Ljiljana M. Janković[1]
University of Niš
Faculty of Philosophy
Department of English Studies

TRANSLATING LITERARY TEXTS FROM ENGLISH INTO SERBIAN: A CONTRASTIVE APPROACH[2]

Abstract: *Contrastive linguistics presupposes a systematic analysis of differences and similarities between two or more languages. Translation studies constitute a field of contrastive linguistics, since translation from one language to another undoubtedly involves the contrasting and comparing of two languages. Some scholars believe that translated texts demonstrate linguistic patterns that systematically distinguish them from non-translated texts in the same language (Baroni & Bernardini, 2006; Volansky et al., 2015; Zanettin, 2013), which supports the idea that translated language is a kind of "third code" (Frawley, 2000 [1984]). However, translation has been defined as both a process and product in linguistic literature. Translation as a process transfers the meaning from one language to another, simultaneously accounting for the textual, grammatical, and pragmatic features of the source text. The empirical research presented in this paper was conducted with the fourth-year students at the English Department at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš, Serbia. A literary text translated from English into Serbian was analysed in order to prove that, despite various linguistic and extra-linguistic constraints, a balance between the style and form and the achievement of accuracy may be attained in the translation process. The analysis of the students' translations demonstrates that the best results are gained by concentrating on the aesthetic values of the source text and by considering the substance of the text, as well as its sense and the message. The paper also considers the fact that in translating into the mother tongue (Serbian), the (English) text to be translated poses a problem of analysis – the translator has to analyse the text to comprehend the implicit and explicit shades of its meaning.*

Key words: *contrastive analysis, English into Serbian translation, lexis, syntax.*

1. Introduction

King Alfred the Great was the king of the West Saxons and Anglo-Saxons. He also acted as his own spy visiting Danish camps disguised as a minstrel since in those days, wandering minstrels were welcome everywhere. He even learned many of the Danish ballads and their language, which helped him notice his enemy's weaknesses and consequently defeat the Danish in the final battle. One episode of King Alfred's successful intrusion into the Danish army camps could be reasonably regarded as a unique epic of royal espionage. However, besides being a great king, Alfred is considered to be one of the first recorded translators. Namely, the translation into Old English of the Latin work *Cura Pastoralis*, a treatise on good leadership, is attributed to Alfred the Great himself. The translation of *The Pastoral Care* (*Shepherd Book*) in Old English is dated to the last decade of Alfred's reign, when he had the leisure to turn from battle to culture. The translation is prefaced by a letter in which he describes how much the standard of Latin learning had declined following the decades of Viking attacks, that now learning had to be acquired beyond the borders of his country. Thus, he instructs the bishops to start a programme of translation from Latin, the language of the church, into the more widely accessible English vernacular, while also educating the young to read their own language.

This illustrates the importance of translation in society. Controversies regarding the characteristics of successful translation were documented since the Roman Age and it is only in the last decades that there has been an evident change in the approach to translation, a move away from theoretical prescription to empirical, non-evaluative description within the framework of the Descriptive Translation Studies (Øverås, 1998).

1.1. The research goal

The empirical research conducted with tertiary-level EFL students aimed to test the extent to which the students' proficiency in English as a foreign language influences the translation of a literary text from English into Serbian, the respondents' mother tongue (MT). The goal was not only to test the students' accuracy when translating selected lexical and syntactic items that constituted the tasks to be analysed and discussed but also to test their awareness of the contextual meaning of those items and of the source text (ST) author's style. Moreover, the research attempted to test the importance of ex-cathedra teaching and direct tuition for tertiary-level students and its impact on the respondents' translation.

1.2. Theoretical framework

Translation studies, especially translation theory, constitute a field of contrastive linguistics. Contrastive linguistics is traditionally defined as a systematic comparison of two or more languages with the purpose of discovering their differences and potential similarities, a method used to define the aspects of two languages which are different or similar (Fisiak, 1981). Translating from one language into another undoubtedly involves contrasting and comparing the source language (SL) and the target language (TL) in order to discover translational equivalents, i.e. which categories of the SL can be translated into which categories of the TL. The SL and the TL are thus compared and contrasted at all levels – lexical, grammatical, and semantic. It means that translating from one language into another is not merely transferring words or grammatical structures but also transferring meaning from the SL to the TL, accounting for the textual, grammatical, and pragmatic features of the source text. Actually, translating presupposes comparing and contrasting two cultures – the culture that uses the SL and the one using the TL. This is particularly proved by the fact that contemporary reference materials mention unique items as the features which tend to be "untranslatable" (unique to the target language).

According to some scholars (Zanettin, 2013; Baroni & Bernardini, 2006; Volansky et al., 2015), translated texts display linguistic patterns that distinguish them from non-translated texts in the same language. Gellerstam (1986) was the first scholar who studied "translationese", which he defined as "all forms of translation which can in some form be viewed as having been influenced by the original text, without the term implying any value judgement" (Gellerstam, 2005:p.202). Baker (1993:p.248) states that this "unusual distribution of features is clearly a result of the translator's inexperience or lack of competence in the target language".

Zanettin's paper "Corpus Methods for Descriptive Translation Studies" (2013) explores "the intersection of corpus linguistics and descriptive translation studies" (Ibid, p.20), indicating that the majority of professional translators rely on the computer-assisted methodologies "and translation memories, which are a specific type of dynamic parallel corpora" (Ibid, p.20). Translators thus compile their terminologies from the corpora. "Now corpus-based translation studies (CTS or CBTS) is an established subfield of the descriptive branch of the discipline and includes a number of different lines of inquiry" (Ibid, p.21). Discussing the recent line of inquiry into translation studies, the same author emphasises a few lines of research. One of them is the hypothesis of translation universals – supposedly invariant features which characterise all translated texts independently of their source

language and translation direction (Baker, 1993, in Zanettin, 2013). Another line of research focuses on individual variation, explained as an attempt to examine translator style or "coherent and motivated patterns of choice 'recognisable across a range of translations by the same translator', which 'distinguish that translator's work from that of other translators' and which 'cannot be explained as directly reproducing the source text's style or as the inevitable result of linguistic constraints'" (Zanettin, 2013:p.21). The third area of study is focused on translation norms and conventions – they are impersonal, they are related to variant traits of translation since they refer to features which characterise translations produced in specific social and historical settings. Therefore, this aspect is at the basis of empirical descriptive studies.

