

New Horizons in English Studies 10/2025

## LANGUAGE



Angelika Żak

MARIA CURIE-SKŁODOWSKA UNIVERSITY, POLAND

ANGELIKAZAK208@GMAIL.COM

[HTTPS://ORCID.ORG/0009-0000-1042-2328](https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1042-2328)

---

# ‘Genialna bomba’ or ‘niesamowity hit’ as a ‘terrific whiz-banger’ of wordplay, slang and idioms: on domestication and foreignization in Polish translations of Roald Dahl’s *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory*

**Abstract.** The study aims at determining the strategies of translating wordplay, slang and idioms in children’s literature. The main focus of this article is a book by Roald Dahl, *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* (2007/1964) and its two Polish translations, namely by Tomasz Wyżyński (1998) and by Magdalena Heydel (2015). Children’s literature, which for centuries was overlooked and underestimated, has recently become a major challenge for translators. Its features and specifics have to be carefully examined since young minds are particularly sensitive when it comes to the language. An emphasis is placed on culture-specific features, along with linguistic ones, as well as on strategies of translation proposed by Lawrence Venuti, domestication and foreignization. Since the Polish versions are separated by twenty years, the objective of the paper is to establish and present their diversity and its explanation, along with analysis of the cognitive scene.

**Keywords.** children’s literature, Venuti’s strategies, domestication, foreignization, wordplay, slang, idioms

## 1. Introduction

As it was mentioned by an American writer, Paul Auster, ‘translators are the shadow heroes of literature, the often forgotten instruments that make it possible for different cultures to talk to one another, who have enabled us to understand that we all, from every part

of the world, live in one world’ (in Allen 2007). In other words, one can say that renditions help us communicate with other countries all over the world. We may get to know their cultures, traditions, or simply their lives. Bearing this in mind, translation requires careful consideration of both source and target cultures to achieve successful adaptation. Since translation encompasses both linguistic and cultural challenge, Venuti (2001) comes up with two contrastive methods of translation, i.e. domestication and foreignization. The translator has to choose which option may be better for their desired audience. One has to bear in mind that whatever the solution is, there is no better or worse equivalence.

This choice also has to be considered taking into account the very special character of children’s literature. Young minds are particularly sensitive when it comes to the language, thus, the translator has to be particularly careful while comparing various word-choices. While the challenges may seem troublesome, most of them can be overcome by simple attention to detail and keeping in mind the reader. Nevertheless, not every book for children is translated using only one strategy. Translators tend to combine different techniques in order to come up with ‘the best’ translation, as one may see later on.

The research in the article is based on one of the most famous children’s novels of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* (2007/1964). Written by the British author Roald Dahl and translated into fifty-five languages, the book can be considered a classic when it comes to children’s fantasy books. Dahl’s *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* has been translated into Polish four times: by Tomasz Wyżyński in 1998 as *Karol i fabryka czekolady*, along with *Charlie i fabryka czekolady* as the title given by Jerzy Łoziński (2005), Magdalena Heydel (2015), and Michał Rusinek (2021). The major objective of the study is to present and contrast two out of the four aforementioned renditions of the book into Polish, i.e. the one by Tomasz Wyżyński (Dahl 1998) and the one by Magdalena Heydel (Dahl 2015). The study focuses on two contrastive methods of translation, domestication and foreignization, as developed by Venuti (2001), focusing on instances of wordplay, slang and idioms from the novel concerned. It is worth mentioning that the two translations discussed in the paper, the one by Tomasz Wyżyński (1998) and Magdalena Heydel (2015), are separated by almost twenty years of changes in language, both spoken and written. However, the two renditions, as well as the original text, were created after Second World War, thus, can be rather easily understood by the present-day audience.

## 2. Children’s literature in translation

Children’s literature is one of the most intuitive genres to be translated. Myles McDowell, comparing such literature to adults’ one claims that (Lathey 2016, 2, quoted after Hollindale 1997, 36):

children’s books are generally shorter; they tend to favour an active rather than a passive treatment, with dialogue and incident rather than description and introspection; child pro-

tagonists are the rule; conventions are much used; the story develops with a clear-cut moral schematism which much adult fiction ignores; children's books tend to be optimistic rather than depressive; language is child-oriented.

Another popular clarification about literature written for younger ones was formed by Paton Walsh, who suggests that a 'perfect children's book' is 'like a soap-bubble' (ibid. 3, quoted after Hollindale 1997, 40). The facade should be appealing for the young minds, and at the same time, the inner part is to be filled with mature statements hidden 'like the air within the bubble' (ibid.).

Although the definitions of children's literature are indistinct, it is worth mentioning that the most essential feature of this kind of genre is to be educational. Some believe in the special power of literature, namely that through its charm a book can persuade youngsters to draw a lesson from protagonists' stories. Through such an experience, young readers are to improve the quality of their lives and, at the same time, are to feel happier and better (Ghesquiere 2006, 22). While some may be against such a view of literature, it is crucial to take into account that children's books are to shape their world-view, as well as, make them reflect upon morality and other values in this world. Thus, it has to be closely examined whether a particular subject is beneficial for children's knowledge, otherwise a clearly vulnerable mind may perceive unknown and unmoral behaviours as the ethical ones (Lathey 2016, 25–27). Translators have to take into account what generation of children during those times has the knowledge about (Oittinen 2006, 42). Taking their experience and abilities into consideration is not an easy thing to do, however, translators have to invent an 'implied reader' and try to overcome all the challenges that children's books may bring. We may identify these obstacles as auditory and visual, as well as culture-related ones.

When considering senses that are the most essential while reading and listening to children's literature, one has to highlight audition and vision. One problematic area regarding the former sense is the presence of a dual audience (Lathey 2016, 16). One should take into consideration not only the books that are written for adults and children but, also literature that is specifically directed towards young readers. Such publications are to be, first of all, bought by older ones and, second of all, read out loud by them. Thus, while converting a text from one language to another, translators have to keep in mind that it has to be as appealing for adults as for children. Another part is performance. Translators have to consider the fact that preliterate children will listen to the book rather than read it on their own. Such features of the text as 'repetition, sentence structure, line breaks, rhythm, and punctuation [...] intonation, tone, tempo, pauses, stress, rhythm, duration' (Oittinen 2006, 39) play a fundamental role while exploring depth of language and narration. According to Lathey (2016, 94), the most common strategy to overcome the problem of sound is to simply read out loud every translated part of the text. During such practice, translators may find unwanted disharmonies or invent a better rhythm that will benefit their work.

