

**Jelena B. Babić Antić**

*Faculty of Philosophy*

*University of Priština with temporary headquarters in Kosovska Mitrovica*

*e-mail: jbabic.antic@gmail.com*

**Melina M. Nikolić**

*Alfa BK University*

*Faculty of foreign languages*

*e-mail: melina.nikolic@alfa.edu.rs*

## **STRATEGIES AND PROCEDURES IN TRANSLATING RELIGIOUS TERMINOLOGY IN THE NOVEL *ČARAPE KRALJA PETRA* BY MILOVAN VITEZOVIĆ FROM SERBIAN INTO ENGLISH AND FRENCH**

**Abstract:** *The aim of this article is to analyse the application of strategies and procedures in translating religious terminology from Serbian source text "Čarape kralja Petra" by Milovan Vitezović into English and French. Drawing on a combination of Venuti's and Newmark's theories, we will attempt to identify the translation strategies and procedures and determine to what extent the translator uses domestication or foreignization, and thus creates either a translation that can be read fluently and which does not contain the specificities of the source text, or a translation that emphasizes cultural diversity and thus respects both the culture and the writer of the original text. We start from the assumption that even though all three languages belong to the Christian culture, Catholicism, Protestantism and Orthodox Christianity, their respective religious terminologies differ significantly. Therefore, the translator's task should be to produce a translation that can be read fluently while at the same time respecting the cultural diversity in question. Our initial assumptions that the two translations are examples of different strategies have proven to be only partially true. The results show the obvious prevalence of the domestication strategy in both translations, with the exception of the non-equivalence and proper names and toponyms, which proves that the translators actually moved away from the original text.*

**Key words:** *cultural translation, translation strategies and procedures, religious terms, domestication and foreignization, Serbian language, English language, French language*

### **Introduction**

Literary translation is rightly considered to be one of the most difficult and challenging tasks that can be put before a translator. Firstly, as a reader, the translator must be able to properly understand the message of the source text (ST), the author's style and his views on the world and the social context in which he creates. Consequently, his goal is to faithfully transfer the original message into the target language (TL). On the other hand, language as a complex system does not only include linguistic components, and therefore translation is by no means only the transfer

of morphosyntactic and semantic elements<sup>1</sup>, but also of the cultural features of the socio-linguistic community of the source language (SL). These features can present a particularly complex and problematic task when the translator attempts to find a compromise and the best possible solution between preserving what is distinctive and specific to a culture and creating a text that is understandable for readers but not “culturally coloured”. They include various components, such as customs, knowledge, beliefs, religion, etc.

This study attempted to analyse the strategies and procedures applied in the translation of religious terms in Milovan Vitezović’s novel *Čarape kralja Petra* into English (*King Petar's Socks*) by Đorđe Krivokapić, and French (*Les chaussettes du roi Pierre*) by Amalija Vitezović, with particular focus on the translators’ choices regarding the strategies of domestication and foreignization, as well as the procedures of transferring cultural-specific religious concepts into the target languages, while also doing the contrastive analysis of the two translations, and the implications those choices might have on the readers.

Milovan Vitezović, a prominent Serbian author, wrote one of the most touching and beautiful stories from the Great War (1914–1918) in his book *Čarape kralja Petra*. During the War, after the enemy has occupied Serbia, King Petar Karađorđević and the entire Serbian government together with the Serbian army and its command are retreating across Albania. Unfortunately, a large number of residents also seek refuge from the enemy, and are forced to join the soldiers and flee from the invaders. Makrena Spasojević, from the village of Slovac near Lajkovac, follows them to look for her son Marinko, who volunteered to join the army. After days of unsuccessful searching, she does not have the strength to continue. An endless column of refugees and tired soldiers has already crossed Kosovo and starts entering snow-bound Albania. It is there that Makrena meets King Petar. She stops him and makes him vow to find her son. On that occasion, she gives him a pair of woolen socks that she has knitted for Marinko. While all seems lost to King Petar, he finds solace in a vow he gives to Makrena: he will find her son among the lost soldiers and give him a pair of socks she made him.<sup>2</sup>

The novel abounds in religious terminology, both in the narration and in the dialogues. The only hope they all still have lies in their faith in God.

While reading the novel in English and French, we notice that the translations differ considerably in view of the choices the translators made regarding the religious terms. Since religion is part of every culture, we will first consider theoretical background on that subject matter.

### **Language, culture and translating religious terms**

Translation emerged after the first contacts between people of different cultures and languages in order to facilitate communication. However, only in the fifties of the twentieth century did the interest in translation find its place as a topic in the field of linguistics.<sup>3</sup> The discipline that today French theorists call *traductology*, English *translatology*, or *translation studies*, and Serbian *translation theory* and *translation science*, arose much later in the eighties.<sup>4</sup> Nida believes that “translation is reproduction in the language with the goal of the closest natural equivalent of the message in the source language, first in terms of meaning and second in terms of style”<sup>5</sup>. In his review of the general principles of translation, Hlebec mentions the so-called

---

<sup>1</sup> Novakov, 2013: 22

<sup>2</sup> Popović, 2020

<sup>3</sup> Munday, 2001: 5

<sup>4</sup> Bassnet, 2002: 1

<sup>5</sup> Nida, 1975: 95

“universalistic understanding of the world, in which the prevailing opinion is that all languages of the world have a large number of common features or the so-called universals, which enable their comparability and translatability”<sup>6</sup>. He adds that for the interpretation of the text, it is necessary for the translator to know the language he is translating from, as well as the language into which he is translating, to know the culture and to be aware of the time in which the literary work was created, as well as the readership for which the translation is intended<sup>7</sup>.

