



TRANSLATION INCONSISTENCIES IN THE TETRALOGY *THIS TIME, THIS LAND* BY DOBRICA ĆOSIĆ: ENGLISH-SERBIAN PARALLELS

Svetlana Obradovićⁱ

Assistant Professor,
English Department,
University of East Sarajevo,
Faculty of Medicine Foča,
Bosnia & Herzegovina

Abstract:

The paper presents a Serbian-English confrontational study aimed at determining the degree of success with which the translator conveys the polyphonic structure of Dobrica Ćosić's tetralogy, *This Time, This Land*, into English. The most significant invariant elements that the translator fails to preserve in the target language are the following: he or she alters the type of experienced speech from the original language, mixes the elements of spoken and unspoken experienced speech, loses the orthographic and spatial distinction between two different forms of experienced speech, transforms primary or main thoughts into secondary ones, and becomes inconsistent within the italicized font in the text. The conducted analysis clearly shows deviations from the syntactic and lexical structure of the original text, which disrupts the expressive function of the tetralogy, without damaging its polyphonic spirit.

Keywords: experienced speech, English language, Serbian language, tetralogy *This Time, This Land*

1. Introduction

The paper determines the degree of success with which the translator conveys the polyphonic structure of Ćosić's tetralogy, *This Time, This Land*, into English, primarily focusing on contextual, semantic, syntactic, and lexical indicators that may hinder understanding and lead to translation issues. A considerable emphasis was put on the oscillations that significantly reduce the stylistic features of the novel, offering, where possible, logical explanations for such translation decisions. The paper represents a valuable contribution to Serbian-English confrontational studies, as it deals with distantly related languages, and the interpretation of errors contributes to the more successful transfer of content from the original language to the target one, especially concerning the methods of conveying experienced speech. Serbian and English research studies on the phenomenon of experienced speech have not been a fertile ground for conflicting opinions. We note rare instances of terminological discrepancies: what

ⁱ Correspondence: email cecavuk119@gmail.com; svetlana.obradovic@ues.rs.ba

exactly does experienced speech encompass? It is generally accepted that among all syntactic-stylistic types of speech, only indirect speech has the status of non-experienced speech, although in Serbian literature we also encounter views like this: "*It [free indirect speech - FIS] is always, unlike direct and indirect speech, experienced speech because the narrator immerses themselves in the speech of a character while retaining their grammatical position*" (Kovačević, 2012: 322) [Italic emphasis belongs to the author]. In Serbian and English, as well as in global literature, the term *experienced speech* is synonymous with FIS statements, which can only be realized in the third person, as the following definition shows: "Within third-person narration (**ER-Form**), there is a direct shift to expressing the thoughts and feelings of a particular character in the story as *their* narration, not the narrator's" (Živković, 1992: 133; cf. Karavesović, 2010: 48; Katnić-Bakaršić, 2001: 114; Petković, 2006: 65; Ćorac, 1982: 438). The English perspective on the FIS phenomenon predominantly includes its syntactic realization in the form of third-person narration (Greenbaum and Quirk, 2009: 301–302; Yule, 1998: 280), but there are also the following views in the literature: "*Although free indirect discourse may possess a particular affinity for the grammatical third person, it can also appear and does appear in the first or second grammatical person*" (Prince, 2011: 186). In Serbian literature, the view that the FIS phenomenon is equivalent to third-person narration has been accepted for decades. This phenomenon is expanded by providing scientific evidence for first and second person narration (Kovačević, 2012). While the realization of FIS in the second person has not been previously mentioned in the literature, the syntactic form in the first person is sometimes pointed out as a possibility: "*In a communicative sense, FIS is a 'collision' of different perspectives; in linguistic terms, it represents a set of features belonging both to direct speech and indirect speech: from the first one, it adopts the independent construction and expressiveness (intonation, modal expressions, connectives, elliptical statements, etc.); and from the second one, it adopts third-person narration (it can also appear in the first person if the narration is in the first person)*" (Rajić, 2010: 520).

2. Methods and corpus

The paper is a micro-linguistic and macro-linguistic interlingual study. Therefore, it relies on the transformational-generative model of contrastive analysis. Serbian functions as language A (the original language), while English is language B (the target language). This is a dependent (unidirectional) contrastive analysis proceeding from language A (\Rightarrow). The unit of comparison is a unit above the sentence level, i.e., at the discourse level. Additionally, this is a partial contrastive analysis since only one linguistic phenomenon is investigated. The paper uses an objective technique of contrastive analysis as the translator holds the status of a second participant in the analysis. As a result, it significantly influences the conclusions we have presented. Within the objective technique, unidirectional translation, as one of the most significant types of this technique, was used. Unidirectional translation represents the semantic equivalence of the text in language A with the text in language B. It is one of the techniques for comparing two languages, based on establishing translation equivalents. To discover translation equivalents, a linguistic phenomenon in language A is observed (in our case, the types of experienced speech), while translation forms of that phenomenon in

language B are noted. This technique allows for a clear insight into the similarities and differences between the two languages, not only in their identification but also in their clear demonstration are concerned.

The analyzed material belongs to the literary-artistic style as we are examining the tetralogy *This Time, This Land*, the fifth piece of work by Dobrica Ćosić, written between 1972 and 1979. The Serbian edition published by the Belgrade-based Laguna in 2014 is used. The first part of the tetralogy, titled *Vreme smrti. #Knj.#1, Prerovo ide u rat* will be referred to in the corpus analysis as VS 1; the second part, titled *Vreme smrti. #Knj.#2, Suvoborska bitka* will be referred to as VS 2; the third part, titled *Vreme smrti. #Knj.#3, Valjevska bolnica* will be referred to as VS 3; and the final part of the tetralogy, *Vreme smrti. #Knj.#4, Izlazak* will be referred to as VS 4. For the purposes of this research project, we use the only English version of the original, published by Harvest/HBJ Book and Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, translated by Muriel Heppel. The first book of the tetralogy, translated as *Into the Battle*, will be referred to as IB; the second book, titled *A Time of Death*, as TD; the third book, *Reach to Eternity*, as RE; and the final book, translated as *South to Destiny*, as SD.

3. Literature review

The confrontational approach includes establishing parallels between Serbian and the following languages: English, Russian, Spanish, French, and German. Milka Nikolić notes that most of these studies focus on the translation aspect, primarily translation from foreign languages into Serbian. The most common subject of contrastive study is Free Indirect Speech (FIS), as translators face significant difficulties while conveying this phenomenon into the target language, particularly concerning tense agreement conventions, the use of deictic structures, and the expressiveness of the source text (2020: 294). We cite the English-Serbian confrontational papers of particular significance to this research: Vidanović (2015); Franglesh (1973); Karavesović (2010); and Palibrk (2010).

4. Results

Invariant elements are those translation elements that must be preserved, while *variant* elements allow the translator some freedom of interpretation (Jovanović, 2015: 73). Jovanović emphasizes that the translator's task becomes particularly challenging when direct and indirect speech as well FIS are being conveyed, since it is necessary to follow numerous sentence nuances, primarily the rhythm and the symbolism of that rhythm. Among the essential morphosyntactic translation elements, the absence of which would cripple the formal and substantive levels of the literary-artistic piece of work itself, are indirect speech, direct speech, and FIS, whether they are set apart as a distinct unit or embedded within the text (2015: 236). These are referred to as stylistic invariants, i.e., elements that must be retained in the translation as they enable an objective assessment of the translator's individuality and creative potential (Jovanović, 2015: 236).

The following lines will examine which of these invariant elements the translator failed to preserve in the target language:

4.1 The translator changes the type of experienced speech from the original language

In the following pages, we will address instances where there is a shift in person in the translation, consequently changing the type of experienced speech:

4.1.1 Free Direct Speech [FDS] (first person) → FIS (third person)

The cited example represents a unique case where the translator transforms the first-person plural into the third-person plural, i.e., FDS in the first-person plural becomes FIS in the third-person plural.

1a) Да, свиће. Нема се куд. Ослања се на дрво. И труба је мокра, кврчи, кашље. Да га гледа како маршује, како одлази, само да му каже: „Срећан пут, сине“, махне руком из јарка, не, не. Растали смо се. Иди, иди, Иване. Жури кући, пријатељу код ког је одсео, бежи да не чује трубу. Не, не. Растали смо се. (VS 1, 364)

1b) Yes, it was already daybreak. He leaned against a tree. The bugle sputtered and squeaked: it was wet. Should he have one more look at Ivan as he marched away? Just to wish him a good journey and wave to him from the ditch by the roadside? No, they had said good-bye. To escape from the sound of the bugle, he hurried away to the house of the friend with whom he was staying. No, he must not go back; they had said good-bye. (IB, 271)

4.1.2 FDS (second person) → FIS (third person)

In the Serbian version, Olga, with the statement *Јеси ли због тога био срећнији?*, addresses an imaginary interlocutor – her husband Vukašin. However, in the translation, the context of the third person from the previous statements is maintained. The change in experienced speech, and consequently in person, was not considered significant while conveying the content, so the translator retains the perspective of the omniscient third person. Such instances of translational inconsistency are very rare in the tetralogy.

