

Cognition, communication, discourse. 2022, 24: 68-77.

<http://sites.google.com/site/cognitiondiscourse/home>

<https://doi.org/10.26565/2218-2926-2022-24-05>

Received 24.04.2022; revised and accepted 24.06.2022.

UDC 811.9'255.4

## TRANSLATING ARTLANGS: THE CLASH OF WORLDVIEWS

**Oleksandr Rebrii\***

Doctor of Sciences in Linguistics, Professor,

V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University (4, Svobody Sq., Kharkiv, 61022, Ukraine);

e-mail: [rebrii1967@gmail.com](mailto:rebrii1967@gmail.com); ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4912-7489>

**Ievgeniia Bondarenko**

Doctor of Sciences in Linguistics, Professor,

V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University (4, Svobody Sq., Kharkiv, 61022, Ukraine);

e-mail: [ievgeniia.bondarenko.2014@gmail.com](mailto:ievgeniia.bondarenko.2014@gmail.com); ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0654-1791>

**Inna Rebrii**

PhD in Linguistics, Associate Professor, Department of Foreign Languages

Ivan Kozhedub National Air Force University, Ukraine

(77/79 Sumska Str., Kharkiv, 61023, Ukraine);

e-mail: [inna.rebrij@gmail.com](mailto:inna.rebrij@gmail.com); ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1008-0142>

**Article citation:** Rebrii, O., Bondarenko, I., & Rebrii, I. (2022). Translating artlangs: the clash of worldviews. *Cognition, communication, discourse*, 24, 68-77. <https://doi.org/10.26565/2218-2926-2022-24-05>.

### Abstract

The research is dedicated to the problem of translating artlangs as a means of the alternative worldview embodiment. The object of research is twofold: the worldview in its linguistic manifestation and artlangs – artistic languages created within literary discourse mainly for expressive purposes. The aim of the research is equally dual: to determine what (kind of) worldview is reflected in artlangs and how it can be reproduced in translation. Our first hypothesis outlines three instances of worldview clashes connected with the perception, interpretation and translation of a piece of fiction depicting an alternative reality via an artlang. The first occurs when the reader decodes the text and recreates in their mind the author's artistic worldview, because the resulting 'picture' is never identical to the original one due to the uniqueness of information processing. The second occurs in translation, because the image of an alternative world in the translator's mind is indeed the projection of that of the author, but formed under the influence of their own (target) worldview and incarnated through the available target linguistic resources. The third occurs when the target reader retrieves the information from the target text and once again forms their own view of the alternative reality. According to our second hypothesis, artlangs' principal translatability is determined by their inextricable ties with natural donor language(s), though their reproduction is a highly demanding creative act whose outcome depends on a number of concomitant circumstances. Here belong: the relation between an artlang's donor language(s) and a piece of fiction's source language; the relation between a piece of fiction's source language and its target language; and, finally, the method of artlang's manufacturing.

**Key words:** alternative reality, artlang, clash, translatability, worldview.

### 1. Introduction

Modern concept of the worldview stems from Humboldt's idea of *Weltansicht*, according to which

*speakers of different languages form their particular worldviews under the influence of the inherent specific structure of their language, but simultaneously cultivate this language by leaving their own personal impressions upon it* (Stria, 2018, p. 216).

Despite its more than 200-year old history and all the disputes and controversies it stirred among several generations of researchers, this idea still retains its validity. Quite obviously, speaking about the worldview in its linguistic embodiment, researchers usually keep in mind natural languages, while the specifics of both drawing and reflecting reality (either tangible or imaginary) by construed ones has largely remained out of scholarly field of interest. Consequently, our attention is equally focused on two research objects: the worldview (or, to be more specific, its linguistic manifestation) and artlangs ('artistic' languages created within literary discourse mainly for expressive purposes). Our aim is similarly dual: firstly, to determine what (kind of) worldview is reflected in artlangs (taken in a broad sense as cognitive, linguistic, stylistic and artistic phenomena) and how (if at all) it can be reincarnated in translation.

