

Translating Croatian Gastronomical Terminology

Zagorec, Dario

Undergraduate thesis / Završni rad

2018

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište u Rijeci, Filozofski fakultet u Rijeci**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:186:398044>

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

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-09-26**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[Repository of the University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences - FHSSRI Repository](#)



Dario Zagorec

TRANSLATING CROATIAN GASTRONOMICAL TERMINOLOGY

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the B.A. in English Language and
Literature and Pedagogy at the University of Rijeka

Supervisor:

Doc. dr. sc. Anita Memišević

July 2018

ABSTRACT

Gastronomy is a crucial element of any culture and it developed over the course of centuries or even millennia. Tied to the people that call it their own, it can be a challenge for translators to properly transfer the specifics and nuances of foreign food into a language and culture that it was never intended for. This paper brings together the research of various scholars, linguists and translators in order to explore the complex methodology of translating gastronomical terms and phrases as well as other cultural terms. It then compares them to the results of a survey conducted for the purpose of seeing how the translation of such terminology is tackled by our own students in the University of Rijeka. The data collected in this paper sheds light on the problems that students tackle when faced with such problematic terminology and offers suggestions for better preparing students for dealing with such terms in the future.

Key words: Croatia, culture, food, gastronomy, translation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 2. TRANSLATING CULTURE..... | 2 |
| 2.1. Characteristics and problems of translating culture..... | 2 |
| 2.2. Translation procedures in literature..... | 3 |
| 2.3. Survey results..... | 8 |
| 2.4. Translation procedures in the survey..... | 12 |
| 3. DISCUSSION..... | 16 |
| 4. CONCLUSION..... | 19 |
| 5. BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 23 |

1. INTRODUCTION

Translation is a complex and dynamic process of transferring meaning from one language to another. As such, it is not an easy task, and it presents many problems for translators, particularly the translation of culturally specific terms or phrases such as gastronomical terms unique to a specific nation or society. It stands to reason that unique types of food and methods of food preparation created over centuries would be an intrinsic element of the culture that spawned them. Chiaro & Rossato (2015) even argue that food is the cornerstone of life, and that it lies at the heart of our cultural identity.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the methods of translating culturally specific terms, particularly those relating to gastronomy, and to see how well English Language and Literature students of the University of Rijeka handle the translation of such terms and phrases. In doing so, we will be able to see which of the students' translation skills need improvement or how they may be improved. To this end, a group of students was given a modified version of an article on the specifics of Croatian gastronomy taken from www.croatia.eu, and were asked to translate the article into English to the best of their abilities. They were allowed to use dictionaries and other forms of literature to freely help themselves in the process of translating the text. Following the article were 10 questions designed to dig deeper into the "hows" and "whys" of their choices of translation.

Analysis of the translations will be synthesised, evaluated and compared to the various different methods of translating culturally specific terminology present in several established translators' and linguists' resources.

2. TRANSLATING CULTURE

2. 1. Characteristics and problems of translating culture

Vermeer (1986: 173) cited in Stojić & Brala-Vukanović (2014: 408) talks about the need for not only the language competence but also cultural competence of translators. This need is born of the fact that translation is not only transferring meaning from one language to another, but also one culture to another. In addition, according to Witte (2000: 54) cited in Stojić & Brala-Vukanović (2014: 419), professional translating presupposes a translator's familiarity and understanding of their own culture as well as their ability to recognize various cultural phenomena whenever necessary. In order for communication between different cultures and languages to be possible, a translator must have knowledge of their own culture and the foreign culture that they are translating into. If they don't have such knowledge, then they must gain it.

Nord (1993: 396), cited in Stojić & Brala-Vukanović (2014: 420) divided the different specificities of various cultures into four categories: general situational contexts, actual situational contexts, non-communicative acts and communicative acts. Food and gastronomy fall into general situational contexts, alongside nature, flora and fauna, lifestyle, living, clothing, history, music, poetry, literature etc. These elements of everyday life, history, culture, politics etc. of a certain nation, which have no equivalent in other nations or places, have been dubbed "realia" by Vlahov and Florin (Guerra 2012: 2). In order to transfer meaning of such concepts into a target language (and as such, culture), it is necessary to either modify or explain them (Snell-Hornby et al., 2005: 288, cited in Stojić & Brala-Vukanović 2014:420). Especially challenging are situations in which a

translator has to translate a phrase or term that is completely unknown to the target culture. The translator can then add an additional explanation in parentheses or footnotes. It is also possible to simply omit the phrase or term and only explain or paraphrase what was said. If a translator assesses that quoting or explaining a culturally specific term is not needed in order to understand the text, then they may omit it altogether. (Stojić & Brala-Vukanović 2014: 422-423)

