

UNIVERZITET U SARAJEVU – FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET

ODSJEK ZA ANGLISTIKU

ZAVRŠNI RAD

KOMPARATIVNA ANALIZA HRVATSKOG I SRPSKOG PREVODA ROMANA  
“ORKANSKI VISOVI“ AUTORICE EMILI BRONTE

Mentor: prof.dr. Amira Sadiković

Student: Azra Čelik

Sarajevo, septembar 2024.

UNIVERSITY OF SARAJEVO - FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

MASTER THESIS

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CROATIAN AND SERBIAN TRANSLATIONS OF  
*WUTHERING HEIGHTS* BY EMILY BRONTË

Mentor: prof.dr. Amira Sadiković

Student: Azra Čelik

Sarajevo, September 2024.

“Translation is an art. When you read a translation it doesn’t mean it’s a secondary experience. It doesn’t mean you’re not reading the author. It means you are reading the product of two authors: the original author and the translator, who has to read the text, interpret it, and regenerate it in terms that make linguistic sense.” – Mark Polizzott

## Contents

Abstract .....	2
Apstrakt .....	2
Introduction .....	3
Author's biography .....	5
Plot summary .....	6
Theoretical overview .....	8
<i>The peculiarities of literary translation</i> .....	8
<i>Strategies in translation</i> .....	10
Comparative analysis .....	12
<i>Introduction</i> .....	12
<i>Chapter 1</i> .....	13
<i>Chapter 2</i> .....	18
<i>Chapter 3</i> .....	19
<i>Chapter 4</i> .....	20
<i>Chapter 6</i> .....	21
<i>Chapter 9</i> .....	24
<i>Chapter 10</i> .....	24
<i>Chapter 12</i> .....	28
<i>Chapter 14</i> .....	29
<i>Chapter 17</i> .....	30
<i>Chapter 18</i> .....	31
<i>Chapter 20</i> .....	33
<i>Chapter 21</i> .....	33
<i>Chapter 29</i> .....	34
<i>Chapter 32</i> .....	35
<i>Chapter 34</i> .....	36
Conclusion .....	38
Works Cited .....	39

## **Abstract**

The aim of this paper is to examine and observe the ways in which the novel *Wuthering Heights* by Emily Brontë is translated into Croatian and Serbian language and to show the lexical and syntactic differences between these two translations. The paper will first provide a brief theoretical overview of literary translation and strategies that are relevant for literary translation. After that, the main focus of the paper will be on the comparative analysis of contemporary translations in Croatian and Serbian language as well as on commenting and comparing the translation equivalents and linguistic differences in the translations in relation to the novel in the source language.

Key words: translation, comparative analysis, equivalence, lexical differences, syntactic differences

## **Apstrakt**

Glavni cilj ovog rada je da istraži i uoči načine na koje je roman *Orkanski visovi* autorice Emili Bronte preveden na hrvatski i srpski jezik i da prikaže leksičke i sintaksičke razlike između ova dva prevoda. U radu će se prvo prikazati kratki osvrt na teorije književnog prevođenja i strategije koje su relevantne za književni prevod. Nakon toga, glavni fokus rada će biti na komparativnoj analizi savremenih prevoda na hrvatski i srpski jezik i komentarisanju i poređenju prevodnih ekvivalenata i jezičkih razlika u prevodima u odnosu na roman na jeziku izvorniku.

Ključne riječi: prevod, komparativna analiza, ekvivalencija, leksičke razlike, sintaksičke razlike

## Introduction

Every translation starts with the act of reading. The translator cannot simply ponder the best translation equivalents without understanding the source text first. Reading the source text allows the translator to grasp the meaning of the work, both at the surface level (words, phrases, collocations, idioms) and at the underlying level of deeper significance. Immersive reading also gives the translator the needed time and space to analyze any possible challenges the source text imposes and to decide which techniques or strategies he will use to overcome those challenges. A manifold understanding of the source text is the only way to ensure that nothing gets lost in translation.

With this in mind, we can certainly say that literary translation, especially the translation of classics, is a challenging task even for professional translators. Classics are timeless pieces of literature that span over hundreds of pages and they are renowned for their unique writing style, narrative structure and symbolism. They are called classics because they remain the pinnacle of the written word and are yet to be surpassed. Thus, the translator's task is not only to convey the message of the source text, but also to capture the peculiarities of the era in which the classic was written such as historical setting, manner of speech and culture. Literary translation requires a great deal of patience and creativity if satisfying result is to be achieved. Therefore, the translator must completely indulge in the reading experience, otherwise the translation will lack quality in many aspects.

Similarly, one of the most vivid ways of seeing the effectiveness of a text, in its parts and as a whole, is by considering some of the salient ways it might have been written. This is where comparative analysis comes into play which allows us to go a step further and scrutinize the translation process as well as identify the similarities, differences and the overall effectiveness between translations.

Therefore, the aim of this paper is to analyse and compare the novel *Wuthering Heights* by Emily Brontë with its two latest translations in Croatian and Serbian. The focus of the paper is to show the lexical and syntactic differences between them and to closely examine the linguistic choices that needed to be made due to the language differences. The purpose of comparing these two translations is to observe the different strategies that were employed by the two translators and to show how much the translation depends on the way it was initially understood by the translator. We will see to which extent is the translatability possible when it comes to literary texts and how the translation process can vary and give a different result

with different translators. With the right approach, analyzing the existing translations can help in better understanding of both the source text and the translation process itself.

The first part of the paper will provide author's biography and plot summary. Then, a brief overview of theory of translation will be presented, along with the strategies that translators use to deal with issues while doing a translation task. The third part will be the comparative analysis which will consist of listing examples from the novel, which will then be followed by a detailed analysis concerning both vocabulary and syntax.

## Author's biography

Emily Jane Brontë (1818-48) was the daughter of the curate of Haworth in West Yorkshire. She was a sister of Charlotte Brontë (1816-55) who wrote *Jane Eyre* (1847) and of Anne Brontë (1820-49) who wrote *Agnes Grey* (1847). The family has come to seem romantically doom-laden because it was ravaged by consumption. Emily, drawing, like her siblings, on the Gondal and Angira sagas they had begun as children, published *Wuthering Heights*, to less than rapturous acclaim, in 1847. The novel was originally published under the male pseudonym of 'Ellis Bell'. *Wuthering Heights* was Emily's only work, but she also wrote poetry. Emily, with Charlotte, had a brief and unhappy spell of education at the Cowan Bridge Clergy Daughters' School and, later, attended a more congenial institution, Roe Head. She was a governess at a school near Halifax and, in 1842, accompanied Charlotte to Brussels, but returned to Yorkshire later that year. It is generally agreed that Emily was, of all the Brontës, the most rooted in Haworth and the West Yorkshire moors and the most knowledgeable about its flora and fauna, its characters and moods. Emily died of consumption in 1848.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Author's biography is retrieved from John S. Whitley's Introduction to *Wuthering Heights*, Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1992. John S. Whitley's Introduction and Notes were added in 2000.



## **Plot summary**

*Wuthering Heights* is set in Yorkshire moors in the late 18<sup>th</sup> to early 19<sup>th</sup> century. It deals with the story of two generations of neighbours whose fates are intertwined, primarily on the axis of love and hate.

The novel opens up with Mr. Lockwood, a new tenant at Thrushcross Grange, paying a visit to his landlord, Mr. Heathcliff, who resides at a nearby dwelling called Wuthering Heights. Upon his arrival, Lockwood senses the uncanny atmosphere surrounding the place, so he asks the housekeeper at the Grange, Ellen Dean (Nelly), to share the story of Heathcliff and Wuthering Heights. Nelly recounts a complicated story of two families, the Earnshaws and the Lintons.

Mr. Earnshaw, the owner of Wuthering Heights, has two children, Hindley and Catherine. Heathcliff, an orphan of mysterious origins, is saved from the streets of Liverpool by Mr. Earnshaw. Mr. Earnshaw decides to adopt him which causes Hindley to become jealous of the young foundling. In order to prevent possible conflict between his two sons, Mr. Earnshaw sends Hindley away to college. During Hindley's absence, Catherine and Heathcliff form a close bond. After Mr. Earnshaw's death, Hindley returns with his wife to claim Wuthering Heights. Heathcliff is bullied and humiliated by Hindley who starts treating him like a servant. Hindley's wife dies soon after giving birth to a baby boy, Hareton. Hindley, grief-stricken and hopeless, starts coping by drinking alcohol and continues to mistreat Heathcliff.

Meanwhile, Heathcliff and Catherine become curious about a well-off family who live at Thrushcross Grange, the Lintons. The Lintons have two children, Edgar and Isabella, who seem to be very sophisticated and civilized compared to their neighbours at Wuthering Heights. After suffering an injury while spying on the Lintons, Catherine stays with them for a few weeks. She becomes close with Edgar and finds his wealth and beauty intriguing. Catherine returns to Wuthering Heights with changed behavior and mannerisms as she was influenced by Lintons and their lifestyle. Edgar soon proposes to Catherine, and she is torn between him and Heathcliff. She confides in Nelly that marrying Heathcliff would degrade her because Hindley has brought him low. However, she reveals that her love for Heathcliff is deeper than the love she feels for Edgar. Heathcliff overhears only a part of their conversation and, wrongly believing that his love for Catherine is not reciprocated, leaves Wuthering Heights that night. Catherine marries Edgar and moves to Thrushcross Grange and

Heathcliff returns after three years of absence as a wealthy and polished man. There is a mystery surrounding his acquired fortune and everyone is intimidated by him. Heathcliff plans to exact a terrible revenge for his former miseries. Edgar finds Heathcliff's presence unsettling and tries to keep him away from Catherine, but they continue to meet despite Edgar's disapproval. Meanwhile, Hindley lets Heathcliff stay at Wuthering Heights because he is money-hungry.

Soon after, Heathcliff starts pursuing Edgar's sister, Isabella, who develops a growing affection towards him. Catherine's jealousy over their relationship drives her to a state of madness and delirium which lasts for several days. Unaware of Catherine's distress, Heathcliff elopes with Isabella. Catherine later discovers that she is pregnant with Edgar's child. Heathcliff treats Isabella terribly after their wedding because he married her solely as a part of the revenge plan to take Thrushcross Grange from Lintons. Edgar refuses to have any contact with Isabella and feels betrayed by their marriage. Being concerned about Catherine's health, Heathcliff visits Thrushcross Grange and the two of them profess their everlasting love to each other. That night, Catherine dies after giving birth to a baby girl, Cathy. Isabella escapes from Wuthering Heights and gives birth to Heathcliff's son, Linton. Hindley dies six months later and Heathcliff becomes the rightful owner of Wuthering Heights. Heathcliff then starts treating Hareton the same way Hindley once treated him and places him into servitude.

