

Borislava Eraković*
Filozofski fakultet u Novom Sadu
Univerzitet u Novom Sadu

UDC: 821.111(73)'255.4=163.41 Salinger J. D.
81'25
DOI: 10.19090/gff.v48i3.2380
Original research paper

RETRANSLATIONS OF *THE CATCHER IN THE RYE* INTO SERBIAN (1979-1995) REVISITED: REFLECTIONS ON THE CHANGING NORMS AND TRANSLATORS' AGENCIES**

The paper relates the renderings of teenage vernacular in the four translations of J. D. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye* in Yugoslavia (1958, 1979, 1987) and Serbia (1995) (Eraković 2002) to the wider cultural factors present at the time of each (re)translation. Retranslation is approached as a phenomenon that is shaped by a variety of factors in a particular historical context. In this case, the factors include the development of the *jeans prose* literary genre in Yugoslavia, different publishing policies and practices during the 1970s and 1990s in Serbia, political contexts surrounding the publications of the four translations, and the translators' agencies. The translators' agencies are deduced from paratexts (the third translator's published commentary and interviews), the differences between the versions of the teenage vernacular in the two translations (1979 and 1987) by the second translator, and a comparative analysis of the global strategies applied in the (re)translations. It is argued that the first translation (1958) predominantly complied with the target literary tradition regarding the acceptability of nonstandard language varieties in a literary work, whereas the following three show evidence of competing translators' agencies in addition to changing publishing policies, which came as consequences of major societal changes.

Keywords: Retranslation, teenage vernacular, historical context, translator agency, jeans prose

INTRODUCTION

Within the Descriptive Translation Studies approach, translations are understood as “facts of a target culture” (Toury 1995: 23), i.e. that they are influenced and constrained by the target context. The discussion in this paper builds on the results of the comparative study (Eraković 2002) of the differences in the dominant strategies in the transferring of the teenage vernacular in the four translations of Jerome David Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye*, which were published in Sarajevo

* borislava.erakovic@ff.uns.ac.rs

** The paper was presented at the ELALT 6 conference in 2022.

in 1958 and in Belgrade in 1979, 1987 and 1995. More specifically, the notable differences between the translators' choices are seen as related to the interplay of factors from wider cultural, economic and political contexts that were present at the time. The first of these factors is related to the changing identity of the target language. Within the span of the 37 years between the first and the last of the four translations of Salinger's novel, the target language changed its official status and name from the Bosnian variety of Serbo-Croatian (1958), to Serbo-Croatian (1979, 1987) and Serbian (1995). Since retranslation is defined as a later translation of a single work into the *same* target language (Koskinen and Paloposki 2010: 294), it is necessary to address the rationale concerning the sameness of the target language, in order to justify the choice of the retranslations that are compared.

Depending on whether (re)translations have the same or different audiences, they can be active (the same audience) or passive (different audiences) (Pym1998:82). The first translation was done into the Bosnian variety of Serbo-Croatian by Nikola Kršić and was published in 1958 in Sarajevo. It was intended for all readers in former Yugoslavia¹. In 1978, this first translation was revised into the Croatian variety and republished in Zagreb². Soon after, in 1979 in Belgrade, it was followed by a new translation into the Serbian variety of Serbo-Croatian by Dragoslav Andrić. In 1987, Andrić published a revised version of his retranslation. Finally, in 1995 the novel was retranslated in Belgrade for the third time, by Flavio Rigonat. Three years later, in 1998, Kršić's translation underwent another revision into Croatian, which was published in Zagreb. It is therefore safe to conclude that the revised translations published in Zagreb and the retranslations published in Belgrade were not intended for the same audience, although all were comprehensible for the speakers of both Croatian and Serbian varieties of Serbo-Croatian. Defined by the criteria of audience, active (re)translations for our purposes are those published in Sarajevo (1958) and Belgrade (1979, 1987, 1995).

There are also translational reasons to treat the Sarajevo translation as the predecessor for later Belgrade translations. The third translator, Rigonat (1995)

¹ In Yugoslavia, Serbo-Croatian was considered a polycentric language with four varieties: Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian and Montenegrin. By some data it was spoken by 73% of the people (Požgaj Hadži 2014: 49). The first translations into Macedonian and Slovenian (Bratož 2004:97) were published in 1966, so the 1958 translation was also read by Slovenes and Macedonians, because Serbo-Croatian was taught in all schools in Yugoslavia.

² In 1978 Kršić's translation was republished by Znanje and in 1998 by ABC naklada (both in Zagreb). Although both were edited by T. Dobričević, they are not identical – each edition adheres to the current Croatian language norm more closely than the previous one.

explicitly mentions the Sarajevo translation as the first translation of Salinger's novel in the Afterward to his retranslation from 1995. In addition, as we will show later, the global strategy applied by the second translator (Andrić 1979/1987), is in contrast to the dominant strategy in the 1958 translation – which is an example of what Koskinen and Paloposki (2015: 27) consider a necessary condition for a retranslator: assuming a stance toward the first translator.

THE RETRANSLATION STUDIES

Research on retranslations is said to have been stimulated by the Retranslation Hypothesis (RH), which was first formulated by Chesterman in a series of statements that served to exemplify explanatory and predictive hypotheses in translation studies as a field of enquiry. He worded the explanatory hypothesis in the following way:

Retranslations tend to be closer to their original texts than first translations because:

- later translators take a critical stance to the earlier translation, seek to improve on it
- the existence of the earlier translation in the target culture affects the potential reception of the new one, and the translator knows this
- the target language has developed and allows the translator more freedom of movement
- T[arget]C[ulture] translation norms have become more relaxed, allowing a closer link to the source text.

