Dialectically-marked proper nouns in audiovisual translation: An analysis of the English subtitles to *The Peasants*[1]

ANNA DUDEK

Abstract

The aim of this article is to analyze translation techniques used in the film translation of dialectically-marked proper names. Undoubtedly, the issue of rendering dialectical varieties constitutes one of the greatest challenges in interlingual translation. The applicable translation techniques, however, are frequently in conflict with the rules of reducing audiovisual target text to an indispensable minimum. The research material consists of the English subtitles to *The Peasants* (*Chłopi*, dir. Jan Rybkowski, Telewizja Polska S.A. 1973; English translation by Agata Deka, PolArt Video 2006). This article outlines the main theoretical approaches and translation techniques which can be used in the cases of dialects, proper names, and audiovisual translation. The research part aims at verifying the hypothesis's claim that these translation methods which require implementation of more complex procedures than, for instance, omission (e.g. replacing the source language

---

[1] This paper is based on a fragment of the author's MA thesis entitled "The Untranslatability of Dialects into the Language Used in Films: An Analysis of Translation Techniques Used in the English Subtitles to *The Peasants*", written under the supervision of Dr habil. Marek Kuźniak, Professor at the University of Wrocław.

dialect with a target text variation) are not applicable in the case of audiovisual translation. The conclusion consists of the outline of the main translation tendencies as well as the verification of the aforementioned hypothesis.

Keywords

proper nouns, dialect, audiovisual translation, *The Peasants*, Władysław Stanisław Reymont

Nacechowane dialektycznie nazwy własne
w przekładzie audiowizualnym.
Analiza angielskich podpisów do filmu *The Peasants*

Abstrakt

Celem niniejszego artykułu jest analiza technik tłumaczeniowych wykorzystywanych w filmowym tłumaczeniu nacechowanych dialektycznie nazw własnych. Nie ulega wątpliwości, że przekład dialektów stanowi jedno z największych wyzwań w przekładzie międzyjęzykowym. Niestety, techniki wykorzystywane przy tego typu tłumaczeniu często kolidują z zasadami przekładu audiowizualnego, które mówią o redukcji tekstu wyjściowego do niezbędnego minimum. Za materiał badawczy posłużyły angielskie podpisy do filmu *The Peasants* (*Chłopi*, reż. Jan Rybkowski, Telewizja Polska S.A. 1973; przekład na język angielski autorstwa Agaty Deki, PolArt Video 2006). W artykule przedstawione zostaną główne założenia teoretyczne oraz techniki tłumaczeniowe, które mogą zostać wykorzystane w przekładzie dialektów, nazw własnych i w przekładzie audiowizualnym. Część analityczna stanowi próbę weryfikacji hipotezy mówiącej o tym, że te metody przekładu, które wymagają zastosowania bardziej złożonych procedur niż, na przykład, opuszczenie (takie jak np. zastąpienie dialektu języka wyjściowego dialektem języka docelowego) nie znajdują zastosowania w przypadku przekładu audiowizualnego. W podsumowaniu przedstawiono główne tendencje tłumaczeniowe oraz weryfikację wyżej wymienionej hipotezy.

Słowa kluczowe

nazwy własne, dialekt, przekład audiowizualny, *The Peasants*, Władysław Stanisław Reymont

1. Introduction

In accordance with Berezowski (1997: 9), "People seem to have been aware of language diversity ever since," the earliest surviving dialect-related records can be traced back to the biblical Book of Judges or, in English literature, to William of Malmesbury (1080–1143) and his complaints on the harshness of speech in Yorkshire (Berezowski 1997: 7–9). Nevertheless, the study of dialects developed no earlier than the 19th century, and it examined lexical items which occurred in the scholars' places of residence. Within the last few decades, the constantly growing interest in dialects resulted in the development of several narrow-field studies, e.g. descriptive linguistics and phonetics (Dejna 1974: 16) and, finally, gave rise to dialectography (dealing with lexicographic, phonetic, and grammatical features of a given variety) and dialectology (a "study of dialects as language types distinguishable by a complex of dialectical features"; Szwedek and Koerner 2001: 134). As far as the Polish language is concerned, Dejna believes that the standard variety of Polish is a cluster of its dialectical variations or, more precisely, a "collection of mutually intelligible dialects[2]." Therefore, the term of *dialekty języka polskiego* ("dialects of the Polish language") should be replaced with *dialekty polskie* ("Polish dialects"; Dejna 1974: 26; cf. Chambers and Trudgill 2004 [1998]: 3).

In contrast to the above study of dialects, studies on audiovisual translation (hereafter referred to as "AVT") can be traced back a few decades. Despite the fact that AVT is a relatively new mode in translation studies, one may find numerous studies discussing its peculiar character. Nevertheless, the issue of

---

[2] All translations, if not otherwise stated, are mine: A.D.

dialect translation in AVT remains an uncommon topic in academic papers. In AVT in general, translators most frequently use techniques aiming at shortening and simplifying the TT, such as the methods of omission and adaptation (cf. Tomaszkiewicz 2006: 155-168; more on this issue in section 2.3. of this article). However, to the author's knowledge, no clear-cut set of translation techniques applicable to AV substandard translation has yet been proposed.

Consequently, this article will analyze the translation techniques which may be useful in the process of translating substandard proper names in AVT. The theoretical part is therefore divided into four sections. The first section provides a description of the notion of dialect, listing adequate translation techniques used in literary translation [on the basis of the two prominent Polish works on this matter, which are: *Dialect in Translation* by Leszek Berezowski (1997) and *Iluzja przekładu* by Krzysztof Hejwowski (2015), respectively]. In the second section, the issue of proper names ("PNs") is examined. By analogy to the previous section, this part also aims at outlining the most popular translation techniques used in PN translation. The third section illustrates the phenomenon of AVT and corresponding translation techniques. The fourth section summarizes what has been said so far, juxtaposes the sections on dialects, PNs, and AVT, and tries to evaluate the usefulness of each of these techniques in AVT of the substandard PNs. The third subchapter of the article is the research proper. This section analyzes substandard PNs derived from the subtitled screen adaptation of Władysław Stanisław Reymont's *Chłopi* (*The Peasants*; dir. Jan Rybkowski, Telewizja Polska S.A. 1973; the version distributed on the American market with English subtitles provided by Agata Deka, PolArt Video 2006). Finally, the fourth subchapter summarizes the research outcomes and draws conclusions regarding the applicability of the translation techniques while dealing with AV substandard translation.

