English Loanwords in Two Russian Translations of J. D. Salinger's Novel The Catcher in the Rye: the Connection between Language Borrowing and Ideology in Translation

Brajnović, Marta

SVEUČILIŠTE U ZAGREBU

FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET

ODSJEK ZA ANGLISTIKU

ODSJEK ZA ISTOČNOSLAVENSKE JEZIKE I KNJIŽEVNOSTI – KATEDRA ZA RUSKI JEZIK

Marta Brajnović

Anglizmi u dvama ruskim prijevodima romana J. D. Salingera *Lovac u Žitu*:
veza između jezičnog posuđivanja i ideologije u prijevodu

Англицизмы в двух русских переводах романа Дж. Д. Сэлинджера *The Catcher in the Rye*:
связь языкового заимствования и идеологии в переводе

Diplomski rad

Mentori:

dr. sc. Nataša Pavlović, izv. prof.

dr.sc. Željka Čelić, izv. prof.

Zagreb, 2018.

UNIVERSITY OF ZAGREB

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

DEPARTMENT OF EAST SLAVIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES – CHAIR OF RUSSIAN LANGUAGE

Marta Brajnović

English Loanwords in Two Russian Translations of J. D. Salinger's Novel *The Catcher in the Rye:*
the Connection between Language Borrowing and Ideology in Translation

M.A. thesis

Supervisors:
Dr. Nataša Pavlović, Associate Professor
Dr. Željka Čelić, Associate Professor

Zagreb, 2018

Table of contents

Abstract

This paper studies English loanwords in two Russian translations of J. D. Salinger's novel *The Catcher in the Rye,* and takes language borrowing as a starting point to explore the influence of social and personal ideology on translation. The aim is to show the interrelation between the influences that translators, their socio-cultural context and the dominant translation norms exert on a given translation.

The total number of English loan words (Anglicisms) is expected to reflect the changes in the Russian lexion, and is therefore expected to be significantly higher in the more recent, contemporary translation. Salinger's novel uses youth slang, and today's Russian youth slang is characterized by a considerable influx of Anglicisms. The two translations are therefore also expected to differ in the number of English loanwords belonging to youth slang. Lastly, on the basis of the previous two hypotheses, the more recent translation is expected to cointain more Anglicisms which belong, according to Martin Haspelmath's classification, to the group of core borrowings, while the older translation is expected to contain more cultural borrowings. These hypotheses are tested by analysing the English loanwords in the two translations, and the results are interpreted within the theoretical framework of descriptive translation studies.

Keywords

Резюме

В данной дипломной работе анализируются английские заимствования в двух переводах романа Джерома Дэвида Сэлинджера *The Catcher in the Rye*: *Над пропастью во ржи* Риты Райт-Ковалевой периода Хрущевской оттепели и *Ловец над хлебным полем* Макса Немцова, впервые опубликованном в 2008 г. Целью данной работы является попытка указать, возможно ли с помощью англицизмов исследовать влияние общественной и личной идеологий на перевод, т.е. являются ли (и, если да, каким способом) английские заимствования указателями взаимодействия влияний, которые переводчики, общественно-культурный контекст переводов и доминирующие переводческие нормы оказывают на определенный перевод. Что касается англицизмов, ожидается, что их общее количество в переводах будет отражать изменения в русской лексике, так как роман Сэлинджера использует молодежный сленг. На основе этого предположения сформулированы гипотезы. Согласно первой гипотезе данного исследования, число англицизмов в переводе Немцова должно быть значительно выше, чем в переводе Райт-Ковалевой, поскольку сегодняшний русский молодежный сленг охарактеризован значительным притоком слов английского происхождения. Следовательно, нами анализируемые два перевода также должны отличатся в числе англицизмов, принадлежащих регистру молодежного сленга. На основе предыдущих двух гипотез, предполагается, что перевод Немцова содержит больше английских заимствований, которые, согласно классификации Мартина Хаспельмата, принадлежат группе базовых заимствований (англ. *core borrowings*), а перевод Райт-Ковалевой содержит больше англицизмов из группы культурных заимствований (англ. *cultural borrowings*). Эти три гипотезы проверены на основе англицизмов, собранных из нами анализируемых переводов. В конце мы объяснили результаты данного исследования на основе парадигмы дескриптивного переводоведения. Чтобы наша интерпретация результатов привела к правильному выводу, данная дипломная работа начинается с краткого обзора истории языкового заимствования из английского в русский язык, затем описывается отношение к англицизмам в современном русском обществе, и анализируются признаки современного русского молодежного сленга. Далее, внимание уделяется языковым особенностям романа Сэлинджера в подлиннике и тому, как из-за них эту книгу в США воспринимали по-разному после публикации: одни хвалили ее, а другие остро критиковали из-за ненормативной лексики. После краткого изложения

работ, занимающихся разновременными переводами романа Сэлинджера на определенный язык, данная работа сосредоточивается на переводы Райт-Ковалевой и Немцова и их общественно-исторические контексты, языковые особенности и критические приемы. Перевод Райт-Ковалевой в большей мере рассматривается в рамках советской цензуры и адаптации оригинального текста согласно доминирующей идеологии (включая язык романа и его интерпретацию). На основе изучения отзывов и комментариев про современный перевод Немцова, данная работа пришла к выводу, что некоторые из старых переводческих норм (особенно те, которые касаются выбора текста для перевода) все еще являются действующими среди русских литературных профессионалов и русских читателей. Мы считаем, что цель перевода Немцова – бросить вызов каноническому переводу Райт-Ковалевой, потому что Немцов отдает предпочтение исконно русскому сленгу (Райт-Ковалева нейтрализовала сленговую лексику в своем переводе) и на самом деле использует достаточно малое количество англицизмов (что противоречит характеристикам современного русского молодежного сленга). Факт, что перевод Немцова плохо приняли критики и читатели, мы здесь считаем указанием на то, что нормы, ставящие на почетное место канонические советские переводы и «запрещающие» новые переопереводы, все еще оказывают значительное влияние в российской литературной сфере. Надо отметить, что таким способом не только литературные профессионалы, но и читатели, участвуют в репродукции этих доминирующих норм. Наша интерпретация результатов исследования осуществлена в рамках теоретической базы дескриптивного переводоведения, особенно на основе работ Гидеона Тури и Андре Лефевра. Несмотря на то, что нужно намного шире исследование, чтобы прийти к окончательному выводу о нормах по переопереводам в современной России, наша работа указывает на то, что какой-то элемент идеологии (личной идеологии переводчика или общественной идеологии, связанной с совокупной системой переводческих норм), всегда играет определенную роль в процессе осуществления перевода.

Ключевые слова

Языковое заимствование, молодежный сленг, англицизм, идеология, дескриптивное переводоведение, переводческие нормы

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this thesis is to explore the influence of ideology on translation and its relation to language borrowing, by comparing two Russian translations of *The Catcher in the Rye*: Rita Rait-Kovaleva's translation *Nad propastiu vo rzhi* and Max Nemtsov's translation published under the title *Lovec nad khlebnym polem*[12]. The study is conducted using a mixed-methods approach: English loanwords in the two translations are first compared in terms of number and type, and the results of this quantitative analysis are then interpreted within the descriptive translation studies (DTS) theoretical framework, as indicators of the influence a given kind of ideology exerts on translation. Ideology is here understood as a set of ideas or beliefs applied to a text undergoing translation in order to achieve a particular aim and expressed by an individual (personal ideology) or the (political and/or literary) establishment. These two types of ideology may or may not correspond to the social ideology shared by the majority of the members of a given community.

The role of personal ideology on translation will be discussed to explain the unexpected absence of English loanwords in Nemtsov's contemporary translation. On the other hand, the role of social ideology will be called upon to explain the impact of the socio-historical context surrounding the production of Rait-Kovaleva's translation, as well as the backlash against Nemtsov's contemporary translation on the part of reviewers, critics and a considerable part of the reading public. Such an analysis is conducted within the framework of descriptive translation studies by relying on André Lefevere's and Gideon Toury's works and combining their approaches. Thus, this paper makes use both of Lefevere's distinction between patronage and poetics as two main factors involved in the rewriting of translations and of Toury's (1995: 54-55) concept of norms as "the translation of general values or ideas shared by a community – as to what is right and wrong, adequate and inadequate". According to Toury (1995: 55), "because of their existence, and the wide range of situations they apply to (with the conformity this implies), [norms] are the main factors ensuring the establishment and retention of social order".

---

[1] The research in this paper is based on the 1986 edition of Rait-Kovaleva's translation and the 2016 edition of Nemtsov's translation.

[2] In this paper, a part of Russian names is transliterated according to the tradition established in English-speaking countries or the way these names have already been transliterated in English by the author(s) (e.g. Jekaterina Young, Internatsionalnaya literatura, Korney Chukovsky, Nataliya Rudnytska), while the remaining majority of Russian names and expressions is transliterated according to the ICAO system (applied to Russian passports since 2013).

In order to provide as much context as possible so as to reach a valid conclusion, this paper first gives an overview of the history of lexical borrowing from English into Russian and the features of contemporary Russian youth slang. The hypotheses in this thesis are based on the scholarly works dealing with these topics, as well as the publisher's preface to Nemtsov's translation. The hypotheses are tested by means of a quantitative analysis, by collecting two sets of English loanwords, in order to verify whether there is a significant difference between these two translations regarding the number of English loanwords, especially when it comes to youth slang. The discrepancy between the expectations formulated in the hypotheses and the results from the quantitative analysis is then interpreted as a consequence of the influence of personal ideology on Nemtsov's part and the position his translation takes in relation to Rait-Kovaleva's canonical translation. When it comes to the influence of social ideology on translation, this paper tries to indicate how Soviet censorship influenced the production of Rait-Kovaleva's translation and how the source text was adapted to fit into the dominant ideology, both in terms of the novel's language and the interpretation of its content. Moreover, some of the old translation norms, especially those concerning translation policy, are shown to still hold sway among contemporary Russian literary professionals and Russian readers.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter provides a brief overview of the key translation theories and concepts applied in this paper and gives a general introduction to the framework of descriptive translation studies and the issues concerning translation, language and culture. A more detailed discussion, including the application of those concepts to concrete examples, will ensue in the latter part of the paper when analysing and interpreting the results from the two sets of English loanwords.

When doing translation research, one of the first problems to arise is how to define what constitutes a translation. Firstly, there is the distinction between translation as a process/activity and translation as an individual text or utterance, i.e. the product of the aforementioned process or activity. Secondly, as Mark Shuttleworth (2014: 181) writes, translation is "an incredibly broad notion which can be understood in many different ways"

and its definition will often depend on the corresponding theoretical model, which means that there can be as many definitions of translation as there are approaches to translation. For instance, Vladimir Ivir (1984: 11) [3] defines translation as "a transformation of a message (thought, feeling, wish, order) previously expressed in one language into an equivalent message expressed in another language". In Leonard Forster's (1958: 6, quoted in Nida 2004: 131) view, a good translation is "one which fulfils the same purpose in the new language as the original did in the language in which it was written". According to Nida and Taber (1969/1982: 12, quoted in Shuttleworth 2014: 182), translation as an activity refers to "reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style", while Roman Jakobson (1959/1966: 233, quoted in Shuttleworth 2014: 182) regards translation as "an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language".

The sheer variety of approaches to translation is a direct result of the very complexity of the translation phenomenon, which is far from restricted only to language:

> Although discussion usually revolves around translation 'from one language to another', in reality, the translation process does not only encompass the substitution of one language for another. In translation, different cultures, personalities, mind-sets, literatures, eras, stages of development, customs and attitudes collide with each other (Komissarov 2002: 23).

Thus, even though translation was studied within the framework of philology for a long time, translation as an activity in fact reflects a particular situation within a given culture and how this culture "behaves" or "reacts" in contact with other cultures. As André Lefevere (1992b: 14) writes, "[t]ranslations are not made in a vacuum. Translators function in a given culture at a given time. The way they understand themselves and their culture is one of the factors that may influence the way in which they translate".

2.1. Descriptive translation studies

Descriptive translation studies (DTS) was first introduced by James S. Holmes in 1972. In his view, translation as a field of study should be divided into the pure and applied branches (with the pure branch further divided into the descriptive and theoretical subgroups, while the applied branch encompasses the prescriptive approaches to translation and

---

[3] All translations from Croatian and Russian are done by the author of the thesis.

translation teaching). Holmes' aim was to establish translation research as an empirical discipline based on the objective description of all translation phenomena (Baker and Saldanha 2009: 77). This idea of translation studies as a proper empirical science was later developed by Gideon Toury (2014: 20), who sees translation as "any target-language utterance which is presented or regarded as such within the target culture, on whatever grounds". This way, even pseudotranslations are a valid object of study within the descriptive translation studies paradigm, since they indicate what features a given text should contain in order to be regarded as a translation by a given community (ibid.). Toury's approach to DTS is strictly target-oriented: he claims that translations are facts of the target system, since "translators operate first and foremost in the interest of the culture into which they are translating, and not in the interest of the source text, let alone the source culture" (2014: 19). Therefore, by describing translations as what they actually are (and not what they should be), DTS enables scholars to reach a conclusion as to what is defined as an equivalent translation by a given community on the basis of the relations existing between a given translation and its target system and its assumed source (2014: 20-21). These two sets of relations are not stable or inherent; rather, Toury claims that they are governed by norms. As already mentioned, norms are a type of socio-cultural constraint reflecting the values and ideas shared by a community. Since "[t]ranslation is a kind of activity which inevitably involves at least two languages and two cultural traditions, i.e. at least two sets of norm-systems on each level" (2014: 56), translation norms regulate the way in which the conflict between the source and target cultures is resolved in the target system. Meanwhile, any kind of failure in observing these established patterns is easily detected by members of the target system (ibid.)

Another significant theory within the DTS framework is Itamar Even-Zohar's polysystem theory. Even-Zohar (1990: 2) sees literature "not as an isolated activity in society, regulated by laws exclusively (and inherently) different from all the rest of the human activities, but as an integral—often central and very powerful—factor among the latter". He claims that all translations done in a particular community (i.e. the community's literary polysystem) indicate two important aspects of the target culture: the principles governing the selection of sources to be translated and the way in which translations make use of the literary repertoire of the home co-systems (e.g. the adoption of certain literary norms of the target culture in translations) (1990: 46). In addition to this, translated literature can occupy either the central or peripheral position within the literary polysystem. That is, it can either influence the shaping of the target system's literature or it can be employed to preserve the already

dominant type of literature by adhering to the dominant norms (1990: 46-48). Yet, not all varieties of translation need necessarily occupy the same position: "As a system, literature is itself stratified" and "while one section of translated literature may assume a central position, another may remain quite peripheral" (1990: 49).

The DTS theoretical framework has been criticized for its excessive rigidity, scientificity and reliance on positivism and for neglecting the particular situations in which translators may find themselves (Baker and Saldanha 2009: 78). In his works, André Lefevere broadens the traditional scope of DTS and emphasizes the role that the target system's dominant ideology plays in the translation process. He defines a translation as a "rewriting of the original text" (1992a: vii; 1992b: xi) and, as such, "[it] reflect[s] a certain ideology and poetics and as such manipulate[s] literature to function in a given society in a given way" (1992b: xi). Furthermore, Lefevere applies his ideological critique to Even-Zohar's polysytem theory and identifies the two main factors exercising control over literary system: the first one refers to interpreters, critics, teachers of literature and translators who try to adapt a translated work in accordance with the dominant concepts of what literature and society should be (2014: 226), while the second one refers to patronage, "the powers (persons, institutions) which help or hinder the writing, reading and rewriting of literature" (2014: 227). The purpose of these control factors is to ensure that the literary system stays in line with the other systems of the target culture (2014: 226). Therefore, according to Levefevere (2014: 237), "translation can no longer be analysed in isolation, […] it should be studied as a part of a whole system of texts and the people who produce, support, propagate, censor them".

2.2. The relationship between culture, language and translation

As it has already been implied, "translation is always a shift, not between two languages, but between two cultures – or two encyclopedias" (Eco 2008: 17). Yet, if translation is defined as an activity which simultaneously brings two cultures into contact and serves as an illustration of the constraints of the target culture, it is necessary try and define what exactly culture is. This paper relies on David Katan's (1999: 17) definition of culture as "a shared system for interpreting reality and shared experience", i.e. culture is understood to be "a shared mental model or map of the world, (…) a system of congruent and interrelated

beliefs, values, strategies and cognitive environments which guide the shared basis of behaviour" (ibid.)[4].

Thus, translation is an aspect of the suprasystem of culture, meaning that the attitudes and norms (and by extension, ideology) prevalent in a community sharing the same culture will also be present in or influence a given translation[5]. In relation to this, Mustapha Ettobi (2006: 27) claims that "no translation can avoid being influenced by the locally dominant view of the foreign language being translated (if it wants to succeed)". More specifically, translations can be employed in the shaping of how the source culture is perceived in the target culture (Venuti 1998: 73). In translation, linguistic and cultural differences

> necessarily undergo a reduction and exclusion of possibilities – and an exorbitant gain of other possibilities specific to the translating language. Whatever difference translation conveys is now imprinted by the receiving culture, assimilated to its positions of intelligibility, its cannons and taboos, its codes and ideologies. The aim of translation is to bring back a cultural other as the recognizable, the familiar, even the same (Venuti 2008: 14).

The linguistic differences that come to the fore when translating a text or utterance are due to the fact that each language segments reality in a different way and that there is no one-to-one correspondence between concepts in languages. Just to name one widely known example form Russian: *goluboi* (sky blue) and *sinii* (dark blue) as two separate concepts. Alternatively, these differences may be caused by the so-called tangible presence of culture in language, and such instances are known as culture-specific items (CSIs). Franco Axielá (1996: 58) defines culture-specific items as

> those 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 target texts.

This broad definition serves to show that CSIs need not only refer to the most arbitrary areas of a particular language and be restricted to, for instance, educational or legal institutions, toponyms or cultural artefacts (1996: 57). It is also important to emphasize that CSIs are not an inherent feature of a particular language, i.e. there is nothing culture-specific for speakers

---

[4] For a more detailed discussion on various definitions of and approaches to culture, see Katan 1999: 16-21.
[5] It should be emphasized, as Vilen Komissarov (2002: 74) notes, that "by no means does the existence of a shared culture and common language imply the uniformity of a given cultural and linguistic community". For sheer practical reasons, this paper focuses only on the issues of the dominant culture which is closely connected with the dominant social ideology within a given community.

of a given language since their language perfectly corresponds to their culture. Rather, CSIs are "the result of a conflict arising from any linguistically represented reference in a source text which, when transferred to a target language, poses a translation problem due to the nonexistence or to the different value (whether determined by ideology, usage, frequency, etc.) of the given item in the target language culture" (ibid.). Franco Axielá also raises the issue of the misconception of the permanent nature of CSIs (ibid.). In fact, culture-specific items should not be seen as an absolute category. Instead, each CSI should be regarded as having the potential to become a part of the target culture over a given period of time, depending on its degree of acceptance and integration. Thus, the status of a CSI may change as time goes by, and while one generation may consider a particular item to still be a CSI (in the sense that it has been "imported" from another culture), a younger generation may consider this item to be an inherent and integral part of the target culture (e.g. *basketball* originated in the USA, but became so widespread and popular in numerous countries that it is no longer regarded to be a sport associated exclusively with the United States; today, *hamburger* may be said to be undergoing a similar process).

How culture-specific items are rendered in the target text will, as mentioned, depend on the currently dominant norm in the target culture[6]. Therefore, be it the translation of CSIs or translation in general, "translating 'correctly'(…) amounts to translating to the prevailing norm, and hence in accordance with the relevant, canonized models" (Hermans 1996: 37). When it comes to CSIs, Lawrence Venuti identifies domestication (the reduction of the "strangeness" or "foreignness" of the target text) as the prevalent translation strategy, while the conscious "rebellion" against these norms is referred to as foreignization[7]. Both strategies show that translated works are positioned as one of the subsystems within a given culture. By extension, a translation can be used either as a site where the dominant social ideology will continue to unobtrusively exert its influence or as a site where such an ideology can be challenged by defying the widely accepted norms.

---

[6] For a classification of the procedures for translating culture-specific items, see Veselica Majhut 2012: 32-54 and Pym (2016).
[7] For more on domestication and foreignization, see Venuti (2008).

3. LANGUAGE BORROWING: THE INFLUX OF LOANWORDS FROM ENGLISH INTO RUSSIAN

This chapter contains the definitions of the key concepts from the field of language borrowing, as well as a short historical overview of the influx of English loanwords into Russian. A special emphasis is placed on the increasing number of English borrowings (a phenomenon which has characterized the development of the contemporary Russian lexicon since, roughly, the late 1950s) in order to provide enough context for the justification of the hypotheses regarding the expected amount of English borrowings in Rita Rait-Kovaleva's and Max Nemtsov's translations of *The Catcher in the Rye*.

3.1. Defining the key concepts

According to Leonid Krysin (2004: 24), language borrowing is a "process whereby various elements are transferred from one language into another". Words that have undergone such a transfer are termed loanwords – "word[s] that at some point in the history of a language entered its lexicon as a result of borrowing (or transfer, or copying)" (Haspelmath 2009: 36)[8]. Haspelmath (2009: 35) claims that there are two main groups of factors influencing the borrowing process: "social and attitudinal factors (the prestige of the donor language, puristic attitudes) [as opposed to] grammatical factors (e.g. the claim that verbs are more difficult to borrow than nouns because they need more grammatical adaptation than nouns)". Next, Haspelmath (2009: 39) defines loanblends as "hybrid borrowings which consist of partly borrowed material and partly native material" and claims that "true" loandblends are not encountered frequently. Rather, "[m]ost hybrid-looking or foreign-looking expressions are in fact not borrowings at all, but loan-based creations, i.e. words created in a language with material that was previously borrowed" (ibid.).

