Artlangs, Worldview and Translation

I. Rebrii

Ivan Kozhedub National Air Force University, Kharkiv, Ukraine
*Corresponding author. E-mail: rebriy@vega.com.ua

Abstract. The article is dealing with the specifics of translating artlangs as the means of creating and expressing a particular worldview which combines the features of an imaginary (possible) world developed by the author with the features of the real world the author and his book belong to. The necessity of translating artlangs is determined by their status of a complex stylistic device whose omission in the target text will automatically decrease its artistic value and interpretability. By translating artlangs, translators pursue the strategy of domestication which contributes to the naturalness of the target text and fluency of its perception.

Keywords: artlang, domestication, donor, translation, worldview.

Introduction. In order to expose ethnomental and ethnocultural specifics of translating artlangs, I decided to turn to the notion of a worldview/world picture. Proceeding from the basic provision that artlangs are artificial languages, constructed within literary discourse, I put forward an inevitable question: "View" or "picture" of what world do they reflect?

The concept of a worldview/world picture is of active use among the representatives of different disciplines and sciences, like philosophy, psychology, literary, cultural and cognitive studies, linguistics, etc. Supplemented by a specifying modifier – "scientific", "conceptual", "linguistic", "physical", "biological", "individual", "common", etc. – the worldview has penetrated terminological paradigms of the abovementioned as well as many other research fields, though its understandings and definitions within them are far from being unanimous. Quite naturally, that in my research I stick to the linguistic interpretation of the worldview which is characterized by the dichotomic opposition: conceptual vs linguistic.

According to the "Dictionary of the Basic Terms of Cognitive and Discursive Linguistics" by A. Martynyuk, conceptual worldview can be characterizes as a global, holistic and dynamic system of information about the world processed and possessed by an individual and/or society which he or she is a member of [2, p. 53]. Conceptual worldview contains considerable layers of non-verbalized knowledge that belong to the sphere of the subconscious and thus can not be expressed in linguistic forms. Correspondingly, linguistic worldview is seen as part of the conceptual one that got objectified in the language forms and thus belongs to the sphere of the conscious [Ibid.]. It is the linguistic worldview that can stand as an object of empirical research as it reflects: 1) knowledge about the language as a (sign) system and 2) knowledge inside the language, i.e. knowledge about the world expressed and transmitted with the help of language signs. The second constituent of linguistic worldview is always nationally and culturally substantiated which leads to its definition as "a conglomerate of knowledge about the world amassed by individuals within a certain society at a certain stage of its development and reflected in language signs; also, linguistic segmentation of the world, its objects and phenomena fixated in the meanings of language units" [3, p. 7-9]. In my article, I would like to explore the relevance of the concept of worldview/world picture in regard to translation in general and artlangs' translation, in particular.

General outline of the problem. According to O. Cherednychenko, "every ethnic culture has something common with and different from other ethnic cultures, and these common/different features are displayed in the network of concepts forming a basis for a particular language and in this language itself. In this respect, we can speak about the similarity between linguistic and conceptual worldviews, but they are never identical, because conceptual worldview is more flexible and it can change faster under the influence of numerous social and historical factors" [1, p. 53]. On the other hand, any language is capable of accommodating new concepts and objectifying them in its units – either old or newly coined ad hoc. Similarly, when the translator has to deal with source language units denoting concepts that are not familiar to the target audience and thus not embodied in any form in a target language, he or she has at their disposal a number of ways to transfer the necessary meaning. In such situations the new concepts are formed with target readers on the basis of the process aptly described as "linguistic perception". Another term that can be used to describe this situation is "translator's nomination", which in fact is the process opposite to "regular" nomination in that sense that it proceeds not from the perception of an object but rather from the perception of the word denoting that object [4]. In my opinion, such a regularity in relations between two different languages and their speakers not only provides for the international proliferation of knowledge, but also forms theoretical foundation for the idea of principal translatability: there is nothing in one languages that cannot be possibly expressed (even if with some losses) in another. Artlangs, which are **the object** of my scientific interest, form a separate category as they seemingly exist "on their own" and have no linguistic attribution to either source or target language and/or culture. Hence, the **aim** of this research is to track how the worldview, encoded in an artistic quasi-language, can be transferred for the sake of a target audience in the process of translation.

