

The Forgotten Speech Tag: An In-depth Look into the Translation of Speech Tags into Lithuanian in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*

Gabrielė Jakaitytė
Vilnius University
gabriele.jakaityte@knf.stud.vu.lt

Loreta Kamičaitytė
Vilnius University
loreta.kamicaityte@knf.vu.lt

Recibido: 26.06. 2023
Revisado: 24.10. 2023
Aceptado: 25. 10. 2023

Abstract: This paper analyses and compares the three currently available Lithuanian translations of George Orwell's novel *Animal Farm* (1945) by Arvydas Sabonis (1991), Edita Mažonienė (2021) and Jovita Liutkutė (2022) with special attention given to the frequently overlooked translation of speech tags. It aims to reveal the peculiarities as well as assess the quality of the translations of the collected speech tags. This is achieved by applying quantitative and qualitative analysis methods, i.e. by systematising the relevant elements of the text and analysing them according to the chosen classification of translation shifts as well as comparing the collected data of each individual translation. One of the most notable aspects of the translations, as observed during the analysis, is a significant variety in the translations of pronouns and verbs, occurring due to the application of the translation shifts of specification and implicitation, which function on a semantic level. These aspects reflect the linguistic preferences of translators when translating into synthetic languages and highlight the richness of the Lithuanian language.

Key words: translation shifts, speech tags, *Animal Farm*

La etiqueta discursiva olvidada: Una mirada en profundidad a la traducción de las etiquetas discursivas al lituano en *Rebelión en la granja* de George Orwell

Resumen: Este artículo analiza y compara tres traducciones lituanas actualmente disponibles de la novela de George Orwell *Rebelión en la granja* (1945) realizadas por Arvydas Sabonis (1991), Edita Mažonienė (2021) y Jovita Liutkute (2022), prestando especial atención a las etiquetas en el lenguaje que a menudo se pasan por alto en la traducción. Su objetivo es revelar las peculiaridades y evaluar la calidad de las traducciones de las etiquetas coloquiales recogidas. Para ello se aplican métodos de análisis cuantitativos y cualitativos, es decir, se sistematizan los

elementos relevantes del texto y se analizan según la clasificación de métodos de traducción elegida, y se comparan los datos recogidos para cada traducción concreta. Uno de los aspectos más notables de las traducciones observadas en el análisis es la importante diversidad en la traducción de pronombres y verbos derivada de la aplicación de tales métodos de traducción, como la especificación y la implicación, que operan a nivel semántico. Estos aspectos reflejan las preferencias lingüísticas de los traductores a la hora de traducir a lenguas sintéticas y ponen de relieve la riqueza de la lengua lituana.

Palabras clave: cambios de traducción, etiquetas coloquiales, *Rebelión en la granja*

Sumario: 1. Introduction. 2. Dialogue and speech tags. 3. Translation shifts as a topic of research. 4. Analysis of the collected data. 4.1. Modulation (generalization). 4.2. Modulation (specification). 4.3. Syntactic-stylistic modification (explicitation). 4.4. Syntactic-stylistic modification (implicitation) 4.5. Mutation (addition). 4.6. Mutation (deletion). 5. Conclusions.

1. Introduction

The analysis of translation shifts is not a particularly novel area of translation studies. Scholars such as Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet (1965), John C. Catford (1965), Kitty van Leuven-Zwart (1989), etc. have revolutionised this field of study by establishing many of the currently implemented approaches to translation, as well as encouraging future generations to analyse how the process of translation functions, and what effect shifts have on various aspects of translated literary works.

To this day, translations into different languages continue to be an area of interest among those who explore this field of study. Mátyás Bánhegyi (2012), Seyed Mohammad Hosseini-Maasoum and Azadeh Shahbaiki (2013), Shadam Hussaeni Handi Pratama and Rudi Hartono (2018), etc. have analysed unique aspects of translation shifts in languages ranging from Persian to Indonesian. However, relatively few authors have looked into Lithuanian translations of literary works and the occurring translation shifts (e.g. Reda Baranauskienė and Inga Kriščiūnaitė (2008), Marija Blonskytė and Saulė Petronienė (2013)), while Lithuanian-centred studies into translations of speech tags specifically, appear to be non-existent.

While limited in scope, this study aims to contribute to the current discussion surrounding the translation of literary works into Lithuanian and encourage further studies into the translation of speech tags. To achieve this, it will analyse the translation shifts occurring on a semantic level in the three available Lithuanian translations of George Orwell's *Animal Farm*, with special attention given to the translation of speech tags.

2. Dialogue and speech tags

In literature, much like in any other form of entertainment, the presentation of content is often as important as the content itself. Vladimir Nabokov's *Lolita* (1955); Markus Zusak's *The Book Thief* (2005) and Donna Tartt's *The Goldfinch* (2013) are just a few literary works that, among other reasons, are remembered for the beauty of their prose. These books contain expertly crafted segments of narration that reflect the authors' understanding of effective language use. However, one should not forget that dialogue, and by extension speech tags, is also a vital part of a quality piece of writing.

Elise Nykänen and Aino Koivisto (2016: 2) describe dialogue as “a narrative mode that displays a conversation or speech between two characters or a group of people (polylogue).” In other words, dialogue in literature visually represents a verbal exchange between characters. Traditionally, the identification of dialogue in any given page is relatively simple, as it is often placed in a separate line than the narration and is framed (or at the very least preceded) by an M-dash, single or double quotation marks, guillemets or other similar punctuation markings.

Dialogue is exceptionally useful when conveying exposition and providing character depth. When used properly, it can bring an entire world to life. However, it is applicable not only in this sense. Kempton (2004: 14–24) broadens the understanding of dialogue application in literature by also highlighting, among others, such aspects as the creation of tension and/or suspense, an increase in perceived speed (i.e. how fast any given scene is progressing), or the establishment of a unique atmosphere.

