

Research article  
Submitted: 1 Sept, 2020  
Accepted: 14 Dec, 2020

## **“EXCUSE ME, HANDS OFF THE MONUMENT”: A CASE STUDY OF THE RUSSIAN (RE)TRANSLATION OF *THE CATCHER IN THE RYE***

**Marta Brajnović, University of Zagreb**

### **Abstract**

*This paper studies two Russian translations of J. D. Salinger’s novel The Catcher in the Rye: the first translation, produced in the Soviet period, and a retranslation produced in the 2000s. The presence of English loanwords and youth slang expressions is selected as a micro-textual variable which may be an indicator of the influence of the target culture context on the shape of the first translation and the retranslation studied. In view of the tendencies in borrowing from English in contemporary Russia, the total number of English loanwords (Anglicisms) is expected to be significantly higher in the more recent translation, and the two translations are also expected to differ in the number of English loanwords belonging to youth slang. These hypotheses are tested by analysing the English loanwords in the two translations. Further, various paratextual elements surrounding the first translation and a retranslation of Salinger’s novel are analysed. The aim is to shed light on the dynamics of the relations between the first, canonized translation and the retranslation as a possible explanation for their linguistic make-up and for the attitudes of the members of the Russian literary establishment towards them. The insights gained by the analysis of the paratexts are interpreted relying on Lefevere’s concepts of patronage and poetics. The analysis of the attitudes of the political and literary establishments in the Soviet and post-Soviet periods towards the first translation and the selected retranslation is also used to provide a wider insight into the dominant attitudes towards retranslation in the Soviet and post-Soviet periods.*

*Keywords: English loan words, youth slang, paratextual analysis, patronage*

## 1. Introduction

J. D. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye*, first published in 1951, is regarded as 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). 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<sup>1</sup>.

Donald Costello (1959: 172) emphasizes the importance of *The Catcher in the Rye* as a reliable record of the teenage vernacular from the 1950s and points out that all of slang expressions used by the main protagonist, Holden Caulfield, 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". Salinger's novel gives precedence to speech over the written word, 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"<sup>2</sup> paradigm (Flaker 1983: 38).

---

<sup>1</sup> For instance, in 1973 *The Catcher in the Rye* was considered the most widely-censored book in the United States, while almost a decade later it had the paradoxical status both 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).

<sup>2</sup> Aleksandar Flaker (1983: 36) defines "jeans prose" as prose texts with a young narrator (be it in the first or third person) who challenges the traditional social structures and whose distinctive style is based on the spoken language of urban youth.

The broad aim of this paper<sup>3</sup> is to explore the role of ideological aspects in the first translation and a later retranslation of Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye* into Russian. The first translation (FTr) of the novel to Russian, *Nad propastiu vo rzhi*<sup>4</sup> [Over the Abyss in the Rye], was produced by Rita Rait-Kovaleva (1898-1989), an eminent Russian translator from English. It was published during the Thaw period<sup>5</sup>, the period of liberalization in the USSR that lasted from the mid-1950s to the early 1960s. The retranslation (RTr) chosen for this study was produced by Max (Maksim Vladimirovich) Nemtsov (1963), a contemporary Russian translator and contributing editor, first published in 2008 under the title *Lovec nad khlebnym polem*<sup>6</sup> [The Hunter over the Grain Field]. Nemtsov's retranslation was preceded by Sergei Makhov's 1998 retranslation of the novel (*Obryv na kraiu rzhanogo polia detstva* [The Cliff at the end of the Rye Field of Childhood]), and succeeded by Iakov Lotovskii's 2010 retranslation (*Nad propastiu vo rzhi* [Over the Abyss in the Rye]). Still, Nemtsov's translation remains the most popular contemporary RTr among them. Thus, translator Aleksandra Gorbova claims that Makhov's translation has passed almost

<sup>3</sup> The study was conducted as the author's M.A. thesis at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Zagreb, Croatia. This paper is a revised version of that thesis.

<sup>4</sup> Russian names whose manner of transliteration is already well established in the English-speaking world are transliterated accordingly (e.g. Internatsionalnaya literatura, Korney Chukovsky), while on the other hand the way authors quoted in this paper transliterated their own names in their works is maintained. The remaining Russian names and expressions are transliterated according to the ICAO system.

<sup>5</sup> In the literature three different years are cited as the years of the publication of Rait-Kovaleva's translation: 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 "Ozhivliash"* 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 *Sravnitelnyi analiz raznovremennykh perevodov romana Dzh. D. Selindzhera "Nad propastiu vo rzhi": sovetskaia i sovremennaia retsenzii*, in Rudnytska's *Soviet Censorship and Translation in Contemporary Ukraine and Russia*, Chukovsky's *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadtsati tomakh. Tom tretii: Vysokoe iskusstvo; Iz anglo-amerikanskikh tetradei*, and in the *Bolshaia biograficheskaia entsiklopediia* ([https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc\\_biography/105504/%d0%a0%d0%b0%d0%b9%d1%82](https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc_biography/105504/%d0%a0%d0%b0%d0%b9%d1%82)). 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 process of translation is 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.

<sup>6</sup> This research is based on the 1986 edition of Rait-Kovaleva's translation and the 2016 edition of Nemtsov's translation.

unnoticed, while translation researcher Natalya Rudnytska (2013) says the same for Lotovskii's translation, even though she also mentions some advantages over Nemtsov's work. Almost all the critical works and reviews read while doing research for this study, which are discussed in detail below, focus on comparing Rait-Kovaleva's and Nemtsov's translations. Furthermore, Nemtsov's translation has seen three editions (2008, 2016, 2017).

