

That's not my name! Translation of proper names in Croatian and Russian translations of George Orwell's *Animal Farm: A Fairy Story*

Lukač, Dora

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2020

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

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:131:594248>

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

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-07-21**



Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Filozofski fakultet
University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities
and Social Sciences

Repository / Repozitorij:

[ODRAZ - open repository of the University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences](#)



University of Zagreb

Faculty of Humanities
and Social Sciences

Department of English

Department of East Slavic
Languages and Literatures

That's not my name!

Translation of proper names in Croatian and Russian translations of George Orwell's

Animal Farm: A Fairy Story

Dora Lukač

Co-supervisor: Nataša Pavlović, PhD

Co-supervisor: Branka Barčot, PhD

Zagreb, September 2020

Table of Contents

Biography	4
Abstract	4
Аннотация	4
Key words	5
Ключевые слова	5
1. Introduction	6
2. Previous research and key concepts	7
2.1. <i>The reception and meaning of Orwell’s Animal Farm</i>	7
2.2. <i>Retranslations and the reasons behind it</i>	9
2.3. <i>The Russian translations of Animal Farm</i>	10
2.4. <i>The Croatian translations of Animal Farm</i>	11
2.5. <i>Proper names as culture-specific items</i>	12
2.6. <i>Procedures for translating proper names and their general orientation</i>	17
3. Aims and hypotheses	28
3.1. <i>Aims</i>	28
3.2. <i>Hypotheses</i>	29
4. Methodology	30
4.1. <i>Material</i>	30
4.2. <i>Procedure</i>	31
5. Findings	33
5.1. <i>Results of the analysis of proper names from the source text</i>	33
5.2. <i>Examples of procedures used in certain categories</i>	37
5.2.1. <i>Anthroponyms</i>	38
5.2.2. <i>Geographical designations and facilities</i>	40
5.2.3. <i>Magazines and newspapers</i>	42
5.2.4. <i>Songs</i>	43
5.2.5. <i>Animal Committees and nicknames for Napoleon</i>	43
5.3. <i>Quantitative analysis</i>	44
5.3.1. <i>Overview of the procedures used in all six translations</i>	44
5.3.2. <i>Detailed quantitative analysis according to each category of items</i>	46
6. Conclusion	51
7. References	54

8. Appendices 60

Biography

I was born on 15 August 1994 in Vinkovci. Having graduated from Gimnazija Matije Antuna Reljkovića Vinkovci, I enrolled in double major programmes of English Language and Literature and Russian Language and Literature at the University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. I earned my bachelor's degree in 2017, and in the same year I started master's degree programmes (specializing in translation). From June until October 2018 I participated in the USA Work and Travel cultural exchange programme, during which I used most of that time to work on Cape Cod, Massachusetts. The summer semester of the academic year 2018/2019 I spent as an exchange student at Tallinn University on an Erasmus+ scholarship. Since October 2019 I have been employed as an in-house translator at Ciklopea.

Abstract

The question of rendering proper names has raised a lot of attention over the years, especially when it comes to the translation of literary texts. The procedures for rendering proper names have been studied mostly in works belonging to the fantasy genre and children's literature. Even though George Orwell's *Animal Farm* belongs to neither of the two categories, it was deemed interesting for a study of this kind because of several reasons. First, it is subtitled *A Fairy Story*, revealing its simplicity in storytelling, and second, it belongs to the subgenre of allegory, which represents an additional challenge to any potential translator. However, the real issue behind this book lies in its political nature and critical attitude towards the Soviet Union, even more so as it was published in 1945, meaning that the political and socio-cultural context influenced its publication and reception to a great extent, especially in the Communist countries. Therefore, this research aims to identify the procedures applied in rendering proper names from *Animal Farm* into two Croatian and four Russian translations, determine the differences among the translations into the same target language, as well as the differences between Croatian and Russian target texts, and, finally, to ascertain the diachronic changes in the general translation orientations by studying translations belonging to different periods.

Аннотация

Проблемой передачи имен собственных занимаются теоретики переводоведения уже много лет, а этот вопрос является особенно интересным, когда речь идет о переводе литературных текстов. Приемы передачи имен собственных исследовались в основном

в произведениях жанра фэнтези и детской литературы. Несмотря на то, что рассказ *Скотный двор* Джорджа Оруэлла не принадлежит ни к одной из этих двух категорий, он был интересным для исследования такого типа по нескольким причинам. Во-первых, подзаголовок этого рассказа – *Сказка*, раскрывает его простоту повествования, а во-вторых, он принадлежит к поджанру аллегории, что представляет собой дополнительную проблему для любого потенциального переводчика. Однако, настоящая проблема, которая стоит за этой книгой, заключается в ее политическом характере и критическом отношении к Советскому Союзу, тем более, потому что она была опубликована в 1945 году. Это значит, что политический и социально-культурный контекст в значительной степени повлияли на ее публикацию и восприятие, особенно в коммунистических странах. Таким образом, данная работа занимается выявлением приемов, применяемых при переводе имен собственных, появляющихся в рассказе *Скотный двор*, в двух хорватских и четырех русских переводах, затем определением различий между переводами на один и тот же целевой язык, а также различий между целевыми текстами на хорватском и русском языках, и, наконец, установлением диахронических изменений в общих направленностях переводов. В этом исследовании изучаются переводы разных периодов: хорватские переводы, опубликованные в 1983 и 2018 году, и русские, опубликованные в 1950, 1988, 1992 и 2002 году.

Key words

Animal Farm, translation, proper names, translation procedures, translation orientation, satire

Ключевые слова

Скотский Хутор, *Скотный двор*, *Зверская Ферма*, перевод, имена собственные, переводческие приемы, направленность перевода, сатира

1. Introduction

George Orwell's *Animal Farm* has attracted a lot of attention ever since the moment 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. His 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 famed glasnost and perestroika (Meyers 1991: 113). This research does not deal with the book's literary or political impact, but approaches it from a translational 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, etc.). However, this literary work was deemed interesting for a study of this kind for several 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 completely correspond to this definition, the subtitle reveals the fact that this 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, a subgenre in which the translation of proper names is encouraged (Newmark 1988: 215). Finally, given its political nature, this research aims to give more information on the diachronic changes in the treatment of a specific category of culture-specific items, which is all the more compelling as the two target languages were spoken in two different communist countries, one of which was directly criticized in the story.

The objective of this paper is to identify the procedures applied in the rendering of proper names into Croatian and Russian as the two target languages in question. It further aims to determine the differences among the translations into the same target language, as well as the differences between Croatian and Russian translations. More specifically, the aim is to ascertain how general translation orientations changed over time by studying target texts belonging to different periods. The study is based on six translations of *Animal Farm*, two of which are Croatian, and the other four Russian. The two Croatian translations were published in 1983 and

¹All definitions of words given in this paper were taken from lexico.com, unless specified otherwise.

2018, respectively, the first translation being published in Croatia while it was still a part of Yugoslavia, and the other long after Croatia had gained independence. The first Russian translation was published much earlier than the rest, in 1950 in Germany, while the time span between the other three is much shorter: the second translation was published in 1988, followed by the third in 1992, and the last in 2002. The first two Russian translations came into existence before the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the third shortly after that key event, and the fourth eleven years later.

2. Previous research and key concepts

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

George Orwell published *Animal Farm*, subtitled *A Fairy Story*, 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 print *Animal Farm*, Orwell was first rejected by his own 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, such as Nicholson & Watson, and Faber & Faber, until finally Seckler & Warburg accepted the manuscript (Kiebusinski 2017: 3-4). The story is set on Manor Farm, an English farm run by the cruel Mr Jones. One night an old boar named Major organizes a meeting at which he talks about the Rebellion and the overthrow of human race, followed by the Republic of the Animals, where one day all animals will be equal, and there will be no hunger or misery, or vile and tyrannical humans to support. The animals jump at the first opportunity to get rid of Jones and establish their rule. The leaders of this new establishment are now pigs, being the cleverest animals on the farm, with Snowball and Napoleon as the most vocal ones. After a while, Snowball is exiled from the farm by Napoleon with the help of nine ferocious dogs, and Napoleon now establishes a different type of rule – the despotic kind. From now on, 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. The story ends with the pigs sitting at the same table as the animals' biggest

enemy – Man, drinking and playing cards, until a row takes place because Napoleon and one of the farmers, Mr Pilkington, accuse each other of cheating.

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, and the pigs are Bolsheviks who led the Revolution; old Major is a combination of Marx and Lenin; Napoleon is, undoubtedly, Stalin, though he also has some features that could be associated with Hitler rather than Stalin; Snowball represents Trotsky, and Squealer embodies the propagandists of the regime. She further explains the meaning some of the other characters carry: Boxer is the decent working man and Clover the motherly working woman; Mollie represents the White Russians who opposed the Revolution and fled the country; dogs are 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 prominent 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).

Orwell himself wrote the preface to the Ukrainian edition of *Animal Farm*, one of the first translations of this book into any language, in which he states the reasons behind writing such a novella. He explains how 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 wrongdoings is meant to be known everywhere in order to avoid repeating their mistakes. Nevertheless, Orwell remained a leftist, not condemning socialism, only the socialist path the Soviet Union decided to take (Orwell 1947; Letemendia 1994: 10). He did not falter even when

he struggled to find a publisher: an offer was made by a right-wing journal *Time and Tide*, which Orwell refused, 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).

After the publication of *Animal Farm*, Orwell attracted 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 the 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. Retranslations and the reasons behind it

The term for “a second or later translation of a single source text into the same target language” is retranslation (Koskinen and Paloposki 2010: 1). Therefore, most of the translations this paper deals with are, in fact, retranslations. In order to understand the occurrence of such a phenomenon, Nike Pokorn (2012 cited in Andraka 2019: 57) lists three possible reasons why retranslations of a certain literary work might be needed: linguistic and stylistic reasons, a controversial translator, or ideologically unacceptable paragraphs². The explanation of these reasons to a certain extent can be found in Koskinen and Paloposki’s article titled *Retranslation*. First, they refer to Antoine Berman, who claims that “first translations are somehow poor and lacking”, while later translations can do a better job in bringing the essence of the source text to the target language (Berman 1990 cited in Koskinen and Paloposki 2010: 3). This reflects the idea that first translations are more domesticating, while retranslations tend to be more foreignizing; an idea often referred to as the Retranslation Hypothesis (Koskinen and Paloposki 2010: 3). Besides the difference in the target text’s orientation, Koskinen and Paloposki also mention the passage of time, and “ageing and alleged outdated features of the previous translation”, as well as “the increased knowledge of the source text, author and culture”, which would allow for a different, more advantageous approach to the source text (Koskinen and Paloposki 2010: 4). It is worth noting that all these reasons lie on the premise that the first

² All the citations and paraphrases taken from papers written in Croatian and Russian were translated into English by the author of this thesis (D.L.).

translation is in some way deficient. However, alternative explanations have been offered, ranging from the power struggles and conflicting interpretations to economic reasons (Koskinen and Paloposki 2010: 4).

2.3. The Russian translations of *Animal Farm*

The four Russian translations used for the purposes of this research are the following:

- 1) Mariâ Kriger and Gleb Struve. *Skotskij Hutor (Скотский Хутор)*. “Posev”, Frankfurt 1950 (RTT1)
- 2) Ilan Polock. *Skotnyj dvor (Скотный двор)*. “Rodnik”, Riga 1988 (RTT2)
- 3) Larisa Georgievna Bepalova. *Skotnyj dvor: Skazka (Скотный двор: Сказка)*. “ARENA”, Moskva 1992 (RTT3)
- 4) Vladimir Pribylovskij. *Zverskaâ Ferma: Skazka (Зверская Ферма: Сказка)*. “Panorama”, Moskva 2002 (RTT4)

Interestingly enough, Slavic languages (Polish, Ukrainian, and Russian) 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 Germany under the title *Skotskij Hutor (Скотский Хутор)* by the DP (Displaced Persons) publisher *Posev*³. The translation was done by Mariâ Kriger and Gleb Struve, who 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 politics played a vital role in literature: the Whites might have loved the satire of the Russian Revolution, but they did not take to 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 such a place, while Moses still makes an appearance in the story, though in a role much less important than in the

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

original (Karp 2017). As *Skotskij Hutor* is the first official translation of *Animal Farm* into Russian, it was read and examined for the sake of this research, along with three other Russian translations, published significantly later. Considering the motivation behind Struve's translation of *Animal Farm* discussed earlier, there is more than one reason why a new translation might be "needed".

The first of these retranslations, Ilan Polock's *Skotnyj dvor*, was the first Russian edition of *Animal Farm* published on the USSR's soil, in the Baltic state of Latvia. It is also the first full translation of the book published on the Soviet territory, whereas the first translator to do that was, in fact, Pribylovskij in his American edition titled *Ferma Ènimal*.

Bespalova was the first translator whose translation of *Animal Farm* was published in Russia, more specifically, in Moscow. However, that edition was published in 1989. The retranslation this research is based on, *Skotnyj dvor: Skazka*, was published in 1992. Bespalova herself says that the 1992 edition was her final version of the translation, with modifications of her previous work. However, this "updated" version was only published once, by *ARENA*, while the later editions were based on her first translation from 1989 (Bespalova 2001).

Finally, the last of the four translations was one of the newest editions available. The author is Vladimir Pribylovskij, who published it in Moscow in 2002 under the title *Zverskaâ Ferma: Skazka*. It is worth mentioning that Pribylovskij had more than one retranslation of this book: his first translation of *Animal Farm*, published in 1986 in New York, was titled *Ferma Ènimal* (*Ферма Энимал*). The other retranslations done between these two were known as *Ferma Životnyh* (*Ферма Животных*).

