

Slaughterhouse-Five and the Sociological Turn in Translation Studies

Karmelić, Petra

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2023

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **University of Zadar / Sveučilište u Zadru**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:162:973656>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#) / [Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-11-25**



Sveučilište u Zadru
Universitas Studiorum
Jadertina | 1396 | 2002 |

Repository / Repozitorij:

[University of Zadar Institutional Repository](#)



zir.nsk.hr



DIGITALNI AKADEMSKI ARHIVI I REPOZITORIJI

Sveučilište u Zadru
Odjel za anglistiku
Sveučilišni diplomski studij
Anglistika; smjer: znanstveni

Petra Karmelić

**Slaughterhouse-Five and the Sociological Turn in
Translation Studies**

Diplomski rad

Zadar, 2023.

Sveučilište u Zadru

Odjel za anglistiku

Diplomski sveučilišni studij engleskog jezika i književnosti; smjer: znanstveni
(dvopredmetni)

Slaughterhouse-Five and the Sociological Turn in Translation Studies

Diplomski rad

Student/ica:

Petra Karmelić

Mentor/ica:

izv. prof. art. Tomislav Kuzmanović, MFA

Zadar, 2023.



Izjava o akademskoj čestitosti

Ja, **Petra Karmelić**, ovime izjavljujem da je moj **diplomski** rad pod naslovom **Slaughterhouse-Five and the Sociological Turn in Translation Studies** rezultat mojega vlastitog rada, da se temelji na mojim istraživanjima te da se oslanja na izvore i radove navedene u bilješkama i popisu literature. Ni jedan dio mojega rada nije napisan na nedopušten način, odnosno nije prepisan iz necitiranih radova i ne krši bilo čija autorska prava.

Izjavljujem da ni jedan dio ovoga rada nije iskorišten u kojem drugom radu pri bilo kojoj drugoj visokoškolskoj, znanstvenoj, obrazovnoj ili inoj ustanovi.

Sadržaj mojega rada u potpunosti odgovara sadržaju obranjenoga i nakon obrane uređenoga rada.

Zadar, 1. srpnja 2023.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. The Emergence of Translation Studies..... | 4 |
| 2.1. The German Precursors | 4 |
| 2.2. Linguistically-Oriented Approaches | 6 |
| 3. The Cultural Turn of the 1980s | 12 |
| 4. The Sociological Turn | 16 |
| 4.1. Translation as Social System | 18 |
| 4.2. Habitus, Field and Capital..... | 20 |
| 4.3. International Literary Space | 23 |
| 4.4. Power Relations..... | 24 |
| 4.5. Perspectives on Methodology | 27 |
| 5. Vonnegut through Sociological Lenses | 30 |
| 5.1. <i>Slaughterhouse-Five</i> | 30 |
| 5.2. Vonnegut in Croatia | 32 |
| 5.3. <i>Klaonica broj pet</i> | 35 |
| 6. Conclusion..... | 72 |
| 7. Works cited..... | 74 |
| 8. Abstract..... | 78 |
| 9. Sažetak..... | 79 |

1. Introduction

The concept of world literature as opposed to national literatures is related to issues such as exclusivity, unequal representation, ideological and political agendas, power relations between nations and languages, unequal chances different writers and literatures have. What is presented as a canon of literary masterpieces, is in fact not a collection of best works that have been written, neither it equally represents all literatures, languages and writers. Principles of politics, ideologies, cultural representation and economics are at stake; different power relations operate at levels of selection, production and reception of literary works. Crucial role in constructing the canon have translators who often receive no attention due to popular belief that a good translator is an invisible one.

Despite often being overlooked, translation is a complex process that results in a new text that will be received and read in a different context. It is not a mere linguistic practice for we know that language is embedded in culture, linguistic acts take place in a context and texts are not created in a vacuum (Bassnett 23). Therefore, literature is not innocent, and neither is translation. About the latter, that will be in our focus in this thesis, Venuti said it is a site of negotiation, understanding and contestation of power relations, and a potential source of scandal (67).

This has not always been an understanding of translation process and translator's task. Translation studies, rapidly developing young discipline, has emerged as part of linguistics and in the first years it focused greatly on texts in isolation – injustice that was corrected with later approaches, especially the ones constructed during the last 20 years. Due to its young age, rapid development and multi-disciplinary field one should not be surprised there have been several radical shifts or turns within the discipline of translation studies described in detail by Mary

Snell-Hornby. Beginning with the linguistically oriented approaches the discipline went through the cultural to the still establishing sociological turn.

Needless to say, the development of the discipline was much more complex and messier, we do not wish to imagine a linear evolution as it would be an oversimplification. More appropriate seems to think of approaches and authors being interconnected and more often than not in contradiction, constantly going back to previous ideas but also inventing new ones while being part of and influenced by broader trends in humanities and social sciences where the discipline exists.

In this MA thesis, we will examine the main trends in translation studies with special attention dedicated to radical turns. The goal here is to critically assess what the last turn, the sociological one has to offer to translation studies. We are interested in theoretical concepts and methodology developed at the crossroad of translation studies and sociology that serve as tools for understanding the power relations influencing the occurrence (or the failure of occurrence) of certain authors and works.

In the first part of our thesis, we shall examine briefly how the discipline came into being. Then, following the chronology from two textbooks of translation theory (Venuti and Snell-Hornby), we shall set a brief scheme of the discipline's development mentioning some authors and ideas important from today's perspective. However, one should keep in mind that this scheme is not extensive but pragmatic; we will be dealing with authors credited for contributing to paradigmatic shifts in translation studies.

Finally, there is a translation of two chapters from *Slaughterhouse Five*, a book written in 1969 by Kurt Vonnegut (1922-2007). Although Vonnegut is a well-established literary name and *Slaughterhouse-Five* is his most successful work, the Croatian translation was published just recently, in 2019, by *Zagrebačka naklada* and translated by Milena Benini. This thesis will

try to provide possible answers, such as why the Croatian translation occurred so late by using insights constructed during the sociological turn.

2. The Emergence of Translation Studies

Although one may argue (and be right) that translation is as old as language, the emergence of translation studies as a distinctive academic discipline is most often situated in the 19th century in the years after World War II (Munday 10). In less than a century, it gave birth to various approaches, some of them in contradiction to another; and dramatically changed course more than once. However, before evaluating what these turns meant for literary translation, we will turn our attention to what preceded modern translation studies: authors and ideas that shaped it into a field in which we continue today.

2.1. The German Precursors

Lawrence Venuti, the influential and often controversial American translator and translation theorist, in his *The Translation Studies Reader* identifies main influences “rooted in German literary and philosophical traditions, in Romanticism, hermeneutics, and existential phenomenology” (11). The authors he mentions as important precursors of our field, among others, include German scholars and philosophers Friedrich Schleiermacher and Wilhelm von Humboldt.

Friedrich Schleiermacher’s scholarly work interesting for this thesis is on hermeneutics. As Hans Vermeer, another German translation scholar, identifies, what is important for this approach is “understanding the utterance itself, how it came into being, its immediate situation and how it relates to its background circumstances” (qtd. in Snell-Hornby 15). Essentially, this means words should not be understood in isolation as in a dictionary, but within the context of the author in which they came into being, or in Schleiermacher’s words: “through the prism of his own nationality and age” (qtd. in Snell-Hornby 15). From today’s perspective, this premise may seem obvious and beyond doubt, but at the time it was revolutionary, some would even

say heresy, for translators to concern themselves not just with words found in the original but with a broader context.

Schleiermacher is also the one to thank for the famous distinction between foreignization and domestication, although he did not use these terms that became well known to translators and theorists. Before continuing, we should try to define these terms as we understand them today. Domestication is a translation strategy that minimizes the foreignness of the text by conforming to the source language and culture (Munday 144). One must be wary of this strategy because, when heavily applied, it results in “the host culture and cultural and historical differences vanish” (Damrosch 168). Venuti calls for the exact opposite, translation that resists betraying the otherness of the source text – foreignizing strategy (168). Schleiermacher preferred word-for-word literalism and texts that read with an effect of foreignness (Venuti 4), yet he allowed both methods as long as there was no compromise which he believe would result only in confusion:

Either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him; or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author towards him. The two roads are so completely separate from each other that one or the other must be followed as closely as possible, and that a highly unreliable result would proceed from any mixture, so that it is to be feared that author and reader would not meet at all. (qtd. in Snell-Hornby 8)

Another revolutionary German scholar, Wilhelm von Humboldt, a linguist, was among the first to introduce the relationship between language and culture into scientific inquiry (Snell-Hornby 13). What he did is study many languages in order to discover the underlying structure – “the inner form of a language” which would give access to forms of the human mind. Humboldt believed that the language people use formed their minds and thoughts. Consequently, people using different languages have different views of the world – an

argument that will become later known as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis or the hypothesis of linguistic relativity. For translators, this means there are no true equivalents because no word is exactly the same as the other (Snell-Hornby 14).

Early 19th century German theorists “treated translation as a creative force in which specific translation strategies might serve a variety of cultural and social functions, building languages, literatures, and nations” (Venuti 11). These kinds of translations are creative, foreignizing, mindful of social functions and effects rather than insisting on equivalence. And, as we shall see in the next sections, their ideas proved inspiring and stayed in circulation with generations of theorists to come.

2.2. Linguistically-Oriented Approaches

After briefly discussing the precursors and influences, we now turn to well-known authors who shaped the field in order to sketch, however partially and selectively, the development of translation studies with special attention dedicated to major turns. Yet another German scholar must be mentioned here: Walter Benjamin with his influential essay “The Task of the Translator”. Benjamin believed, as is commonly accepted these days, that translation is an art form in its own right and not a mere derivative. Following from here, Benjamin concludes that translators, as other artists, should not concern themselves with the meaning of the original, neither with word-for-word nor sense-for-sense. Instead, the translator’s task should be “expressing the innermost relationship of languages to one another”, that is exposing the “pure language” (Benjamin 20). Although at moments he is, as Snell-Hornby noticed, abstract and mystical, Benjamin nevertheless made an important step in the emancipation of translation as a profession and discipline by insisting the translators produce new works of art, not derivatives (17).

In years to follow, translation studies will strongly be dominated by literary theory and especially linguistics going through pragmatic turn (Snell-Hornby 21). This brings us to Roman Jakobson, Russian linguist and the most prominent name of the Prague School. He is best known for his essay “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation” in which, as the name suggests, he is concerned with linguistic categories. He produced a famous typology of translation based on the interpretation of a verbal sign:

- 1) Intralingual translation or rewording is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language.
- 2) Interlingual translation or *translation proper* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language.
- 3) Intersemiotic translation or *transmutation* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems. (Jakobson 114, author’s formatting)

Later on, within the same school tradition, Jiří Levý, Czech scholar, stressed the importance of translator keeping his/her readership in mind. He viewed translation’s aim to be “to impart the knowledge of the original to the foreign reader” (Levý 148). Therefore, the translation process involves three phases: understanding the original, interpreting it and, finally, transferring it to the target language, that is bringing it to the target readership (Snell-Hornby 23). For Levý, “translating is a decision process: a series of a certain number of consecutive situations – moves, as in a game – situations imposing on the translator the necessity of choosing among a certain . . . number of alternatives” (148). To use his example, an English translator must decide whether to translate Brecht’s *Der Gute Mensch von Sezuan* either as *The Good Man of Sechuan* or as *The Good Woman of Sechuan* as the German term “Mensch” covers meaning of both English terms “man” and “woman”.

Continuing the linguistic tradition in translation studies, French scholars, Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet, wrote on methodology of translation: “At first the different methods

or procedures seem to be countless, but they can be condensed to just seven, each one corresponding to a higher degree of complexity. In practice, they may be used either on their own or combined with one or more of the others.” (84)

These procedures occurring during any translation fall into two general types: direct or literal translation includes borrowing, calque and literal translation as main procedures; while oblique or free translation covers: transposition, modulation, equivalence and adaptation. Their work is mostly prescriptive with concrete instructions for translators.

Another representative of linguistic tradition inspired by Humboldt from the first chapter is American Bible translator Eugene A. Nida whose approach is connected to anthropology and questions of culture (Snell-Hornby 25). He understood language as an integral part of culture and words as cultural symbols. Deriving from this, symbols differ between cultures and, consequently, languages. This led Nida to the conclusion that translation cannot provide exact equivalents of words but is aiming for “the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style” (qtd. in Snell-Hornby 25). Therefore, there are two different types of equivalence.

Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content.

In such a translation one is concerned with such correspondences as poetry to poetry, sentence to sentence, and concept to concept. . . . This means, for example, that the message in the receptor culture is constantly compared with the message in the source culture to determine standards of accuracy and correctness. (Nida 129)

On the other hand, dynamic equivalence is aiming for the equivalent effect, to quote Nida: “the relationship between receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message” (129).

Another school of translation theory in Europe was the Leipzig School, again linguistically oriented. However, authors within this school managed to transcend a purely

linguistic approach that was dominant at the time by introducing elements from communication theory to the process of translation that will be taken again by the theory of translatorian action (Snell-Hornby 27). Yet one should keep in mind that their theory works better when applied to non-literary texts and interpreters; and since our thesis deals with literary translation these authors will not be mentioned here except for Otto Kade.

Kade was the most prominent author of this tradition who undertook an important step for establishing the discipline of translation studies – he defined basic technical terms in translation studies and provided definitions for translation, translator and translant that are still used today (Snell-Hornby 28). As for any other field of scientific inquiry, developing the metalanguage is crucial for scientific precision and institutionalization of the discipline.

Continuing on developing the field, George Steiner in his monumental work on hermeneutics of translation *After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation* (1975) argued that translating is a basic human activity happening in all communication, whether within or between languages (resonating with Jakobson's three types of translation). Moreover, Steiner believed in generalisation of the knowledge instead of specialization. This explains why he situated translation studies among ethnography, sociology and formal rhetoric – anticipating the interdisciplinarity that will become integral characteristic of translation studies (Snell-Hornby 35).

The 1970s were important years for the translation studies, a lot was shifting. Snell-Hornby summarizes:

There was firstly the broadening of perspectives within linguistics (and other disciplines) and secondly the breakdown of barriers between the individual fields. The first led to the reorientation from the isolated concept of the linguistic sign and the abstract concept of the language system as described above (with the polarized dichotomies involved) to a holistic notion of the text as part of the world around, and

the second trend led to an invaluable process of cross-fertilization, whereby the study of language was enriched by insights from anthropology, philosophy, sociology and psychology. (Snell-Hornby 40)

It is in this context that James Holmes, American translator often dubbed as the father of modern translation studies, wrote a paper “The Name and Nature of Translation Studies” (1972), which is agreed on as the founding moment (if such ever exists) of the newly establishing discipline. Holmes was interested in developing what he called “disciplinary Utopia” but there were obstacles. First of all, the study of translation did not have a name at the time. Moreover, Holmes was worried about “the lack of any general consensus as to the scope and structure of the discipline” (173). He then suggested the name commonly accepted today and proposed his idea of a structure: within Translation Studies he made a distinction between Pure and Applied (Holmes 176). The Pure branch included Theoretical Translation Studies that can be either general or partial; and Descriptive Translation Studies which are categorized into product-oriented, function-oriented and process-oriented. Applied Translation Studies consists of Translator Training, Translation Aids and Translation Policy and Criticism. However, Holmes’s most important contribution might be his call for collaboration that brought together scholars from different parts of the world (Snell-Hornby 45). This short paragraph does not do justice to Holmes's contributions to our field gaining momentum at the time of his writing.

It is around this time that translation studies started to shape into a distinctive and autonomous academic field. If years summed in this chapter were to be the childhood, a decade to come could be described as the coming of age of translation studies, turbulent as adolescence usually is. The emancipation from the view of translation being merely a linguistic activity is about to happen. Or to use Holmes’s classification, if the 1970s were years of product-oriented

Descriptive Translation Studies, in front of us are function-oriented Descriptive Translation Studies especially developed at the crossroads of sociology and our discipline.

3. The Cultural Turn of the 1980s

After years of translation theory and practice being dominated by linguistics, the 1980s brought a turn, a first major shift in thinking about the translation process influenced by the cultural turn happening across humanities at the time. In 1985 a volume of essays called *The Manipulation of Literature*, Theo Hermans introduced a new paradigm. As he writes in the Introduction:

Since about the mid-1970s, a loosely-knit international group of scholars has been attempting to break the deadlock in which the study of literary translation found itself. Their approach differs in some fundamental respects from most traditional work in the field. Their aim is, quite simply, to establish a new paradigm for the study of literary translation, on the basis of a comprehensive theory and ongoing practical research. (Hermans 10)

These authors became known as the Manipulation School due to their belief that “all translation implies a certain degree of manipulation of the source text for a certain purpose” (Hermans 11). Despite their different approaches, they agreed on the need for both theoretical work and practical research. Moreover, their perspectives on literary translation were descriptive (in contrast to previous approaches being mostly prescriptive), target-oriented (moving away from insistence on fidelity and equivalence), functional (as opposed to linguistic) and systemic (rather than atomic). For this thesis, the most important shift happened in the sudden interest in “the norms and constraints that govern the production and reception of translations” (Hermans 11).