More recent research in translation studies explores translation regarding language change. It focuses on the influence that evolving language norms have on evolving translation styles and norms, on the impact of language change on translation and vice versa (House, 2008; Kranich at al., 2011, 2012). Other studies include corpus-based interpreting studies, contrastive linguistics and research using translation learner corpora.

> 'In interpreting studies, some investigations have been conducted in the framework of universals, while others have focused on specific features of spoken language, ... and on linguistic indicators of social and discursive identity such as modality and interaction markers (Setton, 2011; Straniero Sergio and Falbo, 2012). Contrastive linguistics provides a basis for assessing translation-specific and source language-specific constraints. Translation learner corpora, which typically contain multiple translations of the same source texts, are used to identify patterns in student translations for pedagogical or descriptive purposes.' (Zanettin, 2013:p.21)

Investigating translation studies, the aforementioned author points out a distinction to be established between four tiers of abstraction:

– Tier of theory, which is a general hypothesis that states that, as a result of the process of translation, all translated or interpreted texts share certain properties which distinguish them from similar non-translated texts.
– Descriptive features tier – four features were posited by Baker (1993): simplification, explicitation, normalisation and levelling-out. Other researchers added transfer, translation unique items, asymmetry, shining-through, etc.
– Linguistic indicators that are related to various levels of linguistic analysis.

- Computational implementation of these indicators "that is the way abstract linguistic features are instantiated through formal computational operators". (Zanettin, 2013:p.21)

Considering the goal of this paper, the tier of descriptive features and the tier of linguistic indicators are particularly relevant. Simplification, as one of the descriptive features postulated by Baker (2019), posits the hypothesis that the language contained in a corpus of translations is simpler than that contained in a corpus of comparable texts in the same TL. Laviosa (1997, 1998) proposes that the indicators of lexical simplification are lexical variety (range of vocabulary) and lexical density (information load). The indicators of syntactical simplification are readability (Laviosa, 1997, 1998) and speakability, "the ease of reading aloud" (Puurtinen, 2003:p.395).

Explicitation proposes that the translators consciously or unconsciously tend to make their translations more explicit than the source texts. At the level of syntax, the indicator is the distribution in translated and non-translated texts of devices explicitating optional choices (Olohan and Baker, 2000; Kenny, 2004; Jiménez-Crespo, 2011). At the level of discourse, indicators include explicitating shifts in lexical cohesion in translated texts as compared to their sources (Øverås, 1998).

Normalisation is defined as a tendency of translated texts to conform to the TL rather than the SL patterns and norms, producing more conventional rather than unusual target strings. Lexical indicators of this feature are a degree of lexical and collocational creativity (De Sutter et al., 2012; Olohan 2004; Puurtinen, 2003) and a degree of formality (De Sutter aet al., 2012). A syntactic indicator is a distribution of typical and atypical register features (Hansen-Schirra, 2011). A semantic normalisation is reflected in the range of terms used to represent the conceptual domain of colours (Olohan, 2001).

Regarding another descriptive feature, levelling-out (Baker, 2019) or convergence (Laviosa, 2002), translations should be less idiosyncratic and more similar to each other than original texts are. Some research observes that all translations bear traces of the source language, a feature called 'transfer' or 'SL transfer' or 'shining through'. Maurenen (2004) states that the distribution of the most frequent words is an indicator of lexical interference, whereas Hansen-Schirra (2011) and Teich (2003) discuss that the distribution of typical and atypical register features are the indicators of syntactic interference.

Unique items are defined as features which tend to be 'untranslatable' (unique to the TL), and which should be under-represented in the translated texts.

1.3 Empirical research

The concept of translation as a "third code" (Fawley, 1984) or a kind of a sublanguage is not new. However, what is interesting is the view of interlanguage (the term usually ascribed to FLL) as an inevitable aspect of translation. Examples can be defined as interferences – the translation reflects the SL features that violate systemic rules within the TL. Evident are translations that cannot be considered wrong but rather demonstrating unusual deviations from the norm of usage characteristic of the TL.

The empirical research is based on the analysis of the translations of one literary text by fifty (50) fourth-year students at the English Department, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Nis. The research was conducted in the academic year 2022/2023, during the winter semester and in classes of translation from English into Serbian as part of the mandatory academic course Contemporary English 7. The respondents were divided into two groups – an experimental group (25 students) and a test group (25 students). The students from the experimental group translated the literary text without any prior tuition or practice related to the items studied. The students from the test group translated the same literary text after a relevant instruction in the lexical and grammatical items researched and a thorough practice of the same items. After tuition and practice, the students provided their own translation equivalents of the particular items. The solutions resulted from a creative and inspiring discussion that was triggered among the students from the test group, especially owing to the previous tuition and practice. Various tasks enabled the test-group students to brainstorm their ideas based on the formal knowledge they acquired and the instruction emphasised during the classes of tuition and practice. The respondents were required to translate an excerpt from the novel *Crome Yellow* by Aldous Huxley (Appendix). This excerpt was chosen because it contains certain features that could be analysed in line with the presented theoretical description.

2. Methods

The goal of the research determined the method. The research aimed to analyse the difficulties Serbian tertiary-level EFL students encounter when translating literary texts from English into Serbian. The empirical research was based on the analysis of the students' translation of the lexical and syntactic items, particularly selected as being points of contrast between the two languages, Serbian, the

respondents' mother tongue, and English, the foreign language they study. The method used is contrastive – the points of analysis were discussed at two levels – lexical and syntactic. The results obtained from the respondents' translations were compared and presented for each studied item. The students' translations were analysed in respect of the criterion whether the sentences were translated respecting the Serbian language norm in relation to the studied structures.