2.4. The Croatian translations 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* was published in 1974 by the publishing house *Naprijed* in Zagreb. Later, there were many reprints done 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 the first translation into Croatian, it was not the first Yugoslav translation; that

⁴ A comparison was made between the first Croatian edition of *Animal Farm* from 1974 and the edition from 1983 based on the items researched in this paper. No differences in the procedures applied for rendering those items were found, since the solutions presented in both editions were identical.

title belonged to the Serbian edition published in 1955 in Munich as *Farma životinja: savremena basna*, and it was translated by Slobodan A. Stanković (Kiebusinski 2017: 6). Kiebusinski notes that the former Yugoslav ambassador Aleksandar A. Avakumović, who opposed the Communist's rise to power and even refused to return to his home country after the war was over, initiated the idea for *Animal Farm* to be published in Yugoslavia as early as 1946 (2017: 6). Stanković, the translator of the Serbian edition, 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" (Kiebusinski 2017: 6). He even proposed the idea that everything that takes place on *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 (Kiebusinski 2017: 6). The story behind the Serbian translation was included to give a broader perspective on the situation in Yugoslavia at the time surrounding the publishing of *Animal Farm* and its reception in other Communist countries apart from the Soviet Union, as well as to emphasize the big time gap of 19 years between the first Serbian and the first Croatian translation.

The only Croatian retranslation that could be compared to Roksandić's translation is the one by Lada Furlan Zaborac, also titled *Životinjska farma: bajka*, published in 2009 by *Šareni dućan* in Koprivnica, and reprinted again in 2018. It is precisely this newer edition from 2018 that was used for the purposes of this research⁵.

In accordance with the abbreviations used for the Russian target texts, the two Croatian translations are identified throughout the paper as CTT1 (Roksandić's translation from 1983) and CTT2 (Furlan Zaborac's translation from 2018).

2.5. Proper names as culture-specific items

This study deals with a specific group of culture-specific items – proper names. However, it is necessary to first explain what the term culture-specific item (CSI) encompasses. In her PhD thesis, Veselica Majhut (2012: 21-23) lists a number of definitions by theorists such as Ivir, Newmark, Florin, Mailhac, Olk, Aixelá, and Pedersen, who use various terms for the same phenomenon: cultural word, realia, cultural reference, culture-specific item, and extralinguistic

⁵ The two editions of the second Croatian translation were also compared based on the items researched for the purposes of this thesis. Out 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".

cultural reference. This, in turn, shows that there is no consensus on the definition of this term in the field of Translation Studies (Matijaščić 2015: 28). This thesis follows the example set by Matijaščić, taking Aixelá's term, definition and classification as the starting point for the research, since his proposition corresponds to previous research consulted for this paper, which will be introduced later.

Thus, the definition of a culture-specific item that this study leans 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. (Aixelá 1996: 58)

Aixelá goes even further in his explanation of culture-specific items, distinguishing between “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 applies in this paper. A proper name, according to 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, a mere definition does not suffice for the purposes of this research, since it is based precisely on the rendering of proper names from a literary text into other languages. An important question arises from this process: do proper names in fact have meanings? 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). 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 states 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).

The various functions that proper names can carry have been thoroughly examined by Fernandes (2006: 46), who explains that names in literary texts often carry a message for the reader, where such works operate on two levels of communication: the level in text, and the above-text level, which is focused on the communication between the author and the reader. It

is precisely at this level that names convey semantic, social semiotic, and sound symbolic meanings. The potential of the semantic meaning is often used in allegories, where characters' personalities are summed up by their names, 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 target language, they can be transferred quite easily. Such was the case with *Napoleon*, *Benjamin*, and *Moses*, at least in some of the target texts. 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 phonesthetic 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 Whymper*, which comes from the noun *whimper*, meaning "a whimpering sound", or a whine.

The distinction between 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 if there is a case of an internationally recognized name, such as *England*, for which other languages have their own counterpart, that is, exonym. Hence, those names would be listed as part of the first of two categories of proper names according to Theo Hermans – conventional names, which are "seen as 'unmotivated' and thus as having no 'meaning' of themselves" (1988: 13). Fernandes expands the explanation for this category, listing here also the names whose morphology and phonology do not need to be adapted to the target language system (2006: 49). In other words, those are the names for which there is no need for translation; they can be transferred as they are. However, the concept of conventional names in this paper excludes Fernandes' expansion of Hermans' definition: here, they are understood simply as names the author used without

trying to convey any hidden message to the reader, meaning that names adapted⁶ to the target language system are still considered conventional. 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” (Hermans 1988: 13). These are precisely the types of names that appear in a greater concentration in literary texts, though sometimes the mere fact that a certain work is assigned to a literary genre affects the readers’, and thus the translator’s, perception of the work, and consequently, all of its elements (Hermans 1988: 13). Hermans also points out the tendency of literary texts to “activate the semantic potential of *all* its constituent elements, on all levels” (1988: 13). His observation is confirmed by Kiseleva (2007: 55), who states that names of literary characters tend to be the most expressive and informative elements of a literary work, containing large amounts of implicit information.

The literary genre seems to play a particularly important role in the procedures for translating names. In her paper on translating names in children’s literature, Cámara-Aguilera (2009: 55) focuses only on certain genres – fairy tales and fiction subgenres, or more specifically, allegories. Orwell’s *Animal Farm* was already categorized as an allegory, that is, 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). Therefore, considering Hermans’ categorization of names and the suggested approach to each of them, which is in line with some of the other theorists, such as Klinberg and Newmark, it becomes obvious that proper names in allegorical works should be translated, because otherwise a part of their function would be suppressed (Cámara-Aguilera 2009: 55-57).

Not just focusing on proper names, but taking the bigger picture into account, Franco Aixelá claims that, when faced with cultural signs of the *other*, translation offers the target culture a wide range of procedures to deal with them, from conservation (acceptance of the differences between the two cultures and reproduction of the source text’s cultural signs) to naturalization; the choice of procedures shows “the degree of tolerance of the receiving society and its own solidity” (Aixelá 1996: 54). Venuti shares a similar point of view, stating that “strategies in producing translations inevitably emerge in response to domestic cultural situations” (2001:

⁶ It is important to note that *adapted names* refer to names transferred with the procedure of adaptation, one of the twelve procedures developed for the purposes of this research, and explained in detail in 2.6.

240). However, it is not just the tendencies in translation of certain historical periods that have to be taken into account; the text function and type of reader play an extremely important role as well (Cámara-Aguilera 2009: 51-52), which can be verified by the fact that these two arguments are constantly invoked in papers dealing with the translations of children's literature, such as those of Cámara-Aguilera (2009), Fernandes (2006), Kapkova (2004), or Jaleniauskiėnė and Čičelytė (2009). On the other hand, not all of the factors affecting translator's decisions are external. Apostolova (2004), in fact, notes a variety of aspects closely related to the translator, which are only slightly, or not at all, determined by external forces, but have a profound impact on the final product:

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)

Some theorists, such as Ermolovič (2001), have formulated general approaches to the problem of transferring names from one language into another. Ermolovič has summarized his observations into five recommendations for translators:

- 1) Make sure you are, in fact, dealing with a proper name.
- 2) Determine the category of objects to whose member the proper name refers.
- 3) Determine the national-linguistic affiliation of the name.
- 4) Check if the name has any traditional equivalents.
- 5) Take into account all components of the name's form and content, the nature of the translation, and the target audience. (2001: 14-35).

Most translation scholars 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 target text or not. Of course, the genre of the text also plays an important role when trying to decide on the course of action, as was proven before. Few theorists go further than the idea that loaded names have to be translated, and even fewer offer advice or guidelines on how to approach this translational problem. This is precisely why Ermolovič and his work have been so insightful: besides offering guidelines and an overview

of the usual procedures of transfer, he also gives instruction 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*) because they refer to animals. 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 theorists and the conventional and loaded names distinction. 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 states a few basic criteria applied to the formation of nicknames, such as its dependence on the situation, structure, or degree of the characterization of the referent (2001: 89). Based on those, many different categories of nicknames arise, but, as they are not the object of this research, the categories will not be listed. Nevertheless, they bear great importance for Ermolovič and his guidelines, since the type of nickname determines how the nickname will be transferred into the target text. 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 theoretical framework presented here serves as the basis for explaining all the aspects a translator has to take into account when transferring proper names into the target language, as well as the challenges that stand in their way. The next section brings an overview of various sets of procedures for dealing with names, described and/or recommended by theorists (some of whom have already been mentioned) who based them on separate studies of different literary texts.

2.6. Procedures for translating proper names and their general orientation

Gutiérrez Rodríguez 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” (Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2003: 123). The “lack of a specific theory” becomes sufficiently evident

when a few different papers dealing with the same subject are compared, and an attempt is made to produce one universal theoretical framework, as they all vary.

The first set of procedures presented is the one taken precisely from Gutiérrez Rodríguez. She dealt with the problem of translating proper names from *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*, and *The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring*, meaning she focused on the fantasy genre. Gutiérrez Rodríguez opted for the theories of Moya, Newmark and Ballard, taking transfer, naturalization, and literal translation as the three main processes applied in the translation of proper names. Transfer consists of “passing the SL word on to the TL text” so that the original word is not changed in any way (Moya 2000: 13 cited in Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2003: 126). Naturalization is understood as “the translating process based on transferring proper names and which consists in adapting a word in the SL to the pronunciation and morphology characteristic of the TL” (Moya 2000: 13-3 cited in Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2003: 126). Literal translation is, on the other hand, taken from Newmark. She mentions some other possibilities for translating names, such as cultural equivalent, and the inclusion of additional information in notes, but does not include these procedures in her research, rather taking only transfer and literal translation as its basis because they are “the most feasible ones” (Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2003: 127)⁷.

Jaleniauskienė and Čičelytė, on the other hand, take Davies' procedures as the foundation for their research of the translation of proper names in children's literature. Their corpora include four books translated from English and German by three different translators: *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*, *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*, *Laura und das Geheimnis von Aventera* (English: *Laura and the Secret of Aventera*), and *Eragon*. The authors explain their choice of procedures by the fact that Davies' procedures also take into account proper names as part of the larger category of culture-specific items. Her list consists of seven strategies in total: preservation, addition, omission, globalization, localization, transformation, and creation (Jaleniauskienė and Čičelytė 2009: 32). Based on Davies' classification, these authors propose their own, consisting of three categories of translation procedures applied in the above mentioned translations:

- preservation (when proper names are left without any changes or translated directly),
- localization (when proper names are adapted phonologically, morphologically or gender

⁷ Gutiérrez Rodríguez distinguishes one more procedure during the course of her research, which she only explains, but does not name. The procedure coincides with what Theo Hermans calls “substitution”.

endings added) and transformation and creation (when 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 group. Examples of addition, omission and globalization have not been found. (Jaleniauskiene and Čičelytė 2009: 33)

Next are Mikšić and Vodanović (2019: 121), who, in their paper on literary anthroponymy in Raymond Queneau's novel *The Blue Flowers*, base their study 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 the focus of their research, and as such are not included in the analysis (Mikšić and Vodanović 2019: 121). 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 Matijaščić (2015: 35). Even though her paper deals with CSIs in general, Matijaščić starts her research with the idea introduced by Franco Aixelá of the two categories of culture-specific items – proper nouns and common expressions. Therefore, she also introduces two sets of procedures for translating each of those categories, and the ones intended for proper names were taken from Veselica Majhut (2009 cited in Matijaščić 2015). Originally, there were nine strategies developed by Veselica Majhut 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 (2009 cited in Matijaščić 2015: 35).

However, to the existing nine procedures 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.

Russian translation scholars deal with different ways of translating proper names as well. Anastasiâ Viktorovna Skryl’nik studies the translation of anthroponyms from English into German and Russian, based on the books from the Harry Potter series. She takes her classification from Nikolaj Konstantinovič Garbovskij, who distinguishes four different procedures for translating proper names: transcription, transliteration, calque, and approximate translation (Garbovskij 2004 cited in Skryl’nik 2017: 147).

The other Russian theorist dealing with this topic is the already mentioned Ermolovič, who, apart from offering guidelines on how to approach this linguistic problem, developed six possible procedures for transferring proper names (2001: 35-36):

- 1) Direct transfer of the name in its original form into the TT (not mere copying, but retaining the form of the name written in Latin alphabet)
- 2) Onomastic matching (includes transcription, transliteration, and traditional matches, for example *Ivan* for *John*)
- 3) Translation with a commentary (onomastic matching + commentary)
- 4) Explanatory translation (onomastic matching + additional explanatory modifiers in the text)
- 5) Descriptive translation (explaining the meaning of a proper name by means of common nouns and expressions)
- 6) Transformative translation (use of a completely different name in the TT because the ST name would not be familiar to the TT audience)

The last set of procedures presented here comes from Theo Hermans and Lincoln Fernandes, and serves as the basis for this research, with a few changes and adaptations. There are ten procedures in total proposed by Fernandes, four of which were developed by Hermans, while

the other six were added and explained by Fernandes in his study. The four ways of transferring proper names into target languages according to Hermans are described in detail:

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)

He also lists some other options, such as: *non-translation* (deletion of a ST proper name in the TT), *replacement of a proper noun by a common noun*, *insertion* of a proper name in the TT when there is none in the ST, and *replacement of a common noun with a proper noun* (Hermans 1988: 13-14).

The ten procedures developed by Fernandes build on the basic four procedures presented by Hermans, though Fernandes made some changes, as will be shown below. The procedures are the following (Fernandes 2006: 50-55):

- 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 their understanding in Fernandes' article does not coincide with their use in the present study. First, the procedure of *substitution* is used in this research in accordance with the way Hermans described it, because Fernandes slightly narrowed its definition. For him, substitution is 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” (Fernandes 2006: 52). That would mean that a name used in the TT as a substitute does not exist in the source culture. Hermans' explanation is, on the other hand, much more inclusive, as the name in the TT can be substituted for *any given name* in the ST (Hermans 1988: 13). The example he gives is that of “Verbrugge” being substituted for “Dipanon” in the novel *Max Havelaar*, stating 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 name is *transcription*. Hermans defines it as transliteration or adaptation on the level of spelling, phonology, etc. (Hermans 1988: 13). Fernandes explains the name for this procedure a bit further, stating that it conforms to Aubert's definition, 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 accordance with some of the other authors and their procedures presented earlier (such as Matijašćić or Garbovskij). Therefore, transcription is understood here as

an exact graphical rendering of some language or music sounds by conventional letters or special graphical signs independently according to the graphical and orthographical norms that have been historically shaped in the given language. (Bilodid et al. 1970-1980: 230 cited in Vakulenko 2015: 36).