A representative of these new trends in translation studies is Itamar Even-Zohar, Israeli scholar who introduced the polysystem theory. Even-Zohar conceptualized literature as a heterogeneous hierarchical conglomerate of systems (192), that is, a system of systems where some occupy a primary position and others a secondary position. Within a national polysystem,

a translated literature occupies either the primary position if it forms the centre of the polysystem, or the secondary position if it occupies the peripheral position. In the first case, the target literature lacks certain forms or methods, and that is where the translated literature comes in to fill the empty space. “Through the foreign works, features (both principles and elements) are introduced into the home literature which did not exist there before” (Evan-Zohar 193). This situation occurs when a literature is still in the process of being established, when a literature is peripheral within the world literature system, or when there are crises and empty spaces within a literature. On the other hand, if a translated literature occupies the peripheral position, which happens when national literature is strong and dominant, it has to conform to the norms of the target literature, which have already been established and presently dominate the system (Evan-Zohar 194). However, the relations within a system are not fixed and static, they may change as systems constantly struggle or compete for central position.

Gideon Toury, another Israeli scholar, insisted on abandoning sacred original and shifted translator’s focus to the source culture: “translatorship amounts first and foremost to being able to play a social role, i.e., to fulfil a function allotted by a community . . . in a way which is deemed appropriate in its own terms of reference” (Toury 198). Furthermore, he is interested in sets of norms that are regulating the translation process, a concept borrowed from sociology and understood by Toury as constraints of sociocultural nature or: “general values or ideas shared by a community – as to what is right and wrong, adequate and inadequate” and acquired during socialization or education (199). Then he distinguishes between three kinds of norms operating at different stages of translation; the initial norm is the translator’s basic choice to commit himself/herself either to the norms of the source or the target culture. If a translator chooses to do the first the result is an adequate translation, while the other is an acceptable translation (Toury 201). Secondly, there are preliminary norms which encompasses interconnected translation policy concerned with the selection of texts and the directness of

translation referring to texts being translated either directly or through another language (Toury 202). Finally, operational norms consisting of material and textual-linguistic norms deal with the introduction of the translation in the target culture (Toury 202).

Another breakthrough was the Skopos theory articulated by a German scholar Hans J. Vermeer who discussed translation as a form of translational action based on a source text. Following from there, translation, as any other action, has an aim, a purpose – technically called a skopos. Moreover, any action has a result, be it a new situation or a new object – in our case, a translated text (Vermeer 221). The translator within the Skopos theory becomes what Vermeer calls the expert in translational action responsible for the result of his action (222). This theory finds there is no perfect translation, but only the one dependent on its function, and context. The source text is considered only a “means to a new text” that is strongly embedded in culture and dependent on its reception by the reader (Snell-Horny 53-54). It is no wonder why such “de-throning” of the source text was controversial at the time.

The concept of culture is becoming more present in translation theory culminating in works of Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, especially in the volume these two edited: *Translation, History and Culture* (1990). In the Introduction they raise a set of questions which nicely underline what the cultural turn brought to the translation studies:

First of all, why is it necessary to represent a foreign text in one’s own culture? ... Secondly, who makes the text in one’s own culture “represent” the text in the foreign culture? In other words: who translates, why, and with what aim in mind? Who selects texts as candidates to “be represented?” Do translators? And are those translators alone? Are there other factors involved? Thirdly, how do members of the receptor culture know that the imported text is well represented? Can they trust the translator(s)? . . . Fourthly, not all languages seem to have been created equal. . . . Fifthly, why produce texts that

“refer to” other texts? Why not simply produce originals in the first place? (Bassnett and Lefevere 1)

As one can observe from the passage quoted above, very broad questions are being asked. The emphasis is finally put on extra-textual factors as history or context, and translation is treated as a social, cultural and political act, all of which will only get deepened during the next period in the translation studies.

When discussing the 1990s, Snell-Hornby identifies the postcolonial, the empirical and the globalization turn. First deals with the issue of power and colonization found in, for example, the work of Indian scholar Tejaswini Niranjana (96). The empirical turn continued the Manipulation School’s practical research programme, while the globalization turn, as the name suggests, dealt with the globalising and retribalizing context with the ever-increasing dominance of English language and fast technological development providing new tools for translators and interpreters. These turns, however, will not be discussed in greater detail as the 1990s can be seen as a time of consolidation in the new discipline during which most attention was given to formerly neglected fields – history of translation, interpreting, translation for stage and screen (Snell-Hornby 151). These are not of interest for this thesis.

Writing her book in 2006, Snell-Hornby ends her evaluation of turns in a pessimistic tone with the quotation from Vermeer: “As everywhere more is published nowadays than ever, but very little is produced that is really new. Sometimes one even gets the impression that this is a time in the modern history of translation when the pendulum is swinging back to the tradition” (qtd. in Snell-Hornby 153). Yet, our wish is to present another turn following the cultural one, a still establishing one.

4. The Sociological Turn

In May 2005, “Translation and Interpretation as a Social Practice Conference” was held at the University of Graz. Shortly after, Michaela Wolf and Alexandra Fukari edited a volume *Constructing a Sociology of Translation* that marks the beginning of the sociological turn in translation studies. It drew on different approaches within translation studies, mostly the ones developed during the cultural turn which anticipated many of the questions developed during this period in a more explicit attempt to deal with issues of power, politics, ideology and ethics. This is the reason why some doubt if translation studies is presently within a new turn or is this still part of the cultural turn. To this Wolf replies: “the question . . . no longer seems relevant: cultural and social practices – and consequently their theoretical and methodological conceptualization – cannot be regarded as detached from one another” (6).

Although the history of the culture vs. society debate would be too long to reflect on, let us stop here for a moment to try and understand the disputes. Raymond Williams, one of the most prominent names of cultural studies, claims: “culture is one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language” used and defined across the humanities differently. Here, we will use the most commonly accepted definition among contemporary sociologists: “the way of life of its members; the collection of ideas and habits which they learn, share and transmit from generation to generation” (Linton, qtd. in Haralambos 884). Therefore, culture is something that must be learnt during the socialization and something that is common, shared. Without it, humans could not communicate and understand each other. Moreover, there could not be a society without a culture; however, the same goes in the opposite direction. These two are interdependent and sometimes overlapping. Anthony Giddens, an English sociologist, defined society as: “structured relations and institutions among a large community of people which cannot be reduced to a simple collection or aggregation of individuals” (46). What is important to keep in mind here is that both society and culture are constructed, meaning they

are not given or eternal, they are subject to change. Therefore, translators are social agents involved in a dynamic process of constructing cultures and societies.

In earlier periods of translation studies, linguistic notion of the ideal speaker (consequently meaning the ideal translator) and the construct of the decontextualised “sacred original” pushed the translator’s profession into invisibility (Prunč 40). Although, during the cultural turn, various theories dealt with norms that influence the translator, who is understood as a subject to constraints and restriction and not an active agent, only in the 1990s, translation studies finally started thinking of translators in a different light. They are agents influenced by socio-cultural constraints but also have an active role in the construction of meaning in transcultural communication.

The provisional end of this development is the (re)incarnation of the ideal translator who has now become the real translator and his/her reintegration into the social and historic spaces in which they are both allies and rivals of other agents, both puppets and central actors hoping to secure their position in the social field of translation. (Prunč 43)

Theo Hermans, mentioned earlier in this thesis, is similarly concerned about translators’ position: “having instituted equivalence, it does away with the translation. And where there is no translation, there cannot be a translator” (59). What follows from this is that a translation cannot be equivalent to its original because once it achieves equivalence, it stops being a translation. Moreover, no translation is definitive, meaning it is a repeatable process, it can be done again and again, each time differently, picking between various possibilities and different readings. Just as with Levy’s moves in a game. Therefore, each translator writes their subject-position into their translation.

4.1. Translation as Social System

Theo Hermans also attempted to apply Niklas Luhmann's theory of communication. To understand what Hermans tried to do, we should first deal with Luhmann's ideas. He was Talcott Parsons' student, and his wish was to upgrade Parsons structural functionalism that was, after a period of being primary school within sociology, falling under a lot of criticism for being too abstract, ahistorical, failing to explain the social change, conflict or individual agency, but also for its conservative bias and often tautological arguments (Ritzer 258-260). So, what is new in neofunctionalism? First, within this theory, we deal with a descriptive model that understands society as consisting of elements which, while interacting with one another, form a pattern (Ritzer 261). What is important here is that these elements are interconnected, but without one element being primary. In comparison: for conflict Marxist theorists, economic base is the primary element that shapes and influences all the other elements: institutions of family, religion, politics... Understanding these elements as interdependent without a main one results in rejection of any monocausal determinism. Second, almost equal attention is devoted to action and order/structure mitigating critique that structuralists are unable to explain agency (Ritzer 263). Third, although structural-functional interest in integration (cohesion and order) stayed in theoretical programme, neofunctionalists see it as a possibility and not as a fact and the idea of the static equilibrium is rejected (Ritzer 264). This brings us to the final point, neofunctionalists take into account tensions within systems that can always result in a social change.

Crucial to Luhmann's understanding of societies is the autopoiesis, a term introduced by biologists and neuroscientists, referring to the ability of a system to produce its own elements. Moreover, an autopoietic system is self-organizing, organizing its own boundaries and internal structures. Also, systems are self-referential and closed without a direct connection between a system and its environment (Ritzer 337).

What happens when we apply Luhmann's concepts and ideas to translation? Hermans himself is careful and begins with a disclaimer:

Let me stress that I am not interested in claiming that translation *is* a social system. ... Systems exist in systems theory. Whether they have an objective existence outside it is a question system theory cannot resolve. ... In other words, we can view translation through a system-theoretic prism with the aim of gaining a fresh perspective, a way of focusing attention. (Hermans 67)

We should view translation as a social system that encompasses communications perceived as or dealing with translation. Therefore, it does not comprise of written words or books, but rather of countless communicative acts that are either translations or have something to do with translations (Hermans 66). The system constantly produces, reproduces and modifies its own elements – communicative acts. Over time, a certain stabilization occurs and some communications become more probable than others. Our system emerges as communications of the same type assemble; and programmes, consisting of prescriptions, preferences and permission, occur. What unites this system, makes it distinct from other systems, is the function the system appoints to itself. Luhmann imagined modern society as an aggregate of functionally differentiated social systems. Hermans noticed this function of translation system to extend society's communicative range "by producing communications that circulate as representations of communications on the other side of an intelligibility barrier such as a natural language" (67). The primary source of tension in the system is one between autopoiesis and structural coupling, that is between its autonomy and external factors and environment. To make this point clearer, think of about any book coming to life: the translation system "decides for itself, with reference to its own resources and procedures" how to translate or it would not be autopoietic. But the economic or political system may have demands of their own and

translators would have to and often do adapt accordingly, be it by selecting different texts for translation or translating them differently. Luhmann said systems irritate each other.

4.2. Habitus, Field and Capital

Another sociologist that inspired most of the sociological turn is Pierre Bourdieu, a French shaped by structuralists and Marxists theory – a pair that does not happen too often, these two being opposing sociological traditions. Bourdieu was concerned that sociology fell into false opposition between subjectivism and objectivism, an opposition that translates to individual versus society. Bourdieu summarizes his theory's goal as to account for both because:

. . . sociology would perhaps not be worth an hour's trouble if it solely had as its end the intention of exposing the wires which activate the individuals it observes – if it forgot that it has to do with men, even those who, like puppets, play a game of which they do not know the rules – if, in short, it did not give itself the task of restoring to men the meaning of their actions. (Bourdieu, qtd. in Ritzer 529)

In bridging the gap between an individual and society crucial theoretical concepts that Bourdieu used are habitus, field and capital. Habitus is understood as cognitive structures through which people deal with the social world, these are internalized schemes through which people perceive and understand the social dimension. Or, to switch the relationship, it is the product of the internalization of the structures. However, people occupying different positions (such as gender, class, age, or race) acquire different habitus through life. The way we dress, speak, interact with others, our values and beliefs, the way we spend our time and money, all of these are a reflection of our habitus. To use Bourdieu's 1984 empirical study *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* as an example: aesthetic preferences of different social groups (especially classes) constitute a certain taste which serves as to give an individual

a sense of her or his place in the social order, but also to unify those with similar preferences and to differentiate them from those with different ones. Who do you think goes to the opera and who listens to catchy pop? Or to use our field, who reads canonical pieces of literature and who reads crime or romantic bestsellers? “The habitus allows people to make sense out of the social world, but the existence of a multitude of habitus means that the social world and its structures do not impose themselves uniformly on all actors” (Ritzer 531). Moreover, even though habitus constrains thought and choice of action, it does not determine them – this lack of determinism distinguishes Bourdieu from structuralists (Ritzer 532).

Bourdieu’s field is more about relations, rather than structures. He understood it as a network of relations among the objective positions (either agents or institutions) within it (Ritzer 532). These fields are numerous and each of them has its own specific logic. Moreover, fields are arenas of battle, kind of a competitive field in which different kinds of capital are used to gain and secure position. This brings us to Bourdieu’s third concept: the capital. “It is capital that allows one to control one’s own fate as well as the fate of others” (Ritzer 533). He distinguishes between four types: 1) the economic one, quite an obvious one, has to do with our financial and other assets; 2) the cultural capital refers to cultural competencies, for example: person’s musical taste or etiquette; 3) the symbolic capital stems from person’s prestige and qualifications; and 4) the social capital consists of valued social relations (Ritzer 533).

Jean-Marc Gouanvic, a Canadian author, applied Bourdieusian theory to translation studies and defined the object of research in translation studies as:

. . . the analysis of the differential relationship between the habitus of translation agents (including publishers, critics, etc.) who have taken a position in a given target field in a given epoch, and the determinant factors of the target field as the site of reception of the translation. (Gouanvic 148)

Gouanvic then examines the formation of the French literary field, emerging with Flaubert and Baudelaire in the second half of the 19th century and gradually gaining autonomy (151). What is even more interesting about his work is analysing habitus of three translators of American literature in the French literary space between 1920 and 1960. Maurice-Edgar Coindreau, Marcel Duhamel and Boris Vian are used as a case study to underline how their distinct personal, family and class histories determined their literary tastes and consequently their translational work. Coindreau considered Faulkner, Goyen and O'Connor to be the three great Americans and Gouanvic connects his fascination with southern writers to his habitus by making parallels between the counter-revolution of the Chouannerie and the failure of the southern Secession (Gouanvic 159). Marcel Duhamel, coming from a very modest background and having barely any education, was interested primarily in crime fiction, detective novels, for example: William R. Burnett's *Little Caesar* that gained him recognition (Gouanvic 160). The third translator, Boris Vian was an engineer who promoted American science fiction – his habitus led him to appreciate the genre filled with scientific and technological themes (Gouanvic 161).

Another factor taken into account by Gouanvic is the symbolic capital. In a writer's case, this kind of capital is gained by recognition and constantly regained by new works. This stops being the case with authors who achieve the status of a classic, their capital becomes stable and unquestionable. Situation is quite different for translators. He or she gains capital through the original work and author, but also adds to the original's and the author's capital by getting it recognized at the target literary field (Gouanvic 162). Would Faulkner be equally famous if there was no Coindreau to introduce him to the French readership? Is there the same amount of symbolic capital involved in translations of southern US authors picked by Coindreau as in translating the non-canonical genre, considered a second rate literature, as Duhamel did? Could anyone have introduced and positioned science fiction as Vian did, or

what was important was the symbolic capital of being an engineer from a prestigious university?

4.3. International Literary Space

Pascale Casanova, the French literary critic, is another author inspired greatly by Bourdieu. In her book *The World Republic of Letters*, published in 2004 she envisions world literature as a global literary space or an arena in which literary works compete against one another, emphasizing the inequalities of the international literary space where competition takes place. In her own words:

in the literary world it is the competition among its members that defines and unifies the system while at the same time marking its limits. Not every writer proceeds in the same way, but all writers attempt to enter the same race, and all of them struggle, albeit with unequal advantages, to attain the same goal: ‘literary legitimacy’. (Casanova 40)

Literary works traverse borders due to translation and compete to succeed in the international literary space, yet works of different origin do not have equal chances to success. Casanova wonders what makes some writers internationally acceptable and successful, and others not.

