

CULTURO-HISTORICAL ASPECT IN LITERARY TRANSLATION: A CASE STUDY OF “NADSAT”

Marija Sabaliauskiene

Department of Modern Languages and Intercultural Communication
Kaunas University of Technology
Kaunas, Lithuania
marija.sabal@gmail.com

Abstract- The paper adopts a culturo-historical approach on the translation of the cult novel *A Clockwork Orange* (1962) by Anthony Burgess into the Lithuanian language. More precisely, the object of the paper is the “Nadsat” language of the teen protagonist which is a mixture of English and Russian (heavy in slang and borrowings). From culturo-historical viewpoint, the novel written in “Nadsat” during the peak of the Cold War combines two opposing forces, i.e. English and Russian, in the form of language with culture encoded therein. Such fundamental means of expression poses a considerable translation problem for a Lithuanian translator since in regard to English and Russian, the Lithuanian language and culture stand in a completely different position, i.e. that of subordinate one. Having been a part of the Soviet Union, Lithuania experienced many years of imposed Russification which was met by overwhelming rejection at the time and after regaining the independence in 1990. The post-Soviet period in Lithuania was characterised by a great impact of English because it was considered influential and highly regarded by the state and media [20]. As a result, the translation of the “Nadsat” language into Lithuanian is aggravated in terms of the choice of dominant languages due to the culturo-historical implications. Thus, the paper looks at two attempts to translate the novel, namely by Petrukaitis (1993) and Dagys (1999), paying special attention at the macro translation strategy, i.e. the choice of the language combination, which is analysed through the techniques of foreignization and domestication (Venuti). The two translators combine both strategies but to different degrees, which produces a different effect on the final target texts in comparison to the original role of “Nadsat” in the source text.

Keywords— culture, history, Lithuanian, Nadsat, translation problems.

I. INTRODUCTION

Culture and language are inseparable from each other: language is a means to express the mindset of people of a specific culture, and culture in turn is always shaped by history of the people and their surroundings. This unavoidably influences the process of translation because dealing with languages involves entering the cultures represented by them. As a result, the translators must have a great command of languages they work with and at the same time be well familiar with the relevant cultures and their history to be able to successfully evoke the same feelings to the target readership, which sometimes may require completely distinct wording and stylistic measures. In dealing with such translation challenges the practice of counterparts is always a source for improvement and inspiration.

For this reason, one of such culturo-historical translation problems and the focus of this paper is the translation of the “Nadsat” language, specifically the Russian lexis, created by Anthony Burgess in his novel *A Clockwork Orange* (1962) as a distinctive speech of teenage characters, the protagonist Alex, the main narrator, and his three friends. The foundation of “Nadsat” is English, but all the other constructs come from such sources as Russian, German and French languages,

English slang, Cockney Rhyming Slang and invented slang [21]. The Russian lexis is greatly modified since the words are written using Latin alphabet by representing their pronunciation and at the same time adding English affixes. This, creates an illusion of learning a foreign language while reading the novel and makes it a prominent and extraordinary stylistic feature and with several crucial functions. As stated in [14]:

A Clockwork Orange is narrated in a language that is at once destructive and creative and that reflects the violent world in which the protagonist lives. This language exploits grotesque contrasts between sounds and meanings to create an effect that is both comical and unsettling. It also affects the reader's involvement with the narrator and protagonist, whose confiding tones and flamboyant turns of phrase seek to seduce us into his world. [The text] experiments with language, using alliteration and double meanings, and transgressing semantic boundaries in order to shock and amuse.

[14] highlights a number of most prominent features of “Nadsat”: it represents the world where the protagonist lives by picturing it as violent, but unique; it also creates a special bond with the reader allowing him/her to become a part of that world and also Alex's gang; moreover, it serves a double purpose “to shock and amuse” by being “destructive and creative” at the same time. Going beyond this idea, the combination of two languages, i.e. English and Russian, strengthens the overwhelming sense of duality and adds to the significance of “Nadsat” from the culture-historical context as both countries has long stood in an opposition. Hence, “Nadsat” is not a purely a language functioning as a stylistic device, instead it permeates and impacts every aspect of the novel in this way creating an exceptional and unique setting, characters and impressions.

Such unique nature of “Nadsat” is what feeds the never-ending debate about its functions, meaning, both morphological and phonological structure, as well as the challenge of translation. For instance, many scholars evoke the example of “Nadsat” to illustrate the challenges and available measures for dealing with dialect, slang or argot ([2], [3], [5], [25], etc.); similarly, [14] looks at the Italian translation of the novel, [26] debates on two available Russian translations of the novel, [6] expands the research by looking at the Russian translations as well as Polish one.

