the media (reviews in different periodicals, on the radio, and on TV) and in terms of presentations at literary festivals and in other kinds of public readings: often the reception was geographically limited, had rather shallow media coverage and only lasted for a short period.

In what follows I shall try to offer an explanation for such a situation, taking into account different textual and extra-textual factors which have been identified as determining the potential of a peripheral translated literature to be successfully integrated in a high-impact cultural context. These factors are:

1) the target extra-textual setting;
2) literary and genre-related properties of source texts and criteria for their selection;
3) translator's competence;
4) the translation strategies employed.

However, before entering into a discussion of them, it is necessary to point out that on several occasions translations of Slovene literature have been very successful, in Italy and in other countries with canonical literatures. Let us have a quick look at some such examples.

2.1   Success stories

Among the authors who have been well received are, for instance, the *fin-de-siècle* writer Ivan Cankar (1876–1918) in Italy, modernist author Vladimir Bartol (1903–1967) in France, Italy, and Spain, as well as contemporary writers Boris Pahor (b. 1913) and Lojze Kovačič (1928–2004), the former being particularly successful in France, Austria, and Germany and since 2008 also in Italy,[5] and the

---

5   After its second edition appeared early in 2008, the translation of Pahor's *Nekropola* has become a national best-seller. Interestingly, the author's critical acclaim in Italy, where he has spent nearly all his life, only came after his success in other countries. It is likely that the Italian interest in his work has been mediated

latter in Austria and Germany. Cankar's chief success was *Hlapec Jernej in njegova pravica* (*The bailiff Jernej and his rights*[6]), a story revolving around the issue of property, class, and social justice, whereas Bartol became established with his pseudo-historical novel *Alamut* set in the Arab world.[7] Pahor, one of the most frequently translated Slovene authors today, became known first by the numerous French and German translations of his partially autobiographical novels (in particular *Nekropola*[8]), which take as a starting point the author's concentration-camp experiences during World War II. Kovačič has been highly acclaimed in Austria and Germany after a translation was published in 2004 of the first part of his autobiographical novel *Prišleki* (*The Newcomers*[9]), a saga about his growing-up in Switzerland and the family's forced move to their father's homeland in the late 1930s.

Two conclusions can be drawn at this point. First, in all the cases mentioned above, it appears that the successful reception was made possible not only because of high-quality translations, but also the authors' potential to offer the target reader literary experiences which tie in well with his / her immediate interests shaped either by literary or extra-literary circumstances. For instance, in a period when the tenets of capitalist societies came to be questioned more and more intensely, Cankar's story, with its perceived allusions to the class struggle, appeared topical to the Italian reader, and, likewise, at a time characterized by a growing fear of Islamic fundamentalism, Bartol could hardly be more modern. Pahor's and Kovačič's texts are partially set in the French and in the German-speaking world

---

rather than direct; Pahor's success abroad may have significantly encouraged the translation of his texts at home.

6   Ivan Cankar: *The bailiff Yerney and his rights*. Translated in English by Sidonie Yeras and Sewell H. C. Grant. London: John Rodker, 1930 (first book-length publication in this language). Ivan Cankar: *Il servo Jernej e il suo diritto*. Translated in Italian by Arnaldo Bressan. Milano: Feltrinelli, 1976. [Orig.: Ivan Cankar: *Hlapec Jernej in njegova pravica.* Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 1992 [1907].]

7   Vladimir Bartol: *Alamut*. Translated in Italian by Arnaldo Bressan. Milano: Rizzoli, 1993. [Orig.: Vladimir Bartol: *Alamut.* Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 1988 [1938].]
Vladimir Bartol: *Alamut*. Translated in French by Claude Vincenot. Paris: Phébus, 1998.
Vladimir Bartol: *Alamut*. Translated in Spanish by Mauricio Wacquez. Barcelona: Muchnik Editores, 1989.
Vladimir Bartol: *Alamut*. Translated in Portuguese by Carlos Correia Monteiro de Oliveira. Lisboa: Ulisseia, 2004.
Vladimir Bartol: *Alamut*. Translated in English by Michael Biggins. Seattle: Scala House Press, 2004.

8   Boris Pahor: *Pilgrim among the shadows*. Translated in English by Michael Biggins. New York/San Diego/London: Harcourt Brace & Co., 1995. Boris Pahor: *Necropoli*. Translated in Italian by Ezio Martin. San Canzian d'Isonzo: Edizioni del consorzio culturale del Monfalconese, 1997. New edition: Roma: Fazi Editore, 2008. [Orig.: Boris Pahor: *Nekropola.* Maribor/Trst: Obzorja/Založništvo tržaškega tiska, 1967.]

9   Lojze Kovačič: *The Newcomers*. Translated by Klaus Detlef Olof. Klagenfurt: Drava, 2004. [Orig.: Lojze Kovačič: *Prišleki.* 3 vols. Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, 1984–1985.]

respectively, which may to an extent explain the success of their translations in the two countries; apart from that, Pahor's favourable reception in France may also have been enhanced by the traditional interest of the French readers in resistance literature. Many other elements may certainly have been decisive for the reception of these texts, but it appears that a translation can only be successful in a target culture if it has a sufficient degree of communicative potential for the target reader – which may not match the status of the source text in the source literature – or, in other words, if there is enough common ground shared by the literary work as presented through the target text on the one hand and by the target reader on the other to allow a productive communicative exchange between them. It is clear, however, that the *common ground* constitutes merely a necessary and not a sufficient condition for a favourable reception, which may explain, for example, why the majority of the Slovene writers from Trieste have hardly had any success in Italy, although their texts are concerned with a reality, which is in many cases genuinely Italian. It seems that limited communication between the two ethnic groups of the city has also had important consequences for the exchange between the two literatures: the works of Slovene writers from Trieste have remained, until recently, virtually unknown to Italian readers, in spite of the translations of some of them being available on the Italian market, whereas the Italian Triestine authors, including Italo Svevo, Scipio Slataper and Umberto Saba, who are now considered canonical authors of Italian literature, only began to be translated into Slovene at the end of the 1980s, some notable exceptions being the translations of a novel by Svevo published in 1961 and of several poems by Saba scattered mainly in periodicals from the 1940s on. This, however, is not due merely to a lack of interest in the Triestine literature, but also to objective circumstances such as the limited number of literary translators from Italian into Slovene and the preferences shown by some of the key translation agents (translators, poets, publishers) since the 1960s for the translation of the older classics of Italian literature on the one hand and of more contemporary authors on the other.

Second, all the texts mentioned are prose texts. Although more books of Slovene poetry than other literary genres have been translated, at least into Italian, their reception was on the whole weaker. As a genre, poetry is likely to present more *problems* than other kinds of literary texts: in Slovene literature, the production of poetry in quantitative terms is very high compared to both prose and drama, and there may be cases when a book of poems is translated only because of the author's own desire to make his work available to a foreign audience. Often, however, such

translation projects cannot be very far-reaching. Apart from this, poetry is inherently a *difficult* genre and tends to have fewer readers, for, in principle, it may presuppose greater effort and more cooperation from the reader than a short story or a novel. With some simplification, the observation could be ventured that poetry is written by many and read by few.

2.2   Two exceptions which prove the rule

Again, however, there are two Slovene authors who have had substantially more resonance in Italy than others: Ciril Zlobec and Srečko Kosovel. Let us have a glance at how they came on to the Italian literary scene.

Ciril Zlobec, who was born in 1925 in the Carso / Kras region, which straddles the Italian-Slovene border, and who is one of the foremost Slovene authors after World War II as well as an active translator from Italian and an important mediator between the two cultures, is probably the most successful of all Slovene writers translated into Italian. In his poetry, influences by Italian authors such as Ungaretti, Montale, and Quasimodo can be found. In the period between 1982 and 2004, five collections of Zlobec's poems in Italian translation were produced,[10] all by Italian publishers, and his poetry is also represented in numerous anthologies. In general, the critical response has been quite strong. The majority of the texts were first translated by Zlobec himself and then refined by various Italian translators, among whom one can also find poets such as Giacinto Spagnoletti, Luciano Morandini, Ubaldino Sampaoli, Giacomo Scotti, Dante Maffia, Luciano Luisi and others. The translations of his texts are normally highly domesticating and function naturally as pieces of Italian literature (Ožbot 2000: 84–87; Ožbot 2001b: 302), which is at least partly due to the fact that nearly all the translators had no knowledge of the source language, which, consequently, enabled them to work relatively freely on the target texts to which they tried to give a poetically convincing expression in Italian, necessarily erasing any trace of linguistic specificity of the source texts.

Srečko Kosovel (1904–1926) was also born in the Carso / Kras region and had strong connections with the Triestine culture of the time (Jan 2004). Like Zlobec's

---

10   The most recent collection is: Ciril Zlobec: *Ljubezen – svetlo sonce in temà*; *Amore – sole nero e oro solare*. Translations by Luciano Luisi, Grytzko Mascioni, and Giacomo Scotti. Udine: Campanotto Editore, 2004. The most representative one is: Ciril Zlobec: *La mia breve eternità: Antologia personale 1950–1990*. Roma: Bulzoni, 1991.

works, several of Kosovel's poems also share characteristics with Italian literature, particularly with authors of Futurist orientation. During a thirty-year span beginning in 1972, nine books of his poetry were published in Italian and his texts have also appeared in various anthologies.[11] In general, the translations are again of a domesticating nature, but not all the collections were produced in Italy, nor by well-known poets / translators or publishers.[12] Nonetheless, Kosovel is the only Slovene author whose poems have been included in some Italian textbooks used in the schools of the region Friuli-Venezia Giulia (Jan 2001a: 38).

3   The four factors

After having discussed some representative examples of translated texts of a minor literature in high-impact cultural settings, we can now return to the four factors postulated above and examine them in some detail.

3.1   Target extra-textual setting

In relation to the *extra-textual setting* – which includes elements such as publishers, editors, authors of introductions, reviews and other responses in the media – it is to be noted that in the case of Slovene literature in Italian translation rather few books were produced by publishers which have high press-runs and distribute their products at a national level. What is more, some of them were even published in Slovenia, which, paradigmatically, seems to make success in the Italian market almost impossible to achieve, no matter how acceptable a translation as such may be for the target readers. Often, the accompanying texts were written by Slovene literary critics who were usually unknown in the target culture and whose forewords, introductions and notes did not take into account the specific interests and needs of the Italian reader. The above mentioned cases of success are exceptions which prove the rule: Pahor's much acclaimed *Necropoli* and Zlobec's collections of poems have been published in Italy, mainly by publishers whose books are distributed on a

---

11   The first collection was: Srečko Kosovel: *Poesie di velluto e integrali*. Translated by Jolka Milič. Trieste: L'Asterisco editore, 1972. The two most recent ones are: Srečko Kosovel: *Kons*. Translated by Jolka Milič. Trieste: Ramo d'oro/Tržaška knjigarna – Libreria triestina, 2002; Srečko Kosovel: *Il mio canto/Moja pesem*. Translated by Jolka Milič. Trieste: Ramo d'oro/Tržaška knjigarna – Libreria triestina, 2002.

12   Kosovel's poetry has also been widely translated into other languages, including English, German, and French. The most recent collection of his poems in English is: Srečko Kosovel: *The Golden Boat: Selected Poems*. Translated by David Brooks and Bert Pribac. Cambridge: Salt Publishing, 2008.

national scale; they were produced by expert translators – and, if necessary, also revised by language consultants – who were native speakers of Italian and with whom the authors could cooperate during the translation process; and also, the books are frequently introduced by important figures of Italian culture: one of Zlobec's collections of poems has a foreword by Giacinto Spagnoletti, a foremost literary critic, whereas in the new edition of *Necropoli* there is an introduction by Claudio Magris, an internationally recognized Triestine writer and a renowned intellectual.

3.2   *Literary and genre-related properties of the source texts*

With respect to the *literary and genre-related properties of the source texts and the criteria for their selection,* one can observe that texts of various genres have been translated and that poetry occupies an extremely important position. The problem is, however, that the selection criteria were mainly based upon source-culture considerations, so that, again, the expected literary horizons and interests of target readers were often not taken into account. What enjoys a high status within the source literary system is often – and not only in the case of Slovene literature, of course – automatically expected to be of interest to a foreign audience as well. A typical example is the poetry of France Prešeren, the national poet, whose contribution to the development of the Slovene language and of Slovene literature has been very important indeed. Prešeren (1800–1849) introduced into Slovene literature not only the Romantic sensitivity but also a number of formal poetic models, and fully developed some verse forms, like the sonnet, which had only been used to a very limited extent by earlier Slovene authors. His poetry has been translated into Italian,[13] as well as into a number of other languages, and into several of them more than once.[14] The fundamental question is: have such large-scale translation projects been sensible at all, at least as far as the Italian readership is concerned? Italian literature had a considerable textual output in the Romantic period and one wonders whether there is any point in offering the Italian reader yet another

---

13   To some degree, the most recent bilingual Slovene-Italian edition of Prešeren's poetry bodes well: the translations – made by Giorgio Depangher in collaboration with Marija Pirjevec – and the introduction – written by the latter – do take into account the tastes and the cultural horizons of the target readers. On the other hand, many culture-specific elements of the original poems, including historical and literary references, are retained without being explained (see: France Prešeren: *Poesie/Pesmi.* Kranj/Trieste: Mestna občina Kranj/EST, 1998). [In 2020, a new Italian translation of Prešeren's poetry appeared: *Poesie*. Translated by Miran Košuta. Trieste: ZTT.]

14   On the strategies employed by different translators of Prešeren's poetry into Italian see Pirjevec (1997); a brief critical survey of Italian translations of Prešeren's poetry is offered in Pirjevec (2001).

Romantic poet (Novak 2001: 20). If so, then the translation should be carefully planned, at the extra-textual and at the textual levels. For the latter, it appears that chances of successful reception are greater if the translation is integrated into the target literary system, which can only be achieved through the translator's choices, hence the target text will become linguistically and culturally contextualized. The Italian reader has at his disposal a corpus of texts and it is important with which of them and in what ways the target text will resonate, either by drawing on them and adopting their lexical, syntactic, rhetorical or other elements or by distancing itself from them and thus referring to them *per negationem*.

A frequent problem with non-canonical literatures as source literatures is that the interest in the translation comes from the source culture itself and that a translation is made to satisfy the source-culture need for finding its way among foreign audiences, whereas in the case of translating canonical literatures the interest normally originates in the target literature. This makes the reception by target readers more likely to be successful, for the implication is that there is not only a possibility for translation, but also a necessity for it (Benjamin 2002: 109–110).

3.3   Translator's competence

At this point the *translator's competence* comes into play. Needless to say, for a translation to be appropriate in a given target-culture setting, the translator needs a wide range of knowledge and skills, including mastery of the source and target languages, knowledge of the source and target cultures and their literary traditions as well as a specific ability to translate between languages and cultures. But the translator's competence is merely a necessary and not a sufficient condition for the translation to be successful. To produce texts which will be convincing at a poetic level, for example, the translator needs much more, i.e., an ability to recreate the poetry of the original in the target language. Again, a look at Slovene texts in Italian translations shows that the majority of them are by Slovene translators who are bilingual speakers of Slovene and Italian or sometimes by Italian speakers who did not know the source language well enough to translate directly on the basis of the source texts (in certain cases, they may have no knowledge of the source language at all) and were therefore helped by bilingual speakers, who were sometimes the authors themselves. Both types of translators, i.e., bilingual translators who are primarily members of the source culture on the one hand and monolingual translators who are members of the target culture and translate with

the help of another bilingual speaker on the other are typical as mediators from minor languages into major ones; in both cases, the outcome largely depends on the ability of the translator to produce texts which can be integrated into the target literary system.

Low-impact cultures are by definition translation cultures with a double need for translation: on the one hand, they have to produce translations from other languages if their own languages, literatures, and cultures are to flourish; on the other hand, they are often forced to provide translations from their languages on their own, simply because very few members of major cultures know a given minor language. Typically, low-impact cultures rely, to a great extent, on their own resources in their direct contacts with high-impact cultures and their languages ("self-translation" or "autonomous translation"; Cronin 2006: 40), whereas high-impact cultures typically depend on external input when importing translations of texts from low-impact cultures ("heteronymous" or "dependent translation"; Cronin 2006: 40). It is therefore quite common for a text from a low-impact culture to be first translated by the author himself / herself and then refined by a second *translator*, often a native speaker of the target language, who may or may not have (some) knowledge of the source language. Another practice commonly adopted in the translation of texts from low-impact cultures is to translate through an intermediary or filter language, with all the problematic consequences indirect translation implies. This was also the case with the translations of the best-seller novel *Alamut* mentioned above into Spanish and Portuguese, which are both based on the French translation, although this is acknowledged only in the Portuguese version (Markič 2006). In relation to the translation of texts from low-impact cultures into major languages, and in particular in relation to auto-translation, Michael Cronin asks a somewhat rhetorical question: "Does this practice create a different translation dynamic from translation between two major languages?" (Cronin 2003: 154). The experience of translating Slovene literature into Italian shows that the answer is necessarily affirmative.

3.4   Translation strategies

Finally, in terms of the functioning of a translated text in the target culture, it is important what *strategies* are employed by the translator and here the distinction between domestication and foreignization is particularly relevant. It is generally accepted that with the employment of domesticating strategies, features of the

source culture are in principle wiped out and that the translated text unmistakably assumes a target-cultural identity, whereas foreignizing strategies supposedly leave more room for elements of the source culture to come to the fore. However, this is how the two types of strategies function at an abstract level, because the reality is far more complex. Here, too, a distinction must be made between translations of major literatures (major to major or major to minor) on the one hand and those from minor literatures to major ones on the other. If one takes, for instance, literary translations into Slovene, one can see that they easily tolerate foreignizing strategies, at least in terms of the lexical choices (such as proper names, geographical names, and other culture-specific references) and in terms of rhetorical choices, less so at the levels of morpho-syntax and phraseology. As a peripheral literature which has for centuries been very active as a recipient of foreign literary texts,[15] Slovene literature has been more open to new models than canonical and therefore relatively self-sufficient literatures often tend to be – although in the latter too, the translation strategies adopted vary widely so that the difference can be one of degree rather than of kind. Further, because of the relative strength of foreign influences compared to the Slovene native tradition their impact has been very great indeed.

Therefore the tendency to domestication in the translation of Slovene literature into Italian is understandable: in general, structural linguistic foreignization may demand greater skilfulness from the translator than domestication, because by transposing linguistic patterns of the source text one may easily run the risk of too literal a translation, which may in the end make the text poetically rather feeble. Also, linguistic foreignization may be rather questionable as a means of enabling the reader to gain access to the foreignness of a given source text, for it is difficult to imagine how mere fragments of different aspects of a given source language can be sensibly represented by means of another (i.e., target) language in such a way that target readers would be able to get a meaningful idea of them. Therefore, it is important that the choice of either of the two strategies is motivated by the aim which underlies a given translation project. Is the aim merely to give a foreign audience some vague informative idea of what the source literature is like or is the translation also meant to stimulate the readers to develop an interest in that

---

15   In actual fact, *The Freising Monuments* (*Brižinski spomeniki*), the earliest Slovene texts (dating from the 10th to 11th century), also contain translations from Latin and German (two confession formulas and a sermon on sin and repentance). Later too, translation provided vital impetus for the development of the Slovene language and literature, especially in the Reformation period, with the first Slovene version of the Bible (1584).

literature? In other words, shall the target text be a *literary* translation or merely a translation of a literary text?[16]

In relation to the question of domesticating (*fluent*, *invisible*, *assimilating*, *ethnocentric*) and foreignizing (*exoticizing*) translation, Lawrence Venuti (1995: 23) observes: "The point is rather to develop a theory and practice of translation that resists dominant target-language cultural values so as to signify the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text", suggesting new, unexplored, and unorthodox features of the target language use and exploiting in it "'as yet unknown minor languages' [Deleuze and Guattari 1987]. The aim of minoritizing translation is 'never to acquire the majority,' [Deleuze and Guattari 1987] never to erect a new standard or to establish a new canon, but rather to promote cultural innovation as well as an understanding of cultural difference […]" (Venuti 1998: 11). Venuti's proposal, which is primarily to challenge the mechanisms upon which the functioning of high-impact cultures, like the Anglo-American culture, is based, may offer very good solutions in this regard, but not all texts from all literatures can be imported into a dominant culture in such a way. For rather invisible low-impact cultures to obtain at least minimal visibility within a major culture, relative domestication appears to be a safer option, for in too foreign a context defamiliarization can hardly take place. In actual fact, the very decision to translate texts from a marginal literature can be considered a foreignizing and minoritizing project.[17] Therefore foreignizing translations may represent a sensible option when a literature has already obtained a place in a foreign culture, when some context for its reception as a foreign literature has already been created (Ožbot 2000: 87–88) and when it is safe to depart from the domestic *conceptual* and *textual grids* of the target culture[18] in the words of André Lefevere (1999).

---

16   Here literariness is considered a feature of the text resulting from the readers perceiving its function as literary; and what will be perceived to have a literary function is largely determined by the linguistic and literary tradition of the target literature. This implies that for a translation to be considered a literary text, it has to be formed in such a way as to fit into the network of the target literary system, i.e., it has to correspond, however marginally, to the criteria of literariness set in the target culture (see Aviram 1998: 101–102; Ožbot 2001a: 390).

17   See Venuti (1998: 10): "To shake the regime of English, a translator must be strategic both in selecting foreign texts and in developing discourses to translate them".

18   An interesting parallelism of some sort can be gathered from Cronin's presentation of the Irish situation at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. At the time, some writers felt an urge for foreignizing translation from Irish into English in order "to convey the excitement and the beauty of the source language in the target language" (Cronin 1996: 141). J. M. Synge, a principal actor in the project, considered it feasible, because "'the linguistic atmosphere of Ireland *has become definitely English enough, for the first time, to allow work to be done in English that is perfectly Irish in essence*'" (Cronin 1996: 141, italics mine).

3.4.1 More on domestication and foreignization

The concepts of domestication and foreignization are of such relevance in a discussion about translation of peripheral literatures into major literary cultures that they deserve some further attention.

As far as foreignizing translation is concerned, it is important to distinguish two projects; let us provisionally, and imprecisely, call them the *passive project* and the *active project*. The *passive project* consists in bringing the source culture and the source text closer to the target readers than they would typically be in the case of domesticating translation; a proposal in this direction is given, among others, by Lefevere, who suggests that we should try to understand, for example, Chinese T'ang poetry "on its own terms", and not "'as if it were Imagist blank verse" (Lefevere 1999: 78). Regardless of *how close* a source culture and a source literature can actually be brought to target readers by means of translation, the fact remains that it is impossible for any translation as "a fact of target culture" (Toury 1995: 29) to enable target readers to have genuine access to the source culture. A translation can only be a *functional* substitute for a source text (i.e., it can function in place of a source text, although it has a life of its own), but can never *faithfully* represent it. A translation has its own identity as a target-culture text, in which the target language is necessarily the primary code, irrespective of whether the overall nature of the text is domesticating or foreignizing (Berman 1999: 34). This implies that a translation can never be more than an echo, a recalling or a reverberation of the original (Menke 2002: 83–84); what kind of echo, recalling or reverberation it will be is a function of the choices made by the translator. The *active project*, on the other hand, aims at using translation as an instrument by means of which the target culture itself can be made to change and by means of which its presupposed political, cultural and other values can be questioned and challenged. This has to an extent always been attempted, especially in non-canonical literatures, the development of which may often depend heavily on external stimuli. A related phenomenon is the function of translation as "an agent of regeneration in the target language" (Cronin 2003: 147) and as part of political agendas, as was, for instance, the case with the revival of several European languages in national movements from the mid nineteenth century on, including Slovene but also, for example, Czech, Norwegian, Provençal and Irish (where Cronin talks of "the revival of the Irish language as the vernacular language of the Irish people"; Cronin 1996: 153). Somewhat paradoxically perhaps, foreignizing translation – often as

a project intended to change the target culture – normally presupposes an overtly domestic agenda.

The purpose of exporting a peripheral literature into a major culture, however, is usually a very different one. The goal of such an undertaking is primarily to familiarize the target audience with a hitherto unknown or hardly known literature and to make the readers aware of its communicative potential. It is normally through domesticating translation strategies, at least in terms of the syntactic language structure, that such aims can be achieved.

A short illustration of this point is offered by Srečko Kosovel's poem *O dogmatiki* (*Oh, dogmatics*, 2000: 210) in Italian translation by Jolka Milič:

	O dogmatiki	**O dogmatici**
1	O dogmatiki, [Oh dogmatics,]	O dogmatici, [Oh dogmatics,]
	o doktrinarji, [Oh doctrinaires,]	o dottrinari, [Oh doctrinaries,]
	o čudni, prečudni kritiki, [Oh weird, very weird critics,]	O strani, stranissimi critici, [Oh weird, very weird critics,]
	o vi bledi otroci razuma! [Oh you pale children of reason!]	O pallidi figli della ragione! [Oh pale children of reason!]
5	A jaz krvavim [But I am bleeding]	Il mio cuore [My heart]
	sredi srca [In the middle of my heart]	invece sanguina, [Though bleeds,]
	in vem, kaj se pravi živeti [And I know what it means to live]	conscio di quanto costi vivere [Aware of what it costs to live]
	sredi sivih cest, [In the middle of grey roads,]	tra strade grigie, [Between grey roads,]
	v praznem srcu bolest, [Pain in an empty heart,]	nel cuore vuoto la pena, [In the empty heart the pain,]
10	in, preden izrečeš svojo besedo, [And before you utter your last word]	E prima ancora di proferire parola, [And before uttering a word,]
	umreti. [To die.]	dover morire. [To have to die.]

(Kosovel 2000: 210; translation by Jolka Milič, ibid.)

The target text is clearly domesticating in nature, for it seems that the translator's intention is to convey a poetic message rather than produce a defamiliarizing text which would call the reader's attention to idiosyncrasies stemming from its having

been produced on the basis of a linguistically different source text. In fact, there is nothing in the Italian version which would explicitly signal that it is a translation, and the changes in the target text which may appear dispensable from a systemic point of view seem to be there precisely to enhance its idiomaticity. Thus, for example, in line 5 an inanimate noun (cuore /heart/) is made the subject of the verb sanguinare (/to bleed/), whereas in the original the subject is **jaz** (/I/) and **srce** (/heart/) is part of an adverbial adjunct; in line 10 the temporal conjunction prima (/before/) is intensified by the adverb ancora; and in line 11 a deontic modal verb (dovere) is added to the lexical verb morire (/to die/) – by virtue of all these choices the text reads like a more genuinely Italian poem than it would if no such modification was made.

From among many other possible examples let us mention the translations of poems of a younger, though, compared to Kosovel, more traditionally modernist writer Miroslav Košuta (b. 1936). The following text, which is taken from his bilingual book of poems (Košuta 1999: 134–135) translated into Italian by Daria Betocchi, who is, like the author himself, a bilingual Slovene-Italian speaker from Trieste, shows again that the translator was preoccupied with making the target text highly domesticating, her choices being further constrained by the decision to preserve the rhyme:

	Daljava	**Lontananza**
1	Blešči se, blešči daljava.	Brilla lontano lontano, laggiù.
	[There shines, shines a distance.]	[It shines far away, far away, down there.]
	Je morje? – Je plava.	È il mare? – È blu.
	[Is it the sea? – It is blue.]	[And the sea? – It is blue.]
3	Kaj naj bo torej drugega,	Cos'altro vuoi dunque che sia
	[What else could it be then,]	[What else would you want it to be]
	Meni tako dragega.	di così caro all'anima mia.
	[To me so dear.]	[Of what to my soul is so dear.]