In most cases dialogue is preceded, followed, and/or interrupted by speech tags. It is noteworthy, that there is a surprising variety in the terminology used to refer to these tags. One of the most commonly used synonyms is *dialogue tags*; however, they are also referred to as *reporting clauses / inquirits* (Allison 2018: 111) or *speaker tags* (He et al. 2013: 1313). For the sake of clarity, the abovementioned units will be referred to as simply speech tags.

Speech tags are short, often (but not exclusively) two-word units that provide additional information regarding who is speaking, how something is said, what someone is doing while an utterance is made, etc. Character identification is done by defining an explicit (e.g. *Tom* said), anaphoric (e.g. *he* said) or implicit speaker (specified in a different part of the text and not within the tag itself) (Ek et al. 2018: 818). The latter two aspects are seemingly only limited by the author's imagination. In addition, other than references to the speaker, speech tags also contain verbs, such as *said*, *asked* or *shouted*. However, it is worth mentioning that the popularity of

certain verbs periodically changes. According to Peprník (1969: 146–147), while *say* was often implemented in the 20th-century literature as a universal verb of sorts, in the 18th century authors preferred verbs such as *add*, *answer*, *reply*, etc. and their 19th century counterparts – *address*, *remark*, *demand*, etc. Naturally, while some overlapping in the use of verbs was unavoidable, each century still displayed a clear preference in vocabulary.

It is also worth noting, that while Sedláček (2016: 16) describes speech tags as a pragmatic and stylistic, but ultimately a non-obligatory aspect of prose. Allison considers them to be an almost crucial part of storytelling. The author even states that speech tags are “a technique for representing moral aspects of character keyed to sincerity” (Allison 2018: 110), i.e. they help the reader get a deeper understanding of a character’s inner world, what they really think or feel. This is illustrated by analysing an extract from Dickens’s work and explaining that the feelings of a character were not reflected in their short utterances, but rather in their body language, which was depicted in the speech tags (Allison 2018: 111–113).

Simply put, speech tags, while not frequently looked into, are an ever-present aspect of prose that provide additional information, vital for character or scene enhancement. These tags are characteristically short (created only with a name / pronoun and a verb) and implemented to specify the speaker; however, they can also be relatively complex, i.e. include the information which recontextualises an utterance.

3. Translation shifts as a topic of research

Changes are an unavoidable aspect of the translation process. This has prompted scholars to attempt to better understand and systematise these changes, which resulted in the creation of several classifications of translation shifts (also referred to as *translation procedures*). In this study, due to some restrictions, only three classifications, created by Vinay and Darbelnet, Carford, and van Leuven-Zwart, will be introduced and reviewed.

The earliest recorded attempt at classifying translation shifts was Jean-Paul Vinay’s and Jean Darbelnet’s introduction of *direct* and *oblique* translation procedures in *Comparative Stylistics of French and English. A methodology for translation* (1958). While not explicitly referring to these changes as translation shifts, Vinay and Darbelnet still created the foundation for future approaches to this area of study. In addition, according to Cyrus (2009: 92), their didactic and pedagogical approach is relatively unique among other, theory-based ones.

Direct translation procedures include *borrowing*, *calque* and *literal translation*, while oblique procedures include *transposition*, *modulation*, *equivalence* and *adaptation* (Cyrus 2009: 92).

Borrowing, much like its name suggests, includes taking a source language (SL) element and then transferring it to the target language (TL) with little to no changes to its form. This approach is considered to be the simplest and is often implemented to create a certain stylistic effect, or to add the unique colour of the SL culture (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995: 31–32).

Calque is implemented when a translator borrows an SL utterance and translates each element within that utterance, hence creating either a lexical or a structural calque that often becomes part of the TL (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995: 32).

Literal translation (also known as *word-for-word translation*) is a translation technique which includes taking an SL utterance and directly translating it into the TL, while adhering to the grammar of the TL. This approach is frequently observed among languages that belong to the same family (e.g. Swedish and Norwegian, or French and Italian), and is even more prevalent if the language pairs share the same culture (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995: 33–34).

When applying the abovementioned techniques, changes to the source text (ST) can be considered relatively minor, as the translator stays “close” to the original utterance. It is when one applies the oblique techniques that more significant changes can be observed.

Transposition is primarily concerned with changes made to the word class of an SL element as it is transferred into the TL and can even be applied when reformulating an utterance within the same language. A key aspect of transposition is the fact that when it is applied in translation, it does not affect the overall meaning or weight of an utterance. Due to this, it is a frequently implemented approach in literary translation (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995: 36).

Modulation changes the point of view of the translated element. This includes turning a positive SL utterance into a negative, a singular expression into a plural, or an abstract concept into a concrete one (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995: 36–37).

Equivalence is achieved by taking an SL utterance and transforming it into (frequently) a structurally completely different TL utterance. Equivalent utterances are in most cases fixed and generally mean the same thing among various languages (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995: 38).

Adaptation is in a way similar to equivalence, as it also includes taking an SL utterance and transforming it into a different TL utterance that contains the original meaning. However, unlike equivalence, adaptation is not set. Adapted utterances only retain the original meaning in certain contexts; therefore, an adapted film title in the cinema will not be understood the same in a completely different context (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995: 39).

Generally, while the term *translation shifts* was not explicitly used in Vinay and Darbelnet's work, the classification proposed by them is to this day frequently used by those who analyse translations.

Translation shifts as a term was first officially introduced in 1965 by John C. Catford in his publication *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*. In his work, Catford described shifts as "departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL to the TL" (Catford 1965: 73). In other words, shifts are related to changes made to SL elements as they are translated into the TL.

Unlike the much broader Vinay and Darbelnet's approach, Catford's classification is concise. It differentiates only two possible types of shifts: *level* and *category* (Catford 1965: 73). Level shifts include cases in which a TL element is on a different linguistic level than its equivalent in the TL (e.g. an imperfective verb is translated as either a past simple or past continuous verb). While a category shift deals with *unbounded* and *rank-bound* translation, it is further divided into four subcategories: a) *structure shifts* (the structure of a TL utterance is altered as it is translated into the TL), b) *unit shifts* (SL items of one rank change into a different rank), c) *class shifts* (during the translation process an SL item shifts from one word class into a different word class), d) *intra-system shifts* (cases when the source and target languages have the same formal constitution but when translating the TL takes on a non-corresponding term) (Catford 1965: 73–82).