Therefore, this paper **aims** to examine the translation of the cult novel *A Clockwork Orange* (1962) by Anthony Burgess into the Lithuanian language by adopting a culturo-historical approach that is especially relevant in this case due to the complex relations of the three nations. More precisely, the **focus and the object** of the paper is the main compound of the “Nadsat” language, i.e. the Russianisms and the quality of their translation from macro perspective. To achieve this purpose **the tasks** are concentrated on providing the relevant theoretical background on the interplay among language, culture and

history, specifically addressing the three working languages, and the role of the translator; identify the most vital structural aspects of “Nadsat” as it is in the source text, examine the macro translation strategies invoked in two Lithuanian translations of the source text; and comment on the resulting target texts and their quality as regards culture-historical aspect.

II. MATERIAL AND METHOD

The source text *A Clockwork Orange* by Burgess (1962; hereinafter source text – ST) and two available Lithuanian translations, produced and entitled literally *Prisukamas Apelsinas* by Petrukaitis (1993; hereinafter target text 1 – TT1) and Dagys (1999; hereinafter target text 2 – TT2) serve as the material for this research which focuses on the choice of macro translation strategy, i.e. the combinations of languages chosen by the translators, and the effect this choice has in cultural-historical context.

The descriptive method is used for the discussion of the interplay among language, culture and history as well as the translator’s role therein. Further, the paper provides a more detailed descriptive analysis on how the languages and cultures in question, i.e. English, Russian and Lithuanian, interrelate specifically focusing on historical aspect and the years when *A Clockwork Orange* was written (1962) and the target texts produced (1993 and 1999). The discussion is supported by historical facts, available statistical data, as well as the works of some relevant scholars.

A short glance into the structure of the “Nadsat” language in the source text is also drawn to ease the analysis of the translation of the Russianisms. In turn, they are examined on the grounds of the concepts *foreignization* and *domestication*, coined by Venuti and defined as follows: the former makes the translation sound familiar to the target readership by “providing readers with the experience of recognizing their own culture in the foreign”, whereas the latter is “any translation strategy that resists domestication, fluency and transparency” [24]. As the definitions suggest, the strategies of domestication and foreignization approach translated texts in regard to the load of the foreign elements and their level of familiarity to the target readership implying that the translation should, in fact, sound and read as the original to the target audience.

To illustrate the discussion the examples of foreignisms and their translations are provided, but since the whole novel is written in “Nadsat” and Russian is extensively used in every page, the examples densest in terms of the Russian lexis in them were selected for the sake of economizing. The comparative method is further applied for the analysis of the selected examples in respect of the translation strategies employed by the translators.

III. CULTURO-HISTORICAL ASPECT IN TRANSLATION:

PROBLEMS AND THE TRANSLATOR’S ROLE

To begin with, language and culture (with its history embedded therein) are closely interrelated, which greatly influences the translation of any type and at least a certain amount of culture-awareness is essential for the process of translation. The concept “culture” itself may be defined in different ways, varying depending on the context. For example, [8] indicates that definition of “culture” is very wide and includes many transitional aspects; nevertheless, it is inseparable from language and at the same time from the process of translation. Such interrelation may be explained by the fact that translation constitutes “a process of cultural de-

Furthermore, [10] explains that language is the basis for all social institutions and at the same time it grounds the basic aspects of culture: personal, collective and expressive. This suggests that language is vital for people to express their identities, function in social environment and develop their ideas in the society. Languages and the way they function demonstrate the peculiarities of a specific culture: the mindset of people, their values, beliefs and experiences in general. Translation is a means to transfer and exchange these ideas between the cultures.

Considering the way cultures are reflected in languages and pose problems in translation, the main focus can be switched to *realia* which is defined as “a thing or concept specific to a given cultural/linguistic community /.../” or in a broader sense everything from “items specific to a given cultural/linguistic community (clothes, money, food, beverages, etc.)” to “holidays, historical events, names and addresses as well” [12]. Additionally, *realia* is also referred to as “culture-bound” or “culture-specific terms” [17]; thus, aspects of *realia* may be wide and various, for example proper and geographical names, traditions, customs, idioms or slang, and they all are usually problematic in translation because there are no corresponding lexical items or even concepts in the target language.

In turn, translators are the ones who carry the responsibility of handling such problematic cases in an appropriate way in order to produce a high-quality target text. Thus, several requirements are set for the target text to be considered appropriate. [24] indicates that the translation is accepted as proper “when it reads fluently, when the absence of any linguistic or stylistic peculiarities makes it seem transparent, giving the appearance /.../ that the translation is not in fact a translation, but the ‘original’”. Therefore, translators are expected to provide a target text written as fluently as the original. Accordingly, cultural aspects have to be incorporated in such a manner that they would not seem alien to the reader in the negative sense.