When it comes to establishing the reasons for borrowing words from foreign languages, Haspelmath relies on the works by Carol Myers-Scotton and identifies two groups of borrowings depending on their motivation: cultural borrowings and core borrowings. Cultural borrowings denote a concept which is not inherent to the recipient culture (a new

---

[8] According to Haspelmath, the term "loanword" is synonymous with the term "lexical borrowing". He also lists different types of borrowings which are then divided in two different groups: material borrowing and structural borrowings (here, loanwords are the most significant type of material borrowing) (see Haspelmath 2009: 38-40).

word is "imported" alongside the concept which is "imported"), while core borrowings denote concepts for which a native word already exists in the recipient culture (Haspelmath 2009: 46)[9]. On the other hand, Leonid Krysin (2004: 26-33) and Elena Marinova (2012:89) divide the reasons for borrowing into external and internal reasons. External reasons include close political, economic and cultural relationships, contacts between the donor and recipient cultures, and socio-psychological causes (such as the prestige of the donor language), while internal (language-specific) reasons for importing loanwords include: solving cases of polysemy in the recipient language, distinguishing between shades of meaning, brevity of expression, lexical gaps, the need for new stylistic and/or expressive linguistic means, etc.

A lexical borrowing from English (Anglicism) is in this paper defined as "each word borrowed from the English language denoting an object, idea or concept functioning as constituent parts of the English-speaking civilization; it does not have to be of English origin, but it must be adapted in accordance with the English language system and integrated into the English vocabulary" (Filipović 1990: 17). English loanwords are here also understood as technical terms or names of inventions that are derived from ancient Greek or Latin, but were used in such a form for the first time as a part of the English language[10] (1990: 18).

3.2. English loanwords in Russian: A short historical overview and contemporary attitudes

Zoya Proshina and Brian Ettkin (2005: 439) trace the beginnings of lexical borrowing from English into Russian back to the mid-sixteenth century, when the first British-Russian contacts were established. Around a hundred years later, the relations between the two countries deteriorated due to disputes related to trade and the threat of British influence over Russia; as a result, the next major influx of English loanwords (mainly nautical terms) ensued during the rule of Peter the Great (2005: 440; Benson 1959: 248). During the following two centuries, the number of Anglicisms entering the Russian language was small but steady, since the most prestigious donor language during that period was French (Proshina and Ettkin 2005: 439-441). During the nineteenth century, some English words entered into Russian as a

---

[9] Often, the semantic level of loanwords is characterized by a complex system of changes in meaning. See, for instance, a discussion on transsemantization in Filipović and Menac (2005).

[10] In order to identify the inventor or the person who coined the term that became widely used and to avoid the issue of authorship in some cases, this paper relies on the information found on *Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia*. Moreover, it is interesting to observe the existence of doublets in some languages in cases of neologisms derived from Greek and Latin, such as *kompjuter* (from English *computer*) and *kompjutor* (from Latin *computor*) in contemporary Croatian.

result of literary influences (e.g. Byron's influence on Pushkin: "Kak *dandy* londonskii odet"[11]), while their number increased significantly at the end of the century (Komarova 2012: 25) as a result of the "activities of the Social Democrats, Social Revolutionaries and other radical groups in their fight with the Tzarist government" (Grabowski 1972: 121). After the Russian Revolution of 1905, the influx of Anglicisms was put to a sharp stop: "The lexical borrowings from foreign sources which were attested in the post-Revolutionary decade were few and far between" (Ryazanova-Clarke and Wade 1999: 4). This lasted until the 1930s when borrowing from English was resumed due to the heavy industrialization in the Soviet Union. English borrowings from this period include primarily technical, sports and fishing terms, as well as culture-specific items (Grabowski 1972: 122; Proshina and Ettkin 2005: 442; Ryazanova-Clarke and Wade 1999: 19-22). This borrowing trend was reversed during the 1940s and early 1950s, which were marked by a strong ideological struggle against everything foreign (especially Western). As a result, very few new English lexemes were borrowed into Russian, most of which were technical terms (Proshina and Ettkin 2005: 442). Grabowski (1972: 123) points out the phenomenon of "negative loans" which took hold during this period: "English terms would be borrowed and used only with regard to life in the West (…) [and] a vast number of words with an indifferent or sometimes even positive meaning in English would pass into Russian with a strongly negative shade". Stalin's death in 1953 was followed by what is often perceived in the West as radical shift in the Soviet Union's internal and foreign policies: the Khrushchev Thaw. This period, which lasted until the beginning of the 1960s, was marked by greater liberties in the Soviet society, a relatively relaxed censorship and the re-establishment of contacts with foreign non-communist countries. Thus, from the late 1950s onwards, there has been a consistent influx of English borrowings into the Russian language (ibid.). With regard to the Thaw period, Ryazanova-Clarke and Wade (1999:36) write:

> Not only were a greater number of lexical items coming into Russian, but their semantic and thematic range had changed. If in the previous period the borrowing of technical terminology had prevailed, and even then was rather sporadic, then from the late 1950s borrowing was wide ranging and included words relating to social political and cultural issues and to everyday life.

In his 1959 article on Anglisims in Russian, Morton Benson (1959: 248) notes that English loanwords, especially those from American English, were extremely popular among the

---

[11] Pushkin 2013: 29.

stilyagi youth subgroup. After Khrushchev was ousted from power in 1964, the Soviet Union experienced two decades of conservative stability and economic decline. In relation to lexical borrowing during this so-called "Era of Stagnation", Ryazanova-Clarke and Wade (1999: 54) claim the following: "As happens in relatively stable historical periods, lexical development in the 1970s and 1980s, although inevitably correlating in some ways with the life of society, displayed considerable independence of social factors". The influx of English loanwords continued despite the resistance from the official channels: "The overwhelming influence of Americanisms caused resentment among some linguists and was criticised officially in the press on more than one occasion. The phenomenon was often viewed as a continuation of the ideological dispute between the Soviet Union and the USA" (1999: 61). In her 1972 article, Yvonne Grabowski mentions the issue of doublets, parallel Russian expressions and English loanwords used to refer to the same concept:

> Another interesting feature in connection with the efforts to limit the influx of loans is the relegation of many loanwords to the linguistic underground. Members of certain artistic, youth and other subcultures know among themselves a number of terms derived from English, which have not penetrated the general Russian language, or if they are used, belong to the "negative loans" (1972: 126).

Lexical borrowing from English has been on a steep rise since the 1980s-1990s up to this day (Komarova 2012: 25). As a result, during the 20th century the number of English loanwords in Russian increased 5-8 times (Volodarskaia 2002: 104, quoted in Marinova 2012: 125).

In 21st-century Russian, Anglicisms outnumber lexical borrowings from all other foreign languages and permeate all the most important aspects of Russian contemporary life (Komarova 2012: 25). In other words, it is possible to observe a "continuously growing quantity of loanwords-Anglicisms in the contemporary Russian lexicon" (Vlasenko 2009: 20). This phenomenon has gained quite a lot of attention from Russian scholars, writers, journalists and politicians, usually in the form of a harsh criticism (Marinova 2012: 257). The debate is primarily focused on the tendency among Russian speakers to use English loanwords rather than already existing Russian words or expressions. Such borrowings are referred to, quite tellingly, as barbarbarisms (*barbarizmy*). Arguments against such an influx of English loanwords are often characterized by a bellicose attitude and presented as a "call to arms" to "defend" the Russian language. For instance, Vlasenko (2009: 20) describes the contemporary lexical borrowing process as "the colonization of Russian by Anglicisms",

while Marinova (2012: 257) gives a revealing account of the contemporary debate on loanwords:

> the evaluation of the borrowing process itself has often entailed "military" metaphors, which emphasized the danger of the observed phenomenon with a particular passion. Borrowing has been termed "expansion", "invasion", "incursion", "intervention", "linguistic colonisation", while loanwords have been called "invader-words" which "are on the offensive on all fronts" and which should be "fought back" or "fended off". Such a "military" evaluation has been frequent in journalist comments. However, some linguists have also expressed their opposition to the domination of words of foreign origin, seeing it as a way to manipulate the public opinion. They have referred to borrowing as "vandalization", "barbarization", "westernization", "hybridization", "Americanisation" and even "pidginization" of the Russian language.

Such rhetoric is essentially based on the distinction between justified and unjustified borrowing. While foreign words referring to objects or concepts which do not exist in the recepient language are considered to be justified loanwords, unjustified loanwords are defined as lexical borrowings referring to objects or concepts for which a corresponding Russian term already exists (2012: 133). The latter is thus "unreasonable not only from the point of view of linguoecology, but most importantly – from the position of the identity of the Russian language as the target language of the recipient culture" (Vlasenko 2008: 79).

In general, the reasons for the predominance of English borrowings (not only in Russia, but worldwide) include the status of English as the main language of diplomacy after the end of the Cold War, the export of American culture via entertainment and powerful corporations thanks to the leading position of the American economy, the development of computer technology and the Internet (including all the phenomena that they are associated with, e.g. social networks, games, etc.) where English remains the dominant language (Proshina and Ettkin 2005: 442). Some Russian scholars see the influence of English as a consequence of the widespread misconception among the wider population (especially among the Russian youth) that using English loanwords enables getting closer to the stereotypical and idealized American way of life in which the standard of living is much higher than in Russia (Khrunenkova 2012: 227). Aside from the prestige ascribed to English as one of the reasons for borrowing English loanwords (Zemskaia 2000: 147, 153; Krysin 2004: 27), another important factor is Russia's unhindered opening to the West in the 1990s after the collapse of

the Soviet Union, which led to newly-restored relations in the fields of business, culture, science, trade, tourism, etc. (Zemskaia 2000: 144).

4. YOUTH SLANG

Frederick F. Patton (1980: 270) relies on Elena Zemskaia's definition of slang and claims that "slang lexical items (SLI) are stylistically marked as belonging to colloquial speech, that is, the variety of the standard language used by literate speakers in relaxed oral communication". Such items mainly occur in the speech of young people up to thirty years of age and their purpose is to signal solidarity "with either the younger generation as a whole or a particular 'in-group'" (1980: 272). Moreover, slang primarily functions as an expressive device and as a way of identifying with a particular group (which may be in opposition with the established authority), rather than as a means for conveying information (1980: 270; Adams 2009: 16). Slang is in this respect a unique variety of language: "Almost any linguistic form may be expressive in particular verbal or situational contexts, but SLI have an expressive meaning in all contexts" and their expressivity tends to be pejorative (Patton 1980: 271). Michael Adams (2009: 9) draws a useful distinction between terms which are sometimes used interchangeably: *cant* and *argot* refer to the speech of criminals, *jargon* is a language variety used in a particular occupation (most often by respective professionals), while *slang* is strictly used to signal group identity. Thus, a given word may belong to one, or two or to all three categories simultaneously, depending on the purpose of its usage: "Slang, jargon, and argot aren't essential characteristics of a word; one or another of them applies depending on who uses the word, in what situation, for what reasons" (ibid.). Another important feature of slang is its fleeting nature. As Patton (1980: 272) writes, "[m]uch slang, and especially youth slang, tends to be local and transitory". This may be explained by an infinite number of possible social groups (and/or the overlap between them) in a given community, with each of them aiming to distinguish itself from the other groups. Next, social groups vary in their stability and number of members, thus language can be used to signalize parallel membership to a social group and its subgroup(s) (e.g. youth slang of a particular region, youth slang of a particular city, youth slang of a particular neighbourhood). Such a large number of varieties also mirrors the wide age bracket of youth slang speakers (Krysin 2004: 373). Moreover, youth slang is strongly characterized by the wish to express difference

(or even defiance) in relation to the older generation. As a result, each new coming generation finds a distinct way to signal their social identity and their own zeitgeist, resulting in the temporal instability of youth slang. Krysin (2004: 374) refers to this phenomenon as "the renewal of slang", which is also one of the reasons for the multiplicity of expressions with the same denotative meaning in youth slang. Thus, the majority of youth slang expressions tends to come and pass unrecorded, although the situation may be changing nowadays thanks to online slang dictionaries[12].

Youth slang thus clearly illustrates one of the axioms of sociolinguistics: "that speakers 'exploit' linguistic resources in order to express their social identity" (Armstrong 2015: 185). Considering the influx of English loanwords from this perspective, Vlasenko's (2008: 76) claim that "the tendency of Russian speakers towards shaping one's language as an act of creative self-expression can probably be considered as one of the reasons for the noticeable intensity of the Anglicism 'infestation'" illustrates how the Russian youth use English loanwords to shape their social identity. According to Proshina and Ettkin (2005: 443), "[Russian] youth slang has been particularly receptive to English borrowings". Similarly, Krysin (2004: 375) claims that the contemporary renewal of youth slang is based on borrowing from English and the intentional russification of the English vocabulary. As a result, the overabundance of English loanwords has become one of the main features of contemporary Russian slang, which is shown by Artemii Romanov's (2000: 102, quoted in Proshina and Ettkin 2005: 443) research claiming that 20 per cent of contemporary Russian youth slang is of English origin.

On the basis of recently-published papers and research concerning lexical borrowing from English (see chapter three of the thesis), this percentage is much likely to have increased than diminished during the next 15 years. There are several possible reasons for this phenomenon. Firstly, today's daily life is characterized by considerable reliance on technology (especially computers and the Internet) and, broadly speaking, younger people are more easily adapted to new technologies. Thus, gaming, surfing, blogging/vlogging and social networking have become an integral part of young people's lives. Next, the older and more educated the average person becomes, the less tolerant they tend to be towards foreign language influences, while younger speakers tend to be much more receptive (Zemskaia 2000: 159). This is also illustrates the social function of youth slang: if something is rejected by the

---

[12] See, for instance, online Russian slang dictionaries such as: http://teenslang.su/ or http://znachenieslova.ru/slovar/youthslang/.

older generation, the younger one will tend to embrace it in order to signal difference and/or defiance. Moreover, when applying Leech's language functions on youth slang, its primary function is the expressive function, while the informational function is relegated to the second place (Krysin 2004: 374). Similarly, the function of foreign borrowings in standard language primarily tends to be informational, i.e. in standard language, loanwords primarily serve to denote concepts which the given recipient language lacks. On the other hand, the main function of loanwords in non-standard language varieties (including youth slang) tends to be expressive, resulting in a much wider variety of lexical borrowings (e.g. not only nouns, as it is the case with standard language, but also verbs, adjectives, adverbs, pronouns or interjections) (Marinova 2012: 172). The majority of objections against English borrowings in Russian and the resulting linguistic doublets are based on the fact that Russian words with corresponding denotative meaning already exist. However, new borrowings enter youth slang for another reason altogether: their affective meaning. Thus, the influx of English loanwords in contemporary Russian slang may be said to be a natural result of both external (the influence of technology, the prestige or "coolness" of English) and internal reasons for borrowing (the tendency of non-standard varieties to adopt new expressive linguistic means).

5. *THE CATCHER IN THE RYE* BY JEROME DAVID SALINGER AND ITS (RE)TRANSLATIONS

The Catcher in the Rye, first published in 1951, is Jerome David Salinger's only novel to be released in his lifetime[13], yet it was enough to earn him the reputation as "one of the most influential writers of the 20th century" (Donahue 2010: n.p.). The novel is regarded to be one of the most important books in the post-World War II era due to its undiminished popularity to this day (Hunt Steintle 2008: 130) and its status as "the first [book] to capture the post-World War II alienation of youth: the idiomatic slang, the rage against the hypocrisy of the adult world and the fury at the inevitable loss of innocence that growing up demands" (Donahue 2010: n.p.). However, the novel's theme and distinct language made it both popular among the younger audience and controversial among the older one, resulting in the novel's paradoxical reception as "simultaneously one of America's best-loved and most-frequently banned novels" (Graham 2007: 3).

---

[13] For more on Salinger's life and works, see Graham 2007: 3-9.

5.1. The linguistic properties and critical reception of *The Catcher in the Rye*

The way in which the theme of the book (the disappointment with the adult world) was represented by using youth slang is what made *The Catcher in the Rye* stand out at the time of its publishing and still makes it appealing to contemporary readers. In this respect, Donald Costello emphasizes the importance of *The Catcher in the Rye* as a reliable record of the teenage vernacular from the 1950s (1959: 172) and points out that all of Holden's slang expressions are in widespread use (1959: 176), while William Poster (1990: 26, quoted in Graham 2007: 39) praises the book for its "perfectionist handling of contemporary idiom". The novel contains numerous fillers (e.g. "and all", "or something", "hey", "boy"), intensifiers (e.g. "really", "as hell"), swearwords (e.g. "for Chrissake", "sunuvabitch", "fuck", "whore"), expletives (e.g. "goddamn", "damn"), non-standard derivations (e.g. "Christmasy", "flitty-looking"), informal expressions (e.g. "chisel", "swell", "horse around"), non-standard grammatical forms (e.g. "ya", "gotta", "don'tcha", "caddy'd"), discourse markers ("no kidding", "I mean", "you know"), etc. Swearwords constitute an important part of Holden's vocabulary, and Costello (1959: 175) claims that "Holden's informal, schoolboy vernacular is particularly typical in its 'vulgarity' and 'obscenity'. No one familiar with prep-school speech could seriously contend that Salinger overplayed his hand in this respect". Salinger's novel gives precedence to speech over the written word (i.e. the emphasis is on the faithful reproduction of youth slang), which, together with the voicing of the clash between the older and younger generations from the perspective of a young narrator, will later become one of the main features of the "jeans prose" paradigm (Flaker 1983: 38). According to Robert Gutwillig, "there has never been a more 'American' novel than *The Catcher in the Rye*" (1961: 38, quoted in Graham 2007: 49) and its colloquial speech would be impossible to render in any other language than American English (1963: 2, quoted in Noppers 2010: 46).

However, this very feature which made *The Catcher in the Rye* stand out and for which the novel was appreciated is what made it problematic for a different set of readers and critics. Due to its offensive language, the novel was placed on the "short list of most banned books in school libraries, curricula and public libraries" (Whitfield 1997: 574). Alsen Eberhard (2008: 146) writes that the reviews following the novel's publication were mixed: some praised it, some described it as a failure, while a third camp was primarily concerned with what they regarded to be vulgar and obscene language. According to Sara Graham (2007: 17), "[t]he first official complaint against the novel was made in 1955 and these have continued steadily to the present". For instance, in 1973 *The Catcher in the Rye* was named

the most widely-censored book in the United States, while almost a decade later it had the paradoxical status as the most frequently censored book in the United States and as the second most frequently taught novel in public high schools (Whitfield 1997: 574). The censorship of the novel was not restricted only to the US: it was not until 1994 that the words "fuck you" were kept in the British version of the novel (Schmitz 1998: 5). Stephen J. Whitfield (1997: 590) believes that such a backlash against the novel stems from moralistic criticism, "a tradition of imposing religious standards upon art or rejecting works of the imagination because they violate conventional ethical codes. According to this legacy, books are neither good nor bad without 'for you' being added as a criterion for judgement". *The Catcher in the Rye* has sparked considerable controversy from various camps: it has been denounced as "a corrupting influence on young people" (Graham 2007: 17), it has been accused of blasphemy, it has been criticized for being communist due to its (supposedly) subversive values, and teachers have been sacked for introducing the novel into school curricula (2007: 18). Moreover, the novel received more negative attention in 1980 and 1981, when Mark Chapman, the murderer of John Lennon, read aloud from the novel in court, and when a copy of the novel was found among the possessions of John Hinckley, who attempted to assassinate Ronald Reagan (ibid.). Graham (2007: 18-19) explains the outcry against the novel as a result of the misconception that the novel was written for young readers:

> The concept that Holden is a poor role model for young people only arises when people of Holden's age are encouraged to read the novel, which has never been banned for an adult audience. Salinger consistently writes about children and adolescents, but not for them. Problems have arisen because the novel has become a text that is recommended to adolescents, perhaps on the assumption that it will help them to better understand their situation and, to some readers, *Catcher* remains the definitive novel of teenage experience.

Yet, the question of what exactly then contributed to *The Catcher in the Rye*'s enormous popularity still remains. This is, after all, a book that sold 1,5 million copies within ten years of its publication, 5 million copies by 1965 (Hackett 1967: 13, quoted in Ohmann and Ohmann 1976: 15) and approximately 65 million copies worldwide by 2009[14], despite all the aforementioned criticism. Pamela Hunt Steintle (2008: 133) aptly describes the novel's unusual position with her claim that "While other contemporary novels may have found a similarly split audience (Vladimir Nabokov's *Lolita* comes to mind), they have neither spurred such lengthy controversy nor enjoyed the sustained popularity of *Catcher*". *Catcher*'s

---

[14] According to the List of best-selling books on Wikipedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_best-selling_books. Accessed 8 August 2018.

popularity and numerous reprints are sometimes explained as a result of its inclusion in school curricula or as a phenomenon motivated by a sales increase due to its censorship controversy (Hunt Steintle 2008: 130). On the other hand, Graham (2007: 40) claims that the novel's paperback edition from 1953 enabled it to reach a much wider audience, especially among younger people and university students. According to Salinger's biographer Ian Hamilton (1988: 155-156, quoted in Whitfield 1997: 568), "[*The Catcher in the Rye* had] become the book all brooding adolescents had to buy, the indispensable manual from which cool styles of disaffection could be borrowed". University students spread interest in the novel among their fellow colleagues by word of mouth and acquainted their lecturers with the novel, which would later, in the late 1950s, result in a spur of critical acclaim for the novel (Graham 2007: 40; Whitfield 1997: 568). Such a trend is illustrated by Whitfield's (1997: 568) claim that

> [c]ritical and academic interest [in the novel] has been less consistent [than popular interest]; how J. D. Salinger's only novel achieved acclaim is still a bit mystifying. After its first impact came neglect: only three critical pieces appeared in the first five years. In the next four years, at least seventy essays on *The Catcher in the Rye* were published in American and British magazines.

This period marks the peak of Salinger's reputation (Eberhard 2008: 175), and "since the early sixties, most critics have written appreciative analyses of *The Catcher in the Rye*" (2008: 148). While Salinger's prominence has since then diminished to somewhat more modest proportions (2008: 175), *The Catcher in the Rye* remains to be an object of academic interest[15]. For instance, Holden's speech and his obsession with "phoniness" has been interpreted as a reflection of McCarthyism and the contradictions pervading American society during the Cold War (see Nadel 2008), and even as a novel foreshadowing the youthquake and the crisis in American society during the 1960s, a claim which has in turn not gone uncontested (see Whitfield 1997).