A more recent attempt at systematising translation shifts was made by Kitty van Leuven-Zwart in her article *Translation and Original Similarities and Dissimilarities I* (1989). In her work, the scholar introduces three types of shifts: *modulation*, *modification* and *mutation* (van Leuven-Zwart 1989: 159).

Modulation occurs when a transeme is turned into an architranseme or a hyponym during the translation process. This category is further subcategorised into *semantic modulation* and *stylistic modulation*, both of which can include *generalization* (translation applying more abstract terms) and *specification* (translation using more concrete terms) (Cyrus 2009: 96).

It is worth noting, that specification is generally more frequently observed in translations from analytical languages, such as English, into

synthetic languages (e.g. Lithuanian) which could reflect the stylistic preferences or certain linguistic needs of that language (Pažūsis 2014: 501). This idea is supported by Kubáčková's paper, in which it is further explained that synthetic languages tend to use words that contain more concrete meanings (Mathesius 1975 in Kubáčková 2009, 37).

Modification is subcategorised into *semantic*, *stylistic* and *syntactic modification* (van Leuven-Zwart 1989: 165–168). Since modification and modulation can occur both on a semantic and stylistic level, they can be considered strongly related. However, according to Cyrus, the main difference between the two translation strategies is that “both transems are hyponyms of the architranseme, so the relationship between them is one of contrast” (Cyrus 2009: 96).

While changes made on a semantic and stylistic level were already mentioned in modulation, syntactic changes are unique to modification. They occur when “both transems show different disjunctive aspects of a syntactic nature” and are generally language-bound (van Leuven-Zwart 1989: 166). Syntactic modifications can be further sub-categorised into *syntactic-semantic* (related to grammatical changes, i.e. word class, function, etc.), *syntactic-stylistic* (related the number of elements used to translate an utterance, i.e. *explicitation* or *implication*), and *syntactic-pragmatic* (related to changes made to the speech act or its thematic meaning) modifications (van Leuven-Zwart 1989: 166–168).

Mutation is the third differentiated type of shift and is concerned with cases that do not establish a connection between two transems, as one is either missing an element, has an addition, or is semantically too different in meaning (Cyrus 2009: 97). Due to this, mutation is divided into *addition*, *deletion*, and *radical change of meaning* (van Leuven-Zwart 1989: 169).

All of the reviewed authors have aided in the creation of research of translation shifts, which remains a vital area of study to this day. Scholars from all around the world have implemented their works in creation of newer classifications and in the analysis of written translation as a whole. In the following section, this will be done with special attention given to the translation of speech tags.

4. Analysis of the collected data

In this section, the data collected from the available translations of George Orwell's *Animal Farm* (1945) by Arvydas Sabonis (1991) (hereinafter referred to as TT1), Edita Mažonienė (2021) (TT2) and Jovita Liutkutė

(2022) (TT3) are analysed and compared. The analysis is done according to Kitty van Leuven-Zwart's classification; however, due to the limitations of this study, only the shift categories that primarily affect the translation on a semantic level are considered. These categories are *modulation (generalization, specification)*, *syntactic-stylistic modification (explicitation, implicitation)* and *mutation (addition, deletion)*.

For this study, 222 sentences containing speech tags were collected from the three available translations (74 sentences in each translation). The collection process included reviewing the ST and gathering sentences that contained a speech tag which preceded, interrupted or followed an utterance. Since the story contained several cases of characters quoting someone else's words, as long as the sentence contained a speech tag, it was also counted. If a tag was longer than the characteristic two-word unit, the entire sentence was considered. After the tags had been gathered from the ST, their translations were collected from TT1, TT2 and TT3 and placed in a database. The table below presents the total number of translation shifts identified in each TT.

	TT1	TT2	TT3	Total
GENERALIZATION	2	1	4	7
SPECIFICATION	30	19	38	87
IMPLICITATION	13	8	12	33
EXPLICITATION	9	2	4	15
ADDITION	3	3	10	16
DELETION	13	4	6	23
Total number of shifts	70	37	74	181

Table 1. The frequency of applied translation shifts in the Lithuanian translations of George Orwell's *Animal Farm*

It can be immediately noticed that the number of applied shifts is significantly smaller in TT2. This deviation from TT1 and TT3 is caused by the translator's choice to frequently apply direct translation of speech tags. Among all three versions a clear tendency to implement specification and implicitation has been observed, while generalization and explicitation make up two of the smallest recorded groups. The analysis has also shown that the use of addition and deletion is quite uncommon. However, their application does not seem to be dictated by the TL, but rather by the preferences of the translator.

In the following subsections, the relevant categories will be analysed in greater detail.

4.1. Modulation (generalization)

In the previous section the uncommon application of generalizing techniques when translating into synthetic languages was mentioned (Pažūsis 2014: 501). This idea is reflected perfectly in the number of generalization cases in the three available translations of *Animal Farm*. Between the three versions, generalization was observed in only 7 cases among the collected 222 sentences. The first set of translations can be observed below:

ST	“Surely, comrades,” cried Squealer almost pleadingly, skipping from side to side and whisking his tail, “surely there is no one among you who wants to see Jones come back?”	p. 26
TT1	– Nejaugi, draugai, – kone gailiai sužviėgė jis , straksėdamas į šalis ir iš visų jėgų vizgindamas uodegigalį, – nejaugi tarp jūsų yra tokių, kurie norėtų, kad sugrįžtų Džonas?	p. 37
TT2	– Juk tikrai, draugai, – kone maldaujamai rėkė Žvieglys , straksėdamas iš šono į šoną ir viksdamas uodegėle, – juk tikrai nėra tarp jūsų tokio, kuris lauktų sugrįžtant Džonso?	p. 49
TT3	Neabejoju, draugai, – kone maldaudamas pridūrė jis , kraipydamasis į šalis ir viksnodamas uodega, – esu tikras, kad nė vienas iš jūsų nenori matyti grįžtant Džounsa?	p. 34

Table 2. The first example of the modulation (generalization) shift.

