ANTHROPONYM TRANSLATION IN CHILDREN'S LITERATURE – EARLY 20TH AND 21ST CENTURIES

Anna Fornalczyk

Institute of Applied Linguistics
Warsaw University
ul. Browarna 8/10
00-311 Warszawa
tel. (48) 692 203 167
a.fornalczyk@uw.edu.pl

The focus of my paper lies within a new field of research which is situated at the intersection of two academic disciplines: translation studies and children's literature, the so called children's literature translation studies (CLTS).

The scope of publications on children's literature in translation is very broad. This can already be seen in what is called the first significant document of CLTS (Borodo 2006, 13), in *Children's Books in Translation* edited by Gote Klingberg (1978), who indicated the most important issues for the study of the area (among others, non-textual factors influencing translation and the method of translation). In his book *Children's Literature in the Hands of the Translators* (Malmö 1986), Klingberg argues that children's literature translation is a specific kind of translation, which has to consider cognitive and linguistic abilities of its recipient – the child. Among children's literature translation researchers one should mention Birgit Stolt, Gideon Toury, Katharina Reiss, Zohar Shavit, Ritta Oittinen, Cay Dollerup, Emer O'Sullivan and Tina Puurtinen. These scholars investigate issues related to translation norms and the functioning of translated children's literature, focus on the child recipient and the child-text interaction, examine readability – translation for the purposes of reading aloud, and study comparative children's literature.

What contributed to the growing interest and increasing number of publications in children's literature translation studies? Reinbert Tabbert (2002, 203), in his extensive essay on CLTS, identified several factors:
- the assumption that translated children's books build bridges between different cultures, and therefore it is worthwhile to examine them from a researcher's point of view;
- the existence of and interest in text-specific challenges that books for children pose to the translator (interplay of picture and words in picture books; cultural references; playful use of language; dialect, register, names; the possibility of double address, i.e. that of children and adults);
- the polysystem theory which classifies children's literature as a subsystem of minor prestige within literature (Shavit, the author of the theory, explains that this marginal position

93

accounts for manipulations on translated texts for children, e.g. the change of text genre to adapt it to preferable models in the target system, disrespect for the integrity and complexity of the text, ideological and stylistic adaptation; however, the status of children's literature is changing in the direction of an independent, fast-developing branch of research, cf. Borodo 2006);

- the age-specific addressees either as implied or real readers (considering children's imperfect linguistic competence, their limited world knowledge and pedagogical criteria).

Analysing the development of CLTS, one could notice a shift from conservative approaches (focus on the method of translation and on the status of children's literature) to liberal ones, concentrating on readers' interaction with the translated text. This "methodological shift from source orientation to target orientation" (Tabbert 2002, 303) was consistent with changes in the field of translation studies, a reflection of the so called "cultural turn". Translation is no longer considered a purely linguistic matter. Rather, it is affected by social, cultural, economic and political factors.

The most obvious examples of the last two items could be the structure of the marketplace, influenced by the phenomenon of globalization (the domination of Anglo-American media conglomerates and imitating their publishing policy in other countries); or by political situation (in Poland under the communist rule, translations e.g. from English were not popular or positively reviewed).

The cultural aspect and its influence on the shape of translation cannot be overestimated. Danuta Urbanek (2004), following Jacquemond (1992), assumes that the mode of translating literary works reflects the power relations between the source text and target text culture: a weaker (subordinate) culture translates more from a stronger (hegemonic) culture, and translations are read on a large scale. By their (intentional or not) choice of strategies, translators seem to have a power of shaping the image of the source language culture among readers of the translation. Hejwowski (2004, 96) presents examples of omitting proper names in translations from Polish into English, which is more common than the other way round, presumably because of the smaller popularity of Polish culture compared with English culture, whereas Yamazaki (2002) considers the criterion of intercultural power balance in analysing translations from and into Japanese, English and German.