Twelve years pass and Isabella dies. Heathcliff forces Cathy to marry Linton and insists that they live with him at Wuthering Heights. Edgar's health starts declining and Cathy escapes from Wuthering Heights long enough to be with her father before he dies. Linton dies soon after that, and Heathcliff, who manipulated events in his favor, now gains control of both Wuthering Heights and Thrushcross Grange. Cathy reluctantly lives with Heathcliff and Hareton at Wuthering Heights. Mr. Lockwood, who initially rented Thrushcross Grange, returns months later to find Cathy and Hareton in love. Heathcliff, haunted by memories of Catherine, loses his desire for revenge. He dies soon after and is buried beside Catherine. Cathy and Hareton plan to marry and move to Thrushcross Grange, finding a path to reconciliation and peace, suggesting a possible brighter future.

The story ultimately provides redemption for the destructive world it brings before the reader's eyes. The tragic love of the main characters is redeemed in the happy love of their descendants and continues to be redeemed in the consciousness of every future reader.

## Theoretical overview

### *The peculiarities of literary translation*

“The verb “translate” is rooted in the Latin *translatus*, meaning “to bear across,” and indeed translators, living on the edges of two languages, must ferry meaning across a churning sea of possibilities.” (Hond, par. 2). Translation, which is deemed a seemingly impossible art, has remained a powerful tool for the transmission of stories and ideas around the globe. Similarly, translation has made it possible to transcend the boundaries of time and cross the language barriers between nations and cultures. “They have often been overlooked in the artistic and literary process, but translators have long claimed they have the power to change everything.” (Khomami 13).

Literary translation refers to the rendering of originals in which translators are expected to preserve or recreate “the aesthetic intentions or effects that may be perceived in the source text” (Delabastita 69). This wide-ranging definition places the emphasis on a translation modality that calls for the maintenance of not only the contents and plot of the source but also of its artistic and creative value. “The sign of a good translation is that the reader isn’t aware that it is even a translation, making the translators’ work, by definition, unseen.” (Crofts, qtd. in Khomami, par. 20).

In her book “Klasici u prevodu: kratki osvrt“ Sadiković (13) claims that “in addition to an admirable level of knowledge of the language, which goes without saying, a competent translator, as the first condition for work, needs to be able to argue that he understood the text. In the case of a literary text, it is impossible to work on a translation without a true understanding of the original in all its complexity.” (my translation)<sup>2</sup>. A good translator, then, not only possesses a flair for language but is also intuitive, resourceful, and sensitive to the essential qualities of the source text. “In a way, the translator must know the text better than the author. The author is allowed to write intuitively, sometimes blindly—the translator is not. The translator must translate consciously, deliberately.” (Wimmer).

Thus, literary translation is a unique field that requires precise philological knowledge, intellectual preparation, and artistic sense if ‘literariness’ in the target version is to be

---

<sup>2</sup> Sadiković, Amira. *Klasici u prevodu: kratki osvrt*. Malik Books, 2017.

“Uz zavidan nivo poznavanja jezika, koji se podrazumijeva, kompetentnom prevodiocu je, kao prvi uslov za rad, potrebno da argumentirano može tvrditi da je razumio tekst. U slučaju književnog teksta, nemoguće je raditi na prevodu bez istinskog razumijevanja izvornika u svoj njegovoj složenosti.”

achieved. “A literary translator “must have a feeling for the style of the work, the pace of the sentences, the rhythm, as well as the exciting word choices that make you want to keep reading. A word-for-word translation can work for a recipe, but it can’t work for literature.” (Jensen, qtd. in Hond, par. 12).

“Literary translators are required to appreciate meaning, but they must also be prepared to solve the linguistic problems imposed by style, tone, phonoaesthetics, dialect, connotation and metaphor, as well as to tackle the quandaries that derive from text resistance, ideology, and personal interpretation.” (Riera, par. 3). While subjectivity may highlight nuances thought to be of significance at a particular period, this may weaken over time, suggesting the need for retranslations to satisfy new audiences. “Nuances of tone are everything in literature, and figuring out the voice in another language is extremely difficult,” (Bernofsky, qtd. in Hond, par 11). This high degree of subjectivity, together with the fluidity of language and culture, casts doubt on the notion that any single translation of a work can be definitive. “While the original endures and remains eternally young, the translation ages and must be replaced.” (Rabassa).

New translations tend to be culturally closer to the original because the first phase of understanding the source text and solving (or not solving) syntactic and lexical problems has already been done by earlier translations. Therefore, if two or more translations of the same text exist in the same target language, the later translations tend to be closer to the original than the earlier ones. “According to the so-called retranslation hypothesis, retranslations tend to be more source culture oriented than first translations. First translations, the hypothesis runs, deviate from the original to a higher degree than subsequent, more recent translations, because first translations determine whether or not a text (and its author) is (are) going to be accepted in the target culture.” (Desmidt 669).

Creating new and rendered translations can certainly be intimidating, especially when a piece of literature has already been translated many times in the past. There is always the apprehension that a new translation will be “colored“ by the previous ones and that nothing different or original can be offered. However, existing translations should only serve as inspiration and lead the translators to find better translation solutions. If we know that translators are “invisible authors“, then every translation requires a new approach and, therefore, every translation is unique.

## *Strategies in translation*

Every translation task is complex and challenging in its own way. Translators face many obstacles and difficulties when translating different types of texts, but those difficulties are especially heightened when it comes to literary texts. Therefore, translators are compelled to use various strategies to make the translation process somewhat easier. There is a great number of authors whose works we can consult when it comes to different methods and strategies that are used in translation. However, for the purpose of this paper, we will focus only on Mona Baker's taxonomy in her book *In Other Words: A coursebook on translation*.

Baker (26-42) lists eight strategies, which have been used by professional translators, to cope with the problematic issues while doing a translation task:

1. Translation by a more general word

This is one of the most common strategies to deal with many types of nonequivalence. As Baker believes, it works appropriately in most, if not all, languages, because in the semantic field, meaning is not language dependent.

2. Translation by a more neutral/ less expressive word

This is another strategy in the semantic field of structure.

3. Translation by cultural substitution

This strategy involves replacing a culture-specific item or expression with a target language item considering its impact on the target reader. This strategy makes the translated text more natural, more understandable and more familiar to the target reader.

The translator's decision to use this strategy will depend on:

- a) The degree to which the translator is given license by those who commission the translation
- b) The purpose of the translation

4. Translation using a loan word or loan word plus explanation

This strategy is usually used in dealing with culture-specific items, modern concepts, and buzz words. Using the loan word with an explanation is very useful when a word

is repeated several times in the text. At the first time the word is mentioned by the explanation and in the next times the word can be used by its own.

5. Translation by paraphrase using a related word

This strategy is used when the source item is lexicalized in the target language but in a different form, and when the frequency with which a certain form is used in the source text is obviously higher than it would be natural in the target language.

6. Translation by paraphrase using unrelated words

The paraphrase strategy can be used when the concept in the source item is not lexicalized in the target language. When the meaning of the source item is complex in the target language, the paraphrase strategy may be used instead of using related words; it may be based on modifying a super-ordinate or simply on making clear the meaning of the source item.

7. Translation by omission

This may be a drastic kind of strategy, but in fact it may be even useful to omit translating a word or expression in some contexts. If the meaning conveyed by a particular item or expression is not necessary to mention in the understanding of the translation, translators use this strategy to avoid lengthy explanations.

8. Translation by illustration

This strategy can be useful when the target equivalent item does not cover some aspects of the source item and the equivalent item refers to a physical entity which can be illustrated, particularly in order to avoid over-explanation and to be concise and to the point.

The purpose of presenting the above-mentioned translation strategies is to guide the way of analyzing the already published translations. Every translation task involves a significant amount of work and responsibility and, considering the peculiarity of literary translation, the translator is bound to use, if not all, then most of these strategies.

## **Comparative analysis**

### ***Introduction***

The two translations that are used for the comparative analysis are the latest translations of the novel *Wuthering Heights* in Croatian and Serbian language. The latest editions have been deliberately chosen so we could observe the ways in which *Wuthering Heights* is translated in contemporary times and see whether the translations capture the essence of the original text almost two hundred years later. The Croatian version was published in 2013 in Zagreb by Šareni Dućan, and the translator is Neda Paravić, while the Serbian version was published in 2023 in Belgrade by Laguna, and the translator is Živojin Simić. It is interesting to point out that there is a 10-year gap between the two translations as Serbian translations of classics are more up to date. It is by no means implied that Serbian translations are better just because they are updated every few years - only a thorough comparative analysis can determine that.

Likewise, the aim of the analysis that follows is not to criticize the translations in any way, but to illustrate in several important places how complex the translation process is and what kind of dilemmas translators encounter throughout this process. The analysis that follows is intended to demonstrate different approaches of translators and how the results of these approaches contribute to the understanding of the original. Translation analysis is performed at all linguistic levels - phonological, graphological-orthographic, lexical, morphological and syntactic.

The analysis will be done by providing examples from the original text and their translated counterparts in Croatian and Serbian. The example will either be a sentence or an excerpt if more context is needed for the sentence in focus. I will compare the translations with the original, but also with each other. The examples were chosen on the basis of their peculiar lexical semantics and syntax, and the differences and similarities that I noticed while reading the translations. There are also a couple of examples in which the translators interpreted parts, or whole sentences, in completely different ways, and we will see how that affects the meaning and the message that is conveyed. In such cases, and many others, I used the method of back-translation in order to underline the differences even more.

## Chapter 1

English	Croatian	Serbian
1801. I have just returned from a visit to my landlord – the solitary neighbour that I shall be troubled with.	1801. Upravo sam se vratio iz posjeta svojem kućevlasniku – osamljenom susjedu koji će mi zadati muke.	1801. – Tek što sam se vratio iz posete svom kućevlasniku – usamljenom susedu s kojim ću imati neprijatnosti.