As can be seen in table 2, only in TT1 and TT3 generalization was implemented for the translation of *Squealer*. In both cases, the translators chose to translate the character’s name as the pronoun *jis* (*he*).

In some cases, this approach to translation can create a certain level of ambiguity, as not mentioning who is speaking for an extended period of time can result in readers becoming confused. However, in TT1 this possibility is somewhat remedied by specifying the verb *cried* as *sužviėgė* (*squealed*), as it is a sound often associated with pigs. In addition, it is possible that in both TT1 and TT3 the translators utilised the fact that the sentence was part of a monologue, resulting in minimised risk of confusion.

In contrast, the translator of TT2, as will be observed quite often further in the paper, chose to retain the original element, and instead specified the meaning of *cried*. The specification of this particular verb alongside *said* is an approach that can generally be observed among all three translations.

Overall, in the few cases that generalization was applied, translations were centred around character names, which were almost always translated as pronouns. The only non-name related case is, incidentally, the only identified case of generalization in TT2.

ST	The very first question she asked Snowball was: / “Will there still be sugar after the Rebellion?”	p. 11
TT2	Pirmas dalykas , ko ji paklausė Sniegiaus, buvo toks: / – Ar po Sukilimo vis dar bus cukraus?	p. 34

Table 3. The second example of the modulation (generalization) shift.

In this case, the original word and its translation are nouns. While in TT1 and TT3 longer tags were often translated by implementing several different shifts, and at times, completely altering parts of the tag, the translator in TT2 often stayed close to the original and translated most elements directly. In this case, except for a minor addition, the translator hardly changed anything in the structure of the tag itself and generalized only the word *question*. This change is to an extent redundant, as while in spoken language “the first thing she asked” is accepted, in translation it can be regarded as word-for-word, and by extension, somewhat stylistically awkward.

4.2. Modulation (specification)

Specification is the second and largest group of shifts, which was observed in 87 cases between the three translations.

During the analysis process it was quickly discovered that *said* was the most commonly implemented verb in the ST. Naturally, being the most frequently observed, it also displayed a notable variety when translated. The original 34 instances were translated in 17 different ways (including deletions) in TT1, while 9 and 14 unique translations were observed in TT2 and TT3 respectively.

During the analysis, cases where *said* was translated as *sakė* and *tarė* (and their derivations) were considered to be direct translations. Following this approach, it was observed that the translator of TT2 chose to translate *said* directly in a far greater frequency than the translators of TT1 and TT3. In TT2, out of the original 34 cases, 19 of them were direct translations, while in TT1 and TT3 this approach was applied in 13 and 9 cases respectively.

Most of the remaining unique translations were specifications. TT1 contained 18 specifications of *said*, TT2 – 12, and TT3 – 23. The first case displays one of the simpler approaches to specifying the verb *said*:

ST	“What is that gun firing for?” said Boxer.	p. 77
TT1	– Kodėl jis iššovė? – paklausė Dobilas.	p. 99
TT2	– Kam šauta iš to šautuvo? – paklausė Boksininkas.	p. 99
TT3	– Kokia proga ši salvė? – paklausė Kuoka.	p. 87

Table 4. The first example of the modulation (specification) shift.

Here, all three translators chose to specify the verb in a manner which reflects the fact that the speaker is actually asking a non-rhetorical question and used *paklausė* (*asked*). In this case, while it would have resulted in slightly more faithful translations, the retention of *said* would have likely been considered a mistake, since while in English the use of *said* in a question might be accepted for stylistic reasons, in Lithuanian a question paired with *sake/pasakė* would clash with the interrogative structure of the sentence and distort its overall meaning. Due to this, the use of verbs pertaining to the function of the character’s direct speech is far more fitting in such cases.

Notably, in the three cases that *said* appeared after an interrogative sentence, the translators of TT1 and TT3 chose relatively conventional approaches to its translation. Both chose the translations *paklausė* and *nusistebėjo*, while in TT3 – *paklausė* and *perklausė* were used. The use of *perklausė*, while not incorrect, is quite unusual, as it is not frequently used by the speakers of Lithuanian.

Due to the limitations of the interrogative clause, the translations in nearly all cases were quite simple. However, the table below provides an example of more varied translations of verbs in declarative sentences.

ST	“But he was wounded,” said Boxer. “We all saw him running with blood.”	p. 59
TT1	– Jį sužeidė, – prieštaravo Dobilas, – mačiau jį pasruvusį krauju.	p. 78
TT2	– Bet jis buvo sužeistas, – nenusileido Boksininkas. – Visi matėme, kaip jam bėgo kraujas.	p. 82
TT3	– Bet Sniegelis buvo sužeistas, – priminė Kuoka. – Visi matėme jį plūstant krauju.	p. 70

Table 5. The second example of the modulation (specification) shift.

In this case, the translations of *said* reflect the aforementioned inclination to use words with more specific meanings in translations into Lithuanian and the level of synonymity that can be achieved.

In their texts, the translators of TT1 and TT2 chose to use the verbs that highlight the ongoing argument between two characters (Boxer and Squealer). Both *nenusileido* (*did not back down*) and *prieštaravo* (*objected*) have strong meanings, which can be associated with such attributes as persistence or resolve, and generally refer to a more “heated” atmosphere. The use of such words implies that the discussion is not a quick exchange of thoughts, but rather a confrontation of what two individuals believe to be true.

Priminė (*reminded*) in TT3 is an outlier in this case, as it does not really reflect the situation when taken out of context. Contrarily, *priminė* establishes a significantly softer tone, as it is not primarily associated with a heated exchange or argument. While in theory it does function properly in this translation, i.e. it does not alter the overall meaning of the tag, and the sentence, it is the least effective in creating the sought after interpretation of the situation.