The translations obtained were analysed and classified into grammatically acceptable translation alternatives, contextually unsuitable translation alternatives and ungrammatical translations. Also, the results of the empirical research were presented for each of the observed lexical and syntactic items. Moreover, the semantic criterion was taken into consideration, not only the syntactic functions.

2. 1. Points of analysis

The following are the points analysed in the empirical research conducted:

A) Lexical level

1. difficulties in translating certain lexemes
2. difficulties in translating collocations and finding proper Serbian translation equivalents (collocations)
3. false friends and additional comments
4. translation of English-specific phrases
5. translation of obsolete or rather literary lexemes and finding appropriate Serbian equivalents

B) Syntactic level

1. structural shifts in the translation of certain clauses and sentences
2. translation of non-finite verb forms and clauses
3. translation of sentences containing past-tense forms – which of them could be translated by a conditional in Serbian to refer to an action which was repeated in the past and which could be translated as simple and single past-tense actions.

The list of tasks that the respondents were required to translate and discuss in the course of the empirical research.

A) Lexical level

1) Considering the lexical level, the first task was to discuss the difficulties in translating certain lexemes:

a) bumpingly

b) derange (compare to disarrange)
c) bundle
d) punctured (pricked, fig.)
e) treeless
f) embayed

2) The task to consider Serbian equivalents of the English collocations from the text included the following examples:

a) he crammed his hat over his eyes
b) he felt his spirits mounting
c) to give expression to
d) compile a dictionary
e) his mind wandered

3) This task included the translation and discussion of the following English-Serbian false friends:

a) platform – platforma
b) excursion – ekskurzija
c) course – kurs

4) The task was to translate and provide an idiomatic Serbian equivalent for the phrase *all in good time*, which is specific to the English language and cannot be translated word for word.

5) This task was to find appropriate Serbian equivalents for the obsolete or rather literary lexemes since their markedness contributes to the author's description of grandiosity of expressions mentioned in the text. The students were expected to explore the Serbian equivalents which are rare or have fallen into disuse in their MT:

a) cumbrous
b) locution

B) <u>Syntactic level</u>

1) The respondents were required to translate the following segments from the text and to discuss the structural shifts within them:

a) shouted for a porter
b) One pictured him at home
c) It was in that tone that he must have spoken to his children
d) trying as he did so to find some term
e) he seemed to be getting nearer to what he wanted

2) The task was to comment on the translation of the following non-finite verb forms:

a) in which to give
b) but continued methodically to hand out
c) One pictured him at home, drinking tea
d) He left his luggage to be called for later
e) there were always Norman churches and Tudor mansions to be seen
f) as though to scoop the achieved expression

3) The respondents were required to decide which of the following past-tense forms could be translated by a conditional in Serbian (Serbian 'potencijal' – *bih, bi, bi/bismo, biste, bi + infinitive*) to refer to an action that was repeated in the past and which ones could be translated as simple and single past-tense actions:

a) The guard paid no attention, but continued methodically to hand out
b) One pictured him at home
c) He always took his bicycle when he went into the country
d) And within a radius of twenty miles there were always Norman churches
e) Somehow they never did get seen
f) He was overcome by the beauty of those deeply embayed combes
g) He made a gesture with his hand
h) What was the word to describe the curves of those little valleys?

3. Results

3.1. Lexical level

Considering the items explored at the lexical level, the Serbian tertiary-level EFL students demonstrated the greatest difficulty in translating the lexemes *bumpingly* and *treeless*. Namely, due to the non-existent Serbian equivalents, they had to paraphrase these two lexemes and find some contextually acceptable solutions. As regards Task 2, the respondents provided proper Serbian equivalents for all the given collocations apart from the collocations *to give expression to* and *his mind wandered*. The obtained translations were not wrong but rather unusual in relation to the Serbian language norm. In an attempt to translate the first mentioned English collocation, the respondents tried to find an appropriate Serbian expression and consequently translated it literally, word for word whereas they disregarded the Serbian language norm to use a proper verb instead. The Serbian collocation corresponding to the second English collocation in this task contains the word *thoughts* instead of the

word *mind.* Regarding the task with false friends, the respondents provided the unacceptable translation of all the words given in this task – *platform, excursion* and *course.* These results might have been expected due to the enormous influence English has on Serbian, as is also the case with other world languages. The consequence of the well-known Angloglobalisation is, among other things, the linguistic situation in which even advanced and highly proficient students of English do not differentiate English words from Serbian ones and occasionally use English words freely without taking into consideration their mother tongue lexis. The phrase *all in good time* was translated correctly out of the context but unacceptably in its context since the respondents produced the translations not appropriated to the contextual meaning of this phrase. Finally, the respondents were not able to find appropriate archaic or literary Serbian equivalents for the English words *cumbrous* and *locution*, and consequently could not retain the author's style since these words contribute to the author's intention of producing the impression of grandiosity in that part of the text.

3.1.1. Detailed analysis of the results – lexical level

1) As stated in the overall presentation of the results obtained for the lexical level research, the respondents could not find appropriate translation equivalents for two lexemes. The majority of the students from the experimental group attempted to provide a corresponding Serbian adverb (for *bumpingly*) or adjective (for *treeless*) without observing their mother tongue norm, thus producing either contextually unsuitable or ungrammatical translations. On the other hand, the test group, previously given the opportunity to practice the particular lexemes and discuss their contextual meaning and, consequently, proper translation, did provide adequate translations. The results for these two lexemes, which presented the greatest difficulty out of all the lexemes given in this task, are displayed in the following table.