In other words, transcription is 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 independently of their pronunciation” (Bilodid et al. 1970-1980: 230 cited in Vakulenko 2015: 36).

Even though transcription and transliteration are taken as two different phenomena, they are, for the purpose of this study, put under the same category titled *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 target language system (Fernandes 2006: 51). However, it was seen as necessary

to change the name of the category to avoid confusion, but also because the word “adaptation” has such a broad meaning, which can easily include both transcription and transliteration. This unification 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 of Polock and Pribylovskij.

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 thesis, twelve procedures have been identified, relying mostly on Hermans’ and Fernandes’ papers, with some borrowed and adapted from Matijašćić and Veselica Majhut (2009 cited in Matijašćić 2015). The procedures are listed and exemplified in Table 1.

Table 1. The set of procedures applied for rendering proper names used in this paper

Procedure	Author(s) from whom the procedure is borrowed and/or adapted	Example	Translation
copy	Hermans	<i>Snowball</i> → <i>Snowball</i>	CTT1
copy + explanation in a footnote	Hermans and Veselica Majhut	<i>Squealer</i> → <i>Squealer</i> ⁸	CTT2
adaptation	Hermans	<i>Snowball</i> → <i>Сноуболл</i> (Snouboll)	RTT2
adaptation + explanation in a footnote	Hermans and Matijašćić	<i>John Bull</i> → “Джон Буль” ⁹ (Džon Bul')	RTT3
substitution	Hermans	<i>Bluebell</i> → <i>Белка</i> (Belka)	RTT1
translation	Hermans	<i>News of the World</i> → “Svjetske novosti”	CTT1

⁸ (eng.) skvičalo; izdajica, cinkaroš

⁹ Джон Буль: *John Bull* — название периодического издания — от нарицательного Джон Буль — типичный англичанин, простоватый фермер в памфлете Дж. Арбетнота (John Arbuthnot, 1667-1735).

conventionality	Fernandes	<i>England</i> → <i>Engleska</i>	CTT1
replacement with a common noun/expression	Veselica Majhut	<i>News of the World</i> → <i>zazema</i> (gazeta)	RTT1
deletion	Fernandes	<i>Clementine</i> → Ø	CTT1
addition + copy	Fernandes	<i>John Bull</i> → časopis <i>John Bull</i>	CTT2
addition + adaptation	Fernandes	<i>News of the World</i> → газета “Ньюс оф зе уорлд” (gazeta “N’ûs of ze uorld”)	RTT4
addition + translation	Fernandes	<i>Farmer and Stockbreeder</i> → časopis <i>Farmer i stočar</i>	CTT2

Several remarks should to be made regarding the procedures 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, a change of pronunciation still occurs (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 of translation should also be explained further, as it might cause confusion regarding the broadness of the term “translation” in this sense. Hermans states that a proper name in a source text 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 RTT3, where *Foxwood* is translated as *Плутни* (Plutni), which in Russian colloquially refers to “dodgy, fraudulent tricks”¹⁰. Bespalova here relies not on the literal translation of the entire item, but on the secondary meaning of its first component: “fox” as “a cunning or sly person”.

¹⁰ The definition is taken from gramota.ru.

Thus, she deliberately accentuates the dishonesty that prevails on Mr Pilkington's farm, as well as his own corruptness.

The frequency of use of certain procedures gives us information on the general orientation of a particular translation. The main strategies applied rely on the domestication – foreignization dichotomy, developed by Lawrence Venuti. He defines the domesticating method as “an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to dominant cultural values”, whereas foreignization implies an “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), 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 situations where a CSI is omitted from the target text 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 the 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 make conclusions on the general orientation of the translations studied in this paper, it is necessary to first classify the twelve procedures distinguished in this research.

The first procedure of copying undoubtedly emphasizes the foreignness in the translation, which means it is closer to the pole of foreignization. The same goes for adaptation, though in the case of this procedure not all theorists agree with this premise. For instance, Aixelá, who names this procedure orthographic adaptation (1996: 61), as well as Jaleniauskiene and Čičelytė, who opted for the term localization (2009: 33), agree that the idea behind it falls much closer

to foreignization than to domestication. On the other hand, Biljana Vidiček in her paper on anthroponyms in Ivana Brlić Mažuranić's fairy tale *Kako je Potjeh tražio istinu* (*How Quest Sought the Truth*) deals with the translation of proper names, and classifies the applied procedures into four categories, which correspond to Theo Hermans' classification. In conclusion, she states that only one of the listed procedures is seen as foreignizing, and that it is the procedure of copying (Vidiček 2016: 7). Nevertheless, the accepted view in this thesis is that of Aixelá and the two Lithuanian authors, because adaptation still retains the foreign character of the name, even though its spelling is adapted to the target language system. This, in turn, means that, of the twelve procedures detected in the course of this research, copying and adaptation are seen as non-informative, since they provide no additional information on a CSI, and foreignizing.

On the opposing side 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* (*Angliá*) in Russian, it is clearly an attempt to bring the translation closer to the reader, that is, to domesticate it. Furthermore, substitution is not only in Vidiček's, but also in Jaleniauskienė and Čičelytė's paper (termed transformation), deemed a procedure of domesticating orientation. Translation, however, poses a problem of sorts, as the ideas regarding the orientation it supports differ. The main problem arises from the fact that the papers whose authors believe translation is a foreignizing procedure (such as Aixelá, or Jaleniauskienė and Čičelytė) deal with the translation of CSIs as a much broader category than just proper names, meaning that common nouns are included in their research as well. Moreover, this procedure tends to be referred to as literal translation (Veselica Majhut 2009 cited in Matijaščić 2015: 34). Literal translations of CSIs can still be taken as attempts at introducing unknown or little known items of source culture, and familiarizing the target audience with them. Nevertheless, these literal translations sometimes reveal very little to the reader if they are not explained further (for example, with the help of additional supplements within the text, or outside in the form of footnotes and the like). On the other hand, Vidiček, as was said before, claims this procedure brings the author closer to the reader (2016: 7). It seems that her idea of why translation is to be treated as a domesticating procedure is rooted in some of the already mentioned 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, as Jaleniauskienė and Čičelytė termed them, omission and globalization). 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 delete any cultural embeddedness in the target text, meaning that “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 on which it would be possible to provide any additional information.

The last five procedures are regarded as highly informative, since they all contain extra information on culture-specific items that is not included in the source text. The first two are copy + explanation in a footnote, and adaptation + explanation in a footnote. According to Aixelá, the procedure called *extratextual gloss* combines one of the three procedures he mentions in his paper, retention (which corresponds to Hermans’ copy), orthographic adaptation (the equivalent of adaptation as understood in this thesis) or linguistic (non-cultural) translation, with an explanation (usually given in a footnote, endnote, glossary, etc.) (1996: 62). He classifies the procedure of extratextual gloss as one implemented in order to conserve the original references, that is, as one closer to the foreignizing strategy, which corresponds to the way the two procedures of copy + explanation in a footnote, and adaptation + explanation in a footnote are understood in this paper. 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 taken from Fernandes, his explanation of it remains quite scarce (2006: 54), whereas the one offered by Jaleniauskienė and Čičelytė (2009: 33) is rather broad: they take 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, which in turn means that their definition encompasses two different procedures by Aixelá – extratextual gloss and intratextual gloss. According to Aixelá, intratextual gloss, or what was named here “addition”, combines one of the three already mentioned procedures of repetition, orthographic adaptation, or linguistic (non-cultural) translation with an explanation given as an “indistinct part of the text [...] so as not to disturb the reader’s attention” (Aixelá 1996: 62). He

puts intratextual gloss among the procedures of conservation. However, this paper differentiates between various combinations of other procedures and addition, taking each of those combinations as a separate procedure. It lies on the premise that the other procedure in that combination shifts the orientation of the entire “addition + x” procedure towards either foreignization or domestication. Thus, based on the orientation the other procedure in the combination supports, which has been explained in the previous paragraphs, the following conclusion ensues: 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 of the CSI, despite the attempt to make it at least a bit more understanding to the target audience, while with the procedure of addition + translation the culture-specific item 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.

Having classified the twelve procedures of transferring proper names detected in the translations studied for this paper, the result is the following (see Table 2 in section 4.2. for details): six procedures pertain to foreignizing, four to domesticating, and two to the neutralizing strategy. The foreignizing procedures are: copy, adaptation (both non-informative), copy + explanation in a footnote, adaptation + explanation in a footnote, addition + copy, and addition + adaptation (all containing the criterion of informativity). Procedures belonging to the opposite text-orientation, that is, domestication, are: conventionality, substitution, translation (all lacking the criterion of informativity), and addition + translation (highly informative). The two neutralizing procedures are deletion and replacement with a common noun/expression.

3. Aims and hypotheses

3.1. Aims

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 ascertain the frequency of use of particular procedures, which, in turn, defines the overall strategy that affects the general target-text orientation. Furthermore, the idea is to identify possible differences in the use of procedures when it comes to various groups of proper names (personal names, geographical designations, etc.), as well as conventional and loaded names, and to compare their use and the overall orientation in the translations into the same

target language, 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, six hypotheses have been developed, which can be grouped into three categories: hypotheses regarding all six translations and both target languages, hypotheses regarding the Croatian translations, and hypotheses regarding the Russian translations. First, the four hypotheses related to all six target texts into both target languages will be presented:

H1: Translations into both target languages will more often apply domesticating procedures when rendering loaded proper names than foreignizing procedures.

H2: The procedure of conventionality will be applied in all six translations whenever possible.

H3: The differences in the use 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.

H4: Both Croatian translations will be more foreignizing than any of the Russian translations.

The first of the four hypotheses is in accordance with the already mentioned theories by Klinberg, Newmark and Hermans about rendering the meaning hidden within the name. In the second hypothesis it is presumed that, in the case of unmotivated names, conventionality will be applied if possible. Due to reasons that will be discussed regarding H5, and also because of the fact that there are many more Russian than Croatian retranslations, H3 presupposes the relatively unvaried approach in Croatian translations, while at the same time assuming the application of a wide range of procedures in different Russian editions. Finally, the last hypothesis was developed in regard to a few studies on Croatian translations of different literary works mentioned later on, but also on similar research of the Russian translations of the Harry Potter books, such as those conducted by Kapkova and Skryl'nik.

Next comes the hypothesis concerned with the two Croatian translations:

H5: There will be no major difference in the use of procedures for rendering proper names and text orientations between the two Croatian translations.

Even though Croatian translations were published 35 years apart and in different political systems and countries, the retranslation by Furlan Zaborac is not expected to deviate a lot from the first translation, 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, the last of the six hypotheses pertains only to the Russian translations:

H6: Older Russian translations will be closer to the strategy of domestication.

This is line with the Retranslation Hypothesis introduced earlier. Although it was disproven many times in other research, the idea is that, due to the book's political purpose and Gleb Struve's intentions to open the eyes of his countrymen to the horrors of the Soviet regime, the translators 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 Pollock does not diverge much from their main strategy, and that the change in orientation is gradual.

4. Methodology

4.1. Material

The reasons behind the choice of each of the six translations used for the purposes of this research were already discussed in detail in 2.3. and 2.4. To sum up, the study of the Croatian translations is based on the only two translations into Croatian in existence, 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 taken for this research are significant because of the place and/or year of their publication, and their accessibility on the Internet¹¹.

The translations used for the sake of this paper are the following:

Vladimir Roksandić: *Životinjska farma: bajka* (1974/1983) – CTT1

¹¹ All Russian translations were taken from <https://orwell.ru/>, whereas Pollock'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.

Lada Furlan Zaborac: *Životinjska farma: bajka* (2009/2018) – CTT2

Mariâ Kriger and Gleb Struve: *Skotskij hutor: Skazka* (1950) – RTT1

Ilan Polock: *Skotnyj Dvor* (1988) – RTT2

Larisa Georgievna Bepalova: *Skotnyj Dvor: Skazka* (1992) – RTT3

Vladimir Pribylovskij: *Zverskaâ ferma: Skazka* (2002) – RTT4

4.2. Procedure

While reading the source text in isolation, all the proper names were marked, regardless of their referent. After that, each of the six translations was read side by side with the source text, and all the renderings of the said proper names were marked in the target texts 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 source text proper names, and the applied translation procedures were identified for each pair. Based on the procedures used, the general orientation of each target text was determined. Finally, translations into the same target language were compared according to the applied procedures, their frequency of use, and the main strategy of domestication, foreignization or neutralization, to be followed by a comparison of the given results between the Croatian and Russian translations.

Of all the proper names detected in the source text, 48 were taken for the basis of this research, and were grouped into six categories. Most of the other items stand independently of each other, meaning they cannot be classified as part of one of the existing groups of items, thus making it difficult to do a comparison of the procedures applied for a certain category in a given translation, as well as among all target texts. Therefore, those items were not included in the research. The first category are anthroponyms, that is, names of characters in the story. This is the biggest category by the number of items it contains, which is 21. The second category consists of nine (9) items, all of which name fictional or non-fictional places mentioned throughout the book. The third group is one consisting of names of newspapers and magazines, and has five (5) items. The fourth group has only four (4) items, all of which are song titles. The fifth category are Animal Committees Snowball organized, of which there were only four (4) mentioned by name in the book. The last of the categories contains five (5) nicknames, which are related to Napoleon. They were deliberately separated from anthroponyms, as most of them are mentioned only once, and are not used interchangeably with the character's first name (except for *Leader*).

As was mentioned before, twelve different procedures for rendering proper names have been detected in the six target texts. 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 2.6. Moreover, it should be noted that combinations of the main procedures were detected as well, such as translation + copy in the Croatian translations, and translation + adaptation in the Russian translations. 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 into “*gospodin*” in Croatian and “*г-н/фермер/мистер*” (*g-n/fermer/mister*) in Russian, and *Jones* was simply copied or adapted. The set of procedures used in this paper is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. The set of procedures applied for rendering proper names according to their main strategy and informativity

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

The next section presents the results of the analysis of proper names from the source text, which was conducted so as to offer a better understanding of the characters, and the procedures each of the translators used to render these names. Various dictionaries and encyclopaedias were consulted for the purposes of such an analysis. Afterwards, the examples of procedures applied

in certain categories are presented, followed by a quantitative analysis on the frequency of use of a certain procedure.