2. Theoretical framework[3]

2.1. The concept of dialect and corresponding translation techniques

It seems reasonable to state that it is not an easy task to define the term "dialect." As observed by W. N. Francis:

> Any language spoken by more than a handful of people exhibits this tendency to split into dialects [...]. Actually there is no positive and clear-cut way to establish criteria by which separate dialects can be distinguished from separate languages. It thus appears at the outset that we cannot precisely define our subject matter.
>
> (Francis 1987 [1983]: 1)

Generally referred to as a "language variety" characterized with a tendency of undergoing constant gradual changes (Baker 1992: 15; Dejna 1974: 13-14; Shuy 1971: 5 among others), dialect is defined as a "substandard, low-status, often rustic form of language, generally associated with peasantry [...] or other groups lacking prestige" (Chambers and Trudgill 2004 [1998]: 3, 105). The aforementioned observations imply that non-standard varieties have their currency within local speech communities (Baker 1992: 15; Shuy 1971: 4). One may speculate, then, that every language is an "artifact" used by "human beings to impress their individuality upon their surroundings" (Chambers and Trudgill 2004 [1998]: 102). Dejna (1974: 16) supports this view, stating that distinctive speech contributes to a given ethnic group's unity. Nevertheless, a user of a rustic language variety is frequently considered "provincial, uncultivated, uneducated, and even stupid" (Francis 1987 [1983]: 8-9). This trend was intensified a few decades ago, when one observed a significant educational gap between the working class and an elitist society (Francis 1987 [1983]: 8-9). Finally, Shuy notes: "Dialect

---

[3] The article makes use of the following abbreviations: SL/SC/ST – respectively: source language/culture/text; TL/TC/TT – respectively: target language/culture/text.

is a frequent source of humor; it can also lead to reinforce prejudice. But most people find it interesting and are curious about its origins and distribution" (Shuy 1971: 7).

Despite various views on the subject matter, one fact seems to be indisputable: a dialect variation differs from its standard counterpart in many respects. Many theoreticians point at the distinguishing lexical, grammatical, and phonological features of dialects (Shuy 1971: 4; Chambers and Trudgill 2004 [1998]: 5 among others). As for other views on this matter, Catford defines the issues of "common core" and "markers," the former of which provides a set of aspects unified within all varieties, whereas the latter defines all unique features conditioning a given variation's separateness (Catford 1965: 86). Consequently, all standard varieties are commonly regarded as "unmarked" and thus "can usually be translated in an equivalent unmarked TL dialect" (Catford 1965: 86). It may be concluded, then, that the analyzed obstacles in dialect translation may result from their "markedness". In light of the theory above, the phenomenon of preiotation (observed in several anthroponyms examined in the research part of this paper) may be considered as a Polish dialectical "marker".

Translating substandard varieties may be viewed as an especially challenging task for translators. Pondering over the issue of dialect translation in literature, many theoreticians underscore the possibility of either replacing a ST dialect with a nonstandard TL variation or smoothing ST's "illegible" expressions by neutralizing or omitting them (more possibilities of this kind of opposition are examined later on in this paper). Consequently, one may distinguish a TL geographical equivalent usage, which, in principle, is supposed to correspond to a "dialect related to the same part of the country" (Catford 1965: 87). Although advocated by Lebiedziński, who states that the ST effect can be at least approximated in this manner (Lebiedziński 1981: 91 qtd. in Berezowski 1997: 33), this method is frequently blamed for not taking into account the accompanying linguistic and cultural factors (Wojtasiewicz 1992 [1957]: 90).

Still, in discussing theoretical approaches towards substandard language varieties, one should not forget about the two important works on this issue in Poland, which are, respectively, *Dialect in Translation* by Leszek Berezowski (1997) and *Iluzja przekładu* by Krzysztof Hejwowski (2015). Therefore, the following paragraphs aim at outlining the theories presented by these two scholars, list the translation techniques which, in their respective opinions, are applicable in substandard lexical items translation, and give insight into a critical view provided by the latter towards the assumptions of the former.

Berezowski suggests using one of the following techniques: *neutralization* ("smoothing" the ST linguistic peculiarities by translating them to the TL standard variety); *lexicalization* (containing "some traits of the SL text dialect, although the traces are few" Berezowski 1997: 52); *partial translation* (similar to lexicalization; preserving the third language's lexical items in the TT); *transliteration* (conveying ST phonological units in TL graphological form); *speech defect* ("a procedure foregrounding defects in speakers' phonology as a vehicle of translating the social deixis of the original" Berezowski 1997: 62); *relativization* (characterized by the "reduction of the SL dialect into the TL forms of address and honorifics" Berezowski 1997: 66); *pidginization* (replacing the ST with a TL pidgin variation); *artificial variety* (involving a hypothetical, non-existing TL dialect); *colloquialization* (making use of colloquial TL features) and *rusticalization* (translating ST to a TL regional variety; Berezowski 1997). Berezowski believes that the neutralization procedure is the most radical way, as it "strives to guard the integrity of the text undergoing translation against any distortions at the cost of forgoing its social deixis altogether" (Berezowski 1997: 89-90). The subsequent three techniques, in turn, limit translation of social deictic meaning, whereas the relativization technique aims at conveying social hierarchy. Finally, the four remaining solutions "rely on full nonstandard TL varieties, running thus the risk of replacing the original intertextuality with associations not latent in the SL text" (Berezowski 1997: 89-90).

Hejwowski, in his *Iluzja przekładu* (2015), criticizes Bere-zowski's assumptions. While emphasizing the importance of *Dialect in Translation* for dialect studies in Poland as a "must-read" for all literary translators, Hejwowski suggests supplementing it with additional information and corrections (Hejwowski 2015: 221). For instance, Hejwowski criticizes the use of the term "strategy" in Berezowski's work. In Hejwowski's opinion, a translator typically chooses between several trans-lation techniques which can be used throughout one text. Among other things, this may result from the fact that – very often – the author of a dialectically-marked text is not a speaker of a given substandard variety (Hejwowski 2015: 232-233). Moreover, Hejwowski comments on Berezowski's method of examining "dialect markers" on four language levels (Hejwowski 2015: 225-226) and provides his own classification of translation techniques applicable in the case of translating substandard varieties. These are: *transfer*; *transfer with additional explanations*; *transcription*; *transcription with additional explanations*; *neutralization*; *neutralization with translator's comments* (either given in a text or in a paratext); *functional equivalent*; *stylization* (which includes colloquial; slang; over-standard; rustic; and urban stylizations); *relativization*; and *omission* (Hejwowski 2015: 226-246[4]).