Chesterman (2000: 24-25)

Chesterman then goes on to derive a predictive hypothesis, formulating it as “Later translations of a given text will be found to be closer than earlier ones” (2000:25). Chesterman formulated these hypotheses as paraphrases of Bensimon's and Berman's views published in the special edition of the journal *Palimpsestes* on retranslation in 1990³. Later research on retranslations moved away from the RH as being too narrow to explain this phenomenon, finding that retranslations can be conditioned by a variety of factors. Further along this vein, Paloposki and Koskinen's research in the Finnish context shows that near simultaneous translations may appear because translators and publishers are not aware that other may be at the same task

³ Chesterman's formulation of Berman's and Bensimon's views has recently been discussed in great detail by Peeters and Poucke (2023: 6), who claim that the ideas expressed in RH are actually solely Bensimon's. Due to space limitations, we forego this question from our discussion. The RH has also been reviewed in greater detail by Tahir Gürçağlar (2009), Koskinen and Paloposki (2010) and Deane-Cox (2104: 3-4), among others.

(2010:35), but also that there can be other, marketing reasons (retranslations attract attention), or because different publishers have different profiles in different times. Expectations of the audience have also been found as an influential contextual factor (Koskinen and Paloposki 2010:33). In summarizing previous studies on retranslation, Deane-Cox (2014:2-12) identifies four major causes for retranslations: target norms, ideologies, wider sociocultural context, agencies of translators and commissioners, including rivalry between translators (2014: 17). It will be shown that in the case of the four translations of *The Catcher in the Rye* in former Yugoslavia and Serbia, a similar interplay of factors can be identified.

METHODOLOGY

This study is not intended as a criticism of individual translations. Rather, it is based on the tenets of both descriptive studies and the polysystem theory, as interpreted by Chang, that the role of research is to explain and predict translational behaviour, as opposed to the role of criticism, which is an applied and norm-setting attempt to effect changes in the object of study (Chang 2011:257). In addition, this discussion builds on the previous (Eraković 2002) contrastive analysis of the techniques applied in the translation of teenage vernacular in the four translations and their examples, and relates the translators' approaches to the phenomena outside Salinger's novel.

The extent in which the teenage vernacular was recreated in the first and the second Serbo-Croatian translations (1958 and 1979) is first paralleled to the appearance of this type of language in the model of *jeans prose* (Flaker 1983) in the target literature during 1950s and 1970s. The model was conspicuous in its use of stylisations of urban language, so we draw on Flaker's conclusions regarding the acceptability of this type of language in the target literature. However, considering the order of appearance of this type of language in the works of writers such as Olujić (1963) and Kapor (1972) and writers/translators such as Kiš (1973), we suggest that in the case of the translators of *The Catcher*, the direction of influence may have been the opposite: from the target literature to the translators.

Translations can also be contextualized by means of paratexts, which are defined as (verbal or visual) materials that present a text to the readers, appearing either within the same volume as the text (such as forewords and afterwords) or outside it, in various interviews, conversations, even private communications (Genette 1997, 1-5). Our understanding of the agencies of the two (re)translators (Andrić and Rigonat) is based on the paratexts they left behind and their biographies. We find that these sources are relatable to the global strategy they applied in their

(re)translations. In the case of Andrić, we also consider his lexicographical work that predates his retranslation in 1979 – the first Serbian *Dictionary of Jargon* (1976).

With the passing of time, the teenage vernacular in *The Catcher in the Rye* may have lost some of its initial outrageousness because nonstandard speech has long been accepted on the pages of literary works. The readers in the decades when the four (re)translations appeared, however, were not equally accustomed to it – in the 1990s, the effect of nonstandard language in a literary work was not nearly as shocking as it had been in the 1950s or even the 1970s. Before we address the factors that influenced the translators, however, we begin with a reminder of the features of the main character's language in the novel, as described by the American literary scholar Donald Costello around the time of the novel's first appearance (1959).

FEATURES OF THE TEENAGE VERNACULAR OF THE 1950'S IN *THE CATCHER IN THE RYE*

One of the contentious features of Salinger's novel *The Catcher in the Rye* when it was published in 1951 was the language of the main character, Holden Caulfield, which imitated "the teenage vernacular of the 1950s" (Costello 1959:172). To support this judgment, Costello cites the reviews published in 1951 in some leading American and British papers: the *Atlantic*, the *Library Journal*, the *Guardian*, the *Nation*, the *New Statesman and Nation*, the *Times Book Review*, *Newsweek*, the *Spectator*, and *Time*. In all of these, the language of the novel is described as *authentic, daring, obscene, blasphemous, and with comic effect* (1959:173), so Costello proceeds to analyse how Salinger achieves this effect. He notes that Holden's speech is a stylization, marked by semantically empty expressions (*and all*), idiosyncratic insistences that what is being said is *really* true, direct address to the reader (*If you want to know the truth*), at times intentional use of incorrect grammar, all of which show that Holden is very much aware of his language (1959: 180). Costello lists the types of words that most attribute to the vernacular, citing some examples of vulgarities and obscenities such as *fuck* and *ass*, "divine" words such as *goddam, damn, for Chrissake, for Gods's sake, God, Jesus, Jesus Crist, hell* and "crude" words such as *sonuvabich* and *bastard*. He also counts a hundred slang terms with examples such as *crap, crazy*⁴, *kill* in various expressions such as *shoot the crap, that story drives me crazy or the story killed me*. The novel is also peppered with a limited number of repeated adjectives and adverbs such as *lousy, pretty, crumby, terrific, quite, old, stupid*, which are devoid of any specific meaning in the contexts