At the first glance, the understanding of the source and target cultures and being able to determine the “location” of a specific reference in these cultures should be sufficient for producing a proper target text, but in fact, the process of translation requires much more than that [18]. The margins between different cultures and languages are not, which impedes translators’ work since they have to consider the cultural differences in respect of time, space and the source and target readership [16]. At the same time, translators have to take various decisions, related to different translation strategies, in order to balance between achieving a fluent and non-alien translation and preserving foreign cultural aspects.

As the cultures are constantly changing, the task of bridging them in translation involves continual cultural reassessment. As [18] explains, not the straightforward meaning of the foreign concepts is relevant, but the degree to which they are equivalent to the concepts existing in the target language. He also suggests that “solutions to many of the translators’ dilemmas are not to be found in dictionaries, but rather in an understanding of the way language is tied to local realities, to literary forms and to changing identities” (1996: 138). Therefore, every cultural translation problem that translators encounter has to be assessed individually, considering its significance in the culture of the source and target

communities, level of familiarity to the target audience and possible solution for its translation.

Moreover, defining the target readership is also an important part of translators' work because the text, either the original or translation, is always aimed at a certain group of people. While deciding on the prospective readers may not pose a great deal of problems, differences among the source and target readers' historical, cultural, and sometimes linguistic knowledge may vary greatly [8]. These differences have to be taken into consideration during the process of translation because, as one of the most well-known scholars, Nida, insists, the essential task of the target text is to give a similar impression to the target audience to the one that the source text had on the original readers [15]. Hence, translators have to think over the features of the target readership, that is, their social status, education, cultural knowledge, political beliefs, experience as well as age, sex, race, etc.

In general, transmitting cultural aspect of the source culture in translation is a rather complicated task which involves many aspects. In order to accomplish it, translators need an exhaustive knowledge of the source and the target cultures which have to be constantly reassessed. Translation also requires identification of the target readership and linguistic competence to produce a fluent target text acceptable to the target readers.

IV. CULTURAL-HISTORICAL CLASH: ENGLISH, RUSSIAN AND LITHUANIAN

The discussion of the English, Russian and Lithuanian languages and cultures is relevant for the purpose of the paper: the novel *A Clockwork Orange* was originally written in a language based on English and Russian and translated into Lithuanian. As a result, the three languages and cultures come into interaction with each other. At the same time, the cultural aspect is striking in both the original and target texts, which requires an overview of the English, Russian and Lithuanian interrelationship in the periods when the novel was written (1962) and translations were made (1993 and 1999).

The cultural clash of English and Russian in the second half of the twentieth century is best characterized by the notion of the Cold War. The Cold War was a conflict between two superpowers of the time, the USA and the USSR; it exhibited itself in the clear division of influence, armament in atomic weapons and clash of ideologies [7]. The USA, being a democratic capitalist country, actively fought the values of communism and socialism maintained by its opponent, the USSR [9]. Therefore, the English-Russian relationship during the concerned period of time may be summarized as "a confrontation between fundamentally different social, economic and political systems" [9]. Hence, the use of Russian and English in *A Clockwork Orange* exhibits a combination of two opposites.

Moreover, the Russian language serves as a tool for expressing the political aspect of the novel. The use of Russian in the creation of "Nadsat" is "due to 'propaganda and subliminal penetration techniques' /.../ Russia being the centre of much anxiety at that time, would be a prime example of suspicion for propaganda techniques, much like Germany of the 1940's" [6]. The use of Russian in the novel serves a double purpose: to show the contrast between the two countries and languages in opposition and highlight the negative attitude towards Russian as a symbol of propaganda and brainwash.

Differently from the English-Russian cultural clash, Lithuania was in a subordinate position to Russia in the second half of the twentieth century. During this period of time, Lithuanians experienced mass terror, repressions in the form of deportation or nationalization, spread of propaganda, etc. [11]. The repressions were also applied on the cultural and linguistic level. At that time the process of Russification and Soviet propaganda were imposed through the compulsory teaching and the usage of Russian in educational, public, administrative and cultural institutions [1]. However, Lithuanians searched for the means of fighting the Soviet system and culture: partisan wars were led, various cultural events were organized and secret Lithuanian schools functioned [11]. In contrast to the interrelationship of the two superpowers, the USA and the USSR, the imposed Russian system and culture of that time was much more influential in Lithuania. Consequently, the impact of Russian evoked an overwhelming rejection of Russification, which also continued after regaining the independence in 1990. On the other hand, the remains of the imposed Russification might be felt till the present-day: many Russian words have entered the Lithuanian language that the State Commission of the Lithuanian Language keeps fighting against by introducing norms, regulations and penalties [19]. This situation is also emphasized in [22] claiming that in some cases Russian borrowings take over the whole category of Lithuanian lexis, which is especially true about swearwords.