However, it has to be noted that many of the translation techniques listed both by Berezowski and Hejwowski supplement the text with additional comments, substitute a given phrase with a description, *etc.*, in short – make the TT longer. However, the mode of AVT examined in this paper does allow for text extensions. Yet, before this mode is considered, the following part describes the phenomenon of PNs, along with listing the most frequently used translation techniques in this regard.

---

[4] Apart from the above, Hejwowski states that, in Berezowski's work, the functions of applying language varieties in literary texts were analyzed too briefly (Hejwowski 2015: 221). Consequently, he lists his own classification of language functions, which are: mirroring social differences; displaying ethnic belongings; reflecting the speaker's poor knowledge of language; the speaker's characteristics; showing the speaker's belonging to given subculture or professional group; pointing at time distance; and a language joke (Hejwowski also notes that frequently these functions overlap; Hejwowski 2015: 221-225).

2.2. The concept of proper names and corresponding translation techniques

The *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (2010) defines PN as a "word that is the name of a person, a place, an institution, *etc.* and is written with a capital letter." Therefore, a PN is frequently contrasted with a CN, described as "a word […] that refers to an object or a thing but is not the name of a particular person, place or thing" (*Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* 2010). Additionally, Hejwowski notes that a PN is constructed of a given word or group of words, which are used to identify a specific item – either in reality or only as an imaginary object; PNs show signs of repeatability; and they, unlike adjectives for instance, typically do not call for any additional traceability forms (Hejwowski 2006 [2004]: 88).

As observed by Särkkä (2007; Internet source), there are many distinctive features distinguishing PNs from CNs. For instance, PNs are not preceded by a demonstrative pronoun (e.g. "this John just bought a car" is not common, unless several people share this name) nor do they usually accept "restrictive adjectives" or "restrictive relative clauses" (e.g. "old Shakespeare" refers to a particular time in Shakespeare's life and, from the grammatical point of view, the word in question shall be treated like a CN). Moreover, it is generally accepted that PNs are used for the "identification" of people, places, objects *etc.* As stated by Vermes, "The translation of proper names has often been considered as a simple automatic process […] due to the view that proper names are mere *labels* used to identify a person or a thing[5]" (Vermes 2003; Internet source; emphasis mine). Therefore, despite the existence of numerous theoretical frameworks regarding the issue of translating PNs (some of which are examined later in this part), there are scholars who claim that PNs should not be taken into consideration while translating a given text. For instance, Newmark believes that the lexical

---

[5] Newmark (1988) distinguishes between three types of PNs, namely: people's names, object's names, and geographical terms.

items in question should not be translated, unless they have
well-known TL counterparts, e.g. names of monarchs (Newmark
1988: 214), whereas Särkkä notes that the issue of leaving PNs
untranslated shall be regarded as the "basic rule" of interlingual
translation (Särkkä 2007; Internet source). However, Nord ob-
serves that in real life "proper names may be non-descriptive,
but they are obviously not non-informative" (Nord 2003; Inter-
net source). Additionally, Nord implies that the "mono-referen-
tial" character of PNs (as compared to CNs) does not necessarily
exclude their wide functionality (Nord 2003; Internet source).
Similarly, Tymoczko holds that PNs are "dense signifiers" of "ra-
cial, ethnic, national, and religious identity" and thus are "the
most problematic to translate, in part because their […] signifi-
cance is often culturally specific and dependent on cultural par-
adigms" (Tymoczko 1999: 223-224). The view that PNs should
be translated is also supported by Hejwowski who rejects many
prevailing opinions on this group of words, stating that PNs are
meaningful lexical units which are able to carry connotations
with certain phenomena (e.g. the PN of "Kubuś Puchatek" is typ-
ically associated with a popular character known from
A. A. Milne's books; Hejwowski 2006 [2004]: 86). Moreover,
Hejwowski observes that the meaning of a given PN depends on
its mental representation in the speaker's / listener's mind
(Hejwowski 2006 [2004]: 86-87). Hejwowski also observes that
all PNs used to be meaningful lexical units, but they undergo
the process of conventionality (Hejwowski 2006 [2004]: 88).

Regarding the issue in question, a wide range of translation
techniques has been proposed so far. Hervey and Higgins
(2002), for instance, claim that translators can choose between
the renowned options of domesticating (*i.e.* translating the ST
lexical items in a way in which they are better understandable
by the target audience) or foreignizing (*i.e.* leaving the strange-
sounded lexical items as they are presented in the ST thus
showing the target reader that TT was originally constructed in
a foreign speech; cf. Gottlieb 1997: 317, among others) PNs.
Hermans elaborates, stating that PNs can be

copied, i.e. reproduced in the target text exactly as they were in the source text. They can be *transcribed*, i.e. transliterated or adapted on the level of spelling, phonology, *etc*. A formally unrelated name can be *substituted* in the target text for any given name in the source text. And insofar as a name in a source text is enmeshed in the lexicon of that language and acquires 'meaning,' it can be *translated*.

<div align="right">(Hermans 1988: 13; emphasis mine)</div>

Davies (2003) supplements the aforementioned set of procedures with: *addition* (in cases in which translators "decide to keep the original item but supplement the text with whatever information is judged necessary"; Davies 2003: 77); *omission* (in which a translator omits problematic PNs, "so that no trace of it is found in the translation"; Davies 2003: 79); *globalization* ("the process of replacing culture-specific references with the ones which are more neutral or general"; Davies 2003: 83); *localization* (occurring in cases in which the translator "tries to anchor a reference firmly in the culture of the target audience"; Davies 2003: 83-84); *transformation* (involving "alteration or distortion of the original"; Davies 2003: 86); and *creation* (inventing a radically different PN in TT, which frequently makes use of compensation; Davies 2003: 72-89). Finally, Meyer (2008) identifies the techniques of substituting a PN with a *corresponding pronoun* (with reference to the past events) and replacing it with an *explanatory comment*. Hejwowski also contributes to the theory of translating problematic PNs by listing the following six techniques: *reproduction* (*i.e.* leaving PN in its original form, either without additional comments or with a footnote at the bottom of a page or an explanation in a text); a subtle *retouching*, bringing PNs closer to the TL grammatical and lexical rules (by removing diacritical marks from PNs); *transcription* (applicable in the cases in which two different writing systems are used); *translation* (here, Hejwowski distinguishes between replacing a source text PN with a chosen equivalent; replacing a source text PN with an equivalent coined by translator; and replacing a source text PN with a TT lexical item which is not a PN – like, for instance, a superordinate or a description); *replacing*

a source text PN with a non-equivalent target language PN; and *omission* (which may also occasionally affect the context of the PN; Hejwowski 2006 [2004]: 92-93[6]).