A lot has been said about the connection and mutual conditioning of language and culture. Nevertheless, it is very important to emphasise that language is connected with culture and largely depends on it, and thus culture represents the framework in which all communication takes place. The science of translation sees translation as intercultural communication, while changes in language affect changes in culture. That is why language research inevitably involves the research of cultural aspects, which is especially the case in translation theory.

Different theorists define culture in different ways. Thus, Tylor, a cultural anthropologist, defines culture as a complex entity that includes knowledge, belief, art, morality, law, customs, and all other abilities and habits that man has acquired as a member of society.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, Aixela believes that every social and linguistic community has a number of habits, classification systems, value judgments and the like, which are sometimes similar to the characteristics of another community, and sometimes completely different.<sup>9</sup> A prominent translation theorist, Newmark, claims that culture is a way of life. It is a characteristic of a community that uses a certain language as its means of expression. Thus, languages exist in the context of their cultures and people use language to express various aspects of their culture.<sup>10</sup> Many translation scholars have pointed out that the meaning of a text largely depends on the context; that some form of cultural filter operates during translation and that a professional translator should have so called inter-cultural competence. Katan continues by defining this competence in terms of the translator’s ability to perceive and handle difference.<sup>11</sup>

With the development of translation and cultural studies, the term *cultural translation* emerged in the literature, and is being used to denote the literary translation that conveys cultural differences, cultural heritage, or aims to present another culture through translation. Cultural translation is considered one of the most important and complicated types of translation nowadays. According to Nida and Taber, the content of the message is changed and the new messages are introduced, which were not present in the original text. The reason for all these changes is to adapt the text to the target culture<sup>12</sup>. Hence, translation becomes cultural when the target text retains the cultural features of the source text<sup>13</sup>. Since religion is an inseparable part of a nation’s cultural identity, translating religious terms and discourse should follow the strategies and procedures that are used for translating culture-specific terms.

Novakov analyses various translations of a number of religious terms and notes that:

As is well known, with a long history, Catholicism, Protestantism and Orthodox Christianity have some significant specificities that are not only formal, but often also conceptual. That is why it is not always easy to find the

---

<sup>6</sup> Hlebec, 2008: 61

<sup>7</sup> Hlebec, 2008: 61

<sup>8</sup> Tylor, 1971 in Katan, 1999: 16

<sup>9</sup> Aixela, 1996: 53

<sup>10</sup> Newmark, 1988: 94

<sup>11</sup> Katan, 2009: 284

<sup>12</sup> Nida and Taber, 1982: 199

<sup>13</sup> Munday, 2009: 186

right measure in translation – the one that will make the text familiar to the English [or any other] reader, and at the same time retain the original “color” and imply carefully that the differences do exist.<sup>14</sup>

Taking into account the above, the postulates of translation theory dictate that in that case the translator, in addition to having excellent knowledge of the languages he works with, would have to be familiar with the teachings of the Orthodox Church and religion, as well as with the traditions and culture of the Serbian people. Moreover, it is also imperative that he is familiar with the religion and beliefs of the target readers. When it comes to translating original texts such as this one, which borders on art and literary creativity, Knežević notes that the readership is also very important. In her opinion, the casual reader presents a much greater challenge for the translator because he does not possess the appropriate knowledge or is insufficiently informed.<sup>15</sup>

Unfortunately, the dictionaries, glossaries and lexicons that are necessary for a good translation of such specific terms are scarce. Jovanović states that in the literature dealing with the translating procedures of the Orthodox religious terminology from Serbian into French, there are hardly any papers investigating this particular issue. He only singles out a French textbook for students of Theology by Ana Vujović<sup>16</sup>, which includes a Serbian-French and French-Serbian dictionary. Regarding the translation into English, he mentions that Ivana Knežević and Predrag Novakov are among rare scholars who wrote on the subject matter.<sup>17</sup> We used dictionaries, glossaries and lexicons dating from 1930s to present day, which are all cited in the literature section.

### Corpus and methodology

The corpus includes the translations of the Serbian novel *Čarape kralja Petra* by Milovan Vitezović into English (2000) and French (2008). The religious terminology in the ST mainly consists of names of saints and holidays, toponyms, prayers, vows, curses, exclamations, greetings, proverbs and other expressions that characterize the Orthodox faith and the Serbian language and culture.<sup>18</sup> We start from the assumption that even though all three languages belong to the Christian culture, Catholicism, Protestantism and Orthodox Christianity and their respective religious terminologies differ significantly, and that, therefore, the translator’s task should be to produce a translation that can be read fluently while at the same time respecting the cultural diversity in question. Since culture-specific elements are among the most difficult realities to translate, it is expected that the translators had some problems in transferring them into the target languages. We also assume that the translations are examples of different strategies, because they are solely the choice of the translator and, consequently, the procedures which are themselves examples of respective strategies. Through a comparative analysis of the original and its two translations, we will try to determine whether the translators “came closer to” or “moved away from” the original. We will also try to point out problematic choices and offer more adequate translations for some terms.