When studying translated children's literature, social and pedagogical factors come into the foreground. Children's books do not only provide entertainment and help develop children's reading skills. Read „at an early stage of socialization process" (O'Sullivan, Reynolds and Romuṛen 2005,17), they convey knowledge about the world, about values, customs and accepted behaviours (Puurtinen 1998). They can be used to shape identities, values, cultural expectations. It may be assumed that every book has an implicit ideology (Puurtinen 1998), and in the case of translated literature it is the translator who interprets (and potentially changes) the author's ideology.

Also, it has to be observed that children's literature is subject to different kinds of censorship, often justified on pedagogical grounds (interesting examples can be found in: Adamczyk-Garbowska 147–158 and Shavit 1986, 121–124) or resulting from children's assumed incapability of understanding. Texts translated for children have been often treated with great liberty. Such an attitude could be explained by Zohar Shavit's polysystem theory, according to which children's literature

has a specific, peripheral position in the field of literature, which entitles the translator to "manipulate the text in various ways by changing, enlarging, or abridging it or by deleting or adding to it" (Shavit 1986, 112).

In the light of the tendencies and aspects of children's literature translation, I would like to consider one particular aspect of translation, which often raises controversy, that is, anthroponyms. Anthroponymy, i.e. the study of 'the names of human beings' (the word 'anthroponym' is derived from two Greek words: *anthropos,* 'man', 'mankind' or 'person' and *onoma,* 'name'), may be subdivided into individual or personal names and group names, and – in literary works – encompasses names of personified animals and fictitious creatures as well (the concepts of personification and humanization are described in detail in Krzeszowski 1997, 162, Dobrzyńska 1984, 168ff.). There are many different types of anthroponyms to be found in various societies around the world, e.g. personal names, surnames, clan names, patronyms, tekonyms, nicknames, ethnonyms.

In general, the main function of names is to identify, and their meaning is the object they signify (Frege 1977, 130). There has been a long discussion on whether names are meaningful or not meaningful (more on this issue in Berezowski 2001, 92, Aschenberg 1991, 9-18). Some researchers believe that proper names are indifferent to the notion of meaning in general (they do not have to mean anything to fulfill their primary function, which is identification; sometimes, though, a name is given deliberately to characterize a feature of the object named, e.g. Blackie for a black cat, and is meaningful). Moreover, names have connotations, which are independent from and come later than the act of name-giving, e.g. Warsaw has a connotation "the capital of Poland", which was not present when the name was given to the original settlement). Names can also carry grammatical meaning (e.g. gender).

Names in a literary work are specific: it may be guessed that behind most names there was an author's intention. Proper names in literature fulfill identifying, fictionalizing and characterising functions (Debus 2002, 73–90). The first function has been explained above; the fictionalizing role of names consists in bringing the reader into "a second world", a fictional one. Names can also play a descriptive role, revealing some aspects of a given literary character (sex, age, nationality, sometimes personality traits or appearance, etc.).

Names in translated literature have an additional function, namely, they reveal the existence of the "cultural other" (Hejwowski 2004, 93), and signal the reader that the text originated in a different culture.

How to translate anthroponyms in literary works? Although the usual modus operandi is to transliterate/trancribe them (if the target and source language have different alphabets), or to transplant them into the target language, leaving them in their original form (Zaliwska-Okrutna 2002), translation is also acceptable, sometimes even recommended (which would not be possible with real-world anthroponyms). This is especially the case when a given anthroponym interplays with a common word (in didactic or satirical literature, or in symbolic texts, where names have an intentional meaning). Then the translator's task is to reconstruct in the target language the meaning, and, if possible, connotations the name evokes in the source language.