4.3. Syntactic-stylistic modification (explicitation)

Explicitation is the second smallest group considered in this paper, with only 15 cases. Since synthetic languages are known to contain more words with more concrete meanings, it is not at all surprising that a technique associated with rendering TL utterances with additional words was not frequently implemented.

ST	“He didn’t! I wasn’t! It isn’t true!” cried Mollie, beginning to prance about and paw the ground.	p. 33
TT1	– Netiesa! Jis neglostė! Neleidau! – sušuko Molė, pradėjusi trypčioti ir kanopa kasti žemę.	p. 47
TT2	–Jis neglostė! Aš neleidau! Tai netiesa! – sušuko Molė, ėmusi pūstis ir kasti kanopa žemę.	p. 56
TT3	–Nešnekino! Neleidau! Tai netiesa! – sušuko Molė, muistydamosi ir kanopa kasdama žemę.	p. 44

Table 6. The first example of the syntactic-stylistic modification (explicitation) shift.

The verb *paw* does not have a one-word equivalent in Lithuanian, so in the case above, all three translators applied explicitation by translating the verb as two-word combinations consisting of the verb *to dig* and the noun *hoof*. The only difference among these three translations is the fact that in TT1 the translator used a noun + verb combination, in TT2 – a verb + noun combination, and in TT3 – a noun + verb in a half-participle form

combination. However, this did not affect the overall meaning of the tag, as the word order in Lithuanian is relatively flexible.

In this tag, the translators did not have much freedom when choosing a possible equivalent for the verb *paw*, since it refers to a specific action: an animal scraping the ground. Words such as *krapštyti* (*pick at*) or *kapstyti* (*scratch*) are a possible alternative; however, connotatively they do not fit with the animals in mind (i.e. horses), and *knisti* (*dig*) has a strong connection with pigs. Naturally, since the speaker is a horse, it also severely limits the words to refer to the limb used for the action, i.e. it basically narrows it down to only *kanopa* (*hoof*). Due to this, the only appropriate translation was *kasti kanopa* and its variations.

ST	“Good-bye, Boxer!” they chorused , “good-bye!”	p. 89
TT1	– Viso gero, Dobile! – skandavo jie. – Viso geriausio!	p. 114
TT2	– Viso gero, Boksininke! – choru šaukė jie. – Viso gero!	p. 111
TT3	– Lik sveikas, Kuoka! – visi kaip vienas baubė jie. – Lik sveikas!	p. 98

Table 7. The second example of the syntactic-stylistic modification (explicitation) shift.

Since explicitation is one of the less commonly occurring shifts, it is not surprising that not many matching cases can be observed in all three translations. In TT1, there is no observed case of explicitation, as the translator chose to retain the chant-like nature of the original with *skandavo* (*chant*). *Skandavo* is likely the only possible verb choice which contains both original components of meaning, i.e. an action done by several individuals, and the simultaneous production of loud sounds.

The approach in TT2, while technically considered explicitation, is at the same time also quite literal. While the translation does expand from a single word to two words, it does not exactly make the translation sound natural. As explained above, *chorused* refers to a loud, somewhat synchronised utterance made by several individuals. This is reflected in the verb *šaukė* (*shouted*) and *choru* (*in chorus*). However, even though this translation remains the closest to the original, it is quite awkward in comparison to the other two, as one does not often come across such a unit in Lithuanian.

In TT3 the translator opted for a combination of *visi kaip vienas* (*all as one*) and *baubė* (*bellowed*). In this case, the use of a specifying description of the “speakers” was unavoidable, as the selected verb does not necessarily reflect the participation of others in the action. If the translator had chosen to not use such a term, the result could be considered a

mistranslation, as it would change meaning of the original with no real motivation. In addition, the verb *baubė* also reaffirms the identity of the speakers since this specified verb has strong animalistic associations.

4.4. Syntactic-stylistic modification (implication)

Implication is the fourth type of shift and is the second largest category, appearing in 33 cases among 222 sentences.

ST	"He didn't! I wasn't! It isn't true!" cried Mollie, beginning to prance about and paw the ground.	p. 33
TT1	– Netiesa! Jis neglostė! Neleidau! – sušuko Molė, pradėjusi trypčioti ir kanopa kasti žemę.	p. 47
TT2	–Jis neglostė! Aš neleidau! Tai netiesa! – sušuko Molė, ėmusi pūstis ir kasti kanopa žemę.	p. 56
TT3	–Nešnekino! Neleidau! Tai netiesa! – sušuko Molė, muistydamsi ir kanopa kasdama žemę.	p. 44

Table 8. The first example of the syntactic-stylistic modification (implication) shift.

The first analysed sentence might be familiar, as it was already introduced in a previous sub-section. In that case, it was analysed for the instance of explicitation; however, in this case, it also illustrates a typical case of implication. Here it can be observed that all three translators implemented implication in the translation of *prance about*. The two-word unit was shrunk down to a single word, with various degrees of faithfulness to the original.

TT1's translation is the closest in meaning and association. *Trypčioti* can be associated with horses and can be understood as something akin to nervous/restless stomping, i.e. it does not have any connotations related to aggression. The use of *trypčioti* thematically works, as the speaker herself is a mare. In TT3, the translation *muistydamsi* (*squirming*), while still retains the nervousness of the character, somewhat strays from the fact the speaker is an animal and brings them to a more human level. The choice to either retain or remove animalistic qualities of the speaker, could be a reflection of not only the stylistic preferences of the translator, but also the expectations of the target readers.