## 2. Method

We would like to begin our first terminological overview with the notion of the conceptual worldview that appeared as the result of terminological search for an umbrella structure that would unite under it various forms of mental representations in human consciousness. Correspondingly, the conceptual worldview is defined 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" (Martyniuk, 2012, p. 53). The relations between the conceptual and linguistic views of the world are pretty obvious and may be described as hyper-hyponymic, meaning that the linguistic worldview is that "part of the conceptual one, which got objectified in linguistic forms and thus belongs to the sphere of the conscious" (ibid.). Another definition of the linguistic worldview describes it from a somewhat different angle as "a language-entrenched interpretation of reality, which can be expressed in the form of judgments about the world, people, things or events" (Bartmiński, 2012, p. 23). Thus, the linguistic worldview is "the result of subjective perception and conceptualization of reality performed by the speakers of a given language", which is "clearly subjective and anthropocentric but also intersubjective (social)" (ibid.). Paradoxically, but being opposed as "objective" and "subjective", both interpretations of the linguistic worldview nevertheless emphasize its ethnocentric character, which basically brings us back to Humboldt's another idea, that of *Volksgeist* ('spirit of the nation'), following which the complete and correct reproduction of the worldview in translation is called into question.

Now, we proceed to our second terminological overview in an attempt to uncover both cognitive and linguistic essence of artlangs. All artificial languages (also, conlangs—construed languages) present an extensive and varied group of phenomena, consciously and consistently devised by people (in many cases by one particular person) with two main purposes: (1) to serve as a universal means of communication for people all over the world; and (2) to serve as a means of communication for the characters in fiction (usually, a book or a film). In the former case, artificial languages are called auxlangs (auxiliary languages), and in the latter—artlangs. In his famous essay "A secret vice", one of the most prominent artlang-makers of all times and nations John Ronald Reuel *Tolkien reveals the aesthetic nature of artistic languages*:

*An art for which life is not long enough, indeed: the construction of imaginary languages in full or outline for amusement, for the pleasure of the constructor or even conceivably of any critic that might occur* (1983, p. 202).

Though, on entering the pages of a literary work, an artlang, this "inessential and accidental product of circumstances" (ibid.) undergoes a truly mysterious transformation into the major (idio)stylistic and plot-building element, whose main function is to add plausibility to an alternative world created by the author's imagination. Here again, we turn for support to Tolkien, who claims that "for perfect

construction of an art-language it is found necessary to construct at least in outline a mythology concomitant” (ibid., p. 210), because

*the making of language and mythology are related functions; to give your language an individual flavor, it must have woven into it the threads of an individual mythology, individual while working within the scheme of natural human mythopoeia (ibid.).*

If we substitute Tolkien’s ‘individual mythology’ for ‘the view of an alternative world’ we will conclude that artlangs serve as the main means of its incarnation.

But how alternative is this world, or to be more precise, its image drawn by the writer? In case of artlangs, an inversely proportional relationship can be proposed: the less an artlang reminds any of natural languages, the farther an alternative imaginary world is from reality. This hypothesis can be accepted with regard to at least two relevant factors. The first is the inability of a human being to invent anything absolutely new: every novelty is merely a new combination of old elements. The rule applies to the sphere of language as well. In this connection, Tolkien insists that all new words are “made not created” as “there is in historic language, traditional or artificial, no pure creation in the void” (ibid., p. 204).

The second factor to be taken into consideration in regard to artlangs’ role in forming and transmitting a specific view of the alternative world drawn by the author’s imagination, is the method of their construction. To clarify this issue we will turn to the classification developed within Interlinguistics, a philological discipline that investigates auxiliary languages. According to its classification, all the artlangs fall into three main types: (1) *a posteriori* ones; (2) *a priori* ones; and (3) *mixed* ones. The division is based upon the relations between artlangs and natural languages. A posteriori artlangs consist of units composed on the basis of elements taken from (a) natural language(s), in this case referred to as ‘(a) donor language(s)’. A priori artlangs consist of units that bear no resemblance to any elements of (a) natural language(s). Mixed artlangs combine units of both above types. It is necessary to add that this differentiation is to some extent nominal because, as we highlighted earlier, no artificial language is absolutely free from the influence of (a) natural language(s), but if a posteriori artlangs typically borrow ‘natural’ elements on the morphemic and/or lexical level(s), a priori ones only employ phonological and graphological resources of their donor(s).

