Developing the capacity of education *local leaders for sustaining professional learning communities in Bangladesh*

Zoran Herceg

Department of Community Health Sciences, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, T2N4N1, Canada

ABSTRACT. To completely understand Dante's work, we would need to perfectly comprehend the foundations on which it is built, as well as Dante's own "constructs" and reinterpretations of earlier texts—the transformations of these texts and the whole ideological superstructure of the work built on them. The goal of this essay is to introduce, for the first time in English-language scholarship, a discussion of Pavol Koprda's Slovak translation of Dante's Paradise (2020), the result of extensive Slovak academic research on this topic, based on key sections in which Dante's philosophical back- ground is revealed, and focusing on an interpretation of the third canticle and a reconciliation of the intellectual debates of Dante's time.

INTRODUCTION

Today, Dante's works continue to attract considerable interest from readers, whether they are scholars, students, or general readers, and this is evidenced by the many publica- tions and articles that appear every year—both in Dante's birthplace, Italy, and globally.1 When attempting to explain a literary work by any author, interpretation is, of course, crucial to unravel the mysterious,

figurative world of the author and bring it closer to today's reader. However, in a book or scholarly study, there is more space to examine shorter sections of the work (a tercet, a verse, an expression) compared to the translation, which is why scientific and critical editions contain extensive notes and commentaries (in both the original and the translated works). Interpretation also plays a key role in translation; it is essential to the translator since they are, first and foremost, the interpreter of the work.

A translation cannot perfectly resemble the source text on every single level; however, the Slovak School of Translation Studies and its tradition of translating texts from distant periods has been, since the 1940's, based on the requirement to approach the author and his world in its entirety through the reconstruction of all the qualities of the original. This reconstruction should be based on a philological and, at the same time, historically faithful, literary, cultural, and aesthetic analysis of the text and the context. This approach places high demands on the interpreter and translator because it should be possible to read the translated text as if it were the original one (as a fluent poetic work); in other words, in the Slovak translations of literary texts (particularly in poetry), the closest attention is paid to retaining the aesthetic qualities of expressions, i.e., to conveying both the formal and the content qualities of the text. This interpretive method also places high demands on the translator as a poet, his knowledge of versology (rhyme, rhythm, metrics, etc.), and his work with linguistic–stylistic means of expression in the case of poetry (see Truhlárˇová 2014, pp. 36–37). As a result of these rules, the view that a poetic work should be translated as a poem, not transposed into prose, is still clearly prevalent in our country today. The main representatives of such thinking regarding translation are translators, scholars, and/or translation theorists such as Jozef Felix, Zora Jesenská, Pavol Koprda, Viliam Turcˇány, L'ubomír Feldek, Ján Zambor, and others.

AUTHORIAL INTENT

As has been indicated above, the question of textual interpretations, in all its complex- ity, does not only concern the original texts, in which, as in the case of Dante Alighieri, variegated streams of ideas and interpretations—or even passages and episodes that have not been sufficiently or unambiguously clarified to date (if possible at all)—are witnessed, even seven centuries after their compilation. In fact, it is natural for each reader to relate the text to their own present and subjective experience, and it is indeed possible that they let themselves be influenced by the interpretations of others, e.g., by comments or studies on the subject.2 According to Ferroni ([2012] 2019, p. XXVI),

> "every relationship with a text takes place in an interweaving of comprehension and deformation [. . .]

Every interpretation transforms the text, uncovers, or adds meanings to it that had not previously been identi- fied; it may tend to move away from the original values of the text as far as possible, but also aim at a deeper and more authentic communication with them". Even though there is no objective truth, despite the reader transforming and interpreting values differently, this does not mean that absolute relativism should be arrived at, since interpretation should not be completely open to the point of complete manipulation or overturning the meaning of the work to one's liking.

This idea is also confirmed by what Umberto Eco (1992) states regarding the correct interpretations of a text being only those that are supported by the original: a text may have many meanings, but no single meaning is the correct one; it has to be somehow connected to the original. And likewise in translation, there may be several possibilities, but only those that are based on the right interpretation can be the correct ones. Moreover, in the sense of a certain interpretative scepticism or realism, Hut'ková (2003, p. 43) expresses,

> "there is no such reception [interpretation, translation, etc.] that would definitively reveal all the nuances of the text".

It is evident that recognition and an understanding of the broader context of the age in question is vital to the understanding of any work—for instance, the sources the author may have known that may have inspired him, which of them they may have known directly, which indirectly, and if they knew them at all (see Corti 2003, pp. 365–72). Knowledge of the author's political and philosophical beliefs, the author's intellectual development, and development in his works, i.e., the change in their thinking, are also essential; thus, previous written sources must be consulted to determine whether the author builds on them and how (the complex question of intertextuality), and it is necessary to be familiar with the author's other works as well.