	GRAMMATICALLY ACCEPTABLE		CONTEXTUALLY UNSUITABLE		UNGRAMMATICAL TRANSLATIONS	
	number of lexemes	%	number of lexemes	%	number of incorrect translations	%
E	19	38	20	40	11	22
T	24	48	16	32	9	18

Table 1. Experimental and test group results – Task 1

2) A detailed analysis of the translations in Task 2 shows that the students from both the experimental and test group had trouble translating two particular collocations, as stated in 3.3.1. Both examples illustrate a difference between the two languages, English and Serbian, and should be observed differently. The first collocation, *to give expression to,* has no proper equivalent in Serbian and is translated from English into Serbian using a verb, rather than an expression. The second one, *his mind wandered,* has a corresponding translation equivalent in Serbian but it is *misli su mu odlutale/njegove misli su odlutale,* not a literal translation of the word *mind.* However, although the test group respondents received instruction in Serbian and English collocations and were aware that they should not be translated literally, particularly when this is not in accordance with their mother tongue norm, they, too, disregarded these instructions and reached for easier solutions. The results of both experimental and test group considering the translations of these two collocations are shown in the following table.

	GRAMMATICALLY ACCEPTABLE		CONTEXTUALLY UNSUITABLE		UNGRAMMATICAL TRANSLATIONS	
	number of collocations	%	number of collocations	%	number of incorrect translations	%
E	13	26	20	40	21	42
T	17	34	18	36	15	30

Table 2. Experimental and test group results. Task 2

The comparison of results obtained from both the experimental and test group shows that the difference is rather small referring to the contextually unsuitable translations. This only proves that even tertiary-level EFL students tend to translate English collocations disregarding the context and even ex-cathedra tuition.

3) In the third task, the respondents were required to comment on and translate the following English-Serbian false friends: *platform – platforma, excursion – ekskurzija, course – kurs.* False friends are words and expressions in the foreign language that FL learners are likely to translate incorrectly. The most typical and most frequent false friends are the words and expressions that resemble the words and expressions in the MT (in this case Serbian), but actually have a completely different meaning in the FL (English). This is probably the reason why the respondents from both groups provided either grammatically unacceptable or contextually unsuitable

translations of the given false friends. The majority of the students were oblivious of the fact that the English word *platform* and the Serbian word *platforma* share a common meaning only when referring to shoes with thick soles. Otherwise, they express different meanings. Also, the English word *excursion* was wrongly translated as *ekskurzija*, although the English word does not have the same meaning as the Serbian false translation ('school trip'). Moreover, the students could not provide other, figurative meanings of the word *excursion* and consequently failed to provide adequate Serbian translations. The English word *course* was translated correctly as *kurs* only when it meant some instruction or a particular academic or any other educational course taken in institutions of education or training. In other contexts, this word presented a false friend since it was translated wrongly, disregarding whether it meant the river flow, or the course of the action taken. The results of both the experimental and test group considering the translations of these false friends are shown in the following table.

	GRAMMATICALLY ACCEPTABLE		CONTEXTUALLY UNSUITABLE		UNGRAMMATICAL TRANSLATIONS	
	number of false friends	%	number of false friends	%	Number of incorrect translations	%
E	23	30.6	21	28	31	41.3
T	26	34.6	27	36	22	29.3

Table 3. Experimental and test group results. Task 3

The comparison of the results obtained from both the experimental and test group show the greatest difference regarding contextually unsuitable and ungrammatical translations. The respondents from the test group provided better translations of the given examples of English-Serbian false friends and respected both the norm of the languages studied and the context in which these words were used.

4) The fourth task yielded some interesting results. Namely, whereas the respondents from both groups translated the phrase *all in good time* correctly out of the text, they provided the translations unacceptable in the context. This proves that the students knew the meaning of the phrase but were not able to translate it properly in the text.

	GRAMMATICALLY ACCEPTABLE		CONTEXTUALLY UNSUITABLE		UNGRAMMATICAL TRANSLATIONS	
	number of phrases	%	number of phrases	%	number of incorrect translations	%
E	9	36	13	52	3	12
T	9	36	14	56	2	8

Table 4. Experimental and test group results. Task 4

The results presented in Table 4 show that the majority of the respondents provided contextually unsuitable translations, while only a few of them produced ungrammatical translations of the phrase in task 4. As regards grammatically acceptable translations, the results are equal. There is a minor difference in the results obtained from the experimental and test group regarding ungrammatical translations. However, a rather small, although perhaps significant deviation is observed considering the results obtained from the test group – the respondents provided more contextually unsuitable translations of the English phrase than those from the experimental group, even though they had received instruction prior to the task. This proves that the students disregard the context even when clearly instructed not to.

5) This task yielded the worst results. The majority of the respondents could not provide adequate Serbian equivalents to translate the English archaic or literary words from the text which reflect the style of the author. This is particularly surprising regarding the results obtained from the test group since these students attended a lecture on the importance of preserving the ST style and the necessity of finding appropriate equivalents in the TL. The results are displayed in the following table.

	GRAMMATICALLY ACCEPTABLE		CONTEXTUALLY UNSUITABLE		UNGRAMMATICAL TRANSLATIONS	
	number of archaic words	%	number of archaic words	%	number of incorrect translations	%
E	7	14	26	52	17	34
T	9	18	22	44	19	38

Table 5. Experimental and test group results. Task 5

3.2. Syntactic level

Considering the results obtained in this part of the empirical research, the respondents faced the greatest difficulty in translating the English sentences with *cleft clauses* and the clause with the structure *seem to*. They were not able to provide adequate Serbian structures nor to explain the necessary shifts in translating these particular structures. As regards the clauses containing non-finite verb forms, the greatest problem was translating the infinitive clauses showing intention or manner of doing something (*in which to give*) or indicating what should be done (*to be seen*), or expressing unreality (*as though to scoop*). However, the respondents managed to provide adequate translations of the English sentences containing the Past Simple Tense to indicate repeated actions in the past. The difficulties arose in the examples where there were no adverbs indicating repeated actions in the past since the Serbian language norm prescribes the use of adverbs of frequency when the Past Tense is used with that meaning.