5.2. A short overview of works dealing with retranslations of *The Catcher in the Rye*

Since the central part of this paper will focus on comparing two Russian translations of Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye*, the purpose of this subchapter is to give an overview of

---

[15] For an overview of critical works dealing with *The Cather in the Rye* from the 1950s to the present, see: Graham 1997: 40-66.

works comparing the book's (re)translations in a particular language and to provide some insight into the issues that these works focused on and the conclusions reached thereby.

Walter E. Riedel (1980) in his article *Some German Ripples of Holden Caulfield's 'Goddamn Autobiography': On Translating and Adapting J. D. Salinger's The Catcher in the Rye* discusses two German translations of the *Catcher in the Rye*: Irene Muehlon's translation from 1954 and Heinrich Böll's translation published in 1962. Riedel (1980: 197) claims that Muehlon's translation "left much to be desired", which then served as a motive for Böll's retranslation. Riedel's article then goes on to focus primarily on the latter translation, claiming that the original text's colloquial language became more formal in Böll's translation and that Böll rendered Holden's speech more stylistically varied. Böll's translation omitted a considerable part of the foul language for which *The Catcher in the Rye* was criticized in the US. Riedel also discusses the blatant omission of "fuck you" in Böll's translation and explains it as a consequence of public taste in 1954 and 1962 respectively. He believes that Böll's translation can be regarded as a general illustration of the decisions made during the translation process and concludes that "Since it can be shown that in any translation a significant number of subjective elements are at work – in varying degrees to be sure – all translation may be considered as a process of re-creating an original text in the translator's image" (1980: 204). At the end of his article, Riedel voices his support for a new German translation of the novel, since retranslations enable getting closer to the best translation possible.

Markus Karjalainen (2002) in his Master's thesis titled *Where have all the swearwords gone: An analysis of the loss of swearwords in two Swedish translations of J. D. Salinger's Catcher in the Rye* compares two Swedish translations of Salinger's novel (Brigitta Hammar's translation from 1953 and Klas Östergren's translation from 1987). His thesis focuses on the adaptation of the swearwords contained in the original text and the reasons for the discrepancy between the original and the Swedish texts in this regard. Karjalainen shows that these two translation have adopted a similar strategy concerning swearwords; that is, both translations omitted "close to 50 percent of a certain linguistic element from their translations, namely swearwords, rendering their translations very tame compared to the original" (2002: 79). His conclusion is that such a translation strategy is a result of the dominant norm in Swedish culture according to which it is undesirable to express strong emotions, which is mirrored by negative attitudes towards swearwords and the tendency to avoid using them.

Annebet Noppers (2010) in her Master's thesis *The Translation of Youth Language: A Comparison of Dutch Translations of "The Catcher in the Rye" and "Less Than Zero"* analyses the translation strategies applied in two Dutch translations of Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye* (one by Max Schuchart from 1967 and the other by Johan Hos from 1989) and of Bret Easton Ellis' *Less Than Zero* (Peter Bergsma's translation from 1986 and Balt Lenders' translation from 1993). She restricts her corpus only to dialogues between adolescents in these four translations. Concerning *The Catcher in the Rye*, her results show that over 50% of the source text's non-standard expressions were translated into standard Dutch. Yet, the two translations differ from each other in that Schuchart retained four times as many non-standard expressions and replaced standard source expressions with non-standard Dutch expressions five more times when compared to Hos' translation. Noppers (2010: 53) emphasizes that such figures are a result of Schuchart's tendency to use curse terms which were not part of the standard Dutch language at the time of his translation's publication.

In their joint article titled *A Study of Translation of Fillers and Catch Phrases in Two Persian Translations of "The Catcher in the Rye"*, Marzieh Saffari and Mahmood Hashemian (2012) compare Ahmad Karimi's 2002 and Mohammad Najafi's 1998 translations of Salinger's novel into Persian. Saffari and Hashemian analyse how fillers and catchphrases, two important aspects of colloquial speech, have been rendered in the two Persian translations. Their corpus encompasses only selected chapters from the novel which contain dialogues between Holden and his peers (i.e. chapters 3, 4, 6, 9, 15, 17, 19). Saffari and Hashemian compare the two translations in terms of two strategies for the translation of fillers and catch phrases – repetition cancelling (repeated words in the source text are replaced by various words in the target text) and omission (fillers or catch phrases are simply left out from the translation). The results of their research indicate that there is no significant difference in how often the two Persian translations deployed these strategies, i.e. a significant part of these linguistic devices has been neutralized in both translations, which resulted in significant changes to Holden's character and the loss of the novel's original style.

On the basis of these four articles, it is possible to observe that approaches to translating swearwords and colloquial language roughly coincide in translations and retranslations coming from different cultural backgrounds. For instance, both in the German and Swedish translations a considerable part of the swearwords from the source text was omitted, although for slightly different reasons: Riedel (1980: 203-204) sees it as a consequence of the taste of the contemporary German reading public, while Karjalainen (2002:

64, 80) sees it as a consequence of tendency to avoid the expression of strong emotions in the Swedish culture. When discussing the translation of youth language in general, the German, Dutch and Persian translations show that colloquial expressions tend to be neutralized, making the target text more formal than Salinger's source text. However, it is interesting to note that the older Dutch translation contains more non-standard expressions than the more recent one, due to the fact that the swearwords which the translator decided to keep in the text were not yet accepted as a part of the standard Dutch language, showing how the attitudes towards the (in)acceptability of swearwords may change over time.

6. RITA RAIT-KOVALEVA'S TRANSLATION OF *THE CATCHER IN THE RYE*

An unexpected issue which arose while researching data and academic works on Rait-Kovaleva's translation was how to determine the year of its first publication. There are three competing years: 1955, 1960 and 1965. The year 1955 is cited in two works: Burak's *Soviet Legacy in the "Enlivening" Russian Translations of American Fiction: Origins of "Ozhivliazh"* and in Laptina and Iakovenko's *Osobennosti perevoda imen sobstvennykh*, while 1965 is mentioned in Petrenko's *Roman Dzh. D. Selindzhera "Nad propastiu vo rzhi" i ego perevody na russkii iazyk*, Galliamova and Matveeva's *Sravnitelnii analiz raznovremennykh perevodov romana Dzh. D. Selindzhera "Nad propastiu vo rzhi": sovetskaia i sovremennaia retsenzii*, in Rudnytska's *Soviet Censhorship and Translation in Contemporary Ukraine and Russia*, and in the *Bolshaia biograficheskaia entsiklopediia*[16]. At the same time, Samantha Sherry, Jekaterina Young and Aleksandar Flaker claim that Rait-Kovaleva's translation was published in 1960 (Sherry 2015: 127; Sherry 2013: 755; Young 2000: 413; Flaker 1983: 36), with Flaker adding that the second edition of *The Catcher in the Rye's* Russian translation was published in 1965. This paper does not aim to solve such a conundrum; rather, it is enough to identify the period covering the three supposed years of publication: Khrushchev's Thaw. Although the Thaw period is primarily connected with Nikita Khrushchev's tenure as General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (1953 – 1964), even if Rait-Kovaleva's translation of *The Catcher in the Rye* was published in 1965, the translation process itself is

---

[16] https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc_biography/105504/%d0%a0%d0%b0%d0%b9%d1%82.

here supposed to have taken place in the year(s) preceding 1965, and it would still be regarded to have taken place during the Thaw period.

6.1. Extralinguistic influences on translation: the role of the social context and censorship

The first thing that usually comes to mind when discussing translations in the Soviet Union is censorship. During Khrushchev's Thaw, even though censorship was somewhat (mainly inconsistently) relaxed, the main tenants of Soviet ideology continued to be applied to translated literature. For instance, Nataliya M. Rudnytska (2013: n.p.) claims that

> [a]s a rule, only one variant of translation was allowable. This way it was easier to control the situation: before publishing, a translation had to pass censors' control but a once-published translation tended to become the only, generally acknowledged, 'canonical' version; no one was allowed to criticize it. Such policy resulted in the particular stance of common readers to translations.

In relation to this, Aleksandra Borisenko (2009: n.p.) writes that there were cases of retranslation in the Soviet Union, especially in the cases of children's literature and Shakespeare's works. However, such instances tended to the exception, rather than the rule, and canonized translations were off-limits for criticism (ibid.). Denis Petrenko (2009: 10, 13) interprets Rait-Kovaleva's translation as a product shaped by the following factors: censorship, the Soviet school of translation education, the high standards required of translations in terms of linguistic norms, the necessity to comply with the principles of socialist realism, and her own language bias since she was a representative of the "language elite". Samantha Sherry (2015: 29) further underlies the importance of the then dominant doctrine of "realist translation" which demanded that translated works should read as if they had actually been written in Russian:

> Realist translation was, as the name suggests, more than a simple linguistic approach; rather it was conceived of as a branch of socialist realism. Realist translations were to interpret the original in the light of the target cultural and historical context and, instead of simply carrying out a straight linguistic transfer, should portray a deeper truth; crucially, that truth should be tuned to the Soviet ideological context.

Moreover, this deeper truth to be uncovered behind a literary work became a matter of pure interpretation according to the Soviet ideological norms. Therefore, translations had the task

of seeming as if they had been not only written in Russian, but also within the corresponding discourse: "transmitting the 'reality' behind the original comes to mean writing what the author would have said, were he or she properly educated in Soviet ideology" (2015: 30).

Yet, the issue of censorship itself may not be as straightforward and simple as it may seem at a first glance, as illustrated by Sherry's research. Sherry bases her research on Soviet censorship on two journals – her analysis of censorship under Stalin relies on *Internatsionalnaya Literatura* (1933-1943), while *Inostrannaya Literatura* (1955 -) is used to illustrate the mechanisms of censorship during the Thaw period. When discussing censorship in the post-Stalin period, Sherry (2013: 758) emphasizes that it is more useful to regard censorship as a "set of practices carried out by different agents that encompasses numerous complex mediating actions in the making of a single text" rather than as a monolithic act. This is because the control over censorship, which was in the hands of the party under Stalin, was delegated to editors and translators during the Thaw era (2013: 733). Such a less-centralized system made censorship not only less reliable, but also more paradoxical. This allowed editors and translators "to play a censorial 'game', using their mediatory position to allow as much information through the filter of censorship as possible" (ibid.). This is not to say that they could freely choose what to censor or not. The doctrine of realist translation remained to be the only available mode of translating, and therefore censorship was still part and parcel of the translation process. As a result, translators exercised self-censorship, i.e. they adhered to the norms imposed from above before their translations were assessed for publication. However, self-censorship was far from a straightforward activity. As Sherry (2015: 60) writes,

> Translators' own complex understanding of their actions as censorship demonstrates the difficulty of making a clear distinction between censorship and non-censorship – that is, between the censored text and free expression, or 'evil' censorship and the 'heroic' translator. In examining self-censorship, it can be difficult to draw a constant and distinct line between external and internal, or conscious and unconscious, censorship.

In other words, unless there are explicit decision-making records available, it becomes impossible to distinguish the translation strategies adopted "by choice" from those adopted "by necessity": "External and internal censorship are thus closely intertwined, existing in a complex, mutually reinforcing relationship with one another" (ibid.). The strictness of censorship also seems to have varied according to content. While there were documents which prescribed the deletion of all overt and covert indecencies from texts intended for publication (Petrenko 2016: 33), there are also instances where sexual taboo was euphemized,

rather than omitted. This supports the view that sexual taboo tended to be partial in translations of foreign texts, as opposed to the ideological and political taboos which remained total (Sherry 2015: 93). Foreign literature is therefore claimed to have had more freedom during the Thaw period than original Russian works (2015: 128).

Sherry also raises a few interesting points about Rita Rait-Kovaleva's work as a translator. While an adequate translation of Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye* would have been impossible to publish in the Soviet Union due to the book's overabundance of profanities (Petrenko 2009: 50), Sherry uses an example from Rait-Kovaleva's translation to illustrate how censored or neutralized expressions were used as metalinguistic devices which engaged the reader to actively participate in the reconstruction of the original expression. She interprets Rait-Kovaleva's euphemism *pokhabshchina* (obscenity) for the original text's "fuck you" not only as a means for avoiding the external censor, but also as a cue in constructing the so-called Aesopian reader who will be able to reconstruct the original meaning (2013: 755-756; 2015: 129). Rait-Kovaleva herself claims that *The Catcher in the Rye* was not allowed to be translated for a long time because Soviet reviewers thought the novel contained nothing more than a young loser's babbling written in untranslatable slang. Therefore the book had to wait for a translator who would try and find Russian words for the novel's story (Rait-Kovaleva 1965: 7, quoted in Petrenko 2016: 33). The suitable Russian words for the novel turned out to be mainly euphemisms, along with some milder swearwords. As mentioned, this has been ascribed to external influences (censorship and the realist translation doctrine) and Rait-Kovaleva's own language preferences. Yet, Aleksandra Borisenko (2009: n.p.) strongly disputes the latter and claims that Rait-Kovaleva was "'not the well-mannered lady presented to the contemporary reader; she loved and was able to use strong language; she implored the editor to allow her to put in just the word asshole but even this was not allowed'". Furthermore, it seems that the neutralization of the source language was Rait-Kovaleva conscious translation strategy due to external pressures (i.e. censorship). In her own words, "if you look at my translation of Salinger, you won't be surprised by some softening (…) It is required in the journal" (quoted in Sherry 2013: 757). Thus, Rait-Kovaleva's example illustrates how difficult it may be to draw a clear dividing line between external censorship and self-censorship in Soviet translations, and how subsequent secondary texts can also be employed to shape a particular image of a translator. The importance of these texts, such as reviews and scholarly articles, will be discussed further in detail later in the paper, but suffice it here to say that due the lack of sources available in order to try and establish Rait-

Kovaleva's personal ideological position towards the translation she produced, her translation is in this paper primarily analysed through the prism of the social context and translations norms prevalent in the Thaw period.

6.2. Language in Rait-Kovaleva's translation and its critical reception

The language used in Rita Rait-Kovaleva's translation may be seen as one of the factors contributing to the critical acclaim and popularity that *The Catcher in the Rye* enjoyed in the Soviet Union. In fact, some reviews and critical works tend to underline the positive effect that her translation strategy for the adaptation of the original's slang had on the novel and on the construction on the main character (see Rebenko 2013, Petrenko 2009, Petrenko 2016, Toporov 2008a). Yet, at the same time, there are differing opinions on how Rait-Kovaleva managed to render the source text's slang in her translation. For instance, Alexander Burak (2011: 105, 107-108) interprets her translation as an example of "ozhivliazh" (enlivening), a translation approach that originated in the Kashkin Soviet school of translation and which implies the enlivening of the source text, mainly on the lexical level. According to Burak (2011: 104-110), Rait-Kovaleva created a special kind of language in which she employed unusual collocations and played with connotative meanings, thus moderately foreignizing the Russian translation and creating a colourful translation which was in contrast with the officially approved texts mainly characterized by a formal and verbose style. This view is somewhat in line with what Jekaterina Young (2000: 414) states in her paper: "It has been said that Rait-Kovaleva did not so much translate the slang of American teenagers as invent the Russian equivalent single-handed". On the other hand, Irina Alekseevna (2004: 117) claims that Rait-Kovaleva "splendidly reproduced the source text's youth slang by resorting to Russian slang from the late 1950s and early 1960s".

Rait-Kovaleva's contemporary Korney Chukovsky (2012: 89), a children's poet, translator and critic, writes that she slightly weakened the novel's rough language. However, Chukovsky (ibid.) also claims that she simultaneously tried to convey the expressiveness and colourfulness of the original's language, thus showing the greatness of her skills as a translator. He goes on to conclude that Rait-Kovaleva manages to produce an accurate translation not by conveying the text word by word, but by conveying the psychological nature of each sentence in the novel (2012: 90). Therefore, in terms of finding the "proper" interpretation of the text, Rait-Kovaleva is commended for translating according to the norms

of socialist realism. Petrenko claims that Rait-Kovaleva "applied numerous means of euphemization to achieve a special stylistic effect. It is the very rejection of profanities that lends the main hero the particular inner purity which has been pointed out by Soviet and Russian critics" (2016: 33-34), and he ascribes her translation strategies to her own language preferences and the influence of censorship (2016: 17). According to Petrenko (2009: 181), Rait-Kovaleva avoided profanities and replaced them with other means of expression or paraphrases, both at the lexical and syntactical levels. As a result, her Holden is quite different from Salinger's Holden: in the Russian translation Holden avoids profanities in his speech, he speaks standard Russian with almost no slang expressions and he is characterized by a moral purity, i.e. when discussing sexual matters, he does not go into details which the reader might find embarrassing (2016: 35). Petrenko (ibid.) commends Rait-Kovaleva's translation strategy and sees her translation as a more harmonized text that contributed to a better portrayal of the main character.

Another important aspect influencing the reception of *The Catcher in the Rye* is the dominant ideological reading of the novel. In other words, its content was interpreted to be along the lines of the official state ideology: "J. D. Salinger's novel has a 'faithful' ideological orientation: a teenager, tormented by a life in a bourgeois country, opposes the dominant order of things in the United States" (2016: 32). Thus, the novel was suitable for publishing "as a critique of the moral failings of capitalist society" (Sherry 2015: 130) once the issue of its slang and profanities was solved. Such an interpretation was further supported by the paratexts accompanying the novel, such as Chukovsky's aforementioned positive review of Rait-Kovaleva's work as a translator, and (arguably more importantly) Vera Panova's afterword to the translation. Sherry (2015: 130) emphasizes the importance of Panova's afterword, which functions as a guide for the reader:

> It seems likely that there were two interconnected functions of this paratext. First, it had a mediating function between author and reader, guiding and attempting to control the reader's interpretation and thus ensure an ideologically correct reading. Secondly, the afterword served as a signal of adherence to the norms of the official literary sphere, regardless of its actual effect on readers. It was only because the foreword pointed out its faults that the work could be included at all; problematic material could be mitigated by the presence of the interpretative text.

Thus, *The Catcher in the Rye* was adapted to the literary norms required by the dominant Soviet ideology through an active process of rewriting the text, in which the novel's

translation and its secondary texts played a crucial role. In Vorontsova and Navolneva's (2017: 255) words, Rait-Kovaleva "softened the text of the novel (…), smoothed the unrestrained, sometimes inconsistent language of the main character, reduced the amount of non-standard language and completely submitted the translation to the model of the Soviet literary establishment". Rait-Kovaleva earned praise for these very departures from the source text and her example shows how, if the primary text is produced in accordance with the literary norms (whether under an external pressure, such as censorship, or by the translator's own will), its secondary texts subsequently take up the baton to enshrine it into the literary canon. Rait-Kovaleva's translation illustrates how the adaptation of the stylistic features of the novel (Holden's youth slang) is closely aligned with the officially sanctioned interpretation of the novel (if Holden is a noble hero disillusioned with the bourgeois American society, it is automatically unacceptable for him to use profanities). The outcome of such a translation approach was a new, "independent work" (2017: 255; Shelestiuk 2013: 44), which had the dual role of simultaneously being adapted to and further reinforcing the officially sanctioned taste of the Soviet reading public.

7. MAX NEMTSOV'S TRANSLATION OF *THE CATCHER IN THE RYE*

7.1. Translation in contemporary Russia

The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 entailed not only a new political and economic order in Russia, but a cultural shift as well. These changes spread like ripples and swept over the Russian translation industry. As Irina Alekseeva (2004: 120) writes, "at the beginning of the 1990s, the numerous barriers posed by censorship disappeared, and the translator is free to translate anything they want. Yet, the state publishing system disappeared together with the yoke of censorship, and the quickly-emerging private publishing companies are focused on profit". Thus, translation became a part of the new capitalist model of publishing, with all the pros and cons which this entails. Aleksandra Borisenko (2009: n.p.) lists some of them: there is no censorship, but often there is no editor either. The amount of foreign literature translated has increased dozens or hundreds of times. There has been a rise in inaccurate translations, but also in the number of young and talented translators. The translator profession no longer belongs to the selected few, and the one and the same source book can be published by different publishing companies and retranslated multiple times.

Moreover, just as the newly-formed Soviet Union fought against the old traditions and norms during the 1920s, such seems to be the case with new literary translators in post-Soviet Russia. Petrenko (2009: 69) identifies the following tendencies through which contemporary translators rebel against their predecessors: "the fight against Soviet translations, the aim to speak to the reader in their own language, i.e. not to elevate the reader to the level of literature, but to lower the language of literature to the level of the reader's colloquial conversation". Thus, challenges to the Soviet translation tradition are presented in terms of both theme and language. This also includes retranslating works which were translated for the first time during the Soviet period:

> In the recent decades, the general tendency in the approach to language in translation is as follows: a widespread use of colloquial language, the vernacular, jargonisms, profanities; the attempt to shock the reader by introducing extracts containing descriptions of intimate scenes, which were omitted from previous editions due to censorship, into translations (2009: 11).

With the formerly non-sanctioned language varieties suddenly appearing in published works, there is also the possibility of their inclusion into the standard language: "if such translations become common, they will inevitably influence the Russian tradition of obscene language usage. Rather than in exceptional, marked usage, it [obscene language] will start appearing everywhere. This process is already taking place at such a fast rate" (Shelestiuk 2013: 44). Moreover, the changes occurring in the contemporary Russian lexicon (such as the influx of English loanwords) are in this way also making their impact on translations. In relation to this, Elena Shelestiuk (2013: 43) claims that

> the usage of compensation and adaptation as translation strategies has declined, while the percentage of calques, transcription and transliteration has increased significantly, i.e. the tendency towards foreignizing the English-Russian translation has prevailed over domestication. This tendency mirrors the global domination of the English language, the increasing convergence between English source texts and their translations into foreign languages, the unification (westernization) of languages and cultures.