She speaks of the international literary space guided by mechanisms of literary competition and literary capital (Casanova 13). Here one may wonder if literature is to be spoken of as a book business, or if art should be governed by market factors. She claims that:

One may describe the competition in which writers are engaged as a set of transactions involving a commodity that is peculiar to international literary space, a good that is demanded and accepted by everyone – a form of capital that Valéry called called ‘Culture’ or ‘Civilization,’ which includes literary capital as well. (Casanova 13)

Hence, we can speak of the literary economy as a market or space in which literary value circulates and is traded. In this market, literary capital consists not only of books and texts but also of all literary institutions, academies, juries, critics, etc. (Casanova 14). Literary credit refers to the perceived artistic value of a work or a writer, *perceived* being the operative word. Credit stands on judgments and reputations; it is a belief in the value of a book or an author (Casanova 16).

This helps explain how once a writer becomes known, that is, his/her name gains value on the literary market, he/she is given immediate credit and all other works he/she may write will henceforth be regarded as valuable, based on his/her credit and not necessarily on the quality of the work. In this way, literary capital perpetuates literary capital and makes it even harder for new or unknown peripheral authors to succeed. The same thing happens with centres of the literary world: the oldest centres are richer because they are credited with the most power.

This unequal distribution of literary resources is inherent in the international literary space, dividing it into two poles. The first pole, the European pole, entered the transnational literary competition first, carrying a large amount of accumulated resources. This pole perpetuates its power by the belief in literary prestige. The other pole are places lacking literary resources, having less power and greater difficulty in entering the transnational literary competition. Casanova explains that countries with weak literatures are not countries without good writers, but rather countries lacking literary capital – lacking real readership, publishers, libraries, and having an unfavourable perception of writers (Casanova 16).

4.4. Power Relations

Heilbron and Sapiro, French historical sociologists, considered the international field “constituted by the existence of nation-states and linguistic groups linked to each other by

relations of competition and rivalry” (95). Going from there, the authors believe analysis should begin with the power relations among states and their languages. They identify three types of power relations that should be included in the analysis: political, economic and cultural. The last one comprises two aspects: the symbolic capital accumulated by nations, and the power relations between languages according to the number of primary and secondary speakers (Heilbron and Sapiro 95).

Based on the power relations between languages a distinction is made between hyper-central, central, semi-peripheral and peripheral languages (Moe et al. 23). The classification is borrowed and modified from sociological world-system theory founded by Immanuel Wallerstein, which calls to briefly examine his work. Wallerstein imagined the social system to be a whole capitalist world-economy with different countries occupying different positions within it accordingly to international division of labour (Ritzer 308). The periphery consists of those countries that are rich in raw materials and cheap labour but poor, for example: Philippines, Bangladesh or Zimbabwe. On the other side are countries comprising the core and dominating the system while exploiting periphery. These are wealthy, military strong, colonial countries, for example: United States, United Kingdom, Germany. The unequal flow of exchange constantly reinforces dominant position of the core, but this does not mean the system is not dynamic, countries can lose or upgrade their positions. His approach is innovative in a sense that Wallerstein sees economic domination, and not the political or cultural one as a primary power relation. When applying Wallerstein’s theory to a field of literary translation, interesting observations can be made with a disclaimer that the history of power relations in the field of cultural exchange is not completely analogous to that of economic power (Moe et al. 24).

Abram de Swaan, a Dutch sociologist introduced the world language system comprising of: 1) the peripheral languages which include 98% of all the world’s languages but are spoken

by less than 10% of world population; 2) the central languages that count about a hundred languages, mostly “national”/official languages of states and are spoken by 95% of world population; 3) the super-central languages which are 13 according to de Swaan (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, German, Hindi, Japanese, Malay, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Swahili and Turkish); these are used for international communication, politics, business, technology; 4) finally there is one hyper-central language, currently being English (Moe et al. 30). However, keep in mind English has not been in this position for that long, and may not be in the future.

Similarly, Heilbron based his classification of languages on the share of translations from those languages in the world market for translated books (Moe et al. 34). Again, English is the hyper-central language with 50%-70% of all translations. Next are central languages, for example: French and German, with about 10% to 12%. Semi-peripheral languages, such as Italian, Swedish or Polish, account for 1-3% of the translated books. All other languages have less than 1% of the world market – surprisingly, in this category we find Chinese, Japanese, Arabic and Portuguese which despite large number of speakers are not being translated that much. Again, these positions are not fixed, as Wallerstein and de Swaan already suggested.

This system demonstrates several general mechanisms. Firstly, translation flows are quite asymmetrical, much more is translated from the center toward the periphery than the other way. Moreover, the more central a language is, the lower the percentage of translated texts in comparison to non-translated ones (Heilbron and Sapiro 96). This is in accordance with Even-Zohar’s observations from the third chapter: the dominant countries “export” a lot and translate little into their languages, while the peripheral countries mostly “import” foreign books. Finally, communication/translation among peripheral languages often passes through the intermediary central language (Heilbron and Sapiro 97).

International cultural exchange is under the influence of two kinds of constraints: the political and the economic. The first case is at stake in countries where the political field governs cultural production, such as fascist or communist countries where state's institutions select texts for translations and take care of texts being translated in a way to serve different state's interests. On the other hand, most of the texts produced today in the context of neoliberal capitalism are governed by the logic of the market, supply and demand. Heilbron and Sapiro notice: "In cases of extreme liberalization of the book market, as in the United States, cultural goods appear primarily as commercial products that must obey the law of profitability: this is best illustrated by the process of manufacturing standardized worldwide bestsellers" (98). With strengthening the economic constraints, more power goes to the agents on the demand-side: literary agents, translators, and most importantly, publishers (Heilbron and Sapiro 99). Even though most publishers are after profitability and large readership, part of what is translated is governed by the specific cultural logic. These are the books selected by criteria of literary and aesthetic value, published on a small-scale, aiming for peer recognition instead of commercial success. Therefore, this space often relies on a system of subsidy (Heilbron and Sapiro 100).

4.5. Perspectives on Methodology

After discussing theoretical contributions developed at the crossroads of translation studies and sociology, we now turn to what sociological turn introduced in methodology. Since the field of translational studies is highly interdisciplinary, there is no surprise various methodologies are being used. These are gaining more interest after the 2000 when the Research Models in Translation Studies Conference was held in Manchester. The dilemma proposed there was the opposition between quantitative or descriptive models versus qualitative or explanatory models. Descriptive ones intent to look for patterns or regularities, they take into account social aspects of translation, for example: Toury and his norms. On the

other hand, the explanatory brings to us the contingent dimension and the creativity, dealing more with an individual concerns, for example: Bassnett and Lefevere. However, Agorni believes this distinction must be overcome:

Rather than considering the opposition between descriptive/quantitative and explanatory/qualitative research methods as an automatic premise, a simple change of perspective could make the difference, and reconcile the two poles: instead of seeing them in a binary logic, one excluding the other, they can be considered as points on a continuum, linked by a relation of mutual dependency. (126)

Having this in mind, we can revisit the system theory discussed in a previous chapter. Teo Hermans warns that system theory failed to link questions of power and ideology to the actual agents involved in translation activities (Agorni 127). Moreover, the systemic theory builds around different binary oppositions (for example: centre vs. periphery) which creates difficulties when investigating ambivalent cases. In this light, Andre Lefevere's work on social and individualized control factors on translation activities could be seen as a corrective to overly deterministic system theory (Agorni 128). He uses patronage, ideology and poetics as key concepts that bridge the translation practices and their socio-cultural context.

Agorni further believes this could be done even better by research method of localism as developed by Tymoczko (1999): "localized research into specific translation phenomena (providing a careful and detailed reconstruction of their social, linguistic, historical, and cultural contexts allows individual case studies to avoid the danger of generalisation" (Agorni 129). When localism is employed, it results in case studies which ground translation in its environment and allows the peculiarities to occur, instead of reducing them to coherent patterns making this method especially suitable for hybrid practices. It manages to take into account both patterns and irregularities, both norms and norms-breaking. In one of the rare Croatian writings on methodology in translation studies, Giga Gračan, a Croatian translator, defends

Antun Šoljan's translation of the drama *Ničija zemlja* by Harold Pinter which came under a lot of criticism. Šoljan applied localism when translating this piece – instead in England, the drama takes place in Croatia. Moreover, names, localities and references were domesticated causing controversy.

Another idea on how to overcome the limits of the systemic model is presented by Helene Buzelin, a Canadian scholar who insists on focusing on the production end, instead of the reception end of translating process. She does this by using Bruno Latour's actor-network theory to closely study: "the 'making' of various literary translations hosted by commercial publishing houses – from the negotiations pertaining to the purchase of the translation rights to the marketing of the finished product" (Buzelin 138). For four years (2004-2007), she followed three Montreal-based companies: Fides, Boreal and Les Allusifs. Her work is exceptional because the process of 'making' a literary translation has not been the subject of any in-depth field study and she hints why this could be: perhaps due to translator's invisibility (142) or to go back to Venuti (1998), this could be due to the fact that manufacturing process is a subject to manipulation and source of scandals. Think of those actors who decide about the product's features and its mode of dissemination "torn between the quest for symbolic capital and the need to comply with economic imperatives" (Buzelin 166).

As presented in this chapter, sociology enriched the discipline of translation studies giving it ways, theoretical and methodological, to deal with social context in which translations occur and exist. By understanding translation as a social system, questions of power relations and unequal exchange flows become visible granting us another perspective, as we will argue – a crucial one.

5. Vonnegut through Sociological Lens

What interests us in this chapter is *Slaughterhouse-Five* appearing so late in Croatian translation and possible reasons for such an interesting case. Kurt Vonnegut (1922-2007) was a famous American postmodern writer. His novels like *Cat's Cradle* (1963), *Slaughterhouse-Five* (1969), *Breakfast of Champions* (1972) and many more have captured the attention of both the critics and the readers. In his work, Vonnegut speaks of what it means to be an American in the second half of the 20th century. Of course, he was not the first one to attempt so, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau, Mark Twain and Walt Whitman in the nineteenth century started imagining a new American literature and culture free from the influence and constraints of Europe (Morse 140). However, Vonnegut continues on their tradition and makes success by identifying key social problems and historical crisis with which he deals in his novels, such as World War II, atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the Vietnam War, the Cold War, but also science, technology, ecology, politics (Morse 140). This is why Morse, an American literary critic, among others, regards Vonnegut as “the most representative American writer of the latter half of the twentieth century” for the generation of readers living through the Depression and World War II, and later coping with technological expansion, social inequalities and so on (140). Vonnegut is shocked by the values of the society he lived in, and moreover, aims to shock his readers.

5.1. *Slaughterhouse-Five*

The main theme of *Slaughterhouse-Five* is Allied air-bombing of the German city of Dresden, but also the story of Billy Pilgrim. He is a young American soldier who got captured by the Germans and was held captive in a slaughterhouse in Dresden but survived the aerial bombing and returned home. After returning to Illium, he finished his optometry school, married a daughter of an optometrist and had two children – Barbara and Robert. Also, he

claimed he was abducted by aliens from a planet Trafamaldorian and he could go back and forth in time.

The novel is quite complex and non-traditional in its structure, due to the technique of narration and treatment of the main theme. Because of its focus on the bombing of Dresden, one may be quick to put *Slaughterhouse-Five* into the genre of the historical novel, but traditional historical novels are different and most certainly do not contain science-fiction elements. Moreover, the novel includes many autobiographical details leading some critics to believe that the narrator is indeed the writer. Vonnegut “often introduces the action and explains the details, constantly reminding that he is writing the novel” (Žindžiuvienė qtd. in Pokvytytė 5). So, *Slaughterhouse-Five* is a postmodern mix of genres and techniques. Christina Jarvis, who dedicated most of her scholarly work to Vonnegut’s writing, says it is “a very different kind of war story which combines fact, fiction, and postmodern literary techniques to undermine the conventions of traditional narration itself” (qtd. in Pokvytytė 7).

Although Vonnegut is a well-established literary name and *Slaughterhouse-Five* is his most successful work, Croatian translation was published just recently, in 2019 by Zagrebačka naklada and translated by Milena Benini. Moreover, Vonnegut’s less-known works have been translated earlier: *Jailbird* was translated in 1981 by Omer Lakomica and published by Znanje, *Galapagos* in 1990 by Mario Suško and published by Grafički zavod Hrvatske, and *Cat’s Cradle* in 2010 by Ivan Zorić and published by Europapress holding: Novi Liber. In order to give possible answers to why *Slaughterhouse-Five* was not translated earlier, we have to turn our attention to questions raised by the sociological turn in translation studies. As we have seen in previous chapters, these questions have little to do with aesthetic quality of the work and go beyond texts and linguistics. Therefore, examination of the Croatian literary system is necessary.

5.2. Vonnegut in Croatia

Starting from the analysis of the power relations among states and their languages, as Heilbron and Sapiro suggested one should do when analysing translation process, inequalities become apparent. Vonnegut's original is written in English, one hyper-central, dominant language. On the other hand, Croatian language is peripheral with about 4 million speakers (for pragmatical reasons, in this thesis the number of Croatian population is evened with the number of speakers of Croatian language) and less than 1% on the share of translations in the world market. According to *Portal otvorenih podataka*, only 62 books written in Croatian language managed to get translated into English language – only 62 books managed to go from the periphery straight to the center. Authors with most books on the list are Slavenka Drakulić and Dubravka Ugrešić. However, as Andrea Pisac noticed in her dissertation, what is translated into English does not represent Croatian literature or culture, but rather a selected exoticized image: “while white Western authors are allowed to tackle universal themes, Third World authors are read through a specific contract of the anthropological exotic” (19). Themes of war are favoured and exported, books with other topics are not of interest to the Anglophone readership which has certain expectations.

On the other hand, proper statistical data for the translated literature in Croatia are not available – this is indicative of the importance of literature in the country. However, we will look at neighbour Slovene statistics collected by Irena Perme (qtd. in Moe et al. 42): in the first decade of the 21st century translated literature made about 64% of all literature published by Slovene publishers, 61% coming from English, 21% from German, 10% from French and 8% from Italian. It is reasonable to assume that the numbers are similar in Croatia with countries sharing geographical location and partly history. Unofficial figures on the percentage of translated literature in Croatia range from 40% to 80%, being in concordance with Perme's research.

From the numbers stated above, it is obvious Croatian literary space is dependent on and consisting mostly of the translated literature. One might be quick to conclude that this may mean the Croatian translators enjoy recognition as important agents in constructing literature. However, the translator's profession is undervalued and underpaid, translators do not get mentioned. Moreover, the scientific discipline of translation studies does not formally exist, scientific articles on the topic are rare. About translation reviews, Giga Gračan writes:

In our country, rare are the cases of writing about either literary or professional-scientific translations, except in cases of major issues. As a rule, righteous indignation of analysts has no effect on the fate of these ventures of the inexperience/untrained translator's imagination/skill; it never happened that because of this, a book was withdrawn from sale, nor that the translator in question was denied the trust of the publisher. (Gračan 2)

This ignorance of the translation process and translator's invisibility made writing this thesis more difficult. Firstly, there is very little scholarly literature written on Croatian literary system or space – most of what is written is collected in volumes published every two years by *Društvo hrvatskih književnih prevodilaca* (200-300 copies per volume). The sociological turn got little attention within Croatian academia, partly being the reason for dealing with this topic in our thesis. Moreover, although Serbian, Slovenian and Croatian translation were collected and literary journals examined, there is not a single sentence about the translations of Vonnegut into Croatian. Translations got no Introduction, translator's notes or reviews, and this is for the canonical piece of literature.

However, one can speculate. Surely, part of the reason for *Slaughterhouse-Five* getting translated into Croatian only recently has something to do with novel being translated into Slovenian by Branko Gradišnik and published by *Mladinska knjiga* in 1969, and into Serbian by Branko Vučićević and published by *Beogradski izdavačko-grafički zavod* in 1973. Most of

the people living in former Yugoslavia could read either Slovenian or Serbian therefore making the Croatian translation redundant. However, this does not explain why only 24 years after the independence Croatian translation occurred when most of the canonical pieces got their 'croatized' version earlier during the construction of national literature and identity separated from the former country.

Speculating further, one could ask if the reason for not translating *Slaughterhouse-Five* earlier may lie in its theme. Novels exploring the topic of war are represented in Croatian literature, the Homeland War (1990-1995) being still fresh and formative experience for the generation of writers who got caught in it. Maybe this is the reason why war novels get translated from Croatian and why there was no interest in translating *Slaughterhouse-Five* which already had Serbian and Slovenian translations. Maybe it has something to do with the fact that Vonnegut's novel reads with a powerful anti-war message which may seem out of place in a country glorifying the Homeland war and its heroes.

Profitability is another factor that must be taken into consideration within the globalised neoliberalised book market as Casanova depicts it. Firstly, one could argue the complexity of the text written in a postmodern manner could make the process of translating more difficult, prolonging the time needed and increasing costs. Moreover, Vonnegut being a canonical author already translated into Serbian and Slovenian might have disheartened publishers who need to sell copies in order to make profit.