The concern with sound is also connected with wordplay that often takes part in children's literature. Young readers tend to be curious about hidden messages in texts and explore them while a parent is reading (ibid. 98). Due to the interest, creators fill their works with puns that children may hear on a daily basis. Since it is widely known that such expressions are better understood while read out loud, translators have to use similar strategies to the ones concerning rhythm. Additionally, the most demanding aspect of wordplay is finding an equivalent in target language (TL). Some of the commonly used phrases in one culture may not have a one-to-one correspondence; in such cases, translators have to develop as creative an idiom as the original one. This rather troublesome aspect of sound leads to the next essential group of challenges that are more likely to be distinguished, namely culture-related obstacles.

As mentioned above culture plays a huge role when it comes to the visuals. Thus, one has to take into consideration the text itself. One of the aspects that may greatly differ between cultures are dialects and slang presented in children's literature. Both of them serve as a challenge for translators of all different genres of literature, even if it is poetry or drama. Although such issues may be common, there are no clear-cut strategies to follow while encountering non-standard variants of language. While some claim that a good technique would be neutralizing such a text, Hejwowski (Szymańska 2017, 62, quoted after Hejwowski 2010, 45–47) argues that language can indicate the character's social class, gender, age, education, cultural identity, as well as knowledge of the language itself. Bearing this in mind, translators tend to use various schemes to overcome the problem of no direct equivalence. According to Szymańska (2017), besides neutralization, translators may try stylization. While using this strategy, we may encounter only subtle signals that the text was originally in a kind of dialect. These prompts are inconspicuous enough to keep the TT understandable while suggesting some kind of difference in speech. Ramos Pinto (ibid. 65) calls this 'pseudo-variety'. Other strategies are as follows:

imitating foreign accent, pidginization, artificial language variety (invented by the translator), relativization (using non-standard forms of address only), and a translator's commentary in the text proper, footnotes or preface (usually combined with neutralization).

Nevertheless, every technique, while converting one non-standard variety into another, requires translators' great flexibility with the language and speech.

As presented above, every single aspect of translating children's literature needs careful examination and requires various decisions.. However, most of these choices are all about cultural differences between source text (ST) and TT. Theo Hermans (González Cascallana 2006, 99 quoted after Hermans 1993, 78) used the term 'intercultural traffic' to suggest that all of the translated texts are 'conditioned by the social-cultural context in which they take place'. These aspects once again bring translators to the issue of adapting, as well as, allowing readers to meet the unknown.

### 3. Venuti's strategies and cultural motivation of translation

A lot of aspects of translating children's literature are connected to culture, however, such a phenomenon is present in other genres as well. To understand what culture is, we should consider the two definitions that appear in the Cambridge Dictionary (CD), according to which, it is 'the way of life, especially the general customs and beliefs, of a particular group of people at a particular time', as well as, 'the attitudes, behaviour, opinions, etc. of a particular group of people within society'. Both of these definitions suggest a specific community living in a close area. A similar assumption one can get from reading the definition provided by Sapir (2023). It states that *culture* combines embodiment of 'any socially inherited element in the life of man, material and spiritual' with 'assimilated knowledge and experience' (Sapir 2023, 79–81). It is widely known that nations sharing a habitation and mundane activities will adopt specific customs, distinct from other groups. The same can be mentioned about language and its varieties all over the world. Both, language and culture, are closely associated with each other and also with the place of their occurrence. According to Akbari (2013, 1), language expresses the culture and individuality of the community. It is also said that language 'is a system of signs that is seen as having itself a cultural value' (Kramsch 1998, 3). Nevertheless, in both of these cases, one is able to notice that language and culture are integrated. Thus, while working with language, e.g. translating a text, we should always bear in mind its interrelation with the culture of the particular community.

Nonetheless, nowadays, the exploration of natural equivalence may be disturbed by the process of globalization. Cultures have a tendency to blend with each other, resulting in confusion among scholars. The phenomenon may bring a discussion about whether to stay close to the foreign culture or adapt its aspects to the target culture. It has always been the most troublesome decision that the translator has to make, thus, various theorists tried to term such a phenomenon. The most popular was Lawrence Venuti, who came up with the terms *domestication* and *foreignization* (Venuti 2001, 240). It is worth mentioning that his ideas were not invented but rather adopted and expanded from a German theorist and philosopher, Friedrich Schleiermacher. Schleiermacher in his lecture *On the Different Methods of Translating* (1813) argued that there are just two strategies, 'either the translator moves the reader to the author or the translator moves the author to the reader' (Chouit 2019, 74). These two strategies were the basis of Venuti's, which clearly state that while encountering a foreign element, translators should opt for one of these. Generally speaking, Venuti (2008, 14) states that

the aim of translation is to bring back a cultural other as the recognizable, the familiar, even the same; and this aim always risks a wholesale domestication of the foreign text, often in highly self-conscious projects where translation serves an appropriation of foreign cultures for agendas in the receiving situation, cultural, economic, political.

Additionally, some claim that the use of strategies presented by Venuti depends on factors like ‘the purpose of translation, the publisher’s power to dictate the translation, and the translator’s interpretation of the various cultural elements in the ST’ (Chouit 2019, 73). Nevertheless, if one wishes to choose domestication or foreignization, they have to remember that the most essential aspect of this selection should be to overcome the difficulties of cultural aspects and present them in an intelligible way.

The first definition of *domestication* may be copied from Schleiermacher’s claim, according to which, it is the replacement of the unfamiliar element with the variant known to the reader for the sake of better understanding and reduction of foreignness. It can be said that in such a way the text is ‘target-language-culture-oriented’ (Zhuo 2022, 60). When the target culture is the most important one, the translator has to acknowledge how different generations of a particular society perceive the world. Domestication allows the readers to feel like the text was written specifically for them and, simultaneously, enjoy the new story. When we keep in mind children and their knowledge about the world, it is worth declaring that such a technique may bring many advantages, especially when the native literature is not particularly developed.

However, Venuti was not in favour of this strategy. According to him, it represents cultural appropriation (Lathey 2016, 38). He often compared domestication to colonialism, saying that it is ‘an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to receiving cultural values’ (Munday, Ramos Pinto and Blakesley 2022, 190). It was the way that British and American cultures dominated others, it served to promote domestic agendas and imperialism. Actually, in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, Sir William Jones translated the *Institutes of Hindu Law* into English. He projected a false image of the Hindu people, promoting racism and colonialism (Venuti 2001, 241). Others claim that while it is true that domestication may be beneficial since it makes the text easier to understand and more comprehensible, at the same time, it adds cultural elements but deletes all the essential linguistic and sociocultural markers of the ST (Zhuo 2022, 61).