The problem of transplanting or translating names can be interpreted not only at a purely linguistic matter. Akiko Yamazaki argues that replacing foreign names with more familiar ones not only shows "a lack of respect toward other cultures" but also "deprives child readers of the

chance to realize the wealth of cultural diversity that surrounds them" (2002, 53). In her article, she decidedly opposes the idea of "cultural context adaptation" (that is, translating names in order to adapt a book to the target culture and facilitate its reception by the child reader, or using the strategy of localizing). After Klingberg (1986, 12), she states that any such adaptation falsifies the original and results from the lack of respect for children and for other cultures. The change of names "creates a false impression of a homogeneous world" (Yamazaki 2002, 60) and discourages children from the foreign. Moreover, it makes children unaware of entering a different system (a book which originated in a different culture and language and which may require a different mode of reading) and deprives them of "the perspective into another culture" (op.cit. 57). Zaliwska-Okrutna (2001, 253) stresses another aspect of name-changing: when replacing a name with its equivalent in another language, we at the same time modify the character's nationality, sometimes their age and personality.

On the basis of previous considerations, then, it may be assumed that the translation of anthroponyms (which are culture-bound items) reflects four phenomena: the position of a given literature within the literary polysystem; the translator's attitude towards the readers of the translated text; the power relations between the source and target language culture; and finally – the changing notions of the role and tasks of translation.

I decided to analyse Polish versions of English children's literature texts from the point of view of anthroponym translation. Seven translation series were chosen for the study; each consisting of the English version, one Polish translations from before the Second World War, and one published in the 90s or the first decade of the 21st century. Both periods are exceptional for English books in translation: it was in early 20th century and in the interwar period that translations from English dominated the market of translations (Adamczyk-Grabowska 1988, 42); in the 1990s, after the collapse of communist censorship in Poland, came the second revival of translations from English.

Altogether, more than 300 translated anthroponyms were collected. They were divided into four categories: realistic names, realistic surnames, intentional names (names which were used in wordplays; onomatopoeias, neologisms; or when the author's intention of stressing a particular aspect of a given character is clearly visible), and names of authentic, historic figures. Nationalities (group anthroponyms) were not accounted for, as they are always translated and not so specific as anthroponyms mentioned above.

The two tables below present four anthroponym groups according to the strategies used by the translator. The division of strategies is based on this presented by Hejwowski (2004, 92-93), with small changes:

0. The English and Polish anthroponym function in the same form in both languages (e.g. Ada – Ada, Robert – Robert, etc.).
1. The anthroponym is left in its original version (transplanted or reproduced; e.g. Shelley, Mannering, George).
2. A small modification in spelling or diacritics is introduced (e.g. Marmaduke – Marmaduk, Solomon – Salomon, Jip – Dżip).
3. The anthroponym is translated:
   a) with an acknowledged equivalent (e.g. Jane – Joanna, Victory – Wiktoria, John – Jan)
   b) with an equivalent invented/chosen by the translator (e.g. The Barbary Dragon – Smok

Berberyjski or Smok Barbarii; Malcolm the Bold – Śmiały or Zuchwały; Sooty, a chimney sweep – Smoluch or Sadza; in each case, several options are available, from which translators choose one or invent their own)

   c) with a non-equivalent which is not a proper name (hyperonyme or periphrasis; e.g. Cupid – bożek miłości; Mr. Kimsey – aptekarz; the Ethiopian – czarny człowiek, etc.)

4. The anthroponym is replaced with a non-equivalent proper name (Dicky – Olek, Noeloninuris-Nabuhodonorozius, Cecco – Mundzio, Mildred – Inka).

5. The anthroponym is omitted.

    Table 1. presents strategies used for translating anthroponym in books published in the period 1907–1936[1].

Table 1. **1907–1936 translations.**

Strategy	Realistic name	Realistic surname	Intentional names (names in wordplay, neologisms, onomatopoeias)	Authentic name
0	7			
1	13	22		
2	8	6		
3a	22			5
3a+	7			
3b			20	
3c	6			
4	16	6		
4+	8			
5	35	33	26	9

As can be seen, the most popular strategy in pre-war translations was omitting. In translating realistic names, the widest spectrum of strategies was used. Dominant strategies were: omitting, translating with an acknowledged equivalent, and replacing with a non-equivalent name, although reproduction and modification were also used. A frequent use of diminutive name forms can be observed. Surnames were usually reproduced, whereas intentional names were either omitted or translated with an equivalent chosen by the translator, and authentic names were translated with an acknowledged equivalent.