2a) Откад му она није видела сузне очи? Можда га нису само та политичка разочарења овако погурила. Одувек је нешто крио у себи, тамнело се нешто у њему, али се мучио да буде јак и разборит. Јеси ли због тога био срећнији? Да скрије сузе, хитро оде у другу собу. А шта ћу ја сада, када је између нас стао он који ми је понудио оно што немам? Што нисам ни имала. Што раније никад нисам ни зажељела. За шта нисам ни знала да постоји. Знам, то је несрећа. Али то је она несрећа од које не желимо да се спасемо. (VS 4, 69–70)

2b) When had she last seen tears in his eyes? Perhaps it was not just his political disappointment that had made him downcast. He had always been secretive. There

was darkness inside him, but he made great efforts to be strong and sensitive. Had that brought him happiness? She turned her head away to hide her own tears. *What will I do, she thought, now that there stands between us a man who has offered me what I don't have? What I have never had? What I never even wished for, because I didn't know it existed? This is a misfortune, I know, but one I don't want to escape.* (SD, 38)

4.1.3 FDS (third person) → Direct Speech

Example (3) illustrates a common structure in Ćosić's tetralogy: the narrative structure of direct speech is interrupted by FDS, revealing the hidden thoughts of the character. This form of experienced speech is transformed into direct speech in the English version.

3a) Људи, стигао хлеб – каже гласно као они. – Дачићу, иди у брвнару и донеси цак таина – украшће, сину му. – Не, стој. Нека иде Лазих. Чекајте да вам објасним: имамо наређење из пука да бранимо Превију. Заштитница смо пуку, дивизији. Превија је веома значајан положај. (VS 2, 268)

3b) "The rations have arrived," he said, speaking as loudly as they had. "Dačić go to the log hut and bring the sack of hardtack."

"But he'll steal it, boy!"

"Just a minute – *you* go, Lazić. And the rest of you, listen while I explain things: we have orders from the regiment to defend Previja. We're acting as the defense force for the regiment and the division. Previja is a very important position." (TD, 196)

4.1.4 FIS (third person) → FDS (first person)

Throughout the entire tetralogy, there is a unique instance in which FIS in the third person is transformed into FDS in the first-person plural.

4a) Да губи битке, да изгуби све битке, а да сачува војску – где ће онда с њом? Блуди погледом над Србијом.

Облаци се купе најпре над Копаоником, Ртњем и Миџором, а на Осоговским планинама и Пљачковици – пљускови; громови бију Солунску главу, Крвави камен, Големи Кораб и Ћеравицу...Облачине надлазе са свих страна, слежу се из васионе, умотавају Србију и њена бојишта, кише замућују реке, на путевима за коморским возовима више се не диже прашина; необрана поља, шуме, забрани и шљивари тамне... Србија има земљано лице, са земљаним путевима и селима. Земљаним народом што се комеша између плитких ровова и гробаља, бежи путевима ка југу, престрављен, обосио и оголио, смршао, непрездравио од великог умора...

Како да га брани? Шта може човек пред догађајем који прелама историју? Људско време и дело, трен су и трун. Све велико догађа се по законима васионе и вољи Творца. А за спас Србије, данас се мора велико чинити. За велико дело походна је велика вера. На чему она сада може да се сазда? (VS 4, 88–89)

4b) *Would it be better to lose the battle, lose all the battles, but save the army? Where would we go then?*

His glance roamed overhead. Clouds were approaching from all directions, wrapping themselves around Serbian and her battlefields. The rains silenced the rivers, the dust rose no more behind the baggage trains, and the unharvested meadows, fields, and plum orchards darkened.

Serbia has an earthy face, with its dirt roads and villages, and an earthy people, milling between the shallow trenches and graveyards, fleeing along the roads to the south, frightened, naked, impoverished, and emaciated, not yet recovered from the great typhus epidemic. How can we defend this people? What could a man do in the face of events which were changing the natural course of history? Human time, human deeds were but a moment, a crumb. Everything great happened in accordance with the laws of the universe and the Creator. But something great must be done today, to save Serbia. And great deeds demand great faith. (SD, 49–50)

4.1.5 FIS (third person) → FDS (first person)

One of the most common transformations includes instances in which the form of FIS in the third person shifts to FDS in the first person. In the specific example, given that it pertains to the first part of the tetralogy, it would be expected for the FDS in the first person to be italicized, in accordance with the already established convention.

5a) Усправља се и полази напоље. Шта сам јутрос радила? У свануће сам легла и одмах заспала. Ја спавала, а он јуришао, гранате га засипале. Како сам могла? Излазе из ходника и застаје на степеницама: у сумраку се пале фењери, галаме болничари, стењу људи и волови. Јаучу они што их са кола трпају на носила. Ако му се нешто догодило, одмах ће се ошишати, обући одело умрлог рањеника и још ноћас поћи на фронт. Још ноћас; дрхти и силази низ степенице: ту своју одлуку није смела да му напише... (VS 1, 161)

5b) She straightened up and went into the corridor. *What did I do this morning? I went to bed at daybreak and fell asleep at once. I was asleep, and he was charging, with shells falling all around him.* She went outside and stood on the steps: the lamps were being lit in the gathering darkness, orderlies were shouting, and men and oxen were moaning. Men groaned as they were being loaded onto stretchers. If anything has happened to him, I'll cut off my hair, put on a uniform and leave for the front tonight. Trembling, she ran

down the steps. In her letters she had not dared to tell Vladimir of her resolve to join him at the front... (IB, 117)

Unlike the previous example in which statements in the first person were not italicized, even though they belong to the first part of the tetralogy, the given example from the fourth part illustrates a shift from a FIS third-person narrator into a FDS first-person narrator, while still adhering to the code. Therefore, the underlined statement is written in italics.

6a) Адам Катић га презриво посматрао: откако је овој поручничкој вуцибатини узео плату у једној партији карата и потом му позајмио две хиљаде динара, он више с њим не игра карте, а при сваком обраћању прети му батинама, апсом, последњих дана и стрељањем. Овај гад ће га и стрељати, само да му не врати дуг. Танко му се осмехну, али га прописно поздрави и пође са Симом и Урошем од куће до куће да моли жене: (VS 4, 340)

6b) Adam looked at him with contempt. Ever since he had taken this good-for-nothing lieutenant's pay at a game of cards and then lent him two thousand dinars, Sandić wouldn't play cards with him, and every time Adam spoke, he threatened him with beatings or imprisonment, and now with a firing squad. *That bastard will shoot me simply to avoid paying his debts, thought Adam.* He gave a thin smile but saluted correctly, then set off with Sima and Uroš to go from house to house, asking the women for food: "Can't you give us a bag of oats and an armful of hay, ma'am? And a bit of bread and cheese? I'll pay whatever you ask. We've lived on grapes and apples for two days. Tomorrow the Fritzies will take it all anyway." (SD, 211)

The given example illustrates rare instances including combination of two different types of experienced speech within a single sentence structure: the reporting clause followed by Ćosić's clarification (*мисли Богдан с мржњом загледао у команданта Глишића, милитаристу, задрибалду, националног глупака, буржујског батинаша*) and third-person FIS (*бркове ће му ишчупати*). The translator separates these two types of experienced speech into two distinct sentence structures, resulting in the transformation of the third person into the first one.

7a) Како обавестити грађанство о нашој побуни? Прво социјалистичке посланике, мисли Богдан с мржњом загледао у команданта Глишића, милитаристу, задрибалду, националног глупака, буржујског батинаша, бркове ће му ишчупати. (VS 1, 224)

7b) How can we let the civilian population know about our rebellion? We must tell the socialist deputies first, thought Bogdan, staring at Glišić with eyes full of hate. A nationalist, an idiot, a pigheaded bourgeois thug! I'd like to tear out his mustache! (IB, 163)

4.1.6 FDS (first person) → FIS (third person)

The following examples illustrate the opposite situation: the form of FDS in the first person is transformed into the form of FIS in the third person. The translator does not maintain the first-person perspective for unknown reasons.