Baker (1992: 21) is another author who points out culture-specific concepts such as gastronomical terminology as being one of the common problems of non-equivalence at word level between the source language and the target language of a text. She says “the source language word may express a concept which is totally unknown in the target culture. The concept in question may be abstract or concrete; it may relate to a religious belief, a social custom, or even a type of food. Such concepts are often referred to as “culture-specific.” (Baker 1992: 21) Newmark (1988: 82-83) adds that the uses of cultural equivalent translations are “limited, since they are not accurate, but they can be used in general texts, publicity and propaganda, as well as for brief explanation to readers who are ignorant of the relevant source language culture. They have a greater pragmatic impact than culturally neutral terms.”

2. 2. Translation procedures in literature

The specific method that a translator might decide to use depends on the scope of the translation. Nord (1993: 413), cited by Stojić & Brala-Vukanović (2014: 425) says that an important factor when choosing the correct translation method is the function of the text itself; whether the purpose of the text is to pass knowledge along or if the implication

is that the reader would already have that knowledge to begin with. Stojić & Brala-Vukanović (2014: 422-425) pointed out 7 different strategies for translating culture. These include: borrowing, calque, explanation and paraphrasing, analogous formation, changing hyperonymic and homonymous relationships, adaptation and omission. In addition, Guerra (2012: 7-12) includes: compensation, equivalence, diffusion, generalization, literal translation, modulation, particularization, substitution, transposition and variation. Not all of these can be applied to translating gastronomical terminology and other realia, but many of the strategies were used by the English Language and Literature students who participated in the survey.

Borrowing is taking a term from a source text and keeping it unchanged while citing it in quotes within the target language text. It can also be taken from the source language but then altered to fit the phonological, graphological and morphological norms of the target language. This translation method is only applied in cases when a phrase or term is not key to understanding the text in question or when the previous parts of the text contain enough information to make understanding that part possible. This means that if a translator used this translation method, they assessed that the reader would understand the term based on the context given or that the reader possessed enough knowledge about the culture of the source language in order to understand it. Otherwise, borrowing should be avoided or combined with other methods such as explanation, paraphrasing or analogous formation. Borrowing is most often used for translating terms such as names, abbreviations, customs, holidays, celebrations etc. (Stojić & Brala-Vukanović, 2014: 423)

Explaining and paraphrasing includes a more detailed description or paraphrasing of a certain term from the source text into the target language. This means that a specific

term is explicitly defined, while in the source text it is implicitly defined because the author assumes that the reader of the source text understands it perfectly. (Stojić & Brala-Vukanović 2014: 423-424)

When it comes to more well-known terms, a modified form of the term in the target language may exist. In that case, the term from the source language is completely adapted to the grammatical and phonetic characteristics of the target language in a process called adaptation. (Stojić & Brala-Vukanović 2014: 424-425)

Calque is translating a complex term from a source language piece by piece. In doing so, each component of a lexical whole is individually carried over into another language. As the target language text is written in words the target reader/readers would understand, they would be able to understand them despite the fact that some of the word's meaning in the source culture is lost in the transfer. On the other hand, even though the reader understands the meaning of specific components, the entire phrase or term can still be unclear because they may not be familiar with the reference. This way readers of different cultures can perceive the phrase differently, as it can stay unclear or lead to wrong interpretations. Because of this, in principle, calque comes with an explanation, in order to ensure that the reader would be able to understand it. When a literal translation is clear enough, no additional explanations are needed. (Stojić & Brala-Vukanović 2014: 423)

Transposition “involves changing a grammatical category or replacing one part of the speech for another, without changing the meaning of the message” (Vinay and Dalbarnet 50, cited in Guerra 2012: 12). “Grammatical transpositions, with appropriate morphological and syntactic adjustments, are quite frequent in order to obtain a

translation that sounds as if it had been originally written in the target language.” (Guerra 2012: 12)