As follows, Lithuania did not have many contacts with the English culture during the second half of the twentieth century and especially considering the period when it was a part of the USSR. Due to the confrontation between the two superpowers, the USSR and the USA, as well as the policy of Russification introduced in Lithuania, the English culture was hardly accessible to the Lithuanians. For instance, [23] overviews the system of education in Soviet Lithuania in the 1950s and notes that ideology of communism was present in the curricula of each and every subject at the time. To justify the point he provides endless statistically-based examples. For instance, all textbooks (excluding several on the Lithuanian language) were exclusively written in Russian; in 1957 Russian was the first (and compulsory) foreign language at schools with 493 lessons per academic year, compared to those of other foreign languages, including English (85 lessons per year altogether); at the level of higher education everyone studying in Vilnius University, even the students majoring in the Lithuanian language and literature, had to take courses on history of the Russian literature, history of CCCP nations and the Russian language amounting to 724 hours (18.4% of all subjects), whereas in other specialities the amount of Russian-related subjects comprised as much as 40.8% of all subjects.

However, after Lithuania regained the independence in 1990, the situation began to change slightly. As [20] states, the Lithuanian culture did not remain prestigious for a long time afterwards; the English language and culture was introduced as influential and highly regarded by the state and media, which greatly affected Lithuanian. This tendency is also evidenced by the available statistics of the English and Russian language teaching in the post-soviet Lithuania: in 1992-1993 English was studied by 34.6% of all secondary school pupils having taken up foreign language in contrast to 44.6% of Russian, whereas in 1990-2000 these numbers changed dramatically with 55.3% and 36.1% studying English and Russian respectively [13]. The contrast is even greater on the level of higher education: in 1994-1995 English – 40.0%, Russian –

3.3%; in 1999-2000, English – 45.5%, Russian 1.4 % [20]. These are only few examples illustrating that the post-Soviet period in Lithuania is marked by a great influence of both the English language and culture: such a phenomenon which can also be perceived as an attempt to move away from the imposed Russian culture earlier.

To summarize, the Russian, English and Lithuanian cultures and languages were differently interrelated in the second half of the twentieth century. Russian and English functioned as two superpowers with completely different social, political and economical structures. Due to the Cold War, they were regarded as opposing to each other. In contrast, Russian was imposed as superior to Lithuanian via compulsory process of Russification and various repressions, which were strongly opposed by the Lithuanians. This led to the rejection of the Russian culture and language, which became especially noticeable after the independence of Lithuania when the English culture and language were regarded as prestigious and influential.

V. MERGING ENGLISH AND RUSSIAN IN THE ST

Before analysing macro translation strategies in the two target texts, it is vital to at least slightly glance at the nature of the “Nadsat” language and its structure. Although “Nadsat” is comprised mainly of the English and Russian languages, the grammatical structure can be stated to be purely English, which can be illustrated with any sentence from the novel, for example: “He had books under his arm and a crappy umbrella and was coming round the corner from the Public Biblio, which not many lewdies used those days” [ST]. This sentence, consisting of two main clauses and a non-restrictive relative clause, demonstrates the fixed word order which is one of the main features of the English grammar. The sentence includes a subject “He” in the first position, followed by two verbs “had” and “was coming” and two direct objects “books” and “crappy umbrella”. The non-restrictive relative clause itself is also composed according the same structure: “not many lewdies” being the subject and “used” – the verb.

As follows, individual Russianisms do not appear in their original form, instead they are modified morphologically to fit English grammatical structure. Consider the examples from the ST: “for some shop-crasting [...] four old baboochkas peeting”, “with their maskies on [...] a cold leg of something in one rooker and half of loaf of kleb [...] rookerful of like plum cake” and “[...] that trouble nachinatted that very same day”. These extracts demonstrate the addition of typical English inflections: such as a plural ending *-s* and suffix *-ful* for modifying nouns (*baboochkas* - Rus. бабушка /grandmother, *rookerful* – Rus. рука/hand), the gerund *-ing* for creating nouns and expressing the continuity of the action (shop-crasting - Rus. красть/steal; peeting - Rus. пить/to drink) and the ending *-ed* marks the past tense (*nachinatted* – Rus. начинать/to begin). The given examples have already made clear that changes are also introduced on phonological orthographical level since all Russianisms are spelled in Latin instead of Cyrillic alphabet and agreed to major patterns of English pronunciation (more on the sounds of Nadsat: [27]).