8a) Гледа у Драгана; он чека да њега пита за име. Зову је, одлази без речи. Није ме ни погледала. Зури за њом, хвата се за голу грану шљиве: она тоне у гомилу људи и стоке која, као опшину, нагло крену и пожури путем, уза страну... (VS 2, 70)

8b) She looked at Dragan, while he waited for her to ask him his name. Someone called her, and she went away without a word. She hadn't even looked at him. He hurried after her, seizing the bare branch of a plum tree. She was rapidly disappearing into the crowd of people and animals which, as though struck by a whip, had suddenly started to move along the road... (TD, 48)

In the given example, the translator transforms certain statements of FDS in first person – *Шта ја сад могу да променим? Откуд сам ја крив што они морају да леже на снегу сву ноћ? Док не сване* – into FIS (third person): ‘What could he do about that now? Was it his fault they had to lie in the snow until daybreak?’ The remainder of Ćosić’s internal dialogue is maintained in the first person: *Па и ја морам сву ноћ, овако на коњу, све укруг, као да долап на Морави окрећем. Лакше је њима што леже но мени на коњу, сву ноћ. Ако су људи, морају то да виде*. This transformation is recognized by the translator: *And I must stay on my horse all night, going round and round, as though turning a water wheel on the Morava. It's easier for them down there in the snow, than for me spending the whole night on horseback. They must see that, if they're ordinary human beings*.

9a) ... Али шта је он крив што они не разумеју српски, што је овај свет тако глупо склопљен па сви људи не могу речима да се објасне. Шта ја сад могу да променим? Откуд сам ја крив што они морају да леже на снегу сву ноћ? Док не сване. Па и ја морам сву ноћ, овако на коњу, све укруг, као да долап на Морави окрећем. Лакше је њима што леже но мени на коњу, сву ноћ. Ако су људи, морају то да виде. (VS 2, 417–418)

9b) ... But it was not his fault that they didn't understand Serbian, that in this world men were so stupidly made that they couldn't all explain themselves to one another in words. What could he do about that now? Was it his fault they had to lie in the snow until daybreak? And I must stay on my horse all night, going round and round, as though turning a water wheel on the Morava. It's easier for them down there in the snow, than for me spending the whole night on horseback. They must see that, if they're ordinary human beings. (TD, 308)

4.1.7 FDS (third person) → FIS (third person)

Ćosić introduces generalized FDS in the third person, which is transformed into FIS in the third person. These transformations are rare within the tetralogy.

10a) Вукашина Катића пут нагло спусти пред прве ваљевске куће; испод шљивика, испресецаног рововима, изрованог гранатама, с покршеним воћкама и убијеним војницима и коњима, почиње варош – ратна победа и позадинска свакодневница, у којима треба и даље бити Вукашин Катић, политичар опозиционар и уредник опозиционих новина. Да ли је могуће то наставити? Сретати људе и разговарати о рату и политици, влади и савезницима, писати чланке о непоштеној и неспособној власти, ратним лиферантима, забушантима, скупоћи...У оној нишкој салици за кнежевске балове држати говоре против Пашића. Бавити се страначким комбинацијама, ићи на ручкове и вечере са страначким дипломатама и новинарима и убеђивати их у неминовност и праведност ослобођења и уједињења свих Срба и Југословена – како то и даље чинити? А најпре, стати пред Олгу и рећи: Ја верујем да је Иван заробљен.... (VS 3, 34–35)

10b) Vukašin Katić arrived suddenly in front of the first houses of Valjevo. Just below the plum orchard – crisscrossed with trenches and covered with shell holes, shattered fruit trees, and the bodies of men and horses – was the beginning of the town: the scene of victory in the war and also of everyday life behind the front line, where Vukašin Katić must go on with his life as a politician, a leader of the Opposition and editor of Opposition newspapers. Could he go on with it? Could he face meeting people, talking about the war and politics, the government and the Allies? Writing articles about the corrupt and inefficient government, the war profiteers, the shirkers, the rising prices? Could he go back to the old preoccupation with political combinations, and lunches and dinners with foreign diplomats and journalists, convincing them of the inevitability and justice of liberating and uniting all the Serbs and South Slavs? How could he? First he must stand in front of Olga and say, I believe Ivan has been taken prisoner. (RE, 19–20)

4.1.8 FIS (second person) → FIS (third person)

The given example represents a unique instance in the entire tetralogy which illustrates the transformation from second-person FIS into third-person FIS. This type of transformation is not observed in all FIS sentences.

11a) Све губи значај. И бол. Неће без бола да умре. Неће да га смрт сатре и разори, и у тој трулежи, која шкрипи и шушти под прстима, заустави му срце. Кад јој се прохте, пошто га измучи. Кад све изгуби значај. Он сада треба нешто веома лако да учини. Да гурне прст у тај кружић што се све спорије окреће. Он ће га зауставити, он. Својим прстом. Својом вољом. Зар је то подвиг? Случајно је настао,

неће случајно да нестане. Најпре ћу убити њу, смрт. Најпре њу. То је она моћ, онај корак. Најдужи. Оставља траг у камену. Право у срце. То тупкање је ђубриште. У главу ће. Глава је он. Она је крива што није више уживао живот. И што не верује у загробни живот и Бога. Не лажи себе, невина је глава, невин је отац. А шта онда чека? Зар чека петлове? Свитање, чека. Тада кад настаје дан, тад завући руку под јастук, најпре откочити и чврсто стегнути, јер су му руке много ослабиле.

Не предај се, не ништи се, Гаврило. Гаврило, Гаврило... Говори гласније, вичи своје име, нека чује цела болница! (VS 3, 258)

11b) Everything was losing its meaning, even pain. He didn't want to end like this. He didn't want to die without pain. He didn't want death to destroy him, to stop the beating of his heart in this rotting flesh. Now when he felt like it after so much torment, and when everything had lost the last vestige of meaning, he ought to do something really very easy: press his finger into that little circle which was revolving ever more slowly. He would stop it with his own finger, by his own act of will. Surely that was a heroic deed? His existence had begun by chance, but wouldn't end so. First of all he would kill death itself. That was power – the vital step and the longest. He would leave his tracks in the stone. Straight through the heart. That throbbing organ was a garbage heap. He would fire at his head; his head was him. It was the fault of his head that he hadn't enjoyed life more, that he didn't believe in God or in life after death. But that's a lie; his head was innocent, and so was his father. What was he waiting for? For the cocks to crow? Yes, he was waiting for daybreak. When day showed its first light, then he'd thrust his hand under the pillow; first of all he'd remove the catch and grip it firmly, for his hands were now very weak.

Don't destroy yourself, Gavril! Don't surrender! Don't, Gavril, don't! He raised his voice and cried out his own name: let the whole hospital hear. (RE, 192–193)

4.1.9 Experienced speech → Indirect speech

Experienced speech is often transformed into indirect speech. In the given example, a question in third-person FIS becomes an indirect question, with the independent clause introduced using the verb *wondered*.

12a) Полази дуж зида, тротоаром, спорим, клецавим кораком проверава узгибану калдрму; за леђима му букте швапски жагор и смех. Шта се то догађа с њим? Запиње, вуче се напред оним својим дугим кораком низ таласаву, замућену *улицу* коју стешњавају кровови. Некуда отиче ћерамида. (VS 1, 129)

12b) Vukašin tottered forward on the pavement; behind him he heard a burst of laughter from the Austrians and wondered what was happening to him. He pulled

himself together and hurried on with his usual long stride down the undulating street squeezed by the roofs of the houses. (IB, 92)

The translator often transforms forms of FDS into indirect speech:

13a) ... Баћинац и Миловац, два гоподарећа виса на крилима армије. Ту се учврстити, па двадесет првог новембра велики напад. Двадесет први новембар? За три дана. Да, најкасније. Напад се не може одлагати. Можда је само у ових неколико дана Прва армија још способна за напад. Касније, она више неће моћи да крене у напад; остаће без људи, без вере, без жеље да напада. Моћи ће само да узмиче, распада се, жали свој крај. Морао је сваком официру данас да каже: Српска војска неће бити поражена на Колубари, Суворору, Руднику, него онда када више не буде имала снаге за напад. Зашто још ћути и не саопштава штабовима одлуку да се двадесет првог креће у напад с Миловца и Баћинца? (VS 2, 81–82)

13b) ... The attack must be launched from Baćinac and Milovac, the two commanding heights on the wings of the army. He would take up a firm position there, and launch the big attack on November 21. November 21? That meant in three days's time- the latest possible date. The attack could not be postponed. Perhaps these few days were the last in which the First Army was capable of attack. Later – in a few days' time– it would not be able to attack: it would be without men, without faith, without any wish to attack: capable only of retreat and disintegration, each man wanting only to get to his own home. He must tell every officer today that the Serbian army would not be defeated on the Kolubara, nor on Suvobor or Rudnik, but only when it no longer had the strength to attack, wherever that might be. But why was he still silent, why did he not inform the staff of his decision to start the attack from Milovac and Baćinac on the twenty-first? (TD, 57–58)

Major Gavrilko Stanković is preparing for his first sortie after being wounded. He wants to mount his horse, but in the background, he hears comments from people betting that he will not be able to accomplish such a feat. The major's thoughts are inserted into these statements, as a reaction to what he hears in the distance. In the English version, the comments from passersby who place bets are presented in the form of indirect speech, with the third person transformed into the first person, resulting in reported statements from the perspective of Major Gavrilko Stanković.

