

Submitted: 7 Oct, 2020
Accepted: 25 Nov, 2020

**THAT'S NOT MY NAME: TRANSLATION OF PROPER NAMES
IN CROATIAN AND RUSSIAN (RE)TRANSLATIONS
OF GEORGE ORWELL'S ANIMAL FARM: A FAIRY STORY**

Dora Lukač, University of Zagreb

Abstract

The procedures for rendering proper names have been studied mostly in works belonging to the fantasy genre and children's literature. Although George Orwell's Animal Farm belongs to neither of the two categories, it is affiliated with the subgenre of allegory, which represents quite a challenge to any potential translator. However, the real motivation behind the choice of this book lies in its criticism of the Soviet Union, especially since it was published in 1945, meaning that the political and socio-cultural context influenced its publication and reception to a great extent. This study aims to identify the procedures applied in rendering proper names from Animal Farm in two Croatian (the first translation and retranslation) and four Russian translations (the first translation and three retranslations), and to determine the differences among the translations into the same target language, as well as the differences between Croatian and Russian target texts. Finally, a study of first translations and subsequent retranslations will enable us to detect diachronic changes in the general translation orientations.

Keywords: translation of proper names, retranslation, general translation orientation

1. Introduction

George Orwell's *Animal Farm* has attracted a lot of attention since it was published due to its political nature and openly critical attitude towards one of the biggest forces in the world at the time – the Soviet Union. Orwell's satire was said to be exaggerated, but the book's popularity, especially in Eastern Europe,

speaks volumes about Orwell's criticism, which seemed to be as accurate as it was enduring. *Animal Farm* remained controversial long after its publication, a claim supported by the fact that customs officials cleared the British exhibitors' shelves of this book at the Moscow International Book Fair as recently as 1987, even after the introduction of the *glasnost* and *perestroika* (Meyers 1991: 113). However, in this research our focus is not on the book's literary or political impact. We will approach it from the translation studies perspective, focusing primarily on the translation of proper names.

Proper names are mostly studied in works belonging to the fantasy genre and/or children's literature (Cámara-Aguilera 2009, Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2003, Fernandes 2006, Kiseleva 2007, Čačija and Marković 2018, Narančić Kovač 2019, etc.). However, *Animal Farm* was chosen for a study of this kind for two reasons. First, it is subtitled *A Fairy Story*, which is defined as "a children's tale about magical and imaginary beings and lands"¹. Even though *Animal Farm* does not fully comply with this definition, its subtitle reveals that it is a simple story, meant to be "easily understood by almost anyone", as well as one containing some unusual elements (Orwell 1947). These elements are precisely what makes *Animal Farm* an allegory, which is defined as a "representation of an abstract thing or idea by an object that keeps a certain relation with it, whether real, conventional, or created by the artist's imagination" (Moliner 1992 cited in Cámara-Aguilera 2009: 57). In addition, allegory is a subgenre in which the translation of proper names is encouraged (Newmark 1988: 215). Finally, given its political nature, this research aims to provide insight into diachronic changes in the treatment of names as a specific category of culture-specific items, an insight that can be productively gained by studying (re)translations. This is even more compelling when we know that the relevant target languages (TLs) were spoken in two different communist countries, while one of them was directly criticized in the story.

The objective of this paper² is to identify the procedures applied in the rendering of proper names into Croatian and Russian as the two TLs in question.

¹ All definitions of words given in this paper were taken from Oxford University Press (2020), unless specified otherwise.

² The study was conducted as the author's M.A. thesis at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Zagreb, Croatia. This paper is a revised version of that thesis.

It further aims to determine the differences among the translations into the same TL, as well as the differences between Croatian and Russian translations. More specifically, the aim is to establish how general translation orientations changed over time by studying first translations and retranslations, produced in different periods. The study analyses six translations of *Animal Farm*: two translations into Croatian, and four translations into Russian. The two Croatian translations were published in 1983 and 2018 with the first translation (FTr) published while Croatia was still a part of Yugoslavia, and the retranslation (RTr) long after Croatia had gained independence. The Russian FTr was published in 1950, while RTrs appeared considerably later: the first RTr in 1988, followed by the second RTr in 1992, and the third RTr in 2002. Therefore, the first two Russian translations were published before the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the second RTr shortly after that key event, and the third eleven years later. It is also important to mention that the first translation into Russian was published in Western Germany.

2. Previous research and key concepts

2.1 *The reception and meaning of Orwell's Animal Farm*

George Orwell published *Animal Farm* in 1945. This book is a satire and a political allegory, where everything and everyone described represent events and characters in Russian history from the Russian Revolution of 1917 onwards, although the chronological order of historical events is rearranged (Meyers 1991: 104). When he tried to publish *Animal Farm*, Orwell was first rejected by his publisher, Victor Gollanz, because his work was too critical of the Soviet Union, an important ally in the war against Hitler, and then by a few other publishing houses, until finally Seckler & Warburg accepted the manuscript (Kiebusinski 2017: 3-4). In spite of his troubles, he did not falter during these hard times: a publishing offer was made by the right-wing journal *Time and Tide*, which Orwell rejected, because his "purpose was not to congratulate conservatives or even liberals on the failure of the Russian Revolution, however scathing his criticism of the Stalinist regime within the allegory" (Letemendia 1994: 5).

In her work on George Orwell, Valerie Meyers (1991: 104-110) explains in detail which character from the story embodies which historical figure: if Manor Farm represents Russia, then Mr Jones is the Tsar. The pigs, who started the Rebellion and managed this new establishment, are in fact the Bolsheviki who led the Revolution: old Major is a combination of Marx and Lenin; Napoleon, who sent Snowball into exile and established a despotic kind of rule, is, undoubtedly, Stalin, though he also has some features that could be associated with Hitler; Snowball, consequently, represents Trotsky, whereas Squealer embodies the propagandists of the regime. There are a few other prominent characters, whose roles are further explained by Meyers: the two horses, Boxer and Clover, represent the decent working man and the motherly working woman, while Mollie the mare embodies White Russians who opposed the Revolution and fled the country; dogs are members of Stalin's secret police; sheep the ignorant public; Moses is the opportunist Church preaching of Sugarcandy Mountain (or heaven), and, finally, Benjamin is the cynical, yet powerless average man. The most important human characters, apart from Mr Jones, are the owners of the two neighbouring farms: Mr Frederick, representing Hitler, but also bearing an allusion to the despotic Prussian king Frederick the Great, and Mr Pilkington, the embodiment of the English Prime Minister Winston Churchill. Another aspect of the allegory that helps us fully grasp the plausibility of the idea presented in this story is Orwell's choice of certain animals for their particular "roles": he "counts on our common assumptions about particular species to suggest his meaning", such as sheep being gullible, and pigs greedy and savage (Meyers 1991: 109). Throughout the story, the differences between animals gradually grow bigger, and the quality of life for most of them (except for the pigs as the brains and dogs as the muscles of the whole operation) deteriorates even more. Nonetheless, the animals are kept in order by means of fear and never-ending lies the leadership feeds them. The pigs end up breaking all the Seven Commandments set out right after the Rebellion, thus completely abandoning the teachings on which Animal Farm was founded. With each passing day the pigs resemble the hateful Man ever more, while the idea of the Republic of the Animals, foretold by old Major, grows further away from reality.

Orwell himself wrote the preface to the Ukrainian edition of *Animal Farm*, one of the first translations of this book, in which he explains the reasons behind

writing such a novella. He claims that the Civil War in Spain and the man-hunts that took place right about the same time as the great purges in the Soviet Union made him realize “how easily totalitarian propaganda can control the opinion of enlightened people in democratic countries”, since the British actually believed the press reports from Moscow trials (Orwell 1947). This made Orwell determined to expose the Soviet regime for what it really was, because, as he believed, “the destruction of the Soviet myth was essential if we wanted a revival of the Socialist movement” (Orwell 1947). His idea was to do so through a story “understood by almost anyone and which could be easily translated into other languages” (Orwell 1947). An account of the USSR’s wrongdoing is meant to be known everywhere in order to avoid repeating their mistakes. Nevertheless, Orwell remained a leftist, not condemning socialism, but the path the Soviet Union decided to take (Orwell 1947; Letemendia 1994: 10).