⁴ in its slang meanings.

in which they are used (1959:175-177), but which help achieve the desired effect. In combination with some original, idiosyncratic, “hilariously funny”, “dramatically effective” expressions, Costello says, Salinger achieves a “good comic effect” (1959: 178). Holden is an intelligent and well-read teenager and the reader can see this because Holden also uses a number of words that are above elementary English, such as “ostracized, exhibitionist, unscrupulous, conversationalist, psychic and bourgeois” (1959:179). Toward the end of his article, Costello summarizes the features of the language in *The Catcher in the Rye* in the following way: “[...] it is crude and slangy and imprecise, imitative yet occasionally imaginative, and affected toward standardization by the strong efforts of schools.” (1959:181).

From the day it was first published, *The Catcher of the Rye* has been enormously popular among readers worldwide. Simultaneously, however, it is also one of the most banned books in the US (Whitfield 1997: 574). According to the *Banned and Challenged* list of books created by The American Library Association (ALA), the most common reason cited is its “profanity” (ALA1, also West 2015, 2131). During the 1950s, the infamous McCarthy era, some censors in the USA even believed that “Holden’s filthy” words would somehow make students more susceptible to Marxist indoctrination (West 2015: 2131). Some critics in the 1950s found that the language of this novel was not just colloquial, but also “vulgar, blasphemous, obscene”, to the extent that it should be banned (ALA1). Such attempts subsided in the 1960s, to reappear again around 1978 and keep occurring until the 1990s with one or two censorship attempts every year, the main accusations again being targeted at the language, which “undermines family values” or is “anti-Christian” (West 2015: 2131).

Looking at how the status of the 297 identified informal words⁵ in the novel changed in the four decades from the 1950s to the 1990s, Eraković (2002:10) found that as much as 86% of them remained informal. This is further confirmed by the ALA list, which shows that the novel is still among the 10 most banned books because it contains “offensive language”, is “sexually explicit” and “unsuited to age group”, even in 2009 (ALA2).

The stylization of informal teenage vernacular is therefore very noticeable in the novel. Its function is to characterize Holden as a young man, but also voice an opposition to the traditional, conservative and hypocritical aspects of the American society after the WWII. Costello notes that Salinger uses standard language only for the characters who represent those parts of the society that Holden reacts against.

⁵ Their status was determined according to the *Dictionary of American Slang* (1960), *Random House Webster’s Dictionary* (1996) and *Microsoft World English Dictionary* (1999).

Whitfield (1997: 600) believes that what makes Holden memorable and the novel so distinctive is the “guileless integrity of his language”.

THE FEATURES OF THE TEENAGE VERNACULAR IN THE FOUR TRANSLATIONS

The linguistic analysis of the four translations of Salinger’s novel by Eraković (2002) shows that all translations meet the criteria of semantic transfer. They are all close translations, in the sense that there are no significant additions or omissions, except at the level of phrase and word order when it serves the purpose of achieving idiomatic expression in the target language. The translations, however, employ varying degrees of teenage vernacular. Comparing the number of sentences in the first chapter with an element of teenage vernacular (which are listed in Costello’s overview in the previous section) with the translations, it can be seen that the source text contains the greatest number of such elements (204), to be followed by Andrić 1979 (192), Andrić 1987 (183), Rigonat 1995 (108) and Kršić 1958 (85). A notable feature of the first translation (Kršić 1958) is that it closely follows the source text word order and choice of words, often decreasing the text’s informality, as in the following example:

Salinger 1951	One of those <u>little English jobs</u> that can <u>do</u> around two hundred miles an hour.
Kršić 1958	To su jedna od onih <u>malih engleskih kola</u> koja mogu da <u>razvijaju</u> oko dvije stotine milja na sat.

Kršić’s stylization of the vernacular also largely remains at the level of words: while Salinger uses contractions and short sentence structures to signal the informality, Kršić uses standard forms, and at times combines series of short sentences into one:

Salinger 1951	Maybe two guys. If that many.
Kršić 1958	Možda samo dvojicu, ako i toliko.

Andrić’s 1979 retranslation differs from the first translation in that it systematically localizes Holden’s narrative into Serbian (i.e. Belgrade) teenage vernacular of the 1970s. In the revised version of this retranslation in 1987, Andrić attenuates the jargon. The third translator’s retranslation from 1995 is generally syntactically closer to the original than both Andrić’s translations (Eraković 2002: 98), but there are more colloquial expressions than in the 1958 translation. This can

be illustrated by the following example from the beginning of the novel (all markers of the vernacular/informal language are underlined):