14a) Радојко, смири коња. Коњ не трпи болесничке руке на себи, добар коњ не подноси брбљарије. Шта могу, ослабиле су ми руке. Не могу да се бацим у седло, као некад. Око чега се то свађају болесници? Кладе се да не могу узјати. Ех, људи, људи! Чик! Пашће као пањ. Ја! Као пањ, треснуће о басамаке! Хоћеш о пакло дувана, љуљнуће као дулек. Радојко, откуд људима толика злоба? Кладите се!

Деде, кладите се! Чим закључите опкладе, узјахаћу! Ништа глупље и јадније од смеха, мој Богдане. Гледајте! Баца се у седло, жигну га нога, мамуза коња. Болница се пролама од одушевљених узвика рањеника и богаља. Па он јаше као некад. Може и препоне да прескаче! Излете на капију, на друм. Откуд толики народ на улици, уз тарабе и зидове? Пљесак, узвици одушевљења. Мамуза коња, каријером пролази Ваљевом, народ га поздравља, праведан и племенит народ! (VS 2, 252–253)

14b) Radojko, calm that horse down! A horse can't stand any but healthy hands on it, and a good horse can't take bubbling. Why are the patients quarreling? They're making bets that I can't mount the horse. That'll fall down like a log. All right then, make your bets! As soon as you're done, I'm getting on that horse! Bogdan, my boy, there's nothing sillier than people's laughter. The hospital is echoing with the shouts of the wounded and crippled. But he's riding just as he used to! He can jump over hurdles! He's flying out the gate and onto the highway! Why so many people in the street, pressed up against the walls and fences? They're shouting, clapping, wild with excitement! He's spurring his horse, galloping through Valjevo! (RE, 188–189)

4.2 Mixing the elements of spoken and unspoken experienced speech

In the given example, there are no clear indications as to whether Vukašin is imagining the content of the letter he is going to send to his father in Prerovo after twenty years, or if he is speaking it aloud. The translator concludes that Vukašin is speaking the content of the letter aloud, so the statements are placed inside the quotation marks.

15a) Као да му лакну кад урони у ветровиту, мокру помрчину. Пође улицом без светиљки да никог не сретне, ником не каже реч, никог не чује. По мраку и глибу. У зору ће на станицу, у Ниш. Још ноћас оцу писмо. Мора. После двадесет година. Ноћас сам, оче, коначно одбио да уђем у Пашићеву ратну владу. Остао сам му опозиција. Јесам ли добро учинио, оче? А јутрос сам мог Ивана, добровољца, испратио на фронт, пошто сам уништио Пашићево писмо за Ивановог команданта пука, које би га извукло из стрељачког строја и рова. Тако би и ти поступио, знам. У овој земљи зато и јесмо очеви. Да потврђујемо Аврамову веру и извршавамо његову одлуку. Да жртвујемо синове... Успорава корак поред кућице и башти: опоро и густо миришу и шуморе хризантеме. Помрчина, ветар, земља, све је натопљено мирисом хризантема. И киша. (VS 1, 373)

15b) Vukašin felt better when he plunged into the wet, windy darkness. He set out along an unlighted street so that he would not meet anybody as he walked through the mud and darkness. At daybreak he would go to the station and take the train to Niš. But he would write to his father tonight; he must, after twenty years. "Tonight, Father, I refused once and for all to join Pašić's wartime government. I'm staying in the Opposition. Have I acted rightly, Father? This morning I saw my son, Ivan, off to the

front as a volunteer; I destroyed a letter Pašić gave me for Ivan's commanding officer, which would have kept him out of the trenches. You would have done the same, I know. That's what we fathers exist for, to confirm the faith of Abraham and to carry out his decision – to sacrifice our sons." He slowed down. The wind, the darkness, the earth, even the rain were saturated with the smell of chrysanthemums. (IB, 279)

In the following examples, we will continue to address situations where it is not entirely clear whether the experienced speech is spoken or not, as well as instances where there are clear contextual clues suggesting the presence or absence of the spoken component of the statements.

In the given example, Kosara addresses Ivan's parents, which is marked with quotation marks as it is considered a spoken reply. Subsequently, the mother emotionally bids farewell to her baby, presented in italics. However, there is no clear indication within the paragraph that this is her internal monologue, nor is it clear whether she is addressing Ivan's parents only in her thoughts or directly.

16a) А што сте бринули? Што сте, ко бајаги, бринули, што сте, што сте, госпођо? Нећу нико да брине за мене, нећу! Што ти, синко мој гладни, вичеш толико, што си се заценио, лепи мој?... Сад ћеш да руцкиш, ако ти мајчетина нешто има, ако је од сикирације остала нека кап. 'Оћу да излудим, излудећу! Цапи је, загризи је, гладницо моја, најгладнија на свету... Јао, сине мој, да л' ћеш да запамтиш како те мајка пред полазак у Скопље насикирала? Морам, Живота, да одем до наше куће, долазе Швабе и Бугари, однеће нам све што имамо. Где ћу те у празну кућу? Ја сам крвопилном муком сваку крпу и сваку нашу стварчицу стекла. Ал', Живота, сине мој, сад воз нити полази, нити стиже на време, па бог зна кад ће да ти се врати мајка. Гризи је, вуци, синко мој, вуци, Живота, на дну је млеко. Па мораш да запамтиш, сине Живота, како је твоја мајка први пут овако плакала над тобом, плакала, пелене ти мокре, а цепало јој се срце што мора. А мора. Не може човек све да истрпи. Неки људи могу, ал' мајка не може. Мајка не може да буде цукела и ко бајаги. Па морам. Морам. Јао, сине мој слатки, за твоје добро морам да одем до Скопља и спасем нешто. Донећу ти играчке, зеку, мацу, куцу, меду, купићу ти у Солуну, у Инстанбулу, најлепше играчке што постоје. Је л' нема више ни кап? Добога! Па повуци више, мало запни, Живота, еј, тешко мени. Како сад да те спустим у колевку? Како, како? Ко зна, рат је, могу Бугари да дигну воз у ваздух, па те сад гледам посљедњи пут. Јао, како ћу и шта ћу кад те спустим и покријем, а време ми је за воз. Јао, сине Живота! Живота! Видећеш, вратиће се твоја мајка. Живота, сине мој... (VS 4, 386–387)

16b) *"Why? What's all the fuss about? I don't want anybody to worry about me!" - You're hungry, my pet, aren't you? All out of breath from crying. Now you'll get your lunch, if your poor mother's got anything, with all this worry. I'll go crazy, clean crazy! Go on, take a suck, have a good bite, my poor hungry little boy. Will you remember how upset your mother*

was before she left for Skoplje? I must go to our house, Života. The Ftitzies are coming, and the Bulgarians. They'll take everything we have. Where will I put you in an empty house? I sweated blood to get every single thing, every rag. But now, Života, the trains don't leave on time, and they don't arrive on time, and God knows when your mother will come back to you. Go on, Života, bite it, suck hard, the milk's at the bottom. But you must remember, Života, how your mother cried over you, heartbroken because of what she had to do. So I must go. I must go for your good. I'll bring you a bunny rabbit and a kitten and a puppy. I'll buy you the nicest toys in Salonika and Istanbul. Suck harder, give a good tug. Ah, but it's hard for me, Života! How can I put you in your cradle? How can I? Maybe the Bulgarians will blow the train sky high, and I'm looking at you for the last time. How will I put you down and cover you up. What'll I do? I must go or I'll be late, Života, my son; you'll see, your mother will come back! (SD, 244)

In the following example, the reader reacts to a segment of a letter they have read. In the first segment, it is unclear whether Aćim is thinking about the fact that not many soldiers from Adam's platoon have been killed. The internal monologue is neither italicized nor orthographically marked. In the second segment, while reflecting on the read part of the letter, Aćim uses FDS in the second person, addressing his imaginary interlocutor – the author of the letter. It is not clear whether these statements are spoken aloud or not. The translator evidently considers the statement to be spoken, as it is placed inside the quotation marks.

17a) Зато ми пратите још пара нек ми се нађе ако овас поскупи. За мене се не секирајте и уздравље свима. Адам. Коњички ескадрон Моравске дивизије другог позива у саставу Прве армије.

Вечерас је више изгинуло из Моравске првог позива. То је тамо по планинама, иза Ваљева. А кад ступе у равницу, онда коњица јуриша.

Чита гласно друго Адамово писмо:

Прошле ноћи код села Липолиста ранише ми Драгана. Фала Богу само му шрапнел расекао кожу на левој плећки.