The first part of the paper examines the presence of English loanwords in the FTr and the RTr, in particular those belonging to the youth slang, since this register is a hallmark of Salinger's *Catcher*. The micro-textual variable selected for the quantitative analysis (the presence of English loanwords) is chosen as an indicator of the tolerance of the target culture (TC) towards Anglicisms, which is here assumed to be ideologically conditioned. In the second part of the study, the peritext and epitext of the target texts (TTs) are examined in order to shed additional light on the constraints imposed by ideological aspects and patronage networks both on the TTs and attitudes towards them in the TC.

## 2. Key concepts

### 2.1 Language borrowing

According to Leonid Krysin (2004: 24), language borrowing is a "process whereby various elements are transferred from one language into another"<sup>7</sup>. 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). 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

---

<sup>7</sup> All translations from Croatian and Russian are the author's.

shades of meaning, brevity of expression, lexical gaps, the need for new stylistic and/or expressive linguistic means, etc.

## 2.2 Patronage and poetics

The second part of the study relies largely on André Lefevere's approach to the issues of translation and ideology, in particular on Lefevere's distinction between patronage and poetics as two main factors involved in translation seen as rewriting. Therefore, this section provides a brief overview of Lefevere's rewriting theory and of concepts of patronage and poetics.

The traditional scope of descriptive translation studies paradigm was broadened by Lefevere's contribution (1985/2014, 1992a, 1992b). Lefevere defines translation as a "rewriting of the original text" (1992a: vii). In the General editors' preface to *Translation, History, Culture* Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere emphasize that "[a]ll rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way" (1992: xi). Translation as an activity reflects a particular situation within a given culture and how this culture "behaves" or "reacts" in contact with other cultures. As Lefevere (1992b: 14) notes, "[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". Bringing a new direction to polysystems theory, Lefevere places the main focus on the control mechanisms of society over the literary system, and identifies three main mechanisms: poetics, patronage and ideology (cf. Hermans 1999/2009). Poetics refers to aesthetic principles that dominate the literary system at a certain point in time. While patronage as a control factor is situated outside the literary system itself (Lefevere 1992a: 15), poetics controls the literary system from within and consists of two components (Lefevere 1992a: 36): "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.). Patronage refers to "the powers (persons, institutions), which help or hinder the writing, reading and rewriting of literature" (1992a: 15), and it consists of three

elements: the ideological component (which not only constrains 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). Lefevere (1985/2014: 228) points out that "patrons rarely try to influence a literary system directly" and explains:

They usually operate by means of institutions set up to regulate the writing or at least the distribution of literature: academies, bureaus for censorship, critical journals and the educational establishment. Critics who represent the 'reigning orthodoxy' at any given time in the development of a literary system are close to the ideology of the patrons dominating that phase in the history of the social system in which the literary system is embedded. (ibid.)

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. The purpose of these control factors is to ensure that the literary system stays in line with the other systems of the TC (1985/2014: 226). Therefore, according to Lefevere (1985/2014: 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". As for societal impact on translation, Lefevere (1992a: 41) identifies two factors: "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".

Ideology is here understood as "the conceptual grid that consists of opinions and attitudes deemed acceptable in a certain society at a certain time and through which readers and translators approach texts" (Lefevere 1998: 48).

### **3. English loanwords in Russian: a short historical overview and contemporary attitudes**

Zoya Proshina and Brian Etkin (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 Russian was small but steady, since the most prestigious donor language during that period was French (Proshina and Etkin 2005: 439-441). During the nineteenth century, some English words entered into Russian as a result of literary influences (e.g. Byron's influence on Pushkin: "Kak *dandy* londonskii odet"<sup>8</sup>), 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. In the 1930s 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 Etkin 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 Etkin 2005: 442). Yvonne Grabowski (1972: 123) points out to 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". The death of Stalin in 1953 was followed by what is often perceived in the West as a radical shift in the Soviet Union's internal and foreign policies: the Khrushchev<sup>9</sup> Thaw. This period, which lasted until the early the

---

<sup>8</sup> Pushkin 1833/2013: 29.

<sup>9</sup> Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev (1894 – 1971) was a Soviet politician who led the Soviet Union during part of the Cold War as the first secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union from 1953 to 1964 and as chairman of the Council of Ministers (or premier) from 1958 to 1964. Khrushchev was responsible for the de-Stalinization of the Soviet Union, for backing the progress of the early Soviet space program, and for several relatively liberal reforms in areas of domestic policy.

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, Larissa Ryazanova-Clarke and Terence 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.

Morton Benson (1959: 248) notes that English loanwords, especially those from American English, were extremely popular among the *stilyagi* (a blend of the word "stil", Russian for "style", and the suffix "-iaga", which is used to denote a possessor of a certain quality) youth subgroup. After Khrushchev was ousted from power in 1964, the Soviet Union experienced two decades of conservative stability and economic decline. During this so-called "Era of Stagnation", 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" (Ryazanova-Clarke and Wade 1999: 61). 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 use 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 and 1990s up to this day (Komarova 2012: 25). As a result, during the 20th century the number of English loanwords in Russian increased by 5 to 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); as a result, it is possible to observe a “continuously growing quantity of loanwords-Anglicisms in the contemporary Russian lexicon” (Vlasenko 2009: 20). This phenomenon has gained considerable 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 barbarisms. 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, Svetlana Vlasenko (2009: 20) describes the contemporary lexical borrowing process as “the colonization of Russian by Anglicisms”.

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 Etkin 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 them to get closer to the stereotypical and idealized American way of life in which the standard of living is much higher than in Russia (Khrunenкова 2012: 227). Aside from the prestige assigned to English as one of the reasons for borrowing English loanwords (Zemskaja 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. (Zemskaja 2000: 144).

### 3.1 English loanwords in Russian youth slang

As the use of youth slang is one of the hallmarks of *The Catcher in the Rye*, I will pay a particular attention to youth slang. Frederick F. Patton (1980: 270) defines slang lexical items as those lexemes that 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), rather than as a means for conveying information (1980: 270; Adams 2009: 16). 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, as social groups vary in their stability and number of members, 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.