5. Findings

5.1. Results of the analysis of proper names from the source text

In order to comprehend some of the characters better, or simply to understand the reasons behind the choices of certain procedures for rendering proper names, it is necessary to give a short analysis of all the names used for the purposes of this research, and to decipher which names are conventional, and which are loaded. Two of the simpler categories in the analytical sense are the ones that contain names of different Animal Committees, and nicknames for Napoleon, as all of those proper names are invented and their meanings are fairly obvious from the names themselves. The following category is the one with song titles: two out of the four songs are fictional (*Beasts of England* and *Comrade Napoleon*), while *Clementine* and *La Cucaracha*¹² really do exist. Next comes the group of names of magazines and newspapers. A brief Internet search proves that all five items mentioned in the story are non-fictional. Geographical designations and facilities are particularly interesting, as only two names can be considered unmotivated, and those would be *Willington* and *England*. All the other names bear some sort of semantic load, but a few of them do not need any further explanation, so they will not be mentioned in this analysis. One of the more interesting names is certainly *Sugarcandy Mountain*, which serves as a metaphor for heaven; sugar is even mentioned several times throughout the story as something deeply desired, but not available to everyone. The original name of the farm, *Manor Farm*, comes from the word *manor*, which has several meanings, but is based on the concept of a large country house and its surrounding lands. Historically, it even denoted a feudal lordship, which only helps to emphasize the huge difference in the position animals held in relation to Mr Jones, as well as the cruelty and unfairness of their situation. Next are the names of the two neighbouring farms: *Foxwood* and *Pinchfield*. Both names are closely associated with the last names and personalities of their owners. The owner of *Foxwood* proved himself to be a real “fox”, whereas the owner of *Pinchfield* became known as a liar and a thief¹³.

¹² The name of this song is written incorrectly in the 1951 English edition of *Animal Farm* used in this paper (*La Cucaracha*). Having consulted another edition from 2019, the mistake was corrected.

¹³ According to lexico.com, the verb “to pinch” means, informally, “to steal or take without permission”.

The last category, which is also the largest in terms of the number of proper names it includes, is the category of personal names. There are six people mentioned by name throughout the story: Mr and Mrs Jones, Mr Pilkington, Mr Frederick, Mr Whymper, and Alfred Simmonds, the knacker. *Jones* and *Alfred Simmonds* can be dismissed as unmotivated proper names. However, the other three all have a semantic load that ought to be transferred into the target text. The significance of Mr Frederick and Mr Pilkington, and the allusions they bear, have already been discussed in 2.1., but from a literary point of view. *Mr Frederick* stands as the embodiment of Hitler, and the Prussian king Frederick the Great, but otherwise that name is not linguistically relevant. On the other hand, for the name of *Mr Pilkington*, the representation of Winston Churchill, Orwell might have drawn inspiration from the Scottish dialect, in which the verb *to pilk* means “to pilfer, rob”, and it could be related to his personality traits, taking into consideration the last scene in the book depicting a fight over a game of cards. The last of the six human characters is *Mr Whymper*, mentioned previously in 2.5., when an explanation of the origin of his name was also given: it has roots in the noun *whimper*, meaning “to whine”. Mr Whymper is indeed depicted as a cunning and calculating person, only looking out for his interests, but still subject to the authority of Napoleon (at least that is how he was seen through the eyes of the more naïve animals).

Next are the names of six pigs, again, the only ones mentioned by name in the story. Section 2.1. of this paper describes Meyers’ thoughts on the representation of real historical figures through the characters in the book. It states that four out of six pigs, Major, Napoleon, Snowball and Squealer, who are more important to the story than Minimus and Pinkeye, represent a combination of Marx and Lenin, Stalin with a few of Hitler’s traits, Trotsky, and the propagandists of the Soviet regime, respectively. Besides *Napoleon*, who was named after Napoleon Bonaparte, a dictator and great French military leader, the load of the other three names can be explained in linguistic terms. The word *major* has various meanings, of which three in particular accentuate the personality of old *Major*. As an adjective, it denotes something “important, serious, or significant”, which is how Major was perceived by the other animals on the farm. It also means “greater or more important; main”, as the teachings of Animalism are rooted in the ideas he presented the animals with on the night of his great speech. Finally, as a noun, *major* also denotes “a rank of officer in the army and the US air force, above captain and below lieutenant colonel”, which can be associated with Major’s call for the Rebellion and the overthrow of human race. Napoleon’s archrival, *Snowball*, represents the change Napoleon, i.e. Stalin so desperately tries to hinder. Besides its primary meaning, “a ball of packed snow”, the

word *snowball* also denotes “a thing that grows rapidly in size, intensity, or importance”. It is assumed that this is the aspect of Snowball’s destiny Orwell wanted to underline, especially considering the episode when he gained the votes of the animals in favour of building the windmill, which does not contribute to Napoleon’s plans of establishing a dictatorship. He serves as a figure whose role is to shake things to its core, to make great changes, and to make them fast. The main supporter of Napoleon’s regime is *Squealer*, whose name comes from the same noun, denoting “a person who informs on someone to the police or a person in authority”. The meaning perfectly describes Squealer’s tasks throughout the story: to communicate Napoleon’s orders to other animals, and to carefully listen to their comments and grudging, so as to detect “traitors” and reveal them to the Leader. The last two pig characters are Minimus and Pinkeye. Given his role as the poet of the regime, and the resemblance with another famous Soviet writer, *Minimus* can be said to serve as the embodiment of Maxim Gorky. In the linguistic sense, the name does not seem to have any great importance. The other pig, *Pinkeye*, is an almost irrelevant character, as he was mentioned in the book only once. He acts as a food taster for Napoleon when the Leader becomes obsessed with the idea that someone is trying to poison him. The primary meaning of the word *pink-eye* denotes “conjunctivitis in humans and some livestock”, so this can be presumed as the origin of the name.

The last subgroup of the large category dedicated solely to anthroponyms contains the names of all the other animals, since no other species is as big or important as the pigs. Only some of these characters and their roles were explained by Valerie Meyers, and those are the three horses, Boxer, Clover and Mollie, Moses the raven, and the donkey Benjamin. According to her analysis, Boxer and Clover represent the typical working man and woman the Soviet regime promoted, Mollie is the embodiment of the opposing White Russians, Moses presents the Church, and Benjamin the average, cynical man. Apart from Lexico.com, for the purposes of researching the origins of these names the Online Etymology Dictionary (OED), and the Oxford Dictionary of First Names (ODFN) were also employed. First, the names of the three dogs, Bluebell, Jessie, and Pincher, will be analysed. Their roles in the story are rather limited: they are not mentioned very often, and are only important because Jessie and Bluebell whelped nine puppies, which later became Napoleon’s personal guards. *Bluebell*’s name is most probably related to the same noun, denoting “a European woodland plant of the lily family that produces clusters of blue bell-shaped flowers in spring”. As a name, it appears neither in OED nor in ODFN. However, a corpora search on Sketch Engine was conducted, confirming several uses of the word *Bluebell* as a proper name, both for animals and humans. The second name is that

of *Jessie*. According to both OED and ODFN, it is a simple feminine name, derived from Jessica or Jean (Hanks and Hodges 2003: 2421). The word does have a derogative meaning as well (OED), denoting “an effeminate, weak, or oversensitive man”, but given that Jessie is a bitch, the relation with this interpretation does not seem very likely. The name of the last of the three dogs, *Pincher*, might be related to the verb *to pinch*, meaning “grip (something, typically a person's flesh) tightly and sharply between finger and thumb”, or it might come from the name of a dog breed, Dobermann pinscher (OED).

Next in line are the horses, Boxer, Clover, and Mollie. *Boxer* is described as “an enormous beast, [...] as strong as any two ordinary horses put together” (Orwell 1951: 6). He is not particularly bright, but the others respected him because of his steadiness of character. The common noun *boxer* denotes primarily “a person who takes part in boxing, especially for sport”. Such definition can easily be associated with his built and never-ending strength, as well as his dullness. *Clover*, on the other hand, probably got her name from the name of the plant, which is “an important fodder and rotational crop”. The name appears even in the ODFN (2003: 932), meaning that it is used as a human proper name as well. Lastly, *Mollie* presents a variant spelling of Molly, which is a short form of the name Mary. The Oxford Dictionary of First Names does not offer much information on its meaning, only associating it with Irish origins (2003: 3327). However, under the entry *moll* in both OED and Lexico, it is stated that this word denotes “a prostitute”. By disregarding the literal meaning of the word, and focusing on the aspect of behaving “unworthily for personal or financial gain”, it might be said that this particular meaning affected Orwell’s choice of name. Even if it did not, the fact remains that Mollie betrayed the principles of Animalism for personal gain – ribbons and lumps of sugar.

The last three characters are the only specimens of their species important enough to be named: Muriel, Benjamin, and Moses. The name of the clever white goat *Muriel* appears to have no hidden meaning that Orwell tried to convey. According to both OED and ODFN, the name is of Celtic origin, and literally means “sea bright”. On the other hand, both Benjamin and Moses are biblical names. Oxford Dictionary of First Names states that Benjamin was one of the founders of the twelve tribes of Israel, and means either “son of the right hand” or “son of the south” (2003: 545). In the explanation of the etymology of the name in the Free Dictionary, it is stated that the association with the right hand side was traditionally a reference to strength and virtue¹⁴. Another interpretation of the name is that its second element, *yamin*, means “days”,

¹⁴ Explanation taken from: <https://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com/Benjamin>.

or idiomatically “years”, which would translate the name as “son of (my) old age”, a reference to the fact that Benjamin was Jacob’s youngest son (Hanks and Hodges 2003: 545). Nevertheless, Benjamin is still seen as a mainly Jewish name, so the suffering the Jewish people have gone through might be related to Benjamin’s stoical acceptance of the hardships of life, which is best depicted in the discussion on the benefits of building a windmill:

Benjamin was the only animal who did not side with either faction. He refused to believe either that food would become more plentiful or that the windmill would save work. Windmill or no windmill, he said, life would go on as it had always gone on — that is, badly. (Orwell 1951: 45-46)

The last character left to analyse is *Moses* the raven, whose name is undoubtedly a reference to the biblical character who led the Israelites out of Egypt (Hanks and Hodges 2003: 3352). According to Meyers, Moses represents the Church. In the story, Moses is a pet of Mr Jones, who preaches of a mysterious land to which animals go after they die, thus giving them hope that something better awaits them in the afterlife. He is not particularly loved by the pigs, who proclaimed all of his stories of the Sugarcandy Mountain to be lies; nevertheless, they allow him to stay on the farm and feed him, even giving him beer, which was reserved for the pigs, while he does no work on the farm in return.

Out of the last nine names discussed, that is, the names of animals other than pigs, it seems that some of the connections made on the basis of dictionary definitions taken from Lexico, as well as entries from the Online Etymology Dictionary and Oxford Dictionary of First Names, appear slightly doubtful. However, it was thought that all available information on each of those proper names, as well as some others, should be presented in this paper.

Having finished the analysis, the conclusion is the following: the choice of names of *Mr* and *Mrs Jones*, *Alfred Simmonds*, *Bluebell*, *Jessie*, *Mollie*, *Muriel*, and *Benjamin* from the first category, *Willingdon* and *England* from the second, *John Bull* from the third, and *Clementine* and *La Cucaracha* from the fourth is most likely unmotivated, meaning it does not carry a semantic load that needs to be transferred to the target text.

5.2. Examples of procedures used in certain categories

These tables present examples of different procedures used to transfer proper names in various target texts. It should be noted that they do not represent the general situation on the frequency of use of certain procedures; that will be described later in the text.

5.2.1 Anthroponyms

Table 3. Typical procedures used to render personal names

<i>ST</i>	<i>TT</i>	<i>Translation</i>	<i>Procedure</i>
Squealer	Squealer	CTT1	copy
Squealer	Squealer (see Appendix 2)	CTT2	copy + explanation in a footnote
Snowball	Снежок (Snežok)	RTT1	translation
Snowball	Сноуболл (Snouboll)	RTT2	adaptation
Major	Главарь (Glavar')	RTT3	substitution
Moses	Моисей (Moisej)	RTT4	conventionality

There were a few borderline cases in the category of anthroponyms, which should be explained further for bettering understanding of this analysis and the obtained results.

Since the Croatian translations present the same solutions for all proper names contained in this category, with the only exception being that the translator of CTT2 offers additional explanation for two personal names in the form of a footnote, it means that for both target texts in Croatian there might be some uncertainty as to the definitive description of the used procedures. The names of *Major*, *Napoleon* and *Benjamin* might sparkle a debate, since there is more than one possible interpretation of the use of procedures for rendering these names into the Croatian translations. In the course of this research, all three procedures are determined as simple copy. Nevertheless, with *Major*, it is necessary to take into account the fact that it can also be the result of translation. According to Hrvatski jezični portal (HJP), *major* is defined as the “rank of the first senior officer in the army and military aviation forces”, with another, more common title of *bojnik*¹⁵. *Napoleon* and *Benjamin*, on the other hand, might easily have been transferred into the Croatian target texts through the procedure of conventionality. *Napoleon* is spelled in Croatian the same as the name of the French dictator Napoleon Bonaparte, after whom Orwell’s character got the name in the first place, and the Croatian equivalent of the name *Benjamin* is identical in spelling, but different in pronunciation. However, considering the frequency of use of all the other procedures, especially in the category of anthroponyms, it was concluded that

¹⁵ The online edition of the Croatian Encyclopaedia has been consulted to determine the titles of Croatian military ranks.

all of these names are the result of the use of copy, supported not only by the idea of keeping consistency with the transfer of the rest of the personal names, but also by the flexibility and tolerance of the Croatian language towards foreign names in translations.