The following questions could not be developed in this article because of its complexity: if I read a text by Dante, do I want to read and understand his intention as an author? Do I want to proceed to a real and authentic reading of Dante? Let us admit, not being Dante experts, one must also use the comments of scholars, Danteologists, or translations (eventually with comments and notes). But, when reading the commentaries on Dante's work, or a translation, do I really read the ideas intended by the author himself, or do I at least read the text as close as possible to his original ideas? How do the commentators and/or translators, willingly or unwillingly, alternate and/or shape the text and possibly transform it to deviate from the original meanings?

If we are willing to read authentic Dante, when interpreting or translating his work, we first need to reflect on what the authorial intent is and how he seeks to achieve it. We need to find the internal logic of the text, a kind of connective tissue to help us to interpret the ambiguous or obscure parts of the text correctly and to decide on a particular solution in the translation.3. We assume that all

elements of the text are used by the author to achieve their intention and are not random. Koprda, the translator of the work in question, states that he applied textual hermeneutics in his interpretation. In practice, for Koprda (Gagliardi and Koprda 2016, pp. 8–9), this means that the interpreter is not looking for "one possible meaning from many, but instead [he is looking for] the only possible meaning that is in accordance with the author's life", i.e., with their thinking, which corresponds to the thinking of the period and to its "tendencies", with expressions used in the relevant epoch, etc. Indeed, "the interpreter comes to their conclusion [and makes the final translational solution] only after they have proven that the author could not have considered the matter in a different way, as they believed such an idea (or a 'philosophy') rather than another. It is, in essence, a reconstruction of the text taking into consideration the author's intellectual biography". This method should include a final adjudication in disputed cases when determining the meaning of an obscure expression or a more extensive text.

In our own translation practice, it is our experience that the myriad Dante Studies can sometimes be a burden for the translator—their relevance varies, not all studies are generally available, and, if the translator is not an expert in a certain subject (for example, in Dante Studies), it is difficult to navigate the volume of information, different approaches, etc. In this sense, M. de Montaigne (cited in Felix 1970, p. 31) questions the "interpretations of interpretations" and calls for a proper interpretation of content.

In this study, we focus on Dante's efforts to reconcile or unify Averroist thought and Christian belief. It must be said that, in general, the question of Dante's way of interpreting the relationship between earthly beatitude and heavenly beatitude, or the peculiar nature of Alighieri's philosophical syncretism, is not new and, indeed, for an issue as complex as Dante's relationship to Aristotelian–Averroistic philosophy, it would have been necessary to discuss a large bibliographical corpus. However, this issue is new in Slovakia, where this topic has not resonated more extensively and systematically so far; in fact, it has not even been presented more comprehensively, and the translation method used by the translator in question is also new. For this reason, on the basis of an analysis of the translation and the paratexts (co)authored by the translator of the "new" translation of Paradise (Alighieri 2020), Pavol Koprda, the aim of this study is to map his interpretative assumptions and the way they are reflected in the text in more detail and thus to present this translation to the wider scholarly public, as it seems to be reconciling philosophy and Christianity. This study was primarily based on the hypothesis that the preceding Slovak translation of Paradise (Alighieri 1986) by Viliam Turcˇány does not reflect the complexity of Dante's work nor does it consciously follow the line of Alighieri's outlined reconciliation plan. For such a reason, a comparative linguistic–interpretive analysis of the two Slovak translations of Paradise was carried out in order to determine whether there is a new (unique) interpretive optic in the Slovak

reception space, built on a particular interpretive key, which is conceptually manifested throughout the third canticle. In Section 4, at least some examples and results of comparisons between the two mentioned translations will be presented.

INTERPRETATION AND TRANSLATION BY PAVOL KOPRDA

The advantage for Pavol Koprda, as the translator of Paradise, the subject of this paper, is that all the above stated aspects are well known to him, as he is an Italian studies scholar who has worked with Italian literature and comparative literary studies for several decades. In the last decade, his interpretation of Dante's work has been significantly impacted by the work of Antonio Gagliardi (in, for example, Tommaso D'Aquino e Averroè: La visione di Dio [Thomas Aquinas and Averroes: The Vision of God] from 2002, La comedia divina di Dante [Dante's Divine Comedy], 2014, and others). Most importantly, he became familiar with Averroes' works (Koprda translated a part of Averroes' commentary into Slovak, based on the Italian translation by Augusto Illuminati), which gave him an in-depth knowledge of Averroes' text and especially of the historical and philosophical contexts of the time (Ancient Greek and Arabic philosophy, Christian philosophy).4 The first theoretical correlations of the broader contextual background was introduced by Koprda on the basis of Gagliardi's texts in the extensive monograph Podklady k hermeneutike stredovekej talianskej literatúry ([Background to the Hermeneutics of Medieval Italian Literature] 2016). The new 2020 translation of Paradise (including the translation of Dante's 13th letter to Cangrande della Scala) published by Perfekt is, however, unlike the 2017 version, systematic, consistent, and conceptually coherent. We will present the fundamental theses and premises on which the translation and the extensive notes are based (see Koprda 2020a, pp. 305–584).