(Košuta 1999: 134; translation by Daria Betocchi 1999: 135)

Here again, it is clear that target-language idiomaticity is considered superior to any attempt to make the expression of the source text transparent in the translation. So, for instance, in the first line of the target text the adverb lontano (/far/) is repeated rather than the verb form, as is the case in the source text (**blešči se,** 3rd person of **bleščati se** /to shine/). Also, the somewhat pleonastic laggiù (/down there/) is placed at the end of the line in order to produce a rhyme with blu (/blue/) in the following line. Then, in line 3 a second-person verb form vuoi from

volere (/to wish/) is used, introducing a supposed addressee, whereas the source text does not contain an overt apostrophe. Finally, in line 4 instead of a form of 1st-person pronoun (**meni** /to me/, dative of **jaz**) there is the phrase anima mia (/my soul/), probably for reasons of rhyme and meter. Like the previous translation, this one also appears as a genuine Italian text which bears no trace of its foreign origin.

4   Conclusion

The poems discussed are, of course, only two decontextualized, though paradigmatic, examples of the kind of operation that may be necessary if a text is to function successfully in a target situation. Similar domesticating translation choices could be adduced from many other Slovene literary texts in Italian translation (Ožbot 2000), and likewise from texts concerning other language pairs. No doubt, the importance of the domestication strategy is difficult to assess, but it certainly does play a major role, together with other decisions at the textual and extra-textual level taken by the agents involved in the translation process, as was attempted to be shown through a discussion of the postulated four factors.

Trying to sum up the fundamental features of the exportation of Slovene literature, via translation, into Italian, the following observations can be made. Although the Slovene authors who have managed to succeed in an Italian cultural context do not share a common denominator which could explain the mechanisms underlying their positive reception in the target culture, one thing is obvious: their texts have a potential which has been used adroitly by translators, editors and, publishers, and by virtue of which these texts could be integrated into the target literary system. No matter what drawbacks such an overall target-oriented approach may entail, it offers a way to avoid the production of texts which are unconvincing in literary terms in the target language. And this is, in fact, a principal aim which literatures, authors and translators have when setting off on a journey away from home.

III   Bilingualism and Literary (Non-)Translation: The Case of Trieste and Its Hinterland

1   A preliminary remark

In translation research, much attention has been dedicated to trying to explain and understand reasons which motivate the position translated texts come to occupy in a given target environment – in terms of their cultural impact, literary influence and their function in the broadest sense. These are, of course, natural and legitimate questions which need to be dealt with if we are to arrive at an understanding of how translations are embedded in literary and, more generally, in textual systems and how they function in societies. However, apart from studying translations which have actually been made and which are in most cases available to the researcher, it is also important to reflect upon missing or reduced translation activity characteristic of various target cultural settings, including bilingual and multilingual ones. Poor or absent translation activity and the ensuing (relative) lack of translated texts call for analysis, which should ultimately shed light on the conditions for translation to take place, on the circumstances that encourage or hinder translation processes and on translation as an instrument of interliterary, intercultural and interethnic relations (cf. Lane-Mercier 2011: 164). The aim of this paper is to examine a case of weak translation activity and reduced cultural exchange which have for a long time been typical of Italian and Slovene literature produced in the city of Trieste and its surroundings, although the situation has changed significantly in the past couple of decades.[19]

2   Background considerations: multiculturalism in Trieste

2.1   Historical context

Trieste, the northernmost port on the Adriatic, is one of the many historically multilingual and multicultural cities of Europe. What is peculiar about its linguistic and cultural condition is that it is the meeting place of representatives of the three main European cultural groups: Romance, Slavic and – especially in the

---

19   Some recent case studies dealing with issues of non translation or limited translation activity, although concerning geographically more distant cultures, are offered in Koster (2010), Pięta (2011) and Tahir Gürçağlar (2013).

past –Germanic. This is not only a result of migration, but follows naturally from the city's position in an area where the territories inhabited by Italians, Friulians, Slovenes, Croats and Austrian Germans meet. The growth of Trieste as a multilingual and multicultural city was encouraged in particular after 1719, when the Holy Roman Emperor and Archduke of Austria Charles VI granted it the status of a free trade harbour (*porto franco*). As a consequence, people from various parts of the Empire and beyond began to flow to the place, which offered them exceptional chances for commercial and economic development. Besides the peoples mentioned, in the city's heyday the Triestine ethnic mix also comprised Serbs, Hungarians, Greeks, Armenians, Jews, Britons and others, which can still be noticed from some of its architectural traits as well as from the lively co-existence of different religious communities that continue to be present in Trieste today. The largest urban ethnic group after the Italians are Slovenes, who in the past (and to some extent also today) were especially concentrated in certain districts. In the second half of the 19th century and in the decades before the First World War, they accounted for about a quarter of the residents, the number of Italians (and Friulians[20]) being over twice as high. When a census was conducted in 1910, Trieste had about 230,000 inhabitants – around 140,000 of whom were Italians – and was the biggest Slovene town with about 60,000 Slovenes living there (Vivante 1984: 172; Cattaruzza 1997: 208–214), while the total population of the main city in Slovenia and now the country's capital, Ljubljana, was less than that (about 45,000), although it was ethnically much more homogeneous.[21] The total number of people living in the Austro-Hungarian Empire was around 51 million, of which Slovenes made up 3% (Wolf 2011: 111), a percentage higher than that of Italians.

Given the significant presence of Slovenes in the bustling emporium that was Trieste, it is not surprising that the place was perceived as a vital part of the Slovene national territory, its economic hub and an important centre of Slovene culture,

---

20   The presence of Friulians, a Romance-speaking people inhabiting the easternmost borders of present-day Italy and the Romance world in general, in the city of Trieste and its surroundings was natural, given that the area of their settlement lies only a few tens of kilometres to the north-east of Trieste.

21   According to the 1910 census, there were about 60,000 Slovenes living in Trieste, whereas the number of Italians was around 140,000. The survey, however, was not without problems and the way in which the questionnaire was designed was disadvantageous with respect to non-dominant ethnic groups. In as much as ethnicity was taken to be based on language, the results obtained deviated from the actual state of affairs, for what the subjects were asked about was *the language of ordinary use* (**Umgangssprache**), which was not necessarily their native language or the language they would identify with, but, for instance, the language they would use at work or in the most general day-to-day social interaction.

with a thriving publishing industry and a lively theatrical scene. The cultural significance of the city, which was not only bigger but also more cosmopolitan than the German-dominated and more provincial Ljubljana, can be illustrated by the fact that shortly before the First World War a suggestion was put forward for the first Slovene university to be founded there (Tuma 1997: 295–299; cf. also Ara/ Magris 1987: 70; Grdina 2003: 210–215).[22] This did in fact not happen, since some years later, in 1919, a university was opened in Ljubljana, which after the fall of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, became part of Yugoslavia. Trieste, on the other hand, was incorporated into Italy. This period brought an end to its special status in trading and tax policies, which meant that its period of greatness was over. Besides an economic decline, the city, like the whole region, also started to face severe political problems associated with the rise of Italian Fascism, which was implacably opposed to multiculturalism and multilingualism and in general also to translation from other languages into Italian, although translational exchange in the opposite direction, from Italian into other languages, was considered desirable. Over the following decades, Trieste changed through a process of Italianization and, consequently, the relative number of Slovenes, as well as that of other ethnic groups, decreased considerably compared to the number of Italians. The surrounding areas, though, which historically were Slovene-speaking and which present a natural continuation of the Slovene ethnic territory on the other side of the border, have preserved their ethnic character to a larger degree, a fact which is today also reflected in the official bilingual status of the area, although not of the city itself. Nonetheless, in Trieste communication in Slovene in official settings has recently been on the increase, as exemplified by its use at meetings of the Regional Council of Friuli–Venezia Giulia, which has its base in the city, and consequently by enhanced interpreting activity, thus confirming, with respect to language policies, "that translation is largely dependent on them, but that it also constitutes a key determinant of their effectiveness« (Grin 2010: 17). It is probably correct to assume that in Trieste official bilingualism is now gaining ground, slowly becoming institutionalized at least in certain types of formal situations, with greater institutionalization of language bringing also more linguistic equality and ultimately conferring the minority language a higher status (Meylaerts 2011:

---

22   At the beginning of the century, the idea of establishing a Slovene university in Trieste was not totally new. Antagonisms between Italians and Slovenes notwithstanding, there were some Italian intellectuals in whose eyes cooperation between the two ethnic groups was viewed favourably. One of them was Nicolò De Rin, a Triestine lawyer of anti-Austrian orientation, who suggested to a communal board that it should ask the Austrian government permission to found in Trieste a School of Law, which would be Italian-speaking and would also comprise a Slovene-speaking chair (Vivante 1984: 144).

62). However, as shown by numerous officially bilingual environments around the world, even the status of official bilingualism cannot put an end to various sorts of hidden or overt conflicts between the given two ethnic communities endeavouring either to maintain or subvert the power relations between their languages (cfr. Simon 2012a: 3), which often has significant implications for the necessity, desirability or refusal of translations. So, even if Trieste may be on its long way to achieving a state of becoming a truly bilingual city, it will at the same time remain what Sherry Simon has called a "dual city", the category referring to urban spaces in which "two historically rooted language communities feel a sense of entitlement and lay claim to the territory of the city" (Simon 2012b: 130), adding that:

> One might want to call such cities bilingual, but the term is misleading. Languages that share the same terrain rarely participate in a peaceful and egalitarian conversation: their separate and competing institutions are wary of one another, aggressive in their need for self-protection. Other languages also enter the conversation.

As will be shown in this paper, Trieste certainly qualifies as a dual city, in which enduring stereotypes of the Other's language and culture have in important ways shaped everyday life of its two main ethnic communities, both of whom have often felt threatened at the prospect of having their physical and symbolic territory occupied by the Other. The concept of "conquest" is indeed a relevant one in the contexts of bilingual cities and in general of bilingual territories, as underlined also by Simon:

> [l]inguistically divided or dual cities have their origins in conquest, when a stronger language group comes to occupy or impinge upon a pre-existent language – which may have itself displaced another before it. Empires are especially effective creators of dual cities: administrative or settler colonies impose an imperial language which carries with it values of power and cultural prestige (2012a: 3).

2.2   Trieste's literary cultures

In spite of political manipulations and divisions, Slovenes and Italians have managed to live with each other in the city as well as in its surroundings for centuries. Since the second half of the 19th century, the two ethnic communities have enjoyed a rich cultural life. Part of that is also a remarkable literary output, which,

with respect to the rest of Italian and Slovene literature, is considered distinct enough – in linguistic terms as well as in terms of the approaches adopted in dealing with individual themes and topics – to constitute two literary subsystems of their own and be referred to as *Triestine literature* (It. **letteratura triestina,** Slov. **tržaška književnost**), now an accepted term both in Italian and in Slovene literary studies, serving as more than merely a geographical label. As has been pointed out by Angelo Ara/Claudio Magris (1978: 68–69) with respect to Italian Triestine literature, for a long time it lacked a character of its own, its authors being simply minor figures of Italian literature, until the appearance of writers like Italo Svevo, Umberto Saba and Scipio Slataper at the end of the 19th and in the first decades of the 20th century. These writers' now canonical texts moreover bear an imprint of *triestinità*, whose specific trait is considered to be an analytic approach to the subject matters dealt with. According to Ara and Magris (1987: 73), it was also the very lack of a deep-rooted cultural tradition, characteristic of many other Italian literary environments, which at one point made possible an unhindered growth of a new literary culture with a recognizably analytical slant which developed through a process of reflection on the crisis of civilization at the turn of the century as perceived by certain Triestine authors, in particular Svevo. It is difficult to assess whether a peculiarly analytic character is also a defining feature of Slovene Triestine literature, which on the whole shows important differences compared to its Italian counterpart. However, within Slovene literature, it undoubtedly constitutes a subsystem of its own, since its texts present not only distinctive linguistic features, but are often also characterized by a breadth of vision, if not cosmopolitanism, rare elsewhere as well as by a thematization of issues related to the social position of an ethnic minority and of its relationship towards the dominant culture.

The city's literary production has been the subject of various studies, which have taken into account the multicultural aspects of the reality from which Triestine literature has grown (Ara/Magris 1987; Pizzi 2001) and in some cases also their relevance for translation (Simon 2012a, 2012b). Usually, however, the role of the Slovene element in the city's multilingual and multicultural texture has not yet received due attention, since research has so far concentrated chiefly on Triestine literature written in Italian, taking into account also the incomparably smaller amount of literary texts in German by authors such as Theodor Däubler, Robert Hamerling, Heinrich von Littrow and others (cf. Ara/Magris 1987: 68–70), who spent substantial parts of their lives in the city or its surroundings. Within

German literature, their works are of much lesser importance in comparison to the value ascribed to some texts of Italian Triestine authors in the corpus of Italian literature. Apart from minor German writers whose life and work were in one way or another inseparably linked to the city of Trieste, there is also the figure of Rainer-Maria Rilke whose *Duineser Elegien* (*Duino Elegies*) were begun in 1912 when he was a guest at the castle of Duino on the north-western Triestine riviera. However, no matter how central Rilke's stay there may have been for his famous cycle of elegies, his connection to the region remains too weak for his work to be considered as part of Triestine literature.

There is yet another literary giant whose personal and literary biography is linked to Trieste and, in fact, inextricably so: James Joyce, who spent in the city a period of well over a decade. This was for him a particularly formative time and the linguistic (and cultural) hybridity of Trieste may have fundamentally encouraged his explorations of linguistic heterogeneity as an essential element of his mature fiction (Simon 2012a: 61–62; cf. also McCourt 2009). Notwithstanding the importance of the years Joyce spent in Trieste for his literary development, he too cannot be counted among Triestine authors in a strict sense, since his work is also primarily anchored in a different literary tradition and Trieste was just a stop-over, although a long and significant one, on his literary and personal journey.

The situation is, of course, very different with Triestine authors writing in Italian or in Slovene, many of whom spent their entire lives in the city or in its immediate surroundings, or remained strongly connected with that environment. Their attachment to the Triestine *milieu* is often directly reflected in the geographical, historical and social settings of their textual worlds. In several cases, their works, which display distinctive thematic and linguistic features, are of high literary value and are indeed considered as an integral part of the canon of Italian and Slovene literature respectively. It may be worth mentioning that several Italian-speaking authors from Trieste and the area chose to write in dialect, like Virgilio Giotti, active in the first half of the last century, who is recognized as a notable dialect poet at a national level, and Lino Carpinteri and Mariano Faraguna, who co-authored a number of humorous prose texts and plays some decades later. However, the most prominent Triestine writers, both Italian and Slovene, did not primarily express themselves in dialect, although their language is often strongly impregnated by features alien to standard Italian and standard Slovene, which are, to an important extent, the result of the multilingualism of the authors' environment. Among

classical Italian Triestine authors the prose writers Italo Svevo (1961–1928) and Scipio Slataper (1888–1915) and the poet Umberto Saba (1883–1957) are particularly well-known and representative. On the Slovene side, the foremost figures of Triestine literature are Vladimir Bartol (1903–1967), whose novel *Alamut* (originally published in 1938) achieved wide popularity in France, Spain and Italy at the end of the last century, Alojz Rebula (b.1924), who has authored a number of complex texts often dealing with religious and existential questions, and especially Boris Pahor (1913), an author who, over the past decades, has risen to prominence in several European countries like France, Italy and Germany, mainly with the novel *Necropolis* (orig. *Nekropola*, 1967), in which his concentration-camp experience is narrated. Ironically, his Italian acclaim only came in 2008, when the text's Italian version (*Necropoli*) was finally published not by a local, but by a Roman publisher (Fazi Editore), with a foreword by Claudio Magris, after the novel had previously appeared in Italian in 1997 and 2005, but with very limited impact.[23] Many of Pahor's other texts also concern the question of man's extreme suffering inflicted upon them by fellow human beings, which is explored through the author's personal Nazi concentration-camp experience. The theme of suffering and humiliation in time of war is complemented by another subject, dealt with on an equally concrete background, that is the life of an ethnic minority.

2.3   Two marginal literatures – yet in different ways

Taking into account the fact that Italian and Slovene Triestine literatures are tied to the same physical and, to a degree, the same cultural space shared by their authors, it may be surprising that texts of Slovene Triestine literature have received only limited attention from researchers interested in the literature of Trieste. If initially the motivations for not taking the works by Slovene Triestine authors into due account were largely political and social, more recently the relative lack of attention is to be explained mainly by the language barrier. The majority of researchers interested in the multilingual and multicultural dimension of Triestine literature and its relevance to translation appear to have no direct (or only very limited) access to literary texts in Slovene, which have therefore been considered at best merely in passing. Language has also been an obstacle for a number of scholars, including those who do discuss Slovene Triestine authors as well (cf.

---

23   In all the Italian editions the translation by Ezio Martin has been used, although with several modifications with respect to the version published in 1997.

Pizzi 2013) or those, like Angelo Ara and Claudio Magris, whose bonds with the city are particularly strong and whose work on the identity of Trieste (Ara/Magris 1987) remains a milestone in research of its cultural history and also shows a high awareness of the Slovene side of the city.

However, if the uneven attention researchers have given to the Italian and the Slovene component of Triestine literature respectively is readily explicable, the mutual lack of interest between the two communities for each other's cultural output, with important consequences for translation, is more striking. In fact until recently there has been relatively little translation of Italian Triestine literature into Slovene and only a few works of Slovene Triestine literature have been translated into Italian or found their way to Italian readers. What is more, the overall volume of Slovene translations of Italian literature is considerable; in fact, Italian literature figures among the literatures which have received a relatively large amount of translational attention in Slovene (although less than, for example, German, English or French). Likewise, Slovene literature – in spite of representing less than 0.5% of the total production of translations into Italian – remains one of the Slavic literatures most frequently translated into Italian, exceeded only by Russian literature (Ožbot 2011a: 513), although with a significant limitation of many translated texts being published in the border region of Friuli Venezia Giulia and often not reaching an audience elsewhere in Italy.

The rather low degree of mutual translation is particularly intriguing when one considers that for centuries in the Trieste area, and especially within its heavily bilingual Slovene community, translation in its various forms has indeed been very important in day-to-day communication, on an individual as well as on a societal level. This is exemplified, among other things, by texts of Slovene Triestine literature (including those by the above-mentioned Boris Pahor), which often abound with translated material in the form of lexical and syntactic calques as well as of various other kinds of interlinguistic transfer, which are, ultimately, always a result of translation (Ožbot 2009a). Similar phenomena were observed in relation to other Italian Triestine writers, notably Italo Svevo (cf. Simon 2012a: 56-58), and, more generally, in relation to authors from other multicultural environments, for instance Franz Kafka, whose life in Prague, like Svevo's in Trieste, was lived on the periphery the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Also, both cities, one for a long time prevalently German-speaking and the other dominated, in the past as well as now, by Italian, were surrounded by territories which were linguistically very different

from them, being Czech- and Slovene-speaking respectively. The languages of all these writers display uncertainties and exploit their expressive potential with the help of the contact codes present in the environments where they (have) lived. Kafka's German, Svevo's Italian or Pahor's Slovene are all products of linguistically hybrid environments from which material is drawn and used in idiosyncratic ways, which contrasts rather starkly with how the same languages are employed in literary and non-literary texts produced in more central and linguistically less mixed areas of a given culture. Literatures which are considered geographically marginal – and therefore minor, to use a concept developed by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari in their study of Franz Kafka – are often also linguistically marginal. In fact, one of their fundamental traits is a *deterritorialization of language* (**déterritorialisation de la langue,** Deleuze and Guattari 1975: 29–30) brought about by the separation between the standard linguistic use and the one characteristic of a marginal literature. If Kafka's German was anchored in Prague, a linguistic island surrounded by a much larger Czech-speaking area, and was thus physically separated from "mainland" German, the situation is different in the case of Triestine literature, both Italian and Slovene, since their separation from the rest of Italian and Slovene literatures respectively is a product not of physical isolation but rather of their being grounded in a multilingual environment.

The relatively unusual, unidiomatic use of Italian in Italian Triestine literature stems not only from the city's character as a contact zone shared by different languages and cultures, whose effects upon an individual's linguistic use may be further increased through their intense linguistic socialization in a second language, as in the case of Italo Svevo, in whose formation German figured prominently. There is yet another reason for the uneasiness certain Triestine Italian writers may feel with respect to standard Italian, that is the prominent role played – in Svevo's time as well as today – across all social and generational strata of the city's society by *Triestino*, the local dialect, now a variety of the Veneto dialects – one of which is also Venetian, used in the city of Venice – whereas its former variety, alive until the first decades of the 19th century and known as *Tergestino*, exhibited more Friulian traits (cf. Marcato 2011). The double strangeness of traditional literary Italian to Triestine writers derives, then, from the different sorts of bilingualism (or often, indeed, diglossia) characterizing the city: on the one hand from interactions between Italian and other languages, such as Slovene or, to a lesser extent, German, and on the other hand from the presence of an internal Italo-Romance diglossia, involving *Triestino* as a widely used local idiom, especially in spoken

and less formal communication, and standard Italian, reserved chiefly for written and strictly formal communication. In contrast to Italian Triestine literature, the dichotomy between dialect and standard language is of less consequence for Slovene Triestine authors, but there are nonetheless other important traits shared by texts of Slovene and Italian Triestine literature: these texts grow out of a common multilingual and multicultural space and exhibit a wide range of contact-linguistic phenomena, some of which are typical of the general Slovene or Italian linguistic use of the city, whereas others may be restricted to individual writers' idiolects.

3   On parallel (non)-translation

Although works of Italian and Slovene Triestine literature bear witness to the area's heavily multilingual and multicultural character, when it comes to reciprocal literary translation the output is rather modest, and the reception of translated works often even more so. It appears that despite being contiguous or even partially overlapping, the two literary subsystems have had largely separate existences. The mutual lack of interest, which has sometimes gone as far as total indifference, is perhaps all the more surprising in a city where awareness of the importance of translation has been rather high, since for decades the University of Trieste has been home of a well-known school for the training of translators and interpreters in the country, which until the late 1980s was the only one of its kind in Italy and whose foundation in a culturally and linguistically mixed border area was not a matter of pure chance.

A few facts may suffice to illustrate the relative rareness of translated literary texts. For example, the first Slovene translation of Umberto Saba's poems in book form only appeared in 2008 and *Una vita,* the earliest of Italo Svevo's three major novels, was published no earlier than 2014, whereas his other two novels *La coscienza di Zeno* and *Senilità* appeared in Slovene in 1961 (and again, in a new translation, in 2018) and in 2001 respectively. In the case of Slovene Triestine literature, Boris Pahor's texts had hardly been translated into Italian before he became an internationally acclaimed writer towards the end of the 1990s and they attracted the wider attention of Italian literary critics and readers only about a decade later. Actually, translations of his works into other languages, especially into French and German as well as into Italian itself, were instrumental in finally encouraging an interest in his works among Triestine Italian readers and in enabling him to be seen as a prominent author, recognizing him as such also by making him an

honorary citizen of Trieste in 2013. Works by other Slovene Triestine authors, as much as they have been translated at all, have usually been published by small publishers with limited distribution (some of which are in fact Slovene and publish books in Italian only sporadically), having therefore little chance of being read by an interested Italian-speaking audience, no matter how small it would have been.

3.1   Italian-Slovene translational relations in Trieste

The situation of a relative lack of interest in mutual translation calls for analysis also as an indicator of a more general disinterest for the Other. The question to be asked at this point is, what could possibly be the reasons for the rather limited literary and in particular translational exchange between the two communities, which – it seems – have been living parallel lives instead of actively crossing each other's paths? Necessarily, a variety of issues are at play and involve a complex interaction of political, social, ideological, cultural, literary and linguistic aspects, in a historical and contemporary perspective. A possible starting point to delve into the question may be the observation that, especially in the past, the relationship between the two ethnic communities has been strongly asymmetrical, with the Slovene community occupying the lower end and therefore in many respects also being in a subordinate position with regard to the Italian community. In spite of sharing a territory for centuries and shaping the life of one and the same city, the two communities and the two peoples of which they are a part, i.e. the Italians and the Slovenes, have had very different histories.

Given this, it is not unusual if Italians and Slovenes in Trieste have led largely separate lives, for centuries sharing the urban space, but often ignoring each other. For both communities, the "Other remains within constant earshot" (Simon 2012a:7), but is often perceived as an intruder in the territory, whose perception tends to vary between the two communities. A study conducted in the mid-90s aptly illustrates how the common space is perceived differently by members of the two ethnic communities (Sbisà and Vascotto 2007). As reported by its authors, Marina Sbisà and Patrizia Vascotto, high-school pupils of different age groups, some from Italian and some from Slovene schools of the area, were asked to try to make a detailed presentation of the territory of the province of Trieste for someone who does not know it. As the results show, some meaningful differences can be detected from their descriptions. These differences concern both the natural characteristics of the territory as well as an awareness (or lack of it) of the other

ethnic community sharing the same physical space. In the subjects' perception of the territory, for instance, the sea figures more prominently in the texts produced by the Italian pupils, while the Karst hinterland has a greater role in those written by pupils from Slovene schools. As to the presence of the Other, in some cases an awareness of it is totally absent, especially in Italian pupils who seem to ignore the existence of the other ethnic community. Perceiving the territory as ethnically homogeneous, they do not find it relevant to talk about their ethnic identity (in 97.8% of cases), whereas with Slovene pupils this is less often the case: 35.5% of them explicitly mention their ethnic identity, which is consistent with "the tendency to self-awareness that is characteristic of minorities" (Sbisà and Vascotto 2007: 163). However, despite such differences between the two groups, the study gives a further proof that the lives of the Italian and the Slovene community proceed largely in parallel:

> But the image of the other hardly plays any role in the way majority members represent the territory and even among minority members, the affirmation of one's own identity is not always accompanied by manifestations of awareness of the presence of a diverse majority. Throughout the corpus, perhaps with the exception of two Slovene texts, whenever the distinction between the Italian majority and Slovene minority is represented, it is conceived of as neat, and those hybrid or complex identities, that contact cannot fail to produce, are disregarded (Sbisà and Vascotto 2007: 166).

It should therefore not be too surprising if parallelisms rather than interaction have also characterized to a considerable extent the literary and translational relations between the two communities.

3.1.1 Politics, society and – language

As observed by the historian Angelo Ara (2009: 308), the division between the city, which is predominantly Italian-speaking, and the country, which is prevalently Slovene (and Croatian further to the south), did not only provoke continuous social and ethnic tensions between the two societies, an urban and a rural one, but was also at the basis of strong territorial claims over the region as a whole, not just part of it, by Italians and Slovenes, while, historically speaking, each of the two ethnic groups predominates in only part of the territory. It appears, though, that antagonisms between the two ethnic communities started to be truly felt only in the mid-19th century, with the spread of the national revival movement, which was

particularly strong in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, when it became clear that the multinational state could no more offer a satisfactory model of co-existence of its peoples, who found their inferior position with respect to the dominant German-speaking community increasingly unbearable. As Ara notes (2009: 304), the development of national consciousness in the subordinate peoples had as a consequence an increase in national conflicts between different ethnic groups, which could be particularly intense in multilingual and multinational border regions at the margins of the empire, one of which was also the area around Trieste. Its problems must therefore be considered as part of national, and therefore also linguistic, issues which affected a much larger area in which Italians lived together with Slavic and German populations.

Although the migration towards the urban area of Trieste had been strong ever since the proclamation of the free harbour at the beginning of the 18th century, until the Spring of Nations national awareness had not matured enough to become an agent of conflict between the two communities. The newcomers to the city – most of whom were Slovene, but there were also immigrants of various other ethnic backgrounds – became largely assimilated into the urban Italian-speaking majority. Moving upward on the social scale often implied a shift of language and, in the end, a change of ethnic identity (Ara 2009: 305). Also, throughout the 18th century, linguistic identity was rather linked to the social status than being a pivotal point of national awareness (cf. Remec 2012: 215).