Broadly speaking, the diverse and complicated structure of “Nadsat” is coupled together with its varied functions, shortly mentioned in the introductory part, and its ability to create a special relationship with the readers by teaching them the language and in this way making them increasingly familiar with the world and characters of the novel. So it goes without

VI. TRANSLATION OF “NADSAT” INTO LITHUANIAN: MACRO APPROACH FROM CULTURO-HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Considering the two target texts from the macro approach to translation, a clear difference may be noticed throughout both texts: the TT1 adopts a global translation strategy of using the Lithuanian and English languages, whereas the TT2 employs the combination of the Lithuanian and Russian languages. To illustrate this basically any sentence from the texts could be provided, but the choice was based on economizing, i.e. giving some of the densest sentences in terms of Russianisms (in bold, Table I).

As mentioned, the original combines English and Russian: English constitutes the basis which is added some Russian borrowings and slang, as in the examples 1-3: “viddy” (Rus. видеть – to see), “litsos” (Rus. лицо – face), “rookers” (Rus. рука – hand), “creeching” (Rus. кричать – shout), “chasso” (Rus. часовой – guard), “plenny” (Rus. пленник – prisoner), “krovvy” (Rus. кровь – blood), “rot” (Rus. рот – mouth), “rooker” (Rus. рука – hand) and “bezoomny” (Rus. безумный – crazy). So naturally, the basis for the Lithuanian target texts is the Lithuanian language; however, the languages selected for translation of borrowings and slang are different and for this reason they create a different effect.

In the TT1, the translator uses modified English borrowings and, as in the original, puts a great deal of effort to incorporate them into the Lithuanian grammar. To do this, he makes all the necessary changes: adopts English words to the Lithuanian pronunciation, morphological and syntactic systems by inflecting the words accordingly. At this point it is worthwhile at least shortly mentioning that the Lithuanian language has four tenses for verbs (excluding the gerund and several forms of participles) that also need to be agreed to the grammatical number and person; seven cases, two genders, and grammatical number for nouns and adjectives, and also degrees for the latter, to mention the main. Therefore, in the process of putting English words into Lithuanian sentences, they underwent many changes and became hardly recognizable as English, which can be seen in 1–3 examples: “synome” (see; verb; past tense; 3rd person plural), “feisus” (face; plural noun; accusative case), “hendus” (hand; plural noun; accusative case), “jelinant” (yell; gerund), “ternkiai” (turnkey; plural noun; nominative case), “konviktui” (convict; singular noun; dative case), “maufo” (mouth; singular noun; genitive case), “bladas” (blood; singular noun; nominative case), “fistu” (fist; singular noun; instrumental case) and “susienoinau” (annoy; verb; past tense; 1st person singular; prefix *-su*; reflexive prefix *-si*).

These are only several examples of the morphological and grammatical complexity created by Petrukaitis, which may be summarised as heavy domestication. When several of the mentioned morphological forms are put together, not even mentioning the specific Lithuanian spelling, the resulting borrowings become long, multi-syllabic and absolutely un-English. Since the discussed method of integration is thoroughly applied to all parts of speech, the resulting Anglicisms are also difficult to read and understand, even for a person who actually speaks English well, which creates a similar effect as in the source text: the reader needs to learn the language.

However, moving onto an even greater macro level and framing TT1 in culturo-historical context, the effect of combining Lithuanian and English becomes twofold. TT1 was produced in 1993 when English was gaining rapid popularity, its availability spreading by the increased number of English lessons at schools starting with younger learners, generally English becoming the number one choice among foreign languages to learn, in contrast to Russian which was still a very well-known language among Lithuanians, including potential target readership, but hostile and carrying negative connotations. So from this respect the combination Lithuanian-English is an attempt to move away from Russian by introducing what is considered a fashionable and prestigious, but still a foreign culture. Petrukaitis introduces readers to the lexis which is unfamiliar and foreign to them. From the viewpoint of the target readership, the combination of English and Lithuanian served better to render the impression of cultural opposition which is present in the original due to the

combination of English and Russian. This is because less Lithuanians could speak, understand or were familiar with English than Russian in 1993, similarly as the Russian language was neither widespread nor appreciated among the source text readers.

In other words, this impression of the foreignisation of the TT1, which resembles the clash of cultures similarly to the ST, is balanced by introducing heavy domestication techniques, which results in a modern (from the perspective of target readers at the time) translation, yet crowded with “heavy” linguistic structures and requiring some effort from the reader. Broadly speaking, Petrukaitis’ strategy is very closely linked to the original text: he maintains the culturo-historical clash (although to some degree only) and the magnetic-educational impact on the reader. What he loses (or reduces the effect of) is the expression of violence, brainwash and propaganda that Russian was intended for in the original and has strong connotations in the Lithuanian culture.