After the publication of *Animal Farm*, Orwell attracted the attention of prominent critics of the time and received praising reviews, which brought him the well-deserved recognition as being one of the “major writers of the twentieth century” (Meyers 2002: 4). His views and outspokenness against Stalin’s leadership made him a respected representative of “the left by exiles and refugees of Soviet-occupied countries” (Kiebusinski 2017: 4). Orwell said that *Animal Farm* was the first book in which he tried to fuse political and artistic purposes into one (Meyers 1991: 101). He even refused to take fees for translations made by refugee groups, and encouraged translators to publish in as many languages as possible (Kiebusinski 2017: 4).

2.2 Russian first translation and retranslations of *Animal Farm*

In this research paper four Russian translations are analysed:

1. Mariâ Kriger and Gleb Struve. *Skotskij Hutor*. “Posev”, Frankfurt 1950 (RussFTr)
2. Ilan Polock. *Skotnyj dvor*. “Rodnik”, Riga 1988 (RussRTr1)
3. Larisa Georgievna Bepalova. *Skotnyj dvor: Skazka*. “ARENA”, Moskva 1992 (RussRTr2)

4. Vladimir Pribylovskij. *Zverskaâ Ferma: Skazka*. "Panorama", Moskva 2002 (RussRTr3)

Having in mind Orwell's intention of "destroying the Soviet myth", it is interesting to note that Slavic languages (Polish, Ukrainian, and Russian), all of which were spoken in communist countries, were among the first languages into which *Animal Farm* was translated. The first official translation of this book into Russian was published in 1950 in Western Germany under the title *Skotskij Hutor* by the DP (Displaced Persons) publisher *Posev*³. The translation was done by Mariâ Kriger and Gleb Struve. Struve contacted Orwell right after reading his book, and said he would like to translate it for the benefit of Russians, "who could read the truth about their country only when outside it", meaning that Struve intended the translation to go into the hands of Russian dissidents (Karp 2017). The idea was to smuggle the Russian edition into the USSR, and this is precisely what convinced Orwell to fund its publication. He went through with this arrangement, but had similar doubts as when he was looking for a publisher in England, and was offered to publish *Animal Farm* in a right-wing journal. It was only that this time he was concerned about the Whites, who ran the *Posev* publishing house. In both situations political concerns played a vital role: the Whites might have loved the satire of the Russian Revolution, but they did not appreciate Orwell's description of the Church, so they simply omitted the paragraphs mentioning Moses the raven and his tales of the Sugarcandy Mountain. This is the reason why the first official Russian translation bears no mention of this place, while Moses still makes an appearance in the story, though in a less important role than in the original (Karp 2017). Since the motivation behind Struve's translation of *Animal Farm* was to expose the crimes of the Soviet regime to his fellow citizens, there is more than one reason why a new translation might be "needed".

As Kriger's and Struve's translation was published in Western Germany, the first integral translation of *Animal Farm* published in the USSR, more precisely, in the Baltic state of Latvia, is Ilan Polock's *Skotnyj dvor* (RussRTr1).

³ All Russian names mentioned in this paper, except the ones which already have an established and recognized form, have been transliterated according to the International Standard ISO 9:1995: <http://tetran.ru/SiteContentEn/Download/51>.

The first translation of *Animal Farm* published in Russia, more specifically in Moscow, was done by Larisa Georgievna Bepalova. That edition was printed in 1989. However, the retranslation used in this analysis is *Skotnyj dvor: Skazka*, which was published in 1992 (RussRTr2). Bepalova herself says that the 1992 edition was her final version of the translation, with modifications of her previous work. This “updated” version was published only once, by ARENA, while the later editions were based on her first translation from 1989 (Bepalova 2001).

Finally, the last of the four Russian translations (RussRTr3) was one of the latest retranlations available. The translator is Vladimir Pribylovskij, who published it in Moscow in 2002 under the title *Zverskaâ Ferma: Skazka*. It is worth mentioning that Pribylovskij produced more than one translation of this book: his first translation of *Animal Farm* titled *Ferma Ènimal*, published in 1986 in New York, was the first integral translation into Russian. The other translations done by Pribylovskij between these two were known as *Ferma Životnyh*.

2.3 Croatian first translation and retranlations of *Animal Farm*

When it comes to the translation of Orwell’s *Animal Farm* into Croatian, only two translators have made an attempt to introduce this book to the Croatian audience: Vladimir Roksandić and Lada Furlan Zaborac. Vladimir Roksandić’s first translation titled *Životinjska farma: bajka* (CroFTr) was published in 1974 by the publishing house *Naprijed* in Zagreb. This translation saw a large number of reprints published by different publishing houses. The edition used for this research is the one from 1983 published by *August Cesarec* in Zagreb⁴.

However, even though Roksandić’s translation was a first translation into Croatian, it was not a first translation in the former Yugoslavia. A first translation intended for the Yugoslav market was published in Serbian in 1955 in Munich as *Farma životinja: savremena basna*, and it was translated by Slobodan A. Stanković. At the time when *Animal Farm* was published, the then Socialist Republic of Croatia was part of the former Yugoslavia. It is relevant to mention the Serbian translation in order to provide a broader perspective on the situation

⁴ The first Croatian edition of *Animal Farm* from 1974 and the edition from 1983 were compared and the items researched in this paper examined. No differences in the procedures applied for rendering those items were found, since the solutions presented in both editions were identical.

in Yugoslavia at the time when *Animal Farm* appeared and on its reception in other communist countries apart from the Soviet Union, as well as to emphasize a large time gap of 19 years between the first Serbian and the first Croatian translation. Kiebusinski (2017: 6) notes that the former Yugoslav ambassador Aleksandar A. Avakumović, who opposed the Communists' rise to power and even refused to return to his home country after the war was over, initiated the idea for the translation of *Animal Farm* to be published in Yugoslavia as early as 1946. Stanković, the author of the Serbian translation, was very critical of the new regime in his preface and afterword, stating that "his people, Yugoslavs, who read Orwell's *Animal Farm*, will have 'a picture of Tito's Yugoslavia,' and that in the satire, they will find everything that their Fatherland has undergone and is currently experiencing" (ibid.). He even suggested that everything that takes place in *Animal Farm*, "as a rule takes place in all countries where Communists hold power", thus condemning not just the Yugoslav regime, but all Communist regimes in general (ibid.).

The only Croatian retranslation in existence is the one by Lada Furlan Zaborac, titled *Životinjska farma: bajka* (CroRTr1), published in 2009 by *Šareni dućan* in Koprivnica, and reprinted again in 2018. The later edition from 2018 was used for the purposes of this research⁵.

2.4 Proper names as culture-specific items

In this paper we will focus on a specific group of culture-specific items – proper names. However, it is necessary to briefly explain what the term culture-specific item (CSI) encompasses. Veselica Majhut (2012: 21-23) lists a number of definitions by translation scholars such as Ivir, Newmark, Florin, Mailhac, Olk, Franco Aixelá, and Pedersen, who use various terms to refer to the same phenomenon. Moreover, this shows that there is no consensus on the definition of this term in the field of Translation Studies (Matijaščić 2015: 28).

⁵ In the two editions of the Croatian retranslation the items analysed were also compared. Of 48 items, only one difference in the solutions, and, consequently, procedures applied was found: in the first edition from 2009, Furlan Zaborac simply copies the name of the taproom Mr Jones frequents (the Red Lion), whereas in the second edition from 2018 she translates it, rendering it as "Crveni lav".

The definition of a culture-specific item that this study relies on is that CSIs are

[t]hose textually actualized items whose function and connotations in a source text involve a translation problem in their transference to a target text, whenever this problem is a product of the nonexistence of the referred item or of its different intertextual status in the cultural system of the readers of the target text. (Franco Aixelá 1996: 58)

Javier Franco Aixelá distinguishes “two basic categories from the point of view of the translator: proper nouns and common expressions” (1996: 59). He uses the term *proper nouns* interchangeably with *proper names*, and the same is done in this paper. A proper name, according to Michel Ballard, “refers to an extralinguistic, specific and unique object which is differentiated from other objects belonging to the same kind by means of its name” (1993: 195 cited in Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2003: 124-125).