The imperative of profitability is partly mitigated by subsidy system which is especially important in countries with a small population (meaning small readership base) and little literary capital. In 2022, Croatian Ministry of Culture and Media, supported 71 publisher with a 7.799.000,00 kn. Cultural council and expert committee decided among applicants according to three main criteria: 1) the aesthetic value of the work and the relevance of the authors and other collaborators; 2) the professionalism of the applicant/publisher; and 3) fulfilling the

priorities of the public call – meaning: contribution to Croatian culture, publishing valuable noncommercial works, filling gaps in the domestic cultural scene) (min-kulture.gov.hr). However, as *Portal hrvatskog kulturnog vijeća* warns, these subsidies are granted mostly to big private publishing houses and literary criteria seems to come after the commercial success – contradicting the first criteria for application. There are also international programmes aiming to offer financial help to literary translation, such as *Kreativna Europa*, Traduki and Central and East European Book Projects.

Andy Jelčić, a Croatian translator, in an essay discussing the future of literary translation in Croatia is not optimistic. Jelčić believes there will be less and less translations of canonical pieces of literature, partly because the canon is in great part already translated, but also because these works require lot of effort and grant no commercial success (176). Moreover, the commercialization of literature will further diminish the quality of works that get selected for translation, consequently diminishing the translator's profession.

5.3 Klaonica broj pet

Ili dječji križarski rat: Ples dužnosti sa smrti

2

Čujte:

Billy Pilgrim oslobodio se u vremenu.

Billy je zaspao kao senilni udovac, a probudio se na dan svoga vjenčanja. Prošao je kroz jedna vrata u 1955., a izišao kroz druga u 1941. Vratio se kroz ta ista vrata i zatekao se u 1963. Mnogo puta je vidio svoje rođenje i smrt, kaže, i nasumice posjećuje sve događaje između.

Tako kaže.

Billy se grčio u vremenu, nije imao kontrole nad tim kamo dalje ide i putovanja mu nisu uvijek bila zabavna. Stalno je imao tremu, tako kaže, jer nikada nije znao u kojem će dijelu svoga života morati glumiti.

Billy se rodio 1922. u Iliumu, New York, kao sin jedinac tamošnjeg brijača. Kao dijete izgledao je smiješno i odrastao je u mladića koji je izgledao smiješno visok i slab i oblikom nalik na bocu Coca-Cole. Završio je srednju školu u Iliumu među trećinom najboljih u generaciji te je pohađao jedan semestar večernje škole na Iliumskoj školi optometrije prije nego što su ga unovačili u vojnu službu u Drugom svjetskom ratu. Za vrijeme rata otac mu je nesretno poginuo u lovu. Tako to ide.

Billy je služio s pješastvom u Europi te su ga Nijemci zarobili. Nakon časnog otpusta iz vojske 1945., Billy se ponovno upisao u Iliumsku školu optometrije. Na četvrtoj godini zaručio se s kćerkom osnivača i vlasnika škole, a zatim pretrpio blagi živčani slom.

Liječio se u bolnici za veterane kraj jezera Placid, dobivao je šok-terapiju pa su ga pustili. Oženio se svojom zaručnicom, priveo kraju svoje obrazovanje te mu je svekar u Iliumu otvorio ordinaciju. Ilium je posebice dobar grad za optometriste jer se ondje nalaze državna kovačnica i talionica. Svaki zaposlenik obvezan je posjedovati par zaštitnih naočala i nositi ih u područjima gdje se odvija proizvodnja. Kovačnica i talionica zajedno broje šezdeset i osam tisuća zaposlenih u Iliumu. To znači mnogo leća i mnogo okvira.

U okvirima je lova.

Billy se obogatio. Imao je dvoje djece, Barbaru i Roberta. S vremenom, njegova kći Barbara udala se za drugog optometrista i Billy je njemu otvorio ordinaciju. Billyev sin Robert imao je

mного poteškoća u srednjoj školi, no potom se priključio poznatim specijalnim jedinicama, Zelenim beretkama. Doveo se u red, izrastao u uzornog mladića i borio se u Vijetnamu.

Početkom 1968., skupina optometrista, među njima i Billy, unajmila je zrakoplov da iz Illiuma odlete na međunarodni kongres optometrista u Montrealu. Zrakoplov se srušio na vrh Sugarbush planine u Vermontu. Svi su poginuli osim Billya. Tako to ide.

Dok se Billy oporavljao u bolnici u Vermontu, njegova se je žena slučajno otrovala ugljičnim monoksidom. Tako to ide.

Kad se je Billy napokon vratio kući u Illium nakon zrakoplovske nesreće, na neko se vrijeme povukao u sebe. Imao je grozan ožiljak duž tjemena. Nije nastavio raditi u ordinaciji. Dobio je spremačicu. Kći ga je posjećivala gotovo svakoga dana.

A onda je, bez ikakva upozorenja, Billy otputovao u New York, i javio se u cjelonoćni radijski talk show. Govorio je o tome kako se oslobodio u vremenu. Rekao je i da ga je 1967. oteo leteći tanjur. Tanjur s planeta Tralfamadorea, rekao je. Odveli su ga na Tralfamadore, gdje su ga izložili golog u zoološkom vrtu, rekao je. Tamo su ga parili s bivšom zemaljskom filmskom zvijezdom po imenu Montana Wildhack.

Neke noćne ptice u Illiumu čule su Billya na radiju, i netko od njih nazvao je Billyjevu kćer Barbaru. Barbara je bila uzrujana. Ona i njen suprug otišli su do New Yorka i doveli Billya kući. Billy je nježno ustrajao da je sve što je rekao na radiju istinito. Rekao je da su ga Tralfamadorci oteli za vrijeme svadbe njegove kćeri. Nisu primijetili da ga nema, rekao je, jer su ga Tralfamadorci proveli kroz vremensku crvotočinu, tako da je na Tralfamadoreu mogao biti godinama, a da sa Zemlje izbiva svega mikrosekundu.

Još jedan mjesec minuo je bez incidenta, a zatim je Billy napisao pismo illiumskom *News Leaderu*, koje su novine i objavile. Opisivalo je bića s Tralfamadorea.

U pismu je stajalo da su šezdesetak centimetara visoki, i zeleni, i oblikom nalik na odštopač za odvođe. Njihova vakuum guma je na tlu, a njihove drške, koje su iznimno savitljive, obično su bile uperene u nebo. Na vrhu svake drške nalazi se ručica sa zelenim okom na dlanu. Ta su stvorenja prijateljski nastrojena, i vide četiri dimenzije. Žale Zemljane jer mogu vidjeti samo tri. Zemljane bi mogli naučiti mnogim divnim stvarima, posebice o vremenu. Billy je obećao kazati neke od tih stvari u svome idućem pismu.

Billy je već pisao svoje drugo pismo kad je prvo objavljeno. Drugo pismo započinjalo je ovako:

„Najvažnija je stvar koju sam naučio na Tralfamadoreu bila: kada čovjek umre on samo *naoko* umire. I dalje je itekako živ u prošlosti, pa je iznimno besmisleno da mu ljudi plaču na sprovodu. Svi trenutci, prijašnji, sadašnji i budući, uvijek su postojali, uvijek će postojati. Tralfamadorci mogu vidjeti sve te razne trenutke baš kao što mi možemo vidjeti planinski niz Stjenjaka, naprimjer. Oni vide kako su ti svi trenuci vječni i mogu pogledati u bilo koji trenutak koji ih zanima. Puka je obmana do koje držimo ovdje na Zemlji da jedan trenutak slijedi za drugim, poput perli na koncu, i da jednom kada trenutak prođe da je zauvijek prošao.

Kad Tralfamadorac ugleda leš, jedino što pomisli jest da je mrtva osoba u lošem stanju u tom određenom trenutku, ali ista ta osoba je sasvim u redu u mnogo drugih trenutaka. Sada, kad ja čujem da je netko mrtav, jednostavno slegnem ramenima i kažem ono što Tralfamadorci kažu za mrtve ljude, a to je: 'Tako to ide.'“

I tako dalje.

Billy je pisao to pismo u podrumskoj sobi za razonodu svoje prazne kuće. Njegova spremačica imala je slobodan dan. U sobi za razonodu nalazio se stari pisači stroj. Bila je to prava zvijer. Težio je koliko i prosječni akumulator. Billy ga nije mogao daleko odnijeti tek tako, zbog čega je pisao u sobi za razonodu a ne negdje drugdje.

Uljna grijalica se ugasila. Miš je progrizao izolaciju žice koja vodi do termostata. Temperatura u kući pala je na deset stupnjeva, ali Billy nije primijetio. Nije bio ni toplo odjeven. Bio je bosonog, i dalje u pidžami i ogrtaču, iako je bilo kasno poslijepodne. Bose noge bile su mu plave i boje bjelokosti.

Ali Billyjevo srce bilo je poput užarena ugljena. Ono što ga je tako raspalilo bilo je Billyjevo uvjerenje da će tolikim ljudima donijeti utjehu istinom o vremenu. Zvono na ulaznim vratima zvonilo je i zvonilo gore na katu. To je bila njegova kći Barbara, htjela je ući. Otključala je vrata svojim ključem, prešla duž poda nad njegovom glavom, dozivajući: „Oče? Tata, gdje si?“ I tako dalje.

Billy joj nije odgovarao, stoga je bila gotovo histerična, očekujući da će otkriti njegovo truplo. A zatim je provjerila zadnje mjesto koje se uopće *moglo* provjeriti – sobu za razonodu.

„Zašto mi se nisi javio kad sam te zvala?“ Barbara je pitala, stojeći tamo na vratima sobe za razonodu. Donijela je popodnevene novine, one u kojima je Billy opisao svoje prijatelje s Tralfamadorea.

„Nisam te *čuo*“, odgovorio je Billy.

U tom trenutku stvari su bile ovake: Barbari je bila tek dvadeset i jedna godina, a svoga oca smatrala je senilnim, iako mu je bilo tek četrdeset i šest – senilnim zbog oštećenja mozga u zrakoplovnoj nesreći. Također je smatrala da je ona glava obitelji, pošto je morala organizirati majčin sprovod, pošto je morala pronaći spremačicu za Billya, i sve to. Isto tako, Barbara i njen suprug bili su primorani pobrinuti za se Billyjev posao, kojeg je bilo dosta, pošto je Billyja sada očito bolio đon za posao. Sva ta odgovornost u tako ranoj dobi pretvorila ju je u kvocavo blebetalo. A Billy je u međuvremenu pokušavao zadržati svoje dostojanstvo, uvjeriti Barbaru i sve ostale da je sve samo ne senilan, da se, naprotiv, posvećuje pozivu mnogo bitnijem od pukog posla.

Sada je, smatrao je, propisivao korektivne leće za zemaljske duše. Toliko tih duša bilo je izgubljeno i jadno, Billy je vjerovao, jer ne umiju vidjeti onako dobro kao njegovi mali zeleni prijatelji na Tralfamadoreu.

„Ne laži mi, oče“, rekla je Barbara. „Dobro znam da si čuo kad sam te zvala.“ Kći mu je bila prilično lijepa djevojka, samo što je imala noge krive poput edvardijanskog glasovira. Sad mu je napravila problem zbog pisma u novinama. Rekla je da podsmijehu izlaže sebe i sve oko sebe.

„Oče, oče, oče“, rekla je Barbara, „što ćemo mi s tobom? Hoćeš li nas natjerati da te smjestimo tamo gdje ti je i majka?“ Billyjeva majka još uvijek je bila živa. Živjela je u staračkom domu zvanom Pine Knoll nadomak Illiuma.

„Što te točno u vezi moga pisma toliko ljuti?“ upitao je Billy.

„To je sve ludo! Ništa od toga nije istina!“

„To je sve istina.“ Billy nije dopuštao da ga razljuti. Nikad se ni na što nije ljutio. Bio je divan po tom pitanju.

„Ne postoji planet Tralfamadore.“

„Ne može ga se vidjeti sa Zemlje, ako na to misliš“, rekao je Billy. „Kao što se ni Zemlju ne može vidjeti s Tralfamadorea. Oboje su jako mali. Jako su daleko jedan od drugog.“

„Odakle ti tako suludo ime kao što je *Tralfamadore*?“

„Tako ga stvorenja koja tamo žive zovu.“

„O, Bože“, rekla je Barbara i okrenula mu leđa. Svoj je očaj iskazala pljesnuvši rukama.

„Mogu li ti postaviti jedno jednostavno pitanje?“

„Naravno.“

„Zašto ništa od ovoga nisi spomenuo prije zrakoplovne nesreće?“

„Nisam smatrao da je sazrijelo vrijeme za to.“

I tako dalje. Billy kaže da se prvi put oslobodio u vremenu 1944., davno prije nego što je otputovao na Tralfamadore. Tralfamadorijanci nisu imali ništa s njegovim oslobađanjem od vremena. Oni su mu samo mogli dati uvid u ono što se stvarno događa.

Billy se prvi put oslobodio tijekom Drugog svjetskog rata. Billy u ratu služi kao kapelanov pomoćnik. Kapelanov pomoćnik je po običaju predmet zadirivanja u američkoj vojsci. Billy nije nikakva iznimka. Nemoćan je da naudi neprijatelju ili da pomogne svojim prijateljima. Zapravo, nema prijatelja. Propovjednikov je sluga, ne očekuje promaknuća ni medalje, ne nosi oružje, i gaji skrušenu vjeru u dobrotivog Isusa, što većina vojnika prezire.

Na manevrima u Južnoj Karolini Billy svira crkvene pjesme kojih se sjeća iz djetinjstva, svira ih na malenim crnim vodootpornim orguljama. Imaju trideset i devet tipki i dvije pedale – *vox humana* i *vox celeste*. Billy je isto tako zadužen i za prijenosni oltar, maslinasto-sivi kovčeg s nogama na rasklapanje. Obložen je grimiznim baršunom, a u tom bogatom baršunu leže anodizirani aluminijski križ i Biblija.

Oltar i orgulje proizvedeni su u tvornici usisavača u Camden, New Jersey – a tako na njima i piše.

Jednom prilikom na manevrima Billy svira Moćna tvrđava je naš Bog, koju je uglazbio Johann Sebastian Bach, a riječi napisao Martin Luther. Nedjelja je ujutro. Billy i njegov kapelan okupili su pastvu od pedesetak vojnika na nekom obronku u Karolini. Uto se pojavi sudac. Sudaca je bilo posvuda, tih ljudi koji su odlučivali tko pobjeđuje ili gubi ovu teoretsku bitku, tko je živ, a tko mrtav.

Sudac nosi komičnu vijest. Pastvu je teoretski iz zraka spazio teoretski neprijatelj. Svi su oni sada teoretski mrtvi. Teoretski leševi se nasmiju i pogoste obilnim ručkom.

Prisjećajući se tog incidenta godinama kasnije, Billy je shvatio kakva je to zapravo tralfamadorska igra sa smrću bila, biti mrtav i jesti u isto vrijeme.

Pred kraj manevara, Billyju je odobren izvanredni dopust jer mu je oca, brijača u Illiumu, New York, nasmrt ustrijelio prijatelj dok su lovili divljač. Tako to ide.

Kad se Billy vratio s dopusta, čekaju ga naredbe da mora ići u inozemstvo. Traže ga u glavnom stožeru pješadijske satnije stacionirane u Luksemburgu. Pomoćnik kapelana satnije ubijen je u borbi. Tako to ide.

Billy se pridružio satniji, koja je taman u procesu desetkovanja od strane Nijemaca u slavnoj Bitci u Ardenima. Billy nikad nije niti upoznao kapelana kojemu je trebao služiti, nisu mu čak izdali ni čeličnu kacigu ni vojničke čizme. To je bilo u prosincu 1944., za vrijeme posljednje snažne njemačke ofenzive u ratu.

Billy je preživio, ali je sada ošamućeni lutalica daleko iza novih njemačkih linija. Trojica drugih lutalica, ni približno toliko ošamućenih, dopustili su Billyju da im se priključi. Dvojica su izvidnici, a jedan je protutenkovski topnik. Nemaju ni hrane ni karti. Izbjegavajući Nijemce prodiru u sve potpuniju seosku tišinu. Jedu snijeg.

Hodaju jedan iza drugog. Prvo idu izvidnici, pametni, graciozni, tihi. Nose puške. Za njima ide protutenkovski topnik, nespretni i tup, držeći Nijemce podalje s Colt .45 automatikom u jednoj i rovovskim nožem u drugoj ruci.

Na začelju ide Billy Pilgrim, praznih ruku, utučen i spreman umrijeti. Billy je sav naopak - metar devedeset visok, prsiju i ramena poput kutije šibica. Nema šljema, kaputa, oružja ni čizama. Na nogama ima jeftine, niske civilne cipele koje je kupio za sprovod svoga oca. Billy je ostao bez pete na jednoj cipeli, zbog čega se klata gore-dolje, gore-dolje. Od nehotičnog plesanja gore-dolje, gore-dolje bole ga kukovi.