“Modulation consists of using a phrase that is different in the source language and the target language to convey the same idea” (Vinay and Dalbarnet 51, cited in Guerra 2012: 11) “In other words, there is a change in the point of view, focus, perspective or category of thought in relation to the source language. [...] It is similar to transposition and, sometimes, necessary in order to avoid lack of fluency or exoticism in the translation.” (Guerra 2012: 11)

Literal translation, or “word by word” translation “occurs when a source language word or phrase is translated into a target language word or phrase, without worrying about style, but adapting the text into the target language syntactic rules, with minimal adjustments, so that it sounds both correct and idiomatic (word order, functional words, etc.). In Vinay and Dalbarnet’s words (48), literal translation is the direct transfer of a source language text into a grammatically and idiomatically appropriate target language text in which the translators’ task is limited to observing the adherence to the linguistic servitudes of the target language.” (Guerra 2012: 10-11)

Omission is a method of simply eliminating a term from the source text, but it is only acceptable when the explicit information from the source text is redundant or, in certain contexts, irrelevant in the text itself. One may omit realia, comparisons and metaphors which are specific to the source culture and therefore would not make much sense in the translated version. (Stojić & Brala-Vukanović 2014: 425)

Baker (1992: 26-42) points out several strategies used by professional translators for dealing with various types of non-equivalence: translation by a more general word (superordinate), translation by a more neutral/less expressive word, translation by cultural substitution, translation using a loan word (calque) or loan word plus explanation, translation by paraphrase using a related word, translation by paraphrase using unrelated words, translation by omission and translation by illustration. (Baker 1992: 26-42)

An example of translation by a more general word (superordinate) present among the respondents would be translating *čvarci*, which are a variant of pork rinds, as simply “pork rinds”, without getting into what makes them different from what an English-speaking audience would know as pork rinds.

Baker (1992: 31) describes translation by cultural substitution as “replacing a culture-specific item or expression with a target language item which does not have the same propositional meaning but is likely to have a similar impact on the target reader. The main advantage of using this strategy is that it gives the reader a concept with which they can identify, something familiar and appealing. On an individual level, the translator’s decision to use this strategy will largely depend on (a) how much licence is given to him/her by those who commission the translation and (b) the purpose of the translation.” This translation strategy is very similar to adaptation and modulation, both described above.

Newmark (1988: 83) includes functional equivalent as a method of translating cultural words: “This common procedure, applied to cultural words, requires the use of a culture-free word, sometimes with a new specific term; it therefore neutralises or generalises the SL word [...] This procedure, which is a cultural componential analysis,

is the most accurate way of translating i.e. deculturalising a cultural word. [...] This procedure occupies the middle, sometimes the universal, area between the SL language or culture and the TL language or culture.” The translation of *čvarci* into “pork rinds” can be said to be an example of a functional equivalent in the target language translation of the text on Croatian gastronomy.


2. 3. Survey results

The text was translated and the following questions answered by a total of 16 English Language and Literature students, including 2nd and 3rd year undergraduate students and 1st year graduate students. The survey was completely anonymous. Twelve of the students were female, and four were male. Four students filled out the survey in the form of a physical copy, and the other twelve in an electronic form. In this review, I will be analysing the results of the survey question by question.

Of all the respondents, none of them said that the article was easy or extremely easy to translate, and most of the respondents consider the article to be difficult:

Koliko Vam je bilo teško prevesti tekst? (1 = iznimno lako; 5 = iznimno teško)


16 responses



More than half of the respondents greatly needed the help of dictionaries or other sources of literature:

Koliko su Vam bili potrebni rječnici ili drugi izvori literature prilikom prevođenja? (1 = uopće nisu bili potrebni; 5 = bili su iznimno potrebni)

16 responses



When asked “Which phrases were the most difficult for you to translate and why?“, 69% of respondents agreed that the most challenging phrases were the names of traditional Croatian meals and meals specific to a certain area, including: *buzara*, *brudet*, *na gradele*, *na lešo*, *ispod peke*, *kulen*, *kulenova seka*, *pašticada*, *maneštra* and *čobanac*. The main reason given was the fact that no English equivalent exists for phrases like these. 25% of respondents said that they were not familiar with some of the terms themselves and that they needed to look them up in order to be able to translate them. Only one respondent pointed out that the biggest problem was the construction of sentences and grammatically incorrect source text.