Dante's Paradise culminates in the last canto of The Divine Comedy in which, after a journey through Hell and Purgatory, Dante sees God for a moment during his life. As Dante explains in his 13th letter to Cangrande della Scala (called "accessus"), this canto is crucial to understanding the work. Today, after more than 700 years, Dante's world is distant to us, we do not understand many of his motives well, and many parts of his work have not been satisfactorily elucidated. To completely understand his work, we would have to perfectly know Dante's philosophical (Pagan, Christian, and Arab) background, including texts by Averroes, Aristotle, Avicenna, and Christian texts, as well as Dante's own "constructs", reinterpretations, and transformations of these texts and the ideological superstructure of the work built on top of them. Koprda proposes reading Paradise as an eschatological work, i.e., a work addressing the deepest meaning of human life. Based on the philosophy of the time, Paradise shows the human possibility of merging with the ultimate truth (God) during one's lifetime and how this is to be done. This philosophical impetus is likely to have been Arab

philosophy, whose impact on Dante's work has been denied in the last centuries, as summarized in Eco's (2014) article Dante e l'islam, although accepted by some researchers, such as Gilson. In recent times, the scientific study of the presence of Arab philosophical doctrines in Dante's work has been revived (see Note 1).

As regards the possibility of merging with God during one's lifetime and how it is to be done, Dante's new approach was that whoever achieves the ultimate happiness ("l'ultima felicità", i.e., beatitude, the vision of God, perfection) during his lifetime will also be saved and enjoy eternal life and may also help to save others—this is a traditional part of the interpretations of Dante in which, as the protagonist of a journey to the afterlife, he becomes an example for others and also proof of the possibility of merging with God. The impetus for Dante addressing the "salvation of humanity" from damnation is probably his strong humanistic beliefs and his quest to raise the dignity of a person during one's lifetime, in contrast to Christianity, which sees the meaning of life in the afterlife. Dante's starting point was a disputation of Averroes' reading of Aristotle, in the sense that even Aristotle does not deny the possibility of knowing God ("the ultimate truth") while alive, as Man has all the prerequisites for this (otherwise his desire would remain unfulfilled, i.e., "frustra", a phrase from Par. IV, 129; originally cited in Aristotle's De Anima III, 99, 432b). This subject was of great interest to the intellectuals of the time, as it emphasized human cognitive capacities (and perhaps awakened in them an awareness of their own humanism). Knowing the ultimate truth by applying one's intellectual abilities meant becoming the ultimate truth for a moment, thus also attaining the ultimate happiness—that is, something of ultimate value and something the human wants to achieve. However, this "Aristotelian" point of view does not consider the Christian afterlife, which is why it was doctrinally condemned (Tempier's theses of 1270 and 1277). This issue was addressed by the theology, philosophy, and literature of the time. It is not easy to uncover how the presence and application of Aristotelian–Averroist philosophy is manifested in the literature, as philosophy had to remain hidden due to Tempier's inquisitional prohibitions; literature became the ideal place for this, but it became hermetic and very difficult to comprehend due to extensive allegorisation.7 Dante's authorial intention also consists of trying to deceive the reader, as he presents easily understood subject matter—the story of "Dante's love for Beatrice" and the underworld, which allows him to hide his true intention, which is understood only by those who have the key to decipher it.8 We can speak of a certain "terminological library" (term used by Gagliardi and Koprda), which has been translated from a philosophical language into a literary one, where it is able to hide in images, allegories, polysemy, etc.

"Filosofeggiare" about the ultimate happiness was dangerous and could lead to con- demnation and the death penalty. For this reason, Dante first condemns all the Averroists to Hell (Inf. IX, 6th circle) and then works through their thinking

in Paradise, cleansed of suspicion. Both Aquinas and Bonaventure offered Christian critiques of Averroist reasoning. Dante, independently of them, created his own image of the dignity of human life on Earth, going beyond the philosophical system and its Christian reinterpretation; Dante sought to unite various philosophical viewpoints, including those of Aristotle, Averroes, and Siger of Brabant, and to bring the Christian afterlife into this conceptual system (Koprda 2020c, p. 99).