While keeping in mind domestication, one should reckon its contrasting notion, namely foreignization. The definition, once again, lies in Schleiermacher’s words, yet, to put it simply, it is a strategy that retains foreign elements of the source text, at the same time, ignoring potential difficulties and alienation (Chouit 2019, 72). The translator does not have to be familiar with the target culture, yet, they have to pay attention to elements from the foreign one and, simultaneously, make an attempt to present them clearly. It can be said that the text becomes ‘source-language-culture-oriented’ (Zhuo 2022, 60). Such a strategy may be presented as a metaphor for sending the readers abroad. They have to adapt to new specific situations and keep up with the story. This experience may broaden their horizons, and make them aware of cultural and linguistic differences (Munday, Ramos Pinto and Blakesley 2022, 190). When considering children, it may be beneficial due to various perspectives, as well as, the increase of knowledge about the world. Youngsters are particularly curious about other aspects, thus, it may expand their world-views. Additionally, to raise awareness of foreignization, one may consider the fact that it is often compared to *literal translation*. It mainly

focuses on linguistic effects, regarding such aspects as tone, connotation, polysemy or intertextuality (Venuti 2001, 244).

Interestingly, Venuti said that foreignization was highly desirable considering cultural inventions (Munday, Ramos Pinto and Blakesley 2022, 190). It stays in opposition to colonialism and any variant of racism. On the positive side, this technique is an attempt to juxtapose dissimilarities with the aim of reducing gaps between cultures (Chouit 2019, 76). As it was said before, not only does this attitude towards translation present new perspectives and values, but it also enriches target culture. Nevertheless, there are also disadvantages of this technique. First is that, it may fail to transmit the culture and make the texts difficult to understand; in this situation the reader may be bored (Zhuo 2022, 61). Additionally, the risk may lay in complete alienation and obscurity of the TT, thus, foreignization should be used carefully.

#### **4. Charlie and the Chocolate Factory: a general description**

To examine particular elements of the novel, the knowledge of the plot is essential in order to understand the context. One may suggest that the inspiration for the story came from the author's experience as a child when in his school days Dahl and his classmates were involved in testing chocolate bars of the nearby factory Cadbury.

First things first, the story concerns a young boy, Charlie Bucket. He is a member of a poor family, living in an old, wooden shack, Charlie is thin and hungry most of the time. Nearby stands a chocolate factory, owned by the mysterious Mr Wonka. According to his grandparents' stories, Wonka's sweets are one in a million. The story begins when there is a chance once in a lifetime to see the factory from the inside and get a never-ending supply of chocolates. The owner of this extraordinary place announces that five children who find Golden Tickets in chocolate bars will be able to get a tour around his factory. Thus, the race begins. The first four children are Augustus Gloop, a greedy boy, Veruca Salt, a spoiled girl, Violet Beauregrade, a girl who chews gums all day and, Mike Teavee, a boy who only watches television. Then, there is Charlie who can only be accompanied by his grandpa Joe. Finally, the day of the tour comes and all the lucky ones gather in front of the factory. Mr Willy Wonka shows them a wonderland, a place where almost everything seems possible. What is more, people meet Oompa-Loompas, small creatures brought from Loompaland. During the tour, it is certain that sightseers will not leave the same as they came. Firstly, due to the temptation, Augustus falls into the Chocolate River and is sucked by a pipe. Then, after chewing gum that contains a three-course dinner, Violet turns into a giant blueberry and is sent to the Juicing Room to 'de-juice' her. In the Nut Room, greedy Veruca is attacked by squirrels and along with her parents, she lands in rubbish. The only children left are Charlie and Mike. Due to his fascination with television, Mike is sent inside one and shrunken to the size of an ant. Then, with only grandpa Joe and Charlie, Mr Wonka goes to the lift once again and together, they watch every other person leaving

the factory with the enormous supply of sweets. To Charlie’s surprise, Mr Wonka offers him the whole factory as his successor. Willy suggests that for the time being, his parents can be the ones to help him supervise the company until the boy is old enough to run it by himself. Having said that, they go to Bucket’s cottage and bring the whole family to the factory.

Nonetheless, it has to be highlighted that the original version was slightly different from the one that everybody knows now. It was the portrayal of the Oompa-Loompas, previously called Whipple-Scrumpets, that had to be changed the most drastically due to the wave of criticism that came just after the first publication. Despite satirization of racism in one of his stories, Dahl was criticised for his ‘Victorian treatment’ (Treglown 1994, 35) of characters, cheerful factory labourers and at the same time, black pygmy slaves. The accusations were also based on the history of Oompas, being brought from an exotic land to work in the factory.

The picture below presents illustrations in the first British edition in 1977, made by Faith Jaques.



Picture 1. Black Oompa-Loompas illustrated by Faith Jaques in 1977  
(copied from Treglown 1994).

Nonetheless, the controversial image of Oompa-Loompas was changed and the workers became hippies with golden-brown hair and fair skin, the ones that we can observe in today’s version known by almost every child from all over the world. Thus, with the knowledge of the background of the book, the author and the plot, one may proceed to the examination of a particular aspect.

Another essential aspect worth including before the examination of *domestication* and *foreignization* of the Polish editions are translators themselves. This paper is to examine two of the Polish translations. The first edition is called *Karol i fabry-*

*ka czekolady*. It was published in 1998 by the publishing house ViK and translated by Tomasz Wyżyński. He is a translator of British and American literature, his main concern is fantasy. Wyżyński is also the author of many dictionaries, both general and language-for-specific-purpose ones. The other rendition analysed in this article, which is actually the third Polish one, is entitled *Charlie i fabryka czekolady*, published in 2015 by Znak emotikon. It was translated by Magdalena Heydel, most famous for translating fiction, especially novels and essays by Virginia Woolf. She is a professor at Jagiellonian University in Cracow and executive editor at *Przekładaniec. A Journal of Translation Studies*.

### 5. Wordplay, slang and idioms in *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* vs. Venuti's strategies

Proceeding with wordplay, slang and idioms, it is essential to remember that children's books are to be read out loud. Most examples of such categories are to be translated as poetry in order to keep the rhythm and melody. Additionally, one has to keep in mind the deeper meaning of slang, which may imply a lot of different hints about the characters (see above). Table 1 illustrates the differences between translations of the aforementioned speech in *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory*.

Roald Dahl (1964)	Tomasz Wyżyński (1998)	Magdalena Heydel (2015)
<i>This show's an absolute whiz-banger! It's terrific!</i>	<i>To genialny serial! Prawdziwa bomba!</i>	<i>Ten serial to hit! Jest niesamowity!</i>
<i>Charlie went on wolfing the chocolate.</i>	<i>Karol dalej pożerał czekoladę.</i>	<i>Ale Charlie dalej pożerał czekoladę.</i>

Table 1. Comparison of chosen slang of the original and both Polish translations.