Many of the respondents used the same or similar translation techniques: 56.25% of respondents said they included explanation, borrowing and literal translation in their translations. Out of those 56.25%, two respondents said they also used paraphrasing, two used calques, and one respondent used modulation. The other 43.75% of respondents did not point out specific translation techniques, but rather answered the question with “by using a dictionary“, “by using the Internet“, “translating sentence by sentence“ and, in one case, “by first singling out all the unknown words“.

All 16 respondents left at least some of the phrases in their original form. The phrases that were most frequently left unchanged include: *buzara*, *brudet*, *na gradelama*, *maneštra*, *pašticada*, *škripavac*, *čvarci*, *kulen* and *kulenova seka*, *paprikaš*, *prge*, *štrukli*, *čobanac* and *salenjaci*.

87.5% of respondents explained the gastronomic terms that they left in their original form by leaving a short description of the meal or the technique of meal preparation in brackets or in a footnote, or by adding a comparison with an existing term

in the English language. 12.5% of respondents said that the terms were already described in the source text, and that those that weren't could be understood using context. One respondent pointed out that it was only necessary to add what Croats call certain meals seeing as the article makes it clear what the meals consist of.

50% of the respondents translated *jušni složenac* as “casserole”, “soup casserole” or “soup-like casserole”. The main reasons given include the opinion that that is the most accurate translation for *jušni složenac* and that the respondents found “casserole” to be the official translation of *složenac* when exploring the literature. 18.75% of respondents translated *jušni složenac* as “soup” or “vegetable soup”. One respondent used the term “soup mixture” because the term *jušni složenac* does not exist in the English language; another used the term „stew“, and a third used the word “pottage” because it seemed to them as the most accurate translation. An interesting choice, given that pottage is quite a different meal than *jušni složenac* and the fact that it refers to the stew made by the poor in Europe for the greater part of history. Only one respondent left *jušni složenac* in its original form, with the reason being that there is no English term for *jušni složenac* so they merely indicated in quotation marks that that is what Croats call it.

68.75% of respondents translated *pršut* as “prosciutto” and 75% translated *panceta* as “pancetta”. The main reason for this was the fact that these terms already exist in the English language, having been borrowed from Italian. One respondent translated *pršut* as “bacon”, believing that it was a term often used for *pršut*, and another left *panceta* in its original form, with the term “bacon” left in brackets as an explanation, believing it to be the loan translation of *panceta*. 25% of respondents left the terms in their original form, mostly for the reason that they were explained in the text anyway.

93.75% of respondents left the terms *kulen* and *kulenova seka* in their original form because these terms do not exist in the English language. One respondent added that it is important to leave the original name of the meal, “which is almost a brand name“. 43.75% of respondents left an explanation of these terms in brackets or in footnotes. Only one respondent translated *kulenova seka* as “flavoured sausages“, because they did not know of a better translation.

All 16 respondents translated *gulaš* as “goulash“, with two respondents also adding “stew“ in brackets. All respondents recognized the word “goulash“ as the English equivalent of the word *gulaš*. Two respondents added that “goulash“ was a loan word from Hungarian, where the meal itself comes from.

2. 4. Translation procedures in the survey

Borrowing, usually in concert with description, is the most frequently used translation method for translating gastronomical terminology amongst the English Language and Literature students in the University of Rijeka. 93.75% of respondents left *buzara* completely unchanged in its original form, while 87.5% left *brudet* in its original form. *Na gradelama* was also kept in its original form in 37.5% of cases, while *peka* or *ispod peke* was retained in 31.25% of cases. 81.25% of respondents kept the word *maneštra* in its original form. 25% of respondents kept the term *na lešo* the same as in the source text. All of the respondents kept *pašticada* in its source form. 37.5% of respondents included *pršut* in its original form in their translation, and 31.25 included *panceta*. 93.75% of respondents also kept the term *škripavac* in its original form. 68.75% of respondents included *čvarci* in its original form. 93.75% of respondents left *kulen* and

kulenova seka in their original forms. 87.5% of respondents left *paprikaš* in its original form. All respondents kept the terms *prge* and *štrukli* in their original forms, as well as *čobanac* and *salenjaci*.