For the purpose of this analysis, we draw on a combination of Venuti’s strategies of domestication and foreignization and Newmark’s procedures. In presenting his view on

---

<sup>14</sup> Novakov, 2013: 27

<sup>15</sup> Knežević, 2010: 35-36

<sup>16</sup> Vujović, 2012.

<sup>17</sup> Jovanović, 2017: 640

<sup>18</sup> For French phrases, see Drobnjak & Gudurić 2012

translation strategies, Venuti reminds his readers of Schleiermacher's methods, explaining that the domesticating practice presents "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to receiving cultural values, bringing the author back home"<sup>19</sup>. On the other hand, the foreignizing practice is "an ethnodeliant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad"<sup>20</sup>. Venuti employs these two concepts to refer to translation strategies which deal with the question of how much a translation assimilates a foreign text to translating language and culture, and how much it rather signals the differences of that text. He states that those terms "indicate fundamentally ethical attitudes towards a foreign text and culture, ethical effects produced by the choice of a text for translation and by the strategy devised to translate it."<sup>21</sup>

In this regard, the strategy of domestication implies the creation of a translation that can be read fluently and does not contain the specificities of the source text (ST), i.e. which does not actually act as a translation: "The prevalence of fluent domestication has supported these developments because of its economic value: enforced by editors, publishers and reviewers, fluency results in translations that are eminently readable and therefore consumable on the book market, assisting in their commodification and ensuring the neglect of foreign texts and English-language translation strategies that are more resistant to easy readability"<sup>22</sup>. On the other hand, foreignization creates a translation that emphasizes cultural diversity and thus respects both the culture and the writer of the original text.

Newmark distinguishes between several translation methods and procedures. Methods refer to approaching the text as a whole, which is not relevant for this study since it only examines religious terminology and not the text as a whole, while translation procedures are used to translate sentences and smaller language units. As mentioned above, the analysis of the corpus combines Venuti's strategies of domestication and foreignization with Newmark's procedures, which are all examples of either the first or the second strategy. His taxonomy is as follows:

1. *Transference* (emprunt, loan word, transcription) is the process of transferring a SL word to a TL text as a translation procedure.

2. *Naturalisation* succeeds transference and adapts the SL word first to the normal pronunciation, and then to the normal morphology (word-forms) of the TL.

3. *Cultural equivalent* is an approximate translation where an SL cultural word is translated by a TL cultural word.

4. *Functional equivalent* is the use of a culture free word, sometimes with a new specific term; it therefore neutralises or generalises the SL word.

5. *Descriptive equivalent* is the procedure when the meaning of the culture-specific terms is explained in several words.

6. *Synonym* is a near TL equivalent to an SL word in a context, where a precise equivalent may or may not exist. A synonym is only appropriate where literal translation is not possible and because the word is not important enough for componential analysis.

7. *Through-translation* (calque) is the literal translation of common collocations, names of organisations, the components of compounds, and perhaps phrases. Normally, through-translations should be used only when they are already recognised terms.

8. *Shifts or transpositions* is a translation procedure involving a change in the grammar from SL to TL (singular to plural, when an SL grammatical structure does not exist in the TL or where literal translation is grammatically possible but may not accord with natural usage in the TL, etc.).

---

<sup>19</sup> Venuti, 2008: 15

<sup>20</sup> Venuti, 1995: 15

<sup>21</sup> Venuti, 2008: 19

<sup>22</sup> Venuti, 1995: 12

9. *Modulation* occurs when the translator reproduces the message of the original text in the TL text in conformity with the current norms of the TL.

10. *Recognized translation* implies the use of a generally accepted term in the translation. Organization names and currencies are most often translated by using this procedure.

11. *Translation label* is used to create a temporary translation, usually of a new institutional expression, which should be marked with quotation marks, which can later be discreetly withdrawn.

12. *Compensation* occurs when the meaning, which cannot be conveyed in a certain part of the sentence, is compensated in another part, or in another place.

13. *Componential analysis* means adding semantic components in order to explain the cultural term as closely as possible, stating the origin, purpose or characteristics.

14. *Reduction and expansion* is an imprecise technique that is intuitively used to convey cultural concepts.

15. *Paraphrase* implies an explanation of the meaning of the cultural term so that it is understandable to readers.

16. *Equivalence and adaptation* are translation techniques that Newmark describes, but Vinay and Derbelnet list them in their classification.<sup>23</sup> Equivalence refers to achieving approximate equivalence by using different structures or stylistic devices from those in the source text, which is especially useful in translating idioms, while adaptation involves changing a cultural term when a certain concept is not recognized in the target culture.

17. *Couplet* refers to the combining of two procedures.

18. *Notes, additions and glosses* present additional information in translation and can be found in the form of footnotes, intertextual expansions and glossary of terms.<sup>24</sup>

These procedures are by no means exhaustive, nor will they all be found in our corpus, but Newmark's taxonomy is still regarded as one of the most comprehensible lists of translation procedures. Therefore, we decided to combine them with Venuti's strategies in order to obtain more relevant and comprehensive results. Several procedures are examples of foreignization, such as transference, naturalisation, calque, recognized translation and notes, additions and glosses. Couplet can be a combination of any two or even more procedures, while the others belong to the strategy of domestication.