This is the opening sentence of the novel where we can immediately notice some salient syntactic differences between the two translations. Both translations start the sentence with an adverbial which is more natural for Croatian and Serbian language, while in English this adverbial is placed after the auxiliary verb 'have'. The Croatian version uses the adverbial 'upravo', while the Serbian version uses 'tek' followed by a dash in order to refer to the year 1801 that is mentioned in the beginning. An English sentence must contain some kind of a subject whether it is a real or dummy subject, but this is not the case in Croatian and Serbian language, so both translations omit the subject (personal pronoun 'I/ja'). As we will see throughout the analysis, Croatian and Serbian tend to omit the subject in many examples. Croatian and Serbian are highly inflected languages, so inflectional morphemes tend to modify a verb's gender which is not the case in English language. Using the strategy of omission is acceptable in this situation because the omission is related to language differences. Translation by omission can be applied only in those cases where the words are not of essential importance i.e. when they are not necessary for the proper understanding of the message of the source text. Furthermore, the Croatian translation retains the relative clause from the original sentence '...that I shall be troubled with/ ...koji će mi zadati muke', while the Serbian translation turns it into a prepositional phrase by adding the preposition 's' before the relative pronoun. Once again, we see that the personal pronoun 'I' is omitted from the relative clause which is affected by the verb choices in both translations. The Croatian version uses the verb 'zadati' which naturally collocates with the noun 'muke', so the translator had to use the personal pronoun in the dative case 'mi'. The Serbian version uses the verb 'imati'/'to have' and therefore the personal pronoun could be omitted. The verb choices further affected some lexical choices. The Croatian translator chose the noun 'muke' and the Serbian translation chose 'neprijatnosti'. Another lexical difference is in the adjective 'solitary' – the Croatian version opted for 'osamljenom', while the Serbian version opted for 'usamljenom' which would literally be translated as 'lonely'. In the English version, the sentence ends with a preposition 'with', while both translations had to add a noun after the



verb. In my opinion, both translators did a great job at conveying the meaning of the original sentence, however the Croatian version opted for better translation equivalents.

English	Croatian	Serbian
‘Mr. Lockwood, your new tenant, sir. I do myself the honour of calling as soon as possible after my arrival, to express the hope that I have not inconvenienced you by my perseverance in soliciting the occupation of Thrushcross Grange: I heard yesterday you had had some thoughts –’	- Lockwood, vaš novi stanar, gospodine. Potrudio sam se posjetiti vas što sam prije mogao nakon svojeg dolaska i nadam se da vas nisam uznemirio upornim salijetanjem da se nastanim na Drozdovu majuru; jučer sam čuo da ste pomišljali...	„Ja sam gospodin Lokvud, vaš novi zakupac, gospodine. Čast mi je što mogu da vas posetim odmah po svom dolasku i izrazim nadu da vas nije uznemirilo moje uporno traženje da mi izdate pod zakup Traškros grejndž: juče sam čuo da ste se nosili mišlju...“

The first thing that can be noticed here is that the Croatian translation retains the original name of the character, while the Serbian translation domesticizes it. This is the practice that is strictly followed throughout both translations – the names of characters are in Croatian left as they are written in English, while in Serbian they are changed as to how they are pronounced. Names are treated differently due to different language standards and norms. In Serbian, names must be written phonetically, while in Croatian they need to be written orthographically. Likewise, when it comes to the names of locations, estates, edifices etc. the Serbian translation does the same thing as with the characters' names, while in the Croatian version the translator comes up with actual names for each place. 'Thrushcross Grange' is a fictional location and it is in Croatian translated as 'Drozdov majur', while in Serbian it is 'Traškros grejndž'. Similarly, the place name 'Pennistow Crag' (mentioned in Chapter 8) is in Croatian translated as 'Penistonske stijene', while in the Serbian translation it is 'Penton Kreg'. The only exception is the place name 'Wuthering Heights' which is also a fictional location and it is translated as 'Orkanski visovi' in both versions. This is because 'Orkanski visovi' is a generally accepted translation equivalent for the title of the book and it has been kept in each new version. Similarly, animal names are treated in the same way as place names in both translations – the Croatian translator comes up with new names and the Serbian translation writes the names as to how they are pronounced. In Chapter 2, the Croatian translator changes the dog name 'Gnasher' to 'Zubo', 'Wolf' to 'Vučko' and 'Juno' to 'Junone'. In Chapter 6, the Croatian translator changes the dog name 'Skulker' into 'Demon'. In Chapter 13, the dog name 'Throttler' is changed into 'Gušo'. Croatian translation is undoubtedly more creative in this case, especially since it can be difficult to come up with new names solely for the purpose of translation. Translating place and animal names also adds a cultural element and

may make the reader relate more to the translation because he recognizes the names as something familiar.

English	Croatian	Serbian
In an arch under the dresser reposed a huge, liver-coloured bitch pointer, surrounded by a swarm of squealing puppies; and other dogs haunted other recesses.	U luku ispod ormara odmarala se tamnosmeđa pointerka, okružena hrpom skvičave štenadi. Drugi psi zadržavali su se poput sablasti u ostalim nišama.	U udubljenju ispod ormara ležala je mrka lovačka kučka, okružena gomilom štenadi, koja su skičala. U ostalim udubljenjima bilo je još pasa.

This example has particularly caught my eye because of the many syntactic and lexical differences between the two translations. Both translations have divided the original sentence into two separate sentences. However, the word order is completely different in the second sentence in both translations. The Croatian version has placed the subject as the first element in the sentence and place adverbial at the end (the same as the SVO order in the English version), while the Serbian translation did the opposite. Intervention in the length of the sentence is a justified translation procedure if there is no way to realize it in a syntactically correct and therefore meaningful way. More precisely, it is justified when the syntactic structure of the original is unsustainable, that is, when the information contained in one sentence of the original cannot be expressed in one sentence in translation.

I would like to point out that both versions translated 'dresser' ('cupboard' in English) as 'ormar/orman' which is not the right translation equivalent. A more precise translation would be 'komoda' which is a piece of furniture that is more likely to have an arch. The arch would have to be big enough for a dog to fit under it, so 'ormar' is not a suitable translation equivalent in this case. Similarly, the verb 'repose' is in Croatian translated as 'odmarala' and in Serbian it is translated as 'ležala'. However, 'repose' has a twofold meaning; it can be a verb which means 'be lying, situated, or kept in a particular place', or a noun which means 'a state of rest, sleep, or tranquility'. It seems that the Croatian translation is closer to the meaning of the noun, while Serbian is closer to the meaning of the verb.

In the original sentence, a 'pointer' is mentioned which is a dog breed. The Croatian translator was not too concerned with giving a precise description of the dog so he opted for 'pointerka'. 'Pointerka' is the standard name for this dog breed in Croatian language, however, it can be considered a loan word because the suffix *-ka* was added to the original word. In this case, the translator used the strategy of translation using a loan word and, for that reason,

'pointerka' could be a vague translation equivalent for some readers who are not familiar with this word. Serbian translator opted for a more general word 'lovačka kučka', thus using the strategy of translation by a more general word. In this case, using a more general word does not affect the meaning and possibly helps the reader to have a better understanding of the original sentence. 'Pointer' could also be translated as 'ptičar' especially if we consider the historical context and the fact that bird hunting was popular during this period.

Neither translation has opted for literal translations of the adjective 'liver-coloured' because a literal translation would produce unnatural translation equivalents in both languages. Both translations opted to use the strategy of translation by a more neutral/less expressive word. Croatian translator chose 'tamnosmeđa', while the Serbian translator chose 'mrka'. I think both of these translation equivalents are great solutions. Croatian translation retained the adjective 'squealing' and translated it as 'skvičave' while the Serbian translation changed the syntax and turned the adjective into a relative clause 'koja su skičala'. However, there is a difference between verbs 'skičati' and 'skvičati' as they are related to different sounds.

The verbs are translated completely different in both translations. Serbian version “avoided“ translating the verb 'haunted' so he turned the sentence into the so-called existential structure '...bilo je još pasa'. In Croatian version the verb 'haunted' is translated as 'zadržavali su se poput sablasti'. Here, the translator used the strategy of translation by paraphrase using related words. In this case, Croatian translation is more descriptive and definitely more creative.

<b>English</b>	<b>Croatian</b>	<b>Serbian</b>
He'll love and hate equally under cover, and esteem it a species of impertinence to be loved or hated again. No, I'm running on too fast: I bestow my own attributes over liberally on him.	On će i ljubiti i mrziti potajno, a biti ljubljen ili omražen smatrat će drskošću. Ne, otišao sam predaleko. Pripisao sam mu preslobodno vlastita obilježja.	On će i voleti i mrzeti prekriveno, a smatrati da je drskost ako ga neko voli ili mrzi otvoreno. Isuviše sam brz: pripisujem mu olako sopstvene osobine.

Here, both translations differ in some way from the English version. Croatian version retained the passive voice 'biti ljubljen ili omražen', however it has changed the word order and placed the passive right after the conjunction 'a'. Serbian translation opted for a *that*-clause and turned the passive voice into active voice. Passive is not as commonly used in Croatian and Serbian language as it is in English, so translators use the substitution strategy in order to replace the passive with the active voice. Retaining the passive voice can sometimes result in

a clumsy sentence construction, so a good way to solve this issue is to transform the sentence at the syntactic level.

There are also some lexical differences as the Croatian version completely omits the adverb 'again', while in the Serbian version this adverb is translated as 'otvoreno'. 'Otvoreno' can be considered an imprecise translation equivalent since 'again' in the original sentence means 'in return' and therefore should be translated as 'zauzvrat'. Also, the Croatian version opted for 'potajno', while the Serbian translation opted for 'prekriveno' as a translation equivalent for 'under cover'. The Croatian translator chose the verb 'ljubiti' which literally means 'to kiss', while the Serbian translator chose the verb 'voleti'/'to love' which is also used in the English version. This is something that is consistent throughout both translations and whenever the verb 'love' is mentioned in Croatian it is translated as 'ljubiti' and in Serbian as 'voleti'. "The verb *ljubiti* (...) and the noun *poljubac* contain more physicality (to express love, affection and sexual desire by touching the lips) than the verb *voljeti* which can include all the strong feelings as well as *ljubiti* only that it does not emphasize physical touch as much. *Ljubljenje* and *voljenje*, as verbal nouns of the mentioned verbs, do not need to be explained separately, the difference is obvious and understandable to everyone. However, in the older language these two verbs were so close to each other that, like synonyms, they could be used interchangeably." (my translation)<sup>3</sup>

When it comes to the second sentence, Croatian translation has split it into two separate sentences, while in the Serbian translation it is one sentence just like in the English version. This is a practice that is not consistent throughout both translations – sometimes the Croatian version will retain one long sentence and sometimes the Serbian version will split the sentence and vice versa. Serbian translation has literally translated the phrase 'I'm running on too fast' as 'isuviše sam brz', while the Croatian translator opted for 'otišao sam predaleko' which is more natural in my opinion. There are also some lexical differences in this sentence as Croatian version opted for 'preslobodno vlastita obilježja', while the Serbian version opted for 'olako sopstvene osobine.' These lexical differences in translation (sometimes even more than syntactic differences) emphasize that there are no "right" translation equivalents. There

---

<sup>3</sup> Nives, Opačić. "Ljubiti i voljeti." Matica Hrvatska, *Vijenac* 593, 24 Nov. 2016.

