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In this paper we examine the various ways of expressing nationalism in Balkan terms, using the most well-known translated works of Dimitris Chatzis, Nicholas Gage (Gatzoiannis) and Izmail Kadare, namely an English translation of Chatzis’ To telos tis mikris mas polis, a Greek translation of Gage’s Eleni, and a Greek translation of Kadare’s Kronikë në gur. We start from the assumption that nationalistic stereotypes find their expression in language, especially in one spoken in regions inhabited by numerous ethnic/linguistic groups, which suggests that such a language is more likely to contain pejorative or alienating terms used to name the hated -or just strange- Other; of course, each language has its own mechanisms of expressing alienation with respect to Otherness. Such mechanisms are to a great extent culture-specific, which means that translating such nationalism coloured terms in a target language is not always so straightforward. We proceed by selecting nationalism scenting terms which are typical of the source language/culture and comparing them with terms used as equivalents in the target text/culture, as well as with other terms which are typical of the way source-language speakers view the Other. Our goal is to find out what strategies the translators used to cope with difficult-to-translate nationalism scenting terms as well as to see what changes, if any, such strategies cause to the target text in comparison with the source text.
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1. Introduction

Saying that nationalistic stereotypes find their expression in language would be commonplace. Indeed, languages spoken in regions inhabited by numerous ethnic/linguistic/religious groups are more likely to contain pejorative or alienating terms which can be used to name the hated—or just strange—Other. This used to be—and, sometimes, still is—the case in the Balkans, an area which numbers many ethnic/linguistic groups such as Albanians, Greeks, Rumanians, Vlachs, Jews, Serbs, Croats, Bulgarians, Rroma, Turks etc.

Each language has its own mechanisms of expressing alienation with respect to Other. Such mechanisms are culture-specific to a great extent, which means that it is not always so straightforward to translate such nationalism-coloured terms in a target language. However, a translator should act in such a way as to highlight (or, when such do not exist, to create) socially/intuitively acceptable equivalences between the two stylistic formations (Daltas: 2002, 248), i.e. the source text and the target text. This quest involves one or more of some preliminary tasks: the most important of them may be summarized as follows: 1) finding linguistic similarities, if any, between the source language and the target language; 2) finding cultural/ideological/social similarities, if any, between the source culture and the target culture; 3) finding stylistic similarities, if any, between the text types available in the source language and the ones available in the target language; 4) finding common thinking patterns, if any, between the author of the source text and the reader of the target text; 5) finding common thinking patterns, if any, between the reader of the source text and the reader of the target text; 6) creating artificial linguistic equivalences which either by being explicitly stated as such or by being consistently repeated in the text may provide a bridge between the two languages; 7) creating artificial cultural/ideological/social equivalences which either by being explicitly stated as such or by being consistently repeated in the text may provide a bridge between the two cultures; 8) creating artificial stylistic equivalences which either by being explicitly stated as such or by being consistently repeated in the text may provide a bridge between the two stylistic formations.

The abovementioned description of the main tasks a translator should perform in order to highlight (or, when such do not exist, to create) socially/intuitively acceptable equivalences between the two stylistic for-
mations, i.e. the source text and the target text may be made more explicit by focusing on the surface text. Some notable strategies available to translators in cases of culture-specific or difficult-to-translate terms such as American English *yankee* or Serbian *šiptar* could be the following, each one being adequate for performance of more rather than just one of the abovementioned tasks: A) use of a semantic (formal) equivalent (either a single word or a periphrasis), if any, in the target language; this often leads to loss of connotative information (Wilss: 1982, 126); B) use of a cultural (pragmatic) equivalent (either a single word or a periphrasis), if any, in the target language; if extremely applied, this strategy may produce a «domesticating» translation in Venuti’s (1995: 20) terms; C) use of the same term (borrowing), accompanied by an explanatory note, if necessary; D) coinage of a new term, if possible; and E) use of the same term in the phonetically and grammatically correct form of the target language, provided it has or can easily assume the same communicative value. At this point it is worth stressing that sometimes not just one, but more of the abovementioned preliminary tasks may have to be performed by the translator in connection with one and the same term. The following table illustrates the relationships between the tasks that a translator has to perform in cases of culture-specific terms (including nationalism scenting ones) and the strategies available in order to cope with such terms:

**TABLE 1.**

*Preliminary tasks to be performed by the translator in relation with strategies available*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks to be performed</th>
<th>Strategies available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1) Finding linguistic similarities, if any, between the source language and the target language | A. Use of a semantic (formal) equivalent (either a single word or a periphrasis), if any, in the target language with eventual loss of connotative information  
E. Use of the same term in the phonetically and grammatically correct form of the target language, provided it has or can easily assume the same communicative value |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks to be performed</th>
<th>Strategies available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2) Finding cultural/ideological/social similarities, if any, between the source culture and the target culture | B. Use of a cultural (pragmatic) equivalent (either a single word or a periphrasis), if any, in the target language; if extremely applied, this strategy may produce a «domesticating» translation  
C. Use of the same term (borrowing), accompanied by an explanatory note, if necessary;  
D. Coinage of a new term, if possible |
| 3) Finding stylistic similarities, if any, between the text types available in the source language and the ones available in the target language; | B. Use of a cultural (pragmatic) equivalent (either a single word or a periphrasis), if any, in the target language; if extremely applied, this strategy may produce a «domesticating» translation  
D. Coinage of a new term, if possible  
E. Use of the same term in the phonetically and grammatically correct form of the target language, provided it has or can easily assume the same communicative value |
| 4) Finding common thinking patterns, if any, between the author of the source text and the reader of the target text | A. Use of a semantic (formal) equivalent (either a single word or a periphrasis), if any, in the target language with eventual loss of connotative information  
B. Use of a cultural (pragmatic) equivalent (either a single word or a periphrasis), if any, in the target language; if extremely applied, this strategy may produce a «domesticating» translation  
E. Use of the same term in the phonetically and grammatically correct form of the target language, provided it has or can easily assume the same communicative value |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tasks to be performed</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strategies available</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5) Finding common thinking patterns, if any, between the reader of the source text and the reader of the target text | A. Use of a semantic (formal) equivalent (either a single word or a periphrasis), if any, in the target language with eventual loss of connotative information  
B. Use of a cultural (pragmatic) equivalent (either a single word or a periphrasis), if any, in the target language; if extremely applied, this strategy may produce a «domesticated» translation  
E. Use of the same term in the phonetically and grammatically correct form of the target language, provided it has or can easily assume the same communicative value |
| 6) Creating artificial linguistic equivalences which either by being explicitly stated as such or by being consistently repeated in the text may provide a bridge between the two languages; | C. Use of the same term (borrowing), accompanied by an explanatory note, if necessary  
D. Coinage of a new term, if possible |
| 7) Creating artificial cultural/ideological/social equivalences which either by being explicitly stated as such or by being consistently repeated in the text may provide a bridge between the two cultures | A. Use of a semantic (formal) equivalent (either a single word or a periphrasis), if any, in the target language with eventual loss of connotative information  
C. Use of the same term (borrowing), accompanied by an explanatory note, if necessary  
D. Coinage of a new term, if possible  
E. Use of the same term in the phonetically and grammatically correct form of the target language, provided it has or can easily assume the same communicative value |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tasks to be performed</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strategies available</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8) Creating artificial stylistic equivalences which either by being explicitly stated as such or by being consistently repeated in the text may provide a bridge between the two stylistic formations | A. Use of a semantic (formal) equivalent (either a single word or a periphrasis), if any, in the target language with eventual loss of connotative information  
C. Use of the same term (borrowing), accompanied by an explanatory note, if necessary  
D. Coinage of a new term, if possible  
E. Use of the same term in the phonetically and grammatically correct form of the target language, provided it has or can easily assume the same communicative value |

2. The Translations in Question

In the pages that follow we examine the various ways of expressing nationalism in Balkan terms, using translated works of Dimitris Chatzis, Nicholas Gage (Gatzoyiannis) and Izmail Kadare, namely an English translation of Chatzis’s *To telos tis mikris mas polis*¹, a Greek translation of Gage’s *Eleni*², and a Greek translation of Kadare’s *Kronikë në gur*³. We select nationalism scenting terms which are typical of the source language/culture and compare them with the terms used as equivalents in the target text/culture, or other terms that are typical of the way source-language speakers view the hated Other. Our goal is to find out which of the
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abovementioned strategies the translators used to cope with difficult-to-translate nationalism scenting terms in the target texts examined as well as to see what changes, if any, such strategies cause to the target text in comparison with the source text. Besides, we make an attempt to find out whether there is any relation between strategies used and particular conditions under which each translator worked.