The first examples, the reader may notice, are regarding Mike Teavee. The boy who is really keen on television watches various films and series. There is this one show that according to him is 'an absolute *whiz-banger!* It's *terrific!*' (Dahl 2007, 50). In his short but straightforward speech, one may observe two informal parts of speech. The first one, the noun *whiz-banger* comes, most probably, from the adjectival slang word *whiz-bang* (also spelt as *whizz-bang*). According to the Oxford English Dictionary (OED), it means 'striking, flashy, and impressive; very exciting or appealing, [...] more generally: exceptionally good, excellent'. The second one, the adjective *terrific* is 'an enthusiastic term of commendation [means] amazing, impressive; excellent, exceedingly good, splendid' (OED), what is more, the word may also mean 'frightening, causing terror, fitted to excite fear or dread', which may be connected to the genre of shows that Mike is constantly watching, i.e. gangster ones. The translators opted for different word choices, yet, both used domestication. Wyżyński (1998) chose words like *genialny* and *bomba*, namely 'To *genialny* serial! *Prawdziwa bomba!*' (Dahl, 1998,40).

The adjective *genialny* in colloquial speech means 'awe-inspiring speaker'<sup>1</sup> (Wielki Słownik Języka Polskiego [WSJP]) and also 'extraordinary, outstanding, wonderful'<sup>2</sup> (Słownik Języka Polskiego PWN [SJP PWN]). The second one, just like in the original version, the word has some connotation with something causing terror, meaning 'explosive'<sup>3</sup> (SJP PWN). However, in the informal context, it also means 'excellent, wonderful, extraordinary'<sup>4</sup> (SJP PWN). Additionally, one may observe the change of one part of speech (*whiz-banger* – noun; *terrific* – adjective) into another (*genialny* – adjective; *bomba* – noun) and a use of transposition. Nevertheless, in both cases words fit the original meaning and, at the same time, give the reader the sense of Polish colloquial speech rightly suggesting the speaker of the phrases, namely a young person. When it comes to the second rendition (Heydel 2015), one may observe sentences like 'Ten serial to *hit!* Jest *niesamowity!*' (Dahl 2015, 49). One has to notice that contrary to Wyżyński, Heydel kept the same word classes as in the original version. The noun *hit* means 'something that attracts great interest or is popular at a particular time'<sup>5</sup> (WSJP). It may be stated that the definition more or less connects to the English one, yet, the second part does not have anything in common with it. Nevertheless, the Polish young reader may clearly understand the message behind this word. The second lexeme is the adjective *niesamowity*, which means 'unusual, awe-inspiring or frightening'<sup>6</sup> (WSJP). One is able to notice that just like Wyżyński, Heydel used a word that may be associated with something awful or great. Nevertheless, both renditions seem to fulfil their purpose and be justified in the context presented.

Another interesting example that seems to appear is *wolf*. The reader is able to see that 'Charlie went on *wolfing* the chocolate' (Dahl 2007, 63). The informal verb has different meanings, however, the one that fits this context is 'to eat like a wolf; to devour ravenously' (OED). To be more specific, 'eat a large amount of food very quickly' (CD). In the renditions, both translators chose domestication and opted for *pożerać*, which means 'eat rapidly in the manner of animals'<sup>7</sup> (Słownik Języka Staropolskiego). Additionally, it is a colloquial word that about people may mean 'to eat something quick and ravenously'<sup>8</sup> (SJP PWN). One may conclude that even though those verbs do not occur as very similar in meaning, according to the definitions they actually do. In the Polish language seems not to be any verb that may mean 'eat like an animal' and at the same time, has an element connecting it to the animal itself. Yet, the word

<sup>1</sup> Translated by me; the original text: 'budzący zachwyt mówiącego'.

<sup>2</sup> Translated by me; the original text: 'niezwykły, znakomity, wspaniały'.

<sup>3</sup> Translated by me; the original text: 'ładunek wybuchowy'.

<sup>4</sup> Translated by me; the original text: 'świetny, wspaniały, niezwykły'.

<sup>5</sup> Translated by me; the original text: 'coś, co wzbudza duże zainteresowanie lub cieszy się popularnością w określonym czasie'.

<sup>6</sup> Translated by me; the original text: 'unusual, awe-inspiring or frightening'.

<sup>7</sup> Translated by me; the original text: 'gwałtownie zjadać pokarm na sposób zwierząt'.

<sup>8</sup> Translated by me; the original text: 'zjeść coś szybko i łapczywie'.

*pożerać* covers all the aspects mentioned in the definitions of the word *wolf*, thus the word choice is justified.

The next important aspect of language to be analysed is wordplay. It plays a deeply important role due to the creativity of Dahl, known till this day Table 2 illustrates all versions.

Roald Dahl (1964)	Tomasz Wyżyński (1998)	Magdalena Heydel (2015)
<i>'Whips!' cried Veruca Salt. 'What on earth do you use whips for?'</i>	- <i>Bicze?! — zawołała Weruka Solony. Po co panu bicze, do licha?!</i>	- <i>Bicze! — rozplakała się Veruca Salt. — Ale do czego pan używa biczy?</i>
<i>'For whipping cream, of course,' said Mr Wonka. 'How can you whip cream without whips? Whipped cream isn't whipped cream at all unless it's been whipped with whips. Just as a poached egg isn't a poached egg unless it's been stolen from the woods in the dead of night! Row on, please!'</i>	- <i>Do bicia śmietany, ma się rozumieć! — odpowiedział fabrykant. — Jak można ubić śmietanę bez bicza?! Bita śmietana nie jest bitą śmietaną, jeśli nie ubija jej się biczem! Tak samo jaja w koszulkach nie są jajami w koszulkach, dopóki nie ubierze się ich w koszulki!</i>	- <i>Do bicia śmietany, rzecz jasna — odpowiedział pan Wonka. — Jak sobie wyobrazasz uzyskanie bitej śmietany bez biczy? Bita śmietana nie jest bitą śmietaną, jeśli się jej porządnie nie zbije. Podobnie jak jajko sadzone nie jest jajkiem sadzonym, póki się go wiosną nie zasadzi w polu.</i>
<i>Violet, you're turning violet, Violet!</i>	<i>Jagodo, stajesz się podobna do jagody!</i>	<i>Violetko, zmieniasz się w fioletkę!</i>
<i>'There you are!' cried Mr Wonka. 'Square sweets that look round!'</i>	- <i>Oto cukierki, które się obracają! — zawołał pan Wonka.</i>	- <i>No i bardzo proszę! — zawołał pan Wonka. — Te oto cukierki nie są okrągłe, a wyglądają.</i>
<i>'They don't look round to me,' said Mike Teavee.</i>	- <i>Wcale nie widzę, żeby się obracały — zauważył Michał T. Elewic.</i>	- <i>Jak dla mnie to nie wyglądają na okrągłe — odezwał się Mike Teavee.</i>
<i>'They look square,' said Veruca Salt. 'They look completely square.'</i>	- <i>Są nieruchome — stwierdziła Weruka Solony. — Zupełnie nieruchome!</i>	- <i>Wyglądają na kwadratowe — potwierdziła Veruca Salt. — Wyglądają na kompletnie kwadratowe.</i>
<i>'But they are square,' said Mr Wonka. 'I never said they weren't.'</i>	- <i>Owszem, nieruchome! — odparł pan Wonka.</i>	- <i>No bo są kwadratowe — powiedział pan Wonka. — Przecież nie mówiłem, że nie są kwadratowe.</i>
<i>'You said they were round!' said Veruca Salt.</i>	- <i>A jednak się obracają!</i>	- <i>Mówił pan, że są okrągłe — zawołała Veruca Salt.</i>
<i>'I never said anything of the sort,' said Mr Wonka. 'I said they looked round.'</i>	- <i>Przecież to nieprawda! — zawołała Weruka. — Właśnie że prawda! — odrzekł pan Wonka. — Taką mają naturę!</i>	- <i>Nigdy w życiu niczego takiego nie powiedziałem — odrzekł pan Wonka. — Powiedziałem, że wyglądają!</i>