Thus, artlangs as linguistic manifestations of alternative worldviews always bear some traits of linguistic worldviews of their donor languages. While creating an artlang, the author departs from the linguistic worldview of the donor language(s) and simultaneously draws a picture of an alternative world. Since it all happens within literary discourse, we characterize this alternative worldview as ‘artistic’ as well. As the reader (the reader *per se*, regardless, native or foreign) decodes the book they recreate the author’s worldview, though the resulting ‘picture’ is never identical to the original one due to the uniqueness of his/her own perception and interpretation of both linguistic and extralinguistic information within it. This situation can be characterized as the first instance of clashing worldviews.

But what happens with artlangs in translation and how translatable are they in principle? Typically, the translator would be the representative of a target culture, the native speaker of a target language and the bearer of the target conceptual and linguistic worldviews, which means that both these worldviews are somewhat alien to those of the author who comes from a source culture and speaks a source language. As a result, when the translator re-creates the original piece of fiction composed by the author, the image of an alternative world being formed in his/her mind is indeed the projection of that of the author but made under the influence of his/her own – target – conceptual and linguistic worldviews. And this is the second instance of clashing worldviews.

The result of clashing worldviews is then manifested in target linguistic means, selecting/manufacturing which the translator bears in mind not only a certain mental formation, but also the available resources of the target language (or, in other words, typological relations between

the source and target languages). At the next stage, the target reader decodes the target variant of the text and forms their own—and once again slightly different from that of the translator’s—view of the alternative reality, which is the third—and final—instance of clashing worldviews.

Proceeding from the above considerations, we may preliminarily conclude that the artistic view of an alternative world can be more or less successfully reincarnated in translation though inevitably with some alterations described in terms of (the three instances of) worldview clashes. And now let us switch to the issue of artlangs translatability.

We assume that artlangs as the main linguistic incarnations of the alternative worldview can be reproduced in translation as successfully as this worldview itself. But if we take artlangs for what they are in regard to their linguistic rather than cognitive essence, namely, intricate stylistic devices, we can see that they fall under a very broad category of translation difficulties, whose successful reproduction is principally possible though dependent heavily on the translator’s skillfulness and creativity.

### 3. Results and discussion

In this section of the paper, we aim at demonstrating some technical aspects of translating artlangs of both a posteriori and a priori types on the example of Newspeak from George Orwell’s “1984” and Old Solar language Hlab-Eribol-ef-Cordi from Clive Staples Lewis’s “Space Trilogy”. First of all, we will try to determine whether artlangs should be translated at all taking into account the fact that they are presumably as alien to the source reader as to the target one. The answer depends on the following concomitant circumstances. The first is the relation between an artlang’s donor language(s) and a piece of fiction’s source language; the second is the relation between a piece of fiction’s source language and its target language; and, finally, the third is the method of an artlang’s formation.

Orwell’s Newspeak is known as the attempt to model the language of the future on the basis of the modern English language by exploiting some real tendencies of its development. For example, the author extends to the maximum the idea of linguistic regularity by abolishing irregular past forms of a verb, irregular plural forms of a noun or irregular comparative/superlative forms of an adjective. Another tendency—towards all kinds of shortenings—is borrowed from the languages of totalitarian regimes of the period, Soviet and German Fascist. By mixing real and surreal, Orwell designs a truly dystopian language to illustrate the grim reality of the future. The donor of Newspeak is English and when the book is translated into another natural language Newspeak is supposed to be translated as well, otherwise Orwell’s ideas and principles underlying his artlang will remain lost for the target reader and Orwell’s view of the future (alternative) world will be distorted irreparably. At the same time, a posteriori structure of Newspeak and word-formation methods employed by the author allow the translator to decode the meanings of the lexemes and to find (more or less successfully) proper means to coin their target equivalents. It’s also important to preserve all the linguistic tendencies outlined by Orwell; otherwise this important element of the artlang’s worldview will be missing. For comparative analysis, we have three translations. The first, by Viktor Shovkun, was published by “Vydavnytstvo Zhupanskoho” in 2015; the second, by Vitaliy Danmer was presented on the Internet-portal “Hurтом” as an amateur translation project in 2013; and the third was made by the authors of this publication as part of their research (that is why we limited our translation to the “Principles of Newspeak” alone). Let us consider the following sentence:

- (1) *Consider, for example, such a typical sentence from a Times leading article as **Oldthinkers unbellyfeel Ingsoc**. The shortest rendering that one could make of this in Oldspeak would be: “Those whose ideas were formed before the Revolution cannot have a full emotional understanding of the principles of English Socialism.” But this is not an adequate translation (Orwell, 1987, p. 250).*