The results of the research. Artlangs are a relatively new literary and linguistic phenomenon that only appeared in the XXth century when the ideas of Interlinguistics penetrated literary discourse. Interlinguistics is the branch of philology aimed at studying constructed languages ("conlangs") which can be classified into two broad categories – "auxiliary languages" (or "auxlangs") and "artistic languages" (or "artlangs").

While auxlangs appear as means of international communication specifically created to substitute for

natural languages, artlangs can be characterized as quasi-languages that serve as a stylistic device for the description of alien or future societies and/or species. The best examples of artlangs can be found in such literary genres as utopia/dystopia (e. g. "Newspeak" by George Orwell, "Nadsat" by Aldus Huxley), science fiction ("Hlab-Eribol-ef-Cordi" by Clive Staples Lewis), fantasy ("Quenya", "Sindarin", "Quenderin", "Eldarin", "Avarin", "Nandorin" by John Ronald Reuel Tolkien) or fairy tale ("Lapine" language by Richard Adams). The components of these artlangs will be used as the **illustrative material** for my research. Unlike auxlangs, artlangs are never fully structured; the reader can usually get just a glimpse of an exotic language whose units (as a rule, words, rarely, sentences) are scattered here and there across the body of a literary text. I would like to explore deeper into the functional specifics of artlangs, because here lies the key to their interpretation and translatability. **Methods** employed for the implementation of my aim include structural, semantic, functional and comparative analyses.

How do functions of artlangs correlate with those of natural languages? Any natural language performs simultaneously a number of functions. Among them, researchers usually distinguish the following basic ones: communicative, informative, expressive, and cognitive. Ironically, the first two functions that are usually regarded inseparable seem almost irrelevant to artlangs simply because they do not cross the borders of their literary "cradles". Instead, in artistic languages expressive and cognitive functions come to the forefront.

Expressive function is revealed in an artlang as an intricate stylistic device that basically serves to attract readers' attention due to its uncommonness and non-habitualness. The presence of an invented language in a literary work allows to bring the imaginary world closer to the real one and let the reader feel like a participant of the described events.

On the other hand, artlangs' cognitive function attracts my attention due to the fact that it lies in forming and transmitting a specific view of the world drawn by the author's imagination in his mind. Philologists dealing with the problem of imaginary (possible) worlds, employ the term "artistic worldview" that "appears in the reader's mind while reading a literary work" and "reflects the author's individual worldview" [3, p. 7-9]. Artistic worldview is embodied in specific linguistic means, among which artlangs are the most complicated – as to both their structure and meaning.

In his research of the peculiarities of translating fantasy texts, A. Tiliha makes one step further and proposes to single out what he calls "a fantastic artistic worlview" which is characterized by him as "a form of representing quasi-reality that exists in an imaginary conjunction of time and space" [6, p. 115]. The author claims that "fragments of an invented fantastic world are constructed on the basis of the real world and find their verbal implementation on different levels of the text" (Ibid.). This last statement brings to memory the concept of linguocreative thinking which, according to A. Serebrennikov, is "closely tied to the available language resources", because "in the process of creating a new verbal unit a person always utilizes already existing ones"

[5, p. 198]. Commenting on the process of linguistic evolution, the scholar argues that "language is never created out of nothing" but "always from a certain number of words and forms that remain from its previous state" and "serve as a materialistic foundation for coining something new" [Ibid., p. 199]. In natural languages, the process of linguistic creation and modification is conducted to a large extent subconsciously. The level of "linguistic reflection" among "naïve" language-bearers is typically very low and only professionals dealing with the language (philologists, writers, translators, journalists, etc.) take a conscious and (more or less) systemic stance on its evolution.