‘But they don’t look round!’ said Veruca Salt. ‘They look square!’	- A ja widzę, że leżą bez ruchu na stole! – zaprotestowała Weruka.	- Ale one nie wyglądają – stwierdziła Veruca.  – Wyglądają z całą pewnością – upierał się pan Wonka,
‘They look round,’ insisted Mr Wonka.	– Ani drgną! – A jednak się obracają! – upierał się pan Wonka.	
‘They most certainly do not look round!’ cried Veruca Salt.	– Na pewno nie! – zaperzyła się Weruka.	– Z całą pewnością nie wyglą- dają! – krzyknęła Veruca.
[...]	[...]	[...]
He [Mr Wonka] took a key from his pocket, and unlocked the door, and flung it open... and suddenly... at the sound of the door opening, <u>all the rows of little square sweets looked quickly round to see who was coming in. The tiny faces ac- tually turned towards the door and stared at Mr Wonka.</u>	[Pan Wonka] Wyjął z kieszeni klucz, przekręcił go w zamku, otworzył drzwi i nagle, na dźwięk otwieranych drzwi, <u>wszystkie kwadratowe cukierki obejrzały się, żeby zobaczyć, kto wchodzi do pomieszcze- nia. Ich małe twarzyczki naprawdę obróciły się w stronę drzwi i popatrzyły na pana Wonkę.</u>	[Pan Wonka] Wyjął z kieszeni klucz, przekręcił go w zamku i szeroko otworzył drzwi... a wtedy... nagle... na dźwięk otwieranych drzwi <u>wszystkie te rzędy kwadratowych cukier- ków natychmiast wyglądały, kto wchodzi. Małe twarze rzeczywiście odwróciły się w stronę drzwi i popatrzyły na pana Wonkę.</u>

Table 2. Comparison of chosen wordplay of the original and both Polish translations.

One may observe a fascinating wordplay regarding *whipped cream* and *poached egg*. For a better understanding of the pun, one has to break every word into pieces. Firstly, the adjective *whipped* means ‘eaten with or as with a whip; scourged, flogged, lashed’ (OED), it comes from the noun *whip* meaning ‘an instrument for flogging or beating, consisting either of a rigid rod or stick with a lash of cord, leather, etc. attached, or of a flexible switch with or without a lash, used for driving horses, chastising human beings, and other purposes’ (OED). On the other hand, in the collocation *whipped cream*, the adjective does not mean that the cream was beaten by a whip but rather a mixer or a whisk. Along these lines, *poached egg* means ‘an egg that has been cooked in simmering or gently boiling water without its shell’ (OED). However, when we break the phrase into pieces we may find out that *poached* comes from the verb *poach* which may be understood as ‘to go in illegal pursuit of game, fish, etc., esp. by trespassing (on the lands or rights of another) or in contravention of official protection’ (OED), yet the meaning ‘cook in boiling liquid’ (etymonline) can be found since the mid-15<sup>th</sup> century. Once analysed the second meaning of those phrases, one can proceed to the whole wordplay, which goes as follows:

‘Whips!’ cried Veruca Salt. ‘What on earth do you use whips for?’

‘For whipping cream, of course,’ said Mr Wonka. ‘How can you whip cream without whips? Whipped cream isn’t whipped cream at all unless it’s been whipped with whips. Just as

a *poached egg* isn't a *poached egg* unless it's been stolen from the woods in the dead of night! Row on, please!' (Dahl 2007, 112).

We are able to see that Dahl played with these phrases in their literal and metaphorical meaning. Due to such word choice, one may assume that the rendition of the text should be difficult, yet, in the Polish language, there are some metaphorical expressions connected to these two. When it comes to the *whipped cream*, both translators opted for domestication and chose *bita śmietana*. Just like in the English version, the phrase means 'a cream', however, when we divide the collocation, the first part comes from the verb *bić*, which means 'beat' or 'hit' or 'whale'. Moreover, they added *bicze*, which can be connected to the verb used. Thus, we are able to see that just like in Dahl's wordplay, the target language managed to convey a similar almost identical interpretation. On the other hand, *poached eggs* seem to be a little controversial, since the translators opted for two different versions. Wyżyński (1998) chose *jaja w koszulkach*, whereas Heydel (2015) went with *jajka sadzone*. The first variety of eggs means 'raw egg poured from the shell into boiling water, cooked until the white has coagulated and the yolk remains liquid'<sup>9</sup> (SJP PWN). It is essentially the same type of eggs just in the Polish version. They may be not as popular as the second kind, nonetheless, they still exist in the target culture. *Jajko sadzone*, on the other hand, is 'an egg fried in a pan in such a way that there is the fried white around the faint yolk'<sup>10</sup> (WSJP). Thus, in this case, the egg is fried not cooked like in the original or first Polish translation, yet, it is essential to mention that the translator chose domestication. Yet, the most crucial part of puns is the effect that they produce, therefore, one should look at both translations, i.e.

– *Bicze?! —* zawołała Weruka Solony. Po co panu *bicze*, do licha?!