As national consciousness developed, one's ethnic belonging became an active agent in identity construction, which was found disturbing especially by certain Italian-speaking circles, whose position of the socially dominant group began to be shaken. Also, the sheer number of immigrants to the city increased to such a degree that they could not simply be absorbed by the Italians (Ara 2009: 305). This implies that it was the economic circumstances and rapid urbanization which provoked an intensification of interethnic conflicts (Ara 2009: 311). Moreover, to mitigate its subjects' mistrust towards the state, in 1867 the Habsburg Monarchy passed a law, as part of the December Constitution, whereby, according to whose famous Article 19 the individual peoples of the Austrian part of the Empire had the right to assert their own national and linguistic rights and, as a consequence, use their languages in education, administration and public life in general (Verginella 2002: 456). Some years later, in 1883, during Taaffe's rule as Austrian prime minister, the Imperial Council granted Italian, Slovene and Croatian an

equal status as languages of the law courts in the areas inhabited by the three ethnic groups (Černigoj 2007: 70). As a consequence, Trieste became gripped by a tension between "an imperial tongue and a national language" (Simon 2012a: 58) and at the same time by ever-louder claims for national and linguistic rights of the Slovene and more generally of the Slavic population. National issues started to dominate virtually every aspect of life and battles for language rights, which were a symptom of complex and deep-seated national problems, began to be played out. Considering that language struggles, which imply the recognition of the Other's linguistic identity through bilingualism, necessarily involve (often painful) processes of translation, one has to agree with Sherry Simon's assertion in relation to the cities of *Mitteleuropa* that "translation in the twentieth century must first and foremost be identified as a form of violence and coercion" (Simon 2012b: 133). As far as Trieste is concerned, this is how language wars were perceived by different parts of its population at different times.

Among the most notorious and perhaps the best documented language struggles in the area in and around Trieste were those concerning putting up bi- or multilingual public signs on law courts buildings in the coastal town of Piran/Pirano (Černigoj 2007) and equipping railway stations on the line between Trieste with the Istrian resort Poreč/Parenzo with bi- or multilingual place-name signs (Černigoj 2010). The opening of Slovene language schools was also found extremely problematic by a large part of the Italian population, as was the case in the Rojan/Roiano suburb of Trieste (Ara 2009: 311; cf. also Ara/Magris 1987: 65). The concession of language rights to Slovenes (and Croats) regularly triggered demonstrations amongst the Italian population, for whom the shaking of an established language hierarchy was naturally perceived as a threat to its position, which was vulnerable to an extent, since in Austria-Hungary Triestine Italians too were a minority, in spite of living in a city where they were numerically and culturally dominant. The central Viennese government, however, seemed rather favourable to making Slovene an official language (*Amtssprache*) as well – possibly as a sign of recognition to an ethnic group that was considered more loyal to the Emperor than the Italians living in the Empire were, but also as a means of restraining the burgeoning Italian national awareness. In actual fact, the Italians perceived themselves as the legitimate owners of the territory not just because of their numerical preponderance and cultural supremacy, but also because they believed themselves to be the direct heirs of the Roman civilization, which predated the settlements of the Slavs in the area by several centuries. From their point

of view, then, the Slavic national awakening was an illegitimate process which threatened the long-established relations of power in the area and in particular the Italians' status as the "indigenous" people of the territory (Verginella 2002: 459). The zenith of anti-Slavic nationalism was reached in the Fascist period (1922–1943), when the use of Slovene was officially prohibited.

Yet, it would be unjust to consider a negative attitude towards Slovenes as characteristic of the entire Italian-speaking population of the city. Apart from the Triestine working class, among whom mutual solidarity was placed above ethnic identity, there were also several other individuals and groups for whom peaceful co-existence between Italians and Slovenes (and generally Slavs) was essential and who sought to find ways of achieving it. Among them one can find socialists like Angelo Vivante, democrats like Fabio Cusin, some Catholics as well as some irredentists, i.e. anti-Austrian Italian patriots, like the writer Scipio Slataper (Ara 2009: 311) and his circle, who were aware that the identity of the area had been shaped by contributions from the different ethnic groups living in it (Ara 2009: 312).

3.1.2 Culture, literature and – language

The asymmetrical relationship between Slovenes and Italians in Trieste evident in the political and social spheres may have also been present in the cultural sphere and, in particular, that of literature, where Italians had for centuries been one of the leading nations, with a highly developed literary tradition since as early as the 14th century and consequently a full-fledged literary language. The earliest Slovene texts, on the other hand, date back to the early 11th century, but for some eight centuries after that, the textual production in Slovene was relatively meagre, with the exception of some more prolific periods such as the Reformation, which saw, among other things, the first Slovene translation of the Bible in 1584, then the Baroque period, when some fine examples of homiletic literature were produced, and the Enlightenment, with a significant output of secular plays. But as a whole, Slovene literature began to flourish relatively late, in particular in the first decades of the 19th century and around the Spring of Nations in 1848. As can be expected, language development proceeded in parallel with literary development, and it took a long time before Slovene became accepted as a suitable medium for all kinds of literary and non-literary communication. What is also important to take into consideration is the socio-political status of Slovene: until 1918 its public use was very limited and it only acquired a wide functional scope after

the Second World War, at the time of socialist Yugoslavia, and especially after Slovenia's independence in 1991. Obviously, the situation with Italian was very different: although in many areas of non-literary language use the Latin tradition was strong and although Italy was united only in 1861, Italian had for centuries been used in a great variety of situations and, in spite of the dominance of dialects in day-to-day oral communication, it had reached a state of maturity much earlier than Slovene.

Given the different dynamics of literary and linguistic development in the two cultures, it is not surprising if the Slovene community, which in addition was associated much more with rural than with urban life and therefore had a socially subordinate position, was not considered of much interest to the Italian part of the city's population. The political and social conditioning of the reception (or lack of it) of Slovene literature abroad was remarked upon already by the Triestine intellectual Angelo Vivante, the author of a highly unorthodox treatise on the development of Italian nationalism in Trieste and the surrounding region *Irredentismo adriatico* (1912), who attributed the limited reception of Slovene literature outside its native territory to external political and social circumstances (1912/1984: 158) rather than to its intrinsic nature.

The political situation between the end of the First World War and the fall of socialism in the late 1980s only strengthened the negative attitude towards the Other and their culture and indeed worsened the relations between the two ethnic communities. Initially, this happened partly because of the militantly nationalist Fascist ideology, among whose prime targets were the Slavs, but then also because Trieste and its surroundings were for a long time part of a disputed territory, which after the Second World War was claimed by both Italy and Yugoslavia. The post-war ideological circumstances also made the situation worse: after 1945, Italy and Yugoslavia formed different ideological alliances; Italy developed into an important western power, whereas Yugoslavia, although non-aligned, practice a softer version of a communism. The antagonism between the two ideologies was felt in a particularly strong way in Trieste, where the new communist state was often viewed with great suspicion. The Slovene minority, in its turn, despite being in ideological terms internally divided, was often automatically associated with the communist neighbour on Italy's eastern border. Needless to say, such a strained relationship was not of any use in the promotion of a productive mutual interest between the two communities, between their cultures and literatures. The

situation changed considerably after the fall of socialism, with Slovene independence, with the country's entry in the European Union and with Slovene becoming one of the official languages of the EU, which all enhanced the language's perceived status and increased the interest in Slovene literature (cf. Meylaerts 2009b: 98). Asymmetries, which are characteristic of multilingual societies, continue to persist and are certainly unavoidable, but it appears that the gain in political power conferred upon the community some of the linguistic, literary and in general cultural legitimacy which it had previously lacked: Slovene literature is now being translated into Italian with some more success than in the past and the Italian-speaking population of the city is increasingly interested in learning the Other's language. There are also many other signs pointing to a change in attitude, which could hardly have been imaginable twenty or thirty years ago: for instance, the city's daily newspaper *Il piccolo* has been dedicating considerable attention to issues related to Slovenes and their culture; likewise, several of Trieste's Italian bookshops display in their shop windows and on their shelves books about Slovenia and Slovene culture, including translations of Triestine Slovene literary texts into Italian.[24] The current situation clearly demonstrates the fundamental link between multilingualism and translation. "The question of which language(s) can/cannot/must be used necessarily implies: which one(s) can/cannot/must be translated from or into, by whom, in what way, in which geo-temporal, institutional framework etc." (Meylaerts 2006a: 2).

Interestingly, a development of a new perspective on the Slovene Other can also be observed in literary texts by Italian authors in which various attitudes towards Slovenes are expressed. Traditionally, such attitudes tended to be negative (though not without exception), especially in the period immediately after the Second World War, when the brief, but intense Yugoslav occupation of the city left a deep mark, as can be seen, for example, from Pier Antonio Quarantotti Gambini's anti-Slavic writing. Later, however, feelings of denial and, at best, indifference gradually evolved into an interest in and openness towards the Other, as witnessed, for example, in novels by Fulvio Tomizza, but also by Tullio Kezich, Renato Ferrari and Carolus Cergoly (Barut Polman 2011).

The perception of Slovenes as a coarse, uncivilized and even aggressive people did not help engender an interest in their literature and culture, which had direct

---

24   Recently, an anthological volume edited by Marija Pirjevec and designed for Italian-speaking readers interested in the city's Slovene culture, especially in its literature, has come out under the telling title *L'altra anima di Trieste* ("Trieste's Other Soul"; Trieste: Mladika, 2009).

consequences for translation, since a negative attitude towards a community and its language usually also implies a tendency to refuse translations from that language. To witness a shift in perspective it was necessary to wait until the early 1990s when political, social and language-policy started to change. Through them, the asymmetries between the two ethnic groups began to diminish and Slovene culture started to gain recognition, also in the areas of language and translation, with Slovene coming to be learned by Italian Triestines, with some Italian children attending Slovene schools and with an increased translational exchange. These seem to be significant signs which point to a development of a new bilingual awareness in the city.[25]

3.2   Reduced asymmetries and new perspectives

The new situation of reduced asymmetries has also made possible a breakthrough for Slovene translated literature. By recognizing that in Trieste the Italian and the Slovene communities, despite many differences between them, have for a long time shared and shaped an important reality, which is the urban territory itself, the dominant Italian culture started to accept the presence of the Other and to make space for the city's Slovene culture. Rather than perpetuating the clash between a prestigious central culture on the one hand and a less established peripheral culture on the other hand, the two communities have begun to build a mutual relationship revolving around a common core, on the basis of which the success of various cultural projects recently carried out is to be explained, first and foremost also the highly positive reception of the Italian translations of Boris Pahor's texts.

As has been shown by various studies on the reception of translated texts, especially when they belong to peripheral literatures and are "exported" into central cultures, various text-internal and text-external factors are at play, such as the quality of the translations, their distribution on the book market and promotional events accompanying the publication (cf. Ožbot 2011a). However, apart from all that, the necessary – although not sufficient – condition which may be central to a successful reception of a translation is its sufficient communicative potential

---

25   As François Grin (2010: 16) put it: "[…] people will use a variety of languages (instead of only one) if three conditions are present. These three conditions are: the capacity to use these languages, opportunities to use them, and the desire to do so. Typically, therefore, language policies will try to influence capacity, opportunity and desire – in varying proportions depending on context and objectives. […] Translation itself is a key conduit for language policy, because it reinforces capacity, opportunity and desire."

for the target audience and, ultimately, the latter's willingness to recognize it. In other words, without sufficient common ground between the translated text and its readers, productive communication cannot take place. It seems that Triestine Slovene literature has only been able to offer such communicative potential to the Italian Triestine readers when the political, social and linguistic situation has become more balanced, which has allowed the other community of the city to be seen not so much as an opponent but rather as a neighbour, who has something to offer in terms of their culture as well as historical experience. Boris Pahor's works have always dealt with universal questions that transcend the immediate historical circumstances against which they are explored, which is, after all, the reason why they have been received well in various other target cultures, such as in French and German-speaking cultures. However, their success in their home environment only came about after the potential readers became receptive for Pahor's texts, recognizing in them enough common ground. The author's international success was undoubtedly instrumental in the promotion of his works at home, but a changed relationship between the Italian and the Slovene communities of the city has also played a fundamental role in the reception of the translations.

On the Slovene side, the literature of Italian Triestine authors is currently also being translated to a greater extent than ever before: over the past five years translations of Umberto Saba's collection of poems as well as of his novel *Ernesto* have been published and Slovene versions of some contemporary authors' texts, such as the well-established Claudio Magris and the young and innovative Mauro Covacich, have also been produced. However, the reasons why this did not happen earlier and on a larger scale is probably more of a practical than of a political nature. Within the Slovene Triestine community itself, there has been no immediate need for translation, since virtually all its members are bilingual, as is often the case in asymmetrically bilingual societies, where the "subordinate" party is more likely to be bilingual than the "dominant" one. As to the Slovene translational culture as a whole, it seems that its relative lack of interest in Italian Triestine literature with respect to many other Italian literary texts was conditioned mainly by the personal preferences of the available literary translators (not numerous at that), who chose to work on classical texts (e.g. Dante, Boccaccio, Petrarca), on modernist poetry (e.g. Montale, Quasimodo, Ungaretti), on contemporary post-World-War-II novels (e.g. Moravia, Sciascia, Camilleri) and on plays (e.g. Goldoni, Pirandello, De Filippo) rather than on texts of Triestine literature, with the exception of some authors whose works explicitly deal with themes directly related to Slovenes and

their culture, in particular when they express a positive attitude towards them. Among others, this is the case with Scipio Slataper's *Mio Carso* (publ. 1912, transl. 1988), which stresses that constructive dialogue between the two ethnic groups is an indispensable basis for their future co-existence, or in several novels by the Istrian-born Triestine author Fulvio Tomizza, most notably perhaps in his *Gli sposi di via Rossetti: tragedia di una minoranza* (publ. 1986, transl. 1987), which deals with the death of a Slovene politically committed couple who were murdered in their Trieste flat in the middle of the Second World War by a perpetrator who continues to remain unidentified up to the present.

In terms of publishing activity, approximately 40 books by Slovene Triestine authors in Italian translation have been published in Trieste since the early 1970s, initially only sporadically, since just a few came out before the mid-1980s, when the social and political climate began to change, and over one half of them have been published since 2000. The majority of these works were issued by Slovene publishers based in Trieste (mainly ZTT and Mladika), although various Italian Triestine publishing houses (e.g. Ramo d'oro, Comunicarte, Antony, Hammerle) have also produced some of the editions. Some Slovene Triestine authors have also had their texts published by other Italian publishing houses, some of which are of national importance (Rizzoli, Fazi), whereas others are (or were) much smaller and/or specialized. Among the latter there were, for instance, the publisher Nicolodi and its successor Zandonai, both based at Rovereto and interested in the production of Central European authors. Alojz Rebula, whose writing has a religious dimension, has had some of the translations of his texts published by the well-known catholic publisher San Paolo. In addition to literary works in Italian translation, both Slovene and Italian Triestine publishers have also produced editions by some Slovene authors from central Slovenia, who are not part of the Slovene community in Italy, as well as some non-literary works originally written in Slovene concerning mainly historical and cultural topics.

Turning to translation in the opposite direction, one can observe that a similar number of texts of Italian Triestine literature have been translated into Slovene, the first one appearing in 1961 (Svevo's *La coscienza di Zeno*), followed, again, by a couple of texts in the 1970s, in the 1980s and in the 1990s, but the greatest majority of the translations came out only after 2000. Approximately 60% of the texts were produced by publishers from Slovenia, and a few of them by a Slovene-owned publishing house from Austrian Carinthia (where there is a

Slovene national minority); the rest of the translations were issued by the two principal Slovene publishers in Trieste. The fact that these publishers also include in their repertoire Italian texts in Slovene translations, which cannot primarily be intended for the city's strongly bilingual Slovene community, is to be explained by the characteristic of the Slovene book market which has to a degree functioned as a unitary one, as is reflected, for instance, in the Slovene publishers from Italy (as well as Austria) being represented at the annual national book fair, along with publishers from mainland Slovenia.

However, it is not only the Slovene publishing space that is being increasingly perceived as a single one, at least in terms of the accessibility of the books to the Slovene readers from Slovenia and from across the border. A sense of belonging to one and the same place (physical or virtual one), which is a condition for community formation, can also be detected among modern Triestine authors: in 2000, the anthology *Poeti triestini contemporanei* was published by the Italian Triestine publisher Lint, in which both Italian and Slovene poets are represented, along with some other authors who live in the city, but are not members of either of the two ethnic groups.

4   A closing thought

By way of conclusion, I would like to point out that Trieste's Slovene and Italian communities offer another example of the typical attitude towards translation displayed in many bilingual situations: lack of translation tends to imply self-centredness and disrespect for the Other, as well as "resistance to change" (cf. Koster 2010: 44), whereas the presence of translation is a sign of acknowledgement of the Other. If the present trend is going to continue, Trieste is becoming a more bilingual as well as a more translation-minded city.

IV   The Case for a Common Framework for Transfer-Related Phenomena in the Study of Translation and Language Contact

1   Introduction

Over the past decades, translation has been intensely studied from a variety of perspectives. Research has shed much light on its transformative potential in literature, culture as well as language (Delisle/Woodsworth 1995; Ožbot 2011c; McLaughlin 2011). As is well known, cross-literary influences are to a significant degree exerted through translated texts and many other conceptual changes concerning beliefs and mentalities – religious, ideological or political, among others – are made possible through translations. At the same time, translation is an instrument of sociolinguistic balance, which plays a primary role in language maintenance, attrition, shift and death. The sheer presence (or absence) of translation, as well as its extent and the situations in which it is practised for a given language and language pair, may also be highly indicative of the power relations between the languages concerned.

Also, translation contributes in important ways to the shaping of languages, resulting in the introduction of various new elements. Linguistic innovations can most often be found in the lexicon, for which low contact intensity is sufficient, whereas the grammatical system and discourse patterns are normally transferred in situations of higher contact intensity (Thomason/Kaufman 1988: 74–76). However, translation-related innovations may also affect stylistic patterns and the grammatical system of the target language. Examples abound (see below), both historical and contemporary, although it is often difficult to establish whether a linguistic innovation actually has its origin in a translated text or whether – which is more often the case – its presence in translations is to be interpreted as a *terminus ante quem*, i.e. as evidence of it having already entered into the language, perhaps through the spoken registers. Especially for earlier periods, it is frequently impossible to determine the role of translation in processes of language change, since the availability of parallel and comparable corpora may be very limited. In any case, it may be that through the process of translation a given trait that had already been present in the language is strengthened, possibly marginalizing the hitherto typical feature. In such instances, translation is essential in changing the

quantitative relationships between alternative language uses (cf. Baumgarten/ Özçetin 2008: 294) and in the long run possibly also the lexical, grammatical and pragmatic properties of languages.

In view of this, translations are to be considered a significant means through which "imported" linguistic elements and uses are established in a language, even if they may initially make their way into it through other channels. Let me quote but two instances of translation-related language innovation: recently, a translation-bound transformative relation, in conceptual as well as in grammatical terms, has been suggested for the Greek preposition *epì* and some of its reflections in early translations of the Bible. In Latin, especially, various concepts encompassed by *epì* gave rise to some new constructions which continue in the Romance languages up to the present (Luraghi/Cuzzolin 2007). Also, in Slovene texts of the 16th and 17th centuries, both translated and non-translated ones, there is a heavy presence of verbal calques consisting of an adverbial element and a verb which are modelled upon German prefixed verbs (Merše 2003). Their use diminished later on account of the negative attitude that grammarians expressed towards them, but their presence in texts over a period of time is historically significant.

However, although translation is a recognised and increasingly studied agent of contact-induced language change, it has hardly been dealt with as part of a wider context of transfer-related phenomena of language change. Therefore, the range of translation as a mechanism with potential to trigger change or even transform language remains, to a large extent, yet to be explored. In actual fact, translational situations are a special kind of language-contact situation alongside settings of individual and societal bilingualism as well as second language acquisition: in all these instances, including translational situations, two (or more) languages interact with each other, with various consequences for language processing and production. Such cross-linguistic transfer effects, especially in language production (cf. Jarvis/Pavlenko 2008: 14), have received considerable attention over the past decades. However, the effects of cross-linguistic transfer that can be encountered in translation have rarely been regarded as part of the same phenomenon.

In what follows, I would like to suggest that cross-linguistic transfer can be seen as an instrument of language change in two distinct, if interconnected ways: **a.** as a mechanism of change in *translational situations* and **b.** as a mechanism of change in *classical language-contact situations*. Whereas language change in the latter has been extensively studied, it would be legitimate to also take into consideration

the former as a complementary part of the same phenomenon of transfer-related crosslinguistic interaction. Sections 3 and 4 in this article focus on the context of Slovene multilingualism, where cross-linguistic transfer can be observed in translational settings as well as in classical language-contact settings. As will be shown, the common core of both types of transfer situations is the presence of a semantically based transposition from the source to the target language, which may concern all levels of linguistic structure, from the morphemic to the textual. Naturally, research on language contact has evidenced a variety of contact effects in which semantic transfer is not involved, since they only concern the level of phonetics and phonology, but such cases will not interest us here.

Let us now have a closer look at the relationship between translation and language contact: what fundamental features do they share and how have these been dealt with by researchers?

2   Translation and language contact

Parallelisms between bilingual production (of both natural bilinguals and those who have acquired the knowledge of a second language later in life) and translation have already been observed by various researchers, especially over the recent years, although only few studies have been published which are directly concerned with the issue. Among these it is necessary to mention the article by István Lanstyák and Pál Heltai (2012), who take as their starting point the observation that in bilingualism (including linguistic production of second-language learners) as well as in translation "two languages come into contact" (Lanstyák/Heltai 2012: 99) and that "there is no sharp dividing line between **bilingual** and **translator**" (emphasis in the original; op.cit.: 101). The authors go on to address the issue of the relationship between translation and language contact perhaps in the most direct and exhaustive way so far. The principal value of the paper is in discussing the relationship between translation and language change in general and in dealing with their complementarity in new ways. Other recent contributions to the topic also advocate the need to study translation along with other instances of bilingual communication, but they concentrate mostly on case studies (Siemund/ Kintana 2008; Kranich 2011; Kranich/House/Becher 2012; Kolehmainen 2013).

The reason why the relationship between translation and language change has been neglected for a very long time (and still remains under-researched today)

may be in part a matter of chance, for it is possible that other translation-related problems have been identified and dealt with by researchers before the relationship between translation and language contact came into focus. In part, however, the lack of attention is also due to epistemological circumstances characterised by the persistence of stereotypical ways of looking at translation, in spite of the flexibility of the concept itself, which has indeed a very broad range of uses, including those which refer to instances of non-verbal (or not entirely verbal) communication.

Although, over the past few decades, translation has become an object of intense study from a variety of perspectives, it has become increasingly separated from linguistic research. In an attempt to establish translation studies as an autonomous discipline, the large majority of its researchers who have a "linguistic" (as opposed to "literary") interest in translation have considered translation phenomena as pertaining exclusively to translational situations in a restricted sense, without taking into account the broader context in which translational communication shares a variety of traits with non-translational language use, both by bilingual and monolingual speakers. New insights began to be offered mainly by researchers who have dealt with questions of translation from a wider, cross-disciplinary perspective, not being confined within the limits of the new discipline. Among the scholars who have been particularly aware of features shared by translational and non-translational communication (and therefore also communication in bilingual settings) are Eugenio Coseriu, Andrew Chesterman, István Lanstyák and Pál Heltai. Coseriu (1978: 17), for instance, suggested that translation research be considered part of text linguistics broadly conceived:

> Wie beim Sprechen überhaupt hängt auch beim Übersetzen – das ja eine besondere Art des Sprechens ist – alles mit allem zusammen, so dass jede Formulierung eines Prinzips einer Partialisierung gleichkommt. Und vom Stand der Forschung her ist die angedeutete Aufgabe deshalb nicht leicht, weil die Übersetzungstheorie eigentlich eine Sektion der *Textlinguistik* sein müsste, und diese befindet sie trotz der Fortschritte der letzten Jahre immer noch in ihren Anfängen: Ja, es ist der Textlinguistik bisher noch nicht gelungen, ihren Gegenstand genau abzugrenzen und alle ihre ‚Kategorien' zu identifizieren und sinnvoll zu ordnen.

> [As is the case with speaking in general, also in translation – which is a special kind of speaking – everything is related to everything else so that any formulation of a principle cannot be but partial. And in terms of the research

> situation, the task mentioned is therefore not a simple one, since translation theory should in actual fact be part of text linguistics, and the latter is – in spite of the progress made over the last years – still at its beginnings. Indeed, text linguistics has not yet managed to clearly define its object and to identify and sensibly arrange all its 'categories'. (My translation)]

Coseriu's words were written in a period when language use had only just began to be studied from a textual perspective, and his unorthodox view of translation as an immanently textual phenomenon is particularly insightful. A similar conclusion is reached by Lanstyák and Heltai (2012: 100). They draw attention to Lanstyák (2003), who maintains that

> both types of communication [translation and bilingual communication] involve the use of two languages, and since translators are a subclass of bilinguals, TS may be regarded as a subdivision of contact linguistics, and issues in TS and contact linguistics should be dealt with in a unified framework.

About two decades after Coseriu's article was published, the concept of translation universals became much debated in translation studies. Within that debate, Andrew Chesterman (2004: 45) posed the

> question of whether there might exist universal norms of communication which could provide explanatory principles for possible translation universals, perhaps along the lines of Grice's maxims […] or notions of politeness.

The concept of translation universals – somewhat parallel to the notion of language universals proposed earlier in typological linguistic research – is a problematic and controversial one. It presupposes that there are some general characteristics which can be found in translated texts, such as, for instance, "explicitation" or "normalization". The former consists of making explicit some elements of information which in the source text are only implicit, whereas the latter refers to the tendency of target texts to comply with target-language norms, sometimes even in an exaggerated way. There certainly are features in translators' behaviour and their reflections in the target texts, which may be considered typical, but not necessarily general and therefore "universal". Also, to prove the existence of translation universals, it would be indispensable to have data comparing translated and non-translated language, for it is highly probable that monolingual language users are guided by similar, largely self-imposed norms, often dependent on a given communicative situation (cf. Lanstyák/Heltai 2012: 110). However, problems of the concepts of translation universals notwithstanding, the debate opened the

fundamental question to what degree translational communication may or may not have specific properties in comparison to verbal communication in general. Lanstyák and Heltai, who also deal with the question of translation universals, suggest that "translation universals are in fact **language contact universals**" (op. cit.: 100), which show as "**contact effects,** or **interference**" (op.cit.: 103). The authors distinguish between "absolute contact effects" and "relative contact effects", whereby the former refer to the actual transfer of source-language elements to target-language production, whereas the latter encompass distributional phenomena related to grammatical or lexical elements of the target language which are brought under the influence of the source language. The elements themselves are already present in the target language, but may undergo a redistribution under language-contact circumstances (op.cit.: 104). According to Lanstyák and Heltai, "[m]ost transfer in translation can be compared to relative contact effects, i.e. distributional differences" (op.cit.: 105; cf. Baumgarten/Özçetin 2008: 294).

In a previous article, Heltai's proposal is that translation universals should be considered communication universals (Heltai 2010; Lanstyák/Heltai 2012: 102). The idea that translation universals are actually part of communication universals is not entirely new, since it has previously, although less explicitly, been suggested by a variety of researchers, including Ernst-August Gutt and Juliane House (ibid.). Also, some other basic concepts, such as that of *skopos*,[26] which are largely used in contemporary translation theory, actually reflect more basic principles which have been recognised as such in communication research (Kellermann 1992). It is necessary to add that, unavoidably, translational and non-translational communication also present differences, in that translation is a derived activity, invariably based on a source text, whereas bilingual communication typically does not involve a pre-existent text (although this is also possible, for instance in various types of reported speech; Lanstyák/Heltai 2012: 100). However, any form of bilingualism can also be related to translation and translation is indeed a special form of bilingualism (Ožbot 2011c: 57), both in individual and societal contexts. All translators are by definition bilinguals, although, of course, not all bilinguals are translators, but in their activity as language producers they necessarily also perform "translational operations" between their two (or more) languages. As will be shown below, this holds true of competent bilingual speakers, whose bilingualism

---

26   *Skopos* is the basic concept (from Greek σκοπός 'target', 'purpose') of a functional theory of translation developed in the 1970s by the German scholar Hans J. Vermeer and his colleague Katharina Reiss, according to which the defining feature of every translation is its purpose.

may be highly balanced, as well as of language learners whose knowledge of the two languages in question and their ability to use them may differ starkly.