Фала богу. Несрећниче, шашавко мој. (VS 1, 30)

17b) *So please send me some more money. Then I'll have it in case oats gets even more expensive. Don't worry about me. I hope you are all well.*

Adam

*Cavalry Squadron, Morava Division,
Second Draft, First Army*

This evening there were more deaths from the first draft of the Morava Division. The fighting was in the mountains, beyond Valjevo. But when they came down into the plain, there would be cavalry charges.

He read Adam's second letter aloud:

Last night Dragan was wounded near the village of Lipolist. The shrapnel just grazed the skin of his left shoulder, thank God.

"Thank God. You poor, miserable idiot!" (IB, 17)

The first underlined statement carries the component of spoken speech and is therefore placed inside the quotation marks in the English version. However, it is unclear whether the second statement is spoken or not. The translator places it inside the quotation marks under the assumption that if the character has spoken the first statement, they will continue to speak the subsequent statements as well.

18a) ... Последњих дана и кад није на положају, и кад не гледа Дунав, кад је у соби или кафани, одједном осети дах реке, буди га погубљена студ воде, прожета јесењом трулежи из дунавских шума, на банатској обали. – Утопићу се, сигурно ћу се утопити! – промуца за себе. Кошава га засипа језом с Дунава. – Па ми непрелазимо Дунав, ми њих на обали чекамо. Зашто ме је страх? Лагано крену у кошаву и таму, ка Дунавском кеју. (VS 4, 234–235)

18b) ... Wherever he was during the last few days, he felt the river's breath and the chill of that water with its abundance of fish, shot through with decaying matter from the forests on the Banat shore. "I'll drown, that's for sure!" he muttered to himself. The wind blew through him, bringing with it the horror of the turbulent water. "But we aren't crossing the Danube, we're waiting for them on this bank! Why am I afraid?" He walked slowly into the darkness, toward the Danube quay. (SD, 138–139)

Unlike the previous examples in this subgroup, the following example is not ambiguous. The reporting clause demonstrates that the statement *Цркавају као ми, каже задовољно и гласно да га чују Драговић и Спасоје* carries the characteristics of spoken speech. The reporting clause is conveyed correctly. However, the statement is not placed inside the quotation marks for an unknown reason. A few lines below, the translator places a similar statement inside the quotation marks.

19a) Нађе два ђепна сата, оба раде; покупи све из унутрашњих џепова копорана, кад сване, прегледаће; преврће по ранцима, нигде хлеба; две конзерве и нешто пексимита. Цркавају као ми, каже задовољно и гласно да га чују Драговић и Спасоје, али их више не зове док не покупи што вреди. Натовари се ђебадима и ранцима и суљну се низ полеђену стену, ка својима. Дозива их. Нису ваљда мртви,

секну се и упали жижицу. Спасоје лежи с разнетом главом, у крви. Рафал га исекао, сунце му божје! – каже гласно. Пали другу жижицу: водник се скотрљао до клеке, лежи поребарке; не види крв. Прилази му, прислања главу на леђа: чује му дисање. (VS 2, 279–280)

19b) He shook out the knapsacks: there was no bread anywhere, but he found two cans of food and some kind of jam. So they're starving just like us, he said with satisfaction aloud so Dragović and Spasoje would hear him; but he no longer called their names until he had finished collecting everything of value. He loaded the knapsacks and blankets on his back, and slithered down the icy surface of the rock toward his companions. He called their names. I suppose they're not dead, he thought quickly, then lit a match: there was Spasoje, with his head blown open, in a pool of blood. The bullets had cut him to ribbons. "Poor devil!" he said aloud. He lit another match: the corporal had rolled against a pine tree and lay on his side. He went up to him and pressed his head against Bogdan's back; he could hear his breathing. (TD, 206–207)

In the following example, it is clear that the statement of FDS in the second person is not spoken, as Ćosić introduces the reporting clause *говори у себи*. Despite this, the statements in which the commander prays to a higher power for help are placed inside the quotation marks, thereby attributing to a component of spoken speech.

20a) Нагло спусти слушалицу и смалаксало приђе прозору. Ветар тресе прозор и засипа га кишом. Отвара га и говори у себи: Проспи се, небо. Потопи овај штаб и све штабове. Потопи болнице и гробља. Потопи, небо, све путеве који нас одводе у незнано. (VS 3, 525)

20b) He slammed down the receiver and walked wearily to the window. The wind shook the pane and spattered it with rain. He opened it and said to himself: "May the heavens empty and drown this and all other headquarters! And the hospitals and cemeteries. And submerge all roads that lead into the unknown!" (RE, 386)

4.3 Orthographic and spatial distinction between two different forms of experienced speech

In example (21), Ćosić provides the dialogues between Nurse Milena Katić and the wounded soldier Bogdan Dragović. The dialogues are separated by elements of FDS in the third and second person, representing the thoughts of the resentful soldier, produced as a reaction to the conversation between the two women that he hears in the background. All of this is presented within a single unit to depict the state of mind of the semiconscious soldier. The translator separates the dialogues of different speakers into new sections. The paragraph *"We can't let him go until his temperature is down. Who can look after him better than I can?" Yes, it was she* is an example of translation inconsistency, as the first statement should be enclosed in the quotation marks since the second statement is spoken by the mother and the first one by the nurse. The translator presents both statements as if they belong to a single speaker.

21a) Богдан Драговић осећа хладну руку на челу и из муклог жамора неко дозивање. Одазвао би се, нема гласа. Не може да отвори очи од руке која се, хладна, окрепљујућа, миче по врелини чела. Не спава, мајко. Има велику ватру. То је она, Иванова сестра. Дајте ми га да га носим кући. Ко ли је то? Не можемо да га пустимо док му не спадне ватра. Па ко ће, дете, њега да чува боље од мене? Она је. Бар неколико дана мора да буде под лекарском бригом, наредили су ми доктори. Овдје? Ја ћу да га чувам, не брините. Богдан је друг мога брата, рекла сам вам. А шта ћу ја да радим? Јесте она: одгуркује очне капке: рујни, модри, врани прсти мајчини... Увек су такви, од боја ћилима и крпара. Додирује трепавицама њене прсте, гледа им боре; притискује му чело, обрве, очи; њише их дисањем, подиже их болом у грудима. Шта ће бити с њом ако умрем? А хоћеш ли, госпођице, да уредиш с докторима да останем уз њега док је овде? Помараћу ти. И пазићу све у овој соби. (VS 3, 123–124)

21b) Bogdan Dragović felt a cool hand on his forehead and out of the dull murmuring heard someone call his name. He would have answered, but he had no voice. He could not open his eyes because of that cool, strong hand which moved over the burning surface of his brow.

"No, he's not asleep; he has a high temperature." It was the voice of that girl, Ivan's sister.

"Let me take him home!" Who could that be?

"We can't let him go until his temperature is down. Who can look after him better than I can?" Yes, it was she.

"He must be under medical supervision for at least a few more days. That's the doctor's orders."

"What, here?"

"Don't worry, I'll look after him. Bogdan was my brother's friend."

"What shall I do, then?" Yes, it was she. He forced his eyelids open: there were his mother's fingers, dark red, blue, and black from the dyes of the rugs. He touched her fingers with his eyelashes and saw their wrinkled skin; they were pressing his forehead, his eyebrows, his eyes, rising and falling with his breathing, lifted up by the pain in his chest. What will happen to her if I die?

"Nurse, could you arrange for me to stay beside him while he's here? I'll help you, and I'll keep an eye on everybody in this room." (RE, 90–91)

To emphasize the tension of the situation in the turmoil of war, the interlocutors' lines are often presented within a single unit. General Mišić wants to know the name of the member of his regiment, while the remaining lines belong to the soldier Dragutin. The translator not only separates the lines into distinct units but also changes their order to achieve a more logical sequence.

22a) Шта чекаш! Улази, војниче! – наређује генерал Мишић изубијаном војнику. Како се зовеш? Куд ћу овакав? Драгутин. Испрљаћу све, господине. (VS 2, 23)

22b) "What are you waiting for? Get in, man!" said Mišić to the beaten up soldier from whose face blood was spurting. "What's your name?"

"Dragutin, sir. But where can I go like this? I'll make everything dirty, sir." (TD, 11)

Rarely, when Ćosić decides to employ a monotonous structure in his micro-discourses, he uses the first-person plural form of FDS to express the collective attitude of a nation in the turmoil of war. In the Serbian version, the statements are given in a connected manner: punctuation marks between multiple sentences are removed, and the thought becomes a single sentence consisting of several dependent clauses. In this way, Ćosić expresses a stream of consciousness that is spontaneous, disordered, and, therefore, cannot be punctuated. The translator divides the thoughts into several sentences, each marked by a capital letter and a punctuation mark. The example represents a unique instance when Ćosić introduces the collective voice of the masses.