## Results and discussion

We will first analyse different types of selected religious terms (non-equivalence and proper names and toponyms; prayers and vows, curses and swearwords, and exclamations and greetings), in order to determine which procedures were applied in their translation, which are the most common, and which strategy prevails. Next, we will provide a few examples of the procedures which were either used only once, or very often and in almost every group of religious terms, so we thought it would be more practical to group the examples according to the procedure used.

### Non-equivalence

Non-equivalence in the translation procedure means that the TL has no direct equivalent for a word or phrase which occur in the ST. This phenomenon is common in translating culture-specific realities that religious terms also belong to. We have found only a

---

<sup>23</sup> Vinay and Derbelnet 1958 in Munday 2001: 58.

<sup>24</sup> Newmark 1988: 81-93

few examples of such terms, which have obviously posed a problem to the translators since, in such cases, it is of utmost importance that the translator is familiar with the specific field the terms belong to.

Table 1. Non-equivalent terms

No.	p.	Serbian	English	French
1	28	Nema <i>prote</i> !	There's no <i>priest</i> !	<i>L'archiprêtre</i> n'est pas là...
2	56	Iz usta kremanskog <i>prote</i> Zaharija Zaharića koji je i pričesćavao i ispovedao Mitra Tarabića. On je proročanstvo i zapisao!	Straight from the mouth of the Kreman <i>priest</i> Zaharije Zaharić who took the Communion and Confession of Mitar Tarabić. He wrote down the prophecy!	C'est <i>l'archiprêtre</i> de Kremna, Zaharije Zaharić, qui me l'a dit. Il avait fait communier et confessé Mitar Tarabić. C'est lui qui a consigné la prophétie!
3	92	<i>jerej</i> Nikolaj Velimirović, koji je saslužavao u pomenu	<i>Priest</i> Nikolaj Velimirović, who participated in the requiem mass.	Le <i>prêtre</i> Nikolaj Velimirović; qui avait participé à la célébration.
4	62	<i>dijak</i> Gligorije	the <i>monastery disciple</i> Gligorije	le <i>moine</i> Grégoire

However, in the English target text (ETT) *prota* is translated as *priest*. *Prota* (short for *protojerej*) is indeed a priest, but higher in rank than an ordinary priest – *archpriest* would be the proper term in English, as is *archiprêtre* in the French target text (FTT). The dictionaries offer the following translations for *protojerej* into English – *archpriest*, *archpresbyter*, *first priest*; and into French – *archiprêtre*, *doyen d'une église*; for *jerej* into English – *priest*, *hierous* (*orthodox priest*), and into French – *prêtre*, *prêtre orthodoxe*, *curé*; and for *dijak* into English – *scribe*, *scrivener*, *clerk*, *monastery scholar*, while no available dictionary offers a translation into French.

The proper translation of *dijak* should be *scribe* or *scrivener*, because this term does not necessarily mean that *dijak* is a monk, nor connected to a monastery<sup>25</sup>. Therefore, ETT offers a comprehensible translation, while FTT assumes that the person in question was a monk, although ST does not imply that.

### Proper names and toponyms

The procedures adopted in view of proper names and toponyms differ in English and French. While the English translation is an obvious example of foreignization, the French one shows the traits of domestication.

<sup>25</sup> Ćirković, 1999: 152

Table 2. Proper names and toponyms

No.	p.	Serbian	English	French
1	62	crkva svetog Petra	in St. Petar's church on Lim	A l'église de saint Pierre
2	62	manastir Hilandar	the Monastery of Hilandar	le monastère de Chilandar
3	4	na dan svetog Đurđica	it was the day of St. Djurdjic	le jour de saint Georges
4	8	sveti ratnik Đorđe	the Holy warrior Djordje	le saint guerrier saint Georges
5	162	Idemo da vidimo čuvene arhandele Mihaila i Gavrila.	We are going to see the famous Archangels Mihailo and Gavriilo.	Allons voir les célèbres archanges Michel et Gabriel.
6	68	sveti kralj Stefan Dečanski	Saint King Stefan Dečanski	le saint roi Etienne de Dečani
7	62	dijak Gligorije	the monastery disciple Gligorije	le moine Grégoire
8	66	otac Varsonofije	father Varsonofije	le père Varsonophe
9	92	crkva Bogorodice Ljeviške	the church of Bogorodica Ljeviška	l'église de Notre-Dame de Ljevišta
10	28	U Sabornu crkvu!	To Saborna church!	A la cathédrale !

There are several ways in which proper names and toponyms can be transferred into the TL. They can be retained from the SL or they can be replaced with the equivalent names from the TL. For the Serbian proper names and toponyms (e.g. jerej Nikolaj Velimirović, prota Zaharije Zaharić; Gračanica, Dečani, and many others) both translations use the first procedure, i.e. transference.