3.2.1. Detailed analysis of the results – syntactic level

1) As stated previously, two segments were particularly difficult to translate properly. The first was the translation of the sentence containing the English structure known as *cleft clause* (*c*). The Serbian language, unlike English, is characterised by a flexible word order, the norm used to emphasise particular parts of sentences. Another grammatically acceptable way is the use of particles (*rečce*, *partikule* or *čestice*). This is a heterogeneous group of words in Serbian that, among other things, serve to express various attitudes towards the action, such as confirmation, emphasis, uncertainty, doubt, opposition, etc. (Janković, 2014: pp.583–560). They are closely related to adverbs: *baš, upravo, taman (Baš sam tebe tražio), možda, valjda, ipak, međutim, doduše, čak, štaviše, bar, barem, zbilja, naime, uostalom, najzad,....* (Klajn, 2005:p.52; Stevanović, 1986:p.384; Stanojčić, 2010:p.194). Also, the lexeme *samo* has its constraints and can be used to express the meaning of the lexeme *jedino* and/or *isključivo* (Kovačević, 2011:p.190), thus serving to emphasise the doer of the action because its use

> indicates that the speaker somehow removes the subject from what is ascribed to some inexplicit multitude by the predicate because, according to the speaker's knowledge, this subject has some distinguishing characteristics in relation to that multitude, which the participant may understand as the expression of surprise, warning, etc. (S. Ristić in Kovačević, 2011:p.190). [3]

---

[3] 'ukazuje na to da govornik izdvaja subjekat iz onoga što se nekom neekspliciranom mnoštvu predikatom pripisuje, zato što prema govornikovom saznanju izdvojeni subjekat ima naročite

When translating *cleft* and *pseudo cleft* clauses from English into Serbian, it is essential to consider the fact that the Serbian language lacks these constructions, which means that they should not be translated literally. The respondents in this research could not explain the structural shifts necessary for a proper and grammatically acceptable translation into Serbian. Instead, they translated the given structure literally, disregarding the Serbian language norm and producing ungrammatical (*To je bilo/To je bio ton...*) or contextually unsuitable translations, whereas they were expected to provide proper Serbian sentences which emphasise the manner of doing something (*Sigurno se/Upravo se tim tonom...*). Also, the modal verb *must* in the English example had to be translated expressing certainty (*Mora da se tim tonom ...*).

Another segment in which the respondents disregarded the Serbian language norm is the translation of the English clause containing the structure *seem to* (*e*). In its literal meaning, the verb *seem* is used with all persons in English, whereas this is not in accordance with the Serbian grammar rules. In the Serbian language, the impersonal phrase *čini se/činilo se* is used. This is the reason why this point of syntax represented a problem for the respondents to translate and explain the necessary structural shift they were supposed to perform before translating. An additional problem in this particular example was the progressive infinitive used after the verb *seem* since the Serbian language lacks this non-finite verb form and has only one form of the infinitive (the base form). Therefore, this task required two structural shifts in the translation of the given example: the use of an impersonal phrase instead of a finite and personal one in English, and the use of an appropriate structure instead of the English progressive infinitive. The results are displayed in the following table.

	GRAMMATICALLY ACCEPTABLE		CONTEXTUALLY UNSUITABLE		UNGRAMMATICAL TRANSLATIONS	
	number of clauses	%	number of clauses	%	number of incorrect translations	%
E	7	14	19	38	24	48
T	10	20	13	26	27	54

Table 6. Experimental and task group results. Task 1

karakteristike koje ga odlikuju od tog mnoštva, što se sa stanovišta učesnika situacije može primiti kao iznenađenje, upozorenje, i sl.'

The results presented in Table 6 show that the majority of the respondents provided ungrammatical translations of the two studied structures in Task 1. As expected, the test group respondents produced more grammatically acceptable and fewer contextually unsuitable translations of the given structures compared to the experimental group results. However, the comparison of the results obtained for ungrammatical translations proves that the test group had worse results than the experimental group despite previous tuition and instruction related to this segment of grammar in both languages.

2) Regarding this task, the respondents could not provide adequate translations for four segments of the task, those containing the non-finite verb form, infinitive. In the first example (*a*), this verb form is used in the ST to show some intention on the part of the narrator, which is one of the syntactic functions of the infinitive in the English language. Also, example (*a*) contains the active form of the infinitive, while examples (*d, e*) contain the passive infinitive. In Serbian grammar, one of the syntactic functions of this non-finite verb form is that of a complement. Considering the meaning of intention, the Serbian infinitive verb form is used as a complement of the verbs of motion only (*Pošli su **potražiti** bolje mesto za kampovanje.*). However, this usage is not typical for the contemporary Serbian language and the infinitive is used in place of a purpose clause only in those examples in which the participant or doer of the action is the same in both the main and the subordinate clause (Tanasić, 2005:p.472), which is not the case in the English example (*d*), requiring consequently a translation in accordance with the TL norms. This usage of the infinitive is contextually conditioned, and "it is used in combination with a limited number of verbal lexemes functioning as predicates, i.e. verbs of motion"[4] (Kovačević, 2015:p.128). The infinitive verb form has the syntactic function of complement in Serbian, and it can be replaced with the structure *da + present*, but the reversal is not possible since "the structure *da + present* has a rather broad distribution: neither is the same subject required in both the main and the subordinate clause nor is this structure used with verbs of motion exclusively"[5] (Ibid, p.129 in Janković, 2017: pp.81, 82). Unlike the Serbian infinitive (one base form), the English infinitive has eight forms, out of which six are used in contemporary English. Regarding the category of voice, there are active present (*to play*) and passive present (*to be played*) infinitives. Regarding the category of aspect, there are progressive infinitive (*to be*

---

[4] 'ciljni infinitiv može se javiti samo uz ograničen krug glagolskih leksema u predikatu: uz glagole kretanja'

[5] 'konstrukcija ***da** + **prezent*** ima mnogo širu distribuciju jer ne mora dijeliti isti subjekat sa predikatom osnovne klauze niti mora dolaziti samo uz glagole kretanja.'

playing), perfective form (*to have played*), perfective-progressive infinitive (*to have been playing*) in the active voice, and perfective infinitive in the passive voice (*to have been playing*). Consequently, when translating clauses containing an English infinitive verb form into Serbian, it is necessary to provide adequate translation equivalents, given the fact that English and Serbian differ regarding both the forms and functions of this non-finite verb form. The analysis of the results obtained for this task shows that the respondents disregarded not only the grammatical rules of both languages but also the context and the meaning intended by the author of the ST. The three English examples contain infinitival (non-finite) relative clauses in the syntactic function of postnominal modifiers. Example (*a*) demonstrates an implicit intention or future action, example (*d*) implies suggestion or possibility, whereas example (*e*) contains an implied modal phrase or fact. Therefore, the translation of these non-finite relative clauses should respect not only the syntactic but also the semantic aspect. Example (*f*) contains the infinitive verb form as part of the reduced finite clause that starts with the conjunction *as though*, which is used in English to show an imaginary or unreal situation or a situation that is unlikely or highly impossible. The respondents were expected to provide adequate Serbian structures to retain the meaning of this non-finite clause and observe the Serbian language norm. The results are displayed in the following table.