However, these new retranslations are far from willingly accepted by the Russian public and critics. For instance, Russian translator and critic Victor Toporov (2008a: n.p.) writes that "[r]etranslations are killing the literary classics" and claims that there is no need for retranslations, since any mistakes or outdated elements can simply be corrected or edited, while translators who claim that Soviet translations are lacking due to censorship only want to receive grants for retranslations from foreign institutions. Such a resistance against

retranslation is aptly illustrated by the reception of Max Nemtsov's translation of Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye*.

7.2. Language in Nemtsov's translation and its critical reception

Max Nemtsov's translation of *The Catcher in the Rye*, titled *Lovets nad khlebynm polem*, was first published in 2008. The translation caused quite a stir: numerous reviews in the media, fierce discussions among Russian bloggers, contradictory opinions on bookshop websites and its comparison to Rait-Kovaleva's translation served as a basis for several research papers[17] (Borisenko 2009; Burak 2001: 110). Nemtsov's translation was preceded by Sergei Makhov's translation of Salinger's novel into Russian (*Nad obryvom rzhanogo polia detstva*, 2008), and succeed by Iakov Lotovskii's translation (*Nad propastiu vo rzhi*, 2010), yet Nemtsov's work remains the most popular contemporary translation among them, possibly due to the very commotion it caused[18].

In line with the post-Soviet "rebellious" translation practices, Nemtsov's translation may be seen as diametrically opposite to Rait-Kovaleva's translation, especially in terms of language. In Nemtsov's translation, youth slang from 1950s America has been adapted into contemporary Russian teenage slang (Shelestiuk 2013: 43). If Rait-Kovaleva's translation of the source's text is characterized by neutralization, Nemtsov's translation is characterized by exaggeration. In fact, Nemtsov's translation abounds with non-standard language: he not only "rendered all features of the original, but had exaggerated some of them" (Rudnytska 2013: n.p.). As in Kovaleva's case, the critical reception of Nemtsov's translation also mainly focused on language, although with the opposite verdict. Nemtsov's translation, with its non-standard language choices including argot, slang expressions with negative connotations and profanities (Rebenko 2013: 171-172), has been described as "hard to read due to the large amount of 'unpronounceable' expressions and, frequently, foul language" (2013: 171). Rebenko (2013: 172) further claims that "M. Nemtsov's conscious vulgarization deforms Salinger's individual and artistic style"and that the overabundance of profanities and jargon,

---

[17] These include both scholarly papers published in academic journals and publications in in-house university journals by professors and/or students. See: Galliamova and Matveeva (2015), Rebenko (2013), Laptinova and Iakovenko (2014), Daianova (2015), Shelestiuk (2013), Shilnov (2014).

[18] Aleksandra Gorbova claims that Makhov's translation remained almost unnoticed, while Rudnytska says the same for Lotovskii's translation, despite its advantages over Nemtsov's work. All the critical works and reviews encountered while preparing this thesis (except for Petrenko's book *Roman Dzh. D. Selindzhera "Nad propastiu vo rzhi" i ego perevody na russkii iazyk*) focus on comparing Rait-Kovaleva's and Nemtsov's translations. Furthermore, Nemtsov's translation has seen three editions (2008, 2016, 2017).

contained in Nemtsov's interpretation of the novel, amounts to an unprofessional translation. Thus, Rebenko (ibid.) concludes that Nemtsov's translation is "a mistranslation", since the language Nemtsov employed in his translation would sound unnatural in the speech of an American teenager whose father is a wealthy lawyer. As a result, Nemtsov "constructs a vulgar and cynical character who is different from Salinger's virtuous and romantic Holden Caulfield, which absolutely distorts the artistic value that Salinger's novel has for the target audience" (ibid.).

On the other hand, Elena Shelestiuk (2013: 44) claims that Nemtsov's translation is more in line with the source text than Rait-Kovaleva's in terms of the surface structure. What makes Nemtsov's translation and the like hard to accept in Russia is, according to Shelestiuk, the difference in tolerance towards non-standard words and expressions: while such elements are readily tolerated in the West, their level of tolerance in Russia remains quite low[19]. As a result, profanities, non-standard language and crude jokes tend to be neutralized in translation and very vulgar parts tend to be omitted (ibid.). Meanwhile, Burak (2011: 110) considers Nemtsov's translation to be a part of the same trend as Rait-Kovaleva's. His view is that Nemtsov's work simply represents a new stage in the development of "ozhivliazh": as the old translation came to be regarded as bland or "uncool", there came to be a new enlivened translation, this time rendered in "millennial speak".

Yet, it was not only the language of Nemtsov's translation that prompted negative reviews and sparked debates. It had another fault: the fact that it came to be in the first place. As Aleksandra Borisenko (2009: n.p.) puts it, Nemtsov's translation raised "a moral and ethical problem: should Salinger be translated or not since this has already been done by the great translator, Rita Rait-Kovaleva". The question thus revolved around the practice of retranslation in general. Borisenko cites a fierce opponent of Nemtsov's translation, translator and critic Victor Toporov (2008b: n.p.), who wrote three separate reviews (without having read the new translation) and claimed that "[s]uch instances should not be discussed, but denounced, and not only the translations themselves, but their publication as well (…) Their publication should be denounced as an act of literary vandalism! As, in essence, an attempted murder!". Borisenko (2009: n.p.) further claims that such a view is also shared by the general

---

[19] This also confirmed by Ibrišević and Čelić (2018), whose article shows that even today's Russian university students regard the use of swearwords as inacceptable and see swearwords as almost unquestionable carries of negative connotations, regardless of the age or social category of the speaker. On the other hand, their Croatian counterparts were shown to use swearwords to signal close relations in non-formal contexts, without any implication that the speaker is uneducated or rude.

reader, and she lists a few illustrative comments from the *Live Journal* (Rus. *Zhivoi Zhurnal*) social networking service, for instance[20]:

> *Rait-Kovaleva was primarily a WRITER, like Zakhoder and Pasternak, which is why her translations make the hearts of numerous people skip a beat, while the original text later heavily disappoints. The same goes for "Hamlet", the same goes for "Winnie-the-Pooh"…*

As we can see, not only is Kurt Vonnegut on the losing side in the original text, but also William Shakespeare.

> *Rita Rait-Kovaleva already translated the book. She closed the subject. What insolence – to go painting over Leonardo's work?*

Nevertheless, it turns out that the author of the book is Rait-Kovaleva.

According to Borisenko (2009: n.p.), negative attitudes towards retranslations stem from the fact that the first, canonical translations are perceived as original texts[21]. Thus, a retranslation is by definition regarded to be bad because it dares to try and reproduce the sacred (ibid.), i.e. it challenges the status of the translation enjoying monumental esteem, which is an offence in itself. Thus, the prevalent attitude to contemporary translation is, in Toporov's (2008b: n.p.) words, "Excuse me, keep your hands off the monument!". Borisenko (2009: n.p.) explains that this view dates back to Soviet Union, when translations were considered to be a part of the home literary system: "a good translation is a work well-written in Russian. True literature". In the 1940s, the dominant doctrine was the idea that translation should have the same artistic impact as the source text, or even be so good as to replace the original. The background of this doctrine was the view that the average Soviet citizen did not know, would not know and should not know any foreign language since the contemporary Russian language and literature were so rich and universal that they were able to covey the works of all the world's greatest writers accurately (ibid.). Borisenko (ibid.) then identifies the three mains reasons behind the backlash against Nemtsov's translation: the canonical status of Rait-Kovaleva's translation, the replacement stereotype (if a translation replaces the original, then a retranslation will replace an older translation) and the fact that the reputation of new translations was damaged by their rebellion against the older ones. In the latter's case, many low-quality translations have been published due to the fact that the new, post-Soviet generation of translators was primarily concerned with restoring profanities, as well as

---

[20] Readers' comments are given in italics and they are followed by Borisenko's own commentary.
[21] It should be noted that it is possible for a later retranslation to become the canonical translation due to extralinguistic influences. See Čelić and Lewis (2015) for an analysis of the language and reception of Croatian translations (1918, 1944, 1974 and the latter's revised edition from 2012) of Lermontov's *A Hero of Our Time*.

religious and political matters omitted by Soviet translators, rather than with style or translation skills (ibid.). According to Borisenko (ibid.), this is exemplified by an earlier retranslation of *The Catcher in the Rye*: the translation by Sergei Makhov published in 1998. Makhov states his mission explicitly in the preface: a new translation is needed because Rait-Kovaleva's translation is a completely different book in comparison with the original text. Yet, while Makhov's aim is to break with tradition and show readers what *Catcher*'s translation should really read like, he simultaneously stays closely tied to it; for instance, Petrenko (2009: 199) shows examples where Makhov copied expressions and sentences from Rait-Kovaleva's translation without changing anything. Yet, Borisenko (2009: n.p.) claims that such a ruthless revolt against the older translation on an ideological basis is not completely pointless. Although Makhov's and Nemov's retranslations were primarily concerned with the introduction of youth slang into the text (in Borisenko's opinion neither of them is a successful translation), such attempts still point to the simple fact "that not even the best of translations will replace or exhaust the original" (ibid.).

8. AN ANALYSIS OF RAIT-KOVALEVA'S AND NEMTSOV'S TRANSLATIONS THROUGH THE PRISM OF ENGLISH LOANWORDS

8.1. Goals and hypotheses

The goal of the this research is to establish whether and how language borrowing may be used to indicate the influence of translation norms and ideology, as shown in two Russian translations of J. D. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye*. English loanwords are in this paper regarded as indicators of the influence of translation norms and, in Max Nemtsov's case, the influence of the translator's own ideology on the target text. Moreover, this study will also try to show how secondary texts (i.e. reviews, critical works) have influenced the reception of the two translations, and how they mirror the dominant norms concerning retranslations.

The first hypothesis of this research claims that the number of English loanwords in Russian translations increases with the passage of time. This hypothesis is based on a) the increase in the number of English loanwords in Russian during the decades separating the two translations, as witnesses by the many works dealing with this subject; b) Arkadii Romanov's

(2000: 102, quoted in Proshina and Ettkin 2005: 443) research, in which he claims that a fifth of contemporary youth slag vocabulary consists of English loanwords; and c) the preface to Nemtsov's translation, which claims it to be "uncensored and without omissions" and according to which Holden's slang is rendered as "rough" and "unfinished" (Ianovskaia 2016: 4). According to this hypothesis, the overall number of English loanwords in Nemtsov's translation should be considerably higher than in Rait-Kovaleva's translation. The second hypothesis deals with the subgroup of English loanwords belonging to youth slang, stating that their number will also differ between the two translations, i.e. their number in Nemtsov's translation should again be higher than in Rait-Kovaleva's. Finally, the English loanwords collected from the two translations are compared in terms of Mark Haspelmath's distinction between core and cultural borrowings. Since English borrowings enter youth slang in order to increase its inventory of items indicating affective meaning (see chapter four of this paper), the third hypothesis in this research states that Nemtsov's translation contains more core borrowings than cultural borrowings, while the opposite is true for Rait-Kovaleva's translation. To sum up, Nemtsov's 2008 translation was expected to contain more Anglicisms overall, more Anglicisms belonging to youth slang, and more Anglicisms that can be classified as core borrowings compared to Rait-Kovaleva's translation produced in the Thaw period (i.e. roughly between 1955 and 1965).

8.2. Methodology

The first step in conducting the quantitative analysis was to collect English loanwords from Rita Rait-Kovaleva's and Max Nemtsov's translations of *The Catcher in the Rye,* in line with the definition of English loanwords presented in chapter three. In this research, only English loanwords with a verified etymology are taken into account, while loanblends are disregarded. The collected English loanwords were then counted and the two sets of loanwords (one for each translation) were compared in terms of the total number of word forms and lemmas. In order to verify the etymology of the English loanword candidates, this research applied a filter consisting of three dictionaries: *Noveishii slovar inostrannyh slov i vyrazhenii* (2001) edited by Iu. G. Khatskevich, *Bolshoi slovar inostrannyh slov: 35 tysiach slov* (2010) compiled by Aleksandar Bulyko and the *Vikislovar* online dictionary[22]. Words

---

[22] In cases where there were competing donor languages, this paper also referred to Shaposhnikov's two-volume etymological dictionary (2016) and *Bolshoi akademicheskii slovar* edited by K. S. Gorbachevich et. al (2004-2014).

whose etymology could not be verified in these dictionaries, except for eponyms and brand names adapted to the Russian Cyrillic script and for obvious derivations obtained from existing English loanwords[23], were excluded from this research. In cases where multiple dictionaries offered different etymologies, the etymology with more suggestions was given precedence. If two different donor languages were listed for a given loanword and it was impossible to determine which one should be given precedence by referring to the aforementioned dictionaries, the loanword in question was included in the analysis, and such cases (except for *kofe* and *seks* which are discussed below) are listed in Table 5 in the Appendix, page 87.

The second step was to identify the subgroup English loanwords belonging to youth slang. In order to define which English loanwords belong to the register of youth slang, this thesis relied on Russian youth slang dictionaries by Nikitina (*Kliuchevye kontsepty molodezhnoi kultury: tematicheskii slovar slenga*, 2013) and Zakharova and Shuvaeva (*Slovar molodezhnogo slenga (na materiale leksikona studentov Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta)*, 2014). Later, to expand this category and include all types of non-standard language, this research adopted Annebet Nopper's method of applying a lexical filter: if a given word did not occur in any of the consulted dictionaries, it was classified as a part of non-standard language. The lexical filter consisted of the three dictionaries used to verify the etymology of the supposed English loanwords with the addition of Ozhegov and Shvedova's *Tolkovyi slovar russkogo iazyka* (2006). Beside lexemes appearing in none of the aforementioned dictionaries, all items stylistically marked as belonging to one of the varieties of non-standard language in these dictionaries were also included into the general non-standard language group. This way, the two Russian translations were also compared in terms of the number of youth slang and general non-standard language items.

In an attempt to classify the English loanwords in the two Russian translations according to Haspelmath's distinction between cultural and core borrowings, the Anglicisms were first divided into two categories: proper nouns and common expressions (including common nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc.). Next, Haspelmath's division was applied only to the latter subgroup, because proper nouns primarily encompass people's names and surnames,

---

[23] Such instances include: *viskach* (a derived form of *viski*), *vitalis* (brand name), *gladston* (brand name), *dzhitterbazhit* (derived from *dzhitterbag*), *ivning* (part of a newspaper title), *koktelnaia* (derived from *koteil*), *mansli* (part of a newspaper tile), *mister-vinson* (a compound made up from *mister* and *vinson*), *mister-vinus* (a compound made up from *mister* and *vinus*), *pidzh* (a shortened form of *pidzhak*), *post* (part of a newspaper title), *snobskii* (derived from *snob*), *kadillak* (brand name), *lasall* (brand name), *lasteks* (brand name).

various toponyms and brand names. Since "many proper names tend to be recognized as language-specific" (Hermans 2015: 12), these items would, therefore, qualify as cultural borrowings. In translations, language-specificity is retained by copying or transcribing/transliterating foreign names (for a description of the ways of adapting proper names in translations, see Hermans 2015: 13-14). Today, the Russian translation practice primarily relies on transcribing conventional proper names, except in cases in which a long-term tradition has been established (see Alekseevna 2004: 186-190; Ermolovich 2001). If a proper noun comes to denote a whole class of objects (or even people) through the process of generalization, it loses its status as a proper noun and it becomes an eponym. Thus, in order to filter out the "noise" which proper names would entail and obtain the most reliable and representative results, the two Russian translations were also compared in terms of the number of lemmas and word forms of common expressions borrowed from the English language[24].

8.2.1. Difficulties concerning language borrowing and etymology

One of the difficulties encountered when trying to establish whether a word is an English borrowing or not arose from the fact that there are many Russian words with their formal counterparts in English that did not, however, come into the Russian lexicon from English. This is a result of the fact that in the past both Russian and English extensively borrowed from French independently from one another. Thus, while researching the etymology of English loanword candidates, some of them turned out to be in fact French borrowings (e.g. *taksi, fotka, kepar*). Moreover, there were also instances where it was impossible to reach a definite conclusion regarding etymology; that is, whether the donor language was English or French. For example, there is no consensus on the word *seks:* Khatskevich's dictionary of foreign words and phrases cites French as the donor language (into which it was borrowed from Latin), Bulyko's dictionary of foreign words claims that English is the donor language (where it also originally came from Latin), *Vikislovar* lists only Latin, while Shaposhnikov's etymological dictionary offers both English and French as two equally probable donor languages. This way, the situation is not only complicated by difficulties in determining which language had the role of the donor (or perhaps mediator)

---

[24] Here, this research relies on Franco Axielá's (1996: 73) approach in order to avoid a situation in which "percentages would be strongly influenced by the number of times key items like the names of the main characters are repeated".

language, but also by the different approaches to etymology that dictionaries may adopt: some might list only the original donor language, while others illustrate the subsequent "chain" of mediator languages. As the parallel etymologies of *kofe* (coffee) illustrate, such instances are not only restricted to English and French (see Table 1).

Table 1

Dictionary	Etymology
Khatskevich	Latin (< Arabic)
Bulyko	Dutch (< Arabic)
Vikislovar	English or Dutch (< Arabic)
Shaposhnikov	English or Dutch (< Turkish) (< Arabic)
Bolshoi akademicheskii slovar	Arabic

There are also cases when a given borrowing may acquire a new meaning in the recipient language or become so integrated that it is no longer associated with its original (donor) language. For instance, Khatskevich, Bulyko and *Vikislovar* list Spanish as the donor language of *rancho*, yet the secondary meaning of the word is according to Khatskevich and Bulyko restricted only to farms in the United States[25]. In English, *ranch* is also primarily associated with North American farms and it has acquired a separate meaning in North American English (see *Oxford Dictionary of English* 2003: 1456). Therefore *rancho* is in this paper considered to be an English borrowing because it has become an integral part of the North American culture and it is used in this meaning in *The Catcher in the Rye*. Similarly, *Kapitolii/Kepitol* is also included into the research because the name of the movie palace echoed the US Congress, while connection with the original meaning (the hill in Rome on which the ancient temple of Jupiter was built) is lost.

---

[25] The definitions given in *Vikislovar* and Ozhegov and Shvedova's dictionary are somewhat ambiguous in this respect. They only describe *rancho* as a farm in America, leaving it unclear whether it is an umbrella term used for both North and South America or if they used it only to refer to farms in South America (which is the first meaning listed in Khatskevich's and Bulyko's dictionaries).

8.3. Results

The two sets of English loanwords collected from the two translations are presented in Table 1 and Table 2 in the Appendix. In Rait-Kovaleva's translation, there were 380 lemmas of English origin, while Nemtsov's translation contained 406, which is a difference of around six percent. Next, the total number of English loanwords appearing in various word forms in Rait-Kovaleva's translation was found to be 1857, as opposed to 1915 in Nemtsov's translation. Therefore, in terms of the total number of English loanwords, the difference between the two translations is even smaller: Nemtsov's translation contains only three percent more English loanwords than Rait-Kovaleva's. As a result, while the first hypothesis of this research is formally confirmed in that there are more Anglicisms in the retranslation, the difference is surprisingly small, particularly if we take into account the influx of English loanwords into Russian (see chapter three).

The next step was to compare the numbers once proper names were omitted to see whether the small difference between the two translations was actually due to the frequent usage of character names, eponyms and the like. In this case, Rait-Kovaleva's translation contains 104 lemmas of verified English origin, while the number in Nemtsov's translation is 122. In this case, the difference between the two translations turned out to be slightly higher: the number in Nemtsov's translation represents a 15 percent increase in comparison with Rait-Kovaleva's. However, in terms of the number of occurrences of these lemmas in the two translations, the final sum is rather unexpected: the number of total word forms is roughly four percent higher in Rait-Kovaleva's translation (541) than in Nemtsov's translation (518).

When it comes to the second hypothesis and the comparison of youth slang expressions of English origin in the two translations, the results turned out to be equally underwhelming. No verified slang expression of English origin was found in Rait-Kovaleva's translation, which was not surprising. However, in Nemtsov's translation, only three verified slang lemmas of English origin (*basket*, *bufera* and *stop*) were found, and the total number of their various word forms turned out to be seven. Due to this unexpectedly low number of youth slang expressions of English origin, Annebet Noppers' (2010: 40) lexical filter method was applied, in which she used four contemporary dictionaries and classified all terms that do not appear in any of these dictionaries, or appear in just one of them, as youth language. Here, her approach was slightly modified: all stylistically marked items (whether "offensive", "vernacular", "diminutive" or "colloquial"), alongside words which do not appear in any of the dictionaries, were considered to belong to non-standard language. The aim was to see

whether such an approach would be helpful in showing a greater degree of difference between the two translations. The results were the following: three non-standard expressions of English origin (*koktelnaia, telefonchik, khuliganistyi*) were found in Rait-Kovaleva's translation, while sixteen non-standard expressions of English origin (*basket, bufera, viskach, dzhamp, dzhazovoi, dzhinsiki, kola, mister-vinus, mister-vinson, pidzh, pidzhachok, rollerski, stop, striptizka, klinch*[26]) were found in Nemtsov's translation, including the three verified slang lemmas. Out of these, the compounds *mister-vinus* and *mister-vinson* are two neologisms based on wordplay of *mister Vinus* and *mister Vinson*. These non-standard expressions appear 30 times in Nemtsov's translation, compared to only three instances in Rait-Kovaleva's translation (i.e. each of the non-standard lemmas appears only once). Although the results obtained by applying such an approach seem to confirm the second hypothesis in terms of an increase in the ratio (there are ten times more non-standard word forms in Nemtsov's translation compared to Kovaleva's), the total amount of examples is still too small to reach a valid conclusion. It should also be mentioned that, among the words which do not appear in any of the four dictionaries used as a lexical filter, obvious examples of brand names or parts of newspaper titles adapted to the Russian Cyrillic script (*ivning, mansli, post, vitalis, gladston, lasall, lasteks*), as well as orthographically and morphologically adapted lexemes from American popular culture and sport (*dzhitterbag, pinbol, tom-kollinz, nelson, dzhamp, dzhitterbazhit, dzhazovo*), were not counted as non-standard expressions due to the fact that their primary function is to denote a concept absent in the Russian language, rather than indicate expressiveness[27].