"Glagol *ljubiti* i imenice *poljub* i *poljubac* ipak sadrže više tjelesnosti (dodirom usnama iskazivati ljubav, naklonost i spolnu želju) od glagola *voljeti*, koji može uključivati sve snažne osjećaje kao i *ljubiti*, samo što toliko ne ističe fizičko dodirivanje. *Ljubljenje* i *voljenje*, kao glagolske imenice spomenutih glagola, ne treba posebno objašnjavati, razlika je očita i svima razumljiva. Ipak, u starijem jeziku ta su dva glagola bila tako blizu jedan drugomu da su se, poput sinonima, mogla i zamjenjivati."

are always two, three or more translations for every word and the translator is left to choose, as well as he can, the one that best suits the purpose. Overall, I believe that Serbian translation has better syntactic choices, while the Croatian translation has better lexical choices in this example.

## Chapter 2

English	Croatian	Serbian
'Is there nobody inside to open the door?' I hallooed, responsively. 'They's nobbut t' missis; and shoo'll nut oppen 't an ye mak' yer flaysome dins till neeght.'	- Zar u kući nema nikoga da mi otvori vrata? – viknuh i ja. - Nema nikoga osim gospođe, a ona vam neće otvoriti vrata makar se derali do noći.	„Zar nema nikoga unutra da mi otvori vrata?“, viknuh. „Samo je gospođa unutra, a ona vam neće otvoriti, pa makar grlo derali do noći.“

Joseph, who is one of the older servants at Wuthering Heights, speaks the purest form of broad Yorkshire dialect. His speech is marked by a strong regional accent and peculiarities that set him apart from other characters. “In Wuthering Heights regional dialect is used by the author to delineate social class and manners. Each principal character is given a distinctive form of speaking to denote his or her social standing”.<sup>4</sup> This can present a challenge in translation as the translator has to convey the speech style of each individual character. Joseph's dialect is unintelligible for the most part and difficult to understand, especially for readers who have not come across this kind of dialect before. This is why most new editions of *Wuthering Heights* provide footnotes with interpretations of Joseph's speech. Some editions do not opt for footnotes and instead rewrite the parts of Joseph's speech into contemporary English (they keep the dialect, but only change a few words for easier understanding). As we can see, Joseph's dialect is something that unfortunately gets completely lost in translation and there is no indication for the reader that his speech is different from the speech of other characters in the novel. It seems that translators have focused more on conveying the meaning, rather than capturing the true essence and significance of Joseph's speech. Therefore, those who read the translations will not experience the distinctiveness of Joseph's speech that we can find in the source text. If retaining the dialect cannot be achieved due to language differences, the translators could try to find archaic words in Croatian and Serbian as translation equivalents. If this is also not

<sup>4</sup> Wiltshire, Irene. “Speech in Wuthering Heights: Joseph's Dialect and Charlotte's Emendations.” *Brontë Studies* 30 (2005): 19 - 29.

achievable then they could try to keep the apostrophes in certain words or write certain words phonetically in order to give the reader an idea of his accent. This would undoubtedly take a lot of effort and research on the translator's part, but it would at least create a similar effect of the source text.

English	Croatian	Serbian
“Then I hope his ghost will haunt you; and I hope Mr. Heathcliff will never get another tenant till the Grange is a ruin,” she answered, sharply.	- Tada se nadam da će vas progoniti njegov duh i da gospodin Heathcliff više nikada neće naći stanara sve dok se ne sruši Drozdov majur – oštro će ona.	„U tom slučaju, nadam se da će ti se njegov duh često javljati, a nadam se da gospodin Hitklif neće više dobiti nijednog zakupca dok postoji Grejndž!“ , odgovori ona oštro.

The first thing that can be immediately noticed here is that translations treat the pronoun ‘you’ differently. The Croatian translator opted for ‘vas’ as a plural second person pronoun that is more formal in its usage, while the Serbian translator used a singular second person pronoun ‘ti’ which is more informal. When addressing someone, the plural second person pronoun is used if we want to show respect. This is a very distinct difference in Croatian and Serbian language which is not the case in English language, so translators have to make a choice and be consistent with it throughout the novel.

### Chapter 3

English	Croatian	Serbian
It was a Testament, in lean type, and smelling dreadfully musty: a fly-leaf bore the inscription— “Catherine Earnshaw, her book,” and a date some quarter of a century back.	Bila je to Biblija, tiskana vrlo uskim pismom i s jakim zadahom plijesni: prazni list na početku knjige nosio je natpis <i>Catherine Earnshaw, njezina knjiga</i> i datum od prije četvrt stoljeća.	Bilo je to Sveto pismo, štampano sitnim slovima, i strahovito je zaudaralo na buđ. Na prvoj, praznoj stranici pisalo je: “Knjiga pripada Ketrin Ernšo“ – a zatim datum od pre četvrt veka.

The first thing that can be noticed here is that the Croatian translation retains one longer sentence, while the Serbian translation divides it into two separate sentences. There are also many salient lexical differences between the two translations. ‘Testament’ is in Croatian translated as ‘Biblija’/’Bible’, while in Serbian it is translated as ‘Sveto pismo’/’Scripture’. It is interesting that neither translation opted for ‘Zavjet’ which would probably be the closest translation equivalent. However, the original does not specify whether this is the Old or New Testament, so translations probably wanted to avoid ambiguity. ‘Lean type’ is in Croatian

translated as ‘tiskana vrlo uskim pismom’ and in Serbian it is translated as ‘štampano sitnim slovima’. Both of these translation equivalents are suitable. I would like to point out the Croatian translation for ‘smelling dreadfully musty’ which is ‘s jakim zadahom plijesni’. This might seem like an unusual choice of words as ‘zadah’ could initially be associated with human and animal breath. However, ‘zadah’ can also be applied to inanimate objects. Therefore, this translation equivalent is appropriate for this description. The Serbian translation of this part is ‘strahovito je zaudaralo na buđ’ which is also a great solution. Another possible translation could be ‘koja se osjetila na buđ’. Furthermore, both translations added a piece of information that is not mentioned in the original sentence - the Croatian added ‘na početku knjige/at the beginning of the book’ and Serbian added ‘na prvoj stranici/on the first page’. Using the addition strategy was necessary since Croatian and Serbian do not have another name for a ‘fly-leaf’. Therefore, ‘prazna stranica/prazan list’ would not be a complete translation equivalent. The part “Catherine Earnshaw, her book,” is in Croatian literally translated as ‘Catherine Earnshaw, njezina knjiga’, while in Serbian it is translated as “Knjiga pripada Ketrin Ernšo“. The back-translation of the Serbian version is ‘This book belongs to Catherine Earnshaw’. Therefore, we can conclude that the Croatian translation is more precise here.

#### Chapter 4

English	Croatian	Serbian
Hindley threw it, hitting him on the breast, and down he fell, but staggered up immediately, breathless and white; and, had not I prevented it, he would have gone just so to the master, and got full revenge by letting his condition plead for him, intimating who had caused it.	Hindley je bacio uteg i pogodio ga u prsa, ali čim je Heathcliff pao, odmah se teturajući dignuo, bez daha i blijed, i da ga nisam zadržala, smjesta bi otišao gospodaru i dobio punu zadovoljštinu, braneći se svojim izgledom i dajući na znanje tko ga je prouzročio.	Hindli baci teg i pogodi Hitklifa u grudi, ovaj pade, ali se odmah diže teturajući se, bez daha i bled; i da se nisam umešala, on bi otišao pravo gospodaru i dobro se osvetio pustivši da njegovo stanje govori umesto njega, a on bi imao samo da kaže ko ga je prouzrokovao.

The only thing that I would like to point out here are the tenses that are used for narration. The English version uses past simple, present perfect and past perfect as well as the –ing form. This can pose a challenge in translation as the translator has to pay attention to each individual verb and which tense he will choose. The sentence in the Croatian translation is written by using *perfekt* e.g. ‘je bacio’, while the sentence in the Serbian one by using *aorist* e.g. ‘baci’. However, both translations use *glagolski prilog sadašnji* e.g. ‘teturajući’ and

Serbian translation also uses *glagolski prilog prošli* e.g. ‘pustivši’. The alternating use of past and present tense in Croatian and Serbian language does not in any way jeopardize the understanding of the time to which the narrative refers. Therefore, translations have more freedom with verb choices and tense agreement. Something that I have noticed throughout the analysis is that Croatian has a tendency to use *perfekt*, while the Serbian has a tendency to use *aorist* for narration just like in this example. Similarly, both translations use *glagolski prilog sadašnji* and *glagolski prilog prošli* for translating the –ing form.

## Chapter 6

English	Croatian	Serbian
The household went to bed; and I, too anxious to lie down, opened my lattice and put my head out to hearken, though it rained: determined to admit them in spite of the prohibition, should they return.	Svi su ukućani otišli spavati, a ja sam otvorila rešetku na prozoru i gurnula glavu van osluškujući, premda je kišilo, jer sam odlučila pustiti ih u kuću, ako se vrate, unatoč zabrani.	Svi su otišli na spavanje, a ja, suviše zabrinuta da bih mogla spavati, otvorila sam kapak od prozora i promolila glavu napolje da bih osluškivala, iako je padala kiša, rešena da ih pustim unutra ako se vrate, uprkos zabrani.