The translation of TT2 is quite interesting, as it, in a way, takes an approach similar to the ST. Here the translator chose to use the word *pūstis* which has negative connotations and is even primarily associated with vanity. Naturally, in this context it can be understood as something similar to bristling. However, due to the word's strong negative connotations, it might

be misunderstood by the reader. The same can happen with the wording of the original. The primary meaning that most might associate with *prance about* is “to walk or move in a spirited manner”¹, so while the context allows one to understand that the speaker is agitated, there is still a risk of it being misinterpreted. As a result, while this translation does remain closer to the original stylistically, it does not convey the intended meaning as well.

ST	“[...] SNOWBALL!” he suddenly roared in a voice of thunder . “Snowball has done this thing! [...]”	p. 52
TT1	– [...] SNIEGUOLIS! – suriaumojo jis griausmingu balsu . – Tai Snieguolio darbas! [...]	p. 69
TT2	– [...] SNIEGIUS! – staiga griausmingai užriaumojo jisai. – Tai padarė Sniegius! [...]	p. 75
TT2	– [...] SNIEGELIS! – staiga suriko Napoleonas, kiek tik gerklė nešė . – Tai – Sniegelio darbas! [...]	p. 63

Table 9. The second example of the syntactic-stylistic modification (implication) shift.

For the translation of the idiomatic expression *in a voice of thunder*, the translator of TT3 took a rather interesting approach. In this sentence, in both TT1 and TT2, impication was implemented, which shortened the phrase into a two-word unit. While *roared* is technically not part of the analysed phrase, it is relevant in the context of the translations. In TT1, the translator stayed rather faithful to the original, i.e. they retained the elements *roar* and *voice*, and chose an adjective (*griausmingu*), which reflects the image established by the original. Their back-translation into English would sound quite similar to the original: *roared in a thunderous voice*. In TT2, *voice* was deleted altogether which allowed the surrounding context to create the required sonic effect by only applying *užriaumojo* (*roared*) instead of TT1’s verb + noun approach. Generally speaking, both translations are similar in quality and work well in this context.

In the TT3, however, the translator took a different route and completely transformed the phrase. While it retained the core meaning of the original, *kiek tik gerklė nešė* (something akin to *as loud as he could*) does weaken its impact to an extent. The original created a visual of a strong, booming voice; a voice of a commander informing their subordinates of someone’s betrayal. Yet, TT2’s translation takes this commanding quality away, and in the context of the story, establishes a weaker leader, i.e. he has to strain his voice to acquire the desired volume.

¹ <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/prance>

4.5. Mutation (addition)

The fifth group is mutation, specifically addition. The occurrence of this shift among the three translations varies substantially, as only 3 instances were observed in TT2, while TT3 contained 10. However, overall, the mutation (addition) shift was observed in only 16 cases between the three translations.

Much like with explicitation, the relatively small number of additions makes the analysis of this group rather difficult, as there were no sentences in which a case contained addition in at least two of the three translations. Due to this, the sets of examples will only contain one case of addition.

ST	“Surely, comrades,” cried Squealer almost pleadingly, skipping from side to side and whisking his tail, “surely there is no one among you who wants to see Jones come back?”	p. 26
TT1	– Nejaugi, draugai, – kone gailiai sužviėgė jis, straksėdamas į šalis ir iš visų jėgų vizgindamas uodegį, – nejaugi tarp jūsų yra tokių, kurie norėtų, kad sugrįžtų Džonas?	p. 37
TT2	– Juk tikrai, draugai, – kone maldaujamai rėkė Žviėglys, straksėdamas iš šono į šoną ir viksėdamas uodegėle, – juk tikrai nėra tarp jūsų tokio, kuris lauktų sugrįžtant Džonso?	p. 49
TT3	– Neabejoju, draugai, – kone maldaudamas pridūrė jis, kraipydamasis į šalis ir viksnodamas uodega, – esu tikras, kad nė vienas iš jūsų nenori matyti grįžtant Džouną?	p. 34

Table 10. The first example of the mutation (addition) shift.

In table 10, it can clearly be seen that in TT2 and TT3 it was chosen to directly translate the verb *whisk* as *viksnoti*, which is a unique choice in the sense that it contains a strong association with animals, though it does slow the perceived movements of the speaker, as *viksnoti* is defined as “slowly moving (a tail)”².

In TT1 the translator, however, does quite the opposite, by adding a phrase that translates as “to do something with all one’s might”. This addition, along with *straksėdamas* (*skipping*), creates a strong erratic effect and highlights Squealer’s restless manner of speaking. In this case, it is a motivated addition, which conveys the actions of the character well. And

² <https://ekabali.lt/tales-letuvi-kalbos-zodynas/viksnoti/%20--imas?paieska=viksnoti&=6831925fee843af8dee313f95ac1491>

while in TT2 and TT3 the translations are adequate; they do not convey the full meaning of the original.

The second case to be analysed contains two additions in one sentence.

ST	“Never mind the milk, comrades!” cried Napoleon, placing himself in front of the buckets . “That will be attended to. [...]”	p. 18
TT1	– Pienu mes pasirūpinsim, draugai! – sušuko Napoleonas, atsistodamas priešais kibirus. – Nesukit dėl to sau galvos [...].	p. 27
TT2	– Nesukite galvos dėl pieno, draugai! – sušuko Napoleonas, atsistojęs priešais kibirus. – Išspręsimė šitą klausimą.	p. 41
TT3	– Dėl pieno nesukite galvos, draugai! – sušuko Napoleonas, klestelėdamas ant žemės , priešais pilnus kibirus . – Pienu bus pasirūpinta.	p. 26

Table 11. The second example of the mutation (addition) shift.