Table 2 focuses on translations coming from the recent period.

---

[1] For clarity, all answers which scored below 5 were omitted. (+) means that the name was used in a diminutive form.

Table 2. ***1991–2006 translations.***

Strategy	Realistic name	Realistic surname	Intentional names (names in wordplay, neologisms, onomatopoeias)	Authentic name
0	9		6	
1	70	66		6
2	7			
3a	29		7	16
3b			33	
3c				
4				
5				

What strikes in Table 2 are the empty spaces under 3a, 4 and 5, i.e. the lack of omitting, replacing with a non-equivalent proper name or with a non-equivalent which is not a proper name. Also, no diminutive forms were used. A prevailing strategy in the case of proper names was reproduction, some names were substituted with an acknowledged equivalent. Reproduction is the only strategy in the case of realistic names. Intentional and authentic name rendering is similar to that presented in Table 1.

It seems to be worthwhile to mention specific examples of anthroponym translations in given translation series. Rogoszówna (Barrie 1913), in her translation of *Peter Pan in Kensington Gardens,* replaces almost all realistic names with non-equivalent ones, often in diminutive forms: David – Danio, Mabel – Marynka, Malcolm – Jurek, Marmaduke – Henryś, etc. Słomczyński (Barrie 1991) employs an utterly opposing strategy, reproducing them: David, Mabel, Marmaduk, sometimes modification – Malcolm.

Zaleska (Burnett 1907) often omits surnames, replacing them with periphrasis: Mr. and Mrs. Kimsey – aptekarz z rodziną, Jane Shorts – pokojówka Joanna, Miss Perkins – modniarka. In Łopatka's (2000) translation, all surnames are retained: pan i pani Kimsey, Jane Shorts, pani Perkins.

Interesting comparisons can be made in the group of intentional names, e.g. those coming from *Through the Looking Glass*[2]: Jabberwocky – Jablerwock – Dziwolęk; Tweedledum and Tweedledee – Klaps i Klops – Tarabum i Tarabim; Humpty-Dumpty – Wańka-Wstańka – Krótszy Grubszy; Haigha and Hatta – Saiga i Satta – Hajor i Hatta; or from *Peter and Wendy*[3]: Red-handed Jack – Krwiożerczy Szakal - Czerwonoręki Jack; Tinker Bell – Srebrnodzwonka – Cynowy Dzwoneczek, Nibs – Bezząbek – Stalówa, Slightly – Dzióbek – Kruszyna. A detailed analysis and comparison of translators' techniques would be a very interesting task and in some cases was undertaken by researchers (e.g. Urbanek (2004, 187–200) focused on three Polish translations of *Alice in Wonderland*), however it cannot be done here for lack of space.

---

[2] Examples are presented in chronological order: Carroll 1872, 1936, 2005.
[3] As above: Barrie 1911, 1914, 2006.

Authentic names were usually rendered with an acknowledged equivalent, which is consistent with their usage outside literature.

In the first group of translations, one notices examples of adding anthroponyms. In *The story of Doctor Dolittle*, the expression "work hard" was changed into "harujcie jak murzyni"/"work as hard as the black" (Lofting 1934); Jel (Nesbit 1925) introduces comparisons with Robinson and other fairy-tale characters (Waligóra) which were not present in the original.

The general conclusion is that translators at the beginning of the 20th century approached the text with greater liberty than their successors at the turn of the 20th and the 21st centuries. This seems to reflect the phenomena described above: the more independent position of children's literature within the literary system, the cultural turn in the translation studies (diminishing role of cultural context adaptation); the rising respect and trust towards the child reader, who is offered foreign names to a larger extent than one hundred years ago.