In the rest of the paper, I will try to present the two ways in which transfer plays a central role in language variation and change. The focus is on Slovene, which is a particularly interesting case in that the Slovene culture can be described as a translation culture *par excellence,* where translation has for centuries been of foremost importance both in quantitative and qualitative terms. Even if it cannot always be demonstrated that a certain linguistic feature entered the language through translation, it is beyond doubt that a great many of linguistic innovations which are due to interlingual transfer have been strengthened by means of translated texts. Moreover, Standard Slovene and its regional varieties have also been intensely exposed to language contact, especially with German and in the border regions also with Italian, Hungarian and Croatian. Therefore it comes as no surprise that the language shows some peculiar traits which may be relevant to the study of the relationship between translation, language contact and language change.

3   Transfer in translational situations

The term *translational situations* refers to situations in which a target text is generated on the basis of a given source text with the purpose of conveying a coherent message interlingually. In such situations, the global communicative functions of the two texts play a primary role, to which lower units are subordinated. During this process, linguistic innovations often arise that can gradually lead to diverse types of language change, although, in actual fact, the stage of language change is often not reached, because the innovation does not become generalised. As stated by Kolehmainen (2013: 108):

> Bei den Übersetzungen handelt es sich primär um eine vorläufige synchrone Variation, die sich auf übersetzte Texte beschränkt. Diese ist natürlich auch in anderen Kontaktsituationen möglich – sie bildet den Ausgangspunkt einer sprachlichen Veränderung –, aber in diesen kann die Entwicklung zusätzlich zu einem diachronen Sprachwandel führen, bei dem die Zielsprache permanent restrukturiert wird.
>
> [Translations concern principally temporary synchronic variation, which is limited to translated texts. It is, of course, also possible in other contact situations – constituting the starting point of language change – but in them the

development can then lead to diachronic language change through which the target language becomes permanently restructured. (My translation)]

In translations, it is frequently possible to find evidence of "shining-through"[27] effects (see Kranich/House/Becher 2012: 326), whereby source-text features can be detected in target texts, though without triggering language change as such. For the latter to be ascertained, features of the source language must have been generalised to target-language texts which are not translations, i.e. they have been written directly in that language. Moreover, for such linguistic influence to establish itself, translational communication is not a necessary condition, since languages may influence each other directly through other interlingual transfer situations, during which various contact phenomena arise such as calques of source-language phrasal or clausal structures (cf. Kranich et al. 2011; Toury 1995: 275ff., Mauranen 2000). As has been demonstrated by Kranich/House/Becher (2012) for German popular science writing, the German translations of English texts seem to account for a small amount of language change, since most of the studied features which are characteristic of English popular science texts have not spread to original German texts of comparable genre and function, but have rather remained limited to translations, where the potential of replicating a foreign model is obviously greater than in non-translational text production. Even if original German texts did show features similar to those of comparable English texts, which differ from the German tradition of popular science writing, this could well be the result of the writers' direct exposure to English texts as well as of some more general tendencies in communicating about science in the contemporary world (Kranich/House/Becher 2012: 332). Moreover, it is likely that the innovations spreading from translated texts concern mainly language norms and stylistic conventions rather than the language system (Kolehmainen 2013: 106), which is, on the other hand, more often the case in classical language-contact situations.

However, taking into account that it is very difficult, and often impossible, to determine the precise role of translation in the processes of language variation

---

27   Shining-through effects are typically found in what is sometimes referred to as *overt translation*, as opposed to *covert translation*. The two terms were introduced in the 1970s by Juliane House (House 2010; cf. also Kranich/House/Becher 2012: 316) and describe certain textual properties of translations with respect to whether or not it is possible to detect in them syntactic, phraseological and other signals of their derived nature, i.e. of their being based on a source text written in a language different from their own. Similar dichotomies have been proposed, among others, by Jiří Levý in the early 1960s, who distinguishes between *illusionism* and *anti-illusionism* (Levý 2011: 19–21). Lawrence Venuti has written extensively about the translator's invisibility (Venuti 1995).

and change, it seems nonetheless reasonable to suppose that some changes may in fact have their origin in translational situations, especially in texts that belong to written rather than spoken genres. The following may be an innovation of this kind: it has been shown (Jelovšek 2011) that a Slovene equivalent of the German 3rd person singular neuter personal pronoun *es* was extensively used in the impersonal construction in Slovene Protestant translations which were based on German originals. The following sentence (ex. 1a) is an example of such a use, with the pronoun *ono* functioning as a dummy subject. In modern Slovene, which is a pro-drop language, the use would be unidiomatic; in actual fact, in the version of the same sentence taken from a modern translation of the Bible, the subject is not expressed (ex. 1c). However, in the language of the sixteenth century Slovene Protestant writers, in their translations as well as in their "original" writings (Jelovšek 2011: 421), the use is extensively witnessed.

(1)   [John 1:39]

a. ***Onu*** *ie   pag bilu   okuli   te   deſſete   vre. (Trubar, 1557)*
    it   is-AUX but be-PPC about this/the-GEN tenth-GEN   hour-GEN

b. ***Es*** *war   aber   vmb   die   zehende   stunde. (Lu, 1545)*
    it   was   but   about the-ACC   tenth-ACC hour

c. ***Ø Bilo***   *je   okrog   desete   ure. (SSV, 1996)*
    SBJ be-PPC.3SG   is-AUX   about tenth-GEN   hour-GEN

d. it was about the tenth hour. (RSV)
    'It was about ten o'clock.'

The innovation has not survived, but in a certain period the use of a third-person dummy subject based on the German pattern was important. It is evident from the example that in *translational situations* the source and the target language may be in a contact relationship in which, in the mind of the bilingual user, the target language interacts with the source language in such a way as to be influenced by it and possibly undergo a process of change, during which it is brought closer to the source language. Similar, especially lexical instances of translational innovations, which did not become established in the language, can be found in a variety of Slovene Protestants' texts based upon German models (Merše 2013: 175–176).

4   Transfer in classical language contact situations

Let us now have a look at *classical language contact situations* in the Slovene context, i.e. those which are not subsumed under the term *translation* as interlingual cross-cultural communication at the level of discourse. Note that translational operations may nevertheless take place in the process of bilinguals' text production and, in actual fact, some examples deriving from translated texts are also dealt with in this section. Under the term classical language contact situations I include cases of areal contact between two (or possibly more) languages. These span a variety of contexts of use, from community-based spoken language to written domains, comprising also literary texts, in which linguistic material (lexical and semantic, morphological, syntactic, discursive, pragmatic, conceptual) is mapped from one language onto another language (see Jarvis/Pavlenko 2008: 61–173; cf. also Thomason/Kaufman 1988: 35–109, Winford 2003: 29–100). The result of interlingual mappings are transfer phenomena of various sorts, which are characteristic of language-contact situations: calques, semantic borrowings, structural replications and other types of hybrid elements and features, some of which concern lexical elements, while in others more complex constructions are transferred from one language to the other. This is suggested, e.g. by Matras' distinction between "matter replication" and "pattern replication" (Matras 2009: 234–237), whereby the former refers to various sorts of borrowing and the latter to transfer-related structural changes. As is the case with translation-related transfer, in classical situations of language contact, too, transfer occurs foremost in the language processing and production of bilingual individuals. The contact effects may then spread to communities of speakers and the language system as a whole.

Classical language-contact situations can be found in contexts of societal bilingualism and in second-language acquisition settings (formal and informal ones), where language contact also takes place – if not in overt language production, at least in the learners' minds, i.e. at a purely cognitive level. It is well known that many structural errors and other types of unidiomatic language use by language learners are due to the influence of their L1 (and sometimes of other languages they are familiar with) upon the language in question and are often to be explained by the direct transfer of L1 elements (lexical material, grammatical structures, stylistic and discourse patterns, etc.) into the language which is being learnt. Transfer as interlingual mapping is to be considered an unavoidable process at various stages of language learning (as well as being a constant feature of situations of

natural bilingualism). Often when learners are not able to make adequate use of the resources (at the level of lexis, grammar or discourse) of the language that is being learned, they avail themselves of what is structurally or conceptually available to them in their first language or, sometimes, in another language they have previously learned or studied. The outcome of such operations are transfers, which are to a certain degree present in the production of all language learners, including those who have successfully learned several languages.

To what extent and in what ways transfer will actually take place depends on various circumstances, which may either encourage or hinder it from occurring and which encompass psycholinguistic, cognitive, experiential, situational and language-pair specific factors (Jarvis/Pavlenko 2008: 175). One of the key factors is that transfer can only take place if the recipient language is able to accommodate it. As suggested by Roger Andersen (1983), who formulated the "transfer to somewhere" principle, and as summarised by Jarvis/Pavlenko (2008: 174):

> a language structure will be susceptible to transfer only if it is compatible with natural acquisitional principles or is perceived to have a similar counterpart (a *somewhere* to transfer to) in the recipient language.

In any case, transfer remains an unavoidable cognitive strategy employed in the process of language learning, along with operations such as simplification and generalization, and will only take place when there is some perceived similarity between the two languages involved (ibid.: 78).

4.1   The Slovene-German interface

Phenomena such as the above take place in languages or language varieties developing in situations of natural bilingualism, in which an individual "has learnt two languages without formal teaching in the course of her everyday life as her natural means of communication, and often […] relatively young" (Skutnabb-Kangas 1981: 95). As for Slovene, it is generally assumed that the language possesses a variety of features which are a consequence of its contacts with other languages. For historical reasons, the impact of German has been particularly strong, so much so that Slovene is considered the Slavic language that has undergone a German-induced change comparable perhaps only to Sorbian. This is not surprising, since for centuries, during which the territory of present-day Slovenia was under the Habsburg rule, German was the official language and as such the high code, whereas Slovene

was primarily used as the language of the lower classes and typically relegated to informal settings, with some exceptions such as its use in church. The situation was largely characterised by diglossia, since the majority of Slovene speakers did not possess a balanced competence in the languages concerned, i.e. Slovene and German. Although the knowledge of German was often limited, the language was present, at least to some degree, in the lives of all the population strata, so that it inevitably had a strong impact on Slovene. It is also necessary to emphasize that for centuries there was a marked developmental imbalance between the two languages, German being the language of one of the most powerful European cultures with a strong literary tradition, while Slovene was the language of a numerically small ethnic group which only in the 19th century was able to start catching up with its own cultural, social and political delays (cf. Prunč 1997a, Stabej 1998).

A great number of elements in Slovene are considered to be historically derived from German as the socially dominant language. They comprise both lexical and structural transfer, which clearly testifies to the length and intensity of contact between the two languages (cf. Thomason/Kaufman 1988: 74–76). Among the features which are often accounted for as a consequence of the contact between Slovene and German are the definite and indefinite articles. Like most Slavic languages, standard formal Slovene does not possess a fully functional system of articles, such as the one used, for instance, in Germanic and Romance languages, including German, Italian and Friulian, with which Slovene has for centuries been in close contact. However, especially spoken, colloquial Slovene – in its dialectal as well as non-dialectal varieties – does have a rudimentary system of both definite and indefinite articles. Their use is determined situationally, being typical of informal spoken Slovene, and it is never obligatory, which means that the contact-induced innovation remains a matter of register and style rather than system. The functioning of the article-like elements in contemporary Slovene can be observed from the following two examples, containing an indefinite article (based on the numeral *en* 'one', in its attributive use; ex. 2) and a definite article (based on the demonstrative *ta* 'that'; ex. 3) respectively:

(2)
a. *Imam*   **enega**   *kolega,*   *ki*   *bi*   *ti*
   have-PRS.1SG   one/a-ACC   colleague-ACC   who   part-COND   you-DAT
   lahko   pomagal.
   ADV   help-PPC
   (Colloquial)

b. *Imam   kolega,   ki   bi   ti*
  have-PRS.1SG   colleague-ACC   who   part-COND   you-DAT
  lahko   pomagal.
  ADV   help-PPC
  (*Standard*)
  'I've got a colleague who might help you.'

(3)

a. *Prosim, prinesi   mi   **ta**   moder   pulover.*
  please   bring-IMP I-DAT this/the-ACC   blue-ACC   pullover-ACC
  (*Colloquial*)

b. P*rosim, prinesi   mi   modr**i**   pulover.*
  please   bring-IMP I-DAT blue-ACC   pullover-ACC
  (*Standard*)
  'Please bring me the blue pullover.'

The characteristics of the article-like elements in modern Slovene are in agreement with what has been observed by Heine and Kuteva (2005: 101, 251) about replication in the process of language contact: what is replicated in the recipient language tends to be less grammaticalised than it is in the source language. Also, the use of the articles in Slovene is sporadic with respect to their functioning in German (as well as in the other two neighbouring languages), so it does not appear to be the result of systematic calquing of the German model (cf. Heine/ Kuteva 2005: 224). On the other hand, the Slovene definite article can neither be formally equated with the demonstrative, from which it is ultimately derived (although via one or more foreign sources): unlike the demonstrative, the definite article is not inflected and it only has one form regardless of number, gender and case:

(4) *Pojedel   je   **ta**   veliko   jabolko.*
   eat-PPC   is-AUX.1SG   this/the   big-ACC   apple-ACC
   'He ate the big apple.'

(5) *Pojedli   so   **ta**   velika   jabolka/*
   eat-PPC   be-AUX.3PL   this/the   big-ACC.PL   apple-ACC.PL
   ***ta**   velike   hruške/   **ta**   velike   grozde*
   this/the   big-ACC   pear-ACC.PL   this/the-ACC   big-ACC.PL   grape-ACC.PL
   'They ate the big apples/pears/grapes.'

In contrast, as a demonstrative adjective, *ta* is inflected:

(4') **To** *krasno jabolko je   bilo pravkar utrgano.*
      this lovely   apple   is-AUX be-PPC just pick.up-PPC
      'This lovely apple has just been picked up.'

(5') **Tega**   *krasnega   jabolka   ne   bom   pojedel   sam.*
      this-GEN lovely-GEN apple-NOM not be-AUX.FUT eat-PPC alone
      'I'm not going to eat this lovely apple on my own.'

It has generally been assumed that the use of the two articles has arisen through the influence of German (probably written as well as spoken). It is possible that Italian and Friulian have also contributed to the establishment of this grammatical category in Slovene, for in some areas of the western part of present-day Slovenia the population was in intense contact with speakers of the two Romance languages, with which it shared its territory with the Habsburg Empire. Of course, as noted by Reindl (2005: 199), who has extensively studied the influence of German upon Slovene, there is also a more "universal tendency for the numeral 'one' to develop into an indefinite article and for the demonstrative to develop into a definite article,"[28] an opinion shared by some Slovene grammarians, too (Orožen 1972, 106). But even so, the contact with other languages probably played an essential role in triggering the development of an otherwise latent structural feature of Slovene. Similar developments have been attested for various other languages (Heine/Kuteva 2005: 116–117, 132, 224; Heine 2012: 128–134) which do not possess a full article system, such as Czech, Sorbian, Basque, Romani, etc.

The definite article was particularly frequent in Slovene Protestant translations of the second half of the 16th century which were based on German source texts. As illustrated in the following example from Orožen (1972: 108), all instances of the definite article in the German text (6b) are faithfully reproduced in the Slovene version (6a), although it is necessary to add that some Slovene texts of the period also contain exceptions to this practice (cf. Reindl 2005: 197). In contrast, in the modern Slovene Standard Version (6c) only the demonstrative meanings are expressed (*Tiste dni* 'in those days' and *To je tisti* 'he is the one'):

---

28   Heine and Kuteva (2005: 225) report on a similar process in Estonian as described by Ilse Lehiste, who observed an article-like use in some Estonian translations of a German literary text by Friedrich Schiller.

(6)   [Matthew 3:1–3]

a. V *tim zhafu* Pride Ioannes *tu kerſtnik,* inu pridiguie v*ti pushzhaui te ludouske deshele,* inu praui, Deite pokuro, *tu nebeshku* kraleftuu ie blisi prislilu. Inu *on* je *leta,* od kateriga Eſaias prerok gouori, kir praui: […] (1557)

b. Zv *der* zeit kam Johannes *der* Teuffer vnd prediget in *der* wüsten *des* Jüdischen lands vnd sprach Thut busse *das* Himelreich ist nahe herbey komen. Vnd er ist *der* von dem der Prophet Jsaias gesagt hat vnd gesprochen […] (Lu)

c. *Tiste* dni se je pojavil Janez Krstnik in v Judejski puščavi oznanjal z besedami: "Spreobrnite se, kajti približalo se je nebeško kraljestvo! *To* je *tisti*, o katerem je bilo rečeno po preroku Izaiju: […] (SSV)

d. In *those* days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." For *this* is he who was spoken of by the prophet Isaiah when he said, […] (RSV)

The use of the definite article diminished in later periods, especially in non-translated texts. An important reason for the decrease may have been the attitude of prescriptive grammarians against it, as exemplified in the following quotation from a highly influential Slovene grammar book dating back to the second half of the 18th century: "In Beſtimmung des Artickels darf man ſich auf keine andere Sprache richten" (Pohlin: *Kraynska gramatika* 1768, ²1783, quoted in Orožen 1972: 111; 'With respect to the article, one should not be guided by any other language', my translation).

There are many other features of modern Slovene which concern all levels of language structure – from phonology to morphology, syntax and the lexicon – and can be explained as a consequence of German influence on the language, although the exclusive role of German in the process is in most cases impossible to prove. Among the many such features that are likely to have been induced (or at least reinforced) by the contact with German are several word-formation patterns and the verb-second placement.

4.2   The Slovene-Italian interface

Historically, Italian has also exercised a strong influence on Slovene, although not on the standard language, but on the varieties used along the Italian-Slovene border, especially in the Italian region of Friuli–Venezia Giulia (in the provinces of Trieste, Gorizia and Udine), where there is a Slovene minority whose daily exposure to Italian has been continuous and pervasive. The Slovene used by this minority displays many features which are the result of direct contact with Italian, which is the second language for virtually the whole community of the Slovene speakers in Italy (Ožbot 2009).[29] To various degrees, the Italian influence permeates all situations of language use, being characteristic of spoken as well as written registers. Literary texts are no exception: Italian-induced elements are often a permanent feature of the authors' linguistic usage and not only a means of intentional characterization of the content presented in the texts. It may therefore make sense to draw a parallel between the use of Slovene by the Slovene authors in Italy[30] and the use of languages such as French or English characteristic of postcolonial literatures that are based upon new local language standards. Despite the important differences between postcolonial settings and situations of natural bilingualism, which concern, among other things, social and historical aspects of the interaction between the two (or more) linguistic communities as well as the typological relations between the languages involved, in all these situations the language develops "pluricentrically" as a result of intense contact with one or more other languages (see Clyne 1991, Muhr 2012: 2013). In certain settings, linguistic pluricentrism may, of course, be a delicate question to tackle. It may be particularly difficult to deal with, for instance, in the language classroom, since it undermines the idea of a single standard language, which is still very much present in many national linguistic traditions, including the Slovene one. Nonetheless, the issue cannot be ignored.

In postcolonial environments as well as in cases of natural bilingualism, the language of literature produced in contact situations may offer an insight into the mechanisms of language variation and change. To a significant extent, it is through contact-induced language change involving some form of cross-linguistic transfer, and sometimes also of translation proper, that new, non-standard language

---

29   To some extent, the reverse influence is also present, whereby local variants of Italian and Friulian are affected by contact with Slovene.

30   Similar phenomena can be observed in literary texts produced by members of the Slovene community in Carinthia (Austria).

varieties come into existence.[31] Slovene as it is used by members of the national minority in Italy is just one example among many and, in some sense, Slovene literature produced in the context of heavy Slovene-Italian bilingualism is the result of a literary practice which directly reflects the linguistically (as well as culturally) hybrid status of its native environment. Texts by Slovene bilingual authors often exhibit traits which show how strongly they have been influenced by the language of the majority, so that the hybridity of their works is usually much more than a stylistic feature intentionally employed.

Interestingly, though perhaps not surprisingly, many of the traits characteristic of the language of the classics of Slovene Triestine literature are also found, usually in greater density, in writings produced by bilingual students of Slovene whose socialization was conditioned by a particularly strong exposure to Italian (or rather to its regional varieties), sometimes up to the point when it is difficult to establish, in terms of proficiency, which is the student's first language, Slovene or Italian, since their alleged L1 may be the weaker of the two languages, their supposed L2 being the dominant language (cf. Kolehmainen 2013: 103–105). Given the very strong role Italian played in the lives of many members of the Slovene minority in Italy, it may therefore not be surprising if Italian, as L2, is having a strong influence upon Slovene, as L1. According to findings by Susan G. Guion and her colleagues, as reported by Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008: 198), "the less established the L1 is at the time of L2 acquisition, the less influence it will have on the L2, and the more influence the L2 will have on the L1."

However, the parallelisms between language use in literary works and in situations of natural bilingualism in general should not be seen as too surprising, since "[t]he effects of cross-linguistic similarity can be seen in a variety of domains, and can be found to affect the processes of comprehension, learning, and production" (Jarvis/Pavlenko 2008: 176). Among such contact-conditioned traits are: the use of punctuation, cases, prepositions, as well as syntactic features such as clause structure and word order (cf. Bennett 1987: 281–282), as shown in the following two examples, the first one (ex. 7) from a literary text and the second one (ex. 8) from a translation by a student from the Slovene minority. The glossing of these examples is here intended to illustrate the word order patterns only.

---

31   The issue of the formation of new language varieties has recently been discussed in relation to the English used in Cyprus, although not on the basis of literary production (Buschfeld 2013).

(7)

a. Se ti ne zdi, da   **onkraj vsega trušča politike in orožja   gre**   predvsem za to? (NP 157)
              AdvAdjunct   V (go-PRS.3SG)

b. Se ti ne zdi, da **gre onkraj vsega trušča politike in orožja** predvsem za to? (*Standard*)
              V   AdvAdjunct

[c. Non ti pare che **al di là di tutto il rumore della politica e delle armi   si tratti** soprattutto di ciò?]
              AdvAdjunct   V

'Don't you think that beyond all the political and military tumult, the issue is mainly about that?'

In Slovene, which is largely a V2 language, word order in dependent clauses differs from that of the main clauses in that the verb immediately follows the subordinator, with other elements such as the subject or the adverbial adjuncts coming after the verb. In main clauses, on the other hand, the subject or an adverbial adjunct occupies the initial position and the verb, again, occupies the second position, after the subject or the adverbial adjunct. In Italian, the basic word-order elements do not undergo such a change in position, which is clearly reflected also in Slovene texts produced by members of the Slovene minority in Italy. This is illustrated by the above example (7a) derived from a modern literary classic. In the object clause introduced with the conjunction *da* ('that'; Ital. *che*), it would be expected that the verb would immediately follow the conjunction, as is actually the case in standard language (ex. 7b). This is, however, not the case in the sentence produced by a bilingual, where the adjunct, not the verb comes after the subordinator, just like in Italian; a possible Italian model is suggested in square brackets (ex. 7c).

The same feature can be observed in a translation (ex. 8) made by a Slovene student from Italy raised in a bilingual environment. Given that the piece of writing in question (ex. 8a) is a translation based on an Italian source text (ex. 8c), the potential influence of the Italian model is particularly strong. Here, the use of word order in both the main clause and the dependent clause (introduced by the conjunction *medtem ko* 'whereas'; Ital. *mentre*) can be observed. Again, the bilingual's text shows no inversion between subject and object either in the main clause, which is introduced by an adjunct and would therefore require the verb to immediately follow it, or in the dependent clause, where the same would be expected, given the presence of a conjunction. However, sentence (8a) follows the

same subject-verb (S – V) sequence of the Italian source text (8c), whereas in both instances standard Slovene (8b) requires an inversion (V–S):

(8)

a. ***V primerjavi s predhodnim letom,***   ***priseljencev s stalnim bivališčem***   *<u>je</u>* ***137.000 več,***
   AdvAdjunct   S   V AdvMeasure

   medtem ko   ***novih dovoljenj,***   *ki so bila dana do polovice februarja,*   *<u>je bilo</u>* ***271.519.*** *(ST)*
   whereas   S   RelClause   V   AdvMeasure

b. ***[…] V primerjavi s predhodnim letom***   *je* ***priseljencev s stalnim bivališčem***   ***137.000 več,***
    AdvAdj   V S   AdvMeasure

   medtem ko   *<u>je bilo</u>* ***novih dovoljenj,***   *ki so bila izdana do polovice februarja,*   ***271.519.*** (*Standard*)
   whereas   V   S   RelClause   AdvMeasure

c. ***L'aumento degli extracomunitari residenti,***   ***rispetto all'anno precedente,***   *<u>è</u>* ***di 137 mila unità***
   S   AdvAdjunct   V AdvMeasure

   mentre   ***i nuovi permessi,***   *concessi fino a metà febbraio,*   *<u>sono stati</u>* ***271.517.***
   whereas **S**   RelClause   V   AdvMeasurre

   (Italian source text; *La Repubblica,* 2 March 2001)

'The number of non-EU residents has increased, with respect to last year, by 137,000, whereas the number of new permits issued by mid-February is 271,517.'

Similar contact phenomena can also be observed in examples (9)–(12). In examples (9) and (10), the text producers, a prominent writer and a student respectively, show probable influence of Italian prepositional use. In example (9), the Slovene dative (*ploham in vetru*; nominative *plohe in veter* 'rainfall and wind') is used as an alleged equivalent of the Italian prepositional collocation *aperto al vento, alla pioggia*, etc. ('open to the wind, rainfall', etc.), upon which the construction may have been modelled (cf. Ital. *finestra aperta alle piogge e al vento* 'window open to rainfall and wind'). The result in Slovene is a non-idiomatic combination of the adjective *odprt* 'open' and a double dative object, while the choice of *izpostavljen* 'exposed' would instead be a natural one (*izpostavljen ploham in vetru*).

(9) Skoraj smešno je: tako zbirati v škatle kance, ki kapajo s trehe [sic!], ko je v zidu **široka lina odprta ploham in vetru**! (MTN 91)
   'It is almost ridiculous: to collect in such a way the drops dripping from the roof, while there is a broad opening in the wall exposed to rainfall and wind.'

It is interesting that hardly any occurrences of the phrase *odprt vetru* can be found in Slovene – and none is evidenced in GigaFida,[32] the major corpus of contemporary Slovene – and that one of the three occurrences that have been identified appears in a literary text translated from French, where the phrase *ouvert au vent* is idiomatic.[33]

Likewise, in example (10), Italian prepositional use appears to shine through the Slovene text, which is not uncommon in contact situations, especially when non-prototypical features of meaning are involved (cf. Jarvis/Pavlenko 2008: 188f). The Italian preposition *su,* used in this case with the verb *scrivere* 'to write', is prototypically associated with the Slovene preposition *na* 'on', although the Slovene counterpart of the Italian verb in question (*pisati*) would in such a context require the preposition *v* 'in'. Again, an unusual combination *napiše na življenjepis* '[he] writes *on* the curriculum' is produced – rather than *napiše v življenjepis* '[he] writes *in* the curriculum' – based on the Italian use *scrivere sul curriculum.* What needs to be emphasised is that interlingual transfer may have been brought about not just by the cognitive availability of the underlying Italian structures to the text producer, but also by some parallel ones which in actual fact do exist in Slovene: the verb *pisati* can also collocate with the preposition *na* (*pisati na* 'to write on'), in phrases such as *pisati na papir z glavo,* 'to write on headed paper', *pisati na steno* 'to write on a wall' (cf. Italian *scrivere su carta intestata, scrivere sul muro*), but not in combination with nouns such as *življenjepis* 'CV'.

(10) Zavedam se, da je za iskanje dela v Italiji bolj pomembno to, kar posameznik napiše **na** življenjepis, kot znanje in dobra volja, ki pridejo na dan s trdim delom. (ST)
'I'm aware that when looking for a job in Italy, what one writes **in** the CV is more important that the knowledge and willingness [to do things] which develop with hard work.')