Salinger 1951	He wrote <u>this terrific</u> book of short stories, The Secret Goldfish, <u>in case you never heard of him</u> . The best one in it is “The Secret Goldfish.” It was about <u>this little kid</u> that wouldn’t let anybody look at his goldfish because <u>he’d</u> bought it with his own money. <u>It killed me</u> .
Kršić 1958	On je napisao onu <u>fantastičnu</u> zbirku pripovjedaka „Tajna zlatna ribica“ – ako za njega niste ranije čuli. Najbolja priča u njoj bila je upravo ta »Tajna zlatna ribica«. To je priča o jednom dječaku koji je posijedovao jednu zlatnu ribicu ali nije nikome dozvoljavao ni da je pogleda, zato što <u>ju je kupio za vlastiti novac</u> . Ta me je priča <u>obarala s nogu</u> .
Andrić 1979	Napisao je onu <u>krvišnu</u> knjigu pripovedaka, <i>Tajanstvena zlatna ribica</i> , ako niste znali. A <u>najmoćnija</u> priča u njoj je <i>Tajanstvena zlatna ribica</i> . O nekom <u>klinji</u> što nikome nije dao ni da <u>gvirne</u> na njegovu zlatnu ribicu jer <u>ju je kupio za sopstvenu lovu</u> . E, to me je stvarno <u>iseklo</u> .
Andrić 1987	Napisao je onu <u>strašnu</u> knjigu pripovedaka, <i>Tajanstvena zlatna ribica</i> , ako niste znali. A <u>najmoćnija</u> priča u njoj je <i>Tajanstvena zlatna ribica</i> . O nekom <u>klincu</u> što nikome nije dao ni da <u>gvirne</u> na njegovu zlatnu ribicu jer <u>ju je kupio za sopstvene pare</u> . E, to me je stvarno <u>iseklo</u> .
Rigonat 1995	Napisao je onu <u>fenomenalnu</u> knjigu priča <i>Tajna zlatna ribica</i> , ako slučajno niste čuli za njega. Najbolja priča u njoj je baš "Tajna zlatna ribica": o nekom <u>klincu</u> koji ne da nikome da vidi njegovu zlatnu ribicu jer <u>ju je kupio za svoj novac</u> . Stvarno <u>me oborila</u> .

Paloposki and Koskinen (2010:37) point out that not all subsequent translations are necessarily retranslations, even if done by different translators, because some may be just slightly revised versions. They define revision as an edited, corrected or modernized version of a previous translation (2010: 294). Chesterman (2000: 22) similarly formulated this difference between a retranslation and a revision as a change of focus: while revisions focus on the previous translations, retranslations focus on the original. The second translation (Andrić 1979) is easily identifiable as a retranslation, because the differences introduced in relation to the 1958 translation are not only at the level of word units, but are more global. The vernacular Andrić created is coherent throughout the novel and it imitates the Belgrade teenage vernacular of the 1970s above the word level.

Salinger 1951	<u>They're</u> quite touchy about anything like that, especially my father.	It cost him <u>damn</u> near four thousand <u>bucks</u> .	Now <u>he's</u> out in Hollywood, D.B., being a prostitute.
Kršić 1958	Oni su prilično osjetljivi u tim i takvim stvarima, naročito moj otac.	Koštala su ga <u>prokleta</u> , blizu četiri hiljade dolara.	Sada živi u Hollywoodu, D.B., kao prostitutka.
Andrić 1979	Mnogo su osjetljivi po tim pitanjima, naročito moj <u>stari</u> .	Koštala ga je, <u>brat bratu</u> , skoro četiri hiljade <u>zelembaća</u> .	Sad <u>vam</u> je D.B. u Holivudu – <u>prodana duša</u> .
Andrić 1987	Mnogo su osjetljivi kad je reč o tome, naročito otac.		
Rigonat 1995	Prilično su osjetljivi u tom pogledu, pogotovo otac.	Koštao ga jedno četiri hiljadarke	Sad je tamo u Holivudu, D. B, <u>prodao se</u> .

Andrić's revised retranslation from 1987 is obviously a revision, because the only changes are at the word level – slangy words are generally replaced with less informal, colloquial ones. The matter is not so clear with Rigonat's translation, however. Like the first translation, it is syntactically closer to the original. The differences between the translations by Andrić and Rigonat are not so much in the type of vocabulary they use (both make use of the informal teenage speech from the time of the translation), but in their unit of translation (cf. Eraković 2002: 94-98). In cases when there were no available register equivalents at word level, Andrić compensated with informal words and expressions (pragmatic solutions) in available positions, while Rigonat tended to use standard Serbian expression, thus making his translation in general less colloquial. Examples of this can be seen in the example above, where Andrić compensates the verbal contraction in *they're* with an informal lexical choice for *father* – *stari* [old man], and the intensifier *damn* with the expression *brat bratu* [approximately]. Rigonat, on the other hand, omits *damn* in the translation because literal transfer would be unidiomatic in Serbian and does not compensate for the lost markers of informality which are expressed with verb contractions.

The distinctions between retranslation and revision, however, have not been found to be relevant or generalizable in retranslation studies: every new publication of a translation may contain a number of interventions for a wide variety of reasons (cf. Koskinen and Paloposki 2010:294). The same can be said in our case. Finally, if the four translations were placed along a scale from the one that applies substandard language the least to the one that uses it most, taking into account the markers of teenage vernacular from Costello's list, the order would be 1958 Kršić – 1995 Rigonat – 1987 Andrić – 1979 Andrić. In the following section we address the cultural factors that can be related to this difference in the translators' choices.