Many cases of explaining exist in the respondents' translations, usually alongside borrowing, to serve as a description of the term left in its original form. 56.25% of respondents included short descriptions for *buzara* and *brudet*, usually "types of stew" left in brackets or footnotes. All of the respondents, including the ones that left the terms *na gradele* and *ispod peke* in their original form and the ones that omitted them added a description of the preparation method. 50% of respondents used explaining to describe *paštica*, usually as "type of beef stew". 18.75% of respondents added a description of *pršut*, and 12.5% a description of *panceta*. This is likely due to the fact that a description of the method of preparing both is already present in the text, and the fact that many respondents translated both using adaptation into forms well known in the English language, rendering additional explanations redundant. Only 12.5% of respondents added a description of *škripavac* in parentheses. 31.25% of respondents added a description of *čvarci* in parentheses or footnotes. 43.75% of respondents also added an explanation of *kulen* and *kulenova seka* in parentheses or footnotes. 50% of respondents included an explanation of *paprikaš* that went beyond the fact that it is made from freshwater river fish, a description which is already present in the text.

Uses of adaptation in the respondents' translations include the translations of *pršut* and pancetta into prosciutto (68.75%) and pancetta (75%), as well as *gulaš*, which was turned into "goulash" in every respondent's translation. In addition, 25% of respondents

translated *čvarci* as “pork rinds”, while one respondent translated *čvarci* as “cracklings” and another as “greaves”.

The most prominent use of calque in the text was the respondents’ translation of the term *jušni složenac*. Being not a name of a Croatian dish, but a broader term for a type of food not necessarily specific to a certain region, many respondents translated the individual elements of the term and ended up with “soup casserole” or “soup-like casserole” (50%).

Transposition was not that frequently used by the participants in the survey: one respondent changed *buzara* into “busara” and 12.5% of respondents changed *paprikaš* into “paprikash”.

Prominently, one respondent used modulation to translate *škripavac* as “scaly polypore”.

No examples of literal translation are present in the respondents’ translations, despite several respondents including literal translation in their answer to the question “Which translation methods did you use while translating the text?”. Given that many of the respondents’ answers to this question did not include any actual translation methods, and that they instead just said that they used dictionaries or the Internet, it is likely that they are either not familiar with translation methods or misunderstood the question. As such, they may have confused literal translation with borrowing, which is leaving a term in its original form in the source language, which many of the respondents who said they used literal translation actually used.

Complete omission was never used in the respondents' translations, seeing as when a word was taken out, at least a description was put in its place.

All in all, it is evident that many students preferred the use of adaptation, and especially borrowing and explanation to translate Croatian gastronomical terms. When a version of a term adapted into English existed, like in the case of "prosciutto", "pancetta" and "goulash", most students preferred to use it in order to avoid using too many borrowed words. However, when a cultural equivalent did not exist, most students preferred to simply borrow the term from Croatian and, in most cases, add an explanation of the term in brackets or footnotes. The comparatively less frequent use of other translation procedures, such as calque, transposition and modulation could be explained by the fact that not all gastronomical terms can be translated using all of the strategies, at least without losing some of the meaning or authenticity of the source text. One student explained: "In general, I think that it is better in gastronomy to use the original name because of how specific the meals of a certain area are, because there are usually no equivalent names for specialties. I also think that it is important to take into account the fact that some of the potential readers may use the text for suggestions before or during their travels, so it is better to include the original name to reduce confusion, seeing as they will encounter the source term anyway in that case. I also think that if one uses the original term with an added explanation, there is a cultural exchange because it implies that the meal is special and that one should expect something special and different from what a proper translation might imply."

3. DISCUSSION

In this paper I have presented several characteristics and problems of translating cultural terms, prominently realia like gastronomical terminology, as well as the translation methods and strategies offered by various authors and scholars that can be used to translate such terms.