Examples (11) and (12a)–(12b) derive, again, from two literary texts and also illustrate typical linguistic uses that are the result of two languages interacting in the minds of bilingual text producers. In example (11), the Italian preposition *di*

---

32   http://www.gigafida.net/
33   The text in question is a translation of the French novel *Le roi des montagnes* by Edmund About. The passage is quoted in the French original and in the Slovene and English translations:
• Mme Simons jeta les hauts cris en voyant que sa maison se composait d'une simple bande de feutre grossier, pliée par le milieu, fixée à terre par les bouts, et **ouverte au vent** de deux côtés. (RM 79)
• Gospa Simons je glasno vpila, ko je videla, da je vsa njena hiša sestavljena iz debelega sivega sulena, ki je bil zložen po sredi in pritrjen s koli v zemljo in na dve strani **odprt vetru.** (KM 67)
• Mrs. Simons fairly screamed when she saw that her house was composed of a simple strip of heavy felt, pleated in the middle, fastened to the earth at the two ends, and **opened to the wind** on two sides. (KG 2)

'of', which is also used with Italian verbs such as *pullulare* or *brulicare* (Slovene *mrgoleti* 'to teem [with]'), seems to be at the base of the Slovene genitive *vojaštva* 'army men', nomin. *vojaštvo*. A possible Italian model for the example above could be (ex. 11b) with a significantly similar syntactic structure to the one in example (8) above. However, with the Slovene verb in question the meaning 'to teem (with)' is expressed through an impersonal subjectless construction optionally accompanied with one or more adverbials ('on the day', 'in the town'), as shown in (ex. 11c). Example (11a) could then be idiomatically rendered as in (ex. 11d). A parallel construction with an overt subject is actually also available, but it is much rarer[34] and requires the preposition *od* 'from, by', which brings it syntactically close to the passive (ex. 11e).

(11)

a. *[…] poleg   tega   **je**   Vipavska   dolina*
   apart   this-GEN   be-AUX.PRS3SG   Vipava-ADJ.NOM   valley-NOM
   mrgolela   vojaštva. *(NP 91)*
   teem-PPC   soldier-PL.GEN
   '[…] apart from that, the Valley of Vipava was teeming with army men.'

b. *[…] a parte ciò,   la Valle di Vipava   **brulicava   di soldati***
   to part this   the valley of Vipava   teem-IPFV   of   soldier-PL
   '[…] apart from that, the Valley of Vipava was teeming with army men.'

c. *Na dan   tekme   je   v mestu*
   on day-ACC   match-GEN   be-AUX.PRS3SG   in town-LOC
   mrgolelo   nogometnih   navijačev.
   teem-PPC   football-ADJ.PL GEN   fan-PL.GEN
   'On the day of the match the town was teeming with football fans.'

d. *[…] poleg   tega   **je**   v Vipavski*
   apart   this-GEN   be-AUX.PRS3SG   in Vipava-ADJ.LOC
   *dolini   **mrgolelo   vojaštva.***
   valley-LOC   teem-PPC   soldier-PL.GEN

e. *[…] poleg   tega   **je**   Vipavska   dolina*
   apart   this-GEN   be-AUX.PRS3SG   Vipava-ADJ   valley
   mrgolela   od   vojaštva.
   teem-PPC   of   soldier-PL.GEN

---

34   In this and in other examples the judgments about the relative frequency of use are based on data retrievable from GigaFida.

In the final example the structure of Italian shines through in the use of a demonstrative pronoun. The Italian demonstrative *quello* 'that (one)' can function as an anaphoric substitute for a noun, along similar lines to the English *one*. In Slovene, the construction with the demonstrative *ta* (and its inflected variants, in this case the dative form *temu*) is rather unidiomatic (ex. 12a). A possible Italian model could be example (12b):

(12a) Vso grmado papirjev bi spravil z mize in poskusil na čistini z zgodbo, ki bi imela **vsaj slog podoben** *temu* **Durasove** […]« (SloS 194)
'I'd remove from the table the whole pile of papers and make a fresh attempt with a story that would be at least stylistically similar to Duras' style.' Literally: […] which would **have at least the style similar to** *the one* **of Duras** […].

(12b) Metterei via tutta la mole delle carte per tentare, sulla scrivania sgombra, una storia che avesse **almeno lo stile** simile **a** *quello* **della Duras** [...].

All the above examples, whether the product of bilingual communities or translation, contain features of language which differ from standard usage and which have been brought about by various transfer operations (Ožbot 2009).

5   Conclusion

By taking into account translational situations and classical language contact situations, this article aimed at pointing to some contact-induced features shared by translations as instances of cross-cultural communication on the one hand and texts produced in bilingual contexts, on the other hand. The material originating from bilingual contexts comprised texts by two rather different groups of language users, i.e. prominent literary authors and language learners, who, however, share some important characteristics of language use. It was shown that text production in translational as well as in bilingual settings is significantly determined by the interaction between the two (or sometimes more) languages involved and that interlingual transfer is a feature which they both have in common. In view of the relevance of transfer phenomena to classical language contact, language variation and change as well as to translation, it is suggested that its role in various types of communication involving more than one language deserves more attention than it has so far received.

By way of conclusion, it may be worth adding that apart from cross-linguistic transfer effects, the text production of bilinguals may also be frequently characterised by translation as a means of interlingual communication at the level of discourse. Thus, the ultimate question to be explored further is how to distinguish between operations of cross-linguistic transfer from those of translation proper. However, this is a complex problem involving sociolinguistic, pragmatic and cognitive aspects, among others, and would deserve joint attention from researchers interested in language from a variety of complementary viewpoints.

Glossing abbreviations

3SG	third person singular
ACC	accusative
ADJ	adjective
ADV	adverbial
AUX	auxiliary
COND	conditional
DAT	dative
GEN	genitive
IMP	imperative
IPFV	imperfective
LOC	locative
NOM	nominative
PL	plural
PRS	present
PAST PTCP → PPC	past participle

Research materials

KG   = Edmund About: *Kralj gora. [22].* Trans. K. Hafner. *Slovenec,* 26 January 1924, p. 2.

KM   = Edmund About: *The King of the Mountains.* Trans. C. A. Kingsbury. New York/Chicago: Rand McNally, 1897. [Electronic edition: University of Adelaide].

Lu   = *Luther 1545.* http://www.bibel-online.net/buch/luther_1545_letzte_hand . CID – christliche internet dienst GmbH.

MTN   = Boris Pahor: *Moj tržaški naslov.* Trst: Gregorčičeva založba, 1948.

NP   = Alojz Rebula: *Nokturno za Primorsko.* Celje/Trst: Mohorjeva družba/Mladika, 2004.

RM   = Edmund About: *Le roi des montaignes.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1925 [1857].
RSV   = *The Holy Bible. Revised Standard Version*. New York/Glasgow: Collins, 1971.
SloS   = Boris Pahor: *Slovenska svatba: dnevniški zapiski 1990–1992.* Maribor: Založba Obzorja, 1995.
SSV   = *Sveto pismo. Slovenski standardni prevod.* Ljubljana: Svetopisemska družba Slovenije, 1996.
ST   = student translation

V   Foregnization and Domestication –
A View from the Periphery

1   An Introductory Remark

In this paper I would like to offer a reflection on the traditional and much discussed (as well as disputed) dichotomy between *foreignization* and *domestication*. The opposition has often been used to describe translations, to explain translators' behaviour and also to highlight some fundamental differences between the theoretical standpoints adopted by translation scholars, many of whom have analyzed the dichotomy in depth, although often using different terms than *domestication* and *foreignization*. After first discussing the dichotomy in some detail, I will then try to link it to some differences between major (or central or high-impact) and minor (or small or peripheral) cultures as regards their disposition to accommodate translated texts. My viewpoint will be that of a small culture in the European context.

2   On the concepts of *domestication* and *foreignization*

It is beyond doubt that in the long history of translation theory few concepts have had an impact comparable to that of Friedrich Schleiermacher's classical dichotomy between *foreignization* and *domestication,* as it is now known through the terms established over the past two decades or so principally by Lawrence Venuti (Venuti 1995, 1998). Schleiermacher's original formulation is rather different in that he speaks of two paths open to the translator, one of which is to leave in peace the author and move to him the reader (producing a foreignizing effect), while the other is to leave in peace the reader and move to him the author (producing a domesticating effect). It may be added that Schleiermacher's conceptualization of the relationship between foreignization and domestication was formulated, according to Michael Forster, under the influence of wider debates on the philosophy of language and the nature of communication engaged in by German Romantic thinkers, especially by Johann Gottfried Herder (Forster 2010: 391–468), who – like many of his fellows – was also a practising translator. Many of these debates were directly or indirectly concerned with translation, not only the issue of domestication and foreignization, but also, the question of linguistic

relativity, which has a significant bearing on how translation is viewed and conceptualized. In actual fact, however, the essence of the dichotomy is much older and is ultimately linked to the opposition between literal and free translation, which can be traced down to the time of classical antiquity. In modern translation scholarship, the two basic concepts of the opposition have been given names such as "direct translation" and "indirect translation" (Gutt 1990: 149 ff.), "overt translation" and "covert translation" (House 1977: 188–204), "exotization" vs "naturalization" (van Leuven-Zwart 1990: 75), "anti-illusionism" vs "illusionism" (Levý 2011: 19–21), "semantic translation" vs "communicative translation" (Newmark 1977), "documentary translation" vs "instrumental translation" (Nord 1991a: 105–106; Nord 1991b: 11 n. 5, 72–73), "observational reception" vs "participative reception" (Pym 1992: 178), and "opaque style" vs "transparent style" (Snell-Hornby, quoted in Vannerem/Snell-Hornby 1986: 191 n. 6); see also Siever (2012: 163). The nuances captured by these concepts may be different from what is implied by *foreignization* and *domestication*, however the basic preoccupation remains the same: they concern whether or not there are in a translated text (intentional) shining-through effects (whether syntactic, lexical, phraseological, stylistic or rhetorical) by which it is possible to detect in it cues that attest to its derived nature, i.e. to its being based on a source text written in a language different from its own.

Although Schleiermacher expressed a preference for (what has later become known as) foreignization and saw it in positive terms, the dichotomy between foreignization and domestication should not be viewed in a value-laden or normative manner, but rather in descriptive terms. Neither one or the other can reasonably be labelled *a priori* as positive or negative, although both Herder's and Schleiermacher's rationale for advocating it appears to have been to promote "respect for and openness to the Other" (Forster 2010: 393), an objective stemming from the awareness perceptible in German Romanticism of the importance of translations as a means of enrichment of German literature itself rather than reflecting an ambition to advance the global German literary and cultural dominance, as suggested by Lawrence Venuti and Antoine Berman (Forster 2010: 394). However, modern translation experience does not justify the assumption that foreignization is necessarily positive and domestication negative. The deployment of either one or the other approach is to be viewed in relation to the context in which a translation is produced and received as well as to the function it is intended to have.

In this paper, I will try to show the limits of the dichotomy and explore the fuzzy nature of the concepts of foreignization and domestication, which are in themselves imprecise, adaptable and therefore prone to misunderstanding and manipulation. The attitude towards the two approaches to translation is conditioned historically and culturally, depending primarily on how a given community views itself and others and, consequently, on its perceived need for foreign impulses (or lack of it) and its (in)tolerance of them. In this light, the value of the two concepts, which are more than anything else heuristic tools that help us better understand some translation tendencies and their motivations, is relative. It is necessarily determined by the role ascribed to translated texts (or subgroups thereof) in the target culture and by the agenda they are supposed to serve in linguistic, literary, cultural or political terms. Depending on the target circumstances, both approaches, foreignizing and domesticating, can be employed to reinforce the existing state of things or to encourage changes, and both can lead to a translation's success or contribute to its failure. Or, in Maria Tymoczko's words: "any translation procedure can become a tool of cultural colonization, even foreignizing translation" (Tymoczko 2000: 35).

As has been shown by several researchers (initially by Itamar Even-Zohar and Gideon Toury, among others), there appears, however, to be a basic difference between central and peripheral cultures as far as foreignization and domestication are concerned, at least in the European context. Since peripheral cultures tend to have a greater need for translation than central cultures and are therefore used to continually appropriating foreign models, they are likely to be more open to adopt a variety of translation strategies, foreignizing and domesticating ones, whereas central cultures, which may view themselves as relatively self-sufficient, seem to favour domestication to a greater degree, although, again, domestication (just like foreignization) by itself can have a wide variety of often opposing roles; in the words of Outi Paloposki and Riitta Oittinen, "[w]hether it [domestication] is cultural imperialism or emergent nationalism, carried out for propriety reasons or for educational purposes, depends on the situation" (Paloposki/Oittinen 2000: 387).

Among European peripheral cultures (and their literatures), the Slovene culture is a particularly interesting case: Slovene target texts tolerate foreignization with relative ease – at least in lexical and rhetorical terms, less so perhaps in syntax – and a foreignizing appropriation of source cultural patterns is a characteristic feature of translations into Slovene. On the other hand, a study of translations of

Slovene literature into some central cultures, such as British, French, Italian and German, has revealed that domestication is the prevailing strategy and that the texts which have been received well in the target cultures unfailingly display a target orientation.

3   Small cultures and their specifics

As is generally known, translators in small cultures often use strategies which differ considerably from those of their counterparts in major cultures. There is an important difference in sheer quantitative terms, since minor cultures tend to translate much more than major cultures, proportionately speaking; in Slovenia, for instance, about one third of the total production of books is accounted for by translations, whereas in the UK only about 3% of all the books published are translations. Another key difference is that small cultures typically rely, to a large degree, on their own resources in their contacts with major cultures – thus giving rise to "self-translation" or "autonomous translation" (in Michael Cronin's terms) – whereas major cultures, which tend to be self-sufficient, rather depend on external input when importing texts from low-impact cultures, thus making use of "heteronymous" or "dependent translation" (Cronin 2006: 40), which implies that the impetus to translate from a minor to major culture would frequently come from the minor culture rather than the major culture. Another characteristic of small cultures is, in principle, a greater openness to accommodate a variety of translation strategies, both domesticating (*fluent*, *invisible*, *assimilating*, *ethnocentric*) and foreignizing (*exoticizing*) ones, compared to what is usually the case in major cultures. Since peripheral cultures tend to have a greater need for translation than central cultures and are therefore used to continually appropriating foreign models, they are likely to have a more pluralistic approach to translation, considering foreignization (i.e. source orientation) as a possible option, whereas central cultures, which may view themselves as relatively self-sufficient, seem to favour domestication (i.e. target orientation) to a greater degree.

If central cultures tend to be more self-focused, while peripheral cultures may be more open towards the Other, then the postulation made by Even-Zohar's appears reasonable: in central literatures, in which translations have a peripheral position in the literary polysystem, "acceptability" is typically expected, whereas in peripheral literatures, where translations are considered to be of greater significance, "adequacy" may also be a natural choice. In the former case, "the translator's

main effort is to concentrate upon finding the best ready-made secondary models for the foreign text, and the result often turns out to be a non-adequate translation" (Even-Zohar 1990: 51). On the other hand,

> [s]ince translational activity participates, when it assumes a central position, in the process of creating new, primary models, the translator's main concern here is not just to look for ready-made models in his home repertoire into which the source texts would be transferable. Instead, he is prepared in such cases to violate the home conventions. Under such conditions the chances that the translation will be close to the original in terms of adequacy (in other words, a reproduction of the dominant textual relations of the original) are greater than otherwise. (50)

Likewise, according to Toury, "the more peripheral this status [of translation in a target culture], the more translation will accommodate itself to established models and repertories" (Toury 1995: 271). Of course, both Even-Zohar's and Toury's positions are speculative generalizations and as such may have a limited validity, since a number of specific elements determining a given translational situation must be taken into account. Moreover, the very terms "central" and "peripheral" literature are relative, since the centrality or peripherality of a given literature not only changes with time, but is a matter of degree and also depends on the observer's standpoint: if literatures written in English (American, British, Canadian and Australian, to name just some of them) are central in today's global polysystem (although not all of them to the same extent), then French or Spanish or Italian literatures are less so, but still incomparably more than literatures like Norwegian, Catalan or Slovene, although among the latter, too, there are substantial differences in terms of how peripheral they are perceived to be and by whom. For instance, many peripheral literatures may be considered of relative importance in neighbouring cultures – for which reason Slovene literature may be translated more into Italian or into Croatian than into Portuguese or Swedish – although on a global scale their significance remains rather small. Taking these caveats into account, Slovene literary translation practice can be said to show that the Slovene culture is paradigmatic with respect to the approaches to translation typically allowed in central and in peripheral literatures: in Slovene target texts, foreignization is often encountered, especially at the level of lexis, and appropriation of source elements is a common characteristic of literary texts translated into Slovene.

On the other hand, a study of a literary translations, published since the early 1990s and comprising both prose and poetry, of Slovene literature into some

major languages, particularly into Italian, but also into English, French and German, has revealed that domestication is the prevailing strategy and that the texts which have been received well in the target cultures unfailingly display a target orientation. Of course, domestication does not necessarily mean *radical* domestication, since in different target texts various elements of the source culture (such as personal names, place names and other culture-specific references) have been preserved to a smaller or larger degree, but the overall approach is characterized by trying to establish considerable cultural proximity between the target text and its reader – for instance by choosing poetic forms and by recreating rhythmic patterns familiar to the target audience as well as by making target-oriented syntactic, stylistic and rhetorical choices. Such text-internal characteristics are often complemented by the very choice of the works to be translated, which by virtue of the topics dealt with or positions expressed are likely to resonate with the target readers' experience, expectations or standpoints. To mention but one example, the Slovene author who has probably received most international attention is the Triestine writer Boris Pahor. He became well-known after his novels (in particular *Necropolis, Nekropola* in the Slovene original /1967/) in which he relates his experience as a prisoner in a Nazi concentration camp were translated into several other languages, including in particular French. In France, where the stories of his texts are often set and where literature concerning Second World War resistance has enjoyed considerable popularity, his books were received particularly well, which contributed to their successful introduction into other markets as well, especially Italy. The translations of his works, as well as those of other Slovene authors which have been received in target cultures with acclaim, show a strong tendency to domestication.

The privileging of the domesticating approach in the translation of a peripheral literature into a major culture should not be seen as surprising. There are a variety of reasons which not only justify such a decision but often actually make it the only reasonable choice. No matter how problematic domestication may be in that it plays down the differences between the source and the target cultures, literatures and languages, linguistic foreignization is unlikely to enable the reader to grasp more firmly the foreignness of the source text. In fact, however hard one tries, the characteristics of a source language cannot be rendered in a representative way by means of unnaturally reproducing them in another Zlobec, Ciril:language. This does not imply that foreignization may not be a sensible choice in a given translational situation, but it remains a rather uncertain

instrument of enabling the target reader to gain a closer insight into the functioning of the source text and language. Further, foreignization may require exceptionally high linguistic expertise and sensitivity on the part of the translator, who may otherwise easily end up producing too literal a translation in which the literary qualities of the text do not come to the fore. Therefore, it is reasonable to argue that the decision to translate a text in a more domesticating or in a more foreignizing way should be taken on the basis of the function the translation is supposed to serve and of the cultural context into which it will be inserted. If a source literature has already become relatively established in the target culture, so that translations from it become inserted in an already existing context of reception, then foreignizing translation may be a viable choice (Ožbot 2000), for at such a point it may not be too risky to leave aside the domestic *conceptual* and *textual grids* of the target culture (Lefevere 1999: 77). In other words, only when a corpus of texts or an "archive" (to use a term introduced by Edward Said) of source-culture elements and ideas about them has been established, can the audience's cultural assumption begin to be question and innovation can start to take place. Such an archive consists of "a constellation of ideas, motifs, preconceptions, and images – accumulated throughout a history of numerous forms of contact with another linguistic community – which amounts to an interpretive framework through which the linguistic and artistic products of another culture are filtered" (Shamma 2005: 65). Without a previously established context, foreignization can in actual fact be a means for reinforcing old perceptions and prejudices rather that overcoming them, and potentially lead to a significant loss of interest in the source culture and its literature. This has been shown, for instance, for the reception of Richard Burton's translation of the *Arabian Nights* in the British context where old stereotypes about the Arab world in relation to Western civilization were perpetuated, since "the difference in the translated text was so emphasized that the translation became more 'eccentricizing' and 'exoticizing' than foreignizing. Contrasted to the extreme foreignness (i.e. strangeness) of the translated Other, the values of one's own culture would seem normal and acceptable" (Shamma 2005: 63). Similarly, in translations of texts from peripheral and as yet unestablished literatures, foreignization may consolidate old attitudes towards them and reinforce the target audience's lack of interest in a given source literature. Therefore, in contrast, domestication can be more functional in enabling a non-dominant culture and its literature to be well received and gradually established in a target setting, especially in major cultures which are often

home to central literatures. Often, when a peripheral literature enters a major culture, the purpose of the translation project is to make the source literature positively noticed in the target culture and draw the readers' attention to the communicative potential of the target text and, more generally, of the literature it belongs to. If the communicative potential cannot be appreciated, the translation project is likely to fail. For the latter to be avoided and for productive literary communication to take place, sufficient common ground must be shared by the translated text and its readers in cultural, but also in linguistic terms. It appears that it is usually by means of a chiefly domesticating approach that such a productive communication gets established. In introducing a peripheral literature into a major culture, it is important to enable the target audience to relate to the textual world and to appreciate the expressive features of the translation as a literary work originating in a literature which is different from that of the target. In other words, giving the readers of the translation an opportunity to become interested in (or at least not deterring them from) the source literature is a primary goal in trying to establish firm translational relations between the source and the target literatures. As has been observed by Kasia Koskinen, "The author of the translation can also modulate the readers' affective engagement – and this is precisely what the two translation strategies can be used for. They can be seen as 'affective scripts', designed to maximize positive affect and to minimize negative affect" (Koskinen 2012: 27). Koskinen deals with the notion of affect and its role in translation, stressing as centrally important in the reception of translated texts "degrees of *emotional* affinity" rather than "degrees of cultural affinity". What should perhaps be added is the need for a "*cognitive* affinity", without which successful communication, intercultural or other, cannot be established. Domestication tends, therefore, to be more instrumental in such endeavours than foreignization, and it is to be emphasized that what is often automatically foreignizing and minoritizing in translations from peripheral to central literatures is the very decision to present source-culture texts to a specific target-culture audience.

When Venuti maintains that "[t]he point is rather to develop a theory and practice of translation that resists dominant target-language cultural values so as to signify the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text" (1995: 23), his advocacy of the foreignizing approach, the result of which would be minoritizing translation that would challenge the common cultural practices of the target setting and thus lead to innovation through departure from pre-established schemes of viewing the world and through an awareness of intercultural differences, he

endows translation with a great transformative potential, which may have cultural, political and ideological bearing. However, the proposed translational choices are unlikely to bring about successful results in all target settings. Although they may function in certain situations in major cultures, such as in the British and, in particular, American cultures, when they import texts from literatures which already have a relatively firm place in the target setting, they will usually not enable works of minor literatures to enjoy a favourable reception in it and, consequently, acquire some visibility.

However, no matter how familiar or how foreign a translation is made to be for the target audience, it will always remain in the first place a fact of the target culture (Toury 1995: 29) and as such it will not be able to provide the readers with a "genuine access to the source culture" (Ožbot 2011a: 520). Given the unavoidably appropriating nature of any translation, "foreignizing is also essentially a domestically based strategy. That is, the target culture and target language are the repositories of foreignizing methods, and the manner in which one renders the foreign origin visible is confined to those possibilities accessible in the target system" (Koskinen 2012: 15). Given this, any target text can, in fact, "only be a *functional* substitute for a source text (i.e., it can function in place of a source text, although it has a life of its own), but can never *faithfully* represent it" (Ožbot 2011a: 520). The source text does emerge through the translation, but is normally used independently from it, thus becoming a part, in a more or less successful way, of the corpus of texts of the target culture. The point has been succinctly expressed by Paloposki and Oittinen:

> [...] foreignizing and domesticating are contextual phenomena and need to be studied as such. Even if we agree that translating is always an issue of power and politics, we feel that translation is more than that. The word 'foreignizing' in itself may be misleading, at least in the context of translating: every time we translate we necessarily domesticate, one way or the other. The text becomes part of the target-language culture and literature. The direction of this cultural transfer also matters: translating *into* English is different from translating *from* English. (386)

It is worth emphasizing that a foreignizing appropriation of source elements may be viewed negatively also in peripheral literatures, when these literatures come to perceive the source culture as potentially threatening. Historically speaking, in the Slovene culture, for example, the threat came from German, which for centuries represented the dominant culture, so at the time of national

awakening in the second half of the 19th century translations from languages other than German as well as original compositions were encouraged. Any mark of the German original could be perceived negatively, so a frequent tendency was to altogether avoid translations from German – although rather unsuccessfully, for literary classics, for instance, were too important for a developing literature to be excluded from its nascent corpus of translations. A somewhat similar attitude has been reported, for instance in the case of Irish, where there has been a tendency to un-English texts translated from English as the language of the colonizer by promoting in them traits which are distinctively Irish (Cronin 2011).

4   The Slovene case

Slovene culture as one of Europe's small cultures has been, at least since the time of the national revival, characterized by a lively translation activity and translated texts have played a role of primary importance in the development of Slovene literature itself (see Ožbot 2011c). The translational exchange, however, was for a long time largely unidirectional, since a great many of literary texts were translated into Slovene, but incomparably fewer were rendered from Slovene into other languages. This highly asymmetrical situation only began to change after the Second World War and especially over the past couple of decades, when texts of Slovene literature have been increasingly translated into various European languages, major and minor ones. What seems rather striking about translations of Slovene literature into other cultures, though, is that, with the exception of some success stories (Ožbot 2011a: 514–516), the amount of effort put into such projects by translators, authors, editors, publishers and other agents of translational exchange has often been disproportionate to the results achieved, which have in many cases been relatively limited, to judging by the reception of the translated texts in the target cultures. The reasons for the relatively unsatisfactory outcomes are undoubtedly numerous and complex. A variety of factors concerning literary and extra-literary variables are relevant and include, among other things, the choice of texts that are translated and their communicative potential with regard to the target-culture readership, the expertise of translators and other agents involved, the position of the publisher on the target book market, the scale of the promotional activities undertaken as well as the translation strategies employed (i.e. domesticating or foreignizing ones).

We have analyzed selected translations from Slovene into other languages, especially into Italian, comprising works by three contemporary writers, two poets, Ciril Zlobec and Miroslav Košuta (both into Italian), and one prose writer, Boris Pahor (into Italian, English, French and German). All three are well-known figures of Slovene literature and certainly Zlobec and Pahor are to be considered to be among the few Slovene authors who have achieved considerable renown abroad, the former in Italy and the latter especially in France, Italy and Germany. What has been clearly shown is that the translations of their texts are highly domesticating – definitely in terms of the linguistic choices made, since the translations read like idiomatic texts of target literatures; it is actually just some names that betray a "non native" origin of the texts.

The tendency to domestication can well be seen from the first three introductory sentences to Boris Pahor's *Necropolis*, where the author describes his post-war return to the site in Alsace where he was imprisoned in a Nazi concentration camp. The passage reads as follows – in the Slovene original, in a "literal" translation into English, intended to give an insight into the structure of the Slovene text, and the published translations into English, French, German and Italian:

> *Slovene original*
>
> Nedeljski popoldan je in asfaltirani trak, ki se vzpenja gladek in ovinkast zmeraj više v planine, ni tako samoten, kakor bi mi bilo prav. Avtomobili me prehitevajo, drugi se vračajo v Schirmek, v dolino, takó da mi turistični promet trga in banalizira pričakovano zbranost. Saj vem, tudi jaz sem s svojim vozilom del motorizirane procesije, a predstavljam si, da bi, če bi bil sam, zavoljo nekdanje spojenosti s tem ozračjem, moja pričujočnost zdaj ne spreminjala sanjske podobe, ki skozi ves povojni čas nedotaknjena počiva v senci moje zavesti.