The names of *Major* and *Napoleon* were also problematic for (most) Russian translations. In RTT1, RTT2 and RTT4, *Major* was rendered as *Майор* (*Major*). Similarly to Croatian translations, there are two possible explanations regarding the used procedure, which in this case might be either adaptation or translation, as the word *майор* is defined by gramota.ru as an “officer rank in the army higher than captain and below lieutenant colonel”. The situation with the name of *Napoleon* is two-sided as well: in all four translations, he was rendered *Наполеон* (*Napoleon*), which can, again, be the result of the procedure of conventionality, or the procedure of adaptation. There were issues determining the procedure for one more name, *Boxer*, but this time only for RTT1, in which it was transferred as *Боксёр* (*Boksër*). The definition of *боксёр* is the same as the definition of the word *boxer* in English, which is why this solution can be taken as a direct translation of the original name, but also as an adaptation with a changed pronunciation. The choice and explanation for the definitive descriptions of the used procedures in these cases were not as straightforward as they were with the Croatian translations, primarily because the set of procedures used in the Russian translations for the category of anthroponyms is larger in the number of applied procedures. Therefore, the procedures used for these three names were determined in relation to the other procedures applied in this category, as well as the general orientation of the target text. This, in turn, means that, even though different translations have identical solutions for each of these proper names, the procedure the translators employed still might differ. For instance, RTT1 exhibits the use of four different procedures in this particular category, three out of which belong to the strategy of domestication. Taking that into consideration, as well as the fact that all the proper names that obviously carry a semantic load, such as *Snowball* or *Squealer*, have been translated, and the names with a cultural equivalent have been conventionalised, it can be concluded that the names of *Major* (*Майор*) and *Boxer* (*Боксёр*) are the result of the procedure of translation, whereas *Napoleon* (*Наполеон*) is the result of the application of conventionality. In RTT2 the prevailing strategy used for the category of anthroponyms is undoubtedly foreignization, even when the two disputed names of *Major* (*Майор*) and *Napoleon* (*Наполеон*) are excluded from the analysis, which only has one example of the use of translation. Hence, the conclusion for this target text would be that the translator in both these cases applied the procedure of adaptation, as for most of the other personal names. In RTT3 most of the procedures applied

belong again to the domesticating strategy, just like in RTT1, and the only borderline case in this translation is the name of *Napoleon* (*Наполеон*). However, considering the general text orientation, the not so frequent use of the procedure of adaptation, as well as the fact that conventionality was used with two other proper names from this category, *Benjamin* (*Вениамин*) and *Moses* (*Моисей*), the interpretation imposed by all these arguments is that *Napoleon* (*Наполеон*) is the result of the procedure of conventionality. Finally, RTT4, similarly to RTT2, applies mostly foreignizing procedures for the rendering of personal names with a slightly larger number of domesticating procedures: RTT2 has only one application of the translation procedure, whereas RTT4, even without *Major* and *Napoleon*, has at least three uses of the translation procedure and one of conventionality. Having examined the proper names that were simply adapted in RTT4 and comparing them to the ones that have been translated, it was noticed that the three translated names were also translated either in all three previous Russian target texts (*Squealer*) or in two out of three (*Snowball* and *Clover*, and their names were adapted only in RTT2). On the other hand, *Major* has been treated differently in all three Russian translations, meaning there is no consistency to rely on: in RTT1 the name is translated, in RTT2 adapted, and in RTT3 substituted. The only similarity it shows is the one with RTT2 in the frequency of use of foreignizing procedures, and this is why the procedure of rendering the name *Major* in this particular translation, RTT4, will be described as adaptation. As for *Napoleon*, given that RTT4 does have four other uses of domesticating procedures in the category of personal names, out of which one belongs to the same type as the one used for *Napoleon*, the conclusion is that this name resulted from the application of conventionality.

5.2.2. Geographical designations and facilities

Table 4. Typical procedures used to render geographical designations and facilities

<i>ST</i>	<i>TT</i>	<i>Translation</i>	<i>Procedure</i>
Pinchfield	Pinchfield	CTT1	copy
Pinchfield	Pinchfield (see Appendix 2)	CTT2	copy + explanation in a footnote
Pinchfield	Пинчфилд (Pinčfild)	RTT2	adaptation
Pinchfield	Скудополье (Skudopol'e)	RTT1	translation
Pinchfield	Склоки (Skloki)	RTT3	substitution

England	Англия (Angliâ)	RTT4	conventionality
Sugarcandy Mountain	молочные реки и кисельные берега (moločnye reki i kisel'nye berega)	RTT3	replacement with a common noun/expression
Sugarcandy Mountain	Ø	RTT1	deletion

This category consists of nine items: two denote a non-fictional country and village where the story takes places; one is a village taproom; four present the names of farms, and two refer to fictional places – *Sugarcandy Mountain* (heaven for animals) and the future *Republic of the Animals*.

Of the first two proper names in this category referencing to non-fictional geographical designation, there is one particularly interesting – *Willingdon*. It is copied in the Croatian, i.e. adapted in the Russian translations. However, it should be noted that, although in all four Russian target texts the procedure of adaptation was employed, the final solution is not the same in all translations. In RTT1 and RTT4 *Willingdon* was rendered as *Виллингдон* (*Villingdon*), whereas in RTT2 and RTT3 the solution presented is *Уиллингдон* (*Uillingdon*). This difference arises from the lack of systematisation and uniformity in the application of transcription; nowadays the [w] sound is usually transcribed by “y”, while its rendering by “в” is considered to be traditional (Iivainen 1960: 137-141).

Another important thing to note is the rendering of the *Republic of the Animals* in both Croatian translations, as well as RTT4. CTT1 and CTT2 offer the same solutions for this proper name, but the interesting part is that neither one of the two translators keeps consistency with the previous solution, so two different renderings occur in the story: *Životinjska Republika* in chapter 3, and *Republika Životinja* in chapter 10. In all four cases the procedure of translation is employed, and the offered solutions vary not only in their structure, but also in the possible interpretations. The literal translation of the *Republic of the Animals* would be the second translation, *Republika Životinja*. On the other hand, if the first translation, *Životinjska Republika*, were to be back-translated, the result would be *Animal Republic*. A similar occurrence can also be found in RTT4. In chapter 3, Pribylovskij first rendered this item as *Республика Зверей* (*Respublika Zverej*), whereas in chapter 10 he offers another solution –

Республика Животных (Respublika Životnyh). The difference lies in how he transferred the word *animal*. According to gramota.ru, *животное (životnoe)* is defined as “any living being, apart from plants”, that is, “a living creature opposed to man”. The definition of *зверь (zver’)* is somewhat narrower: it is denoted as “a wild, usually predatory animal”. Notwithstanding the variations of the same reference, Pribylovskij too employed the procedure of translation for both these solutions. The other three Russian translations kept consistency with the previous mention of this item, meaning that they only offered one solution, in accordance with the source text, for which they used the procedure of translation as well.

5.2.3. Magazines and newspapers

Table 5. Typical procedures used to render names of magazines and newspapers

<i>ST</i>	<i>TT</i>	<i>Translation</i>	<i>Procedure</i>
Daily Mirror	<i>Daily Mirror</i>	CTT1	copy
Daily Mirror	«Дейли Миррор» („Dejli Mirror“)	RTT2	adaptation
News of the World	«Ньюс оф уорлд» (see Appendix 3) („N’ûs of uorld“)	RTT3	adaptation + explanation in a footnote
News of the World	“Svjetske novosti”	CTT1	translation
News of the World	Газета (gazeta)	RTT1	replacement with a common noun/expression
News of the World	list <i>News of the World</i>	CTT2	addition + copy
News of the World	газета «Ньюс оф зе уорлд» (gazeta „N’ûs of ze uorld)	RTT4	addition + adaptation
Daily Mirror	газета «Зеркало дня» (gazeta „Zerkalo dnâ)	RTT1	addition + translation

This category contains five references to actual newspapers and magazines that were in circulation during Orwell’s lifetime. However, only two were named here so as to show how different translators treat the same CSIs.

5.2.4. Songs

Table 6. Typical procedures used to render song titles

<i>ST</i>	<i>TT</i>	<i>Translation</i>	<i>Procedure</i>
Clementine	КЛЕМЕНТИНА (Klementina)	RTT1	adaptation
Clementine	Pjesma <i>Clementine</i>	CTT2	addition + copy
Beasts of England	СКОТЫ АНГЛИИ (Skoty Anglii)	RTT2	translation
Clementine	Ø	CTT1	deletion

Only four items belong to the category of song titles, two of which refer to non-fictional songs, *Clementine* and *La Cucaracha*, while the other two are fictional: a song devoted to the Rebellion, *Beasts of England*, and another one about Napoleon titled *Comrade Napoleon*.

5.2.5. Animal Committees and nicknames for Napoleon

Table 7. Typical procedures used to render names of Animal Committees and nicknames for Napoleon

<i>ST</i>	<i>TT</i>	<i>Translation</i>	<i>Procedure</i>
Egg Production Committee	Комитет за proizvodnju jaja	CTT1	translation
Egg Production Committee	КОМИТЕТ ПО яйцекладке (Комитет по âjcekladke)	RTT3	
Father of All Animals	Otac svih životinja	CTT2	

Father of All Animals	Отец Всех Животных (Otec Vseh Životnyh)	RTT4	
-----------------------	---	------	--

The last two categories of the names of Snowball’s Animal Committees and nicknames for Napoleon consist of nine items in total, four of which denote the Committees, and the other five refer to Napoleon. The categories are put together simply because all six target texts in the case of all nine items employ one and the same procedure – translation.

5.3. Quantitative analysis

5.3.1. Overview of the procedures used in all six translations

Table 8. Quantitative data on procedures used to render proper names throughout all six target texts

	CTT1	CTT2	RTT1	RTT2	RTT3	RTT4
Total number of items	48	48	48	48	48	48
Number of different procedures employed	4	6	8	5	7	5
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
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%)
Uses of non-informative domesticating procedures	19 (39.6%)	17 (35.4%)	32 (66.7%)	18 (37.5%)	35 (72.9%)	22 (45.8%)
Uses of highly informative domesticating procedures	0	1 (2.1%)	3 (6.2%)	1 (2.1%)	1 (2.1%)	1 (2.1%)
Overall use of domesticating procedures	19 (39.6%)	18 (37.5%)	35 (72.9%)	19 (39.6%)	36 (75%)	23 (47.9%)
Uses of non-informative foreignizing procedures	27 (56.2%)	20 (41.7%)	10 (20.8%)	28 (58.3%)	7 (14.6%)	24 (50%)
Uses of highly informative foreignizing procedures	0	10 (20.8%)	1 (2.1%)	0	4 (8.3%)	1 (2.1%)
Overall use of foreignizing procedures	27 (56.2%)	30 (62.5%)	11 (22.9%)	28 (58.3%)	11 (22.9%)	25 (52.1%)
Uses of neutralizing procedures	2 (4.2%)	0	2 (4.2%)	1 (2.1%)	1 (2.1%)	0

The data from Table 8, collected during the course of this research, suggest the following:

- 1) CTT1 shows the least variation in the number of procedures applied in the text (4), whereas RTT1 records the most (8).
- 2) CTT1 and CTT2 have three procedures in common: copy, translation, and conventionality, and their application is not very different, especially given the fact that two of the other three procedures in CTT2 are also based on copy in combination with either explanation in a footnote or addition. A comparison between the solutions and procedures applied in CTT1 and CTT2 shows that, of 11 differences, there are eight similar solutions (see Appendices 1 and 2).

- 3) Both Croatian translations use more foreignizing than domesticating procedures for rendering proper names (CTT1 applies them in 56.2% of the cases, and CTT2 in 62.5%).
- 4) There are four procedures employed in all four Russian translations: adaptation, translation, conventionality, and addition + translation, though their use varies to a large extent, depending on the target text (compare Appendices 3, 4, 5 and 6).
- 5) RTT1 and RTT3 use more domesticating procedures (72.9% and 75%, respectively), while RTT2 and RTT4 show a tendency to the application of foreignizing procedures (RTT2 58.3%; RTT4 52.1%).
- 6) Even though foreignizing procedures prevail in both RTT2 and RTT4, their percentage of use does not indicate a significant majority.
- 7) RTT2 and RTT4, besides both exhibiting foreignization as the main strategy, also share the same number of procedures applied throughout the text (5).

This overview of the quantitative data on the procedures used in all six translations is followed by a more detailed analysis of the frequency of use of certain procedures in a particular category of the researched items.

5.3.2. Detailed quantitative analysis according to each category of items

Table 9. Quantitative data on procedures used to render personal names

	CTT1	CTT2	RTT1	RTT2	RTT3	RTT4
Total number of items	21	21	21	21	21	21
Number of different procedures employed	1	2	4	2	4	3
copy	21 (100%)	19 (90.5%)	0	0	0	0
copy + explanation in a footnote	0	2 (9.5%)	0	0	0	0
adaptation	0	0	7 (33.3%)	20 (95.2%)	4 (19.0%)	16 (76.2%)
translation	0	0	7 (33.3%)	1 (4.8%)	4 (19.0%)	3 (14.3%)
substitution	0	0	3 (14.3%)	0	10 (47.6%)	0
conventionality	0	0	4 (19.0%)	0	3 (14.3%)	2 (9.5%)

All six target texts contain 21 occurrences of personal names, the same number as in the source text. CTT1 uses only one procedure for rendering personal names – copy, whereas the translator of CTT2, although employing mostly the procedure of copy (19 times, that is, in 90.5% of the cases), also uses copy + explanation in a footnote (9.5%) with two proper names from this category. The orientation of these two target texts, at least when it comes to the use of procedures rendering anthroponyms, is unequivocally foreignizing.

The situation with Russian translations is somewhat different. Most applied procedures can be found in RTT1 and RTT3: adaptation, translation, substitution, and conventionality. Adaptation was used in 7 cases (33.3%) in RTT1, and for only 4 items in RTT3 (19%); translation was applied 7 times (33.3%) in RTT1, and again 4 (19%) times in RTT3; only 3 (14.4%) references were substituted in RTT1, and 10 (47.6%) in RTT3; and conventionality was employed 4 (19%) times in RTT1, and 3 (14.3%) times in RTT3. Based on these findings, the translators of RTT1 and RTT3 preferred domesticating procedures for transferring personal names of characters.

The other two Russian target texts employed even fewer procedures: RTT2 shows use of only two types, adaptation (20; 95.2%) and translation (1; 4.8%), whereas the translator of RTT4 applied three procedures for rendering personal names: adaptation (16; 76%), translation (3; 14.3%), and conventionality (2; 9.5%). The obtained results suggest that the translators of RTT2 and RTT4, Polock and Pribylovskij respectively, were more in favour of the foreignizing procedures in rendering the proper nouns from this category.