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). Vlasenko (2008: 76) claims 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 ‘infestation’ with Anglicisms”. According to Proshina and Etkin (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 research claiming that 20 per cent of contemporary Russian youth slang is of English origin (2000: 102, quoted in Proshina and Etkin 2005: 443). According to recently published research concerning lexical borrowing from English, it seems that this percentage is more likely to have increased than diminished in the two decades following Romanov's aforementioned research.

#### **4. Aims and methodology**

##### *4.1 Aims*

The aim of the first part of the study is to compare the frequency of the use of English loanwords in the FTr, produced in the Soviet period, and the RTr, produced in the post-Soviet period. The presence of English loanwords in the two TTs is taken as an indicator of the influence of the dominant ideology (in Lefevere's sense) on the translator's decisions and consequently on the TT's make-up.

In the second part of the study, the aim is to try to provide explanations for the findings from the first part, by analysing the attitudes expressed in the peritext and epitext of the FTr and RTr. The aim of the paratextual analysis is to shed light on the ideological aspects that influenced the make-up of these specific TTs and their interpretation and status in the TC. In addition, the paratextual analysis will allow a broader insight into the attitudes of the literary establishment in these two periods towards retranslation as such.

##### *4.2 Hypotheses regarding the presence of English loanwords*

On the basis of my insight into the tendencies of the growing number of English loanwords in contemporary Russia (see section 4), I formulated the hypothesis predicting that the overall number of English loanwords will be higher in the RTr than in the FTr.

The second hypothesis deals with the subgroup of English loanwords belonging to youth slang, the landmark feature of Salinger's novel. According to this hypothesis, the number of English loanwords belonging to youth slang is also expected to be higher in the RTr than in the FTr. In order to test this hypothesis I also compared the two texts in terms of the number of stylistically marked English loanwords.

#### 4.3 Methodology of the extraction of English loanwords

The first step in conducting the quantitative analysis was to extract English loanwords from the two TTs, in line with the definition of English loanwords applied. In this paper, Rudolf Filipović's definition of a lexical borrowing from English (i.e. Anglicism) is adopted:

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 understood to include technical terms or names of technological inventions that are derived from ancient Greek or Latin, but were used in such a form for the first time as part of the English language (Filipović 1990: 18). Only English loanwords with a verified etymology are taken into account, while loan blends (combinations of elements from different languages) are disregarded. The extracted English loanwords were then counted and the loanwords were compared in terms of the total number of lemmas (i.e. types) and in terms of the total number of occurrences of these lemmas (i.e. tokens). For each TT, therefore, there are two sets of English loanwords (one for the number of lemmas and the other for the total number of occurrences of these lemmas) and the two sets are compared with the corresponding one from the other TT.

In order to verify the etymology of the English loanword candidates, this research applied a filter consisting of three dictionaries<sup>10</sup>: *Noveishii slovar inostrannyh slov i vyrazhenii* (2001) edited by Iu. G. Khatskevich, *Bolshoi slovar*

<sup>10</sup> The dictionaries used in this research were chosen because they were available under the constraints of the research.

*inostrannyh slov: 35 tysiach slov* (2010) compiled by Aleksandar Bulyko and the *Vikislovar* online dictionary. In the cases where there were competing donor languages, I also used Shaposhnikov's two-volume etymological dictionary (2016) and *Bolshoi akademicheskii slovar* edited by K. S. Gorbachevich et al. (2004-2014). Words whose etymology could not be verified in these dictionaries were excluded from this research, except for eponyms and brand names adapted to the Russian Cyrillic script and for obvious derivations obtained from existing English loanwords<sup>11</sup>. In cases where multiple dictionaries offered different etymologies, the etymology appearing in more sources 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.

The next step was to identify the subgroup of English loanwords belonging to youth slang. In order to identify which English loanwords belong to the register of youth slang, I relied on Russian youth slang dictionaries by Nikitina (2013) and Zakharova and Shuvaeva (2014). Since in this research I use Frederick F. Patton's definition of slang as a stylistically marked language variety belonging to colloquial speech (see section 4.1), I then decided to compare the FTr and the RTr in terms of stylistically marked English loanwords. Therefore, in order to include all types of stylistically marked language varieties, I adopted Annebet Noppers' method of applying a lexical filter (2010: 40), which she originally used to identify youth language: if a given word did not occur in any of the consulted dictionaries or it did in just one, it was not classified as slang but as a stylistically marked item. The lexical filter consisted of the three dictionaries used to verify the etymology of the supposed English loanwords with the addition of *Tolkovyi slovar russkogo iazyka* (2006). However, here I slightly modified this method: all stylistically marked items (whether "offensive", "vernacular", "diminutive" or "colloquial"), alongside words which do not appear in any of the dictionaries or appear in just one were classified in the category of stylistically marked language

<sup>11</sup> 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 *kokteil*), *mansli* (part of a newspaper title), *mister-vinson*, *mister-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).

varieties. It should also be mentioned that, among the words that 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 were not counted as stylistically marked lemmas due to the fact that their primary function is to denote a concept absent in the Russian language, rather than indicate expressiveness (*ivning* (Eng. *Evening*), *mansli* (Eng. *Monthly*), *post* (Eng. *Post*), *vitalis* (Eng. *Vitalis*), *gladston* (Eng. *Gladstones*), *lasall* (Eng. *LaSalle*), *lasteks* (Eng. *Lastex*)). The same applies to orthographically and morphologically adapted lexemes from American popular culture and sport (*dzhitterbag* (Eng. *jitterbug*), *pinbol* (Eng. *pinball*), *tom-kollinz* (Eng. *Tom Collinses*), *nelson* (Eng. *nelson*), *dzhamp* (Eng. *jump*), *dzhitterbazhit* (Eng. *jitterbug*), *dzhazovo* (Eng. *jazzy*)). In this way, the FTr and RTr were also compared in terms of the number of youth slang expressions and general stylistically marked language varieties borrowed from English.