The word 'household' is in Croatian translated as 'ukućani' and in Serbian it is translated as a pronoun 'svi'/everyone'. In this case, the Croatian translation equivalent is closer to the original because Serbian has replaced it with a more general word, possibly assuming that the reader understands from the context that Nelly is referring to people who live in the house. The Croatian translation has, for some reason, completely omitted the part 'too anxious to lie down' while Serbian has accurately translated it. There are also a few differences in verb choices; 'put my head out' is in Croatian translated as 'gurnula glavu van' and in Serbian it is translated as 'promolila glavu napolje'. Both of these translations are suitable, but the Serbian translation sounds better in my opinion. Furthermore, both translations have placed the constituent 'spite of the prohibition' in the last place, while in the original it comes before the last comma. Translation of 'should they return' is a good example of the so-called *translation shift* or more precisely a *class shift*. Class shift occurs when the translation equivalence of a source language item is a member of a different class from the original item.<sup>5</sup> In this case, the verb 'should' is translated as a conjunction 'ako/if'. 'Should' cannot be translated literally in this context because it is not used as a modal auxiliary verb. Therefore, translators had to

<sup>5</sup> Fouad, Ammar and Sadkhan Ramadhan. "Translation Lexical Shifts in 'The Swing' with Reference to Culture-Specific Items." *ResearchGate*, 2015, pp. 6.



choose a word that belongs to a different word class in order to accurately convey the meaning of the original sentence.

<b>English</b>	<b>Croatian</b>	<b>Serbian</b>
Old Mr and Mrs Linton were not there; Edgar and his sister had it entirely by themselves.	Gospodin i gospođa Earnshaw nisu bili ondje; Edgar i njegova sestra bili su sami.	Stari gospodin i gospođa Linton nisu bili tu, samo Edgar i njegova sestra.

The first thing that we can notice here is that the Croatian translator has mistaken the surnames and wrote Earnshaw instead of Linton. In this part of the novel Heathcliff and Catherine (whose last name is Earnshaw) are spying on the Lintons, so the Croatian translation implies that they are spying on themselves which is not possible of course. This was probably an unintentional mistake and one that might even go unnoticed by some readers. It is not unusual for slip ups of this kind to occur considering the vast amount of information the translator is processing at the same time. However, this example shows that close reading and proof-reading are crucial when it comes to literary translation. The same kind of mistake can be found later in the following sentence of Chapter 30 – ‘He said Mrs Linton was ‘thrang,’ and the master was not in’. The Serbian translation of this sentence is: ‘Rekao je da je gospođa Hitklif za poslom, a da gospodar nije kod kuće.’ Here, it is the Serbian translator who has mistaken the surnames and wrote ‘Hitklif’ instead of ‘Linton’. This kind of mistake is unacceptable and cannot be overlooked since it can possibly affect the meaning or proper understanding of the source text.

Going back to the first example, the adjective ‘stari’/‘old’ can be found in the Serbian translation, while the Croatian translation has omitted it for some reason. Furthermore, the Croatian translator chose ‘ondje’ and Serbian translator chose ‘tu’ as translation equivalents for the adverb ‘there’. Both of these equivalents are correct because they are synonyms. The second part of the sentence is different in both translations compared to the original sentence. The Croatian translator opted for ‘Edgar i njegova sestra bili su sami.’ If we were to do a back-translation this would mean that ‘Edgar and his sister were alone.’ The Serbian translator opted for ‘samo Edgar i njegova sestra’ which would translate to ‘only Edgar and his sister (were there)’. The Serbian translator probably wanted to avoid repetition so he elided ‘were there’ in the second part of the sentence. It is interesting that neither translation chose ‘imali su cijelu prostoriju samo za sebe’ which would probably be the closest translation of the

original sentence. Overall, the Serbian translation leaves a greater impression because it has accurately conveyed the content of the original sentence.

English	Croatian	Serbian
The cowardly children crept nearer also, Isabella lisping - 'Frightful thing! Put him in the cellar, papa. He's exactly like the son of the fortune-teller that stole my tame pheasant. Isn't he, Edgar?'	Doplazila su i kukavička djeca, a Isabella je zašušketalala: 'Štrašno štvorenje! Štrpaj ga u podrum, tata! Ižgleda baš kao šin vračare koja mi je ukrala fažana, žar ne, Edgar?'	Kukavička djeca se došunjaše bliže, a Izabela provriska: 'Strašno stvorenje. Tata, stavi ga u podrum. Isti je kao sin onog gatara što je ukrao mog pitomog fazana, je'l da, Edgare?'

This example is particularly interesting because the translators approached the source text in a completely different way. Lisping is mentioned in the original sentence which is a speech impediment that specifically relates to making the sounds associated with the letters 's' and 'z'. The Croatian translator opted to retain this verb as 'zašušketalala' and transform the sentence to sound as if Isabella actually has some kind of a lisp when she is speaking. The translator did this by replacing the letters 's' and 'z' with the letters 'š' and 'ž'. These letters do not exist in the English alphabet and they are typically referred to as "diacritic letters" or "letters with diacritical marks". These marks indicate specific pronunciation or phonetic values. The letter 'š' is pronounced like the English 'sh' sound, as in 'shoe' or 'shower'. The letter 'ž' is pronounced like the 's' in 'measure' or the 'g' in 'genre'. The Croatian translator successfully achieved the effect of the source text by adding these letters and creating lisping sounds. The Serbian translator did not retain the verb 'lisping' and decided to use the verb 'provriska' which literally means 'started screaming'. Therefore, the Serbian translator did not experiment with sounds due to the different verb choice and thus did not truthfully reflect the content of the original. The Croatian translation is definitely more creative and adding such a seemingly small detail definitely enriched the translation and also made it more accurate. Furthermore, the verb 'crept nearer' is in Croatian translated as 'doplazila', while in Serbian it is translated as 'došunjaše bliže'. 'Došunjaše' might be more common verb than 'doplazila'. However, the Croatian translation equivalent is definitely an interesting choice.

## Chapter 9

English	Croatian	Serbian
It was far in the night, and the bairnies grat, The mither beneath the mools heard that,	»Duboka je noć, i dječica plaču, a majka pod zemljom ih čuje...«	U gluvoj noći plač dečiji majku u grobu uznemiri...

These two lines are from a translation of an ancient Danish ballad called 'The Ghaist's warning'. Nelly is humming these lines while she is putting baby Hareton to sleep. As we can see, this is not a typical nursery rhyme which has memorable and amusing lyrics. The tone of this song is dark and gruesome which is also reflected in the translations. In this case, it seems that the Serbian translation reads more smoothly than the Croatian translation. However, the original lines have an end rhyme 'grat-that' and there is no rhyme in the translations. It seems that both translators have focused more on conveying the meaning of the lines rather than achieving the same effect of the original. There is a possibility that translators did not feel the need to make these lines sound "catchy" since this is not a traditional nursery rhyme. In situations like these, translators would usually need to experiment with syntax and lexical choices in order to achieve the rhyme. However, the rhyme in this example is not particularly demanding and it would only take a little bit of effort on the translator's part to convey it. Therefore, a possible translation of these lines is:

Gluho doba noći  
i dječica plaču  
pod zemljom duboko  
majka ih ču...

## Chapter 10

English	Croatian	Serbian
It was not the thorn bending to the honeysuckles, but the honeysuckles embracing the thorn.	Ona se nije morala prilagođavati njima, već oni njoj, jer trn se ne uvija oko kozje krvi nego kozja krv grli trn.	Nije se trn savijao oko cveta, već se cvet savijao oko trna.

The English sentence in this example is the so-called *it*-cleft sentence which falls under the category of non-canonical sentence structures. Non-canonical sentence constructions (or information-packaging constructions) in English depart from the basic SVO word order in an

English sentence. The major function of *it*-cleft sentences is to put into focus the element that the author wants to emphasize and also to place heavier constituents towards the end of the sentence.<sup>6</sup> Thus, their syntax is more complex which makes them harder to translate. Neither translation added any elements of emphasis to achieve the effect of the *it*-cleft sentence. We can notice that the Croatian translation is significantly longer because the translator decided to add certain elements to the sentence. A subject is inserted in the Croatian version which is not mentioned in the source text – 'ona'/'she' which refers to Catherine. In fact, the entire part 'Ona se nije morala prilagođavati njima, već oni njoj' cannot be found in the source text. For some reason the translator felt the need to add this extra piece of information, perhaps in order to clarify the meaning of the upcoming sentence for the reader. Therefore, the addition strategy is not justified in this example as the translator has not used it because of the absence of a translation equivalent, but has rather attempted to embellish the translation or add a possible interpretation of the original sentence. The translation of the original sentence comes after the second comma: 'jer trn se ne uvija oko kozje krvi nego kozja krv grli trn.' On the other hand, the Serbian translator does not assume what the author meant, but translates the sentence in the way it is written which is always a better option. Croatian translator decided to change the word order into SVA, thus deviating from the non-canonical syntax of the original sentence. The translation is written in present simple tense, while the original is written in past simple tense. On the other hand, the Serbian translation starts the sentence with a negative form of the verb *be* - 'nije', so it does not follow the SVA word order. Serbian translation keeps the past simple tense. There is a difference in verb choices between the translations. The Croatian translator chose 'uvija' as the translation equivalent for 'bending' and 'grli' as the translation equivalent for 'embracing'. The Serbian translator chose 'savijao' as the translation equivalent for both 'bending' and 'embracing'. I think that Croatian translation is more precise when it comes to verb choices because honeysuckle is known for its intertwined stems and these verbs help the reader visualise this particular flower. There is also a difference in lexical choices as the Croatian translator opted for 'kozja krv' as a translation equivalent for 'honeysuckles'. Serbian translator chose 'cvet'/'flower', thus using the strategy of translation by a more general word. Overall, I would say that the Serbian translation leaves a greater impression because the Croatian use of the addition strategy was unnecessary. The addition strategy is acceptable only if an element of the source language does not exist in the same form in the target language which is not the case in this example.

---

<sup>6</sup> Ward, Gregory and Birner Bett. *Information Structure and Noncanonical Syntax*. Basil Blackwell, 2004.

English	Croatian	Serbian
It ended. Well, we <i>must</i> be for ourselves in the long run; the mild and generous are only more justly selfish than the domineering; and it ended when circumstances caused each to feel that the one's interest was not the chief consideration in the other's thoughts.	A tada je sreći došao kraj. Pa, na koncu konca, svi mi <i>moramo</i> misliti ponajprije na sebe, samo što blagi i plemeniti imaju više prava biti sebičniji od nasilnih. Njihova je sreća završila kada su ih okolnosti navele na to da interesi jednoga nisu bili glavna briga u mislima drugoga.	Tome je došao kraj. Svaki čovek <i>mora</i> misliti na sebe u krajnjoj liniji; blagi i velikodušni samo su pravednije sebični od oholih. Njihovoj sreći je došao kraj kad su okolnosti pokazale da interes jednog ne zauzima središnje mesto u mislima drugog.