Billy na sebi ima tanku vojničku jaknu, majicu i hlače od grube vune te duge gaće koje su bile natopljene znojem. Jedini od njih četvorice ima bradu. Nesređenu, čekinjastu bradu, i gdje koje su čekinjice bijele, iako je Billyju tek dvadeset i jedna godina. Također je ćelavio. Zbog vjetra i hladnoće i strašnog napora crven je u licu.

Uopće ne izgleda kao vojnik. Izgleda kao prljavi plamenac.

Trećeg dana lutanja, netko izdaleka zapuca na četvorku – puca četiri puta dok prelaze usku kaldrmu. Jedan je hitac namjenjen za izvidnike. Idući je za protutenkovskog topnika, koji se zove Roland Weary.

Treći je hitac za prljavog plamenca, koji se sledio nasred ceste kad je smrtonosna pčela prozujala kraj njegova uha. Billy pristojno ostaje stajati na mjestu, dajući strijelcu još jednu priliku. Prema njegovom zbrkanom shvaćanju pravila rata strijelcu bi se *trebala* dati druga prilika. Idući hitac promaši Billyjeva koljena za nekoliko centimetara; metak se, sudeći po zvuku, u zraku okretao oko svoje osi.

Roland Weary i izvidnici sigurni su u jarku, dok Weary reži na Billyja, „Makni se s ceste, mater ti jebem glupu.“ Ovaj posljednji izraz i dalje je novotarija u govoru bijelaca 1944. godine. Billyju, koji nikada nikog nije jebao, ona se doima svježom i neobičnom – i učini svoje. Trgnula ga je i sklonila s ceste.

„Opet sam ti spasio život, majmune glupi“, Weary reče Billyju u jarku. Danima već spašava Billyju život, grdeći ga, šutajući ga, šamarajući ga, tjerajući ga da se kreće. Prijeko je potrebno primijeniti okrutnost jer Billy ništa ne bi napravio da samoga sebe spasi. Billy želi odustati. Promrzao je, gladan, posramljen, nesposoban. Sada, trećega dana, jedva razlikuje san i javu, a ne razlikuje bogznakako ni hodanje i stajanje na mjestu.

Samo želi da ga svi ostave na miru. „Dajte vi nastavite dalje bez mene“, neprestano ponavlja.

Wearyju je rat nov koliko i Billyju. I on je zamjena. Kao dio artiljerijske postrojbe, pomogao je ispaliti jedan hitac u naletu bijesa –

iz 57-milimetarskog protutenkovskog topa. Top je ispustio parajući zvuk poput otkopčavanja šlica Boga Svemogućega. Podigao je snijeg i raslinje plamenom dugačkim gotovo deset metara. Plamen je ostavio crnu strelicu na tlu, pokazujući Nijemcima točno gdje je top sakriven. Hitac je promašio.

Promašio je tenk Tigar. On je okrenuo svoju 88-milimetarsku gubicu, njušeći, pa ugledao strelicu na tlu. Opalio je. Pobio je sve članove artiljerijske postrojbe osim Wearyja. Tako to ide.

Rolandu Wearyu tek je osamnaest godina, na kraju je svog nesretnog djetinjstva većinom provedenog u Pittsburghu, Pennsylvania. U Pittsburghu je bio omražen. Bio je omražen jer je bio glup i debeo i zločest, a i smrdio je po slanini ma koliko se prao. U Pittsburghu su ga neprestano odbacivali ljudi koji ga nisu htjeli kraj sebe.

Wearyju je dozlogrdilo da ga odbacuju. Kad bi Wearyja odbacili, on bi pronašao nekoga tko je bio omraženiji čak i od njega, i s tom bi se osobom zafrkavao neko vrijeme, glumeći da su prijatelji. A potom bi pronašao kakav izgovor da ubije boga u njoj.

Obrazac se ponavljao. Bio je to ludi, seksi, ubojiti odnos u koji je Weary stupao s ljudima koje bi na koncu pretukao. Pričao im je o zbirci oružja njegova oca: puškama i mačevima i spravama za mučenje i okovima i tako dalje. Wearyjev otac, vodoinstalater, doista je skupljao takve stvari, a zbirka mu je bila osigurana na četiri tisuće dolara. Nije bio jedini. Pripadao je velikom klubu sastavljenom od ljudi koji skupljaju takve stvari.

Wearyjev otac jednom je Wearyjevoj majci darovao španjolski prstolomac u ispravnom stanju – da joj služi kao uteg za papir u kuhinji. Drugom joj je prilikom darovao stolnu lampu čije je postolje bilo trideset centimetara visoka kopija slavne 'Željezne djevice od Nürnberga'. Prava Željezna djevica bila je srednjovjekovna sprava za mučenje, svojevrsan kotao u obliku žene – obložen bodljama. Prednja strana žene bila je sastavljena od dvaju vrata sa šarkama. Zamisao je bila da se zločinca strpa unutra, a zatim polagano zatvaraju vrata. Dvije posebne bodlje bile su postavljene u razini očiju. Na dnu se nalazio odvod kroz koji je otjecala sva krv.

Tako to ide.

Weary ispriča Billyju Pilgrimu o Željeznoj djevici, o odvodu na dnu – i čemu on služi. Priča Billyu o dum-dum metcima. Ispriča mu o Derringer pištolju njegova oca, koji se mogao nositi u džepu prsluka, a svejedno je mogao čovjeku napraviti rupu 'kroz koju bi maleni sokol mogao proletjeti bez da išta dotakne krilima.'

Weary se jednom prilikom podrugljivo okladio s Billyjem da ovaj uopće ne zna što je to slivnik za krv. Billy je pretpostavio da je to odvod na dnu Željezne djeve, no bio je u krivu. Slivnik za krv, kako je saznao Billy, bio je plitki žlijeb na bridu oštrice mača ili bajuneta.

Weary priča Billyu o zgodnim načinima mučenjima o kojima je čitao ili ih vidio u filmovima ili čuo na radiju –

i o drugim zgodnim načinima mučenjima koje je sam izumio. Zabijanje zubarove bušilice tipu u uho bio je jedan od njegovih izuma. Pita Billya što misli koja je vrsta smaknuća najgora. Billy nema stav o tome. Ispostavlja se da je točan odgovor: „Nabiješ tipa na kolac na mravinjaku usred pustinje – kužiš? Okrenut je prema gore, i staviš mu meda na jaja i na pimpek, i odrežeš mu očne kapke tako da mora buljiti u sunce dok ne umre.“

Tako to ide.

Sada Weary, dok leži u jarku s Billyjem i izvidnicima nakon što su na njih pucali, natjera Billya da pomno promotri njegov rovovski nož. Nož nije dio službene opreme. Bio je dar od njegova oca. Imao je dvadeset pet-centimetarsku trostranu oštricu. Držak je na sebi imao bokser, niz prstena kroz koje je Weary provukao svoje zdepaste prste. Prsteni nisu bili obični. Bili su prekriveni bodljama.

Weary prisloni bodlje o Billyjev obraz, pogladi ga divljački nježnom suzdržanošću. „Kako bi ti se sviđalo da te ovime opalim - ha? Haaaaaaaaa?“ upita ga.

„Ne bi“, reče Billy.

„Znaš zašto je oštrica trostrana?“

„Ne.“

„Jer ostavlja ranu koja se ne zatvara.“

„Uf.“

„Napravi trostranu rupu u tipu. Zabodeš običan nož u tipa – napraviš rez. Okej? Rez se zatvori samo tako. Okej?“

„Okej.“

„Jebenti. Šta ti znaš? Koji vrag vas uče na fakultetu?“

„Nisam baš dugo bio tamo,“ reče Billy, što je bila istina. Na fakultetu je proveo svega šest mjeseci, a taj fakultet uopće nije bio pravi fakultet. Bila je to večernja škola Iliumskog optometrijskog učilišta.

„Faca s faksa“, zajedljivo reče Weary.

Billy slegne ramenima.

„Nije život samo ono što pročitaš iz knjiga“, reče Weary. „Vidjet ćeš.“

Billy, tamo u jarku, ne odgovara ni na ovo, jer ne želi da se razgovor oduži više nego što je potrebno. U blagom je iskušenju da kaže da zna, doduše, ponešto o krvoproliću. Billy je,

uostalom, razmišljao o mučenju i užasnim ranama na početku i na kraju gotovo svakoga dana svoga djetinjstva. Billy je imao strahovito jezivo raspelo na zidu svoje malene sobe u Illiumu. Vojni kirurg divio bi se kliničkoj vjernosti umjetnikova prikaza svih Kristovih rana - rane od koplja, rana od trnja, rupe probijene željeznim klinovima. Billyjev Krist umro je strašnom smrću. Bio je bijedan.

Tako to ide.

Billy nije bio katolik, iako je odrastao uz sablasno raspelo na zidu. Njegov otac nije bio vjernik. Njegova majka bila je rezervna orguljašica u nekoliko crkava po gradu. Vodila je Billyja sa sobom kad god bi svirala, a i naučila ga je ponešto odsvirati. Govorila je da će se pridružiti crkvi čim odluči koja je ona prava.

Nikad se *bogme* nije odlučila. Međutim, osjećala je strašnu žudnju za raspelom. Jedno je i kupila u trgovini suvenirima u Santa Feu, na izletu njihove malene obitelji na Zapad u vrijeme Velike depresije. Poput tolikih Amerikanca, trudila se izgraditi smislen život od stvari koje bi pronašla u trgovinama suvenirima.

Tako je raspelo završilo na zidu Billyja Pilgrima.

Dvojica izvidnika, grleći u jarku kundake svojih pušaka, prošaptaju da je ponovno vrijeme za pokret. Prošlo je deset minuta bez da je itko došao provjeriti jesu li pogodeni ili ne, da ih dokrajči. Tko god da je pucao, očito je daleko i sasvim sam.

Četvorka ispuže iz jarka bez da privuče dodatnu paljbu. Otpužu u šumu poput velikih, nesretnih sisavaca, a to i jesu. Zatim ustaju i kreću brzo hodati. U šumi je mračno i hladno. Borovi su pravilno posađeni u stupcima i recima. Nema raslinja. Deset centimetara čistog snijega pokriva tlo. Amerikanci su primorani ostavljati u snijegu tragove jednako

nedvosmislene kao slike u knjigama o standardnim plesovima - *korak, klizni, stani - korak, klizni, stani*.

„Približi se i ostani blizu!“ Roland Weary upozorava Billyja Pilgrima dok kreću. Weary izgleda kao tupson ili glupson, sav nakrcan za borbu. Nizak i debeo.

Na sebi ima svaki komad opreme koji mu je vojska ikad izdala, svaki dar koji je dobio od doma: šljem, naglavak za šljem, vunenu kapu, šal, rukavice, pamučnu potkošulju, vunenu potkošulju, vunenu majicu, džemper, košulju, jaknu, kaput, pamučne gaće, vunene gaće, vunene hlače, pamučne čarape, vunene čarape, vojničke čizme, gas masku, čaturicu, pribor za jelo, pribor za prvu pomoć, rovovski nož, deku, šatorsko krilo, kabanicu, neprobojnu Bibliju, pamflet naslovljen 'Upoznaj svoga neprijatelja', drugi pamflet naslovljen 'Zašto se borimo,' te još jedan pamflet njemačkih fraza ispisanih engleskom fonetikom koji bi omogućio Wearyju da Nijemcima postavi pitanja poput 'Gdje vam je glavni stožer?' i 'Koliko topova imate?' ili da im kaže, 'Predajte se. Nemate izlaza', i tako dalje.

Weary kod sebe ima i komad balza drva koji mu treba poslužiti kao jastuk u rovu. Ima pribor za profilaksu s dva čvrsta kondoma 'Isključivo za prevenciju bolesti!' Ima zviždaljku koju neće nikome pokazati dok ga ne unaprijede u kaplara. Ima i prostačku sliku žene koja spolno opći sa šetlandskim ponijem. Nekoliko je puta natjerao Billya Pilgrima da se divi toj slici.

Ženu i ponija postavili su pred plišane zastore obrubljene vunanim kuglicama. Sa svake im je strane stajao po jedan dorski stup. Ispred jednog se nalazila se palma lončanica. Wearyjeva slika kopija je prve prostačke fotografije u povijesti. Riječ *fotografija* prvi je put upotrijebljena 1839., i te iste godine, Louis J.M. Daguerre otkrio je Francuskoj akademiji da se slika nastala

na posrebnom metalnom pladnju prekrivenom tankim slojem srebrnog jodida može razviti pomoću živine pare.

1841., svega dvije godine kasnije, Daguerreov pomoćnik, Andre Le Fevre, uhićen je u vrtu Tuileries zbog pokušaja da nekom gospodinu proda sliku žene i ponija. I Weary je svoju sliku kupio tamo – u vrtu Tuileries. Le Fevre se pravdao da je slika visoka umjetnost, i da je njegova namjera bila oživjeti grčku mitologiju. Rekao je da stupovi i palma to dokazuju.

Kad su ga upitali koji je točno mit želio prikazati, Le Fevre je odgovorio da je bilo na tisuće takvih mitova, sa ženom kao smrtnicom i bogom u obliku ponija.

Osuđen je na šest mjeseci zatvora. Tamo je umro od upale pluća. Tako to ide.

Billy i izvidnici mršavi su ljudi. Roland Weary ima sala za istopiti. Ključa ispod svih onih slojeva vune i pojaseva i platna. Ima toliko energije da juri amo-tamo između Billya i izvidnika, prenoseći glupe poruke koje nitko nije poslao i koje nitko nije rado primao. Također počinje vjerovati, jer je zaposleniji od svih ostalih, da je on vođa.

Toliko mu je vruće i toliko je nakrcan da zapravo nema nikakav osjećaj za opasnost. Njegovo viđenje vanjskog svijeta ograničeno je na ono što uspijeva razabrati kroz uski prorez između oboda svoga šljema i šala od doma, koji skriva njegovo dječачko lice od hrpta nosa nadolje. Ispod svega toga mu je toliko udobno da se može pretvarati da je kod kuće na sigurnom, nakon što je preživio rat, i da prepričava svojim roditeljima i sestri istinitu ratnu priču - dok istinita ratna priča i dalje traje.

Wearyeva verzija te istinite ratne priče ide ovako: Došlo je do velikog njemačkog napada, a Weary i njegovi protutenski prijatelji krvnički su se borili sve dok svi osim Wearya nisu poginuli. Tako to ide. A zatim je Weary sreo dvojicu izvidnika, i odmah su postali dobri prijatelji, te su odlučili probiti se natrag do svojih linija. Dogovorili su se da će se kretati brzo. Da se nikad neće predati. Svi su se ukруг rukovali. Prozvali su se "Trojicom mušketira".

No zatim je taj prokleti fakultetlija, koji je bio toliko slab da nije ni trebao biti u vojsci, upitao može li poći s njima. Nije imao čak ni pištolj ni nož. Nije imao čak ni šljem ni kapu. Nije mogao čak ni hodati pravo – neprestano se klatio gore-dolje, gore-dolje, sve ih izluđujući, odajući im položaj. Bio je bijedan. Tri Mušketira gurali su i nosili i vukli fakultetliju skroz do njihovih vlastitih linija, kazivala je Wearyjeva priča. Bogle su mu spasili prokletu kožu.

U stvarnosti, Weary se vraća istim putem i pokušava doznati što se dogodilo s Billyjem. Govori izvidnicima da pričekaju dok on ode po glupog fakultetliju. Prolazi niske grane. Udara mu je o vrh šljema, *tup*. Weary to ne čuje. Negdje laje veliki pas. Weary ne čuje ni to. Njegova ratna priča je u vrlo uzbudljivoj fazi. Časnik je čestitao Trojici Mušketira, govoreći im da će ih preporučiti za Brončane zvijezde.

„Mogu li još nešto učiniti za vas momke?“ upitao je časnik.

„Da, gospodine“, odgovorio je jedan od izvidnika. „Voljeli bismo se držati zajedno ostatak rata, gospodine. Postoji li kakav način da uredite da nitko nikada ne razdvoji tri mušketira?“

Billy Pilgrim zaustavlja se u šumi. Oslanja se o drvo zatvorenih očiju. Glava mu je zabačena unatrag a nosnice raširene. Poput pjesnika u Partenonu.

Tada se Billy prvi put oslobodio u vremena. Pažnja mu se veličanstveno stala klatiti kroz puni luk njegova života, prelazeći u smrt, koja je bila ljubičasto svjetlo. Ondje nije bilo nikog drugog, ni ičeg drugog. Bilo je samo ljubičasto svjetlo - i šum.

A zatim se Billy ponovno sunuo u život, krećući se unatrag sve dok nije dospio do prije rođenja, koje je bilo crveno svjetlo i grgoljavi zvukovi. A zatim se opet sunuo u život i zaustavio se. Bio je maleni dječak koji se tušira sa svojim maljavim ocem u iliumskoj dvorani. Mirisao je klor iz bazena vrata do, čuo prasak odskočne daske.