	GRAMMATICALLY ACCEPTABLE		CONTEXTUALLY UNSUITABLE		UNGRAMMATICAL TRANSLATIONS	
	number of clauses	%	number of clauses	%	number of incorrect translations	%
E	19	19	43	43	38	38
T	23	23	45	45	32	32

Table 7. Experimental and task group results. Task 2

The results presented in Table 7 were partly expected. The respondents from the test group provided more grammatically acceptable translations than the experimental group respondents. Moreover, they produced fewer ungrammatical translations, which proves that they benefited from ex-cathedra teaching and respected the grammatical rules of both the MT and the FL. Yet, the fact that the test group respondents provided more contextually unsuitable translations emphasises again the students' disregard for the context of the ST despite their proficient knowledge of the FL.

4) The results obtained for this task showed that the respondents, although tertiary-level EFL students, could not provide appropriate translation equivalents for three structures containing the English past tense forms when they referred to actions that were repeated in the past. Both the English and the Serbian language use the same grammatical forms to indicate repeated actions in the past: the Past Simple Tense and conditional (English) and the Past Tense and potencijal (Serbian). However, the results of the empirical research proved that there were certain difficulties even when translating the structures that represent points of similarity between the two languages. Examples (*b, e,* and *h*) posed a special difficulty. The translation of example (*b*) was acceptable out of the context – *Zamislili biste ga kako sedi kod kuće.* However, this translation was not appropriate to the context. A contextually acceptable translation should incorporate the Serbian modal verb *moći* in order to retain the original meaning of the ST – *Mogli ste ga zamisliti kako sedi kod kuće.* Although the English example (*e*) contains the adverb of frequency *never* that was supposed to facilitate the translation and indicate that the sentence refers to a repeated action in the past, this example was not translated properly. An additional difficulty was posed by the passive form in the sentence and the inversion was used to show the emphasis intended by the author. This had to be taken into consideration when translating, as well as the Serbian language norm. Instead of translating this particular example literally and using the passive form of the verb *videti,* the respondents were expected to use the impersonal Serbian structure with the pronoun *se* and the modal verb *moći* – e.g. *One se nekako nikada nisu mogle videti,* or to translate this sentence using the active verb form in Serbian – e.g. *On nekako nikada nije mogao/stigao/imao vremena ... da ih vidi.* The last example (*h*) is actually a rhetorical question and should be translated respecting the author's style and register. It also contains an infinitival non-finite verb form in the ST. This particular infinitive form cannot be translated literally into Serbian, which means that the Serbian infinitive is not an adequate translation equivalent in this case. The majority of the respondents translated this example literally, producing either ungrammatical or contextually unsuitable sentences (*Koja je to bila reč da opiše ...?*) instead of using a proper Serbian structure, *potencijal*, which would be more appropriate to the context and the ST style (e.g. *Kojom bi to rečju mogao da opiše ...*), thus retaining both the meaning and the linguistic tool of the author of the ST. The results pertaining to this task are shown in the following table.

	GRAMMATICALLY ACCEPTABLE		CONTEXTUALLY UNSUITABLE		UNGRAMMATICAL TRANSLATIONS	
	number of clauses	%	number of clauses	%	number of incorrect translations	%
E	21	28	29	38.6	25	33.3
T	31	41.3	32	42.6	12	16

Table 8. Experimental and test group results. Task 3

The presented results show that the respondents from both the experimental and test group provided the greatest number of contextually unsuitable translations despite the fact that they are tertiary-level EFL students. The test group respondents had better results than those from the experimental group – they produced more grammatically acceptable translations and provided fewer incorrect translations when compared to the experimental group results. However, a small deviation is observed in the test group results, the one regarding contextually unsuitable translations – the experimental group results were better than the test group ones since the experimental group respondents produced fewer contextually unsuitable translations. Although prior instruction proved beneficial regarding grammar rules of the FL and MT, it appears that it did not have a good impact on the respondents' awareness of the importance of the context when translating from the FL to the MT.

4. Discussion

Considering the reference materials and the empirical research conducted, it can be concluded that translation may be regarded as a third code, a sublanguage which definitely reflects the individuality of the translator. Also, the interference is evident – the lexical and syntactic material is transferred from the FL to the MT and vice versa, particularly regarding those lexical and syntactic features that the TL lacks. The studied translations bear traces of the FL (English), the FL transfer, which proves the interference flow from the FL to the MT. Regarding the theoretical framework, results of the empirical research show that the students tend to oversimplify certain features of the MT and consequently respect the features of the FL. This resulted in the translations that are simpler in their lexis and syntax than the corresponding structures in the ST. Moreover, in their inability to provide appropriate Serbian phrases and structures, the respondents frequently produced

translations that are more explicit than the ST, attempting to either retain the same structures used in the ST or unnecessarily paraphrasing certain lexical and syntactic items.

This empirical research faces certain constraints, especially considering a rather small number of respondents (fifty) and the fact that the participants were tertiary-level EFL students. Also, the CA was applied to lexical and syntactic items only. Some potential further research might involve a greater number of participants whose MT is Serbian and whose mastery of English differs from that of university students. It could examine and analyse other points of difference between the two languages as regards translation of literary texts – the issue of translating or not translating words and phrases written in a foreign language other than English (e.g. the French adjectives that the author of the ST uses in order to prove his point that the beauty of the landscape can be described only by using French) or the problem of translating the sentence in the ST that contains figures of speech, such as alliteration and assonance (*dinted, dimpled, wimpled*) in this particular text.