There are many lexical differences that I would like to point out in this example. 'It' refers to Edgar's and Catherine's happiness that is mentioned in the paragraph before this sentence. Even though the reader can understand from the context what is being referred to, the Croatian translator decided to add the noun 'sreći'. Likewise, Croatian translation added 'tada' and the Serbian translation added 'tome'. In the original we have the verb 'ended', while both translations opted to use verb + noun 'došao kraj'. It is interesting that neither translation opted for 'to je završilo' which would be a literal translation. 'We' is in Croatian translated as 'svi mi'/'all of us' so the Croatian retained the plural, while in Serbian it is translated as 'svaki čovjek/ every person', thus the Serbian opted for singular. The translation of 'in the long run' is particularly interesting as Croatian has opted for 'na koncu konca', while the Serbian opted for 'u krajnjoj liniji'. These translation equivalents are synonymous, so they are both acceptable. Another translation equivalent could be 'na kraju krajeva'. It seems that Croatian has also added 'ponajprije' as an additional or alternative translation equivalent. The part 'the mild and generous are only more justly selfish than the domineering' is translated in different ways and I will use back-translation to highlight the differences. In Croatian, the back translation would be 'only the mild and the noble have more right to be more selfish than the violent', while in Serbian the back translation would be 'the mild and the generous are only more righteously selfish than the arrogant'. We can say that Serbian translation is closer to the original and also sounds more natural in my opinion. Furthermore, both translations divided the sentence into two separate sentences starting with 'it ended'. We have the same sentence as in the beginning and translations did not opt for literal translation once again. In Croatian we have 'njihova je sreća završila' and in Serbian we have 'niihovoj sreći je došao kraj'. Both translations decided to translate the same sentence in a different way than they did before in order to avoid repetition. The verb 'cause'

is in Croatian translated as ‘navele’ and in Serbian as ‘pokazale. In this case, Croatian equivalent is closer to the original. Lastly, ‘chief consideration’ is in Croatian translated as ‘glavna briga’ and in Serbian as ‘središno mesto’. Even though both translations chose completely different translation equivalents, the overall meaning stayed the same.

<b>English</b>	<b>Croatian</b>	<b>Serbian</b>
‘You are a dog in the manger, Cathy, and desire no one to be loved but yourself!’	»Ti si kao pas u jaslama, Cathy, ne jede sijeno, a ne da blagu da ga jede, i želiš da svi samo tebe vole!«	'Keti, ti si kao onaj pas što niti kost glođe niti je drugom daje, i želiš da samo ti budeš voljena!'

Here, both translations offer creative solutions. In this context, *a dog in the manger* refers to someone who will not use what is wanted by someone else, but will not surrender it to that person. Croatian translation retained 'pas u jaslama' and also added 'ne jede sijeno, a ne da blagu da ga jede', while the Serbian translation opted for 'niti kost glođe niti je drugom daje'. Therefore, the Croatian translation used the addition strategy, while the Serbian translation used the substitution strategy. Addition and substitution were not necessary in this case, but they are acceptable because they truthfully convey the meaning of the original. These translation equivalents could also be considered culturally specific because these sayings or proverbs are used only in Croatian and Serbian language and they would completely lose their initial meaning if we were to do a back translation into English. Similarly, both translations inserted 'kao' ('like' in English) in order to add comparison. Furthermore, the Serbian translation retained the passive voice of the original 'budeš voljena' while the Croatian translation turned it into active voice 'svi samo tebe vole'. Retaining the passive is suitable since the passive here implies that there is no agent of the action, which is exactly what is written in the original.

<b>English</b>	<b>Croatian</b>	<b>Serbian</b>
Even you, Nelly, if we have a dispute sometimes, you back Isabella at once; and I yield like a foolish mother: I call her a darling, and flatter her into a good temper.	I ti, Nelly, ako se katkada porječemo, odmah staješ na njezinu stranu i popustiš joj kao glupa majka. Zovem je 'draga' i laskam joj da se oraspoloži.	Čak i ti, Neli, ako se nas dve sporečemo ponekad, odmah se stavljaš na njenu stranu, a ja popuštam kao luckasta mati: tepam joj i laskam dok joj se ne vrati dobro raspoloženje.

It seems that translators understood the source text in different ways. 'And I yield like a foolish mother' is in Croatian translated as 'i popustiš joj kao glupa majka'. This implies that Nelly is the one who yields which is not the case because Catherine is describing herself here.

The Serbian translation is 'ja popuštam kao luckasta mati' which is the same as the original meaning and has been translated accurately.

## Chapter 12

English	Croatian	Serbian
<p>“The black press? Where is that?” I asked. You are talking in your sleep!</p> <p>“It’s against the wall, as it always is,” she replied. ‘It does appear odd - I see a face in it!’</p> <p>“There is no press in the room, and never was,’ said I, resuming my seat, and looping up the curtain that I might watch her.</p>	<p>»Crni ormar? Gdje je on?« upitala sam. »Vi pričate u snu!</p> <p>Ondje, uza zid, kao i uvijek«, odgovorila je. »Doista izgleda čudno— vidim jedno lice u njemu!«</p> <p>U ovoj sobi nema ormara, nije ga nikad ni bilo«, rekla sam, sjela i odmaknula zavjesu da je mogu promatrati.</p>	<p>‘Crni orman? Gde je?’, upitah je. ‘Govorite u snu! Nema ormana u sobi, niti ga je ikad bilo, rekla sam joj ponovo, sela i podigla zavesu da bih joj posmatrala lice.</p>

Both Croatian and Serbian translator opted to translate 'black press' as 'ormar'/'orman'. In the English edition of *Wuthering Heights* that is used for this analysis a note is provided which says that black press is a machine used for pressing cloth. However, some other editions have interpreted 'black press' as a mirror or as a piece of antique furniture that functions as a linen cupboard. Therefore, the translation might depend on the edition of *Wuthering Heights* that the translator is consulting. In this case, the translators used the strategy of translation by a more general word, possibly to avoid ambiguity. Furthermore, we can notice that the Serbian translation is significantly shorter because Catherine's reply has been skipped over and completely omitted. I believe this is an unintentional omission as there is no other reason for this part of the dialogue to be missing. The Serbian translation excludes important information about the character who is uttering this sentence because it reflects Catherine's state of delirium. We can conclude that the Croatian translation is undoubtedly more accurate here.

English	Croatian	Serbian
<p>I performed the duty of a faithful servant in telling you, and I have got a faithful servant’s wages!</p>	<p>Obavila sam dužnost vjerne sluškinje što sam vam sve ispričala pa sam i dobila plaću vjerne sluškinje!</p>	<p>Izvršila sam dužnost vernog sluge opomenuvši vas, i zbog toga sam nagrađena grdnjom kao da sam neverni sluga!</p>

It seems that translators have understood the second part of the original sentence differently. Croatian has literally translated it as 'pa sam i dobila plaću vjerne sluškinje' which is the same

thing that is written in the original. Knowing the context, what Nelly meant by 'faithful servant's wages' is that she did not actually get paid, but was rather scolded by Edgar for not telling him about Catherine's condition. This underlying meaning is reflected in the Serbian translation 'i zbog toga sam nagrađena grdnjom kao da sam neverni sluga!' The back translation of the Serbian version is 'and for that I was rewarded with a scolding as if I were an unfaithful servant!'. The Serbian translation went above the word level and translated the true meaning of the source text. However, we can conclude that the Croatian translation is more accurate because the translator did not assume what the author meant and rather translated the sentence in the way it was written. The translator is not supposed to embellish the translation as that it is an intervention in the author's choice of words. It should be up to the reader to interpret the sentences and there is no need for translator to do that.

#### **Chapter 14**

<b>English</b>	<b>Croatian</b>	<b>Serbian</b>
He might as well plant an oak in a flower-pot, and expect it to thrive, as imagine he can restore her to vigour in the soil of his shallow cares!	Mogao bi zasaditi i hrast u lonac za cvijeće i nadati se da će ondje rasti kao što misli da će joj vratiti snagu na tlu svoje plitke skrbi.	Što on uobražava da će na tlu svojih plitkih osjećaja moći da joj vrati snagu isto kao kad bi posadio hrast u saksiju za cveće i očekivao da nikne!

While the Croatian translator kept the same word order as it is in the original, the Serbian translator opted to completely change it. Even though the Croatian version is closer to the original in the sense that the sequence in which the information is conveyed is the same as in English, the Serbian one sounds natural as well. However, the Croatian translation changes the sentence into a declarative form and the Serbian keeps the exclamative form. There are also many lexical differences between the translations. 'Flower-pot' is in Croatian translated as 'lonac za cvijeće' which is a literal translation and in Serbian it is translated as 'saksiju za cveće'. Both translations equivalents are acceptable. The verb 'plant' is in Croatiaian translated as 'zasaditi' and 'posadio' in Serbian. This is the same verb 'saditi' just with different prefixes. Croatian and Serbian language have many variants of the same verb due to prefixes and suffixes so translators tend to have more freedom with verb choices without affecting the meaning. Similarly, the verb 'thrive' is in Croatian translated as 'rasti' and 'nikne' in Serbian. Both of these translation equivalents are appropriate. Overall, I would say that both translation managed to accurately convey the meaning of the original sentence.



<b>English</b>	<b>Croatian</b>	<b>Serbian</b>
My history is <i>dree</i> , as we say, and will serve to wile away another morning.	Moja je priča duga i zamorna, pa će vam dobro doći da vam prođe još jedno poslijepodne.	Moja priča se <i>otegla</i> , kao što mi kažemo, i poslužiće da vas zabavi još jedno jutro.

'Dree' is an archaic word which means 'long' in this context. The Serbian translator has to be complemented on his creative approach because he chose the verb 'otegla' as a translation equivalent for 'dree'. 'Otegla' is a culturally specific term which literally means 'dragged out/on'. Therefore, we can say that the Serbian translation used the strategy of translation by cultural substitution. On the other hand, the Croatian translation chose two adjectives 'duga i zamorna' as a translation equivalent for 'dree'. The Croatian translator omitted one part of the sentence and that is 'as we say' because 'duga i zamorna' is a neutral expression, so adding this part would be redundant. However, the Serbian translation had to retain this part 'kao što mi kažemo' because he used a culturally specific term and it is actually something that people would naturally say or use in a conversation. Similarly, 'wile' is another archaic word which means to lure or entice. However, in this context we have 'wile away' which means to spend or pass time especially in a leisurely or pleasurable fashion. The Croatian translation chose 'prođe' and Serbian translation chose 'zabavi' as a translation equivalent for 'wile away'. The Croatian translation is a bit closer to the original meaning, but the Serbian translation is still accurate. Overall, I would say that the Serbian version offered more imaginative solutions in this case.