However, rendering of proper names in a translation of a literary text raises an important question: do proper names in fact have meaning? There are two main schools of thought: the first one advocates the opinion that proper names are denotative, that is, their function is “only and solely to mark or to point at something or someone”, whereas the second school states that they are connotative, so they “do not only point at the designated object, but they also refer to what is denominated” (Estébanez 2002: 92-93 cited in Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2003: 125). Christiane Nord (2003: 183) claims that, even though proper names are mono-referential (referring to a single entity), they are not mono-functional (so they can carry various types of meaning). She also points out that some names may be non-descriptive, but they are still informative, giving us information on the referent such as their gender, geographical origin, or even their age (Nord 2003: 183).

Various potential functions of proper names have been thoroughly examined by Lincoln Fernandes (2006: 46), who explains that names in literary texts often carry a message for the reader because such works operate on two levels of communication: the in-text level, and the above-text level, which is focused on the communication between the author and the reader. It is precisely at the latter level that names convey semantic, social semiotic, and sound symbolic

meanings. The potential of their semantic meaning is often used in allegories, where names sum up characters' personalities, or even contain clues about a character's destiny or the development of the story (Fernandes 2006: 46). An example of such a meaning hidden within one of the names of characters from *Animal Farm* could be found in Snowball the pig, having in mind that a *snowball* is not only "a ball of packed snow", but also "a thing that grows rapidly in size, intensity, or importance". In regard to the social semiotic meaning, names can serve as signs generating various associations, such as historical, religious, class, gender, etc. It is precisely these historical and cultural associations that pose a problem for translators (Fernandes 2006: 46-47). However, if such names have an international character or a counterpart in the TL, they can be transferred quite easily. Such was the case with *Napoleon*, *Benjamin*, and *Moses*, at least in some of the TTs studied. Finally, sound symbolism is defined as "the use of specific sounds or features of sounds in a partly systematic relation to meanings or categories of meaning" (Matthews 1997: 347 cited in Fernandes 2006: 47). There are two main types of sound symbolic meaning. The imitative sound symbolic meaning is related to onomatopoeia and represents sounds that are actually heard, for example, in the name *Squealer*. The other type is the phonoaesthetic meaning, related to the use of phonesthemes: sounds, sound clusters, or sound types directly associated with a certain meaning (Shisler 1997 cited in Fernandes 2006: 47). It can be detected in the name of *Mr Whympet*, which comes from the noun *whimper*, meaning "a whimpering sound", or a whine.

The distinction between various groups of proper names is somewhat different from the translational perspective, since the translator's primary concern is whether a name should be translated or not. As was previously mentioned, social semiotic meaning is relatively easy to deal with in the case of an internationally recognized name, such as *England*, for which other languages have their own counterpart, that is, an exonym. According to Theo Hermans, those names would be included in the category of conventional names, which are "seen as 'unmotivated' and thus as having no 'meaning' of themselves" (1988: 13). The second category is that of loaded names, which are seen as motivated, ranging from "faintly 'suggestive' to overtly 'expressive' names and nicknames", and including "those fictional as well as non-fictional names around which certain

historical or cultural associations have accrued in the context of a particular culture" (ibid.). These are precisely the types of names that appear very often in literary texts. Hermans also points out to the tendency of literary texts to "activate the semantic potential of *all* its constituent elements, on all levels" (ibid.). His observation is confirmed by Irina Kiseleva (2007: 55), who says that names of literary characters tend to be the most expressive and informative elements of a literary work, containing large amounts of implicit information.

A particular literary genre seems to play an especially important role in the choice of procedures for translating names. Elvira Cámara-Aguilera (2009: 55) addresses the issue of translating names in children's literature and focuses only on certain genres – fairy tales and allegories, and Orwell's *Animal Farm* was already categorized as one. Therefore, considering Hermans' classification of names into two groups and the suggested approach to each of them, which is in line with other scholars, such as Göte Klinberg (1986: 43-45 cited in Cámara-Aguilera 2009: 55) and Peter Newmark (1986: 71 cited in Cámara-Aguilera 2009: 57), we may conclude that proper names in allegorical works should be translated, because otherwise part of their function would be suppressed.

Apart from the genre, the text function and type of reader play an extremely important role in the decisions regarding the translation of names (Cámara-Aguilera 2009: 51-52). These two factors are constantly invoked in papers dealing with the translations of children's literature (Cámara-Aguilera 2009; Fernandes 2006; Kapkova 2004). On the other hand, not all of the factors affecting the translator's decisions are external:

The transformation of names in translation [...] is rooted deeply in the cultural background of the translator which includes phonetic and phonological competence, morphological competence, complete understanding of the context, correct attitude to the message, respect for tradition, compliance with the current state of cross-cultural interference of languages, respect for the cultural values and the responsibilities of the translator. The process reaches from an ear for aesthetic sounding to the philosophical motivation of re-naming. (Apostolova 2004)

Most translation scholars (Hermans 1988, Klingberg 1986, Newmark 1988, Nord 2003) focus on the existence or absence of the semantic load in names. In

other words, their primary concern when translating proper names is whether they carry any meaning that ought to be transferred into the TT or not.

However, further elaboration of the idea that loaded names have to be translated and advice or guidelines on how to approach this translational problem are scarce in the literature. This is precisely why Dmitrij Ivanovič Ermolovič (2001) and his work have been so insightful: he gives instructions on solving this issue in particular situations, such as how to transfer names of animals who have been anthropomorphized. Technically, most characters' names from *Animal Farm* would belong to the category of *proper names of animals* (in Russian *zoonimy* and in Croatian *zoonimi*). Simply put, they can be understood as "nicknames of animals" (Ermolovič 2001: 113). Ermolovič's advice on transferring proper names of animals in literary texts is in line with other scholars' opinions and with the distinction between conventional and loaded names. However, when it comes to fairy tales and allegories in which animals have human characteristics, the approach becomes rather different: since their names are, from a linguistic point of view, analogous to human nicknames, they have to be treated as such (Ermolovič 2001: 116-117). In onomastics, a nickname is considered to be a type of anthroponym, an additional name given to a person by others in accordance with the person's characteristics, circumstances in life, or by any other analogy (Podol'skaâ 1978: 115 cited in Ermolovič 2001: 87). Ermolovič suggests that several basic criteria should be applied to the formation of nicknames, such as their dependence on the situation, structure, or a degree of the characterization of the referent (2001: 89). Applying these criteria Ermolovič classifies nicknames into a number of different categories. This categorization is important for Ermolovič's guidelines as the type of nickname determines how the nickname will be transferred to the TT. In other words, the category it belongs to gives the translator additional information on the aspect of the nickname they should focus on to truly grasp the meaning behind it, and successfully convey that meaning to the target audience (Ermolovič 2001: 99).

The next section brings an overview of various taxonomies of procedures for dealing with names, described and/or recommended by scholars who based them on separate studies of different literary texts.

2.5 Procedures for translating proper names and their general orientation

Marta María Gutiérrez Rodríguez (2003: 123) claims that “the translation of proper names shows itself as one of the most complex issues as regards literary translation” because of two specific reasons: “the lack of a specific theory relative to the translation of names and the trends currently in force”. That there is a “lack of a specific theory” becomes evident when we compare other studies dealing with the translation of proper names.

Owing to space restrictions, we will only briefly present the main taxonomies of procedures for rendering names in translation that proved to be useful in compiling a taxonomy used in this research.

Gutiérrez Rodríguez (2003) deals with the problem of translating proper names in the fantasy genre. She opted for the approaches proposed by Newmark and Ballard, taking “transfer”, “naturalization”, and “literal translation” as the three main procedures applied in the translation of proper names. Although she mentions some other possibilities for translating names, such as cultural equivalent, and the inclusion of additional information in notes, she does not include these procedures in her research, but takes only transfer and literal translation as its basis because they are “the most feasible ones” (Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2003: 127)⁶.