The target texts we chose to deal with in this paper show some peculiarities with respect to the cultures they depict and the source languages from which they have been translated. In particular: i) Chatzis’s work was written in Greek, a language which contains many terms having to do with national and/or religious identities, given that it has been spoken in various continents and linguistic/cultural environments (cf. Kehagioglou 2001: 1, 37). Moreover, Greek is peculiar in using the same term in different registers to depict the speaker’s attitude towards the Other. These registers are based on the use of doublets, or even triplets, denoting the same nationality or ethnic/cultural/linguistic group, e.g. Ιταλός/Ιταλιάνος, Εβραϊος/Οβραϊος/Οβριός, Ισπανός/Σπανιόλος etc. Of course there are cases when such doublets are just regional, dialectal, sociolectal or just idiolectal variants (Carpentier: 1990, 71ff.) with little or no relation to register or the speaker’s attitude towards the Other. The latter is also expressed by means of suffixes added to national names, e.g. Γερμανός/Γερμαναράς, Τούρκος/Τουρκαλάς etc. The target text we chose for Chatzis’s work is an English translation, given that English has rather different expression habits from Greek – apart from common IE or «European Sprachbund» elements (Beschert, Bernini, Buridan: 1990). This means that, in this case, the translator’s main problem is to transfer the intentionality (de Beaugrande & Dressler: 1974, 19ff.) of the source text to the target text; ii) Gage’s work was written in English, although he was a Greek, and narrates events which took place in Greek linguistic/cultural context. This means that the Greek target text shares the same cultural context with the source text, which makes it possible for the translator to use terms peculiar to this culture even from the linguistic point of view, thus improving the work by enriching it with linguistic/cultural elements which are not explicit in the source text. In doing so, the translator also improves the situationality (de Beaugrande & Dressler: ibid.) of the target text. iii) Kadare’s work was written in Albanian, a language which shares many similarities with Greek due to their common Balkan and/or Ottoman cultural and/or linguistic heritage. However, given that Greeks and Albanians often found themselves in opposing sides, their languages do not share the same nationalism scented terms
when Albanians speak of Greeks and vice versa. The Greek target text we chose to work with has been translated from French. Thus we can observe eventual implications of this «double» translation by comparing the Albanian text with the Greek text.

3. Chatzis

In Chatzis’s work the main groups representing Otherness are the Jews, appearing mainly in the story of «Sabelti Cabilli», and the Rroma, appearing mainly in the story of «Sioulas the tanner»; there are also Germans, in few instances. We shall not deal with all groups representing Otherness in Chatzis’s work (such as Turks, «Franks», Serbs, Albanians), but only with the ones labelled with terms which, in our opinion, are culture- and/or language-specific.

Jews and what relates to them are designated by the following slightly marked terms in the source text: «Οβραιός» («Jewish […] man»), as for example in pp. 16, 49, 56, 67, 79 and elsewhere; «Οβρτός», in p. 46; «Ουβριός», in pp. 42, 43, 45; «Οβραιό», in p. 49; «Οβριώ», in pp. 44, 59 and elsewhere; «οβραϊκός» (adj.), as for example in pp. 45, 53, 65, 70, 74 and elsewhere. The unmarked or standard form is Εβραιός (cf. Hebrew), at least in modern use, while the terms starting with O-/o- may have slightly pejorative overtones, given said standardization. However, in Chatzis’s times the terms «Οβραιός», «Οβριός», «Ουβριός» could also have been used simply as popular or «dialectal» (Carpentier: ibid.) variants of standard Greek Εβραιός (= a Jew, a Jewish man), i.e. with no marked sense. The respective female terms are Οβραία, Οβριά (the term Ουβριά does not appear in Chatzis’s work, although it did exist as the female counterpart of Ουβριός). The adjective οβραϊκός is the respective form for standard εβραϊκός (a term of elevated style) or εβραικός (a colloquial, rather popular term with usually no pejorative connotations). In the English translation we chose those terms are translated by «Jew/Jewish man», «Jewess/Jewish woman» and «Jewish», respectively, all of them being unmarked, i.e. having neutral sense. Here the translator used strategy A in all instances, by choosing just a formal equivalent of the marked Greek ethnonym. In our opinion this was the only way to translate those Greek terms, as there are no pragmatic equivalents in English. In the source text