However, the tendency to transplant anthroponyms may be interpreted in a different way, namely, as a manifestation of the hegemony of English in the intercultural power balance. This issue would require further research; here I will limit myself to a brief and selective analysis of two translations of Polish books for children into English: *Dzieci to lubią najbardziej – antologia polskiej literatury dziecięcej. Children's favourites – an anthology of Polish writing for young people.* Transl. by Jolanta Scicińska, Siedmioróg: Wrocław 2004 and *Koziołek Matołek* by Kornel Makuszyński in Teresa Bałuk-Ulewiczowa's translation (a fragment from "Przekładaniec" 1/2006, 24-37). Intentional names were usually translated (strategy 3b): Koziołek Matołek – Silly Billy the Goat, Jeż Igiełka – Mr. Sharp, historic names – reproduced (Popiel, Lech, Piast), whereas realistic names and surnames were rendered by means of strategies 3a and 4: Krysia – Chris, Tosia – Tanya, Bronek – Brendan, Zosia Niszczycielka – Sonia the Destroyer, Walicki – Mr Warwick. Strategies used for translating realistic names may be interpreted as indicative of the inferior position of Polish culture in the English-language target culture; as already said, however, such a theory would require further research, as other factors may be at work here.

All in all, it is important that children's literature is treated equally with other literary works, also as regards translation. If one of its function is „building bridges between cultures", it seems essential that its translations retain as much original flavour as possible, and help familiarize the young reader with foreign (or „other") culture, which can be achieved, among others, by showing respect to names in their original form.

REFERENCES

Children's literature:

1. Barrie J. M. 1906. Peter Pan in Kensington Gardens. http://www.gutenberg.org/dirs/etext98/tlwbd10.txt.
2. Barrie J.M. 1913. Przygody Piotrusia Pana (transl. Z. Rogoszówna), Warszawa: J. Mortkowicz.
3. Barrie J.M. 1991. Przygody Piotrusia Pana: Piotruś Pan w Ogrodach Kensingtońskich (transl. M. Słomczyński), Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Dolnośląskie.
4. Barrie J.M. 1911. Peter and Wendy. http://www.gutenberg.org/dirs/etext91/peter16.txt.
5. Barrie J.M. 1914. Przygody Piotrusia duszka podług bajki angielskiej A. Barriego. Warszawa: M. Arct.
6. Barrie J.M. 2006. Piotruś Pan i Wendy (transl. M. Rusinek), Kraków: Znak.

7. Burnett F. H. 1886. Little Lord Fauntleroy. http://www.gutenberg.org/files/479/479.txt.
8. Burnett F. H. 1907 .Mały lord, (transl. M. J. Zaleska), Kraków: Gebethner i Wolff.
9. Burnett F. H. 2000. Mały lord. (transl. P. Łopatka), Kraków: Zielona Sowa.
10. Carroll L. 1865. Alice's adventures in Wonderland. http://www.gutenberg.org/dirs/etext91/alice30.txt.
11. Carroll L. 1927. Ala w krainie czarów. (transl. M. Morawska), Warszawa; Kraków; Lublin [etc.]: Gebethner i Wolff.
12. Carroll L. 1999. Alicja w Krainie Czarów. (transl. J. Kozak), Warszawa: Prószyński i S-ka.
13. Carroll L. 1872. Through the looking glass. http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/12.
14. Carroll L. 1936. W zwierciadlanym domu. (transl. J. Zawisza-Krasucka), Warszawa: J. Przeworski.
15. Carroll L. 2005. Alicja po drugiej stronie zwierciadła. (transl. H. Baltyn), Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Nasza Księgarnia.
16. Lofting H. 1920. Story of doctor Dolittle.http://www.gutenberg.org/dirs/etext96/dolit10.txt.
17. Lofting H. 1934. Doktór Dolittle i jego zwierzęta (transl. W. Kragen), Kraków: J. Mortkowicz; Warszawa: Tow. Wydawnicze.
18. Lofting H. 1999. Doktor Dolittle i jego zwierzęta. (transl. H. Kozioł), Kraków: Zielona Sowa.
19. Nesbit E. 1898. The Story of the Treasure Seekers. Http://www.gubenberg.org/dirs/etext97/tsots11.txt.
20. Nesbit E. 1925.Poszukiwacze skarbu (transl. H. Jel), Warszawa, Kraków : Towarzystwo Wydawnicze.
21. Nesbit E. 2003. Poszukiwacze skarbu: przygody dzieci z rodziny Bastablów szukających fortuny. (transl. M. Król), Kraków: Zielona Sowa: Polskapresse.