Table 10. Quantitative data on procedures used to render geographical designations and facilities

	CTT1	CTT2	RTT1	RTT2	RTT3	RTT4
Total number of items	9	9	9	9	9	9
Number of different procedures employed	3	4	4	3	5	3
copy	3 (33.3%)	1 (11.1%)	0	0	0	0
copy + explanation in a footnote	0	2 (22.2%)	0	0	0	0
adaptation	0	0	1 (11.1%)	3 (33.3%)	1 (11.1%)	3 (33.3%)
translation	5 (55.6%)	5 (55.6%)	6 (66.7%)	5 (55.6%)	5 (55.6%)	5 (55.6%)
substitution	0	0	0	0	1 (11.1%)	0

conventionality	1 (11.1%)	1 (11.1%)	1 (11.1%)	1 (11.1%)	1 (11.1%)	1 (11.1%)
replacement with a common noun/expression	0	0	0	0	1 (11.1%)	0
deletion	0	0	1 (11.1%)	0	0	0

There are nine references to geographical designations and facilities in the source text, and eight different procedures applied for each of them. CTT1 employs three procedures in total, copy (3 times; 33.3%), conventionality (1; 11.1%) and translation (5; 55.6%), whereas in CTT2, in addition to these procedures (copy 1.11%; conventionality 11.1%; translation 55.6%), there are two noted uses of the highly informative procedure of copy + explanation in a footnote (22.2%). The application of the procedures used in CTT1 matches their employment in CTT2, apart from copy + explanation in a footnote applied to the names of the two farms of *Foxwood* and *Pinchfield*, which were simply copied in CTT1 with no additional information. Based on this analysis, both Croatian target texts exhibit a preference for the domesticating strategy (used in 66.7% of the cases) when rendering names of geographical designations and facilities.

When it comes to Russian translations, all four of them incline towards domestication of the occurrences from this category, but in different percentages. The procedures of adaptation, translation, and conventionality serve as the basis for all four target texts. RTT2 and RTT4 employed only these three procedures, and their application for particular items is identical: adaptation (3; 33.3%), translation (5; 55.6%), and conventionality (1; 11.1%). Besides these three (adaptation 1.11%; translation 66.7%; conventionality 1.11%), RTT1 also introduces the neutralizing procedure of deletion (1; 11.1%). RTT3 employs the largest set of procedures by number, five in total. Apart from adaptation (1; 11.1%), translation (5; 55.6%), and conventionality (1; 11.1%), Bespalova uses substitution (1; 11.1%) and replacement with a common noun/expression (1; 11.1%) as well. The analysis regarding Russian translations and the procedures applied for the items of this particular category suggests that RTT1 and RTT3 use domesticating procedures more often (in 77.8% of the cases) than RTT2 and RTT4 (66.7%).

Table 11. Quantitative data on procedures used to render the names of newspapers and magazines

	CTT1	CTT2	RTT1	RTT2	RTT3	RTT4
Total number of items	5	5	5	5	5	5

Number of different procedures employed	2	2	3	3	2	3
copy	3 (60%)	0	0	0	0	0
adaptation	0	0	0	3 (60%)	0	3 (60%)
adaptation + explanation in a footnote	0	0	0	0	4 (80%)	0
translation	2 (40%)	0	0	0	0	0
replacement with a common noun/expression	0	0	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	0	0
addition + copy	0	4 (80%)	0	0	0	0
addition + adaptation	0	0	1 (20%)	0	0	1 (20%)
addition + translation	0	1 (20%)	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)

In total, eight procedures were applied for rendering the names of these items. The two Croatian translations employed two procedures each: CTT1 uses copy (3; 60%) and translation (2; 40%) for rendering the names of magazines and newspapers, whereas CTT2 applies the procedures of addition + copy (4; 80%), and addition + translation (1; 20%). The use of procedures in this category suggests a more foreignizing orientation of both Croatian target texts, with CTT2 adopting the more informative approach by providing additional information on each item within the main body of the text.

When it comes to Russian translations, only RTT3 registers the application of two procedures, whereas the other three target texts note the use of three different procedures. The only procedure employed in all four translations is addition + translation: RTT1 has three items rendered in such a way (60%), while RTT2, RTT3 and RTT4 have only one (20%). On the other hand, the only procedure used in just one translation is adaptation + explanation in a footnote, which is the prevailing procedure in RTT3 (4; 80%). Other detected procedures are replacement with a common noun/expression, found in RTT1 (1; 20%) and RTT2 (1; 20%), addition + adaptation used in RTT1 (1; 20%) and RTT4 (1; 20%), and adaptation employed in RTT2 (3; 60%) and RTT4 (3; 60%). Having taken into account these results, it can be concluded that the main strategy for this category in RTT1 is domestication with the criterion of informativity included in the rendering of four items. The other three target texts favour

foreignization. However, they do differ in the frequency of use of highly informative procedures: RTT2 has only one such application (addition + translation), RTT4 records two (addition + adaptation, and addition + translation), whereas in RTT3 all five items are rendered using procedures that provide extra information. This is also the first time that RTT3 does not show a tendency to domestication.

Table 12. Quantitative data on procedures used to render song titles

	CTT1	CTT2	RTT1	RTT2	RTT3	RTT4
Total number of items	4	4	4	4	4	4
Number of different procedures employed	2	2	2	2	2	2
Translation	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)
Addition + copy	0	2 (50%)	0	0	0	0
Deletion	2 (50%)	0	0	0	0	0
Adaptation	0	0	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)

Four different procedures have been applied throughout the six target texts, though every translation records the use of only two procedures. From the quantitative analysis, it is evident that all six target texts used the procedure of translation, which was employed only for the two invented song titles. The two Croatian translations differ in the use of procedures for *Clementine* and *La Cucaracha*: CTT1 applies deletion, completely omitting these items from the translation, whereas CTT2 employs addition + copy. On the other hand, all four Russian translations offered the same solutions for these two song titles, simply adapting them into the target texts. The frequency of use of procedures in this group of proper names shows that there is no conclusive result for any of the six translations. The ratio of domesticating and neutralizing procedures applied in CTT1 is 1:1, and corresponds to the ratio of foreignizing and domesticating procedures used in the other five translations. The only difference that could be detected in the use of foreignizing procedures is that Furlan Zaborac has two applications of the highly informative procedure of addition + copy, whereas none of the Russian translators included the criterion of informativity in their solutions.

Table 13. Quantitative data on procedures used to render names of Animal Committees and nicknames for Napoleon

	CTT1	CTT2	RTT1	RTT2	RTT3	RTT4
Total number of items	9	9	9	9	9	9
Number of different procedures employed	1	1	1	1	1	1
Translation	9 (100%)	9 (100%)	9 (100%)	9 (100%)	9 (100%)	9 (100%)

This analysis goes to show that, not only do all the target texts apply the same procedure of translation, which makes these two categories the most homogenized of the six, but they also share the same prevailing strategy of domestication (100%). The translators' decision to employ translation with the nine references contained in these categories is not surprising, given the fact that they are all fictional and based on common nouns with an easily discernible semantic meaning.

6. Conclusion

The selected proper names appearing in George Orwell's *Animal Farm* are rendered into Croatian and Russian target texts 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 the paper deals with a source text written in Latin alphabet, while one of the two target languages, Russian, uses Cyrillic alphabet. This makes it impossible for the Russian target texts 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. The proper names are categorized into six separate groups, depending on their referent. This classification has allowed for a detailed study of the application of these procedures, as well as their frequency of use, both on the level of the whole text and within certain categories, thus also enabling a comparison between the translations into the same target language, and, finally, on an even higher level, between the two target languages. Of the six hypotheses presented in 3.2., only two have been proved. The overall application of procedures and their differences in use between CTT1 and CTT2 are presented in Table 8, but the more specific distinctions can be found in Appendices 1 and 2, which show that, in spite of the slight contrasts in the procedures employed for rendering proper names, CTT1 and CTT2 remain very similar, and share the same main strategy of foreignization

(H5 proved). The other proved hypothesis is H3, which assumes that the differences among the Russian translations in the use of procedures and text orientations will be more pronounced than between the Croatian translations. First, there is the huge discrepancy in the number of employed procedures, with RTT2 and RTT4 using only five, whereas RTT3 and RTT1 exhibit the use of seven and eight different procedures, respectively. Apart from that, the four Russian target texts differ also in the text orientation, that is, the main strategy applied throughout the text. While RTT1 and RTT3 are undoubtedly domesticating, RTT2 and RTT4 show an inclination towards the use of the foreignizing strategy, though not with the same conviction.

The results show that the prevailing strategy in Russian target texts does change with time, but the change is not consistent, meaning that, in this case, the newer translations are not necessarily more foreignizing than the older translation, and this is supported by the fact that RTT3 is more domesticating than RTT1, and RTT2 more foreignizing than RTT4 (H6 disproved). Moreover, another assumption was that all six translations would prefer the domesticating procedures when rendering loaded proper names. However, having analysed the number of translated loaded proper names in regards to the total number of loaded names, it was concluded that not all target texts follow this strategy: CTT2 translated only 48.6% of loaded names, whereas CTT1 and RTT2 (both 51.4%) barely translated more than half (H1 disproved). Similarly, it was thought that, regardless of the target language, conventionality would be a procedure of choice whenever possible, but neither one of the Croatian translators applied it when it comes to anthroponyms nor are Russian translations consistent in its use, as there were situations in, for instance, RTT4, when the procedure is employed with one personal name, but not with the other (H2 disproved). The last of the six hypotheses states that both Croatian translations will be more foreignizing than any of the Russian translations. Based solely on the numbers gotten from the frequency of use of the procedures for rendering proper names, RTT2 has a slightly higher percentage of employing foreignizing procedures than CTT1 (58.3% > 56.2%), and the difference lies in just one use (H4 disproved).

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 among the Russian translations varied, so there is no definitive conclusion as to why it changes. 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 all detectable groups of CSIs. Given the fact that there are

many more Russian translations, at least some of them could be included in the study, especially other translations from the same translators, such as Bespalova and Pribylovskij. The sociocultural and political context undoubtedly played a great role in the publication of all these translations, specifically the Russian ones, so it would definitely prove beneficial to research the cultural background, and not just focus on the linguistic issues at hand. When it comes to expanding the corpora of Croatian translations, other Yugoslav languages could also 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. Similar research could be conducted on other allegories as well to see how big of an influence on rendering proper names the affiliation with this genre has. Finally, considering the impact this book has had on literature, as well as its political background, it would be interesting to compare various translations published in different time periods in (former) Communist countries.

7. References

Primary sources

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

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

Orwell, George. 1974. *Životinjska farma: bajka*. Zagreb: Naprijed (prijevod Vladimir Roksandić)

Orwell, George. 1983. *Životinjska farma: bajka*. Zagreb: “August Cesarec” (prijevod Vladimir Roksandić)

Orwell, George. 2009. *Životinjska farma: bajka*. Koprivnica: Šareni dućan (prijevod Lada Furlan Zaborac)

Orwell, George. 2018. *Životinjska farma: bajka*. Koprivnica: Šareni dućan (prijevod Lada Furlan Zaborac)

(Kriger and Struve 1950)

Орвэлл, Георг. 1950. *Скотский Хутор*. (перевод Мария Кригер и Глеб Струве). Available at: <https://orwell.ru/library/novels/Animal_Farm/russian/rsh_mkgs> [Accessed 20 September 2020].

(Polock 1988)

Оруэлл, Джордж. 1988. *Скотный двор*. (перевод Илан Полоцк). Available at: <https://orwell.ru/library/novels/Animal_Farm/russian/rsd_ip> [Accessed 1 October 2020].

(Bespalova 1992)

Оруэлл, Джордж. 1992. *Скотный двор: Сказка*. (перевод Лариса Георгиевна Беспалова). Available at: <https://orwell.ru/library/novels/Animal_Farm/russian/rsd_lb> [Accessed 10 October 2020].

(Pribylovskij 2002)

Оруэлл, Джордж. 2002. *Зверская Ферма: Сказка*. (перевод Владимир Прибыловский). Available at: <https://orwell.ru/library/novels/Animal_Farm/russian/rzf_vp> [Accessed 20 October 2020].

Secondary sources

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

Andraka, Marija. 2019. "Pinokio u hrvatskim prijevodima: strategije prenošenja kulturnoga konteksta." *Libri et liberi* 8(1), pp. 55-75. Available at: <https://hrcak.srce.hr/index.php?show=clanak&id_clanak_jezik=331138> [Accessed 9 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), pp. 47–61. Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237602003_The_Translation_of_Proper_Names_in_Children%27s_Literature> [Accessed 11 January 2019].

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

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

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, pp. 123-136. Available at: <<https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/974490.pdf>> [Accessed 7 April 2020].

Hanks, Patrick & Hodges, Flavia. 2003. *A Dictionary of First Names*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

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, pp. 1-24.

Iivainen, Leevi. 1960. "The Rendering of English Proper Names in Russian". *The Slavonic and East European Review* 39(92), pp. 137-147. Available at: <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/4205222?seq=1>> [Accessed 7 March 2020].

Jaleniauskienė, Evelina & Čičelytė, Vilma. 2009. "The Strategies for Translating Proper Names in Children's Literature". *Studies About Languages* 15, pp. 31-42. Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228653802_The_Strategies_for_Translating_Proper_Names_in_Children's_Literature> [Accessed 12 January 2019].

Kiebusinski, Ksenya. 2017. "Not Lost in Translation: Orwell's 'Animal Farm' among Refugees and beyond the Iron Curtain". *The Halcyon* 59, pp. 3-6. Available at: <https://www.academia.edu/34832860/Not_Lost_in_Translation_Orwells_Animal_Farm_among_Refugees_and_beyond_the_Iron_Curtain?auto=download> [Accessed 24 March 2020].

Koskinen, Kaisa & Paloposki, Outi. 2010. "Retranslation". Available at: <https://www.academia.edu/8364692/_2010_Koskinen_and_Paloposki_Retranslation> [Accessed 2 May 2020].