Another point discussed in the paper is the benefit of ex-cathedra teaching at the tertiary level of studying English. The obtained results did prove that the test group respondents benefited greatly from direct tuition on the selected grammar rules. However, a detailed analysis of the results obtained from the test group translations proves that the respondents disregarded the context and style of the ST author when translating particular lexical and syntactic items despite being instructed not to.

In conclusion, translation of literary texts is not merely a matter of accuracy. It is more about striking a balance between the style and form of the ST, aspiring to respect the norms of both the SL and the TL.

References

1. Baker, M. (1993) Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and Applications. In: Baker M., Francis G. & Tognini Bonelli E. (eds.) pp. 233–250.
2. Baker, M. (2019) *Researching Translation in the Age of Technology and Global Conflict.* London, Routledge.
3. Baroni, M. & Bernardini, S. (2006) A New Approach to the Study of Translationese: Machine-learning the difference between original and translated text. In: *Literary and Linguistic Computing,* 21 (3), pp. 259–274.
4. De Sutter, G., Delaere, I., & Plevoets, K. (2012) Lexical lectometry in corpus-based translation studies. Combining profile-based correspondence analysis and logistic regression modeling. In: M. Oakes & *M. Ji (eds.) Quantitative Methods in Corpus-Based Translation Studies*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 325–346.

5. Fisiak, J. (1981) *Theoretical Issues in Contrastive Linguistics.* Amsterdam, John Benjamins B.V.

6. Frawley, W. (2000) Prolegomenon to a Theory of Translation. In: L. Venuti (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader.* London, Routledge, pp. 250–263.

7. Gellerstam, M. (1986) Translationese in Swedish novels translated from English. In: Wollin, L. and Lindquist, H. (eds.) *Translation studies in Scandinavia: Proceedings from the Scandinavian Symposium on Translation Theory* (SSOTT) II, Lund: CWK Gleerup, pp. 88–95.

8. Gellerstam, M. (2005) Fingerprints in Translation. In: Anderman, G. and Rogers, M. (eds.) *In and Out of English. For Better, For Worse.* Translating Europe, Multilingual Matters, University of Surrey.

9. Hansen-Schirra, S. (2011) Between normalization and shining-through. In: Kranich, S., Viktor Becher, V., Höder, S. & House, J. (eds.) **Multilingual Discourse Production: Diachronic and Synchronic Perspectives**, pp. 133–162.

10. House, J. (2008) Beyond intervention: Universals in translation? *Trans-kom*, 1(1), 6–19.

11. Janković, Lj. (2014) Marginalizacija određenih struktura srpskog jezika pri prevođenju sa engleskog na srpski jezik kod studenata anglistike". U: *Jezik, književnost, marginalizacija: jezička istraživanja.* Faculty of Philosophy, Niš, pp. 583–591.

12. Janković, Lj. (2017) Error Analysis of the Use of Non-Finite Clauses by EFL University Students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Niš, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš.

13. Jiménez-Crespo, M. A. (2011) The future of general tendencies in translation: Explicitation in web localization. *Target*, 23(1), 3–25.

14. Kenny, D. (2004) Parallel corpora and translation studies: old questions, new perspectives? Reporting 'that' in Gepcolt: a case study. In: G. Barnbrook, P. Danielsson, & M. Mahlberg (eds.) *Meaningful Texts: The Extraction of Semantic Information from Monolingual and Multilingual Corpora.* London and New York, Continuum, pp. 154–165.

15. Klajn, I. (2005) *Gramatika srpskog jezika*. Beograd, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.

16. Kovačević, M. (2011) *Gramatička pitanja srpskog jezika.* Beograd, Jasen.

17. Kranich, S., V. Becher, and S. Höder. (2011) A tentative typology of translation-induced language change. In: S. Kranich, V. Becher, S. Höder, & J. House (eds.) Multilingual Discourse Production. Diachronic and Synchronic Perspectives, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 9–44.

18. Kranich, S., V. Becher, & J. House. (2012) Changing conventions in English-German translations of popular scientific texts. In: K. Braunmüller & C. Gabriel (eds.) *Multilingual Individuals and Multilingual Societies.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 315–334.

19. Laviosa, S. (1997) How Comparable Can Comparable Corpora Be? *Target*, 9(2), 289–319.

20. Laviosa, S. (1998) Core patterns of lexical use in a comparable Corpus of English narrative prose. *Meta*, 43(4), 557–570.

21. Mauranen, A. (2004) Corpora, universals and interference. In: A. Mauranen, Kujamaki P. (eds.) *Translation Universals. Do they exist?* John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 65–82.

22. Øverås, L. (1998) In Search of the Third Code: An Investigation of Norms in Literary Translation. *Meta* 43 (4), 557–570.

23. Olohan, M. & Baker, M. (2000) Reporting that in translated English: evidence for subconscious processes of explicitation. *Across Languages and Cultures* 1(2), 141–158.

24. Olohan, M. (2001) Spelling out the optionals in translation: A corpus study. https://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/publications/cl2003/CL2001%20conference/papers/olohan.pdf [Accessed 10th February 2024].

25. Olohan, M. (2004) *Introducing Corpora in Translation Studies.* Routledge. https://www.scribd.com/document/663801171/Olohan-2004-Introducing-Corpora-in-Language-Studies [Accessed 15th February 2024].

26. Puurtinen, T. (2003) Explicitating and Implicitating Source Text Ideology. *Across Languages and Cultures* 4 (1), 53–62.

27. Stanojčić, Ž. (2010) *Gramatika srpskog književnog jezika*. Beograd, Kreativni centar.

28. Stevanović, M. (1991*) Savremeni srpskohrvatski jezik (gramatički sistemi i književnojezička norma) II Sintaksa,* peto izdanje. Beograd, Naučna knjiga.