The enigmatic Dante's expressions include the use of terminology and imagery typical of Provençal lyricism (e.g., the longing for a beloved lady represents the longing for intellectual perfection). Words such as "il varco" (Par. XXVII, 82), "il passo" (Par. IV, 91; Par. XXII, 123), "il guado" (Par. II, 126) refer to the place of passage into the afterlife and, therefore, refer to Dante's "trasumanar" (cf. Par. I, 70). "Verace amor" (Par. X, 84) is love for the ultimate truth. "La dritta via" (Inf. I, 3) and its variants of "dritta strada" (Par. XXIX, 128), "fuor di strada" (Par. VIII, 148; in Koprda's translation rendered explicitly as "out of the direct path" with the addition of the adjective "direct"), "in alto mar per dritto segno" (Par. XI, 120,) and similar phrases represent the way to God through one's own intellectual powers, during a lifetime. The image of the boat and Ulysses and his "folle volo" (Inf. XXVI, 125) and similar metaphors based on the term "folle" (fool) (or its various allusions) depict the episode of Ulysses in Dante's Inferno and his forced attempt to cross the Pillars of Hercules, i.e., the boundary between the world of the living and the world of the dead, with the aim of identifying himself with God already during his earthly life without the help of divine grace; this fact is condemned by Alighieri in the first cantica following the examples of Odysseus and Lucifer. In Paradise, alluding to the infernal episode, the author creates intertextual connection with the philosophical meaning as explained above.

Koprda emphasises the need for a certain awareness that helps one understand ex-pressions, words, terms, or images and to divide them from a casual appearance. Dante, like a magnificent strategist, relates to Arabic and Greek philosophy, but dresses the phi- losophy in such Christian garb that it appears to be a text purely conceived according to this ideology. The translator's goal, as stated by Koprda (2020a), is to provide the reader with the closest possible approximation of Dante's original thought and that of his era, especially with regard to Dante's real intention throughout his entire work, by explicitly indicating (in the text of the translation itself and/or in the paratext, such as notes, scholar papers, the epilogue, etc.) which interpretative key to use to support a "correct reading" (Koprda has a reading in mind that most likely corresponds to the author's intention). At the same time, Koprda does not conceal the existence of certain points or passages not yet endowed with a clear and adequate interpretation and proposals. In the case of passages or subjects (characters) with several levels of meaning and multiple interpretations, he always indicates which of the possible hypotheses can be considered the most relevant (e.g., certain

apparently enigmatic expressions are, in fact, according to Koprda, literal Italian translations of Aristotle, defined by Dante himself earlier in the Convivio) (cf. Koprda 2020a, pp. 17–39).

In his interpretation, the translator proceeded according to the method of lectio difficilior and lectio facilis, similarly to the Dante scholar Petrocchi who, in turn, if unable to find an aspect in the case of the existence of two occurrences that would allow him to identify which of the two was really Dante's and which—for example—the copyists', he attributed to Dante the one that helped the context be read as serious discourse; thus, in the case of more ambiguous meanings, double readings, or lack of clarity of the passage, Koprda also selected the one that, in his opinion, made more sense in accordance with Dante's intellectual biography. The criterion of the preference of interpretations that showed closer adherence to the ideal structure of Paradise is also applied at moments when Koprda could not find the relevant texts. In these situations, he turned to Petrocchi and, from his readings, chose the one that was not "trivialising", "even though it may not have been part of the group of copies of the so-called first or old Vulgate" (Koprda 2020b, p. 73).

To summarize, in most cases, Koprda's paratext presents the variants of meaning of the different readings of a questionable Italian expression, and for interpretation, the one that allows for the most useful contextualization is proposed as valid, without therefore denying the reasons for other readings. If a hint, a word, an expression, an image, or an Averroist or Aristotelian way of thinking appears in Dante's text, the respective passage from the works of Averroes or Aristotle is quoted in the commentary.

An interesting observation arose in the course of work on the translation, as follows: "the most delicate passages of the text are read by commentators as conforming to the conclusions of Thomas Aquinas. By delicate places I mean those that hint at adhering to one of the theses of contemporary Averroist thought. In such a case, I was not satisfied with the available instrumentarium and began to search in the past, too. It seemed to me that the further one proceeded from the Middle Ages to our times, the readings were more tenacious in denying the presence of the Averroist key in Dante's work. Not only that, but I became witness to the most common ways of denial used: the thesis used by Dante is read through the sole eyes of the biblical tradition (or Aristotle). In most cases, Dante's words referring to a philosophical discourse are skipped over, glossed over, read in another key, generally as components of an insignificant, scattershot image of little importance. It is not infrequent for this purpose that the historically occurring transcription of the word is used, rendered preferable although copied incorrectly, it fatally diverts from what Dante really meant. This is what I call 'adaptation techniques'. Dante today is read in an 'adapted' form" (Koprda 2020b, pp. 72–73).