It is one of the few examples of the actual sentence written in Newspeak. Besides, the author supplements it with what we, following Roman Jakobson's terminology, may call an "intralingual translation" (Jakobson, 2000, p. 114). Translation by Viktor Shovkun:

- (2) *Розгляньмо, наприклад, таке типове речення з Таймсу, як as **Oldthinkers unbellyfeel Ingsoc**. Найкоротшим перекладом цього речення Старомовою буде: «Ті, чії ідеї сформувалися до Революції, неспроможні емоційно опанувати принципи Англійського Соціалізму». Але це не зовсім точний переклад (Orvell 2015, с. 286).*

As one can see, contrary to our assumption about the necessity to translate artlangs, Shovkun leaves the Newspeak elements intact inside the Ukrainian context. By rendering Orwell's intralinguistic translation, he gives the target reader more or less coherent idea of the original phrase meaning, but deprives him/her of the original flavor of the artlang's dehumanized unnaturalness. The fairness of our claim is indirectly confirmed by Orwell, who points out that any possible translation of a Newspeak phrase into standard English is far from being 'adequate'. That is because it loses its *Volksgeist*, we may add from ourselves. Translation by Vitaliy Danmer:

- (3) *Розглянемо, наприклад, таке типове речення з передової статті "Часопису" як **СТАРОДУМЦІ НЕЖИВОЧУЮТЬ ІНГСОЦ**. Найкоротшим варіантом перекладу який хтось міг би зробити з цього на Старосурж може бути: "Ті чії переконання були сформовані до даної Революції не в змозі мати повного емоційного розуміння даних принципів Англійського Соціалізму". Але це не є у достатній мірі правильни (Orvell www).*

Danmer pursues the opposite strategy. He recreates the original units by employing the same word-formation methods as Orwell did: 'Oldthinkers' = 'old' + 'thinkers' → 'стародумці' = 'старо' (short from 'старі') + 'думці' ('думець' = 'той, хто думає'); 'unbellyfeel' = 'un' + 'belly' + 'feel' → 'неживочують' = 'не' + 'живо' (from 'живий' instead of 'живіт') + 'чують' (synonym to 'відчувають'); 'Ingsoc' = 'Ing' (short and modified from 'English') + 'soc' (short from 'socialism') → 'Інгсоц' = 'Інг' (short from 'Інгліш', transcribed 'English') + 'соц (short from 'соціалізм'). Some of the translator's decisions seem rather controversial. For example, when he substitutes 'живіт' ('belly') for 'живий' ('alive') and 'відчувати' ('feel') for 'чути' ('hear'); or when he uses transliterated 'інгліш' instead of authentic 'англійський'. We can only assume that at least some of these decisions were dictated by euphonic considerations. Otherwise, Danmer's strategy works well enough to let the target reader feel the artlang's artificiality and complexity on the verge of bureaucracy. This approach helps minimize the distortion of the artistic worldview drawn by Orwell in his dystopian novel.

The third translation was made by the authors of this publication as part of their research project on artlangs' translation:

- (4) *Подивіться, наприклад, на типові речення з передовиці Таймс: «**Стародумники ненутрочують Ангсоц**». Коротко передати його зміст Старомовою можна було б таким чином: "Ті, чії погляди сформувалися до революції, не можуть всім серцем зрозуміти принципи Англійського Соціалізму". Проте такий переклад не є повним (own translation).*

It was made before Danmer's version of "1984" was uploaded for public use. In general, our strategy is similar to that in the previous example: 'Oldthinkers' = 'old' + 'thinkers' → 'стародумники' = 'старо' (short from 'старі') + 'думники' ('думник' = 'той, хто думає'); 'unbellyfeel' = 'un' + 'belly' + 'feel' → 'ненутрочують' = 'не' + 'нутро' + 'чують' (instead of 'відчувають'); 'Ingsoc' =

‘Ing’ (short and modified from ‘English’) + ‘soc’ (short from ‘socialism’) → ‘Ангсоц’ = ‘Анг’ (short from ‘англійський’) + ‘соц’ (short from ‘соціалізм’).