THE JEANS PROSE PARALLELS

According to Aleksandar Flaker, Salinger's novel was one of the influences that, in combination with the national traditions and some Eastern European literary models, inspired the appearance of the literary model which he termed *jeans prose* (1983:40). Flaker based this model on the shared features of a number of novels published in Yugoslavia, Central and Eastern European countries and the USSR from the 1950s until the 1980s. Their protagonist is invariably a young person who uses urban language to express nonconformist attitudes toward the existing traditions in the society (1983:15). In Yugoslavia, the first representatives of the model were the early novels by Grozdana Olujić in 1958 and 1963, Antun Šoljan and Mirjana Stefanović in 1961, Alojz Majetić in 1963. In Serbia, some most prominent novelists of this type were Bora Ćosić (1969) and Momo Kapor (1972). Similarly to Salinger in the States, some of these writers faced court trials and censorship (Flaker 1983:17, Ilić 2019, Stamenković 2017:248). Since the use of slang and colloquialisms in these novels was met with negative critical appraisal, this might have influenced the translators of *The Catcher* to treat the teenage vernacular differently in their translations. Flaker cites instances of Croatian writers of *jeans prose* Slamnig and Šoljan having to defend and justify the use of jargon in their novels, and states that the opposition was strong and constant in the 1950s because it was politically judged as a bad influence on younger readers (1983:124). The change of attitude that ensued in the 1970s, Flaker attributes to the influence of "brave" translators and publishers. One of them was the writer Danilo Kiš, who famously translated Queneau's *Zazie in the Metro* in 1973 using Belgrade youth jargon. A "brave publisher" was, for example, the publishing house Veselin Masleša (Sarajevo), which published Sagan's *Hello Sadness* (with another teenage protagonist) in Yugoslavia as early as 1955.

As has been suggested by the tenets of the polysystem theory (Even-Zohar 1990:194) and cultural research (Venuti 1998: 132), translations can occupy peripheral position in relation to the target culture, be conservative and support target language canons and trends, but they can also occupy the central position and be resistant (to the target norms) and innovative in the choice of expression. Kiš's translation of *Zazie in the Metro* was one such case that seems to have supported the introduction of the vernacular into the literary model of the jeans prose. Flaker, however, believes the ground was already prepared for Salinger's *Catcher* by Yugoslav writers during the 1960s and 1970s (1983:317). Already in 1972, this can be exemplified by the condensed use of jargon that characterized Momo Kapor's novel *Beleške jedne Ane*, a highly popular novel in Yugoslavia. The first translator, Kršić, however, did not have this ground ready in 1958. His choice toward a more

standard linguistic expression and the minimal use of the teenage vernacular is clearly conforming to the target norm that expected the use of standard register in the literature for young people. There might also be another reason why this type of language could have been less important for the first translator. As Ilić (2019) pertinently notes, the 1950s saw a surge in the number of translations of the works by those “Western” writers who could be interpreted as being critical toward capitalist societies (Faulkner, for example), which was a means to present “the true face” of the Western society, as an artistic critique of capitalism in the socialist Yugoslavia. Such an intention is also traceable in the *Note about the writer* that was included as the Afterword of the 1958 translation:

Salinger je u svom djelu dao duboku psihološku studiju mladog američkog čovjeka i njegovog duševnog razvitka uopšte, a posebno u onom najosjetljivijem periodu njegova života kada počinje sa razumijevanjem da posmatra svijet oko sebe. *Salinger stvara jasnu i uvjerljivu sliku zašto upravo oni koji u američkom društvu imaju mogućnosti da se školuju i da se razviju u korisne članove društva, tako često bježe od života, ne teže ničemu, nemaju nikakvog cilja, žele da budu „lovci u žitu“*. (1958: 286)

[Salinger in his work offers a deep psychological study of a young American and his spiritual development in general, but particularly during the most sensitive period of his life when he begins to look at the world surrounding him with understanding. *Salinger creates a clear and persuasive picture showing why it is particularly those who in the American society have all the opportunities for education and development into constructive members of the society, all too often run away from life, do not strive toward anything, have no goals and want to be „catchers in the rye“*.] (our translation and emphasis)

Kršić’s translation, therefore, came at a time when *The Catcher in the Rye* may not have been primarily relevant because of its rebellious language, but because of what the novel says about the American society.

Andrić’s use of jargon in the translations from 1979 and 1987 can be related to the condensed use of jargon in Kapor’s novel from 1972 and Kiš’s translation from 1973. In other words, as Flaker notes, substandard language varieties were now allowed to appear in novels and Andrić could feel free to use it in his translation, as he did. The reactions, however, were still not favourable – according to Andrić himself, negative reactions to his use of Belgrade jargon in the 1976 translation were

so prominent that he felt he needed to produce another translation⁶. In his 1987 revision, Andrić therefore took a step in the opposite direction, replacing many teenage slang expressions with more general colloquialisms.

The global strategy in the first Andrić's translation (1979), however, cannot be addressed without taking into account his agency – and the same can be said about the choices made by Rigonat in his translation in 1995. Some indications of their agencies can be seen in the variety of sources, as will be shown in the following section.

AGENCY OF THE TRANSLATORS: BIOGRAPHIES AND PARATEXTS

Koskinen and Kinnunen (2010:6) define the concept of translator's agency as willingness and ability to act, which involves reflectivity and intentionality. It is related to the position of power and presupposes a social context.