23a) Човек је откад се зна за њега, и види се одмах: дошао усред наше сјеваније кад нам кола низ урвину јуре и испречио се пред руду а може дупе украј а не под гранате које само што не прште по овом кркљанцу где се не зна ни шта смо ни куда ћемо под проваљеним небом те нам од кише и зуби иструлише а сутра ће нам мраз и снег уши и прсте да скрате па ћемо да останемо заувек у рову и раци истој можда ће бити како он каже а ако и с њим не буде боље и тако како рече онда се више ни у кога и ни у шта немамо да уздамо: баш да видимо шта ће и овај човечуљак са жутиим брковима што се у новом шињелу и чизмама до колена с вранцем посиљима и свитом искурчио пред нас кад нам се све смркло да не сване никад јер и нема за шта кад нам је судбина псећа и до рата и у рату. (VS 2, 46)

23b) You can see what a man's like by everything he does: he came right into the middle of our blasted mess when our cart was tearing down the underbush and stuck himself in front of the shaft, but perhaps he had his backside hindmost, but not under the shells which were spurting all over this chaos. We don't know where we're going to go in this cloudburst; our teeth will rot from this rain and tomorrow the frost and snow will rip the top off our ears and fingers and toes. We'll stay in this ditch forever, in the same grave maybe. It will be like he says maybe. It will be even better with him, just as he

says; then there's nothing and nobody to rely on. We'll just see what this man with the yellow mustache will do, the one who turned up here in front of us in his new overcoat and boots up to his knees and his orderlies and his staff, just when everything was black as night and we'll never see daylight again. And what can we do when we had a dog's life before the war and now in the war. (TD, 30)

The following example presents the dream of the sleeping Miloje Dačić. The dream is presented lacking punctuation marks, which is a feature the translator does not replicate in the English language. In his dream, he hears his master, Aćim Katić, addressing him: *шта си Милоје радио до подне сам мораш да покосиш сви косачи су у рату*. The translator does not place this statement inside the quotation marks, although they use interrogative sentence word order: *Aćim waved his stick and said what have you been doing Miloje*.

24a) ...Сам коси Аћимову велику ливаду поред Мораве како замахне косом препелица прхне са јаја жао му јаја препелице кукају око њега Аћим маше штапом шта си Милоје радио до подне сам мораш да покосиш сви косачи су у рату запиње прште јаја причице беже из њих и пијучу пред косом жене за њим преврћу откосе и пласте сено преровски атар се заливадио и с оне стране Мораве зажутела се дуњица заплавела детелина до неба кад ће то да покоси руке му се из рамена чупају жене му прете вилама куле над Планином црни облаци на длановима му пуцају жуљеви лину киша... (VS 3, 388)

24b) He was by himself, mowing Aćim's big meadow beside the Morava. As he swung his scythe, a quail fluttered out of an egg. He felt sorry for the egg; the quails were crying. Aćim waved his stick and said what have you been doing Miloje; you must mow that meadow yourself by noon. All the rapers are in the army now. The eggs spattered and the little birds ran out of them chirruping in front of his scythe. Behind him women turned over the newly cut grass and piled it into stacks. They were mowing the meadows all around Prerovo. The quince were turning yellow on the other side of the Morava and the clover was blue as far as he could see. When would he finish mowing? His arms were nearly wrenched off his shoulders; the women were threatening him with their forks; the clouds were black towers above the mountain; blisters were bursting on the palms of his hand; it was pouring. (RE, 286–287)

4.4 Transformation of Primary Thoughts into Secondary Ones

Example (25) represents a unique instance where the translator places a certain type of speech within parentheses as a secondary thought – *Богдан мисли да сам кукавица*. In this way, the translator attempts to introduce order into the series of different thoughts passing through the mind of Ivan Katić. Not only is the form of FDS placed in parentheses, but it is also transformed into third-person FIS.

25a) ... Мучи се и не може никако да се сети: зашто је цивиле ритао ногом у стражњицу, жирадо шешир, фес, тројица, четврти подигао столицу, герок, онај што је претио Глишићем и војводом Путником: тога је промашио и лупио ногом о зид, можда је и прсте поломио: боли, јесте, боли, може се и без прстију погинути за отаџбину, да, онај уштогљени идиот са жирадо шеширом, кад се брже сазнало да је члан Државног савета, усред Слободе грдио српску интелигенцију, Пашића, за ту господу српски команданти немају памет једног швапског наредника: тада је он устао и распалио га ногом у гузицу, али пре тога попео се на столицу, на столицу или на сто, и викнуо: *Dulce est for patria mori!* Жирадо шешир виче *est, est*, ко је он да ме исправља што сам изоставио *est*, откуд сам баш то изоставио, јесте: ено га на келнерају, тај жирадо шешир, он је узрок, то јест повод, стварно је вређао расположење ђака у Слободи, тај једини жирадо шешир, а да га Богдан није ухватио, Богдан мисли да сам кукавица, он би све те избеглице и позадинске пацове и шимпанзе побацао у Вардар;... (VS 1, 265–267)

25b) Try as he would, he simply could not remember why he had kicked those civilians in the ass, three civilians altogether, including one in a straw hat and one in a fez. A fourth, wearing a flock coat, he had missed, hitting his foot against the wall. Maybe he had broken his toes; his foot sure hurt. Maybe he would die for the homeland without any toes. That stuffy old idiot with the straw hat, a member of the State Council, had berated Pašić and the Serbian intelligentsia right in the middle of the cafe; for those gentlemen the Serbian commanders hadn't as much sense as a German sergeant. Then he had kicked him hard in the ass, but first he had climbed onto a chair, or maybe it was a table, and shouted: *Dulce pro patria mori*. Straw Hat had shouted, "*Est, est*"; who does he think he is to correct me for leaving out *est*, and why did I leave it out anyway? There he is, that Straw Hat, at the bar. It was all his fault; he really had spoiled the mood of the students in the Sloboda, and if Bogdan hadn't caught hold of him (and Bogdan thought he was a coward), he would have thrown all those refugees, those draft-dodging rats and apes into the Vardar... (IB, 193–195)

4.5 Inconsistencies with italicized font

Direct speech is often italicized as if it were an instance of inner speech. In the given example, the statement is quoted because it refers to the past, minimizing the possibility of error. The following direct speech sentence is treated as direct speech by the translator.

26a) Оста сам, али не седе; ослони се шакама о сто пун јутрошњих неповољних телеграма из савезничких престоница и извештаја са бојишта које му је малопре предао министар војске: „Критично! Критичније не може бити, господине председниче.“ „Биће још критичније, господине пуковниче, биће“, узвратио му, с помишљу: Човек који у свакој несрећи не мисли да може бити још теже није за министра у мојој влади... (VS 1, 59)

26b) When Jovanović had gone out. Pašić leaned over his desk, piled high with morning's disagreeable telegrams from the Allied capitals and recent reports from the battlefield: *The situation could not be more critical, Prime Minister. "It will certainly get worse, Colonel."* Pašić murmured, and the thought struck him that a man who didn't think in time of misfortune that things could be even worse didn't belong in his cabinet... (IB, 39–40)

The translator marks the direct speech placed inside the quotation marks with italics, along with the form of FDS in the third person that follows after the closing quotation marks.

27a) ... Сео је уз плот који Адамова нога прескаче, ухватио се за прошће што га Адамове руке сваке ноћи стежу. Запамтио је: „Ти што се сатиру по женама, кратког су века. Убија их нека звезда поноћница коју само они виде, кад обневиде. Њена жишка падне им у срце и нагори га, Тад почне јектика.“ Каква звезда, каква жишка! Те који због жена људима ломе плотове, њих колац убија, секира. На њих трчи пас, нож, куршум, свакојака усмртија. Ноћу гину. (VS 1, 35)

27b) ... Djordje sat down by the fence which Adam's legs jumped every night and seized hold of the fence post which Adam's hands gripped every night. *Those who wear themselves out with women have a short life, he thought. They are blinded by a midnight star which only they can see. Its spark falls into their hearts and burns them up. Then tuberculosis starts. Some star! Some spark! Those who break people's fences to get to women are killed by an ax. They are attacked by dogs, knives, bullets. Death rushes at those who run after women. They perish by night.* (IB, 21)

Example (28) illustrates instances of translation inconsistency within adjacent paragraphs. Ćosić introduces paragraphs of dialogue without explicit replies, where Kosara addresses nervous passengers at the train station. Based on Kosara's responses, it can be inferred what the other passengers' statements might be like. In the following paragraph, she speaks with a soldier who helps her bathe her son in cold water. The soldier's replies are not explicitly given. Evidently, replies are omitted in both paragraphs, so it is unclear why the translator italicizes Kosara's conversation with the passengers, thereby entering the realm of inner discourse, while placing the paragraph in which Kosara has a dialogue with the soldier inside the quotation marks.