Mali Billy je bio prestravljen, jer mu je njegov otac bio rekao da će naučiti plivati metodom potoni-ili-plivaj. Njegov otac naumio je baciti Billya u duboki dio, i Billyu je bolje da propliva.

Bilo je nalik na smaknuće. Billy je obamro dok ga je otac nosio od tuševa do bazena. Oči su mu bile sklopljene. Kad je otvorio oči, bio je na dnu bazena, i posvuda se čula prekrasna glazba. Izgubio je svijest, no glazba je nastavila svirati. Maglovito je naslutio da ga netko spašava. Billy je to prezirao.

Odande je otputovao kroz vrijeme u 1965. Bila mu je četrdeset i jedna godina, i bio je u posjeti svojoj staroj majci u Pine Knollu, domu za umirovljenike u koji ju je bio smjestio ni mjesec dana prije. Navukla je upalu pluća, i nisu očekivali da će preživjeti. Poživjela je, doduše, godinama nakon tog.

Glas joj je gotovo posve otišao, stoga, da bi je čuo, Billy je morao staviti svoje uho tik do njezinih suhih usana. Očito je imala nešto jako važno za reći.

„Kako...?“ počela je, pa stala. Bila je isuviše umorna. Nadala se da neće morati izreći ostatak rečenice, i da će ju Billy dovršiti mjesto nje.

No Billy nije imao pojma što joj je na pameti. „Kako *što*, Majko?“ potakao ju je. Teško je progutala, kanula koju suzu. Zatim je skupila snagu iz svega svog uništenog tijela, čak i iz vrhova prstiju i najsitnijih žilica u tijelu. Naposljetku je skupila dovoljno da prošapće ovu cijelu rečenicu:

„Kako li sam tako *ostarila*?“

Billyeva drevna majka se onesvijestila, i Billya je iz sobe izvela ljupka medicinska sestra. Tijelo starca prekriveno plahtom provezli su taman u času kad je Billy stupio u hodnik. Čovjek je bio slavni maratonac u svoje vrijeme. Tako to ide. To je bilo prije nego je Billyju razbijena

glava u zrakoplovnoj nesreći, uzgred rečeno - prije nego je postao tako govorljiv o letećim tanjurima i putovanju kroz vrijeme.

Billy je sjeo u čekaonu. Još uvijek nije bio udovac. Osjetio je nešto tvrdo pod jastukom prepunjenog naslonjača. Izvadio je to i otkrio da se radi o knjizi, *Smaknuće Vojnika Slovika*, Williama Bradforda Huieja. Bio je to istiniti prikaz smrti pred američkim streljačkim vodom vojnika Eddieja D. Slovika, 36896415, jedinog američkog vojnika strijeljanog zbog dezerterstva od Građanskog rata. Tako to ide.

Billy je pročitao mišljenje vojnog suca koji je pregledao Slovikov slučaj, koje je završavalo ovako: *Izravno se suprostavio autoritetu vlade, a buduća disciplina ovisi o odlučnom odgovoru na taj izazov. Ako ikad treba provesti smrtnu kaznu zbog dezerterstva, to treba učiniti u ovom slučaju, ne kao mjeru kažnjavanja niti odmazdu, već da bi se održala ona disciplina bez koje vojska ne može uspjeti protiv neprijatelja. Nije bilo preporuke za pomilovanje u ovom slučaju, a ne daje se ni ovdje.* Tako to ide.

Billy je trepnuo u 1965. i oputovao kroz vrijeme u 1958. Bio je na banketu priređenom u čast momčadi Male Lige u kojoj je njegov sin Robert igrao bejzbol. Trener, koji se nikada nije ženio, držao je govor. Sav se raznježio. „Kunem se Bogom“, govorio je „bila bi mi čast i da ovoj djeci samo nosim vodu.“

Billy je trepnuo u 1958. i oputovao kroz vrijeme u 1961. Bila je Stara godina, a Billy se opio i osramotio na zabavi gdje su svi bili optometristi ili oženjeni za optometriste.

Billy inače nije puno pio, jer mu je rat uništio želudac, ali sada je bogme cugnuo, i prvi i zadnji put bio nevjeran svojoj ženi Valenciji. Nekako je uvjerio neku ženu da pođe s njim u vešeraj, a zatim da sjedne na sušilicu, koja je radila.

Žena je i sama bila jako pijana, i pomogla je Billyu da joj skine stezник. „O čemu si želio pričati?“ upitala je.

„Nema veze“, rekao je Billy. Uistinu je smatrao da nema veze. Nije se mogao sjetiti kako se žena zove.

„Kako to da te zovu Billy a ne William?“

„Zbog posla“, odgovorio je Billy. To je bila istina. Njegov svekar, vlasnik Iliumske škole optometrije, koji mu je i dao posao, bio je genijalac u svojoj struci. Rekao mu je da potiče ljude da ga zovu Billy –

jer će ga tako lakše zapamtiti. Također će i djelovati pomalo čarobno, jer nema puno drugih odraslih Billya. Također će primorati ljude da ga odmah smatraju prijateljem.

Usred svega toga dogodilo se i nešto uistinu grozno, ljudi su izražavali gađenje spram Billya i te žene, i Billy se najednom našao u svom automobilu, pokušavajući pronaći volan.

Sada je najvažnije bilo pronaći upravljač. Isprva, Billy se razmahao rukama u nadi da će ga pogoditi. Kad to nije upalilo, postao je metodičan i tražio ga tako da mu nikako nije mogao izmaknuti. Snažno se oslonio o vrata sebi slijeva i pretražio svaki centimetar pred sobom. Kad nije uspio pronaći upravljač, pomaknuo se petnaestak centimetara te iznova tražio. Začudo, naposljetku se našao pritisnut o desna vratia, ali upravljač nije pronašao. Zaključio je da ga je netko ukrao. To ga je ljutilo dok je padao u nesvijest.

Nije mogao pronaći upravljač zato što je bio na stražnjem sjedalu.

Sada je netko tresao Billya da se probudi. Billy se još osjećao pijano i još je bio ljut zbog ukradenog upravljača. Ponovno se vratio Drugi svjetski rat, iza njemačkih linija. Trese ga Roland Weary. Grabi ga za ovratnik vojničke jakne. Udara Billyem o drvo, a onda ga povlači od stabla i baca u smjeru kojim se trebao sam kretati.

Billy stane, odmahne glavom. „Vi samo nastavite“, reče.

„Molim?“

„Nastavite bez mene. Ja sam dobro.“

„Što si?“

„Dobro sam.“

„Isuse, ne bih volio da se netko *razboli*“, reče Weary, kroz pet slojeva vlažnog šala od doma. Billy nikad nije bio vidio Wearyjevo lice. Jednom ga je pokušao zamisliti, pa je zamislio žabu u akvariju.

Weary šuta i gura Billya gotovo pola kilometra. Izvidnici čekaju kod obale smrznutog potoka. Čuju psa. Čuju ljude kako se međusobno dovikuju, dozivaju poput lovaca koji vrlo dobro slute gdje im je plijen.

Obale potoka dovoljno su visoke da izvidnici mogu ustati a da ih se ne primijeti. Billy smiješno tetura niz nasip. Za njim ide Weary, uz klopot i štropot i zvon i sav usijan.

„Evo ga, momci“, reče Weary. „Ne želi živjeti, al će svejedno preživjet. Kad se izvuče iz ovoga, Boga mi, dugovat će Trojici mušketira što je osto živ.“ Ovo je prvi put da izvidnici čuju da Weary sebe i njih smatra Trojicom mušketira.

Billy Pilgrim, ondje u koritu potoka, misli da se on, Billy Pilgrim, bezbolno pretvara u paru. Kad bi ga svi načas pustili na miru, pomisli, više nikome ne bi stvarao nikakve probleme. Pretvorio bi se u paru i ispario gore među vrhove drveća.

Veliki pas opet negdje zalaje. Uz pomoć straha i jeke i zimskih tišina, zvuči poput velikog brončanog gonga.

Roland Weary, osamnaestogodišnjak, progura se između izvidnika i prebaci svoju tešku ruku preko ramena obojice. „Što će Tri mušketira sad?“ upita.

Billy Pilgrim proživljava divno priviđenje. Nosio je suhe, tople, bijele čarape i sklizao se po podu plesne dvorane. Tisuće su klicale. Ovo nije bilo putovanje kroz vrijeme. Nikad se nije dogodilo, nikad se neće dogoditi. Bilo je to ludilo mladića koji umire u cipelama punima snijega.

Jedan od izvidnika pogne glavu, pusti da mu pljuvačka kapne s usana. Drugi napravi isto. Proučavaju kako pljuvačka ne ostavlja ni najmanjeg traga ni u snijegu ni u povijesti. Oni su maleni, spretni ljudi. Dotad su mnogo puta bili iza njemačkih linija i živjeli kao šumska stvorenja, od jednog časa do drugog u korisnom strahu, i bezumno razmišljali leđnom moždinom.

Sada su se izmaknuli Wearyjevim rukama punm ljubavi. Govore mu da bi on i Billy trebali pronaći nekog da se predaju. Izvidnici ih više neće čekati.

I ostave Wearyja i Billyja u koritu potoka.

Billy Pilgrim nastavio se sklizati, radio je trikove u čarapama, trikove koje bi većina ljudi smatrala nemogućim: kretao se oko sebe, zaustavljao se u mjestu i takve stvari. Klicanje se nastavilo, ali kako se priviđenje pretvaralo u putovanje kroz vrijeme mijenjao mu se ton.

Billy je prestao klizati i našao se za govornicom u kineskom restoranu u Iliumu, u New Yorku, jednog ranog poslijepodneva u jesen 1957. U klubu Lions oduševljeno su mu pljeskali. Upravo su ga izabrali predsjednika i morao je održati govor. Ukipio se od straha. Mislio je da je došlo do strašne pogreške jer će ti uspješni, samouvjereni tipovi sada otkriti da su izabrali komičnog beskičmenjaka. Čut će njegov kreštav glas, isti onakav kakav je imao u ratu. Progutao je slinu jer je znao da je ono što ima umjesto glasnica malena zviždaljka izdjeljana od vrbine grane. Još gore, nije imao što reći. Publika se bila umirila. Svi ružičasti i sjajni od ponosa.

Billy je otvorio usta i ispustio dubok, snažn ton. Glas mu je bio prekrasan instrument. Zbijao je šale koje su raspametile publiku. Uozbiljio se bio, opet zbijao šale, pa priveo stvar kraju uz riječ dvije o poniznosti. Objašnjenje tog čuda bilo je sljedeće: Billy je završio tečaj javnog govorništva.

A zatim se opet našao u koritu zaleđenog potoka. Roland Weary samo što nije ubio boga u njemu.

Weary je ispunjen tragičnim gnjevom. Opet su ga napustili. Strpa pištolj u futrolu. Spremi nož u korice. S trokutastom oštricom i slivnicima za krv na sve tri strane. A zatim snažno protrese Billya, razdrma mu kostur, tresne ga o obalu.

Weary zalaje i zacvili kroz slojeve šala od doma. Priča nerazgovjetno o žrtvama što ih je podnio za Billya. Razveže se o pijetetu i junaštvu "Trojice mušketira," prikazuje, u najsjajnijem i najstrastvenijem svijetlu, njihove vrline i velikodušnost, vječnu čast koju su stekli za se, te iznimim uslugama koje su učinili Kršćanstvu.

Isključivo je Billyjeva krivica što ta borbena organizacija više ne postoji, Weary smatra, i Billy će platiti. Weary ga dobro opali u vilicu, odbaci ga od obale na snijegom prekriveni led potoka. Billy je na sve četiri na ledu, a Weary ga udara u rebra i prebaca ga na bok. Billy se pokušava sklupčati u loptu. „Ti uopće ne bi trebao biti u vojsci“, reče Weary.

Billy nehotice proizvodi nekakve zvukove koji nalikuju na smijeh. „Tebi je to smješno, ha?“ Weary zapita. Priđe Billyju iza leđa. Billyjeva jakna i majica i potkošulja podigle su se do ramena od svog tog nasilja pa su mu leđa gola. Ondje, samo par centimetara od vrhova Wearyjevih vojničkih čizama, bijedna su dugmad Billyjeve kralježnice.

Weary zabaci svoju desnu čizmu, usmjeri udarac na kralježnicu, na cijev u kojoj je toliko Billyjevih važnih žica. Weary želi slomiti tu cijev.

Ali onda shvati da ima publiku. Petorica njemačkih vojnika i policijski pas na uzici gledaju odozgo u korito potoka. Plave oči vojnika pune su civilne znatiželje dok pokušavaju razabrati zašto bi jedan Amerikanac pokušavao ubiti drugog. tako daleko od doma, i zašto bi se žrtva smijala.

3

Nijemci i pas dio su vojne operacije koja nosi zabavno i samo po sebi razumljivo ime, ljudski pothvat koji je rijetko opisivan u tančine, čije samo ime, objavljeno kao vijest ili povijesna činjenica, daje mnogim ratnim ljubiteljima nešto nalik na post-koitalno zadovoljstvo. To je, u mašti ljubitelja borbe, božanski opuštena ljubavna igra koja slijedi orgazam pobjede. Naziva se 'metenje'.

Pas, koji je zvučao tako opasno u zimskim daljinama, ženka je njemačkog ovčara. Drhti. Rep joj je podvinut među noge. Posudili su je tog jutra od nekog seljaka. Nikad prije nije bila u ratu. Nema pojma koje se igre igraju. Zove se Princeza.

Dvojica Nijemaca su dječaci u ranoj tinejdžerskoj dobi. Dvojica su oronuli stari ljudi, slinavi i krezubi poput šarana. Nisu članovi redovite vojske, naoružani i odjeveni su djelomično, ostacima skinutih s pravih vojnika koji su nedavno umrli. Tako to ide. Seljaci su s druge strane njemačke granice, ne daleko odande.

Njihov zapovjednik je sredovječni kaplar – crvenih očiju, suh i žilav poput sušene govedine, rata mu je preko glave. Četiri puta ranjen – i pokrpan i poslan natrag u rat. Izvrstan vojnik koji je spreman da odustane, spreman da pronađe nekog da se preda. Krive su mu noge nagurane u zlatne konjaničke čizme koje je skinuo s mrtvog mađarskog pukovnika na ruskoj fronti. Tako to ide.

Te čizme gotovo su sve što ima na ovom svijetu. Njegov su dom. Anegdota: Jednom ga je neki novak promatrao kako polira i lašti te zlatne čizme, pa je podigao jednu prema novaku i rekao: „Ako se dovoljno duboko zagledaš, vidjet ćeš Adama i Evu.“

Billy Pilgrim nije čuo tu anegdotu. No, ležeći ondje na crnom ledu, Billy bulji u patinu kaplarovih čizama i vidi Adama i Evu u zlatnim dubinama. Goli su. Tako su nevini, tako ranjivi, tako željni da se ponašaju časno. Billy Pilgrim ih voli.

Do zlatnih čizama stoji par nogu umotanih u krpe. Previjene su trakama platna, obuvane u otvorene drvene klompe. Billy pogleda u lice koje ide s klompama. Lice plavog anđela, petnaestogodišnjeg dječaka.

Dječak je prelijep poput Eve.

Billyju pri ustajanju pomogne krasni dječak, taj nebeski dvospolac. I drugi prilaze da otaru snijeg s Billyja, a zatim ga pretražuju da vide ima li oružja. Nema ga. Najopasnija stvar koju nalaze na njemu je petcentimetarska olovčica.

Tri bezazlena *praska* dopru iz daljine. Stižu iz njemačkih pušaka. Dvojica izvidnika koji su napustili Billyja i Wearyja upravo su ubijeni. Čekali su Nijemce u zasjedi. Otkriveni su i ustrijeljeni sleđa. Umiru u snijegu, ne osjećajući ništa, bojeći snijeg u boju šerbeta od maline. Tako to ide. Tako Roland Weary ostaje posljednji od Trojice mušketira.

I Wearyja, očiju razrogačenih od straha, razoružavaju. Kaplar daje Wearyjev pištolj lijepom dječaku. Divi se Wearyjevom okrutnom rovovskom nožu, govori na njemačkom da bi Weary nesumnjivo volio isprobati nož na njemu, odvaliti mu lice bodljikavim bokserom, zarinuti mu oštricu u trbuh ili grlo. Ne zna engleski, a Billy i Weary ne razumiju njemački.

„Zgodne su ti igračke“, kaplar reče Wearyju i pruža nož jednom starcu. „Lijepa stvar? Hmmm?“

Razdere Wearyjev kaput i džemper. Mjedeni gumbi frcaju poput kokica. Kaplar posegnu u Wearyjeva prsa kao da mu želi iščupati još udarajuće srce, ali umjesto toga izvadi Wearyjevu Bibliju otpornu na metke.

Biblija otporna na metke je Biblija dovoljno malena da je se ubaci u vojnikov džep na prsima, preko njegova srca. Obložena je čelikom.