In the case of youth slang and non-standard language, the research conducted for this thesis has essentially resulted in the absence of the expected quantity of English loanwords. When it comes to the total number of Anglicisms (in terms of both lemmas and word forms), the difference between the two translations is too slight to be used as a basis for a definitive conclusion, not to mention that in one case the number of English loanwords turns out to be higher in Kovaleva's translation. Although a limited number of English loanwords was expected from Rait-Kovaleva's translation because the then dominant doctrine of socialist

---

[26]Although the word *klinch* is registered in Russian dictionaries, here it is regarded to be non-standard expression because it is used in a sense which is not registered in Russian, but exists in English: "an embrace, especially an amorous one" (*Oxford Dictionary of English* 2003: 323).

[27] Even though *dzhazovoi* is related a concept imported from American culture, here it is classified as an item of non-standard language because it is derived in a non-standard grammatical form (the standard adjectival form in Russian is *dzhazovyi*).

realism entailed the domestication of translations[28], the small margin of difference between her and Nemtsov's translations in this regard is rather surprising. Yet, such results are not considered to invalidate the research done for this paper; rather, they are taken as a starting point for a discussion on why they contradicted the hypotheses.

The third hypothesis of this research was based on Mark Haspelmath's distinction between core and cultural borrowings and it states that Rita Rait-Kovaleva's translation of *The Catcher in the Rye* contains more cultural borrowings than core borrowings, while Max Nemtsov's translation contains considerably more core borrowings. There were, however, numerous difficulties encountered while trying to classify the two sets of English loanwords accordingly.

At a first glance, the distinction between cultural and core borrowings may seem to be rather straightforward: "A simple dichotomy divides loanwords into cultural borrowings, which designate a new concept coming from outside, and core borrowings, which duplicate meanings for which a native word already exists" (Myers-Scotton 2002: 41, Myers-Scotton 2006: §8.3, quoted in Haspelmath 2009: 46). As discussed in chapter three, this is also in line with contemporary Russian attitudes towards borrowing English loanwords. That is, English borrowings are labelled as either justifiable (they denote a new concept which the recipient language lacks, i.e. justifiable borrowings are in fact cultural borrowings) or unjustifiable (English loanwords are used instead of a Russian word denoting the same concept, i.e. core borrowings are can be regarded as unjustifiable borrowings). The first issue that comes to mind is the fact that such a classification, as well as the value judgement that may be assigned to it, is based on denotative (conceptual) meaning exclusively, thus disregarding non-standard language varieties (such as youth slang) whose primary role is to convey affective meaning. Yet, even when focusing exclusively on the denotative meaning of words in order to simplify the classification of lexical borrowings, there are several issues that arise as soon as such a model is applied to a corpus containing a wide array of loanwords, as it happened to be the case with the two sets of English loanwords collected for this research. Attempts at classifying the loanwords according to Haspelmath's two categories soon showed that such a model is much easier to apply in cases involving recent loanwords, or when there is no difficulty in determining whether a word for a given concept already existed or not. Such cases primarily refer to loanwords denoting concepts specific to British or American cultures at the time they

---

[28] The domestication in her translation is not only limited to adapting youth slang in accordance with the Soviet norms, but she also neutralized some culture-specific items. For instance, "hamburger" was substituted with *kotleta.*

were borrowed into Russian (regardless of whether they are still considered to be culture-specific items by Russian speakers or not) and are therefore easily classified as cultural borrowings. They include, for instance, types of sports previously not found in Russia (*basketbol*, *beizbol*, *kriket*, *golf*, *futbol*, *softbol*), concepts relating to popular culture and music (*bliuz*, *dzhitterbag*, *dzhez*), imperial measurements (*iard*, *fut*, *milia*, *galon*), graphically adapted brand names (*vitalis*, *gladston*, *kadillak*), etc.

On the other hand, problems arise when dealing with English loanwords that have been part of the Russian language for a longer period of time and denote everyday objects, professions, etc. In such cases, it is much harder to establish whether the loanword was imported alongside the concept it refers to or not. Here, these issues will be illustrated on a few concrete examples. In the case of *vokzal*, it was not possible to verify whether this Anglicism was used to refer to a train station as soon as it was borrowed, or whether a Russian (or maybe a loanword from another language) was initially used and later replaced in usage by the English loanword. Moreover, there are also English loanwords that have acquired new meanings in Russian through semantic extension, and their classification would in turn depend on the meaning used in a particular context. For instance, *pidzhak* is in Rait-Kovaleva's and Nemtsov's translations used in its primary meaning (men's suit jacket), which makes it a cultural borrowing. Had it been used in its secondary meaning (a short female jacket), it would be classified as a core borrowing. Another difficulty has to do with the fact that a core borrowing may technically change into a cultural borrowing over time. In other words, the issue is whether a given borrowing indeed denoted a new concept at the time when it was borrowed or not, since the distinction between the concept the borrowing refers to and the concept a corresponding native word refers to may occur after the loanword itself was borrowed. For instance, there were traditional folk games in Russia before the arrival of the loanwords such as *sport* and *match*. However, it was not possible to determine whether *sport* was at the time conceptualized as a completely different thing (as an activity involving invariable rules and clearly defined roles such as referees, coaches, players, etc.), or whether it was just seen as an activity similar to the traditional Russian folk games and then later started being conceptualized differently from them. Another similar problem concerns examples such as *snob*, *khuligan* and *detektiv*. The issue at hand concerning these examples is whether such concepts existed, but maybe were not lexicalized until the loanword was introduced into the Russian language. That is, it seems logical to assume that there existed pretentious people, young troublemakers and people whose job was to investigate a person or a crime before

these English loanwords were borrowed into Russian, yet such a supposition is very hard to verify (or at least it has been within the framework of this research). Such examples raise the question of the historical development of the Russian lexicon, as well as the issue of conceptualization in relation to language borrowing. Providing a more profound insight into these issues falls well beyond the scope of this paper, and it is enough just to raise a few major concerns and make an attempt at such a classification[29]. As it has been mentioned, Nemtsov's translation was expected to contain considerably more core borrowings than Rait-Kovaleva's translation, yet the results have shown it not to be true. In fact, there are only five English loanwords (*bekon, bufera, pattern, reporter, gangster*) which can be classified as core borrowings in Nemtsov's translation, as opposed to one (*gangster*) in Rait-Kovaleva's translation. Even if all the loanwords which could be classified as cultural borrowings with some justification were taken into account, there would still be almost no difference in their number between the two translations (93 to 92 in favour of Rait-Kovaleva's translation). Such results may be explained as a consequence of the fact that, unexpectedly, Nemtsov's translation contains a very small number of English loanwords.

8.4. Discussion of the results within the DTS theoretical framework

The hypotheses of this study, based upon works dealing with language borrowing in contemporary Russian, the influence of English on the lexicon of Russian youth slang (most prominently on Romanov's claim that 20 percent of contemporary youth slang vocabulary is made up from English loanwords), and on the publisher's preface to Max Nemtsov's translation, were not convincingly confirmed by the results of the quantitative analysis. Taking into account the assumption that Rait-Kovaleva's and Nemtsov's translations each reflect the contemporary Russian language respectively (i.e. that the language in the translations is not deliberately archaised etc.), the hypotheses were drawn deductively and tested by collecting sets of English loanwords for each of the two translations. The two sets were compared in terms of the number of lemmas and word forms of English loanwords in general and those belonging to youth slang and non-standard language varieties. In addition to this, attempts were made to classify the English loanwords from the two translations as either cultural or core borrowings (see Haspelmath 2009). In all three instances, the results indicate

---

[29] The two tables (Table 3 and 4) showing an attempt at applying such a classification on the sets of English loanwords collected from Rait-Kovaleva's and Nemtsov's translations respectively can be found in the Appendix, pages 81-86. The borrowings that were impossible to classify accordingly are marked with an asterisk.

that Rait-Kovaleva's and Nemtsov's translations do not differ to a great extent with regard to English loanwords. This section of the thesis will employ the theoretical framework of descriptive translation studies in an attempt to provide an explanation as to why none of the three hypotheses have been convincingly confirmed by quantitative results. The lack of difference regarding the quantity of English loanwords in the two Russian translations of Salinger's novel is thus taken as a starting point for a discussion on the influence that (translator's and/or institutional) ideology on the one hand and translation policy, which Toury (1995: 58) defines as "those factors that govern the choice of text-types, or even individual texts, to be imported through translation into a particular culture/language at a particular point in time", on the other, exert on translation.

John Schmitz (1998: 2) writes that "[i]n a poststructural view of translation, the translator always alters the original and the changes are dictated by the political-social-cultural ideology existing at the time the translation is being prepared". The aim of this discussion is to show how ideological influence shaped Rait-Kovaleva's and Nemtsov's translations of *The Catcher in the Rye*. However, it is not only the influence of ideology "from outside" that takes part in the shaping of a given translation; under certain conditions the ideology of the individual translator working on a given text can play a major role as well. Román Álvarez and M. Carmen-África Vidal (1996: 6) list the numerous restrictions and influences under which translation as an activity is performed and which shape the end product:

> Translators are constrained in many ways: by their own ideology; by their feelings of superiority or inferiority towards the language in which they are writing the text being translated; by the prevailing poetical rules at that time; by the very language in which the texts they are translating is written; by what the dominant institutions and ideology expect of them; by the public for whom the translation is intended. The translation itself will depend upon all of these factors.

On the other hand, André Lefevere (1992a: 41) identifies two main types of influences on translation: "Two factors basically determine the image of a work of literature as projected by a translation. These two factors are, in order of importance, the translator's ideology (whether he/she willingly embraces it, or whether it is imposed on him/her as a constraint by some form of patronage), and the poetics dominant in the receiving literature at the time the translation is made". To further clarify this, patronage refers to "the powers (persons, institutions), which help or hinder the writing, reading and rewriting of literature" (1992a: 15). Patronage consists

of three elements: the ideological component (which not only constraints the development of form and subject-matter, but also encompasses conventions and beliefs that guide our actions), the economic component (nowadays usually in the form of monetary compensation for the translator's work) and status (the integration in a particular social class, academic or intellectual circle, etc.) (1992a: 16). Furthermore, Lefevere (1992a: 17) claims that patronage can be either undifferentiated or differentiated, depending on whether the three components of patronage are exerted by the same patron or not.

Here, the absence of English loanwords in Max Nemtsov's translation, which goes against the descriptions of "natural" youth slang in contemporary Russia, is interpreted as an intentional act, i.e. as an act of personal ideology on the part of the translator. As it has been discussed in chapter seven, Nemtsov intensified the usage of youth slang in the novel, and yet, the slang that he uses does not seem to correspond with the unaltered slang the publisher's preface claims it to be. The youth slang in Nemtsov's translation is based on Russian argot and other non-standard varieties: "His [Nemtsov's] Caulfied is a vocational-technical school student from the Perestroika period, a pre-revolutionary peasant, a post-war loser and a contemporary D student with a smartphone" (Idov 2008: n.p.). Thus, Nemtsov primarily puts the Russian inventory of expressive slang units and profanities into focus, which may be interpreted as his aim to demonstrate that such an array indeed exists in the Russian language.

This is also substantiated by the content of the rather short, but (quite subtly) ideologically invested paratext in Nemtsov's translation. Although Nemtsov's translation does not contain the translator's foreword describing explicitly his "mission statement" (as, for instance, Makhov's translation does), the publisher's preface (Ianovskaia 2016: 4) openly invites the reader to compare Nemtsov's translation to Rait-Kovaleva's: "The reader has the choice and the possibility to compare Rita Rait-Kovaleva's classic translation and Max Nemtsov's contemporary excellent work". Thus, Nemtsov's youth slang becomes more of a response to the youth slang (or rather, the absence of it) in Rait-Kovaleva's translation. In other words, if Rait-Kovaleva neutralized the slang and profanities from the source text, Nemtsov accentuates them for this very reason. This is here also regarded as an explanation why Nemtsov gives precedence to Russian expressions: his aim is to show that Russian not only has the ability to "soften" crude expressions, but that it in fact contains an impressive arsenal of such expressions. In this respect, Nemtsov's translation is not only motivated by the source text, but also – and possibly even more – by Rait-Kovaleva's canonical translation.

Furthermore, the paratexts in Nemtsov's and Rait-Kovaleva's translations aptly illustrate Lefevere's (2014: 234) claim that "[n]o translation, published as a book, is likely to give you just the translation. It is nearly always accompanied by an introduction, which is a form of criticism cum interpretation". Interpretation, an instance of rewriting of literature just like translation itself (2014: 233), thus becomes a means of presenting a selected work according to one's ideological position, as well as disseminating a particular reading of the given text. For instance, Samantha Sherry (2015: 129) sees the afterword to Rait-Kovaleva's translation of *The Catcher in the Rye* as "a part of the formal 'apparatus' that allowed the text to be published, giving the reader advice on how to approach potentially problematic content". It is equally important to emphasize that the afterword was written by an authoritative voice from the contemporary Russian literary scene, the renowned writer Vera Panova, winner of three State Stalin Prizes and two Orders of the Red Banner of Labour. In order to prevent the reader from identifying with Holden's rebelliousness, Panova calls him

> "'барчук' [barchuk] (landowner's son) – an eighteenth-century term that had acquired
> negative connotations of bourgeois idleness in the Soviet period – she also calls him
> variously a 'бездельник' [bezdelnik] (loafer) and 'лодырь' [lodyr] (idler), a 'лгун' [lgun]
> (liar) and a 'стиляга' (stiliaga), which was a particularly contemporary insult" (ibid.).

The inscription of *The Catcher in the Rye* within the framework of Soviet ideology and the dominant poetics is also visible in the paratext contained in the 1986 edition of Rait-Kovaleva's translation of the novel. Firstly, the publisher's preface (Karpyn 1986: 4) claims that "[Salinger] recounts the real values of life, each of his lines asserts and advocates the high principles of humanism, contrasting them with the heartlessness of the bourgeois society". The publisher's short preface is then followed by A. M. Gavriliuk's (1986: 8), preface to the book which claims that "The pimping, prostitution, explicit violence which Holden comes across reveal to him such realities of the capitalist world that his previous misfortunes completely pale in comparison". Moreover, Salinger is interpreted as seeing "the reason of the alienation between people as a result of the growing contradiction between material progress and the spiritual degradation of the bourgeois society" (ibid.). Gavriliuk (1986: 10) ends the preface with the following conclusion:

> The structure, form, the character of the narrative, the very personal manner of narration
> resembling a monologue, the sincere and intimate dialogue with the reader – all of this helps
> to establish contact with the reader and has enormous emotional influence. Salinger's works

are permeated with concern over human destiny, the urge to defend people and the timeless spiritual values fostered by people.

This way, Gavriliuk entirely omits language as one of the key aspects of Salinger's works. By glossing over the issue of language in *The Catcher in the Rye* and the fact that it could not have been published without being censored, this example shows that Salinger's novel was appreciated for the aesthetic value that stems from the ideologically acceptable interpretation assigned to the novel: a young, noble hero who unravels the faults of capitalist America. As Nigel Armstrong (2015: 191) writes, the appreciation of literary value, like any aesthetic value, is completely subjective. Thus, once the form and content of Salinger's novel were adapted to Soviet norms – the first in terms of neutralized foul language and the latter in terms of interpretation – there was nothing to hinder the critical praise of *The Catcher in the Rye*. As it was shown in chapter four of this paper, the reception of the novel in the USA was anything but uniform praise. Marina Rebenko (2013: 170) discusses this phenomenon and claims: "the American and the Russian 'Salingerianas' significantly differ from each other in certain aspects, sometimes they do so up to such a degree that it is even possible to speak of diametrically opposite interpretations of the author's [Salinger's] ambiguities". Returning to the issue of paratexts, the publisher's preface (Ianovskaia 2016: 4) in Nemtsov's translation also contains a fairly obvious interpretation: "The main hero's, [i.e.] Holden Caulfield's, unkempt slang even more strongly reproduces the keen perception of reality and the rejection of the accepted canons and the morals of contemporary society". Here, Holden is no longer interpreted as a rebel against the bourgeois American society, as he was in the Soviet preface, but as a rebel against the established canons (quite tellingly, these canons are not explicitly restricted only to the USA). As a result, it is even possible to establish a metaphorical connection between Holden and Nemtsov's translation: the retranslation also "rises against" the accepted canon, i.e. against the canonical translation of the novel.

In addition to this, Rait-Kovaleva's and Nemtsov's translations can also be seen as products of different types of patronage in Lefevere's sense. Rait-Kovaleva's translation was produced in the Soviet Union, an example *par excellence* of Lefevere's (1992a: 17) claim that undifferentiated patronage is typical of totalitarian states. Moreover, the dominant doctrine of realist translation, according to which translated literature became a part of the home system (and, by extension, its dominant ideology), aptly illustrates Lefevere's (ibid.) claim that "[i]n systems with undifferentiated patronage, the patron's efforts will primarily be directed at preserving the social system as a whole". Thus, the three aspects of patronage are brought

together: the translator follows the official ideological guidelines in terms of form and content, s/he is paid by the state and s/he gains status through appreciation by fellow translators or critics, who are a part of the same system (e.g. Korney Chukovsky's review of Rait-Kovaleva's translation), as well as various prizes or orders handed out by the state (Rait-Kovaleva was awarded the Order of Friendship of Peoples). Nemtsov's translation, on the other hand, emerged in a different social and economic context, in which patronage is differentiated. Nemtsov received his remuneration from the publisher, yet his translation did not earn him any respect from critics, quite the contrary (see chapter seven of this paper). Furthermore, the negative critical reception of Nemtsov's translation is mirrored in papers written by university students and/or younger scholars (see, for instance, Galliamova and Matveeva 2015; Daianova 2015), thus showing that younger scholars and students tend to conform to the dominant ideology and poetics in order to achieve status and recognition by their fellow senior colleagues.

Moreover, Nemtsov's translation also shows that the status component of patronage is in this particular case connected with the other means of controlling the literary system – poetics. While patronage as a control factor is situated outside the literary system itself (Lefevere 1992a: 15), poetics controls the literary system from within:

> Inside the literary system the professionals are the critics, reviewers, teachers, translators. They will occasionally repress certain works of literature that are too blatantly opposed to the dominant concept of what literature should (be allowed to) be – its poetics – and of what society should (be allowed to) be – ideology (1992a: 14).

According to Lefevere (1992a: 36), poetics consists of two components: "the inventory of literary devices, genres, motifs, prototypical characters and situations, and symbols" and the functional component, which refers to "a concept of what the role of literature is, or should be, in a social system as a whole" (ibid.) and "is obviously closely tied to the ideological influences as such, and generated by ideological forces in the environment of the literary system" (1992a: 27). This need not apply only to translations of new works entering the literary system, but to retranslations as well. Thus, in Nemtsov's case, the denial of status (i.e. the backlash against his translation) was caused by his refusal to adhere to the functional component of the dominant poetics. In other words, his attempt to create a new translation which would be an alternative to Rait-Kovaleva's canonized and sanctified translation is regarded by the "guardians" of the dominant poetics (who, apparently, still have influence within the Russian literary system) as an act of blasphemy. Consequently, the role of the sub-

system of translated literature is to keep the canonical status of the Soviet translations unchallenged.

This way, literary criticism has a crucial role in both disseminating and "defending" the dominant poetics. It is thanks to this very dual role that literary critics, reviewers, etc. (in Lefevere's words, professionals within the literary system) also influence the development of the literary system: "The realization that criticism is part of the rough and tumble of the development of a literary system, not a description of that system, may prove productive in opening the way for an analysis of literary systems as such" (Lefevere 2014: 219). Lefevere (1992a: 15-16) further claims that

> Professionals who represent the "reigning orthodoxy" at any time given in the development of a literary system are close to the ideology of patrons dominating that phase in the history of the social system in which the literary system is embedded. In fact, the patron(s) count on these professionals to bring the literary system in line with their own ideology.

In the case of *Catcher*'s two Russian translations, this is shown by the fact that Rait-Kovaleva produced her translation within the framework of the dominant doctrine of socialist realism (which was the only mode sanctioned by the Communist Party) and received praise for it from other professionals, such as fellow translators, critics, reviewers. In contemporary Russia, the situation is more complex due to differentiated patronage: the economic aspect of patronage is to a considerable degree controlled by private publishing houses, which allows translations outside the main ideological current to be published. Yet, as Nemtsov's example shows, literary professionals (such as reviewers and critics) still perform their function of quelling the insurgent voices that may arise within the dominant poetics, primarily by drowning out these voices through numerous and unequivocal negative commentaries. As Leverefe (2014: 236) notes:

> It is and remains a fact of literary life that patrons and critics are, in the final analysis, influential in deciding what will "make it" in a given literature and what will not. They do the screening and they pronounce the verdict. The fight to influence that verdict one way or the other is fought with weapons taken not primarily from the writings of the author in question, but by means of rewritings of all kinds, which are used against each other until a certain consensus is reached in systems with differentiated patronage.

In other words, all texts accompanying a given translation can be regarded as equally important as the translation itself, since they all participate in the shaping of the translation's reception.

This shaping of reception is primarily aimed at the reader, i.e. its purpose is to mould the way the wider audience will accept a given translation. The work of translators, reviewers and critics is essential in providing the "proper" interpretation of a given work to the wider public:

> When non-professional readers of literature (...) say they have "read" a book, what they mean is that they have a certain image, a certain construct of that book in their heads. That construct is often loosely based on some selected passages of the actual text of the book in question (the passages included in anthologies used in secondary or university education, for instance) supplemented by other texts that rewrite the actual text in one way or another, such as plot summaries in literary histories or reference books, reviews in newspapers, magazines or journals, some critical articles, performances on stage or screen, and, last but not least, translations (Lefevere 1992a: 6-7).

The whole phenomenon of rewriting, in Lefevere's sense, a particular work and shaping its reception thus involves an intricate network of closely aligned activities, whose aim is to project an ideologically acceptable rewriting onto the mass readership. This is shown by the online comments that Borisenko lists in her article and, while she expresses her amazement that professional translator Toporov and the average reader share the same opinions, this is in fact due to the literary professionals' successful work. The comments expressing anger over Nemtsov's translation show how the average reader, having internalized the norms regarding rewriting texts, participates in the upholding of the dominant poetics and the norms it entails. In relation to this, Francis R. Jones (2006: 192) claims that "translation norms (that is, culture-specific conventions governing literary translation) prompt translators and readers to prefer certain representations and disprefer others". Thus, Nemtsov's translation is "bad" because it breaks the dominant norm requiring that the status of the canonical translations remains unchallenged.