4. This is a regional variant showing the change of /o/ into /u/ in unstressed positions, which is typical of Northern Greek speech.
we found also the highly derogatory terms «σαλιόβριος» and «τσιφουτς», in p. 45; in those instances the translator used the terms «filthy Jew» and «tsifoutis», respectively. As we can see, in the first case he used a peripheral English term which successfully translates the Greek term, i.e. he used strategy B, while in the second case he simply borrowed the Greek term (of Turkish origin) in transliteration, accompanying it with an explanatory note, i.e. he used strategy C. Another slightly burlesque term is the word «χαχάμης», in p. 73-74. It comes from Hebrew חכם (= wise) and is used in Greek to denote a rabbi; its burlesque connotations may be due to its sound which reminds of the Greek interjection χα-χα which stands for laughter. Χαχάμης gave also the rather obsolete derivative 5 χαχαμίκος, known mostly through the Greek «shadow theatre» (Καραγκιόζης) and denoting any Jew, no matter if he is a rabbi or not. In this case the translator opted for strategy A, as he concluded that in this instance the author did not use «χαχάμης» in any pejorative sense. If he had come to the conclusion that the author did use the term in a burlesque or other pejorative sense, he should rather have borrowed the term in transliteration.

Rroma and what relates to them are designated by the following rather marked terms in the source text: «γύρτος», in pp. 16, 17, 18 and elsewhere; «γυρτικός» (adj.), in p. 16 and elsewhere. Nowadays, the Rroma themselves do not accept but their self-designation (sing. Ῥόμα, pl. Rroma) as the only unmarked term. In Greek this term (often appearing as Pom for both numbers) dates only from late 1980s. The term which used to be considered unmarked and was current mainly among the Greek authorities was Αθηνανός, now rather obsolete. The current, rather unmarked form in colloquial usage is Ταγγάνος. The most widely used pejorative term is Γύρτος. This term, written with minuscule initial, used to denote also a blacksmith, a gunsmith and the like. 6 However, it is probable that in Chatzis’s times the term «γύρτος» was written mainly with minuscule initial, as the Rroma were not yet felt as a nation in the modern sense of the word, but rather as a social group or as a human race; hence it is not always easy to discern in which cases the author used the term in the sense of Gypsy and in which cases he used it in the sense of «blacksmith» or both.

5. The suffix -ικος comes probably from Ladino -ico (instead of Spanish -ito), so the term χαχαμίκος could be a direct borrowing from Ladino.
6. The reason is obvious, as most Rroma had such occupations. Cf. the case of Spanish gallego (= porter, bearer), a semantic modification of the ethnonym Gallego (= a native of Galicia).
In our English target text this term appears as «gypsy» (with minuscule initial), which was the best choice on the translator’s part, as it carries the same ambivalence (Ballard: 1990, 154, 155; Margot: 1979, 151) if we accept that the English term «gypsy» retains the sense of «blacksmith» and the like through a cultural borrowing into the target language. If so, then we can assert that the translator successfully applied strategy A in all instances, with no loss of connotative information. At any rate, the Rroma traits of the «gypsy» are explicitly stated in one instance («μπρμπέλικα μάτια», «καπνισμένο μούτρο», see below), so we are informed that the «gunsmith» was indeed a Rrom. With the Rroma are indeed connected the burlesque expressions «μπρμπέλικα μάτια» and «καπνισμένο μούτρο», in p. 16, which describe the physical traits popularly believed to be shared by the typical Rroma. The English translation in this instance was «dark mischievous eyes» and «swarthy face». The term «μπρμπέλικος» is actually a culture-specific term, which has no semantic -or even connotative- equivalent in English. In Greek «μπρμπέλικα μάτια» means eyes with small dark spots on the iris rather than dark eyes; hence one could allege that the translator’s choice was not exact. However, the English linguistic culture knows rather few persons with this trait, which has no special connotations in English. By contrast, «dark mischievous eyes» was a very good choice, as it has clear cultural connotations among English-speakers; it is in this way the average English-speaker would perceive the physical traits of the Rroma. «Swarthy face» seems to have been the only possible choice, although «swarthy» has none of the burlesque connotations of the Greek term «καπνισμένος» which literally means «smoked». In both instances (i.e. «μπρμπέλικος» and «καπνισμένος») the translator used strategy B. See also below about the Rroma in Kadare’s work.