Skupnik pronalazi prostačku sliku žene i ponija u Wearyjevom bočnom džepu. „Kakav sretan poni, ha?“ upitao je. „Hmhhh? Hmhhh? Ne bi li ti želio biti taj poni?“ Daje sliku drugom starcu. „Ratni plijen! Tvoj je, sretni mladiću.“

Zatim naređuje Wearyju da sjedne u snijeg i skine svoje vojničke čizme, koje daje prelijepom dječaku. Wearyju daje dječakove klompe. Tako sada ni Weary ni Billy nemaju primjerene vojničke obuće i moraju hodati kilometre i kilometre, s Wearyjevim klompama što klepeću, s Billyjem koji se klata gore-dolje, gore-dolje, povremeno se zabijajući u Wearyja.

„Oprosti“, govori Billy, ili „Ispričavam se.“

Napokon ih dovode do kamene kolibe na križanju ceste. To je sabirna točka za ratne zarobljenike. Billyja i Wearyja uvode unutra, gdje je toplo i zadimljeno. Vatra cvrči i pucketa u kaminu. Lože namještaj. Ondje je još dvadesetak Amerikanaca, koji sjede na podu oslonjeni leđima o zid, netremice zagledani u plamenove – razmišljajući o čemu god se razmišljati moglo, što je ništa.

Nitko ne razgovara. Nitko nema dobrih ratnih priča.

Billy i Weary pronalaze mjesta za sebe i Billy zaspe s glavom na ramenu jednog satnika koji se ne buni. Satnik je kapelan. Rabin. Propucan je kroz dlan.

Billy je otputovao kroz vrijeme, otvorio oči, našao se kako zuri u staklene oči mehaničke sove boje zelenog žada. Sova je visjela naopačke sa šipke od nehrđajućeg čelika. Sova je bila

Billyjev optometar u njegovu uredu u Iliumu. Optometar je uređaj za mjerenje refraktivnih nedostataka u očima – kako bi se prepisale odgovarajuće korektivne leće.

Billy je zaspao pregledavajući pacijenticu koja je sjedila u stolcu s druge strane sove. Već je prije znao zaspati na poslu. Isprva je bilo smiješno. Sada se Billy već počinjao brinuti oko toga, i oko vlastita uma uopće. Pokušao se prisjetiti koliko mu je godina, nije mogao. Pokušao se prisjetiti koja je godina. Ni toga se nije mogao sjetiti.

„Doktore“, rekla je pacijentica oklijevajući.

„Hm?“ odgovorio je.

„Jako ste tihi.“

„Oprostite.“

„Govorili ste – i onda ste naglo utihnuli.“

„Hm.“

„Vidite nešto strašno?“

„Strašno?“

„Neku bolest u mojim očima?“

„Ne, ne“, rekao je Billy, koji je želio ponovno zadrijemati. „Oči su vam u redu. Samo trebate naočale za čitanje.“ Rekao joj je da ode na drugi kraj hodnika i pogleda široki izbor okvira koje tamo imaju.

Kad je otišla, Billy je razgrnuo zavjese bez da je bio imalo pametniji što je vani. Pogled mu je i dalje bio zaklonjen roletama, koje je bučno podigao. Jako sunce nadrlo je unutra. Tamo vani bile su parkirane tisuće automobila, svjetlucajući na ogromnom jezeru asfalta. Billyjev ured bio je dio trgovačkog centra u predgrađu.

Tik ispod prozora stajao je Billyjev Cadillac El Dorado Coupe de Ville. Iščitao je naljepnice na braniku. „Posjetite Kanjon Ausable“, pisalo je na jednoj. „Podržite lokalnu

policiju“, pisalo je na drugoj. Bila je i treća. „Smijenite Earla Warrena“, stajalo je na njoj. Najlepnice o policiji i liberalu Earlu Warrenu bili su darovi od Billyjevog tasta, člana desno orijentiranog Udruženja Johna Bircha. Godina na registracijskoj tablici bila je 1967., što je značilo da je Billyju Pilgrimu bilo četrdeset i četiri godine. Zapitao je sama sebe: „Kamo su otišle sve te godine?“

Billy je svrnuo pažnju na svoj radni stol. Ondje je ležao otvoren primjerak *Optometrijske revije*. Bio je otvoren na uvodni članak, kojeg je Billy sada čitao, blago mičući usnama.

Što se dogodi u 1968. obilježit će sudbinu europskih optometrista za narednih 50 godina! pročitao je Billy. *Uz to upozorenje, Jean Thiriart, Tajnik Nacionalne udruge belgijskih optometrista, zalaže se za osnivanje "europskog optometrijskog društva." Alternativa, rekao je, jest da se stekne status profesije, ili, do 1971., se svode na ulogu prodavača naočala.*

Billy Pilgrim silno se trudio da mu bude stalo.

Sirena se oglasila, uplašila boga u njemu. Očekivao je Treći svjetski rat svakog časa. Sirena je samo oglašavala da je podne. Bila je smještena u kupoli na vrhu vatrogasnog doma preko puta Billyjevog ureda.

Billy je zatvorio oči. Kad ih je otvorio, opet je bio u Drugom svjetskom ratu. Glava mu počiva na ramenu ranjenog rabina. Nijemac ga šuta po nogama, govoreći mu da se probudi, da je vrijeme da nastave dalje.

Amerikanci zajedno s Billyjem vani na cesti oformljuju paradu budala.

Nazočan je i fotograf, njemački ratni izvjestitelj s Leicom. Slika Billyjeva i Roland Wearyjeva stopala. Slika će biti naširoko objavljena dva dana kasnije kao ohrabrujuć dokaz o tome kako je američka vojska često bijedno opremljena, iako je na glasu kao bogata.

Fotograf želi i nešto življe, sliku stvarnog zarobljavanja. Stoga mu stražari uprizorljuju jedno. Bacaju Billyja u grmlje. Kada izlazi iz grmlja, lica ogrnuta tupavom dobrom voljom, prijete mu svojim strojnicama, hineći da ga upravo u tom času zarobljuju.

Billyjev osmijeh dok izlazi iz grmlja neobičan je u najmanju ruku poput Mona Lisina, jer je istovremeno jednom nogom u Njemačkoj u 1944. i vozi se u svome Cadillacu u 1967. Njemačka je izbljedjela, a 1967. je postala sjajna i jasna, bez smetnji od ikojeg drugog vremena. Billy je išao na ručak Lions kluba. Bio je vruć kolovoz, ali Billyjev je auto imao klimu. Zaustavilo ga je crveno svjetlo usred iliumskog crnačkog geta. Ljudi koji su ondje živjeli toliko su mrzili to mjesto da su mu prije mjesec dana bili spalili dobar dio. To je bilo sve što su imali, i to su uništili. Četvrt je podsjećala Billyja na neke od gradova koje je vidio u ratu. Rubnici i pločnici bili su na mnogo mjesta smrvljeni, pokazujući kuda su prošli tenkovi i gusjeničari Nacionalne garde.

"Brat po krvi", pisalo je ružičastom bojom na zidu razvaljenog dućana.

Začuo se kucaj na prozoru Billyjevog automobila. Ondje je stajao crnac. Htio je razgovarati o nečemu. Svjetlo na semaforu se promijenilo. Billy je učinio najjednostavniju stvar. Odvezao se dalje.

Billy se vozio kroz poprište još i veće pustoši. Izgledalo je poput Dresdena nakon bombardiranja – poput površine Mjeseca. Kuća u kojoj je Billy odrastao nekad je stajala usred prostora koji je sada bio toliko prazan. To se zvalo urbana obnova. Uskoro će ovdje niknuti novi Upravni centar Illiuma i Umjetnički paviljon i Laguna mira i neboderi.

Billy Pilgrim nije imao ništa protiv toga.

Govornik na sastanku Lions kluba bio je bojnici u Marincima. Rekao je da Amerikanci nemaju izbora nego se nastaviti boriti u Vijetnamu sve dok ne pobijede ili dok komunisti ne shvate da ne mogu nametati svoj način života slabim zemljama. Bojnik je tamo služio u dvije ture. Pripovijedao je o mnogim užasnim i mnogim prekrasnim stvarima koje je vidio. Bio je za pojačano bombardiranje, za bombardiranje Sjevernog Vijetnama natrag u kameno doba, ako se odbije urazumiti.

Billy nije dirnulo da prosvjeduje protiv bombardiranja Sjevernog Vijetnama, nije se grozio užasnih stvari koje je sam vidio da bombardiranje čini. Samo je ručao s Lions klubom čiji je sada bio predsjednik.

Billy je na zidu svog ureda imao uokvirenu molitvu koja je sažimala njegovu metodu da gura dalje, iako nije baš bio oduševljen životom. Mnogi pacijenti koji su vidjeli tu molitvu na Billyjevom zidu rekli su mu da je i njima pomogla da nastave. Išla je ovako:

BOŽE DAJ MI
SNAGE DA PRIHVATIM
ONO ŠTO NE MOGU PROMIJENITI,
HRABROSTI
DA PROMIJENIM ONO ŠTO MOGU,
I MUDROSTI DA UVIJEK
RAZLIKUJEM TO DVOJE.

Među stvarima koje Billy Pilgrim nije mogao promijeniti bile su prošlost, sadašnjost i budućnost.

Sada su ga upoznivali sa bojnikom Marinaca. Osoba koja ih je upoznivala govorila je bojniku da je Billy veteran, i da Billy ima sina koji je narednik u Zelenim beretkama – u Vijetnamu.

Bojnik je Billyju rekao da Zelene beretke rade sjajan posao i da bi trebao biti ponosan na svoga sina.

„*Jesam. Bogme jesam*“, rekao je Billy Pilgrim.

Otišao je kući odrijemati nakon ručka. Doktor mu je dao naputak da odrijema svaki dan. Doktor se nadao da će to ublažiti nešto na što se Billy tužio: svako malo, bez ikakva očitog razloga, Billy Pilgrim bi se uhvatio kako plače. Nitko nikad nije Billya vidio kako to radi. Samo je doktor znao. Billy je to radio jako tiho i ne jako vlažno.

Billy je imao divnu kuću u gregorijanskom stilu u Iliumu. Bio je bogat poput Kreza, što nikad nije očekivao da će biti, ni u milijun godina. Imao je pet optometrista zaposlenih u radnji u trgovačkom centru, i zarađivao preko šezdeset tisuća dolara godišnje. K tome, bio je vlasnik petine novog hotela Holiday Inna na cesti 54, te polovice triju Tastee-Freeze štandova. Tastee-Freeze bio je neka vrst smrznute kreme. Pružala je sav užitak koji je sladoled mogao pružiti, bez tvrdoće i opore hladnoće sladoleda.

Billyjev dom bio je prazan. Njegova kći Barbara uskoro će se vjenčati, te su ona i njegova žena otišle u grad da izaberu kristal i srebrninu. Ceduljica s obavijesti o tome stajala je na

kuhinjskom stolu. Nije bilo posluge. Ljudi jednostavno više nisu bili zainteresirani za domaćinske karijere. Nije bilo ni psa.

Nekoć su imali psa po imenu Flekica, ali je uginuo. Tako to ide. Billy je jako volio Flekicu, i Flekica je volio njega.

Billy se uspeo tepihom prekrivenim stubištem u njegovu i ženinu sobu. Prostorija je imala tapete s cvjetnim uzorkom. Bračni krevet bio je kraj stolića s radio-budilicom. Na stoliću je također bio upravljač za električni pokrivač, i prekidač za paljenje blagog vibratora koji je bio pričvršćen za opruge madraca. Vibrator se na tržištu zvao 'Magični prsti'. To je također bila doktorova ideja.

Billy je skinuo svoje trifokalne naočale i kaput i kravatu i cipele, zatvorio je rolete i povukao zavjese, pa je legao na pokrivač kreveta. Ali sna ni za lijek. Umjesto njega, došle su suze. Curile su. Billy je upalio Magične prste i drmusalo ga je dok je plakao.

Zazvonilo je na vratima. Billy je ustao s kreveta i pogledao kroz prozor prema ulaznim vratima, da vidi je li navratio tko važan. Ondje dolje bio je bogalj, trzav u prostoru koliko i Billy u vremenu. Grčevi su tjerali čovjeka da stalno trapavo pleše te da mijenja izraz lica, kao da pokušava oponašati razne poznate filmske zvijezde.

Drugi bogalj zvonio je na vratima preko puta. Bio je na štakama. Imao je samo jednu nogu. Toliko se nabio na štaku da su mu ramena skrivala uši.

Billy je znao što su bogalji naumili: prodavali su pretplate za časopise koji nikad neće stići. Ljudi su se pretplaćivali na njih jer su prodavači bili toliko jadni. Billy je čuo za tu prevaru od govornika u Lions klubu prije dva tjedna – nekog čovjeka iz Ureda za unapređenje poslovanja. Čovjek je rekao da bi svatko tko vidi bogalje da obrađuju kvart prodajući pretplate na časopise trebao pozvati policiju.

Billy je pogledao niz ulicu, ugledao novu Buick Rivieru parkiranu oko pola ulice dalje. U njoj je sjedio neki čovjek, i Billy je točno pretpostavio da je on taj koji je unajmio bogalje da ovo rade. Billy je nastavio plakati dok je razmatrao o bogaljima i njihovom šefu. Njegovo zvono pakleno je zveketalo.

Zatvorio je oči i opet ih otvorio. I dalje je plakao, ali je sada ponovno bio u Luksemburgu. Stupa uz mnogo drugih zarobljenika. Oči mu suze od zimskog vjetra.

Sve otkad je Billy bačen u grmlje radi slike, priviđa mu se vatra svetog Elma, neka vrsta elektronskog sjaja oko glava njegovih drugova i onih koji su ih zarobili. Ima ga i u krošnjama drveća i na krovovima Luksemburga. Izgleda prekrasno.

Billy korača s rukama na glavi, kao i svi ostali Amerikanci. Billy se klata gore-golje, gore-golje. Slučajno se zabija u Rolanda Wearyja. „Ispričavam se“, govori.

Wearyjeve oči također su pune suza. Weary plače zbog strašnih bolova u stopalima. Otvorene klompe pretvaraju mu stopala u krvavu kašu.

Na svakom raskrižju Billyjevoj se grupi pridružuje još Amerikanaca s rukama na obasjanim glavama. Billy se svima smiješi. Kreću se poput vode, svo vrijeme nizbrdo, i dotiču napokon do glavne ceste na dnu doline. Kroz dolinu teče Mississippi poniženih Amerikanaca. Deseci tisuća Amerikanaca vuču se prema istoku, dlanova isprepletenih na vrhu glava. Uzdišu i stenju.

Billy i njegova skupina pridružuju se rijeci poniženja, a kasno poslijepodnevno sunce izlazi iza oblaka. Amerikanci nemaju cestu samo za sebe. Traka prema zapadu kipti i vrvi vozilima koji

prevoze njemačke pričuve na bojišnicu. Pričuve se sastojali od nasilnih, vjetrom opaljenih, čekinjastih muškaraca. Zubi su im kao klavijature.

Nakićeni su remenjem s mecima za strojnice, puše cigare i cugaju. Grizu kobasice kao vukovi, tapšaju si žuljevite dlanove ručnim bombama.

Jedan vojnik u crnom ima pijanku sam za sebe na vrhu tenka. Pljuje na Amerikance. Pljuvačka pogodi rame Rolanda Wearyja, okiti Wearyja *fourragereom* šmrklji i krvavica i duhana i rakije.

Billyju je to poslijepodne bolno uzbudljivo. Toliko toga ima za vidjeti – zmajeve zube, ubilačke strojeve, trupla bosih nogu, plava i boje slonovače. Tako to ide.

Klateći se gore-dolje, gore-dolje, Billy se pun ljubavi smiješi svijetlo ljubičastoj seoskoj kući isprobijanoj mecima iz strojnice. Pod iskrivljenim vratima stoji njemački pukovnik. S njim je njegova nenašminkana kurva.

Billy se zabija u Wearyjevo rame, na što mu Weary jecajući uzvikuje. „Hodaj ravno! Hodaj ravno!“

Sada se uspinju blagom padinom. Stignu do vrha i više nisu u Luksemburgu. Sad su u Njemačkoj.

Filmska kamera postavljena je na granici – da zabilježi slavnu pobjedu. Dvojica civila u kaputima od medvjede kože naslanjaju se na kameru dok Billy i Weary prolaze mimo. Ostali su bez filma prije nekoliko sati.

Jedan od njih načas se zagleda u Billyjevo lice, a onda se ponovno usredotoči na beskraj. U beskraju se diže tanak tračak dima. Tamo se vodi bitka. Tamo ljudi umiru. Tako to ide.

I sunce zađe, a Billy se uhvati kako se klata u mjestu u nekom željezničkom dvorištu. Ondje čekaju redovi i redovi teretnih vagona. Vagoni dovoze pričuve na bojišnicu. Sada će voziti zatvorenike u unutrašnjost Njemačke.