TABLE I. EXAMPLES OF FOREIGNISMS IN ST AND TWO TT

ST	TT1	TT2
<p>1) We could viddy each other’s flushed litsos and the shaking of fisty rookers, and there was a lot of creeching and cursing.</p> <p>2) Then I put in my complaint and every chasso said it was probably Your Humble Narrator, brothers, that started it all anyway, me having no mark of a scratch on me but this horrible plenny dipping red red krovvy from the rot where I’d got him with my clawing rooker.</p> <p>3) That made me real bezoomny. (p 65)</p>	<p>1) Mes synome įraudusius vienas kito feisus, grūmojančius į kumščius sugniaužtus hendus, visur girdėjosi jelinant ir keikiantis.</p> <p>2) Kai išsakaiu savo nusiskundimą, visi ternkiai pareiškė, esą Jūsų Nuolankusis Pasakotojas tikriausiai bus užviręs visą tą košę, mat ant manęs nebuvo jokio įdrėskimo, o tam klaikiam konviktui iš maufu lašėjo raudonas bladas, kur užvožiau jam fistu.</p> <p>3) Tada aš nejuokais susienoinau. (p 69)</p>	<p>1) Tada išvydom visą sceną – įkaitusius, įraudusius vieni kitų licy, kratomus kumščius, roty, prasiziojusias rėkti ir keiktis.</p> <p>2) Išsakaiu savo skundą, bet nadziry visi kaip vienas atkirto, kad tai aš, nuolankusis jūsų metraštininikas, matyt, viską ir pradėjau – pats be menkiausio įdrėskimo, o nelaimingasis plenny visas pasruvęs krovy iš rot, kur pataikė mano ruka.</p> <p>3) Tada įsiutau kaip bezumny /.../. (p 96)</p>

In contrast, the translator of the TT2 uses the Russian language for borrowing, similarly to the original text, as in sentences 1–3: “*licy*” (Rus. лицо – face), “*roty*” (Rus. рот – mouth), “*nadziry*” (Rus. надзиратель – guard), “*plenny*” (Rus. пленник – prisoner), “*krovy*” (Rus. кровь – blood), “*rot*”, “*ruka*” (Rus. рука – hand) and “*bezumny*” (Rus. безумный – crazy). The translator also italicizes borrowings and slang and uses only their basic forms, i.e. infinitives and nominative cases, in order, as he himself explains in the preface of the novel, not to disturb the Lithuanian sentence structure, to avoid sounding artificial and raising associations with Soviet criminal slang, and to treat both languages equally [4]. Thus, in comparison to the TT1, the strategy applied by Dagys results in a much more reader-friendlier style because the foreignisms are easily noticeable and quite short.

Judging from the mentioned, Dagys aimed at a foreignised target text because there is very little adaptation of the Russianisms to fit the Lithuanian language system; instead of adopting the lexis, he even strengthens the foreignness by italicising it to distinguish from all the remaining text. The most vivid instance from the 1–3 examples to illustrate this is probably “*susienoinau*” (TT1) and “*bezumny*” [TT2]. The former, as has been mentioned, underwent heavy modification: made from the English *to annoy*, it is a verb in past tense, 1st person singular with two prefixes –*su* and reflexive prefix –*si*. In contrast, even though “*bezumny*” [TT2] expresses the same

idea, it is an adjective in nominative case made from the Russian *безумный* (crazy) thus, having undergone only changes in the choice of alphabet. However, such Dagys’ technique makes the target text easier to understand for the target readers who also do not have to decide themselves which words are foreign as they come in italics, in contrast to the source readership who are provided with a mixture of different slang incorporated into Standard English. Adopting such a method, Dagys greatly reduced one of the primary functions of “Nadsat”: to teach the reader the language in this way forming a special bond.

As from the culturo-historical perspective, the combination of Lithuanian-Russian shows a certain degree of domestication, which, however, is not as substantial as that of both domestication and foreignization techniques in TT1. Even though in the period when TT2 was translated (1999) the Russian language had lost its popularity and prestige among the Lithuanian learners and target readership, the Russian language and culture remained widespread and familiar to most Lithuanians, and even presently many Russianisms still prevail in the Lithuanian language. As a result, the choice of Russian fails to express the clash and opposition of cultures presented in the source text. Due to the closely interrelated history of Russia and Lithuania and also the imposed Russian culture, the Russian language seems familiar to the target reader even if s/he does not speak it. Accordingly, both languages and

cultures are in their own, specific clash, which is nowhere near the one expressed in the original. In fact, as Dagys claims, the aim of the translation was to avoid spotlighting this specific clash of the Russian and Lithuanian languages in order to distance the reader from associations with the Soviet Union and present “Nadsat” only as a stylistic device [4]. Indeed, the foreign elements remain purely a stylistic device with some minor, yet still negative, connotations echoing the common Lithuanian-Russian history. Even though the negative connotations serve well for the expression of violence present in the ST, yet more importantly this method of translation deprives the reader of so many other experiences accessible to the source readership, starting from learning the language and becoming the part of the Alex’s gang to feeling the exceptional unique setting the events take place in.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