However, as for the Biblical proper names and names that already have an equivalent in English and French, the translations differ. The English text opts for transference (keeping all the SL names), while the French uses the equivalent French names. Although the name of the King in question is not a religious name, it is the same as the Biblical name of Saint Peter. In ETT both are *Petar*, like in the ST. However, in FTT, both the King's name and the name of the church (ex. 1) replaced with *Pierre*, which is the French name for the above mentioned saint. Thus, in FTT *Gligorije* is *Grégoire* (ex. 7), *Varsonofije* – *Varsonophe* (ex. 8), and *Mihailo* and *Gavrilo* – *Michel et Gabriel* (ex. 5), etc.

The same procedure is applied to the translations of the phenomenon that probably only exists in Serbian. Namely, both *sveti Đorđe* (ex. 3) and *Đurđic* (ex. 4) are proper names for *Saint George* in Serbian. The English text keeps both in Serbian, while the French text uses *Saint Georges* for both. Only in one case does FTT use transcription, when *Hilandar* is transcribed into *Chilandar* (ex. 2).

The strategy used in English is therefore a typical example of foreignization, where the target reader might think that *sveti Đorđe* and *Đurđic* are two different saints. The same goes for the names of two archangels Michael and Gabriel. We do not see any reason which would justify the use of this procedure, except for the initial choice of the translator to stick to the strategy of foreignization. This inevitably leads to misunderstanding and cannot be considered as a proper translation.



We should also mention the incorrect transfer of the Serbian adjectival form of Dečani – Dečanski (ex. 5) into English, which is usually transferred as a phrase with *of*: *Stefan of Dečani*. The FTT uses the French equivalent for Stefan – *Etienne*. Moreover, the translation of *crkva Bogorodice Ljeviške* (ex. 9) should translate the word *Bogorodica* into *Our Lady* or *The Virgin* since it is not a proper name, just like *Saborna crkva* into *cathedral*, which was the choice of the French translator – *cathédrale* (ex. 10).

In the case of French, we can say that the procedures used are predominantly the examples of the strategy of domestication, which allows the readership to follow the story much more easily.

### Prayers and vows

In the following examples we notice the use of couplets which combine cultural equivalents and transpositions in both ETT and FTT.

Table 3. Prayers and vows

No.	p.	Serbian	English	French
1	12	<i>Neka mi Gospod da i neka mi sveti Đorđe pomogne, da me danas na frontu neprijatelji ne promaše!</i>	<i>I pray to God and I wish St. Djordje would help me so that the enemy will not miss me on the battlefield today!</i>	<i>Que le Seigneur et saint Georges m'aident pour que les ennemies ne me ratent pas aujourd'hui sur le front !</i>
2	136	<i>Daće Bog da grob nikome ne ustreba!</i>	<i>If God wills, nobody shall need a grave!</i>	<i>Dieu voudra que personne n'aie besoin de cette tombe !</i>
3	112	<i>Ako iko mog Marinka, daće Bog da je živ, može naći, možeš samo Ti, Gospodaru. I neka Ti je to pred Bogom najviši amanet, Gospodaru.</i>	<i>If anyone can find my Marinko, if God wills him to be alive, it's only you who can do it, my Lord. And let it be the greatest charge with you before God, my Lord.</i>	<i>S'il y a quelqu'un qui puisse trouver mon Marinko, plût à Dieu qu'il soit vivant, c'est toi, sire. Et que ce soit ton gage le plus important devant Dieu, sire.</i>
4	112	<i>Zbogom, Gospodaru, i da Bog da moj amanet da ne zaboraviš.</i>	<i>Goodbye, My Lord, and I pray to God you should not forget my charge.</i>	<i>Adieu ; sire ; et Dieu veuille que tu n'oublies pas ton gage.</i>

When reading the prayers and vows from Table 3. the reader follows the story fluently, because the religious terms and phrases are universal to all Christian religions. (The only exception is the proper name *Đorđe*, which we have already analysed above). The couplets consist of the procedures that fall into the category of domestication strategy.

*Daće Bog* (ex. 2 and 3) and *da Bog da* (ex. 4) are examples of cultural equivalents, because those phrases are used in respective languages with the same meaning. Slight changes in syntax in all examples illustrate the procedure of transposition, e.g. *Neka mi Gospod da i neka mi sveti Đorđe pomogne* and *I neka Ti je to pred Bogom najviši amanet* are translated in both TLs in accordance with their respective syntactic rules.

### Curses and swearwords

All curses and swearwords are translated with cultural equivalents.

Table 4. Curses and swearwords

No.	p.	Serbian	English	French
1	124	<i>Idite dođavola!</i>	<i>Go to hell!</i>	<i>Allez-vous-en au diable !</i>
2	142	<i>Prokleta bila!</i>	<i>Let it be cursed!</i>	<i>Qu'elle soit maudite !</i>
3	140	Kako, <i>pobogu</i> , kakav ste Vi to čovek?	What do you mean, <i>for God's sake</i> , what kind of a man are you?	Mais, <i>parbleu</i> , quelle sorte de personne êtes-vous ?

Although Serbian *Idite dođavola* means *Go to the devil*, English uses the same curse with Hell, while French keeps *le diable* (*devil*) (ex. 1). The second example has the exact same meaning in all three languages.

It is interesting to mention the French word *parbleu* is a form used instead of *par dieu*. We can say that the translation into French is just as accurate as the English one because the meaning is the same.

### Exclamations and greetings

Similarly with the examples from the previous table, exclamations and greetings with religious words, mainly *God*, are also universal in all three cultures, and both translators use cultural equivalents to translate them.