> *English "literal" rendition (my translation)*
>
> It's Sunday afternoon and the asphalt strip that is going upwards smooth and curving ever higher in the mountains is not so desolate as would suit me. Cars are overtaking me, others are returning to Schirmeck, to the valley, so that the tourist traffic is disrupting and banalizing my anticipated concentration. I do know, I too with my vehicle am part of the motorized procession, but I imagine that, if I was on my own, because of my past unitedness with this atmosphere, my presence would now not change the dream-like picture which during the whole of the post-war time rests intact in the shadow of my consciousness.

English translation (Michael Biggins)

It's a Sunday afternoon, and the smooth and sinuous asphalt strip that leads ever higher into the mountains is not as desolate as I would have wished it to be. Cars pass me or return down into the valley, toward Schirmeck, and the volume of tourist traffic disrupts, defiles, even, the calm I had anticipated. Admittedly, my car and I are now a part of the motorized procession. I had hoped that if there was no other traffic but me, my former intimacy with this place would keep my intrusion from distorting the dreamlike images that have lived untouched in the shadows of my mind ever since the war.

French translation (Andrée Lück-Gaye)

Dimanche après-midi : la route goudronnée qui monte, lisse et tortueuse dans les montagnes, n'est pas aussi solitaire que je le voudrais. Des voitures me doublent, d'autres rentrent à Schirmeck, dans la vallée, et la circulation entrave le recueillement que j'espérais trouver. Je sais bien que moi aussi je participe avec mon véhicule à la procession motorisée, mais je me figure que si j'étais seul, ma présence, parce que je suis un vieux familier de cette atmosphère, ne modifierait en rien l'image qui repose au fond de moi, intacte, depuis la fin de la guerre.

German translation (Mirella Urdih-Merkù)

Es ist Sonntagnachmittag und das Asphaltband, das sich in glatten Kurven immer höher in die Berge windet, ist nicht so einsam, wie es mir recht wäre. Autos überholen mich, andere fahren zurück ins Tal nach Schirmeck, und dieser Touristenverkehr verhindert die Sammlung, die ich mir erhofft habe, und lässt alles banal werden. Ich weiß, dass ich mit meinem Fahrzeug gleichfalls Teil dieser motorisierten Prozession bin, doch ich habe mich vorgestellt, meine Anwesenheit allein ließe wegen der einstigen Verschmelzung mit dieser Atmosphäre das Traumbild unverändert, das die ganze Nachkriegszeit hindurch unberührt im Schatten meines Bewusstseins geruht hat.

Italian translation (Ezio Martin)

Domenica pomeriggio. Il nastro d'asfalto liscio e sinuoso che sale verso le alture fitte di boschi non è deserto come vorrei. Alcune automobili mi superano, altre stanno facendo ritorno a valle, verso Schirmek; così il traffico turistico trasforma questo momento in qualcosa di banale e non mi permette di mantenere il raccoglimento che cercavo. So bene che anch'io, con la mia macchina, faccio parte di questa processione motorizzata, eppure sono sicuro che, vista la mia passata intimità con questi luoghi, se sulla strada fossi solo, il fatto di viaggiare in automobile non scalfirebbe l'immagine onirica che dalla fine della guerra riposa intatta nell'ombra della mia coscienza.

As is clear from these brief passages, all the translators have striven to make the text linguistically and stylistically acceptable in terms of the established target conventions. To achieve this, they "naturalized" it various ways. For instance, the Italian and the French versions are more nominal than the Slovene original, which is more verb-oriented, as can be seen from the opening words of the first sentence, which contain a verb (*je* 'is'), but in the French and the Italian translations they are turned into nominalized expressions of time. In addition to that, the French translation shows a segmentation of the text into more sentences than those found in the original. Further, all the versions display a totally idiomatic use of punctuation, which differs in important ways from Slovene, the exception being the German translation, since in the German and the Slovene language punctuation principles are largely the same. At the syntagmatic level, several structural changes with respect to the Slovene original have occurred in all four translations, which shows that apart from rendering correctly the sense of a given micro unit, the translators found it of primary importance to render the text idiomatic in the target language.

The rest of the four translations of the *Necropolis* follow the same domesticating principle, which has also been applied to the translations of texts by the two aforementioned poets into Italian. There too, the primary concern of the translators was to ensure that the translations smoothly enter the space of the target literature as genuine artistic creations.

5   A concluding remark

Contrasting such naturalizing practice as has been observed in the translations of Slovene texts which have enjoyed a positive reception in the target cultures with the much more heterogeneous strategies employed in translations of foreign texts into Slovene, the question which automatically comes to mind is what is the reason for the discrepancy. For any firm conclusion to be reached, a much larger corpus of translations would have to be studied, but the general tendency appears to be undeniable: successful translations from a small and relatively unestablished literature such as Slovene into major languages tend to be domesticating, whereas well-received translations from both central and peripheral literatures in the Slovene target culture display both domesticating and foreignizing approaches.

To conclude, domestication and foreignization are not mutually exclusive, but are rather a matter of degree as well as of cultural expectations (or "convention", according to Levý), and the latter necessarily differ from one cultural context to another. As has been suggested by Michael Boyden (2006),

> […] domestication and foreignization constitute opposite but complementary strategies for the accommodation of linguistic differences. […] While the domesticating strategy accommodates cultural items (authors, texts, periods, movements, or whatever else) by indigenizing or assimilating them, the foreignizing strategy does so by underscoring their particularity. Although they go in opposite directions, both strategies in the end fill a similar social function: they ensure that the item enters into the discourse of belonging or identity by which a specific culture describes itself in relation to the rest of the world. (122)

Given this, the value of the two concepts of domestication and foreignization is relative. They may be of help in taking translational decisions as well as in trying to understand them, but they do not have any instrinsic value against which to gauge the quality of translated texts.

Literary Texts Cited

Košuta, Miroslav: *Memoria del corpo assente./Spomin odsotnega telesa.* Transl. Daria Betocchi. Trieste: ZTT EST, 1999.

Pahor, Boris: *Nekropola.* Maribor and Trieste: Obzorja/Založništvo tržaškega tiska.

Pahor, Boris: *Pilgrim among the shadows*, Transl. Michael Biggins. New York/San Diego/London: Harcourt Brace & Co., 1995.

Pahor, Boris: *Necropoli.* Transl. Ezio Martin. Roma: Fazi Editore, 2008.

Pahor, Boris: *Nekropolis.* Transl. Mirella Urdih-Merkù. Berlin: Berliner Taschenbuch Verlag, 2003.

Pahor, Boris: *Pèlerin parmi les ombres.* Trans. Andrée Lück-Gaye. Paris: La Table Ronde, 1990.

Zlobec, Ciril: *La mia breve eternità: Antologia personale 1950–1990.* Transl. Arnaldo Bressan, Ubaldino Sampaoli, Giacomo Scotti, Jolka Milič, and Sergij Šlenc. Roma: Bulzoni, 1991.

Zlobec, Ciril: *Ljubezen – svetlo sonce in temà*; *Amore – sole nero e oro solare.* Transl. Luciano Luisi, Grytzko Mascioni, and Giacomo Scotti. Udine: Campanotto Editore, 2004.

VI Reflection on Translation in a Translation-Oriented Culture: Some Notes on the Slovene Tradition

1 Introductory observations

As is well-known, in small cultures, at least in the European context, translations tend to occupy a privileged position compared to major cultures, which often rely more heavily on the production of "original" texts, i.e. those not claiming to be target-language versions of source texts written in a different language. This is true of translated literary as well as non- literary texts, although the observations in this paper relate principally to literary translation rather than to technical translation. In the present discussion of the history of the study of translation in Slovenia, there are at least two reasons for privileging literary translation. First, historically speaking, the majority of those who have commented on translation in Slovenia, whether from a practical or theoretical background, have dealt mainly with literary as well as (to a lesser extent) religious texts, and only to a much more limited extent with pragmatic texts. Second, there has to date been little research on the history of non-literary translation in Slovenia, also because research on historical aspects of non-literary translation, including translation in institutional settings (e.g. for legal, administrative or indeed educational purposes, such as the translation of textbooks), presupposes at least some knowledge about translation policy and planning, which have as yet hardly been studied.[35]

However, notwithstanding the importance of translations for a small culture, there is no reason to suppose that such a culture will also be prominent in research on translation. As this paper will try to show, in Slovenia there has been a considerable amount of reflection on translation, both before the consolidation of the discipline of translation studies in the early 1980s[36] as well as in earlier decades and

---

35 For some preliminary research on this topic see Teržan Kopecky (2007).

36 The decision to set the consolidation of translation studies in the 1980s is of course to an extent arbitrary, although it was in actual fact in that decade that translation research began to develop on a large scale in quantitative as well as in qualitative terms. Mary Snell-Hornby's seminal volume *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach* published in 1988 both reflected the new stage reached by translation research and at the same time significantly contributed to the epistemological conceptualization of the new field. As is generally known, the need to establish a new field of research had been expressed several times before, notably in James S. Holmes' 1972 paper on the "Name and Nature of Translation studies", but for some more time translation research did not gain general academic recognition as a new discipline. On the other hand, much cutting-edge research on translation had been carried out in the 1970, for instance by

centuries, when many practising translators engaged in what can for the most part be characterized as "pre-theoretical" reflection on translations. Although many highly relevant and perceptive observations were made on translations and translating, in Slovenia translation research only began to be carried on a larger scale towards the end of the twentieth century – with a few exceptions concerning the Slovene history of translation – under the influence of the international developments in the already burgeoning field of translation studies.

This article will give an overview of the debates and discussions on the role of translation in Slovenia throughout different periods of the Slovene cultural history and show how the importance of translated texts is eventually matched with the attention granted to translation research.

2   The Slovene culture as a translation-oriented culture

It is difficult to overstate the role of translated texts in Slovene culture,[37] both historically and today, not only in terms of the impact they had on the development of the Slovene language and literature, but also in other areas of cultural and intellectual life such as religion, science and scholarship more generally. For over a thousand years Slovenes had no or limited political autonomy and compensated for this through cultural affirmation, which also included writing in the Slovene language and translating into Slovene from other languages, especially neighbouring ones, such as German and Italian, or from Latin as the language of the Church and learning. Through translation from these and other languages, Slovenes enriched their own language and culture and were at the same time able to break from the relative isolation imposed upon them by the adverse political conditions, connect to the wider world and, ultimately, obtain a place on the international cultural and also political map. Translations were of major importance for the Slovene cultural advancement, while being at the same time instruments of taste formation and channels through which various Slovene circles became acquainted with ideas and ideologies from outside Slovenia, political and other. If intense translational activity can be said to reflect an ambition of Slovenes to strengthen their position as a community with an

---

German scholars such as Hans J. Vermeer and Katharina Reiss, but their work is not permeated either with an explicit need for epistemologically defining translation studies as a new research field.

37   A brief overview of the role of translation in the Slovene culture from a historical perspective is offered in Ožbot (2011c).

identity of its own, it is equally true that the attitude towards translation in the Slovene culture mirrors the circumstances which shaped the Slovene history in general.

Various culturally central texts in Slovene are translations and the Slovene language and Slovene literature have been in important ways shaped by translated texts. For instance, the first written documents in Slovene dating from around 1000 AD (*Brižinski spomeniki,* i.e. the Freising manuscripts, containing confession formulas and a sermon on sin and penance) are translations from Latin and German and also in later periods, such as the Reformation, the nineteenth century or the inter-war era, translations were vital for the development of the Slovene language and Slovene literature. During the first century of translation activity, and particularly in the Reformation, mainly religious texts were translated into Slovene, but from the Enlightenment on, translation was of central importance also for secular Slovene poetry, prose and drama as well as of various non-literary genres, many of which have developed on the basis of foreign models that were imported into the target culture through translation. According to data provided by Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia for 2014, translations account for about one third of all the titles published in Slovene per year (STAT 2014), which is a very high proportion in comparison with other European countries, among which, for instance, the UK (together with Ireland), which is at the opposite end, with translations accounting for only about 3% of the total book production.[38] The volume of translations compared to that of original texts published in Slovenia has remained steady for a number of years now, and although the absolute number of the titles published per year has been on the increase (5,554 items in 2014 compared to 4,340 items in 2007; STAT 2009), the proportion between translated and non-translated texts has remained fairly constant.

The volume of translated texts and the important role of translation in the Slovene culture are hardly surprising. In fact, as is the case in many other small cultures, in Slovenia too there is a perceived double need for translation: first, translations from other languages and literatures are necessary if Slovene literature is to continue to be a fully developed literature, since literary expression which is inspired by domestic as well as by foreign models is likely to be richer than the one which remains restricted to the impulses from its own linguistic

---

38   This percentage refers to the translations in general, i.e. of literary and non-literary texts. In actual fact, the amount of translated literary texts is slightly higher, reaching about 4,5%. The figures have been calculated on the basis of data available for the years 2000, 2005 and 2008 (see Donahaye 2012: 28).

environment. Second, like other cultures with a relatively small number of native speakers and an even more restricted number of bilinguals who are able to translate from the language in question, Slovenes have often had to produce themselves translations of their own texts into other languages, big or small alike. This makes Slovenia a typical environment where "self-translation" or "autonomous translation" is practised, whereas many other cultures, in particularly the numerically big and, in terms of power relations, dominant ones, are characterized by "dependent translation" or "heteronymous translation" (Cronin 2006: 40), which is especially true when such culture import texts, via translation, from small cultures.

As has been the case in many other environments, in the Slovene context too the production of translations has also encouraged substantial reflection on various translational issues, both from an internal perspective, i.e. from the point of view of the translators themselves, as well as from an external one, i.e. from the point of view of writers or scholars of language and literature or from the point of view of literary critics. At least prior to the mid-20th century, such reflections are for the most part non-theoretical or pseudo-theoretical, but are interesting also because they often tie in with or (broadly) correspond to ideas promoted in canonical translation theories which developed in other intellectual environments and are now considered to be the historical building blocks of the modern discipline of translation studies. Such correspondences are probably often fortuitous in the sense that the Slovene writers on translation may not have been acquainted with foreign ideas in question, but dealing with the same kind of problems they seem to have reached similar conclusions. In fact, until the first couple of decades after the Second World War, it is relatively rarely that in Slovene texts one encounters references to foreign thinkers on translation, which, however, does not make the translational metatexts any less relevant for the study of the Slovene tradition of reflection on translation.

The first (pseudo-theoretical) considerations date back to the Reformation, when the Slovene Protestants translated a considerable amount of religious texts. For the Protestants, translation was a theologically necessary and a culturally justifiable endeavour, and the belief in the positive role of translation characterized subsequent reflections on the subject as well. The second surge in the Slovene reflection on translation before modern times came about in the 19th century. Let us have a closer look at these two periods.

3   Reflections on translation in the Reformation

As has been suggested by the Icelandic researcher Gauti Kristmannsson (2001), translation has often had the function of enhancing the position of national languages. This could happen either through literary movements as well as through religious ones, and – as he states – the Reformation is the religious counterpart of the mother-tongue movement (Kristmannsson 2001: 19). In the second half of the sixteenth century, Slovene Protestants translated a number of religious texts, including the *Bible,* the first complete Slovene version of which was translated by one man, Jurij Dalmatin, and came out in 1584. Although the translation activity of the Slovene Protestants was eminently religious in nature, it had long-lasting consequences not only in the realm of religion, but also for the development of the Slovene language, literature and culture in the broadest sense. At the time, the production of texts in Slovene saw an unprecedented surge in quantity, quality and intensity, which was enough to signal a turning point for the fortunes of the Slovene language and its speakers. It is worth pointing out that with the translation of the *Bible,* the Slovene language became in its cultural status and, to some degree, also in its resources comparable to other cultures with more developed languages and literatures, for which the translations of the Bible were not only of religious significance, but also had the function of linguistic, literary and cultural reference points.

In the introduction to his translation, Jurij Dalmatin underlines the close connection between the religious and the linguistic function of the *Bible:*

> God revealed his word to the barbarian peoples […] in the German language, which is intelligible to the ordinary man. In this way, it was not only the German language which flourished through the pure word of God, but it was also the word of God which flourished through the language and especially through the good German translation of the Bible. (Dalmatin quoted in Stanovnik (2013: 55–58), my translation)

This is one of the earliest examples of a metatext on translation written in Slovene, but it is far from being an isolated one in the Reformation period. Like Dalmatin, his colleagues too were eager to make observations on various aspects of translation, usually in the introductions to translated texts themselves. In such translation-related passages, the authors talk about the circumstances in which their translations were made, the purpose of the Slovene versions in question and the general translation principles endorsed. Sometimes the observations refer to

specific problems experienced in the process of translating individual texts. For instance, Primož Trubar, the central figure of Slovene Protestantism, who is considered the "father" of the Slovene language due to his authorship of the first Slovene printed texts, *Abecedarium* and *Catechismus* (Trubar 1966), which were published in Tübingen in 1550, enables us to glean what his approach to translation was by underlining "faithfulness" of the translated text to the original and "intelligibility" of the translation for the believer. This shows that Trubar directly followed Martin Luther, who strove to make the language of his German translation understood by the contemporary audience, in accordance with the Protestant belief that the Bible should be directly accessible to everyone (Stanovnik 2005: 19). It is highly likely that Trubar was well acquainted also with Luther's *Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen*, but does not explicitly mention the text in his writing (Stanovnik 2005: 14–15). Trubar's position is, of course, in line with Protestant thinking, but at the same time it can also be appreciated for not discriminating between languages as far as their power of expression is concerned and for being unfailingly "egalitarian" in presupposing that human beings are capable of unmediated access to complex verbal messages regardless of the many differences in their individual circumstances.

For a rather long time after the Reformation, i.e. until the beginning of the 19th century, literary production (both original and translated) was limited and so was discussion on translation. As can be expected, the number of religious texts decreased and non-religious texts, literary and non-literary ones, soon started to predominate. The nineteenth century was a period of great political ferment and nation building, and as was the case during the Reformation some centuries earlier, this time too translations often turned out to mirror some of the central contemporary preoccupations.

4   The 19th century – a variety of perspectives on translation

The 19th century was a period of intense translation activity, especially from German. While the number of both literary and non-literary translations grew, translated literary texts appear to have been of a particular significance not just because they contributed to the expansion of the corpus of translations in Slovene and were therefore proof of the expressive potential of Slovene, but also because they were instrumental in the development of native production, since many Slovene authors of the time (as well as of later periods) took the production of translated

texts as a useful practice to help them hone their linguistic and literary skills in their native language. Not only were the processes leading to the production of translations and of originals interrelated, also the texts which came into existence through these two modes of production coexisted unproblematically. Gradually, however, along with the search of a peculiarly Slovene national character, translations (especially from German) started to be perceived as having a potentially negative effect and were sometimes viewed with suspicion as an allegedly dangerous enterprise from the perspective of native literature. In the opinion of various Slovene writers, translations were considered as competitors to original text production, which could have a potentially destructive influence on original literary production in Slovene. Translation was believed to be necessarily restricted, for instance, to selected literary classics and it was further held that translations were to be made only by writers of quality. Moreover, not all literatures were equally qualified as source literatures, though translation from Slavic literatures was considered acceptable. In general, however, "original" text production was primarily encouraged, without recognizing that translation can stimulate original production as well as promote a domestic agenda.

Opposition to translation is certainly not peculiar to the Slovene cultural setting, but has been a characteristic of many other environments at different times (cf. Ožbot 2011c: 61–63), from the ancient Rome, to England during the Reformation and to other small cultures in periods of national awakening. In the Slovene case, the opposition to translation is probably to be interpreted as a reaction against German influence, which had for centuries permeated the Slovene culture, and reached a peak in the nineteenth century, not least through translation from German, encompassing high literature, popular texts and, increasingly more practical works such as textbooks. While translations from German – as well as from other languages – enriched and strengthened Slovene culture, they also consolidated the Germanic cultural dominance in Slovenia, also in the domain of language, which developed under a heavy German influence.

Although translations from German were seen as the most problematic, some Slovene nineteenth-century writers who were involved in cultural policy viewed negatively all translations, not only those based on German texts. In part this was due to the dubious quality of certain contemporary translations from various languages, however, this was not the main reason for the resistance to translation. An interesting case is that of Josip Stritar (Stanovnik 2013: 96–123), one of the

principal writers of Slovene Romanticism and one of the most cosmopolitan Slovene authors of the period. He studied Classics at Vienna University and spent most of his life in Vienna working as a language teacher. In the 1870s, he edited *Zvon,* an influential Slovene literary magazine, in which, however, only original Slovene texts were published as well as Slovene literary texts translated into other languages. Stritar's position certainly appears to be paradoxical, in view of his liberalism, cosmopolitanism and first-hand knowledge of world literature. On the other hand, it seems that his opposition to translation is explicable precisely as a means of encouraging domestic literary production only through which Slovene literature could in his opinion grow in quality so as to become comparable in scope to other European literatures.

Although stances on translation such as that of Stritar did not win out in the long term, they were important inasmuch as they influenced attitudes towards translated texts as well as towards the relevance of translation as an object of intellectual attention. All this, in turn, had important consequences for the general perception of translation in society, which has often been considered a second-rate endeavour. Again, this is not a peculiarly Slovene phenomenon, but is also found in several other cultures and is reflected in academic research, which until the last decades of the twentieth century usually ascribed only marginal importance to translation, with a few notable exceptions, such as Biblical translations. In Slovene literary circles, the situation began to change towards the end of the nineteenth century, when translations came to be viewed as necessary elements of culture and an indicator of cultural development and connectedness to the wider literary world. Several proposals concerning suitable texts to be translated into Slovene were put forward. There was a decisive turn away from German literature, with the exception of certain canonical texts, and various writers suggested that translation from small literatures (such as, for instance, Scandinavian literatures and various Slavic literatures) should be privileged, since those literatures may have developed in similar contexts to Slovene literature. The general attitude towards translation became much more positive and translated texts came to be seen as important pillars of the textual corpus in Slovene rather than a threat to native literature. The amount of translated texts grew rapidly, and translations from non-European literatures, such as Chinese or Japanese, were made, although in such cases indirect translations heavily prevailed, and this continued to be the rule rather than an exception well into the second half of the twentieth century.

Nonetheless, in spite of the growth of the Slovene corpus of translations and of the generally favourable attitude towards them, questions of translation did not yet receive much scholarly attention, which only happened in the last decades of the twentieth century. Before the Second World War, however, translation as a subject of intellectual debate was approached either from a practical point of view or in terms of its relevance to culture planning and cultural policy. In the pre-war period discussion of translation theory was almost non-existent, although a short essay from 1928 by Anton Debeljak, a translator from Romance languages, which he dedicated to the Slovene poet Oton Župančič as a literary translator stands out: it appears that Debeljak had an impressive knowledge of translation theory and about issues related to translation.[39]

5   From reflection on translation to translation research

For several decades into the twentieth century, discussion on translation in Slovenia remained mainly of a practical or pre-theoretical nature. It was actually only in the late 1980s and especially in the 1990s that translations began to be considered more widely as valuable objects of research and important cultural phenomena. A notable exception, was the field of comparative literature, which at the University of Ljubljana was well developed even before the Second World War and which dedicated a considerable amount of attention to issues of translation as an important object of study, whereas in language departments, if translation was dealt with it at all, it was usually in the service of foreign-language learning. In fact, it was often researchers in comparative literature that acquainted the Slovene public with the initial developments in the new field of translation studies. They sometimes viewed the ongoing translation research with suspicion, not least because in the 1960s and 1970s approaches to the study of translation were often still rather limited to the analysis of levels lower than the textual level, so the need for an integration of the nascent discipline and literary studies, which were able to adopt a more textual approach to literature, was emphasized. In this context, questions related to the boundaries between literary studies and the new discipline were also discussed (Dolinar 1975: 60). The relationship between comparative literature and translation studies continues to be an object of scholarly debate (Bassnett 1993, D'hulst 2007), highlighting the fluidity in the delineation of academic disciplines.

---

39   A. Debeljak, *Oton Župančič – prevajalec (1928)* (Stanovnik 2013: 251–258).

The attention given to translation by certain Slovene scholars of comparative literature was in accordance with the tenets of the discipline. Anton Ocvirk, the main representative of comparative literature in Slovenia, spent some time in the early 1930s as a postgraduate in Paris, where he was influenced by the French school of comparative literature epitomized by Fernand Baldensperger, Paul Van Tieghem and Paul Hazard. When he returned to Ljubljana, he wrote an introductory survey of the field (Ocvirk 1936), in which he devoted considerable attention to translations, both as instruments of the development of a national literature and as an object of study. Some of his pupils also nurtured an interest in translation, and, in some cases, even more so than their teacher. They were mainly practising literary translators, who translated a number of canonical texts of world literature into Slovene, and alongside their practical work they were also concerned with studying translations, mainly from a historical point of view, as well as being active as members of the Association of the Slovene Literary Translators, to whose publications they contributed in important ways. In the circle of literary scholars who were at the same time active as translators there is also Majda Stanovnik, who has authored several important publications, including an overview of the Slovene translation history (Stanovnik 2005) as well as an anthology of the Slovene translators' own writings on translation, the first part of which, covering the period from the Reformation to the eve of the second World War, has been recently published (Stanovnik 2013), while the second volume appeared in 2016 (Stanovnik 2016). Interestingly, however, translations were not uniformly considered of central importance for comparative literary studies, as has been shown by Stanovnik (2012), and although translated texts remain a prerequisite for the discipline of comparative literature, their role is often taken for granted and not explicitly dealt with.

Apart from the attention given to the study of translation at the Department of Comparative Literature of the University of Ljubljana, translation theory was not part of university curricula. However, a lack of academic interest in issues of translation was at least to some degree compensated for by the Association of Slovene Literary Translators ("Društvo slovenskih književnih prevajalcev"), which organized lectures and annual meetings and issued publications that served as important platforms for the discussion of translation issues, through which the Slovene practising translators and academics could become acquainted with new developments in international translation research. The main forum for the discussion about translation were the *Proceedings of the Association of Slovene Literary Translators* (*Zborniki Društva slovenskih književnih prevajalcev*), a series of annual

publications, whose first volume appeared in 1975 and was followed by thirty more by 2006, when the series was replaced by the journal *Hieronymus,* to which a book series *Studia translatoria* was added two years later. In Slovenia, another book series devoted to translation and related fields is currently published by the Department of Translation of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Ljubljana, i.e. *Translation Studies and Applied Linguistics* (2008–), in which twelve volumes have been published so far.

Given the role the *Proceedings of the Association of Slovene Literary Translators* had in the promotion of the study of translation in Slovenia over three decades, a brief presentation of it seems to be in place. The series was created at the suggestion of Janko Moder (1914–2006), one of the founders of the Association in 1953 and himself a prolific translator as well as organizer of professional events for practising literary translators. The volumes published in the series dealt with a variety of topics, though not always aimed at an academic audience. In the early volumes, in particular, a number of the contributions were of a practical nature (and sometimes also showed prescriptive or, indeed, purist tendencies), which is understandable, since the primary intended audience of the publications were practising literary translators. Many of them, however, did have an interest in translation studies, being eager to either actively contribute to the field or to learn about studies made by others, sometimes in the hope that the knowledge thus gained would help them in their activity as translators. The majority of the volumes are thematic in nature, but often also containing a special section with papers on other translation-related issues. Initially, the volumes were mainly concerned with Slovene translation history, dealing either with the legacy of single well-known Slovene translators or with translations of Slovene authors into other languages. For instance, the 1986 volume brings together papers on the work of the foremost translator from the classical languages, Anton Sovrè (after whom the main annual prize awarded by the Association is named), whereas the 1977 and the 1980 volumes deal with two canonical authors of Slovene literature, Ivan Cankar and Oton Župančič, respectively.