To sum up, languages are firmly tied to the cultures they flourish in, and cultures in turn cannot be parted from their history. This interrelation often poses problems for translators who need to navigate between at least two, or sometimes even more languages and cultures to find the most satisfying compromise between the target readership and the intended meaning of the source text.

An especially challenging translation in this respect is the “Nadsat” language in *A Clockwork Orange* by Burgess (1962) composed of many attributes the most prominent one being Russian lexis intermingled with English. The task of its translation becomes even more difficult when the target audience has experienced a tense relationship with the cultures in question as is with Lithuanian, English and Russian. Having been a part of Soviet Union for quite a long time, Lithuania has undergone severe process of imposed Russification which led to perceiving English as a modern and liberal culture to strive for. Thus, Lithuanian being in somewhat subordinate position to both English and Russian, which in turn appear as complete opposites due to their own histories, aggravates the translation of “Nadsat” into Lithuanian. As such a tough egg to crack, *A Clockwork Orange* has already been translated twice into Lithuanian.

The two Lithuanian translations *Prisukamas Apelsinas* by Petrukaitis (1993; TT1) and Dagys (1999; TT2) evidence completely different combinations of languages and therefore distinct effect on the target reader in terms of culturo-historical aspect. TT1 demonstrates heavy foreignization technique by introducing English lexis into the Lithuanian language serving as the base because in 1993 when the translation was produced, English was just beginning to spread widely, swiftly increasing in popularity and bringing its tempting, but not yet well-known culture. Still, another macro strategy applied systematically throughout the TT1 is that of heavy domestication: individual English words are modified accordingly to smoothly disgorge into the Lithuanian grammatical system. This required a great deal of alterations because Lithuanian is an inflectional, whereas English an analytical language. Putting everything together, TT1 succeeded in representing (to some degree) the cultural clash present in the original, creating a unique language of the teenage protagonists that the readers need to encode and learn, similarly as in the source text. However, it failed to represent the violence and propaganda, which Russian was originally intended for.

In contrast, TT2 employed the combination of Lithuanian-Russian, which from the macro perspective may be seen as a

certain level of domestication. Even though in 1999 when the translation was done, Russian was no longer popular among the learners and the target audience, the culture and language has long remained familiar to the Lithuanians (even till the present day) and carries some negative connotations raising associations with Soviet criminal slang. Moreover, similarly to TT1, TT2 also demonstrates a certain level of the opposite technique, i.e. foreignization, since all Russianisms appear in a simple form (infinitives and nominative cases) and to stress that they are somewhat alien in the Lithuanian they are also italicised. To generalise, such a translation decision fails to represent the culturo-historical clash and duality of the setting intended in the source text; it also deprives the reader of the possibility to learn a new language and in this way engage into the plot more actively. On the other hand, this choice functions well for arousing the associations with propaganda and brainwash as well as representing the violent scenes.

All the mentioned put together, both translations make some sacrifice during the process and both of them combine foreignization and domestication techniques. However, at the end of the day, TT1 succeeds in rendering a similar effect on target readership as the original has on its readers by presenting the dual setting through cultural clash as well as creating and teaching a new language. In contrast, TT2 deprives the reader of the mentioned, but instead preserves the aspect of violence and propaganda that TT1 fails to express that well.