Germans and what relates to them are designated by the marked term γερμαναράς, in p. 197 («γερμαναράδες», in plural form). The standard unmarked term, used elsewhere in the source text, is Γερμανός (= German), with usually no connotations. The term «γερμαναράδες», written with minuscule initial in our source text, came to be used as a derogatory or burlesque term for Germans in current Greek use. However, the suffix -αράς usually denotes something big, strong and the like. It is in this sense that Germans are named «γερμαναράδες» in p. 197 of the source text, which means that here alienation takes place on the basis of a positive image of the Other, as the Germans are contrasted with «puny nomarchs the Greek state employed». Anyway, the burlesque overtone of -αράς is still present. The translator used the periphrastic expression «strong Ger-
mans», which was his only choice, as the English language has no term or suffix denoting both strength and wickedness, hence he successfully used strategy B. Of course, this leads to a slight loss of connotative information.

4. Gage

In Gage’s work the main groups representing Otherness and labelled with pejorative or burlesque terms are the Americans (or rather the Greeks who lived in America and were influenced by the American culture) and the Germans. We shall not deal with all groups representing Otherness in Gage’s work (such as Italians or English), but only with the ones labelled with terms which, in our opinion, are culture- and/or language-specific.

In this work, Gage narrates that his mother, a Greek woman who had lived in America, was called «the Amerikana» by her fellow villagers, i.e. she represented Otherness for them just because she had lived abroad. This reveals the deep chauvinistic views of many Greeks (at least of that time) and their repugnance towards cultural differences (particularly -and strangely enough- when they are of Western origin, we are afraid). Here the author borrowed the term directly from colloquial Greek (<Ἀμερικάνα), thus retaining «all the prejudices that came with it» (p. 27 of the source text). The Greek translator had nothing to do but transliterate the term and use it unchanged in the target text. This was the right choice, as the source text narrates events which took place in a Greek linguistic/cultural context. This strategy is essentially strategy C, although the borrowing was on the author’s part rather than the translator’s. However, the mere fact that the translator did not have but to transfer the term unchanged into the target text suffices for this strategy to be treated as part of the above-mentioned strategy C, even if the Greek-ness of the term used in the source text is considered. It is worth mentioning that this strategy was used in all instances of «Amerikana» (cf. p. 212 of the source text).

In page 253 of the source text we see the term «German bitch» with reference to Queen Frederica. This pejorative designation is pronounced by a communist guerrilla. Given the communists’ revulsion against Westerners and royal families, the translator used the term «Γερμανία σκόλα», thus enhancing the target text’s coherence (de Beaugrande & Dressler: ibid.) and shedding light to the intentionality of the source text. The term «Γερμανία» is now obsolete, and seems to the only choice available on the translator’s part, as the suffix -ίδα found in the standard term Γερμανίδα would sound somewhat archaic or elevated and thus would not be likely
to be used by a guerrilla. Besides, the term Γερμανίδα would be too neutral to be used in such an instance. Here the translator used strategy A.

In page 52 we find the term «Chams» used by the author to denote Muslim Greeks of Epirus, as he informs us. This term is a re-Turkicized term for the Greek word Τσάμηδες (perhaps connected with the Greek hydronym Θάμης) or, less probably, with the ancient Illyrian tribe of Σάμις; the translator made the right choice in using strategy E and translating it as «Τσάμηδες». This term, as well as the term denoting their land, Τσάμινια, has very bad connotations for average Greeks (Vickers: 2002, 3,4).

5. Kadare

In Kadare’s work the main groups representing Otherness are the Greeks, the Italians, the Rroma, as well as the Germans. However, we shall not deal with Germans in Kadare’s work, as they are not designated with some difficult-to-translate term in the source text.