#### 4.3.1 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. 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.<sup>12</sup> The situation is not only complicated by difficulties in determining which language had the role of the donor (or perhaps mediator) 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.

<sup>12</sup> 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.

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<sup>13</sup>. 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 North American culture and 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.

## 5. Findings from the quantitative analysis: English loanwords in Rait-Kovaleva's and Nemtsov's translations

Due to space constraints, I will only briefly present quantitative data obtained in the textual analysis. In the FTr, there are 380 lemmas of English origin, including common and proper nouns, with names of the main characters being the most frequently used ones: Fibi/Fib (Eng. Phoebe), Stredleiter (Eng. Stradlater), Ekli (Eng. Ackley), Salli (Eng. Sally), while the RTr contains 406 lemmas of English origin, including common and proper nouns, with names of the main characters being the most frequently used ones: Fibi/Fib (Eng. Phoebe), Stredleiter (Eng. Stradlater), Ekli (Eng. Ackley), Selli (Eng. Sally), Pensi (Eng. Pencey). This means that the RTr contains around six percent more lemmas of English origin than the FTr. Next, the total number of occurrences of these lemmas (i.e. tokens) in the FTr is 1857, as opposed to 1915 in the RTr. Therefore, in terms of the total number (occurrences) of English loanwords, the difference between the two TTs is even smaller: the RTr contains only three percent more English

---

<sup>13</sup> 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).

loanwords than the FTr. Having this in mind I am led to conclude that, while the first hypothesis is formally confirmed in that there are more Anglicisms in the RTr, the difference, when I keep in mind the tendencies in the Russian language, as presented in section 4, is surprisingly small.

When it comes to the second hypothesis and the comparison of youth slang expressions of English origin in the two TTs, the results turned out to be equally underwhelming. No verified slang expression of English origin was found in the FTr, while only three verified slang lemmas of English origin (*basket*, *bufera* and *stop*) were found in the RTr, and the total number of their occurrences (i.e. tokens) turned out to be seven.

The results of the comparison of the FTr and the RTr in terms of stylistically marked English loanwords are the following: three stylistically marked lemmas of English origin (*koktelnaia*, *telefonchik*, *khuliganistyi*) were found in the FTr, while fifteen stylistically marked lemmas of English origin (*basket*, *bufera*, *viskach*, *dzhamp*, *dzhazovoi*, *dzhinsiki*, *kola*, *mister-vinus*, *mister-vinson*, *pidzh*, *pidzhachok*, *rollerski*, *stop*, *striptizka*, *klinch*<sup>14</sup>) were found in the RTr, including the three verified slang lemmas. These stylistically marked lemmas appear 30 times in the RTr, compared to only three occurrences in the FTr (i.e. each of the stylistically marked lemmas appears only once). Although the results obtained by applying such an approach seem to confirm the second hypothesis in that a greater number of slang and stylistically marked items of English origin and their respective occurrences was found in the RTr compared with the FTr, their total numbers are still too small to reach a definite conclusion.

## **6. Findings from the analysis of paratexts: ideological aspects of the first translation and a retranslation of *The Catcher in the Rye***

In this section I will attempt to provide an explanation as to why neither of the two hypotheses has been convincingly confirmed by the quantitative data. 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

<sup>14</sup> Although the word *klinch* is registered in Russian dictionaries, here it is regarded as a stylistically marked 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).



on the influence that ideological constraints exert on translation. First, I will sketch the dominant attitudes of the members of the Russian literary establishment, regarded as “professionals” forming the patronage networks, towards translation and retranslation in the Soviet and post-Soviet periods, when the FTr and RTr were produced.

### 6.1 (Re)translation practices in the Soviet Union

Writing about the publishing practices during the Soviet period in general, Rudnytska (2013: n.p.) claims that

[a]s a rule, only one translation variant was allowed. 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.

Russian translator and philologist Aleksandra Borisenko (2009: n.p.) points out that retranslations in the Soviet Union were produced, especially those of children’s literature and canonical works, such as Shakespeare’s works. However, such instances tended to be the exception, rather than the rule, and canonized translations were off-limits for criticism (ibid.). Rait-Kovaleva’s FTr of *The Catcher in the Rye* seems to be an apt example of the “sacrosanct” status of first translations, as will be shown in the discussion below. British researcher of cultural history of the Soviet Union, Samantha Sherry (2015: 29) 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 and 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). Borisenko explains that in the Soviet Union, translations were considered to be a part of the home literary system: “a good translation is a work well-written in Russian. True literature”. (2009: n.p.) As Borisenko (ibid.) further elaborates, in the 1940s, the dominant doctrine was the idea that the translation should have the same artistic impact as the ST, 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 convey the works of all the world's greatest writers accurately (ibid.).

An important feature of translation practices in the Soviet period is related to censorship. Sherry's research shows that the issue of censorship may not be as straightforward as it may seem at a first glance. 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 under Stalin was in the hands of the communist party, during the Thaw era was delegated to editors and translators (2013: 733). Such a less-centralized system made censorship not only less reliable, but also more paradoxical. That is, self-censorship was far from a straightforward activity, and as a result, 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" (Sherry 2015: 60).

## 6.2 Rait-Kovaleva's translation and its reception by the literary establishment

In this section I will analyse some instances of the peritext and epitext of the FTr in an attempt to trace the main attitudes of the literary establishment towards the FTr.