Later, in the 1980s and 1990s, attention was turned to topics which could, on the one hand, be explored within the specifically Slovene context, but also offered scope for broader debates that could touch upon theoretical issues, while at the same time remaining of practical importance for professional translators. Besides universal issues which have marked (pre)theoretical reflection on translation not

just in the Slovene tradition, but also in many other European and non-European traditions, such as questions of translatability, appropriate and inappropriate translation strategies and source- or target-orientation in translation, to name but a few, topics of theoretical, descriptive and applied value have been explored. Among them there are issues related to Biblical translation, to translation and national identity, to the translation of the novel, the translation of children's literature, etc. In 1999, some younger members of the Association took over editing the Proceedings, which became more ambitious in the number of contributions and in the depth of treatment of the topics. Increasingly, non-Slovene translation scholars were invited to contribute to the Proceedings, among them also some of the major specialists in the field of translation studies. Especially in the last volumes in the series, a number of contributions are written in languages other than Slovene (mainly in English or German). While until 2001 the publication remained centred on one theme (or sometimes two themes), such as the translation of texts set to music, the translation of troubadour lyrics, the translation of comics and picture books, etc., in 2002 a historical approach was adopted and the last five volumes (2002–2006) dealt with questions of the history of translation, mainly, though not exclusively, in the Slovene context. During the three decades of the life of the Proceedings, 31 the annual volumes were published, along with two special ones, of celebratory nature. Three other volumes, two of which make part of the main series (Moder 1985; Grum 1998), deserve to be singled out: one of them, compiled by Janko Moder (1985), is actually a lexicon of modern translation (*Leksikon novejšega prevajanja*) and contains biographical data on translators and, in particular, bibliographical data on the texts they translated, from other languages into Slovene or vice versa; both published and unpublished translations are taken into account. The volume was followed in 2007 by a similar reference work, authored by the bibliographer Martin Grum, covering the period from 1550 to 1945 (Grum 2007), but comprising only entries from A to J; its continuation (K-Ž) is currently being prepared. Grum is also the author of another reference volume, *Modrov zbornik* (Grum 1998), which contains up-to-date material that complements the 1985 lexicon and also concerns contemporary translation.

In addition to the Association of Slovene Literary Translators, there is also the Association of Scientific and Technical Translators of Slovenia ("Društvo znanstvenih in tehniških prevajalcev Slovenije"), which was established in 1961 and has since 1966 published its own journal *Mostovi*. The publication has a very practical slant and is intended to help technical translators solve concrete problems they

encounter in their work and encourage them to reflect upon their own activity as translators. Several articles discuss – from a descriptive rather that a theoretical perspective – various linguistic, and especially contrastive topics, as well as present new translation tools, from translation memories to dictionaries.

Whether contributions on translation appeared in publications of the two professional associations or elsewhere (for instance, in journals or in prefaces to translated texts), many of them are of interest for what they reveal about the preoccupations of those interested in issues of translation – as translators, critics or scholars. Often, the discourse on translation seems surprisingly modern, in terms of the opinions expressed, the concepts used or the terminology suggested. It may be worth underlining that besides the texts which dealt with translation principles, problems and standards or evaluations of individual translations, there are also some papers on translation policy, one of the earliest being the one by Herbert Grün, a literary translator from English and German (Grün 1952; Stanovnik 1987), followed by some others in which it was programmatically suggested which texts of individual national literatures would have to be translated in order for the Slovene translation corpus to grow and become more complete. What is interesting is that the phrase "translation policy" (*prevajalska politika*), typical of contemporary translation studies, was used as early as the 1950s.[40] Grün perceived a need for a careful selection of literary texts to be translated into Slovene, whereby different national literatures, different styles and different genres should be represented. Although it was no longer doubted that translations were necessary, they continued to be perceived as potentially problematic, perhaps not so much as a possible threat to native literary production, but as an indicator of declining literary activity in the target culture itself. In any case, it was necessary to emphasize their importance (Stanovnik 1987: 45).

6   Contemporary translation research

It was necessary to wait until the 1990s, however, for translation to become an object of academic study in Slovenia in its own right. When translation studies

---

40   It is likely that the history of Eastern European traditions in translation studies contains many stories of the kind. Probably various concepts which are now generally used in the discipline and believed to derive from well-established mainstream approaches in translation research have actually in parallel been formulated in academic or professional environments which are hardly known today, not only in the "West", but perhaps also in the "East". For this see, for example, Costantino (2015: 245), who reports on an early use of the term "translation theory" in an Ukrainian work by Oleksandr Finkel'.

as an academic discipline became more widely recognized internationally and the number of scholars dealing with translation increased in different parts of Europe (cf. Ožbot 2011b), in Slovenia too translations started to be considered interesting in their own right and not merely as texts which were necessarily of secondary importance compared to their originals. A considerable amount of work has been done in translation studies in Slovenia in the past three decades, and a variety of different approaches have been employed in the study of translated literary and non-literary texts. Among the approaches which have been used most frequently by Slovene researchers are various descriptive approaches which deal with translation from a functional perspective (often on the basis of Vermeer's and Reiss' *Skopostheorie* or some derived version of it) or from a cultural or sociological perspective. Descriptive studies have often been conducted within an applied framework, with the aim of understanding how texts in Slovene and other languages function from a translational perspective and, consequently, to help practising translators and advanced language learners in better mastering the skills they need to translate and to communicate successfully. Typically, research conducted within established frameworks has focused on original material, involving to various degrees texts in Slovene.

Over the past two decades or so, some research on subtitling (Kovačič 1992) and interpreting[41] has also been carried out; the latter has concerned, inter alia, studies of community interpreting and of medical interpreting; a glossary of conference interpreting terminology in five languages is also available (Markič/Ljeskovac 2011). In Slovenia, interpreting studies research developed later than translation studies research, which is probably due to the fact that for a long time no formal qualifications in interpreting could be obtained in Slovenia, with the result that Slovene interpreters received their training at foreign institutions. As the amount of interpreters' work increased substantially with Slovenia's entry in the EU in 2004, there was also more research on various aspects of interpreting.

Considerable interest has been shown also in the history of translation, especially into Slovene, to which a number of publications have been dedicated, including a monograph on the topic (Stanovnik 2005), six volumes of the Proceedings of the Association of Slovene Literary Translators (2001–2006) and some monographs which have appeared as part of the series *Studia translatoria* in which, on average, one volume of original research is published per year. The monographs deal

---

41   For a short overview of interpreting studies in Slovenia see Markič (2013).

with topics such as the history of literary translation from French into Slovene, the historical concept of faithfulness in translation, the translation of verse, issues of Italian-Slovene and Slovene-Italian literary translation and the history of the Slovene reflection on translation. What remains a desideratum is, however, more robust translation criticism. Critical reflection on translation was actually highly developed and was relatively widespread in newspapers and journals in the period between the two world wars, as well as during the first decades after the war. It is actually in several pieces of translation criticism that, along with addressing the characteristics of a given translation, their authors, who were normally also translators, expressed their stances on translation principles, standards and policy. Often they took as a starting point their experience as translators with a wide variety of texts, spanning from those in classical languages, Latin and Greek, to Old English poetry, Indian Vedic Literature as well as works in the majority of modern European languages and several non-European ones. Sometimes reference is made to historical figures of translation (pre)theory, such as Dryden and Amyot, but also to modern thinkers such as George Steiner, which shows that the Slovene translation circles were in contact with the history of reflection on translation and with its contemporary developments. By now, the situation has changed considerably, since translation criticism has only a minor role, particularly in comparison to literary criticism.

In the light of what has been stated so far, it can be observed that in Slovene culture the activity of translation has been accompanied by substantial reflection on various translation-related issues. Especially since the late 1980s research on translation has grown in an unprecedented way, in parallel with an increased amount of translation (or translation-centred) teaching going on at Slovene universities, not only in translation departments, but also in comparative literature and in language departments, although in individual departments translation is often taught from different perspectives and with different aims, not necessarily practical ones, but possibly critical and/or analytic. As far as the formation of translators and interpreters is concerned, Slovenia has provided professional training on its own since 1997, when the Department of translation at the Faculty of Arts of the University of Ljubljana was founded,[42] whereas more recently translation programmes have also been introduced at the universities of Maribor and Koper. While, before then, translators usually had degrees from language

---

42   Already in the 1980s, students of English and German could choose in the second half of their four-year course between a teaching- and a translation-oriented programme.

departments or from the department of comparative literature, or were – as was not infrequently the case – self-educated, interpreters were often trained abroad, after having obtained, typically, a degree in languages at home. Over the past two decades, translation has been a popular subject to study at university but also to get acquainted with at various workshops and summer schools.

As to the Slovene reflection on translation, what appears to characterize it is the absence of a specific, recognizable theory, similar in originality to those which developed in various other European traditions – for instance in the German tradition, with Katharina Reiss and Hans J. Vermeer, but also with Christiane Nord and Juliane House – as well as in the Slavic and the Baltic countries, where scholars such as Roman Jakobson, Jiří Levý, Anton Popovič and Peter Torop come to mind as possibly among the most original and the best known ones. A contributing factor to the relatively limited "autochtonous" theoretical production is probably the size of the country itself, if compared to bigger Slavic environments such as the Polish and the Russian ones, which have indeed produced a lot of interesting and original research on translation. The absence of a theoretically-oriented original contribution from Slovene translation researchers is not necessarily to be viewed as a shortcoming, but rather as a consequence of the circumstances, including research preferences of the relevant parts of the Slovene academic community. Moreover, on the basis of an examination of how translation as an object of study was explored by Slovene scholars and writers before the establishment of translation studies on the international academic scene shows that the Slovene reflection on translation cannot be said to have been connected in particular to any other tradition, not even at a receptive level, and certainly not in terms of its output. This makes the Slovene situation rather different from the one in various other Eastern European academic environments, where important connections between some of the traditions can be identified, for instance between Russian, Czech, Slovak and Polish research on translation (Costantino 2015: 258; Jettmarová 2008).

7   "Slovene" translation research beyond Slovenia's borders

It should be added that at present translation research involving Slovene is not only carried out in Slovenia, but also at the universities of Trieste and Graz, where important translator and interpreter training institutes are based, both of which have opened soon after World War II. Here too, we find the well-established

pattern of translator training institutions being founded not just in areas of contact between different languages and peoples, but also in the areas where the Eastern and Western Europe meet. Particularly in Graz, translation research encompassing Slovene is well developed, mainly through the work of Erich Prunč, a Carinthian Slovene who has had a prominent role in the growth of the Graz Translation Institute and who is recognized as one of the foremost figures of contemporary translation research, especially in the German-speaking world, and is also the author of a reference work on the development of the discipline and on its current trends (Prunč 2012). He is credited in particular for having conceptualized the term *Translationskultur* ("translation culture"; Prunč 1997b), which has proved useful and influential in that it has the potential to describe and account for different practices of translation and different modes of the reception of translated texts in various cultures (cf. Schippel 2008). *Translationskultur*, constructed in analogy to the concept of *Sprachkultur*, refers to a subsystem within a given culture which is related to the activity of translation in the broadest sense and consists of socially established norms, conventions, expectations and values of all those who actually or potentially take part in translation processes (Prunč 1997b: 107). In addition to his work in German, he has also produced a number of publications in Slovene and has set up a large historical database on translations from German into Slovene. A typical translation scholar of his generation, Prunč, who was for a long time also a practising interpreter, first received a grounding in philology. Being thus well equipped with linguistic and literary knowledge as well as methodologically adroit enough to venture into a new "territory", he was among the first academics in the German-speaking world to become interested in the new field of research, which looked promising because of its connectedness to the actual reality of language use, while at the same time opening up a myriad of new research questions of theoretical and descriptive concern, both historical and modern.

8   Conclusion

The paper has sought to identify the principal forces which have shaped the Slovene study of and attitudes towards translation since the Reformation and outline their main characteristics both historically and today. Slovenia has a rich history of translation and an interesting history of reflection on translation, mainly focused on examining texts translated into Slovene, which proceeded in parallel to

the production of translations themselves. Unsurprisingly, therefore, those who contributed to the reflection on translation were usually literary translators, authors and critics. Although in Slovenia systematic reflection on translation developed relatively late, i.e. only in the last decades of the 20th century, an awareness about the cultural importance of translations was present already at the time of the Reformation and has subsequently increased.

By examining the (sometimes controversial) position of translated texts in the Slovene culture, the paper has tried to show how inextricably the history of the reflection on translation is linked to the general cultural history of the nation. Paying attention to how translation has been dealt with in pre-theoretical writings on translation, it has emphasized the impact that the rapid development of translation studies over the past decades has had on Slovene translation research. The expansion of research has constantly been accompanied by an increase in the amount of translations produced, both from and into Slovene, in the area of literary and non-literary translation alike. Literary translation, which has had a special role in the country's cultural history, continues to burgeon, with translations often being of a high quality, while there are ever more languages from which direct translation into Slovene is available.

It is difficult to predict what direction translation studies will take in the future in Slovenia. However, one thing is certain: if someone is ever going to write a history of the humanities in Slovenia in the late 20th and early 21st centuries, they will have to acknowledge translation to be one of those objects of research that has most intensely come into the focus of Slovene scholars, as is actually also true of many other cultures of Europe in general, both Eastern and Western.

References

ANDERSEN, Roger (1983) "Transfer to somewhere." In: Susan M. Gass/Larry Selinker (eds), *Language Transfer in Language Learning.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 177–201.

ARA, Angelo (2009) *Fra nazione e impero: Trieste, gli Asburgo, la Mitteleuropa.* Milano: Garzanti.

ARA, Angelo/Claudio MAGRIS (²1987 [1982]) *Trieste: Un'identità di frontiera.* Torino: Einaudi.

AVIRAM, Amittai F. (1998) "Literariness, Markedness, and Surprise in Poetry." In: Carol Myers-Scotton (ed.), *Codes and Consequences: Choosing Linguistic Varieties.* New York: Oxford University Press, 101–123.

BARUT POLMAN, Klavdija (2012) *Podoba Slovencev v italijanski književnosti.* Unpublished MA thesis. Ljubljana: Univerza v Ljubljani, Filozofska fakulteta.

BASSNETT, Susan (1993) *Comparative Literature.* Oxford: Blackwell.

BAUMGARTEN, Nicole/Demet ÖZÇETIN (2008) "Linguistic variation through language contact in translation." In: Peter Siemund/Noemi Kintana (eds), *Language Contact and Contact Languages.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 293–316.

BENJAMIN, Andrew (2002) "The absolute as translatability. Working through Walter Benjamin on language." In: Beatrice Hansen/Andrew Benjamin (eds.), *Walter Benjamin and Romanticism.* New York: Continuum, 109–122.

BENNETT, David C. (1987) "Word-order change in progress: the case of Slovene and Serbo-Croat and its relevance for Germanic." *Journal of Linguistics* 23/2, 269–287.

BERMAN, Antoine (1999) *La traduction et la lettre ou l'auberge du lointain.* Paris: Seuil.

BOYDEN, Michael (2006) "Language politics, translation, and American literary history." *Target* 18/1, 121–137.

BRECELJ, Marijan (1965) "Onorate l'altissimo poeta: ob sedemstoletnici Dantejevega rojstva 1265–1965." Nova Gorica: Goriška knjižnica. [Italian version: "Onorate l'altissimo poeta: nel settimo centenario della nascita di Dante: 1265–1965. Bibliografia dantesca slovena." Gorizia: /s.n./].

BRECELJ, Marijan (2000) *Štiri stoletja in pol pevajanja italijanskih besedil v slovenščino 1550–2000: Bibliografsko gradivo.* Nova Gorica: Goriška knjižnica Franceta Bevka.

BT = Book Trust (Translated Fiction). Http://www.translatedfiction.org.uk

BUSCHFELD, Sarah (2013) *English in Cyprus or Cyprus English: An empirical investigation of variety status.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

CASANOVA, Pascale (2002) "Consécration et accumulation de capital littéraire. La traduction comme échange inégal." *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 144, 7–20.

CASANOVA, Pascale (2004) *The World Republic of Letters.* Translated by Malcolm B. DeBevoise. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

CATTARUZZA, Marina (1997) "Slowenen und Italiener in Triest: 1850–1914." *In:* Andreas Moritsch/Harald Krahwinkler (eds), *Alpen-Adria-Städte im nationalen Differenzierungsprozeß.* Klagenfurt/Laibach/Wien: Hermagoras, 199–256.

CHESTERMAN, Andrew (2004) "Beyond the particular." In: Anna Mauranen/Pekka Kujamäki (eds), *Translation Universals: Do they exist?.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 33–50.

CHESTERMAN, Andrew (2014) "Translation Studies Forum: Universalism in translation studies." *Translation Studies* 7/1, 82–90.

CLYNE, Michael (ed.) (1991) *Pluricentric Languages: Differing Norms in Different Nations.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

COSERIU, Eugenio (1978) "Falsche und richtige Fragestellungen in der Übersetzungstheorie." In: Lillebil Grähs/Gustav Korlén/Bertil Malmberg (eds), *Theory and Practice of Translation.* Bern/Frankfurt am Main/Las Vegas: Peter Lang, 17–32.

COSTANTINO, Lorenzo (2015) "Translation Theories in 'the other Europe'." *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 10/2, 243–262.

CRONIN, Michael (1998) "The Cracked Looking Glass of Servants: Translation and Minority Languages in a Global Age." *The Translator* 4/2, 145–162.

CRONIN, Michael (1996) *Translating Ireland: Translating Languages, Cultures.* Cork: Cork University Press.

CRONIN, Michael (2003) *Translation and Globalization.* London: Routledge.

CRONIN, Michael (2006) *Translation and Identity.* London/New York: Routledge.

CRONIN, Michael (2011) "Ireland in Translation." *English Today* 27/2, 53–57.

ČERNIGOJ, Meta (2007) "Boj za dvojezične napise v Istri v letu 1894." *Zgodovina za vse: vse za zgodovino* 14/2, 69–88.

ČERNIGOJ, Meta (2010) "'Očjo al treno': zapleti z dvojezičnostjo ob železniški progi Trst-Poreč in druga odprta narodna vprašanja v Istri na prelomu 19. v 20. stoletje." *Zgodovina za vse: vse za zgodovino* 17/2, 45–66.

DELEUZE, Gilles/Félix GUATTARI (1975) *Kafka: Pour une littérature mineure.* Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.

DELISLE, Jean/Judith WOODSWORTH (eds) (1995) *Translators through History.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

D'HULST, Lieven (2007) "Comparative Literature versus Translation Studies: Close Encounters of the Third Kind?" *European Review* 15/1, 95–104.

DOLINAR, Darko (1975) "Znanstveno raziskovanje prevajanja in literarna veda." In: Janko Moder (ed.), *Zbornik "bled 75".* Ljubljana: Društvo književnih prevajalcev Slovenije/Društvo znanstvenih in tehničnih prevajalcev Slovenije, 55–60.

DONAHAYE, Jasmine (2012) *Three percent? Publishing data and statistics on translated literature in the United Kingdom and Ireland.* Aberystwyth: Mercator Institute for Media, Languages and Culture, Aberystwyth University.

EVEN-ZOHAR, Itamar (1990) "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem." *Poetics Today* 11/1, 45–51.

FORSTER, Michael N. (2010) *After Herder: Philosophy of Language in the German Tradition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

GRDINA, Igor (2003) *Slovenci med tradicijo in perspektivo: politični mozaik 1860–1918.* Ljubljana: Študentska založba.

GRIN, François (2010) "Translation and the Dynamics of Multilingualism." *Cahier de recherche élf* 3. Université de Genève, Observatoire élf. [http://www.unige.ch/traduction-interpretation/recherches/groupes/elf/documents/elfwp3.pdf]

GRUM, Martin (ed.) (1998) *Modrov zbornik.* Ljubljana: Društvo slovenskih književnih prevajalcev.

GRUM, Martin (ed.) (2007) *Slovenski prevajalski leksikon 1550–1945: Poskusni zvezek: A-J.* Ljubljana: Društvo slovenskih književnih prevajalcev.

GRÜN, Herbert (1952) "O Prevajalski politiki." *Naši razgledi* I/14, 23.

GUTT, Ernst-August (1990) "A Theoretical Account of Translation – Without a Translation Theory." *Target* 2/2, 135–164.

HEINE, Bernd (2012) "On polysemy copying and grammaticalization in language contact." In: Claudine Chamoreau/Isabelle Léglise (eds), *Dynamics of contact-induced language change*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 125–166.

HEINE, Bernd/Tania KUTEVA (2005) *Language Contact and Grammatical Change.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HELTAI, Pál (2010) "A fordítás monitor modellje és a fordítói beszédmód." In: Judit Navracsics (ed.), *Nyelv, beszéd, írás*. Budapest: Tinta könyvkiadó, 95–110.

HLADNIK, Miran (1992) "Vloga prevoda v slovensko-nemški literarni tekmi." In: Miran Hladnik/Darinka Počaj-Rus (eds), *Zbornik predavanj: XXVIII. seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture*. Ljubljana: Center za slovenščino, 109–119.

HOUSE, Juliane (1977) *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment.* Tübingen: Narr.

HOUSE, Juliane (2010) "Overt and covert translation." In: Yves Gambier/Luuk van Doorslaer (eds), *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 245–247.

JAFFE, Alexandra (1999) "Locating power: Corsican translators and their critics." In: Jan Blommaert (ed.), *Language Ideological Debates.* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Guyter, 39–66.

JAN, Zoltan (2001a) *Cankar, Kosovel, Zlobec in Ljubka Šorli pri Italijanih.* Ljubljana: Rokus.

JAN, Zoltan (2001b) *Poznavanje slovenske književnosti v Italiji po letu 1945.* Ljubljana: Rokus.

JAN, Zoltan (2004) "Srečko Kosovel pri Italijanih." *Primorska srečanja* 273: 16–23.

JARVIS, Scott/Aneta PAVLENKO (2010) *Crosslinguistic Influence in Language and Cognition.* London/New York: Routledge.

JELOVŠEK, Alenka (2011) "Neosebna raba oblike *ono* v jeziku slovenskh protestantov." *Slavistična revija* 59/4, 415–435.

JETTMAROVÁ, Zuzana (2008) "Czech and Slovak Translation Theories: The Lesser-Known Tradition." In: Jana Králová/Zuzana Jettmarová (eds), *Tradition versus Modernity: from the Classic Period of the Prague School to Translation Studies at the Beginning of the 21st Century.* Prague: Charles University, 15–46.

KELLERMANN, Kathy (1992) "Communication: Inherently strategic and primarily automatic." *Communication Monographs* 59/3, 288–300.

KOLEHMAINEN, Leena (2013) "Die Unikat-Hypothese der Translation: Etwas Altes, etwas Neues und etwas Geliehenes." *trans-kom* 6/1, 92–114.

KOSKINEN, Kasia (2012) "*Domestication, Foreignization* and the Modulation of Affect." In: Hannu Kemppanen/Marja Jänis/Alexandra Belikova (eds), *Domestication and Foreignization in Translation Studies.* Berlin: Frank & Timme, 13–32.

KOSOVEL, Srečko (2000) *Ves svet je kakor: Pesmi, integrali./Tutto il mondo è come: Poesie, integrali.* Translated by Jolka Milič. Sežana: Občina/Comune.

KOSTER, Cees (2010) "Non-Translation as an Event. The Reception in the Netherlands of John Dos Passos in the 1930s." In: Ton Naaijkens (ed.), *Event or Incident. On the Role of Translations in the Dynamics of Cultural Exchange*. Bern: Peter Lang, 29–46.

KOŠUTA, Miroslav (1999) *Memoria del corpo assente./Spomin odsotnega telesa.* (Translated by Daria Betocchi) Trieste: ZTT EST.

KOVAČIČ, Irena (1992) *Jezikoslovni pogled na podnaslovno prevajanje televizijskih oddaj.* Unpublished PhD thesis. Ljubljana: University of Ljubljana.

KRANICH, Svenja/Viktor BECHER/Steffen HÖDER/Juliane HOUSE (eds) (2011) *Multilingual Discourse Production: Diachronic and Synchronic Perspectives.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

KRANICH, Svenja/Juliane HOUSE/Viktor BECHER (2012) "Changing conventions in English-German translations of popular scientific texts." In: Kurt Braunmüller/Christoph Gabriel (eds), *Multilingual Individuals and Multilingual Societies.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 315–334.

KRISTMANNSSON, Gauti (2015) "Zur Nation durch Translation." In: Dilek Dizdar/Andreas Gipper/Michael Schreiber (eds), *Nationenbildung und Übersetzung.* Berlin: Frank & Timme, 17–25.

LANE-MERCIER, Gillian (2011) "Éléments pour un nouveau paradigme des rapports de contiguïté socioculturelle et disciplinaire. L'exemple du Canada et du Québec."

In: Francis Mus/Karen Vandemeulebroucke (eds) *La traduction dans les cultures plurilingues.* Arras: Artois Presses Université, 161–172.

LANSTYÁK, István (2003) "Fordítás és kontaktológia." *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle* 5/3, 49–70.

LANSTYÁK, István/Pál HELTAI (2012) "Universals in Language Contact and Translation." *Across Languages and Cultures* 13/1, 99–121.

LEFEVERE, André (1999) "Composing the other." In: Susan Bassnett/Harish Trivedi (eds.), *Post-colonial Translation.* London/New York: Routledge, 75–94.

LEVÝ, Jiří (2011) *The Art of Translation.* Transl. Patrick Corness. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. [Czech original publ. in 1963.]

LURAGHI, Silvia/Pierluigi CUZZOLIN (2007) "Mediating culture through language: Contact-induced phenomena in the early translations of the Gospels." In: Paolo Ramat/ Elisa Roma (eds), *Europe and Mediterranean as Linguistic Areas: Convergencies from a historical and typological perspective.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 133–158.

MARCATO, Carla (2011) "Plurilinguismo tra realtà e letteratura a Trieste." In: Dario Brancato/Marisa Ruccolo (eds), *La* terra *di Babele: Saggi sul plurilinguismo nella cultura italiana.* New York/Ottawa: Legas, 99–110.

MARKIČ, Jasmina (2006) "Alamutova popotovanja po Iberskem polotoku." In: Martina Ožbot (ed.), *Prevajanje besedil iz prve polovice 20. stoletja: 31. zbornik Društva slovenskih književnih prevajalcev//Translation of texts from the first half of 20th century: Proceedings of the Association of Slovene Literary Translators, Volume 31.* Ljubljana: Društvo slovenskih književnih prevajalcev, 124–137.

MARKIČ, Jasmina (2013) "O tolmačenju in tolmačeslovju." In: Vojko Gorjanc (ed.), *Slovensko tolmačeslovje.* Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete, 6–19.

MARKIČ, Jasmina/Nevenka LJESKOVAC ([1993]/2011) *Konferenčna terminologija.* Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete.

MATRAS, Yaron (2009) *Language Contact.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MAURANEN, Anna (2000) "Strange Strings in Translated Language: A Study on Corpora." In: Maeve Olohan (ed.), *Intercultural Faultlines: Research Models in Translation Studies I: Textual and Cognitive Aspects.* Manchester: St. Jerome, 119–141.

McCOURT, John (2009) "Trieste." In: John McCourt (ed.), *James Joyce in Context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 228–238.

McLAUGHLIN, Mairi (2011) *Tradurre/Tradire: Translation as a Cause of Linguistic Change from Manuscripts to the Digital Age.* Berkeley: The Doe Library.

MENKE, Bettine (2002) "'However one calls into the forest…' Echoes of translation." Translated by Robert J. Kiss. In: Beatrice Hansen/Andrew Benjamin (eds.), *Walter Benjamin and Romanticism.* New York: Continuum, 83–97.

MERŠE, Majda (2003) "Glagolski kalki v zgodovini slovenskega knjižnega jezika (prevzemanje, raba in primerjava s stanjem v slovanskih jezikih)." *Slavistična revija* 51 (special number), 81–103.

MERŠE, Majda (2013) *Slovenski knjižni jezik 16. stoletja: Razprave o jezikovnem sistemu, besedju in prevodni problematiki.* Ljubljana: Založba ZRC.

MEYLAERTS, Reine (2006a) "Heterolingualism in/and translation: How legitimate are the Other and his/her language? An introduction." *Target.* 18/1, 1–15.

MEYLAERTS, Reine (2006b) "Literary heteroglossia in translation: When the language of translation is the locus of ideological struggle." In: João Ferreira Duarte/Alexandra Assis Rosa/Teresa Seruya (eds), *Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 85–98.

MEYLAERTS, Reine (2009a) "' Et pour les Flamands, la même chose' : quelle politique de traduction pour quelles minorités linguistiques ? "*Meta* 54/1, 7–21.