However, it should be noted that the procedures in question deal with PNs in general, as those lexical items which are directly ascribed to given phenomena (people, geographical areas, *etc.*), thus referring to a standard language rather than to its substandard varieties. This paper, however, focuses only on specific types of PNs, which are substandard anthroponyms, and geographical areas.[7] These items, connected with rural areas and their long-lasting traditions (which, frequently, significantly contributed to cultural and linguistic legacy of the whole country) may be viewed as even more deeply rooted in the SC than their standard counterparts, and thus more problematic to translate. To make matters worse, this kind of lexical items is more and more frequently used in AVT productions, which directly results from AVT's rapid development and occurrence at a worldwide level. The following section of this paper discusses this mode in detail, presents its main characteristics and, by analogy to the previous subchapters, lists the most popular translation techniques.

2.3. Uniqueness of AVT and corresponding translation techniques

Despite its popularity, AVT has not been scientifically examined until recently. One may note, however, that the vast majority of scholars seem to share the same view. As a mode constrained by a number of specific requirements (e.g. time and space limitations), AVT focuses on the maximal TT reduction while simultaneously aiming at preserving the indispensable ST message

---

[6] What is more, Hejwowski states that it is also possible to mix the techniques listed above, e.g. in the places names which are constructed of more than one word: here, one part may be translated by means of its equivalent, whereas the other part – modified or left without any changes (Hejwowski 2006 [2004]: 93).

[7] Therefore, the term "PN" used in this paper should be considered only in this regard.

(Tomaszkiewicz 2006, Díaz-Cintas and Anderman 2009 among others). The film's semiotic composition consisting of "written and spoken linguistic elements, still and moving pictures, sounds, and music" (Tomaszkiewicz 2006: 102) is also at issue. As Díaz-Cintas and Anderman observe, "Translating only the linguistic component without taking into account the value of the other semiotic dimensions of film […] would certainly be a recipe for disaster" (Díaz-Cintas and Anderman 2009: 9). Díaz-Cintas and Anderman also believe that the problems resulting from film translation can even be strengthened by "the use of unknown dialectical and sociolectal variations" (Díaz-Cintas and Anderman 2009: 4).

While discussing the most popular translation techniques used in AVT, one may make use of the theory presented by Teresa Tomaszkiewicz, who in her work entitled *Przekład audiowizualny* (2006) lists: *omission* (deleting problematic phrases from the text); *direct translation* (literal translation; making use of either calques or borrowings); *explanatory periphrastic substitution / paraphrasing* (adding explanatory information to the problematic phrases); *equivalence* (aiming at replacing the ST item with its TT closer equivalent[8]); and *adaptation* (in accordance with Tomaszkiewicz, constituting an "extreme example" of the equivalence technique, aiming at making TT as much familiar to the target receiver as possible. Here, one may list: *deictic substitution*, which replaces the TT problematic phrase with an item appropriate to the general context, e.g. demonstratives; *allusions*, for instance, historical ones; and *references to the TC-bound phenomena*, which are well-known to the TT receiver; Tomaszkiewicz 2006: 155-168).

Again, the theory described above refers to AVT in general. Still, little is known about the dialect translation in AVT.[9]

---

[8] The notion of equivalence constitutes both a complex and disputable term in translation studies. However, this notion is not the subject of this paper. For more information, see: Jakobson (2000 [1959]); Nida (2000 [1964]); Newmark (1981); Venuti (2000), among others.

[9] Among relevant studies on the subject one may distinguish, for instance, the study on Italian dubbing conducted by Ranzato (2010). Still, to the author's knowledge, this is one of very few studies on this issue so far.

Consequently, as it was previously indicated, the following sub-section summarizes assumptions described in the previous sub-sections, providing evaluation of the main translation strategies and techniques listed so far and assessing their usefulness in AV substandard translation.

2.4. Dialectically-marked PNs in AVT

The subsections above aimed at describing and listing translation techniques applicable to the following three phenomena: dialect; PN; and AVT. However, it may be reasonably stated that none of these three sets of techniques thoroughly covers the topic of this paper: those translation techniques which were listed in the parts dedicated to dialects and PNs are applicable mainly in literary translation. AVT, however, is apparently distinct from literary translation. Consequently, it may be claimed that the majority of translation techniques (used either in the case of dialect or in the PN translations) cannot be applied to the AV mode. What stands in the way are the aforementioned film aesthetics and the juxtaposition of its semiotic systems. Audiovisual TT, due to its supposed succinct yet comprehensive character, does not allow for elaborate and long explanations added to culture-specific lexical items in the forms of, for instance, footnotes.

This section aims at evaluating the validity of translation techniques while dealing with dialectically-marked PNs in AVT. Consequently, the main translation strategies and techniques listed in the previous sections on dialect, PNs, and AVT (*i.e.* in the sections 2.1. "The concept of dialect and corresponding translation techniques;" 2.2. "The concept of proper names and corresponding translation techniques;" and 2.3. "Uniqueness of AVT and corresponding translation techniques") are listed below, with an adequate comment added to each of them: "yes" – for confirming the applicability of a given technique to translate dialectically-marked PNs in AVT; and "no" – for rejecting it as inapplicable in this respect:

1. Dialect – main translation techniques listed in section 2.1.:
    a. Berezowski (1997)
        – *neutralization* – yes; due to the character of AV products, this technique – next to omission, as will be shown below – may be even considered to be the preferred option while translating dialectically-marked PNs in AVT;
        – *lexicalization* – yes / no; in the case of subtitling, any creation of simplistic, phonetically-transcribed items in AVT may be occasionally difficult to read and thus incomprehensible to the TT audience;
        – *partial translation* – yes / no; depending on the complexity of the target product, one may claim that mixing partially translated or neutralized phrases with original ST lexical items in AVT may cause confusion, as the TT receiver may not be able to decipher strange-sounded terms put next to well-known phrases while watching a film;
        – *transliteration* – yes; this technique may be especially useful while translating dialectically-marked lexical items in AVT, as it contributes towards simplifying both written and spoken text;
        – *speech defect* – yes / no; as in the case of lexicalization, certain complex speech defects (*i.e.* consistent deletion of given letters / sounds throughout the text) may be incomprehensible in fast-paced AV products. Based on observation, one may claim that this technique is more frequently applied in dubbing rather than in voice-over or subtitling, as in the last two modes it may seem to be unprofessional;
        – *relativization* – yes; limiting dialect translation to, for instance, honorifics, allows for marking the ST rustic sound without creating any excessive distortive effect in the TT;