Russian philologist Denis Petrenko (2009: 10, 13) interprets Rait-Kovaleva's translation as a product shaped by the following factors: censorship, the Soviet school of translation, 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". The language used in Rait-Kovaleva's FTr 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. For instance, Rait-Kovaleva's contemporary

Korney Chukovsky<sup>15</sup> (1966/2012: 89) writes that she slightly weakened the novel's rough jargon, but tried to convey all of its expressiveness, strength and colourfulness, 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 essence of each sentence in the novel (1966/2012: 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 euphemizing 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). In Rait-Kovaleva's FTr, Holden not only avoids profanities in his speech and speaks standard Russian with almost no slang expressions but he is also characterized by a moral purity, i.e. when discussing sexual matters, he does not go into details which the reader might find embarrassing (Petrenko 2016: 35). Petrenko (ibid.) commends Rait-Kovaleva's translation strategy and considers her translation a more harmonized text which had a positive impact on the structure of the novel and the construction of the main character (in comparison with Salinger's original). Russian philologists Irina Vorontsova and Mariya Navolneva point out that 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". (2017: 255)

However, Sherry raises a few interesting points about the work of Rita Rait-Kovaleva. 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

---

<sup>15</sup> Korney Ivanovich Chukovsky, pseudonym of Nikolay Vasilyevich Korneychukov, (1882 – 1969) was a Russian critic and writer of children's literature, often considered the first modern Russian writer for children. The first edition of "Volume III" of his "Collected Works" quoted here was published in 1966.

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 in her article "Nit Ariadny" claims that *The Catcher in the Rye* was not translated for a long time because some [Soviet] reviewers and translators who read the novel thought it 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 story (Rait-Kovaleva 1965: n.p.)<sup>16</sup>. Borisenko (2009: n.p) 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 not even that was permitted". Furthermore, it seems that the neutralization of the SL was Rait-Kovaleva's 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.

Another important aspect influencing the reception of Rait Kovaleva's FTr is its compliance with the dominant ideological reading of the novel: "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" (Petrenko 2016: 32). Thus, we may conclude 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 paratextual material accompanying the novel, such as Chukovsky's aforementioned positive review of Rait-Kovaleva's work as a translator. In addition, attention should be paid to the afterword to the translation, written by Vera Panova, a famous Soviet novelist

<sup>16</sup> In this research, I used an online edition of Rait-Kovaleva's article, which was published in 1965 in "Redaktor i perevod: sbornik statei" edited by A. I. Mironova (Moscow: Kniga).

and journalist. 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.

Aside from Panova's afterword, the inscription of *The Catcher in the Rye* within the framework of Soviet ideology and the dominant poetics is also visible in the peritext of the 1986 edition of the FTr. First, 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 literary scholar and philologist A. M. Gavriiliuk'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.). It is important to notice that in her preface Gavriiliuk entirely omits language as one of the key aspects of Salinger's works. Gavriiliuk's failure to mention the issue of language in the ST may lead us to conclude 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. Thus, once the form and content of Salinger's novel were adapted to Soviet ideology, there was nothing to hinder the critical praise of *The Catcher in the Rye*.

To conclude, the Russian FTr 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 peritext (Panova's afterword and Gavriiliuk's preface) played a crucial role. 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" (Vorontsova and Navolneva 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.

### 6.3 (Re)translation practices in post-Soviet 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 Russian translator and university professor 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. 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 immensely, 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 ST can be published by different publishing companies and retranslated multiple times. 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". Moreover, new literary translators in post-Soviet Russia tend to challenge the Soviet translation tradition in terms of theme and language but also by 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 (Petrenko 2009: 11).

However, these new retranslations are far from being 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 RTr. I will discuss in more detail the attitudes towards Nemtsov’s approach to the translation of slang below. Still, I should point out here that critics found that the “fault” with this translation was that it was produced in the first place. As 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, Toporov (2008b: n.p.), who wrote three separate reviews 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 reader, and to support this claim lists a few illustrative comments from the *Live Journal* (Rus. *Zhivoi Zhurnal*) social networking service. For instance<sup>17</sup>:

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”...

---

<sup>17</sup> Readers’ comments are given in italics and they are followed by Borisenko’s own commentary.

*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 first, canonical translations are perceived as original texts. 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 retranslation is, in Toporov’s words, “Excuse me, hands off the monument!” (2008b: n.p.).

On the other hand, in recent years some authors focused on the positive sides of Nemtsov’s RTr and the issue of the Russian audience being accustomed to Rait-Kovaleva’s FTr. For instance, literary translator Arkadii Zastyrets (quoted in 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, 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 extralinguistic circumstances which strongly influence the final outcome.

Such a positive attitude towards retranslations is also shared by Vorontsova and 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 different attitudes within the Russian literary system. However, it would be necessary to conduct a much more extensive study involving a greater number of retranslations of different works and their accompanying paratexts 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 context.

#### 6.4 *Nemtsov's retranslation, its reception and the ideological influences behind it*

Max Nemtsov's retranslation of *The Catcher in the Rye* was first published in 2008. Its publishing 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 FTr served as a basis for several research papers (Borisenko 2009; Burak 2001: 110). In line with the post-Soviet rebellious translation practices, Nemtsov's RTr may be seen as diametrically opposite to Rait-Kovaleva's FTr, especially in terms of language. In Nemtsov's RTr, youth slang from 1950s America has been adapted into contemporary Russian teenage slang (Shelestiuk 2013: 43). If Rait-Kovaleva's FTr is characterized by neutralization, Nemtsov's RTr is characterized by exaggeration: he not only "rendered all features of the original, but had exaggerated some of them" (Rudnytska 2013: n.p.). Moreover, it is very interesting to note that Nemtsov deviated from what would be expected of the contemporary Russian slang, as shown by the quantitative analysis in this research and taking into account the previously described tendencies in the borrowing of English loanwords into contemporary Russian slang. This is here interpreted as an indication of the traces of ideology at play during the translation process, whether it was Nemtsov's personal choice to put the Russian inventory of slang items in the focus since they were suppressed in the FTr (which would fall into the category of personal ideology) or the fact that Nemtsov as a translator was also under the influence of the dominant norm that extensive language borrowing from English into Russian is undesirable (a view supported by a significant part of the Russian "linguistic establishment", as shown in section 4). In the latter case, this would be a case of the influence that patronage, as defined by Lefevere, exercises on translation. However, much like the interplay between internal and external censorship in Rait-Kovaleva's times, it seems that the distinction between ideology "coming from the inside" and the "ideology coming from the outside" in the translation process can be hard to distinguish even today, unless the translator keeps a journal or gives an interview explicitly detailing their decisions.