28a) Куд сте наврли, госпођо? Стићи ћете у Солун, не брините. Баш ме брига што је класа! Нема класе, господине, кад бежиш из Србије. Нећу да се скинем из воза док се лепо не разјутри. Немам пара за собу, и нећу дете да вучем нишким улицама. Идем у једну праву господску кућу, београдска господа, ви добро знате кад господа устаје. Жалим. Стојте и чекајте док ми се дете не пробуди.

Па шта хоћете, да дојим дете стојећи? Пардон, госпођо. Ако нисте рађали, ви нисте рођени. Жандарма ћете да доведете? Почешаћу се испод пупка кад га видим. Баш ме брига што сте платили карту до Атине. Ја сам платила до Ниша, и све док воз не пође из Ниша, имам право да седим. Ручким ми, сине, још мало. Вуци још. А сад, нека вам је срећан пут, господо, и клекните одмах па се молите Богу да вам бугарске комите не дигну пругу, и воз, и вас, све у ваздух!

Војниче, види се да си човек, чим ти је рат одгризао ногу. Деде, здравља ти, пумпај ми воду да окупам дете. Таква му навика. Чим се надоји, одмах се унереди. Право да ти кажем, идем у праву господску кућу, први пут ће деда и баба да виде унука, и није лепо да им буде неокупан. Ма није ладна. Откад сам га родила, нисам га трипут окупала у топлој води. Лето је још, мушко је, фала богу, и оћу да ми се навикава на ладно. Као што знаш, буразеру, живот је прилично ладан. Не запињи толико, заболеће га од млаза. Живота му име. Није, ваљда, да се и твој син зове Живота? Е баш ми је мило. А ти ми се не подмешташ но стварно мислиш да ми је леп син? Видиш да не плаче од ладне воде. Јуначина моја слатка... Медаљама, златним Обилићима имаш ти да се играш. Здипиће за тебе твоја мајка. Придржи ми га, молим те, да оперем пелене. Е, фала ти, буразеру. Нека бог да, твој син да преживи ту офанзиву што долази на Србију, да ти порасте, и да поштује оца, који за краља и отаџбину даде ногу. (VS 4, 98–99)

28b) *Where are you rushing off to, gentlemen? You'll get to Salonika, don't worry. Who cares whether it's first class! There's no first class when you're fleeing from Serbia. I'm not getting off the train until it's broad daylight. I have no money for a room, and I'm not about to drag my child through the streets of Niš. I'm going to a really fine house, to some gentlefolk from Belgrade, and you know what time they get up. Sorry, you can stand and wait till my baby wakes up.*

"I can see you're decent, Soldier. The war's bitten off your leg. Old man, pump me some water, bless you, to wash my baby. As soon as he's been fed he makes a mess. I'm going to a fine house, it's the first time Grandma and Grandpa will see their grandchild, and he should be clean. No, it isn't too cold. He hasn't been washed in warm water three times since he was born. It's still summer, he's a boy, thank God, and I want him to get used to cold water. Not so fast, the jet will hurt him. See, cold water doesn't make him cry, my little hero. Just hold him, won't you, while I wash his diapers? Thank you, my friend." (SD, 55)

The translator most frequently demonstrates inconsistency regarding italics in the first and fourth part of the tetralogy. Specifically, the first-person plural FDS statements are italicized, which is justified. However, within the same paragraph, there are additional statements of this type of FDS which are not italicized: *Једино српске будале могу да буду идеалисти, кад су нам савезници лорд Киченер, Делкасе, Сазанов и Сонино. Први пут је да се*

прихвати закон света у коме живимо, да се дела по њему и никако друкчије: свим средствима за опстанак и победу, свим! И упорно, докле год је то корисно.

29a) Најпре им мора рећи најгоре. Ратни догађаји се окрећу против Србије. Матица историје вуче нас на дно. Ако је следимо – страдамо; ако јој се супростављамо – може нас и нестати. Оним разноразним идеалистима, чињеницама поразбијати огледала. Бар што се српске политике тиче, од данашњег дана до краја рата и победе, има да се зна: са идеалима у души не води се рат против Фрање Јосифа, Виљема II, Ватикана, грофа Тисе и Радославова. Једино српске будале могу да буду идеалисти, кад су нам савезници лорд Киченер, Делкасе, Сазанов и Сонино. Први пут је да се прихвати закон света у коме живимо, да се дела по њему и никако друкчије: свим средствима за опстанак и победу, свим! И упорно, докле год је то корисно. (VS 4, 104)

29b) He must tell them the worst. The tide of the war was turning against Serbia. *History is pulling us under, he thought; if we succumb, we'll suffer for it; if we oppose her, we may die.* He would shatter idealists with facts. The Serbs couldn't wage war against Franz Josef, Wilhelm II, the Vatican, Count Tisa, and Radolavov with ideals. Only fools could be idealists in Serbia when her allies were Lord Kitchener, Delcasse, Sazanov, and Sonino. The right course was to accept the inevitable and act accordingly, to use all means to secure survival and victory. To persevere as long as it was profitable. (SD, 59)

The first and fourth parts of *This Time, This Land* reveal a wide range of translation inconsistencies: the first-person form of FDS is not italicized, even though italic type is a convention font for this type of experienced speech. In the specific example, the translator recognizes and adds the first-person form as well as the reporting clause, but does not italicize the statement for unknown reasons.

30a) У посљедњој реченици као да му је уздрхтао глас. Зар заиста нема другог излаза? Сутра ме досљедност може учинити и издајником. Стварност ће ме учинити будалом. Слуша сат, чека да му Пашић каже шта је он одлучио. Свакако га није позвао да му каже оно што је до сада рекао. (VS 1, 90)

30b) Did Pašić voice tremble as he spoke the last sentence? Was there no way out? Tomorrow my consistency may make me a traitor and reality show me up as a fool, thought Vukašin. He listened to the clock and waited for Pašić to tell him what he had decided. Certainly, Pašić hadn't sent for him just to tell him this. (IB, 63)

In addition to FDS discourse in the first person, FDS discourse in the second person, in which the character addresses an imaginary interlocutor, should also, according to the previously established code, be in italics. The cited example illustrates a deviation from it.

31a) Наслања се на ограду моста и зуре у мутну, надохлу Рашку у коју су, помисли, пре седам векова у муци гледали Немања и Стефан Првовенчани (и његове мошти понети у избеглиштво!), а од њиховог времена све се на овој земљи променило да буде исто. Исто је, а опет друкчије, као што ова мутна вода није мутна вода Немање и Првовенчаног. И њих су изневеравали савезници, али ни њима част и понос нису били пречи од циља. И они су ћутњом скривали душу. И они су се пред псима сагињали за каменицу и кад каменицу око себе нису видели. Не може бити да је игра изгубљена, господине Поенкаре. Не може бити. (VS 4, 501)

31b) He leaned against the parapet of the bridge and stared at the turbid waters of the Raška, and thought how seven centuries ago Nemanja and his son Stephen the first must have looked at this same river. Since their time everything in the land had changed, only to become the same again. Yet not quite the same, just as this turbid water was not the same. For Nemanja and his son, pride and honor had not been more important than their objectives, yet they too been betrayed by their allies. They too had concealed their souls in silence. The game wasn't lost, Monsieur Poincare – it couldn't be! (SD, 315)

Bogdan Dragović imagines what he would say to his superior if he attempted to extract the identity of a potential assassin through physical violence. If there were another possibility– Bogdan addresses an imaginary interlocutor in the form of FDS discourse in the second person– the conveyance of the content would not occur in the manner presented by the translator. Therefore, the underlined statements should have been placed either in italics or inside the quotation marks, which the translator evidently failed to do.

32a) Ако почне да их туче пред стројем свих шест чета, он ће јурнути на њега и обориће га с кобиле, откинуће му еполете: Ти си официрска битанга и краљевска стока! Сабљашу, батинашу буржујски! Швабе удри, а не српске ђаке и добровољце! Позвати батаљон у касарну, подићи барикаде. Одржати говор и изабрати штаб ђачке побуне. Захтевати да Пашић дође на преговоре. Не пристати на разговоре с војним властима. Антимилитаристичке и патриотске пароле. (VS 1, 223–224)

32b) But if they beat them in front of all six platoons, then he would rush out at Glišić, throw him off his horse, and tear off his epaulets. You lazy, good-for-nothing bastard, you royalist beast, you saber-swinging bourgeois! Hit out at the Austrians, not at Serbian students and volunteers! He would summon the whole battalion to the barracks; they would put up barricades, and no talks with the military! Antimilitaristic and patriotic slogans! (IB, 163)

5. Conclusion

The most common types of translation inconsistencies occur in the area of transposing one form of experienced discourse into another. Specifically, the translator changes the grammatical person from the original statement, which consequently leads to a change in the type of experienced speech. The forms of transformations found in the corpus are the following: FDS (1st person) → FIS (3rd person); FDS (2nd person) → FIS (3rd person); FDS (3rd person) → direct discourse; FIS (3rd person) → FDS (1st person); FIS (3rd person) → FDS (1st person); FDS (1st person) → FIS (3rd person); FDS (3rd person) → FIS (3rd person); FIS (2nd person) → FIS (3rd person); experienced speech → indirect speech. The retention of the grammatical person, and therefore the retention of the same type of experienced discourse, is not considered important. Ćosić tends to introduce different types of experienced discourse within a few sentence structures, even within the same sentence. This type of polyphonic structure of the novel creates a more effective depiction of the characters' inner world. Nevertheless, it is easier for the translator to retain the point of view used in the previous statements than to constantly change it. There are many examples in which the translator makes the necessary transformation in one part of the paragraph, but then fails to do so in another part of it for unknown reasons.