### **Chapter 17**

<b>English</b>	<b>Croatian</b>	<b>Serbian</b>
And dreary, and chill, and dismal, that morrow did creep over!	I tako se došuljao taj dan – i pust, i leden, i tužan!	Tmurno, turobno, hladno jutro izazivalo je jezu!

The English sentence departs from the standard SVO word order. 'That morrow' is the initial subject of the sentence and has been moved from its canonical position to the right. The Croatian translation has changed the word order and placed the clause 'i tako se došuljao taj dan' in the beginning which is the clause that comes after the comma in the original sentence. The English sentence uses the auxiliary verb *did* for emphasis and this emphasis is in Croatian achieved by starting the sentence with 'i tako'. Changing the word order also contributed to the emphasis because the emphasis would not have had the same effect if the

translator decided to keep the syntax of the original sentence. Likewise, by moving the second clause to the beginning and retaining the emphasis conveys the information to the reader in a more logical sequence. On the other hand, the Serbian translation does not change the word order and does not add any elements for emphasis. Therefore, syntactically, the Croatian translation reads more naturally than the Serbian one. Croatian used the verb 'došuljao' which is a precise translation for 'creep over'. However, Serbian used the verb 'izazivalo' which completely changes the meaning of the entire sentence. The Serbian translation implies that this day was causing dread which is not the meaning of the original sentence. The meaning of the original sentence is that a new day arrived and this is reflected accurately only in the Croatian translation. There are also many lexical differences; 'morrow' is in Croatian translated as 'dan'/'day' and in Serbian it is translated as 'jutro'/'morning'. 'Morrow' is an archaic word which means 'the following day', so both translation equivalents are acceptable here. It is interesting that all three adjectives are translated in a different way. 'Dreary' is in Croatian translated as 'pust' and 'tmurno' in Serbian; 'chill' is in Croatian translated as 'leden' and 'hladno' in Serbian; 'dismal' is in Croatian translated as 'tužan' and 'turobno' in Serbian. Overall, we can say that the Croatian translation has better syntactic and lexical choices.

### Chapter 18

English	Croatian	Serbian
<p>“He is not at home then, is he?” I panted, quite breathless with quick walking and alarm. “No, no,” she replied: “both he and Joseph are off, and I think they won’t return this hour or more. Step in and rest you a bit.”</p>	<p>»Znači da ga nema kod kuće?« Bila sam bez daha od od hodanja i uzrujavanja. »Ne, nije«, odgovorila je. »Nema ni njega ni Josepha, a mislim da se još neće vratiti. Uđite i predahnite.«</p>	<p>'Znači, on nije kod kuće?', upitah je zadihana od brzog hoda i uzbuđenja. 'Nije, nije, i on i Džozef su otišli i mislim da se neće vratiti pre jednog sata. Uđite i odmorite se malo.</p>

I would like to point out the mistake that has been made in the Croatian translation. The question that has been asked is 'Znači da ga nema kod kuće?' and the reply is 'Ne, nije.' The logical answer would be 'Ne, nema' because 'nije' does not match the verb that is used in the question. If the question was 'Znači da nije kod kuće?' than the answer 'nije' would be possible. We can assume this was done unintentionally because this is the only instance where I could notice a grammatical mistake of this kind in the Croatian translation. As we can see,

in the Serbian translation the question is 'Znači, on nije kod kuće?' and the reply is 'Nije, nije' which is used correctly.

English	Croatian	Serbian
Then the language he had held to her rankled in her heart; she who was always “love,” and “darling,” and “queen,” and “angel,” with everybody at the Grange, to be insulted so shockingly by a stranger!	Jezik kojim joj se obratio pekao ju je kao rana. Nju da tako strahovito uvrijedi neznanic! Nju, kojoj su se svi na majuru obraćali s »ljubavi«, »kraljice«, »anđele«.	A nagrizable su joj srce i reči koje joj je uputio. Zar nju, za sve u Grejndžu uvek 'milu', 'dragu', 'kraljicu', 'anđela', toliko da uvrijedi jedan tuđinac?

Croatian translation divided the original sentence into three separate sentences and also changed the word order. Serbian translation divided the original sentence into two separate sentences. We can notice that the Croatian translator uses the word 'nju' twice and places it at the beginning of the sentence. This is known as *structural parallelism* which is the repetition of the same syntactic pattern in several sentences in a row, with new or partly new vocabulary. *Structural parallelism* is a rhetorical device which contributes to coherence of the text. One sentence becomes an image of the previous one, and the reader senses the similarity.<sup>7</sup> We can assume that this is exactly what the Croatian translator wanted to achieve here. The translations change the sentence form – the original sentence is exclamative while the Croatian translation has two declaratives and one exclamative sentence. Serbian translation changes the second sentence into an interrogative. There are also some lexical differences. ‘Language’ is in Croatian translated as ‘jezik’ which is a literal translation, while in Serbian it is translated as ‘reči’/’words’. Both of these translation equivalents are suitable in this context. The verb ‘held’ is in Croatian translated as ‘obratio’ and in Serbian it is translated as ‘uputio’. Again, both of these verb choices are appropriate. ‘Rankled in her heart’ is in Croatian translated as ‘pekao ju je kao rana’ and in Serbian it is translated as ‘nagrizable su joj srce’. Even though the Serbian translation is more similar to the original, the Croatian translation still made a great choice. For some reason the Croatian translation omitted the adjective 'darling' and only translated the other three adjectives, while the Serbian translation kept all four adjectives. Overall, I think that both translations managed to convey the meaning of the original despite the different syntactic and lexical choices.

<sup>7</sup> Hasselgård, Hilde, et al. *English Grammar – Theory and Use*. Scandinavian University Press, 2012.

## Chapter 20

English	Croatian	Serbian
But he had sense to postpone complaining: there might be compensation within.	No bio je dovoljno pametan da pritužbe ostavi za poslije, jer je mislio da će unutrašnjost kuće nadoknaditi ono što nije vidio izvana.	Ali bio je dovoljno razborit da ne počne odmah sa žalbama. Možda je unutrašnjost lepša.

What can be immediately noticed here is that the Croatian translation is slightly longer than both the English and the Serbian version. 'To postpone complaining' is in Croatian translated 'da pritužbe ostavi za poslije' which is the same as the original. However, in Serbian it is translated as 'da ne počne odmah sa žalbama'. If we do a back translation of the Serbian sentence it would be 'but he was smart enough not to start complaining right away'. As we can see, the Serbian translation slightly departs from the original when it comes to word choices, but the meaning is still the same and accurately conveyed nonetheless. When it comes to the second part of the sentence, in Croatian it is translated as 'jer je mislio da će unutrašnjost kuće nadoknaditi ono što nije vidio izvana'. The back translation is 'because he thought the inside of the house would compensate for what he had not seen from the outside.' The Croatian translator added some information that is not mentioned in the original, thus using the addition strategy. The added information is implied by the context, so using this strategy is redundant. The Serbian translation of the second part is 'Možda je unutrašnjost lepša' which is 'The inside might be more beautiful' in back translation. Therefore, we can conclude that the Croatian translator felt the need to add some details, while the Serbian translation is pretty straightforward.

## Chapter 21

English	Croatian	Serbian
After exchanging numerous marks of fondness with him, his cousin went to Mr. Heathcliff, who lingered by the door, dividing his attention between the objects inside and those that lay without: pretending, that is, to observe the latter, and really noting the former alone.	Kad su razmijenili brojne znakove naklonosti, njezin je bratić prišao gospodinu Heathcliffu koji je stajao do vrata pazeći šta se događa i unutra i vani ili, točnije rečeno, pretvarajući se da gleda van, ali je zapravo obraćao pažnju samo na ono što se zbiva unutra.	Posle uzajamnih izliva nježnosti, njegova rođaka priđe gospodinu Hitklifu, koji je zastao pored vrata i gledao čas unutra čas napolje, pretvarajući se kao da mu pažnju više privlači ono što se događa napolju, a u stvari je motrio šta se događa unutra.

Here, the translations differ in their understanding of the source text. In the original, it says that 'his cousin went to Mr. Heathcliff'. 'His cousin' refers to Catherine who is Linton's cousin. In Croatian translation we have 'njezin bratić' which is inaccurate because the translator changed the possessive pronoun to 'her' instead of using 'his' like the original sentence. Croatian translation implies that Linton was the one who went to Mr. Heathcliff which is not the case. In Serbian translation we have 'njegova rođaka' which is the right translation.

<b>English</b>	<b>Croatian</b>	<b>Serbian</b>
I set the extinguisher on the flame, receiving as I did so a slap on my hand and a petulant "cross thing!"	Spustila sam gasilo na plamen. Udarila me po ruci i drsko mi dobacila: »Odvratna si!	Pritisnem plamen useknjivačem, i osetim udarac po ruci uz ljutit uzvik: "Nadžakbabo!"

Here, Catherine insults Nelly by calling her a "cross thing". Calling someone a "cross thing" would typically mean that the person is irritable, peevish, or difficult to deal with. A literal translation would not be possible in this case because there is no translation equivalent for this phrase in Croatian and Serbian. Therefore, both translations had to use the strategy of translation by a more general word. The Croatian translator opted for "odvratna si" which would be "you are disgusting" in back-translation. I think this insult might be too harsh in this context. The Serbian translator opted for "nadžakbabo" which has no actual meaning in English as it is a culturally specific term. "Nadžakbaba" is used to describe a woman who is generally mean and unpleasant. Therefore, the Serbian translation is closer to the original and also wittier.

### **Chapter 29**

<b>English</b>	<b>Croatian</b>	<b>Serbian</b>
"It was a strange way of killing, not by inches, but by fractions of hairbreadths, to beguile me with the spectre of a hope, through eighteen years!"	Čudan je to način ubijanja, osamnaest godina obmanjuje me ta sjenka nade pijući mi krv na slamku!	Osamnaest godina zavaravati me tračkom nade, čudan je to način ubijanja, lagan, postepen, malo-pomalo!