Guerra (2012: 1) notes that “some words or phrases denoting objects, facts, phenomena, etc... are so deeply rooted in their source culture and so specific (and perhaps exclusive or unique) to the culture that produced them that they have no equivalent in the target culture, be it because they are unknown, or because they are not yet codified in the target language.” She further argues that “when cultural differences exist between the two languages, it is extremely difficult to achieve a successful transfer, if not impossible (whatever the competence of the translator in the two languages involved)”, and that “even the slightest variation from the source language cultural term can be taken as an act of subversion against the culture it represents.” (Guerra 2012: 1)

This is an opinion shared by several of the students in the study: one student kept the term *kulen* the same and added “cured meat” in brackets, because they thought it was important to leave the name of the product the same as it is “almost a brand”. Seeing as *kulen* is regarded as a premium dried meat product in Croatia, one which is produced in a very specific way and smoked and air-dried for several months; the price of which is comparable to smoked ham, and which even has a “*Kulenijada*” festival to honor the tradition of producing this delicacy, this argument holds water. *Kulen* is very distinctive from other dried meats and it is an original Croatian product present in the Croatian Ministry of Culture’s list of protected cultural goods. Translating *kulen* simply as “flavoured

sausages” or “cured meat” does not do it justice, and it arguably does not do most culturally specific foods justice either: by translating taco, paella, tortilla, curry or any number of other foreign dishes in a way in which the original name is lost, a great part of what makes the given meal unique to its source culture is lost. While there is no clear-cut guide to tackling any translation, it seems that keeping the original terms for iconic foods while presenting a description or explanation of the food is the best way of making sure that as little as possible is lost in translation.

The previous statement by Guerra showcases the difficulties that translators face when having to choose how to translate a cultural term which has no equivalent in the target language. There may be a multitude of strategies that one can choose from in order to translate such a specific term, but no translation is perfect; something is always lost in the transfer. In fact, Guerra (2012: 21-22) says that “some scholars (Santoyo, Garcia Yebra, Yifeng, etc.) consider that, in some cases, translation is impossible, basically when one has to translate poetic texts or those of a cultural nature.” She argues, however, that if everything conceivable by the human mind must be capable of being expressed in another, everything can be translated from one language to another.

In the main section of this paper I presented various strategies that one may use to translate culturally specific terms, but Guerra argues that even though “many translation scholars consider them pivotal in the translation process, [...] these strategies are not the universal panacea and studies on translation strategies and procedures have been sometimes criticised. Some authors (Chuquet and Pallard 10, Kelly 133, Larose 18, etc.) criticise the nature of these procedures, indicating that borrowings and calques, for instance, are not really translation procedures, while others (especially adaptation) are

beyond the limits of translation, or that there is no clear boundary between them. Guerra also talks about the usefulness of knowing the methods themselves; too many studies focus on labelling the various strategies and not on applying them, which would be more useful for students.

Venuti (240), cited by Guerra (2012: 23) says that the main problems of translating cultural elements are: (1) focusing primarily on the cultural elements and not on the language and style of the text, just trying to “adapt” the source language culture to the target language culture, and (2) focusing mainly on language and style, preserving elements of the original culture and not rendering the message accurately. This analysis would imply that the ideal solution is to strike a balance between creating an accurate translation and one that adapts the source language culture to the target culture; in other words, to find a balance between domestication and foreignization. Domestication, according to Venuti (1995: 21) is “an ethno-centric reduction of the foreign text to [...] target language cultural values”, while foreignization entails “choosing a foreign text and developing a translation method along lines which are excluded by dominant cultural values in the target language”. (Venuti 1997: 242, cited in Munday 2001: 146-147). If one subverts too heavily the source language culture, the full meaning is lost, but focusing too heavily on preserving the cultural elements of the source language culture makes the translation sloppy and difficult to read, as it abounds with foreign terminology.

I noted this problem in the translations of the students: many of them focused too heavily on borrowing and explanations, making the final translation full of the original Croatian terminology. However, those that tried to use other translation procedures ended up with translations that did not live up to the original text, seeing as much of what makes

Croatian gastronomy unique was lost in translation. This finding matches the arguments of scholars that argue that translating cultural elements never results in a text that is perfectly equivalent in meaning to the source language text.

4. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, research on the translation of cultural terms consistently proves that there is no perfect method for translating terms and phrases with no cultural equivalent in the target language; however, a translator can and should always attempt to present a text that balances being easily readable and understandable to the target audience and living up to the source language culture.