Taking into account these considerations, I would like to make two assumptions of both empirical (i.e. concerning artlangs' translation) and theoretical (i.e. concerning methodology of artlangs' research within Translation Studies paradigm) character. The first is that artlangs obligatory include elements of natural languages. These elements may come from different levels (phonemes, morphemes, lexemes) and from different languages (in order to avoid juxtaposition of terminology I'll call natural languages, from which artlangs "borrow" their elements "donor languages" or simply "donors" instead of "source languages"). Artlangs also employ their donors' morphology and syntax.

The second assumption comes from the first and regards artlangs' translatability (I remind, that this is already the second argument in favour of artlangs' translatability): if we consider an artlang a complicated and complex case of putting together linguistic elements of different levels of a particular language, the same combination principle may be successfully applied for its translation. Hypothetically, all you have to do is take equivalent elements of equivalent levels in another language and put them together in accordance with relevant rules of word formation. In reality, this seemingly easy process always falls under different limitations of linguistic and extra-linguistic character. Take, for example, the following elements from George Orwell's Newspeak in the dystopian novel "1984":

*Because of the greater difficulty in securing euphony, irregular formations were commoner in the B vocabulary than in the A vocabulary. For example, the adjectival forms of **Minitrue**, **Minipax**, and **Miniluv** were, respectively, **Minitruthful**, **Minipeaceful**, and **Minilovely**, simply because **-trueful**, **-paxful**, and **–loveful** were slightly awkward to pronounce* (Orwell, 1984).

*Оскільки досягти милозвучності було не так вже й легко, у Словнику В частіше зустрічалися відхилення від норми у порівнянні зі Словником А. Наприклад, від іменників **Мініправда**, **Мінімир** та **Мінілюбов** прикметники були утворені таким чином, аби максимально відповідати вимозі милозвучності: **мінілюбний** (а не **мінілюбовний**), **мініправдний** (а не **мініправдивий**), **мінімінімирний** (а не **мінімировий**). Забраковані форми були визнані складнішими для вимови* (Орвелл, 1984).

In my translation of Orwell's formations I just followed in the author's footsteps trying to imitate as closely as possible his word-building principles and techniques. At the first stage (*analysis*) I dissected the source words into their "input material". At the next stage

(*transfer*) I selected equivalents to the components, obtained at the first stage. Finally, at the third stage (*restructuring*) I put these components together anew by the method known as "loan translation" or "calque". As one can see, the whole procedure closely reminds Eugene Nida's transformation model of translation.

But, as it was mentioned, not all constituents of artlangs are that easy for translation. Look at the next example:

*Thus, in all verbs the preterite and the past participle were the same and ended in **-ed**. The preterite of **steal** was **stealed**, the preterite of **think** was **thinked**, and so on throughout the language, all such forms as swam, **gave**, **brought**, **spoke**, **taken**, etc., being abolished. All plurals were made by adding **-s** or **-es** as the case might be. The plurals of **man**, **ox**, **life**, were **mans**, **oxes**, **lifes**. Comparison of adjectives was invariably made by adding **-er**, **-est (good, gooder, goodest)**, irregular forms and the more, most formation being suppressed* (Orwell, 1984).

Here, Orwell employs the idea of making Newspeak more regular than the English language by eliminating three types of irregularities: irregular past tense forms of verbs, irregular plural forms of nouns and irregular comparison forms of adjectives. Due to the differences in the formation of these categories in Ukrainian, I had to apply compensation transformation for verbs and adjectives and to remove nouns, among whose categories in the source language I couldn't find any that would guarantee a similar effect:

*Це, наприклад, стосувалося дієслів, для яких були відмінені усі форми давноминулого часу, на зразок **вкрав був**, **думав був**, **плив був**, **дав був**, **приніс був**, **говорив був**, **узяв був**. Усі ступені порівняння прикметників утворювалися лише за допомогою суфіксів. Усі складені форми вищого та найвищого ступенів (**більш**, **найбільш**) були вилучені. Новомова була позбавлена нерегулярних порівняльних форм, якими вважалися усі, утворені з будь-якими відхиленнями від вихідної (простої) форми: тепер неможна було вживати **кращий** чи **найкращий**, а лише **добріший** та **найдобріший*** (Орвелл, 1984).