MEYLAERTS, Reine (2009b) "Les relations littéraires au-delà des oppositions binaires : national et international, traduit et non traduit." *TTR* 22/2, 93–117.

MEYLAERTS, Reine (2011) "Intercultural mediators in multilingual culture: blessing or curse?" In: Francis Mus/Karen Vandemeulebroucke (eds.), *La traduction dans les cultures plurilingues.* Arras: Artois Presses Université, 61–72.

MODER, Janko (ed.) (1985) *Slovenski leksikon novejšega prevajanja.* Koper: Lipa.

MUHR, Rudolf (ed.) (2012) *Non-Dominant Varieties of Pluricentric Languages: Getting the Picture.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

MUHR, Rudolf/Carla AMORÓS NEGRE/ Carmen FERNÁNDEZ JUNCAL (eds) (2013) *Exploring Linguistic Standards in Non-dominant Varieties of Pluricentric Languages.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

NEWMARK, Peter (1977) "Communicative and Semantic Translation." *Babel* 23/4, 163–180.

NORD, Christiane (1991a) "Scopos, Loyalty, and Translational Conventions." *Target* III/1, 91–109.

NORD, Christiane (1991b) *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis.* Amsterdam/ Atlanta: Rodopi.

NOVAK, Boris A. (2001) "Verzifikacijski problemi prevajanja Prešerna v angleščino in francoščino." In: Martina Ožbot (ed.), *Prevajanje Prešerna – Prevajanje pravljic: 26. zbornik Društva slovenskih književnih prevajalcev/Translation of Prešeren – Translation of Fairy Tales: Proceedings of the Association of Slovene Literary Translators, Volume 26.* Ljubljana: Društvo slovenskih književnih prevajalcev, 19–30.

OCVIRK, Anton (1936) *Teorija primerjalne literarne zgodovine.* Ljubljana: Znanstveno društvo.

OROŽEN, Martina (1972) "K določnemu členu v slovenščini." *Slavistična revija* 20/1, 105–114.

OŽBOT, Martina (2000) "Slovene Literature in Italian Translation: Facts, fiction and beyond." In: Meta Grosman/Mira Kadric/Irena Kovačič/Mary Snell-Hornby (eds), *Translation into non-mother tongues: in professional practice and training.* Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 81–89.

OŽBOT, Martina (2001a) "Problemi posredovanja slovenskih literarnih besedil v tuje kulture." In: Martina Ožbot (ed.), *Prevajanje Prešerna – Prevajanje pravljic: 26. zbornik Društva slovenskih književnih prevajalcev/Translation of Prešeren – Translation of Fairy Tales: Proceedings of the Association of Slovene Literary Translators, Volume 26.* Ljubljana: Društvo slovenskih književnih prevajalcev, 388–394.

OŽBOT, Martina (2001b) "Some Remarks on Asymmetrical Cultural Transfer: The Case of Slovenian Literature for Italian Readers." In: Eteiro Pajares/Raquel Merino/José Miguel Santamaría (eds), *Transvases culturales: literatura, cine, traducción.* Vitoria: Servicio Editorial de la Universidad del País Vasco, 297–303.

OŽBOT, Martina (2009a) "Sloveno e italiano in contatto: qualche osservazione sugli scambi linguistici in una zona bilingue." In: Carlo Consani/Paola Desideri/Francesca Guazzelli/Carmela Perta (eds), *Alloglossie e comunità alloglotte nell'Italia contemporanea: Teorie, applicazioni e descrizioni, prospettive.* Roma: Bulzoni, 2009, 39–52.

OŽBOT, Martina (2009b) "Umberto Saba in sloveno: fortuna e traduzioni." In: Elvio Guagnini (ed.), *Per Saba, ancora...: Riflessioni e dibattiti.* Trieste: Circolo della Cultura e delle Arti, 55–69.

OŽBOT, Martina (2011a) "Dwarfs in Giants' Lands: Some Observations on Translating Minor Literatures into High-Impact cultures: The Case of Slovene Literature in Italy." *Meta* 56/3, 511–525.

OŽBOT, Martina (2011b) "Interdisciplinarnost – je sploh (še) mogoče drugače?" In: Simona Kranjc (ed.), *Meddisciplinarnost v slovenistiki.* Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete, 351–356.

OŽBOT, Martina (2011c) "Translation as an Agent of Culture Planning in Low-Impact Cultures." In: Antoine Chalvin/Anne Lange/Daniele Monticelli (eds), *Between Cultures and Texts: Itineraries in Translation History. – Entre les cultures et les textes: Itinéraires en histoire de la traduction.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 55–66.

PALOPOSKI, Outi/Riitta OITTINEN (2000) "The Domesticated Foreign." In: Andrew Chesterman/Natividad Gallardo San Salvador/Yves Gambier (eds), *Translation in Context.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 373–390.

PIĘTA, Hanna (2011) "(Non)translation of Polish literature during the Portuguese first republic." *IberoSlavica* 2, 99–111.

PIRJEVEC, Marija (1997) "Troje strategij pri prevajanju Prešernovega soneta v italijanščino." In: Boris Paternu/Franc Jakopin (eds), *Sonet in sonetni venec.* Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, 329–335.

PIRJEVEC, Marija (2001) "Prodor prvega slovenskega klasika v italijanski svet." In: Martina Ožbot (ed.), *Prevajanje Prešerna – Prevajanje pravljic: 26. zbornik Društva slovenskih književnih prevajalcev/Translation of Prešeren – Translation of Fairy Tales: Proceedings of the Association of Slovene Literary Translators, Volume 26.* Ljubljana: Društvo slovenskih književnih prevajalcev, 119–124.

PIZZI, Katia (2001) *A City in Search of an Author: The Literary Identity of Trieste.* London/New York: Sheffield Academic Press.

PIZZI, Katia (2013) "Triestine Literature between Slovenia and Italy: A Case of Missed Transculturalism?" *Primerjalna književnost* 36/1, 145–155.

PRUNČ, Erich (1997a) "Slovenščina in jezikovna enakopravnost v mednarodni komunikaciji." *Slavistična revija* 45/3–4, 547–557.

PRUNČ, Erich (1997b) "Translationskultur (Versuch einer konstruktiven Kritik des translatorischen Handelns)." *TEXTconTEXT* 11/1, 99–127.

PRUNČ, Erich (2007) "Interdisciplinarnost in raziskovalna povezanost." In: Karmen Teržan Kopecky (ed), *Slovenski prevodi nemških besedil v obdobju avstro-ogrske monarhije – znanstvene refleksije.* Maribor: Filozofska fakulteta, 53–71.

PRUNČ, Erich (2009) "Veliki čudež malega jezika." *Jezik in slovstvo* 54/1, 5–12.

PRUNČ, Erich (2012³) *Entwicklungslinien der Translationswissenschaft: Von den Asymmetrien der Sprachen zu den Asymmetrien der Macht.* Berlin: Frank & Timme.

PYM, Anthony (1992) "The Relations Between Translation and Material Text Transfer." *Target* IV/2, 171–189.

REINDL, Donald F (2005) "The Effects of Historical German-Slovene Langauge Contact on the Slovene Language." PhD diss. Bloomington: Indiana University. [Published version: *Language Contact: German and Slovenian.* Bochum: Brockmeyer, 2008.]

REMEC, Meta (2012) "'Viva!' ali 'Živijo!'?: Slovensko in italijansko časopisje o mednacionalnih konfliktih v Istri v letih 1896 in 1897." *Acta Histriae* 20/1–2, 213–232.

SBISÀ, Marina/Patrizia VASCOTTO (2007) "How to conceive of the other's point of view: Considerations from a Case Study in Trieste." In: Sharon Millar/John Wilson (eds), *The Discourse of Europe: Talk and text in everyday life.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 153–171.

SCHIPPEL, Larisa (ed.) (2008) *Translationskultur – ein innovatives und produktives Konzept.* Berlin: Frank & Timme.

SHAMMA, Tarek (2005) "The Exotic Dimension of Foreignizing Strategies." *The Translator* 11/1, 51–67.

SIEVER, Holger (2012) "Das übersetzerische Denken von Frühromantik und Funktionalismus." *trans-kom* 5/1, 157–177.

SIMON, Sherry (2012a) *Cities in Translation: Intersections of Language and Memory.* London/New York: Routledge.

SIMON, Sherry (2012b) "The City in Translation: Urban cultures of central Europe." *Target* 24/1, 126–140.

SI/RR 2009 = *Statistične informacije/Rapid reports. [Kultura/Culture], 25 (2. VI).* Ljubljana: Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia.

SKUTNABB-KANGAS, Tove (1981) *Bilingualism or Not: The Education of Minorities.* Transl. Lars Malmberg and David Crane. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

STABEJ, Marko (1998) "Oblikovanje knjižnega jezika v 19. stoletju med narodno enotnostjo in socialno razločevalnostjo." In: Erika Kržišnik (ur.), *Zbornik predavanj: XXXIV. Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture.* Ljubljana: Center za slovenščino, 19–33.

STANOVNIK, Majda (1987) "Literarni prevod na Slovenskem 1945–1965." *Primerjalna književnost* 10/2, 41–52.

STANOVNIK, Majda (2005) *Slovenski literarni prevod 1550–2000.* Ljubljana: Založba ZRC.

STANOVNIK, Majda (2012) "Prevod – literarnozgodovinska stalnica in spremenljivka." *Primerjalna književnost* 35/3, 87–101.

STANOVNIK, Majda (2013) *Prevajalci o prevodu: Od Trubarja do Župančiča. Antologija.* Ljubljana: Založba ZRC.

STANOVNIK, Majda (2016) *Prevajalci o prevodu 2: Od J. Modra do J. Milič. Antologija.* Ljubljana: Založba ZRC.

STAT, Statistični urad Republike Slovenije (2009) *Statistične informacije: Kultura./Rapid reports: Culture.* http://www.stat.si/doc/statinf/10–si–267–0901.pdf (19.01. 2016).

STAT, Statistični urad Republike Slovenije (2014) *Založništvo, Slovenija, 2014.* http://www.stat.si/StatWeb/prikazi-novico?id=5683&idp=12&headerbar=10 (19.01.2016).

ŠKERLJ, Stanko/Atilij RAKAR (1965) "Pubblicazioni dantesche in lingua slovena (1922–1964)." In: Vittore Branca/Ettore Caccia (eds), *Dante nel mondo.* Firenze: Olschki, 313–318.

TAHIR GÜRÇAĞLAR, Şehnaz (2013) "Does the Drina Flow? Cultural indifference and Slovene/Yugoslav literature in Turkish." *Across* 14/2, 183–198.

TERŽAN KOPECKY, Karmen (ed.) (2007) *Slovenski prevodi nemških besedil v obdobju Avstroogrske monarhije: znanstvene refleksije.* Maribor: Filozofska fakulteta.

THOMASON, Sarah Grey/Terrence KAUFMAN (1988) *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

TOURY, Gideon (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

TOURY, Gideon (2003) "Culture Planning and Translation." In: Susan Petrilli (ed.), *Translation Translation.* Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi, 399–412.

TRUBAR, Primož ([1550]/1966) *Abecedarium und der klein Catechismus in der Windis-chen Sprach: ane Buquice is tih se ty Mladi inu preprosti Slouenci mogo lahku vkratkim zhasu brati nauuzhiti.* Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba. [Facsimile.]

TUMA, Henrik (1997 [1937]) *Iz mojega življenja: spomini, misli, izpovedi.* Ljubljana: Založba Tuma.

TYMOCZKO, Maria (2000) "Translation and Political Engagement: Activism, Social Change and the Role of Translation in Geopolitical Shifts." *The Translator* 6/1, 23–47.

VAN LEUVEN-ZWART, Kitty M. (1990) "Translation and Original. Similarities and Dissimilarities. II." *Target* II/1, 69–95.

VANNEREM, Mia/Mary SNELL-HORNBY (1986) "Die Szene hinter dem Text: 'scenes-and-frames semantics' in der Übersetzung." In: Mary Snell-Hornby (ed.), *Übersetzungswissenschaft – eine Neu-orientierung. Zur Integrierung von Theorie und Praxis.* Tübingen: Francke, 184–205.

VENUTI, Lawrence (1995) *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation.* London/New York: Routledge.

VENUTI, Lawrence (1998) *Scandals of Translation.* London/New York: Routledge.

VERGINELLA, Marta (2002) "Govorica nasilja v slovensko-italijanskem nacionalnem konfliktu." *Acta Histriae* 10/2, 455–464.

VIVANTE, Angelo (1984 [1912]) *Irredentismo adriatico.* Trieste: Edizioni "Italo Svevo".

WEHLE, Winfried (1996) "Das langsame Abschied vom nahen Fremden." In: Fritz Nies (in collaboration with Bernd Kortländer) (ed.), *Literaturimport und Literaturkritik: das Beispiel Frankreich.* Tübingen: Narr, 157–167.

WINFORD, Donald (2003) *Introduction to Contact Linguistics.* Oxford: Blackwell.

WOLF, Michaela (2011) "The Invention of a 'Habsburg Culture': Multilingualism and cultural translation – two sides of the same coin?" In: Francis Mus/Karen Vande-meulebroucke (eds), *La traduction dans les cultures plurilingues.* Arras: Artois Presses Université, 109–121.

Summary

The volume is concerned with questions of translation and multilingualism, mainly from a descriptive but also from a theoretical perspective. Throughout, multilingualism is understood to encompass situations of two or more languages coexisting in a given environment and interacting with each other to various degrees. The present monograph comprises six chapters, which study translated texts and their relation to multilingualism as a societal phenomenon.

The first chapter ("Translation as an Agent of Culture Planning in Low-Impact Cultures") is meant to serve as a general introduction to **translation as an element of culture planning** broadly conceived and therefore encompassing, among other elements, language, literature and ideology. It is maintained that in small or low-impact cultures, with which non-canonical (peripheral) literatures written in languages of limited diffusion are usually associated and which are normally characterized by multilingualism of different kinds and degrees, the potential for translation to serve as an agent of culture planning and change significantly differs from its potential in high-impact (central) cultures. This is evident from the prominent role played by translations in sheer quantitative terms as well as from the variety and type of translation strategies adopted by translators in low-impact cultures. As a paradigmatic instance of translation as an agent of culture planning, the case of Slovene culture is discussed, which throughout its documented history has been strongly dependent on translation. Parallels with situations in some other European cultures are also drawn.

In a different way, issues of culture planning are also addressed in the following chapter ("Dwarfs in Giants' Lands: Some Observations on Translating Minor Literatures into High-Impact Cultures – The Case of Slovene Literature in Italy"), where questions relating to **the translation of literatures written in limited-diffusion languages and belonging to low-impact cultures into languages of high-impact cultures** are explored. The analysis centres on the introduction of Slovene literature to and its continuing presence in contemporary Italy, though the Italian situation shares a great deal of similarities with other situations of asymmetrical translational transfer. In an attempt to identify the elements which play a significant role in the successful integration of a peripheral literature in a high-impact target culture, four factors are postulated and discussed, which are of

primary importance in the translation planning process: a) the target extra-textual setting, b) the literary and genre-related properties of source texts and criteria for their selection, c) the translator's competence, d) the translation strategies employed. It is suggested that a consistently target-oriented approach may be central to a positive reception of a peripheral literature in a high-impact target setting.

The third chapter ("Bilingualism and Literary (Non-)Translation: The Case of Trieste and Its Hinterland") is centred on the issue of **weak translation activity in some bilingual settings**. It presents an analysis of the situation in the city of Trieste and its surroundings, where a substantial Slovene minority has lived for centuries alongside the Romance-speaking (mainly Italian) population as well as various other smaller ethnic groups. The Italian and the Slovene communities have had different histories and at various points conflicts between them have arisen, sparked by national issues and complicated further by political circumstances. To a large extent, the two ethnic groups have lived parallel lives, often with only minimal interest in each other's cultures. This has also had an impact on literary translation, the output of which has been rather modest until recently, and often even more so on the reception of translated works – in spite of the city's rich literature in both Italian and Slovene. The study seeks to identify and explore the nature of this translational relationship, taking into account the social, political, cultural, literary and linguistic factors underlying it. It is shown that the situation only began to change in the early 1990s, following the fall of communism and the independence of Slovenia, when the asymmetries between the two ethnic groups started to diminish and when the Slovene culture and language started to gain greater recognition, which in turn opened new prospects for translation.

The next chapter is a more theoretical ("The Case for a Common Framework for Transfer-Related Phenomena in the Study of Translation and Language Contact"). Here, attention is drawn to the fact that phenomena relating to **cross-linguistic transfer** are of central relevance to **contact-induced language change both in translational situations and in cases of classical language contact**. It is suggested that translation, which is in actual fact a special type of language contact, is an important mechanism of contact-induced language change, which can be productively studied along with other types of language-contact situations, typically associated with societal bilingualism and with language-learning settings. In prototypical instances of language contact as well as of translation, two (and sometimes more) languages interact with each other, with various consequences

for language processing and production, and linguistic material (lexical, conceptual, structural, stylistic, etc.) is mapped from one language onto the other. This results in contact phenomena of various kinds. While cross-linguistic transfer effects, especially in language production, have been intensely studied for several decades, the impact of cross-linguistic transfer as a mechanism of language variation and change in translation has so far received very little attention.

Theoretical considerations are also of importance in the fifth chapter ("Foreignization and Domestication – A View from the Periphery"), which aims to show that **the attitude** towards **the concepts of foreignization and domestication,** as they are understood in modern translation studies, is **conditioned historically and culturally,** depending on how a given community views itself and others and, consequently, on its perceived need for foreign impulses (or lack of it) and its (in)tolerance of them. The opposition has often been used to describe translations, to explain translators' behaviour and also to highlight some fundamental differences between theoretical standpoints adopted by translation scholars, which may derive from their preference for one or the other of the two approaches. This chapter tries to point to the limits of the dichotomy and explore the fuzzy nature of the concepts of foreignization and domestication, which are in themselves imprecise, adaptable and therefore prone to misunderstanding and manipulation. Their value is necessarily determined by the role ascribed to translated texts in the target culture and by the agenda they are supposed to serve in linguistic, literary, cultural or political terms.

The final chapter ("Reflection on Translation in a Translation-Oriented Culture: Some Notes on the Slovene Tradition") offers a **brief overview of the role that translation has played in the Slovene context**. Like a number of small European cultures, the Slovene culture can be considered a typical translation culture. Many milestone events in the history of the Slovene language, literature and culture at large were to a significant degree shaped by translated texts and today translations account for about one third of all the titles published in Slovene per year. As can be expected, in such a translation-oriented culture the activity of translation has been accompanied by reflection on translational issues by translators, writers and scholars of language and literature. However, in spite of the mainly favourable attitude towards translation in the Slovene tradition, it was sometimes viewed with suspicion as an allegedly dangerous enterprise that might stifle the development of original literary production. A view of translated texts as second-rate in

comparison with non-translated writing was also prevalent in academic circles at least up to the last decades of the twentieth century, and had major consequences for the development of translation research and for the perception of translation in society at large. The chapter seeks to identify the principal forces which have shaped the Slovene study of and attitudes towards translation and outline their main characteristics both historically and today.

Povzetek

Monografija se ukvarja z vprašanji prevajanja in večjezičnosti, predvsem z opisnega, a hkrati tudi s teoretskega stališča. Izraz »večjezičnost« je razumljen tako, da se nanaša na situacije, kjer sobivata dva ali več jezikov, ki na različne načine stopajo v medsebojna razmerja. Delo obsega šest poglavij, ki zadevajo prevode in njihovo razmerje do dvojezičnosti kot družbenega pojava.

Prvo poglavje (»Translation as an Agent of Culture Planning in Low-Impact Cultures«) služi kot splošni uvod v razpravljanje o **prevajanju kot elementu kulturnega načrtovanja** v širšem smislu, ki poleg drugih elementov vključuje jezik, književnost in ideologijo. Avtorica trdi, da je v majhnih oziroma nedominantnih kulturah – v katerih običajno najdemo nekanonične oziroma periferne književnosti, napisane v manj razširjenih jezikih, in za katere je običajno značilna takšna ali drugačna večjezičnost – vloga prevajanja kot dejavnika kulturnega načrtovanja in spreminjanja zelo drugačna kot v centralnih oziroma dominantnih kulturah. To je razvidno iz osrednje vloge, ki jo imajo v majhnih kulturah prevodi že v kvantitativnem pogledu, pa tudi iz raznolikosti in vrst prevodnih strategij, za katere se prevajalci v takšnih kulturah odločajo. Kot paradigmatičen primer je predstavljena slovenska kultura, v kateri je imelo prevajanje kot dejavnik kulturnega načrtovanja izjemno vlogo skoz vso njeno zgodovino, kar se odraža skoz temeljno odvisnost te kulture od prevedenih besedil. Prikazane so tudi vzporednice z nekaterimi drugimi evropskimi kulturami.

Na drugačen način se kulturnega načrtovanja dotika tudi naslednje poglavje (»Dwarfs in Giants' Lands: Some Observations on Translating Minor Literatures into High-Impact Cultures – The Case of Slovene Literature in Italy«), ki se posveča vprašanjem **prevajanja književnosti, ki so napisane v manj razširjenih jezikih in ki pripadajo nedominantnim kulturam, v jezike dominantnih kultur**. Analizirane so okoliščine vztrajnega posredovanja slovenske književnosti v Italijo, ki ima dolgo zgodovino, čeprav je italijanska situacija podobna številnim drugim situacijam, za katere je značilno asimetrično prevodno posredovanje. Razprava skuša ugotoviti, od katerih poglavitnih dejavnikov je odvisno, ali bo prevodno posredovanje iz periferne v centralno kulturo uspešno, pri čemer predlaga in predstavlja štiri: a) ciljne zunajbesedilne okoliščine, b) literarne in žanrske lastnosti izhodiščnih besedil ter kriteriji za njihovo izbiro v procesu prevajanja,

c) prevajalčeve kompetence, d) prevodne strategije. Na osnovi obravnavanih besedil je mogoče skleniti, da je ciljno naravnan prevajalski pristop lahko ključnega pomena za pozitiven sprejem periferne književnosti v centralni kulturi.

Glavno vprašanje tretjega poglavja (»Bilingualism and Literary (Non-)Translation: The Case of Trieste and Its Hinterland«) je **šibka prevodna dejavnost v nekaterih dvojezičnih okoljih**. Predstavljen je položaj v Trstu in okolici, kjer močna slovenska manjšina že stoletja sobiva skupaj z romansko govorečim, predvsem italijanskim prebivalstvom pa tudi z nekaterimi drugimi, manjšimi etničnimi skupnostmi. Italijani in Slovenci so imeli v Trstu precej različno zgodovino in so bili večkrat vpleteni v medsebojne konflikte, ki so jih spodbujali nacionalni problemi, dodatno pa so jih zapletale politične okoliščine. V veliki meri sta slovenska in italijanska skupnost živeli vzporedna življenja, pogosto s komaj kaj medsebojnega kulturnega interesa. To se je poznalo tudi na področju prevajanja, kjer je bila produkcija do nedavna razmeroma skromna, še posebej omejena pa je pogosto bila recepcija prevedenih besedil, čeprav se obe skupnosti lahko ponašata z bogato književnostjo. Študija analizira in pretresa naravo danega prevodnega odnosa, ob upoštevanju spremljajočih družbenih, političnih, kulturnih, književnih in jezikovnih dejavnikov. Situacija se je začela opazneje spreminjati v začetku 90. let prejšnjega stoletja, s padcem komunizma in slovensko samostojnostjo. Asimetrični odnosi so se počasi začeli spreminjati predvsem spričo večjega zanimanja večinske skupnosti za manjšinsko, kar je imelo pozitivne posledice tudi za prevajanje.

Poglavje, ki sledi, je bolj teoretske narave (»The Case for a Common Framework for Transfer-Related Phenomena in the Study of Translation and Language Contact«). Razprava opozarja na to, da so **pojavi, povezani z medjezikovnim prenosom, osrednjega pomena za jezikovno spreminjanje, tako v prevodnih situacijah kot v situacijah, kjer se pojavlja klasični jezikovni stik**. Prevajanje, ki je pravzaprav posebna vrsta jezikovnega stika, je predstavljeno kot pomemben mehanizem jezikovnega spreminjanja, ki ga je mogoče opazovati skupaj z drugimi situacijami jezikovnega stika, ki jih običajno povezujemo z družbeno dvojezičnostjo in z učenjem jezikov. V prototipičnih primerih jezikovnega stika kot tudi pri prevajanju prihaja do interakcije med dvema jezikoma (ali več), kar ima razne posledice za jezikovno procesiranje in produkcijo, v obeh primerih, tako pri klasičnem jezikovnem stiku kot pri prevajanju, pa se jezikovno gradivo (besedno, konceptualno, strukturno, slogovno itd.) preslikava z enega jezika na drugega. Rezultat so raznovrstni stični pojavi. Medtem ko se učinki medjezikovnih prenosov, predvsem na

ravni jezikovne produkcije, intenzivno proučujejo že več desetletij, pa je bilo vlogi medjezikovnega prenosa kot mehanizma jezikovne raznolikosti in spreminjanja, še posebej v prevodnem okviru, doslej namenjene malo pozornosti.

Teoretski vidiki so pomembni tudi v petem poglavju (»Foreignization and Domestication – A View from the Periphery«), ki ima namen pokazati, da je **odnos** do **pojmov »potujevanje« in »podomačevanje«,** kot ju razume sodobno prevodoslovje, **pogojen zgodovinsko in kulturno** in odvisen od tega, kako dana skupnost vidi sebe in druge, in posledično od tega, kakšno potrebo čuti (ali ne) po tujih vzgibih in kako s tovrstnimi vzgibi ravna. Dihotomija med potujevanjem in podomačevanjem se pogosto uporablja pri opisovanju prevodov, pri razlaganju prevajalčevega postopanja pa tudi pri poudarjanju nekaterih temeljnih razlik med teoretskimi stališči posameznih prevodoslovcev, ki so lahko povezane z njihovimi preferencami glede enega ali drugega pristopa. Razprava poudarja, da je ta dihotomija v svoji uporabnosti omejena in da sta oba koncepta po naravi nejasna, prilagodljiva in zato lahko tudi predmet manipulacij. Njuno vrednost določajo vloga, ki se pripisuje prevodom v ciljni kulturi, in nameni, ki naj bi jim prevedena besedila služila v jezikovnem, književnem, kulturnem ali politično-ideološkem pogledu.

Zaključno poglavje (»Reflection on Translation in a Translation-Oriented Culture: Some Notes on the Slovene Tradition«) nudi kratek pregled **vloge, ki jo je prevajanje imelo na Slovenskem**. Kot za številne druge majhne evropske kulture tudi za slovensko velja, da je tipična prevodna kultura. Mnogo mejnikov v zgodovini slovenskega jezika, književnosti in kulture nasploh je v pomembni meri povezanih s prevodi, ki danes predstavljajo približno tretjino celotne letne knjižne produkcije v slovenščini. Kot je mogoče pričakovati, je za tako izrazito prevodno naravnano kulturo značilna tudi refleksija o vprašanjih prevajanja in prevodov, ki jo sooblikujejo prevajalci, pisatelji ter strokovnjaki za jezikoslovje in literarno vedo. Toda kljub večinoma naklonjenemu odnosu do prevajanja na Slovenskem, so se glede njegove vrednosti skoz zgodovino večkrat pojavljali dvomi, češ da gre za nevarno dejavnost, ki bi lahko zadušila razvoj domače, izvirne ustvarjalnosti. Stališče, da so prevodi nekaj drugorazrednega v primerjavi z neprevodno produkcijo, je prevladovalo tudi v akademskih krogih vsaj do dvajsetih let prejšnjega stoletja in imelo občutne posledice za razvoj raziskovanja prevodnih fenomenov in za oblikovanje stališč do prevajanja v družbi. Razprava skuša ugotoviti, kako so na Slovenskem prevodi postali zanimivi za raziskovalce in kakšen je bil skoz čas odnos do prevedenih besedil.

Index