- *pidginization* – yes / no; as in the cases of lexicalization / partial translation;
- *artificial variety* – no; it may be stated that introducing a completely new language throughout an audiovisual product would not be effective, as it requires even more time from the TT audience to understand the text than it was in the cases of lexicalization / partial translation / pidginization;
- *colloquialization* – yes; using a colloquial register should not confuse the receivers to an extent which would make it impossible for them to understand the TT;
- *rusticalization* – yes, provided that only those rustic lexical items which are well-known to wider TT audience would be applied (without involving rarely-used structures requiring comments, footnotes *etc.*).

b. Hejwowski (2015)
- *transfer* – yes, definitely applicable to AVT;
- *transfer with additional explanations* – no; any additional explanations added to the AV text would most probably result in lowering the level of TT's understandability;
- *transcription* – yes; as in the case of Berezowski's transliteration;
- *transcription with additional explanations* – no; as in the case of Hejwowski's transfer with additional explanations;
- *neutralization* – yes; as in the case of Berezowski's neutralization;
- *neutralization with translator's comments* – no; as in the case of Hejwowski's transfer / transcription with additional explanations;
- *functional equivalent* – yes, provided that the condition of "smooth AVT comprehension" is fulfilled;
- *stylization* – yes, as in the case of Berezowski's rusticalization;

  - *relativization* – yes; as in the case of Berezowski's relativization;
  - *omission* – yes; as it was already noted above, this technique is definitely useful while dealing with problematic, dialectically-marked lexical structures. Nonetheless, the rustic sound of the ST would be completely lost.

2. PNs – main translation strategies / techniques listed in section 2.2.:

   a. Hervey and Higgins (2002)
   - *domestication* – yes; this strategy would definitely improve the TT comprehension, although depriving it of the original rustic sound to a greater or lesser extent;
   - *foreignization* – yes / no. Usefulness of this strategy most frequently depends on the degree of foreignness in the TT, thus it should be considered on a case-by-case basis.

   b. Hermans (1988)
   - *copy* – yes; this technique allows for maintaining the original, dialectically-marked lexical items in a text;
   - *transcription* – yes; as in the case of Hejwowski's transcription;
   - *substitution* – yes; as in the case of Berezowski's rusticalization;
   - *translation* – yes, if understood as replacing the SL dialectically-marked lexical items with their closest TL equivalents.

   c. Davies (2003)
   - *addition* – no; as in the case of Hejwowski's transfer with additional explanations;
   - *omission* – yes; as in the case of Hejwowski's omission;
   - *globalization* – yes; as in the case of Berezowski's neutralization;
   - *localization* – yes / no; this technique is successful,

provided that it does not involve any excessively complex structures;

- *transformation* – yes; as in the case of Berezowski's rusticalization;
- *creation* – no, as – in Davies' opinion – it frequently calls for compensation.

d. Meyer (2008)
- *substitution with a corresponding pronoun* – yes; as it was in the case of Berezowski's rusticalization;
- *replacement with an explanatory comment* – no; as in the case of Hejwowski's transfer with additional explanations.

e. Hejwowski (2006) [2004]
- *reproduction* – yes / no, depending on its form:
    o reproduction without additional comments – yes;
    o reproduction with a footnote at the bottom of a page or explanation in a text – no; as in the case of Hejwowski's transfer with additional explanations.
- *retouching* – yes; especially useful in the case of subtitling;
- *transcription* – yes; as above;
- *translation* – yes / no, depending on its form:
    o replacing a source text PN with a chosen equivalent – yes, as in the case of Hejwowski's functional equivalent;
    o replacing a source text PN with an equivalent coined by translator – no; this technique would most probably result in the receiver's confusion;
    o replacing a source text PN with a TT lexical item which is not a PN – yes, provided that PN would be replaced with an easily under-standable lexical item, e.g. a pronoun;

- *replacing a source text PN with a non-equivalent target language PN* – yes; as in the case of Hejwowski's functional equivalent;
- *omission* – yes; as above.

3. AVT – main translation techniques listed in section 2.3.:

   a. Tomaszkiewicz (2006)

   - *omission* – yes; as in the case of Hejwowski's omission;
   - *direct translation* – yes, as in the case of Hermans' copy;
   - *explanatory periphrastic substitution / paraphrasing* – no; as in the case of Hejwowski's transfer with additional explanations;
   - *equivalence* – yes; as in the case of Hejwowski's functional equivalent;
   - *adaptation* – yes / no, depending on its form:
     - o deictic substitution – yes, as in the case of Hejwowski's replacement of a source text PN with a TT lexical item which is not a PN;
     - o allusions – yes / no, provided that only widely-known allusions are used;
     - o references to the TC-bound phenomena – yes / no, the same as in the case of allusions.

Initial studies showed that the majority of translation strategies and techniques described in sections 2.1., 2.2., and 2.3. may find their application in the case of dialectically-marked PNs in AVT. In general, they are translation strategies / techniques which do not call for complex translator's actions and simultaneously simplify the TT (e.g. omission and neutralization). However, a couple of the techniques listed above are only applicable if translators use them with respect to the AVT requirements, *i.e.* they would not use complex TT structures which would not be comprehensible in the case of fast-paced dialogues or subtitles. Finally, the analysis showed that translation techniques which result in applying additional comments to the TT most probably cannot be used in the case of AVT.

The aim of the following study is to examine the distribution of the aforementioned translation techniques in practice. Consequently, the research part is divided into two sections. The first section, analyzing anthroponyms used throughout the text, examines various phenomena related to their translation. The second section deals with the issue of geographical terms, verifying the translation techniques used in this regard. The article makes use of the lexical items derived from the English subtitles of the movie based on *Chłopi* by Władysław Stanisław Reymont (*The Peasants*).

3. Research[10]

This part of the paper analyzes chosen translation techniques, verifying their usefulness while translating substandard lexical items in AVT. In total, the research material consists of 19 lexical items divided into two main subsections. The first subsection deals with anthroponyms and consists of 17 examples gathered into six groups. The second subsection analyzes geographical terms, which are listed in one set of two examples. The outcomes of the research are presented in the fourth section of this paper.

3.1. Anthroponyms

The first group of analyzed research material consists of two examples, listed in (1) below:

(1) a. *Jagna*: Skoro **Maciej** mi je dali [korale: A.D.], to są moje!
       Jagna: **Maciej** gave them [the beads: A.D.] to me. They are mine.
    b. *Priest*: A kogoż to chowacie dzisiaj, kogo? **Macieja Borynę**, powiadacie.