INTERPRETIVE DIFFERENCES IN THE TRANSLATIONS OF KOPRDA (2020) VS. TURCˇÁNY (1986)

In this section, we will give a few simple examples—the results of a comparative linguistic–interpretive analysis of the two Slovak translations of Paradise. As we can see, the examined texts and paratexts showed different translation approaches and interpretations between Koprda and Turcˇány. The translation by the poet Viliam Turcˇány was made after a previous collaboration with the Romance scholar Jozef Felix, with whom he translated the first two canticles and Vita Nuova in 1958. In the notes to the translation, he explains the historical anchoring of the episodes, introduces protagonists who might not be familiar to Slovak readers, and discusses certain linguistic peculiarities of Dante's text. On the other hand, it does not deal with controversial passages that might be related to the interpretive line as we have presented it in Koprda. Turcˇány's translation is, in short, a literal reading of Dante's text, but the translator has no ambition to make it more coherent; he limits himself to "at least some" explanation of the images in order to give the readers, at minimum, some guidelines, but it is difficult to define the methodological basis of his explications and conclusions (in this optics, his translation solutions seem coincidental). References to other commentators are absent. Rather, Turcˇány concentrates on finding similarities between Dante's text and the domestic literary production or clarifies the use of poetic means in the context of the national literature. Such contextualizing is also achieved through his own experience as a translator, e.g., the translation of Petrarch's poetry, the Stilnovists, the troubadours, etc. The commentary is thus limited to the presentation of Dante as an excellent poet and the historical events related to his life.

According to Koprda, Canto IV addresses the question of whether it is possible to know God through human knowledge during life ("Io veggio ben che già mai non si sazia/nostro intelletto, se 'l ver non lo illustra/di fuor dal qual nessun vero si spazia./Posasi in esso, come fera in lustra,/tosto che giunto l' ha; e giugner puollo:/se non, ciascun disio sarebbe frustra", Par. IV, 124–126).13 Dante expresses himself approvingly (v. 128). Koprda (2020a, p. 21) explicates through a parallel that, just as light must first illuminate the transparent environment that mediates light in order to subsequently make colours visible (which are otherwise only "in potency"), so human eyes will only be able to see (intellectually know) once they have been illuminated by the ultimate Truth. There is no commentary on the verses in question in Turcˇány's translation, but the text of the translation shows that Turcˇány translates quite literally, saying that

> "the spirit is not satisfied with any food, and apart from the truth that leads to peace, there are no other truths that touch the eyes".

Koprda, in the cantos that deal with the structure of heaven, sees hidden philosophical messages and connects them with the question of merit, i.e., the

extent to which the protagonists have contributed to their place in paradise. In Canto VI, Emperor Justinian says of himself, "Cesare fui e son Iustinïano,/che, per voler del primo amor ch'i' sento,/d'entro le leggi trassi il troppo e 'l vano" (vv. 10–12). As Koprda (2020a, pp. 22, 353) notes, according to some commentators, it is suggested here that the Corpus Iuris Civilis was compiled by Justinian in such a way as to exclude what is repetitious and what is superfluous from among the laws. Koprda, however, interprets "il troppo" as greed(iness) (symbolized by the she-wolf in the first canto of Inferno). According to Aristotle, ignorance of the middle measure is the cause for which men desire more than is given to humans to desire. For Aristotle, it is an eccentric extreme that does not allow man to improve intellectually to the point of knowing the ultimate truth. From a semantic point of view, Justinian at the same time seems to be saying (thanks to the multiple meanings of the text) that he has succeeded by law in restraining desire, which has no measure. Thus, not only by the Corpus Iuris Civilis as such but also by this particular consequence, he has earned supreme happiness on Earth and eternal beatitude after death. Turcˇány interprets it only in the sense of the compilation of the law codex and presents the connections of Justinian's name within the Slovak context and the work of the poet Ján Kollár.

In Canto VII (vv. 85–93), according to Koprda, Dante for the first time writes that initially, there were two possibilities to see God: the way by God's forgiveness (the Christian one) or the way to God by one's own efforts (one's own abilities; like Odysseus or Lucifer; the pre-Christian one) ("o che Dio solo per sua cortesia/dimesso avesse, o che l'uom per sé isso/avesse sodisfatto a sua follia" Par. VII, 92–93). Koprda (2020a, p. 21) emphasizes that Dante is replicating Odysseus' words from Inferno ("dei remi facemmo ali al folle volo", Inf. XXVI, 125). As above, Koprda makes vague, ambiguous places explicit in accordance with the interpretation presented here. Although Turcˇány does not explicitly state a different position by his translation, it is once again literal and devoid of notes. In verses 103–105, however, there is a fundamental differentiation in the translations: Koprda explicitly interprets that these are the two (aforementioned) paths to God; Turcˇány's literal translation does not exclude Koprda's interpretation either, but this time, Turcˇány provides a note:

> "By both paths Dante designates mercy and justice (these are the qualities which, according to the poet, should adorn every ruler)".

It is therefore a different interpretation without indicating on what basis such an interpretation is founded.