Table 5. Exclamations and greetings

No.	p.	Serbian	English	French
1	126	<i>Pomaže Bog</i> , junaci! Vaše Veličanstvo, <i>Bog Vam dobro dao</i> .	<i>God bless you</i> , brave men Your majesty, let God give you only good things.	<i>Dieu vous garde</i> , mes héros ! Votre Majesté, Dieu vous garde.
2	142	<i>Pomaže Bog</i> , sine! <i>Bog Vam pomogao</i> , Vaše Veličanstvo	<i>God helps</i> , my son! God help you, Your Majesty.	<i>Bonjour</i> , mon fils ! <i>Bonjour</i> , Votre Majesté.
3	116	<i>Pobogu</i>	<i>Dear God</i>	<i>Mon Dieu</i>
4	120	<i>Eh, Bože, eh, Bože!</i> – smejao se gorko kralj Petar	<i>Oh, God, oh, God!</i> Laughed King Petar bitterly.	<i>Mon Dieu, mon Dieu !</i> le roi Pierre rit amèrement ...
5	162	<i>Slava Bogu</i> , lepih li zvana.	<i>Praise to God</i> , what beautiful bells	<i>Gloire à Dieu</i> , que de belles cloches !

In Table 5 we notice the use of synonymous expressions in ETT for *Pomaže Bog*, namely *God bless you* (ex. 1) and *God helps* (ex. 2). Also, it must be pointed out that the translation of example 2 into French follows the procedure of reduction by omitting the key word

*God* and using simply the ordinary greeting *Bonjour*. Neither of the above-mentioned procedures of using synonyms and omission is justifiable, because it does not contribute to a better understanding of the ST, nor does it emphasize cultural similarities or differences.

### Other cases of translation procedures

In this section we will illustrate some translation procedures that are not common and are used mainly in single cases; also, those commonly used and in almost every group of religious terms, as it may be more practical to group the examples according to the procedure used.

#### Description

We only found one proverb in the ST – *sila Boga ne moli* which does not have an adequate equivalent either in English or in French with the meaning of this particular example, so both translators use description as the translation procedure to move closer to the target reader.

Table 6. Proverbs

No.	p.	Serbian	English	French
1	4	ispred <i>sile koja Boga ne moli</i> i koja se u strašnim zločinima na Boga i ne obazire	fleeing [...] <i>those heathen forces</i> whose terrible crimes showed their contempt for God	devant <i>la force qui primait le droit</i> et qui commettait ses crimes atroces sans aucun respect pour Dieu.

In this procedure the religious term *Bog (God)* is omitted and the description transfers the semantics of the proverb. The translators obviously thought this was the best way to relay the meaning of the ST to the target readers.

#### Synonyms

The phrase *služba Božja* or *Božja služba* occurs often in the ST. In Serbian, the word order is not fixed as is in English and French, so the words in this noun phrase can switch places without any change of meaning. It is interesting to see that the translators tried to use synonyms to compensate for this grammatical feature.

Table 7. Synonyms

No.	p.	Serbian	English	French
1	4	posle službe Božje	after the church service	après le service divin
2	8	služba Božja / Božja služba	the religious service / the service	le service divin / la liturgie
3	14	Božja služba	the holy service	le service divin

In ETT, the translator uses three different phrases: *the church service*, *the religious service* and *the holy service* which are all equivalents for the Serbian phrase. On one occasion (ex. 2), he even omits the adjective to avoid repetition. The French translator opts for two synonymous phrases: *le service divin* and *la liturgie*. Both translators use two synonyms when

the phrases occur in two consecutive sentences, *the religious service / the service* and *le service divin / la liturgie*, where it is justifiable. However, we cannot understand the reason for a variety of adjectives used in noun phrases with *service* as the headword: *church, religious* and *holy* in ETT. Therefore, we think that the use of synonymy in these cases is unnecessary.

### Reduction – Omission of religious terms

Table 8. Reduction

No.	p.	Serbian	English	French
1	46	đavo je poneo svaku šalu	it's no time for making jokes	Ce n'est plus de la rigolade
2	40	Kad pobogu?	When, for God's sake?	Mais quand ?!
3	142	<i>Pomaže Bog, sine! Bog Vam pomogao, Vaše Veličanstvo</i>	<i>God helps, my son! God help you, Your Majesty.</i>	<i>Bonjour, mon fils ! Bonjour, Votre Majesté.</i>

It is interesting that neither the English nor the French translator use the word *devil* as the translation for *đavo* in the Serbian fixed expression *đavo je poneo svaku šalu* (ex. 1). They both use cultural equivalents since the expressions with *devil/diable* do not exist in the TLs. This example can also be considered as a couplet, a combination of reduction and description procedures.

In example 2, only the French text differs in that the religious term *pobogu* is not translated at all, for which we cannot think of a proper justification. There is a French word that is commonly used with the same meaning: *parbleu*, which was actually used in one of the examples that we have already analysed (Table 4, ex. 3). It remains unclear why the translator did not use the same term in this case. The third example is also a case of omission of a religious term, which was discussed in the section about exclamations and greeting (Table 5, ex. 3).