The similarity between the resulting target fragments can be explained by the same method of translation (namely, loan translation, or calque) and limited number of possible Ukrainian options for most words or their component morphemes, like ‘English’, ‘socialist’, ‘old’, etc. At the same time, our translation seems to avoid some of Danmer’s controversies, in particular those connected with translating ‘belly’ (we offered variant ‘нутро’ bearing in mind Ukrainian expression ‘чутти / відчувати нутром’ – ‘to feel something intuitively, subconsciously’, which in our eyes is very close to what Orwell describes as “a full emotional understanding” (1987, p. 250) and ‘Ing’ (we believe that to those unfamiliar with the peculiarities of English pronunciation option ‘Анг’ is undoubtedly more preferable than ‘інг’).

The above analysis confirms not only the principal translatability of an a posteriori artlang, but also the relevant possibility of rendering the concomitant worldview infused into it by the author of the source text. We can also see quite clearly the inevitable alterations in the artistic worldview resulting from both the translator’s interpretation (the first instance of clashing worldviews) and the switch to another natural donor language and its cultural environment (the second instance of clashing worldviews).

Now let us explore similarly the translation of an a priori artlang, which in our case is Old Solar language Hlab-Eribol-ef-Cordi from Lewis’s “Space Trilogy”. Unlike Newspeak, it only borrows from its donor, presumably English or Latin, phonemes and their graphic representations – letters. It makes Old Solar’s words undecipherable both morphemically and (in most cases) contextually. It also means that the author’s commentaries are to be added for the reader to be able to understand them. The situation with translating a priori artlangs brings to mind language Jungle imagined by American philosopher Willard Quine to illustrate his principle of indeterminacy of translation (Quine, 2013). Quine considers a situation when translation is made from a language whose bearers do not speak any other languages and which is so far unknown to bearers of other languages and is not related to any other known languages. Quine describes such translation as ‘radical’ and presupposes that all possible interpretations of Jungle utterances made by the translator are inevitably arbitrary and thus may differ from interpretations by other translators. In fact, the hero of Lewis’s novel finds himself in an analogous position trying to decipher the speech of aliens basing on his observations and resulting outcome.

Lewis uses Latin alphabet for transcribing the words of his artlang. It means that these words can be transposed without any visible change into any language that also uses Latin alphabet (even with modifications). At the same time, for translations into languages with different alphabetic systems (which is the case with the Ukrainian language) some other strategy should be followed. Since Old Solar’s words have no morphemic division, they can be either transliterated or transcribed. For the languages, where spelling is close to pronunciation, this differentiation is irrelevant, but for the English-based a priori artlang this issue gains importance. Actually, the choice here lies with the interpreter, but if they opt for reproducing the phonetic side of the artlang rather than the graphic one, they should have a rather clear idea of what it is like. In our case, we have some useful insights from the author himself: “When asked about names he created in his Space Trilogy, such as Glund (Jupiter) and Viritribia (Mercury), Lewis replied that they were not connected to any actual language. He explained, ‘I am always playing with syllables and fitting them together (purely by ear) to see if I can hatch up new words that please me. I want them to have an emotional, not intellectual, suggestiveness’” (Downing, 2005, p. 137).

If the author was composing Old Solar’s words “purely by ear”, we may conclude that their pronouncing was more important for him than spelling and, consequently, the interpreter should be more oriented towards transcription as the main method of translation if they aspire to cause as little damage to the view of the fantastic world portrayed by Lewis. Here appears another question: How are the artlang’s words actually pronounced? Hypothetically, three answers are possible: (1) following

pronunciation rules of the English language; (2) following the Latin rule ‘one letter – one sound’; (3) following specific rules as invented by the author and inherent to this artlang alone.

The book does not mention any specific phonological rules of Old Solar, we do not find them in any paratexts (Lewis’s letters, interviews, memoirs, etc.) either, thus the interpreter should choose between the first two options. Meanwhile, we could assume that since Elwin Ransom, who ‘discovered’ Old Solar was a philologist, a studier of languages, he would not follow English spelling conventions, but would, instead, assign one Latin letter to each sound. This assumption sounds quite plausible as the author’s rejection from English rules of reading allows him to alienate Old Solar from its natural donor.