Another significant difference is the interpretation of verse 148 (Par. VIII), which discusses going off the straight path. According to Koprda, this is a reference to the "direct way", "dritta via" (as mentioned in the 3rd section), which is the way to God by one's own efforts during life. Turcˇány interprets the passus historically—as a probable allusion to Brother Louis (brother of both Carlo Martello and Robert), who entered the Order and later became Bishop of

Toulouse, or to Robert himself.

Dante's expression "verace amor" (Par. X, 84) may be "true love", but in the spirit of Koprda's interpretation, it is also "love of the ultimate truth". He favours, therefore, the latter expression in order to make the philosophical message hidden in the multiple- meaning expression explicit. Turcˇány translates only in the primary sense.

The difference in conceptions can also be seen in the paratexts to the translations, e.g., in the attribution of authorship to the composition of Fiore. Turcˇány takes the formulation from the Enciclopedia dantesca about Dante as the author; Koprda (in Gagliardi and Koprda 2016, pp. 8, 358) rules out Dante as its author

> "because it adapts Jean de Meung's poem Roman de la Rose [. . .] and [Dante], starting with the poem Donne ch'avete intelletto d'amore, was a rationalist, an ascetic, while the composition Fiore carries on a conversation in terms of Epicurean love".

The hypothesis that Viliam Turcˇány does not reflect the complexity of Dante's work, nor was the translation confirmed to consciously follow the line of Alighieri's outlined reconciliation plan. In brief, Turcˇány's interpretive method is rather intuitive and focused on the text of the poem as a poetic artefact, while Koprda is precise and consistently based on the interpretation of primary sources and secondary literature.

INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT IN SYNTHESIS

When taking a very synthetic view, it can be stated that this reconciliation idea devel- oped gradually in Dante's work as a result of his study and philosophical thinking, and this gradual development is reflected in his earlier works. Drawing from sources and the secondary literature, Koprda reconstructs Dante's intellectual development as follows: a first period of "intellectual biography", which represents his friendship with Cavalcanti; the second is Vita Nuova (inclination to Platonism as regards the path to ultimate happiness); and the third is the writing of Convivio. Between Convivio and The Divine Comedy, Koprda notes a profound revolution in his thinking, while in Convivio, he relies on a philosophy that is originally God's wisdom, and it is impossible for Man to know God; he does not desire it (Dante sought to avoid Lucifer's sin of comparing himself with God, but he created another heresy—a lack of desire for God). In The Divine Comedy, he seeks to correct this mistake. On the one hand, The Divine Comedy is based on the essentiality of the role of Christ, but the correction of the error made in Convivio is undertaken in a questionable way as regards doctrine: Dante accepted the thesis he opposed in Convivio—Averroes' thesis that we should desire God by knowing the essence of things until we know

him. However, here, he added the help of God's grace (see Koprda 2020c, p. 100). In Paradise, Dante seeks to canonize human agency on Earth (the active life of the individual) and its result, ultimate temporal happiness, by stating that God respects this after death as the basis of eternal bliss. On this basis, the structure of Paradise and the arrangement of the figures taken to heaven were created.

In the first canto of Paradise (67–72), Dante points out the similarity of the one who is acquiring knowledge with the one who already has knowledge, and he puts forward an idea that is not inconsistent with the ideas of Thomas Aquinas. Dante looks for the form of his transfiguration in Glaucus' transformation into a sea deity and gives this example as a model for those whose actions predestine them to achieve the ultimate happiness in life. In short, Dante presents in images and in "examples" what Averroes does in expressions and also looks for biblical examples that are similar to Averroes's reasoning. Dante seeks to convince the reader that his ideas, if not always taken from Aquinas, are from the Old or New Testament. He reconciles three cultures and ideologies, Greek, Arab, and Christian, as regards ultimate human happiness and the way to achieve it. This reconciliation consists of Christianity recognising, in addition to the post-mortem knowledge of God and post- mortem beatitude, the direct way ("dritta via") to God by "knowing all that is knowable" during life (with the help of God's grace) and thus the ultimate beatitude during life via this knowledge. Philosophers, on the other hand, should accept that what belongs to the system of knowledge and happiness also belongs to the Christian doctrine (which stands above the scientific one).

CONCILIATION PROJECT

In Paradise, Dante seeks to reconcile the intra-Christian dispute about the possibility of a vision of God, and, from an ontological point of view, this is not a place where disputes are even possible. Therefore, he can place opposing philosophers together; he creates harmony between the Franciscans and the Dominicans, between Bonaventure and Joachim of Fiore, and between Aquinas and Siger of Brabant. Their antagonism is transformed into achieving the same goal, albeit via different routes (Šavelová 2016, p. 18).

It should be noted, as shown before, that the conciliatory point of view in Slovak translations of Dante's works is not new; the first translator of Paradise, the poet Viliam Turcˇány (1986, p. 320), describes Dante as

> "a great reconciler of contradictory ideas of the past and present—only the parts together give the complete truth".