The results obtained in the survey on Croatian gastronomical terminology might have been different if I had had a greater number of translations to analyse; 16 respondents is certainly not a lot and if there had been more I may have reached different conclusions. It would also have been interesting to compare the results of the survey to the translations of professional translators, but that exceeds the scope of this thesis.

All in all, this survey indicates a need to better educate students about the problems of source language and target language equivalence when it comes to translating cultural terminology, as well as the methods of dealing with those problems. Emphasis should be placed on the need to create a translation that strikes a balance between domesticating and foreignizing the target language text, so that students could perform better at such tasks in the future.

APPENDIX A

Hrvatska kuhinja se obilježava svojom raznolikošću, pri čemu se izdvajaju četiri geografska područja Hrvatske sa svojim specifičnostima i specijalitetima. Na jadranskoj obali prehranu čine mnogobrojna jela od ribe i drugih plodova mora – sipa, lignji, hobotnice, školjaka. Od njih se rade buzare i brudeti, peku se na gradelama ili ispod peke. Od povrća se rade jušni složenci (maneštre) ili se priprema na lešo. Omiljeno je jelo od govedine pašticada, a od svinjetine se dimljenjem i sušenjem na otvorenom rade pršut i panceta. U Lici i Gorskom kotaru poznata su jela od mesa divljači, posebno gulaši od sretine ili veprovine. Kuhinja tih tradicionalno stočarskih krajeva bogata je i mliječnim proizvodima, poput poznatog ličkog sira škripavca. Mliječne prerađevine zastupljene su i u kuhinji sjeverne i središnje Hrvatske. Poznate su podravske prge, sušeni sir začinjen crvenom paprikom i češnjakom. Štrukli, savijača od vučenog tijesta, najpopularnije je jelo s toga područja. U kulinarskoj tradiciji sjeveroistočne Hrvatske bitnu ulogu ima svinjetina, svježe pripremljena ili prerađena u suhomesnate proizvode, uključujući čvarke ili poznate kulen i kulenovu seku. Poznato je jelo čobanac, gulaš od više vrsta mesa. Od riječne ribe priprema se paprikaš. Od svinjskog se sala rade poznati kolači salenjaci.

APPENDIX B

1. Koliko Vam je bilo teško prevesti tekst? (1 = iznimno lako; 5 = iznimno teško)

1 2 3 4 5

2. Koliko su Vam bili potrebni rječnici ili drugi izvori literature prilikom prevođenja? (1 = uopće nisu bili potrebni; 5 = bili su iznimno potrebni)

1 2 3 4 5

3. Koji su Vam od termina bili najteži za prevesti i zašto?

4. Koje ste tehnike prevođenja koristili prilikom prevađanja teksta?

5. Jeste li ostavili neke gastronomske termine u njihovom izvornom obliku, bez da ste ih direktno prevađali?

DA NE

6. Ako ste ostavili koje gastronomske termine u izvornom obliku, na koji način ste objasnili što oni znače?

7. Kako ste preveli jušni složenac i zašto?

8. Kako ste preveli termine *pršut* i *panceta* te zašto?

9. Kako ste preveli termine *kulen* i *kulenova seka* te zašto?

10. Kako ste preveli termin *gulaš* i zašto?

5. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baker, Mona. *In Other Words: a Coursebook on Translation*. Routledge, 1992.

Chiaro, Delia & Rossato, Linda: "Food and translation, translation and food." *The Translator*, 1 Dec. 2015. pp. 237-243., <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2015.1110934>. Accessed 27 June 2018.

Guerra, Ana Fernández. "Translating Culture: Problems, Strategies and Practical Realities." *A Journal of Literature, Culture and Literary Translation*, Dec. 2012. pp.1-27., <https://hrcak.srce.hr/116870>. Accessed 27 June 2018.

Munday, Jeremy. *Translating the Foreign: the (in)Visibility of Translation*. Routledge, 2001.

Newmark, Peter. *A Textbook of Translation*. Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 1988.

Stojić Aneta, et al. *Priručnik Za Prevoditelje: Prilog Teoriji i Praksi*. Filozofski Fakultet, 2014.