### Transposition

Transposition appears to be the most common procedure in both translations, which is not surprising when we know that the syntactic systems of the three languages differ considerably. We have chosen just a few to illustrate how certain forms of ST are replaced by different forms of the TL.

Table 9. Transposition

No.	p.	Serbian	English	French
1	54	profesor Đukanović se latio proročanstva	Professor Djukanović took to profesying.	Le professeur Djukanović recourut à la prophétie.
2	60	zemaljsko stradanje	the earthly sufferings	la souffrance de ce monde
3	60	neodoljivo i blazeno carstvo nebesko	the irresistible and blessed kingdom of heaven	le royaume des cieux, irresistible et plein de béatitude

4	14	[...] se smatralo kraljevom zanetošću molitvom, u kojoj je najteže Boga izmoliti	[...] was taken as <i>the King's preoccupation with the prayer</i> , where the most difficult thing was to get God's answer to the prayer.	[...] croyant <i>que le roi était absorbé dans la prière</i> par laquelle il implorait Dieu.
---	----	--	--	--

In the first example in ETT the noun from ST *proročanstvo* is translated with a gerund *profesying*, which is a verb form which functions as a noun, although in English, whenever there is a noun (in this case *prophecy*), it is the preferred form over a gerund. However, the verb *take* with the dependent preposition *to* requires a gerund.

The second and third examples show the differences in word order within a noun phrase in Serbian and French, while with the last example we attempt to illustrate the syntactic transformation. Namely, the nominalized phrase in ST *kraljevom zanetošću molitvom*, is translated into English with the same phrase *the King's preoccupation with the prayer*, while in the FTT it is turned into a clause.

An attempt to analyse whether there are other possibilities to transfer the intended meaning of the above examples was not made, because in translating literary works there usually is more than just one option, or just one appropriate translation. Consequently, we did not attempt to evaluate the translations, although in a few cases we did point out some of the mistakes or suggest better solutions.

Venuti also adds that these strategies do not necessarily produce a “perfect” translation, which remains under continuous scrutiny of other translators and translation scholars:

any application of them to a specific translation project, must be treated as culturally variable and historically contingent, dependent on acts of interpretation that are informed by archival research and textual analyses and, like every interpretation, are subject to challenge and revision on the basis of different critical methodologies and in response to developing cultural debates.<sup>26</sup>

### Concluding remarks

We based this analysis on the assumption that because of all the obvious differences between the three languages, their cultures and respective religions, translators must have had some difficulties in attempting to translate religious terminology. This has proved to be true, particularly in the examples of non-equivalence and proper names and toponyms. This might be the case because those elements are the most culture-specific, i.e. they are terms that most obviously depict and characterize the specificities of a culture, and are, therefore, the most difficult to translate accurately. Regarding the other elements that we analysed in this study, prayers and vows, curses and swearwords, and exclamations and greetings, it does not appear that the translators had any particular problems.

We also assumed that the translations should be done in a way which respects and preserves cultural diversity, at least to a certain extent. However, the results show that this assumption has been only partially proved. When it comes to the strategies that the translators opted for, the analysis has shown the obvious prevalence of the domestication strategy. The translators actually moved away from the original text in the majority of translation procedures

---

<sup>26</sup> Venuti, 2008: 19

which were applied, namely cultural equivalents and transpositions in the majority of cases, followed by synonyms, description and reduction.

Through the comparative analysis of the original and its two translations, we concluded that despite the initial impression that ETT would be an obvious example of foreignization, while FTT would illustrate the use of the domestication strategy, it transpired that both translations are predominantly moving away from the ST. ETT did retain all the proper names and toponyms from the ST, even when it was inappropriate. This might cause confusion to the target readers.

We agree that the translator should always have the choice whether to apply either strategy, but the ultimate goal should be to introduce Serbian culture and Orthodox Christianity to other nations in the best and clearest possible way, and that is most often done through translation. Therefore, we should strive to work on new dictionaries, glossaries and lexicons that would include culture-specific terminology, not just for English and French but also for other languages in order to facilitate translations of the works that represent Serbian culture and its religion all around the world.

### Corpus

Vitezović, M. (2000). *King Petar's Socks. Čarape kralja Petra*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik. Uporedo srpski tekst i engleski prevod. Đorđe Krivokapić.

Vitezović, M. (2008). *Les chaussettes du roi Pierre. Čarape kralja Petra*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik. Uporedo srpski tekst i francuski prevod. Amalija Vitezović.

### Dictionaries

Benson, M. (1979). *Srpskohrvatsko-engleski rečnik*. Beograd: Prosveta

Bujas, Ž. (1983). *Hrvatsko ili srpsko engleski enciklopedijski rječnik*. Vol. I i II. Zagreb: Grafički zavod Hrvatske

Ćirković, S. & Mihaljčić, R. (Eds.) (1999). *Leksikon srpskog srednjeg veka*. Beograd: Knowledge

Dayre, J., Deanović, M. & Maixner, R. (1956). *Hrvatskosrpsko-francuski rječnik*. Zagreb: NIP

Dobrić, A. (2004). *Srpsko-engleski i englesko-srpski teološki rečnik. Serbian-English and English-Serbian Dictionary of Theology. 2nd ed*. Beograd: Hrišćanski kulturni centar.