Letemendia, Veronica Claire. 1994. "Revolution of Animal Farm: Orwell's Neglected Commentary." *Journal of Modern Literature* 18(1), pp. 127-137. Available at: <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3831551>> [Accessed 24 March 2020].

Matijaščić, Silvija. 2015. "Treatment of Culture-Specific Items in the Croatian and Russian Translations of 'The Maltese Falcon'". *Hieronymus* 2, pp. 27-55. Available at: <http://www.ffzg.unizg.hr/hieronymus/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Hieronymus_2_2015_Matijascic1.pdf> [Accessed 7 August 2019].

Meyers, Jeffrey, ed. 2002. *George Orwell: The Critical Heritage*. Taylor & Francis e-Library

Meyers, Valerie. 1991. *George Orwell*. Basingstoke and London: Macmillan.

Mikšić, Vanda & Vodanović, Barbara. 2019. "Književna antroponimija i izazovi prevođenja na primjeru romana Modri cvijetak Raymonda Queneaua." *Književna smotra* 51(194(4)), pp. 119-126. Available at: <<https://hrcak.srce.hr/233563>> [Accessed 12 April 2020].

Munday, Jeremy. 2016. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London and New York: Routledge

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), pp. 182-196. Available at: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/bce5/71499b5b1bd6c06ca3988f9f5079a92f9ff1.pdf?_ga=2.99655326.1239053494.1598284361-1356183583.1582979025> [Accessed 2 May 2020].

Schmidt, Goran. 2013. "Foreignization and domestication in the Croatian translations of Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray*." *Jezikoslovlje* 14(2-3), pp. 537-548. Available at: <<https://hrcak.srce.hr/112225>> [Accessed 15 May 2020].

Vakulenko, Maksym O.. 2015. "Practical transcription and transliteration: Eastern-Slavonic view." *Govor* 32(1), pp. 35-56. Available at: <<https://hrcak.srce.hr/165990>> [Accessed 26 February 2020].

Veselica Majhut, Snježana. 2012. *Cultural specificity in the translation of popular fiction from English into Croatian during the socialist and transition periods (1960-2010)*. Ph.D. Facultat de lletres, Tarragona.

Venuti, Lawrence. 2001. "Strategies of Translation". In M. Baker, ed., *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 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 Brlic-Mazuranic and aspects of their translation in target language texts". Available at: <<https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/153449749.pdf>> [Accessed 11 December 2018].

(Ermolovič 2001)

Ермолович, Дмитрий Иванович. 2001. *Имена собственные на стыке языков и культур: Заимствование и передача имен собственных с точки зрения лингвистики и теории перевода*. Москва: «Р.Валент»

(Karpkova 2004)

Капкива, Светлана Юрьевна. 2004. "Перевод личных имен и реалий в произведении Дж. Ролинг Гарри Поттер и Тайная комната". *ВГУ, Лингвистика и межкультурная*

коммуникация 1. Available at: < <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/perevod-lichnyh-imen-i-realiy-v-proizvedenii-dzh-roling-garri-potter-i-taynaya-komnata> > [Accessed 10 January 2019].

(Kiseleva 2007)

Киселева, Ирина Анатольевна. 2007. “Особенности перевода литературы жанра фэнтези”. *СнбГУ* 9(1(2)). Available at: <<https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/osobennosti-perevoda-literatury-zhanra-fentezi-1>> [Accessed 29 March 2020].

(Skryl'nik 2017)

Скрыльник, Анастасия Викторовна. 2017. “Способы перевода антропонимов с английского на немецкий и русский языки“. *Грамота* 3(1), pp. 146-150. Available at: <<https://www.gramota.net/materials/2/2017/3-1/44.html>> [Accessed 12 January 2019].

Online dictionaries

Hrvatski jezični portal < <http://hjp.znanje.hr/>>

Oxford Dictionary. <<https://www.lexico.com/en>>

The Free Dictionary <<https://www.thefreedictionary.com/>>

Online Etymology Dictionary (OED) <<https://www.etymonline.com/>>

Грамота.ру <<http://gramota.ru/>>

Русский Викисловарь. <https://ru.wiktionary.org/wiki/Заглавная_страница>

Websites

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

Hrvatska enciklopedija <<https://www.enciklopedija.hr/>>

Karp, Masha. 2017. *Orwell in Translation*. [online] European studies blog. Available at: <<https://blogs.bl.uk/european/2017/11/orwell-in-translation.html>> [Accessed 26 April 2020].

Orwell, George. 1947. *George Orwell's Preface to the Ukrainian Edition of Animal Farm*. [online] The Orwell Foundation. Available at: <<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 24 April 2020].

Sketch Engine <<https://www.sketchengine.eu/>>

(Bespalova 2001)

Беспалова, Лариса Георгиевна. 2001. *Скотный двор: сказка*. [online] George Orwell's Library. Available at: <https://orwell.ru/library/novels/Animal_Farm/russian/rsd_lb> [Accessed 25 April 2020].

8. Appendices

Each of the six appendices presented here contains a table with all 48 proper names studied for the purposes of this paper, their renderings in one of the target texts, and the procedures applied for each item.

Appendix 1 (CTT1)

George Orwell: <i>Animal Farm: A Fairy Story</i> (1951)	Vladimir Roksandić: <i>Životinjska farma : bajka</i> (1983)	Procedure used for rendering proper names
<i>Anthroponyms (personal names)</i>		
(Mr) Jones	gospodin Jones	translation + copy
Mrs Jones	gospođa Jones	translation + copy
Major	Major	copy
Snowball	Snowball	copy
Napoleon	Napoleon	copy
Squealer	Squealer	copy
Bluebell	Bluebell	copy
Jessie	Jessie	copy
Pincher	Pincher	copy
Boxer	Boxer	copy
Clover	Clover	copy
Muriel	Muriel	copy
Benjamin	Benjamin	copy
Mollie	Mollie	copy
Moses	Moses	copy
(Mr) Pilkington	(gospodin) Pilkington	translation + copy
(Mr) Frederick	(gospodin) Frederick	translation + copy
(Mr) Whymper	(gospodin) Whymper	translation + copy
Minimus	Minimus	copy
Pinkeye	Pinkeye	copy
Alfred Simmonds	Alfred Simmonds	copy
<i>Geographical designations and facilities</i>		
Willingdon	Willingdon	copy
England	Engleska	conventionality
Taproom of the Red Lion	točionica “Crveni lav”	translation
Manor Farm	Vlastelinska farma	translation
Animal Farm	Životinjska farma	translation
Foxwood	Foxwood	copy
Pinchfield	Pinchfield	copy
Sugarcandy Mountain	Slatka Gora	translation
Republic of the Animals	Životinjska Republika / Republika Životinja	translation
<i>Magazines and newspapers</i>		
News of the World	“Svjetske novosti”	translation
John Bull	<i>John Bull</i>	copy
Tit-Bits	<i>Tit-Bits</i>	copy

Daily Mirror	<i>Daily Mirror</i>	copy
Farmer and Stockbreeder	<i>Farmer i uzgajivač stoke</i>	translation
Songs		
Beasts of England	Životinje Engleske	translation
Comrade Napoleon	Drug Napoleon	translation
Clementine	Ø	deletion
La Cucaracha	Ø	deletion
Animal Committees		
Egg Production Committee	Komitet za proizvodnju jaja	translation
Clean Tails League	Liga čistih repova	translation
Wild Comrades' Re-education Committee	Komitet za preodgajanje divljih drugova	translation
Whiter Wool Movement	Pokret za bjelju vunu	translation
Nicknames for Napoleon		
Leader	Vođa	translation
Father of All Animals	Otac svih životinja	translation
Terror of Mankind	Užas čovječanstva	translation
Protector of the Sheep-fold	Zaštitnik ovčjeg tora	translation
Ducklings' Friend	Prijatelj pačića	translation

Appendix 2 (CTT2)

George Orwell: <i>Animal Farm: A Fairy Story</i> (1951)	Lada Furlan Zaborac: <i>Životinjska farma : bajka</i> (2018)	Procedure used for rendering proper names
Anthroponyms (personal names)		
(Mr) Jones	gospodin Jones	translation + copy
Mrs Jones	gospođa Jones	translation + copy
Major	Major	copy
Snowball	Snowball	copy
Napoleon	Napoleon	copy
Squealer	Squealer	copy + explanation in a footnote
Bluebell	Bluebell	copy
Jessie	Jessie	copy
Pincher	Pincher	copy
Boxer	Boxer	copy
Clover	Clover	copy
Muriel	Muriel	copy
Benjamin	Benjamin	copy
Mollie	Mollie	copy
Moses	Moses	copy
(Mr) Pilkington	(gospodin) Pilkington	translation + copy
(Mr) Frederick	(gospodin) Frederick	translation + copy
(Mr) Whymper	(gospodin) Whymper	translation + copy + explanation in a footnote
Minimus	Minimus	copy

Pinkeye	Pinkeye	copy
Alfred Simmonds	Alfred Simmonds	copy
<i>Geographical designations and facilities</i>		
Willingdon	Willingdon	copy
England	Engleska	conventionality
Taproom of the Red Lion	gostionica "Crveni lav"	translation
Manor Farm	Vlastelinska farma	translation
Animal Farm	Životinjska farma	translation
Foxwood	Foxwood	copy + explanation in a footnote
Pinchfield	Pinchfield	copy + explanation in a footnote
Sugarcandy Mountain	Šećerna gora	translation
Republic of the Animals	Životinjska Republika / Republika Životinja	translation
<i>Magazines and newspapers</i>		
News of the World	list <i>News of the World</i>	addition + copy
John Bull	časopis <i>John Bull</i>	addition + copy
Tit-Bits	časopis <i>Tit-Bits</i>	addition + copy
Daily Mirror	časopis <i>Daily Mirror</i>	addition + copy
Farmer and Stockbreeder	časopis <i>Farmer i stočar</i>	addition + translation
<i>Songs</i>		
Beasts of England	<i>Životinje Engleske</i>	translation
Comrade Napoleon	<i>Drug Napoleon</i>	translation
Clementine	<i>Pjesma Clementine</i>	addition + copy
La Cucaracha	<i>Pjesma La Cucaracha</i>	addition + copy
<i>Animal Committees</i>		
Egg Production Committee	Komitet za proizvodnju jaja	translation
Clean Tails League	Liga čistih repova	translation
Wild Comrades' Re-education Committee	Komitet za preodgoj divljih drugova	translation
Whiter Wool Movement	Pokret za bjelju vunu	translation
<i>Nicknames for Napoleon</i>		
Leader	Voda	translation
Father of All Animals	Otac svih životinja	translation
Terror of Mankind	Strah i trepet ljudskog roda	translation
Protector of the Sheep-fold	Zaštitnik ovčjeg tora	translation
Ducklings' Friend	Prijatelj pačica	translation

The explanations in a footnote for four proper names are the following:

Squealer: (eng.) skvičalo; izdajica, cinkaroš

gospodin Whymper: (eng.) cmizdravac

Foxwood; Pinchfield: (eng.) Pinchfield – škrta zemlja; Foxwood – lisičja šuma

Appendix 3 (RTT1)

George Orwell: <i>Animal Farm: A Fairy Story</i> (1951)	Mariâ Kriger and Gleb Struve: <i>Skotskij Hutor</i> (1950)	Procedure used for rendering proper names
<i>Anthroponyms (personal names)</i>		
(Mr) Jones	г-н/фермер Джонс (g-n/fermer Džons)	translation + adaptation
Mrs Jones	госпожа Джонс (gospoža Džons)	translation + adaptation
Major	Майор (Major)	translation
Snowball	Снежок (Snežok)	translation
Napoleon	Наполеон (Napoleon)	conventionality
Squealer	Фискал (Fiskal)	translation
Bluebell	Белка (Belka)	substitution
Jessie	Милка (Milka)	substitution
Pincher	Щипун (Šipun)	translation
Boxer	Боксёр (Boksër)	translation
Clover	Кашка (Kaška)	translation
Muriel	Манька (Man'ka)	substitution
Benjamin	Вениамин (Veniamin)	conventionality
Mollie	Молли (Molli)	adaptation
Moses	Моисей (Moisej)	conventionality
(Mr) Pilkington	г-н Пилкингтон (g-n Pilkington)	translation + adaptation
(Mr) Frederick	г-н Фридрих (g-n Fridrih)	translation + conventionality
(Mr) Whympet	г-н Уимпер (g-n Uimper)	translation + adaptation
Minimus	Минимус (Minimus)	adaptation
Pinkeye	Красноглаз (Krasnoglaz)	translation
Alfred Simmonds	Альфред Симмондс (Al'fred Simmonds)	adaptation
<i>Geographical designations and facilities</i>		
Willingdon	Виллингдон (Villingdon)	adaptation
England	Англия (Angliâ)	conventionality
Taproom of the Red Lion	Кабачка «Красный Лев» (кабачка „Krasnyj Lev“)	translation
Manor Farm	Барский Хутор (Barskij Hutor)	translation
Animal Farm	Скотский Хутор (Skotskij Hutor)	translation
Foxwood	Лисий Заказ (Lisij Zakaz)	translation
Pinchfield	Скудополье (Skudopol'e)	translation
Sugarcandy Mountain	Ø	deletion
Republic of the Animals	Республика Животных (Respublika Životnyh)	translation
<i>Magazines and newspapers</i>		

News of the World	газета (gazeta)	replacement with a common noun/expression
John Bull	Еженедельник «Джон Булл» (eženedel'nik „Džon Bull“)	addition + adaptation
Tit-Bits	Еженедельник «Болтовня» (eženedel'nik „Boltovná“)	addition + translation
Daily Mirror	газета «Зеркало дня»	addition + translation
Farmer and Stockbreeder	журнал «Хуторянин и животновод» (žurnal „Hutorânin i životnovod“)	addition + translation
<i>Songs</i>		
Beasts of England	Скот английский (Skot angljskij)	translation
Comrade Napoleon	Товарищ Наполеон (Tovariš Napoleon)	translation
Clementine	Клементина (Klementina)	adaptation
La Cucaracha	Кукарача (Kukarača)	adaptation
<i>Animal Committees</i>		
Egg Production Committee	Комитет Яйценесения (Komitet Âiceneseniâ)	translation
Clean Tails League	Союз Чистых Хвостов (Souz Čistyh Hvostov)	translation
Wild Comrades' Re-education Committee	Комитет по Перековке Диких Товарищей (Komitet po Perekovke Dikih Tovarišej)	translation
Whiter Wool Movement	Движение за Более Белую Шерсть (Dviženie za Bolee Beluû Šerst')	translation
<i>Nicknames for Napoleon</i>		
Leader	Вождь (Vožd')	translation
Father of All Animals	Отец Всех Скотов (Otec Sveh Skotov)	translation
Terror of Mankind	Ужас Человечества (Užas Čelovečstva)	translation
Protector of the Sheep-fold	Защитник Отары Овец (Zašitnik Otary Ovec)	translation
Ducklings' Friend	Друг Утят (Drug Utât)	translation