But why should artlangs be translated at all? Can't they just be left *per se*, that is exactly how they were conceived by the authors? In order to answer these questions, I should admit that within literary works artlangs play the same role as natural languages in the real life. They sort of inform potential readers about what life is like inside that imaginary world. In particular, it means that the authors themselves determine which objects of this world are to be nominated and which are not. Most of the remarks and dialogues of the characters that are supposed to speak artlangs are given in donor languages. Artlangs appear in texts sporadically, for creating the effect of "the otherness". Translator's decision "to skip" artlang by substituting its units with ones taken from the target language will ruin this effect and cause irreparable damage to the artistic value of the book. At the same time, the decision to leave an artificial language intact (especially in situations that assume the change of an alphabet, for example, from Latin into Cyrillic) will definitely endanger the reader's ability to understand it due to its connection with the donor language which – from translation perspective – is a source language as well.

On the other hand, by overloading the book with artificial words the author takes a risk to make reading more complicated and thus to avert potential audience from it. Take, for instance, Burgess's dystopia "A Clockwork Orange", which, due to the use of Nadsat, turns into a kind of a puzzle, resulting in the readers' "alienation, aloofness from a familiar, customary world" [7, p. 153]. While some of the novel's editions were supplemented with Nadsat glossaries, Burgess himself despised this practice arguing that the dominant for the novel idea of brainwashing applies to its readers as well. In ideal, the English-speaking readers of the novel were to use the Russian dictionary or learn some Russian before getting acquainted with the book.

The attempt to systematize Nadsat quite logically demonstrates rather lengthy rows of lexemes denoting such concepts as, for example, A CRIMINAL (*baddiwad, banda, bratty, cally animal, droog, gruppa, malchick, nazz, prestoopnik, shaika, shoot, staja*) or A FEMALE (*baboochka, cheena, dama, devotchka, forella, ptitsa, sharp, soomka, zheena*). Such situation can indeed be explained by the plot and by the status of Nadsat as a youth jargon. The same is true for the concept A HUMAN BODY (*brooko, cluve, litso, glazz, goober, gorlo, groody, gulliver, keeshkas, noga, ooko, pletcho, plot, rooker, rot, sharries, shiyah, tally, voloss, yahzick, yarbles, zoobies*), as the novel's characters get hit in the "gulliver" (head), "ooko" (ear) or "brooko" (belly) all the time. At the same time a lot of the words, injected by Burgess in the novel, make an impression of pure arbitrariness, like *collocol* (bell), *dook* (spirit), *eetya* (name), *gazetta* (newspaper), *gromky* (loud), *knopka* (button), *lomtick* (slice), *minoota* (minute), *nadmenny* (arrogant), etc. With all its subjectivity, the author's choice, nevertheless, helps to create the atmosphere of ease, to show how vital that jargon is for the characters of the book. Here, I return to the idea of the subjectivity of worldviews depicted by artlangs. Subjective is the choice of the nominated objects, but subjective is also the method of their nomination.

It's worth to mention that in relation to their donors, all artlangs fall into two types: *a posteriori* and *a priori* ones. A posteriori artlangs are built from the morphemes or lexemes of their donor(s), while a priori artlangs consist of unmotivated words and only borrow from their donor(s) phonemes/letters. Take, for example, Lewis's "Old Solar" language also known as *Hlab-Eribol-ef-Cordi*, construed on the basis of the Latin alphabet. Though units of a priori languages have no inner form and their meanings can only be inferred from the contextual comments, they are often loadedwith some sound symbolism. At the same time, euphonic considerations are not always taken into account by authors who, on the contrary, may be willing to achieve an estrangement effect due to the uncommon (sometimes unpronounceable) combinations of letters/sounds. In a posteriori languages the translator can always track down the author's word-formation methods and imitate them with the help of a target language elements. In either case, artlangs can never get rid of the influence imposed on them by their donors, and will preserve their traces on different levels. Correspondingly, the worldview represented by an artlang will have much in common with the worldview