This statement, however, is symptomatic of any interpretation of Dante's work, since in the third canticle, he brings together diverse philosophical movements, philosophers, and religious orders in one place. The author creates

the idea of a general unification with the optics of a higher goal—a vision of God, in other words—all working towards the same goal, though perhaps by a different path. Turcˇány's philological interpretation of the third canticle, however, is not always able to explain the images and expressions used by Dante in light of their unifying goal, as systematically presented by Koprda. For this reason, Turcˇány's interpretive method is rather intuitive, and so we can consider Koprda's translation as unique in the Slovak environment, both in its interpretive line and in its translation elaboration, including an extensive annotation apparatus that guides the reader and tries to offer them an interpretive key to single verses, passages, and episodes in accordance with Dante's conciliation plan.

REFERENCES

Abdel-Ati Al-Naggar, Abdallah. 2007. Intercultural Relations bet ween East and West: Dante Alighieri and His Divine Comedy in Arabic-Islamic Eyes. Rewaq. Available online: https://www.academia.edu/42142124/Dante_Alighieri_and_his_Divine_ Comedy_in_Arabic_Islamic_Eyes_New_Islamic_Sources_of_the_Immortal_Poem_Rewaq_History_Heritage_Doha_Hassan_ in_Mohamed_Centre_for_Historical_Studies_Jan_2019_Isuue_7_7_17 (accessed on 14 January 2024).

Alighieri, Dante. 1986. Božská komédia. Raj [Divine Comedy. Paradise]. Translation, Commentary, and Study by Viliam Turcˇány. Bratislava: Tatran, p. 423.

Alighieri, Dante. 1994. La Commedia secondo l'antica vulgata. Edited by Giorgio Petrocchi. Firenze: Casa Editrice Le Lettere.

Alighieri, Dante. 2014. Opere. Volume secondo. Convivio, Monarchia, Epistole, Egloghe. Edited by Gianfranco Fioravanti. Milano: Mondadori Editore.

Alighieri, Dante. 2020. Božská komédia. Raj [Divine Comedy. Paradise]. Translation and Commentary by Pavol Koprda. Bratislava: Perfekt.

Baran´ski, Zygmunt. 2020. Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio. Literature, Doctrine, Reality. Cambridge: Legenda—Modern Humanities Research Association.

Barolini, Teodolinda. 1992. The Undivine Comedy: Detheologizing Dante. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Barolini, Teodolinda. 2022. Dante's Multitudes: History, Philosophy, Method. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Bianchi, Luca, and Anna Pegoretti. 2022. Il Dante di Bruno Nardi tra filosofia, poesia e profetismo. In Idee di Dante: scrittori e critici.

Edited by Maurizio Fiorilla, Luca Marcozzi and Anna Pegoretti. Roma: «L'Erma» di Bretschneider, pp. 239–52.

Celli, Andrea. 2013. Dante e l'Oriente. Le fonti islamiche nella storiografia novecentesca. Roma: Carocci Editore. Corti, Maria. 2003. Scritti su Cavalcanti e Dante. Torino: Einaudi Editore.

Eco, Umberto. 1992. Interpretation and Overinterpretation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eco, Umberto. 2014. Dante e l'islam. Espresso. December 12. Available online: https://espresso.repubblica.it/opinioni/la-bustina-di- minerva/2014/12/10/news/dante-e-l-islam-1.191222/ (accessed on 24 March 2018).

Felix, Jozef. 1970. Modernita súcˇasnosti [Modernity of the Present]. Bratislava: Slovenský spisovatel'.

Ferroni, Giorgio. 2019. Storia della letteratura italiana. Dalle origini al quattrocento. Milano: Mondadori. First published 2012. Gabrieli, Francesco. 1967. Maometto e le Grandi Conquiste Arabe. Verona: Produzione AME.

Gagliardi, Antonio. 2002. Tommaso d'Aquino e Averroè. La visione di Dio. Soveria Manelli: Rubettino Editore. Gagliardi, Antonio. 2014. La commedia divina di Dante. Tra Averroè e Cristo. Soveria Manelli: Rubettino Editore.

Gagliardi, Antonio, and Pavol Koprda. 2016. Podklady k hermeneutike stredovekej talianskej literatúry [The Background to the Hermeneutics of Medieval Italian Literature]. Nitra: Univerzita Konštantína Filozofa v Nitre.

Gagliardi, Antonio, and Pavol Koprda. 2017. Danteho Raj [Dante's Paradise]. Nitra: Univerzita Konštantína Filozofa v Nitre. Gilson, Étienne. 2011. La filosofia nel Medioevo: Dalle origini patristiche alla fine del XIV secolo. Milano: BUR Rizzoli.