REFERENCES

- [1] Anušauskas, A. 2003. “Tautinių-kultūrinių pokyčių prielaidos Rytų Lietuvoje Antrojo pasaulinio karo ir pokario metais”. In *Lietuvos gyventojų genocido ir rezistencijos tyrimo centras*. Available at: <http://www.genocid.lt/Leidyba/13/arvydasa.htm>. Accessed: 12 March 2007.
- [2] Azevedo, M. M. 1998. “Orality in translation: Literary dialect from English into Spanish and Catalan”. In *Symposium on comparative literature, linguistics, and culture*. Vol. 10. Pp. 27-43. Available at: <http://www.raco.cat/index.php/Sintagma/article/viewFile/60478/99046>. Accessed: 20 April 2010.
- [3] Craik, R. 2003. “‘Bog or god’ in *A clockwork orange*”. In *ANQ: A quarterly journal of short articles, notes and reviews*. Vol. 16. Iss. 4. Pp. 51-54.
- [4] Dagys, S. and S. Repečka. 1999. “Pratarmė”. In *Prisukamas apelsinas*. Vilnius: Lietuvos rašytojų sąjungos leidykla. p.p. 5-10.
- [5] Evans, R. O. 1971. “Nadsat: The argot and its implications in Anthony Burgess’ ‘A clockwork orange’”. *Journal of modern literature*. Vol. 1, No. 3. Pp. 406-410. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/3831064?uid=3738480&uid=2&uid=4&sid=21104636643673>. Accessed: 20 April 2010.
- [6] Ginter, A. 2003. “Slang as the third language in the process of translation: *A clockwork orange* in Polish and Russian”. In *Stil*. p. p. 295-306. Available at: www.fil.ug.gda.pl/upload/files/190/sgg16luka_s.pdf. Accessed: 16 April 2010.
- [7] Hobsbawm, E. 2000. *Kraštutinių amžius: Trumpasis XX amžius: 1914-1991*. Vilnius: ALK Mintis.
- [8] James, K. 2002. “Cultural implications for translation”. In *Translation journal*. Vol. 6, No. 4. Available at: <http://accurapid.com/journal/22delight.htm>. Accessed: 20 April 2010.
- [9] Johnson, L. R. 1996. *Central Europe: Enemies, neighbors, friends*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [10] Karamanian, A. P. 2001. “Translation and culture”. In *Translation journal*. Vol. 6. No. 1. Available at: <http://accurapid.com/journal/19culture2.htm>. Accessed: 27 November 2009.

- [11] Kiaupa, Z. 2002. *The history of Lithuania*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
- [12] Klaudy, K. 2010. "Specification and generalization of meaning in translation". In *Meaning in translation*. Ed. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and Thelen. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- [13] Lithuanian Department of Statistics. 2014. Available at: <http://www.stat.gov.lt/en/home>. Accessed: 14 August 2014.
- [14] Maher, B. 2011. *Recreation and style: Translating humorous literature in Italian and English*. Amsterdam. John Benjamins Publishing.
- [15] Nida, E. A. 1964. *Toward a science of translating with special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- [16] Robinson, D. 1997. *Becoming a translator: An accelerated course*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [17] Schaffner, Ch. and U. Wiesemann. 2001. *Annotated texts for translation: English-German: functionalists approaches illustrated*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- [18] Simon, S. 1996. *Gender in translation: Cultural identity and the politics of transmission*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [19] State commission of the Lithuanian language. 2014. Available at: <http://www.vlkk.lt/eng/2>. Accessed: 14 September 2012.
- [20] Šarkanas, G. 2006. "Lietuva ir lietuvybė". In *Kontrapropaganda*. Available at: <http://counter-propaganda.w3.lt/lithua/ltlithua.php>. Accessed: 20 April 2010.
- [21] Taylor, J. 1999. "From Burgess to *A clockwork orange*: A history of Nadsat". Available at:
- [22] Teišerskis, A. 2007. "Išgelbėkime savo kalbą". In *XXI Amžius*. V 28 (1525). Available at: http://www.xxiamzius.lt/numeriai/2007/04/11/zvil_02.html. Accessed 31 March 2011.
- [23] Vaitiekūnas, V. 1960. "Švietimas okupuotoje Lietuvoje". In *Aidai*. January 2011. Pp. 11-21. Available at: http://www.aidai.us/index.php?view=article&catid=203%3a196001&id=2765%3apo&option=com_content&itemid=236. Accessed: 20 August 2014.
- [24] Venuti, L. 1995. *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. London & New York: Routledge
- [25] Vogler, K. 2009. *Nadsat in "A Clockwork Orange": Alienation or Identification?*. Norderstedt: Grin Verlag.
- [26] Windle, K. 1995. "Two Russian translations of *A clockwork orange*, or the homecoming of Nadsat". In *Canadian Slavonic Papers*. Vol 37. No. 1-2. Pp. 163-186.
- [27] Wood II, F. and D. Marlow. 2013. "Phonosymbolic representations in *A clockwork orange*". *Ninth Annual SC Upstate Research Symposium*. Spartanburg. Pp. 170-172.

SOURCES

- [1] Berdžesas, A. 1993. *Prisukamas apelsinas*. Vilnius: Alna litera.
- [2] Burgess, A. 1972. *A clockwork orange*. London: Penguin Books.
- [3] Burgess, A. 1999. *Prisukamas apelsinas*. Vilnius: Lietuvos rašytojų sąjungos leidykla.