At the time when Nikola Kršić (1928-1985) did the first translation of the *Catcher in the Rye* in 1958 in Yugoslavia, he was a novice translator, just starting his career as an academic in military engineering (Panjko 2013). Being a newcomer to the field of translation, Kršić could express little agency in the choice of translation strategy, and this is another explanation for the more conservative nature of his translation. The case was radically different with the two retranslators, Andrić and Rigonat.

By his education, Dragoslav Andrić (1923-2005) was a philologist and a dramatist (having graduated in two study programmes, one in English language and literature and the other in Dramaturgy, from the University of Belgrade). He is the author of the Serbian first *Dictionary of Jargon* (1976), which was originally motivated by his work on the translation of the *West Side Story* for The Belgrade Drama Theatre in the 1960s.⁷ This also enabled him to tackle the language of Salinger's novel in a significantly different way to that of Kršić. Andrić was later awarded for a lifetime achievement in literary translation (Serbian Literary Translation Association 1991) and for accomplishments in education, science and art (The Vuk award in 1997). That Andrić could publish two translations of the same work within the span of eight years is a testament both to his acclaim as a translator in Serbia, and to his agency in applying the translation strategy he felt was justified. Understanding how exceptional such a practice was at the time requires a consideration of the wider context. During the 1970s and 1980s, the translation scene

⁶ Andrić, personal communication in 2001.

⁷ Personal communication.

in Serbia was at its peak (cf. Eraković 2021). This was the time when two Serbian translator associations published four volumes of translation journals annually (*Mostovi* from 1970 and *Prevodilac* from 1980), with critiques and texts on various translational issues written by academics as well as translators. The journals also published translators' responses to their critics (cf. Stakić 1986), contesting the criticisms and defending their understanding of what quality in literary translation entails (cf. Petrović 1970). The publishing houses in question (Rad in 1979 and Bigz in 1987) were also highly reputable and had quality control procedures in place: translations were reviewed by editors in chief, expert consultants and language editors (cf. Bertolino 2019). This was the climate in which Andrić published his retranslation and later revision. In addition to this, his 1979 translation is an example of what Vanderschelden (quoted in Paloposki and Koskinen 2010: 32) describes as a "cold" translation, done after enough time has passed since the first publication of the source text, when the translator has opportunity to draw on research and audience responses. Although his revised translation in 1987 attenuated the vernacular, it should be noted that its expression was still going against the safe option of using standard language expression that syntactically closely follows the source text.

The author of the last translation (1995) was Flavio Rigonat, who previously had already tried his hand as a translator of Bukowski, Henry Miller, Isaac Bashevis Singer and Joyce. His educational and professional background was law, but he soon founded his own publishing house (Haos/Lom) and turned to translation (Rigonat 2011, 2022). His agency derives from his double status of an established translator/publisher, and his publicly expressed belief that "translators should avoid slang" and that "slang in translation sounds unnatural and forced" (Rigonat n.d.). He also expressed his negative view of Andrić's use of the vernacular in an unmitigated way in the *Afterword* to his own translation and in his published interviews (n.d, 2011).

Both Andrić's and Rigonat's translations are examples of active, competing translations, vying for the same audience in Serbia, but only Rigonat's is still reprinted⁸. Kršić's (1958) translation, originally written in Bosnian variety and later revised into Croatian variety, has remained the only Croatian translation of *The Catcher*, which reflects the political reality of the post-Yugoslav societies. Considering the size of the book market in Serbia today, there is no room for two

⁸ There is, however, a record in the Cobis.rs (Serbian library information system), that the 1979 translation by Dragoslav Andrić was reprinted in 2019, but that no Serbian library has a copy of this publication. See <https://plus.cobiss.net/cobiss/sr/sr/bib/273702924>.

translations of the same novel any more, which might explain why other Serbian publishing houses have not reprinted either of the two Andrić's translations.

CONCLUSION: THE SURVIVAL OF (RE)TRANSLATIONS

Considering the changing fate and critical appraisal of the *jeans prose* novels in the 1950s, 1970s, and 1980s, the presence of substandard language in them has been related to the translators' decisions on how to recreate Holden Caulfield's language in *The Catcher in the Rye*. In the terminology of the polysystem theory, there is an indication that the first translation from 1958 and the retranslation from 1995 occupied peripheral position in Serbian culture, i.e. they followed the established models in the target literature. The retranslation (1976) and its revision (1987) by Andrić strove for a more central position in the target literature, supporting new types of language appearing in the literary works in the target culture. They also express the translator's understanding that a translator should have the right to interpret a literary work based on his own, explicit or underlying, theory of translation and not be negatively judged for it.

Berman believed that retranslations pave the way toward the major cultural translation of a given work (Peeters and Van Poucke 2023: 5). For Serbian translations, we argue that the factors that influence which retranslations are published today are least of all translational and are mostly related to the power of institutions, political and economic, as well as cultural. As Toury noted, regardless of the intended or initial position of a translation in the target culture, it changes with time, so later translations also shed light on the preferences pertinent to later periods (1995: 25). Translations as "facts of the target culture" can influence the target literature or be influenced by it and our conclusions in this regard are based on the features and the time of appearance of the first novels that used the literary model of *jeans prose* in Serbia. We believe that the way teenage vernacular was presented in the novels of this genre and the critical appraisal that met them at the time, can partly explain the absence of the 1979/1987 retranslations by Dragoslav Andrić today. The second part of the explanation is related to the power of cultural institutions such as publishing houses and their financial judgements in the Serbian book market.