Snopovi ručnih svjetiljki poskakuju mahnito.

Nijemci svrstavaju zarobljenike po činu. Stavljaju narednike s narednicima, bojnike s bojnicima, i tako dalje. Odred pukovnika zaustavlja se kraj Billyja. Jedan od njih ima dvostruku upalu oba plućna krila. Ima groznicu i vrti mu se u glavi. Dok se željezničko dvorište okretalo i vrtjelo oko pukovnika, pokušava se održati na nogama zureći u Billyjeve oči.

Pukovnik kašlje i kašlje, pa kaže Billyju, „Jesi li ti jedan od mojih?“ Čovjek je izgubio cijelu pukovnicu, oko četiri tisuće pet stotina ljudi – dobar dio zapravo su bili djeca. Billy ne odgovara. Pitanje mu nema smisla. „Koja si jedinica?“ upita pukovnik. Kašlje i kašlje. Kad god udahne pluća mu štropotaju poput masnih papirnatih vrećica.

Billy se nije mogao sjetiti iz koje je on jedinice.

„Jesi iz Četiristo pedeset prve?“

„Četiristo pedeset prve što?“ upita Billy.

Nastaje još jedna duga tišina. „Pješadijska pukovnica“, naposljetku će pukovnik.

„Oh“, reče Billy Pilgrim.

Nastaje još jedna otegnuta tišina, dok pukovnik umire i umire, utapajući se na mjestu. A sada mokro poviče: „To sam ja, momci! Divlji Bob!“ Tako je oduvijek htio da ga njegovi vojnici zovu: Divlji Bob.

Nitko tko ga može čuti nije iz njegove pukovnije, osim Rolanda Wearyja, a Weary ne sluša. Jedino o čemu Weary može razmišljati bolovi su u njegovim stopalima.

Ali pukovnik umisli da se obraća svojim voljenim trupama posljednji put te im govori da se nemaju čega sramiti, da su posvuda po bojištu mrtvi Nijemci kojima bi bilo kudikamo draže da nikada nisu čuli za Četiristo pedeset prvu. Govori da će nakon rata održati okupljanje pukovnije u svojem gradiću, a to je Cody, u Wyomingu. Peći će na roštilju cijele volove.

Sve to govori dok zuri u Billyjeve oči. Zbog njega unutrašnjost lubanje jasnog Billyja odjekuje besmislicama. „Bog s vama, momci!“ viče, a to odjekuje i odjekuje. Zatim govori: „Ako se ikad nađete u Codyju, u Wyomingu, samo pitajte za Divljeg Boba!“

Bio sam tamo. Kao i moj stari ratni drug, Bernard V. O'Hare.

Billy Pilgrim strpan je u vagon s mnogo drugih vojnika. On i Roland Weary su razdvojeni. Weary je strpan u drugi vagon na tom istom vlaku.

Uski otvori za zrak nalaze se u kutevima vagona, pod rubom strehe. Billy stoji kraj jednog od njih, i, kako se gomila tiska o njega, djelomice se uspinje uz dijagonalnu kutnu gredu da napravi više mjesta. Oči su mu u ravnini s otvorom za zrak pa može vidjeti drugi vlak desetak metara dalje.

Nijemci pišu po vagonima plavom kredom – broj osoba u svakom vagonu, njihov čin, njihovu nacionalnost, datum kada su ukrcani. Drugi Nijemci osiguravaju zasune na vratima vagona žicom i bodljama i ostalim željezničkim otpadom. Billy čuje nekoga kako piše i po njegovu vagonu, ali ne može vidjeti tko.

Većina vojnika u Billyjevom vagonu vrlo su mladi – na kraju djetinjstva. No zbijen u kut s Billyjem bivši je skitnica od četrdeset godina.

„Bio sam i gladniji nego sada“, skitnica reče Billyju. „Bio sam i na gorim mjestima od ovog. Ovo nije tako loše.“

Čovjek u vagonu preko puta vikne kroz otvor za zrak da je netko ondje upravo umro. Tako to ide. Četvorica čuvara ga čuju. Ta ih vijest ne uzbuđuje.

„Jo, jo“, govori jedan od njih kimajući sneno. „Jo, jo.“

No čuvari ne otvaraju vagon s mrtvacem. Umjesto toga otvaraju susjedni vagon, i Billyja Pilgrim očara što sve ima unutra. Poput raja je. Svjetlo svijeća, ležajevi s nabacanim poplunima i dekama. Okrugla peć s vrućim loncem kave na njoj. Stol s bocom vina i štrucom kruha i kobasicom. Četiri zdjele juhe.

Na zidovima slike dvoraca i jezera i lijepih djevojaka. To je pokretni dom željezničkih čuvara, ljudi čiji je posao da stalno paze na teret što ide ovamo onamo. Četvorica stražara ulaze unutra i zatvaraju vrata.

Nešto kasnije izlaze van pušeći cigare, razgovarajući zadovoljno mekim donjim registrom njemačkog jezika. Jedan od njih ugleda Billyjevo lice u otvoru za zrak. Maše mu prstom ljubazno upozoravajući, govoreći mu da bude dobar dečko.

Amerikanci preko puta opet govore čuvarima za mrtvaca u njihovom vagonu. Čuvari donose nosila iz svog udobnog vagona, otvaraju vagon s mrtvacem i ulaze unutra. Mrtvačev vagon uopće nije natrpan. Unutra je svega šestorica živih pukovnika - i jedan mrtav.

Nijemci iznose leš. Leš je Divlji Bob. Tako to ide.

Usred noći neke od lokomotiva počnu trubiti jedna drugoj i zatim kreću. Lokomotiva i zadnji vagon svakog vlaka označeni su narančasto-crnom vrpcom, ukazujući na to da je vlak van igre za bombardere – da prevozi ratne zarobljenike.

Rat samo što nije završio. Lokomotive kreću prema istoku kasno u prosincu. Rat će završiti u svibnju. Njemački zatvori posvuda su prepuni i zarobljenici više nemaju što za jesti, niti ima goriva da ih grije. A ipak – stižu novi zarobljenici.

Vlak Billyja Pilgrima, najduži od svijeta, ne miče dva dana.

„Ovo nije loše“, skitnica reče Billyju drugoga dana. „Ovo nije ništa.“

Billy pogleda kroz otvor za zrak. Željezničko dvorište sada je pusto, izuzev bolničkog vlaka označenog crvenim križevima – na tračnicama jako, jako daleko. Njegova lokomotiva zafijuće. Lokomotiva Billy Pilgrimovog vlaka fijukne natrag. Pozdravljaju se.

Iako se Billyjev vlak ne kreće, vagoni su čvrsto zaključani. Nitko ne smije izaći prije posljednjeg odredišta. Čuvarima koji vani koračaju amo-tamo, svaki vagon je zaseban organizam koji jede i pije i olakšava se kroz otvore za zrak. Ponekad kroz njih i govori ili viče. Unutra ulaze voda i štruce crnog kruha i kobasice i sira, a van izlaze govna i pišalina i psovke.

Ljudska bića tamo unutra olakšavaju se u čelične kacige, koje dodaju ljudima kraj otvora za zrak, koji ih prazne. Billy je praznitelj. Ljudska bića također dodaju čuture, koje stražari pune vodom. Kada dođe hrana, ljudska su bića tiha i puna povjerenja i prelijepa. Diješe.

Ljudska bića tamo unutra naizmjenice stoje ili leže. Noge onih koji stoje poput su stupova ograda zarivenih u toplu, meškoljavu zemlju koja prdi i uzdiše. Neobična zemlja mozaik je spavača koji se gnijezde poput žlica.

Sada vlak počinje gmizati prema istoku.

Negdje u svemu tome je Božić. Billy Pilgrim gnijezdi se poput žlice sa skitnicom na Badnjak, i zaspi. Otputovao je kroz vrijeme opet u 1967. - u noć kada ga je oteo leteći tanjur s Tralfamadaorea.

6. Conclusion

When it comes to producing a translation, i.e., analyzing its position within a home culture, it seems crucial to include the analysis of social context and translators as social agents – themes explicitly brought to the core of translation studies by the sociological turn. The translation of Vonnegut's *Slaughterhouse-Five* into Croatian is a good example of this. Everything we know about the relations between periphery and centre, but also about the translations of works with a canonical status, tells us Vonnegut's seminal work should have been translated earlier. However, turning our attention to the social context in which the translation occurred just in 2019 and not earlier, possible answers emerge.

Translated pieces of literature do not occur in vacuum; they are always embedded within a certain social context. Firstly, individuals who belong to social systems conduct the translation process – they are social agents influenced by the system but also having agency. Moreover, as with any other human/social activity, the translation is intertwined and affected by different social institutions which influence the selection, production and distribution of texts. Social agents and institutions never come neutral, without power relations among them, these being of political, ideological, cultural or economic (but most often a combination of few) character. Therefore, the field initially growing out of linguistics and dealing with equivalence and Bible translations, now focuses on the extra-textual factors, issues of political, economical and cultural dynamics.

Much of the seminal contemporary works in translation studies have been strongly influenced by sociological theories and theorists, as Luhmann, Bourdieu, Wallerstein and others. In the recent attempt to construct a sociology of translation some important insights came. Firstly, it introduced the relations of power which underly the process of translation in its different stages. This is most obvious in works inspired by Bourdieu theorizing a field of international relations of exchange, unequal, asymmetrical and showing certain patterns.

Secondly, it imported into the discipline important methodological insights, mostly analytical tools. Most of efforts done with regards to this issue deal with overcoming the obstructive opposition between quantitative (descriptive) and qualitative (explanatory models). Also, theoretical concepts borrowed from sociology have a function of uniting the very interdisciplinary field. Therefore, we hope to have presented the importance of translation studies developed at the crossroad with sociology. Moreover, as we know, with rare exceptions, this particular area of research did not get proper attention within Croatian translation studies.

7. Works Cited

- “Analiza programa potpora za izdavanje knjiga koji provodi Ministarstvo kulture RH.” *Portal hrvatskog kulturnog vijeća*, accessed 20th Jun. 2023, [https://www.hkv.hr/izdvojeno/nae-
teme/civilno-drustvo/35093-analiza-programa-potpورا-za-izdavanje-knjiga-koji-
provodi-ministarstvo-kulture-rh.html](https://www.hkv.hr/izdvojeno/nae teme/civilno-drustvo/35093-analiza-programa-potpورا-za-izdavanje-knjiga-koji-provodi-ministarstvo-kulture-rh.html)
- “Baza prijevoda hrvatske književnosti.” *Portal otvorenih podataka*, accessed 20th Jun. 2023, <https://data.gov.hr/ckan/dataset/baza-prijevoda-hrvatske-knjizevnosti>
- “Ministarstvo Kulture: Potpora izdavanju knjiga.” *Ministarstvo Kulture*, accessed 23rd Feb. 2023, [https://min-kulture.gov.hr/financiranje/odobreni-programi-u-2022-
godini/potpورا-izdavanju-knjiga-pregled-sa-stanjem-29-3-2022/21797](https://min-kulture.gov.hr/financiranje/odobreni-programi-u-2022-godini/potpورا-izdavanju-knjiga-pregled-sa-stanjem-29-3-2022/21797)
- Agorni, Mirella. “Locating Systems and Individuals in Translation Studies” *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, edited by Wolf, Michaela, and Fukari, Alexandra, 2007, pp. 123-135.
- Bassnett, Susan and Lefevere, Andre. *Translation, History, and Culture*. Pinter Publishers London, 1990.
- Benjamin, Walter. “The Task of the Translator.” *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2000, pp. 15-23.
- Buzelin, Helene. “Translations “In the Making”.” *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, edited by Wolf, Michaela, and Fukari, Alexandra, 2007, pp. 135-171.
- Casanova, Pascale. *The World Republic of Letters*. Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Damrosch, David. *What Is World Literature?* Princeton University Press, 2003.

- Even-Zohar, Itamar. "The Position of Translated Literature Within the Literary Polysystem." *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2000, pp. 192-198.
- Giddens, Anthony, and Philip W. Sutton. *Sociology*. Polity Press, 2021.
- Gouanvic, Jean-Marc. "A Bourdieusian Theory of Translation, or the Coincidence of Practical Instances." *The Translator*, vol. 11, no. 2, 2005, pp. 147–166.
- Gračan, Giga. "Lokalizacija kao prevodilačka metodologija na primjeru drame Ničija zemlja Harolda Pintera u prijevodu Antuna Šoljana." *Kolo*, no. 3, 1998.
- Haralambos, Michael, and Martin Holborn. *Sociology: Themes and Perspectives*. Collins, 2008.
- Heilbron, Johan, and Sapiro, Gisele. "Outline for a Sociology of Translation. Current issues and future prospects." *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, edited by Wolf, Michaela, and Fukari, Alexandra, 2007, pp. 93-109.
- Hermans, Theo. "Translation, Irritation and Resonance." *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, edited by Wolf, Michaela, and Fukari, Alexandra, 2007, pp. 57-79.
- Hermans, Theo. *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*, edited by Hermans, Teo, Croom Helm London, 1985
- Holmes, James S. "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies." *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2000, pp. 172-186.
- Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2000, pp. 113-119.

- Jelčić, Andy. "Beyond – razmatranja o budućnosti književnoga prevođenja." *Književno prevođenje i svjetska književnost*, edited by Nataša Medved and Sead Muhamedagić, Društvo hrvatskih književnih prevodilaca, 2019, pp. 165-178.
- Levý, Jiří. "Translation as a Decision Process." *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2000, pp. 148-160.
- Moe, Marija Zlatnar, et al. *Center and Periphery: Power Relations in the World of Translation*. Znanstvena Založba Filozofske Fakultete, 2019.
- Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies*. Routledge, 2009.
- Nida, Eugene. "Principles of Correspondence." *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2000, pp. 126-141.
- Pokvytytė, Kristina. *Povilas Gasiulis' translation strategies for repetition in Kurt Vonnegut's novel Slaughterhouse-Five*. 2009. Vytautas Magnus University. Master thesis
- Pisac, Andrea. *Trusted Tales: creating authenticity in literary representations from ex-Yugoslavia*. 2011. University of London, PhD thesis.
- Pokvytytė, Kristina. *Povilas Gasiulis' translation strategies for repetition in Kurt Vonnegut's*
- Prunč, Erich. "Priests, Princes, and Pariahs. Constructing the Professional Field of Translation." *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, edited by Wolf, Michaela, and Fukari, Alexandra, 2007, pp. 39-57.
- Ritzer, George, and Douglas J. Goodman. *Sociological Theory*. McGraw-Hill, 2008.
- Snell-Hornby, Mary. *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigm or Shifting Viewpoints*. John Benjamins, 2006.

Toury, Gideon. "The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation." *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2000, pp. 198-213.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Routledge, 2012.

Vermeer, Hans J. "Skopos and Commission in Translational Action." *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2000, pp. 221-233.

Vinay, Jean-Paul and Darbelnet, Jean. "A Methodology for Translation." *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2000, pp. 84-94.

Williams, Raymond. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. Oxford University Press, 1976.

Wolf, Michaela, and Fukari, Alexandra. *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. J. Benjamins, 2007.

8. Abstract

Slaughterhouse Five and the Sociological Turn in Translation Studies

Kurt Vonnegut's most famous novel *Slaughterhouse-Five* was translated into the Croatian language just recently in 2019 by Milena Benini. This canonical piece of literature was used to show the importance of including sociological approaches within the discipline of translation studies. Beginning with the emergence of the discipline, a brief scheme of development is provided in the thesis. Special attention is dedicated to radical turns. The focus is on the sociological turn – a still establishing one. Using theories of well-known authors such as Theo Hermans and Pascale Casanova but also sociologists Pierre Bourdieu and Niklas Luhmann, importance of including social contexts when analyzing translation is presented.

Key words: literary translation, translation studies, the sociological turn, Kurt Vonnegut, *Slaughterhouse-Five*

9. Sažetak

Klaonica Pet i sociološki obrat u traduktologiji

Najpoznatiji roman Kurt Vonneguta *Klaonica Pet* na hrvatski je prevela Milena Benini tek 2019. Ovo kanonsko djelo poslužilo je demonstriranju važnosti uključivanja socioloških pristupa u disciplinu traduktologije. U radu je ponuđena kratka shema razvoja discipline počevši od nastanka prevoditeljskih studija. Posebna pažnja posvećena je radikalnim preokretima. Naglasak je na sociološkom obratu koji se još uspostavlja. Koristeći poznate autore poput Thea Hermansa i Pascale Casanova, ali i sociologa Pierrea Bourdieua i Niklasa Luhmanna, prezentirana je potreba uključivanja društvenog konteksta u analize prijevoda.

Ključne riječi: književni prijevod, traduktologija, sociološki obrat, Kurt Vonnegut,

Klaonica 5