Evelina Jaleniauskiene and Vilma Čičelytė (2009), on the other hand, take Eirlys E. Davies’ procedures (preservation, addition, omission, globalization, localization, transformation, and creation) as the foundation for their research into the translation of proper names in children’s literature. Davies applied her taxonomy consisting of seven procedures to analyse the translation of CSIs as a larger category to which proper names belong. Based on Davies’ classification, these authors propose their own, consisting of three translation procedures found to be applied in their corpus:

preservation (when proper names are left without any changes or translated directly), localization (when proper names are adapted phonologically, morphologically or gender endings added) and transformation and creation (when

⁶ Gutiérrez Rodríguez distinguishes one more procedure, which she only explains, but does not name. The procedure coincides with what Hermans calls “substitution”.

proper names have vivid modifications or equivalents in Lithuanian). Since there is no clear distinction between transformation and creation, these two strategies are analysed as one category. Examples of addition, omission and globalization have not been found. (Jaleniauskiene and Čičelytė 2009: 33)

Vanda Mikšić and Barbara Vodanović (2019) base their research on literary anthroponymy in Raymond Queneau's novel *The Blue Flowers* on six basic procedures for translating names developed by Ballard. While they do acknowledge the existence of some other procedures, such as omission, extratextual explanation, intratextual expansion, pronominalization and the like, these are not in the focus of their research, and as such are not included in the analysis. The six basic procedures are: transfer, transcription and transliteration, phonetic and/or orthographic assimilation, literal translation, different identification (which is basically a cultural equivalent), and sound games and ludic translation (Ballard 2001 cited in Mikšić and Vodanović 2019: 121).

One of the more elaborate classifications of procedures for translating proper names is certainly the one used by Silvija Matijašćić (2015: 35). Matijašćić studies translation of CSIs in general and starts her research with Franco Aixelá's classification of CSIs into two large groups: proper nouns and common expressions. Therefore, following in Franco Aixelá's footsteps Matijašćić introduces two sets of procedures for translating each of those categories. The procedures intended for proper names were taken from Veselica Majhut (2009: 28). Originally, there were nine strategies developed by Veselica Majhut (2009 cited in Matijašćić 2015: 35) for rendering proper names:

1. simple transference
2. transference + classifier
3. transference + explanation in the footnote
4. orthographic adaptation
5. naturalization
6. naturalization + classifier
7. simple omission
8. replacement with another name
9. replacement with another common noun

Matijaščić added three procedures of her own: simple transliteration, transliteration + classifier, and transliteration + explanation in the footnote (Matijaščić 2015: 36). She claims that this was necessary due to the fact that her study is based on “the translation of a ST written in Latin alphabet into a language that uses Cyrillic alphabet”, that is, Russian (Matijaščić 2015: 37) The relevance of Matijaščić’s classification for this research lies primarily in the fact that both studies use Russian translations as part of their corpora.

Among Russian translation scholars dealing with different ways of translating proper names we should mention Ermolovič again, who developed six possible procedures for transferring proper names: direct transfer, onomastic matching, translation with a commentary, explanatory translation, descriptive translation, and transformative translation (2001: 35-36).

The last taxonomy of procedures presented here was created by Hermans and modified by Fernandes. This taxonomy served as the basis for our research, with a few changes and adaptations. Hermans describes in detail the four ways of transferring proper names into TLs:

They can be *copied*, i.e. reproduced in the target text exactly as they were in the source text. They can be *transcribed*, i.e. transliterated or adapted on the level of spelling, phonology, etc. A formally unrelated name can be *substituted* in the target text for any given name in the source text [...] And insofar as a proper name in a source text is enmeshed in the lexicon of that language and acquires ‘meaning’, it can be *translated*. Combinations of these four modes of transfer are possible, as a proper name may, for example, be copied or transcribed *and* in addition translated in a (translator’s) footnote. (Hermans 1988: 13)

The ten procedures developed by Fernandes (2006: 50-55) build on the four basic procedures presented by Hermans. Thus, Fernandes proposes the following procedures:

1. rendition (corresponds to Hermans’ procedure of translation)
2. copy
3. transcription
4. substitution

5. recreation (recreating an invented name from the ST into the TT, trying to reproduce similar effects)
6. deletion
7. addition (more information added to the original name)
8. transposition (replacement of one word class with another without changing the meaning of the original message)
9. phonological replacement (a TT name attempts to mimic phonological features of a ST name)
10. conventionality (a TL name is conventionally accepted as the translation of a particular SL name)

Two of the ten listed procedures need further explanation, as Fernandes' understanding of these procedures differs from how we understand them in the present study. First, the procedure of *substitution* is used in this research in the way Hermans (1988: 13) defines it, i.e. as the use of any name in the TT for any given name in the ST.⁷ Hermans provides the example of "Verbrugge" being substituted for "Dipanon" in the novel *Max Havelaar*, pointing out that "the reason for this particular choice of substitute is unclear, except that 'Dipanon' presumably sounds more like a French name" (Hermans 1988: 20).

The second procedure that might cause confusion due to its label is *transcription*. Hermans defines it as transliteration or adaptation on the level of spelling, phonology, etc. (1988: 13). Fernandes notes that this procedure corresponds to the definition provided by Aubert, who uses transcription as a synonym for transliteration (2006: 51). In this paper, however, the distinction between the two terms does exist, which is in line with other authors and their procedures (cf. Matijašćić 2015). Therefore, "transcription" is understood here as the "reproduction of the word original sound by the apparatus of a recipient language" (Vakulenko 2015: 36). "Transliteration" is, on the other hand, defined as the "substitution of letters of a certain writing by the letters of another writing

⁷ Fernandes (2006: 52) slightly narrows "substitution" and defines it as a procedure in which "the TL name and the SL name exist in their respective referential worlds, but are not related to each other in terms of form and/or semantic significance".

independently of their pronunciation" (Bilodid et al. 1970-1980: 230 cited in Vakulenko 2015: 36).

Even though transcription and transliteration are understood as two different phenomena, they are, for the purposes of this study, put under the same category labeled *adaptation*. Adaptation still relies on Hermans' definition of the category of transcription, meaning it encompasses all sorts of changes made to the proper name on the level of phonology, morphology, grammar, etc. to conform to the TL system (Fernandes 2006: 51). Although in translation studies the term "adaptation" usually has a broader meaning, we use it here to denote a procedure which includes both transcription and transliteration. This merging of transcription and transliteration into a single procedure was seen as optimal for yet another reason: with some of the names of characters (in Russian translations) it can be difficult to distinguish between transcription and transliteration, since the name would have the same form in both cases, such as *Боксер* (Bokser) in the translations by Polock (RussRTr1) and Pribylovskij (RussRTr2).

Table 1 Taxonomy of procedures applied for rendering proper names used in the study

Procedure	Author(s) from whom the procedure is borrowed and/or adapted	Example	Target text
copy	Hermans	<i>Snowball</i> → <i>Snowball</i>	CroFTr
copy + explanation in a footnote	Hermans; Veselica Majhut	<i>Squealer</i> → <i>Squealer</i> Footnote text: "(eng.) skvičalo; izdajica, cinkaroš" (English: squealer, traitor, rat) (Orwell 2018: 19)	CroRTr1
adaptation	Hermans	<i>Snowball</i> → <i>Сноуболл</i> (Snouboll)	RussRTr1
adaptation + explanation in a footnote	Hermans; Matijaščić	<i>John Bull</i> → "Джон Буль" (Džon Bul') Footnote text: "Džon Bul': John Bull —	RussRTr2

		nazvanje periodičeskogo izdaniâ – ot naricatel'nogo Džon Bull" – tipičnyj angličanin, prostovatyj fermer v pamflete Dž. Arbetnota (John Arbuthnot, 1667-1735)" (the name of a periodical – from the eponymous character John Bull – a typical Englishman, a simple farmer in a pamphlet by J. Arbuthnot (Oruèll 1992)	
substitution	Hermans	<i>Bluebell</i> → <i>Белка</i> (Belka)	RussFTr
translation	Hermans	<i>News of the World</i> → "Svjetske novosti"	CroFTr
conventionality	Fernandes	<i>England</i> → <i>Engleska</i>	CroFTr
replacement with a common noun/expression	Veselica Majhut	<i>News of the World</i> → <i>газета</i> (gazeta 'newspaper')	RussFTr
deletion	Fernandes	<i>Clementine</i> → ∅	CroFTr
addition + copy	Fernandes	<i>John Bull</i> → časopis <i>John Bull</i> 'the John Bull periodical'	CroRTr1
addition + adaptation	Fernandes	<i>News of the World</i> → газета "Ньюс оф зе уорлд" (gazeta "N'ûs of ze uorld" 'News of the World newspaper')	RussRTr3
addition + translation	Fernandes	<i>Farmer and Stockbreeder</i> → časopis <i>Farmer i stočar</i> 'the Farmer and Stockbreeder magazine'	CroRTr1

Based on the previous classifications and the issues arising from some of them, as well as the research conducted on the six translations of *Animal Farm* for the purposes of this paper, twelve procedures have been identified, relying mostly on Hermans' and Fernandes' taxonomies, with some procedures borrowed and adapted from Matijaščić (2015) and Veselica Majhut (2009). The procedures are listed and illustrated with examples of their use in Table 1.