---

[10] Each example is composed of two passages: the first taken from the original Polish dialogue list, and the second rewritten from the English subtitled version. The speakers' names are written in italics, whereas the examined lexical items are bolded.

> *Priest*: Whom are you burying today? **Maciej Boryna**, you'll say.

At this point, one may make use of the theoretical assumptions outlined by Hejwowski who stated that PNs are meaningful in the sense that they are attributed to a specific cognitive background by the speaker/receiver (Hejwowski 2006 [2004]: 86). Indisputably, the novel *Chłopi* is a classic of Polish literature and thus is well-known by Polish people – and not only by those who read it. Consequently, everything connected with this piece of literature – plot, character names *etc.* – is highly evocative of village surroundings and rustic language variations. Consequently, the name "Maciej," although frequently given to people living in towns, is frequently associated with rural areas due to the popularity of the novel in question. A similar effect may be observed in the case of the surname "Boryna," which evokes direct connotations with *Chłopi*. As it can be seen from the examples above, the protagonist's name both in (1a) and (1b) did not undergo any changes at all. This effect results from the techniques applied here, which may be classified as, for instance, Herman's copy and Hejwowski's transfer (noticeably, these techniques found their application in the case analyzed in this paper, although neither of them were specified by their authors as applicable strictly to this subject matter). It may be stated that the TT contains some element of the original sound, as the names in question were not changed in translation. Nonetheless, the TT receiver is definitely deprived of the aforementioned cognitive background possessed by the audience in Poland and, consequently, carries only a small part of cultural connotations in the TC.

If the translator's aim is to familiarize the target audience with the translated text, then the aforementioned "foreignness" effect can also be mitigated by replacing the PN with an adequate pronoun (as suggested by Meyer and Tomaszkiewicz) or simply by the technique of omission (Hejwowski, Davies, and Tomaszkiewicz) and neutralization (Berezowski and Hejwowski):

(2) a. *Mateusz*: **Jagna** musi uciekać!
       Mateusz: **She** must run!
    b. *Józka*: **Jambroży** puszczał krew, i nic!
       Józka: **They** bled her, but no good.
    c. *Mateusz*: A tak to mnie witasz, **Jaguś**?
       Mateusz: Is that how you greet me?
    d. *Maciej*: Dla **Jędrycha**?
       Maciej: For **your brother**?

The final result may also agree with the assumptions of Bere-
zowski's and Hejwowski's neutralization techniques, as well as
with Hejwowski's method of PN translation, assuming replace-
ment of a source text PN with an item which cannot be classified
as a PN. Again, the findings of the initial research led in 2.4. are
confirmed in practice. It cannot be denied that the issue of cul-
tural barrier was efficiently overcome. One may argue, however,
whether "efficiently" equates to "successfully." The method of
"ironing out" PNs is referred to by many theoreticians as taking
the easiest way out of the problem. On the one hand, the re-
duced TT meets the aforementioned AVT technical require-
ments. On the other hand, however, the target audience is de-
prived of any connotations with the SC. One thing is for certain:
these procedures, by eliminating problematic lexical items, im-
prove the general understanding of the TT, especially while
reading fast-paced subtitles, when the audience needs to split
its attention between the text and the picture.

   Nevertheless, an additional comment should be made on (2d).
Despite using those techniques which were initially rejected as
inappropriate in the case of dialectically-marked PNs in AVT (*i.e.*
Meyer's explanatory comment usage or Tomaszkiewicz's explan-
atory periphrastic substitution), a similar effect as in (2a) – (2c)
was achieved: the expression of "your brother," as deprived of
any culture-bound marks, can be easily comprehended by the
target audience. This can be explained by the fact that the "ex-
tension" of the ST item was not too excessive: in fact, the final
effect reminds one of the technique of neutralization or
Hejwowski's translation. Consequently, this kind of concise

explanation can be successfully used in subtitling, as it would not harm its aesthetical character.

In the following set of examples, the ST lexical items were deprived of Polish diacritical marks:

(3) a. *Hanka*: **Józia**!
   Hanka: **Jozia.**
   b. Antek: **Józka**! Witek! No, chodźta tu!
   Antek: **Jozka**, Witek, come here.

In these cases, the techniques of Berezowski's transliteration, Hermans' transcription, and Hejwowski's retouching were used. Again, as it was in the case of (1), one needs to emphasize that – although the name of "Józefa" used in its diminutive forms in both (3a) and (3b), is widely recognized also among people living in towns, it is frequently attributable to the rural areas. Consequently, the transcribed lexical items still do not allow the target receiver to experience the whole cognitive background possessed by the Polish audience. Additionally, it is valid to speculate if the translator's efforts are not in vain with this respect, as the analyzed PN – although converted to the basic Latin alphabet thus domesticated in spelling – still causes the "strangeness effect." Finally, it should also be noted that the translator's inconsistency in translating this name may result in the target audience's confusion.

The following set of examples expounds the translation of an anthroponym, which is frequently used throughout the text, "Piotr:"

(4) a. *Hanka*: **Pietrek**, a chodźże i ty do ojca!
   Hanka: Come to daddy, **Piotrek**.
   b. *Hanka*: **Pietruś**, powiedz: "tata"!
   Hanka: **Piotrek**, say: "daddy."
   c. *Hanka*: A bo to mało razy przykazywałam **Piotrkowi**?
   Hanka: I kept telling **Piotr** to put it [the cart: A.D.] into the shed.

Both *Pietrek* and *Pietruś*, "dialectically-affected" diminutive variations of the PN in question, were neutralized to a standard *Piotrek*. This form, in turn, contrasts with the translator's choices presented in (3a) and (3b). The translator's strategy may be substantiated by the fact that the examples in (4) refer to two persons of different ages. Consequently, (4a) and (4b) refer to Hanka and Antek's son. The example of (4c), illustrating the standard form of this name put in for the sake of comparison in this set, refers to the couple's farm-hand. This example was also neutralized – in this case, however, the translator decided to use the basic form of the analyzed name instead of one its diminutive forms. The conclusion that the translator used diminutive forms for children and the basic form for the adults is not of much help, as the TT receiver may fail to associate the various TT forms with the same ST name.

Finally, as it was already indicated, this article discusses various instances of preiotation. This phenomenon, adding a non-syllabic [j] at the beginning of the word (e.g. ᴶAgata), is currently considered to be a dialectically-marked linguistic relic (Karaś, Internet source), bringing connotations of 19th century rural areas. The following sets of examples examine the corresponding instances of PNs:

(5) a. *Hanka*: **Jagna**! Wy tak ze mną nie igrajcie!
      Hanka: **Yagna**, stop playing pranks with me.
   b. *Jan*: Jakbyście mnie, **Jaguś**, nie poznali!
      Jan: Don't you recognize me, **Yagna**[11]?