Kovačević (2015: 264) rightly observes that the spoken direct discourse is the least likely to require a marker for its expression. For this reason, other types of discourse must clearly indicate that they do not belong to spoken direct discourse. Otherwise, the omission of a verb would lead to confusion where the component of spoken or unspoken discourse is concerned. However, Ćosić violates this norm due to the above-mentioned reasons, so Kovačević's assertion concerning the necessity of introducing a reporting clause would also have to encompass spoken direct discourse. Since Ćosić does not use orthographic markers where the norm prescribes them, the clear distinction in the component of spoken discourse is lost; therefore, there are examples in which the translator is forced to arbitrarily add the component of spoken or unspoken discourse to certain statements, without contextual indications that would confirm the correctness of his decision. Namely, when observing a certain statement that lacks orthographic markers, it is impossible to assert with certainty, based on any contextual clues, that the statement is expressed as part of the characters' internal monologue. The translator, however, arbitrarily assigns the epithet of spoken or unspoken discourse to these statements.

Ćosić does not make a clear orthographic or spatial distinction between the interlocutors' replies. Elements of FDS or FIS often intertwine within these replies, forming a single unit. When transferring such content into English, the translator separates these replies into distinct units. Not only does the translator separate the interlocutors' replies, but also alters their order to create a more logical sequence. Additionally, there are instances where Ćosić blurs the clear boundaries between sentence structures. The translator reintroduces order by beginning the sentence with a capital letter and ending it with a punctuation mark. These transformations are again the result of the translator's attempt to simplify the reading process. Such transformations significantly diminish the stylistic effect of Ćosić's expression.

The translator also attempts to impose order when it comes to the sequence of thoughts passing through the characters' minds. Ćosić separates such thoughts with commas, while the translator differentiates between primary and secondary thoughts, placing the subordinate ones in parentheses.

Non-referential direct discourse, marked by quotation marks, is italicised. The translator uses this form of emphasis for forms of inner discourse. Only a few lines later, a similar expression, again given in quotation marks, is translated correctly. Such inconsistencies have no logical explanation. The translator can be inconsistent not only within a single paragraph but across several of them. The translator's errors regarding the use of italics primarily occur in the first and fourth parts of the tetralogy, as these sections involve the purposeful use of italics: marking unspoken thoughts and feelings of the characters in the form of FDS in the first and second person. There are instances where italics are used within one sentence structure, while another, formally identical one, is not italicized. The translated sentence is recognized as a form of FDS, with correct grammatical person, and sometimes even with the reporting clause, but it is not italicized. Sometimes errors arise due to the lack of clear distinctions between different forms of experienced discourse (e.g., since the translator is uncertain whether a particular statement is spoken or not, it is transferred into English without any emphasis—there are neither italics nor quotation marks). Karavesović rightly points out that the problem is further complicated by the fact that syntactic criteria are not consistently used in contemporary prose. The perspective and focalization of the narrator and characters intertwine, so the reader must use contextual clues to discern to whom a particular statement belongs: FIS can be seen as a stylistic device, but on a structural level, the translator may face significant challenges, especially in cases where there is a problem in determining reference and resolving structural ambiguities, such as verb deixis (2010: 45–46).

Translating experienced speech is one of the most challenging tasks in translation practice since it preserves the writer's individual expression. From the analysis provided, it can be concluded that the translator copies to a limited extent the narrative structure of the Serbian language. There are deviations in the translations from the syntactic and lexical structure of the original, but despite this, the polyphonic spirit of the novel is preserved. The corpus shows that the expressive function of the tetralogy has been compromised most seriously. Such transformations of the original are a consequence of the fact that translation is a necessary evil since it damages the original text (Palibrk, 2015: 149).

Conflict of interest statement

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

About the author

Svetlana Obradović holds the academic title of Assistant Professor in the narrower scientific field of Specific Languages and the specialized area of Anglistics – English Language and Linguistics at the Faculty of Medicine in Foča, University of East Sarajevo. She has been performing the duties of an academic associate as a Doctor of English Language and Literature since November 4, 2015. Her research fields are Narratology and Contrastive Linguistics-

English and Serbian. She is a member of the Editorial Board of the journal *Biomedical Research*, published by the Faculty of Medicine at the University of East Sarajevo, as well as a member of the team for the International Accreditation of the study programs in Medicine and Medicine in English.

Sources

- Ћосић Д, 2014. Време смрти, Књ.1, Прерово иде у рат, Београд, Лагуна./ Heppell M, 1983. *This Land, This Time, Volume 1, Into the Battle*, San Diego, New York, London, A Harvest/HBJ Book, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Ћосић Д, 2014. Време смрти, Књ. 2, Сувоборска битка, Београд: Лагуна. / Heppell M, 1983. *This Land, This Time, Volume 2: A Time of Death*, San Diego, New York, London, A Harvest/HBJ Book, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Ћосић Д, 2014. Време смрти, Књ. 3, Ваљевска болница, Београд, Лагуна. / Heppell M, 1983. *This Land, This Time, Volume 3: Reach to Eternity*, San Diego, New York, London, A Harvest/HBJ Book, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Ћосић Д, 2014. Време смрти, Књ. 4, Излазак, Београд, Лагуна./ *This Land, This Time, Volume 4: South to Destiny*, San Diego, New York, London, A Harvest/HBJ Book, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

References

- Видановић, М Н, 2015. Типови туђег говора у британским и америчким писаним медијима и њихови еквиваленти у српском. *Наслеђе*, XII (30): 199–208.
- Đorđević R, 2004. *Uvod u kontrastiranje jezika* (6. izd.), Filološki fakultet u Beogradu.
- Greenbaum S, Quirk R, 2009. *A Student's Grammar of the English Language*, Edinburgh, Longman.
- Živković D (ed.), 1992. *Rečnik književnih termina*, Beograd, Nolit.
- Jovanović A A, 2015. *Osnovi teorije prevođenja: sa kritičkim poređenjem prevoda*, Beograd-Zagreb, Factum izdavaštvo.
- Yule G, 1998. *Explaining English Grammar*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Каравесовић Д, 2010. Слободни неуправни говор: енглеско–српске паралеле. *Наслеђе*, VII (15/2): 43–54. UDK 811.163.41:811.111
- Katnić-Bakaršić M, 2001. *Stilistika*, Sarajevo, Naučna i univerzitetska knjiga.
- Ковачевић М, 2012. О типовима туђег говора у роману „Сара“ Петра Сарића. In М. Ковачевић (Ed.). *Лингвостилистика књижевног текста*, 310–330. Београд Српска књижевна задруга.
- Ковачевић М, 2015. *Стилистика и граматика стилских фигура (IV битно допуњено издање)*, Београд, Јасен.
- Николић В М, 2020. Србистичка истраживања типова туђег говора током последње две деценије. *Српски језик*, XXV: 287–301. <https://doi.org/10.18485/sj.2017.22.1.9>

- Палибрк И, 2010. О преводу слободног неуправног говора у романима „Госпођа Даловеј“ и „Ка светионику“. Наслеђе, VII (15/1): 143–152. UDK 811.163.41'367,821.111'255.4-31=16341
- Prins Dž, 2011. Naratološki rečnik. Prev. B. Miladinov, Beograd, Službeni glasnik.
- Рајић Ј, 2010. Слободан неуправни говор: језичка реализација полифоничног исказа у наративном дискурсу. Српски језик, XV: 515–524. UDK 81'367
- Петковић Н, 2006. Огледи из српске поетике (2. изд.), Београд, Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства.
- Ćorac M, 1982. Metaforski lingvostilemi, Beograd, Privredno-finansijski zavod.
- Frangéš I, 1973. Slobodni neupravni govor u prijevodima rimskih klasika na hrvatski književni jezik. Umjetnost riječi, XVII (3): 185–204.