As in Rait-Kovaleva's case, the critical reception of Nemtsov's translation also mainly focused on language, although with the opposite verdict. Nemtsov's RTr, 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). Russian philologist Marina Rebenko (2013: 172) further claims that Nemtsov's "conscious vulgarization deforms Salinger's individual and artistic style" and that the overabundance of profanities and jargon, contained in Nemtsov's interpretation of the novel, amounts to an unprofessional translation. On the other hand, philologist Elena Shelestiuk (2013: 44) claims that Nemtsov's RTr is more in line with the ST than Rait-Kovaleva's in terms of the surface structure. What makes Nemtsov's translation hard to accept in Russia is, according to Shelestiuk, a difference in tolerance towards non-standard words and expressions: while such elements are readily tolerated in the West, in Russia, the level of tolerance towards them remains quite low<sup>18</sup>. 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.). The publisher's preface (Ianovskaia 2016: 4) in Nemtsov's post-Soviet RTr 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 RTr "rises against" the accepted canon, i.e. against the canonical translation of the novel.

To conclude, both the FTr and RTr can be seen as products of different types of patronage in Lefevere's sense. Rait-Kovaleva's FTr was produced in the Soviet Union, an example *par excellence* of Lefevere's claim that undifferentiated patronage is typical of totalitarian states (1992a: 17). In such cases, the three

---

<sup>18</sup> This is also confirmed by Ibrišević and Čelić (2018).

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 part of the same system (e.g. Korney Chukovsky's review of Rait-Kovaleva's FTr), as well as various prizes or orders handed out by the state (Rait-Kovaleva was awarded the Order of Friendship of Peoples). Nemtsov's RTr, on the other hand, was published 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.

Moreover, Nemtsov's RTr also shows that the status component of patronage is in this particular case connected with the other means of controlling the literary system – poetics. 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. This way, literary criticism has a crucial role in both disseminating and "defending" the dominant poetics. It is due 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. As Nemtsov's example shows, literary professionals still perform their function of quelling insurgent voices that may arise within the dominant poetics, primarily by drowning out these voices through numerous and unequivocal negative commentaries. The purpose of such efforts by literary professionals is to mould the way the wider audience will accept a given translation and to provide 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).

Thus, Nemtsov's translation is "bad" because it breaks the dominant norm requiring that the status of canonical translations remains unchallenged. This norm continues to exert influence even today and enables Rait-Kovaleva's FTr to maintain its privileged status among all other translations of *The Catcher in the Rye*, as illustrated by Borisenko's following claim: "Translation practice changes (...) as the era changes, but stereotypes stand still in their places and demand order and a firm hand". (2009: n.p.)

Furthermore, Rait-Kovaleva's FTr also shows that a translation enjoying a privileged status gains 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* and readers gradually internalized the reading of the novel that was projected at them: if Holden is taken to be a noble hero, 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, Rebenko (2013: 171) claims that the argot lexemes that Nemtsov uses in his RTr "distort Salinger's communicative intention – to present his literary character as a finely organised individual in search of truth". Since Kovaleva's FTr 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 an original work, as it is evident in the comments from Borisenko's article.

According to Lefevere, "[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" (1992b: 2). Thus, retranslations claiming to represent the ST more truthfully (e.g. the publisher's preface to Nemtsov's RTr (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 FTr, Nemtsov’s RTr automatically fell in disfavour of the critics and reviewers. As mentioned, the interpretation contained in the peritext of a literary work is primarily directed at the audience, which, by internalizing the 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. 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. ‘Hands off the monument!’ [is what] they echo”.

## 7. Conclusion

In two Russian translations of J. D. Salinger’s novel *The Catcher in the Rye* ideological constraints imposed on the translation process are reflected on at least two levels: in the textual features of the two TTs and in the reception of these translations by the establishment.

The present research essentially showed an absence of the expected quantity of English loanwords, with neither of the hypotheses regarding the use of English loanwords being convincingly confirmed by the quantitative analysis. For this reason, the results of the quantitative analysis were taken as a starting point for a discussion on why the hypotheses were not strongly supported. Consequently, the quantitative findings were interpreted as indicators of the influence of the patronage network and poetics on translation. The decision of the retranslator was to give precedence to native Russian expressions, while extratextual influences and norms of the doctrine of social realism affected the FTr.

Furthermore, the paratexts in both FTr and RTr aptly illustrate Lefevere’s (1985/2014: 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 (1985/2014: 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.

This study also tried to demonstrate how the paratext accompanying the FTr helped shape and disseminate the dominant interpretation of the novel as well as enshrine the FTr into the Soviet literary canon. It has been established that old norms regarding translation policy still play a significant role in the contemporary Russian literary sphere, continue to shape the reception of post-Soviet retranslations and are upheld by a significant part of the contemporary Russian reading public.

## References

- Alekseeva, Irina Sergeevna. 2004. *Vvedenie v perevodovedenie*. Sankt-Peterburg: Filologicheskii fakultet SPbGU / Moscow: Izdatelskii centr "Akademiia".
- Armstrong, Nigel. 2015. "Culture and translation". In: Sharifian, Farzad (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Culture*. London and New York: Routledge. 181-195.
- Bassnett, Susan and Lefevere, André. 1992. "General editors' preface". In: Lefevere, André (ed.), *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook*. London and New York: Routledge. xi-xiii
- Bassnett, Susan and Lefevere, André. 1998. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon and Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters
- Belotserkovskaia, Iana. 2015. "Takoi knigi u Selindzhera net". *Oblastnaia gazeta*. URL: <https://www.oblgazeta.ru/culture/24024/>. Accessed on: 7 February 2018.
- Benson, Morton. 1959. "English Loanwords in Russian". *The Slavic and East European Journal* 3(2): 248-267.
- Borisenko, Aleksandra Leonidovna. 2009. "Selindzher nachinaet i vyigryvaet". *Inostrannaya literatura* 7: 223-233. URL: <http://magazines.russ.ru/inostran/2009/7/bo16.html>. Accessed on: 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* 13: 100-110.