Still, as Borisenko (2009: n.p.) notes, it is interesting to observe how a retranslation is perceived as a challenge, as something hostile. This may be due to the rigidness of the norms that are apparently shared by a considerable number of literary reviewers and a significant part of the reading public. For instance, Rait-Kovaleva's translation was first shaped by the dominant norms in the Soviet Union in terms of censorship of language, and then it was interpreted according to the dominant poetics through rewritings by other literary professionals (Holden as a sincere young man disillusioned with the bourgeois society). Apparently, the same norms continue to exert

influence even today and (at least try to) keep Rait-Kovaleva's translation in its privileged place over all other translations of *The Catcher in the Rye*, as illustrated by Borisenko's (ibid.) following claim: "Translation practice changes (…) as the era changes, but stereotypes still stand in their places and demand order and a firm hand". "Defending" canonical translations often entails blatantly attacking the new one(s): Toporov (2008a: n.p.) accuses Nemtsov of having no flair for language and of not only deciding to translate despite of it, but to retranslate, of all of things, Rait-Kovaleva's classic translation, and concludes: "I am out of words… at least those suitable for printing". Similarly, Mikhail Idov (2008: n.p.) writes in his review that, if Salinger's original text inspired Mark Chapman to kill John Lennon, Nemtsov's translation could only "inspire a mentally unstable reader to rob a beer stall".

Moreover, Rait-Kovaleva's translation also shows how a translation enjoying a privileged status gained the readers' trust. From the point of view of Soviet ideology, her translation was trusted because it was produced under controlled conditions, i.e. in accordance with the dominant translation norms. The dissemination of the view that such a translation managed to produce an even "better" text than the original one led to the readership's acceptance of this kind of rewriting of *The Catcher in the Rye*. In other words, readers gradually internalized the reading of the novel that was projected at them: if Holden is taken to be a noble hero in the search of truth, then it is automatically unacceptable for him to use profanities in his speech. As a result, Nemtsov's Holden with his numerous expletives and slang expressions is regarded as a distortion of Holden's "true" character. For instance, Marina Rebenko (2013: 171) claims that the argot lexemes that Nemtsov uses in his translation "distort Salinger's communicative intention – to present his literary character as a finely organised individual in search of truth". Similarly, Mikhail Idov (2008: n.p.) writes that Nemtsov's translation transforms "the hero-narrator from a slightly show-off youngster from a good family into a wandering hooligan without a completely clear national or class background". Since Kovaleva's translation met the expectations "to reinforce literary, moral, religious or political values already held by that [Soviet] reader[s]" (Venuti 1998: 124), it also gained the readers' trust, even up to such a degree that it acquired the status of the source text, as shown by the comments from Borisenko's article.

According to Lefevere (1992b: 2), "[t]ranslations which members of a culture have come to trust may mean more to them than translations that can claim to represent

the original better". Thus, retranslations claiming to represent the source text more truthfully (which Makhov explicitly does in the preface to his translation, while the publisher's preface to Nemtsov's translation (Ianovskaia 2016: 4) claims it to be "uncensored" and "without omissions"), are actually disregarded as unworthy, or even suspicious. By breaking the norm and "standing up against" Rait-Kovaleva's canonical translation, these retranslations automatically fell in disfavour of the critics and reviewers, who in turn "have to power to sanction whatever text type translators may be working on" (Franco Axielá 1996: 54). As mentioned, the shaping of the reception is primarily directed at the audience, which, by internalizing the reception and interpretation supplied by professionals, starts to actively participate in the reproduction of the dominant norms and ideology. As a result, the perpetuity of the dominant norms not only relies on a strict top-to-bottom principle (i.e. patrons-professionals-audience), but is also a product of the interplay between the audience's internalization and reproduction of norms. By accepting the dominant norms, the audience also becomes an element contributing to their perpetuation by voicing its dissatisfaction with translations that break or challenge these norms. In the case of Rait-Kovaleva's and Nemtsov's translations, this is aptly illustrated by Borisenko's (2009: n.p.) claim that "the polemical techniques adopted by professionals/experts turn out to be indistinguishable from the conclusions of people who have not read the book, do not speak English and make three mistakes per word in their native language. 'Keep your hands off the monument!' [is what] they echo".

Other than Borisenko's article, there have been some new works in the recent years that focus on the positive sides of retranslation and the issue of the Russian audience being accustomed to Rait-Kovaleva's translation. For instance, literary translator Arkadii Zastyrets (Belotserkovskaia 2015: n.p.) claims that "a wave of criticism was sparked against the translator [Nemtsov] over the 'inaccurate translation', although it is fairly accurate from the point of view of language. This speaks volumes of the fact that we have become quite accustomed to the Salinger introduced to us by Rait-Kovaleva, and we find all other translations difficult to accept". Moreover, in an article on Russian retranslations of *The Catcher in the Rye*, translator Aleksandra Gorbova (2016: n.p.) writes that "there is nothing wrong with the mere emergence of another translation of a popular book. On the contrary, this is actually a very good thing: the reader has the possibility to choose and compare. Especially since language changes all the time, not to mention the extralingustic circumstances which strongly influence the final outcome".

Such a positive attitude towards retranslations is also shared by Irina Vorontsova and Mariya Navolneva (2017: 263), who claim that "[i]t might be right to say that Salinger changes as we do. Therefore, new retranslations of the novel can only be welcome".

These statements concerning *The Catcher in the Rye* may be taken to represent a potential emergence of a new set of norms within the Russian literary system, especially in terms of preliminary norms regarding translation policy. This section of the paper attempted to show how Russian literary professionals have attempted to preserve the old norms concerning the choice of texts to be translated: texts having canonical Russian translations should not be retranslated by other translators. These norms appear to be accepted and internalized by a significant part of the Russian reading public, at least in the case of Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye*.

9. CONCLUSION

The aim of this thesis was to show how ideology exerts influence on translation by analysing how some changes in the Russian lexicon (i.e. the increasing number of English loanwords) are reflected in two Russian translations of J. D. Salinger's novel *The Catcher in the Rye*: Rita Rait Kovaleva's translation from the Thaw period and Max Nemtsov's contemporary translation (first published in 2008). In order to provide justification for the hypotheses that the number of Russian loanwords should be significantly higher in the more recent translation, this paper provides an overview of the history of lexical borrowing from English into Russian, as well as a description of the main features of youth slang.

None of the hypotheses were convincingly confirmed by the quantitative analysis. Firstly, there is very little difference between the two translations when it comes to the number of lemmas or the total number of word forms of English origin. Secondly, although there are more instances of English loanwords belonging to youth slang and non-standard language in Nemtsov's translation, the numbers obtained in the research are simply too small to reach a valid conclusion. The attempt to classify the two sets of English loanwords according to Martin Haspelmath's distinction between cultural and core borrowings put several problems regarding language borrowing into focus. Yet, even when taking into account only those items that could be classified in a satisfactory way, the results showed

again a very small difference between the two translations. Therefore, the next step in the paper was to provide a possible explanation for such an outcome, and the results obtained in the quantitative analysis were interpreted as indicators of the influence of ideology on translation.

Thus, language borrowing was used as a case in point to illustrate the influence of translator's personal ideology. On the basis of the paratext accompanying Max Nemtsov's translation, the fact that the hypotheses regarding the number of English borrowings were not convincingly confirmed was used as a starting point for a discussion on Nemtsov's aim to give precedence to native Russian slang expressions in order to challenge Rita Rait-Kovaleva's canonical translation, which neutralized the slang from the source text. Kovaleva's translation was analysed from the perspective of the extralinguistic influences on her translation, such as the dominant doctrine of social realism and its norms, that shaped translation production in the Soviet Union.

This thesis also tried to demonstrate how secondary texts accompanying Rait-Kovaleva's translation helped shape and disseminate the dominant interpretation of Salinger's novel, as well as enshrine the translation into the Soviet literary canon. This is because Kovaleva's target text conformed to all the dominant norms of socialist realism, both in terms of form (i.e. language) and content (Holden was seen as youth rebelling against the bourgeois society). The paper then proceeded to show that old norms regarding translation policy – those stipulating that there should be only one translation per each source text and that canonical translations should not be "challenged" by new retranslations – still play a significant role in the contemporary Russian literary sphere and continue to shape the reception of post-Soviet retranslations. This was done by researching reviews and critical works dealing with Nemtsov's translation and comparing it to Rait-Kovaleva's, as well as by underlining the value judgement often expressed in them. In order to illustrate how some members of the Russian reading public internalized the dominant norms regarding such a translation policy, this study found it very helpful to rely on Aleksandra Borisenko's article *Selindzher nachinaet i vyigryvaet* (2009), which is the earliest work containing a critical analysis of the general backlash against Nemtsov's translation found when conducting this research. The negative reception of Nemtsov's translation shows how the audience may become an active element in the reproduction of the dominant norms and in guaranteeing their survival. In the recent years, a few other translators and scholars have voiced their support of retranslations and acknowledged the fact that the Russian audience tends to reject

retranslations due to being accustomed to the canonical Soviet translations. Thus, it is possible to speak of a new set of norms, which may gradually take hold within the Russian literary sphere. However, it would be necessary to conduct a much more extensive study involving a greater number of retranslations of different works and their accompanying secondary texts in order to reach a valid conclusion whether this is actually a trend or an exception and how this is connected with other aspects of the Russian literary polysystem.

Nevertheless, the two translations analysed in this paper show that there is always an element of ideology at play when a translation is produced, be it personal (the translator's own agenda) or social ideology (the whole system of norms emanating from the ideological position of the political and/or literary establishment). In both Rait-Kovaleva's and Nemtsov's translations, ideology may be said to have exerted the greatest influence in terms of language. In fact, language is the feature that most reviews and critical works examined in this thesis tended to focus on, thus aptly illustrating André Lefevere's (1992a: 39) claim that "on every level of the translation process, it can be shown that, if linguistic considerations enter into conflict with considerations of an ideological and/or poetological nature, the latter tend to win out".

REFERENCES

Adams, Michael (2009): *Slang: The People's Poetry*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Alekseevna, Irina Sergeevna (2004): *Vvedenie v perevodovedenie*. Sankt-Peterburg: Filologicheskii fakultet SPbGU / Moscow: Izdatelskii centr "Akademiia".

Álvarez, Román and Vidal, M. Carmen-África: (1996): "Translating: A Political Act". *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Edited by Román Álvarez and M. Carmen-África Vidal. Clevedon/Philadelphia/Adelaide: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Armstrong, Nigel (2015): "Culture and translation". *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Culture*. Edited by Farzad Sharifian. London / New York: Routledge.

Baker, Mona and Saldanha, Gabriela, editors (2009*): The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London / New York: Routledge.

Belotserkovskaia, Iana (2015): "Takoi knigi u Selindzhera net". *Oblastnaia gazeta.* 30 June 2015. https://www.oblgazeta.ru/culture/24024/. Accessed: 7 February 2018.

Benson, Morton (1957): "English Loanwords in Russian". *The Slavic and East European Journal*. Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 248-267.

Borisenko, Aleksandra Leonidovna (2009): "Selindzher nachinaet i vyigryvaet". *Inostrannaya literatura*. No. 7, pp. 223-233. http://magazines.russ.ru/inostran/2009/7/bo16.html. Accessed: 24 January 2018.

Bulyko, Aleksandar Nikolaevich (2010): *Bolshoi slovar inostrannyh slov: 35 tysiach slov*. Moscow: Martin.

Burak, Alexander Lvovich. (2011): "Soviet Legacy in The 'Enlivening' Russian Translations of American Fiction: Origins of 'Ozhivliazh'". *Vestnik NGLU*. Issue 13. Problemy perevoda i perevodovedeniia, pp. 100-110.

Čelić, Željka and Lewis, Kristian (2015): "Lingvokulturogicheskii analiz perevodov Geroia nashego vremeni na khorvattskii iazyk". *Tvrochestvo M. Iu. Lermontova: motivy, temy, perevody*. Maribor: Zora.

Chukovsky, Korney Ivanovich (2012): *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadtsati tomakh. Tom tretii: Vysokoe iskusstvo; Iz anglo-amerikanskikh tetradei*. Compiled by E. Chukovskaia and P. Kriuchkov. Moscow: Agenstvo FTM, Ltd.

Costello, Donald (1959): "Language of 'The Catcher in the Rye'". *American Speech*, Vol. 34, No. 3, pp. 172-181.

Daianova, Daria Vladimirovna (2015): "Sleng kak element molodezhnoi subkultury (na primere sravnitelno sopostavitelnogo analiza perevodov proizvedenii Dzh. D. Selindzhera 'Nad propastiu vo rzhi' i S. Chboski 'Khorosho byt tikhonei'". *Science Time*. No. 5 (17), pp. 139-145.

Donahue, Deirdre (2010): "J. D. Salinger: An enigma to the very end". USA Today. https://usatoday30.usatoday.com/life/books/news/2010-01-28-salinger-obit_N.htm. Accessed: 12 January 2018.

Eberhard, Alsen (2008): "*The Catcher in the Rye". J. D. Salinger*. Edited by Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase Publishing.

Eco, Umbeto (2008): *Experiences in Translation*. Toronto/Buffalo/London: University of Toronto Press.

Ermolovich, Dmitrii Ivanovich (2001): *Imena sobstvennye na styke iazykov i kultur*. Moscow: "R.Valent".

Ettobi, Mustapha (2006): "Cultural Representation in Literary Translation: Translators as Mediators/Creators". *Journal of Arabic Literature*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 206-229.

Even-Zohar, Itamar (1990): "Polysystem Studies" *Poetics Today* 11:1. pp. 1-26, 45-51.

Filipović, Rudolf (1990): *Anglicimzmi u hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti – Školska knjiga.

Filipović, Rudolf and Menac, Antica (2005): *Engleski element u hrvatskome i ruskom jeziku*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

Flaker, Aleksandar (1983): *Proza u trapericama: prilog izgradnji modela prozne formacije na građi suvremenih književnosti srednjo- i istočnoevropske regije*. Zagreb: Sveučilišna naklada Liber.

Forster, Leonard: (1958): "Translation: An Introduction". *Aspects of Translation: Studies in Communication 2.* Edited by A. H. Smith London: Seeker and Warburg, pp.1–28.

Franco Axielá, Javier (1996): "Culture-Specific Items in Translation". *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Edited by Román Álvarez and M. Carmen-África Vidal. Clevedon/Philadelphia/Adelaide: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Galliamova, M. S., and Matveeva, E. O. (2015): "Sravnitelnii analiz raznovremennykh perevodov romana Dzh. D. Selindzhera 'Nad propastiu vo rzhi': sovetskaia i sovremennaia retsenzii". *Mezhdunarodnyi nauchno-issledovatelskii zhurnal*. No. 3, part 2, pp. 74-75.

Gavriliuk, A. M. (1986): "Preface". *Nad propastiu vo rzhi*. By Dzherom David Selindzher. Translated by Rita Rait-Kovaleva. Lviv: Visha shkola, izdatelstvo pri Lvovskom gosudarstvennom universitete. pp. 5-10.

Gorbachevich, Kiril Sergeevich et. al., editor (2004-2014): *Bolshoi akademicheskii slovar.* Moscow/Saint Petersburg: Nauka. vol. 1-23.

Gorbova, Aleksandra (2016): "Trudnosti perevoda: na khlebnom pole mezhdu propastiu i obryvom". *Pereplet*. 21 December 2016. http://vpereplete.org/2016/12/trouble-translation/. Accessed: 7 February 2018.

Grabowski, Yvonne (1972): "English Loanwords in Contemporary Russian". *Études Slaves et Est-Européennes / Slavic and East-European Studies*. Vol. 17. pp. 121-129.

Graham, Sara (2007): *J. D. Salinger's* The Catcher in the Rye. London / New York: Routledge.

Gutwillig, Robert (1963): "Everybody's Caught The Catcher in the Rye". *Studies in J. D. Salinger: Reviews, Essays, and Critiques of The Catcher in the Rye and Other Fiction*. Edited by Marvin Laser and Norman Fruman. New York: The Odyssey Press.

Gutwillig, Robert: (1961) "Everybody's Caught *The Catcher in the Rye*". *New York Times Book Review*, p. 38.

Hackett, Alice Payne (1967): *70 Years of Best Sellers; 1895-1965*. New York: R.R. Bowker.

Hamilton, Ian (1988): *In Search of J. D. Salinger*. New York: Random House.

Haspelmath, Martin (2009): "Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues". *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*. Edited by Martin Haspelmath and Uri Tadmor. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Hermans, Theo (1996): "Norms and the Determination of Translation: A Theoretical Framework". *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Edited by Román Álvarez and M. Carmen-África Vidal. Clevedon/Philadelphia/Adelaide: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Hermans, Theo (2015): "On Translating Proper Names, with reference to *De Witte* and *Max Havelaar*". *Modern Dutch Studies: Essays in Honour of Professor Peter King on Occasion of His Retirement*. Edited by M. J. Wintle. London / New Delhi / New York / Sydney: Bloomsbury.

Hunt Steintle, Pamela (2008): "*The Catcher in the Rye* as Postwar American Fable". *J.D. Salinger*. Edited by Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase Publishing.

Ianovskaia, M. (2016): "Preface". *Lovets nad khlebnym polem*. By Dzherom Favid Selindzher. Translated by Max Nemtsov. Moscow: Izdateltsvo "E". p. 4.

Ibrišević, Zvonimir and Čelić, Željka (2018): "Nepristoinost v iazyke – lingvisticheskii analiz obshchestvenno okrashennykh slov". *Ukrajinistika na Sveučilištu u Zagrebu: 20 godina*. Zagreb: FF press.

Idov, Mikhail (2008): "Effekt khlebnogo polia". *Kommersant*. 12 December 2008. https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/1091065. Accessed: 14 February 2018.

Ivir, Vladimir (1984): *Teorija i tehnika prevođenja: udžbenik za III i IV razred srednjeg obrazovanja prevodilačke struke*. Novi Sad: Centar "Karlovačka gimnazija" Sremski Karlovci, Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika u Novom Sadu.

Jakobson, Roman (1959/1966) "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation". On Translation. Edited by Reuben A. Brower. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jones, Francis R. (2006): "'Geldshark Ares god of War': Ideology and Time in Literary Translation". *The Yearbook of English Studies.* Vol. 36, No. 1, pp. 191-203.

Karjalainen, Markus (2002): *Where have all the swearwords gone: An analysis of the loss of swearwords in two Swedish translations of J. D. Salinger's Catcher in the Rye*. http://ethesis.helsinki.fi/julkaisut/hum/engla/pg/karjalainen/wherehav.pdf. Accessed: 1 October 2017.

Karpyn, D. S. (1986): "Preface". *Nad propastiu vo rzhi*. By Dzherom David Selindzher. Translated by Rita Rait-Kovaleva. Lviv: Visha shkola, izdatelstvo pri Lvovskom gosudarstvennom universitete. p. 4.

Katan, David (1999*): Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing

Khatskevich, Iu. G. (2001): *Noveishii slovar inostrannyh slov i vyrazhenii.* Moscow: AIST / Minsk: Harvest.

Khrunenkova, Anna (2012): "Inostrannye slova: 'lingvisticheskaia moda' ili neobhodimost?". *Russian Language Journal*, Vol. 62, pp. 225-237.

Komarova, Polina Gennadevna (2012): "Mezhieiazykovaia i vnutriiazykovaia paronimiia". *Vestnik Viatskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta.* 2:4, pp. 24-27.

Komissarov, Vilen Naumovich (2002): *Sovremennoe perevodovedenie: uchebnoe posobie*. Moscow: ÈTS.

Krysin, Leonid Petrovich (2004): *Russkoe slovo, svoe i chuzhoe: Issledovaniia po sovremennomu russkomu iazyku i sotsiolingvistike*. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskoi kultury.

Laptinova, Anastasiia Viktorovna and Iakovenko, Tatiana Igorevna (2014): "Osobennosti perevoda imen sobstvennyh na primere romana Dzheroma Selindzhera 'Nad propastiu vo rzhi'". *Apriori*. No. 2. pp. 1-9.

Lefevere, André (1992a): *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London / New York: Routledge.

Lefevere, André (2014): "Why Waste Our Time on Rewrites? The Trouble with Interpretation and the Role of Rewriting in an Alternative Paradigm". *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. Edited by Theo Hermans. London/Sydney: Croom Helm.

Lefevere, André, editor (1992b): *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook*. London / New York: Routledge.

Marinova, Elena Viacheslavovna (2012): *Inoiazychnaia leksika sovremennogo russkogo iazyka: uchebnoe posobie*. Moscow: Flinta.

Myers-Scotton, Carol (2002): *Contact linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, Carol (2006): *Multiple voices: An introduction to bilingualism*. Malden: Blackwell.

Nadel Alan (2008): "Rhetoric, Sanity, and the Cold War: The Significance of Holden Caulfield's Testimony". *J. D. Salinger*. Edited by Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase Publishing.

Nida, Eugen (2004): "Principles of Correspondence". *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. London / New York: Routledge, pp. 126-140.

Nida, Eugene A. and Taber, Charles R. (1969/1982): *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Nikitina, Tatiana Gennadevna (2013): *Kliuchevye kontsepty molodezhnoi kultury: tematicheskij slovar slenga*. Saint Petersburg: "Dmitrii Bulanin".

Noppers, Annebet (2010): *The Translation of Youth Language: A Comparison of Dutch Translations of the 'Catcher in the Rye' and 'Less Than Zero'*. https://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/178970. Accessed: 1 October 2017.

Ohmann, Caroll and Ohmann, Richard (1976): "Reviewers, Critics, and 'The Catcher in the Rye'". *Critical Inquiry* 3:1, pp. 15-37.