– Do *bicia śmietany*, ma się rozumieć! — odpowiedział fabrykant. — Jak można *ubić śmietanę* bez *bicza*?! *Bitą śmietaną* nie jest *bitą śmietaną*, jeśli nie *ubija* jej się *biczem*! Tak samo *jaja w koszulkach* nie są *jajami w koszulkach*, dopóki nie *ubierze* się ich w *koszulki*! (Dahl 1998, 87; translation by Wyżyński),

– *Bicze!* – rozplakała się Veruca Salt. – Ale do czego pan używa *biczy*?

– Do *bicia śmietany*, rzecz jasna – odpowiedział pan Wonka. – Jak sobie wyobrażasz uzyskanie *bitej śmietany* bez *biczy*? *Bitą śmietaną* nie jest *bitą śmietaną*, jeśli się jej porządnie nie *zbije*. Podobnie jak *jajko sadzone* nie jest *jajkiem sadzonym*, póki się go wiosną nie *zasadzi* w polu.' (Dahl 2015, 118; translation by Heydel).

It seems that the translators managed to construct the sense of misunderstanding, as well as play with the food names present in the Polish language. Both of them pro-

<sup>9</sup> Translated by me; the original text: 'surowe jajko wylane ze skorupki na gotującą wodę, gotowane dopóty, aż białko się zetnie wokół żółtka, a żółtko pozostanie płynne'.

<sup>10</sup> Translated by me; the original text: 'jajko usmażone na patelni w taki sposób, że wokół słabo ściętego żółtka jest obwódka ściętego białka'.

duced the result as a pun based on the second or literal meaning of the words provided. To my mind, even though Heydel changed the original image, the renditions are surely justified.

Another important wordplay, concerning also proper names is ‘*Violet*, you’re turning *violet*, *Violet!*’ (Dahl 2007, 124). The pun is connected to the name of the character and the situation when she changes into a giant blueberry. Violet desires to taste a ‘forbidden’ gum that is supposed to taste a three-course dinner, including tomato soup, roast beef, and blueberry pie. Yet, after the flavour changes to the latter, Violet starts to change into the berry. Dahl might have chosen the name of the character, which is also the colour because of her fate. Thus, once again the wordplay is based upon the literal and metaphorical meaning, in this case, the name. In his rendition, Wyżyński (1998) since the very beginning made his job easier due to the domestication of the character’s name. It can be seen that while choosing *Jagoda* and not the Polish version of the name *Wioletta*, he clearly knew that this version would be more appropriate for the play on words. In this example, he once again opted for domestication and came up with ‘*Jagodo*, stajesz się podobna do *jagody!*’ (Dahl 1998, 100). *Jagoda* is regarded as the name and as the ‘shrublet with black fruits with a bluish tinge; also: a fruit of this plant’<sup>11</sup> (SJP PWN). Taking the definition into consideration, the essence of this pun can be understood by the target readers and at the same time, the joke may make them laugh. On the other hand, Heydel (2015) opted for foreignization while converting the proper name, therefore her rendition seems to be harder to create. Nonetheless, she came up with ‘*Violetko*, zmieniasz się w *fioletkę!*’ (Dahl 2015, 132). First thing first, the translator used the diminutive form of the name to make the wordplay even more advanced. It seems that she combined the name with the colour violet, in Polish ‘fiolet’ or ‘fioletowy’. Blending these two, she created actually a new word, that is not found in any dictionaries. Evidently, the rendition may be a foreignization due to the sophisticated word choice which leads to less understanding. What is more, it may be confusing for some of the youngest.

The next wordplay connected to the issue of meaning is the *square sweets that look round*. One may immediately notice some kind of confusion regarding this phrase due to the opposite messages that it evokes. Sweets that are square cannot be at the same time round, yet, the essence of this pun lies in the literal meaning and phrasal verbs, i.e. *look round*. Literally, one may see that phrase as ‘having the form of a circle or ring; shaped like a circle; circular; annular; (also occasionally) having the form of a spiral’ (OED). Yet in its metaphorical meaning the collocation may be understood as ‘to look around oneself in various directions; to survey one’s surroundings; [...] also: to turn one’s head in order to look in another direction’ (OED). What is more, one has to highlight that phrases such as *look round* and *look around* are used interchangeably and have the exact meaning. Dahl played with exactly these two meanings and created

<sup>11</sup> Translated by me; the original text: ‘krzewinka o czarnych owocach z niebieskawym nalotem; też: owoc tej rośliny’.

confusion while combining different shapes (square and round). To analyse the pun in greater detail, one should look at the whole text, i.e.


'There you are!' cried Mr Wonka. '*Square sweets that look round!*'  
'*They don't look round to me,*' said Mike Teavee.  
'They look square,' said Veruca Salt. 'They look completely square.'  
'But they are square,' said Mr Wonka. 'I never said they weren't.'  
'You said they were round!' said Veruca Salt.  
'I never said anything of the sort,' said Mr Wonka. 'I said they looked round.'  
'But they don't look round!' said Veruca Salt. 'They look square!'  
'They look round,' insisted Mr Wonka.  
'They most certainly do not look round!' cried Veruca Salt.

[...]


He [Mr Wonka] took a key from his pocket, and unlocked the door, and flung it open... and suddenly... at the sound of the door opening, *all the rows of little square sweets looked quickly round to see who was coming in. The tiny faces actually turned towards the door and stared at Mr Wonka* (Dahl 2007, 135–136).

When Mr Wonka seems to reflect upon this phrase in its abstract meaning, the others seem to understand it literally. Nevertheless, after seeing what the sweets are, none of the gathered people ventured to doubt Wonka's words. Additionally, it seems that the illustration incorporated into the text itself plays a huge role in understanding the word choice of the English edition and the renditions.

The pictures below present the portrayal of the sweets in the original version and the latter translation (Picture 1) and the first Polish translation (Picture 2).



Picture 2. *The portrayal of the square sweets that look round by Quentin Blake – English version and translated by Heydel.*



Picture 3. *The portrayal of the square sweets that look round by Michael Foreman – translation by Wyżński.*

The pun seems to be complicated for translating due to differences in languages, especially lack of phrasal verbs in Polish. Yet, one should analyse the renditions individually, the one made by Wyżyński (1998) reads as follows:

- *Oto cukierki, które się obracają!* — zawołał pan Wonka.
- *Wcale nie widzę, żeby się obracały* – zauważył Michał T. Elewicz.
- Są nieruchome — stwierdziła Weruka Solony. — Zupełnie nieruchome!
- Owszem, nieruchome! – odparł pan Wonka.
- A jednak się obracają!
- Przecież to nieprawda! — zawołała Weruka.
- Właśnie że prawda! — odrzekł pan Wonka. — Taką mają naturę!
- A ja widzę, że leżą bez ruchu na stole! – zaprotestowała Weruka.
- Ani drgną! – A jednak się obracają! — upierał się pan Wonka.
- Na pewno nie! — zaperzyła się Weruka.