Borislava Eraković

НОВИ ОСВРТ НА ВИШЕСТРУКЕ ПРЕВОДЕ РОМАНА *THE CATCHER IN THE RYE*
НА СРПСКИ: УЛОГА ПРОМЕНЉИВИХ НОРМИ И ПРЕВОДИЛАЧКЕ
АГЕНТИВНОСТИ

Резиме

Рад се на примеру компаративног приказа разлика у приступима превођењу тинејџерског говора у вишеструким преводима романа *The Catcher in the Rye* (1979, 1987, 1995) на српски бави анализом социо-културних фактора који су утицали на избор преводачких стратегија и опстајавање тих превода у циљној култури. Феномен вишеструких превода је дефинисан као резултат комплексне интеракције различитих социо-културних фактора, који се крећу од историјског контекста, политичких утицаја (агитпроп политика 1950-их), књижевно-теоријских норми у погледу прихватљивости супстандардног језичког варијетета у домаћој књижевности и моделу прозе у траперицама (Флакер 1983), агентивности преводаца и променљивих процедура у издавачкој делатности у време када су објављени анализирани преводи. Поред самих превода, као извори кориштени су паратекстови (интервјуи преводаца и поговори уз преводе) и биографије преводаца. Анализа показује да је на избор преводачких поступака у преношењу тинејџерског говора у првом преводу (1958) пресудну улогу имала норма која је такав језик у књижевним делима за младе сматрала штетним, али поговор уз овај превод показује да је вредност Селинцеровог дела у југословенском друштву била и политичка, јер је однос главног лика према америчком друштву 1950-их схваћен и као критика капиталистичког система. Анализа превода Драгослава Андрића из 1979. године открива другачији приступ језику и превођењу: преводац стилизује тинејџерски говор на основу сопственог истраживања тог регистра (*Речник жаргона*, 1976) и уверења да језик превода треба да делује аутентично у жаргону. Ревизија тог превода из 1987, у којој је Андрић изразите жаргонизме заменио колоквијалним изразима, показује да супстандардни језик још увек није био прихватљив, и поред тога што су овим преводима претходили Кишов превод Кеноове *Цаце у метроу* (1973), велика популарност *Белешки једне Ане* Моме Капора (1972) и других представника прозе у траперицама током 1960-их у којима је жаргон био заступљен. Стандарднији језички израз у поновном преводу из 1995. године Флавија Ригоната одаје разумевање превођења као процеса који се заснива остваривању еквиваленција на нивоу нижих језичких јединица. У интервјуима Ригонат такође исказује уверење да је жаргон дозвољен писцима, али не и преводиоцима, јер утиче на трајност превода. У погледу статуса анализираних вишеструких превода, на основу чињенице да се и данас, у Хрватској штампају ревидирани Кршићев превод из 1958, а у Србији Ригонатов превод из 1995, закључује се да је положај ових превода у односу на циљну књижевност периферан, тј. да су опстали преводи који чувају вредности конзервативније књижевне норме.

Кључне речи: вишеструки преводи, тинејџерски жаргон, историјски контекст, преводачка агентивност, проза у траперицама

REFERENCES

- ALA 1 American Library Association (ALA). Banned & Challenged Classics. Accessed 16 August, 2022 from: <https://www.ala.org/advocacy/bbooks/frequentlychallengedbooks/classics>
- ALA 2 American Library Association (ALA). Top ten most challenged books list. Accessed 16 August, 2022 from: <https://www.ala.org/advocacy/bbooks/frequentlychallengedbooks/top10#2009>
- Andrić, D. (1976). *Dvosmerni rečnik srpskog žargona i žargonu srodnih reči*. Beograd: Bigz.
- Bensimon, P. (1990). Présentation. *Palimpsestes* 13/4, ix-xiii.
- Berk Albachten, Ö. –Tahir Gürçağlar, Ş. (2019). Introduction. In: Berk Albachten, Ö. –Tahir Gürçağlar, Ş. (eds.) *Perspectives on retranslation. Ideology, paratexts, methods*. Routledge. 13-21.
- Berman, A. (1990). La Retraduction comme espace de traduction. *Palimpsestes* 13/4, 1–7.
- Bertolino, N. (2019). *Knjiga o zavičajima*. Beograd: Treći trg.
- Bratož, S. (2004). A Stylistic Analysis of Four Translations of J. D. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye*. *ELOPE: English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries*, 1/1-2, 95–104. doi: [10.4312/elope.1.1-2.95-104](https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.1.1-2.95-104)
- Chang, N.F. (2011). In Defense of Polysystem Theory. *Target* 23/2, 311–347.
- Chesterman, A. (2000). A causal model for Translation Studies. In: Olohan, M. (ed.) (2000). *Intercultural Faultlines: Research Models in Translation Studies I: Textual and Cognitive Aspects*. Manchester: St Jerome. 15–27.
- Costello, D. (1959). The Language of 'The Catcher in the Rye'. *American Speech* 34/3, 172-181. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/454038>
- Ćosić, B. (1969/1970). *Uloga moje porodice u svetskoj revoluciji*. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Deane-Cox, S. (2014). *Retranslation: translation, literature and reinterpretation*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Eraković, B. (2002). *O prevođenju urbanog američkog supstandarda (na primerima romana Lovac u raži Dž. D. Selindžera i Na putu Dž. Keruaka)*. Novi Sad: Pokrajinski sekretarijat za kulturu, obrazovanje i nauku.
- Eraković, B. (2021). The translation field in Serbia 1960-1990: Organizational-theoretical aspects. *STRIDON: Studies in Translation and Interpreting*, 1(2), 25–48. <https://doi.org/10.4312/stridon.1.2.25-48>.
- Even Zohar, I. (1990). The position of translation literature within the literary polysystem. In Venuti, L. (ed.) (2004) *The translation studies reader*. London and New York: Routledge, 192-197.