Several remarks should be made regarding the procedures presented in Table 1. First of all, even though copying is defined as a reproduction of the name in the TT exactly as it appears in the ST, it still includes a change of pronunciation (Nord 2003: 185; Ermolovič 2001: 19). This means that "there is always a certain degree of at least phonological adaptation included in rendering proper nouns in the target text" (Čačija and Marković 2018: 203).

The procedure called *translation* should also be explained further, as it might cause confusion regarding a wide range of phenomena the term "translation" refers to. Hermans notes that a proper name from a ST can be translated if it is "enmeshed in the lexicon of that language and acquires 'meaning'" (1988: 13). This paper relies primarily on his definition of the translation procedure, which is more inclusive than those of some other theorists, who write only of "literal translation" (such as Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2003, and Mikšić and Vodanović 2019). An example of this procedure, which echoes the wider definition adopted in this research, can be found in RussRTr2, where *Foxwood* is translated as *Плутни* (Plutni), which in Russian colloquially refers to "dodgy, fraudulent tricks"⁸. The translator of RussRTr2 here does not rely on the literal translation of the entire item, but on the secondary meaning of its first component: "fox" as "a cunning or sly person". Thus, she deliberately accentuates the dishonesty that prevails on Mr Pilkington's farm, as well as his own corruptness.

The frequency of the use of certain procedures can give us information on the general orientation of a particular TT. The main text orientations rely on the domestication – foreignization dichotomy, as elaborated by Lawrence Venuti. He defines the domesticating method as "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to dominant cultural values", whereas foreignization implies an

⁸ The definition is taken from Gramota.ru (2020).

“ethnodeviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text” (Venuti 2004: 81). In other words, domestication “entails translating in a transparent, fluent, ‘invisible’ style in order to minimize the foreignness of the TT”, moving the author toward the reader (Munday 2016: 225). On the other hand, foreignization is “achieved by a non-fluent, estranging or heterogeneous translation style designed to make visible the presence of the translator and to highlight the foreign identity of the ST”; it moves the reader toward the writer (Munday 2016: 226).

However, based on Veselica Majhut’s research (2012: 82-83, 2020: 101-106), the possibility of a third target-text orientation is included in this paper: neutralization. The exoticizing, assimilating and neutralizing text-level orientations she distinguishes are “related to the presence of culture-specific content in a TT”, meaning that in the situations where a CSI is omitted from the TT or replaced with a common expression, it is not possible to force the applied procedures into a two-pole approach (Veselica Majhut 2012: 83). Apart from neutralization, another aspect of Veselica Majhut’s classification adopted for the purposes of this research is the criterion of “informativity” of a certain procedure, which is “related to the level of relevant information on the SC elements present in the TT” (Veselica Majhut 2012: 83). The introduction of this criterion is based on the idea of offering a “clear distinction between the simple exoticizing preservation of CSIs and the provision of information on these elements”, so that procedures that retain a CSI and provide additional information are not regarded as more assimilating, that is domesticating, than the procedures that simply retain the item (Veselica Majhut 2012: 83).

In order to reach conclusions about the general orientation of the TTs studied in this paper, it is necessary to classify the twelve procedures according to their contribution to text orientation.

The procedure of copying undoubtedly emphasizes the foreignness in the TT, which means that it is closer to the pole of foreignization. The same goes for adaptation, though not all scholars would agree with this interpretation. However, Franco Aixelá, who calls this procedure *orthographic adaptation* (1996: 61), as well as Jaleniauskienė and Čičelytė, who opted for the term *localization* (2009: 33), agree that the effect this procedure has is much closer to

foreignization than to domestication. We accepted Franco Aixelá's view because adaptation still retains the foreign character of the name, even though its spelling is adapted to the TL system. This, in turn, means that, of the twelve procedures identified in this research, copying and adaptation are seen both as foreignizing and non-informative procedures, since they provide no additional information on a CSI.

At the opposing end of the pole, there are three non-informative procedures that belong to the strategy of domestication: substitution, translation, and conventionality. Conventionality, in a way, speaks for itself: if a proper noun from the ST is substituted for its equivalent in the TT, such as *England* for *Engleska* in Croatian, or *Англия (Angliâ)* in Russian, it is clearly an attempt to bring the translation closer to the reader, that is, to domesticate it. Further, some scholars see substitution as a procedure of domesticating orientation as well. A procedure called *translation*, however, poses a problem, since there are different views on the orientation it supports. The main problem arises from the fact that the authors who believe that translation is a foreignizing procedure (Franco Aixelá 1996: 61-62 and Jaleniauskienė and Čičelytė 2009: 33) do not examine the translation of proper names but deal with the translation of CSIs as a much broader category, and include common nouns in their research as well. Moreover, this procedure tends to be referred to as "literal translation" (Veselica Majhut 2009: 23). Literal translations of CSIs can still be taken as an attempt at introducing unknown or little-known items from SC, and familiarizing the target audience with them. Nevertheless, literal translations sometimes reveal very little to the reader if they are not explained further with the help of in-text additions or footnotes and the like. On the other hand, Biljana Vidiček, whose research is focused on the translation of proper names, claims that this procedure brings the author closer to the reader (2016: 7). It seems that her reasons for why *translation* is to be treated as a domesticating procedure are rooted in some of the theories by Klinberg and Newmark: if translators do not translate a loaded name, they would clearly be violating the functionality of the story (Vidiček 2016: 7). Therefore, the translator's task is to preserve the meaning of the name, and bring it close enough to the target audience to convey the hidden message, which can only be achieved if the name is domesticated (at least to a degree).

The two procedures belonging to the neutralizing text-level orientation are deletion and replacement with a common noun/expression (or, omission and globalization, as Jaleniauskienė and Čičelytė call them). In binary approaches, these two procedures are treated as belonging to the domesticating pole because they have the effect of “easier accessibility of a TT segment for TT readers” (Veselica Majhut 2012: 83). However, they completely erase any cultural embeddedness of the TT, i.e. “they do not contribute to the introduction of TC traits or values in a TT, but rather to the neutralization of all cultural markers” (Veselica Majhut 2012: 83). From this it can be concluded that the criterion of informativity is not present in these procedures, as there is no SC element about which additional information could be provided.

The last five procedures are regarded as informative, since they all contain extra information on CSIs that is not included in the ST. The first two are *copy + explanation in a footnote*, and *adaptation + explanation in a footnote*⁹. The other three procedures can be listed under the umbrella term of *addition*, though addition always comes in combination with another procedure. Despite the fact that addition as a procedure was adopted from Fernandes’ taxonomy, his explanation of it remains quite scant (2006: 54). On the other hand, Jaleniauskienė and Čičelytė’s (2009: 33) view of addition is rather broad: they understand addition as keeping the original item, i.e. copying it, but adding information about it, both within and outside the main body of the text. In this paper, we distinguish various combinations of other procedures and addition, taking each of those combinations as a separate procedure. This approach rests on the premise that the other procedure combined with addition may shift the orientation of the entire “addition + x” procedure towards either the foreignizing or domesticating pole. Thus, based on the orientation the other procedure in the combination supports, we suggest the following classification: addition + copy, and addition + adaptation belong to the category of foreignizing procedures, whereas addition + translation leans more towards the domesticating orientation. In other words, the first two procedures retain the foreign character

⁹ They correspond to Franco Aixelá’s procedure called *extratextual gloss*, which combines retention (analogous to Hermans’ copy), orthographic adaption (the equivalent of adaption as understood in this thesis) or linguistic (non-cultural) translation, with an explanation (usually given in a footnote, endnote, glossary, etc.) (1996: 62).

of the CSI, despite the attempt to make it at least a bit more easily accessible to the target audience. On the other hand, with “addition + translation” the CSI is translated, but, as it still might not be understandable enough, the translator also includes an explanation that disrupts the reader’s attention as little as possible.