In fact, in regard to English – Ukrainian translation due to phonological differences and euphonic considerations it is virtually impossible to follow transliteration or transcription strictly, that is why in many cases we have a mixture of both. This observation is proved by some examples from Lewis’s novel “Out of the Silent Planet” (in the Ukrainian translation by Andriy Masliukh “За межі мовчазної планети”).

In example (6), the translator clearly gives preference to transliteration:

- (5) *You have done very well, **Гноо**, said Oyarsa. Stand away that I may see it, for now I will speak to it* (Lewis www).
- (6) – *Ви все зробили дуже добре, **Гноо**, – мовив Оярса. – А тепер відійдіть, щоб я його побачив. Мені треба з ним поговорити* (Liuis, 2010, p. 135).

According to the rules of English reading, word combination ‘oo’ should be pronounced as [u:]; then transcribed variant of translation would be ‘Гну’ instead of ‘Гноо’. But if we accept the ‘one letter – one sound’ principle presupposed above, it turns out that transliteration here coincides with transcription. In the following example, our attention is drawn to another combination of vowels— ‘au’:

- (7) *No **hнау** can match them in making and shaping things as none can match us in singing* (Lewis www).
- (8) *Ніхто з **гнау** не зрівняється з ними у виготовленні всілякої всячини, як, приміром, ніхто не зрівняється з нами у співі* (Liuis, 2010, p. 76).

Once again, Masliukh transliterates the source lexeme; in case of transcribing it according to the rules of English reading, the Ukrainian variant would be ‘гну’. According to our earlier assumption, in this case the combination of vowels should be pronounced as two separate sounds, and that is exactly the way it is reproduced by the translator in Cyrillic.

Next, we have another example that breaks the established pattern:

- (9) *Up this he must go, and somewhere beyond the tops of the mountains he would come to the tower of **Augray**. **Augray** would help him. He could cut weed for his food before he left the forest and came into the rock country* (Lewis www).
- (10) *Цією дорогою треба підніматися вгору, і вже десь там, за вершинами гір, він побачить вежу **Огрея**. **Огрей** йому допоможе. Перед тим, як залишити ліс і податися в гори, варто запастися їстівною травою* (Liuis, 2010, p. 123).

As one can see, reproducing the character’s name the translator transcribes the initial combination of vowels instead of transliterating it (which would be in Ukrainian ‘ay’—‘Аурпей’) like he did in the

previous cases. It is hard to guess what motivated this decision, but obviously neither systemic ('Аурпей' is as pronounceable as 'Орпей') nor euphonic (neither variant provokes any unpleasant phonetic associations with Ukrainian readers) considerations. What this fact demonstrates is that translators do not always follow strictly certain patterns or strategies in their work which fact falls under the concept of the legendary 'human factor'. In situations broadly described as 'translation difficulties', translators often sketch up several possible variants, which they test contextually before giving preference to one particular variant (which again can be changed more than once at the later stages of translation and editing processes). Final option is often made intuitively when the translator themselves cannot explain their motivation coherently.

Take, for instance, the situation with consonant 'l'. In the Ukrainian translation, Masliukh does not palatalize it contrary to the Russian translation by Sergey Koshelev, Maria Mushinskaya and Anna Kazanskaya (that we use occasionally for comparative analysis). Compare:

(11) *The island is all full of **eldila**, said the hross in a hushed voice* (Lewis www).  
– *На острові сила-силенна **елділів**, – мовив грос приглушеним голосом* (Liuys, 2010, p. 112).

(12) – *На острові множество **эльдилов**, – шепотом произнес хросс* (Liuys www).

Palatalization of 'л' in the Russian translation is expressed with the help of the soft sign while in the Ukrainian translation it is absent. The same pattern is observed in the majority of cases, but then we come across the following nonce formation:

(13) *It became plain that **Maleldil** was a spirit without body, parts or passions. – He is not a hnau, said the hrossa. – What is hnau? asked Ransom. – You are hnau. I am hnau. The seroni are hnau. The **pfifltriggi** are hnau* (Lewis www).

(14) *Невдовзі стало зрозуміло, що **Малелділ** – це неподільний, безплотний та безпристрасний дух. – Він – не гнау, – пояснили гроси. – Що таке гнау? – запитав Ренсом. – Ти – гнау. Я – гнау. Сероні – гнау. **Пфіфльтригі** – гнау* (Liuys, 2010, p. 76).