Research literature:

Adamczyk-Garbowska M. 1988. Polskie tłumaczenia angielskiej literatury dziecięcej. Problemy krytyki przekładu. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich – Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.

Aschenberg H. 1991. Eigennamen im Kinderbuch: eine textlinguistische Studie. Tübingen: Narr Verlag.

Berezowski L. 2001. Articles and Proper names. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Berezowski L. 2003. Co to znaczy, ze nazwy własne nic nie znaczą. *Anglistyka wrocławska wczoraj i dziś. ed. A. Michońska-Stadnik.* Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego. P. 109–118.

Borodo M. 2006. Children's Literature Translation Studies? Zarys badań nad literaturą dziecięcą w przekładzie. *Przekładaniec* (No. 1), p. 12–23.

Debus F. 2002. Namen in literarischen Werken. (Er-)Findung – Form – Funktion. Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Dobrzyńska T. 1984. Metafora. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Frege G. (1977). Pisma semantyczne. Warszawa: PWN.

Hejwowski K. 2004. Kognitywno-komunikacyjna teoria przekładu. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Jacquemond R. 1992. Translation and cultural hegemony: the case of French-Arabic translation. [in:] L. Venuti (ed.), Rethinking translation. Discourse, subjectivity, ideology. London, New York: Routledge. p. 139–158.

Krzeszowski T. 1997. Angels and devils in hell: elements of axiology in semantics. Warszawa: Energeia.

O'Sullivan E, Reynolds K., Rømoren R. (eds.). 2005. Introduction. Children's Literature Global and Local: Social and Aesthetic Perspectives. Oslo: Novus Press, 11–22.

Puurtinen T. 1998. Syntax, readability and ideology in children's *literature. Meta* (XLIII, 4). http://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/1998/v43/n4/003879ar.html.

Shavit Z. 1986. Poetics of Children's Literature. Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press.

Tabbert, R. 2002. Approaches to the translation of children's literature. A review of critical studies since 1960. – *Target* (14:2), 303–351.

Urbanek D. 2004. Pęknięte lustro. Tendencje w teorii i praktyce przekładu na tle myśli humanistycznej. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Trio, Instytut Rusycystki Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Yamazaki A. 2002. Why Change Names? On the Translation of Children's Books. *Children's Literature in Education* (vol. 33, No. 1), 53–62.

Zaliwska-Okrutna U. 2001. Patty, Patricia czy Patrycja? Antroponimy jako problem tłumaczeniowy i glottodydaktyczny. [in:] Kopczyński, A., Zaliwska-Okrutna, U. (eds) Język rodzimy a język obcy – komunikacja, przekład, dydaktyka. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego. 247–256.

100

ANTROPONIMŲ VERTIMAI VAIKŲ LITERATŪROJE XX AMŽIAUS PRADŽIOJE IR XXI AMŽIUJE

Anna Fornalczyk

S a n t r a u k a

Vertimas apima ne tik kalbos sritį, bet ir socialinius, kultūrinius bei ekonominius faktorius. Šio straipsnio tyrimo objektas – vaikų literatūros vertimas iš anglų kalbos į lenkų kalbą dabar ir dvidešimtojo amžiaus pradžioje. Autorė analizuoja antroponimų vertimo būdus, vertindama jų slinktį originalo kalbos link kaip ženklą, jog vaikų literatūros statusas literatūros polisistemoje darosi vis reikšmingesnis, o vaikai yra atviresni kitų kultūrų poveikiui ir geriau pasirengę patirti autentiškas kitos kultūros apraiškas.