- Chukovsky, Korney Ivanovich. 1966/2012. *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh. Tom tretii: Vysokoe iskusstvo; Iz anglo-amerikanskikh tetradei*. Moscow: Agenstvo FTM, Ltd.
- Costello, Donald. 1959. "Language of 'The Catcher in the Rye'". *American Speech* 34(3): 172-181.
- Donahue, Deirdre. 2010. "J. D. Salinger: An enigma to the very end". *USA Today*. URL: [https://usatoday30.usatoday.com/life/books/news/2010-01-28-salinger-obit\\_N.htm](https://usatoday30.usatoday.com/life/books/news/2010-01-28-salinger-obit_N.htm). Accessed on: 12 January 2018.
- Eberhard, Alsen. 2008. "The Catcher in the Rye". In: Bloom, Harold (ed.), *J. D. Salinger*. New York: Infobase Publishing. 145-174.
- Filipović, Rudolf. 1990. *Anglicizmi u hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti and 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.
- Galliamova, M. S. and Matveeva, E. O. 2015. "Sravnitelnyi analiz raznovremennykh perevodov romana Dzh. D. Selindzhera 'Nad propastiu vo rzhi': sovetskaia i sovremennaia retsenzii". *Mezhdunarodnyi nauchno-issledovatel'skii zhurnal* 3(2): 74-75.
- Gavriliuk, A. M. 1986. "Preface". In: Selindzher, Dzherom David, *Nad propastiu vo rzhi* [translated by Rita Rait-Kovaleva]. Lviv: Visha shkola, izdatelstvo pri Lvovskom gosudarstvennom universitete. 5-10.
- Gorbachevich, Kiril Sergeevich et. al. (eds.). 2004-2014. *Bolshoi akademicheskii slovar*. Moscow and Saint Petersburg: Nauka. 1-23.
- Gorbova, Aleksandra. 2016. "Trudnosti perevoda: na khlebnom pole mezhdu propastiu i obryvom". *Pereplet*. URL: <http://vpereplete.org/2016/12/trouble-translation/>. Accessed on: 7 February 2018.
- Grabowski, Yvonne. 1972. "English Loanwords in Contemporary Russian". *Études Slaves et Est-Européennes / Slavic and East-European Studies* 17: 121-129.
- Graham, Sara. 2007. *J. D. Salinger's The Catcher in the Rye*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2009. "Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues". In: Haspelmath, Martin and Tadmor, Uri (ed.), *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. 35-54.
- Hermans, Theo. 1999/2009. *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained*. London and New York: Routledge

- Hunt Steintle, Pamela. 2008. "The Catcher in the Rye as Postwar American Fable". In: Bloom, Harold (ed.), *J.D. Salinger*. New York: Infobase Publishing. 129-144.
- Ianovskaia, Marina. 2016. "Preface". In: Selindzher, Dzherom David, *Lovets nad khlebnyim polem* [translated by Max Nemtsov]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo "E". 4.
- Ibrišević, Zvonimir and Čelić, Željka. 2018. "Nepristoinost v iazyke – lingvisticheski analiz obshchestvenno okrashennykh slov". *Ukrajnistika na Sveučilištu u Zagrebu: 20 godina*. Zagreb: FF press. 218-225.
- Karpyn, D. S. 1986. "Preface". In: Selindzher, Dzherom David, *Nad propastiu vo rzhi* [translated by Rita Rait-Kovaleva]. Lviv: Visha shkola, izdatelstvo pri Lvovskom gosudarstvennom universitete. 4.
- Khatskevich, Iurii G. 2001. *Noveishii slovar inostrannykh slov i vyrazhenii*. Moscow: AIST / Minsk: Harvest.
- Khrunenкова, Anna. 2012. "Inostrannye slova: 'lingvisticheskaia moda' ili neobhodimost?". *Russian Language Journal* 62: 225-237.
- Komarova, Polina Gennadevna. 2012. "Mezhieiazykovaia i vnutriiazykovaia paronimiia". *Vestnik Viatskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* 2(4): 24-27.
- 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. "Osobnosti perevoda imen sobstvennykh na primere romana Dzheroma Selindzhera 'Nad propastiu vo rzhi'". *Apriori* 2: 1-9.
- Lefevere André. 1985/2014. "Why waste our time on rewrites? The Trouble with Interpretation and the Role of Rewriting in an Alternative Paradigm". In: Hermans, Theo (ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature*. London: Croom Helm. 215-243.
- Lefevere, André. 1992a. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lefevere, André. 1992b. "The role of ideology in the shaping of a translation". In Lefevere, André (ed.). *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook*. London and New York: Routledge. 14-18
- Lefevere, André. 1998. "Translation Practice(s) and the Circulation of Cultural Capital. Some Aeneids in English." In: Bassnett, Susan and Lefevere, André (eds.), *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon and Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters. 41-57.
- Marinova, Elena Viacheslavovna. 2012. *Inoiazychnaia leksika sovremennogo russkogo iazyka: uchebnoe posobie*. Moscow: Flinta.