In p. 140 we have the following dialogue: «— Ata ishin tē zeshkēt. — Jevgi janē grekēt?» (= — They were swarthy. — Are the Greeks gypsies?). Here we have an originally unmarked term, «zeshkēt», which becomes somewhat marked as it is connected with Greeks, who were an enemy. They are paralleled to the Rroma by means of the term «jevgi (pl.)» which has the same derogatory overtones as the Greek term γύρφοτος (see also above about the Rroma in Chatzi’s work). In this instance we have a double derogatory use, as both the Greeks and the Rroma are depicted as inferior in the dialogue. The translator was correct in translating the French term «gitans» (probably used in the French source text) by «γύρφοτος» in this instance, although she translated it by «τσιγγάνοι» in all other instances. In our opinion, if she had had the Albanian text, she should have used «γύρφοτος» in all instances, thus imitating the lexical cohesion of the former. However, she translated from French; that is why she used in all but one case the term «τσιγγάνοι» which reminds of the French «gitans», although the Albanian text has everywhere the slightly pejorative or burlesque term «jevg (sing.)/jevgj (pl.)» (e.g. in pp. 45, 46, 49 and elsewhere in the Albanian text). In any event, the fact that she used «γύρφοτος» in the above instance shows that she guessed well the intentionality of the source text, i.e. defamation of both the Greeks and the Rroma. Here the translator used strategy B and probably obtained an improved intentionality in comparison with the French text.

In p. 204 we find «kaureve» (gen./dat. pl., nom. sing. «kaur») as a pe-
jorative term for Italians and Greeks. This is a culture-specific term probably connected with Turkish (originally Persian) $gâvur$ and Islamic religion and denoting an *infidel, a Christian, a non-Muslim*. The French source text probably uses the term «glaouers (pl.)», translated as «γκωούρηδες» in Greek. This is an instance of common Ottoman heritage in Albanian and Greek, although the two peoples do not share the same religion for the most part. Here the translator used strategy E.

6. Conclusions

In the cases of Chatzis’s work examined above the translator had: i) to find linguistic similarities between the source language and the target language; this was the case of «Οβραιος» with its various forms and derivatives; «χάχμηρ»; and «γόρτος» with its various forms and derivatives, where the translator used strategy A; ii) to find cultural/ideological/social similarities, if any, between the source culture and the target culture; iii) to find common thinking patterns between the author of the source text and the reader of the target text; iv) to find common thinking patterns between the reader of the source text and the reader of the target text; the above three tasks had to be performed in connection with «παλιόβριος»; «μπριμπάλικα μάτια; «καπνισμένο μούτρο»; and «Γερμανάρις», where the translator used strategy B for all the above terms; v) to create artificial linguistic equivalences which either by being explicitly stated as such or by being consistently repeated in the text may provide a bridge between the two languages; this was the case of «τσουφούτης», where the translator used strategy C.

In the cases of Gage’s work examined above the translator had: i) to create artificial cultural/ideological/social equivalences which either by being explicitly stated as such or by being consistently repeated in the text may provide a bridge between the two cultures; this was the case of «Amerikà», where the translator used essentially strategy C, although in a rather special way; ii) to find linguistic similarities between the source language and the target language; this was the case of «Chams», where the translator used strategy E.
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7. In Albanian *kaur(r)* we see an unusual evolution of the initial consonant of the Turkish (originally Persian) word (a similar form is found in Serbian/Croatian *kaурin*); the word may have been influenced by the etymologically unrelated Arabic *kāfir* or borrowed via some Greek dialectal variant. The same word is found in Medieval Greek: καούρης, also a Greek surname.
In the cases of Kadare’s work examined above the translator had: i) to find cultural/ideological/social similarities, if any, between the source culture and the target culture; ii) to find common thinking patterns between the author of the source text and the reader of the target text; the above two tasks had to be performed in the case of «jëvëji» -> (gítans) -> «γύμφτιο», where the translator used strategy B; iii) to find linguistic similarities between the source language and the target language; iv) to find cultural/ideological/social similarities, if any, between the source culture and the target culture; v) to find common thinking patterns between the author of the source text and the reader of the target text; vi) to find common thinking patterns between the reader of the source text and the reader of the target text; the above four tasks had to be performed in the case of «kaureve» -> («giaours») -> «γιαουρθης», where the translator used strategy E.