29. Tanasić, S. (2009) *Sintaksičke teme. Put u reči*, knjiga 8. Beograd, Beogradska knjiga.

30. Teich, E. (2003) *Cross-linguistic variation in system and text: A methodology for the investigation of translations and comparable texts*. Berlin, New York, Mouton de Gruyter.

31. Volansky, V., Ordan, N. & Wintner, S. (2014) On the features of translationese. *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities* 30 (1).

32. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/273736323_On_the_features_of_translationese [Accessed 18th January 2024].

33. Zanettin, F. (2013) Corpus Methods for Descriptive Translation Studies. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 95, 20–32.

Ljiljana M. Janković
Univerzitet u Nišu
Filozofski fakultet
Departman za anglistiku

PREVOĐENJE KNJIŽEVNIH TEKSTOVA SA ENGLESKOG NA SRPSKI JEZIK: KONTRASTIVNI PRISTUP

Rezime

Kontrastivna lingvistika predstavlja sistematsku analizu razlika i sličnosti između dva ili više jezika. Studije prevođenja pripadaju oblasti kontrastivne lingvistike jer prevođenje sa jednog na drugi jezik neumitno obuhvata kontrastiranje i poređenje dva jezika. Neki naučnici koji se bave ovom oblašću smatraju da se u prevedenim tekstovima mogu uočiti lingvistički obrasci na osnovu kojih se može utvrditi da se prevedeni tekstovi razlikuju od neprevedenih tekstova na istom jeziku (Baroni & Bernardini, 2006; Volansky et al., 2015; Zanettin, 2013), čime se potvrđuje ideja da je jezik prevoda neka vrsta „trećeg koda" (Frawley, 2000 [1984]). Međutim, u lingvističkoj literaturi, prevod se definiše kao proces ali i kao proizvod. Ukoliko se prevod shvati kao proces, onda se na ovaj način prenosi značenje iz jednog u drugi jezik, uz istovremeno prenošenje tekstualnih, gramatičkih i pragmatičkih karakteristika izvornog teksta. U ovom radu predstavljeno je empirijsko istraživanje koje je sprovedeno sa studentima četvrte godine Osnovnih akademskih studija anglistike na Filozofskom fakultetu Univerziteta u Nišu, Srbija. Analiziran je prevod jednog književnog teksta sa engleskog na srpski jezik kako bi se pokazalo da se, uprkos različitim lingvističkim i vanlingvističkim ograničenjima, može postići ravnoteža između stila i forme izvornog teksta i prevoda, a da se time ne naruši tačno prenošenje značenja sa jednog jezika na drugi. Analiza prevoda studenata pokazuje da se najbolji rezultati postižu ukoliko se obrati pažnja ne samo na značenje i poruku koju pisac izvornog teksta želi da prenese, već i na estetske kvalitete izvornog teksta. Pored toga, ovaj rad razmatra i činjenicu da se prilikom prevođenja na maternji jezik (srpski) javlja problem analize teksta na stranom jeziku (engleski) – prevodilac treba da analizira tekst na stranom jeziku kako bi razumeo sve implicitne i eksplicitne nijanse značenja kojima se izvorni tekst odlikuje.

▸ *Ključne reči*: kontrastivna analiza, prevod sa engleskog na srpski jezik, leksika, sintaksa.

Appendix

The train came bumpingly to a halt. Here was Camlet at last. Denis jumped up, crammed his hat over his eyes, deranged his pile of baggage, leaned out of the window and shouted for a porter, seized a bag in either hand, and had to put them down again in order to open the door. When at last he had safely bundled himself and his baggage on to the platform, he ran up the train towards the van.

"A bicycle, a bicycle!" he said breathlessly to the guard. He felt himself a man of action. The guard paid no attention, but continued methodically to hand out, one by one, the packages labelled to Camlet. "A bicycle!" Denis repeated. "A green machine, cross-framed, name of Stone. S-T-O-N-E."

"All in good time, sir," said the guard soothingly. He was a large, stately man with a naval beard. One pictured him at home, drinking tea, surrounded by a numerous family. It was in that tone that he must have spoken to his children when they were tiresome. "All in good time, sir". Denis's man of action collapsed, punctured.

He left his luggage to be called for later, and pushed off on his bicycle. He always took his bicycle when he went into the country. It was part of the theory of exercise. One day one would get up at six o'clock and pedal away to Kenilworth, or Stratford-on-Avon – anywhere. And within a radius of twenty miles there were always Norman churches and Tudor mansions to be seen in the course of an afternoon's excursion. Somehow they never did get seen, but all the same it was nice to feel that the bicycle was there, and that one fine morning one really might get up at six.

Once at the top of the long hill which led up from Camlet station, he felt his spirits mounting. The world, he found, was good. The far-away blue hills, the harvests whitening on the slopes of the ridge along which his road led him, the treeless skylines that changed as he moved – yes, they were all good. He was overcome by the beauty of those deeply embayed combes, scooped in the flanks of the ridge beneath him. Curves, curves: he repeated the word slowly, trying as he did so to find some term in which to give expression to his appreciation. Curves – no, that was inadequate. He made a gesture with his hand, as though to scoop the achieved expression out of the air, and almost fell off his bicycle. What was the word to describe the curves of those little valleys? They were as fine as the lines of a human body, they were informed with the subtlety of art ...

Galbe. That was a good word; but it was French. Le galbe evase de ses hanches: had one ever read a French novel in which that phrase didn't occur? Some day he would compile a dictionary for the use of novelists. Galbe, gonfle, goulu: parfum, peau, pervers, potele, pudeur: vertu, volupte.

Ljiljana M. Janković

But he really must find the word. Curves, curves ... Those little valleys had the lines of a cup moulded round a woman's breast; they seemed the dinted imprints of some huge divine body that had rested on these hills. Cumbrous locutions, these; but through them he seemed to be getting nearer to what he wanted. Dinted, dimpled, wimpled – his mind wandered down echoing corridors of assonance and alliteration ever further and further from the point. He was enamoured with the beauty of words.

Taken and adapted from *Crome Yellow* by Aldous Huxley