Ozhegov, Sergei Ivanovich and Shvedova, Nataliia Iurevna (2006): *Tolkovyi slovar russkogo iazyka: 80 000 slov i frazeologicheskikh vyrazhenii*. Moscow: OOO "A TEMP".

Patton, Frederick R. (1980): "Expressive Means in Russian Youth Slang". *The Slavic and East European Journal*. Vol. 24, No. 3, pp. 270-282.

Petrenko, Denis Ivanovich (2009): *Roman Dzh. D. Selindzhera "Nad propastiu vo rzhi" i ego perevody na russkii iazyk*. Stavropol: Izdatelstvo Stavropolskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta.

Petrenko, Denis Ivanovich (2016): "Perevod i ideologiia (na materiale perevoda romana Dzh. D. Selindzhera 'The Catcher in the Rye' v SSSR)". *Vestnik PNIPU*. No. 3, pp. 28-37.

Poster, William (1990): "Tomorrow's child". *Critical Essays on Salinger's The Catcher in the Rye*. Edited by Joel Salzberg. Boston: G. K. Hall & Co.

Proshina, Zoya G. and Ettkin, Brian P. (2005): "English–Russian Language Contacts". *World Englishes*, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 439–444.

Pushkin, Alexander Sergeyevich (2013): *Evgenii Onegin*. Moscow: OLMA Media Grupp.

Pym, Anthony (2016): *Translation Solutions for Many Languages: Histories of a Flawed Dream*. London [etc.]: Bloomsbury Academic.

Rait-Kovaleva, Rita (1965): "Nit Ariadny*". Redaktor i perevod: sbornik statei*. Edited by A. I. Mironova. Moscow: Kniga.

Rebenko, Marina Iupiyivna (2013): "Subieektivnaia deformatsiia iazykovoi lichnosti Goldena Kolfilda v perevodakh romana Dzh. D. Selindzhera 'Nad propastiu vo rzhi'". *Vestnik VGU*. No. 1, pp.170-173.

Riedel, Walter E. (1980): *Some German ripples of Holden Caulfield's "Goddamn Autobiography": On Translating and Adapting J.D. Salinger's The Catcher in the Rye*. http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/crcl/article/view/2411/1806. Accessed: 1 October 2017.

Romanov, Arkadii Iurevich (2000): *Anglitsizmy i amerikanizmy v russkom iazyke i otnoshenie k nimi*. Saint Petersburg: Izadelstvo Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta.

Rudnytska, Nataliya M. (2013): "Soviet Censorship and Translation in Contemporary Ukraine and Russia". *Translation Journal*. Volume 17, No. 2. http://translationjournal.net/journal/64catcher.htm. Accessed: 31 January 2018.

Ryazanova-Clarke, Larissa and Wade, Terence (1999): *The Russian Language Today*. London / New York: Routledge.

Saffari, Marzieh and Hashemian, Mahmood (2012): "A Study of Translation of Fillers and Catch Phrases in Two Persian Translations of *The Catcher in the Rye*". *Journal of Language, Culture, and Translation*, 1(2), pp. 69–80.

Schmitz, John (1998): "Suppression of References to Sex and Body Functions in the Brazilian and Portuguese Translations of J. D. Salinger's The Catcher in the Rye". *Meta* 432: 242–253.

Selindzher, Dzherom David (1986): *Nad propastiu vo rzhi*. Translated by Rita Rait-Kovaleva. Lviv: Visha shkola, izdatelstvo pri Lvovskom gosudarstvennom universitete.

Selindzher, Dzherom David (2016): *Lovets nad khlebnym polem*. Translated by Max Nemtsov. Moscow: Izdateltsvo "E".

Shaposhnikov, Aleksandr Konstantinovich (2016): *Etimologicheskii slovar sovremennogo russkogo iazyka*. Volume 1. Moscow: Izdatelstvo "Flinta".

Shaposhnikov, Aleksandr Konstantinovich (2016): *Etimologicheskii slovar sovremennovo russkogo iazyka*. Volume 2. Moscow: Izdatelstvo "Flinta".

Shelestiuk, Elena Vladimirovna (2013): "Lingvokulturnyi perenos kak psikholingvisticheskaia osnova perevodcheskoi adaptatsii". *Vestnik Cheliabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*. No. 24 (315). Issue 82, pp. 37-47.

Sherry, Samantha (2013): "Better Something Than Nothing: The Editors and Translators of *Inostrannaia literatura* as Censorial Agents". *The Slavonic and East European Review*. Vol. 91, No. 4, pp. 731-758.

Sherry, Samantha (2015): *Discourses of Regulation and Resistance: Censoring Translation in the Stalin and Khrushchev Era*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Shilnov, Andrei Gennadevich. "Problema perevoda slengovoi leksiki na primere analiza perevodov romana Dzh. D. Selindzhera 'Nad propastiu vo rzhi' ". *Industriia perevoda: materialy VI Mezhudnarodnoi nauchnoi konferentsii (Perm 2-4 iunia 2014 g.)*. Volume 1, pp. 126-131. http://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=22981224 Accessed: 20 March 2017.

Shuttleworth, Mark (2014): *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. London / New York: Routledge.

Soanes, Catherine and Stevenson, Agnus, editors (2003): *Oxford Dictionary of English*. Oxford [etc.]: Oxford University Press.

Toporov, Victor (2008a): "Biut chasy, iadrena mat!". *Chastnyi Korrespondent*. 17 November 2008. http://www.chaskor.ru/article/byut_chasy_yadrena_mat_1121. Accessed: 14 February 2018

Toporov, Victor (2008b): "Pokushenie na ubiistvo". *Chastnyi Korrespondent.* 25 November 2008. http://www.chaskor.ru/article/pokushenie_na_ubijstvo_1290. Accessed: 14 February 2018.

Toury, Gideon (1995): *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Toury, Gideon (2014): "A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies". *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. Edited by Theo Hermans. London and Sydney: Croom Helm.

Venuti, Lawrence (1998): *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London / New York: Routledge.

Venuti, Lawrence (2008): *The Translator's Invisibility: a History of Translation*. London / New York: Routledge.

Veselica Majhut, Snježana (2012): *Cultural specificity in the translation of popular fiction from English into Croatian during the socialist and transition periods (1960-2010)*. Doctoral thesis. Tarragona: Universitat Rovira i Virgili. http://hdl.handle.net/10803/90251. Accessed: 10 September 2018.

Vikislovar. https://ru.wiktionary.org/wiki/%D0%97%D0%B0%D0%B3%D0%BB%D0%B0%D0%B2%D0%BD%D0%B0%D1%8F_%D1%81%D1%82%D1%80%D0%B0%D0%BD%D0%B8%D1%86%D0%B0. Accessed: 1 February 2018.

Vlasenko, Svetlana Viktorovna (2008): "Adaptivnost russkogo kak perevodiashchego iazyka v anglo-russkom kommunikativnom vzaimodeistvii s pozitsii perevodovedeniia". *Iazyk, soznanie, kommunikaciia.* Edited by Viktoriia Vladimirovna Krasnykh and Andrei Ivanovich Izotov. Moscow: MAKS press. Issue 36.

Vlasenko, Svetlana Viktorovna (2009): "Anglo-russkii kvaziperevod ili totalnyi iazykovoi import anglizmov v sovremennyi russkii iazyk". *Mir russkogo slova*. No. 1. pp. 20-29.

Volodarskaia, Emma Fedorovna (2002): "Zaimstvovanie kak otrazhenie russko-angliiskikh kontaktov". *Voprosy iazykoznaniia*. No. 4, pp. 96-118.

Vorontsova, Irina and Navolneva, Mariya (2017): "Dva perevoda romana Dzh. D. Selindzhera 'The Catcher in the Rye' v diakhronii: sravnitelnii analiz". *Novii filologicheskii vestnik / The New Philological Bulletin*. No. 3 (42), Moscow. pp. 254-264.

Whitfield, Stephen J. (1997): "Cherished and Cursed: Toward a Social History of *The Catcher in the Rye*". *The New England Quarterly*. Vol. 70, No. 4, pp. 567-600.

Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia. https://www.wikipedia.org/. Accessed: 21 November 2017.

Young, Jekaterina (2000): "Dovlatov's Reception of Salinger". *Forum for Modern Language Studies*. 36: 4, pp. 412–425.

Zakharova, Liudmila Andreevna and Shuvaeva, Anastasiia Vasilevna (2014): *Slovar molodezhnogo slenga (na materiale leksikona studentov Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*. Tomsk: Izdatelskii Dom Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta.

Zemskaia, Elena Andreevna (2000): *Russkii iazyk kontsa XX stoletiia (1985-1995).* Moscow: Iazyk russkoi kultury.

APPENDIX

Table 1 (Rita Rait-Kovaleva's translation)

Lemma	Number of appearances (word forms) in the translation
автобус (avtobus)	11
Алек (Alek)	7
Алиса (Alisa)	4
Алисин (Alisin)	1
Алли (Alli)	38
Альфред (Alfred)	1
Аляска (aliaska)	1
аляскинский (aliaskinskii)	1
Анна (Anna)	1
Аннаполис (Annapolis)	4
Антолини (Antolini)	47
Арнольд (Arnold)	3
Артур (Artur)	1
Астор (Astor)	1
Атлантик (Atlantik)	2
Бадди (Baddi)	2
бар (bar)	14
Барбизон (Barbizon)	2
Бармен (barmen)	2
баскетбол (basketbol)	2
баскетбольный (basketbolnyi)	3
бейсбольный (bejsbolnyi)	4
Бенедикт (Benedikt)	3
Беовульф (Beovulf)	2
Бердселл (Berdsell)	6
Бернис (Bernis)	4
Бернс (Berns)	2
Бетти (Betti)	1
Билтмор (Biltmor)	3
Бинз (Binz)	3
бифштекс (bifshteks)	4
Блоп (Blop)	1
Блоу (Blou)	2
Блумингдейл (Blumingdeil)	1
блюз (bliuz)	1
Боб (Bob)	2
Бобби (Bobbi)	5
бойкотировать (boikotirovat)	2
бойскаут (boiskaut)	1
боксировать (boksirovat)	1
бридж (bridzh)	4
Брин-Мор (Brin-Mor)	1
Бродвей (Brodvei)	6
Броссар (Brossar)	8
Брук (Bruk)	1
Бруклин (Bruklin)	1
Брукс (Bruks)	1
бьюик (biuik)	1
Бэд (Bed)	1

Бэнки (Benki)	7
вагон (vagon)	8
Вайнтрауб (Vaintraub)	1
Валенсия (Valensiia)	5
Вашингтон (Vashington)	2
Вермонт (Vermont)	3
Вест-Пойнт (Vest-Point)	1
Викер-бар (Viker-bar)	3
Виндси (Vindsi)	2
Винсон (Vinson)	7
виски (viski)	13
Вог (Vog)	1
вокзал (vokzal)	9
вокзальный (vokzalnyi)	1
Вэй (Vei)	2
Галлахер (Gallakher)	8
галлон (gallon)	2
Гамлет (Gamlet)	6
гангстер (gamgster)	2
Гарвард (Garvard)	1
Гарри (Garri)	1
Гаррис (Garris)	1
Гейл (Geil)	1
Генри (Genri)	1
Гизела (Gizela)	1
Глостер (Gloster)	1
Голдфарб (Goldfarb)	1
Голливуд (Gollivud)	13
Голмборг (Golmborg)	2
гольф (golf)	8
Горвиц (Gorvits)	7
Гофман (Gofman)	2
граммофонный (grammofonnyi)	1
Грант (Grant)	1
Грендел (Grendel)	1
Гринич-вилледж (Grinich-villedzh)	4
Гэри (Geri)	3
Гэтсби (Getsbi)	4
давид-копперфилдовский (david-kopperfildovskii)	1
дайкири (daikiri)	1
Дайнсен (Dainsen)	2
детектив (detektiv)	2
Детройт (Detroit)	1
джаз (dzhaz)	1
джазовый (dzhazovyi)	1
Джеймс (Dzheims)	11
Джейн (Dzhein)	51
Джек (Dzhek)	1
Дженнет (Dzhennet)	1
джентльмен (dzhentlmen)	3
Джим (Dzhim)	2
Джин (Dzhin)	2
джиттербаг (dzhitterbag)	4

Джо (Dzho)	2
Джозефина (Dzhozefina)	1
Джордж (Dzhordzh)	1
Дик (Dik)	1
Дикинсон (Dikinson)	2
Диккенс (Dikkens)	2
Дикстайн (Dikstain)	4
дог (dog)	2
доллар (dollar)	26
Донат (Donat)	3
Дуглас (Duglas)	1
Дэвид (Devid)	2
Зембизи (Zembizi)	1
Зигфилд (Zigfild)	1
ивнинг (ivning)	1
Исак (Isak)	1
Ист-Сайд (Ist-Said)	1
йейлский (ieilskii)	1
Йеллоустонский (Ielloustonskii)	1
кадиллак (kadillak)	4
Кайбл (Kaibl)	2
Калифорния (Kaliforniia)	1
Кальц (Kalts)	1
Капитолий (Kapitolii)	1
Карл (Karl)	3
Касл (Kasl)	11
квакер (kvaker)	1
Кембл (Kembl)	1
Кентукки (Kentukki)	1
Кинселла (Kinsella)	2
Кисела (Kisela)	3
клуб (klub)	8
ковбойский (kovboiskii)	2
Код (Kod)	1
Койл (Koil)	2
кока-кола (koka-kola)	6
коктейль (kokteil)	10
коктейльная (kokteilnaia)	1
Колинос (Kolinos)	1
колледж (kolledzh)	6
Колорадо (Kolorado)	2
Колумбийский (Kolumbiiskii)	1
Колумбия (Kolumbiia)	1
Колфилд (Kolfild)	21
колфилдовский (kolfildovskii)	2
Коннетикат (Konnetikat)	1
корпорация	1
корт (kort)	1
кофе (kofe)	14
Коффл (Koffl)	2
Крабс (Krabs)	1
Кребс (Krebs)	1
крикет (kriket)	1
Кросс (Kross)	1
Купер (Kuper)	2

Кэвендиш (Kevendish)	2
Кэллон (Kellon)	1
Кэртис (Kertis)	1
Кюдехи (Kiudekhi)	2
Лаверн (Lavern)	6
Лант (Lant)	12
Ларднер (Lardner)	5
Леги (Legi)	1
леди (ledi)	2
Лексингтон (Leksington)	1
Лексингтон-авеню (Leksington-aveniu)	1
Лилиан (Lillian)	7
Линда (Linda)	1
Линкольн (Linkoln)	1
Линн (Linn)	1
Листеровский (Listerovskii)	1
лифт (lift)	20
лифтер (lifter)	9
лифтерский (lifterskii)	1
Лонг-Айленд (Long-Ailend)	1
Лондон (London)	1
лорд (lord)	1
Лорре (Lorre)	2
Лоуренс (Lourens)	2
Луи (Lui)	1
Луиза (Luiza)	1
Льюс (Lius)	21
Мак (Mak)	6
Мак-Берни (Mak-Berni)	1
Маклин (Maklin)	1
мансли (mansli)	2
Маргулис (Margulis)	1
Марк (Mark)	1
Марко (Marko)	2
Марсалла (Marsalla)	3
Марсия (Marsiia)	5
Марти (Marti)	8
мартини (martini)	2
Массачусетс (Massachusets)	3
матч (match)	12
Мейн (Mein)	4
Мелвин (Melvin)	1
менеджер (menedzher)	1
микрофон (mikrofon)	1
миля (milia)	9
Миранда (Miranda)	2
мисс (miss)	5
миссис (missis)	24
мистер (mister)	50
Морис (Moris)	19
Морроу (Morrou)	7
Моэм (Moem)	2
Мэдисон-авеню (Medison-aveniu)	2
Мэл (Mel)	5

Мэри (Meri)	2
мюзик-холл (miuzik-holl)	1
Нантукет (Nantuket)	1
нейлоновый (neilonovyi)	1
нельсон (nelson)	2
нокаутировать (nokautirovat)	1
Норуолк (Noruolk)	1
Ньюарк (Niuark)	1
нью-гемпширский (niu-gempshirskii)	1
Нью-Йорк (Niu-Iork)	31
нью-йоркский (niu-iorkskii)	1
Оксфорд (Oksford)	1
Оливер (Oliver)	1
Оливье (Olive)	2
Оссенбергер (Ossenberger)	5
Пайк (Paik)	2
парамаунт (paramaunt)	1
парк (park)	25
Пенисильванский (Pensilvanskii)	1
Пенсильвания (Pensilvaniia)	1
пиджак (pidzhak)	1
пижама (pizhama)	12
пикап (pikap)	1
пинг-понг (ping-pong)	2
пинта (pinta)	1
Пит (Pit)	1
Питер (Piter)	2
Пол (Pol)	1
полисмен (polismen)	3
поло (polo)	1
пост (post)	1
Принстон (Prinston)	6
Принстонский (Pristonskii)	1
прожектор (prozhektor)	1
пудинг (puding)	1
Пэнси (Pensi)	41
Радио-Сити (Radio-Siti)	7
Раймонд (Raimond)	1
Раймю (Raimiu)	1
ранчо (rancho)	3
револьвер (revolver)	3
Ринг (Ring)	2
Ричард (Richard)	2
Роберт (Robert)	7
Роберта (Roberta)	3
Робинсон (Robinson)	1
Рокетт (Rokett)	2
Рокки (Rokki)	1
ром (rom)	2
Рудольф (Rudolf)	6
Рэндал (Rendal)	2
Салли (Salli)	53
сандвич (sandvich)	2
Санни (Sanni)	7

Санта-Клаус (Santa-Klaus)	1
Саттон-плейс (Satton-pleis)	1
свитер (sviter)	9
Седебиго (Sedebigo)	1
секс (seks)	3
сексуальный (seksualnyi)	2
Сельма (Selma)	1
Сетон-отель (Seton-otel)	1
Симмонс (Simmon)	3
Сингер (Singer)	2
Сиэттл (Siettl)	4
Слегл (Slegl)	2
Смит (Smit)	1
сноб (snob)	3
собистский (snobistskii)	2
Спенсер (Spenser)	33
спортивный (sportivnyi)	4
спортсмен (sportsmen)	3
Стейбл (Steibl)	3
Стил (Stil)	2
Сторк-клуб (Stork-klub)	1
Стрэдлейтер (Stredleiter)	85
стрэдлейтеровский (stredleiterovskii)	1
Стрэнд (Strend)	1
Стэнфорд (Stenford)	1
Сэксон-холл (Sekson-holl)	1
сэр/сер (ser)	26
Сэтрдей (Setrdei)	1
Тафт (Taft)	1
Твист (Tvist)	1
телефон (telefon)	26
телефонный (telefonnyi)	3
телефончик (telefonchik)	1
теннис (tennis)	6
теннисный (tennisnyi)	2
Термер (Termer)	12
Тичнер (Tincher)	2
Томас (Tomas)	2
Томпсон (Tompson)	1
тоннель (tonnel)	2
тосты (tosty)	3
Тоу (Tou)	1
тренер (trener)	1
Трентон (Trenton)	1
Удроф (Udrof)	2
Уолш (Uolsh)	2
Уорд (Uord)	1
Уэзерфилд (Uezerfild)	8
Уэйн (Uein)	2
Фей (Fei)	2
Феллон (Fellon)	3
Фенсер (Fenser)	1
ферма (ferma)	9
Фиби/Фиб (Fibi/Fib)	94
Фибиный (Fibinyi)	3

Фил (Fil)	1
Филадельфия (Filadelfiia)	1
Филлис (Fillis)	1
фильм (film)	12
Фитцджеральд (Fittsdzherald)	2
фланелевый (flanelevyi)	1
Флетчер (Fletcher)	2
Флорида (Florida)	1
Фонтанн (Fontann)	1
Форест-хилл (Forest-hill)	1
форест-хиллский (firest-hillskii)	1
Фредерик (Federik)	1
фут (fut)	2
футбол (futbol)	5
футбольный (futbolnyi)	6
Хаас (Khaas)	4
Харди (Khardi)	3
Хартселл (Khartsell)	1
Хейс (Kheis)	9
Херб (Kherb)	1
Хови (Khovi)	1
хоккейный (hokkeinyi)	1
Холден (Kholden)	41
холл (kholl)	8
Холленд-Таннел (Khollend-Tannel)	1
хулиганистый (khuliganistyi)	1
Хуттон (Khutton)	3
Хуттонский (Khuttonskii)	11
цент (tsent)	2
Чайлдс (Chailds)	4
Чарлина (Charlina)	2
Чарльз (Charlz)	2
чек (chek)	2
чемпион (chempion)	2
Чикаго (Chikago)	1
Чоут (Chout)	1
Шерли (Sherli)	5
Шерман (Sherman)	1
Шипли (Shipli)	5
Шмит (Shmit)	5
Эгерстаун (Egerstaun)	4
Эглетингер (Egletinger)	3
Эд (Ed)	8
Эдвард (Edvard)	1
Эдди (Eddi)	12
Эдмонт (Edmont)	2
Эдмунд (Edmund)	2
Эк (Ek)	1
Экли (Ekli)	68
Эл (El)	2
Элктон-хилл (Elkton-hill)	11
Эмили (Emili)	2
Эндовер (Endover)	3
Энтони (Entoni)	1

Эрнест (Ernest)	9
Эрни (Erni)	17
Эстелла (Estella)	2
Эттербери (Etterberi)	1
Юстасия (Iustasiia)	3
ярд (iard)	1
Total	1857

Table 2 (Max Nemtsov's translation)