(15) *Он уяснил, что **Малельдил** – неделимый дух, лишенный тела и страстей. – Он – не хнау, – объяснили хроссы. – Что такое хнау? – спросил Рэнсом. – Ты – хнау. Я – хнау. Серони – хнау. **Пфифльтригги** – хнау* (Liuys www).

The word 'pfifltriggi' denoting one of the space races is extremely uncomfortable for pronouncing in English, as well as in Ukrainian due to the atypical for these languages accumulation of consonants. Meanwhile 'л' is predictably palatalized in the Russian translation and—quite unpredictably—in the Ukrainian one, which we treat as yet another case of pattern-breaking.

In general, we believe that the role of a priori artlangs in objectifying the view of an alternative world is less important than that of a posteriori ones. It can be explained by that simple fact that manufactured (i.e. composed of phonemes rather than morphemes) words are devoid of inner form, which, reconsidering Alexander Potebnia's legacy, can be defined as a certain idea / feature / characteristic underlying the concept that has been retained in the word (Potebnia, 1913). In a broader sense, the inner form of a word is understood as a semantic and structural correlation of morphemes within a word with other morphemes of that particular language. In other words, inner form of a word is that quite ephemeral substance that inextricably ties each a posteriori artlang to its donor(s) and eventually determines its inner form as a language in general.

As opposed to morpheme-based words from a posteriori artlangs, the meanings of a priori artlangs' words are decoded in their contextual descriptions, thus they sort of remain outside these



words and in this form can be transferred into the target text with minimal losses and, correspondingly, with minimal distortion of the artistic view of an alternative world. On the other hand, this artistic worldview remains maximally vague in both original and translation, unavailable for the reader's intentional perception due to the absence of any clear reference between their constituents' form and meaning (i.e. the absence of their inner form).

#### 4. Conclusions

The research provides for some tentative conclusions that obviously should be further validated by more comprehensive investigations into the problem of reproducing different types of the worldview (linguistic, artistic, etc.) in translation. The problem was considered on the material of artlangs as the most demonstrative linguistic element of the alternative world's artistic view. The research exposed three instances of worldview clashes connected with the perception, interpretation and translation of a piece of fiction depicting an alternative reality. The first refers to any situation when the reader (no matter, source or target) decodes the book and recreates in his/her mind the author's artistic worldview, because the resulting 'picture' is never identical to the original one due to the uniqueness of human processing both linguistic and extralinguistic information. The other two instances refer to the situation of translation itself. The second instance of clashing worldviews takes place when the translator reads the original piece of fiction composed by the author, because the image of an alternative world being formed in his/her mind is indeed the projection of that of the author but made under the influence of his/her own – target – conceptual and linguistic worldviews. Finally, the third instance of clashing worldviews takes place when the target reader retrieves information from the translated variant of the text and forms his/her own—and once again slightly different from that of the translator—view of the alternative reality.

Artlangs' principal translatability is determined by their inextricable ties with their natural donor language(s), though in practice of literary translation their reproduction is a highly demanding creative act whose outcome depends on such concomitant circumstances as. Here we distinguish the following: the relation between an artlang's donor language(s) and a piece of fiction's source language; the relation between a piece of fiction's source language and its target language; and, finally, the method of an artlang's manufacturing.

#### References

- Bartminski, J. (2012). *Aspects of cognitive ethnolinguistics*. London, Sheffield: Equinox Publishing.
- Downing, D. C. (2005). *Into the Wardrobe: C. S. Lewis and the Narnia Chronicles*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jakobson, R. (2000). On linguistic aspects of translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (pp. 113–118). New York: Routledge.
- Martyniuk, A. P. (2012). *Slovnyk osnovnykh terminiv kohnityvno-dyskursyvnoi linhvistyky* [The dictionary of the basic terms of cognitive and discursive linguistics]. Kharkiv: KhNU imeni V. N. Karazina.
- Potebnia, A. A. (1913). *Mysl y yazyk. Yazyk y narodnost. O natsyonalizme* [Thought and language. Language and nation. About nationalism]. Kharkov: Typohrafiya "Myrnyi trud".
- Quine, W. V. (2013). *Word and object. Foreword by Patricia Smith Churchland; preface to the new edition by Dagfinn Føllesdal*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England: The MIT Press.
- Stria, I. (2018). Linguistic worldview in multilingual groups as an indicator of developing a communal identity: The case of Esperanto. *Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury*, 30, 5–229. <https://doi.org/10.17951/et.2018.30.215>
- Tolkien, J. R. R., (1983). A Secret Vice. In Ch. Tolkien (Ed.), *The Monsters and the critics and other essays* (pp. 198–223). London: George Allen and Unwin.