[...]

[Pan Wonka] Wyjął z kieszeni klucz, przekręcił go w zamku, otworzył drzwi i nagle, na dźwięk otwieranych drzwi, *wszystkie kwadratowe cukierki obejrzały się, żeby zobaczyć, kto wchodzi do pomieszczenia. Ich maleńkie twarzyczki naprawdę obróciły się w stronę drzwi i popatrzyły na pana Wonkę* (Dahl 1998, 109–110).

One can clearly see that Wyżyński talked his way out of the tight spot and chose domestication. As a result of this strategy, he come up with *nieruchome cukierki, które się obracają*. The wordplay in this case is based on the fact that the faces of the sweets are the ones that are to turn round and not the sweets themselves. The verb *obracać się* means 'turn on its axis or in a circle' as well as 'turn in a certain direction'<sup>12</sup> (SJP PWN). One can clearly notice that even though the words were changed, the translator still made some kind of connection to the shape 'round'. The meaning here is not as metaphorical as in the English version, nonetheless, the reader can clearly get the essence of the pun and make sense of it. On the other hand, Heydel (2015) came up with a different word choice and the pun goes as follows:

- No i bardzo proszę! – zawołał pan Wonka. – *Te oto cukierki nie są okrągłe, a wyglądają.*
- *Jak dla mnie to nie wyglądają na okrągłe* – odezwał się Mike Teavee.
- Wyglądają na kwadratowe – potwierdziła Veruca Salt. – Wyglądają na kompletnie kwadratowe.
- No bo są kwadratowe – powiedział pan Wonka. – Przecież nie mówiłem, że nie są kwadratowe.
- Mówił pan, że są okrągłe – zawołała Veruca Salt.

<sup>12</sup> Translated by me; the original text: 'zrobić obrót wokół własnej osi lub po kole' [także] 'zwrócić się w jakąś stronę'.

– Nigdy w życiu niczego takiego nie powiedziałem – odrzekł pan Wonka. – Powiedziałem, że wyglądają!

– Ale one nie wyglądają – stwierdziła Veruca.

– Wyglądają z całą pewnością – upierał się pan Wonka.

– Z całą pewnością nie wyglądają! – krzyknęła Veruca.

[...]

[Pan Wonka] Wyjął z kieszeni klucz, przekręcił go w zamku i szeroko otworzył drzwi... a wtedy... nagle... na dźwięk otwieranych drzwi *wszystkie te rzędy kwadratowych cukierków natychmiast wyglądały, kto wchodzi. Małeńkie twarze rzeczywiście odwróciły się w stronę drzwi* i popatrzyły na pana Wonkę (Dahl 2015, 145–146).

Here the translator also decided to keep the shape, actually both shapes. Nevertheless, it seems that the essence of the pun is somehow lost. One would think what being in the shape of a ball ('okrągłe') has to do with appearing or peeking out ('wyglądają'). Keeping the shape in this translation made it a little awkward and tenebrous, which may lead to incomprehension in the reader and a lack of amusing parts in it. Nonetheless, it has to be highlighted that Heydel also played with words and their meanings. One may clearly see that *wyglądać* has two equal meanings, i.e. 'look out from behind something' and 'have a certain appearance'<sup>13</sup> (SJP PWN). Thus, the translators have to be given credit even though we might have not noticed the wordplay at first glance.

Last but not least, idioms play a huge role in everyday speech, whether it was 100 years ago or it is today. Table 3 presents an idiom found in the book that seems particularly interesting.

Roald Dahl (1964)	Tomasz Wyżyński (1998)	Magdalena Heydel (2015)
<i>See you later, alligator!</i>	<i>See you later, alligator!</i>	<i>Do widzenia! Do widzenia! Kup se trąbkę do trąbienia!</i>

Table 3. Comparison of chosen idioms of the original and both Polish translations.

Almost at the end of the story, one may encounter an expression *See you later, alligator!*. It is a phrase that means 'a silly way of saying "goodbye," when you or someone else is leaving. It commands a response... "After while, crocodile."' (UD). The collocation is based on a rhyming of the last two words, i.e. /'leɪ.təʃ/ and /'æɪ.l.ɪ.ɡeɪ.təʃ/. One may notice that while pronouncing these words out loud the last syllables sound the same. The renditions once again differ greatly. Wyżyński (1998) decided to keep the English version without any changes and went with the foreignization, *See you later, alligator!*. However, there is no footnote or additional explanation to that phrase, thus it may be misunderstood or completely incomprehensible to younger children, especially the ones that do not know any English. On the other hand, Heydel

<sup>13</sup> Translated by me; the original text: 'spojrzeć, wychyliwszy się z za czegoś' [i] 'mieć określony wygląd'.

(2015) decided to find a phrase that would convey the meaning of saying goodbye and at the same time, to keep the rhyme part. She domesticated the text and came up with *Do widzenia! Do widzenia! Kup se trąbkę do trąbienia!*. The message in this example is clear due to the *do widzenia* part which literally means ‘goodbye’. Additionally, while looking at the pronunciation of the words such as *do widzenia* and *do trąbienia*, one may be able to notice that they rhyme, i.e. /dɔ vʲidzɛɲa/ and /dɔ trɔmbʲɛɲa/<sup>14</sup>. Thus, it seems that the latter translation of the collocation may be closer to the readers, as well as, more comprehensible.

In conclusion, based on the analysis presented in this section, one may notice that the case of wordplay may be the most challenging. It seems that translated literally the essence of the pun is lost due to the differences in languages, especially the ones that belong to various families. As presented, different translators tend to choose different strategies and techniques, nonetheless, most of them are headed in the direction of domestication. The same goes with idioms and slang expressions, they tend to differ between cultures. Thus, has to be adapted to the target culture rather than translated literally because they may lose their metaphorical meaning.