Appendix 4 (RTT2)

George Orwell: <i>Animal Farm: A Fairy Story</i> (1951)	Пан Polock. <i>Skotnyj dvor</i> (1988)	Procedure used for rendering proper names
<i>Anthroponyms (personal names)</i>		

(Mr) Jones	(мистер) Джонс (mister Džons)	translation + adaptation
Mrs Jones	миссис Джонс (missis Džons)	translation + adaptation
Major	Майор (Major)	adaptation
Snowball	Сноуболл (Snouboll)	adaptation
Napoleon	Наполеон (Napoleon)	adaptation
Squealer	Визгун (Vizgun)	translation
Bluebell	Блюбелл (Blûbell)	adaptation
Jessie	Джесси (Džessi)	adaptation
Pincher	Пинчер (Pinčer)	adaptation
Boxer	Боксер (Bokser)	adaptation
Clover	Кlover (Klover)	adaptation
Muriel	Мюриель (Mûriel')	adaptation
Benjamin	Бенджамин (Bendžamin)	adaptation
Mollie	Молли (Molli)	adaptation
Moses	Мозус (Mozus)	adaptation
(Mr) Pilkington	мистер Пилкингтон (mister Pilkington)	translation + adaptation
(Mr) Frederick	мистер Фредерик (mister Frederik)	translation + adaptation
(Mr) Whymper	мистер Уимпер (mister Uimper)	translation + adaptation
Minimus	Минимус (Minimus)	adaptation
Pinkeye	Пинки (pinkî)	adaptation
Alfred Simmonds	Альфред Симмонс (Al'fred Simmons)	adaptation
<i>Geographical designations and facilities</i>		
Willingdon	Уиллингдон (Uillingdon)	adaptation
England	Англия (Angliâ)	conventionality
Taproom of the Red Lion	распивочная «Красный лев» (raspivočnaâ „Krasnyj lev“)	translation
Manor Farm	ферма «Усадьба» (ferma „Usad'ba“)	translation
Animal Farm	Скотский хутор (Skotskij hutor)	translation
Foxwood	Фоксвуд (Foksvud)	adaptation
Pinchfield	Пинчфилд (Pinčfîld)	adaptation
Sugarcandy Mountain	Леденцовая Гора (Ledencovaâ Gora)	translation
Republic of the Animals	республика животных (republika životnyh)	translation
<i>Magazines and newspapers</i>		
News of the World	газета (gazeta)	replacement with a common noun/expression
John Bull	«Джон Буль» („Džon Bul“)	adaptation

Tit-Bits	«Тит-бит» („Tit-bit“)	adaptation
Daily Mirror	«Дейли Миррор» („Dejli Mirror“)	adaptation
Farmer and Stockbreeder	журнал «Фермер и животновод» (žurnal „Fermer i životnovod“)	addition + translation
<i>Songs</i>		
Beasts of England	Скоты Англии (Skoty Anglii)	translation
Comrade Napoleon	Товарищ Наполеон (Tovariš Napoleon)	translation
Clementine	Клементина (Klementina)	adaptation
La Cucaracha	Кукарача (Kukarača)	adaptation
<i>Animal Committees</i>		
Egg Production Committee	комитет по производству яиц (komitet po proizvodstvu jajc)	translation
Clean Tails League	лига чистых хвостов (liga čistyh hvostov)	translation
Wild Comrades' Re-education Committee	комитет по вторичному образованию диких товарищей (komitet po vtoričnomu obrazovaniiu dikih tovarišej)	translation
Whiter Wool Movement	движение за белую шерсть (dviženie za beluū šerst')	translation
<i>Nicknames for Napoleon</i>		
Leader	Вождь (Vožd')	translation
Father of All Animals	Отец всех животных (Otec vseh životnyh)	translation
Terror of Mankind	ужас человечества (užas čelovečstva)	translation
Protector of the Sheep-fold	покровитель овец (pokrovitel' ovec)	translation
Ducklings' Friend	защитник утят (zašitnik utât)	translation

Appendix 5 (RTT3)

George Orwell: <i>Animal Farm: A Fairy Story</i> (1951)	Larisa Georgievna Bepalova: <i>Skotnyj dvor: Skazka</i> (1992)	Procedure used for rendering proper names
<i>Anthroponyms (personal names)</i>		
(Mr) Jones	(мистер) Джонс (mister Džons)	translation + adaptation
Mrs Jones	миссис Джонс (missis Džons)	translation + adaptation
Major	Главарь (Glavar')	substitution

Snowball	Обвал (Obval)	translation
Napoleon	Наполеон (Napoleon)	conventionality
Squealer	Стукач (Stukač)	translation
Bluebell	Ромашка (Romaška)	substitution
Jessie	Роза (Roza)	substitution
Pincher	Кусай (Kusaj)	substitution
Boxer	Боец (Боец)	substitution
Clover	Кашка (Kaška)	translation
Muriel	Мона (Mona)	substitution
Benjamin	Вениамин (Veniamin)	conventionality
Mollie	Молли (Molli)	adaptation
Moses	Моисей (Moisej)	conventionality
(Mr) Pilkington	(мистер) Калмингтон (mister Kalmington)	translation + substitution
(Mr) Frederick	(мистер) Питер (mister Piter)	translation + substitution
(Mr) Whymper	(мистер) Сопли (mister Sopli)	translation + substitution
Minimus	Последыш (Posledyš)	substitution
Pinkeye	Буркало (Burkalo)	translation
Alfred Simmonds	Альфред Симмондс (Alfred Simmonds)	adaptation
<i>Geographical designations and facilities</i>		
Willingdon	Уиллингдон (Uillingdon)	adaptation
England	Англия (Angliâ)	conventionality
Taproom of the Red Lion	гостиница «Красный Лев» (gostinica „Krasnyj Lev“)	translation
Manor Farm	Господский Двор (Gospodskij Dvor)	translation
Animal Farm	Скотный Двор (Skotnyj Dvor)	translation
Foxwood	Плутни (Plutni)	translation
Pinchfield	Склоки (Skloki)	substitution
Sugarcandy Mountain	молочные реки и кисельные берега / молочные реки с кисельными берегами (moločnye reki i kisel'nye beregа / moločnye reki s kisel'nymi beregami)	replacement with a common noun/expression
Republic of the Animals	Скотская Республика (Skotskaâ Respublika)	translation
<i>Magazines and newspapers</i>		
News of the World	«Ньюс оф уорлд» („N'ûs of uorld“)	adaptation + explanation in a footnote
John Bull	«Джон Буль» (“Džon Bul”)	adaptation + explanation in a footnote

Tit-Bits	«Тит-бит» („Tit-bit“)	adaptation + explanation in a footnote
Daily Mirror	«Дейли Миррор» (“Dejli Mirror”)	adaptation + explanation in a footnote
Farmer and Stockbreeder	комплект «Земледельца и скотовода» (komplekt „Zemledel'ca i skotovoda“)	addition + translation
<i>Songs</i>		
Beasts of England	Твари Англии (Tvari Anglii)	translation
Comrade Napoleon	Товарищ Наполеон (Tovariš Napoleon)	translation
Clementine	Клементина (Klementina)	adaptation
La Cucaracha	Кукарача (Kukarača)	adaptation
<i>Animal Committees</i>		
Egg Production Committee	Комитет по яйцекладке (Komitet po âjcekladke)	translation
Clean Tails League	Комиссия по очистке хвостов (Komissiâ po očistke hvostov)	translation
Wild Comrades' Re-education Committee	Ассоциация по перевоспитанию диких товарищей (Associaciâ po perevosпитaniû dikih tovarišej)	translation
Whiter Wool Movement	Движение за самую белую шерсть (Dviženie za samuû beluû šerst')	translation
<i>Nicknames for Napoleon</i>		
Leader	Вождь (vožd')	translation
Father of All Animals	Отец Животных Всего Мира (Otec Životnyh Vsego Mira)	translation
Terror of Mankind	Гроза Рода Человеческого (Groza Rosa Čelovečeskogo)	translation
Protector of the Sheep-fold	Мудрый Пастырь (Mudryj Pastyr')	translation
Ducklings' Friend	Лучший Друг Утят (Lučšij Drug Utât)	translation

The explanations in a footnote for four proper names are the following:

Ньюс оф уорлд: *News of the World* — воскресная газета бульварного типа; часто публикует сенсационные материалы неполитического характера; тираж около 5 млн. экз. Основана в 1843 году.

Джон Буль: *John Bull* — название периодического издания — от нарицательного Джон Буль — типичный англичанин, простоватый фермер в памфлете Дж. Арбетнота (John Arbuthnot, 1667-1735).

Тит-бит: *Tit-Bits* — «Титбитс» (букв. лакомые кусочки) — популярный ежемесячный журнал; печатает статьи, рассказы и картинки развлекательного характера, биографические очерки и т. п. Основан в 1895 году.

Дейли Миррор: *the Daily Mirror* — «Дейли миррор» — ежедневная малоформатная газета (tabloid), рассчитанная на массового читателя; по некоторым вопросам поддерживает Лейбористскую партию (Labour Party); публикует много сенсационно-развлекательных и рекламных материалов; тираж около 3 млн. экз.; издается в Лондоне концерном «Миррор групп ньюспейперз» (Mirror Group Newspapers). Основана в 1903 году.

Appendix 6 (RTT4)

George Orwell: <i>Animal Farm: A Fairy Story</i> (1951)	Vladimir Pribylovskij. <i>Zverskaâ Ferma: Skazka</i> (2002)	Procedure used for rendering proper names
<i>Anthroponyms (personal names)</i>		
(Mr) Jones	(мистер) Джонс (mister Džons)	translation + adaptation
Mrs Jones	(миссис) Джонс (missis Džons)	translation + adaptation
Major	Майор (Major)	adaptation
Snowball	Снежок (Snežok)	translation
Napoleon	Наполеон (Napoleon)	conventionality
Squealer	Визгун (Vizgun)	translation
Bluebell	Блюбель (Blûbel')	adaptation
Jessie	Джесси (Džessi)	adaptation
Pincher	Пинчер (Pinčer)	adaptation
Boxer	Боксер (Bokser)	adaptation
Clover	Кашка (Kaška)	translation
Muriel	Мюриель (Mûriel')	adaptation
Benjamin	Бенджамин (Bendžamin)	adaptation
Mollie	Молли (Molli)	adaptation
Moses	Моисей (Moisej)	conventionality
(Mr) Pilkington	(мистер) Пилькингтон (mister Pil'kington)	translation + adaptation
(Mr) Frederick	(мистер) Фредерик (mister Frederik)	translation + adaptation
(Mr) Whymper	(мистер) Вимпер (mister Vimper)	translation + adaptation
Minimus	Минимус (Minimus)	adaptation
Pinkeye	Пинки (Pinki)	adaptation
Alfred Simmonds	Альфред Симонс (Al'fred Simons)	adaptation

<i>Geographical designations and facilities</i>		
Willingdon	Виллингдон (Villingdon)	adaptation
England	Англия (Angliâ)	conventionality
Taproom of the Red Lion	бар «Рыжий Левъ» (bar „Ryžij Lev“)	translation
Manor Farm	Барская Ферма (Barskaâ Ferma)	translation
Animal Farm	Зверская Ферма (Zverskaâ Ferma)	translation
Foxwood	Фоксвуд (Foksvud)	adaptation
Pinchfield	Пинчфильд (Pinčfil'd)	adaptation
Sugarcandy Mountain	Леденцовые Горы (Ledencovye Gory)	translation
Republic of the Animals	Республика Зверей / Республика Животных (Respublika Zverej / Respublika Životnyh)	translation
<i>Magazines and newspapers</i>		
News of the World	газета «Ньюс оф зе уорлд» (gazeta „N'ûs of ze uorld“)	addition + adaptation
John Bull	«Джон Буль» („Džon Bul“)	adaptation
Tit-Bits	«Тит Битс» („Tit Bits“)	adaptation
Daily Mirror	«Дейли Миррор» („Dejli Mirror“)	adaptation
Farmer and Stockbreeder	журнал «Земледелец и животновод» (žurnal „Zemledelec i životnovod“)	addition + translation
<i>Songs</i>		
Beasts of England	Все животные Британии (Vse životnyje Britanii)	translation
Comrade Napoleon	Наш Отец Наполеон (Naš Otec Napoleon)	translation
Clementine	Клементина (Klementina)	adaptation
La Cucaracha	Кукарача (Kukarača)	adaptation
<i>Animal Committees</i>		
Egg Production Committee	Комитет по Производству Яиц (Komitet po Proizvodstvu Jáic)	translation
Clean Tails League	Лига Чистых Хвостов (Liga Čistyh Hvostov)	translation
Wild Comrades' Re-education Committee	Комитет Перековки Диких Товарищей (Komitet Perekovki Dikih Tovarišej)	translation
Whiter Wool Movement	Движение за Самую Белую Шерсть (Dviženie za Samuû Beluû Šerst')	translation

<i>Nicknames for Napoleon</i>		
Leader	Вождь (Vožd')	translation
Father of All Animals	Отец Всех Животных (Otex Vseh Životnyh)	translation
Terror of Mankind	Ужас Человечества (Užas Čelovečestva)	translation
Protector of the Sheep-fold	Покровитель Овчарен (Pokrovitel' Ovčaren)	translation
Ducklings' Friend	Друг Утят (Drug Utât)	translation