- 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'*. URL: <https://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/178970>. Accessed on: 1 October 2017.
- 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* 24(3): 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 ideologija (na materiale perevoda romana Dzh. D. Selindzhera 'The Catcher in the Rye' v SSSR)". *Vestnik PNIPU* 3: 28-37.
- Poster, William. 1990. "Tomorrow's child". In: Salzberg Joel (ed.), *Critical Essays on Salinger's The Catcher in the Rye*. Boston: G. K. Hall & Co.
- Proshina, Zoya G. and Etkin, Brian P. 2005. "English–Russian Language Contacts". *World Englishes* 24(4): 439–444.
- Pushkin, Alexander Sergejevich. 1833/2013. *Evgenii Onegin*. Moscow: OLMA Media Grupp.
- Rait-Kovaleva, Rita. 1965. "Molodym perevodchikam o svoem perevodcheskom opyte". In: *Nit Ariadny*. URL: <http://editorium.ru/1487/>. Accessed on: 13 December 2020.
- Rebenko, Marina Iupiyivna. 2013. "Subieektivnaia deformatsiia iazykovoi lichnosti Goldena Kolfilda v perevodakh romana Dzh. D. Selindzhera 'Nad propastiu vo rzhi'". *Vestnik VGU* 1: 170-173.
- 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* 17(2). URL: <http://translationjournal.net/journal/64catcher.htm>. Accessed on: 31 January 2018.
- Ryazanova-Clarke, Larissa and Wade, Terence. 1999. *The Russian Language Today*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Salinger, J. D. 1991. *The Catcher in the Rye*. New York and Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

- 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: Izdatelstvo "E".
- Shaposhnikov, Aleksandr Konstantinovich. 2016. *Etimologicheskii slovar sovremennogo russkogo iazyka*. Volumes 1-2. Moscow: Izdatelstvo "Flinta".
- Shelestiuk, Elena Vladimirovna. 2013. "Lingvokulturnyi perenos kak psikholingvisticheskaia osnova perevodcheskoi adaptatsii". *Vestnik Cheliabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* 24(82): 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* 91(4): 731-758.
- Soanes, Catherine and Stevenson, Agnus (eds.) 2003. *Oxford Dictionary of English*. Oxford [etc.]: Oxford University Press.
- Sherry, Samantha. 2015. *Discourses of Regulation and Resistance: Censoring Translation in the Stalin and Khrushchev Era*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Toporov, Victor. 2008a. "Biut chasy, iadrena mat!". *Chastnyi Korrespondent*. URL: [http://www.chaskor.ru/article/byut\\_chasy\\_yadrena\\_mat\\_1121](http://www.chaskor.ru/article/byut_chasy_yadrena_mat_1121). Accessed on: 14 February 2018
- Toporov, Victor. 2008b. "Pokushenie na ubiistvo". *Chastnyi Korrespondent*. URL: [http://www.chaskor.ru/article/pokushenie\\_na\\_ubijstvo\\_1290](http://www.chaskor.ru/article/pokushenie_na_ubijstvo_1290). Accessed on: 14 February 2018.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1998. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Vikislovar*. URL: [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](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 on: 1 February 2018.
- Vlasenko, Svetlana Viktorovna. 2009. "Anglo-russkii kvaziperevod ili totalnyi iazykovi import anglizmov v sovremennyi russkii iazyk". *Mir russkogo slova* 1: 20-29.
- Volodarskaia, Emma Fedorovna. 2002. "Zaimstvovanie kak otrazhenie rusko-angliiskikh kontaktov". *Voprosy iazykoznanii* 4: 96-118.
- Vorontsova, Irina Igorevna and Navolneva, Mariya Aleksandrovna. 2017. "Dva perevoda romana Dzh. D. Selindzhera 'The Catcher in the Rye' v diakhronii: sravnitel'nyi analiz". *Novii filologicheskii vestnik / The New Philological Bulletin* 3(42): 254-264.

- Whitfield, Stephen J. 1997. "Cherished and Cursed: Toward a Social History of *The Catcher in the Rye*". *The New England Quarterly* 70(4): 567-600.
- Young, Jekaterina. 2000. "Dovlatov's Reception of Salinger". *Forum for Modern Language Studies*. 36(4): 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.
- Zemskaja, Elena Andreevna. 2000. *Russkii iazyk kontsa XX stoletia (1985-1995)*. Moscow: Iazyk russskoi kultury.

### **Sažetak**

*U radu se analiziraju dva ruska prijevoda romana J. D. Salingerova The Catcher in the Rye: prvi prijevod, nastao u Sovjetskom Savezu, te ponovni prijevod iz 2000-ih. Prisutnost engleskih posuđenica i izraza koji pripadaju mladenačkom slengu odabrana je kao mikrotekstualna varijabla koja može biti pokazatelj utjecaja konteksta ciljne kulture na izradu prvog i ponovnog prijevoda. Imajući na umu tendencije u posuđivanju iz engleskog jezika u suvremenoj Rusiji, očekuje se da je ukupan broj engleskih posuđenica (anglicizama) znatno veći u novijem prijevodu te da se dva prijevoda razlikuju u broju engleskih posuđenica koje pripadaju mladenačkom slengu. Te se hipoteze ispituju analizom engleskih posuđenica u dvama prijevodima. Nadalje, analiziraju se različiti elementi parateksta prvog i ponovnog prijevoda Salingerova romana. Cilj je ovog dijela analize rasvijetliti dinamiku odnosa između prvog, kanoniziranog prijevoda i ponovnog prijevoda te ponuditi moguće objašnjenje za njihovu jezičnu konfiguraciju kao i za stavove pripadnika ruskog književnog establishmenta prema oba prijevoda. Uvidi dobiveni analizom paratekstova tumače se u svjetlu Lefeverovih koncepata pokroviteljstva (patronage) i poetike (poetics). Analizom stavova političkih i književnih autoriteta u sovjetskom i post-sovjetskom razdoblju prema prvom prijevodu i odabranom ponovnom prijevodu ujedno se stječe dublji uvid u dominantne stavove prema ponovnom prevođenju u sovjetskom i post-sovjetskom razdoblju.*

*Gljučne riječi: posuđenice iz engleskoga, mladenački sleng, analiza parateksta, pokroviteljstvo*