Hut'ková, Anita. 2003. Vybrané kapitoly z teórie prekladu literárno-umeleckých textov: Ucˇebné texty. Banská Bystrica: Univerzita Mateja Bela. Koprda, Pavol. 2020a. Danteho Raj: stopy štruktúry v originále a v preklade [Dante's Paradise: Traces of structure in the original and in translation]. In Ru˚ že je rosa è rose est ru˚ že: Prˇeklad, Prˇevod, Interpretace [Rose is rosa è rose est rose: Translation, Transfer, Interpretation].

Edited by Alice Flemrová and Záviš Šuman. Praha: Univerzita Karlova, Filozofická fakulta, pp. 29–51.

Koprda, Pavol. 2020b. Per una nuova traduzione del Paradiso in lingua slovacca. Studi italo—slovacchi IX: 66–77.

Koprda, Pavol. 2020c. Slovo na úvod [Introduction]. In Božská komédia. Raj [Divine Comedy. Paradise]. Bratislava: Perfekt, pp. 97–102. Landoni, Elena. 2014. 'Or per Empierti bene ogne desio'. Lingua e letteratura, fede e ragione, amore e libertà in Dante. Mantova: Universitas Studiorum.

Mallette, Karla. 2007. Muhammad in Hell. Dante Studies, with the Annual Report of the Dante Society. 125, pp. 207–24. Available online: http://www.jstor.org/stable/40350665 (accessed on 31 January 2023).

Navrátil, Martin. 2018. Aktuálne otázky slovenskej textológie: Textologický diskurz na Slovensku [Current Issues of Slovak Textology: Textological Discourse in Slovakia]. Slovenská literatúra 65: 294–301.

Perez, Francesco. 2001. La Beatrice svelata: Preparazione alla intelligenza di tutte le opere di Dante Alighieri. Palermo: Flaccovio Editore.

Pinto, Raffaele. 2020. L'averroismo della Monarchia e i suoi riflessi nel Paradiso. In Per Enrico Fenzi: Saggi di Allievi e amici per i suoi ottant'anni. Edited by Paolo Borsa, Paolo Falzone, Luca Fiorentini, Sonia Gentili, Luca Marcozzi, Sabrina Stroppa and Natascia Tonelli. Firenze: Le Lettere, pp. 185–204.

Pucciarelli, Valeria. 2012. Dante e l'Islam. La controversia sulle fonti escatologiche musulmane della Divina Commedia. San Demetrio Corone: Irfan Edizioni.

Rossetti, Gabriele. 2013. Il mistero dell'Amor platonico del Medio Evo. Milano: Luni Editrice. First published 1840.

Sabolová-Princic, Dagmar. 1994. Preklady Danteho Pekla na Slovensku a v exile [Translations of Dante's Inferno in Slovakia and in exile]. In K otázkam teórie a dejín prekladu na Slovensku 2 [On the issues of the theory and history of translation in Slovakia 2]. Bratislava: Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV, pp. 189–99.

Sabolová-Princic, Dagmar. 2004. Talianski klasici v slovenských prekladoch. Dante, Manzoni, Leopardi [Italian Classics in Slovak Translations.

Dante, Manzoni, Leopardi]. Bratislava: Veda.

Šavelová, Monika. 2016. Odhal'ovanie Danteho intelektuálnej biografie [Unveiling Dante's Intellectual Biography]. Nitra: Univerzita Konštantína Filozofa v Nitre.

Šavelová, Monika. 2021. Dalle origini a Petrarca: commento e traduzione dei testi scelti. Nitra: Univerzita Konštantína Filozofa v Nitre. Stone, Gregory. 2006. Dante's Pluralism and the Islamic Philosophy of Religion. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Truhlárˇová, Jana. 2014. Jozef Felix a historická prekladatel'ská metóda [Jozef Felix and the Historical Translation Method]. In Myslenie o preklade na Slovensku [Thinking about translation in Slovakia]. Bratislava: Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV, Kalligram, pp. 32–54.

Turcˇány, Viliam. 1986. Komentár [Commentary]. In Božská komédia. Raj [Divine Comedy. Paradise]. Translation, Commentary, and Study by Viliam Turcˇány. Bratislava: Tatran.

Turcˇány, Viliam. 1994. Prekladanie Danteho vo dvojici. Slovak Review 3: 158–61.

Wetherbee, Winthrop, and Aleksander Jason. 2023. Dante Alighieri. In The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Edited by Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman. Stanford: Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. Available online: https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2023/entries/dante/ (accessed on 26 March 2023).

Zambor, Ján. 2008. O troch slovenských prekladoch Danteho Pekla [About three Slovak translations of Dante's Inferno]. Romboid 43:30–42.

Zambor, Ján. 2010. Tvarovanie básne, tvarovanie zmyslu [Shaping the Poem, Shaping Meaning]. Bratislava: Veda.