To conclude, Table 2 presents the classification of the procedures for rendering proper names with regard to their contribution to the main strategy of the TT and the level of informativity.

Table 2 Taxonomy of procedures applied for rendering proper names according to their main strategy and level of informativity

	Foreignizing procedures	Neutralizing procedures	Domesticating procedures
non-informative procedures	copy	deletion	substitution
	adaptation	replacement with a common noun/expression	translation
			conventionality
informative procedures	copy + explanation in a footnote		addition + translation
	adaptation + explanation in a footnote		
	addition + copy		
	addition + adaptation		

3. Aims and hypotheses

3.1 Aims of the study

The aim of this research is to determine what procedures for rendering proper names were applied in the two Croatian and four Russian translations of *Animal Farm*. More precisely, the aim is to establish how frequently particular procedures are used, which, in turn, affects the general target-text orientation. Furthermore, the idea is to compare the use of procedures and the overall orientation in the translations into the same TL, with a special emphasis on how

these approaches changed over time. Finally, this paper will also explore the dissimilarities in the use of certain procedures and target-text orientations between the two target languages, Croatian and Russian.

3.2 Hypotheses

In accordance with the aims of this research, four predictive hypotheses have been developed:

- H1: The differences in the choice of procedures for rendering proper names and text orientations are more pronounced among the Russian translations from different periods than between the two Croatian translations.
- H2: There is no major difference in the choice of procedures for rendering proper names and text orientations between the two Croatian translations.
- H3: Both Croatian translations are more foreignizing than any of the Russian translations.
- H4: Older Russian translations are closer to the strategy of domestication.

Due to the reasons that will be discussed later regarding H3, and also because of the fact that there are many more Russian than Croatian retranslations, H1 predicts that the Croatian TTs will exhibit a relatively unvaried approach. At the same time, we predict that in the Russian TTs the employment of a wide range of procedures will be observed. H2 was developed taking into account a few studies on Croatian translations of different literary works (cf. Schmidt 2013, Matijaščić 2015). H3 is concerned only with the two Croatian TTs. Even though Croatian translations were published 35 years apart and in different political systems and countries, the RTr by Furlan Zaborac is not expected to differ considerably from the FTr, which has had many reprints, and has become canonized. In addition, some previous studies conducted on other literary works have shown that the Croatian language tolerates foreign names quite well, and often leaves them unchanged (Schmidt 2013, Matijaščić 2015). Finally, H4 pertains only to the Russian translations. The idea is that, due to the book's

political purpose and Struve's intention to open the eyes of his countrymen to the horrors of the Soviet regime, the translators of the RussFTr, Kriger and Struve, might have tried to domesticate the novella as much as possible to bring it closer to the target audience. It was also assumed that the translator of RussRTr1 did not diverge much from the main strategy applied in the RussFTr, and that the change in the orientation of the Russian TTs is gradual.

4. Methodology

4.1 Corpus

The reasons behind the choice of each of the six translations used for the purposes of this research were already discussed in detail in sections 2.2. and 2.3. To sum up, the study of the Croatian translations is based on the only two existing translations into Croatian, though the editions used here are reprints. On the other hand, when it comes to Russian translations, there are many of them, but the four selected for this research are considered interesting because of the place and/or year of their publication.¹⁰

The corpus of the TTs used in this study is presented in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3 Croatian corpus of target texts analysed

Title	Year of publication	Translator
<i>Životinjska farma: bajka</i> (CroFTr)	1974/1983	Vladimir Roksandić
<i>Životinjska farma: bajka</i> (CroRTr1)	2009/2018	Lada Furlan Zaborac

Table 4 Russian corpus of target texts analysed

Title	Year of publication	Translator
<i>Skotskij Hutor</i> (<i>Скотский Хутор</i>) (RussFTr)	1950	Mariâ Kriger and Gleb Struve

¹⁰ All Russian translations were taken from <https://orwell.ru/>, whereas Polock's and Pribylovskij's translations can also be found on <http://www.lib.ru/> (Maksim Moshkow's Library), which is the oldest electronic library in the Russian Internet segment.

<i>Skotnyj dvor</i> (Скотный двор) (RussRTr1)	1988	Ilan Polock
<i>Skotnyj dvor: Skazka</i> (Скотный двор: Сказка) (RussTr2)	1992	Larisa Georgievna Bespalova
<i>Zverskaâ Ferma: Skazka</i> (Зверская Ферма: Сказка) (RussRTr3)	2002	Vladimir Pribylovskij

4.2 Methods of data extraction and analysis

First, all the proper names in the ST were marked, regardless of their referent. After that, each of the six TTs was read side by side with the ST, and all the renderings of the said proper names were marked in the TTs as well. Next, all the data were entered into tables, and the proper names classified into categories depending on their referents. Then the renderings were paired with ST proper names, and the applied translation procedures were identified for each pair. Based on the procedures used, the general orientation of each TT was determined. Finally, translations into the same TL were compared according to the applied procedures, and on the basis of the frequency of their use, the main strategy of domestication, foreignization or neutralization was established, to be followed by a comparison of the given results between the Croatian and Russian translations. Of all the proper names detected in the ST, 48 names were thoroughly analysed.¹¹

As we explained in section 2.5, twelve different procedures for rendering proper names have been identified in the six TTs. The basis for the chosen procedures, and their classification according to the text-level orientation, as well as the presence of the criterion of informativity are explained in detail in 2.5.¹² The taxonomy of procedures used in this paper is presented in Table 1.

¹¹ This study is a revised version of a larger scale research conducted for an M.A. thesis. Having in mind space restrictions, we will here present just part of the findings related to the quantitative data obtained.

¹² It should be noted that combinations of the main procedures were found as well, such as translation + copy in the Croatian TTs, and translation + adaptation in the Russian TTs. However, they were not listed as separate procedures because they were employed only when there was a combination of a common noun and a proper name, such as Mr Jones, where Mr was translated

5. Findings

We will now present the quantitative data on the use of procedures to render proper names in the six TTs.

Table 5 Quantitative data on the number of procedures used to render proper names in all six target texts

TT	CroFTr	CroRTr1	RussFTr	RussRTr1	RussRTr2	RussRTr3
Total number of items	48	48	48	48	48	48
Number of different procedures employed	4	6	8	5	7	5

As we can see from the data presented in Table 5, the CroFTr shows the least variation in the number of procedures applied in the text (4), whereas the RussFTr exhibits the most (8). When we compare the Croatian TTs we can observe that there is no substantial difference in the range of procedures applied. However, in the RussFTr and RussRTr2 a larger number of various procedures is applied than in RussRTr1 and RussRTr3.

Table 6 Quantitative data on the procedures used to render proper names in all target texts

Procedure	CroFTr	CroRTr1	RussFTr	RussRTr1	RussRTr2	RussRTr3
copy	27 (56.2%)	20 (41.7%)	0	0	0	0
copy + explanation in a footnote	0	4 (8.3%)	0	0	0	0
adaptation	0	0	10 (20.8%)	28 (58.3%)	7 (14.6%)	24 (50%)
adaptation + explanation in a footnote	0	0	0	0	4 (8.3%)	0
substitution	0	0	3 (6.2%)	0	11 (22.9%)	0

into "gospodin" in Croatian and "г-н/фермер/мистер" (g-n/fermer/mister) in Russian, and Jones was simply copied or adapted.

translation	18 (37.5%)	16 (33.3%)	24 (50%)	17 (35.4%)	20 (41.7%)	19 (39.6%)
conventionality	1 (2.1%)	1 (2.1%)	5 (10.4%)	1 (2.1%)	4 (8.3%)	3 (6.2%)
replacement with a common noun/expression	0	0	1 (2.1%)	1 (2.1%)	1 (2.1%)	0
deletion	2 (4.2%)	0	1 (2.1%)	0	0	0
addition + copy	0	6 (12.5%)	0	0	0	0
addition + adaptation	0	0	1 (2.1%)	0	0	1 (2.1%)
addition + translation	0	1 (2.1%)	3 (6.3%)	1 (2.1%)	1 (2.1%)	1 (2.1%)

Table 6 shows that both in the CroFTr and CroRTr1 the same procedures were employed: copy, translation, and conventionality, and their application is not very different, especially given the fact that two of the other three procedures employed only in CroRTr1 are also based on copy in combination with either explanation in a footnote or addition. In all four Russian TTs four procedures are employed: adaptation, translation, conventionality, and addition + translation.