In the target texts we dealt with in this paper the translators successfully used all strategies we spoke of in the beginning of our presentation in order to translate such difficult, nationalistic-scented terms, with the frequency illustrated in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases examined</th>
<th>Strategy A</th>
<th>Strategy B</th>
<th>Strategy C</th>
<th>Strategy D</th>
<th>Strategy E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4 (Chatzis, Gage)</td>
<td>4 (Chatzis, Kadare)</td>
<td>2 (Chatzis, Gage)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (Gage, Kadare)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be of interest to consider the different translation conditions under which the translators worked in connection with the strategies used, namely: a) in the case of Chatzis’s work, where we have a rather «neutral» case of translation, i.e. a source language to be translated into a target language with no particular relation between the two languages/cultures/settings (apart from their common Indo-European origin and their common «European Sprachbund» elements), the translator used strategies A, B, and C. Strategies D and E were not easy to use under such conditions, since: i) coinage of a new, virtually equivalent term would be here possible (or desired) only if we had closely related cultures and/or languages; and ii) use of the same term in the phonetically and grammatically correct form of the target language would similarly require closely related cultures.
and/or languages, in order to be easily assigned the same communicative value.

In the case of Gage’s work we have a source text written in English by a Greek-speaker, translated into Greek. This situation suggests a pre-existing affinity between source text and target text, which makes the whole task easier for the translator, who used strategies C and E. Strategies A, B and D were not just difficult to use, but superfluous as well, taking into account that: i) use of a semantic (formal) equivalent (either a single word or a periphrasis) for nationalism scented terms used by Greeks in a Greek setting would make no sense, as the target language contains itself the terms which existed in the author’s mind; hence there was no need to jeopardize the connotative information of the source text by using this strategy; ii) use of a cultural (pragmatic) equivalent (either a single word or a periphrasis) in the target language would make no sense for the same reasons; of course, one cannot even speak of «domesticating» translation in this case, as the question of «domestication» would be irrelevant in a target text translated into the language/culture of the source text’s setting; and iii) coinage of a new term would be irrelevant for the same reasons.

In the case of Kadare’s work we have a source text written in Albanian, a target text translated into French which served as the source text for the Greek translation here discussed. This situation suggests a pre-existing affinity between the original source text (i.e. the Albanian one) and the Greek target text, which however is obscured by the fact that the work was translated from a French source text (itself a target text of the original). Here the translator used only strategies B and E. Strategies A, C, and D were not easy (or possible) to use, since: i) use of a semantic (formal) equivalent (either a single word or a periphrasis) for nationalism scented terms used by Greeks in a Greek setting would make no sense, as the target language contains itself the terms which existed in the author’s mind; hence there was no need to jeopardize the connotative information of the source text by using this strategy; ii) use of the same term (borrowing), accompanied by an explanatory note, would be irrelevant, as the two cultures do share common images, hence they contain common terms to denote alienation to each other; iii) coinage of a new term would be irrelevant for the same reasons.

When viewed under the perspective of «strangeness in linguistic terms», a notion put forward by M. Schmitz-Emans with starting point B. Waldenfels’s «Fremdheit» (Waldenfels: 1997, 35ff.), the above con-
siderations lead to the conclusion that all three translations here discussed fall under Schmitz-Emans’s first category:

The normal and everyday-strange phenomena are speaking a foreign language that we are able to learn. We can translate them into our own language, though never without leaving untranslated parts. (Schmitz-Emans: 2001, 211)

However, some structural differences do exist between the languages involved, as in the case of «γερμαναράδες», given that standard English does not use similar structures (namely suffixes) to convey information about positive or negative judgments with respect to a nation, an ethnicity etc. We may, therefore, assume that those «untranslated parts» mentioned by Schmitz-Emans are true instances of her second category of «strangeness in linguistic terms»:

Structural strangeness is heterologous to our language, respectively to our symbolic orders and to our grammar of thinking: it is, therefore, incomprehensible. What we understand, however, is that it is a language (which means we may regard it as meaningful), and so there may be a minimum of communication. (Schmitz-Emans: ibid.)

Concluding, we could say that language and culture do play a role in translating nationalism cented terms in literature. For example, when both source- and target language are Balkan languages, the existing linguistic/cultural similarities influence both the translator’s preliminary tasks and the strategies available to him/her in his/her mission to cope with alienation and/or strangeness in literature (e.g. «καυρεν»/«γκισούρηδες», «γένε»/«γύρτον»). There is more connotative information lost when translating from a non-Balkan language into a Balkan language (e.g. «μπιρμπίλικα μάτια»/«mischievous eyes», «γερμαναράδες»/«strong Germans»), however successful the translator’s choice may have been.
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