## 6. Conclusion

The objective of the article is to provide an insight into the translation of children’s literature, studying instances of wordplay, slang and idiomatic expressions found in Roald Dahl’s novel *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* (2007/1964). Throughout the paper, one finds the approaches to translation and, at the same time, the practical examples that support them. One also has a look at the intricacy of books for the young. The actual challenges found in the first part of this paper are aimed at portraying the complexity of children’s literature. For centuries, this type of genre was overlooked and underrated by many; thus, it may be a surprise to actually find so many obstacles and features essential while translating those books. In search of the most adequate methodology to provide an explanation for differences between Polish translations, one can dig into Lawrence Venuti’s strategies, which are based on Schlaiermacher’s lecture. Considering domestication and foreignization, one can understand the importance of the culture and beliefs of the people of a foreign country. From this part, one may observe the importance of identity and experience in a particular part of the world. Taking into consideration those techniques of translation, we approach the practical part.

Since Roald Dahl is known for his extra-creativity, the data in this book is enormous. The author aimed to portray as many imaginative words as possible. The novel is full of invented words and phrases, as well as idioms and interesting collocations. Thus, it was a particularly engaging activity to choose between all of them in order to

---

<sup>14</sup> The phonetic transcription written in International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA); converted by BALTOSLAV Konwerter IPA.

present the most interesting problematic linguistic aspects. One can observe an analysis of the original version, the first Polish translation by Tomasz Wyżyński (1998), and one of the newest renditions by Magdalena Heydel (2015). From the very beginning, one may notice three major areas of struggle: wordplay, slang, and idioms. The examination of this group seems to be particularly engaging since some of them are based on metaphorical and literal meanings of words and expressions. Similarly, a lot of slang collocations are used in the book. In the late 50s and early 60s, when the book was written and published, the slang in the United States began to flourish, which can be clearly seen in the book.

The article aims to provide the differences between two Polish translations of *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory*. Both of them apply different techniques, but not in all cases, in order to create a cognitive scene. All the linguistic devices implemented by translators play a role in the whole text. One can notice that when it comes to wordplay, slang, and idioms, Wyżyński mostly chooses domestication, yet so does Heydel. Thus, one may assume that in such complicated expressions, the foreignization can be challenging to convey or even impossible, regarding the younger one as a reader. Additionally, one may notice that regarding idiom found in the book, the rendition seems to be rather challenging, thus Wyżyński chooses to stick with the original version and adapts foreignization. Moreover, the cognitive scenes presented by translators appear to differ, yet, they still manage to keep the proper meaning and importantly, the amusing and colloquial effect. Nonetheless, both renditions succeed in their attempts to preserve the linguistic aspects as reasonably as they can and keep the text as interesting as in the original version. Furthermore, in both, one may find a logical explanation for the usage of either of the strategies. What is the most important, the playfulness with words and structures that Dahl is famous for is not lost in the translation, rather the renditions make it more comprehensible for target readers.

## References

- Akbari, Monireh. 2013. "The Role of Culture in Translation." *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies (Special Issue on Applied Linguistics)* 3 (8).
- Allen, Esther, ed. 2007. *To Be Translated or Not to Be : PEN/IRL Report on the International Situation of Literary Translation*. Barcelona: Institut Ramon Llull.
- Cambridge University Press & Assessment. 2024. *Cambridge Dictionary*. Cambridge Dictionary Press. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/>.
- Cameron, Eleanor. 1972. "McLuhan, Youth and Literature." *The Horn Book*. <https://www.hbook.com/story/mcluhan-youth-and-literature-part-i-2>.
- Carroll, Lewis. 2000. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. BookVirtual Corporation.
- Chouit, Abderraouf. 2019. "A Critical Evaluation of Venuti's Domestication and Foreignization Theory of Translation." *Revue de Traduction et Langues* 18 (1): 8–22.
- Dahl, Roald. 1998. *Karol i Fabryka Czekolady*. Translated by Tomasz Wyżyński. ViK.

- . (1964) 2007. *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory*. Puffin Books.
- . 2015. *Charlie i Fabryka Czekolady*. Translated by Magda Heydel. Znak emotikon.
- Ghesquiere, Rita. 2006. "Why Does Children's Literature Need Translations?" In *Literature in Translation: Challenges and Strategies*, edited by Jan Van Coillie and Walter P. Verschueren. St. Jerome Publishing.
- González Cascallana, Belén. 2006. "Translating Cultural Intertextuality in Children's Literature." In *Literature in Translation: Challenges and Strategies*, edited by Jan Van Coillie and Walter P. Verschueren. St. Jerome Publishing.
- Harper, Douglas. 2023. "Online Etymology Dictionary." *Etymonline.com*. <https://www.etymonline.com/>.
- Hejwowski, Krzysztof. 2010. "O Tłumaczeniu Aluzji Językowych." In *Przekład-Język-Kultura*. Lublin: UMCS.
- Hermans, Theo. 1993. *On Modelling Translation: Models, Norms and the Field of Translation*. Hollindale, Peter. 1997. *Signs of Childness in Children's Books*. Stroud: Thimble Press.
- "Konwerter IPA." 2024. *Baltoslav.eu*. Accessed June 19. <https://baltoslav.eu/ipa/index.php?mova=pl>.
- Kramersch, Claire. 1998. *Language and Culture*. Oxford University Press.
- Lathey, Gillian. 2016. *Translating Children's Literature*. 2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN: Routledge.
- Munday, Jeremy, Sara Ramos Pinto, and Jacob Blakesley. 2022. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. 5th ed. London: Routledge.
- Oittinen, Riitta. 2006. "No Innocent Act. On the Ethics of Translating for Children." In *Literature in Translation: Challenges and Strategies*, edited by Jan Van Coillie and Walter P. Verschueren. St. Jerome Publishing.
- "Oxford English Dictionary." 2024. *www.oed.com*. Oxford University Press. <https://www.oed.com/?tl=true>.
- Sapir, Edward. 2023. *Culture, Language and Personality*. Univ of California Press.
- "Słownik Języka Polskiego PWN." 2016. *Sjp.pwn.pl*. PWN. <https://sjp.pwn.pl/>.
- "Słownik Pojęciowy Języka Staropolskiego – UkładSłownik." 2024. *Spjs.ijp.pan.pl*. Accessed June 19. <https://spjs.ijp.pan.pl/ukladSłownik/index>.
- Szymańska, Izabela. 2017. *The Treatment of Geographical Dialect in Literary Translation from the Perspective of Relevance Theory*.
- Treglown, Jeremy. 1994. *Roald Dahl: A Biography*. London: Faber and Faber Limited.
- "Urban Dictionary." 2000. *Urban Dictionary*. <https://www.urbandictionary.com/>.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 2001. "Strategies of Translation." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, edited by Mona Baker. Routledge.
- . 2008. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- "WSJP." n.d. *Wsjp.pl*. <https://wsjp.pl/>.
- Zhuo, Yanling. 2022. "Translation Strategies of Domestication and Foreignization." *Advances in Educational Technology and Psychology* 6: 59–64.