In reference to the theory outlined above, the translator had a choice between several translation techniques, e.g. Berezowski's transliteration or Hejwowski's retouching. An attempt

---

[11] Apart from showing strong rural linguistic traits, this female protagonist's name seems to raise controversies among theoreticians. In their studies, a few scholars believe that "Jagna" served primarily as a diminutive form of "Agnieszka", "Agata" and "Jadwiga", turning into a separate name later on (cf. Malec 1995). Noticeably, the time of events presented in *The Peasants* is restricted to the unspecified end of the 19th century. Therefore, it may be stated that the protagonist's name was intended to be a diminutive form.

at adjusting the ST lexical items to the TL's phonetic and grammatical rules may be most useful in this situation. Consequently, in examples (5a) and (5b), Deka transliterated the initial "J" to "Y." However, taking the other preiotated PNs into account, one may doubt whether the translator's choice of technique was unified in any way:

(6) a. *Michał*: Niech **Jankiel** powie.
     Michał: Ask **Yankiel**.
  b. *Villager:* **Jambroży**, zamknijcie wrota, żeby to nikt nie wchodził.
     Villager: **Jambroz**, shut the gate to keep them away.
  c. *Jagustynka*: **Jagata**!
     Jagustynka: **Agata**!
  d. *Kuba*: Albo **Jagustynki** zawołaj, może co poradzą.
     Kuba: Or call **Agustynka**. She might help.

Unfortunately, the translator's choices with respect to the phenomenon of preiotation leave much to be desired. Jankiel, a diminutive form of "Jakow;" Jambroży, the iotated version of "Ambroży;" Jagata, derived from "Agata;" and Jagustynka, stemming from "Augusta" or "Agustyna" – the iotated anthroponyms listed in (6) were translated by means of various techniques, which most probably results in the TT receiver's confusion. Although the first example stands in line with (5a) and (5b), the TT name shown in (6b) was transliterated in both inconsistent and erroneous ways. Moreover, although the initial "Y" would be most probably pronounced as /j/ by an English native speaker, leaving the preiotated "J" in subtitled version brings risk of pronouncing the PN with /dʒ/, whereas leaving "A" – with, for instance, /ə/. Last but not least, the translator's aim in the cases of (6c) and (6d) was most probably to neutralize the analyzed lexical items. Nevertheless, these PNs were not thoroughly domesticated, as they still evoke strangeness in the TT reception.

3.2. Geographical terms

The last set of examples gives an insight into the case of geographical names:

(7) a. *Maciej*: Ludzie z **Modlicy**! Ludzie z **Rzepek**! I skądta jeszcze jesteśta!
   Maciej: Villagers from **Modlica**! From **Rzepki**! And wherever you come from!
   b. *Priest* [funeral speech: A.D.]: A któż ci to? Borynam z **Lipiec**!
   Priest: Who is there? Boryna from **the Lipce Village**.

Once again, these PNs used among SL speakers most frequently bring connotations with rural areas. "Modlica" and "Rzepki" illustrated in (7a), although copied to the TT, seem to be thoroughly understandable due to the context and synchronized film picture. Still, the term "Lipce" from (7b) was supplemented with an additional comment. As it was in the case of (2d), the number of signs added to the original item allowed for putting it to the subtitled line, thus leaving the TT audience little chances of misunderstanding.

4. Conclusion

In total, there were 19 PNs given in the form of seven sets of examples. The study showed that three passages were foreignized, five were domesticated, and eleven could not be unequivocally classified into one of the aforementioned strategies. This effect may be ascribed to the translator's specific choice of domesticated activities, which – either as a consequence of her inconsistency or excessive knowledge – resulted in foreignizing rather than domesticating the TT. When it comes to the translation techniques applied, one may list: transcription/trans-literation/retouching (eight instances); neutralization (six instances); copy/transfer (three instances); and additional comment (two instances).

Despite the fact that – as it might have been concluded from the statistical data above – the transcription/transliteration/retouching techniques occur most frequently in the text, it has to be emphasized that – even when involving changes in the ST's form, for instance, by removing diacritical marks from the lexical units – the transliterated TT product remained a "foreign culture bearer." One may conclude, then, that taking the "easy way out," *i.e.* copying PNs in their original forms, would certainly be equally effective, as it would allow for preserving the ST culture-specific background in the language as well. Fortunately, the translator's inconsistency and doubts regarding the choice of an appropriate strategy while translating a given linguistic phenomenon (e.g. preiotation) is "rescued" by the aforementioned audiovisual "semiotic complex" (more precisely, by the actors' dialogues dispelling all doubts concerning the pronunciation).

To sum up, the conducted study most probably confirmed the hypothesis that dialectically-marked items are reduced in AVT. Berezowski's solutions of reconstructing the whole ST by means of, for instance, pidgin or rustic TT variations, as well as Hejwowski's technique of stylization were not applied in any of the instances, appearing to be too elaborate and inappropriate to the analyzed mode. One may reasonably state, then, that the "over-sophisticated" translation techniques aiming at converting the ST to completely different TT rustic variations may do more harm than good in AVT. On the other hand, the techniques used in AVT and listed by Tomaszkiewicz (omission, deictic substitution, and adaptation) appear to be more applicable here. Last but not least, a comment on the assumptions put forth in the initial study in 2.4. should be made. As it was shown above, many of the translation techniques – although not classified by their authors as applicable in the case of dialectically-marked PNs – were successfully used in this film's translation. On the contrary, however, the research showed that those techniques which supplement the TT with additional comments and explanations (e.g. Tomaszkiewicz's explanatory periphrastic substitution) and were initially rejected as inappropriate to translate

dialectically-marked PNs, found their application in *The Peas-ants* [however, only if the quantity of added letters / words would not harm the product's perception; compare (2d) and (7b)].

Finally, it can be observed that – despite the translator's actions – the original linguistic sound of *Chłopi* and the 19th century Polish village was lost in the TT. Fortunately, AVT allowed for this loss to be compensated via its other semiotic dimensions, *i.e.* by means of picture and sound. Consequently, it may be claimed that AVT does not require the application of sophisticated, literary translation-like translation techniques, as its other semiotic dimensions successfully fill in the "gaps" created by means of using simplifying translation devices. Finally, to quote Johann Wolfgang Goethe, whose age-old words fit surprisingly well with AVT mode: "If you want to influence the masses, a simple translation is always best" (Goethe qtd. in Lefevere 1992: 5). It seems reasonable to conclude that the TT audience has not changed much since Goethe's times and the AV requirements of smooth TT comprehension seem to support this view.