In table 11, it can be seen that only TT3 contains the shift of modification (addition). In TT1 and TT2 the translators chose to apply implicitation and translated *placing himself* as a one-word unit *atsistodamas/atsistojęs*, which roughly means the same as the original. In contrast, TT3 chose to specify that the speaker (Napoleon) placed himself on the ground by adding the phrase *ant žemės*. This may appear redundant, as there seemingly is no reason to clarify such a detail – it is clear enough in the given context. However, *ant žemės* becomes necessary when one takes into account the verb that was used. *Klestelėdamas* refers to the action of suddenly falling or sitting down³, and while it can be used alone, in most cases it appears alongside a specifying element (e.g. on the ground, on the sofa, on the chair, etc.), almost as a collocation. This necessity was not encountered in TT1 and TT2, as the chosen verb *stand* can be used alone. In addition, TT3 was the only translation, in which the translator saw the need to specify that the buckets were full. This, while introducing an additional descriptive element into the translation, is ultimately somewhat redundant, as the context (the author mentioning that five buckets were filled with milk, and, later on, that the milk had disappeared) implied this detail perfectly well. Moreover, unlike the previously mentioned phrase *ant žemės*,

³ <https://ekabaltikabartines-letuviu-kalbos-zodynas/kestel%C4%97ti%20--jimas?paieska=kestel%C4%97ti&i-c4e98334f600-4600-9ca0-5a6fa56bbece>

the added word *pilnus* is not inserted due to a stylistic expectation. Hence, while not wrong in this case, it is redundant.

4.6. Mutation (deletion)

Deletion is the sixth and final type of shifts that is analysed in this study. Much like addition, it is not a commonly implemented approach among the translators, appearing in only 23 cases among the collected 222 sentences.

ST	“It was the most affecting sight I have ever seen!” said Squealer, lifting his trotter and wiping away a tear. [...]	p. 90–91
TT1	– Niekio panašaus dar nebuvo patyręs! – pasakojo Spieglys, braukdamas ašaras. – Iki paskutinės akimirkos nesitraukiau nuo jo. [...]	p. 116
TT2	– Nesu matęs labiau jaudinančio vaizdo! – kalbėjo Žvieglys, braukdamas ašarą. – Iki paskutinosios budėjau prie jo.	p. 113
TT3	– Tai buvo labiausiai jaudinantis vaizdas, kokį tik kada nors esu regėjęs! – tarė Žvieglys ir, pakėlęs naga , nusibraukė ašarą. – Sėdėjau prie Kuokos lovos, kai jis mus paliko.	p. 101

Table 12. The first example of the mutation (deletion) shift.

In this example, it can be seen that in TT1 and TT2 the original three-word unit *lifting his trotter* was removed altogether. This deletion does not negatively affect the overall meaning of the tag, as the context provides enough information for the idea itself to be understood – regardless of whether the reference to the trotter is there or not, the reader can still understand that Squealer used his front legs (as an equivalent to hands) to wipe away his tears. The retention of the original element would not assist in conveying the meaning of the ST, but instead, could lead to possible confusion (as will be discussed with TT3).

The potential issue with retaining *lifting his trotter* can be seen in TT3. The translator chose to preserve the original unit by only removing *his* and nearly directly translating *lifting* and *trotter*. However, this translation of *trotter* is a bit unusual, since while the original word itself refers to a pig’s leg, the primary meaning of the word *nagas* is a *nail*, which can be

misunderstood. A better solution in this case would have been to use words such as *koja* or *kojelė* (both meaning *leg*), since the general Lithuanian-speaking community refers to animal appendages as legs or paws.

The ST in table 13 displays another case of deletion, in which it can immediately be noticed that TT2 is the outlier among the three versions.

ST	“Fools! Fools!” shouted Benjamin, prancing round them and stamping the earth with his small hoofs. “Fools! Do you not see what is written on the side of the van?”	p. 89
TT1	– Kvailiai! Kvailiai! – ėmė šaukti Benjaminas, lakstydamas aplinkui ir trypdamas savo mažitėmis kanopomis. – Kvailiai! Argi nematote, kas parašyta ant furgono?	p. 114
TT2	– Kvailiai! Kvailiai! – rėkė Benjaminas, šokinėdamas aplink juos ir trypdamas žemę mažomis kanopėlėmis. – Kvailiai! Ar nematote, kas parašyta ant furgono?	p. 111
TT3	– Kvailiai! Kvailiai! – subliuvo Bendžaminas, straksėdamas tarp jų ir trepsėdamas kanopėlėmis. – Goželiai! Argi nematote, kas parašyta ant vežimo šono?	p. 98

Table 13. The second example of the mutation (deletion) shift.

In this case, the direct approach in TT2 can be considered the preferred one when compared to TT1. Both translators used the word *trypdamas* (*stomping*), yet much like with *klestelėdamas*, the word *trypčiodamas* is also commonly used alongside a specifier. While this approach in TT1 is technically not wrong, it does raise the question “What is he stomping?”. In this case, even though the context does make it clear that the speaker is anxiously stomping the ground, such a simple translation should not raise questions.

In TT3 a synonym of *trypdamas* was used. However, *trepsėjimas* has a slightly different meaning, i.e. instead of just stomping the ground, the speaker is, to an extent, trotting in place. The action itself is much lighter in perceived weight, but also reflects the speaker’s restlessness. In addition, *trepsėjimas* can be used both with and without a specifying word or phrase, so in this case, the lack of the word *ground* does not appear awkward or raise any questions.

After reviewing all the chosen cases, all three translations reflect the aforementioned preference for word specification when translating from analytical languages. Approaches that primarily condensed the meaning of

the original into fewer words (i.e. specification and implicitation) were by far more commonly employed than their opposites (generalisation and explicitation). Addition and deletion were both relatively uncommon, but it also could be noted that their application was not always adequate. Generally speaking, the translator of TT1 tended to retain the animalistic quality of the original, while in TT2 and TT3 more human-related words were often used. In addition, although it was only partially reflected in the analysis, the collected data shows that the translator of TT2 directly translated tags far more frequently than the translators of TT1 and TT3.

5. Conclusions

Regardless of the fact that speech tags are an important and ever-present part of literature, which provides copious amounts of additional information within a few words, they are still an under-researched topic in translation studies. Few have looked into their translation specifically, and Lithuanian-centred studies on the topic appear to be non-existent.