*Glosar religijskih pojmova*. (1999). Međureligijsko vijeće Bosne i Hercegovine. Retrieved from [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1R\\_j1S9XiiLHM5LnxvLSQ9sQVQh4nOnT/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1R_j1S9XiiLHM5LnxvLSQ9sQVQh4nOnT/view?usp=sharing)

Hlebec, B. (2010). *Enciklopedijski srpsko-engleski rečnik*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike

Jovanović, S. (1991). *Savremeni srpskohrvatsko-francuski rečnik sa gramatikom*. Beograd: Prosveta

*Pravoslavni rečnik*. Srpska pravoslavna crkva, Eparhija šumadijska. Retrieved from <https://eparhija.com/blog/pravoslavni-recnik>

Stevović, J. N. (1930). *Francusko-srpski i srpsko-francuski rečnik*. Beograd: Geca Kon

Vukičević, P. (2004). *Rečnik pravoslavlja; englesko-srpski: srpsko-engleski*. Beograd: Jezikoslovac.

## Bibliography

- Aixela, J. F. (1996). Culture-specific items in translation. In: Alvarez, R. & Vidal, M. (Eds.). *Translation, power, subversion*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 52–78.
- Bassnet, S. (2002). *Translation studies*. London: Routledge.
- Drobnjak, D and Gudurić, S. (2012). Dieu dans les phraséologies française et serbe. *Francuske studije danas*. Novaković, J. Ur. 283-294.
- Hlebec, B. (2008). *Opšta načela prevođenja*. Novi Sad: Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika.
- Jovanović, N. I. (2017). O problemima prevođenja religijske terminologije sa francuskog na srpski jezik: Primer „Teologija bolesti“ Žan-Klod Laršea. *Crkvene studije* vol. 14, 639–660.
- Katan, D. (1999). *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Katan, D. (2009). Translation as intercultural communication. In: Munday, J. (Ed.). *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Knežević, I. (2010): *Teološki diskurs engleskog i srpskog jezika. Leksičko-semantički i stilistički problemi prevođenja*. Beograd: Institut za teološka istraživanja / Pravoslavni bogoslovski fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu.
- Munday, (2001). *Introducing translation studies*. London: Routledge.
- Munday, (2009). Issues in Translation Studies. In: Munday, J. (Ed.). *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. A. (1975). *Language structure and translation. Essays*. Stanford University Press.
- Nida, E. & Taber, C. (1982). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Novakov, P. (2013). Kulturološki elementi u prevodu: suočavanje sa drugima. In: Živković, M. (Ur.) *Multikulturalnost i savremeno društvo*. Novi Sad: Fakultet za pravne i poslovne studije dr Lazar Vrkatić. 21–32
- Popović, J. (2020, December 12). Čarape kralja Petra. *Politika*. Retrieved from: <https://www.politika.rs/scc/clanak/467888/Carape-kralja-Petra>
- Stefanović Karadžić, V. (1977). *Srpske narodne poslovice*. Beograd: Nolit.
- Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, L. (2008). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London & New York: Routledge.
- Vujović, A. (2012). *Francuski jezik za studente teologije*. Beograd: Institut za teološka istraživanja / Pravoslavni bogoslovski fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu.

**Jelena B. Babić Antić**  
**Melina Nikolić**

**STRATEGIJE I POSTUPCI U PREVOĐENJU RELIGIJSKE TERMINOLOGIJE  
U ROMANU *ČARAPE KRALJA PETRA* MILOVANA VITEZOVIĆA  
SA SRPSKOG NA ENGLLESKI I FRANCUSKI JEZIK**

U ovom radu smo pokušali da utvrdimo koje strategije i postupci su primenjeni prilikom prevođenja religijske terminologije u romanu *Čarape Kralja Petra* Milovana Vitezovića na engleski i francuski jezik. Oslanjajući se na teorijske postavke Venutija i Njumarka, cilj nam je bio da identifikujemo prevodne postupke i utvrdimo u kojoj meri je prevodilac koristio strategije odomaćivanja ili otuđivanja i da li je kreirao prevod koji se čita tečno i ne sadrži specifičnosti izvornog teksta, ili prevod koji naglašava kulturnu različitost i time ostaje blizak kulturi i autoru originala. Pošli smo od pretpostavke da i pored toga što sva tri jezika pripadaju hrišćanskoj kulturi, između katolicizma, protestantizma i pravoslavlja, kao i među njihovim religijskim terminologijama, postoje značajne razlike. Svesni smo činjenice da su prevodi rezultat različitih strategija koje donekle predstavljaju i subjektivnu procenu i izbor prevodioca, kao i da one uključuju određene prevodilačke postupke. U skladu sa tim, pretpostavili smo da bi zadatak prevodilaca trebalo da bude stvaranje prevoda koji bi se čitao sa lakoćom, ali koji bi istovremeno poštovao kulturološke razlike. Početna pretpostavka da su ova dva prevoda primeri različitih strategija samo je delimično potvrđena. Rezultati pokazuju da je u oba prevoda pretežno korišćena strategija odomaćivanja, osim u slučaju bezekvivalentne terminologije, kao i ličnih imena i toponima gde se prevodi razlikuju, na osnovu čega možemo zaključiti da se prevodioci zapravo udaljavaju od originalnog teksta.