**Sources for illustrations**

- Lewis, C. S. (n.d.). *Out of the Silent Planet*. Retrieved from <https://freeditorial.com/en/books/out-of-the-silent-planet>
- Liuis, K. S. (2010). *Za mezhi movchaznoi planety. Perelandra. Kosmichna trylohiia* [Out of the Silent Planet. Perelandra. The Space Trilogy]. Translated by A. Masliukh. Lviv: Svichado (in Ukrainian).
- Liuis, K. S. (n. d.). *Za predely bezmolvnoi planety* [Out of the Silent Planet]. Translated by S. Koshelev, M. Mushinskaya, & A. Kazanskaya. Retrieved from <https://bookshake.net/b/za-predely-bezmolvnoy-planety-klayv-steyplyz-lyuis>
- Orwell, G. 1984 (1987). *1984*. New York and Scarborough, Ontario: A Signet Classic.
- Orvell, Dzh. (2015). *1984*. Translated by V. Shovkun. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo Zhupanskooho (in Ukrainian).
- Orvell, Dzh. (n. d.). *1984*. Translated by V. Danmer. Retrieved from [https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Orwell\\_George/1984/](https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Orwell_George/1984/) (in Ukrainian).

**ПЕРЕКЛАД АРТЛАНГІВ: ЗІТКНЕННЯ КАРТИН СВІТУ****Олександр Ребрій**

доктор філологічних наук, професор,  
Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна  
(майдан Свободи 4, 61022, Харків, Україна)  
e-mail: [rebrii1967@gmail.com](mailto:rebrii1967@gmail.com); ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4912-7489>

**Євгенія Бондаренко**

доктор філологічних наук, професор,  
Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна  
(майдан Свободи 4, 61022, Харків, Україна)  
e-mail: [ievgeniia.bondarenko.2014@gmail.com](mailto:ievgeniia.bondarenko.2014@gmail.com); ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0654-1791>

**Інна Ребрій**

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,  
Харківський національний університет Повітряних Сил імені Івана Кожедуба  
(вул. Сумська 77/79, 61023, Харків, Україна)  
e-mail: [inna.rebrij@gmail.com](mailto:inna.rebrij@gmail.com); ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1008-0142>

**Анотація**

Дослідження присвячено проблемі перекладу артлангів як засобу втілення картини альтернативного світу. Об'єкт дослідження подвійний: картина світу у її мовному вимірі та артланги – художні мови, що створюються в межах художнього дискурсу переважно з експресивною метою. Мета дослідження є так само подвійною: визначити, яка саме картина світу відбивається в артлангу і як її можна відтворити в перекладі. Наша перша гіпотеза окреслює три прояви зіткнень картин світу, пов'язаних з особливостями сприйняття, інтерпретації та власне перекладу художнього твору, в якому за допомогою артлангу змальовано альтернативну реальність. Перший відбувається, коли читач розкодує текст та відтворює у свідомості художню картину світу автора, адже той образ, що в нього виникає, ніколи не дорівнює первинному завдяки унікальності процесу обробки інформації. Другий прояв має місце в процесі перекладу, адже образ альтернативного світу у свідомості перекладача певною мірою є проекцією авторського, але формується під впливом його власного (цільового) світобачення та актуалізується за рахунок наявних ресурсів цільової мови. Третій випадок спостерігається, коли цільовий читач вилучає інформацію з друготвору і знову формує свої власне уявлення про зображену альтернативну реальність. Відповідно до нашої другої гіпотези, принципова перекладність артлангів визначається нерозривними зв'язками з природними мовами-донорами, хоча їхнє відтворення є надзвичайно складним творчим процесом, результат якого зумовлюється дією низки супутніх обставин, таких як: відносини між мовою-донором та мовою, якою написаний твір; відносини між вихідною та цільовою мовами твору; спосіб створення артлангу.

**Ключові слова:** альтернативна реальність, артланг, зіткнення, картина світу, перекладність.