- Flaker, A. (1983). *Proza u trapericama*. Zagreb: Liber.
- Genette, G. (1997). *Paratexts: Thresholds of interpretation*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ilić, B. (2019). Roman Grozdane Olujić Preživeti do stura u okruženju sprskog posleratnog romana. *Uzdanica* 16/1, 105-117.
- Kapor, M. (1972). *Beleške jedne Ane*. Beograd: Bigz.
- Koskinen, K. –Kinnunen, T. (2010). Introduction. In: Kinnunen, T.–Koskinen, K. (eds.) (2010). *Translators' Agency*. Tampere: Tampere University Press. 4–10.
- Koskinen, K. –Paloposki, O. (2010). Retranslation. In: Van Doorslaer, L. –Gambier, Y. (eds.) (2010). *Handbook of Translation Studies*, vol.1. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 294–298.
- Koskinen, K. –Paloposki, O. (2015). Anxieties of influence. The voice of the *first* translator in retranslation. *The Target* 27 (1), 25–39.
- Majetić, A. (1963). *Čangi*. Novi Sad: Progres.
- Mihajlović-Mihiz, D. (1968). *Kad su cvetale tikve*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- Olujić, G. (1958/2018). *Izlet u Nebo*. Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga.
- Olujić, G. (1963/2018). *Glasam za ljubav*. Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga.
- Paloposki, O. –Koskinen, K. (2010). Reprocessing Texts: The Fine Line between Retranslating and Revising. *Across Languages and Cultures* 11 (1), 29–49.
- Panjko, K. (2013). Kršić, Nikola. Hrvatski biografski leksikon. Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža. Accessed 16 August, 2022 from: <https://hbl.lzmk.hr/clanak.aspx?id=11468>
- Peeters, K. –Van Poucke, P. (2023). Retranslation, thirty-odd years after Berman. *Parallèles*, 35/1, 3-27. doi: 10.17462/para.2023.01.01.
- Petrović, A.Š. (1970). Otvoreno pismo jednom profesoru. *Mostovi* 1/2, 138-141.
- Požgaj-Hadži, V. (2014). Language Policy and Linguistic Reality in Former Yugoslavia and its Successor States. *Inter Faculty*, 5. 49-91. doi: 10.15068/00143222.
- Pym, A (1998). *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Rigonat, F. (2011). Na putu prema sebi. Accessed 16 August, 2022 from: <https://sensa.mondo.rs/budjenje-duse/inspirativne-zivotne-price/a1170/Na-putu-prema-sebi.html?page=1>
- Rigonat, F. (2022). Erotski i noar romani kod nas ne prolaze. Accessed 16 August, 2022 from: <https://nova.rs/kultura/intervju-flavio-rigonat-erotski-i-noar-romani-kod-nas-ne-prolaze/>

- Rigonat, F. (n.d.). Teško je kopirati velikog pisca. Accessed 16 August, 2022 from: <https://popforum.rs/tesko-je-kopirati-velikog-pisca/>
- Salinger, J. D. (1951). *The Catcher in the Rye*. Penguin Books.
- Salinger, Dž. D. (1958). *Lovac u žitu*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Selindžer, Dž.D. (1979). *Lovac u raži*. Beograd: Rad.
- Selindžer, Dž. D. (1987). *Lovac u raži*. Beograd: Bigz.
- Selindžer, Dž.D. (1995). *Lovac u raži*. Beograd: Haos.
- Stakić, J. (1986). Narugati se žičari pa ubiti prevodioca. *Mostovi* 4/68, 343-344.
- Stamenković, S. (2017). Selindžerov Lovac u raži i srpska, hrvatska i bugarska džins proza: problem određenja i trajanja modela. *Studia Philologica* 36/1, 235-240. <https://journals.uni-vt.bg/studiaphilologica/eng/vol36/iss1/23>
- Stefanović, M. (1961). *Odlomci izmišljenog dnevnika*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- Šoljan, A. (1961). *Izdajice*. Zagreb: Zora.
- Tahir Gürçağlar, Ş. (2009). Retranslation. In: Baker, M. –Saldanha, G. (Eds.). *Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*. London/New York: Routledge, 233–235.
- Tahir Gürçağlar, Ş.(2020). Introduction. *TranscUltrAl* 12/1, 1-8. doi:10.21992/tc29467.
- Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Venuti, L. (1998). Strategies of translation, In Baker, M.-Malmkjaer, K. (Eds.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London and New York: Routledge, 240-243.
- West, Mark I. (2015). J.D. Salinger, In *Censorship: A World Encyclopedia*, ed. by Derek Jones, London and New York: Routledge.
- Whitfield, S. J. (1997). Cherished and Cursed: Toward a Social History of The Catcher in the Rye. *The New England Quarterly*, 70(4), 567–600. <https://doi.org/10.2307/366646>.