In this example, translations deviate from the original sentence syntactically and lexically. Both translations have completely changed the word order compared to the original sentence, but in different ways. The beginning of the Croatian translation is the same as the original,

but in Serbian this part of the sentence is placed right after the first comma. In the English version, the time adverbial 'through eighteen years' is placed at the end, while it comes first in the Serbian translation and in the Croatian translation it is placed right after the comma. 'Not by inches, but by fractions of hairbreadths' has been placed last in both translations and translators came up with completely different translation equivalents for this phrase. The Croatian translator opted for 'pijući mi krv na slamku' which is an idiomatic expression and it literally means 'drinking my blood with a straw'. Heathcliff is saying how Catherine is slowly killing him and driving him crazy, so using this idiom in this context is appropriate even though it slightly departs from the original sentence. On the other hand, the Serbian translator decided to use adverbials of manner 'lagan, postepen, malo-pomalo' to translate this phrase. I think that both translations offer great solutions because a literal translation would sound quite unnatural in this case. However, Croatian and Serbian have a similar expression for 'by fractions of hairbreadths' which is 'za dlaku'. 'Za dlaku' is used for something that was about to happen but it was somehow avoided. This is exactly what Heathcliff is describing in the original sentence – Catherine is close to killing him and she almost does it every time. However, neither translation opted to use this expression for some reason. Furthermore, the verb 'beguile' is in Croatian translated as 'obmanjuje' and in Serbian as 'zavaravati'. These verbs are synonyms, so they are both appropriate. 'Spectre of hope' is in Croatian translated as 'sjenka nade' while in Serbian it is translated as 'tračak nade'. Overall, both translations have accurately conveyed the meaning of the original despite the different syntactic and lexical choices.

### **Chapter 32**

<b>English</b>	<b>Croatian</b>	<b>Serbian</b>
This September I was invited to devastate the moors of a friend in the north, and on my journey to his abode, I unexpectedly came within fifteen miles of Gimmerton.	U rujnu sam bio povan k jednom prijatelju na sjeveru u lov na vrištinama, i na putu do njegove kuće neočekivano sam se našao dvadesetak milja od Gimmertona.	Pozvali su me da u septembru opustošim lovište jednog prijatelja na severu, i na putu ka njegovoj kući neočekivano sam se našao na petnaest milja od Gimertona.

What is interesting here is that neither of the two translators converted the miles into kilometers. Converting the miles into kilometers would be more natural since this measure is used in Croatia and Serbia. However, the Croatian translation wrote 'dvadesetak' which literally means 'around twenty' while the Serbian translation wrote 'petnaest'/'fifteen' which is

the same as the original. It is unclear why the Croatian translator decided to change the number since there was no conversion. Something that can also be noticed here is the translation of 'to devastate the moors'. The Croatian translator opted for a place adverbial 'u lov na prištinama', while the Serbian translator opted for 'opustošim lovište' which is the same as the original. However, 'vriština' would be the most precise translation equivalent for 'moor'. It can be concluded that the Serbian translation is closer to the original both syntactically and lexically in this case.

### Chapter 34

English	Croatian	Serbian
I lingered round them, under that benign sky: watched the moths fluttering among the heath and harebells, listened to the soft wind breathing through the grass, and wondered how anyone could ever imagine unquiet slumbers for the sleepers in that quiet earth.	Ostao sam sa njima neko vrijeme pod blagim nebom, promatrao noćne leptire kako lepršaju oko vrijesa i zvončica, osluškivao povjetarac koji je puhao kroz travu pitajući se kako bi itko ikad mogao zamisliti da su nespokojni oni koji počivaju u toj mirnoj zemlji.	Šetao sam polako oko njih, pod blagim nebom; posmatrao noćne leptire među vresom i zvončićima, slušao tih šum vetra i trave, i čudio se kako iko može zamišljati da spavači pod tom mirnom zemljom spavaju nemirnim snom.

The meaning of the verb 'linger' is 'stay in a place longer than necessary because of a reluctance to leave'. The Croatian translation has opted for 'ostao'/'stayed', while the Serbian translation opted for 'šetao'/'walked'. Both translations added a piece of information that is not mentioned in the original; the Croatian added 'neko vrijeme'/'a while' and the Serbian added 'polako'/'slowly'. Taking this into consideration, the Croatian translation is closer to the meaning of the original. It is interesting that neither translation opted for the verb 'zadržao' which would be a good translation equivalent for 'lingered'. Furthermore, the Serbian translation omitted the verb 'fluttering', while the Croatian translation retained it. The part 'listened to the soft wind breathing through the grass' is in Croatian turned into a relative clause 'osluškivao povjetarac koji je puhao kroz travu', while Serbian has simply translated it as 'slušao tih šum vetra i trave'. Again, the Croatian translation is closer to the original. The last part of the original sentence is slightly different in both translations. The verb 'wonder' is in Croatian translated as 'pitajući se' and in Serbian as 'čudio se'. Both of these translation equivalents are appropriate. Croatian translation retains the time adverbial 'ever'/'ikad', while the Serbian omits it. Both translations use a *that*-clause after 'zamisliti' in Croatian and after 'zamišljati' in Serbian. The back translation of the Croatian *that*-clause is

'...that those who are sleeping in that quiet earth are restless.', while the back translation of the Serbian *that*-clause is '... that the sleepers under that quiet earth are sleeping restlessly'. As we can see both translations slightly depart from the original, but they successfully convey its meaning. Overall, considering that this is the last sentence of the novel, the Croatian translation leaves a greater impression in terms of syntax and vocabulary.



## **Conclusion**

The intention of this comparative analysis was to present different translations and different translation procedures. We have seen the complexity of a translation process and the difficulties the translators dealt with along the way. In addition, we understood the different choices translators had to make in order to truthfully convey the meaning of the source text. Throughout the analysis, very different approaches to translation could be noticed.

Syntactically, both translations tried to follow the original as much as possible. However, there were instances where they deviated from the original to some extent due to language differences. In other cases, certain changes were necessary in order to make sentences sound more natural. Lexically, in most examples the two translations had quite different translation equivalents, but the general meaning was overall the same. The Croatian translation tends to add more details and offer additional information, thus trying to make it easier for the reader to understand the text. Serbian translation is, on the other hand, pretty straightforward and concise in most examples. When it comes to translation strategies, translations mostly used the strategies of addition, omission, general word, paraphrase and cultural substitution. Employing these strategies has enabled translators to successfully navigate all kinds of issues that were imposed by vocabulary, syntax and style. Although it seemed like translations significantly deviate from the original in most examples, such an impression would be wrong. The translators followed the tone of the original with the length of the sentence, and lexical solutions were conditioned by comprehensibility.

As someone who has analyzed these translations, it would be unfair to prefer one translation over the other simply because of the effort I know has been put into both translations. After all, this paper did not concern itself with whether one translation was utterly bad and the other was good. Both translations equally stand out in many aspects, despite a few bad choices here and there.

This kind of analysis aims to motivate translators towards new readings of both original works and their translations. The translation process is always subject to analysis, but it is also the only way that leads to new understandings, not only of the translation, but also of the original which can only result in even better and improved translations. We can conclude that new translations of classics are necessary because language and culture change over time and, for that reason, translation can never be considered complete. Something that was written a hundred years ago may not be interpreted in the same way today. Thus, translation is there to change our perception of the world and bring classic pieces of literature closer to the contemporary reader.

## Works Cited

- Baker, Mona. *In Other Words (A coursebook on translation)*. Routledge, 2001.
- Braga Riera, Jorge. "Literary translation". *Encyclopedia of translation & interpreting*, 2022. <https://zenodo.org/records/6369076>
- Brontë, Emily. *Orkanski visovi*. Translated by Pavarić Neda. Šareni dućan, 2013.
- Bronte, Emili. *Orkanski visovi*. Translated by Simić Živojin. Laguna, 2023.
- Brontë, Emily. *Wuthering Heights*. Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1992.
- Delabastita, Dirk. "Literary Translation". *Handbook of Translation Studies Online*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, vol. 2, 2011, pp. 69-78. <https://www.benjamins.com/online/hts/articles/lit2>
- Desmidt, Isabelle. "(Re)translation Revisited." *Meta*, vol. 54, no. 4, 2009, p. 669–683. <https://doi.org/10.7202/038898ar>
- Fouad, Ammar and Sadkhan Ramadhan. "Translation Lexical Shifts in 'The Swing' with Reference to Culture-Specific Items." *ResearchGate*, 2015, pp. 6. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/335665784\\_Translation\\_Lexical\\_Shifts\\_in\\_The\\_Swing\\_with\\_Reference\\_to\\_Culture-Specific\\_Items](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/335665784_Translation_Lexical_Shifts_in_The_Swing_with_Reference_to_Culture-Specific_Items)
- Hasselgård, Hilde, et al. *English Grammar – Theory and Use*. Scandinavian University Press, 2012.
- Hond, Paul. "The Peculiar Perils of Literary Translation". *Columbia Magazine*, Winter 2021-22, <https://magazine.columbia.edu/article/peculiar-perils-literary-translation>
- Khomami, Nadia. "'Translation is an art': why translators are battling for recognition". *The Guardian*, 3 July 2023, <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2023/jul/03/translation-is-an-art-why-translators-are-battling-for-recognition>
- Nives, Opačić. "Ljubiti i voljeti." *Matica Hrvatska, Vijenac* 593, 24 Nov. 2016, [www.matica.hr/vijenac/593/ljubiti-i-voljeti-26206/](http://www.matica.hr/vijenac/593/ljubiti-i-voljeti-26206/)
- Rabassa, Gregory. *If this be Treason: Translation and Its Dyscontents: a Memoir*. New Directions, 2005.
- Sadiković, Amira. *Klasici u prevodu: kratki osvrt*. Malik Books, 2017.
- Ward, Gregory and Birner Bett. *Information Structure and Noncanonical Syntax*. Basil Blackwell, 2004.
- Wiltshire, Irene. "Speech in Wuthering Heights: Joseph's Dialect and Charlotte's Emendations." *Brontë Studies* 30 (2005): 19 - 29.

<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Speech-in-Wuthering-Heights%3A-Joseph%27s-Dialect-and-Wiltshire/468bb72643e41870d5e434359400e495a631914d>

Wimmer, Natasha. "By the Light of Translation". *The Art of Empathy: Celebrating Literature in Translation*. National Endowment for the Arts, 2014