References

Baker, Mona (1992). *In Other Words*. London: Routledge.

Berezowski, Leszek (1997). *Dialect in Translation.* Wrocław: Wydawnic-two Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Catford, John C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chambers, Jack K., Peter Trudgill (2004) [1998]. *Dialectology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, Eirlys E. (2003). "A Goblin or a Dirty Nose?" In: *The Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication* 9/1: 65-100.

Dejna, Karol (1974). *Dialekty polskie*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Díaz-Cintas, Jorge, Gunilla Anderman (eds.) (2009). *Audiovisual Translation: Language Transfer on Screen*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dudek, Anna (2015). *The Untranslatability of Dialects into the Language Used in Films: An Analysis of Translation Techniques Used in the English Subtitles to* The Peasants [Nieprzekładalność dialektów na język filmowy: analiza technik tłumaczeniowych zastosowanych w angielskich podpisach do filmu *The Peasants*]. Unpublished MA thesis. Wrocław: University of Wrocław.

Dudek, Anna (2013). *Domestication and Foreignisation in the Polish Translations of the Movies* Meet the Parents*,* Meet the Fockers *and* Little Fockers [Adaptacja i egzotyzacja w polskich przekładach filmów *Meet the Parents*, *Meet the Fockers* i *Little Fockers*]. Unpublished BA thesis. Legnica: The Witelon University of Applied Sciences in Legnica.

Fernandes, Lincoln, (2006). "Translation of names in children's fantasy literature: Bringing the young reader into play". Available at <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237246131_ Translation_of_Names_in_Children%27s_Fantasy_Literature_Bringing_the _Young_ Reader_into_Play_i>. Accessed 6.11.2017.

Fornalczyk, Anna (2007). "Anthroponym translation in children's literature – Early 20th and 21st centuries". Available at <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.518.9390&rep= rep 1 & type=pdf >. Accessed 6.11.2017.

Francis, Winthrop Nelson (1987) [1983]. *Dialectology. An Introduction.* New York: Longman.

Gottlieb, Henrik (1997). *Subtitles, Translation and Idioms.* Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen.

Hejwowski, Krzysztof (2015). *Iluzja przekładu.* Katowice: Śląsk Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Stowarzyszenie Inicjatyw Wydawniczych.

Hejwowski, Krzysztof (2006) [2004]. *Kognitywno-komunikacyjna teoria przekładu.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Hermans, Theo (1988). "On translating proper names, with reference to De Witte and Max Havelaar." In: M. J. Wintle (ed.) *Modern Dutch Studies: Essays in Honour of Professor Peter King on the Occasion of his Retirement.* London/Atlantic Highlands: The Athlone Press.

Hervey, Sándor, Ian Higgins (2002). *Thinking French Translation, A Course in Translation Method: French to English.* Second edition. London: Routledge.

Hornby, Albert Sydney, Joanna Turnbull, Diana Lea, Dilys Parkinson, Patrick Phillips (2010). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jakobson, Roman (2000) [1959]. "On linguistic aspects of translation". In: Lawrence Venuti (ed.) *The Translator Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge, 113-118.

Karaś, Halina, "Prejotacja". Available at <http://www.dialektologia. uw.edu.pl/index.php?l1=leksykon &lid=656>. Accessed 6.11.2017.

Lebiedziński, Henryk (1981). *Elementy przekładoznawstwa ogólnego.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

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

Malec, Maria (ed.) (1995). *Słownik etymologiczno-motywacyjny staropolskich nazw osobowych.* Kraków: Zakład Onomastyki Polskiej IJP PAN.

Meyer, Bernd (2008). "Interpreting proper names: Different interventions in simultaneous and consecutive interpreting?" Available at <http://www.trans-kom.eu/bd01nr01/trans-kom_01_01_08_Meyer_Interpreting_Proper_Names.20080707.pdf. Accessed 6.11.2017.

Newmark, Peter (1988). *A Textbook of Translation.* London: Prentice Hall.

Newmark, Peter (1981). *Approaches to Translation.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Nida, Eugene (2000) [1964]. "Principles of correspondence". In: Lawrence Venuti (ed.) *The Translator Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge, 126-140.

Nord, Christiane (2003). "Proper names in translations for children: Alice in wonderland as a case in point". Available at <https://www.erudit.org/fr/revues/meta/2003-v48-n1-2-meta550/006966ar/>. Accessed 6.11.2017.

Ranzato, Irene (2010). "Localising Cockney: Translating dialect into Italian." In: Jorge Díaz-Cintas, Anna Matamala, Josélia Neves (eds.) *New Insights into Audiovisual Translation and Media Accessibility.* Amsterdam: Media for All 2, 111-121.

Särkkä, Heikki (2007). "Translation of proper names in non-fiction texts". Available at <http://translationjournal.net/journal/39proper.htm>. Accessed 6.11.2017.

Shuy, Roger W. (1971). "Dialects: What they are". In: Joseph Fletcher Littell (ed.). *Dialects and Level of Language.* Evanston: McDougal, Littell and Company.

Szwedek, Aleksander, Ernst F. K. Koerner (1973). *Towards a History of Linguistics in Poland: From the Early Beginnings to the end of the 20th century.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

The Peasants [*Chłopi*]. Dir. Jan Rybkowski. With Emilia Krakowska, Władysław Hańcza and Ignacy Gogolewski. Translated by Agata Deka. PolArt Video, 2006 [Telewizja Polska S.A., 1973].

Tomaszkiewicz, Teresa (2006). *Przekład audiowizualny*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Tymoczko, Maria (1999). *Translation in a Postcolonial Context*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Venuti, Lawrence (2000). "Translation, community, utopia". In: Laurence Venuti (ed.). *The Translator Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge, 468-488.

Venuti, Lawrence (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge.

Vermes, Albert P. (2003). "Proper names in translation: an explanatory attempt". Available at <https://akademiai.com/doi/abs/10.1556/Acr.4.2003.1.5>. Accessed 6.11.2017.

Vinay, Jean-Paul, Jean Darbelnet (1995). *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*. Translated by J. C. Sager, M. J. Hamel. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Wojtasiewicz, Olgierd (1992) [1957]. *Wstęp do teorii tłumaczenia*. Warszawa: Zakład Im. Ossolińskich – Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.

Anna Dudek
ORCID iD: 0000-0003-1160-8954
Institute of English Studies
University of Wrocław
ul. Kuźnicza 22
50-138 Wrocław
Poland
anna.dudek.uwr@gmail.com