Table 7 Quantitative data on the proportion of domesticating, foreignizing and neutralizing procedures in target texts

Orientation	CroFTr	CroRTr1	RussFTr	RussRTr1	RussRTr2	RussRTr3
Domesticating procedures	39.6%	37.5%	72.9%	39.6%	75%	47.9%
Foreignizing procedures	56.2%	62.5%	22.9%	58.3%	22.9%	52.1%
Neutralizing procedures	4.2%	0	4.2%	2.1%	2.1%	0

We can see in Table 7 that in both Croatian TTs foreignizing procedures for rendering proper names are used more frequently than domesticating (in the CroFTr they account for 56.2%, and in CroRTr1 for 62.5% of all procedures

applied). Therefore, we may observe a tendency of slight growth in the use of foreignizing procedures in CroRTr1. On the other hand, in the RussFTr and RussRTr2 domesticating procedures are used more frequently (72.9% and 75%, respectively) than foreignizing procedures, while RussRTr1 and RussRTr3 show a tendency to employ more often foreignizing procedures (RussRTr1 58.3%; RussRTr3 52.1%). Even though foreignizing procedures prevail in both RussRTr1 and RussRTr3, their proportion of use does not indicate an important dominance. In addition to exhibiting foreignization as the main strategy, RussRTr1 and RussRTr3 also share the same number of different procedures applied throughout the text.

In Table 8 we will present the data on the proportion of the use of informative and non-informative procedures. As we have pointed out in 2.5, the criterion of informativity is not applied to neutralizing procedures. That is the reason why in Table 8 we do not present the data on the proportion of their use.

Table 8 Quantitative data on the proportion of informative and non-informative procedures in target texts

Orientation	CroFTr	CroRTr1	RussFTr	RussRTr1	RussRTr2	RussRTr3
Informative domesticating procedures	0	2.1%	6.2%	2.1%	2.1%	2.1%
Non-informative domesticating procedures	39.6%	35.4%	66.7%	37.5%	72.9%	45.8%
Informative foreignizing procedures	0	20.8%	2.1%	0	8.3%	2.1%
Non-informative foreignizing procedures	56.2%	41.7%	20.8%	58.3%	14.6%	50%

We can see in Table 8 that in all TTs non-informative procedures are preferred. The differences observed are related to the choice of domesticating or foreignizing procedures discussed above and not to the choice between informative or non-informative procedures.

6. Conclusion

The selected proper names appearing in George Orwell's *Animal Farm* are rendered into the Croatian and Russian TTs with the help of 12 different

procedures in total, though none of the translations apply all of them. The reason for this primarily lies in the fact that this study deals with an ST written in Latin alphabet, while one TL, Russian, uses the Cyrillic alphabet. This makes it impossible for the Russian TTs to apply copy or any of the procedures that have copy in their combination, unless the translators transferred the name directly in its original form. Of the four hypotheses presented in 3.2., only two have been confirmed (H1 and H3). The differences among the Russian translations in the use of procedures and text orientations are more pronounced than between the Croatian translations, which is evident from the fact that there is a huge discrepancy in the number of employed procedures in the Russian translations: in RussRTr1 and RussRTr3 only five diverse procedures are used, whereas in RussRTr2 and in the RussFTr seven and eight different procedures are used. Apart from that, the four Russian TTs also differ in text orientation, that is, the main strategy applied throughout the TT. While the RussFTr and RussRTr2 are undoubtedly domesticating, RussRTr1 and RussRTr3 show an inclination towards the foreignizing strategy, though the proportion of the use of foreignizing procedures in both TTs is not strikingly similar (H1 confirmed). As pointed out above, H2 was also confirmed. The overall number of procedures employed in the CroFTr and CroRTr1 are presented in Table 5, but the more specific distinctions show that, in spite of the slight contrasts in the procedures employed for rendering proper names, the CroFTr and CroRTr1 remain very similar, and share the same main strategy of foreignization.

In H3 it was hypothesized that both Croatian translations would be more foreignizing than any of the Russian translations. Based solely on the data obtained for the frequency of the use of procedures for rendering proper names, RussRTr1 has a slightly higher percentage of foreignizing procedures than the CroFTr (58.3% > 56.2%), which means that H3 was not confirmed.

Finally, the results show that the prevailing strategy in the Russian TTs does change with time, but the change is not consistent, meaning that, in this case, the later translations are not necessarily more foreignizing than the older translation, and this is supported by the fact that RussRTr2 is more domesticating than the RussFTr, and RussRTr1 more foreignizing than RussRTr3 (H4 not confirmed).

To sum up, Croatian translations of Orwell's *Animal Farm* tend to be more foreignizing when it comes to the rendering of proper names, whereas the main strategy used in the Russian translations varies, and we could not provide an answer as to why it is so without expanding our research to include investigation of the broader context in which these translations were produced. It should also be taken into account that this research is based on a specific group of CSIs: proper names. Notwithstanding their importance for the general text orientation, they are not the only factor determining it. Nevertheless, this study has provided a lot of material for further research. First, it could be expanded to encompass other groups of CSIs. We should also be aware that our corpus is too small to generalize about tendencies in Russian translations. In further research we should include more of them, especially other translations from the same translators, such as Bepalova and Pribylovskij. The sociocultural and political context undoubtedly played a great role in the publication of all these translations, particularly the Russian ones, so it would definitely prove beneficial to research the cultural context, and not focus exclusively on the linguistic issues at hand.

When it comes to expanding the corpora of Croatian translations of *Animal Farm*, we suggest that in order to get an insight into the reception of the translation of *Animal Farm* in Croatia translations into other Yugoslav languages be included, particularly the early Serbian translation from 1955, which was published only ten years after the original, and five years after the first Russian translation. The idea for this comes from the fact that in the former Yugoslavia the policy of publishing houses was to distribute books in all republics, irrespective of where the publisher was located and which language was used in the book.

Further, similar research could be conducted on other allegories with a view to further researching the influence that the affiliation with this genre has on the rendering of proper names. Finally, considering the literary impact of this book, as well as its political background, it would be interesting to compare various translations published in different time periods in (former) communist countries.

References

Primary sources

English source texts

Orwell, George. 1951. *Animal Farm: a fairy story*. London: Penguin Books in association with Martin Secker and Warburg.

Orwell, George. 2019. *Animal Farm*. [ebook] Global Grey. URL: <https://www.globalgreybooks.com/animal-farm-ebook.html>. Accessed on: 25 April 2020].

Croatian translations

Orwell, George. 1974. *Životinjska farma: bajka* [translated by Vladimir Roksandić]. Zagreb: Naprijed = Orwell, George. 1983. *Životinjska farma: bajka* [translated by Vladimir Roksandić]. Zagreb: "August Cesarec". (CroFTr)

Orwell, George. 2009/2018. *Životinjska farma: bajka*. Koprivnica: Šareni dućan [translated by Lada Furlan Zaborac]. (CroRTr1)

Russian translations

Orwell, Georg. 1950. *Skotskij Hutor* [translated by Mariâ Kriger and Gleb Struve]. Frankfurt: Posev. URL: https://orwell.ru/library/novels/Animal_Farm/russian/rsh_mkgs. Accessed on: 20 September 2020. (RussFTr)

Orwell, Džordž. 1988. *Skotnyj dvor* [translated by Ilan Polock]. Riga: Rodnik. URL: https://orwell.ru/library/novels/Animal_Farm/russian/rsd_ip. Accessed on: 1 October 2020. (RussRTr1)

Orwell, Džordž. 1992. *Skotnyj dvor: Skazka*. [translated by Larisa Georgievna Bepalova]. Moskva: Arena. URL: https://orwell.ru/library/novels/Animal_Farm/russian/rsd_lb. Accessed on: 10 October 2020. (RussRTr2)

Orwell, Džordž. 2002. *Zverskaâ Ferma: Skazka* [translated by Vladimir Pribylovskij]. Moskva: Panorama. URL:

https://orwell.ru/library/novels/Animal_Farm/russian/rzf_vp. Accessed on: 20 October 2020]. (RussRTr3)

Secondary sources

Aixelá, Javier Franco. 1996. "Culture-specific Items in Translation". In: Álvarez, R. and M. Carmen-África Vidal (eds.), *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 52-78.