Lemma	Number of appearances (word forms) in the translation
автобус (avtobus)	13
автостоп (avtostop)	1
Алек (Alek)	6
Алековый (Alekovyi)	1
Алфред (Alfred)	1
Аляска (Aliaska)	2
Аннаполис (Annapolis)	4
Антолини (Antolini)	54
Арнолд (Arnold)	3
Артур (Artur)	1
Астор (Astor)	1
Атлантик (Atlantik)	3
Бад (Bad)	1
Бадди (Baddi)	3
Банки (Banki)	1
бар (bar)	17
бармен (barmen)	4
баскет (basket)	1
баскетбол (basketbol)	2
баскетболист (basketbolist)	1
баскетбольный (basketbolnyi)	1
бейсбольный (beisbolnyi)	5
бекон (bekon)	2
Бенедикт (Benedikt)	3
Беовульф (Beovulf)	2
Бёрдселл (Berdsell)	6
Бернис (Bernis)	5
Бёрнс (Berns)	2
Бетти (Betti)	1
Бизон (Bizon)	1
Билтмор (Biltmor)	3
Бинз (Binz)	3
бифштекс (bifshteks)	4
Блоп (Blop)	1
Блуминдейлз (Blumingdeilz)	1
блюз (bliuz)	1
Боб (Bob)	2
Бобби (Bobbi)	5
бойкот (boikot)	2
бойскаут (boiskaut)	1
бридж (bridzh)	4
Бродвей (Brodvei)	5

бродвейский (brodveiskii)	1
Броссар (Brossar)	8
Брук (Bruk)	1
Бруклин (Bruklin)	1
бурбон (burbon)	2
буфера (bufera)	4
бьюик (biuik)	1
Бэнки (Benki)	8
вагон (vagon)	5
Вай (Vai)	2
Валенсия (Valensiia)	5
Вашингтон (Vashington)	3
Вермонт (Vermont)	3
Вест-Пойнт (Vest-Point)	1
Вест-Сайд (Vest-Said)	1
Викс (Viks)	1
Виллидж (Villidzh)	2
Винсон (Vinson)	5
Винус (Vinus)	2
вискач (viskach)	3
виски (viski)	1
виталис (vitalis)	2
Вог (Vog)	1
вокзал (vokzal)	10
Вудрафф (Vudraff)	2
Вутон (Vuton)	15
галлон (gallon)	3
гамбургер (gamburger)	3
гангстер (gangster)	1
Гарвард (Garvard)	1
Гарри (Garri)	1
Генри (Genri)	1
Гертруда (Gertruda)	1
гидрант (gidrant)	1
гладстон (gladston)	3
Глостер (Gloster)	1
Голдфарб (Goldfarb)	1
Голливуд (Gollivud)	13
гольф (golf)	6
Гранд-Сентрал (Grand-Sentral)	2
Грант (Grant)	1
Грендел (Grendel)	1
Гринич-Виллидж (Grinich-Villidzh)	2
Гэйл (Geil)	1
Гэллахер (Gellakher)	8
Гэри (Geri)	2
Гэтсби (Getsbi)	4
дайкири (daikiri)	1
Дакота (Dakota)	1
детектив (detektiv)	2
детективный (detektivnyi)	1
Детройт (Detroit)	1
джаз (dzhaz)	1
джазово (dzhazovo)	1

джазовой (dzhazovoi)	1
джамп (dzhamp)	1
Джеймс (Dzheims)	10
Джейн (Dzhein)	52
Дженет (Dzhenet)	1
джентльмен (dzhentlmen)	3
Джин (Dzhin)	2
джинсики (dzhinsiki)	1
джиттербаг (dzhitterbag)	2
джиттербажить (dzhitterbazhit)	2
Джо (Dzho)	2
Джозефин (Dzhozefin)	1
Джордж (Dzhordzh)	1
Дик (Dik)	1
Дикинсон (Dikinson)	2
диксиленд (diksilend)	1
Дикстайн (Dikstain)	4
Динесен (Dinesen)	2
дог (dog)	3
доллар (dollar)	1
Донат (Donat)	3
Дуглас (Duglas)	2
Дэвид (Devid)	3
Дэвид-Копперфилдов (Devid-Kopperfildov)	1
Замбези (Zambezi)	1
Зигфелд (Zigfeld)	1
Ивнинг (Ivning)	1
Исак (Isak)	2
Ист-Сайд (Ist-Said)	1
Йеллоустоунский (Ielloustounskii)	1
Йель (Iel)	2
йельский (ielskii)	1
Кабел (Kabel)	2
кадиллак (kadillak)	3
Калифорния (Kaliforniia)	1
Карл (Karl)	3
Касл (Kasl)	11
квакер (kvaker)	1
Кейп-Код (Keip-Kod)	1
кемпинг (kemping)	1
Кентукки (Kentukki)	1
Кёртис (Kertis)	1
Кинселла (Kinsella)	3
клинч (klinch)	1
клуб (klub)	11
ковбой (kovboi)	1
ковбойский (kovboiskii)	2
Койл (Koil)	2
коктейль (kokteil)	9
кола (kola)	6
Колинос (Kolinos)	1
колледж (kolledzh)	7
Коллон (Kollon)	1
Колорадо (Kolorado)	2

Колумбия (Kolumbiia)	2
Колфилд (Kolfild)	25
колфилдовский (kolfildovskii)	1
коммандер (kommander)	1
Коннектикут (Konnektikut)	2
корпоративный (korporativnyi)	1
корт (kort)	1
кофе (kofe)	15
Коффл (Koffl)	2
Крабс (Krabs)	1
крикет (kriket)	1
Кросс (Kross)	1
Крэбс (Krebs)	1
Кудахи (Kudakhi)	2
Кулц (Kults)	1
Купер (Kuper)	2
Кэвендиш (Kevendish)	2
Кэмпбелл (Kempbell)	1
Кэпитол (Kepitol)	1
Кэпитол (Kepitol)	1
Кэри (Keri)	1
Лаверн (Lavern)	6
Ларднер (Lardner)	5
ласалл (lasall)	1
ластекс (lasteks)	1
Левин (Levin)	1
леди (ledi)	1
Лексингтон (Leksington)	1
Лексингтон-авеню (Leksington-aveniu)	1
Лии (Lii)	1
Лиллиан (Lillian)	8
Линда (Linda)	1
Линкольн (Linkoln)	1
Линн (Linn)	1
Листер (Lister)	1
лифт (lift)	21
лифтер (lifter)	7
лифтерский (lifterskii)	1
Лонг-Айленд (Long-Ailend)	1
лорд (lord)	2
Лоренс (Lorens)	2
Лорри (Lorri)	2
Луи (Lui)	1
Лунт (Lunt)	12
Люс (Lius)	19
Макбёрни (Makberni)	1
Маклин (Maklin)	1
Мансли (Mansli)	3
Маргулис (Margulis)	1
Мари (Mari)	1
Марк (Mark)	1
Марко (Marko)	2
Марсалла (Marsalla)	2
Марти (Marti)	9

мартини (Martini)	3
Марша (Marsha)	4
Массачусетс (Massachusets)	3
матч (match)	5
Мель-вин (Mel-vin)	2
микрофон (mikrofon)	1
миля (milia)	9
Миранда (Miranda)	2
мисс (miss)	5
миссис (missis)	29
мистер (mister)	53
мистер-винсон (mister-vinson)	2
мистер-винус (mister-vinus)	1
мокасины (mokasiny)	3
Морис (Moris)	18
Морроу (Morrou)	9
Моэм (Moem)	2
Мэдисон-авеню (Medison-aveniu)	3
Мэл (Mel)	5
Мэн (Men)	4
Мэри (Meri)	1
мюзикл (miuzikl)	1
Мюзик-холл (Miuzik-holl)	3
Нантакет (Nantaket)	1
Норуок (Noruok)	1
Нью-арк (Niu-ark)	1
ньюгемпширский (niugempshirskii)	1
Нью-Йорк (Niu-Iork)	31
Нью-Йоркер (Niu-Iorker)	1
нью-йоркский (niu-iorkskii)	1
Оксфорд (Oksford)	1
Оливье (Olive)	2
Олли (Olli)	36
Оссенбергер (Ossenberger)	5
Пайк (Paik)	2
Парамаунт (Paramaunt)	1
парк (park)	27
паттерн (pattern)	2
Пенисильвания (Pensilvaniia)	1
Пенисильванский (Penisilvanskii)	1
пенни (penni)	1
Пенси (Pensi)	55
Пенсильванский (Penisilvanskii)	1
пидж (pidzh)	3
пиджак (pidzhak)	2
пиджачок (pidzhachok)	1
пижама (pizhama)	12
пинбол (pinbol)	1
пинг-понг (ping-pong)	2
пинта (pinta)	1
Пит (Pit)	1
Питер (Piter)	2
Пол (Pol)	1
поло (polo)	1
Пост (Post)	1

Принстон (Prinston)	9
прожектор (prozhektor)	1
Радио-Сити (Radio-Siti)	6
ранчо (rancho)	3
репортер (reporter)	1
Ринг (Ring)	5
Ричард (Richard)	2
Роберт (Robert)	8
Роберта (Roberta)	3
Робинсон (Robinson)	1
роллерски (rollerski)	2
ром (rom)	2
Рудольф (Rudolf)	6
Руперт (Rupert)	1
Рэймонд (Reimond)	1
Рэмю (Remiu)	1
Рэндэл (Rendel)	2
Саксон-Холл (Sakson-Holl)	3
Санта-Клаус (Santa-Klaus)	1
Саттон-плейс (Satton-pleis)	1
свитер (sviter)	6
Седебего (Sedebego)	1
секс (seks)	5
Селма (Selma)	2
Сентрал-Парк (Sentral-Park)	4
Сетон (Seton)	1
Симмонз (Simmonz)	3
Сингер (Singer)	3
Сиэтл (Sietl)	4
скотч (skotch)	6
Слэгл (Slegl)	2
Смит (Smit)	1
смокинг (smoking)	1
сноб (snob)	4
снобский (snobskii)	2
Сомерсет (Somerset)	2
софтбол (softbol)	1
Спенсер (Spenser)	35
Сполдингз (Spoldingz)	1
спорт (sport)	1
спортивный (sportivnyi)	3
Стейбил (Steibil)	4
Стил (Stil)	2
стоп (stop)	2
стриптизка (striptizka)	1
Стрэдлейтер (Stredleiter)	91
Стрэдлейтеров (Stredleiterov)	3
Стрэнд (Strend)	1
Стэнфорд (Stenford)	1
Сэлли (Selli)	55
сэр (ser)	26
Сэтрдей (Setrdei)	1
Тафт (Taft)	1
телефон (telefon)	13
телефонный (telefonnyi)	3

теннис (tennis)	6
теннисный (tennisnyi)	3
Тёрмер (Termer)	12
Тихнер (Tihner)	2
Томас (Tomas)	3
том-коллинз (tom-kollinz)	1
Томсен-хилл (Tomsen-hill)	1
тоннель (tonnel)	3
Тоу (Tou)	1
тренировать (trenirovat)	1
Трентон (Trenton)	1
Уайнтрауб (Uaintraub)	1
Уолш (Uolsh)	2
Уорд (Uord)	1
Уэзерфилд (Uezerfild)	10
Уэйн (Uein)	1
Фейт (Feit)	2
Фенсер (Fenser)	1
ферма (ferma)	8
Фиби/Фиб (Fibi/Fib)	120
Фибин (Fibin)	5
Филадельфия (Filadelfiia)	1
Филлис (Fillis)	2
фильм (film)	2
Фицджералд (Fitsdzherald)	2
фланелевый (flanelevyi)	3
Флетчер (Fletcher)	2
Флорида (Florida)	1
Фонтанн (Fontann)	1
Форест-Хиллз (Forest-Hillz)	2
Фредерик (Frederik)	1
фут (fut)	2
футбол (futbol)	10
футболист (futbolist)	1
футбольный (futbolnyi)	4
Фэллон (Fellon)	3
Хаас (Khaas)	4
Харди (Khardi)	3
Харцелл (Khartsell)	1
Хауи (Khaui)	1
Хейз (Kheiz)	10
Херб (Kherb)	1
хоккейный (khokkeinyi)	1
Холден (Kholden)	42
Холланд (Kholland)	1
Холмборг (Kholmborg	2
Хорвиц (Khorvits)	8
Хоффман (Khoffman)	1
Хренли (Khrenli)	2
Хэзел (Khezel)	1
Хэзл (Khezl)	2
Хэррис (Kherris)	1
цент (tsent)	3
Чайлдз (Chaildz)	5
чемпионский (chempionskii)	1

Чикаго (Chikago)	1
Чоут (Chout)	1
Шарлин (Sharlin)	2
Шейни (Sheini)	1
Шерман (Sherman)	1
Шипли (Shipli)	4
Ширли (Shirli)	5
Шмидт (Shmidt)	4
Эглитинджер (Eglitindzher)	2
Эд (Ed)	8
Эдвард (Edvard)	1
Эдгар (Edgar)	1
Эдди (Eddi)	5
Эдмонт (Edmont)	2
Эдмунд (Edmund)	2
Эйджерстаун (Eidzherstaun)	4
Эк (Ek)	1
Экли (Ekli)	67
Эл (El)	2
Элис (Elis)	6
Элктон-Хиллз (Elkton-Hillz)	13
Эмили (Emili)	2
Эндовер (Endover)	1
эндоверский (endoverskii)	2
Энн-Луиз (Enn-Luiz)	1
Энтони (Entoni)	1
Эрнест (Ernest)	7
Эрни (Erni)	20
Эстелль (Estell)	2
Эттенбери (Ettenberi)	1
Юстасия (Iustasiia)	3
ярд (iard)	1
Total	1915

Table 3 (Rita Rait-Kovaleva's translation)

Anglicism	Haspelmath's classification
автобус (avtobus)	cultural
бар (bar)	cultural
бармен (barmen)	cultural
баскетбол (basketbol)	cultural
баскетбольный (basketbollnyi)	cultural
бейсбольный (beisbolnyi)	cultural
бифштекс (bifshteks)	cultural
блюз (bliuz)	cultural
бойкотировать (boikotirovat)	cultural
бойскаут (boiskaut)	cultural
боксировать (boksirovat)	cultural
бридж (bridzh)	cultural

бьюик (biuik)	cultural
вагон (vagon)	*
виски (viski)	cultural
вокзал (vokzal)	*
вокзальный (vokzalnyi)	*
галлон (gallon)	cultural
гангстер (gangster)	core
гольф (golf)	cultural
граммофонный (grammofonnyi)	cultural
дайкири (daikiri)	cultural
детектив (detektiv)	*
джаз (dzhaz)	cultural
джазовый (dzhazovyi)	cultural
джентльмен (dzhentlmen)	cultural
джиттербаг (dzhitterbag)	cultural
дог (dog)	cultural
доллар (dollar)	cultural
ивнинг (ivning)	cultural
кадиллак (kadillak)	cultural
квакер (kvaker)	cultural
клуб (klub)	cultural
ковбойский (kovboiskii)	cultural
кока-кола (koka-kola)	cultural
коктейль (kokteil)	cultural
коктейльная (kokteilnaia)	cultural
колледж (kolledzh)	cultural
корпорация (korporatsiia)	cultural
корт (kort)	cultural
кофе (kofe)	cultural
крикет (kriket)	cultural
леди (ledi)	cultural
лифт (lift)	cultural
лифтер (lifter)	cultural
лифтерский (lifterskii)	cultural
лорд (lord)	cultural
мансли (mansli)	cultural
мартини (martini)	cultural
матч (match)	*
менеджер (menedzher)	cultural
микрофон (mikrofon)	cultural
миля (milia)	cultural
мисс (miss)	cultural
миссис (missis)	cultural
мистер (mister)	cultural
мюзик-холл (miuzik-holl)	cultural
нейлоновый (neilonovyi)	cultural
нельсон (nelson)	cultural
нокаутировать (nokautirovat)	cultural

парк (park)	*
пиджак (pidzhak)	cultural
пижама (pizhama)	cultural
пикап (pikap)	cultural
пинг-понг (ping-pong)	cultural
пинта (pinta)	cultural
полисмен (polismen)	cultural
поло (polo)	cultural
пост (post)	cultural
прожектор (prozhektor)	cultural
пудинг (puding)	cultural
ранчо (rancho)	cultural
револьвер (revolver)	cultural
ром (rom)	cultural
сандвич (sandvich)	cultural
свитер (sviter)	cultural
секс (seks)	*
сексуальный (seksualnyi)	*
сноб (snob)	*
собистский(snobistskii)	*
спортивный (sportivnyi)	*
спортсмен (sportsmen)	*
сэр/сер (ser)	cultural
телефон (telefon)	cultural
телефонный (telefonnyi)	cultural
телефончик (telefonchik)	cultural
теннис (tennis)	cultural
теннисный (tennisnyi)	cultural
тоннель (tonnel)	*
тосты (tosty)	*
тренер (trener)	*
ферма (ferma)	*
фильм (film)	cultural
фланелевый (flanelevyi)	cultural
фут (fut)	cultural
футбол (futbol)	cultural
футбольный (futbolnyi)	cultural
хоккейный (khokkeinyi)	cultural
холл (kholl)	*
хулиганистый (khuliganistyi)	*
цент (tsent)	cultural
чек (chek)	cultural
чемпион (chempion)	*
ярд (iard)	cultural

Table 4 (Max Nemtsov's translation)

Anglicism	Haspelmath's classification
автобус (avtobus)	cultural
автостоп (avtostop)	*
бар (bar)	cultural
бармен (barmen)	cultural
баскет (basket)	cultural
баскетбол (basketbol)	cultural
баскетболист (basketbolist)	cultural
баскетбольный (basketbolnyi)	cultural
бейсбольный (beisbolnyi)	cultural
бекон (bekon)	core
бифштекс (bifshteks)	*
блюз (bliuz)	cultural
бойкот (boikot)	*
бойскаут (boiskaut)	cultural
бридж (bridzh)	cultural
бурбон (burbon)	cultural
буфера (bufera)	core
бьюик (biuik)	cultural
вагон (vagon)	*
вискач (viskach)	cultural
виски (viski)	cultural
виталис (vitalis)	cultural
вокзал (vokzal)	*
галлон (gallon)	cultural
гамбургер (gamburger)	cultural
гангстер (gangster)	core
гидрант (gidrant)	cultural
гладстон (gladston)	cultural
гольф (golf)	cultural
дайкири (daikiri)	cultural
детектив (detektiv)	*
детективный (detektivnyi)	*
джаз (dzhaz)	cultural
джазово (dzhazovo)	cultural
джазовой (dzhazovoi)	cultural
джамп (dzhamp)	cultural
джентльмен (dzhentlmen)	cultural
джинсики (dzhinsiki)	cultural
джиттербаг (dzhitterbag)	cultural
джиттербажить (dzhitterbazhit)	cultural
диксиленд (diksilend)	cultural
дог (dog)	cultural
доллар (dollar)	cultural
кадиллак (kadillak)	cultural
квакер (kvaker)	cultural

кемпинг (kemping)	cultural
клинч (klinch)	core
клуб (klub)	*
ковбой (kovboi)	cultural
ковбойский (kovboiskii)	cultural
коктейль (kokteil)	cultural
кола (kola)	cultural
колледж (kolledzh)	cultural
коммандер (kommander)	cultural
корпоративный (korporativnyi)	cultural
корт (kort)	cultural
кофе (kofe)	cultural
крикет (kriket)	cultural
ласалл (lasall)	cultural
ластекс (lasteks)	cultural
леди (ledi)	cultural
лифт (lift)	cultural
лифтер (lifter)	cultural
лифтерский (lifterskii)	cultural
лорд (lord)	cultural
мартини (martini)	cultural
матч (match)	*
микрофон (mikrofon)	cultural
миля (milia)	cultural
мисс (miss)	cultural
миссис (missis)	cultural
мистер (mister)	cultural
мистер-винсон (mister-vinson)	cultural
мистер-винус (mister-vinus)	cultural
мокасины (mokasiny)	cultural
мюзикл (miuzikl)	cultural
парк (park)	*
паттерн (pattern)	core
пенни (penni)	cultural
пидж (pidzh)	cultural
пиджак (pidzhak)	cultural
пиджачок (pidzhachok)	cultural
пижама (pizhama)	cultural
пинбол (pinbol)	cultural
пинг-понг (ping-pong)	cultural
пинта (pinta)	cultural
поло (polo)	cultural
прожектор (prozhektor)	cultural
ранчо (rancho)	cultural
репортер (reporter)	core
роллерски (rollerski)	cultural
ром (rom)	cultural
свитер (sviter)	*

секс (seks)	*
скотч (skotch)	cultural
смокинг (smoking)	cultural
сноб (snob)	*
снобский (snobskii)	*
софтбол (softbol)	cultural
спорт (sport)	*
спортивный (sportivnyi)	*
стоп (stop)	*
стриптизка (striptizka)	*
сэр (ser)	cultural
телефон (telefon)	cultural
телефонный (telefonnyi)	cultural
теннис (tennis)	cultural
теннисный (tennisnyi)	cultural
том-коллинз (tom-kollinz)	cultural
тоннель (tonnel)	*
тренировать (trenirovat)	*
ферма (ferma)	*
фильм (film)	cultural
фланелевый (flanelevyi)	cultural
фут (fut)	cultural
футбол (futbol)	cultural
футболист (futbolist)	cultural
футбольный (futbolnyi)	cultural
хоккейный (khokkeinyi)	cultural
цент (tsent)	cultural
чемпионский (chempionskii)	*
ярд (iard)	cultural

Table 5

	Bulyko	Khatskevich	Vikislovar	*Bolshoi akademicheskii slovar*	Shaposhnikov
автобус (avtobus)	/	German	English/French	German (< French)	German (< Latin)
автостоп (avtostop)	/	English	French + English	/	/
вагон (vagon)	French (< English)	French (< English)	French (< English < Middle Dutch)	French, English	English (< German)
гидрант (gidrant)	Greek	English (< Old Greek)	/	Greek	/
корпорация (korporatsiia)	English (< Latin)	Latin	Latin	French, German (< Latin)	/
парк (park)	English (< Latin)	English (< Latin)	German/English/ French (< Latin)	English (< Latin)	French (< Latin, Old German)
пижама (pizhama)	English (< Hindu)	English (< Urdu)	Hindu (< Persian)	English (< Hindu)	/
ферма (ferma)	English, French	French (< Latin)	French (< Latin)	unavailable	French
фланелевый (flanelevyi)	from *flanel* (French)	from *flanel* (French)	from *flanel* (German/French < English < Welsh)	unavailable	from *flanel* (French < English < Welsh)