represented by its donor. Metaphorically speaking, hob-bits, elves or gnomes from Tolkien's books will always be perceived like "English" hobbits, elves or gnomes, and fantastic reality whose part and parcel they are, will always be perceived like a derivative of English reality. When an artlang is translated a new worldview is created simultaneously. Being unable to shake off all the traces of the original language and culture, this new worldview becomes an important element of domestication strategy incorporating numerous elements of translation language and culture.

Conclusion. Summing up my above considerations as to artlangs, worldview and translation, I want to state that the status of artlangs as linguistic embodiments of possible (imaginary) worlds determines ethnomental and ethnocultural difficulties of their reproduction in translation. Being a unique means of forming an artistic worldview that has no correlations in any natural language, each artlang can be considered sort of a creative "side branch" of its donor, from which it borrows different elements (from phonemes to lexemes) as well as the rules of their implementation. By translating artlangs, translators pursue the strategy of domestication thus striving to increase the naturalness of the target text and fluency of its perception by the target audience.

REFERENCES

1. Cherednychenko, Oleksandr. (2007). *Pro movu i pereklad* [On language and translation]. Kyiv: Lybid'. 248 p.
2. Martynyuk, Alla. (2012). *Slovnyk osnovnykh terminiv kohnityvno-dyskursyvnoyi linhvistyky* [Dictionary of the basic terms of cognitive and discursive linguistics]. Kharkiv: Kharkiv University Publishers. 196 p.
3. Popova, Zinaida and Ivan Sternin. (2007) *Osnovnye cherty semantiko-kognitivnogo podhoda k jazyku* [Main features of semantic and cognitive approach to the language]. In: *Antologija konceptov* [Anthology of concepts]. Karasik, Vladimir and Ivan Sternin (eds.). Moscow: Gnosis. P. 7–9.
4. Rebrii, Oleksandr. (2007). *Kompleksnyy pidkhid do vyrishennya problemy perekladats'koyi nominatsiyi* [Complex approach to resolving the problem of translator's nomination]. In: Messenger of Kharkiv Karazin National University. Philology Series. #772. P. 34–37.
5. Serebrennikov, Boris. (1988). *Rol' chelovecheskogo faktora v jazyke: Jazyk i myshlenie* [The role of a human factor in the language. Language and thinking]. Moscow: Nauka. 242 p.
6. Tiliha, Anton. (2013). *Vidtvorennya toponimiky yak skladovoyi fantastychnoyi khudozhn'oyi kartyny svitu v anhlo-ukrayins'kykh perekladakh* [Reproduction of toponyms as constituents of the fantastic artistic worldview]. In: *Filolohichni traktaty* [Philological Treatises]. Volume 4. # 2. Sumy: Sumy University Publishers. P. 114–118.
7. Zhadanov, Yuriy and Olga Serdukova. (2012). *Osobennosti ispol'zovanija iskusstvennyh jazykov v antiutopii XX veka* [The pecularity of usage of artificial languages in dystopia of the 20-th century]. In: Messenger of Kharkiv Karazin National University. Philology Series. # 994. Issue 64. P. 152–156.

Артланги, картина мира и перевод
И. Ребрий

Аннотация. Статья посвящена особенностям перевода артлангов как средства создания и воспроизведения особой картины мира, в которой соединяются характеристики вымышленного (возможного) мира, разработанного автором, и характеристики реальной действительности, к которой принадлежит автор и его произведение. Необходимость перевода артлангов обусловлена их статусом комплексного стилистического приема, опущение которого в целевом тексте автоматически приведет к снижению его художественной ценности и уровня интерпретируемости. Переводя артланги, переводчики преследуют стратегию одомашнивания, стремясь, таким образом, к природности целевого текста и плавности его восприятия.

Ключевые слова: артланг, донор, картина мира, одомашнивание, перевод.