Apostolova, Gergana. 2004. *Names and The Translation*. [online] Liternet.bg. URL: <https://liternet.bg/publish10/gapostolova/names.htm>. Accessed on: 15 April 2020.

Bespalova, Larisa Georgievna. 2001. *Skotnyj dvor: skazka*. [online] George Orwell's Library. URL: https://orwell.ru/library/novels/Animal_Farm/russian/rsd_lb. Accessed on: 25 April 2020.

Cámara-Aguilera, Elvira. 2009. "The Translation of Proper Names in Children's Literature". *Anuario de investigación en literatura infantil y juvenil: ANILIJ* 7(1). 47–61. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237602003_The_Translation_of_Proper_Names_in_Children%27s_Literature. Accessed on: 11 January 2019.

Čačija, Romana and Marković, Mirjana. 2018. "Translating Neologisms and Proper Nouns in Fantasy Fiction for Young Adults." *Strani jezici* 47(4): 197-219. URL: <https://hrcak.srce.hr/225526>. Accessed on: 29 February 2020.

Ermolovič, Dmitrij Ivanovič. 2001. *Imena sobstvennye na styke âzykov i kul'tur: Zaimstvovanie i peredača imen sobstvennyh s točki zreniâ lingvistiki i teorii perevoda*. Moskva: «R.Valent»

Fernandes, Lincoln. 2006. "Translation of Names in Children's Fantasy Literature: Bringing the Young Reader into Play". *New Voices in Translation Studies* 2: 44-57. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237246131_Translation_of_Names_in_Children's_Fantasy_Literature_Bringing_the_Young_Reader_into_Play_i. Accessed on: 3 August 2019.

Gramota.ru. 2020. <http://gramota.ru/>.

Gutiérrez Rodríguez, Marta María. 2003. "The problem of the translation of proper names in 'Harry Potter' and 'The Lord of the Rings'". *ES: Revista de filología inglesa* 25: 123-136. URL: <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/974490.pdf>. Accessed on: 7 April 2020.

- Hermans, Theo. 1988. "On Translating Proper Names, with reference to De Witte and Max Havelaar". In: M. J. Wintle (ed.), *Modern Dutch Studies. Essays in Honour of Professor Peter King on the Occasion of his Retirement*. London/Atlantic Highlands: The Athlone Press. 1-24.
- Iivainen, Leevi. 1960. "The Rendering of English Proper Names in Russian". *The Slavonic and East European Review* 39(92): 137-147. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4205222?seq=1>. Accessed on: 7 March 2020.
- Jaleniauskiene, Evelina and Čičelytė, Vilma. 2009. "The Strategies for Translating Proper Names in Children's Literature". *Studies About Languages* 15: 31-42. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228653802_The_Strategies_for_Translating_Proper_Names_in_Children's_Literature. Accessed on: 12 January 2019.
- Kapkova, Svetlana Ūr'evna. 2004. "Perevod ličnyh imen i realij v proizvedenii Dž. Roling Garri Potter i Tajnaâ komnata". VGU, Lingvistika i mežkul'turnaâ komunikaciâ 1. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/perevod-lichnyh-imen-i-realiy-v-proizvedenii-dzh-roling-garri-potter-i-taynaya-komnata>. Accessed on: 10 January 2019.
- Karp, Masha. 2017. *Orwell in Translation*. [online] European studies blog. URL: <https://blogs.bl.uk/european/2017/11/orwell-in-translation.html>. Accessed on: 26 April 2020.
- Kiebusinski, Ksenya. 2017. "Not Lost in Translation: Orwell's 'Animal Farm' among Refugees and beyond the Iron Curtain". *The Halcyon* 59: 3-6. URL: https://www.academia.edu/34832860/Not_Lost_in_Translation_Orwells_Animal_Farm_among_Refugees_and_beyond_the_Iron_Curtain?auto=download. Accessed on: 24 March 2020.
- Kiseleva, Irina Anatol'evna. 2007. "Osobennosti perevoda literatury žanra fèntezi". SpbGU 9(1(2)). URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/osobennosti-perevoda-literatury-zhanra-fentezi-1>. Accessed on: 29 March 2020.
- Letemendia, Veronica Claire. 1994. "Revolution of Animal Farm: Orwell's Neglected Commentary." *Journal of Modern Literature* 18(1): 127-137. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3831551>. Accessed on: 24 March 2020.
- Matijaščić, Silvija. 2015. "Treatment of Culture-Specific Items in the Croatian and Russian Translations of 'The Maltese Falcon'". *Hieronymus* 2: 27-55. URL: http://www.ffzg.unizg.hr/hieronymus/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Hieronymus_2_2015_Matijascic1.pdf. Accessed on: 7 August 2019.

- Meyers, Jeffrey, ed. 2002. *George Orwell: The Critical Heritage*. Taylor and Francis e-Library.
- Meyers, Valerie. 1991. *George Orwell*. Basingstoke and London: Macmillan.
- Mikšić, Vanda and Vodanović, Barbara. 2019. "Književna antroponimija i izazovi prevođenja na primjeru romana Modri cvijetak Raymonda Queneaua." *Književna smotra* 51(194(4)): 119-126. URL: <https://hrcak.srce.hr/233563>. Accessed on: 12 April 2020.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2016. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Narančić Kovač, Smiljana. 2019. Character names in Croatian translations of *Alice in Wonderland*. In: Flegar, Ž. and Moritz, I. (eds.). *Children and Languages Today: First and Second Language Literacy Development*. Wilmington, Delaware; Malaga: Vernon Press. 157-180
- Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Nord, Christiane. 2003. "Proper Names in Translations for Children: *Alice in Wonderland* as a Case in Point". *Meta: Translators' Journal* 48(1-2): 182-196. Available at: https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/bce5/71499b5b1bd6c06ca3988f9f5079a92f9ff1.pdf?_ga=2.99655326.1239053494.1598284361-1356183583.1582979025. Accessed on: 2 May 2020.
- Orwell, George. 1947. *George Orwell's Preface to the Ukrainian Edition of Animal Farm*. [online] The Orwell Foundation. URL: <https://www.orwellfoundation.com/the-orwell-foundation/orwell/books-by-orwell/animal-farm/preface-to-the-ukrainian-edition-of-animal-farm-by-george-orwell/>. Accessed on: 24 April 2020.
- Oxford University Press. 2020. <<https://www.lexico.com/en>>
- Schmidt, Goran. 2013. "Foreignization and domestication in the Croatian translations of Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray*." *Jezikoslovlje* 14(2-3): 537-548. URL: <https://hrcak.srce.hr/112225>. Accessed on: 15 May 2020.
- Vakulenko, Maksym O. 2015. "Practical transcription and transliteration: Eastern-Slavonic view." *Govor* 32(1): 35-56. URL: <https://hrcak.srce.hr/165990>. Accessed on: 26 February 2020.
- Veselica Majhut, Snježana. 2009. *The effect of sociocultural context on the procedures for translating culture-specific items*. Unpublished MA Thesis. Tarragona: Universitat Rovira i Virgili.

- Veselica Majhut, Snježana. 2012. *Cultural specificity in the translation of popular fiction from English into Croatian during the socialist and transition periods (1960-2010)*. Unpublished PhD Thesis Tarragona: Universitat Rovira i Virgili.
- Veselica Majhut, Snježana. 2020. Krčma, gostionica, pub: dijakronijska studija prevođenja kulturno specifičnih referenci u kriminalističkim romanima. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 2001. "Strategies of Translation". In: Baker, M. (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge. 240-244.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 2004. *The translator's invisibility: a history of translation*. London and New York: Routledge
- Vidiček, Biljana. 2016. "Anthroponyms of the fairy tale 'Kako je Potjeh tražio istinu' by Ivana Brljic-Mazuranic and aspects of their translation in target language texts". URL: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/153449749.pdf>. Accessed on: 11 December 2018.