During the theoretical overview it was established that when translating from analytical languages into synthetic ones, translators show an immediate preference for specifying techniques. This was reflected in the three Lithuanian translations of George Orwell's *Animal Farm* by Arvydas Sabonis, Edita Mažonienė and Jovita Liutkutė, as among the collected 222 sentences, the modulation (specification) shift was observed in 87 cases; and the shift of syntactic-stylistic modification (implicitation) in 33 cases.

Unsurprisingly, since modulation (generalisation) and syntactic-stylistic modification (explicitation) are essentially the exact opposite of the previously mentioned shifts, their recorded numbers are far smaller. Generalisation was only observed in 7 cases and explicitation in 15. It is noteworthy that generalisation was mostly implemented for the translation of character names, as only one non-name related case was noted in the three translations.

Mutations of addition and deletion were relatively uncommon, appearing in only 16 and 23 cases respectively. The quality of their application was at times questionable, as in some cases they either failed to convey the intended meaning, or their implementation was redundant. Generally, it appears that the employment of these shifts was not motivated by the TL, but rather by the personal preferences of the translators, as the number of recorded cases varies greatly from one translation to the other.

The analysis of the collected data clearly indicates that the translator of TT2 tended to directly translate speech tags regardless of their length. In TT1 and TT3, translation shifts were implemented at least twice as often as in TT2; however, while direct translations are often associated with lower quality translations, in this case, such an approach was, at times, preferable, as the translation was better, or at the very least, not incorrect.

Since one of the most frequently used verbs in the ST was *said*, it displayed the largest variety of synonymy when translated into Lithuanian. The translation of character names / references to characters or translation of nouns shows no real trend, as most of the recorded cases were either directly translated or occurred only once or twice.

Translation of speech tags, while unpopular in research, is an interesting area of study, which helps establish a better understanding of the translator's stylistic preferences, and the expectations of the target readers. Depending on the quality of the translation, a speech tag can greatly enhance the interpretation of the spoken words, or completely diminish their impact.

Bibliography

- ALLISON, S. (2018). *Reductive Reading: A Syntax of Victorian Moralizing*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- BÁNHEGYI, M. (2012). "Translation Shifts and Translator Strategies in the Hungarian Translation of Alice Munro's "Boys and Girls"". *Central European Journal of Canadian Studies*, 8(1), 89-102.
- BARANAUSKIENĖ, R., & KRIŠČIŪNAITĖ, I. (2008). "Transformation Peculiarities in the Lithuanian Translation of "Eat, Pray, Love" by E. Gilbert". *Jaunųjų mokslininkų darbai*, 4(20), 22-28.
- BLONSKYTĖ, M., & PETRONIENĖ, S. (2013). "Translation of the Russian Nadsat Slang in Anthony Burgess' Novel "A Clockwork Orange" into Lithuanian". *Kalbų studijos*, (22), 62-70.
- CATFORD, J. C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation; an Essay in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CYRUS, L. (2009). "Old Concepts, New Ideas: Approaches to Translation Shifts". *MonTI. Monographs in Translation and Interpreting*, (1), 87-106.
- EK, A., WIRÉN, M., ÖSTLING, R., BJÖRKENSTAM, K. N., GRIGONYTĖ, G., & GUSTAFSON-CAPKOVÁ, S. (2018). "Identifying Speakers and Addressees in Dialogues Extracted from Literary Fiction." *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*.

- HOSSEINI-MAASOUM, S. M., & SHAHBAIKI, A. (2013): "Translation Shifts in the Persian Translation of "A Tale of Two Cities" by Charles Dickens". *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2(1), 391-398.
- HUSSENI, S., & HARTONO, R. (2018): "Semantic Shift in the English - Indonesian Translation of Dessen's "What Happened to Goodbye"". *English Education Journal*, 8(2), 195-207.
- KEMPTON, G. (2004). *Write Great Fiction – Dialogue*. Cincinnati: Writer's Digest Books.
- KOIVISTO, A., & NYKÄNEN, E. (2016). "Introduction: Approaches to Fictional Dialogue". *International Journal of Literary Linguistics*, 5(2).
- KUBÁČKOVÁ, J. (2009). "Keeping Czech in Check: A Corpus-based Study of Generalization in Translation". *SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation*, 4 (1), 33-51.
- NABOKOV, V. (1955). *Lolita*. Paris: Olympia Press.
- ORWELL, G. (1991). *Gyvulių ūkis*. Vilnius: Vyturys.
- ORWELL, G. (2021). *Gyvulių ūkis*. Kaunas: LECTIO DIVINA.
- ORWELL, G. (2021). *Animal farm*. London: Macmillan Collector's Library.
- ORWELL, G. (2022). *Gyvulių ūkis*. Vilnius: Alma littera.
- PAŽŪSIS, L. (2014). *Kalba ir vertimas*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas.
- PEPRNÍK, J. (1969): "Reporting Phrases in English Prose". *Brno Studies in English*, 8(1), 145-151.
- SEDLÁČEK, M. (2016). *Reporting Clauses in Czech and in English*.
- TARTT, D. (2013). *The Goldfinch*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- VAN LEUVEN-ZWART, K. (1989): "Translation and Original: Similarities and Dissimilarities, I". *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, 1(2), 151-181.
- VINAY, J. P., & DARBELNET, J. (1995). *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation (Vol. 11)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- ZUSAK, M. (2005). *The Book Thief*. Sydney: Picador.
- Lietuvių kalbos išteklių informacinė sistema E. KALBA. [Online] <https://ekalba.lt/dabartines-lietuviu-kalbos-zodynas/klestel%C4%97ti,%20~jimas?paieska=klestel%C4%97ti&i=c4e983f3-f600-4600-9ca0-5a6fa56bbece>
- Lietuvių kalbos išteklių informacinė sistema E. KALBA. [Online]: <https://ekalba.lt/dabartines-lietuviu-kalbos-zodynas/viksnoti,%20~jimas?paieska=viksnoti&i=68319f25-fee8-43af-8dee-313f95ac1491>.
- Merriam-Webster. [Online] <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/prance>.